National Research Journal of Business Economics
Volume No: 12, Issue No: 2, Year: 2025 (July-December)
PP: 351-360
ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GLOBAL REGULATORY FRAMEWORKS GOVERNING ALGORITHMIC TRADING

Dr. S.B.Yadav

Professor
Head of Research Center, C.K.T. College, New Panvel, (W), Raigad, Maharashtra, India

Aruna Baswaraj Saganali

Research Scholar
C.K.T. College, New Panvel, (W), Raigad, Maharashtra, India

ABSTRACT

Algorithmic trading has fundamentally reshaped modern financial markets by increasing execution speed, enhancing liquidity, and improving price discovery. However, the proliferation of automated and high-frequency trading strategies has also introduced significant systemic, operational, and market integrity risks. In response, jurisdictions worldwide have developed regulatory frameworks aimed at mitigating these risks while preserving innovation and competitiveness. This paper undertakes a comparative analysis of regulatory approaches governing algorithmic trading in the United States, the European Union, the United Kingdom, India, and Singapore. It evaluates differences in licensing regimes, pre-trade risk controls, testing requirements, surveillance mechanisms, enforcement styles, and transparency obligations. The study finds that while the European Union adopts a highly prescriptive, ex-ante regulatory model under MiFID II, the United States relies more heavily on enforcement-driven oversight through agencies such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission. Emerging markets, including India and Singapore, emphasize preventive controls and technology risk management under centralized supervision by the Securities and Exchange Board of India and the Monetary Authority of Singapore, respectively. The paper argues that regulatory divergence creates potential arbitrage risks in increasingly interconnected markets and highlights the need for greater international coordination, particularly in light of AI-driven trading and cross-border digital asset markets.

Keywords

Algorithmic Trading, High-Frequency Trading, Financial Regulation, Market Microstructure, MiFID II, SEC, ESMA, SEBI, MAS, Regulatory Arbitrage, Systemic Risk, Cross-Border Supervision.

1. INTRODUCTION

The digitization of financial markets has led to a structural transformation in the way securities are traded globally. What began as electronic order-matching systems in the late twentieth century has evolved into sophisticated algorithmic ecosystems capable of executing thousands of trades within microseconds. Algorithmic trading defined as the use of computer algorithms to automatically generate and execute trading decisions now accounts for a substantial proportion of trading volume in advanced financial markets. High-frequency trading (HFT), a subset of algorithmic trading characterized by ultra-low latency strategies and rapid order submission and cancellation, has become a dominant force in equity and derivatives markets.

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

The benefits of algorithmic trading are well documented. Empirical research suggests that automation can narrow bid-ask spreads, enhance market liquidity, and improve price efficiency. By reducing human error and enabling rapid response to information, algorithmic systems have contributed to more integrated and globally connected markets. However, these advantages are accompanied by new categories of risk. Automated systems can generate cascading feedback loops during periods of stress, amplify volatility, and exacerbate liquidity shortages. Market manipulation strategies such as spoofing and layering have become more technologically sophisticated. Operational failures, coding errors, and cybersecurity vulnerabilities further threaten market integrity.

Major market disruptions have underscored these risks. The 2010 Flash Crash in the United States demonstrated how automated trading strategies could interact in unpredictable ways, triggering extreme short-term volatility. Similarly, the 2012 Knight Capital incident revealed the consequences of inadequate testing and governance of trading algorithms. Such events catalyzed regulatory reforms across jurisdictions, prompting policymakers to reconsider how best to oversee increasingly automated markets.

In the United States, regulatory authority is divided primarily between the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, reflecting the country's segmented oversight of securities and derivatives markets. Key measures such as Regulation SCI and the Market Access Rule impose system integrity standards and mandatory pre-trade risk controls. The U.S. regulatory model is often described as enforcement-centric, relying heavily on post-violation penalties and litigation to deter misconduct.

In contrast, the European Union has implemented a comprehensive, prescriptive framework through MiFID II under the coordination of the European Securities and Markets Authority. MiFID II introduced explicit obligations for algorithm testing, mandatory kill switches, order-to-trade ratio controls, and authorization requirements for high-frequency trading firms. The EU model emphasizes ex-ante safeguards and harmonized compliance standards across member states.

Following its withdrawal from the EU, the United Kingdom continues to regulate algorithmic trading through a retained version of MiFID II supervised by the Financial Conduct Authority. Meanwhile, emerging financial centres have adopted distinct approaches. India's regulatory framework, overseen by the Securities and Exchange Board of India, includes algorithm approval mechanisms and increasing scrutiny of retail algorithmic trading. Singapore, under the Monetary Authority of Singapore, emphasizes technology risk governance and system resilience within a principles-based supervisory regime.

Despite the proliferation of regulatory initiatives, divergence in oversight mechanisms persists. Differences in licensing requirements, enforcement intensity, transparency obligations, and supervisory philosophy create the potential for regulatory arbitrage, whereby firms exploit jurisdictional inconsistencies. Moreover, the emergence of artificial intelligence-driven trading systems and cross-border digital asset markets presents novel regulatory challenges that extend beyond traditional securities frameworks.

This paper conducts a comparative analysis of algorithmic trading regulation across these jurisdictions. It evaluates regulatory design, effectiveness, and coherence while assessing whether greater international harmonization is necessary to ensure market stability without stifling innovation. By integrating doctrinal legal analysis with comparative regulatory assessment, the study contributes to contemporary debates on the governance of automated financial markets.

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. **Brogaard (2010) & Hasbrouck and Saar (2013):** These studies focus on the market efficiency effects of algorithmic and high-frequency trading. They argue that automated trading enhances liquidity and facilitates price discovery, particularly in normal market conditions, suggesting that outright bans could reduce market quality.
2. **Kirilenko et al. (2017) & Easley, López de Prado, and O'Hara (2012):** This research highlights the destabilizing effects of algorithmic trading during stress periods. Kirilenko et al. show how rapid algorithm interactions contributed to the 2010 Flash Crash, while Easley et al. measure order flow toxicity and adverse selection risks, underscoring the need for robust risk controls.
3. **Cumming and Johan (2016) & Armour et al. (2016):** These authors examine regulatory responses to high-frequency trading across jurisdictions. They note significant variation in enforcement intensity and pre-trade safeguards, emphasizing the balance regulators must strike between innovation and market stability.
4. **Moloney (2018):** Moloney evaluates the European MiFID II framework, highlighting its role in increasing market transparency, harmonizing supervisory practices, and establishing clear obligations for algorithmic trading, especially in the EU context.
5. **Arner, Barberis, and Buckley (2017):** This work addresses the emergence of AI in financial markets, emphasizing challenges in explainability, accountability, and supervisory oversight. They contrast adaptive principles-based frameworks, such as Singapore's, with more prescriptive systems, highlighting regulatory flexibility in managing technological risk.

3. RESEARCH GAP

Despite extensive scholarship on algorithmic trading, several critical gaps remain. Most studies focus on single jurisdictions, particularly the United States or the European Union under MiFID II, leaving comparative analysis across developed and emerging markets such as India and Singapore underexplored. Similarly, research often describes regulatory frameworks without empirically evaluating their effectiveness in mitigating volatility, systemic risk, or market manipulation. Limited attention has been paid to regulatory arbitrage, where firms may exploit cross-jurisdictional differences, and few studies address emerging challenges posed by AI-driven trading, including explainability, accountability, and supervisory limitations. Additionally, oversight of retail algorithmic trading, particularly in markets like India under the Securities and Exchange Board of India, remains understudied. This paper addresses these gaps by offering an objective-wise, comparative evaluation of five major jurisdictions, incorporating AI and cross-border considerations into regulatory analysis.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a comparative doctrinal and analytical research methodology, supplemented by secondary empirical data.

4.1 Research Design

- Qualitative comparative legal analysis
- Secondary data-based financial market analysis
- Policy evaluation framework

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

4.2 Data Sources

4.2.1 Primary Sources

- Statutes and regulatory frameworks (e.g., Regulation SCI, Market Access Rule, MiFID II)
- Policy papers from:
    - Securities and Exchange Commission
    - Commodity Futures Trading Commission
    - European Securities and Markets Authority
    - Financial Conduct Authority
    - Securities and Exchange Board of India
    - Monetary Authority of Singapore

4.2.2 Secondary Sources

- Peer-reviewed journal articles
- BIS and IOSCO reports
- Market microstructure studies
- Enforcement case records

4.3 Analytical Framework

The study evaluates jurisdictions across the following regulatory dimensions:

1. Licensing & Authorization
2. Pre-Trade Risk Controls
3. Testing & Validation
4. Market Surveillance
5. Transparency & Reporting
6. Enforcement Mechanisms
7. Regulatory Philosophy

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

Comparative Regulatory Table: Algorithmic Trading Frameworks

Regulatory Dimension	United States	European Union	United Kingdom	India	Singapore
Primary Regulator(s)	Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC); Commodity Futures Trading Commission	European Securities and Markets Authority (ESMA) + National Competent Authorities	Financial Conduct Authority (FCA)	Securities and Exchange Board of India (SEBI)	Monetary Authority of Singapore (MAS)

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

	(CFTC)				
Core Legislation / Rules	Regulation SCI; Market Access Rule (15c3-5); Reg ATS; Dodd–Frank provisions	MiFID II; RTS 6 (Algo/HFT requirements)	Retained MiFID II framework (post-Brexit adaptations)	SEBI Circulars on Algorithmic Trading; Retail Algo Proposals	MAS Technology Risk Management Guidelines
Licensing & Registration	Broker-dealer registration; no separate HFT license	Mandatory authorization for HFT firms	FCA authorization under UK MiFID regime	Exchange-level approval of algorithms	Risk-based licensing; no specific HFT license
Pre-Trade Risk Controls	Market Access Rule requires risk checks and supervisory controls	Mandatory kill switches, order-to-trade ratios, pre-trade risk limits	Similar to EU but with flexibility	Order throttling; algorithm approval; position limits	Strong emphasis on system resilience and risk controls
Testing & Validation	Required under SCI; firm-level compliance	Mandatory pre-deployment testing; stress testing	Retained testing standards	Exchange testing before deployment	Internal validation; supervisory review
Market Surveillance	Heavy enforcement; anti-spoofing rules (CFTC)	Structured reporting & surveillance systems	FCA market abuse regime	Exchange surveillance systems	Supervisory monitoring; technology audits
Transparency & Reporting	Audit trails; large trader reporting	Extensive transaction reporting; algo flagging	Similar to EU reporting structure	Detailed audit trail requirements	Reporting obligations under Securities & Futures Act
Enforcement Style	Litigation-heavy; high monetary penalties	Administrative fines; harmonized EU sanctions	Administrative + civil enforcement	Exchange + regulatory sanctions	Supervisory interventions
Retail Algorithm Trading	Limited specific retail framework	Focus on professional firms	Retail protections via conduct rules	Active regulation of retail algos	General investor protection framework
Regulatory Approach	Enforcement-driven;	Highly prescriptive;	Moderately prescriptive;	Centralized &	Principles-based;

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

	fragmented	ex-ante controls	pro-competitiveness	preventive	technology risk focus
Regulatory Arbitrage Risk	Moderate (fragmented agencies)	Lower within EU; cross-border issues remain	Potential divergence post-Brexit	Regional market-specific	Lower due to centralized oversight

5.1 Objective 1: Examine Major Regulatory Frameworks

The comparative examination of regulatory frameworks demonstrates clear structural differences across jurisdictions. The European Union's framework under MiFID II represents the most prescriptive model, mandating formal authorization for high-frequency trading firms, compulsory algorithm testing, pre-deployment stress assessments, kill switch mechanisms, and order-to-trade ratio limits. In contrast, the United States framework, administered primarily by the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, relies heavily on compliance obligations and post-violation enforcement actions. Rather than requiring a distinct HFT license, the U.S. emphasizes system integrity requirements and strong anti-manipulation enforcement.

India, under the supervision of the Securities and Exchange Board of India, adopts a centralized preventive approach by requiring exchange-level approval of algorithms and imposing controls aimed particularly at retail algorithmic participation. Singapore's model, governed by the Monetary Authority of Singapore, emphasizes principles-based technology risk management, focusing on governance, operational resilience, and supervisory oversight rather than detailed prescriptive mandates.

Interpretation:
The European Union prioritizes preventive, ex-ante controls; the United States emphasizes deterrence through litigation and enforcement; India focuses on market integrity and retail protection; and Singapore prioritizes systemic resilience through supervisory flexibility.

5.2 Objective 2: Compare Regulatory Design Differences

Regulatory Feature	EU	US	India	Singapore
Kill Switch	Mandatory	Required via compliance	Indirect via exchange	Risk-based
HFT License	Yes	No	No	No
Retail Algo Rules	Limited	Minimal	Active regulation	General investor rules
Enforcement Style	Administrative	Litigation-heavy	Mixed	Supervisory

A structural comparison of regulatory design reveals significant divergence in licensing, risk controls, retail oversight, and enforcement philosophy. The EU mandates explicit HFT authorization and codifies compulsory kill switch mechanisms and risk thresholds. The United States does not impose a separate HFT licensing regime but enforces risk controls

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

through broker-dealer obligations and supervisory compliance requirements. India does not require an HFT license but mandates exchange-level algorithm approval and has actively proposed frameworks governing retail algorithmic trading. Singapore does not prescribe specific algorithm licensing but incorporates risk-based oversight within broader financial supervisory structures.

Enforcement styles further distinguish these models. The EU primarily relies on administrative penalties and harmonized sanctions, whereas the U.S. employs litigation-heavy enforcement and significant monetary penalties. India utilizes a mixed system combining regulatory and exchange-level sanctions, while Singapore relies on supervisory intervention and compliance audits.

Interpretation:
The EU adopts a formal ex-ante regulatory model; the U.S. operates a reactive, enforcement-driven model; India reflects centralized oversight with preventive intent; and Singapore applies flexible, principles-based supervision tailored to institutional risk profiles.

5.3 Objective 3: Evaluate Effectiveness in Risk Mitigation

Effectiveness was assessed using secondary indicators, including flash crash frequency, market volatility trends, enforcement actions, and liquidity spread analysis. Evidence suggests that MiFID II has enhanced transparency and auditability across European markets, although compliance costs have increased significantly for market participants. In the United States, enforcement actions against spoofing and manipulative practices have strengthened deterrence; however, jurisdictional fragmentation between regulatory agencies continues to pose coordination challenges.

India's algorithm approval framework appears to reduce the likelihood of retail misuse and operational malfunctions but may inadvertently slow innovation due to administrative constraints. Singapore's technology risk management approach has contributed to sustained market stability, reflecting strong supervisory vigilance and institutional oversight capacity.

Interpretation:
While regulatory interventions reduce operational and manipulation risks, no jurisdiction fully eliminates systemic vulnerabilities. Algorithmic feedback loops and extreme volatility events remain possible, particularly during periods of market stress.

5.4 Objective 4: Identify Regulatory Arbitrage Risks

Cross-border algorithmic trading infrastructure enables firms to strategically allocate servers, subsidiaries, and trading operations across jurisdictions. Differences in order-to-trade restrictions, licensing requirements, and enforcement intensity create potential incentives for regulatory arbitrage. The divergence between EU and UK regulatory approaches following Brexit may further intensify regulatory competition. Similarly, fragmented oversight in the United States may present structural opportunities for jurisdictional optimization by trading firms.

Interpretation:

Regulatory divergence generates moderate arbitrage risk, particularly in fragmented or loosely harmonized systems. Without coordinated international standards, cross-border algorithmic activity may undermine domestic regulatory objectives.

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

5.5 Objective 5: Address AI and Future Challenges

The emergence of artificial intelligence and machine learning–driven trading systems introduces governance challenges beyond the scope of traditional rule-based regulatory frameworks. Key concerns include AI explainability, model accountability, cross-border crypto algorithmic trading, decentralized exchanges, and supervisory technology limitations. Existing regulations were primarily designed for deterministic algorithms, not autonomous adaptive systems capable of evolving without explicit programming adjustments.

Interpretation:
Future regulatory models must incorporate AI explainability audits, model risk management standards, and enhanced supervisory technology (SupTech) capabilities. Without such evolution, regulatory frameworks risk becoming structurally outdated.

6. OVERALL INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

The comparative analysis reveals that prescriptive regulatory models, such as the EU framework under MiFID II, provide clarity and structured preventive safeguards but impose higher compliance costs. Enforcement-driven systems, such as that of the United States, offer strong deterrence but depend heavily on post-event corrective action. Preventive centralized models, as seen in India, strengthen control over algorithm deployment but may constrain innovation. Principles-based frameworks, exemplified by Singapore, offer flexibility but rely substantially on supervisory expertise and institutional capacity.

Overall, the absence of harmonized global standards in algorithmic trading regulation increases systemic interconnected risk. As markets become increasingly digitized and AI-driven, coordinated international governance will become essential to balancing financial innovation with systemic stability.

7 POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The comparative analysis reveals that while major jurisdictions have established structured oversight mechanisms for algorithmic trading, regulatory divergence persists in enforcement intensity, licensing requirements, AI governance, and cross-border coordination. To enhance systemic resilience without undermining innovation, the following reforms are recommended:

1. Global Minimum Standards

Given the cross-border nature of algorithmic trading, international bodies should develop baseline regulatory standards. These should include mandatory pre-trade risk controls (e.g., kill switches and position limits), algorithm testing requirements, audit trail preservation, and governance accountability frameworks. While the European model under MiFID II offers a structured template, implementation should remain adaptable to jurisdictional contexts.

2. AI Governance and Explainability

Regulatory frameworks must evolve to address machine learning–based trading systems. Authorities such as the Securities and Exchange Commission and the European Securities and Markets Authority should require AI model documentation, explainability audits, and continuous validation mechanisms to ensure accountability and reduce systemic opacity.

3. Cross-Border Supervisory Cooperation

Regulators should strengthen cooperation through harmonized reporting standards, shared enforcement databases, and joint investigations. Divergence between jurisdictions—including evolving frameworks under the Securities and Exchange Board of India and the Monetary

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

Authority of Singapore—highlights the need for coordinated oversight to minimize regulatory arbitrage.

4. Supervisory Technology (SupTech) Investment

Regulators must deploy advanced surveillance technologies capable of detecting spoofing, algorithmic feedback loops, and systemic stress in real time. Enhanced supervisory capacity is essential to keep pace with high-speed, AI-driven trading environments.

5. Balanced Innovation Through Regulatory Sandboxes

To prevent excessive compliance burdens from stifling innovation, jurisdictions should expand regulatory sandboxes that allow controlled experimentation with advanced trading technologies under supervisory monitoring.

8. CONCLUSION

Algorithmic trading has redefined the structure and functioning of global financial markets. While regulatory authorities across the United States, European Union, United Kingdom, India, and Singapore have implemented comprehensive oversight mechanisms, regulatory divergence persists in licensing requirements, pre-trade risk controls, transparency obligations, and enforcement intensity.

The European Union's prescriptive regime under MiFID II represents the most structured ex-ante regulatory model. The United States emphasizes enforcement and litigation, reflecting its fragmented oversight architecture. India adopts preventive algorithm approval mechanisms, particularly for retail participation, while Singapore emphasizes principles-based technology risk management.

Despite these efforts, systemic vulnerabilities remain, particularly in cross-border trading environments and AI-driven algorithmic systems. Regulatory arbitrage risks, supervisory capacity limitations, and the rapid evolution of decentralized finance highlight the need for greater international coordination.

This study concludes that while current frameworks mitigate operational and manipulation risks to a degree, they are insufficient to address the complexities of autonomous AI trading and globally integrated digital markets. A harmonized global baseline—incorporating mandatory risk controls, AI explainability standards, cross-border supervisory cooperation, and adaptive regulatory sandboxes—may represent the next stage in financial regulatory evolution.

REFERENCES

1. Armour, J., Awrey, D., Davies, P., Enriques, L., Gordon, J. N., Mayer, C., & Payne, J. (2016). *Principles of financial regulation*. Oxford University Press.
2. Arner, D. W., Barberis, J., & Buckley, R. P. (2017). FinTech and regtech in a nutshell, and the future in a sandbox. *CFA Institute Research Foundation*, 3(4), 1–20.
3. Bank for International Settlements. (2018). *Sound practices: implications of fintech developments for banks and bank supervisors*. BIS Basel Committee on Banking Supervision.
4. Brogaard, J. (2010). High frequency trading and its impact on market quality. *Northwestern University Working Paper*.
5. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. (2015). *Concept release on automated trading*. Washington, DC.

ISSN: 2349-2015
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal (IF: 6.74)
Journal Website: www.nrjbe.in

6. Cumming, D., & Johan, S. (2016). The problems with and regulation of high-frequency trading. *Journal of Corporate Finance, 38*, 1–21.
7. Easley, D., López de Prado, M., & O'Hara, M. (2012). The volume clock: Insights into the high frequency paradigm. *Journal of Portfolio Management, 39*(1), 19–29.
8. European Securities and Markets Authority. (2015). *Final report: Guidelines on systems and controls in an automated trading environment for trading platforms, investment firms and competent authorities*.
9. Hasbrouck, J., & Saar, G. (2013). Low-latency trading. *Journal of Financial Markets, 16*(4), 646–679.
10. Kirilenko, A., Kyle, A., Samadi, M., & Tuzun, T. (2017). The flash crash: High-frequency trading in an electronic market. *Journal of Finance, 72*(3), 967–998.
11. Moloney, N. (2018). *EU securities and financial markets regulation* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
12. Monetary Authority of Singapore. (2021). *Technology risk management guidelines*. MAS Publications.
13. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2022). *Consultation paper on algorithmic trading by retail investors*. SEBI Publications.
14. Securities and Exchange Commission. (2014). *Regulation systems compliance and integrity (Regulation SCI)*. SEC Release No. 34-73639.