Diagnosing Financial Fragility in a Complex Economy

Jorge A. Arroyo*

February 2026

A Practitioner's Guide

Abstract

Periods of market stability often coincide with rising financial fragility. Standard risk measures appear reliable until liquidity constraints bind, at which point losses escalate rapidly and decision-making becomes forced. This article reframes fragility as a diagnostic and governance problem rather than a forecasting failure. It explains how leverage, funding dependence, crowding, and intermediary balance-sheet constraints accumulate quietly during calm periods and are transmitted through liquidity constraints under stress. The article then offers practical guidance for monitoring fragility, stress testing liquidation mechanics, constructing resilient portfolios, and establishing governance rules that prioritize robustness over precision.

1 Fragility as a Decision Problem

1.1 Motivation: Stability That Breaks

Periods of market stability often give rise to a false sense of security. Strong performance, low volatility, and ample liquidity are interpreted as evidence that risk is well controlled. Yet these same conditions frequently precede episodes of severe financial stress. The resulting losses are commonly described as "unforeseeable shocks or rare tail events," but this interpretation obscures a more important failure: decisions made under apparent stability can systematically increase vulnerability. This is why two portfolios with identical volatility, drawdowns, and risk metrics can behave radically differently once markets come under stress—one adjusting gradually, the other collapsing under binding liquidity and funding constraints (Bookstaber, 2000).

For investment professionals, the core challenge is not the arrival of bad news, but the erosion of margins of safety during calm periods. Risk appears cheap, diversification seems effective, and liquidity is assumed to be readily available. Acting defensively under these conditions is costly. Reducing exposure or building liquidity buffers can lead to underperformance, tracking error, and career risk. As a result, fragility is often observable in advance but difficult to address before stress materializes.

This dynamic reflects a broader paradox: stability itself can become destabilizing. When volatility is low and outcomes are predictable, leverage rises, maturity mismatches deepen, and portfolios become increasingly reliant on continuous market access. These shifts are gradual and rational

*Independent Researcher, San Juan, Puerto Rico

at the individual level, yet they create systems that are highly sensitive to small disturbances. When conditions change, losses escalate rapidly, not because fundamentals deteriorate suddenly, but because liquidity constraints dominate outcomes (Danielsson et al., 2013; Minsky, 1992).

1.2 Research Question

This article addresses a practical question faced by investment professionals and risk managers:

> *How can investment professionals diagnose rising financial fragility and adjust portfolio and governance decisions before liquidity constraints dominate outcomes?*

The emphasis on diagnosis is deliberate. The objective is not to predict crises or identify precise timing, but to support decisions under uncertainty by identifying conditions in which portfolios become vulnerable to forced actions.

1.3 Markets as Adaptive, Balance-Sheet-Constrained Systems

Standard risk frameworks often treat markets as environments in which prices adjust smoothly to new information and risk is largely exogenous. In practice, financial markets are adaptive systems shaped by incentives, regulations, and balance-sheet constraints. Asset prices reflect not only beliefs about fundamentals, but also the capacity of intermediaries and investors to hold risk.

Balance sheets play a central role in this process. Leverage, collateral requirements, and capital constraints determine how much risk can be absorbed and for how long. When balance-sheet capacity is abundant, risk premia are low and stable. When constraints bind, small losses can trigger disproportionate price movements as investors are forced to deleverage (Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009; Geanakoplos, 2010; He and Krishnamurthy, 2013).

These dynamics make risk endogenous. Actions taken to manage individual risk—such as reducing exposure or meeting margin requirements—can amplify system-wide stress when undertaken simultaneously. Models calibrated to historical data often fail to capture this feedback because they implicitly assume that risk is independent of behavior (Danielsson et al., 2016; Danielsson and Shin, 2002). As a result, periods of calm may coincide with the accumulation of vulnerabilities that only become visible once constraints tighten.

Regulatory and policy frameworks interact with these dynamics in complex ways. While designed to enhance stability at the institutional level, they can encourage homogeneous behavior, regulatory arbitrage, and the migration of leverage to less transparent parts of the system (Baudino et al., 2024; Comotto, 2012). Understanding markets as balance-sheet-constrained systems is therefore essential for diagnosing fragility in a complex financial environment.

1.4 Contribution and Practical Preview

This article does not attempt to predict financial crises, estimate their probability, or provide optimal timing rules for risk reduction. Instead, it offers a diagnostic lens for identifying conditions under which portfolios and institutions become fragile to liquidity shocks.

The contribution is twofold. First, the article integrates insights from the literature on liquidity, leverage, and endogenous risk into a unified explanation of how fragility accumulates during calm

periods and converts into forced liquidation under stress. Second, it translates this explanation into an operational framework: a phase-sequenced diagnostic (Box 1), a portfolio vulnerability self-assessment (Box 2), and escalation protocols designed to support earlier intervention despite career risk and organizational inertia.

For practitioners, the value lies in enabling earlier, more disciplined decision-making. By focusing on diagnostics rather than forecasts, investment professionals can reduce reliance on forced actions under stress, preserve optionality, and manage the tradeoff between short-term performance and long-term resilience (Goetzmann, 2020).

2 How Fragility Accumulates in Apparently Stable Markets

Periods of market calm are rarely neutral. They are environments in which financial fragility is actively produced (Danielsson et al., 2013; Minsky, 1992). Stable prices, low volatility, and strong performance signals encourage behaviors that appear individually rational yet collectively reduce the system's margin of safety. As a result, the very conditions that practitioners associate with low risk often coincide with the rapid accumulation of vulnerabilities that only become visible once liquidity constraints bind.

Fragility accumulates not because risk is misunderstood, but because it is systematically reframed as cheap, diversifiable, and easily reversible (Danielsson et al., 2016; Goetzmann, 2020). This reframing occurs through several reinforcing channels that embed leverage, funding dependence, and correlation into portfolios long before stress materializes. In calm regimes, conventional metrics are effective at measuring the *noise* of day-to-day fluctuations but remain largely silent about the buildup of *structural instability*—the latent "snowpack" that determines whether a modest shock will propagate into forced liquidation (Bookstaber, 2000; Danielsson et al., 2013).

A central mechanism is leverage, both explicit and embedded. Explicit leverage arises through borrowing, derivatives, and financing structures that amplify exposure relative to capital. Embedded leverage, by contrast, is embedded in asset characteristics and portfolio mandates. Assets that offer steady carry, volatility compression, or yield enhancement effectively embed short-option positions, generating smooth returns in normal conditions while exposing portfolios to nonlinear losses during stress (Asness et al., 2014; Koh et al., 2015). Importantly, the risk of leverage is not the leverage itself, but the potential for that leverage to force liquidation when funding conditions tighten (Bookstaber, 2000; Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009). As long as asset prices are stable and funding is plentiful, this risk remains latent.

Maturity mismatch further amplifies fragility by introducing rollover dependence. Portfolios that finance long-duration or illiquid assets with short-term funding rely on continuous access to liquidity markets. When refinancing is easy, this dependence appears innocuous. When refinancing becomes uncertain, solvency concerns can emerge rapidly, even without large valuation losses. In this sense, fragility is created by time mismatches rather than by price movements alone (Comotto, 2012; Han and Leika, 2019; Minsky, 1992).

At the same time, extended stability compresses compensation for bearing risk. Risk premia decline, spreads narrow, and volatility falls, reinforcing the perception that assets are safer and more liquid than they truly are. This compression encourages position scaling and balance-sheet

expansion precisely when the system's capacity to absorb shocks is eroding. Low measured risk thus becomes both a signal and a driver of fragility, a dynamic consistent with theories of endogenous risk accumulation (Danielsson et al., 2013; He and Krishnamurthy, 2013; Minsky, 1992).

Crowding provides another critical channel through which fragility accumulates. As assets and strategies perform well, capital flows concentrate into similar exposures across portfolios, often driven by benchmark constraints, style classifications, and risk models that reward recent performance. Although individual portfolios may appear diversified, collective positioning becomes increasingly correlated. This correlation is typically invisible in normal times because it reflects common funding and liquidation needs rather than shared fundamentals (Bookstaber, 2000; Pojarliev and Levich, 2010). When stress arrives, assets that were presumed independent begin to move together as portfolios attempt to exit simultaneously (Pojarliev and Levich, 2010).

Intermediary balance-sheet capacity plays a central role in this process. Market liquidity depends on the willingness and ability of dealers and intermediaries to absorb inventory. During tranquil periods, abundant capital and competition among intermediaries mask this constraint. As positions accumulate and balance sheets become saturated, liquidity provision becomes increasingly fragile. Small shocks can then trigger disproportionate reductions in market-making capacity, transforming modest price declines into system-wide liquidity shortages (Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009; He and Krishnamurthy, 2013).

Policy and regulatory environments can unintentionally accelerate these dynamics. Capital rules, risk-weighted assets, liquidity requirements, and accommodative monetary policy can reshape incentives in ways that encourage leverage migration, regulatory arbitrage, and risk concentration outside traditional banking channels. While these measures may reduce idiosyncratic risk at the institution level, they can simultaneously increase systemic fragility by encouraging homogeneous behavior and reliance on common funding sources (Anadu et al., 2020; Baudino et al., 2024; Comotto, 2012). In this way, policy success in stabilizing outcomes can sow the seeds of future instability.

Crucially, these mechanisms operate quietly. Fragility is not an abrupt event but a gradual erosion of resilience driven by incentives, constraints, and adaptation. By the time volatility rises and correlations spike, the system has already shifted into a state where liquidity, not valuation, governs outcomes (Bookstaber, 2000; Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009; Lou and Sadka, 2011). Understanding how fragility accumulates during calm periods is therefore essential for diagnosing risk before it becomes unavoidable.

3 Liquidity as the Transmission Mechanism

Fragility becomes economically consequential when liquidity constraints bind. Losses during stress episodes are often not the result of new information alone; they arise when accumulated vulnerabilities are converted into forced actions. Liquidity is the mechanism through which this conversion occurs. It determines not only whether positions can be adjusted, but whether balance sheets can survive.

A critical distinction is between *asset liquidity* and *funding liquidity*. Asset liquidity refers to the ability to trade an asset quickly at low cost, typically measured by bid–ask spreads, market depth, and price impact (Amihud and Mendelson, 1991). Funding liquidity, by contrast, refers to the ability of an investor or intermediary to obtain financing against assets—to roll liabilities, meet margin

requirements, and maintain access to credit. These two forms of liquidity are deeply interconnected, but they fail through different channels (Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009). In fragile regimes, funding liquidity is typically the binding constraint.

In stable conditions, asset liquidity is often treated as a static attribute. Securities with narrow spreads and high trading volume are assumed to remain liquid under stress. This assumption is fragile. Asset liquidity is state dependent: it deteriorates precisely when many investors attempt to transact simultaneously. During stress, liquidity provision becomes constrained not by willingness to trade, but by balance-sheet capacity and inventory risk. Market makers who normally absorb order flow may instead withdraw or become liquidity demanders themselves (Bookstaber, 2000).

A canonical liquidity crisis cycle connects these concepts and clarifies how fragility turns into realized loss. It begins with an initial loss or shock that tightens constraints through margin calls, haircuts, or redemptions. The resulting funding pressure forces asset sales into markets whose depth is already weakening. Those sales generate market impact, worsening mark-to-market losses and triggering further constraint tightening. The cycle then repeats as forced liquidation becomes the dominant driver of prices rather than information about fundamentals (Bookstaber, 2000).

Funding liquidity governs the speed and severity of this transition. Margin requirements, haircuts, and financing terms function as state variables that tighten endogenously as volatility rises. When prices fall or uncertainty increases, lenders raise margins or restrict collateral eligibility, reducing the amount of leverage that can be supported. This tightening forces deleveraging regardless of an investor's long-term view. The result is a *margin spiral*: declining prices increase required margins, which force asset sales, which further depress prices (Brunnermeier and Pedersen, 2009; Geanakoplos, 2010).

These dynamics are often mechanical rather than discretionary. Forced selling is not driven by panic or sentiment but by contractual constraints. Capital ratios, margin calls, and funding withdrawals impose deadlines that convert mark-to-market losses into realized losses. In such environments, liquidity should be understood as *time-to-failure* rather than as a transaction cost or quoted spread (Dai et al., 2023; Duffie and Ziegler, 2001). The relevant question is not whether an asset can be sold cheaply, but whether it can be sold quickly enough to satisfy binding constraints.

Once funding liquidity tightens, asset liquidity deteriorates rapidly. Dealers reduce inventory, bid–ask spreads widen, and depth evaporates. Price changes begin to reflect balance-sheet stress rather than information about fundamentals. Correlations rise across otherwise unrelated assets as investors sell what they can rather than what they prefer to sell (Bookstaber, 2000; Danielsson et al., 2013). Assets that appeared safe due to their liquidity in normal times often suffer the largest drawdowns because they become the primary source of cash for the system (Lou and Sadka, 2011).

Importantly, liquidity failure is often nonlinear. Markets do not transition smoothly from liquid to illiquid states. Instead, small shocks can trigger discontinuous shifts when aggregate balance-sheet constraints bind. Credit lines are withdrawn, collateral eligibility changes, and markets may effectively shut down for certain instruments. In practice, liquidity crises are frequently characterized by quantity rationing rather than by gradually widening prices (Comotto, 2012).

The propagation of stress through liquidity channels explains why losses persist even after initial shocks subside. Capital and risk-bearing capacity return slowly, particularly when intermediaries

are impaired. Until balance sheets are repaired, market liquidity remains fragile, and risk premia stay elevated (Baudino et al., 2024; He and Krishnamurthy, 2013). Recovery is therefore governed by the rebuilding of funding capacity, not by the resolution of uncertainty about fundamentals.

In complex financial systems, liquidity is not a background condition but an endogenous outcome. It reflects the interaction between leverage, funding structures, and intermediary constraints. When these constraints tighten, liquidity transforms fragility into realized losses, overwhelming models and strategies that rely on continuous market access. Diagnosing financial fragility therefore requires understanding liquidity not as a property of assets, but as a system-level constraint that governs outcomes under stress (Minsky, 1992).

The March 2020 U.S. Treasury market turmoil provides a canonical illustration of this sequence. A funding shock triggered mechanical deleveraging that overwhelmed even the benchmark safe-asset market (Financial Stability Board, 2020). As volatility surged, derivatives margin requirements tightened sharply, creating immediate cash demands for levered holders (Kashyap et al., 2025). Treasury cash–futures basis trades were particularly exposed, combining short-term repo financing with separately margined derivative positions, so higher volatility translated directly into margin calls and deadline-driven unwinds (Kruttli et al., 2025). Consistent with a forced-liquidity episode rather than a fundamentals repricing, Treasury yields spiked while selling pressure came from sectors with acute liquidity needs (Vissing-Jorgensen, 2021). Market functioning deteriorated rapidly as depth collapsed and transaction costs rose, stabilizing only after large-scale Federal Reserve purchases restored effective intermediation capacity (Financial Stability Board, 2020; Vissing-Jorgensen, 2021).

Box 1 summarizes this crisis cycle as a diagnostic workflow, organizing observable indicators in the order they typically emerge as constraints tighten.

Box 1. Liquidity Crisis Diagnostic Workflow

This workflow orders liquidity indicators by *causal sequence* (not timing). The phases describe how constraints tighten and how losses propagate once funding becomes binding.

Phase 1: Fragility Build-Up

- Leverage and position scaling rise while measured risk remains subdued
- Funding reliance, crowding, and compressed premia increase latent unwind risk

Phase 2: Constraint Tightening

- Margins/haircuts rise, maturities shorten, or collateral eligibility tightens
- Credit terms shift from committed to discretionary; state dependence becomes visible

Phase 3: Forced Liquidation

- Sales are driven by deadlines (margin, redemptions, rollovers), not valuation
- Depth weakens and price impact rises; "sellable" assets become the system's cash source

Phase 4: Amplification

- Margin/loss spirals tighten funding as prices fall
- Correlations rise and diversification erodes as constrained investors synchronize

Phase 5: System Stress

- Liquidity fails via quantity rationing (lines cut, inventories withdrawn), not just wider spreads
- Recovery depends on balance-sheet repair and the slow return of risk-bearing capacity

Interpretation. Diagnosis is strongest when indicators cluster across *consecutive* phases, implying limited time-to-failure.

Box 2. Portfolio Vulnerability Self-Assessment: Translating System Signals into Portfolio Exposure

Boxes 1 and 3 diagnose *system* fragility. This self-assessment *explicitly* maps those signals to *portfolio* exposure to funding and liquidation constraints.

1. **Funding dependence and constraint sensitivity**
   - What fraction of financing must be rolled within 30/90 days, and how much is committed versus discretionary?
   - Do stress tests assume current terms, or stress-regime terms (higher haircuts, shorter maturities, collateral ineligibility)?
   - How exposed is the portfolio to a shift from price rationing to *quantity rationing* (lines cut, eligibility removed)?
2. **Liquidation feasibility, embedded leverage, and common exits**
   - Can 10–20% be liquidated within a week under stressed depth without materially moving markets?
   - Which positions are liquid mainly because dealers intermediate them rather than because natural buyers exist?
   - How much return comes from carry/volatility compression (embedded short optionality), and where do payoffs become nonlinear under tighter funding?
   - Under stress, are positions diversified by fundamentals or tied together by shared funding channels and liquidation needs?

Interpretation. Vulnerability is elevated when short-dated funding, limited liquidation capacity, and embedded leverage coexist. As signals move from Phase 1 to Phase 2 (Box 1), the key question is whether the portfolio has sufficient *time-to-failure* to act without being forced.

4 Why Models, Expertise, and Governance Fail in Regime Shifts

Periods of market stress are often followed by the assertion that losses were unforeseeable despite sophisticated risk systems and experienced professionals. This defense misunderstands the nature of failure in regime shifts. Models rarely fail because they are poorly constructed. They fail because they are embedded in institutions whose incentives, communication structures, and decision processes are not designed for nonlinear transitions.

A central problem is that most risk models assume that uncertainty is exogenous. Volatility, correlations, and tail events are treated as properties of the environment rather than as outcomes shaped by market participants themselves. This assumption is largely harmless in stable regimes, when endogenous feedback effects are dormant. During stress, however, risk becomes endogenous: prices, liquidity, and correlations respond to the collective actions triggered by the very models designed to manage risk (Danielsson and Shin, 2002; Danielsson et al., 2013). Under these conditions, models calibrated to historical distributions provide a false sense of precision.

A related problem is that many institutions measure the *noise* of markets more effectively than they measure the *stability of the system*. Volatility and correlation estimates can be precise in

calm periods, yet remain largely silent about the buildup of latent fragility—the "snowpack" that determines whether a modest disturbance leads to an "avalanche" of forced selling (Bookstaber, 2000). As a result, risk appears lowest precisely when leverage, crowding, and funding dependence are growing.

Institutional failure typically precedes statistical failure. In calm markets, different risk models produce similar readings, reinforcing confidence in point estimates. This convergence masks underlying model risk—the uncertainty arising from the choice of model itself. During regime shifts, disagreement between valid models increases sharply, precisely when decisions matter most (Danielsson et al., 2016). Yet governance processes often continue to rely on single-number summaries that were appropriate only in stable conditions.

Measurement failure is compounded by incentive failure. Risk limits, performance benchmarks, and capital charges are typically defined relative to recent history. When volatility is low and liquidity abundant, these constraints relax automatically, encouraging leverage expansion and position concentration. Acting against this dynamic is costly: reducing exposure during calm periods can create career risk, tracking error, and underperformance relative to peers. As a result, institutions are rewarded for behavior that increases fragility and penalized for precaution.

Communication failure further amplifies these problems. Complex portfolios and sophisticated models can obscure rather than clarify risk for decision-makers and asset owners. Complexity often functions as an agency cost: it weakens accountability by making tail risks difficult to explain, challenge, or attribute ex post (Damodaran, 2013; Koh et al., 2015). In such environments, apparent precision substitutes for understanding, and confidence in expertise discourages early intervention.

These failures are particularly acute in regime shifts because they coincide with structural breaks in market behavior. Risk models built on continuous distributions struggle to capture discontinuities driven by binding constraints, such as margin calls, capital ratios, and funding withdrawals. Correlations spike not because fundamentals change, but because balance-sheet pressures force simultaneous selling across portfolios (Bookstaber, 2000). Governance frameworks that treat these events as extreme realizations of normal risk underestimate their qualitative difference.

The distinction between exogenous and endogenous risk clarifies why expertise alone is insufficient. When risk resembles a roulette wheel, forecasting and optimization are effective. When risk resembles a poker game—where outcomes depend on the actions of others—forecasting becomes unreliable, and strategic interaction dominates (Danielsson and Shin, 2002). In such settings, the most important uncertainties cannot be quantified ex ante.

Finally, complexity magnifies these challenges by increasing the distance between decision-makers and underlying exposures. Layered structures, embedded leverage, and opaque instruments reduce transparency exactly when rapid judgment is required. As complexity rises, the locus of risk shifts from measurable volatility to governance capacity: the ability to recognize constraint-driven dynamics and act decisively before forced actions dominate outcomes.

Regime shifts therefore expose not a lack of intelligence or effort, but a mismatch between tools designed for stable environments and decisions required under stress. Managing financial fragility requires institutions to acknowledge the conditional usefulness of models, the limits of expertise, and the need for governance structures that prioritize robustness over precision.

5 Managing for Robustness: A Practitioner Toolkit

If fragility is a consequence of incentives, constraints, and adaptation, then managing it requires a shift in objectives. The goal is not to forecast crises or optimize portfolios for a single expected future, but to increase robustness across a range of adverse states. This section translates the diagnostic insights developed earlier into practical tools for monitoring, stress testing, portfolio construction, and governance.

5.1 Fragility Monitoring Dashboard

Effective diagnosis begins with monitoring variables that signal declining margins of safety rather than rising volatility alone. A fragility dashboard should focus on indicators that capture leverage growth, funding dependence, crowding, and intermediary constraints—conditions that make outcomes sensitive to small shocks.

Key indicators include measures of leverage and embedded optionality, such as rapid balance-sheet expansion, increased use of derivatives, or yield-enhancement strategies that generate steady income at the cost of nonlinear downside. Funding dependence can be monitored through reliance on short-term financing, collateral reuse, and sensitivity to margin or haircut changes. Rising crowding can be inferred from increasing return correlations across strategies, style exposures, or benchmarks, even when asset-level correlations remain low (Pojarliev and Levich, 2010).

The dashboard should distinguish between *liquidity level* and *liquidity risk*. Assets that appear liquid in normal times may be highly exposed to aggregate liquidity shocks (Lou and Sadka, 2011), making covariance with system-wide liquidity conditions more informative than trading volumes or spreads alone.

Finally, intermediary capacity should be treated as a system-wide constraint. Measures of dealer balance-sheet usage, market depth concentration, and the health of nonbank financial intermediaries offer early warnings that liquidity provision may be saturating (Baudino et al., 2024). No single indicator is decisive; fragility emerges when multiple signals deteriorate simultaneously.

5.2 Stress Testing That Reflects Constraints

Traditional stress tests emphasize price shocks applied to static portfolios. While useful, such exercises understate fragility by assuming that liquidity conditions remain unchanged. Constraint-aware stress testing instead focuses on the mechanics that turn losses into forced actions.

Key scenarios should include funding withdrawals, rollover failures, and sudden increases in margins or haircuts. Rather than applying constant liquidation costs, stress tests should allow liquidity to deteriorate endogenously as selling pressure rises (Han and Leika, 2019; Meucci, 2012). This approach captures the feedback loop in which declining prices erode capital, trigger funding constraints, and force further sales.

Stress tests should also incorporate correlation breakdowns driven by common liquidation needs rather than by fundamentals. In such scenarios, diversification benefits vanish, and portfolios experience losses across multiple holdings simultaneously. The objective is not to estimate precise

losses, but to identify states in which survivability depends on access to funding rather than on valuation accuracy.

5.3 Portfolio Construction Under Fragility

Managing portfolios under fragility requires reframing optimization as a problem of survivability. Portfolios should be constructed to remain viable under funding stress, even at the cost of lower expected returns in normal times.

Liquidity tiering is a central principle. Assets should be classified not only by asset class, but by instrument structure and trading profile. Highly standardized instruments with deep markets offer very different exit characteristics than bespoke or opaque securities, even within the same asset category (Bessembinder et al., 2013). Treating these assets as interchangeable obscures critical differences in liquidation risk.

Redundancy and optionality further enhance robustness. Holding multiple avenues for meeting liquidity needs—such as unencumbered cash, committed credit lines, or assets with independent funding characteristics—reduces reliance on any single channel. Position scalability also matters: exposures should be sized so that partial liquidation is feasible without overwhelming market capacity.

Knightian uncertainty plays a limited but important role in this context. Some risks cannot be reliably quantified ex ante, particularly those associated with regime shifts and endogenous feedback loops. When uncertainty dominates risk, portfolios that prioritize robustness over fine-tuned optimization are better positioned to survive adverse states (Geanakoplos, 2010).

5.4 Governance and Pre-Commitment Rules

Diagnostics are only effective if they trigger action. Governance frameworks must therefore translate fragility signals into predefined responses. Pre-commitment rules help overcome the career risk and inertia that discourage early intervention during stable periods.

Such rules may include leverage caps that tighten automatically as funding conditions improve, escalation protocols when multiple fragility indicators breach thresholds, or predefined liquidity buffers that cannot be deployed for return enhancement. Crisis playbooks should specify decision rights, communication channels, and acceptable actions under stress, reducing ambiguity when speed matters most.

Importantly, these rules should be framed as tools for managing institutional risk rather than for generating alpha. Their value lies in reducing regret, preserving optionality, and avoiding forced decisions when markets are least accommodating.

5.4.1 Escalation Logic Linked to Liquidity-Cycle Phases

Diagnostics add value only when they change decisions. Rather than treating fragility indicators as forecasts, practitioners can use the liquidity-cycle phases (Box 1) as an escalation logic that clarifies objectives as constraints tighten.

- **Phase 1 (Fragility Build-Up):** Reduce hidden vulnerability while preserving optionality. Typical responses include reviewing funding terms, testing liquidation feasibility under stressed depth, and slowing the accumulation of embedded leverage even when measured risk remains low.
- **Phase 2 (Constraint Tightening):** Protect funding capacity and avoid forced actions. Responses may include reducing exposures that rely on short-term rollover, strengthening committed liquidity buffers, and stress testing margins/haircuts at levels consistent with a stress regime.
- **Phase 3 (Forced Liquidation):** Preserve solvency and decision freedom. Pre-committed actions are executed to raise liquidity in an orderly manner, limits on position scalability are enforced, and discretionary risk-taking is deferred until forced selling pressure subsides.
- **Phases 4–5 (Amplification and System Stress):** Survive without irreversible impairment. Actions prioritize preserving balance-sheet capacity, avoiding procyclical leverage, and maintaining the ability to choose—rather than being compelled to transact in deteriorating market conditions.

This escalation discipline is intentionally non-prescriptive about timing. Its value is governance: it clarifies what "risk reduction" means in each phase and supports earlier action when decision-making is still discretionary. By pre-committing to phase-based responses, institutions can reduce the career risk and organizational inertia that otherwise discourage defensive positioning during Phase 1–2 conditions.

5.5 Limits, Tradeoffs, and Ethical Constraints

Managing for robustness involves tradeoffs. Maintaining liquidity buffers, limiting leverage, and reducing complexity can lower returns during benign periods and may appear inefficient when judged by short-term performance metrics. When fragility channels are muted, strategies that appear aggressive may be survivable (Anarkulova et al., 2025). When those channels bind, even ostensibly conservative portfolios can become vulnerable. The distinction lies not in the aggressiveness of the strategy, but in its dependence on continuous liquidity and balance-sheet capacity.

Policy backstops can mitigate some forms of fragility, but they introduce second-order effects by altering incentives and encouraging risk migration. Practitioners should therefore avoid assuming that public interventions will reliably stabilize private portfolios.

Finally, robust decision-making requires acknowledging ethical constraints. Actions that preserve institutional survival—such as early de-risking or liquidity hoarding—may contribute to broader stress if adopted universally. Recognizing these externalities does not eliminate them, but it underscores the importance of transparency, proportionality, and pre-commitment in managing fragility.

Robustness is not free. It is a deliberate choice to accept visible costs in exchange for resilience under uncertainty.

Box 3. Systemic Fragility Diagnostic Checklist

These indicators are often benign in isolation. Fragility rises when they cluster, signaling declining margins of safety and greater sensitivity to liquidity shocks.

Early Warning Signals

- Compressed premia with rising leverage, position scaling, or embedded short optionality
- Increasing dependence on short-term funding, margin finance, or rollover
- Crowding: rising strategy/style comovement despite low realized volatility
- Risk concentration via benchmarks, index inclusion, or homogeneous mandates

Key Diagnostics

- Portfolio outcomes become more sensitive to funding terms than to valuation moves
- Exposure to margin/haircut jumps or collateral ineligibility (cliff effects)
- Reliance on intermediary balance-sheet capacity for liquidity provision
- Positions are not scalable: partial exits would materially move markets

Red Flags Under Stress

- Liquidity fails via quantity rationing (lines cut, inventories withdrawn), not just wider spreads
- Forced selling dominates price discovery; correlations spike across unrelated assets
- "Liquid" assets are sold first to raise cash, amplifying drawdowns and undermining diversification
- Decisions lag due to governance ambiguity or model disagreement

Interpretation. Fragility is elevated when portfolios require continued liquidity to validate positions rather than resilience of funding and liquidation capacity. When multiple indicators activate simultaneously, small shocks can trigger disproportionate losses through binding constraints.

6 Conclusion: Robustness over Precision

Financial fragility is not primarily a forecasting problem. It is a decision problem shaped by incentives, constraints, and the structure of modern financial systems. Losses during crises do not arise because professionals fail to anticipate shocks, but because portfolios and institutions are positioned in ways that make them vulnerable once liquidity constraints bind.

Periods of stability encourage behaviors that appear prudent in isolation—leverage expansion, maturity transformation, risk compression, and reliance on continuous market access. These behaviors reduce visible risk while eroding margins of safety. When conditions change, liquidity becomes the binding constraint, converting small shocks into forced actions and disproportionate losses. By the time volatility rises and correlations spike, fragility has already accumulated.

This article has argued for a shift from prediction to diagnosis. Rather than asking when a crisis will occur, practitioners should focus on whether portfolios can withstand disruptions to funding, intermediary capacity, and market liquidity. Diagnosing fragility requires monitoring leverage, crowding, and funding dependence; stress testing the mechanics of liquidation rather than prices

alone; and recognizing that some risks only reveal their shape once liquidity and funding terms change.

Robust decision-making accepts that precision is conditional. Models, expertise, and optimization are valuable tools in stable regimes. But they lose reliability when feedback effects dominate and balance-sheet constraints start setting the terms of trade. In such environments, robustness—defined by redundancy, scalability, and pre-commitment—offers more protection than finely tuned forecasts.

For practitioners, the implications are practical rather than theoretical. Managing fragility means acting earlier than feels comfortable, accepting short-term inefficiencies, and prioritizing survivability over relative performance. It also requires governance structures that support precautionary action and reduce the career risk associated with prudence.

In complex financial systems, resilience is not achieved by eliminating risk, but by recognizing its sources and limits. Portfolios designed to survive under uncertainty may appear conservative in calm markets, but they preserve the most valuable asset in periods of stress: the ability to choose rather than to be forced.

Key Takeaways

- Fragility accumulates during stability; liquidity converts it into loss.
- Diagnose funding, leverage, and liquidation constraints—not just prices.
- Prefer robustness, redundancy, and pre-commitment over precision forecasts.

References

Amihud, Y. and H. Mendelson (1991). Liquidity, asset prices and financial policy. *Financial Analysts Journal 47*(6), 56–66.

Anadu, K., M. Kruttli, P. McCabe, and E. Osambela (2020, May). The shift from active to passive investing: Potential risks to financial stability? Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2018-060r1, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Anarkulova, A., S. Cederburg, and M. S. O'Doherty (2025, July). Beyond the status quo: A critical assessment of lifecycle investment advice. Working Paper 4590406, SSRN.

Asness, C. S., A. Frazzini, and L. H. Pedersen (2014). Low-risk investing without industry bets. *Financial Analysts Journal 70*(4), 24–41.

Baudino, P., P. de Carvalho, and J.-P. Svoronos (2024, October). Liquidity stress tests for banks: Range of practices and possible developments. FSI Insights on policy implementation 59, Bank for International Settlements.

Bessembinder, H., W. F. Maxwell, and K. Venkataraman (2013). Trading activity and transaction costs in structured credit products. *Financial Analysts Journal 69*(6), 55–67.

Bookstaber, R. (2000). Understanding and monitoring the liquidity crisis cycle. *Financial Analysts Journal 56*(5), 17–22.

Brunnermeier, M. K. and L. H. Pedersen (2009). Market liquidity and funding liquidity. *The Review of Financial Studies 22*(6), 2201–2238.

Comotto, R. (2012, February). Haircuts and initial margins in the repo market. Report, International Capital Market Association (ICMA) European Repo Council, Zurich. Dated 8 February 2012.

Dai, W., M. Medhat, R. Novy-Marx, and S. Rizova (2023, November). Reversals and the returns to liquidity provision. Working Paper 4339591, SSRN.

Damodaran, A. (2013). Living with noise: Valuation in the face of uncertainty. *Journal of Applied Finance 23*(2), 6–22. Also available via SSRN.

Danielsson, J., K. R. James, M. Valenzuela, and I. Zer (2016). Model risk of risk models. *Journal of Financial Stability 23*, 79–91.

Danielsson, J. and H. S. Shin (2002, September). Endogenous risk. Working paper, London School of Economics.

Danielsson, J., H. S. Shin, and J.-P. Zigrand (2013). Endogenous and systemic risk. In J. G. Haubrich and A. W. Lo (Eds.), *Quantifying Systemic Risk*, pp. 73–94. University of Chicago Press.

Duffie, D. and A. Ziegler (2001, August). Liquidation risk. Working paper, Stanford University. Working paper version. A later journal version appears in Financial Analysts Journal (2003).

Financial Stability Board (2020, November). Holistic review of the march market turmoil. Report, Financial Stability Board.

Geanakoplos, J. (2010). The leverage cycle. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 24*(1), 1–65.

Goetzmann, W. N. (2020). The financial analysts journal and investment management. *Financial Analysts Journal 76*(3), 5–21.

Han, F. and M. Leika (2019, November). Integrating solvency and liquidity stress tests: The use of markov regime-switching models. IMF Working Paper WP/19/250, International Monetary Fund.

He, Z. and A. Krishnamurthy (2013). Intermediary asset pricing. *American Economic Review 103*(2), 732–770.

Kashyap, A. K., J. C. Stein, J. L. Wallen, and J. Younger (2025). Treasury market dysfunction and the role of the central bank. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* (1), 221–296.

Koh, B. S. K., F. Koh, D. K. C. Lee, K. G. Lim, D. Ng, and K. F. Phoon (2015). A risk- and complexity-rating framework for investment products. *Financial Analysts Journal 71*(6), 10–28.

Kruttli, M. S., P. J. Monin, L. Petrasek, and S. W. Watugala (2025). Ltcm redux? hedge fund treasury trading, funding fragility, and risk constraints. *Journal of Financial Economics 169*, 104017.

Lou, X. and R. Sadka (2011). Liquidity level or liquidity risk? evidence from the financial crisis. *Financial Analysts Journal 67*(3), 51–62.

Meucci, A. (2012). A fully integrated liquidity and market risk model. *Financial Analysts Journal 68*(6), 35–47.

Minsky, H. P. (1992, May). The financial instability hypothesis. Working Paper 74, The Jerome Levy Economics Institute of Bard College. Prepared for Handbook of Radical Political Economy (Edward Elgar, 1993).

Pojarliev, M. and R. M. Levich (2010, January). Detecting crowded trades in currency funds. Working Paper 15698, National Bureau of Economic Research.

Vissing-Jorgensen, A. (2021). The treasury market in spring 2020 and the response of the federal reserve. *Journal of Monetary Economics 124*, 19–47.