arXiv:math/0506027v1 [math.ST] 2 Jun 2005

Modelling Multivariate Volatilities via Conditionally Uncorrelated Components*

Jianqing Fan[1,2] Mingjin Wang[2,3] Qiwei Yao[2,3]

[1] Benheim Center of Finance and
Department of Operations Research and Financial Engineering
Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

[2]Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, London, WC2A 2AE, UK

[3] Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

Abstract

We propose to model multivariate volatility processes based on the newly defined conditionally uncorrelated components (CUCs). This model represents a parsimonious representation for matrix-valued processes. It is flexible in the sense that we may fit each CUC with any appropriate univariate volatility model. Computationally it splits one high-dimensional optimization problem into several lower-dimensional subproblems. Consistency for the estimated CUCs has been established. A bootstrap test is proposed for testing the existence of CUCs. The proposed methodology is illustrated with both simulated and real data sets.

Key words: dimension reduction, extended GARCH(1,1), financial returns, multivariate volatility, portfolio volatility, time series.

*Partially supported by an EPSRC research grant and by NSF grant DMS-0355179.

1 Introduction

One of the most prolific areas of research in the financial econometrics literature in last two decades is to model time-varying volatility of financial returns. Many statistical models, most designed for univariate data, have been proposed for this purpose. From the practical point of view, there are at least two incentives to model several financial returns jointly. First, time-varying correlations among different securities are important and useful information for portfolio optimization, asset pricing and risk management. Secondly, modelling for single security may be improved by incorporating the relevant information in other securities. The quest for modelling multivariate processes, which are often represented by conditional covariance matrices, has motivated the attempts to extending univariate volatility models to multivariate cases, aiming for practical and/or statistical effectiveness. We list some of the endeavors below.

Let $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ be a vector-valued (return) time series with

$$E(\mathbf{X}_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = 0, \qquad \mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{X}_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \mathbf{\Sigma}_t \equiv \big(\sigma_{t,ij}\big),$$

where $\mathcal{F}_t$ is the σ-algebra generated by $\{\mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{X}_{t-1}, \cdots\}$, and $\mathbf{\Sigma}_t$ is an $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$-measurable $d \times d$ semi-positive definite matrix. One of the most general multivariate GARCH(p, q) model is the BEKK representation (Engle and Kroner 1995)

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_t = \mathbf{C} + \sum_{i=1}^{p}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbf{A}_{ij}\mathbf{X}_{t-i}\mathbf{X}_{t-i}^{\tau}\mathbf{A}_{ij}^{\tau} + \sum_{i=1}^{q}\sum_{j=1}^{m} \mathbf{B}_{ij}\mathbf{\Sigma}_{t-i}\mathbf{B}_{ij}^{\tau}, \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathbf{C}, \mathbf{A}_{ij}, \mathbf{B}_{ij}$ are $d \times d$ matrices, and $\mathbf{C}$ is positive definite (denoted as $\mathbf{C} > 0$). Although the form of the above model is quite general especially when m is reasonably large (Proposition 2.2 of Engle and Kroner 1995), it suffers from the problems of overparametrization. Similar to multivariate ARMA models, not all parameters in model (1.1) are necessarily identifiable even when $m = 1$. Overparametrization will also lead to a flat likelihood function, making statistical inference intrinsically difficult and computationally troublesome. See, for example, Engle and Kroner (1995), and Jerez, Casals and Sotoca (2001).

To overcome the difficulties due to overparametrization, a dynamic conditional correlation (DCC) model (Engle 2002, Engle and Sheppard 2001) has been proposed. It is based on the decomposition

$$\mathbf{\Sigma}_t = \mathbf{D}_t\mathbf{R}_t\mathbf{D}_t, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\mathbf{D}_t = \text{diag}(\sigma_{t,11}^{1/2}, \cdots, \sigma_{t,dd}^{1/2})$, $\sigma_{t,ii}$ is the conditional variance of the i-th component of $\mathbf{X}_t$, and $\mathbf{R}_t \equiv (\rho_{t,ij})$ is the conditional correlation matrix. A simple way to facilitate such a model is to model each $\sigma_{t,ii}$ with a univariate volatility model and to model conditional correlation using a rolling exponential smoothing as follows

$$\rho_{t,ij} = \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \lambda^k \varepsilon_{t-k,i}\varepsilon_{t-k,j} \Big/ \Big\{ \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \lambda^k \varepsilon_{t-k,i}^2 \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} \lambda^k \varepsilon_{t-k,j}^2 \Big\}^{1/2},$$

where $\varepsilon_{ti} = X_{ti}/\sigma_{t,ii}^{1/2}$. Even with such a simple specification, estimation typically involves solving a high-dimensional optimization problem as, for example, the Gaussian likelihood function cannot be factorized into several lower-dimensional functions. To overcome the computational difficulty, Engle (2002) proposes a two-step estimation procedure as follows: first fit each $\sigma_{t,ii}$ in (1.2) with a univariate GARCH(1,1) model using the observations on the i-th component of $\mathbf{X}_t$ only, and then model the conditional correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}_t$ by a simple GARCH(1,1) form

$$\mathbf{R}_t = \mathbf{S}(1 - \theta_1 - \theta_2) + \theta_1(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-1}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-1}') + \theta_2\mathbf{R}_{t-1}, \tag{1.3}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ is a $d \times 1$ vector of the standardized residuals obtained in the separate GARCH(1,1) fittings for the d components of $\mathbf{X}_t$, and $\mathbf{S}$ is the sample correlation matrix of $\mathbf{X}_t$. Note there are only two unknown parameters θ_1, θ_2 in the dynamical correlation model (1.3), so it can be easily implemented even for large or very large d. However it may not provide adequate fitting when the components of $\mathbf{X}_t$ exhibit different dynamic correlation structures; see an example of three-dimensional data set in section 4 below. Furthermore in modelling the volatility for each component, no attempts are made to extract additional information from other components.

Alexander (2001) proposes an orthogonal GARCH model which fits each principal component (PC) with a univariate GARCH model separately, and treats all PCs as *conditionally* uncorrelated random variables. Since PCs are only unconditionally uncorrelated, such a misspecification may lead to non-negligible errors in the fitting; see, for example, Figure 5 and related discussions in section 4 below.

Other multivariate volatility models include, for example, vectorized multivariate GARCH models of Bollerslev, Engle and Wooldridge (1988), constant conditional correlation multivariate GARCH models of Bollerslev (1990), a multivariate stochastic volatility model of Harvey, Ruiz and Shephard (1994), a generalized orthogonal GARCH models of van der Weide (2002), an easy-to-fit ad hoc approach of Wang and Yao (2005); see also a survey in Bauwens, Laurent and

Rombouts (2003) and the references within.

While all the aforementioned models have their own merits, each of them has one or more of the three drawbacks; (i) overparametrization, (ii) computational complication, and (iii) too simple to catch some important dynamical structures.

In this paper, we propose a new modelling methodology which mitigates the above three drawbacks. The basic idea is to assume that $\mathbf{X}_t$ is a linear combination of a set of *conditionally uncorrelated components* (CUCs); see section 2.1 below. One fundamental difference from the orthogonal GARCH model is that we use CUCs, instead of PCs, which are genuinely conditionally uncorrelated. The advantages of the new approach include: (i) the CUC decomposition leads to a parsimonious representation for multivariate volatility (matrix-valued) processes — there is no model identification problems, (ii) it has the flexibility to model each CUC with any appropriate univariate volatility models, (iii) computationally it splits a high-dimensional optimization problem into several lower-dimensional subproblems, and (iv) it allows the volatility model for one CUC to depend on the lagged value of the other CUCs.

The idea of using CUCs is similar to the so-called the independent component analysis (Hyvärinen, Karhunen and Oja 2001). However instead of requiring all the component series are independent with each other, we only impose a weaker condition that the component series are conditionally uncorrelated; see (2.1) below. Of course the existence of CUCs is also not always guaranteed. We propose a bootstrap test to assess the feasibility of such an approach. Our empirical experience shows that for a large number of practical examples, there is no significant evidence to reject the hypothesis that the CUCs exist.

Literature on applying independent components analysis to financial and economic time series includes, for example, Back and Weigend (1997), Kiviluoto and Oja (1998), Mălăroiu, Kiviluoto and Oja (2000), and van der Weide (2002). Although our basic idea is somehow similar to van der Weide (2002), our approach is completely different.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 contains a detailed description of the proposed new methodology and the associated theoretical results. Simulation results are reported in section 3. Illustrations with real data examples are presented in section 4. Technical proofs are relegated in appendices.

2 Methodology

2.1 Basic setting

To simplify the matter concerned, we may assume $\mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{X}_t) = \mathbf{I}_d$ — the $d \times d$ identity matrix. In practice, this amounts to replacing $\mathbf{X}_t$ by $\mathbf{S}^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}_t$, where $\mathbf{S}$ is the sample covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}_t$. We assume that each component of $\mathbf{X}_t$ is a linear combination of d conditionally uncorrelated components (CUCs) $Z_{t1}, \cdots, Z_{td}$ which satisfy the conditions $E(Z_{ti}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = 0$, $\mathrm{Var}(Z_{ti}) = 1$, and

$$E(Z_{ti}Z_{tj}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = 0, \quad \text{for all } i \neq j. \tag{2.1}$$

Put $\mathbf{Z}_t = (Z_{t1}, \cdots, Z_{td})^\tau$. The above setting implies that

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Z}_t, \quad \mathbf{Z}_t = \mathbf{A}^\tau \mathbf{X}_t, \tag{2.2}$$

for a constant matrix $\mathbf{A}$. Furthermore, $\mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{Z}_t) = \mathbf{A}^\tau \mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{X}_t)\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}^\tau\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_d$. Hence $\mathbf{A}$ is a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix with $\frac{d}{2}(d-1)$ free elements. Put

$$\mathrm{Var}(\mathbf{Z}_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_{t1}^2, \cdots, \sigma_{td}^2), \tag{2.3}$$

i.e. $\sigma_{tj}^2 = \mathrm{Var}(Z_{tj}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$. It is easy to see that once we have specified σ_{tj}^2 – the volatility of the j-th CUC, for $j = 1, \cdots, d$, volatilities for any portfolios can be deduced accordingly. For example, for any portfolios $\xi_t = \mathbf{b}_1^\tau \mathbf{X}_t$ and $\eta_t = \mathbf{b}_2^\tau \mathbf{X}_t$ it holds that

$$\mathrm{Var}(\xi_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} b_{j1}^2\, \sigma_{tj}^2, \qquad \mathrm{Cov}(\xi_t, \eta_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} b_{j1}b_{j2}\, \sigma_{tj}^2.$$

where $(b_{1j}, \cdots, b_{dj}) = \mathbf{b}_j^\tau \mathbf{A}$ $(j = 1, 2)$. Hence, the CUC decomposition (2.2) facilitates a parsimonious modelling for d-dimensional multivariate volatility process via d univariate volatility models. In this way, we reduce the number of parameters involved substantially.

2.2 Estimation of CUCs

2.2.1 Estimation procedure

By (2.2), $Z_{tj} = \mathbf{a}_j^\tau \mathbf{X}_t$, and $\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_d$ are d orthogonal vectors. The goal is to estimate the orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_d)$. Note the order of $\mathbf{a}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}_d$ is arbitrary, and cannot be identified. Furthermore, $\mathbf{a}_j$ can be replaced by $-\mathbf{a}_j$.

Condition (2.1) is equivalent to

$$\max_{B\in\mathcal{B}_t}\left|E\{Z_{ti}Z_{tj}I(B)\}\right|=0 \tag{2.4}$$

for any π-class $\mathcal{B}_t\subset\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ such that the σ-algebra generated by $\mathcal{B}_t$ is equal to $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ (Theorem 7.1.1 of Chow and Teicher, 1997). In practice, we use some simple $\mathcal{B}_t$ for the sake of the tractability. This leads to choosing an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A}=(\mathbf{a}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{a}_d)^\tau$ which minimizes

$$\Psi_n(\mathbf{A})\equiv\sum_{1\le i<j\le d}\sup_{B\in\mathcal{B},\,1\le k\le k_0}\frac{1}{n-k}\Big|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau\Big\{\sum_{t=k+1}^{n}\mathbf{X}_t\mathbf{X}_t^\tau I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B)\Big\}\mathbf{a}_j\Big|, \tag{2.5}$$

where $\mathcal{B}$ is a collection of subsets in $\mathcal{R}^d$, $k_0\ge 1$ is a prescribed integer. We denote by $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}=(\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_1,\cdots,\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_d)^\tau$ the resulting estimator.

Since the order of $\mathbf{a}_1,\cdots,\mathbf{a}_d$ is arbitrary, we measure the estimation error by

$$D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}},\ \mathbf{A})=1-\frac{1}{d}\sum_{i=1}^{d}\max_{1\le j\le d}|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j|. \tag{2.6}$$

Note that for any orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$, $D(\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B})\ge 0$. Furthermore, if the columns of $\mathbf{A}$ are obtained from a permutation of the columns of $\mathbf{B}$ or their reflections, $D(\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B})=0$. In fact $\Psi_n(\mathbf{A})=\Psi_n(\mathbf{B})$ if and only if $D(\mathbf{A},\mathbf{B})=0$.

In practice, we may let $\mathcal{B}$ consist of balls with an appropriately selected radius (such that each ball contains sufficiently many data points) centered on a grid in the sample space of $\mathbf{X}_t$. For example, we may use those observations $\mathbf{X}_t$ as the centres of balls such as at least one of the components of $\mathbf{X}_t$ is the 10th, the 20th, $\cdots$ the 90th sample percentile of the corresponding component observations.

To overcome the difficulties in handling the constraint $\mathbf{A}^\tau\mathbf{A}=\mathbf{I}_d$ in solving the above optimization problem, we reparametrize $\mathbf{A}$ in terms of the decompositions:

$$\mathbf{A}=\prod_{1\le i<j\le d}\mathbf{E}_{ij}(\varphi_{ij}), \tag{2.7}$$

where $\mathbf{E}_{ij}(\varphi_{ij})$ is obtained from the identity matrix $\mathbf{I}_d$ with the following replacements: both the (i,i)-th and the (j,j)-th elements are replaced by $\cos\varphi_{ij}$, the (i,j)-th and the (j,i)-th elements are replaced, respectively, by $\sin\varphi_{ij}$ and $-\sin\varphi_{ij}$ (Vilenkin 1968, van der Weide 2002). Obviously $\mathbf{E}_{ij}(\varphi_{ij})$ is an orthogonal matrix, so is $\mathbf{A}$ given in (2.7). Writing $\mathbf{A}$ in (2.2) in the form of (2.7), the constrained minimization of (2.5) over orthogonal $\mathbf{A}$ is transformed to an unconstrained minimization problem over a $\frac{d(d-1)}{2}\times 1$ vector $\boldsymbol{\varphi}=(\varphi_{12},\varphi_{13},\cdots,\varphi_{1d},\varphi_{23},\cdots,\varphi_{d-1,d})^\tau$. This

minimization problem is typically solved by iterative algorithms. We stop the iteration when $D(\mathbf{A}_k, \mathbf{A}_{k+1})$ is smaller than a prescribed small number, where $\mathbf{A}_k$ denotes the value of $\mathbf{A}$ in the k-th iteration, and D is defined as in (2.6).

Remark 1. In practice, we may replace (2.5) by a weighted version

$$\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}, 1\le k\le k_0} \frac{1}{n-k}\Big|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \Big\{\frac{\sum_{t=k+1}^n \mathbf{X}_t\mathbf{X}_t^\tau[I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B)+\varepsilon_0]}{\sum_{i=k+1}^n [I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B)+\varepsilon_0]}\Big\}\mathbf{a}_j\Big|,$$

where ε_0 is a small constant guarding against zero denominator. This puts more emphasis on small sets B. Furthermore, the superemum over k in (2.5) may be replaced the summation over k.

2.2.2 Asymptotic properties

We first introduce two concepts: mixing which measures the decaying speed of the auto-dependence for a time series over an increasing time span, and the Vapnik-Červonenkis (or VC) index which measures the complexity of a collection of sets.

Let $\mathcal{F}_i^j$ be the σ-algebra generated by $\{\mathbf{X}_t, i\le t\le j\}$. The β-mixing coefficients is defined as

$$\beta(n) = E\left\{\sup_{B\in\mathcal{F}_n^\infty} |P(B) - P(B|\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^0)|\right\}.$$

(See §2.6.1 of Fan and Yao, 2003.)

For an arbitrary set of n points $\{x_1,\cdots,x_n\}$, there are 2^n possible subsets. Say that $\mathcal{B}$ picks out a certain subset from $\{x_1,\cdots,x_n\}$ if this can be formed as a set of the form $B\cap\{x_1,\cdots,x_n\}$ for a set B in $\mathcal{B}$. The collection $\mathcal{B}$ shatters $\{x_1,\cdots,x_n\}$ if each of its 2^n subsets can be picked out by $\mathcal{B}$. The VC-index of $\mathcal{B}$ refers to the smallest n for which no set of size n is shattered by $\mathcal{B}$. A collection of sets $\mathcal{B}$ is called a VC-class if its VC-index is finite. The collections of sets of rectangles, balls and their unions are VC-classes. See Chapter 2.6 of van der Vaart and Wellner (1996) for further discussion on VC-classes.

Under the regularity conditions listed below, the estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ is consistent; see Theorem 1. Its proof is relegated in Appendix A.

(A1) The collection $\mathcal{B}$ of sets in $\mathcal{R}^d$ is a VC-class.

(A2) The process $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ is strictly stationary with $E||\mathbf{X}_t||^2<\infty$, where $||\cdot||$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Furthermore, the β-mixing coefficients $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ satisfy $\beta(n)=O(n^{-b})$ for some $b>0$.

(A3) There exists a $d \times d$ orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A}_0$ which minimises

$$\Psi(\mathbf{A}) \equiv \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} \sup_{1 \le k \le k_0, B \in \mathcal{B}} \left| E\{\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t^\tau \mathbf{a}_j I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B)\} \right|.$$

Furthermore the minimum value of Ψ is obtained at an orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A}$ if and only if $D(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}_0) = 0$.

(A4). $E\|\mathbf{X}_t\|^{2p} < \infty$ for some $p > 2$ and the β-mixing coefficient in (A2) holds for $b > p/(p-2)$.

(A5) $\Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}) \le -aD(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}_0)$ for any orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A}$ such that $D(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{A}_0)$ is smaller than a small but fixed constant, where $a > 0$ is a constant.

Remark 2. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be the set consisting of all $d \times d$ orthogonal matrices. Then $\mathcal{H}$ may be partitioned into the equivalent classes defined by the distance D in (2.6) as follows: the D-distance between any two elements within an equivalent class is 0, and the D-distance between any two elements from different classes is greater than 0. Let $\mathcal{H}_D$ be the quotient space $\mathcal{H}/D$ consisting of those equivalent classes in $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. we treat $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ as the same element in $\mathcal{H}_D$ if and only if $D(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) = 0$. Condition (A3) ensures $\mathbf{A}_0$ is the unique minimiser of $\Psi(\mathbf{A})$ on $\mathcal{H}_D$. In fact both $\Psi(\cdot)$ and $\Psi_n(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{H}_D$ with D-distance; see Lemma 1 in Appendix A below.

Theorem 1. Let $k_0 \ge 1$ be a fixed integer. Under conditions (A1)–(A3), $D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}_0) \to 0$ almost surely as $n \to \infty$. If, in addition, condition (A4) holds, then

$$\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}) = O_P(n^{-1/2}), \quad \text{for any orthogonal } \mathbf{A}.$$

Furthermore, $n^{1/2} D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}_0) = O_P(1)$ provided that, in addition, condition (A5) also holds.

When the CUCs exist, namely $\Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) = 0$, $\mathbf{A}_0$ corresponds to the transform for the CUCs. When the CUC does not exist, Theorem 1 continues to hold. In this case, $\Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) \neq 0$ and indeed $\mathbf{A}_0$ can depend on the π-class $\mathcal{B}$. In practice, we really do not know whether this condition holds or not. In that case, our aim becomes naturally to find an orthogonal transform such that the resulting components are as less conditionally correlated as possible. Observe that the conditional correlation criterion

$$\Psi(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le d} \sup_{1 \le k \le k_0, B \in \mathcal{B}} \left| \mathrm{Corr}(\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{X}_t, \mathbf{a}_j^T \mathbf{X}_t | \mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B) \right| P(\mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B).$$

Thus, a reasonable criterion is to find an orthogonal transform $\mathbf{A}$ to minimize $\Psi(\mathbf{A})$. The following theorem shows that our estimation method possesses some degrees of robustness and is better than the principal component transform in terms of minimizing the conditional correlation criterion $\Psi(\mathbf{A})$.

Theorem 2. Let $k_0 \geq 1$ be a fixed integer. Under conditions (A1), (A2), for any other orthogonal transform $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$, we have

$$\liminf\{\Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{B}})\} \leq 0.$$

Theorem 2 shows for any other orthogonal transform $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}$, asymptotically, the transformed components have higher conditional correlation, in terms of $\Psi(\cdot)$, than those transformed by $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$.

2.3 Modelling volatilities for CUCs

Once the CUCs have been identified, we may fit each σ_{tj}^2 with any appropriate univariate volatility model, for example, a GARCH model, a stochastic volatility model, or any nonparametric and semiparametric volatility models. As a simple illustration, we establish below an extended GARCH(1,1) model for each of σ_{ti}^2 given in (2.3).

2.3.1 Extended GARCH(1,1) models

We assume, for the j-th CUC, $j = 1, \cdots, d$,

$$Z_{tj} = \sigma_{tj}\varepsilon_{tj}, \qquad \sigma_{tj}^2 = \gamma_j + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji} Z_{t-1,i}^2 + \beta_j \sigma_{t-1,j}^2, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_{tj},\ -\infty < t < \infty\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with mean 0 and variance 1, ε_{tj} is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, $\gamma_j > 0$ and $\alpha_j, \alpha_{ji}, \beta_j \geq 0$. This model contains extra $d-1$ terms $\sum_{i\neq j} \alpha_{ji} Z_{t-1,i}^2$ from the standard GARCH(1,1) model, which incorporates the possible association between the j-th CUC and the other CUCs, while the conditional zero-correlation condition (2.1) still holds. Such a dependence is termed as that the i-th component (if $\alpha_{ji} \neq 0$) is causal in variance to the j-th component (Engle, Ito and Lin 1991).

In practice, we expect that σ_{tj}^2 may depend on $Z_{t-1,i}^2$ only for a small number of i's, including $i = j$, i.e. many coefficients α_{ji} (for $i \neq j$) may be 0. Section 2.3.3 below outlines a data-analytic approach for building such a component-dependent model.

When $\beta_j \in [0,1)$, (2.8) implies

$$\sigma_{tj}^2 = \mathrm{Var}(Z_{tj}|\mathcal{F}_{t-1}) = \frac{\gamma_j}{1-\beta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_j^{k-1} Z_{t-k,\,i}^2. \tag{2.9}$$

Put $\mathbf{Z}_t = (Z_{t1}, \cdots, Z_{td})^\tau$. Theorem 2 below gives a sufficient condition of the existence of stationary solution to model (2.8).

Theorem 3. (i) The extended GARCH(1,1) model (2.8) defines a unique d-dimensional strictly stationary process $\{\mathbf{Z}_t\}$ with $E||\mathbf{Z}_t||^2 < \infty$ under the condition

$$r \cdot \max\{\alpha_{j1}, \cdots, \alpha_{jd}\} + \beta_j < 1, \qquad 1 \le j \le d, \tag{2.10}$$

where $r = \max_{1\le j\le d} d_j$, and d_j is the number of non-vanishing coefficients among $\alpha_{j1}, \cdots, \alpha_{jd}$.

(ii) Under condition (2.10), $E(Z_{tj}^2) = 1$ for all $1 \le j \le d$ if and only if

$$\gamma_j = 1 - \beta_j - \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji}, \qquad 1 \le j \le d. \tag{2.11}$$

The proof of the above theorem is in Appendix B. When $\alpha_{ji} = 0$ for all $i \neq j$, i.e. each Z_{tj} follows a standard GARCH(1,1) model, (2.10) reduces to $\alpha_{jj} + \beta_j < 1$, which is the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of unique strictly stationary solution with finite second moments for the corresponding GARCH(1,1) model; see Chen and An (1998). In practice condition (2.10) may often be violated, indicating the likely inappropriateness of GARCH specification for σ_{tj}^2. However if we view the right hand side of (2.9) as an approximation for σ_{tj}^2, such an approximation process is strictly stationary under a weaker condition $\beta_j < 1$. For further discussion of the approximation point of view, we refer to Penzer, Wang and Yao (2004).

2.3.2 quasi-MLE

To facilitate a likelihood, let us assume hypothetically that ε_{tj} in (2.8) has a density $f(\cdot)$, which can be the standard normal distribution, generalized Gaussian distribution and t-distribution. The implied (negative) log-likelihood function for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j \equiv (\alpha_{j1}, \cdots, \alpha_{jd}, \beta_j)^\tau$ is

$$l_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) = \sum_{t=\nu+1}^{n} \big\{ \log \sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j) - \log f(Z_{tj}/\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)) \big\}, \tag{2.12}$$

for a given integer $\nu \geq 1$, where $\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2 = \mathrm{Var}(Z_j|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$ is given by (2.8). By (2.9) and (2.11),

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2 &= \frac{\gamma}{1-\beta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_j^{k-1} Z_{t-k,i}^2 \\ &= 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji}}{1-\beta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_j^{k-1} Z_{t-k,i}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.13}$$

This form of $\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2$ ensures $\mathrm{Var}(Z_{tj}) = 1$; see Theorem 2(ii). The quasi-maximum likelihood estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j$ minimizes (2.12). In practice, we let $Z_{ti} \equiv 0$ for all $t \leq 0$ on the right hand side of (2.13).

2.3.3 Selection of casual components

To obtain a parsimonious representation for σ_{tj}^2, we may select only those significant $Z_{t-1,i}$ on the RHS of the second equation in (2.8). This is particularly important when the number of components d is large. It may be achieved by using the ideas for variable selection in regression analysis. Below we outline such an algorithm based on a combination of the stepwise addition method and the BIC criterion.

We start with the standard GARCH(1,1) model (i.e. $\alpha_{jj} \neq 0$ and $\alpha_{ji} = 0$ for $j \neq i$). We then add one more $Z_{t-1,i}$ each time which maximizes the (quasi-)likelihood. More precisely, suppose the model contains $(k-1)$ terms $Z_{t-1,j_1}, \cdots, Z_{t-1,j_{k-1}}$ already. We choose an additional term $Z_{t-1,\ell}$ among $\ell \notin \{j, j_1, \cdots, j_{k-1}\}$ which maximizes the quasi-likelihood function. Note that this is a two-step maximization problem: For each given $\ell \notin \{j, j_1, \cdots, j_{k-1}\}$, we compute the qMLE $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j^{(k)}$ for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(k)} \equiv (\alpha_{jj}, \alpha_{jj_1}, \cdots, \alpha_{j\ell}, \beta_j)^\tau$ with the constraints $\alpha_{ji} = 0$, for $i \notin \{j, j_1, \cdots, j_{k-1}, \ell\}$. We then choose an $\ell \notin \{j, j_1, \cdots, j_{k-1}\}$ to minimize $l_j(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j^{(k)})$, and denote by $l_j(k)$ the minimum value and the index of the selected variable j_k. Put

$$\mathrm{BIC}_j(k) = l_j(k) + (k+2)\log(n-\nu).$$

We choose r_j which minimizes $\mathrm{BIC}_j(k)$ over $0 \leq k \leq d$. Note that $k = 0$ corresponds the standard GARCH(1,1) fitting for Z_{tj}.

2.3.4 LADE

If CUCs Z_{tj} are known (i.e. $\mathbf{a}_j$ are known), the asymptotic properties of qMLE may be derived in the similar manner as Hall and Yao (2003). See also Mikosch and Straumann (2004). For

example, the estimator $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j$ would suffer from complicated asymptotic distributions and slow convergence rates if ε_{tj} is heavy-tailed in the sense that $E(|\varepsilon_{tj}|^4) = \infty$. On the other hand, a least absolute deviation estimator based on a log-transformation is always asymptotically normal with the standard root-n convergence rate; see Peng and Yao (2003).

To construct the LADE with the constraint $\mathrm{Var}(Z_{tj}) = 1$, we write $\varepsilon_{tj} = v_0 e_{tj}$ in the first equation in (2.8), where the median of e_{tj}^2 is equal to 1 and $v_0 = 1/\mathrm{STD}(e_{tj})$. With $\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2$ expressed in (2.13), parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ and v_0 are (jointly) identifiable. Now

$$\log Z_{tj}^2 - \log\{\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2\} - \log v_0^2 = \log(e_{tj}^2).$$

Since the median of $\log(e_{tj}^2)$ is 0, the true values of the parameters minimise

$$E\big|\log Z_{tj}^2 - \log\{\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2\} - \log v_0^2\big|.$$

Therefore we may estimate the parameters by minimizing

$$\sum_{t=\nu+1}^{n} |\log Z_{tj}^2 - \log\{\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2\} - \log v_0^2\big|, \tag{2.14}$$

where $\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2$ is given in (2.13), with the part of $a_{ji} = 0$ for the non-casual component in the variance. So far $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ and v_0 are treated as free parameters. The estimators obtained are root-n consistent.

To make an explicit use of the condition that $\mathrm{Var}(\varepsilon_{tj}) = 1$, we may estimate parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ as follows. With the initial estimate $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j^{(0)}$, let $\widehat{v}_0$ be the reciprocal of the sample standard deviation of the residuals $\{\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{tj}\}$, where $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{tj} = Z_{tj}/\{\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j^{(0)})\}$. With the given $\widehat{v}_0$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j^{(0)}$, we can minimize

$$\sum_{t=\nu+1}^{n} w_t\big(\log Z_{tj}^2 - \log\{\sigma_{tj}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_j)^2\} - \log \widehat{v}_0^2\big)^2,$$

where $w_t = |\log Z_{tj}^2 - \log\{\sigma_{tj}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j^{(0)})^2\} - \log \widehat{v}_0^2\big|^{-1}$. We may update $\widehat{v}_0$ and iterate further until the estimated $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ converges. Note that we have used a weighted L_2 loss function to approximate the L_1 loss to expedite the computation.

2.4 Inference based on bootstrapping

A natural question for the proposed approach is if the CUCs $Z_{t1}, \cdots, Z_{td}$ exist, although the minimiser $\{\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j\}$ of (2.5) always exists. To address this issue statistically, we may construct a test for the null hypothesis

$$H_0: \ \mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Z}_t \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{Z}_t = \mathrm{diag}(\sigma_{t1}, \cdots, \sigma_{td})\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t,$$

where $\mathbf{A}^\tau\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_d$, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon_{t1}, \cdots, \varepsilon_{td})^\tau$, $\{\varepsilon_{t1}\}, \cdots, \{\varepsilon_{td}\}$ are d independent series, and each of them is a sequence of i.i.d. r.v.s with mean 0 and variance 1. Note that the null hypothesis above is a sufficient but not necessary condition for the existence of CUCs. The independence condition is required to construct a bootstrap test for this null hypothesis.

Note when Z_{ti} and Z_{tj} are not conditionally uncorrelated, the left hand side of (2.4) is equal to positive constant instead of 0. Therefore, the *large* values of $\Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}})$ will indicate that the CUCs do not exist. We adopt a bootstrap method below to assess how large is large enough to reject H_0.

If the null hypothesis H_0 could not be rejected, we may also construct confidence sets for the coefficients $\mathbf{a}_j$ (i.e. the columns of $\mathbf{A}$) of the CUCs, and the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ based on the same bootstrap scheme. Formally confidence sets for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ could be constructed based on asymptotic distributions of, for example, the LADE $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j$, which may be derived in the similar manner of Peng and Yao (2003). However such an approach is based on the assumption that the CUCs are known (i.e. the vectors $\mathbf{a}_j$ are known), and, therefore, fails to take into account of the errors due to the estimation for $\mathbf{a}_j$.

Let $\widehat{\mathbf{A}} = (\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_1, \cdots, \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_d)$ be the estimator derived from minimizing (2.5). Let $Z_{tj} = \widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^\tau \mathbf{X}_t$. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j$ be an estimator for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$, such as the LADE defined in section 2.3.4.

The bootstrap sampling scheme consists of the three steps below.

(i) For $j = 1, \cdots, d$, draw ε^*_{tj}, for $-\infty < t \le n$, by sampling randomly with replacement from the standardized residuals $\{\widehat{\varepsilon}_{\nu+1,j}, \cdots, \widehat{\varepsilon}_{nj}\}$ which are obtained from standardizing the raw residuals

$$Z_{tj}/\sigma_{tj}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j), \qquad t = \nu + 1, \cdots, n.$$

(ii) For $j = 1, \cdots, d$, draw $Z^*_{tj} = \sigma^*_{tj}\varepsilon^*_{tj}$, for $-\infty < t \le n$, where

$$(\sigma^*_{tj})^2 = 1 - \widehat{\beta}_j - \sum_{i=1}^{d} \widehat{\alpha}_{ji} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \widehat{\alpha}_{ji}(Z^*_{t-1,i})^2 + \widehat{\beta}_j(\sigma^*_{t-1,j})^2.$$

(iii) Let $\mathbf{X}^*_t = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}(Z^*_{t1}, \cdots, Z^*_{td})^\tau$ for $t = 1, \cdots, n$.

A test for the existence of the CUCs: Let $\Psi^*_n(\mathbf{A})$ be defined as in (2.5) with $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ replaced by $\{\mathbf{X}^*_t\}$, and the bootstrap estimator $\mathbf{A}^* = (\mathbf{a}^*_1, \cdots, \mathbf{a}^*_d)$ be computed in the same manner as $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$

with $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ replaced by $\{\mathbf{X}_t^*\}$. Note that the bootstrap sample $\{\mathbf{X}_t^*\}$ is drawn from the model with $\widehat{\mathbf{a}}_j^\tau \mathbf{X}_t$ as its *genuine* CUCs. Hence the conditional distribution of $\Psi_n^*(\mathbf{A}^*)$ (given the original sample $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$) may be taken as an approximation for the distribution of $\Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}})$ under H_0. Thus we reject H_0 if $\Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}})$ is greater than the $[B\alpha]$-th largest value of $\Psi_n^*(\mathbf{A}^*)$ in a replication of the above bootstrap resampling for B times, where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is the size of the test and B is a large integer.

Confidence sets for $\mathbf{A}$: A bootstrap approximation for an $(1-\alpha)$ confidence set of the transformation matrix $\mathbf{A}$ can be constructed as

$$\{\mathbf{A} \,\big|\, D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}) \le c_\alpha, \mathbf{A}^\tau \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_d\}, \tag{2.15}$$

where c_α is the $[B\alpha]$-th largest value of $D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}; \mathbf{A}^*)$ in a replication of bootstrap resampling for B times. Note that when $\mathbf{A}$ is in the confidence set, so is $\mathbf{B}$ if the columns of $\mathbf{B}$ form a permutation of the (reflected) columns of $\mathbf{A}$; see (2.6).

Interval estimators for the components of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j$: A bootstrap confidence interval for any component, say, β_j of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_j$ may be obtained as follows. Repeat the above bootstrap sampling B times for some large integer B, resulting in bootstrap estimates $\beta_{j1}^*, \cdots, \beta_{jB}^*$. An approximate $(1-\alpha)$ confidence interval for β_j is $(\beta_{j(b_1)}^*,\ \beta_{j(b_2)}^*)$, where $\beta_{j(i)}^*$ denotes the i-th smallest value among $\beta_{j1}^*, \cdots, \beta_{jB}^*$, and $b_1 = [B\alpha/2]$ and $b_2 = [B(1-\alpha/2)]$.

3 Simulation

We conduct a Monte Carlo experiment to illustrate the proposed CUC-approach. In particular we check the accuracy of the estimation for the transformation matrix $\mathbf{A}$ in (2.2).

We consider a CUC-GARCH(1,1) model with $d = 3$

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{Z}_t, \qquad \mathbf{Z}_t|\mathcal{F}_{t-1} \ \sim\ N(0,\ \mathrm{diag}\{\sigma_{t,1}^2, \sigma_{t,2}^2, \sigma_{t,3}^2\}), \tag{3.1}$$

where $\sigma_{t,i}^2 = \gamma_i + \alpha_i Z_{t-1,i}^2 + \beta_i \sigma_{t-1,i}^2$, and

$\mathbf{A}$			i	γ_i	α_i	β_i
0	0.500	0.866	1	0.02	0.08	0.90
0	0.866	-0.500	2	0.10	0.10	0.80
-1	0	0	3	0.28	0.12	0.60

It is easy to see that $\mathbf{A}^\tau\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_3$ and $\gamma_i = 1 - \alpha_i - \beta_i$ so that the variances of the CUCs are 1 [see (2.11)]. Since $\alpha_1 + \beta_1 = 0.98$ is very close to 1, the volatility for the first CUC is highly persistence. On the contrary, the volatility persistence in the third component is less pronounced as $\alpha_3 + \beta_3 = 0.72$ only.

For each of 200 samples with size $n = 500$ and 1000 respectively from the above model, we estimated the transformation matrix $\mathbf{A}$ by minimizing $\Psi_n(\mathbf{A})$ defined in (2.5), which was solved using the proprietary optimization routines in MATLAB. Note that as far as the estimation of $\mathbf{A}$ is concerned, two orthogonal matrices are treated as identical if the D-distance between them is 0; see (2.6). The coefficients α_i, β_i and γ_i were estimated using quasi-MLE based on a Gaussian likelihood. The resulting estimates were summarized in Table 1 and Figure 1.

Table 1: Simulation Results: summary statistics of the errors in estimation

		$D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A})$	$\widehat{\alpha}_1$	$\widehat{\beta}_1$	$\widehat{\alpha}_2$	$\widehat{\beta}_2$	$\widehat{\alpha}_3$	$\widehat{\beta}_3$
	mean	0.0753	0.0719	0.8701	0.0865	0.7506	0.0997	0.6189
	median	0.0474	0.0705	0.8870	0.0830	0.7801	0.0861	0.6445
$n = 500$	STD	0.0714	0.0300	0.0830	0.0469	0.1469	0.0600	0.2017
	bias	-	-0.0081	-0.0299	-0.0135	-0.0494	-0.0203	0.0189
	RMSE	-	0.0303	0.0888	0.0484	0.1546	0.0629	0.2022
	mean	0.0679	0.0722	0.8921	0.0846	0.7751	0.0937	0.6307
	median	0.0434	0.0731	0.8999	0.0833	0.7956	0.0938	0.6517
$n = 1000$	STD	0.0648	0.0224	0.0400	0.0346	0.1065	0.0412	0.1634
	bias	-	-0.0078	-0.0079	-0.0154	-0.0249	-0.0263	0.0307
	RMSE	-	0.0234	0.0403	0.0384	0.1191	0.0487	0.1660

Since both the means and the standard deviations $D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A})$ are very small, the estimation for $\mathbf{A}$ is accurate. The coefficients in each CUC models were also estimated accurately. The errors in estimation decrease as the sample size increases from 500 to 1000.

Since biases reported in Table 1 are always negative; see also Figure 1. This indicates that the coefficients in the GARCH(1, 1) models for CUCs were slightly underestimated. Also note that the estimation errors decrease when the volatility persistence (measured by $\alpha_i + \beta_i$) increases; see the upper panel of Figure 1 for the estimation with the sample size 1000. To make a comparison,

the estimation errors of the GARCH coefficients when the true $\mathbf{A}$ is used are plotted in the lower panel. The differences are small.

4 Real data examples

In this section we illustrate the proposed method with two real data sets.

The first data set, denoted as SCI, consists of the 2275 daily log returns (in percentages) of S&P 500 index, stock price of Cisco System and stock price of Intel Corporation in 2 January 1991 — 31 December 1999. This data set has been analyzed in Tsay (2001). Figure 2 depicts the time series plots of the three series. Descriptive statistics are listed in Table 2. Obviously, the unconditional distribution of all of these series exhibit excessive kurtosis; indicating significant departure from normal distributions.

The Ljung-Box Q statistics suggest some plausible autocorrelation in these series. But this may be due to the heteroscedasticity. Hence we compute the p-values of these Q tests based on a bootstrap procedure: for each of the mean-deleted component return series, we first fit a univariate GARCH(1,1) model

$$Y_t = \sigma_t \epsilon_t, \qquad \sigma_t^2 = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Y_{t-1}^2 + \beta_1 \sigma_{t-1}^2,$$

and denote the estimated parameters as $\widehat{\alpha}_0, \widehat{\alpha}_1, \widehat{\beta}_1$, respectively, and the standardized residuals as $\widehat{\epsilon}_t$. Draw ϵ_t^* randomly with replacement from $\{\widehat{\epsilon}_t,\ t = 1, \cdots, n\}$ and draw Y_t^* from

$$Y_t^* = \sigma_t \epsilon_t^*, \qquad \sigma_t^2 = \widehat{\alpha}_0 + \widehat{\alpha}_1 Y_{t-1}^{*2} + \widehat{\beta}_1 \sigma_{t-1}^{*2}.$$

Let Q^* be a Q-statistic based on Y_t^*. The p-value of Q is now estimated by the relative frequency of the occurrence of the event that Q^* is great than Q in a repeated bootstrap sampling for 1000 times. In Table 2, those p-values are listed in parentheses below the values of the corresponding Q statistics. Based on those p-values, there is no significant evidence for the existence of autocorrelation in all the three component series. Accordingly there is no need to fit a VAR model for the conditional mean for this data set.

Let $\mathbf{Y}_t$ be the mean-deleted returns of SCI. Let $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{\Lambda}\mathbf{P}^\tau$ be the sample covariance matrix of $\mathbf{Y}_t$, where $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{P}^\tau = \mathbf{I}_3$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ is diagonal. Let $\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{P}^\tau \mathbf{Y}_t$. Then we may regard the (unconditional) covariance matrix of $\mathbf{X}_t$ is $\mathbf{I}_3$.

Table 2: Summary Statistics of the Two Real Data Sets

	S&P 500	Cisco	Intel	HS	JN	SH	ST	TW
N	2275	2275	2275	1349	1349	1349	1349	1349
Mean	0.0656	0.2567	0.1561	-0.0198	-0.0477	0.0178	-0.0081	-0.0400
Stdev	0.8747	2.8540	2.4644	2.1822	1.7382	1.5401	1.8784	1.9863
Min	-7.1140	-22.1000	-14.5810	-14.7346	-9.0145	-8.7277	-9.1535	-9.9360
Max	4.9900	15.5760	12.8500	20.2083	8.8876	8.8491	19.5559	9.7871
Skewness	-0.3600	-0.3963	-0.2353	0.6419	0.1375	0.1861	0.9114	0.1345
Kurtosis	9.0469	6.7229	5.4701	14.3999	5.0891	8.4310	15.2063	5.4082
$Q(10)$	22.8322	25.3861	6.8567	32.2251	8.8471	12.9372	28.6943	16.9723
	(0.2440)	(0.0870)	(0.8180)	(0.1760)	(0.7540)	(0.7770)	(0.2180)	(0.2540)
$Q(20)$	44.2898	33.9490	30.3427	46.1651	19.1511	26.9255	40.7220	28.4664
	(0.2300)	(0.2500)	(0.1170)	(0.2810)	(0.7200)	(0.7310)	(0.2870)	(0.3290)

Note: $Q(k)$ is referred to the Ljung-Box portmanteau test statistics. Figures in parentheses are their corresponding p-values based on 1000 bootstrap replications.

Based on data $\mathbf{X}_t$, an estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ was obtained with $\Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) = 0.1732$. Consequently a GARCH(1,1) model was fitted for each CUC. The estimated coefficients are listed in Table 3 which shows that the volatility of the first and third CUCs is highly persistent as $\widehat{\alpha}_1+\widehat{\beta}_1 = 0.9925$ and $\widehat{\alpha}_3 + \widehat{\beta}_3 = 0.9611$. (One may fit the first CUC with an IGARCH model.) On the other hand, the volatility of the second CUC is less persistent as $\widehat{\alpha}_2 + \widehat{\beta}_2 = 0.80$.

We applied the bootstrap procedure (with 500 replications) described in section 2.4 to test the existence of the CUCs. The p-value is 0.60, indicating that there is no strong evidence against the hypothesis of the existence of CUCs. The $(1-\alpha)$ bootstrap confidence set for the transformation matrix $\mathbf{A}$ is $\{\mathbf{A}|D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}) \leq c_\alpha,\ \mathbf{A}^\tau\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{I}_3\}$ with $c_\alpha = 0.1718$ for $\alpha = 0.05$, and 0.1368 for $\alpha = 0.1$. Since $D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{I}_3) = 0.2593$, $\mathbf{I}_3$ is not contained in the confidence sets. This indicates that the principal components cannot be taken as the CUCs. The confidence intervals for the parameters for each CUC-GARCH(1,1) models are listed in Table 3. The length of the confidence intervals increase as the volatility persistent measured by $\widehat{\alpha}_i + \widehat{\beta}_j$ decreases. This is consistent with the finding from the simulation study reported in section 3.

Based on the fitted conditional variances $\widehat{\sigma}^2_{ti}$ for the CUCs, the conditional variance matrix

for the original series $\mathbf{Y}_t$ is equal to

$$\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_t = \mathbf{W}\text{diag}\{\widehat{\sigma}_{t1}^2, \widehat{\sigma}_{t2}^2, \widehat{\sigma}_{t3}^2\}\mathbf{W}^\tau,$$

where $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{\Lambda}^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$. Since the volatility processes of the first and third CUC are highly persistent, they can be modelled with Integrated GARCH models. If so, the volatility processes for original series and their covariance processes are virtually modelled by mixtures of IGARCH models and mean-reverting GARCH models, which is similar to the Component GARCH model used in Ding and Granger (1996) to capture the long memory properties for a univariate volatility process.

Table 3: Fitted CUC-GARCH(1,1) model for SCI

	Estimate	95% Confidence Set	90% Confidence Set
$\mathbf{a}_1$	$(-0.5605, -0.0018, -0.8081)^\tau$		
$\mathbf{a}_2$	$(0.5693, 0.7217, -0.3939)^\tau$	$c_{0.05} = 0.1718$	$c_{0.10} = 0.1368$
$\mathbf{a}_3$	$(0.6015, -0.6922, -0.3989)^\tau$		
γ_1	0.0074	(0.0042, 0.0592)	(0.0048, 0.0449)
α_1	0.0519	(0.0316, 0.0915)	(0.0350, 0.0812)
β_1	0.9406	(0.8446, 0.9576)	(0.8740, 0.9548)
γ_2	0.1997	(0.0460, 0.7138)	(0.0673, 0.5705)
α_2	0.0432	(0.0077, 0.1054)	(0.0107, 0.0926)
β_2	0.7572	(0.2446, 0.9289)	(0.3600, 0.9069)
γ_3	0.0389	(0.0200, 0.1042)	(0.0239, 0.0870)
α_3	0.0884	(0.0476, 0.1305)	(0.0517, 0.1236)
β_3	0.8727	(0.7889, 0.9266)	(0.8051, 0.9140)

Figure 3 depicts the fitted volatility processes for each return series and Figure 4 displays the conditional correlations among the three components series. Note the volatilities of the S&P 500 index has a much smaller scale than those of the two individual stocks. Increasing trends can be observed in all the three correlation processes over the last three years, which may be connected with the high volatilities in all the return series over the same period. But on the other hand, the high volatility of Cisco prices in the middle period did not lead to a high correlation with the other two. This suggests a unilateral impact from the market to the single stock.

Figure 5 displays the fitted volatility processes for the three return series based on the orthogonal GARCH(1,1) model of Alexander (2001) and Ding and Engle (2001). Note that orthogonal GARCH model effectively treats the principal components as conditional uncorrelated variables, which may overlook important conditional dependence structure in the original data. Note that the time varying patterns in the three processes in Figure 5 are similar, which is different from Figure 3 of CUC-GARCH(1,1) fitted. Especially the orthogonal GARCH fitting artificially inflates the volatility of S&P500 index in the middle period; see the original time plot of the series in Figure 2. The inflation is due to treating the conditional correlated principal components as CUCs. As we stated above, the identity matrix is indeed not included in the confidence set for $\mathbf{A}$.

Our second data set consists of the daily close returns of five Asian stock indices, namely, Hang Seng index of Hong Kong (HS), Japan Nikkei 225 index (JN), Shanghai Composite index of China (SC), Straits Time index of Singapore (ST) and Taiwan Weighted index (TW) in the period of 1 August 1997 — 30 December 2003. Adjustments are also made to account for the differences in the holidays of the five markets. The five return series are plotted in Figure 6, and the descriptive statistics are listed in Table 2. Most of the sample means of these returns are negative, except the mean of SC. Different from the three series in SCI, all five series are right-skewed over this specific period. The bootstrap p-values for the Q statistics are obtained in the same way as before; indicating no significant autocorrelation in all the five series.

We fitted a CUC-extended GARCH(1,1) to the mean-deleted return series. The lagged valued from the other CUCs were selected using BIC together with a forward searching; see section 2.3.3. The fitted extended GARCH(1,1) models, based on quasi-MLE with Gaussian likelihood, for the five CUCs are reported in Table 4. According to the fitted models, the first CUC is causal in variance to the fifth CUC, the second CUC is causal in variance to the first and the third CUCs, and the fifth CUC is causal in variance to the first CUC. On the other hand, no additional variables were selected in the models for the second and fourth CUCs.

Figure 7 displays the fitted volatility processes for the five original stock returns. As expected, the most volatile waves are observed at the early of 1998 with the onset of the Asian financial crisis, which are especially predominant in Hong Kong and Singapore markets. While the shock is still big, the impact of the crisis on Japan and Taiwan markets is less drastic. Furthermore, the effect to Shanghai market is on a much smaller scale. In Figure 8, we present the fitted conditional

correlation between Hong Kong and the other four markets. Obviously, the most correlated period is in accord with the epidemic of Asian financial crisis. After that, the correlations between Hong Kong and Singapore almost remain at a constant level except two downslides in the middle of 1999 and 2002, respectively. Likewise, the correlations between Hong Kong and Taiwan are almost at a constant level, although a little smaller than that with Singapore market. A upward trend can be seen in the correlation between Hong Kong and Japan markets in the last few years, which suggests that these two markets were becoming more closely integrated. On the contrary, the correlations between Hong Kong and Shanghai markets seems to have a downward to zero trend in the last few years. The implications of these observations to international diversification deserve a further investigation.

Table 4: Extended GARCH(1,1) for CUCs of Asian Market Data

j	j_i	r	$\sigma_{t,j}$	BIC
1	5, 2	2	$\sigma^2_{t,1} = 0.0271 + 0.8609\sigma^2_{t-1,1} + 0.0405Z^2_{t-1,1} + 0.0637Z^2_{t-1,5} + 0.0117Z^2_{t-1,2}$	3622
2		0	$\sigma^2_{t,2} = 0.0521 + 0.8004\sigma^2_{t-1,2} + 0.1475Z^2_{t-1,2}$	3602
3	2	1	$\sigma^2_{t,3} = 0.0077 + 0.9301\sigma^2_{t-1,3} + 0.0526Z^2_{t-1,3} + 0.0098Z^2_{t-1,2}$	3731
4		0	$\sigma^2_{t,4} = 0.0704 + 0.8539\sigma^2_{t-1,4} + 0.0757Z^2_{t-1,4}$	3780
5	1	1	$\sigma^2_{t,5} = 0.0122 + 0.8227\sigma^2_{t-1,5} + 0.1530Z^2_{t-1,5} + 0.0261Z^2_{t-1,1}$	2534

Finally we compared the fitting based on our CUC-based GARCH(1,1) with the orthogonal GARCH(1,1) models and Engle's dynamic conditional correction (DCC) model (1.2) and (1.3) in terms of a goodness-of-fit tests based on the Ljung-Box statistic (Tse and Tsui 1999). Note the DCC-model for each component of $\mathbf{Y}_t$ reduced to the standard univariate GARCH(1,1) fitting. We define the standardized residual for the i-th series as $\widehat{u}_{ti} = Y_{ti}/\widehat{\sigma}^{1/2}_{t,ii}$, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{t,ii}$ is the (i,i)-th element of the fitted conditional variance of $\mathbf{Y}_t$. Define

$$C_{t,ij} = \begin{cases} \widehat{u}^2_{ti} - 1 & i = j \\ \widehat{u}_{ti}\widehat{u}_{tj} - \widehat{\rho}_{t,ij} & i \neq j, \end{cases}$$

where $\widehat{\rho}_{t,ij} = \widehat{\sigma}_{t,ij}/(\widehat{\sigma}_{t,ii}\widehat{\sigma}_{t,jj})^{1/2}$ is the estimated conditional correlation between Y_{ti} and Y_{tj}. If the model is correctly specified, there is no autocorrelation in $\{C_{t,ij}, t \geq 1\}$ for any fixed i, j. Put

$$Q(ij, M) = n\sum_{k=1}^{M} r^2_{ij,k},$$

where $r_{ij,k}$ is the lag k sample autocorrelation of $C_{t,ij}$. It is intuitively clear that the large values of $Q(ij, M)$ indicate the lack of fit for the conditional correlation between the i-th and j-th components $\mathbf{Y}_t$ for $i \neq j$, and the lack of fit for the conditional variance of the i-th component for $i = j$. Although the distribution theory of $Q(ij, M)$ is unknown, empirical evidence suggests that χ^2_M provides a reasonable reference in practice; see Tse and Tsui (1999).

Table 5 lists the values of the Q-statistics with $M = 10$. The significant levels were gauged according to the χ^2_{10}-distribution. The advantage of using the CUC-GARCH model over the Orthogonal GARCH model is obvious as the Q-values for the former tend to be smaller, or significantly smaller, than those for the latter. Furthermore, all the Q values for the fitted CUC-GARCH models are insignificant at the level of 10%, while the test rejects some Orthogonal GARCH fittings at the significance level 1%. For example, the p-values for testing the correlations between S&P 500 and Cisco stock, and S&P 500 and Intel stock is less than 1%; indicating significant autocorrelation. This may explain the incomprehensible jumps in the fitted volatility for S&P 500 by orthogonal GARCH model in Figure 5. The same phenomena may also be observed in the fitting for the second data set. The orthogonal GARCH model failed to provide adequate fittings for Hang Seng index (HS), Singapore Straits Time index (ST) and Taiwan Weighted index (TW), as indicated by the large Q-values; see Table 5.

Overall the DCC model provide a competitive performance to the CUC model for the Asian Markets data. This is may due to a certain degree of homogeneity among the five Asian market indices. For SCI consisting of one market index and two stock prices, the gain of using CUC over DCC is more pronounced. First, the DCC-model seems to fail to catch the dynamic correlation between the returns of the S&P 500 index and the Cisco stock price. Furthermore, although Q-value for the CUC-model for S&P 500 is marginally larger than that of the DCC model, the Q-values for the CUC-models for both Intel and Cisco prices are substantially smaller than those for the DCC models; suggesting an improvement for the modelling volatility dynamics for the Intel or the Cisco price by incorporating the information from other series.

The Q-tests with different values of M lead to similar pattern as Table 5, which, therefore, are omitted to save the space.

Table 5: Specification test — $Q(10)$ for cross products of standardized residuals

	SCI data			Asian Market Data			
i, j	O-GARCH	DCC	CUC-GARCH	O-GARCH	DCC	CUC-GARCH	CUC-Ex GARCH
1	59.9140***	5.9498	6.2050	56.7580***	6.0285	11.4480	8.6961
2	10.5100	9.0587	8.0542	12.3540	7.8517	8.6713	8.7751
3	2.6192	6.4293	2.2397	8.5368	9.2749	8.5301	8.5265
4				18.6100**	2.6610	4.0512	3.7954
5				18.0610*	7.4710	11.7960	13.5150
1,2	51.8060***	10.4887	10.9090	7.1025	7.0622	4.6433	4.2671
1,3	77.5140***	20.6745**	10.5170	3.8940	4.6465	3.4987	3.5564
1,4				17.2180*	4.7943	6.2915	5.8084
1,5				9.2396	6.1648	5.6669	6.3143
2,3	5.9453	7.0617	9.6275	9.6031	10.1762	9.6444	9.5912
2,4				6.3708	7.7241	3.4542	3.2648
2,5				6.8629	5.8438	6.1856	6.9089
3,4				11.9120	8.0303	7.3119	5.8486
3,5				2.2256	2.1565	1.5721	1.6857
4,5				5.4389	4.7838	3.0312	3.1083

*Note: 1) ***, **, * indicate that the corresponding test is significant at the level 0.01, 0.05 and 0.1, respectively. 2) i, j in the left column corresponds to to the orders of component series in each data sets. For example, "1,2" stands for the cross product of the standardized residuals of S&P 500 and Cisco for the SCI, and for HS and JN for the Asian market data set.*

Appendix A — Proof of Theorem 1

We introduce some notation first. Let

$$\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) = (n-k)^{-1} \sum_{t=k+1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t^\tau I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B), \qquad \mathbf{C}_k(B) = E\{\mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t^\tau I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B)\}.$$

The lemma below shows that both $\Psi(\cdot)$ and $\Psi_n(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{H}_D$ with D-distance, where $\mathcal{H}_D$ is the quotient space; see Remark 2.

Lemma 1. For any $\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{H}_D$, it holds that

$$|\Psi(\mathbf{U}) - \Psi(\mathbf{V})| \le c \, \mathrm{tr} E(\mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t^T) \, \{D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\}^{1/2},$$

and

$$|\Psi_n(\mathbf{U}) - \Psi_n(\mathbf{V})| \le c \, \mathrm{tr}(n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_t^T) \, \{D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V})\}^{1/2}$$

almost surely, where $c > 0$ is a constant and $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A})$ is the trace of a matrix $\mathbf{A}$.

Proof. We only prove the lemma for $\Psi(\cdot)$. The result for $\Psi_n(\cdot)$ may be shown in the same manner. Let $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{u}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{u}_d)^\tau$, $\mathbf{V} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \cdots, \mathbf{v}_d)^\tau$, $u_{ijk}(B) = E\{\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B) \mathbf{u}_j\}$ and $v_{ijk}(B) = E\{\mathbf{v}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B) \mathbf{v}_j\}$. We assume that the orders and the directions of $\mathbf{u}_i$ and $\mathbf{v}_j$ are arranged such that $\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i \in [0, 1]$ for all i, and

$$D(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{V}) = 1 - \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1 - \mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i). \tag{5.1}$$

See (2.6). Put the spectral decomposition for $\mathbf{C}_k(B)$ as

$$\mathbf{C}_k(B) = \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell(B, k) \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau,$$

where $\mu_1(B, k) \ge \cdots \ge \mu_d(B, k) \ge 0$ are the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C}_k(B)$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_d$ are their corresponding (orthonormal) eigenvectors. It is easy to see that $\mu_\ell(B, k) \le \mu_\ell$ for all k and B, where $\mu_1 \ge \cdots \ge \mu_d$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix $E\{\mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}^\tau\}$. Consequently, by noticing that $|\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{u}_j| \le 1$ and $|\mathbf{v}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell| \le 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|u_{ijk}(B) - v_{ijk}(B)| \; &\le \; \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell |\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{v}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{v}_j| \\
\le \; &\sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell \{|\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{v}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{u}_j| + |\mathbf{v}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{v}_i^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau \mathbf{v}_j|\} \\
\le \; &\sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell \{|(\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{v}_i)^\tau \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell| + |\boldsymbol{\gamma}_\ell^\tau (\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{v}_j)|\}
\end{aligned}$$

By using the Cauchy-Schwartz's inequality, the above inequality is furthered bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell \{||\mathbf{u}_i - \mathbf{v}_i|| + ||\mathbf{u}_j - \mathbf{v}_j||\} \\ = \quad & \sqrt{2}\{(1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i)^{1/2} + (1-\mathbf{u}_j^\tau \mathbf{v}_j)^{1/2}\} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell. \end{aligned} \tag{5.2}$$

Note that for $x \neq 0$, it holds that

$$|x+y| - |x| = y\,\mathrm{sgn}(x) + 2(x+y)\{I(-y < x < 0) - I(0 < x < -y)\}. \tag{5.3}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\mathbf{U}) \; &= \; \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \sup_{1\le k\le k_0,\, B\in\mathcal{B}} \big[|v_{ijk}(B)| + |v_{ijk}(B) + \{u_{ijk}(B) - v_{ijk}(B)\}| - |v_{ijk}(B)|\big] \\ = \quad & \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \sup_{1\le k\le k_0,\, B\in\mathcal{B}} \big[|v_{ijk}(B)| + \{u_{ijk}(B) - v_{ijk}(B)\}\mathrm{sgn}\{v_{ijk}(B)\} \\ & + 2u_{ijk}(B)\{I(B_1) - I(B_2)\}\big], \end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

where

$$B_1 = \{v_{ijk}(B) - u_{ijk}(B) < v_{ijk}(B) < 0\}, \quad B_2 = \{0 < v_{ijk}(B) < v_{ijk}(B) - u_{ijk}(B)\}.$$

On the set $B_1 \cup B_2$,

$$|u_{ijk}(B)| \le |u_{ijk}(B) - v_{ijk}(B)| + |v_{ijk}(B)| \le 2|u_{ijk}(B) - v_{ijk}(B)|.$$

This, combining with (5.2) and (5.4), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\Psi(\mathbf{U}) - \Psi(\mathbf{V})| \\ \le \quad & \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \sup_{1\le k\le k_0,\, B\in\mathcal{B}} \big[\sqrt{2}\{(1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i)^{1/2} + (1-\mathbf{u}_j^\tau \mathbf{v}_j)^{1/2}\} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell + 2|u_{ijk}(B)| I_1(B_1)\big] \\ \le \quad & 5\sqrt{2} \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \{(1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i)^{1/2} + (1-\mathbf{u}_j^\tau \mathbf{v}_j)^{1/2}\} \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell \\ \le \quad & 10\sqrt{2}d \sum_{\ell=1}^{d} \mu_\ell \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i)^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

Now the lemma follows from (5.5) and the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} (1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i)^{1/2} \le d^{1/2} \Big\{ \sum_{i=1}^{d} (1-\mathbf{u}_i^\tau \mathbf{v}_i) \Big\}^{1/2},$$

see also (5.1). This completes the proof.

Proof of Theorem 1. Since $\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)$ is a real symmetric matrix, it holds for any unit vectors $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$ that

$$|\mathbf{a}^\tau\{\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)\}\mathbf{b}| \leq ||\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)||,$$

where $||\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)||$ denotes the sum of the absolute values of the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)$. This may be obtained by using the spectral decomposition of $\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)$. Consequently it holds uniformly for any orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{A}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A})| &\leq \sum_{1\leq i<j\leq d} \sup_{1\leq k\leq k_0, B\in\mathcal{B}} |\mathbf{a}_i^\tau\{\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)\}\mathbf{a}_j| \\ &\leq \frac{d(d-1)}{2} \sup_{1\leq k\leq k_0, B\in\mathcal{B}} \|\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)\|. \end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

Note the (i,j)-th element of $\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)$ is

$$\frac{1}{n-k}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B) - E\{X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B)\},$$

where X_{ti} denotes the i-th element of $\mathbf{X}_t$. Since $E|X_{ti}X_{tj}| < \infty$ and $\mathcal{B}$ is a VC-class, the covering number for the set of functions $\{X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B), B\in\mathcal{B}\}$ has a polynomial rate of growth for any underlying probability measure (Theorem 2.6.4, van der Vaart and Wellner 1996). Hence, it is a Glivenko-Cantelli class. It follows now from Theorem 3.4 of Yu (1994) that

$$\sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}\Big|\frac{1}{n-k}\sum_{t=k+1}^{n} X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B) - E\{X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k}\in B)\}\Big| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}|\lambda_{\max}(B,k)| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \qquad \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}|\lambda_{\min}(B,k)| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

where $\lambda_{\max}(B,k)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(B,k)$ denote, respectively, the maximum and the minimum eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)$. Thus

$$\sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}}\|\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)\| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,$$

for $k = 1, \cdots, k_0$. Now it follows from (5.6) that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{A}\in\mathcal{H}_D}|\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A})| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

Combining this with Lemma 1 above and the continuity of the argmax mapping (Theorem 3.2.2 and Corollary 3.2.3, van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996), it holds that $D(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}, \mathbf{A}_0) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. This completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.

Under the additional condition $E|X_{ti}X_{tj}|^{2p} < \infty$ and the mixing condition given in Condition (A4), Theorem 1 of Arcones and Yu (1994) implies that the set of functions $\{X_{ti}X_{tj}I(\mathbf{X}_{t-k} \in B), B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ is a Donsker class, and hence the process $\{\mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B), B \in \mathcal{B}\}$ indexed by $B \in \mathcal{B}$ converges weakly to a Gaussian process, where $\mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B) = \sqrt{n}\{\mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B) - \mathbf{C}_k(B)\}$. It follows from (5.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le d} \sup_{B\in\mathcal{B}, 1\le k\le k_0} \big[|\mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{C}_k(B)\mathbf{a}_j| + n^{-1/2}\mathrm{sgn}\{\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B)\mathbf{a}_j\}\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j \\ &\quad + \mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j\{I(B_3) - I(B_4)\}\big] \\ &= \Psi(\mathbf{A}) + O_P(n^{-1/2}), \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

where

$$B_3 = \{n^{-1/2}\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j < \mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B)\mathbf{a}_j < 0\}, \quad B_4 = \{0 < \mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B)\mathbf{a}_j < n^{-1/2}\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j\}.$$

The last equality in (5.7) follows from the fact that on $B_3 \cup B_4$,

$$|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j| \le |\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{C}_k(B)\mathbf{a}_j| + n^{-1/2}|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j| \le 2n^{-1/2}|\mathbf{a}_i^\tau \mathbf{\Delta}_{n,k}(B)\mathbf{a}_j|.$$

It follows from (5.7) and condition (A5) that

$$\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}_0) - \Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) = \Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}) + O_P(n^{-1/2}) \le -aD(\mathbf{A}_0, \mathbf{A}) + O_P(n^{-1/2}). \tag{5.8}$$

Now by substituting $\mathbf{A}$ by $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$, the left hand side of (5.8) must be non-negative by the definition of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}$. The right hand side of (5.8) would be negative unless

$$D(\mathbf{A}_0, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}) = O_P(n^{-1/2}).$$

This completes the proof.

Appendix B — Proof of Theorem 2

From the proof of Theorem 1, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{A}\in\mathcal{H}} |\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A})| \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0. \tag{5.9}$$

Since $\Psi(\mathbf{A})$ is continuous on the compact quotient space $\mathcal{H}$, there exists a minimizer $\mathbf{A}_0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}) &= \Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) - \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}) + \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) \\ &\leq \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}_0) \\ &= \{\Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}})\} + \{\Psi_n(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi_n(\mathbf{A}_0)\} + \{\Psi_n(\mathbf{A}_0) - \Psi(\mathbf{A}_0)\}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the fact $\Psi_n(\widehat{A}) - \Psi_n(\mathbf{A}_0) \leq 0$, we conclude from (5.9) that

$$\liminf\{\Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{A}}) - \Psi(\widehat{\mathbf{B}})\} \leq 0.$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Appendix C — Proof of Theorem 3

For each j, there are at most r non-zero α_{jk}. Since $\beta_j < 1$, it holds that

$$\sigma_{tj}^2 = \frac{\gamma_j}{1-\beta_j} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \alpha_{ji} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \beta_j^{k-1} Z_{t-k,i}^2.$$

Now Theorem 2 follows from Lemma 2 below immediately by letting $Y_{tj} = X_{tj}^2$ and $\rho_{tj} = \sigma_{tj}^2$. Note that Lemma 2 may be proved in the similar manner to the proof of Theorem 1 of Giraitis at al (2000); see also section 2.7.1 of Fan and Yao (2003).

Lemma 2. Consider a d-dimensional ARCH(∞) process $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{t1}, \cdots, Y_{td})^\tau$ defined by

$$Y_{tj} = \rho_{tj}\zeta_{tj}, \qquad \rho_{tj} = c_j + \sum_{i=1}^{d}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} b_{jik} Y_{t-k,i}$$

for $j = 1, \cdots, d$, where $\{\zeta_{tj}\}$ is a sequence of non-negative i.i.d. random variables with $E(\zeta_{tj}) = 1$, $Y_{tj} \geq 0$, $c_j, b_{jik} \geq 0$. Furthermore, for each j, $b_{jik} \neq 0$ for at most $r(\geq 0)$ values of k. Then the above model admits a unique strictly stationary solution $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}$ with the finite mean

$$E(\mathbf{Y}_t) = (\mathbf{I}_d - \mathbf{B})^{-1}(c_1, \cdots, c_d)^\tau$$

under the condition $\max_{1\leq j,i\leq d} b_{ji\cdot} < 1/r$, where $b_{ji\cdot} = \sum_{k\geq 1} b_{jik}$, and $\mathbf{B}$ is a $d \times d$ matrix with $b_{ji\cdot}$ as its (j,i)-th element.

References

Alexander, C. (2001). Orthogonal GARCH. In *Mastering Risk*. Financial Times-Prentice Hall: London; **2**, 21-38.

Arcones, M.A. and Yu, B. (1994). Central limit theorems for empirical processes and U-processes of stationary mixing sequences. *Jour. Theor. Probab.*, bf 7, 47–71.

Back, A. and Weigend, A.S. (1997). A first application on independent component analysis to extracting structure from stock returns. *International Journal of Neural Systems*, **8**,473-484.

Bauwens, L., Laurent, S. and Rombouts, J.V.K. (2003). Multivariate GARCH models: a survey. *A preprint*.

Bollerslev, T. (1990). Modelling the coherence in short-run nominal exchange rates: a multivariate generalized ARCH model. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, **72**, 498-505.

Bollerslev, T.R., Engle, R. and Wooldridge, J. (1998). A capital asset pricing model with time varying covariances. *Journal of Political Economy*, **96**, 116-131.

Chen, M. and An, H. (1998). A note on the stationarity and the existence of moments of the GARCH models. *Statistica Sinica*, **8**, 505-510.

Chow, Y.S. and Teicher, H. (1997). *Probability Theory* (3rd edition). Springer, New York.

Ding, Z. and Granger, C.W.J. (1996). Modeling volatility persistence of speculative returns: A new approach. *Journal of Econometrics*, **73**, 185-215.

Ding, Z. and Engle, R. (2001). Large scale conditional covariance matrix modeling, estimation and testing. *Working Paper*, **FIN-01-029**, NYU Stern School of Business.

Engle, R. (2002).Dynamic conditional correlation – a simple class of multivariate GARCH models. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **20**, 339-350.

Engle, R.F., Ito, T. and Lin, W.-L. (1990). Meteor shoers or heat waves? heteroskedastic intra-daily volatility in the foreign exchange market. *Econometrica*, **58**, 525-542.

Engle, R.F. and Kroner, K.F. (1995). Multivariate simultaneous generalised ARCH. *Econometric Theory* , **11**, 122-150.

Engle, R.F., Ng, V.K. and Rothschild, M. (1990). Asset pricing with a factor ARCH covariance structure: Empirical estimates for treasury bills. *Journal of Econometrics*, **45**, 213-238.

Engle, R.F. and Sheppard, K. (2001). Theoretical and empirical properties of dynamic conditional correlation multivariate GARCH. *A preprint*.

Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer, New York.

Giraitis, L., Kokoszka, P., and Leipus, R. (2000). Stationary ARCH models: Dependence structure and central limit theorem. *Econometric Theory*, **16**, 3–22.

Hall, P. and Yao, Q. (2003). Inference for ARCH and GARCH models. *Econometrica*, **71**, 285-317.

Harvey, A., Ruiz, E. and Shephard, N. (1994). Multivariate stochastic variance models. *The Review of Economic Studies*, **61**, 247-264.

Hyvärinen, A., Karhunen, J. and Oja, E. (2001). *Independent Component Analysis*. Wiley, New York.

Jerez, M., Casals, J. and Sotoca, S. (2001). The likelihood of multivariate GARCH models is ill-conditioned. *A preprint*.

Kiviluoto, K. and Oja, E. (1998). Independent component analysis for parallel financial time series. In *Proc. Int. Conf. on Neural Information Processing (ICONIP'98)*, vol.2, pp.895-989, Tokyo.

Mălăroiu, S., Kiviluoto, K. and Oja, E. (2000). Time series prediction with independent component analysis. *A preprint*.

Mikosch, T. and Straumann, D. (2004). Stable limits of martingale transforms with application to the estimation of GARCH parameters. *A preprint*.

Peng, L. and Yao, Q. (2003). Least absolute deviations estimation for ARCH and GARCH models. *Biometrika*, **90**, 967-975.

Penzer, J., Wang, M. and Yao, Q. (2004). Approximating volatilities by asymmetric power GARCH functions. *A preprint*.

Tsay, R. (2001). *Analysis of Financial Time Series*. Wiley, New York.

Tse, Y. K. and Tsui, A.K.C. (1999). A note on diagnosing multivariate conditional heteroscedasticity models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, **20**, 679-691.

Vilenkin, N. (1968). Special functions and the theory of group representation, translations of mathematical monographs. *American Math. Soc.*, Providence, Rhode Island, 22.

van der Vaart, A.W. and Wellner, J.A. (1996). Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes. Springer, New York.

van der Weide, R. (2002). GO-GARCH: a multivariate generalized orthogonal GARCH model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **17**, 549-564.

Wang, M. and Yao, Q. (2005). Modelling multivariate volatilities: an ad hoc approach. To appear in "*Contemporary Multivariate Analysis and Experimental Designs*" J. Fan, G. Li & R. Li (edit.) World Scientific, Singapore.

Yu, B. (1994). Rates of convergence for empirical processes of stationary mixing sequences. *Ann. Statist.*, **22**, 94-116.




Figure 1: *Boxplots of the errors in estimation for CUC-GARCH(1,1) model (3.1) with* $\mathbf{A} = \widehat{\mathbf{A}}$ *estimated (upper panel) and the true* $\mathbf{A}$ *(lower panel). The sample size is* $n = 1000$.




Figure 2: *Plots of daily log return of (a) S&P 500 index, (b) Cisco Systems stock and (c) Intel Corporation stock. Time span is from January 2, 1991 to December 31, 1999 with 2275 observations.*




Figure 3: *Fitted volatility processes based on CUC-GARCH(1,1) model for daily log returns of (a) S&P 500 index, (b) Cisco Systems stock and (c) Intel Corporation stock.*




Figure 4: *Fitted conditional correlations based on CUC-GARCH(1,1) model for daily log returns between (a) S&P 500 index and Cisco Systems stock, (b) S&P 500 index and Intel Corporation stock, and (c) Cisco Systems stock and Intel Corporation stock.*




Figure 5: *Fitted volatility processes based on Orthogonal-GARCH(1,1) model for daily log returns of (a) S&P 500 index, (b) Cisco Systems stock and (c) Intel Corporation stock.*




Figure 6: *Plots of dividend adjusted daily log returns of (a) Hang Seng index in Hong Kong, (b) Japan Nikkei 225 index, (c) Shanghai Composite index in China, (d) Singapore Straits Time index, and (e) Taiwan Weighted index. Time span is from August 1, 1997 to December 30, 2003 with 1349 observations.*




Figure 7: *Fitted volatility processes based on CUC-Extended GARCH(1,1) model for daily log returns of (a) Hang Seng index in Hong Kong, (b) Japan Nikkei 225 index, (c) Shanghai Composite index in China, (d) Singapore Straits Time index, and (e) Taiwan Weighted index.*






Figure 8: *Fitted conditional correlations between daily log-returns of Hang Seng index (HS) and (a) Japan Nikkei 225 index (JN), (b) Shanghai Composite index in China (SC), (c) Singapore Straits Time index (ST), (d) Taiwan Weighted index (TW).*


0.25
0.2
0.15
0.1
0.05
0
ε
α1
α2
α3


1
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
β1
β2
β3