

Risk evaluation with enhanced covariance matrix

Krzysztof Urbanowicz*

*Faculty of Physics and Centre of Excellence for Complex
Systems Research, Warsaw University of Technology
Koszykowa 75, PL-00-662 Warsaw, Poland*

Peter Richmond†

*School of Physics, Trinity College
Dublin 2, Ireland*

Janusz A. Hołyst‡

*Faculty of Physics and Centre of Excellence for Complex
Systems Research, Warsaw University of Technology
Koszykowa 75, PL-00-662 Warsaw, Poland*

(Dated: April 22, 2019)

Abstract

We propose a route for the evaluation of risk based on a transformation of the covariance matrix. The approach uses a ‘potential’ or ‘objective’ function. This allows us to rescale data from different assets (or sources) such that each set then has similar statistical properties in terms of their probability distributions. The method is tested using historical data from both the New York and Warsaw Stock Exchanges.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Tp, 89.65.Gh

Keywords: information entropy, stochastic processes, probability distribution, stock market data, correlations

*Electronic address: urbanow@pks.mpg.de

†Electronic address: richmond@tcd.ie

‡Electronic address: jholyst@if.pw.edu.pl

I. INTRODUCTION

Optimization of portfolios has been much studied since the pioneering work of Markowitz [1, 2] on the mean-variance portfolio optimization [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. However the basic construction of the portfolio has not changed much as a result. Computation of Sharp ratios [17, 18] and the Markowitz analysis equate risk with the co-variance matrix. Portfolio allocations are then computed by maximizing a suitable constructed utility function [19, 20, 21]. Moreover, the approach taken by Markowitz and many other authors [1, 2] is essentially only appropriate for random walks and Gaussian distributions [3, 4, 5]. Many economists have sought to use other utility functions and invoke additional objectives [22, 23] in which portfolio weights are computed via maximization of these different utility functionals. Others have introduced additional features of the probability distribution such as the third moment or skewness of the returns [22, 23]. This builds in aspects of the deviation of the probability distribution from the Gaussian as well as the asymmetry. Introducing even a constant value for the skewness may yield more reliable portfolio weights than a calculation in which only the variance or second moment of the distribution is used and where the risk of extreme values is seriously underestimated. Similar comments could be made about the introduction of the kurtosis which is a first order route to addressing the issue of ‘fat’ tails.

An important outcome is the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) [10, 24, 25, 26] where risk relates to correlations within the market portfolio [10, 24, 25, 26] although the risk now is clearly that all investments will collapse simultaneously. Furthermore it is assumed that risk that achieves premiums in the long term should not be reducible otherwise arbitrage is possible [25]. This is essentially the Arbitrage Pricing Theory (APT).

However, key issues remain unresolved. For example, one weakness of CAPM and APT theories is that they assume efficiency in the proliferation of market information. In a real market not all investors have the same or complete information and arbitrage is possible. Merton [27] has discussed this and in so doing has extended CAPM theory to deal more effectively with small firms for which information is not always readily available.

Here we concern ourselves with a new approach to the exploitation of datasets for the computation of portfolio weights within a diversified portfolio. The method exploits the full character of the distribution function each asset in the portfolio and seeks to maximize

the impact of correlations. In the next section we discuss the background to our approach and introduce the so-called *objective* function. Having established this we show how, from data, we can construct values for a renormalized objective function. These are then used in section III to obtain covariance matrices and weights for portfolios of stocks. The calculations are illustrated in section IV by examples from both the US and Warsaw stock exchanges. We also show how the approach modifies the underlying distribution of eigenvalues enhancing the correlations for larger values.

II. OBJECTIVE FUNCTION

Consider an asset, characterized by a price, $S(t)$ and return $x(t) = \ln S(t+1)/S(t)$. The objective function, $w(x)$ is defined in terms of the stationary probability distribution for returns, $P(x)$, viz:

$$P(x) = \frac{1}{Z} e^{-w(x)/D}, \quad (1)$$

where Z is a normalization factor. Such functions are familiar to physicists and may be derived by minimizing a ‘free energy’ functional, $F(w(x))$, subject to constraints on the mean value of the objective function, viz:

$$F = \int_{\mathbf{R}} dx P(x) [\ln P(x) + w(x)/D - \lambda] \quad (2)$$

Such a form for the probability distribution is also the outcome of a model that assumes returns are governed by a generalised Markovian stochastic process of the form

$$x(t+1) - x(t) = f(x) + g(x)\varepsilon(t) \quad (3)$$

The Gaussian processes, ε , satisfy:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \varepsilon(t)\varepsilon(t') \rangle &= D\delta(t-t') \\ \langle \varepsilon(t) \rangle &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

For the moment we leave the form of the functions f and g unspecified except to say that they only depend on $x(t)$. The solution to such a stochastic process has been deduced elsewhere [28, 29, 30]. Adopting the Ito convention, the distribution function, $P(x, t)$, associated with the process is given by the Fokker Planck equation:

$$\frac{\partial P(x, t)}{\partial t} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} (Dg^2(x)P(x, t)) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x} (f(x)P(x, t)) \quad (5)$$

TABLE I: Examples of objective values $w(x)$ and corresponding probability distributions, P for different choices of f and g .

$f(x)$	$g(x)$	$w(x)$	$P(x)$
$\text{sgn}(x)$	1	$ x $	$e^{- x /D}$
x	1	x^2	$e^{-x^2/D}$
$\lambda g g'$	$g(x)$	$(2D - \lambda) \ln g$	$\frac{1}{g^{2D-\lambda}}$
$\frac{2x}{\nu} (1 - x^2/\nu)$	$1 + x^2/\nu$	$(\nu + 1) / 2 \ln (1 + x^2/\nu)$	$\frac{1}{(1+x^2/\nu)^{(\nu+1)/2}}$

The stationary solution is:

$$P(x) = \frac{e^{\int dx \frac{f}{(Dg^2)}}}{Z(g^2(x))} = \frac{1}{Z} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{D} \int dx \frac{2Dg g' - f}{g^2} \right) \quad (6)$$

Z is again a normalization factor.

A number of different cases are evident are expressed in the table I. Row four is obtained from row three by introducing $(\nu + 1) / 2 = 2D - \lambda$ and choosing $g(x) = 1 + x^2/\nu$ when we see that the distribution function reduces to a student distribution. Clearly $\nu > 1$ otherwise we cannot normalize the distribution function. In developing our methodology in the next sections we shall focus on the use of the student distribution that seems to offer good fits to the data we consider. Tsallis and Anteneodo [31] have shown how similar multiplicative stochastic processes based on other non-analytic choices for the function f and g can lead to q-exponentials.

III. PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION

As we have noted above it is usual for a portfolio of M stocks to compute portfolio weights, p_i using the covariance matrix, $\mathbf{C}$ and defining the risk, R , as:

$$R = \sum_{i,j} \mathbf{C}_{i,j} p_i p_j \quad (7)$$

Optimizing this in the absence of risk free assets yields the weight of stock i :

$$p_i = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_j \mathbf{C}_{i,j}^{-1} \quad (8)$$

where Z is a normalization factor.

From our previous discussion, it should be clear that the magnitude of the correlations calculated in this way depend on the relative ‘objective values for pairs of stocks, i and j . Transforming the objective value will change the magnitude of this correlation. We now assert following the discussion in the previous section that the maximum correlation is obtained by renormalizing the objective values such that the total set of values, $x_i(t_j)$ for all i from 1 to M and j from 1 to M are drawn from a common distribution. To effect this change, we first compute for each asset the probability distribution by fitting the data for each asset using a student distribution characterised by the power law index. We then compute for each value of the return $x_i(t_j)$ the corresponding objective value, $w_i(x_{t_j})$. These objective values are then transformed to yield a set of renormalised objective values as follows:

$$\bar{w}_i(x_{t_j}) = \frac{w_i(x_{t_j})}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_i w_i(x_{t_j})} \frac{1}{NM} \sum_{i,j}^{N,M} w_i(x_{t_j}) \quad (9)$$

Having computed these renormalized objective values we can now obtain the corresponding set of values for $x_i(t)$ by inverting the values according to a new student distribution that characterises the entire data set consisting of $M \times N$ values. Hence using the result in row 4 of table 1:

$$x = \pm \sqrt{\nu(1 - e^{2w/(\nu+1)})} \quad (10)$$

Thus we can now compute for our portfolio of M stocks a new covariance matrix, $\tilde{\mathbf{C}}$ using these renormalized values of x . This yields a new minimized value for the risk:

$$\tilde{R} = \sum_{i,j} \tilde{\mathbf{C}}_{i,j} \tilde{p}_i \tilde{p}_j \quad (11)$$

IV. ILLUSTRATIVE RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

We show in Figures 1 and 2 the outcome of implementing the method for a simple portfolio of 2 stocks (i.e, $M = 2$). Specifically we used data for NYSE stocks General Electric and Boeing. For each stock we used 12500 data points extending over the time period January 1999 to December 2000. Student distributions are fitted separately to the positive and negative returns. It can be seen that the student distributions for each stock are different prior to renormalization but are the same after renormalization. The overall changes as a result of our renormalization process are small but we shall see below that they can lead to changes in the distribution of eigenvalues for large eigenvalues.

We followed up this computation by renormalizing data for two different groups of stocks. First we selected 60 stocks from the NYSE as before over the period January 1999 to December 2000 and implemented the prescription over a moving 75 day window using 1500 points for each window. In this way we could compute the various elements of the correlation matrix and the associated optimum weights for the different stocks in the portfolio as a function of time. The results are shown in Figure 3. Figure 4 gives the results of a similar set of calculation for a portfolio of 33 stocks from the Warsaw stock exchanges over the period May 2001 to February 2006. In order to prevent situations arising where all the money is invested in just one stock we have, in our calculations, imposed the limit $|p_i| < 0.15$.

Although we have not included transaction costs, in both cases it seems that using data based on our renormalization procedure is a better route to greater overall returns.

Additional insight into the procedure is provided when we compare the distribution of eigenvalues for the standard covariance matrix with the corresponding distribution for the renormalized covariance matrix. These are shown in Figure 5. It can be seen that the transformation procedure enhances correlations as anticipated and this enhancement occurs at larger eigenvalues.

We are currently examining other opportunities to stock assessment offered by the approach.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by the Polish Ministry of Science and Higher Education (Grant No. 134/E-365/SPB/COST/KN/DWM105/2005-2007). Krzysztof Urbanowicz thanks European COST concerted action P10 for financial support that facilitated this collaboration between the Warsaw University of Technology and Trinity College Dublin.

-
- [1] H. Markowitz, *Portfolio selection*, Journal of Finance **7**, 77-99 (1952).
 - [2] H. Markowitz, *Portfolio selection: Efficient diversification of investments*, J. Wiley & Sons, New York (1959).
 - [3] J.Voit, *The Statistical Mechanics of Financial Markets*, (Springer-Verlag 2001).




FIG. 1: Plot of the histogram of returns and normalized returns in the case of General Electric counted in NYSE in years 1999 and 2000 and corresponding Student distributions with $\nu_+ = 3.11$, $\nu_- = 3.07$ and $\nu_+ = 3.17$, $\nu_- = 3.25$ respectively.

- [4] J.P. Bouchaud, M. Potters, *Theory of financial risks - from statistical physics to risk management*, (Cambridge University Press 2000).
- [5] R.N. Mantegna, H.E. Stanley, *An Introduction to Econophysics. Correlations and Complexity in Finance*, (Cambridge University Press 2000).
- [6] E.E. Peters, *Chaos and Order in the Capital Markets. A new view of cycle, Price, and Market Volatility*, (John Wiley & Sons 1997).
- [7] K. Urbanowicz and J.A. Hołyst, *Application of noise level estimation for portfolio optimization*, Proceedings of the Third Nikkei Conference, Springer (2005).
- [8] K. Urbanowicz and J.A. Hołyst, *Physica A* **344**, 284-288 (2004).
- [9] M. Gili and E. Kellezi, *A global optimization heuristic for portfolio choice with VaR and Expected shortfall* <http://www.smartquant.com/references.php> (2001).
- [10] J.H. Cochrane, *New facts in finance*, Economic Perspectives, <http://www.smartquant.com/references.php>.
- [11] V. Tola, F. Lillo, M. Gallagati, and R.N. Mantegna, *Cluster analysis for portfolio optimization*,




FIG. 2: Plot of the histogram of returns and normalized returns in the case of Boeing counted in NYSE in years 1999 and 2000 and corresponding Student distributions with $\nu_+ = 2.54$, $\nu_- = 3.05$ and $\nu_+ = 3.22$, $\nu_- = 3.18$ respectively.

arXiv:physics/0507006 (2005)

- [12] M. Snarska and J. Krzych *Automatic trading agent. RMT based portfolio theory and portfolio selection*, arXiv:physics/0608293 (2006).
- [13] A. Inoue and Y. Nakano, *Optimal long term investment model with memory*, arXiv:math.PR/0506621 (2006).
- [14] M.H. Cohen and V.D. Natoli, *Risk and utility in portfolio optimization*, arXiv:cond-mat/0212187 (2002).
- [15] A.F. Perold, Large-scale portfolio optimization, *Management science*, Vol. 30, No. 10, 1143-1160 (1984).
- [16] H. Levy and R. Duchin, Asset return distributions and investment horizon, *The Journal of portfolio management*, 47-62 (Spring 2004).
- [17] W.F. Sharp, *Capital asset prices: a theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk*, *Journal of Finance* **1**, 425-442 (1964).
- [18] W.E Ferson, A.F. Siegel, The efficient use of conditional information in portfolios, *The Journal*




FIG. 3: Portfolios runaway of 60 stocks at New York Stock Exchange from May 1999 to December 2000. Equally distributed portfolio (open circles) and portfolio with weights calculated from standard covariance matrix Eq. (8) (solid squares) and portfolio with weights calculated from normalized covariance matrix are presented.

of Finance, Vol. 56, No. 3, 967-982 (2001).

- [19] J.G. Kallberg, W.T. Ziemba, Comparison of alternative utility functions in portfolio selection problems, *Management Science*, Vol. 29, No. 11, 1257-1276 (1983).
- [20] W.T. Ziemba, C. Parkan and R. Brooks-Hill, Calculation of investment portfolios with risk free borrowing and lending, *Management Science* Vol. 21, No. 2, 209-222 (1974).
- [21] G. Hanoch and H. Levy, The efficiency analysis of choices involving risk, *The Review of economic studies* Vol. 36, No. 3, 335-346 (1969).
- [22] P. Chunchachinda, K. Dandapani, S. Hamid and A.J. Prakash, Portfolio selection and skewness: Evidence from international stock markets, *Journal of Banking and Finance* Vol. 21, 143-167 (1997).
- [23] F. D. Arditti and H. Levy, Portfolio efficiency in three moments: The Multiperiod Case, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 30, No. 3, 797-809 (1975).
- [24] G.C. Lim, T.H. McCurdy, V.L. Martin, *Covariability, multivariability and flexibility: conditional CAPM and time-varying risk premia* <http://www.smartquant.com/references.php>




FIG. 4: Portfolios runaway of 33 stocks at Warsaw Stock Exchange from May 2001 to February 2006. Equally distributed portfolio (open circles) and portfolio with weights calculated from standard covariance matrix Eq. (8) (solid squares) and portfolio with weights calculated from normalized covariance matrix are presented.

(1998)

- [25] Y. Malevergne and D. Sornette, *Self-consistent asset pricing models*, arXiv:physics/0608284 (2006).
- [26] H. Varian, A portfolio of Nobel laureates: Markowitz, Miller and Sharp, *The Journal of economic perspective*, Vol. 7, No.1, 159-169 (1993).
- [27] R.C. Merton, A Simple model of capital market equilibrium with incomplete information, *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. 42, No. 3, 483-510 (1987).
- [28] P. Richmond, "Power Law Distributions and Dynamic Behaviour of Stock Markets", *Eur J Phys B* 4, 523 (2001).
- [29] S. Solomon and P. Richmond, "Power Laws are Disguised Boltzmann Laws", *International J Mod Phys C* 12 (3), 1-11 (2001).
- [30] J. Zinn-Justin "Quantum field theory and critical phenomena", chap. 4, Oxford University Press, Oxford (2002).
- [31] C. Anteneodo, C. Tsallis and A.S. Martinez, "Multiplicative noise: A mechanism leading to




FIG. 5: Distribution of eigenvalues of covariance matrices of 78 stocks in NYSE (January 1999 - December 2000). Eigenvalues of standard covariance matrix (solid squares) and of covariance matrix from renormalized data (open circles) are presented in the graph.

nonextensive statistical mechanics”, J. Math Phys. 44, 5194 (2003).