WHITE PAPER

Market Framework Model (MFM)™

A Multi-Layer Structural Framework for Market Context

Author

M.C.M. van Kroonenburgh, MSc

Heerlen, The Netherlands

Version 1.0

Date

November 16, 2025

Executive Summary

Markets produce signals easily, but structure is harder to see. Most analytical tools isolate individual components of behavior (momentum, patterns, volatility or relative strength) without offering a unified view of how these elements interact.
The Market Framework Model (MFM) addresses this gap by organizing market behavior into a **multi-layer structural framework**. MFM separates four dimensions of market structure:

- ***Regime***: the higher-timeframe environment that defines directional bias and risk asymmetry
- ***Rotation (MRM)***: the internal momentum cycle that reveals whether a trend is strengthening, deteriorating, exhausting or repairing
- ***Leadership***: the relative strength of an asset compared to its benchmark, determining whether it drives or follows market flow
- ***Forecast (MPF)***: localized probability zones that indicate where structural tension is concentrated

Individually, these layers offer partial information. Together, they form context: a coherent map of market behavior that clarifies interpretation without attempting prediction. Validation across five fundamentally different assets (BTC, XRP, TSLA, ASML and GOLD) shows that MFM captures structural tendencies consistently across timeframes and volatility profiles. Stable assets express clear regimes, clean rotational patterns and coherent leadership cycles, while chaotic assets reveal fragmentation rather than artificial structure. Forecasts appear selectively and cluster near genuine structural pressure zones.

MFM does not forecast outcomes, nor does it replace risk management. Its value lies in organizing uncertainty into interpretable structure. By providing a reproducible framework for reading environment, behavior, relative strength and local tension, MFM enables analysts, traders and researchers to understand *why* markets behave the way they do, rather than reacting to isolated signals. The result is not certainty, but clarity. An essential foundation for decision-making in modern, fast-moving markets.

Index

1. Introduction: Why MFM exists

Financial markets move in rhythms, not in isolated signals. Most technical tools zoom in on one layer (momentum, price action, relative strength or pattern recognition) without describing how these layers interact. The result is fragmentation: traders see “signals,” but not the structural context that governs whether a signal matters. The **Market Framework Model (MFM)™** addresses that gap. It is a multi-layer structural framework designed to interpret markets through four interacting dimensions:

- Regime: the higher-timeframe environment that dictates directional bias
- Rotation (MRM): momentum and phase behavior within that regime
- Leadership: cross-asset strength and vulnerability relative to a benchmark
- Forecast (Market Pattern Forecast (MRM)™): pivot-driven pattern probabilities within the surrounding structure

Individually, these layers reveal behavior. Together, they form market context: a coherent map of where the market is in its cycle, how momentum rotates, which asset leads, and when patterns meaningfully cluster. MFM does not attempt prediction. It replaces prediction with *clarity*, a systematic way to read structure before reacting to signals.

This whitepaper formalizes that architecture, outlines its four pillars, and presents cross-asset evidence from 2018–2025 showing that markets behave more coherently when viewed through interaction, not isolation.

2. Market philosophy: Why structure matters

Financial markets rarely move in straight lines. They oscillate, rotate, expand, contract, pause, and accelerate, long before any indicator or pattern brings attention to it. Most analytical tools attempt to capture small pieces of this behavior, but without a unifying structure those pieces create noise rather than insight. The philosophy behind the Market Framework Model (MFM) starts from a simple premise: *Signals are easy to generate. Structure is hard to see.* To understand why structure must come first, MFM is built on five foundational principles.

2.1 Markets are cyclic, but not repetitive

Cycles in markets are not strict repetitions; they are *structural tendencies*. Momentum builds, matures, dissipates, and resets in recognizable sequences. Trends do not emerge randomly. Tops and bottoms do not arrive without precursors. Even periods of “chaos” follow a rhythm of compression and release. The problem is not that cycles fail. The problem is that most tools observe cycles at the *wrong resolution*. Analysts zoom in on one layer (speed, direction, volatility, pattern), while the cycle itself unfolds across multiple. MFM formalizes this cross-layer view: the cycle of a market is visible only when higher-timeframe environment, mid-timeframe rotation, and short-term pattern pressure are interpreted together.

2.2 Momentum is rotational, not binary

Momentum does not flip from “bullish” to “bearish.” It transitions. Acceleration slows before it reverses. Weakness stabilizes before it recovers. Extremes release pressure before a new phase begins. These transitions form rotational momentum, the structural heartbeat inside every trend.

This rotation is observable:

- in the spread between fast and slow oscillators,
- in the shape of volatility contraction,
- and in the slope of recovery during exhaustion phases.

Traditional indicators treat momentum as a measurement. MFM treats momentum as a *process*: something that moves through phases, not values.

2.3 Regimes shape behavior, more than any signal

Every market behavior exists inside a regime: bull, bear, distribution, accumulation or transition.

These regimes define:

- the dominant direction,
- the reliability of patterns,
- the probability that momentum completes its rotation,
- and the asymmetry of risk.

A bullish pattern in a bearish regime is not a bullish signal. It is a *probability out of context*. Human traders often react to individual formations. MFM forces the opposite: *first read the environment, then the event.* A market never expresses the same signal in the same way across regimes. Context is not optional, it is causal.

2.4 Forecasts describe structural probability, not timing

Patterns do not predict outcomes. They describe tension.

A pattern has value only when:

- the surrounding regime supports it,
- the rotational phase aligns,
- leadership is not fighting the move,
- and volatility allows follow-through.

Without these conditions, a pattern becomes anecdotal. MFM treats forecasts as *probabilistic signals of tension*, not predictors of direction or timing. A forecast is meaningful only when it emerges as the top layer of multiple interacting structures, not as an isolated formation.

2.5 Interpretation before reaction, structure over signals

Most errors in trading arise from one assumption: *that signals speak for themselves.* They don't. Signals require translation. A sell signal in Phase 1 is not the same as a sell signal in Phase 3. A bullish breakout with lagging leadership is not the same as one with strong leadership. A forecast without supportive regime is not a forecast worth acting on.

MFM shifts the order of reasoning:

1. ***Regime***: environment
2. ***Rotation***: internal behavior
3. ***Leadership***: cross-asset strength
4. ***Forecast***: probability cluster

Signals are only the output. Structure is the language that explains them.

2.6 Why structure matters more today than ever

Modern markets move faster, rotate quicker, and are increasingly shaped by cross-asset flows. What used to be "momentum" is now liquidity rotation. What used to be "patterns" is now structural noise within high-frequency rebalancing. And what used to be "trend" is now a biased distribution shaped by macro regimes and benchmark strength. In that environment, classical indicators are insufficient. Not because they are wrong, but because they observe the market at a *single dimension*. MFM provides a multi-layered map of how markets behave. Not to predict what comes next, but to interpret what is already visible but rarely contextualized.

2.7 From philosophy to architecture

These principles define the "*why*". The next chapter defines the "*how*" by transforming these ideas into a structured architecture of layers that interact: regime, rotation, leadership, and forecast. Together they form the core logic of the Market Framework Model.

3. Architecture: A multi-layer model of market structure

Markets behave in layers. Direction emerges on higher timeframes, momentum rotates inside that direction, strength shifts between assets, and patterns cluster near structural pivots. Most analytical methods capture only one of these dimensions. MFM organizes all four into a single coherent architecture that makes those interactions observable. At its core, the model separates *environment, internal behavior, cross-asset positioning, and local structural probability.* This layered view prevents the common mistake of treating events and patterns as independent signals. Nothing in a market stands alone; every event occurs inside a structure.

3.1 Regime: Defining the environment

The first layer is the regime. It captures the broad market environment: bull, distribution, bear, accumulation or transition. A regime is not a trend or a signal; it is the structural condition that shapes everything that happens within it. Directional bias, volatility profile, risk asymmetry and even the reliability of common patterns all depend on the underlying regime. No layer outranks it.

3.2 Rotation: Behavior inside the environment

The second layer describes rotational momentum. Trends do not accelerate or reverse in a single motion; they transition through structural phases. The Momentum Rotation Model (MRM) captures this internal cycle: the build-up of momentum, its deterioration, its exhaustion and its eventual repair. Rotation sits inside the regime: it gives structure to what is otherwise experienced as “choppiness,” “loss of strength,” or “stabilization.”

3.3 Leadership: Strength in relation to a benchmark

The third layer adds a relational dimension. Markets do not move in isolation. Capital rotates between assets, sectors and benchmarks. Leadership describes whether an asset is driving the market or following it, whether it is showing structural strength or structural weakness. Two identical price structures can differ markedly in meaning depending on leadership state; a leading asset inside a supportive regime expresses structural strength, while the same behavior in a conflicting regime may signal fragility.

3.4 Forecast: Localized structural probability

Forecasts form the surface layer. They describe where structural tension is building—zones where pivots or reversals statistically cluster. MFM does not treat these as predictive signals. A forecast means nothing without its surrounding structure. Its meaning changes entirely depending on regime, rotation phase and leadership state. Forecasts are not the starting point of interpretation; they are the final expression of deeper structural forces.

3.5 Interacting layers

These layers do not function independently. Regime constrains rotation: a phase that would signal exhaustion in a bull regime behaves differently when it occurs inside a bear regime. Rotation sharpens or weakens the meaning of forecasts by revealing whether the internal cycle is ready to move. Leadership influences whether any structure has the energy to extend beyond its local pattern. Forecasts make structural tension visible, but only through the lens of the other three layers can they be interpreted reliably.

3.6 A Hierarchy of interpretation

MFM therefore imposes a reading order. First the regime: what environment are we in? Then rotation: what internal behavior is unfolding? Then leadership: is the asset aligned with or fighting the broader flow? Only last comes the forecast: where is structural tension visible? This hierarchy prevents premature conclusions and removes the need to guess what a pattern “means.” Structure determines meaning. Each layer explains part of the behavior; together they form a coherent map of the market.

4. Visual Implementation

For a framework to be useful, it must be interpretable. The Market Framework Model (MFM)™ is designed with a visual structure that allows the user to see the environment. The cycle, and the short-term structure at a glance, without overwhelming the chart or creating signal fatigue. The visualization is therefore minimalistic, layered, and intentionally sparse. Its purpose is to clarify structure, not to add noise. MFM represents each analytical layer in a distinct visual form, ensuring that interpretation remains consistent across assets and timeframes.

4.1 Multi-layer chart structure

4.1.1 Regime ribbon

The regime layer is displayed as a thin ribbon along the top of the chart. Each regime state (bull, distribution, bear, accumulation, transition) is expressed through a distinct color tone. The color-ribbon does not provide entry or exit signals. Instead, it establishes the long-term directional environment and volatility character in which all price movements should be interpreted. A chart can therefore be bullish, rotational, or bearish before a single candle is analyzed. The ribbon sets the backdrop for everything that follows.

4.1.2 Rotation zones (MRM)

The mid-term rotation layer is embedded as soft background zones behind price. These zones represent the four phases of the Momentum Rotation Model (MRM)™: overheat, rotation, capitulation, and repair. The color palette is deliberately muted to avoid dominating the chart, yet distinct enough to show cyclical shifts with clarity. Rotation zones reveal the structural heartbeat of the market. They show where the cycle is stretching, where it is turning, and where it is repairing. Their purpose is not to instruct, but to inform.

4.1.3 Forecast markers (MPF)

The short-term forecast layer is visualized using small, directional markers (typically triangles) placed near price only when structural alignment exists. MPF does not generate constant markers; silence is an integral part of the model. Forecast markers appear only when the short-term pattern meets the thresholds for probabilistic relevance. Because MPF is intentionally selective, its visual representation must also be restrained. The markers serve as tactical cues, not persistent guidance.

4.1.4 Leadership comparison markers

In markets where relative strength matters (such as equities, crypto sectors, or cross-asset interactions) MFM optionally displays leadership markers indicating whether the asset is outperforming or underperforming a selected benchmark (e.g., SPX, BTC, gold). These markers are not directional indicators; they are context enhancers. They clarify whether strength is absolute or relative, and whether weakness is structural or isolated.

4.2 Readability Principles

The visual design of MFM adheres to three core principles:

1. **Minimalism**

   Only the information with structural significance is shown. No additional oscillators, histograms, or overlays are required. The model is intentionally sparse so that the analyst can remain focused on the architecture rather than on decoration.

2. **Context-First**

   The model is built to tell a layered story: *regime* → *rotation* → *forecast*. Each layer enhances the others, and none are intended to dominate. Context determines meaning, and the design reflects that philosophy. Users can understand the entire environment in seconds.

3. **Signal Scarcity**

   MFM is not a signal generator. The model avoids the clutter and fatigue commonly associated with technical indicators. Forecast markers only appear when short-term structure is clear; rotation zones update only when momentum phases shift; regime only changes when long-term structure changes. Scarcity makes the few signals that do appear more meaningful.

Figure 1 - The MFM visual framework applied to a 4-hour AMZN chart. Background colors represent the rotation cycle, the banner reflects the active regime and leadership state, and local forecast markers indicate where structural tension tends to cluster. The chart serves as a visual example of the model, not a trading signal.

5. The four structural pillars of MFM

The Market Framework Model is built on four structural pillars. Each pillar captures a different dimension of behavior, but none of them are designed to function in isolation. Their value emerges from interaction, not from standalone interpretation. Together they form the structural map that allows analysts to understand *why* the market behaves the way it does, not merely *how* it moves.

5.1 Regime: The foundational context

The regime pillar defines the environment in which all other behavior takes place. A market in a bull regime expresses strength differently than in accumulation, and far differently than in distribution or bear conditions. Regimes influence volatility, the reliability of continuation patterns, and the tendency of corrective phases to resolve into strength or weakness. MFM does not treat regimes as long-term labels but as dynamic states that shape (and often constrain) interpretation. A regime rarely changes without warning; shifts often begin as deterioration in internal rotation or in leadership behavior. Because of this, the regime pillar sits at the base of the framework. Every other dimension gains meaning only relative to this environmental layer.

5.2 Rotation (MRM): The behavioral cycle

The second pillar captures the internal condition of the trend. The Momentum Rotation Model (MRM) describes how momentum evolves inside a regime: strengthening, deteriorating, exhausting or repairing. These transitions are visible before reversals occur and often before classical indicators react. Rotation explains *where* a trend is in its lifecycle and whether it still has structural integrity. A trend may remain bullish even when internal momentum deteriorates, or it may show early signs of structural stress while price continues upward. Rotation acts as the interpretive bridge between environment and local market signals: it reveals whether conditions inside the regime are supporting, weakening or contradicting price movement.

5.3 Leadership: Relative strength within a structural environment

Leadership describes the position of an asset relative to its benchmark. It answers a simple but structurally decisive question: *Is this asset driving the broader market, or is it being carried by it?* Markets do not move in isolation. Capital rotates between sectors, indices, asset classes and risk profiles. Leadership captures that rotation and expresses it as a structural state: *leading* or *lagging*. This distinction is not directional; it is relational.
A leading asset can rise or fall. A lagging asset can also rise or fall. What matters is whether the asset expresses relative structural strength or relative structural weakness compared to its benchmark.

5.3.1 Leadership as structural context

Leadership is not a signal. It is a contextual filter that influences how regime, rotation and forecast express themselves.

- In periods of structural strength, leadership clusters tend to persist.
- In deteriorating environments, leadership becomes unstable and often flips early.
- During transitions, leadership reveals where capital is beginning to reposition before price trends confirm.

A key function of leadership is that it separates internal behavior (rotation) from external pressure (benchmark behavior). This makes it possible to distinguish whether a trend is healthy or whether it only appears healthy because the benchmark is strong.

5.3.2 Leading vs lagging across different regimes

The meaning of leadership depends on the regime above it.

In a bull regime

Leading assets tend to exhibit:

- stronger follow-through,
- more stable pullbacks,
- and higher probability that rotation phases complete constructively.

Lagging assets in a bull regime often signal internal fragility. They rise because the environment forces them upward, not because their structure is supportive.

In a bear regime

Leadership behaves very differently. A “leading” asset may still be declining in absolute terms, but it is showing relative resilience compared to its benchmark. This resilience often marks where accumulation may start once the regime shifts. Lagging assets in a bear regime are structurally weak. They are typically the first to break down further when rotation deteriorates or volatility expands.

In distribution and accumulation regimes

Leadership becomes an early-warning indicator.

- In distribution, leadership loss frequently precedes deeper deterioration.
- In accumulation, early leadership clusters often reveal where structural recovery is forming before price confirms it.

This regime-specific behavior is essential for interpretation; leadership without context is incomplete.

5.3.3 Macro rotation influence: Equities, crypto and commodities

Leadership dynamics differ across asset classes due to macro-structural forces.

Equities

Equities follow sector rotation and benchmark flows.
Leadership transitions often reflect:

- earnings cycles,
- liquidity conditions,
- sector rebalancing,

- or macro risk-on/risk-off transitions.

An equity leading the SPX in Phase 4 recovery inside a bull regime behaves very differently from one leading during Phase 2 deterioration or distribution.

Crypto Assets

Crypto leadership tends to be volatility-driven and shorter-lived. BTC dominance often dictates structural flow, making BTC the natural benchmark. Most altcoins, including structurally chaotic ones, express leadership only in isolated bursts; sustained leadership is rare and typically unstable.

Commodities (e.g., GOLD)

Commodity leadership often reflects macro regimes, not micro-trend dynamics.
Gold, for example, tends to lead in:

- risk-off environments,
- falling real yields,
- inflationary cycles,
- or when equities show structural fragility.

Unlike crypto, leadership in commodities can remain stable even if price itself is not trending strongly. This macro distinction is crucial for interpreting leadership signals across different markets.

5.3.4 Conceptual examples (no charts required)

Example 1: Leadership clarifies trend strength

A bullish breakout in TSLA looks promising. But if SPX is *lagging*, the breakout is structurally unstable: TSLA is pushing against a weakening benchmark. If SPX is *leading*, the breakout has supportive flow behind it; the same pattern carries more structural weight.

Example 2: Leadership reveals hidden weakness

BTC enters Phase 4 recovery inside a bull regime. If BTC is *lagging* its benchmark (e.g., TOTAL or a major macro index), recovery may stall. But if BTC begins to *lead* during Phase 4, structural recovery is confirmed. Not by price, but by relational strength. These examples show that leadership is not a timing tool; it is a *structural filter*.

5.3.5 Why leadership matters

Leadership identifies where capital wants to be. It captures the structural “direction of preference” in markets that cannot be seen from price alone.

In practice, leadership:

- amplifies or suppresses the impact of rotation,
- conditions the meaning of regimes,
- filters the relevance of forecasts,
- and reveals structural weakness or strength well before price confirms it.

By expressing relative behavior rather than absolute movement, leadership completes the structural hierarchy of MFM. It connects individual asset behavior to the broader forces that drive market flow.

5.4 Forecast (MPF): Localized structural probability

Forecasts represent the probability clusters that emerge around structural pivots. They do not attempt to predict direction or timing. Instead, the MPF model highlights where tension accumulates: the zones where historical structure suggests that reversals, continuations or compression events become statistically more likely. A forecast gains meaning only when the deeper structure supports it. A forecast-up inside a bearish regime with lagging leadership does not signal opportunity; it signals conflict. A forecast-down inside Phase 1 exhaustion carries a different weight than the same signal in Phase 4 recovery. MPF is therefore the interpretive expression of the deeper layers, not the driver of them.

5.5 How the four pillars create context

The four pillars create structure by defining different dimensions of behavior: environment (regime), internal condition (rotation), relational strength (leadership) and localized probability (forecast). Their interaction determines whether the market is coherent or conflicted. A single pillar rarely provides actionable context. Two pillars begin to define conditions. Three pillars frequently reveal structural inflection points. When all four align, not as a signal but as a *configuration*, the market displays its highest clarity. Not because outcomes are guaranteed, but because uncertainty is structured. The strength of MFM lies not in any one pillar but in the systematic reading order that prevents premature interpretation. Structure dictates meaning. The pillars formalize that logic.

6. Validation: Evidence of structural coherence across assets

A structural framework cannot be validated through performance metrics alone. Performance describes outcomes; structure describes behavior. Because MFM is not a predictive model but an interpretive one, validation focuses on whether its layers behave *consistently, coherently and meaningfully across different assets, timeframes and volatility conditions*. The purpose of this chapter is therefore not to prove that MFM "works" in the sense of generating entries or exits, but to demonstrate that its four pillars reveal *stable patterns of structure* that do not depend on a single market type.

To examine this, we analyze five fundamentally different assets:

- **Bitcoin (BTC)**: high-volatility, high-cycle coherence
- **XRP**: event-driven, structurally noisy
- **Tesla (TSLA)**: high-beta equity with periodic leadership cycles
- **ASML**: steady mega-cap with strong structural consistency
- **Gold (XAUUSD)**: macro-driven, risk-off leadership asset

This selection spans crypto, high-volatility equities, stable equities and commodities, ensuring that validation is not biased toward a single behaviour regime. The datasets cover multiple years (2018–2025 where available) and three timeframes (4H, 1D, 1W).

6.1 Methodology

The validation procedure examines each of the four MFM pillars:

1. **Regime behavior**: Do regime blocks stay coherent, or are they erratic and meaningless?
2. **Rotation phases (MRM)**: Do rotational phases cluster in identifiable patterns?
3. **Leadership**: Does the asset exhibit clear leading/lagging behaviour relative to its benchmark?
4. **Forecast (MPF) signals**: Do forecasts cluster in a structurally meaningful way, not randomly?

The purpose is not to measure "accuracy," but to observe whether structure behaves structurally, in patterns that can be consistently interpreted.

The counts and percentages presented in Appendix D are indicative rather than statistical. They reflect stable structural proportions (e.g., rarity of Phase 1 & 3, dominance of rotation phases 2 & 4, frequency of leadership loss) that appear across all assets and timeframes. The results confirm whether the framework captures behavior that aligns with observable market reality.

6.2 Regime consistency across assets

Regime behavior is stable across nearly all assets. Markets cycle through bull, distribution, bear and accumulation environments in large, recognizable clusters. BTC and GOLD show particularly coherent long-term regimes, while TSLA and ASML exhibit stable multi-month

cycles aligned with broader macro flow. XRP is the exception, with frequent transitions that reflect its event-driven nature. Even in this outlier case, the regime pillar still provides value: it exposes the instability rather than masking it. Regimes therefore behave as expected: *not predictive, but structurally defining.*

6.3 Rotation (MRM) phase behavior

Rotational phases appear in clean clusters across assets with consistent volatility:

- BTC, TSLA, ASML and GOLD show predictable transitions between deterioration, exhaustion and recovery.
- Phase 1 (overextension) and Phase 3 (capitulation) remain rare across all assets and timeframes, reflecting real market behaviour rather than indicator noise.
- Phase 2 and Phase 4 dominate the mid-range, consistent with the idea that markets spend more time in transition and repair than in extremes.

XRP again deviates, with more frequent “no phase” states due to its chaotic structure. This divergence strengthens rather than weakens validation: *the model exposes instability, rather than generating artificial structure.*

6.4 Leadership dynamics

Leadership (relative strength) behaves as a genuine structural pillar.

- **ASML and GOLD** display consistent multi-month leadership cycles aligned with macro flows.
- **TSLA** alternates between strong leadership and deep lagging periods. Exactly what a high-beta equity should express.
- **BTC** shows cyclical leadership, especially in expansion phases.
- **XRP** demonstrates persistent lagging behavior, which matches its historical inability to outperform BTC except during isolated events.

Leadership therefore reflects real cross-asset dynamics. It does not produce random state changes, nor does it artificially amplify noise.

6.5 Forecast (MPF) selectivity and structural alignment

Forecasts appear infrequently (typically 3–6% of bars) and cluster near turning environments:

- BUY forecasts concentrate in Phase 3 or Phase 4 behaviour
- SELL forecasts concentrate in distribution or early deterioration
- Forecast density increases in structurally pressured environments
- Forecast scarcity is high during clean trends

The exact proportions differ per asset, but the underlying pattern remains stable: *MPF highlights structural tension rather than generating signals.* This selective behaviour is consistent across all five assets. Including XRP, where forecasts fail more often but still cluster around genuine structural pressure zones.

6.6 Multi-Pillar confluence

The strongest validation emerges from confluence analysis.
Across all assets:

- 4-pillar alignment is rare, exactly as intended
- 3-pillar alignment occurs around structural inflection zones
- 2-pillar alignment dominates neutral environments
- 0–1 pillar alignment characterizes noise and whipsaw conditions

The rank-order of confluence frequency is consistent: *ASML ≈ GOLD > BTC > TSLA >>> XRP.*

This is intuitive: structurally stable assets show more coherent confluence, while chaotic assets express less. The model does not behave like a signal engine that artificially seeks alignment, it reveals the underlying structural quality of the asset.

6.7 Interpretation of Results

The cross-asset results support the core philosophy of MFM:

- Markets express *structure*, not isolated signals
- Structure is visible only through multiple interacting layers
- The four pillars reveal meaningful differences across assets
- Stable assets exhibit coherent regimes, rotations, leadership and forecasts
- Chaotic assets fail to show coherence, and MFM exposes that chaos

The model therefore behaves as intended: it does not guarantee outcomes, it clarifies behavior. MFM's interpretive power lies not in its predictions but in its consistent representation of market structure across fundamentally different environments.

The detailed results for all assets and timeframes are presented in Appendix D.

7. Practical use cases: Applying the framework in real market analysis

The purpose of MFM is not to generate signals but to provide a coherent structural map that improves interpretation, timing, and decision-making. The framework can be applied across different timeframes and trading styles without modifying its internal logic. This chapter outlines several practical use cases that demonstrate how MFM supports market understanding.

7.1 Top-Down structural reading

MFM is designed around a strict interpretive order*: regime → rotation → leadership → forecast.* This sequence reduces noise and prevents premature conclusions.

A practical reading typically proceeds as follows:

1. **Identify the regime (1W, then 1D)**
   The regime defines directional bias, volatility expectations, and the asymmetry of risk.
   No lower-layer signal overrides a higher-layer regime.
2. **Assess rotational behavior (MRM) on the active timeframe**
   Determine whether momentum is strengthening, deteriorating, exhausting or recovering.
   This reveals where the trend is in its lifecycle.
3. **Evaluate leadership relative to a benchmark**
   Leadership shows whether the asset is positioned to follow through or whether it is structurally weak.
   A lagging asset inside a bullish regime signals fragility; a leading asset strengthens conviction.
4. **Interpret forecasts (MPF) last**
   Forecasts represent tension, not direction.
   Their meaning depends entirely on the surrounding structure.

This reading order is the backbone of all practical applications.

7.2 Swing trading & position trading

Swing traders benefit from the layered structure because it clarifies *when not to act*.

- Regime alignment avoids countertrend trades made on local noise.
- Rotation indicates whether a trend is maturing or stabilising.
- Leadership warns when an asset is losing strength even though price appears bullish.
- Forecasts highlight potential turning zones without forcing action.

The combination allows traders to size positions according to clarity rather than conviction.

7.3 Active risk management

MFM functions as a structural risk filter:

- A bearish regime combined with lagging leadership increases failure risk.
- A transition regime with Phase 3 behavior warns of elevated volatility.
- Phase 4 inside a bull regime often signals stabilization rather than reversal risk.

The model does not remove uncertainty but organizes it. Risk becomes interpretable instead of reactive.

7.4 Improving timing in trend-following systems

Trend-following strategies often struggle with:

- late entries,
- premature exits,
- structure-poor chop zones
- or fake breakouts driven by short-lived volatility.

MFM enhances these systems by providing context:

- A breakout with leadership and Phase 4 recovery behaves differently than one with Phase 2 deterioration.
- A breakdown inside a mature bear regime carries different risk than one inside accumulation.
- Forecast clusters allow trend-followers to avoid entries near structural tension zones.

This does not replace trend-following; it elevates it.

7.5 Cross-asset interpretation & sector rotation

The leadership pillar is particularly relevant for equities and macro assets.

- Leadership identifies when an asset drives its benchmark.
- Leadership loss often precedes deterioration in trends.
- Cross-asset timing improves by observing when capital rotates between sectors, indices or asset classes.

The framework therefore provides insight into market structure beyond individual charts.

7.6 Discretionary decision support

Discretionary analysts and portfolio managers can use MFM to contextualise:

- probability of continuation vs regression,
- whether a move is structurally supported or isolated,
- whether price action reflects strength or exhaustion,
- when volatility is likely to compress or expand.

MFM does not dictate decisions; it makes them more informed.

7.7 Educational & research applications

Because the model separates layers of behavior, it is suitable for:

- teaching multi-timeframe analysis,
- studying momentum cycles,
- analyzing sector rotation,
- testing confluence-based behavior,
- or mapping market rhythms for academic research.

It allows students and analysts to observe structure without conflating it with signals.

7.8 Summary

MFM's value lies in context, not prediction. It enables analysts, traders and researchers to interpret markets through structure instead of noise. By separating environment, behavior, relative strength and local tension, the model provides clarity across assets and timeframes.

8. Limitations: What MFM does not provide

Every analytical framework has boundaries. Because MFM is a structural model rather than a predictive system, its limitations are integral to its proper use. A model that claims certainty is unreliable; a model that defines its uncertainty is usable. This chapter outlines the limitations of MFM with clarity and without reservation.

8.1 Not a predictive system

MFM does not forecast direction or timing. Its layers reveal environment, rotation, leadership and structural tension, but they do not guarantee outcomes. A forecast-up does not imply an imminent rally; a bearish rotation does not define when price must reverse. Markets can ignore tension, extend moves beyond structural expectations, or reverse without completing their internal cycle. MFM interprets these dynamics, it does not anticipate them.

8.2 No replacement for risk management

The framework describes structure, not exposure. Risk sizing, portfolio allocation, hedging and stop placement remain the responsibility of the analyst or trader.
A coherent market structure does not eliminate downside risk; it merely clarifies the environment in which risk exists. Even in high-confluence configurations, outcomes remain probabilistic.

8.3 Sensitivity to benchmark choice

The leadership pillar depends on benchmark selection. The model does not prescribe which benchmark is correct: BTC for altcoins, SPX for equities, or GOLD for macro analysis are sensible defaults, but structural relationships can shift over time. A poor benchmark choice can distort leadership interpretation without the model being at fault.

8.4 Structural clarity varies by asset

Not all assets express structure equally. ASML and GOLD demonstrate clear regimes, clean rotational behavior and stable leadership. XRP behaves chaotically, with irregular cycles and frequent structural breaks. MFM exposes this instability but cannot “correct” it or impose coherence where none exists. The framework is descriptive, not normative.

8.5 No guarantee of follow-through

Even when all four pillars align, markets can fail to follow through. Liquidity shocks, macro events, news-driven volatility, or sudden rotations can override structure temporarily or permanently. High confluence increases structural clarity, not certainty.

8.6 Visual interpretation remains necessary

MFM is not a black-box system. Even with clear layers, interpretation requires contextual judgement:

- distinguishing compression from indecision,
- understanding how sector flows influence leadership,
- recognizing when a regime is in transition,
- reading volatility conditions that fall outside model definitions.

Human interpretation remains an essential part of the process.

8.7 No Performance Claims

The framework is not validated through profit metrics. MFM evaluates structural behavior, not back tested returns. The absence of performance claims is deliberate: the purpose of the model is to describe market context, not to promise advantage or profitability.

8.8 Summary

MFM provides structure, not signals; clarity, not prediction. It does not reduce uncertainty but organizes it. Its limitations define the boundaries within which it delivers value, and they ensure that the model is used as intended: *as a structural interpretive tool rather than a trading engine*.

9. Future work: Expanding the structural framework

MFM is intentionally modular. Because the framework separates environment, rotation, leadership and forecast into distinct layers, it can evolve without altering its foundational logic. This chapter outlines the most meaningful avenues for future development: technical, analytical and practical, without overstating their certainty or scope. The objective of future work is not to transform MFM into a predictive system, but to extend its structural clarity and increase its applicability across markets and platforms.

9.1 Automated layer integration

The current implementation of MFM relies on visual interpretation. A natural next step is the development of automated tools that assess:

- regime transitions,
- rotational acceleration or deterioration,
- leadership shifts,
- and the clustering of forecasts relative to structural pressure.

Such automation would not replace human interpretation but would create a consistent, replicable foundation for comparing assets, timeframes and market conditions.

9.2 Confluence scoring models

MFM already identifies alignment between its four pillars. Future iterations can formalise this into a structural confluence score that quantifies:

- regime alignment,
- rotational readiness,
- leadership strength,
- and forecast density.

This would allow analysts to compare structural clarity across assets or historical periods without converting the framework into a trading system.

9.3 Sector and cross-asset rotation models

The leadership pillar naturally extends to sector dynamics.
Future research may explore:

- leadership cycles within equity sectors,
- cross-asset rotation between equities, crypto, commodities and bonds,
- or macro-regime interactions that drive leadership shifts.

This would allow MFM to support portfolio-level decision-making and sector allocation.

9.4 Pattern recognition and structural mapping

Forecast (MPF) currently identifies high-probability pivot zones.
An extended version could incorporate:

- recognition of structural compression,
- clustering of pattern types,
- mapping of structurally meaningful ranges,
- early detection of regime transition pressure.

Such developments would not forecast outcomes but would refine the identification of structural tension.

9.5 Multi-timeframe integration

An important avenue for future work is formalizing how structure flows between timeframes:

- weekly regime → daily rotation → intraday behavior,
- daily leadership → weekly structural trend quality,
- cluster analysis across neighboring timeframes.

Structured multi-timeframe interpretation would increase the reliability of context assessments and reduce ambiguity.

9.6 API and platform integration

Because the framework is modular and data-driven, it can be integrated into analytical platforms:

- TradingView indicators that expose the four layers programmatically,
- REST-based APIs that evaluate confluence and regime states,
- data feeds that allow strategy engines to incorporate structural context.

These integrations do not transform MFM into a trading bot; they expose its interpretive layers for systematic use.

9.7 Educational and research applications

The separation of environment, behavior, relative strength and local tension makes MFM suitable for:

- academic research into market structure,
- curriculum development for technical analysis education,
- cross-asset behavioral studies,
- evaluation of structural differences between asset classes.

MFM's modularity supports replication, experimentation and methodological comparison.

9.8 Summary

Future work will not change the essence of MFM. The framework will remain interpretive, not predictive; structural, not signal-driven. Its evolution lies in refining clarity, improving accessibility and formalizing the relationships between its layers. The goal is not to reduce uncertainty but to reveal structure with increasing precision.

10. Conclusion: Structure Over Signals

The Market Framework Model (MFM) presents a different way of understanding financial markets. Instead of treating signals, indicators and patterns as independent events, it organizes them into a coherent structural hierarchy. By separating regime, rotation, leadership and forecast (and by defining how these layers interact) MFM replaces reactive interpretation with contextual reasoning.

Throughout this paper, the framework has been evaluated across a diverse set of assets, timeframes and volatility environments. The results show that market behavior becomes clearer when viewed through interacting layers rather than individual signals. Stable assets reveal coherent regimes, clean rotational behavior and meaningful leadership cycles. Chaotic assets expose their instability rather than forcing artificial structure. Forecasts cluster where structural tension naturally builds, without dictating outcomes.

MFM does not offer prediction, certainty or guaranteed outcomes. It offers something more fundamental: a reproducible way to understand *why* markets behave the way they do. In doing so, it restores structure where classical indicators often generate noise. It enables analysts, traders and researchers to interpret markets through environment, behavior, relative strength and local probability rather than isolated events.

As markets evolve (becoming faster, more interconnected and more rotation-driven) the need for structural interpretation will only increase. MFM is not the final form of that interpretation, but a foundation: a framework that connects layers of behavior into a coherent, navigable whole.

Structure will not remove uncertainty. But it makes uncertainty readable. And in financial markets, that is often the difference between reacting blindly and acting with clarity.

Appendix A: Regime logic

Regimes define the broad environment in which market behavior unfolds. They are not trends, signals or momentum states, but structural conditions that shape how price expresses itself. The regime layer establishes the directional bias, volatility profile and risk asymmetry of the market. Every layer above it (rotation, leadership and forecast) depends on the context set by the regime.

Regimes evolve slowly on higher timeframes and rarely shift without precursors. Internal momentum deterioration, leadership loss, volatility compression or extended distribution often appear before a formal regime transition becomes visible. For this reason, regime is treated as the foundational layer of the Market Framework Model.

MFM recognizes five regime states: bull, distribution, bear, accumulation and transition. These states describe how the market is organizing itself over the medium to long term.

A.1 Bull regime

A bull regime reflects sustained structural strength. Price behavior typically shows higher highs, constructive pullbacks and stable leadership. Forecast-down signals may appear, but they tend to function as local pressure rather than structural reversals. Rotational deterioration inside a bull regime often resolves as consolidation rather than breakdown.

The key characteristic of a bull regime is that upward movement requires less structural effort than downward movement. Positive rotation or leadership tends to accelerate follow-through; negative rotation often results in shallow correction.

A.2 Distribution Regime

Distribution marks the early stages of structural weakening within an uptrend. Price remains elevated, but internal condition deteriorates: rotation begins to slip, leadership becomes inconsistent, and volatility increases. This regime often precedes a reset or a more pronounced correction, but the timing of that shift is variable.

Distribution is defined not by direction but by loss of structural coherence. It is a transitional environment in which trends become fragile and signals lose reliability. Forecast-down clusters tend to appear more frequently, and leadership fluctuations become an early warning signal.

A.3 Bear regime

A bear regime reflects sustained structural weakness. Lower highs, deteriorating rotation and prolonged leadership loss dominate the environment. Forecast-up signals may occur, but they tend to be countertrend tension rather than structural reversals.

In bear conditions, downward movement requires less structural pressure than upward movement. Positive rotation or leadership often stabilizes price temporarily but does not reverse the broader environment without substantial structural repair. Volatility tends to be elevated, and short-lived rallies frequently fail.

A.4 Accumulation regime

Accumulation is the counterpart to distribution. It forms near or after prolonged weakness when price begins to compress, rotation stabilizes and leadership shows early signs of recovery. Trends are not yet bullish, but the structural environment is no longer dominated by weakness.

Accumulation regimes do not predict reversals; they describe potential recovery conditions. Structural tension shifts from the downside to the upside, but resolution can take significant time. Forecast-up signals near the end of accumulation tend to cluster around emerging structural strength.

A.5 Transition regime

Transition describes the ambiguous state between major regimes. These periods occur when the environment is shifting but has not yet committed to a direction. Rotation may improve while leadership weakens, or leadership may strengthen while forecast clusters remain mixed.

Transitions are not meant to be traded aggressively; they are meant to be recognized. They often precede significant structural reorganization and provide early context for what comes next, but not timing.

A.6 Interpretation and practical use

The regime layer provides the structural foundation for all interpretation:

- It defines which signals matter and which should be ignored.
- It shapes the meaning of rotation phases.
- It determines how leadership cycles behave.
- It contextualizes forecast tension.

Regime is therefore not an indicator; it is the environmental logic of the market. Every meaningful analysis begins here.

Appendix B: Rotation logic (MRM)

Rotation describes the internal behavior of momentum inside a regime. Where the regime defines the environment, rotation reveals the *condition* of the trend. How strength builds, stabilizes, deteriorates or exhausts. The Momentum Rotation Model (MRM) captures this evolution through a small set of structural phases. These phases do not measure momentum; they describe its state of transition. Momentum does not move from bullish to bearish in a single step. It rotates. Acceleration slows before it reverses. Weakness stabilizes before it recovers. Exhaustion forms before repair can begin. The purpose of MRM is to map these transitions in a way that is consistent across assets, timeframes and volatility regimes.

B.1 The nature of rotational momentum

Classical indicators treat momentum as a value. MRM treats momentum as a *process*. In this process, the internal cycle of the market passes through recognizable structural states:

- periods of strong upward pressure,
- gradual loss of force,
- exhaustion or capitulation,
- and eventual stabilization or repair.

These states form a repeating internal rhythm that plays out even when price appears noisy. MRM does not attempt to predict when transitions will occur; it simply identifies *which structural state is currently active*.

B.2 The four core phases

MRM identifies four rotational phases. These phases do not represent entry or exit signals; they describe the internal health of the trend relative to its environment.

Phase 1: Acceleration (overextension)

Phase 1 reflects strong, often unsustainable upward pressure. Momentum extends faster than the underlying structure typically supports. Trends in Phase 1 can continue, but they do so under increasing internal tension. Phase 1 is therefore rare and represents the late stage of a strong push rather than its beginning.

Phase 2: Deterioration (slowing trend)

In Phase 2, momentum begins to weaken. Price may still rise or consolidate, but the internal structure loses alignment. Deterioration does not imply reversal; it indicates that the trend is maturing and becoming more fragile. This is the most common rotational state, reflecting the market's natural tendency toward slowing expansion.

Phase 3: Exhaustion or capitulation

Phase 3 captures the point at which internal pressure has fully unwound. Exhaustion can occur during uptrends (buyers depleted) or downtrends (sellers depleted). Price may drop sharply, spike violently or compress. The behavior varies, but the structural meaning is consistent: the internal engine is empty. Like Phase 1, Phase 3 is rare. Its significance lies not in timing reversals, but in identifying that the market has reached the end of a structural cycle.

Phase 4: Repair or stabilization

Phase 4 reflects early recovery. Momentum begins to rebuild in alignment with the regime. The environment does not instantly become bullish or bearish; instead, the internal structure reorganizes. Phase 4 is the state in which trends often prepare for the next meaningful movement. Not because reversals must occur, but because the underlying structure becomes coherent again.

B.3 Relationship between rotation and regime

Rotation never stands alone.
Its meaning depends entirely on the regime above it.

- Phase 3 in a bull regime behaves differently than Phase 3 in a bear regime.
- Phase 4 inside accumulation often precedes constructive behavior.
- Phase 2 inside distribution may warn of deeper structural weakness.
- Phase 1 inside a bear regime is typically unstable and short-lived.

Rotation provides the “texture” of behavior within the environmental logic set by the regime. It reveals how mature, stressed or reorganizing the internal cycle is.

B.4 Rotation as a contextual filter

Because rotation captures structural readiness rather than direction, it acts as a critical filter for interpreting price behavior:

- A bullish breakout with Phase 2 deterioration is fragile.
- A recovery during Phase 4 behaves differently from one during Phase 1.
- A forecast-up inside Phase 3 reflects structural pressure rather than a textbook reversal signal.

Rotation does not confirm or deny setups. It clarifies *whether the internal state of the market aligns with what price appears to express*.

B.5 Why rotation matters

Most indicators fail not because their measurements are incorrect, but because they collapse all internal behavior into a single number or threshold. Rotation restores the missing structure: it captures the *process* of momentum, not its instantaneous value. By defining the internal state of the trend, rotation helps answer questions that cannot be resolved by price alone:

- Is the trend accelerating or losing force?
- Is exhaustion near or is the trend healthy?
- Is volatility meaningful or merely transitional?
- Is the market preparing for continuation or still unwinding?

These insights make rotation a cornerstone of the framework, the bridge between environmental structure and localized probability.

Appendix C: Forecast logic (MPF)

Forecasts represent concentrated zones of structural tension. They do not predict direction or timing. Instead, the Market Pattern Forecast (MPF) model identifies where market structure historically compresses, rotates or prepares for transition. These areas (often surrounding pivots) reveal where the underlying conditions are primed for change, without implying that change will occur immediately or at all. MPF is therefore not a pattern system but a probability-mapping layer. It highlights *where* structure matters, not *what* price must do.

C.1 The role of forecasts in a structural framework

Forecasts sit at the top of the MFM hierarchy. While regime, rotation and leadership describe the environment, internal behavior and cross-asset position, the forecast layer reveals localized pressure.

This pressure often emerges from:

- structural compression,
- extended imbalance,
- exhaustion inside rotation cycles,
- or the convergence of multiple contextual forces.

MPF isolates these conditions and marks them visually, but leaves interpretation to the broader structural context.

C.2 Forecasts as structural probability, not entry signals

A key misconception in technical analysis is the belief that a pivot, pattern, or “setup” implies direction. MPF explicitly avoids this. A forecast-up does not imply that price is preparing to rally; it indicates that upward resolution is structurally *possible* given the surrounding tension. The same applies to forecast-down markers.

These markers gain meaning *only* through interaction with the deeper layers:

- A forecast-up inside a bearish regime often reflects countertrend tension rather than opportunity.
- A forecast-down during Phase 4 repair typically signals pressure, not structural collapse.
- Forecast clusters inside accumulation or distribution identify zones where energy is building, not where timing is precise.

MPF does not define what will happen. It defines where the structural conversation is taking place.

C.3 How forecast zones form

Forecasts arise from the interaction of:

1. ***Pivot-based structural behavior***: areas where price has historically reorganized.

2. ***Momentum compression or exhaustion***: often visible in Phase 3 and Phase 4 transitions.
3. ***Asymmetry between directional pressure and market condition***: where structure and price temporarily diverge.

These forces do not create certainty; they create tension, the raw material of potential movement. MPF marks these areas not because the market must react to them, but because these are the points where structure is *most likely to matter*.

C.4 Forecast clustering and structural weight

Forecasts gain significance when they cluster.
A single forecast marker can reflect transient imbalance.
Multiple markers in close proximity often indicate:

- a maturing rotation cycle,
- a regime that is nearing inflection,
- a leadership shift,
- or volatility preparing to expand.

Clusters do not indicate direction. They indicate structural importance. This distinction is essential: clusters show *where the next meaningful move is likely to originate*, not *what that move will be*.

C.5 Interaction with the other layers

Forecasts are never interpreted in isolation. Their meaning flows downward through the structural hierarchy:

- Regime determines whether a forecast aligns with the directional environment.
- Rotation clarifies whether the internal cycle supports or contradicts the forecast.
- Leadership reveals whether the asset has the strength or weakness to act on its tension.

Only when these layers interact does a forecast become structurally coherent. The of alignment does not invalidate a forecast; it simply signals that the tension may dissolve rather than resolve.

C.6 Forecasts as a decision filter

Because MPF identifies tension rather than outcomes, it acts as a filter for decision-making:

- Avoiding entries directly into forecast clusters reduces exposure to volatility traps.
- Recognizing when forecasts align with rotation and leadership clarifies when a move is structurally supported.
- Understanding countertrend forecasts prevents misinterpreting transient tension as a reversal.

In practice, MPF prevents overreaction by revealing *where the market is unstable*, not where it is actionable.

C.7 Why the forecast layer matters

Price does not move uniformly. It expands and contracts around areas of structural pressure. Most models attempt to predict these movements directly. MPF instead highlights the zones where structural forces are concentrated, allowing the analyst to interpret price behavior with greater clarity and less bias. The layer does not offer certainty. It offers visibility into where uncertainty itself is organizing.

Appendix D: Cross-asset validation results (2018–2025)

This appendix summarizes the structural behavior of five assets across multiple timeframes: BTC, XRP, TSLA, ASML and GOLD. The goal is not to measure performance, accuracy or return, but to evaluate whether the four pillars of MFM (regime, rotation, leadership and forecast) behave coherently across fundamentally different market conditions. The results presented here are indicative, not statistical. They are derived from multi-year visual and structural analysis and reflect the general proportions, tendencies and behavioral patterns observed across:

- 4H, 1D and 1W timeframes
- The years 2018–2025 (where available)
- Assets with fundamentally different volatility profiles and structural qualities

These tables give a compact overview of structural tendencies discussed in Chapter 6.

D.1 Overview of structural behavior

The high-level summary across all assets shows:

- Regimes form stable, coherent clusters in structurally sound assets (BTC, TSLA, ASML, GOLD), and become fragmented in chaotic assets (XRP).
- Rotation (MRM) behaves consistently: Phase 1 and Phase 3 remain rare across all assets; Phase 2 and Phase 4 dominate the mid-cycle behavior.
- Leadership expresses cyclical strength in BTC, TSLA, ASML and GOLD, while XRP shows persistent lagging and erratic leadership transitions.
- Forecasts (MPF) appear selectively (typically 3–6% of bars) and cluster near structural tension zones across all assets.

The tables below formalize these tendencies.

D.2 Regime distribution (indicative proportions)

These proportions reflect the general percentage of time each asset spent in bull, distribution, bear and accumulation environments.
They are not exact measurements; their purpose is structural comparison.

Asset	Bull	Distribution	Bear	Accumulation	Notes
BTC	~35%	~20%	~30%	~15%	Clear long-term cycles; well-structured transitions
XRP	~15%	~25%	~35%	~25%	Highly fragmented; frequent regime breaks
TSLA	~30%	~25%	~30%	~15%	Strong cyclicality with high volatility transitions
ASML	~40%	~20%	~25%	~15%	Stable macro-aligned structure
GOLD	~35%	~25%	~25%	~15%	Macro-coherent; clear defensive cycles

D.3 Rotation phase frequency (MRM)

Indicative frequencies of the four rotation phases across assets:

Asset	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Notes
BTC	Rare	Common	Rare	Common	Clear mid-cycle behavior; stable extremes
XRP	Occasional	Frequent	Occasional	Erratic	Rotation stability low; noise-dominant
TSLA	Rare	Frequent	Rare	Frequent	Behavior matches high-beta equity cycles
ASML	Very rare	Frequent	Very rare	Frequent	Strong, clean rotational patterns
GOLD	Very rare	Frequent	Rare	Frequent	Consistent structural cycles

D.4 Leadership behavior

Leadership results are expressed as indicative proportions of time spent leading vs lagging the chosen benchmark (BTC for crypto assets, SPX for equities, macro-index for GOLD).

Asset	Leading	Lagging	Notes
BTC	~50%	~50%	Leadership cycles align with macro phases
XRP	~20%	~80%	Persistent laggard; event-driven spikes
TSLA	~45%	~55%	Alternates in multi-month cycles
ASML	~60%	~40%	Strong, stable leadership in macro uptrends
GOLD	~55%	~45%	Clear risk-off leadership cycles

D.5 Forecast (MPF) selectivity

Indicative proportion of bars with active forecasts and clustering tendencies:

Asset	Forecast Frequency	Cluster Behaviour	Notes
BTC	~4–6%	Strong clustering	Appears near structural pressure zones
XRP	~3–5%	Irregular clusters	Still aligns with genuine pressure despite noise
TSLA	~3–5%	Well-defined clusters	Strong connection to rotation states
ASML	~2–4%	Clean clustering	High structural clarity
GOLD	~3–4%	Clear clustering	Aligns with macro volatility cycles

D.6 Four-pillar confluence

This table summarizes how often multiple MFM pillars align in a structurally meaningful way.

Asset	4-Pillar Align	3-Pillar Align	Notes
BTC	Rare	Moderate	Strong at regime transitions
XRP	Very rare	Sparse	Chaotic structure reflected accurately
TSLA	Rare	Moderate	High-beta but structurally expressive
ASML	Occasional	Frequent	Most coherent of all assets
GOLD	Occasional	Frequent	Macro structure highly consistent

D.7 Interpretation of the validation results

The results across all assets support the core principles of MFM:

- Structure appears clearly in assets with stable behavioral patterns.
- Chaotic assets do not break the model; they are exposed by it.
- Regimes, rotation phases, leadership cycles and forecasts all behave in ways that match their theoretical definitions.
- Multi-pillar confluence behaves exactly as expected: rare, informative and structurally meaningful.
- Forecasts cluster around real structural pressure zones, even in noisy assets like XRP.

These findings demonstrate that MFM provides a coherent, repeatable structural map across multiple market types, without relying on prediction, optimization or parameter fitting.

Clarification

In MRM, F1–F3 and P1–P3 refer to the same phases.
*The prefix **"F"** originates from the indicator's code notation (flag/phase marker),*
*while **"P"** is used in written publications to denote the conceptual Phases of Momentum Rotation. For clarity, both terms are interchangeable.*

Disclaimer
The Momentum Rotation Model (MRM) and all related publications are provided for educational and informational purposes only. They do not constitute financial advice, investment recommendations, or trading signals. Any examples, charts, or backtests are illustrative and hypothetical, based on historical data, and do not guarantee future performance. Trading and investing in financial markets involve risk, including the potential loss of capital. Readers and users remain solely responsible for their own decisions. The author and Inratios© make no representations or warranties as to the accuracy, completeness, or reliability of any information provided. Use of the MFM model or any derived insights implies acceptance of these terms.