

No Questions Asked: Effects of Transparency on Stablecoin Liquidity During the Collapse of Silicon Valley Bank

Walter Hernandez Cruz^{1,2}, Jiahua Xu^{1,2}, Paolo Tasca^{1,2}, and Carlo Campajola^{1,2}

¹ University College London, London, UK

² DLT Science Foundation, London, UK

{walter.hernandez.18, jiahua.xu, p.tasca, c.campajola}@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract. Fiat-pegged stablecoins are by nature exposed to spillover effects during market turmoil in Traditional Finance (TradFi). We observe a difference in TradFi market shocks impact between various stablecoins, in particular, USD Coin (USDC) and Tether USDT (USDT), the former with a higher reporting frequency and transparency than the latter. We investigate this, using top USDC and USDT liquidity pools in Uniswap, by adapting the Marginal Cost of Immediacy (MCI) measure to Uniswap’s Automated Market Maker, and then conducting Difference-in-Differences analysis on MCI and Total Value Locked (TVL) in USD, as well as measuring liquidity concentration across different providers. Results show that the Silicon Valley Bank (SVB) event reduced USDC’s TVL dominance over USDT, increased USDT’s liquidity cost relative to USDC, and liquidity provision remained concentrated with pool-specific trends. These findings reveal a flight-to-safety behavior and counterintuitive effects of stablecoin transparency: USDC’s frequent and detailed disclosures led to swift market reactions, while USDT’s opacity and less frequent reporting provided a safety net against immediate impacts.

Keywords: Stablecoins · Financial Contagion · Liquidity Risk · Decentralized Exchanges · Investor Behavior · Decentralized Finance · Market Microstructure.

In March 2023, SVB, the leading commercial bank servicing nearly half of all venture-backed tech startups in Silicon Valley, collapsed [87]. During SVB’s collapse Circle Internet Financial Ltd. (Circle), the issuer of the second-largest stablecoin by market capitalization USDC [39], revealed that nearly 8% of its cash reserves [14,33] amounting to US\$3.3 billion was held at SVB and had been frozen - and potentially lost as uninsured deposits³.

Stablecoins are digital assets (“tokens”) used in cryptocurrency markets as proxies for fiat money. This is a necessity since, for both regulatory and technological reasons, it is impossible to use fiat money for operations on blockchains. Their value is pegged to a currency, typically the US Dollar, and the peg is maintained by backing the asset with reserves. Usually, these can be in fiat money (“fiat-backed” stablecoins), or cryptocurrencies like Ether (“crypto-backed” stablecoins), and stablecoin holders have the right to redeem their tokens for the equivalent underlying upon request in a structure that is similar to that of a Constant Net Asset Value (CNAV) Money Market Fund (MMF). The most popular fiat-backed stablecoins at the time of writing are Tether Holdings Limited (Tether)’s USDT and Circle’s USDC, while MakerDAO’s Dai Stablecoin (DAI) is the most used in the crypto-backed family. Much like the runs that CNAV MMFs suffer when their Net Asset Value (NAV) “breaks the buck” [81], Circle’s transparency in declaring their significant exposure as an uninsured depositor of SVB led to a panic in cryptocurrency markets, causing USDC to lose its peg to the US Dollar and trade below US\$0.87 for several hours [30].

Our study analyzes the impact that SVB’s collapse had on liquidity provision in Decentralized Exchanges (DEXs). In particular, we analyze the highest-volume liquidity pools trading the two most popular stablecoins, USDC and USDT, and compare the dynamics of concentration and depth of available liquidity in the weeks leading to and following the event. Liquidity pools are trading venues

³ <https://twitter.com/circle/status/1634391505988206592>

that operate through an Automated Market Maker (AMM), a set of algorithms matching liquidity providers with liquidity takers without relying on a centralized market maker or clearinghouse [91,41]. The most popular of these DEXs is Uniswap v3 [17], which at the time of the event dominated the market with over 60% of DEXs trading volume [65] and is our main source of liquidity data.

Our study finds its motivation in several streams of financial economics literature. In particular, we are interested in analyzing the impact of information asymmetries [19,57,43] on liquidity provision, a topic that has been extensively studied in the context of traditional, Limit Order Book (LOB)-based markets [32,46] but, to the best of our knowledge, has so far remained largely unexplored in Decentralized Finance (DeFi) markets. We also take inspiration from the literature on financial contagion [21,31], as we analyze the spillovers of liquidity shocks from the real world to cryptocurrency markets, and from the extensive literature on market microstructure that focuses on optimal execution and liquidity dynamics [23,88]. Throughout our analysis, we consider USDC as our asset of interest and keep USDT as a control. This choice is dictated by the fact that the two assets are similar in most aspects (i.e. type of backing, adoption, liquidity) except for the exposure that USDC disclosed to the SVB bankruptcy [14,33]. Noticeably, it is unknown whether or not USDT was also exposed to the event [15], as Tether is far less transparent about the nature and location of its reserves [70].

We find an apparent flight-to-safety behavior: USDC’s TVL decreased $\sim 19.40\%$ relative to USDT, while USDT’s liquidity cost increased $\sim 241\%$. Stablecoin-only pools lost liquidity providers as USDx-WETH/WBTC pools attracted more. These results are consistent with traditional financial distress literature about flight-to-safety behavior [68], with investors rebalancing their portfolios towards seemingly safer and more liquid assets [31,86] and the trend of decreasing liquidity during market turmoil [31]. Additionally, we find that higher-fee pools tended to have considerably more providers (e.g., USDCWETH3000, WETHUSDT3000) than lower-fee ones (e.g., WBTCUSDC500, DAIUSDT500), but overall liquidity remained concentrated ($Gini > 0.9$), supporting findings in [66]. Therefore, our results suggest that USDC’s transparency and detailed disclosures led to swift reactions, while USDT’s less frequent and opaque reporting provided a temporary buffer against immediate impacts.

1 Related Work

While existing literature has examined SVB’s collapse impact on global stock markets [74], United States (US) market sectors [92], euro area banks [75], financial contagion in major economies [20], and cryptocurrency markets [52], our research uniquely focuses on the DeFi sector and its spillover effects from TradFi market shocks. The closest to our work is [52], who use a BEKK-GARCH model to analyze cryptocurrency price changes on Centralized Exchanges (CEXs). We instead examine liquidity dynamics within DeFi, specifically USDC and USDT liquidity pools on Uniswap. Liquidity is crucial in financial markets, as its abundance or scarcity can determine the efficiency of price discovery, the speed at which new information is digested by the market, and even trigger catastrophic “flash crashes” [31,36,24,40,88,51,61]. While DeFi markets are shallower and have lower volume than CEXs, they offer full transparency, and liquidity manipulation practices like order spoofing are much harder and riskier to implement than in unregulated CEXs, providing a market picture that is more likely to be genuine. Therefore, our study’s significance lies in its analysis of DeFi liquidity pool reactions to external shocks, which, to the best of our knowledge, is a previously unexplored area.

The underlying assumption that liquidity should react to shocks is well-rooted in traditional financial theory. Drechsler et al. [46] show that liquidity providers are negatively exposed to increases in volatility due to growing adverse selection risk: as such, a shock affecting the value of a stablecoin should map to a significant reduction of its available liquidity on the market. Chordia et al. [37] find

that volatility is informative in predicting liquidity shifts, while Amihud [22] finds that expectations about liquidity affect valuations in stocks.

The effects of disclosure and transparency have also been widely studied in the context of traditional financial markets. The primary inspiration for our work is Holmstrom [57], who points out that the role of transparency in debt and monetary instruments is opposite to the one it has for equities. While in the latter higher transparency and disclosure are often associated with lower financing costs and higher valuations [43], the former behave as “no questions asked” assets, for which the only point when information is relevant is close to the maturity of the debt or the redemption of the monetary asset, impacting valuation exclusively in a negative or neutral fashion. Mario Draghi’s “whatever it takes” speech in July 2012 [45] was a clear example of this theory at work, shrouding the deteriorating health of the Eurosystem behind a veil of opacity and thus saving it from what might have become a self-induced financial catastrophe for the European banking system.

Finally, we build on the growing literature on the microstructural properties of DEXs. In particular Lehar and Parlour [67] compare AMMs with LOB-based exchanges and find market regimes under which AMMs are more convenient trading venues; Lehar et al. [66] show that Uniswap v3 pools attract additional liquidity through market fragmentation; and [34] highlight strategic liquidity provision practices that take advantage of the unique setting of public blockchains. Therefore, our findings contribute to the ongoing debate over the viability of DeFi markets as complementary venues to their traditional counterparts.

2 Background

2.1 Events

We analyze the market dynamics surrounding SVB’s collapse in March 2023, precipitated by the following events:

- March 2022: Federal Reserve Open Market Committee (FOMC) starts increasing interest rates to combat inflation [7,76], affecting leveraged sectors and lending institutions [2].
- 8 March 2023: Silvergate Capital announces liquidation [8,64].
- 9 March 2023: SVB’s stock falls more than 60% at the stock market opening [59].
- 10 March 2023: SVB experiences a bank run and regulatory takeover [73].
- 11 March 2023, 3:11 AM UTC: Circle reveals \$3.3 billion (8% of its \$40 billion cash reserves [14]) held at SVB [33]⁴.
- 12 March 2023: Signature Bank closure by New York regulators [63].
- 17 March 2023: SVB’s parent company files for chapter 11 bankruptcy [10].
- 22 March 2023: the Federal Reserve (FED) raises rates to 4.75-5% [84].
- 26 March 2023: First Citizens Bank (FCB) acquires SVB [9].

We define three analysis periods relative to Circle’s announcement⁴:

- **Before:** 1 February 2023 – 3:11 AM UTC, 11 March 2023
- **During:** 3:11 AM UTC, 11 March 2023 – 17 March 2023
- **After:** 17 March 2023 – 30 April 2023

⁴ <https://twitter.com/circle/status/1634391505988206592>

2.2 Liquidity and exchange mechanisms in DeFi

Mechanism A liquidity position (L^2) in Uniswap’s V3 is defined by its AMM’s equation [17]:

$$\underbrace{\left(X_{real} + \frac{L}{\sqrt{P_b}}\right)}_{X_{virtual}} \overbrace{\left(Y_{real} + L\sqrt{P_a}\right)}^{Y_{virtual}} = L^2 \quad (1)$$

Re-arranging Equation 1, we can calculate the real amounts of token X (X_{real}) and token Y (Y_{real}) in tick i , identified by its price bounds $[P_a^{(i)}, P_b^{(i)}]$ when:

$$X_{real}, Y_{real} = \begin{cases} L \frac{\sqrt{P_b^{(i)}} - \sqrt{P_a^{(i)}}}{\sqrt{P_a^{(i)} P_b^{(i)}}}, 0 & \text{if } P < P_a^{(i)} \\ 0, L(\sqrt{P_b^{(i)}} - \sqrt{P_a^{(i)}}) & \text{if } P \geq P_b^{(i)} \\ L \frac{\sqrt{P_b^{(i)}} - \sqrt{P}}{\sqrt{P} \times \sqrt{P_b^{(i)}}}, L(\sqrt{P} - \sqrt{P_a^{(i)}}) & \text{if } P_a^{(i)} \leq P < P_b^{(i)} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

Exchange Traditional LOB exchanges match orders based on price and time priority, while AMM exchanges, like Uniswap and others, use a constant product formula (Equation 1) to determine prices from token ratios in liquidity pools [16,91,41]. Despite this difference, price effects in both systems are comparable, with a LOB market’s midpoint analogous to an AMM pool’s current price [66]. Additionally, Uniswap has several versions, but for our analysis, we focus on Uniswap V3 due to its other advantages, some of which are analogous to Limit Order Books (LOBs):

- Concentrated liquidity within price range $[P_a, P_b]$, unlike V1 and V2’s $[0, \infty]$ distribution [16], which means that trades execute against liquidity within a specified price range $[P_a, P_b]$ [17,50], similar to a market maker’s simultaneous sell and buy orders in a LOB [66].
- Higher trading volume and more responsive liquidity provision [38].
- Multiple fee tiers (0.01%, 0.05%, 0.30%, 1.00%) for risk-reward adjustment [17].

Liquidity Provision in Uniswap Liquidity is crucial in financial markets, enabling easy buying and selling of assets without significant price changes [23]. An AMM pool in Uniswap’s Decentralized Exchange (DEX) acts as the sole market maker, separating liquidity providers from traders [17]. This structure may create a more level playing field for traders [26]. Additionally, Uniswap’s transparency, by running on a blockchain, allows the identification of liquidity providers through Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs) representing their positions [6] and also, enabling all participants to see available liquidity, potentially improving price discovery and reducing information asymmetry [17,90,34]. This transparency may encourage responsible market-making and better monitoring of manipulation [71], but could expose providers to front-running or targeted attacks [49]. For example, a small fraction ($\sim 0.3\%$) of Uniswap V3 liquidity comes from Miner Extractable Value (MEV) bots executing Just-In-Time (JIT) liquidity attacks [89,90,34], which, however, we consider negligible for our study.

3 Methodology

3.1 Data Collection

We analyze ten key Uniswap liquidity pools (Table 1) representing our control (USDT) and treatment (USDC) groups, selected for their consistently high TVL and volume [67,5,1], at the time of this

Table 1: Liquidity Pools for DiD analysis with trading fees

Control (USDT)	Treatment (USDC)
WETH/USDT (Fee: 0.01)	USDC/WETH (Fee: 0.01)
WETH/USDT (Fee: 0.05)	USDC/WETH (Fee: 0.05)
WETH/USDT (Fee: 0.3)	USDC/WETH (Fee: 0.3)
WBTC/USDT (Fee: 0.3)	WBTC/USDC (Fee: 0.05)
DAI/USDT (Fee: 0.05)	DAI/USDC (Fee: 0.05)
USDC/USDT (Fee: 0.01)	

writing. Our selection criteria prioritize pairs with Wrapped Ethereum (WETH)⁵, which typically have more liquidity on Uniswap than on CEXs [69], as well as DAI and Wrapped Bitcoin (WBTC)⁶ pairs due to their high volume and TVL on Uniswap [3]. We also include the USDC/USDT pair for direct comparison between treatment and control groups. To reconstruct liquidity pool states for the *before*, *during*, and *after* periods (subsection 2.1), we:

1. Obtain latest positions from Uniswap V3’s subgraph⁷ at current time T_0 (data collection start).
2. Trace positions backward ($T_0, T_{-1}, T_{-2}, \dots, T_{-n}$).
3. Identify and record closed (burned) positions via unique Non-Fungible Token (NFT) identifiers.
4. Add burned positions back to the reconstructed pool state at relevant times (T_{-n}).

This process reliably reconstructs historical liquidity pool states based on the data available at Uniswap V3’s subgraph⁷.

3.2 Liquidity analysis metrics

Marginal Cost of Immediacy To analyze the impact of events on liquidity costs, we take advantage of the similarities between Uniswap V3 pools’ concentrated liquidity architecture and a more traditional LOB [66]. We then adapt the Marginal Cost of Immediacy measure introduced by Cenesizoglu et al. [35] to a liquidity pool, in which the ask side cost of liquidity is defined as:

$$MCI_A = \frac{VWAPM_A}{Vlm_A} \tag{3}$$

$$VWAPM_A = \ln \frac{\frac{Vlm_A}{\sum_{l=1}^L Q_{A,l}}}{0.5(P_{A,1} + P_{B,1})} \tag{4}$$

$$Vlm_A = \sum_{l=1}^L P_{A,l} Q_{A,l} \tag{5}$$

and for the bid side as:

$$MCI_B = \frac{-VWAPM_B}{Vlm_B} \tag{6}$$

MCI measures the marginal cost of executing trades that consume a significant portion of available liquidity, considering its distribution across price levels [35]. This concept applies to both LOB and AMM exchanges, as it captures the ease of an asset’s trading without causing significant price movements. By incorporating price and quantity information for USDC and USDT from their liquidity pools, we can measure transaction costs during SVB’s fallout. In Uniswap’s AMM context:

⁵ WETH has the same value as ETH, its underlying asset
⁶ WBTC has the same value as BTC, its underlying asset
⁷ <https://github.com/Uniswap/v3-subgraph>

- Buy orders: Swap the paired token for USDC or USDT (e.g., WETH for USDC in the USDC/WETH pool).
- Sell orders: Swap USDC or USDT for the paired token.

We adapt the MCI formula (Equation 3 and Equation 6) for Uniswap by considering liquidity at different price levels within $[P_a, P_b]$, as determined by active liquidity. To calculate *VWAP*, we simulate order execution with given sizes or tick spans. First, to allocate Y and X tokens into ticks at a given time, we aggregate liquidity (L^2) (Equation 1) for all positions in tick i at time T_{0-n} using Equation 2. Then, for a sell or buy order consuming all liquidity in tick i , we calculate ΔX and ΔY using Equation 7:

$$\Delta X, \Delta Y = \begin{cases} X_{real}, \frac{L^2}{X_{virtual} - \Delta X} - Y_{virtual} & \text{for a sell order (swap token } Y \text{ for } X) \\ \frac{L^2}{Y_{virtual} - \Delta Y} - X_{virtual}, Y_{real} & \text{For a buy order (swap token } X \text{ for } Y) \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

By calculating the swap ΔX and ΔY for a given order size consuming all the liquidity at a level or range of levels, the MCI formula estimates the cost of executing a buy or sell order given a specific liquidity level in the affected price range. This is analogous to how MCI is calculated for LOB exchanges, where the formula considers the available liquidity at different order book levels. We can then adapt the MCI of [35] to the DeFi case by recognizing that the Volume-Weighted Average Price (*VWAP*) and the Volume-Weighted Average Price scaled by the Mid-price (*VWAPM*), which in our case is the pre-transaction price P on the pool, are:

$$VWAPM = \ln \frac{\sum_l \Delta X_l}{\sum_l \Delta Y_l} \frac{1}{P} \quad (8)$$

Finally, the MCI for buy and sell orders is calculated as:

$$MCI = (-1)^B \times \frac{VWAPM}{\sum_l \Delta X_l} \quad (9)$$

where B is 1 for sell (bid-side) orders and 0 for buy (ask-side) orders to calculate MCI_B and MCI_A , respectively. Consistent with the literature [35], we represent MCI in basis points per thousand X units, which in our case is a stablecoin. Once we generate the MCI_A and MCI_B , we can calculate the bid-ask imbalance [35], denoted as MCI_{IMB} , by:

$$MCI_{IMB} = \frac{MCI_A - MCI_B}{MCI_A + MCI_B} \quad (10)$$

A positive imbalance implies that the marginal cost of swapping ask-side liquidity (buying) is higher than the cost of swapping bid-side liquidity (selling), and vice-versa. Finally, we also calculate the average MCI_μ , denoted as:

$$MCI_\mu = \frac{MCI_A + MCI_B}{2} \quad (11)$$

which we use to quantify the average cost of liquidity regardless of the transaction side.

3.3 Event study

We employ an event study methodology to assess the impact of key events (subsection 2.1) on liquidity costs, as well as the number of active liquidity providers and their liquidity concentration measured by a Gini coefficient. Using DiD, we measure the significance of these changes, with USDC

Table 2: Differences-in-Differences Estimation Results

	Total Value Locked in USD
Treatment (β_1)	0.067217*** (0.017)
Group (β_2)	1.668278*** (0.018)
Treatment interaction (β_3)	-0.323698*** (0.024)
Relative Effect $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2}$	-0.1940
Observations	178

Standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

Table 3: Differences-in-Differences Estimation Results using MCI for liquidity pool levels 1, 5, 10, 15, 20

	1	5	10	15	20
Treatment (β_1)	-0.0138*** (0.001)	-0.0137*** (0.003)	-0.0137*** (0.001)	-0.0137*** (0.001)	-0.0136*** (0.001)
Group (β_2)	0.0035* (0.001)	0.0017 (0.004)	0.0015 (0.001)	0.0015 (0.001)	0.0016 (0.001)
Treatment Interaction (β_3)	0.0166*** (0.002)	0.0207*** (0.004)	0.0172*** (0.002)	0.0162*** (0.002)	0.0155*** (0.002)
Relative Effect $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2}$	4.8012	11.9550	11.6857	10.7729	9.5653
Observations	1442	1442	1442	1442	1442

Standard errors are in parentheses. * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.001$

pools (Table 1) as the treatment group and the same-pair USDT pools as the control group. This approach isolates the effect of SVB’s downfall on USDC’s top liquidity pools, represented as:

$$y_{i,t} = \beta + \beta_1 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{t>\tau} + \beta_2 \cdot \mathbf{1}_{i=\text{USDC}} + \beta_3 \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{i=\text{USDC}} \times \mathbf{1}_{t>\tau}) + \epsilon_{i,t} \quad (12)$$

where τ is the treatment date, $\mathbf{1}_A$ is 1 if A is true and 0 otherwise, and y can be TVL in USD or MCI_μ measured on the first 1, 5, 10, 15 or 20 liquidity pool ticks around the active tick. From Equation 12, we care about the statistical significance of β_3 and the interaction between $\mathbf{1}_{i=\text{USDC}}$ and $\mathbf{1}_{t>\tau}$. Finally, the ratio $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2}$ quantifies the net effect that the events had on USDC pools and not on USDT.

4 Results

4.1 Difference-in-Differences

The statistically significant negative treatment interaction coefficient (β_3) for Total Value Locked in USD reveals the SVB collapse’s substantial impact on the treated group (USDC) compared to the control group (USDT). The relative effect, calculated as $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2}$, weakens the advantage in TVL of USDC relative to USDT by a $\sim 19.40\%$ post-event (see Table 2). This aligns with [18,52], demonstrating that stablecoins with perceived stronger ties to traditional banking are more susceptible to financial stress spillovers.

4.2 Marginal Cost of Immediacy

The DiD estimation results for MCI_μ across liquidity pool levels 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20 (Table 3) reveal the differential impact of the SVB collapse on USDC and USDT, with USDC experiencing



(a) Median daily MCI_μ for AMM's liquidity levels of 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20(b) Median daily MCI_{IMB} for AMM's liquidity levels of 1, 5, 10, 15, and 20

Fig. 1: Median daily MCI_μ and MCI_{IMB} for USDC and USDT. Shaded area: interquartile range (75th to 25th percentile). Lines mark events: Silvergate Bank's liquidation (teal), SVB stock crash (gray), Circle's tweet (tan), SVB bankruptcy (red), FED rate hike (golden), FCB buys SVB (green).


a more significant increase in marginal trading costs, especially at deeper pool levels. The negative and statistically significant treatment coefficient (β_1) across all levels indicates lower MCI_μ values for USDC (treated group) compared to USDT (control group) during the event period. However, the positive and statistically significant treatment interaction coefficient (β_3) shows that the gap in MCI_μ values between USDC and USDT widened during this period, implying a more substantial increase in marginal trading costs for USDC. The relative effect, calculated as $\frac{\beta_3}{\beta_2}$, increases from 4.80 at level 1 to 11.96 at level 5, indicating that the difference in marginal trading costs between USDC and USDT became more pronounced at deeper liquidity pool levels.

4.3 Gini Coefficient


The Gini Coefficient remained relatively high (above 0.9) for most USDC and USDT trading pairs throughout March 2023 (see Figure 2a and Figure 2c). This suggests a concentrated liquidity provision, with a small number of liquidity providers contributing a significant proportion of the total liquidity. However, some trading pairs, such as WBTCUSDC500, showed lower Gini Coefficients, indicating a more even distribution of liquidity among providers (see Figure 2a and Figure 2c) while other trading pairs like USDCUSDT100 had more activity regarding liquidity providers adding or removing liquidity. We analyze these results further on section 5.1




(a) Median daily Gini Coefficient for USDC’s liquidity pools (Table 1)



(b) Median daily total liquidity providers for USDC’s liquidity pools (Table 1)



(c) Median daily Gini Coefficient for USDT’s liquidity pools (Table 1)



(d) Median daily total liquidity providers for USDT’s liquidity pools (Table 1)

Fig. 2: Gini coefficient and total liquidity providers for USDC and USDT. The lines across the plots represent different events.

5 Discussion

5.1 Liquidity analysis

Marginal Cost of Immediacy Our results in subsection 4.2 align with the liquidity preference theory [86], which asserts that investors shift towards safer, more liquid assets during market stress [31]. As USDC’s exposure to SVB became known, investors perceived USDT as a safer alternative, evidenced by changes in MCI_μ and MCI_{IMB} between 8-18 March 2023. Following Silvergate Bank’s liquidation announcement on 8 March, USDT’s daily median MCI_μ at levels 1 and 20 increased by $\sim 241\%$, indicating heightened buying pressure. This trend intensified on 9 March with SVB’s stock crash [59] but reversed on 11 March when Circle disclosed its SVB reserves¹.

On 17 March, when SVB declared bankruptcy [10], USDC’s selling pressure increased significantly, with its MCI_{IMB} at 20 levels dropping by $\sim 186\%$. Conversely, USDT’s positive MCI_{IMB} suggested a buying preference, aligning with [52]’s findings on stablecoins’ vulnerability to financial stress. This flight-to-safety behavior increased liquidity demand for USDT, despite its lack of transparency regarding cash reserves [15,70]. By 20 March, USDC’s MCI imbalance (levels 10-20) matched USDT’s, indicating ongoing market uncertainty. The FED’s interest rate hike announcement on 22 March [84,80,83], which seemingly led to increased buying pressure for USDC. Then, despite FCB’s announcement to buy SVB [9] seemed to have improved market sentiment (subsection 5.3), MCI imbalances did not return to pre-event levels, suggesting a persistent impact on market sentiment and a continued preference for USDT over USDC for the weeks that followed.

¹ <https://twitter.com/circle/status/1634391505988206592>

Liquidity Concentration USDT pairs experienced less pronounced changes because of a possible perception of more stability. The SVB crisis in March 2023 significantly impacted liquidity distribution in USDC and USDT trading pairs. Following SVB’s stock crash on 9 March [59] and Circle’s announcement on 11 March¹, the Gini Coefficient for USDC pairs decreased (Figure 2a). For instance, USDCUSDT100’s Gini Coefficient dropped from 0.9609 to 0.8756 between 8-9 March, while liquidity providers plummeted from ~ 395 to ~ 16 , a $\sim 95.95\%$ decrease (Figure 2b).

This aligns with the tendency for liquidity to decrease during market stress [31]. On the other hand, Uniswap V3’s design allows liquidity providers to adjust positions during market downturns quickly [56,55], potentially explaining the rapid withdrawal of liquidity. Additionally, USDT pairs experienced less pronounced changes in the number of liquidity providers, except for DAIUSDT500, which dropped from ~ 121 to ~ 19 between 8-9 March and matched the trend of USDCUSDT100. Curiously, WETHUSDT500 and WBTCUSDT3000 followed a decreasing trend in their Gini Coefficient starting on 8 March as more liquidity providers seemed to migrate to these pools from pools that are of only stablecoin pairs like DAIUSDT500 and USDCUSDT100. In this context, ETH and BTC may have been perceived as more stable than stablecoins directly affected (USDC) or with uncertain exposure (USDT) to SVB crisis. Besides, the diversification benefits of holding cryptocurrency assets alongside stablecoins may have motivated liquidity providers to rebalance their portfolios, consistent with modern portfolio theory [72].

SVB’s bankruptcy declaration on 17 March [10] led to another decrease in liquidity providers, particularly in the USDCUSDT100 pool (Figure 2b), likely due to heightened market uncertainty. The FED’s interest rate hike announcement on 22 March [84] saw USDCUSDT100’s Gini Coefficient at 0.9467 with 80 liquidity providers (Figure 2a, Figure 2c). FCB’s acquisition of SVB on 26 March [9] had a stabilizing effect, with USDCUSDT100’s liquidity providers surging from 80 to 292, a 265% increase (Figure 2b, Figure 2d). The less volatile Gini Coefficients and the return of liquidity providers by late March 2023 indicate restored market confidence following FCB’s intervention in the SVB collapse.

5.2 Market dynamics

The banking crisis of March 2023, exemplified by SVB stock crash on March 9 following its announcement of a \$1.8 billion loss [59], had significant spillover effects on the DeFi ecosystem (see subsection 4.1). Circle, the issuer of USDC, had disclosed in its January and February 2023 reserve reports that it held cash reserves at SVB, Silvergate Bank (which voluntarily liquidated on March 8), and Signature Bank (which closed on March 12) [13,12,8,63]. These institutions were among the seven banks managing USDC’s cash reserves [12] in March 2023.

Although Circle did not reveal the exact distribution of its reserves across these banks[13,12], as the banking crisis escalated[52], informed investors began withdrawing USDC from DeFi liquidity pools (see Figure 3), such as those on Uniswap, and exchanging it for other stablecoins. Initially, Silvergate Bank reported a \$1 Billion loss on 1 March 2023 and raised concerns about its ability to continue operating[8], which culminated with Silvergate Bank’s voluntary liquidation on 8 March[8]. This news alone caused an 11.25% drop in USDC’s Total Value Locked in USD on Uniswap. Then, on March 9, when SVB’s stock fell more than 60% at the stock market opening [59] until Circle publicly acknowledged its exposure to SVB on 11 March[33], USDC’s Total Value Locked in USD in Uniswap fell by 6.95% (Figure 3). These investors’ behaviors during Silvergate Bank and SVB’s events highlight the existence of information asymmetry in the market, with some well-informed investors reacting more quickly to market developments[19].

¹ <https://twitter.com/circle/status/1634391505988206592>




Fig. 3: Total Value Locked in USD before and after different events

The flight-to-safety or flight-to-quality behavior highlights the strong connections between traditional banking and DeFi. This interconnection is a primary driver of the observed spillover effects and market reactions within DeFi amid the banking turmoil in March 2023. The flight-to-safety behavior observed during this period is consistent with the literature on investor behavior during times of financial stress[68], in which investors tend to rebalance their portfolios towards *seemingly* safer and more liquid assets[31,86]. The significant drop in USDC liquidity pool’s TVL in USD (see Figure 3) and the increased demand for other stablecoins[52] (see subsection 4.2) demonstrates this phenomenon in the context of DeFi.

5.3 Monetary Policy and Market Stabilization Measures

Major central banks, including the FED, European Central Bank, and Bank of England, raised interest rates between 2022-2023 to combat inflation [7,47,48], pressuring financial institutions [60]. This particularly affected SVB, which had benefited from previous low-rate policies [54]. The rate hikes devalued SVB’s bonds, contributing to its March 2023 bank run vulnerability [60]. Despite ongoing banking turmoil [78], the FED raised rates to 4.75-5% on 22 March 2023 [84]. This decision negatively impacted bank stocks [78,79] and seemed to cause an 8.53% drop in USDC liquidity pools’ TVL in USD (Figure 3). Stability returned after FCB’s announcement to acquire SVB on 26 March 2023 [9], facilitated by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC)’s provision of a contingent liquidity credit line [9]. This action restored banking confidence and reduced uncertainty about Circle’s reserves. The ensuing recovery in USDC’s liquidity pools (Figure 3) reflects the stabilizing effect of decisive interventions, echoing observations from the 2008 crisis [53] and Ben Bernanke’s Great Depression research on bank failures’ role in deepening economic downturns [28].

5.4 Reserve assets composition of USDC and USDT

The March 2023 banking turmoil highlighted the trade-offs between liquidity and reserve portfolio management for USDC and USDT. Circle’s liquidity-focused approach for USDC, with high cash

reserves (25.39% in February[12], 12.47% in March[14], and 1.32% in April 2023[11]), prioritized meeting potential redemption demands. This aligns with asset-liability management principles [85] but exposed USDC to greater risk when three of its seven deposit-holding banks failed, particularly SVB¹. Contrarily, Tether’s more diversified USDT reserve portfolio, including less liquid assets (e.g., precious metals [44,77]) and more volatile assets (e.g., Bitcoins [27,62]), provided a buffer against the turmoil with USDT’s March 2023 reserves show only 0.59% (\$0.48 billion) in cash out of its \$81.83 billion portfolio[15], demonstrating the potential stability benefits of diversification[72]. However, Tether’s approach carries risks. In a stablecoin run scenario [18], highly volatile assets could be redeemed at a lower initial value and less liquid assets could be challenging to convert without significant losses. This mismatch between USDT’s liabilities (stablecoins issued) and illiquid reserve assets creates a maturity transformation risk, a key vulnerability in traditional banking that can fuel runs [29,42]. The contrasting impacts of the banking turmoil on USDC and USDT underscore the complex balance between maintaining liquidity for redemptions and reducing portfolio risks through diversification.

5.5 Transparency in reporting

The disparate impacts on USDC and USDT of the March 2023 banking crisis may originate from differences in transparency and reserve disclosure frequencies. While transparency typically improves cryptocurrencies’ Initial Coin Offerings (ICOs) success [58], stablecoins present a contradiction. Circle’s monthly USDC reports [82] contrast with Tether’s semi-annual USDT reports [70], allowing USDC holders to respond more swiftly to perceived risks. [18] show that greater reserve transparency can increase run risk under pessimistic expectations and low conversion costs. Our MCI liquidity analysis (subsection 4.2) corroborates this during the March 2023 crisis. USDC’s transparency about its SVB holdings could have likely reduced confidence, which was exacerbated by low DeFi transaction costs and the inability to halt trading on DEXs like in TradFi for particular assets or securities to prevent further loss of value [4]. This aligns with theories on how information asymmetries amplify investor coordination failures [25]. Contrarily, Tether’s March 2023 report lacked details on cash reserve deposits [15,70], such as the banks holding them, seemingly obscuring its exposure. Despite USDT’s opacity, traders sought more liquidity in its pools, showing a willingness to pay a premium to switch from USDC to USDT (subsection 5.1, subsection 5.2).

6 Limitations

Our analysis focuses on USDC and USDT, including DAI as a trading pair, but does not capture interactions with other stablecoins like TrueUSD (TUSD), etc. The study is limited to some of the top ten liquidity pools for USDC and USDT (Table 1) at the time of writing. The dataset’s hourly and daily frequency may not reflect sudden changes observable at more granular levels, as aggregation smooths out rapid fluctuations compared to higher-frequency data (e.g., minute-by-minute).

7 Conclusion

The SVB collapse significantly impacted the DeFi ecosystem. During this event, we observed an apparent flight-to-safety behavior: USDC’s TVL decreased $\sim 19.40\%$ relative to USDT, USDT’s

¹ <https://twitter.com/circle/status/1634391505988206592>

liquidity cost increased by $\sim 241\%$, while Stablecoin-only pools lost liquidity providers as USDx-ETH/BTC pools gained. These results align with traditional financial stress literature [68,31,86].

Our findings revealed a transparency contradiction in stablecoins, suggesting that USDC's transparency and high-frequency reporting led to swift and abrupt market reactions, while USDT's less frequent and opaque disclosures provided a temporary buffer. The results would suggest the need to re-evaluate disclosure policies for stablecoins that have no safety net (e.g. insurance or lenders of last resort) regarding their reserves liquidity, as well as a stronger focus on robust reserve management to reduce liquidity risks.

References

1. Tether (USDT): Buy and sell on Uniswap, <https://app.uniswap.org/explore/tokens/ethereum/0xdac17f958d2ee523a2206206994597c13d831ec7>
2. The Fed - 3. Leverage in the Financial Sector, <https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/2023-may-financial-stability-report-leverage.htm>
3. Top Ten Pools Uniswap Info, <https://info.uniswap.org/#/pools>
4. Trading Suspensions | U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission, <https://www.sec.gov/litigation/suspensions>
5. USDC (USDC): Buy and sell on Uniswap, <https://app.uniswap.org/explore/tokens/ethereum/0xa0b86991c6218b36c1d19d4a2e9eb0ce3606eb48>
6. Why is liquidity position ownership represented by tokens or NFTs? – Uniswap Labs, <https://support.uniswap.org/hc/en-us/articles/20980786685069-Why-is-liquidity-position-ownership-represented-by-tokens-or-NFTs->
7. Federal Reserve Board - Open Market Operations Archive (2013), https://www.federalreserve.gov/monetarypolicy/openmarket_archive.htm
8. Crypto bank Silvergate sinks after delaying annual report | Reuters (2023), <https://www.reuters.com/technology/silvergate-slumps-28-after-delaying-annual-report-warning-about-viability-2023-03-02/>
9. First Citizens Bank Enters into Whole Bank Purchase of Silicon Valley Bridge Bank, N.A. - Mar 27, 2023 (2023), <https://newsroom.firstcitizens.com/2023-03-27-First-Citizens-Bank-Enters-into-Whole-Bank-Purchase-of-Silicon-Valley-Bridge-Bank,-N-A>
10. Kroll Restructuring Administration (2023), <https://restructuring.ra.kroll.com/svbf/>
11. USDC Reserve Report - April 2023 (2023), https://www.circle.com/hubfs/USDCAttestationReports/2023/2023USDC_CircleExaminationReportApril2023.pdf
12. USDC Reserve Report - February 2023 (2023), https://www.circle.com/hubfs/USDCAttestationReports/2023USDC_CircleExaminationReportFebruary2023.pdf
13. USDC Reserve Report - January 2023 (2023), https://www.circle.com/hubfs/USDCAttestationReports/2023USDC_CircleExaminationReportJanuary2023.pdf
14. USDC Reserve Report - March 2023 (2023), https://www.circle.com/hubfs/USDCAttestationReports/2023/2023USDC_CircleExaminationReportMarch2023.pdf
15. USDT Reserve Report - March 2023 (2023), https://assets.ctfassets.net/vyse88cgwfb1/24G4DuQ0HE7h7EQE6vGy4J/8a8a170edf687ea07b3f86048af8b87b/ES0.03.01_Std_ISAE_3000R_Opinion_31-03-2023_BDO_Tether_CRR.pdf
16. Adams, H., Zinsmeister, N., Robinson, D.: Uniswap v2 Core pp. 1–10 (2020)
17. Adams, H., Zinsmeister, N., Salem moody, M., River Keefer, U., Robinson, D.: Uniswap v3 whitepaper. Uniswap (March) (2021), <https://uniswap.org/whitepaper-v3.pdf>
18. Ahmed, R., Aldasoro, I., Duley, C.: Public information and stablecoin runs (2024), www.bis.org
19. Akerlof, G.A.: The market for “lemons”: Quality uncertainty and the market mechanism. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **84**(3), 488–500 (1970). <https://doi.org/10.2307/1879431>
20. Akhtaruzzaman, M., Boubaker, S., Goodell, J.W.: Did the collapse of Silicon Valley Bank catalyze financial contagion? *Finance Research Letters* **56**, 104082 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.104082>
21. Allen, F., Gale, D.: Financial contagion. *Journal of Political Economy* **108**(1), 1–33 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1086/262109/0>
22. Amihud, Y.: Illiquidity and stock returns: Cross-section and time-series effects. *Journal of Financial Markets* **5**(1), 31–56 (2002). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1386-4181\(01\)00024-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1386-4181(01)00024-6)
23. Amihud, Y., Mendelson, H.: Asset pricing and the bid-ask spread. *Journal of Financial Economics* **17**(2), 223–249 (1986). [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X\(86\)90065-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-405X(86)90065-6)

24. Amihud, Y., Mendelson, H., Pedersen, L.H.: Liquidity and asset prices. *Foundations and Trends in Finance* **1**(4), 269–364 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1561/05000000003>
25. Angeletos, G.M., Werning, I.: Crises and prices: Information aggregation, multiplicity, and volatility. *American Economic Review* **96**(5), 1720–1736 (2006). <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.96.5.1720>
26. Angeris, G., Chitra, T.: Improved Price Oracles: Constant Function Market Makers. *AFT 2020 - Proceedings of the 2nd ACM Conference on Advances in Financial Technologies* pp. 80–91 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3419614.3423251>
27. Bakas, D., Magkonis, G., Oh, E.Y.: What drives volatility in Bitcoin market? *Finance Research Letters* **50**, 103237 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2022.103237>
28. Bernanke, B.S.: Nonmonetary Effects of the Financial Crisis in the Propagation of the Great Depression. *The American Economic Review* **73**(3), 257–276 (1983)
29. Bologna, P.: Working Paper Series: Banks’ maturity transformation: risk, reward, and policy. *ESRB European Systemic Risk Board* **63** (2018)
30. Bonifacic, I.: USDC stablecoin breaks dollar peg following Silicon Valley Bank collapse (2023), <https://www.engadget.com/usdc-stablecoin-breaks-dollar-peg-following-silicon-valley-bank-collapse-232052571.html?guccounter=1>
31. Brunnermeier, M.K., Pedersen, L.H.: Market liquidity and funding liquidity. *Review of Financial Studies* **22**(6), 2201–2238 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhn098>
32. Campajola, C., Lillo, F., Tantari, D.: Unveiling the relation between herding and liquidity with trader lead-lag networks. *Quantitative Finance* **20**(11), 1765–1778 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14697688.2020.1763442>
33. Capoot, A.: Stablecoin USDC breaks dollar peg after firm reveals it has \$3.3 billion in SVB exposure (2023), <https://www.cnn.com/2023/03/11/stablecoin-usdc-breaks-dollar-peg-after-firm-reveals-it-has-3point3-billion-in-svb-exposure.html>
34. Capponi, A., Jia, R., Zi, B., Zhu, Q.: The Paradox Of Just-in-Time Liquidity in Decentralized Exchanges: More Providers Can Sometimes Mean Less Liquidity (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.18164v2>
35. Cenesizoglu, T., Grass, G.: Bid- and ask-side liquidity in the NYSE limit order book. *Journal of Financial Markets* **38**, 14–38 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.finmar.2017.10.002>
36. Chen, W.D., Chen, Y., Huang, S.C.: Liquidity risk and bank performance during financial crises. *Journal of Financial Stability* **56**, 100906 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2021.100906>
37. Chordia, T., Sarkar, A., Subrahmanyam, A.: An empirical analysis of stock and bond market liquidity. *Review of Financial Studies* **18**(1), 85–129 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhi010>
38. CoinMarketCap: Top Cryptocurrency Decentralized Exchanges (2022), <https://coinmarketcap.com/rankings/exchanges/dex/>
39. CoinMarketCap.com: Top Stablecoin Tokens by Market Capitalization | CoinMarketCap (2022), <https://coinmarketcap.com/view/stablecoin/>
40. Cornett, M.M., McNutt, J.J., Strahan, P.E., Tehranian, H.: Liquidity Risk Management and Credit Supply in the Financial Crisis. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2012). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1601992>
41. Dahi, F., Hernandez, W., Feng, Y., Xu, J., Malhotra, A., Tasca, P.: Automated Market Maker on the XRP Ledger **42**, 1–23 (2023), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.13749>
42. Diamond, D.W., Rajan, R.G.: Liquidity risk, liquidity creation, and financial fragility: A theory of banking. *Journal of Political Economy* **109**(2), 287–327 (2001). <https://doi.org/10.1086/319552>
43. DIAMOND, D.W., VERRECCHIA, R.E.: Disclosure, Liquidity, and the Cost of Capital. *The Journal of Finance* **46**(4), 1325–1359 (1991). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1991.tb04620.x>
44. Dinh, T., Goutte, S., Nguyen, D.K., Walther, T.: Economic drivers of volatility and correlation in precious metal markets. *Journal of Commodity Markets* **28**, 100242 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcomm.2021.100242>
45. Draghi, M.: Verbatim of the remarks made by Mario Draghi (2012), <https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2012/html/sp120726.en.html>
46. Drechsler, I., Moreira, A., Savov, A., Thank, W., Brunnermeier, M., Kyle, P., Fournier, M., Hu, Y., Schreindorfer, D., Schmidt, D., Westerfield, M., Song, Z., Daniel, K., Duffie, G., Kaniel, R., Kelly, B.: Liquidity and Volatility (10 2020). <https://doi.org/10.3386/W27959>
47. ECB.europa.eu: Key ECB interest rates (2013), <http://www.ecb.europa.eu/stats/monetary/rates/html/index.en.html>
48. England, B.o.: What we are doing about the rising cost of living (2023), <https://www.bankofengland.co.uk/cost-of-living>
49. Eskandari, S., Moosavi, S., Clark, J.: SoK: Transparent Dishonesty: Front-Running Attacks on Blockchain. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science (including subseries Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence and Lecture Notes in Bioinformatics)* **11599 LNCS**, 170–189 (2020). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-43725-1_{_}13/COVER

50. Fan, Z., Marmolejo-Cossio, F., Moroz, D., Neuder, M., Rao, R., Parkes, D.C.: Strategic Liquidity Provision in Uniswap V3. *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs* **282** (2023). <https://doi.org/10.4230/LIPIcs.AFT.2023.25>, <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.12033v4>
51. Filimonov, V., Sornette, D.: Quantifying reflexivity in financial markets: Toward a prediction of flash crashes. *Physical Review E - Statistical, Nonlinear, and Soft Matter Physics* **85**(5), 56108 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.85.056108>
52. Galati, L., Capalbo, F.: Silicon Valley Bank bankruptcy and Stablecoins stability. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **91**, 103001 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2023.103001>
53. Gorton, G., Metrick, A.: The federal reserve and panic prevention: The roles of financial regulation and lender of last resort. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **27**(4), 45–64 (2013). <https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.27.4.45>
54. Harari, D.: Interest Rates and Monetary Policy: Key Economic Indicators, <https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/sn02802/>
55. Heimbach, L., Schertenleib, E., Wattenhofer, R.: Exploring Price Accuracy on Uniswap V3 in Times of Distress. *DeFi 2022 - Proceedings of the 2022 ACM CCS Workshop on Decentralized Finance and Security*, co-located with CCS 2022 pp. 47–53 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3560832.3563435>
56. Heimbach, L., Schertenleib, E., Wattenhofer, R.: Risks and Returns of Uniswap V3 Liquidity Providers pp. 89–101 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3558535.3559772>
57. Holmström, B.: Understanding the Role of Central Banks in the Financial System. paper delivered at the 13th BIS Annual ... (January 2012), 40–64 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1643-0.ch003>, http://bis.hasbeenforeclosed.com/events/conf140626/vonthadden_comments.pdf
58. Howell, S.T., Niessner, M., Yermack, D.: Initial coin offerings: Financing growth with cryptocurrency token sales. *Review of Financial Studies* **33**(9), 3925–3974 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhz131>
59. Hu, K., Tong, A., Rajesh, A.M.: Silicon Valley Bank scrambles to reassure clients after 60% stock wipe-out (2023), <https://www.reuters.com/business/finance/silicon-valley-bank-sell-stock-cope-with-cash-burn-2023-03-09/>
60. Jiang, E.X., Matvos, G., Piskorski, T., Seru, A.: Monetary Tightening and U.S. Bank Fragility in 2023: Market-to-Market Losses and Uninsured Depositor Runs? *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4393389>, <https://www.nber.org/papers/w31048>
61. Kirilenko, A., Kyle, A.S., Samadi, M., Tuzun, T.: The Flash Crash: High-Frequency Trading in an Electronic Market. *Journal of Finance* **72**(3), 967–998 (2017). <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.12498>
62. Kuiper, C., Neureuter, J.: Research Round-Up: A Deep Dive on Why Bitcoin is so Volatile (2022), <https://www.fidelitydigitalassets.com/research-and-insights/research-round-deep-dive-why-bitcoin-so-volatile>
63. Lang, H., Anand, N.: Signature Bank Becomes Next Casualty of Banking Turmoil After SVB (2023), <https://www.reuters.com/business/finance/new-york-state-regulators-close-signature-bank-2023-03-12/>
64. Lang, H., Chakroborti, A.: Crypto-focused bank Silvergate plans to wind down following blow from FTX | Reuters (2023), <https://www.reuters.com/technology/crypto-focused-bank-silvergate-plans-wind-down-operations-2023-03-08/>
65. Lee, S.P.: Market Share of Decentralized Crypto Exchanges, by Trading Volume | CoinGecko (2023), <https://www.coingecko.com/research/publications/decentralized-crypto-exchanges-market-share>
66. Lehar, A., Parlour, C., Zoican, M.: Fragmentation and optimal liquidity supply on decentralized exchanges. *Edinburgh Economics of Technology* (2023), <http://arxiv.org/abs/2307.13772>
67. Lehar, A., Parlour, C.A.: Decentralized Exchange: The Uniswap Automated Market Maker. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2021), <https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=3905316>
68. Lehnert, T.: Flight-to-safety and retail investor behavior. *International Review of Financial Analysis* **81**, 102142 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102142>
69. Liao, G., Robinson, D.: The Dominance of Uniswap v3 Liquidity (2022), <https://uniswap.org/TheDominanceofUniswapv3Liquidity.pdf>
70. London, R.M., Damak, M.: Stablecoin Stability Assessment: Tether (USDT)
71. Makarov, I., Schoar, A.: Blockchain Analysis of the Bitcoin Market. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2021). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3949206>
72. Markowitz, H.: Portfolio selection. *Harry Markowitz: Selected Works* pp. 15–30 (2009). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2975974>
73. Ortenca, J.F., Gara, A.A., Masters, B., Kinder, T., Hammond, G., Gandel, S., Smith, C., Fedor, L., Noonan, L., Smith, R., Platt, E.: Silicon Valley Bank shut down by US banking regulators (2023), <https://www.ft.com/content/6943e05b-6b0d-4f67-9a35-9664fb456504>
74. Pandey, D.K., Hassan, M.K., Kumari, V., Hasan, R.: Repercussions of the Silicon Valley Bank collapse on global stock markets. *Finance Research Letters* **55**, 104013 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fr.l.2023.104013>

75. Perdichizzi, S., Reghezza, A.: Non-significant in life but significant in death: Spillover effects to euro area banks from the SVB fallout. *Economics Letters* **230**, 111231 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2023.111231>
76. Powell, J.H.: Remarks by Chair Pro Tempore Powell on Restoring Price Stability (2022), <https://www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/powell20220321a.htm>
77. Raza, S.A., Masood, A., Benkraiem, R., Urom, C.: Forecasting the volatility of precious metals prices with global economic policy uncertainty in pre and during the COVID-19 period: Novel evidence from the GARCH-MIDAS approach. *Energy Economics* **120**, 106591 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2023.106591>
78. Rennison, J.: Stocks Drop After Fed Raises Rates - The New York Times (2023), <https://www.nytimes.com/2023/03/22/business/stock-markets-rates-fed-decision.html>
79. Romero, D.: Stock market news today: Stocks teeter after Federal Reserve raises rates by 0.25% (2023), <https://finance.yahoo.com/news/stock-market-news-today-live-updates-march-22-2023-123738540.html?guccounter=1>
80. Rushe, D.: US Federal Reserve raises interest rates a quarter-point amid banking turmoil | Federal Reserve | The Guardian (2023), <https://www.theguardian.com/business/2023/mar/22/interest-rate-rise-us-federal-reserve-banking-turmoil>
81. Schmidt, L., Timmermann, A., Wermers, R.: Runs on Money Market Mutual Funds. *American Economic Review* **106**(9), 2625–2657 (2016). <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20140678>
82. Schroerer, L., Damak, M.: Analytical Contacts Stablecoin Stability Assessment USDC (2023), https://www.spglobal.com/_assets/documents/ratings/research/101590836.pdf
83. Siegel, R.: Federal Reserve raises interest rate by 0.25 points despite banking crisis - The Washington Post (2023), <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2023/03/22/fed-rate-hike-svb/>
84. Smith, C., Duguid, K.: Federal Reserve presses ahead with quarter-point rate rise despite banking turmoil (2023), <https://www.ft.com/content/8fefddc0-c611-4400-b112-51e8d0a763da>
85. Supervision, B.C.o.B.: Basel III: the liquidity coverage ratio and liquidity risk monitoring tools (2013)
86. Tobin, J.: Liquidity preference as behavior towards risk. *Review of Economic Studies* **25**(2), 65–86 (1958). <https://doi.org/10.2307/2296205>
87. Tobin, M., Miller, H.: Silicon Valley Bank Was Practically Everything to Tech Industry: What to Know - Bloomberg (2023), <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2023-03-10/silicon-valley-bank-the-investor-lender-networker-of-startups>
88. Vayanos, D., Wang, J.: Liquidity and asset returns under asymmetric information and imperfect competition. *Review of Financial Studies* **25**(5), 1339–1365 (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1093/rfs/hhr128>
89. Wan, X., Adams, A.: Just-in-time Liquidity on the Uniswap Protocol. *SSRN Electronic Journal* (2023). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4382303>
90. Xiong, X., Wang, Z., Knottenbelt, W., Huth, M.: Demystifying Just-in-Time (JIT) Liquidity Attacks on Uniswap V3. 5th Conference on Blockchain Research and Applications for Innovative Networks and Services, BRAINS 2023 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1109/BRAINS59668.2023.10316935>
91. Xu, J., Paruch, K., Cousaert, S., Feng, Y.: SoK: Decentralized Exchanges (DEX) with Automated Market Maker (AMM) Protocols. *ACM Computing Surveys* **55**(11) (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3570639>
92. Yousaf, I., Goodell, J.W.: Responses of US equity market sectors to the Silicon Valley Bank implosion. *Finance Research Letters* **55**, 103934 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.frl.2023.103934>