arXiv:1708.02424v1 [q-fin.PM] 8 Aug 2017

Cardinality constrained portfolio selection via factor models

Juan Francisco Monge
Centro de Investigación Operativa, Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche, (Spain), monge@umh.es

In this paper we propose and discuss different 0-1 linear models in order to solve the cardinality constrained portfolio problem by using factor models. Factor models are used to build portfolios to track indexes, together with other objectives, also need a smaller number of parameters to estimate than the classical Markowitz model. The addition of the cardinality constraints limits the number of securities in the portfolio. Restricting the number of securities in the portfolio allows us to obtain a concentrated portfolio, reduce the risk and limit transaction costs. To solve this problem, a pure 0-1 model is presented in this work, the 0-1 model is constructed by means of a piecewise linear approximation. We also present a new quadratic combinatorial problem, called a minimum edge-weighted clique problem, to obtain an equality weighted cardinality constrained portfolio. A piecewise linear approximation for this problem is presented in the context of a multi factor model. For a single factor model, we present a fast heuristic, based on some theoretical results to obtain an equality weighted cardinality constraint portfolio. The consideration of a piecewise linear approximation allow us to reduce significantly the computation time required for the equivalent quadratic problem. Computational results from the 0-1 models are compared to those using a state-of-the-art Quadratic MIP solver.

Key words: finance, portfolio selection, Factor models, minimum-variance portfolio.

1. Introduction

The portfolio selection problem deals with selecting a collection of financial assets and in what proportion, according to the investor's risk preference, with the aim of obtaining the maximum expected return.

The selection of assets allocated to the portfolio can be managed using different approaches: minimum risk allocation, equal weighting, risk parity, Sharpe ratio, and many others.

In the seminar work of Markowitz (1952), the return and risk are evaluated by means of the expected value and the variance of the selected assets. Markowitz introduced the concept of an efficient frontier and showed that there is a set of optimal portfolios, not only one. The classical Markowitz model can be formulated as a quadratic linear model, and the investor can find an optimal portfolio maximizing the expected return under a risk level, $w^* = \arg_w \max\{\, w^T\mu \; s.t. \; w^T\Sigma w = \sigma^*,\; w^T 1 = 1\}$, or minimizing the risk under a return level, $w^* = \arg_w \min\{\, w^T\Sigma w \; s.t. \; w^T\mu = r^*,\; w^T 1 = 1\}$, where w denotes the vector of weights in the portfolio, μ the vector of expected returns, and Σ the covariance matrix of expected returns. A significantly important portfolio is given when the constraint related to the return level is relaxed, obtaining the global minimum risk solution. This solution is important in the literature. For example, in (DeMiguel et al. 2009) the authors show that the minimum variance portfolio is a more reliable and robust outsample than the traditional mean variance portfolios. Another important portfolio is given when a tradeoff objective function return/risk is considered, $w^* = \arg_w \max\{\, w^T\Sigma w - \lambda\, w^T\Sigma w \; s.t. \; w^T 1 = 1\}$, where λ is the risk aversion coefficient. Although we have considered in this paper the minimum variance portfolio, we will see that the results can easily be applied to the objective functions mentioned above.

The factor model theory establishes the expected return of each asset as a linear function on the risk factors, through the parameter β, where β is a measure of the risk contribution for the individual asset to the portfolio. The father of factor models is W.F. Sharpe, and their Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) theory, see (Sharpe 1963, 1964).

The Markowitz mean-variance framework requires that are estimate a large number of parameters. If there are n assets, we need to estimate n means, n variances and $n(n-1)/2$ covariances, $0(n^2)$. The factor model requires fewer parameters to be estimated; the order is given by the number of factors m, i.e. $O(m^2)$, where the number of factors m is much smaller than n.

The cardinality constrained portfolio problem is a classic problem in the literature. In (Chang et al. 2000) the authors present several properties for the efficient frontier for the cardinality

constrained problem in the classical mean-variance Markowitz model, giving properties of solutions, showing for example, the discontinuity of the efficient frontier, also as the traditional minimization of trade-of objective function mean/risk does not provide all the efficient solutions. The authors also present different heuristics for this problem, while (Woodside-Oriakhi et al. 2011) is related to methaheuristic approaches. The exact resolution of the problem is analyzed in (Cesarone et al. 2013), where the authors present an exact algorithm for medium size problems, that provide a good approximation for larger problems.

In (Shaw et al. 2008) the authors present a Lagrangian decomposition scheme for the cardinality constrained portfolio problem. The authors present a decomposition of the covariance matrix in two matrix; a diagonal matrix with the risk of each asset, and another non-diagonal with the covariance among the factors. This idea allows them to reduce the dimensions of the quadratic problem to be solved. See (Gao and Li 2013) for another application of the Lagrangian decomposition scheme for this problem. See in (Bertsimas 2009) an alternative procedure based on solving a succession of problems into a tree search.

Another alternative that can be found in the literature, regarding the cardinality constrained problem, refers to the investment being made in lots, the excess capital going to a risk-free asset, see (Li et al. 2006). In (Castro et al. 2011) the authors propose a algebraic algorithm to solve the integer problem with linear objective function, the expected return, under linear and non-linear constraints.

All the above papers only deal with the classical Markowitz model; these papers do not integrate the cardinality constrain in factor models. To the best of our knowledge there does not exist in the literature a paper combining factor models and the cardinality constraint.

The main contribution of this work relates to the linear approximation of the quadratic factor model problem. Two linear approximations are considered in this work; the first through a piecewise linear function, and the second imposing the equal weighted in the solution. The singularity present in the covariance matrix of the factor models allows us to take advantage above the Cplex solver.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. Section 2 deals with the main concepts of factor models and introduces the mathematical notation for the cardinality constrained minimum variance problem via factor models, the piecewise linear approximation of this problem and the model where the equal weighted constraint is imposed. Section 3 studies the problem where a single factor is considered; it also presents theoretical results for this new combinatorial problem and a heuristic algorithm to solve it. Section 4 reports the computational results for a set of instances used in the literature. Finally, section 5 concludes and outlines future plans.

2. Factor Model

For a risky asset $i \in I$, a factor model assumes that the return rates r_i of asset i is given by $r_i = \alpha_i + \beta_i F + \epsilon_i$, where $F = (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ is a vector of random variables called factors, with $E(f_l) = 0$, $\alpha_i \in I\!R$ is a constant, $\beta_i \in I\!R^m$ is a constant vector and ϵ_i is a (error) mean zero random variable, uncorrelated with the factors, $E(\epsilon_i) = 0$ and $E(\epsilon_i \cdot f_l) = 0$. The factors F are correlated with covariance matrix Σ_F. We use the notation $\sigma_{lm} = E(f_l \cdot f_m)$ and $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} = E(\epsilon_i^2)$.

For a portfolio formed with n assets, defined by weights $w^T = (w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_n)$, then the portfolio is determined by a factor model, where the return $r = \sum_{i \in I} w_i r_i$ of the porfolio is

$$r = \sum_{i \in I} w_i \alpha_i + \sum_{i \in I} w_i \beta_i^T F + \sum_{i \in I} w_i \epsilon_i$$

In matrix form:

$$r = w^T(\alpha + \beta^T F + \epsilon)$$

where

$\alpha \in I\!R^n$, $\beta \in I\!R^{m \times n}$, $F \sim N(0, \Sigma_F)$, $\epsilon \sim N(0, \Sigma_\epsilon)$

The mean-variance parameters can be calculated directly in terms of the factor model:

$$E(r) = w^T \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \alpha_i$$

$$V(r) = w^T \Sigma_r w = w^T(\beta^T \Sigma_F \beta + \Sigma_\epsilon) w = w^T \beta^T \Sigma_F \beta w + w^T \Sigma_\epsilon w =$$

$$= \sum_{i,j \in I} \sum_{l,m \in F} w_i w_j \beta_{il} \beta_{jm} \sigma_{lm} + \sum_{i \in I} w_i^2 \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}$$

2.1. Cardinality constrained minimum-variance portfolio problem with factor models.

Let K be the desired number of assets in the portfolio. Consider the following decision variables:

$x_i,$ binary variable that takes value 1 if the asset i is selected, $\forall i \in I$.

$w_i,$ weight of asset i in the portfolio, $\forall i \in I$.

Then, the Cardinality Constrained Minimum Variance portfolio via Factor Models (CCMVFM) is the solution to the mixed 0-1 binary quadratic optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} (CCMVFM) \quad \min_{w,x} \quad & \sum_{i,j\in I}\sum_{l,m\in F}\beta_{il}\beta_{jm}\sigma_{rl}w_iw_j + \sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}w_i^2 \\ s.t. \quad & \sum_{i\in I} w_i = 1\,, \\ & \sum_{i\in I} x_i \leq K, \\ & 0 \leq w_i \leq x_i\,, \qquad \forall i \in I, \\ & x_i \in \{0,1\}\,, \qquad \forall i \in I. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

If the factors are uncorrelated ($\sigma_{lm} = 0, \forall\, l, m \in F : l \neq m$), the objective function of the problem ($CCMVFM$ (1)) can be written as:

$$\min_{w,x} \quad \sum_{i,j\in I}\sum_{l\in F}\beta_{il}\beta_{jl}\sigma_{ll}w_iw_j + \sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}w_i^2$$

Piecewise linear approximation

In order to improve the computational time required to solve the $CCMVFM$ model (1), we propose a piecewise linear approximation. Consider S_w, set of s ordered disjoint segments of variable w_i, i.e, the set of ordered disjoints segments in the interval $[0,1] = [\overline{w}_i^0 = 0, \overline{w}_i^1) \cup [\overline{w}_i^1, \overline{w}_i^2) \cup \cdots \cup [\overline{w}_i^{s-1}, \overline{w}_i^s = 1]$; and, S_β, set of t ordered disjoint segments of variable $\beta_{\cdot l}$ in the interval $[\beta_{\min}, \beta_{\max}] = [\overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^0 = \beta_{\min}, \overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^1) \cup [\overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^1, \overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^2) \cup \cdots \cup [\overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^{t-1}, \overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^t = \beta_{\max}]$, where $\beta_{\cdot l} = \sum_{i\in I} w_i\beta_{il}$. So, the quadratic model (1) can be approximated by the following 0-1 pure quadratic model:

$$(CCMVFM_{LA}) \qquad \min_{x,y} \quad \sum_{t,t'\in S_\beta}\sum_{l,m\in F}\sigma_{lm}\overline{\beta}_{\cdot l}^{\,t}\overline{\beta}_{\cdot m}^{\,t'}y_l^t y_m^{t'} + \sum_{i\in I, s\in S_w}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}\,\overline{w}_i^{s\,2}\,x_i^s \tag{2}$$

$$s.t. \quad \sum_{s\in S_w} x_i^s = 1\,, \qquad \forall i \in I, \tag{3}$$

$$\sum_{t\in S_\beta} \overline{y}_l^t = 1\,, \qquad \forall l \in F, \tag{4}$$

$$\sum_{i\in I} \sum_{s\in S_w : s>0} x_i^s \leq K\,, \tag{5}$$

$$\sum_{i\in I} \sum_{s\in S_w : s>0} \overline{w}_i^s x_i^s = 1\,, \tag{6}$$

$$\sum_{i\in I} \sum_{s\in S_w : s>0} \beta_{il} \overline{w}_i^s x_i^s \leq \sum_{t\in S_\beta} \overline{\beta}_{.l}^t y_l^t\,, \qquad \forall l \in F, \tag{7}$$

$$x_i^s \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall i \in I\,, s \in S_w, \tag{8}$$

$$y_l^t \in \{0,1\}\,, \qquad \forall l \in F, t \in S_\beta, \tag{9}$$

where the 0-1 variable x_i^s takes value 1 if the weight of asset i is fixed in the solution at level $\overline{w}_i^s$, and the 0-1 variable y_l^t takes value 1 if $\overline{\beta}_{.l}^t$ is the least upper bound of $\beta_{.l}$ in the set S_β.

If the factors are uncorrelated ($\sigma_{lm} = 0, \forall l, m \in F : l \neq m$), then the quadratic model (2)-(9) becomes in the following linear pure 0-1 model:

$$\min_{x,y} \quad \sum_{t\in S_\beta} \sum_{l\in F} \sigma_{ll} \overline{\beta}_{.l}^{t\,2} y_l^t + \sum_{i\in I, s\in S_w} \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2 \overline{w}_i^{s\,2} x_i^s \tag{10}$$

$$s.t. \quad (3) - (9).$$

2.2. Equality weighted cardinality constrained portfolio problem

A simplification model of ($CCMVFM$ (1)) is the model when the equality weighted constraint is imposed, i.e., the weight of asset i, w_i, is $1/K$ if the asset i is selected, and 0 otherwise. The problem of finding find the best Equality Weighted Cardinality Constrained Minimum Variance portfolio for a multi Factor Model (EWCCMVFM), i.e., the solution of CCMVFM problem, when the weight of all assets selected are the same, is the solution of the 0-1 pure binary quadratic optimization problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(EWCCMVFM) \quad \frac{1}{K^2}\min_{x} \quad & \sum_{i,j\in I}\sum_{l,m\in F}\beta_{il}\beta_{jm}\sigma_{lm}x_i x_j + \sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}x_i^2 \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{i\in I} x_i = K\,, \\
& x_i \in \{0,1\}\,, \qquad \forall i \in I,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}
$$

where x_i takes value 1 if the asset i is selected, and 0 otherwise. The constraint ($\sum_{i\in I} w_i = 1$) in (1) forces us to select exactly K assets ($\sum_{i\in I} x_i = K$) in the model (11), i.e., we need to impose the equality in the cardinality constraint. Note also, we can replace the term $\sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}x_i^2$ in the objective function for $\sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}x_i$, because x_i takes the value 0 or 1.

The problem (11) can be written as $\{\min_x \sum_{i,j\in I} a_{ij}x_i x_j,\ \text{s.t.}\sum_{i\in I} x_i = K,\ x_i \in \{0,1\}\,\forall i \in I\}$, where

$$
a_{ij} = \begin{cases}
\frac{1}{K^2}\sum_{l,m\in F}\beta_{il}\beta_{jm}\sigma_{lm} & \text{if} \quad i \neq j, \\
\frac{1}{K^2}\sum_{l,m\in F}\beta_{il}\beta_{im}\sigma_{lm} + \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} & \text{if} \quad i = j.
\end{cases}
$$

A well-know problem in the literature is the Maximum Edge-Weigted Clique Problem (MEWCP), see (Alidaee et al. 2007, Macambira and Souza 2000) among others. The MEWCP problem can be defined as follows: Given a complete graph $G = (V, E)$ with nodes and unrestricted edge weights c_{ij}, find a subclique of G with k nodes such that the sum of the weights in the sub-clique is maximized. A non-linear formulation of the problem is:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(MEWCP) \quad \max \quad & \sum_{i,j\in V, i<j} c_{ij}x_i x_j \\
s.t. \quad & \sum_{i\in V} x_i \leq k, \\
& x_i \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall i \in I.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}
$$

PROPOSITION 1. *An instance of EWCCMVFM problem can be transformed into an instance of MEWCP.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{G}$ a larga number, for example $\mathcal{G} = \max\{a_{ij},\ i,j \in I\}$, then, the solution of the problem $(MEWCP)$ with $c_{ij} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{G} - (2\,a_{ij} + \dfrac{a_{ii}+a_{jj}}{K-1}) & \text{if} \quad i<j \\ 0 & \text{if} \quad i \geq j \end{cases}$ is solution of the problem $(EWCCMVFM)$. $\square$

Proposition 1 implies that the EWCCMVFM problem inherits all the properties of MEWCP. Nevertheless, the EWCCMVFM has remarkable matrix coefficients, see appendix. This fact makes this problem (EWCCMVFM) more treatable computationally.

There exists in the literature linear formulations for the MEWCP, however these formulations are not considered in this work because they behaved worse than the quadratic formulation (12), see (Macambira and Souza 2000) and the references therein for a good explanation of the MEWCP problem.

Piecewise linear approximation

Using the same approximation used in (CCMVFM), the problem (EWCCMVFM) can be approximated by the following quadratic 0-1 problem:

$$(EWCCMVFM_{LA}) \qquad \frac{1}{K^2}\min \quad \sum_{t,t'\in S_\beta}\sum_{l,m\in F}\sigma_{lm}\overline{\beta}^{t}_{.l}\overline{\beta}^{t'}_{.m}y^t_l y^{t'}_m + \sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}x_i \tag{13}$$

$$s.t \quad \sum_i x_i = K, \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{1}{K}\sum_i \beta_{il}x_i \leq \sum_t \overline{\beta}^{s}_{.l}y^t_l\,, \qquad \forall l\in F, \tag{15}$$

$$\sum_{t\in S_\beta} y^t_l = 1, \qquad \forall l\in F, \tag{16}$$

$$x_i\in\{0,1\}, \qquad \forall i\in I, \tag{17}$$

$$y^t_l\in\{0,1\}, \qquad \forall l\in F, t\in S_\beta. \tag{18}$$

If the factors are uncorrelated ($\sigma_{lm}=0, \forall\, l,m\in F : l\neq m$), then the quadratic model (13)-(18) becomes in the following linear pure 0-1 model:

$$\frac{1}{K^2}\min \quad \sum_{i\in I}\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}x_i + \sum_{t\in S_\beta}\sum_{l\in F}\sigma_{ll}\overline{\beta}^{t\,2}_{.l}y^t_l \tag{19}$$

$$s.t \quad (14)-(18)$$

We have presented different models for the cardinality constrained portfolio selection via factor models: the $CCMVFM$ problem and its linear approximation ($CCMVFM_{LA}$), and the $EWCCMVFM$ problem and its linear approximation ($EWCCMVFM_{LA}$). All these models have different classifications in mathematical programming theory depending on their characteristics: linear or non-linear objective function, continuous or integer variables, etc. Table 1 shows the characteristics of problems defined above, depending on whether the model considers correlated or uncorrelated factors. Note that on consideration of uncorrelated factors, both approximations become in a 0-1 pure linear problems.

The linear approximation of $CCMVFM$ and $CCMVFM_{LA}$ models, needs to add to the model new binary variables, one binary variable x_i^s for each asset $i \in I$ and each segment $s \in S_w$ considered, and one variable y_l^t for each factor $l \in F$ and each segment $t \in S_\beta$. Table 2. shows the dimension of each model, where a column under heading $n01$ gives the number of binary variables of each model, the following column nc gives the number of continuous variables, and finally the column m gives the number of constraints. These dimensions are given by N the number of assets, NF the number of factors, $|S_w|$ the number of segments considered for each variable x_i^s and finally $|S_\beta|$ the number of segments considered for each variable y_l^t . The number of segments considered in the computational experience has been fixed to 500, for $|S_\beta|$, and as a function of the parameter of cardinality K, for $|S_w|$.

Although the dimensions of linear approximations are much higher than the original quadratic model (CCMVFM), we will see that, given the great advance currently present in the optimization solvers for combinatorial problems, the resolution of these lineal models is much less expensive than the equivalent quadratic model.

3. Equality weighted cardinality constrained minimum variance portfolio problem for a single factor model.

In this section we study some properties for the EWCCMV problem where only one factor is considered. For a single factor f, the return rates r_i of asset $i \in I$ is given by $r_i = \alpha_i + \beta_i f + \epsilon_i$, where $E(f) = 0$ and $E(f^2) = \sigma_f^2$.

The quadratic 0-1 model for the Equality Weighted Cardinality Constraint Minimum Variance portfolio with a Single Factor f (EWCCMVSF) is:

$$\begin{aligned} (EWCCMVSF) \quad & \frac{1}{K^2} \min_{x} \quad \sigma_f^2 \sum_{i,j \in I} \beta_i \beta_j x_i x_j + \sum_{i \in I} \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2 x_i \\ & s.t. \qquad \sum_{i \in I} x_i = K, \\ & \qquad\quad x_i \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall i \in I. \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Problem (20) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} (EWCCMVSF) \quad & \frac{1}{K^2} \min_{\overline{\beta},\overline{\alpha},x} \overline{\beta}^2 + \overline{\alpha} \\ & s.t. \qquad \sum_{i \in I} x_i = K, \\ & \qquad\quad \overline{\beta} = \sigma_f \textstyle\sum_{i \in I}, \beta_i x_i, \\ & \qquad\quad \overline{\alpha} = \textstyle\sum_{i \in I}, \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2 x_i, \\ & \qquad\quad x_i \in \{0,1\}, \qquad \forall i \in I. \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

3.1. Theoretical results

Let A be the set of points on the plane, $A = \left\{(\beta_i \sigma_f, \sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2), \forall i \in I\right\}$, and the cardinality parameter K.

Definition 1. The addition set of A, denoted by $A(K)$, is the set of all points generated by the addition of K points from A.

$$A(K) = \left\{ \sum_{a_i \in S \subset A} a_i, \forall S \subset A : |S| = K \right\}$$

Definition 2. Convex hull of set $A(K)$, denoted by $conv(A(K))$, is the set of all convex combination of points generate by addition of K points in A, that is:

$$conv(A(K)) = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i a_i : a_i \in A, x_i \in R, 0 \leq x_i \leq 1, \sum_{i=1}^{N} x_i = K \right\}.$$

The linear relaxation of problem (20) and (21) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (EWCCMVSF) \quad & \frac{1}{K^2} \min_{\overline{\beta},\overline{\alpha}} \overline{\beta}^2 + \overline{\alpha} \\ & s.t. \qquad (\overline{\beta},\overline{\alpha}) \in conv(A(K)). \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

PROPOSITION 2. *The optimal solution of (22) is reached in the frontier of set conv*$(A(K))$.

Proof. It remains to show that this proposition is true. □

THEOREM 1 **(Carathéodory, (caratheodory 1907))**. *For* $S \subset \mathcal{R}^d$, *if* $x \in conv(S)$ *then* $x \in conv(T)$ *for some* $T \subset S, |T| \leq d+1$.

Proof. □

The Carathéodory theorem establishes that any point in $conv(A(K)) \subset \mathcal{R}^2$ can be represented as a convex combination of 3 points of $A(K)$. Note that the 3 points are from $A(K)$, and each point in $A(K)$ is the addition of K points of A. The next corollary restricts the Carathéodory theorem to the frontier of set $conv(A(K))$.

COROLLARY 1. *The frontier of the polyhedron* $conv(A(K)) \subset \mathcal{R}^2$ *is formed for faces of dimension 0 and 1, then the solution of (22),* $(\overline{\beta}^*, \overline{\alpha}^*)$, *is a convex combination of two points of* $A(K)$. *Assuming that there are no collinear points in the frontier of* $conv(A(K))$.

Proof. □

From the corollary 1 it follows that the solution of (22) is reached in one point of $A(K)$, or in the linear combination of two of them. One consequence of this result is that the solutions only have two or less fractional values. We establish this property in the following proposition.

PROPOSITION 3. *The solution of the problem (20) contains at most two variables with a fractional value.*

Proof. If the solution of (20) is reached in a vertex v of $conv(A(K))$, this point is the addition of K points of A, therefore, exist $S \subset A : |S| = K$ such that $v = \sum_{a_i \in S} a_i$, and $x_i = 1$ if $i \in S$.

If the solution is reached in a face of dimension 1, an arista of $conv(A(K))$, then the solution is a convex combination of two vertex, $v_1 = \sum_{a_i \in S_1} a_i$ and $v_2 = \sum_{a_i \in S_2} a_i$, of $conv(A(K))$, the two vertex defining the arista.

Suppose that $S_1 \cup S_2 > K+1$, i.e., v_1 and v_2 differ in two or more points from A. For example,

$v_1 = a_1 + a_2 + a_5 + \cdots + a_K + a_{K+1} + a_{K+2}$, and $v_2 = a_3 + a_4 + a_5 + \cdots + a_K + a_{K+1} + a_{K+2}$.

The interior point $0.5v_1+0.5v_2=0.5(a_1+a_2)+0.5(a_3+a_4)+a_5+\cdots+a_K+a_{K+1}+a_{K+2}$ can also be written $0.5(a_1+a_3)+0.5(a_4+a_4)+a_5+\cdots+a_K+a_{K+1}+a_{K+2}=0.5(a_1+a_3+a_5+\cdots+a_K+a_{K+1}+a_{K+2})+0.5(a_2+a_4+a_5+\cdots+a_K+a_{K+1}+a_{K+2})=0.5z_1+0.5z_2$, where $z_1, z_2 \in A(K)$. If z_1 and z_2 belong to the interior of $A(K)$, then $0.5v_1+0.5v_2$ is an interior point, also a contradiction. If z_1 or z_2 are vertexs of $conv(A(K))$, then v_1, v_2 and z_1 (or v_1, v_2 and z_2) are collinear points, and this contradicts the supposition that there are no collinear points in the frontier of $conv(A(K))$.

Therefore, a point in the frontier of $conv(A(K))$ is a linear combination at most two points of $A(K)$, and these two points of $A(K)$ differ at most in one point from A. □

Remark: In the multi factor model the solution is also in the frontier, but in this case the dimension of polyhedral facets are less or equal to $|F|$, where $|F|$ is the number of factors. In this case the solution is a combination of $|F|+1$ points (vertices) of $A(K)$, but now, these points (vertices) do not have to be consecutive, consequently they can differ in more than one point from A. It will be seen in the computational experience that the resolution of the factor models problem requires a little time, as in practice the solution of the linear relaxation of EWCCMVFM problem has few fractional variables.

3.2. Algorithm for the Equality weighted cardinality constrained minimum variance portfolio problem for a single factor model

As an alternative to the EWCCMVSF model, in this section we introduce a new algorithm for obtaining a fast solution to this model. The algorithm is based on the next proposition, proposition 4.

Given the set of assets T of cardinality K, the objective function value in (20) (without the constant factor $1/K$) is:

$obj(S)=\sum_{i\in T}\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2+\sigma_f^2\sum_{i,j\in T}\beta_i\beta_j=\sum_{i\in T}\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2+\sigma_f^2\beta_T^2$, where $\beta_T=\sum_{i\in T}\beta_i$.

Let $S\cup\{i\}$ and $S\cup\{j\}$ two sets of cardinality K, differentiating in a single element, then:

$$obj(S\cup\{i\})-obj(S\cup\{j\})=\sigma_{\epsilon_i}^2-\sigma_{\epsilon_j}^2+\sigma_f^2(\beta_S+\beta_i)^2-\sigma_f^2(\beta_S+\beta_j)^2, \tag{23}$$

where $\beta_S=\sum_{i\in S}\beta_i$.

DEFINITION 3. We say that the asset i is better than asset j for set S, $i <<_S j$, if $obj(S \cup \{i\}) \leq obj(S \cup \{j\})$.

PROPOSITION 4. *If exist* $S^* \subset I$ *and* $S \subset I$ *with* $i <<_{S^*} j$ *and* $(\beta_{S^*} - \beta_S)(\beta_i - \beta_j) > 0$, *then* $i <<_S j$.

Proof. If $i <<_{S^*} j$, then $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} - \sigma^2_{\epsilon_j} + \sigma^2_f(\beta_{S^*} + \beta_i)^2 - \sigma^2_f(\beta_{S^*} + \beta_j)^2 < 0$.
Suppose for a contradiction that $i <<_S j$ is not true, then $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j} - \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} + \sigma^2_f(\beta_S + \beta_j)^2 - \sigma^2_f(\beta_S + \beta_i)^2 \leq 0$. By adding the above expressions, we obtain $\sigma^2_f(\beta_{S^*} + \beta_i)^2 - \sigma^2_f(\beta_{S^*} + \beta_j)^2 + \sigma^2_f(\beta_S + \beta_j)^2 - \sigma^2_f(\beta_S + \beta_i)^2 < 0$, then $(\beta_{S^*} - \beta_S)(\beta_i - \beta_j) < 0$, and we have a contradiction, and this proves that if $i <<_{S^*} j$ then $i <<_S j$, with $(\beta_{S^*} - \beta_S)(\beta_i - \beta_j) > 0$. □

The previous proposition allows us to build a constructive heuristic for the EWCCMVSF problem, see algorithm description in Algorithm 1.

Let us describe the algorithm.

As the first step, the algorithm starts with an initial solution, S_0, formed by the assets with less β-value. At the second step, the algorithm identify the asset $j^* \in S_0$, in the set of assets that are selected in the current solution, with the greatest contribution in the objective function. Next, identify the asset $i^* \in \mathcal{I} \setminus S_0$, in the assets that are not selected in the current solution, with the lower contribution. So, if the testing is positive then an improvement of the solution value of model EWCCMVSF can be performed locally by the algorithm from the current solution. Otherwise, the improvement to the current solution could not be performed and the algorithm ends.

Although the algorithm does not guarantee finding the optimal solution to the problem (EWCCMVSF (20)), let us justify its good behaviour. It will also be seen later in the computational experience.

The optimal solution of (20) is a set of K assets, namely S^*. If the asset i belong to S^* then $i <<_{S^* \setminus \{i\}} j$, $\forall j \notin S^*$, i.e, the asset i is better than any j, $j \notin S^*$, combined with the assets of $S^* \setminus \{i\}$. The algorithm starts with a set formed by the assets of lower β. For each asset i present in the optima solution, $i \in S^*$ and not present in S_0, it holds that $(\beta_{S^*} > \beta_{S_0})$ and $(\beta_i > \beta_j)$ for all

$j \in S_0 \setminus S^*$. Therefore , the asset i improves the solution provided by S_0. It is easy to prove that the algorithm will find the optimal solution as long as it removes from the set S_0 an optimal asset $i \in S^*$.

In order to improve the solution provided for the algorithm 1, we have developed a second algorithm, see Algorithm 2. It is possible that the parameter of cardinality imposed was large, obtaining a solution which is worse than for a smaller number of assets. Algorithm 2 looks for the asset in the solution with the largest contribution, and it looks to see if by removing the asset, an improvement is obtained. The algorithm repeats the procedure while improving the solution.

Algorithm 1: Constructive heuristic for the EWCCMVSF problem

input : A set I of N ordered assets (less β_i first, with $i \in I$), and a set

$$A = \left\{(\beta_i \sigma_f, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}), \forall i \in I\right\}.$$

input : Parameter of cardinality K.

1 *Let* $S_0 = \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ *the set of the first* k *assets of* I.

2 **repeat**

3 **for** $j \in S_0$ **do**

4 Calculate $obj(S_0) - obj(S \setminus \{j\}) = \sigma^2_{\epsilon_j} + \sigma^2_f \left((\sum_{k \in S_0} \beta_k)^2 - (\sum_{k \in S_0 : k \neq j} \beta_k)^2 \right)$

5 *Let* $j^* = \arg_{j \in S_0} \max\{obj(S_0) - obj(S \setminus \{j\})\}$, *i.e.,* j^* *is the asset in* $S_0 \subset I$ *with the greater contribution in the objective function.*

6 **for** $i \in I \setminus S_0$ **do**

7 Calculate $obj(S_0) - obj(\{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}\} \cup \{i\}) = \sigma^2_{\epsilon_j} - \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} + \sigma^2_f (\beta_S + \beta_j)^2 - \sigma^2_f (\beta_S + \beta_i)^2$

8 *Let* $i^* = \arg_{i \in I \setminus S_0} \max\{obj(S_0) - obj(\{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}\} \cup \{i\})\}$, *i.e.,* i^* *is the asset in* $I \setminus S_0$ *with the lower contribution in the objective function when asset* j^* *is removed from* S_0.

9 **if** $i^* <<_{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}} j^*$ **then** $S_0 = \{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}\} \cup \{i^*\}$;

10 **until** $j^* <<_{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}} i^*$;

output: Set S_0 of cardinality K.

Algorithm 2: Improving the solution of Algorithm 1

input : A set S_0 from Algorithm 1, and a set $A = \left\{(\beta_i \sigma_f, \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}), \forall i \in S_0 \subset I\right\}$.

repeat

  for $i \in S_0$ **do**

    Calculate $obj(S_0) - obj(S \setminus \{i\}) = \sigma^2_{\epsilon_i} + \sigma^2_f \left((\sum_{k \in S_0} \beta_k)^2 - (\sum_{k \in S_0 : k \neq i} \beta_k)^2 \right)$

  Let $i^* = \arg_{i \in S_0} \max\{obj(S_0) - obj(S \setminus \{i\})\}$*, i.e.,* i^* *is the asset in* $S_0 \subset I$ *with the biggest contribution in the objective function.*

  if $iobj(S_0) > \frac{K^2}{(K-1)^2} obj(S_0 \setminus \{i^*\})$ **then** $S_0 = S_0 \setminus \{i^*\}$, and $K = K - 1$.;

until $j^* <<_{S_0 \setminus \{j^*\}} i^*$;

output: Set S_0 of cardinality K.

4. Computational Results

In this section we present the results obtained from the computational experience. We have generated several instances from the index tracking instances available at the OR-Library (Beasley 1990). A full list of the test datasets in the OR-Library, for a single factor model, can be found in `http://people.brunel.ac.uk/~mastjjb/jeb/orlib/indtrackinfo.html`. The instances selected are indtrack5,6,7 and 8, the biggest. These datasets have been used in several papers, see (Beasley et al. 2003, Canakgoz and Beasley 2009, Chang et al. 2000, Woodside-Oriakhi et al. 2011). Each dataset contains the weekly market price for a set of assets and the market index. Additionally, we have considered for each dataset their four principal components in order to use these components as factors and evaluate the factor models presented in section 2.

The computational experiments were conducted on a PC with 2.9 gigahertz Intel Core i5 processor, 8gigabytes of RAM, and operating system OX. We use the optimization engine CPLEX v12.5.

We have divided the computational experience into three parts. First, we compare the performance of the different models we have proposed for factor models. Next, we repeat the computa-

tional experiment for a single factor model. Finally, we have generated an ad hoc instance to take models and the algorithm to the limit.

4.1. Computational results for a factor models.

For each dataset considered, we have calculated their first four principal components, and then, the β and $\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}$ for each asset in these components (factors). Note that the use of principal components as factors provide factors which are uncorrelated. The computational experience is performed on the following four models: $CCMVFM$, $CCMVFM_{LA}$, $EWCCMVFM$ and $EWCCMVFM_{LA}$. Each dataset is solved for different values of cardinality parameter K. Tables 3-6 show the computational results for the four models in each dataset (the caption of each table collects the dataset name, the market and the number of assets), where the columns for each model and cardinality considered are as follows: $time$, elapsed time to obtain the optimal solution or the time limit of 3600 seconds; obj, solution value; $\%desv = 100(obj(\cdot) - obj(CCMVFM)/obj(CCMVFM))$, deviation of the solution value obtained by the model from the solution of CCMVFM problem; K, the number of assets in the solution of the CCMVFM problem and the number of assets in the solution together with the number of assets that coincide with the solution of the problem CCMVFM; $||w - w^*||_1$, L_1 distance of the solution variables from the solution variables of CCMVFM problem; $SD = \sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}$, standard deviation of each solution, $\%desv$, %deviation of SD for each model respect the model ($CCMVFM$); and SR the ratio return/risk ($w^T R/\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}$) for each model.

Quality evaluation of $CCMVFM_{LA}$ solution. If we focus attention on Table 6 (biggest dataset considered), we can observe the very small elapsed time that is required and the goodness of the solution ($\%desv$) versus the one provided by the model ($CCMVFM$), it is not too-high. You can also observe that CPLEX reaches the time limit (1 h.) in all the instances we have experimented with, for different values of cardinality K, while the elapsed time of the $CCMVFM_{LA}$ problems is one or two orders of magnitude smaller than the CPLEX limit considered. For example, we should point out the instance for cardinality $K = 10$, where the linear approximation model ($CCMVFM_{LA}$) obtains a solution with a deviation of 0.16% from the ($CCMVFM$) model in

approximately 20 seconds, and a 6% better standard deviation than the standard deviation of ($CCMVFM$) model. Despite the fact that the numbers of identical assets in both solutions are only 5 of 10, with a L_1 distance of 0.88. These comments are also valid for the smaller datasets, see Tables 3-5.

Quality evaluation of $EWCCMVFM$ and $EWCCMVFM_{LA}$ solutions. First we can observe the very little elapsed time that is required to obtain the optimal solution of $EWCCMVFM$ and its approximation $EWCCMVFM_{LA}$. In any instance more than 3 seconds is required. The solutions of $EWCCMVFM$ and its approximation are very similar, therefore the $EWCCMVFM_{LA}$ does not provide any advantages to justify its use. In Table 6, the deviation of $EWCCMVFM$ solution from $CCMVFM$ solution varies from 0.48% to 7.55%. This difference comes from imposing the equality weighted constraint on the solution. Nevertheless, the equality weighted solution provides better results, in some instances, when the standard deviation and the ratio return/risk are evaluated. An exception occurs in Table 3, where setting the cardinality parameter K to 20 or 30 forces us to select a larger number of assets when no more than 13 are suitable.

The dimensions of each problem can be obtained from Table 2. Table 7 shows the dimensions of the largest instance considered for each model, which has been obtained from the indtract8.txt dataset; this instance contains $N = 2151$ assets from the Russel 300 index and the parameter of cardinality fixed to 50. The number of segments in the linear approximations have been fixed to $|S_w| = 4 \cdot K + 1 = 4 \cdot 50 + 1 = 201$, and $|S_\beta| = 500$. Although the problem $EWCCMVFM_{LA}$ for this instance has more than four hundred thousand binary variables, CPLEX only needs 155 seconds to solve it.

In summary, from the results obtained by the models, we can deduce from our preliminary computational experimentation that the solution values do not differ too-much. $CCMVFM$ problems require a high elapsed time, while the rest of models are very fast, in fact the elapsed time can be measured in a few seconds.

4.2. Computational results for a single factor model.

We next compare the performance of the models and algorithm we have proposed in section 3 for a single index factor. We have used the same data sets and the index included in them. Additionally, we have replaced the model names with their counterpart names in a a single factor model, and we have replaced also the approximation of $EWCCMVSF$, ($EWCCMVSF_{LA}$), by the algorithms proposed in section 3.

Tables 8-11 show the same information as in Tables 3-6, but for the single factor model.

We first discuss the small instances presented in Table 8. Obviously, in the Small network the time differences between the models are slight. In the instances with cardinality 20 and 30, since we have imposed these parameters of cardinality, the $EWCCMVSF$ model obtains a much worse solution with 20 and 30 asset when the optimal solution for $CCMVSF$ problem is selected only 16 asset. In this sense, the algorithm 2 improves the solution by removing assets from the solution, obtaining as a result a maximum cardinality of 9 assets for this instance.

For the sake of simplicity we now discuss only the biggest instance, Table 11, but similar conclusions can be drawn from the other two sets of instances reported in tables 9 and 10. Our first observation is that the computing time for solving problem ($CCMVSF$) (i.e, the original problem by plain use of CPLEX) is high for all the instances (1 h in our experimentation is the allowed computing time). On the other hand, the linear approximation ($CCMVSF_{LA}$) requires only a few seconds to obtain a solution, while the deviation is only of 0.28% in the worst case (instance with parameter of cardinality $K = 30$), providing even better results in some instances than the solution obtained by the $CCMVSF$ problem. Comparing now the results obtained from the the $EWCCMVSF$ model, the time spent on the $EWCCMVSF$ problem in all the instances is less than three seconds, this is a consequence of the Proposition 3 in section 3. Moreover, the quality of the solutions obtained from ($EWCCMV$) is high, with a deviation of 4.35% in the worst instance and selecting 48 of 50 assets present in the solution of ($CCMVSF$) problem and a L_1 distance of 0.31. The good quality of solutions is also observed in the standard deviation SD a ratio SR of them, all the solutions being close to each other.

From a practical point of view, we have evaluated the validity of the models presented ins this work. We believe that the models, especially the equality weighted models can be helpful to the practitioners to evaluate the best assets to consider and in a posterior analysis to apply other more complex techniques .

Finally, it can be seen in tables 8-11 that when K increases all the measures take similar values.

4.3. An ad hoc instance

In Order to test the models and the algorithm in the case of a more difficult problem, we have built the following instance, called indtrack5678. For a single factor model we added all the β_i and σ_{ϵ_i} from the data sets indtrack5, indtrack6, indtrack7 and indtrack8. This new dataset contains 4151 assets.

In Figure 1 we plot one point for each asset $i \in I$, representing the systematic (β_i) and non-systematic ($\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}$) risk for each of them. In the original dataset (figure on the left) the cloud of points is located around all the graph region. Ideally, one would like to have points near the intersection of axes which represent low risk (systematic and non-systematic). On the other hand, located points not close to the intersection of the axes are dominated for the remaining points, and hopefully these points will not be present in the solution of CCMVFM problem. This feature in the datasets make the instances more treatable, computationally speaking.

We call *ad hoc* instance, the instance indtrack5678 where the assets have been sorted by the systematic risk β_i value (from lowest to highest ones) and matching each β_i value with the non-systematic risk ($\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}$) sorted in reverse order. This *ad hoc* instance provides non dominated assets between them, non dominated in Pareto sense. The cloud of points for the ad-hoc instance (figure on the right) is structured, because all the points are non-dominated. The same consideration taken above is valid here, the best assets are located near to the intersection axes, but now these points are non-dominated among these. Therefore, this new instance is more difficult for the factor models problem than the previous example. In Table 12 we report the results for this structured data set.

First of all, we can see that the algorithm does not provide the optimal solution in 3 of 6 instances. Another important feature in the results is that the $EWCCMV$ model obtains the best

solution in 4 of the 6 instances, exactly for the values of parameter K equal to 5, 10, 20 and 40. The $CCMVSF$ model is the best for the rest of the instances, but requiring one hour of computational time. The solutions obtained suggest multiple alternative choice of assets. For example, in the instance with cardinality 30, the objective solution value of $CCMVSF$ and $EWCCMVSF$ are quite similar (only 0.01% of deviation) but quality speaking are very different, they only have 11 assets in common.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have proposed and analyzed two alternative model to obtain the cardinality constrained minimum-variance portfolio via factor models. The intention in both models is to obtain a linear model in contrast with the quadratic factor model present in the literature. This goal is reached when the factors are uncorrelated. This assumption is not very restrictive in the financial context.

Regarding the comparison of the models, the Equality Weighted cardinality constrained portfolio problem has provided the most promising results, obtaining goods solutions. In terms of computational time, all the instances require less than three second to solve them. On the other hand, the heuristic presented in this paper, when a single factor is considered, obtains the optimal solution in all the instances, with the exception of the ad-hoc instance generated. Therefore, the EWCCMF model and the heuristic approach can be regarded as being superior to the classical factor models in terms of usability; it obtains high quality solutions with little computational time.

Furthermore, since the models presented in this work have provided good results, we also plan to extend these models, for example, when the objective is to minimise a trade-off function risk/return.

Acknowledgments

This work was partly supported by the Spanish Ministry for Economy and Competitiveness, the State Research Agency and the European Regional Development Fund under grant MTM2016-79765-P (AEI/FEDER, UE).

Appendix. Can be solved the EWCCMVSF problem in polynomial time?

DEFINITION 4. A matrix M is a *Monge matrix* if for every pair of rows $i<j$ and for every pair of columns $k<l$ satisfies the *Monge property*

$$M_{ik}+M_{jl}\leq M_{il}+Mjk. \tag{24}$$

DEFINITION 5. A matrix M is called an *inverse Monge matrix* if it satisfies the inverse *Monge property*

$$M_{ik}+M_{jl}\geq M_{il}+Mjk, \quad \text{for all} \quad i<j,\, k<l. \tag{25}$$

Note that a symmetric Monge matrix is called a *Supnick* matrix.

Monge matrices have many applications in combinatorial optimization problems, see (Pferschy et al. 1994, Woeginger 2003, Burkard et al. 1996, Rudolf and Woeginger 1995). For example, the Traveling Salesman Problem (TSP) can be solved in linear time if the underlying distance matrix is a Monge matrix, see (Park 1991).

PROPOSITION 5. *The underlying matrix in (EWCCMVSF (20)) is an inverse Monge matrix.*

Proof. The objective function of the *EWCCMVSF* model can be expressed as

$$\min \quad \frac{1}{K^2}\sum_{i,j\in I}\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_j\right)x_ix_j$$

where $\sum_{i\in I}x_i=K$. The problem (20) is given by the matrix $M_{ij}=\left\{\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_j\right\}_{ij}$. If we consider the ordered set I, i.e, $\beta_1\leq\beta_2,\cdots\leq\beta_n$, is easy to prove that $M_{ik}+M_{jl}\geq M_{il}+M_{jk}$, for all $i<j$ y $k<l$.

$$\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_k}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_k\right)+\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_l}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_j\beta_l\right)\geq\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_l}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_l\right)+\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_k}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_j\beta_k\right)$$

$$\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_k}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_k\right)+\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_l}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_j\beta_l\right)-\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_l}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_l\right)-\left(\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_j}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_k}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_j\beta_k\right)=$$

$$=\sigma^2_f(\beta_i-\beta_j)(\beta_k-\beta_l)\geq 0$$

□

Therefore, finding the equality weighted cardinality constrained portfolio for a single factor model is reduced to finding the K columns/rows in the matrix $\left\{\frac{\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}+\sigma^2_{\epsilon_i}}{2K}+\sigma^2_f\beta_i\beta_j\right\}_{ij}$ with lower cost. An open question is as follows:

Can *the EWCCMVSF problem be solved in polynomial time*?

I did not find the answer to the above question and I suggest that the reader might attempt to answer this.

References

B. Alidaee, F. Glover, G. Kochenberger and H. Wang. Solving the maximum edge weight clique problem via unconstrained quadratic programming. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 181:592–597, 2007.

K.P. Anagnostopoulos and G. Mamanis. The meanvariance cardinality constrained portfolio optimization problem: An experimental evaluation of five multiobjective evolutionary algorithms. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 38:14208–14217, 2011.

D. Bertsimas and R. Shioda. Algorithm for cardinality-constrained quadratic optimization. *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 43:1–22, 2009.

J.E. Beasley, N. Meade and T.J. Chang. An evolutionary heuristic for the index tracking problem. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 148:621–643, 2003.

J.E. Beasley. OR-Library: distributing test problems by electronic mail. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 41:1069–1072, 1990.

D. Bienstock. Computational study of a family of mixed-integer quadratic programming problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 74:121–140, 1996.

N.A.Canakgoz and J.E. Beasley. Mixed-integer programming approaches for index tracking and enhanced indexation. *European Journal of Operational Research* , 196:384–399, 2009.

R.E. Burkard. B. Klinz and R. Rudolf. Perspectives of Monge properties in optimization. *Discrete Applied Mathematics.* 70:95-161, 1996.

C. Carathéodory. Über den Variabilitätsbereich der Koeffizienten von Potenzreihen, die gegebene Werte nicht annehmen. *Mathematische Annalen*, 64:95–115, 1907.

F. Castro, J. Gago, I. Hartillo, J. Puerto and J.M. Ucha. An algebraic approach to integer portfolio problems. *European Journal of Operations Research*, 210: 647–659, 2011.

F. Cesarone, A. Scozzari and F. Tardella. A new method for mean-variance portfolio optimization with cardinality constraints. *J Annals of Operations Research*, 8:213-234, 2013.

T.J. Chang, N. Meade, J.E. Beasley, Y.M. Sharaiha, Heuristics for cardinality constrained portfolio optimisation. *Computers & Operations Research*, 27: 1271–1302, 2000.

V. DeMiguel, L. Garlappi and R. Uppal. Optimal Versus Naive Diversification: How Inefficient is the 1/N Portfolio Strategy? *Review of Financial Studies*, 18, 1219–1251. 2009.

J. Gao and D. Li. Optimal Cardinality Constrained Portfolio Selection. *Operations Research*, 61: 745–761, 2013.

D. Li, X. Sun and J. Wang. Optimal lot solution to cardinality constrained mean-variance formulation for portfolio selection. *Mathematical Finance*, 16:83–101, 2006.

E.M. Macambira and C.C. de Souza. The edge-weighted clique problem: Valid inequalities, facets and polyhedral computations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 123:346-371, 2000.

R. Mansini, W. Ogryczak and M. Grazia-Speranza. Twenty years of linear programming based portfolio optimization. *European Journal of Operations Research*, 234: 518–535, 2014.

H.M. Markowitz. Portfolio Selection. *Journal of Finance*, 7: 77–91.

D. Maringer and H. Kellerer. Optimization of cardinality constrained portfolios with a hybrid local search algorithm. *OR Spectrum*, 25:481–495, 2003.

J.K. Park. A special case of the n-vertex traveling salesman problem that can be solved in O(n) time. *Inf. Process. Lett.* 40:247-254, 1991.

U. Pferschy, R. Rudolf and G. Woeginger. Monge matrices make maximization manageable. *Operations Research Letters.* 16:245-254,1994.

R. Rudolf and G. Woeginger. The Cone of Monge Matrices: Extremal Rays and Applications. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research.* 42:161-168, 1995.

W.F. Sharpe. A simplified model for portfolio analysis. *Management Science*, 9:277–293, 1963.

W.F. Sharpe. Capital asset prices: A theory of market equilibrium under condition of risk. *Journal of Finance*, 19:425–442, 1964.

D.X. Shaw, S. Liu and L. Kopman. Lagrangian relaxation procedure for cardinality- constrained portfolio optimization. *Optimization Methods & Software*, 23:411–420, 2008.

Woeginger, G.J. Computational problems without computation. Nieuw Archief voor Wiskunde. 2:140-147, 2003

M. Woodside-Oriakhi , C. Lucas and J.E. Beasley. Heuristic algorithms for the cardinality constrained efficient frontier. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 213:538–550, 2011.

Model	*Linear* pure 01	*Quadratic* pure 01	*Quadratic* *mixed* 01
$CCMVFM$	-	-	UFM, CFM
$CCMVFM_{LA}$	UFM	CFM	-
$EWCCMVFM$	-	UFM, CFM	-
$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	UFM	CFM	-

UFM; Uncorrelated Factor Models. CFM; Correlated Factor Models

Table 1 Classification Models

Model	$n01$	nc	m
$CCMVFM$	N	N	$N+2$
$CCMVFM_{LA}$	$N \cdot \lvert S_w \rvert + NF \cdot \lvert S_\beta \rvert$	-	$N+2NF+2$
$EWCCMVFM$	N	-	1
$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	$N + NF \cdot \lvert S_\beta \rvert$	-	$2NF+2$

$|S_w| = 4 \cdot K + 1$, and $|S_\beta| = 500$

Table 2 Dimension Models




Figure 1 Indtrack5,6,7,8: Systematic (β_i) and nonsystematic (σ_{ϵ_i}) Risk

$N = 225$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVFM$	0.11	0.01939		5		0.01971		0.00000
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	0.90	0.01941	0.10 %	5 - 5	0.21	0.02024	2.73 %	-0.00419
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.03	0.01967	1.37 %	5 - 5	0.24	0.02006	1.78 %	-0.00315
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.04	0.01968	1.40 %	5 - 5	0.24	0.02006	1.78 %	-0.00315
$K = 10$	$CCMVFM$	0.12	0.01886		10		0.01945		0.01633
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	0.82	0.01897	0.61 %	10 - 8	0.39	0.01998	2.74 %	0.00942
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.07	0.01967	4.30 %	10 - 8	0.71	0.02029	4.30 %	-0.00263
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.09	0.01967	4.32 %	10 - 8	0.71	0.02029	4.30 %	-0.00263
$K = 20$	$CCMVFM$	0.06	0.01882		13		0.01938		0.01180
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	1.45	0.01887	0.26 %	15 - 13	0.17	0.01970	1.62 %	0.00855
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.31	0.02064	9.63 %	20 - 13	0.98	0.02112	8.97 %	-0.00513
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.20	0.02064	9.66 %	20 - 13	0.98	0.02112	8.97 %	-0.00513
$K = 30$	$CCMVFM$	0.03	0.01882		13		0.01938		0.01180
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	1.66	0.01887	0.25 %	15 - 13	0.17	0.01958	1.04 %	0.00874
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.36	0.02170	15.31 %	30 - 13	1.22	0.02200	13.52 %	0.00376
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.20	0.02171	15.32 %	30 - 13	1.22	0.02200	13.52 %	0.00376

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 3 indtrack5.txt Nikkei 225 index. N=225

$N = 457$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVFM$	653.98	0.02030		5		0.02272		0.13508
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	4.90	0.02043	0.66 %	5 - 3	1.15	0.02308	1.59 %	0.13842
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.28	0.02174	7.09 %	5 - 2	1.20	0.02240	-1.40 %	0.14915
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.27	0.02175	7.14 %	5 - 2	1.20	0.02240	-1.40 %	0.14915
$K = 10$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.01703		10		0.01830		0.13563
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	1.33	0.01712	0.51 %	10 - 8	0.51	0.01948	6.45 %	0.16445
	$EWCCMVFM$	1.23	0.01813	6.46 %	10 - 6	0.80	0.01914	4.54 %	0.14137
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.30	0.01814	6.48 %	10 - 5	1.00	0.01942	6.08 %	0.15028
$K = 20$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.0155		20		0.01681		0.16360
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	3.06	0.01553	0.17 %	20 - 18	0.29	0.01769	5.26 %	0.16235
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.76	0.01603	3.42 %	20 - 16	0.57	0.01790	6.50 %	0.14760
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.13	0.01604	3.49 %	20 - 16	0.57	0.01790	6.50 %	0.14760
$K = 30$	$CCMVFM$	2.93	0.01510		30		0.01718		0.15862
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	5.41	0.01525	0.95 %	30 - 30	0.22	0.01757	2.31 %	0.15265
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.26	0.01564	3.53 %	30 - 26	0.48	0.01782	3.73 %	0.17109
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.18	0.01565	3.65 %	30 - 25	0.54	0.01781	3.70 %	0.16706

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 4 indtrack6.txt S&P 500 index. N=457

$N = 1318$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.01134		5		0.01298		0.10390
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	33.96	0.01205	6.24 %	5 - 3	0.85	0.01446	11.45 %	0.09846
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.87	0.01149	1.30 %	5 - 4	0.46	0.01235	-4.83 %	0.10731
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.16	0.01150	1.42 %	5 - 5	0.12	0.01299	0.10 %	0.10520
$K = 10$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00904		10		0.01124		0.11999
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	13.63	0.00931	2.98 %	10 - 8	0.37	0.01128	0.33 %	0.12247
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.58	0.00918	1.49 %	10 - 8	0.48	0.01102	-1.94 %	0.15623
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.15	0.00924	2.14 %	10 - 9	0.29	0.01068	-5.01 %	0.13644
$K = 20$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00729		20		0.00982		0.13600
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	45.96	0.00765	4.89 %	20 - 15	0.58	0.00968	-1.45 %	0.17680
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.55	0.00741	1.54 %	20 - 18	0.31	0.00978	-0.47 %	0.12624
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.15	0.00753	3.30 %	20 - 19	0.26	0.01018	3.61 %	0.13306
$K = 30$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00656		30		0.00914		0.16385
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	155.05	0.00697	6.36 %	30 - 22	0.61	0.00943	3.13 %	0.21373
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.89	0.00676	3.11 %	30 - 25	0.40	0.00950	3.93 %	0.15389
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.19	0.00686	4.65 %	30 - 25	0.41	0.00923	0.94 %	0.15019
$K = 40$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00621		40		0.00849		0.19668
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	195.53	0.00660	6.26 %	40 - 31	0.50	0.00895	5.34 %	0.22163
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.75	0.00650	4.71 %	40 - 33	0.48	0.00915	7.75 %	0.16893
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.33	0.00659	6.11 %	40 - 34	0.41	0.00874	2.92 %	0.18297
$K = 50$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00603		50		0.00867		0.19824
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	183.74	0.00642	6.50 %	50 - 41	0.40	0.00863	-0.36 %	0.19161
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.60	0.00643	6.65 %	50 - 42	0.53	0.00903	4.15 %	0.20117
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.13	0.00654	8.37 %	50 - 42	0.52	0.00911	5.11 %	0.19687

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 5 indtrack7.txt Russel 2000 index. N=1318

$N = 2151$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.01173		5		0.01141		0.10210
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	115.95	0.01207	2.91 %	5 - 4	0.76	0.01372	20.24 %	0.10374
	$EWCCMVFM$	1.49	0.01190	1.47 %	5 - 3	0.82	0.01197	4.84 %	0.07009
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.43	0.01192	1.63 %	5 - 3	0.82	0.01266	10.95 %	0.06949
$K = 10$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00927		10		0.01127		0.11764
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	19.46	0.00928	0.16 %	10 - 5	0.88	0.01058	-6.10 %	0.10693
	$EWCCMVFM$	0.98	0.00931	0.48 %	10 - 6	0.83	0.00999	-11.35 %	0.14778
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.30	0.00940	1.39 %	10 - 5	1.03	0.01008	-10.52 %	0.17230
$K = 20$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00720		20		0.00968		0.13191
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	50.84	0.00733	1.82 %	20 - 15	0.51	0.00936	-3.27 %	0.16734
	$EWCCMVFM$	1.68	0.00753	4.60 %	20 - 13	0.76	0.00961	-0.78 %	0.15225
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.37	0.00751	4.23 %	20 - 14	0.67	0.00949	-1.99 %	0.15928
$K = 30$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00644		30		0.00927		0.15817
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	102.04	0.00655	1.71 %	30 - 21	0.54	0.00881	-4.95 %	0.17737
	$EWCCMVFM$	1.66	0.00679	5.54 %	30 - 21	0.68	0.00933	0.71 %	0.17964
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.71	0.00674	4.75 %	30 - 20	0.73	0.00909	-1.86 %	0.17367
$K = 40$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00602		40		0.00926		0.17618
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	138.7	0.00615	2.19 %	40 - 32	0.41	0.00869	-6.14 %	0.18834
	$EWCCMVFM$	1.83	0.00639	6.17 %	40 - 30	0.65	0.00951	2.78 %	0.17404
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.68	0.00635	5.50 %	40 - 32	0.56	0.00903	-2.49 %	0.18674
$K = 50$	$CCMVFM$	3600.00	0.00579		50		0.00976		0.17368
	$CCMVFM_{LA}$	155.21	0.00593	2.44 %	50 - 43	0.31	0.00905	-7.29 %	0.19553
	$EWCCMVFM$	2.74	0.00622	7.55 %	50 - 38	0.63	0.00916	-6.19 %	0.19066
	$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	0.48	0.00622	7.49 %	50 - 38	0.63	0.00925	-5.22 %	0.18851

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 6 indtrack8.txt Russel 3000 index. N=2151

$Model$	$n01$	nc	m
$CCMVFM$	2151	2151	2153
$CCMVFM_{LA}$	434351	-	2161
$EWCCMVFM$	2151	-	1
$EWCCMVFM_{LA}$	4151	-	10

Table 7 Dimension Model for $N = 2151$ and $K = 50$.

$N = 225$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVSF$	0.26	0.01820		5		0.01893		0.03109
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.13	0.01824	0.21 %	5 - 4	0.39	0.0193	1.92 %	0.03648
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.02	0.01831	0.61 %	5 - 5	0.15	0.0193	1.94 %	0.02940
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01831	0.61 %	5 - 5	0.15	0.0193	1.94 %	0.02940
$K = 10$	$CCMVSF$	0.08	0.01736		10		0.01794		0.04348
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.17	0.01738	0.14 %	10 - 10	0.10	0.01825	1.72 %	0.04162
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.02	0.01766	1.71 %	10 - 10	0.32	0.01833	2.15 %	0.05960
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01763	1.55 %	9 - 9	0.31	0.01809	0.85 %	0.04647
$K = 20$	$CCMVSF$	0.03	0.01730		16		0.01816		0.04792
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.34	0.01732	0.09 %	17 - 16	0.08	0.01831	0.84 %	0.05180
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.02	0.01836	6.14 %	20 - 16	0.86	0.01936	6.58 %	0.06977
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01763	1.90 %	9 - 9	0.41	0.01809	-0.37 %	0.04647
$K = 30$	$CCMVSF$	0.03	0.01730		16		0.01816		0.04792
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.39	0.01732	0.09 %	19 - 16	0.09	0.01826	0.55 %	0.04999
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.02	0.01931	11.63 %	30 - 16	1.16	0.02027	11.60 %	0.05360
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01763	1.90 %	9 - 9	0.41	0.01809	-0.37 %	0.04647

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 8 indtrack5.txt Nikkei 225 index. N=225

$N = 457$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVSF$	1402.49	0.01299		5		0.02198		0.06554
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.23	0.01301	0.17 %	5 - 5	0.05	0.02190	-0.37 %	0.06486
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.07	0.01313	1.06 %	5 - 5	0.13	0.02252	2.49 %	0.06470
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01313	1.06 %	5 - 5	0.13	0.02252	2.49 %	0.06470
$K = 10$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00985		10		0.02185		0.07077
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.33	0.00986	0.14 %	10 - 9	0.22	0.02342	7.21 %	0.06589
	$EWCCMVSF$	1.15	0.00992	0.77 %	10 - 10	0.10	0.02227	1.91 %	0.07036
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.00992	0.77 %	10 - 10	0.10	0.02227	1.91 %	0.07036
$K = 20$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00775		20		0.02085		0.07614
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.56	0.00776	0.13 %	20 - 19	0.11	0.02061	-1.16 %	0.07771
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.95	0.00783	1.01 %	20 - 19	0.20	0.02049	-1.73 %	0.07752
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.00783	1.01 %	20 - 19	0.20	0.02049	-1.73 %	0.07752
$K = 30$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00703		30		0.02024		0.07604
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.74	0.00704	0.12 %	30 - 29	0.08	0.02099	3.73 %	0.07390
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.74	0.00722	2.69 %	30 - 29	0.24	0.02020	-0.19 %	0.07605
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.00722	2.69 %	30 - 29	0.24	0.02020	-0.19 %	0.07605

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 9 indtrack6.txt S&P 500 index. N=457

$N = 1318$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.01104		5		0.01221		0.10533
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.52	0.01105	0.05 %	5 - 5	0.03	0.01247	2.13 %	0.10567
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.67	0.01111	0.64 %	5 - 5	0.10	0.01220	-0.14 %	0.10625
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.01111	0.64 %	5 - 5	0.10	0.01220	-0.14 %	0.10625
$K = 10$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00867		10		0.01065		0.11182
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	1.19	0.00866	-0.15 %	10 - 8	0.39	0.01069	0.38 %	0.12050
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.99	0.00873	0.71 %	10 - 8	0.44	0.01110	4.23 %	0.12488
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.00	0.00873	0.71 %	10 - 8	0.44	0.01110	4.23 %	0.12488
$K = 20$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00690		20		0.00931		0.15070
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	3.14	0.00692	0.39 %	20 - 19	0.14	0.00931	0.02 %	0.15643
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.56	0.00702	1.80 %	20 - 20	0.17	0.00941	1.07 %	0.14976
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00702	1.80 %	20 - 20	0.17	0.00941	1.07 %	0.14976
$K = 30$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00616		30		0.00880		0.17744
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	4.41	0.00619	0.46 %	30 - 28	0.13	0.00897	1.96 %	0.17802
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.45	0.00627	1.82 %	30 - 28	0.27	0.00902	2.48 %	0.17907
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00627	1.82 %	30 - 28	0.27	0.00902	2.48 %	0.17907
$K = 40$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00577		40		0.00881		0.19180
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	5.17	0.00579	0.35 %	40 - 38	0.13	0.00899	2.07 %	0.18897
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.46	0.00596	3.29 %	40 - 37	0.30	0.00888	0.84 %	0.18926
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00596	3.29 %	40 - 37	0.30	0.00888	0.84 %	0.18926
$K = 50$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00554		50		0.00865		0.20516
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	5.86	0.00557	0.58 %	50 - 47	0.15	0.00883	2.12 %	0.21575
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.41	0.00578	4.35 %	50 - 48	0.31	0.00906	4.81 %	0.19987
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00578	4.35 %	50 - 48	0.31	0.00906	4.81 %	0.19987

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 10 indtrack7.txt Russel 2000 index. N=1318

$N = 2151$		Solution							
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$	SD	$\%desv$	SR
$K = 5$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.01048		5		0.01193		0.11668
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	0.92	0.01049	0.11 %	5 - 5	0.06	0.01226	2.78 %	0.11645
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.92	0.01057	0.89 %	5 - 5	0.13	0.01192	-0.06 %	0.11939
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.01057	0.89 %	5 - 5	0.13	0.01192	-0.06 %	0.11939
$K = 10$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00833		10		0.01172		0.11569
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	1.78	0.00818	-1.75 %	10 - 6	0.74	0.01155	-1.4 %	0.11382
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.36	0.00828	-0.55 %	10 - 7	0.64	0.01167	-0.39 %	0.10813
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00828	-0.55 %	10 - 7	0.64	0.01167	-0.39 %	0.10813
$K = 20$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00635		20		0.01187		0.11308
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	4.91	0.00636	0.16 %	20 - 19	0.13	0.01146	-3.39 %	0.1191
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.87	0.00645	1.52 %	20 - 18	0.32	0.01265	6.58 %	0.10659
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.04	0.00645	1.52 %	20 - 18	0.32	0.01265	6.58 %	0.10659
$K = 30$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00555		30		0.01226		0.11084
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	14.15	0.00556	0,28 %	30 - 29	0,1	0,01233	0,62 %	0,10308
	$EWCCMVSF$	0,51	0,00563	1,36 %	30 - 29	0,19	0,01261	2,89 %	0,10829
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0,01	0,00563	1,36 %	30 - 29	0,19	0,01261	2,89 %	0,10829
$K = 40$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0,00512		40		0,01237		0,12275
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	26,58	0,00512	-0,04 %	40 - 37	0,19	0,01283	3,72 %	0,11696
	$EWCCMVSF$	3,19	0,00519	1,39 %	40 - 34	0,41	0,01281	3,56 %	0,10080
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0,04	0,00519	1,39 %	40 - 34	0,41	0,01281	3,56 %	0.10080
$K = 50$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.00480		50		0.01232		0.12428
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	12.50	0.00481	0.21 %	50 - 48	0.10	0.01239	0.58 %	0.12879
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.52	0.00491	2.22 %	50 - 47	0.27	0.01224	-0.63 %	0.13159
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.01	0.00491	2.22 %	50 - 47	0.27	0.01224	-0.63 %	0.13159

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 11 indtrack8.txt Russel 3000 index. N=2151

$N = 4151$		Solution				
	$Model$	$time$	obj	$\%desv$	K	$\|\|w - w^*\|\|_1$
$K = 5$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.030696		5	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	20.01	0.030205	-1.60 %	5 - 0	2.00
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.21	0.030203	-1.61 %	5 - 2	1.20
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.030203	-1.61 %	5 - 2	1.20
$K = 10$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.025344		10	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	5.48	0.025184	-0.63 %	10 - 2	1.61
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.43	0.025180	-0.65 %	10 - 4	1.21
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.025196	-0.58 %	10 - 4	1.21
$K = 20$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.022003		20	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	149.73	0.020957	-4.75 %	20 - 0	2.00
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.30	0.020957	-4.76 %	20 - 0	2.00
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.020960	-4.74 %	20 - 0	2.00
$K = 30$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.018621		30	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	286.09	0.018624	0.02 %	30 - 10	1.33
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.25	0.018624	0.01 %	30 - 11	1.22
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.018624	0.01 %	30 - 11	1.22
$K = 40$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.016955		40	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	106.10	0.016962	0.04%	40 - 32	0.41
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.23	0.016954	-0.01%	40 - 34	0.30
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.016954	-0.01%	40 - 34	0.30
$K = 50$	$CCMVSF$	3600.00	0.015727		50	
	$CCMVSF_{LA}$	26.18	0.015746	0.12%	50 - 37	0.57
	$EWCCMVSF$	0.26	0.015745	0.11%	50 - 35	0.63
	Alg. (1) + Alg. (2)	0.03	0.015745	0.12%	50 - 40	0.43

Time limit 3600 sec.

Table 12 indtrack5,6,7,8.txt N=4151