

# An Unconventional Attempt to Tame Mandelbrot's Grey Swans

Denis M. Filatov<sup>1</sup>, Maksim A. Vanyarkho<sup>2</sup>

*Sceptica Scientific Ltd, Carpenter Court, 1 Maple Road, Bramhall, Stockport SK7 2DH, UK*  
{<sup>1</sup>denis.filatov, <sup>2</sup>maksim.vanyarkho}@sceptica.co.uk

**Abstract.** We suggest an original physical approach to describe the mechanism of market pricing. The core of our approach is to consider pricing at different time scales separately, using independent equations of motion. Such an approach leads to a pricing model that not only allows estimating the volatility of future market prices, but also permits forecasting the direction of the price move. Alongside with that, it is crucial that our model implies no calibration on historical market data. And last but not least, properties of the model's solution are consistent with those of real markets: it has fat tails, possesses scaling and evinces nonlinear market memory. As our model has been derived with the tip of the pen, it may be not a yet another confirmation of the known empirical facts, but a theoretical justification thereto. Tests on real financial instruments prove the competence of our approach.

**Keywords:** Levy-stable and fat-tailed probability distributions, scaling of price changes, nonlinear market memory, open systems with non-conserved energy, “grey” and “black swans”, econophysical pricing models

**AMS classification:** 03H10, 37N40, 62M20, 62P20, 91B25, 91B80

## 1 Introduction

Due to the works by Benoit Mandelbrot in the early 1960s it is now a common place in the financial community that successive price changes on financial markets are described by probability distributions called fat-tailed [15-17]. A particular class of fat-tailed distributions is Levy-stable, or  $\alpha$ -stable, probability distributions, where  $0 < \alpha \leq 2$ . The classical Gaussian distribution corresponds to the limit case  $\alpha = 2$  [20]. Besides, Mandelbrot showed successive price changes to be dependent the next of the previous, and such a dependence takes place throughout all time scales, be they minutely, daily, monthly etc. price changes. The discoveries made by Mandelbrot have subsequently been confirmed and extended beyond by other researchers [3, 6, 9].

The presence of fat-tailed probability distributions underlying the mechanism of market pricing is usually disregarded while markets are quiet, but they are recalled each time when a new economic crisis befalls. The effect of fat-tailed probability distributions is observed when there occurs an event (say, an extraordinarily large and unexpected price change) which before was thought to be very improbable. To identify such events, Nassim Taleb suggested the term “black swan” as the contrary to usual, quiet and expected, events – “white swans” [24] (also [7]). More precisely, a “black swan” is the extreme case of the unexpected, the unknown unknown, when the event

cannot even be imagined before it happens. The intermediate case, the known unknown, is a “grey swan”, when the unexpected event is actually recognisable to happen in theory, but ignored until it appears in practice.

Since the works by Mandelbrot, so far there have been suggested various pricing models aimed to predict the appearance of market “grey swans”. As the fat-tailed probability distributions are observed in many physical applications apart from economics, it is natural that many physicists have addressed this problem [2, 5, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 21-23, 25-29, 31]. However, at the practical stage econophysical modelling is currently reduced to *imitation* of the pricing process: it is intended to tune the parameters of a mathematical model, typically engaged from some or other area of physics using analogue approach, in such a manner that the result of the subsequent simulation would statistically match the real historical market quotes as much as possible. In other words, a posteriori calibration of the model is required. Obviously, happen a small perturbation in the input data (what, needless to say, takes place every instant in financial markets), a recalibration is required, otherwise the model would stop being able to simulate the real pricing dynamics in the future [4]. In other words, those models possess no forecast strength. Besides, even if to forget for a while of the necessity to calibrate the existing models, the next challenge is how to forecast the sign of future price change. Whereas there have been suggested numerous models allowing to estimate the volatility of future prices, the issue how to distinguish in what direction, up or down, the price will go has not been resolved so far [18, 23, 27].

Apart from the replicative character of existing models, often the model development involves making some or other a priori assumptions either about the markets in general or about a specific behaviour of market agents in particular. In our opinion, such assumptions carry input perturbation risks similar to those mentioned above, in the sense that a tiny debatable supposition underlying an econophysical model may eventually lead to a simulation inadequate to market reality. For instance, we reckon it is irrelevant whether the investors act rationally or irrationally; if the current price has taken into account all available market information or not; etc. Being a complex system, any market has thousands (if not millions) of dependencies between its members and thus various suppositions may or may not be fulfilled [1]. Therefore, efforts should be focused on the development of such a market dynamics model which would reflect the reality without involving disputable suppositions.

In general, we share the key idea of econophysics: economics should not be considered as a qualitatively different science standing apart from physics, and therefore one has to use the methodology of physics for developing economical models. Nevertheless, in order to find out why price changes possess certain properties (including the fat tails and “market memory”), we suggest the opposite way: instead of fitting market reality into a predetermined model we try to develop a model which would be consistent with the reality. In doing so, we use an original quantitative formalisation of

the old market concept of two players, the “bull” and the “bear”. As a result, we derive an original equation of motion whose solution bears the properties of fat tails and scaling, as well as evinces nonlinear dependence of successive price changes (“market memory”). Furthermore, as the solution is merely an expression of the future price change subject to the known previous one, it has no a posteriori parameters to tune at all, and hence the model requires no calibration. And yet, due to the asymmetry of the solution in respect of the zero price change the model allows estimating both the volatility and the direction of the future movement.

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we give a qualitative description of our approach. In Section 3 we provide the theoretical results, demonstrating that the properties of the solution to our model are consistent with the properties of real markets which have been empirically established so far beginning from works [15, 16]. Then, in Section 4, we provide results of the numerical experiments with real financial instruments, showing the ability of the model to detect dependencies in successive price changes without preliminary calibration of the model. We also give an analysis of the results. In Section 5 we conclude the paper.

## **2 Physics of Our Approach**

We consider the entire set of market agents as an open mechanical system of two players, the “bull” and the “bear” (according to the historically established), each of whom is “tugging” the price to his side. New information thrown into the market is likened to the energy introduced into the system. The energy changes the players’ alignment of forces, thereby changing the price. The concrete material factors raising the alignment of forces are of no importance: those might be bad weather conditions in some or other regions of the planet, changes of the interest rates due to the central banks’ decisions, political instability etc. Obviously, the exact relevant “bullish” and “bearish” factors affecting the price are unknown. Nevertheless, we do not need them. All we have to do is to find out in how many times the probability of a price change is greater or less than the probability of the other, independently of the specific market factors resulting in such a change. This is done via the estimation of the amount of energy introduced into the system: the more the incoming energy, the less likely the corresponding price change will take place. As the system is deemed to be open, the energy introduced can have any value, i.e. it is not required to be conserved over time [4]. We also consider the price to be formed simultaneously at diverse time scales (e.g., minutes, days, months etc.). Enumerating over possible values of the future price change, we determine the least “energy-expensive” and therefore the most probable ones.

A qualitative difference of such an approach from other econophysical techniques consists in that it allows developing a model which takes into account all incoming information, but makes no debatable a priori assumptions about the markets or its particular agents, nor requires a posteriori calibration as it bears no parameters to tune.

### 3 Theoretical Results


Our model is a probabilistic equation of motion of the form

$$\Pr(\Delta x) = \Pr({}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}} | {}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}})^1. \quad (1)$$

For each pair of two successive price changes,  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$  and  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}}$ , it yields the probability of transition from the first state – the past – to the second one – the future. The model’s solution is a probability density function of the future price change subject to the known previous one. (More precisely, the general solution to the model is a family of probability distributions rather than a single density function, but for short we shall be speaking as if there is only one distribution, assuming the previous price change  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$  known and fixed.)

As the price is being formed at different time scales, there is a separate equation of motion for each scale  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ . This is an unconvencionality of our approach which makes our attempt to solve the old problem – to adequately describe the market pricing mechanism – different from the others. To some extent, the cascade idea may be treated as close [27]. However, as far as we know, the idea to use simultaneously a few equations of motion has not been explicitly formulated so far [18].

The developed model possesses the following remarkable properties:



**Fig. 1.** An example of the model’s approximate solution – asymmetric fat-tailed probability distribution

1. The probability distribution belongs to the class of asymmetric fat-tailed distributions (Fig. 1). Estimates of the parameter  $\alpha$  (the degree

---

<sup>1</sup> As the explicit expression of the equation of motion is a trade secret of the company, we write it in an implicit manner. However, in Section 3 we demonstrate properties of the model’s solution, in Section 4 we provide numerical results obtained with the model, while the model itself is available for independent testing on [www.sceptica.co.uk](http://www.sceptica.co.uk)

of “fat-tailedness”) according to [11, 13] yield to be from 0.61 to 0.96, which is essentially far from the Gaussian case  $\alpha = 2$ .

From the practical standpoint it is crucially important that the solution’s asymmetry allows forecasting not only about the absolute value of future price change, but also about the sign of the change, i.e. about the direction thereof.

The wave-like structure of the solution explains the effect of discontinuity of price changes often observed on real markets. In terms of a classical empirical technique – the technical analysis – these are levels of support and resistance that attract the price, so for the price it is more likely to get “nailed” to some or other price level rather than to stop somewhere between the picks [19].


In spite of the presence of nonzero expectation, there is an asymptotic (“tailed”) symmetry of the distribution in general, which results in that the correlation coefficient between price changes simulated with the model and taken spaced at a certain time lag decays as the lag grows, rapidly becoming close to zero (Fig. 2). To show this analytically, consider a future quote change  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}}$  large enough in the absolute value so that

$$\begin{aligned} r_{{}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}}, {}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}}} &\sim \sum_{k,l} ({}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev},k} - {}^j\overline{\Delta x}_{\text{prev}}) ({}^j\Delta x_{\text{next},l} - {}^j\overline{\Delta x}_{\text{next}}) \\ &\rightarrow \sum_{k,l} ({}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev},k} - {}^j\overline{\Delta x}_{\text{prev}}) {}^j\Delta x_{\text{next},l}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Then, since  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev},k}$  is fixed, we can rewrite (2) as

$$r_{{}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}}, {}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}}} \rightarrow ({}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev},k} - {}^j\overline{\Delta x}_{\text{prev}}) \sum_l {}^j\Delta x_{\text{next},l}, \quad (3)$$


and hence, due to the asymptotic symmetry,  $\sum_l {}^j\Delta x_{\text{next},l} \rightarrow 0$  as  $|l| \rightarrow \infty$ .



**Fig. 2.** Correlation coefficient between price changes rapidly decays to zero

Nevertheless, the zero correlation does not mean there is no dependence in the price changes – the correlation field simulated with the model does not


resemble to be produced by a random walk, as it evinces a certain internal structure (Fig. 3).




**Fig. 3.** Correlation field (shown smoothed and affinely transformed) clearly indicates to possess a non-random internal structure

Both properties, the zero correlation of price changes and the non-random correlation field, are consistent with the empirical results stating a fast decay of the autocorrelation function when analysing real market data [18, 26], which implies that

2. There exists (actually, *nonlinear*) dependence between price changes.



(a)




(b)

**Fig. 4.** Solution's tail at two different scales:  
the scale of figure (a) is two times less than that of figure (b)

Yet,

3. The distributions' structure is kept unchanged when varying the scale (Fig. 4), which is consistent with the property of scaling of price changes of real market instruments [16, 18].

Finally, the model is also consistent with the real markets' property on volatility [18]: the autocorrelation between squares of price changes is of a power (specifically, linear) law (Fig. 5).



**Fig. 5.** Correlation coefficient between squares of price changes is of a power law

## 4 Numerical Results

To estimate the degree of the model’s forecast strength – the ability to give a forecast without preliminary calibration, – we have performed two series of numerical experiments. We considered the model at a fixed time scale  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ , without scales complexification, as the latter is a nontrivial issue requiring further study.

The main goal was to find out whether the model is able to detect dependencies in successive price changes and predict directions of the movements. Although the model’s solution at a fixed  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$  is a probability distribution, and hence it allows estimating the probability of any specific value  ${}^j\Delta x_{\text{next}}$ , i.e. not only its sign, we carried out the experiments regardless of the future movements’ concrete values. Apart from practical importance of the ability to forecast the direction, there were two reasons for that. First, for a model pretending to provide adequate forecast of price changes it is a necessary condition to correctly predict at least the direction, otherwise there is no reason to expect adequacy in forecasting a specific value. Second, whereas the model currently implements no scales complexification, the latter is expected to play an essential role in price formation, and therefore the residual between an actual and predicted price change, computed in the absence of scales complexification, would be useless for subsequent analysis, as it would be impossible to find out if the error is due to the model’s principal inadequacy or it is merely because of the neglect of the influence of diverse scales on price formation. Unlike that, the residual between an actual and forecast direction, being computed as a binary function “matched / mismatched”, is fairly simple and hence more reliable to analyse.

### 4.1 Series I

First we tested the model on tick quotes of six real financial instruments as well as on the normal random walk  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . To compare the results, we also performed tests with randomly permuted original price changes which thereby had assuredly borne no dependence at all.

We took quotes of the currency pair euro-dollar from November 2009 to March 2012, the oil (Brent), the gold and the wheat from 2011 to 2013, as well as the stocks of Google and Apple from September 2011 to December 2013. The mean sample lengths were 351 883, 251 506, 449 731, 67 704, 22 321 and 124 692 successive nonzero price changes respectively [30].

For each nonzero price change  $\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$  we computed the probability distribution of the next price change  $\Delta x_{\text{next}}$ . Having that, we made a probability forecast of the direction of that change and compared it with the real price change’s direction that took place on the market. The measurement of residual was quite apparent: if the directions matched, the number of right forecasts was increased by one; if the directions were opposite, we increased the number of wrong forecasts; in the border case – when the real price change was nil – both the numbers of right and wrong forecasts were increased by 1/2. For each month we computed the relative frequency to make the right guess on the direction of future price change, after which we calculated the



mean relative frequency over months (Table 1). The supplementary materials provide detailed tables summarising the sample lengths and the corresponding outcomes, as well.

**Table 1.** Relative frequency of success in forecasting the direction of future price change (ticks) for various financial instruments, %

Financial instrument	Relative frequency's skewness ( $\text{Pr} - 50$ )	
	original data	randomly permuted data
EUR/USD	<b>1.32</b>	0.00
Oil	<b>2.26</b>	-0.00
Gold	<b>2.84</b>	-0.01
Wheat	<b>4.26</b>	-0.05
Google	<b>-1.10</b>	-0.04
Apple	<b>-1.48</b>	0.04
Random walk	0.02	-0.04

From Table 1 it follows that the chance to forecast the direction for the random walk is foreseeably about 50% (or, in other words, the relative frequency's skewness  $\text{Pr} - 50\%$  is about nil) both on the original and randomly permuted data. However, for the real financial instruments the situation is completely different: while the skewness is still about nil when processing the permuted real data, there is a statistically significant skewness when processing the original real price changes. Note that for Google and Apple the skewnesses are negative, that is the model gives wrong forecasts about the direction more frequently than it provides right predictions. This, however, does not mean the model is inadequate. This merely indicates that for those instruments the influence of major scales is essentially more important than for the others, and hence it should not be disregarded. In other words, accurate forecasting of quote dynamics may significantly imply the use of scales complexification.

#### 4.2 Series II


Apart from the tick quotes, we also performed experiments with the same instruments on minutely (M1, M5, M10, M15, M30), hourly (H1) and daily (D1) quotes with the corresponding closing prices [30]. The time period was since 2000 till 2013 (please, refer to the supplementary materials for details).

In order to obtain stable results on short-sampled non-tick time frames, we used stochastic modelling, performing 100 (on minutes) to 100 000 (on hours and days) repeated simulations for each  $\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$ . Stochastic modelling has provided more stability to the outcomes, in the sense it has allowed to accurately compute the relative frequency of the appearance of a  $\Delta x_{\text{next}}$  subject to the fixed  $\Delta x_{\text{prev}}$ , so that the errors' dispersions have got smaller.

In Fig. 6 we plot graphs of the skewness of the relative frequency of success for the original and randomly permuted data.

From the figure it follows that forecasting the permuted quote changes (hollow markers) is expectedly a random process – the chance to make the right prediction is about 50%. Specifically, on all the minute time frames there

are fairly zero skewnesses with slightly growing dispersions observed when passing to major scales, particularly for Google and Apple. These dispersions are explained by the small numbers of process realisations amplified by rather short samples on the time frames H1 and D1 compared to the minute frames. Empirically estimated, to obtain accurate results a sample should contain not less than 5 000-6 000 entries, while the number of process realisations should be not less than ten.



**Fig. 6.** Graphs of the relative frequency's skewness to make the right forecast of the direction of future price change

Nevertheless, forecasting the original data is successful, as statistically significant skewnesses, at the average above 1% (with maximum over 4% on ticks for the wheat), are observed (filled markers). As for some particular values close to zero (Oil on D1, Google on D1, Apple on H1), these are supposed to be because of the lack of scales complexification. Besides, one should not forget that zero skewness (or 50% relative frequency of success, as

well) can be an indicator of the purely random market behaviour corresponding to the limit case of the fat-tailed probability distributions – the Gaussian distribution. Whether or not we face it in those particular cases, it does not matter now. But what counts indeed is the fact of the statistically significant relative frequency’s skewness observed through nearly all the time frames and on all the instruments, although the model had not been preliminarily calibrated.

Summarising the results of the two series, one can conclude that the model does detect dependence of future price changes on the previous ones having no a priori information about the data being processed.

In the current state the model is available for independent testing on the Internet at [www.sceptica.co.uk](http://www.sceptica.co.uk).

## 5 Conclusion

Analysis of the properties of the developed pricing model permits to conclude that the model’s solution – a family of fat-tailed probability distributions possessing the property of scaling and detecting nonlinear dependence (“market memory”) in successive quote changes – is consistent with the results of the researches on the study of the properties of real market data which have been empirically got so far. But what makes our model qualitatively different from the others is that it is purely analytical, as the probability distribution has resulted as the solution to the corresponding equation of motion containing no a posteriori parameters to tune, i.e. requiring no calibration. In other words, the model consistent with market reality has been derived with the tip of the pen: instead of an *imitation* of the real pricing process it provides a theoretical *justification* to the properties of real market quotes.

For the future research we consider it necessary to find the mechanism of time scales complexification as well as to discover a yet another equation of motion, that which is responsible for the acceleration of trading time [17]. Once the research is completed, we expect those findings, together with the current results, will lead to a pricing model possessing the desired forecast strength suitable for practical purposes.

## References

1. J. Y. Campbell, A. W. Lo and A. Craig MacKinlay, *The Econometrics of Financial Markets*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1997
2. M. Contreras, R. Pellicer, M. Villena and A. Ruiz, *A Quantum Model of Option Pricing: When Black-Scholes Meets Schrodinger and Its Semi-Classical Limit*, Phys. A, 389 (2010) 5447–5459
3. M. M. Dacorogna, R. Gençay, U. A. Muller, R. B. Olsen and O. V. Pictet, *An Introduction to High-Frequency Finance*, San Diego, Academic Press, 2002
4. M. Gallegati, S. Keen, T. Lux and P. Ormerod, *Worrying Trends in Econophysics*, Phys. A, 370 (2006) 1–6

5. V. Gisin and A. Markov, *Asset Pricing in a Fractional Market under Transaction Costs*, in: D. Sornette, S. Ivliev and H. Woodard (eds.), *Market Risk and Financial Markets Modeling*, Berlin, Springer, 2012, pp. 47–56
6. J. B. Glattfelder, A. Dupuis and R. B. Olsen, *Patterns in High-Frequency FX Data: Discovery of 12 Empirical Scaling Laws*, *Quant. Finance*, 11 (2011) 599–614
7. A. G. Haldane and B. Nelson, *Tails of the Unexpected*, available at [www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/Documents/speeches/2012/speech582.pdf](http://www.bankofengland.co.uk/publications/Documents/speeches/2012/speech582.pdf) as a talk given at the conference “*The Credit Crisis Five Years On: Unpacking the Crisis*”, University of Edinburgh Business School, 8-9 June 2012, pp. 1–31
8. E. E. Haven, *A Discussion on Embedding the Black-Scholes Option Pricing Model in a Quantum Physics Setting*, *Phys. A*, 304 (2002) 507–524
9. J. James, *Currency Management: Overlay and Alpha Trading*, London, Risk Books, 2004
10. T. K. Jana and P. Roy, *Supersymmetry in Option Pricing*, *Phys. A*, 390 (2011) 2350–2355
11. S. Kogon and D. Williams, *Characteristic-Function-Based Estimation of Stable Distribution Parameters*, in: R. Adler et al. (eds.), *A Practical Guide to Heavy Tails: Statistical Techniques and Applications*, Boston, Birkhauser, 1998, pp. 311–335
12. A. Kolokolov, *Hedging with Futures: Multivariate Dynamic Conditional Correlation GARCH*, in: D. Sornette, S. Ivliev and H. Woodard (eds.), *Market Risk and Financial Markets Modeling*, Berlin, Springer, 2012, pp. 63–72
13. I. Koutrouvelis, *Regression-type Estimation of the Parameters of Stable Laws*, *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 69 (1980) 108–113
14. T. Lux and M. Marchesi, *Scaling and Criticality in a Stochastic Multi-Agent Model of a Financial Market*, *Nature*, 397 (1999) 498–500
15. B. Mandelbrot, *The Variation of Certain Speculative Prices*, *J. Bus.*, 36 (1963) 394–419
16. B. Mandelbrot, *Fractals and Scaling in Finance*, N. Y., Springer, 1997
17. B. Mandelbrot, *The (Mis)Behavior of Markets*, N. Y., Basic Books, 2004
18. R. Mantegna and H. Stanley, *Introduction to Econophysics: Correlations and Complexity in Finance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2000
19. J. J. Murphy, *Technical Analysis of the Financial Markets: A Comprehensive Guide to Trading Methods and Applications*, New York Institute of Finance, 1999
20. J. Nolan, *Stable Distributions – Models for Heavy Tailed Data*, Boston, Birkhauser, 2013 (Introduction available at [www.academic2.american.edu/~jpnolan/stable/stable.html](http://www.academic2.american.edu/~jpnolan/stable/stable.html))
21. R. Pincak, *The String Prediction Models as Invariants of Time Series in the Forex Market*, *Phys. A*, 392 (2013) 6414–6426
22. A. N. Shiryaev, *Essentials of Stochastic Finance: Facts, Models, Theory*, Singapore, World Scientific, 1999

23. D. Sornette, *Why Stock Markets Crash: Critical Events in Complex Financial Systems*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2003
24. N. N. Taleb, *The Black Swan: The Impact of the Highly Improbable*, N. Y., Random House, 2007
25. H. Tanaka, *A Percolation Model of Stock Price Fluctuations*, *Mathematical Economics*, 1264 (2002) 203–218
26. P. V. Vidov and M. Yu. Romanovskiy, *Nonclassical Random Walks and the Phenomenology of the Securities Yield Fluctuations on the Stock Market*, *Uspekhi Phys. Nauk*, 7 (2011) 774–778 (in Russian)
27. J. Voit, *The Statistical Mechanics of Financial Markets*, Berlin, Springer, 2005
28. F. Wang and J. Wang, *Statistical Analysis and Forecasting of Return Interval for SSE and Model by Lattice Percolation System and Neural Network*, *Computers & Industrial Engineering*, 62 (2012) 198–205
29. J.-Z. Wang, J.-J. Wang, Z.-G. Zhang and S.-P. Guo, *Forecasting Stock Indices with Back Propagation Neural Network*, *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38 (2011) 14346–14355
30. Websites of the Forex bank “Dukascopy”, Switzerland ([www.dukascopy.com](http://www.dukascopy.com)), and the investment holding company “Finam”, Russia ([www.finam.ru](http://www.finam.ru))
31. V. Zharkov, *Adelic Theory of the Stock Market*, in: D. Sornette, S. Ivliev and H. Woodard (eds.), *Market Risk and Financial Markets Modeling*, Berlin, Springer, 2012, pp. 255–267

**EURUSD D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2001	268	258	50.7915	50.3531
2002	274	266	51.4157	50.5323
2003	309	301	51.3106	51.4351
2004	309	307	52.0892	50.3041
2005	309	305	50.7288	50.7975
2006	311	305	50.6220	48.4397
2007	322	314	50.6693	50.2798
2008	364	358	51.4076	50.4307
2009	363	359	53.1865	49.6569
2010	363	357	50.5462	51.8374
2011	362	357	50.7220	48.0645
2012	359	349	49.5328	48.1974
2013	364	359	52.4975	49.6931
<b>Mean</b>		<b>323</b>	<b>51.1938</b>	<b>50.0017</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.1938</b>	<b>0.0017</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4277</b>	<b>4195</b>		

**EURUSD H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2001	4673	4434	51.5835	50.7088
2002	3928	3755	50.8657	50.4252
2003	5924	5683	51.2888	49.9907
2004	6056	5809	51.5153	49.8763
2005	6148	5880	51.1014	49.9147
2006	6126	5789	51.6285	50.1072
2007	6095	5738	51.1639	49.7831
2008	6742	6229	51.0673	49.5369
2009	6546	6320	51.0000	50.2965
2010	6503	6260	50.9889	49.5130
2011	6449	6218	51.0487	50.2024
2012	6468	6135	51.4049	50.1878
2013	6460	6096	51.0300	49.8915
<b>Mean</b>		<b>5719</b>	<b>51.2067</b>	<b>50.0334</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.2067</b>	<b>0.0334</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>78118</b>	<b>74346</b>		

**EURUSD M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	12963	12358	50.8098	50.0494
2011	12844	12279	51.0209	49.9009
2012	12903	12030	51.3581	49.8906
2013	12848	11818	51.2527	49.8980
<b>Mean</b>		<b>12121</b>	<b>51.1104</b>	<b>49.9347</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.1104</b>	<b>-0.0653</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>51558</b>	<b>48485</b>		

**EURUSD M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	25830	24183	50.9314	50.1149
2011	25593	23990	50.9588	50.0384
2012	25753	23340	51.4139	49.8479
2013	25629	22885	51.5959	50.0486
<b>Mean</b>		<b>23600</b>	<b>51.2250</b>	<b>50.0125</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.2250</b>	<b>0.0125</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>102805</b>	<b>94398</b>		

**EURUSD M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	38685	35678	51.0109	49.8911
2011	38334	35412	51.1161	49.9412
2012	38595	34214	51.2968	50.2913
2013	38381	33527	51.5488	49.9860
<b>Mean</b>		<b>34708</b>	<b>51.2432</b>	<b>50.0274</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.2432</b>	<b>0.0274</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>153995</b>	<b>138831</b>		

**EURUSD M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	77110	68928	51.0132	49.9175
2011	76472	68830	51.2256	49.9751
2012	77079	65700	51.5193	49.9873
2013	76585	63816	51.6484	49.9455
<b>Mean</b>		<b>66819</b>	<b>51.3516</b>	<b>49.9564</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.3516</b>	<b>-0.0436</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>307246</b>	<b>267274</b>		

**EURUSD M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	382106	306695	51.7996	50.0032
2011	379862	306900	51.6605	50.0078
2012	382976	283656	52.2889	49.9750
2013	380245	267714	52.3738	49.9845
<b>Mean</b>		<b>291241</b>	<b>52.0307</b>	<b>49.9926</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>2.0307</b>	<b>-0.0074</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1525189</b>	<b>1164965</b>		



EURUSD ticks (Dukascopy)

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2009	1731989	292222	51.4771	50.0472
	1646651	260935	51.5720	50.0102
2010	1748179	286504	51.5981	49.9630
	1958458	353742	51.3015	50.0233
	2149241	339053	51.4288	49.9966
	2281966	357923	51.2236	50.0149
	2192845	437322	50.9865	50.0234
	2032650	338792	51.3927	50.0335
	1687019	263307	51.1433	49.9742
	1746138	251492	51.0903	49.9594
	1750389	241474	51.0219	50.0292
	1592282	263830	50.8041	49.9846
2011	887503	269718	51.0741	49.9698
	1373414	285660	51.1955	50.0242
	1450299	304957	51.2258	50.0654
	1497623	258403	51.4029	49.9228
	1852742	269399	51.5304	50.0711
	1618076	245660	51.4661	49.9257
	2289498	389464	51.2501	50.0060
	2227295	369212	51.1940	50.0391
	2187642	369077	51.2710	50.0569
	2699800	465729	51.2148	50.0076
2012	2579145	433915	51.1258	49.9553
	2589607	442571	51.3047	50.0285
	2616463	460975	51.5108	50.0089
	2135884	308329	51.8125	49.9760
	7408936	941166	51.8965	49.9667
	<b>Mean</b>		<b>351883</b>	<b>51.3154</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.3154</b>	<b>0.0031</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>57931734</b>	<b>9500831</b>		

**Oil Brent D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2000	366	251	50.6054	49.9630
2001	365	252	49.8224	49.1493
2002	365	251	50.4591	49.3840
2003	365	250	49.5751	50.3993
2004	366	257	49.0229	51.0891
2005	365	256	49.7901	51.1028
2006	365	254	49.4058	50.6726
2007	293	257	47.9348	51.3295
2008	304	302	51.0186	50.3606
2009	304	301	50.0120	50.0756
2010	310	309	49.1609	49.0329
2011	302	301	51.7178	48.8144
2012	309	308	51.2068	51.1529
2013	309	306	51.4592	49.8487
<b>Mean</b>		<b>275</b>	<b>50.0851</b>	<b>50.1696</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.0851</b>	<b>0.1696</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>4688</b>	<b>3855</b>		

**Oil Brent H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2007	1207	1162	51.5231	50.1823
2008	5408	5304	50.6759	50.3451
2009	5628	5470	50.8149	49.9324
2010	5718	5579	50.7711	50.0646
2011	5691	5604	50.5576	50.3336
2012	5745	5613	50.7186	49.9413
2013	5759	5594	50.7302	50.3318
<b>Mean</b>		<b>4904</b>	<b>50.8273</b>	<b>50.1616</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8273</b>	<b>0.1616</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>35156</b>	<b>34326</b>		

**Oil Brent M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	11235	10844	50.6937	50.0752
2011	11265	10967	50.7466	49.8197
2012	11406	11039	50.9533	50.2359
2013	11436	10927	51.0359	49.7631
<b>Mean</b>		<b>10944</b>	<b>50.8574</b>	<b>49.9735</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8574</b>	<b>-0.0265</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>45342</b>	<b>43777</b>		

**Oil Brent M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	21964	20797	50.7866	49.9530
2011	22220	21383	50.7713	50.0836
2012	22473	21364	50.8618	49.8214
2013	22515	21150	51.1630	49.9827
<b>Mean</b>		<b>21174</b>	<b>50.8957</b>	<b>49.9602</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8957</b>	<b>-0.0398</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>89172</b>	<b>84694</b>		

**Oil Brent M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	32310	30252	50.9873	50.0001
2011	32988	31428	50.7472	49.9735
2012	33220	31323	50.9083	50.1675
2013	33253	30793	50.8912	50.0672
<b>Mean</b>		<b>30949</b>	<b>50.8835</b>	<b>50.0521</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8835</b>	<b>0.0521</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>131771</b>	<b>123796</b>		

**Oil Brent M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	60988	55733	50.7921	50.0658
2011	63876	59742	50.8056	49.9833
2012	63780	58869	50.9904	50.0673
2013	63501	57428	50.9483	49.9830
<b>Mean</b>		<b>57943</b>	<b>50.8841</b>	<b>50.0249</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8841</b>	<b>0.0249</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>252145</b>	<b>231772</b>		

**Oil Brent M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	246310	208268	50.8856	50.0088
2011	269982	237105	50.9128	50.0022
2012	262754	226990	50.8362	49.9191
2013	259125	216902	50.9789	49.9636
<b>Mean</b>		<b>222316</b>	<b>50.9034</b>	<b>49.9734</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9034</b>	<b>-0.0266</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1038171</b>	<b>889265</b>		

**Oil Brent ticks (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)	
2011	307995	207124	52.5323	49.8346	
	391004	275195	52.6719	50.0184	
	478416	339651	52.5878	49.8824	
	358196	252004	52.5135	50.1375	
	491184	368207	52.2195	49.8714	
	504339	365618	52.6959	50.0187	
	411888	294483	52.4818	50.0557	
	521936	390987	52.3934	50.0460	
	478531	356075	52.1380	50.0424	
	528603	386389	52.0015	49.9867	
	490999	358301	52.2286	49.9746	
	340615	241846	51.9366	49.9963	
	2012	412974	288331	52.2306	49.9816
		406220	281216	52.2611	50.0683
		394789	277306	52.5236	50.0427
301998		205813	52.2639	49.8992	
327351		223412	51.8927	50.0394	
345973		244792	52.0093	49.9978	
343146		243027	51.9004	50.0222	
312626		217334	52.2074	50.1003	
321138		224414	52.1628	49.9082	
355862		248221	52.2919	50.1607	
310138		215916	52.1474	49.9449	
219937		145974	51.8976	49.9075	
2013	330964	211578	52.6364	49.9837	
	301578	194041	52.5021	50.0559	
	266071	171395	52.4601	49.9796	
	379589	258009	52.2005	50.0641	
	300657	207287	51.9121	49.9267	
	299249	201231	52.2559	49.9799	
	320272	201733	52.2607	49.8404	
	294462	192631	52.1668	50.0755	
	297036	197164	52.0724	49.9762	
	346928	229961	52.2954	49.9637	
	302032	195803	52.3355	50.1052	
215691	141744	51.9539	49.9619		
<b>Mean</b>		<b>251506</b>	<b>52.2567</b>	<b>49.9958</b>	
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>2.2567</b>	<b>-0.0042</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>13010387</b>	<b>9054213</b>			

**Gold D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2000	247	240	50.7284	48.9110
2001	247	241	50.2224	50.9538
2002	249	247	51.5941	49.4252
2003	248	248	52.1535	50.2115
2004	244	241	52.1786	49.3311
2005	249	241	49.1186	51.4146
2006	249	247	50.8623	50.3240
2007	271	268	52.1671	52.0107
2008	312	308	49.3945	48.5885
2009	307	307	50.6380	48.6783
2010	307	306	51.8117	50.2367
2011	306	305	50.3546	51.1520
2012	312	311	51.3666	50.1369
2013	312	312	52.0775	50.3168
<b>Mean</b>		<b>273</b>	<b>51.0477</b>	<b>50.1208</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.0477</b>	<b>0.1208</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3860</b>	<b>3822</b>		

**Gold H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2007	1840	1783	50.2736	49.4310
2008	6011	5892	50.8999	50.0530
2009	6106	5937	51.4324	49.6425
2010	6124	5944	51.8022	50.0999
2011	6107	5987	51.1233	50.1665
2012	6147	6026	51.0932	49.9841
2013	6160	6005	50.7275	49.8897
<b>Mean</b>		<b>5368</b>	<b>51.0503</b>	<b>49.8952</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.0503</b>	<b>-0.1048</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>38495</b>	<b>37574</b>		

**Gold M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	11996	11524	51.1910	50.0680
2011	11975	11661	50.6694	49.9577
2012	12036	11624	51.0310	49.8772
2013	12061	11650	50.8760	50.0537
<b>Mean</b>		<b>11615</b>	<b>50.9419</b>	<b>49.9892</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9419</b>	<b>-0.0109</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>48068</b>	<b>46459</b>		

**Gold M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	23869	22608	51.2647	49.8656
2011	23712	22816	51.0798	49.8917
2012	23866	22778	50.9130	49.9857
2013	23905	22794	50.8644	50.0466
<b>Mean</b>		<b>22749</b>	<b>51.0305</b>	<b>49.9474</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.0305</b>	<b>-0.0526</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>95352</b>	<b>90996</b>		

**Gold M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	35659	33266	51.1829	50.0066
2011	35535	33903	50.9633	50.0010
2012	35794	33759	51.0554	50.0423
2013	35849	33780	51.0402	50.0439
<b>Mean</b>		<b>33677</b>	<b>51.0605</b>	<b>50.0235</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.0605</b>	<b>0.0234</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>142837</b>	<b>134708</b>		

**Gold M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	70942	64425	50.9757	50.0316
2011	70625	66042	50.8580	50.0091
2012	71236	65719	50.9197	50.0248
2013	71291	65700	50.9909	49.9751
<b>Mean</b>		<b>65472</b>	<b>50.9361</b>	<b>50.0102</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9361</b>	<b>0.0101</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>284094</b>	<b>261886</b>		

**Gold M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	336088	274998	51.1945	49.9739
2011	342437	295045	50.9563	49.9489
2012	345817	289821	51.0719	50.0053
2013	346408	290101	51.0821	49.9777
<b>Mean</b>		<b>287491</b>	<b>51.0762</b>	<b>49.9765</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.0762</b>	<b>-0.0236</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>1370750</b>	<b>1149965</b>		



**Gold ticks (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)	
2011	582877	370902	53.3471	50.0372	
	503449	315735	53.1343	49.8307	
	561233	363860	53.0942	50.0857	
	564048	365062	53.2326	49.9412	
	714774	499956	52.7888	50.0300	
	572704	368042	53.1075	50.0416	
	541818	348328	53.1327	50.0633	
	1000001	765618	53.3921	50.0256	
	1000000	794893	53.0955	49.9547	
	809174	615788	52.0070	49.9366	
	700223	523954	52.2157	49.8893	
	671985	495610	52.5703	49.9726	
	2012	637130	444918	52.3452	49.9407
		747131	514836	52.8000	49.9366
712763		493688	52.6580	49.9526	
569122		383251	52.7004	49.9515	
700001		478278	52.7799	50.0068	
679502		474669	52.8559	50.0750	
575353		377511	52.8084	50.0244	
531883		333930	53.0978	49.9850	
645022		415363	52.9309	49.9931	
628876		392142	52.7412	49.9054	
549674		343278	52.8011	50.1270	
491495		302353	52.9646	50.0567	
2013		557513	343712	52.9746	50.0249
		633520	393080	53.2057	49.9914
	494771	300216	53.2112	50.0783	
	946883	668573	53.1128	49.9282	
	807910	567905	52.3544	49.9424	
	797716	559107	52.6101	49.9477	
	694321	474354	52.4560	49.9961	
	702068	483703	52.4935	49.9787	
	686467	463690	52.6491	50.0126	
	716444	485168	52.6984	50.0007	
486346	310329	52.8948	49.9045		
555246	358502	53.0118	50.0477		
<b>Mean</b>		<b>449731</b>	<b>52.8409</b>	<b>49.9893</b>	
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>2.8409</b>	<b>-0.0107</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>23769443</b>	<b>16190304</b>			

**Wheat D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2000	242	237	51.6040	50.0641
2001	234	227	51.5893	49.4615
2002	251	241	50.4124	47.8731
2003	226	221	49.8124	48.4946
2004	251	244	50.2032	50.6407
2005	250	245	50.6920	49.2684
2006	250	247	50.8103	51.1082
2007	253	246	50.0188	48.6631
2008	252	249	52.1181	50.5674
2009	250	249	52.7725	50.8288
2010	264	258	51.3450	49.1852
2011	300	298	52.0048	52.2391
2012	303	301	47.7238	49.6256
2013	303	299	50.5233	49.7834
<b>Mean</b>		<b>254</b>	<b>50.8307</b>	<b>49.8431</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8307</b>	<b>-0.1569</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3629</b>	<b>3562</b>		

**Wheat H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	1137	1071	52.0946	49.8973
2011	4720	4472	50.2773	50.6511
2012	5163	4828	50.5005	49.4762
2013	4912	4446	50.8995	50.2864
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3704</b>	<b>50.9430</b>	<b>50.0778</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9430</b>	<b>0.0777</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>15932</b>	<b>14817</b>		

**Wheat M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	2135	1964	51.1945	51.4924
2011	8854	8206	50.9650	50.3252
2012	9924	8952	50.5938	50.0470
2013	9443	8166	50.9674	50.3821
<b>Mean</b>		<b>6822</b>	<b>50.9302</b>	<b>50.5617</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9302</b>	<b>0.5617</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>30356</b>	<b>27288</b>		

**Wheat M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	4088	3617	51.5964	49.9223
2011	16977	15040	51.0741	49.7479
2012	19301	16742	50.8285	50.2321
2013	18034	14948	51.5463	50.0721
<b>Mean</b>		<b>12587</b>	<b>51.2613</b>	<b>49.9936</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.2613</b>	<b>-0.0064</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>58400</b>	<b>50347</b>		

**Wheat M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	5945	5096	51.7749	49.5991
2011	24532	21384	51.6175	50.0720
2012	28054	23675	51.3780	49.9859
2013	25845	20887	51.5797	49.9143
<b>Mean</b>		<b>17761</b>	<b>51.5875</b>	<b>49.8928</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.5875</b>	<b>-0.1072</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>84376</b>	<b>71042</b>		

**Wheat M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	10847	9075	51.6938	49.6671
2011	44979	37726	51.6710	49.9404
2012	51712	42123	51.6230	49.8812
2013	46121	35872	52.0772	49.9952
<b>Mean</b>		<b>31199</b>	<b>51.7663</b>	<b>49.8710</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>1.7663</b>	<b>-0.1290</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>153659</b>	<b>124796</b>		

**Wheat M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	35605	27092	52.0170	49.9378
2011	148036	113728	51.9029	50.0023
2012	175312	129949	52.1527	50.0114
2013	148092	102593	52.5159	50.0243
<b>Mean</b>		<b>93341</b>	<b>52.1471</b>	<b>49.9940</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>2.1471</b>	<b>-0.0061</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>507045</b>	<b>373362</b>		

Wheat ticks (Finam)

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)	
2011	136311	82880	54.6947	49.9180	
	118175	70901	54.0677	49.9104	
	182464	116337	54.0078	49.8032	
	102211	65598	53.6541	50.3003	
	179500	120674	53.8774	49.8736	
	132053	86661	54.0312	50.0369	
	137312	87267	54.2645	50.1839	
	104156	67874	53.3452	49.7834	
	141171	86114	54.3913	49.9251	
	145429	87140	53.9477	50.0017	
	95156	53444	53.9753	50.1619	
	96852	54837	54.2316	50.1887	
	2012	115581	62249	55.1102	50.0072
		88443	47500	54.3885	49.8789
114894		62086	55.0575	49.8953	
77602		42766	54.2581	50.0538	
159408		90143	54.4119	50.0760	
117721		68688	53.4868	49.6783	
204678		129141	53.1632	50.0736	
116198		72278	52.6592	50.0477	
173018		100283	53.9413	49.8469	
166943		91436	54.3714	49.9442	
124722		66151	54.3076	50.0726	
107120		54429	54.7200	49.8898	
2013		140474	71939	54.8111	49.6872
		110291	54962	54.2484	49.5788
	116846	58663	54.5437	50.1560	
	87236	44960	53.6521	49.7509	
	115981	57596	54.2121	49.9262	
	81145	41155	54.6873	49.9623	
	96072	47965	53.8696	50.1303	
	63812	34180	53.6074	50.1126	
	102451	48659	55.4985	49.6640	
	108722	50454	55.0383	49.8315	
60696	27435	55.0939	50.1094		
72930	32483	55.7971	49.7937		
<b>Mean</b>		<b>67704</b>	<b>54.2618</b>	<b>49.9515</b>	
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>4.2618</b>	<b>-0.0485</b>	
<b>Total</b>	<b>4293774</b>	<b>2437328</b>			

**Google D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2004	92	92	49.6976	51.2776
2005	250	250	50.3697	49.9471
2006	249	249	51.7213	51.6003
2007	250	250	50.3455	48.7226
2008	273	273	51.4418	51.4463
2009	282	267	46.7975	50.5436
2010	250	250	50.1916	51.8110
2011	225	225	48.9599	47.3084
2012	248	248	51.1114	48.7578
2013	250	249	48.9688	50.5284
<b>Mean</b>		<b>235</b>	<b>49.9605</b>	<b>50.1943</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>-0.0395</b>	<b>0.1943</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>2369</b>	<b>2353</b>		

**Google H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2009	1191	1184	50.8093	49.8780
2010	2011	1995	50.7183	50.0588
2011	1579	1573	50.3980	49.6250
2012	1719	1712	51.0447	50.8222
2013	1737	1736	50.2782	49.4384
<b>Mean</b>		<b>1640</b>	<b>50.6497</b>	<b>49.9645</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.6497</b>	<b>-0.0355</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8237</b>	<b>8200</b>		

**Google M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	3521	3507	50.3370	50.0143
2011	2895	2880	50.3052	49.7049
2012	3188	3177	50.7378	49.9078
2013	3217	3208	50.8507	50.2142
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3193</b>	<b>50.5577</b>	<b>49.9603</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.5577</b>	<b>-0.0397</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12821</b>	<b>12772</b>		

**Google M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	6788	6742	50.8484	50.6939
2011	5733	5712	50.8480	49.6549
2012	6373	6341	50.3827	50.2329
2013	6424	6389	50.6676	49.9429
<b>Mean</b>		<b>6296</b>	<b>50.6867</b>	<b>50.1312</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.6867</b>	<b>0.1312</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25318</b>	<b>25184</b>		

**Google M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	10054	9982	51.2534	50.1563
2011	8555	8500	50.7215	49.8256
2012	9551	9490	50.7297	49.9248
2013	9613	9562	50.5913	50.1028
<b>Mean</b>		<b>9384</b>	<b>50.8240</b>	<b>50.0024</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.8240</b>	<b>0.0024</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37773</b>	<b>37534</b>		

**Google M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	19848	19685	51.0983	49.9101
2011	16962	16807	50.8531	50.0788
2012	18941	18780	51.0152	50.0218
2013	18755	18599	50.8629	49.8103
<b>Mean</b>		<b>18468</b>	<b>50.9574</b>	<b>49.9553</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.9574</b>	<b>-0.0448</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>74506</b>	<b>73871</b>		

**Google M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	97723	95584	51.2476	50.0571
2011	72637	71107	50.6930	50.0410
2012	73510	72009	50.4893	50.0346
2013	63699	62606	50.4095	50.0561
<b>Mean</b>		<b>75327</b>	<b>50.7099</b>	<b>50.0472</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.7098</b>	<b>0.0472</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>307569</b>	<b>301306</b>		



**Google ticks (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2011	38496	24897	50.1567	49.5501
	48848	34140	49.2164	49.9692
	42128	30397	49.2022	49.5608
	35248	25442	48.8051	50.3125
2012	46936	32399	49.3919	50.3843
	31604	21835	48.2253	50.0893
	29829	21740	48.7235	49.7424
	33682	24213	48.6949	50.1053
	37329	26546	48.4649	49.6101
	31098	21231	48.7329	50.0424
	33723	24070	49.1608	50.4383
	27376	21221	48.7960	50.4265
	35455	27967	48.9362	49.7944
	42670	33002	48.1728	49.8046
2013	29230	22838	48.8878	49.9869
	22521	17762	48.9612	49.4342
	28787	22226	48.9922	50.0900
	27209	20755	48.9376	49.6459
	25548	18838	49.0046	49.5036
	31537	22084	48.7660	49.9955
	27426	18965	48.8110	49.8998
	33314	22611	48.9231	50.4246
	30765	21383	48.8121	49.8667
	15061	12479	49.7195	49.8477
	15786	12783	49.2920	49.7770
	28738	22777	48.4413	50.3512
	12112	9595	48.5303	49.8385
13676	10799	48.4256	50.3010	
<b>Mean</b>		<b>22321</b>	<b>48.8994</b>	<b>49.9569</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>-1.1006</b>	<b>-0.0431</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>856132</b>	<b>624995</b>		

**Apple D1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2000	251	246	53.1493	50.0413
2001	247	240	53.0089	50.8657
2002	251	245	49.0528	51.5300
2003	251	246	50.7284	50.6311
2004	250	245	50.3969	49.7335
2005	250	249	50.1026	49.6153
2006	249	248	50.3056	50.9251
2007	250	250	50.9829	50.1594
2008	273	271	53.9314	49.1510
2009	280	266	47.3347	49.6453
2010	250	250	48.3537	51.8148
2011	225	225	47.0934	51.2241
2012	248	247	49.4806	50.9871
2013	250	250	51.6349	49.5370
<b>Mean</b>		<b>248</b>	<b>50.3969</b>	<b>50.4186</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.3969</b>	<b>0.4186</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>3525</b>	<b>3478</b>		

**Apple H1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2009	1194	1182	49.9262	49.9832
2010	2012	1982	50.3208	50.3821
2011	1581	1573	50.8903	49.3774
2012	1722	1718	49.0030	50.1232
2013	1737	1733	50.4123	48.4724
<b>Mean</b>		<b>1638</b>	<b>50.1105</b>	<b>49.6677</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.1105</b>	<b>-0.3323</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>8246</b>	<b>8188</b>		

**Apple M30 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	3524	3476	50.1145	49.9692
2011	2900	2881	50.5078	50.0774
2012	3191	3182	50.4705	50.7316
2013	3218	3203	50.4589	50.5548
<b>Mean</b>		<b>3186</b>	<b>50.3879</b>	<b>50.3333</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.3879</b>	<b>0.3333</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>12833</b>	<b>12742</b>		

**Apple M15 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	6796	6703	50.4276	50.1013
2011	5738	5686	50.6585	49.6231
2012	6374	6336	50.4159	50.0240
2013	6428	6378	50.8921	49.9704
<b>Mean</b>		<b>6276</b>	<b>50.5985</b>	<b>49.9297</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.5985</b>	<b>-0.0703</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>25336</b>	<b>25103</b>		

**Apple M10 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	10064	9919	50.7706	50.0147
2011	8562	8492	50.9583	50.2580
2012	9552	9487	50.6048	50.3689
2013	9631	9566	50.8619	49.9322
<b>Mean</b>		<b>9366</b>	<b>50.7989</b>	<b>50.1435</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.7989</b>	<b>0.1434</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>37809</b>	<b>37464</b>		

**Apple M5 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	19863	19481	50.8478	49.9317
2011	17034	16824	50.7103	50.0055
2012	19088	18953	50.6097	50.2969
2013	19255	19087	50.7827	49.9528
<b>Mean</b>		<b>18586</b>	<b>50.7376</b>	<b>50.0467</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.7376</b>	<b>0.0467</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>75240</b>	<b>74345</b>		

**Apple M1 (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2010	98160	94449	50.6973	49.9177
2011	84062	81719	50.7288	50.0725
2012	94722	92999	50.7706	49.9759
2013	93711	91672	50.8827	49.9708
<b>Mean</b>		<b>90210</b>	<b>50.7699</b>	<b>49.9842</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>0.7698</b>	<b>-0.0158</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>370655</b>	<b>360839</b>		

**Apple ticks (Finam)**

date	original sample length	nonzero sample length	prob. of success	prob. of success (perm.)
2011	270463	166822	48.7786	50.0923
	319909	198259	48.7463	50.0393
	234604	146933	48.8069	50.0684
	147845	93583	48.5366	50.4119
2012	153719	91966	49.3715	50.0663
	236809	151967	48.9136	50.3465
	272221	183861	48.7708	50.0495
	258969	174405	48.7194	50.0401
	222662	152415	48.4716	50.1512
	160613	110776	48.7411	49.9756
	197174	136997	48.5970	50.0259
	163015	112350	48.5376	50.1113
	199025	138613	48.3270	49.9776
	244923	170684	48.4178	49.8942
	225577	161534	48.1348	50.0446
	211445	149871	48.2064	49.9223
2013	204995	138982	48.5480	50.1076
	170129	115446	48.5703	49.9437
	164109	108272	48.2604	49.9801
	179751	115610	48.1667	49.9905
	154164	102352	48.2086	50.3312
	133561	92132	48.2243	49.7031
	120276	84633	48.4368	49.8452
	124559	87907	48.5758	50.1803
	133516	92247	48.5891	50.0927
	123408	86080	48.2795	49.6974
	82012	56612	48.3334	49.8225
	99078	70077	48.3525	50.0885
<b>Mean</b>		<b>124692</b>	<b>48.5222</b>	<b>50.0357</b>
<b>Skewness</b>			<b>-1.4778</b>	<b>0.0357</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>5208531</b>	<b>3491386</b>		