

Acknowledging its substantial contribution to emissions, China embarked on a mission to establish pilot carbon emission rights exchanges in key cities and provinces, including Shenzhen, Beijing, Shanghai, and Hubei, commencing in 2013. A significant milestone was reached on July 16, 2021, with the official launch of the national carbon emission trading market. Positioned as a crucial economic instrument for carbon emission control, carbon trading is poised to propel China towards its ambitious environmental goals of achieving a “carbon peak in 2030” and attaining “carbon neutrality in 2060.”

At the core of China’s strategy for sustainable development lies the dual-carbon strategy, a fundamental national policy. The carbon market represents a pivotal innovation within China’s climate governance framework, signaling a departure from past reliance on administrative directives and financial subsidies towards a market-driven carbon pricing mechanism in response to climate change. The role of the carbon market is indispensable in the nation’s pursuit of carbon peak and carbon neutrality goals. Since the inception of China’s carbon trading pilot market, its prices have undergone notable fluctuations and transformations. As the Chinese carbon market continues to mature, establishing stronger connections with the energy market, stock market, financial market, and other relevant sectors, the application of big data analysis methods assumes paramount significance in unraveling the intricate dynamics of China’s carbon market price fluctuations.

Literature Review

The existing research on the carbon trading market has laid an analytical foundation for us. From the perspective of literature development, the EU carbon market was the earliest and most mature. In terms of the fluctuation characteristics of carbon trading prices, foreign carbon trading markets have been established for a longer time, the trading system is more developed, and the market is more mature. The existing literature mainly focuses on the following aspects: first, the price fluctuation of the carbon spot market; Second, the price fluctuation in the carbon derivatives market; The third is the dynamic relationship between the carbon spot market and the carbon derivatives market. Daskalakis et al. found that carbon storage quotas would have a negative impact on the effectiveness and liquidity of the carbon spot market [1]. Feng Zhenhua and Wei Yiming used the CAPM model to analyze the price risk of the EU carbon market and examined the fluctuation of the EU carbon quota price under different expected returns [2]. Huang Jie found that the yield of carbon futures contracts in the EU has a strong volatility agglomeration through the establishment of GARCH model, and there is a causal relationship between the price of EUA and CER futures, and accordingly put forward relevant suggestions for the establishment of a carbon futures market in China in the future [3]. Gorenflo’s research shows that the EU carbon

futures price leads the carbon spot price [4]. Zhang Chen and Liu Yujia extended the research on carbon market spillover effects to the three markets of EU carbon spot, carbon futures and carbon options. The research found that there are significant mean and volatility spillover effects in the three markets, and the carbon derivatives market is the main risk spillover source of EU carbon market [5]. However, since the EU has established a unified carbon market from the beginning, there is no transition stage of regional pilot, so there is no relevant research on the spillover effect of the regional carbon market. Zhang et al. analyzed the scale of international carbon emissions trading and the unfair distribution of benefits under the framework of the Kyoto Protocol based on the equilibrium price of the marginal emission reduction cost and the market price of emission rights, and found that developed countries occupied the leading position in the pricing power of international carbon emissions trading and obtained considerable benefits from it. Then, it is necessary for developing countries to carry out reasonable assessment and long-term planning for carbon emissions trading [6]. Joyeux and Milunovich used the carry-cost model to study the market efficiency of CO₂ emissions of EU futures market from June 2005 to December 2007, and found that the estimated model parameters began to approach their theoretical values when approaching smaller samples [7]. Research shows that carbon emissions can be controlled through carbon emissions trading [8], carbon emissions pricing plays a key role in achieving emission reduction goals [9], and the peak value of domestic carbon emissions trading volume and carbon emissions price fluctuations are highly concentrated [10, 11]. In the foreign carbon market, the price fluctuation of the EU carbon quota market has a significant “leverage effect” in both stages [12], and the jump of the EUA spot market shows dynamic time-varying and jump diffusion [13]. According to the trading price data of seven regional carbon markets established in China, the trading price fluctuation of carbon emission rights is mainly characterized by small volume and large price difference [14], volatility spillover effect [15] and nonlinearity [16]. Relevant research also further confirmed that there is a long-term stable relationship between international carbon futures prices and domestic carbon prices, showing an obvious one-way causal relationship [17, 18]. According to the characteristics of carbon market price fluctuations, Wang Jiazhen and others identified five major risks leading to carbon market price fluctuations, including policy risk, liquidity risk, macroeconomic fluctuation risk, risk of participants, and spillover risk. To prevent the risk of carbon market price fluctuations, they put forward risk prevention suggestions to improve the carbon market trading system, improve the financial attributes of the carbon market and prevent other market spillover effects in advance [19]. Fan Liwei et al. proposed the SSA-SVR decomposition integrated prediction framework based on a rolling time window [20]. Li Yao used nonlinear Granger causality test and

