Resampling Procedure in estimation of Optimal Portfolios for Time -Varying ARCH Processes

Hiroshi Shiraishi *Waseda University*

Abstract

This paper discusses a resampling procedure in estimation of optimal portfolios when the returns are the class of nonstationary ARCH models with time-varying parameters. The asymptotic properties of weighted Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GQML}$ of time-varying ARCH(p) processes are studied, including asymptotic normality. In particular, the extra bias due to nonstationarity of the process is investigated. We consider bias adjusted estimators $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{GQML}$ by use of resampling. In this paper we assume that the optimal portfolio g depends on the ARCH parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, i.e., $g = g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Then the asymptotic distribution of the optimal portfolio estimator $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{GQML})$ is derived. We numerically evaluate the magnitude of $g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GQML})$ and $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{GQML})$ for actual financial data, which shows eventually the effect of bias adjustment.

1. Introduction

In the theory of portfolio analysis, optimal portfolios are determined by the mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and variance Σ of the portfolio return. Several authors proposed estimators of the optimal portfolios as functions of the sample mean $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and the sample variance $\hat{\Sigma}$ for independent returns of assets. However, empirical studies show that financial return processes are often dependent. From this point of view, Engle (1982) introduced the ARCH model where the conditional varinace is stochastic and dependent on past observations. The ARCH model and its related models have gained widespread recognition because they model quite well the volatility in financial markets over relatively short periods of time. However, these models hold the stationary assumption. Now given the changing pace of the world's economy, modeling financial returns over long intervals using stationary time series may be inappropriate. To overcome this issue, Dahlhaus and Rao (2006) introduced a time-varying ARCH (tvARCH) model which is a class of ARCH models with time-varying parameters. They studied the parameter estimation for tvARCH(p) models by weighted Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood methods. Furthermore, they showed asymptotic normality of the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GQML}$. In this paper, denoting the optimal portfolios by a function $g = g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ of ARCH parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we discuss the asymptotic property of optimal portfolio estimators (i.e. $g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{GQML})$) when the returns are vector-valued non-Gaussian tvARCH(p) processes with time dependent mean.

Since the nonstationarity of the process causes the estimator to be biased, we also consider bias adjusted estimators by use of resampling. In general, it is difficult to apply

resampling to dependent data, because the idea is to simulate sampling from the population by sampling from the sample under the i.i.d. assumption. Hall and Yao (2003) and Shiraishi (2008) suggested a resampling procedure when the process is GARCH model. In a similar way to the procedure, we show that stationary ARCH processes (which locally approximate tvARCH processes) can be generated. Then, based on the approximated ARCH processes, unbiased estimators $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{GQML}$ for ARCH parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ can be constructed, which implies that we can construct unbiased optimal portfolio estimators $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{GQML})$.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows the tvARCH process can be locally approximated by stationary ARCH processes. Therefore, the tvARCH processes can be called locally stationary. Then, we study parameter estimation for tvARCH(p) models by weighted Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood methods. We show that this estimator has a good property even if Gaussianity assumption is dropped. We elucidate the asymptotics of the estimator. Furthermore, we generate approximated stationary ARCH processes by use of resampling. Then, we construct an unbiased estimator for ARCH parameter and prove asymptotic normality of the estimator. In Section 3, we propose an optimal portfolio depending on the ARCH parameter. Moreover, we examine our approach numerically. The result shows eventually the effect of bias adjustment.

Throughout this paper, $|\boldsymbol{a}|$ and $|A|$ denote the Euclidean norm of a vector $\boldsymbol{a}$ and a matrix A defined by $\sqrt{\boldsymbol{a}'\boldsymbol{a}}$ and $\sqrt{tr(A'A)}$, respectively. We write $X_n \xrightarrow{d} X$ (or $\xrightarrow{p}$ or $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$) if $\{X_n\}$ converges in distribution (or in probability or almost surely) to X. The 'vec' operator transforms a matrix into a vector by stacking columns, and the 'vech' operator transforms a symmetric matrix into a vector by stacking elements on and below the main diagonal.

2. Asymptotic Theory for Fundamental Quantities

We suppose that the return process $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} = (X_{1,t,N}, \ldots, X_{m,t,N})'; t = 1, \ldots, N, N \in \boldsymbol{Z}\}$ is an m-vector ARCH process with time-varying parameter $\{\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N} = (\theta_{1,t/N}, \ldots, \theta_{q,t/N})'; t = 1, \ldots, N\}$, defined by

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}) + D_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N})\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \tag{2.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_m)$ is an mean vector function, $D_{t,N} = diag(h^{\frac{1}{2}}_{1,t,N}, \ldots, h^{\frac{1}{2}}_{m,t,N})$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = (\epsilon_{1,t}, \ldots, \epsilon_{m,t})'$ are i.i.d. random vectors with $E(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t) = \boldsymbol{0}, E(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t') = I_m$ and $E(|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t|^{12+\delta}) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Here $\boldsymbol{H}_{t,N} = (h_{1,t,N}, \ldots, h_{m,t,N})'$ are m vectors defined by

$$\boldsymbol{H}_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}) = \boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N})\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-j,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{(t-j)/N}) \tag{2.2}$$

with $\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-j,N} = (Y^2_{1,t-j,N}, \ldots, Y^2_{m,t-j,N})', Y_{i,t-j,N} = X_{i,t-j,N} - \mu_i, \boldsymbol{U} = (U_1, \ldots, U_m)'$ and $A_j = (A_{ab,j})_{a,b=1,\ldots,m}$. The order p is assumed known. We also assume that the time-varying parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}$ are unknown and included a compact subset Θ of $\boldsymbol{R}^q$, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N} \in \Theta \subset \boldsymbol{R}^q$ for $\forall t, N \in \boldsymbol{Z}$. We introduce the notation $\nabla_i = \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_i}, \nabla_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j}, \nabla_{ijk} =$

$\frac{\partial^3}{\partial\theta_i\partial\theta_j\partial\theta_k}$, $\nabla = (\nabla_1, \ldots, \nabla_q)'$ and $\nabla^2 = (\nabla_{ij})_{i,j=1,\ldots,q}$ for $\forall\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.

We call the sequence of stochastic processes $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} : t = 1, \ldots, N\}$ with satisfy (2.1) and (2.2) a time-varying ARCH process with order p (tvARCH(p) process). As shown below, the tvARCH(p) process can be locally approximated by stationary ARCH processes. Therefore, we also call tvARCH processes locally stationary. We make the following assumptions.

Assumption 1.
There exist $0 < \rho, Q, M < \infty, 0 < \nu < 1$ and a positive sequence $\{l(j)\}$.

(i) For $\forall\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta, i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $j = 1, \ldots, p$

$$\rho < U_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad |\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le Q, \quad |\boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le Q \quad \text{and} \quad |A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le \frac{Q}{l(j)}$$

where $\{l(j)\}$ satisfies $mQ\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l(j)} \le 1 - \nu$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{j}{l(j)} < \infty$.

(ii) For each $u \in (0, 1]$, we assume $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u \in Int(\boldsymbol{\Theta})$ and

$$|\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u) - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'})| \le M|u - u'|, \quad |\boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u) - \boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'})| \le M|u - u'|$$

and

$$|A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_u) - A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u'})| \le \frac{M}{l(j)}|u - u'|,$$

for $u, u' \in (0, 1]$.

(iii) The third derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ exist with

$$|\nabla_{i_1\ldots i_k}\boldsymbol{\mu}_a(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le C, \quad |\nabla_{i_1\ldots i_k}\boldsymbol{U}_a(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le C \quad \text{and} \quad |\nabla_{i_1\ldots i_k}A_{ab,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \le C$$

for $k = 1, 2, 3, i_1, \ldots, i_k = 1, \ldots, q, a, b = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\forall\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, where C is a finite constant independent of i, a, b and $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

(iv) The third derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_u$ exist with

$$\left|\frac{\partial^j \boldsymbol{\theta}_u}{\partial u^j}\right| \le C < \infty$$

for $j = 1, 2, 3$ and $\forall u \in (0, 1]$.

(v) The random vector $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ has a positive density on an interval containing zero.

For each given $u_0 \in (0, 1]$, we assume that there exist a stochastic process $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(u_0) = (\tilde{X}_{1,t}(u_0), \ldots, \tilde{X}_{m,t}(u_0))'; t \in \boldsymbol{Z}\}$, that is, the stationary ARCH process associated with the tvARCH(p) process at time point u_0 if it satisfies

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(u_0) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) + \tilde{D}_t(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \qquad (2.3)$$

where $\tilde{D}_t(u_0) = diag(\tilde{h}_{1,t}(u_0)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{m,t}(u_0)^{\frac{1}{2}})$. Here $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_t(u_0) = (\tilde{h}_{1,t}(u_0), \ldots, \tilde{h}_{m,t}(u_0))'$ are m vectors defined by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_t(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) = \boldsymbol{U}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) \vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_{t-j}(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) \tag{2.4}$$

with $\vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_{t-j}(u_0) = (\tilde{Y}_{1,t-j}(u_0)^2, \ldots, \tilde{Y}_{m,t-j}(u_0)^2)', \tilde{Y}_{i,t-j}(u_0) = \tilde{X}_{i,t-j}(u_0) - \mu_i$.

Comparing (2.1) and (2.2) with (2.3) and (2.4), it seems clear that if t/N is close to u_0. Then, $\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N})$ and $\vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_t(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})$ should be close and the degree of the approximation should depend both on the rescaling factor N and the derivation $|t/N - u_0|$. This is shown below.

Lemma 1.
Suppose $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(u_0)\}$ are tvARCH(p) and ARCH processes defined by (2.1),(2.2) and (2.3),(2.4), respectively. Then, under Assumption 1, we have

$$\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}) = \vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_t(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) + O_p\left(\left|\frac{t}{N} - u_0\right| + \frac{1}{N}\right).$$

In what follows, we consider a kernel type estimator of the parameter of a tvARCH(p) model given the sample $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N}; t = 1, \ldots, N\}$. We now define the segment (kernel) estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}$ for $u_0 \in (0, 1)$. Let $t_0 \in \boldsymbol{N}$ such that $|u_0 - t_0/N| < 1/N$. The estimator is the minimizer of the weighted conditional likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}_{t_0,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{k=p+1}^{N} \frac{1}{bN} W\left(\frac{t_0 - k}{bN}\right) l_{k,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{2.5}$$

where

$$l_{k,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\log\det\left(D_{k,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^2\right) + (\boldsymbol{X}_{k,N} - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))' D_{k,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-2} (\boldsymbol{X}_{k,N} - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right\}$$

and $W : [-1/2, 1/2] \to \boldsymbol{R}$ is a kernel function of bounded variation with $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)dx = 1$ and $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} xW(x)dx = 0$. That is, we consider

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_0/N} = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta} \mathcal{L}_{t_0,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}). \tag{2.6}$$

In the derivation of the asymptotic properties of this estimator, we make use of the local approximation of $\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t,N}$ by the stationary process $\vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_t(u_0)$ defined in (2.4). Similarly to the above, we therefore define the weighted likelihood

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}) := \sum_{k=p+1}^{N} \frac{1}{bN} W\left(\frac{t_0 - k}{bN}\right) \tilde{l}_k(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{2.7}$$

where $|u_0 - t_0/N| < 1/N$ and

$$\tilde{l}_k(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\log\det\left(\tilde{D}_k(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2\right) + \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_k(u_0) - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)' \tilde{D}_k(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta})^{-2} \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_k(u_0) - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\right\}.$$

Similarly to Dahlhaus and Rao (2006), it is shown that both $\mathcal{L}_{t_0,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ converge to

$$\mathcal{L}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}) := E\left(\tilde{l}_0(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)$$

as $N \to \infty, b \to 0, bN \to \infty$ and $|u_0 - t_0/N| < 1/N$. It is easy to show that $\mathcal{L}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is minimized by $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}$. For later reference, we introduce the followings:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma(u_0) &:= -E\left(\nabla^2 \tilde{l}_0(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\right) = -\left\{\Sigma_{ij}(u_0)\right\}_{i,j=1,\dots,q} \\
K(u_0) &:= \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)^2 dx\right) E\left(\nabla\tilde{l}_0(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla\tilde{l}_0(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})'\right) \\
&= \left\{\left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)^2 dx\right) K_{ij}(u_0)\right\}_{i,j=1,\dots,q} \\
\boldsymbol{B}(u_0) &:= \left(\frac{1}{2}\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} x^2 W(x) dx\right) \Sigma(u_0)^{-1}\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u^2}\nabla\mathcal{L}(u,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\bigg|_{u=u_0}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{ij}(u_0) &= \sum_{l=1}^{m} E\left(\frac{\nabla_i\mu_l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\mu_l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})} + \frac{1}{2}\frac{\nabla_i\tilde{h}_{l,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\tilde{h}_{l,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})^2}\right) \\
K_{ij}(u_0) &= \sum_{l=1}^{m} E\left(\frac{\nabla_i\mu_l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\mu_l(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}\right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{4}\sum_{l_1,l_2=1}^{m}\left\{E\left(\frac{\nabla_i\tilde{h}_{l_1,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\tilde{h}_{l_2,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l_1,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\tilde{h}_{l_2,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}\right) Cov\left(\epsilon_{l_1,0}^2,\epsilon_{l_2,0}^2\right)\right. \\
&\quad + 2E\left(\frac{\nabla_i\tilde{h}_{l_1,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\mu_{l_2}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l_1,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\tilde{h}_{l_2,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})^{1/2}}\right) Cov\left(\epsilon_{l_1,0}^2,\epsilon_{l_2,0}\right) \\
&\quad \left. + 2E\left(\frac{\nabla_i\mu_{l_1}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})\nabla_j\tilde{h}_{l_2,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}{\tilde{h}_{l_1,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})^{1/2}\tilde{h}_{l_2,0}(u_0,\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})}\right) Cov\left(\epsilon_{l_1,0},\epsilon_{l_2,0}^2\right)\right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then, we have the following result.

Theorem 1.
Suppose $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} : t = 1,\dots,N\}$ is a tvARCH(p) process which satisfies Assumption 1 and W is a kernel function of bounded variation with $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)dx = 1$ and $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} xW(x)dx = 0$. Then, if $|u_0 - t_0/N| < 1/N$ and $b = O(N^{-1/5})$,

$$\sqrt{bN}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_0/N} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}) \xrightarrow{d} N(\boldsymbol{B}_K(u_0), \Sigma(u_0)^{-1}K(u_0)\Sigma(u_0)^{-1}),$$

where K is a constant value satisfied with $K = bN^{1/5}$ and $\boldsymbol{B}_K(u_0) = K^{5/2}\boldsymbol{B}(u_0)$.

We have shown that the bias can be explained in terms of the derivatives of the tvARCH process. Furthermore, we have proved asymptotic normality of the estimator. This derivative enables us to study more precisely the nonstationary behavior of the process. Theorem 1 leads us to take an optimal bandwidth b_{opt} based on minimization the mean squared error.

Remark 1.
Under the conditions of Theorem 1, the mean squared error $RMSE(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_0/N}) = E|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t_0/N} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}|^2$ *is minimized by*

$$b_{opt} = N^{-\frac{1}{5}} \frac{tr\left\{\Sigma(u_0)^{-1}K(u_0)\Sigma(u_0)^{-1}\right\}}{|\boldsymbol{B}(u_0)|^2}.$$

Since magnitude of the bias depend on degree of the nonstationarity, length of the optimal bandwidth is inverse to proportion to the magnitude of the bias. Thus, the optimal choice of the bandwidth (of the segment length) depends on the degree of stationarity of the process. Because b_{opt} depends on the asymptotic bias and variance, in the actual real data analysis, one idea is to start with preliminary estimators $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{u_0}), \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_0(u_0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{u_0})$ for $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0}), \tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_0(u_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{u_0})$, respectively. Then we can calculate their derivatives numerically, and plug them in $\Sigma(u_0), K(u_0)$ and $\boldsymbol{B}(u_0)$.

Next, we construct unbiased estimator of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}$ by use of resampling. Let $\mathcal{X}_N = \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1,N}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_{N,N}\}$ be observations from described as (2.1) and (2.2). Based on $\mathcal{X}_N$, we can construct $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t/N}\}_{t=1,\ldots,N}$ by (2.6). Then, the error $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ are recovered by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t \equiv D_{t,N}^{-1}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t/N})\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{t/N})\} \quad (t = p+1, \cdots, N).$$

Let $G_N(\cdot)$ denote the emprical distribution which put mass $1/(N-p)$ at $\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t$. Let $F_N^*(\boldsymbol{x}) = G_N(\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^{-2}(\boldsymbol{x} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}))$ where $\boldsymbol{x} \in \boldsymbol{R}^m$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}} = 1/(N-p)\sum_{t=p+1}^N \hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t$ and $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}^2 = 1/(N-p)\sum_{t=p+1}^N (\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t - \bar{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}})'$. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*\}$ be i.i.d. observations from $F_N^*(\cdot)$. Given $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*\}$, we generate $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t^*(1)\}$ by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t^*(1) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) + \tilde{D}_t^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*, \tag{2.8}$$

where $\tilde{D}_t^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) = diag(\tilde{h}_{1,t}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})^{1/2}, \ldots, \tilde{h}_{m,t}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})^{1/2})$. Here $\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_t^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) = (\tilde{h}_{1,t}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}), \ldots, \tilde{h}_{m,t}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}))'$ are defined by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{H}}_t^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) = \boldsymbol{U}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) + \sum_{j=1}^{p} A_j(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})\vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_{t-j}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})$$

with $\vec{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}}_{t-j}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) = (\tilde{Y}_{1,t-j}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})^2, \ldots, \tilde{Y}_{m,t-j}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N})^2)'$ and

$$\tilde{Y}_{i,t}^*(1, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) = \begin{cases} \tilde{X}_{i,t}^*(1) - \mu_i(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{N/N}) & if\ t > -K \\ 0 & if\ t \leq -K \end{cases}.$$

From the above procedure, we need to draw $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*$ for $-K \le t \le N$. If it is necessary to remove suspected edge effects, we may treat K as a sufficiently large integer. Throughout this paper, $(*)$ implies that we are dealing with the bootstrap quantity, hence distribution P^* and expectation E^* etc. are taken under $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^*\} \sim i.i.d.\ F_N^*$ given $\mathcal{X}_N = \{\boldsymbol{X}_{1,N}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{X}_{N,N}\}$.

By using this model, we introduce a resampled estimator of the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}$, that is,

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}^* = \arg\min_{\boldsymbol{\theta}\in\Theta} \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \tag{2.9}$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_N^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{k=p+1}^{N} \frac{1}{bN} W\left(\frac{N-k}{bN}\right) \tilde{l}_k^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta})$$

and

$$\tilde{l}_k^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{2}\left\{\log\det\left(\tilde{D}_k^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta})^2\right) + \left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_k^*(1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)' \tilde{D}_k^*(1, \boldsymbol{\theta})^{-2}\left(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_k^*(1) - \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\right)\right\}.$$

Then, we have the following result.

Theorem 2.
Suppose $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t^*(1) : t = 1, \ldots, N\}$ is generated by (2.8) satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose too that W is a kernel function of bounded variation with $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)dx = 1$, $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} xW(x)dx = 0$ and $b = O(N^{-1/5})$. Then,

$$\sqrt{bN}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}) \xrightarrow{d^*} N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma(1)^{-1}K(1)\Sigma(1)^{-1}).$$

3. Optimal portfolios

In this section, we propose an optimal portfolio estimator when the obserbed return process is written as (2.1) and (2.2). We construct an optimal portfolio estimator for the stationary ARCH process associated with the tvARCH(p) process at time point $1(= N/N)$.

Suppose that (pseudo) return process is described by (2.3) and (2.4) at time point 1. Then, the mean vector and variance matrix are written by

$$E(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(1)) = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}) \tag{3.1}$$

$$V(\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(1)) = \prod_{j=1}^{p}(I_m - A_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}))^{-1}\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}}((\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})) \equiv V(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}) \tag{3.2}$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{U}} = diag(U_1, \ldots, U_m)$. Let $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_m)'$ be the vector of portfolio weights. Then, the return of portfolio at time t is $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t(1)'\boldsymbol{\omega}$, and the expectation and variance are, respectively, given by $\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})'\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\omega}'V(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})\boldsymbol{\omega}$. Optimal portfolio weights have been proposed by various criteria. They are expressed as a function $g(\boldsymbol{\mu}, V)$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and V. (See Shiraishi and Taniguchi (2008)).

Since the mean vector and variance matrix are parametrized by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, we can express the optimal portfolio function as $g = g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$. Also, it should be noted that since the vector of portfolio weight $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_m)'$ satisfies the restriction $\boldsymbol{e}'\boldsymbol{\omega} = 1$, where $\boldsymbol{e} = (1, \dots, 1)'$, we have only to estimate the subvector $(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{m-1})'$. Hence we assume that the function g is $(m-1)$-dimensional, i.e.,

$$g : \boldsymbol{\theta} \to \boldsymbol{R}^{m-1}. \tag{3.3}$$

For g given by (3.3) we impose the following.

Assumption 2.
The function $g(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is continuously differentiable.

Then we have the following result.

Theorem 3.
Suppose $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_t^*(1) : t = 1, \dots, N\}$ is generated by (2.8) satisfying Assumption 1. Suppose too that W is a kernel function of bounded variation with $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} W(x)dx = 1$, $\int_{-1/2}^{1/2} xW(x)dx = 0$ and $b = O(N^{-1/5})$. Then, under Assumption 2, we have

$$\sqrt{bN}(g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{N/N}) - g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})) \xrightarrow{d^*} N(\boldsymbol{0}, \nabla g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})\Sigma(1)^{-1}K(1)\Sigma(1)^{-1}\nabla g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})').$$

In what follows, we examine our approach numerically. Here, we discuss a global asset allocation problem where Japanese capital must be allocated to "U.S. dollar", "Australian dollar" and "Euro", respectively. Based on the daily log-returns for these exchange rates, we construct the mean-variance optimal portfolios. The data are from Jan 1st, 2007 to Jun 1st, 2007.

Suppose now the return process $\{\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} = (X_{1,t,N}, X_{2,t,N}, X_{3,t,N})'; t = 1, \dots, N,\ N = 2, \dots, 100\}$ is the following tvARCH(1) process ;

$$\boldsymbol{X}_{t,N} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}_{t/N} + D_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N})\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$$

where $D_{t,N} = diag(h^{1/2}_{1,t,N}, h^{1/2}_{2,t,N}, h^{1/2}_{3,t,N})$, and $\boldsymbol{H}_{t,N} = (h_{1,t,N}, h_{2,t,N}, h_{3,t,N})'$ is defined by

$$\boldsymbol{H}_{t,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N}) = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}_{t/N} + \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(3)}_{t/N}\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t-1,N}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}_{t/N}),$$

with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t/N} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)'}_{t/N}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)'}_{t/N}, vec(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(3)}_{t/N})')'$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(1)}_{t/N} = (\theta^{(1)}_{1,t/N}, \theta^{(1)}_{2,t/N}, \theta^{(1)}_{3,t/N})'$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(2)}_{t/N} = (\theta^{(2)}_{1,t/N}, \theta^{(2)}_{2,t/N}, \theta^{(2)}_{3,t/N})'$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(3)}_{t/N} = (\theta^{(3)}_{ij,t/N})_{i,j=1,2,3}$ and $\vec{\boldsymbol{Y}}_{t,N} = ((X_{1,t,N} - \theta^{(1)}_{1,t/N})^2, (X_{2,t,N} - \theta^{(1)}_{2,t/N})^2, (X_{3,t,N} - \theta^{(1)}_{3,t/N})^2)'$.

By using (2.6) and (2.9), we construct Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood estimator $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N}$ (GQMLE), and resampled Gaussian quasi maximum likelihood estimator $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{N/N}$ (rGQMLE), respectively. Then, two types of optimal portfolio estimator $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})$ and $g(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{N/N})$ are constructed from (3.1) and (3.2). Here, we set down target returns (μ_P) from 0.0001 to 0.0010. Then, optimal portfolio $g(\mu_P, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is written as

$$g(\mu_P, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\mu\mu} \cdot \sigma_{ee} - (\sigma_{\mu e})^2} \{(\sigma_{ee} \cdot \mu_P - \sigma_{\mu e})\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - (\sigma_{\mu e} - \sigma_{\mu\mu})\boldsymbol{e}\}$$

where $\sigma_{\mu\mu} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})'V(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \sigma_{\mu e} = \boldsymbol{\mu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})'V(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}\boldsymbol{e}, \sigma_{ee} = \boldsymbol{e}'V(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{-1}\boldsymbol{e}$ and $\boldsymbol{e} = (1,1,1)'$.
Figure 1 shows the portfolio returns ($= \boldsymbol{\alpha}_N' \boldsymbol{X}_{N+1,N+1}$) for

- GQMLE (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N = g(0.0005, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{N/N})$),
- rGQMLE (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N = g(0.0005, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*_{N/N})$) and
- SM&SV (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_N = g(0.0005, \textit{sample mean}, \ \textit{sample variance})$),

and $N = 2, \ldots, 100$.

Figure 1 is about here.

It is easy to see that the variations for GQLME and rGQMLE are smaller than those for SM&SV. This symptom leads us our optimal portfolio estimators are low-risk in view of the variation. In Table 1, we can see sample means of the portfolio returns for $N = 2, \ldots, 100$ and $\mu_P = 0.0001, \ldots, 0.0010$.

Table 1 is about here.

Obviously, the sample means for GQLME and rGQMLE are larger than those for SM&SV. Compare GQMLE with rGQMLE, those for rGQMLE are quite close to the target returns rather than those for GQMLE, which shows eventually the effect of bias adjustment. Finally, we show sample mean squares errors of the portfolio returns for $N = 2, \ldots, 100$ and $\mu_P = 0.0001, \ldots, 0.0010$ in Table 2.

Table 2 is about here.

For almost all target returns, the MSEs for GQLME and rGQMLE are smaller than those for SM&SV. Although those for rGQMLE are relatively larger than those for GQMLE, the spreads are not so wide.

Summarizing the numerical study, our proposed optimal portfolio estimators are obviously attractive rather than traditional one. Furthermore, we obtained the large effect of bias adjustment by use of resampling.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank for his Professor Masanobu Taniguchi of Waseda University for his encouragement, guidance, and advice for this paper.

References

[1] Allen, M. and Datta, S (1999) A Note on Bootstrapping M-estimators in ARMA models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis.* **20**, 365-379.

[2] Bose, A. (1988) Edgeworth Correction by Bootstrap in Autoregressions. *The Annals of Statistics.* **16**, 1709-1722.

[3] Brockwell, P. J. and Davis, R. A. (1991) *Time Series: Theory and Methods.* New York: Springer.

[4] Bühlmann, P. (1997) Sieve Bootstrap for Time Series. *Bernoulli.* **3**, 123-148.

[5] Dahlhaus, R. and Rao, S, S. (2006) Statistical Inference for Time-varying ARCH processes. *The Annals of Statistics.* **34** 1075-1114.

[6] David, R. (2004) *Statistics and Finance: An Introduction.* New York: Springer.

[7] Efron, B. (1979) Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics.* **7**, 1-26.

[8] Engle, R. F. (1982) Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica.* **50**, 987-1007.

[9] Fuller, W. A. (1996) *Introduction to Statistical Time Series*, second edition. New York: Willy.

[10] Hall, P. and Horowiz, Q. (1996) Bootstrap Critical Values for Tests Based on Generalized-Method-of-Moment Estimators *Econometrica.* **64**,891-916.

[11] Hall, P. and Yao, Q. (2003) Inference in ARCH and GARCH Models with Heavy-Tailed Errors. *Econometrica.* **71**,285-317.

[12] Jeantheau, T. (1998) Strong consistency of estimators for multivariate ARCH models. *Econometric Theory.* **14**, 70-86.

[13] Jobson, J. D. and Korkie, B. (1980) Estimation for Markowitz Efficient Portfolios. *Journal of the American Statistical Association.* **75**,544-554.

[14] Kakizawa, Y. (1999) Valid Edgeworth expansions of some estimators and bootstrap confidence intervals in first-order autoregression. *Journal of Time Series Analysis.* **20**,343-359.

[15] Lahiri, S. N. (2003) *Resampling Methods for Dependent Data.* New York: Springer.

[16] Paparoditis, E. (1996) Bootstrapping Autoregressive and Moving Average Parameter Estimates of Infinite Order Vector Autoregressive Processes. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis.* **57**,277-296.

[17] Shiraishi, H. (2008) Resampling Procedure to Construct Value at Risk Efficient Portfolios for Stationary Returns of Assets. *Waseda University Time Series Discussion Paper.*

[18] Stout, W. F. (1974) *Almost Sure Convergence.* New York: Academic Press.

[19] Taniguchi, M. and Kakizawa, Y. (2000) *Asymptotic Theory of Statistical Inference for Time Series.* New York: Springer.



Figure 1: Time series plots of portfolio return for SM&SV portfolio, GQMLE portfolio and rGQMLE portfolio

Table 1: Sample Mean of portfolio return for SM&SV portfolio, GQMLE portfolio and rGQMLE portfolio

Target Return	SM&SV	GQMLE	rGQMLE
0.0001	-0.0000493	0.0000442	0.0003009
0.0002	-0.0000704	0.0000394	0.0002921
0.0003	-0.0001079	0.0000347	0.0002833
0.0004	-0.0001253	0.0000299	0.0002745
0.0005	-0.0001685	0.0000252	0.0002657
0.0006	-0.0002217	0.0000204	0.0002569
0.0007	-0.0002234	0.0000156	0.0002481
0.0008	-0.0002554	0.0000109	0.0002393
0.0009	-0.0003253	0.0000061	0.0002305
0.0010	-0.0003003	0.0000014	0.0002216

Table 2: Mean Squares Error of portfolio return for SM&SV portfolio, GQMLE portfolio and rGQMLE portfolio

Target Return	SM&SV	GQMLE	rGQMLE
0.0001	0.0000057	0.0000057	0.0000064
0.0002	0.0000092	0.0000053	0.0000054
0.0003	0.0000141	0.0000049	0.0000051
0.0004	0.0000206	0.0000046	0.0000056
0.0005	0.0000285	0.0000045	0.0000068
0.0006	0.0000379	0.0000043	0.0000088
0.0007	0.0000488	0.0000043	0.0000114
0.0008	0.0000611	0.0000044	0.0000148
0.0009	0.0000751	0.0000045	0.0000189
0.0010	0.0000903	0.0000048	0.0000238