

Volume-driven time-of-day effects in intraday volatility models

Igor F. B. Martins ^{(a),*}, Audronė Virbickaitė^(b), Hoang Nguyen^(c), Hedibert Freitas Lopes^(d)

* Corresponding author

^(a) School of Business - Örebro University, Sweden

^(b) Department of Quantitative Methods, CUNEF Universidad, Madrid, Spain

^(c) Department of Management and Engineering, Linköping University, Sweden

^(d) Insper Institute of Education and Research, São Paulo, Brazil,

September 11, 2026

*Corresponding author. Email: igor.ferreira-batista-martins@oru.se. Address: Örebro University, Fakultetsgatan 1, 702 81, Örebro, Sweden. Igor Ferreira Batista Martins acknowledges financial support from the Jan Wallander and Tom Hedelius foundation and Tore Browalds foundation grant number BFv22-0005. A. Virbickaitė is partially supported by the grant PID2022-138289NB-I00 from the Spanish State Research Agency (Agencia Estatal de Investigación - Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación). Hoang Nguyen acknowledges financial support from the project “Improved Economic Policy and Forecasting with High-Frequency Data” (Dnr: E47/22) funded by the Torsten Söderbergs Foundation. Hedibert Freitas Lopes was partially supported by São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) Grants 2013/00506-1, 2018/04654-9 and 2023/02538-0.

Abstract

We propose a high-frequency stochastic volatility model that integrates persistent component, intraday periodicity, and volume-driven time-of-day effects. By allowing intraday volatility patterns to respond to lagged trading activity, the model captures economically and statistically relevant departures from traditional intraday seasonality effects. We find that the volume-driven component accounts for a substantial share of intraday volatility for futures data across equity indexes, currencies, and commodities. Out-of-sample, our forecasts achieve near-zero intercepts, unit slopes, and the highest R^2 values in Mincer-Zarnowitz regressions, while horse-race regressions indicate that competing forecasts add little information once our predictions are included. These statistical improvements translate into economically meaningful gains, as volatility-managed portfolio strategies based on our model consistently improve Sharpe ratios. Our results highlight the value of incorporating lagged trading activity into high-frequency volatility models.

Keywords: Intraday volatility, high-frequency, volume, periodicity.

JEL Classification: C11, C22, C53, C58

1 Introduction

Successful modeling and forecasting of financial volatility plays a critical role in risk management, portfolio allocation, derivative pricing, and market microstructure analysis. While daily and lower frequency volatility are largely driven by their own persistence, intraday volatility exhibits richer and more complex dynamics. In addition to the persistent component, high-frequency volatility follows a strong time-of-day pattern which is typically captured by a static dummy-based component forming a periodic effect, sometimes referred to as seasonal or diurnal (Engle and Sokalska, 2012; Stroud and Johannes, 2014; Rossi and Fantazzini, 2015; Bekierman and Gribisch, 2021; Martins and Lopes, 2025; Martins et al., 2025). However, such static structures cannot adapt to short-term deviations associated with market trading activity, and therefore miss an important source of intraday heterogeneity.

In order to address the limitations of previous approaches, we make the following methodological and empirical contributions. Methodologically, we propose a new high-frequency stochastic volatility model that embeds time-of-day effects within a volume-driven dynamic framework. The model decomposes time-of-day effects into two components: a static baseline that captures the recurring intraday pattern and a dynamic component that allows these periodic effects to adjust flexibly in response to deviations of lagged trading volume from its typical level. This volume-driven adaptation provides a parsimonious yet interpretable way to model economically meaningful departures from the periodic specification. As a result, volatility can respond dynamically to short-term market activities. We develop a Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) algorithm to estimate the proposed model and a particle filter to produce intraday volatility forecasts.

Empirically, we show the relevance and usefulness of this approach across multiple assets. First, our volume-driven component explains between 33% to 45% of intraday log-variance variation. Second, the dynamic time-of-day component significantly improves out-of-sample forecasting accuracy measured by squared, absolute and Qlike losses. These improvements are statistically validated by Diebold-Mariano tests for predictive superiority. Third, beyond the statistical performance, the proposed model yields economically meaningful gains in volatility-managed portfolios highlighting the practical importance of volume-driven intraday heterogeneity in modern financial markets. Results hold across multiple robustness checks.

This paper relates to the literature highlighting the role of trading activity in volatility dynamics, motivated by the well-established theoretical and empirical evidence linking trading volume and volatility. Classic frameworks such as the Mixture of Distributions Hypothesis (MDH) (Clark, 1973; Tauchen and Pitts, 1983; Andersen, 1996) and the Sequential Information Arrival Hypothesis (SIAH) (Copeland, 1976; Jones et al., 1994) indicate that trading volume reflects the rate of information flow into prices, which naturally generates a positive relation between volume and volatility. A detailed review of early literature on the return-volume relationship across financial markets is presented by Karpoff (1987).

MDH posits that volatility and trading volume are contemporaneously related, both driven by the rate of information flow arriving in the market. In this framework, contemporaneous trading volume serves as a proxy for the intensity of information arrivals, which in turn shapes volatility. Early evidence by Lamoureux and Lastrapes (1990) shows that when trading volume is included in volatility models, persistence parameters become small and statistically insignificant, suggesting that volume captures much of the serial correlation in volatility. In a stochastic volatility setting, Abanto-Valle et al. (2010) demonstrate that information about volatility can be inferred not only from returns but also from trading volume. Louhichi (2011) further decompose trading volume into the number and size of trades, showing that the well-documented positive relationship between volatility and volume is primarily driven by the number of trades. More recently, Slim and Dahmene (2016) confirm a strong positive contemporaneous relationship between total trading volume and realized volatility, particularly its continuous component. In line with the MDH, Ramos et al. (2020) show that salient information increases both trading volume and volatility, suggesting that the two are driven by a common information-based channel.

However, the contemporaneous focus of MDH overlooks potential lagged interactions between volume and volatility, which are central to the SIAH. According to SIAH, new information reaches investors sequentially, leading to a lead-lag relationship between trading volume and volatility. Trading volume tends to react first to new information, while volatility adjusts later as more market participants process the new information and respond to it. Multiple empirical findings support this view. Chiang et al. (2010) report that trading volume possesses strong predictive power for future volatility and that the relationship is nonlinear. Using HAR framework, Wang et al. (2015) show that lagged trading volume significantly improves forecasts of daily realized volatility. Similarly,

Zheng et al. (2019) find that trading volume predicts both same-day and near-future peaks in volatility. Yet, as Liu et al. (2023) point out, there remains no dominant conclusion regarding the forecasting role of volume, with roughly half of existing studies supporting SIAH and the other half consistent with MDH. More recent works show that volume remains a critical determinant of modern market dynamics, liquidity provision, price discovery, and volatility clustering even in today’s high-frequency, electronic trading environment (Rubia and Sanchis-Marco, 2013; Easley et al., 2016; Naimoli and Storti, 2019; Easley et al., 2021).

Our study contributes to the SIAH literature by providing novel high-frequency empirical evidence on the predictive power of lagged trading volume for volatility. We show that lagged deviations of trading volume from its typical intraday pattern - rather than raw volume itself - offer timely signals of changing market conditions. Importantly, the strength of this predictive relationship is heterogeneous: the estimated coefficients vary substantially across different trading hours, reflecting how the influence of information flow depends on which global markets are active. These findings extend the SIAH framework to the high-frequency domain and highlight the nonlinear nature of the volume-volatility relationship.

Closest to our setting is Bollerslev et al. (2018), who study the intraday interaction between volume and volatility around macroeconomic announcements. While their analysis highlights event-driven shifts, our focus is complementary. We concentrate on systematic time-of-day variation. Since each intraday observation is inherently tied to a trading interval, a volume-driven adjustment to these patterns provides a natural and broadly applicable channel through which trading activity shapes volatility throughout the trading day. Importantly, our framework is flexible enough to incorporate event-related effects in the spirit of Bollerslev et al. (2018), even though our emphasis here is on the time-of-day component.

More broadly, our work relates to a large literature on modeling intraday volatility. While it is possible to model the persistent component of intraday volatility using Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (GARCH) as in Andersen and Bollerslev (1997, 1998); Andersen et al. (2007); Engle and Sokalska (2012), or realized volatility (RV) as in Dumitru et al. (2025), we opt to use a stochastic volatility (SV) approach as in Taylor (1986); Broto and Ruiz (2004). SV models treat volatility as an unobserved latent process, is consistent with continuous-time asset pricing, and generally yields smoother paths for volatility dynamics. Empirically, SV approaches

have been shown to deliver superior out-of-sample performance relative to GARCH and RV, as documented in Stroud and Johannes (2014); Bekierman and Gribisch (2021); Martins and Lopes (2025); Martins et al. (2025), among others.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the data, the econometric model, and the Bayesian approach. Section 3 reports the in-sample evidence on the role of volume-driven time-of-day effects. Section 4 evaluates out-of-sample forecasting performance and presents the portfolio application. Section 5 concludes.

2 Data, econometric model and estimation approach

This section describes the data, econometric framework, and estimation strategy. We begin by introducing the futures contracts and intraday dataset used in this article. We then present our proposed stochastic volatility model that decomposes intraday return volatility into persistent, time-of-day, and Sunday opening components, with particular emphasis on a novel volume-driven time-of-day effect. Finally, we describe a Bayesian estimation approach that performs joint inference on model parameters and latent volatility states, relying on modern Bayesian forecasting techniques that have proven effective for nonlinear models (Martin et al., 2024).

2.1 Data

Our empirical analysis focuses on four highly liquid futures contracts: the E-mini S&P 500, the E-mini Nasdaq 100, the Euro FX futures, and West Texas Intermediate crude oil futures, or in short, S&P 500, Nasdaq, Euro and WTI. The E-mini equity index futures, traded electronically on CME Globex, are scaled-down versions of their full-sized counterparts, with notional values of 50 times and 20 times the underlying index for the S&P 500 and Nasdaq 100, respectively. The smaller size contracts lower margin requirements and trading costs, making E-minis the dominant vehicle for intraday trading and price discovery in U.S. equity index futures markets. The Euro FX futures contract, also traded on CME Globex, tracks the value of the Euro against the U.S. dollar. WTI crude oil futures, traded on NYMEX, are the most liquid energy futures contract worldwide and serve as the global benchmark for crude oil pricing. Together, these assets span equity, currency, and commodity markets, offering a rich variety of trading environments. All four contracts trade

nearly around the clock, with sessions beginning on Sunday at 18:00 Eastern Time (ET) and ending on Friday at 17:00 ET, with one-hour break every day between 17:00-18:00. Historically, the E-mini S&P 500 and Nasdaq 100 had an additional 15-minute daily maintenance break from 16:15 to 16:30 ET, but this restriction was lifted in June of 2021.

Our sample spans from January 3, 2016, to August 30, 2024. The data are split into an estimation sample ending on December 31, 2021, and an out-of-sample evaluation period covering the remaining observations. Our model uses 5-minute (log-)returns and trading volume in number of contracts. A 24-hour day consists of 288 five-minute intervals, although daylight saving time adjustments occasionally produce 23-hour or 25-hour days. Non-trading intervals are filled using the last available transaction price and assuming zero volume¹. One exception is when a trading break occurs. In such cases, all timestamps within the break are removed from our sample. Thus, most days consists of 276 observations. The data is constructed from continuous futures by linking successive most-liquid contracts from the CME group to form uninterrupted time series. Appendix A at the end of the manuscript contains the main descriptive statistics and plots related to our data.

2.2 Econometric model

We model univariate de-meaned² 5-minute log-returns, y_t , as

$$y_t = \exp(h_t/2)\varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1), \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (1)$$

where h_t represents the conditional log-variance process of returns.³ We decompose the log-variance into five additive components,

$$h_t = m_0 + tod_t^p + tod_t^v + x_t + sot_t, \quad (2)$$

¹The number of filled in observations is extremely small, raging from 0.0039% to 0.1029% of the sample, depending on the asset. Due to an increase in trading activity, no observations were missing at critical points, such as market close and re-opening (17:00 and 18:00).

²We use the in-sample mean for de-meaning. One could also consider a model for the mean, such as an ARMA process, for example. As a robustness check we have re-estimated the Proposed model using the AR(1) residuals and the results remain virtually unchanged.

³One could also assume that $\varepsilon_t \sim \mathbf{Student} - \mathbf{t}(0, 1, \nu)$, however we found that the conditional distribution of the high-frequency returns is close to Gaussian.

where m_0 denotes the unconditional level of log-volatility, tod_t^p captures periodic time-of-day effects, tod_t^v captures volume-driven deviations in time-of-day effects, x_t is the persistent latent component, and so_t accounts for the effect of volatility shifts around the Sunday market opening ⁴.

Let's denote k as the specific 5-minute intraday window corresponding to the timestamp t via the window indicator function $w(t) = k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and, since our assets are traded 23 hours a day, $K = 276$. Let $\mathbf{I}_t$ be a K -dimensional vector that is 1 in the position $w(t)$ and zero otherwise. The periodic time-of-day component, tod_t^p , is represented as

$$tod_t^p = \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^p \text{ with } \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k^p = 0, \quad (3)$$

where the K -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^p = \{\beta_1^p, \dots, \beta_K^p\}'$ captures the fixed periodicity in intraday volatility. Since $\mathbf{I}_t$ includes all 5-minute windows of the 23 traded hours and our h_t specification in Equation (2) already includes the intercept m_0 , we impose the zero-sum restriction $\sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k^p = 0$ to ensure identification. This parameterization anchors the set of fixed intraday effects around zero, allowing m_0 to represent the average log-variance level.

Our main modeling novelty comes when modeling the volume-driven time-of-day effects tod_t^v . This component allows intraday effects to evolve over time by incorporating lagged trading activity. Consider the lagged trading window $k^* = w(t-1)$, let us denote the average log-volume for time-of-day k^* as $\bar{V}_{k^*}$ and, analogously, denote the time-of-day standard deviation as $\sigma_{V_{k^*}^*}$. The volume-driven time-of-day component tod_t^v is represented as

$$tod_t^v = v_{t-1} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^v \text{ with } v_{t-1} = \frac{V_{t-1} - \bar{V}_{k^*}}{\sigma_{V_{k^*}^*}}, \quad (4)$$

where v_{t-1} is the scaled deviation of lagged log-volume from its time-of-the day average $\bar{V}_{k^*}$ and the K -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^v$ captures how this deviation interacts with the intraday structure. The volume-driven component allows for the inclusion of new information to intraday volatility via lagged trading activity. When trading activity is unusually high or low, the volume-driven component allows the log-variance process to shift accordingly. Unlike $\boldsymbol{\beta}^p$, there is no need to impose a zero-sum restriction on $\boldsymbol{\beta}^v$, since v_{t-1} has mean-zero by construction. One could also

⁴The pronounced spike in volatility observed when markets reopen on Sundays reflects the accumulation of uncertainty and order imbalances over the weekend, see Martins et al. (2025) for empirical evidence regarding WTI.

consider that tod_t^v loads on weighted sums of multiple lagged volume deviations⁵. However, for simplicity, we consider deviations only from one lagged observation.

The fixed and dynamic time-of-day components can be viewed jointly as

$$tod_t = tod_t^p + tod_t^v = \mathbf{I}_t'(\boldsymbol{\beta}^p + v_{t-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^v). \quad (5)$$

When volume is at its time-of-day average, $tod_t^v = 0$ and the specification collapses to the standard static form. However, when trading activity is unusually high or low, the volume-driven component allows more flexibility in the log-variance process to depart from the static baseline.

The persistent component follows a stochastic volatility process,

$$x_t = \phi x_{t-1} + \sigma_x \eta_t, \quad \eta_t \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1), \quad (6)$$

with persistence parameter ϕ and innovation scale σ_x . This component captures the rate at which shocks to volatility decay.

Finally, we include adjustments for the Sunday market opening following Martins et al. (2025). This is modeled as

$$so_t = \mathbf{H}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{so}, \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_t$ is a m -dimensional indicator vector for the Sunday opening session and its lagged 5-minute trading windows, and the m -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{so}$ captures the associated log-variance shift. Therefore, our model allows for shifts in volatility up to m lags after the Sunday opening event.

Equations (1) - (7) specify our model for intraday returns with volatility that combines a persistent latent factor, periodic and volume-driven time-of-day effects, and Sunday opening adjustments. The key innovation lies in the specification of the volume-driven time-of-day component, tod_t^v , which allows the strength of intraday periodic patterns to flexibly adjust to lagged market activity. This feature extends the traditional periodicity-based approach by linking intraday volatility directly to trading intensity, thereby capturing short-term deviations from static patterns.

⁵We implement another form of volume-driven component in the spirit of the HAR model: $tod_t^v = v_{t-1} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{v,5m} + v_{t-1}^{1h} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{v,1h} + v_{t-1}^{1d} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{v,1d}$, where $v_{t-1}^{1h} = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j=1}^6 v_{t-j}$, $v_{t-1}^{1d} = \frac{1}{276} \sum_{j=1}^{276} v_{t-j}$. The out-of-sample forecasts based on this HAR-type volume model produces similar losses as the 5-minute lagged volume model.

Table 1 summarizes how our proposed specification nests several stochastic volatility models as special cases. These include (i) a vanilla SV model (SV), (ii) an SV with deterministic time-of-day effects (PSV), and (iii) an SV with deterministic time-of-day and Sunday-opening effects (PSVO). These benchmarks serve as natural points of comparison in our empirical analysis.

Table 1: Nested models

	Persistence (x_t)	Deterministic ToD (tod_t^p)	Sunday Open (so_t)	Volume ToD (tod_t^v)
Proposal	✓	✓	✓	✓
PSVO	✓	✓	✓	
PSV	✓	✓		
SV	✓			

The first column lists the model mnemonics, and the remaining columns indicate which components are included: a persistent stochastic volatility factor (x_t), deterministic time-of-day effects (tod_t^p), volume-driven time-of-day effects (tod_t^v) and Sunday-opening effects (so_t). Our proposed model includes all components, while the other specifications represent restricted variants.

2.3 Estimation approach

We adopt a Bayesian framework to estimate the model described in Section 2.2 by Equations (1) - (7). Our Bayesian approach simultaneously estimates all parameters and latent states, avoiding the need for potentially inefficient two-stage estimators and allowing for direct probabilistic statements on both parameters and latent volatility dynamics. Since the conditional likelihood involves high-dimensional latent states and cannot be integrated out in closed form, posterior inference relies on MCMC methods to generate draws from the joint posterior distribution of parameters and latent processes.

We follow the log-linearization strategy of Kim et al. (1998a) to facilitate efficient sampling. Specifically, we rewrite (1) as

$$\log(y_t^2) = h_t + \log(\varepsilon_t^2), \quad (8)$$

and approximate $\log(\varepsilon_t^2)$ with a finite mixture of seven Gaussian components⁶. The model can be expressed in a conditionally Gaussian state-space form. Intuitively, this transformation allows us to treat log-squared returns as a noisy signal of the latent log-variance. This representation

⁶As a robustness check, we replicated the estimation procedure of Omori et al. (2007), employing their 10-component Gaussian mixture approximation to the $\log \chi^2$ distribution, and obtained similar results.

is computationally convenient and enables the application of the Carter and Kohn (1994) and Frühwirth-Schnatter (1994) forward-filtering backward sampling (FFBS) algorithm for block updating of the latent states conditional on the mixture indicators.

Let $\Theta = (m_0, \phi, \sigma_x^2, \beta^p, \beta^v, \beta^{so}, \{x_t\}_{t=1}^T)$ be the set of model parameters and latent states. We employ standard proper, but not strongly informative, conjugate priors whenever possible. We assume Gaussian priors for m_0 , ϕ , β^p , β^v and β^{so} . We assume $m_0 \sim \mathbf{N}(\mu_{m_0} = \bar{y}^*, V_{m_0} = 2)$, where $\bar{y}^* = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \log(y_t^2) + 1.27$ reflecting that the average $\bar{y}_t^*$ should proxy the log-variance level while the constant 1.27 accounts for the expected value of $\log(\varepsilon_t^2)$, which is distributed as $\log-\chi_1^2$ (Ruiz, 1994). Due to the high persistence commonly observed in the stochastic volatility literature, we assume a prior $\phi \sim \mathbf{N}(\phi_0 = 0.95, V_{\phi_0} = 0.25)$. We take a conservative approach by assuming a prior belief of no time-of-day effects (neither fixed nor volume-driven) and no shift due to the Sunday opening while also allowing for reasonable variability by considering $\{\beta_k^p\}_{k=1}^{K-1} \sim \mathbf{N}(\beta_0^p = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^p} = 0.5\mathbf{I}_{K-1})$, $\beta^v \sim \mathbf{N}(\beta_0^v = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^v} = 0.5\mathbf{I}_K)$, and $\beta^{so} \sim \mathbf{N}(\beta_0^{so} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^{so}} = 4\mathbf{I}_m)$ where $\mathbf{I}$ is the identity matrix that corresponds to the dimensions of β^p , β^v and β^{so} . We assume an Inverse Gamma prior $\mathbf{IG}(\alpha_{\sigma_x} = 1, \beta_{\sigma_x} = 10)$ for σ_x^2 reflecting the restriction of non negative variance. Our choice of conditionally conjugate priors enables direct sampling from the conditional posterior distributions using a Gibbs sampler, see Appendix B at the end of the manuscript for details.

3 In-sample results

This section illustrates the volume-driven time-of-day effects on intraday volatility. We first quantify the relative importance of this channel through a variance decomposition of the latent log-variance, and then examine the dynamic effects of above-average volume on volatility throughout the trading day. We then turn to the remaining components of the log-variance decomposition described in Equation (2).

3.1 Volume-driven intraday heterogeneity

Table 2 reports the variance decomposition of the latent log-variance h_t , calculated at the posterior parameter modes, into its persistent, static and volume-driven time-of-day, and Sunday-opening components. We compute the decomposition as the ratio of the individual component

contribution to the total variability of the estimated volatility.

Table 2: Variance decomposition

	Persistence (x_t)	Deterministic ToD (tod_t^p)	Sunday Open (so_t)	Volume ToD (tod_t^v)
Panel A: Nasdaq				
Proposal	25.34	29.14	0.10	45.42
PSVO	70.69	29.02	0.29	–
PSV	70.49	29.51	–	–
Panel B: S&P500				
Proposal	36.08	24.87	0.10	38.94
PSVO	75.73	23.98	0.29	–
PSV	76.38	23.62	–	–
Panel C: Euro				
Proposal	24.13	36.41	0.08	39.38
PSVO	57.92	41.89	0.19	–
PSV	58.29	41.71	–	–
Panel D: WTI				
Proposal	34.93	31.98	0.11	32.98
PSVO	65.11	34.51	0.38	–
PSV	65.56	34.44	–	–

This table reports the variance decomposition of the log-variance (h_t) at the posterior parameter modes into the latent persistent component (x_t), periodic effect (tod_t^p), volume-driven time-of-day component (tod_t^v), and Sunday-opening adjustment (so_t). Entries are normalized percentage shares.

For the proposed model, across almost all assets (with the exception of WTI), the volume-driven time-of-day component explains the largest share of variation, particularly for the Nasdaq where it accounts for more than 45 percent of the total⁷. The static time-of-day factor and the persistent latent components also contribute meaningfully, while the Sunday-opening adjustment has a small percentage share overall which is consistent with its rare occurrence relative to the high-frequency sampling of intraday volatility⁸. However, the Sunday open has an effect on volatility that is statistically significant and economically meaningful. This is in line with the findings in Martins et al. (2025), who show that for the WTI futures Sunday open is the second most important event

⁷In the robustness check section in the Appendix C, where we estimated the model on four smaller subsamples, we find that the share of variability explained by the tod_t^v component changes over time, nonetheless, in most cases remains an important component.

⁸If the variance decomposition table is restricted to Sundays only, the explained share of the variability increases substantially, see Appendix D for details.

for high frequency volatility, comparable to that of DOE⁹ Crude Oil Inventory announcements, and doubling the effect of the FOMC¹⁰ Rate Decision announcement.


When comparing the variance decomposition with that of the restricted models, two notable features emerge: the reallocation of variability and the stability of the remaining components. In particular, once the volume-driven component is included, almost all variability is transferred from the persistent component. This leads to a dramatic reduction in the variance of the variance parameter (as reported in Appendix E), indicating a more stable volatility process. The improvement reflects a meaningful reallocation of explained variability from unobserved persistence to observed lagged trading volume, providing a more interpretable and data-driven structure. This, in turn, translates into notable gains in one-step-ahead forecasting accuracy, as demonstrated in the subsequent sections. Moreover, the share of explained variability of the remaining components remains largely stable, particularly for the deterministic time-of-day effects. A plot illustrating the component-wise volatility decomposition for a small subsample can be seen in Appendix F.

Figure 1 shows the posterior means of the volume-driven time-of-day effects in the standard deviation scale, $\exp(\beta^v/2)$, together with their 90 percent credible intervals, across Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d). In all cases, $\exp(\beta^v/2)$ is positive and significantly above one, confirming that higher-than-typical lagged trading activity systematically amplifies volatility. Moreover, the evolution of the estimated coefficients clearly exhibits non-constant patterns, indicating that the effect of lagged volume on volatility varies over the trading day. This finding aligns with the broader body of research on the relationship between trading volume and asset returns. For example, McMillan (2007) highlight the nonlinear nature of this relationship and provide an extensive overview of related contributions in the literature.


The figure also reveals an economically meaningful intraday structure. Almost all assets (except for the Euro) show a pronounced decline in the impact of above-average trading volume at the 18:00 ET market reopening following the daily trading break. This pattern can be attributed to two factors. First, the rise in volatility observed at reopening is largely captured by a spike in the periodic component (see Figure 2). Second, at that point, the most recent lagged-volume information comes from the previous trading session, which, from an economic perspective, should

⁹The United States Department of Energy


¹⁰The Federal Open Market Committee




(a) Nasdaq



(b) S&P 500



(c) Euro



(d) WTI

Figure 1: Volume-driven time-of-day effects

The plots show the posterior means of the volume-driven time-of-day effects in the standard deviation scale, $\exp(\beta^v/2)$, with 90% credible intervals, for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d). Values above one indicate that above-average trading volume amplifies volatility. Vertical dashed lines represent the following daily events: UK stock market opening (UK), US opening auction (Pre), US opening (US), future’s close (Close) and future’s opening (Open).

have only a limited influence on volatility at the start of a new session. Spikes are also evident around key market times: for Nasdaq, S&P 500, and WTI futures, effects vary sharply near the U.S. equity close (16:00 ET), while Euro futures display a sharp increase following the ECB fixing (8:15 ET). These patterns suggest that the interaction between intraday trading activity and volatility is closely tied to global market coordination, emphasizing the importance of a dynamic, volume-adjusted specification.

Overall, the in-sample analysis of volume-driven time-of-day effects shows that intraday fluctuations in trading activity play a central role in shaping high-frequency volatility across all four assets. These findings highlight the importance of accounting for lagged volume-related effects in volatility modeling.


3.2 Static time-of-day, Sunday-opening and persistent volatility effects

Figures 2 and 3 illustrate the posterior means of the static time-of-day and Sunday-opening effects, on the standard deviation scale, $\exp(\beta^p/2)$ and $\exp(\beta^{so}/2)$, along with 90% credible intervals, for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d).


Panels a) and b) of Figure 2 display the well-documented U-shaped intraday pattern during regular U.S. trading hours (9:30 – 16:00 ET) for Nasdaq and S&P 500 futures (Andersen and Bollerslev, 1997, 1998; Stroud and Johannes, 2014; Martins et al., 2025). Panels c) and d) show similar U-shaped patterns for Euro and WTI futures, spanning from the London open (3:00 ET) to early U.S. market trading hours and the historical pit trading hours (9:00 to 14:30 ET), respectively. In all cases, peaks coincide with major market openings and closings, highlighting the role of scheduled trading activity in shaping intraday volatility.

Figure 3 indicates a strong Sunday-opening effect with volatility rising nearly to 1.5-1.75 times its baseline level in the first 5-minutes. However, this effect quickly dissipates within 30 minutes from the opening.


Finally, Figure 4 shows the posterior means of the log-variance on the standard deviation scale, $\exp(h/2)$, for each asset reflecting the combined effect of the persistence, static and volume-driven time-of-day and Sunday-opening components. In all cases, the COVID19 pandemic is associated with a clear spike in volatility. For the Euro, however, the pandemic was not the peak volatility episode. Instead, the highest levels were observed in 2016–2017, plausibly reflecting the Brexit




(a) Nasdaq



(b) S&P 500




(c) Euro




(d) WTI

Figure 2: Static time-of-day effects


Posterior means of the static time-of-day effects in the standard deviation scale, $\exp(\beta^p/2)$, with 90% credible intervals, for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d). A value of 1.5 indicates that volatility is 1.5 times is baseline level. Vertical dashed lines represent the following daily events: UK stock market opening (UK), US opening auction (Pre), US opening (US), future's close (Close) and future's opening (Open).




(a) Nasdaq



(b) S&P 500



(c) Euro



(d) WTI

Figure 3: Sunday-opening effects

Posterior means of the Sunday-opening effects in the standard deviation scale, $\exp(\beta^{so}/2)$, with 90% credible intervals, for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d).

referendum, the U.S. presidential election, and elevated Eurozone political risk. Parameter estimation results for the proposed model and SV-based counterparts can be found in Appendix E at the end of the manuscript. Appendix E also presents the daily average of the annualized standard deviations implied by our proposed model.




Figure 4: Estimated volatility

Estimated volatility calculated at the posterior parameter modes using the proposed stochastic volatility model, $\exp(\mathbf{h}/2)$, for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d). The annualized equivalent volatility is presented in Appendix E.

4 Out-of-sample results and applications

Although achieving a good in-sample fit is important, the true measure of a model’s value lies in its predictive performance and practical applicability. Our results demonstrate that the proposed model performs exceptionally well on both fronts. We evaluate the one-step-ahead out-of-sample performance of the four stochastic volatility models described in Table 1, a GARCH(1,1) and benchmark autoregressive realized volatility models (AR1–RV, AR6–RV, AR12–RV, HAR) for

Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI crude oil during the period from January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. For the SV models specified in Table 1, we fix parameters on their in-sample posterior modes and rely on a particle filter Gordon et al. (1993) to update latent states. For GARCH and RV-based benchmark models, we fix parameters on their maximum likelihood estimates.

4.1 Volatility forecasts

We evaluate the one-step-ahead out-of-sample predictive performance using three complementary approaches. First, we consider the Mincer–Zarnowitz (MZ) regression, which provides a direct test of forecast unbiasedness and efficiency. Specifically, 5-minute realized volatility, calculated as the square root of the sum of squared one-minute returns during the corresponding 5-minute window, is regressed on a one-step-ahead forecast produced by a competing model:

$$rvol_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{t|t-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2),$$

where $\widehat{vol}_{t|t-1}^{model}$ denotes the forecasted volatility for period t made at time $t - 1$. Ideally, a model should produce $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = 1$ with high explanatory power as measured by R^2 .

Second, we implement a horse-race regression to directly compare the forecasts of the proposed specification against those of competing models. The regression is given by

$$rvol_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{t|t-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{t|t-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \varepsilon_t \sim \mathbf{N}(0, \sigma^2),$$

where the competitor is any alternative benchmark. If $\beta_1 = 1$, the proposal dominates, while $\beta_1 = 0$ implies that only the competitor contains all predictive information. Values of β_1 greater than one indicate that the competitor’s forecast contributes negatively once the proposal is included, further reinforcing the superiority of the proposed approach.

Finally, we complement these regression-based diagnostics with the Diebold–Mariano (DM) test of equal predictive ability, using squared, absolute, and Qlike forecast errors (Patton, 2011). The DM statistic evaluates whether differences in forecast accuracy across models are statistically significant, with negative values favoring the proposal. Together, these metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of the forecasting performance and their statistical significance.

Table 4 reports the combined results across all assets. Columns 2-4 present the MZ regression estimates of α_0 , α_1 , and the associated R^2 . Columns 5-6 show the estimates of β_1 and its t -statistic from the horse-race regressions. Columns 7-12 report average squared, absolute (scaled by 10^{-3}) and Qlike forecast errors together with DM statistics relative to the proposal.

The MZ results show that the proposed model is consistently the best performing across all markets. In every case, $\hat{\alpha}_0$ is closer to zero and $\hat{\alpha}_1$ closer to unity than for competing models, and R^2 values are substantially higher. For instance, the R^2 ranges from 0.65 for Euro futures to 0.75 for Nasdaq, while the best competitor typically delivers values below 0.55. These results indicate that the proposal produces forecasts that are both the closest of being unbiased and more informative about realized volatility.

The horse-race regressions reinforce this finding. Across all assets, $\hat{\beta}_1$ lies very close to one and is in some cases above unity, implying that once the forecast from the proposal is included, the competitor adds little or even negative information. Taken together, the horse-race regressions show that the proposal systematically outperforms its restricted variants (including traditional stochastic volatility), GARCH, and RV-based benchmarks. The relatively poor performance of GARCH model, as compared to its counterpart - vanilla SV model - is not surprising, given the ample evidence in the literature of the superior performance of the SV models, both in-sample and in forecasting (Geweke et al., 1994; Kim et al., 1998b; Yu, 2002; Carnero et al., 2004; Chan and Grant, 2016; Pang and Zhao, 2025). The superiority of the SV model variants versus the RV-based benchmarks in the high-frequency volatility modeling was documented in Martins and Lopes (2025).

The DM tests provide formal evidence that these gains are statistically significant. Using three loss functions, the null hypothesis of equal predictive accuracy is overwhelmingly rejected in favor of the proposal. The statistics are large in magnitude and consistently negative, indicating that the proposed model achieves strictly lower forecast losses across equity, currency, and commodity markets.

Overall, the evidence across all tests and assets consistently supports the superior performance of including lagged volume-driven time-of-day effects. As a robustness check, we have checked the forecasting performance using different proxies for the volatility, namely, absolute 5-minute returns and realized kernels (Bartlett and Parzen), and the obtained results are qualitatively identical and

Table 3: Forecasting results with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute		Qlike	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg.	DM
Panel A: Nasdaq											
Proposal	-0.001	1.027	0.748			1.045		16.995		-4.992	
PSVO	0.005	0.901	0.553	1.167	396.075	1.880	-17.976	22.219	-106.798	-4.710	-20.897
PSV	0.006	0.896	0.546	1.153	402.542	1.912	-17.553	22.309	-105.609	-4.706	-20.977
SV	0.005	0.921	0.459	1.158	477.689	2.254	-21.750	24.771	-135.357	-4.395	-13.234
GARCH	0.005	0.913	0.421	1.107	503.270	2.414	-24.391	25.669	-135.500	-4.440	-18.977
AR1-RV	0.008	0.914	0.409	1.023	506.604	2.469	-22.543	25.759	-127.506	-4.344	-12.478
AR6-RV	0.003	0.966	0.513	1.022	420.258	2.020	-18.826	22.496	-95.504	-4.507	-9.108
AR12-RV	0.002	0.974	0.519	1.029	414.813	1.994	-18.291	22.392	-95.359	-4.553	-10.587
HAR	0.004	0.962	0.480	1.028	449.002	2.159	-21.701	23.832	-112.221	-4.516	-11.094
Panel B: SP500											
Proposal	0.000	1.033	0.733			0.629		13.507		-5.438	
PSVO	0.005	0.896	0.550	1.214	375.134	1.070	-15.950	17.004	-99.825	-5.216	-24.682
PSV	0.005	0.894	0.544	1.197	380.797	1.086	-14.677	17.086	-99.179	-5.212	-24.708
SV	0.004	0.914	0.470	1.196	445.672	1.251	-17.575	18.729	-128.443	-4.946	-15.431
GARCH	0.003	0.949	0.433	1.134	466.908	1.330	-19.409	19.328	-129.089	-4.981	-14.842
AR1-RV	0.004	0.931	0.414	1.030	475.494	1.377	-19.013	19.881	-128.651	-4.966	-22.944
AR6-RV	0.002	0.971	0.520	1.037	387.376	1.124	-14.667	17.182	-89.675	-5.087	-10.128
AR12-RV	0.001	0.978	0.526	1.047	382.482	1.111	-14.263	17.079	-88.848	-5.114	-11.070
HAR	0.002	0.969	0.485	1.037	418.139	1.206	-17.345	18.227	-107.729	-5.091	-15.588
Panel C: Euro											
Proposal	0.000	0.999	0.652			0.157		7.581		-6.529	
PSVO	0.000	1.014	0.423	1.018	353.922	0.261	-16.876	8.624	-52.681	-6.379	-24.378
PSV	0.000	1.011	0.419	1.022	356.776	0.262	-16.867	8.635	-53.019	-6.374	-22.337
SV	0.001	0.994	0.373	1.001	390.275	0.283	-17.460	9.018	-66.215	-6.182	-13.111
GARCH	0.002	0.878	0.341	0.985	416.399	0.301	-19.840	9.614	-87.306	-6.222	-14.161
AR1-RV	0.002	0.983	0.293	0.965	443.572	0.320	-22.009	9.848	-91.742	-6.126	-18.469
AR6-RV	0.000	1.004	0.407	0.924	367.950	0.268	-15.785	8.666	-49.595	-6.294	-10.873
AR12-RV	0.000	0.999	0.417	0.920	360.707	0.263	-15.183	8.550	-44.850	-6.305	-11.566
HAR	0.001	0.994	0.363	0.941	398.646	0.288	-18.330	9.120	-66.867	-6.240	-13.303
Panel D: WTI											
Proposal	0.009	0.966	0.689			3.162		34.909		-3.528	
PSVO	0.012	0.896	0.470	0.900	373.737	5.406	-6.725	42.125	-71.654	-3.370	-28.945
PSV	0.013	0.888	0.453	0.905	387.348	5.578	-5.864	42.278	-71.132	-3.347	-9.991
SV	0.013	0.898	0.390	0.945	430.984	6.201	-6.702	45.334	-95.958	-2.978	-3.768
GARCH	0.018	0.779	0.356	0.934	471.040	6.875	-8.161	48.519	-109.686	-3.173	-4.374
AR1-RV	0.017	0.849	0.304	0.922	493.537	7.113	-7.960	49.060	-112.704	-3.047	-5.967
AR6-RV	0.006	0.947	0.424	0.867	410.903	5.818	-5.811	42.718	-69.921	-3.188	-3.642
AR12-RV	0.006	0.951	0.435	0.860	403.041	5.704	-5.581	42.197	-66.076	-3.173	-3.050
HAR	0.011	0.906	0.384	0.887	439.723	6.243	-6.642	44.854	-85.252	-3.157	-4.256

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $R\hat{V}_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \hat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $R\hat{V}_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \hat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \hat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-12 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the benchmark.

Table 4: Forecasting results with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute		Qlike	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg.	DM
Panel A: Nasdaq											
Proposal	-0.001	1.027	0.748			1.045		16.995		-4.992	
PSVO	0.005	0.901	0.553	1.167	396.075	1.880	-17.976	22.219	-106.798	-4.710	-20.897
PSV	0.006	0.896	0.546	1.153	402.542	1.912	-17.553	22.309	-105.609	-4.706	-20.977
SV	0.005	0.921	0.459	1.158	477.689	2.254	-21.750	24.771	-135.357	-4.395	-13.234
GARCH	0.005	0.913	0.421	1.107	503.270	2.414	-24.391	25.669	-135.500	-4.440	-18.977
AR1-RV	0.008	0.914	0.409	1.023	506.604	2.469	-22.543	25.759	-127.506	-4.344	-12.478
AR6-RV	0.003	0.966	0.513	1.022	420.258	2.020	-18.826	22.496	-95.504	-4.507	-9.108
AR12-RV	0.002	0.974	0.519	1.029	414.813	1.994	-18.291	22.392	-95.359	-4.553	-10.587
HAR	0.004	0.962	0.480	1.028	449.002	2.159	-21.701	23.832	-112.221	-4.516	-11.094
Panel B: SP500											
Proposal	0.000	1.033	0.733			0.629		13.507		-5.438	
PSVO	0.005	0.896	0.550	1.214	375.134	1.070	-15.950	17.004	-99.825	-5.216	-24.682
PSV	0.005	0.894	0.544	1.197	380.797	1.086	-14.677	17.086	-99.179	-5.212	-24.708
SV	0.004	0.914	0.470	1.196	445.672	1.251	-17.575	18.729	-128.443	-4.946	-15.431
GARCH	0.003	0.949	0.433	1.134	466.908	1.330	-19.409	19.328	-129.089	-4.981	-14.842
AR1-RV	0.004	0.931	0.414	1.030	475.494	1.377	-19.013	19.881	-128.651	-4.966	-22.944
AR6-RV	0.002	0.971	0.520	1.037	387.376	1.124	-14.667	17.182	-89.675	-5.087	-10.128
AR12-RV	0.001	0.978	0.526	1.047	382.482	1.111	-14.263	17.079	-88.848	-5.114	-11.070
HAR	0.002	0.969	0.485	1.037	418.139	1.206	-17.345	18.227	-107.729	-5.091	-15.588
Panel C: Euro											
Proposal	0.000	0.999	0.652			0.157		7.581		-6.529	
PSVO	0.000	1.014	0.423	1.018	353.922	0.261	-16.876	8.624	-52.681	-6.379	-24.378
PSV	0.000	1.011	0.419	1.022	356.776	0.262	-16.867	8.635	-53.019	-6.374	-22.337
SV	0.001	0.994	0.373	1.001	390.275	0.283	-17.460	9.018	-66.215	-6.182	-13.111
GARCH	0.002	0.878	0.341	0.985	416.399	0.301	-19.840	9.614	-87.306	-6.222	-14.161
AR1-RV	0.002	0.983	0.293	0.965	443.572	0.320	-22.009	9.848	-91.742	-6.126	-18.469
AR6-RV	0.000	1.004	0.407	0.924	367.950	0.268	-15.785	8.666	-49.595	-6.294	-10.873
AR12-RV	0.000	0.999	0.417	0.920	360.707	0.263	-15.183	8.550	-44.850	-6.305	-11.566
HAR	0.001	0.994	0.363	0.941	398.646	0.288	-18.330	9.120	-66.867	-6.240	-13.303
Panel D: WTI											
Proposal	0.009	0.966	0.689			3.162		34.909		-3.528	
PSVO	0.012	0.896	0.470	0.900	373.737	5.406	-6.725	42.125	-71.654	-3.370	-28.945
PSV	0.013	0.888	0.453	0.905	387.348	5.578	-5.864	42.278	-71.132	-3.347	-9.991
SV	0.013	0.898	0.390	0.945	430.984	6.201	-6.702	45.334	-95.958	-2.978	-3.768
GARCH	0.018	0.779	0.356	0.934	471.040	6.875	-8.161	48.519	-109.686	-3.173	-4.374
AR1-RV	0.017	0.849	0.304	0.922	493.537	7.113	-7.960	49.060	-112.704	-3.047	-5.967
AR6-RV	0.006	0.947	0.424	0.867	410.903	5.818	-5.811	42.718	-69.921	-3.188	-3.642
AR12-RV	0.006	0.951	0.435	0.860	403.041	5.704	-5.581	42.197	-66.076	-3.173	-3.050
HAR	0.011	0.906	0.384	0.887	439.723	6.243	-6.642	44.854	-85.252	-3.157	-4.256

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-12 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the benchmark.

quantitatively similar, see Appendix G at the end of the manuscript for details.

4.2 Volatility-managed portfolios

An important question is whether the statistical gains in volatility forecasting documented above translate into economically meaningful improvements. Moreira and Muir (2017) proposed a volatility-managed portfolio strategy that directly exploits time-variation in expected risk. The approach scales the portfolio’s exposure to the risky asset inversely with its forecasted volatility, thereby reducing leverage in high-volatility periods and increasing exposure in low-volatility periods. Intuitively, if volatility is predictable, then risk-adjusted returns, as measured by the Sharpe ratio, can be improved by dynamically adjusting risk rather than holding a constant exposure. While alternative evaluation frameworks exist in the literature, such as the trading strategies in Degiannakis and Filis (2022), Degiannakis and Kafousaki (2025), and Delis et al. (2025), these typically require option-implied volatility indices and longer forecasting horizons, making them less suited for our high-frequency setting where several assets lack such instruments. The volatility-managed portfolio approach offers a flexible alternative, applicable to any asset and forecast horizon.

Formally, the return on the volatility-managed portfolio, y_t^{vm} , in each period t is given by

$$y_t^{vm} = \frac{c}{vol_{t|t-1}^{model}} y_t,$$

where, as before, $vol_{t|t-1}^{model}$ denotes the forecasted volatility for period t made at time $t - 1$, y_t is the asset return and c is a constant chosen to ensure y_t^{vm} and y_t have the same unconditional volatility¹¹. The portfolio weight of the risky asset at each period t is given by $w_t = \frac{c}{vol_{t|t-1}^{model}}$, with the remaining weight allocated to cash. A more realistic condition can be achieved by enforcing a no-leverage, no-short-sale constraint, i.e., by restricting $w_t \in [0, 1]$.

Table 5 reports the performance of volatility-managed portfolios across Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro and WTI futures. For each asset, we present average annualized returns (in percent) and annualized Sharpe ratios for the unmanaged (buy and hold) benchmark and for volatility-managed strategies based on competing volatility models. After obtaining the unrestricted portfolio, we also construct a no-leverage, no-short-sale portfolio (NoLS), and calculate its Sharpe ratio. Next, we calculate the

¹¹As explained in Moreira and Muir (2017), the choice of c does not affect the Sharpe ratio.

total turn-over $TO = \sum_{t=1}^T |w_t - w_{t-1}|$ and the break-even transaction cost $BE = \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T y_t^{vm} - \sum_{t=1}^T y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^T |w_t - w_{t-1}|}$.

The “NA” value of *Break – even* in Table 5 means that the average return of the managed volatility portfolio with no leverage no short portfolio is smaller than buy and hold portfolio.

Table 5: Volatility-managed portfolios

	Nasdaq				S&P 500			
	<i>Avg</i>	<i>Sharpe</i>	<i>Sharpe – NoLS</i>	<i>Break – even</i>	<i>Avg</i>	<i>Sharpe</i>	<i>Sharpe – NoLS</i>	<i>Break – even</i>
Not Managed	0.03	0.14	NA	NA	0.04	0.19	NA	NA
Proposal	0.79	3.28	1.47	0.77	0.64	3.52	1.54	0.63
SSVO	0.38	1.56	0.54	0.30	0.30	1.61	0.65	0.24
SSV	0.38	1.56	0.54	0.29	0.30	1.61	0.64	0.23
SV	0.22	0.90	0.34	0.13	0.21	1.15	0.54	0.18
GARCH	0.12	0.49	0.23	0.11	0.12	0.64	0.34	0.17
AR1-RV	0.22	0.93	0.39	0.08	0.14	0.74	0.43	0.06
AR6-RV	0.18	0.76	0.35	0.16	0.14	0.76	0.39	0.11
AR12-RV	0.18	0.76	0.34	0.16	0.14	0.76	0.38	0.11
HAR	0.22	0.90	0.35	0.08	0.17	0.92	0.44	0.07

	Euro				WTI			
	<i>Avg</i>	<i>Sharpe</i>	<i>Sharpe – NoLS</i>	<i>Break – even</i>	<i>Avg</i>	<i>Sharpe</i>	<i>Sharpe – NoLS</i>	<i>Break – even</i>
Not Managed	-0.03	-0.37	NA	NA	0.07	0.17	NA	NA
Proposal	0.00	0.05	-0.37	0.03	0.32	0.81	0.93	0.50
SSVO	-0.02	-0.28	-0.53	NA	0.20	0.50	0.24	0.00
SSV	-0.03	-0.31	-0.59	NA	0.24	0.60	0.30	0.08
SV	-0.04	-0.52	-0.66	NA	0.12	0.31	0.25	0.02
GARCH	-0.05	-0.56	-0.59	NA	0.10	0.25	0.18	NA
AR1-RV	-0.04	-0.46	-0.63	NA	0.12	0.31	0.16	NA
AR6-RV	-0.04	-0.52	-0.61	NA	0.17	0.43	0.26	0.04
AR12-RV	-0.04	-0.49	-0.57	NA	0.17	0.43	0.28	0.07
HAR	-0.04	-0.41	-0.56	NA	0.20	0.50	0.26	0.03

The table reports annualized average returns (*Avg*) and Sharpe ratios for unmanaged portfolios and for volatility-managed strategies based on competing volatility models. *Sharpe – NoLS* and *Break – even* (in *bps*) reports the Sharpe ratio and break-even transaction cost of the no leverage no short managed volatility portfolio. The “NA” value in *Break – even* means that the average return of the managed volatility portfolio with no leverage no short portfolio is smaller than buy and hold portfolio. Results are shown for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures.

Three key patterns emerge. First, volatility management delivers large economic gains relative to the unmanaged portfolios: Sharpe ratios increase markedly, particularly for equity index futures. For example, in the S&P 500 and Nasdaq, the Sharpe ratios of the unmanaged portfolios are 0.19 and 0.13, respectively, but rise above 3.0 under our proposed specification. Second, across all assets, the proposal dominates competing approaches (SSVO, PSV, SV, GARCH, and RV-based benchmarks), yielding consistently higher average returns and Sharpe ratios. Third, these conclusions hold even for a no-leverage, no-short portfolio. However, due to the high trading frequency, the break-even transaction cost is small, consistent with evidence that high-frequency

trading offers limited profit opportunities. In short, these improvements reflect the proposal’s ability to better time volatility and hence scale exposure more effectively.

The benefits are especially pronounced in equity index futures, where risk timing appears most valuable, but meaningful gains are also present in commodities (WTI) and currencies (Euro). In contrast, traditional SV and GARCH-based strategies yield relatively modest improvements, while AR1-RV often fail to deliver positive economic gains. Overall, Table 5 highlights that more accurate high-frequency volatility forecasts translate directly into superior portfolio performance when applied in a volatility-managed framework.

5 Conclusion

This paper develops a framework for modeling high-frequency volatility that jointly accounts for persistent behavior, static time-of-day adjustments, and volume-driven time-of-days effects. By conditioning intraday periodicity on past short-term departures from typical intraday trading volume, our model captures timely and economically relevant deviations from static volatility patterns, providing a more accurate and microstructure-consistent description of intraday risk dynamics.

Across equity indexes, currency, and commodity futures, the volume-driven component explains a large share of intraday volatility variation, highlighting the empirical importance of conditioning on trading activity. In particular, the volume-driven component absorbs part of the variability from the persistent component, leading to a more stable volatility process: part of the noisy, unobserved stochastic variation is now captured through observed trading activity. Furthermore, the model not only reproduces well-known U-shaped volatility patterns but also uncovers features associated with global trading activity. It indicates that the deviations from the time-of-day average volume are deeply tied to volatility. Our findings are consistent with the Sequential Information Arrival Hypothesis (SIAH) literature by showing that the lead–lag relationship between trading volume and volatility also holds in a high-frequency setting. Moreover, we find that the strength of this relationship is time-varying: information flows shape return volatility differently depending on which market is open at a given time. Nonetheless, the relationship remains consistently statistically significant.

Out-of-sample forecast comparisons provide strong evidence in favor of the proposed specifica-

tion. In Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, our model yields intercepts close to zero, slopes close to one, and the highest explanatory power across all assets. Horse-race regressions confirm that once our forecasts are included, those from competing models contribute little to none additional information. Moreover, Diebold–Mariano tests overwhelmingly reject equal predictive accuracy and favor our specification under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. The results are robust even when different volatility proxies are used, as well as for different subsamples. Together, these findings indicate that the model provides the most accurate forecasts of realized volatility among the alternatives considered.

From an economic perspective, these statistical improvements translate into superior portfolio performance. When applied to volatility-managed investment strategies, our forecasts consistently improve Sharpe ratios relative to unmanaged benchmarks and competing volatility models. The benefits are most striking in equity index futures, where dynamic exposure based on our specification more than triples the Sharpe ratio compared to GARCH or standard stochastic volatility alternatives. Overall, our results suggest that lagged trading volume provides a critical dimension for understanding and forecasting intraday volatility.

Declaration of generative AI and AI-assisted technologies in the writing process

During the preparation of this work the authors used ChatGPT in order to check for grammar errors and improve readability. After using this tool/service, the authors reviewed and edited the content as needed and take full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Appendix

A Descriptive statistics and plots

Table 6 reports the summary statistics of five-minute log-returns and trading volumes for the Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures over the sample period from January 2016 to August 2024. As expected, returns exhibit near-zero means with substantial excess kurtosis and negative skewness (except for Euro), reflecting the leptokurtic and asymmetric nature of high-frequency financial returns. Unconditional volatility (as captured by standard deviation) is highest for WTI and lowest for the Euro. Trading volumes vary considerably across assets, with the S&P 500 showing the largest average volume, consistent with its market depth and liquidity.

Table 6: Summary statistics

	Mean	Std	Q2	Min	Max	Skew	Kurt	n_{ins}	n_{oos}
Panel A: Nasdaq									
Return (percent)	0.000	0.084	0.000	-4.304	2.828	-0.953	85.482	420713	189182
Volume (1,000 contracts)	1.693	2.758	0.509	0.000	44.085	3.130	16.748	–	–
Panel B: S&P 500									
Return (percent)	0.000	0.069	0.000	-4.194	2.782	-1.199	139.143	420746	189182
Volume (1,000 contracts)	5.444	9.793	1.369	0.000	275.823	4.823	50.257	–	–
Panel C: Euro									
Return (percent)	0.000	0.029	0.000	-1.045	1.531	0.246	61.937	425077	190208
Volume (1,000 contracts)	0.644	0.896	0.386	0.000	44.343	6.304	91.629	–	–
Panel D: WTI									
Return (percent)	0.000	0.196	0.000	-41.388	30.118	-14.365	5672.061	424924	189443
Volume (1,000 contracts)	1.297	2.155	0.563	0.000	93.090	5.659	70.710	–	–

The table reports summary statistics of the 5-minute log-returns (in percentage) and trading volumes (1,000 contracts) for two market indices (Nasdaq and S&P 500), exchange rate (Euro) and commodity (WTI) from January 3, 2016 to August 30, 2024. n_{ins} and n_{oos} stand for the number of observations in-sample and out-of-sample.

Figure 5 complements the descriptive statistics table by illustrating the joint dynamics of absolute returns (in black, scale on the left) and trading volumes (1,000 contracts, in gray, inverted scale in the right). Both series display pronounced clustering, particularly around major market stress episodes such as the 2020 volatility spike. The mirror plotting permits to illustrate the close co-movement between return volatility and trading activity: periods of heightened volatility tend to coincide with elevated trading volumes.




Figure 5: Descriptive plots

The plots draw the evolution of absolute 5-minute log-returns, in black (scale on the left) and volume, in gray (1,000 contracts, inverted scale on the right) from January 3, 2016 to August 30, 2024 for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro and WTI (Panels a-d).

B MCMC algorithm

Our proposed model described in Section 2.2 is defined by Equations (1) - (7). To facilitate efficient sampling, we apply log-linearization to Equation (1) and approximate $u_t = \log(\varepsilon_t^2)$ with a finite mixture of seven Gaussian components (Kim et al., 1998a). A summary of the equations required for sampling as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\log(y_t^2) &= h_t + u_t \text{ with } u_t \sim \mathbf{N}(\mu_{c,t}, \sigma_{c,t}^2), \\ h_t &= m_0 + x_t + tod_t^p + tod_t^v + so_t, \\ x_t &= \phi x_{t-1} + \sigma_x \eta_{x,t} \text{ with } \eta_{x,t} \sim \mathbf{N}(0, 1), \\ tod_t^p &= \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^p \text{ with } \sum_{k=1}^K \beta_k^p = 0, \\ tod_t^v &= v_{t-1} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^v, \\ so_t &= \mathbf{H}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{so}.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = (m_0, \phi, \sigma_x^2, \boldsymbol{\beta}^p, \boldsymbol{\beta}^v, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{so}, \{x_t\}_{t=1}^T)$ be the set of model parameters and latent states. And let $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ be all the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ except the ones we sample from in a given step of the MCMC chain. For each iteration, the MCMC scheme samples from the following full conditional posterior distributions.

1) Sample $\phi | \boldsymbol{\Psi}, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate Gaussian distribution. We consider the persistent equation as a linear regression, $x_t \sim \phi x_{t-1}$. Then the conditional posterior distribution of ϕ is a conjugate Gaussian distribution given a Gaussian prior and a Gaussian likelihood. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\phi | \boldsymbol{\Psi}, \mathbf{y} &\sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\phi}, \hat{V}_\phi), \text{ where} \\ \hat{V}_\phi &= \left(\frac{1}{V_{\phi_0}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_x^2} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{t-1} x_{t-1} \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{\phi} &= \hat{V}_\phi \left(\frac{\phi_0}{V_{\phi_0}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_x^2} \sum_{t=1}^T x_t x_{t-1} \right).\end{aligned}$$

2) Sample $\sigma_x^2 | \boldsymbol{\Psi}, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate inverse Gamma distribution. We use the linear representation of the persistent component. The conditional posterior distribution of σ_x^2 is a conjugate inverse

Gamma distribution due to an inverse Gamma prior and a Gaussian likelihood. We have that

$$\sigma_x^2 | \Psi, \mathbf{y} \sim \mathbf{IG} \left(\alpha_{\sigma_\eta} + \frac{T}{2}, \beta_{\sigma_\eta} + \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T (x_t - \phi x_{t-1})^2}{2} \right).$$

3) Sample the mixture component $\{c_t, \mu_{c,t}, \sigma_{c,t}^2\}_{t=1}^T | \Psi$ following (Kim et al., 1998a). We first sample $\{c_t\}_{t=1}^T$ from the posterior probability

$$\pi(c_t = c | \Psi) \propto \mathbb{P}(c_t = c) \frac{1}{\sigma_c} \exp \left\{ -\frac{(u_t - \mu_c)^2}{2\sigma_c^2} \right\},$$

where $\mathbb{P}(c_t = c)$ is the mixture weight of the c -th Gaussian component with mean μ_c and variance σ_c^2 (Kim et al., 1998a). Then set the $\{\mu_{c,t}, \sigma_{c,t}^2\}_{t=1}^T$ as the mean and variance of the c_t -th Gaussian component.

4) Sample $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T | \Psi, \mathbf{y}$ following in Carter and Kohn (1994) and Frühwirth-Schnatter (1994). We rewrite the model in terms of measurement and state equations as,

$$\begin{aligned} \log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^p - tod_t^v - so_t &= x_t + u_t, \\ x_t &= \phi x_{t-1} + \sigma_x \eta_{x,t}. \end{aligned}$$

We sample the conditional posterior distribution of $\{x_t\}_{t=1}^T$ from a Gaussian linear state space model using the Forward Filtering Backward Sampling (FFBS) algorithm.

5) Sample $m_0 | \Psi, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate Gaussian distribution. We rewrite the log-linearized model as a linear regression,

$$\log y_t^2 - x_t - tod_t^p - tod_t^v - so_t = m_0 + u_t.$$

The conditional posterior distribution of m_0 is a Gaussian distribution due to a Gaussian prior and a Gaussian likelihood. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} m_0 | \Psi, \mathbf{y} &\sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\mu}_{m_0}, \hat{V}_{m_0}), \\ \hat{V}_{m_0} &= \left(V_{m_0}^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c,t}^2} \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{\mu}_{m_0} &= \hat{V}_{m_0} \left(V_{m_0}^{-1} \mu_{m_0} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c,t}^2} (\log y_t^2 - x_t - tod_t^p - tod_t^v - so_t - \mu_{c,t}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

6) Sample $\{\beta_k^p\}_{k=1}^{K-1}|\Psi, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate Gaussian distribution. We rewrite the log-linearized model as a linear regression,

$$\begin{aligned}\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^v - so_t &= \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^p + u_t, \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (I_{t,k} - I_{t,K}) \beta_k^p + u_t.\end{aligned}$$

Then the conditional posterior distribution of $\{\beta_k^p\}_{k=1}^{K-1}$ is a conjugate Gaussian distribution due to a Gaussian prior and a Gaussian likelihood. We have that,

$$\begin{aligned}\{\beta_k^p\}_{k=1}^{K-1}|\Psi, \mathbf{y} &\sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^p, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^p}), \\ \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^p} &= \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^p}^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t' \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^p &= \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^p} \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^p}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^p + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t' (\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^v - so_t - \mu_{c,t}) \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t = (I_{t,1} - I_{t,K}, \dots, I_{t,K-1} - I_{t,K})$, and set $\beta_K^p = - \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \beta_k^p$.

7) Sample $\beta^v|\Psi, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate Gaussian distribution. We rewrite the log-linearized model as a linear regression,

$$\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^p - so_t = v_{t-1} \mathbf{I}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^v + u_t.$$

Then the conditional posterior distribution of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^v$ is a conjugate Gaussian distribution due to a Gaussian prior and a Gaussian likelihood.

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\beta}^v|\Psi, \mathbf{y} &\sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^v, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^v}), \\ \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^v} &= \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^v}^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} v_{t-1}^2 \mathbf{I}_t' \mathbf{I}_t \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^v &= \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^v} \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^v}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^v + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} v_{t-1} \mathbf{I}_t' (\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^p - so_t - \mu_{c,t}) \right).\end{aligned}$$

8) Sample $\beta^{so}|\Psi, \mathbf{y}$ from a conjugate Gaussian distribution. We rewrite the log-linearized model as a linear regression,

$$\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^p - tod_t^v = \mathbf{H}_t' \boldsymbol{\beta}^{so} + u_t.$$

Then the conditional posterior distribution of β^{so} is a conjugate Gaussian distribution due to a Gaussian prior and a Gaussian likelihood. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}\beta^{so}|\Psi, \mathbf{y} &\sim \mathbf{N}(\hat{\beta}^{so}, \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^{so}}), \\ \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^{so}} &= \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^{so}}^{-1} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} \mathbf{H}_t' \mathbf{H}_t \right)^{-1}, \\ \hat{\beta}^{so} &= \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{\beta^{so}} \left(\mathbf{V}_{\beta_0^{so}}^{-1} \beta_0^{so} + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{\sigma_{c_t}^2} \mathbf{H}_t' (\log y_t^2 - m_0 - tod_t^p - tod_t^v - \mu_{c,t}) \right).\end{aligned}$$

C Robustness check: subsample analysis

As a robustness check for the forecasting exercise, we split the data into four subperiods:

1. Estimation: 2016–2017, Forecast: 2018
2. Estimation: 2018–2019, Forecast: 2020
3. Estimation: 2020–2021, Forecast: 2022
4. Estimation: 2022–2023, Forecast: 2024

The forecasting results using the 5-minute realized volatility proxy are available in Tables 7 – 10. Out of all assets and subsamples, the Proposed model overwhelmingly outperforms all other competing models, with one notable exception: WTI data for the 2020 forecasting period. This is not surprising given that the sample used for estimation, 2018–2019, was a relatively calm period, and the model could not forecast the unprecedented movements in crude oil markets that occurred during the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020. Nonetheless, for the other three assets, the Proposed model produces the best out-of-sample results even for the COVID-19 period.

Table 7: Forecasting results for NASDAQ subsamples with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM
Panel A: 2016-2017-2018									
Proposal	0.003	0.961	0.728			1.015		17.887	
PSVO	0.002	1.022	0.620	0.830	171.432	1.425	-10.440	20.967	-39.422
PSV	0.002	1.016	0.610	0.841	178.354	1.462	-10.477	21.071	-39.793
SV	0.002	1.029	0.535	0.895	224.997	1.745	-14.341	23.040	-55.377
GARCH	0.002	0.992	0.507	0.877	242.151	1.838	-16.486	23.677	-57.206
AR1-RV	0.007	0.997	0.473	0.879	260.058	2.003	-16.755	24.284	-59.838
AR6-RV	0.002	1.002	0.585	0.786	203.207	1.550	-10.595	21.256	-36.560
AR12-RV	0.002	1.001	0.589	0.783	200.112	1.531	-10.388	21.177	-35.944
HAR	0.004	0.996	0.539	0.836	227.193	1.725	-14.018	22.634	-48.534
Panel B: 2018-2019-2020									
Proposal	0.003	0.974	0.726			2.799		25.486	
PSVO	-0.003	1.082	0.616	0.826	175.481	3.963	-9.866	31.118	-43.374
PSV	-0.002	1.081	0.593	0.859	190.072	4.196	-8.001	31.339	-43.142
SV	-0.001	1.061	0.521	0.949	230.601	4.920	-9.107	34.074	-56.988
GARCH	0.005	0.930	0.523	0.878	233.298	4.892	-10.050	35.076	-58.149
AR1-RV	0.008	1.059	0.475	0.864	260.157	5.509	-10.229	35.815	-58.386
AR6-RV	0.003	1.020	0.585	0.793	200.572	4.252	-6.447	31.110	-37.084
AR12-RV	0.002	1.016	0.593	0.793	194.744	4.164	-6.248	30.896	-36.409
HAR	0.004	1.030	0.544	0.839	223.004	4.694	-8.294	33.041	-47.673
Panel C: 2020-2021-2022									
Proposal	0.002	0.985	0.702			1.938		24.166	
PSVO	0.011	0.854	0.486	1.040	233.065	3.441	-11.014	31.066	-59.118
PSV	0.011	0.848	0.477	1.042	238.126	3.506	-10.969	31.227	-59.228
SV	0.010	0.873	0.384	1.092	279.058	4.060	-13.585	34.503	-79.280
GARCH	0.016	0.787	0.339	1.046	302.561	4.470	-16.030	36.002	-78.927
AR1-RV	0.020	0.828	0.337	0.989	298.615	4.434	-14.370	35.038	-70.566
AR6-RV	0.008	0.926	0.436	0.976	251.544	3.689	-11.868	31.254	-54.105
AR12-RV	0.006	0.943	0.442	0.974	248.090	3.639	-11.522	31.169	-54.063
HAR	0.011	0.906	0.399	0.975	268.681	3.939	-13.717	33.013	-63.506
Panel D: 2022-2023-2024									
Proposal	0.004	0.867	0.750			0.556		12.983	
PSVO	0.001	0.896	0.595	0.732	179.236	0.868	-5.450	16.858	-40.980
PSV	0.001	0.888	0.589	0.735	182.981	0.883	-5.638	16.917	-41.181
SV	0.002	0.877	0.486	0.791	227.737	1.092	-8.287	18.941	-55.458
GARCH	-0.001	0.877	0.449	0.792	244.450	1.207	-9.957	21.179	-71.507
AR1-RV	-0.011	1.052	0.435	0.791	247.423	1.240	-10.333	23.182	-90.971
AR6-RV	-0.004	1.019	0.537	0.726	212.699	0.964	-6.286	17.758	-45.912
AR12-RV	-0.003	1.016	0.546	0.721	209.317	0.942	-5.952	17.212	-40.923
HAR	-0.006	1.030	0.505	0.749	223.986	1.039	-7.454	19.210	-58.320

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for four subsamples. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-10 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared and absolute loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

Table 8: Forecasting results for S&P 500 subsamples with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM
Panel A: 2016-2017-2018									
Proposal	0.002	1.074	0.741			0.633		14.450	
PSVO	0.003	1.025	0.601	1.040	190.711	0.935	-7.774	16.787	-41.745
PSV	0.003	1.019	0.592	1.052	196.931	0.955	-8.099	16.846	-41.977
SV	0.003	1.038	0.537	1.045	232.035	1.087	-10.190	18.123	-56.400
GARCH	0.004	0.989	0.513	0.992	244.531	1.130	-11.243	18.295	-53.070
AR1-RV	0.003	1.035	0.469	0.984	267.749	1.242	-12.752	19.186	-60.936
AR6-RV	0.001	1.011	0.584	0.873	205.630	0.959	-7.380	16.774	-34.091
AR12-RV	0.001	1.007	0.590	0.872	201.822	0.945	-7.158	16.708	-33.324
HAR	0.001	1.017	0.539	0.935	230.834	1.065	-9.862	17.860	-47.698
Panel B: 2018-2019-2020									
Proposal	-0.003	1.086	0.741			2.667		23.106	
PSVO	-0.005	1.130	0.610	1.147	192.295	4.041	-10.558	28.140	-46.919
PSV	-0.004	1.114	0.581	1.122	209.678	4.308	-7.837	28.337	-43.396
SV	-0.002	1.107	0.520	1.152	247.009	4.917	-8.177	30.417	-52.880
GARCH	0.005	0.945	0.526	0.976	238.100	4.796	-8.780	31.076	-51.745
AR1-RV	0.009	1.054	0.458	0.989	273.242	5.641	-9.345	32.501	-54.464
AR6-RV	0.003	1.019	0.574	0.909	210.030	4.316	-6.199	28.083	-34.552
AR12-RV	0.002	1.015	0.584	0.913	203.757	4.212	-6.018	27.875	-33.987
HAR	0.004	1.030	0.534	0.968	233.167	4.748	-7.898	29.708	-43.714
Panel C: 2020-2021-2022									
Proposal	0.003	0.971	0.686			1.161		19.405	
PSVO	0.010	0.837	0.479	1.069	223.924	1.990	-10.522	24.271	-57.049
PSV	0.010	0.834	0.470	1.070	228.744	2.025	-9.832	24.351	-56.547
SV	0.009	0.850	0.388	1.089	263.838	2.300	-11.472	26.678	-75.519
GARCH	0.010	0.878	0.346	1.028	277.609	2.441	-12.684	26.670	-67.676
AR1-RV	0.014	0.836	0.338	0.975	283.122	2.495	-12.353	27.144	-67.784
AR6-RV	0.006	0.929	0.439	0.962	235.299	2.076	-9.673	24.183	-49.405
AR12-RV	0.004	0.945	0.445	0.958	231.927	2.049	-9.423	24.093	-49.034
HAR	0.007	0.910	0.402	0.956	253.211	2.221	-11.439	25.529	-59.229
Panel D: 2022-2023-2024									
Proposal	0.002	0.928	0.747			0.271		9.768	
PSVO	0.001	0.894	0.570	0.856	185.770	0.467	-9.599	12.065	-37.193
PSV	0.001	0.891	0.567	0.857	187.588	0.470	-9.711	12.086	-37.418
SV	0.003	0.862	0.466	0.913	231.305	0.579	-11.627	13.493	-52.307
GARCH	-0.002	0.931	0.426	0.899	244.457	0.623	-12.980	14.899	-68.226
AR1-RV	-0.008	1.011	0.407	0.896	251.310	0.681	-14.672	17.337	-99.494
AR6-RV	-0.003	1.005	0.513	0.839	212.132	0.520	-9.487	12.965	-46.622
AR12-RV	-0.002	1.004	0.522	0.836	208.223	0.507	-8.933	12.494	-40.148
HAR	-0.004	1.007	0.479	0.861	225.361	0.563	-10.963	14.092	-60.714

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for four subsamples. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-10 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared and absolute loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

Table 9: Forecasting results for Euro subsamples with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM
Panel A: 2016-2017-2018									
Proposal	0.001	0.937	0.601			0.115		7.232	
PSVO	0.003	0.858	0.327	0.980	220.895	0.196	-22.439	8.821	-54.304
PSV	0.003	0.858	0.324	0.983	221.969	0.197	-22.357	8.834	-54.633
SV	0.003	0.875	0.275	0.971	239.368	0.210	-22.120	9.161	-61.424
GARCH	0.000	0.887	0.257	0.947	246.097	0.221	-24.748	9.896	-80.447
AR1-RV	0.002	0.884	0.217	0.920	260.984	0.226	-25.460	9.751	-72.643
AR6-RV	0.001	0.951	0.309	0.893	227.717	0.199	-19.871	8.821	-49.760
AR12-RV	0.001	0.958	0.319	0.890	223.662	0.196	-19.045	8.702	-46.571
HAR	0.002	0.924	0.269	0.906	242.335	0.210	-22.338	9.197	-59.209
Panel B: 2018-2019-2020									
Proposal	0.001	0.975	0.660			0.145		7.503	
PSVO	0.000	1.036	0.470	0.954	198.622	0.227	-19.360	8.971	-49.089
PSV	0.000	1.034	0.464	0.959	201.676	0.230	-16.593	8.981	-48.676
SV	0.001	0.974	0.437	0.936	215.511	0.240	-14.873	9.338	-56.752
GARCH	0.000	0.972	0.437	0.898	217.127	0.240	-14.951	9.546	-60.607
AR1-RV	-0.002	1.213	0.375	0.903	250.375	0.277	-21.191	9.950	-65.562
AR6-RV	-0.001	1.083	0.480	0.835	200.360	0.224	-13.024	8.812	-39.676
AR12-RV	-0.001	1.061	0.492	0.822	194.236	0.218	-12.160	8.692	-36.562
HAR	-0.001	1.120	0.441	0.866	219.564	0.242	-15.882	9.224	-49.721
Panel C: 2020-2021-2022									
Proposal	0.002	0.993	0.617			0.251		9.800	
PSVO	0.003	0.985	0.367	1.020	214.129	0.415	-11.123	11.209	-34.870
PSV	0.003	0.984	0.360	1.028	216.996	0.419	-11.187	11.228	-35.175
SV	0.003	0.961	0.319	1.015	233.974	0.446	-11.693	11.739	-44.536
GARCH	0.009	0.694	0.292	0.982	264.575	0.498	-14.853	12.794	-59.607
AR1-RV	0.009	0.831	0.249	0.967	263.655	0.512	-14.834	12.557	-54.559
AR6-RV	0.004	0.929	0.352	0.929	222.433	0.424	-10.670	11.265	-32.969
AR12-RV	0.003	0.945	0.362	0.922	217.837	0.415	-10.192	11.149	-30.686
HAR	0.005	0.897	0.311	0.937	239.535	0.454	-12.340	11.777	-42.173
Panel D: 2022-2023-2024									
Proposal	0.000	0.942	0.631			0.073		5.437	
PSVO	0.000	0.874	0.358	1.005	188.057	0.129	-6.928	6.261	-28.075
PSV	0.000	0.878	0.355	0.994	188.849	0.129	-6.901	6.251	-27.486
SV	0.002	0.843	0.268	0.987	216.867	0.144	-6.893	6.385	-28.757
GARCH	0.001	0.766	0.217	0.982	234.391	0.174	-9.772	8.007	-70.604
AR1-RV	-0.001	0.828	0.189	0.934	239.891	0.185	-10.979	8.776	-86.120
AR6-RV	-0.001	0.933	0.299	0.919	206.640	0.140	-6.576	6.420	-29.416
AR12-RV	-0.001	0.945	0.307	0.921	203.777	0.136	-6.175	6.139	-21.279
HAR	-0.001	0.891	0.251	0.926	221.618	0.154	-7.968	7.137	-47.969

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for four subsamples. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-10 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared and absolute loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

Table 10: Forecasting results for WTI subsamples with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized volatility

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM
Panel A: 2016-2017-2018									
Proposal	0.004	1.021	0.737			1.546		24.646	
PSVO	0.008	0.894	0.457	1.004	275.964	3.169	-26.042	33.202	-67.480
PSV	0.009	0.889	0.447	1.008	280.819	3.228	-20.381	33.305	-67.356
SV	0.011	0.869	0.377	1.037	313.486	3.641	-20.549	35.408	-78.274
GARCH	0.013	0.733	0.347	1.007	340.483	4.177	-25.732	40.001	-97.258
AR1-RV	-0.009	1.009	0.300	1.017	340.894	4.093	-23.981	41.186	-112.147
AR6-RV	-0.003	1.000	0.410	0.973	294.965	3.409	-17.989	34.547	-72.277
AR12-RV	-0.002	0.998	0.422	0.963	290.004	3.339	-17.397	33.794	-67.240
HAR	-0.005	1.005	0.372	0.985	311.509	3.637	-20.085	36.700	-85.229
Panel B: 2018-2019-2020									
Proposal	-0.067	2.048	0.338			109.196		109.203	
PSVO	0.009	1.095	0.100	2.117	145.583	124.960	-5.535	129.469	-68.507
PSV	0.017	1.052	0.090	2.044	148.015	126.224	-5.032	129.789	-67.158
SV	-0.238	1.933	0.245	0.996	76.389	112.511	-0.974	136.629	-68.889
GARCH	0.055	0.676	0.439	0.445	149.817	91.632	2.191	94.762	17.701
AR1-RV	0.003	1.450	0.433	0.087	12.322	88.509	3.163	97.965	23.313
AR6-RV	0.003	1.139	0.508	0.088	18.335	69.720	6.259	80.381	48.635
AR12-RV	0.002	1.096	0.513	0.110	24.233	68.112	6.525	79.099	48.602
HAR	-0.002	1.244	0.491	0.054	9.838	74.432	5.283	84.942	43.344
Panel C: 2020-2021-2022									
Proposal	0.012	0.965	0.675			4.919		44.912	
PSVO	0.017	0.872	0.430	0.927	235.019	8.675	-5.301	55.131	-48.909
PSV	0.019	0.860	0.405	0.930	246.967	9.073	-4.119	55.311	-47.618
SV	0.021	0.855	0.338	0.966	273.469	10.056	-4.455	59.042	-62.000
GARCH	0.032	0.716	0.288	0.955	305.562	11.547	-5.760	64.296	-73.176
AR1-RV	0.038	0.741	0.244	0.948	315.928	11.760	-5.442	63.972	-71.785
AR6-RV	0.017	0.886	0.352	0.907	268.663	9.782	-4.165	56.593	-49.273
AR12-RV	0.015	0.898	0.362	0.902	264.209	9.608	-4.046	56.007	-47.437
HAR	0.025	0.828	0.314	0.923	285.993	10.471	-4.693	59.214	-57.828
Panel D: 2022-2023-2024									
Proposal	0.013	0.807	0.652			1.541		25.531	
PSVO	0.004	0.856	0.518	0.660	142.998	2.053	-9.872	30.559	-37.036
PSV	0.004	0.849	0.501	0.679	149.503	2.128	-10.744	30.773	-37.912
SV	0.007	0.836	0.405	0.748	182.954	2.472	-14.718	33.255	-51.163
GARCH	0.001	0.824	0.385	0.750	191.878	2.766	-19.587	37.492	-74.154
AR1-RV	-0.029	1.066	0.316	0.745	215.021	3.196	-25.352	43.796	-105.604
AR6-RV	-0.011	1.029	0.448	0.675	174.567	2.258	-11.344	32.417	-45.503
AR12-RV	-0.007	1.017	0.458	0.668	171.169	2.182	-10.118	31.091	-37.217
HAR	-0.015	1.038	0.403	0.702	189.323	2.508	-15.235	35.726	-64.371

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for four subsamples. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute realized volatility.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-10 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared and absolute loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

D Sunday opening component

Table 11 reports the variance decomposition of the latent log-variance h_t for Sundays only, calculated at the posterior parameter modes, into its persistent, static and volume-driven time-of-day, and Sunday-opening components. We compute the decomposition as the ratio of the individual component contribution to the total variability of the estimated volatility. Compared to the variance decomposition in Table 2, the share of the explained variability by the Sunday open component increases from approximately 0.1% to 3% across all assets for the Proposed model. The importance of the Sunday open component is even more pronounced in the PSVO model, where the share of the explained variability increases from 0.2-0.4% to 7-9%. These findings indicate that the overall importance of Sunday open component is relatively small because of the rare occurrence of Sunday data (only about 5% of the sample for all assets), nonetheless, it is an important component if we consider Sundays only.

Table 11: Variance decomposition for Sundays

	Persistence (x_t)	Deterministic ToD (tod_t^p)	Sunday Open (so_t)	Volume ToD (tod_t^v)
Panel A: Nasdaq				
Proposal	25.62	10.33	3.03	61.03
PSVO	80.72	11.04	8.23	—
Panel B: S&P500				
Proposal	37.54	9.83	2.83	49.81
PSVO	82.06	10.38	7.56	—
Panel C: Euro				
Proposal	33.63	12.48	3.42	50.46
PSVO	77.40	15.15	7.45	—
Panel D: WTI				
Proposal	37.82	10.20	2.55	49.43
PSVO	78.83	11.50	9.67	—

This table reports the variance decomposition of the log-variance (h_t) at the posterior parameter modes into the latent persistent component (x_t), periodic effect (tod_t^p), volume-driven time-of-day component (tod_t^v), and Sunday-opening adjustment (so_t) for Sundays only. Entries are normalized percentage shares.

Figure 6 presents the average absolute returns calculated at each 5-minute mark for Sundays vs

non-Sundays. The plots illustrate the importance of the Sunday open effect in economic terms: the spike in volatility, as proxied by the absolute returns, at Sunday open is 3 to 5 times larger than the spike in volatility when markets open any other day. As discussed in Martins et al. (2025), this is consistent with markets assimilating information accumulated during the non-trading period.




Figure 6: Average absolute returns on Sundays vs non-Sundays

The plots show the average absolute returns for each 5-minute mark in the day for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d). Black lines represent the average over all days excluding Sundays, meanwhile the gray lines represent the average for Sundays only.

E Additional results

Table 12 reports the posterior modes of the estimated model parameters for the proposed model and its restricted specifications across the four asset classes. Across all assets, the persistence parameter ϕ is close to unity, indicating a high degree of volatility persistence typical of high-frequency financial data. Since there are 276 coefficients in β^p and β^v vectors, and 6 more in β^{so} vector, we report the minimum and maximum posterior modes for each vector. Interestingly, the inclusion of volume-driven time-of-day effects considerably reduces the variance of the volatility process σ_x , resulting in more stable volatility dynamics. The rest of the parameters remain relatively similar across models. Overall, the results confirm that incorporating trading volume and time-of-day information enhances model flexibility without distorting the core volatility structure.

Table 12: Estimated model parameters

	m_0	ϕ	σ_x	$\min(\beta^f)$	$\max(\beta^f)$	$\min(\beta^{so})$	$\max(\beta^{so})$	$\min(\beta^v)$	$\max(\beta^v)$
Panel A: Nasdaq									
Proposal	-15.848	0.997	0.006	-1.375	2.904	0.101	1.098	0.956	1.792
PSVO	-15.688	0.986	0.051	-1.359	2.737	0.594	2.368	-	-
PSV	-15.684	0.986	0.052	-1.358	2.728	-	-	-	-
SV	-15.657	0.975	0.132	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panel B: S&P 500									
Proposal	-16.204	0.996	0.007	-1.610	2.332	0.144	1.047	0.715	1.589
PSVO	-16.076	0.986	0.056	-1.305	2.209	0.508	2.378	-	-
PSV	-16.068	0.985	0.058	-1.308	2.211	-	-	-	-
SV	-16.073	0.974	0.138	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panel C: Euro									
Proposal	-17.191	0.996	0.004	-1.209	1.691	0.120	0.847	0.665	1.438
PSVO	-17.077	0.970	0.039	-1.210	1.953	0.236	1.567	-	-
PSV	-17.079	0.970	0.040	-1.209	1.945	-	-	-	-
SV	-17.077	0.969	0.071	-	-	-	-	-	-
Panel D: WTI									
Proposal	-14.686	0.998	0.005	-1.445	2.345	-0.005	0.855	0.903	1.904
PSVO	-14.178	0.975	0.065	-1.428	2.239	0.338	2.503	-	-
PSV	-14.176	0.975	0.068	-1.436	2.236	-	-	-	-
SV	-14.193	0.965	0.148	-	-	-	-	-	-

The table reports the posterior modes of the estimated model parameters for the proposed model and its restricted specifications across the four asset classes.

Figure 7 presents the daily average of annualized standard deviations implied by our model

for each asset. Since volatility varies over the course of the trading day in our framework, we report the average annualized volatility within each day to facilitate the comparison with other lower frequency benchmarks. The figure reveals a sharp and synchronized spike in volatility across all four assets during the onset of the Covid-19 crisis in early 2020. For the S&P 500, Nasdaq, and WTI, annualized volatility surpasses 100%, while the Euro also exhibits a notable, though comparatively more contained, increase. All assets have plausible long-run volatility levels that are consistent with findings in the existing literature with, for example, annualized standard deviations close to 12% for the S&P 500 and near 30% for WTI.




Figure 7: Annualized standard deviation

Daily average of the estimated annualized standard deviations in percentage for Nasdaq, S&P 500, Euro, and WTI futures (Panels a–d).

F Volatility components

Figure 8 presents the total and component-wise volatility comparison between the proposed model and its restricted variant, PSVO, for a small subsample (two weeks) to facilitate readability. The proposed model is shown in gray, and the restricted PSVO model in black. The top plot displays the total volatility on a standard deviation scale. We observe that the estimated overall volatility is very similar across both models, confirming that both specifications capture the same underlying process.

The bottom four plots show the component-wise volatility decomposition for both models. The most striking differences appear in the persistence component, x_t . The proposed model estimates a smooth path for persistence, while the restricted model produces extremely noisy trajectories. These discrepancies arise because the proposed model incorporates the volume-driven component, which captures much of the variability through lagged log-volume shown in the bottom right plot. When this component is omitted, all variability is absorbed by the persistence component, making it more volatile and noisy, leading to less precise forecasts.

The remaining volatility components - namely, the periodic time-of-day (tod_t^p) and Sunday-open (so_t) effects - are nearly identical across both models. This further confirms that incorporating lagged trading volume enhances model flexibility without distorting the core volatility dynamics. In essence, the addition of the lagged volume to the model redistributes hard-to-predict uncertainty from the persistence term to the more predictable deterministic lagged-volume component.




Figure 8: Estimated volatility for the proposed model (thick gray line) and the restricted PSVO variant (thin black line) for 2 weeks in January 2016. The top plot draws the overall volatility in the standard deviation scale, the rest of the plots draw the volatility components, also in the standard deviation scale.

G Robustness check: other proxies for the volatility

As a robustness check for the forecasting exercise, we employ different proxies for the volatility: instead of the square root of the realized variance, we consider the absolute value of the 5-minute return, and realized kernel (Bartlett and Parzen) based measures, see Tables 13-15. The model ordering remains the same, with the Proposal being vastly superior as compared to its restricted variants and other standard benchmarks.

Table 13: Forecasting results with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized kernel (Parzen)

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute		Qlike	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg.	DM
Panel A: Nasdaq											
Proposal	-0.003	1.041	0.728			1.191		18.273		-5.060	
PSVO	0.005	0.891	0.513	1.274	409.557	2.164	-20.345	24.472	-125.595	-4.713	-25.851
PSV	0.005	0.887	0.506	1.254	414.478	2.197	-19.776	24.566	-123.865	-4.709	-25.905
SV	0.005	0.907	0.423	1.233	481.108	2.539	-23.582	26.883	-148.875	-4.385	-13.972
GARCH	0.005	0.901	0.388	1.164	499.093	2.692	-25.948	27.727	-146.870	-4.431	-19.876
AR1-RV	0.007	0.903	0.379	1.070	497.028	2.735	-23.998	27.568	-133.327	-4.333	-12.878
AR6-RV	0.003	0.954	0.475	1.093	422.221	2.298	-20.703	24.778	-111.750	-4.498	-9.781
AR12-RV	0.002	0.962	0.480	1.103	418.021	2.274	-20.214	24.691	-112.226	-4.546	-11.504
HAR	0.003	0.950	0.445	1.088	446.517	2.430	-23.398	25.900	-123.434	-4.508	-11.691
Panel B: SP500											
Proposal	-0.002	1.043	0.709			0.721		14.539		-5.525	
PSVO	0.004	0.886	0.510	1.319	384.341	1.231	-17.954	18.682	-117.302	-5.251	-30.845
PSV	0.004	0.884	0.504	1.296	388.452	1.248	-16.552	18.766	-116.268	-5.247	-30.814
SV	0.004	0.901	0.433	1.272	446.052	1.413	-19.139	20.330	-140.997	-4.973	-17.329
GARCH	0.002	0.935	0.400	1.189	459.581	1.485	-20.712	20.926	-140.081	-4.995	-16.958
AR1-RV	0.003	0.920	0.384	1.070	461.791	1.527	-20.635	21.357	-135.342	-4.982	-25.979
AR6-RV	0.001	0.959	0.482	1.105	386.159	1.282	-16.365	18.948	-105.882	-5.110	-12.090
AR12-RV	0.001	0.965	0.486	1.119	382.571	1.269	-15.984	18.844	-105.380	-5.137	-13.269
HAR	0.001	0.957	0.450	1.092	411.811	1.360	-19.054	19.862	-119.253	-5.111	-18.094
Panel C: Euro											
Proposal	-0.001	1.009	0.631			0.176		8.026		-6.616	
PSVO	0.000	0.993	0.385	1.087	358.161	0.292	-18.124	9.353	-66.127	-6.421	-29.477
PSV	0.000	0.990	0.381	1.090	360.971	0.294	-18.117	9.363	-66.355	-6.415	-27.146
SV	0.001	0.973	0.339	1.053	388.823	0.314	-18.371	9.722	-77.145	-6.219	-14.528
GARCH	0.002	0.859	0.310	1.032	412.632	0.336	-21.097	10.430	-101.842	-6.248	-16.264
AR1-RV	0.001	0.961	0.265	1.000	434.448	0.350	-22.435	10.468	-97.193	-6.157	-20.118
AR6-RV	0.000	0.982	0.370	0.977	367.290	0.300	-16.969	9.432	-63.240	-6.327	-12.945
AR12-RV	0.000	0.977	0.379	0.976	361.123	0.296	-16.462	9.343	-59.956	-6.338	-13.780
HAR	0.001	0.972	0.329	0.987	394.936	0.319	-19.276	9.837	-77.331	-6.270	-15.304
Panel D: WTI											
Proposal	0.002	0.990	0.679			3.454		36.056		-3.643	
PSVO	0.010	0.882	0.427	0.992	391.053	6.253	-7.559	45.627	-93.243	-3.411	-41.387
PSV	0.011	0.873	0.411	0.994	403.879	6.439	-6.481	45.776	-92.137	-3.388	-14.699
SV	0.011	0.880	0.351	1.023	444.227	7.054	-7.090	48.707	-114.844	-3.019	-4.497
GARCH	0.016	0.763	0.320	0.999	479.098	7.819	-8.582	52.538	-131.726	-3.199	-5.735
AR1-RV	0.016	0.828	0.270	0.979	497.687	7.981	-8.276	52.416	-128.182	-3.072	-7.354
AR6-RV	0.005	0.926	0.380	0.944	422.579	6.701	-6.348	46.589	-92.895	-3.218	-4.738
AR12-RV	0.004	0.930	0.390	0.939	415.431	6.589	-6.147	46.099	-89.655	-3.207	-3.935
HAR	0.009	0.886	0.345	0.955	448.334	7.117	-7.076	48.458	-104.520	-3.187	-5.454

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. The variance proxy employed is the 5-minute realized kernel (Parzen).

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-12 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

Table 14: Forecasting results with volatility proxy as the 5-minute realized kernel (Bartlett)

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute		Qlike	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg.	DM
Panel A: Nasdaq											
Proposal	-0.004	1.037	0.708			1.312		19.403		-5.083	
PSVO	0.004	0.881	0.490	1.307	401.732	2.329	-20.900	25.746	-127.677	-4.716	-26.776
PSV	0.005	0.876	0.483	1.285	406.051	2.361	-20.291	25.840	-125.885	-4.711	-26.845
SV	0.004	0.896	0.403	1.252	466.510	2.696	-23.830	28.039	-148.698	-4.384	-14.249
GARCH	0.005	0.889	0.370	1.178	481.919	2.846	-25.994	28.838	-145.836	-4.431	-20.135
AR1-RV	0.007	0.892	0.361	1.080	478.514	2.878	-24.003	28.540	-129.845	-4.334	-13.171
AR6-RV	0.002	0.942	0.453	1.112	409.930	2.453	-20.923	26.012	-112.619	-4.495	-10.005
AR12-RV	0.002	0.950	0.458	1.123	406.114	2.429	-20.456	25.935	-113.322	-4.545	-11.867
HAR	0.003	0.939	0.424	1.103	432.172	2.582	-23.508	27.028	-122.278	-4.509	-12.112
Panel B: SP500											
Proposal	-0.002	1.040	0.688			0.791		15.376		-5.551	
PSVO	0.004	0.876	0.488	1.352	377.110	1.324	-18.551	19.625	-119.713	-5.260	-32.136
PSV	0.004	0.874	0.481	1.327	380.733	1.341	-17.042	19.711	-118.705	-5.256	-32.102
SV	0.004	0.890	0.412	1.292	433.261	1.503	-19.425	21.197	-140.821	-4.978	-17.565
GARCH	0.002	0.924	0.381	1.202	443.685	1.571	-20.825	21.755	-139.005	-4.998	-17.221
AR1-RV	0.003	0.909	0.366	1.079	444.755	1.610	-20.757	22.142	-133.229	-4.986	-26.293
AR6-RV	0.001	0.948	0.460	1.123	375.211	1.370	-16.634	19.894	-107.625	-5.114	-12.458
AR12-RV	0.000	0.954	0.464	1.138	371.931	1.358	-16.262	19.799	-107.443	-5.142	-13.723
HAR	0.001	0.946	0.429	1.107	398.622	1.447	-19.236	20.738	-119.191	-5.115	-18.707
Panel C: Euro											
Proposal	-0.001	1.009	0.613			0.190		8.404		-6.644	
PSVO	0.000	0.982	0.365	1.107	351.163	0.311	-18.671	9.787	-68.506	-6.431	-30.619
PSV	0.000	0.978	0.362	1.111	353.938	0.313	-18.656	9.797	-68.678	-6.426	-28.351
SV	0.000	0.961	0.322	1.068	379.396	0.332	-18.784	10.139	-78.432	-6.227	-14.943
GARCH	0.002	0.848	0.293	1.046	402.389	0.356	-21.719	10.890	-104.524	-6.253	-16.846
AR1-RV	0.001	0.950	0.252	1.008	421.198	0.367	-22.631	10.828	-95.720	-6.165	-20.676
AR6-RV	0.000	0.970	0.350	0.992	358.772	0.319	-17.483	9.882	-65.952	-6.334	-13.613
AR12-RV	0.000	0.965	0.359	0.992	353.148	0.315	-17.011	9.804	-63.292	-6.346	-14.501
HAR	0.000	0.960	0.311	0.999	384.630	0.337	-19.695	10.251	-78.312	-6.278	-15.963
Panel D: WTI											
Proposal	0.000	0.992	0.664			3.701		37.405		-3.681	
PSVO	0.010	0.871	0.406	1.019	388.054	6.669	-8.033	47.613	-98.709	-3.423	-44.316
PSV	0.011	0.862	0.390	1.019	400.165	6.855	-6.860	47.766	-97.612	-3.400	-16.608
SV	0.011	0.868	0.333	1.044	438.284	7.459	-7.411	50.583	-119.024	-3.032	-4.824
GARCH	0.016	0.753	0.304	1.017	471.008	8.264	-8.982	54.680	-137.537	-3.208	-6.292
AR1-RV	0.016	0.816	0.256	0.993	487.383	8.376	-8.556	54.190	-130.604	-3.081	-7.949
AR6-RV	0.005	0.913	0.361	0.964	416.580	7.114	-6.681	48.636	-98.412	-3.227	-5.196
AR12-RV	0.004	0.918	0.370	0.960	409.859	7.004	-6.485	48.177	-95.588	-3.217	-4.311
HAR	0.009	0.874	0.327	0.973	440.687	7.522	-7.391	50.400	-108.764	-3.196	-5.960

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. The variance proxy employed is the 5-minute realized kernel (Bartlett).

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-12 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

Table 15: Forecasting results with volatility proxy as the 5-minute absolute returns

Model	Mincer–Zarnowitz			Horse–Race		Squared		Absolute		Qlike	
	$\hat{\alpha}_0$	$\hat{\alpha}_1$	R^2	$\hat{\beta}_1$	$t(\hat{\beta}_1)$	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg. $\times 10^{-3}$	DM	Avg.	DM
Panel A: Nasdaq											
Proposal	-0.006	0.943	0.490			2.823		31.850		-5.161	
PSVO	0.004	0.765	0.309	1.384	293.043	3.964	-21.907	37.305	-105.919	-4.720	-25.741
PSV	0.004	0.760	0.305	1.358	295.675	3.996	-21.371	37.390	-104.369	-4.715	-26.059
SV	0.004	0.771	0.250	1.253	319.475	4.218	-22.786	38.696	-112.132	-4.381	-16.835
GARCH	0.004	0.768	0.231	1.156	324.796	4.323	-23.751	39.333	-109.830	-4.434	-22.179
AR1-RV	0.006	0.773	0.228	1.051	321.870	4.275	-21.013	38.278	-85.750	-4.338	-15.078
AR6-RV	0.002	0.814	0.283	1.127	287.153	3.986	-19.982	37.164	-85.595	-4.492	-12.131
AR12-RV	0.001	0.821	0.287	1.137	284.308	3.965	-19.630	37.159	-87.122	-4.543	-14.523
HAR	0.002	0.815	0.267	1.092	295.443	4.056	-21.325	37.646	-87.487	-4.509	-13.417
Panel B: SP500											
Proposal	-0.004	0.941	0.468			1.675		24.882		-5.636	
PSVO	0.003	0.763	0.307	1.430	276.387	2.281	-20.414	28.661	-102.956	-5.284	-34.213
PSV	0.003	0.760	0.302	1.400	278.412	2.298	-19.280	28.744	-102.199	-5.279	-33.992
SV	0.003	0.768	0.255	1.296	299.577	2.406	-20.060	29.639	-110.099	-5.001	-20.649
GARCH	0.001	0.802	0.238	1.167	297.640	2.430	-20.008	30.009	-106.839	-5.015	-20.440
AR1-RV	0.002	0.789	0.229	1.046	300.188	2.455	-19.788	30.064	-96.058	-5.000	-28.630
AR6-RV	0.000	0.822	0.287	1.134	263.869	2.279	-17.519	28.789	-88.910	-5.134	-16.762
AR12-RV	0.000	0.828	0.290	1.148	261.172	2.267	-17.144	28.739	-89.628	-5.162	-17.955
HAR	0.000	0.824	0.270	1.089	273.059	2.325	-19.243	29.236	-91.783	-5.129	-20.550
Panel C: Euro											
Proposal	-0.003	0.930	0.409			0.389		13.140		-6.744	
PSVO	0.000	0.850	0.215	1.118	253.551	0.510	-17.474	14.369	-58.896	-6.473	-32.596
PSV	0.000	0.846	0.213	1.122	255.654	0.512	-17.483	14.379	-59.105	-6.467	-31.008
SV	0.000	0.829	0.188	1.062	269.859	0.527	-17.227	14.582	-62.531	-6.267	-16.322
GARCH	0.001	0.730	0.171	1.047	288.372	0.565	-21.770	15.496	-94.749	-6.281	-18.492
AR1-RV	0.001	0.818	0.147	0.978	292.442	0.549	-19.088	14.924	-66.439	-6.197	-22.083
AR6-RV	0.000	0.837	0.205	1.000	258.779	0.518	-16.535	14.493	-57.704	-6.367	-15.876
AR12-RV	0.000	0.833	0.210	1.006	256.208	0.517	-16.407	14.475	-57.727	-6.379	-16.632
HAR	0.000	0.827	0.182	0.990	272.880	0.531	-17.786	14.678	-61.900	-6.309	-17.838
Panel D: WTI											
Proposal	-0.008	0.924	0.466			7.584		57.715		-3.807	
PSVO	0.007	0.753	0.246	1.087	294.715	11.082	-10.445	67.913	-93.122	-3.459	-46.584
PSV	0.008	0.744	0.235	1.080	301.904	11.248	-8.954	68.051	-91.973	-3.438	-21.888
SV	0.009	0.744	0.197	1.074	320.596	11.656	-9.047	69.765	-102.277	-3.067	-5.640
GARCH	0.013	0.648	0.182	1.045	344.356	12.847	-11.621	75.028	-130.777	-3.233	-7.780
AR1-RV	0.013	0.702	0.153	0.989	345.214	12.381	-9.697	72.466	-107.081	-3.105	-9.442
AR6-RV	0.003	0.785	0.216	0.993	304.982	11.364	-8.338	68.831	-91.087	-3.255	-6.496
AR12-RV	0.003	0.790	0.222	0.992	301.094	11.272	-8.167	68.509	-89.544	-3.247	-5.377
HAR	0.007	0.753	0.196	0.990	318.817	11.699	-8.933	69.918	-95.476	-3.225	-7.384

The table reports combined results for Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, Horse-race regressions, and Diebold–Mariano tests for one-step-ahead out-of-sample forecasting exercise for January 1, 2022 to August 30, 2024. The volatility proxy employed is the 5-minute absolute returns.

Columns 2-4 report $\hat{\alpha}_0$, $\hat{\alpha}_1$, and R^2 of the Mincer–Zarnowitz regressions, $RV_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{model} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 5-6 report $\hat{\beta}_1$ and $t(\hat{\beta}_1)$ testing $H_0 : \beta_1 = 0$ from the Horse-race regressions $RV_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{proposal} + (1 - \beta_1) \widehat{vol}_{i|i-1}^{competitor} + \varepsilon_i$.

Columns 7-12 report the Diebold–Mariano (DM) statistics that compare predictive accuracy against the Proposal under squared, absolute and Qlike loss functions. Negative and statistically significant DM statistics indicate superior performance of the Proposal.

References

- C. A. Abanto-Valle, H. S. Migon, and H. F. Lopes. Bayesian modeling of financial returns: A relationship between volatility and trading volume. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 26(2):172–193, 2010.
- T. G. Andersen. Return volatility and trading volume: An information flow interpretation of stochastic volatility. *The Journal of Finance*, 51(1):169–204, 1996.
- T. G. Andersen and T. Bollerslev. Intraday periodicity and volatility persistence in financial markets. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 4(2-3):115–158, 1997.
- T. G. Andersen and T. Bollerslev. Deutsche Mark—Dollar volatility: Intraday activity patterns, macroeconomic announcements, and longer run dependencies. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(1):219–265, 1998.
- T. G. Andersen, T. Bollerslev, F. X. Diebold, and C. Vega. Real-time price discovery in global stock, bond and foreign exchange markets. *Journal of International Economics*, 73(2):251–277, 2007.
- J. Bekierman and B. Gribisch. A mixed frequency stochastic volatility model for intraday stock market returns. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 19(3):496–530, 2021.
- T. Bollerslev, J. Li, and Y. Xue. Volume, volatility, and public news announcements. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 85(4):2005–2041, 2018.
- C. Broto and E. Ruiz. Estimation methods for stochastic volatility models: A survey. *Journal of Economic surveys*, 18(5):613–649, 2004.
- M. A. Carnero, D. Peña, and E. Ruiz. Persistence and kurtosis in garch and stochastic volatility models. *Journal of financial econometrics*, 2(2):319–342, 2004.
- C. K. Carter and R. Kohn. On Gibbs sampling for state space models. *Biometrika*, 81(3):541–553, 1994.
- J. C. Chan and A. L. Grant. Modeling energy price dynamics: Garch versus stochastic volatility. *Energy Economics*, 54:182–189, 2016.

- T. C. Chiang, Z. Qiao, and W.-K. Wong. New evidence on the relation between return volatility and trading volume. *Journal of Forecasting*, 29(5):502–515, 2010.
- P. K. Clark. A subordinated stochastic process model with finite variance for speculative prices. *Econometrica*, pages 135–155, 1973.
- T. E. Copeland. A model of asset trading under the assumption of sequential information arrival. *The Journal of Finance*, 31(4):1149–1168, 1976.
- S. Degiannakis and G. Filis. Oil price volatility forecasts: What do investors need to know? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 123:102594, 2022.
- S. Degiannakis and E. Kafousaki. Disaggregating vix. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 2025.
- P. Delis, S. Degiannakis, and G. Filis. Navigating crude oil volatility forecasts: Assessing the contribution of geopolitical risk. *Energy Economics*, 148:108594, 2025.
- A. M. H. Dumitru, R. Hizmeri, and M. Izzeldin. Forecasting the realized variance in the presence of intraday periodicity. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 170:107342, 2025.
- D. Easley, M. L. De Prado, and M. O’Hara. Discerning information from trade data. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 120(2):269–285, 2016.
- D. Easley, M. López de Prado, M. O’Hara, and Z. Zhang. Microstructure in the machine age. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 34(7):3316–3363, 2021.
- R. F. Engle and M. E. Sokalska. Forecasting intraday volatility in the US equity market: Multiplicative component GARCH. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 10(1):54–83, 2012.
- S. Frühwirth-Schnatter. Data augmentation and dynamic linear models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 15(2):183–202, 1994.
- J. Geweke et al. Bayesian comparison of econometric models. Technical report, Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, Minnesota, 1994.
- N. J. Gordon, D. J. Salmond, and A. F. Smith. Novel approach to nonlinear/non-Gaussian Bayesian state estimation. In *IEE proceedings F (radar and signal processing)*, volume 140, pages 107–113. IET, 1993.

- C. M. Jones, G. Kaul, and M. L. Lipson. Transactions, volume, and volatility. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 7(4):631–651, 1994.
- J. M. Karpoff. The relation between price changes and trading volume: A survey. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 22(1):109–126, 1987.
- S. Kim, N. Shephard, and S. Chib. Stochastic volatility: likelihood inference and comparison with ARCH models. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 65(3):361–393, 1998a.
- S. Kim, N. Shephard, and S. Chib. Stochastic volatility: likelihood inference and comparison with arch models. *The review of economic studies*, 65(3):361–393, 1998b.
- C. G. Lamoureux and W. D. Lastrapes. Heteroskedasticity in stock return data: Volume versus GARCH effects. *The Journal of Finance*, 45(1):221–229, 1990.
- M. Liu, W.-C. Choo, C.-C. Lee, and C.-C. Lee. Trading volume and realized volatility forecasting: Evidence from the China stock market. *Journal of Forecasting*, 42(1):76–100, 2023.
- W. Louhichi. What drives the volume–volatility relationship on Euronext Paris? *International Review of Financial Analysis*, 20(4):200–206, 2011.
- G. M. Martin, D. T. Frazier, W. Maneesoonthorn, R. Loaiza-Maya, F. Huber, G. Koop, J. Maheu, D. Nibbering, and A. Panagiotelis. Bayesian forecasting in economics and finance: A modern review. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 40(2):811–839, 2024.
- I. Martins and H. F. Lopes. What events matter for exchange rate volatility? *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 104:102073, 2025.
- I. Martins, A. Virbickaitė, H. Nguyen, and H. F. Lopes. Fast and slow level shifts in intraday stochastic volatility. *Scandinavian Working Papers No 2025:12*, pages 1–37, 2025.
- D. G. McMillan. Non-linear forecasting of stock returns: Does volume help? *International Journal of Forecasting*, 23(1):115–126, 2007.
- A. Moreira and T. Muir. Volatility-managed portfolios. *The Journal of Finance*, 72(4):1611–1644, 2017.

- A. Naimoli and G. Storti. Heterogeneous component multiplicative error models for forecasting trading volumes. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 35(4):1332–1355, 2019.
- Y. Omori, S. Chib, N. Shephard, and J. Nakajima. Stochastic volatility with leverage: Fast and efficient likelihood inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 140(2):425–449, 2007.
- T. Pang and Y. Zhao. On garch and autoregressive stochastic volatility approaches for market calibration and option pricing. *Risks*, 13(2):31, 2025.
- A. J. Patton. Volatility forecast comparison using imperfect volatility proxies. *Journal of econometrics*, 160(1):246–256, 2011.
- S. B. Ramos, P. Latoeiro, and H. Veiga. Limited attention, salience of information and stock market activity. *Economic Modelling*, 87:92–108, 2020.
- E. Rossi and D. Fantazzini. Long memory and periodicity in intraday volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 13(4):922–961, 2015.
- A. Rubia and L. Sanchis-Marco. On downside risk predictability through liquidity and trading activity: A dynamic quantile approach. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 29(1):202–219, 2013.
- E. Ruiz. Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation of stochastic volatility models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 63(1):289–306, 1994.
- S. Slim and M. Dahmene. Asymmetric information, volatility components and the volume–volatility relationship for the CAC40 stocks. *Global Finance Journal*, 29:70–84, 2016.
- J. R. Stroud and M. S. Johannes. Bayesian modeling and forecasting of 24-hour high-frequency volatility. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109(508):1368–1384, 2014.
- G. E. Tauchen and M. Pitts. The price variability-volume relationship on speculative markets. *Econometrica*, pages 485–505, 1983.
- S. J. Taylor. *Modelling financial time series*. Chichester: Wiley, 1986.

- X. Wang, C. Wu, and W. Xu. Volatility forecasting: The role of lunch-break returns, overnight returns, trading volume and leverage effects. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 31(3):609–619, 2015.
- J. Yu. Forecasting volatility in the new zealand stock market. *Applied Financial Economics*, 12(3):193–202, 2002.
- Z. Zheng, J. Gui, Z. Qiao, Y. Fu, H. E. Stanley, and B. Li. New dynamics between volume and volatility. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 525:1343–1350, 2019.