

Penalized Principal Component Analysis for Large-dimension Factor Model with Group Pursuit

Yong He^a, Dong Liu^b, Guangming Pan^b, Yiming Wang^a

^a*Institute for Financial Studies, Shandong University, Jinan, China*

^b*School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

Abstract

This paper investigates the intrinsic group structures within the framework of large-dimensional approximate factor models, which portrays homogeneous effects of the common factors on the individuals that fall into the same group. To this end, we propose a fusion Penalized Principal Component Analysis (PPCA) method and derive a closed-form solution for the ℓ_2 -norm optimization problem. We also show the asymptotic properties of our proposed PPCA estimates. With the PPCA estimates as an initialization, we identify the unknown group structure by a combination of the agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithm and an information criterion. Then the factor loadings and factor scores are re-estimated conditional on the identified latent groups. Under some regularity conditions, we establish the consistency of the membership estimators as well as that of the group number estimator derived from the information criterion. Theoretically, we show that the post-clustering estimators for the factor loadings with group pursuit achieve efficiency gains compared to the estimators by traditional PCA method. Thorough numerical studies validate the established theory and a real financial example illustrates the practical usefulness of the proposed method.

Keywords: Factor model; Large-dimensional; Penalized Principal Component Analysis; Agglomerative hierarchical clustering; Homogeneity; Information criterion

1. Introduction

As a powerful technique for data simplification and dimension reduction, factor models are widely used to extract representative features and explain the generative process of massive variables. They have been applied in various fields such as financial engineering, economic analysis and biological technology, including studying the expected returns (Ross, 2013, 1977; Fama and French, 1992, 1993), risks of portfolios (Fan et al., 2015) and gene expression data (Mayrink and Lucas, 2013). Factor models have also been combined with many modern statistical learning methods to improve predictive power, such as factor profiled sure independence screening in Wang (2012), the estimation of large covariance matrices in Fan et al. (2018) and factor-adjusted multiple testing in Fan et al. (2019).

Thus far, the most effective tools for analyzing and predicting large-dimensional time series are the

large-dimensional (approximate) factor models, which allow the idiosyncratic errors to be cross-sectionally correlated (Chamberlain and Rothschild, 1982). The estimation and inference for factor models are crucial in economic studies, particularly in areas such as asset pricing and return forecasting. With the increase of data dimension in these areas, how to accurately estimate and infer the unknown factor scores and loadings becomes more and more challenging and attracts growing attention of econometricians. Principal component analysis (PCA) method and Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE) method are two common methods for inferring factor models, whose asymptotic properties have been fully explored in the literature, see for example, Bai and Ng (2002), Bai (2003), Forni et al. (2005), Bai and Li (2012), Bai and Li (2016), Chen et al. (2021a), Wang (2022), Ma and Tu (2023). In particular, the PCA method, known for its simplicity and effectiveness, is closely connected with the factor model and has long been a hot research topic in the econometric community. An increasing number of work focus on more flexible factor models, for instance, factor models with structural breaks (Bates et al., 2013; Baltagi et al., 2017); constrained factor model (Tsai and Tsay, 2010); factor model with latent group structures (Tu and Wang, 2023; He et al., 2024b); robust factor analysis (Yu et al., 2019; Chen et al., 2021b; He et al., 2022); matrix/tensor factor models (Han et al., 2020, 2022; Chen et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2022; He et al., 2023a,b, 2024a; Barigozzi et al., 2024).

In the era of “big data”, the cross-sectional dimension in the approximate factor models typically grows extremely large, thus the number of unknown parameters increases dramatically, which causes great challenges for accurate estimation. To alleviate this issue, Tsai and Tsay (2010) proposed a constrained factor model to study the monthly U.S. excess stock returns where the stocks within the same sector of industry are assumed to share the same loadings on risk factors. In addition, Xiang et al. (2023) divided the cities into four groups and assume the market and government factors have the same impact on house price growth within each group. Both the studies have assumed the group information is pre-specified, which lack support of economic theory. Consequently, the derived results can be misleading when the group membership is misspecified. As an alternative, Tu and Wang (2023) assumed the loading vectors in the factor model have a latent group structure, portraying the homogeneous effects of the common factors on the individuals falling into the same group. He et al. (2024b) also proposed robust estimators of the factors and factor loadings in the presence of both group structure and heavy-tailedness. Shi et al. (2022) proposed to do forecast combination or portfolio analysis by adopting ℓ_2 -norm relaxation on the weights, deeming that one should assign the same weight to all individual units within the same latent group whereas potentially distinct weights to the units in different groups. The factor model example for theoretical development in their work also presumes that the factor loadings are directly governed by certain latent group structures.

This paper is inspired by a growing literature on homogeneity in panel data, such as Wang et al. (2018), Vogt and Linton (2017), Ma and Huang (2017), Chen (2019), Ma et al. (2020), Chen et al. (2021a), Guo and Li (2022), Wei et al. (2023), Tu and Wang (2023) and Wang and Zhu (2024). Without resorting to any prior

information, we develop a completely data-driven unsupervised grouping criterion for the cross-sectional units under the framework of approximate factor model. Our proposed method mainly include the following two steps. In the first step, we propose a fusion Penalized Principal Component Analysis (PPCA) method to derive an initial estimator with group structure. Interestingly, a closed-form solution for the penalized optimization problem is derived in this paper, which is computationally as efficient as the traditional PCA method. In the second step, we apply the classical hierarchical clustering (AHC) method to the ℓ_1 -distance between the estimated loading vectors by PPCA derived from the first step. We summarize the major contributions of this paper as follows. Firstly, we propose a fusion Penalised PCA (PPCA) method for estimating the factor scores and factor loadings. A novel ℓ_2 type fusion penalty is exerted on the pairwise loading vectors to encourage similarity of loadings for individuals within the same group, which interestingly results in a closed-form solution. We study the consistency and asymptotic normality of the PPCA estimators and achieve a faster convergence rate than the traditional PCA estimators by selecting an appropriate tuning parameter. Secondly, we introduce a clustering procedure for determining the group membership of each cross-sectional unit and an information criterion for selecting the number of groups. We investigate the asymptotic properties of the clustering procedure under a relaxed condition on the minimum signal strength and group sizes compared with [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#), which demonstrates that the proposed method can accurately identify the group memberships and estimate the group number with probability approaching to 1. In addition, we have also established the asymptotic properties of the post-grouping estimators of the factor loadings. Thorough simulation experiments verify the well finite sample performance of the proposed method in terms of both identifying group memberships and selecting group number. We apply our proposed approach to analyze a portfolio returns dataset, in which we discover intriguing patterns of clustering that contribute to a substantial enhancement in predictive accuracy.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces the approximate factor model with group homogeneity, and we propose the novel PPCA method to estimate the factor scores and factor loadings. Cross Validation (CV) criteria are also introduced for the selection of tuning parameters. Meanwhile this section also introduces the clustering method and an information criterion for identifying the latent group structure and estimating the unknown group number, respectively. Section 3 establishes the asymptotic properties of the proposed PPCA estimators and the subsequent estimators of the clustering procedure. Section 4 displays the finite sample performance of the proposed method by simulation studies, and Section 5 illustrates its practical merits with an U.S. portfolio return dataset. Section 6 concludes the paper and discusses possible future research directions. All the technical proofs of the theorems and additional empirical results are relegated to the supplementary material.

To end this section, we introduce some notations used throughout this paper. Denote $\mathbf{0}_N$ as the N -dimensional vector with all elements zero. For a vector \mathbf{a} , we denote $\|\mathbf{a}\|_q$ as its ℓ_q norm. Denote \mathbf{I}_N as the

N -dimensional identity matrix. For a matrix \mathbf{A} , $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{A})$ denotes the trace of \mathbf{A} . We denote $\lambda_j(\mathbf{A})$ as the j -th largest eigenvalue of a symmetric matrix \mathbf{A} while $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ correspond to the maximum and minimum eigenvalue, respectively. We define $\|\mathbf{A}\|_F = \text{Tr}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$, $\|\mathbf{A}\| = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A})$ as the Frobenius norm and the spectral norm of \mathbf{A} respectively. $X_n \lesssim Y_n$ means there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $X_n \leq cY_n$ for sufficiently large n , while $X_n \gtrsim Y_n$ means there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $X_n \geq cY_n$ for sufficiently large n , and $X_n \asymp Y_n$ means both $X_n \lesssim Y_n$ and $X_n \gtrsim Y_n$ hold. The cardinality of a set \mathcal{G} is denoted as $|\mathcal{G}|$. The constants c and M in different lines can be not identical.

2. Methodology

In this section, we formally introduce our method which includes two main steps. Firstly, we introduce a pairwise fusion penalty to encourage group pursuit for the factor loadings, thereby putting forward the Penalized PCA method to enhance estimation accuracy for the factor structure. To identify group memberships, we perform the AHC algorithm to cluster the individuals into groups, then further deriving refined post-grouping estimators of the factor loadings.

2.1. Preliminary

Consider the static approximate factor model originated from [Chamberlain and Rothschild \(1982\)](#) for a large panels $\{x_{ti}\}_{t \leq T, i \leq N}$,

$$x_{ti} = \sum_{l=1}^r b_{il} f_{tl} + e_{ti}, \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (2.1)$$

where b_{il} are the factor loadings, f_{tl} are the random factor scores, e_{ti} are the idiosyncratic errors which can be cross-sectionally correlated, r is the number of common factors. In model (2.1), only x_{ti} can be observed, while r , b_{il} , f_{tl} and e_{ti} are all unobserved. In this paper, one of our research interests is to refine the estimates of the unknown factor loadings and factor scores by conventional PCA given the prior knowledge of the existence of latent groups of individuals.

The vector and matrix form of model (2.1) are as follows

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top + \mathbf{E} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t^\top = (x_{t1}, \dots, x_{tN})$, $\mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_N)^\top = (b_{il})_{N \times r}$, $\mathbf{f}_t^\top = (f_{t1}, \dots, f_{tr})$, $\mathbf{e}_t^\top = (e_{t1}, \dots, e_{tN})$, $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ti})_{T \times N}$, $\mathbf{F} = (f_{tl})_{T \times r}$ and $\mathbf{E} = (e_{ti})_{T \times N}$. From model (2.2), we can see there exists an identifiable issue among the common factor scores and the factor loadings. In this paper, we assume $\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} / T = \mathbf{I}_r$ to ensure identifiability up to orthogonal transformations, see for example [Bai \(2003\)](#) and [Bai and Li \(2012\)](#) for more detailed discussions on the identifiability issue. Model (2.1) typically can be estimated by Principle

Component Analysis (PCA) and Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MLE), see for example [Bai \(2003\)](#) and [Bai and Li \(2012\)](#). In this paper, we primarily focus on the PCA method. A conventional PCA solution to Model (2.1) in [Bai \(2003\)](#) is to minimize

$$Q_1(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}) = (NT)^{-1} \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} / T = \mathbf{I}_r.$$

The factor number r can be estimated by the Information Criterion (IC) by [Bai and Ng \(2002\)](#) or other criteria such as Eigenvalue-Ratio (ER) by [Ahn and Horenstein \(2013\)](#). Let the columns of $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ be \sqrt{T} times the leading r eigenvectors of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top$. Then the solution to minimizing the loss function $Q_1(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F})$ is $\widehat{\mathbf{B}} = T^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}}$. Therefore, the estimators of the common components are naturally $\widehat{c}_{ti} = \sum_{l=1}^r \widehat{b}_{il} \widehat{f}_{tl}$. The theoretical properties of \widehat{b}_{il} , \widehat{f}_{tl} , and \widehat{c}_{ti} are given in [Bai \(2003\)](#) for the large-dimensional case where both N and T go to infinity.

When it comes to the convergence rates of the loadings estimators, although the assumption that the dimension of the loading vector \mathbf{b}_i is often relatively small which significantly decreases the number of unknown parameters, however, due to the individual specific nature of the factor loadings, the total number of the loading vectors to be estimated is equal to the number of the cross-sectional units N . This still would make the convergence rate of the loadings estimators relatively slow, as given by [Bai \(2003\)](#). To avoid fitting too many parameters, it's typically assumed that there exist certain types of structural sparsity, which would further reduce the dimension of the parameters of interest and is plausible in many real scenarios such as analyzing repetitive psychology tests scores.

In this paper, we consider a similar setting as in [Shi et al. \(2022\)](#), [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) and [He et al. \(2024b\)](#) and assume the approximate factor model has a latent group homogeneity structure, where factor loadings are the same across units that fall into the same group. Assume there is a partition of index set $\{1, \dots, N\}$, denoted by $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{K_0}\}$ such that

$$\mathbf{b}_i = \sum_{k=1}^{K_0} \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G}_k} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{i \in \mathcal{G}_k\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{G}_k \cap \mathcal{G}_j = \emptyset \quad \text{for} \quad k \neq j, \quad (2.3)$$

where K_0 is the true number of latent groups which is assumed to be finite but unknown, $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G}_k}$ is the common value of the loading vectors whose index is in \mathcal{G}_k , $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$ denotes the indicator function and \emptyset denotes the empty set. From the group homogeneity condition (2.3), it's easy to see that the individuals in the same group share the common loading vectors so as to reduce the number of the loading vectors from N to K_0 . The group number K_0 and the true group $\{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{K_0}\}$ are all unknown, and in the following section we propose a novel PPCA method to estimate the factor loadings and then apply an AHC procedure to the PPCA estimators to derive the estimators of group memberships.

2.2. PPCA method for estimating factor loadings and scores

In model (2.1), only x_{ti} can be observed and our goal in this section is to give a more accurate estimate of the factor scores and factor loadings with prior knowledge of latent group structure. We exploit the pairwise fusion penalty in the literature and propose a Penalized PCA approach with a given r to encourage the sparsity of $(\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j)$, namely,

$$\left(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}, \widehat{\mathbf{F}}\right) = \underset{\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{TN} \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2 + \widetilde{\lambda} \sum_{i < j} \|\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} / T = \mathbf{I}_r, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\widetilde{\lambda} > 0$ is a tuning parameter. Clearly, a sufficiently small $\widetilde{\lambda}$ implies that there may not exist group structures and our estimator degenerates into the conventional PCA method. On the contrary, a sufficiently large $\widetilde{\lambda}$ would force all individuals to share the same factor loadings. Therefore, a moderate $\widetilde{\lambda}$ would lead to heterogeneous group structures of the factor loadings. The tuning parameter $\widetilde{\lambda}$ typically can be determined by cross validation, as will be discussed in Section 2.5.

At a first glance, the optimization problem seems to be difficult as there is $N(N-1)$ penalties in (2.4). Interestingly, we derive a closed-form solution to the optimization problem. For better illustration, we first let

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}) = \frac{1}{TN} \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2 + \widetilde{\lambda} \sum_{i < j} \|\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2^2, \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F} / T = \mathbf{I}_r.$$

To minimize $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F})$, we first define the Laplacian matrix $\mathbf{\Pi} = N\mathbf{I}_N - \mathbf{A}$ where \mathbf{A} is a $N \times N$ all one matrix, i.e., $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{1})_{N \times N}$. Meanwhile, we define the normalized form of $\mathbf{\Pi}$ as $\mathbf{\Pi}_N = \mathbf{\Pi} / N$ and write

$$\sum_{i < j} \|\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j\|_2^2 = N \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_N \mathbf{B}).$$

Denoting $\lambda = N^2 \widetilde{\lambda}$, thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F}) &= \frac{1}{TN} \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2 + \frac{\lambda}{N} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_N \mathbf{B}) \\ &= \frac{1}{NT} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) - \frac{1}{NT^2} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{F}\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{X}) + \frac{1}{N} \|T^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{F} - \mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \frac{\lambda}{N} \operatorname{Tr}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{\Pi}_N \mathbf{B}). \end{aligned}$$

We first assume λ and $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ are given while $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}} / T = \mathbf{I}_r$. Therefore, the solution with respect to the factor loadings would be

$$\widehat{\mathbf{B}} = \frac{1}{T} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{I} + \lambda \mathbf{\Pi}_N$ and it depends on the tuning parameter λ and N . Then plugging $\widehat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}} / T$

back to $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{B}, \mathbf{F})$, we have

$$\mathcal{L}(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{F}) = \frac{1}{NT} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) - \frac{1}{NT^2} \text{Tr}(\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{F}).$$

Thus the solution with respect to the factor scores \mathbf{F} can be taken as \sqrt{T} times the leading r eigenvectors of $\mathbf{X} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top$. As for the selection of tuning parameter λ , we put forward a Cross-Validation(CV) procedure in the following Section 2.5.

Intuitively, it is straightforward to replace the ℓ_2 norm penalty by a general ℓ_q norm, i.e., $\|\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j\|_q$, which would also be appropriate for group pursuits. However, we prefer the proposed ℓ_2 norm penalty as in this case we acquire a closed-form solution, i.e, we just need to perform eigen-decomposition of $\mathbf{X} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top$, which is computationally as efficient as conventional PCA and significantly alleviates computational burdens compared with other ℓ_q norms.

One disadvantage of the squared ℓ_2 -norm penalty lies in that the estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$ in equation (2.5) would not show strict group structure, that is, for some index pairs (i, j) , $(\widehat{b}_i - \widehat{b}_j)$ can be sufficiently small but not exactly zero. Therefore, it is necessary to further resort to some clustering algorithms to identify the latent groups. However, it's worth pointing out that our proposed Penalized PCA method would deliver a more efficient estimator in certain cases compared with the conventional PCA method, which benefits the downstream clustering procedure.

2.3. Homogeneity pursuit

As long as we obtain the PPCA estimators in the first step, various clustering algorithms can be used to recover the latent group memberships based on the PPCA estimators, such as the well known K -means or Agglomerative hierarchical clustering (AHC). In this paper, we also adopt the classical AHC algorithm to identify the latent homogeneity structure in the loading vectors with a given factor number r , for ease of presentation and comparison with Tu and Wang (2023) and He et al. (2024b). In detail, we first define the distance measure between \mathbf{b}_i and \mathbf{b}_j as:

$$\Delta_{ij} = \frac{1}{r} \|\mathbf{H}^\top (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j)\|_1, \quad (2.6)$$

where \mathbf{H} is an $r \times r$ rotation matrix. From (2.6), we can easily see that if $i, j \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $\Delta_{ij} = 0$ while $\Delta_{ij} \neq 0$ if $i \in \mathcal{G}_{k_1}$ and $j \in \mathcal{G}_{k_2}$, whenever $k_1 \neq k_2$. Then denote $\mathbf{\Delta} = (\Delta_{ij})$ as a distance matrix among the loading vectors. To apply the AHC method, we give a natural estimate of Δ_{ij} as follows:

$$\widehat{\Delta}_{ij} = \frac{1}{r} \|\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_i - \widehat{\mathbf{b}}_j\|_1 = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{l=1}^r |\widehat{b}_{il} - \widehat{b}_{jl}|.$$

Naturally, denote $\widehat{\Delta}_N$ as the estimator of Δ , whose elements are define in (2.6). In the following, we give the AHC algorithm with a given group number K , $1 \leq K \leq N$.

The AHC algorithm :

Step 1. Start with N groups, with each group containing one cross-sectional unit, and set $\widehat{\Delta} = \widehat{\Delta}_N$.

Step 2. Search for the smallest distance among the off-diagonal elements of $\widehat{\Delta}$, and merge the corresponding two groups.

Step 3. Re-calculate the distance among the remaining groups and update the distance matrix $\widehat{\Delta}$. For the distance between any two groups \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , we adopt the complete linkage defined as $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{A}, j \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{\Delta}_{ij}$, i.e., the furthest distance between an individual in \mathcal{A} and an individual in \mathcal{B} .

Step 4. Repeat Steps 2-3 until the number of groups reduces to K . Denote the current index sets as $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1|K}, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{2|K}, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{K|K}$. Then $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1|K}, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{2|K}, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{K|K}\}$ is the estimated group membership for the given group number K .

2.4. Post-grouping estimators and selection of the group number

This subsection focuses on the selection of group number using an information criterion. For a given K , we would obtain the clusters $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K) = \{\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{1|K}, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{2|K}, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{K|K}\}$ using the AHC algorithm. To fully make use of the homogeneity structure, we adopt the same goodness of fit measure as in [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) and [He et al. \(2024b\)](#). We first minimize the following loss function to obtain the factor loadings using the specific group structure

$$(NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T (x_{ti} - \mathbf{b}_i^\top \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t)^2,$$

subject to the group structure condition

$$\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}_{k|K} \quad \text{for } i \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad k = 1, \dots, K,$$

where $\mathbf{b}_{1|K}, \dots, \mathbf{b}_{K|K}$ are the distinct factor loadings in the K groups separately. With the estimated group structure, we can update the estimates of the factor loadings as follows:

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i|\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K)} = \frac{1}{|\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}|} (\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \sum_{i \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}} \mathbf{x}_i = \frac{1}{T|\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}|} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \sum_{i \in \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}} \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (2.7)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ is the estimator of the factor scores derived in Section (2.2), and $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{1i}, \dots, x_{Ti})^\top$. The matrix form of the estimated factor loadings is denoted as follows

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K)} = (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{1|\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K)}, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{N|\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(K)})^\top.$$

We then define the following goodness-of-fit measure for the information criterion

$$S(K) = (NT)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left(x_{ti} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i|\hat{\mathcal{G}}(K)}^\top \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t \right)^2. \quad (2.8)$$

We adopt the following information criterion

$$\mathbb{I}\mathbb{C}(K) = \log[S(K)] + K \cdot \rho, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\rho \in (0, 1)$ is the tuning parameter depending on N and T . Then given a large positive integer \bar{K} , we can estimate the group number by minimizing the function $\mathbb{I}\mathbb{C}(K)$, denoted as \hat{K} , where

$$\hat{K} = \arg \min_{1 \leq K \leq \bar{K}} \mathbb{I}\mathbb{C}(K). \quad (2.10)$$

Since given the selected group number \hat{K} , we can further obtain the estimated clustering group $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{K}) = \{\hat{\mathcal{G}}_{1|\hat{K}}, \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{2|\hat{K}}, \dots, \hat{\mathcal{G}}_{\hat{K}|\hat{K}}\}$ by the AHC algorithm introduced in the last section. Replacing $\hat{\mathcal{G}}(K)$ with $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{K})$ in (2.7), we can get the post-grouping loading matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\hat{K})} = (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_N)^\top$.

Furthermore, after obtaining the post-grouping factor loading estimate $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, we may opt to minimize the following least squares problem to update the estimators of factor scores

$$\min_{\mathbf{f}_t} \sum_{i=1}^N (x_{ti} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^\top \mathbf{f}_t)^2, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2.11)$$

from which we can easily get the updated estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t = (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{B}}^\top \mathbf{x}_t$, $t = 1, \dots, T$, and therefore $\tilde{\mathbf{F}} = \mathbf{X} \tilde{\mathbf{B}} (\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{B}})^{-1}$. As an important remark, we can also estimate the factor scores and loadings under the framework of constrained factor models following the work by [Tsai and Tsay \(2010\)](#), where the constraints for the loading matrix can be specified on the basis of our estimated group structure $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$.

2.5. Selection of tuning parameters

In this section, we introduce two Cross-Validation (CV) criteria for the selection of tuning parameters to achieve distinct goals. Given that the PPCA method is contingent upon tuning parameter λ and that the estimation accuracy of the PPCA estimators would influence subsequent clustering performance, thus if our primary goal is to achieve more accurate PPCA estimates for better subsequent clustering outcomes, we can utilize the CV criterion to select a suitable tuning parameter, which minimizes the following objective function at each validation step

$$\|\mathbf{X} - \hat{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda) \hat{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda)^\top\|_F^2, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda)$ and $\hat{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)$ are the PPCA estimators by (2.4) which correspond to the tuning parameter λ .

If our goal is to enhance the performance of clustering while concurrently striving to optimize the post-grouping estimators, we can implement an alternative CV criterion. For a given $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where Λ is the candidate set for tuning parameter λ , we can first obtain the PPCA estimates $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)$, $\widehat{K}(\lambda)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))$ using the information criterion (2.9) and the AHC algorithm, which can be used to obtain the post-grouping estimators for loadings:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{i|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))} = \frac{1}{T|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))|} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)^\top \sum_{i \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))} \mathbf{x}_i.$$

Then we have $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda) = (\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{1|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{N|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}(\widehat{K}(\lambda))})^\top$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda) = \mathbf{X}\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda) \left(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda) \right)^{-1}$. Thus we can further utilize the CV criterion to minimize the following objective function at each validation step

$$\|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{F}}(\lambda)\tilde{\mathbf{B}}(\lambda)^\top\|_F^2. \quad (2.13)$$

Although the CV criterion in (2.13) entails greater computational burden compared with that in (2.12), it would result in more accurate post-grouping estimators. In both simulation studies and real empirical studies, we employ the CV criterion in (2.13) to select the tuning parameter λ .

3. Theoretical analysis

In this section, we first introduce some mild conditions, which bring the current work into a large-dimensional framework with both serially and cross-sectionally correlated errors. We establish the consistency of the proposed PPCA estimators. We show that the convergence rates depend on the tuning parameters and the loadings. Furthermore, when certain conditions on central limit theorems are satisfied, we derive the asymptotic normalities of the proposed PPCA estimators. We also study the asymptotic properties of the clustering procedure in terms of estimating the group memberships and the unknown group number. We derive the convergence rates of the post-grouping estimators of the factor loadings.

3.1. Assumptions

First of all, to investigate the asymptotic properties of the PPCA estimators, the following technical assumptions are needed, which are common in the related literature such as Bai (2003), Bai and Ng (2002), Fan et al. (2013), Yu et al. (2020) and He et al. (2022).

Assumption 1. For all $t \leq T$ and $l \leq r$, $E(f_{tl}) = 0$, $E(f_{tl}^2) = 1$ and $E(f_{tl}^4) \leq M$ for some constant $M > 0$. Further assume $\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{F}/T = \mathbf{I}_r$ almost surely and for any T dimensional vector \mathbf{v} such that $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$, we have $E\|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{F}\|^2 \leq M$.

Assumption 2. For any $j \leq N$ and $l \leq r$, assume $|b_{jl}| \leq M$. Further assume $N^{-1}\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{B} \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B$, while the eigenvalues of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B$ are distinct and bounded away from zero and infinity, i.e., $c_1 \geq \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B) > \dots > \lambda_r(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_B) \geq c_2$, for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.

Assumption 3. The error matrix $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{S}\mathbf{P}_2$, where $\mathbf{S} = (\epsilon_{tj})_{T \times N}$ with ϵ_{tj} being independent and $E(\epsilon_{tj}) = 0$, $E(\epsilon_{tj}^2) = 1$, $E(\epsilon_{tj}^4) \leq M$, \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 are two deterministic square matrices. There exists positive constants c_1 and c_2 so that $c_2 \leq \lambda_t(\mathbf{P}_1^\top\mathbf{P}_1) \leq c_1$ for any $t \leq T$ and $c_2 \leq \lambda_j(\mathbf{P}_2^\top\mathbf{P}_2) \leq c_1$ for any $j \leq N$. In addition, \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{F} are independent.

Assumption 1 requires the latent factors have bounded fourth moments. By assuming that $\mathbf{F}^\top\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I}_r/T$ almost surely and $E\|\mathbf{v}^\top\mathbf{F}\|^2 \leq M$ for any $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$, we require that the serial dependence among factors can not be too strong and guarantee the model is identifiable up to orthogonal transformations. Assumption 2 requires the factors are all strong and pervasive and the corresponding eigenvectors are identifiable, which is common in the related literature on factor models. Under Assumption 3, time series and cross-sectional dependence in the idiosyncratic errors are allowed such that the factor model is an approximate one rather than a strict one. Similar assumption can be founded in Bai and Ng (2006), Han and Caner (2017) and Yu et al. (2020).

3.2. Convergence rates of PPCA estimators

In this section, we establish the consistency of the proposed PPCA estimators. We first give a theoretical result which shows how the convergence rates depend on the tuning parameter λ .

Theorem 3.1. Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold, then there exists a sequence of revertible matrices \mathbf{H} (depending on N, T and the tuning parameter λ) such that $\mathbf{H}^\top\mathbf{H} \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{I}_r$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T}\|\widehat{\mathbf{F}} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{H}\|_F^2 &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-2})}{NT^2}\right), \\ \frac{1}{N}\|\widehat{\mathbf{B}} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{H}\|_F^2 &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N}\|(\mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_N)\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-2})}{NT} + \frac{1}{N^2}\right), \\ \frac{1}{N}\|\widehat{\mathbf{C}} - \mathbf{C}\|_F^2 &= O_p\left(\frac{1}{N}\|(\mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_N)\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \frac{\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-2})}{NT} + \frac{1}{N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{C}} = \widehat{\mathbf{F}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}^\top$ and $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top$. Indeed, we deduce $\mathbf{H} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{F}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{F}}/T)\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_r^{-1}$ where $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{B}/N$, $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}_r$ is the diagonal matrix composed of the leading r eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{X}^\top/(NT)$.

Theorem 3.1 gives the convergence rates of the estimated factor scores and loadings by the PPCA method. As for the estimator of the factor score matrix, compared with the convergence rate $O_p(N^{-1} + T^{-2})$ in Bai (2003), our PPCA estimator can be more accurate if $1/(1+\lambda)^2 = o(1)$ and $T = o(\sqrt{N})$. As for the estimator of the loading matrix, the convergence rate is composed of three terms and the first term depends on both

the loading's structure and the tuning parameter λ . The first term is from the shrinkage bias. We claim that with a suitably selected tuning parameter λ , the shrinkage bias is always negligible. The second term is a scaling of order T^{-1} , while the scaling depends on the tuning parameter λ . When λ is sufficiently large, the second term would converge to zero. Therefore when $T = o(N^2)$ holds, the PPCA estimator for the loading matrix would be more efficient than that by the conventional PCA method whose convergence rate is $O_p(N^{-1} + T^{-2})$ by Bai (2003). The convergence rate for the common components is easily derived by combining the convergence rates of the estimators for the loadings and factor scores.

In the following, we provide an algebraic analysis of the impact of the tuning parameter λ on the convergence rates of the estimators for common components. The analysis for factor loadings follows similarly. To derive the best convergence rate, we need to minimize the function $f(\lambda)$, where

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} \|(\mathbf{D}^{-1} - \mathbf{I}_N)\mathbf{B}\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2 T} + O\left(\frac{1}{NT}\right).$$

Suppose \mathbf{D}^{-1} has spectral decomposition $\mathbf{D}^{-1} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}_D\mathbf{U}^\top$. Then we have

$$f(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda^2}{N(1+\lambda)^2} \|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{T(1+\lambda)^2} + O\left(\frac{1}{NT}\right),$$

where $\mathbf{B}^* = \text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, 0)\mathbf{U}^\top\mathbf{B}$, $\text{diag}(1, \dots, 1, 0)$ defines a $N \times N$ diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are $(1, \dots, 1, 0)$. It can be easily deduced that $f(\lambda)$ is minimized by taking $\lambda_1^* = N/(T\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2)$, and we have

$$f(\lambda_1^*) = \frac{(NT)^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2}{N^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2 + T^{-1}} + O\left(\frac{1}{NT}\right),$$

from which we can further see that the optimal convergence rate depends on the size of $N^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2$. If $N^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2 = o(T^{-1})$, the convergence rates for the estimators of loadings and common components are faster than those by conventional PCA method. Even if $N^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2 \gg T^{-1}$, we would still have $f(\lambda_1^*) \leq cT^{-1}$ for some constant c , which guarantees that our PPCA method would not perform worse than the conventional PCA method.

3.3. Asymptotic normality of the PPCA estimators

In this section, we aim to derive the asymptotic normality of the proposed PPCA estimators. The following additional assumptions are needed to derive the asymptotic distributions.

Assumption 4. For any $t \leq T$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{e}_t \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V}_t),$$

where $\mathbf{V}_t = \|\mathbf{p}_{1,t}\|^2 \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}(\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{P}_2^\top\mathbf{P}_2\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{B})$, where $\mathbf{p}_{1,t}$ is the t -th row of \mathbf{P}_1 .

Assumption 5. For any $j \leq N$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{E} \frac{\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}}{\|\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top \frac{\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}}{\|\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{W}_j),$$

where \mathbf{d}_j^{-1} is the j -th column of the matrix \mathbf{D}^{-1} and $\mathbf{W}_j = \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \text{cov}(\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{E} \mathbf{D}_j^{-1} / \|\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|)$.

Assumption 4 is essential to derive the asymptotic normality for the estimators of factor scores, while Assumption 5 is exerted to guarantee the asymptotic normality for the estimators of factor loadings. Note that \mathbf{D}^{-1} contains the tuning parameter λ implicitly which may depend on N and T . Accordingly, we allow the asymptotic normality to hold with varying λ . The assumptions are not stringent and similar assumptions are introduced for deriving the limiting distributions of the PCA estimators in Bai (2003).

Theorem 3.2. Denote the spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{\Omega}$ as $\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega \mathbf{\Lambda}_\Omega \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega^\top$. Assume that Assumptions 1-4 hold, for the estimated factor scores, we have

1. if $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} = o(1)$, then we have

$$\sqrt{N}(\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{f}_t) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Lambda}_\Omega^{-1} \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega^\top \mathbf{V}_t \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega \mathbf{\Lambda}_\Omega^{-1}),$$

where $\mathbf{\Omega} = N^{-1} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}$, \mathbf{H} is the same matrix defined in Theorem 3.1 and \mathbf{V}_t is defined in Assumption 4. It can be shown that $\mathbf{V}_t = \|\mathbf{p}_{1,t}\|^2 \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} (\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{P}_2^\top \mathbf{P}_2 \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B})$, where $\mathbf{p}_{1,t}$ is the t -th row of \mathbf{P}_1 and the matrices \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 are defined in Assumption 3.

2. otherwise, there exists a constant c such that $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} > c$, then we have

$$\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{f}_t = O_p \left(\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \left(\sqrt{N} \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} \right) \right).$$

The first part of Theorem 3.2 shows that when $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} = o(1)$, the biases of the estimated factor scores are asymptotically negligible. We can also see that the asymptotic variances of the PPCA estimators are asymptotically equivalent to those of the conventional PCA estimators. The second part show that when $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} > c$, the convergence rate depends on $\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / \left(\sqrt{N} \min\{T, \sqrt{NT}\} \right)$. When $N \gg T$, for the second case, it holds that $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{f}_t = O_p \left(\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / (T\sqrt{N}) \right)$, which is consistent with the rate $\text{Tr}(\mathbf{D}^{-2}) / (NT^2)$ derived in Theorem 3.1. While when $T \gg N$, $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{f}_t = O_p \left(\|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F / (N\sqrt{T}) \right)$, which is bounded by $c\sqrt{T}$. In the following Theorem 3.3, we establish the asymptotic normality for the PPCA estimators of factor loadings under a scaling condition on the time horizon T and cross-sectional size N .

Theorem 3.3. Under Assumptions 1-3 and Assumption 5, with the same notations as in Theorem 3.2, for the estimated factor loadings, we have

1. if $T = o(N)$, then we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{d}_j^{-1})}{\|\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega^\top \mathbf{W}_j \mathbf{\Gamma}_\Omega),$$

where \mathbf{W}_j is defined in Assumption 5 and

$$\mathbf{W}_j = \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T \|\mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|^2} \|\mathbf{P}_2 \mathbf{d}_j^{-1}\|^2 \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{F}^\top \mathbf{P}_1 \mathbf{P}_1^\top \mathbf{F}).$$

2. otherwise, when there exists a constant c such that $T > cN$, we have

$$\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\mathbf{b}}_j - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{d}_j^{-1}) = O_p(1).$$

3.4. Theoretical properties of the AHC clustering procedure and post-grouping estimators

In this section, we investigate the asymptotic properties of the clustering procedure and the post-grouping estimators of factor loadings. In the following theorem, we show that with the prior knowledge of the group number K_0 , the AHC clustering algorithm based on the PPCA estimators would accurately identify the group memberships with probability tending to 1.

Theorem 3.4. Denote $d_n = \min_{1 \leq k_1 \neq k_2 \leq K_0} \min_{i \in \mathcal{G}_{k_1}, j \in \mathcal{G}_{k_2}} \|\mathbf{H}^\top (\mathbf{b}_i - \mathbf{b}_j)\|$. Suppose Assumptions 1-3 hold and d_n satisfies the condition $\max\{\sqrt{N/T}, N^{-1/2}\} = o(d_n)$. If the number of latent group K_0 is known a priori and the tuning parameter satisfies $\lambda \asymp \lambda_1^* = N/(T\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2)$, we have

$$P\left(\{\widehat{\mathcal{G}}_1, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_2, \dots, \widehat{\mathcal{G}}_{K_0}\} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{K_0}\}\right) \rightarrow 1,$$

as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$.

In Theorem 3.4, we require that the minimum signal strength d_n may diminish towards zero, but at a rate slower than $\max\{\sqrt{N/T}, \sqrt{1/N}\}$. Moreover, if $N^{-1}\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2 = o(T^{-1})$ and $N \geq \sqrt{T}$, we allow d_n converges to zero at a more faster rate compared with Tu and Wang (2023), which implies that our method is able to handle more challenging clustering problems. Chen (2019) and Chen et al. (2021a) establish similar consistency results for group pursuit under time-varying coefficient panel data models and functional-coefficient models, respectively. However, the estimation error introduced in estimating the unknown factors brings additional technical challenges to the theoretical development for group identification consistency, as also evidenced by Tu and Wang (2023).

Next, we discuss the consistency of the group-specific oracle estimators of the factor loadings, which is denoted as $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o$, i.e., $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o$ is the estimator derived with the true homogeneity structure in (2.3). Naturally, the

constraints in the optimization problem (2.11) becomes

$$\mathbf{b}_i = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G},k}, \quad i \in \mathcal{G}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K_0.$$

It's easy to obtain the oracle loading estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o$ by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o = \frac{1}{T|\mathcal{G}_k|} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \sum_{m=1}^{|\mathcal{G}_k|} \mathbf{x}_{k,i_m}, \quad \text{for } i \in \mathcal{G}_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K_0,$$

where we denote \mathbf{x}_{k,i_m} as the i_m -th column of the observed data vector for the cross-sectional units in \mathcal{G}_k with $i_m \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $m = 1, \dots, |\mathcal{G}_k|$, $k = 1, \dots, K_0$.

The following theorem gives the convergence rate of the oracle estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o$.

Theorem 3.5. Suppose that Assumptions 1-3 are satisfied. Then given the true group structure $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{G}_1, \dots, \mathcal{G}_{K_0}\}$, there exists a rotation matrix $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{\Omega}(\mathbf{F}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{F}}/T)\mathbf{\Lambda}_r^{-1}$, such that

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G},k}\|_2^2 = O_p \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}\|_F^2}{TN^2|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^2}{TN|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^2}{N^2|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2 T^2} + \frac{1}{NT} \right),$$

for each $i \in \mathcal{G}_k$, $k = 1, \dots, K_0$, where \mathbf{B} is the true factor loading matrix and \mathbf{D}^{-1} is defined in (2.5).

In the following we give a more detailed discussion on the convergence rate of the group-specific oracle estimator of factor loadings. For the first term, we first denote an all one matrix as $\mathbf{A} = (1)_{N \times N}$. Suppose \mathbf{A} has the spectral decomposition as $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{U}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{U}^\top$, where \mathbf{U} are composed of the eigenvectors and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is a diagonal matrix whose first element on the diagonal is N and the other elements are all zero. By the definition of \mathbf{D}^{-1} , we decompose \mathbf{D}^{-1} into two parts

$$\mathbf{D}^{-1} = \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)N} \mathbf{A} + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} \mathbf{I}_N.$$

Then we can write $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}$ as

$$\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B} = \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)N} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B} + \frac{1}{1+\lambda} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B}.$$

Therefore the first term is bounded by $\lambda^2 \|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}/N\|_F^2 / [(1+\lambda)^2 N^2 T] + 1 / [(1+\lambda)^2 T]$, that is

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}\|_F^2}{TN^2|\mathcal{G}_k|} \lesssim \frac{\lambda^2}{(1+\lambda)^2} \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A} \mathbf{B}\|_F^2}{TN^4|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2 T|\mathcal{G}_k|}. \quad (3.1)$$

By a similar argument, for the second and third term, we have

$$\frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^2}{TN|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^2}{N^2|\mathcal{G}_k|} \lesssim \frac{\lambda^2}{(1+\lambda)^2} \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A}\|_F^2}{N^3|\mathcal{G}_k|} \left(\frac{1}{T} + \frac{1}{N} \right) + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2} \left(\frac{1}{T|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{N|\mathcal{G}_k|} \right). \quad (3.2)$$

Combining (3.1) and (3.2), we have

$$\|\tilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^* - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G},k}\|_2^2 \leq O_p \left(\frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2} \eta(\mathbf{B}) + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2} \left(\frac{1}{T|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{N|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{T^2} \right) + \frac{1}{NT} \right),$$

where $\eta(\mathbf{B}) = (TN^4|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} \|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A}\|_F^2 + ((TN^3|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + (N^4|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1}) \|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{A}\|_F^2$. Set

$$h(\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{(1+\lambda)^2} \eta(\mathbf{B}) + \frac{1}{(1+\lambda)^2} \left(\frac{1}{T|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{N|\mathcal{G}_k|} + \frac{1}{T^2} \right).$$

Then $h(\lambda)$ would be minimized by taking $\lambda_2^* = \left((T|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + (N|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + T^{-2} \right) / \eta(\mathbf{B})$. Then we can easily deduce that if $\eta(\mathbf{B}) > O\left((T|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + (N|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + T^{-2} \right)$, then $h(\lambda_2^*) = O_p\left((T|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + (N|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + T^{-2} \right)$, and the estimators would still be consistent. Compared with the PPCA estimate of factor loadings, the convergence rate can be improved under the following two cases: (1) $T > N$ and $T = o(N|\mathcal{G}_k|)$; (2) $T \leq N$ and $1/|\mathcal{G}_k| = o(1)$. On the other hand, if $\eta(\mathbf{B}) = o\left((T|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + (N|\mathcal{G}_k|)^{-1} + T^{-2} \right)$, then $h(\lambda_2^*) = \eta(\mathbf{B})$, and compared with the initial PPCA estimators, the convergence rate for the oracle group-specific estimators of loadings can be further improved by similar discussion. Under this framework, the group-specific estimator with λ_2^* would always perform better than the estimator by [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#).

In practice, the true group number K_0 is unknown and in the following, we show that the proposed information criterion can correctly determine the number of groups asymptotically. Consequently, the final group-specific loading matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ equals the oracle estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}^o$ with probability tending to one. To derive the consistency of \hat{K} , the following additional assumptions are essential.

Assumption 6. (a) There exists a constant $\tau_1 \in (0, 1)$ such that

$$\min_{1 \leq k \leq K_0} |\mathcal{G}_k| \geq \tau_1 \cdot \min\{N, N^{\frac{1}{4}} T^{\frac{1}{2}}\};$$

(b) The tuning parameter ρ in (2.10) satisfies (i) $C_{NT} \cdot \rho \rightarrow \infty$, $C_{NT} = \min\{\sqrt{N_{k_0}}, \sqrt{T}\}$, with $N_{K_0} = \min |\mathcal{G}_k|$, $k = 1, \dots, K_0$ and (ii) $\rho \rightarrow 0$.

Assumption 6 (a) exerts a condition on the minimum group size, which relaxes the stringent condition by [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) that the group sizes is of the same order as N . Assumption 6 (b) gives some mild conditions on ρ, C_{NT} . For the tuning parameter ρ , one possible choice that satisfies Assumption 6 is

$$\rho = \frac{\log(\min\{N_K, T\})}{\min\{N_K, T\}}, \quad \text{with } N_K = \min\{|\tilde{\mathcal{G}}_{k|K}|, k = 1, \dots, K\},$$

which is used in our numerical experiment and shows very well empirical performance.

Theorem 3.6. Suppose that Assumptions 1-6 are satisfied. If the tuning parameter satisfies $\lambda \asymp \lambda_1^* = N/(T\|\mathbf{B}^*\|_F^2)$, we have

$$P(\widehat{K} = K_0) \rightarrow 1;$$

$$P(\widetilde{\mathbf{B}} = \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}^o) \rightarrow 1,$$

as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}^o = (\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_1^o, \dots, \widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_N^o)^\top$.

In the following we study the limiting distributions of the oracle estimators of group-specific factor loadings $\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{G},k}^o$. We first need some assumptions as follows.

Assumption 7. For each k , as $T, |\mathcal{G}_k| \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T|\mathcal{G}_k|}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{G}_k} \frac{\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}}{N} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{f}_t e_{jt} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Phi_k),$$

where

$$\Phi_k = \lim_{|\mathcal{G}_k| \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{G}_k|} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{G}_k} \sum_{q \in \mathcal{G}_k} \Phi_{lq}, \quad \Phi_{lq} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_t \mathbf{f}_s^\top e_{ls} e_{qt}].$$

Assumption 7 is for the asymptotic normality of the re-estimated factor loadings. Validation of the assumptions is out of the scope of current paper, but we claim that neither of them is stringent and similar assumptions are imposed for deriving the limiting distributions of the PCA estimators in Bai (2003).

Theorem 3.7. Under Assumptions 1-7, as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, we have

1. if $|\mathcal{G}_k| = o(\min\{N, (1+\lambda)^2 T\})$ and $\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^2 (1/N + T/N^2) = o(1)$ then for each $i \in \mathcal{G}_k, k = 1, \dots, K_0$,

$$\sqrt{T|\mathcal{G}_k|}(\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G},k}) = \Lambda_r^{-1} \frac{\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top \mathbf{F} \mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{B}}{T} \frac{1}{N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T|\mathcal{G}_k|}} \mathbf{F}^\top \sum_{i \in \mathcal{G}_k} \mathbf{e}_i + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Lambda_S^{-1} \Gamma_S^\top \Phi_k \Gamma_S \Lambda_S^{-1}),$$

where Λ_r is the $r \times r$ diagonal matrix formed by the first r largest eigenvalues of $(NT)^{-1} \mathbf{X} \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{X}$ arranged in the descending order, \mathbf{H} is given in Theorem 3.1, and Φ_k is defined in Assumption 7.

2. otherwise,

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{b}}_i^o - \mathbf{H}^\top \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{G},k} = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{1}{T(1+\lambda)} + \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F}{\sqrt{TN|\mathcal{G}_k|}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F}{\sqrt{N^2|\mathcal{G}_k|}} \right).$$

4. Simulation studies

In this section, we first conduct numerical simulations to investigate the finite sample performance of our proposed PPCA estimators in comparison with those of the conventional PCA estimators. Then we

evaluate the finite sample performance of AHC clustering procedure with PPCA and PCA estimators as initial values respectively. Throughout the simulations, we assume the number of factors is unknown and apply the information criterion IC_2 of Bai and Ng (2002) to determine the factor numbers for PPCA and conventional PCA. For PPCA, the tuning parameter λ is selected by the 20-fold CV criterion proposed in Section 2.5 and the candidate set of λ is $\{N, b^{-1}\}$ for $b \in \{0.05, 0.1, \dots, 1\}$ with an interval of 0.05. Our simulation results are based on 200 replications.

4.1. Comparison of the PPCA estimators and the conventional PCA estimators

In this section, we compare the finite sample performance of PPCA estimators in (2.5) with those of the conventional PCA estimators. We consider the following factor model with two common factors,

$$x_{ti} = b_{i1}f_{t1} + b_{i2}f_{t2} + \sqrt{\theta_i}e_{ti}, i = 1, \dots, N, \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where the factors and the idiosyncratic errors are generated by the following process: for any $m \leq r$, the factors are generated by an Auto-Regressive process AR(1), that's, $f_{tm} = 0.2f_{t-1,m} + v_{tm}$, where $v_{tm} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The idiosyncratic error matrix is generated by $\mathbf{E} = \mathbf{P}_1\mathbf{S}\mathbf{P}_2$, where $\epsilon_{tj} \stackrel{i.i.d}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \kappa\sigma_e^2)$ and we set $\sigma_e^2 = 1$ and $\kappa \in \{0.5, 0.8, 1\}$ for different noise-to-signal ratio. The matrices \mathbf{P}_1 and \mathbf{P}_2 are both banded matrices with bandwidth equal to 1 and all the non-zero-off-diagonal entries equal to 0.02. We set $\theta_i = 4(b_{i1}^2 + b_{i2}^2)/3$ for $K_0 = 3$. For $K_0 = 4$, we set $\theta_i = b_{i1}^2 + b_{i2}^2$.

For a fair comparison, we generate the homogeneous structure similar to that in Tu and Wang (2023). Specifically, we consider the following two scenarios:

Scenario 1 Set $T \in \{100, 150, 200\}$, $N \in \{90, 120, 150\}$ and $K_0 = 3$ with equal group sizes. For the group structure of factor loadings, we consider the following data generating process

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1: x_{ti} &= 2f_{t1} + \sqrt{16/3}e_{ti}; \\ \mathcal{G}_2: x_{ti} &= 2f_{t2} + \sqrt{16/3}e_{ti}; \\ \mathcal{G}_3: x_{ti} &= 2.4f_{t1} + 3.2f_{t2} + \sqrt{64/3}e_{ti}. \end{aligned}$$

Scenario 2 Set $T \in \{100, 150\}$, $N \in \{120, 160, 200\}$ and $K_0 = 4$ with equal group sizes. For the group structure of factor loadings, we consider the following data generating process

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_1: x_{ti} &= 2f_{t1} + \sqrt{4}e_{ti}; \\ \mathcal{G}_2: x_{ti} &= 2f_{t2} + \sqrt{4}e_{ti}; \\ \mathcal{G}_3: x_{ti} &= f_{t1} + 3f_{t2} + \sqrt{10}e_{ti}; \\ \mathcal{G}_4: x_{ti} &= 3f_{t1} + f_{t2} + \sqrt{10}e_{ti}. \end{aligned}$$

We evaluate the performance of the conventional PCA method and the proposed PPCA method by the empirical Mean Squared Error (MSE) in terms of estimating the common components, defined as

$(NT)^{-1} \sum_{s=1}^{200} \|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{(s)} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{(s)}^\top - \mathbf{F} \mathbf{B}^\top\|_F^2 / 200$, where $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_{(s)}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{(s)}$ represent the estimators of \mathbf{F} and \mathbf{B} at the s -th replication.

Table 1: MSEs in terms of estimating the common components.

T	N	$\kappa = 0.5$		$\kappa = 0.8$		$\kappa = 1$	
		PPCA	PCA	PPCA	PCA	PPCA	PCA
Scenario 1							
200	150	0.1451	0.1483	0.2325	0.2416	0.2923	0.3058
200	120	0.1684	0.1733	0.2719	0.2829	0.3419	0.3586
200	90	0.2064	0.2116	0.3353	0.3468	0.4201	0.4409
150	150	0.1637	0.1681	0.2626	0.2746	0.3276	0.3482
150	120	0.1883	0.1924	0.3044	0.3151	0.3776	0.4004
150	90	0.2230	0.2294	0.3619	0.3776	0.4581	0.4817
100	150	0.1988	0.2066	0.3192	0.3393	0.4004	0.4318
100	120	0.2229	0.2293	0.3581	0.3780	0.4513	0.4823
100	90	0.2622	0.2711	0.4272	0.4495	0.5445	0.5763
Scenario 2							
150	200	0.0923	0.0936	0.1476	0.1509	0.1851	0.1895
150	160	0.1031	0.1050	0.1648	0.1694	0.2054	0.2129
150	120	0.1232	0.1252	0.1962	0.2024	0.2429	0.2546
100	200	0.1159	0.1181	0.1857	0.1907	0.2269	0.2397
100	160	0.1258	0.1294	0.1996	0.2090	0.2484	0.2629
100	120	0.1440	0.1486	0.2307	0.2406	0.2881	0.3031

Table 1 presents the MSEs of both PCA and PPCA methods, where the number of factors is all correctly identified (not shown in the tables). Clearly, our proposed PPCA outperforms the PCA estimator under all settings. Moreover, as the sample size gradually increases, the MSEs for both PCA and PPCA estimators decrease. As the noise level κ increases, the MSEs increase accordingly, yet our PPCA estimator remains superior to the PCA estimator. It is noteworthy that as κ increases, the advantages of our proposed PPCA estimator in terms of MSEs become more pronounced, further highlighting the stability and superiority of our PPCA estimators, which implies that the PPCA method delivers more precise estimators, acting as more competitive initial estimators compared with the PCA method for the subsequent clustering.

4.2. Clustering performance with PPCA initial estimates

In this section, we show the clustering performance of the AHC procedure with PPCA and PCA estimators as initial values for both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2. The AHC procedure with PCA estimators as initial

values is exactly the clustering method proposed by [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) and we briefly denote it as “TW”.

To assess the accuracy with PPCA and PCA initial values, we report the average MSE of post-group estimator of common components. Furthermore, we also evaluate the distance of the estimated loading space $\text{span}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}})$ and the true loading space $\text{span}(\mathbf{B})$. In view of the identifiability issue, we apply the subspace metrics used in [Yu et al. \(2022\)](#) to evaluate the empirical performance, that is,

$$\mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B}) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{r} \text{Tr}(\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}^\top \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Q}^\top) \right)^{1/2},$$

where \mathbf{Q} and $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ are the left singular-vector matrices of the true loading \mathbf{B} and its estimator $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$. Clearly, $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B}) \in [0, 1]$ and $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B}) = 0$ or 1 if and only if the spaces spanned by \mathbf{Q} and $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}$ are the same or orthogonal. In the following we introduce the clustering-related indexes to evaluate the recovery of group memberships: the Rand index, aRand index, Jacarrd index and Purity index. These indexes are commonly used for evaluating the performance of clustering methods, as adopted in [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#) and [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) and the better the clustering performance, the closer these indexes approach 1. Besides, we report \hat{K}_{mean} as the average of the estimated group numbers. We also denote “Freq ($a|b$)” as the number of underestimates (denoted by a) and overestimates (denoted by b) for the number of groups.

The simulation results of Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 are shown in the [Table 2](#) and [Table 3](#). Firstly, when the noise level is low, i.e., $\kappa = 0.5$, our method can correctly estimate the true number of groups and the grouping structures in all settings, while the TW method performs no better than ours. Secondly, as the noise level increases, both the methods tend to underestimate or overestimate the true number of groups, and the clustering performance correspondingly deteriorates. However, compared with the TW method, our method still shows a significant advantage under all settings. Notably, when $T = 100$, $N = 150$ and $\kappa = 1$, the TW method overestimates the true number of clusters 20 times, whereas our method only overestimates it once. Moreover, the performance of our proposed method in terms of clustering metrics, as well as the distance $\mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B})$ and MSEs also show significant improvement in comparison with those by the TW method. This is consistent with the conclusions derived in the last section, that our method is relatively more stable and shows more pronounced advantages when the noise level is high. In summary, for Scenario 1, in all cases, our method consistently outperforms the TW method in terms of all the indexes. The same conclusions can be drawn for Scenario 2 by the results shown in [Table 3](#).

5. Real data analysis

In this section, we apply the proposed method to identify the group structure of the daily returns from $N = 49$ broadly diversified portfolios, ranging from January 4, 2016 to September 28, 2018. The dataset is

Table 2: Clustering performance and post-grouping estimator accuracy for Scenario 1.

(T, N)	κ	Initial Values	Clustering-related Indexes						Accuracy Indexes	
			\hat{K}_{mean}	Freq	Rand	aRand	Jaccarrd	Purity	$\mathcal{D}(\tilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B})$	MSE
(100,90)	0.5	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9994	0.9988	0.9984	0.9996	0.0166	0.1562
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0135	0.1534
	0.8	PCA	3.015	0 3	0.9912	0.9800	0.9758	0.9933	0.0487	0.2931
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	0.9993	0.9985	0.9982	0.9995	0.0200	0.2493
	1	PCA	3.020	3 7	0.9785	0.9525	0.9450	0.9817	0.0832	0.4231
		PPCA	2.995	1 0	0.9953	0.9899	0.9881	0.9955	0.0355	0.3301
(100,120)	0.5	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9992	0.9983	0.9978	0.9994	0.0151	0.1190
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0117	0.1147
	0.8	PCA	3.020	0 4	0.9916	0.9811	0.9770	0.9940	0.0413	0.2247
		PPCA	3.000	0 4	0.9996	0.9991	0.9988	0.9997	0.0179	0.1860
	1	PCA	3.020	1 5	0.9845	0.9655	0.9590	0.9877	0.0680	0.3135
		PPCA	3.010	0 2	0.9961	0.9913	0.9892	0.9972	0.0312	0.2481
(100,150)	0.5	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9995	0.9989	0.9986	0.9996	0.0138	0.0942
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0114	0.0916
	0.8	PCA	3.035	0 7	0.9941	0.9866	0.9834	0.9965	0.0335	0.1716
		PPCA	3.005	0 1	0.9990	0.9978	0.9973	0.9992	0.0186	0.1519
	1	PCA	3.100	0 20	0.9827	0.9607	0.9518	0.9900	0.0701	0.2570
		PPCA	3.005	0 1	0.9984	0.9966	0.9958	0.9989	0.0223	0.1908
(150,90)	0.5	PCA	3.005	0 1	0.9996	0.9991	0.9989	0.9998	0.0140	0.1542
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0124	0.1528
	0.8	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9978	0.9951	0.9941	0.9982	0.0251	0.2570
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	0.9997	0.9994	0.9993	0.9998	0.0174	0.2463
	1	PCA	3.005	0 1	0.9934	0.9852	0.9824	0.9946	0.0405	0.3426
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	0.9995	0.9990	0.9986	0.9996	0.0211	0.3092
(150,120)	0.5	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9999	0.9998	0.9998	0.9999	0.0107	0.1147
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0101	0.1142
	0.8	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9994	0.9986	0.9982	0.9995	0.0170	0.1870
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	0.9998	0.9996	0.9995	0.9998	0.0142	0.1841
	1	PCA	3.005	0 1	0.9965	0.9922	0.9904	0.9974	0.0272	0.2460
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	0.9996	0.9992	0.9990	0.9997	0.0169	0.2312
(150,150)	0.5	PCA	3.000	0 0	0.9998	0.9997	0.9996	0.9999	0.0094	0.0923
		PPCA	3.000	0 0	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	1.0000	0.0086	0.0915
	0.8	PCA	3.010	0 2	0.9992	0.9982	0.9977	0.9998	0.0142	0.1489
		PPCA	3.005	0 1	0.9999	0.9999	0.9998	1.0000	0.0115	0.1468
	1	PCA	3.015	0 3	0.9957	0.9903	0.9882	0.9970	0.0263	0.2029
		PPCA	3.005	0 1	0.9998	0.9997	0.9996	0.9999	0.0137	0.1841

Table 3: Clustering performance and post-grouping estimator accuracy for Scenario 2.

(T, N)	κ	Initial Values	Clustering-related Indexes						Accuracy Indexes	
			\widehat{K}_{mean}	Freq	Rand	aRand	Jaccarrd	Purity	$\mathcal{D}(\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{B})$	MSE
(100,120)	0.5	PCA	4.000	3 3	0.9960	0.9899	0.9866	0.9944	0.0210	0.0853
		PPCA	3.995	1 0	0.9981	0.9953	0.9936	0.9975	0.0174	0.0818
	0.8	PCA	3.865	20 1	0.9749	0.9425	0.9323	0.9566	0.0501	0.1700
		PPCA	3.905	14 0	0.9827	0.9600	0.9519	0.9706	0.0421	0.1558
	1	PCA	3.540	61 2	0.9316	0.8513	0.8347	0.8729	0.0922	0.2837
		PPCA	3.690	41 0	0.9521	0.8945	0.8807	0.9132	0.0737	0.2420
(100,160)	0.5	PCA	4.000	0 0	0.9988	0.9969	0.9957	0.9987	0.0150	0.0602
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9994	0.9984	0.9976	0.9994	0.0142	0.0593
	0.8	PCA	3.845	22 3	0.9724	0.9389	0.9302	0.9510	0.0486	0.1432
		PPCA	3.905	13 1	0.9809	0.9564	0.9483	0.9679	0.0414	0.1265
	1	PCA	3.315	81 1	0.9089	0.8101	0.7992	0.8232	0.1043	0.2876
		PPCA	3.495	60 0	0.9299	0.8516	0.8396	0.8668	0.0885	0.2423
(100,200)	0.5	PCA	4.015	3 4	0.9983	0.9954	0.9934	0.9986	0.0153	0.0495
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9990	0.9975	0.9964	0.9990	0.0138	0.0486
	0.8	PCA	3.950	12 4	0.9829	0.9583	0.9471	0.9740	0.0417	0.1073
		PPCA	3.990	2 1	0.9907	0.9763	0.9678	0.9884	0.0327	0.0926
	1	PCA	3.920	20 10	0.9694	0.9267	0.9089	0.9532	0.0619	0.1524
		PPCA	3.985	4 2	0.9846	0.9604	0.9466	0.9810	0.0458	0.1233
(150,120)	0.5	PCA	4.000	0 0	0.9998	0.9995	0.9993	0.9998	0.0124	0.0773
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9998	0.9996	0.9995	0.9998	0.0122	0.0772
	0.8	PCA	3.955	5 0	0.9927	0.9841	0.9822	0.9869	0.0246	0.1377
		PPCA	3.965	4 0	0.9950	0.9895	0.9885	0.9907	0.0216	0.1334
	1	PCA	3.895	13 1	0.9837	0.9649	0.9612	0.9700	0.0364	0.1858
		PPCA	3.940	7 0	0.9905	0.9793	0.9765	0.9830	0.0301	0.1731
(150,160)	0.5	PCA	4.005	0 1	0.9998	0.9995	0.9993	0.9999	0.0104	0.0593
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9999	0.9997	0.9996	0.9999	0.0103	0.0592
	0.8	PCA	3.980	3 1	0.9955	0.9901	0.9885	0.9924	0.0193	0.1019
		PPCA	3.975	3 0	0.9960	0.9912	0.9900	0.9928	0.0180	0.1012
	1	PCA	3.860	22 1	0.9793	0.9541	0.9475	0.9613	0.0393	0.1548
		PPCA	3.895	16 0	0.9838	0.9637	0.9582	0.9705	0.0346	0.1472
(150,200)	0.5	PCA	4.000	0 0	0.9994	0.9986	0.9981	0.9994	0.0102	0.0482
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9998	0.9996	0.9994	0.9998	0.0096	0.0476
	0.8	PCA	3.980	2 0	0.9965	0.9923	0.9911	0.9940	0.0173	0.0818
		PPCA	4.000	0 0	0.9992	0.9980	0.9971	0.9992	0.0143	0.0771
	1	PCA	3.990	3 2	0.9939	0.9851	0.9805	0.9914	0.0256	0.1063
		PPCA	3.995	1 0	0.9959	0.9894	0.9854	0.9950	0.0228	0.1026

widely studied using factor models and can be publicly downloaded from Kenneth R. French’s webpage at https://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html. In particular, Guo and Li (2022) and Tu and Wang (2023) ever explored the group structures of this dataset under the framework of factor models. Accordingly, our goal is to study the homogeneity structure by our proposed method. In this section, we keep the stock returns from December 5, 2016 to November 30, 2017 as the training dataset to identify the group memberships, and the remaining test set is used for out-of-sample prediction. After preprocessing and standardization, the dimension of the training datasets returns as $(T, N) = (250, 49)$.

In the training set, we first determine the number of factors to be 3 by the information criterion IC_2 of Bai and Ng (2002). To explore whether the dataset exhibits a grouping structure, we ignore the latent group structure and apply the R function `ggplot` to show kernel density function of factor loadings estimated by PCA estimators in Figure 1, from which we conclude that the distribution exhibits multiple modes with multiple prominent peaks, indicating the presence of a grouping structure in factor loadings. Hence, it is more reasonable to consider the proposed PPCA method for this real dataset.




Figure 1: Kernel density functions of each columns of the estimated factor loading matrix by the PCA method.

Next, we investigate the homogeneity structure of factor loadings by our method and the TW method in Tu and Wang (2023). The information criterion introduced in (2.9) identifies 9 distinct groups by the PPCA estimators. For brevity, the estimated membership for all 9 groups with PPCA and PCA as initial values are reported in the supplement. To better illustrate the difference of the estimated group structures,

we draw the Sankey diagram in Figure 2 to show the flow of the group memberships estimated by the two methods. Clearly, our identified group structure has similarities to that identified by Tu and Wang (2023). For example, both methods cluster the gold industry and coal industry into separate groups, while also grouping the mining and oil sectors together. However, there also exist significant distinctions between the group structures identified by our method and the TW method by Tu and Wang (2023), one can refer to Table ?? and ?? in the appendix for more details.

Finally, we compare the out-of-sample prediction performance of our proposed method with that of Tu and Wang (2023). For the accuracy measure, we follow Guo and Li (2022) to use the out-of-sample prediction error (OSPE) of a given month, which is defined as

$$\text{OSPE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{49} \sum_{t \in \tau} (x_{ti} - \hat{x}_{ti})^2}{49 \times |\tau|},$$

where τ denotes the set of days in this month remained after removing the missing values and \hat{x}_{ti} is the predicted value of the i -th series at time t -th day of a month. Specifically, to forecast the daily returns in December 2017, we use a training set from December 2016 to November 2017 to estimate the loading matrix and then form the forecast with factors estimated from the full sample prior to this month. Next, to forecast the returns in January 2018, the training set is further augmented with data in December 2017. We continue this process until September 2018, and the OSPEs are sequentially calculated, presented in Table 4, where the OSPE1 represents the OPSE results of the method by Tu and Wang (2023), while the OPSE2 represents those by our proposed method. From Table 4, we can see that our proposed method always outperforms Tu and Wang (2023)'s method in terms of OPSEs.

Table 4: The results of OPSEs.

	2017.12	2018.01	2018.02	2018.03	2018.04	2018.05	2018.06	2018.07	2018.08	2018.09
OPSE1	1.8036	1.5782	3.4238	2.7635	2.3107	1.3026	2.0564	1.3511	1.5763	1.4675
OPSE2	1.7761	1.4815	3.4121	2.7463	2.1952	1.2439	1.9313	1.3066	1.4938	1.3973

6. Conclusions and discussions

In this paper, we first propose a PPCA method with ℓ_2 -norm penalty for group pursuit under factor model and provide a closed-form solution. We give the asymptotic properties of the PPCA estimators. We further present an AHC approach for estimating the latent homogeneity structure in the loadings. Then we adopt the constrained least squares method to obtain the group-specific loading vectors. We also propose an information criterion to determine the unknown group number. Consistency and asymptotic normality are derived for both the PPCA estimators and the post-grouping estimators under very mild conditions.




Figure 2: The Sankey diagram: the flows of portfolios from our identified groups (left) to those of [Tu and Wang \(2023\)](#) (right).

Moreover, we study the clustering and group number consistency under mild condition of minimum signal strength and group sizes. It is demonstrated that our proposed PPCA method outperforms the PCA method when latent groups exist. We also conclude that the PPCA estimators act as more promising initial values for subsequent clustering procedure. The real data analysis illustrates the practical merits of our methodology.

The current work can be extended in several directions. Firstly, the proposed PPCA method can be used

to locate change points in the presence of group structure (Baltagi et al., 2017). Secondly, the matrix factor model (Han et al., 2020, 2022; Chen et al., 2022; Yu et al., 2022; He et al., 2023a,b, 2024a) has been well studied in the literature in the last few years and pursuit for two-way group homogeneity is an interesting and challenging problem. Such extensions deserve separate study and are left as our future work.

Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge National Science Foundation of China (12171282), Qilu Young Scholars Program of Shandong University.

References

- Ahn, S.C., Horenstein, A.R., 2013. Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica* 81, 1203–1227.
- Bai, J., 2003. Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica* 71, 135–171.
- Bai, J., Li, K., 2012. Statistical analysis of factor models of high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics* 40, 436 – 465.
- Bai, J., Li, K., 2016. Maximum likelihood estimation and inference for approximate factor models of high dimension. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 98, 298–309.
- Bai, J., Ng, S., 2002. Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica* 70, 191–221.
- Bai, J., Ng, S., 2006. Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models, errata. Manuscript, Columbia University .
- Baltagi, B.H., Kao, C., Wang, F., 2017. Identification and estimation of a large factor model with structural instability. *Journal of Econometrics* 197, 87–100.
- Barigozzi, M., Cho, H., Maeng, H., 2024. Tail-robust factor modelling of vector and tensor time series in high dimensions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09390 .
- Bates, B.J., Plagborg-Møller, M., Stock, J.H., Watson, M.W., 2013. Consistent factor estimation in dynamic factor models with structural instability. *Journal of Econometrics* 177, 289–304.
- Chamberlain, G., Rothschild, M., 1982. Arbitrage, Factor Structure, and Mean-Variance Analysis on Large Asset Markets. Working Paper 996. National Bureau of Economic Research.

- Chen, J., 2019. Estimating latent group structure in time-varying coefficient panel data models. *The Econometrics Journal* 22, 223–240.
- Chen, J., Li, D., Wei, L., Zhang, W., 2021a. Nonparametric homogeneity pursuit in functional-coefficient models. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 33, 387–416.
- Chen, L., Dolado, J.J., Gonzalo, J., 2021b. Quantile factor models. *Econometrica* 89, 875–910.
- Chen, R., Yang, D., Zhang, C.H., 2022. Factor models for high-dimensional tensor time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117, 94–116.
- Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1992. The cross-section of expected stock returns. *The Journal of Finance* 47, 427–465.
- Fama, E.F., French, K.R., 1993. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33, 3–56.
- Fan, J., Ke, Y., Sun, Q., Zhou, W., 2019. Farmtest: Factor-adjusted robust multiple testing with approximate false discovery control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 114, 1880–1893.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., Mincheva, M., 2013. Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 75, 603–680.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., Shi, X., 2015. Risks of large portfolios. *Journal of Econometrics* 186, 367–387.
- Fan, J., Liu, H., Wang, W., 2018. Large covariance estimation through elliptical factor models. *Annals of statistics* 46, 1383.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M., Reichlin, L., 2005. The generalized dynamic factor model: one-sided estimation and forecasting. *Journal of the American statistical Association* 100, 830–840.
- Guo, C., Li, J., 2022. Homogeneity and structure identification in semiparametric factor models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40, 408–422.
- Han, X., Caner, M., 2017. Determining the number of factors with potentially strong within-block correlations in error terms. *Econometric Reviews* 36, 946–969.
- Han, Y., Chen, R., Yang, D., Zhang, C., 2020. Tensor factor model estimation by iterative projection. *The Annals of Statistics*, in press .
- Han, Y., Zhang, C.H., Chen, R., 2022. Rank determination in tensor factor model. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 16, 1726–1803.

- He, Y., Kong, X., Trapani, L., Yu, L., 2023a. One-way or two-way factor model for matrix sequences? *Journal of Econometrics* 235, 1981–2004.
- He, Y., Kong, X., Yu, L., Zhang, X., 2022. Large-dimensional factor analysis without moment constraints. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40, 302–312.
- He, Y., Kong, X., Yu, L., Zhang, X., Zhao, C., 2023b. Matrix factor analysis: From least squares to iterative projection. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 42, 322–334.
- He, Y., Kong, X.B., Trapani, L., Yu, L., 2024a. Online change-point detection for matrix-valued time series with latent two-way factor structure. *The Annals of Statistics*, in press .
- He, Y., Ma, X., Wang, X., Wang, Y., 2024b. Large-dimensional robust factor analysis with group structure. arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.07138 .
- Liu, D., Zhao, C., He, Y., Liu, L., Guo, Y., Zhang, X., 2022. Simultaneous Cluster Structure Learning and Estimation of Heterogeneous Graphs for Matrix-Variate fMRI Data. *Biometrics* 79, 2246–2259.
- Ma, C., Tu, Y., 2023. Group fused lasso for large factor models with multiple structural breaks. *Journal of Econometrics* 233, 132–154.
- Ma, S., Huang, J., 2017. A concave pairwise fusion approach to subgroup analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 112, 410–423.
- Ma, S., Huang, J., Zhang, Z., Liu, M., 2020. Exploration of heterogeneous treatment effects via concave fusion. *The International Journal of Biostatistics* 16, 20180026.
- Mayrink, V.D., Lucas, J.E., 2013. Sparse latent factor models with interactions: Analysis of gene expression data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* , 799–822.
- Ross, S.A., 1977. The capital asset pricing model (capm), short-sale restrictions and related issues. *The Journal of Finance* 32, 177–183.
- Ross, S.A., 2013. The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing, in: *Handbook of the fundamentals of financial decision making: Part I*. World Scientific, pp. 11–30.
- Shi, Z., Su, L., Xie, T., 2022. ℓ_2 -Relaxation: With Applications to Forecast Combination and Portfolio Analysis. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* , 1–44.
- Tsai, H., Tsay, R.S., 2010. Constrained factor models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105, 1593–1605.
- Tu, Y., Wang, B., 2023. On structurally grouped approximate factor models. Manuscript.

- Vogt, M., Linton, O., 2017. Classification of non-parametric regression functions in longitudinal data models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 79, 5–27.
- Wang, F., 2022. Maximum likelihood estimation and inference for high dimensional generalized factor models with application to factor-augmented regressions. *Journal of Econometrics* 229, 180–200.
- Wang, H., 2012. Factor profiled sure independence screening. *Biometrika* 99, 15–28.
- Wang, W., Phillips, P.C., Su, L., 2018. Homogeneity pursuit in panel data models: Theory and application. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 33, 797–815.
- Wang, W., Zhu, Z., 2024. Homogeneity and sparsity analysis for high-dimensional panel data models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 42, 26–35.
- Wei, K., Qin, G., Zhu, Z., 2023. Subgroup analysis for longitudinal data based on a partial linear varying coefficient model with a change plane. *Statistics in Medicine* 42, 3716–3731.
- Xiang, J., Guo, G., Li, J., 2023. Determining the number of factors in constrained factor models via bayesian information criterion. *Econometric Reviews* 42, 98–122.
- Yu, L., He, Y., Kong, X., Zhang, X., 2022. Projected estimation for large-dimensional matrix factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 229, 201–217.
- Yu, L., He, Y., Zhang, X., 2019. Robust factor number specification for large-dimensional elliptical factor model. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 174, 104543.
- Yu, L., He, Y., Zhang, X., Zhu, J., 2020. Network-assisted estimation for large-dimensional factor model with guaranteed convergence rate improvement. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.10955* .