

The Long Memory of Order Flow in the Foreign Exchange Spot Market

Martin D. Gould^{*†‡}, Mason A. Porter^{§¶}, and Sam D. Howison^{§||}

‡ CFM–Imperial Institute of Quantitative Finance, Imperial College, London SW7 2AZ

§ Oxford Centre for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Mathematical Institute, University of Oxford, Oxford OX2 6GG

¶ CABDyN Complexity Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 1HP

|| Oxford–Man Institute of Quantitative Finance, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX2 6ED

July 28, 2022

Abstract

We study the long memory of order flow for each of three liquid currency pairs on a large electronic trading platform in the foreign exchange (FX) spot market. Due to the extremely high levels of market activity on the platform, and in contrast to existing empirical studies of other markets, our data enables us to perform statistically stable estimation without needing to aggregate data from different trading days. We find strong evidence of long memory, with a Hurst exponent of $H \approx 0.7$, for each of the three currency pairs and on each trading day in our sample. We repeat our calculations using data that spans different trading days, and we find no significant differences in our results. We test and reject the hypothesis that the apparent long memory of order flow is an artefact caused by structural breaks, in favour of the alternative hypothesis of true long memory. We therefore conclude that the long memory of order flow in the FX spot market is a robust empirical property that persists across daily boundaries.

Keywords: Long memory; autocorrelation; foreign exchange market; order flow; market microstructure.

*Corresponding author. Email: m.gould@imperial.ac.uk.

†MDG completed part of this work while at the University of Oxford.

1 Introduction

The autocorrelation properties of financial time series have been the subject of fierce statistical debate for more than 50 years [17, 20, 29, 45, 47]. Several important properties of financial markets have been reported to exhibit autocorrelations that decay slowly, often over periods of days or even months [10, 11, 15, 20, 33, 55]. These observations have prompted some authors to conjecture that some financial time series exhibit a phenomenon known as *long memory* [3, 6, 17], by which the decay of autocorrelation is sufficiently slow that the sum of terms in their autocorrelation function (ACF) diverges to infinity.

In recent decades, the widespread uptake of electronic limit order books (LOBs) [31] in many financial markets has facilitated the recording of order-flow data, which provides a detailed description of traders' actions and interactions at the microscopic scale. The availability of such data has ignited interest in the possibility that financial markets might exhibit long memory at the level of individual order flow, and several empirical studies during the past decade have reported this to be the case in a wide range of different markets [13, 42, 56, 71].

In a recent publication, Axioglou and Skouras [2] challenged this view. They noted that in order to construct sufficiently long time series to perform statistically stable estimation, existing studies of long memory in order flow have aggregated data from different trading days. They argued that the apparent long memory reported by many studies is mostly an artefact caused by aggregating the data in this way. Specifically, they argued that the statistical properties of order flow change each day, and that concatenating order-flow series from different trading days creates nonstationarities at the boundaries between daily series. Many statistical tests are known to produce similar output for nonstationary series as they do for stationary series with long memory [8, 28, 32]. Therefore, distinguishing between these alternatives is a difficult task.

Assessing whether or not order flow really is a long-memory process is important for several reasons. From a practical perspective, the present values of a long-memory process are correlated with values in the distant future [6], so identifying and quantifying the strength of long memory is useful for forecasting. From a theoretical perspective, several recent publications suggest that long-range autocorrelations in order flow may hold the key to understanding the complex statistical properties of price formation in financial markets, such as price impact, volatility, and the heavy-tailed distribution of returns [12, 24, 26, 70, 72]. Moreover, if order flow really is a long-memory process, then identifying the sources of long-range autocorrelations may provide insight into traders' strategic decision-making processes [19, 71].

In this paper, we perform an empirical study of a new, high-quality data set from a large electronic trading platform in the foreign exchange (FX) market to assess the long-memory properties of order flow for 3 liquid currency pairs. Due to the extremely high levels of market activity on the platform, and in contrast to existing empirical studies of other markets, our data enables us to perform statistically stable estimates of the long-memory properties of order flow without needing to aggregate data from different trading days. We are therefore able

to exclude the possibility that our results are influenced by nonstationarities at the boundaries between different trading days, and we thereby avoid Axioglou and Skouras' [2] criticism of previous studies.

We employ a wide range of estimators and techniques to investigate the long-memory properties of the order flow that we study. For each of the 3 currency pairs, and on all trading days in our sample, we find strong, statistically significant evidence for long memory in order flow. At small lags, we also uncover negative autocorrelations that, to our knowledge, have not been reported elsewhere in the literature.

To investigate how aggregating data from different trading days impacts our results, we also concatenate pairs of adjacent intra-day order-flow series to create cross-day series that span daily boundaries. We repeat all of our calculations on these cross-day series, and we find that our results are very similar to those for the intra-day series. We test and reject the hypothesis that the apparent long memory in the cross-day series is an artefact caused by a structural break at the daily boundaries, in favour of the alternative hypothesis of true long memory. We therefore conclude that the long memory of order flow in the FX spot market is a robust empirical property that persists across daily boundaries.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we present a technical overview of long memory. In Section 3, we provide a detailed discussion of long memory in order flow. In Section 4, we review the findings of several empirical studies of this effect in other markets. We describe our data in Section 5, and we discuss our methodology for constructing intra-day and cross-day order-flow series in Section 6. We present our main results in Section 7, and we discuss our findings in Section 8. We conclude in Section 9. In A, we discuss the statistical techniques that we use throughout the paper.

2 Long-Memory Processes

Let

$$\{W_t\} = W_1, W_2, \dots \quad (1)$$

denote a real-valued, second-order stationary¹ time series with mean

$$\mathbb{E}(W_t) = \mu, \quad (2)$$

autocovariance function

$$\gamma(k) = \text{cov}(W_t, W_{t+|k|}), \quad (3)$$

and autocorrelation function (ACF)

$$\rho(k) = \frac{\gamma(k)}{\gamma(0)}. \quad (4)$$

¹A time series $\{W_t\}$ is *second-order stationary* if its first and second moments are finite and do not vary with time [16, 66].

2.1 Short Memory

The time series $\{W_t\}$ is said to exhibit *short memory* if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-N}^N |\rho(k)| < \infty. \quad (5)$$

For example, if $\{W_t\}$ is an AR(1) process [3]

$$W_t = \phi W_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (6)$$

where $|\phi| < 1$ and ε_t is uncorrelated Gaussian noise, then

$$|\rho(k)| \sim \phi^{-k} \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, by the convergence properties of geometric series,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-N}^N |\rho(k)| < \infty, \quad (8)$$

so $\{W_t\}$ is a short-memory process.

2.2 Long Memory

The time series $\{W_t\}$ is said to exhibit *long memory* if

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=-N}^N |\rho(k)| = \infty. \quad (9)$$

One way in which a time series can exhibit long memory is if there exists some constant $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $\rho(k)$ decays asymptotically as a power of k :

$$\rho(k) \sim k^{-\alpha} L(k), \quad k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (10)$$

where L is a slowly varying function² [17, 42, 43]. Smaller values of α correspond to slower decay of the long-range autocorrelations in $\{W_t\}$ [12, 42].

2.3 Spectral Density

The long-memory properties of $\{W_t\}$ can also be characterized by the behaviour of its *spectral density* [6]

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma(k) e^{-ik\lambda} \quad (11)$$

²A function L is *slowly varying* if $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L(zk)}{L(k)} = 1$ for all $z > 0$.

in the limit $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. If there exists a constant $l \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$f(\lambda) \rightarrow l \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0, \quad (12)$$

then $\{W_t\}$ is a short-memory process. If, by contrast, there exists a constant $\beta \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$f(\lambda) \sim \lambda^{-\beta} \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow 0, \quad (13)$$

then $\{W_t\}$ is a long-memory process. Larger values of β correspond to slower decay of the long-range autocorrelations in $\{W_t\}$ [6].

2.4 The Rescaled-Range Statistic and the Hurst Exponent

Let

$$\bar{W}_k = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=t+1}^{t+k} W_j. \quad (14)$$

The *rescaled-range statistic* [52] is the ratio

$$Q(t, k) = \frac{R(t, k)}{S(t, k)}, \quad (15)$$

where, for $t, k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$,

$$R(t, k) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left[\sum_{j=t+1}^{t+i} (W_j - \bar{W}_k) \right] - \min_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left[\sum_{j=t+1}^{t+i} (W_j - \bar{W}_k) \right] \quad (16)$$

and

$$S^2(t, k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{j=t+1}^{t+k} (W_j - \bar{W}_k)^2. \quad (17)$$

The rescaled-range statistic Q measures the range of partial sums of deviations of the time series $\{W_1, W_2, \dots\}$ from its mean, rescaled by an estimate of its standard deviation [45]. The following theorem by Mandelbrot [48] provides a relationship between a time series' long-range autocorrelations and its rescaled-range statistic.

Theorem 2.1. *If $\{W_t\}$ is a second-order stationary process such that W_t^2 is ergodic and $t^{-H} \sum_{i=1}^t W_i$ converges weakly to a fractional Brownian motion³ with parameter H as $t \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$k^{-H} Q(t, k) \xrightarrow{d} \eta \text{ as } k \rightarrow \infty, \quad (18)$$

where η is a nondegenerate random variable and \xrightarrow{d} denotes convergence in distribution.

³A *fractional Brownian motion* [49] is a Gaussian process $B_H(t)$ with zero drift that satisfies $B_H(0) = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[B_H(t)B_H(s)] = \frac{1}{2} (|t|^{2H} + |s|^{2H} - |t-s|^{2H})$ for some $H \in (0, 1)$.

The constant H is called the *Hurst exponent* of $\{W_t\}$ [6, 37, 50, 51, 52, 53]. A time series with a Hurst exponent of $H = 1/2$ is a short-memory process. For a long-memory process that satisfies the conditions of Theorem 2.1, H is related to α in Equation (10) by

$$H = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \quad (19)$$

and to β in Equation (13) by

$$H = \frac{\beta + 1}{2}. \quad (20)$$

2.5 Empirical Assessment of Long Memory

In many empirical situations, it is common to observe only a single, finite-length realization $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ of $\{W_t\}$. If the statistical properties of $\{W_t\}$ are unknown, then estimating the long-memory properties of $\{W_t\}$ from $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ entails considerable challenges [5, 6, 54].

For an empirically observed time series $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$, let

$$\bar{w} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i \quad (21)$$

denote the sample mean, let

$$\hat{\gamma}(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-|k|} (w_{i+|k|} - \bar{w})(w_i - \bar{w}) \quad (22)$$

denote the sample autocovariance function, and let

$$\hat{\rho}(k) = \frac{\hat{\gamma}(k)}{\hat{\gamma}(0)} \quad (23)$$

denote the sample ACF. It is very difficult to estimate the large- k decay of $\rho(k)$ from $\hat{\rho}$, so direct estimation of the long-memory properties of $\{W_t\}$ from $\hat{\gamma}$ often produces very poor results [42]. Instead, most empirical studies employ heuristic methods for this task (see [65] for a detailed discussion). The performance of such techniques on empirically observed series varies considerably, so it is common for empirical studies to evaluate the output of several heuristic methods rather than relying on a single estimator. We provide a detailed description of the techniques that we use throughout the paper in A.

2.6 Long Memory versus Nonstationarity

A key difficulty with assessing the long-memory properties of empirically observed time series is that many estimation techniques can produce similar output for a nonstationary series (e.g., a series with a monotonic trend [8] or change

in mean [28, 32]) as they do for a stationary series with long memory [62, 65, 73]. Several authors have thereby argued that the apparent long memory reported by empirical studies of financial time series is actually an artefact caused by non-stationarities [2, 7, 44, 57]. Assessing whether or not this is the case is important for two reasons. First, observing a long history of a long-memory process significantly improves forecasts [6], whereas including too many previous values can instead *harm* forecasts for nonstationary series [7]. Second, understanding the structure of a time series can help to illuminate the data-generating mechanism. For example, estimating the times at which a series undergoes a change in mean can help to identify important events in the underlying process [32].

Disentangling the statistical properties of a time series with long memory and a time series with nonstationarities is a difficult task, and the choice of whether to model such time series using a long-memory model or a nonstationary model often depends on the desired application. Long-memory models are parsimonious, straightforward to simulate, and there are many techniques that require only mild assumptions to estimate their parameters from data [6]. Nonstationary models can illuminate important features of an underlying series (such as the locations and frequency of structural breaks) that are not addressed by long-memory models, but they typically require the inclusion of either a large number of parameters (which can lead to over-fitting) or latent parameters (which can be difficult to estimate from data).

3 The Long Memory of Order Flow

3.1 Limit Order Books

More than half of the world’s financial markets utilize LOBs to facilitate trade [64]. In contrast to quote-driven systems, in which prices are set by designated market makers, trade in an LOB occurs via a continuous double-auction mechanism whereby institutions submit orders. An *order* $x = (p_x, \omega_x, t_x)$ submitted at time t_x with price p_x and size $\omega_x > 0$ (respectively, $\omega_x < 0$) is a commitment by its owner to sell (respectively, buy) up to $|\omega_x|$ units of the asset at a price no less than (respectively, no greater than) p_x .

Whenever an institution submits a buy (respectively, sell) order x , an LOB’s trade-matching algorithm checks whether it is possible for x to *match to* an active sell (respectively, buy) order y such that $p_y \leq p_x$ (respectively, $p_y \geq p_x$). If so, the matching occurs immediately and the owners of the relevant orders agree a trade for the specified amount at the specified price. If not, then x becomes *active*, and it remains active until either it matches to an incoming sell (respectively, buy) order, or it is *cancelled*.

Orders that result in an immediate matching upon arrival are called *market orders*. Orders that do not — instead becoming active orders — are called *limit orders*.⁴ The *LOB* $\mathcal{L}(t)$ is the set of all active orders for a given asset on a given

⁴Some platforms allow other order types (such as fill-or-kill, stop-loss, or peg orders [38]), but it is always possible to decompose the resulting order flow into limit and/or market orders.

platform at a given time t . For a detailed introduction to LOBs, see [31].

Many LOBs record comprehensive digital transcriptions of order flow on a given platform. These transcriptions provide an event-by-event account of the temporal evolution of $\mathcal{L}(t)$, and they thereby enable detailed empirical analysis of financial markets at the microscopic scale [18].

3.2 Order-Sign Series

In this paper, we perform an empirical analysis of the long-memory properties of two different order-flow series. Given a sequence of N consecutive arrivals of limit orders into $\mathcal{L}(t)$, the *order-arrival series*

$$\omega_{x_1}, \omega_{x_2}, \dots, \omega_{x_N} \quad (24)$$

is the time series of the arriving orders' sizes. Similarly, given a sequence of M consecutive departures of active orders from $\mathcal{L}(t)$, the *order-departure series*

$$\omega_{x'_1}, \omega_{x'_2}, \dots, \omega_{x'_M} \quad (25)$$

is the time series of the departing active orders' sizes. An entry in the order-arrival series always corresponds to the arrival of a new limit order, but an entry in the order-departure series can occur either because an active order is cancelled or because an incoming market order triggers a matching and thereby removes a limit order from $\mathcal{L}(t)$. Together, the order-arrival series and order-departure series completely determine the temporal evolution of $\mathcal{L}(t)$.

When studying the long-memory properties of order-flow series, it is customary to study not the time series of order sizes directly, but rather the corresponding time series of *order signs*. Specifically, for a given order x_i of size ω_{x_i} , the order sign L_i is given by

$$L_i = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if } \omega_{x_i} < 0, \\ +1, & \text{if } \omega_{x_i} > 0. \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Recall from Section 3.1 that an order has negative size if and only if it is a buy order. Therefore, an order-sign series is simply a time series of ± 1 s, where -1 entries correspond to buy-order activity and $+1$ entries correspond to sell-order activity.

The reason for studying time series of order signs — instead of the corresponding time series of order sizes — is that empirical studies of a large variety of different markets have reported that order sizes often vary over several orders of magnitude (see [31] for a recent survey of empirical studies of LOBs). This brings into question the convergence properties of higher-order moments of time series of order sizes. By contrast, studying only the time series of order signs guarantees that all moments exist, while still providing insight into the long-range autocorrelation properties of buy and sell activity in order flow.

Therefore, we study LOBs in terms of these simple building blocks.

4 Literature Review

Early studies of the autocorrelation properties of order flow tended to focus on short-range (i.e., small-lag) autocorrelations in order-sign series. Hasbrouck [34] studied the order-sign series for trades on the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) during March–April 1985. He reported that lag-one autocorrelations were strongly positive, and that the mean sample ACF across all stocks in the sample was positive up to lags of at least 200. Biais *et al.* [9] studied order-sign series for market orders, limit orders, and cancellations for 40 stocks traded on the Paris Bourse in 1991. For each type of order flow, they reported that any given event type (e.g., buy market order) was likely to be followed by another event of the same type. Ellul *et al.* [23] and Yeo [74] both reported similar findings for activity on the NYSE during 2001.

More recent work has focussed on the long-memory properties of order-sign series. Lillo and Farmer [42] studied order-sign series for limit order arrivals, market order arrivals, and cancellations for 20 stocks on the London Stock Exchange (LSE) during 1999–2002. They used a wide range of statistical techniques and estimators to test and reject the hypothesis that these series were short-memory series, in favour of the alternative hypothesis of long memory. They also estimated the Hurst exponent for each series and reported a mean value of $H \approx 0.7$. The cross-sectional variation in H across the stocks that they studied was small but significant. Because their sample ACFs contained no significant peaks or breaks corresponding to the length of a single trading day, Lillo and Farmer argued that long memory in order flow persists across daily boundaries. They also repeated their experiments on similar data from the NYSE and found similar results.

Bouchaud *et al.* [13] studied long-range autocorrelations in the order-sign series for market orders on Euronext in 2001–2002. For all of the stocks that they studied, they reported that the sample ACFs decayed approximately according to a power law. They estimated each stock’s power-law exponent directly from its sample ACF and reported values that correspond to Hurst exponents (see Equation (19)) ranging from $H \approx 0.65$ to $H \approx 0.9$. Similarly to Lillo and Farmer’s results for the LSE [42], Bouchaud *et al.* argued that long-range autocorrelations in order flow persist across daily boundaries.

Mike and Farmer [56] studied order-sign series of both market orders and limit orders for 25 stocks traded on the LSE during 2000–2002. The authors used detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) (see A.3) to estimate the Hurst exponent for each stock and reported values in the range from $H \approx 0.75$ to $H \approx 0.88$, with a mean of $H \approx 0.83$ across all stocks.

To date, two mechanisms have been proposed to explain the slow decay of autocorrelations in order-flow series. The first is that traders display *herding* behaviour, either because they all respond similarly to common information or because they monitor each other’s actions and update their strategies by imitating those of their most successful competitors [41]. The second is that traders who wish to perform large trades decompose them into smaller chunks, which they submit over several days (or even months) to minimize their market

impact [12, 13, 43]. This strategy is commonly known as *order-splitting*.

Gerig [26] assessed the plausibility of these two explanations by studying order-flow series from the LSE during 2000-2002. In contrast to most LOB data sets, Gerig’s data included information about the broker that submitted each order. This enabled him to compare the autocorrelation properties of order flow generated by individual brokers to those of the aggregate order flow generated by all brokers. He reported that correlations across different brokers decayed quickly to 0, but that autocorrelations in order flow from individual brokers exhibited long memory. He thereby argued that order-splitting is a much more plausible explanation for long memory in order flow than is herding. Tóth *et al.* [71] also studied data containing brokerage identifiers from the LSE (over the period 2000–2009), and reached a similar conclusion.

Recently, however, Axioglou and Skouras [2] challenged the existence of long memory in order flow by arguing that this apparent effect was mainly an artefact caused by nonstationarities in the underlying order-flow series. They noted that in order to construct sufficiently long time series to perform statistically stable estimation of long-range autocorrelations, existing studies of long memory in order flow have aggregated data from different trading days, and they conjectured that doing so produces order-flow series with structural breaks at the daily boundaries.

To test this hypothesis, the authors studied the order-sign series for market orders on the LSE during 2005–2006. They first aggregated data from several different trading days, and they noted that standard statistical tests applied to this data concluded strongly in favour of long memory. They then constructed shorter time series by aggregating data across pairs of consecutive trading days. They applied the cumulative-sum change-point estimator (see A.5) to these series, and they were able to detect the daily boundaries with high accuracy. They then applied Berkes’ change-point test to formally test the hypothesis that the apparent long memory in the cross-day series was actually due to a structural break. Working at the 5% significance level, they could not reject the null hypothesis of a piecewise stationary series with a structural break in favour of the alternative hypothesis of true long memory in about two thirds of the order-flow series that they studied. They concluded that although order flow exhibited significant autocorrelations within a single trading day, these autocorrelations did not persist across daily boundaries.

5 Data

We have been granted access to a high-quality data set from Hotspot FX [38, 39, 40], which is one of the largest multi-institution trading platforms in the FX spot market [60]. The platform serves a broad range of trading professionals — including banks, financial institutions, hedge funds, high-frequency traders, corporations, and commodity trading advisers [39].

The data describes the full order-arrival and order-departure series (see Section 3.2) for the EUR/USD (Euro/US dollar), GBP/USD (Pounds sterling/US

dollar), and EUR/GBP (Euro/Pounds sterling) currency pairs⁵ between the hours of 08:00:00–17:00:00 GMT on 30 trading days during May–June 2010. According to the 2013 Triennial Central Bank Survey [4], global trade for EUR/USD, GBP/USD, and EUR/GBP constitutes about 24%, 9%, and 2%, respectively, of the FX market’s total turnover.

In Table 1, we list several summary statistics regarding order flow in our data. The number of arriving orders is largest for EUR/USD and smallest for EUR/GBP. On most trading days that we study, the total number of arrivals slightly exceeds the total number of departures. This implies that active orders accumulate throughout the trading day. To quantify the imbalance between buying and selling activity each day, we calculate the mean of each order-sign series. We call this quantity the *order-flow imbalance*. An order-flow imbalance of +1 (respectively, -1) indicates that for the given currency pair on the given day, all activity is due to sell orders (respectively, buy orders). An order-flow imbalance of 0 indicates that for the given currency pair on the given day, one half of all activity is due to sell orders and one half is due to buy orders. For each of the three currency pairs, the order-flow imbalance that we observe on Hotspot FX is small, which suggests that buying and selling activity is approximately equal on all trading days that we study.

		EUR/USD	GBP/USD	EUR/GBP
Number of Arrivals	Minimum	3455561	2962688	2019826
	Maximum	6003406	5296372	3623053
	Mean	4533550.8	4340345.4	2932726.8
Order-Flow Arrival Imbalance	Minimum	-0.0267	-0.0122	-0.0237
	Maximum	0.0174	0.0251	0.0050
	Mean	0.0002	0.0027	-0.0021
Number of Departures	Minimum	3449793	2961217	2019672
	Maximum	5992343	5293082	3622559
	Mean	4524175.4	4337320.6	2932171.5
Order-Flow Departure Imbalance	Minimum	-0.0267	-0.0122	-0.0237
	Maximum	0.0176	0.0251	0.0050
	Mean	0.0002	0.0027	-0.0021

Table 1: Summary statistics for the order-flow series across the 30 trading days that we study.

Trade for each currency pair occurs in a separate LOB with price-time priority. As is customary on multi-institution trading platforms in the FX spot market, Hotspot FX enables institutions to specify *credit limits* for their trading counterparties. Each institution can only access the trading opportunities offered by counterparties with whom they possess sufficient bilateral credit. We call this market organization a *quasi-centralized limit order book (QCLOB)* because different institutions have access to different subsets of a centralized liq-

⁵A price for the currency pair XXX/YYY denotes how many units of the *counter currency* YYY are exchanged per unit of the *base currency* XXX.

uidity pool. Examples of platforms that utilize QCLOBs include Reuters [69], EBS [22], and Hotspot FX [39], which together facilitate a mean turnover in excess of US \$0.5 trillion each day.⁶ For a detailed discussion of QCLOBs, see [30].

6 Methodology

For a given trading day D_i , we use the Hotspot FX data (see Section 5) to produce an ordered list of the limit order arrivals that occur during the peak trading hours of 08:00:00–17:00:00 GMT. We then use Equation (26) to deduce the intra-day arrival sign series from this list. Similarly, we use the Hotspot FX data to produce an ordered list of the active order departures that occur during the same period, and we then use Equation (26) to deduce the intra-day departure sign series from this list. We repeat this process for each of the 30 trading days D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{30} in our sample.

For a given pair of consecutive trading days D_i and D_{i+1} , we construct the cross-day arrival-sign and departure-sign series by concatenating the second half of the relevant intra-day series from day D_i and the first half of the corresponding intra-day series from day D_{i+1} . If an intra-day series has odd length, we round down to the previous integer.

The lengths of the intra-day series vary according to the number of arrivals and departures each day. For the cross-day series, both the series lengths and the locations of the boundaries between different trading days vary according to the number of arrivals and departures on the two relevant days. In particular, the boundary between trading days D_i and D_{i+1} does not necessarily lie at the mid-point in the cross-day series. When estimating the change-point between different trading days (see A.5), we therefore introduce the following normalization to enable comparisons between different cross-day series. Given a cross-day series of length N with daily boundary r^* that satisfies $1 < r^* < N$, and given a change-point estimator \hat{r}^* for r^* , the *normalized change-point estimator* \tilde{r} is given by

$$\tilde{r} = \begin{cases} (\hat{r}^* - r^*)/r^*, & \text{if } \hat{r}^* \leq r^*, \\ (\hat{r}^* - r^*)/(r - r^*), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

Observe that $\tilde{r} \in [-1, 1]$ and $\tilde{r} = 0$ if and only if $\hat{r}^* = r^*$.

⁶According to the 2013 Triennial Central Bank Survey [4], the mean daily turnover of the global FX spot market exceeds US \$2 trillion, which surpasses the mean daily turnover of the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) by a factor of more than 50 [58] and outstrips the daily global gross domestic product by a factor of more than 5 [25]. The market consists of several constituent parts, including the spot, forwards, options, and swaps markets. The spot market accounts for approximately 38% of the market’s total volume.

7 Results

In this section, we present our empirical results for the arrival-sign series. In all cases, the corresponding results for the departure-sign series are qualitatively similar.

7.1 Results for Intra-Day Series

In Figure 1, we plot the sample ACFs for each of the three currency pairs' intra-day arrival-sign series on 4 May 2010. The results for all other intra-day series on each day in our sample are qualitatively similar. Up to lags of about 25 events, the sample ACFs fluctuate between positive and negative values, which indicates that the order-flow series contain short-range negative autocorrelations. Although these autocorrelations have a magnitude below about 0.1 and are therefore relatively weak, this effect is present on each day in our sample, and we therefore deem it to be a robust statistical property of the data. To our knowledge, this behaviour has not been reported by other empirical studies of autocorrelation in order flow.

In Figure 2, we plot the intra-day sample ACFs in doubly logarithmic coordinates. To help reduce the noise at higher lags,⁷ we plot the mean sample ACFs, which we average across all 30 days in our sample. After the short-term negative autocorrelations subside (which occurs before lag 50, the lower bound in our plots), the sample ACFs remain positive for lags of several thousands of events, which suggests that there are long-range, positive autocorrelations in the series.

In Figure 3, we show rescaled-range plots (see A.1) for each of the three currency pairs' arrival-sign series. To create these plots, we divide each day's arrival-sign series into $B = 100$ blocks; we also produced similar plots for several different values of $B \in [10, 1000]$ and found similar results. For each of the three currency pairs, the slope of the rescaled-range plot for each intra-day order-flow series is close to 0.5 for values of k below about 10000. For larger values of k , however, the slope of each rescaled-range plot increases above 0.5. This suggests that the intra-day order-flow sign series are long-memory processes.

To test this hypothesis more formally, we perform Lo's modified rescaled-range test (see A.2). On every day in our sample, and even with large choices of bandwidth parameter, Lo's modified rescaled-range test causes us to reject the null hypothesis of short memory at the 5% significance level. Similarly, when using Andrews' plug-in estimator to estimate the bandwidth (see Equation (34)), Lo's test rejects the null hypothesis of short memory for each of the three currency pairs and on all 30 days in our sample. Therefore, Lo's test provides strong evidence that the intra-day order-sign series are long-memory processes.

Given the strong results of Lo's test, we now turn to assessing the strength of the long memory in intra-day order flow. To do so, we use two different methods to estimate the Hurst exponent H : DFA (see A.3) and log-periodogram

⁷The statistical errors associated with estimating the sample ACF are approximately constant at all lags, but the signal strength decreases at larger lags due to data sparsity [12].




Figure 1: Sample autocorrelation functions (ACFs) for (top row) EUR/USD, (middle row) GBP/USD, and (bottom row) EUR/GBP intra-day limit order sign series. In each row, the left plot shows the sample ACF for 4 May 2010. The results for all other days in our sample are qualitatively similar.




Figure 2: Mean sample ACFs across all 30 days for (top row) EUR/USD, (middle row) GBP/USD, and (bottom row) EUR/GBP intra-day limit order sign series in log-log coordinates.




Figure 3: Rescaled-range plots for (green curves) EUR/USD, (orange curves) GBP/USD, and (purple curves) EUR/GBP limit order sign series. The pale curves indicate the rescaled-range statistics $\bar{R}(k)$ (see Equation (29)) for a single day and the darker curves indicate the mean across all 30 days. The dotted black line has a slope of 0.5.




Figure 4: Box plots of Lo's modified rescaled-range test statistic $V(q)$ for several choices of bandwidth parameter q (see A.2) for (top) EUR/USD, (middle) GBP/USD, and (bottom) EUR/GBP arrival-sign series. For each choice of q , the boxes indicate the lower quartile, median, and upper quartile of $V(q)$ and the whiskers indicate the minimum and maximum of $V(q)$ across all 30 days in the sample. The light grey shading indicates the critical region for Lo's modified rescaled-range test at the 5% significance level.

regression (see A.4). Due to the negative short-range autocorrelations that we observe in the sample ACFs (see Figure 1), it is necessary to identify sensible choices of input parameters — namely, the window length m of a DFA and the number c of Fourier frequencies in a log-periodogram regression — when performing these estimation techniques.

To help identify a suitable choice of m for our DFA estimates of H , we first plot the length- m mean detrended standard deviation $F(m)$ for several choices of m (see Figure 5). For window lengths m that are smaller than about 25, the negative autocorrelations dominate the mean detrended standard deviations $F(m)$. Therefore, these values of m are unsuitable for calculating a DFA estimate of H . For window lengths m that are larger than about 100000, the statistical noise caused by data sparsity makes the scaling behaviour of m unclear. For intermediate window lengths m , the log-log plots of $F(m)$ follow an approximately straight line. We therefore perform our DFA estimates of H using $m_{\min} = 100$.




Figure 5: Length- m mean detrended standard deviation $F(m)$ for the (solid green curves) EUR/USD, (dashed orange curves) GBP/USD, and (dotted-dashed purple curves) EUR/GBP limit order sign series. Each curve corresponds to a single intra-day series. The dotted black line indicates $m = 100$.

To help identify a suitable choice of c for our log-periodogram regression estimates of H , we plot the log-periodogram regression estimates of H for several different values of c (see Figure 6). In all cases, the estimates of H tend to decrease as c increases, and there is no clear plateau over which the estimates

of H are stable. In the absence of an obvious choice for c , we use the popular rule-of-thumb [27] $c = \sqrt{N}$, where N is the length of the given series. We stress, however, that the plots in Figure 6 indicate that our log-periodogram regression estimates of H depend heavily on this choice, and that using a different choice for c would produce quantitatively different results. For example, another popular rule-of-thumb [65] is $c = 0.1 \times (N/2)$, but using this choice on the intra-day order-flow series produces estimates of $H \approx 0.5$ due to the extremely large size of the series. The absence of a clear choice for c highlights a weakness of log-periodogram regression in the present application.




Figure 6: Log-periodogram regression estimates of H for given number c of Fourier frequencies for the (solid green curves) EUR/USD, (dashed orange curves) GBP/USD, and (dotted-dashed purple curves) EUR/GBP limit order sign series. Each curve corresponds to a single intra-day series.

In Figure 7, we plot the DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of H (using our choices of $m_{\min} = 100$ and $c = \sqrt{N}$) for each intra-day arrival-sign series. For each of the three currency pairs, the DFA estimates of H cluster in the range of about 0.6 to about 0.8. The log-periodogram regression estimates of H tend to be slightly larger (they cluster in the range of about 0.65 to about 0.85), but because these results depend heavily on the choice of c (see Figure 6), we deem the DFA estimates to be more useful.

In Table 2, we list the means and standard deviations of our DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of H across all 30 days in our sample. As noted above, our results for arrival-sign series and departure-sign series are very




Figure 7: DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of the Hurst exponent H for the intra-day (green squares) EUR/USD, (orange circles) GBP/USD, and (purple triangles) EUR/GBP arrival-sign series.

similar in each case. In all cases, the mean estimates of H are many standard deviations larger than 0.5, which strongly supports the hypothesis that these series exhibit long memory. Moreover, with the exception of the log-periodogram regression estimates for EUR/GBP, the differences between the mean estimated Hurst exponents across the different currency pairs is smaller than the standard deviation of the mean estimated Hurst exponents across different days. Therefore, based on our results in Figures 5, 6, and 7 and Table 2, we regard $H \approx 0.7$ to be a good estimate for the Hurst exponent of limit order signs and cancellation signs for each of the three currency pairs.

		DFA	LP
EUR/USD	Arrivals	0.70 (0.04)	0.74 (0.03)
	Departures	0.70 (0.04)	0.74 (0.03)
GBP/USD	Arrivals	0.72 (0.04)	0.74 (0.03)
	Departures	0.72 (0.03)	0.74 (0.03)
EUR/GBP	Arrivals	0.72 (0.02)	0.79 (0.04)
	Departures	0.71 (0.02)	0.78 (0.04)

Table 2: DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of the Hurst exponent H for the EUR/USD, GBP/USD, and EUR/GBP intra-day arrival-sign and departure-sign series. Each entry indicates the mean of the estimates across all intra-day series, and the numbers in parentheses indicate 1 standard deviation of the estimates across all intra-day series.

7.2 Results for Cross-Day Series

To assess how aggregating data from different trading days impacts our results, we repeat all of our calculations using the cross-day series (see Section 6). In all cases, we find that the sample ACFs, rescaled-range plots, and results from Lo’s modified rescaled-range test are qualitatively similar to those for the intra-day series (see Figures 1, 2, 3, and 4). This provides strong evidence that the cross-day order-flow series exhibit long memory. To quantify the strength of this long memory, we calculate DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of the Hurst exponent H using the same choices of input parameters ($m_{\min} = 100$ and $c = \sqrt{N}$) as we used for our corresponding estimates of H for the intra-day series. We plot our results in Figure 8 and list the means and standard deviations of our estimates across all 29 cross-day periods in Table 3.

In all cases, our estimates of H for the cross-day series are very similar to the corresponding estimates for the intra-day series (see Figure 8 and Table 2). As with the intra-day series, the DFA estimates of H cluster in the range of about 0.6 to about 0.8 and the log-periodogram regression estimates of H cluster in the range of about 0.65 to about 0.85. We therefore regard $H \approx 0.7$ to be a good estimate for the Hurst exponent of the cross-day limit order sign and cancellation sign series for each of the three currency pairs.




Figure 8: DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of the Hurst exponent H for the EUR/USD, GBP/USD, and EUR/GBP cross-day arrival-sign series.

		DFA	LP
EUR/USD	Arrivals	0.71 (0.03)	0.74 (0.03)
	Cancellations	0.70 (0.03)	0.74 (0.03)
GBP/USD	Arrivals	0.73 (0.03)	0.74 (0.03)
	Cancellations	0.73 (0.03)	0.74 (0.03)
EUR/GBP	Arrivals	0.72 (0.03)	0.79 (0.04)
	Cancellations	0.72 (0.03)	0.78 (0.04)

Table 3: DFA and log-periodogram regression estimates of the Hurst exponent H for the EUR/USD, GBP/USD, and EUR/GBP cross-day arrival-sign and departure-sign series. Each entry indicates the mean of the estimates across all cross-day series, and the numbers in parentheses indicate 1 standard deviation of the estimates across all cross-day series.

Finally, we address the conjecture by Axioglou and Skouras [2] that the apparent long memory in the cross-day series is mostly an artefact caused by structural breaks at the boundaries between different trading days (see Section 4). To do so, we first calculate the normalized cumulative-sum change-point estimates (see A.5) for each cross-day order flow series. To provide an illustration of the estimator’s null distribution for a second-order stationary series with no structural breaks, we also estimate the normalized cumulative-sum change-point estimate on simulated series of 1000000 random variables drawn independently and at random from the standard normal distribution, repeat this process 100000 times, and calculate the empirical cumulative density functions (ECDFs) of our simulated estimates. We plot our results for the cross-day arrival-sign series in Figure 9; results for the cross-day departure-sign series are qualitatively similar.




Figure 9: ECDFs of the normalized cumulative-sum change-point estimator for the (green curve) EUR/USD, (orange curve) GBP/USD, and (purple curve) EUR/GBP cross-day arrival-sign series. Results for the cross-day departure-sign series are qualitatively similar. The dotted black curve illustrates the estimator’s null distribution for a second-order stationary series with no structural breaks (see the description in the main text).

In each case, the shape of the ECDF for the cross-day series is similar to that of the null distribution for simulated series with no structural break. Therefore, the cumulative-sum change-point estimator performs very poorly at detecting the true locations of the daily boundaries in the cross-day series, which sug-

gests that the apparent long-memory properties of these series are not strongly influenced by concatenating order-flow series from different trading days.

To test this hypothesis more formally, we also perform Berkes’ change-point test (which, as we discuss in A.5, compares the null hypothesis of a single structural break against the alternative hypothesis of true long memory) on both the intra-day and cross-day order-flow series in our sample. We show box plots of our results in Figure 10.




Figure 10: Box plots of Berkes’ change-point test statistic M (see Section A.5) for EUR/USD, GBP/USD, and EUR/GBP arrival-sign series. The left plot shows the results for the intra-day series, and the right plot shows the results for the cross-day series. The boxes indicate the lower quartile, median, and upper quartile of M , and the whiskers indicate the minimum and maximum of M across all (intra-day or cross-day) series. In each case, we use Andrews’ [1] data-driven plug-in estimator \hat{q} from Equation (34) to calculate M . The light grey shading indicates the critical region for Berkes’ change-point test at the 5% significance level. The results for departure-sign series are qualitatively similar.

For each arrival-sign and departure-sign series and for each of the three currency pairs, the test rejects the null hypothesis at the 5% significance level. This result provides strong evidence against the hypothesis that the apparent long memory in the cross-day series is an artefact caused by structural breaks at the daily boundaries.

8 Discussion

For each of the three currency pairs and for each of the 30 days in our sample, the results of our statistical tests strongly support the hypothesis that both the arrival-sign and departure-sign series exhibit long memory that persists over several thousands of events. For each of the three currency pairs, our calculations suggest that this long memory in order flow can be characterized by a Hurst exponent of $H \approx 0.7$. The variation in this result — both across the different currency pairs and across the different days in our sample — is small. We find no evidence that the apparent long-memory properties that we observe are an artefact caused by a structural break at the boundaries between different trading days. We therefore conclude that long memory is a robust statistical

property of order flow in the FX spot market.

Due to the quasi-centralized nature of trade on multi-institution trading platforms in the FX spot market (see Section 5), institutions that access Hotspot FX cannot view the temporal evolution of the full LOB $\mathcal{L}(t)$. Instead, they only see the arrivals and departures of orders that originate from institutions with whom they possess sufficient bilateral credit. Despite this important difference between this platform and the ones investigated by other empirical studies of long memory in order flow, our estimates of H on Hotspot FX are very similar to those reported elsewhere in the literature (see Section 4). Most notably, our estimates of H are almost exactly equal to those reported by Lillo and Farmer for order flow on the LSE [42], and they lie within the range of values reported by Bouchaud *et al.* for order flow on Euronext [13]. We argue that because not all institutions on Hotspot FX can see all order flow from all others, our results provide yet more evidence to support the hypothesis that the primary cause of long memory in order flow is order-splitting, rather than herding (see Section 4).

It is interesting to consider why our results for the FX spot market differ so strongly from those reported by Axioglou and Skouras for the LSE [2]. We conjecture that the answer to this question lies in the structural differences between the trading days in these two markets. Trading on the LSE commences at 08:00:00 and ceases at 16:30:00 each day [68]. By contrast, trading in the FX spot market occurs 24 hours a day. Although we restrict our attention to the peak trading hours of 08:00:00–17:00:00 GMT, the absence of a market-wide closing time has several important consequences for the way that traders act.

First, many financial institutions require that traders unwind their positions (i.e., rebalance their net daily holdings to 0) before the end of each trading day [46]. The LSE market closing at 16:30:00 constitutes a hard deadline by which any traders who seek to unwind their positions must fulfil this goal, even if doing so requires them to trade at unfavourable prices. This may cause the statistical properties of order flow late in the trading day to differ substantially from those early in the trading day, and may therefore result in a structural break at the daily boundaries when concatenating data from different days. In the FX spot market, by contrast, there is no market-wide closing time by which traders who seek to unwind their positions must complete this task.

Second, the absence of market opening and closing times in the FX spot market enables traders in different time zones to begin and end their trading days at different times. Hsieh and Kleidon [36] noted that many traders spend the early part of their trading day assessing the state of the market, the middle part of their trading day performing the majority of their trades, and the late part of their trading day resetting their net inventory to 0. In markets with specified opening and closing times (such as the LSE), all traders progress through this cycle in phase. In the FX spot market, by contrast, traders in different time zones can choose the length and timing of their trading days as they wish. The flux of traders from different time zones into and out of the FX spot market may cause the statistical properties of order flow to differ from those in markets where all traders' trading days are aligned by the market opening and closing

times.

Third, Axioglou and Skouras [2] conjectured that most traders on the LSE reassess their trading strategy once per day, while markets are closed, then implement their chosen strategy throughout the next trading day. This is not a plausible description of the actions of traders in the FX spot market, which is always open.

A final interesting point for discussion is to consider why the order-flow sign series that we study contain short-range negative autocorrelations, when such behaviour has not been reported by empirical studies of other markets. Although this negative autocorrelation is relatively weak (see Figure 1), this effect is present on each day in our sample, and we therefore believe it to be a robust statistical property of the data. We conjecture that this behaviour may be a consequence of the extremely high activity levels in the FX spot market. In other markets, there are unlikely to be as many orders arriving and departing from the LOB as is the case in the FX spot market. On Hotspot FX, even if many institutions are employing order-splitting strategies, it is likely that at any given time, some such institutions are order-splitting large buy orders while others are simultaneously order-splitting large sell orders. Superimposing the order flow from institutions implementing the same strategy but in opposite directions could produce negative autocorrelations at small lags while still producing long memory on longer time horizons.

9 Conclusions

In this paper, we have investigated the long memory of order flow in the FX spot market. Due to the extremely high levels of activity on the platform that we study, and in contrast to other empirical studies on this topic, we were able to investigate the long-memory properties of intra-day series without needing to aggregate data from different trading days. For each of the three currency pairs and on each of the trading days that we studied, we found strong evidence that both arrival-sign and departure-series exhibit long memory with a Hurst exponent of $H \approx 0.7$. At shorter lags, we also uncovered a negative autocorrelation in order flow that, to our knowledge, has not been reported by other studies. It is an important consideration for future research to test whether such negative autocorrelations are present in other markets, and if so, to understand how incorporating such behaviour into models of order flow could help enhance their predictive power.

We found that all of our results for data that spans different trading days were similar to those for intra-day data, and we strongly rejected the hypothesis that the apparent long memory of order flow is an artefact caused by structural breaks at the daily boundaries between different trading days. We therefore concluded that long memory is a robust statistical property of order flow on Hotspot FX that persists across daily boundaries. We conjectured that the differences between our findings and those reported by Axioglou and Skouras for the LSE [2] were caused by differences in the structure of trading days in

the two markets. Further empirical study of data from other markets will help to illuminate the role of daily periodicities in the long memory of order flow.

Finally, we note that the existence of long memory in order flow raises an interesting question called the “efficiency paradox” [24]: how can return series remain unpredictable given that order flow exhibits long memory? To date, there are two main hypotheses. Some authors [13, 14] have argued that markets reside at a “self-organized critical point” in which liquidity takers cause long-range autocorrelations in order flow that exactly balance the long-range *negative* autocorrelations caused by liquidity providers. Others [42, 24] have argued that predictability in order flow is offset by a negative correlation with available liquidity. At present, there is no clear consensus as to which approach best describes the temporal evolution of real markets, and further empirical and theoretical study of this question remains an important and exciting avenue for future research.

A Empirical Tests for Long Memory

In this appendix, we describe in detail the empirical tests that we use throughout the paper. See [6] for further discussion of these and other techniques for assessing the long-memory properties of an empirically observed series.

A.1 Rescaled-Range Plots

For a given *block number* $B \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$G(k) = \left\{ t = \frac{N(i-1)}{B} + 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, B; t+k \leq N \right\}. \quad (28)$$

A *rescaled-range plot* (also known as a *pox plot*) [50, 52, 67] is a plot of

$$\bar{R}(k) = \frac{1}{|G(k)|} \sum_{t \in G(k)} Q(t, k) \quad (29)$$

versus k on doubly logarithmic axes, where $|G(k)|$ denotes the number of elements in $G(k)$. The slope of a rescaled-range plot for large values of k provides a rough estimate for the Hurst exponent H [52].

A.2 Lo’s Modified Rescaled-Range Statistic

Lo [45] noted that if a time series $\{W_t\}$ is subject to short-range autocorrelations, then the denominator $S(t, k)$ of the rescaled-range statistic $Q(t, k)$ is not a consistent estimator for the standard deviation of $\{W_t\}$. Therefore, an important difficulty in using the rescaled-range statistic to assess the long-memory properties of an empirically observed time series $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ is that the finite-sample properties of Q are not invariant to short-range dependence. To address this problem, Lo proposed replacing the denominator of Q with the

Newey-West estimator [59],⁸ which discounts short-range dependence in $\{W_t\}$ up to a specified lag $q < N$. The parameter q is called the *bandwidth parameter*. Lo's modified rescaled-range statistic [45] is

$$\tilde{Q}(q) = \frac{R(1, N)}{\hat{\sigma}(q)}, \quad (30)$$

where

$$\hat{\sigma}^2(q) = \begin{cases} S^2(1, N), & \text{if } q = 0, \\ S^2(1, N) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^q \left(1 - \frac{i}{q+1}\right) \hat{\gamma}(i), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

Given $\tilde{Q}(q)$, the statistic

$$V(q) = \frac{\tilde{Q}(q)}{\sqrt{N}} \quad (32)$$

can be used as a test statistic for the hypothesis test

$H_0 : \{W_t\}$ is a short-memory process,

$H_1 : \{W_t\}$ is a long-memory process.

This hypothesis test is called *Lo's modified rescaled-range test* [45]. In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic critical region for the test at the 5% significance level is approximately [0.809, 1.862].

Teverovsky *et al.* [67] remarked that although Lo's modified rescaled-range statistic is a significant improvement over the original rescaled-range statistic, Lo's test can fail to reject H_0 for some time series with long memory. Moreover, they noted that both the size and the power of the test depend on q . The optimal choice of q for $\tilde{Q}(q)$ and $V(q)$ depends on the behaviour of the spectral density f of $\{W_t\}$ [1]. If f is unknown (as is usually the case for empirically observed series), then there is no universal rule via which to choose q . In empirical applications, it is therefore customary to calculate $\tilde{Q}(q)$ and $V(q)$ using several different choices of q and/or to calculate a so-called *plug-in estimator* \hat{q} [1, 2, 45] by assuming that f is equal to the spectral density of a specified parametric process. Andrews [1] derived plug-in estimators for several different parametric processes (including autoregressive, moving-average, and ARMA models).

Throughout this paper, we use the plug-in estimator for an AR(1) process

$$W_t = \phi W_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (33)$$

where $\phi \in \mathbb{R}$ is the autocorrelation parameter and ε_t is uncorrelated Gaussian noise. This estimator is given by [1, 45]

$$\hat{q} = \left\lceil \left(\frac{3N}{2} \right)^{1/3} \left(\frac{2\hat{\phi}}{1 - \hat{\phi}^2} \right)^{2/3} \right\rceil, \quad (34)$$

where $\hat{\phi}$ is the maximum-likelihood estimate of ϕ given $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$ and $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the greatest integer less than or equal to x .

⁸For a suitable choice of q , Newey and West [59] showed that $\hat{\sigma}(q)$ is a consistent estimator for the standard deviation of $\{W_t\}$, even if $\{W_t\}$ is subject to short-range autocorrelations.

A.3 Detrended Fluctuation Analysis

Detrended fluctuation analysis (DFA) [61] is a technique for estimating the Hurst exponent from an empirically observed series $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$. Let

$$w_i^* = \sum_{j=1}^i w_j, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N. \quad (35)$$

For a given window length $m \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $m \leq N$, divide $\{w_1^*, w_2^*, \dots, w_N^*\}$ into non-overlapping windows of length m . For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \lfloor N/m \rfloor\}$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the integer part, label the data points in window j as $y_{1,j}, y_{2,j}, \dots, y_{m,j}$, perform an ordinary least-squares regression to fit a straight line to the m data points in the window, and let $\hat{y}_{i,j}$ denote the value of the regression line at the point $y_{i,j}$ for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. For each window, calculate the *detrended standard deviation*

$$F_j(m) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (y_{i,j} - \hat{y}_{i,j})^2}, \quad (36)$$

and then calculate the *length- m mean detrended standard deviation*

$$F(m) = \frac{1}{\lfloor N/m \rfloor} \sum_{j=1}^{\lfloor N/m \rfloor} F_j(m). \quad (37)$$

Repeat this process for several logarithmically spaced choices of window length m , and plot $F(m)$ versus m using doubly logarithmic axes. Identify the smallest value m_{\min} such that the plot is approximately straight for all $m \geq m_{\min}$. The DFA estimate of H is given by the slope of the best-fit line for $m \geq m_{\min}$.

A.4 Log-Periodogram Regression

Recall from Section 2.3 that the long-memory properties of a time series $\{W_t\}$ can be characterized by the behaviour of its spectral density function $f(\lambda)$ as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. Therefore, estimating the behaviour of $f(\lambda)$ close to 0 provides an alternative approach to estimating the Hurst exponent H . Let

$$\lambda_{j,N} = \frac{2\pi j}{N}, \quad j \in \left\{1, 2, \dots, \left\lfloor \frac{N-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right\} \quad (38)$$

denote the *Fourier frequencies* of $\{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_N\}$, and let

$$I(\lambda_{j,N}) = \frac{1}{2\pi N} \left| \sum_{t=1}^N (w_t - \bar{w}) e^{-it\lambda_{j,N}} \right|^2 \quad (39)$$

denote the corresponding *periodogram*. The slope of an ordinary least-squares regression of $\log(I(\lambda_{j,N}))$ onto $\log(\lambda_{j,N})$ for small $\lambda_{j,N}$ is an estimator for $-\beta$, and it is therefore an estimator for H [6, 42, 65].

Despite the attractiveness of its computational simplicity, log-periodogram regression suffers from a substantial practical drawback [6]: there is no universal rule for choosing the number c of Fourier frequencies with which to perform the regression. The scaling in Equations (12) and (13) only holds for $\lambda \rightarrow 0$, so choosing an overly large c leads to large bias but choosing an overly small c leads to high variance. Robinson [63] derived an expression for the optimal choice of c to minimize the mean squared error of the estimated cumulative spectral distribution function, but the optimal choice turns out to depend on the unknown value of H . Therefore, Robinson’s expression does not provide a method for choosing c for an empirically observed time series. Instead, most empirical studies use one of two rules of thumb for this choice: $c = \sqrt{N}$ [27] or $c = 0.1 \times (N/2)$ [65]. Despite their widespread use, neither of these rules are based on rigorous derivation or optimization.

A.5 Berkes’ Change-Point Test

Many standard tests for nonstationarities in an empirically observed series have low power in the presence of long memory [21, 35], and there is no universal test that is able to determine whether the apparent long-memory properties of an empirically observed time series are an artefact caused by some unknown form of nonstationarity [32]. However, Berkes *et al.* [7] developed a hypothesis test that can help distinguish between long memory and a specific type of nonstationarity, which they called a *structural break*.⁹

Definition. *The time series $\{Z_t\}$ is a short-range dependent series with a structural break at time r^* if there exists a real-valued, second-order stationary, short-memory process $\{\zeta_t\}$ and a constant $\mu^* \neq 0$ such that*

$$Z_t = \begin{cases} \zeta_t, & t \leq r^*, \\ \mu^* + \zeta_t, & t > r^*. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Given a finite-length empirical observation $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_N\}$ of a time series $\{Z_t\}$, *Berkes’ change-point test* is the hypothesis test

$H_0 : \{Z_t\}$ is a short-memory process with a single structural break,

$H_1 : \{Z_t\}$ is a long-memory process.

The test uses the so-called *cumulative-sum change-point estimator* [7]

$$\hat{r}^* = \min \left\{ r : \max_{1 \leq j \leq N} \left| \sum_{i=1}^j z_i - \frac{j}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i \right| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^r z_i - \frac{r}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N z_i \right| \right\}. \quad (41)$$

⁹We use Berkes’ change-point test to examine whether apparent long memory in the Hotspot FX data is caused by a structural break between consecutive pairs of trading days, and we therefore only test for a single change point. A similar framework can be used to test for any bounded number of structural breaks [7].

For a given $q < N$, let

$$T^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}_{(1)}^2(q)\sqrt{\hat{r}^*}} \max_{1 \leq i \leq \hat{r}^*} \left| \sum_{j=1}^i z_j - \frac{i}{\hat{r}^*} \sum_{j=1}^{\hat{r}^*} z_j \right|,$$

$$T^{(2)} = \frac{1}{\hat{\sigma}_{(2)}^2(q)\sqrt{N - \hat{r}^*}} \max_{\hat{r}^* \leq i \leq N} \left| \sum_{j=\hat{r}^*}^i z_j - \frac{i - \hat{r}^*}{N - \hat{r}^*} \sum_{j=\hat{r}^*}^N z_j \right|,$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_{(1)}(q)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{(2)}(q)$ are the values of $\hat{\sigma}(q)$ from Equation (31) for the $\{z_1, z_2, \dots, z_{\hat{r}^*}\}$ and $\{z_{\hat{r}^*+1}, z_{\hat{r}^*+2}, \dots, z_N\}$ series, respectively. The test statistic for Berkes' test is

$$M = \max(T^{(1)}, T^{(2)}). \quad (42)$$

In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, the asymptotic critical value of M at the 5% significance level is 1.48 [7].

Acknowledgements

We thank Julius Bonart, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, Rama Cont, J. Dooyne Farmer, Austin Gerig, Ben Hambly, and Gabriele La Spada for useful discussions. We thank Hotspot FX for providing the data for this project. We also thank Terry Lyons, Rich Plummer-Powell, and Justin Sharp for technical support. MDG and SH thank the Oxford-Man Institute of Quantitative Finance, and MDG thanks EPSRC and the James S. McDonnell Foundation for supporting this research.

References

- [1] D. W. K. Andrews. Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica*, 59:817–858, 1991.
- [2] C. Axioglou and S. Skouras. Markets change every day: evidence from the memory of trade direction. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 18(3):423–446, 2011.
- [3] R. T. Baillie. Long memory processes and fractional integration in econometrics. *Journal of Econometrics*, 73(1):5–59, 1996.
- [4] Bank for International Settlements. Foreign exchange turnover in April 2013: preliminary global results. Technical report, Bank for International Settlements, available at <http://www.bis.org/publ/rpfx13fx.pdf>, 2013.
- [5] J. Beran. Statistical methods for data with long-range dependence. *Statistical Science*, 7:404–416, 1992.

- [6] J. Beran. *Statistics for Long-Memory Processes*, volume 61. Chapman and Hall, New York, NY, USA, 1994.
- [7] I. Berkes, L. Horváth, P. Kokoszka, and Q. M. Shao. On discriminating between long-range dependence and changes in mean. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34:1140–1165, 2006.
- [8] R. N. Bhattacharya, V. K. Gupta, and E. Waymire. The Hurst effect under trends. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 20:649–662, 1983.
- [9] B. Biais, P. Hillion, and C. Spatt. An empirical analysis of the limit order book and the order flow in the Paris Bourse. *The Journal of Finance*, 50(5):1655–1689, 1995.
- [10] G. G. Booth and F. R. Kaen. Gold and silver spot prices and market information efficiency. *Financial Review*, 14(1):21–26, 1979.
- [11] G. G. Booth, F. R. Kaen, and P.E. Koveos. R/S analysis of foreign exchange rates under two international monetary regimes. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 10(3):407–415, 1982.
- [12] J. P. Bouchaud, J. D. Farmer, and F. Lillo. How markets slowly digest changes in supply and demand. In T. Hens and K. R. Schenk-Hoppé, editors, *Handbook of Financial Markets: Dynamics and Evolution*, pages 57–160. North–Holland, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 2009.
- [13] J. P. Bouchaud, Y. Gefen, M. Potters, and M. Wyart. Fluctuations and response in financial markets: the subtle nature of ‘random’ price changes. *Quantitative Finance*, 4(2):176–190, 2004.
- [14] J. P. Bouchaud, J. Kockelkoren, and M. Potters. Random walks, liquidity molasses and critical response in financial markets. *Quantitative Finance*, 6(02):115–123, 2006.
- [15] A. Chakraborti, I. M. Toke, M. Patriarca, and F. Abergel. Econophysics review I: empirical facts. *Quantitative Finance*, 11(7):991–1012, 2011.
- [16] C. Chatfield. *Time-Series Forecasting*. Chapman and Hall, Boca Raton, FL, USA, 2000.
- [17] R. Cont. Long-range dependence in financial markets. In J. Lévy-Véhel and E. Lutton, editors, *Fractals in Engineering*, pages 159–179. Springer, London, UK, 2005.
- [18] R. Cont. Statistical modeling of high-frequency financial data. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 28(5):16–25, 2011.
- [19] R. Cont and J. P. Bouchaud. Herd behavior and aggregate fluctuations in financial markets. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 4(2):170–196, 2000.

- [20] R. Cont, M. Potters, and J. P. Bouchaud. Scaling in stock market data: stable laws and beyond. In B. Dubrulle, F. Graner, and D. Sornette, editors, *Les Houches Workshop*, pages 75–85, New York, NY, USA, 1997. Springer.
- [21] F. X. Diebold and G. D. Rudebusch. On the power of Dickey–Fuller tests against fractional alternatives. *Economics Letters*, 35(2):155–160, 1991.
- [22] EBS. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from <https://emea.ebsspot.com/SHARED/HELP/userguide.pdf>, 2011.
- [23] A. Ellul, C. W. Holden, P. Jain, and R. Jennings. A comprehensive test of order choice theory: Recent evidence from the NYSE. *LSE Discussion paper 471*, available at <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/24896/>, 2003.
- [24] J. D. Farmer, A. N. Gerig, F. Lillo, and S. Mike. Market efficiency and the long-memory of supply and demand: Is price impact variable and permanent or fixed and temporary? *Quantitative Finance*, 6(02):107–112, 2006.
- [25] International Monetary Fund. World economic outlook. Technical report, International Monetary Fund, available at <http://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2013/01/pdf/text.pdf>, 2013.
- [26] A. N. Gerig. *A Theory for Market Impact: How Order Flow Affects Stock Price*. PhD thesis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Champaign, IL, USA, 2007.
- [27] J. Geweke and S. Porter-Hudak. The estimation and application of long-memory time-series models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 4(4):221–238, 1983.
- [28] L. Giraitis, P. S. Kokoszka, and R. Leipus. Testing for long memory in the presence of a general trend. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 38(4):1033–1054, 2001.
- [29] P. Gopikrishnan, V. Plerou, L. A. N. Amaral, M. Meyer, and H. E. Stanley. Scaling of the distribution of fluctuations of financial market indices. *Physical Review E*, 60(5):5305–5316, 1999.
- [30] M. D. Gould, M. A. Porter, and S. D. Howison. Quasi-centralized limit order books. *arXiv:1310.8387*, 2015.
- [31] M. D. Gould, M. A. Porter, S. Williams, M. McDonald, D. J. Fenn, and S. D. Howison. Limit order books. *Quantitative Finance*, 13(11):1709–1742, 2013.
- [32] C. W. J. Granger and N. Hyung. Occasional structural breaks and long memory with an application to the S&P 500 absolute stock returns. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 11(3):399–421, 2004.

- [33] M. T. Greene and B. D. Fielitz. Long-term dependence in common stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 4(3):339–349, 1977.
- [34] J. Hasbrouck. Trades, quotes, inventories, and information. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 22(2):229–252, 1988.
- [35] U. Hassler and J. Wolters. On the power of unit root tests against fractional alternatives. *Economics Letters*, 45(1):1–5, 1994.
- [36] D. A. Hsieh and A. W. Kleidon. Bid-ask spreads in foreign exchange markets: implications for models of asymmetric information. In J.A. Frankel, G. Galli, and A. Giovannini, editors, *The Microstructure of Foreign Exchange Markets*, pages 41–72. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, USA, 1996.
- [37] H. Hurst. Long term storage capacity of reservoirs. *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers*, 116:770–799, 1951.
- [38] Knight Capital Group. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from http://www.hotspotfx.com/download/userguide/HSEFX/HSEFX_UserGuide_wrapper.html, 2015.
- [39] Knight Capital Group. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from <http://www.hotspotfx.com/overview/index.jsp>, 2015.
- [40] Knight Capital Group. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from http://www.hotspotfx.com/products/hotspot_volumes.jsp, 2015.
- [41] B. LeBaron and R. Yamamoto. Long-memory in an order-driven market. *Physica A*, 383(1):85–89, 2007.
- [42] F. Lillo and J. D. Farmer. The long memory of the efficient market. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics and Econometrics*, 8(3):1–33, 2004.
- [43] F. Lillo, S. Mike, and J. D. Farmer. Theory for long memory in supply and demand. *Physical Review E*, 71(6):066122, 2005.
- [44] M. Liu. Modeling long memory in stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics*, 99(1):139–171, 2000.
- [45] A. W. Lo. Long-term memory in stock market prices. *Econometrica*, 59(5):1279–1313, 1991.
- [46] R. K. Lyons. Tests of microstructural hypotheses in the foreign exchange market. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 39(2):321–351, 1995.
- [47] B. B. Mandelbrot. The variation of certain speculative prices. *The Journal of Business*, 36(4):394–419, 1963.
- [48] B. B. Mandelbrot. Limit theorems on the self-normalized range for weakly and strongly dependent processes. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 31(4):271–285, 1975.

- [49] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. W. Van Ness. Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications. *SIAM Review*, 10(4):422–437, 1968.
- [50] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. R. Wallis. Noah, Joseph, and operational hydrology. *Water Resources Research*, 4(5):909–918, 1968.
- [51] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. R. Wallis. Computer experiments with fractional Gaussian noises: Part 1, averages and variances. *Water Resources Research*, 5(1):228–241, 1969.
- [52] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. R. Wallis. Computer experiments with fractional Gaussian noises: Part 2, rescaled ranges and spectra. *Water Resources Research*, 5(1):242–259, 1969.
- [53] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. R. Wallis. Robustness of the rescaled range R/S in the measurement of noncyclic long run statistical dependence. *Water Resources Research*, 5(5):967–988, 1969.
- [54] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. R. Wallis. Some long-run properties of geophysical records. *Water Resources Research*, 5(2):321–340, 1969.
- [55] R. N. Mantegna and H. E. Stanley. *An Introduction to Econophysics: Correlations and Complexity in Finance*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999.
- [56] S. Mike and J. D. Farmer. An empirical behavioral model of liquidity and volatility. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 32(1):200–234, 2008.
- [57] T. Mikosch and C. Stărică. Long-range dependence effects and ARCH modeling. In P. Doukhan, G. Oppenheim, and M.S. Taqqu, editors, *Theory and Applications of Long-Range Dependence*, pages 439–459. Birkhäuser Boston, New York, NY, USA, 2002.
- [58] New York Stock Exchange. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from <http://www.nyxdata.com/nyxedata/asp/factbook/main.asp>, 2015.
- [59] W. K. Newey and K. D. West. A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, 55:703–708, 1987.
- [60] E. Pan. FX trading and technology in 2012. Technical report, Stream-Base Systems, available at <http://www.tradersmagazine.com/news/fxsurveysb.php>, 2012.
- [61] C. K. Peng, S. V. Buldyrev, S. Havlin, M. Simons, H. E. Stanley, and A. L. Goldberger. Mosaic organization of DNA nucleotides. *Physical Review E*, 49(2):1685–1689, 1994.
- [62] W. Rea, L. Oxley, M. Reale, and J. Brown. Estimators for long-range dependence: an empirical study. *arXiv:0901.0762*, 2009.

- [63] P. M. Robinson. Rates of convergence and optimal spectral bandwidth for long range dependence. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 99(3):443–473, 1994.
- [64] I. Roşu. A dynamic model of the limit order book. *Review of Financial Studies*, 22(11):4601–4641, 2009.
- [65] M. S. Taqqu, V. Teverovsky, and W. Willinger. Estimators for long-range dependence: an empirical study. *Fractals*, 3(4):785–798, 1995.
- [66] S. J. Taylor. *Modelling Financial Time Series*. World Scientific Publishing, Singapore, 2008.
- [67] V. Teverovsky, M. S. Taqqu, and W. Willinger. A critical look at Lo’s modified R/S statistic. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 80(1):211–227, 1999.
- [68] The London Stock Exchange. Retrieved 14 April 2015 from <http://www.lseg.com/areas-expertise/our-markets/london-stock-exchange/equities-markets/trading-services/domestic-trading-services/sets>, 2015.
- [69] Thomson–Reuters. https://dxtrapub.markets.reuters.com/docs/Matching_Rule_Book.pdf, 2011.
- [70] B. Tóth, Y. Lempérière, C. Deremble, J. De Lataillade, J. Kockelkoren, and J. P. Bouchaud. Anomalous price impact and the critical nature of liquidity in financial markets. *Physical Review X*, 1(2):021006, 2011.
- [71] B. Toth, I. Palit, F. Lillo, and J. D. Farmer. Why is equity order flow so persistent? *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 51:218–239, 2015.
- [72] M. Wyart, J. P. Bouchaud, J. Kockelkoren, M. Potters, and M. Vettorazzo. Relation between bid-ask spread, impact and volatility in order-driven markets. *Quantitative Finance*, 8(1):41–57, 2008.
- [73] L. Xu, P. C. Ivanov, K. Hu, Z. Chen, A. Carbone, and H. E. Stanley. Quantifying signals with power-law correlations: A comparative study of detrended fluctuation analysis and detrended moving average techniques. *Physical Review E*, 71(5):051101, 2005.
- [74] W. Y. Yeo. Serial correlation in the limit order flow: Causes and impact. *Working Paper, SSRN eLibrary ID 971400*, 2008.