

Econometric Reviews >
Volume 27, 2008 - Issue 1-3

942 Views | 91 CrossRef citations to date | 0 Altmetric

Original Articles

Predicting the Daily Covariance Matrix for S&P 100 Stocks Using Intraday Data—But Which Frequency to Use?


Michiel de Pooter, Martin Martens & Dick van Dijk

Pages 199-229 | Received 21 Sep 2005, Accepted 04 Apr 2006, Published online: 07 Mar 2008

Cite this article <https://doi.org/10.1080/07474930701873333>

Sample our
Mathematics & Statistics
Journals

>> **Sign in here** to start your access
to the latest two volumes for 14 days



Full Article Figures & data References Citations Metrics

Reprints & Permissions [Read this article](#)

Abstract

This arti
mean-va
constitu
sampling
sampling
popu
balan
microstr
correctio
covarian
affect th

We Care About Your Privacy

We and our 848 partners store and/or access information on a device, such as unique IDs in cookies to process personal data. You may accept or manage your choices by clicking below, including your right to object where legitimate interest is used, or at any time in the privacy policy page. These choices will be signaled to our partners and will not affect browsing data. [Privacy Policy](#)

We and our partners process data to provide:

Use precise geolocation data. Actively scan device characteristics for identification. Store and/or access information on a device. Personalised advertising and content, advertising and content measurement, audience research and services development.

List of Partners (vendors)

I Accept

Essential Only

Show Purpose

forming
individual
e optimal
optimal
than the
striking a
to market
. Bias-
cy
substantially
dings are



also robust to the presence of transaction costs and to the portfolio rebalancing frequency.

Keywords: [Bias-correction](#) [High-frequency data](#) [Mean-variance analysis](#) [Realized volatility](#) [Tracking error](#) [Volatility timing](#)

JEL Classification: [G11](#)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Federico Bandi, Jeffrey Russell, Valeri Voev, the editors Michael McAleer and Essie Maasoumi, and two anonymous referees for helpful comments and suggestions. Any remaining errors are ours alone.

Notes

¹Zhang et al. ([2005](#)) focus solely on estimating the variance but here we apply their approach to covariances as well, as suggested by Zhang ([2005](#)).

²We should note that the two time-scales estimator of Zhang et al. ([2005](#)) is derived under the same model assumptions (see Equation (4) in Zhang et al., [2005](#)). By using it in the same format for covariances we acknowledge that for example the weights for the covariance matrices at two frequencies may be suboptimal and that the estimator

may be reserved for these

³ <http://v>

⁴For obvious reasons, the first trading strategy



Notes: The various sampling frequencies, 1997, through the average variance reflects the average realized

covariance the mean reflects the average taken over all 3003 pairs of stocks and over all 1788 trading days. The variance is the average taken over the 3003 sample variances of the realized covariances. In Panel A the “standard” realized covariance matrix $V_{t-1, h}$ given in (1) is used. Panel B is based on the two time-scales estimator given in (2), while Panel C shows results for the lead-lag corrected estimator given in (3), with Bartlett-kernel weights $d_l = 1 - l/(q + 1)$ and $q = 1$.

⁵An exception is the realized variance at the one- and two-minute frequencies, where also the variance increases due to the increased importance of bid-ask bounce.

⁶We experimented with alternative values for q , which led to qualitatively similar findings. Detailed results are available upon request. The issue of determining the optimal value of q is beyond the scope of this article and is left for future research.

⁷As explained below, we require part of the sample period to initialize the conditional covariance matrix estimates, which in our case equals 122 trading days. This implies that the effective sample period available for portfolio construction and evaluation runs from October 8, 1997 until May 27, 2004 (1666 trading days).

⁸Fleming et al. (2003) use a similar approach when assessing the effect of transaction costs.

⁹Note that our approach here differs from Fleming et al. (2003). Our method of holding multiple portfolios simultaneously is commonly applied in the literature on stock selection, see Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) and Rouwenhorst (1998), among many others.

¹⁰Fleming et al. (2003) use a similar approach when assessing the effect of transaction costs. They cite the GARCH model for volatility forecasting. They cite the GARCH model for volatility forecasting. They cite the GARCH model for volatility forecasting.

Note that our approach here differs from Fleming et al. (2003). Our method of holding multiple portfolios simultaneously is commonly applied in the literature on stock selection, see Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) and Rouwenhorst (1998), among many others. (13) and estimate returns (optimal updates when the updates are based on the two time-scales estimator, and the final two



columns when 1 lead and 1 lag of the (co-)variances are added to the contemporaneous (realized) covariances.

Notes: The table shows the out-of-sample performance of the overall minimum variance portfolio, with weights given in (6), and the minimum variance portfolio given a target level of return of 10%, with weights given in (8), constructed using rolling covariance matrix forecasts based on various sampling frequencies and based on different ways of measuring the realized covariance matrix (standard, two time-scales, and 1 lead and 1 lag). For the target return portfolios, we report the mean return (μ_P) and standard deviation (σ_P) in annualized percentage points, the Sharpe ratio (SR), the annualized basis points fee (Δ_γ) an investor with quadratic utility and constant relative risk aversion of γ would pay to switch from the daily returns covariance matrix estimate to the intraday returns of the optimal portfolios, and average daily turnover (TO) in percentage points. For the minimum variance portfolios, we report the standard deviation (α_{MVP}) in annualized percentage points average daily turnover (TO) in percentage points.

¹¹We examined the sensitivity of our results to the target return level by varying μ_P between 2% and 18%. These alternative target return levels led to qualitatively similar conclusions as those reported below. Detailed results are therefore not shown here, but are available on request.

Notes: The table shows the out-of-sample performance of the overall minimum tracking error portfolio, with weights given in (6), and the minimum tracking error portfolio given a target level of return of 1%, with weights given in (8), constructed using rolling covariance matrix forecasts based on different ways of measuring the realized covariance matrix (standard, two time-scales, and 1 lead and 1 lag). For the target return portfolios, we report the mean active return (μ_P) and standard deviation (σ_P) in annualized percentage points, the information ratio (IR), the annualized basis points fee (Δ_γ) an investor with quadratic utility and constant relative risk aversion of γ would pay to switch from the daily returns covariance matrix estimate to the intraday returns of the optimal portfolios, and average daily turnover (TO) in percentage points. For the minimum tracking error portfolios, we report the standard deviation (α_{MTEP}) in annualized percentage points average daily turnover (TO) in percentage points.



Notes: The table shows the out-of-sample performance of the minimum variance portfolio given a target level of return of 10%, with weights given in (8), constructed using rolling covariance matrix forecasts based on daily returns and on intraday returns at the sampling frequency that maximized the information ratio, based on the “standard” way of measuring the realized covariance matrix. We report the mean return (μ_P) and standard deviation (α_P) in annualized percentage points, the Sharpe ratio (SR), and the annualized basis points fee (Δ_γ) an investor with quadratic utility and constant relative risk aversion of γ would pay to switch from the daily returns covariance matrix estimate to the intraday returns of the optimal portfolios. The column headed c indicates the level of transaction costs, expressed in annualized percentage points, which correspond with the reduction in the annualized portfolio return if the entire portfolio would have to be traded every day during the whole year. The column headed h indicates the optimal sampling frequency, expressed as the length of the corresponding return interval in minutes.

Notes: The table shows the out-of-sample performance of the minimum tracking error portfolio given a target level of return of 1%, with weights given in (8), constructed using rolling covariance matrix forecasts based on daily returns and on intraday returns at the sampling frequency that maximized the information ratio, based on the ‘standard’ way of measuring the realized covariance matrix. We report the mean active return (μ_P) and tracking error (TE_P) in annualized percentage points, the information ratio (IR), the annualized basis points fee (Δ_γ) an investor with quadratic utility and constant relative risk aversion of γ would pay to switch from the daily returns covariance matrix estimate to the intraday returns of the optimal portfolios. The column headed c indicates the level of transaction costs, expressed in annualized percentage points, which correspond with the reduction in the annualized portfolio return if the entire portfolio would have to be traded every day during the whole year. The column headed h indicates the optimal sampling frequency, expressed as the length of the corresponding return interval in minutes.



Note: The table shows the out-of-sample performance of the minimum volatility portfolio given a target level of return of 1%, with weights given in (8), constructed using rolling covariance matrix forecasts based on daily returns and on intraday returns at the sampling frequency that maximized the information ratio, based on the ‘standard’ way of measuring the realized covariance matrix. The table shows the mean active return (μ_P) and tracking error (TE_P) in annualized percentage points, the information ratio (IR), the annualized basis points fee (Δ_γ) an investor with quadratic utility and constant relative risk aversion of γ would pay to switch from the daily returns covariance matrix estimate to the intraday returns of the optimal portfolios. The column headed c indicates the level of transaction costs, expressed in annualized percentage points, which correspond with the reduction in the annualized portfolio return if the entire portfolio would have to be traded every day during the whole year. The column headed h indicates the optimal sampling frequency, expressed as the length of the corresponding return interval in minutes.

performance using an expanding window period (starting with 250 days). Columns 2 and 3, and 6 and 7, report the mean and standard deviation of the resulting estimates of α_h . Columns 4 and 8, headed 'Perf.', show the Sharpe ratio and volatility (panel A) or the information ratio and tracking error (panel (B) for the resulting portfolios. Columns 5 and 9, headed 'LogL', show the SR/IR and σ_P/TE_P for portfolios constructed with decay parameters for the conditional covariance matrix that are estimated by maximizing the log-likelihood over the complete out-of-sample period.

Related Research Data

[Jump robust two time scale covariance estimation and realized volatility budgets](#)


Source: Routledge

[The influence of intraday seasonality on volatility transmission pattern](#)

Source: Taylor & Francis

Bibliography

Source: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Linking provided by  ScholarSplorer

Related research

People also read

Recommended articles

Cited by



Information for

- Authors
- R&D professionals
- Editors
- Librarians
- Societies

Opportunities

- Reprints and e-prints
- Advertising solutions
- Accelerated publication
- Corporate access solutions

Open access

- Overview
- Open journals
- Open Select
- Dove Medical Press
- F1000Research

Help and information

- Help and contact
- Newsroom
- All journals
- Books

Keep up to date

Register to receive personalised research and resources by email

 Sign me up



✕