

# Power variations and testing for co-jumps: the small noise approach\*

Daisuke Kurisu†

## Abstract

In this paper we study the effects of noise on the bipower variation (BPV), realized volatility (RV) and testing for co-jumps in high-frequency data under the *small* noise framework. We first establish asymptotic properties of the BPV in this framework. In the presence of the small noise, the RV is asymptotically biased and the additional asymptotic conditional variance term appears in its limit distribution. We also give feasible estimation methods of the asymptotic conditional variances of the RV. Second, we derive the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic proposed in Jacod and Todorov (2009) under the presence of small noise for testing the presence of co-jumps in two dimensional Itô semimartingale. In contrast to the setting in Jacod and Todorov (2009), we show that the additional conditional asymptotic variance terms appear, and give consistent estimation procedures for the asymptotic conditional variances in order to make the test feasible. Simulation experiments show that our asymptotic results give reasonable approximations in the finite sample cases.

**Key Words:** High-Frequency Financial Data, Market Microstructure Noise, Small Noise Asymptotics, Bipower Variation, Realized Volatility, Co-jump test.

## 1 Introduction

Recently, a considerable interest has been paid on estimation and testing for the underlying continuous time stochastic processes based on high-frequency financial data. In the analysis of high-frequency data, it is important to take into account the influence of market microstructure noise. The market microstructure noise captures a variety of frictions inherent in the trading process such as bid-ask bounce and discreteness of price changes (Aït-Sahalia and Yu, 2009). There are a large number of papers on the high-frequency data analysis in the presence of noise. For example, Zhang, Mykland and Aït-Sahalia (2005), Bandi and Russel (2006) and Bibinger and Reiss (2014) investigate the case when the log-price follows a diffusion process observed with an additive noise. They assume that the size of noise does not depend on the observed frequency. To be precise, they assume that observed log-prices are of the form

$$Y_{t_i^n}^{(m)} = X_{t_i^n}^{(m)} + v_i^{(m)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad m = 1, \dots, d \quad (1)$$

where  $(X_t = (X_t^{(1)}, \dots, X_t^{(d)})^\top)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is the underlying  $d$ -dimensional continuous time log-price process and  $v_i = (v_i^{(1)}, \dots, v_i^{(d)})^\top$  are  $d$ -dimensional i.i.d. random noise vectors of which each component has mean 0 and constant variance independent of the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ . Zhang,

---

\*This version: December 31, 2023.

†Graduate student, Graduate School of Economics, University of Tokyo, 7-3-1 Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan. E-mail: dkurisu.mathstat@gmail.com

Mykland and Ait-Sahalia (2005) and Bandi and Russel (2006) study the one dimensional ( $d = 1$ ) case, and Bibinger and Reiss (2014) study the multi-dimensional case. Intuitively, such an assumption of i.i.d. noise means that the noise is dominant to the log-price when the observation frequency increases. In this paper, we instead assume that the effect of noise depends on the frequency of the observation, and the observed log-prices are of the form;

$$Y_{t_i^n}^{(m)} = X_{t_i^n}^{(m)} + \epsilon_{n,m} v_i^{(m)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad m = 1, \dots, d \quad (2)$$

where  $\epsilon_n = (\epsilon_{n,1}, \dots, \epsilon_{n,d})^\top$  is a  $d$ -dimensional sequence satisfying  $\epsilon_{n,m} \downarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $m$ . We call this assumption *small noise*. Under the small noise assumption, the noise is vanishing as the observation frequency increases. Hence the small noise assumption is interpreted as an intermediate assumption between the no noise model (in this model  $Y_{t_i^n}^{(m)} = X_{t_i^n}^{(m)}$ , that is, the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is observed directly) and the model (1). Related literature that considers small noise includes Gloter and Jacod (2001a,b), Barndorff-Nielsen, et al. (2008), Li, Xie and Zheng (2014), Li, Zhang and Li (2015) and among others. Hansen and Lunde (2006) give an empirical evidence that the market microstructure noise is small. In this paper we study effects of small noise on the asymptotic properties of some statistics for estimating the integrated volatility and testing the presence of co-jumps.

The first purpose of the paper is to investigate the effect of small noise on the bipower variation (BPV) proposed in Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2004, 2006) and the estimation of the integrated volatility. We establish the asymptotic properties of the BPV when the latent process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is one dimensional Itô semimartingale. We also propose estimation procedures of the integrated volatility using the realized volatility (RV) and the asymptotic conditional variances which appear in the limit distribution of the RV under the small noise assumption. In contrast to the no noise model, the RV is asymptotically biased and an additional asymptotic conditional variance term appears in its limit distribution (see also Bandi and Russel (2006), Hansen and Lunde (2006), Li, Zhang and Li (2015), Kunitomo and Kurisu (2015) and among others). Our main idea of estimating the integrated volatility and the asymptotic conditional variance of the RV is based on the global approximation method, the truncation method, and the SIML method developed in Jacod and Protter (2012), Mancini (2009) and Kunitomo and Sato (2013) respectively. We use the truncating method for estimating the jump part of the quadratic variation of the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  and use the SIML for correcting the bias of the RV. In the recent related literature, Li, Zhang and Li (2015) proposed the unified approach for estimating the integrated volatility of a diffusion process when both small noise and rounding error are present. In this paper, we only consider the additive noise, however, we assume that the log-price process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is a  $d$ -dimensional Itô semimartingale which includes a diffusion process as a special case.

Examining whether the two asset prices have contemporaneous jumps (co-jumps) or not is one of the effective approaches toward distinguishing between systematic and idiosyncratic jumps of asset prices and also important in option pricing and risk management. From the empirical side, Gilder, Shackleton and Taylor (2014) investigate co-jumps and also give a strong evidence of the presence of co-jumps. Bollerslev, Todorov and Li (2013) provide another empirical evidence for the dependence in the extreme tails of the distribution governing jumps of two stock prices. In spite of the importance of this problem, a testing procedure for co-jumps is not sufficiently studied. Jacod and Todorov (2009) is the seminal paper in this literature and other important contributions are Mancini and Gobbi (2012) and Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015). Mancini and Gobbi (2012) study the no noise model. Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015) is a recent important contribution to co-jump test for the model (1). Their co-jump test is based on the wild bootstrap-type approach and for testing the null hypothesis that observed two log-prices have no co-jumps.

On the other hand, a grate variety of testing methods for detecting the presence of jumps in the one dimensional case have been developed. See, for example, Barndorff-Nielsen and Shephard (2006), Fan and Wang (2007), Jiang and Oomen (2008), Bollerslev, Law and Tauchen (2008), Jacod (2008), Mancini (2009), and Aït-Sahalia and Jacod (2009) for the no noise model, and Aït-Sahalia, Jacod and Li (2012) and Li (2013) for the model (1) with, conditionally on  $X$ , mutually independent noise.

The second purpose of this paper is to propose a testing procedure of the existence of co-jumps in two log-prices when the small noise exists. We assume that the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  in the model (2) is two dimensional Itô semimartingale and investigate the asymptotic properties of the test statistic proposed in Jacod and Todorov (2009). We show that, because of the presence of the small noise, the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic is different from their result. In fact, the additional asymptotic conditional variance appears in its limit distribution. To construct a co-jump test, we develop a fully data-driven estimating procedure of the asymptotic variance. Our estimating procedure of the asymptotic variance is based on the local approximation method developed in Jacod and Protter (2012) for estimating a local volatility, the truncation method for estimating functionals of jumps of the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 0}$ , and the SIML for estimating the variance of small noise.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 we describe the theoretical settings of the underlying Itô semimartingale and market microstructure noise. In Section 3 we investigate the effects of noise on the asymptotic properties of the BPV, and give some comments on the stable limit theorems of the RV. We also propose an estimation method of the integrated volatility in the *small noise* framework. In Section 4 we study statistics related to the detection of co-jumps in the two dimensional setting when the noise satisfy the small noise assumption. Then we propose a testing procedure for the presence of co-jumps. In Section 5 we give estimation methods of asymptotic conditional variances which appear in the limit theorems of the RV and co-jump test statistic studied in the previous sections. We report some simulation results in Section 6 and we give some concluding remarks in Section 7. Proofs are collected in Appendix A.

## 2 Setting

We consider the continuous-time financial market in a fixed terminal time  $T$ . We set  $T = 1$  without loss of generality. The underlying log-price is a  $d$ -dimensional Itô semimartingale. We observe the log-price process in high-frequency contaminated by the market microstructure noise.

Let the first filtered probability space be  $(\Omega^{(0)}, \mathcal{F}^{(0)}, (\mathcal{F}_t^{(0)})_{t \geq 0}, P^{(0)})$  on which the  $d$ -dimensional Itô semimartingale  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is defined, and let the second filtered probability space be  $(\Omega^{(1)}, \mathcal{F}^{(1)}, (\mathcal{F}_t^{(1)})_{t \geq 0}, P^{(1)})$  on which the market microstructure noise terms  $v_{t_i^n}$  are defined for the discrete time points  $0 \leq t_1^n < \dots < t_n^n \leq 1$ . Then we consider the filtered probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \geq 0}, P)$ , where  $\Omega = \Omega^{(0)} \times \Omega^{(1)}$ ,  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}^{(0)} \otimes \mathcal{F}^{(1)}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_t = \bigcap_{s > t} \mathcal{F}_s^{(0)} \otimes \mathcal{F}_s^{(1)}$  for  $0 \leq t \leq s \leq 1$ .

We consider the following model for the observed log-price at  $t_i^n \in [0, 1]$  as

$$Y_{t_i^n}^{(m)} = X_{t_i^n}^{(m)} + \epsilon_{n,m} v_i^{(m)} \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad m = 1, \dots, d$$

where  $v_n = (v_n^{(1)}, \dots, v_n^{(d)})^\top$  are  $d$ -dimensional i.i.d. random noise and noise coefficient  $\epsilon_n = (\epsilon_{1,n}, \dots, \epsilon_{d,n})^\top$  is a sequence of  $d$ -dimensional vector which depends on sample size  $n$  and for each  $m$ ,  $\epsilon_{m,n} \rightarrow 0$ . We assume that these terms satisfy Assumptions 2 and 3 described below.

Moreover,  $X = (X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is an Itô semimartingale of the form

$$\begin{aligned} X_t = X_0 &+ \int_0^t b_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s + \int_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \kappa \circ \delta(s, x) (\mu - \nu)(ds, dx) \\ &+ \int_s \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \kappa' \circ \delta(s, x) \mu(ds, dx), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $(W_s)$  is a  $d'$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion,  $(b_s)$  is a  $d$ -dimensional adapted process,  $\sigma_s$  is a  $(d \times d')$ -(instantaneous) predictable volatility process and we define the process  $c = \sigma \sigma^\top$ . Furthermore,  $\delta(\omega, s, x)$  is a predictable function on  $\Omega \times \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $\kappa : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$  is a continuous truncation function with compact support and  $\kappa'(x) = x - \kappa(x)$ ,  $\mu(\cdot)$  is a Poisson random measure on  $\mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\nu(ds, dz) = ds \otimes \lambda(dz)$  is a predictable compensator or intensity measure of  $\mu$ . We partially follow the notation used in Jacod and Protter (2012). We assume that the observed times  $0 = t_0^n < t_1^n < \dots < t_n^n = 1$  are such that  $t_i^n - t_{i-1}^n = 1/n = \Delta_n$ . When  $d = 2$  (bivariate case), let

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta X_t &= X_t - X_{t-}, \quad \tau = \inf\{t : \Delta X_t^{(1)} \Delta X_t^{(2)} \neq 0\}, \\ \tilde{\Gamma} &= \{(\omega, t, x) : \delta^1(\omega, t, x) \delta^2(\omega, t, x) \neq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

and for  $i = 1, 2$ , define

$$\delta_t'^i(\omega) = \begin{cases} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\kappa^i \circ \delta 1_{\tilde{\Gamma}})(\omega, t, x) \lambda(dx) & \text{if the integral makes sense,} \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We also make the following assumptions.

- Assumption 1.** (a) The path  $t \mapsto b_t(\omega)$  is locally bounded.  
(b) The process  $\sigma$  is continuous.  
(c) We have  $\sup_{\omega, x} \|\delta(\omega, t, x)\|/\gamma(x)$  is locally bounded for a deterministic nonnegative function satisfying  $\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\gamma(x)^h \wedge 1) \lambda(dx) < \infty$  for some  $h \in (0, 2)$ .  
(d) For each  $\omega$ , and  $i = 1, 2$ , the path  $t \mapsto \delta_t'^i(\omega)$  is locally bounded on the interval  $[0, \tau(\omega))$ .  
(e) We have  $\int_t^{t+u} \|\sigma_s\| ds > 0$  a.s. for all  $t, u > 0$ .

If  $X$  does not have the last two terms of the right hand side of (3) (these are jump parts of  $X$ ), then we say that  $X$  is continuous. Otherwise, we say that  $X$  is discontinuous. For the noise term, we assume the following conditions.

**Assumption 2.** There exist some  $q \geq 0$  and  $\zeta_m > 0$ ,  $1 \leq m \leq d$  such that

$$n\epsilon_{m,n}^2 = \zeta_m n^{-2q} + O\left(n^{-(1+2q)}\right).$$

**Assumption 3.**  $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  is a sequence of i.i.d.  $d$ -dimensional standard normal random variables.

When  $q = 0$ , Assumption 2 coincides with the small noise assumption in Kunitomo and Kurisu (2015). If the noise coefficient does not depend on the sampling scheme, that is, for each component there exist some positive constants  $\zeta_m$  such that  $\epsilon_{m,n} = \zeta_m$ , then the effect of noise is asymptotically dominant. This case corresponds to the i.i.d. noise setting. Assumption 2 means that the effect of noise depends on a sample number  $n$ . Hence the effect of noise gets smaller if the sampling frequency increases.

### 3 The Effects of Small Noise on BPV and RV

In this section, we assume that the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  is one dimensional, and give the asymptotic properties of the BPV and give some remarks on the estimation of the integrated volatility and the asymptotic conditional variance of the RV under the presence of small noise.

#### 3.1 Asymptotic Properties of the BPV and the RV

The bipower variation (BPV) and the realized volatility (RV) are often used for estimating the integrated volatility. We give some results on asymptotic properties of the BPV and the RV. Let  $\Delta_i^n X = X_{i\Delta_n} - X_{(i-1)\Delta_n}$  and define the following statistics

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V}_p^{(n)}(X) &= \sum_{i=1}^n |\Delta_i^n X|^p, \\ \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} |\Delta_i^n X|^r |\Delta_{i+1}^n X|^s.\end{aligned}$$

According to the above definition,  $\tilde{V}_2^{(n)}(X)$  is the realized volatility (RV(X)) and  $\tilde{V}_{1,1}^{(n)}(X)$  is the bipower variation (BPV(X)). First we give an asymptotic property of above statistics. The following result describes the effect of the small noise.

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. Let  $r, s$  and  $k$  be positive integers, then,*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(X) &= O_P(n^{1-(r+q)}), \\ \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) &= O_P(n^{1-(r+s)/2-q}).\end{aligned}$$

In the following results, we freely use the stable convergence arguments and  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally Gaussianity, which have been developed and explained by Jacod (2008) and Jacod and Protter (2012), and use the notation  $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s}$  as the stable convergence in law. For the general reference on stable convergence, we also refer to Häusler and Luschgy (2015). Next result follows immediately from Proposition 1.

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. Let  $X$  be continuous, and  $r$  and  $s$  be positive integers such that  $(r+s)/2$  is integral. If  $q > 0$ , then we have the following convergence in probability:*

$$n^{(r+s)/2-1} \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) \xrightarrow{P} m_r m_s \int_0^1 \sigma_u^{r+s} du,$$

and if  $q > 1/2$ , then we have the following stable convergence in law:

$$\sqrt{n} \left( n^{(r+s)/2-1} \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - m_r m_s \int_0^1 \sigma_u^{r+s} du \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U,$$

where  $m_r = 2^{r/2} \Gamma((r+1)2^{-1}) / \Gamma(2^{-1})$  for  $r > 0$  and  $U$  is  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally Gaussian with mean 0 and  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditional variance  $E[U^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] = (m_{2r} m_{2s} + 2m_r m_s m_{r+s} - 3m_r^2 m_s^2) \int_0^1 \sigma_u^{2(r+s)} du$ .

From the remark of Theorem 2.5 in Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2006), if  $X$  is continuous, then

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \text{BPV}(X) - m_1^2 \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds \right) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} \tilde{U},$$

where  $\tilde{U}$  has the same distribution as  $U$  in Proposition 2 (replacing  $r, s = 1$ ). The latter part of Proposition 2 implies that if  $q > 1/2$ , we can replace  $\tilde{V}_{1,1}^{(n)}(X)$  as  $\tilde{V}_{1,1}^{(n)}(Y)$ . In such a case we can use the BPV as the consistent estimator of the integrated volatility.

For the no noise case, the  $\text{RV}(X)$  (when  $X$  is continuous) and the  $\text{BPV}(X)$  (when  $X$  could have jumps) are often used for estimating the integrated volatility. To construct a confidence interval of integrated volatility or construct a testing procedure for the presence of jumps when log-price  $X$  is contaminated by small noise, we must consistently estimate the asymptotic conditional variance of the limit distribution of the RV and jump test statistics. In place of the BPV, the multipower variation (MPV) is often used for estimating volatility functionals  $\int_0^1 \sigma_s^p ds$  for  $p \geq 1$  which appear in the limit distribution of the RV. By the similar argument in Proposition 1, it is possible to obtain the asymptotic property for the special case of the MPV;

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-3} |\Delta_{i+3}^n Y| |\Delta_{i+2}^n Y| |\Delta_{i+1}^n Y| |\Delta_i^n Y| \\ = \Delta_n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-3} |\Delta_{i+3}^n X| |\Delta_{i+2}^n X| |\Delta_{i+1}^n X| |\Delta_i^n X| + O_P(n^{-q}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the MPV is the consistent estimator of  $\int_0^1 \sigma_s^4 ds$  when the asymptotic order of noise is sufficiently higher ( $q > 0$ ). In this case, we obtain the same result as that of the no noise case.

From the first part of Proposition 1, we obtain that if  $q = 0$  and  $r = 1$ , then  $\text{RV}(Y) - \text{RV}(X) = O_P(1)$ . Kunitomo and Kurisu (2015) proved that under the small noise assumption, the RV is asymptotically biased and derived the following two stable convergence results under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. If  $X$  is continuous, then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RV}(Y) &\xrightarrow{P} \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds + 2\zeta_1 \equiv U_{0,1}, \\ \sqrt{n}(\text{RV}(Y) - U_{0,1}) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_1 + U_2 + U_3, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where  $U_j$  for  $j = 1, 2, 3$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditional variances  $E(U_1^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}) = 2 \int_0^1 \sigma_s^4 ds$ ,  $E(U_2^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}) = 8\zeta_1 \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds$  and  $E(U_3^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}) = 12\zeta_1^2$ .

If  $X$  is the Itô semimartingale of the form (3), then

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RV}(Y) &\xrightarrow{P} \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s)^2 + 2\zeta_1 \equiv U_{0,2}, \\ \sqrt{n}(\text{RV}(Y) - U_{0,2}) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_1 + U_2, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where  $U_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditional variances  $E(U_1^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}) = 2 \int_0^1 \sigma_s^4 ds + 4 \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} \sigma_s^2 (\Delta X_s)^2$  and  $E(U_2^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}) = 8\zeta_1 \left[ \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s)^2 \right]$ .

To construct a feasible estimation procedure of the RV, we need to estimate the noise parameter  $\zeta_1$  and the asymptotic conditional variance of its limit distribution. In Section 5, we

construct estimators of the asymptotic conditional variances of the RV for the case when  $X$  is continuous or  $X$  have jumps.

### 3.2 Estimation of the Integrated Volatility under Small Noise

We propose an estimation method of estimating the integrated volatility in the presence of small noise. In the model (1) with i.i.d. noise, it is well known that the variance of noise can be estimated by

$$\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y)^2 \xrightarrow{P} \zeta_1.$$

However, when the noise satisfy the small noise assumption, for example  $q = 0$ , this estimation does not work. In fact for the small noise case,  $(2n)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y)^2 \xrightarrow{P} 0$  regardless of the value of  $\zeta_1$ . Thus we must consider another procedure for estimating  $\zeta_1$ . The separated information maximum likelihood (SIML) method investigated in Kunitomo and Sato (2013) can be used to estimate  $\zeta_1$ . The SIML is a consistent estimator of the quadratic variation  $[X, X]$  of the process  $X$  under both the small noise case and the i.i.d. noise case. Therefore, under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, we have

$$[\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}} \xrightarrow{P} [X, X], \quad (6)$$

where  $[\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}}$  is the SIML estimator discussed in Section 5. From (4), (5) and (6), we obtain

$$\widehat{\zeta}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y)^2 - [\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}} \right) \xrightarrow{P} \zeta_1. \quad (7)$$

We consider two types of the truncated version the RV

$$\text{TRVC} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y)^2 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n Y| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}}, \quad \text{TRVJ} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y)^2 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n Y| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}},$$

where  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ . When  $X$  have jumps, we can estimate the jump part of the quadratic variation by TRVJ when Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied

$$\text{TRVJ} \xrightarrow{P} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s)^2.$$

Therefore, from the remark in Section 3.1 and (7), we can estimate the integrated volatility (IV) by the bias correction of the RV.

**Proposition 3.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. Then,*

$$\widehat{IV} = \text{TRVC} - 2\widehat{\zeta}_1 = [\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}} - \text{TRVJ} \xrightarrow{P} \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds.$$

In this section we considered only one dimensional case, however, an extension to the multivariate case is straightforward for the estimation of the covolatility,  $\int_0^1 c_s^{(p,q)} ds$  where  $c_s^{(p,q)}$  is the  $(p, q)$  component of the volatility process  $c_s$  defined in Section 2.

## 4 Co-jump test under small noise

One of the interesting problems in high-frequency financial econometrics is whether the two asset prices have co-jumps or not. To the best of our knowledge, none of the existing literature has so far proposed a co-jump test in the small noise framework. In this section, we consider two dimensional case  $(X_t = (X_t^{(1)}, X_t^{(2)})^\top)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  and propose a testing procedure for detecting the existence of co-jumps for discretely observed processes contaminated by small noise. For this purpose, we study the asymptotic properties of the statistics

$$S_{k,r,s}^{(n)}(Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/k \rfloor} (\Delta_i^n Y^{(k,1)})^r (\Delta_i^n Y^{(k,2)})^s,$$

where  $\Delta_i^n Y^{(k,l)} = Y_{ik\Delta_n}^{(l)} - Y_{(i-1)k\Delta_n}^{(l)}$  for  $k \geq 2$ ,  $l = 1, 2$ , and  $\lfloor x \rfloor$  is the integer part of  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . For the notational convenience, let

$$F_{r,s} = \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} (r^2 c_u^{(1,1)} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^{2(r-1)} (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^{2s} + 2rs c_u^{(1,2)} (\Delta X_u^{(1)})^{2r-1} (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^{2s-1} + s^2 c_u^{(2,2)} (\Delta X_u^{(1)})^{2r} (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^{2(s-1)}),$$

where  $c_u^{(p,q)}$  is the  $(p, q)$  component of the process  $c_u$  defined in Section 2. To describe our result, we first decompose the sample space  $\Omega$  into three disjoint sets

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega^{(j)} &= \{\omega : \text{on } [0, 1] \text{ the process } \Delta X_s^{(1)} \Delta X_s^{(2)} \text{ is not identically } 0\}, \\ \Omega^{(d)} &= \{\omega : \text{on } [0, 1] \text{ the processes } \Delta X_s^{(1)} \text{ and } \Delta X_s^{(2)} \text{ are not identically } 0, \\ &\quad \text{but the process } \Delta X_s^{(1)} \Delta X_s^{(2)} \text{ is } \}, \\ \Omega^{(c)} &= \{\omega : \text{on } [0, 1] \text{ } X^{(1)} \text{ and } X^{(2)} \text{ is continuous}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Evaluating the discretization error of the process, we first obtain the asymptotic property of  $S_{k,r,s}^{(n)}(Y)$  which plays an important role in constructing a co-jump test under the presence of small noise.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Let  $S_0 = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_s^{(2)})^2$  and  $k = 1$  or  $2$ . Then, in restriction to  $\Omega^{(j)}$ , we have:*

$$\sqrt{n}(S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) - S_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} \tilde{U}^{(1,2)} = U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)},$$

where  $U_l^{(1,2)}$  for  $l = 1, 2, 3$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and the following variances

$$\begin{aligned} E[(U_1^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] &= kF_{2,2}, \\ E[(U_2^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] &= 8\zeta_2 \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^4 (\Delta X_s^{(2)})^2, \\ E[(U_3^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] &= 8\zeta_1 \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_s^{(2)})^4. \end{aligned}$$

Now we propose a co-jump test for two-dimensional high-frequency data under the presence of small noise. We focus on a following statistic

$$T^{(n)} = \frac{S_{2,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)}{S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)}.$$

From the result of Theorem 2 below, we can construct a co-jump test. We set the null hypothesis  $\mathbb{H}_0$  that observed two log-prices have co-jumps, that is, we are on  $\Omega^{(j)}$  and the alternative hypothesis that we are on  $\Omega^{(d)}$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Then under the null hypothesis  $\mathbb{H}_0$ , we have:*

$$\sqrt{n}(T^{(n)} - 1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U = \frac{U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)}}{(U_0^{(1,2)})^2},$$

where  $U_0^{(1,2)} = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_s^{(2)})^2$ ,  $U_l^{(1,2)}$  for  $l = 1, 2, 3$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent Gaussian random variables defined in Theorem 1.

We notice that the above result includes Theorem 4.1 in Jacod and Todorov (2009) as a special case when  $\zeta_1 = \zeta_2 = 0$ . We can also obtain the asymptotic property of the test statistic under the alternative hypothesis. In restriction to the set  $\Omega^{(d)}$ , because of the presence of small noise, we have

$$S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) = S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(X) + 2R_{k,2,1}^{(n)}(X) + 2R_{k,1,2}^{(n)}(X) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}),$$

where  $R_{k,r,s}^{(n)}(X) = \epsilon_{r \wedge s, n} \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^r (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)})^s (\Delta v_i^{(k,r \wedge s)})$  and  $\Delta v_i^{(k,l)} = \sum_{j=k(i-1)+1}^{ki} (v_j^{(l)} - v_{j-1}^{(l)}) = v_{ki}^{(l)} - v_{k(i-1)}^{(l)}$ . From the similar argument of the proof of Theorem 3.1 in Jacod and Todorov (2009) and the definition of the noise, it is also possible to obtain that in restriction to the set  $\Omega^{(d)}$ ,  $T^{(n)} \xrightarrow{P} \Phi$  where  $\Phi$  is a random variable which is almost surely different from 1. Then the consistency of the test follows.

To be precise, let  $V_{1,2}^{(j)}$  be the asymptotic conditional variance of the random variable given in Theorem 2 and  $\widehat{V}_{1,2}^{(j)}$  be a consistent estimator of  $V_{1,2}^{(j)}$ . Then we can consider the size and power of the co-jump test. For  $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ , let  $q_\alpha$  be the  $100\alpha\%$  quantile of standard normal distribution that is,  $P(Z \geq q_{1-\alpha}) = \alpha$  for  $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ . From the result of Theorem 2, it is possible to deduce

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}(T^{(n)} - 1)}{\sqrt{\widehat{V}_{1,2}^{(j)}}} \geq q_{1-\alpha} \right| \Omega^{(j)} \right) &\rightarrow \alpha, \quad \text{if } P(\Omega^{(j)}) > 0, \\ P \left( \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}(T^{(n)} - 1)}{\sqrt{\widehat{V}_{1,2}^{(j)}}} \geq q_{1-\alpha} \right| \Omega^{(d)} \right) &\rightarrow 1, \quad \text{if } P(\Omega^{(d)}) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $P(\cdot|\Omega^{(j)})$  and  $P(\cdot|\Omega^{(d)})$  are conditional probabilities with respect to the sets  $\Omega^{(j)}$  and  $\Omega^{(d)}$ . Hence if we have the consistent estimator of asymptotic conditional variance  $V_{1,2}^{(j)}$ , then we can carry out co-jump test. Estimation procedures of the asymptotic variances are discussed in Section 5.

## 5 Consistent estimation of the asymptotic conditional variances

In this section, we first construct an estimator of the noise parameter  $\zeta_m$ . Then we propose estimation procedures of the asymptotic conditional variance of the RV and the co-jump test statistics.

## 5.1 Estimation of the noise variances

The most important characteristic of the SIML is its simplicity compared with the pre-averaging method in Jacod et al. (2009) and the spectral method in Bibinger and Winkelmann (2015) for estimating the quadratic variation consistently, and have asymptotic robustness for the rounding-error (Kunitomo and Sato, 2010, 2011). It is also quite easy to deal with the multivariate high-frequency data in this approach as demonstrated in Kunitomo and Sato (2011).

Let  $W_n = (Y_{\Delta_n}^\top, Y_{2\Delta_n}^\top, \dots, Y_1^\top)^\top$  be a  $n \times d$  matrix where  $Y_{j\Delta_n}$  is the  $j$ th observation of the process  $Y$  and  $\mathbf{C}_n$  be  $n \times n$  matrix,

$$\mathbf{C}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & \cdots & 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C}_n^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & -1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We consider the spectral decomposition of  $\mathbf{C}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{C}_n^{-1})^\top$ , that is,

$$\mathbf{C}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{C}_n^{-1})^\top = \mathbf{P}_n \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{P}_n^\top = 2\mathbf{I}_n - 2\mathbf{A}_n,$$

where  $\mathbf{D}_n$  is a diagonal matrix with the  $k$ th element

$$d_k = 2 \left[ 1 - \cos \left( \pi \left( \frac{2k-1}{2n+1} \right) \right) \right], \quad k = 1, \dots, n,$$

and

$$\mathbf{P}_n = (p_{jk}), \quad p_{jk} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{n + (1/2)}} \cos \left[ \frac{2\pi}{2n+1} \left( k - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( j - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right], \quad 1 \leq j, k \leq n,$$

$$\mathbf{A}_n = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We transform  $W_n$  to  $Z_n$  by

$$Z_n = \Delta_n^{-1/2} \mathbf{P}_n \mathbf{C}_n^{-1} (W_n - \bar{W}_0),$$

where  $\bar{W}_0 = (Y_0^\top, \dots, Y_0^\top)^\top$ . The SIML estimator of the quadratic variation  $[X, X]$  is defined by

$$[\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}} = \frac{1}{m_n} \sum_{k=1}^{m_n} Z_n^\top Z_n, \quad m_n = O(n^\alpha), \quad 0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{2}.$$

From the straightforward extension of Theorem 1 of Kunitomo and Sato (2013), we obtain

$$[\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}} \xrightarrow{\text{P}} [X, X] = \int_0^1 c_s ds + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s)(\Delta X_s)^\top. \quad (8)$$

From (4), (5) and (8), we obtain the next proposition.

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. Then,*

$$\frac{1}{2} \left( \text{RV}(Y^{(m)}) - [\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}}^{(m,m)} \right) \xrightarrow{\text{P}} \zeta_m, \quad m = 1, \dots, d,$$

where  $[\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{\text{SIML}}^{(m,m)}$  is the  $(m, m)$  component of the SIML estimator.

## 5.2 Estimation of the asymptotic conditional variances of the RV and the test statistic

We propose estimating procedures of the the asymptotic conditional variances of the co-jump test statistic studied in Section 4, and the RV when the process  $(X_t)_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$  has continuous path or discontinuous path. We introduce some notations. For  $l, m, p, q = 1, \dots, d$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &= \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} c_u^{(p,q)} (\Delta X_u^{(l)})^r (\Delta X_u^{(m)})^s, \quad r, s \geq 1, \\ J^{(l,m)}(r, s) &= \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} (\Delta X_u^{(l)})^r (\Delta X_u^{(m)})^s, \quad r, s \geq 2, \\ A^{(l,m)}(r) &= \int_0^1 (c_s^{(l,m)})^r ds, \quad r \geq 1. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the asymptotic conditional variance of the co-jump test statistic, we consider the following statistics. For  $l, m, p, q = 1, \dots, d$  and  $r, s \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(l)})^r (\Delta_i^n Y^{(m)})^s \\ &\quad \times \left[ \frac{1}{2k_n \Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} \left[ (\Delta_i^n Y^{(p)}) (\Delta_i^n Y^{(q)}) 1_{\{\|\Delta_j^n Y\| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - 2\delta_{pq} \sqrt{\widehat{\zeta}_p \widehat{\zeta}_q} \right] \right], \\ \widehat{J}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &= \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(l)})^r (\Delta_i^n Y^{(m)})^s, \\ \widehat{F}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &= r^2 \widehat{D}_{l,l}^{(l,m)}(2(r-1), 2s) + 2rs \widehat{D}_{l,m}^{(l,m)}(2r-1, 2s-1) + s^2 \widehat{D}_{m,m}^{(l,m)}(2r, 2(s-1)), \end{aligned}$$

where  $I_n(i) = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : j \neq i, 1 \leq j \leq n, |i-j| \leq k_n\}$ ,  $k_n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $k_n \Delta_n \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\alpha > 0$  and  $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ .

Although we can construct the consistent estimators of the asymptotic variances based on the truncated functionals (see also Mancini (2009) and Jacod and Todorov (2009)) for the no noise case, the truncation method gives us biased estimators since we now assume the presence of the small noise. In fact, since the size of noise gets smaller as the observation frequency increase, truncation is not sufficient to distinguish the continuous part of process  $X$  with the noise. The reason is as follows: from the similar argument of Theorem 9.3.2 in Jacod and Protter (2012), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2k_n \Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} (\Delta_j^n Y^{(p)}) (\Delta_j^n Y^{(q)}) 1_{\{\|\Delta_j^n Y\| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2k_n \Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} (\Delta_j^n C^{(p)} + \epsilon_{p,n} \Delta_j v^{(p)}) (\Delta_j^n C^{(q)} + \epsilon_{q,n} \Delta_j v^{(q)}) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where  $C_t = \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s$  and  $\Delta_j^n C^{(p)}$  is the  $p$ th component of  $C_{j\Delta_n} - C_{(j-1)\Delta_n}$ .

Since  $E(\Delta_i^n C^{(p)} \epsilon_{j,n} \Delta_i v^{(q)}) = 0$  and  $\epsilon_{p,n} \epsilon_{q,n} E(\Delta_i v^{(p)} \Delta_i v^{(q)}) = 2\delta_{pq} \sqrt{\widehat{\zeta}_p \widehat{\zeta}_q} \Delta_n + o(\Delta_n)$  for all  $1 \leq p, q \leq d$ ,  $\#I_n(i) = 2k_n$  where  $\delta_{pq}$  is a Dirac's delta function, we have

$$\frac{1}{2k_n \Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} \Delta_j^n C^{(p)} \Delta_j^n C^{(q)} - c_{i\Delta_n}^{(p,q)} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{2k_n\Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} (\Delta_j^n Y^{(p)})(\Delta_j^n Y^{(q)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_j^n Y|| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - [c_{i\Delta_n}^{(p,q)} + 2\delta_{pq} \sqrt{\widehat{\zeta}_p \widehat{\zeta}_q}] \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Then, for  $\widehat{D}_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(r, s)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{2k_n\Delta_n} \sum_{j \in I_n(i)} \left[ (\Delta_i^n Y^{(p)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(q)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_j^n Y|| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - 2\delta_{pq} \sqrt{\widehat{\zeta}_p \widehat{\zeta}_q} \right]$$

is estimating the spot volatility  $c_{i\Delta_n}^{(p,q)}$ . By the simple extension of Theorem 2 in Kunitomo and Kurisu (2015), it can be obtained that  $(\Delta_i^n Y^{(l)})^r (\Delta_i^n Y^{(m)})^s$  is an unbiased estimator of  $(\Delta X_{i\Delta_n}^{(l)})^r (\Delta X_{i\Delta_n}^{(m)})^s$ . Hence, for estimating the asymptotic conditional variance of the RV, we consider the following statistics

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{c}_i^{(l,m)} &= \frac{1}{2k_n\Delta_n} \sum_{i=k_n+1}^{n-k_n} (\Delta_i^n Y^{(l)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(m)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n Y|| \leq \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - 2\delta_{lm} \sqrt{\widehat{\zeta}_l \widehat{\zeta}_m}, \\ \widehat{A}^{(l,m)}(r) &= \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n+1} (\widehat{c}_i^{(l,m)})^r, \\ \widehat{D}_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(1, 1) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{c}_i^{(p,q)} (\Delta_i^n Y^{(l)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(m)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n Y|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we obtain the next result.

**Proposition 5.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Then, for  $l, m, p, q = 1, \dots, d$  and  $r, s \geq 1$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{D}_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &\xrightarrow{P} D_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(r, s), & \widehat{J}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &\xrightarrow{P} J^{(l,m)}(r, s), \\ \widehat{F}^{(l,m)}(r, s) &\xrightarrow{P} F^{(l,m)}(r, s), & \widehat{A}^{(l,m)}(r) &\xrightarrow{P} A^{(l,m)}(r). \end{aligned}$$

From Propositions 4 and 5, we can construct the consistent estimator of the asymptotic variance of the co-jump test statistics

$$\widehat{V}_{1,2}^{(j)} = \frac{\widehat{F}^{(1,2)}(2, 2) + 8(\widehat{\zeta}_2 \widehat{J}^{(1,2)}(2, 4) + \widehat{\zeta}_1 \widehat{J}^{(1,2)}(4, 2))}{n \times \widehat{J}^{(1,2)}(2, 2)},$$

and for the consistent estimators of the asymptotic variances of the RV,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{V}^{(c)} &= (2\widehat{A}^{(1,1)}(4) + 8\widehat{\zeta}_1 \widehat{A}^{(1,1)}(2) + 12\widehat{\zeta}_1^2)/n, \quad \text{if } X \text{ is continuous,} \\ \widehat{V}^{(j)} &= (2\widehat{A}^{(1,1)}(4) + 4\widehat{D}_{1,1}^{(1,1)}(1, 1) + 8\widehat{\zeta}_1 [\widehat{X}, \widehat{X}]_{(1,1)}^{\text{SIML}})/n, \quad \text{if } X \text{ is an Itô semimartingale of the form (3).} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain the next two central limit theorems.

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Then we have the following convergence in law:*

(i) If  $X$  is continuous, then

$$(\widehat{V}^{(c)})^{-1/2}(\text{RV}(Y) - U_0^{(c)}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, 1),$$

$$\text{where } U_0^{(c)} = \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds + 2\zeta_1.$$

(ii) If  $X$  is the Itô semimartingale of the form (3), then

$$(\widehat{V}^{(j)})^{-1/2}(\text{RV}(Y) - U_0^{(j)}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, 1),$$

$$\text{where } U_0^{(j)} = \int_0^1 \sigma_s^2 ds + \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s)^2 + 2\zeta_1.$$

**Corollary 2.** Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Then, under the null hypothesis  $\mathbb{H}_0$ , we have:

$$(\widehat{V}_{1,2}^{(j)})^{-1/2}(T^{(n)} - 1) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, 1).$$

## 6 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we report several results of numerical experiment. We simulate a data generating process according to the procedure in Cont and Tankov (2004). First we consider the estimation of the integrated volatility. We used the following data generating processes

$$dX_t = \sigma_t dW_t + dJ_t^{cp}, \quad (9)$$

$$dX_t = \sigma_t dW_t + dJ_t^\beta, \quad (10)$$

where  $W$  is a standard Brownian motion.  $J_t^{cp}$  is a compound Poisson process in  $t \in [0, 1]$  where the intensity of the Poisson process is  $\lambda = 10$  and the jump size is a uniform distribution on  $[-0.3, -0.05] \cup [0.05, 0.3]$ .  $J_t^\beta$  is a  $\beta$ -stable process with  $\beta = 1.5$ . We also set the truncate level  $\alpha\Delta_n^\theta$  as  $\alpha = 2$  and  $\theta = 0.48$ . These values are also used in the simulation of the co-jump test. As a stochastic volatility model, we use

$$d\sigma_t^2 = \alpha(\beta - \sigma_t^2)dt + \sigma_t^2 dW_t^\sigma, \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha = 5$ ,  $\beta = 0.2$  and  $\rho = E[dW_t dW_t^\sigma] = -0.5$ . For the market microstructure noise, we have adopted the three types of Gaussian noise  $N(0, \zeta\Delta_n)$  with  $\zeta = 0, 10^{-4}$  or  $10^{-2}$  (we call these cases as (i), (ii) and (iii)). We also consider the following cases:

- CJ1:  $1/\Delta_n = 20,000$ ,  $X$  follows the process (9).
- CJ2:  $1/\Delta_n = 30,000$ ,  $X$  follows the process (9).
- SJ1:  $1/\Delta_n = 20,000$ ,  $X$  follows the process (10).
- SJ2:  $1/\Delta_n = 30,000$ ,  $X$  follows the process (10).

CJ and SJ correspond to a finite activity jump case and an infinite activity jump case respectively. We present the root mean square errors (RMSE) for each case in Table 1. Compared with CJ, the RMSEs in SJ tends to be large. This is because of the difficulty in a finite sample case to distinguish infinite activity jumps and the other part of the observed process.

Next we check the performance of the proposed feasible CLT for the RV. We use the following data generating processes

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t &= \sigma_t dW_t, \quad \text{for continuous case,} \\ dX_t &= \sigma_t dW_t + dJ_t^{cp}, \quad \text{for jump case,} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the process (12) and  $\sigma$  are the same processes as (11) and (9). Figures 1 and 2 give the standardized empirical densities when the small noise is  $N(0, 10^{-2}\Delta_n)$ . The simulation size is  $N = 1,000$  and the number of the observations is  $n = 20,000$ . The red line is the density of standard normal distribution. The left figure corresponds to the bias-variance corrected case implied by the Corollary 1 and the right figure corresponds to the no correction case. We found that contamination of the small noise still has the significant effect on the distribution of the limiting random variables when  $\zeta_m \neq 0$  in the continuous case. We can see this in Figure 1. However we have a good approximation for the finite sample distribution of statistics if we correct the effect of noise by using the small noise asymptotics.

Finally we give the simulation result of the co-jump test. We simulate two dimensional Itô semimartingale by following model

$$\begin{aligned} dX_t^{(1)} &= \sigma_t^{(1)} dW_t^{(1)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} x_1 \mu_1(dt, dx_1) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_{t-}^{(1)} x_3 \mu_3(dt, dx_3), \\ dX_t^{(2)} &= \sigma_t^{(2)} dW_t^{(2)} + \int_{\mathbb{R}} x_2 \mu_2(dt, dx_2) + \int_{\mathbb{R}} X_{t-}^{(2)} x_3 \mu_3(dt, dx_3), \end{aligned}$$

where  $W = (W^{(1)}, W^{(2)})$  is a two dimensional Brownian motion and  $\mu_j$  for  $j = 1, 2$  and 3 are the Poisson random measures which are independent of  $W$  with compensators

$$\nu_j(dt, dx_j) = \lambda_j \frac{1_{\{x_j \in [-0.3, -0.05] \cup [0.05, 0.3]\}}}{0.5}, \quad j = 1, 2, 3.$$

In this simulation, we set  $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 15$  and  $\lambda_3 = 25$ . For the volatility process  $\sigma$ , we set

$$d(\sigma_t^{(j)})^2 = \alpha_j(\beta_j - (\sigma_t^{(j)})^2)dt + (\sigma_t^{(j)})^2 dW_t^{\sigma^{(j)}}, \quad j = 1, 2,$$

where  $\sigma^{(1)}$  and  $\sigma^{(2)}$  are independent and  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 5$ ,  $\beta_1 = 0.2$ ,  $\beta_2 = 0.15$ ,  $E[dW_t^{\sigma^{(j)}} dW_t^{(j)}] = \rho_j dt$ ,  $\rho_1 = -0.5$  and  $\rho_2 = -0.4$ . For the market microstructure noise, we use the four types of Gaussian noise for each component with mean 0 and the same variance  $\epsilon_{1,n} = \epsilon_{2,n} = \zeta/n$  where  $\zeta = 0, 10^{-8}, 10^{-4}$  or 1 (we call these cases as I, II, III and IV). We consider the 5% significant level for the following cases:

- C1 :  $1/\Delta_n = 20,000$ , co-jump.
- C2 :  $1/\Delta_n = 30,000$ , co-jump.
- D1 :  $1/\Delta_n = 20,000$ , no co-jump.
- D2 :  $1/\Delta_n = 30,000$ , no co-jump.

In Figure 4, we plot the empirical distribution obtained from Corollary 2 in the case C2-IV. It is interesting to see that proposed testing procedure gives a good approximation of the limit distribution of test statistics even in large noise case ( $\zeta = 1$ ). Table 2 also give the empirical size and power of the proposed co-jump test. In the cases C1 and C2, the empirical size of the test is about the same for each size of noise. In the case C2, the co-jump test gives very close value to the significant level, 0.05. The power of the test is notable. For every cases except D1-IV, the empirical power of the test is very close to 1.

## 7 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we developed the small noise asymptotic analysis when the size of the market microstructure noise depends on the frequency of the observation. By using this approach, we can identify the effects of jumps and noise in high-frequency data analysis. We investigated the asymptotic properties of the BPV and the RV in one dimensional case in the presence of small noise. An estimating method of the integrated volatility and the asymptotic conditional variance of the RV is proposed. We established feasible central limit theorems of the RV under the small noise assumption when the latent process  $X$  is an Itô semimartingale. Our method gives a good approximation of the limiting distributions of the sequence of random variables.

We also proposed a testing procedure of the presence of co-jumps when the two dimensional latent process is observed with small noise for testing the null hypothesis that the observed two latent processes have co-jumps. Proposed co-jump test is an extension the co-jump test in Jacod and Todorov (2009) for the noisy observation setting. Estimators of the asymptotic conditional variance of the test statistics can be constructed in a simple way. We found that the power of the proposed test is remarkable. In particular, this co-jump test has a good performance even when the size of noise is large.

Currently we are investigating the asymptotic behaviors of other statistics and statistical procedures when continuous time processes observed with noise.

## A Proofs

### A.1 Proofs for Section 3

Throughout Appendix, we use the techniques developed in Jacod and Protter (2012). We can replace Assumption 1 to the local boundedness assumption below and such a replacement can be established by the localizing procedure provided in Jacod and Protter (2012).

**Assumption 4.** *We have Assumption 1 and there are a constant  $A$  and a nonnegative function  $\Gamma$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  for all  $(\omega, t, x) \in (\Omega, \mathbb{R}_+, \mathbb{R}^d)$  such that*

$$\max\{||b_t(\omega)||, ||\sigma_t(\omega)||, ||X_t(\omega)||, ||\Gamma(x)||\} \leq A.$$

Under Assumption 4, we can obtain following essential estimations for Itô semimartingale. First we consider the decomposition of  $X$ ,

$$X_t = X_0 + B_t + C_t + J_t,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_t &= \int_0^t \left( b_s + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \kappa \circ \delta(s, x) \lambda(dx) \right) ds, \quad \text{for general case,} \\ B'_t &= \int_0^t b_s ds, \quad \text{for continuous case,} \\ C_t &= \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s, \quad J_t = \int_0^t \delta(s, x) (\mu - \nu)(ds, dx). \end{aligned}$$

For all  $p \geq 1$ ,  $s, t \geq 0$ , we obtain some estimations

$$E\left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \|B_{s+u} - B_s\|^p | \mathcal{F}_s^{(0)}\right) \leq K_p t^p, \quad (13)$$

$$E\left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \|B'_{s+u} - B'_s\|^p | \mathcal{F}_s^{(0)}\right) \leq K_p t^p, \quad (14)$$

$$E\left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \|C_{s+u} - C_s\|^p | \mathcal{F}_s^{(0)}\right) \leq K_p t^{p/2}, \quad (15)$$

$$E\left(\sup_{0 \leq u \leq t} \|J_{s+u} - J_s\|^p | \mathcal{F}_s^{(0)}\right) \leq K_p t^{\frac{p}{h} \wedge 1}. \quad (16)$$

See section 2 of Jacod and Protter (2012) for details of the derivation of these estimates.

*Proof of Proposition 1.* First, we have

$$\tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{p=1}^{2r} \binom{2r}{p} (\Delta_i^n X)^{2r-p} (\epsilon_n \Delta v_i)^p.$$

By using the estimation inequalities of Itô semimartingale, we have

$$(\Delta_i^n X)^{2r-p} (\epsilon_n \Delta v_i)^p = O_P(\Delta_n^{(\frac{1}{2}+q)p} \times \Delta_n^{(r-\frac{p}{2})}) = O_P(\Delta_n^{q+r}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Therefore, we obtain  $\tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{2r}^{(n)}(X) = O_P(\Delta_n^{q+r-1})$ . Second, we have

$$\tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (|\Delta_i^n X + \epsilon_n \Delta v_i|^r |\Delta_{i+1}^n X + \epsilon_n \Delta v_{i+1}|^s - |\Delta_i^n X|^r |\Delta_{i+1}^n X|^s).$$

By using the estimating inequalities repeatedly, we have  $|\Delta_i^n X / \sqrt{\Delta_n}|^p = O_P(1)$  for  $p \geq 1$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_n^{(r+s)/2} (|\Delta_i^n X + \epsilon_n \Delta v_i|^r |\Delta_{i+1}^n X + \epsilon_n \Delta v_{i+1}|^s - |\Delta_i^n X|^r |\Delta_{i+1}^n X|^s) \\ &= \left| \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} + \frac{\epsilon_n \Delta v_i}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \right|^r \left| \frac{\Delta_{i+1}^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} + \frac{\epsilon_n \Delta v_{i+1}}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \right|^s - \left| \frac{\Delta_i^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \right|^r \left| \frac{\Delta_{i+1}^n X}{\sqrt{\Delta_n}} \right|^s \\ &= O_P(\epsilon_n \Delta_n^{-1/2}) = O_P(\Delta_n^q), \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we obtain  $\tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) = O_P(\Delta_n^{q-(r+s)/2+1})$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 2.* By Proposition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} n^{(r+s)/2-1} \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - m_r m_s \int_0^1 \sigma_s^{r+s} ds &= n^{(r+s)/2-1} \left( \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(Y) - \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) \right) \\ &\quad + \left( n^{(r+s)/2-1} \tilde{V}_{r,s}^{(n)}(X) - m_r m_s \int_0^1 \sigma_s^{r+s} ds \right) \\ &= O_P(n^{-q}) + O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

From the Theorem 2.3 of Barndorff-Nielsen et al. (2006), the second part of above decomposition converge stably to  $U$  defined in Proposition 2. Then we obtain the desired result.  $\square$

## A.2 Proofs for Section 4

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We can decompose  $S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)$  as follows,

$$S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) = U_{1,n} + \sum_{j=1}^2 U_{2,j,n} + \sum_{j=1}^3 U_{3,j,n} + \sum_{j=1}^3 U_{4,j,n},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1,n} &= \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)})^2, \\ U_{2,1,n} &= 2R_{k,2,1}^{(n)}(X), \\ U_{2,2,n} &= 2R_{k,1,2}^{(n)}(X), \\ U_{3,1,n} &= \epsilon_{2,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2, \\ U_{3,2,n} &= 4\epsilon_{1,n}\epsilon_{2,n} \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)}) (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)}) (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)}) (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)}), \\ U_{3,3,n} &= \epsilon_{1,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)})^2, \\ U_{4,1,n} &= 2\epsilon_{1,n}\epsilon_{2,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)}) (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)}) (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2, \\ U_{4,2,n} &= 2\epsilon_{1,n}^2\epsilon_{2,n} \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)}) (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)}), \\ U_{4,3,n} &= \epsilon_{1,n}^2\epsilon_{2,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2, \end{aligned}$$

and where  $R_{k,1,1}^{(n)}(X)$  and  $R_{k,1,2}^{(n)}(X)$  are defined in Section 4.

**Evaluation of  $U_{1,n}$  :**

From Theorem 3.3.1. and Proposition 15.3.2 in Jacod and Protter (2012), we have  $U_{1,n} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} (\Delta X_u^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^2 \equiv U_0$ . and

$$\sqrt{n}(U_{1,n} - U_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} N(0, kF_{2,2}).$$

**Evaluation of  $U_{2,1,n}$  and  $U_{2,2,n}$  :**

Let  $(Z_p^{(1)})$  and  $(Z_p^{(2)})$  be the mutually independent sequences of i.i.d. standard normal random variables defined on the second filtered probability space  $(\Omega^{(1)}, \mathcal{F}^{(1)}, (\mathcal{F}_t^{(1)})_{t \geq 0}, P^{(1)})$ , and  $(\tau_p)$

be the co-jump times of the first and second component of the process  $(X_t = (X_t^{(1)}, X_t^{(2)}))_{0 \leq t \leq 1}$ . We prove the following result

$$\begin{aligned} & (\sqrt{n}U_{2,1,n}, \sqrt{n}U_{2,2,n}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} (U_2^{(1,2)}, U_3^{(1,2)}), \\ U_2^{(1,2)} &= \sqrt{8\zeta_2} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} (\Delta X_{\tau_p}^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_{\tau_p}^{(2)})^2 Z_p^{(2)} 1_{\{\tau_p \leq 1\}}, \\ U_3^{(1,2)} &= \sqrt{8\zeta_1} \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} (\Delta X_{\tau_p}^{(1)}) (\Delta X_{\tau_p}^{(2)})^2 Z_p^{(1)} 1_{\{\tau_p \leq 1\}}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first step of the proof, we prove our result in a simple case when the process  $X$  have at most finite jumps in the interval  $[0, 1]$ . Then we prove the general case when  $X$  may have infinite jumps in the interval.

(Step1) We introduce some notations. Let  $(T_p)$  be the reordering of the double sequence  $(T(m, j) : m, j \geq 1)$ . A random variable  $T(m, j)$  is the successive jump times of the Poisson process  $1_{A_m \setminus A_{m-1}} \star \mu$  where  $A_m = \{z : \Gamma(z) > 1/m\}$ .  $\mathcal{P}_m$  denote the set of all indices  $p$  such that  $T_p = T(m', j)$  for some  $j \geq i$  and some  $m' \leq m$ . If  $(i-1)k\Delta_n < T_p \leq ik\Delta_n$ , We also consider the following random variables;

$$\begin{aligned} W_-^{(k,m)}(n, p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\Delta_n}} (X_{T_p-}^{(m)} - X_{(i-1)k\Delta_n}^{(m)}), \\ W_+^{(k,m)}(n, p) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k\Delta_n}} (X_{ik\Delta_n}^{(m)} - X_{T_p}^{(m)}), \\ W^{(k,m)}(n, p) &= W_-^{(k,m)}(n, p) + W_+^{(k,m)}(n, p). \end{aligned}$$

We also set the following stochastic processes;

$$\begin{aligned} b(m)_t &= b_t - \int_{A_m \cap \{z : \|\delta(t, z)\| \leq 1\}} \delta(t, z) \lambda(z), \\ X(m)_t &= X_0 + \int_0^t b(m)_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma_s dW_s + (\delta 1_{A_m^c}) \star (\mu - \nu)_t, \\ X'(m) &= X - X(m) = (\delta 1_{A_m}) \star \mu. \end{aligned}$$

$\Omega_n(m)$  denote the set of all  $\omega$  such that each interval  $[0, 1] \cap ((i-1)k\Delta_n, ik\Delta_n]$  contains at most one jump of  $X'(m)$ , and that  $\|X(m)(\omega)_{t+s} - X'(m)(\omega)_t\| \leq 2/m$  for all  $t \in [0, 1]$  and  $s \in [0, \Delta_n]$ .

Moreover, let

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_p^{n,k} &= \left( \Delta X_{T_p}^{(1)} + \sqrt{k\Delta_n} W^{(k,1)}(n, p) \right)^2 \left( \Delta X_{T_p}^{(2)} + \sqrt{k\Delta_n} W^{(k,2)}(n, p) \right), \\ \tilde{\eta}_p^{n,k} &= \sqrt{\zeta_2} \eta_p^{n,k} (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)}), \\ Y_n(m) &= \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_m : T_p k\Delta_n \in [1/k\Delta_n]} \tilde{\eta}_p^{n,k}. \end{aligned}$$

By the above notations, on the set  $\Omega_n(m)$ , we have

$$\sqrt{n}U_{2,1,n} = 2\sqrt{n}R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X(m)) + 2\sqrt{n}R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X'(m)). \quad (17)$$

(Step 2) A Taylor expansion of  $f(x_1, x_2) = x_1^2 x_2$  yields  $\eta_p^{n,k} - (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(2)}) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . By Proposition 4.4.10 in Jacod and Protter (2012), we have

$$(\eta_p^{n,k})_{p \geq 1} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} \left( (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(2)}) \right)_{p \geq 1}. \quad (18)$$

The sequence  $(\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})$  for  $k = 1, 2$  consists of correlated Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and have a covariance structure

$$\text{Cov}(\Delta v_i^{(k,2)}, \Delta v_j^{(k,2)}) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } i = j \\ -1 & \text{if } |i - j| = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } |i - j| > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Using the estimation inequalities (13), (15) and (16), if  $|i - j| \geq 1$ , then we have  $\xi_i^n \xi_j^n = O_P(n^{-3/2})$  where  $\xi_i^n = (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,2)}) (\Delta v_1^{(k,2)})$ . Therefore, the correlation between  $\Delta v_i^{(k,2)}$  and  $\Delta v_j^{(k,2)}$  when  $|i - j| = 1$  is asymptotically negligible. Since the set  $\{T_p : p \in \mathcal{P}_m\} \cap [0, 1]$  is finite, it follows

$$2\sqrt{n}R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X'(m)) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} \sqrt{8\zeta_2} \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_m : T_p \leq 1} (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_{T_p}^{(2)}) Z_p^{(2)} \equiv R_{2,2,1}(X'(m)). \quad (19)$$

(Step 3) From the similar argument of the proof of Theorem 5.1.2 in Jacod and Protter (2012), it is possible to prove

$$R_{2,2,1}(X'(m)) \xrightarrow{P} U_2^{(1,2)}, \quad (20)$$

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left( \Omega_n(m) \cap \sup_{t \leq 1} \|\sqrt{n}R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X(m))\| > \eta \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \eta > 0. \quad (21)$$

Together with (17), (19), (20) and (21), we obtain  $\sqrt{n}U_{2,1,n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_2^{(2,1)}$ .

We also have  $\sqrt{n}U_{2,2,n} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_3^{(1,2)}$  in the same way. Since  $U_{1,n}$ ,  $U_{2,1,n}$  and  $U_{2,2,n}$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent by the definition of the noise, we obtain a joint convergence

$$\sqrt{n}(U_{1,n} - U_0, U_{2,1,n}, U_{2,2,n}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} (U_1^{(1,2)}, U_2^{(1,2)}, U_3^{(1,2)}).$$

Therefore, we also obtain  $\sqrt{n}(U_{1,n} + U_{2,1,n} + U_{2,2,n} - U_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)}$ .

#### Evaluation of the remaining terms :

Let  $\xi_i^n = \epsilon_{2,n}^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2$ . Then  $U_{3,1,n} = \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} \xi_i^n$ .

Using the inequalities (13), (15) and (16), we have

$$E[\xi_i^n] = \epsilon_{2,n}^2 E[(\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2] E[(\Delta_i^n X^{(k,1)})^2] = O(1/n^2).$$

Therefore, we obtain  $U_{3,1,n} = O_P(1/n)$ . Similarly, we have  $U_{3,2,n} = U_{3,3,n} = U_{4,1,n} = U_{4,2,n} = O_P(1/n)$ . Since  $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{[n/k]} (\Delta v_i^{(k,1)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(k,2)})^2 \xrightarrow{P} 4\zeta_1\zeta_2$ , we have  $U_{4,3,n} = O_P(1/n\sqrt{n})$ .

Consequently, we obtain  $\sqrt{n}(S_{k,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) - U_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)}$ .  $\square$

Next we consider the stable convergence of the difference of the statistics  $S_{2,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)$  and  $S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)$  to construct testing procedure for detecting co-jumps.

**Proposition 6.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied with  $q = 0$  in Assumption 2. Let*

$$S_0 = \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_s^{(2)})^2,$$

$$W^{(n)} = \sqrt{n}[(S_{2,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) - S_0) - (S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) - S_0)].$$

*Then, in restriction to the set  $\Omega^{(j)}$ , we have:*

$$W^{(n)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}-s} U^{(1,2)} = U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)},$$

*where  $U_l^{(1,2)}$  for  $l = 1, 2, 3$  are  $\mathcal{F}^{(0)}$ -conditionally mutually independent Gaussian random variables with mean 0 and the following variances,*

$$E[(U_1^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] = F_{2,2}, E[(U_2^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] = 8\zeta_2 \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} (\Delta X_u^{(1)})^4 (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^2 \text{ and } E[(U_3^{(1,2)})^2 | \mathcal{F}^{(0)}] = 8\zeta_1 \sum_{0 \leq u \leq 1} (\Delta X_u^{(1)})^2 (\Delta X_u^{(2)})^4.$$

*Proof of Proposition 6.* By using the estimation inequalities (13), (15) and (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^{[n/2]} (\Delta_i^n Y^{(2,1)})^2 (\Delta_i^n Y^{(2,2)})^2 \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{[n/2]} (\Delta_i^n X^{(2,1)})^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(2,2)})^2 + 2R_{2,1,2}^{(n)}(X) + 2R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

We decompose  $W^{(n)}$  into three leading terms

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(n)} &= \sqrt{n}(S_{2,2,2}^{(n)}(X) - S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(X)) + 2\sqrt{n}(R_{2,1,2}^{(n)}(X) - R_{1,1,2}^{(n)}(X)) \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{n}(R_{2,2,1}^{(n)}(X) - R_{1,2,1}^{(n)}(X)) + o_P(1) \\ &= \text{I}_{n,1} + \text{II}_{n,2} + \text{III}_{n,3} + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Because of the independence of the noise  $v_i^{(1)}$  and  $v_i^{(2)}$ , the three terms  $\text{I}_{n,1}$ ,  $\text{II}_{n,2}$  and  $\text{III}_{n,3}$  are asymptotically mutually independent. Therefore, it is sufficient to evaluate each term. We can rewrite  $\text{II}_{n,2}$  by using the estimation inequalities (13), (15) and (16)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{II}_{n,2} &= 2\sqrt{\zeta_1} \sum_{i=1}^{[n/2]} \sum_{j=2(i-1)+1}^{2i} (\Delta_j^n X^{(1)}) (\Delta_j^n X^{(2)})^2 \left( \sum_{l=2(i-1)+1}^{2i} \Delta v_l^{(1)} - \Delta v_j^{(1)} \right) + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}) \\ &= \tilde{\text{II}}_{n,2} + O_P(1/\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

By the application of Proposition 15.3.2 in Jacod and Protter (2012) for  $\text{I}_{n,1}$  and the similar argument of the evaluation of  $U_{2,1,n}$  in the proof of Theorem 1, we finally obtain that  $W^{(n)}$  converge stably to  $U_1^{(1,2)} + U_2^{(1,2)} + U_3^{(1,2)}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* From the definition of  $T^{(n)}$ ,

$$T^{(n)} - 1 = \frac{S_{2,2,2}^{(n)}(Y) - S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)}{S_{1,2,2}^{(n)}(Y)}.$$

Then by Proposition 6, we obtain the result.  $\square$

### A.3 Proofs for Section 5

*Proof of Proposition 4.* For the consistency of the SIML, see the proof of Theorem 1 in Kunitomo and Sato (2013).  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 5.* We only give the proof of a consistency of  $\widehat{D}_{p,q}^{(l,m)}(1,1)$  and  $\widehat{A}^{(l,m)}(r)$ . The proofs of consistency of the other estimators are similar to the proof below.

Under Assumptions of Proposition 5 and for any  $\eta > 0$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ ,  $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} 1_{\{|\epsilon_{j,n} \Delta v_i^{(j)}| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} > \eta\right) \\ & \leq P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n 1_{\{|\epsilon_{j,n} \Delta v_i^{(j)}| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} > \eta\right) \leq P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^n \left\{|\epsilon_{j,n} \Delta v_i^{(j)}| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\right\}\right) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n P\left(|\epsilon_{j,n} \Delta v_i^{(j)}| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\right) \leq 4 \sum_{i=1}^n \max\left\{P\left(\epsilon_{j,n} v_i^{(j)} > \frac{\alpha \Delta_n^\theta}{2}\right), P\left(\epsilon_{j,n} v_i^{(j)} < -\frac{\alpha \Delta_n^\theta}{2}\right)\right\} \\ & = 4 \sum_{i=1}^n o(n^{-1}) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Then  $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left|1_{\{|\Delta_i^n Y| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n X| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta/2\}}\right| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ . Therefore we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(2)}) 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n Y| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(2)}) 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n X| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta/2\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Moreover, for  $\eta > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\left|\epsilon_{1,n} \epsilon_{2,n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)})(\Delta v_i^{(1)})(\Delta v_i^{(2)}) 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n X| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}}\right| > \eta\right) \\ & \leq \frac{(\epsilon_{1,n} \epsilon_{2,n})^2}{\eta^2} E \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)}) 1_{\{|\Delta_i^n X| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} (\Delta v_i^{(1)})(\Delta v_i^{(2)}) \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq \frac{(\epsilon_{1,n} \epsilon_{2,n})^2}{\eta^2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n A_i^{1,n} + \sum_{i=2}^n A_i^{2,n} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} A_i^{3,n} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A_i^{1,n} &= E \left[ (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(2)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(2)})^2 (\Delta v_i^{(1)})^2 \right], \\ A_i^{2,n} &= E \left[ (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_{i-1}^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)})(\Delta_{i-1}^n X^{(2)})(\Delta v_i^{(1)})(\Delta v_{i-1}^{(1)})(\Delta v_i^{(2)})(\Delta v_{i-1}^{(2)}) \right], \\ A_i^{3,n} &= E \left[ (\Delta_{i+1}^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_{i+1}^n X^{(2)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)})(\Delta v_{i+1}^{(1)})(\Delta v_i^{(1)})(\Delta v_{i+1}^{(2)})(\Delta v_i^{(2)}) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now we evaluate the last three terms in above inequality. By Hölder's inequality and the estimation of Itô semimartingale, we have  $A_i^{1,n} = A_i^{2,n} = A_i^{3,n} = O(n^{-2})$ . Therefore,

$$\epsilon_{1,n}\epsilon_{2,n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)})(\Delta_i v^{(1)})(\Delta_i v^{(2)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n X|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

From the similar argument, we have for  $1 \leq l, m \leq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \epsilon_{m,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(l)})^2 (\Delta_i v^{(m)})^2 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n X|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ & \epsilon_{m,n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(l)})^2 (\Delta_i^n X^{(m)})(\Delta_i v^{(m)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n X|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ & \epsilon_{l,n} \epsilon_{m,n}^2 \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(l)})(\Delta_i v^{(l)})(\Delta_i v^{(m)})^2 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n X|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(2)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n Y|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} - \sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n X^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n X^{(2)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n X|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta/2\}} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Therefore,  $\sum_{i=1}^n (\Delta_i^n Y^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(2)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n Y|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} \sum_{0 \leq s \leq 1} (\Delta X_s^{(1)})(\Delta X_s^{(2)})$ . Then, from Theorem 9.4.1 and Theorem 9.5.1 in Jacod and Protter (2012), we have the following result

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \widehat{C}_i^{(1,2)} (\Delta_i^n Y^{(1)})(\Delta_i^n Y^{(2)}) 1_{\{||\Delta_i^n Y|| > \alpha \Delta_n^\theta\}} \xrightarrow{P} D_{1,2}^{(1,2)}(1, 1), \\ & \Delta_n \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n+1} (\widehat{C}_i^{(1,2)})^r \xrightarrow{P} A^{(1,2)}(r). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we obtain the desired results.  $\square$

*Proofs of Corollaries 1 and 2.* The result immediately follows from the remarks in Section 3, Theorem 2, Propositions 4 and 5.  $\square$

## B Figures and tables




Figure 1: Empirical distributions of the RV for the continuous case (Corollary 1(i)). The left figure corresponds to the bias-variance corrected case implied by Corollary 1(i). The right figure corresponds to the no correction case (statistics are standardized as  $\zeta_1 = 0$  in Corollary 1(i)). The red line is the density of a standard normal distribution.




Figure 2: Empirical distributions of the RV for the jump case (Corollary 1(ii)). We plot the left and right figures in the same way as Figure 2.




Figure 3: Empirical distribution of the co-jump test implied by Corollary 2 in C2-IV. The red line is the density of a standard normal distribution.

Table 1: RMSEs of  $\widehat{IV}$ , Values are reported as multiples of  $10^{-3}$

Case	CJ1-(i)	CJ1-(ii)	CJ1-(iii)	CJ2-(i)	CJ2-(ii)	CJ2-(iii)
RMSE	2.137	2.192	2.349	1.701	1.735	1.878
Case	SJ1-(i)	SJ1-(ii)	SJ1-(iii)	SJ2-(i)	SJ2-(ii)	SJ2-(iii)
RMSE	11.45	11.47	11.40	9.501	9.496	9.470

Table 2: Empirical size and power of the co-jump test (5% significant level)

Case	C1-I	C1-II	C1-III	C1-IV	C2-I	C2-II	C2-III	C2-IV
Size	0.071	0.073	0.065	0.069	0.057	0.062	0.058	0.059
Case	D1-I	D1-II	D1-III	D1-IV	D2-I	D2-II	D2-III	D2-IV
Power	0.994	0.996	0.993	0.896	0.991	0.993	0.995	0.981

## References

- Aït-Sahalia, Y. and Jacod, J. (2009), Testing for jumps in a discretely observed process. *Ann. Statist.* 37-1, 184-222.
- Aït-Sahalia, Y. and Jacod, J. and Li, J. (2012), Testing for jumps in noisy high-frequency data. *J.Econometrics* 168-2, 207-222.
- Aït-Sahalia, Y. and Yu, J. (2009), High-frequency market microstructure noise estimated and liquidity measures. *Ann. Appl. Statist.* 3-1, 422-457.
- Bandi, F. M. and Russel, J. R. (2006), Separating microstructure noise from volatility. *J. Financial Econometrics* 79-3, 655-692.

- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Graversen, S. E., Jacod, J., Podolskij, M. and Shephard, N. (2006), A central limit theorem for realised power and bipower variations of continuous semimartingales. in: *From Stochastic Analysis to Mathematical Finance, Festschrift for Albert Shiryaev*, Springer, 2006.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and Shephard, N. (2004), Power and bipower variation with stochastic volatility and jumps. *J. Financial Econometrics* 2-1, 1-48.
- Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and Shephard, N. (2006), Econometrics of testing for jumps on financial econometrics using bipower variation. *J. Econometrics* 4-1, 1-30.
- 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, 1481-1536.
- Bibinger, M. and Reiss, M. (2014), Spectral estimation of covolatility from noisy observations using local weights. *Scand. J. Statist.* 41, 23-50.
- Bibinger, M. and Winkelmann, L. (2015), Econometrics of co-jumps in high-frequency data with noise. *J. Econometrics* 184-2, 361-378.
- Bollerslev, T., Law, T. H., Tauchen, G. (2008), Risk, jumps, and diversification. *J. Econometrics* 144-1, 234-256.
- Bollerslev, T., Todorov, V. and Li, S. Z. (2013), Jump tails, extreme dependencies, and the distribution of stock returns. *J. Econometrics* 172-2, 307-324.
- Cont, R. and Tankov, P. (2004), *Financial Modeling with Jump Process*, Chapman & Hall.
- Fan, J. and Wang, Y. (2007), Multi-scale jump and volatility analysis for high-frequency data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 102-480, 1349-1362.
- Glider, D., Shackleton, M. B. and Taylor, S. J. (2014), Cojumps in stock prices: Empirical evidence. *J. Banking. Finance* 40, 443-459.
- Gloter, A. and Jacod, J. (2001a), Diffusions with measurement errors. I-Local asymptotic normality. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* 5, 225-242.
- Gloter, A. and Jacod, J. (2001b), Diffusions with measurement errors. II-Optimal estimators. *ESAIM: Probability and Statistics* 5, 243-260.
- Hansen, P. R. and Lunde, A. (2006), Realized variance and market microstructure noise. *J. Business. Econ. Statist.* 24-2, 127-161.
- Häusler, E. and Luschgy, H. (2015), *Stable Convergence and Stable Limit Theorems*. Springer.
- Jacod, J. (2008), Asymptotic properties of realized power variations and related functionals of semimartingales. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 118-4, 517-559.
- Jacod, J., Li, Y., Mykland, P. A., Podolskij, A. and Vetter, M. (2009), Microstructure noise in the continuous case: the preaveraging approach. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* 119-7, 2249-2276.
- Jacod, J. and Protter, P. (2012), *Discretization of Processes*, Springer.
- Jacod, J. and Todorov, V. (2009), Testing for common arrivals of jumps for discretely observed multidimensional processes. *Ann. Statist.* 37-4, 1792-1838.

- Jiang, G. J. and Oomen, R. C. A. (2008), Testing for jumps when asset prices are observed with noise—a “swap variance” approach. *J. Econometrics* 144-2, 352-370.
- Kunitomo, N. and Kurisu, D. (2015), On effects of jump and noise in high-frequency financial econometrics. Discussion Paper, CIRJE-F-996, University of Tokyo.
- Kunitomo, N. and Sato, S. (2010), Robustness of the separating information maximum likelihood method estimation of realized volatility with micro-market noise. CIRJE Discussion Paper F-733, University of Tokyo.
- Kunitomo, N. and Sato, S. (2011), The SIML estimation of realized volatility of Nikkei-225 futures and hedging coefficient with micro-market noise. *Mathematics and Computers in Simulation*, 81-7, 1272-1289.
- Kunitomo, N. and Sato, S. (2013), Separating information maximum likelihood estimation of the integrated volatility and covariance with micro-market noise. *The North Amer. J. Economics. Finance* 26, 282-309.
- Li, J. (2013), Robust estimation and inference for jumps in noisy high-frequency data: A local-to-continuity theory for the pre-averaging method. *Econometrica* 81-4, 1673-1693.
- Li, Y., Xie, S. and Zheng, X. (2014), Efficient estimation of integrated volatility incorporating trading information. working paper.
- Li, Y., Zhang, Z. and Li, Y. (2015), A unified approach to volatility estimation in the presence of both rounding and random market microstructure noise. working paper.
- Mancini, C. (2009), Non-parametric threshold estimation for models with stochastic diffusion coefficient and jumps. *Scand. J. Statist.* 36-2, 270-296.
- Mancini, C. and Gobbi, F. (2012), Identifying the Brownian covariation from the co-jumps given discrete observations. *Econometric Theory* 28-2, 249-273.
- Zhang, L., Mykland, P. A. and Aït-Sahalia, Y. (2005), A tale of two time series: determining integrated volatility with noisy high-frequency data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 100-472, 1394-1411.