

Lux, Thomas

**Working Paper**

## Detecting multi-fractal properties in asset returns: The failure of the scaling estimator

Economics Working Paper, No. 2003-14

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Christian-Albrechts-University of Kiel, Department of Economics

*Suggested Citation:* Lux, Thomas (2003) : Detecting multi-fractal properties in asset returns: The failure of the scaling estimator, Economics Working Paper, No. 2003-14, Kiel University, Department of Economics, Kiel,  
<https://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:101:1-200911031081>

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/3032>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# Detecting multi-fractal properties in asset returns: The failure of the 'scaling estimator'

by Thomas Lux

C | A | U

Christian-Albrechts-Universität Kiel

Department of Economics

*Economics Working Paper*

*No 2003-14*



# Detecting multi-fractal properties in asset returns: The failure of the ‘scaling estimator’

Thomas Lux

Department of Economics, University of Kiel  
Olshausenstr. 40, 24118 Kiel, Germany  
[lux@bwl.uni-kiel.de](mailto:lux@bwl.uni-kiel.de)

It has become popular recently to apply the multifractal formalism of statistical physics (scaling analysis of structure functions and  $f(\alpha)$  singularity spectrum analysis) to financial data. The outcome of such studies is a nonlinear shape of the structure function and a nontrivial behavior of the spectrum. Eventually, this literature has moved from basic data analysis to estimation of particular variants of multi-fractal models for asset returns via fitting of the empirical  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions. Here, we reinvestigate earlier claims of multi-fractality using four long time series of important financial markets. Taking the recently proposed multi-fractal models of asset returns as our starting point, we show that the typical ‘scaling estimators’ used in the physics literature are unable to distinguish between spurious and ‘real’ multi-scaling of financial data. Designing explicit tests for multi-scaling, we can in no case reject the null hypothesis that the apparent curvature of both the scaling function and the Hölder spectrum are spuriously generated by the particular fat-tailed distribution of innovations characterizing financial data. Given the well-known overwhelming evidence in favor of different degrees of long-term dependence in the powers of returns, we interpret this inability to reject the null hypothesis of multi-scaling as a lack of discriminatory power of the standard approach rather than as a true rejection of multi-scaling in financial data. However, the complete ‘failure’ of the multi-fractal apparatus in this setting also raises the question whether results in other areas (like geophysics) suffer from similar short-comings of the traditional methodology.

**PACS: 05.45.-a, 89.65.-r, 89.65.-s (JEL Classification: C20, G12, C15)**

**May 2003**

## I. MULTI-SCALING AND MULTI-FRACTALITY IN ASSET RETURNS

Mandelbrot, Calvet and Fisher [1], Mandelbrot [2] and Calvet and Fisher [3] have proposed a compound model consisting of a multi-fractal time transformation  $\theta_t$  and an incremental Brownian motion  $B_H$  as a new model of financial returns ( $r_t$ ):

$$r_t = B_H [\theta(t)] \quad (1)$$

The major new innovation of this model is the use of a multi-fractal cascade as a transformation of chronological time into ‘business time’. Put differently, one might also simply interpret the multi-fractal component as a process governing instantaneous volatility. In their original form, multi-fractal cascades are operations performed on probability measures. The ‘cascade’ starts with assigning uniform probability to the interval  $[0,1]$ . In the elementary case of a so-called Binomial cascade, this interval is first split up into two subintervals of equal length, which receive a fraction  $m_0$  and  $1 - m_0$ , respectively, of the total probability mass.

In the next step, each subinterval is again split up into two subintervals, which again receive fractions  $m_0$  and  $1 - m_0$  of the probability mass of their ‘mother’ intervals. In principle, this procedure is, then, repeated *ad infinitum*. While the probabilities  $m_0$  and  $1 - m_0$  are constant over the evolution of the cascade in the Binomial model, a straightforward modification is using random numbers rather than the same constant values in each iteration. The Log-normal model is one example along these lines using random numbers from an appropriately scaled Lognormal distribution [4]. One may conveniently define its multipliers, say  $M$ , via  $-\log_2 M \sim N(\lambda, \sigma^2)$ . Conservation of average mass in each iteration implies  $E[M] = 0.5$ , and translates into a restriction on the location and variance of the underlying Normal distribution:  $\sigma^2 = 2(\lambda - 1)/\ln(2)$ .

The major attraction of this new model is its ability to generate *various degrees* of long memory in different powers of returns – a feature that has been found to characterize virtually all financial prices (e.g., Deng, Engle and Granger [5]; Lobato and Savin [6]) but which is absent in traditional volatility models like GARCH and stochastic volatility models as well as in their long-memory variants (e.g., FIGARCH), cf. Mills [7].

The varying degree of long memory of this process is equivalent to nonlinear scaling of the moments under time aggregation. In fact, as pointed out in Calvet and Fisher [3], multi-fractal measures are characterized by a non-linear scaling function of moments:

$$E[\theta(\Delta t)^q] = c(q) \cdot \Delta t^{\tau_\theta(q)+1}, \quad (2)$$

with  $c()$  a ‘prefactor’ depending on the depth of the cascade and  $\tau_\theta(q)$  the nonlinear scaling function of moments depending on the particular variant of multi-fractal process used as the time

transformation  $\theta(t)$ . As shown by Mandelbrot, Calvet and Fisher [1], the scaling behavior of the multi-fractal time transformation carries over to returns from the compound process (1) which would obey a scaling function  $\tau_r(q) = \tau_\theta(q/H)$ . For many popular multi-fractals, their  $\tau_\theta(q)$  function can be solved analytically and estimation of the multi-fractal parameters is often done by matching the empirical  $\tau(q)$  function to its theoretical counterpart. The traditional approach in the physics literature consists in extracting  $\tau_\theta(q)$  or  $\tau_r(q)$  from a chain of log-log fits of the behavior of various moments  $q$  for a certain selection of time aggregates  $\Delta t$ . One, therefore, uses linear fits to the temporal scaling of powers  $q$ :

$$\ln E\left[|r_{t,\Delta t}|^q\right] = a_0 + a_1 \cdot \ln(\Delta t) \quad (3)$$

and fits the empirical  $\tau_r(q)$  curve (for a selection of discrete  $q$ ) to the hypothesized analytical one. Alternatively and perhaps even more widespread in the literature, one would use the so-called Legendre transformation of the scaling function

$$f_\theta(\alpha) = \arg \min_q [q\alpha - \tau_\theta(q)]. \quad (4)$$

and estimate parameters of the underlying multi-fractal model by matching the empirical and hypothetical spectrum of so-called Hölder exponents  $f_\theta(\alpha)$  which for most common multi-fractals can also be derived analytically. Again, the shape of the spectrum carries over from the multi-fractal time transformation to returns in the compound process via a simple relationship:  $f_r(\alpha) = f_\theta(\alpha/H)$ .

Two particular cases discussed in the above papers are the Binomial and Lognormal multi-fractals whose multipliers are chosen from either a Binomial distribution with probabilities  $m_0$  and  $1 - m_0$ , or from a Lognormal distribution

with scale parameter  $\lambda$  (because of the restriction for the variance  $\sigma^2$  outlined above, the Lognormal model effectively also has only one parameter). For these simple cases, the pertinent  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions are obtained as follows:

$$\tau_B(q) = -\log_2(m_1^q + m_0^q), \quad (5)$$

$$f_B(\alpha) = -\frac{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha}{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}} \log_2\left(\frac{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha}{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}}\right) - \frac{\alpha - \alpha_{\min}}{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}} \log_2\left(\frac{\alpha - \alpha_{\min}}{\alpha_{\max} - \alpha_{\min}}\right)$$

with  $\alpha_{\min} = -\log_2(m_0)$  and  $\alpha_{\max} = -\log_2(1 - m_0)$  for the Binomial model and:

$$\tau_L(q) = q\lambda - q^2(\lambda - 1) - 1, \quad (6)$$

$$f_L(\alpha) = 1 - \frac{(\alpha - \lambda)^2}{4(\lambda - 1)}$$

for the Lognormal model.

The estimation of particular compound multi-fractal models for financial returns via (5) or (6) is a new contribution of Mandelbrot, Calvet and Fisher [1], and Calvet and Fisher [3], but interpretation of a non-linear shape of the empirical  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions alone as evidence for multi-fractality is much more widespread. Papers in this vein include, for example, Ghasghaie, S. *et al.*, [8], Vandewalle and Ausloos [9,10], Schmitt, Schertzer and Lovejoy [11], Pasquini and Serva [12], Breymann *et al.* [13] and Muzy *et al.* [14]. Our criticism below, therefore, also extends to these more general, data-analytical approaches for detecting multi-scaling as a time series property of financial data.

## II. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE ‘SCALING ESTIMATOR’: A TEST WITH SURROGATE DATA

One interesting (but neglected) aspect of these estimation procedures is that they do not only provide a point estimate, but that they could also be interpreted as a *test* for multi-scaling (non-linear scaling of moments) of the pertinent data set against the alternative hypothesis of uni-scaling (linear behavior). Namely, both the Binomial and Lognormal case have a *uni-fractal* limiting case. In the former case this limit is obtained with  $m_0 = 0.5$ , in the later case it is given by  $\lambda = 1$ . For the Binomial model, it is easy to see that with a split of mass with probabilities 0.5 no differentiation of the measure (and, hence, no transformation of time) is obtained so that eq. 1 simply boils down to fractional Brownian motion. In the Lognormal case, the same occurs via the dependence of the variance on  $\lambda$ : in the case of  $\lambda = 1$ , the variance vanishes and we also end up with a flat measure which transforms time only in a trivial way. In terms of the scaling function and Hölder spectrum, we would end up with *linear* scaling  $\tau(q) = qH - 1$ , the well-kown uni-fractal relationship characterizing fractional Brownian motion (and scaling  $\tau(q) = q/2 - 1$  for the case of Wiener Brownian motion) which translates into a degenerate Hölder spectrum with  $f(\alpha) = 1$  if  $\alpha = H$  and 0 elsewhere.

Typically, simulations of uni-fractal processes would neither give rise to *perfectly linear*  $\tau(q)$  functions<sup>1</sup> nor *perfectly degenerate*  $f(\alpha)$  spectra. Some slight, *spurious* curvature would have to be expected in both of these functions. Although in extant literature, typically *any* estimate of the multi-fractal parameters

<sup>1</sup> Berthelsen *et al.* [16], Bouchaud *et al.* [17], LeBaron [18] and Venziano *et al.* [19] have already pointed out the possibility of obtaining spurious multi-scaling for particular stochastic processes.

(or, in the more data-analytical approaches: *any* degree of non-linearity of the scaling functions) has been accepted as evidence of multi-scaling, one would rather prefer to have a criterion for estimates that are *sufficiently far away* from the borderline cases  $m_0 = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 1$  to accept the null hypothesis of ‘true’ (as opposed to spurious) multi-fractality.

As no theoretical results are available on the distribution of estimates from the scaling estimators derived from  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions, we pursue a bootstrap or surrogate data approach in dealing with this issue. In order to do so, we may even allow for a generalization of the model (1) proposed by Mandelbrot *et al.* in that we do not have to postulate any particular distribution of the innovations. Our null hypothesis is absence of multi-fractality, i.e.  $m = 0.5$  or  $\lambda = 1$ , while at the same time we allow ourselves to be totally agnostic about the incremental distribution. Our null hypothesis, thus, implies absence of any temporal structure in the data brought about by the multi-fractal time transformation. To arrive at an assessment of the distribution of the  $m_0$  and  $\lambda$  estimates, we, then simply have to repeat our estimation procedure sufficiently often for randomized data and compare the original estimate with the ensemble of estimates from the shuffled series. At significance level  $\alpha$ , we would reject the null hypothesis if our original estimate would be further away from  $m_0 = 0.5$  ( $\lambda = 1$ ) than  $\alpha$  percent of the estimates from the synthetic data. Note that this is a one-sided test design as our null-hypothesis holds that the randomized data are characterized by absence of multi-scaling.

In fact, the similarity between the original scaling functions and scaling functions obtained for shuffled data has already been noted by Matia *et al.* [15]. Their visual comparison might serve to raise doubts about the reliability of any inference on ‘true’ underlying multi-scaling to be drawn from such analyses.

Nevertheless, they did not question the usual conclusion drawn from the non-linearity of the  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions, but conjectured that some part of it may be attributed to a broad probability distribution. What we attempt in the following is a somewhat sharper conclusion in the form of a statistical test for the presence of multi-scaling.

Below we report the results from applying this test design to various financial data sets. Our data are: two stock market indices (the New York Stock Exchange Composite Index and the German DAX), an exchange rate (Deutsche Mark/U.S\$), and the daily price of gold from the London Precious Metal Exchange. All time series extend over relatively long time horizons. Time intervals and number of observations are: for the DAX the period 10/59 - 12/98 ( $n = 9818$ ), for the NYCI: 01/66 - 12/98 ( $n = 8308$ ), for US\$-DM: 01/74 - 12/98 ( $n = 6140$ ), and for the Gold price: 01/78 - 12/98 ( $n = 5140$ ). The time series have been demeaned and autocorrelation at the first lag has been filtered out before estimating the multi-fractal parameters.

### ***Tables 1 and 2 about here***

Tables 1 and 2 show empirical estimates together with minima and maxima of estimates from 1,000 reshuffled series, and the rank the empirical estimates would occupy within the reshuffled ones.<sup>2</sup> These

---

<sup>2</sup> It is interesting to compare the estimates for  $\lambda$  in the case of the U.S.\$-DEM with the one reported by Calvet and Fisher [3]: while our estimate from the  $\tau(q)$  function is identical with theirs (which is, however, obtained from a fit of the  $f(\alpha)$  function), the one we get for the  $f(\alpha)$  function is much lower. However, note that data sources and time periods are different which could, in principle, explain this discrepancy. Furthermore, the scaling estimator is characterized by a large standard error which sometimes generates large discrepancies

experiments have been carried out for both the Lognormal and Binomial model with both the  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions used for estimation of the multi-fractal parameters (cf. Tables 1 and 2, respectively). All results are clearly insignificant at any traditional level of significance, and we, therefore, cannot reject the null hypothesis of absence of multi-scaling (or a Binomial or Lognormal multi-fractal time transformation) in any of the four time series under consideration. In none of these eight cases do we find an estimate for the original series that is particularly far in the right tail of the bootstrapped estimates (say, beyond rank 900 of 1,000). Hence, the apparent multi-scaling might well be generated as a spurious result from the particular incremental distribution found in the data. One may note that often the entire distribution of estimates from the shuffled data is placed considerably far from its expected value, e.g. in the interval  $[0.77, 1.00]$  for the  $\tau(q)$  estimates of the Binomial model when applied to NYCI data. Figs. 1 and 2 provide illustrations of original  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions together with a random selection of those from reshuffled data which shows that there are, in fact, no apparent differences between both the original data and typical randomized data sets.<sup>3</sup>

---

between estimates obtained for slightly different set-ups (cf., Lux [20]).

<sup>3</sup> Besides our general caveat against taking curvature of  $f(\alpha)$  and  $\tau(q)$  plots as convincing evidence of multi-scaling, it might be interesting to point out some perplexing regularities in Tables 1 and 2: First, the ranking of the four markets in terms of deviations from the benchmarks  $m_0 = 0.5$  and  $\lambda = 1$  is the same in all four cases. Since higher  $m_0$  (or  $\lambda$ ) means more pronounced bursts, this might be viewed as a ranking in terms of volatility persistence. Second, along with the inter-market ranking, the ranking of the original estimates within their shuffled counterparts is also extremely consistent within markets, across the four different sets of experiments.

*Figs 1 and 2 about here*

### III. CONCLUSIONS

A surrogate data test like the one pursued above can usually be interpreted as testing whether certain features of the data can be explained by a rather simple or uninteresting model. This is exactly what we have found: the apparent nonlinear scaling from the very popular  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  approaches can be accounted for by spurious multi-scaling typically obtained with financial data after randomization of their temporal structure. Note that inability of rejection of the null hypothesis (absence of multi-scaling) might either occur because the null hypothesis is indeed true or because the discriminating statistics fails to have sufficient power against the alternatives present in the data. The overall conclusion is, therefore, not necessarily that we have demonstrated the absence of multi-fractality altogether, but could also be that the power of the traditional approaches for detecting this behavior is small at least when confronted with typical financial data. In fact, taking into account the overwhelming evidence in favor of different degrees of long-term dependence in various powers of returns (Deng, Engle and Granger [5]; Lobato and Savin [6]), we are rather inclined to follow the later interpretation of our results. It is also worth pointing out that our results are in harmony with findings of spurious curvature of the  $\tau(q)$  and  $f(\alpha)$  functions in experiments with some fat-tailed distributions (Nakao [21]). They also square well with the finding that the scaling estimates suffer from large biases and standard errors (Lux [20]; Yamasaki [22]).

The failure of the traditional scaling approach when confronted with financial data raises the question whether results in other areas found in the literature are similarly meaningless. It, therefore, seems worthwhile to reinvestigate typical

applications of the multi-fractal apparatus such as, e.g., turbulent flows or geophysical data using the bootstrapping approach advocated in this paper. Future work should also investigate whether new methods for estimating multi-fractal models(Lux [20], Calvet and Fisher [23]) would yield more clear-cut evidence for multi-fractality under a surrogate data perspective.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Helpful discussions with T. Kaizoji, K. Matia, G. Stanley and K. Yamasaki are gratefully acknowledged. This paper has been written during a sabbatical stay at International Christian University Tokyo whose great hospitality is gratefully acknowledged. The author also gratefully appreciates financial support by the Landeszentralbank Schleswig-Holstein and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

- [1] Mandelbrot, B., A. Fisher and L. Calvet (1997) *A Multifractal Model of Asset Returns*. mimeo: Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics.
- [2] Mandelbrot, B. (1999) A Multifractal Walk down Wall Street, *Scientific American*, February, 50 - 53.
- [3] Calvet, L. and A. Fisher (2002a) Multi-Fractality in Asset Returns: Theory and Evidence, *Review of Economics & Statistics* 84, 381 – 406.
- [4] Mandelbrot, B., 1974, Intermittent Turbulence in Self Similar Cascades: Divergence of High Moments and Dimension of the Carrier, *Journal of Fluid Mechanics* 62, 331 – 358
- [5] Ding, Z., C.W.J. Granger and R.F. Engle (1993) A Long Memory Property of Stock Market Returns and a New Model, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 1, 83 - 106.
- [6] Lobato. I.N. and N.E. Savin (1998) Real and Spurious Long-Memory Properties of Stock Market Data, *Journal of Business and Economics Statistics*, 16, 261 - 283.
- [7] Mills, T., 1993, The Econometric Modelling of Financial Time Series. Cambridge : University Press.
- [8] Ghasghaie, S. *et al.* (1996) Turbulent Cascades in Foreign Exchange Markets, *Nature* 381, 767 - 770.
- [9] Vandewalle, N. and M. Ausloos (1998a) Sparseness and Roughness of Foreign Exchange Rates, *International Journal of Modern Physics C*, 9, 711 - 719.
- [10] Vandewalle, N. and M. Ausloos (1998b) Multi-affine Analysis of Typical Currency Exchange Rates, *European Physical Journal B*, 4, 257 - 261.
- [11] Schmitt, F., D. Schertzer and S. Lovejoy (1999), Multifractal Analysis of Foreign Exchange Data, *Applied Stochastic Models and Data Analysis*, 15, 29 – 53.
- [12] Pasquini, M. and M. Serva, 1999, Multiscale Behavior of Volatility Autocorrelations in a Financial Market, *Economics Letters* 65, 275 – 279.
- [13] Breymann, W, S. Ghashgaie and P. Talckner (2000) A Stochastic Cascade Model for FX Dynamics, *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 3, 357 – 360.
- [14] Muzy, J.-F., D. Sornette, J. Delour and A. Arneodo (2001) Multifractal Returns and Hierarchical Portfolio Theory, *Quantitative Finance*, 1, 131 – 148.
- [15] Matia, K., Y. Ashkenazy and H.E. Stanley (2003) Multifractal Properties of Price Fluctuations of Stock and



- Commodity Markets, *Europhysics Letters* 61, 422 – 428.
- [16] Berthelsen, C.L., J.A. Glazier and S. Raghavachari, 1994, Effective Multifractal Spectrum of a Random Walk, *Physical Review E* 49, 1860 - 1864
- [17] Bouchaud, J.-P., M. Potters and M. Meyer, 2000, Apparent Multifractality in Financial Time Series. *European Physical Journal B* 13, 595 – 599
- [18] LeBaron, B. (2001) Stochastic Volatility as a Simple Generator of Apparent Financial Power Laws and Long Memory, *Quantitative Finance* 1, 621 – 631.
- [19] Veneziano, D., G.E. Moglen and R.F. Bras, 1995, Multifractal Analysis: Pitfalls of Standard Procedures, *Physical Review E*, 52, 1387 – 1398.
- [20] Lux, T. (2003) *The Multi-Fractal Model of Asset Returns: Its Estimation via GMM and Its Use for Volatility Forecasting*. Manuscript, University of Kiel.
- [21] Nakao, H. (2000) Multi-Scaling Properties of Truncated Lévy Flight, *Physical Review Letters* A 266, 282 – 289.
- [22] Yamasaki, K. (2003) *The Reliability of Mutifractal Indicators*, Manuscript, Tokyo University of Information Sciences.
- [23] Calvet, L. and A. Fisher, 2002, *Regime-Switching and the Estimation of Multifractal Processes*. Manuscript: Harvard University

**Table I: Reshuffle Test for Significance of Log-Normal and Binomial Multi-Fractal Estimates from Scaling Estimator –  $\tau(q)$  fit**

Data	Empirical data	Reshuffled data (1,000 runs)		
	$\hat{\lambda}$ from $\tau(q)$	Min $\hat{\lambda}$	Max $\hat{\lambda}$	Rank of empirical $\hat{\lambda}$
NYCI	1.226	1.086	1.300	705
DAX	1.180	1.150	1.248	844
US\$-DEM	1.109	1.050	1.233	166
Gold	1.140	1.059	1.260	322
	$\hat{m}_0$ from $f(\alpha)$	Min $\hat{m}_0$	Max $\hat{m}_0$	Rank of empirical $\hat{m}_0$
NYCI	0.961	0.774	1.000	731
DAX	0.893	0.659	0.977	848
US\$-DEM	0.762	0.667	0.977	159
Gold	0.818	0.657	1.000	308

*Note:* The scaling estimator is implemented in the following way: 25 time increments  $\Delta t$  ranging from  $\Delta t = 5$  to  $\Delta t = T/5$  ( $T$  the length of the time series) have been used which are equally spaced in logs (i.e. the next  $\Delta t$  is computed as  $\Delta t' = \exp(\ln(\Delta t) + \ln(T/5)/25)$ , only positive moments are used,  $q = 0.1, 0.2 \dots (0.1) \dots 3, 3.5, (0.5) \dots 10$ , and the estimates of  $\lambda$  and  $m_0$  are found by minimizing the squared deviation between the theoretical and empirical scaling function at the above  $q$  values.

The time intervals and number of observations are:

DAX: 10/59 - 12/98 ( $n = 9818$ ),

NYCI: 01/66 - 12/98 ( $n = 8308$ ),

US\$-DM: 01/74 - 12/98 ( $n = 6140$ ),

Gold price: 01/78 - 12/98 ( $n = 5140$ ).

**Table II: Reshuffle Test for Significance of Log-Normal and Binomial Multi-Fractal Estimates from Scaling Estimator –  $f(\alpha)$  fit**

Data	Empirical data	Reshuffled data (1,000 runs)		
	$\hat{\lambda}$ from $f(\alpha)$	Min $\hat{\lambda}$	Max $\hat{\lambda}$	Rank of empirical $\hat{\lambda}$
NYCI	1.240	1.033	1.549	751
DAX	1.140	1.011	2.162	816
US\$-DEM	1.031	1.007	2.644	130
Gold	1.076	1.009	2.582	401
	$\hat{m}_0$ from $f(\alpha)$	Min $\hat{m}_0$	Max $\hat{m}_0$	Rank of empirical $\hat{m}_0$
NYCI	0.811	0.607	0.870	738
DAX	0.741	0.554	0.990	844
US\$-DEM	0.616	0.501	0.992	153
Gold	0.675	0.554	0.992	341

*Note:* Same time intervals, number of observations, and implementation of the scaling estimator as in Table 1, but here the estimates of  $\lambda$  and  $m_0$  are found by minimizing the squared deviation between the theoretical and empirical spectrum at the  $\alpha$  coordinates of the empirical spectrum.

Scaling Function of Moments, NYCI




Fig 1:  $\tau(q)$  function for New York Stock Exchange Composite Index returns (solid line) and twenty reshuffled series (dotted lines). The broken line gives the scaling behavior  $\tau(q) = q/2 - 1$  of Gaussian random variables.




Fig. 2:  $f(\alpha)$  spectrum for New York Stock Exchange Composite Index returns (solid line) and twenty reshuffled series (dotted lines).