

FORECASTING REALIZED COVARIANCES USING HAR-TYPE MODELS

MATIAS QUIROZ[†], LALEH TAFAKORI[‡] AND HANS MANNERS[§]

ABSTRACT. We investigate methods for forecasting multivariate realized covariances matrices applied to a set of 30 assets that were included in the DJ30 index at some point, including two novel methods that use existing (univariate) log of realized variance models that account for attenuation bias and time-varying parameters. We consider the implications of some modeling choices within the class of heterogeneous autoregressive models. The following are our key findings. First, modeling the logs of the marginal volatilities is strongly preferred over direct modeling of marginal volatility. Thus, our proposed model that accounts for attenuation bias (for the log-response) provides superior one-step-ahead forecasts over existing multivariate realized covariance approaches. Second, accounting for measurement errors in marginal realized variances generally improves multivariate forecasting performance, but to a lesser degree than previously found in the literature. Third, time-varying parameter models based on state-space models perform almost equally well. Fourth, statistical and economic criteria for comparing the forecasting performance lead to some differences in the models' rankings, which can partially be explained by the turbulent post-pandemic data in our out-of-sample validation dataset using sub-sample analyses.

Keywords: State space model, Heterogeneous autoregressive, Realized measures, Volatility forecasting.

[†]: *School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, University of Technology Sydney, Australia.*

[‡]: *Department of Mathematical Sciences, RMIT University, Australia.*

[§]: *Department of Economics, University of Graz, Austria.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Accurate modeling and forecasting of volatility are pivotal in risk management, pricing derivatives, and guiding investment decisions in financial markets. The stock market's inherent association with the national economy underscores the importance of volatility, evident in major financial events like the stock market crash of 1987, the 2008 Lehman Brothers bankruptcy, and subsequent global financial crises. Volatility modeling, particularly with high-frequency data, has evolved over the years, moving from early models like generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (GARCH) and stochastic volatility to more sophisticated approaches based on realized variance measures. Intraday volatility, exemplified by events such as the crash in 2010 and trading errors by Knight Capital in 2012, underscores regulators' need to thoroughly investigate the relationship between high-frequency trading and intraday fluctuations to mitigate potential risks. The ability to accurately forecast volatility becomes increasingly crucial in today's financial markets, particularly during instability as triggered by, e.g., Brexit and the COVID-19 pandemic. Financial market volatility quantifies the variability in asset returns and constitutes a fundamental component in pivotal aspects of financial decision-making, including trading of volatility, asset allocation, risk management, and derivatives and asset pricing; see, e.g., Caporin et al. (2017), Harvey and Palumbo (2023) and Kikuchi and Vachadze (2018). Early attempts at modeling financial market volatility, dating back to the 1960s, employed temporal models such as those proposed by Fama (1965). These models, often based on autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (GARCH) frameworks (Engle, 1982; Bollerslev, 1986; Bollerslev et al., 1994), demonstrated robust in-sample parameter estimation but exhibited limitations in predicting daily squared returns (Poon and Granger, 2003).

For a price process lacking jumps, volatility quantifies the magnitude of price fluctuations and is defined as the square root of integrated volatility (IV). Historically, researchers relied on low-frequency data for IV estimation, such as daily squared returns, despite the resulting high variance of such estimates. With the advent of high-frequency (intraday) data, Andersen and Bollerslev (1998a) and Andersen and Bollerslev (1998b) introduced realized variance (RV) as an estimator of latent variance. This model-free metric is calculated by aggregating the squared price changes observed within each trading day from high-frequency data, offering a significant improvement in volatility estimation and prediction accuracy compared to GARCH and stochastic volatility models (Andersen et al., 2003). Furthermore, RV provides an ex-post estimate of asset return variance and is a consistent estimator of IV under the assumption of a diffusion process for the logarithmic asset price (Kinnebrock and Podolskij, 2008).

RV is advantageous for high-frequency data but faces challenges due to microstructure noise, as highlighted by studies like Figlewski (1997) and Andersen et al. (2001). This noise, stemming from market data imperfections, introduces biases in RV estimates. To address this, researchers have developed microstructure noise-robust IV estimators to enhance accuracy in high-frequency volatility modeling. However, eliminating noise may be impractical. Alternatively, using lower-frequency data reduces the impact of noise. Still, it raises the variance of the RV estimator, posing a key challenge in achieving the optimal balance between noise reduction and variance control in high-frequency data-based volatility estimation. Bandi and Russell (2008), Patton and Sheppard (2015), and Liu et al. (2015) shed light on a trade-off between the effect of the estimator and microstructure noise. They found that using 5-minute data for estimating RV is the recommendable frequency. Furthermore, another commonly used method is the realized kernel suggested by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2008), which is popular for reducing the impact of microstructure noise when dealing with high-frequency data. The realized kernel approach is particularly suitable for estimating the realized covariance matrix, ensuring positive definiteness; see Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2011). This is the method we rely on for realized covariance estimation in this paper, and we use it in combination with 1-minute returns due to its ability to mitigate microstructure noise.

The use of high-frequency measures results in more accurate variance forecasts compared to those derived from GARCH or stochastic volatility (SV) models tailored for daily returns, as demonstrated by Francq and Zakoian (2019) and Koopman et al. (2005). Moreover, enhancing GARCH and SV models with RV measures derived from high-frequency data leads to enhanced model fit and forecasting accuracy. This enhancement is evidenced in studies such as Engle and Gallo (2006) and Hansen et al. (2012) for observation-driven models, as well as Dobrev and Szerszen (2010), and Takahashi et al. (2009) for stochastic volatility models. However, an approach for forecasting RV directly has become extremely popular, namely the heterogeneous autoregressive (HAR) model by Corsi (2009). The HAR model is widely adopted due to its simplicity and excellent predictive performance, making it a prominent choice in the literature (e.g., Busch et al., 2011; Soucek and Todorova, 2013; Cubadda et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2023). HAR models can effectively replicate volatility persistence by capturing aggregated volatility across various interval sizes. Since the HAR model can be represented as a constrained autoregressive model of the order 20 model, parameter estimation using ordinary least squares (OLS) is straightforward. In the context of multivariate volatility, a realized covariance (RCov) matrix is formed from the returns of financial assets. Chiriac and Voev (2011) expanded the univariate HAR to the multivariate domain, namely multivariate HAR, to model and predict the RCov. Like its univariate

counterpart, the multivariate HAR model boasts a straightforward and easily implementable structure. An alternative approach for modeling realized covariance matrices is the Conditional Autoregressive Wishart by Golosnoy et al. (2012).

Huang et al. (2019) observe that volatility risk fluctuates over time and influences asset pricing. However, despite this, models applied for realized volatility have primarily remained static and have not explored the dynamics of variance, skewness, or the potential evolution of information flow pace. This limitation became evident during the 2008 financial crisis when volatility experienced a sudden and significant increase. Models with constant parameters proved inadequate in capturing this abrupt rise in volatility, potentially harming their forecasting accuracy. The widespread use of constant-parameter models is attributed to their simplicity in estimation and standard inference under accurate specification. However, this convenience comes at the cost of neglecting crucial structural changes in the volatility process, particularly over extended sample periods. Early models seeking to move away from the assumption of constant parameters include the nonparametric and parametric model in Fan and Yao (2003) and Cai et al. (2000), change-point ARCH models in Davis et al. (2006), regime-switching models in Bollerslev et al. (1994) and Ang and Bekaert (2002), and the mixture GARCH model developed by Haas et al. (2009). More recently, Engle et al. (2013) have proposed multiplicative component structures, while Amado and Teräsvirta (2013) explore both additive and multiplicative components. In a multivariate context, Bauwens et al. (2013) and Bauwens et al. (2016) introduce component structures for capturing lower-frequency movements.

For modeling and forecasting RV using HAR models, in addition to the arguments above for time-variation in model parameters, Bollerslev et al. (2016) point out that, after all, RV is only an estimator for the underlying volatility and therefore is characterized by measurement errors. Consequently, the OLS estimator suffers from an attenuation bias. This is solved by conditioning the coefficients on realized quarticity, an estimator for RV's variance, which results in the so-called HARQ model having superior model fit and forecasting performance. The multivariate extension for predicting realized covariance matrices using a variety of approaches is studied in Bollerslev et al. (2018). Adapting the attenuation bias approach to the natural logarithm of univariate RV is suggested in Wang et al. (2020). We propose to use this to model the log of the marginal RV in the multivariate realized covariance approach in Bollerslev et al. (2018) and show that this improves the resulting forecast. An alternative approach to incorporate time-varying parameters in the univariate setting is the state-space approach in Bekierman and Manner (2018), modelling the persistence in the HAR models as a latent autoregressive process of order one.

To summarize our contributions, we compare and extend forecasting models for realized covariance. We build on the recommended approach from Bollerslev et al. (2018) that breaks the problem of forecasting realized covariances into separate models for variances and correlations. We extend this by comparing models for RV vs. $\log RV$, models with and without controlling for attenuation bias, and state-space HAR models as in Bekierman and Manner (2018). The models are compared for predicting daily covariances of 30 assets over approximately 12 years using statistical and economic measures for forecast comparison.

This paper is set up as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the models and present the theoretical framework. Section 3 evaluates the benchmark models based on their fit and forecasting capabilities, while Section 4 provides the conclusion.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1. Models for univariate realized volatility. In this work, we consider an asset with a price process, P_t , governed by a stochastic differential equation that captures both long-term trends and random fluctuations. We focus on the daily integrated variance, IV_t calculated through the integral of squared instantaneous volatility σ_s^2 as follows

$$IV_t = \int_{t-1}^t \sigma_s^2 ds. \quad (2.1)$$

Assume that there are M intraday returns in a trading day t and denote the j th intraday return by $r_{t,j}$. Then the *Realized Volatility* for day t is defined as

$$RV_t = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^M r_{t,j}^2}. \quad (2.2)$$

Realized volatility RV is inherently heterogeneous, encompassing multiple volatility components. It has been observed that volatility over extended time intervals tends to exert a greater influence on short-term volatility than the reverse. This can be understood intuitively: intraday speculators are influenced by long-term volatility since it shapes the expected trend, whereas long-term traders are less impacted by the fluctuations caused by intraday activities. Recognizing these characteristics of realized volatility, Corsi (2009) introduced the heterogeneous autoregressive (HAR) model. This model, which is autoregressive in nature, captures the volatility dynamics by incorporating three distinct components. The daily *realized volatility* RV_{t-1} , the weekly mean *realized volatility* $RV_{t-1:t-5}$ and the monthly mean *realized volatility* $RV_{t-1:t-20}$ ¹. The HAR model

¹More precisely, $RV_{t-1:t-j} = \frac{1}{j} \sum_{i=1}^j RV_{t-i}$

has the following form:

$$RV_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RV_{t-1} + \beta_2 RV_{t-1:t-5} + \beta_3 RV_{t-1:t-20} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.3)$$

with ϵ_t a mean zero error term. The same model may be specified for $\log RV_t$, which we denote as the HARL model.

Bollerslev et al. (2016) note that the HAR model suffers from an attenuation bias. Their key insight is that realized volatility is a noisy measurement of the integrated volatility, and that the variance of the measurement is not homogeneous in time as assumed in early work (see, e.g., Koopman and Scharth, 2012) in the standard HAR model in Corsi (2009), but depends on the integrated quarticity IQ_t . Bollerslev et al. (2016) account for the heterogeneity by allowing time-varying coefficients by including a covariate RQ_t , which is the realized quarticity at time t . The authors demonstrate that accounting for time-varying coefficients is of less importance for the weekly and monthly lags, and thus propose the model

$$RV_t = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \gamma RQ_{t-1}^{1/2}) RV_{t-1} + \beta_2 RV_{t-5:t-1} + \beta_3 RV_{t-20:t-1} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.4)$$

which is known as the HARQ model. Realized quarticity is defined as $RQ_t = \frac{M}{3} \sum_{i=1}^M r_{t,i}^4$.² The underlying concept of this model is that when the variance of the measurement error is substantial, resulting in a large $RQ_{t-1}^{1/2}$, the model exhibits reduced persistence for $\gamma < 0$. Wang et al. (2020) extend this idea to a model for the natural logarithm of RV , motivated by the common approach to model $\log RV_t$ instead of RV_t , as

$$\log RV_t = \beta_0 + \left(\beta_1 + \gamma \frac{RQ_{t-1}^{1/2}}{RV_{t-1}} \right) \log RV_{t-1} + \beta_2 \log RV_{t-5:t-1} + \beta_3 \log RV_{t-20:t-1} + \epsilon_t. \quad (2.5)$$

This model, termed HARQL, has been shown to perform very well empirically.

Bekierman and Manner (2018) suggested a different approach to introduce a time-varying component to the autoregressive parameter by relying on the state space model

$$RV_t = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \lambda_t) RV_{t-1} + \beta_2 RV_{t-1:t-5} + \beta_3 RV_{t-1:t-20} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.6)$$

where the error term ϵ_t is assumed to be iid normally distributed. The state variable is driven by a Markovian process with Gaussian noise

$$\lambda_t = \phi \lambda_{t-1} + \eta_t, \quad \eta_t \sim N(0, \sigma_\eta^2). \quad (2.7)$$

The idea behind their model is that the time-varying coefficient λ_t may capture time-variation due to the measurement error and other variations. The model can directly

²It is important to note, however, that not only is IV_{t-1} measured with uncertainty, but RQ_{t-1} also acts as a noisy estimator for IQ_{t-1} .

be applied to $\log RV_t$ by replacing (2.6) with

$$\log RV_t = \beta_0 + (\beta_1 + \lambda_t) \log RV_{t-1} + \beta_2 \log RV_{t-1:t-5} + \beta_3 \log RV_{t-1:t-20} + \epsilon_t. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that this model for $\log(RV_t)$ instead of RV_t has the advantage that the assumption $\epsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ is more likely to hold. Forecasts for RV_t use properties of the log-normal distribution; see Bekierman and Manner (2018). Bekierman and Manner (2018) report much better forecasting performance for models based on $\log RV_t$. We term these state space models as HARS and HARSL, respectively. When predicting the realized variance (on the ordinary scale) for the log models, we use the standard approach that bias corrects $\exp(\widehat{\log RV_t})$ assuming the estimate is normally distributed.

The models above are univariate in nature, but they form the basis of the multivariate forecasting models realized covariance matrices that we introduce next.

2.2. Models for realized covariance. Now consider an N -dimensional price process P_t with spot covariance matrix $\Sigma(u)$ and integrated covariance matrix for day t

$$\Sigma_t = \int_{t-1}^t \Sigma(u) du,$$

which can, e.g., be estimated using the multivariate kernel estimator by Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2011). We denote the corresponding estimates by S_t and let s_t be the (half-vectorisation of the) realized covariance $S_t \in \mathbb{R}_+^{N^*}$ of N assets at time t , where $N^* = N(N+1)/2$ (the number of unique elements in the covariance matrix). To extend the HAR model to a multivariate setting, Chiriac and Voev (2011) propose a parsimonious extension by modeling the vectorized covariance matrix, s_t , by

$$s_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 s_{t-1} + \alpha_2 s_{t-5:t-1} + \alpha_3 s_{t-20:t-1} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.9)$$

where ϵ_t is a mean-zero error vector, α_0 is of dimension N^* and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ are scalar parameters. Bollerslev et al. (2018) note that this suffers from the attenuation bias in a similar way as in the univariate case and propose a vech HARQ model that directly extends the HARQ model above to the multivariate case by allowing α_1 to be time-varying. The time variation is driven by the diagonal elements of the measurement error covariance matrix Π_t . Specifically, the multivariate HARQ model is given by

$$s_t = \alpha_0 + (\alpha_1 \iota + \alpha_{1Q} \pi_t) \circ s_{t-1} + \alpha_2 s_{t-5:t-1} + \alpha_3 s_{t-20:t-1} + \epsilon_t, \quad (2.10)$$

with the N^* dimensional vector $\pi_t = \sqrt{\text{diag}(\Pi_t)}$ (\circ denotes element-wise multiplication), which can be estimated straightforwardly from the data, ι an N^* vector of ones and α_{1Q} a scalar parameter.

Another approach is to model the marginal variances and the cross-correlations separately, the approach we heavily rely on in this paper, by using the following decomposition of the realized covariance matrix

$$S_t = D_t R_t D_t, \quad (2.11)$$

where D_t is a diagonal matrix with standard deviations and R_t is the correlation matrix. Oh and Patton (2016) propose the HAR-DRD model, where the individual variances are modeled via a univariate HAR model, and the correlation matrix is modeled analogously to (2.9). We follow this approach and model the correlations parsimoniously through the following scalar HAR model

$$\mathbf{r}_t - \bar{\mathbf{r}} = \gamma_1(\mathbf{r}_{t-1} - \bar{\mathbf{r}}) + \gamma_2(\mathbf{r}_{t-1:t-5} - \bar{\mathbf{r}}) + \gamma_3(\mathbf{r}_{t-1:t-20} - \bar{\mathbf{r}}) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t,$$

with $\bar{\mathbf{r}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T \mathbf{r}_i$ and the components of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ are iid mean zero errors. Oh and Patton (2016) show that the predictions using this model formulation are valid correlation matrices if the estimates $\hat{\gamma}_1, \hat{\gamma}_2, \hat{\gamma}_3 > 0$ and $\hat{\gamma}_1 + \hat{\gamma}_2 + \hat{\gamma}_3 < 1$. The forecast is then produced by separately forecasting each part and combined to a realized covariance forecast using (2.11). Bollerslev et al. (2018) propose the HARQ-DRD model, which uses the univariate HARQ specification (2.4) for the individual variances and the above model for realized correlations. Bollerslev et al. (2018) point out that it is possible to model the correlation matrix using (2.10), thus allowing for time-varying coefficients, but note that the heteroskedasticity in the measurement errors of the correlations tend to be somewhat limited. Therefore, constant parameters are recommended for modeling and forecasting the realized correlations.

We propose to build on the DRD decomposition of the covariance matrix in (2.11) and replace the univariate HARQ model with models that have been shown to provide superior empirical performance in the univariate case. To be specific, RV_t is modeled using the HARQL model (2.5) as well as the state-space versions HARS in (2.6) and HARSL in (2.8).

2.3. Estimation. The estimation of the HAR and HARQ models, both based on RV_t and $\log RV_t$, and for the correlation model is straightforwardly done by OLS. The state space model, on the other hand, requires maximum likelihood estimation using the Kalman filter. Consider, e.g., the HARSL model in (2.8), which we can rewrite as

$$\begin{aligned} \log RV_t &= \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \log RV_{t-1} + \alpha_2 \log RV_{t-5:t-1} + \alpha_3 \log RV_{t-20:t-1} + \log RV_{t-1} \lambda_t + \varepsilon_t, \\ \lambda_t &= \phi \lambda_{t-1} + v_t. \end{aligned} \quad (2.12)$$

Setting $y_t = \log RV_t$, $\alpha = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2)^\top$,

$$x_t = (1, \log RV_{t-1}, \log RV_{t-5:t-1}, \log RV_{t-20:t-1})^\top$$

and $f_t = \log RV_{t-1}$, we can simplify (2.12)

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= f_t \lambda_t + x_t^\top \beta + \varepsilon_t, \\ \lambda_t &= \phi \lambda_{t-1} + v_t. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

The Kalman filtering is implemented using the `d1m` package in R (see, e.g., Durbin and Koopman, 2012, Petris, 2010), which estimates state space models of the form

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= F_t \lambda_t + \varepsilon_t, \\ \lambda_t &= G_t \lambda_{t-1} + v_t. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Note that $F_t = f_t$ is time-varying and that $G_t = \phi$ is static.

2.4. Forecast evaluation. The models described above deliver one-step-ahead predictions \widehat{S}_t for the realized covariance matrix S_t . To evaluate the predictions, we use the Frobenius norm and the quasi-likelihood (Q-Like) loss function; see Laurent et al. (2013) for their motivation. The Frobenius norm is commonly used to measure the distance between two matrices,

$$L_t^f = \sqrt{\text{Tr} \left((S_t - \widehat{S}_t)(S_t - \widehat{S}_t)^\top \right)}.$$

The Q-Like measure is based on the negative of the log-likelihood of a multivariate normal distribution and is defined as,

$$L_t^q = \log |\widehat{S}_t| + \text{Tr}(\widehat{S}_t^{-1} S_t).$$

We take the average losses over the entire out-of-sample period, and lower values are preferable.

Next, we consider the economic evaluation of the covariance predictions using some criteria suggested in the literature and nicely motivated and summarized in Bollerslev et al. (2018). Their economic evaluations are based on the use in the construction of global minimum variance (GMV) portfolios and portfolios designed to track the aggregate market. Based on the covariance forecast \widehat{S}_t of the returns on the assets, to minimize the conditional volatility, the optimal portfolio allocation vector is

$$w_t = \frac{H_{t|t-1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\iota}}{\boldsymbol{\iota}^\top H_{t|t-1}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\iota}},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ is a $n \times 1$ vector of ones. The variance of this portfolio should be smaller for better forecasts.

Let $r_t^{(j)}$ represent the return on asset j in day t . The turnover from day t to day $t + 1$ is given by

$$TO_t = \sum_{j=1}^n |w_{t+1}^{(j)} - w_t^{(j)} \frac{1 + r_t^{(j)}}{1 + w_t^\top r_t}|.$$

With proportional transaction costs cTO_t (with c being, e.g., 0, 1% or 2%), the portfolio excess return net of transaction costs is

$$r_{pt} = w_t^\top r_t - cTO_t.$$

To assess how extreme the portfolio allocations are, we use the portfolio concentrations

$$CO_t = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n w_t^{(j)2} \right)^{1/2},$$

and the total portfolio short positions,

$$SP_t = \sum_{j=1}^n w_t^{(j)} \mathbb{1}_{\{w_t^{(j)} < 0\}}.$$

Using a quadratic utility function, the economic value of the different models is determined by solving for Δ_γ in

$$\sum_{t=1}^T U(r_{pt}^k, \gamma) = \sum_{t=1}^T U(r_{pt}^l - \Delta_\gamma, \gamma),$$

where the utility of the investor with risk aversion γ is assumed to be

$$U(r_{pt}^k, \gamma) = (1 + r_{pt}^k) - \frac{\gamma}{2(1 + \gamma)} (1 + r_{pt}^k)^2.$$

Δ_γ is the return that an investor with risk aversion γ would be willing to pay to switch from model k to l .

3. APPLICATION

The application is based on high-frequency returns for a set of assets contained in the Dow Jones 30 index at some point in our sample period.³ We use a multivariate realized kernel to estimate the daily return covariance matrix from intraday 1-minute returns from March 2008 until June 2024, resulting in 4051 daily observations of realized covariance matrices. We also computed the realized quartilities for the same period. Both quantities are computed using the `highfrequency` package in R (Boudt et al.,

³The data were obtained from EOD historical data via www.eodhd.com. The ticker symbols of the included assets can be found in Table 2.

2022). Returns are in percentage form (that is, multiplied by 100) in all calculations unless otherwise stated.

The data have some outliers, which we treat as follows. First, we consider a (daily) realized covariance matrix an outlier if any of its elements is more than 20 standard deviations away from its mean. Only 36 of 4051 observations were classified as outliers. We also found 44 outliers detected for the realized quartilities. The union between these two sets of outliers is 53 out of 4051 for the 30 assets. For these 53 days, we replace the realized covariance matrix with the covariance matrix of the previous day. Note that we cannot simply replace the outlier element with its mean because this does not guarantee that the covariance matrix remains positive definite. We treat the realized quartilities in the same way.

The realized covariances are then modeled using the following 7 models, HARSL-DRD, HARS-DRD, multivariate HAR (M-HAR), univariate HARL, univariate HAR, HARQL, and HARQ, (only HARQL and HARQ use realized quartilities) outlined in Section 2.

The models use up to 20 lags as regressors, and hence we lose the first 20 observations, leaving a total of 4051 observations. Table 1 shows summary statistics of variances, quartilities and correlations for all $n = 30$ assets.

Table 2 reports the average parameter estimates over all 30 assets using all the available data. The table also shows the Frobenius norm and quasi-likelihood measures, which are losses indicating the quality of the fit. However, it is important to note that these are computed in-sample. The dramatically lower values for HARS indicate overfitting, which we examine later.

TABLE 1. Summary statistics

Ticker	Variance		Quarticity		Correlations	
	Mean	Std	Median	IQR	Mean	Std
AAPL	3.221	6.139	18.892	184.197	0.316	0.350
AMGN	2.607	4.892	13.994	112.932	0.280	0.334
AXP	4.415	10.230	19.165	251.034	0.365	0.336
BA	4.752	11.870	30.351	333.274	0.331	0.348
CAT	4.292	7.888	32.286	358.000	0.356	0.343
CRM	5.526	12.282	53.465	542.026	0.280	0.349
CSCO	2.852	5.470	12.279	126.676	0.345	0.326
CVX	3.053	6.601	15.228	157.138	0.323	0.345
DIS	2.983	6.312	12.193	119.394	0.347	0.337
GE	5.267	14.062	27.388	294.294	0.322	0.327
GS	4.316	10.014	26.222	274.918	0.348	0.332
HD	2.742	5.177	11.704	106.322	0.340	0.336
HON	2.728	5.533	10.178	123.980	0.389	0.328
IBM	2.033	4.283	6.016	56.197	0.364	0.334
INTC	3.512	5.245	23.431	246.868	0.322	0.336
JNJ	1.312	2.587	3.168	26.277	0.311	0.336
JPM	4.561	11.325	19.959	256.341	0.366	0.332
KO	1.433	3.011	2.815	25.397	0.296	0.332
MCD	1.583	3.675	3.545	33.104	0.303	0.339
MMM	2.242	4.183	8.625	98.181	0.381	0.330
MRK	2.296	4.154	8.082	89.121	0.284	0.342
MSFT	2.733	4.223	13.794	129.022	0.331	0.341
NKE	2.939	5.829	13.727	145.529	0.322	0.339
PG	1.483	4.093	2.826	24.995	0.285	0.334
TRV	2.744	6.768	7.696	82.316	0.320	0.331
UNH	3.515	7.205	16.004	160.649	0.276	0.342
V	2.869	5.314	12.332	120.496	0.326	0.334
VZ	1.878	3.612	5.252	49.230	0.273	0.335
WMT	1.601	3.697	3.861	29.268	0.277	0.334
XOM	2.752	5.308	10.751	121.844	0.325	0.342

Note: The first column shows the mean and standard deviation of the realized variance (first column). The middle column shows the median and interquartile range (IQR) of the realized quarticity. The final column shows the mean across the assets of their time-averaged correlations, and the mean across the assets of the standard deviation (over time) of the correlations. The calculations are based on returns in percentage form, i.e. scaled by 100.

TABLE 2. In-sample results

Models	$\bar{\alpha}_0$	$\bar{\alpha}_1$	$\bar{\alpha}_2$	$\bar{\alpha}_3$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\sigma}_\epsilon$	$\bar{\sigma}_\eta$	$\bar{\alpha}_{1,\eta}$	$\bar{L}^{\text{Frobenius}}$	$\bar{L}^{\text{Q-Like}}$
M-HAR	0.1593 (0.0443)	0.1983 (0.0293)	0.3884 (0.0388)	0.2847 (0.0484)	-	-	-	-	48.1023	42.4565
HAR	0.4184 (0.2436)	0.2147 (0.1098)	0.3311 (0.1287)	0.3125 (0.1202)	-	4.9211 (2.4239)	-	-	46.654	40.3348
HARL	-0.1138 (0.0443)	0.2762 (0.0293)	0.2182 (0.0388)	0.3701 (0.0484)	-	0.7609 (0.0303)	-	-	46.1667	40.2713
HARQ	0.2955 (0.251)	0.4245 (0.1191)	0.2744 (0.1294)	0.2446 (0.1034)	-	4.8483 (2.3991)	-	-0.0006 (0.0004)	46.3588	40.6368
HARQL	-0.0300 (0.0576)	0.5663 (0.0774)	0.1939 (0.0440)	0.3010 (0.0420)	-	0.7421 (0.0280)	-	-0.0522 (0.0078)	45.2730	40.2152
HARS	0.4541 (0.1996)	0.5463 (0.1666)	0.1008 (0.0616)	0.2588 (0.0990)	-0.0885 (0.1549)	2.5564 (1.7944)	1.0768 (0.6525)	-	36.8527	33.7369
HARSL	-0.0888 (0.0740)	0.2656 (0.0275)	0.1640 (0.0332)	0.3239 (0.0556)	0.9564 (0.0450)	0.7399 (0.0315)	0.0425 (0.0250)	-	44.2440	39.4222

Note: Parameter estimates and in-sample loss measures for all models using all the available data for the 30 assets. For the multivariate HAR (M-HAR), $\alpha_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{n(n+1)/2}$ ($= 465$ for $n = 30$ assets), and $\bar{\alpha}_0$ denotes the average of the the 465 estimates. The sample standard deviation of the 465 estimates is shown in parentheses. Moreover, for M-HAR, $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e. the bar notation is not needed for M-HAR (and the standard deviation of the single estimate is omitted). For the other models, all parameters are scalar-valued, with the parameters being different for each asset: the bar notation indicates averaging over the 30 assets. The sample standard deviations of the 30 estimates are shown in parentheses. Empty cells in the table indicate that the parameter is not available for the corresponding model. The Frobenius and Q-like measures are computed using the mean over the in-sample period.

3.1. Forecasting performance. Model selection based on in-sample loss measures may suffer from overfitting. We saw in the previous section that the HARS model achieved a dramatically lower loss compared to the other models. It is thus preferable to fit the model with a training set (in-sample) of the data and use a test set (out-of-sample) for evaluation, which we now do in a forecasting setting.

Recall that the statistical quality of the forecast is evaluated using the Frobenius norm of the predicted covariance matrix minus the true covariance matrix and the Q-Like measure based on the negative log density of a multivariate normal. For both metrics, lower values are preferable.

To evaluate the forecasting abilities of the different models, we therefore consider an out-of-sample evaluation. For each period, we consider the accuracy of the one-step-ahead forecast via a cross-validation approach with a rolling window of fixed size of 1000 observations (equal to the number of in-sample observations) that rolls forward one step at a time. The parameter estimates remain fairly stable as the rolling window moves forward, and thus we re-estimate the model only every 30th observation for computational convenience. This results in predictions for the period April 2012 until June 2024, a total of 3031 predictions for which we compute the loss functions. We additionally divide the losses of losses into two sub-samples: those that correspond to time periods with low-quarticity (defined as the smallest 50% quarticity values) and high-quarticity (defined as the largest 50% quarticity values), respectively. The results are shown in Table 3. We computed the 90% model confidence sets (MCS) for each loss and sub-sample, respectively, and marked the included models with an asterisk.

The results show that the HARQL model generally has the best performance with the lowest loss in 3 out of 6 cases and 5 inclusions in the MCS. The second best model appears to be the HARSL with the lowest loss twice and five inclusions in the MCS. The other models perform clearly worse and are only included in the MCS for the cases that include most models. The worst performance is found for the HARS and M-HAR models with clearly higher losses and each only one inclusion in the MCS. The poor out-of-sample performance of the HARS model confirms the suspected overfitting observed in the in-sample results. Moreover, the poor performance of the HARQ model is in contrast with the findings in Bollerslev et al. (2016, 2018), whereas the strong performance of the HARQL model highlights the importance of addressing attenuation bias.

Next, we performed pairwise Diebold-Mariano tests in order to evaluate specific model extensions against their respective baseline models presented in Table 4. In particular, we compare models along three dimensions: $\log RV$ models vs models for RV

TABLE 3. Statistical out-of-sample losses

Models	Sample 2008-2024					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
M-HAR	40.929	38.718	18.585	24.139	63.289*	53.307
HAR	40.275	36.914*	17.378	24.439	63.188*	49.397*
HARL	39.391	36.773*	15.937	23.390	62.861*	50.164*
HARQ	40.741	39.998*	17.241	24.261	64.257*	55.745*
HARQL	38.946*	36.790*	15.527*	23.358	62.382*	50.231*
HARS	43.080	37.302*	19.062	24.367	67.114	50.246
HARSL	38.953*	36.922*	15.702	23.274*	62.220*	50.578*

Note: Statistical losses for the predicted covariance matrices for the out-of-sample period April 2012- June 2024. The in-sample periods cover the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The losses are computed using the mean over the corresponding observations. Bold fonts mark the lowest loss in each column. An asterisk indicates that the model is included in the model confidence set of significance level $\alpha = 0.10$.

in levels, Q-models against the non-attenuated counterparts of the models, and state-space models against fixed parameter versions. The results are not clear-cut, and we conclude the following: The *log* versions outperform the models for *RV* in the low quarticity periods. The HARQ model does not outperform its non-attenuated counterpart, and similarly, the evidence that the HARQL is better than the HARL is quite weak. Finally, time-variation based on the state-space approach is better only for the *logRV* models, and even here, the evidence is not perfectly clear.

Our sample period includes the highly volatile Covid-19 period, which may drive the results. Therefore, in the appendix, we report the results after splitting the out-of-sample periods into the pre-Covid time 2012-2019 and the (post) Covid period 2020-2024; see Tables A1-A4. For the pre-Covid subsample, the ranking of the losses is very similar to the full sample ranking, and the HARQL emerges as the best model. However, the results are more mixed for the 2020-2024 subsample, with HARQL and HARSL performing comparably well, albeit with a slight advantage for HARSL. The pairwise Diebold-Mariano tests for the pre-Covid period show more rejections than for the full-sample period and confirm the superiority of the models for *logRV*. For the 2020-2024 period the results are more mixed, but give evidence in favor of the *logRV* models for the low-quarticity periods and the HARSL over the HARL.

In general, we conclude that the HARQL model provides the best overall forecast performance, suggesting that modeling *logRV* while addressing attenuation bias is the preferred approach for modeling and forecasting. Nevertheless, the similar performance of the HARSL model makes it a viable alternative as well.

TABLE 4. Pairwise Diebold-Mariano tests

Models	Out of Sample 2012-2024					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
HARL vs. HAR	0.979	0.996	0.000	0.000	0.993	0.998
HARQL vs. HARQ	0.238	0.159	0.000	0.000	0.295	0.159
HARSL vs. HARS	0.140	0.376	0.017	0.000	0.154	0.452
HARQ vs. HAR	0.937	0.842	0.855	0.757	0.935	0.842
HARQL vs. HARL	0.781	0.889	0.000	0.960	0.822	0.880
HARS vs. HAR	0.851	0.965	0.973	0.994	0.838	0.961
HARSL vs. HARL	0.000	0.999	0.136	0.000	0.000	0.999

Note: This table reports the p-values for the pairwise comparison of the different models by Diebold-Mariano tests for the out-of-sample period April 2012- June 2024.

3.2. Economic evaluation. For evaluating the economic relevance of the competing forecasting models, we follow the methodology in Bollerslev et al. (2018) summarized in Section 2.4 for the same evaluation periods as above. Based on the different forecasts, we construct the global minimum variance portfolio (GMVP), with and without short-selling restrictions, and evaluate its performance using some measures. These measures are turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), short positions (SP), mean and standard deviations of the realized portfolio returns, the Sharpe ratio, and Δ_γ , which is the amount an investor is willing to pay to switch from a given model to the HARQL model. We selected this model as the basis for its convincing performance in terms of statistical losses. The Sharpe ratio and Δ_γ are computed for different transaction costs $c = 0, 1, 2$ percent of the turnover and $\gamma = 1, 10$. Note that a positive Δ implies that HARQL is the superior portfolio, whereas negative values show that the corresponding other portfolio is preferred. The results are in Tables 5 and 6.

The results for portfolios without a short-selling restriction, reported in Table 5, show that different models achieve a comparably low portfolio standard deviation. The HARQ is the only model with a notably higher standard deviation. The model confidence set for the standard deviations (not reported) includes all models, which is also true for (almost) all scenarios considered below. The turnover is lowest for the M-HAR, followed by HAR, and highest for HARQL. Portfolio concentration and short positions are very similar across all models. The mean returns vary significantly over the models, which is attributed to chance, given that means are treated as unpredictable and left unmodeled. Their large variation contrasts with the results in Bollerslev et al. (2018) and drives the results, sometimes dominating the performance of the volatility predictions. Portfolio performance, considering Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ , is best for HARS and HARQL for low transaction costs, but HAR and HARL are preferable for 2% transaction costs.

TABLE 5. Economic evaluation 2012-2024

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.493	0.625	0.809	0.919	1.031	1.021	0.815
CO		0.422	0.413	0.411	0.429	0.425	0.425	0.414
SP		-0.340	-0.290	-0.293	-0.310	-0.309	-0.314	-0.297
Mean ret.		3.605	6.789	7.295	6.001	8.046	8.439	6.433
Std.		13.598	13.289	13.148	15.084	13.359	13.654	13.393
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe	0.265	0.511	0.555	0.398	0.602	0.618	0.480
	Δ_1	191.791	53.563	31.113	97.476	0.000	-15.311	69.363
	Δ_{10}	203.295	50.383	21.222	185.251	0.158	-0.864	71.125
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe	0.181	0.401	0.411	0.256	0.422	0.444	0.339
	Δ_1	137.994	12.976	8.920	86.253	0.000	-16.361	47.727
	Δ_{10}	149.728	9.990	-0.952	174.159	0.158	-1.803	49.511
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe	0.096	0.291	0.268	0.114	0.243	0.270	0.197
	Δ_1	84.225	-27.552	-13.276	75.060	0.000	-17.411	26.119
	Δ_{10}	96.312	-30.408	-23.132	163.068	0.157	-2.737	27.891

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios for the out-of-sample period April 2012- June 2024 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .

The results when imposing a short-selling restriction can be found in Table 6. Regarding TO, M-HAR and HARS models give the more stable portfolio weights, whereas portfolio concentration is again comparable across models. The HAR, HARL, and HARQL models achieve the lowest portfolio standard deviation. As in the previous case, the variation in mean returns is noticeable and strongly drives the economic value of the competing portfolios. Again, the portfolio based on the HARS model has the highest mean returns and has the largest Sharpe ratios for all levels of transaction costs. For low transaction costs, the second best model is the HARQL, but for larger transaction costs, the basic HAR model is second-best in terms of Sharpe-ration and Δ_γ .

In the appendix, the corresponding results for the 2012-2019 and 2020-2024 subsamples can be found; see Tables A6-A8. For the first subsample, the HARQL performs well but is characterized by high turnover that results in large transaction costs for higher values of c . For the 2020-2024 period, the results are mixed, but the HARS model has the best economic performance due to significantly higher mean returns. In terms of portfolio standard deviations, it stands out that the HARQ model performs significantly worse than all other models for the more turbulent 2020-2024 period. The basic HAR model performs fairly well for both subsamples for large transaction costs due to its low turnover and low portfolio variance.

TABLE 6. Economic evaluation 2012-2024 without short-selling

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.335	0.383	0.516	0.565	0.650	0.621	0.518
CO		0.363	0.366	0.364	0.377	0.371	0.371	0.366
SP		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean ret.		4.184	7.008	7.114	6.113	7.454	8.454	6.719
Std.		13.855	13.122	13.148	14.854	13.201	13.482	13.312
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe	0.302	0.534	0.541	0.412	0.565	0.627	0.505
	Δ_1	143.808	18.720	14.320	66.729	0.000	-41.402	32.129
	Δ_{10}	175.485	15.173	11.995	149.738	0.158	-27.769	37.588
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe	0.246	0.466	0.450	0.323	0.450	0.520	0.414
	Δ_1	112.260	-7.967	0.894	58.239	0.0002	-44.297	18.900
	Δ_{10}	144.060	-11.403	-1.422	141.323	0.158	-30.602	24.394
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe	0.189	0.398	0.358	0.234	0.335	0.412	0.324
	Δ_1	80.741	-34.655	-12.533	49.778	0.0002	-47.191	5.730
	Δ_{10}	112.790	-37.982	-14.841	132.908	0.157	-33.434	11.197

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios not allowing for short-sales for the out-of-sample period April 2012- June 2024 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .

Overall, these results are not as clear-cut as the statistical evaluation. We can conclude that the simpler M-HAR and HAR models lead to more stable portfolio weights and, hence, less turnover than the more sophisticated models. The mean returns vary unexpectedly much across models, which strongly drives the economic performance, but all models, except the HARQ, result in similar portfolio standard deviations. As global minimum variance portfolios are constructed to minimize portfolio volatility, this indicates that multiple models can result in fairly reliable predictions for the covariance matrix. The HARQL model, our preferred specification for statistical losses, performs fairly well and may be recommended if transaction costs are low. However, the basis HAR model does a good job for high transaction costs.

4. CONCLUSION

We studied the problem of forecasting realized covariance matrices by extending the approach proposed by Bollerslev et al. (2018), which relies on forecasting realized correlations and variances separately. Researchers face the decision of how to precisely model RV , and it is not clear which approach is best in the multivariate asset case, so we tried to shed light on this issue by focusing mainly on combining different approaches

for univariate RV forecasting while fixing the model for correlations. The evaluation of the models' forecasting performance was based on commonly used statistical and economic criteria using a dataset of 30 stocks that were part of the Dow Jones 30 index at some point during the sample period. The predictions were evaluated for the period 2012-2024 using a rolling window scheme, and as a robustness check, additionally split the evaluation period into two sub-periods (pre-Covid and Covid/post-Covid).

For the statistical losses the results are clear cut and suggest that our proposed multivariate HARQL model for predicting realized covariances based on a univariate attenuation bias approach (Wang et al., 2020) and the log-transformation of RV is superior. However, the state-space model for $\log RV$ also performs well, confirming the finding for the univariate case in Bekierman and Manner (2018). Moreover, the results suggest that, in general, forecasting models based on $\log RV$ are preferable over models for RV itself and that accounting for the attenuation bias is only advantageous for $\log RV$. In contrast, the performance of the $HARQ$ model in levels is disappointing compared to the results in Bollerslev et al. (2016, 2018).

The economic evaluation showed mixed and partially counterintuitive results, contrasting the clear-cut findings in Bollerslev et al. (2018) and in our statistical evaluation. The HARQL model performs well but is associated with high portfolio turnover, leading to large transaction costs. On the other hand, the basic HAR has fairly low turnover while still leading to low portfolio variance. The results are strongly driven by large differences in mean portfolio returns, which one would expect to be similar across models. The mixed results can partially be explained by the volatile post-pandemic sample period, arguably making the problem significantly more difficult, and the fact that we consider a set of 30 assets, in contrast to only 10 assets studied in Bollerslev et al. (2018). Combining the findings of the statistical and economic evaluations, the HARQL model can be regarded as a recommendable specification.

Future research may investigate under which conditions statistical and economic evaluation of covariance forecasts disagree and whether realized covariance forecasting models are helpful for portfolio construction in larger-dimensional settings and during adverse market conditions. Additionally, research might look further into the predictions of realized correlations and whether time-varying parameter models can improve forecast performance.

REFERENCES

- Amado, C. and Teräsvirta, T. (2013). Modelling volatility by variance decomposition. *Journal of Econometrics*, 175(2):142–153.
- Andersen, T. G. and Bollerslev, T. (1998a). Answering the skeptics: Yes, standard volatility models do provide accurate forecasts. *International Economic Review*, pages 885–905.
- Andersen, T. G. and Bollerslev, T. (1998b). Deutsche mark–dollar volatility: Intraday activity patterns, macroeconomic announcements, and longer run dependencies. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(1):219–265.
- Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F. X., and Ebens, H. (2001). The distribution of realized stock return volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 61(1):43–76.
- Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F. X., and Labys, P. (2003). Modeling and forecasting realized volatility. *Econometrica*, 71(2):579–625.
- Ang, A. and Bekaert, G. (2002). International asset allocation with regime shifts. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 15(4):1137–1187.
- Bandi, F. M. and Russell, J. R. (2008). Microstructure noise, realized variance, and optimal sampling. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 75(2):339–369.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Hansen, P. R., Lunde, A., and Shephard, N. (2008). Designing realized kernels to measure the ex post variation of equity prices in the presence of noise. *Econometrica*, 76(6):1481–1536.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Hansen, P. R., Lunde, A., and Shephard, N. (2011). Multivariate realised kernels: consistent positive semi-definite estimators of the covariation of equity prices with noise and non-synchronous trading. *Journal of Econometrics*, 162(2):149–169.
- Bauwens, L., Braione, M., and Storti, G. (2016). Forecasting comparison of long term component dynamic models for realized covariance matrices. *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, (123/124):103–134.
- Bauwens, L., Hafner, C. M., and Pierret, D. (2013). Multivariate volatility modeling of electricity futures. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 28(5):743–761.
- Bekierman, J. and Manner, H. (2018). Forecasting realized variance measures using time-varying coefficient models. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 34(2):276–287.
- Bollerslev, T. (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 31(3):307–327.
- Bollerslev, T., Engle, R. F., and Nelson, D. B. (1994). ARCH models. *Handbook of Econometrics*, 4:2959–3038.
- Bollerslev, T., Patton, A. J., and Quaedvlieg, R. (2016). Exploiting the errors: A simple approach for improved volatility forecasting. *Journal of Econometrics*, 192(1):1–18.

- Bollerslev, T., Patton, A. J., and Quaedvlieg, R. (2018). Modeling and forecasting (un)reliable realized covariances for more reliable financial decisions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 207(1):71–91.
- Boudt, K., Kleen, O., and Sjørup, E. (2022). Analyzing intraday financial data in R: The highfrequency package. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 104(8):1–36.
- Busch, T., Christensen, B. J., and Nielsen, M. Ø. (2011). The role of implied volatility in forecasting future realized volatility and jumps in foreign exchange, stock, and bond markets. *Journal of Econometrics*, 160(1):48–57.
- Cai, Z., Fan, J., and Li, R. (2000). Efficient estimation and inferences for varying-coefficient models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95(451):888–902.
- Caporin, M., Rossi, E., and De Magistris, P. S. (2017). Chasing volatility: A persistent multiplicative error model with jumps. *Journal of Econometrics*, 198(1):122–145.
- Chiriac, R. and Voev, V. (2011). Modelling and forecasting multivariate realized volatility. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 26(6):922–947.
- Corsi, F. (2009). A simple approximate long-memory model of realized volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 7(2):174–196.
- Cubadda, G., Guardabascio, B., and Hecq, A. (2017). A vector heterogeneous autoregressive index model for realized volatility measures. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 33(2):337–344.
- Davis, R. A., Lee, T. C. M., and Rodriguez-Yam, G. A. (2006). Structural break estimation for nonstationary time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(473):223–239.
- Dobrev, D. and Szerszen, P. (2010). The information content of high-frequency data for estimating equity return models and forecasting risk. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
- Durbin, J. and Koopman, S. J. (2012). *Time Series Analysis by State Space methods*, volume 38. OUP Oxford.
- Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica*, 50:987–1007.
- Engle, R. F. and Gallo, G. M. (2006). A multiple indicators model for volatility using intra-daily data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 131(1-2):3–27.
- Engle, R. F., Ghysels, E., and Sohn, B. (2013). Stock market volatility and macroeconomic fundamentals. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(3):776–797.
- Fama, E. F. (1965). The behavior of stock-market prices. *The journal of Business*, 38(1):34–105.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*, volume 20. Springer.

- Figlewski, S. (1997). Forecasting volatility. *Financial Markets, Institutions & Instruments*, 6(1):1–88.
- Francq, C. and Zakoian, J.-M. (2019). *GARCH Models: Structure, Statistical Inference and Financial Applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Golosnoy, V., Gribisch, B., and Liesenfeld, R. (2012). The conditional autoregressive wishart model for multivariate stock market volatility. *Journal of Econometrics*, 167(2):211–223.
- Haas, M., Mittnik, S., and Paolella, M. S. (2009). Asymmetric multivariate normal mixture GARCH. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(6):2129–2154.
- Hansen, P. R., Huang, Z., and Shek, H. H. (2012). Realized GARCH: A joint model for returns and realized measures of volatility. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27(6):877–906.
- Harvey, A. and Palumbo, D. (2023). Score-driven models for realized volatility. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Huang, D., Schlag, C., Shaliastovich, I., and Thimme, J. (2019). Volatility-of-volatility risk. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 54(6):2423–2452.
- Kikuchi, T. and Vachadze, G. (2018). Minimum investment requirement, financial market imperfection and self-fulfilling belief. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 28:305–332.
- Kinnebrock, S. and Podolskij, M. (2008). A note on the central limit theorem for bipower variation of general functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 118(6):1056–1070.
- Koopman, S. J., Jungbacker, B., and Hol, E. (2005). Forecasting daily variability of the S&P 100 stock index using historical, realised and implied volatility measurements. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 12(3):445–475.
- Koopman, S. J. and Scharth, M. (2012). The analysis of stochastic volatility in the presence of daily realized measures. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 11(1):76–115.
- Laurent, S., Rombouts, J., and Violante, F. (2013). On loss functions and ranking forecasting performances of multivariate volatility models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 173:1–10.
- Liu, L. Y., Patton, A. J., and Sheppard, K. (2015). Does anything beat 5-minute RV? A comparison of realized measures across multiple asset classes. *Journal of Econometrics*, 187(1):293–311.
- Liu, M., Choo, W.-C., Lee, C.-C., and Lee, C.-C. (2023). Trading volume and realized volatility forecasting: Evidence from the China stock market. *Journal of Forecasting*, 42(1):76–100.

- Oh, D. H. and Patton, A. J. (2016). High-dimensional copula-based distributions with mixed frequency data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 193(2):349–366.
- Patton, A. J. and Sheppard, K. (2015). Good volatility, bad volatility: Signed jumps and the persistence of volatility. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 97(3):683–697.
- Petris, G. (2010). An R package for dynamic linear models. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 36:1–16.
- Poon, S.-H. and Granger, C. W. J. (2003). Forecasting volatility in financial markets: A review. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 41(2):478–539.
- Soucek, M. and Todorova, N. (2013). Realized volatility transmission between crude oil and equity futures markets: A multivariate har approach. *Energy Economics*, 40:586–597.
- Takahashi, M., Omori, Y., and Watanabe, T. (2009). Estimating stochastic volatility models using daily returns and realized volatility simultaneously. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 53(6):2404–2426.
- Wang, Y., Liang, F., Wang, T., and Huang, Z. (2020). Does measurement error matter in volatility forecasting? Empirical evidence from the Chinese stock market. *Economic Modelling*, 87:148–157.

APPENDIX A. ADDITIONAL RESULTS

TABLE A1. Statistical out-of-sample losses 2012 to 2019

Models	Out of Sample 2012-2019					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
M-HAR	28.549	32.226	15.248	20.860	41.851	43.592
HAR	28.151	31.249*	14.662	21.283	41.639	41.216*
HARL	27.324	31.140*	13.383	20.030	41.265	42.251
HARQ	28.034	31.159*	14.389	20.956	41.680	41.363*
HARQL	26.883*	31.103*	13.036*	20.000	40.730*	42.207
HARS	29.746	31.378*	16.159	21.052	43.334	41.704*
HARSL	27.227	31.253*	13.223	19.929*	41.231	42.578

Note: Statistical losses for the predicted covariance matrices for the out-of-sample period April 2012- December 2019. The in-sample periods cover the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The losses are computed using the mean over the corresponding observations. Bold fonts mark the lowest loss in each column. An asterisk indicates that the model is included in the model confidence set of significance level $\alpha = 0.10$.

TABLE A2. Statistical out-of-sample losses 2020 to June 2024

Models	Out of Sample 2020-2024					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
M-HAR	62.143*	49.843*	29.531	33.170	94.814*	66.546*
HAR	61.051*	46.620*	26.307	32.969	95.858*	60.296*
HARL	60.069*	46.424*	24.485	32.279	95.718*	60.595*
HARQ	62.515*	55.144*	26.499	33.229	98.595*	77.098*
HARQL	59.617*	46.534*	23.821*	32.214	95.478*	60.880*
HARS	65.929*	47.454*	28.205	33.262	103.719*	61.672*
HARSL	59.047*	46.424*	24.056*	32.067*	94.101*	61.229*

Note: Statistical losses for the predicted covariance matrices for the out-of-sample period January 2020- June 2024. The in-sample periods cover the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The losses are computed using the mean over the corresponding observations. Bold fonts mark the lowest loss in each column. An asterisk indicates that the model is included in the model confidence set of significance level $\alpha = 0.10$.

TABLE A3. Pairwise Diebold-Mariano tests

Models	Out of Sample 2012-2019					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
HARL vs. HAR	0.000	0.999	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
HARQL vs. HARQ	0.000	0.999	0.000	0.000	0.000	1.000
HARSL vs. HARS	0.003	0.980	0.034	0.000	0.010	0.994
HARQ vs. HAR	0.156	0.871	0.200	0.000	0.202	0.917
HARQL vs. HARL	0.000	0.221	0.000	0.970	0.000	0.184
HARS vs. HAR	0.994	0.978	0.956	0.819	0.986	0.974
HARSL vs. HARL	0.475	1.000	0.369	0.011	0.563	1.000

Note: This table reports the p-values for the pairwise comparison of the different models by Diebold-Mariano tests for the out-of-sample period April 2012 - December 2019.

TABLE A4. Pairwise Diebold-Mariano tests 2020-2024

Models	Out of Sample 2020-2024					
	Full sample		Low-quarticity		High-quarticity	
	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like	Frobenius	Q-Like
HARL vs. HAR	0.989	0.870	0.000	0.000	0.996	0.903
HARQL vs. HARQ	0.280	0.158	0.000	0.000	0.334	0.158
HARSL vs. HARS	0.152	0.215	0.092	0.000	0.159	0.260
HARQ vs. HAR	0.940	0.842	0.982	0.999	0.936	0.842
HARQL vs. HARL	0.854	0.924	0.000	0.635	0.882	0.923
HARS vs. HAR	0.840	0.925	0.878	0.957	0.834	0.915
HARSL vs. HARL	0.000	0.963	0.224	0.000	0.000	0.978

Note: This table reports the p-values for the pairwise comparison of the different models by Diebold-Mariano tests for the out-of-sample period January 2020 - June 2024.

TABLE A5. Economic evaluation 2012-2019

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.448	0.571	0.797	0.866	1.058	0.995	0.809
CO		0.415	0.403	0.405	0.414	0.419	0.417	0.408
SP		-0.339	-0.287	-0.301	-0.303	-0.319	-0.317	-0.305
Mean ret.		4.395	8.473	9.192	9.893	10.623	9.944	8.798
Std.		11.810	10.740	11.004	10.953	10.949	11.174	11.028
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.372	0.788	0.835	0.903	0.970	0.889	0.797
	Δ_1	264.193	88.969	60.028	30.519	0.000	29.343	76.627
	Δ_{10}	299.226	80.992	62.345	30.835	0.158	38.436	79.880
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe Comp.	0.278	0.666	0.663	0.724	0.742	0.680	0.619
	Δ_1	203.226	40.251	33.938	11.386	0.000	23.054	51.710
	Δ_{10}	238.390	32.406	36.279	11.840	0.158	32.279	54.986
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.190	0.534	0.488	0.524	0.508	0.463	0.446
	Δ_1	142.285	-8.408	7.907	-7.749	0.000	16.794	26.820
	Δ_{10}	177.547	-16.185	10.208	-7.157	0.157	26.124	30.087

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios for the out-of-sample period April 2012-December 2019 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .

TABLE A6. Economic evaluation 2020-2024

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.570	0.718	0.829	1.009	0.985	1.063	0.825
CO		0.433	0.428	0.421	0.455	0.434	0.439	0.423
SP		-0.341	-0.294	-0.278	-0.322	-0.291	-0.307	-0.282
Mean ret.		2.340	4.093	4.257	-0.228	3.921	6.030	2.649
Std.		16.216	16.787	16.179	20.296	16.703	17.094	16.688
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.144	0.243	0.263	-0.011	0.234	0.352	0.158
	Δ_1	67.637	-7.145	-18.465	212.268	0.000	-91.883	56.905
	Δ_{10}	39.152	-1.994	-49.156	449.087	0.157	-68.122	56.149
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.065	0.148	0.148	-0.122	0.103	0.213	0.048
	Δ_1	26.137	-33.761	-34.032	214.661	0.000	-84.000	40.896
	Δ_{10}	-1.961	-28.366	-64.672	451.477	0.156	-60.129	40.142
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe Avg.	-0.012	0.052	0.034	-0.233	-0.028	0.075	-0.062
	Δ_1	-15.303	-60.377	-49.599	217.083	0.000	-76.116	24.916
	Δ_{10}	-43.081	-54.742	-80.192	453.872	0.156	-52.128	24.132

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios for the out-of-sample period January 2020-June 2024 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .

TABLE A7. Economic evaluation 2012-2019 without short-selling

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.309	0.351	0.512	0.538	0.667	0.609	0.521
CO		0.353	0.353	0.353	0.361	0.360	0.360	0.355
SP		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean ret.		5.855	8.483	8.999	9.254	9.725	9.368	8.775
Std		5.823	8.702	9.207	9.592	10.015	9.728	8.967
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.493	0.790	0.831	0.860	0.903	0.852	0.812
	Δ_1	166.744	51.767	30.575	19.624	0.000	15.886	39.888
	Δ_{10}	211.643	50.363	32.673	19.229	0.158	24.460	41.475
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.430	0.712	0.718	0.740	0.754	0.720	0.696
	Δ_1	130.932	20.133	15.030	6.688	0.000	10.115	25.276
	Δ_{10}	175.918	18.830	17.168	6.382	0.158	18.752	26.886
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.368	0.634	0.605	0.621	0.606	0.587	0.581
	Δ_1	95.147	-11.440	-0.453	-6.248	0.000	4.341	10.724
	Δ_{10}	140.190	-12.705	1.660	-6.464	0.157	13.044	12.296

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios not allowing for short-sales for the out-of-sample period April 2012- December 2019 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .

TABLE A8. Economic evaluation 2020-2024 without short-selling

		M-HAR	HAR	HARL	HARQ	HARQL	HARS	HARSL
TO		0.377	0.436	0.521	0.611	0.619	0.639	0.511
CO		0.379	0.385	0.381	0.404	0.387	0.390	0.383
SP		0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Mean ret.		1.509	4.648	4.097	1.086	3.819	6.991	3.428
Std.		16.714	16.438	16.391	20.018	16.561	16.933	16.762
$c = 0\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.090	0.282	0.249	0.054	0.230	0.412	0.204
	Δ_1	67.637	-7.145	-18.465	212.268	0.000	-91.883	56.905
	Δ_{10}	39.152	-1.994	-49.156	449.087	0.157	-68.122	56.149
$c = 1\%$	Sharpe Avg.	0.040	0.223	0.179	-0.013	0.147	0.328	0.136
	Δ_1	26.137	-33.761	-34.032	214.661	0.000	-84.000	40.896
	Δ_{10}	-1.961	-28.366	-64.672	451.477	0.156	-60.129	40.142
$c = 2\%$	Sharpe Avg.	-0.010	0.164	0.108	-0.082	0.063	0.244	0.068
	Δ_1	-15.303	-60.377	-49.599	217.083	0.000	-76.116	24.916
	Δ_{10}	-43.081	-54.742	-80.192	453.872	0.156	-52.128	24.132

Note: Global minimum variance portfolios not allowing for short-sales for the out-of-sample period January 2020- June 2024 with the previous 4 years of data as the in-sample period using a rolling window approach. The table shows the turnover (TO), portfolio concentration (CO), and short positions (SP). The table also shows the annual average return and the annual standard deviation of the daily portfolio returns. The lower panel shows the Sharpe ratios and Δ_γ for various cost levels c .