On the Exact Characterization and (Rough) Nature of Volatility: An Essay on Fractional Stochastic Processes

Aryan Ayyar[a,*]

[a]*Manipal Academy of Higher Education (MAHE), Bengaluru, India*

Abstract

Financial market volatility is known for its unpredictable, jagged behavior, far removed from the smooth fluctuations assumed in classical models. This essay offers a clear and intuitive exploration of rough volatility, a paradigm that embraces the market's inherent irregularity by modeling volatility with fractional Brownian motion and stochastic Volterra equations. We begin by explaining how the Hurst parameter quantifies roughness, then contrast standard Brownian motion's memoryless nature with fractional Brownian motion's long-term dependence. Building on these foundations, we introduce fractional calculus and demonstrate how fractional integrals endow volatility models with persistent memory. The discussion culminates in the formulation of stochastic Volterra equations, which capture both mean-reversion and rough noise through singular kernels. By blending mathematical rigor with accessible intuition, this essay illuminates why rough volatility models calibrated to real market data offer more realistic risk assessments and pricing tools than their classical counterparts.

1. Introduction

The modeling of financial volatility has been a cornerstone of quantitative finance, with traditional models often relying on the assumption of standard Brownian motion to describe price dynamics[1]. However, empirical observations of real market data have consistently revealed that volatility exhibits much more irregular and erratic behavior than these conventional models predict. This phenomenon has led to the development of rough volatility models, which provide a more accurate mathematical framework for capturing the inherent complexity of financial markets. Rough volatility models represent a major shift in our understanding of volatility dynamics, moving away from the smooth, predictable paths of standard Brownian motion toward models that can accommodate the jumpy, memory-dependent nature of actual market volatility. By the means of this essay, we aim to explore the theoretical foundations of rough volatility models, with particular emphasis on the role of the Hurst parameter, fractional Brownian motion, and the mathematical machinery of fractional calculus that runs these models.Given the computational challenges asso-

*Corresponding author

[1]This work is based on an intended to be an appreciation of the seminal 2018 paper by Eduardo Abi Jaber and Omar El Euch. All errors are my own and I take full responsibility for all interpretations of this paper.

ciated with fractional stochastic processes, researchers have developed multifactor approximations of rough volatility models. These approximations maintain the essential characteristics of rough volatility while making the models more tractable for practical implementation. Multifactor approximations typically involve representing the fractional process as a sum of standard processes with different time scales, each capturing different aspects of the memory structure. This approach allows practitioners to retain the benefits of rough volatility modeling while working within existing computational frameworks. Rough volatility models have significant implications for derivatives pricing and risk management. The non-Markovian nature of these models means that the entire path history becomes relevant for pricing, not just the current state. This path dependence can lead to substantial differences in option prices compared to traditional models. Furthermore, the rough nature of volatility implies that volatility forecasts should incorporate long memory effects, potentially improving the accuracy of risk measures such as Value at Risk (VaR) and Expected Shortfall.

2. Roughness in Volatility

Extensive empirical analysis of financial market data has consistently demonstrated that real market volatility is significantly more irregular than what standard models predict. The log-volatility, i.e. the logarithm of volatility exhibits particularly erratic behavior, especially at short time scales. This finding has profound implications not just for risk management and derivatives pricing but also for market microstructure as well. Empirical studies have revealed that in practice, financial data suggests $H \approx 0.1 - 0.2$, which is substantially less than the value $H = 0.5$ associated with standard Brownian motion. Such empirical findings provide strong evidence for the rough nature of volatility and justifies the need for more sophisticated modeling approaches.

2.1. The Hurst Parameter

The fundamental concept underlying rough volatility models is the quantification of volatility's "memoryness" or smoothness through a parameter known as the Hurst parameter, denoted as H. This parameter serves as a critical indicator of the temporal correlation structure within volatility processes. The Hurst parameter provides a clear taxonomy for understanding different types of stochastic behavior, for example when $H < 0.5$, the process exhibits anti-persistent behavior, characterized by frequent reversals and jumps, making the volatility "rough". At exactly $H = 0.5$, the volatility follows standard Brownian motion, representing the classical case with no memory . For $H > 0.5$, the process displays persistent behavior, resulting in smooth volatility paths with positive temporal correlations.

2.2. Fractional Calculus

The mathematical foundation of rough volatility models rests on fractional calculus, particularly fractional integrals. Understanding these mathematical constructs is crucial for grasping how rough volatility models operate.

Definition 2.1 (Riemann-Liouville Fractional Integral)**.** For a function $f : [a, b] \to \mathbb{R}$ that is locally integrable and $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re(\alpha) > 0$, the Riemann-Liouville fractional integral of order α is defined as

$$I^\alpha f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \int_a^x (x-t)^{\alpha-1} f(t)\, dt \tag{1}$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ denotes the gamma function and a is a fixed base point.The operator I^α generalizes the concept of repeated integration through Cauchy's formula for n-fold integration. For positive integers n, we have:

$$I^n f(x) = \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_a^x (x-t)^{n-1} f(t)\, dt \tag{2}$$

The fractional integral exhibits several important properties that illuminate its behavior for different values of α. Firstly, when $\alpha = 1$, the fractional integral reduces to the standard Riemann integral

$$I^1 f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1)} \int_a^x (x-t)^{1-1} f(t)\, dt = \int_a^x f(t)\, dt \tag{3}$$

Next, for $\alpha = 1/2$, we obtain the semi-integral, a true fractional operator

$$I^{1/2} f(x) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(1/2)} \int_a^x (x-t)^{-1/2} f(t)\, dt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_a^x \frac{f(t)}{\sqrt{x-t}}\, dt \tag{4}$$

The fractional integral can be expressed as a convolution with a power-law kernel. We define the fractional kernel

$$K_\alpha(t) = \frac{t^{\alpha-1}}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}(t) \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{1}_{[0,\infty)}$ is the indicator function. Then:

$$I^\alpha f(x) = (K_\alpha * f)(x) = \int_0^x K_\alpha(x-t) f(t)\, dt \tag{6}$$

The convolution structure reveals that fractional integration introduces memory effects, where the kernel $K_\alpha(t)$ acts as a weighting function that determines how past values of f influence the current fractional integral.

Theorem 2.2 (Semigroup Property)**.** *The fractional integral operators satisfy the fundamental semigroup property:*

$$I^\alpha I^\beta f = I^{\alpha+\beta} f \tag{7}$$

for $\alpha, \beta > 0$, provided the integrals exist.

The parameter α controls the strength and decay rate of the memory effect. As α decreases toward zero, the kernel $K_\alpha(t)$ exhibits increasingly singular behavior near $t = 0$, corresponding to stronger memory effects and rougher sample paths in stochastic applications.

3. Stochastic Volterra Equations

3.1. Fractional Brownian Motion

A standard Brownian motion, or Wiener process, $B(t)$ is a centered Gaussian process on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ with continuous paths, $B(0) = 0$, and covariance $\mathbb{E}[B(s)B(t)] = \min\{s, t\}$.

Equivalently, $B(t)$ has independent, stationary increments such that for $0 \le s < t$, $B(t) - B(s) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, t-s)$. The process is a continuous martingale with respect to its natural filtration $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(B(u) : 0 \le u \le t)$, since $\mathbb{E}[B(t) \mid \mathcal{F}_s] = B(s) \quad \text{for } s \le t$, and it satisfies the strong Markov property [1, 2]. Moreover, Brownian motion is self–similar with Hurst exponent $H = 1/2$, meaning $\{B(ct) : t \ge 0\} \overset{d}{=} \{\sqrt{c}\, B(t) : t \ge 0\}$, and arises as the weak limit of rescaled random walks by Donsker's theorem [3].

In contrast, a fractional Brownian motion with Hurst parameter $H \in (0,1)$, denoted $B^H(t)$, is the unique centered Gaussian process with covariance

$$\mathbb{E}[B^H(s)B^H(t)] = \tfrac{1}{2}\big(s^{2H} + t^{2H} - |t-s|^{2H}\big).$$

It admits the Mandelbrot–Van Ness representation [4]:

$$B^H(t) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(H+\frac{1}{2})}\left[\int_{-\infty}^{0} \big((t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}} - (-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\big)\, dW(u) + \int_0^t (t-u)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}\, dW(u)\right],$$

where $W(u)$ is a standard Brownian motion. Fractional Brownian motion exhibits long–range dependence when $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$: the increments correlation decays as

$$\operatorname{Corr}\big(B^H(t+1) - B^H(t),\, B^H(s+1) - B^H(s)\big) \sim C_H\, |t-s|^{2H-2},$$

for large $|t-s|$. It is self–similar of order H,

$$\{B^H(ct) : t \ge 0\} \overset{d}{=} \{c^H B^H(t) : t \ge 0\},$$

and its sample paths are almost surely Hölder continuous of any exponent $\gamma < H$ but nowhere differentiable [5, 6]. Gatheral, Jaisson, and Rosenbaum [7] provide empirical evidence that log–volatility in financial markets behaves like a fractional Brownian motion with $H \approx 0.1$, far lower than $1/2$. This roughness ($H < 1/2$) generates persistent volatility clustering and non–Markovian effects absent in classical stochastic volatility models, motivating the rough fractional stochastic volatility framework.

Rough volatility models can be viewed as instances of *stochastic Volterra equations*, which generalize Itô SDEs by allowing the drift and diffusion coefficients to depend on the entire past trajectory via a convolution kernel. In its simplest form, a stochastic Volterra equation for a process X_t can be written as

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t K(t,s)\, b(s, X_s)\, ds \;+\; \int_0^t K(t,s)\, \sigma(s, X_s)\, dW_s,$$

where W_t is a standard Brownian motion, b and σ are measurable coefficient functions, and $K(t,s)$ is a deterministic kernel capturing memory. When $K(t,s) = 1$, this reduces to the classical Itô SDE. More generally, K may be singular as $t \downarrow s$, inducing *rough* paths in X.

Matcha with Ayyar

Consider this puzzle over your morning coffee: Suppose we have a general Volterra integral equation of the form

$$y(t) = f(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)g(s,y(s))\,ds,$$

where $K(t,s)$ is our memory kernel that weighs how much the past values $y(s)$ influence the current value $y(t)$.

Question: What happens if we set the kernel to be completely "flat", that is, $K(t,s) = 1$ for all t and s? Can you show that this transforms our memory-laden Volterra equation into a simple, memoryless differential equation?

Hint: Think about what differentiation does to an integral, and remember the fundamental theorem of calculus.

To understand the connection between Volterra equations and classical differential equations, consider a general deterministic Volterra integral equation of the second kind:

$$y(t) = f(t) + \int_0^t K(t,s)g(s,y(s))\,ds,$$

where $f(t)$ is a given function, $K(t,s)$ is the kernel, and $g(s,y)$ represents a nonlinear coefficient function. Now, let us examine what happens when we set the kernel to the constant function $K(t,s) = 1$. The Volterra equation becomes

$$y(t) = f(t) + \int_0^t g(s,y(s))\,ds.$$

By applying the fundamental theorem of calculus and differentiating both sides with respect to t, we obtain

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = \frac{df}{dt} + g(t,y(t)).$$

This is a classical first-order ordinary differential equation with initial condition $y(0) = f(0)$. Consider the linear case where $g(s,y) = ay(s) + b$ for constants a and b, and let $f(t) = y_0$ be constant. The Volterra equation becomes

$$y(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t (ay(s) + b)\,ds.$$

Differentiating with respect to t

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = ay(t) + b,$$

with initial condition $y(0) = y_0$.This is a standard linear ODE whose solution can be found using an integrating factor. The general solution is

$$y(t) = \left(y_0 + \frac{b}{a}\right)e^{at} - \frac{b}{a}.$$

We can verify this satisfies our original Volterra formulation by substituting back

$$\int_0^t (ay(s) + b)\, ds = \int_0^t \left(a \left[\left(y_0 + \frac{b}{a} \right) e^{as} - \frac{b}{a} \right] + b \right) ds \tag{8}$$

$$= \int_0^t a \left(y_0 + \frac{b}{a} \right) e^{as}\, ds \tag{9}$$

$$= \left(y_0 + \frac{b}{a} \right) (e^{at} - 1) \tag{10}$$

$$= y(t) - y_0, \tag{11}$$

confirming that $y(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t (ay(s) + b)\, ds$.This pattern demonstrates how setting $K(t, s) = 1$ reduces the memory-dependent Volterra equation to a memoryless differential equation, where the solution at time t depends only on the current state $y(t)$ rather than the entire history $\{y(s) : 0 \leq s \leq t\}$. The transition from Volterra to ODE represents a loss of path dependence and long-range memory effects that are crucial for modeling rough volatility phenomena.

3.2. The Exponential Kernel: Another Path to Classical Dynamics

We now explore a more sophisticated example that demonstrates how certain memory kernels can still reduce Volterra equations to ordinary differential equations, albeit through a more subtle mechanism.

Theorem 3.1 (Exponential Kernel Reduction)**.** *Consider the Volterra integral equation*

$$y(t) = y_0 + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a decay parameter and $g(s, y)$ is a measurable function. This equation is equivalent to the second-order ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} + \lambda \frac{dy}{dt} - \frac{dg}{dt}(t, y(t)) - \lambda g(t, y(t)) = 0,$$

with initial conditions $y(0) = y_0$ and $\frac{dy}{dt}(0) = g(0, y_0)$.

Proof. Let us denote the Volterra equation as

$$y(t) = y_0 + I(t),$$

where

$$I(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds.$$

First, we differentiate $y(t)$ with respect to t $\frac{dy}{dt} = \frac{dI}{dt}$.. To compute $\frac{dI}{dt}$, we use the fundamental theorem of calculus and the product rule. For the integral $I(t) = \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds$, we have:

$$\frac{dI}{dt} = e^{-\lambda(t-t)} g(t, y(t)) + \int_0^t \frac{\partial}{\partial t} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds.$$

Since $e^{-\lambda(t-t)} = 1$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial t} e^{-\lambda(t-s)} = -\lambda e^{-\lambda(t-s)}$, we obtain

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = g(t, y(t)) - \lambda \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds.$$

Observing that $\int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} g(s, y(s))\, ds = I(t) = y(t) - y_0$, we have:

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = g(t, y(t)) - \lambda(y(t) - y_0).$$

Differentiating once more

$$\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} = \frac{dg}{dt}(t, y(t)) - \lambda \frac{dy}{dt}.$$

Substituting our expression for $\frac{dy}{dt}$

$$\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} = \frac{dg}{dt}(t, y(t)) - \lambda \left[g(t, y(t)) - \lambda(y(t) - y_0) \right].$$

Rearranging terms, we obtain the result

$$\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} + \lambda \frac{dy}{dt} - \frac{dg}{dt}(t, y(t)) - \lambda g(t, y(t)) = -\lambda^2 (y(t) - y_0).$$

However, from our first-order relation $\frac{dy}{dt} = g(t, y(t)) - \lambda(y(t) - y_0)$, we have $\lambda(y(t) - y_0) = g(t, y(t)) - \frac{dy}{dt}$. Therefore:

$$\frac{d^2y}{dt^2} + \lambda \frac{dy}{dt} - \frac{dg}{dt}(t, y(t)) - \lambda g(t, y(t)) = 0.$$

The initial conditions follow directly: $y(0) = y_0$ from the original equation, and $\frac{dy}{dt}(0) = g(0, y_0)$ from our first differentiation. □

3.3. Formulation and Intuition

In the context of rough volatility, one often considers the log–variance process V_t satisfying

$$V_t = V_0 + \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})} \left(\theta - \lambda V_s \right) ds \; + \; \nu \int_0^t \frac{(t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})}\, dW_s,$$

where $H \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ is the Hurst exponent, $\theta, \lambda, \nu > 0$ are parameters, and the kernel

$$K_H(t-s) = \frac{(t-s)^{H-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(H + \frac{1}{2})},$$

is the fractional integral kernel of order $H + \frac{1}{2}$. The deterministic convolution term models mean–reversion with memory, while the stochastic convolution introduces rough Gaussian noise.

3.4. Existence, Uniqueness, and Regularity

Under suitable Lipschitz and growth conditions on b and σ, and for kernels satisfying

$$\int_0^t K(t,s)^2\, ds < \infty,$$

one can establish existence and uniqueness of adapted solutions by Picard iteration in Banach spaces of Hölder–continuous functions [8, 9]. Moreover, if $K(t,s) \sim (t-s)^{\alpha-1}$ near $s \to t$, the solution inherits Hölder regularity of order $\gamma < \alpha - \frac{1}{2}$, yielding exactly the observed roughness for $H < \frac{1}{2}$. The Volterra formulation makes clear why rough volatility models capture both the persistent clustering of realized variance and the non–Markovian, path–dependent effects evidenced in option markets. Calibration to SPX VIX futures and SPX option smiles confirms that models with $H \approx 0.1$ fit market data significantly better than classical Markovian stochastic volatility models [10, 11]. The Volterra structure also enables efficient simulation via hybrid schemes that approximate the convolution by a finite sum of exponentials, preserving both memory and tractability.

4. Implications, Applications and Conclusion

The fractional integral framework provides a natural explanation for the well-documented phenomenon of volatility clustering in financial markets. The memory weighting function K_α ensures that past volatility shocks continue to influence current volatility levels, with the influence decaying according to a power law rather than exponentially. This power-law decay is fundamentally different from the exponential decay assumed in traditional volatility models such as GARCH, and it provides a more realistic representation of how volatility persistence manifests in real markets. Rough volatility models represent a significant advancement in our ability to model and understand financial market dynamics. By incorporating the empirically observed rough nature of volatility through the mathematical framework of fractional calculus, these models provide a more accurate and realistic representation of market behavior. The key insights from rough volatility models include the fundamental importance of the Hurst parameter in characterizing volatility dynamics, the role of fractional Brownian motion in capturing non-Markovian behavior, and the mathematical elegance of fractional integrals in creating memory effects through convolution with power-law kernels.As financial markets continue to evolve and generate increasingly complex data, rough volatility models offer a robust theoretical foundation for developing more sophisticated risk management tools and pricing models. The ongoing research in this field promises to further enhance our understanding of market microstructure and volatility dynamics, ultimately leading to more effective financial models and better-informed investment decisions. The transition from standard to rough volatility modeling represents not merely a technical improvement, but a fundamental shift in how we conceptualize the nature of financial risk and market behavior. This paradigm shift opens new avenues for research and practical applications that will undoubtedly shape the future of quantitative finance.

References

[1] J. L. Doob, *Stochastic Processes*, Wiley, 1953.

[2] D. W. Stroock and S. R. S. Varadhan, *Multidimensional Diffusion Processes*, Springer, 1979.

[3] M. D. Donsker, "The invariance principle for certain probability limit theorems," *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, no.6, 1951.

[4] B. B. Mandelbrot and J. W. Van Ness, "Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications," *SIAM Review*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 422–437, 1968.

[5] J.-P. Kahane, "Some random series of functions," 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[6] I. Nourdin and G. Peccati, *Normal Approximations with Malliavin Calculus*, Cambridge University Press, 2012.

[7] J. Gatheral, P. Jaisson, and M. Rosenbaum, "Volatility is rough," *Quantitative Finance*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 933–949, 2018.

[8] F. Bianchi and S. Hendrickx, "Volterra SDEs with singular kernels," *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 2021.

[9] S. Gerhold, T. Kluge, and M. Wagner, "Existence and approximation of solutions to stochastic Volterra equations," *Electron. Commun. Probab.*, 2020.

[10] R. El Euch, M. Fukasawa, and M. Rosenbaum, "The characteristic function of rough Heston models," *Mathematical Finance*, 2019.

[11] O. Abi Jaber, C. Larsson, and S. Pulido, "Classical solutions to rough volatility models," *Finance and Stochastics*, 2021.