



Systemic risk & supercooled Stefan problem on networks

Mykhaylo Shkolnikov (with Sergey Nadtochiy and Francois Delarue)

Princeton University

March 18, 2019

Outline

- 1 Motivation: default cascades in systemic risk
- 2 Basic models of banking networks
- 3 Large system limit & supercooled Stefan problem
- 4 Regular behavior vs. systemic crises
- 5 Stability vs. fragility on networks

Motivation

Goal: understand how default cascades arise in banking networks.

More generally: how do microscopic effects in a large system lead to macroscopic phenomena?

Example 1: systemic risk

- Banking system with banks borrowing from each other.
- Banks default \rightarrow losses to other banks.
- Losses \rightarrow new defaults.
- New defaults \rightarrow new losses \rightarrow default cascade.

Other examples

Example 2: neural networks

- **Neurons** in a part of the brain, e.g. 10^6 in the human hippocampus.
- **Membrane potential** of a neuron reaches a **critical level** (“spike”) → the neuron **fires**.
- Neuron **firing** → **spike** in surrounding neurons.
- Surrounding neurons may **fire** → **synchronization**.

Example 3: supercooling

- **Liquid**, e.g. water, cooled **below its freezing temperature**, but remaining liquid. **Freezes** when poured onto a **warmer** surface.
- **Local freezing** → **global freezing**.

Basic structural model for default cascades, in words

- Log-assets of N banks: $Y^1(0), Y^2(0), \dots, Y^N(0) \in [0, \infty)$.
- Evolve according to **independent Brownian motions**, each with **drift** α , **dispersion** σ .
- When a process hits 0, it is **absorbed**. \leftrightarrow **default**
- This leads to **immediate downward jumps** by other processes, tuned by a parameter $C > 0$. \leftrightarrow **losses**
- If some processes cross 0 due to jumps, these processes are **removed**, jump sizes of remaining particles are **adjusted**, etc. \leftrightarrow **new losses**
- When **cascade resolved**: remaining processes **continue as BMs**, etc.

Our model, in formulas

- **Process locations:** Y^1, Y^2, \dots, Y^N .
- As long as processes on $(0, \infty)$:

$$dY_t^i = \alpha dt + \sigma dB_t^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$

B^1, B^2, \dots, B^N **independent standard BMs.**

- **Hitting times:**

$$\tau^i = \inf\{t > 0 : Y_t^i \leq 0\}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

- Suppose Y^i hits 0 at time t and is **removed**.

Our model: cascades, in words

- **Shift** the remaining processes by

$$C \log \left(1 - \frac{1}{S_{t-}} \right),$$

where S_{t-} is the **pre-cascade size of the system**.

- **Note:** factor \downarrow in size S_{t-} , \uparrow in parameter C .
- Update may lead to processes i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k crossing 0, these are removed, and we **adjust the shift** to

$$C \log \left(1 - \frac{k+1}{S_{t-}} \right).$$

- May cause **more immediate absorptions**, in which case **repeat** procedure etc., until determine all processes to remove at time t .

Our model: cascades, in formulas

- **System size:** $S_t := \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau^i > t\}}$.
- **Order statistics:** $Y_{t-}^{(1)} \leq Y_{t-}^{(2)} \leq \dots \leq Y_{t-}^{(S_{t-})}$ of $(Y_{t-}^i : \tau^i \geq t)$.

- **# of processes removed at time t :**

$$D_t := \inf \left\{ k : Y_{t-}^{(k)} + C \log \left(1 - \frac{k-1}{S_{t-}} \right) > 0 \right\} - 1.$$

- **Log-asset dynamics:**

$$Y_t^i := Y_0^i + \alpha t + \sigma B_t^i + \sum_{u \leq t} C \log \left(1 - \frac{D_u}{S_{u-}} \right).$$

Large system limit: starting point

To study **macroscopic default cascades**:

- take $N \rightarrow \infty$;
- macroscopic default cascades \leftrightarrow blow-ups in a limiting process.

Crucial observation: sum of jumps

$$\sum_{u \leq t} C \log \left(1 - \frac{D_u}{S_{u-}} \right) = \sum_{u \leq t} C \log \left(\frac{S_u}{S_{u-}} \right) = C \log \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau^j > t\}} \right).$$

\rightarrow functional of the **empirical measure** $\varrho^N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y^i}$

\rightarrow **interaction of mean-field type**

Large system limit: McKean-Vlasov heuristics

McKean-Vlasov heuristics (cf. **Sznitman '89**):

- **Classical setting:**

$$Y_t^i = Y_0^i + \int_0^t b(Y_s^i, \varrho_s^N) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(Y_s^i, \varrho_s^N) dB_s^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

- **Guess:** $\varrho^N \xrightarrow{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho$, **deterministic**.

- \implies for large N , particle locations **well-approximated** by

$$\bar{Y}_t^i = \bar{Y}_0^i + \int_0^t b(\bar{Y}_s^i, \varrho_s) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(\bar{Y}_s^i, \varrho_s) dB_s^i, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, N.$$

- $\implies \varrho = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \varrho^N = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\varrho}^N = \mathcal{L}(\bar{Y}^1)$.

- **Conclusion:** in $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit, Y^i converge to **unique solution** of

$$\bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_0 + \int_0^t b(\bar{Y}_s, \mathcal{L}(\bar{Y}_s)) ds + \int_0^t \sigma(\bar{Y}_s, \mathcal{L}(\bar{Y}_s)) dB_s.$$

Large system limit: our setting

- **McKean-Vlasov heuristics** suggests Y^i converge to **unique sol.** of

$$\bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_0 + \alpha t + \sigma \bar{B}_t + \Lambda_t,$$

where

$$\Lambda_t := C \log \mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} > t), \quad \bar{\tau} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t \leq 0\}.$$

- **Problems: non-uniqueness, non-existence** in $C([0, \infty), \mathbb{R})$.
- $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} > t)$ or $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau^j > t\}}$ do not specify **cascade mechanism**.
- $\rightsquigarrow D_t := \inf\{y > 0 : y - F_t(y) > 0\}$
 $:= \inf \left\{ y > 0 : y + C \log \left(1 - \frac{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t, \bar{Y}_{t-} \in (0, y))}{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t)} \right) > 0 \right\}.$
- **Specify** $\Lambda_t = \Lambda_{t-} + F_t(D_t)$, rcll.
- Call solutions with **correct cascade mechanism** **physical solutions**.

A first limit theorem

Theorem (Nadtochiy, S. '17) Suppose $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{Y_i(0)} \rightarrow \nu$; ν has a bounded density f_ν on $[0, \infty)$ vanishing in a neighborhood of 0.

Then:

The sequence $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{Y}_i}$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ is tight and any limit point is supported on physical solutions \bar{Y} with $\bar{Y}_0 \stackrel{d}{=} \nu$.

Technical points: theorem for auxiliary log capitalization processes; Skorokhod M1 topology on rcll paths (key observation of **Delarue, Inglis, Rubenthaler, Tanré '15**).

Connection to Stefan problem

- Consider a variant of the **limiting problem**:

$$\bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_0 + B_t - \Lambda_t, \quad t \leq \bar{\tau}, \quad \bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_{\bar{\tau}}, \quad t > \bar{\tau},$$

$$\Lambda_t = C \mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \leq t).$$

- If Λ' exists on $[0, T)$, densities $p(t, \cdot)$ of \bar{Y}_t solve

$$\partial_t p = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} p + \Lambda'_t \partial_x p, \quad p(0, \cdot) = f, \quad p(\cdot, 0) = 0,$$

$$\Lambda'_t = \frac{C}{2} \partial_x p(t, 0), \quad t \in [0, T).$$

- Change of variables: $u(t, x) := p(t, x - \Lambda_t)$, $x \geq \Lambda_t$, $t \in [0, T)$.

Connection to Stefan problem cont.

- **Supercooled Stefan problem (1D, one phase):**

$$\partial_t u = \frac{1}{2} \partial_{xx} u \quad \text{on} \quad \{(t, x) \in [0, \infty)^2 : x \geq \Lambda_t\},$$

$$\Lambda'_t = C \partial_x u(t, \Lambda_t), \quad t \geq 0,$$

$$u(0, x) = f(x), \quad x \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad u(t, \Lambda_t) = 0, \quad t \geq 0,$$

where $f \geq 0$, $C \geq 0$.

- **Blow-up:** for some $T < \infty$, $\lim_{t \uparrow T} \Lambda'_t = \infty$.
- **Classical solution** on $[0, T)$.

Brief history of Stefan problems

- **Stefan 1889–1891: free boundary problems** for the **heat equation**.
- Physical models of **ice formation; evaporation & condensation**.
- Dormant until **Brillouin '31, Rubinshtein: ≈ 2500 papers** by '67.
- **Kamenomostkaja '61: definitive solution**.
- **'70-today: supercooled Stefan problem**.
- **Sherman '70: presence of blow-ups**.
- For some $T < \infty$: **boundary speed $\rightarrow \infty$** .

Back to our physical solutions: questions

- By the theorem, a **physical solution** \bar{Y} with **rcll paths exists**.
- How do the **jumps** in \bar{Y} arise? \longleftrightarrow systemic crises, synchronization of neurons, leaps of the solid/liquid frontier.
- E.g., what can one say about

$$t_{\Delta} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \Delta\bar{Y}_t \neq 0\}$$

and the empirical log-asset distribution $\mathcal{L}(\bar{Y}_{t_{\Delta}-})$ right before t_{Δ} ?

Main theorem I: regular interval

Theorem (Nadtochiy, S. '17) Suppose $\bar{Y}_0 \stackrel{d}{=} \nu$ has a density $f_\nu \in W_2^1([0, \infty))$ and $f_\nu(0) = 0$.

Then: there exists $t_{reg} > 0$ such that on $[0, t_{reg})$ all physical solutions are indistinguishable and satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{Y}_t &= \bar{Y}_0 + \alpha t + \sigma B_t + \int_0^t \lambda_s ds, \quad t \in [0, \bar{\tau} \wedge t_{reg}), \\ \lambda_t &= C \partial_t \log \mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} > t), \quad t \in [0, t_{reg}).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $t_{reg} = \inf\{t > 0 : \|\lambda\|_{L^2([0,t])} = \infty\}$.

Main theorem II: description of jumps

Theorem (Nadtochiy, S. '17) Consider a physical solution \bar{Y} .

Then:

(a) the time of the first jump $t_\Delta := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \Delta \bar{Y}_t \neq 0\}$ is given by

$$t_\Delta = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : \exists \eta > 0 \text{ s.t. } \frac{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t, \bar{Y}_{t-\epsilon} \in (0, y))}{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t)} \geq \frac{y}{C}, y \in [0, \eta] \right\},$$

and

(b) the size of the jump at t_Δ is

$$\sup \left\{ \eta \geq 0 : \frac{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t_\Delta, \bar{Y}_{t_\Delta-\epsilon} \in (0, y))}{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} \geq t_\Delta)} \geq \frac{y}{C}, y \in [0, \eta] \right\}.$$

All regimes, uniqueness (Delarue, Nadtochiy, S. '19)

- For **uniqueness**, need to understand **all** regimes.
- **Case 1:** \bar{Y}_{t-} has a density $f \in C^1([0, \infty)) \cap C^\omega((0, \infty))$, $f(0) = 0$.
 $\implies \dot{\Lambda} = \lambda$ is continuous on $[t, t + \varepsilon)$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.
- **Case 2:** \bar{Y}_{t-} has a density $f \in C^\omega((0, \infty))$, $f(0+) \in [0, 1/C)$.
 $\implies \Lambda$ is $(1/2 + \delta)$ -Hölder on $[t, t + \varepsilon)$, back to **Case 1** on $(t, t + \varepsilon)$.
- **Case 3:** \bar{Y}_{t-} has a density $f \in C^\omega((0, \infty))$, $f(0+) \geq 1/C$.
 $\implies \Lambda_t - \Lambda_{t-} = -\inf \{y \geq 0 : \mathbb{P}(\bar{Y}_{t-} \in (0, y]) < y/C\}$,
back to **Case 1** on $(t, t + \varepsilon)$.
- **Uniqueness** follows from this and sandwiching between two **maximal** physical solutions.

General networks (Nadtochiy, S. '18)

- More generally, may replace

$$\bar{Y}_t = \bar{Y}_0 + \alpha t + \sigma \bar{B}_t + \Lambda_t,$$

$$\Lambda_t := C \log \mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau} > t), \quad \bar{\tau} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t \leq 0\}$$

by its **network** version:

$$\bar{Y}_t^x = \bar{Y}_0^x + \int_0^t \alpha_s^x ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s^x d\bar{B}_s + \Lambda_t^x,$$

$$\Lambda_t^x := C^x \int_{\mathcal{X}} \log \mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau}^{x'} > t) \kappa(x, dx'), \quad \bar{\tau}^{x'} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \bar{Y}_t^{x'} \leq 0\}.$$

- Hereby, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ are different **types of banks**, stochastic kernel κ defines a **weighted directed network** on \mathcal{X} .

General networks: questions

- Does a solution $\{\bar{Y}^x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ with rcll paths still **exist**?

Yes, can prove this directly using a **new Schauder's theorem** for the **Skorokhod M1 topology**.

- How do the **jumps** in $\{\bar{Y}^x\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ arise?

\longleftrightarrow systemic crises/synchronization of neurons.

- E.g., what can one say about

$$t_{\Delta} := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \Delta \bar{Y}_t^x \neq 0 \text{ for some } x \in \mathcal{X}\}$$

and empir. log-asset distributions $\{\mathcal{L}(\bar{Y}_{t_{\Delta}-}^x)\}_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$ **right before** t_{Δ} ?

Preparation: logarithmic Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue

- Let \mathcal{X} is **finite**.
- Suppose that the time $t-$ configuration satisfies

$$\frac{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau}^x \geq t, \bar{Y}_{t-}^x \in (0, y))}{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\tau}^x \geq t)} \geq c^x y, \quad y \in [0, \eta^x], \quad x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

- If the matrix $(C^x \kappa(x, \{x'\}) c^{x'})_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}}$ is **irreducible**, the limit

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \int_{\mathcal{X}^n} \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} (C^{x_m} c^{x_{m+1}}) \kappa(x_0, dx_1) \dots \kappa(x_{n-1}, dx_n)$$

is referred to as its **logarithmic Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue**.

General networks: jump criterion

Theorem (Nadtochiy, S. '18) Suppose that $\alpha^x \leq \bar{\alpha}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\underline{\sigma} \leq \sigma^x \leq \bar{\sigma}$, $x \in \mathcal{X}$ with suitable $\bar{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\underline{\sigma}, \bar{\sigma} \in (0, \infty)$.

If $(C^x \kappa(x, \{x'\}) c^{x'})_{x, x' \in \mathcal{X}}$ is irreducible with a strictly positive logarithmic Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue, then

$$\Delta \bar{Y}_t^x \neq 0$$

for at least one $x \in \mathcal{X}$.

THANK YOU
FOR YOUR ATTENTION!