## A Random Matrix Approach to Cross-Correlations in Financial Data

Vasiliki Plerou<sup>1;2</sup>, Param eswaran Gopikrishnan<sup>1</sup>, Bernd Rosenow<sup>1;3</sup>,

Lus A.N unes Am ara<sup>1</sup>, Thom as G uhr<sup>4</sup>, and H.Eugene Stanley<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Center for Polym er Studies and Departm ent of Physics, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts 02215, USA

<sup>2</sup>D epartm ent of P hysics, B oston C ollege, C hestnut H ill, M assachusetts 02167, U SA

 $^3$  D epartm ent of P hysics, H arvard U n iversity, C am bridge, M assachusetts 02138, U SA

<sup>4</sup> M ax{P lanck{Institute for N uclear P hysics, D {69029 H eidelberg, G erm any

(July 31, 2001.)

W e analyze cross-correlations between price uctuations of di erent stocks using methods of random matrix theory (RMT). Using two large databases, we calculate cross-correlation matrices C of returns constructed from (i) 30-m in returns of 1000 US stocks for the 2-yr period 1994 (95 (ii) 30m in returns of 881 US stocks for the 2-yr period 1996 (97, and (iii) 1-day returns of 422 US stocks for the 35-yr period 1962 [96. We test the statistics of the eigenvalues i of Cagainst a \null hypothesis" a random correlation matrix constructed from mutually uncorrelated time series. We nd that a m a prity of the eigenvalues of C fall within the RM T bounds [; +] for the eigenvalues of random correlation m atrices. We test the eigenvalues of C within the RMT bound for universal properties of random matrices and nd good agreem ent with the results for the Gaussian orthogonal ensemble of random matrices implying a large degree of random ness in the measured cross-correlation coe cients. Further, we nd that the distribution of eigenvector components for the eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues outside the RMT bound display system atic deviations from the RMT prediction. In addition, we nd that these \deviating eigenvectors" are stable in time. We analyze the components of the deviating eigenvectors and nd that the largest eigenvalue corresponds to an in uence common to all stocks. Our analysis of the remaining deviating eigenvectors shows distinct groups, whose identities correspond to conventionally-identi ed business sectors. Finally, we discuss applications to the construction of portfolios of stocks that have a stable ratio of risk to retum.

PACS numbers: 05.45.Tp, 89.90.+n, 05.40.-a, 05.40Fb

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

#### A . M otivation

Q uantifying correlations between di erent stocks is a topic of interest not only for scienti c reasons of understanding the economy as a complex dynam ical system, but also for practical reasons such as asset allocation and portfolio-risk estim ation [1{4]. Unlike most physical system s, where one relates correlations between subunits to basic interactions, the underlying \interactions" for the stock market problem are not known. Here, we analyze cross-correlations between stocks by applying concepts and m ethods of random m atrix theory, developed in the context of complex quantum systems where the precise nature of the interactions between subunits are not known.

In order to quantify correlations, we rst calculate the price change (\return") of stock i = 1;:::;N over a time scale t

$$G_{i}(t) \ln S_{i}(t+t) \ln S_{i}(t); \qquad (1)$$

where  $S_i(t)$  denotes the price of stock i. Since di erent stocks have varying levels of volatility (standard deviation), we de ne a norm alized return

$$g_{i}(t) = \frac{G_{i}(t) \quad hG_{i}i}{i}; \qquad (2)$$

where  $_{i}$   $\stackrel{p}{\text{IG}_{i}^{2}i}$   $\stackrel{hG_{i}i^{2}}{\text{Is the standard deviation of}}$ G<sub>i</sub>, and h idenotes a time average over the period studied. We then compute the equal-time cross-correlation m atrix C with elements

$$C_{ij}$$
 hg(t)g<sub>j</sub>(t)i: (3)

By construction, the elements  $C_{ij}$  are restricted to the domain 1  $G_{ij}$  1, where  $C_{ij} = 1$  corresponds to perfect correlations,  $C_{ij} = 1$  corresponds to perfect anti-correlations, and  $C_{ij} = 0$  corresponds to uncorrelated pairs of stocks.

The di culties in analyzing the signi cance and m eaning of the empirical cross-correlation coe cients C  $_{ij}$  are due to several reasons, which include the following:

Em ailplerou@ cglbu.edu (corresponding author)

(i) M arket conditions change with time and the crosscorrelations that exist between any pair of stocks m ay not be stationary.

(ii) The nite length of time series available to estimate cross-correlations introduces \m easurement noise".

If we use a long time series to circum vent the problem of nite length, our estimates will be a ected by the non-stationarity of cross-correlations. For these reasons, the empirically-measured cross-correlations will contain \random " contributions, and it is a dicult problem in general to estimate from C the cross-correlations that are not a result of random ness.

How can we identify from C<sub>ij</sub>, those stocks that remained correlated (on the average) in the time period studied? To answer this question, we test the statistics of C against the \null hypothesis" of a random correlation matrix a correlation matrix constructed from mutually uncorrelated time series. If the properties of C conform to those of a random correlation matrix, then it follows that the contents of the empirically-measured C are random . Conversely, deviations of the properties of C from those of a random correlation matrix convey inform ation about \genuine" correlations. Thus, our goal shall be to compare the properties of C with those of a random correlation m atrix and separate the content of C into two groups: (a) the part of C that conform s to the properties of random correlation matrices (\noise") and (b) the part of C that deviates (\inform ation").

### B.Background

The study of statistical properties of matrices with independent random elements | random matrices | has a rich history originating in nuclear physics [5{13]. In nuclear physics, the problem of interest 50 years ago was to understand the energy levels of com plex nuclei, which the existing models failed to explain. RMT was developed in this context by W igner, D yson, M ehta, and others in order to explain the statistics of energy levels of complex quantum systems. They postulated that the Ham iltonian describing a heavy nucleus can be described by a matrix H with independent random elements H ij drawn from a probability distribution [5{9]. Based on this assum ption, a series of rem arkable predictions were m ade which are found to be in agreem ent with the experim entaldata [5{7]. For complex quantum system s, RMT predictions represent an average over all possible interactions [8{10]. Deviations from the universal predictions of RMT identify system -speci c, non-random properties of the system under consideration, providing clues about the underlying interactions [11{13].

Recent studies [14,15] applying RM T m ethods to analyze the properties of C show that 98% of the eigenvalues of C agree with RM T predictions, suggesting a con-

siderable degree of random ness in the measured crosscorrelations. It is also found that there are deviations from RMT predictions for 2% of the largest eigenvalues. These results prompt the following questions:

 $\ensuremath{\mathbb{W}}$  hat is a possible interpretation for the deviations from RMT?

A re the deviations from RMT stable in time?

W hat can we infer about the structure of C from these results?

W hat are the practical implications of these results?

In the following, we address these questions in detail. We nd that the largest eigenvalue of C represents the in uence of the entire market that is common to all stocks. Our analysis of the contents of the remaining eigenvalues that deviate from RMT shows the existence of cross-correlations between stocks of the same type of industry, stocks having large market capitalization, and stocks of ms having business in certain geographical areas [16,17]. By calculating the scalar product of the eigenvectors from one time period to the next, we nd that the \deviating eigenvectors" have varying degrees of time stability, quantied by the magnitude of the scalar product. The largest 2-3 eigenvectors are stable for extended periods of time, while for the rest of the deviating eigenvectors, the time stability decreases as the the corresponding eigenvalues are closer to the RMT upper bound.

To test that the deviating eigenvalues are the only \genuine" information contained in C, we compare the eigenvalue statistics of C with the known universal properties of real symmetric random matrices, and we nd good agreement with the RM T results. U sing the notion of the inverse participation ratio, we analyze the eigenvectors of C and nd large values of inverse participation ratio at both edges of the eigenvalue spectrum | suggesting a \random band" matrix structure for C. Lastly, we discuss applications to the practical goal of nding an investment that provides a given return without exposure to unnecessary risk. In addition, it is possible that our methods can also be applied for Itering out hoise' in empirically-measured cross-correlation matrices in a wide variety of applications.

This paper is organized as follows. Section II contains a brief description of the data analyzed. Section III discusses the statistics of cross-correlation coe cients. Section IV discusses the eigenvalue distribution of C and compares with RMT results. Section V tests the eigenvalue statistics C for universal properties of real sym m etric random m atrices and Section VI contains a detailed analysis of the contents of eigenvectors that deviate from RMT. Section V II discusses the time stability of the deviating eigenvectors. Section V III contains applications of RMT m ethods to construct bptim al' portfolios that have a stable ratio of risk to return. Finally, Section IX contains som e concluding remarks.

### II.DATA ANALYZED

W e analyze two di erent databases covering securities from the three major US stock exchanges, namely the New York Stock Exchange (NYSE), the American Stock Exchange (AMEX), and the National Association of Securities Dealers Autom ated Quotation (Nasdaq).

D atabase I: We analyze the Trades and Quotes database, that documents all transactions for all major securities listed in all the three stock exchanges. We extract from this database time series of prices [18] of the 1000 largest stocks by market capitalization on the starting date January 3, 1994. We analyze this database for the 2-yr period 1994 [95 [19]. From this database, we form L = 6448 records of 30-m in returns of N = 1000 U S stocks for the 2-yr period 1994 [95. We also analyze the prices of a subset comprising 881 stocks (of those 1000 we analyze for 1994 [95) that survived through two additional years 1996 [97. From this data, we extract L = 6448 records of 30-m in returns of N = 881 US stocks for the 2-yr period 1996 [97.

D atabase II: W e analyze the Center for Research in Security Prices (CRSP) database. The CRSP stock les cover common stocks listed on NYSE beginning in 1925, the AM EX beginning in 1962, and the Nasdaq beginning in 1972. The les provide complete historical descriptive information and market data including comprehensive distribution information, high, low and closing prices, trading volumes, shares outstanding, and total returns. W e analyze daily returns for the stocks that survive for the 35-yr period 1962{96 and extract L = 8685 records of 1-day returns for N = 422 stocks.

### III. STAT IST IC S OF CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

W e analyze the distribution P (C<sub>ij</sub>) of the elements fC<sub>ij</sub>; i for jg of the cross-correlation matrix C . W e rst exam ine P (C<sub>ij</sub>) for 30-m in returns from the TAQ database for the 2-yr periods 1994{95 and 1996{97 [Fig.1(a)]. First, we note that P (C<sub>ij</sub>) is asymmetric and centered around a positive mean value (hC<sub>ij</sub>i > 0), in - plying that positively-correlated behavior is more prevalent than negatively-correlated (anti-correlated) behavior. Secondly, we nd that hC<sub>ij</sub>i depends on time, e.g., the period 1996{97 shows a larger hC<sub>ij</sub> than the period 1994{95. We contrast P (C<sub>ij</sub>) with a control | a correlation matrix R with elements R<sub>ij</sub> constructed from N = 1000 mutually-uncorrelated time series, each

of length L = 6448, generated using the empiricallyfound distribution of stock returns [20,21]. Figure 1(a) shows that P (R<sub>ij</sub>) is consistent with a Gaussian with zero mean, in contrast to P (C<sub>ij</sub>). In addition, we see that the part of P (C<sub>ij</sub>) for C<sub>ij</sub> < 0 (which corresponds to anti-correlations) is within the Gaussian curve for the control, suggesting the possibility that the observed negative cross-correlations in C m ay be an elect of random – ness.

Figure 1 (b) shows P (C<sub>ij</sub>) for daily returns from the CRSP database for venon-overlapping 7-yr sub-periods in the 35-yr period 1962 (96. We see that the time dependence of hC<sub>ij</sub>i is more pronounced in this plot. In particular, the period containing the market crash of C ctober 19, 1987 has the largest average value hC<sub>ij</sub>i, suggesting the existence of cross-correlations that are more pronounced in volatile periods than in calm periods. We test this possibility by comparing hC<sub>ij</sub>i with the average volatility of the market (measured using the S&P 500 index), which shows large values of hC<sub>ij</sub>i during periods of large volatility Fig. 2].

# IV . E IG EN VALUE D ISTR IBUT ION OF THE CORRELATION MATRIX

As stated above, our aim is to extract information about cross-correlations from C. So, we compare the properties of C with those of a random cross-correlation matrix [14]. In matrix notation, the correlation matrix can be expressed as

$$C = \frac{1}{L} G G^{T}; \qquad (4)$$

where G is an N L matrix with elements  $fg_m$  $g_i$  (m t); i = 1; ...; N; m = 0; ...; L lg, and G<sup>T</sup> denotes the transpose of G. Therefore, we consider a \random " correlation matrix

$$R = \frac{1}{L} A A^{T} ;$$
 (5)

where A is an N L matrix containing N time series of L random elements with zero mean and unit variance, that are mutually uncorrelated. By construction R belongs to the type of matrices often referred to as W ishart matrices in multivariate statistics [22].

Statistical properties of random matrices such as R are known [23,24]. Particularly, in the lim it N ! 1 ;L ! 1, such that Q L=N is xed, it was shown analytically [24] that the distribution  $P_{\rm rm}$  () of eigenvalues of the random correlation matrix R is given by

$$P_{m}() = \frac{Q}{2} \frac{P_{(+)}()}{(+)};$$
 (6)

for within the bounds i +, where and + are the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of R respectively, given by

$$= 1 + \frac{1}{Q} \quad 2 \quad \frac{r}{Q} :$$
 (7)

For nite L and N, the abrupt cut-o of P  $_{\rm m}$  () is replaced by a rapidly-decaying edge [25].

W e next com pare the eigenvalue distribution P () of  $C \text{ with } P_{m}$  () [14]. We examine t = 30 min returns for N = 1000 stocks, each containing L = 6448records. Thus Q = 6:448, and we obtain = 0:36 and  $_{+}$  = 1.94 from Eq. (7). We compute the eigenvalues i of C, where i are rank ordered (i+1 > i). Figure 3(a) com pares the probability distribution P ( ) with P  $_{\rm m}$  ( ) calculated for Q = 6:448. We note the presence of a well-de ned \bulk" of eigenvalues which fall within the bounds [; +] for  $P_m$  (). We also note deviations for a few ( 20) largest and sm allest eigenvalues. In particular, the largest eigenvalue 1000 50 for the 2-yr period, 25 times larger than + = 1:94. which is

Since Eq. (6) is strictly valid only for L ! 1 and N ! 1, we must test that the deviations that we nd in Fig. 3(a) for the largest few eigenvalues are not an e ect of nite values of L and N. To this end, we contrast P() with the RMT result  $P_{\rm rm}$  () for the random correlation matrix of Eq. (5), constructed from N = 1000 separate uncorrelated time series, each of the same length L = 6448. We end good agreement with Eq. (6) Fig. 3(b)], thus showing that the deviations from RMT found for the largest few eigenvalues in Fig. 3(a) are not a result of the fact that L and N are nite.

Figure 4 compares P () for C calculated using L = 1737 daily returns of 422 stocks for the 7-yr period 1990{96.We nd a well-de ned bulk of eigenvalues that fall within  $P_{\rm rm}$  (), and deviations from  $P_{\rm rm}$  () for large eigenvalues | similar to what we found for t = 30 m in [Fig. 3(a)]. Thus, a comparison of P () with the RM T result  $P_{\rm rm}$  () allows us to distinguish the bulk of the eigenvalue spectrum of C that agrees with RM T (random correlations) from the deviations (genuine correlations).

### V.UNIVERSAL PROPERTIES: ARE THE BULK OF EIGENVALUES OF C CONSISTENT W ITH RMT?

The presence of a well-de ned bulk of eigenvalues that agree with P<sub>rm</sub> () suggests that the contents of C are mostly random except for the eigenvalues that deviate. O ur conclusion wasbased on the com parison of the eigenvalue distribution P () of C with that of random matrices of the type R =  $\frac{1}{L}$  A A<sup>T</sup>. Quite generally, com parison of the eigenvalue distribution with P<sub>rm</sub> () alone is not su cient to support the possibility that the bulk of the eigenvalue spectrum of C is random. Random matrices that have drastically di erent P () share sim ilar correlation structures in their eigenvalues | universal properties | that depend only on the general symmetries of the matrix [11{13}. Conversely, matrices that have the

same eigenvalue distribution can have drastically di erent eigenvalue correlations. Therefore, a test of random – ness of C involves the investigation of correlations in the eigenvalues  $_{\rm i}$ .

Since by de nition C is a real symmetric matrix, we shall test the eigenvalue statistics C for universal features of eigenvalue correlations displayed by real symmetric random matrices. Consider a M M real sym m etric random matrix S with o -diagonal elements S<sub>ii</sub>, which for i < j are independent and identically distributed with zero m ean  $hS_{ij}i = 0$  and variance  $hS_{ij}^2i > 0$ . It is conjectured based on analytical [26] and extensive num erical evidence [11] that in the lim it M ! 1, regardless of the distribution of elements Sij, this class of matrices, on the scale of local m ean eigenvalue spacing, display the universal properties (eigenvalue correlation functions) of the ensemble of matrices whose elements are distributed according to a Gaussian probability measure called the Gaussian orthogonalensemble (GOE) [11].

Form ally, GOE is de ned on the space of real sym – m etric m atrices by two requirem ents [11]. The rst is that the ensemble is invariant under orthogonal transform ations, i.e., for any GOE m atrix Z, the transform ation Z!  $Z^0 = W^T Z W$ , where W is any real orthogonal m atrix (W W<sup>T</sup> = I), leaves the joint probability P (Z)dZ of elements Z<sub>ij</sub> unchanged: P (Z<sup>0</sup>)dZ<sup>0</sup> = P (Z)dZ. The second requirem ent is that the elements fZ<sub>ij</sub>; i jg are statistically independent [11].

By de nition, random cross-correlation matrices R (Eq. (5)) that we are interested in are not strictly GOE - type matrices, but rather belong to a special ensemble called the \chiral" GOE [13,27]. This can be seen by the following argument. De ne a matrix B

$$B \qquad \begin{array}{c} 0 \quad G \\ G^{T} \quad 0 \end{array} \qquad (8)$$

The eigenvalues of B are given by det ( ${}^{2}I \quad GG^{T}$ ) = 0 and similarly, the eigenvalues of R are given by det( $I \quad GG^{T}$ ) = 0. Thus, all non-zero eigenvalues of B occur in pairs, i.e., for every eigenvalue of R, = are eigenvalues of B. Since the eigenvalues occur pairw ise, the eigenvalue spectra of both B and R have special properties in the neighborhood of zero that are di erent from the standard GOE [13,27]. As these special properties decay rapidly as one goes further from zero, the eigenvalue correlations of R in the bulk of the spectrum are still consistent with those of the standard GOE. Therefore, our goal shall be to test the bulk of the eigenvalue spectrum of the empirically-m easured cross-correlation m atrix C with the known universal features of standard GOE - type m atrices.

In the following, we test the statistical properties of the eigenvalues of C for three known universal properties [11{13] displayed by GOE matrices: (i) the distribution of nearest-neighbor eigenvalue spacings  $P_{nn}$  (s), (ii) the distribution of next-nearest-neighbor eigenvalue spacings  $P_{nnn}$  (s), and (iii) the \number variance" statistic <sup>2</sup>.

The analytical results for the three properties listed above hold if the spacings between adjacent eigenvalues (rank-ordered) are expressed in units of average eigenvalue spacing. Quite generally, the average eigenvalue spacing changes from one part of the eigenvalue spectrum to the next. So, in order to ensure that the eigenvalue spacing has a uniform average value throughout the spectrum, we must nd a transform ation called \unfolding," which maps the eigenvalues i to new variables called \unfolded eigenvalues" i, whose distribution is uniform [11{13]. Unfolding ensures that the distances between eigenvalues are expressed in units of localm ean eigenvalue spacing [11], and thus facilitates com parison with theoretical results. The procedures that we use for unfolding the eigenvalue spectrum are discussed in Appendix A.

# A.D istribution of nearest-neighbor eigenvalue spacings

We rst consider the eigenvalue spacing distribution, which re ects two-point as well as eigenvalue correlation functions of all orders. We compare the eigenvalue spacing distribution of C with that of GOE random matrices. For GOE matrices, the distribution of \nearest-neighbor" eigenvalue spacings s  $_{k+1}$  k is given by [11{13]

$$P_{GOE}(s) = \frac{s}{2} \exp -\frac{1}{4} s^2$$
; (9)

often referred to as the  $\backslash W$  igner sum ise" [28]. The G aussian decay of  $P_{GOE}$  (s) for large s [bold curve in Fig. 5(a)] im plies that  $P_{GOE}$  (s)  $\backslash probes$ " scales only of the order of one eigenvalue spacing. Thus, the spacing distribution is known to be robust across di erent unfolding procedures [13].

We rst calculate the distribution of the \nearest-neighbor spacings" s  $_{k+1}$  k of the unfolded eigenvalues obtained using the Gaussian broadening procedure. Figure 5 (a) shows that the distribution P<sub>nn</sub> (s) of nearest-neighbor eigenvalue spacings for C constructed from 30-m in returns for the 2-yr period 1994 {95 agrees well with the RM T result P<sub>GOE</sub> (s) for GOE matrices.

Identical results are obtained when we use the alternative unfolding procedure of thing the eigenvalue distribution. In addition, we test the agreem ent of  $P_{nn}$  (s) with RMT results by thing  $P_{nn}$  (s) to the one-parameter B rody distribution [12,13]

$$P_{Br}(s) = B (1 + ) s exp( B s^{+});$$
 (10)

where B  $\left[\left(\frac{+2}{+1}\right)\right]^{1+}$ . The case = 1 corresponds to the GOE and = 0 corresponds to uncorrelated eigenvalues (Poisson-distributed spacings). We obtain = 0:99 0:02, in good agreement with the GOE prediction = 1. To test non-parametrically that  $P_{GOE}$  (s) is the correct description for  $P_{nn}$  (s), we perform the K olm ogorov-Sm innov test. We nd that at the 60% condence level, a K olm ogorov-Sm innov test cannot reject the hypothesis that the GOE is the correct description for  $P_{nn}$  (s).

Next, we analyze the nearest-neighbor spacing distribution  $P_{nn}$  (s) for C constructed from daily returns for four 7-yr periods [Fig. 6]. We nd good agreement with the GOE result of Eq. (9), similar to what we nd for C constructed from 30-m in returns. We also test that both of the unfolding procedures discussed in Appendix A yield consistent results. Thus, we have seen that the eigenvalue-spacing distribution of empirically-m easured cross-correlation matrices C is consistent with the RMT result for real symmetric random matrices.

## B.D istribution of next-nearest-neighbor eigenvalue spacings

A second independent test for GOE is the distribution  $P_{nnn}$  (s<sup>0</sup>) of next-nearest-neighbor spacings s<sup>0</sup> k+2 k between the unfolded eigenvalues. For matrices of the GOE type, according to a theorem due to Ref. [10], the next-nearest neighbor spacings follow the statistics of the G aussian sym plectic ensemble (GSE) [11{13,29}]. In particular, the distribution of next-nearest-neighbor spacings of the G aussian sym – plectic ensemble (GSE) [11,13]. Figure 5 (b) shows that  $P_{nnn}$  (s<sup>0</sup>) for the same data as Fig. 5 (a) agrees well with the RM T result for the distribution of nearest-neighbor spacings of GSE matrices,

$$P_{GSE}(s) = \frac{2^{18}}{3^{6}3} s^4 \exp - \frac{64}{9} s^2$$
 : (11)

### C.Long-range eigenvalue correlations

To probe for larger scales, pair correlations (\twopoint" correlations) in the eigenvalues, we use the statistic <sup>2</sup> offen called the \num ber variance," which is dened as the variance of the num ber of unfolded eigenvalues in intervals of length `around each  $_{\rm i}$  [11{13],

where n (; ') is the num ber of unfolded eigenvalues in the interval [ =2; + =2] and h::: i denotes an average over all . If the eigenvalues are uncorrelated,  $^2$  '. For the opposite extrem e of a \rigid" eigenvalue spectrum (e.g. sim ple harm onic oscillator),  $^2$  is a constant. Quite generally, the num ber variance  $^2$  can be expressed as

$${}^{2}(') = {}^{2} {}^{2}(') = {}^{2} {}^{2} {}^{(')} {}^{x} x) Y (x) dx; \qquad (13)$$

where Y (x) (called to -evel cluster function") is related to the two-point correlation function [c.f., Ref. [11], pp.79]. For the GOE case, Y (x) is explicitly given by

$$Y(x) = \hat{s}(x) + \frac{ds}{dx} \Big|_{x}^{Z_{1}} s(x^{0}) dx^{0};$$
 (14)

where

$$s(x) \quad \frac{\sin(x)}{x}: \qquad (15)$$

For large values of ', the number variance  $\ ^2$  for GOE has the <code>\intem</code> ediate" behavior

Figure 7 shows that  $^{2}$  (') for C calculated using 30-m in returns for 1994{95 agrees well with the RMT result of Eq. (13). For the range of 'shown in Fig. 7, both unfolding procedures yield similar results. Consistent results are obtained for C constructed from daily returns.

### D . Im plications

To sum marize this section, we have tested the statistics of C for universal features of eigenvalue correlations displayed by GOE m atrices. W e have seen that the distribution of the nearest-neighbor spacings  $P_{nn}$  (s) is in good agreem ent with the GOE result. To test whether the eigenvalues of C display the RM T results for long-range two-point eigenvalue correlations, we analyzed the num ber variance  $^2$  and found good agreement with GOE results. Moreover, we also nd that the statistics of nextnearest neighbor spacings conform to the predictions of RMT.These ndings show that the statistics of the bulk of the eigenvalues of the empirical cross-correlation matrix C is consistent with those of a real sym m etric random matrix. Thus, information about genuine correlations are contained in the deviations from RMT, which we analyze below.

#### VI.STATISTICS OF EIGENVECTORS

### A .D istribution of eigenvector com ponents

The deviations of P () from the RMT result P  $_{\rm rm}$  () suggests that these deviations should also be displayed in the statistics of the corresponding eigenvector com ponents [14]. A coordingly, in this section, we analyze the distribution of eigenvector components. The distribution of the components  $u_1^k;l=1;\ldots;N$  g of eigenvector  $u^k$  of a random correlation m atrix R should conform to a G aussian distribution with m ean zero and unit variance [13],

$$_{m}(u) = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} \exp(\frac{u^{2}}{2})$$
: (17)

First, we compare the distribution of eigenvector com ponents of C with Eq. (17). We analyze (u) for C com puted using 30-m in returns for 1994 {95. W e choose one typical eigenvalue k from the bulk ( k + ) de ned by  $P_{m}$  () of Eq. (6). Figure 8(a) shows that (u) for a typical u<sup>k</sup> from the bulk shows good agreement with the RMT result m (u). Similar analysis on the other eigenvectors belonging to eigenvalues within the bulk yields consistent results, in agreem ent with the results of the previous sections that the bulk agrees with random matrix predictions. We test the agreement of the distribution (u) with  $_{\rm m}$  (u) by calculating the kurtosis, which for a Gaussian has the value 3. We nd signi cant deviations from \_m (u) for 20 largest and sm allest eigenvalues. The remaining eigenvectors have values of kurtosis that are consistent with the Gaussian value 3.

Consider next the \deviating" eigenvalues  $_{i}$ , larger than the RMT upper bound,  $_{i} > _{+}$ . Figure 8 (b) and (c) show that, for deviating eigenvalues, the distribution of eigenvector components (u) deviates system atically from the RMT result  $_{rm}$  (u). Finally, we exam ine the distribution of the components of the eigenvector  $u^{1000}$  corresponding to the largest eigenvalue  $_{1000}$ . Figure 8 (d) shows that ( $u^{1000}$ ) deviates remarkably from a G aussian, and is approximately uniform, suggesting that all stocks participate. In addition, we nd that alm ost all components of  $u^{1000}$  have the same sign, thus causing (u) to shift to one side. This suggests that the significant participants of eigenvector  $u^{k}$  have a common component that a ects all of them with the same bias.

## B . Interpretation of the largest eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenvector

Since all components participate in the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue, it represents an inuence that is common to all stocks. Thus, the largest eigenvector quanti es the qualitative notion that certain new sbreaks (e.g., an interest rate increase) a ect all stocks alike [4]. One can also interpret the largest eigenvalue and its corresponding eigenvector as the collective response' of the entire market to stim uli. We quantitatively investigate this notion by comparing the projection (scalar product) of the time series G on the eigenvector  $u^{1000}$ , with a standard measure of US stock market perform ance | the returns  $G_{SP}$  (t) of the S&P 500 index. We calculate the projection  $G^{1000}$  (t) of the time series  $G_j$  (t) on the eigenvector  $u^{1000}$ ,

$$G^{1000}$$
 (t)  $u_{j=1}^{1000} G_{j}$  (t) : (18)

By de nition,  $G^{1000}$  (t) shows the return of the portfolio de ned by  $u^{1000}$ . We compare  $G^{1000}$  (t) with  $G_{SP}$  (t), and nd remarkably similar behavior for the two, indicated by a large value of the correlation coe cient  $hG_{SP}(t)G^{1000}(t)i = 0.85$ . Figure 9 shows  $G^{1000}(t)$  regressed against  $G_{SP}(t)$ , which shows relatively narrow scatter around a linear t. Thus, we interpret the eigenvector  $u^{1000}$  as quantifying market-wide in uences on all stocks [14,15].

We analyze C at larger time scales of t = 1 day and nd sim ilar results as above, suggesting that sim – ilar correlation structures exist for quite di erent time scales. Our results for the distribution of eigenvector components agree with those reported in Ref. [14], where t = 1 day returns are analyzed. We next investigate how the largest eigenvalue changes as a function of time. Figure 2 shows the time dependence [30] of the largest eigenvalue ( $_{422}$ ) for the 35-yr period 1962{96. We nd large values of the largest eigenvalue during periods of high market volatility, which suggests strong collective behavior in regimes of high volatility.

O neway of statistically modeling an in uence that is common to all stocks is to express the return G  $_{\rm i}$  of stock i as

$$G_{i}(t) = _{i} + _{i}M(t) + _{i}(t);$$
 (19)

where M (t) is an additive term that is the same for all stocks, h (t)i = 0,  $_i$  and  $_i$  are stock-specic constants, and hM (t) (t)i = 0. This common term M (t) gives rise to correlations between any pair of stocks. The decom position of Eq. (19) form s the basis of widely-used econom ic m odels, such as multi-factor m odels and the C apital A set P ricing M odel [4,31{47}]. Since u<sup>1000</sup> represents an in uence that is common to all stocks, we can approximate the term M (t) with G<sup>1000</sup> (t). The parameters  $_i$  and  $_i$  can therefore be estimated by an ordinary least squares regression.

Next, we remove the contribution of G<sup>1000</sup> (t) to each time series G<sub>i</sub>(t), and construct C from the residuals  $_{i}$ (t) of Eq. (19). Figure 10 shows that the distribution P (C<sub>ij</sub>) thus obtained has signi cantly smaller average value hC<sub>ij</sub>i, showing that a large degree of cross-correlations contained in C can be attributed to the in-uence of the largest eigenvalue (and its corresponding eigenvector) [48,49].

# C.Number of signi cant participants in an eigenvector: Inverse Participation Ratio

Having studied the interpretation of the largest eigenvalue which deviates signi cantly from RMT results, we next focus on the remaining eigenvalues. The deviations of the distribution of components of an eigenvector  $u^k$  from the RMT prediction of a Gaussian is more pronounced as the separation from the RMT upper bound  $_k$  + increases. Since proximity to + increases the elects of random ness, we quantify the number of components that participate signi cantly in each eigenvector,

which in turn re ects the degree of deviation from RMT result for the distribution of eigenvector components. To this end, we use the notion of the inverse participation ratio ( $\mathbb{P}R$ ), often applied in localization theory [13,50]. The  $\mathbb{P}R$  of the eigenvector u<sup>k</sup> is de ned as

$$I^{k} = \begin{bmatrix} u_{1}^{k} \end{bmatrix}^{4};$$
 (20)

where  $u_1^k$ , l = 1; :::;1000 are the components of eigenvector  $u^k$ . The meaning of  $I^k$  can be illustrated by two limiting cases: (i) a vector with identical components  $u_1^k \quad 1 = \overline{N}$  has  $I^k = 1 = N$ , whereas (ii) a vector with one component  $u_1^k = 1$  and the remainder zero has  $I^k = 1$ . Thus, the IPR quanti es the reciprocal of the num ber of eigenvector components that contribute signi cantly.

Figure 11 (a) shows  $I^k$  for the case of the control of Eq. (5) using time series with the empirically-found distribution of returns [20]. The average value of  $I^k$  is hIi 3  $10^3$  1=N with a narrow spread, indicating that the vectors are extended [50,51] i.e., alm ost all components contribute to them . Fluctuations around this average value are con ned to a narrow range (standard deviation of 1:5  $10^4$ ).

Figure 11 (b) shows that  $I^k$  for C constructed from 30m in returns from the period  $1994\{95, agrees w \text{ ith } I^k \text{ of }$ the random control in the bulk (  $< _{\rm i} < _{+}$ ). In contrast, the edges of the eigenvalue spectrum of C show signi cant deviations of Ik from hIi. The largest eigenvalue has 1=I<sup>k</sup> 600 for the 30-m in data [Fig. 11(b)] and 1=I<sup>k</sup> 320 for the 1-day data [Fig. 11 (c) and (d)], showing that alm ost all stocks participate in the largest eigenvector. For the rest of the large eigenvalues which deviate from the RMT upper bound, I<sup>k</sup> values are approxim ately 4-5 tim es larger than hIi, show ing that there are varying num bers of stocks contributing to these eigenvectors. In addition, we also not that there are large  $I^k$ values for vectors corresponding to few of the sm all eigenvalues  $_{i}$  0.25 < . The deviations at both edges of the eigenvalue spectrum are considerably larger than hIi, which suggests that the vectors are localized [50, 51] i.e., only a few stocks contribute to them .

The presence of vectors with large values of  $I^k$  also arises in the theory of Anderson localization [52]. In the context of localization theory, one frequently nds \random band m atrices" [50] containing extended states with sm all  $I^k$  in the bulk of the eigenvalue spectrum, whereas edge states are localized and have large  $I^k$ . Our nding of localized states for sm all and large eigenvalues of the cross-correlation m atrix C is rem iniscent of Anderson localization and suggests that C m ay have a random band m atrix structure. A random band m atrix B has elements  $B_{ij}$  independently drawn from di erent probability distributions. These distributions are often taken to be G aussian param eterized by their variance, which depends on i and j. A lthough such m atrices are random arising

from the fact that a metric can be de ned on their set of indices i. A related, but distinct way of analyzing crosscorrelations by de ning 'ultra-metric' distances has been studied in Ref. [16].

## D . Interpretation of deviating eigenvectors $u^{990}\,\{u^{999}$

W e quantify the number of signi cant participants of an eigenvector using the IPR, and we exam ine the  $1=I^k$ components of eigenvector  $u^k$  for common features [17]. A direct exam ination of these eigenvectors, how ever, does not yield a straightforward interpretation of their economic relevance. To interpret their meaning, we note that the largest eigenvalue is an order of magnitude larger than the others, which constrains the remaining N 1 eigenvalues since Tr C = N. Thus, in order to analyze the deviating eigenvectors, we must remove the e ect of the largest eigenvalue 1000.

In order to avoid the e ect of  $_{1000}$ , and thus G  $^{1000}$  (t), on the returns of each stock G  $_{i}$  (t), we perform the regression of Eq. (19), and compute the residuals  $_{i}$  (t). We then calculate the correlation m atrix C using  $_{i}$  (t) in Eq.(2) and Eq.(3). Next, we compute the eigenvectors  $u^{k}$  of C thus obtained, and analyze their signi cant participants. The eigenvector  $u^{999}$  contains approxim ately  $1=I^{999} = 300$  signi cant participants, which are all stocks with large values of m arket capitalization. Figure 12 shows that the m agnitude of the eigenvector components of  $u^{999}$  shows an approxim ately logarithm ic dependence on the m arket capitalizations of the corresponding stocks.

W e next analyze the signi cant contributors of the rest of the eigenvectors. We nd that each of these deviating eigenvectors contains stocks belonging to sim ilar or related industries as signi cant contributors. Table I show s the ticker sym bols and industry groups (Standard Industry Classi cation (SIC) code) for stocks corresponding to the ten largest eigenvector com ponents of each eigenvector. We nd that these eigenvectors partition the set of all stocks into distinct groups which contain stocks with large market capitalization  $(u^{999})$ , stocks of msin the electronics and computer industry  $(u^{998})$ , a com bination of gold m ining and investment  $m s (u^{996} and$ u<sup>997</sup>), banking ms (u<sup>994</sup>), oiland gas re ning and equipm ent  $(u^{993})$ , auto m anufacturing m s  $(u^{992})$ , drug m anufacturing  $\text{ms}(u^{991})$ , and paper manufacturing  $(u^{990})$ . One eigenvector (u<sup>995</sup>) displays a mixture of three industry groups | telecom m unications, m etalm ining, and banking. An exam ination of these m s show s signi cant business activity in Latin America. Our results are also represented schematically in Fig. 13. A similar classi cation of stocks into sectors using di erent m ethods is obtained in Ref. [16].

Instead ofperform ing the regression of Eq(19), one can rem ove the U-shaped intra-daily pattern using the procedure of R ef [53] and com pute C. The results thus obtained are consistent with those obtained using the procedure of using the residuals of the regression of Eq. (19) to compute C (Table I). O frem C is constructed from returns at longer time scales of t = 1 week or 1 m onth to avoid short time scale e ects [54].

## E.Sm allest eigenvalues and their corresponding eigenvectors

Having exam ined the largest eigenvalues, we next focus on the sm allest eigenvalues which show large values of  $I^{k}$ [Fig. 11]. We nd that the eigenvectors corresponding to the sm allest eigenvalues contain as signi cant participants, pairs of stocks which have the largest values of C<sub>ii</sub> in our sam ple. For exam ple, the two largest com ponents of u<sup>1</sup> correspond to the stocks of Texas Instrum ents (TXN) and M icron Technology (MU) with  $C_{ij} = 0.64$ , the largest correlation coe cient in our sample. The largest com ponents of u<sup>2</sup> are Telefonos de M exico (TM X) and G rupo Televisa (TV) with  $C_{ij} = 0.59$  (second largest correlation coe cient). The eigenvector u<sup>3</sup> shows NewmontGoldCompany (NGC) and NewmontMiningCorporation (NEM) with  $C_{ij} = 0.50$  (third largest correlation coe cient) as largest components. In all three eigenvectors, the relative sign of the two largest com ponents is negative. Thus pairs of stocks with a correlation coe cient much larger than the average hC ijie ectively \decouple" from other stocks.

The appearance of strongly correlated pairs of stocks in the eigenvectors corresponding to the sm allest eigenvalues of C can be qualitatively understood by considering the example of a 2 2 cross-correlation m atrix

$$C_{2 2} = {\begin{array}{*{20}c} 1 & c \\ c & 1 \end{array}}$$
 (21)

The eigenvalues of  $C_2_2$  are = 1 c. The smaller eigenvalue decreases monotonically with increasing cross-correlation coe cient c. The corresponding eigenvector is the anti-symmetric linear combination of the 1 and , in agreement with our basis vectors 0 1 em pirical nding that the relative sign of largest com ponents of eigenvectors corresponding to the sm allest eigenvalues is negative. In this simple example, the symmetric linear com bination of the two basis vectors appears as the eigenvector of the large eigenvalue + . Indeed, we nd that TXN and MU are the largest components of  $u^{998}$ , TM X and TV are the largest components of  $u^{995}$ , and NEM and NGC are the largest and third largest com ponents of u<sup>997</sup>.

### VII. STABILITY OF EIGENVECTORS IN TIME

W e next investigate the degree of stability in time of the eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues that deviate from RMT results. Since deviations from RMT results im ply genuine correlations which remain stable in the period used to compute C, we expect the deviating eigenvectors to show some degree of time stability.

We not identify the p eigenvectors corresponding to the p largest eigenvalues which deviate from the RMT upper bound \_+. We then construct a p N matrix D with elements  $D_{kj} = fu_j^k$ ;  $k = 1; \dots; p; j = 1; \dots; N$  g. Next, we compute a p p \overlap matrix" O (t; ) =  $D_A$   $D_B^T$ , with elements  $O_{ij}$  de ned as the scalar product of eigenvector  $u^i$  of period A (starting at time t = t) with  $u^j$  of period B at a later time t+ ,

$$O_{ij}$$
 (t; )  $D_{ik}$  (t)  $D_{jk}$  (t + ): (22)  
 $k=1$ 

If all the p eigenvectors are \perfectly" non-random and stable in time  $O_{ij} = ij$ .

We study the overlap matrices 0 using both high-frequency and daily data. For high-frequency data (L = 6448 records at 30-m in intervals), we use a moving window of length L = 1612, and slide it through the entire 2-yrperiod using discrete time steps L=4=403. We est identify the eigenvectors of the correlation matrices for each of these time periods. We then calculate overlap matrices 0 (t = 0; = nL=4), where n 2 f1;2;3;::g, between the eigenvectors for t= 0 and for t= .

Figure 14 shows a grey scale pixel-representation of the matrix O (t; ), for di erent . First, we note that the eigenvectors that deviate from RMT bounds show varying degrees of stability (O<sub>ij</sub>(t; )) in time. In particular, the stability in time is largest for  $u^{1000}$ . Even at lags of = 1 yr the corresponding overlap 0.85. The remaining eigenvectors show decreasing amounts of stability as the RMT upper bound  $_+$  is approached. In particular, the 3-4 largest eigenvectors show large values of O<sub>ij</sub> for up to = 1 yr.

Next, we repeat our analysis for daily returns of 422 stocks using 8685 records of 1-day returns, and a sliding window of length L = 965 with discrete time steps L=5 = 193 days. Instead of calculating O (t; ) for all starting points t, we calculate O () hO(t; ) i, averaged overallt = n L=5, where n 2 f0;1;2;:::g. Figure 15 show sgrey scale representations of O () for increasing . We nd sim ilar results as found for shorter time scales, and nd that eigenvectors corresponding to the largest 2 eigenvalues are stable for time scales as large as = 20 yr. In particular, the eigenvector u<sup>422</sup> shows an overlap of

0:8 even over time scales of = 30 yr.

### V III. APPLICATIONS TO PORTFOLIO OPT IM IZATION

The random ness of the \bulk" seen in the previous sections has implications in optim alportfolio selection [54]. We illustrate these using the Markow itz theory of optim al portfolio selection  $[\beta, 17, 55]$ . Consider a portfolio (t) of stocks with prices  $S_i$ . The return on (t) is given by

$$= \bigvee_{\substack{i=1\\ i=1}}^{X^{i}} w_{i}G_{i}; \qquad (23)$$

where  $G_i(t)$  is the return on stock i and  $w_i$  is the fraction of wealth invested in stock i. The fractions  $w_i$  are normalized such that  $\prod_{i=1}^{N} w_i = 1$ . The risk in holding the portfolio (t) can be quantiled by the variance

$${}^{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{i}w_{j}C_{ij i j}; \qquad (24)$$

where  $_{i}$  is the standard deviation (average volatility) of G<sub>i</sub>, and C<sub>ij</sub> are elements of the cross-correlation matrix C. In order to nd an optimal portfolio, we must minimize <sup>2</sup> under the constraint that the return on the portfolio is some xed value. In addition, we also have the constraint that  $\prod_{i=1}^{N} w_{i} = 1$ . M inimizing <sup>2</sup> subject to these two constraints can be implemented by using two Lagrangemultipliers, which yields a system of linear equations for w<sub>i</sub>, which can then be solved. The optimal portfolios thus chosen can be represented as a plot of the return as a function of risk <sup>2</sup> [Fig.16].

To nd the e ect of random ness of C on the selected optim alportfolio, we rst partition the tim e period 1994 (95 into two one-year periods. U sing the cross-correlation m atrix C<sub>94</sub> for 1994, and G<sub>i</sub> for 1995, we construct a fam - ily of optim alportfolios, and plot as a function of the predicted risk  $_{\rm p}^2$  for 1995 [Fig.16(a)]. For this fam ily of portfolios, we also compute the risk  $_{\rm r}^2$  realized during 1995 using C<sub>95</sub> [Fig.16(a)]. We nd that the predicted risk,

$$\frac{\frac{2}{r}}{\frac{2}{p}}$$
  $\frac{2}{170\%}$  : (25)

Since the meaningful inform ation in C is contained in the deviating eigenvectors (whose eigenvalues are outside the RM T bounds), we must construct a `ltered' correlation matrix C<sup>0</sup>, by retaining only the deviating eigenvectors. To this end, we rst construct a diagonal matrix <sup>0</sup>, with elements  $_{ii}^{0} = f0; :::;0; _{988}; :::; _{1000}g$ . We then transform <sup>0</sup> to the basis of C, thus obtaining the `ltered' cross-correlation matrix C<sup>0</sup>. In addition, we set the diagonal elements C $_{ii}^{0} = 1$ , to preserve  $Tr(C) = Tr(C^{0})$ = N. We repeat the above calculations for noding the optim alportfolio using C<sup>0</sup> instead of C in Eq. (24). Figure 16 (b) shows that the realized risk is now much closer to the predicted risk

$$\frac{2}{r} \frac{2}{p} \frac{2}{p}$$
 25% : (26)

T hus, the optim algortfolios constructed using  $C^0$  are significantly more stable in time.

### IX . CONCLUSIONS

How can we understand the deviating eigenvalues | i.e., correlations that are stable in time? One approach is to postulate that returns can be separated into idiosyncratic and common components | i.e., that returns can be separated into di erent additive \factors", which represent various econom ic in uences that are common to a set of stocks such as the type of industry, or the e ect of news [4,31{49,56,57].

On the other hand, in physical system s one starts from the interactions between the constituents, and then relates interactions to correlated \m odes" of the system. In econom ic system s, we ask if a similar mechanism can give rise to the correlated behavior. In order to answer this question, we model stock price dynam ics by a family of stochastic di erential equations [59], which describe the `instantaneous" returns  $g_i(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \ln S_i(t)$  as a random walk with couplings  $J_{ij}$ 

$${}_{\circ}@_{t}g_{i}(t) = \underline{r}_{i}g_{i}(t) \qquad g_{i}^{3}(t) + \begin{array}{c} X \\ J_{ij}g_{j}(t) + \frac{1}{\circ} \\ i \end{array} (t) : (27)$$

Here,  $_{i}(t)$  are G aussian random variables with correlation function  $h_{i}(t)_{j}(t^{0})i = _{ij o}(t t^{0})$ , and  $_{o}$  sets the time scale of the problem. In the context of a soft spin model, the rst two terms in the rhs of Eq. (27) arise from the derivative of a double-well potential, enforcing the soft spin constraint. The interaction among soft-spins is given by the couplings  $J_{ij}$ . In the absence of the cubic term, and without interactions,  $_{o}$ =r<sub>i</sub> are relaxation times of the hg<sub>i</sub>(t)g<sub>i</sub>(t+) i correlation function. The return G<sub>i</sub> at a nite time interval t is given by the integral of g<sub>i</sub> over t.

Equation (27) is similar to the linearized description of interacting <code>\soff spins" [58]</code> and is a generalized case of the models of Refs. [59]. W ithout interactions, the variance of price changes on a scale t \_\_\_\_i is given by  $h(G_i(t))^2 i = t = (r^2_i)$ , in agreement with recent studies [61], where stock price changes are described by an anom alous di usion and the variance of price changes is decomposed into a product of trading frequency (analog of 1= i) and the square of an \in pact parameter" which is related to liquidity (analog of 1=r).

As the coupling strengths increase, the soft-spin system undergoes a transition to an ordered state with permanent local magnetizations. At the transition point, the spin dynamics are very \slow" as relected in a power law decay of the spin autocorrelation function in time. To test whether this signature of strong interactions is present for the stock m arket problem, we analyze the correlation functions  $c^{(k)}$  ( )  $hG^{(k)}(t)G^{(k)}(t+)i_{,}$  $_{i=1}^{1000} \, u_{i}^{k} G_{i} \left( t \right)$  is the time series dewhere G<sup>(k)</sup> (t) ned by eigenvector  $\boldsymbol{u}^k$  . Instead of analyzing  $\boldsymbol{c}^{(k)}$  ( ) directly, we apply the detrended uctuation analysis (DFA) method [60]. Figure 17 shows that the correlation functions  $c^{(k)}$  () indeed decay as power laws [62] for the deviating eigenvectors  $u^k$  in sharp contrast to the behavior of  $c^{(k)}$  () for the rest of the eigenvectors and the autocorrelation functions of individual stocks, which show only short-ranged correlations. We interpret this as evidence for strong interactions [63].

In the absence of the non-linearities (cubic term ), we obtain only exponentially-decaying correlation functions for the  $\mbox{m}$  odes" corresponding to the large eigenvalues, which is inconsistent with our nding of power-law correlations.

To sum m arize, we have tested the eigenvalue statistics of the empirically-measured correlation matrix C against the null hypothesis of a random correlation m atrix. This allows us to distinguish genuine correlations from \apparent" correlations that are present even for random matrices. We nd that the bulk of the eigenvalue spectrum of C shares universal properties with the G aussian orthogonal ensemble of random matrices. Further, we analyze the deviations from RMT, and nd that (i) the largest eigenvalue and its corresponding eigenvector represent the in uence of the entire market on all stocks, and (ii) using the rest of the deviating eigenvectors, we can partition the set of all stocks studied into distinct subsets whose identity corresponds to conventionally-identi ed business sectors. These sectors are stable in time, in some cases for as m any as 30 years. Finally, we have seen that the deviating eigenvectors are useful for the construction of optim al portfolios which have a stable ratio of risk to return.

### ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e thank J-P.Bouchaud, S.V.Buldyrev, P.C izeau, E.Derman, X.Gabaix, J.Hill, M.Janjuævic, L.Viciera, and J.Zou for helpful discussions. W e thank O.Bohigas for pointing out Ref. [23] to us. BR thanks DFG grant RO1-1/2447 for nancial support. TG thanks Boston University for warm hospitality. The Center for Polymer Studies is supported by the NSF, British Petroleum, the NIH, and the NRCPS (PS1 RR13622).

### APPENDIX A:\UNFOLDING"THE EIGENVALUE DISTRIBUTION

As discussed in Section V, random matrices display universal functional forms for eigenvalue correlations that depend only on the general symmetries of the matrix. A rst step to test the data for such universal properties is to nd a transformation called \unfolding," which maps the eigenvalues  $_i$  to new variables called \unfolded eigenvalues"  $_i$ , whose distribution is uniform [11{13]. Unfolding ensures that the distances between eigenvalues are expressed in units of boalm ean eigenvalue spacing [11], and thus facilitates comparison with analytical results. We rst de ne the cum ulative distribution function of eigenvalues, which counts the number of eigenvalues in the interval  $_{\rm i}$  ,

$$F () = N P (x)dx;$$
 (A1)

where P (x) denotes the probability density of eigenvalues and N is the total number of eigenvalues. The function F () can be decomposed into an average and a uctuating part,

$$F() = F_{av}() + F_{uc}()$$
: (A2)

Since P  $_{uc}$  dF  $_{uc}$  ()=d = 0 on average,

$$P_{m}$$
 ()  $\frac{dF_{av}()}{d}$  (A3)

is the averaged eigenvalue density. The dimensionless, unfolded eigenvalues are then given by

$$_{i}$$
  $F_{av}$   $(_{i})$ : (A 4)

Thus, the problem is to nd  $F_{\rm av}$  (). We follow two procedures for obtaining the unfolded eigenvalues  $_{\rm i}$ : (i) a phenom enological procedure referred to as Gaussian broadening [11{13], and (ii) tting the cumulative distribution function F () of Eq. (A1) with the analytical expression for F () using Eq. (6). These procedures are discussed below .

#### 1. G aussian B roadening

G aussian broadening [64] is a phenom enological procedure that aim s at approximating the function  $F_{\rm av}$ () de ned in Eq.A2 using a series of G aussian functions. C onsider the eigenvalue distribution P (), which can be expressed as

P() = 
$$\frac{1}{N} \frac{X^{N}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}}$$
 (A5)

The -functions about each eigenvalue are approximated by choosing a Gaussian distribution centered around each eigenvalue with standard deviation  $({}_{k+a} {}_{k-a})=2$ , where 2a is the size of the window used for broadening [65]. Integrating Eq. (A 5) provides an approximation to the function  $F_{av}()$  in the form of a series of error functions, which using Eq. (A 4) yields the unfolded eigenvalues.

#### 2. Fitting the eigenvalue distribution

Phenom enological procedures are likely to contain artical scales, which can lead to an \over-tting" of the smooth part  $F_{\rm av}$ () by adding contributions from the

uctuating part F  $_{\rm uc}$  (). The second procedure for unfolding aim sat circum venting this problem by thing the cumulative distribution of eigenvalues F () (Eq. (A1)) with the analytical expression for

where  $P_{\rm rm}$  () is the probability density of eigenvalues from Eq. (6). The t is perform ed with , \_+, and N as free parameters. The tted function is an estimate for  $F_{\rm av}$  (), whereby we obtain the unfolded eigenvalues  $_{\rm i}$ . One di culty with this method is that the deviations of the spectrum ofC from Eq. (6) can be quite pronounced in certain periods, and it is di cult to nd a good t of the cumulative distribution of eigenvalues to Eq. (A 6).

- [1] J.D.Farmer, Comput.Sci.Eng.1, 26 (1999).
- [2] R.N.M antegna and H.E.Stanley, An Introduction to Econophysics: Correlations and Complexity in Finance (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1999).
- [3] J.P.Bouchaud and M.Potters, Theory of Financial Risk (C am bridge University Press, C am bridge 2000).
- [4] J.Campbell, A.W. Lo, A.C.MacKinlay, The Econom etrics of Financial Markets (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1997).
- [5] E. P. W igner, Ann. M ath. 53, 36 (1951); Proc. Cam bridge Philos. Soc. 47 790 (1951).
- [6] E.P.W igner, \Results and theory of resonance absorption," in Conference on Neutron Physics by Time-ofight (O ak Ridge National Laboratories Press, Gatlinburg, Tennessee, 1956), pp. 59.
- [7] E. P. W igner, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. 47, 790 (1951).
- [8] F.J.Dyson, J.M ath. Phys. 3, 140 (1962).
- [9] F. J. Dyson and M. L. Mehta, J. Math. Phys. 4, 701 (1963).
- [10] M. L. Mehta and F. J. Dyson, J. Math. Phys. 4, 713 (1963).
- [11] M. L. Mehta, Random Matrices (A cademic Press, Boston, 1991).
- [12] T. A. Brody, J. Flores, J. B. French, P. A. Mello, A. Pandey, and S. S. M. Wong, Rev. Mod. Phys. 53, 385 (1981).
- [13] T.Guhr, A.Muller-Groeling, and H.A.W eidenmuller, Phys.Rep.299,190 (1998).
- [14] L. Labux, P. Cizeau, J.-P. Bouchaud and M. Potters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1469 (1999).
- [15] V.Plerou, P.G opikrishnan, B.Rosenow, L.A.N.Amaral, and H.E.Stanley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 1471 (1999).
- [16] R. N. Mantegna, Eur. Phys. J. B 11, 193 (1999); L. Kullmann, J.Kertesz, and R. N. Mantegna, e-print condmat/0002238; An interesting analysis of cross-correlation between stock market indices can be found in G. Bo-

nanno, N. Vandewalle, R. N. Mantegna, e-print condmat/0001268.

- [17] P.G opikrishnan, B.R osenow, V.P lerou, and H.E.Stanley, Physical Review E, in press; See also condm at/0011145.
- [18] The time series of prices have been adjusted for stock splits and dividends.
- [19] Only those stocks, which have survived the 2-yr period 1994{95 were considered in our analysis.
- [20] V.Plerou, P.G opikrishnan, L.A.N.Am aral, M.M eyer, and H.E.Stanley, Phys. Rev. E 60, 6519 (1999); P. G opikrishnan, V.Plerou, L.A.N.Am aral, M.M eyer, and H.E.Stanley, Phys. Rev. E 60, 5305 (1999); P. G opikrishnan, M.M eyer, LAN.Am aral, and H.E.Stanley, Eur.Phys.J.B 3, 139 (1998).
- [21] T.Lux, Applied Financial E conom ics 6, 463 (1996).
- [22] R. M uirhead, A spects of M ultivariate Statistical Theory (W iley, New York, 1982).
- [23] F.J.D yson, Revista Mexicana de Fsica, 20, 231 (1971).
- [24] A.M. Sengupta and P.P.M itra, Phys. Rev. E 60 (1999) 3389.
- [25] M. J. Bowick and E. Brezin, Phys. Lett. B 268, 21, (1991); J. Feinberg and A. Zee, J. Stat. Phys. 87, 473 (1997).
- [26] A nalytical evidence for this \universality" is sum m arized in Section 8 of R ef. [13].
- [27] A recent review is J.J.M. Verbaarschot and T.W ettig, e-print hep-ph/0003017.
- [28] For GOE matrices, the W igner sum ise (Eq. (9)) is not exact [11].D espite this fact, the W igner sum ise is widely used because the di erence between the exact form of  $P_{GOE}$  (s) and Eq. (9) is almost negligible [11].
- [29] A nalogous to the GOE, which is de ned on the space of real sym m etric m atrices, one can de ne two other ensembles [11]: (i) the Gaussian unitary ensemble (GUE), which is de ned on the space of herm itian m atrices, with the requirem ent that the joint probability of elem ents is invariant under unitary transform ations, and (ii) the Gaussian sym plectic ensemble (GSE), which is de ned on the space of herm itian \self-dual" m atrices with the requirem ent that the joint probability of elem ents is invariant under sym plectic transform ations. Form alde nitions can be found in R ef. [11].
- [30] S.D rozdz, F.G ruem m er, F.Ruf, J.Speth, e-print condm at/9911168.
- [31] W .Sharpe, Portfolio Theory and Capital Markets (M c-G raw Hill, New York, NY, 1970).
- [32] W. Sharpe, G. Alexander, and J. Bailey, Investments, 5th Edition (Prentice Hall, Englewood Clis, 1995).
- [33] W .Sharpe, J.Finance 19, 425 (1964).
- [34] J.Lintner, Rev. Econ. Stat. 47, 13 (1965).
- [35] S.Ross, J.Econ. Theory 13, 341 (1976).
- [36] S. Brown and M. Weinstein, J. Finan. Econ. 14, 491 (1985).
- [37] F.Black, J.Business 45, 444 (1972).
- [38] M. Blum e and I. Friend, J. Finance 28, 19 (1973).
- [39] E.Fam a and K.French, J.Finance 47, 427 (1992); J. Finan. Econ. 33, 3 (1993).
- [40] E. Fam a and J. M acbeth, J. Political Econ. 71, 607 (1973).

- [41] R.Rolland S.Ross, J.Finance 49, 101 (1994).
- [42] N.Chen, R.Roll, and S.Ross, J.Business 59, 383 (1986).
- [43] R.C.Merton, Econometrica 41, 867 (1973).
- [44] B. Lehm ann and D. Modest, J. Finan. Econ. 21, 213 (1988).
- [45] J.Cam pbell, J.Political E conom y 104, 298 (1996).
- [46] J.Cam pbell and J.Ammer, J.Finance 48, 3 (1993).
- [47] G. Connor and R. Korajczyk, J. Finan. Econom. 15, 373 (1986); ibid. 21, 255 (1988); J. Finance 48, 1263 (1993).
- [48] A non-Gaussian one-factor model and its relevance to cross-correlations is investigated in P.Cizeau, M.Potters, and J.P.Bouchaud, e-print cond-m at/0006034.
- [49] The limitations of a one-factor description as regards extreme market uctuations can be found in F.Lillo and R.N.M antegna, e-print cond-m at/0006065; e-print cond-m at/0002438.
- [50] Y.V.Fyodorov and A.D.M irlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 1093 (1992); 71, 412 (1993); Int.J.M od.Phys.B 8, 3795 (1994); A.D.M irlin and Y.V.Fyodorov, J.Phys.A: M ath.Gen.26, L551 (1993); E.P.W igner, Ann.M ath. 62, 548 (1955).
- [51] P.A. Lee and T.V. Ram akrishnan, Rev. M od. Phys. 57, 287 (1985).
- [52] M etals or sem iconductors with in purities can be described by H am iltonians with random hopping integrals [F. W egner and R. Opperm ann, Z. Physik B 34, 327 (1979)]. Electron-hopping between neighboring sites is more probable than hopping over large distances, leading to a H am iltonian that is a random band matrix.
- [53] Y. Liu, P. Gopikrishnan, P. Cizeau, C.-K. Peng, M. Meyer, and H. E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. E 60, 1390 (1999); Y. Liu, P. Cizeau, M. Meyer, C.-K. Peng, and H. E. Stanley, Physica A 245, 437 (1997); P. Cizeau, Y. Liu, M. Meyer, C.-K. Peng, and H. E. Stanley, Physica A 245, 441 (1997).
- [54] E.J.Elton and M.J.G ruber, Modern Portfolio Theory and Investment Analysis, J.W iley, New York, 1995.
- [55] L. Labux et al., Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance 3, 391 (2000).
- [56] J.D. Noh, Phys. Rev. E 61, 5981 (2000).
- [57] M.Marsili, e-print cond-m at/0003241.
- [58] K.H.Fischer and J.A.Hertz, Spin Glasses (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1991).
- [59] J.D. Farm er, e-print adap-org/9812005; R. Cont and J.-P.Bouchaud, Eur. Phys. J. B 6, 543 (1998).
- [60] C.K.Peng, et al., Phys. Rev. E 49, 1685 (1994).
- [61] V.Plerou, P.G opikrishnan, L.A.N.Am aral, X.G abaix, and H.E.Stanley, Phys. Rev. E 62, R 3023 (2000).
- [62] In contrast, the autocorrelation function for the S& P 500 index returns G<sub>SP</sub> (t) displays only correlations on short-time scales of < 30 m in, beyond which the autocorrelation function is at the level of noise [53]. On the other hand, the returns for individual stocks have pronounced anti-correlations on short time scales ( 30 m in), which is an e ect of the bid-ask bounce [4]. For certain portfolios of stocks, returns are found to have long m em ory [A. Lo, E conom etrica 59, 1279 (1991)].</p>
- [63] For the case of predom inantly \ferrom agnetic" couplings  $(J_{ij} > 0)$  within disjoint groups of stocks, a factor model (such as Eq. (19)) can be derived from the model of \in-

teracting stocks" in Eq. (27). In the spirit of a mean-eld approximation, the in uence of the price changes of all other stocks in a group on the price of a given stock can be modeled by an elective eld, which has to be calculated self-consistently. This elective eld would then play a similar role as a factor in standard economic models.

- [64] M. Brack, J. D am gaard, A S. Jensen, H C. Pauli, V M. Strutinsky, and C Y. W ong, Rev. M od. Phys. 44, 320 (1972).
- [65] H.Bruus and J.-C Angles d'Auriac, Europhys. Lett. 35, 321 (1996).

TABLE I. Largest ten components of the eigenvectors  $u^{999}$  up to  $u^{991}$ . The columns show ticker symbols, industry type, and the Standard Industry Classication (SIC) code respectively.

T icker	Industry	Indu <i>s</i> try Code	
	u <sup>999</sup>		
XON	0 il & G as E quipm ent/Services	2911	
ΡG	C leaning P roducts	2840	
JN J	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834	
КO	Beverages-Soft Drinks	2080	
PFE	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834	
BEL	Telecom Services/Domestic	4813	
МОВ	0 il & G as E quipm ent/Services	2911	
BEN	Asset Management	6282	
UN	Food — Major Diversi ed	2000	
A IG	Property/Casualty Insurance	6331	
	u <sup>998</sup>		
ΤΧΝ	Sem iconductor-B road Line	3674	
ΜU	Sem iconductor-M em ory Chips	3674	
LSI	Sem iconductor-Specialized	3674	
МΟТ	E lectronic E quipm ent	3663	
CPQ	PersonalCom puters	3571	
СҮ	Sem iconductor-B road Line	3674	
TER	Sem iconductor Equip/M aterials	3825	
N SM	Sem iconductor-B road Line	3674	
HW P	D iversi ed C om puter System s	3570	
ЪМ	D iversi ed C om puter System s	3570	
997			
PDG	Gold	1040	
NEM	Gold	1040	
NGC	Gold	1040	
ABX	Gold	1040	
A SA	Closed-End Fund – (Gold)	6799	
	C 11	1040	

A SA	Closed-End Fund – (Gold)	6799
ΗM	Gold	1040
BM G	Gold	1040
AU	Gold	1040
H SM	General Building Materials	5210
ΜU	Sem iconductor-M em ory Chips	3674

		u <sup>996</sup>	
NEM	Gold		1040
РDG	Gold		1040
ABX	Gold		1040

НM	Gold	1040
NGC	Gold	1040
A SA	Closed-End Fund – (Gold)	6799
BM G	Gold	1040
CHL	W ireless C om m unications	4813
СМВ	M oney Center Banks	6021
CCI	M oney Center Banks	6021

### u<sup>995</sup>

	ä		
ТΜХ	Telecommunication Services/Foreign	4813	
ΤV	Broadcasting – Television	4833	
ΜXF	Closed-End Fund – Foreign	6726	
IC A	Heavy Construction	1600	
GΤR	Heavy Construction	1600	
СТС	Telecom Services/Foreign	4813	
ΡB	Beverages-Soft Drinks	2086	
ΥΡF	Independent0il& Gas	2911	
ΤΧΝ	Sem iconductor-Broad Line	3674	
ΜU	Sem iconductor-M em ory Chips	3674	

	u <sup>994</sup>	
BAC	M oney Center Banks	6021
CHL	W ireless C om m un ications	4813
ΒK	M oney Center Banks	6022
CCI	M oney Center Banks	6021
СМВ	M oney Center Banks	6021
ΒТ	M oney Center Banks	6022
JPM	M oney Center Banks	6022
ΜΕL	Regional-Northeast Banks	6021
ΝB	M oney Center Banks	6021
W FC	M oney CenterBanks	6021

	u <sup>993</sup>			
ΒP	0 il & G as E quipm ent/Services	2911		
МОВ	0 il & GasEquipment/Services	2911		
SLB	0 il & GasEquipment/Services	1389		
ТΧ	M a jor Integrated O il/G as	2911		
UCL	0il& GasRening/Marketing	1311		
ARC	0 il & GasEquipment/Services	2911		
ΒΗΙ	0 il & GasEquipment/Services	3533		
CHV	M a jor Integrated O il/G as	2911		
APC	Independent 0 il & G as	1311		
AN	A uto D ealerships	2911		

	u <sup>992</sup>	
FPR	A uto M anufacturers/M a jor	3711
F	A uto M anufacturers/M a jor	3711
С	A uto M anufacturers/M a jor	3711
GΜ	A uto M anufacturers/M a jor	3711
ΤΧΝ	Sem iconductor-Broad Line	3674
ADI	Sem iconductor-Broad Line	3674
СҮ	Sem iconductor-Broad Line	3674
TER	Sem iconductor Equip/M aterials	3825
ΜGΑ	A uto P arts	3714
LSI	Sem iconductor-Specialized	3674
	991	

	u	
ABT	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
ΡFΕ	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834

SG P	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
LLY	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
JN J	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
AHC	0 il & G as R e ning/M arketing	2911
ВМ Ү	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
HAL	0 il & G as E quipm ent/Services	1600
W LA	D rug M anufacturers/M a jor	2834
BHI	Oil& GasEquipment/Services	3533



FIG.1. (a) P (C<sub>ij</sub>) for C calculated using 30-m in returns of 1000 stocks for the 2-yr period 1994{95 (solid line) and 881 stocks for the 2-yr period 1996{97 (dashed line). For the period 1996{97 hC<sub>ij</sub>i = 0.06, larger than the value hC<sub>ij</sub>i = 0.03 for 1994{95. The shaded region shows the distribution of correlation coe cients for the control P (R<sub>ij</sub>) of Eq. (5), which is consistent with a G aussian distribution with zero mean. (b) P (C<sub>ij</sub>) calculated from daily returns of 422 stocks for ve 7-yr sub-periods in the 35 years 1962{96. We nd a large value of hC<sub>ij</sub>i = 0.18 for the period 1983{89, com pared with the average hC<sub>ij</sub>i = 0.10 for the other periods.



FIG.2. The stair-step curve shows the average value of the correlation coe cients hC  $_{ij}i$ , calculated from 422 422 correlation matrices C constructed from daily returns using a sliding L = 965 day time window in discrete steps of L=5 = 193 days. The diam onds correspond to the largest eigenvalue  $_{422}$  (scaled by a factor 4  $1^\circ$ ) for the correlation matrices thus obtained. The bottom curve shows the S&P 500 volatility (scaled for clarity) calculated from daily records with a sliding window of length 40 days. W e nd that both hC  $_{ij}i$  and  $_{422}$  have large values for periods containing the market crash of 0 ctober 19, 1987.



FIG.3. (a) Eigenvalue distribution P () for C constructed from the 30-m in returns for 1000 stocks for the 2-yr period 1994 [95. The solid curve shows the RM T result  $P_{rm}$  () of Eq. (6). We note several eigenvalues outside the RM T upper bound + (shaded region). The inset shows the largest eigenvalue 1000 50 + . (b) P () for the random correlation m atrix R, com puted from N = 1000 com puter-generated random uncorrelated time series with length L = 6448 shows good agreem ent with the RM T result, Eq. (6) (solid curve).



FIG.4.P() for C constructed from daily returns of 422 stocks for the 7-yr period 1990{96. The solid curve shows the RMT result  $P_{\rm rm}$  () of Eq. (6) using N = 422 and L = 1;737. The dot-dashed curve shows a t to P() using  $P_{\rm rm}$  () with + and as free parameters. We nd similar results as found in Fig.3(a) for 30-m in returns. The largest eigenvalue (not shown) has the value \_{422} = 46:3.



FIG.5. (a) Nearest-neighbor (nn) spacing distribution Pnn (s) of the unfolded eigenvalues i of C constructed from 30-m in returns for the 2-yr period 1994 {95. We nd good agreem ent with the GOE result  $P_{GOE}$  (s) [Eq. (9)] (solid line). The dashed line is a t to the one parameter Brody distribution P<sub>Br</sub> [Eq. (10)]. The tyields = 0:99 0:02, in good agreement with the GOE prediction = 1. A Kolm ogorov-Sm innov test shows that the GOE is  $10^5$  times more likely to be the correct description than the Gaussian unitary ensemble, and  $10^{20}$  times more likely than the GSE. (b) Next-nearest-neighbor (nnn) eigenvalue spacing distribution  $P_{nnn}$  (s) of C compared to the nearest-neighbor spacing distribution of GSE shows good agreement. A Kolmogorov-Sm imov test cannot reject the hypothesis that  $P_{GSE}$  (s) is the correct distribution at the 65% con dence level. The results shown above are using the Gaussian broadening procedure. Using the second procedure of thing F ( ) (Appendix A) yields sim ilar results.



FIG.6. Nearest-neighbor spacing distribution P (s) of the unfolded eigenvalues  $_{i}$  of C computed from the daily returns of 422 stocks for the 7-yr periods (a) 1962{68 (b) 1976{82 (c) 1983{89, and (d) 1990{96. We nd good agreement with the GOE result (solid curve). The unfolding was performed by using the procedure of tting the cumulative distribution of eigenvalues (Appendix A). G aussian broadening procedure also yields similar results.



FIG.7. (a) Number variance  $^2$  (') calculated from the unfolded eigenvalues  $_i$  of C constructed from 30-m in returns for the 2-yr period 1994 (95. W e used G aussian broadening procedure with the broadening parameter a = 15. W e nd good agreement with the GOE result of Eq.13 (solid curve). The dashed line corresponds to the uncorrelated case (Poisson). For the range of 'shown, unfolding by tting also yields sim ilar results.



FIG.8. (a) D istribution (u) of eigenvector components for one eigenvalue in the bulk < < + show s good agreement with the RM T prediction of Eq. (17) (solid curve). Sim - ilar results are obtained for other eigenvalues in the bulk. (u) for (b) u<sup>996</sup> and (c) u<sup>999</sup>, corresponding to eigenvalues larger than the RM T upper bound + (shaded region in Fig.3). (d) (u) for u<sup>1000</sup> deviates signi cantly from the G aussian prediction of RM T. The above plots are for C constructed from 30-m in returns for the 2-yr period 1994{95. W e also obtain sim ilar results for C constructed from daily returns.



FIG.9. (a) S&P 500 returns at t = 30 m in regressed against the 30-m in return on the portfolio G<sup>1000</sup> (Eq. (18)) de ned by the eigenvector  $u^{1000}$ , for the 2-yr period 1994{95. Both axes are scaled by their respective standard deviations. A linear regression yields a slope 0.85 0.09. (b) Return (in units of standard deviations) on the portfolio de ned by an eigenvector corresponding to an eigenvalue  $_{400}$  within the RM T bounds regressed against the norm alized returns of the S&P 500 index shows no signi cant dependence. Both axes are scaled by their respective standard deviations. The slope of the linear t is 0.014 0.011, close to 0 indicating that the dependence between G<sup>1000</sup> and G<sub>SP</sub> (t) found in part (a) is statistically signi cant.



FIG. 10. Probability distribution P( $C_{ij}$ ) of the cross-correlation coe cients for the 2-yr period 1994{95 before and after rem oving the e ect of the largest eigenvalue  $_{1000}$ . Note that rem oving the e ect of  $_{1000}$  shifts P( $C_{ij}$ ) toward a sm aller average value h $C_{ij}i = 0.002$  com pared to the original value h $C_{ij}i = 0.03$ .



FIG.11. (a) Inverse participation ratio ( $\mathbb{PR}$ ) as a function of eigenvalue for the random cross-correlation m atrix R of Eq. (6) constructed using N = 1000 m utually uncorrelated time series of length L = 6448. IPR for C constructed from (b) 6448 records of 30-m in returns for 1000 stocks for the 2-yr period 1994{95, (c) 1737 records of 1-day returns for 422 stocks in the 7-yr period 1990{96, and (d) 1737 records of 1-day returns for 422 stocks in the 7-yr period 1983{89. The shaded regions show the RM T bounds [+;].



FIG. 12. All  $10^3$  eigenvector components of  $u^{999}$  plotted against market capitalization (in units of US D ollars) shows that mswith large market capitalization contribute significantly. The straight line, which shows a logarithm ic t, is a guide to the eye.



FIG.13. Schem atic illustration of the interpretation of the eigenvectors corresponding to the eigenvalues that deviate from the RMT upper bound. The dashed curve shows the RMT result of Eq. (6).



FIG.14. G rey scale pixel representation of the overlap m atrix O (t; ) as a function of time for 30-m in data for the 2-yr period 1994{95. Here, the grey scale coding is such that black corresponds to O<sub>ij</sub> = 1 and white corresponds to O<sub>ij</sub> = 0. The length of the time w indow used to compute C is L = 1612 ( 60 days) and the separation = L=4 = 403 used to calculate successive O<sub>ij</sub>. Thus, the left gure on the rst row corresponds to the overlap between the eigenvector from the starting t = 0 w indow and the eigenvector from time w indow = L=4 later. The right gure is for = 2L=4. In the same w ay, the left gure on the second row is for = 3L=4, the right gure for = 4L=4, and so on. Even for large 1 yr, the largest four eigenvectors show large values of O<sub>ij</sub>.



FIG.15. G rey scale pixel representation of the overlap matrix hO (t; ) it for 1-day data, where we have averaged over all starting points t. Here, the length of the time window used to compute C is L = 965 ( 4 yr) and the separation = L=5 = 193 days used to calculate O<sub>ij</sub>. Thus, the left gure on the rst row is for = L=5 and the right gure is for = 2L=5. In the same way, the left gure on the second row is for = 3L=5, the right gure for = 4L=5, and so on. Even for large 20 yr, the largest two eigenvectors show large values of O<sub>ij</sub>.



FIG.16. (a) Portfolio return R as a function of risk D  $^2$  for the fam ily of optim alportfolios (without a risk-free asset) constructed from the original matrix C. The top curve shows the predicted risk  $D_p^2$  in 1995 of the fam ily of optim al portfolios for a given return, calculated using 30-m in returns for 1995 and the correlation m atrix C<sub>94</sub> for 1994. For the same fam ily of portfolios, the bottom curve shows the realized risk D  $_{\rm r}^2$ calculated using the correlation matrix C<sub>95</sub> for 1995. These two curves di er by a factor of D $_r^2 = D_p^2$  2:7. (b) R isk-return relationship for the optim al portfolios constructed using the Itered correlation matrix C<sup>0</sup>. The top curve shows the predicted risk  $D_p^2$  in 1995 for the fam ily of optim alportfolios for a given return, calculated using the ltered correlation matrix  $C_{94}^0$ . The bottom curve shows the realized risk  $D_r^2$  for the sam e fam ily of portfolios com puted using C<sup>0</sup><sub>95</sub>. The predicted risk is now closer to the realized risk:  $D_r^2 = D_p^2$ 1:25.Forthe sam e fam ily of optim alportfolios, the dashed curve shows the realized risk computed using the original correlation matrix  $C_{95}$  for which  $D_r^2 = D_p^2$ 1:3.



FIG.17. (a) Autocorrelation function  $c^{(k)}$  ( ) of the time series de ned by the eigenvector  ${\rm u}^{\rm 999}$  . The solid line shows a t to a power-law functional form <sup>k</sup>, whereby we obtain values k = 0.61 0.06. (b) To quantify the exponents k for all  $k = 1; \dots; 1000$  eigenvectors, we use the method of DFA analysis [60] often used to obtain accurate estimates of power-law correlations. We plot the detrended uctuation function F ( ) as a function of the time scale for each of the 1000 time series. Absence of long-range correlations would  $^{0:5}$ , whereas F () imply F () with 0:5 < 1 in plies power-law decay of the correlation function with exponent = 2 2. We plot the exponents as a function of the eigenvalue and nd values exponents signi cantly larger than 0:5 for all the deviating eigenvectors. In contrast, for the remainder of the eigenvectors, we obtain the mean value = 0:44 0:04, com parable to the value = 0:5 for the uncorrelated case.