

Shocks-adaptive Robust Minimum Variance Portfolio for a Large Universe of Assets

Qingliang Fan^a, Ruike Wu^b, and Yanrong Yang^c

^aDepartment of Economics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

^bSchool of Economics, Xiamen University

^cCollege of Business & Economics, The Australian National University

October 4, 2024

Abstract

This paper proposes a robust, shocks-adaptive portfolio in a large-dimensional assets universe where the number of assets could be comparable to or even larger than the sample size. It is well documented that portfolios based on optimizations are sensitive to outliers in return data. We deal with outliers by proposing a robust factor model, contributing methodologically through the development of a robust principal component analysis (PCA) for factor model estimation and a shrinkage estimation for the random error covariance matrix. This approach extends the well-regarded Principal Orthogonal Complement Thresholding (POET) method (Fan et al., 2013), enabling it to effectively handle heavy tails and sudden shocks in data. The novelty of the proposed robust method is its adaptiveness to both global and idiosyncratic shocks, without the need to distinguish them, which is useful in forming portfolio weights when facing outliers. We develop the theoretical results of the robust factor model and the robust minimum variance portfolio. Numerical and empirical results show the superior performance of the new portfolio.

JEL Classification: G11, C38, C55, C58

Keywords: Minimum variance portfolio, factor model, robust portfolio, covariance learning.

1 Introduction

Diversification is widely recognized in academia and industry as the predominant investment strategy. The mean-variance model (Markowitz, 1952) provides an elegant analytical solution given the population mean and (co)variances. Real data frequently display characteristics of heavy tails and high dimensionality, presenting challenges to the robustness of portfolio strategies that rely on optimization methods. It is well documented that portfolios based on optimization are highly sensitive to input data, often resulting in extreme portfolio weights and poor out of sample performance.

This paper studies the large dimensional minimum variance portfolio (MVP), inspired by the real-world investment scenarios that fund managers frequently encounter, where they must manage a vast universe of assets, often exceeding the sample size. The focus of the MVP is primarily on the covariance structure, presenting a more straightforward task in such complex environments (Jagannathan and Ma, 2003; DeMiguel et al., 2009). Specifically, we propose a robust minimum variance portfolio (R-MVP) to deal with outliers (or heavy tails) in the financial return data. By “*robust portfolio*”, specifically, it means (1), the portfolio constructed according to the presumed optimization rule (here it is the minimum variance) is robust to the features of real data deviating from classic assumptions such as i.i.d., the existence of second moment, and sub-Gaussian tails; (2), the portfolio is data-adaptive: it closely aligns with the MVP based on POET under regular conditions, and shifts towards a robust version when encountering outliers; and (3), its out of sample performance is robust. The robustness is guaranteed by our asymptotic theory in Section 4. When applying to the real data, the R-MVP is shown to be immune to highly sensitive weights due to potential financial turmoils, including both market and idiosyncratic shocks. For instance, the 2007-2008 financial crisis, triggered by the banking sector, spread across the entire market. During this period, we observed various shocks affecting the entire market as well as specific individual firms. We achieve the robust portfolio by proposing a robustified version of the factor model described below.

In asset pricing studies, the factor model is the main workhorse (Fama and French, 1992; Bai and Ng, 2002) that evolved from the capital asset pricing model (CAPM). The theoretical work of arbitrage pricing theory (APT, Ross, 1976) laid the foundation for approximate factor models, which conveniently decompose the return data covariance matrix into a low-rank component and a sparse component (Chamberlain and Rothschild, 1983). Following the literature, we estimate the high-dimensional covariance matrix using the popular approximate factor model. The celebrated POET (Fan et al., 2013) method employs the factor model for dimension reduction and an adaptive thresholding method to regularize the error covariance matrix estimation. However, the POET method does not deal with heavy tails. The subsequent methods, e.g. Fan et al. (2018) and Fan et al. (2019) further discuss heavier tails in the data but still need the existence of the second moment. In practical applications, the occurrence of heavy tails is common in financial returns. From a modeling perspective, many financial asset returns might not even possess a finite second moment.

To deal with above issues in the data, our procedure employs a robust PCA method for the estimation of the factor model (Maronna, 2005), and a simple thresholding method for the residual covariance (Cai and Liu, 2011). Our method enhances the robustness of the MVP by incorporating a weight function into the estimation procedure, which effectively mitigates the impact of outliers. The weight in the robust PCA is automatically derived from the data, serving as a generalization of classical PCA. This approach is adept at handling data that may contain outliers, without the need to prespecify their effects. We develop the desired theoretical properties of the robust factor model and R-MVP, including factor loading and common factors estimation consistency, error covariance estimation consistency,

and oracle risk and Sharpe ratio consistency. Moreover, the proposed R-MVP is robust to the global (homogeneous) and idiosyncratic (heterogeneous) outliers, representing the shocks to the whole market and individual assets, respectively. In our model, we allow for either one or both of the two shocks without the need to specify them in the data. Additionally, we generalize the POET method and provide a weighted PCA approach which is of independent interest.

1.1 MVP Preliminaries

MVP has a surging appearance in recent studies on portfolio management (DeMiguel et al., 2009; Fan et al., 2012; Ding et al., 2021; Caner et al., 2023). Specifically, the classic MVP problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} \min \quad & W^\top \Sigma_r W, \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & W^\top \mathbf{1}_p = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{1.1}$$

where Σ_r is the p -dimensional population covariance matrix of asset returns; W is a $p \times 1$ vector of asset weights in the portfolio, and $\mathbf{1}_p$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of 1's. The analytical solution for MVP weight is:

$$W^* = \frac{\Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}. \tag{1.2}$$

The variance of MVP and the corresponding Sharpe ratio (SR) are:

$$R_{\min} = W^{*\top} \Sigma_r W^* = \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}, \tag{1.3}$$

$$SR = \frac{W^{*\top} \mu}{\sqrt{W^{*\top} \Sigma_r W^*}} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu}{\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}}. \tag{1.4}$$

respectively, and μ is the expected excess returns (over a risk-free rate) of p stocks.

1.2 A Brief Literature Review

In the literature, many papers propose robust methods for portfolio allocation. Robust estimation has been studied in the classic literature (Huber, 1964, 1973) and it has recently drawn much interest in portfolio-related studies. DeMiguel and Nogales (2009) propose robust portfolios based on M- and S-estimation techniques and show their performance in mostly low-dimension cases. Delage and Ye (2010) form the robust portfolio while considering a moment-based uncertainty set. Plachel (2019) introduce a joint method for covariance regularization and robust optimization within the framework of minimum variance problem. Blanchet et al. (2022) propose a distributionally robust mean-variance portfolio, where the model uncertainty is imposed on the distribution of asset return. However, these methods usually deal with low-dimension situation. Petukhina et al. (2024) propose a robust (minimum variance) Markowitz portfolio utilizing a projected gradient descent technique while avoiding the estimation of the covariance as a whole. The theoretical results of Petukhina et al. (2024) are based on i.i.d. assumption of the return vectors.

A strand of literature deals with high-dimensionality issues in portfolios allocation. Ledoit and Wolf (2017) consider the nonlinear shrinkage method in portfolio selection. Ao et al. (2019) propose the MAXSER method that can achieve optimality in mean-variance portfolios with a large number of assets. Li et al. (2022) further extend their studies by imposing factor structure. Ding et al. (2021)

developed a unified minimum variance portfolio under statistical factor models in high-dimensional situation. [Caner et al. \(2023\)](#) use a residual based nodewise regression to estimate the large covariance matrix of assets and provide the out of sample rates for the Sharpe ratio. However, these methods do not consider the outliers and robust portfolio.

Our paper also connects to factor models and robust estimation. The factor model ([Fan et al., 2013](#); [Ait-Sahalia and Xiu, 2017](#); [Ding et al., 2021](#)) is a main workhorse in portfolio studies. [Giglio et al. \(2022\)](#) provides an excellent survey on recent developments in factor models, machine learning, and asset pricing. Drawing on the previous literature on robust estimation ([Maronna, 2005](#)), we propose a robust PCA procedure for potential extreme returns in the covariance estimation. [Fan et al. \(2018\)](#) summarize a unified framework for applying POET to various potentially heavy-tailed distributions and propose a Kendall’s tau based robust estimator of a large covariance matrix. [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#) propose a robust covariance matrix estimator for factor models based on Huber loss function. The main difference between [Fan et al. \(2019\)](#) and ours is that they assume observable factors, while we work on both observable and unobservable factors. Our work is most closely related to [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#) and is an adaptively robustified version of the POET method.

1.3 Our Contributions

The contributions of the paper are summarized in the following.

1. We develop a robust minimum variance portfolio, which is shown to have desirable theoretical and numerical results when the outliers can be either at the global, idiosyncratic, or both levels. We show the optimal risk consistency and optimal Sharpe ratio consistency with this approach.
2. We develop an adaptive robust estimation procedure for factor models that can handle high-dimensional return data with outliers. These outliers can originate from both factors (global) and error terms (idiosyncratic). Our robust estimation procedure can automatically adapt to regular or outlier data without the need to predefine the types of outliers. It operates by diminishing the influence of extreme observations on the portfolio weights. We derive the theoretical properties of the robust factor model estimation, allowing for the variance of common factors to diverge to infinity, which is new to the literature. Our theoretical derivation differs from that of POET, as the identification conditions of the two methods are different. While our primary focus is on robust portfolios, this paper also makes contribution to the literature on robust factor models.
3. Our robust investment strategy demonstrates superior out of sample performance compared to existing methods, achieving higher Sharpe ratios and better risk measures across various simulation settings and empirical studies. Additionally, our unified estimation approach is straightforward and easy to implement in practical scenarios.

1.4 Organization

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 states the basic factor model. Section 3 describes the estimation procedure. Section 4 provides the main theoretical results. Section 5 provides Monte Carlo simulation results. An empirical application using the S&P 500 index and Russell 2000 component stock returns follows in Section 6. Section 7 concludes the paper. Supplementary material collects the proofs of the main theoretical results.

Throughout the paper, λ_{max} and λ_{min} denote the maximum and minimum eigenvalue respectively, $\mathbb{P}(A)$ is the probability of event A occurs. We denote by $\|A\|_F$, $\|A\|$, and $\|A\|_1$, the Frobenius norm, spectral norm and L_1 -norm of a matrix A, defined respectively by $\|A\|_F = \text{tr}^{1/2}(A^\top A)$, $\|A\| = \lambda_{max}^{1/2}(A^\top A)$ and $\|A\|_1 = \max_j \sum_i |a_{ij}|$, respectively. If A is a vector, $\|A\|_F$ and $\|A\|$ are equal to the Euclidean norm.

2 Factor Model on Asset Returns

The investment universe in this study is composed of p assets with observable return data. Following the classic arbitrage pricing theory (Ross, 1976) and the approximate factor model of Chamberlain and Rothschild (1983), the expected return of financial assets is assumed to be driven by some finite number of common factors. Specifically, the assets return can be modeled as

$$r_{it} = b_i^\top F_t + e_{it}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, p; \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (2.1)$$

where r_{it} is the excess of the risk-free return (hereafter also referred to as return for simplicity) of asset i at time t , F_t is the m -dimensional vector of common factors at time t , b_i is the $m \times 1$ factor loading, which captures the relationship between common factors and financial asset i , m is the number of common factors, and e_{it} is the idiosyncratic error. In practice, factors can be either observed or not¹. In this paper, we assume unobserved factors as the default setting.

The vector form of model (2.1) is

$$r_t = BF_t + e_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (2.2)$$

where $r_t = (r_{1t}, r_{2t}, \dots, r_{pt})^\top$ is the vector of returns for p assets, $B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_p)^\top$ is the factor loading matrix, and $e_t = (e_{1t}, e_{2t}, \dots, e_{pt})^\top$. Without loss of generality, we assume that the common factor F_t is regularized such that its covariance matrix Σ_F is the identity matrix. After imposing a factor structure (2.2) on financial return data, we can decompose its covariance matrix as follows:

$$\Sigma_r = BB^\top + \Sigma_e, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (2.3)$$

Based on the factor-structured covariance matrix in (2.3), the proposed MVP strategy has the representation

$$W^* = \frac{(BB^\top + \Sigma_e)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top (BB^\top + \Sigma_e)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}, \quad (2.4)$$

which is the $p \times 1$ vector of optimal asset weights.

3 Robust Estimation Approach

We begin by obtaining the factor loading estimator \hat{B} and common factor estimator \hat{F}_t . Consider the following optimization problem,

$$\min_{B, F_t} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau \left(\|r_t - BF_t\|^2 \right), \quad (3.1)$$

¹Some of those factors are commonly used by practitioners (Fama and French, 1992, 1993, 2015), while others might not be universally accepted. Harvey and Liu (2021), Feng et al. (2020) have good discussions on this ‘‘zoo of factors’’.

where $\rho_\tau(\cdot)$ is the Huber loss function, given by

$$\rho_\tau(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}x & \sqrt{x} \leq \tau \\ \tau\sqrt{x} - \frac{\tau^2}{2} & \sqrt{x} > \tau. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

By taking the derivative of (3.1) with respect to F_t and B together with identification condition $p^{-1}B^\top B = I_m$, it can be shown that the factor loading estimator \hat{B} is \sqrt{p} times the corresponding (to its m largest eigenvalues) eigenvectors of $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{F}_t = p^{-1}\hat{B}^\top r_t$ where

$$\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t r_t r_t^\top, \quad (3.3)$$

and

$$\omega_t = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} & \|r_t - BF_t\| \leq \tau \\ \frac{\tau}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r_t^\top r_t - r_t^\top BB^\top r_t/p}} & \|r_t - BF_t\| > \tau \end{cases} \quad (3.4)$$

is the weight function. The weighting sequence $\{\omega_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is completely data-driven and is shock-adaptive. The weight function ω_t automatically assigns the lower values to those periods in which the shocks are large so that the covariance matrix (3.3) is less affected by the outliers. Therefore, our portfolio can be robust. Note that the classic principal component estimation procedure applied in Fan et al. (2013) is a special case of our model by setting $\omega_t = 0.5$ for all t .

Remark 1. For robust loss function $\rho_\tau(\cdot)$, we simply choose the commonly-used Huber loss function. Other types of robust loss function could be also applied, e.g. the bisquare loss function $\min\{1, 1 - (1 - x/\tau^2)^3\}$ used by Maronna (2005).

3.1 Relation with POET

The estimation robustness is achieved by regulating both the common factors and error terms. Recall that \hat{B} is given by \sqrt{p} times the corresponding eigenvectors of $\hat{\mathbf{V}}$, and consider the following minimization problem using the transformed return (hence the transformed factors and errors)

$$\arg \min_{F, B} \|\tilde{R}^\top - FB^\top\|_F^2, \quad (3.5)$$

subject to the identification condition $p^{-1}B^\top B = I_m$, where $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_T)$, $\tilde{r}_t = B\tilde{F}_t + \tilde{e}_t$, $\tilde{F}_t = \omega_t^{1/2}F_t$ and $\tilde{e}_t = \omega_t^{1/2}e_t$. For the minimization problem (3.5), it is shown (Bai and Ng, 2002; Bai, 2003) that the columns of estimated factor loading from (3.5) are \sqrt{p} times the eigenvectors corresponding to the m largest eigenvalues of the matrix $\tilde{R}\tilde{R}^\top = \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{r}_t \tilde{r}_t^\top = \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t r_t r_t^\top$, which is \hat{B} . As a result, the estimated factor loading from solving the problem (3.1) enjoys the same property as that from problem (3.5). Note that \tilde{r}_t is the regularized asset returns, which consist of regularized factors \tilde{F}_t and regularized error terms \tilde{e}_t , where \tilde{F}_t and \tilde{e}_t are the robustified version of F_t and e_t , respectively. Therefore, it is equivalent to get the robust estimation of (3.1) from the PCA of a transformed factor model whose outliers in both factors and residuals are taken care of. Conceptually, compared to the estimation procedure in Fan et al. (2013), which is developed based on the original return R itself, our estimation achieves robustness using the robustified return \tilde{R} .

3.2 Computation Algorithm

Since ω_t depends on the unknown factor loading, in practice, we can obtain numerical solutions for \hat{B} and \hat{F}_t in (3.1) using Algorithm 1 shown below.

Algorithm 1 Procedure for robust PCA.

1. Set $i \leftarrow 1$.
 2. Compute initial values for optimizing variables by using conventional PCA. In details, we calculate $B^{(0)} = \sqrt{p} \times \text{eig}_m(RR^\top)$ and $F_t^{(0)} = B^{(0)}r_t/p$ where $\text{eig}_m(A)$ takes corresponding (to its m largest eigenvalues) eigenvectors of matrix A .
- repeat**
- (1). Compute weighting sequence ω_t by (3.4) based on $B^{(i-1)}$, and further obtain $\hat{\mathbf{V}} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t r_t r_t^\top$.
 - (2). Update $B^{(i)}$ by $\sqrt{p} \times \text{eig}_m(\hat{\mathbf{V}})$, and $F_t^{(i)} = B^{(i)\top} r_t/p$ for $t = 1, \dots, T$.
 - (3). $\Delta = \text{abs}(\|r_t - B^{(i-1)}F_t^{(i-1)}\|^2 - \|r_t - B^{(i)}F_t^{(i)}\|^2)$, $i \leftarrow i + 1$.
- until** $i > \text{MaxI}$ or $\Delta < \text{tol}$.
-

Algorithm 1 requires five inputs: the $T \times p$ return data matrix R , the number of common factors m , threshold parameter τ , the maximum steps MaxI and the tolerance level tol . Based on this iterative calculation, we can choose the value of τ as the empirical upper quantile of $\|r_t - B^{(i-1)}F_t^{(i-1)}\|$. In practice, we recommend using the 0.9-th quantile, which has shown good performance in our numerical studies. The proposed algorithm is efficient and it typically stops within a few steps.

Remark 2. *The practitioners can apply the standard approach proposed by Bai and Ng (2002) to determine the number of common factors m , which is given by*

$$\hat{m} = \underset{0 \leq m_1 \leq M}{\text{argmin}} \log \left\{ \frac{1}{pT} \left\| \tilde{R} - \hat{B}^{m_1} \hat{F}^{m_1\top} \right\|_F^2 \right\} + m_1 g(T, p), \quad (3.6)$$

where M is a predetermined upper bound for the number of factors, \tilde{R} is transformed returns based on classic factor loading estimation, \hat{B}^{m_1} and \hat{F}^{m_1} are estimated factor loadings and common factors conditional on factor number m_1 , and $g(T, p)$ is a penalty function of p and T , e.g., $g(T, p) = (p + T) \log(pT/(p + T))/pT$. In addition, the proposed algorithm can be further modified to iteratively update the estimation of the number of common factors. In more details, one can re-estimate the factor numbers via criterion (3.6) after updating the weight sequence in step (1) of Algorithm 1.

After obtaining \hat{B} and \hat{F}_t , we can compute the estimated residuals $\hat{e}_t = r_t - \hat{B}\hat{F}_t$, and thus estimate the error (residual) covariance matrix Σ_e . In this paper, we follow the studies of Cai and Liu (2011) and Fan et al. (2013), and impose approximate sparsity assumption on $\Sigma_e = (\sigma_{e,ij})_{p \times p}$: for some $q \in [0, 1]$,

$$\kappa_q = \max_{i \leq p} \sum_{j \leq p} |\sigma_{e,ij}|^q, \quad (3.7)$$

does not grow too fast as $p \rightarrow \infty$. In particular, κ_q is the maximum number of non-zero elements in each row when $q = 0$. Then, we apply the shrinkage estimation to the off-diagonal elements in sample covariance matrix. Specifically, the error covariance estimator is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_e = (\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{e},ij})_{p \times p}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{e},ij} = \begin{cases} s_{\hat{e},ii} & i = j \\ \chi_{ij}(s_{\hat{e},ij}) & i \neq j \end{cases} \quad (3.8)$$

where $s_{\hat{e},ij} = (1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt}$ is the (i, j) -th element of sample covariance matrix of \hat{e}_t , $\chi_{ij}(\cdot)$ is a shrinkage function satisfying $\chi_{ij}(z) = 0$ if $|z| \leq \tau_{ij}$, and $|\chi_{ij}(z) - z| \leq \tau_{ij}$, where τ_{ij} is a positive

threshold. The general $\chi_{ij}(\cdot)$ includes many commonly-used thresholding functions such as soft thresholding ($\chi_{ij}(z) = \text{sgn}(z)(|z| - \tau_{ij})^+$, $(z)^+ = \max\{z, 0\}$) and hard thresholding ($\chi_{ij}(z) = z\mathbb{I}(|z| \geq \tau_{ij})$, where $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$ is an indicator function). In this paper, we use the adaptive thresholding method developed by [Cai and Liu \(2011\)](#), with entry-adaptive $\tau_{ij} = c_\tau \tilde{\zeta}_T \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}$, where $c_\tau > 0$ is a large constant, $\tilde{\zeta}_T = 1/\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log p/T}$, and $\hat{\theta}_{ij} = (1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - s_{\hat{e}_{ij}})^2$. It is worth noting that the shrinkage estimator in the residual covariance matrix also helps the portfolio to achieve certain robustness, since it regulates the extremely large values in the sample covariance matrix.

With estimated factor loading \hat{B} and error covariance estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_e$, we can obtain the return covariance estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_r = \hat{B}\hat{B}^\top + \hat{\Sigma}_e$. Then, the proposed R-MVP is given by

$$\hat{W}_R = \frac{\hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}. \quad (3.9)$$

4 Assumptions and Asymptotic Theory

We first present the assumptions to facilitate the theoretical derivations.

4.1 Basic Assumptions

Assumption 1. (a) $B^\top B$ is diagonal and $\|p^{-1}B^\top B - I_m\|_F = O_p(p^{-1/2})$.

(b) There exists constant $M > 0$ such that for all $i \leq p$, $E\|b_i\|^2 < M$.

Assumption 1(a) is similar to Assumption 3.1 in [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#). It is one of the most common assumptions in the literature of approximate factor models. It implies that the first m eigenvalues of $B^\top B$ grow at rate $O(p)$ and requires the factors to be pervasive, i.e., to impact a non-vanishing proportion of individual time series. Under this assumption and other regularity conditions, the factor loadings and common factors can be consistently estimated (up to some rotations).

Assumption 2. (a) $\{e_t\}$ is strictly stationary and ergodic with zero mean and finite covariance matrix Σ_e .

(b) There exists constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_e) > c_1$, $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_e) < c_2$, and $\min_{i \leq p, j \leq p} \text{var}(e_{it}e_{jt}) > c_1$.

Assumption 2(a) is general for the error term, requiring that the error term has a zero mean and a finite covariance matrix. Assumption 2(b) requires that Σ_e be well-conditioned and ensures that the largest eigenvalue of Σ_r grow at rate $O(p)$.

Define $E(F_{it}^2) = C\delta$ for $i \leq p$, $t \leq T$, and $\max_{t \leq T} E\|F_t\| = C\Delta$, where C is some positive constant. In classic factor model setups, δ and Δ are often assumed to be of constant order, as in [Bai and Ng \(2002\)](#); [Bai \(2003\)](#); [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#). In this paper, we derive asymptotic results while allowing for situations where the factor may not have a finite second order moment or even a finite maximum first-order moment, and that both δ and Δ can diverge to positive infinity at some rate. If F_t has exponential tails such that for any $j \leq m$, $\mathbb{P}(|F_{jt}| > s_1) \leq \exp(-(s_1/s_2)^{s_3})$, it is clear that δ is finite, and it can be shown $\Delta = O_p((\log T)^{1/s_3})$ by Bonferroni's method. If F_t is independent and identically distributed, it is clear that $\delta^{1/2}$ has the same order of magnitude of Δ . We note that our theoretical derivation can also be extended to situations where the covariance matrix of the error term does not exist.

The following Assumption 3 regulates the behavior of transformed factors \tilde{F}_t and transformed error terms \tilde{e}_t .

Assumption 3. (a) $\{\tilde{e}_t, \tilde{F}_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is strictly stationary, and $E(\tilde{e}_{it}) = E(\tilde{e}_{it}\tilde{F}_{jt}) = 0$ for all $i \leq p, j \leq m$ and $t \leq T$.

(b) There exists $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 > 0$ and $d_1, d_2 > 0$, such that for any $s > 0, i \leq p$ and $j \leq m$,

$$IP(|e_{it}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/d_1)^{\varphi_1}), IP(|\tilde{e}_{it}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/d_1)^{\varphi_1}), IP(|\tilde{F}_{jt}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/d_2)^{\varphi_2}).$$

(c) $\text{cov}(\tilde{F}_t) = I_m, \|T^{-1}\tilde{F}^\top \tilde{F} - I_m\| = o_p(1)$, where $\tilde{F} = (\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_T)^\top$.

(d) There exists a positive constant C such that $\|\tilde{\Sigma}_e\|_1 \leq C$, where $\tilde{\Sigma}_e$ is the covariance matrix of transformed error term \tilde{e}_t .

Assumption 4. There exists $\varphi_3 > 0$ such that $(\log p)^{2/\varphi-1} = o(T)$ and $(\log p)^{6/\tilde{\varphi}-1} = o(T)$ where $\varphi = 1.5\varphi_1^{-1} + 1.5\varphi_2^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1}$, $\tilde{\varphi}^{-1} = 3\varphi_1^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1} > 1$ and $3\varphi_2^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1} > 1$, and $C > 0$ satisfying: for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ (the set of positive integers),

$$\alpha(t) \leq \exp(-Ct^{\varphi_3})$$

where α is α -mixing coefficient defined based on σ -algebras generated by $\{e_t, \tilde{e}_t, \tilde{F}_t\}$.

Assumption 3(b) and Assumption 4 specify the exponential-type tails and mixing dependence for e_t, \tilde{e}_t , and \tilde{F}_t , respectively. These conditions allow us to apply the Bernstein type inequality for the weakly dependent data and thus help to analyze the terms such as $(1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T e_{it}e_{jt}$ and $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{F}_t\tilde{e}_{it}$. Similar conditions are also imposed in Fan et al. (2011) and Fan et al. (2013). Assumption 3(c) requires that the transformed factor \tilde{F}_t is regularized with covariance matrix being an identity matrix, which is often assumed for simplicity in literature, e.g., Fan et al. (2013); Li and Li (2022). Assumption 3(d) ensures that the largest m eigenvalues of transformed sample covariance matrix $T^{-1}\tilde{R}\tilde{R}^\top$ diverges to infinity at order p where $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_T)$, and guarantees the consistency of factor number estimation, also refer to Assumption 3.2 of Fan et al. (2013). To sum up, Assumptions 3 and 4 are regularization condition on the transformed common factors and error terms. As we consider heavy-tailed data, such conditions specify that the robustified data \tilde{r}_t has certain good behavior such that the traditional PCA is applicable.

Let $\varepsilon_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iT})^\top$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_i = (\tilde{e}_{i1}, \dots, \tilde{e}_{iT})^\top, i = 1, \dots, p$, then we additionally impose the following regularity conditions.

Assumption 5. (a) $\max_i \sum_{s=1}^p |E(\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^\top \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)|/T = O(1)$.

(b) For all $s, i \leq p$,

$$E\left(\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^\top \tilde{\varepsilon}_i - E(\tilde{\varepsilon}_s^\top \tilde{\varepsilon}_i)\right)^4 = O(T^2).$$

(c) For $j \leq p$ and $t \leq T$, we have $E\left\|\sum_{j=1}^p b_j e_{jt}\right\|^4 = O(p^2)$.

(d) $T = o(p^2), \delta = o(p), \Delta^2 = o(p), \delta\sqrt{p}/T = o(1), \Delta^2\sqrt{p}/T = o(1), \kappa_q \zeta_T^{1-q} = o(1)$ where $\zeta_T = \frac{\delta^{1/2+T^{1/4}+\Delta}}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\delta^{1/2}p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}$.

Assumption 5(a)-(c) are analogous to condition 3.4 in Fan et al. (2013). Since \tilde{e}_{st} is strictly stationary over t for all s , Assumption 5(a) is equivalent to require that $\max_i \sum_{s=1}^p |\tilde{\sigma}_{e,si}| = O(1)$ where $\tilde{\sigma}_{e,si} = E(\tilde{e}_{st}\tilde{e}_{it})$, which is a type of sparsity condition. Similarly, Assumption 5(b) can be rewritten as $E\left[\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^T(\tilde{e}_{st}\tilde{e}_{it}) - E(\tilde{e}_{st}\tilde{e}_{it})\right]^4 = O(T^2)$. Assumption 5(d) ensures the convergence of \hat{b}_i , \hat{F}_t , and $\hat{\Sigma}_e$ to corresponding population version, respectively.

The following two assumptions are necessary for the consistency of the optimal minimum variance estimator and the Sharpe ratio estimator, which are obtained using the plug-in method based on the analytical solutions given in equations (1.3) and (1.4).

Assumption 6. *The minimum risk $R_{\min} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} \asymp p^{1-\eta}$, where η is a constant satisfying $p^\eta \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q = o(1)$.*

Assumption 7. *Suppose the term $\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu \asymp p^{1-\phi}$, where ϕ is a constant satisfying $p^\phi \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q = o(1)$.*

Assumptions 6 and 7 guarantee the convergence of minimum risk estimator and Sharpe ratio estimator. Similar assumptions can be referred to Ding et al. (2021) and Fan et al. (2024).

Remark 3. *A simple example in Ding et al. (2021) demonstrates that it is reasonable to assume R_{\min} and $\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu$ are of the order of powers of p . Suppose that $r_i = \beta_i f + e_i$, $(\beta_i)_{1 \leq i \leq p}$ are i.i.d. with mean 1 and standard deviations σ_β , $E(f) = \sigma(f) = 1$, and $\Sigma_e = I$. Under such a model, $\Sigma_r = \tilde{\beta}\tilde{\beta}^\top + I$ where $\tilde{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$, and $\mu = \mathbf{1}_p$. If $\sigma_\beta > 0$, by Proposition 2.2 of Ding et al. (2021), this model corresponds to a well-diversifiable case with R_{\min} and $1/\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu$ converging to zero at rate $O(1/p)$, and thus $\eta = 2$, and $\phi = 0$. If $\sigma_\beta = 0$, it is easy to see that the minimum variance portfolio is equal allocation, leading to a minimum risk of $1 + 1/p$, and thus $\eta = \phi = 1$.*

4.2 Asymptotic Theory

Define $\tilde{V} = \text{diag}(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_m)$, where $\tilde{\lambda}_i, i = 1, \dots, m$ is the i -th largest eigenvalues of $p^{-1}\tilde{R}^\top\tilde{R}$ in descending order, and then define $\tilde{H} = p^{-1}\tilde{V}^{-1}\tilde{B}^\top B\tilde{F}^\top \tilde{F}$. The following lemma shows the asymptotic properties of the estimated factor loading \hat{b}_i and common factors \hat{F}_t .

Lemma 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1- 4, 5(a)-(c), let $\varpi_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \hat{b}_i - \tilde{H}b_i \right\| &= O_p(\varpi_T), \\ \max_t \left\| \hat{F}_t - \tilde{H}F_t \right\| &= O_p\left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta \log p}{T}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The following Theorems 1 and 2 demonstrate the asymptotic results of estimated covariance matrices.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Assumptions 1 - 5 hold true. Let $\tau_{ij} = C\varsigma_T\sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}$ where $\varsigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \sqrt{\frac{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2}{p} + \frac{\delta\sqrt{p}}{T}}$. Then there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e - \Sigma_e \right\| = O_p(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q) = o_p(1),$$

where $\zeta_T = \frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\delta^{1/2} p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}$. The eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}_e$ are all bounded away from 0 with probability approaching 1, and

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| = O_p(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q) = o_p(1).$$

Theorem 2. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, we have*

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\| = O_p \left(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right) = o_p(1),$$

where $\Sigma_r = BB^\top + \Sigma_e$, and ζ_T is defined in Theorem 1.

The following implications stem from Theorems 1 and 2: (1) We utilize the identification condition $p^{-1}B^\top B = I_m$, which is different from the condition $T^{-1}F^\top F = I_m$ in Fan et al. (2013). This difference implies different convergence rates for the estimated factor loading and, consequently, the covariance matrix. Specifically, the convergence rate derived from Fan et al. (2013) of $\hat{\Sigma}_e$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1}$ to the corresponding population version is $\kappa_q \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)^{1-q}$. For comparison, the convergence rate derived by us is $\kappa_q \left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\delta^{1/2} p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}} \right)^{1-q}$. It is clear that our matrix estimator converge at a slower rate than the corresponding matrix estimator of Fan et al. (2013) even if the data satisfied some assumptions that δ and Δ are all bounded. (2) The orders of magnitude of δ and Δ affect the convergence rate of estimated quantities. To achieve the convergence shown in Theorem 1 and 2, the maximum first order moment of common factors is allowed to diverge to infinity at a rate of at most \sqrt{p} , and the second moment of factors is allowed to diverge to infinity at a rate of at most $\min\{T/p^{1/2}, p\}$. (3) The asymptotic results are unchanged if we replace ζ_T by $\tilde{\zeta}_T$ in threshold τ_{ij} , where $\tilde{\zeta}_T/\zeta_T = o(1)$, e.g., $\tilde{\zeta}_T = 1/\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log p/T}$ used in Fan et al. (2013) and our empirical applications. (4) The convergence rate of estimated inverse covariance matrix of return is the same as that of estimated error covariance matrix.

Next, we turn to consider the rates of convergence for the minimum risk estimator and Sharpe ratio estimator, respectively. Recall that, the minimum risk estimator and Sharpe ratio estimator are respectively given by

$$\hat{R}_{min} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} \quad (4.1)$$

and

$$\hat{SR} = \frac{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \hat{\mu}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}}, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\hat{\mu} = \hat{B} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{F}_t$. The asymptotic behavior of the minimum risk estimator with respect to the oracle risk defined in (1.3) is demonstrated as follows:

Theorem 3. *Under conditions of Theorem 2, suppose Assumption 6 holds. Then we have the convergence rate for minimum risk estimator:*

$$\left| \frac{\hat{R}_{min}}{R_{min}} - 1 \right| = O_p \left(p^\eta \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right) = o_p(1).$$

With a similar ratio criterion, we further evaluate the Sharpe ratio estimation.

Theorem 4. *Under conditions of Theorem 2, suppose Assumptions 6 and 7 hold. Then we have the convergence rate for Sharpe ratio estimator:*

$$\left| \frac{\hat{SR}}{SR} - 1 \right| = O_p \left(p^{(\phi+\eta)} \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right) = o_p(1).$$

Theorems 3 and 4 demonstrate the consistency of the minimum risk and Sharpe ratio of the proposed robust portfolio, which are desirable in portfolio allocation. We note that the consistency orders are primarily affected by the estimation of the sparse error covariance matrix. The similar theoretical results for the convergence of minimum risk and Sharpe ratio based on factor model can be referred to the work of Ding et al. (2021) and Fan et al. (2024).

5 Simulation

In this section, we conduct simulations to evaluate the finite sample performance of the proposed portfolio R-MVP.

5.1 Model Set-up

To mimic the real world scenarios, we design the Monte Carlo simulations such that investors make decisions based on historical data available at current time t , and then hold portfolios for a period of time T . We evaluate the portfolios based on their out of sample performances.

We first introduce the data generating process (DGP) without shocks. This is named **DGP 1** which is the baseline setting. We generate the $p \times (2T)$ return data $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^{2T}$ based on the factor model defined in (2.1) with $m = 2$ common factors. The first T data $\{r_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is the training set used for model estimation and constructing portfolios, and the remaining data $\{r_t\}_{t=T+1}^{2T}$ is used for out of sample evaluation. We generate two common factors from the following AR(1) processes :

$$f_{1,t} = 0.01 + 0.6f_{1,t-1} + u_{1,t}$$

$$f_{2,t} = 0.01 + 0.95f_{2,t-1} + u_{2,t}$$

where $u_{1,t} \sim N(0, 1 - 0.6^2)$ and $u_{2,t} \sim N(0, 1 - 0.95^2)$ which indicate $\Sigma_F = I_2$, and $f_{1,0} = f_{2,0} = 0$. Both two factors are stationary processes but the second factor is more commonly referred to as the near-unit root process². The similar setting for autoregressive common factors can be found in Su and Wang (2017), Fan et al. (2024). For factor loading $b_i = (b_{i,1}, b_{i,2})^\top$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and idiosyncratic error $e_t = (e_{1t}, \dots, e_{pt})^\top$, we draw them from normal distribution, that $b_{i,j} \sim N(\mu_{b,j}, \sigma_{b,j}^2)$, $j = 1, 2$ and $e_t \sim N(0, \Sigma_e)$.

To illustrate the performance of R-MVP, we further define three DGPs by incorporating homogeneous and heterogeneous outliers, respectively, and both two shocks simultaneously:

DGP 2, heterogeneous outliers: We impose shocks S at fixed frequency v into e_t , where $S \sim N(\mu_S, \Sigma_e)$ with $\mu_S = (5\Sigma_{e,11}^{1/2}, \dots, 5\Sigma_{e,pp}^{1/2})$ and $v = 50$ where $\Sigma_{e,ii}$ is i -th diagonal element of Σ_e . These shocks are individual-specific. It can mimic the shocks to individual firms such as product recalls for a specific firm.

DGP 3, homogeneous outliers: We impose fixed-size shocks H_j at fixed frequency v on $u_{j,t}$, $j = 1, 2$, where $H_1 = 5\sqrt{1 - 0.6^2}$, $H_2 = 5\sqrt{1 - 0.95^2}$ and $v = 40$. These shocks are global. It can mimic the shocks to all the firms such as the global economic crisis.

DGP 4, homogeneous + heterogeneous outliers: We impose aforementioned shocks H_j and S for $u_{j,t}$ and e_t simultaneously.

²Simulations based on common factors with autocorrelation coefficients close to 0 are also investigated and exhibit similar results.

DGPs 2 and 3 introduce shocks into the return data to produce outliers, which are measured (in this section and for the convenience of study) by a threshold of five times corresponding standard deviations. The outliers take place at discrete time points $[v, 2v, \dots]$ and we set different values of v for homogeneous and heterogeneous shocks such that outliers of $u_{j,t}$ and e_{it} occur at the different dates in DGP 4. We note that the homogeneous and heterogeneous shocks imposed in DGPs 2-4 do not affect population covariance matrix of return data $\{r_t\}$. Under DGP 2 where $r_t = BF_t + e_t + S\mathbb{I}(t = kv)$, we have

$$\Sigma_r = BB^\top + \Sigma_e + \text{cov}(S\mathbb{I}(t = kv))$$

where the interactive term is 0, and $\text{cov}(S\mathbb{I}(t = kv)) = 0$ since integration of finite point is 0. For DGP 3, constant shocks are required to keep the variances of common factors unchanged. Specifically, under DGP 3, $f_{j,t} = \mu_{f,j} + \alpha_j f_{j,t-1} + u_{j,t} + H_j \mathbb{I}(t = kv), 1 \leq kv \leq T, j = 1, 2$. Assume there are K shocks before current time, such that $Kv \leq t$. then for calculating the variance of $f_{j,t}$, we first make following transformation

$$\begin{aligned} f_{j,t} &= \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_j^{t-iv} H_j + (\mu_{f,j} + u_{j,t}) + \alpha_j (\mu_{f,j} + u_{j,t-1}) + \alpha_j^2 (\mu_{f,j} + u_{j,t-2}) + \dots \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_j^{t-iv} H_j + \frac{\mu_{f,j}}{1 - \alpha_j} + u_{j,t} + \alpha_j u_{j,t-1} + \alpha_j^2 u_{j,t-2} + \dots \end{aligned}$$

since $\{u_{j,t}\}$ is i.i.d. random variable with mean 0 and finite variance, we then have $E(f_{j,t}) = \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_j^{t-iv} H_j + \mu_{f,j}/(1 - \alpha_j)$, hence the variance of $f_{j,t}$ is

$$E(f_{j,t} - E(f_{j,t}))^2 = E(u_{j,t} + \alpha_j u_{j,t-1} + \alpha_j^2 u_{j,t-2} + \dots)$$

which is fixed and the same as that in DGP 1. Hence, Σ_F and Σ_e are the same as the baseline model in DGPs 2, 3 and 4, and true population covariance matrix $\Sigma_r = BB^\top + \Sigma_e$ is fixed.

For values of parameters in the DGPs, we calibrate them from real data. In details, we select largest 100 stocks measured by market values in S&P 500 index at January 2006, then we apply POET (with thresholding parameter 0.5) to daily excess return data from Jan 2006 to Dec 2009 which contains 1008 observations to obtain estimation of factor loading \hat{B} and sparse residual covariance matrix $\hat{\Sigma}_e$. Then, we set $\mu_{b,1} = 0.018, \mu_{b,2} = -0.001, \sigma_{b,1} = 0.0072, \sigma_{b,2} = 0.0084$ according to the mean and variance of \hat{B} . For Σ_e , we set it to be the residual covariance matrix estimator $\hat{\Sigma}_e$ using p largest stocks. The results of the following four combinations of sample size and portfolio dimension will be reported: $\{p = 50, T = 100\}, \{p = 50, T = 150\}, \{p = 80, T = 100\}, \{p = 80, T = 150\}$. Each portfolio is held for time T (from $T + 1$ to $2T$).

5.2 Performance Measures

To assess the performance of the proposed estimator, we apply the following out of sample evaluation statistics for portfolios and covariance matrices:

(1) Out of sample risk: the standard deviation of out of sample portfolio excess returns $\{r_t^p\}_{t=1}^T$ where $r_t^p = \hat{W}' r_{t+T}, t \in [1, T]$ and \hat{W} is the vector of estimated portfolio weights, specifically,

$$\text{SD} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^T (r_t^p - \hat{\mu}^p)^2}, \quad \hat{\mu}^p = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T r_t^p \quad (5.1)$$

(2) Out of sample Sharpe ratio error: the absolute difference between out of sample Sharpe ratio of estimated and infeasible oracle portfolio, where out of sample Sharpe ratio is given by $SR = \hat{\mu}^p / SD$.

(3) Maximum drawdown (MDD): the largest difference among cumulative returns throughout the entire sample,

$$MDD = \max_{1 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq T} (\gamma_{t_1} - \gamma_{t_2})$$

where γ_{t_1} and γ_{t_2} refer to the cumulative portfolio return from the beginning of investment to t_1 and t_2 respectively, and is defined as $\gamma_t = \sum_{i=1}^t r_i^p$ for $t = t_1, t_2$.

(4) Weight error: the ℓ_2 norm of the difference between the estimated and oracle weights.

$$\text{Weight error} = \|\hat{W} - W\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_i (\hat{W} - W)_i^2} \quad (5.2)$$

where W is true minimum variance weights calculated by using true Σ_r .

(5) Covariance matrix error: the relative error matrix measured by Frobenius norm of estimated covariance matrix of assets returns. This measure is also used in [Fan et al. \(2013, 2019\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2021\)](#).

$$\text{Covariance error} = \|\Sigma_r^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_r \Sigma_r^{-1/2} - I_p\|_F = \|\hat{\Sigma}_r - \Sigma_r\|_{\Sigma} \quad (5.3)$$

All the above statistics are reported based on the simulation replications of 200 times.

5.3 Comparison Portfolios

For other comparison strategies, we consider the following portfolios: (1) Linear: portfolio using the linear shrinkage estimator proposed by [Ledoit and Wolf \(2003\)](#). (2) Nonlinear: portfolio when the nonlinear shrinkage estimator proposed by [Ledoit and Wolf \(2017\)](#) is used. (3) POET: portfolio whose covariance matrix is estimated using [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#). The comparison with POET is informative to assess the robustness of our proposed R-MVP. The thresholding parameter (c_τ in our paper) for R-MVP and POET is set to 0.5 following [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#) and we choose the soft threshold shrinkage function. Finally, for threshold parameter τ of Huber loss function in our proposal, we set it as the 0.9-th quantile of $\{\|r_t - B^{(i-1)} F_t^{(i-1)}\|, t = 1, \dots, T\}$ at each step i during iterative calculation, which implies that about 90% of data is weighted by 0.5.

5.4 Results

Tables 1-2 tabulate the simulation results under DGPs 1-4 with $p = 50$ and $p = 80$, respectively. The reported values are all enlarged by 100 for ease of presentation. The main findings can be summarized as follows: (1) In the baseline setting, R-MVP is the best non-oracle portfolio in terms of all considered measures. The POET enjoys the second lowest values (close to those of R-MVP) of out of sample risk, weight error and relative covariance error. Non-linear shrinkage based portfolio has lower out of sample risk than linear shrinkage based portfolio, but it loses to linear based portfolio in terms of maximum drawdown and Sharpe ratio error. (2) In the presence of heterogeneous outliers, the superiority of R-MVP over other portfolios become more visible. E.g., in the case of $p = 80, T = 100$, the gaps of R-MVP over the second-best portfolio in terms of out of sample risk, maximum drawdown, Sharpe ratio error, weight error and covariance error are 1.12e-3, 0.0195, 0.0127, 4.48e-3 and 2.95, respectively, which are significantly higher than those of 7e-5, 0.0054, 0.0109, 2.2e-4 and 0.155 under baseline. (3) The findings in presence of homogeneous outliers are interesting. Firstly, it can be observed that the

Table 1: Simulation results under DGP 1-4 with $p = 50, T = 100$ and $p = 50, T = 150$.

	p=50, T = 100					p=50, T = 150				
	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV
DGP1, Benchmark										
Oracle	0.637	8.215	0	0	0	0.639	10.270	0	0	0
Linear	0.782	11.348	8.228	1.833	499.2	0.740	13.863	5.061	1.603	410.5
Non-linear	0.756	12.147	9.569	1.569	548.5	0.722	14.523	5.501	1.416	443.3
POET	0.704	11.207	8.716	1.167	297.7	0.688	13.601	5.068	1.037	262.5
R-MVP	0.698	10.446	7.184	1.145	291.2	0.686	13.114	4.476	1.022	259.6
DGP2, 5 times standard deviation heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.637	8.215	0	0	0	0.639	10.270	0	0	0
Linear	0.987	16.024	10.525	2.789	868.1	0.963	18.734	7.065	2.805	791.4
Non-linear	0.955	16.284	11.540	2.516	837.5	0.934	19.092	7.410	2.546	771.5
POET	0.885	15.530	12.926	2.344	594.8	0.864	18.294	8.810	2.244	547.6
R-MVP	0.793	12.832	10.035	1.826	443.4	0.777	15.261	6.842	1.706	408.6
DGP3, 5 times standard deviation homogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.637	8.376	0	0	0	0.639	10.378	0	0	0
Linear	0.766	11.821	8.069	1.733	523.6	0.733	13.965	4.993	1.544	427.4
Non-linear	0.744	12.882	9.638	1.551	557.3	0.716	14.712	5.682	1.398	451.4
POET	0.694	11.899	8.980	1.124	310.5	0.682	13.703	5.241	1.000	274.5
R-MVP	0.688	10.937	7.235	1.102	302.4	0.680	13.124	4.296	0.984	269.1
DGP4, 5 times standard deviation homogeneous shocks and heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.637	8.376	0	0	0	0.639	10.378	0	0	0
Linear	0.982	17.212	11.276	2.836	876.5	0.961	18.604	6.652	2.848	798.8
Non-linear	0.940	17.752	12.398	2.476	844.6	0.922	18.910	7.221	2.509	776.4
POET	0.847	16.417	13.136	2.105	549.8	0.828	16.515	7.845	1.997	502.3
R-MVP	0.761	13.142	9.935	1.626	427.8	0.751	14.414	6.003	1.539	399.7

^a The reported statistics are out of sample risk, maximum drawdown, out of sample Sharpe ratio error, weight error, and covariance error.

^b The values are all enlarged by 100 for ease of presentation.

^c The number of factors in POET and R-MVP is set to 2, and thresholding parameter c_τ for R-MVP and POET are set to 0.5.

Table 2: Simulation results under DGP 1-4 with $p = 80, T = 100$ and $p = 80, T = 150$.

	p=80, T = 100					p=80, T = 150				
	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV
DGP1, Benchmark										
Oracle	0.492	5.683	0	0	0	0.487	7.317	0	0	0
Linear	0.671	8.806	8.109	1.902	778.6	0.618	10.236	5.439	1.666	645.0
Non-linear	0.623	9.330	9.254	1.608	839.8	0.578	10.511	5.401	1.428	699.7
POET	0.557	8.250	8.739	1.008	416.1	0.531	9.655	5.344	0.836	359.0
R-MVP	0.550	7.714	7.016	0.986	400.6	0.528	9.016	4.556	0.822	350.5
DGP2, 5 times standard deviation heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.492	5.683	0	0	0	0.487	7.317	0	0	0
Linear	0.903	12.671	10.749	2.742	1323.3	0.884	14.298	6.969	2.773	1205.1
Non-linear	0.844	11.943	10.559	2.297	1304.3	0.826	13.812	7.004	2.299	1199.8
POET	0.777	11.232	11.027	2.315	989.2	0.751	12.283	7.757	2.229	883.2
R-MVP	0.665	9.281	9.285	1.849	694.7	0.644	10.201	6.455	1.733	616.1
DGP3, 5 times standard deviation homogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.492	5.715	0	0	0	0.488	7.338	0	0	0
Linear	0.650	8.891	8.280	1.798	803.2	0.607	9.939	5.351	1.598	661.6
Non-linear	0.605	9.601	9.334	1.563	849.5	0.570	10.360	5.680	1.406	706.4
POET	0.545	8.358	8.175	0.955	422.6	0.523	9.334	4.962	0.794	366.5
R-MVP	0.537	7.752	6.641	0.937	408.1	0.521	8.864	4.155	0.785	356.9
DGP4, 5 times standard deviation homogeneous shocks and heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.492	5.715	0	0	0	0.488	7.338	0	0	0
Linear	0.909	13.440	11.220	2.828	1341.8	0.891	14.190	6.884	2.854	1218.7
Non-linear	0.831	12.701	11.106	2.274	1310.3	0.816	13.626	7.055	2.279	1205.5
POET	0.745	11.186	10.901	2.229	920.9	0.726	11.352	7.763	2.134	824.2
R-MVP	0.628	9.169	9.301	1.689	647.0	0.612	9.753	5.974	1.592	582.2

^a see notes in Table 1

risk and weight error decrease. Secondly, the changes of maximum drawdown and Sharpe ratio error are uncertain, which depends on two forces : (i) With more accurate weight estimator, the portfolio's maximum drawdown and Sharpe ratio should be closer to the oracle. Thus, the MDD and Sharpe ratio error values will decrease. (ii) With positive shocks on common factors, the levels of factors rise, and it leads to higher oracle maximum drawdown and Sharpe ratio (hence the magnitude of its error). Even though the weights remain unchanged from those in the baseline setting, the maximum drawdown and Sharpe ratio of all portfolios increase, e.g., the oracle maximum drawdown increases to 0.08376 from 0.08215 in the case of $p = 50$ and $T = 100$. We note that R-MVP is still the best non-oracle portfolio under DGP 3, compared to other competitors. (4) In the presence of both homogeneous outliers and heterogeneous outliers, the advantages of R-MVP are quite visible.




Figure 1: The out of sample risks of POET-based portfolio, R-MVP and corresponding oracle results over all replications under DGP 1 and 4 with $p = 50, T = 100$.

Figure 1 plots the out of sample risks of POET-based portfolio, R-MVP and corresponding oracle results over 200 simulation replications under DGP 1 and 4 with $p = 50, T = 100$ (the results under other $[p, T]$ combinations and near unit root situations are similar). To make it an easy and direct comparison, the results for each replication in DGP 1 and DGP 4 are put in the same figure. And they are shown in the left and right halves of the x-axis, respectively. Firstly, despite the risks of POET-based strategy are slight higher than those of R-MVP under baseline DGP 1, the gaps are quite small and their risks coincide in many replications. Secondly, the risks of R-MVP are close to the oracle levels, the yellow diamonds and blue dots in the figure can not be separated simply. Thirdly, when the data includes large shocks, R-MVP has better risk control ability. It can be observed that the risk of POET-based portfolio under all simulation replications is much higher than that of R-MVP.

Since portfolio performance is shown to be affected mainly by individual outliers, we try two other DGP settings as follows: (1) $S_2 \sim N(\mu_{S,2}, \Sigma_e)$ with fix frequency $v = 50$ where $\mu_{S,2} = (3\Sigma_{e,11}^{1/2}, \dots, 3\Sigma_{e,pp}^{1/2})$; (2) $S_3 \sim N(\mu_S, 2\Sigma_e)$ with fixed frequency $v = 50$. We denote these two data generating processes as **DGP 5**, and **6**. DGP 5 imposes weaker shocks compared to DGP 2. On the other hand, DGP 6 considers shocks with a larger covariance matrix. The results of four combinations

Table 3: Simulation results under DGP 5 and 6 with $p = 50, T = 100, 150$ and $p = 80, T = 100, 150$.

	p=50, T = 100					p=50, T = 150				
	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV
DGP 5, 3 times standard deviation heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.637	8.215	0	0	0	0.639	0	0	0	NaN
Linear	0.902	13.695	9.383	2.492	597.6	0.862	16.240	6.211	2.371	509.7
Non-linear	0.830	14.053	10.722	1.945	617.6	0.802	16.561	6.711	1.877	520.3
POET	0.754	12.769	11.021	1.550	359.5	0.735	15.046	7.005	1.415	323.9
R-MVP	0.728	11.307	8.331	1.406	336.1	0.714	13.861	5.571	1.282	306.3
DGP 6, 2 times covariance matrix of shocks										
Oracle	0.637	8.215	0	0	0	0.639	10.270	0	0	0
Linear	0.971	15.705	10.252	2.702	912.8	0.951	18.560	6.923	2.738	827.8
Non-linear	0.947	15.985	11.332	2.485	877.4	0.927	18.926	7.206	2.522	805.5
POET	0.882	15.426	12.667	2.327	636.0	0.861	18.360	8.764	2.229	574.9
R-MVP	0.784	12.637	9.743	1.776	450.9	0.769	15.148	6.741	1.657	415.7
	p=80, T = 100					p=80, T = 150				
	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV	Risk	MDD	SR	Weight	COV
DGP 5, 3 times standard deviation heterogeneous shocks										
Oracle	0.492	5.683	0	0	0	0.487	7.317	0	0	0
Linear	0.824	11.494	10.131	2.606	927.9	0.786	12.636	6.507	2.527	789.5
Non-linear	0.712	10.392	9.950	1.904	949.9	0.682	11.839	6.663	1.845	811.3
POET	0.619	9.065	10.281	1.518	533.6	0.589	10.149	6.788	1.355	462.5
R-MVP	0.585	8.256	8.440	1.360	479.3	0.562	9.331	5.548	1.222	425.8
DGP 6, 2 times covariance matrix of shocks										
Oracle	0.492	5.683	0	0	0	0.487	7.317	0	0	0
Linear	0.874	12.343	10.528	2.637	1392.2	0.863	14.042	6.946	2.701	1256.6
Non-linear	0.827	11.825	10.513	2.266	1367.1	0.812	13.651	6.998	2.290	1246.8
POET	0.767	11.161	11.179	2.269	1060.5	0.743	12.333	7.725	2.205	926.6
R-MVP	0.653	9.094	9.228	1.797	707.4	0.631	10.016	6.366	1.686	622.1

^a see notes in Table 1

of p and T are reported in Table 3. Some conclusions are further drawn: (1) Evidently, we can still observe that R-MVP manifests its superiority under new DGPs. (2) In more details, when shocks become larger (with larger variance), R-MVP gets even larger advantages compared to the other portfolios. E.g., in the case of DGP 2 with $p = 80, T = 150$, the gaps of R-MVP from POET are about $1.07\text{e-}3, 0.0208$ and $0.0130, 4.96\text{e-}03$ and 2.67 in terms of risk, maximum drawdown, Sharp ratio error, weight error and covariance error, respectively, and in DGP 6 that gaps increase to $1.12\text{e-}3, 0.0232, 0.0136, 5.19\text{e-}03, 3.05$.




Figure 2: The standard deviation of each element of p -dimensional portfolio weights under DGP 1 and 4 with $p = 50, T = 100$. Left half of panel : results over 200 replications under DGP 1. Right half of panel : results over 200 replications under DGP 2.

Furthermore, we analyze the stability of portfolio weights of considered portfolios. The simulation data are randomly generated from the same population distribution in each setting. A robust portfolio should have small variances for the weights of each asset. Figure 2 shows empirical standard deviation of estimated weights by different portfolios under DGP 1 (left panel) and DGP 4 (right panel) with $p = 50, T = 100$. The results under other combinations of $[p, T]$ are similar and are not reported. In each replicated experiment, the sizes of imposed shocks follow a random distribution and are different. Therefore, the higher standard deviation of portfolio weights means the corresponding strategy is more sensitive to the outliers of the return data. The oracle portfolio weight (not plotted) has zero standard deviation since the true covariance matrix maintains unchanged over replications. In DGP 1, the

weights' standard deviations of POET-based portfolio and R-MVP are lowest (the average lines nearly coincide but R-MVP still show a slight lower average of all weights' standard deviations). The standard deviation of weights of nonlinear shrinkage based portfolio weight is slightly higher than R-MVP. The linear shrinkage based portfolio has large variations in the weights. Also, it can be observed that the variation patterns of POET-based portfolio and R-MVP are similar. It is worth noting that standard deviations of each weight in nonlinear shrinkage based portfolio are close to each other and have the lowest variation across the weights. In the presence of both homogeneous and heterogeneous outliers (DGP 4, right half of the figure), it is clear that R-MVP is the most robust to outliers. The weights' standard deviations of R-MVP are still close to the levels under DGP 1. However, weight standard deviations of other comparison strategies increase sharply. E.g., although POET-based portfolio still enjoys the second lowest weight standard deviation, its values are nearly 1.3 times those of R-MVP and 1.6 times the levels of DGP 1, the variation of weights of nonlinear shrinkage based portfolio increases sharply and is also about 1.7 times the levels of DGP 1, but it is still better than linear shrinkage based portfolio.




Figure 3: Weighting sequence ω_t calculated by Eq. (3.4) with bi-square loss function and $p = 50, T = 150$. Outlier weight: ω_t at time points hit by shocks, e.g., $T = 50, 100, 150$. Normal weight: ω_t other than the outlier weights.

To get a better insight into the superiority of R-MVP in the presence of outliers, we plot weighting sequence ω_t calculated by (3.4) under DGP 2 with $p = 50, T = 150$ in Figure 3. For easy comparison, we transform the weights into percentage form, and note that $\omega_t = 6.67 \times 10^{-3}$ of POET which treats all time points equally. It is clear that R-MVP assigns much low weights to time points where shocks occur, hence the influences of outliers are reduced largely, and as a consequence, R-MVP achieves the desired robust performance.

At last, we show the robustness of the proposed R-MVP by observing the marginal effects of both types shocks in the training set. We generate the return data from DGP 4 but impose the homogeneous and heterogeneous shocks step by step. Specifically, let n denote the number of shocks we impose, then homogeneous and heterogeneous shocks are imposed at time points $40 \times i$ and $50 \times i$, respectively, $1 \leq i \leq n$. Obviously when $n = 0$, the data is the same as if generated from DGP 1. We consider the case with $p = 50$ and $T = 250$, which indicates the maximum value can be taken by n is 5. Then with




Figure 4: Weight error, negative weight error, out of sample risk and out of sample Sharpe ratio error of various portfolios with respect to the number of outliers in the training set.

respect to n , we plot curves for following measures: (1) out of sample risk, (2) out of sample Sharpe ratio error, (3) weight error and (4) negative weight error which is defined as $\sum_{i=1} |\hat{w}_i \mathbb{I}(\hat{w}_i < 0)|$. The curves are shown in Figure 4. It is evidence that the average slopes of R-MVP are the smallest in terms of four measures, which indicates the robustness of R-MVP that it is less affected by the large hits. Additionally, R-MVP has significantly lower amount of short positions (measured by summation of negative weights) than other competitors when data is contaminated by shocks, which means R-MVP possesses lower transaction cost in practical applications.

6 Real Data Study

This section demonstrates the out of sample performance of the proposed R-MVP in real data. We focus on four portfolio performance measures: out of sample Sharpe ratio, out of sample risk, MDD, which are all introduced in the simulation section, and out of sample cumulative excess return, which is the sum of out of sample realized portfolio returns in the investment period. The competing investment strategies include the ones in simulation studies, plus (1) the benchmark “1/N”, (2) minimum variance portfolio using the sample covariance matrix, (3) the unified minimum variance problem estimator (MVP-UF) proposed by Ding et al. (2021), (4) M-portfolio proposed by DeMiguel and Nogales (2009) which also considers robust estimation in the minimum variance problem, (5) minimum variance portfolio based on robust covariance estimation (RCOV) developed by Fan et al. (2019), and (6) minimum variance portfolio based on robust covariance estimation under elliptical factor model (eFM-COV) developed by Fan et al. (2018).

At the beginning of the investment decision period (denoted as T_0), we use the historical excess return data (the training data set) with length T to compute the covariance matrix estimators and the weights of a portfolio. The holding period for all actively managed portfolios is HT . To mimic real-world mutual fund, we use the holding time of one week (5 trading days) and one month (21 trading days). During the holding period, we use excess return data r_t to calculate the returns of each portfolio. After each holding period, we rebalance the portfolios using historical data of the same length T in a rolling window manner. We repeat this process until the last period of the testing sample. We first assume the same holding period for all strategies and no transaction fees to make a fair comparison. In the following we also consider transaction cost.

In practice, transaction cost is important for investors. Following DeMiguel et al. (2009) and Ao et al. (2019), the excess portfolio return net of transaction cost is computed as,

$$r_t^{net} = \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^p c \left| \hat{W}_{t+1,i} - \hat{W}_{t,i}^+ \right| \right) (1 + r_t) - 1 \quad (6.1)$$

where $\hat{W}_{t+1,i}$ ($\hat{W}_{t,i}^+$) is the i -th element of portfolio weight after (before) rebalancing, and r_t is the excess return of the portfolio without transaction cost. The parameter c controls the level of the transaction cost. In this study, c is set to 10 basis points following Ao et al. (2019). Furthermore, the total portfolio turnover is defined as

$$TO = \frac{1}{RT} \sum_{l=1}^{RT} \sum_{i=1}^p |\hat{W}_{l+1,i} - \hat{W}_{l,i}^+| \quad (6.2)$$

where $\hat{W}_{l+1,i}$ is the desired portfolio weight at $(l+1)$ -th rebalancing, and $\hat{W}_{l,i}^+$ is portfolio weight before the $(l+1)$ -th rebalancing.

6.1 Data

We conduct empirical analysis based on daily return data of S&P 500 index and Russell 2000 index component stocks downloaded from CRSP. The stocks selected in S&P 500 index are large cap stocks, and Russell 2000 index consists of 2000 smallest stocks in Russell 3000 index and is often used to represent small-cap company stocks. We consider both indices' constituent stocks to represent a good mixture of both large- and small-cap stocks. Specifically, we consider the following investing pools (henceforth referred to as scenarios (1) and (2), respectively): (1) largest 200 stocks in S&P 500 index measured by market value. (2) largest 200 stocks in Russell 2000 index measured by market value. Above two asset pools can represent large-cap-specialized mutual fund, and small-cap-specialized mutual fund, respectively. We consider out of sample period from 01/03/2011 to 12/31/2013 with sample size $T = 400$, which contains a total of three years. The historical data used at most decision nodes include many individual outliers; see the number of heterogeneous outliers during considered periods from the upper panel of Figure 7. For some anecdotal examples, during the studied sample period, JPMorgan Chase suffered a loss of around 2 billion dollars in April and May 2012 due to the "errors", and "bad judgment" of trading strategy. The share price of Netflix, an American online streaming company, plummeted by more than 30% on Oct 25, 2011 after it announced the mass loss of users in the previous quarter. There are many other cases of these individual firm-specific shocks. We remove those stocks that do not have entire history data when doing the first calculation under the rolling window scheme. Finally, we take risk-free return data from the Fama-French data library. And the results based on weekly and monthly holding frequencies are both considered.

We first make a preliminary analysis of considered return data taking scenario (2) where the investment pool is composed of the largest 200 stocks in Russell 2000 index as an example (the results are similar for scenario (1)). Figure 5 provides Q-Q plots of return residual calculated by applying principal component analysis on historical data at the first decision node, against Gaussian distribution and t-distribution with degrees of freedom 3, 4 and 6. It can be observed that the residual series (randomly selected) is well fitted by t-distribution with the degree of freedom 4. Generally speaking, t-distribution is more suitable than Gaussian distribution for fitting daily return residuals, and the behaviors of most residuals can be depicted by t-distribution with degree of freedom varying from 3 to 6. It indicates that our robust method may be more appropriate given the feature of heavy-tails in

the data. Moreover, we visualize the individual (residual) outliers in Figure 6, where the upper panel provides the time plot of the number of outliers based on historical data at 01/2011 and the lower panel further draws allocation of outliers in the form of a sparse matrix that outliers take 1 and others take 0. For the criterion of judging outliers, we simply use 1.96 standard deviations around mean return as the critical boundary of outlier returns. From the upper panel, it seems that the gray background region has more outliers than the blank background region (with 5% confidence level, if we roughly assume 200 residuals are normally distributed, the total outliers should be close to 10). The lower panel shows that there are plenty of outliers in estimated residuals, especially between 05/2009 and 08/2009. These findings further imply the suitability of our proposal.




Figure 5: Q-Q plot of excess return residual of stocks in Russell 2000 index against Gaussian distribution and t-distribution with degree of freedom 3, 4 and 6.

6.2 Choice of Thresholding Parameter

In practice, the value of c_τ can be data driven, that we use K -fold cross-validation method to determine it. With the residual \hat{e}_t from our robust PCA estimation procedure, we randomly divide them into two subsets, denoted as $\{\hat{e}_t\}_{t \in A}$ and $\{\hat{e}_t\}_{t \in B}$ respectively. The sample sizes of each subset are $T(A)$ and $T(B)$, with $T(A) + T(B) = T$. Subset A is used for training and subset B is used for validation. Therefore, we choose the threshold c_τ by minimizing the following objective function over




Figure 6: Time plot of the number of outliers (upper panel) of largest 200 Russell 2000 component residuals and corresponding allocated patterns (lower panel).

a compact interval:

$$c_\tau^* = \underset{\underline{c}_\tau < \tilde{c}_\tau \leq \bar{c}_\tau}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j=1}^K \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{A,j}(\tilde{c}_\tau) - S_e^{B,j} \right\|_F^2$$

where \underline{c}_τ is the minimum constant that guarantees the positive definiteness of $\hat{\Sigma}_e^{A,j}(\tilde{c}_\tau)$, \bar{c}_τ is large constant such that $\hat{\Sigma}_e^{A,j}(\tilde{c}_\tau)$ is diagonal, $\hat{\Sigma}_e^{A,j}(\tilde{c}_\tau)$ is the threshold residual covariance estimator by using subset A in j -th loop with threshold \tilde{c}_τ , and $S_e^{B,j}$ is sample covariance matrix by using subset B in j -th loop. In this paper, we simply set $T(A) = \lfloor 2T/3 \rfloor$ in our empirical studies.

6.3 Results

The results with monthly and weekly holding periods are reported in Tables 4 and 5, respectively. The number of common factors and thresholding parameter values are computed at the first decision node and are kept fixed. For threshold value τ of Huber loss function, we take 0.9-th quantile of sequence $\|r_t - B^{(i-1)}F_t^{(i-1)}\|$ at each step of algorithm for R-MVP. The soft threshold function is applied for R-MVP and POET with threshold from cross-validation method. For others, threshold in M-portfolio is set to 0.0001 as recommended by DeMiguel and Nogales (2009), the tuning parameter of MVP-UF is selected by cross-validation procedure proposed by Ding et al. (2021), the parameter values of Huber loss threshold and soft threshold function for RCOV and eFM-COV are specified according to their simulation settings.

Table 4: Empirical daily application under rolling window scheme, out of sample period is from 01/03/2011 to 12/31/2013, sample size $T = 400$, monthly holding period.

	max SP 200					max Russell 200				
	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR
Without transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.395	0.00576	0.0934	0.080	-	0.363	0.00693	0.0712	0.106	-
Sample	-0.009	0.00691	-0.0018	0.225	-	0.192	0.00864	0.0302	0.206	-
1/N	0.483	0.01205	0.0545	0.256	-	0.379	0.01615	0.0320	0.396	-
Linear	0.100	0.00626	0.0217	0.141	-	0.274	0.00780	0.0478	0.160	-
Nonlinear	0.257	0.00573	0.0609	0.084	-	0.310	0.00754	0.0560	0.145	-
POET	0.386	0.00576	0.0911	0.083	-	0.354	0.00694	0.0693	0.112	-
MVP-UF	0.386	0.00576	0.0911	0.083	-	0.354	0.00694	0.0693	0.112	-
M-portfolio	0.034	0.00739	0.0062	0.280	-	0.141	0.00967	0.0199	0.244	-
RCOV	0.505	0.02080	0.0330	0.355	-	0.417	0.00762	0.0745	0.161	-
eFM-COV	-2.279	0.08717	-0.0356	2.367	-	2.602	0.21674	0.0163	4.616	-
With transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.355	0.00577	0.0838	0.082	0.84	0.348	0.00688	0.0687	0.109	0.37
Sample	-0.097	0.00694	-0.0189	0.260	1.87	0.116	0.00863	0.0184	0.214	1.16
1/N	0.482	0.01205	0.0544	0.256	0.01	0.378	0.01612	0.0319	0.396	0.02
Linear	0.043	0.00628	0.0092	0.163	1.22	0.220	0.00779	0.0384	0.163	0.72
Nonlinear	0.229	0.00574	0.0543	0.089	0.59	0.266	0.00751	0.0481	0.147	0.60
POET	0.346	0.00577	0.0816	0.085	0.85	0.333	0.00691	0.0655	0.115	0.41
MVP-UF	0.346	0.00577	0.0816	0.085	0.85	0.333	0.00691	0.0655	0.115	0.41
M-portfolio	-0.105	0.00745	-0.0191	0.340	2.97	0.020	0.00971	0.0029	0.296	1.97
RCOV	-0.193	0.02148	-0.0122	0.527	15.12	0.383	0.00763	0.0684	0.168	0.63
eFM-COV	-4.627	0.09446	-0.0666	4.701	65.05	0.114	0.21625	0.0007	4.822	43.09

^a “max SP 200” (“max Russell 200”) means we use largest 200 stocks in S&P 500 index (Russell 2000 index) measured by market values as asset pool.

^b The reported measures CR, Risk, SR, MDD and TR are out of sample cumulative portfolio return, out of sample risk, out of sample Sharpe ratio, maximum drawdown and portfolio turnover ratio, respectively.

Table 5: Empirical daily application under rolling window scheme, out of sample period is from 01/03/2011 to 12/31/2013, sample size $T = 400$, weekly holding period.

	max SP 200					max Russell 200				
	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR
Without transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.400	0.00566	0.0942	0.074	-	0.386	0.00688	0.0747	0.094	-
Sample	0.021	0.00682	0.0041	0.223	-	0.185	0.00857	0.0288	0.202	-
1/N	0.508	0.01196	0.0567	0.256	-	0.409	0.01606	0.0339	0.395	-
Linear	0.134	0.00617	0.0290	0.140	-	0.263	0.00774	0.0453	0.152	-
Nonlinear	0.267	0.00567	0.0629	0.080	-	0.319	0.00753	0.0564	0.146	-
POET	0.396	0.00567	0.0932	0.075	-	0.370	0.00694	0.0711	0.098	-
MVP-UF	0.396	0.00567	0.0932	0.075	-	0.370	0.00694	0.0711	0.098	-
M-portfolio	0.043	0.00738	0.0078	0.236	-	0.226	0.00946	0.0319	0.204	-
RCOV	1.299	0.02250	0.0770	0.299	-	0.589	0.01167	0.0674	0.156	-
eFM-COV	33.291	1.15642	0.0392	7.220	-	2.125	0.24704	0.0117	3.415	-
With transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.320	0.00567	0.0753	0.078	0.40	0.361	0.00687	0.0701	0.096	0.16
Sample	-0.158	0.00687	-0.0306	0.307	0.90	0.064	0.00855	0.0100	0.216	0.54
1/N	0.507	0.01196	0.0565	0.256	0.01	0.408	0.01605	0.0345	0.395	0.01
Linear	0.019	0.00620	0.0040	0.178	0.58	0.190	0.00773	0.0327	0.161	0.33
Nonlinear	0.205	0.00568	0.0481	0.089	0.31	0.242	0.00751	0.0430	0.150	0.36
POET	0.316	0.00567	0.0743	0.079	0.40	0.341	0.00693	0.0656	0.101	0.18
MVP-UF	0.316	0.00567	0.0743	0.079	0.40	0.341	0.00693	0.0656	0.101	0.18
M-portfolio	-0.330	0.00749	-0.0587	0.443	1.86	-0.017	0.00945	-0.0024	0.270	1.15
RCOV	-1.419	0.02678	-0.0707	1.631	13.63	0.459	0.01196	0.0512	0.169	0.86
eFM-COV	23.264	1.29198	0.0240	22.238	112.16	-1.440	0.24937	-0.0077	4.395	38.60

^a see notes in Table 4.

From both tables, one can see that R-MVP has robust results both with and without transaction costs during the studied periods. Specifically, R-MVP achieves the highest Sharpe ratio in most cases, and its risks are also very close to the lowest level. For cumulative returns, R-MVP has a considerable advantage over other methods except for the “1/N” and RCOV strategies, which both undertake much higher risk than R-MVP. RCOV does not seem to have a stable performance, it is very good when asset pool consists of Russell 200, but very bad for the 200 largest stocks in S&P 500 index. E.g. its risk is approximately 0.02 which is the twice as much as that of the “1/N” strategy, and its turnover ratio is quite substantial at 15.12. Furthermore, R-MVP enjoys the lowest maximum drawdown. The “1/N” strategy, on the other hand, has very large MDD. The turnover ratio of R-MVP and POET-based portfolios are close to each other, but R-MVP has overall smaller turnover. E.g., in the cases of 200 largest Russell 2000 firms with monthly rebalancing, the turnover ratio of R-MVP is 0.37, which is lower than that of POET-based portfolio 0.41. The M-portfolio, which is also established on robust method, does not perform well in high-dimensional problems. POET and MVP-UF have good out of sample performances in terms of Sharpe ratio and risks, although their performances are topped by R-MVP.

6.4 Comparison of R-MVP and POET

To get direct insight on the robustness performance of the proposed R-MVP, we provide time plots of the number of individual outliers (upper panel) and the difference between cumulative returns of R-MVP and POET-based portfolio (lower panel, weekly rebalancing, $p = 200$) in Figure 7. We use 144 stocks with complete observations during 05/2009 - 12/2013 from the largest 200 Russell 2000 stocks (we do the same for 200 largest stocks in S&P 500 index, which has 196 stocks with complete data) to count the number of heterogeneous outliers, which is shown by upper panel of Figure 7. It shows that the return data during 07/2011-01/2012 (gray shadow region of the upper panel) has many outliers. Furthermore, we highlight the time period of decision nodes where the historical data contains periods 07/2011-01/2012. One can observe that the gap in cumulative return tends to increase in the investment period. A similar phenomenon can be observed from the results with the monthly holding period. The increment part can be regarded as the contributions of robust PCA. Moreover, it seems that the increasing performance gap of small-cap stock constituted portfolio is larger than that of large-cap based portfolio. This can be potentially explained by the fact that small-cap stocks returns are more volatile than large-cap stocks. We leave future studies for a more thorough investigation.

6.5 Long-term Performance

In this subsection, we further exhibit the out-of-sample performance of the proposed R-MVP over a longer period of time. To be specific, we continue to examine the same investment universe as in the previous subsections, but over a longer out-of-sample periods: (1) largest 200 stocks in S&P index, out of sample period is from 01/03/2006 to 12/31/2014; (2) largest 200 stocks in Russell 2000 index, out of sample period is from 01/03/2011 to 12/31/2019. The length of used historical returns is 400, and portfolios are rebalanced monthly. We report the results of cumulative return, risk, Sharpe ratio, maximum drawdown and turnover ratio with and without transaction costs in Table 6. It shows our strategy has good performance in the long term. The R-MVP is the best overall performer in Sharpe ratio. It achieves a good balance between satisfactory returns while the risk is controlled at the near-minimum level. For example, R-MVP has the largest SR 0.0806 and CR 1.19, the lowest risk




Figure 7: Time plots of the number of heterogeneous outliers and cumulative excess return gaps between R-MVP based portfolio and POET based portfolio.

0.00657 when investing in scenario (2). “1/N” strategy gets higher cumulative return than R-MVP, but undertaking a much higher risk and maximum drawdown when investing in S&P components. And those metrics of RCOV and eFM-COV are not on par with other portfolios due to large risk exposures and hence the drawdown. Also one can observe that R-MVP outperforms POET-based portfolio.

Furthermore, we visualize the out of sample cumulative excess returns in Figure 8. In the plot, we stop drawing the line of cumulative returns once it reaches -50%, due to the empirical observations that the average maximum drawdown of delisted funds is approximately 40%. We do not plot the linear shrinkage based portfolio and the Kendall’s tau covariance estimator based portfolio (eFM-COV) since they are dominated by nonlinear shrinkage based portfolio. The MVP-UF strategy in scenario (1) is exactly the same with POET based portfolio. Hence, we do not plot it as well. It is evident that the R-MVP exhibits superior overall performance in the long investment horizon. If we zoom in the period from 2008 to 2010, which includes the financial crisis, it can be observed that our R-MVP is much more robust than others and exhibits the lowest drawdown, while the cumulative returns of “1/N” portfolio and M-portfolio exceed -50%.

7 Conclusion

This paper proposes a robust minimum variance portfolio that allows for outliers in the form of different shocks. Our method is adaptive to global or idiosyncratic shocks data, utilizing the robust PCA for approximate factor model estimation and a thresholding method for the residual covariance

Table 6: Empirical daily application under rolling window scheme, (1) largest 200 stocks in S&P 500 index, out of sample period is from 01/03/2006 to 12/31/2015; (2) largest 200 stocks in Russell 2000 index, out of sample period is from 01/03/2011 to 12/31/2019; sample size $T = 400$ for both cases, monthly holding period.

	max SP 200					max Russell 200				
	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR	CR	Risk	SR	MDD	TR
Without transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.722	0.00805	0.0399	0.341	-	1.191	0.00657	0.0806	0.118	-
Sample	0.441	0.00897	0.0219	0.443	-	0.942	0.00778	0.0539	0.211	-
1/N	1.008	0.01544	0.0290	0.802	-	0.768	0.01286	0.0266	0.396	-
linear	0.521	0.00813	0.0285	0.390	-	1.079	0.00710	0.0676	0.160	-
nonlinear	0.627	0.00788	0.0354	0.384	-	1.128	0.00703	0.0714	0.156	-
POET	0.693	0.00806	0.0382	0.374	-	1.146	0.00660	0.0773	0.124	-
MVP-UF	0.693	0.00806	0.0382	0.374	-	1.173	0.00662	0.0789	0.124	-
M-portfolio	-0.006	0.00951	-0.0003	0.691	-	1.122	0.00843	0.0592	0.263	-
RCOV	-0.361	0.04232	-0.0038	2.487	-	1.156	0.00782	0.0658	0.195	-
eFM-COV	-4.196	0.08466	-0.0221	6.324	-	2.382	0.48559	0.0022	33.073	-
With transaction cost										
R-MVP	0.550	0.00803	0.0305	0.416	1.07	1.1039	0.00653	0.0752	0.119	0.48
Sample	0.189	0.00894	0.0094	0.544	1.72	0.855	0.00842	0.0452	0.322	1.17
1/N	1.030	0.01540	0.0298	0.780	0.01	0.813	0.01284	0.0282	0.396	0.02
linear	0.341	0.00809	0.0188	0.471	1.12	0.967	0.00708	0.0608	0.163	0.65
nonlinear	0.492	0.00783	0.0280	0.449	0.78	1.009	0.00700	0.0642	0.159	0.71
POET	0.519	0.00804	0.0287	0.449	1.08	1.049	0.00657	0.0711	0.125	0.51
MVP-UF	0.519	0.00804	0.0287	0.449	1.08	1.074	0.00658	0.0726	0.125	0.54
M-portfolio	-0.382	0.00950	-0.0179	0.890	2.96	0.855	0.00842	0.0452	0.322	1.98
RCOV	-2.321	0.04291	-0.0241	3.511	16.46	0.917	0.00781	0.0523	0.269	1.98
eFM-COV	-10.568	0.08669	-0.0543	11.284	38.16	-3.071	0.47468	-0.0029	32.148	85.62

^a see notes in Table 4.




Figure 8: Time plots of cumulative excess return of considered portfolios. Panel (a): largest 200 stocks in S&P 500 index, time period 01/03/2006-12/31/2014; Panel (b): largest 200 stocks in Russell 2000 index, time period 01/03/2011-12/31/2019.

matrix. We develop theorems of estimation consistency and the desired properties of the optimized portfolio. Simulation studies and real data analysis show the robust and superior performance of the proposed portfolio in various outlier settings.

Supplementary Material to “Shocks-adaptive Robust Minimum Variance Portfolio for a Large Universe of Assets”

This supplementary material consists of two parts. Appendix A offers some basic lemmas that are useful for proving the main results in the paper. Appendix B presents detailed proofs for Lemma 1 and Theorems 1-4 in the main paper.

Throughout the appendix, $\lambda_{max}(A)$ and $\lambda_{min}(A)$ take the largest and smallest eigenvalue of matrix A , respectively. $\|A\|$ and $\|A\|_F$ are spectral norm and Frobenius norm of matrix A , defined respectively by $\|A\| = \lambda_{max}^{1/2}(A^\top A)$ and $\|A\|_F = tr^{1/2}(A^\top A)$. And when A is a vector, $\|A\|$ and $\|A\|_F$ are equal to Euclidean norm. C is some positive constant that may change from line to line.

A Basic Lemmas

In this section, we first derive the asymptotic results for the estimations from principal component analysis of return data. These results will then be applied to the transformed returns \tilde{R} in the next section.

Let us begin by considering the asset returns following the factor structure:

$$r_t = BF_t + e_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $r_t = (r_{1t}, r_{2t}, \dots, r_{pt})^\top$ is the vector of returns for p assets, $B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_p)^\top$ is the factor loading matrix, and $e_t = (e_{1t}, e_{2t}, \dots, e_{pt})^\top$. Further, let Σ_e denote the covariance matrix of the error terms, with each element denoted by $\sigma_{e,ij}$. By vector form of factor structure (A.1), we have the matrix form

$$R = BF^\top + \mathcal{E},$$

where $R = (r_1, \dots, r_T)$, $B^\top = (b_1, \dots, b_p)$, $F = (F_1, \dots, F_T)^\top$ and $\mathcal{E} = (e_1, \dots, e_T)$. Thus $R^\top = FB^\top + \mathcal{E}^\top$. Let $Y = R^\top = (Y_1, \dots, Y_p)$, $\mathcal{E}^\top = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_p)$, $\varepsilon_s = (\varepsilon_{s1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{sT})^\top$ and $\varepsilon_{st} = e_{st}$, we then have

$$Y_i = Fb_i + \varepsilon_i. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We consider the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{argmin}_{F,B} \|Y - FB^\top\|_F^2 \\ \frac{1}{p} B^\top B = I_m, \quad F^\top F \text{ is diagonal.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

It has been shown that the columns of estimated factor loading $\hat{B} = (\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_p)^\top$ are \sqrt{p} times the eigenvectors corresponding to the m largest eigenvalues of the $p \times p$ matrix $Y^\top Y$ where $\hat{b}_i = (\hat{b}_{1i}, \dots, \hat{b}_{mi})^\top$, and $\hat{F} = p^{-1}Y\hat{B}$ (Bai and Ng, 2002; Bai, 2003).

By the same steps of (A.1) in Bai (2003), we have the following identity:

$$\hat{b}_i - Hb_i = (V/T)^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i) / T + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \zeta_{si} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^T \hat{b}_s \eta_{si} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \xi_{si} \right) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where V is the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix of the first m largest eigenvalues of $p^{-1}Y^\top Y$ in descending order,

$H = \frac{1}{p}V^{-1}\hat{B}^\top BF^\top F$, $\zeta_{si} = \varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i/T - E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T$, $\eta_{si} = b_s^\top \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it}/T$, and $\xi_{si} = b_i^\top \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st}/T$.

Assumption A.1. (i) $\{e_t, F_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is strictly stationary, and $E(e_{it}) = E(e_{it}F_{jt}) = 0$ for all $i \leq p, j \leq m$ and $t \leq T$.

(ii) $\max_i \sum_{s=1}^p |E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)|/T = O(1)$.

(iii) For all $s, i \leq p$,

$$E\left(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i - E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)\right)^4 = E\left[\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\varepsilon_{st} \varepsilon_{it}) - E(\varepsilon_{st} \varepsilon_{it})\right]^4 = O(T^2).$$

(iv) There exist $M > 0$ such that for all $i \leq p$, $E\|b_i\|^2 < M$.

(v) There exist $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 > 0$ and $d_1, d_2 > 0$, such that for any $s > 0$, $i \leq p$ and $j \leq m$,

$$P(|e_{it}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/d_1)^{\varphi_1}), P(|F_{jt}| > s) \leq \exp(-(s/d_2)^{\varphi_2}).$$

(vi) $\{e_t, F_t\}$ is strong mixing process: there exists $\varphi_3 > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ (the set of positive integers),

$$\alpha(t) \leq \exp(-Ct^{\varphi_3})$$

where α is α -mixing coefficient defined based on σ -algebras generated by $\{e_t, F_t\}$.

(vii) $\tilde{\varphi}^{-1} = 3\varphi_1^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1} > 1$, $3\varphi_2^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1} > 1$. Let $\varphi = 1.5\varphi_1^{-1} + 1.5\varphi_2^{-1} + \varphi_3^{-1}$, $(\log p)^{2/\varphi-1} = o(T)$ and $(\log p)^{2/\tilde{\varphi}-1} = o(T)$.

Lemma A.1. Suppose Assumption A.1 holds, for all $j \leq m$,

$$(i) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T \right)^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{p}\right),$$

$$(ii) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \zeta_{si} \right)^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),$$

$$(iii) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \eta_{si} \right)^2 = O_p\left(\frac{\log p}{T}\right),$$

$$(iv) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \xi_{si} \right)^2 = O_p\left(\frac{\log p}{T}\right).$$

Proof: (i) First, we have $\forall j, \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js}^2 = p$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T \right)^2 &\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p (E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T)^2 \\ &\leq \max_{i \leq p} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p (E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T)^2 \leq \max_{i,s} |E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T| \max_i \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p |E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i)/T|. \\ &= O(p^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by Assumption A.1(ii).

(ii) By using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \zeta_{si} \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{p^3} \sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \hat{b}_{jl} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right) \leq \frac{1}{p^3} \left(\sum_{sl} (\hat{b}_{js} \hat{b}_{jl})^2 \sum_{sl} \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p^2} \left(\sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $E \left(\sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right)^2 \right) = p^2 E \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right)^2 \right) \leq p^4 \max_{s,i} E |\zeta_{si}|^4$. By Assumption A.1(iii), $\max_{s,i} E \zeta_{si}^4 = O(T^{-2})$, it indicates that $\left(\sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^p \zeta_{si} \zeta_{li} \right)^2 \right) = O_p(p^4/T^2)$ and thus yields the result.

(iii) Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \eta_{si} \right)^2 &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} b_s^\top \right\|^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\|^2 \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js}^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \|b_s\|^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

By applying Assumption A.1(iv), first we have $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \|b_s\|^2 = O_p(1)$. Then, based on Assumption A.1(i) and (v)-(vii), following the Lemma B.1 of Fan et al. (2011), we also have $\max_{i,j} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{jt} e_{it} \right| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right)$, and thus $\max_i \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\|^2 \leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_{jt} e_{it} \right)^2 = O_p \left(\frac{\log p}{T} \right)$.

(iv) Similar to part (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \xi_{si} \right)^2 &= \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p b_i^\top \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st} \frac{1}{T} \hat{b}_{js} \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|b_i\|^2 \times \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st} \frac{1}{T} \hat{b}_{js} \right\|^2 \\ &\leq O_p(1) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st} \right\|^2 \times \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js}^2 = O_p \left(\frac{\log p}{T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma A.2. Suppose Assumption A.1 holds,

$$(i) \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{T^p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i) \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right),$$

$$(ii) \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \zeta_{si} \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}} \right),$$

$$(iii) \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \eta_{si} \right\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right),$$

$$(iv) \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \xi_{si} \right\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right).$$

Proof: (i) By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the fact that $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|\hat{b}_i\|^2 = O_p(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{Tp} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i) \right\| &\leq \max_{i \leq p} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \|\hat{b}_s\|^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i / T)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1) \max_{i \leq p} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i / T)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1) \max_{s,i} \sqrt{|E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i / T)|} \max_i \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p |E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i / T)| \right)^{1/2} \\ &= O_p(p^{-1/2}), \end{aligned}$$

where we apply Assumption A.1(i) and (ii).

(ii) Similarly,

$$\max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \zeta_{si} \right\| \leq \max_{i \leq p} \frac{1}{p} \left(\sum_{s=1}^p \|\hat{b}_s\|^2 \sum_{s=1}^p \zeta_{si}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(O_p(1) \max_i \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \zeta_{si}^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

By Assumption A.1(iii), $E \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \zeta_{si}^2 \right)^2 \leq \max_{s,i} E(\zeta_{si}^4) = O(T^{-2})$. It then follows from the Chebyshev's inequality and Bonferroni's method that $\max_i \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \zeta_{si}^2 = O_p(\sqrt{p}/T)$.

(iii) We have

$$\max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \eta_{si} \right\| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \hat{b}_s^\top \right\| \max_i \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right),$$

where the last equality holds by the fact that $\max_i \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\| = O_p(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}})$ from the proof of Lemma A.1(iii).

(iv) Also, we have

$$\max_{i \leq p} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_s \xi_{si} \right\| \leq \max_{i \leq p} \|b_i\| \times \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st} \frac{1}{T} \hat{b}_s \right\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right),$$

where $\left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{st} \frac{1}{T} \hat{b}_s \right\| = O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right)$ from the proof of Lemma A.1(iv) and $\max_{i \leq p} E\|b_i\| = O_p(1)$ by Assumption A.1(iv).

Assumption A.2. (i) $B^\top B$ is diagonal and $\|I_m - p^{-1} B^\top B\|_F = O_p(p^{-1/2})$.

(ii) $\text{cov}(F_t) = I_m$, and $\|T^{-1} F^\top F - I_m\| = o_p(1)$.

(iii) There exists some positive constant c_1 such that $\|\Sigma_e\| \leq c_1$, where Σ_e is covariance matrix of e_t .

Lemma A.3. Suppose Assumption A.2 holds, let $\hat{\lambda}_m$ denote the m -th largest eigenvalue of $p^{-1} Y Y^\top$, then $\hat{\lambda}_m > C_1 T$ with probability approaching one for some constant $C_1 > 0$.

Proof: We first note that the eigenvalues of $T^{-1} Y Y^\top$ and $T^{-1} Y^\top Y$ only differ by $|T - p|$ zero eigenvalues. Since $Y = R^\top$, $T^{-1} Y^\top Y = T^{-1} R R^\top$. Assumption A.2(i) indicates that all eigenvalues of the $m \times m$ matrix $p^{-1} B^\top B$ approach to 1 as $p \rightarrow \infty$, which are bounded away from both zero and infinity. As such, under Assumptions A.2, by applying Proposition 2.1 and Lemma C.4 of Fan et al.

(2013), we have that $\nu_m \geq Cp$ for some $C > 0$ where ν_m is the m -th largest eigenvalue of $BB^\top + \Sigma_e$ for sufficiently large p . Using Weyl's theorem, if we show that $\|T^{-1}RR^\top - BB^\top - \Sigma_e\| = o_p(p)$, then we can conclude that $\hat{\nu}_m > C_1p$ with probability approaching one for some $C_1 > 0$ where $\hat{\nu}_m$ is the m -th largest eigenvalue of $T^{-1}RR^\top$. As a result, $\hat{\lambda}_m = T\hat{\nu}_m/p > C_1T$ with probability approaching one.

Based on factor structure, we have

$$T^{-1}RR^\top = B \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t F_t^\top B^\top + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T e_t e_t^\top + B \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_t^\top + \left(B \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_t^\top \right)^\top.$$

Then, we have $\|B \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t F_t^\top - I_m \right) B^\top\| = o_p(p)$ by Assumption A.2(ii). By Assumption A.1(v)-(vii), the Lemma A.3 of Fan et al. (2011) implies that $\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (e_t e_t^\top - \Sigma_e) \| = O_p(p\sqrt{\log p/T}) = o_p(p)$. By the fact that $\max_i \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_{it} \right\| = O_p(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}})$, it is easy to obtain that $\|B \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T F_t e_t^\top\| = o_p(p)$. We finish the proof.

Lemma A.4. *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.2 hold,*

$$(i) \max_{j \leq m} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\hat{b}_i - Hb_i)_j^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\log p}{T}\right),$$

$$(ii) \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|\hat{b}_i - Hb_i\|^2 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\log p}{T}\right),$$

$$(iii) \max_{i \leq p} \|\hat{b}_i - Hb_i\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

Proof: By Lemma A.3, all the eigenvalues of V/T are bounded away from zero and infinity. Using the inequality $(a + b + c + d)^2 \leq 4(a^2 + b^2 + c^2 + d^2)$ and (A.4), for some constant $C > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \leq m} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\hat{b}_i - Hb_i)_j^2 &\leq C \max_j \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} E(\varepsilon_s^\top \varepsilon_i) / T \right)^2 + C \max_j \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \zeta_{si} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + C \max_j \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \eta_{si} \right)^2 + C \max_j \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{b}_{js} \xi_{si} \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Each of the four terms on the right hand side above are bounded in Lemma A.1.

$$(ii) \text{ The result follows that } \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|\hat{b}_i - Hb_i\|^2 \leq m \max_j \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (\hat{b}_i - Hb_i)_j^2.$$

(iii) The result follows (A.4) and Lemma A.2 directly.

Lemma A.5. *Suppose Assumptions A.1 and A.2 hold,*

$$(i) HH^\top = I_m + O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right),$$

$$(ii) H^\top H = I_m + O_p\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}\right)$$

Proof: First of all, by Lemma A.3, $\|V^{-1}\| = O_p(T^{-1})$. Furthermore, $\|\hat{B}\| = \sqrt{p}$ by $p^{-1}\hat{B}^\top \hat{B} = I_m$, $\|B\| = \lambda_{max}^{1/2}(BB^\top) = O_p(\sqrt{p})$ by Assumption A.2(i), and $\|\frac{1}{T}F^\top F\| = \|\frac{1}{T}FF^\top\| = O_p(1)$ by Assumption A.2(ii). It then follows from the definition of H that $\|H\| = O_p(1)$. Then

$$\|HH^\top - I_m\|_F \leq \|HH^\top - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p Hb_i b_i^\top H^\top\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p Hb_i b_i^\top H^\top - I_m \right\|_F.$$

For the first term, it has

$$\|HH^\top - H \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p b_i b_i^\top \right) H^\top\|_F \leq \|H\|^2 \|I_m - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p b_i b_i^\top\|_F = O_p(p^{-1/2}),$$

where we apply Assumption A.2(i). The second term, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Lemma A.4, can be bounde as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p H b_i (H b_i)^\top - \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{b}_i \hat{b}_i^\top \right\|_F &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p (H b_i - \hat{b}_i) (H b_i)^\top \right\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \hat{b}_i (H b_i - \hat{b}_i)^\top \right\|_F \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|H b_i - \hat{b}_i\|^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|H b_i\|^2 \right)^{1/2} + \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|H b_i - \hat{b}_i\|^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i=1}^p \|\hat{b}_i\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Since $HH^\top = I_m + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$ and $\|H\| = O_p(1)$, right multiplying H gives $HH^\top H = H + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$. Part (i) also gives that $\|H^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$. Hence further left multiplying H^{-1} yields $H^\top H = I_m + O_p \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} \right)$.

B Proof of the Main Results

Proof of Lemma 1. Recall that the columns of estimated factor loading estimator \hat{B} are \sqrt{p} times the corresponding (to its m largest eigenvalues) eigenvectors of $\hat{V} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t r_t r_t^\top$. By model (2.1) in the main paper, we notice that

$$\underbrace{\omega_t^{1/2} r_t}_{\tilde{r}_t} = B \underbrace{\omega_t^{1/2} F_t}_{\tilde{F}_t} + \underbrace{\omega_t^{1/2} e_t}_{\tilde{e}_t}, t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where $\tilde{r}_t = \omega_t^{1/2} r_t$, $\tilde{F}_t = \omega_t^{1/2} F_t$ and $\tilde{e}_t = \omega_t^{1/2} e_t$. Let $\tilde{R} = (\tilde{r}_1, \dots, \tilde{r}_T)$, we have $\tilde{R} \tilde{R}^\top = \sum_{t=1}^T \omega_t r_t r_t^\top$. As such, it is clear that the factor loading estimator \hat{B} is also the solution of problem A.3 with $Y = \tilde{R}^\top$. Furthermore, the conditions assumed in Lemma 1 guarantee that the transformed factors \tilde{F}_t and error terms \tilde{e}_t satisfy the Assumptions A.1 and A.2. As a result, by Lemma A.4, \hat{b}_i has the asymptotic property as follows

$$\max_{i \leq p} \left\| \hat{b}_i - \tilde{H} b_i \right\| = O_p(p^{-1/2} + p^{1/4} T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where $\tilde{H} = p^{-1} \tilde{V}^{-1} \hat{B}^\top B \tilde{F}^\top \tilde{F}$, \tilde{V} is the $m \times m$ diagonal matrix of the first m largest eigenvalues of $p^{-1} \tilde{R}^\top \tilde{R}$ in descending order, and $\tilde{F} = (\tilde{F}_1, \dots, \tilde{F}_T)^\top$.

Now, we further consider $\hat{F}_t = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p r_{jt} \hat{b}_j$. By the fact that $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{b}_j \hat{b}_j^\top = I_m$, we can make decomposition as follow,

$$\hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{H} b_j e_{jt} + \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p r_{jt} (\hat{b}_j - \tilde{H} b_j) + \tilde{H} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p b_j b_j^\top - I_m \right) F_t. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

For the first term on the right hand side of (B.3), by Assumption 5(c), $E\|\sum_{j=1}^p b_j e_{jt}\|^4 = O(p^2)$ and using Chebyshev's inequality and Bonferroni's method, we yield $\max_t \|\sum_{j=1}^p b_j e_{jt}\| = O_p(T^{1/4}\sqrt{p})$ with probability one. Thus, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it follows that

$$\max_t \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{H} b_j e_{jt} \right\| \leq \|\tilde{H}\| \max_t \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p b_j e_{jt} \right\| = O_p(T^{1/4}p^{-1/2}),$$

where $\|\tilde{H}\| = O_p(1)$ indicated by the proof of Lemma A.5. For the second term, by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality,

$$\max_t \left\| \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p r_{jt} (\hat{b}_j - \tilde{H} b_j) \right\| \leq \max_t \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p r_{jt}^2 \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \|\hat{b}_j - \tilde{H} b_j\|^2 \right)^{1/2} = O_p \left(\delta^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right) \right),$$

where we apply Lemma A.4(ii) and the fact that $E(r_{jt}^2) = O(\delta)$ indicated by Assumption 1(b) and 2(a). Finally, for the third term, by Assumption 1, we can conclude that

$$\max_t \left\| \tilde{H} \left(\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p b_j b_j^\top - I_m \right) F_t \right\| = O_p(\Delta p^{-1/2}).$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\max_t \|\hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t\| = O_p \left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta \log p}{T}} \right). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

□

Lemma B.1. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1,*

$$\max_{i \leq p, t \leq T} \left\| \hat{b}_i^\top \hat{F}_t - b_i^\top F_t \right\| = O_p \left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\sqrt{\delta \log p} + \Delta p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}} \right)$$

Proof of Lemma B.1. Uniformly in i and t , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{b}_i^\top \hat{F}_t - b_i^\top F_t \right\| &\leq \left\| \hat{b}_i - \tilde{H} b_i \right\| \left\| \hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t \right\| + \left\| \tilde{H} b_i \right\| \left\| \hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \hat{b}_i - \tilde{H} b_i \right\| \left\| \tilde{H} F_t \right\| + \left\| b_i \right\| \left\| F_t \right\| \left\| \tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H} - I_m \right\| \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\sqrt{\delta \log p} + \Delta p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

□

Lemma B.2. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, $\max_i \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it}|^2 = O_p \left(\frac{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2}{p} + \frac{\delta \sqrt{p}}{T} \right)$. If $\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\sqrt{\delta \log p} + \Delta p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}} = o(1)$, then $\max_{i,t} |e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it}| = o_p(1)$.*

Proof of Lemma B.2. We have $e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it} = b_i^\top \tilde{H}^\top (\hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t) + (\hat{b}_i^\top - b_i^\top \tilde{H}^\top) \hat{F}_t + b_i^\top (\tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H} - I_m) F_t$, using

the inequality $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 4a^2 + 4b^2 + 4c^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it}|^2 &\leq 4 \max_i \left\| b_i^\top \tilde{H}^\top \right\|^2 \max_t \left\| \hat{F}_t - \tilde{H} F_t \right\|^2 \\
&+ 4 \max_i \left\| \hat{b}_i^\top - b_i^\top \tilde{H}^\top \right\|^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{F}_t \right\|^2 + 4 \max_i \|b_i\|^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|F_t\|^2 \left\| \tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H} - I_m \right\|_F^2 \\
&= O_p \left(\frac{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2}{p} + \frac{\delta \log p}{T} \right) + O_p \left(\frac{\delta}{p} + \frac{\delta \sqrt{p}}{T} \right) + O_p \left(\delta \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\log p}{T} \right) \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\frac{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2}{p} + \frac{\delta \sqrt{p}}{T} \right). \tag{B.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Lemma A.5, (B.2), (B.4) and the fact that $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \hat{F}_t \right\|^2$ and $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \|F_t\|^2$ are both $O_p(\delta)$. The second part follows from Lemma B.1 directly. \square

Recall that the adaptive thresholding estimator for Σ_e is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_e = (\hat{\sigma}_{\hat{e},ij})_{p \times p}, \quad \hat{\sigma}_{\hat{e},ij} = \begin{cases} s_{\hat{e},ii} & i = j \\ \chi_{ij}(s_{\hat{e},ij}) & i \neq j \end{cases} \tag{B.7}$$

where $s_{\hat{e},ij} = (1/T) \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt}$ is the (i, j) -th element of sample covariance matrix based on \hat{e}_t , $\chi_{ij}(\cdot)$ is a shrinkage function satisfying $\chi_{ij}(z) = 0$ if $|z| \leq \tau_{ij}$, and $|\chi_{ij}(z) - z| \leq \tau_{ij}$, where $\tau_{ij} = C \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij} \varsigma_T}$ is a positive threshold and $\hat{\theta}_{ij} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\hat{e}_{it} \hat{e}_{jt} - s_{\hat{e},ij})^2$.

Proof of Theorem 1. For notation simplicity, we abbreviate $s_{\hat{e},ij}$ as s_{ij} in this proof. By the condition of threshold function, we have $\chi_{ij}(t) = \chi_{ij}(t) \mathbb{I}(|t| > C \varsigma_T \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}})$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, by Lemma B.2, we have $\max_{i,t} |e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it}| = o_p(1)$, $\max_i \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T |e_{it} - \hat{e}_{it}|^2 = O_p(a_T^2)$ and $a_T = \sqrt{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2/p + \delta \sqrt{p}/T} = o(1)$. Let $\varsigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + a_T$. Under the exponential tails and mixing dependence conditions, we can apply the Lemmas A.3 and A.4 of Fan et al. (2011) and obtain that for any $x > 0$, there are positive constants M, θ_1 and θ_2 such that each of the events

$$\begin{aligned}
A_1 &= \left\{ \max_{i,j} |s_{\hat{e},ij} - \sigma_{ij}| \leq M \varsigma_T \right\} \\
A_2 &= \left\{ \theta_2 < \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}} < \theta_1, \text{ all } i \leq p, j \leq p \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

occurs with probability at least $1 - x$.

Now for $C = \theta_2^{-1}2M$, under the event $A_1 \cap A_2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e - \Sigma_e \right\| &\leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\chi_{ij}(s_{ij}) - \sigma_{e,ij}| \\
&= \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p \left| \chi_{ij}(s_{ij}) \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) - \sigma_{e,ij} \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) - \sigma_{e,ij} \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| \leq C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) \right| \\
&\leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\chi_{ij}(s_{ij}) - s_{ij}| \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) + \sum_{j=1}^p |s_{ij} - \sigma_{e,ij}| \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}| \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| \leq C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}}) \\
&\leq \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p C_{\zeta T} \sqrt{\hat{\theta}_{ij}} \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \theta_2) + M_{\zeta T} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| > C_{\zeta T} \theta_2) + \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}| \mathbb{I}(|s_{ij}| < C_{\zeta T} \theta_1) \\
&\leq (C\theta_1 + M)_{\zeta T} \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{I}(|\sigma_{e,ij}| > M_{\zeta T}) + \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}| \mathbb{I}(|\sigma_{e,ij}| < C_{\zeta T} \theta_1 + M_{\zeta T}) \\
&\leq (C\theta_1 + M)_{\zeta T} \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{|\sigma_{e,ij}|^q}{M^q \zeta_T^q} \mathbb{I}(|\sigma_{e,ij}| > M_{\zeta T}) \\
&\quad + \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}| \frac{(C\theta_1 + M)^{1-q} \zeta_T^{1-q}}{|\sigma_{e,ij}|^{1-q}} \mathbb{I}(|\sigma_{e,ij}| < (C\theta_1 + M)_{\zeta T}) \\
&\leq \frac{C\theta_1 + M}{M^q} \zeta_T^{1-q} \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}|^q + (C\theta_1 + M)^{1-q} \zeta_T^{1-q} \max_i \sum_{j=1}^p |\sigma_{e,ij}|^q \\
&= \kappa_q \zeta_T^{1-q} (C\theta_1 + M) (M^{-q} + (C\theta_1 + M)^{-q}). \tag{B.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\kappa_q = \max_i \sum_{j \leq p} |\sigma_{e,ij}|^q$. Let $M_1 = (C\theta_1 + M) (M^{-q} + (C\theta_1 + M)^{-q})$, then with probability at least $1 - 2x$, $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e - \Sigma_e \right\| \leq M_1 \kappa_q \zeta_T^{1-q}$. Since x is arbitrary, we have $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e - \Sigma_e \right\| = O_p(\kappa_q \zeta_T^{1-q})$. If in addition $\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q = o(1)$, then the minimum eigenvalue of $\hat{\Sigma}_e$ is bounded away from zero with probability approaching one since $\lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_e) > c_1$ by Assumption 2(b). This then implies $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| = O_p(\kappa_q \zeta_T^{1-q})$. Finally, note that

$$\zeta_T \asymp \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} + \sqrt{\frac{(\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta)^2}{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{\delta \sqrt{p}}{T}} \asymp \zeta_T := \frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{\delta^{1/2} p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

We complete the proof of Theorem 1. □

Define

$$G_T = \hat{B} - B \tilde{H}^\top$$

where $\hat{B} = (\hat{b}_1, \dots, \hat{b}_p)^\top$.

Lemma B.3. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1,*

$$(i) \ \|G_T\|_F^2 = O_p\left(1 + \frac{p^{3/2}}{T}\right).$$

$$(ii) \left\| \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} - (B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right\| = O_p \left(p \left(\varpi_T + \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right) \right) = o_p(p).$$

Proof of Lemma B.3. (i) We have $\|G_T\|_F^2 \leq \max_i p \left\| \hat{b}_i - \tilde{H}b_i \right\|^2 = O_p \left(1 + \frac{p^{3/2}}{T} \right)$.

(ii) By result (i) and Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} - (B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right\| \\ & \leq \left\| G_T^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} G_T \right\| + 2 \left\| G_T^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right\| + \left\| B\tilde{H}^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1}) B\tilde{H}^\top \right\| \\ & = O_p \left(p \left(\varpi_T + \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varpi_T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}$. □

Lemma B.4. *Under the conditions of Theorem 1, with probability approaching one, for some $c > 0$,*

$$(i) \lambda_{\min} \left(I_m + (B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right) \geq cp.$$

$$(ii) \lambda_{\min} \left(I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right) \geq cp.$$

$$(iii) \lambda_{\min} \left(I_m + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right) \geq cp.$$

$$(iv) \lambda_{\min} \left((\tilde{H}\tilde{H}^\top)^{-1} + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right) \geq cp.$$

Proof of Lemma B.4. (i) By Lemma A.5, with probability approaching one, $\lambda_{\min}(\tilde{H}\tilde{H}^\top)$ is bounded away from zero. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{\min} \left(I_m + (B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right) & \geq \lambda_{\min} \left((B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B\tilde{H}^\top \right) \\ & \geq \lambda_{\min} (\Sigma_e^{-1}) \lambda_{\min} \left((B\tilde{H}^\top)^\top B\tilde{H}^\top \right) \\ & \geq \lambda_{\min} (\Sigma_e^{-1}) \lambda_{\min} \left(B^\top B \right) \lambda_{\min} \left(\tilde{H}\tilde{H}^\top \right) \\ & \geq cp. \end{aligned}$$

(ii) The result follows from part (i) and Lemma B.3(ii). Part (iii) and (iv) follow from a similar argument of part (i) and Lemma A.5. □

Proof of Theorem 2. Define

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_r = B\tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H}B^\top + \Sigma_e.$$

Note that $\hat{\Sigma}_r = \hat{B}\hat{B}^\top + \hat{\Sigma}_e$ and $\Sigma_r = BB^\top + \Sigma_e$. Then by triangular inequality, it follows that

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\| \leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \right\| + \left\| \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\|.$$

Using the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we have $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \right\| \leq \sum_{i=1}^6 L_i$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
L_1 &= \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \right\| \\
L_2 &= \left\| (\hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_e^{-1}) \hat{B} \left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1} \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \right\| \\
L_3 &= \left\| (\hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_e^{-1}) \hat{B} \left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1} \hat{B}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \\
L_4 &= \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} (\hat{B} - B \tilde{H}^\top) \left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1} \hat{B}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \\
L_5 &= \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} (\hat{B} - B \tilde{H}^\top) \left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1} \tilde{H} B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \\
L_6 &= \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} B \tilde{H}^\top \left(\left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1} - \left[I_m + \tilde{H} B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \tilde{H}^\top \right]^{-1} \right) \tilde{H} B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \quad (\text{B.9})
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we bound each of the six terms respectively. For L_1 , it is bounded by Theorem 1. Let $\Omega = \left[I_m + \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right]^{-1}$, then

$$L_2 \leq \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} - \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \left\| \hat{B}^\top \Omega \hat{B} \right\| \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \right\|.$$

Note that Theorem 1 implies that $\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \right\| = O_p(1)$. Lemma B.4 implies that $\|\Omega\| = O_p(p^{-1})$. This shows that $L_2 = O_p(L_1)$. Similarly, $L_3 = O_p(L_1)$. In addition, since $\|G_T\|_F^2 = O_p(1 + \frac{p^{3/2}}{T})$, $L_4 \leq \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} (\hat{B} - B \tilde{H}^\top) \right\| \|\Omega\| \left\| \hat{B}^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| = O_p(\varpi_T)$. Similarly, $L_5 = O_p(L_4)$. Finally, let $\Omega_1 = \left[I_m + (B \tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \tilde{H}^\top \right]^{-1}$. By Lemma B.4, $\|\Omega_1\| = O_p(p^{-1})$, then by Lemma B.3(ii),

$$\|\Omega - \Omega_1\| = \|\Omega(\Omega^{-1} - \Omega_1^{-1})\Omega_1\| \leq O_p(p^{-2}) \left\| (B \tilde{H}^\top)^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \tilde{H}^\top - \hat{B}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_e^{-1} \hat{B} \right\| = O_p\left(p^{-1} \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q + p^{-1} \varpi_T\right).$$

As a result, $L_6 \leq \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} B \tilde{H}^\top \right\|^2 \|\Omega - \Omega_1\| = O_p\left(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q + \varpi_T\right)$. Adding up $L_1 - L_6$ gives

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \right\| = O_p\left(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q + \varpi_T\right).$$

Note that $\varpi_T/\zeta_T = o(1)$. As a result,

$$\left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \right\| = O_p\left(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q\right).$$

On the other hand, using Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \tilde{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\| &\leq \left\| \Sigma_e^{-1} B \left(\left[(\tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H})^{-1} + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right]^{-1} - \left[I_m + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right]^{-1} \right) B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} \right\| \\
&\leq O_p(p) \left\| \left[(\tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H})^{-1} + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right]^{-1} - \left[I_m + B^\top \Sigma_e^{-1} B \right]^{-1} \right\| \\
&= O_p(p^{-1}) \left\| (\tilde{H}^\top \tilde{H})^{-1} - I_m \right\| = o_p(\zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Recall that

$$\hat{R}_{\min} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}, \quad R_{\min} = \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}.$$

Then, we have

$$\left| \frac{\hat{R}_{\min}}{R_{\min}} - 1 \right| = \left| \frac{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} - 1 \right| = \frac{|\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p - \mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p|}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} \leq \frac{p \cdot \|\Sigma_r^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1}\|}{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

The bound for the numerator of (B.10) is $O_p(p \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q)$ by Theorem 2. The exact order of the denominator of (B.10) is $p^{1-\eta}$, which is guaranteed by Assumption 6 and the same argument as the proposition of Ding et al. (2021). In view of these results, we have the result

$$\left| \frac{\hat{R}_{\min}}{R_{\min}} - 1 \right| = O_p(p^\eta \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q). \quad (\text{B.11})$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4. We decompose the Sharpe ratio in the following way.

$$\frac{\hat{S}R - SR}{SR} = \frac{Z_1 + Z_2}{\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \cdot \mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu}},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} Z_1 &= \mathbf{1}_p^\top \left(\hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \hat{\mu} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu \right) \cdot \sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p}, \\ Z_2 &= \mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu \left(\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} - \sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now we consider the first term involving Z_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} |J_1| &:= \frac{|Z_1|}{\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \cdot \mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu}} \\ &\leq \frac{\left| \mathbf{1}_p^\top \left(\hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right) \hat{\mu} \right| + \left| \mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} (\hat{\mu} - \mu) \right|}{\sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p \cdot \mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu}} \cdot \sqrt{\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mathbf{1}_p} \\ &\leq C \left(p^\phi \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\| + p^{\phi-1/2} \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| \right) \\ &= O_p \left(p^\phi \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q + p^\phi \tilde{\zeta}_T \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where we apply Assumption 7 to determine the order of magnitude of $\mathbf{1}_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu$, the last equality uses

the results that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\| &= \left\| \hat{B}\hat{\mu}_f - B\mu_f \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \hat{B}\hat{\mu}_f - B\tilde{H}^\top \hat{\mu}_f \right\| + \left\| B \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (\tilde{H}^\top \hat{F}_t - F_t) \right\| \\
&\leq \left\| \hat{B} - B\tilde{H}^\top \right\| \|\hat{\mu}_f\| + \|B\| \max_t \left\| \tilde{H}^\top \hat{F}_t - F_t \right\| \\
&= O_p \left(\sqrt{p}\varpi_T + \sqrt{p} \left(\frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{T}} \right) \right) \\
&= O_p \left(\sqrt{p}\tilde{\zeta}_T \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mu}_f = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{F}_t$ and $\tilde{\zeta}_T = \frac{\delta^{1/2} + T^{1/4} + \Delta}{\sqrt{p}} + \frac{p^{1/4}}{\sqrt{T}}$.

Similarly, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
|J_2| &:= \frac{|Z_2|}{\sqrt{1_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} 1_p} \cdot |1_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} \mu|} \leq \frac{\left| \sqrt{1_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} 1_p} - \sqrt{1_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} 1_p} \right|}{\sqrt{1_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} 1_p}} \\
&= \frac{\left| 1_p^\top (\Sigma_r^{-1} - \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1}) 1_p \right|}{\sqrt{1_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} 1_p} \left(\sqrt{1_p^\top \Sigma_r^{-1} 1_p} + \sqrt{1_p^\top \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} 1_p} \right)} \leq p^\eta \left\| \hat{\Sigma}_r^{-1} - \Sigma_r^{-1} \right\| \\
&= O_p \left(p^\eta \zeta_T^{1-q} \kappa_q \right). \tag{B.13}
\end{aligned}$$

Then the result is derived from (B.12) and (B.13). \square

References

- Ait-Sahalia, Y. and D. Xiu (2017). Using principal component analysis to estimate a high dimensional factor model with high-frequency data. *Journal of Econometrics* 201(2), 384 – 399.
- Ao, M., Y. Li, and X. Zheng (2019). Approaching mean-variance efficiency for large portfolios. *The Review of Financial Studies* 32(7), 2890–2919.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica* 71(1), 135–171.
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica* 70(1), 191–221.
- Blanchet, J., L. Chen, and X. Y. Zhou (2022). Distributionally robust mean-variance portfolio selection with wasserstein distances. *Management Science* 68(9), 6382–6410.
- Cai, T. and W. Liu (2011). Adaptive thresholding for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(494), 672–684.
- Caner, M., M. Medeiros, and G. Vasconcelos (2023). Sharpe ratio analysis in high dimensions: Residual-based nodewise regression in factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 235, 393–417.
- Chamberlain, G. and M. Rothschild (1983). Arbitrage, factor structure, and mean-variance analysis on large asset markets. *Econometrica* 51, 1281 – 1304.
- Delage, E. and Y. Ye (2010). Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research* 58(3), 595–612.

- DeMiguel, V., L. Garlappi, F. J. Nogales, and R. Uppal (2009). A generalized approach to portfolio optimization: Improving performance by constraining portfolio norms. *Management Science* 55(5), 798–812.
- DeMiguel, V., L. Garlappi, and R. Uppal (2009). Optimal versus naive diversification: How inefficient is the 1/n portfolio strategy? *The Review of Financial Studies* 22(5), 1915–1953.
- DeMiguel, V. and F. Nogales (2009). Portfolio selection with robust estimation. *Operations Research* 57(3), 560–577.
- Ding, Y., Y. Li, and X. Zheng (2021). High dimensional minimum variance portfolio estimation under statistical factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 222(1B), 502–515.
- Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (1992). The cross-section of expected stock returns. *Journal of Finance* 47(2), 427–465.
- Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (1993). Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics* 33(1), 3–56.
- Fama, E. F. and K. R. French (2015). A five-factor asset pricing model. *Journal of Financial Economics* 116(1), 1–22.
- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and M. Mincheva (2011). High dimensional covariance matrix estimation in approximate factor models. *The Annals of Statistics* 39(6), 3320.
- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and M. Mincheva (2013). Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 75(4), 603–680.
- Fan, J., H. Liu, and W. Wang (2018). Large covariance estimation through elliptical factor models. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(4), 1383 – 1414.
- Fan, J., W. Wang, and Y. Zhong (2019). Robust covariance estimation for approximate factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 208(1), 5–22.
- Fan, J., J. Zhang, and K. Yu (2012). Vast portfolio selection with gross-exposure constraints. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(498), 592–606.
- Fan, Q., R. Wu, Y. Yang, and W. Zhong (2024). Time-varying minimum variance portfolio. *Journal of Econometrics* 239, 105339.
- Feng, G., S. Giglio, and D. Xiu (2020). Taming the factor zoo: A test of new factors. *The Journal of Finance* 75(3), 1327–1370.
- Giglio, S., B. Kelly, and D. Xiu (2022). Factor models, machine learning, and asset pricing. *Annual Review of Financial Economics* 14, 337–368.
- Harvey, C. R. and Y. Liu (2021). Lucky factors. *Journal of Financial Economics* 141(2), 413–435.
- Huber, P. J. (1964). Robust estimation of a location parameter. *The Annals of Statistics* 53, 73–101.
- Huber, P. J. (1973). Robust regression: Asymptotics, conjectures and monte carlo. *The Annals of Statistics* 1, 799–821.
- Jagannathan, R. and T. Ma (2003). Risk reduction in large portfolios: Why imposing the wrong constraints helps. *The Journal of Finance* 58(4), 1651–1683.
- Ledoit, O. and M. Wolf (2003). Improved estimation of the covariance matrix of stock returns with an application to portfolio selection. *Journal of Empirical Finance* 10(5), 603–621.
- Ledoit, O. and M. Wolf (2017). Nonlinear shrinkage of the covariance matrix for portfolio selection: Markowitz meets goldilocks. *The Review of Financial Studies* 30(12), 4349–4388.
- Li, G., L. Huang, J. Yang, and W. Zhang (2022). A synthetic regression model for large portfolio allocation. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40(4), 1665–1677.

- Li, Q. and L. Li (2022). Integrative factor regression and its inference for multimodal data analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 117(540), 2207–2221.
- Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. *Journal of Finance*, 77–91.
- Maronna, R. (2005). Principal components and orthogonal regression based on robust scales. *Technometrics* 47(3), 264–273.
- Petukhina, A., Y. Klochkov, W. Härdle, and N. Zhivotovskiy (2024). Robustifying Markowitz. *Journal of Econometrics* 239(2), 105387.
- Plachel, L. (2019). A unified model for regularized and robust portfolio optimization. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 109, 103779.
- Ross, S. A. (1976). The arbitrage theory of capital asset pricing. *Journal of Economic Theory* 13(3), 341–360.
- Su, L. and X. Wang (2017). On time-varying factor models: Estimation and testing. *Journal of Econometrics* 198(1), 84–101.
- Wang, H., B. Peng, D. Li, and C. Leng (2021). Nonparametric estimation of large covariance matrices with conditional sparsity. *Journal of Econometrics* 223(1), 53–72.