

Optimal Clearing Payments in a Financial Contagion Model

Giuseppe Calafiore, Giulia Fracastoro, and Anton V. Proskurnikov

Abstract—Modern financial networks are characterized by complex structures of mutual obligations. Such interconnections may propagate and amplify individual defaults, leading in some cases to financial disaster. For this reason, mathematical models for the study and control of systemic risk (the risk of severe instabilities on the system as a whole, due to default of single entities) have attracted considerable research attention in recent years. One important line of research is concerned with mechanisms of *clearing*, that is, the mechanism by which mutual debts are repaid, in the regular regime, or in a default regime. One of the first models of a clearing mechanism was proposed by Eisenberg and Noe in [1] and is based on the three rules: limited liability, the priority of debt claims over the shareholders' interests, and the equal priority of debts (pro-rata rule). These three principles naturally lead to the concept of clearing vector (the vector of the entities' total payments). In this paper, we propose a necessary and sufficient condition for the uniqueness of clearing vector applicable to an arbitrary topology of the financial network. Further, we show that the overall system loss can be reduced if one relaxes the pro-rata rule and replaces the clearing vector by a matrix of clearing payments. This approach shifts the focus from the individual interest to the system, or social, interest, in order to control and contain the adverse effects of cascaded failures.

I. INTRODUCTION

Globalization has led to highly interconnected financial systems, where organizations - from private firms to governmental institutions - are densely linked to each other with an intricate structure of obligations. The behavior of such financial interconnected system has been extensively studied over the past years, see for instance [2], [3]. The interconnections among financial institutions create potential channels of contagion, where a failure of a single entity of the system can result in a threat to the stability of the entire global financial system. Recent examples of such a behaviour include the collapse of Lehman Brothers, being one of the reasons of the global-wide financial crisis in 2008, the government bailout of the giant insurance company AIG in order to prevent a failure cascade, and the exposure of European banks to potential defaults by some European countries. For this reason, much effort has been invested in understanding the effects of systemic risk: how stresses, such as bankrupts and failures, to one part of the system can spread to others, and eventually lead to avalanche breakdown, see, e.g., [1], [4]–[6].

An important line of research pursued in systemic risk theory focuses on development of realistic models of *clearing*

procedures between financial institutions. Clearing allows to reduce the absolute liabilities by a full or partial reimbursement of credits in order to diminish eventual consequences of defaults [7]. The seminal work in [1] introduced a simple model of clearing in a financial network, in which financial institutions have two types of assets: the external assets (e.g., incoming cash flows) and the internal assets (e.g., some funds that banks lend to one another). The model from [1] assumes that the obligations of all entities (nodes) within the financial system are paid simultaneously and are determined by three fundamental rules: 1) limited liability, that is, the total payment of each node can not exceed its available cash flow; 2) the priority of the debt claims, that is, stockholders receive no value until the node is able to completely pay off all of its outstanding liabilities; 3) the proportionality, or pro-rata rule, that is, all debts have equal priority, so that all claimant institutions are paid proportionally to their nominal claims. Under these assumptions, the matrix of mutual interbank payments is uniquely determined by the so-called *clearing vector* that is found from a nonlinear equation. Using the Knaster-Tarski fixed-point theorem, it was shown in [1] that a clearing vector always exists. Furthermore, such vector is unique under certain regularity assumptions, see [1], [8].

The basic model offered in [1] has been later extended in various directions, incorporating non-trivial features of real-world financial networks. The models presented in [9], [10], for instance, take into account cross-holdings and seniorities of liabilities, and the works of [11], [12] introduce the concept of liquidity risk. Other works considered also illiquid assets [13], cross-ownership of equities and liabilities [14], decentralized clearing processes [15], and multiple maturity dates [16].

The contribution of the present work is twofold. First, we address the problem of the uniqueness of the clearing vector. The first sufficient graph-theoretical condition for its uniqueness was obtained in [1] (see also the works [7], [17], giving a simpler and more elegant proof): the clearing vector is unique if the financial network is *regular*, which means that every bank either has an outside asset, or has a (direct or indirect) creditor with outside assets. Another sufficient condition for uniqueness is formulated in [6]: the clearing vector is unique if each node of the network has a chain of liability to the external sector. Both conditions, even though they hold in the generic situation, are only sufficient yet not necessary. To the best of our knowledge, the only necessary and sufficient condition for the clearing vector's uniqueness applicable to an arbitrary financial network available in the literature is the very general result from [18], which examines the uniqueness of equilibria in a dynamical flow network

The authors are with the Department of Electronics and Telecommunications, Politecnico di Torino, Turin, Italy. E-mails: {giuseppe.calafiore, giulia.fracastoro, anton.proskurnikov}@polito.it.

with saturations. As it will be discussed below in Section IV, this criterion (similar to criteria previously developed in [19]) appears to be superfluous for the classical Eisenberg-Noe model, being primarily motivated by the more general models from [20]. In this paper, we give an alternative necessary and sufficient criterion, which is simpler for validation than the criterion in [18]. In particular, as will be discussed, we do not need to compute the dominating left and right eigenvectors of the payment matrix. Similar to the algorithm from [18], our method in fact allows to find the set of all clearing vectors (being a convex polytope). We also derive some new properties of the maximal (or dominant) clearing vector, in particular, the criterion for its positivity.

The second aspect addressed in this paper is the relaxation of the proportionality (pro-rata) rule. Although this rule seems fair at the “local” level of a node (all debts have equal priority) and allows in general to determine the matrix of payments uniquely, we show that its abolishment allows to reduce the total system loss, intended as the deviation between the nominal and actual payment vector, in some norm [6]. A natural question thus arises: what is the “price” of a pro-rata restriction in terms of the system loss? Although analytic comparison between the optimal proportional and non-proportional clearing policies is difficult, we provide a numerical experiment using a synthetic random network model inspired by a standard “testbench” network from [21]. One downside of relaxing the pro-rata rule is the loss of the clearing matrix uniqueness; furthermore, even the *optimal* clearing matrix can be non-unique. Also, the feasible payment matrices do not constitute a complete lattice, in particular, even for very simple financial networks with $n = 3$ nodes the minimal and maximal payment matrix may fail to exist.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II defines the notation used in the paper. Section III introduces the Eisenberg-Noe model and related concepts. Section IV offers a necessary and sufficient condition for the clearing vector’s uniqueness, in the situation where the pro-rata constraint is adopted. In Section V, we consider the set of clearing matrices that do not satisfy the pro-rata rule. We demonstrate that one such matrix can always be found by solving a convex optimization problem aimed at minimizing the the system loss. However, in general the optimal clearing matrix is non-unique, furthermore, the set of such matrices has no minimal and maximal elements. Section VI presents numerical simulations to compare the system losses in the cases where the proportionality rule is adopted and where it is discarded. Section VII concludes the paper.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND NOTATION

Given a finite set \mathcal{V} , the symbol $|\mathcal{V}|$ stands for its cardinality. For two families of real numbers $(a_\xi)_{\xi \in \Xi}, (b_\xi)_{\xi \in \Xi}$, the symbol $a \leq b$ (b dominates a , or a is dominated by b) denotes the element-wise relation $a_\xi \leq b_\xi \forall \xi \in \Xi$. We write $a \lesssim b$ if $a \leq b$ and $a \neq b$. The operations \min, \max are also defined elementwise, e.g., $\min(a, b) \doteq (\min(a_\xi, b_\xi))_{\xi \in \Xi}$. These notation symbols apply to both vectors (usually, $\Xi = \{1, \dots, n\}$) and matrices (usually, $\Xi = \{1, \dots, n\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}$).

Every nonnegative square matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}}$ corresponds to a weighted digraph $\mathcal{G}[A] = (\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{E}[A], A)$ whose nodes are indexed by \mathcal{I} and whose set of arcs is defined as $\mathcal{E}[A] = \{(i, j) : a_{ij} > 0\}$. The value a_{ij} can be interpreted as a weight of arc (i, j) , which is also denoted as $i \rightarrow j$. A sequence of arcs $i_0 \rightarrow i_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow i_{s-1} \rightarrow i_s$ constitute a *walk* between nodes i_0 and i_s in graph $\mathcal{G}[A]$. The set of nodes $J \subseteq \mathcal{I}$ is *reachable* from node i if $i \in J$ or a walk from i to some element $j \in J$ exists; J is called *globally reachable* in the graph if it is reachable from every node $i \notin J$.

A graph is strongly connected (strong) if every two nodes i, j are mutually reachable. A graph that is not strong has several strongly connected components (for brevity, we call them simply *components*). A component is said to be non-trivial if it contains more than one node. A component is said to be a *sink* component if no arc leaves it and a *source* component if no arc enters it.

The spectral radius of a square matrix A is denoted by $\rho(A)$. We call a matrix A *Schur stable* if $\rho(A) < 1$.

A nonnegative square matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}}$ is said to be *stochastic* if all its rows sum to 1: $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} a_{ij} = 1 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$ and *substochastic* if $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} a_{ij} \leq 1 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Introducing the vector of ones $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$, matrix $A \geq 0$ is stochastic if $A\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$ and substochastic if $A\mathbf{1} \leq \mathbf{1}$.

The well-known Gershgorin disk theorem implies that $\rho(A) \leq 1$ for any substochastic matrix A . If A is stochastic, then $\rho(A) = 1$ and A cannot be Schur stable. In general, Schur stability of a substochastic matrix admits an elegant characterization in terms of the matrix graph.

Lemma 1: Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I} \times \mathcal{I}}$ be a substochastic matrix. Then the following three statements are equivalent:

- 1) Matrix A is Schur stable: $\rho(A) < 1$;
- 2) For any subset of indices $\mathcal{I}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, the corresponding submatrix $A^0 = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}_0}$ is *not* stochastic;
- 3) The set of nodes $\mathcal{I}_d = \{i : \sum_j a_{ij} < 1\}$ is globally reachable in the graph $\mathcal{G}[A]$ (in particular, $\mathcal{I}_d \neq \emptyset$).

In particular, an irreducible substochastic matrix is either Schur stable or stochastic.

Proof: Implication 3 \implies 1 is a well-known fact, see e.g. [22, Lemma 5] and [23, Lemma 1]. To prove 1 \implies 2) notice that if A has a stochastic submatrix $A^0 = (a_{i,j})_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}_0}$, then $0 \leq \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{I}_0} a_{ik} \leq 1 - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} a_{jk} = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_0$, that is, $a_{ik} = 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}_0, k \notin \mathcal{I}_0$. Hence, A is decomposable as follows

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A^0 & \mathbf{O} \\ * & * \end{pmatrix},$$

where \mathbf{O} is a block of zeros and $*$ stand for some other submatrices. Hence, 1 is an eigenvalue of A and $\rho(A) = 1$.

To prove implication 2 \implies 3, assume, on the contrary that 2) holds yet \mathcal{I}_d cannot be reached from some node $i \notin \mathcal{I}_d$. Let \mathcal{I}_0 stand for the set of nodes reachable from i (including i itself). By assumption, $\mathcal{I}_0 \cap \mathcal{I}_d = \emptyset$ and no arc leaves the set \mathcal{I}_0 . Therefore, $a_{jk} = 0$ whenever $j \in \mathcal{I}_0, k \notin \mathcal{I}_0$ and one has

$$1 = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} a_{jk} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_0} a_{jk} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{I}_0,$$

that is, $A^0 = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}_0}$ is stochastic submatrix. \blacksquare

III. FINANCIAL NETWORKS

We henceforth use the notation introduced in [6], except for a few minor changes. A *financial network* may be represented as a weighted graph $\mathcal{G} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}, \bar{P})$ whose nodes stand for financial institutions (banks, funds, insurance companies etc.) and whose weighted adjacency matrix $\bar{P} = (\bar{p}_{ij})$ represents the mutual liabilities of the institutions. Namely, entry $\bar{p}_{ij} \geq 0$ stands for the obligation of payment from node i to node j at the end of the current time period, and arc $(i, j) \in \mathcal{E}$ from node i to node j exists if and only if $\bar{p}_{ij} > 0$. By definition, $\bar{p}_{ii} = 0 \forall i$, so the graph contains no self-arcs.

Along with mutual liabilities, the banks have *outside assets*. The outside asset $\bar{c}_i \geq 0$ is the total payment due from non-financial entities (the external sector) to node i ; these numbers constitute vector $\bar{c} = (\bar{c}_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$. Similarly, one can consider the outside liability of node i is the total payment $\bar{b}_i \geq 0$ from node i to the non-financial sector. Often the outside liabilities are replaced by payments to an additional “fictitious” node, representing the external sector [1]. Adding this “virtual” node to \mathcal{V} , we may assume without loss of generality that $\bar{b} = 0$.

For each node i , we define the nominal in-flow and out-flow (standing for the *asset* and *liability* sides of the balance sheet):

$$\bar{\phi}_i^{\text{in}} \doteq \bar{c}_i + \sum_{k \neq i} \bar{p}_{ki}, \quad \bar{p}_i \doteq \bar{\phi}_i^{\text{out}} \doteq \sum_{k \neq i} \bar{p}_{ik}. \quad (1)$$

The nodes with $\bar{p}_i = 0$ have no outgoing arcs and, according to the graph-theoretical terminology, they are called *sinks*. As mentioned before, one such node can be fictiously defined for the purpose of collecting the debts to the external sector. In general, however, other sinks may exist in the network.

Normally, $\bar{\phi}_i^{\text{in}} \geq \bar{\phi}_i^{\text{out}}$, that is, each bank is able to pay its debts at the end of the current period. The main concern of systemic risk theory is the situation where some banks suffer financial shocks, and their outside assets drop to smaller values $c_i \in [0, \bar{c}_i)$. In this situation, it may happen that

$$c_i + \sum_{k \neq i} \bar{p}_{ki} < \bar{p}_i,$$

in which situation node i is unable to fully meet its payment obligations and hence *defaults*. When in default, a node pays out according to its capacity, thus reducing the amounts paid to the adjacent nodes, which in turn, for this reason, may also default and reduce their payments, etc. As a result of default, the *actual* payment $p_{ij} \in [0, \bar{p}_{ij}]$ from node i to node j , in general, may be less than the nominal due payment \bar{p}_{ij} . A natural question arises: which matrices of actual payments $P = (p_{ij}) \leq \bar{P}$ may be considered as “fair” in the case of default? We shall see that the pro-rata rule is a commonly accepted rule for allocating payments in the case of default, but we shall also explore an alternative approach that aims at minimizing the overall loss over the financial system.

Denote the vectors of actual in-flows and out-flows by

$$\phi^{\text{in}} \doteq c + P^{\top} \mathbf{1}, \quad p \doteq \phi^{\text{out}} \doteq P \mathbf{1}. \quad (2)$$

The minimal requirements to the matrix of actual payments $P = P(c)$ are as follows [1]:

- i) (**limited liability**) The total payment of node i does not exceed the in-flow, that is, $\phi_i^{\text{in}} \geq \phi_i^{\text{out}}$;

- ii) (**absolute priority of debt claims**) Either node i pays its obligations in full ($p_i = \bar{p}_i$), or it pays all its value to the creditors ($p_i = \phi_i^{\text{in}}$).

Recalling that $P \leq \bar{P}$ and thus $p = P \mathbf{1} \leq \bar{p}$, conditions i)-ii) may be reformulated in the following compact form

$$P \mathbf{1} = \min(\bar{p}, c + P^{\top} \mathbf{1}). \quad (3)$$

Definition 1: A matrix P is called a *clearing matrix* (or matrix of clearing payments) corresponding to the vector of outside assets c , if $0 \leq P \leq \bar{P}$ and (3) holds.

Notice that (3) is a system of $n \doteq |\mathcal{V}|$ nonlinear equations with n^2 variables p_{ij} . Hence, one cannot expect to find a unique solution. To provide the uniqueness of the solution (in the generic situation), a third requirement has been introduced in [1] known the *proportionality* or *pro-rata* rule, which expresses the requirement that all debts have equal priority and must be paid in proportion to the initial claims. The imposition of this rule reduces the number of variables to $n = |\mathcal{V}|$. It is known [1] that the clearing vector always exists, also, one such vectors can be found by solving a convex optimization problem with n variables. In Section IV, we find a necessary and sufficient criterion for such a vector’s uniqueness, extending the sufficient conditions previously found in [1], [6]. We also offer an algorithm to find the set of all clearing vectors.

Also, an idea we propose in this work is the possibility of turning away from the pro-rata rule, and compute instead an optimal clearing matrix which guarantees the best possible system-level performance. Such clearing matrix can be computed by solving a convex optimization problem in n^2 variables, as discussed in Section IV. The underlying philosophy is that while the pro-rata rule is enforced in order to be fair locally for the individual nodes involved in the payment obligations, the optimal clearing matrix approach aims at being fair globally, by devising clearing payments that minimize the overall impact of defaults on the whole system. This second approach indeed outperforms the method of pro-rata clearing vector in terms of the overall system loss, as will be demonstrated in Section VI by numerical experiments on a random synthetic network, inspired by networks from [21].

IV. PRO-RATA RULE AND CLEARING VECTORS

One standard approach to determine the clearing payments is based on imposing additional restrictions on the payments p_{ij} , stating that the payments of node i to the claimants should be proportional to the nominal payments \bar{p}_{ij} . It is convenient to introduce the matrix of normalized, or *relative* liabilities

$$A = (a_{ij}), \quad a_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{\bar{p}_{ij}}{\bar{p}_i}, & \bar{p}_i > 0, \\ 1, & \bar{p}_i = 0 \wedge i = j, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

By definition, the matrix A is *stochastic*, that is, $a_{ij} \geq 0$ and $\sum_j a_{ij} = 1$ for all i or, equivalently, $A \mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}$. The pro-rata rule can then be formulated as

$$p_{ij} = p_i a_{ij}, \quad \forall i, j \in \mathcal{V}. \quad (5)$$

Condition (5) is known as *pro-rata* [6], proportionality [8], or equal priority [1] rule. Under this rule,

$$(P^\top \mathbf{1})_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} (P^\top)_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_{ji} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} p_j a_{ji} = (A^\top p)_i \quad \forall i,$$

which allows to rewrite (3) in the equivalent vector form

$$p = \min(\bar{p}, c + A^\top p). \quad (6)$$

Definition 2: Under the assumption (5), the vector p is said to be a *clearing* vector if $p \geq 0$ and (6) holds.

The existence of a clearing vector is usually proved by appealing to the general Knaster-Tarski fixed-point theorem [1], [7]. This theorem implies that the set of clearing vectors is non-empty and, furthermore, constitutes a complete lattice (with respect to the relation \leq), therefore, the *minimal* and *maximal* clearing vectors do exist. This monotonicity-based approach is convenient, because it allows to prove the existence of clearing vectors in more complicated models [7], [24]. The Knaster-Tarski theorem also suggests an iterative procedure to compute some clearing vector, which was called the fictitious default algorithm [1]. This algorithm is in fact *distributed* in the sense that at each stage the entities use only “local” information (their outside assets and payments from their neighbors in the graph).

Below, we examine the properties of the maximal (or *dominant*) clearing vector, which can be found in several ways. One way for finding it is to solve a convex optimization (e.g., LP or QP) problem with n variables and $2n$ linear constraints (we use this approach in our numerical experiments). In the case of a large-scale network, these optimization problems can also be solved in a distributed way [25]. Another option is to use a modification of the fictitious default algorithm proposed in [8], which finds the maximal clearing vector in no more than n steps, and at each step one has to solve a non-degenerate system of linear equations of the dimension $O(n)$.

In degenerate situations, the clearing vector may be non-unique. For instance, if $A = I_n$, $\bar{p} = 0$ and $c = 0$, every vector p such that $0 \leq p \leq \bar{p}$, obviously, satisfies (6). We will see that the existence of such a “closed” subgroup of banks that are unaffected by the remaining network and external sector is in fact the only reason for non-uniqueness (Theorem 2 below). Below we find necessary and sufficient conditions for the clearing vector’s uniqueness and show that, even if this condition does not hold, some of the clearing vector’s elements are uniquely determined by A and c .

A. The dominant clearing vector – Extremal properties

Although the existence of a maximal clearing vector is usually proved via the Knaster-Tarski fixed-point theorem, we consider an alternative construction, which also clarifies the geometrical meaning of this vector.

Consider the convex polyhedron

$$\mathcal{D} = [0, \bar{p}] \cap \{p : c + A^\top p \geq p\}. \quad (7)$$

Obviously, the set \mathcal{D} is non-empty (containing, e.g., the null vector), being thus a convex hull spanned by several extreme points (or vertices). The following lemma shows that one of

the extreme points is the maximal (with respect to \leq relation) element of \mathcal{D} , and also the maximal clearing vector.

Definition 3: A function $F : [0, \bar{p}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called non-increasing (respectively, decreasing) if $F(p^1) \geq F(p^2)$ (respectively, $F(p^1) > F(p^2)$) whenever $p^1, p^2 \in [0, \bar{p}]$ and $p^1 \leq p^2$ (respectively, $p^1 \leq p^2$).

Lemma 2: The polyhedron (7) has the following properties:

- 1) a *maximal* point $p^* \in \mathcal{D}$ exists that dominates all other points $p^* \geq p$, for all $p \in \mathcal{D}$;
- 2) p^* is a global minimizer in the optimization problem

$$\min F(x) \quad \text{subject to} \quad x \in \mathcal{D} \quad (8)$$

whenever function $F : [0, \bar{p}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is non-increasing. If F is decreasing, then p^* is the *unique* minimizer in (8).

- 3) p^* is a clearing vector for the financial network.

Proof: Since \mathcal{D} is compact (closed and bounded), the projection map $p \mapsto p_i$ reaches a maximal value $p_i^* = \max_{p \in \mathcal{D}} p_i$. The vector $p^* \doteq (p_i^*)_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$, by construction, dominates every vector from \mathcal{D} . It remains to show that this vector belongs to \mathcal{D} . By definition, $p_i^* \in [0, \bar{p}_i] \forall i$. Also, $c + A^\top p^* \geq c + A^\top p \geq p \forall p \in \mathcal{D}$. Hence, for each index $i \in \mathcal{V}$ one has

$$(c + A^\top p^*)_i \geq p_i \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{D}.$$

Taking the maximum over all p , one shows that

$$(c + A^\top p^*)_i \geq p_i^* = \max_{p \in \mathcal{D}} p_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V},$$

i.e., $c + A^\top p^* \geq p^*$. The proof of the first statement is then finished. The second statement is now straightforward from Definition 3. The third statement follows from [1, Lemma 4], stating that every minimizer in problem (8) with a decreasing function F is a clearing vector. We give the proof for the reader’s convenience. Assume, by the purpose of contradiction, that (6) fails to hold, that is, $p_i^* < \min(\bar{p}_i, c_i + \sum_{k \neq i} a_{ki} p_k^*)$ for some i . Consider the vector $\hat{p} \doteq p^* + \delta e_i$, where $\delta > 0$ is sufficiently small and e_i is the coordinate vector whose i th coordinate is 1 and others are null. By noticing that $(c + A^\top \hat{p})_i > \hat{p}_i$ and

$$(c + A^\top \hat{p})_j \geq (c + A^\top p^*)_j \geq p_j^* = \hat{p}_j \quad \forall j \neq i,$$

one shows that $\hat{p} \in \mathcal{D}$, which contradicts to Statement 1. ■

The clearing vector p^* from Lemma 2 is henceforth referred to as the *dominant* clearing vector, because it dominates all elements of \mathcal{D} (and, in particular all clearing vectors). Fig. 1 illustrates the possible structures of polyhedron \mathcal{D} and the location of p^* in the case of two financial institutions.

Lemma 2 implies that one of the clearing vectors can be found by solving the following convex QP problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \|\bar{\phi}^{\text{in}} - \phi^{\text{in}}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{p} \geq p \geq 0 \\ & c + A^\top p \geq p, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$




Fig. 1. The set \mathcal{D} and the dominant clearing vector in the case of two nodes.

where $\phi^{\text{in}} = c + A^\top p$, $\bar{\phi}^{\text{in}} = \bar{c} + A^\top \bar{p}$. Alternatively, one may solve the LP program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{p \in \mathbb{R}^n} \quad & \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{\phi}_i^{\text{in}} - \phi_i^{\text{in}}) \\ \text{s.t.:} \quad & \bar{p} \geq p \geq 0 \\ & c + A^\top p \geq p. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

It can be easily shown that both $\|\phi^{\text{in}} - \bar{\phi}^{\text{in}}\|_2^2$ and $\|\phi^{\text{in}} - \bar{\phi}^{\text{in}}\|_1 = \mathbf{1}^\top (\bar{\phi}^{\text{in}} - \phi^{\text{in}})$ are decreasing on $[0, \bar{p}]$. Hence, the unique minimizer $p = p^*$ exists in the optimization problems (9) and (10). Notice that usually uniqueness of a solution is guaranteed only for *strictly* convex function, whereas the linear function (10) is not strictly convex, and the function (9) fails to be strictly convex if $\det A = 0$.

It should be noted that the optimization problems to find the dominant clearing vector admit various reformulations; some of them were used in [26] to study the sensitivity of the clearing vector to system's parameters.

The extremal property of the dominant clearing vector p^* and Lemma 1 allows us to prove the following lemma, showing that most elements of p^* are positive.

Lemma 3: The element p_i^* of the dominant clearing vector is positive if and only if i is not a sink node ($\bar{p}_i > 0$) and one of the following conditions holds:

- 1) i has outside assets, that is, $c_i > 0$;
- 2) i is reachable from some node $j \neq i$ with $c_j > 0$;
- 3) the strongly connected component of graph \mathcal{G} to which i belongs is a sink component.

Proof: We start with “if” part. If $c_i > 0$ and $\bar{p}_i > 0$, then polytope \mathcal{D} , obviously, contains the vector εe_i , where $\varepsilon \in (0, \min(c_i, \bar{p}_i))$. Since $p^* = \max \mathcal{D}$, we have $p_i^* > 0$ whenever condition 1) holds. Notice also that if $p_j^* > 0, p_i^* > 0$ and $a_{ji} > 0$, then (6) implies that $p_i^* > 0$. Hence, condition 2) also entails that $p_i^* > 0$. Assume now that condition 3) holds and let \mathcal{I} be the set of nodes of the strongly connected component containing i . Since i is not a sink, this component is non-trivial (contains two or more nodes), and for each $j \in \mathcal{I}$ we have $\bar{p}_j > 0$. Also, the submatrix $\tilde{A} = (a_{jk})_{j,k \in \mathcal{I}}$ is stochastic and irreducible, hence, in view of the Perron-Frobenius theorem, there exist a *strictly positive* eigenvector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ such that

$A^\top v = v$. Rescaling, one may assume that $v_i \leq \bar{p}_i \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. Hence, \mathcal{D} contains the vector p , where

$$p_j \doteq \begin{cases} v_j, j \in \mathcal{I} \\ 0, j \notin \mathcal{I} \end{cases} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{V},$$

in particular, $p_i^* \geq p_i > 0$.

To prove the “only if” part, notice first that $p_i^* > 0$ entails that $\bar{p}_i > 0$, so i is not a sink node. Assume, on the contrary, that none of 1)-3) holds. Consider again the strongly connected component $\mathcal{I} \ni i$ and the corresponding irreducible submatrix $\tilde{A} = (a_{jk})_{j,k \in \mathcal{I}}$. Since condition 3) is violated, we have $\rho \doteq \rho(\tilde{A}) < 1$. Introducing the *positive* Perron-Frobenius eigenvector $v \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $\tilde{A}^\top v = v$ and (6) entails that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} v_j p_j^* &\leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} v_j \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} a_{kj} p_k^* + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} v_j \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{I}} a_{kj} p_k^* \leq \\ &\leq \rho \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}} v_k p_k^* + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}} v_j \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{I}} a_{kj} p_k^*. \end{aligned}$$

The latter inequality may hold only if $k \notin \mathcal{I}$ exists such that $a_{kj} p_k^* > 0$. In other words, there exists another strongly connected component $\mathcal{I}_1 \neq \mathcal{I}$ such that $p_j^* > 0 \forall j \in \mathcal{I}_1$ and \mathcal{I}_1 is connected to \mathcal{I} by at least one arc (this implies that no arc can go from \mathcal{I} to \mathcal{I}_1). Since condition 2) is violated for i , conditions 1 and 2 are also violated for every $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}_1$. Now we can repeat the argument, replacing \mathcal{I} by \mathcal{I}_1 and find another strongly connected component $\mathcal{I}_2 \neq \mathcal{I}_1$, such that at least one arc comes from \mathcal{I}_2 to \mathcal{I}_1 (in view of this $\mathcal{I}_2 \neq \mathcal{I}$), $p_j^* > 0 \forall j \in \mathcal{I}_2$ and none element of \mathcal{I}_2 satisfies condition 1 or 2. Repeating this process, one could construct the infinite set of disjoint strongly connected components $\mathcal{I}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{I}_1, \mathcal{I}_2, \dots$ such that \mathcal{I}_s is connected to \mathcal{I}_{s-1} , $p_j^* > 0 \forall j \in \mathcal{I}_s$ yet conditions 1 and 2 fail to hold for $i \in \mathcal{I}_s$. This leads to the contradiction (the set of nodes \mathcal{V} is finite). ■

B. Uniqueness of the clearing vector: a sufficient condition

In this subsection, we offer a *sufficient* condition ensuring that no clearing vectors other than the dominant clearing vector p^* exist. Furthermore, we show that *some* elements of the clearing vectors are always determined uniquely.

We start with introducing some auxiliary notation. Let $C^+ \doteq \{i : c_i > 0\}$ stand for the set of nodes that have outside assets and $S \doteq \{i : \bar{p}_i = 0\}$ stand for the set of sink nodes that owe no liability payments (and thus have no outgoing arcs in the graph). We introduce the set

$$I_0 \doteq C^+ \cup S = \{i : c_i > 0 \vee \bar{p}_i = 0\}. \quad (11)$$

The following lemma establishes a sufficient condition for uniqueness of the clearing vector.

Lemma 4: If the set I_0 is *globally* reachable in the graph of a financial network \mathcal{G} , then the dominant clearing vector p^* is the only clearing vector corresponding to the vector of outside assets c . More generally, let $I'_0 \supseteq I_0$ stand for the set of all nodes in the graph \mathcal{G} , from where I_0 can be reached. Then, for *every* clearing vector p we have $p_i = p_i^* \quad \forall i \in I'_0$.

Proof: Consider an arbitrary clearing vector p^0 and let $J \doteq \{i : p_i^0 < \bar{p}_i\}$. Our goal is to show that $p_i^0 = p_i^* \forall i \in I'_0$.

Step 1. In view of (6), the vector $p = p^0$ obeys the equations

$$p_i = \bar{p}_i \quad \forall i \notin J, \\ p_i = (c + A^\top p)_i = c_i + \sum_{k \notin J} a_{ki} \bar{p}_k + \sum_{j \in J} a_{ji} p_j \quad \forall i \in J. \quad (12)$$

Step 2. We are going to show that if (12) has at least one solution, then $p = p^*$ should be a solution to (12), every solution to the system (12) is a global minimizer in the optimization problem (8) with

$$F(p) \doteq \sum_{k \notin J} (\bar{p}_k - p_k) + \sum_{j \in J} \left(c_j + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ij} p_i - p_j \right). \quad (13)$$

If p^0 satisfies (12), then $F(p^0) = 0 \leq F(p) \forall p \in \mathcal{D}$. The function (13) is non increasing, because it can be written as

$$F(p) = \beta - b^\top p, \quad b_i \doteq 1 - \sum_{j \in I} a_{ij} \geq 0, \quad \beta = \text{const},$$

Lemma 2 guarantees that p^* is a global minimizer in (8) and $F(p^*) = 0$. Recalling that $p^* \in \mathcal{D}$, this is possible only if all addends in the right-hand side of (13) vanish as $p = p^*$.

Step 3. We now show that the equations (12) uniquely determine the subvector $(p_i)_{i \in I'_0}$. The first equation in (12) entails that $p_i = \bar{p}_i \forall i \in I'_0 \setminus J$. By construction, the set I'_0 cannot be reached from any other node $j \notin I'_0$ (otherwise, I_0 could also be reached from j), that is, $a_{ji} = 0$ whenever $i \in I'_0$ and $j \notin I'_0$. Hence, for all solutions to (12) one has

$$p_i = c_i + \sum_{k \notin J} a_{ki} \bar{p}_k + \sum_{j \in I'_0 \cap J} a_{ji} p_j \quad \forall i \in I'_0 \cap J. \quad (14)$$

We are now going to show that the matrix $\tilde{A} = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in I'_0 \cap J}$ is Schur stable. Assume, by purpose of contradiction, that $\rho(\tilde{A}) = 1$ and thus (see Lemma 1) \tilde{A} contains a *stochastic* submatrix $a_{ij})_{i,j \in K}$, where $K \subseteq I'_0 \cap J$. Since matrix A is also stochastic, one has $a_{ij} = 0$ whenever $i \in K$ and $j \in \mathcal{V} \setminus K$. Denoting

$$\tilde{z} \doteq (z_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}}, \quad z_i \doteq \begin{cases} 1, & i \in K, \\ 0, & i \notin K, \end{cases}$$

one obviously has $Az \geq z$ or, equivalently, $z^\top A^\top \geq z^\top$. The equations (14) and the first equation in (12) entail that

$$z^\top p = \sum_{i \in K} z_i p_i = \sum_{i \in K} z_i \left(c_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ji} p_j \right) \stackrel{z_i=0 \forall i \notin K}{=} \\ = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} z_i \left(c_i + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}} a_{ji} p_j \right) \geq z^\top c + z^\top p,$$

whence $z^\top c = 0$ and thus $K \cap C^+ = \emptyset$. On the other hand, $K \subseteq J \subseteq \mathcal{V} \setminus S$, therefore, K and I_0 are disjoint set. By construction, graph \mathcal{G} contains no arcs connecting K to nodes from $\mathcal{V} \setminus K$, in particular, I_0 is not reachable from K . This contradicts to the definition of I'_0 , which contains K .

We have shown that \tilde{A} is Schur stable, in particular, (14) has a unique solution. Since both p^0 and p^* satisfy (12) (and also (14)), $p_i^0 = p_i^*$ for all $i \in I'_0$, which finishes the proof. ■

Remark 1: Since each (simple) path in the graph ends in one of the *sink* components, it can be easily proved that the condition from Lemma 4 admits the following equivalent reformulation: each sink component of graph \mathcal{G} is either trivial (contains the only node) or has node i such that $c_i > 0$.

C. Uniqueness of the clearing vector: the general case

In this subsection, we derive two necessary and sufficient criteria of the clearing vector's uniqueness. The first of them (Theorem 1) assumes that the dominant clearing vector p^* is known. This result and the algorithm on which it relies allow not only to test the uniqueness of a clearing vector, but in fact also to describe the whole polytope of such vectors. If, however, one is interested only in the uniqueness of a clearing vector, a simpler graph-theoretic criterion can be used (Theorem 2) that does not require knowledge of p^* .

Assume that the condition from Lemma 4 does not hold, that is, $I'_0 \neq \mathcal{V}$. The banks corresponding to nodes from $\mathcal{V}_1 \doteq \mathcal{V} \setminus I'_0$ do not have outside assets ($\mathcal{V}_1 \cap C^+ = \emptyset$) and do not pay to nodes from I'_0 (otherwise, a chain of liability from them to I_0 would exist). Hence, matrix $A^1 \doteq (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{V}_1}$ is stochastic.

At the same time, nodes from I'_0 can have liability payments to nodes from \mathcal{V}_1 , which payments depend only on the dominant vector p^* and constitute the vector

$$c^{(1)} \doteq (c_i^{(1)})_{i \in \mathcal{V}_1}, \quad c_i^{(1)} = c_i^{(1)}(p^*) \doteq \sum_{k \in I'_0} a_{ki} p_k^*, \quad i \in \mathcal{V}_1.$$

We can now apply Lemma 4 to a reduced financial network \mathcal{G}_1 with the node set \mathcal{V}_1 , the normalized payment matrix A_1 and the vector of external assets $c^{(1)}$. Introducing the set¹

$$I_1 = \{i \in \mathcal{V}_1 : c_i^{(1)} > 0\}$$

and denoting $I'_1 \supseteq I_1$ all nodes from which set I_1 is reachable (banks that are connected by chains of liability to nodes from I_1), Lemma 4 ensures that the elements of the reduced network's clearing vector $p_i, i \in I'_1$, are determined *uniquely*. The definition (6) entails that for if p is a clearing vector for the original network, then its subvector $p^1 = (p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_1}$ is a clearing vector for the reduced network \mathcal{G}_1 . This also applies to p^* . Lemma 4 entails now that for each clearing vector p (in the original network) one has $p_i = p_i^* \forall i \in I'_1$.

If $I'_0 \cup I'_1 = \mathcal{V}$, we have uniqueness of the clearing vector. Otherwise, we have a group of banks $\mathcal{V}_2 = \mathcal{V} \setminus (I'_0 \cup I'_1)$ that are not in debt to the nodes from I'_1 and I'_0 , however, they can receive liability payments from the group I'_1 . For the group \mathcal{V}_2 , these payments may be considered as outside assets. Denote

$$c^{(2)} \doteq (c_i^{(2)})_{i \in \mathcal{V}_2}, \quad c_i^{(2)} \doteq \sum_{k \in I_1} a_{ki} p_k^*.$$

If the set $I_2 = \{i \in \mathcal{V}_2 : c_i^{(2)} > 0\}$ is non-empty, one can consider the set $I'_2 \supseteq I_2$ of all nodes from where I_2 can be reached. Lemma 1 implies that the elements $p_i, i \in I'_2$ of the clearing vector are uniquely determined: $p_i = p_i^* \forall i \in I'_2$.

We arrive at the following iterative procedure, which allows to test the clearing vector's uniqueness (and, in fact, even to find the whole state of clearing vectors).

¹Notice that unlike I_0 , the set I_1 contains no sink nodes. By construction, all sink nodes of the graph \mathcal{G} belong to I_0 .

Algorithm 1 The clearing vector's uniqueness test.

Initialization. Compute the dominant clearing vector p^* (e.g., by solving the QP (9) or the LP (9)). Set $q \leftarrow 0$, $I_0 \leftarrow C^+ \cup S = \{i : c_i > 0 \vee \bar{p}_i = 0\}$. Find the set $I'_0 \supseteq I_0$ of all nodes, from which I_0 is reachable.

repeat

- 1) $q \leftarrow q + 1$;
- 2) $\mathcal{V}_q \leftarrow \mathcal{V} \setminus (I'_0 \cup I_1 \dots \cup I'_{q-1})$;
- 3) compute the vector of payments from I'_{q-1} to \mathcal{V}_q

$$c^{(q)} = (c_i^{(q)})_{i \in \mathcal{V}_q}, \quad c_i^{(q)} \doteq \sum_{k \in I'_{q-1}} a_{ki} p_k^* \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_q;$$

- 4) find the set $I_q = \{i \in \mathcal{V}_q : c_i^{(q)} > 0\}$;
- 5) find the set $I'_q \supseteq I_q$ of nodes from \mathcal{V}_q , from where I_q can be reached in \mathcal{G} .

until $\mathcal{V}_q = \emptyset$ or $c^{(q)} = 0$.

Theorem 1: Algorithm 1 stops in a finite number of steps $s \geq 0$. The elements of a clearing vector, corresponding to indices $i \in I'_0 \cup I'_1 \cup \dots \cup I'_s$, are uniquely determined: $p_i = p_i^*$. The clearing vector is unique if and only if $\mathcal{V}_s = \emptyset$, otherwise, there are infinitely many clearing vectors. Precisely, p is a clearing vector if and only if

$$p_i = \begin{cases} p_i^*, & i \in I'_0 \cup I'_1 \dots \cup I'_s, \\ \xi_i, & i \in \mathcal{V}_s, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}_s}$ is an arbitrary vector satisfying the constraints

$$B^\top \xi = \xi, \quad 0 \leq \xi_i \leq \bar{p}_i \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_s, \quad B \doteq (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{V}_s}. \quad (16)$$

Proof: The first statement is obvious, since the sets I'_0, I'_1, \dots are disjoint and the set of all nodes \mathcal{V} is finite.

To prove the second statement, we show it via induction on $k = 0, 1, \dots$ that for each clearing vector p and each k we have $p_i = p_i^* \forall i \in I'_k$. The induction base ($k = 0$) is proved in Lemma 4. Assume that the statement has been proved for $k = 0, \dots, q-1$ (where $q \geq 1$); we have to prove it for $k = q$. By construction, banks from \mathcal{V}_q ($q \geq 1$) have no liability to banks from $\mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{V}_q = I'_0 \cup \dots \cup I'_{q-1}$. Also, they neither have outside assets ($c_i = 0 \forall i \notin I_0$) nor receive payments from banks from I'_0, \dots, I'_{q-2} . Only banks from I'_{q-1} can pay liability to them. For each clearing vector p , (6) entails that

$$p_i = \min(\bar{p}_i, \sum_{s \in I'_{q-1}} a_{si} p_s + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{V}_q} a_{ki} p_k) \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_q. \quad (17)$$

In view of the induction hypothesis, the first sum is nothing else than $c_i^{(q)}$ for all clearing vectors p . Hence, for any clearing vector p (of the original financial network) the subvector $(p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_q}$ serves a clearing vector in the *reduced* financial network, determined by the set of nodes $\mathcal{V}_q \neq \emptyset$, the respective submatrix $A^q = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{V}_q}$ and the vector $c^{(q)}$, standing for the ‘‘external’’ assets. This holds, in particular, for the dominant clearing vector $p = p^*$. Lemma 4 guarantees that the elements $p_i, i \in I'_q$ are determined uniquely, that is, $p_i = p_i^* \forall i \in I'_q$, which proves the induction step $k = q$. This finishes the proof of the second statement of Theorem 1.

Furthermore, it is now obvious that each clearing vector (that is, a solution to (6)) has the structure (15), where $\xi = (p_i)_{i \in \mathcal{V}_s} \geq 0$ is some vector. If $\mathcal{V}_s = \emptyset$ (and the component ξ is empty), the only clearing vector is $p = p^*$. Otherwise, ξ obeys (16). Indeed, the matrix B is stochastic by construction, so that $\mathbf{1}^\top B = \mathbf{1}^\top$. In view of (6), one has

$$\xi \leq B^\top \xi.$$

Multiplying the latter inequality by $\mathbf{1}^\top$, one shows that it can only hold if $\xi = B^\top \xi$. On the other had, $\xi_i \leq \bar{p}_i \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_s$. The inverse statement is also obvious: each vector (15) satisfying (16) is a solution to (6). To finish the proof of the theorem, it remains to show that there are infinitely many subvectors ξ obeying (16). Notice that B is a stochastic matrix, and hence $\rho(B) = 1$. Also, $\bar{p}_i > 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{V}_s$ (the nodes cannot be sinks). The Perron-Frobenius theorem entails the existence of at least one non-negative eigenvector $\xi^0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{V}_s} \setminus \{0\}$, which obeys (16). Obviously, the set of all vectors satisfying (16) is a convex polytope, which contains a trivial vector $\xi = 0$ and, thus, also the whole line segment $[0, \xi^0]$. We have proved that the set of clearing vectors is infinite. ■

Example 1. Algorithm 1 is illustrated by Fig. 2, which displays a network with $n = 15$ nodes that contains only one sink node ($S = \{0\}$) and three nodes with outside assets ($C^+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$), which four nodes constitute the set I_0 . Lemma 3 entails that in this situation $p_i^* > 0 \forall i \neq 0, 9$ (notice that nodes 13-15 constitute a sink component, satisfying thus condition 3) from Lemma 3). The set I'_0 contains I_0 and two nodes 4, 5 that owe liability payments to nodes 0 and 2. The set I_1 contains nodes that have no liability payments to I'_0 , however, receive the liability payments from 4 and 5. Hence, $c_6^{(1)}, c_7^{(1)}, c_8^{(1)} > 0$. The nodes 6, 7, 8 constitute the set I_1 ; the set I'_1 is obtained by adding node 9 paying liability to one of them. On the next iteration of the algorithm, one computes the sets $I_2 = \{10, 11\}$ and $I'_2 = \{12\} \cup I_2$. The nodes of the graph are not exhausted, however, the next vector $c^{(3)}$ will be zero, because the remaining nodes of the graph constitute an isolated group. Hence, the clearing vector is not unique, however, for each clearing vector p one has $p_i = p_i^*, \forall i = 0, \dots, 12$.

Theorem 1 allows to prove the following technical proposition, which is of independent interest. The *net* vector (or the vector of *equities*) corresponding to the clearing vector p is

$$\zeta \doteq \phi^{\text{in}} - \phi^{\text{out}} = c + A^\top p - p. \quad (18)$$

In view of (6), this vector can be alternatively written as $\max(c + A^\top p - \bar{p}, 0)$. The component ζ_i shows the net worth of node i , that is, the difference between the in- and the out-flows. By construction, $\zeta_i \geq 0$.

Corollary 1: [1, Theorem 1], [7, Lemma 2.1] The vector of equities ζ is same for all possible clearing vectors p .

Corollary 1 is immediate from representation (15). Indeed, the equities of banks from \mathcal{V}_s are all zeros, whereas the remaining equities depend only on the subvector $(p_i)_{i \in I'_0 \cup \dots \cup I'_s}$, which is uniquely determined by c and \bar{P} .

Notice that although the subvector ξ in (15) is defined non-uniquely, some its elements are in fact uniquely determined due to Lemma 3. As we know, $\xi_i = p_i^* = 0$ whenever i does




Fig. 2. The sets I_s (encircled by blue lines) and I'_s (encircled by red lines) for a special financial network with $n = 15$ nodes with $p_i^* > 0 \forall i \neq 0$.

not belong to a sink component and is not reachable from C^+ . Combining Theorem 1 with the result of Lemma 3, we can establish an alternative uniqueness criterion, which *does not* require knowledge of the vector p^* .

Theorem 2: The following two conditions are equivalent:

- (i) the clearing vector is unique (and equals p^*);
- (ii) each non-trivial sink component of \mathcal{G} either has a node from C^+ or is reachable from C^+ .

Proof: Suppose that (i) holds and consider some non-trivial sink component whose set of nodes is \mathcal{I} . Obviously, $\bar{p}_i > 0 \forall i \in \mathcal{I}$. The submatrix $\tilde{A} = (a_{ij})_{i,j \in \mathcal{I}}$ is stochastic, let $v \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{I}}$ stand for the Perron-Frobenius eigenvector of A^\top such that $A^\top v = v$. Assume that \mathcal{I} neither intersects C^+ nor is reachable from C^+ . If $j \notin \mathcal{I}$ is connected to some node $i \in \mathcal{I}$, then $c_j = 0$ and j cannot be reached from C^+ . In view of Lemma 3, $p_j^* = 0$ and, therefore, for all vectors from \mathcal{D} we have $p_j = 0$. Therefore, every vector p such that

$$p = \begin{cases} p_i^*, i \notin \mathcal{I}, \\ \varepsilon v_i, i \in \mathcal{I} \end{cases}$$

satisfies (6) when $\varepsilon > 0$ is small enough. We arrive at the contradiction with the assumption of the clearing vector's uniqueness. Implication (i) \implies (ii) is proved.

Suppose now that (ii) holds yet the clearing vector is not unique. Consider the final set $\mathcal{V}_s \neq \emptyset$ found by Algorithm 1 ($s \geq 1$). By construction, no arc leads from \mathcal{V}_s to I'_0, \dots, I'_{s-1} , therefore, \mathcal{V}_s contains at least one sink component. This sink component cannot be trivial, because all sink nodes belong to $I_0 \subseteq I'_0$. For the same reason, this sink component contains no nodes from C^+ . In view of (ii), a path from C^+ to \mathcal{V}_s exists. In view of Lemma 3, for each node j on this path we have $p_j^* > 0$. Hence, there should exist an arc $j \rightarrow i$ connecting some $j \notin \mathcal{V}_s$ (with $p_j^* > 0$) to some $i \in \mathcal{V}_s$. This contradicts to the assumption that \mathcal{V}_s is a final set, because $c^{(s)} > 0$. Implication (ii) \implies (i) is proved. \blacksquare

D. Theorems 1 and 2 vs. previously known results

Comparing Theorem 1 to the previously known results, one first has to notice several important features. To find the dominant clearing vector p^* , one needs to know the matrix \bar{P} (equivalently, \bar{p} and A) and the vector of external assets $c \geq 0$. As we have already discussed, efficient algorithms exist to compute this vector (e.g., by solving an LP or a convex QP). As soon as this vector is found, the computation of the sets I_s, I'_s, \mathcal{V}_s requires in fact very limited information. We do not need to compute the vectors $c^{(q)}$, it suffices to know which of their components are positive. A closer look at our algorithm shows that this depends on 1) the set C^+ (banks with external assets); 2) the set of banks such that $p_i^* > 0$; 3) the topology of the liability graph. This information allows to check the uniqueness of the clearing vector and, furthermore, find the components shared by all clearing vectors. Also, we give an explicit and simple description of *all* clearing vectors.

1) *Criteria from [1] and [6]:* The uniqueness criterion from [1] states that the clearing vector is unique if the set C^+ is globally reachable, being thus a special case of Lemma 4. The proof of this criterion (found in [1] and simplified in [7]) starts with an elegant direct proof of Corollary 1. It should be noticed that the proof from [1] can be extended, with some variations, to more general models [7], [20].

The criterion from [6] can be considered as another special case of Lemma 4. It guarantees uniqueness in the situation where all nodes are connected to the external sector by chains of liability. Adding a fictitious sink node standing for the external sector, this node is thus reachable from all other nodes. It should be noted that the aforementioned results from [1], [6], [7] do not allow to parameterize all clearing vectors when the uniqueness cannot be proved.

2) *An extension of the Eisenberg-Noe model and the uniqueness criterion from [18], [19]:* The original Eisenberg-Noe model assumes that, in case of default, the available assets of the bank are distributed pro rata between *all* creditors, including the external ones. Under such an assumption, the payments to external sector can be formally addressed to a “fictitious” bank, standing for the external sector and

represented by an additional sink node in the network. This transformation allows to get rid of one parameter (the vector of external payments), including it into the matrix \bar{P} .

At the same time, one can suppose that some external payments (e.g., operational costs) cannot be reduced in spite of the dropping outside assets. In this situation, the non-negative vector $c \geq 0$ is replaced by the real vector $e \in \mathbb{R}^V$ whose elements can be both positive and negative. Such a model, extending the original model from [1], was proposed in [20]. It should be noticed that, unlike the case where $e \geq 0$, the banks can become *insolvent* in the sense that the

$$\zeta_i = (A^\top p)_i + e_i - p_i < 0.$$

In order to take this effect into account, the definition of the clearing vector has to be modified [20]:

$$p = \min(\bar{p}, \max(A^\top p + e, 0)). \quad (19)$$

Obviously, in the case where $e = c \geq 0$, the definition of the clearing vector (19) is equivalent to (6). However, the criteria developed for studying uniqueness of the generalized clearing vectors (19) appear to be superfluous in the classical model and are not very convenient. The most general of such criteria, proposed in [18], requires to know not only the irreducible decomposition of the matrix A (equivalently, the structure of the network's strongly connected components), but also to find the left and right Perron-Frobenius eigenvector for each irreducible block. These eigenvectors are needed for checking of the clearing vector's uniqueness and for parameterization of the whole set of such vectors. Unlike this result, Theorem 2 (restricted to the case $e \geq 0$) gives a necessary and sufficient uniqueness condition in terms of the vector c and the network's graph. If the full set of clearing vectors has to be found, one also needs to compute the dominant clearing vector p^* , after which Algorithm 1 and Theorem 1 can be applied.

It should be noted that the criteria earlier established in [19] (see also [27]) to test the solution uniqueness in (19) are restricted to strongly connected financial networks (which excludes, in particular, the possibility of having sink nodes) and are thus inapplicable to the general Eisenberg-Noe model.

V. RELAXING THE PRO-RATA CONDITION

We next examine the case of clearing payments without the pro-rata rule. As soon as the pro-rata constraint is removed, the clearing matrix is no longer unique. One matrix corresponds to the pro-rata rule (as we have seen, this matrix always exists and, under some natural assumption, is unique), however there are other clearing matrices that can be found, e.g., by solving optimization problems similar to (8).

There are several reasons to consider clearing matrices different from the pro-rata matrix. The first reason is that, as discussed in [6], [15], the creditors of different standings may have different priorities, and *the principles of proportionality and priority play an important role in bankruptcy law across the globe* [15]. Another reason is that the relaxation of the pro-rata constraint can visibly reduce the systemic loss function [6], that is, the total imbalance between the nominal and actual payments (see Section VI).

A. Convex optimization approach

Recalling that $[0, \bar{P}] = \{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : 0 \leq p_{ij} \leq \bar{p}_{ij} \forall i, j\}$, we consider the convex polyhedron in the space of matrices

$$\mathcal{D}_{n \times n} = [0, \bar{P}] \cap \{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n} : c + P^\top \mathbf{1} \geq P\mathbf{1}\}.$$

We call a function $F : [0, \bar{P}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ *decreasing* if $F(P^1) > F(P^2)$ whenever $P^1 \preceq P^2$. For any such function, consider the optimization problem

$$\min F(P) \quad \text{subject to} \quad P \in \mathcal{D}_{n \times n}. \quad (20)$$

Lemma 5: For any decreasing function $F : [0, \bar{P}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, every local minimizer in problem (20) is a clearing matrix.

Proof: Assume, by the purpose of contradiction, that a local minimizer P^* fails to satisfy (3). Hence, an index i exists such that

$$p_i^* \doteq (P^* \mathbf{1})_i = \sum_j p_{ij}^* < \min \left(\bar{p}_i, c_i + \sum_k p_{ki}^* \right).$$

Since $p_i^* < \bar{p}_i$, there exists some j such that $p_{ij}^* < \bar{p}_{ij}$. Then for small $\delta > 0$ matrix $\hat{P} = P^* + \delta e_i e_j^\top$ (obtained from P^* by the replacement $p_{ij}^* \mapsto p_{ij}^* + \delta$, all other entries being invariant) belongs to $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. Indeed, $\hat{P} \in [0, \bar{P}]$ and

$$\hat{p} \doteq \hat{P} \mathbf{1} = p^* + \delta e_i \leq c + (P^*)^\top \mathbf{1} \leq c + (\hat{P})^\top \mathbf{1}.$$

At the same time, $F(\hat{P}) < F(P^*)$. This contradicts to the assumption of local optimality. ■

Notice that Lemma 5 does not require the function to be continuous. For a continuous function, the global minimum always exists due to compactness of $\mathcal{D}_{n \times n}$. Two examples of functions continuous and decreasing on $[0, \bar{P}]$ are

$$\|\bar{\phi}^{\text{in}} - \phi^{\text{in}}\|_2^2 = \|(\bar{c} - c) + (\bar{P} - P)^\top \mathbf{1}\|_2^2, \quad (21)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{\phi}_i^{\text{in}} - \phi_i^{\text{in}}) = \mathbf{1}^\top (\bar{c} - c) + \mathbf{1}^\top (\bar{P} - P)^\top \mathbf{1} \quad (22)$$

(recall that the nominal asset vector \bar{c} and the nominal payment matrix \bar{P} here are constant). Both these functions provide a global, system-level, measure of the impact of defaults on the deviation of payment from their nominal liabilities. In particular, minimization of the performance index (21) leads to the (non-strictly) convex QP problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \quad & \|(\bar{c} - c) + (\bar{P} - P)^\top \mathbf{1}\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{P} \geq P \geq 0 \\ & c + P^\top \mathbf{1} - P\mathbf{1} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

whereas minimization of the linear function (22) is equivalent to the LP problem

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{P \in \mathbb{R}^{n,n}} \quad & \sum_{i,j \in V} p_{ij} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \bar{P} \geq P \geq 0 \\ & c + P^\top \mathbf{1} - P\mathbf{1} \geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

B. Non-uniqueness of optimal clearing matrix

As it follows from Lemma 2, the set of matrices obeying *pro-rata* constraint 5 always has a maximal element, corresponding to the dominant clearing vector p^* . Also, this set is closed with respect to the operation \max , because the maximum of two clearing vector, as can be easily seen, is also a clearing vector. In some situations, clearing matrices automatically satisfy the *pro-rata* rule (for instance, if each node of the graph has only one outgoing arc), which makes Lemma 4 and Theorem 1 applicable.

However, in general the set of all clearing matrices has a non-trivial structure and fails to be a complete lattice². Lemma 2 does not retain its validity in the class of all admissible clearing matrices, in particular, there exists no maximal clearing matrix, as exemplified by the following.

Example 2. Consider a degenerate 3-node network whose nodes 1 and 2 are sinks ($\bar{p}_{1i} = 0, \bar{p}_{2i} = 0 \forall i$) and have no outside assets ($c_1 = c_2 = 0$), whereas node 3 has outside asset $c_3 > 0$ and owes liability payment to both 1 and 2 ($\bar{p}_{31}, \bar{p}_{32} > 0$). A clearing matrix P , obviously, has the following structure

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ p_{31} & p_{32} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad p_{31} \in [0, \bar{p}_{31}], p_{32} \in [0, \bar{p}_{32}]. \quad (25)$$

and the equation (3) is equivalent to

$$p_{31} + p_{32} = \theta \doteq \min(\bar{p}_{31} + \bar{p}_{32}, c_3). \quad (26)$$

Considering two clearing matrices

$$P^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \theta & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad P^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \theta & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

one may easily notice that no matrix $P \geq \max(P_1, P_2)$ can satisfy (26). In particular, the set of clearing matrices understood in the sense of Definition 1 has *no* maximal element. It can be easily noted that every matrix (25) that satisfies (26) serves a *global* minimizer in (24). Hence, in spite of the strict monotonicity of the performance index in (24), the solution to the optimization problem is not unique.

The unique (thanks to Lemma 4) clearing vector and the clearing matrix corresponding to it are, respectively

$$p^* = (0, 0, \theta)^\top, \quad P^* = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\bar{p}_{31}\theta}{\bar{p}_{31} + \bar{p}_{32}} & \frac{\bar{p}_{32}\theta}{\bar{p}_{31} + \bar{p}_{32}} & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

VI. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

Imposing a *pro-rata* rule on the payments has a systemic impact on the network, which we can evaluate by comparing it with the minimum level achievable by an optimal clearing matrix. Indeed, using a global loss function such as, e.g., function (21) or (22), we can compute the minimal system

²It should be noticed that some alternative definitions of clearing matrices are possible, under which the set of clearing matrices becomes a complete lattice, see, e.g., a very general construction from [15] that deals with integer payments and allowing the banks to apply different bankruptcy policies. As stated in [15], this approach provides the uniqueness of the maximal clearing matrix, which can be found from an optimization problem similar to (24).

loss when the *pro-rata* rule is respected ($p_{ij} = a_{ij}p_i^*$, where p^* is the optimal clearing vector) and when the *pro-rata* rule is relaxed to (3). As a testbench for the numerical experiments, we used synthetic random networks similar to ones proposed in [21]. We describe the test model in the next subsection.

A. A model of random network

The random graphs used for simulations are constructed using a technique inspired by [21]. The topology of the graph is given by the standard Erdős-Renyi $G(n, p)$ graph. The interbank liabilities \bar{p}_{ij} for every edge (i, j) of the random graph are then found by sampling from a uniform distribution $\bar{p}_{ij} \sim \mathcal{U}(0, P_{max})$, where P_{max} is the maximum possible value of a single interbank payment. In the experiments we set $P_{max} = 100$. Unlike [21], the values \bar{p}_{ij} can thus be heterogeneous. Also, we do not consider payments to external sector (deposits etc.): as it has been discussed, we can always get rid of them by introducing a fictitious node.

Following [21], we define the total amount of the external assets $E = \frac{\beta}{1-\beta}I$, where $I = \sum_{i,j=1}^n \bar{p}_{ij}$ is the total amount of the interbank liabilities and $\beta = E/(E + I)$ is a parameter representing the percentage of external assets in total assets at the system level; in our experiments $\beta = 0.05$. The nominal asset vector \bar{c} is then computed in two steps. First, each bank is given the minimal value of external assets under which its balance sheet is equal to zero. At the second step, the remainder of the aggregated external assets is evenly distributed among all banks.

The financial shock is modeled by randomly choosing a subset of n_s banks of the system and nullifying their external financial assets.

B. The price of *pro-rata* rule: a numerical study

To evaluate the “price” of imposing the *pro-rata* rule, we consider the affine function of *system loss* proposed in [6], that is $l \doteq \sum_i (\bar{p}_i - p_i)$, where $p_i = \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij}$. Minimization of this loss is equivalent to minimization of (22) or maximization of (24)). Obviously, this function is strictly monotone. Hence, its minimal value over all matrices obeying the *pro-rata* constraint (5) is $l_{pr} = \sum_i (\bar{p}_i - p_i^*)$, where p^* is the dominating clearing vector from Lemma 2, which is found by solving problem (9). Relaxing the *pro-rata* constraint, we find the globally optimal clearing matrix P^* , resulting in the system loss $l_{nopr} = \mathbf{1}^\top (\bar{P} - P^*) \mathbf{1}$. The price, or global effect, of the *pro-rata* rule can be estimated by the following ratio

$$G = \frac{l_{pr} - l_{nopr}}{l_{pr}} \in [0, 1].$$

If $G = 0$ (as, e.g., in Example 2, where all clearing matrices are optimal), the imposition of *pro-rata* constraint is “gratuitous” in the sense that it does not increase the aggregate system loss: $l_{pr} = l_{nopr}$. The larger value G we obtain, the more “costful” is the *pro-rata* restriction.

It seems natural that G is growing as the graph is becoming more dense, since in this situation the *pro-rata* rule visibly reduces the number of free variables in the optimization problem. We have tested this conjecture using the random




Fig. 3. Gain obtained by relaxing the pro-rata rule.

model described above. The random graph contained $n = 50$ nodes, whereas the average node degree $d = np$ varied from 0 to 35. The number n_s of nodes that receive the shock varies from 1 to 5. The results were averaged over 50 runs. The resulting dependence between G and d is illustrated in Fig. 3. We can see that the relaxation of the pro-rata rule can give gain up to 43%. We can observe that, when there is a stronger shock, the relaxation of the pro-rata rule has a larger impact.

To evaluate the price of the pro-rata rule, we also introduce another metric that measures the number of defaulted nodes. This metric evaluates the dimension of the failure cascade caused by the initial shock. Fig. 4 compares the number of defaulted nodes ($\phi_i^{\text{out}} < \bar{\phi}_i^{\text{out}}$) with or without the pro-rata rule. We can observe that relaxing the pro-rata rule can significantly reduce the failure cascade.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the financial networks model of [1], we explored in this paper the concept of a clearing vector of payments, and we developed new necessary and sufficient conditions for its uniqueness, together with a characterization of the set of all clearing vectors, see Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. Further, we examined matrices of clearing payments that naturally arise if one relaxes the pro-rata rule. Optimal clearing matrices can be computed efficiently by solving a convex optimization problem. Using numerical experiments with randomly generated synthetic networks, we showed that relaxation of the pro-rata rule allows to reduce significantly the overall systemic loss and the total number of defaulted nodes.

Many aspects remain to be explored. First and foremost, the biggest gap from theory to practice is that, in practice, the overall structure of the financial network is not known precisely, let alone the inter-bank liability amounts. For effective practical implementation, therefore, one should develop a system-level (i.e., *global*) approach whose iterations are based only on *local* exchange of information between nodes. The development of such distributed and decentralized optimal clearing payment algorithm is the subject of ongoing research. Another interesting aspect arises if one allows the liabilities




Fig. 4. Number of defaulted nodes with or without the pro-rata rule.

to be spread over some interval of time, rather than cleared instantly, as it is supposed in the mainstream model of [1]. This would lead to *dynamic* clearing payments, and to the ensuing optimal dynamic optimization problems.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Eisenberg and T. H. Noe, "Systemic risk in financial systems," *Management Science*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 236–249, 2001.
- [2] D. M. Gale and S. Kariv, "Financial networks," *American Economic Review*, vol. 97, no. 2, pp. 99–103, 2007.
- [3] S. Battiston, J. B. Glattfelder, D. Garlaschelli, F. Lillo, and G. Caldarelli, "The structure of financial networks," in *Network Science*. Springer, 2010, pp. 131–163.
- [4] A. Haldane and R. May, "Systemic risk in banking ecosystems," *Nature*, vol. 469, pp. 351–355, 2011.
- [5] M. Elliott, B. Golub, and M. O. Jackson, "Financial networks and contagion," *American Economic Review*, vol. 104, no. 10, pp. 3115–53, 2014.
- [6] P. Glasserman and H. P. Young, "Contagion in financial networks," *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp. 779–831, 2016.
- [7] Y. M. Kabanov, R. Mokbel, and K. El Bitar, "Clearing in financial networks," *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, vol. 62, no. 2, pp. 252–277, 2018.

- [8] L. C. Rogers and L. A. Veraart, "Failure and rescue in an interbank network," *Management Science*, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 882–898, 2013.
- [9] T. Suzuki, "Valuing corporate debt: the effect of cross-holdings of stock and debt," *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, vol. 45, no. 2, pp. 123–144, 2002.
- [10] H. Elsinger *et al.*, *Financial networks, cross holdings, and limited liability*. Oesterreichische Nationalbank Austria, 2009.
- [11] R. Cifuentes, G. Ferrucci, and H. S. Shin, "Liquidity risk and contagion," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, vol. 3, no. 2-3, pp. 556–566, 2005.
- [12] H. S. Shin, "Risk and liquidity in a system context," *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 315–329, 2008.
- [13] H. Amini, D. Filipović, and A. Minca, "To fully net or not to net: Adverse effects of partial multilateral netting," *Operations Research*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 1135–1142, 2016.
- [14] T. Fischer, "No-arbitrage pricing under systemic risk: Accounting for cross-ownership," *Mathematical Finance: An International Journal of Mathematics, Statistics and Financial Economics*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 97–124, 2014.
- [15] P. Csóka and P. Jean-Jacques Herings, "Decentralized clearing in financial networks," *Management Science*, vol. 64, no. 10, pp. 4681–4699, 2018.
- [16] M. Kusnetsov and L. A. M. Veraart, "Interbank clearing in financial networks with multiple maturities," *SIAM Journal on Financial Mathematics*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 37–67, 2019.
- [17] K. Y. M. El Bitar, Kh. and R. Mokbel, "On uniqueness of clearing vectors reducing the systemic risk," *Inform. Primen.*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 109–118, 2017.
- [18] L. Massai, G. Como, and F. Fagnani, "Equilibria and systemic risk in saturated networks," *Mathematics of Operation Research (to appear)*, 2021, online as ArXiv preprint 1912.04815.
- [19] X. Ren and L. Jiang, "Mathematical modeling and analysis of insolvency contagion in an interbank network," *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 44, no. 6, pp. 779–783, 2016.
- [20] H. Elsinger, A. Lehar, and M. Summer, "Risk assessment for banking systems," *Management Science*, vol. 52, no. 9, pp. 1301–1314, 2006.
- [21] E. Nier, J. Yang, T. Yorulmazer, and A. Alentorn, "Network models and financial stability," *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, vol. 31, no. 6, pp. 2033–2060, 2007.
- [22] P. Frasca, C. Ravazzi, R. Tempo, and H. Ishii, "Gossips and prejudices: Ergodic randomized dynamics in social networks," in *Proc. of IFAC NecSys 2013 Workshop*, Koblenz, Germany, 2013, pp. 212–219.
- [23] A. Proskurnikov and M. Cao, "Modulus consensus in discrete-time signed networks and properties of special recurrent inequalities," in *Proc. of IEEE Conf. Decision and Control*, 2017, pp. 2003–2008.
- [24] H. Amini, D. Filipovic, and A. Minca, "Uniqueness of equilibrium in a payment system with liquidation costs," *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 44, no. 1, pp. 1 – 5, 2016.
- [25] T. Chang, A. Nedić, and A. Scaglione, "Distributed constrained optimization by consensus-based primal-dual perturbation method," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, vol. 59, no. 6, pp. 1524–1538, 2014.
- [26] M. Liu and J. Staum, "Sensitivity analysis of the Eisenberg–Noe model of contagion," *Operations Research Letters*, vol. 38, no. 5, pp. 489–491, 2010.
- [27] D. Acemoglu, A. Ozdaglar, and A. Tahbaz-Salehi, "Systemic risk and stability in financial networks," *American Economic Review*, vol. 105, no. 2, pp. 564–608, 2015.