

# Optimal Rebate Design: Incentives, Competition and Efficiency in Auction Markets

Thibaut MASTROLIA\* and Tianrui XU†

January 23, 2025

## Abstract

This study explores the design of an efficient rebate policy in auction markets, focusing on a continuous-time setting with competition among market participants. In this model, a stock exchange collects transaction fees from auction investors executing block trades to buy or sell a risky asset, then redistributes these fees as rebates to competing market makers submitting limit orders. Market makers influence both the price at which the asset trades and their arrival intensity in the auction. We frame this problem as a principal-multi-agent problem and provide necessary and sufficient conditions to characterize the Nash equilibrium among market makers. The exchange's optimization problem is formulated as a high-dimensional Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation with Poisson jump processes, which is solved using a verification result. To numerically compute the optimal rebate and transaction fee policies, we apply the Deep BSDE method introduced in [Henry-Labordere, 2017, Han and Long, 2020]. Our results show that optimal transaction fees and rebate structures improve market efficiency by narrowing the spread between the auction clearing price and the asset's fundamental value, while ensuring a minimal gain for both market makers indexed on the price of the asset on a coexisting limit order book.

**Keywords:** Microstructure, market design, auctions, Nash equilibrium, stochastic games, stochastic control, market making, HJB PDE.

---

\*UC Berkeley, Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, mastrolia@berkeley.edu

†UC Berkeley, Department of Mathematics, tianrui.xu@berkeley.edu

## 1 Introduction

The 2020 Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences awarded Robert Wilson and Paul Milgrom for their work to improve auction theory and invented new auction formats, benefitting sellers, buyers and taxpayers around the world. It brought significant attention to auction market design. Auction markets have diverse applications, ranging from online advertising, stock trading, to electricity markets (see [Milgrom et al., 2019] for an overview of these applications). Nobel laureates Robert Wilson and Paul Milgrom not only made profound theoretical contributions to auction theory but also applied their expertise practically (see [Milgrom, 2021] for further details). For instance, in their earlier works [Wilson, 1977] and [Milgrom, 1979], they studied the conditions under which an auction market yields a final price that closely approximates the true price of the asset being auctioned. Later, they advised the U.S. Federal Communications Commission (FCC) and helped implementing the simultaneous multiple round auction design for spectrum license allocation. Inspired by these works, this paper delves into auction market design for stock exchanges, aiming to bridge theory and practice in order to improve the efficiency of stock markets.

When we think of auctions, we often picture people loudly raising their voices to bid for a product. It might come as a surprise to many that modern stock trading is also conducted through auctions. For example, the central limit order book operates as a double auction, where participants silently submit their desired share prices and quantities to the stock exchange. The term “double” refers to the fact that both buyers and sellers place bids — buyers bidding to purchase shares and sellers bidding to sell them. A match occurs only when the highest bid price from the buyers meets or exceeds the lowest ask price from the sellers. Alternatively, batch auction is a trading mechanism where orders are collected over a specific period of time and then processed or executed at a single, determined point, or “batch”, rather than being matched continuously in real-time. This process aggregates all buy and sell orders that have been submitted during the batch period and determines a price at which the maximum number of orders can be executed, based on supply and demand.

Applying the central limit order book and batch auction mechanisms in real-world exchanges has resulted in two primary trading systems: the continuous limit order book system and the periodic auction system. The continuous limit order book functions as a double auction in real time, continuously accepting new orders and matching them whenever a suitable counterparty is willing to buy or sell at a specific price or better (limit orders) or at the best available price (market orders). We refer to [Avellaneda and Stoikov, 2008, Gayduk and

Nadtochiy, 2018, Cont et al., 2010, Guéant et al., 2013, Foucault, 1999, Colliard and Foucault, 2012, Baldacci et al., 2023a, Barucci et al., 2025] or the monograph [Cartea et al., 2015] for empirical facts, price formation and stochastic control problems related to limit order book and market making. In contrast, a periodic auction runs a batch auction periodically: upon the entry of a trader, an auction is initiated and remains open for a set duration, ranging from a few seconds to a few minutes, as determined by the stock exchange. During this period, any order can join with a proposed price and quantity. Once the auction closes, the exchange computes a clearing price that maximizes executed quantities. All buy orders above the clearing price and all sell orders below the clearing price are executed at the clearing price instead of their initially proposed prices. A new auction may start once the previous one concludes, hence the name “periodic” auction. Unlike the continuous system, periodic auctions do not reflect a continuous trading along time and defer all transactions at the end of each auction duration. Auctions have known a growing interest among traditional exchanges, as for example CBOE U.S. Equities Periodic Auctions, Turquoise operated by the London Stock Exchange Group, CME Globex.

### 1.1 Periodic auction *vs* continuous limit order book

Although the continuous limit order book is the most commonly used trading mechanism by stock exchanges around the world, the “continuous” nature of this trading system also presents troubles. The influential work of [Budish et al., 2015] argues that the design of the continuous trading system inherently creates arbitrage opportunities in short time intervals. These arbitrage opportunities encourage market participants to compete for speed, or more specifically to compete for faster reaction to market changes and faster execution of their orders. The work further argues that such competition for speed is uneconomical as the total arbitrage gains have not increased while traders increasingly invest resources to enter this speed race. Other influential work by [Wah and Wellman, 2013] and [Farmer and Skouras, 2012] discover similar problems of the continuous trading system; for example, [Wah and Wellman, 2013] argues that high-frequency traders, acting as latency arbitrageurs, widen bid-ask spreads and thus disrupt market price efficiency. Given these defects of the continuous trading system, it raises the question of whether other trading systems could address the issues. The influential study [Budish et al., 2015] argues that financial exchanges should use frequent batch auctions with uniform price double auctions conducted, for example, every tenth of a second to eliminate inherent LOB’s flaws. The article [Jusselin et al., 2021] has then determined the optimal duration of auctions based on financial data from Euronext. It advocates for auction mechanism rather than limit order book in most of cases. Finally, [Duffie and Zhu, 2017, Derchu et al., 2024] investigate hybrid market with continuous trading sessions in alternance with batch auctions. All this study advocate for the use of batch auctions to

raise liquidity, reduce mechanical flaws induced by high frequency trading activities and enhance the market efficiency.

## 1.2 Auction, transaction fees and rebates

In this paper, we want to study what further market design should we include in a periodic auction market so that a realization of such market can be well-operated and beneficial. We adopt the market design proposed by [Derchu et al., 2024] where a periodic auction market operates alongside a continuous limit order book. This design allows traders to join in either market based on their preferences.

The previous subsection highlights that a periodic auction market offers the benefits of restricting speed-based competition and enhancing price discovery by aggregating the views of all market participants during the set period (see [Jusselin et al., 2021]). However, the existing design of a periodic auction market has its flaws. A very simple toy two-players auction game has been studied in [Derchu et al., 2023] to generate liquidity. With imperfect information and without any incentives, this model shows that the auction market is inefficient and does not lead to any trade between market participants. [Derchu et al., 2023] however proves that the introduction of transaction fees indexed on each players half spread leads to a transaction and proposes a quantitative value for the optimal fees that the exchange has to propose in this model to generate liquidity. Rebates-fees policy are thus fundamental to generate trade in auction markets with imperfect information. In addition to that, [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024] emphasizes another vulnerability in the design of a periodic auction: unregulated strategic traders have no incentive to arrive earlier than the last moment of an auction and such behavior increases the distance between the clearing price and the efficient price of an asset. It thus requires to design optimal incentives to monitor the behaviors of strategic traders.

*“The majority of auctions worldwide require cash bids. Yet in many auctions, bidders do not have cash equal to the sum they wish to bid. As a result, bidders finance part of their bids. This financing may come from the financial markets or from the seller.”* [Rhodes-Kropf and Viswanathan, 2005]. In a CLOB model, incentive and make-takes fees policy have been previously investigated in [Euch et al., 2021]. The specificity of our work is to design efficiently rebates policy in periodic auction markets proposed by the exchange to auction market maker while transaction fees are paid by buyer/seller investors.

**Contributions and model relevancy.** We aim at answering what is an optimal rebates and transaction fees scheme that the exchange should propose to auction market participants to enhance market efficiency and improve the exchange’s profit. We emphasize that the exchange’s objective includes not only improving market efficiency but also ensuring its own profitability by collecting the fees. This dual objective is important because, as highlighted in [Budish et al., 2024], exchanges have little motivation to shift trading activity from a continuous trading market to an auction market unless the new mechanism generates sufficient financial benefits for the exchange itself. The realism of our model is encoded with the following empirical economical facts.

- Competition between strategic traders (market makers). We consider strategic market makers in competition in a batch auction, setting their quote and volume as limit order along the duration of the auction and controlling their trading speed. This traders receives rebates from the exchange.
- Cancellation of orders sent by investors. Buyer/seller investors send auction market orders to buy or sell a certain volume of the asset at the clearing price set by the exchange at the end of the auction, whatever is this price. Investors are not strategic but rather spontaneous and pay a fixed transaction fee per share for each order sent in the auction. We incorporate in our model the cancellation of these orders by investors at random times.
- Heterogeneity of traders’ behavior. Traders are not assumed to be symmetrical. Different volumes sent by different traders is considered with different trading speed.
- Rebates design. The main improvement of this work compared to the previous study [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024] is to quantitatively derive an optimal incentive structure proposed by the exchange. In contrast to our earlier work, where we discretize the time span and simplify trader interactions, this paper models time as a continuous variable and considers a Nash equilibrium game between two strategic traders.
- Deep learning methods. Due to the complexity of our model and the high dimensionality of the problem with multiple variables and players, we use a deep learning BSDE method to solve the optimization problem associated with the controlled multi-dimensional SDE with jumps and controlled intensities considered.

To determine the optimal incentive structure, this paper adopts a principal-agent framework, where the stock exchange is viewed as the principal and traders as the agents. The stock exchange proposes incentives, and the agents decide when to submit their orders and at what price, aiming to maximize their gains under the given

incentives. The principal-agent problem is well-established in literature. The seminal work of [Holmstrom and Milgrom, 1987] introduces a continuous-time approach to principal-agent problems, while the seminal work of [Sannikov, 2008] presents a continuous-time model that allows the principal to offer continuous incentives to agents in an infinite time horizon and retire agents if necessary. Building on this, [Cvitanic et al., 2018] provides a general framework to solve principal-agent problems, which we utilize in this paper to derive the optimal incentive structure. The principal-agent model has also been extended in several directions. Some works explore volatility control and general stochastic control models [Cvitanic et al., 2018, Chiusolo and Hubert, 2024], multi-principal settings (see for example [Mastrolia and Ren, 2018, Hu et al., 2023] or [Euch et al., 2021]) and some investigate multi-agent setups (see for example [Keun Koo et al., 2008] and [Espinosa and Touzi, 2015]). Applications in finance have been investigated for optimal portfolio allocation and asset pricing, see for example [Ou-Yang, 2003, Cvitanic and Xing, 2018]. In this paper, we focus on a multi-agent setup for optimal market making drawing on the work of [Elie and Possamaï, 2019, Hernández-Santibáñez, 2024, Baldacci and Bergault, 2024], which addresses multi-agent principal-agent problems by linking the existence of an optimal incentive solution to a Nash equilibrium between competing agents. Formulating an optimal financial policy for market making regulation has been previously investigated in [Euch et al., 2021, Baldacci et al., 2021, Baldacci et al., 2023b, Larsson et al., 2023] to design optimal make-take fees that attract traders to exchanges in continuous limit order book or dark pool. Our work extend the study to auctions market and optimal rebate design.

However, a drawback of applying the principal-agent framework to real-world problems is that the optimal incentive is embedded within a complex partial differential equation, making it difficult to visualize in practical terms. To better understand what the incentive might look like in reality, we employ a numerical approach—namely, the Deep BSDE method—to solve for and visualize the optimal incentive structure. This method (see [Henry-Labordere, 2017],[Han and Long, 2020],[Ji et al., 2020],[Ji et al., 2022]) uses a neural network to solve optimization problems that involves backward stochastic differential equations. Recent advances in machine learning along with the surge in open-source tools have made it simple to implement a neural network. Notice that the Deep BSDE method can also be used to numerically solve a partial differential equation; see [Weinan et al., 2021], [Beck et al., 2020],[Raissi, 2024], [Han et al., 2017]. Additionally, see [Voskamp, 2023], [Lu et al., 2024], [Georgoulis et al., 2024] for related studies on applying machine learning to solve stochastic control problems with jumps.

The structure of this paper is as follows: Section 2 introduces the mathematical model, outlining the characteristics of market participants and the auction’s clearing price rule. Section 3 presents the principal-agent

framework, with Section 3.1 detailing the agent's problem, Section 3.1.2 discussing the competition among agents, and Section 4 focusing on the exchange's problem to design optimal rebates and transaction fees policies. Section 5 applies the Deep BSDE method to solve and visualize the optimal solution.

## 2 The auction market model

### 2.1 The auction market

In this section we define *informally* the auction market we are considering. The mathematical definition is presented in the next section. We consider a financial asset with efficient price  $P^*$  traded in a batch auction with a fixed duration  $T > 0$ . In this auction, we consider two types of traders: strategic market makers, choosing their bidding prices and controlling their intensity of arrivals along the auction duration and investors sending market order to buy or sell the asset with a fix volume.

**Efficient price** The market trades a risky asset with efficient price  $P^*$  defined as:

$$dP_t^* = \sigma dW_t, \quad t \in [0, T],$$

where  $W$  is a Brownian motion and  $\sigma$  a fixed constant. We denote  $P_T^{cl}$  to be the clearing price of the auction determined by the stock exchange. This notion of efficient price can be seen as the price induced by the Efficient Market Hypothesis (no-arbitrage price), or more realistically the mid price in a limit order book.

#### 2.1.1 Strategic trader: auction market makers

We consider two strategic traders in this auction: Market Maker  $p$  and Market Maker  $q$  sending orders according to right-continuous and adapted counting processes  $N^p$  and  $N^q$  with intensity process  $\lambda^p$  and  $\lambda^q$  respectively. Note that  $N_t^p$  and  $N_t^q$  denote the total number of orders the traders submit in the auction. For example, if  $N_t^p$  has a jump at time  $t$ , *i.e.*  $N_t^p - N_{t-}^p = 1$ , then the market maker  $p$  submits an order at time  $t$ . In addition, we assume that a strategic traders do not want the intensity process to deviate too much from some target intensity  $\lambda_0$  fixed. This reference can be seen as a benchmark trading strategy à la Almgren and Chriss, that the trader wants to follow. We also assume that these strategic traders chooses continuously their bidding prices, denoted respectively by  $P_t^p$  or  $P_t^q$  at time  $t$ . These prices deviates from the efficient price  $P^*$  given the signal received by the market makers. We denote by  $P^{*,p}$  and  $P^{*,q}$  two copies of

$P^*$ . We define  $dP_t^i = \mu_t^i dt + dP_t^{*,i}$  for  $i = p, q$  and we assume that each trader quotes a spread to the efficient price to favor their positions.

The strategic traders are called "strategic" because they control both their arriving intensity  $\lambda$  and the spread  $\mu$ . We call them market makers since they drive the price of the auction through their bidding prices  $P^p, P^q$ .

Let  $P_T^{cl}$  be the clearing price of the auction at the clearing time  $T$ . The quantity a market maker's order would be settled depends on the clearing price  $P_T^{cl}$  and is assumed to follow a linear demand/supply function. In other words, the volume sent by each market maker is given by  $Q^i(P_T^{cl})$  where  $Q^i(x) = K^i(P_t^i - x)$  for  $i = p, q$ . If  $P_T^{cl} \leq P_t^i$ , we have  $Q \geq 0$  which implies that the order is a buy limit order in the auction since its price is above the clearing price. If  $P_T^{cl} > P_t^i$ , we have  $Q < 0$  which implies that the order is a sell limit order. At the end of an auction, the total quantity the trader  $i$  would be settled with is  $\int_0^T K^i(P_t^i - P_T^{cl}) dN_t^i = \sum_{0 < t \leq T} K^i(P_t^i - P_T^{cl})(N_t^i - N_{t-}^i)$ .

To differentiate the two strategic traders, we denote their parameters to be  $(\alpha^p, N^p, P^p, P^{*,p}, W^p)$  and  $(\alpha^q, N^q, P^q, P^{*,q}, W^q)$ , where  $\alpha^p = (\lambda^p, \mu^p)$  and  $\alpha^q = (\lambda^q, \mu^q)$  are the controls of the two traders.

### 2.1.2 Spontaneous buyer/seller auctions' investors

We assume that non-strategic buyers and sellers also take part in this auction. We assume they arrive according to right-continuous and adapted counting processes and submit only market orders with a fixed volume to buy or sell the asset at the end of the auction. We denote  $N_t^a$  to be the number of buyers arrived up to  $t$  seconds and  $N_t^b$  to be the number of sellers arrived up to  $t$  seconds, where 'a' refers to 'ask' and 'b' refers to 'bid'. We assume  $N_t^a$  and  $N_t^b$  are independent counting processes with intensity processes  $\lambda^a$  and  $\lambda^b$  respectively. To encompass the main empirical facts and realism of auction market, we enforce the following assumptions:

- *Orders cancellation.* We assume these market participants might cancel their orders before the auction closes. Let  $\theta : \mathbb{R}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  be a non-increasing function with  $\theta(0) \geq 1$  and let  $(A_i)_i, (B_i)_i$  be independent and identically distributed uniform random variables in  $[0, 1]$ . The  $i$ -th buyer submits an order of size  $v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)}$  and the  $i$ -th seller submits an order of size  $v_i^b \mathbf{1}_{B_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)}$ , where the characteristic function represents the cancellation options of these participants and  $v_i^a$  and  $v_i^b$  are bounded by some positive constant  $v^a$  and  $v^b$  respectively.



- *Market impact and order flow.* We assume that the trading behavior of the auction market makers influences the order flow of investors in the auction as follow: the higher the price proposed by the strategic traders, the more sellers and less buyers come to the market; the lower the price proposed by the strategic traders, the more buyers and less sellers come to the market.
- *Transaction fees.* Non-strategic traders, on the other hand, incur a fixed transaction fee  $d$  per order at the end of the auction, for some  $d \geq 0$ .

To characterize the market impact of the strategic traders and the impact of the fixed incentive  $d$  on non-strategic traders, we assume

$$\lambda_t^a = \lambda^a(\mu_t, d) := \lambda_0 i^a(\mu_t^p, \mu_t^q) \iota(d) \text{ and } \lambda_t^b = \lambda^b(\mu_t, d) := \lambda_0 i^b(\mu_t^p, \mu_t^q) \iota(d),$$

for some constant  $\lambda_0$ , some monotonically non-increasing function  $i^a$ , non-decreasing function  $i^b$  and non-increasing function  $\iota$  with  $i^a(0, 0) = i^b(0, 0) = \iota(0) = 1$ . For example, setting  $\lambda_t^a = \lambda_0 e^{-c_1 \mu_t^p - c_2 \mu_t^q} e^{-d}$  and  $\lambda_t^b = \lambda_0 e^{c_3 \mu_t^p + c_4 \mu_t^q} e^{-d}$ , for some non-negative constants  $c_1, c_2, c_3$ , and  $c_4$ , would satisfy the requirement.

To initiate a periodic auction, we assume that there is always a block trade to be executed in the market at time  $t = 0$ . This block trades is submitted at a price  $P_0^*$  and will be settled with a quantity  $K_0(P_0^* - P_T^{cl})$  at the close of the auction. This setup is to ensure there is always liquidity in an auction market. This assumption models efficiently the mechanism of a ‘closing auction’ at the end of the day, considering all the limit order not executed in the limit order book.

### 2.1.3 Clearing Price Rule

At the end of the auction  $T > 0$ , the exchange has to determine the price  $x$  of the asset to maximize the volume traded. Given  $x > 0$ , the volume of limit orders received is

$$LM_T(x) = \int_0^T K^p(P_s^p - x) dN_s^p + \int_0^T K^q(P_s^q - x) dN_s^q,$$

while the number of auction market orders by buyer/seller investor is

$$MO_T = \sum_{i=1}^{N_T^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_T^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_j)}.$$

The clearing price is set by the stock exchange to maximize the total number of traded volume for an auction. Denote  $P^{cl}$  to be the clearing price of an auction if it ends at time  $T$ . Given the traded volume of each strategic trader is a linear function of the clearing price,  $P^{cl}$  is the equilibrium point of the supply-demand curve of the

auction order flow at the clearing time  $T$ . Similarly to [Du and Zhu, 2017] and [Jusselin et al., 2021, Section 2.3], it is given by  $LM_T(P^{cl}) + MO_T = 0$  or equivalently

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N_T^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_T^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} + \int_0^T K^p (P_s^p - P^{cl}) dN_s^p + \int_0^T K^q (P_s^q - P^{cl}) dN_s^q + K^0 (P_0^* - P^{cl}) = 0.$$

Therefore, and due to the linearity of the supply demand considered, we get

$$P_T^{cl} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N_T^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_T^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} + \int_0^T K^p P_s^p dN_s^p + \int_0^T K^q P_s^q dN_s^q + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p N_T^p + K^q N_T^q + K^0}. \quad (2.1)$$

### 2.1.4 Rebates policy

The stock exchange reallocates the transaction fees  $d$  paid by the investors, buyers and sellers, to auction's market makers offers. These incentives, taking the form of rebates  $\xi^p, \xi^q$  offered to the market makers are received at the end of the auction based on the auction market activity. Note that if  $\xi^i < 0$ , it represents a fee paid to the exchange, while  $\xi^i > 0$  indicates a compensation received from the exchange, indexed on the market characteristics. These rebates are announced at time 0 and paid at time  $T > 0$  indexed on the market characteristics.

## 2.2 Mathematical framework

We define  $\Omega = \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S} \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R}) \times \mathcal{S} \times C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the set of left limit and right continuous non-decreasing function from  $[0, T]$  into  $\mathbb{N}$  and  $C([0, T], \mathbb{R})$  is the set of continuous function from  $[0, T]$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ . Let  $\mathcal{F}$  be the Borel algebra of  $\Omega$ . The canonical process on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F})$  is denoted by  $C_t = (C_t^1, C_t^2, C_t^3, C_t^4, C_t^5, C_t^6, C_t^7) := (N_t^a, N_t^b, W_t, N_t^p, W_t^p, N_t^q, W_t^q)$ . We define the set of  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_t$  to be the natural filtration of  $(C_t)_t$ . We introduce  $\mathbb{P}^0$  to be the measure under which  $W_t, W_t^p$ , and  $W_t^q$  are independent standard Brownian motion and under which  $N_t^a, N_t^b, N_t^p$  and  $N_t^q$  are independent Poisson processes with some fixed non-random intensity  $\lambda_0 > 0$ .

**Definition 2.1** (Auction market). *The space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}^0)$  is called an auction market where:*

- $N^a, N^b$  modeled the arriving of buy and sell orders in the auction with intensity  $\lambda_0$  under the market probability  $\mathbb{P}^0$ ,
- $\sigma W$  is the randomness resulting from the efficient price of the traded asset in the auction, for some constant  $\sigma > 0$ ,

- $N^p, N^q$  denotes the respective order flow sent by Market Maker  $p$  and Market Maker  $q$  in the auctions, at a rate  $\lambda_0$  under  $\mathbb{P}^0$  while  $\sigma W^p, \sigma W^q$  represent their respective limit order bidding prices in the auction.

In order to build a controlled market probability and auction market model, we introduce the following technical result, adapted from [Björk, 2021, Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 5.4].

**Theorem 1** (Change of probability measure and Girsanov's Theorem). *Fix  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}, \mathbb{F})$  a filtered probability space. We define  $N^1, \dots, N^k$  a sequence of mutually independent optional counting processes with intensities  $\lambda^1, \dots, \lambda^k$  which are non-negative optional processes on this space. Let  $W^1, \dots, W^\ell$  be standard mutually independent Brownian motions and  $\phi^1, \dots, \phi^k$  be predictable processes with  $\phi_t^i \geq -1$ , for any  $i = 1, \dots, k, \mathbb{P}$ -a.s.. Let  $\delta^1, \dots, \delta^\ell$  be  $\mathbb{F}$ -adapted processes. We assume that*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_0^T\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}|\delta_t^i|^2dt+\sum_{j=1}^k\int_0^T((1+\phi_t^j)\ln(1+\phi_t^j)+\phi_t^j)dt\right)\right]<\infty. \quad (2.2)$$

Then

- i. There exists a unique solution  $L$  to

$$dL_t = L_t \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \delta_t^i dW_t^i + L_{t-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_t^j (dN_t^j - \lambda_t^j dt), \quad L_0 = 1,$$

with  $\mathbb{P}(L_t > 0) = 1$ , for every  $t \in [0, T]$  and such that  $L$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale and there exists a probability measure  $\mathbb{Q}$  on  $\mathcal{F}_T$  defined by  $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}|_{\mathcal{F}_T} = L_T$ , and  $\frac{d\mathbb{Q}}{d\mathbb{P}}|_{\mathcal{F}_t} = L_t$ ;

- ii. Under the probability measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $N^1, \dots, N^k$  are counting processes with compensators  $(\lambda_t^i)(1 + \phi_t^i)$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ ;

- iii. The processes  $\tilde{W}^1, \dots, \tilde{W}^\ell$  defined by  $d\tilde{W}_t^i = dW_t^i - \delta_t^i dt$ , for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ , are standard Brownian motions under  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

- iv. Under the probability measure  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $N^1, \dots, N^k$  do not have common jumps, i.e.  $\mathbb{Q}(\Delta N_t^i \Delta N_t^j = 0) = 1$  for every  $t$  and every  $i \neq j \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

*Proof.* *Proof of i.* This is a direct consequence of [Björk, 2021, Proposition 2.10] or [Oksendal and Sulem, 2019, Theorem 1.36].

*Proof of ii.* By Definition 4.1 in [Björk, 2021], it is sufficient to show that for every non-negative predictable process  $h$  and every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t \lambda_t^i (1 + \phi_t^i) ds = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i$ .

We have

$$\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [L_T \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i].$$

Define  $Z_t := L_t Y_t$ , where  $Y_t := \int_0^t h_s dN_s^i$ . By Ito's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_t &= Z_0 + \int_0^t Y_s dL_s^c + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (L_s Y_s - L_{s-} Y_{s-}) \\ &= \int_0^t Y_{s-} dL_s + \int_0^t L_{s-} h_s dN_s^i + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (L_{s-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_s^j \Delta N_s^j) (h_s \Delta N_s^i), \end{aligned}$$

where  $dL_s^c$  refers to the continuous part of  $L_s$  (i.e., non-jump part of  $L_s$ ),  $\Delta L_s = L_s - L_{s-}$ , and  $\Delta Y_s = Y_s - Y_{s-}$ .

By part i, we have  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T Y_{s-} dL_s \right] = 0$ . By mutually independence of  $N^1, \dots, N^k$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [\sum_{0 < s \leq t} \Delta N_s^j \Delta N_s^i] = 0$ , for  $i \neq j$ .

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ L_T \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} [Z_T] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T Y_{s-} dL_s + \int_0^T L_{s-} h_s dN_s^i + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (L_{s-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_s^j \Delta N_s^j) (h_s \Delta N_s^i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ 0 + \int_0^T L_{s-} h_s dN_s^i + \sum_{0 < s \leq t} (L_{s-} \phi_s^i \Delta N_s^i) (h_s \Delta N_s^i) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T L_{s-} h_s dN_s^i + L_{s-} \phi_s^i h_s dN_s^i \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}} \left[ \int_0^T L_{s-} h_s (1 + \phi_s^i) \lambda_s^i ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t \lambda_t^i (1 + \phi_t^i) ds = \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}} \int_0^T h_t dN_t^i$ .

*Proof of iii.* Note that  $[\tilde{W}^i, \tilde{W}^i] = [W^i, W^i] = 0$ . Then by Theorem 4.6.4 (Levy) in [Shreve et al., 2004], it is sufficient to show that  $\tilde{W}^i$  is a  $\mathbb{Q}$ -martingale.

Fix  $0 \leq s < t \leq T$ , by Lemma 5.2.2 in [Shreve et al., 2004],  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\tilde{W}_t^i | \mathcal{F}_s] = \frac{1}{L_s} \mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\tilde{W}_t^i L_t | \mathcal{F}_s]$ . To show that  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{Q}}[\tilde{W}_t^i | \mathcal{F}_s] = \tilde{W}_s^i$ , it is sufficient to show that  $\tilde{W}^i L$  is a  $\mathbb{P}$ -martingale.

By Ito's formula,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_t^i L_t &= \tilde{W}_s^i L_s + \int_s^t \tilde{W}_v^i dL_v^c + \int_s^t L_v d\tilde{W}_v^i + \int_s^t d\tilde{W}_v^i dL_v^c + \sum_{s < v \leq t} \tilde{W}_{v-}^i \Delta L_v \\
&= \tilde{W}_s^i L_s + \int_s^t \tilde{W}_v^i (L_v \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_v^j dW_v^j - L_{v-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_v^j \lambda_v^j dv) + \int_s^t L_v d\tilde{W}_v^i \\
&\quad + \int_s^t d\tilde{W}_v^i (L_v \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_v^j dW_v^j - L_{v-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_v^j \lambda_v^j dt) + \int_s^t \tilde{W}_{v-}^i L_{v-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_v^j dN_v^j \\
&= \tilde{W}_s^i L_s + \int_s^t (L_v + \tilde{W}_v^i L_v \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_v^j) dW_v^j + \int_s^t \tilde{W}_{v-}^i L_{v-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_v^j (dN_v^j - \lambda_v^j dv).
\end{aligned}$$

As  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\int_s^t \tilde{W}_{v-}^i L_{v-} \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_v^j (dN_v^j - \lambda_v^j dt) | \mathcal{F}_s] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\int_s^t (L_v + \tilde{W}_v^i L_v \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_v^j) dW_v^j | \mathcal{F}_s] = 0$ , we can conclude  $\mathbb{E}^{\mathbb{P}}[\tilde{W}_t^i L_t | \mathcal{F}_s] = \tilde{W}_s^i L_s$ .

*Proof of iv.* Fix  $t$  and  $i \neq j \in 1, \dots, k$ , we claim  $\mathbb{Q}(\Delta N_t^i \Delta N_t^j = 0) = 1$ .

By independence of  $N^i$  and  $N^j$  under measure  $\mathbb{P}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P}(\Delta N_t^i \Delta N_t^j = 0) = 1$  by Prop 3.1 in [Björk, 2021].

Then  $\mathbb{P}(\Delta N_t^i \Delta N_t^j > 0) = 0$ . As  $\mathbb{Q} \ll \mathbb{P}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}(\Delta N_t^i \Delta N_t^j > 0) = 0$ .  $\square$

In our auction model, we are considering two market makers, Market Maker  $p$  and Market Maker  $q$  controlling their bidding prices through the deviation from the efficient price with control  $\mu^p, \mu^q$  and controlled trading intensities  $\lambda^p, \lambda^q$  respectively. The following corollary motivates the study. We refer to [Euch et al., 2021, Section 2.2] for a similar definition in a limit order book market model. We denote by  $\mathcal{A}$  the set of control  $\alpha = (\alpha^p, \alpha^q)$  where  $\alpha^i = (\mu^i, \lambda^i)$ ,  $i \in \{p, q\}$ ,  $\mu^i$  is a  $B$ -valued  $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable process and  $\lambda^i$  is an  $\Lambda$ -valued  $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable process with  $B$  a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}$  and  $\Lambda$  is a bounded subset of  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . Consequently, note that  $(\mu^p, \lambda^p; \mu^q, \lambda^q)$  satisfy (2.2) with  $\delta^i = \frac{\mu^i}{\sigma}$  and  $\phi^i = \frac{\lambda^i - \lambda_0}{\lambda_0}$  for  $i = p, q$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{A}^i$  the set of  $\alpha^i$  as the  $i$ th component of a control  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$  with  $i = p, q$ . Note that  $L^\alpha$  is thus the solution to

$$dL_t^\alpha = L_t^\alpha \sum_{i=p,q} \frac{\mu_t^i}{\sigma} dW_t^i + L_{t-}^\alpha \sum_{i=p,q,a,b} \frac{\lambda_t^i - \lambda_0}{\lambda_0} (dN_t^i - \lambda_0 dt), \quad L_0^\alpha = 1,$$

with an explicit solution, see [Shreve et al., 2004, Theorem 11.6.10],

$$L_t^\alpha = \exp\left(\sum_{i=p,q} \int_0^t \left[-\frac{\mu_s^i}{\sigma} dW_s^i - \frac{(\mu_s^i)^2}{2\sigma^2} ds\right] + \sum_{i=a,b,p,q} \int_0^t \left[\ln\left(\frac{\lambda_s^i}{\lambda_0}\right) dN_s^i + (\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^i) ds\right]\right), \quad t \in [0, T].$$

Moreover and due to the bounded property of  $\lambda, \mu$ ,  $L^\alpha$  admits moment of any orders.

**Corollary 2.2** (Controlled auction market). *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P}^0)$  be an auction market. Let  $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$ . There exists a control market probability  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$  and a tuple  $(N^a, N^b, P^*, N^p, P^p, N^q, P^q)$  such that*

$$dP_t^* = \sigma dW_t, \quad dP_t^p = \mu_t^p dt + \sigma d\tilde{W}_t^p, \quad \text{and} \quad dP_t^q = \mu_t^q dt + \sigma d\tilde{W}_t^q,$$

where  $W, \tilde{W}^p, \tilde{W}^q$  are independent standard Brownian motions under the measure  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ ; and  $N_t^a, N_t^b, N_t^p$  and  $N_t^q$  are counting process with respective intensities  $\lambda_t^a, \lambda_t^b, \lambda_t^p, \lambda_t^q$  respectively, under  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ . In addition,  $N_t^a, N_t^b, N_t^p$  and  $N_t^q$  do not jump together  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha - a.s.$ . The tuple  $(N^a, N^b, P^*, N^p, P^p, N^q, P^q)$  defined by the previous corollary and controlled by  $\alpha$  is called a controlled auction market model while  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$  is the controlled market probability.

**Remark 2.3.** *Integrable spread and bounded trading intensity.* Assuming that  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  are bounded is stronger than a Novikov condition type to well-define  $L^\alpha$  but required to ensure that  $L^\alpha$  has moment of any orders for the technical details in the proof below. It is first realistically reasonable to assume  $\lambda$  bounded since traders are limited in their speed of execution due to technological constraints.

Note now that spreads may not be bounded and defined as signal received by the strategic traders, see for example [Derchu et al., 2023]. In this case, we should assume for example a BMO property of  $L^\alpha$  to ensure that  $L^\alpha$  has moment of any order, see [Kazamaki, 2006, Chapter 3].

We denote  $\mathbb{E}^0$  to be the expectation with regard to measure  $\mathbb{P}^0$  and denote  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha$  to be the expectation with regard to measure  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ .

### 3 Rebates design: a contracting Principal-multi Agents problem

We are considering an exchange (the principal) and a few stock traders divided in two main categories: investors (buyers or sellers) and strategic traders (the agents, also the market makers). The stock exchange proposes an incentive (rebates) to each strategic traders (market maker in this work) and proposes a uniform transaction fee to investors. The exchange aims at designing the optimal rebates scheme and the optimal transaction fee that should be offered to these traders.

We first introduce the auction's market characteristics as a tuple  $X_t = (X_t^1, X_t^2, X_t^3, X_t^4, X_t^5, X_t^6, X_t^7)$  where  $X_t^1 := \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)}$  and  $X_t^2 := \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_j)}$ , denotes the volumes sent by buyers and sellers investors respectively in the auction at time  $t$ ;  $X_t^3 := P_t^*$ ,  $X_t^4 := \int_0^t P_s^p dN_s^p$  and  $X_t^6 := \int_0^t P_s^q dN_s^q$  are the respective cumulative bidings sent by Market Maker  $p$  and Market Maker  $q$  while  $X_t^5 := N_t^p$  and  $X_t^7 := N_t^q$  is the number of orders sent by Market Maker  $p$  and Market Maker  $q$ . We set  $P = (P^p, P^q)$  the price processes sent by both market makers.

**A rebates**  $\xi = (\xi^p, \xi^q)$  is a pair of  $\mathcal{F}_T$ -measurable random variable offered to Trader  $p$  and Trader  $q$ . We

define the set of **admissible incentives** by

$$\mathcal{C}^{R_0} = \{\xi : \mathcal{F}_T - \text{measurable, } \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}^\alpha[|\xi^p|] < \infty, \text{ and } \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}^\alpha[|\xi^q|] < \infty, V_0^i(\xi^i, d, \alpha^j; \alpha^i) \geq R_0^i, i \neq j \in \{p, q\}\},$$

where  $V_0^i(\xi^i, d, \alpha^j; \alpha^i)$  denotes the value function, as the expected profit and loss of Market Maker  $i = p, q$ , defined rigorously below and  $R_0 := (R_0^p, R_0^q)$  is the vector of reservation utilities of Market Makers  $p$  and  $q$ . We denote  $\mathcal{C}_i^{R_0}$  the set of rebates  $\xi^i$  as the  $i$ th component of a rebate  $\xi \in \mathcal{C}^{R_0}$  for  $i = p, q$ .

### 3.1 Market makers' Nash equilibrium

Strategic traders aim to maximize simultaneously and without communication their gains by controlling arrival intensity and proposed price. A strategic trader's gain is composed of:

- a payoff  $g^i(X_T)$  for  $i = p, q$ , resulting from the trades in the auctions,
- the incentive (rebates) from the exchange;
- and a penalty term relating to their arriving intensity, recalling that each strategic trader has a target intensity  $\lambda_0$  which they shouldn't deviate too much from.

For each order  $P_t^i$  submitted, the payoff of Market Maker  $i$  is  $K(P^{cl} - P_t^i)(P^{cl} - P_T^*)$ , since if  $P_T^{cl} \leq P_t^i$ , the trader  $i$  sells at  $P^{cl}$  and buys at  $P_T^*$  to close the position. Thus, the trader gains  $(P^{cl} - P_T^*)$  per order and gains  $K(P^{cl} - P_t^i)(P^{cl} - P_T^*)$  in total. Conversely, if  $P^{cl} > P_t^i$ , the trader becomes a buyer in the auction market. The trader buys at the clearing price and sells at the efficient price at time  $T$ , so gains  $(P_T^* - P^{cl})$  per order and gains  $K(P_t^i - P^{cl})(P_T^* - P^{cl})$  in total. In both situations, the payoff functions are  $K(P^{cl} - P_t^i)(P^{cl} - P_T^*)$ . Thus,  $g^i(X_T)$  would be the trader  $i$ 's total payoff from trade at the end of an auction and given by

$$\begin{aligned} g^i(X_T) &:= \int_0^T K^i(P^{cl} - P_s^i)(P^{cl} - P_T^*) dN_s^i \\ &= K^i(P^{cl} - P_T^*)(P^{cl} N_T^i - \int_0^T P_s^i dN_s^i), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$g^p(X_T) = K^p \left( \frac{X_T^1 - X_T^2 + K^p X_T^4 + K^q X_T^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_T^5 + K^q X_T^7 + K^0} - X_T^3 \right) (X_T^5 \frac{X_T^1 - X_T^2 + K^p X_T^4 + K^q X_T^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_T^5 + K^q X_T^7 + K^0} - X_T^4),$$

and

$$g^q(X_T) = K^q \left( \frac{X_T^1 - X_T^2 + K^p X_T^4 + K^q X_T^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_T^5 + K^q X_T^7 + K^0} - X_T^3 \right) (X_T^7 \frac{X_T^1 - X_T^2 + K^p X_T^4 + K^q X_T^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_T^5 + K^q X_T^7 + K^0} - X_T^6).$$

Assume that Market Maker  $i = p, q$  chooses the control  $\alpha^i = (\lambda^i, \mu^i)$  while their opponent Market Maker  $j \neq i$  is choosing  $\alpha^j = (\lambda^j, \mu^j)$  and assume that the stock exchange proposes rebates  $\xi = (\xi^p, \xi^q)$  and transaction fees scheme  $d$ . The value function of Market Maker  $i$  is then given by

$$V_0^i(\xi^i, d, \alpha^j; \alpha^i) := \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ g^i(X_T) + \xi^i - \int_0^T \frac{(\lambda_s^i - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds \right].$$

**Remark 3.1.** Note that  $d$  affects the processes  $N^a, N^b$  and so the components  $X^1, X^2$  and the clearing price. Therefore, it affects the value functions of the Market Makers while they do not pay  $d$  directly unlike the investors.

Given fix rebates  $\xi = (\xi^p, \xi^q)$  and transaction fees scheme  $d$ , the Market Makers' problem is to find simultaneously a control  $\alpha^* = (\alpha^{p,*}, \alpha^{q,*})$  such that

$$NE(\xi, d) \begin{cases} V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \alpha^{q,*}; \alpha^{p,*}) : & = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \alpha = (\alpha^p, \alpha^{q,*})} V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \alpha^{q,*}; \alpha^p) \\ V_0^q(\xi^q, d, \alpha^{p,*}; \alpha^{q,*}) : & = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \alpha = (\alpha^{p,*}, \alpha^q)} V_0^q(\xi^q, d, \alpha^{p,*}; \alpha^q). \end{cases}$$

Such  $\alpha^*$  satisfying  $NE(\xi, d)$  defines a Nash Equilibrium composed with spread  $\mu^p, \mu^q$  and trading intensities  $\lambda^p, \lambda^q$  under rebates and transaction fees scheme.

### 3.1.1 Best response of a representative Market Maker

To give a characterization of the Nash equilibrium  $NE(\xi, d)$  under an agreement composed with rebates and transaction fees scheme, we start to study the behavior of one strategic trader, Market Maker  $p$  for example when  $\alpha^q$  is fixed and known, that is to find  $\alpha^{p,*}$  such that

$$V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \alpha^q; \alpha^{p,*}) = \sup_{\alpha^p \in \mathcal{A}^p} V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \alpha^q; \alpha^p) = \sup_{\alpha^p \text{ s.t. } (\alpha^p, \alpha^q) \in \mathcal{A}} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ g^p(X_T) + \xi^p - \int_0^T \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds \right]. \quad (3.1)$$

We consider the following set of incentive compatible contracts for Market Maker  $p$  when  $\alpha^q$  is fixed by the other Market Maker.

$$\Xi^p := \{Y_T^{p, Y_0^p, Z^p, d}, Z^p \in \mathcal{Z}^p, Y_0^p \geq R_0^p\},$$

where the process  $Y_t^{p, Y_0^p, Z^p, d}$  is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{p, Y_0^p, Z^p, d} = & Y_0^p + \int_0^t Z_s^{1,p} (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{2,p} (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{3,p} dW_s + \int_0^t Z_s^{4,p} (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\ & + \int_0^t Z_s^{5,p} dW_s^p + \int_0^t Z_s^{6,p} (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{7,p} dW_s^q - \int_0^t F^p(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \alpha_s^q, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^p) ds, \end{aligned}$$



where  $r_s := [v_{(N_{s^-}^a+1)}^a \mathbf{1}_{A_{(N_{s^-}^a+1)} \leq \theta(T-s)}, v_{(N_{s^-}^b+1)}^b \mathbf{1}_{B_{(N_{s^-}^b+1)} \leq \theta(T-s)}]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & F^p(x, z, r, P, \mu^q, \lambda^q, d; \mu^p, \lambda^p) \\ &= (g(x + [r^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(x))\lambda^a(\mu, d) + (g(x + [0, r^2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(x))\lambda^b(\mu, d) \\ &+ (g(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x))\lambda^p + (g(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x))\lambda^q \\ &- \frac{(\lambda^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} - z^{1,p}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^a(\mu, d)) - z^{2,p}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^b(\mu, d)) - z_s^{4,p}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^p) - z_s^{6,p}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^q) - \frac{\mu^p}{\sigma} z^{5,p} - \frac{\mu^q}{\sigma} z^{7,p} \end{aligned}$$

with  $\hat{\alpha}_s^p := \hat{a}^p(X_s, Z_s^p, r_s, P_s, d, \alpha_s^q)$ , defined as the maximizer

$$\hat{a}^p(x, z, r, P, d, a^q) \in \arg \sup_{\mu^p \in \Delta, \lambda^p \in \Lambda} F^p(x, z, r, P, a^q, d; \mu^p, \lambda^p),$$

and where  $\mathcal{Z}^p$  denotes the space of random  $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable processes  $Z^p$  with values in  $\mathbb{R}^7$  such that

$$\sup_{d \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{\alpha^p \in \mathcal{A}^p} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \mathbb{E}^\alpha |Y_t^{p; Y_0^p, Z^p, d}| < \infty \text{ and } \int_0^T \|Z_s^p\|^2 ds < \infty, \mathbb{P}^0 - a.s.$$

**Remark 3.2.** Similarly,  $\Xi^q$  denotes the set of contracts  $Y_T^{q; Y_0^q, Z^q, d}$  indexed by  $Z^q \in \mathcal{Z}^q$  with generator  $F^q$  when  $\alpha^p$  is fixed. We define more generally for  $i \neq j = p, q$

$$\begin{aligned} & F^i(x, z, r, P, \mu^j, \lambda^j, d; \mu^i, \lambda^i) \\ &= (g^i(x + [r^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(x))\lambda^a(\mu, d) + (g^i(x + [0, r^2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g^i(x))\lambda^b(\mu, d) \\ &+ (g^i(x + [0, 0, 0, P^i, 1, 0, 0]) - g^i(x))\lambda^i + (g^i(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^j, 1]) - g^i(x))\lambda^j \\ &- \frac{(\lambda^i - \lambda_0)^2}{2} - z^{1,i}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^a(\mu, d)) - z^{2,i}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^b(\mu, d)) - z_s^{4,i}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^i) - z_s^{6,i}(\lambda_0 - \lambda^j) - \frac{\mu^p}{\sigma} z^{5,i} - \frac{\mu^q}{\sigma} z^{7,i}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 3.3.** We fix  $\alpha^q \in \mathcal{A}^q$ , and  $d \in \mathbb{R}_+$ .

1.  $\mathcal{C}_p^{R_0^p} = \Xi^p$ , in other words, for any  $\xi^p \in \mathcal{C}_p^{R_0^p}$  there exists a unique  $Z^p \in \mathcal{Z}^p$  such that  $\xi^p = Y_T^{p, Y_0^p, Z^p, d}$ .

2. Conversely, for every  $\xi^p = Y_T^{p, Z^p, d}$  the strategic trader  $p$ 's optimal controls is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(x, z, r, \mu^q, d, a^q) &= \text{root of } \left\{ -\frac{z_5}{\sigma} + \lambda_0 e^{-d} (z_1 + g(x + [r_1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(x)) \frac{\partial i^a(\mu, \mu^q)}{\partial \mu} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \lambda_0 e^{-d} (z_2 + g(x + [0, r_2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(x)) \frac{\partial i^b(\mu, \mu^q)}{\partial \mu} \right\} \vee (-\mu_\infty) \wedge \mu_\infty; \end{aligned}$$

$$\hat{\lambda}(x, z, p^p, a^q) = 0 \vee \{ \lambda_0 + z_4 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, p^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x) \} \wedge \lambda_\infty.$$

*Proof.* The proof is divided in four main parts. In the first part (a), we show that  $g^p(X_t)$  is  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ -integrable. We define  $L^1(\mathbb{P}^\alpha)$  the set of integrable random variable under  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ . Then we derive in Part (b) the Ito's

decomposition of the dynamic value function associated with the Market Maker  $p$ 's optimization given in 1, by  $\mathcal{C}_p^{R_0^p} = \Xi^p$ . Part (c) focuses on the characterization of the optimal control  $\alpha^p = (\hat{\mu}, \hat{\lambda})$  and proves 2. Part (d) finally proves the uniqueness of the representation of a rebate in  $\Xi^p$ .

*Part (a):* Let  $\xi^p \in \mathcal{C}_p^{R_0^p}$ ,  $(\alpha^p, \alpha^q) \in \mathcal{A}$ , and  $d \geq 0$ . We define the dynamic utility of Market Maker  $p$  by

$$V_t(\xi^p, d, \alpha^q; \alpha^p) := \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ g^p(X_T) - g^p(X_t) + \xi^p - \int_t^T \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds \middle| \mathcal{F}_t \right].$$

Notice that  $V_T(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) = \xi^p$  and  $V_0(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) = \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ g^p(X_T) + \xi^p - \int_0^T \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds \right]$  since  $g(X_0) = 0$ .

We want to show that  $V_t$  is well-defined. As  $\xi^p \in L^1(\mathbb{P}^\alpha)$  and  $\lambda^p$  is bounded by  $\lambda_\infty$ , the proof is reduced to show that  $g^p(X_t) \in L^1(\mathbb{P}^\alpha)$ , for every  $t \in [0, T]$ .

Let  $\tilde{W}_t^p = -\int_0^t \frac{\mu_s^p}{\sigma} ds + W_t^p$ . Define  $W_{max}^p := \max_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{W}_t^p$  and  $W_{min}^p := \min_{t \in [0, T]} \tilde{W}_t^p$ . Note that  $\tilde{W}_t^p$  is a Brownian motion under  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ . Since  $W_0 = 0$ ,  $W_{max}^p \geq 0$  and  $W_{min}^p \leq 0$ . Using the reflexivity of the Brownian motion,  $W_{max}^p$  has the same distribution as  $|\tilde{W}_T^p|$  and  $W_{min}^p$  has the same distribution as  $-W_{max}^p$ . In addition,  $|\int_0^t K^p P_s^p dN_s^p| \leq K^p N_t^p (|P_0^*| + t\mu_\infty + \sigma W_{max}^p - \sigma W_{min}^p)$ .

We define similarly  $W_{max}^q$  and  $W_{min}^q$  for the other strategic trader.

For every  $t \in [0, T]$ , by Holder's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |g^p(X_t)| \right] &= \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \left| K^p (P^{cl} - P_t^*) (P^{cl} N_t^p - \int_0^t P_s^p dN_s^p) \right| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ K^p |P^{cl}|^2 N_t^p \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |K^p P_t^* \int_0^t P_s^p dN_s^p| \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |K^p P_t^* P^{cl} N_t^p| \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |K^p P_t^* \int_0^t P_s^p dN_s^p| \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ K^p |P^{cl}|^2 N_t^p \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ K^p |P^{cl}| N_t^p \check{P}_t \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |K^p P_t^* P^{cl} N_t^p| \right] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ K^p |P_t^*| N_t^p \check{P}_t \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ K^p |P^{cl}|^2 N_t^p \right] + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (K^p P^{cl} N_t^p)^2 \right]} \left( \sqrt{\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (\check{P}_t^*)^2 \right]} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (P_t^*)^2 \right]} \right) \\ &\quad + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (K^p N_t^p)^2 \right]} \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (P_t^* \check{P}_t)^2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\check{P}_t := (|P_0^*| + t\mu_\infty + \sigma W_{max}^p - \sigma W_{min}^p)$ . For every  $t \in [0, T]$ , we know

$$\lambda_t^a \leq \lambda_0 i^a(-\mu_\infty, -\mu_\infty) \iota(d), \quad \lambda_t^b \leq \lambda_0 i^b(\mu_\infty, \mu_\infty) \iota(d),$$

and  $\lambda_t^p$  and  $\lambda_t^q$  are bounded by  $\lambda_\infty$ . Consequently,  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha [N_t^a] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha [N_t^b] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha [N_t^p] + \mathbb{E}^\alpha [N_t^q]$  are uniformly bounded in  $t$ . Note that

$$\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (N_t^a)^2 \right] \leq e^{(t\lambda_0 e^{(c_1+c_2)\mu_\infty} e^{-d})} \left[ (t\lambda_0 e^{(c_1+c_2)\mu_\infty} e^{-d}) (t\lambda_0 e^{(c_1+c_2)\mu_\infty} e^{-d} + 1) \right] < \infty.$$

Similarly,  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (N_t^b)^2 \right]$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (N_t^p)^2 \right]$ , and  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (N_t^q)^2 \right]$  are bounded. Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ W_{max}^p \right] = \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |\tilde{W}_T^p| \right] = \sigma \sqrt{\frac{2T}{\pi}}$ ,  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (W_{max}^p)^2 \right] = \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (\tilde{W}_T^p)^2 \right] = \sigma^2 T$ , and  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (P_t^*)^2 \right] = \sigma^2 t + (P_0^*)^2$ .

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ (P_t^{cl} N_t^p)^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \frac{1}{(K^p)^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} - \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_j)} + \int_0^t K^p P_s^p dN_s^p + \int_0^t K^q P_s^q dN_s^q + K^0 P_0^* \right)^2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ \frac{1}{K^2} \left( (v^a N_t^a)^2 + (v^b N_t^b)^2 + 2v^a v^b N_t^a N_t^b + 2K(v^a N_t^a + v^b N_t^b) N_t^p \check{P}_t + 2K^q (v^a N_t^a + v^b N_t^b) N_t^q \check{P}_t \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + (K^p N_t^p)^2 |\check{P}_t|^2 + (K^q N_t^q)^2 |\check{P}_t|^2 + 2K^p K^q N_t^p N_t^q (|P_0^*| + t\mu_\infty + \sigma W_{max}^q - \sigma W_{min}^q) \check{P}_t \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + K^0 P_0^* (2v^a N_t^a + 2v^b N_t^b + 2K^p N_t^p \check{P}_t + 2K^q N_t^q \check{P}_t) \right) \right] < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We thus conclude that  $\mathbb{E}^\alpha [ |g^p(X_t)| ] < \infty$ .

*Part (b):* By Ito's formula, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
g(X_T) &= \int_0^T \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_3}(X_s) \sigma dW_s + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \int_0^T \frac{\partial^2 g}{\partial x_3^2}(X_s) ds + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [v_{N_s^a}^a \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_s^a} \leq \theta(T-s)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^a \\
& \quad + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, v_{N_s^b}^b \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_s^b} \leq \theta(T-s)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^b \\
& \quad + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s, 1, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^p + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^q \\
&= \int_0^T K(X_s^4 - X_s^5 \frac{X_s^1 - X_s^2 + KX_s^4 + K^q X_s^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{KX_s^5 + K^q X_s^7 + K^0}) \sigma dW_s \\
& \quad + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [v_{N_s^a}^a \mathbf{1}_{A_{N_s^a} \leq \theta(T-s)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^a \\
& \quad + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, v_{N_s^b}^b \mathbf{1}_{B_{N_s^b} \leq \theta(T-s)}, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^b \\
& \quad + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^p + \int_0^T [g(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g(X_{s-})] dN_s^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Define

$$M_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) := V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) + g^p(X_t) - \int_0^t \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds. \quad (3.2)$$

Then  $M_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) = \mathbb{E}^\alpha [g^p(X_T) + \xi^p - \int_0^t \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds | \mathcal{F}_t]$  is a  $\mathbb{P}^\alpha$ -martingale.

By Martingale Representation Theorem ([[Euch et al., 2021](#), Lemma A.1.]), there exists a predictable process

$\tilde{Z}(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) = (\tilde{Z}^1, \tilde{Z}^2, \tilde{Z}^3, \tilde{Z}^4, \tilde{Z}^5, \tilde{Z}^6, \tilde{Z}^7)(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} M_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &= M_0(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^1(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^a - \lambda_s^a ds) + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^2(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^b - \lambda_s^b ds) \\ &+ \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^3(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)dW_s + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^4(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^p - \lambda_s^p ds) + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^5(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dW_s^p - \frac{\mu_s^p}{\sigma} ds) \\ &+ \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^6(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^q - \lambda_s^q ds) + \int_0^t \tilde{Z}_s^7(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dW_s^q - \frac{\mu_s^q}{\sigma} ds). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $M_T = g^p(X_T) + \xi^p - \int_0^T \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds$ , and from (3.2), we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &= g^p(X_T) - g^p(X_t) + \xi^p - \int_t^T \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^1(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^a - \lambda_s^a ds) \\ &- \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^2(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^b - \lambda_s^b ds) - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^3(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)dW_s - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^4(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^p - \lambda_s^p ds) \\ &- \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^5(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dW_s^p - \frac{\mu_s^p}{\sigma} ds) - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^6(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dN_s^q - \lambda_s^q ds) \\ &- \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^7(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)(dW_s^q - \frac{\mu_s^q}{\sigma} ds) \\ &= \int_t^T [K^p(X_s^4 - X_s^5 \frac{X_s^1 - X_s^2 + K^p X_s^4 + K^q X_s^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_s^5 + K^q X_s^7 + K^0})\sigma - \tilde{Z}_s^3]dW_s - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^5 dW_s^p - \int_t^T \tilde{Z}_s^7 dW_s^q \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [r_s^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-}) - \tilde{Z}_s^1](dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, r_s^2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-}) - \tilde{Z}_s^2](dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-}) - \tilde{Z}_s^4](dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g^p(X_{s-}) - \tilde{Z}_s^6](dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \xi^p \\ &- \int_t^T \left[ \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} + \tilde{Z}_s^1(\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^a) + \tilde{Z}_s^2(\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^b) + \tilde{Z}_s^4(\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^p) ds + \tilde{Z}_s^6(\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^q) + \frac{\mu_s^p}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_s^5 + \frac{\mu_s^q}{\sigma} \tilde{Z}_s^7 \right] ds \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [r_s^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_{s-})] \lambda_0 ds \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, r_s^2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g^p(X_{s-})] \lambda_0 ds \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g^p(X_{s-})] \lambda_0 ds \\ &+ \int_t^T [g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g^p(X_{s-})] \lambda_0 ds. \end{aligned}$$

Define  $Z(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) = (Z^1, Z^2, Z^3, Z^4, Z^5, Z^6, Z^7)(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
Z_s^1(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= -g^p(X_{s-} + [r_s^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) + g^p(X_{s-}) + \tilde{Z}_s^1(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^2(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= -g^p(X_{s-} + [0, r_s^2, 0, 0, 0, 0]) + g^p(X_{s-}) + \tilde{Z}_s^2(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^3(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= -K^p(X_s^4 - X_s^5 \frac{X_s^1 - X_s^2 + K^p X_s^4 + K^q X_s^6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p X_s^5 + K^q X_s^7 + K^0})\sigma + \tilde{Z}_s^3(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^4(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= -g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) + g^p(X_{s-}) + \tilde{Z}_s^4(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^5(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= \tilde{Z}_s^5(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^6(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= -g^p(X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) + g^p(X_{s-}) + \tilde{Z}_s^6(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d), \\
Z_s^7(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) &:= \tilde{Z}_s^7(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Notice that  $Z^1, Z^2, Z^4, Z^6$  are predictable and  $Z^3, Z^5, Z^7$  are adapted.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\xi^p &= V_0(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) - \int_0^T Z_s^3 dW_s - \int_0^T Z_s^5 dW_s^p - \int_0^T Z_s^7 dW_s^q - \int_0^T Z_s^1 (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) - \int_0^T Z_s^2 (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) \\
&\quad - \int_0^T Z_s^4 (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) - \int_0^T Z_s^6 (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) - \int_0^T F^p(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \alpha_s^q, d; \alpha_s^p) ds.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

*Part (c).* We now fix  $\xi^p \in \Xi^p$ ,  $\alpha^q \in \mathcal{A}^q$ , and  $d > 0$ . Define the stochastic processes  $\hat{\mu}^p$  and  $\hat{\lambda}^p$  by  $\hat{\mu}_s^p = \hat{\mu}(X_{s-}, Z_s, r_s, \mu_s^q, d)$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_s^p = \hat{\lambda}(X_{s-}, Z_s, P_s^p)$  for  $s \in [0, T]$  given by 2. Notice that  $\hat{\mu}^p$  and  $\hat{\lambda}^p$  are predictable and bounded and thus admissible in  $\mathcal{A}^p$ . By setting  $Y_t = V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \hat{\alpha}^p, d)$ , there exists  $(Y_0, Z) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{Z}$  such that  $\xi^p = Y_T$ , where

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_t &= Y_0 + \int_0^t Z_s^1 (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^2 (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^3 dW_s + \int_0^t Z_s^4 (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\
&\quad + \int_0^t Z_s^5 dW_s^p + \int_0^t Z_s^6 (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^7 dW_s^q - \int_0^t F(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \alpha_s^q, d) ds,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
F(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \alpha_s^q, d) &= \sup_{\mu, \lambda: |\mu| < \mu_\infty, 0 \leq \lambda < \lambda_\infty} \left\{ (g(X_s + [r_s^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_s)) \lambda_s^a \right. \\
&\quad + (g(X_s + [0, r_s^2, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g(X_s)) \lambda_s^b + (g(X_s + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(X_s)) \lambda_s^p \\
&\quad + (g(X_s + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g(X_s)) \lambda_s^q - \frac{(\lambda_s^p - \lambda_0)^2}{2} - Z_s^1 (\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^a) - Z_s^2 (\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^b) \\
&\quad \left. - Z_s^4 (\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^p) - Z_s^6 (\lambda_0 - \lambda_s^q) - \frac{\mu_s^p}{\sigma} Z_s^5 - \frac{\mu_s^q}{\sigma} Z_s^7 \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

We prove that  $\hat{\mu}^p$  and  $\hat{\lambda}^p$  are the strategic trader  $p$ 's optimized controls for (3.1).

By using a similar approach as in Part (a) above, since  $g(X_t)$  and  $(X_t^4 - X_t^5 P_t^{cl})^2$  are  $\mathbb{P}^0$ -integrable for every  $t \in [0, T]$  we deduce from [Björk, 2021, Proposition 2.10] and [Shreve et al., 2004, Theorem 4.3.1] that  $\int_0^t Z_s^1(dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds)$ ,  $\int_0^t Z_s^2(dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds)$ ,  $\int_0^t Z_s^3 dW_s$ ,  $\int_0^t Z_s^4(dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds)$ ,  $\int_0^t Z_s^5 dW_s^p$ ,  $\int_0^t Z_s^6(dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds)$ , and  $\int_0^t Z_s^7 dW_s^q$  are  $\mathbb{P}^0$ -martingales. From (3.4), we deduce that  $\hat{\alpha}^p = (\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\lambda}^p)$  is the trader  $p$ 's optimal control.

*Part (d):* We show the representation  $(Y_0, Z)$  of  $\xi^p$  is unique.

Suppose there exists two representations  $(Y_0, Z)$  and  $(\tilde{Y}_0, \tilde{Z})$  of  $\xi^p$ . Take any  $t \in [0, T]$ , define  $V_t^{\circ,p}(\xi^p, \alpha^q, d) := \sup_{\alpha^p \in \mathcal{V}_t} V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d)$ , where  $\mathcal{V}_t$  is the restriction of the collection of controls  $\mathcal{V}$  to time  $[t, T]$ . Then  $V_t^{\circ,p}(\xi^p, \alpha^q, d) = \sup_{\alpha^p \in \mathcal{V}_t} \mathbb{E}^0[V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \alpha^p, d) | \mathcal{F}_t] = \sup_{\alpha^p \in \mathcal{V}_t} \mathbb{E}^0[\xi^p + \int_t^T f(X_s, Z_s, r_s, \alpha_s^p, \alpha_s^q, P_s^p, P_s^q, d) ds | \mathcal{F}_t] \leq V_t(\xi^p, \alpha^q, \hat{\alpha}^p, d)$ . Then  $Y_t = \tilde{Y}_t$ , for every  $t \in [0, T]$ . We thus have  $(Y_0, Z) = (\tilde{Y}_0, \tilde{Z})$ . □

### 3.1.2 Nash Equilibrium between Strategic Traders

We define the subset  $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 2}$  as the set of  $z$  such that for any  $x, r, P, d \in \mathbb{R}^7 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  there exists  $\hat{\alpha}(x, z, r, P, d) = (\hat{\alpha}^p(x, z, r, P, d); \hat{\alpha}^q(x, z, r, P, d)) := (\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\lambda}^p; \hat{\mu}^q, \hat{\lambda}^q) \in (\Delta \times \Lambda)^2$  defined as the fixed point to the following system

$$(FP) \begin{cases} \hat{\alpha}^p(x, z, r, P, d) \in \arg \sup_{\mu^p \in \Delta, \lambda^p \in \Lambda} F^p(x, z, r, P, \hat{\alpha}^q(x, z, r, P, d), d; \mu^p, \lambda^p), \\ \hat{\alpha}^q(x, z, r, P, d) \in \arg \sup_{\mu^q \in \Delta, \lambda^q \in \Lambda} F^q(x, z, r, P, \hat{\alpha}^p(x, z, r, P, d), d; \mu^q, \lambda^q). \end{cases}$$

We define the subset  $U_{max} \subset U$  to be the set of  $z$  such that for any  $x, r, P, d \in \mathbb{R}^7 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$  there exists  $\hat{\alpha}(x, z, r, P, d) = (\hat{\alpha}^p(x, z, r, P, d); \hat{\alpha}^q(x, z, r, P, d)) := (\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\lambda}^p; \hat{\mu}^q, \hat{\lambda}^q) \in (\Delta \times \Lambda)^2$  with  $\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\mu}^q \notin \{\mu_\infty, -\mu_\infty\}$ .

**Remark 3.4.** We provide in this remark examples and conditions ensuring that  $U$  (or  $U_{max}$ ) is not empty

1. Rebates indexed on investors' activity only and fixed point. Take  $z^{k,i} = 0$  for any  $k \in \{3, \dots, 7\}$  and  $i = p, q$ . It means that only  $z^{1,p}, z^{1,q}$  and  $z^{2,p}, z^{2,q}$  are actively considered in the contract, that is the indexation with respect to the volume  $v^a, v^b$  sent by buyer/seller investors redistributed to the Market Makers. Then, (FP) is equivalent to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (Dg^{p,1}(x) + z^{1,p}) \frac{\partial \lambda^a}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) + (Dg^{p,2}(x) + z^{2,p}) \frac{\partial \lambda^b}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) = 0, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^p = \mu_\infty, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^p = -\mu_\infty \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g^p(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x)) \\ (Dg^{q,1}(x) + z^{1,q}) \frac{\partial \lambda^a}{\partial \mu^q}(\hat{\mu}, d) + (Dg^{q,2}(x) + z^{2,q}) \frac{\partial \lambda^b}{\partial \mu^q}(\hat{\mu}, d) = 0, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^q = \mu_\infty, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^q = -\mu_\infty \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g^q(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x)), \end{array} \right.$$

where

$$Dg^{i,1}(x) = g^i(x + [r^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g^i(x), \quad Dg^{i,2}(x) = g^i(x + [0, r^2, 0, 0, 0, 0]) - g^i(x).$$

The solution in  $\hat{\lambda}$  is explicit. It thus remains to choose  $z^{1,p}, z^{1,q}, z^{2,p}, z^{2,q}, \lambda^a, \lambda^b$  ensuring that this system admits a solution. For example, if we choose

$$\lambda^a = \lambda_0 e^{-c\mu^p - \tilde{c}\mu^q} e^{-d} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^b = \lambda_0 e^{c\mu^p + \tilde{c}\mu^q} e^{-d},$$

we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} e^{2c\hat{\mu}^p + 2\tilde{c}\hat{\mu}^q} = \frac{Dg^{p,1}(x) + z^{1,p}}{Dg^{p,2}(x) + z^{2,p}} = \frac{Dg^{q,1}(x) + z^{1,q}}{Dg^{q,2}(x) + z^{2,q}}, \quad \text{or } \hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\mu}^q \in \{\mu_\infty, -\mu_\infty\} \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g^p(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x)) \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g^q(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x)). \end{array} \right.$$

The set  $U_{max}$  hence contains all the  $z \in \mathbb{R}^7$  such that  $z^{k,i} = 0$  for  $k \in \{3, \dots, 7\}$ ,  $i = p, q$  and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{Dg^{p,1}(x) + z^{1,p}}{Dg^{p,2}(x) + z^{2,p}} = \frac{Dg^{q,1}(x) + z^{1,q}}{Dg^{q,2}(x) + z^{2,q}} > 0 \\ Dg^{p,1}(x) + z^{1,p} < 0 \\ Dg^{q,1}(x) + z^{1,q} < 0. \end{array} \right.$$

2. *Symmetric Market Makers.* Assume that  $\Lambda = [0, \lambda_\infty]$  for some positive constant  $\lambda_\infty$ ,  $R_0^p = R_0^q$ ,  $K^p = K^q$  and for any  $\alpha = (\mu^p, \lambda^p; \mu^q, \lambda^q) \in \Delta \times \Lambda \times \Delta \times \Lambda$  we have

$$\lambda^a(\mu^p, \mu^q, \lambda^p, \lambda^q) = \lambda^a(\mu^q, \mu^p, \lambda^q, \lambda^p), \quad \lambda^b(\mu^p, \mu^q, \lambda^p, \lambda^q) = \lambda^b(\mu^q, \mu^p, \lambda^q, \lambda^p).$$

Then, note that  $Dg^{p,1} = Dg^{q,1} =: Dg^1$  and  $Dg^{p,2} = Dg^{q,2} =: Dg^2$  so that (FP) is equivalent to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{z^{5,p}}{\sigma} + (Dg^1(x) + z^{1,p}) \frac{\partial \lambda^a}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) + (Dg^2(x) + z^{2,p}) \frac{\partial \lambda^b}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) = 0, \quad \text{or } \hat{\mu}^p = \mu_\infty, \quad \text{or } \hat{\mu}^p = -\mu_\infty \\ -\frac{z^{7,q}}{\sigma} + (Dg^1(x) + z^{1,q}) \frac{\partial \lambda^a}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) + (Dg^2(x) + z^{2,q}) \frac{\partial \lambda^b}{\partial \mu^p}(\hat{\mu}, d) = 0, \quad \text{or } \hat{\mu}^q = \mu_\infty, \quad \text{or } \hat{\mu}^q = -\mu_\infty \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x) + z^{4,p}) \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x) + z^{6,q}). \end{array} \right.$$

In particular, if

$$\lambda^a = \lambda_0 e^{-c(\mu^p + \mu^q)} e^{-d} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda^b = \lambda_0 e^{c(\mu^p + \mu^q)} e^{-d},$$

we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{z^{5,p}}{\sigma} - c(Dg^1(x) + z^{1,p})e^{-c(\hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q)} + c(Dg^2(x) + z^{2,p})e^{c(\hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q)} = 0, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^p = \mu_\infty, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^p = -\mu_\infty \\ -\frac{z^{7,q}}{\sigma} - c(Dg^1(x) + z^{1,q})e^{-c(\hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q)} + c(Dg^2(x) + z^{2,q})e^{c(\hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q)} = 0, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^q = \mu_\infty, \text{ or } \hat{\mu}^q = -\mu_\infty \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x) + z^{4,p}) \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x) + z^{6,q}). \end{array} \right.$$

If  $z^{1,p} = z^{1,q} = z^1$ ,  $z^{2,p} = z^{2,q} = z^2$ ,  $z^{5,p} = z^{7,q} = \tilde{z}$  and there exists  $\gamma$  such that

$$-\frac{\tilde{z}}{\sigma} - c(Dg^1(x) + z^1)\frac{1}{\gamma} + c(Dg^2(x) + z^2)\gamma = 0, \quad (3.5)$$

$$Dg^1(x) + z^1 < 0, \quad Dg^2(x) + z^2 < 0, \quad (3.6)$$

(FP) admits a solution in  $U_{max}$ . In this case, we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q = \frac{\ln(\gamma)}{c} \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g(x) + z^{4,p}) \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1]) - g(x) + z^{6,q}). \end{array} \right.$$

Therefore, the set  $U$  contains the set of  $z$  such that  $z^{1,p} = z^{1,q}$ ,  $z^{2,p} = z^{2,q}$ ,  $z^{5,p} = z^{7,q}$  and such that (3.5) and (3.6) admits a solution.

Our goal is to characterize a set of rebates  $(\xi, d)$  such that  $NE(\xi, d)$  admits a solution. Extending the definition of  $\Xi^p$ , we now consider the following set of contracts

$$\Xi := \{Y_T^{Y_0, Z, d}, Z \in \mathcal{Z}, Y_0^i \geq R_0^i, i = p, q\},$$

where the process  $Y_t^{Y_0, Z, d} := (Y_t^{p, Z, d}, Y_t^{q, Z, d})$  is defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{i, Z, d} = & Y_0^i + \int_0^t Z_s^{1, i} (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{2, i} (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{3, i} dW_s + \int_0^t Z_s^{4, i} (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\ & + \int_0^t Z_s^{5, i} dW_s^p + \int_0^t Z_s^{6, i} (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{7, i} dW_s^q - \int_0^t F^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $r_s := [v_{(N_{s-}^a+1)}^a \mathbf{1}_{A_{(N_{s-}^a+1)} \leq \theta(T-s)}, v_{(N_{s-}^b+1)}^b \mathbf{1}_{B_{(N_{s-}^b+1)} \leq \theta(T-s)}]$ , We denotes  $\hat{\alpha}_s^i := \hat{\alpha}^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, d)$  and where  $\mathcal{Z}$  denotes the space of random  $\mathbb{F}$ -predictable processes  $Z = (Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}^p \times \mathcal{Z}^q$ .

We recall that a pair of controls  $\alpha = (\hat{\alpha}^p, \hat{\alpha}^q) \in \mathcal{A}$  is said to be a Nash equilibrium for the two strategic traders if it solves

$$NE(\xi, d) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \hat{\alpha}^q; \hat{\alpha}^p) : = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \alpha = (\alpha^p, \hat{\alpha}^q)} V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \hat{\alpha}^q; \alpha^p) \\ V_0^q(\xi^q, d, \hat{\alpha}^p; \hat{\alpha}^q) : = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}, \alpha = (\hat{\alpha}^p, \alpha^q)} V_0^q(\xi^q, d, \hat{\alpha}^p; \alpha^q). \end{array} \right.$$



Lemma 3.3 shows that the optimal control for each strategic trader in solving  $NE(\xi, d)$  depends on not only the exchange's incentive, the transaction fee, but also the action of the other trader. Therefore, we aim to identify the set of incentives and fees that could lead to a Nash equilibrium between the two strategic traders. Note that without the right incentive and fee, the strategic traders may otherwise engage in an endless search for a better trading strategy, that is why we need to characterize the set of  $(\xi, d)$  such that  $NE(\xi, d) \neq \emptyset$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{U}$  the subset of  $\mathcal{Z}$  such that  $Z$  is  $U$ -valued.

**Theorem 2.** *For a given  $\xi \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $d \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , the following are equivalent:*

(i) *there exists a Nash equilibrium  $\alpha = (\alpha^p, \alpha^q)$ , that is  $NE(\xi, d) \neq \emptyset$ ;*

(ii) *there exists unique  $Y_0 = (Y_0^p, Y_0^q) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$  and unique  $Z = (Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{U}$  such that  $\xi = (\xi^p, \xi^q) = (Y_T^{p, Z^p, d}, Y_T^{q, Z^q, d})$ , where for  $i \in \{p, q\}$ ,*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{i, Z^i, d} = & Y_0^i + \int_0^t Z_s^{1, i} (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{2, i} (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{3, i} dW_s + \int_0^t Z_s^{4, i} (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\ & + \int_0^t Z_s^{5, i} dW_s^p + \int_0^t Z_s^{6, i} (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^t Z_s^{7, i} dW_s^q - \int_0^t F^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i) ds, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\hat{\alpha}_s^i = \hat{\alpha}^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, d)$  solves (FP).

In addition, if one of the above is satisfied, then  $\alpha$  from (i) equals  $\hat{\alpha}$  in (ii).

*Proof.* Assume that there exists a Nash equilibrium  $\alpha = (\alpha^p, \alpha^q)$ . Then, (ii) is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.3 for both Market Maker  $p$  and  $q$  simultaneously under the assumption that there exists a solution to (FP). Conversely, assume that (ii) is satisfied with the fixed point  $\hat{\alpha}$ . Then,  $\hat{\alpha}^i$  is the best response of Market Maker  $i$  regarding the control  $\hat{\alpha}^j$  played by the other market maker regarding 2. in Lemma 3.3. Hence,  $\hat{\alpha} \in NE(\xi, d)$  where  $\xi = (Y_T^{p, Z^p, Y_0^p, d}, Y_T^{q, Z^q, Y_0^q, d}) \in \Xi$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5** (Symmetric Market Makers and Nash equilibrium). *Let  $\alpha = (\mu^p, \lambda^p; \mu^q, \lambda^q) \in \Delta \times \Lambda \times \Delta \times \Lambda$  and assume that*

$$\lambda^a(\mu, d) = \lambda_0 e^{-c(\mu^p + \mu^q)} e^{-d} \text{ and } \lambda^b(\mu, d) = \lambda_0 e^{c(\mu^p + \mu^q)} e^{-d},$$

$R_0^p = R_0^q, K^p = K^q$ . Then, there exists a Nash equilibrium, i.e.  $NE(\xi, d) \neq \emptyset$  if  $\xi = Y_T^{Y_0, Z, d}$ , where  $Z^{1, p} = Z^{1, q}, Z^{2, p} = Z^{2, q}, Z^{5, p} = Z^{7, q}$  and there exists  $\gamma$  satisfying (3.5). In this case, we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \hat{\mu}_t^p + \hat{\mu}_t^q = \frac{\ln(\gamma_t)}{c} \\ \hat{\lambda}_t^p = (\lambda_0 + g(X_t + [0, 0, 0, P_t^p, 1, 0, 0])) - g(X_t) + Z_t^{4, p} \\ \hat{\lambda}_t^q = (\lambda_0 + g(X_t + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_t^q, 1])) - g(X_t) + Z_t^{6, q}. \end{array} \right.$$

## 4 Stock Exchange's Problem: optimal rebates and transaction fees

The principal, the stock exchange, aims to minimize the market inefficiency (defined as the distance between the clearing price and the efficient price), minimize total incentives provided to the strategic traders, and maximize total transaction fees collected from non-strategic traders. Define  $\rho(\xi, d, \alpha) = \mathbb{E}^\alpha \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + \xi \cdot I_2 - d \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} \right) \right]$ , where  $I_2 = [1; 1]$ . The exchange aims to find the best  $\xi$  and  $d$  that minimizes  $\rho(\xi, d, \alpha)$ .

Define  $NEI(\xi, d) = \{\alpha \in NE(\xi, d) : \rho(\xi, d, \alpha) \leq \rho(\xi, d, \beta), \text{ for any } \beta \in NE(\xi, d)\}$ .

**Remark 4.1.** *The reason we introduce  $NEI(\xi, d)$  is because certain pairs  $(\xi, d) \in NE(\xi, d)$  might result in more than one pairs of Nash equilibrium actions of the strategic traders; we thus assume that the traders always pick the Nash equilibrium action that benefits the exchange the most. The exchange proposes thus recommended price and intensity of arrival to the Market Makers, as explained in [Elie and Possamai, 2019]. Unlike [Hernández-Santibáñez, 2024, Assumption 3.1] we are not assuming the uniqueness of Nash equilibrium and we defer the choice to the exchange as formulated in the seminal paper of Holmstrom and Milgrom [Holmstrom and Milgrom, 1987] as recommended actions.*

For any  $d \in \mathbb{R}_+$ , Define  $\mathcal{I}(d)$  to be the set of incentives  $\xi$  such that  $\xi \in \mathcal{I}$  and  $NE(\xi, d) \neq \emptyset$ . Let  $\hat{\alpha}(\xi, d) \in NEI(\xi, d)$  given by Theorem 2. We formulate the problem of the exchange as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \min_{d>0, \xi \in \mathcal{I}(d)} \rho(\xi, d, \hat{\alpha}(\xi, d)) \\ &= \min_{d>0, \xi \in \mathcal{I}(d)} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(\xi, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + \xi \cdot I_2 - d \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

$$\text{subject to } V_0^p(\xi^p, d, \hat{\alpha}) \geq R_0^p, \quad V_0^q(\xi^q, d, \hat{\alpha}) \geq R_0^q \quad (4.2)$$

where  $R_0 = (R_0^p, R_0^q) \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is the vector of reservation constraint utility of the market makers  $p$  and  $q$ .  $R_0^p$  and  $R_0^q$  can be for example chosen as the PnL of each market maker if they were trading on a coexisting limit order book at the fair price  $P^*$  along the duration  $T$ .

Due to the simplicity of the transaction fees structure for investors given by the  $d$  constant, we rely on numerical method to find the optimal  $\hat{d}$ . Fixing  $d > 0$ , the exchange optimizes the rebate by solving

$$\rho(d) = \min_{\xi \in \mathcal{I}(d)} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(\xi, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + \xi \cdot I_2 - d \left( \sum_{i=1}^{N_t^a} v_i^a \mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_t^b} v_j^b \mathbf{1}_{B_j \leq \theta(T-\tau_i)} \right) \right] \quad (4.3)$$

to find the optimal rebate policy  $\hat{\xi}(d)$ .

### 4.1 Saturated utility reservations

Recalling Theorem 2, it is equivalent to find optimal controls  $(\hat{Y}_0^p, \hat{Y}_0^q, \hat{Z}^p, \hat{Z}^q)$  such that  $\xi^p \in \Xi^p$  and  $\xi^q \in \Xi^q$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho(d) &= \inf_{Y_0^p \geq R_0^p, Y_0^q \geq R_0^q, (Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(Z, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T^{Y_0, Z} \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right] \\
&= \inf_{Y_0^p \geq R_0^p, Y_0^q \geq R_0^q, (Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(Z, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_0 \cdot I_2 + (Y_T^{Y_0, Z} - Y_0) \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right] \\
&= \inf_{Y_0^p \geq R_0^p, Y_0^q \geq R_0^q} [Y_0 \cdot I_2] + \inf_{(Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(Z, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T^{0, Z} \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right] \\
&= R_0^p + R_0^q + \inf_{(Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(Z, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T^{0, Z} \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

The optimization problem of the exchange is reduced to the optimization on the  $Z$  process controlling  $X, Y$ :

$$\inf_{(Z^p, Z^q) \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}(Z, d)} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T^{0, Z} \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right]. \quad (4.4)$$

### 4.2 Optimal incentives and rebate policy

We turn to the solution of (4.4) by using a verification argument. We first define  $\mathcal{C}'([0, T])$  as the set of function  $\phi$  defined from  $t \in [0, t] \times (x, y, r, p; z, d) \in \mathcal{S} = \mathbb{R}^7 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^2 \times \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 2} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  into  $\mathbb{R}$ , which are continuously differentiable in time  $t$ , twice continuously differentiable with respect to the variables  $x_3, p, y$  and continuous in the other variables. We then define the Dynkin operator  $A$  associated with the processes  $X, Y$  for any  $\phi \in \mathcal{C}'([0, T], \mathcal{S})$  by

$$\begin{aligned}
A\phi(t, x, y, r, p; z, d) &:= \sum_{i=p, q} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial y_i}(t, x, y, r, p) \left\{ \lambda_0(z^{1, i} + z^{2, i} + z^{4, i} + z^{6, i}) - F^i(x, z, r, p, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i) - z^{5, i} \frac{\mu^p}{\sigma} - z^{7, i} \frac{\mu_s^q}{\sigma} \right\} \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_3 \partial x_3}(t, x, y, r, p) \sigma^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i, j=p, q} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y_i \partial y_j}(t, x, y, r, p) \left\{ z^{3, i} z^{3, j} + z^{5, i} z^{5, j} + z^{7, i} z^{7, j} \right\} \\
&- \sum_{j=p, q} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial x_3 \partial y_j}(t, x, y, r, p) \sigma z^{3, j} + \sum_{i=p, q} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial p_i}(t, x, y, r, p) \mu^i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=p, q} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial p_i \partial p_i}(t, x, y, r, p) \sigma^2 \\
&- \sum_{i=p, q} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y_i \partial p_p}(t, x, y, r, p) \sigma z^{5, i} - \sum_{i=p, q} \frac{\partial^2 \phi}{\partial y_i \partial p_q}(t, x, y, r, p) \sigma z^{7, i} \\
&+ [\phi(t, x + [r_1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0], y + [-z^{1, p}, -z^{1, q}], r, p) - \phi(t, x, y, r, p)] \lambda_t^a \\
&+ [\phi(t, x + [0, r_2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0], y + [-z^{2, p}, -z^{2, q}], r, p) - \phi(t, x, y, r, p)] \lambda_t^b \\
&+ [\phi(t, x + [0, 0, 0, p^p, 1, 0, 0], y + [-z^{4, p}, -z^{4, q}], r, p) - \phi(t, x, y, r, p)] \hat{\lambda}_t^p \\
&+ [\phi(t, x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, p^q, 1], y + [-z^{6, p}, -z^{6, q}], r, p) - \phi(t, x, y, r, p)] \hat{\lambda}_t^q,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\lambda^a, \lambda^b, \hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\alpha}^p; \hat{\alpha}^q) = (\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\lambda}^p; \hat{\mu}^q, \hat{\lambda}^q)$ , are functions of  $(x, z, p, d)$  from Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3** (Verification and optimal rebates). *Let  $d > 0$  be fixed. Assume that*

- *there exists a function  $\phi \in C'([0, T], \mathcal{S})$  satisfying*

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial t} + \inf_{z \in \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 2}} A\phi(t, x, y, r, p; z, d) = 0, & t < T, \\ \phi(T, x, y, r, p; d) = \left( \frac{x_1 - x_2 + K^p x_4 + K^q x_6 + K^0 P_0^*}{K^p x_5 + K^q x_7 + K^0} - x_3 \right)^2 + y \cdot I_2 - d(x_1 + x_2), & (x, y, r, p) \in \mathcal{S}; \end{cases} \quad (4.5)$$

- *there exists  $n_1, n_2, n_3 \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $C \in \mathbb{R}$  s.t.  $|\phi(t, x, y, r, p, d)| < C(1 + |x|^2 + |y| + |r|^{n_1} + |p|^{n_2})$  for every  $(t, x, y, r, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}$ ;*
- *for every  $(t, x, y, r, p) \in [0, T] \times \mathcal{S}$ , there exists  $\hat{z}(d) = \hat{z}(t, x, y, r, p; d) \in \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 2}$  such that  $A\phi(t, x, y, r, p; \hat{z}(d), d) = \inf_z \in \mathbb{R}^{7 \times 2} A\phi(t, x, y, r, p; \hat{z}(d), d)$  and such that  $\hat{Z}_t(d) = \hat{Z}(t, X_t, Y_t, r_t, P_t; d) \in \mathcal{Z}$ .*

Then  $\rho(d) = R_0^p + R_0^q + \phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, p_0)$  and  $\hat{Z}(d)$  is the optimal control of the exchange's problem (4.1).

Consequently, the optimal rebate policy is

$$\xi^p = Y_T^{p, \hat{Z}^p(d), d}, \quad \xi^q = Y_T^{q, \hat{Z}^q(d), d},$$

where  $Y_T^{i, z, d}$  is defined by Theorem 2.

*Proof.* The proof is based on a classical verification theorem based on a localisation procedure and by applying Ito's formula. Define a local time  $\theta_n = T \wedge \inf\{t > 0 : \|X_t\| > n, \|Y_t\| > n, |r_t| > n, |P_t| > n\}$ . By applying Ito's formula between 0 and  $\theta_n$ , we get for any control  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi(\theta_n, X_{\theta_n}, Y_{\theta_n}^{Z, d}, r_{\theta_n}, P_{\theta_n}) \\ &= \phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, P_0) + \int_0^{\theta_n} \left[ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial s}(s, X_s, Y_s^{Z, d}, r_s, P_s) + A\phi(s, X_s, Y_s^{Z, d}, r_s, P_s; Z_s, d) \right] ds \\ &+ \int_0^{\theta_n} [\phi(s, X_{s-} + [r_s^1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0], Y_{s-}^{Z, d} + [Z_s^{1,p}, Z_s^{1,q}], r_{s-}, P_{s-}) - \phi(s, X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^{Z, d}, r_{s-}, P_{s-})] d\tilde{N}_s^a \\ &+ \int_0^{\theta_n} [\phi(s, X_{s-} + [0, r_s^2, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0], Y_{s-}^{Z, d} + [Z_s^{2,p}, Z_s^{2,q}], r_{s-}, P_{s-}) - \phi(s, X_{s-}, Y_{s-}, r_{s-}, P_{s-})] d\tilde{N}_s^b \\ &+ \int_0^{\theta_n} [\phi(s, X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0], Y_{s-}^{Z, d} + [Z_s^{4,p}, Z_s^{4,q}], r_{s-}, P_{s-}) - \phi(s, X_{s-}, Y_{s-}, r_{s-}, P_{s-})] d\tilde{N}_s^p \\ &+ \int_0^{\theta_n} [\phi(s, X_{s-} + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1], Y_{s-}^{Z, d} + [Z_s^{6,p}, Z_s^{6,q}], r_{s-}, P_{s-}) - \phi(s, X_{s-}, Y_{s-}^{Z, d}, r_{s-}, P_{s-})] d\tilde{N}_s^q, \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

where  $\tilde{N}_t^i := N_t^i - \int_0^t \lambda_s^i ds$  for any  $i = a, b$  and  $\tilde{N}_t^j := N_t^j - \int_0^t \hat{\lambda}_t^j dt$  for  $j = p, q$  are  $\mathbb{P}^{\hat{\alpha}}$ -martingales.

By the continuity of  $\phi$  and its derivative and by the boundedness of all the state variables  $X, Y, r, P$  on  $[0, \theta_n]$ , we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}}[\phi(\theta_n, X_{\theta_n}, Y_{\theta_n}^{Z,d}, r_{\theta_n}, P_{\theta_n})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}}\left[\phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, P_0) + \int_0^{\theta_n} \left\{ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial s}(s, X_s, Y_s^{Z,d}, r_s, P_s) ds + A\phi(s, X_s, Y_s^{Z,d}, r_s, P_s; Z_s) \right\} ds\right] \\ &\geq \phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, P_0), \text{ for any } Z \in \mathcal{Z}, \end{aligned}$$

where equality is attained at  $Z = \hat{Z}$  by the definition of  $\phi$  solving (4.5).

Note that

$$|\phi(\theta_n, X_{\theta_n}, Y_{\theta_n}^{Z,d}, r_{\theta_n}, P_{\theta_n})| < C(1 + |X_{\theta_n}|^2 + |Y_{\theta_n}| + |r_{\theta_n}|^{n_1} + |P_{\theta_n}|^{n_2}) \leq \sup_{t \in [0, T]} C(1 + |X_t|^2 + |Y_t^{Z,d}| + |r_t|^{n_1} + |P_t|^{n_2}).$$

For  $i = p, q$ , we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0, T]} |P_t^i|^{n_2} \leq c_{n_2} \left( (T\mu_\infty)^{n_2} + \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |\sigma \tilde{W}_t^i|^{n_2} \right),$$

for some constant  $c_{n_2} > 0$  independent of  $n$ . Recall now from the proof of Lemma 3.3 that  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |X_t|^2 < \infty$ . As  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we also have  $\mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}} \sup_{t \in [0, T]} |Y_t| < \infty$ . We then deduce from the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}}[|P_T^d - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T \cdot I_2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2)] = \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}}\phi(T, X_T, Y_T, r_T, P_T; d) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}}\phi(\theta_n, X_{\theta_n}, Y_{\theta_n}, r_{\theta_n}, P_{\theta_n}; d) \geq \phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, P_0; d), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $Z \in \mathcal{Z}$  with equality for  $Z = \hat{Z}(d)$ . Then  $\rho(d) = \phi(0, X_0, Y_0, r_0, P_0; d)$  and  $\xi = Y_T^{\hat{Z}(d), d}$  is the optimal rebate scheme.  $\square$

### 4.3 Interpretations and key financial insights

We now turn to the financial interpretation of our results with a focus on the rebates shape and optimal controls of the market makers.

**Optimal rebates policy.** We recall that the optimal rebates structure is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \xi^i &= R_0^i + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{1,i} (dN_s^a - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{2,i} (dN_s^b - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^T Z_s^{3,i} dW_s + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{4,i} (dN_s^p - \lambda_0 ds) \\ &\quad + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{5,i} dW_s^p + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{6,i} (dN_s^q - \lambda_0 ds) + \int_0^T \hat{Z}_s^{7,i} dW_s^q - \int_0^T F^i(X_s, \hat{Z}_s, r_s, P_s, d) ds, \quad i \in \{p, q\}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the sake of simplicity we set  $\hat{Z} = \hat{Z}(d)$ . Each strategic trader gets incentive indexed on the canonical process  $X$  penalized by the function  $F^i$  representing the certain equivalent of their own utility. For each market maker  $i = p, q$ :

- $\hat{Z}^{1,i}$  and  $\hat{Z}^{2,i}$  are the incentives to trade in the auction in view of the number of non-strategic buyers or sellers investors arrived in the auction respectively;
- $\hat{Z}^{3,i}$  denotes the incentive to trade given the fundamental price  $P^*$ ;
- $\hat{Z}^{4,i}$  and  $\hat{Z}^{6,i}$  are the incentive to trade indexed on the arriving of the market maker  $p$  or  $q$  respectively in the auction;
- $\hat{Z}^{5,i}$  and  $\hat{Z}^{7,i}$  are the incentives indexed on the anchor prices of each strategic trader  $p, q$  through the Brownian motions  $W_s^p$  and  $W_s^q$  respectively;
- and lastly the time component  $F^i$  is the inner gain of market maker  $i$  resulting from the optimization (certain utility equivalent) that the exchange redistributes to the other agents.

The  $F^i$  component is elegantly designed as it is responsive to each strategic trader's gains and losses throughout the auction. Recall that a strategic trader's payoff from the market is  $g^i(X_t)$  at time  $t$ . When a new order enters to the market at time  $t$ , the net gain for the strategic trader  $i$  is  $g^i(X_t) - g^i(X_{t-})$  at this new order. We say that the trader incurs a loss due to a new order if the net gain is negative and profits at the new order if the net gain is positive. Observing the structure of  $F^i$ , we see that the incentive  $\xi$  has a positive increment at time  $t$  when a strategic trader experiences a loss from a coming order at time  $t$  and has a negative increment if a strategic trader profits at a new order at time  $t$ . In short, the incentive  $\xi^i$  compensates each strategic trader when a market change harms the trader and the incentive charges a trader when a market change benefits the trader. Additionally, the  $F^i$  component depends on the incentive  $d$  provided by the exchange to non-strategic traders. This reveals an interesting dynamic: the competitive nature of the strategic traders make them not only influenced by incentives directed at them, but also by incentives offered to other market participants.

Given this rebate policy, we now turn to the interpretation of the strategic traders' controls  $\hat{\alpha} = (\hat{\mu}^p, \hat{\lambda}^p; \hat{\mu}^q, \hat{\lambda}^q)$ .

**Optimal trading speed in the auctions** The optimal arriving intensity for the strategic trader  $p$  is  $\hat{\lambda}(X_s, \hat{Z}_s, P_s^p) = 0 \vee \{\lambda_0 + \hat{Z}_s^{4,p} + g^p(X_s + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g^p(X_s)\} \wedge \lambda_\infty$  and for the strategic trader  $q$  is  $\hat{\lambda}(X_s, \hat{Z}_s, P_s^q) = 0 \vee \{\lambda_0 + \hat{Z}_s^{6,q} + g^q(X_s + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g^q(X_s)\} \wedge \lambda_\infty$ . This implies that the strategic traders anchor at  $\lambda_0$  and adjust their intensities as time goes on. The traders intend to arrive more often if they gain from their arrivals, i.e. when  $g^p(X_s + [0, 0, 0, P_s^p, 1, 0, 0]) - g^p(X_s) > 0$  and  $g^q(X_s + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P_s^q, 1]) - g^q(X_s) > 0$ . Additionally, when the exchange awards the traders' arrivals (*i.e.*, when

$Z_s^{4,p}$  and  $Z_s^{6,q}$  are positive), trader  $p$  and trader  $q$  will increase the arriving intensity and conversely when the exchange penalizes a trader's arrival, the traders will slow down their trading activities. This demonstrates the effectiveness of the rebates and fees scheme as the exchange can monitor and regulate trader activity in such a way.

**Optimal spread.** In terms of the optimal spread, we illustrate the results with the example  $i^a(\mu^p, \mu^q) = e^{-c(\mu^p + \mu^q)}$  and  $i^b(\mu^p, \mu^q) = e^{c(\mu^p + \mu^q)}$  for some constant  $c$  with the symmetric market maker case investigated in 2. Remark 3.4. Let  $z^{1,p} = z^{1,q} = z^1$ ,  $z^{2,p} = z^{2,q} = z^2$ ,  $z^{5,p} = z^{7,q} = \tilde{z}$ . Assume that there exists  $\gamma$  such that

$$-\frac{\tilde{z}}{\sigma} - c(Dg^1(x) + z^1)\frac{1}{\gamma} + c(Dg^2(x) + z^2)\gamma = 0, \quad Dg^1(x) + z^1 < 0, \quad Dg^2(x) + z^2 < 0, \quad (4.7)$$

then

$$\begin{cases} \hat{\mu}^p + \hat{\mu}^q = \frac{\ln(\gamma)}{c} \\ \hat{\lambda}^p = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, P^p, 1, 0, 0])) - g(x) + z^{4,p} \\ \hat{\lambda}^q = (\lambda_0 + g(x + [0, 0, 0, 0, 0, P^q, 1])) - g(x) + z^{6,q}. \end{cases}$$

If there exists such  $\gamma$ , we conclude that if  $i^a$  and  $i^b$  take the form proposed, any  $\xi = Y_T^{Y_0, Z}$  that has non-empty  $NEI(\xi^{Y_0, Z}, d)$  need to satisfy this relation for  $\{z^{1,p}, z^{2,p}, z^{5,p}, z^{1,q}, z^{2,q}, z^{7,q}\}$ . Note that  $NEI(\xi, d)$  will contain uncountable many pairs of  $(\mu^p, \mu^q)$  with  $\mu^p + \mu^q = \ln(\gamma)/c$ , for all possible  $\gamma$ . This observation is interesting as it shows that it is the combined price impact of the two strategic traders that matters to the market and to the exchange instead of the individual proposed price of each strategic trader.

## 5 Numerical methods: deep neural network in high dimension for HJB equations with jumps

Although Section 3 implicitly identifies the optimal incentive structure  $\xi$  for the strategic traders, it does not provide unfortunately explicit solutions of the PDE considered in Theorem 3. It remains to find how a stock exchange can in practice implement this incentive and how a stock exchange can determine the optimal fee  $d$  for the non-strategic traders. To address this, we present a numerical method designed to explicitly find the optimal incentive structure and optimal fee  $d$ , using the Deep BSDE method, see [Henry-Labordere, 2017, Han and Long, 2020, Ji et al., 2020, Ji et al., 2022].

The optimal fee  $\hat{d}$  can be found by a simple iteration method, whereas the main challenge is to identify  $\hat{\xi}(d)$ . In the following, we explain how  $\hat{\xi}(d)$  is solved with the Deep BSDE method, assuming  $d$  is fixed.

Recall from Theorem 2 that finding the optimal incentive structure  $\xi$  is equivalent to finding an optimal pair  $(Y_0, Z)$ . With the constraint (4.2) and Section 4.1, this simplifies to finding an optimal pair  $(0, Z)$ . Theorem 3 shows that the optimal  $Z$  can be viewed as a function of  $\{t, X_t, Y_t, r_t, P_t; d\}$ . Consequently, we use a neural network to approximate the function  $Z(t, x, y, r, p; d)$ , defining the network's loss function as the stock exchange's objective in (4.3) and (4.2). The reason a neural network can be used to learn a function is supported by the Universal Approximation Theorem [Hornik et al., 1989], which states that a neural network with sufficient layers and appropriate activation functions can approximate any  $C^k$  functions effectively.

### 5.1 Algorithm and Parameter Calibration

For a given time interval  $[0, T]$ , we partition it into  $n$  sub-intervals:  $0 = t_0, t_1, \dots, t_n = T$  with  $\Delta t = \frac{T}{n}$ .

Let the neural network model's input be  $(r, x, y, p)$  and the output be  $\varphi(t, x, y, p)$ . Denote the sample size (batch size) to be  $M$ . Recall the problem of the exchange in (4.1), (4.2), and (4.3), we define the network's objective as:  $\min_{d, Z} \left\{ \rho(Y_T^{0, Z, d}, d, \hat{\alpha}(Y_T^{0, Z, d}, d)) + \epsilon \max(R_0 - V_0(Y_T^{0, Z, d}, d, \hat{\alpha}), 0) \cdot I_2 \right\}$ , for some constant  $\epsilon > 0$ . Using the definition of  $V_0$  in (3.1), we can further format this objective as

$$\min_{d, Z} \left\{ \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}} \left[ |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) + Y_T^{0, Z, d} \cdot I_2 \right] + \sum_{i=p, q} \epsilon \max(R_0^i - \mathbb{E}^{\hat{\alpha}} \left[ g^i(X_T) + Y_T^{i, 0, Z, d} - \int_0^T \frac{(\lambda_s^i - \lambda_0)^2}{2} ds \right], 0) \right\}.$$

The algorithm 1 for computing the loss function is provided below:

---

#### Algorithm 1 Loss Function of the Neural Network

---

- 1: Initialize  $X_0, Y_0, P_0$
  - 2: **for**  $t = 0$  to  $n - 1$  **do**
  - 3:   Compute  $Z_t = 20 * \varphi(t, X_t, Y_t, P_t)$
  - 4:   Find a Nash equilibrium  $\hat{\alpha}_t$
  - 5:   Compute  $X_{t+1}, Y_{t+1}, P_{t+1}$  from  $X_t, Y_t, P_t$
  - 6: **end for**
  - 7: Compute  $P_T^{cl}, P_T^*, g^p(X_T)$ , and  $g^q(X_T)$  from  $X_T, Y_T, P_T$
  - 8: Loss =  $\left[ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \left( |P_T^{cl} - P_T^*|^2 + Y_T^{p, Z, d} + Y_T^{q, Z, d} - d(X_T^1 + X_T^2) \right) \right] + \sum_{i=p, q} \epsilon \max(R_0^i - \left[ \frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M \left( g^i(X_T) + Y_T^{i, Z, d} - \sum_{t=0}^{n-1} \frac{(\lambda_t^i - \lambda_0)^2}{2} \Delta t \right) \right], 0)$
  - 9: **return** Loss
- 

**Remark 5.1.** Note that we multiply 20 at  $Z_t = 20 * \varphi(t, X_t, Y_t, P_t)$  to ensure that equation (3.6) is satisfied, thus a Nash Equilibrium control  $(\alpha^p, \alpha^q)$  can be found.



As for the parameters, we set  $T = 10$ . This value was chosen randomly but can be interpreted as the auction remaining open for 10 seconds or 10 minutes. Recall that non-strategic auction participants cancel their orders based on the values of  $\mathbf{1}_{A_i \leq \theta(T - \tau_i)}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{B_i \leq \theta(T - \tau_i)}$ ; we take  $\theta(T - \tau_i) = \frac{1}{1 + T - \tau_i} + 0.5$ .

We set  $K = K_0 = K^p = K^q = 1$  assuming a \$1 spread between the clearing price and the order price would prompt traders to demand an additional share. We set  $v^a = v^b = 1$ ,  $\lambda_0 = 100$  assuming a non-strategic trader submits an order for one share and the anchor arrival intensity is 100 orders/traders per unit of time. We set  $c = 0.1$ , considering the shape of  $e^{cx}$  and selecting a value that reasonably reflects how sensitive the arrival intensity of non-strategic traders is to the spread offered by strategic traders. For the reservation parameter, we set  $R_0 = [100 - 35000, 100 - 35000]$ . The \$100 says each strategic trader gains at least \$100 from the auction whereas 35000 accounts for the distance between the strategic trader's  $\lambda$  and  $\lambda_0$ , thereby providing greater flexibility for the strategic trader.

We calibrate  $P_0^*$  and  $\sigma$  by using the trading data of "Apple" and "Alphabet" extracted from YahooFinance on period Oct-2-2023 to Dec-29-2023. The calibration method is illustrated in [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024, Section 2.4]. We test two sets of parameters: we set  $P_0^* = 184.39$ ,  $\sigma = 1.76$  for Apple, and  $P_0^* = 134.24$ ,  $\sigma = 2.11$  for Alphabet. We set  $\lambda_\infty = 200$  and  $\mu_\infty = 60$ ; both are large enough such that the program would not touch the bound when searching for the optimal controls. We vary  $\epsilon \in [0.5, 3]$ .

As discussed in Section 4.3,  $NE(\xi, d)$  may contain multiple pairs of optimal actions  $\alpha = (\alpha^p, \alpha^q)$ . More specifically, if there exists a positive  $\gamma$  that satisfies equation (4.7), then for any  $(\mu^p, \mu^q)$  such that  $\mu^p + \mu^q = \frac{\ln \gamma}{c}$ , we have  $(\mu^p, \mu^q) \in NE(\xi, d)$ . To select a unique pair  $(\mu^p, \mu^q)$  for our algorithm, we fix  $(\mu^p, \mu^q) = (0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c}, 0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c})$ . Based on our initial tests which selected the pair that minimizes the loss of the exchange, recalling the definition of  $NEI(\xi, d)$ , from  $\frac{\ln \gamma}{c} * (-1, 2)$ ,  $\frac{\ln \gamma}{c} * (-0.5, 1.5)$ ,  $\frac{\ln \gamma}{c} * (0, 1)$ ,  $\frac{\ln \gamma}{c} * (0.5, 0.5)$ , and  $\frac{\ln \gamma}{c} * (1, 0)$ , we found that the pair  $(0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c}, 0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c})$  is consistently selected. Thus in consideration of the computation cost we fix  $(\mu^p, \mu^q) = (0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c}, 0.5 * \frac{\ln \gamma}{c})$ .

Based on the choice of  $(\mu^p, \mu^q)$  discussed above and the discussion of symmetric market makers in Remark 3.4, we further simplify the numerical method to assume that the exchange sends identical incentive contract to strategic trader  $p$  and strategic trader  $q$ , i.e.  $Z^{1,p} = Z^{1,q}$ ,  $Z^{2,p} = Z^{2,q}$ ,  $Z^{3,p} = Z^{3,q}$ ,  $Z^{4,p} = Z^{6,q}$ ,  $Z^{5,p} = Z^{7,q}$ ,  $Z^{6,p} = Z^{4,q}$ ,  $Z^{7,p} = Z^{5,q}$ .

For the numerical method, we set  $n = 50$ ,  $M = 256$  to balance precision and computation cost. The model uses 2 hidden layers, with 8 neurons in the first hidden layer and 7 neurons in the second hidden layer. Note that the number of neurons in the second hidden layer corresponds to the output dimension.

Activation function is set to be the sigmoid function for all layers (including the output layer) except the input layer. We tested other activation functions, such as the identity function, ReLU, and tanh. However, the sigmoid function proved to be the most stable, as it supports the existence of Nash equilibrium controls. We employ Adam optimization with automatic differentiation, using a learning rate chosen from  $\{0.001, 0.0005, 0.0001, 0.00005, 0.00001\}$ .

### 5.2 Illustration and Policy Recommendations

In terms of the optimal  $d$  which minimizes  $\rho(d)$ , we find  $\hat{d} = 3.0$  for Apple and  $\hat{d} = 2.0$  for Alphabet. Figure 1 shows that as the transaction fee  $d$  initially increases,  $\rho(d)$  decreases, likely due to increased fee revenues. However, beyond the optimal point, further increases in  $d$  transaction fee cease to be beneficial probably because higher fees discourage non-strategic traders from participating in the auction, ultimately reducing the exchange’s overall gains.




Figure 1. Transaction fee  $d$  v.s.  $\Lambda(d)$


We then want to illustrate  $\hat{\xi}(\hat{d}) = Y_T^{R_0, Z}$ . Due to similarity between Apple and Alphabet’s result, we only present Apple’s result here.

Figure 2 (e) displays the average optimal  $-\int_0^t F^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i) ds$ , where the blue solid line represents the continuous incentive for trader  $i = p$ , and the orange dashed line represents the incentive for trader  $i = q$ . Figure 2 (f) displays the average optimal  $F^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i)$ . Figure 2 (g) displays the total rebate  $Y_t^{0, Z, \hat{d}}$ , with  $\xi(\hat{d}) = Y_t^{0, Z, \hat{d}}$ . Figure 2 (a) shows  $Z^1, Z^2, \dots, Z^7$ . Figures 2 (b) and (c) show the strategic


traders' responses to these incentives, while Figure 2 (d) shows the arriving intensities of the non-strategic buyers and sellers. It is important to note that the difference between  $\lambda^p$  and  $\lambda^q$ , and between the continuous incentive  $F^i(X_s, Z_s, r_s, P_s, \hat{\alpha}_s^j, d; \hat{\alpha}_s^i)$ , shown in Figure 2 (b), (e), (f) and (g), are numerical artifact. Theoretically, these values should be identical; however due to the imperfection in generating Brownian motions using a computer program, discrepancies arise.

We now discuss the results. From our test (figure 2(a)),  $Z_t^1, Z_t^2$  remains relatively stable over time  $t$ , so the exchange can treat these two variables as a constant vector across  $t$  for simplicity. Our primary focus is on  $Z_t^4$  and  $Z_t^6$ , which influence the traders' arrival intensities over time. A specific feature of an auction market in contrast to a continuous trading session is that orders are not executed immediately. This delay allows traders to select their arrival time or intensity during the auction to optimize their gains. For instance, traders may choose to arrive late to gain more market information to profit from the early-arriving orders. Early arriving traders can also benefit from the market by placing misleading orders or setting a tone at the beginning of the market. Consequently, the component related to arrival intensity of the incentive becomes important as it can help mitigate the timing advantages present in an auction market. In our previous work [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024], we also focused on exploring the optimal shape of this component in a discrete-time setting. Now, we discuss the shapes of  $Z_t^4$  and  $Z_t^6$ . From figure 2(a), we see that they increase over a brief period and then gradually decrease over time. This indicates that the exchange does not want the traders to arrive too early but also seeks to avoid overly late arrivals. Due to this incentive structure, we see that the strategic traders reduce their arrival intensity over time, sending fewer orders as the auction progresses. This aligns with our findings and proposals in the preliminary work [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024], which indicate that the exchange prefers traders to arrive earlier in the auction rather than later. From this result, we recommend the exchange to formulate the intensity related incentive in this way. Based on these results, we recommend that exchanges design the arrival intensity related incentive with a generally decreasing shape.


Additionally, we see that the fee is effective in regulating other behaviors of strategic and non-strategic traders throughout the auction. The strategic traders' spreads,  $\mu^p$  and  $\mu^q$ , decrease to zero as time advances. This indicates that the strategic traders are submitting orders that align more closely with the efficient price, rather than introducing misleading or disruptive pricing signals. Furthermore, the imbalance between the arriving intensity of non-strategic buyers and non-strategic sellers diminishes due to the closing gap between the strategic traders' price and the efficient price. With regard to the incentive structure, we observe from figure 2 (e) and (f) that the time-dependent component of the incentives and its derivatives increase over time. Figure 2 (g) indicates that the total incentive also increases over time. This pattern may be attributed




(a) Selected  $Z$




(b) Traders' optimal arriving intensities,  $\hat{\lambda}$




(c) Traders' optimal spreads,  $\hat{\mu}$




(d) The value of  $\lambda^a$  and  $\lambda^b$



(e) Exchange's optimal incentive  $-\int_0^t F_s ds$



(f) Exchange's optimal  $F$

(g) Continuation utilities  $Y_t^p, Y_t^q$ .

**Figure 2.** Result for Apple. The sample size is 256, and the values presented here are the means across the sample.

to strategic traders becoming less inclined to participate and earning less as the auction progresses, so the exchange compensates them by enhancing the incentives. The insight we gain here can be a potential strategy for the exchange to design incentives. Specifically, an effective incentive could be formulated as an inverse function relative to the traders' gains or the traders' willingness to participate. By shaping the incentive structure in this way, the exchange can effectively regulate the auction.

Lastly, we demonstrate the effectiveness of the fee and incentive in improving both market efficiency and the exchange's outcomes by comparing two scenarios: one with no fees or incentives and one with the optimal fee and incentive  $(\hat{d}, \hat{\xi}(\hat{d}))$ . When  $(d = 0, \xi = 0)$ , the exchange's value is  $\rho = 454$  for Apple and  $\rho = 487$  for Alphabet, whereas with  $(\hat{d}, \hat{\xi}(\hat{d}))$ , it improves significantly to  $\rho(\hat{d}) = -45119$  for Apple and  $\rho(\hat{d}) = -44003$  for Alphabet. This demonstrates that the fee and incentive substantially enhance the exchange's outcomes. In terms of market efficiency, when  $(d = 0, \xi = 0)$ , the expected market spread is  $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha(0,0)}[|P_T^{cl} - P_T|^2] = 454$  for Apple and 487 for Alphabet, compared to  $\mathbb{E}^{\alpha(\hat{\xi}, \hat{d})}[|P_T^{cl} - P_T|^2] = 144$  for Apple and 127 for Alphabet under the optimal fee and incentive structure. Therefore, we recommend implementing the fee and the incentive to promote both the welfare of the exchange and the overall efficiency of the market.

## References

- [Avellaneda and Stoikov, 2008] Avellaneda, M. and Stoikov, S. (2008). High-frequency trading in a limit order book. *Quantitative Finance*, 8(3):217–224.
- [Baldacci and Bergault, 2024] Baldacci, B. and Bergault, P. (2024). Optimal incentives in a limit order book: a spde control approach. *Market Microstructure and Liquidity*, page 2050012.
- [Baldacci et al., 2023a] Baldacci, B., Bergault, P., and Possamaï, D. (2023a). A mean-field game of market-making against strategic traders. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 14(4):1080–1112.
- [Baldacci et al., 2023b] Baldacci, B., Manziuk, I., Mastrolia, T., and Rosenbaum, M. (2023b). Market making and incentives design in the presence of a dark pool: a stackelberg actor–critic approach. *Operations Research*, 71(2):727–749.
- [Baldacci et al., 2021] Baldacci, B., Possamaï, D., and Rosenbaum, M. (2021). Optimal make-take fees in a multi market-maker environment. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 12(1):446–486.
- [Barucci et al., 2025] Barucci, E., Mathieu, A., and Sánchez-Betancourt, L. (2025). Market making with fads, informed, and uninformed traders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.03658*.
- [Beck et al., 2020] Beck, C., Hutzenthaler, M., Jentzen, A., and Kuckuck, B. (2020). An overview on deep learning-based approximation methods for partial differential equations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.12348*.
- [Björk, 2021] Björk, T. (2021). *Point Processes and Jump Diffusions: An introduction with finance applications*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Budish et al., 2015] Budish, E., Cramton, P., and Shim, J. (2015). The high-frequency trading arms race: Frequent batch auctions as a market design response. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(4):1547–1621.
- [Budish et al., 2024] Budish, E., Lee, R. S., and Shim, J. J. (2024). A theory of stock exchange competition and innovation: Will the market fix the market? *The Journal of Political Economy*, 132(4):1209–1246.
- [Cartea et al., 2015] Cartea, Á., Jaimungal, S., and Penalva, J. (2015). *Algorithmic and high-frequency trading*. Cambridge University Press.
- [Chiusolo and Hubert, 2024] Chiusolo, A. and Hubert, E. (2024). A new approach to principal-agent problems with volatility control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09471*.
- [Colliard and Foucault, 2012] Colliard, J.-E. and Foucault, T. (2012). Trading fees and efficiency in limit order markets. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 25(11):3389–3421.
- [Cont et al., 2010] Cont, R., Stoikov, S., and Talreja, R. (2010). A stochastic model for order book dynamics. *Operations research*, 58(3):549–563.
- [Cvitanić et al., 2018] Cvitanić, J., Possamaï, D., and Touzi, N. (2018). Dynamic programming approach to principal–agent problems. *Finance and Stochastics*, 22:1–37.

- [Cvitanić and Xing, 2018] Cvitanić, J. and Xing, H. (2018). Asset pricing under optimal contracts. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 173:142–180.
- [Derchu et al., 2024] Derchu, J., Guillot, P., Mastrolia, T., and Rosenbaum, M. (2024). Ahead: Ad hoc electronic auction design. *Frontiers of Mathematical Finance*, 3(2):163–213.
- [Derchu et al., 2023] Derchu, J., Kavvathas, D., Mastrolia, T., and Rosenbaum, M. (2023). Equilibria and incentives for illiquid auction markets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15805*.
- [Du and Zhu, 2017] Du, S. and Zhu, H. (2017). What is the optimal trading frequency in financial markets? *The Review of Economic Studies*, 84(4):1606–1651.
- [Duffie and Zhu, 2017] Duffie, D. and Zhu, H. (2017). Size discovery. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(4):1095–1150.
- [Elie and Possamaï, 2019] Elie, R. and Possamaï, D. (2019). Contracting theory with competitive interacting agents. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 57(2):1157–1188.
- [Espinosa and Touzi, 2015] Espinosa, G.-E. and Touzi, N. (2015). Optimal investment under relative performance concerns. *Mathematical Finance*, 25(2):221–257.
- [Euch et al., 2021] Euch, O. E., Mastrolia, T., Rosenbaum, M., and Touzi, N. (2021). Optimal make–take fees for market making regulation. *Mathematical Finance*, 31(1):109–148.
- [Farmer and Skouras, 2012] Farmer, D. and Skouras, S. (2012). Review of the benefits of a continuous market vs. randomised stop auctions and of alternative priority rules (policy options 7 and 12).
- [Foucault, 1999] Foucault, T. (1999). Order flow composition and trading costs in a dynamic limit order market. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 2(2):99–134.
- [Gayduk and Nadtochiy, 2018] Gayduk, R. and Nadtochiy, S. (2018). Endogenous formation of limit order books: dynamics between trades. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 56(3):1577–1619.
- [Georgoulis et al., 2024] Georgoulis, E. H., Papapantoleon, A., and Smaragdakis, C. (2024). A deep implicit-explicit minimizing movement method for option pricing in jump-diffusion models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06740*.
- [Guéant et al., 2013] Guéant, O., Lehalle, C.-A., and Fernandez-Tapia, J. (2013). Dealing with the inventory risk: a solution to the market making problem. *Mathematics and financial economics*, 7:477–507.
- [Han et al., 2017] Han, J., Jentzen, A., et al. (2017). Deep learning-based numerical methods for high-dimensional parabolic partial differential equations and backward stochastic differential equations. *Communications in mathematics and statistics*, 5(4):349–380.
- [Han and Long, 2020] Han, J. and Long, J. (2020). Convergence of the deep bsde method for coupled fbsdes. *Probability, Uncertainty and Quantitative Risk*, 5(1):5.
- [Henry-Labordere, 2017] Henry-Labordere, P. (2017). Deep primal-dual algorithm for bsdes: Applications of machine learning to cva and im. *Available at SSRN 3071506*.

- [Hernández-Santibáñez, 2024] Hernández-Santibáñez, N. (2024). Principal-multiagents problem under equivalent changes of measure: General study and an existence result. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 177:104448.
- [Holmstrom and Milgrom, 1987] Holmstrom, B. and Milgrom, P. (1987). Aggregation and linearity in the provision of intertemporal incentives. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 303–328.
- [Hornik et al., 1989] Hornik, K., Stinchcombe, M., and White, H. (1989). Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators. *Neural networks*, 2(5):359–366.
- [Hu et al., 2023] Hu, K., Ren, Z., and Yang, J. (2023). Principal-agent problem with multiple principals. *Stochastics*, 95(5):878–905.
- [Ji et al., 2020] Ji, S., Peng, S., Peng, Y., and Zhang, X. (2020). Three algorithms for solving high-dimensional fully coupled fbsdes through deep learning. *IEEE Intelligent Systems*, 35(3):71–84.
- [Ji et al., 2022] Ji, S., Peng, S., Peng, Y., and Zhang, X. (2022). A deep learning method for solving stochastic optimal control problems driven by fully-coupled fbsdes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05796*.
- [Jusselin et al., 2021] Jusselin, P., Mastrolia, T., and Rosenbaum, M. (2021). Optimal auction duration: A price formation viewpoint. *Operations Research*, 69(6):1734–1745.
- [Kazamaki, 2006] Kazamaki, N. (2006). *Continuous exponential martingales and BMO*. Springer.
- [Keun Koo et al., 2008] Keun Koo, H., Shim, G., and Sung, J. (2008). Optimal multi-agent performance measures for team contracts. *Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics*, 18(4):649–667.
- [Larsson et al., 2023] Larsson, M., Muhle-Karbe, J., and Weber, B. (2023). Optimal contracts for delegated order execution. *Available at SSRN*.
- [Lu et al., 2024] Lu, L., Hu, R., Yang, X., and Zhu, Y. (2024). Multi-agent relative investment games in a jump diffusion market with deep reinforcement learning algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.11967*.
- [Mastrolia and Ren, 2018] Mastrolia, T. and Ren, Z. (2018). Principal-agent problem with common agency without communication. *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 9(2):775–799.
- [Mastrolia and Xu, 2024] Mastrolia, T. and Xu, T. (2024). Clearing time randomization and transaction fees for auction market design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.09764*.
- [Milgrom, 2021] Milgrom, P. (2021). Auction research evolving: Theorems and market designs. *The American Economic Review*, 111(5):1383–1405.
- [Milgrom et al., 2019] Milgrom, P., Aghion, P., Rey, P., Rey, H., and Aghion, P. (2019). Auction market design: Recent innovations. *Annual Review of Economics*, 11(1):383–405.
- [Milgrom, 1979] Milgrom, P. R. (1979). A convergence theorem for competitive bidding with differential information. *Econometrica*, 47:679–688.



- [Oksendal and Sulem, 2019] Oksendal, B. and Sulem, A. (2019). Stochastic control of jump diffusions. In *Applied Stochastic Control of Jump Diffusions*, pages 93–155. Springer.
- [Ou-Yang, 2003] Ou-Yang, H. (2003). Optimal contracts in a continuous-time delegated portfolio management problem. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 16(1):173–208.
- [Raissi, 2024] Raissi, M. (2024). Forward–backward stochastic neural networks: deep learning of high-dimensional partial differential equations. In *Peter Carr Gedenkschrift: Research Advances in Mathematical Finance*, pages 637–655. World Scientific.
- [Rhodes-Kropf and Viswanathan, 2005] Rhodes-Kropf, M. and Viswanathan, S. (2005). Financing auction bids. *RAND Journal of Economics*, pages 789–815.
- [Sannikov, 2008] Sannikov, Y. (2008). A continuous-time version of the principal-agent problem. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 75(3):957–984.
- [Shreve et al., 2004] Shreve, S. E. et al. (2004). *Stochastic calculus for finance II: Continuous-time models*, volume 11. Springer.
- [Voskamp, 2023] Voskamp, R. (2023). Deep learning-based algorithms for stochastic control of jump diffusion in finance.
- [Wah and Wellman, 2013] Wah, E. and Wellman, M. P. (2013). Latency arbitrage, market fragmentation, and efficiency: a two-market model. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth ACM conference on Electronic commerce*, pages 855–872.
- [Weinan et al., 2021] Weinan, E., Han, J., and Jentzen, A. (2021). Algorithms for solving high dimensional pdes: from nonlinear monte carlo to machine learning. *Nonlinearity*, 35(1):278.
- [Wilson, 1977] Wilson, R. (1977). A bidding model of perfect competition. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 44(3):511–518.