

Cleaning the covariance matrix of strongly nonstationary systems with time-independent eigenvalues

Christian Bongiorno and Damien Challet

*Université Paris-Saclay, CentraleSupélec, Laboratoire de Mathématiques et Informatique pour la Complexité et les Systèmes, 91192 Gif-sur-Yvette, France**

Grégoire Loeper

BNP Paribas,

20 boulevard des Italiens, 75009 Paris, France†

(Dated: November 29, 2021)

We propose a data-driven way to clean covariance matrices in strongly nonstationary systems. Our method rests on long-term averaging of optimal eigenvalues obtained from temporally contiguous covariance matrices, which encodes the average influence of the future on present eigenvalues. This zero-th order approximation outperforms optimal methods designed for stationary systems.

Covariance matrices are central pillars of multivariate dependence modelling. In the simplest case, a system of interest is stationary and produces Gaussian features. Even in these favorable circumstances, estimating covariance matrices is hard when the number of data points is comparable with the number of features, which is called the curse of dimensionality. Covariance cleaning has a long history in Physics. For example Random Matrix Theory provides a way to separate the eigenvalues of the correlation matrix into a random bulk and significant ones [8, 13, 15]. More recently, the scientific community reached a consensus about the optimal way to clean covariance matrices when one only modifies their eigenvalues, yielding so-called optimal Rotationally Invariant Estimators (RIE) [3, 4, 6, 9, 10], which minimize the distance between the true covariance matrix and the RIE-filtered one. The optimality proof relies on three assumptions: i) the ground truth does not change (stationary systems), ii) the data matrix is very large, and iii) the data has finite fourth moments.

The most interesting complex systems are rarely stationary and often produce heavy-tailed features. Environmental systems, ecosystems and many socio-economic systems are nonstationary in essence. For example, competition for scarce resources is a driver of evolution which is a source of intrinsic instability, as exemplified by financial markets [7, 12, 16]. This paper shows that the optimal stationary RIE ceases to be optimal in nonstationary systems and proposes instead a very simple cleaning method of nonstationary covariance matrices that rests on the averaging of the way the eigenvalues of correlation matrices evolve in time. In other words, we show that the eigenvalues of strongly nonstationary systems may be filtered in a systematic way that is approximately time-invariant.

The setup is as follows: at time t , one needs to predict the covariance matrix of N time-series (features) $r_{t',i}$

in the test interval $[t, t + \delta_{\text{test}}[$ from the train interval $[t - \delta_{\text{train}}, t[$. One first estimates the empirical covariance matrix of the train interval, denoted by $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{train}}$. The aim of covariance matrix filtering is to bring $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{train}}$ as close as possible to the realized $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}$, that is, to minimize the Frobenius distance $\|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{train}}\|_F$, defined as the average element-wise squared element difference.

Consider the spectral decomposition $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{train}} = V_{\text{train}} \Lambda_{\text{train}} V_{\text{train}}^\dagger$, where V_{train} is the $N \times N$ eigenvector matrix and $\Lambda_{\text{train}} = (\lambda_i \delta_{ij})$ is the diagonal matrix of eigenvalues. By convention, the eigenvalues are sorted so that $\lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N$. The RIE cleaning approach consists in keeping the eigenvector V_{train} and finding new eigenvalues Λ_{opt} such that the filtered covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}} = V_{\text{train}} \Lambda_{\text{opt}} V_{\text{train}}^\dagger$ minimizes the Frobenius norm $\|\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{opt}} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}\|_F$. If the empirical test covariance matrix were known, the optimal (Oracle) eigenvalues would equal

$$\Lambda_{\text{opt}} = \text{diag}(V_{\text{train}}^\dagger \hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}} V_{\text{train}}), \quad (1)$$

where the $\text{diag}(X)$ operator sets to zero all the non-diagonal elements of X . This equation makes it clear that the future contains valuable information to clean $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}$. In a stationary world, however, Refs [1, 4, 9] provide an unbiased estimator of Λ_{opt} that does not require the knowledge of $\hat{\Sigma}_{\text{test}}$, which will be denoted by NLS (Non-Linear Shrinkage) henceforth.

In a nonstationary world, Eq. (1) encodes the link between the past and the future in an RIE setting. In a strongly nonstationary system, computing the Oracle eigenvalues exactly for a generic time t and intervals δ_{train} and δ_{test} may be impossible. Even computing analytically the average Λ_{opt} may be impossible.

We propose instead a purely data-driven approach to estimate the average Λ_{opt} . Because Λ_{opt} are the Oracle eigenvalues, we call our method the average Oracle (henceforth AO). The average Oracle eigenvalues are computed over multiple sub-sampling of consecutive train and test periods: we select B random times $t^{(b)}$ in the full historical data set; the train and test intervals are defined as $[t^{(b)} - \delta_{\text{train}}, t^{(b)}[$ and $[t^{(b)}, t^{(b)} + \delta_{\text{test}}[$ respectively. Each

* christian.bongiorno@centralesupelec.fr;

damien.challet@centralesupelec.fr

† gregoire.loeper@bnpparibas.com

sub-sampling has an associated set of Oracle eigenvalues

$$\Lambda_{opt}^{(b)} = \text{diag}(V_{\text{train}}^{(b)\dagger} \hat{\Sigma}^{(b)}_{\text{test}} V_{\text{train}}^{(b)}). \quad (2)$$

The average Oracle is then defined in a rank-wise fashion: the k -th eigenvalue is

$$\Lambda_{AO,k} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \Lambda_{opt,k}^{(b)}. \quad (3)$$

Finally, the AO-filtered matrix is given by

$$\Sigma_{AO} = V_{\text{train}}^\dagger \Lambda_{AO} V_{\text{train}}.$$

The empirical eigenvalues from the train interval are completely discarded and replaced by the AO ones. We emphasize that the train eigenvectors encode some information about the structure of dependence.

Once the average Oracle eigenvalues are computed, they are constant and do not depend on the data in the train interval: we thus propose to tackle non-stationarity with a time-invariant eigenvalue cleaning scheme. This is a zero-th order approximation, as the fluctuations of Λ_{opt} around Λ_{AO} most probably contain valuable additional information. Nevertheless, this approximation is a powerful filtering tool and is easily computed from data without any modelling assumption about the underlying system. The crucial ingredient of AO is to keep the dependence on the average eigenvalue on its rank.

In practice, whether AO or NLS perform better depends on the relative importance of non-stationarity with respect to curse-of-dimensionality estimation problems. Thus, we expect that the answer is system- and time-dependent.

In some nonstationary systems, the order of magnitude of univariate variances Σ_{ii} also strongly depend on time. Therefore, we focus on the eigenvalue correction of the correlation matrix, which removes one source of non-stationarity. We use data from financial markets which display abrupt changes of both the variance of individual asset price changes [11] and of the correlation matrices [14].

In the following, we use about 25 years of daily data for $N = 1000$ assets from the US stock market. The calibration period over which Λ_{AO} is computed ranges from 1995 to 2005. We take $B = 10000$ random times $t^{(b)}$. For the sake of computation speed, we take $n < N$ assets; for each time $t^{(b)}$, we select a random subset of n assets that have less than 20% of zero or missing returns. In addition, we require that no pair of assets in our subset have a in-sample correlation coefficient larger than 0.95. Because we also randomize asset selection, the resulting Average Oracle eigenvalues can be applied to any selection of assets (and to other markets, as we show below). The alternative choice of constant feature set (e.g. assets) is also a valid possibility. The resulting AO eigenvalues are reported in Fig. 1.

The first way to compare the performance of both the stationary-optimal NLS and the nonstationary-minded




FIG. 1. Inverse average Oracle eigenvalues as a function of the eigenvalue rank for $n = 100$ and various train window size. US financial data; $B = 10000$ sub-intervals in the 1995-2006 period.




FIG. 2. Average Frobenius distance between the filtered and test covariance matrices as a function of the calibration window length in the out-of-sample period. The upper plot refers to the original data set; the lower plot to the stationaryized data. 100 portfolios with random $n = 100$ assets are computed for each day of the out-of-sample.

AO is to compute the average Frobenius norm in the out-of-sample period (2006 – 2018). We carried out extensive simulations with various $\delta_{\text{train}}, \delta_{\text{test}} \in \{40, \dots, 500\}$, selecting $n = 100$ assets for each day, 100 random asset selections from the available assets in the out-of-sample period. We compared the average Oracle approach with an efficient and probably good numerical implementation of the optimal NLS RIE [1, 5] based on cross-validation (thus known as CV) within the train window.

The average Frobenius norm in the out-of-sample period




FIG. 3. Average realized volatility of Global Minimum Variance portfolios as a function of the calibration window length. The upper plot refers to the original dataset; the lower plot to the stationary data. 100 portfolios with random $n = 100$ assets are computed for each day of the out-of-sample.

for NLS and AO is reported in the upper plot of Fig. 2. AO clearly does better than NLS, even if the latter is designed to minimize this norm in the stationary case. For the sake of completeness, we also added the unrealistic case where the Oracle eigenvalues are computed from the future as in Eq. (1), which shows how much the AO could still be improved with a higher-order cleaning scheme.

It is easy to check that the superior performance of the Average Oracle is mainly due to nonstationarity. Indeed, let us stationarize data in each train and test intervals defined from $t^{(b)}$ when computing the Average Oracle by shuffling the days in the $[t^{(b)} - \delta_{\text{train}}, t^{(b)} + \delta_{\text{test}}]$ period and then taking the first δ_{train} shuffled days as the train period. We then compute the Average Oracle on stationarized data and measure the Frobenius distance on stationarized data as well. This time (Fig. 2, bottom plot), the NLS method clearly outperforms the average oracle, as it should. Thus, the advantage of the Average Oracle is precisely that it captures some part of the average dynamics that is discarded by the assumption of stationarity.

The covariance matrix is a central quantity in multivariate inference problems. Because the Average Oracle leads to appreciably better estimation of the covariance matrices in strongly nonstationary systems, we expect its domain of application to be wide. A canonical application of covariance matrices in a financial context is global minimum-variance portfolio optimization. The aim is to minimize the realized variance of the value of a portfolio of assets from the knowledge of data in the train interval.

Mathematically, a portfolio is defined by the fraction w_i of wealth invested into each available asset $i = 1, \dots, N$. In other words, the performance of a portfolio with weights $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the weighted sum of the performance of all the assets, i.e., $r_P = \sum_{i=1}^N w_i r_i$, where r_i is the price return of asset i , and its variance is $w^\dagger \Sigma w$. Practically, the weights are computed from the data in the train window and the covariance is that of the test window, thus the realized portfolio volatility σ_P is given by

$$(\sigma_P)^2 = w^\dagger \hat{\Sigma}^{\text{test}} w. \quad (4)$$

Minimizing σ_P is easier if the distance between Σ^{train} and Σ^{test} is small, hence the importance of the Frobenius norm (see Fig. 2). The optimization problem usually adds the normalization constraint $\sum_{i=1}^N w_i = 1$. Simple computations lead to the optimal weights

$$w^* = \frac{\Sigma^{-1} \mathbb{1}}{\mathbb{1}^\dagger \Sigma^{-1} \mathbb{1}}. \quad (5)$$

This defines the Global Minimum Variance Portfolio problem (GMV). Thus portfolio optimization also requires that the inverse of the covariance matrix (the precision matrix) is also well filtered. For example, the optimal weights are much influenced by the smallest eigenvalues of Σ .

Figure 3 shows that the realized volatility of GMV portfolios is smaller when using the average Oracle than when using CV, as expected from the Frobenius norm. However, AO is also better than the Oracle eigenvalues when $\delta_{\text{train}} < 270$, which may come from the fact that the AO is less noisy.

We use the same way to check the importance of non-stationarity. The average Oracle still outperforms the Oracle and NLS for small enough δ_{train} . This means that the Frobenius distance is not a sufficient cost function when it comes to finding the best way to clean covariance matrices in a view to perform portfolio optimization. A subtle point here is that we filter the correlation matrix eigenvalues, while the interplay between the dynamics of univariate variances and the correlation matrix eigenvalues plays a role in explaining the differences of portfolio performance.

We also checked that the average Oracle outperforms the stationary-optimal NLS estimator most of time by plotting the average realized volatility as a function of time (Fig. 4): There are only a few periods during which AO losses to NLS, and there seems to be no difference between the AO calibration period (until 2005) and the testing period (from 2006).

As a final test, we applied the average Oracle calibrated with US data to Hong-Kong equity data and found qualitatively similar data (see S.I.). This strongly suggests that the AO captures a systematic nonstationary effect found in two different nonstationary systems.

Interestingly, the average Oracle and CV share a common ingredient. Indeed, CV does compute the average




FIG. 4. Difference of realized volatility as a function time between NLS and the average Oracle. $N = 100$, averages over 100 portfolios per date.

Oracle eigenvalues of bootstrapped calibration and out-of-sample periods restricted to δ^{train} , whereas the average Oracle method uses 20 years of data and respects causality (time ordering) between the calibration and the out-of-sample time windows. Causality needs to be conserved in nonstationary systems.

The fact that the average Oracle only very rarely leads to worse portfolios suggests that there is not much additional information to be exploited from the fluctuations of the eigenvalues around their historical averages. To test this hypothesis, we trained a 3-layer perceptron that took as input the eigenvalues and the inverse participation ratio of their respective eigenvectors and that learned the Oracle eigenvalues (see S.I.). Generating train and test correlation matrices in the same way as above, we found that the eigenvalues predicted by the neural network are essentially independent from the input values: the neural network learns the average eigenvalues as well. While this is not a formal proof, it is a strong indication that the

average information from the future regarding eigenvalues is far more important than the empirical eigenvalues.

We note that CV can also be applied to z-scores of asset price returns instead of on the return themselves. In this case, we find that CV leads to the same GMV portfolio variance on average. This means that the average Oracle provides a hands-off approach to covariance cleaning and does not require complex computations. Once calibrated, the AO is very fast.

I. CONCLUSIONS

The average Oracle is a first step towards accounting for non-stationarities when filtering covariance matrices, as it is a zero-order correction. Any additional knowledge about the underlying system may help design higher-order corrections to covariance matrices. This knowledge may not come from the covariance matrix itself, but from possibly higher-order dependence measures, such as triads, which are much better at predicting the instability of the sign of correlation coefficients (see for example Ref. [2]).

The fact that the average influence of the future on the correlation eigenvalues is more informative than the empirical eigenvalues themselves in strongly nonstationary systems suggests that an element of caution should be taken when using filtering methods whose assumptions do not hold.

An important extension of this work is to quantify how much exploitable information lies in the fluctuations of the Oracle eigenvalues around their averages, i.e., how to mix the Average Oracle eigenvalues with the empirical ones from the train period.

-
- [1] Daniel Bartz. Cross-validation based nonlinear shrinkage. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.00798*, 2016.
 - [2] Christian Bongiorno and Damien Challet. Nonparametric sign prediction of high-dimensional correlation matrix coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.11214*, 2020.
 - [3] Joël Bun, Romain Allez, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and Marc Potters. Rotational invariant estimator for general noisy matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(12):7475–7490, 2016.
 - [4] Joël Bun, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and Marc Potters. Cleaning large correlation matrices: tools from random matrix theory. *Physics Reports*, 666:1–109, 2017.
 - [5] Joël Bun, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and Marc Potters. Overlaps between eigenvectors of correlated random matrices. *Physical Review E*, 98(5):052145, 2018.
 - [6] Robert F. Engle, Olivier Ledoit, and Michael Wolf. Large dynamic covariance matrices. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 37(2):363–375, 2019. doi: 10.1080/07350015.2017.1345683. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/07350015.2017.1345683>.
 - [7] J Doyne Farmer. Market force, ecology and evolution. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 11(5):895–953, 2002.
 - [8] Laurent Laloux, Pierre Cizeau, Jean-Philippe Bouchaud, and Marc Potters. Noise dressing of financial correlation matrices. *Physical review letters*, 83(7):1467, 1999.
 - [9] Olivier Ledoit and Michael Wolf. Nonlinear shrinkage of the covariance matrix for portfolio selection: Markowitz meets goldilocks. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(12):4349–4388, 2017.
 - [10] Olivier Ledoit, Michael Wolf, et al. Nonlinear shrinkage estimation of large-dimensional covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):1024–1060, 2012.
 - [11] Yanhui Liu, Parameswaran Gopikrishnan, H Eugene Stanley, et al. Statistical properties of the volatility of price fluctuations. *Physical Review E*, 60(2):1390, 1999.
 - [12] Andrew W Lo. *The adaptive markets hypothesis*. Princeton University Press, 2019.
 - [13] Vladimir A Marčenko and Leonid Andreevich Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 1(4):457, 1967.
 - [14] Hirdesh K Pharasi, Kiran Sharma, Anirban Chakraborti, and Thomas H Seligman. Complex market dynamics in

the light of random matrix theory. *New Perspectives and Challenges in Econophysics and Sociophysics*, pages 13–34, 2019.

- [15] Vasiliki Plerou, Parameswaran Gopikrishnan, Bernd Rosenow, Luís A Nunes Amaral, and H Eugene Stanley. Universal and nonuniversal properties of cross correlations in financial time series. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(7): 1471, 1999.
- [16] Yi-Cheng Zhang. Toward a theory of marginally efficient markets. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 269(1):30–44, 1999.




FIG. 5. Average Frobenius distance between the filtered and test covariance matrices as a function of the calibration window length in the out-of-sample period. The upper plot refers to the original data set; the lower plot to the stationaryized data. 100 portfolios with $n = 100$ random assets are computed for each day of the out-of-sample period.

Appendix A: Hong Kong Stock Exchange

We tested the AO eigenvalues calibrated with data for US stocks on the Hong Kong stock exchange within the period [2004-01-01,2017-06-23]. In Fig. 5 we show the Frobenius distance between the covariance estimator and the out-of-sample covariance matrix. As for US equities, the AO provides a better estimator of the out-of-sample covariance matrix for the regular time-series, while being worse for stationaryized data.

In Fig. 6, we show the realized variance of global minimum portfolios. As for the US equities, the AO yields lower variance than the Oracle for short calibration windows; AO also beats NLS for all the calibration window lengths that we tested, both for the regular and stationary case.

Appendix B: Neural networks learn the Average Oracle

We trained multi-layer perceptrons (MLP) to learn the mapping between eigenvalue of rank k of \hat{C}_{train} and the corresponding Oracle eigenvalue. Mathematically, if $\lambda_{i,train}$ denotes the i -th eigenvalue of \hat{C}_{train} , the MLP learns

$$(\lambda_{i,train}, \text{other predictors}) \xrightarrow{\text{MLP}} \lambda_{i,opt} \quad (\text{B1})$$




FIG. 6. Average realized volatility of Global Minimum Variance portfolios as a function of the calibration window length. The upper plot refers to the original dataset; the lower plot to the stationaryized data. 100 portfolios with $n = 100$ random assets are computed for each day of the out-of-sample period.

Note that \hat{C}_{train} can be the unfiltered correlation matrix or an already filtered one. In principle, because covariance matrix filtering generally modifies the eigenvalue distribution of \hat{C}_{train} , one needs to train one MLP per filtering method.

The general principle is simple: the inputs are the ranked eigenvalues (and possibly some additional predictors) and the outputs are the Oracle ranked eigenvalues. We tried to add some information about the eigenvectors with the Inverse Participation Ratio (IPR) associated to each eigenvalue, which encodes the diversity of the associated eigenvector. The IPR is defined as

$$IPR(v) = \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^N (v_k)^4} \quad (\text{B2})$$

which reaches its minimum value if only one component of v is different from zero (1, to be precise).

We keep the architecture of the neural network as simple as possible. Specifically, we investigate how simple it can be. To this effect, the input layer is a dense one with $2N$ neurons and the output layer a dense one with N neurons. We let a single hidden layer be a bottleneck with B neurons. When $B = 1$, the network's task is to summarize the distribution of the input values by a scalar and has to make do with only one parameter to encode the distribution of the filtered eigenvalues. We test the influence of parameter B on the MLP's ability

to reproduce the distribution of Oracle eigenvalues. The full description of the neural architecture is as follows

- Dense layer with $2N$ neurons, sigmoid activation function
- Dropout layer with 0.2 rate
- Dense layer with B neurons, sigmoid activation function
- Dropout layer with 0.2 rate
- Dense layer with N neurons, linear activation function

The loss (cost) function is

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_i (\lambda_{i,opt} - \lambda_{i,NN})^2$$

a. Calibration

We used the same data experiment as in the main text. We found that whatever B , the MLPs outputs are nearly constant (the eigenvalues change by about 0.001%) and indeed are exactly the average Oracle. This may be due to a wrong neural architecture. However, we chose a generic one which has no reason to be wrong. This confirms that there is very little additional information about filtering in the predictors (the eigenvalues) compared to the Oracle eigenvalues, i.e., that the average contribution of non-stationarity is overwhelmingly important in this context. In addition, the MLPs were fed with some information about the eigenvectors, which was not enough not to have nearly constant outputs from the MLPs.