

Liquidity Jump, Liquidity Diffusion, and Crypto Wash Trading

Qi Deng^{1,2,3*}
and
Zhong-guo Zhou⁴

Abstract

We hypothesize that at least a portion of the short-term price jumps in the crypto market are manifestations of liquidity fluctuation caused by wash trading practices. We develop a model to decompose asset liquidity into two components: liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion, which proxy the size and probability of wash trading, respectively. Using the US stock trading data as benchmark, we establish that the combination of high liquidity diffusion (≥ 1) and high liquidity jump (≥ 1) indicates wash trading, while large-volume trades with high liquidity jump (≥ 1) but low liquidity diffusion (< 1) are actually legitimate trades. The liquidity measures provide a useful tool to all market participants, including researchers, regulators, market makers and investors to understand the interplay between liquidity fluctuation (jump) and liquidity volatility (diffusion), and make appropriate decisions in crypto trading.

JEL Classification: C32, C53, C58, G11, G12, G17

Key words: liquidity; liquidity jump; liquidity diffusion; wash trading; crypto asset

Funding Source: The work was supported by Hubei University of Automotive Technology under Grant number BK202209]; Hubei Provincial Bureau of Science and Technology under Grant number 2023EHA018].

1. College of Artificial Intelligence, Hubei University of Automotive Technology, Shiyan, China
 2. Jack Welch College of Business & Technology, Sacred Heart University, Fairfield, CT, USA
 3. Cofintelligence Financial Technology Ltd., Hong Kong and Shanghai, China
 4. Department of Finance, Financial Planning, and Insurance, Nazarian College of Business and Economics, California State University Northridge, CA, USA
- *. Corresponding author: dq@huat.edu.cn; dengq@sacredheart.edu

Liquidity Jump, Liquidity Diffusion, and Crypto Wash Trading

1. Introduction

The trading of crypto assets is largely unregulated and therefore subject to a manipulative trading practice known as “wash trading.” Le Pennec, Fiedler and Ante (2021) analyze wash trading based on web traffic and wallet data, and propose that wash trading counts for more than 90% volume-wise of the investigated crypto exchanges. Aloosh and Li (2024) provide evidence in wash trading of Bitcoin across crypto exchanges. Sifat, Tariq and van Donselaar (2024) examine wash trading in nonfungible token (NFT) transactions. The most comprehensive study on crypto wash trading is by Cong et al. (2023), which categorizes crypto exchanges into two exclusive groups/tiers: regulated and unregulated, and finds that wash trading is prevalent on unregulated exchanges but absent on regulated exchanges. While most of the above studies deploy sophisticated methodologies in documenting and estimating the severity of wash trading among crypto assets on an aggregated level, two questions remain to be answered: 1) how to adequately measure the size and probability of crypto wash trading on daily basis, and 2) what specific information market participants should analyze to make informed decisions in crypto trading.

Cong et al. (2023) find that the wash trading of a crypto asset is proportional to its price over the immediate horizon (during the same week), which is consistent with the intention of manipulative traders to induce “short-term price jumps” and profit from them. We thus hypothesize that at least a portion of the short-term price jumps are manifestations of liquidity fluctuation caused by manipulated trades. In order to identify and then quantify the wash trading-induced liquidity fluctuation, in this paper, we propose a model that decompose asset liquidity into two distinctive yet complementary components: a “liquidity jump” that represents the magnitude of the liquidity fluctuation, and a “liquidity diffusion” that reflects the probability of the liquidity

fluctuation. The liquidity jump is defined as the ratio of regular return and liquidity-adjusted return that measures the magnitude of liquidity fluctuation, while the liquidity diffusion is defined as the ratio of regular volatility and liquidity-adjusted volatility that gauges the intraday liquidity volatility. In essence, we propose liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion proxy the size and probability of wash trading, respectively. Using the trading data from US stock markets (which are highly regulated and therefore virtually wash trading free) as a benchmark, we find that manipulative traders of crypto assets create high liquidity diffusion in order to induce high liquidity jump, from which they profit. Therefore, the combination of high liquidity diffusion and high liquidity jump indicates wash trading. On the other hand, large-volume trades with high liquidity jump but low liquidity diffusion are actually legitimate high-liquidity trades.

From the perspective of investors, both liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion provide specific information to help them make informed investments in crypto assets (perceivably) infested with wash trading. By analyzing the distributions of liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion of the top market-cap crypto assets, we find that, while wash trading is frequent for small market-cap crypto assets, it is relatively uncommon among high market-cap crypto assets (specifically BTC) that trade in established though unregulated exchanges (e.g., Binance). Therefore, investors may consider investing in these assets to diversify their portfolios. From the perspective of regulators, liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion provide a tool to identify wash trading-induced liquidity fluctuation, and further enable them to take actions to combat wash trading. Although we use crypto assets to exemplify the usefulness and utilities of our model, it should be effective for other assets with extreme liquidity fluctuation.

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 reviews literature on liquidity modeling. Section 3 introduces the asset-level liquidity-adjusted return and volatility model that produces

liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion. Section 4 provides descriptive statistics and visualizations of the datasets (with the US stocks, crypto assets without and with treatments on wash trading), discusses the distributions of liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion, and interprets relevancy of liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion to wash trading. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Literature Review

We propose that wash trading initiators try to conduct manipulative trades to stimulate short-term price jumps in order to profit, and that these wash trading-induced short-term price jumps are manifestations of liquidity fluctuation caused by these manipulative trades. In this section, we review the related literature on liquidity proxies, liquidity fluctuation, liquidity volatility, and models of assets with extreme liquidity fluctuation to identify gaps in the context of revealing the connections between liquidity fluctuation (both size and probability) and crypto wash trading.

2.1 Liquidity Proxies

Fong, Holden and Trzcinka (2017) identify a multitude of high-quality liquidity proxies and find that the daily version of Closing Percent Quoted Spread (Chung and Zhang, 2014) is the best daily percent-cost proxy, and that the daily version of Amihud (2002) is the best daily cost-per-dollar-volume proxy. Amihud and Mendelson (1986) define an asset's illiquidity as the cost of immediate execution (trading friction) and use bid-ask spread as a general measure of illiquidity even though some traders may trade large blocks of shares outside the bid-ask spread (Chan and Lakonishok, 1995; Keim and Madhavan, 1996). While the bid-ask spread explains the returns of NASDAQ, it does not explain that of NYSE and AMEX (Eleswarapu, 1997), thus some literature suggests using price impact (return) as a liquidity measure (Brennan and Subrahmanyam, 1996; Amihud, 2002; Pástor and Stambaugh, 2003; and Acharya and Pedersen, 2005). In this paper we

use minute-interval trading data of selected assets with no orderbook (bid-ask) information, thus the daily version of Amihud (2002) is a natural starting point for our own liquidity measures, which is essentially of a cost-per-dollar-volume variety. Specifically, we propose a model that derives liquidity measures (jump and diffusion) from asset returns (regular and liquidity-adjusted), which are derived from a minute-level liquidity ratio structured similarly to that of Amihud (2002).

2.2 Liquidity Fluctuation

The liquidity jump (proxy of liquidity fluctuation magnitude) that gauges the gain of manipulative traders is based on the economic theories of in market microstructure, behavioral finance, and liquidity premium, and specifically built upon the well-established notion that low-liquidity assets have high liquidity fluctuation, and vice versa. The interplay of market microstructure and behavioral finance theories examine how the design of financial markets influence price formation, trading behavior, and liquidity. Kyle (1985) shows how informed traders exploit uninformed liquidity traders, leading to wider bid-ask spreads and higher liquidity fluctuation. For low-liquidity assets, the risk of adverse selection is higher as market makers cannot easily distinguish between informed and uninformed traders, as a result they widen spreads to protect themselves, causing high liquidity fluctuation. Glosten and Milgrom (1985) demonstrate how market makers adjust spreads in response to the probability of trading with informed traders. In illiquid markets, higher uncertainty about asset values leads to greater spread. Ho and Stoll (1981) examines how market makers manage inventory risk. When market makers hold too much or too little inventory, they adjust their quotes, leading to fluctuations in liquidity. In low-liquidity markets, inventory imbalances are more pronounced, causing greater liquidity fluctuation. Easley and O'Hara (1987) introduce the concept of trade size and its impact on liquidity. Large trades in illiquid markets can cause significant price movements and liquidity fluctuations.

The liquidity premium theory explains how assets are priced in relate to liquidity risk. Amihud and Mendelson (1986) propose that most direct and fundamental sources of illiquidity are exogenous transaction costs and the exogenous trading horizons, and propose that the additional return of a stock required to compensate spread increase is higher for lower-spread stocks than for higher-spread ones. Amihud, Mendelson and Pedersen (2005) point out that the costs of illiquidity affect stock price and that illiquidity is time-varying prompt investors to require compensation. They present and fine-tune a number of pricing models to reflect such liquidity premium, which is typically modeled as an additional term in the expected return equation. In this paper, we improve their models by incorporating liquidity premium into liquidity-adjusted return, and the ratio of the regular return to the liquidity-adjusted return is the liquidity jump.

2.3 Liquidity Volatility

Time-varying liquidity affects volatility as it affects price (Amihud, Mendelson and Pedersen, 2005). Petkova, Akbas and Armstrong (2011) find that stocks with higher liquidity variability command higher expected returns, suggesting that investors dislike volatility of liquidity due to possible liquidity downturns. On the other hand, Chordia, Subrahmanyam and Anshuman (2001) show that there is a strong and negative relation between the volatility of liquidity and expected returns; Pereira and Zhang (2010) find that stocks with higher volatility of liquidity tend to earn lower returns, revealing investors' preference due to possible liquidity upturns. Amiram et al. (2019) consolidate the abovementioned dispute by decomposing the total volatility into a jump component and a diffusion component, and observe a positive relation between the jump volatility and illiquidity and a negative relation between the diffusive volatility and illiquidity, suggesting different effects on liquidity risk premium for the two volatility components. Their findings inspire us to decompose liquidity fluctuation into two components: a jump component and a diffusion

component, which in turn help identify wash trades and to distinguish wash trades from legitimate high-liquidity trades at the same time.

Andersen, Bollerslev, and Meddahie (2011) extend the diffusive volatility model of Amiram et al. (2019) to the market microstructure noise (transient distortions in observed prices caused by bid-ask bouncing, order imbalances, and latency), in which liquidity is factored in implicitly. Bollerslev and Todorov (2023) argue that the risk associated with market price jumps is priced differently from continuous price moves, and develop a series of model-free, short-time and risk-neutral variance expansions to delineate jumps in generating both price and variance risks. They find that simultaneous jumps in the price and the stochastic volatility command a sizeable risk premium. Therefore their approach also promotes the idea of decomposing the liquidity into a jump component (price) and a diffusion component (volatility), and suggests that manipulative traders generate profits from the increase of both liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion.

The liquidity diffusion (proxy of liquidity volatility) that helps reveal the behavior patterns of manipulative traders is inherently grounded on the economic theory of market microstructure, specifically microstructure noise. Aït-Sahalia, Mykland and Zhang (2005) demonstrate that high-frequency volatility estimators must disentangle true price movements from microstructure noise to avoid biased measurements (e.g., legitimate high liquidity trades vs. manipulative trades). For example, intraday liquidity crunches (caused by irregularities such as manipulative trades) often reflect transient noise rather than fundamental value shift, complicating volatility forecast. These findings underscore the importance of microstructure noise models in capturing liquidity-induced volatility (e.g., Menkveld, 2013; Tripathi and Dixit, 2020), and particularly call for modeling noise with integrated liquidity information that the liquidity diffusion provides.

2.4 Models of Assets with Extreme Liquidity Variability

Most of the existing volatility of liquidity models are not fully tested empirically on assets with extreme liquidity variability, primarily due to the fact that the trading of a vast majority of liquid assets is regulated, and as such does not exhibit statistically meaningful pattern of extreme liquidity variability. The rapid proliferation of crypto assets over the past ten years has created one of the largest unregulated alternative asset classes with excessive trading activities, and offers us an excellent empirical proving ground to examine and model assets with extreme liquidity variability.

Cong et al. (2023) categorize 29 centralized crypto exchanges into a regulated group that resembles the transaction patterns of regular financial markets, and an unregulated group that displays abnormal trading characteristics. They quantify that wash trades average more than 70% of the reported volumes for the unregulated exchanges, suggesting that wash trading-infested crypto assets must be modeled with purposely designed models. Using millisecond-level data for five major crypto assets and two crypto indices, Manahov (2021) shows that the traders facilitate extreme price movements and demand liquidity premium and that there is presence of herding behavior during up markets. Shen, Urquhart, and Wang (2022) look into intraday time series momentum for Bitcoin and find that the return of the first half-hour trading positively predicts that of the second half-hour, suggesting the existence of an intraday trading momentum, and that the momentum is driven by liquidity provision. These studies suggest that manipulative traders may first create high liquidity volatility (liquidity diffusion) by conducting manipulative trades on both sides (bid and ask) to control the trend of price moves, then take advantage of herding behavior and momentum (liquidity jump) to profit from unsuspected investors. As such, the proposed liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion are particularly useful in modeling the liquidity risk of crypto assets infested with wash trades.

2.5 Liquidity Decomposition and Research Gaps

In addition to some research mentioned above (e.g., Amiram et al., 2019; Bollerslev and Todorov, 2023), certain earlier works, such as those by Amihud (2002) and Hou and Moskowitz (2005) show that liquidity can vary across different market conditions and asset classes, which, in essence, discuss the cross-sectional liquidity variability (jump). Gabaix et al. (2006) find the evidence of clustering in jumps and that extreme liquidity is not purely random but is driven by common factors or dynamics in the market, which contemplates the temporal liquidity variability (diffusion). Another stream of research, such as by Datar, Naik, and Radcliffe (1998), Chordia and Subrahmanyam (2004), and Bekaert, Harvey and Lundblad (2007), shows that the level of liquidity variability is generally associated with transaction costs, bid-ask spreads, and market depth, touching upon liquidity diffusion in the context of market microstructure. Roll (1984), Huberman and Halka (2001), and Aït-Sahalia, Mykland and Zhang (2005) share a broader view on a crucial role that liquidity plays towards market efficiency, pricing dynamics, and risk management in continuous-time processes, revealing both cross-sectional and temporal nature of liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion, respectively.

However, there are still two major gaps in the abovementioned literature: 1) there is no explicit attempt to actually divide liquidity into a jump component and a diffusion component, and therefore the two-way microstructure-level interaction between liquidity and trading cannot be fine-tuned; and 2) all studies have an implicit assumption that the assets under investigation are strictly-regulated and therefore do not exhibit extreme liquidity variability and are not subject to wash trading. Both gaps render their models inadequate in dealing with crypto wash trading. To our best knowledge, this paper is the first attempt to explicitly decompose asset liquidity into

liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion, and to connect these liquidity measures to the size and probability of wash trading.

3. Liquidity Jump and Liquidity Diffusion

3.1 Liquidity Jump and Liquidity Diffusion – minute-level

Imagine that a risk-averse investor had a choice between two assets, A and B, with identical expected return and volatility, yet A had a much higher trading volume/amount than B, the investor most likely would choose A, particularly if the investor's horizon were not indefinite. The intuitive reason for this choice is that the perceived volatility of A is lower than that of B. This choice is consistent with Amihud, Mendelson and Pedersen (2005). Using the minute-level trading data (crypto trading data from the largest crypto asset exchange Binance API, and stock trading data from the Polygon.io API), we model this perceived and unobservable volatility as a minute-level liquidity-adjusted variance $\sigma_T^{2\ell}$ at equilibrium for time-period T (a 24-hour/1440-minute trading day for crypto assets and a 6.5-hour/390-minute trading day for the US stocks), with the variance of each minute being adjusted by an illiquidity factor similar to that of Amihud (2002). The expression of $\sigma_T^{2\ell}$ is given as follows (using τ as minute-level time index for minute τ):

$$\sigma_T^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau} (r_\tau - \bar{r}_\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \eta_T \ell_\tau (r_\tau - \bar{r}_\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \ell_T (r_\tau - \bar{r}_\tau)^2 \quad (1)$$

$$\Rightarrow \sigma_T^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T \left(\sqrt{\eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau}} r_\tau - \sqrt{\eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau}} \bar{r}_\tau \right)^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T (\sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau} r_\tau - \sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau} \bar{r}_\tau)^2 = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T (\sqrt{\ell_T} r_\tau - \sqrt{\ell_T} \bar{r}_\tau)^2$$

where:

$$\ell_\tau = \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau}$$

$$\ell_T = \eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau} = \eta_T \ell_\tau$$

subject to:

$$\sum_{\tau=1}^T \eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau} = \sum_{\tau=1}^T \eta_T \ell_\tau = \sum_{\tau=1}^T \ell_T = T$$

$$\Rightarrow \eta_T = \frac{T}{\sum_{\tau=1}^T \frac{|r_\tau|/|\bar{r}_\tau|}{A_\tau/\bar{A}_\tau}} = \frac{T}{\sum_{\tau=1}^T \ell_\tau}$$

where r_τ is the observed return at minute τ , $|r_\tau|$ is its absolute value, $\overline{|r_\tau|}$ is its arithmetic average in that day, A_τ is the dollar amount traded at minute τ , $\overline{A_\tau}$ is its arithmetic average in day T , η_T is the daily normalization factor on day T and is a constant for day T , $T=1440$ or 390 as there are 1440 minutes (24 hours) or 390 minutes (6.5 hours) in a crypto or US stock trading day, respectively

The term ℓ_τ is essentially a normalized (~ 1) minute-level version of Amihud (2002), with both numerator and denominator of ℓ_τ being normalized with regard to its respective parameters, the absolute return and trading amount ($|r_\tau|$ and A_τ), and ℓ_T is a further normalized ℓ_τ with a daily normalization factor η_T . The term ℓ_τ reflects the variability of a particular asset's intraday illiquidity, which is useful for intraday trading; the term ℓ_T provides direct daily liquidity comparison between assets, which is useful for portfolio optimization.

Furthermore, in Equation 1, $\sigma^{2\ell}$ is the variance of an unobservable minute-level liquidity-adjusted return at equilibrium, r_τ^ℓ :

$$\sigma^{2\ell} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{\tau=1}^T (r_\tau^\ell - \overline{r_\tau^\ell})^2 \quad (2)$$

where r_τ^ℓ is the liquidity-adjusted return at minute τ , $\overline{r_\tau^\ell}$ is its arithmetic average in day T .

By equating the right-hand side of Equations 1 and 2, we connect an asset's observed return r_τ and its unobservable liquidity-adjusted counterpart r_τ^ℓ (1st order approximation) as follows¹:

$$\begin{aligned} r_\tau^\ell &= \sqrt{\eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|r_\tau|}{A_\tau/\overline{A_\tau}}} r_\tau = \sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau} r_\tau = \sqrt{\ell_T} r_\tau = \frac{1}{\beta_\tau^\ell} r_\tau \\ \Rightarrow r_\tau &= \beta_\tau^\ell r_\tau^\ell \\ \Rightarrow \beta_{r_\tau}^\ell &= \frac{r_\tau}{r_\tau^\ell} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_T \frac{|r_\tau|/|r_\tau|}{A_\tau/\overline{A_\tau}}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_T}} \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where r_τ is observed return at minute τ , r_τ^ℓ is the liquidity-adjusted return at minute τ , β_τ^ℓ is the liquidity factor at minute τ .

We structure $\beta_{r_\tau}^\ell$ in such a way that it is a unitless liquidity measure and normalized (~ 1), and that when liquidity is high (amount is high), r_τ is greater than r_τ^ℓ , while liquidity is low (amount is low), r_τ is smaller than r_τ^ℓ . This reflects the intuition of a liquidity premium, that a perfectly liquid

¹ Note that although we define $r_\tau^\ell = \sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau} r_\tau$, in general $\overline{r_\tau^\ell} = \sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau} \overline{r_\tau}$ does not hold. However, its 1st order approximation is acceptable.

(frictionless, $A_\tau \rightarrow \infty$) stock generates no liquidity-adjusted return ($r_\tau^\ell \rightarrow 0$), and that a perfectly illiquid (infinite friction, $A_\tau \rightarrow 0$) stock earns an infinite liquidity-adjusted return ($r_\tau^\ell \rightarrow \infty$).² We thus refer β_τ^ℓ as the minute-level “liquidity fluctuation Beta” given as:

$$\beta_{r_\tau}^\ell = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta_T \ell_\tau}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\ell_T}} \subset \begin{cases} > 1; \text{high minute liquidity fluctuation} \\ = 1; \text{equilibrium minute liquidity fluctuation} \\ < 1; \text{low minute liquidity fluctuation} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Furthermore, σ^2_T is the variance of the observed regular minute-level return r_τ , thus we also introduce a minute-level “liquidity volatility Beta,” $\beta_{\sigma_\tau}^\ell$, which reflects the volatility of liquidity for time-period T, defined as follows:

$$\beta_{\sigma_\tau}^\ell = \sigma_T / \sigma_T^\ell \subset \begin{cases} > 1; \text{high minute liquidity volatility} \\ = 1; \text{equilibrium minute liquidity volatility} \\ < 1; \text{low minute liquidity volatility} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Together, $\beta_{r_\tau}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_\tau}^\ell$ form the “minute-level liquidity Beta” pair, which enables us to further derive the daily-level liquidity fluctuation and liquidity volatility measures.

3.2 Liquidity Jump and Liquidity Diffusion – daily-level

We then construct the unobservable daily-level liquidity-adjusted return by aggregating the intraday (minute-level) liquidity-adjusted returns. The realized and unobservable daily liquidity-adjusted returns on day t are given as (using t as day-level time index for day t):

$$r_t = (1 + r_\tau)^T - 1$$

$$r_t^\ell = (1 + r_\tau^\ell)^T - 1$$

The “daily liquidity fluctuation Beta,” $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$, for day t is thus defined as follow³:

$$\beta_{r_t}^\ell = |r_t / r_t^\ell| \subset \begin{cases} > 1; \text{high daily liquidity fluctuation} \\ = 1; \text{equilibrium daily liquidity fluctuation} \\ < 1; \text{low daily liquidity fluctuation} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

² Note that ℓ_τ is zero if r_τ is zero in that minute, which makes $\beta_{r_\tau}^\ell$ infinite. To correct this singularity, we assign a random number two magnitudes (10^{-2}) smaller than $\bar{r}_{\sqrt{\tau}}$ to each r_τ with a zero value.

³ Unlike $\beta_{r_\tau}^\ell$, it is possible that r_t / r_t^ℓ is negative, therefore $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$, a positive value, is defined as $|r_t / r_t^\ell|$.

The realized and unobservable daily intraday (minute-level) variance for time-period T is:

$$\sigma_t^{\ell} = T\sigma_T^{\ell}$$

In addition to $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$, we also introduce a ‘‘intraday liquidity volatility Beta,’’ $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$, which reflects the volatility of liquidity on day t , defined as follows:

$$\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} = \sigma_t / \sigma_t^{\ell} \subset \begin{cases} > 1; \text{high daily liquidity volatility} \\ = 1; \text{equilibrium daily liquidity volatility} \\ < 1; \text{low daily liquidity volatility} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The proposed liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ are mainly grounded in the economic theories of market microstructure, behavioral finance, and liquidity risk and premium, in conjunction to the characteristics of assets with different liquidity levels. The liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ captures the sudden and discontinuous change of daily liquidity level of an asset. A low-liquidity asset (e.g., crypto assets) would have a greater number of days with a higher value ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} > 1$), indicating their high liquidity fluctuation, while a high-liquidity asset (e.g., US stocks) would have a greater number of days with a lower value ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} < 1$), which is consistent with the market microstructure and behavioral theories that connect liquidity fluctuation to asset liquidity.

The liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ reflects the intraday volatility of liquidity conditions, that an asset with stable trading volume (e.g., US stocks) would have a lower value ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} < 1$), while an asset with erratic trading volume (e.g., crypto assets) induced by manipulative trades would have a higher value ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} > 1$), which aligns with liquidity risk premium theory that emphasizes the role of liquidity variability in asset pricing. In addition, $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ may reflect the volatility of liquidity shocks, which is a key concept in market microstructure. A higher value ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} > 1$) indicates frequent and severe liquidity shocks that may lead to large price movements, while low values ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} < 1$) suggests infrequent and mild liquidity shocks. This is consistent with the market

microstructure theory in that liquidity shocks increase price volatility and require a higher return, and is particularly relevant in the context of crypto wash trading.

Together, $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ form a “liquidity Beta” pair that provides a more comprehensive view of liquidity risk on daily basis. In particular, the combination of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ provides a useful tool to researchers to study the interplay between sudden liquidity change (jump) and gradual changes in liquidity (diffusion), helping them understand the behavioral patterns of manipulative traders. From the perspective of regulators, the interaction between $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ can be monitored to track liquidity dynamics and detect manipulative trading practices in real time. From a liquidity provision standpoint, market makers can examine the prevailing liquidity conditions inferred from the liquidity Beta pair to adjust their quotes to improve market efficiency. For the benefit of investors, $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ can be incorporated into their investment strategies to minimize transaction costs and optimize execution timing. Also, these proposed liquidity measures incorporate high-frequency data, allowing investors to capture intraday liquidity dynamics.

4. Dataset, Descriptive Statistics, and Discussions

4.1 Dataset

We use the US stock trading data as benchmark to establish and assess the utilities of liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion as tools to identify wash trades. We collect minute-level trading data of all 1,503 constituent stocks of the SP500 (large cap), SP400 (mid cap) and SP600 (small cap) indices from the Polygon.io API. For each index, we pick five largest stocks in terms of market cap, thus we select 15 stocks from the three indices.⁴ All 15 stocks have at least ten years of

⁴ We obtain the market caps of all 1,503 stocks from the Yahoo Finance API on October 12, 2024 at the market close.

complete historical data (July 28, 2014 to February 10, 2025 with 2,652 trading days). The selected stocks, in alphabetical order, are AAPL, AMZN, ATI, CMA, CRS, EME, GOOG, IBKR, LII, MLI, MSFT, NVDA, TPL, VFC and WSO. We construct and calculate minute-level return and variance, both regular and liquidity-adjusted. From the minute-level data we calculate the daily return and (intraday) volatility, both regular (r_t and σ_t) and liquidity-adjusted (r_t^ℓ and σ_t^ℓ), as well as the daily liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and daily liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$.⁵ We report the descriptive statistics of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ for all 15 US stocks in Table 1.

We then collect tick-level trading data of the top 15 non-stable-coin crypto assets (prices measured with their trading pairs with Tether or USDT⁶) in market cap from the Binance API⁷ with at least four years of complete historical data (October 15, 2020 to February 7, 2025 with 1,577 trading days). We then discard crypto assets that are either platform gas/incentive tokens (e.g., BNB) or task facility/incentive tokens (e.g., LINK), of which liquidity provision is affected by non-trading activities and therefore distorted, and end up with 10 crypto assets. The selected crypto assets, in alphabetical order, are ADA, AVAX, BCH, BTC, ETC, ETH, LTC, SOL, UNI and XRP. We calculate the daily $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ following the same steps as that for the US stocks. We report the descriptive statistics of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ for all 10 crypto assets in Table 2.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics and Distribution of Stock $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$

Panel A of Table 1 summarizes the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ for all stocks. For $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$, the mean is between 0.44 (TPL) and 1.39 (GOOG) and the median ranges from 0.20 (TPL)

⁵ We cap the value of both $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ to 10 in order to avoid any outliers to bias our analysis.

⁶ USDT is a “stable coin” pegged to the US Dollar, and for our purpose of portfolio construction it is regarded as a “risk-free” asset with a 0% interest rate.

⁷ <https://coinmarketcap.com>, accessed on October 12, 2024.

to 0.87 (AMZN). The number of days with the maximum value of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ (=10) is in the range of 20 or 0.75% (TPL) to 65 or 2.45% (GOOG) of the total number of 2,652 trading days, which suggests that the trades with extreme liquidity are scarce among stocks.⁸ The number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ spans from 187 or 7.05% (TPL) to 1,015 or 38.27% (AMZN). We observe that, the five largest market-cap stocks, AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT and NVDA, also have the highest $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ in both mean and median (mean: 1.20-1.39, median: 0.82-0.87), and the highest number of days with high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ (804 or 30.32% to 1,015 or 38.27%). Panel B of Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ for all stocks. For $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$, the mean is between 0.22 (TPL) and 0.79 (AMZN) and the median ranges from 0.21 (TPL) to 0.80 (AMZN). The number of days with $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$ is between 0 (CRS, EME, MLI, TPL and WSO) and 29 or 1.09% (NVDA), suggesting that liquidity volatility is very low for stocks. Again, the largest market-cap stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT and NVDA) also have the highest $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ in both mean and median (mean: 0.76-0.79, median: 0.76-0.80), and the highest number of days with $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$ (6 or 0.23% to 29 or 1.09%).

Combining the descriptive statistics of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ (Panel A) and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ (Panel B), we establish that the US stocks display a pattern of very low level of liquidity diffusion (the maximum number of days with $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$ is 1.09% for NVDA) and reasonable low level of liquidity jump (the number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ between 7.05% and 38.27%) on daily level. As the US stocks are heavily regulated and therefore virtually immune to wash trading, with this rather strong and indicative empirical evidence, we conjure that wash trading can only occur on days when both liquidity measures are high ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$ and $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$).

⁸ For the purpose of being concise, from this point on we just use the percentage number (e.g., 20 or 0.75% days) to represent the longer phase (e.g., 20 days or 0.75% out of the total number of 2,652 trading days).

From Panel C of Table, we find that there are between 0 and 15 or 0.57% (NVDA) trading days with both high liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$) and high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$). It is worth mentioning that the top five stocks in number of trading days with high liquidity measures, AAPL (13 or 0.49%), AMZN (11 or 0.41%), GOOG (4 or 0.15%), MSFT (10 or 0.38%) and NVDA (15 or 0.57%), are also the top five stocks in market cap. This suggests that the demand for these stocks is high, and the pressure for legitimate high-volume trades creates both higher liquidity fluctuation and liquidity volatility compared to other stocks. In the next several subsections, we will use this knowledge to gauge the level of wash trading among crypto assets.

4.3 Descriptive Statistics and Distribution of Crypto $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$

Panel A of Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ for all the selected crypto assets without treatment on wash trading. The mean is between 1.54 (BTC) and 1.99 (BCH, UNI) and the median is between 0.85 (XRP) and 1.09 (SOL). The number of days with high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$) ranges from 652 or 41.34% (XRP) to 868 or 55.04% (SOL). It is worth mentioning that the three largest crypto assets in both market cap and liquidity, BTC, ETH and XRP, have the lowest $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ in both mean and median (mean: 1.54, 1.63, 1.57, median: 0.92, 1.01, 0.85, respectively), and the lowest number of days with high $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ (708 or 44.90%, 800 or 50.73%, 652 or 41.34%, respectively).⁹ Panels B of Table 2 summarize the descriptive statistics of liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$. The mean is between 0.82 (BTC) and 1.15 (BCH, UNI) and the median between 0.82 (BTC) and 1.06 (BCH). The number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ (≥ 1) ranges from a low of 15 or 0.95% (BTC) to a high of 968 or 61.38% (BCH). Again, the three largest crypto assets

⁹ For the median of $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and the number of days with high $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$, both ETC and LTC have lower values than ETH does. However, this does not affect our subsequent discussions and results.

(BTC, ETH and XRP) have the lowest number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$ (15 or 0.95%, 77 or 4.88%, 124 or 7.86%, respectively).

Panel C of Table 2 captures the number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$ and high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$, with a rather wide span of 8 or 0.51% (BTC) to 545 or 34.56% (BCH). Based upon our conjuncture (Subsection 4.2) that wash trading exhibits both high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$, we observe that the selected crypto assets demonstrate rather different level of wash trading. The largest crypto asset, BTC, has a rather small number of days potentially affected by wash trading (8 or 0.51%). On the other hand, crypto assets with lower market cap and liquidity have a high number of days potentially infested with wash trading. This is consistent with the market microstructure theory, as the lower the market cap of a crypto asset, the easier its trading gets manipulated.

4.4 Comparisons of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ between Stocks and Cryptos

Comparing the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ for stocks (Panel A of Table 1) and cryptos (Panel A of Table 2), we observe that for mean and median, as well as the number of days with high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$), the values are numerically higher for crypto assets than for stocks by a wide margin (highest for stock: 38.27% for AMZN, lowest for crypto: 41.34% for XRP). This observation indicates that in general, crypto assets have higher liquidity fluctuation than stocks, which is consistent with the market microstructure theory that low-liquidity assets (e.g., crypto assets) have higher liquidity fluctuation than high-liquidity assets (e.g., US stocks). A closer look shows that the five largest market-cap stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT and NVDA) also have the highest $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ in both mean and median (mean: 1.20-1.39, median: 0.82-0.87), and the highest number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ (30.32% to 38.27%). On the other hand, the three largest crypto assets in both market cap and liquidity (BTC, ETH and XRP) have the lowest $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ in both

mean and median (mean: 1.54, 1.63, 1.57, median: 0.92, 1.01, 0.85, respectively), and the lowest number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ (44.90%, 50.73%, 41.34%,).

From comparisons between the descriptive statistics of liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ for stocks (Panel B of Table 1) and that for cryptos (Panel B of Table 2), we observe that for mean and median, the values are numerically higher for crypto assets than for stocks, indicating that crypto assets have higher liquidity volatility than stocks, which is consistent with the market microstructure noise theory. For the number of days with high liquidity jump ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$), the values are numerically higher for crypto assets than for stocks by a large margin, with a very noticeable exception of BTC, of which the value is 0.95% and is actually lower than that of NVDA at 1.09%. Again, the largest market-cap stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT and NVDA) have the highest $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ in both mean and median (mean: 0.76-0.79, median: 0.76-0.80) and the highest number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ (0.23% to 1.09%) among stocks, and the three largest crypto assets (BTC, ETH and XRP) have the lowest number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ (0.95%, 4.88%, 7.86%, respectively) among crypto assets.

In Subsection 4.2 we conjecture that wash trading occurs when both liquidity measures are high ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$). For the stocks, there are between 0 and 15 or 0.57% days that exhibit both high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$, and its value is highest for the top five stocks (AAPL: 0.49%, AMZN: 0.41%, GOOG: 0.15%, MSFT: 0.38%, and NVDA: 0.57%). As the US stock market is heavily regulated and trading rules are rigorously monitored and enforced, it is essentially free of wash trading. As such, these top market-cap stocks establish the “top line” of stocks: those stocks with similar or lower number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$ are not affected by wash trading. For the crypto assets, the number of days with both high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ has a rather wide span of 8 or 0.51% (BTC) to 545 or 34.56% (BCH). The largest crypto asset, BTC, has a rather small

number of days affected by wash trading (0.51%), thus its exposure to wash trading is not more severe than that for large market-cap stocks, such as AAPL, AMZN and NVDA (0.53%, 0.57% and 1.09%, respectively). As such, BTC establishes the “bottom line” for crypto assets: those crypto assets with similar or higher number of days with $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$ are infected by wash trading. By this criterion, the second and third largest crypto assets, ETH and XRP, have a relatively small number of days affected by wash trading (53 or 3.36%, 66 or 4.19%, respectively), while other crypto assets are much more severely infected.

That there is a very thin yet clear overlap of “top line” stocks and “bottom line” cryptos (i.e., BTC vs. AAPL, AMZN and NVDA) reveals that, although the overall crypto market is fragmented, unregulated and with shallow depth, the largest crypto assets (particularly BTC) traded in established (though still unregulated) exchanges such as Binance exhibit liquidity provision similar to that of the largest stocks, and therefore only moderately affected by wash trading. Comparing the visualizations in Figure 1 and Figure 2, we observe that the distribution of $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} - \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ of crypto assets is, in general, quite different from that of stocks. With the exceptions of BTC and to a less degree ETH, all the other selected crypto assets exhibit extreme liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} > 3$), which indicates that crypto assets have higher liquidity volatility than stocks, suggesting that the former are prompt to wash trading. We employ an ANOVA procedure to test the statistical significance of the estimates in Section 5.

4.5 Sensitivity Test with Cryptos $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ with Treatment

To test the robustness of the conjuncture that wash trading only occurs when both liquidity measures are high ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$), we need to test the sensitivity of these liquidity measures to liquidity change, that if we intentionally remove a certain number of minute-level trades that

are likely wash trades (essentially very high-volume trades in crypto market), whether the values of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ decrease with statistical significance and by how much. In particular, different responses between $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ to the removal of likely wash trades would help disclose the behavioral patterns of manipulative traders.

We repeat the procedure of deriving the daily $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ for crypto assets, only this time with a “treatment” on wash trading, which is essentially a simulated “regulative measure” designed to remove extreme liquidity variability. Specifically, when we aggregate the tick-level data to construct minute-level (intraday) amount (A_t), we divide A_t into four quartiles (Q1-Q4) of equal quantity and reduce the quantity of Q3 (50 percentile) by a factor of 50%, and the quantity of Q4 (75 percentile) by a factor of 75%. From the minute-level data we further calculate daily amount A_t , which is on average about 40% of the untreated “raw” daily amount across the selected crypto assets (or about 60% of the raw daily amount is regarded as being from wash trades). Since Cong et al. (2023) estimate that wash trades count for 46.47% of the total amount in Binance, our treatment is more stringent, making our results robust. We then calculate $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ and report the descriptive statistics for all 10 crypto assets in Table 3.

Panels A and B of Table 3 summarize the descriptive statistics of the $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ with treatment on wash trading, respectively. All the main measures are lower than their corresponding values for the same crypto assets without the treatment (Panels A and B of Table 2), indicating that treatment on wash trading indeed reduces liquidity fluctuation and liquidity volatility. However, the levels of reduction are quite different between $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$. Specifically, the number of days with high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ (≥ 1) is between 502 or 31.83% (BTC) to 751 or 47.62% (UNI) with the treatment, while without the treatment, the number is between 652 or 41.34% (XRP) and 868 or 55.04%

(SOL). The number of days with high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$ is between 0 (BTC and ETH) to 154 or 9.77% (BCH) with the treatment, and the same measure is between 15 or 0.95% (BTC) and 968 or 61.38% (BCH) without the treatment. These results clearly point to that $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ is much more sensitive to the removal of likely wash trades than $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$. Furthermore, Panel C of Table 3 shows that the number of days with both high $\beta_{r_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$ and high $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell (\geq 1)$ with the treatment ranges from 0 (BTC, ETH and XRP) to 95 or 6.02% (BCH), which is significantly reduced from the same measure without the treatment at 8 or 0.51% (BTC) to 545 or 34.56% (BCH). Based on our conjuncture, with treatment, the potential exposure to wash trading for the top three crypto assets (BTC, ETH and XRP) is no more severe than that for the top stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT and NVDA).

Comparing the distribution of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell - \beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ in Figure 3 against that in Figures 1 and 2, we observe that the treatment essentially reduces the liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ of crypto assets to a level that is comparable to that of stocks. The most obvious observation is that a plot in Figure 3 (with the treatment) has a much narrower interval along the x-axis ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$) than its corresponding plot in Figure 2 (without the treatment) with the visible exceptions of BTC and ETH, while both plots have the same interval along the y-axis ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell$) with a maximum value of 10. These visualizations illustrate that treatment on wash trading results in a marginally lower number of days with high liquidity jump and a significantly lower number of days with high liquidity diffusion. We employ an ANOVA procedure to test the statistical significance of the estimates in Section 5.

In addition to testing the robustness of our conjuncture that that wash trading occurs when $\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$, the sensitivity test also helps reveal how manipulative traders conduct wash trading. That $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ is much more sensitive than $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ in responding to the treatment indicates that wash trading exhibits high liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$) that reflects the manipulative traders'

behavioral pattern of placing frequent and short-term momentum trades with drastically different price points on either bid or ask side, and wash trading also exhibits high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$) that signifies the manipulative traders’ timing preference to profit after having created high liquidity diffusion. Therefore, high liquidity diffusion “precedes” high liquidity jump, that manipulative traders “start” with stirring up high liquidity diffusion, and “end” at profiting from high liquidity jump. On the other hand, when liquidity diffusion is low ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell < 1$), high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$) actually indicates legitimate high-liquidity trades under either regulated (e.g., stocks) or unregulated (e.g., crypto assets) institutional settings.

5. ANOVA Tests and Results

5.1 ANOVA and Pairwise Tests

In the previous section and using the trading data of virtually wash trading-free US stocks as empirical evidence, we first establish that wash trading exhibits both high liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell \geq 1$) and high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell \geq 1$). We make three observations: 1) crypto assets without treatment on wash trading have higher liquidity jump and diffusion than stocks, and therefore the former are more likely exposed to wash trading, 2) a crypto asset with the treatment exhibits lower liquidity jump and diffusion than itself without the treatment, and therefore is exposed to lower level of wash trading, and 3) the largest market-cap crypto assets with the treatment exhibit much reduced levels of liquidity measures that are comparable to the largest market-cap stocks.

In order to examine the statistical significance of the above observations and validate our findings, we further conduct a series of ANOVA tests. First, we conduct a number of 2-asset/3-element 1-way ANOVA tests. Each ANOVA test is conducted on one liquidity measure ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ or $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$), using two assets with three elements: one stock, one crypto asset without the treatment, and

the same crypto asset with the treatment. For example, an ANOVA test of $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ on AAPL_BTC_wo_BTC_w produces the ANOVA properties of liquidity diffusion on stock AAPL and crypto asset BTC without and with the treatment, in which BTC_wo represents BTC without ('wo') the treatment, and BTC_w with ('w') the treatment. There are 15 stocks and 10 crypto pairs (each crypto asset can be without and with the treatment), which yields 150 ANOVA tests for either $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ or $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$, or a total of 300 ANOVA tests.

If the result of an ANOVA test is significant ($p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$), i.e., at least one of the three means of the stock and crypto pair (e.g., AAPL_BTC_wo_BTC_w) is not statistically equal, we further conduct a set of pairwise tests on the same assets (e.g., AAPL_BTC_wo, AAPL_BTC_w, and BTC_wo_BTC_w, thus each pairwise test consists of three 2-element "paired" tests). We repeat the same pairwise test three times, each with a different alternative ('two-sided', 'greater than' and 'less than') to capture all statistically significant non-equalities. Thus, there are up to 450 (150×3) pairwise tests for each liquidity measure, or a total of 900 possible pairwise tests.¹⁰

5.2 Results and Discussions

We find that all the 300 ANOVA tests produce significant results. As such, each 2-asset/3-element combination (again, a stock, a crypto without and with the treatment) yields three pairwise tests with different alternatives ('two-sided', 'greater than', 'less than'). Also, we find that each and every crypto asset without the treatment has significantly greater value than any stock for both liquidity measures, therefore we statistically validate our first observation that crypto assets

¹⁰ Note that for a pairwise test, 'greater than' is statistically equivalent to 'less than' if the result is significant (non-equality holds) for the paired assets. The reason we conduct pairwise tests with both 'greater than' and 'less than' alternatives is that Python actually compares the pairs in an alphabetical order, and therefore some pairs are only tested in 'greater than' alternative, while others only in 'less than' alternative. Therefore, 'greater than' and 'less than' tests are complementary and together they cover all possible pairs that are statistically unequal.

without the treatment have higher liquidity jump and diffusion than stocks. Combining this with the observations that crypto assets without the treatment have higher number of days with high values (≥ 1) for both liquidity measures than the corresponding stocks (Panel C of Table 1 vs. Panel C of Table 2), we conclude, with statistical confidence, that crypto assets (without the treatment) are exposed to wash trading.

Furthermore, we find that every crypto asset without the treatment has significantly greater values than itself with the treatment for both liquidity measures, which statistically validates our second observation. Combining this with that crypto assets without the treatment have higher number of days with wash trading than the same assets with the treatment (Panel C of Table 2 vs. Panel C of Table 3), we conclude, with statistical confidence, that the treatment is effective in removing wash trades, and therefore our conjuncture is robust.¹¹

In order to establish the statistical confidence for the third observation, in Table 4, we report the results of all pairwise tests on one liquidity measure (either $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ or $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$) that is statistically no less for the stock than for the crypto asset with the treatment.¹² For liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$, we find that the values of two market-cap stocks (AMZN, GOOG) are statistically greater than that of BTC with the treatment, and the value of GOOG is statistically greater than that of XRP with the treatment (Panel A of Table 4). For liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$, we find that the values of all top five market cap stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT, NVDA) are statistically greater than the top

¹¹ In this paper, we do not report the results of ANOVA tests as all they are all statistically significant. We do not report the results of the pairwise tests of a stock and a crypto without the treatment, or of a crypto without the treatment and the same asset with the treatment in the main manuscript to keep it concise. All these results are significant and are reported in supplement files and available if requested.

¹² In Table 4, we do not report the results of the pairwise tests of a stock and a crypto with treatment that are significant with the ‘two-sided’ alternative, nor do we report the results that are insignificant with the ‘greater’ or ‘less’ alternatives, for the reason of conciseness. These results are reported in supplement files and available upon request.

four market cap crypto assets (BTC, ETH, XRP), as well as SOL (except for AAPL) and LTC (Panel B of Table 4). These statistical results validate our early assertion that the treatment has a marginal effect in reducing the liquidity jump, but a major impact on reducing the liquidity diffusion. Also, we statistically validate our third observation that large-cap crypto assets with the treatment exhibit reduced levels of liquidity measures that are comparable to the large-cap stocks.

In Figure 4, we illustrate/visualize the liquidity measures of the top five stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT, NVDA) relative to the top three crypto assets (BTC, ETH, XRP) in a series of 2D point plots. These point plots clearly show that both liquidity measures of crypto assets without the treatment are higher than that of some large market-cap stocks, while the liquidity measures of crypto assets with the treatment are comparable to those of some large market-cap stocks.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we aim to measure the size and probability of crypto wash trading in order to help market participants make informed decisions in crypto trading. We hypothesize that manipulated trades induce liquidity fluctuation, which manifests as short-term price jumps, from which the manipulated traders profit. In order to measure liquidity fluctuation, we propose that asset liquidity can be divided into two distinctive yet complementary components: liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$). The liquidity jump is defined as the ratio of regular return and liquidity-adjusted return that measures the size of daily liquidity fluctuation, and the liquidity diffusion is the ratio between regular volatility and liquidity-adjusted volatility that reflects the intraday liquidity volatility.

Using the trading data in the US stock market, which is highly regulated and therefore virtually immune to wash trading, as the benchmark, we conjure that the combination of high liquidity

diffusion and high liquidity jump ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1, \beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$) is the most reliable indicator for wash trading. We then investigate wash trading among selected crypto assets. We find that, in general, liquidity diffusion and liquidity jump for crypto assets are much higher than that for stocks, indicating that crypto assets are exposed to wash trading, which is consistent with Cong et al. (2023). However, the distribution of these liquidity measures indicates that wash trading is relatively less common among high market-cap crypto assets that trade in established though unregulated exchanges. The largest market-cap crypto assets (particularly BTC) have relatively low level of wash trading. On the other hand, crypto assets with low market cap are more severely affected by wash trading, where are consistent with market microstructure and behavioral finance theories. From the perspective of investors, investments in high market-cap crypto assets, particularly in BTC and in an established exchange may help diversify their portfolios, even if the exchange is unregulated.

Furthermore, we test the robustness of the conjuncture by testing the sensitivity of these liquidity measures to liquidity change. We introduce a treatment on wash trading, which is essentially a simulated regulative measure designed to remove manipulative trades that induce high liquidity variability. We demonstrate that the treatment greatly reduces the level of liquidity diffusion of crypto assets, while at the same time only marginally decreases the level of liquidity jump. Particularly, with the treatment, the largest market-cap crypto assets (BTC, ETH, XRP) all have a level of liquidity diffusion comparable to that of the top market-cap stocks (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, GOOGL, MSFT, and NVDA). The sensitivity test results suggest that high liquidity diffusion precedes high liquidity jump, that wash trading creates high liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$) in order to induce high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$), from which the manipulative traders can take the

advantage of. On the other hand, large-volume trades with high liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$) but low liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} < 1$) may actually reflect legitimate high demand.

In summary, we provide the answers to the questions raised in Section 1: 1) how to adequately measure the size and probability of crypto wash trading on daily basis, and 2) what specific information market participants should analyze to make informed decisions in crypto trading. The liquidity jump and liquidity diffusion form a “liquidity Beta” pair that maps well with the size and probability of crypto wash trading and provides a more comprehensive view of liquidity risk on daily basis. The liquidity measures provide a useful tool to all market participants, including researchers, regulators, market makers and investors to understand the interplay between liquidity fluctuation (jump) and liquidity volatility (diffusion), and make appropriate decisions in crypto trading. While we use crypto assets to exemplify the utilities of our model, the model can be used to value other asset classes with extreme liquidity variability.

References

- Acharya, V.V. and Pedersen, L.H., 2005. Asset pricing with liquidity risk. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 77(2), pp.375-410.
- Aït-Sahalia, Y., Mykland, P.A. and Zhang, L., 2005. How often to sample a continuous-time process in the presence of market microstructure noise. *Review of Financial Studies*, 18(2), pp.351-416.
- Aloosh, A. and Li, J., 2024. Direct evidence of bitcoin wash trading. *Management Science*, published online: March 15, 2024, available at: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2021.01448>
- Amihud, Y., 2002. Illiquidity and stock returns: cross-section and time-series effects. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 5(1), pp.31-56.
- Amihud, Y. and Mendelson, H., 1986. Liquidity and stock returns. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 42(3), pp.43-48.
- Amihud, Y., Mendelson, H. and Pedersen, L.H., 2005. Liquidity and asset prices. *Foundations and Trends® in Finance*, 1(4), pp.269-364.
- Amiram, D., Cserna, B., Kalay, A. and Levy, A., 2019. The Information Environment, Volatility Structure, and Liquidity. *Columbia Business School Research Paper*, 15-62.
- Anderson, T. G., Bollerslev, T. and Meddahi, N., 2011. Realized volatility forecasting and market microstructure noise. *Journal of Econometrics* 160, 220-234.
- Bekaert, G., Harvey, C.R. and Lundblad, C., 2007. Liquidity and expected returns: Lessons from emerging markets. *Review of Financial Studies*, 20(6), pp.1783-1831.
- Bollerslev, T. and Todorov, V., 2023. The jump leverage risk premium. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 150, 103772.
- Brennan, M.J. and Subrahmanyam, A., 1996. Market microstructure and asset pricing: On the compensation for illiquidity in stock returns. *Journal of financial economics*, 41(3), pp.441-464.
- Chan, L.K. and Lakonishok, J., 1995. The behavior of stock prices around institutional trades. *The Journal of Finance*, 50(4), pp.1147-1174.
- Chordia, T. and Subrahmanyam, A., 2004. Order imbalance and individual stock returns: Theory and evidence. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 72(3), pp.485-518.
- Chordia, T., Subrahmanyam, A. and Anshuman, V.R., 2001. Trading activity and expected stock returns. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 59(1), pp.3-32.
- Chung, K.H. and Zhang, H., 2014. A simple approximation of intraday spreads using daily data. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 17, pp.94-120.
- Cong, L. W., Li, X., Tang, K. and Yang, Y., 2023. Crypto wash trading. *Management Science*, 69, 6427-6454.
- Datar, V.T., Naik, N.Y. and Radcliffe, R., 1998. Liquidity and stock returns: An alternative test. *Journal of Financial Markets*, 1(2), pp.203-219.

- Easley, D. and O'hara, M., 1987. Price, trade size, and information in securities markets. *Journal of Financial economics*, 19(1), pp.69-90.
- Eleswarapu, V.R., 1997. Cost of transacting and expected returns in the Nasdaq market. *Journal of Finance*, 52(5), pp.2113-2127.
- Fong, K.Y., Holden, C.W. and Trzcinka, C.A., 2017. What are the best liquidity proxies for global research? *Review of Finance*, 21(4), pp.1355-1401.
- Gabaix, X., Gopikrishnan, P., Plerou, V. and Stanley, H.E., 2006. Institutional investors and stock market volatility. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121(2), pp.461-504.
- Glosten, L.R. and Milgrom, P.R., 1985. Bid, ask and transaction prices in a specialist market with heterogeneously informed traders. *Journal of financial economics*, 14(1), pp.71-100.
- Hou, K. and Moskowitz, T.J., 2005. Market frictions, price delay, and the cross-section of expected returns. *Review of Financial Studies*, 18(3), pp.981-1020.
- Ho, T. and Stoll, H.R., 1981. Optimal dealer pricing under transactions and return uncertainty. *Journal of Financial economics*, 9(1), pp.47-73.
- Huberman, G. and Halka, D., 2001. Systematic liquidity. *Journal of Financial Research*, 24(2), pp.161-178.
- Kyle, A.S., 1985. Continuous auctions and insider trading. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pp.1315-1335.
- Le Penec, G., Fiedler, I. and Ante, L., 2021. Wash trading at cryptocurrency exchanges. *Finance Research Letters*, 43, p.101982.
- Manahov, V. 2021. Cryptocurrency liquidity during extreme price movements: is there a problem with virtual money? *Quantitative Finance*, 21, pp.341-360.
- Menkveld, A.J., 2013. High frequency trading and the new market makers. *Journal of financial Markets*, 16(4), pp.712-740.
- Pástor, L. and Stambaugh, R.F., 2003. Liquidity risk and expected stock returns. *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(3), pp.642-685.
- Pereira, J.P. and Zhang, H.H., 2010. Stock returns and the volatility of liquidity. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 45(4), pp.1077-1110.
- Petkova, R., Akbas, F. and Armstrong, W.J., 2011. The volatility of liquidity and expected stock returns. *Available at SSRN 1786991*.
- Roll, R., 1984. A simple implicit measure of the effective bid-ask spread in an efficient market. *Journal of Finance*, 39(4), pp.1127-1139.
- Shen, D., Urquhart, A., Wang, P., 2022. Bitcoin intraday time series momentum. *The Financial Review*, 57, 319-344.
- Sifat, I., Tariq, S.A. and van Donselaar, D., 2024. Suspicious trading in nonfungible tokens (NFTs). *Information & Management*, 61(1), pp.103898.
- Tripathi, A. and Dixit, A., 2020. Liquidity of financial markets: a review. *Studies in Economics and Finance*, 37(2), pp.201-227.

Table 1 - Descriptive Statistics of Stocks

Panel A and Panel B report the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$) and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$), respectively, for each stock over the entire sample period. Panel C reports the number of days with both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ being no less than 1. The maximum value of both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ is capped at 10.

Panel A		liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$)													
ticker	AAPL	AMZN	ATI	CMA	CRS	EME	GOOG	IBKR	LII	MLI	MSFT	NVDA	TPL	VFC	WSO
count	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652
mean	1.20	1.32	1.09	1.09	0.99	0.83	1.39	1.09	0.82	0.90	1.26	1.25	0.44	1.06	0.71
std	1.55	1.69	1.74	1.77	1.74	1.54	1.88	1.79	1.54	1.72	1.65	1.64	1.06	1.61	1.36
min	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
median	0.83	0.87	0.57	0.58	0.47	0.39	0.85	0.55	0.38	0.39	0.83	0.82	0.20	0.61	0.33
max	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} = 10$	48	54	53	59	55	32	65	59	36	57	47	52	20	38	27
as % of total number of days	1.81%	2.04%	2.00%	2.22%	2.07%	1.21%	2.45%	2.22%	1.36%	2.15%	1.77%	1.96%	0.75%	1.43%	1.02%
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	804	1015	652	648	560	433	997	662	480	481	894	888	187	666	381
as % of total number of days	30.32%	38.27%	24.59%	24.43%	21.12%	16.33%	37.59%	24.96%	18.10%	18.14%	33.71%	33.48%	7.05%	25.11%	14.37%
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	46	69	221	202	282	303	95	221	357	342	77	64	612	171	385
as % of total number of days	1.73%	2.60%	8.33%	7.62%	10.63%	11.43%	3.58%	8.33%	13.46%	12.90%	2.90%	2.41%	23.08%	6.45%	14.52%

Panel B		liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$)													
ticker	AAPL	AMZN	ATI	CMA	CRS	EME	GOOG	IBKR	LII	MLI	MSFT	NVDA	TPL	VFC	WSO
count	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652
mean	0.76	0.79	0.63	0.61	0.50	0.46	0.77	0.60	0.45	0.44	0.76	0.76	0.22	0.63	0.41
std	0.08	0.08	0.15	0.13	0.12	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.07	0.10	0.08	0.12	0.11
min	0.39	0.30	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.11	0.31	0.11	0.08	0.08	0.14	0.14	0.07	0.08	0.08
median	0.77	0.80	0.65	0.63	0.51	0.47	0.77	0.61	0.45	0.44	0.76	0.77	0.21	0.65	0.41
max	1.79	1.21	1.07	1.11	0.91	0.86	1.08	1.01	1.04	0.83	1.59	1.92	0.98	1.01	0.74
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} = 10$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	14	15	1	2	0	0	6	1	1	0	10	29	0	1	0
as % of total number of days	0.53%	0.57%	0.04%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.23%	0.04%	0.04%	0.00%	0.38%	1.09%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	0	0	5	10	2	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	25	5	3
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.19%	0.38%	0.08%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.04%	0.11%	0.00%	0.00%	0.94%	0.19%	0.11%

Panel C		$\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$ & $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$													
ticker	AAPL	AMZN	ATI	CMA	CRS	EME	GOOG	IBKR	LII	MLI	MSFT	NVDA	TPL	VFC	WSO
count	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652	2652
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}, \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	13	11	1	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	10	15	0	1	0
as % of total number of days	0.49%	0.41%	0.04%	0.04%	0.00%	0.00%	0.15%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%	0.38%	0.57%	0.00%	0.04%	0.00%

Table 2 - Descriptive Statistics of Crypto Assets – without Treatment on Wash Trading

Panels A and B report the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$) and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$), respectively, for each crypto asset **without** treatment on wash trading. Panel C reports the number of days with both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ being no less than 1. The maximum value of both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ is capped at 10.

Panel A		liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$)									
ticker	ADA_wo	AVAX_wo	BCH_wo	BTC_wo	ETC_wo	ETH_wo	LTC_wo	SOL_wo	UNI_wo	XRP_wo	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
mean	1.88	1.98	1.99	1.54	1.88	1.63	1.82	1.93	1.99	1.57	
std	2.39	2.51	2.53	2.03	2.41	2.02	2.45	2.37	2.49	2.12	
min	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
median	1.00	1.05	1.04	0.92	0.99	1.01	0.90	1.09	1.06	0.85	
max	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} = 10$	77	85	87	47	70	47	67	72	78	47	
as % of total number of days	4.88%	5.39%	5.52%	2.98%	4.44%	2.98%	4.25%	4.57%	4.95%	2.98%	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	789	813	817	708	783	800	724	868	825	652	
as % of total number of days	50.03%	51.55%	51.81%	44.90%	49.65%	50.73%	45.91%	55.04%	52.31%	41.34%	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	62	67	76	55	62	52	76	64	72	68	
as % of total number of days	3.93%	4.25%	4.82%	3.49%	3.93%	3.30%	4.82%	4.06%	4.57%	4.31%	

Panel B		liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$)									
ticker	ADA_wo	AVAX_wo	BCH_wo	BTC_wo	ETC_wo	ETH_wo	LTC_wo	SOL_wo	UNI_wo	XRP_wo	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
mean	0.97	1.10	1.15	0.82	1.12	0.86	0.92	1.01	1.15	0.87	
std	0.27	0.52	0.32	0.07	0.26	0.07	0.13	0.46	0.36	0.12	
min	0.55	0.32	0.58	0.43	0.55	0.52	0.65	0.65	0.67	0.62	
median	0.91	0.94	1.06	0.82	1.05	0.85	0.90	0.88	1.05	0.85	
max	6.17	6.01	5.13	1.15	2.92	1.26	3.49	8.42	6.01	3.86	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} = 10$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	413	607	968	15	940	77	252	358	924	124	
as % of total number of days	26.19%	38.49%	61.38%	0.95%	59.61%	4.88%	15.98%	22.70%	58.59%	7.86%	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	

Panel C		$\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1 \ \& \ \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$									
ticker	ADA_wo	AVAX_wo	BCH_wo	BTC_wo	ETC_wo	ETH_wo	LTC_wo	SOL_wo	UNI_wo	XRP_wo	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}, \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	256	344	545	8	513	53	166	219	530	66	
as % of total number of days	16.23%	21.81%	34.56%	0.51%	32.53%	3.36%	10.53%	13.89%	33.61%	4.19%	

Table 3 - Descriptive Statistics of Crypto Assets – with Treatment on Wash Trading

Panels A and B report the descriptive statistics of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$) and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$), respectively, for each crypto asset **with** treatment on wash trading. Panel C reports the number of days with both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ being no less than 1. The maximum value of both $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ is capped at 10.

Panel A		liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}$)									
ticker	ADA_w	AVAX_w	BCH_w	BTC_w	ETC_w	ETH_w	LTC_w	SOL_w	UNI_w	XRP_w	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
mean	1.51	1.56	1.59	1.21	1.61	1.37	1.43	1.54	1.63	1.26	
std	2.06	2.10	2.09	1.68	2.13	1.89	1.95	2.16	2.12	1.82	
min	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	
median	0.84	0.89	0.90	0.75	0.86	0.82	0.81	0.85	0.95	0.74	
max	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} = 10$	48	50	47	31	51	42	43	64	57	41	
as % of total number of days	3.04%	3.17%	2.98%	1.97%	3.23%	2.66%	2.73%	4.06%	3.61%	2.60%	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	640	679	691	502	694	575	611	631	751	510	
as % of total number of days	40.58%	43.06%	43.82%	31.83%	44.01%	36.46%	38.74%	40.01%	47.62%	32.34%	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	58	66	70	62	59	53	56	53	62	57	
as % of total number of days	3.68%	4.19%	4.44%	3.93%	3.74%	3.36%	3.55%	3.36%	3.93%	3.61%	

Panel B		liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$)									
ticker	ADA_w	AVAX_w	BCH_w	BTC_w	ETC_w	ETH_w	LTC_w	SOL_w	UNI_w	XRP_w	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
mean	0.77	0.80	0.86	0.66	0.85	0.70	0.75	0.76	0.86	0.70	
std	0.09	0.10	0.11	0.05	0.10	0.04	0.07	0.09	0.10	0.06	
min	0.39	0.35	0.40	0.36	0.40	0.43	0.46	0.45	0.50	0.40	
median	0.75	0.78	0.85	0.67	0.84	0.70	0.75	0.73	0.85	0.70	
max	1.34	1.45	1.34	0.85	1.39	0.88	1.49	1.25	1.55	1.58	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} = 10$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	34	44	154	0	104	0	6	29	100	1	
as % of total number of days	2.16%	2.79%	9.77%	0.00%	6.59%	0.00%	0.38%	1.84%	6.34%	0.06%	
number of days $\beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \leq 0.10$	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
as % of total number of days	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%	

Panel C		$\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} \geq 1 \ \& \ \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$									
ticker	ADA_w	AVAX_w	BCH_w	BTC_w	ETC_w	ETH_w	LTC_w	SOL_w	UNI_w	XRP_w	
count	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	1577	
number of days $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell}, \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell} \geq 1$	27	30	95	0	62	0	3	20	67	0	
as % of total number of days	1.71%	1.90%	6.02%	0.00%	3.93%	0.00%	0.19%	1.27%	4.25%	0.00%	

Table 4 – ANOVA Pairwise Tests for Stocks and Crypto Assets with Treatment

This table reports the results of associated pair tests for liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^l$) liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^l$) with the value of stock being statistically greater than that of crypto asset with treatment on wash trading.

Panel A		Pairwise Test - Liquidity Jump $\beta_{r_t}^l$ - Stock - Crypto with Treatment on Wash Trading							
Contrast	A	B	T	dof	alternative	p-unc	p-corr	p-adjust	sig
liquidity jump $\beta_{r_t}^l$	AMZN	BTC_w	2.12	3312.19	greater	0.02	0.05	holm	**
	BTC_w	GOOG	-3.22	3598.79	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	GOOG	XRP_w	2.18	3391.83	greater	0.01	0.04	holm	***
Panel B		Pairwise Test - Liquidity Diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^l$ - Stock - Crypto with Treatment on Wash Trading							
Contrast	A	B	T	dof	alternative	p-unc	p-corr	p-adjust	sig
liquidity diffusion $\beta_{\sigma_t}^l$	AAPL	BTC_w	47.86	4220.16	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AAPL	ETH_w	32.81	4136.09	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AAPL	LTC_w	2.76	3866.46	greater	0.00	0.01	holm	***
	AAPL	XRP_w	26.09	4083.34	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	ADA_w	AMZN	-8.30	3111.46	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AMZN	BTC_w	63.65	4213.07	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AMZN	ETH_w	49.63	4153.55	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AMZN	LTC_w	16.33	3826.88	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AMZN	SOL_w	12.93	3190.50	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	AMZN	XRP_w	40.68	4055.69	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	BTC_w	GOOG	-54.64	4137.10	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	ETH_w	GOOG	-39.29	4215.72	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	GOOG	LTC_w	6.15	3607.19	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	GOOG	SOL_w	4.05	2967.00	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	GOOG	XRP_w	31.01	3882.99	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	BTC_w	MSFT	-49.14	4144.63	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	ETH_w	MSFT	-33.38	4213.00	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	MSFT	XRP_w	25.97	3896.73	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	BTC_w	NVDA	-43.51	4163.55	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
	ETH_w	NVDA	-29.67	3902.17	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***
LTC_w	NVDA	-3.20	4160.55	less	0.00	0.00	holm	***	
NVDA	SOL_w	1.74	3690.83	greater	0.04	0.12	holm	**	
NVDA	XRP_w	24.30	4226.32	greater	0.00	0.00	holm	***	

*** - significant at 1% level, ** - significant at 5% level, * significant at 10% level.

Figure 1 – Distribution of Stocks ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell - \beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$)

This figure provides the scatter plots of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell$) and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$) for 15 US stocks over the entire sample period. The max values of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ are capped at 10. The stocks are AAPL, AMZN, ATI, CMA, CRS, EME, GOOG, IBKR, LII, MLI, MSFT, NVDA, TPL, VFC, and WSO.




Figure 2 – Distribution of Crypto Assets ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell - \beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$) – without Treatment on Wash Trading

This figure provides the scatter plots of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^\ell$) and liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$) without treatment on wash trading for 10 crypto assets over the entire sample period. The max values of $\beta_{r_t}^\ell$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^\ell$ are capped at 10. The crypto assets are ADA, AVAX, BCH, BTC, ETC, ETH, LTC, SOL, UNI, and XRP.




Figure 3 – Distribution of Crypto Assets ($\beta_{r_t}^l - \beta_{\sigma_t}^l$) – with Treatment on Wash Trading

This figure provides the scatter plots of liquidity jump ($\beta_{r_t}^l$) vs. liquidity diffusion ($\beta_{\sigma_t}^l$) with treatment on wash trading for 10 crypto assets over the entire sample period. The max values of $\beta_{r_t}^l$ and $\beta_{\sigma_t}^l$ are capped at 10. The crypto assets are ADA, AVAX, BCH, BTC, ETC, ETH, LTC, SOL, UNI, and XRP.




Figure 4 – Point Plots of $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} - \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$: ANOVA Tests

This figure provides the point plots of $\beta_{r_t}^{\ell} - \beta_{\sigma_t}^{\ell}$ for one stock (AAPL, AMZN, GOOG, MSFT, NVDA) and one crypto asset (BTC, ETH, XRP) pair without and with treatment on wash trading.

