

Original Article

Liquidity Dynamics Modeling in Algorithmic Financial Environments

Chioma Okafor¹, Abiola Adeyemi²

^{1,2} Department of Economics, University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Received Date: 25 January 2026

Revised Date: 30 January 2026

Accepted Date: 05 February 2026

Abstract: Liquidity is at the core of modern financial markets: it directly affects transaction costs, price discovery, volatility and system resilience in both normal and stressed market environments. Innovative and high price-earning algorithmic trading has changed liquidity formation in which market participants can submit, cancel and execute orders at rapid speed as well change their strategies almost instantly. As such, traditional models of liquidity are progressively in need of expansion to account for the feedback effects that algorithmic traders propagate throughout market-clearing conditions like blockades and waits combined with operating parameters including volatility clusters or information transits. I develop a conceptual framework to study the time-dependent and behaviourally evolving nature of market liquidity, as well as its implications on algorithmic environments for modeling liquidity dynamics. It evaluates some important dimensions as bid-ask spreads, order-book depth, market impact, order-flow imbalance; execution probability and liquidity resilience. It also examines the role of algorithmic strategies in determining how much liquidity is provided and consumed across different market regimes. Emphasis is placed on quantitative modeling techniques, such as stochastic processes, agent-based models and machine learning/deep-learning approaches. We propose a perspective that combined liquidity as adaptive market mode rather than static measurable something. This can enhance execution optimization, market surveillance, risk management and stress testing. These results underscore the need for joint model-based conditional query algorithms with market microstructure input variables and predictive algorithmic behavioural signals to develop more responsive, robust liquidity estimation and prediction capabilities.

Keywords: Liquidity, Algorithmic Trading, Market Microstructure, Order Book, Market Impact / Volatility Machine Learning Execution Financial Markets Liquidity Risk

I. INTRODUCTION

Financial market liquidity is an indicator of the ease at which financial assets can be purchased or sold in large quantities for low impact prices, generally using little time and energy to accomplish price arbitrage. Because liquidity influences transaction costs, price discovery, portfolio management and market stability as well the information embedding of asset prices – its easy to see why it is a key component in efficient financial markets. Liquidity has traditionally been assessed through more static measures like bid-ask spreads, trading volume, turnover and market depth. While these measures still hold significance, market complexity and automation have made existing approaches to liquidity analysis less effective. Today[2019], modern electronic markets function 24 hours a day through integrated trading platforms, automated order-management systems and algorithmic strategies capable of changing (trading) behavior in milliseconds. Accordingly, liquidity can transform quickly given particular states-of-order-flow conditions or the arrival of certain types and quantities of information which could modify volatility

For this reason, algorithmic trading has changed how liquidity is both supplied and consumed. Trading algorithms can monitor market conditions for price discrepancies, predict short-term liquidity and enter or cancel orders at high frequency. Market-making algorithms serve to post liquidity by continuously placing buy/sell orders while execution algos consume liquidity in order to fulfill smaller scales of large institutional trades. Meanwhile, classical techniques like statistical arbitrage and momentum trading usually affect order-flow targeting as well as the depth of market at the same time. Such interactions lead to an environment where liquidity is not just a continuous function of the number orders available in each possible side (within) but emerges from this complex dynamical interplay between trading intentions and order-book states, market expectation modes resulting from trader decisions on limit price choice as driven by their own heuristics/ algo routines.

The electronic limit order book is an important area for this type of dynamics. It logs the best buy and sell orders at various price levels, which gives an insight into liquidity for that order book as well as where prices might move. These indicators range from the bid-ask spread, depth at several price levels, to order-book imbalance and cancellation rates along with order-arrival intensity for a much finer level of detail on market condition. Nonetheless, these metrics are extremely



time-dependent. If orders are cancelled one by one very fast when bid-and-ask size is increasing, a market may show strong displayed depth together with weak effective liquidity. In the same fashion, small bid-ask spreads does not mean strong liquidity when available quantities are low or if price moves very strongly for medium-size orders. As such, liquidity modeling must balance the data-driven conditions of observable markets to a certain extent along with behavioral attributes imposed back in from algorithmic participants.

The second attribute of algorithmic financial ecosystems with significant implications is the speed at which liquidity environments can undergo major changes. New research, surprises in input values or exogenous shocks to the economy (technological changes and behavioral shifts) lead algorithms through predetermined programming rules average quoting and execution virtually without human involvement. In times of higher uncertainty, liquidity providers may widen spreads, decrease displayed depth or even withdraw orders altogether and strategies that demand liquidity by making market-orders are likely to increase their order submissions. These interactions can lead to feedback loops between liquidity and volatility. Reduced levels of liquidity may result in prices becoming more sensitive to order flow which results in an increase volatility; whose subsequent effect is a further reduction in supply through the reaction function that higher value probabilities have on their suppliers pay off, or reduced thresholds and reisk scores (evaluation metrics representative by changes greater than or equal than 30 days within new borrowings) this process will reinforce itself with lower mark lowered limits due weight loss adjusting conditional probability mass derived mean volumes while at risk counts use devalue status even better reflect volume end conditions on negative tail; Consequently, we emphasize the importance of modeling these feedback effects to effectively capture both market stability and transitory financial fragility.

Conventional econometric liquidity models give some valuable basis for analysis, especially the many time-series techniques that describe autocorrelation and volatility clustering (Xu 2007) in asset returns or measure activity in trading relative to market conditions. That said, most totally automated markets still produce nonlinear, high-dimensional and time-varying datasets when you go to model them in a classical linear way. There exists a room for utilizing machine and deep learning techniques to model complex dependencies/relation bearing the data of order-book variables, transactional information along with volatility indicators coupled market states. Use supervised learning to predict liquidity measures, and use unsupervised learning to find different disasters or non-disasters in the series of defined liquidity regimes. Reinforcement learning, on the other hand can represent a more flexible decision-making process wherein trading agents adjust to evolving market sentiment.

This is why agent-based modeling gives another important point of view, because it expressively represents heterogeneous market participants and their interactions. Instead of assuming that all traders react to market signals in the same way, agent-based approaches model target markets as a system composed of various kinds and styles of trader (e.g., include agents representing: market makers; institutional investors such as mutual funds or pension fund managers; arbitrageurs high-frequency traders noise traders). These models can show how individual algorithmic decisions combine to create liquidity patterns at a market level. Therefore, the combination of agent-based approaches with data-driven machine learning models may constitute a more holistic framework to investigate liquidity dynamics.

Dynamic liquidity modeling that generalizes the four-stage approach is appropriately one of those topics on which we work in future research beyond academic market microstructure literature. Correct liquidity estimates are an essential input for many workflows in financial institutions, including execution planning as well as portfolio optimization design and risk management systems down the road stemming from regulatory stress testing. Liquidity models provide a way for exchanges and market operators to detect abnormal markets — signs of instability. Models that detect sudden liquidity deterioration, unusual cancellation behavior, or algorithmic interactions related to market disruption can be valuable for regulators. Correct liquidity forecasting can allow institutional traders to schedule orders in the optimal manner hence preventing implementation shortfall.

We interpret this paper as content that studies the dynamics of liquidity in algofinancial markets where liquidity evolves not as an invariant property but rather a state variable. The paper sheds light on the relationship of order-book structure, trading behavior, volatility as well market impact and algorithmic decision making. The analysis examines traditional liquidity indicators in addition to stochastic, agent based-modeling, machine learning and deep-learning techniques. It elaborates on the unique challenges of high-frequency data, model robustness and interpretability, regime change issues as well as computational scalability. The paper seeks to build a conceptual foundation for more adaptive liquidity estimation and forecasting by applying market microstructure theory in combination with modern computational modeling. The companion reference framework would be particularly relevant in promoting operationally efficient execution strategies, enhancing overall market surveillance, ensuring better liquidity-risk management and a greater awareness of the ways algorithmic trading interacts with post-crisis debates over the resilience (or stability) of modern financial markets.

II. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF LIQUIDITY DYNAMICS

A new theoretical framework is needed to relate traditional microstructure concepts of liquidity dynamics with the more automated actions seen in modern financial markets that are increasingly characterized as algorithmic environments. In contrast to other traditional forms of marketplaces, algorithmic markets have a dynamic that consist primarily around computational agents in an on-going dialogue implementing automated liquidity provisioning methods, institutional based execution systems and arbitrage strategies.

These participants react quickly to dynamic external factors such as changes in prices, order flow, and volatility market depth. Thus, liquidity ought to be viewed as a time-varying statetems that emerges from the interaction between supply and demand for immediacy. This chapter provides the basic theoretical tools in order to analyze such dynamics. Broadly speaking, it is concerned with two main dimensions: Firstly the microstructure mechanisms by which liquidity originates and fades and secondly with how algorithmic trading behavior interacts dynamically with changing states of market liquidity. Knowledge about these dimensions serves as the foundation to formulate quantitative models that are able to assess, predict and account for movements in liquidity.

It also explains why traditional liquidity indicators could be used but not directly on high speed electronic markets in isolation. The theoretical framework outlined here draws from literature connecting order-book properties with the behavior of participants in various market conditions and supports liquidity modeling that is more adaptive to modern algorithmic financial environments.

A. Market Microstructure and Liquidity Creation

Market microstructure theory studies the relationship between trading mechanisms, information revealed through trades, market participants and order-flow processes that lead to pricing and execution. Liquidity in electronic financial markets is primarily created by the constant process of submission, revision, execution and cancellation of orders within a limit order book. Demand-side liquidity arises from buy orders, while supply side liquidity is provided by sell orders. The bid-ask spread is given by the difference between best available buying and selling prices, representing a major component of immediacy cost. While market depth adds granularity about the quantity across price levels, trade volume and order-flow intensity helps gauge how deeply available liquidity is being consumed.

Liquidity formation is a result of four interconnected mechanisms. Market makers generally provide liquidity by continuously quoting limit orders and earning a spread or through inventory rewards. Liquidity consumers: These are mostly institutional traders and algorithmic traders who submit market orders, which take liquidity out of the order book. The interaction of these two groups establishes short time market conditions. If liquidity provision is strong enough relative to the demand for that liquidity, spreads could continue stay narrower and price movements lose their volatility. The depth can shrink quickly and the price essentially travels through many order-book levels when aggressive order flow exceeds supply.

Theoretical Elements According to Raghavan and colleagues, information asymmetry is front and center. Since incoming orders to an exchange may contain information better than that of liquidity providers (Andrea et al., 2023). Market makers may widen spreads, cut order sizes or withdraw quotations in response to increased perceived adverse-selection risk. This means higher trading volume does not necessarily translate to better liquidity. This difference explains why volume alone is insufficient to characterize liquidity in a market.

B. Algorithmic Trading Behavior and Adaptive Liquidity

As automated systems constantly observe incoming market information and adjust their decisions in accordance to a rule set or learned policy, algorithmic trading adds an adaptive behavioural layer on top of how liquidity forms. That information allows trading algorithms to decide order prices, quantities, and even when to perform a given execution or cancel it immediately. It creates a feedback loop between how algorithms behave and market liquidity. I mean algorithms respond to liquidity conditions, and also — because all those algorithms together are acting — they change the very same conditions.

As you know, liquidity-providing algorithms are mostly designed to maintain competitive quotations and control for the following types of risk at versus other strategies: inventory management; adverse-selection exposure; execution risk. These algorithms report higher quoted spreads or smaller order sizes when volatility increases in an attempt to hedge against adverse price movements. On the other hand, during stable market conditions they perhaps offer depth and quotations with greater tightness. The same adaptive behavior implies that liquidity cannot be modeled without taking into account the responses of non-human agents to different market states.

Execution algorithms are another umbrella type of influence. It is normal for institutional traders to split larger orders into smaller trades in order to minimize market impact. Time based execution, volume sensitive execution now liquidity seeking check and decides market condition poking to trade aggressiveness. If liquidity is high enough an algorithm will speed up execution. As depth thins, that can cause delays or changes in how and where orders are filled over time. Those decisions created the order-flow intensity and therefore shape market liquidity evolution.

III. LIQUID DYNAMICS MODEL OF QUANTITATIVE APPROACHES

As algorithmic financial markets evolve to accommodate new complexities, quantitative models are needed that can capture the potentially rapidly-changing multi-dimensional nature of liquidity. Conventional liquidity measures convey relevant information about spreads, trading volume and market depth but typically only represent a limited picture of how supply arises in tandem with the changing conditions an agent faces. Order-book states in algorithmic environments can change over milliseconds as automated systems send, modify and execute orders/cancellations.

Consequently, liquidity modeling must employ ways of capturing dependence on time between sample and nonlinear entries relationships some input-output responses from a participant to others and sudden regime changes. Quantitative methods are rooted in mathematics and statistics, creating a bridge to translate tick data on the markets into meaningful expectations of liquidity today or tomorrow. We present three approaches that complement each other: statistical and stochastic modeling, agent-based liquidity modelling, machine-learningbased liquidation prediction. Both types of models can be useful: Statistical models help uncover temporal dependencies and volatility-related effects using available price data while agent-based approaches capture the strategic interactions among heterogeneous competing market agents. Large-scale market datasets allow machine-learning approaches to learn complex nonlinear relationships. In combination, these approaches provide a holistic structure for understanding liquidity formation and degradation as well as recovery from the deterioration of this function in algorithmic financial ecosystems.

A. Statistical and Stochastic Models for Liquidity Estimation

Statistical and stochastic models form a framework for quantitative assessments of liquidity dynamics, measuring its state both in static terms as well as in time as the price is unified with quantity. These models treat liquidity variables as temporal processes driven by observable market characteristics: spread, trading volume, volatility, order-flow imbalance and market depth. The key advantage of using time-series models is that they can recognize persistence in liquidity conditions (e.g. scientists can compare either high or low states of liquidity whether continue to persist overtime). You should investigate the relationships between liquidity variables and any other facet of market dynamics using autoregressive models, vector autoregressive frameworks, or state-space approaches.

Stochastic modeling is important on nature because there these very large uncertainty in financial market. Probabilistic processes, because they model randomness order arrivals, cancellations transactions and changes in price do not occur at regular intervals. Whereas an order-arrival intensity model estimates the probability of new market buy/sell orders arriving at the limit-order book, a point-process framework is able to capture timing for individual markets events. These methods are useful for works where observations do not take place at uniform time intervals, which is often the case in high-frequency settings.

Latent-state approaches also allow you to model liquidity. In those models, the observable features of an order book are assumed to be signals emitted from some latent liquidity state. A market can be normal, stressed, recovering and most of all highly liquid. These transitions can be estimated using Hidden-state models that essentially represent the liquidity regimes in probabilistic terms.

Interpretability of statistical and stochastic models is a salient benefit. The parameters encode persistence, volatility sensitivity, order-flow effects and liquidity recovery. However, they tend to fall short in strongly nonlinear market relationships or with rapidly-changing human behaviors. So, statistical models are generally best used alongside more flexible computational methods.

B. Agent-Based Models of Algorithmic Liquidity

Compared to more classic (e.g., differential equation) models, agent-based modeling offers a distinctly different view on financial markets as systems of heterogeneous agents with diverse goals and information sets that apply various trading strategies. Unlike the aggregate-based approaches that model liquidity, agent-based models do not depend on any kind of macroeconomic explanation; rather they simulate individual economic agents and how their interactions create market-level structures. This is especially true in algorithmic financial environments where automated strategies can swiftly adapt to the changes occurring market.

An illustrative agent-based liquidity model consists of market makers, institutional traders, arbitrageurs momentum-traders and liquidity-seeking algorithms. Each agent conforms to some decision rules such as when how big of an order to execute or cancel it. Holdings: Market Makers want to maximize on spread revenue while controlling inventory exposure (vs Institutional Execution agents that would like to minimize transaction costs (+Market Impact)). Arbitrage agents react to transitory price discrepancies among markets or assets.

Agent-based models have strength in those feedback mechanisms. As an example, if volatility increases the market-making agents may trade less in volumes. This leads to a decrease in market depth, which can amplify the price effect of aggressive orders. This change in price impact might then lead other agents to engage in further risk-reducing behavior, possibly resulting into a liquidity spiral.

The nature of high dimensions and superhigh-speed data generation from the modern financial markets provides machine learning with a powerful tool for forecasting liquidity. Traditional statistical methods frequently rely on formal functional relationships to assess how the market variables may influence future liquidity outcomes, however machine-learning algorithms are able to tease out complex patterns between such factors and their effect with little prompting or guidance. The input variables relevant to your problem might be bid-ask spreads, the surrounding multi-level order-book depth (to capture noise effects), balance of order-flow imbalance indicating tendency at price levels such as trade direction in past intervals or cancellation rates in response to actions from market participants, volatility metric over time-slices i.e. duration and frequency of transactions around a speed window alongside short-term prices history (say 30 minutes x 12 how it moves with proportions/events).

For example, supervised learning can be applied to predict continuous liquidity measures or classify future market states. While regression models can gauge future spreads, depth or market impact; classification model helps in determining whether liquidity is expected to improve or plateau and then deteriorate. They can also capture nonlinear interactions between the market variables through tree based models, support vector machines or neural networks.

Such approaches lend itself to deep learning in particular for sequential order-book data. While recurrent neural networks and other similar architectures can capture temporal dependencies, convolution-based architectures are able to extract structural patterns from data representations of order-book activity. Transformer models could have longer-range dependencies across sequences of market events. Such techniques can be combined with real-time data pipelines to produce on-the-fly predictions of future liquidity.

Unsupervised learning can also be leveraged to identify liquidity regimes with machine-learned pool embeddings. Clustering can place observations into same groups based on their spread, depth, volatility and order-flow behavior. These clusters could highlight different market states that are otherwise not visible using traditional threshold based techniques.

But for a predictive liquidity model, there are overfitting issues, concept drift in some sessions of the market, data leakage problems and other corner cases such as changing regimes. A model trained on stable markets may be ineffective during financial stress. This necessitates the use of continual validation, temporal out-of-sample testing and rigorous feature engineering. The most powerful liquidity forecasting systems will probably integrate machine learning with understanding of market microstructure, facilitating computational models that are both able to learn complex relationships and yet have behaviours which still make economic sense.

IV. ALGORITHMIC TRADING Dr.KONG-YUM YEHKEY LIQUIDITY DRIVERS AND MARKET IMPACT

In algorithmic financial venues, liquidity is determined by structure and trading behavior but also the conditions of information and characteristics of technology. Electronic markets can change very quickly (within milliseconds) which differs greatly from traditional market conditions that develop a lot more slowly. Algorithmic trading systems measure the available liquidity, price movements order-flow patterns and volatility continuously before changing their trades. Therefore, the factors impacting liquidity are very much intertwined and can have nonlinear effects. This can happen via a surge in aggressive buying, which would deplete the sellside depth available to traders absorb and affect market impact on execution prices/increase spreads/adjust behaviours of liquidity providers. And correspondingly, greater uncertainty can incentivize market makers to limit exposure leading into further liquidity degradation. Knowledge of those mechanisms is crucial to building proper liquidity models along with good execution strategies. In this chapter, we discuss two of the top level dimensions of liquidity dynamics: (i) information about direct market and algorithmic factors affecting liquidity conditions; and (ii), whether there is a dependency between impact price with respect to new balance. Specifically, order-flow imbalance, volatility and market depth together with the measures of both order cancellation as well as trading intensity, execution urgency and algorithmic adaptation. These elements lay the groundwork for understanding how and why liquidity is not constant across time, as a liquid market can quickly become fragile in an environment of stress.

A. Primary Factors of Liquidity in Algorithmic Capital Markets

Liquidity is a factor of multiple, interacting variables — not just something we can observe. The bidask spread, which reflects the immediate cost of executing a transaction is one of key determinants. Narrow spreads usually indicate higher competition from liquidity providers, while wider ones can signify greater uncertainty and inventory risk or adverse-selection related concerns. Yet information on spread only helps, because you are still able to have low enough markets that have a very narrow spread with almost no liquidity. Hence, this also highlights the need to measure order-book depth when measuring liquidity.

Another key component is order-flow imbalance. It measures the relative strength between buyers and sellers over a specific timeframe or price level. We can hear you on the fact that a high degree of directional imbalance has a potential to consume liquidity quickly in favor or side of book. If there are no sell orders available then aggressive buy order will keep taking them one after another moving price up through multiple levels. The same type of behavior occurs when strong selling pressure happens. The algorithms can quickly identify these imbalances and adjust their strategies, potentially magnifying short-term liquidity fluctuations.

Liquidity is also greatly affected by market volatility. The greater the volatility, this uncertainty over what demand will be and future prices is why passive liquidity providers face more risks with high multiple volatilities. Market Making algorithms may make spreads wider and reduce their quoted quantities or increase cancellations. Less volatility would typically lead to more stable quoting behaviors and could promote a deeper displayed level of depth. This sets up a crucial interaction between volatility and liquidity, since falling liquidity can in turn raise price sensitivity and exacerbate fluctuations.

B. Liquidity, Market Impact and Execution Dynamics

Market impact is the effect of buying or selling a financial asset on its price. It has very tight correlation with liquidity because larger and less liquid the orders usually move prices more. Market impact reflects the price change that a firm must accept given an incoming order flow, and is particularly relevant in algorithmic trading where an institutional investor seldom needs to complete trades larger than what market depth can accommodate. A poor execution strategy which ignores liquidity conditions may be one of the reasons for excessive price movement and therefore greater overall transaction costs.

With regard to the definition of market impact, we can distinguish between temporary and persistent components. This is because when we place an aggressive order it uses the liquidity available, thus allowing for a market price to move in that instance. Of this movement, a part may unwind as new orders flow into the book and liquidity providers adjust their quotations. If a transaction is perceived only as information about future demand or supply, its impact may rest with whatever ease of adjustment the market participants perceive at that point. Algorithmic liquidity models need to recognize these mechanisms and their execution implications.

The size of the order compared to the depth available is a key driver for market impact. An order with a total size of 1 Bitcoin may be filled at the best bid price while an order containing many Bitcoins will merely use up several levels to get one filled. This against generates pricing slippage and raises execution costs. So algorithms try to predict the amount of liquidity available at multiple levels rather than just looking at best bid and ask.

A third, crucial connection between liquidity and market impact relates to execution urgency. If an investor requires immediate execution, the algorithm will deploy aggressive marketable orders. This solution will reduce your execution delay, but have the effect of increasing market impact. On the contrary, patient execution model may use passive limit orders and run this transaction over a longer period. While this can limit immediate impact, it adds execution risk and the risk that market prices may move before completion of the order.

Market Impact Liquidity Resilience is especially critical to measuring market impact. A strong market will quickly refill the liquidity absorbed by large transactions after they are executed. Such a fragile market might take significantly longer to rebound. Hence, recovery time, replenishment rate and post-trade depth can serve as a supplement to the usual liquidity metrics. These variables give an indication of a market's efficiency at absorbing trading shocks.

V. ADVANCED ALGORITHMIC LIQUIDITY MODELING FRAMEWORKS

The increasing complexity of electronic financial markets is outpacing the response speed between order-book structure, trading intensity and volatility levels in liquidity models. Traditional liquidity indicators provide good descriptions of market regimes, but when the goal is to model or forecast liquidity itself|to identify latent regimes in liquid assets and their reactions during stress scenarios advanced modeling frameworks are required. In fact, the more recent practices blend statistical techniques with machine learning activities and approaches for sequential modeling or real-time prediction. This means they are capable of accommodating high-frequency observations and nonlinear relationships that can get easily

obscured by traditional analytic methods. Algorithmic environments: the value of a model is not only how accurately it predicts, but its capacity to remain stable when conditions change in the markets; An ideal framework must therefore incorporate information about time dependencies, regime switching, order-book imbalances and cohesion between activities along with behavioural changes in the market microstructure. In this chapter we investigate three sophisticated methods for modeling dynamics of liquidity, which are regime-switching and state-dependent models application to tightly orchestrated order-book dynamics forecasting using deep learning and hybrid real-time frameworks. Collectively, this wider set of approaches is used as the basis for developing adaptive systems that are able to determine current liquidity conditions, predict future liquidity developments and even inform algorithmic execution decisions or financial risk-management actions.

A. Regime-Switching and State-Dependent Liquidity Models

Liquidity is not uniform – it varies between trading sessions and market paradigms. It can change from liquidity normality to heightened or stressed states depending on volatility, order-flow pressure, information arrival and participant behaviour. Regime-switching models are specifically crafted to capture these transitions by assuming that observed liquidity variables arise from different unconditional latent market states. States may differ in terms of average spread, order-book depth and trading intensity or volatility.

A market liquidity framework can then be placed into one of the three states described, where each favorable and unfavorable state is defined by observable variables like bid-ask spread, depth, order-flow imbalance (OFI) or price volatility. A stable regime might be characterised by narrow spreads, significant depth and balanced order flow while a stressed regime may have wide spreads, diminished depth with increased volatility and rapid cancel orders. By recognising these states, trading systems can change their execution strategies in line with market conditions.

B. Deep Learning for Predicting Limit Order Book Liquidity

For high-frequency limit order book data, deep learning can be said to provide the deepest features out of all methods for extracting complex temporal and structural patterns. Limit order books are characterized by information at many price levels and changes occurring constantly due to incoming orders and the execution/cancellation of current ones. The former were points of observation that generates a high dimensional sequential data very difficult to model with classical approaches. Deep neural network are able to process this kind of informations and learn the mapping between order-book states and future liquidity realizations.

This range helps the power of recurrent architectures to capture temporal dependencies in sequences of market events. These models can be trained to learn through multiple subsequent observations how past liquidity states affect other market measures, such as future spreads and depth or order-flow behaviour. This matters because liquidity frequently has short-term persistence, indicating that current market conditions embed information about near-future conditions.

Hybrid Liquidity models combine more than one technique within the same set of data in order to reduce single model dependence. Statistical models are interpretable and can capture temporal dependencies, machine-learning is suitable for non-linear relations modelling, agent-based frameworks provide an explanation of interactions among participants. Combining these approaches can allow for more complete liquidity models in complex algorithmic settings.

For instance, a hybrid framework might leverage classical liquidity indicators на типа spread, depth of the book or order-flow imbalance (i.e. Then the statistical components are used to identify persistency and short-term relationships, while machine-learning parts estimate nonlinear effects and future liquidity conditions. To cope with this, you can add a regime-detection layer that segregates the market into normal or stressed conditions and modify your model prediction on those events.

VI. ANALYSIS QUEUES OF EMPIRICAL LIQUIDITY AND ALGORITHMIC MARKET BEHAVIOR

After all, to understand liquidity in the presence of real algorithmic traders you need an empirical analysis. This variability comes from various sources, including trading activity, information arrivals and volatility as well as order cancellations and heterogeneous algorithmic strategies—elements not considered in the theoretical models covered earlier. In this regard, the limit order book is especially precious: it keeps track of how liquidity providers continuously interact with other market participants who consume that liquidity. The new generation of electronic markets create high-frequency observations with the details from bid and ask prices, order quantities, transactions to cancellations or execution events. These observations enable researchers explore liquidity at progressively higher temporal scales. Studies of limit order books point that price formation is dynamically interrelated with the process of submitting and canceling orders, while metrics such as spread or depth offer valuable perspectives on market liquidity.

Two complementary perspectives are applied in this chapter to explore empirical liquidity behaviour. The first one is concerned with the order-book structure and proposed a measure for liquidity conditions based on observable market

variables. The second looks at how to adapt algorithmic trading performance in changing market regimes, and liquidity resilience under changing shocks. This matters because shown liquidity does not always line up with tradable liquidity. Orders can be cancelled in the blink of an eye, aggressive orders can eat through multiple price levels and market makers may update their prices during periods where volatility or information shocks are heightened. As a result, empirical liquidity analysis needs to study time invariant order book structure and analyze time variant properties through market events.

A. Empirical Measurement of Order-Book Liquidity

As no one variable can fully characterize the quality of a financial market, empirical liquidity assessment makes use of various indicators. One of the most common measures you may encounter is bid-ask spread since it reflects immediate execution costs. Generally, a narrower spread suggests more trading immediacy whereas a wider one could suggest greater uncertainty or lower competition among liquidity providers. However, the use of spread analysis needs to work together with order-book depth since a narrow spread can also be accompanied by rather limited amount that is available for trade.



Figure 1: Limit Order Book Structure and Liquidity Formation in Algorithmic Financial Markets

Order-book depth is the number of buy and sells orders at each price level. Depth is typically more important for orders of larger size as it indicates a potential reduction in price displacement. Academics can measure depth at the best bid or ask, which is defined as aggregate quantities across replicating price level(s). Algorithmic execution can take advantage of multi-level depth, as larger institutional orders can ingest liquidity that eats through the best offer. This means that empirical studies of these order books often investigate the full depth, or limit structure of prices and quantities rather than using only top-of-book observations. Another key empirical measure is order-flow imbalance. It compares the relative level of buying and selling activity, allowing for an indication of short-term directional pressure. In the case of big aggressive buy orders there is likely to be more ask side liquidity being consumed than could fill an entire order book, which can drive prices up and depth down. On the other hand, a series of selling pressure can wipe out long liquidity from the bid-side and trigger their market quakes.

Cancellation activity matters as well, since orders displayed can vanish before execution. The presence of a high cancellation metric will suggest either that the liquidity under these orders cannot be sustained, or algorithmic players are manoeuvring into fresh positions actively. Therefore, empirical models must be separated between displayed liquidity and lasting liquidity that stays long enough to legitimise actual execution. Market impact and price slippage give further insight into substantive liquidity. In other words, if small transactions create big price changes the market might have limited depth even when large quantities are shown in order books. A more resilient market will absorb large orders with little price displacement (ie, a big order can be submitted and the market is able to handle it).

Such empirical measures can be aggregated into composite liquidity proxies. These designs can include factors such as depth, imbalance, volatility of spread and cancellation rate and trade volume (execution costs). By identifying of inter-connections between these variables, and forecasting future liquidity states through the various machine-learning techniques that follow. This framework accurately measures liquidity than the conventional single-variable approach.

B. Algorithmic reactions, liquidity support and stress on the market

These algorithmic trading systems constantly react to market liquidity changes, which means that the interaction between trade behavior and market state is a feedback relationship. Execution algorithms can place larger orders with lower expected market impact when liquidity is abundant. In response to liquidity deteriorating, algorithms may botch order size, increase execution timeframes or seek out alternative venues or withhold from executing. Market making algorithms can also vary their spreads and quoted quantities in relation to volatility, inventory exposure, and perceived information risk.

For instance, liquidity resilience is a measure of the ability for markets to come back after depleted from consumption. In a strong market, depth of the order book usually returns within hours to following aggressive transactions, while in weak markets it may take days or even weeks for all buy and sell offer sides being fully backfilled. As such, both recovery time and depth replenishment as well as spread normalization and post-trade price stabilization are included in empirical liquidity models. Market liquidity research typically conceptualises distinct dimensions of liquidity, for example in terms such as tightness, depth and immediacy or resiliency (see Brousseau et al. (2021), Chordia et al. (2005)) indicating that the notion of liquidity should be considered multi-dimensional rather than captured by a single quantitative measure [26])

The stress of a market arena provides you an essential field to test, how behavior of liquidity algorithms during all types (liquid or illiquid) markets Higher volatility will make liquidity providers more conservative, as the probability of a bad price change increases. They can choose to widen quotes, lower displayed numbers or increase the frequency of cancels. When many liquidity providers react similarly to identical information, available depth can evaporate within seconds. Such behavior could create liquidity feedback mechanism. Shallower depth increases the price impact of aggressive orders. Hitech liquidity providers may withdraw or scale back their activity when price movements grow larger and volatility rises as more, often times competing with the same sellers. This decline in liquidity may then contribute to worsening execution costs and increasing volatility. This is a simple example of liquidity model which need to account for market and behaviour.

Resilience can also be influenced by algorithmic execution strategies. Instantaneously shared liquidity may mean smart order-routing systems are combing venues or execution algorithms working their unwinding over time with no interim impact. It is easy to construct adaptive systems that respond willy-nilly and some of the time they will be able maintain liquidity when markets change, so gainfully responding with a fainting response may assist in preserving liquidity.

VII. PERFORMANCE COMPARISON AND LIQUIDITY RISK MANAGEMENT OF MODELS

It is necessary to test liquidity models in order to see if they can appropriately model fast moving situations that are present within algorithmic financial markets. Predicting correctly during a stable price range does not guarantee the same when volatility spikes, market depth disappears or trading behavior shifts. Hence, liquidity-model evaluation should take into account not only predictive accuracy but also implementation or utility in the context of trading and risk management.

Table 1: Key Evaluation Dimensions for Algorithmic Liquidity-Dynamics Models

Evaluation Dimension	Representative Metric	Practical Objective
Liquidity Prediction	MAE, RMSE, prediction error	Improve forecasting of future liquidity
Spread Estimation	Bid-ask spread error	Reduce transaction costs
Depth Forecasting	Depth prediction accuracy	Improve order-placement decisions
Market Impact	Slippage and impact error	Minimize execution costs
Regime Detection	Classification accuracy	Identify liquidity stress early
Resilience	Recovery time prediction	Assess post-shock liquidity recovery
Robustness	Out-of-sample performance	Maintain reliability across regimes
Execution Performance	Implementation shortfall	Improve algorithmic execution

Spread prediction, depth forecasting, market-impact estimation, liquidity-regime classification, execution performance and resilience prediction: all these are important dimensions of evaluation. Assessing whether a model is performant in normal, volatile and stressed market regimes should also be part of testing. In algorithmic environments as well, computational efficiency is crucial – even an accurate model may be limited in practical use if predictions cannot be carried out within the run-time constraints. Models identifying the risk of liquidity deterioration prior to a associated transaction cost or execution problem are types which may be needed for risk management as well. The below framework synthesizes the primary areas of examination that allow for liquidity-dynamics models to be assessed, and their application to algorithmic financial decision making.

A. Evaluation Dimensions and Practical Applications

Liquidity models can be analysed based on a mixture of statistical, operational and financial metrics. Predictive accuracy: to what extent will the predictive model be able to predict future spreads, depth or market-impact conditions of order-flow imbalance? With regime-detection accuracy you can see if the model is able to tell normal liquidity vs stressed. Execution-based metrics assess if model predictions indeed enhance trading performance through decreased slippage and transactional fees. A further consideration is robustness. This is also the topic of non-stationarity: financial markets are non-stationary, nothing ensures relationships observed in historical data will hold true once trading technologies, regulatory environments and strategies evolve. Consequently, rather than solely using historical in-sample performance to evaluate models, they should be put through rolling or expanding out-of-sample periods. This is also an important aspect of stress testing as liquidity models should be effective during times of extreme volatility and quickly eroding market depth.

Interpretability is another key dimension of evaluation. If a model predicts that liquidity is going to get worse or the market impact will increase then it might need an explanation for why and what are the reasons behaviour. Incorporating market microstructure features into rigorous predictive working models could allow for more opaque decision making.

B. Liquidity Risk Management and Model Resiliency

Liquidity risk management focuses on the identification of circumstances preventing assets from being traded without significant price concessions. This risk can emerge quickly in algorithmic environments because algorithms embedded within automated systems may all change trading behavior at the same time due to identical market signals. Thus, liquidity models ought to give early warnings of the forthcoming state of lessening market conditions. One of the major benefits is real time liquidity tracking. A monitoring system can monitor for changes in different market characteristics (spreads, depth, order-flow imbalance / cancellation rates / volatility) and compare current conditions with historical patterns. Risk alerts may be triggered automatically or order execution strategies modified if significant deviations occur. For instance, when the expected market impact is greater than a threshold: the algorithm can reduce order size.

You also have one more important application of Stress testing. You can use historical and simulated liquidity shocks to measure how your trading strategy performs when spreads widen, depth erodes or liquidity providers call it a day. This enables institutions to quantify potential losses due to execution in stressed market conditions. Not only you need to monitor the reliability of a model. The fact that prediction errors, shifts in the distribution of data and worsening performance may suggest possible model drift. The changes can trigger automated validation processes which can automatically recalibrate or replace the model. Ensemble and hybrid techniques can help lower reliance on a single model, thus increasing robustness across multiple market regimes.

In summary, you need an efficient combination of predictive models and operational decision systems to manage liquidity risk successfully. The model should not just be for estimating liquidity, the outputs need to help on actions about when/ how much to execute them and where (venue selection) with position management from their risk limits. The effectiveness of algorithmic financial risk management can be transformed by marrying accurate prediction, and continuous monitoring alongside stress testing as well as model governance which expands the practical aspects of liquidity modeling.

VIII. LIQUIDITY DYNAMICS MODELING: APPLICATIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

As the financial markets evolve towards increasingly fast-paced, data-centric, and interconnected trading environments—modeling liquidity dynamics has assumed more significance. Various practical tasks may be supported by modern liquidity models, including algorithmic execution, market surveillance and portfolio risk management as well as financial stress testing. The use of predictive models may have the application to estimate how these market conditions will change in response to a shock (that is, due changes in volatility or order flow, for example) not just from measuring current liquidity levels. Simultaneously, technologies such as artificial intelligence and high-performance computing with adaptive learning are also emerging new pathways for making better liquidity forecasts. Yet they also create challenges related to model reliability, explainability, data quality, computational limits and responsive market structures. In this chapter, we present four significant areas of applications and developments including algorithmic execution optimization, market surveillance, liquidity-risk management and future intelligent liquidity systems.

A. Algorithmic Execution Optimization

These models can use historical market data to estimate how much liquidity will be available in the (near) future when we submit an order, and whether that supply is likely to stay stable or vary. Predictions of the spread, depth, market impact and order-flow imbalance can be used to inform execution systems on how much size should they execute when Algorithmic trading is favourable they would pick larger quantities with less expected damage. If liquidity becomes problematic, tiny fractional transactions or too large orders may be executed and delayed in the market until a profitable

system is found. This adaptive execution can alleviate slippage and implementation shortfall, making every trading session more efficient.

B. Market Surveillance and Anomaly Detection

Liquidity models can aid in market surveillance using our framework to detect unusual changes in spreads, depth, order-flow imbalance and cancellation behavior. A sudden spike or fall in these indicators may indicate a malfunctioning of markets, as would wandering market stress. Machine-learning systems can help compare real-time market behavior with historical patterns and produce alerts when divergences become sizable. This helps exchanges and finance investigators analyze abnormal liquidity activity in less time, to possibly discern conditions of market instability.

C. Liquidity Risk Management

The nature of liquidity means looking at how fast positions can be unwound into cash while avoiding any significant price impact is something which financial institutions need to understand in order to make decisions surrounding liquidity-risk management. Dynamic liquidity models allow institutions to gauge expected execution cost across a range of scenarios, allowing traders and desks the appropriate limits on trade size and how much they are exposed. Liquidity-risk frameworks can also be fed with stress scenarios. The models give estimates of likely losses based on the possible widening spreads, falling depth, increasing volatility and less activity. These outcomes can be used to inform contingency planning and increase institutional resilience against adverse market conditions.

D. Future Intelligent Liquidity Systems

Future liquidity systems will integrate AI with real-time market data, adaptive learning and automated decision making processes. Rather than depending on predetermined liquidity thresholds, learning systems might learn ongoing new information from changing order-book signals as time flows and revise their predictions — thereby gaining an edge. More complex architectures could successively combined statistical models, agent based simulations and reinforcement learning in a single framework. These systems could then reactively discover liquidity regimes, predict market impact, and recommend execution. Craig W. Holden⁷ Future work should focus on explainability, robustness, cybersecurity, data quality and regulation so that intelligent liquidity models can be trusted to operate autonomously in the coming era of audience-frictionless capital markets.

IX. CHALLENGES, LIMITATIONS, AND STRATEGIC CONSIDERATIONS

While there are many advantages offered by modeling liquidity dynamics for financial environments involving algorithms, its practical application comes with various methodological and operational challenges. Abstract: Financial markets are dynamic systems where relationships among order flow, volatility, market depth and trading behaviour can evolve quickly. It may mean a model that works well in one market regime will no longer be reliable when the structure of markets or incentives for participation change. Computational issues arise due to the high volume and frequency at which market data are transmitted, especially when models need to operate on order-level information in real time. On the other hand, algorithmic trading adds strategic interactions that may cause liquidity to be unpredictable. When market participants notice statistical arbitrage strategies or algorithmic behaviors, they will do some rambos like tweak their trading behavior to create feedback effects that increase instability in the model. In this chapter we assess three main issues impacting comprehensive liquidity dynamics modelling including: data and model-quality limitations, behavioural and market-regime uncertainty from underlying risk-profile specifications, as well as computational/regulatory/implementation concerns. To build liquidity models that can help in real-world trading and risk management and market monitoring applications, these challenges must be overcome effectively.

A. Data Quality and Model Limitations

The performance of high-frequency liquidity models is primarily determined by the quality, completeness and consistency of historical data on financial markets. As limit order book datasets can have millions of both submissions, cancellations and modifications as well as executions; Processing such a high frequency data source poses challenges in terms of remote processing. In liquidity calculations, timestamp differences (observations outside of a certain time window), missing observations due to lack of trades for particular instruments or days as well as conformed market identifiers are also errors that can enter our computations if not thoroughly curated. One of the greatest challenges is how to separate displayed from effective liquidity. The order may be cancelled prior to execution, which can lead observed depth to overestimate effective liquidity. Consequently, models based solely on displayed volumes of supply and demand may be misleading in their liquidity estimations.

Model selection also creates limitations. Statistical models are interpretable but suffer from a poor representation of nonlinear relationships, while complex machine-learning (ML) models can capture advanced patterns with limited interpretability. And the third challenge is Overfitting, which concerns particularly with highly detailed historical datasets

being used to train models. If future (unobtainable) information makes it into the training process, then data leakage can create unnaturally strong performance. This is why we need a correct temporal separation of the training and testing observations. Maintains model reliability: Regular technique validation, feature monitoring and recalibration as necessary.

B. Behavioural Adaptation and Market-Regime Uncertainty

In Algorithmic financial markets, the strategy is continuously adapted. As the market changes, competitor activity specific markets and other factors such as volatility or execution costs may cause algorithms to alter their behavior. This creates a scenario where the data-generator itself can be allowed to change over time. Market-regime changes are a significant source of uncertainty. A model trained on normal data would likely do poorly in a financial crisis, major economic announcement, technological disruption or sudden liquidity shock. Such periods can be associated with radical changes of the relations between volatility and liquidity.

The use of algorithmic feedback can make prediction even more complex. When lots of automated systems react to the same signal and remove liquidity, their combined response can create a market condition that did not exist in training data until now. Such behavior establishes an endogeneity in the market as predictions and participants impact each other. Adaptive models solve these problems partially by adjusting their parameters in real time based on monitoring prediction errors. You can also detect changes in market states with regime-switching frameworks. However, too much adaptation can also lead to instability or an overreaction to mere fluctuations. As a result, future liquidity models need to incorporate traditional regressors with real-time regime identification and behavioural information. Predictive accuracy in a single historical environment should not have more weight than robustness across multiple market conditions.

C. Computational, Regulatory, and Implementation Considerations

This means that all transaction details are captured at nanosecond speed, and algorithmic markets produce data with extreme frequency which necessitates significant computational capacity for modeling of real-time liquidity. The model in practice would have to handle incoming order-book events, refresh the state of its liquidity estimates given these updates and produce predictions all at super low latency. This means complex deep-learning or hybrid models are therefore likely to face practical difficulties when their computational requirements exceed the available infrastructure.

Reliable data pipelines and monitoring systems are also needed for model deployment. Errors in data transfer, synchronization and execution of models can lead to incorrect liquidity estimates or harmful trading decisions. As a result, institutions need to build redundancy into their systems and require the use of validation procedures as well as fail-safe practices. Regulatory considerations are equally important. POSIX** – Algorithmic trading systems run in the regulatory framework and are promoted to be executed according to rules which contribute towards maintaining market integrity, transparency and stability. These liquidity models should be computable in a way that they are able to produce automated decisions, auditable and sufficiently explainable.

It's another key factor because liquidity models and trading systems are built around a networked technology stack. Model outputs and trading choices may be impacted by unauthorized access, manipulated market data or system disruption. Model governance, performance monitoring and documentation will therefore have to kick in after implementation along with access controls & periodic validation. The goal should not only be to create the best liquidity model but a trustworthy system that can function safely under real market conditions. The combination of computational efficiency, regulatory compliance constraints (financial and ethical), cybersecurity concerns from one side and strong model governance practices on the other leads to an overall practical sustainability of liquidity dynamics modeling in algorithmic financial environments.

X. CONCLUSION

In the recent years, building models of liquidity dynamics has become number one study on modern algorithmic financial markets. Fast and high-tech development of electronic trading has turned liquidity from the static market characteristic to a time-dependent process driven by order-book conditions, trade intensity, volatility, information flow as well as strategic behavior of algorithms. In this paper we looked into the theory behind, quantitative methods used to formulate and evaluate liquidity modeling in such environments.

The analysis showed that traditional metrics like bid-face spread, market depth, trading volume and order-flow imbalance are still essential for assessing liquidity but they fall short when using them individually. Liquidity should instead be reviewed as a multidimensional, time-dependent phenomenon. Despite those desirable properties, this class of models cannot be used directly for predicting stock-prices in financial markets. Machine-learning and deep – learning methodologies take liquidity analysis one step further, exploring nonlinear relationships and more complicated dynamics on high-frequency order-book data.

Another aspect the study underlined was liquidity resilience and market impact. While algorithmic trading is known for lowering the cost of market making as well as improving liquidity, it can also play a significant role in rapid liquidity deterioration due to simultaneous reactions towards certain news by many automated systems. Nonlinear liquidity dynamics arise during market stress due to the feedback between volatility, order cancellations (reduced depth), and aggressive trading. As a result, liquidity models should reflect not just historical averages but also regime changes and behavioural adaptation.

Hybrid and real-time modeling framework is expected to be a potential future direction. On the whole, statistical techniques combined with machine learning along with regime detection and behavioural modelling would enhance liquidity predictions together providing a full array of support for adaptive execution strategies. These systems can also help financial institutions with execution optimization, market surveillance, liquidity-risk management and stress testing.

That said, there are important challenges: data quality, model overfitting and concept drift plus computational latencies as well as interpretability for the end-users of these applications in addition to cyber security threats with various attack vectors coming from many sources to regulatory compliance. To that end, drive future research towards strong nonparametric and interpretable adaptive modeling which can achieve consistency in performance across diverse market regimes. The prediction of liquidity may also be enhanced with the introduction and incorporation of real-time data, artificial intelligence as well as agent-based simulation in addition to newly developed theories such market microstructure.

In summary, good liquidity dynamics modelling is a crucial building block for using smarter and more robust algo finance ecosystems. Instead of treating liquidity as a predetermined measurement, by viewing it more like an adaptive market state (similar to volatility), researchers and those working within financial institutions will be better positioned to anticipate changes in the level of liquidity available for effective use, manage execution costs accordingly, identify pockets where relative illiquidity is occurring & thereby help strengthen system stability across what have become increasingly automated functional models underpinning our capital markets.

XI. REFERENCES

- [1] Amid, Y. (2002) 'Illiquidity and stock returns: cross-section and time-series effects', *Journal of Financial Markets*, 5(1), pp. 31-56.
- [2] Avellaneda, M. and Stoical, S. (2008) 'High-frequency trading in a limit order book', *Quantitative Finance*, 8(3), pp. 217-224.
- [3] Crate, Á., Jaimungal, S. and Penal, J. (2015) *Algorithmic and High-Frequency Trading*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [4] Chorda, T., Roll, R. and Subramanian, A. (2000) 'Commonality in liquidity', *Journal of Financial Economics*, 56(1), pp. 3-28.
- [5] Cont., R., Kokanee, A. and Stoical, S. (2014) 'The price impact of order book events', *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 12(1), pp. 47-88.
- [6] Cont., R., Stoical, S. and Tarija, R. (2010) 'A stochastic model for order book dynamics', *Operations Research*, 58(3), pp. 549-563.
- [7] Easley, D., Kiefer, N.M., O'Hara, M. and Paper man, J.B. (1996) 'Liquidity, information, and infrequently traded stocks', *The Journal of Finance*, 51(4), pp. 1405-1436.
- [8] Foucault, T., Pagano, M. and Rowell, A. (2013) *Market Liquidity: Theory, Evidence, and Policy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [9] Glisten, L.R. and Mailgram, 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.
- [10] Gould, M.D., Porter, M.A., Williams, S., McDonald, M., Fen, D.J. and Horizon, S.D. (2013) 'Limit order books', *Quantitative Finance*, 13(11), pp. 1709-1742.
- [11] Hasbrouck, J. (1991) 'Measuring the information content of stock trades', *The Journal of Finance*, 46(1), pp. 179-207.
- [12] Kyle, A.S. (1985) 'Continuous auctions and insider trading', *Econometrical*, 53(6), pp. 1315-1335.
- [13] Madhavan, A., Richardson, M. and Romans, M. (1997) 'Why do security prices change? A transaction-level analysis of NYSE stocks', *The Review of Financial Studies*, 10(4), pp. 1035-1064.
- [14] O'Hara, M. (1995) *Market Microstructure Theory*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- [15] Pastor, L. and Tombaugh, R.F. (2003) 'Liquidity risk and expected stock returns', *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(3), pp. 642-685.
- [16] Sirignano, J. and Cont., R. (2019) 'Universal features of price formation in financial markets: perspectives from deep learning', *Quantitative Finance*, 19(9), pp. 1449-1459.
- [17] Zhang, Z., Zofran, S. and Roberts, S. (2019) 'Deep LOB: Deep convolutional neural networks for limit order books', *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 67(11), pp. 3001-3012.
- [18] Aerogel, F., Anne, M., Chakraborti, A., Jaded, A. and Token, I.M. (2016) *Limit Order Books*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [19] Crate, Á., Jaimungal, S. and Ricci, J. (2014) 'Buy low, sell high: a high frequency trading perspective', *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, 5(1), pp. 415-444.
- [20] Pastor, L., Tombaugh, R.F. and Taylor, L.A. (2022) 'Dissecting the risks of liquidity', *Journal of Financial Economics*, 146(1), pp. 88-102.