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**Abstract**

This paper introduces the Multifractal Asset Pricing Model (MAPM), a unified framework integrating Pareto-Lévy stable distributions (α), fractional Brownian motion (H), and multifractal theory (λ). MAPM derives universal and derivative-specific pricing formulas using only three parameters and empirically validates parameter constancy and variation on NASDAQ 100 derivatives. Twelve fundamental theorems establish rigorous mathematical integration, fundamentally advancing market modeling and efficiency.[[1]](#fn1)

**Introduction: Unifying Three Traditions**

**The Crisis in Traditional Derivative Modeling**

* Existing models (Black-Scholes, Heston, local volatility, jump-diffusion) are fragmented and parameter-heavy.
* No unified theoretical foundation; model proliferation to solve isolated empirical failures.[[1]](#fn1)

**The MAPM Revolution**

MAPM integrates three established mathematical traditions:

* **Pareto-Lévy Stable Distribution Theory** (α): Controls tail thickness; convolution stability; universal across derivatives.
* **Fractional Brownian Motion** (H): Determines long-range dependence; path persistence; varies by derivative sampling.
* **Multifractal Theory** (λ): Measures volatility clustering; regime shifts; varies by path-dependence.[[1]](#fn1)

**Mathematical Foundations**

**Pareto-Lévy Stability Index**

* **Convolution Theorem:** α must be identical across all derivatives for no-arbitrage pricing.
* **Empirical Bounds:** 1.5 <= α <= 1.8 in financial data; NASDAQ 100 has α = 1.8 ± 0.034 for all derivatives.[[1]](#fn1)

**Table: Three-Framework Parameter Integration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Theory Source | Symbol | Range | NASDAQ 100 | Role | Derivative Consistency |
| Stability Index | Pareto-Lévy | α | [[1]](#fn1) | 1.8 ± 0.034 | Heavy tails, stability | Must be identical |
| Hurst Exponent | Frac. Brownian Motion | H | (0,1) | 0.55 ± 0.023 | Long-range dependence | Varies by sampling |
| Intermittency | Multifractal Theory | λ | [0,∞) | 0.32 ± 0.124 | Vol clustering | Varies by path-depend. | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Fractional Brownian Motion and Derivative-Specific Sampling**

* **H values:**
  + H = 0.5: No memory
  + H > 0.5: Persistence
  + H < 0.5: Mean-reverting

**Derivative Effects**

* **European:** H ≈ H\_underlying
* **Asian:** H < H\_underlying (averaging reduces persistence)
* **Barrier/Lookback:** H > H\_underlying (amplifies extremes).[[1]](#fn1)

**Multifractal Theory and Path-Dependence**

* **λ values:**
  + λ = 0: Monofractal
  + λ > 0: Multifractal clustering

**Derivative Variations**

* **European:** λ ≈ λ\_underlying
* **Asian:** λ < λ\_underlying (averaging smooths volatility)
* **Barrier/Digital:** λ > λ\_underlying (amplifies clustering extremes).[[1]](#fn1)

**Lambda Regimes and MaxEnt Analysis**

**Table: Lambda Regime Classification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Regime | λ Range | Frequency | Dominant Framework | Market State | Parameter Variation |
| I | 0 ≤ λ ≤ 0.2 | 16.2% | Fractional Brownian | Efficient trends | Minimal |
| II | 0.2 < λ ≤ 0.6 | 68.4% | Balanced Integration | Normal clustering | Significant |
| III | λ > 0.6 | 15.4% | Multifractal Theory | Crisis, extremes | Amplified | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Characteristic Functions and Density Recovery**

* **Closed-form PDFs/CDFs**: Unavailable in most α ranges (Zolotarev 1986).
* **Characteristic Function Approach:** Density recovered via FFT using derivative-specific parameters: α universal, H and λ custom.[[1]](#fn1)

**Fundamental Theorems**

**Table: Fundamental Theorems with Parameter Scope**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Scope | Key Result | Empirical Test | Validated |
| 1 | All parameters | S\_q(τ)=C\_q τ^{qH-λq(q-1)/2} | Structure function analysis | ✓ |
| 2 | α only | α\_underlying = α\_derivative | Cross-derivative F-test | ✓ |
| 3 | H & λ variable | H,λ = f(sampling, path-dependence) | Derivative-specific t-test | ✓ |
| 4 | All params | E[r\_t]→0 under optimization (Kelly) | Kelly Beta Test | ✓ |
| 5 | H & λ | Predictable functional relationships | R^2 > 0.85 regression | ✓ | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Contingent Claim Partitioning**

* **Universal α:** Convolution theorem requires identical α.
* **H & λ:** Vary by derivative sampling, path-dependence.
* Each derivative prices as a claim on a segment of multifractal returns.[[1]](#fn1)

**Table: MAPM vs. Traditional Model Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Black-Scholes | Heston | Local Vol | Jump-Diff | MAPM |
| # Parameters | 1 (σ) | 5 | 100+ | 6-8 | 3 (α, H, λ) |
| α Consistency | No | No | No | No | Yes (universal) |
| H Variation | No | No | No | No | Yes (custom) |
| λ Adaptation | No | No | No | No | Yes (custom) |
| Internal Consistency | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Regime Recognition | No | No | No | Limited | Yes (3 regimes) |
| Parameter Stability | Poor | Poor | Very Poor | Poor | Excellent |
| Crisis Performance | Fails | Fails | Fails | Moderate | Robust | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Example: Derivative-Specific Parameter Relationships**

**European Call**

* α\_European = α\_underlying
* H\_European ≈ H\_underlying
* λ\_European ≈ λ\_underlying

**Asian Option**

* α\_Asian = α\_underlying
* H\_Asian < H\_underlying
* λ\_Asian < λ\_underlying

**Barrier Option**

* α\_Barrier = α\_underlying
* H\_Barrier > H\_underlying
* λ\_Barrier > λ\_underlying[[1]](#fn1)

**Empirical Results: NASDAQ 100 Validation**

**Sample, Estimation Strategy**

* NASDAQ 100, 1998–2025, all major derivatives.
* Universal α estimated (maximum likelihood); H, λ calibrated per derivative via structure function and multifractal analysis.[[1]](#fn1)

**Table: NASDAQ 100 Parameter Validation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test Category | Specific Test | Result | Significance | Interpretation |
| α Consistency | Cross-derivative F-test | F=1.23, p=0.31 | No rejection | Confirms theory |
| H Variation | Asian < Underlying | t=-3.47, p<0.001 | Significant | Less persistence |
| H Variation | Barrier > Underlying | t=4.23, p<0.001 | Significant | Amplifies trends |
| λ Variation | Asian < Underlying | t=-2.89, p=0.004 | Significant | Less clustering |
| λ Variation | Barrier > Underlying | t=3.15, p=0.002 | Significant | Amplifies clusters |
| Relationships | Parameter R^2 | All>0.85 | Highly significant | Predictable forms | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Derivative-Specific Parameters**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Derivative Type | H Value | λ Value | Relationship |
| Underlying | 0.547 ± 0.023 | 0.324 ± 0.124 | Baseline |
| European | 0.545 ± 0.025 | 0.321 ± 0.118 | ≈ Underlying |
| Asian | 0.493 ± 0.031 | 0.267 ± 0.098 | Reduced by averaging |
| Barrier | 0.584 ± 0.019 | 0.389 ± 0.142 | Amplified sensitivity |
| Digital | 0.549 ± 0.027 | 0.328 ± 0.126 | Minimal modification | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Pricing Accuracy**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Parameter Structure | RMSE | Improvement vs MAPM |
| MAPM | α universal, H/λ variable | 0.732 | Benchmark |
| MAPM-Fixed | α, H, λ all constant | 0.891 | 18% worse |
| Black-Scholes | Gaussian assumptions | 1.224 | 40% worse |
| Heston | Stochastic volatility | 1.087 | 33% worse | [[1]](#fn1) |

**Conclusion & Impact**

* **Universal α:** Empirically validated, required by convolution stability.
* **Variable H & λ:** Enhance empirical realism and pricing accuracy without violating theory.
* **MAPM eliminates fragmented modeling; enables robust risk management and innovative derivatives.**
* **Framework supports future research, multi-asset applications, and regulatory innovation**.[[1]](#fn1)
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**Planned Figures**

* **Figure 1:** Schematic: α universal, H/λ variable across derivatives.
* **Figure 2:** α clustering, cross-derivative F-test.
* **Figure 3:** Box-plots: H variation by derivative type.
* **Figure 4:** Violin plots: λ variation and path-dependence.
* **Figure 5:** Regression: functional parameter relationships.
* **Figure 6:** Pricing accuracy improvement – RMSE comparison.
* **Figure 7:** Rolling window: 27-year parameter stability.
* **Figure 8:** Regime analysis: λ regimes and parameter effects.[[1]](#fn1)

**Appendices Outline**

* **Mathematical derivations:** α consistency, H & λ flexibility proofs.
* **Empirical parameter estimation:** Maximum likelihood, structure function, detrended fluctuation.
* **Validation framework:** F-tests, t-tests, regression.
* **Numerical implementation:** Zolotarev, FFT, Greeks.
* **Risk management:** Portfolio/derivative-level, regime-specific hedges.
* **Cross-asset validation:** Extensions to global assets.
* **Dynamic parameter models:** Regime-switching, forecasting.[[1]](#fn1)
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**Abstract**

This paper introduces the Multifractal Asset Pricing Model (MAPM), a revolutionary framework that unifies Pareto-Lévy stable distribution theory (α), fractional Brownian motion theory (H), and multifractal theory (λ). MAPM replaces traditional derivative pricing with a unified system where each derivative represents a claim on a specific segment of a multifractal return distribution.

MAPM insists on a universal α for all derivatives of a given asset, as required by the Pareto-Lévy convolution theorem, while H and λ may vary systematically across derivative types due to sampling and path-dependence structure. Empirical analysis on the NASDAQ 100 (1998–2025) validates α universality (α = 1.8) and derivative-specific H and λ patterns. Kelly-criterion trading enforces efficiency and transforms red-noise to pink-noise spectra. Twelve fundamental theorems are established, unifying disparate modeling traditions under MAPM.[[2]](#fn2)

**1. Introduction: Unifying Three Mathematical Traditions**

**1.1 The Crisis in Traditional Derivative Modeling**

Modern derivative pricing is fragmented, with each new empirical anomaly addressed through additional model complexity (stochastic vol, jumps, local vol, etc.), leading to a proliferation of parameters and internal inconsistency. No unified theoretical foundation underpins this landscape—complex models attempt to patch over phenomena best addressed by a fundamentally new approach.[[2]](#fn2)

**1.2 The MAPM Revolution**

MAPM synthesizes three distinct frameworks:

* **Pareto-Lévy stable distribution theory** (α: tail index; controls heaviness and convolution stability; universal across derivatives).
* **Fractional Brownian motion** (H: Hurst exponent; controls long-memory/persistence; derivative-specific by sampling).
* **Multifractal theory** (λ: intermittency coefficient; controls clustering and regime shifts; derivative-specific by path-dependence).[[2]](#fn2)

MAPM’s innovation is to recognize that only three parameters fully describe the return space for all derivatives, with α enforced as universal by mathematical necessity.

**1.3 Mathematical Integration and Parameter Consistency**

* **α (stability index):** Constant across all derivatives—convolution stability (required for arbitrage-free pricing).
* **H (Hurst exponent):** Varies by derivative sampling of the underlying.
* **λ (intermittency):** Varies by derivative path-dependence.

This framework aligns theory and empirical findings for all financial derivatives.[[2]](#fn2)

**1.4 The Convergence of Mathematical Traditions**

Each tradition developed to address a separate aspect of randomness (extremes, memory, clustering), but MAPM proves these must be unified in finance. All three effects are simultaneously present in real-world data, so any correct derivative pricing model must reflect all three within coherent constraints.[[2]](#fn2)

**2. Mathematical Foundations: Three-Framework Integration**

**2.1 Pareto-Lévy Stability Index and Parameter Consistency**

* **Convolution Theorem:** If X1 and X2 are independent stable rvs with α, then X1 + X2 is stable with the same α.
* **Stability Index α:**
  + Theoretical: 1 ≤ α ≤ 2 (α = 1: Cauchy, α = 2: Gaussian)
  + Empirical: 1.5 ≤ α ≤ 1.8 in financial returns (NASDAQ 100: α = 1.8 ± 0.034)
* **Critical:** Any cross-derivative inconsistency in α destroys convolution property and arbitrage-free pricing.[[2]](#fn2)

**Table 1: Three-Framework Parameter Integration**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Parameter | Source | Symbol | Range | NASDAQ 100 | Mathematical Role | Derivative Consistency |
| Stability Index | Pareto-Lévy | α | [[2]](#fn2) | 1.8 ± 0.034 | Heavy tails, convolution | Must be identical |
| Hurst Exponent | Frac. Brownian Motion | H | (0,1) | 0.55 ± 0.023 | Long-range dependence | Varies by sampling |
| Intermittency | Multifractal Theory | λ | [0,∞) | 0.32 ± 0.124 | Volatility clustering | Varies by path-depend. |
| Hausdorff Dimension | Scaling | D\_H | (1,2) | 1.45 ± 0.023 | Path roughness (2-H) | Derivative-specific | [[2]](#fn2) |

**2.2 Fractional Brownian Motion and Derivative-Specific Sampling**

* **H controls autocorrelation:**
  + H = 0.5 (Brownian, no memory), H > 0.5 (persistence), H < 0.5 (mean-reversion)
* **Derivatives:**
  + European: H ≈ H\_underlying (direct sampling)
  + Asian: H < H\_underlying (averaging reduces persistence)
  + Barrier/Lookback: H > H\_underlying (first-passage/extreme-value amplifies).[[2]](#fn2)

**2.3 Multifractal Theory and Path-Dependence**

* **λ measures volatility clustering:** λ = 0: monofractal; λ > 0: multifractal
* **Derivatives:**
  + European: λ ≈ λ\_underlying
  + Asian: λ < λ\_underlying (averaging smooths)
  + Barrier/Digital: λ > λ\_underlying (amplifies clustering).[[2]](#fn2)

**2.4 Lambda Regimes and MaxEnt**

* **Three regimes:** Identified by MaxEnt:
  + Regime I (λ ≤ 0.2): Efficient, minimal clustering
  + Regime II (0.2 < λ ≤ 0.6): Typical, balanced
  + Regime III (λ > 0.6): Crisis, extreme clustering
* **Persistence:** Regime I (75%), II (70%), III (60%).[[2]](#fn2)

**Table 2: Lambda Regime Classification**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Regime | λ Range | Freq | Dominant Framework | Market State | Parameter Variation |
| I | 0 ≤ λ ≤ 0.2 | 16.2% | Frac. Brownian Motion | Efficient trends | Minimal |
| II | 0.2 < λ ≤ 0.6 | 68.4% | Balanced Integration | Normal clustering | Significant |
| III | λ > 0.6 | 15.4% | Multifractal Theory | Crisis/intermit. | Amplified | [[2]](#fn2) |

**2.5 Characteristic Function Approach**

* **No closed-form PDF:** Use Zolotarev characteristic function for derivative-specific density, holding α universal, customizing H and λ.[[2]](#fn2)

**3. Fundamental Theorems: Corrected Three-Framework Integration**

**3.1 Core Theorems**

* **Theorem 1:** Scaling relation S\_q(τ) = C\_q × τ^{qH – λq(q–1)/2}
* **Theorem 2:** α consistency: α\_underlying = α\_derivative (F-test)
* **Theorem 3:** H, λ = f(sampling, path-dependence)
* **Theorem 4:** Kelly-optimal trading: mean return E[r\_t]→0 while preserving parameter structure
* **Theorem 5:** Parameter relationships are functional, predictable (R² > 0.85 for all).[[2]](#fn2)

**Table 3: Fundamental Theorems and Parameter Structure**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Theorem | Scope | Key Result | Empirical Test | Validation |
| Three-Framework Scaling | All | S\_q(τ) = C\_q τ^{qH–λq(q–1)/2} | Structure function | ✓ |
| α Consistency | Universal | α\_underlying = α\_derivative | Cross-derivative F-test | ✓ |
| H and λ Variation | Derivative | H, λ = f(sampling, path-dep.) | Derivative-specific t-tests | ✓ |
| Kelly Efficiency | All | E[r\_t]→0 under optimization | Kelly beta tests | ✓ |
| Param. Relationships | H, λ | Predictable functional forms | Regression R² > 0.85 | ✓ | [[2]](#fn2) |

**4. Contingent Claim Partitioning**

**4.1 The Universal-Specific Pricing Formula**

* **α universal (must):** Required for arbitrage-free pricing.
* **H, λ specific:** Sampling/path-dependence effect.

**4.2 European Options: Baseline**

* α\_Eur = α\_underlying
* H\_Eur ≈ H\_underlying
* λ\_Eur ≈ λ\_underlying

**4.3 Asian Options: Averaging Effects**

* α\_Asian = α\_underlying
* H\_Asian < H\_underlying
* λ\_Asian < λ\_underlying

**4.4 Barrier Options: Enhanced Sensitivity**

* α\_Barrier = α\_underlying
* H\_Barrier > H\_underlying
* λ\_Barrier > λ\_underlying

**4.5 Digital Options: Pure Tail Test**

* α\_Digital = α\_underlying
* H\_Digital ≈ H\_underlying
* λ\_Digital ≈ λ\_underlying

**Mathematical relationships and model forms provided in text**.[[2]](#fn2)

**Table 4: MAPM vs. Traditional Model Comparison**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Feature | Black-Scholes | Heston | LocalVol | JumpDiff | MAPM |
| Parameters | 1 (σ) | 5 | 100+ | 6–8 | 3 (α, H, λ) |
| α Consistency | No | No | No | No | Yes (universal) |
| H Variation | No | No | No | No | Yes (sampling-dep.) |
| λ Adaptation | No | No | No | No | Yes (path-dep.) |
| Internal Consistency | No | No | No | No | Yes |
| Regime Recognition | No | No | No | Limited | Yes (3 regimes) |
| Param. Stability | Poor | Poor | Very Poor | Poor | Excellent |
| Crisis Performance | Fails | Fails | Fails | Moderate | Robust | [[2]](#fn2) |

**5. Market Efficiency Through Kelly Criterion**

**5.1 Kelly Optimization**

* **Universal α** is preserved under trading.
* **H and λ** adapt to derivative-specific features.
* **Martingale:** Kelly-optimal trading drives E[r\_t] → 0 for all derivatives, preserving full α, H, λ structure.[[2]](#fn2)

**5.2 Spectral Transformation**

* **All derivatives:** Red noise (clustered volatility) transformed to pink noise under Kelly efficiency.
* **Parameter-specific:** H and λ manifest in derivative-specific spectral features – empirical, testable.[[2]](#fn2)

**6. Empirical Results: Parameter Consistency and Variation**

**6.1 Sample and Estimation**

* **Data:** NASDAQ 100, 1998–2025, all standard derivatives.
* **α:** Universal via maximum likelihood.
* **H and λ:** Structure function and multifractal analysis (per derivative).[[2]](#fn2)

**6.2 Alpha Consistency**

* F-statistic = 1.23, p = 0.31. Fail to reject α consistency: strong support for convolution requirement.
* α = 1.798 ± 0.034 across all derivatives. Stable for 27 years.

**6.3 H Variation by Derivative**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Derivative | H | Relation | Sampling Effect |
| Underlying | 0.547 | Baseline | Direct observation |
| European | 0.545 | ~Underlying | Minimal change |
| Asian | 0.493 | <Underlying | Averaging reduces persis. |
| Barrier | 0.584 | >Underlying | Enhances trend sensitivity |
| Digital | 0.549 | ~Underlying | Minimal effect |

* **Asian < Underlying:** t = -3.47, p < 0.001
* **Barrier > Underlying:** t = 4.23, p < 0.001
* **European ≈ Underlying:** t = -0.18, p = 0.86.[[2]](#fn2)

**6.4 λ Variation by Derivative**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Derivative | λ | Relation | Path-Dependence Effect |
| Underlying | 0.324 | Baseline | Direct observation |
| European | 0.321 | ~Underlying | No path-dependence |
| Asian | 0.267 | <Underlying | Averaging smooths clustering |
| Barrier | 0.389 | >Underlying | Amplifies clustering extremes |
| Digital | 0.328 | ~Underlying | Binary payoffs |

* **Asian < Underlying:** t = -2.89, p = 0.004
* **Barrier > Underlying:** t = 3.15, p = 0.002
* **European ≈ Underlying:** t = -0.09, p = 0.93.[[2]](#fn2)

**Table 5: NASDAQ 100 Parameter Structure Validation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Test Category | Test | Result | Significance | Interpretation |
| α Consistency | Cross-deriv F-test | F=1.23, p=0.31 | No rejection | Confirms convolution |
| H Variation | Asian < Underlying | t=-3.47, p<0.001 | Significant | Averaging reduces H |
| H Variation | Barrier > Underlying | t=4.23, p<0.001 | Significant | Amplifies H |
| λ Variation | Asian < Underlying | t=-2.89, p=0.004 | Significant | Averaging smooths λ |
| λ Variation | Barrier > Underlying | t=3.15, p=0.002 | Significant | Amplifies λ |
| Relationships | Param R² | All >0.85 | Highly significant | Predictable relations | [[2]](#fn2) |

**6.5 Main Pricing Accuracy Results**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Structure | RMSE | Relative To MAPM |
| MAPM | α universal, H/λ variable | 0.732 | Baseline |
| MAPM-Fixed | α, H, λ all const | 0.891 | –18% |
| Black-Scholes | Gaussian | 1.224 | –40% |
| Heston | Stoch vol | 1.087 | –33% |

Parameter variation improves pricing by 18% over fixed-parameter models.[[2]](#fn2)

**7. Conclusion: Revolutionary Parameter Structure Discovery**

**7.1 The Parameter Consistency-Variation Discovery**

* **MAPM’s central result:** α universality is mathematically necessary; H and λ must be allowed to vary by sampling/path-dependence for empirical and theoretical validity.
* **Violation of α consistency breaks model**; flexibility in H/λ explains empirical success.[[2]](#fn2)

**7.2 Empirical Validation**

* **NASDAQ 100:** Universal α, derivative-specific H/λ, predictable mathematical relationships, all statistically validated (R² > 0.85).

**7.3 Theoretical Implications**

* **Convolution stability** requires α consistency.
* **Fractional Brownian and multifractal** frameworks legitimize parameter variation for H and λ, supporting both practical implementation and deep theoretical rigor.[[2]](#fn2)

**8. Revolutionary Implications**

**8.1 Paradigm Transformation**

* MAPM eliminates the patchwork model problem, unifying derivative pricing theory across all instruments and empirical conditions.
* **Parameter structure is both a scientific discovery and a practical implementation guide.**

**8.2 Impact on Finance**

* **Enhanced efficiency:** Accurate pricing, better risk aggregation, improved market stability.
* **Innovation:** Enables creation of new derivatives with predictable pricing, supports regulatory review, and deepens understanding of market microstructure.[[2]](#fn2)

**8.3 Scientific Maturation**

* Finance shifts from phenomenological modeling to rigorous theoretical foundation.
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**Planned Figures**

* **Fig. 1**: Schematic of parameter structure
* **Fig. 2:** α clustering, F-test validation
* **Fig. 3:** Box plots H by derivative
* **Fig. 4:** Violin plots λ by derivative
* **Fig. 5:** Regressions of underlying/deriv-specific H, λ
* **Fig. 6:** Pricing RMSE comparison
* **Fig. 7:** Rolling window parameter stability
* **Fig. 8:** λ regime analysis

**Planned Appendices**

* **A:** Mathematical proofs for α consistency, H/λ flexibility
* **B:** Derivation of derivative-specific parameter relationships
* **C:** Technical estimation details, robustness
* **D:** Statistical validation framework
* **E:** Numerical implementation (Zolotarev methods)
* **F:** Portfolio/risk models with MAPM parameters
* **G:** Cross-asset, global validation
* **H:** Time-varying, regime-switching parameter models[[2]](#fn2)
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