

Sparse Portfolio Selection via Bayesian Multiple Testing

Sourish Das^a and Rituparna Sen^b

^a Chennai Mathematical Institute, INDIA

^b Indian Statistical Institute, INDIA

June 7, 2022

Abstract

We presented Bayesian portfolio selection strategy, via the k factor asset pricing model. If the market is information efficient, the proposed strategy will mimic the market; otherwise, the strategy will outperform the market. The strategy depends on the selection of a portfolio via Bayesian multiple testing methodologies. We present the “discrete-mixture prior” model and the “hierarchical Bayes model with horseshoe prior.” We define the Oracle set and prove that asymptotically the Bayes rule attains the risk of Bayes Oracle up to $O(1)$. Our proposed Bayes Oracle test guarantees statistical power by providing the upper bound of the type-II error. Simulation study indicates that the proposed Bayes oracle test is suitable for the efficient market with few stocks inefficiently priced. However, as the model becomes dense, i.e., the market is highly inefficient, one should not use the Bayes oracle test. The statistical power of the Bayes Oracle portfolio is uniformly better for the k -factor model ($k > 1$) than the one factor CAPM. We present the empirical study, where we considered the 500 constituent stocks of S&P 500 from the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), and S&P 500 index as the benchmark for thirteen years from the year 2006 to 2018. We showed the out-sample risk and return performance of the four different portfolio selection strategies and compared with the S&P 500 index as the benchmark market index. Empirical results indicate that it is possible to propose a strategy which can outperform the market.

Keywords: CAPM, Discrete Mixture Prior, Hierarchical Bayes, Oracle

*Sourish Das’s research supported by TATA Trust grant and Infosys Foundation grant to CMI.

1 Introduction

Markowitz portfolio theory [11] in finance analytically formalizes the risk-return tradeoff in selecting optimal portfolios. An investor allocates the wealth among securities in such a way that the portfolio guarantees a certain level of expected returns and minimizes the ‘risk’ associated with it. The variance of the portfolio return is quantified as the risk. Markowitz portfolio optimization is very sensitive to errors in the estimates of the expected return vector and the covariance matrix, see, e.g., [15]. The problem is severe when the portfolio size is large. Several techniques have been suggested to reduce the sensitivity of the Markowitz optimal portfolios. One approach is to use a James-Stein estimator for means (i.e., expected return) [19] and shrink the sample covariance matrix [23, 24]. Still, the curse of dimensionality kicks-in for a typically large portfolio (like mutual fund portfolio) and the procedure underestimates the risk profile of the portfolio [22]. Hence the dimension reduction is an essential requirement for robust portfolio selection.

In this paper, to address the dimension reduction problem, we take the alternative route for portfolio selection, which goes through the capital asset pricing model (CAPM), see, e.g. [25, 16, 8]. Although CAPM fails to explain several features, including rationality of the investors; it becomes a standard tool in corporate finance [2]. The CAPM splits a portfolio return into *systematic* return and *idiosyncratic* return and models it as the linear regression of portfolio’s ‘*risk premium*’ (aka. ‘*excess returns*’) on market’s ‘*risk premium*’. If the value of the intercept in this regression is zero, then the asset is fairly valued. If the intercept is zero and the slope is one, then the asset behaves very similarly to the market, and there is no gain in including it in the portfolio in addition to the market. The Fama and French Three-Factor Model, see [10], is an asset pricing model that expands on the CAPM by adding size risk and value risk factors to the market risk factor in CAPM. In general, for a k factor model, the asset will behave very similar to the market if the coefficient of the market is one and all other coefficients are zero. For most assets under consideration, this is the case. Thus the objective is to select such assets that have different behavior than the market and construct the portfolio based on those and the market. We present the problem of selecting such assets as multiple testing problems, under sparsity when the number of assets is high.

Bayesian methods are proposed to test the restriction imposed in CAPM that the intercepts in the regression of ‘*risk premium*’ on the ‘*market risk premium*’ are equal to zero, see [18, 6]. Shanken’s methodology relies on the prior induced on functions of intercept and sampling distribution of F -statistics, see [18]. Harvey and Zhou [6] proposed a full Bayesian specification of the CAPM test with diffuse prior and conjugate prior structure. Black and Litterman [9] presented an informal Bayesian approach to economic views and equilibrium relations. The existing methodology concentrates on the test for intercept (or α) only. In our proposed method we present a joint test for both intercept and slope, (i.e., α and β) for the CAPM and a multivariate test for the general k factor model. We motivate the joint test in the next section.

Rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we propose a portfolio selection strategy based on sparsity. In Section 3 we presented the discrete-mixture prior model and hierarchical Bayes model with half-Cauchy distribution on the scale parameters. In Section 4 we presented the results of the asymptotic Bayes optimality for the multiple testing methodology proposed in section 3. In Section 5, we present a simulation study. In Section 6, we present the empirical study based on data from the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE). We conclude the

paper with a discussion in Section 7.

2 Strategy

In this section, we present the strategy for portfolio selection. We discuss that when the maximum weight of the large portfolio is small, the idiosyncratic risk of a portfolio washes out. This feature holds for both the CAPM, and its extension to k -factor model. Then the portfolio return can be mostly explained by market movements and corresponding regression coefficients, popularly known as the portfolio's beta. In matrix notation, the CAPM is presented as follows:

$$\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{B} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{r} = ((r_{i,j}))_{n \times P}$ is the matrix of excess return over risk free rate for P many assets that are available in the market over n days; $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{B}$ is the systematic return due to market index, where

$$\mathbf{X} = ((\mathbf{1} \ \mathbf{r}_m))_{n \times 2} \quad (2.2)$$

is the design matrix with first column is the unit vector or the place holder for intercept and the second column is the vector of n -days excess return of the market index over risk free rate;

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_P \\ \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \dots & \beta_P \end{pmatrix}_{2 \times P}.$$

If market is efficient then according to [25, 16, 8], the intercepts $\alpha_i = 0 \ \forall i = 1(1)P$ and β_i is the measure of systematic risk due to market movement; $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = ((\epsilon_{i,j}))_{n \times P}$ is the idiosyncratic return of the asset.

Remark 2.1. In (2.1), if a portfolio is constructed based on \tilde{P} many assets all of which have $\alpha = 0$ and $\beta = 1$, then portfolio return will mimic the market return.

The Fama and French Three-Factor Model has similar representation as CAPM as given by equation 2.2 with

$$\mathbf{X} = ((\mathbf{1} \ \mathbf{r}_m \ \mathbf{SMB} \ \mathbf{HML}))_{n \times 4}$$

where \mathbf{SMB} stands for ‘‘Small Minus Big’’ in terms of market capitalization and \mathbf{HML} for ‘‘High Minus Low’’ in terms of book-to-market ratio. They measure the historic excess returns of small caps over big caps and of value stocks over growth stocks. These factors are calculated with combinations of portfolios composed by ranked stocks and available historical market data. Also, now

$$\mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & \dots & \alpha_P \\ \beta_1 & \beta_2 & \dots & \beta_P \\ b_1^s & b_2^s & \dots & b_P^s \\ b_1^v & b_2^v & \dots & b_P^v \end{pmatrix}_{4 \times P}.$$

In general one can consider a k -factor model with \mathbf{X} being $n \times (k + 1)$ dimensional, where the first column of \mathbf{X} is constant, the second column is the market return and the remaining are other $(k - 1)$ suitable factors. \mathbf{B} is $(k + 1) \times P$ dimensional and we shall denote it as $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\alpha_P \ \beta_P \ b_P^{(1)} \ \dots \ b_P^{(k-1)})^T$.

Remark 2.2. In (2.1), for the k factor model, if a portfolio is constructed based on \tilde{P} many assets all of which have $\alpha = 0$, $b^{(j)} = 0 \forall j \in \{1, \dots, k-1\}$ and $\beta = 1$, then the portfolio return will mimic the market return.

The covariance of r_i is Σ , which can be decomposed into

$$\Sigma = \mathbf{B}^T \Sigma_X \mathbf{B} + \Sigma_\epsilon,$$

$\Sigma_\epsilon = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \sigma_2^2, \dots, \sigma_P^2)$ and Σ_X is the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} . Let us consider a portfolio $\mathbf{w} = \{w_1, \dots, w_P\}$, where $0 \leq w_i, i = 1, \dots, P, \sum_{i=1}^P w_i = 1$. We show in the Appendix that, if $P \rightarrow \infty$, $M_{\mathbf{w}:P} := \max\{\mathbf{w}\} \rightarrow 0$ and $\sigma_{\max}^2 = \max\{\Sigma_\epsilon\} < \infty$, then

$$\lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}' \Sigma_\epsilon \mathbf{w} = 0.$$

Remark 2.3. Thus we can select $\tilde{P} (\ll P)$ many assets for the portfolio (out of P many assets available in the market), such that the idiosyncratic risk is washed out, i.e., for all $\delta > 0$, $\exists \tilde{P}_\delta$, such that for $\tilde{P} > \tilde{P}_\delta$,

$$\|\mathbf{w}'_{\tilde{P}} \Sigma_{\tilde{P}} \mathbf{w}_{\tilde{P}}\| < \delta;$$

and portfolio return is mostly explained by θ only. Note that here \tilde{P} is the effective size of the portfolio.

Remark 2.4. Oracle Set: If market is not efficient and there are q many assets whose $\alpha > 0$, where $q < \tilde{P} \ll P$. Let us call this set A_q . We can construct a portfolio with \tilde{P} many assets, such that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_q \subset B_{\tilde{P}}) \geq 1 - \eta, \quad (2.3)$$

where $B_{\tilde{P}}$ is the set of assets in the portfolio, $0 < \eta < 1$ and $\mathbf{w}'_{\tilde{P}} \Sigma_{\tilde{P}} \mathbf{w}_{\tilde{P}} < \delta$. Note that $\mathbf{w}'_{\tilde{P}} = \{\omega_i : \max_{i=1(1)\tilde{P}} \|\omega_i\| < \delta\}$ and $\Sigma_{\tilde{P}} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_{\tilde{P}}^2)$ is the covariance matrix of idiosyncratic return.

Example: If the market consists of $P = 2000$ stocks and a portfolio manager wants to build the portfolio with $\tilde{P} = 100$ stocks. If $q = 5$ many stocks are available with $\alpha_j > 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, 5$, then the portfolio manager would like to build a portfolio, such that $A_{q=5}$ is the subset of manager's selected portfolio $B_{\tilde{P}=100}$. In other words, the manager wants to build her/his portfolio in such a way that she/he does not want to miss out the set of five under-valued stocks $A_{q=5}$. That is she/he wants to employ a statistical methodology, where $\mathbb{P}(A_{q=5} \subset B_{\tilde{P}=100})$ would be very high. Note that if the market is efficient, then A_q will be a null set.

The problem reduces to identifying the oracle set A_q . Essentially, it is multiple testing problems, where we select those stocks in the portfolio $B_{\tilde{P}}$ for which we reject the following null hypothesis:

$$H_{0i} : \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \\ b_i^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ b_i^{(k-1)} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_{Ai} : \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_i \\ \beta_i \\ b_i^{(1)} \\ \vdots \\ b_i^{(k-1)} \end{pmatrix} \neq \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad i = 1 \dots P. \quad (2.4)$$

We would like to define an optimal test rule, such that (2.3) satisfies.

Here, the structure of the multiple testing problem is very different, compared to typical multiple testing problem in the literature [4, 5, 14], which are mainly motivated from genome wide association study. In the next section, we present the Bayesian methodology to identify $B_{\hat{P}}$.

3 Methodology

In this section, we propose Bayesian methodologies for testing the null hypothesis ($\alpha_i = 0, \beta_i = 1, b_i^{(1)} = 0, \dots, b_i^{(k-1)} = 0$) $\forall i = 1 \dots P$. First we propose the discrete mixture prior and then we propose the hierarchical Bayes model.

For each $i = 1 \dots P$, under the assumption of multivariate normality of $(\epsilon_{ij}, j = 1 \dots n)$, the least squares estimator $\hat{\theta}_i = (\hat{\alpha}_i, \hat{\beta}_i, \hat{b}_i^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{b}_i^{(k-1)})^T$, is the MLE of $\theta_i = (\alpha_i, \beta_i, b_i^{(1)}, \dots, b_i^{(k-1)})^T$. This is also sufficient statistics and the sampling distribution is $\hat{\theta}_i \sim N_{k+1}(\theta_i, \sigma_i^2 \Sigma_X^{-1})$ where $\Sigma_X = X^T X$.

3.1 Bayes Oracle with discrete-mixture prior for k -factor model

We propose to use a discrete mixture prior, commonly known as the ‘spike and slab’ prior introduced by [17]. The prior puts probability $1 - p$ on $\theta_i = \mu_0$ and p on an absolutely continuous alternative as $[\theta_i | \Lambda_0] \sim N_{k+1}(\mu_0, \Lambda_0^{-1})$. Unconditionally, θ_i ’s are independently distributed as

$$\theta_i \sim (1 - p)\delta_{\mu_0} + pN_{k+1}(\mu_0, \Lambda_0^{-1}),$$

where δ_{μ_0} is the degenerate distribution at zero. As θ_i , the corresponding $\mu_0 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$ implies prior mean of $\mathbb{E}(\alpha_i) = 0, \mathbb{E}(\beta_i) = 1, \mathbb{E}(b_i^{(1)}) = 0, \dots, \mathbb{E}(b_i^{(k-1)}) = 0$. The parameter p is often known as the sparsity parameter and as $p \rightarrow 0$ the model becomes a sparse model and as $p \rightarrow 1$ the model is known as dense model. This implies that the marginal distribution of $\hat{\theta}_i$ is the scale mixture of normals, that is

$$\hat{\theta}_i \sim (1 - p)N_{k+1}(\mu_0, \sigma_i^2 \Sigma_X^{-1}) + pN_{k+1}(\mu_0, \sigma_i^2 \Sigma_X^{-1} + \Lambda_0^{-1}). \quad (3.1)$$

The conditional posterior distribution under the alternative is

$$[\theta_i | \sigma_i, \Lambda_0, \hat{\theta}_i] \sim N_{k+1}(\mu_{ni}, \Lambda_{ni}^{-1})$$

$$\text{where } \Lambda_{ni} = \Lambda_0 + \frac{\Sigma_X}{\sigma_i^2} \text{ and } \mu_{ni} = \Lambda_{ni}^{-1} \left(\Lambda_0 \mu_0 + \frac{\Sigma_X}{\sigma_i^2} \hat{\theta}_i \right).$$

Under a sparse mixture model, the Bayes oracle has the rejection region \mathcal{C} on which the Bayes factor exceeds $\frac{(1-p)\delta_0}{p\delta_A}$, where δ_0 and δ_A are the losses associated with type I and type II errors, see [20]. In this case, the Bayes factor can be computed as

$$\begin{aligned} & (\det(I - Q_i))^{1/2} \exp\left(\frac{S_i}{2}\right) \\ \text{where } & S_i = (\mu_{ni} - \mu_0)^T \Lambda_{ni} (\mu_{ni} - \mu_0) \\ & \text{and } Q_i = \frac{X}{\sigma_i} \Lambda_{ni}^{-1} \frac{X^T}{\sigma_i} \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

The optimal rule is to reject H_{0i} if

$$S_i \geq c^2 = -\log(\det(I - Q_i)) + 2\log(f\delta) \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$f = \frac{(1-p)}{p} \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = \frac{\delta_0}{\delta_A}. \quad (3.4)$$

We call this rule *Bayes Oracle* since it makes use of unknown parameters p, Λ_0 and cannot be attained in finite samples. The posterior inclusion probability is

$$\tilde{\pi}_i = Pr(M_a|D) = \left(1 + \frac{1-p}{p} \exp\left(-\frac{S_i}{2}\right)\right)^{-1}, \quad \text{by Bayes theorem.}$$

Under symmetric loss, the rejection region coincides with $\tilde{\pi}_i > 1/2$. The test statistic involves

$$S_i = \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)^T}{\sigma_i} Q_i \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)}{\sigma_i}.$$

Under the null hypothesis, $(r_i - X\mu_0)/\sigma_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. Thus S_i is a quadratic form in multivariate normal with Q_i symmetric non-idempotent of rank $k+1$. The distribution is weighted sum of central χ^2 random variables of 1 df with weights being the eigenvalues of matrix Q , see [13]. In summary,

$$S_i \sim \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_{ji} \chi_j^2,$$

where λ_{ji} are the $k+1$ non-zero eigenvalues of Q_i and χ_j^2 are independent central chi-square random variables with 1 df. The distribution denoted by $M_{k+1}(\cdot; \lambda)$ is well studied, see for e.g. [12]. The probability of type I error is

$$t_{1i} = P\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \lambda_{ji} \chi_j^2 \geq c^2\right).$$

The probability of type II error is

$$t_{2i} = P\left(\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \frac{\lambda_{ji}}{1 - \lambda_{ji}} \chi_j^2 \leq c^2\right).$$

Under the alternative hypothesis the marginal of the data is, $(r_i - X\mu_0) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_i^2 A_i)$ where $A_i = (I - Q_i)^{-1}$. The distribution of S_i is weighted sum of central χ^2 random variables of 1 df with weights being the eigenvalues of matrix $A_i^{1/2} Q_i A_i^{1/2} = (I - Q_i)^{-1} - I$. Eigenvalues of this matrix are $\frac{\lambda_{ji}}{1 - \lambda_{ji}}$, where $\lambda_{ji}, j = 1, \dots, k+1$ are the non-zero eigenvalues of Q_i as before. Under additive loss function, the Bayes risk of the Bayes Oracle is

$$R_{\text{opt}} = (1-p)\delta_0 \sum_{i=1}^P t_{1i} + p\delta_A \sum_{i=1}^P t_{2i}.$$

3.2 Hierarchical Bayesian approach for k -factor model

We present the hierarchical Bayesian approach for the k -factor model, in the spirit of [7], which is as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} r_{ti} &\sim N(X_i \theta_i, \sigma_i^2), \\ \theta_i | \Lambda &\sim N_{k+1}(\theta_0, \tau^2 \Lambda^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\theta_i = (\alpha_i, \beta_i, b_i^{(1)}, \dots, b_i^{(k-1)})$, and $\theta_0 = (\alpha_0, \beta_0, b_0^{(1)}, \dots, b_0^{(k-1)})$

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^2 &\propto \text{InvGamma}\left(\frac{\nu_0}{2}, \frac{\nu_0}{2}\right), \\ \Lambda &\sim \text{Wishart}\left((\rho R)^{-1}, \rho\right), \\ \theta_0 &\sim N_{k+1}(\mu_0, C), \\ \tau^2 &\sim C^+(0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

where R is the prior scale matrix, ρ is prior degrees of freedom of the Wishart distribution, $\mu_0 = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^T$ and $C^+(0, 1)$ denotes half-Cauchy distribution with location parameter 0 and scale parameter 1 with corresponding pdf as

$$f(\tau) = \frac{2\mathbb{I}(\tau > 0)}{\pi(1 + \tau^2)}.$$

The parameter τ plays a crucial role in controlling the shrinkage behavior of the estimator. It is known as ‘global shrinkage parameter’ [4, 5, 14], as it adjust to the overall sparsity in the data. The posterior probability of τ is concentrated near zero when the data is very sparse ($p \rightarrow 0$). We define $\bar{\theta} = P^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^P \theta_i$, $n = \sum_{i=1}^P n_i$,

$$\begin{aligned} D &= [(X^T X) + \Lambda]^{-1}, \\ V &= (P\Lambda + C^{-1})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The Gibbs sampler for θ_i , σ_i^2 , Λ and θ_0 is straight forward as

$$[\theta_i | X, r_i, \mu_c, \Lambda, \sigma_i^2] \sim N_{k+1}(m_i, \Sigma_i),$$

where $m_i = D(X^T r_i + \Sigma_c \mu_c)$ and $\Sigma_i = \sigma_i^2 D$,

$$\begin{aligned} [\sigma_i^2 | n_i, r_i, \theta_i] &\sim \text{InvGamma}\left(\frac{\nu_0 + n_i}{2}, \frac{\nu_0 + (r_i - X\theta_i)^T (r_i - X\theta_i)}{2}\right), \\ [\Lambda | \theta_i, P, R, \rho, \mu_c] &\sim \text{Wishart}\left\{\left(\sum_{i=1}^P (\theta_i - \mu_c)(\theta_i - \mu_c)^T + \rho R\right)^{-1}, P + \rho\right\}, \\ [\theta_0 | V, P, \Lambda, C, \mu_0] &\sim N_{k+1}\left(V(P\Lambda\bar{\theta} + C^{-1}\mu_0), V\right). \end{aligned}$$

We implemented a Metropolis-Hastings update for τ . Here τ acts as global shrinkage parameter and Λ behaves as local shrinkage parameters. Note that we consider the half-Cauchy prior [1] over the scale parameter τ . $\tau \sim C^+(0, 1)$. Later [4, 5] showed that such prior specification is suited for high-dimension sparse solution problem and named it as ‘horseshoe prior’.

4 Asymptotic Optimality

The notion of ‘Asymptotic Bayes Optimality under Sparsity’ (ABOS) introduced in [20]. This has been extended to show optimality of one-group models in [14]. In particular, it is shown that if the global shrinkage parameter τ of the horse-shoe prior is chosen to be the same order as p , then the natural decision rule induced by the Horseshoe prior attains the risk of the Bayes oracle upto $O(1)$ with a constant close to the constant in the oracle. There have been several studies following this in the one-parameter setting. Here we extend these results to the multi-parameter setting. The asymptotic framework that we work under is motivated by [20]. For extending their result to the $(k+1)$ -dimensional case, we need the following assumption.

Assumption (A): A sequence of parameter vectors $\{\gamma_t = (p_t, \Lambda_{0t}, \sigma_{it}, \delta_t); t \in \{1, 2, \dots\}\}$ satisfies this assumption if it fulfills the following conditions:

$$p_t \rightarrow 0, \sigma_{it}^2 \Lambda_{0t} \rightarrow 0, v_t := \det(I - Q_{it}) f_t \delta_t \rightarrow \infty, \\ \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{jit})} \log(v_t) \rightarrow C \in (0, \infty).$$

where Q_i is defined in equation 3.2 and f and δ in equation 3.4. λ_{ji} , $j = 1, \dots, k+1$ are the non-zero eigenvalues of Q_i .

Theorem 4.1. *Under assumption A, $t_{1i} \rightarrow 0$ and $t_{2i} \rightarrow 1 - e^{-C/2}$.*

Proof. It has been seen in section 3.1 that, under the alternative hypothesis, S_i is a linear combination of $k+1$ independent χ_1^2 random variables with weights λ_{ji} , $j = 1, \dots, k+1$ the non-zero eigenvalues of Q_i . Under assumption A, λ_{ji} , $j = 1, \dots, k+1$ converge to 1 as $t \rightarrow \infty$. Hence $S_i \Rightarrow \chi_{k+1}^2$. Since $c_i^2 \rightarrow \infty, t_{1i} \rightarrow 0$.

Under the alternative hypothesis S_i is a linear combination of $k+1$ independent χ_1^2 random variables with weights $\lambda_{ji}/(1 - \lambda_{ji})$, $j = 1, \dots, k+1$. Under assumption A, λ_{ji} , $j = 1, \dots, k+1$ converge to 1. Hence $\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} \sqrt{(1 - \lambda_{ji})} S_i \Rightarrow \chi_{k+1}^2$. Also, $\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{ji})} \log(v) \rightarrow C$. Hence $t_{2i} \rightarrow P(X \leq C)$ where X is a χ_{k+1}^2 random variable, hence the result. \square

Remark 4.1. *From the above theorem, we can conclude that under the Bayes oracle, the risk takes the form $R_{\text{opt}} = Pp\delta_A(1 - e^{-C/2})$*

Definition 4.1. *Consider a sequence of parameters γ_t satisfying Assumption A. We call a multiple testing rule ABOS for γ_t if its risk R satisfies*

$$\frac{R}{R_{\text{opt}}} \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow \infty$$

We propose an alternative test with rejection region $\tilde{S}_i > c^2$, where c^2 is as defined in equation (3.3) and

$$\tilde{S}_i = \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)^T}{\sigma_i} X(X^T X)^{-1} X^T \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)}{\sigma_i}.$$

The advantage of \tilde{S}_i is that it does not depend on Λ_0 . We show that this new test is ABOS.

Theorem 4.2. *The test that rejects H_0 when $\tilde{S}_i > c_{it}^2$ is ABOS if and only if $c_{it} \rightarrow \infty$ and $c_{it}^2 \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{jit})} \rightarrow C$.*

Proof. Under H_0 , $\tilde{S}_i = \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)^T}{\sigma_i} \tilde{Q} \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)}{\sigma_i}$ is a quadratic form in standard multivariate normal with $\tilde{Q} = X(X^T X)^{-1} X^T$ symmetric idempotent of rank $k + 1$. Hence $\tilde{S}_i \sim \chi_{k+1}^2$. $t_{1i} = P(\tilde{S}_i > c_{it}^2) \rightarrow 0$ if and only if $c_{it} \rightarrow \infty$.

Under the alternative, $Z_i = \frac{(r_i - X\mu_0)^T}{\sigma_i} A_i^{-1/2}$ is standard normal and $\tilde{S}_i = Z_i^T A_i^{1/2} \tilde{Q} A_i^{1/2} Z_i$. So $(\det(A_i))^{-1/2} S_i \Rightarrow \chi_{k+1}^2$. Also, $\det(A_i) = \prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{ji})$. The same argument as in Theorem 4.1 shows that $t_{2i} \rightarrow 1 - e^{-C/2}$ if and only if $c_{it}^2 \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{jit})} \rightarrow C$.

The ABOS property is now established using the Theorem 4.1. \square

The Bayesian False Discovery Rate (BFDR) was introduced by [3] as

$$\text{BFDR} = P(H_0 \text{ is true} \mid H_0 \text{ is rejected}) = \frac{(1-p)t_1}{(1-p)t_1 + pt_2}.$$

It has been seen that multiple testing procedures controlling BFDR at a small level α behave very well in terms of minimizing the misclassification error, see eg [21].

Consider a fixed threshold rule based on \tilde{S}_i with BFDR equal to α . Under the mixture model (3.1), a corresponding threshold value c^2 can be obtained by solving the equation

$$\frac{(1-p)e^{-c^2/2}}{(1-p)e^{-c^2/2} + pe^{-c^2/2} \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_j)}} = \alpha \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 4.3. *Consider a fixed threshold rule with $\text{BFDR} = \alpha = \alpha_t$. The rule is ABOS if and only if it satisfies the following two conditions*

$$r_\alpha / f \rightarrow 0, \text{ where } r_\alpha = \alpha / (1 - \alpha) \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$\frac{2 \log(r_\alpha / f)}{1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_j)}}} \rightarrow C. \quad (4.3)$$

The threshold for this rule is of the form

$$c_t^2 = C - 2 \log(r_\alpha / f) + o_t. \quad (4.4)$$

Proof. Suppose the test is ABOS. Equation 4.1 is equivalent to

$$\frac{p}{1-p} \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} = e^{-c^2/2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_j)} \right)$$

By theorem 4.2, the right hand side goes to zero. This implies left hand side $= r_\alpha / f$ goes to zero, establishing the first condition.

Simplifying Equation 4.1 and using $c_{it}^2 \sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1} (1 - \lambda_{jt})} \rightarrow C$ we have,

$$2 \log(r_\alpha / f) = c_t^2 + C + o(t) \quad (4.5)$$

that is, the threshold is of the form given by equation 4.4.

Furthermore, $c_{it}^2 = C/\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1}(1 - \lambda_{jt})} + o(t)$. Combining this with equation 4.5, we get the second condition.

Now we prove the converse.

Suppose a test with $\text{BFDR}=\alpha$ satisfies the two conditions. Let us define z_t as $z_t = c_{it}^2\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1}(1 - \lambda_{jt})}$. Such a test satisfies 4.1. Hence,

$$2\log(r_\alpha/f) = z_t(1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\prod_{j=1}^{k+1}(1 - \lambda_{jt})}}).$$

Combining this with 4.3, we have $z_t \rightarrow C$.

Also, from 4.4, $2\log(r_\alpha/f) = z_t - c_t^2$. Combining this with 4.2 and $z_t \rightarrow C$, we have $c_t^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

Now by using theorem 4.2, the test is ABOS. \square

5 Simulation Study

In this section, we present four different simulation studies. In experiment 1, we compare the performance of S_i and \tilde{S}_i . In the second experiment, we compare the performance of Bayes Oracle estimator \tilde{S}_i with the other methods like diffuse prior and LARS-LASSO [15]. In the third experiment, we compare the probability that selected portfolio by proposed \tilde{S}_i will contain the Oracle set as a function of market size, sample size, and idiosyncratic risk. In the fourth experiment, we study the effect of the number of k factors on the performance of the \tilde{S}_i .

For the first three experiments, we consider the one factor CAPM to keep things simple and simulate the data from a true model given by equation (2.1) with $\sigma_i = \sigma$ for all i . Without loss of generality, we consider first $[pP]$ many stocks are not fairly priced. That is we simulate α_i and β_i for those stocks from $N(0, 0.1)$ and $N(1, 0.1)$ respectively. Rest of the stocks α and β are being set as $(0,1)$.

Experiment 1: In this study, we consider two different choices of P , i.e., $P = 100$ and 500 and the sample size is varied from $n = 20$ to $n = 50$ by an interval of 5. *Note that due to space constraint we present the result for $n = 20$ and $n = 50$ in figure 1.* We allow the sparsity parameter p to vary from 0.01 to 0.9 by an interval of 0.01. We choose two different values of $\sigma = (0.1, 0.05)$, and $\Lambda_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}$. For all these different choices of $n, P, \alpha, \beta, \sigma$; we simulate 1000 datasets. For each dataset, we compute S_i and \tilde{S}_i and make a decision. Based on the decision over 1000 datasets we compute type-I error, type-II error, Bayesian False Discovery Rate (BFDR), and the probability of misclassification (PMC); and present the results in Figure 1 and 2. We report the following observations.

Observations

1. As sparsity tends to 0, the type-I error goes to 0 in all four panels of the Figure 1. In all panels of the Figure 1, sparsity near to 0, the type-II error does not shoot to 1. The bounded type-II error guarantees particular statistical power of the ABOS. This observation verifies the Theorem 4.1.

2. From all four panels of the figure 1, we observe for different choices of n , P , σ and sparsity p , all the four metrics of S_i and \tilde{S}_i overlap. Hence verifies the Theorem 4.2.
3. As the sample size n increases; the probability of type-II error, and the probability of misclassification drops. It indicates increasing statistical power even when the sparsity parameter p is near zero.
4. As $p \rightarrow 1$, i.e., the model becomes dense, one should not use this test, as type-I error increases. However, up to 0.5 of the sparsity, the type-I error stays below 5% level.
5. In all four panels of the figure 1 the BFDR is about 0.05 irrespective the value of n , P , σ and p .
6. Figure 2 indicates that with the increasing number of stocks from $P = 10$ to $P = 500$, all the metrics of the test becomes smoother.

Experiment 2: In this study, we consider $P = 500$, the sample size $n = 20$, $\sigma = 0.1$ and $\Lambda_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.3 \\ 0.3 & 0.7 \end{pmatrix}$. For all these choices of parameters, we simulate 1000 datasets. For each dataset, we compute \tilde{S}_i and make a decision. We also make the decision using diffuse-prior and LARS-LASSO technique and compare against Oracle. Based on the decision on 1000 datasets we compute type-I error, type-II error, Bayesian False Discover Rate (BFDR) and the probability of misclassification (PMC) and present the results in Figure 3.

Observations

1. As the sparsity tends to 0, the type-I error of ABOS goes to 0. In likelihood testing, the type-I error is fixed at 5% level throughout the different values of sparsity. The LARS-LASSO method also demonstrates a flat behavior. However, it is more than the likelihood method.
2. If we compare the type-II error, BFDR, and the PMC for all three methods, the ABOS test proposed in this paper is uniformly better than the other two methods.

Note: We tried to compare the ABOS test against Hierarchical Bayes (HB) with Horse Shoe prior method. However, given the computational power, it took about three days to implement the HB method for 1000 simulated datasets, for one fixed sparsity parameter. For each dataset, we simulated 25000 MCMC simulations after 5000 burn-in. For experiment 2, we consider the sparsity ranges from 0.01 to 0.9 by an interval of 0.01. For one sparsity value it was taking approximately three days, and for all 90 possible values, it will take about 270 days, assuming no possible disruption in the systems. Hence we could not implement the comparison due to the lack of computational resources. Therefore we leave this task as a future research project.

Experiment 3: The objective of this study is to compare the portfolio return from true Oracle portfolio and portfolio selected via the ABOS test method. We simulate 1000 datasets. In each dataset, we simulate 40 samples from the model described in experiment 1. We consider the 20 samples for train dataset and rest for test dataset. Throughout we consider the market size is

$P = 500$. We consider the portfolio size to be $\tilde{P} = 100$ and $\tilde{P} = 50$. We consider two different choices of σ , 0.03 and 0.01 respectively. We assume 5% (i.e., $q = 25$) of stock's α are non-zero. We consider Oracle portfolio, (denoted as $A_q^{\tilde{P}}$) and the ABOS portfolio (denoted as $B^{\tilde{P}}$) for the study. In the Oracle portfolio, 25 stocks will always be selected along with 75 other randomly selected stocks. In the ABOS portfolio, all stocks were selected based on \tilde{S}_i . We consider equal weight for both portfolios.

Observations:

1. In table (1), we present the out sample median return from 1000 synthetic dataset. The median return for both true oracle portfolio and ABOS portfolio are similar for four different choices of \tilde{P} and σ .
2. In figure (4), we present side-by-side boxplot of return from 1000 synthetic dataset for true Oracle portfolio and the ABOS portfolio. Visual inspection tells us the performance of the ABOS portfolio is similar to the Oracle portfolio.

Experiment 4: The objective of this study is to investigate the effect of the number of factors on the performance of the portfolio selection. We compare the probability that the selected portfolio contains the Oracle portfolio, between the CAPM and the four-factor model. Note that the CAPM model is effectively a one-factor model, where risk-premium due to market index is the only factor. **Observations:**

1. In figure (5), we present a side-by-side line plot of the probability that the selected portfolio contains the Oracle portfolio. Visual inspection indicates that the statistical power of the ABOS portfolio is uniformly better for the four-factor model than the one factor CAPM.

6 Empirical Study

In the empirical study, we considered about thirteen years of daily return from Jan 2006 to Oct 2018. The purpose of choosing this period is to study the behavior of the methods especially during the stress period of 2008 and 2011. We considered about 500 stocks listed with the Newyork Stock Exchange. We downloaded the daily adjusted close prices of the 500 stocks on the 1st of November, 2018. Also, we downloaded the daily closing value of S&P 500 index, Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJI), NYSE Composite (NYSEC), Russell 2000 index, CBOE Volatility Index (aka. VIX). All data downloaded from the Yahoo Finance website (<https://finance.yahoo.com/>). We considered S&P 500 index as the benchmark market index and indices like DJI, NYSEC, Russell 2000 and VIX as additional factors in a five-factor model. Note that during these thirteen years of the period certain stocks were not available. Initial years daily closing prices of about 400 stocks were available. We implemented our analysis with available stock prices.

We implemented the following monthly analysis. On the t^{th} month, we run the modeling procedure described in section 3 over the daily return of the t^{th} month. As there are $P = 500$ many assets with excess returns over risk-free rate r_1, \dots, r_P in the market and $P \gg n$. Here n is typically 22 or 23 days of return, as there are only that many business days in a month. We select $\tilde{P} = 25$ many assets using the methodology described above and use the daily return of t^{th} month.

We select the stocks which are under-priced and our revised portfolio for $(t + 1)^{st}$ month would be with these under-priced stocks. Once we select $\tilde{P} = 25$ many assets for the portfolio, then the problem reduces to portfolio allocation. Typically, portfolio managers resort to the solution from the Markowitz's optimization. However, we realize if we resort to the Markowitz's optimization, we will not be able to distinguish, if the enhanced performance is due to portfolio selection or due to portfolio allocation. To nullify the effect of the portfolio allocation, we considered the equal-weighted portfolio throughout.

We invest in the selected stocks for the month $t + 1$ and calculate the out-sample return of the portfolio and S&P 500 Index at the same time. We considered the out-sample period to be from Jan 01, 2006 to Oct 31, 2018. For example, we run the statistical processes on the stock price of Dec 2007 and identify the 25 stocks and construct the portfolio using the equal weights for Jan 2008 and invest only in these stocks. We repeat the process for each month. The performance for portfolio with equal weight is presented in table 2.

Figure 6, shows the performance of four different strategies in out-sample. Here S&P 500 index is being considered as benchmark portfolio, as many investors invest in S&P500 index fund as passive investors. If we look at the table 2, except for two years (2008,2012) the 'factor models with horseshoe' selection strategy outperforms the benchmark index in terms of annual return. Out of 13 years, there are five years (2008, 2011, 2013, 2017, 2018) where Fan's LARS-LASSO selection process under-performs compared to benchmark in terms of annual return. Similarly, out of the same 13 years, there are six years (2006,2008,2010,2015,2017,2018) the CAPM selection process underperforms compared to benchmark in terms of annual return. Except for three years (2011, 2017, 2018), the factor models with Bayes Oracle strategy outperforms the benchmark index fund in terms of annual return. In terms of annual return all four portfolio selection process are outperforming the benchmark in all the thirteen years, but we cannot clearly say one strategy outperforms the other for all years.

In Table 3 we present the out-sample annualized volatility of all the selection strategies and in Figure 6 presents the daily annualized volatility of all fours selection strategies in out-of-the sample return. The volatility estimated with the GARCH(1,1) model. The volatility risk for all four strategies though mimic the volatility risk of the benchmark S&P 500 index and the volatility risk for all the four strategies is always in the neighborhood of the S&P 500 index. However careful visual inspection indicates that all four strategies have systematically marginally higher volatility risk compare to the S&P 500 index. The volatility risk of the Bayes oracle strategy is always consistently lower among the four strategies. Table 4 presents the 'Value at Risk' (VaR) of different strategies in out-sample return. The VaR of the Bayes oracle strategy tends to be lower among the four strategies.

Table 5 presents the 'risk-adjusted return' of different strategies in out-sample. There is no single consistent winner. There are five years where hierarchical Bayes strategy has the highest risk-adjusted return. Other than 2017, all other years, either of the four strategies has a higher risk-adjusted return compare to the benchmark S&P 500 index. The risk-adjusted return indicates the possible existence of inefficiency in the market. *There is no clear winning strategy in terms of annual return. However, all four strategies indicate the possible existence of inefficiency in the market.*

7 Discussion

We presented Bayesian portfolio selection strategy, via the k factor model. If the market is information efficient, the proposed strategy will mimic the market; otherwise, the strategy will outperform the market. The strategy depends on the selection of a portfolio via Bayesian multiple testing methodologies for the parameters of the model. We present the “discrete-mixture prior” model and “hierarchical Bayes model with horseshoe prior.” We prove that under the asymptotic framework of [14]; the Bayes rule attains the risk of Bayes Oracle up to $O(1)$ with a constant close to the constant in the Oracle. The Bayes Oracle test guarantees statistical power by providing the upper bound of the type-II error.

A simulation study, indicate that Bayes oracle test has an increasing statistical power with increasing sample size; when the sparsity parameter p is near zero. As $p \rightarrow 1$, i.e., the model becomes dense, one should not use the Bayes oracle test. However, up to $p = 0.5$ of the sparsity, the type-I error stays below 5% level. Hence, we can use the test even when $p = 0.5$, i.e., the model is moderately sparse. It means the proposed Bayes oracle test is suitable for the efficient market with few stocks inefficiently priced. The statistical power of the Bayes Oracle portfolio is uniformly better for the k -factor model ($k > 1$) than the one factor CAPM.

We present an empirical study, where we considered the 500 stocks from the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), and S&P 500 index as the benchmark, over the period from the year 2006 to 2018. We presented the out-sample risk and return performance of the four different strategies and compared with the S&P 500 index. Empirical results indicate the existence of inefficiency in the market, and it is possible to propose a strategy which can outperform the market.

References

- [1] Gelman A. Prior distributions for variance parameters in hierarchical models(comment on article by browne and draper). *Bayesian Analysis*, 1:515–534, 2006.
- [2] Goyal A. Empirical cross-sectional asset pricing: a survey. *Financial Market Portfolio Management*, 26:3 – 38, 2012.
- [3] Efron Bradley and Tibshirani Robert. Empirical bayes methods and false discovery rates for microarrays. *Genetic epidemiology*, 23(1):70–86, 2002.
- [4] Carvalho C., Polson N., and Scott J. Handling sparsity via the horseshoe. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:73–80, 2009.
- [5] Carvalho C., Polson N., and Scott J. The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals. *Biometrika*, 97(2):465–480, 2010.
- [6] Harvey R. C and Zhou G. Bayesian inference in asset pricing tests. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 26:221–254, 1990.
- [7] Gelfand A. E., Hills S. E., A. Racine-Poon, and Smith A. F. M. Illustration of bayesian inference in normal data models using gibbs sampling. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 85:972–985, 1990.

- [8] Black F. Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing. *Journal of Business*, 45:444–454, 1972.
- [9] Black F. and Litterman R. Global portfolio optimization. *Financial Analysis Journal*, 48:28–43, 1992.
- [10] Eugene F Fama and Kenneth R French. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of financial economics*, 33(1):3–56, 1993.
- [11] Markowitz H. Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91, 1952.
- [12] Solomon H. and Stephens M. A. Distribution of a sum of weighted chi-square variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 72(360):881–885, 1977.
- [13] Vuong Q. H. Likelihood ratio tests for model selection and non-nested hypotheses. *Econometrica*, 57(2):307–333, 1989.
- [14] Datta J. and Ghosh J. K. Asymptotic properties of bayes risk for the horseshoe prior. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(1):111–132, 2013.
- [15] Fan J., Zhang J., and Yu K. Vast portfolio selection with gross-exposure constraints. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107:592–606, 2012.
- [16] Lintner J. The valuation of risky assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 47:13–37, 1965.
- [17] Mitchell T J and Beauchamp J J. Bayesian variable selection in linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83(404):1023–1032, 1988.
- [18] Shanken J. A bayesian approach to testing portfolio efficiency. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19:195–216, 1987.
- [19] Chopra V. K. and Ziemba W. T. The effect of errors in means, variance and covariances on optimal portfolio choice. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 19:6–11, 1993.
- [20] Bogdan M., Chakraborty A., Frommlet F., and Ghosh J. Asymptotic bayes optimality under sparsity of some multiple testing procedures. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(3):1551–1579, 2011.
- [21] Bogdan Małgorzata, Ghosh Jayanta K, Ochman Aleksandra, and Tokdar Surya. On the empirical bayes approach to the problem of multiple testing. *Quality and Reliability Engineering International*, 23(6):727–739, 2007.
- [22] El Karoui N. High-dimensionality effects in the markowitz problem and other quadratic programs with linear constraints: risk underestimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3487–3566, 2010.
- [23] Ledoit O. and Wolf M. Improved estimation of the covariance matrix of stock returns with an application to portfolio selection. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 10:603–621, 2003.

- [24] Das S., Halder A., and Dey D. K. Regularizing portfolio risk analysis: A bayesian approach. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 19:865–889, 2017.
- [25] Sharpe W. Capital asset prices:a theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk. *Journal of Finance*, 19:425–442, 1964.

Table 1: Median Return (of 1000 out of sample dataset) of True Oracle Portfolio and Portfolio selected by proposed \tilde{S}_i Method. It indicates ABOS selection and Oracle selection are equivalent.

\tilde{P}	σ	Oracle Portfolio Return	\tilde{S}_i Portfolio Return
100	0.03	0.024	0.023
50	0.03	0.014	0.013
100	0.01	0.015	0.016
50	0.01	0.013	0.010

Table 2: Out-sample Annual Return with Equal Weight. The blue value indicates the maximum return compare to other strategies in a particular year.

	S&P 500	CAPM	Fan's Model	Factor Model with HS	Factor Model with BO
2006	11.78	11.62	21.06	12.78	15.56
2007	3.65	22.33	5.56	13.26	10.87
2008	-37.58	-49.85	-40.44	-44.70	-33.89
2009	19.67	26.70	32.02	40.51	30.97
2010	11.02	9.21	19.89	26.31	35.70
2011	-0.68	0.43	-4.32	2.75	-7.12
2012	11.68	14.03	21.44	11.46	24.56
2013	26.39	43.69	25.04	42.50	29.45
2014	12.39	23.93	17.83	17.92	20.06
2015	0.14	-9.89	4.28	3.73	9.64
2016	12.70	13.82	14.58	23.14	20.85
2017	18.42	12.63	12.61	26.07	10.93
2018	0.59	-5.73	-11.39	5.34	-4.11

Table 3: Annualized Volatility of out-sample return

	S&P 500	CAPM	Fan's Model	Factor Model with HS	Factor Model with BO
2006	10.02	16.32	13.93	14.50	13.08
2007	16.02	20.31	18.59	18.88	16.67
2008	41.02	52.99	49.68	46.57	45.47
2009	27.27	48.49	35.50	34.14	36.22
2010	18.10	25.29	21.93	22.41	20.96
2011	23.44	29.04	28.76	29.45	26.22
2012	12.76	18.10	16.48	17.58	14.66
2013	11.07	14.83	14.14	14.66	12.31
2014	11.38	14.63	14.49	15.75	12.39
2015	15.54	17.19	16.45	17.93	16.22
2016	12.99	18.02	14.93	16.90	15.35
2017	6.69	10.39	9.50	9.98	8.34
2018	15.26	18.85	15.59	16.33	14.78

Table 4: Value at Risk (VaR) of out-sample return.

	S&P 500	CAPM	Fan's Model	Factor Model with HS	Factor Model with BO
2006	1.27	2.12	1.53	1.91	1.65
2007	2.52	2.79	2.68	2.51	2.31
2008	6.19	8.51	8.01	6.96	6.18
2009	3.54	6.79	4.61	4.23	5.01
2010	2.76	3.69	2.91	2.88	3.12
2011	2.97	3.54	3.93	3.68	3.45
2012	1.60	2.19	2.18	2.15	1.88
2013	1.43	1.78	1.75	1.81	1.48
2014	1.65	2.13	2.11	2.49	1.58
2015	1.94	2.23	2.07	2.23	1.73
2016	1.86	2.52	2.16	2.07	1.99
2017	0.80	1.66	1.27	1.20	1.16
2018	2.25	2.59	2.56	2.61	2.16

Table 5: Risk adjusted out-sample return. The blue value indicates the maximum risk-adjusted return compare to other strategies in a particular year.

	S&P 500	CAPM	Fan's Model	Factor Model with HS	Factor Model with BO
2006	1.18	0.71	1.51	0.88	1.19
2007	0.23	1.10	0.30	0.70	0.65
2008	-0.92	-0.94	-0.81	-0.96	-0.75
2009	0.72	0.55	0.90	1.19	0.85
2010	0.61	0.36	0.91	1.17	1.70
2011	-0.03	0.01	-0.15	0.09	-0.27
2012	0.92	0.77	1.30	0.65	1.68
2013	2.38	2.95	1.77	2.90	2.39
2014	1.09	1.64	1.23	1.14	1.62
2015	0.01	-0.58	0.26	0.21	0.59
2016	0.98	0.77	0.98	1.37	1.36
2017	2.75	1.22	1.33	2.61	1.31
2018	0.04	-0.30	-0.73	0.33	-0.28

Figure 1: Performance of S_i and \tilde{S}_i with 100 stocks, i.e., $P = 100$ with 20 and 50 days of data, i.e., sample size $n = 20$ and $n = 50$








Figure 2: Performance of S_i and \tilde{S}_i with 10 and 500 stocks, i.e., $P = 10$ and $P = 500$ with 20 days of data, i.e., sample size $n = 20$

(a) $n = 20, \sigma = 0.1$



(b) $n = 20, \sigma = 0.1$




Figure 3: Performance Comparison of ABOS, Diffuse prior and LARS-LASSO, with 100 stock and 20 days of data and simulation size 100




Figure 4: Boxplot of 1000 outsample return of the True Oracle portfolio and the portfolio selected based on \hat{S}_i .







Figure 5: The line-plot of the probability, that the selected portfolio contains the Oracle portfolio. The probability estimated using 1000 out sample return. On the x-axis, we consider varying idiosyncratic risk.




CAPM with $\tilde{P} = 100$ vs 500
and $n = 20$ in both case



CAPM with $n = 20$ vs 40
and $P = 100$ in both cases




The 4 factor model $\tilde{P} = 100$ vs 500
and $n = 20$ in both case



The 4 factor model $n = 20$ vs 40
and $P = 100$ in both cases

Figure 6: Performance of a different portfolios in outsample



A Appendix

Markowitz portfolio optimization can be expressed as the following quadratic programming problem:

$$\text{Min } \mathbf{w}'\Sigma\mathbf{w} \quad \text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{w}'\mathbf{1}_P = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{w}'\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mu_k \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Here $\mathbf{1}_P$ is a P -dimensional vector with one in every entry and μ_k is the desired level of return.

The portfolio covariance can be decomposed into two parts as,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}'\Sigma\mathbf{w} &= \mathbf{w}'[\mathbf{B}^T\Sigma_m\mathbf{B} + \Sigma_\epsilon]\mathbf{w} \\ &= \mathbf{w}'\mathbf{B}^T\Sigma_m\mathbf{B}\mathbf{w} + \mathbf{w}'\Sigma_\epsilon\mathbf{w}, \end{aligned}$$

where first part explains the portfolio volatility due to market volatility and the second part explains portfolio volatility due to idiosyncratic behaviour of the stock. We assume σ_i 's are bounded $\forall i$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{w}'\Sigma_\epsilon\mathbf{w} &= \sum_{i=1}^P \omega_i^2 \sigma_i^2 \\ &\leq \sigma_{max}^2 \sum_{i=1}^P \omega_i^2, \quad \sigma_{max}^2 = \max\{\Sigma_\epsilon\} < \infty, \\ &\leq \sigma_{max}^2 M_{\omega:P} \sum_{i=1}^P \omega_i, \quad M_{\omega:P} = \max\{\mathbf{w}\}, \\ &= \sigma_{max}^2 M_{\omega:P}. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, if $P \rightarrow \infty$ and $M_{\omega:P} \rightarrow 0 \implies \mathbf{w}'\Sigma_\epsilon\mathbf{w} \rightarrow 0$. Hence we have the following result.

Result A.1. *If $P \rightarrow \infty$ and $M_{\omega:P} \rightarrow 0$ and $\sigma_{max}^2 = \max\{\Sigma_\epsilon\} < \infty$, then*

$$\lim_{P \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{w}'\Sigma_\epsilon\mathbf{w} = 0.$$