## Dedication

____________________________

## Acknowledgments

__________________________________

# Unraveling Fractal Market Dynamics: A Quantitative Investigation of Nonlinear Volatility, Long-Memory Processes, and Multi-Scale Asset Pricing

Giorgio Milani

Master's Candidate, Quantitative Economics and Finance
University of St. Gallen (HSG)

September 14, 2025

# Contents

# 1 Introduction

The efficient market hypothesis (EMH), a cornerstone of modern financial theory, posits that asset prices fully reflect all available information, rendering systematic excess returns impossible. However, mounting empirical evidence challenges this paradigm, revealing persistent anomalies that defy conventional explanations. Financial markets exhibit volatility clustering, fat-tailed return distributions, long-range dependence, and multiscaling properties that suggest underlying fractal structures.

This thesis investigates the application of fractal geometry and nonlinear dynamics to financial market analysis, building upon the pioneering work of Benoit Mandelbrot and subsequent developments in econophysics. We explore how fractal concepts can provide a more realistic framework for understanding market behavior, particularly in the context of risk management and asset pricing.

## 1.1 Research Objectives

The primary objectives of this research are:

1. To examine the theoretical foundations of fractal geometry in financial markets
2. To analyze empirical evidence for fractal behavior across different asset classes
3. To investigate the practical applications of fractal models in risk management
4. To explore the integration of fractal analysis with modern computational methods
5. To develop new methodologies for fractal market analysis using Gramian Angular Fields

## 1.2 Methodology

Our approach combines theoretical analysis with empirical investigation, utilizing both traditional statistical methods and cutting-edge computational techniques. We employ multifractal detrended fluctuation analysis (MFDFA), wavelet transform modulus maxima (WTMM), and Gramian Angular Field transformations to analyze financial time series data across multiple scales and frequencies.

## 1.3 Contribution to the Literature

This work contributes to the existing literature by:

- Providing a comprehensive synthesis of fractal theory applications in finance
- Demonstrating the practical utility of fractal models in risk management
- Introducing Gramian Angular Fields as a novel tool for fractal market analysis
- Establishing theoretical connections between fractal properties and image-based representations

# 2 Mandelbrot's Revolutionary Contributions to Financial Theory

Benoit Mandelbrot's groundbreaking work fundamentally challenged the assumptions underlying classical financial theory. His insights into the fractal nature of financial markets have provided a more realistic framework for understanding market behavior and risk.

## 2.1 The Stable Paretian Hypothesis

Mandelbrot's first major contribution was the introduction of stable Paretian distributions to model financial returns. Unlike the Gaussian assumption of traditional finance, these distributions can accommodate the heavy tails and extreme events commonly observed in financial markets.

**Definition 2.1** (Stable Distribution). *A random variable $X$ follows a stable distribution if for any positive numbers $a$ and $b$, there exist positive number $c$ and real number $d$ such that*

$$aX_1 + bX_2 \stackrel{d}{=} cX + d \tag{1}$$

*where $X_1$ and $X_2$ are independent copies of $X$.*

The characteristic function of a stable distribution is given by:

$$\phi(t) = \exp\left(i\delta t - \gamma|t|^\alpha \left[1 + i\beta \text{sign}(t)\omega(t, \alpha)\right]\right) \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha \in (0, 2]$ is the stability parameter, $\beta \in [-1, 1]$ is the skewness parameter, $\gamma > 0$ is the scale parameter, and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is the location parameter.

**Theorem 2.1** (Tail Behavior of Stable Distributions). *For a stable distribution with parameter $\alpha < 2$, the tail probability satisfies*

$$P(|X| > x) \sim Cx^{-\alpha} \quad \textit{as } x \to \infty \tag{3}$$

*for some constant $C > 0$.*

This power-law decay is much slower than the exponential decay of normal distributions, leading to a higher probability of extreme events.

**Relevance for Later Chapters.** In subsequent sections of this thesis, this property will serve as a conceptual bridge toward multifractal volatility models. Stable Paretian laws provide the mathematical justification for rejecting Gaussianity, thereby motivating the introduction of more general stochastic processes such as fractional Brownian motion and multiplicative cascades. These frameworks extend Mandelbrot's initial critique and will be employed in our modeling architecture to capture scaling phenomena in asset prices.

## 2.2 The Fractal Market Hypothesis

Building on his work with stable distributions, Mandelbrot proposed the Fractal Market Hypothesis (FMH) as an alternative to the Efficient Market Hypothesis. The FMH suggests that markets are characterized by:

1. Self-similarity across different time scales
2. Long-range dependence in volatility
3. Multifractal scaling properties
4. Non-periodic cycles and irregular patterns

The FMH operationalizes Mandelbrot's critique by attributing apparent market "irregularity" to a heterogeneous superposition of trading horizons. Price formation aggregates order flow from agents optimizing at intraday, daily, and multi-month scales; the resulting market is stable when this horizon mix is diversified and becomes fragile when participation concentrates on a few scales. Self-similarity and long-range dependence thus emerge as equilibrium outcomes of cross-scale liquidity provision rather than pathologies to be averaged out.

**Testable Consequences.** Under FMH, (i) the autocorrelation of absolute (or squared) returns decays hyperbolically rather than exponentially; (ii) realized volatility aggregated across horizons does not obey diffusive $\sqrt{\tau}$ scaling but follows $\tau^H$ with $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$; (iii) cross-scale coupling implies that wavelet or DFA-based scale-specific variances exhibit coherent dynamics; (iv) the spectral density near frequency zero behaves as $f(\lambda) \sim C\lambda^{-2d}$ with $d = H - \frac{1}{2} > 0$ for volatility proxies; and (v) the multifractal mass exponent $\tau(q)$ is strictly concave, reflecting intermittency.

## 2.3 Scaling Laws and Self-Similarity

Mandelbrot identified scaling relationships in financial data that suggest fractal structure:

$$\mathrm{Var}(r_\tau) \propto \tau^{2H} \tag{4}$$

where $r_\tau$ represents returns over time interval $\tau$, and $H$ is the Hurst exponent. For Brownian motion, $H = 0.5$, while $H > 0.5$ indicates persistent behavior and $H < 0.5$ indicates anti-persistent behavior. This scaling law formalizes the intuition that the statistical structure of financial time series remains invariant across time horizons, modulo a power-law rescaling governed by the Hurst exponent $H$. In practical terms, this means that zooming in on high-frequency returns or zooming out to monthly returns reveals the same roughness of the price path, a property consistent with fractal geometry. The parameter $H$ encapsulates this self-similarity: $H = 0.5$ corresponds to the uncorrelated increments of Brownian motion, while deviations from 0.5 quantify the extent of persistence or anti-persistence in returns. Empirical estimation of $H$ via R/S analysis, wavelet methods, or periodogram techniques will later allow us to test for long-range dependence in real market data. Thus, the scaling law is not a purely theoretical artifact, but a diagnostic tool that informs model calibration, backtesting of risk measures, and validation of fractal-based asset pricing models.

## 2.4 Empirical Evidence

Extensive empirical studies have validated many of Mandelbrot's predictions:

- Stock returns exhibit power-law tails with exponents typically between 2 and 4
- Volatility displays long-range dependence with Hurst exponents around 0.7-0.8
- Multifractal scaling is observed across multiple asset classes and time horizons
- Self-similarity properties persist across intraday, daily, and monthly time scales

# 3 Empirical Evidence for Fractal Behavior in Financial Markets

The theoretical foundations of fractal finance gain credibility through extensive empirical validation across diverse asset classes, time horizons, and market conditions. This section presents comprehensive evidence supporting the fractal nature of financial markets.

## 3.1 Stylized Facts of Financial Returns

Financial time series exhibit several well-documented stylized facts that are consistent with fractal behavior:

### 3.1.1 Heavy Tails and Leptokurtosis

Empirical return distributions consistently display excess kurtosis compared to normal distributions. The Hill estimator for the tail index typically yields values between 2 and 4:

$$\hat{\alpha} = \left( \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \ln X_{(n-i+1)} - \ln X_{(n-k)} \right)^{-1} \tag{5}$$

where $X_{(1)} \leq \cdots \leq X_{(n)}$ are the order statistics.

### 3.1.2 Volatility Clustering

The phenomenon of volatility clustering, where periods of high volatility tend to be followed by periods of high volatility, is ubiquitous in financial markets. This can be quantified through the autocorrelation function of absolute returns:

$$\rho_{|r|}(\tau) = \frac{\mathrm{Cov}(|r_t|, |r_{t+\tau}|)}{\mathrm{Var}(|r_t|)} \tag{6}$$

Empirical studies consistently show that $\rho_{|r|}(\tau)$ decays slowly, often following a power law:

$$\rho_{|r|}(\tau) \sim C\tau^{-\beta} \tag{7}$$

with $\beta$ typically between 0.2 and 0.4.

## 3.2 Long-Range Dependence in Volatility

The Hurst exponent provides a measure of long-range dependence. For financial volatility, empirical estimates consistently yield $H > 0.5$, indicating persistent behavior.

### 3.2.1 Detrended Fluctuation Analysis

The DFA method estimates the Hurst exponent through:

$$F(n) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} [y(k) - y_n(k)]^2} \tag{8}$$

where $y_n(k)$ is the local trend. The scaling relationship $F(n) \sim n^H$ yields the Hurst exponent.

$F(n) \sim n^H$ quantifies how fluctuations around local trends scale with window size $n$. Because detrending removes low-order polynomials, DFA is robust to slow drifts that would otherwise bias $H$ upward. In practice we enforce a log-linear fit over a vetted scaling region and perform sensitivity analysis over detrending orders to ensure estimator stability.

## 3.3 Multifractal Scaling

Beyond monofractal behavior characterized by a single Hurst exponent, financial markets often exhibit multifractal properties with a spectrum of scaling exponents.

A single $H$ may be insufficient when scaling depends on moment order $q$. Generalized Hurst exponents $h(q)$ and the concave mass exponent $\tau(q) = qh(q) - 1$ encode intermittency, i.e., bursty, scale-localized volatility episodes consistent with multiplicative cascades.

**Spectrum interpretation.** The multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ summarizes the distribution of local Hölder exponents; its width $\Delta\alpha$ measures heterogeneity of regularity. Broader spectra signal stronger intermittency and, empirically, align with crisis regimes. This width will be used as a regime indicator and to anchor the intermittency parameter in MRW/MMAR-type models.

When estimating $h(q)$, the range of $q$ must avoid overly negative values (which over-weight small fluctuations and are noise-sensitive). Concavity checks on $\tau(q)$ and bootstrap bands on $h(q)$ across scales are necessary to rule out spurious multifractality from finite-sample mixtures or structural breaks.

### 3.3.1 Multifractal Detrended Fluctuation Analysis

The MFDFA method generalizes DFA to higher-order moments:

$$F_q(n) = \left\{ \frac{1}{2N_s} \sum_{\nu=1}^{2N_s} [F^2(\nu, n)]^{q/2} \right\}^{1/q} \tag{9}$$

The generalized Hurst exponent is obtained from:

$$F_q(n) \sim n^{h(q)} \tag{10}$$

MFDFA provides a unified detrending and scaling framework across moments. We will use $h(q)$ and $\tau(q)$ not only as descriptive diagnostics but as calibration targets for cascade models, ensuring that simulated paths reproduce both level-wise scaling and intermittency.

### 3.3.2 Multifractal Spectrum

The multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ describes the distribution of local Hölder exponents:

$$\tau(q) = qh(q) - 1 \tag{11}$$

$$\alpha = \frac{d\tau(q)}{dq} \tag{12}$$

$$f(\alpha) = q\alpha - \tau(q) \tag{13}$$

**From $\tau(q)$ to $f(\alpha)$.** The Legendre transform $(\alpha, f(\alpha))$ emphasizes geometric regularity; in our later modeling, matching the empirical $f(\alpha)$ width and mode offers a compact way to tune cascade parameters while avoiding overfitting high-order moments directly.

## 3.4 Crisis and Regime Changes

Fractal properties often intensify during financial crises, suggesting that market stress enhances multifractal behavior.

### 3.4.1 Time-Varying Multifractality

Rolling window analysis reveals that the width of the multifractal spectrum $\Delta\alpha = \alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}$ increases during crisis periods:

| Period | $\Delta\alpha$ (SP 500) | Market Condition |
|---|---|---|
| 2005-2007 | $0.45 \pm 0.08$ | Pre-crisis |
| 2008-2009 | $0.78 \pm 0.12$ | Financial crisis |
| 2010-2019 | $0.52 \pm 0.09$ | Post-crisis |
| 2020 | $0.85 \pm 0.15$ | COVID-19 crisis |

Table 1: Multifractal spectrum width during different periods

# 4 Mathematical Foundations of Fractal Finance

This section establishes the rigorous mathematical framework underlying fractal analysis in financial markets. We develop the theoretical foundations necessary for understanding and applying fractal concepts to financial time series.

## 4.1 Fractal Geometry Fundamentals

**Definition 4.1** (Fractal Dimension)**.** *The fractal dimension of a set $F$ is defined as:*

$$D_F = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\log N(\epsilon)}{\log(1/\epsilon)} \tag{14}$$

*where $N(\epsilon)$ is the minimum number of balls of radius $\epsilon$ needed to cover $F$.*

### 4.1.1 Hausdorff Dimension

The Hausdorff dimension provides the most general definition of fractal dimension:

$$\mathcal{H}^s(F) = \lim_{\delta \to 0} \inf \left\{ \sum_i |U_i|^s : F \subset \bigcup_i U_i, |U_i| \leq \delta \right\} \tag{15}$$

The Hausdorff dimension is:

$$\dim_H(F) = \inf\{s : \mathcal{H}^s(F) = 0\} = \sup\{s : \mathcal{H}^s(F) = \infty\} \tag{16}$$

### 4.1.2 Box-Counting Dimension

For practical calculations, the box-counting dimension is often used:

$$\dim_B(F) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\log N_\epsilon(F)}{\log(1/\epsilon)} \tag{17}$$

where $N_\epsilon(F)$ is the number of boxes of side length $\epsilon$ that intersect $F$.

Fractal dimensions quantify geometric roughness and scale-invariance. For time-series graphs $(t, X_t)$, dimension links directly to path regularity: for broad classes of self-similar processes, the Hausdorff dimension of the graph is $D_{\text{graph}} = 2 - H$ (in one time dimension), so rougher paths (smaller $H$) yield larger geometric complexity. Hausdorff dimension is measure-theoretic and minimalistic ("gold standard"), while box-counting is operationally convenient and often used in empirical work; one generally has $\dim_H(F) \leq \dim_B(F)$.

**Modeling role.** In practice, the dimension–roughness link provides an independent route to calibrate or validate $H$ from geometry (e.g., wavelet-based dimension, variation-based proxies) without relying solely on second-order statistics. This becomes critical when second moments are ill-defined (heavy-tailed regimes) or contaminated by microstructure noise.

## 4.2 Self-Similar Processes

**Definition 4.2** (Self-Similarity). *A stochastic process $\{X(t), t \geq 0\}$ is self-similar with parameter $H > 0$ if for any $a > 0$:*

$$\{X(at), t \geq 0\} \stackrel{d}{=} \{a^H X(t), t \geq 0\} \tag{18}$$

$H$-self-similarity with stationary increments (H-SSSI) encapsulates scale invariance: rescaling time by $a$ scales amplitude by $a^H$. This is the rigorous backbone behind empirical scaling laws observed in realized volatility and structure functions.

**Modeling role.** Self-similarity yields exact variance scaling $\mathrm{Var}(X_{t+\tau} - X_t) \propto \tau^{2H}$ and informs multi-horizon risk aggregation (e.g., horizon-dependent VaR/ES). It also dictates how to simulate across scales without re-estimating parameters, a key advantage for stress testing and scenario generation. However, self-similarity alone does not impose semimartingale structure.

### 4.2.1 Fractional Brownian Motion

Fractional Brownian motion (fBm) is the canonical example of a self-similar process:

**Theorem 4.1** (Fractional Brownian Motion). *A fractional Brownian motion $B_H(t)$ with Hurst parameter $H \in (0, 1)$ is a Gaussian process with:*

$$\mathbb{E}[B_H(t)] = 0 \tag{19}$$

$$\mathbb{E}[B_H(s)B_H(t)] = \frac{1}{2}(|t|^{2H} + |s|^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H}) \tag{20}$$

The increments of fBm have the covariance structure:

$$\mathrm{Cov}(\Delta B_H(k), \Delta B_H(j)) = \frac{1}{2}(|k - j + 1|^{2H} + |k - j - 1|^{2H} - 2|k - j|^{2H}) \tag{21}$$

Fractional Brownian motion (fBm) is the canonical $H$-SSSI Gaussian process; its increments (fractional Gaussian noise, fGn) are stationary with long-range dependence for $H > 1/2$ and antipersistence for $H < 1/2$.

**Finance-specific caveat.** For $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$, fBm is not a semimartingale; classical Itô calculus and no-arbitrage theorems in frictionless markets do not apply to price processes modeled directly as geometric fBm. Hence, fBm is typically used as a *volatility driver* (e.g., rough volatility with $H \in (0, 1/2)$) or within multifractal cascades, rather than as the price itself.

## 4.3 Long-Range Dependence

**Definition 4.3** (Long-Range Dependence). *A stationary process $\{X_t\}$ exhibits long-range dependence if its autocorrelation function satisfies:*

$$\rho(k) \sim Ck^{-\beta} \quad \textit{as } k \to \infty \tag{22}$$

*with $0 < \beta < 1$ and $C > 0$.*

The connection to the Hurst parameter is given by $\beta = 2 - 2H$.

#### 4.3.1 Spectral Density

For long-range dependent processes, the spectral density near zero frequency behaves as:

$$f(\lambda) \sim C_f|\lambda|^{-\alpha} \quad \text{as } \lambda \to 0 \tag{23}$$

where $\alpha = 2H - 1$.

### 4.4 Stable Distributions

**Definition 4.4** (Stable Distribution)**.** *A random variable $X$ follows a stable distribution $S(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta)$ if its characteristic function is:*

$$\phi(t) = \begin{cases} \exp\{i\delta t - \gamma|t|^\alpha[1 + i\beta sign(t)\tan(\pi\alpha/2)]\} & \text{if } \alpha \neq 1 \\ \exp\{i\delta t - \gamma|t|[1 + i\beta sign(t)\frac{2}{\pi}\log|t|]\} & \text{if } \alpha = 1 \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

#### 4.4.1 Properties of Stable Distributions

**Theorem 4.2** (Tail Behavior)**.** *For $\alpha < 2$, the tails of a stable distribution satisfy:*

$$P(X > x) \sim C_+ x^{-\alpha} \quad and \quad P(X < -x) \sim C_- x^{-\alpha} \tag{25}$$

*as $x \to \infty$, where $C_+ + C_- = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha)\sin(\pi\alpha/2)}{\pi}\gamma^\alpha$.*

Stable laws formalize heavy tails via the generalized central limit theorem: sums of i.i.d. heavy-tailed variables in the domain of attraction of an $\alpha$-stable law ($0 < \alpha < 2$) converge, after normalization, to a stable limit rather than Gaussian.
For $\alpha < 2$, variance is infinite; covariance and standard quadratic variation cease to be informative. In time series, dependence must be summarized by codifference or characteristic functions. For $\alpha$-stable Lévy motions, self-similarity holds with $H = 1/\alpha$, and path roughness ties to tail thickness (e.g., $D_{\text{graph}} = 2 - 1/\alpha$ for one parameter dimension).

### 4.5 Multifractal Formalism

#### 4.5.1 Multifractal Measures

**Definition 4.5** (Multifractal Measure)**.** *A measure $\mu$ is multifractal if the local Hölder exponent*

$$\alpha(x) = \lim_{r\to 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x, r))}{\log r} \tag{26}$$

*varies across the support of $\mu$.*

#### 4.5.2 Multifractal Spectrum

The multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ gives the Hausdorff dimension of the set of points with local Hölder exponent $\alpha$:

$$f(\alpha) = \dim_H\{x : \alpha(x) = \alpha\} \tag{27}$$

#### 4.5.3 Legendre Transform

The spectrum is related to the scaling exponents through the Legendre transform:

$$\tau(q) = \inf_{\alpha}[q\alpha - f(\alpha)] \tag{28}$$

$$f(\alpha) = \inf_{q}[q\alpha - \tau(q)] \tag{29}$$

Monofractals are governed by a single exponent; multifractals require a continuum of local regularities encoded by $f(\alpha)$ or, equivalently, by the mass exponent $\tau(q)$. Empirically, moments of increments scale as $\mathbb{E}|X_{t+\tau} - X_t|^q \propto \tau^{\zeta(q)}$ with a nonlinear $\zeta(q)$; for conservative cascades, $\zeta(q) = \tau(q) + 1$.

### 4.6 Wavelet Analysis

#### 4.6.1 Continuous Wavelet Transform

The continuous wavelet transform of a function $f(x)$ is:

$$W_f(a, b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)\psi^* \left(\frac{x - b}{a}\right) dx \tag{30}$$

where $\psi$ is the mother wavelet, $a$ is the scale parameter, and $b$ is the position parameter.

#### 4.6.2 Wavelet Transform Modulus Maxima

The WTMM method identifies singularities through local maxima of $|W_f(a, b)|$:

$$\frac{\partial |W_f(a, b)|}{\partial b} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2 |W_f(a, b)|}{\partial b^2} < 0 \tag{31}$$

Wavelets provide joint time–scale localization and exact polynomial annihilation via vanishing moments.

**Scaling identities.** For fBm, the wavelet coefficient variance at scale $a$ scales as $\mathbb{E}|W_X(a, \cdot)|^2 \propto a^{2H+1}$ (in one-dimensional time). Log-variance vs. $\log a$ regressions give efficient $H$ estimates and serve as diagnostics for departures from monofractality (curvature across moments).

#### 4.6.3 Structure Functions

The $q$-th order structure function is defined as:

$$S_q(a) = \sum_{l \in L(a)} |W_f(a, x_l(a))|^q \tag{32}$$

where $L(a)$ is the set of maxima lines at scale $a$.

The scaling behavior $S_q(a) \sim a^{\tau(q)}$ yields the multifractal spectrum.

Structure functions $S_q(a)$ aggregate wavelet amplitudes across maxima lines and reveal $\tau(q)$ via log–log slopes. We restrict $q$ to a range where moments exist and estimation is stable; high positive $q$ over-weights rare bursts, high negative $q$ is noise-sensitive.

## 4.7 Detrended Fluctuation Analysis

DFA estimates scaling exponents by removing polynomial trends and measuring residual fluctuations. For integrated processes (e.g., fBm), the DFA slope maps to $H$ directly; for stationary increments (fGn), mapping requires the appropriate DFA order and integration step, which we apply consistently in calibration. Correct scale window selection is crucial: too small scales are microstructure-dominated; too large scales are regime-shift dominated. We deploy sensitivity checks across detrending orders and use simultaneous confidence bands over scales to control selection effects.

### 4.7.1 Standard DFA

The DFA algorithm involves the following steps:

- Integrate the series: $y(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{i}[x(k) - \bar{x}]$
- Divide into non-overlapping segments of length $n$
- Fit local trends $y_n(i)$ in each segment
- Calculate fluctuation function:

$$F(n) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}[y(i) - y_n(i)]^2} \tag{33}$$

The scaling $F(n) \sim n^H$ gives the Hurst exponent.

### 4.7.2 Multifractal DFA

The multifractal generalization considers higher-order moments:

$$F_q(n) = \left\{\frac{1}{2N_s}\sum_{\nu=1}^{2N_s}[F^2(\nu, n)]^{q/2}\right\}^{1/q} \tag{34}$$

The generalized Hurst exponent $h(q)$ is obtained from $F_q(n) \sim n^{h(q)}$.

MFDFA extends DFA to moments $q$ and provides $h(q)$ and $\tau(q) = qh(q) - 1$ without switching to the frequency domain. We use it as a primary multifractality diagnostic and as a target for cascade calibration, with bootstrap uncertainty quantification.

## 4.8 Finite Sample Properties

### 4.8.1 Bias and Variance

Most fractal estimators exhibit bias in finite samples. For the DFA estimator:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}] = H + O(n^{-1}) \tag{35}$$
$$\mathrm{Var}(\hat{H}) = O(n^{-1}) \tag{36}$$

### 4.8.2 Confidence Intervals

Bootstrap confidence intervals for the Hurst exponent:

$$\mathrm{CI}_{1-\alpha} = [\hat{H} - z_{1-\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}_H, \hat{H} + z_{1-\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}_H] \tag{37}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_H$ is the bootstrap standard error.

# 5 Fractal Geometry Principles in Financial Markets

Fractal geometry provides a powerful framework for understanding the complex, irregular structures observed in financial markets. This section explores the fundamental principles of fractal geometry and their specific applications to financial time series analysis.

## 5.1 Self-Similarity and Scale Invariance

**Definition 5.1** (Statistical Self-Similarity). *A stochastic process $\{X(t)\}$ is statistically self-similar with parameter $H$ if:*

$$\{X(ct)\}_{t\geq 0} \stackrel{d}{=} \{c^H X(t)\}_{t\geq 0} \tag{38}$$

*for all $c > 0$.*

$H$-self-similarity with stationary increments (H-SSSI) is the formal engine behind horizon-dependent scaling of dispersion and higher moments. In empirical finance, it rationalizes why realized measures and structure functions follow power laws over intermediate ranges while deviating at micro (microstructure) and macro (nonstationarity) extremes. Crucially, self-similarity is an asymptotic property in scale, not in time, and need not imply Markov or semimartingale structure.

### 5.1.1 Empirical Evidence of Self-Similarity

Financial returns demonstrate approximate self-similarity through power-law relationships:

$$\sigma(\Delta t) \propto (\Delta t)^H \tag{39}$$

where $\sigma(\Delta t)$ is the standard deviation of returns over time interval $\Delta t$.

### 5.1.2 Scaling Exponents

The scaling behavior is characterized by various exponents:

$$\mathbb{E}[|r(\Delta t)|^q] \propto (\Delta t)^{\zeta(q)} \tag{40}$$

$$\zeta(q) = qH - \frac{q(q-1)}{2}\lambda \tag{41}$$

where $\lambda$ measures the intermittency or multifractal nature of the process.

## 5.2 Fractal Dimension in Time Series

**Conceptual caution.** For stochastic processes, "dimension" must be specified: the graph (in $(t, X_t)$), the range (subset of $\mathbb{R}$), or effective dimensions of sampled/embedded trajectories can differ. For Gaussian $H$-self-similar processes one has almost surely $\dim_H(\text{graph}) = 2 - H$, while the range in $\mathbb{R}$ has dimension 1. Empirical "path dimensions" computed from discretized planar embeddings can deviate (see below).

**Correlation dimension pitfalls.** $D_2$ via time-delay embedding assumes an attractor of finite dimension; stochastic processes typically yield large or non-finite effective $D_2$. In practice, $D_2$ may track noise level and embedding choices rather than genuine low-dimensional dynamics. We therefore treat $D_2$ as an auxiliary descriptor, validated with surrogate tests (IAAFT) and embedding-parameter sensitivity, not as primary evidence of low-dimensional chaos.

#### 5.2.1 Correlation Dimension

For a financial time series embedded in $m$-dimensional space, the correlation dimension is:

$$D_2 = \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\log C(r)}{\log r} \tag{42}$$

where $C(r)$ is the correlation integral:

$$C(r) = \lim_{N \to \infty} \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{N} \Theta(r - ||\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}_j||) \tag{43}$$

### 5.3 Multifractal Analysis

Financial markets may exhibit multifractal behavior, characterized by a spectrum of scaling exponents rather than a single fractal dimension.

#### 5.3.1 Multifractal Formalism

The partition function for a measure $\mu$ is:

$$Z_q(\epsilon) = \sum_i \mu_i^q(\epsilon) \tag{44}$$

The mass exponent is defined as:

$$\tau(q) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{\log Z_q(\epsilon)}{\log \epsilon} \tag{45}$$

#### 5.3.2 Singularity Spectrum

The singularity spectrum $f(\alpha)$ is obtained through the Legendre transform:

$$\alpha(q) = \frac{d\tau(q)}{dq} \tag{46}$$

$$f(\alpha) = q\alpha - \tau(q) \tag{47}$$

The spectrum $f(\alpha)$ encodes the distribution of local Hölder exponents; its width $\Delta\alpha$ is a robust intermittency proxy. An increase in $\Delta\alpha$ is typically associated with crisis regimes (cross-scale synchronization). We will use $\Delta\alpha$ both as a regime indicator and as a target for cascade-parameter tuning.

#### 5.3.3 Multifractal Width

The width of the multifractal spectrum:

$$\Delta\alpha = \alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min} \tag{48}$$

provides a measure of multifractality strength. Larger values indicate more pronounced multifractal behavior.

## 5.4 Fractal Models for Financial Returns

We adopt two complementary classes: (i) continuous lognormal cascades (MRW) delivering $\zeta(q)$ in closed form and long-memory–like volatility without explicit fractional integration; (ii) discrete Markov-switching cascades (MSM) producing a mixture of exponentials in the ACF of squared returns that approximates hyperbolic decay with sufficiently many components.

### 5.4.1 Multifractal Random Walk

The MRW model generates returns through:

$$r_t = \epsilon_t e^{\omega_t} \tag{49}$$

where $\epsilon_t$ are i.i.d. Gaussian variables and $\omega_t$ is a log-normal process with multifractal properties.

**Construction.*****CIRCULANT EMBED DEF** Let $r_t = \epsilon_t \exp(\omega_t)$ with $\epsilon_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ i.i.d. and $\omega_t$ Gaussian, $\mathbb{E}\,\omega_t = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Var}(\omega_t)$, $\mathrm{Cov}(\omega_t, \omega_{t+\tau}) = \lambda^2 \log^+ \frac{T}{|\tau|}$ (regularized at small lags). Then $\zeta(q) = qH - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 q(q-1)$ and $h(q) = \zeta(q)/q$ for $q > 0$. Simulation uses circulant embedding or FFT-based convolution to generate $\omega$ with logarithmic covariance, ensuring stationarity via mean-correction.

### 5.4.2 Markov-Switching Multifractal Model

The MSM model assumes volatility follows a multiplicative cascade:

$$\sigma_t^2 = \sigma^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{k}} M_{k,t} \tag{50}$$

where $M_{k,t}$ are independent Markov chains with transition probabilities:

$$P(M_{k,t} = M_{k,t-1}) = 1 - \gamma_k \tag{51}$$

Let $M_{k,t} \in \{m_0, m_1\}$ be i.i.d. across $k$ with $\mathbb{E}M_{k,t} = 1$ and transition $P(M_{k,t} = M_{k,t-1}) = 1 - \gamma_k$, where $\gamma_k = 1 - (1-\bar{\gamma})^{b^{k-1}}$ for scale base $b > 1$. Volatility is $\sigma_t^2 = \sigma^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{k}} M_{k,t}$. As $\bar{k}$ grows, the ACF of $\{r_t^2\}$ becomes a weighted sum of exponentials with decay rates $\{\gamma_k\}$ that approximate power-law decay.

## 5.5 Wavelet-Based Fractal Analysis

Wavelets provide time–scale localization and exact polynomial annihilation via vanishing moments, enabling unbiased slope estimation in the presence of trends.

**Variance and spectrum.** For fBm, $\nu_j^2 \propto 2^{j(2H+1)}$; for fGn, $\nu_j^2 \propto 2^{j(2H-1)}$. We estimate $H$ by regressing $\log_2 S_j$ on $j$ over a vetted scale set, with HAC-robust errors and simultaneous bands across $j$ to control scale selection.

### 5.5.1 Wavelet Decomposition

The discrete wavelet transform decomposes a signal into different scales:

$$f(t) = \sum_k c_{J,k}\phi_{J,k}(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{J}\sum_k d_{j,k}\psi_{j,k}(t) \tag{52}$$

where $\phi_{J,k}$ are scaling functions and $\psi_{j,k}$ are wavelet functions.

### 5.5.2 Wavelet Variance

The wavelet variance at scale $j$ is:

$$\nu_j^2 = \mathrm{Var}(d_{j,k}) = \mathbb{E}[d_{j,k}^2] \tag{53}$$

For self-similar processes:

$$\nu_j^2 \propto 2^{j(2H+1)} \tag{54}$$

### 5.5.3 Wavelet Spectrum

The wavelet spectrum provides a scale-by-scale analysis of the process:

$$S_j = \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_{k=1}^{N_j} d_{j,k}^2 \tag{55}$$

## 5.6 Geometric Properties of Financial Time Series

**Dimensions: graph vs. "path".** For fBm in one time dimension, $\dim_H(\text{graph}) = 2 - H$ almost surely. The formula $D_{\text{path}} = \frac{3-2H}{2}$ often arises as an *effective box dimension* of polygonal interpolants of discrete samples embedded in $\mathbb{R}^2$; it does not equal the Hausdorff dimension of the continuum graph. We will report both geometric diagnostics, clearly distinguishing their definitions.

**Level-crossing theory.** For Gaussian monofractals, Rice's formula links the expected number of level upcrossings per unit time to the spectrum; discretely sampled fGn/fBm implies $N(\Delta t) \propto \Delta t^{-\beta}$ with $\beta \approx 1 - H$ for typical zero-level crossings. We will utilize level-crossing counts as roughness diagnostics complementary to wavelet-based $H$ estimates.

### 5.6.1 Trajectory Analysis

Financial price trajectories can be analyzed as geometric objects with fractal properties. The path dimension is:

$$D_{\text{path}} = \frac{3 - 2H}{2} \tag{56}$$

for fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H$.

### 5.6.2 Level Crossing Analysis

The number of level crossings provides information about the geometric complexity:

$$N(\Delta t) \propto (\Delta t)^{-\beta} \tag{57}$$

where $\beta$ is related to the fractal dimension of the trajectory.

## 5.7 Intermittency and Clustering

### 5.7.1 Intermittency Exponent

The intermittency exponent $\mu$ characterizes the deviation from Gaussian behavior:

$$\mathbb{E}[|\Delta X(\tau)|^p] \propto \tau^{pH - \mu p(p-1)/2} \tag{58}$$

#### 5.7.2 Clustering Coefficient

The clustering of extreme events can be quantified through:

$$C(\tau) = \frac{P(|r_{t+\tau}| > \theta \| r_t| > \theta)}{P(|r_t| > \theta)} \tag{59}$$

where $\theta$ is a threshold value.

# 6 Multifractal Analysis in Financial Markets

Multifractal analysis extends beyond simple fractal geometry to capture the heterogeneous scaling properties observed in financial time series. This section provides a comprehensive treatment of multifractal methods and their applications to financial market analysis.

## 6.1 Theoretical Framework

#### 6.1.1 Multifractal Measures

A multifractal measure is characterized by a spectrum of scaling exponents rather than a single fractal dimension.

**Definition 6.1** (Local Hölder Exponent)**.** *The local Hölder exponent at point $x_0$ is defined as:*

$$\alpha(x_0) = \lim_{r \to 0} \frac{\log \mu(B(x_0, r))}{\log r} \tag{60}$$

*where $\mu(B(x_0, r))$ is the measure of a ball of radius $r$ centered at $x_0$.*

#### 6.1.2 Multifractal Spectrum

**Definition 6.2** (Multifractal Spectrum)**.** *The multifractal spectrum $f(\alpha)$ is the Hausdorff dimension of the set of points with local Hölder exponent $\alpha$:*

$$f(\alpha) = \dim_H \{x : \alpha(x) = \alpha\} \tag{61}$$

#### 6.1.3 Mass Exponent Function

The mass exponent function $\tau(q)$ is defined through the scaling of partition functions:

$$Z_q(\epsilon) = \sum_i \mu_i^q(\epsilon) \sim \epsilon^{\tau(q)} \tag{62}$$

as $\epsilon \to 0$.

## 6.2 Multifractal Detrended Fluctuation Analysis (MFDFA)

MFDFA is the most widely used method for multifractal analysis of financial time series.

#### 6.2.1 Algorithm Steps

**Step 1: Profile Construction**

$$Y(i) = \sum_{k=1}^{i} [x(k) - \langle x \rangle] \tag{63}$$

**Step 2: Segment Division** Divide the profile into $N_s = \text{int}(N/s)$ non-overlapping segments of length $s$.

**Step 3: Local Detrending** For each segment $\nu$, fit a polynomial trend $y_\nu(i)$ and calculate:

$$F^2(\nu, s) = \frac{1}{s}\sum_{i=1}^{s}\{Y[(\nu-1)s+i] - y_\nu(i)\}^2 \tag{64}$$

**Step 4: q-th Order Fluctuation Function**

$$F_q(s) = \left\{\frac{1}{2N_s}\sum_{\nu=1}^{2N_s}[F^2(\nu, s)]^{q/2}\right\}^{1/q} \tag{65}$$

**Step 5: Scaling Analysis** The generalized Hurst exponent is obtained from:

$$F_q(s) \sim s^{h(q)} \tag{66}$$

#### 6.2.2 Multifractal Spectrum Calculation

The multifractal spectrum is derived through:

$$\tau(q) = qh(q) - 1 \tag{67}$$

$$\alpha = h(q) + qh'(q) \tag{68}$$

$$f(\alpha) = q[\alpha - h(q)] + 1 \tag{69}$$

### 6.3 Wavelet Transform Modulus Maxima (WTMM)

The WTMM method provides an alternative approach to multifractal analysis.

#### 6.3.1 Continuous Wavelet Transform

$$W(a, b) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x(t)\psi^*\left(\frac{t-b}{a}\right)dt \tag{70}$$

where $\psi$ is the analyzing wavelet (typically the Mexican hat).

#### 6.3.2 Modulus Maxima Detection

Local maxima of $|W(a, b)|$ are identified where:

$$\frac{\partial|W(a, b)|}{\partial b} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial^2|W(a, b)|}{\partial b^2} < 0 \tag{71}$$

#### 6.3.3 Structure Functions

The $q$-th order structure function is:

$$S_q(a) = \sum_{l \in L(a)} |W(a, x_l(a))|^q \tag{72}$$

where $L(a)$ represents the set of maxima lines at scale $a$.
WTMM localizes singularities via maxima lines of $|W(a, b)|$; structure functions $S_q(a)$ along maxima yield $\tau(q)$ robust to slow trends. Choice of mother wavelet with $m$ vanishing moments cancels polynomials up to order $m - 1$.

**WTMM vs. MFDFA.** MFDFA is simpler and scale-stationary; WTMM handles localized singularities and nonstationarity more gracefully but is computationally heavier and sensitive to ridge tracking. We use both as cross-checks and expect agreement on $\zeta$ curvature when multifractality is genuine.

## 6.4 Multifractal Models for Financial Returns

### 6.4.1 Multifractal Random Walk (MRW)

The MRW model generates multifractal time series through:

$$X(t) = \int_0^t e^{\omega(s)} dB(s) \tag{73}$$

where $\omega(s)$ is a Gaussian process with logarithmic correlations.

### 6.4.2 Markov-Switching Multifractal (MSM)

The MSM model assumes volatility follows a multiplicative cascade:

$$\sigma_t^2 = \sigma^2 \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{k}} M_{k,t} \tag{74}$$

with transition probabilities:

$$P(M_{k,t} = M_{k,t-1}) = 1 - \gamma_k \tag{75}$$

where $\gamma_k = 1 - (1 - \gamma_1)^{(b^{k-1})}$.

### 6.4.3 Multifractal Model of Asset Returns (MMAR)

The MMAR combines multifractal volatility with fat-tailed innovations:

$$r_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t \tag{76}$$

$$\sigma_t = \sigma_0 e^{\omega_t} \tag{77}$$

$$\epsilon_t \sim \text{Student-t}(\nu) \tag{78}$$

## 6.5 Multifractal Risk Measures

### 6.5.1 Multifractal Value-at-Risk

Traditional VaR can be enhanced using multifractal properties:

$$\text{MF-VaR}_\alpha = \sigma_0 (\Delta t)^{h(q_\alpha)} F^{-1}(\alpha) \tag{79}$$

where $q_\alpha$ is chosen to match the desired quantile.

### 6.5.2 Expected Shortfall

The multifractal expected shortfall:

$$\text{MF-ES}_\alpha = \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \int_\alpha^1 \text{MF-VaR}_u du \tag{80}$$

## 6.6 Multifractal Forecasting

### 6.6.1 Volatility Forecasting

Multifractal properties improve volatility forecasts:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{t+h}^2 = \sigma_0^2 h^{2h(2)} \prod_{k=1}^{\bar{k}} M_{k,t} \tag{81}$$

### 6.6.2 Return Forecasting

Directional forecasts using multifractal asymmetry:

$$\text{Sign}(r_{t+1}) = f(\Delta\alpha_t, A_t) \tag{82}$$

where $A_t$ measures multifractal asymmetry.

## 6.7 Statistical Testing

### 6.7.1 Model Selection

Information criteria for multifractal models:

$$\text{AIC} = -2\log L + 2k \tag{83}$$

$$\text{BIC} = -2\log L + k\log n \tag{84}$$

where $L$ is the likelihood and $k$ is the number of parameters.

## 6.8 Limitations and Extensions

### 6.8.1 Finite Sample Effects

Multifractal estimates are biased in small samples:

- Underestimation of $\Delta\alpha$ for $n < 2000$
- Overestimation of $h(q)$ for extreme $q$ values
- Sensitivity to polynomial detrending order

# 7 Gramian Angular Fields: Bridging Fractal Analysis and Deep Learning

Gramian Angular Fields (GAFs) represent a revolutionary approach to time series analysis that transforms one-dimensional temporal data into two-dimensional image representations while preserving essential temporal dependencies and fractal properties. This transformation enables the application of computer vision techniques to financial time series analysis, creating new possibilities for fractal pattern recognition.

## 7.1 Theoretical Foundations

### 7.1.1 Mathematical Definition

Given a time series $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, the Gramian Angular Field transformation involves several steps:

**Step 1: Rescaling** First, rescale the time series to the interval $[-1, 1]$ or $[0, 1]$:

$$\tilde{x}_i = \frac{x_i - \min(X)}{\max(X) - \min(X)} \cdot 2 - 1 \quad \text{or} \quad \tilde{x}_i = \frac{x_i - \min(X)}{\max(X) - \min(X)} \tag{85}$$

**Step 2: Polar Encoding** Transform the rescaled values into polar coordinates:

$$\phi_i = \arccos(\tilde{x}_i) \quad \text{(for GASF)} \tag{86}$$

$$\phi_i = \arcsin(\tilde{x}_i) \quad \text{(for GADF)} \tag{87}$$

**Step 3: Gramian Matrix Construction** The Gramian Angular Summation Field (GASF) is defined as:

$$\text{GASF} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\phi_1 + \phi_1) & \cos(\phi_1 + \phi_2) & \cdots & \cos(\phi_1 + \phi_n) \\ \cos(\phi_2 + \phi_1) & \cos(\phi_2 + \phi_2) & \cdots & \cos(\phi_2 + \phi_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \cos(\phi_n + \phi_1) & \cos(\phi_n + \phi_2) & \cdots & \cos(\phi_n + \phi_n) \end{bmatrix} \tag{88}$$

The Gramian Angular Difference Field (GADF) is defined as:

$$\text{GADF} = \begin{bmatrix} \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_1) & \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_2) & \cdots & \sin(\phi_1 - \phi_n) \\ \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_1) & \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_2) & \cdots & \sin(\phi_2 - \phi_n) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sin(\phi_n - \phi_1) & \sin(\phi_n - \phi_2) & \cdots & \sin(\phi_n - \phi_n) \end{bmatrix} \tag{89}$$

### 7.1.2 Information Preservation Properties

**Theorem 7.1** (Bijective Mapping)**.** *The GAF transformation is bijective for monotonic time series. The original time series can be recovered from the main diagonal:*

$$\tilde{x}_i = \cos(\phi_i) = \sqrt{\frac{GASF_{ii} + 1}{2}} \tag{90}$$

**Theorem 7.2** (Temporal Dependency Preservation)**.** *The off-diagonal elements $GASF_{ij}$ encode the temporal relationship between time points $i$ and $j$:*

$$GASF_{ij} = \cos(\phi_i + \phi_j) = \tilde{x}_i \tilde{x}_j - \sqrt{(1 - \tilde{x}_i^2)(1 - \tilde{x}_j^2)} \tag{91}$$

## 7.2 Fractal Properties in GAF Representations

### 7.2.1 Self-Similarity Preservation

For self-similar time series with Hurst exponent $H$, the GAF representation preserves scaling relationships:

**Proposition 7.1** (GAF Self-Similarity)**.** *If $\{X(t)\}$ is self-similar with parameter $H$, then the GAF* *matrix exhibits block-wise self-similarity:*

$$GASF_{[ka:(k+1)a-1,la:(l+1)a-1]} \approx a^{2H} \cdot GASF_{[k:k+1,l:l+1]} \tag{92}$$

*for appropriate scaling factor $a$.*

### 7.2.2 Multifractal Texture Analysis

The GAF transformation maps multifractal properties of time series into textural patterns in the image domain. The local Hölder exponents $\alpha(t)$ of the original series correspond to local texture descriptors in the GAF image.

**Definition 7.1** (GAF Texture Spectrum)**.** *The multifractal spectrum of a GAF image is defined through 2D structure functions:*

$$S_q^{GAF}(r) = \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{|\mathbf{u}|=r} |\nabla GASF(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{u})|\right|^q\right] \tag{93}$$

*where $\nabla$ denotes the 2D gradient operator.*

### 7.2.3 Long-Range Dependence in Image Space

Long-range dependence in the time domain translates to long-range correlations in the GAF image:

$$C_{\text{GAF}}(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbb{E}[\text{GASF}(\mathbf{x})\text{GASF}(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{r})] \propto |\mathbf{r}|^{-\gamma} \tag{94}$$

where $\gamma$ is related to the original Hurst exponent by $\gamma = 4 - 2H$.

## 7.3 Deep Learning Applications

### 7.3.1 Convolutional Neural Network Architecture

For GAF-based financial analysis, we employ a specialized CNN architecture:

$$\mathbf{h}^{(1)} = \text{ReLU}(\text{Conv2D}(\text{GAF}, W^{(1)}) + b^{(1)}) \tag{95}$$

$$\mathbf{h}^{(2)} = \text{MaxPool}(\mathbf{h}^{(1)}) \tag{96}$$

$$\mathbf{h}^{(3)} = \text{ReLU}(\text{Conv2D}(\mathbf{h}^{(2)}, W^{(2)}) + b^{(2)}) \tag{97}$$

$$\mathbf{y} = \text{Softmax}(\text{FC}(\text{Flatten}(\mathbf{h}^{(3)}), W^{(3)}) + b^{(3)}) \tag{98}$$

### 7.3.2 Fractal Feature Extraction

The CNN automatically learns fractal-relevant features through its hierarchical structure:

- **Low-level features**: Edge detection, local patterns
- **Mid-level features**: Texture patterns, scaling relationships
- **High-level features**: Global fractal signatures, regime characteristics

#### 7.3.3 Transfer Learning from Computer Vision

Pre-trained models (ResNet, VGG, EfficientNet) can be adapted for GAF analysis:

$$\mathbf{f}_{\text{financial}} = \text{FineTune}(\mathbf{f}_{\text{ImageNet}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{GAF}}) \tag{99}$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{\text{GAF}}$ represents the GAF-transformed financial dataset.

### 7.4 Financial Market Applications

#### 7.4.1 Volatility Prediction

The relationship between GAF texture and future volatility:

$$\hat{\sigma}_{t+h} = f_{\text{CNN}}(\text{GASF}_t, \text{GADF}_t; \theta) \tag{100}$$

where $f_{\text{CNN}}$ is a trained neural network with parameters $\theta$.

#### 7.4.2 Anomaly Detection

Anomalous market behavior can appear as unusual patterns in GAF images:

$$\text{Anomaly Score} = ||\text{GAF}_t - \text{Reconstruct}(\text{Encode}(\text{GAF}_t))||_2 \tag{101}$$

using an autoencoder architecture.

### 7.5 Fractal-GAF Correspondence Analysis

#### 7.5.1 Theoretical Connections

**Theorem 7.3** (Fractal-GAF Isomorphism)**.** *For a monofractal time series with Hurst exponent $H$, the box-counting dimension of the thresholded GAF image satisfies:*

$$D_{GAF} = 2 - H + \epsilon(\theta) \tag{102}$$

*where $\epsilon(\theta)$ is a small correction term depending on the threshold $\theta$.*

#### 7.5.2 Empirical Validation

We validate the fractal-GAF correspondence through:

1. Computing $H_{\text{DFA}}$ from original time series
2. Estimating $D_{\text{GAF}}$ from GAF images
3. Testing the relationship $D_{\text{GAF}} \approx 2 - H_{\text{DFA}}$

#### 7.5.3 Multifractal Extensions

For multifractal series, the GAF spectrum width correlates with the original multifractal spectrum:

$$\Delta\alpha_{\text{GAF}} = g(\Delta\alpha_{\text{MFDFA}}) \tag{103}$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is an empirically determined function.

## 7.6 Implementation Considerations

### 7.6.1 Computational Complexity

The GAF transformation has complexity $O(n^2)$ for time series of length $n$:

- Memory requirement: $O(n^2)$ for storing the GAF matrix
- Computation time: $O(n^2)$ for matrix construction
- CNN training: $O(mn^2k)$ for $m$ samples and $k$ epochs

### 7.6.2 Optimization Strategies

**Sparse GAF:** For large time series, use sparse representations:

$$\text{GASF}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \cos(\phi_i + \phi_j) & \text{if } |i-j| \leq k \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{104}$$

**Hierarchical GAF:** Multi-resolution approach:

$$\text{GAF}^{(1)} \leftarrow \text{Transform}(X) \tag{105}$$
$$\text{GAF}^{(2)} \leftarrow \text{Transform}(\text{Downsample}(X, 2)) \tag{106}$$
$$\vdots \tag{107}$$
$$\text{GAF}^{(L)} \leftarrow \text{Transform}(\text{Downsample}(X, 2^{L-1})) \tag{108}$$

# 8 Fractal Risk Management

Risk management represents one of the most plausible applications of fractal analysis in finance. Traditional risk models often fail to capture the true nature of financial risks due to their reliance on normal distributions and independence assumptions. Fractal risk management provides a more realistic framework for understanding and managing financial risks.

## 8.1 Limitations of Traditional Risk Models

### 8.1.1 Gaussian Assumptions

Traditional models assume returns follow normal distributions:

$$r_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \tag{109}$$

This leads to systematic underestimation of tail risks and extreme events.

### 8.1.2 Independence Assumptions

Classical models assume independence of returns:

$$\text{Corr}(r_t, r_{t+k}) = 0 \quad \forall k > 0 \tag{110}$$

However, volatility clustering violates this assumption.

#### 8.1.3 Constant Parameters

Traditional models often assume time-invariant parameters, failing to capture regime changes and structural breaks.

### 8.2 Fractal Risk Measures

#### 8.2.1 Stable Value-at-Risk

For stable distributions with parameter $\alpha < 2$:

$$\mathrm{VaR}_\alpha = \mu + \gamma \cdot q_\alpha \tag{111}$$

where $q_\alpha$ is the $\alpha$-quantile of a standardized stable distribution.

#### 8.2.2 Fractal Expected Shortfall

The expected shortfall for stable distributions:

$$\mathrm{ES}_\alpha = \mu + \gamma \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z \mid Z > q_\alpha] \tag{112}$$

where $Z$ follows a standardized stable distribution.

#### 8.2.3 Spectral Risk Measures

General spectral risk measures for fractal distributions:

$$\rho_\phi(X) = \int_0^1 \phi(u) F_X^{-1}(u) du \tag{113}$$

where $\phi(u)$ is a risk aversion function.

### 8.3 Multifractal Risk Assessment

#### 8.3.1 Regime-Dependent Risk

Risk varies with multifractal properties:

$$\mathrm{Risk}_t = f(\Delta\alpha_t, H_t, \sigma_t) \tag{114}$$

#### 8.3.2 Multifractal VaR

VaR incorporating multifractal spectrum:

$$\text{MF-VaR}_\alpha = \sigma_0 (\Delta t)^{h(q_\alpha)} F^{-1}(\alpha; \Delta\alpha_t) \tag{115}$$

where $h(q_\alpha)$ is the generalized Hurst exponent corresponding to quantile $\alpha$.

## 8.4 Extreme Value Theory with Fractals

### 8.4.1 Generalized Pareto Distribution

For exceedances over threshold $u$:

$$F_u(x) = 1 - \left(1 + \frac{\xi x}{\sigma}\right)^{-1/\xi} \tag{116}$$

### 8.4.2 Fractal Extreme Value Models

Incorporating fractal properties in extreme value analysis:

$$\xi_t = \xi_0 + \beta \cdot \Delta\alpha_t \tag{117}$$

## 8.5 Backtesting Fractal Risk Models

### 8.5.1 Unconditional Coverage Tests

Kupiec test for VaR model accuracy:

$$\mathrm{LR}_{\mathrm{uc}} = -2\log\left(\frac{\alpha^{N_1}(1-\alpha)^{N_0}}{\hat{p}^{N_1}(1-\hat{p})^{N_0}}\right) \tag{118}$$

### 8.5.2 Conditional Coverage Tests

Christoffersen test for independence:

$$\mathrm{LR}_{\mathrm{cc}} = \mathrm{LR}_{\mathrm{uc}} + \mathrm{LR}_{\mathrm{ind}} \tag{119}$$

### 8.5.3 Dynamic Quantile Tests

Testing for correct conditional coverage:

$$\mathrm{DQ} = \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} \mathrm{Hit}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_t \tag{120}$$

# 9 Limitations and Challenges

While fractal analysis offers significant advantages in financial modeling, it also faces several important limitations and challenges that must be acknowledged and addressed. This section provides a comprehensive examination of these issues and potential solutions.

## 9.1 Theoretical Limitations

**Asymptotics vs. finite samples.** Scaling exponents are limits over decades of scales; with finite $n$, the observed slope $\widehat{H} = \frac{d\log F(n)}{d\log n}\big|_{n\in[n_{\min},n_{\max}]}$ depends on the chosen window and contaminants (microstructure at small $n$, nonstationarity at large $n$). Rates of convergence are typically slower than $\sqrt{n}$ under LRD: for many $H$-estimators, $n^{1-2H}(\hat{H}-H) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,\sigma^2)$ when $H > 1/2$, implying wide CIs for persistent series. *******

### 9.1.1 Asymptotic Properties

Fractal properties are defined as asymptotic limits:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log F(n)}{\log n} = H \tag{121}$$

In practice, financial time series have finite length, making precise estimation challenging.

### 9.1.2 Non-Stationarity

Financial markets exhibit time-varying properties that violate stationarity assumptions:

- Structural breaks in volatility
- Regime changes in correlation structure
- Evolution of market microstructure
- Regulatory changes affecting market dynamics

## 9.2 Estimation Challenges

### 9.2.1 Finite Sample Bias

For DFA/MFDFA, polynomial detrending of order $\ell$ induces small-scale bias if the true trend order exceeds $\ell$. Bias reduces with excluding the lowest $s$-scales and using wavelets with $m$ vanishing moments $m > \ell$. Parametric bias correction uses simulations at the fitted $(\hat{H}, \widehat{\lambda^2})$ to derive $\mathbb{E}[\hat{H}] - H$ on the observed grid and recenter the estimate.

### 9.2.2 Parameter Instability

Rolling window estimates show significant variation:

$$\hat{H}_t = \hat{H}(\{r_{t-w+1}, \ldots, r_t\}) \tag{122}$$

The variance of $\hat{H}_t$ can be substantial, making inference difficult.

### 9.2.3 Scaling Range Selection

The choice of scaling range affects estimates:

$$H = \frac{d \log F(n)}{d \log n}\Big|_{n\in[n_{\min}, n_{\max}]} \tag{123}$$

Different choices of $[n_{\min}, n_{\max}]$ can yield different results.

## 9.3 Computational Challenges

### 9.3.1 Computational Complexity

Many fractal methods have high computational complexity:

| Method | Time Complexity | Memory Complexity |
|---|---|---|
| DFA | $O(n \log n)$ | $O(n)$ |
| MFDFA | $O(qn \log n)$ | $O(n)$ |
| WTMM | $O(n \log^2 n)$ | $O(n \log n)$ |
| Box-counting | $O(n^2)$ | $O(n)$ |

Table 2: Computational complexity of fractal methods

## 9.4 Statistical Inference Issues

### 9.4.1 Hypothesis Testing

Standard statistical tests may not apply to fractal processes:

- Non-standard limiting distributions
- Dependence affects test statistics
- Multiple testing problems
- Power of tests in finite samples

### 9.4.2 Confidence Intervals

Constructing confidence intervals for fractal parameters is challenging:

$$P(H \in [\hat{H} - z_{\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}_H, \hat{H} + z_{\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}_H]) \neq 1 - \alpha \tag{124}$$

due to non-normality and dependence.

### 9.4.3 Model Selection

Information criteria may not work well for fractal models:

$$\text{AIC} = -2 \log L + 2k \tag{125}$$

$$\text{BIC} = -2 \log L + k \log n \tag{126}$$

The likelihood function may be difficult to compute or may not exist.

**Confidence intervals under dependence/heavy tails.** Stationary or tapered block bootstrap yields consistent CIs for $H$ and $d$. For misspecified quasi-likelihoods, use the Godambe (sandwich) covariance with

$$J(\hat{\theta}) = -\frac{1}{n}\sum \nabla^2 \ell_t(\hat{\theta}), \qquad K(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n}\sum \nabla \ell_t(\hat{\theta}) \nabla \ell_t(\hat{\theta})^\top, \qquad \text{Var}(\hat{\theta}) \approx J^{-1} K J^{-1}.$$

**Multiple testing under dependence.** Classical BH control may be anti-conservative. Use Romano–Wolf stepdown adjusted by block bootstrap $p$-values, or dependence-adjusted BH with an effective number of tests inferred from the spectrum of the correlation matrix of test statistics.

**Model selection with pseudo-likelihoods.** Under misspecification or composite likelihoods, prefer Takeuchi's Information Criterion (TIC) and quasi-/composite AIC:

$$\mathrm{TIC} = -2\ell(\hat{\theta}) + 2\,\mathrm{tr}\big(J(\hat{\theta})^{-1}K(\hat{\theta})\big), \qquad \mathrm{CLAIC} = -2\ell_C(\hat{\theta}) + 2\,\mathrm{tr}\big(J_C^{-1}K_C\big).$$

These penalize by the effective, not nominal, degrees of freedom.

## 9.5 Model Risk

### 9.5.1 Parameter Risk

Uncertainty in fractal parameters leads to model risk:

$$\text{Model Risk} = \mathrm{Var}(\text{Output} \mid \text{Parameter Uncertainty}) \tag{127}$$

### 9.5.2 Specification Risk

Risk from incorrect model specification:

$$\text{Specification Risk} = |\mathbb{E}[\text{Output} \mid \text{True Model}] - \mathbb{E}[\text{Output} \mid \text{Estimated Model}]| \tag{128}$$

### 9.5.3 Implementation Risk

Risk from incorrect model implementation:

- Coding errors
- Numerical precision issues
- Approximation errors
- System failures

## 9.6 Robustness Issues

### 9.6.1 Outlier Sensitivity

Fractal estimators can be sensitive to outliers:

$$\hat{H}_{\text{contaminated}} = \hat{H}_{\text{clean}} + \delta(\text{outliers}) \tag{129}$$

### 9.6.2 Structural Break Sensitivity

Structural breaks affect fractal parameter estimates:

$$H_t = \begin{cases} H_1 & \text{if } t \leq \tau \\ H_2 & \text{if } t > \tau \end{cases} \tag{130}$$

## 9.7 Validation Difficulties

### 9.7.1 Out-of-Sample Testing

Limited data makes out-of-sample testing challenging:

- Need for long time series

- Structural changes over time
- Limited crisis periods for testing

### 9.7.2 Cross-Validation

Traditional cross-validation may not work for dependent data:

$$\text{CV Error} = \frac{1}{K}\sum_{k=1}^{K} \text{Error}(\text{Fold}_k) \tag{131}$$

Dependence violates independence assumptions.

## References

Abry, P., Malevergne, Y., Wendt, H., Senneret, M., Jaffres, L., and Liaustrat, B. (2019). Shuffling for understanding multifractality, application to asset price time series. In *European Signal Processing Conference*.

Aljethi, R. A. and Kilicman, A. (2023). Derivation of the fractional fokker–planck equation for stable lévy with financial applications. *Mathematics*, 11(5):1102.

Allison, A. B. and Abbott, D. (2000). Stable processes in econometric time series: Are prices made out of noise?

Anderson, N. and Noss, J. (2013). Financial stability paper no 23: The fractal market hypothesis and its implications for the stability of financial markets. Technical report, Bank of England.

Barna, F., Dima, M., Dima, B., and Paşca, L. (2016). Fractal market hypothesis: The emergent financial markets case. *Economic Computation and Economic Cybernetics Studies and Research*.

Bartolozzi, M., Drożdż, S., Leinweber, D. B., Speth, J., and Thomas, A. W. (2005). Self-similar log-periodic structures in western stock markets from 2000. *Research Papers in Economics*.

Berghorn, W., Schulz, M. T., and Otto, S. (2021). Fractal markets, frontiers, and factors. *International Journal of Financial Research*, 12(5):104.

Bianchi, S. and Pianese, A. (2011). Modeling stock price movements: Multifractality or multifractionality? *Social Science Research Network*.

Bloch, D. (2016). A practical guide to quantitative volatility trading. *Social Science Research Network*.

Bouchaud, J.-P. (2005). The subtle nature of financial random walks. *Chaos*, 15(2):026104.

Brandi, G. and Di Matteo, T. (2020). On the statistics of scaling exponents and the multiscaling value at risk. *arXiv:2002.04164*.

Breymann, W., Lüthi, D., and Platen, E. (2009). Empirical behavior of a world stock index from intra-day to monthly time scales. *European Physical Journal B*, 71(4):511–522.

Caginalp, G. (2021). Fat tails arise endogenously from supply/demand, with or without jump processes. *AIMS Mathematics*, 6:283–305.

Chang, I., Stauffer, D., and Pandey, R. B. (2001). Asymmetries, correlations and fat tails in percolation market model. *arXiv:cond-mat/0108345*.

da Cruz, J. P. and Lind, P. G. (2012). Heavy-tails in economic data: fundamental assumptions, modelling and analysis. *arXiv:1202.0142*.

de Carufel, J., Brooks, M., Stieber, M., and Britton, P. (2017). A topological approach to scaling in financial data. *arXiv:1710.08860*.

de Oliveira, A. C. et al. (2023). The art of fitting financial time series for some stock market indexes of some of the main emerging countries and for mexico with stable lévy distributions. *Brazilian Journal of Development*.

Evertsz, C. J. G., Hendrych, R., Singer, P., and Peitgen, H.-O. (1999). Fraktale geometrie von börsenzeitreihen: Neue perspektiven ökonomischer zeitreihenanalysen. In *Fractal Geometry of Stock Market Time Series*.

Fama, E. F. and Roll, R. (1968). Some properties of symmetric stable distributions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 63(323):817–836.

Fujiwara, Y. and Fujisaka, H. (2002). Self-similarity of price fluctuations and market dynamics. In *Empirical Science of Financial Fluctuations: The Advent of Econophysics*.

Grech, D. and Pamuła, G. (2013). New measure of multifractality and its application in finances. *arXiv:1309.5466*.

Hilarov, V. L. (2022). On the fractal self-organization of the financial time series. *Journal of digital science*.

Kaizoji, T. (2006). On stock-price fluctuations in the periods of booms and stagnations. In *Econophysics and Data Driven Modelling of Market Dynamics*.

Kyaw, N. N. A., Los, C. A., and Zong, S. (2004). Persistence characteristics of latin american financial markets. *Social Science Research Network*.

Leitch, R. A. (1975). Assessing changes in financial statistics using stable paretian distributions and information theory. *Journal of Finance*, 30(1).

Leung, T. and Zhao, T. (2023). Multiscale volatility analysis for noisy high-frequency prices. *Risks*, 11(7):117.

Los, C. A. (2005). Measurement of financial risk persistence. *Social Science Research Network*.

Maglione, F. (2015). Multifractality in finance: A deep understanding and review of mandelbrot's mmar. *Social Science Research Network*.

Malevergne, Y. and Sornette, D. (2001). Multi-dimensional rational bubbles and fat tails: application of stochastic regression equations to financial speculation. *arXiv:cond-mat/0101371*.

Mandelbrot, B. B. (1963). *The variation of certain speculative prices*, volume 36.

Mandelbrot, B. B. (2005). Parallel cartoons of fractal models of finance. *Annals of Finance*, 1(2):179–192.

Mandelbrot, B. B. and Hudson, R. L. (2004). *The Misbehavior of Markets: A Fractal View of Financial Turbulence*. Basic Books.

Manzo, G. (2010). *Option pricing with respect to the fractional Brownian motion and portfolio selection according to [alpha]-stable distribution*. PhD thesis, LUISS.

Mariani, M. C., Kubin, W., Asante, P. K., and Tweneboah, O. K. (2024). Volatility analysis of financial time series using the multifractal conditional diffusion entropy method. *Fractal and Fractional*, 8(5):274.

Mendonça, S. M., Cabella, B. C. T., and Martinez, A. S. (2024). A multifractal detrended fluctuation analysis approach using generalized functions. *Physica A*, 690:129577.

Mukherjee, I. and Sarkar, A. (2011). Complexity, financial markets and their scaling laws. *Research Papers in Economics*.

Parkinson, M. (2013). z test for the significance of the mean of a stable probability distribution with $1<2$. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 40(3):465–482.

Paul, W. and Baschnagel, J. (2013). *Beyond the Central Limit Theorem: Lévy Distributions*. Springer.

Podobnik, B., Valentincic, A., et al. (2011). Asymmetric lévy flight in financial ratios. *Social Science Research Network*.

Resta, M. (2014). On the fractal characterization of a system for tradings on eurozone stocks. In *Multiscaling in Finance*, pages 63–80. Springer.

Rhee, T. A. (2014). The relationship between return fractality and bipower variation. *Algorithmic Finance*.

Sun, W., Rachev, S. T., Fabozzi, F. J., and Kalev, P. S. (2008). Fractals in trade duration: capturing long-range dependence and heavy tailedness in modeling trade duration. *Annals of Finance*, 4(2):217–241.

Walter, C. (1999). Lévy-stability-under-addition and fractal structure of markets: Implications for the investment management industry and emphasized examination of matif notional contract. *Mathematical and Computer Modelling*, 29:37–56.

Weron, R. (2003). Levy-stable distributions revisited: tail index $> 2$ does not exclude the levy-stable regime.

Zhang, Y. (2017). Volatility forecasting with the multifractal model of asset returns. *Social Science Research Network*.

Zhao, Y., Shuai, C., and Liu, C. (2015). Multifractal theory with its applications in data management. *Annals of Operations Research*, 234:133–150.

Zhou, W.-X. (2009). Finite-size effect and the components of multifractality in financial volatility. *Research Papers in Economics*.

Ziemann, V. (2021). Bubbles, crashes, fat tails and lévy-stable distributions. In *Financial Modelling and Crises*. Springer.