

# MULTI-MIXED FRACTIONAL BROWNIAN MOTIONS AND ORNSTEIN–UHLENBECK PROCESSES

HAMIDREZA MALEKI ALMANI

*School of Technology and Innovations, University of Vaasa, P.O. Box 700,  
FIN-65101 Vaasa, FINLAND*

TOMMI SOTTINEN

*School of Technology and Innovations, University of Vaasa, P.O. Box 700,  
FIN-65101 Vaasa, FINLAND*

ABSTRACT. We consider the so-called multi-mixed fractional Brownian motions (mmfBm) and multi-mixed fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes (mmfOU). These processes are constructed by mixing or by superimposing infinitely many independent fractional Brownian motions and fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes, respectively. We prove their existence as  $L^2$  processes and study their path properties, viz. Hölder continuity and conditional full support property. In the finite mixture case we study their statistical parameter estimation by using generalized method of moments (GMM) estimators.

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND PRELIMINARIES

The fractional Brownian motion (fBm)  $B^H$ , with parameter  $H \in (0, 1)$  called the Hurst index, is the unique (up to a multiplicative constant) centered  $H$ -self-similar stationary-increment Gaussian process [12, 14]. The covariance of the fBm is given by

$$\begin{aligned} r_H(t, s) &= \mathbb{E}[B_t^H B_s^H] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} [|t|^{2H} + |s|^{2H} - |t - s|^{2H}]. \end{aligned}$$

For  $H = 1/2$  this process is well-known as the Brownian motion or Wiener process. The fBm has almost surely Hölder continuous paths with Hölder index  $H$ . As a stationary-increment process, the fBm admits the spectral density

$$(1) \quad f_H(x) = \frac{\sin(\pi H)\Gamma(1 + 2H)}{2\pi} |x|^{1-2H},$$

---

*E-mail addresses:* Hamidreza.Maleki.Almani@uwasa.fi, tommi.sottinen@uwasa.fi.

*Date:* November 28, 2021.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 60G10, 60G15, 60G22, 62M09.

*Key words and phrases.* generalized method of moments, multi-mixed fractional Brownian motion, multi-mixed fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process, parameter estimation.

see [19]. While the fBm has been proposed as a model for financial time series, see e.g. [4], modeling with it makes the arbitrage possible. To eliminate this problem, a generalization called mixed fractional Brownian motion (mfBm) was introduced in [5]. This is the mixture model

$$M^{a,b} = aB + bB^H,$$

where  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $B$  is a standard Brownian motion independent of the fBm  $B^H$ . If  $H > 1/2$ , this mixed process has the path roughness governed by the Brownian part and the long-range dependence governed by the fractional Brownian part. A natural generalization of the mixed process is to add the number of mixtures. Indeed, e.g. in [20] the  $n$ -mixture,

$$M^n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k B^{H_k}$$

was considered. Here  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma_k \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $(B^{H_k})_{k=1}^n$  are independent fBm's with different Hurst parameters  $H_k \in (0, 1)$ . These  $n$ -mixtures were also studied in [13] and [21]. In this paper, we study the infinite-mixture generalization that we call the multi-mixed fractional Brownian motion (mmfBm).

For other kind of generalizations of the fBm, see e.g. [17] and [18].

The fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process (fOU)  $U^{\lambda,H}$ , with parameters  $H \in (0, 1)$  and  $\lambda > 0$ , is the stationary solution of the Langevin equation

$$dU_t^{\lambda,H} = -\lambda U_t^{\lambda,H} dt + dB_t^H,$$

which is given by

$$U_t^{\lambda,H} = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} dB_s^H,$$

where  $(B_s^H)_{s \leq 0}$  is an independent copy of the fBm  $(B_s^H)_{s \geq 0}$ , see e.g. [6]. Note that the Langevin equation and its solution can be understood via integration-by-parts. The fOU admits the spectral density

$$(2) \quad f_{\lambda,H}(x) = \frac{\sin(\pi H)\Gamma(1+2H)}{2\pi} \frac{f_H(x)}{x^2 + \lambda^2},$$

where  $f_H$  is the spectral density of the driving fBm, see [2]. The  $n$ -mixed and infinite-mixed, or multi-mixed fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process (mmfOU) with parameter  $\lambda > 0$  is defined naturally as the solution of Langevin equation with mmfBm as driving noise.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define our infinitely multi-mixed fractional Brownian motions (mmfBm) and the associated multi-mixed fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes (mmfOU), prove their existence in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$  and provide their basic properties. In Section 3 we analyze the Hölder continuity and show the conditional full support property of the mmfBm and mmfOU processes. In Section 4 we study parameter estimation for the mmfOU processes in the finite-mixture case by using a generalized method of moments (GMM) developed in [2] and show the consistency and asymptotic normality of the GMM estimator. Finally, in Section 5 we investigate the GMM estimator in a simulation example.

## 2. DEFINITIONS AND BASIC PROPERTIES

**Definition 1.** Let  $\sigma_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfy

$$(3) \quad \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 < \infty,$$

and let  $H_k, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , satisfy

$$(4) \quad \begin{aligned} H_k &\neq H_l \text{ for } k \neq l, \\ H_{\inf} &= \inf_{k \in \mathbb{N}} H_k > 0 \\ H_{\sup} &= \sup_{k \in \mathbb{N}} H_k < 1. \end{aligned}$$

The multi-mixed fractional Brownian motion (mmfBm) is

$$M = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k B^{H_k},$$

where  $B^{H_k}, k \in \mathbb{N}$ , are independent fBm's.

The following proposition shows the existence of the mmfBm.

**Proposition 1.** *The mmfBm  $M$  exist as a random function taking values in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$  for all  $T > 0$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $M^n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k B^{H_k}$ . Clearly  $M^n$  takes values in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ . Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n > m$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|M^n - M^m\|_{L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])}^2 &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E} [(M_t^n - M_t^m)^2] dt \\ &= \int_0^T \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{k=m+1}^n \sigma_k B_t^{H_k} \right)^2 \right] dt \\ &= \sum_{k=m+1}^n \int_0^T \sigma_k^2 \mathbb{E} [(B_t^{H_k})^2] dt \\ &= \sum_{k=m+1}^n \int_0^T \sigma_k^2 t^{2H_k} dt \\ &= \sum_{k=m+1}^n \sigma_k^2 \frac{T^{1+2H_k}}{1+2H_k} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=m+1}^n \sigma_k^2 \max \{1, T^3\}, \end{aligned}$$

which shows that the sequence  $(M^n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  is Cauchy. Thus  $M^n \rightarrow M$  in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$  showing the existence.  $\square$

In the same way we see that the mmfBm  $(M_t)_{t \geq 0}$  exist in the sense that  $M_t^n \rightarrow M_t$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$  for all  $t \geq 0$ .

The following is now obvious:

**Proposition 2.** *The mmfBm has stationary increments, its covariance function is*

$$(5) \quad r(t, s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 [|t|^{2H_k} + |s|^{2H_k} - |t-s|^{2H_k}]$$

and it admits the spectral density

$$(6) \quad f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(\pi H_k) \Gamma(1 + 2H_k)}{2\pi} \sigma_k^2 |x|^{1-2H_k}.$$

**Definition 2.** The multi-mixed fractional Ornstein–Uhlenbeck process (mmfOU)  $U$  with parameter  $\lambda > 0$ , is the stationary solution of the Langevin equation

$$(7) \quad dU_t = -\lambda U_t dt + dM_t,$$

where the equation is understood in the integration-by-parts sense.

**Proposition 3.** *On  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ , the mmfOU can be represented as the integral*

$$U_t = e^{-\lambda t} \xi + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} dM_s,$$

where the integral is understood in the integration-by-parts sense, and

$$\xi = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda s} dM_s,$$

where  $(M_s)_{s \leq 0}$  is an independent copy of the mmfBm  $(M_s)_{s \geq 0}$ .

*Proof.* Let  $M^n = \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k B^{H_k}$ . Then, the stationary solution of the Langevin equation

$$dU_t^n = -\lambda U_t^n dt + dM_t^n,$$

is given by

$$U_t^n = e^{-\lambda t} \xi_n + \int_0^t e^{-\lambda(t-s)} dM_s^n,$$

where

$$\xi_n = \int_{-\infty}^0 e^{\lambda s} dM_s^n.$$

Then, with integration-by-parts

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^t e^{\lambda s} dM_s^n &= e^{\lambda t} M_t^n - \lambda \int_0^t e^{\lambda s} M_s^n ds \\ &\rightarrow e^{\lambda t} M_t - \lambda \int_0^t e^{\lambda s} M_s ds = \int_0^t e^{\lambda s} dM_s, \end{aligned}$$

because  $M^n \rightarrow M$  in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ . With the same arguments  $\xi_n \rightarrow \xi$  in  $L^2(\Omega)$ . This yields  $U^n \rightarrow U$  in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 1.** *For  $0 \neq p \in (-1, 1)$ ,  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $t > 0$*

$$(8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} \frac{|x|^p}{\lambda^2 + x^2} dx \\ &= \frac{\pi e^{-\lambda t}}{2 \cos(\frac{p\pi}{2}) \lambda^{1-p}} \left\{ 1 + \frac{e^{-p\pi i} \gamma(-p, -\lambda t)}{\Gamma(-p)} + \frac{e^{2\lambda t} \Gamma(-p, \lambda t)}{\Gamma(-p)} \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma, \Gamma$  are incomplete gamma functions given in Appendix A, equations (18) and (18).

*Proof.* Recall that for the Fourier transform

$$\mathcal{F}(f)(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-itx} f(t) dt,$$

we have the convolution theorem

$$(9) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} \mathcal{F}(f)(x) \mathcal{F}(g)(x) dx = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(t - \xi) g(\xi) d\xi.$$

Moreover, we have

$$(10) \quad \mathcal{F}\left(e^{-\lambda|t|}\right) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + x^2},$$

$$(11) \quad \mathcal{F}\left(|t|^\alpha\right) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \cdot \Gamma(\alpha + 1) \cos\left(\frac{(\alpha + 1)\pi}{2}\right) |x|^{-(\alpha+1)}.$$

The first formula (10) is valid for  $\lambda > 0$ . The second formula (11) is valid for  $-1 < \alpha < 0$ . For  $-2 < \alpha < -1$ , because of the function  $|t|^\alpha$ , some singular terms arise at the origin. Nevertheless, it admits a unique meromorphic extension as a tempered distribution, also denoted  $|t|^\alpha$  as a homogeneous distribution on all real line  $\mathbb{R}$  including the origin (see [8]). So, we use that extension and formula (11) will be valid for all  $-1 \neq \alpha \in (-2, 0)$ . So, using  $f(t) = e^{-\lambda|t|}$  and  $g(t) = |t|^\alpha$  in (9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{2}{\pi} \cdot \Gamma(\alpha + 1) \cos\left(\frac{(\alpha + 1)\pi}{2}\right) \lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} \frac{|x|^{-(\alpha+1)}}{\lambda^2 + x^2} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\xi|^\alpha e^{-\lambda|t-\xi|} d\xi \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^0 (-\xi)^\alpha e^{-\lambda(t-\xi)} d\xi + \int_0^t \xi^\alpha e^{-\lambda(t-\xi)} d\xi \\ & \quad + \int_t^\infty \xi^\alpha e^{-\lambda(\xi-t)} d\xi \\ &= \frac{e^{-\lambda t}}{\lambda^{(\alpha+1)}} \int_0^\infty u^\alpha e^{-u} du + \frac{e^{-\lambda t - (\alpha+1)\pi i}}{\lambda^{(\alpha+1)}} \int_0^{-\lambda t} u^\alpha e^{-u} du \\ & \quad + \frac{e^{\lambda t}}{\lambda^{(\alpha+1)}} \int_{\lambda t}^\infty u^\alpha e^{-u} du \\ &= \frac{e^{-\lambda t} \Gamma(\alpha + 1)}{\lambda^{(\alpha+1)}} + \frac{e^{-\lambda t - (\alpha+1)\pi i} \gamma((\alpha + 1), -\lambda t) + e^{\lambda t} \Gamma((\alpha + 1), \lambda t)}{\lambda^{(\alpha+1)}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, choosing  $p = -(\alpha + 1)$  proves (8).  $\square$

**Proposition 4.** *The covariance function of the fOU is*

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda, H}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[U_s^{\lambda, H} U_{s+t}^{\lambda, H}] \\ &= \frac{\Gamma(1 + 2H)}{4} \frac{e^{-\lambda t}}{\lambda^{2H}} \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}_{2H-1}(-\lambda t) + e^{2\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H-1}(\lambda t) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where for  $z, x \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $z \neq -1, -2, \dots$

$$\tilde{\gamma}_z(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{e^{z\pi i} \gamma(z, x)}{\Gamma(z)} & ; z \neq 0 \\ 1 & ; z = 0, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\tilde{\Gamma}_z(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{\Gamma(z, x)}{\Gamma(z)} & ; z \neq 0 \\ 0 & ; z = 0. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* If  $H = 1/2$ , we are dealing with the Brownian motion, and the result is well-known. If  $H \neq 1/2$ , we obtain from the spectral density that

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda, H}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[U_s^{\lambda, H} U_{s+t}^{\lambda, H}] \\ &= \frac{\sin(\pi H) \Gamma(1 + 2H)}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{itx} \frac{|x|^{1-2H}}{\lambda^2 + x^2} dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, applying (8) with  $p = 1 - 2H$  proves (12).  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** *The covariance function of the mmfOU is*

$$\begin{aligned} (13) \quad \rho_{\lambda}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[U_s U_{s+t}] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k^2 \Gamma(1 + 2H_k) e^{-\lambda t}}{4\lambda^{2H_k}} \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}_{2H_k-1}(-\lambda t) + e^{2\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H_k-1}(\lambda t) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and it admits the spectral density

$$(14) \quad f_{\lambda}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma_k^2 \sin(\pi H_k) \Gamma(1 + 2H_k)}{2\pi} \frac{|x|^{1-2H_k}}{x^2 + \lambda^2}.$$

*Proof.* From (2) it follows that the spectral density of  $U^n$  is

$$f_{\lambda, n}(x) = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{\sin(\pi H_k) \Gamma(1 + 2H_k)}{2\pi} \sigma_k^2 \frac{|x|^{1-2H_k}}{x^2 + \lambda^2},$$

and  $f_{\lambda, n}(x) \rightarrow f_{\lambda}(x)$  because  $U^n \rightarrow U$  in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ . This proves (14). Similarly, (13) follows by Proposition 4.  $\square$

*Remark 1.* Proposition 4 represents the covariance function  $\rho_{\lambda, H}(t)$  in a closed form involving special complex functions. However, these special complex functions are usually not suitable for numerical computations. For example, In [2], Lemma B.1, the following representation was used:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda, H}(t) &= H\Gamma(2H) \frac{e^{-\lambda t}}{\lambda^{2H}} \left\{ \frac{1 + e^{2\lambda t}}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{\Gamma(2H - 1)} I_{\lambda, H}(t) \right\}, \\ I_{\lambda, H}(t) &= \int_0^t \int_0^{\lambda v} e^{2\lambda v} e^{-s} s^{2H-2} ds dv. \end{aligned}$$

the double integral above seems reasonable enough, but yields slow numerical calculation in practice. This can be remedied by calculating the inner

integral as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} I_{\lambda,H}(t) &= \int_0^{\lambda t} \int_{s/\lambda}^t e^{2\lambda v} e^{-s} s^{2H-2} ds dv \\ &= \frac{1}{2\lambda} \int_0^{\lambda t} s^{2H-2} (e^{2\lambda t-s} - e^s) ds \\ &= \frac{e^{\lambda t}}{\lambda} \int_0^{\lambda t} s^{2H-2} \sinh(\lambda t - s) ds. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda,H}(t) &= \frac{\Gamma(2H+1)}{2\lambda^{2H}} \left\{ \cosh(\lambda t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \int_0^{\lambda t} s^{2H-2} \sinh(\lambda t - s) ds \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda}(t) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(2H_k+1)}{2\lambda^{2H_k}} \sigma_k^2 \left\{ \cosh(\lambda t) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H_k-1)} \int_0^{\lambda t} s^{2H_k-2} \sinh(\lambda t - s) ds \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $\beta < 0$ . Then as  $x \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-x} \int_0^x e^y y^{\beta} dy &= x^{\beta} + \sum_{n=1}^N (-1)^n \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (\beta - k) \right) x^{\beta-n} + O(x^{\beta-N-1}), \\ e^x \int_x^{\infty} e^{-y} y^{\beta} dy &= x^{\beta} + \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (\beta - k) \right) x^{\beta-n} + O(x^{\beta-N-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum_{n=1}^0$  means 0.

*Proof.* The proof is the same as the proof of Lemma 2.2 in [6].  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $N = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda t} \tilde{\gamma}_{2H-1}(-\lambda t) &= \frac{(\lambda t)^{2H-2}}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (2H-2-k) \right) (-\lambda t)^{-n} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O((\lambda t)^{-N-1}) \right\}, \\ e^{\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H-1}(\lambda t) &= \frac{(\lambda t)^{2H-2}}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \left\{ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^N \left( \prod_{k=0}^{n-1} (2H-2-k) \right) (\lambda t)^{-n} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + O((\lambda t)^{-N-1}) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\sum_{n=1}^0$  means 0.

*Proof.* First we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-\lambda t} \tilde{\gamma}_{2H-1}(-\lambda t) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{-\lambda t} e^{(2H-1)\pi i} \gamma(2H-1, -\lambda t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{-\lambda t} \lambda^{2H-1} \int_0^t \xi^{2H-2} e^{\lambda \xi} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{-\lambda t} \int_0^{\lambda t} v^{2H-2} e^v dv, \end{aligned}$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H-1}(\lambda t) &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{\lambda t} \Gamma(2H-1, \lambda t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{\lambda t} \lambda^{2H-1} \int_t^\infty \xi^{2H-2} e^{-\lambda \xi} d\xi \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(2H-1)} \cdot e^{\lambda t} \int_{\lambda t}^\infty v^{2H-2} e^{-v} dv. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we can apply Lemma 2.  $\square$

The following theorem shows that the long-range dependence of the mmfOU is governed by the long-range dependence of the largest Hurst index in the driving mmfBm.

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $H \neq \frac{1}{2}$ . Then as  $t \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $N = 1, 2, \dots$*

$$(15) \quad \rho_{\lambda, H}(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda^{-2n} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{2n-1} (2H - k) \right) t^{2H-2n} + O(t^{2H-2N-2}),$$

and

$$(16) \quad \rho_\lambda(t) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{\text{sup}}^2 \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda^{-2n} \left( \prod_{k=0}^{2n-1} (2H_{\text{sup}} - k) \right) t^{2H_{\text{sup}}-2n} + O(t^{2H_{\text{sup}}-2N-2}).$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{\text{sup}} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_{k(n)}, \\ \text{s.t. } H_{k(n)} &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} H_j. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Substituting (15) and (15) to (12), we obtain (15). Now, define

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda, m}(t) &= \mathbb{E}[U_s^m U_{s+t}^m] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^m \sigma_k^2 \frac{\Gamma(1 + 2H_k) e^{-\lambda t}}{4\lambda^{2H_k}} \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}_{2H_k-1}(-\lambda t) + e^{2\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H_k-1}(\lambda t) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $m \geq 2$  (in this case there is some  $H_k \neq \frac{1}{2}$ ). Then from (15) we have for  $t \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{\lambda, m}(t) &= \frac{1}{2} \sigma_{k(m)}^2 \sum_{n=1}^N \lambda^{-2n} \left( \prod_{j=0}^{2n-1} (2H_{k(m)} - j) \right) t^{2H_{k(m)}-2n} \\ &\quad + O(t^{2H_{k(m)}-2N-2}). \end{aligned}$$



Now,  $H_{k(m)} \rightarrow H_{\text{sup}}$  and  $\sigma_{k(m)} \rightarrow \sigma_{\text{sup}}$  as  $m \rightarrow \infty$  ( $\sigma_{k(m)}$  converges because  $\sigma_m \rightarrow 0$ ). Moreover,  $\rho_{\lambda,m}(x) \rightarrow \rho_{\lambda}(x)$  because  $U^m \rightarrow U$  in  $L^2(\Omega \times [0, T])$ . These observations prove (16).  $\square$

### 3. PATH PROPERTIES

#### 3.1. Continuity.

**Theorem 2.** *Both mmfBm and mmfOU have Hölder-continuous paths of any order  $H_{\text{inf}} - \epsilon$ , with  $\epsilon > 0$ , but not Hölder continuous paths with index  $H_{\text{inf}}$ .*

*Proof.* For the mmfBm we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(M_t - M_s)^2] = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 |t - s|^{2H_k}.$$

Thus, the claim follows from Theorem 1 of [1]. For the mmfOU, the claim follows in a similar way from Corollary 2 of [1].  $\square$

**3.2. Conditional Full Support.** As explained in [3], in mathematical finance models one of the must require the so-called Conditional Full Support (CFS) to avoid simple kind of arbitrage. This means that, given the information up to any time  $\tau \in [0, T]$ , the process is inherently free enough to go anywhere after time  $\tau$  with positive probability. This motivates us to study the CFS property of the mmfBm and mmfOU processes.

**Theorem 3.** *Both the mmfBm and the mmfOU have conditional full support.*

*Proof.* It is easy to check that

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 f_{H_k}(x) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\varepsilon_H \Gamma(1)}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) |x|^{1-2H_{\text{inf}}} & : |x| \leq 1 \\ \frac{\varepsilon_H \Gamma(1)}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) |x|^{1-2H_{\text{sup}}} & : |x| \geq 1 \end{cases} =: h(x),$$

where

$$\varepsilon_H := \inf \left\{ \sin(\pi H_k) \right\}_{k \geq 1} = \inf \left\{ \sin(\pi H_{\text{inf}}), \sin(\pi H_{\text{sup}}) \right\}$$

Since  $0 < H_{\text{inf}} \leq H_{\text{sup}} < 1$ ,  $\varepsilon_H > 0$ . Thus  $h(x) > 0$  for  $x \neq 0$ . Thus, for any  $x_0 > 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log f(x)}{x^2} dx &\geq \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log h(x)}{x^2} dx \\ &= \log \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_H}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) \right\} \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^2} \\ &\quad + (1 - 2H_{\text{sup}}) \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log x}{x^2} dx \\ &> -\infty, \end{aligned}$$

and by Theorem 2.1 of [7] this proves that  $M$  has conditional full support.

For mmfOU it is easy to check that

$$f_\lambda(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 f_{\lambda, H_k}(x) \geq \begin{cases} \frac{\varepsilon_H \Gamma(1)}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) \frac{|x|^{1-2H_{\inf}}}{\lambda^2 + x^2} & : |x| \leq 1 \\ \frac{\varepsilon_H \Gamma(1)}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) \frac{|x|^{1-2H_{\sup}}}{\lambda^2 + x^2} & : |x| \geq 1 \end{cases} =: h(x),$$

where

$$\varepsilon_H := \inf \left\{ \sin(\pi H_k) \right\}_{k \geq 1} = \inf \left\{ \sin(\pi H_{\inf}), \sin(\pi H_{\sup}) \right\}$$

Since  $0 < H_{\inf} \leq H_{\sup} < 1$ , we have  $\varepsilon_H > 0$ . Consequently,  $h(x) > 0$  for  $x \neq 0$ . Therefore, for any  $x_0 > 1$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log f_\lambda(x)}{x^2} dx &\geq \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log h(x)}{x^2} dx \\ &= \log \left\{ \frac{\varepsilon_H}{2\pi} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sigma_k^2 \right) \right\} \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^2} \\ &\quad + (1 - 2H_{\sup}) \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log x}{x^2} dx \\ &\quad - \int_{x_0}^{\infty} \frac{\log(\lambda^2 + x^2)}{x^2} dx \\ &> -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows now from Theorem 2.1 of [7].  $\square$

#### 4. PARAMETER ESTIMATION

In this section, we use a generalized method of moments (GMM) introduced in [2] for the parameter estimation of finite-mix mmfOU process  $U^n$ . First we recall the estimator as introduced in [2], and then we show its consistency and asymptotic normality for the finite-mix mmfOU processes.

The parameters which we want to estimate are

$$\lambda > 0, \quad H_k \in [H_{\inf}, H_{\sup}] \subset (0, 1), \quad \sigma_k^2 > 0; \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

In other word we are going to estimate the parameter vectors

$$\theta = (\lambda; \mathbf{H}; \boldsymbol{\sigma}^2)' \in \mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$$

where

$$\mathbf{H} = (H_1, \dots, H_n),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = (\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_n^2).$$

The autocovariance function of  $U^n$  is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\theta(t) &= \rho_{\lambda, n}(t) = \mathbb{E}[U_s^n U_{s+t}^n] \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \frac{\Gamma(1 + 2H_k) e^{-\lambda t}}{4\lambda^{2H_k}} \left\{ 1 + \tilde{\gamma}_{2H_k-1}(-\lambda t) + e^{2\lambda t} \tilde{\Gamma}_{2H_k-1}(\lambda t) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is continuous in  $t$ , and so  $U^n$  is ergodic (see [9], page 257).

Now, to state the GMM estimator we first need to define a filter associated with the parameter and a positive integer  $L \geq 2n + 1$ .

**Definition 3.** A filter of length  $L + 1$  and order  $l$  is a sequence of real numbers  $\mathbf{a} = (a_k)_{k=0}^L = (a_0, \dots, a_L)$  such that

$$\sum_{q=0}^L a_q q^r = 0, \quad 0 \leq r \leq l-1, \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}$$

$$\sum_{q=0}^L a_q q^l \neq 0.$$

when  $l > 0$ . When  $l = 0$ , we let  $a_0 = 1$  and  $a_q = 0$  for  $0 < q \leq L$ .

In this paper we need a family of filters of length  $L$  and of orders  $l = 0, 1, \dots, L$ . For each filter  $\mathbf{a}$  with order  $l$  define

$$\mathbf{b} = (b_0, \dots, b_L)',$$

where

$$b_0 := \sum_{q=0}^L a_q^2,$$

$$b_k := 2 \sum_{q=0}^{L-k} a_{q+k} a_q, \quad k = 1, \dots, L.$$

For different orders  $l_i \neq l_j$ , the corresponding vectors  $\mathbf{b}_i$  and  $\mathbf{b}_j$  are linearly independent. So, we can choose  $L$  filters  $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_L$  with respective orders  $l_1, \dots, l_L$  such that the  $L \times (L + 1)$  matrix  $B = [\mathbf{b}_1 \ \mathbf{b}_2 \ \dots \ \mathbf{b}_L]'$  satisfies  $2n + 1 \leq \text{rank}(B) \leq L$ . Then, for a fixed step size  $\alpha > 0$ , we can define the function  $V(\theta)$ , for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  (this  $\Theta$  is a closed subset of  $\mathbb{R}^{2n+1}$ ), as

$$V(\theta) := \sum_{k=0}^L b_k \rho_\theta(\alpha k) = \sum_{k=0}^L b_k \rho_{\lambda, n}(\alpha k),$$

and the *filtered process with step size*  $\alpha > 0$  for  $t \geq 0$ , as

$$\varphi(t) := \sum_{q=0}^L a_q U_{t-q\alpha}^n,$$

for the filter  $\mathbf{a}$ . Let  $\theta_0$  be the true value of the parameter. Due to the stationarity of  $U^n$ , the random variable  $\varphi(t)$  is centered Gaussian with variance  $\mathbb{E}[\varphi(t)^2] = V(\theta_0)$ . Following the notation of [15], for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  we can define the vector of differences

$$\mathbf{g}(t, \theta) := (g_1(t, \theta), \dots, g_L(t, \theta))',$$

where

$$g_\ell(t, \theta) = \varphi_\ell(t)^2 - V_\ell(\theta), \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq L,$$

and the subscript  $\ell$  means that we use the filter  $\mathbf{a}_\ell$  in the filtered process and variance. Moreover,  $\mathbf{g}(t, \theta)$  satisfies a *population moment condition* (see [10] and [15])

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(t, \theta_0)] = 0, \quad t \geq 0.$$

Also, the vector  $\mathbf{g}$  is in the second Wiener chaos (see [16]).

Now, assume that we have observed the process  $U^n$  at discrete times  $0 = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_{N-1} < t_N = T$  with fixed time step  $\alpha = t_i - t_{i-1}$ .

Let  $A$  be a symmetric positive-definite matrix (A suitably chosen  $A$  ensures that the GMM estimate is efficient, see [2] Section 2.3). For each  $\theta \in \Theta$ , and time  $t \geq 0$  denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g}_0(\theta) &:= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{g}(t, \theta)] \text{ (vector of expected differences),} \\ \hat{\mathbf{g}}_N(\theta) &:= \frac{1}{N-L+1} \sum_{i=L}^N \mathbf{g}(t_i, \theta) \text{ (vector of sampled differences),} \\ Q_0(\theta) &:= \mathbf{g}_0(\theta)' A \mathbf{g}_0(\theta) \text{ (squared distance of expected differences),} \\ \hat{Q}_N(\theta) &:= \hat{\mathbf{g}}_N(\theta)' A \hat{\mathbf{g}}_N(\theta) \text{ (sampled version of the above distance).} \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\mathbf{g}_0(\theta)$  does not depend on time  $t$ , due to the stationarity of  $U^n$ . Finally, we define the GMM (Generalized Method of Moments) estimator of  $\theta_0 = (\lambda_0; \mathbf{H}_0; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_0^2)$  as (see [11], [10]):

$$(17) \quad \hat{\theta}_N = (\hat{\lambda}_N; \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N; \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_N^2)' = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{Q}_N(\theta).$$

In fact, if the function  $Q_0(\theta)$  attains a unique zero at  $\theta_0$ , then we can find a value  $\hat{\theta}_N$  such that the approximation of  $Q_0$ , which is  $\hat{Q}_N$ , should be the smallest possible.

All the remaining results are still valid if we substitute the fixed matrix  $A$  with a sequence of random matrices (perhaps depending on the data) with a deterministically bounded eigenstructure. In particular, we can choose such sequence in order to attain convergence in probability to the efficient alternative of  $A$  (see [2], Section 2.3).

In the following we will show the consistency and asymptotic normality of the GMM estimator (17).

**4.1. Consistency.** Suppose  $X^\theta$  is a centered Gaussian stationary-increment process with parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$  having a spectral density function (SDF)  $f_\theta$ , and the autocovariance function

$$\rho_\theta(t) = \mathbb{E}[X_{s+t}^\theta X_s^\theta] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{itx} f_\theta(x) dx.$$

As in [2], for the consistency, the main question is to find conditions under which the mapping  $\theta \mapsto \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  is smooth and invertible at least in a closed subset  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ , where

$$\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\theta,p}(\alpha) = (\rho_\theta(0 \cdot \alpha), \dots, \rho_\theta((p-1) \cdot \alpha))',$$

and  $\alpha > 0$  is step size. Actually, this is equivalent for  $\nabla_\theta \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  to be non-singular in a closed subset  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ . To show this for the mmfOU processes, we use the next theorem.

**Theorem 4.** *For a Gaussian stationary-increment Gaussian process  $X^\theta$  with parameter  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,*

- (i) *the  $\nabla_\theta \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  exists in a closed subset  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  if and only if the partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial f_\theta}{\partial \theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  all exist in  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  and belong to  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ ,*
- (ii)  *$\nabla_\theta \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  is non-singular in a closed subset  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  if and only if for  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  the Fourier projection of all functions  $\frac{\partial f_\theta}{\partial \theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  with respect to the subspace  $W_{p,\alpha} = \langle e^{i(k-1)\alpha x} \rangle_{k=1,\dots,p}$  are linearly independent in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ .*

*Proof.* Each component of row  $k$  and column  $j$  of the matrix  $\nabla_{\theta}\rho_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  is

$$\frac{\partial\rho_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(\alpha \cdot (k-1)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i(k-1)\alpha x} \frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x) dx,$$

where  $f_{\theta}(x)$  is the SDF of  $X_{\theta}(t)$ . So, the  $\nabla_{\theta}\rho_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  exists in a closed subset  $\Theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  if and only if the partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  all exist in  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  and belong to  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ . Moreover,  $\nabla_{\theta}\rho_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  is non-singular if and only if its columns are linearly independent, in other word:  $\Delta_1$ : for any  $c_1, \dots, c_p \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , if the linear combination of the columns of  $\nabla_{\theta}\rho_{\theta,p}(\alpha)$  with these coefficients is zero, then  $c_1 = \dots = c_p = 0$ . Equivalent to have:

$\Delta_2$ : for any  $c_1, \dots, c_p \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , if

$$\sum_{j=1}^p c_j \frac{\partial\rho_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(\alpha \cdot (k-1)) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{i(k-1)\alpha x} \left( \sum_{j=1}^p c_j \frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x) \right) dx = 0$$

for  $k = 1, \dots, p$ , then  $c_1 = \dots = c_p = 0$ .

Now, because all  $\frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  in  $\theta \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$  belong to  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ , and so they have Fourier expansion in the basis  $\{e^{i(k-1)\alpha x}\}_{k=-\infty}^{\infty}$ . So, considering subspace

$$W_{p,\alpha} = \left\langle e^{i(k-1)\alpha x} \right\rangle_{k=1,\dots,p} \subset L^2(\mathbb{R}),$$

each function  $\frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  have a projection on this subspace which we denote by  $proj_{W_{p,\alpha}} \frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ . With this augments, the proposition  $\Delta_2$  is equivalent to have:

all functions  $proj_{W_{p,\alpha}} \frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  are linearly independent in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ .

In other word:

the Fourier projection of all functions  $\frac{\partial f_{\theta}}{\partial\theta_j}(x)$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  with respect to the subspace  $W_{p,\alpha}$  are linearly independent in  $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ .  $\square$

With the help of the theorem above, we obtain the strong consistency for the GMM estimators for the mmfOU processes.

**Theorem 5.** For the GMM parameter estimator (17) for the mmfOU process  $U^n$ , we have

$$\hat{\theta}_N = (\hat{\lambda}_N; \hat{\mathbf{H}}_N; \hat{\sigma}_N^2)' \xrightarrow{a.s.} \theta_0 = (\lambda_0; \mathbf{H}_0; \sigma_0^2).$$

*Proof.* Straightforward partial differentiation yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_{\lambda,n}}{\partial\lambda}(x) &= -\frac{2\lambda}{(\lambda^2 + x^2)^2} \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 c_{H_k} |x|^{1-2H_k}, \\ \frac{\partial f_{\lambda,n}}{\partial H_k}(x) &= -\frac{2}{\lambda^2 + x^2} \sigma_k^2 |x|^{1-2H_k} \left( c_{H_k} \log|x| + \frac{\partial c_{H_k}}{\partial H_k} \right), \\ \frac{\partial f_{\lambda,n}}{\partial\sigma_k^2}(x) &= \frac{1}{\lambda^2 + x^2} c_{H_k} |x|^{1-2H_k}. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $H_k$ 's are distinct, Assumption 2.1 of [2] is valid and we can apply Theorem 2.1 in [2] and the previous theorem.  $\square$

**4.2. Asymptotic Normality.** For the stationary-increment centered Gaussian process  $X^\theta$ , denote

$$\bar{f}_\theta(x) := \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} f_\theta \left( x + \frac{2p\pi}{\alpha} \right), \quad x \in \left[ -\frac{\pi}{\alpha}, \frac{\pi}{\alpha} \right],$$

and for  $l_i, l_j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$

$$R_\theta(x|i, j) := \min(1, |x|^{l_i+l_j}) \bar{f}_\theta(x).$$

Then, as explained in [2], the main question for asymptotic normality is to have  $R_{\theta_0}(\cdot|i, j) \in L^2(-\pi, \pi)$ .

For the mmfOU process  $U^n$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_\theta(x|i, j) &= \min(1, |x|^{l_i+l_j}) \bar{f}_{\lambda, n}(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 \min(1, |x|^{l_i+l_j}) \bar{f}_{\lambda, H_k}(x) \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n \sigma_k^2 R_{\lambda, H_k}(x|i, j). \end{aligned}$$

So,  $R_\theta(\cdot|i, j) \in L^2(-\pi, \pi)$  if and only if  $R_{\lambda, H_k}(\cdot|i, j) \in L^2(-\pi, \pi)$  for each  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . Therefore, by Lemma 3.1 of [2] we have the following:

**Lemma 4.** *For the mmfOU process  $R_{\theta_0}(\cdot|i, j) \in L^2(-\pi, \pi)$  if*

- (i)  $l + l' \geq 1$ , when  $H_k \in (0, 1)$ ,
- (ii)  $l + l' = 0$ , when  $H_k \in (0, \frac{3}{4})$ ,

where  $L \geq 3$ .

Now, for  $\theta \in \Theta$  define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}_N(\theta) &:= \nabla_\theta \hat{\mathbf{g}}_N(\theta), \\ G(\theta) &:= \mathbb{E}[\nabla_\theta \mathbf{g}(\cdot, \theta)]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $G(\theta)$  does not depend on time  $t$  because of the stationarity of  $U^n$ .

Finally, we have the asymptotic normality for the GMM estimator for the mmfOU processes.

**Theorem 6.** *The GMM estimator (17) for the mmfOU processes satisfy*

- (i)  $\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\theta}_N - \theta_0\|^2] = O(N^{-1})$ ,
- (ii)  $N^c \|\hat{\theta}_N - \theta_0\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  for  $c < \frac{1}{2}$ ,
- (iii)  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\theta}_N - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, C(\theta_0) \Lambda C(\theta_0)')$ ,

where  $C(\theta_0) = [G(\theta_0)' A G(\theta_0)]^{-1} G(\theta_0)' A$ , and  $\Lambda$  is a  $L \times L$  matrix such that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{ij} &= 2 \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} \left[ \sum_{k=0}^L b_k^{i,j} \rho_{\theta_0}(\alpha \cdot (k+p)) \right]^2, \\ b_k^{i,j} &= \sum_{q=0}^{L-k} a_q^i a_{q+k}^j + \sum_{q=0}^{L-k} a_q^j a_{q+k}^i. \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Theorem 4 and Lemma 4 yields that in fact the Assumptions 1.2-1.3 of [2] are valid, and so we can apply Lemma 2.2 and Theorem 2.3 of [2].  $\square$

## 5. SIMULATION

We performed a simulation study for the GMM estimator. We first simulated a number of replications for the mmfOU process, and then estimated its parameters  $\theta = (\lambda; \mathbf{H}; \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ .

We used iterations of Langevin equation (7) at  $N$  points of time interval  $[0, 1]$  with uniform step-sizes. Number of  $m$  independent replications with  $\lambda = 1, H_k \in [0.57, 0.63]$ , and  $\sigma_k \in [0.95, 1.05]$  for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, n$  were produced for the mmfOU process. We produced  $m = 10, 30, 100$  paths respectively for  $n = 5, 10, 10$  at  $N = 100, 100, 1000$  points.

In each setup, we used the autocovariance function  $\rho_\lambda$  given in (15) to estimate the parameters  $\hat{\theta}_{N,i} = (\hat{\lambda}_{N,i}; \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{N,i}; \hat{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}_{N,i})$  in each  $i$ th replication for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . To do this, we needed filters of orders  $L \geq 2n + 1$  (number of parameters). To minimize the number of calculations, we used finite difference filters of the least order  $L = 2n + 1$  and random symmetric positive-definite matrices  $A$  (see [2]). We used three empirical metrics:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{MSE} &:= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\hat{\theta}_{N,i} - \theta\|^2, \\ e(\widehat{Var}) &:= \text{maximum eigenvalue of } \widehat{Var}(\theta_N), \\ \widehat{Bias}^2 &:= \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\theta}_{N,i} - \theta \right\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\widehat{Var}(\theta_N)$  is the empirical covariance matrix of the estimated parameters based on the  $m$  replications. For our simulation setups, values of these metrics are given in Table 1. Due to computational complexity, we had to relax the standard tolerances in Matlab's numerical integration and optimization. Still, the method produced reasonably accurate estimations.

TABLE 1. Comparison of the metrics of estimated parameters in each setup of simulation.

Simulation	$\widehat{MSE}$	$e(\widehat{Var})$	$\widehat{Bias}^2$
N=100, n=5, m=10	0.101	0.053	0.022
N=100, n=10, m=30	0.319	0.249	0.058
N=1000, n=10, m=100	0.572	0.437	0.049

## APPENDIX A. INCOMPLETE GAMMA FUNCTIONS

For  $x, z \in \mathbb{C}$  where  $x \neq 0$ , and  $z \neq 0, -1, -2, \dots$  the lower and upper incomplete gamma functions are special functions respectively defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(z, x) &= \int_0^x t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt, \\ \Gamma(z, x) &= \int_x^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

They satisfy the following properties (see, e.g., <https://dlmf.nist.gov/8>):

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(z+1, x) &= z\gamma(z, x) - x^z e^{-x}, \\ \Gamma(z+1, x) &= z\Gamma(z, x) + x^z e^{-x}. \\ \gamma(z, x) &= \frac{\gamma(z+1, x) + x^z e^{-x}}{z}, \\ \Gamma(z, x) &= \frac{\Gamma(z+1, x) - x^z e^{-x}}{z}.\end{aligned}$$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] E. AZMOODEH, T. SOTTINEN, L. VIITASAARI, AND A. YAZIGI, *Necessary and sufficient conditions for Hölder continuity of Gaussian processes*, *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, 94 (2014), pp. 230–235.
- [2] L. A. BARBOZA AND F. G. VIENS, *Parameter estimation of Gaussian stationary processes using the generalized method of moments*, *Electron. J. Stat.*, 11 (2017), pp. 401–439.
- [3] C. BENDER, T. SOTTINEN, AND E. VALKEILA, *Pricing by hedging and no-arbitrage beyond semimartingales*, *Finance Stoch.*, 12 (2008), pp. 441–468.
- [4] ———, *Fractional processes as models in stochastic finance*, in *Advanced mathematical methods for finance*, Springer, Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 75–103.
- [5] P. CHERIDITO, *Mixed fractional Brownian motion*, *Bernoulli*, 7 (2001), pp. 913–934.
- [6] P. CHERIDITO, H. KAWAGUCHI, AND M. MAEJIMA, *Fractional Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes*, *Electron. J. Probab.*, 8 (2003), pp. no. 3, 14 pp. (electronic).
- [7] D. GASBARRA, T. SOTTINEN, AND H. VAN ZANTEN, *Conditional full support of gaussian processes with stationary increments*, *Journal of Applied Probability*, 48 (2011), pp. 561–568.
- [8] I. GELFAND AND G. SHILOV, *Generalized functions vol 1 (new york: Academic)*, (1964).
- [9] U. GRENNANDER, *Stochastic processes and statistical inference*, *Arkiv för matematik*, 1 (1950), pp. 195–277.
- [10] A. R. HALL, *Generalized method of moments*, Oxford university press, 2005.
- [11] L. P. HANSEN, *Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators*, *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, (1982), pp. 1029–1054.
- [12] A. N. KOLMOGOROFF, *Wienersche Spiralen und einige andere interessante Kurven im Hilbertschen Raum*, *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. URSS (N.S.)*, 26 (1940), pp. 115–118.
- [13] H. MALEKI ALMANI, S. M. HOSSEINI, AND M. TAHMASEBI, *Fractional brownian motion with two-variable hurst exponent*, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, Manuscript submitted for publication, Manuscript Number: CAM-D-19-01620, (2019).
- [14] B. B. MANDELBROT AND J. W. VAN NESS, *Fractional Brownian motions, fractional noises and applications*, *SIAM Rev.*, 10 (1968), pp. 422–437.
- [15] K. NEWBY AND D. MCFADDEN, *Large sample estimation and hypothesis*, *Handbook of Econometrics*, IV, Edited by RF Engle and DL McFadden, (1994), pp. 2112–2245.
- [16] I. NOURDIN AND G. PECCATI, *Normal approximations with Malliavin calculus: from Stein’s method to universality*, vol. 192, Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [17] E. PERRIN, R. HARBA, C. BERZIN-JOSEPH, I. IRIBARREN, AND A. BONAMI, *nth-order fractional brownian motion and fractional gaussian noises*, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 49 (2001), pp. 1049–1059.
- [18] E. PERRIN, R. HARBA, I. IRIBARREN, AND R. JENNANE, *Piecewise fractional Brownian motion*, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 53 (2005), pp. 1211–1215.
- [19] G. SAMORODNITSKY AND M. TAQQU, *Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance*, *Stochastic Modeling Series*, Taylor & Francis, 1994.



- [20] C. THÄLE, *Further remarks on mixed fractional brownian motion*, Applied Mathematical Sciences, 38 (2009), pp. 1885–1901.
- [21] B. YAN, *Option pricing under the generalized mixed fractional brownian motion model*, (2014).