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#### Abstract

In this thesis we explore the problem of detecting change-points in cross-asset correlations using a non-parametric approach. We began by comparing and contrasting several common methods for change-point detection as well as methods for measuring correlation. We finally settle on a statistic introduced in early 2012 by Herold Dehling et.al. and test this statistic against real world financial data. We provide the estimated change-point for this data as well as the asymptotic $p$-value associated with this statistic. Once this process was complete we went on to use simulated data to measure the accuracy, power, and type 1 error associated with this new statistic. Finally, we were able to draw conclusions on the functionality and usefulness of this statistic.
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## CHAPTER 1

## INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

Trying to predict changes in financial markets is a problem as old as the markets themselves. Many mathematicians and financial analysts have spent countless hours trying to find mathematical indicators of when a market or specific asset is going to shift in value. With the recent economic downturn which began in late 2007, this problem has once again become one of the most important issues on many investors' minds. While there are countless factors causing shifts in markets, the idea is that the asset value itself should give us some indication of an approaching change. Many people have worked on the problem of price changes within markets as a way to later hedge against losses.

There are risks associated in any financial contract that you enter. Therefore, hedging practices are used to help offset the effects of negative events. For instance, when a person buys a car or a house they generally buy insurance to compensate for possible losses. The risks themselves cannot be eliminated, but the negative financial effects that can be caused by those risks can be reduced. In the case of investment risks the practice of hedging becomes more complicated than simply paying a yearly fee in return for compensation in the event of a loss. Instead, investors strategically use
financial instruments to offset financial downturns in other instruments. In other words, they hedge against investment risk by making more investments.

A portfolio is a collection of investments held by a person or company. Asset allocation within a portfolio is the way in which a person spreads the total investment amount among the individual investments within that portfolio. The idea of diversification as a way to hedge against losses uses strategic asset allocation. Specifically, an investor intentionally invests in two or more assets that are negatively correlated or not correlated at all. In plain terms, the investments are made in assets whose prices either trend opposite to each other or have no relationship to each other.

Diversification was first introduced as a way to hedge against portfolio risk by Harry Markowitz in his 1952 publication, Diversification and Portfolio Risk. Markowitz went on to win the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1990. His idea blossomed and is now standard practice as a way to reduce a portfolio's risk exposure.

In diversification, both negatively correlated and uncorrelated assets can be used. However, when two assets are strongly negatively correlated, they are both likely to respond to the same event. In this case, the value of one asset (asset A) will move up while the value of the other asset (asset B) moves down. While this is mitigates the loss in B, any time one asset is growing in value, the other is theoretically going to fall in value. In the case of no correlation, if an event happens to make the value of asset A go
up or down, that same event should have either no effect or an unpredictable effect on asset B. Asset B should continue to perform as it did before the event. While the lack of correlation might not offset negative movement as strongly as negative correlation would, the investor will not automatically lose money in one asset because the other is doing well and can actually have growth (or decay) in the value of both assets.

Improper diversification methods, including investing in strongly correlated assets or investing in a single asset, can prove to be disastrous for the investor. The old adage "putting all your eggs in one basket" is a perfect analogy for this type of investing. A prime example of this was during the Enron scandal. Many of Enron's employees had the majority, if not all, of their retirement savings tied up in Enron stock. Therefore, when the company went bankrupt and the stock was worthless these employees lost everything that they thought they had saved for retirement. If an employee had invested prudently and had a truly diversified portfolio, only the funds in the Enron stock would have been lost while funds invested in other assets would be safe (unless the other asset had a strong positive correlation with Enron stock).

Diversification of a portfolio is a continuous process. The correlations among assets can change as time goes on as well as the percentage of funds in each asset due to the outperformance of one asset over another. "In particular, correlations among stock returns seem to increase in times of crisis, as evidenced by the most recent joint
downturn in stock markets worldwide."[8] For this reason, reallocation of assets is a constant consideration. Prudent investors periodically check to see that their diversification strategies are still effective. In the case of correlations, this information can only be found in retrospect. This is to say that an investor can only look at previous data to determine whether the assets in question are correlated. Because statistical significance of the correlation depends on the number of data points being considered, the sensitivity to a change in correlation decreases as the number of data points increases. For this reason, an investor's portfolio may have been exposed to correlation risk for an extended period of time before he or she is aware that there is a problem. Our goal is to find a way to more quickly, accurately, and efficiently detect a positive change in asset correlations.

Statistics have long been used as a powerful and important tool in the analysis of financial data. Finding the expected return and volatility of an asset are two very important areas of financial analysis. Stochastic models are often used to perform these analyses. However, the use of stochastic models is more for the ease of calculation and in many cases does not accurately portray real world data. This means that, while the calculations are made easy, if the correct model is not applied the results are basically meaningless. Many times there isn't a stochastic distribution that adequately portrays the data. Two of the biggest problems with financial data are that it tends to have heavier tailed distributions than the commonly used normal distribution and each data
point is not independent of all of the rest. Looking at the price of an asset, one can easily see that the price on one day has some dependence on the price the previous day. This is why nonparametric approaches to these analyses are gaining in popularity. Nonparametrics allow the financial analyst the freedom of not assuming a known underlying distribution to the data but instead rely on assumptions that are somewhat less restrictive.

While nonparametric statistics can provide an eloquent way to find the needed statistics, the calculations themselves can be tedious and many times are computationally intensive and impractical for "hand" calculation for even moderate size data sets. Thanks to improvements in computing power and availability, the tediousness of these calculations is no longer an issue. This is why nonparametric analysis is growing rapidly in popularity in the financial world.

Another consideration when looking at financial data is that most of the time they are time series. That is, each data point or measurement is taken sequentially over time. Pricing data can be observed daily, weekly, monthly, or at any other time period. This means that these data fail to fulfill one of the most critical assumptions of standard methods - namely, that observations are independent of each other. One of the biggest interests in time series analysis is in forecasting. This is seen in the use of time series in the financial realm.

Classical time series methods such as linear regression, ARMA models, and the Black-Scholes model do not take diversification into consideration. They are strictly concerned with one, and only one, asset. This can lead investors to make decisions based on information about one asset that does not necessarily benefit the portfolio as a whole. These classical approaches also depend on fitting the data to a model, an idea that often falls short in accuracy when dealing with financial data. These are some other reasons that nonparametric methods are rapidly growing in the world of financial forecasting.

Now that we have discussed the financial and mathematical background to our investigation, we can move toward making some inferences and discussing possible solutions to the questions that we wish to answer: Can we locate a specific change point in the correlation of two assets using non-parametrics? If so, how much data is needed to detect this change-point? And finally, how robust are these methods?

When trying to diversify a portfolio, investors start by determining two or more assets that are uncorrelated or negatively correlated and invest in both assets. "Historically, diversification benefits resulted in significant investment interest for commodities." [6] However, there seems to have been a shift in correlations over the past few years leading to much higher correlations between commodities and equities as well as commodities amongst themselves. [6]

We decided to look at the weekly price data of two commodities over the time period of 2003 until the current date (March 2012). The idea was to choose two commodities that would likely be unrelated in a market sense. The first asset of interest that came to mind for us was the price of a barrel of oil. Oil in particular seems to always be of interest to investors as well as world economists. The price of oil can be influenced by many factors including unrest in the middle east, new laws and regulations set by governments or OPEC, Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, and even speculations by investors of a change approaching in just about anything that is related to the world economy. The next thing that came to mind was the price of a ton of soybeans. Factors that would influence the price of soybeans include time of year, weather (such as drought) in soybean producing countries, and the price of storage. One could conceive that oil may have a slight impact on soybean futures because the equipment used to farm soybeans generally uses gasoline or fuel powered engines. However, this seemed like it would have a minimal impact on the overall value of soybeans.

We were able to download weekly price per barrel from the Energy Information Administration web. Next, we were able to gather weekly data on the price per metric ton (1000 kilograms) of soybeans from wikiposit.com. We took the data over the same time frame as the oil prices and then looked at graphs of each of the two commodities prices.

Figure 1.1 Weekly Oil Price 01/03/2003-03/16/2012


Figure 1.2 Weekly Soybean Price 01/03/2003-03/16/2012


By simply looking at the graphs, it appears that the price patterns of these two commodities are completely different from 2003 up to 2007. Then, in late it appears that the prices of both commodities rise sharply before abruptly falling in 2008. This is exactly the type of pattern that we were hoping for since this suggests a change from the two prices being relatively uncorrelated to becoming strongly correlated. For this reason we decided to choose these commodities as our real world data to analyze.

## CHAPTER 2

# A LOOK AT COMMONLY USED METHODS FOR CORRELATION CALCULATION AND CHANGE-POINT DETECTION 

2.1 Cross correlation versus autocorrelation

The word correlation is used often. However, there is a distinct difference between correlation, cross-correlation, and autocorrelation. The ordinary correlation statistic is a measure of the linear relationship between two numeric variables. An example of this would be the relationship between a person's height and weight. The ordinary correlation coefficient is defined as

$$
r=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)}{(n-1) s_{x} s_{y}}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}}} .
$$

This statistic tells us whether there exists a linear relationship between two variables within a single data set. The ordinary correlation coefficient can range between -1 and 1 with 0 implying that there is no linear relationship between the two variables. Note that a correlation can be 0 (or close to 0 ) even when two variables are strongly related in a nonlinear fashion, such as a parabolic curve.

An autocorrelation is the correlation between a variable and its prior values. In a time series, a non-zero autocorrelation implies that the current value of the series is
dependent on past values. The general formula for a lag $k$ autocorrelation, with $k$ being the number of time periods that the second series is "lagged", statistic is

$$
r_{k}=\frac{\sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)\left(y_{i-k}-\bar{y}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_{i}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}}
$$

and has properties similar to the ordinary correlation coefficient.

Cross-correlation is similar in calculation to the ordinary correlation coefficient except that $x$ and $y$ no longer represent two variables in a single data set but rather two data points from separate time series. Cross-correlation can also be computed using a lag $k$ approach as follows

$$
r_{k}=\frac{\sum_{i=1+k}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)\left(y_{i-k}-\bar{y}\right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1+k}^{n}\left(x_{i}-\bar{x}\right)^{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1+k}^{n}\left(y_{i-k}-\bar{y}\right)^{2}}} .
$$

Using this we can see if two separate time series have a relationship. It is important to recall that correlation does not imply causation. In other words, two correlated time series are not an indication that one depends on the other but simply that they react to the same events. This is the type of correlation that investors are very interested in for diversification purposes.[1]

Even though it appeared by looking at the graphs of the oil and soybean prices that they went from being relatively uncorrelated to being strongly correlated, the only
way to know this for sure is to look at the graph of their cross correlation. Therefore, we did just that and found that we had been correct.

Figure 2.1 Cross-correlation of Oil and Soybeans 01/03/2003 - 03/16/2012


We decided to start the graph in mid-2004 even though our data set started at the beginning of 2003. This is because cross correlation is sensitive to the number of data points used. Therefore, we wanted to have enough historical data to accurately portray the true correlation between these assets before determining the strength of the cross correlation.

As can be seen in the graph, the cross correlation among oil prices and soybean prices started out slightly negative in 2004 and continues on this negative trend until 2007. Then, the correlation took a drastic turn in the positive direction taking the two assets from a negative correlation of about -0.4 at the beginning of 2007 to a very strongly positive correlation of about 0.7 in 2009.

### 2.2 Change-Points

A change-point is the point at which properties of a time series change. [7] Change point detection has many real world applications in medicine, finance, physics, and other fields. Change-points can only be detected in retrospect. In other words, a change-point can't be detected unless it has already occurred through a change in slope, correlation, or autocorrelation. The real question is how much data is needed to detect a change-point. In finance, as in any other field, early detection of a change would be very valuable. There are many different ideas and ways to detect change-points in data.

Quality control techniques such as control charts and cumulative sum charts were initially considered as a way to locate the change point(s) in our financial time series data. Control charts are a traditional way to detect changes in a process due to 'special causes' such as a change in a materials supplier in the case of manufacturing, rather than what would be considered common variation or random "noise". The
stability or instability of the process can then been shown graphically. One benefit to control charts is that they can be updated with each new data point. At first, looking at the problem of detecting a change in correlation using control charts seemed like a reasonable option. We want two assets to be uncorrelated to make our diversification methods effective. Therefore, a window around 0 correlation could be considered 'in control' for our time series. Cumulative sum charts (CUSUM) were introduced by E. S. Page from the University of Cambridge. These charts are another method to detect a change in some parameter of interest, $\Theta$. The process involves summing samples from a process $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{n}}$ and the assigned weights $\omega_{n}$ (usually the likelihood function) as follows:

$$
\begin{gathered}
S_{n}=0 \\
S_{n+1}=\max \left(0, S_{n}+X_{n}-\omega_{n}\right) .
\end{gathered}
$$

The change is detected by a value of $S_{n}$ exceeding a given threshold for the process. However, these detection methods generally rely on a time series being stationary, independent and identically distributed (iid), and at least the distribution before the change being known. Financial data cannot be assumed to be stationary and in fact is usually not. Think of long term changes in the Dow Jones Industrial Average, for example. Financial time series data is not iid. In fact, as has been previously stated, data in financial time series are generally dependent on previous values. Also stochastic distributions rarely accurately model financial time series data. With these assumptions
not being met, the idea of using quality control methods to detect a change in asset price correlations was abandoned.

With the fairly recent increase in computing power, non-parametric methods seem to be the new horizon for financial data analysis. There are several methods of testing for independence of bivariate data sets non-parametrically. They include a distribution-free test for independence based on signs known as Kendall's Tau and a distribution-free test for independence based on ranks known as the Spearman Coefficient.

### 2.3 Kendall's Tau

Suppose we are studying a sample of $n$ pairs $\left(X_{1}, Y_{1}\right),\left(X_{2}, Y_{2}\right), \ldots\left(X_{n}, Y_{n}\right)$ from a continuous bivariate density. Kendall's Tau uses the idea of concordant and discordant pairs. A concordant pair, $\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}, Y_{i}\right)$, is a pair of observations that move in the same direction. [4]

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}<\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { and } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}<\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
& \text { or } \\
& \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}>\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { and } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}>\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}
\end{aligned}
$$

A discordant pair is a pair of observations that move in different directions.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}<\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { and } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}>\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}} \\
\text { or } \\
\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}>\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}} \text { and } \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}<\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}
\end{gathered}
$$

We start by assuming that $\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ are iid from some joint distribution $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{xy}}$. By definition, this means that $\mathrm{F}_{x y}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{x}) \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{y})$. Define the null hypothesis as $\mathrm{H}_{0}=$ $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{xy}}(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})=\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{x}}(\mathrm{x}) \mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{y})$ and our $\tau$ as $\tau=2^{*} \mathrm{P}\left(\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)>0\right)-1$. One can easily see that X independent of $Y$ implies that $\tau=0$. By the law of contraposition $\tau \neq 0$ implies that $X$ is not independent of Y. A warning: this is an "if" and not an "if and only if" statement. Therefore, $\tau=0$ does NOT imply that $X$ and $Y$ are independent. We expect $\tau>0$ if there are mostly concordant pairs implying a positive association and $\tau<0$ if there are mostly discordant pairs implying a negative association. [4] The value of $\tau$ is not a measure of association but rather a probability estimate. To compute the Kendall's sample correlation statistic for Kendall's sign test simply subtract the number of discordant pairs from the number of concordant pairs in the data set, i.e. $K=C-D$. For the exact test, we reject $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ if:

Right Tailed: $\mathrm{K} \geq \mathrm{k}_{\alpha}$

Left Tailed: $\mathrm{K} \leq-\mathrm{k}_{\alpha}$

Two-Tailed: $|\mathrm{K}| \geq \mathrm{k}_{\alpha / 2}$

For the right tail test, the alternative $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\tau>0$ implies a positive correlation. For the left tailed test, $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\tau<0$ implying a negative correlation. Finally, the two-tailed test has $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\tau \neq 0$. The two-tailed test simply implies an associate without specifying positive or negative. There are three types of Kendall's $\tau, \tau_{a}, \tau_{\mathrm{b}}$, and $\tau_{c}$. $\tau_{\mathrm{a}}$ does not adjust for ties. $\tau_{\mathrm{b}}$ does make an adjustment for ties. This is the only one that SAS will compute. The type $\tau_{c}$ is generally used for rectangular matrices. [4] Since $\tau$ is a probability that cannot be found explicitly, there is an estimation for $\tau, \hat{\tau}^{\hat{c}}[5]$.

$$
\hat{\tau}=\frac{2 K}{n(n-1)}=\frac{2 K}{\binom{n}{2}}
$$

For the large sample approximation of K :

$$
\mathrm{K}^{*}=\frac{K-E_{0}(K)}{\sqrt{\left\{\operatorname{var}_{0}(K)\right\}}}=\frac{K}{\sqrt{\left\{\frac{n(n-1)(2 n+5)}{18}\right\}}}
$$

Here, we reject $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ if:

Right Tailed: $\mathrm{K}^{*} \geq z_{\alpha}$

Left Tailed: $K^{*} \leq-z_{\alpha}$

Two-Tailed: $\left|\mathrm{K}^{*}\right| \geq z_{\alpha / 2}[5]$

In SAS, proc corr will return the large sample approximation for Kendall's Tau correlation statistic along with the associated p-value. There is an asymptotic confidence interval for Kendall's Tau by Samara-Randles, Fligner-Rust, and Noether. [5] However,
like many non-parametric calculations, this calculation is tedious and the formula has been omitted for brevity.

### 2.4 Spearman's Rank Test

The initial assumptions for Spearman's Rank Test are the same as for Kendall's tau including data being from a bivariate distribution with joint density $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{xy}}$ and marginal distributions $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{y}}$. However, unlike Kendall's Tau, the alternative hypotheses are more general concepts of positive and negative association. For the right tailed test, $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\mathrm{X}$ and Y are positively associated. For the left tailed test, $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\mathrm{X}$ and Y are negatively associated. Finally, for the two-tailed test, $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\mathrm{X}$ and Y are not independent variables.[5]

The test procedure begins by ranking the $X$ and $Y$ separately with $R_{i}=\operatorname{rank}\left(x_{i}\right)$ and $S_{i}=$ $\operatorname{rank}\left(\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$. We then define $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{i}}$. To calculate the exact Spearman's Rank Coefficient:

$$
r_{s}=\frac{12 \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\left[R_{i}-\frac{n+1}{2}\right]\left[S_{i}-\frac{n+1}{2}\right]\right\}}{n\left(n^{2}-1\right)}=1-\frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^{n} D_{i}^{2}}{n\left(n^{2}-1\right)}
$$

where $D_{i}=S_{i}-R_{i}$, for $i=1,2, \ldots n$.

Reject the null hypotheses, $\mathrm{H}_{0}$, as follows:

## Right Tail: $r_{s} \geq r_{s, \alpha}$

Left Tailed: $r_{s} \leq-r_{s, \alpha}$

Two-Tailed: $\left|r_{s}\right| \geq r_{s, \alpha / 2}$

The large sample approximation for $r_{s}$ is:

$$
r_{s}^{*}=\frac{r_{s}-E_{0}\left(r_{s}\right)}{\sqrt{\left\{\operatorname{var}_{0}\left(r_{s}\right)\right\}}}=\sqrt{(n-1)} r_{s}
$$

since $E_{0}\left(r_{s}\right)=0$ and $\operatorname{varor}_{0}\left(r_{s}\right)=\frac{1}{n-1}$. Now, we reject $H_{0}$ if:

$$
\text { Right Tail: } r_{s}^{*} \geq z_{\alpha}
$$

Left Tailed: $r_{s}{ }^{*} \leq-z_{\alpha}$

Two-Tailed: $\left|r_{s}{ }^{*}\right| \geq z_{\alpha / 2}$

Dominik Wied and Walter Kramer [9] proposed a test statistic for finding a change point based on the Pearson Correlation Coefficient, Q , where

$$
\rho_{t}=\frac{\operatorname{Cov}\left(X_{t}, Y_{t}\right)}{\sqrt{\operatorname{Var}\left(X_{t}\right)} \sqrt{\operatorname{Var}\left(Y_{t}\right)}}
$$

They were testing whether the correlation between $X_{t}$ and $Y_{t}$ is constant over time. For their test $H_{0}: \varrho_{\mathrm{t}}=\mathrm{Q}_{0} \forall \mathrm{t} \in\{1, \ldots, \mathrm{~T}\}$ versus $H_{1}: \exists \mathrm{t} \in\{1, \ldots, \mathrm{~T}-1\}$ such that $\rho_{\mathrm{t}} \neq \rho_{\mathrm{t}+1}$ for a constant $\rho_{0}$. The proposed test statistic is

$$
Q_{t}(X, Y)=\widehat{D} \max _{1 \leq j \leq T}\left(\frac{j}{\sqrt{T}}\left|\hat{\rho}_{j}-\hat{\rho}_{T}\right|\right)
$$

where,

$$
\hat{\rho}_{k}=\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{k}\left(X_{t}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)\left(Y_{t}-\bar{Y}_{k}\right)}{\sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{k}\left(X_{t}-\bar{X}_{k}\right)^{2}} \sqrt{\sum_{t=1}^{k}\left(Y_{t}-\bar{Y}_{k}\right)^{2}}}
$$

and

$$
\bar{X}_{k}=\frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{k} X_{t} \text { and } \bar{Y}_{k}=\frac{1}{k} \sum_{t=1}^{k} \bar{Y}_{t} .
$$

Wied et al. specified the scalar $\widehat{D}$ which is needed for the asymptotic null distribution. The idea behind this test statistic is that "the test rejects the null hypothesis of constant correlation if the empirical correlations fluctuate too much."[8]

This approach was considered. However, we believed that there was a better approach that did not depend on a parametric statistic such as the Pearson Coefficient. We found an approach based on Spearman's Rho proposed by Wied, Dehling, van Kampen, and Vogle (2011). Here, the previous work of Wied and Dehling using Pearson's Coefficient is altered to be closely related to Spearman's Rho. The test statistic is

$$
W=\widehat{D} \max _{1 \leq k \leq n}\left|\frac{k}{\sqrt{n}}\left(\hat{\rho}_{k}-\hat{\rho}_{n}\right)\right|
$$

where $\widehat{D}$ is given by the authors but omitted here for brevity. One can immediately see the similarities to the test statistic $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{t}}(\mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Y})$. This makes sense as the two proposed test statistics share several authors.

While Spearman's Rho and Kendall's Tau are similar in statistical properties, Croux and Dehon (2010) compare the robustness and efficiency at the normal model and conclude that Kendall's Tau is the more favorable option. Dehling shared these feelings as he along with Vogel, Wendler, and Wied authored a paper in March 2012 proposing a new test statistic that is closely related to Kendall's Tau. This is the test statistic that we endeavored to research further.

## CHAPTER 3

## METHODS

Dehling extended the work that he did with Wied and Kramer to take a nonparametric approach to the problem of locating a change point among asset correlations. He started by changing the test statistic to depend on Kendall's Tau rather than the Pearson Coefficient. Instead of directly calculating the correlation of two time series, Kendall's Tau tells the probability of an association and whether that association is positive or negative. Another argument for the use of Kendall's Tau over Person's Coefficient is that $\tau$ "possesses a higher efficiency at heavy tailed distributions." [2] However, Dehling et al. used $\tau_{a}$ and we used $\tau_{\mathrm{b}}$. We did this for several reasons. First, the program that we used (SAS) to find the test statistic and p-value for both our financial pricing data and for our simulations will only compute $\tau_{\mathrm{b}}$. Second, we believe that it is unreasonable not to account for ties. Third, of my financial pricing data which has 481 pairs, only 17 ties occurred in the oil prices and 4 in soybean prices. This means that the difference between $\tau_{\mathrm{a}}$ and $\tau_{\mathrm{b}}$ will be negligible.

Another inconsistency is in the general way that $\tau$ is defined and the way that Dehling et al. defined it. The general definition is, as stated in the previous chapter, $\tau=2^{*} \mathrm{P}\left(\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}-\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)>0\right)-1$. This is the definition that SAS uses when finding $\hat{\tau}$. Dehling et al. used the definition $\tau=\mathrm{P}\left(\left(\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-}-\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-}-\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}-1}\right)>0\right)$. This definition is what was used to
describe the asymptotic distribution and therefore will not only have an effect on the test statistic but also the asymptotic p-value. Fortunately, this is a linear transformation so we simply performed the inverse linear transformation on the $\tau^{\prime}$ s found in our program to fix the discrepancy.

The test statistic proposed by Dehling is

$$
\hat{T}_{n}=\max _{1 \leq k \leq n}\left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{n}}\left|\hat{\tau}_{k}-\hat{\tau}_{n}\right|\right)
$$

The null hypothesis for this test statistic is $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ : there is no change in correlation between the marginal distributions of the pairs $\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$ and the alternative is $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ :there is a change in correlation between $\left(\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$.

In the paper "An Efficient and Robust Test for Change-Points in Correlation" the authors described and developed the test statistic and the $p$-value for the statistic, however, they failed to run their test statistic on any real world data. We decided that would be the place to start. Once we had successfully written code in SAS to calculate the $\widehat{T}_{n}$ and p-value, we ran it on real financial data as well as simulated data sets.

The SAS code for our test statistic and p-value worked in steps. First, the data was used to find Kendall's Tau for each paired data point. This was accomplished by building a "new" data set by adding each point to the previous points one at a time and outputting each $\hat{\tau}_{k}$ into a data set. Once this was accomplished we had our $\hat{\tau}_{n}$ which
was the last entry in our table. Next, the function $\hat{T}_{k}=\frac{k}{\sqrt{n}}\left|\hat{\tau}_{k}-\hat{\tau}_{n}\right|$ was applied for each $k$ and saved to the data set. The final step was to sort the data in descending order by $\hat{T}_{k}$. This made the first entry in our data set the maximum and therefore our test statistic $\hat{T}_{n}$. Once the test statistic was located, we could continue on to find the asymptotic p-value. This was found by first finding $\widehat{D}_{n}^{2}$ which is a function of the kernel that was given by Dehling et al. Once we had $\widehat{D}_{n}^{2}$, we could continue by using the joint distribution, $F_{x y}$, with $\widehat{D}_{n}^{2}$ to find the asymptotic p -value for our test statistic. For more information on this process, please refer to Dehling et al.'s "An Efficient and Robust Test for ChangePoints in Correlations."

One objective was to use the code to run simulations to determine the efficiency of the test statistic. We started by deciding how to generate the simulation data. It has been shown that "if a test is required for non-zero correlation between two time series, both series should first be filtered to convert them to white noise before computing the cross-correlation function." [3] We used this as a ground zero for generating our simulation data which we fitted into a macro in SAS to loop it through our code a specified number of times (n). This way, we could produce a data set in SAS that had all n outputs including the $\widehat{T}_{n}, \mathrm{p}$-value, number of observations, the correlation between the series before the known change point, and the number of observations and correlation after the known change point. With this information, it would be easy to examine just how much data was required for our test statistic to detect a known
change, how sensitive it was to change in correlation, and how often it correctly located the change point.

Once we had our real world example, our SAS code, and our method for running simulations, we proceeded with Dehling et al.'s test statistic to establish its power and efficiency. The idea was to determine how much data was needed and how large the change in correlation needed to be for this statistic to have significant power.

## CHAPTER 4

## RESULTS

Since Dehling et al. had neglected to run any real world data (at least that was published in their paper), we decided to start by doing just that. We imported our data into SAS and found our change point and p-value. According to the test, the change point occurred on February 23, 2007 with a p-value of $5.911 \times 10^{-11}$. With a p-value this significant, the null is rejected in favor of the alternative which is that the change point occurs on February 23, 2007. Looking at the graph of our correlation, this change point seemed reasonable. However, without running simulations to help determine accuracy and power, we cannot say for certain that this method of change point detection is valid or know how much data is necessary to find the change point.

Next, we ran simulations where we would know the true change point and control how much change in correlation occurred. Our parameters for the simulations were as follows: $\mathrm{n} 1=$ number of data points before the change in correlation; $\mathrm{n} 2=$ number of data points after the change in correlation; $\mathrm{r} 1=$ the correlation of our x and y before the change; $\mathrm{r} 2=$ the correlation between x and y after the change; and nsim= the number of simulations to run with the previously mentioned parameters which was always set to 1000. The values of $x$ and $y$ were determined by a random number generator from a standard normal distribution with the parameter that the overall correlation between
them remain the close to the given $r 1$ and $r 2$. This information was then put through our original SAS code to determine Kendall's Tau for each $\left(X_{k}, Y_{k}\right)$ created by the random number generator. The process continued as described in the previous chapter for each of the 1000 simulations by a macro that was written to loop through the code, generating a new data set at the beginning of each loop. Each loop output the Replicate number (the test statistic) and the p-value to a new data set to be stored and used for further examination.

After running each simulation and retrieving the data set we ran proc means to find the average change point (replicate) and the average $p$-value for that of simulations. From this data set we were also able to determine how many times the test statistic found the change point within $\pm 5$ replicates of the true change, what the estimated type 1 error was, and the estimated power of the test statistic for that particular set of parameters at an $\alpha=0.10$ level. This information yielded the following results:

Table 4.1 Simulation Results for Smaller Samples

| n1 | n2 | r1 | r2 | Avg. Replicate | Avg P-value | Within 5 | Est. Power | Est. Type 1 Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | 10 | 0 | 0.2 | 21.491 | 0.1758854 | 168 | 0.032 | 0.322 |
| 40 | 20 | 0 | 0.2 | 26.883 | 0.182776 | 244 | 0.099 | 0.241 |
| 40 | 30 | 0 | 0.2 | 31.84 | 0.1765535 | 249 | 0.119 | 0.228 |
| 40 | 10 | 0 | 0.4 | 23.506 | 0.1675343 | 247 | 0.064 | 0.294 |
| 40 | 20 | 0 | 0.4 | 29.208 | 0.1585997 | 385 | 0.177 | 0.251 |
| 40 | 30 | 0 | 0.4 | 34.018 | 0.1412458 | 385 | 0.219 | 0.262 |
| 40 | 10 | 0 | 0.5 | 24.992 | 0.1627557 | 300 | 0.083 | 0.295 |
| 40 | 20 | 0 | 0.5 | 31.535 | 0.1312008 | 445 | 0.255 | 0.256 |
| 40 | 30 | 0 | 0.5 | 36.21 | 0.1071198 | 506 | 0.351 | 0.27 |
| 40 | 10 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 21.838 | 0.1757083 | 172 | 0.038 | 0.32 |
| 40 | 20 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 26.965 | 0.177525 | 265 | 0.114 | 0.248 |
| 40 | 30 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 32.15 | 0.1704857 | 261 | 0.114 | 0.267 |
| 40 | 10 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 22.095 | 0.1777651 | 197 | 0.04 | 0.301 |
| 40 | 20 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 27.297 | 0.1736528 | 297 | 0.123 | 0.257 |
| 40 | 30 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 33.175 | 0.1541243 | 330 | 0.18 | 0.251 |
| 40 | 20 | 0 | 0.8 | 35.78 | 0.0814251 | 679 | 0.495 | 0.238 |
| 52 | 26 | 0 | 0.2 | 35.979 | 0.1923689 | 208 | 0.068 | 0.232 |

For larger data sets we looked at all of the same information except we widened the window of interest from $\pm 5$ around the true change to $\pm 10$.

Table 4.2 Simulation Results for Larger Samples

| n1 | n2 | r1 | r2 | Avg. Replicate | Avg. P-Value | Within $\mathbf{1 0}$ | Est. Power | Est. Type I Error |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 100 | 50 | 0 | 0.4 | 36.335 | 0.107399 | 506 | 0.375 | 0.3 |
| 150 | 100 | 0 | 0.4 | 140.219 | 0.041807 | 526 | 0.476 | 0.413 |
| 100 | 100 | 0 | 0.4 | 98.884 | 0.054375 | 541 | 0.491 | 0.355 |
| 100 | 50 | 0 | 0.8 | 95.514 | 0.015133 | 824 | 0.818 | 0.176 |

One can see that this test lacks both power and accuracy with these small data sets and relatively low changes in correlation. In fact, the test only has significant power once the data set reaches 150 data points and a change in correlation of 0.8.

Other consistencies among the simulations include the test's tendency toward negative bias, i.e. underestimating the true change-point, and the relatively large p values. The average p-values range from 0.015133 up to 0.192369 .

To gain a clearer visual idea of how this test performed, we looked at histograms for both average replicate number and p-value of our simulations. Here we have included some examples of this output.

Figure 4.1 Distribution of the Replicate for Condition $1(n 1=40, n 2=10, r 1=0.2, r 2=0.5)$


Figure 4.2 Distribution of the $P$-value for Condition $1(n 1=40, n 2=10, r 1=0.2, r 2=0.5)$


Figure 4.3 Distribution of the Replicate for Condition $2(n 1=40, n 2=30, r 1=0.0, r 2=0.5$ )


Figure 4.4 Distribution of the P -value for Condition $2(\mathrm{n} 1=40, \mathrm{n} 2=30, r 1=0.0, r 2=0.5)$


From these histograms we can see that there is a very large difference in the test's ability to accurately find a change point and give a significant p -value depending on the amount of change in correlation and the amount of data after the change. This test is basically useless for the first example with the replicate that was chosen as the change point is nearly evenly spread across the entire possible range and approximately $31 \%$ of the p -values are insignificant at the 0.10 level. This is not surprising for this data set since non-parametric approaches generally have less power than their parametric counterparts and the data set for this example is extremely small and so is the amount of the change in correlation. There is a very large contrast between the first example and the second. The second example has more data after the change point and a much larger change in correlation. For this example, the test seems to find the actual change point reasonably well and the distribution of the average p-values are heavily skewed right, which is what we want.

It's one thing to look at separate histograms for the replicate and p-values. It's another thing to be able to see how the replicates and p-values coincide. Seeing this interaction would give a visual representation to the idea of power and show us just how much type 1 error we are encountering. The best way to do this was to plot the pvalue against the replicate number and then estimate how many times the p-values were below 0.10 as well as how often the test found the change-point within 5 replicates of the actual change. The results were as follows:

Figure 4.5 Plot of P-value by Replicate for Condition $1(n 1=40, n 2=10, r 1=0.2, r 2=0.5)$


Figure 4.6 Plot of P-value by Replicate for Condition 2 ( $\mathrm{n} 1=40, \mathrm{n} 2=30, r 1=0.0, \mathrm{r} 2=0.5$ )


Figure 4.7 Plot of P-value by Replicate for Condition 3 ( $\mathrm{n} 1=100, \mathrm{n} 2=50, \mathrm{r} 1=0.0, \mathrm{r} 2=0.4$ )


It is clear from these illustrations that the power goes up and the type 1 error goes down as the amount of data and the amount of change in correlation go up.

One note to make about this test is that it will always give you an estimate for the change-point, whether or not an actual change has occurred. This has to do with the design of the test. The test statistic is found using a maximum function. This means that there is always at least one solution. It also means that it doesn't have a set "threshold" that must be met before signaling a change. This is important to remember because one cannot simply assume a change has occurred because the test output a replicate number.

## CHAPTER 5

## CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

While we recognize that change-points can only be detected in retrospect, we would like to require minimal data to find the change. This statistic lacks both power and accuracy for data sets that would be of reasonable size for financial data. The test only starts to have significant power once the data set has 100 points before the change and 50 points after as well as a change in cross-correlation of 0.8 . This is a problem when you are talking about financial pricing data because pricing data is taken over time intervals such as days or weeks. Not accurately detecting a change until 50 days after the change has occurred is not terrible. However, many long term investors are likely to use weekly or monthly data rather than daily. This is a problem because 50 data points equates to nearly a year when weekly data is observed. This essentially means that an investor's portfolio has been exposed to elevated risk for a year before there is a strong indication that a risk even exists. Also, a cross-correlation of 0.8 would be extremely unacceptable for assets that are supposed to be diversified. In fact, most investors would probably like to reconsider their allocation methods once previously uncorrelated assets become correlated as strongly as 0.3-0.5.

One area that was not explored due to time constraints was the comparison between the power and efficiency of this test statistic as opposed to test statistics that
implement Spearman's Rho or Pearson's Coefficient. To truly form an unbiased comparison, these three test statistics would need to run on identical data sets where the true change-point is known. To fully gauge the robustness of these three statistics simulations should be run using several distribution types, instead of only generating standard normal data. This further examination of these test statistics would give us a better understanding of when each one generates significant results and may lead to future improvements in the overall design of our test statistic.

For other fields of study that might be interested in change-point analysis, such as medicine, 150 data points might be considered a fairly small data set. In these sort of studies it is often the case that the change point simply needs to be found and the amount of data required does not have to be as small as in the financial world. For this reason, we feel that this test may have many uses in change-point analysis in general but lacks the necessary power and efficiency to be of use in the financial world, for which it was intended.
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## APPENDIX A

## SAS Code for Oil Price vs. Soybean Price



| 46 | 14-Nov-03 | 29.01 | 0.03422 | 14-Nov-03 | 773 | 0.0404 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 47 | 21 -Nov-03 | 29.61 | 0.02068 | 21-Nov-03 | 753.5 | -0.0252 |
| 48 | 28-Nov-03 | 28.34 | -0.04289 | 28-Nov-03 | 756.25 | 0.0036 |
| 49 | 5-Dec-03 | 28.93 | 0.02082 | 5-Dec-03 | 760.5 | 0.0056 |
| 50 | 12-Dec-03 | 30.17 | 0.04286 | 12-Dec-03 | 776.25 | 0.0207 |
| 51 | 19-Dec-03 | 30.87 | 0.02320 | 19-Dec-03 | 764.75 | -0.0148 |
| 52 | 26-Dec-03 | 28.84 | -0.06576 | 26-Dec-03 | 792 | 0.0356 |
| 53 | 2-Jan-04 | 29.78 | 0.03259 | 2-Jan-04 | 792.5 | 0.0006 |
| 54 | 9-Jan-04 | 31.5 | 0.05776 | 9-Jan-04 | 790 | -0.0032 |
| 55 | 16-Jan-04 | 31.7 | 0.00635 | 16-Jan-04 | 835.75 | 0.0579 |
| 56 | 23-Jan-04 | 31.88 | 0.00568 | 23-Jan-04 | 839.25 | 0.0042 |
| 57 | 30-Jan-04 | 30.39 | -0.04674 | 30-Jan-04 | 819.5 | -0.0235 |
| 58 | 6-Feb-04 | 29.66 | -0.02402 | 6-Feb-04 | 840 | 0.0250 |
| 59 | 13-Feb-04 | 30.12 | 0.01551 | 13-Feb-04 | 829 | -0.0131 |
| 60 | 20-Feb-04 | 31.39 | 0.04216 | 20-Feb-04 | 893 | 0.0772 |
| 61 | 27-Feb-04 | 32.27 | 0.02803 | 27-Feb-04 | 942.5 | 0.0554 |
| 62 | 5-Mar-04 | 33.73 | 0.04524 | 5-Mar-04 | 933.75 | -0.0093 |
| 63 | 12-Mar-04 | 33.36 | -0.01097 | 12-Mar-04 | 954 | 0.0217 |
| 64 | 19-Mar-04 | 34.56 | 0.03597 | 19-Mar-04 | 1024 | 0.0734 |
| 65 | 26-Mar-04 | 33.59 | -0.02807 | 26-Mar-04 | 1013 | -0.0107 |
| 66 | 2-Apr-04 | 32.23 | -0.04049 | 2-Apr-04 | 1045.5 | 0.0321 |
| 67 | 9-Apr-04 | 32.75 | 0.01613 | 9-Apr-04 | 988 | -0.0550 |
| 68 | 16-Apr-04 | 33.95 | 0.03664 | 16-Apr-04 | 965 | -0.0233 |
| 69 | 23-Apr-04 | 33.7 | -0.00736 | 23-Apr-04 | 967 | 0.0021 |
| 70 | 30-Apr-04 | 34.64 | 0.02789 | 30-Apr-04 | 1034 | 0.0693 |
| 71 | 7-May-04 | 36.38 | 0.05023 | 7-May-04 | 1050.5 | 0.0160 |
| 72 | 14-May-04 | 37.62 | 0.03408 | 14-May-04 | 969 | -0.0776 |
| 73 | 21-May-04 | 38.43 | 0.02153 | 21-May-04 | 872.5 | -0.0996 |
| 74 | 28-May-04 | 37.95 | -0.01249 | 28-May-04 | 814 | -0.0670 |
| 75 | 4-Jun-04 | 37.25 | -0.01845 | 4-Jun-04 | 838.5 | 0.0301 |
| 76 | 11-Jun-04 | 35.34 | -0.05128 | 11-Jun-04 | 847 | 0.0101 |
| 77 | 18-Jun-04 | 35.09 | -0.00707 | 18-Jun-04 | 872 | 0.0295 |
| 78 | 25-Jun-04 | 34.71 | -0.01083 | 25-Jun-04 | 920.5 | 0.0556 |
| 79 | 2-Jul-04 | 34 | -0.02046 | 2-Jul-04 | 939.5 | 0.0206 |
| 80 | 9-Jul-04 | 36.51 | 0.07382 | 9-Jul-04 | 954 | -0.2584 |
| 82 | 23-Jul-04 | 39.05 | 0.03416 | 23-Jul-04 | 669.5 | -0.0537 |
| 83 | 30-Jul-04 | 40.66 | 0.04123 | 30-Jul-04 | 599.5 | -0.1046 |
| 84 | 6-Aug-04 | 42.01 | 0.03320 | 6-Aug-04 | 606.75 | 0.0121 |
| 85 | 13-Aug-04 | 43.16 | 0.02737 | 13-Aug-04 | 652 | 0.0746 |
| 86 | 20-Aug-04 | 44.56 | 0.03244 | 20-Aug-04 | 594.75 | -0.0878 |
| 87 | 27-Aug-04 | 42.23 | -0.05229 | 27-Aug-04 | 600.5 | 0.0097 |
| 88 | 3-Sep-04 | 41 | -0.02913 | 3-Sep-04 | 614.75 | 0.0237 |
| 89 | 10-Sep-04 | 40.6 | -0.00976 | 10-Sep-04 | 563 | -0.0842 |
| 90 | 17-Sep-04 | 41.55 | 0.02340 | 17-Sep-04 | 553 | -0.0178 |
| 91 | 24-Sep-04 | 45.3 | 0.09025 | 24-Sep-04 | 523.5 | -0.0533 |
| 92 | 1-Oct-04 | 47.11 | 0.03996 | 1-Oct-04 | 534.5 | 0.0210 |
| 93 | 8-Oct-04 | 48.09 | 0.02080 | 8-Oct-04 | 528.5 | -0.0112 |
| 94 | 15-Oct-04 | 50.96 | 0.05968 | 15-Oct-04 | 514 | -0.0274 |
| 95 | 22-Oct-04 | 50.5 | -0.00903 | 22-Oct-04 | 530 | 0.0311 |
| 96 | 29-Oct-04 | 50.15 | -0.00693 | 29-Oct-04 | 527.5 | -0.0047 |
| 97 | 5-Nov-04 | 45.78 | -0.08714 | 5-Nov-04 | 505 | -0.0427 |
| 98 | 12-Nov-04 | 42.83 | -0.06444 | 12-Nov-04 | 523.5 | 0.0366 |
| 99 | 19-Nov-04 | 40.63 | -0.05137 | 19-Nov-04 | 550.5 | 0.0516 |
| 100 | 26-Nov-04 | 42.78 | 0.05292 | 26-Nov-04 | 548.5 | -0.0036 |
| 101 | 3-Dec-04 | 41.31 | -0.03436 | 3-Dec-04 | 525.75 | -0.0415 |
| 102 | 10-Dec-04 | 37.6 | -0.08981 | 10-Dec-04 | 533 | 0.0138 |
| 103 | 17-Dec-04 | 39.98 | 0.06330 | 17-Dec-04 | 548.75 | 0.0295 |


| 104 | 24-Dec-04 | 41.15 | 0.02926 | 24-Dec-04 | 550.5 | 0.0032 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 105 | 31-Dec-04 | 39.79 | -0.03305 | 31-Dec-04 | 547.75 | -0.0050 |
| 106 | 7-Jan-05 | 42.07 | 0.05730 | 7-Jan-05 | 551.75 | 0.0073 |
| 107 | 14-Jan-05 | 44.59 | 0.05990 | 14-Jan-05 | 542 | -0.0177 |
| 108 | 21-Jan-05 | 45.08 | 0.01099 | 21-Jan-05 | 516.75 | -0.0466 |
| 109 | 28-Jan-05 | 45.82 | 0.01642 | 28-Jan-05 | 514 | -0.0053 |
| 110 | 4-Feb-05 | 44.04 | -0.03885 | 4-Feb-05 | 499.5 | -0.0282 |
| 111 | 11-Feb-05 | 43.29 | -0.01703 | 11-Feb-05 | 525.75 | 0.0526 |
| 112 | 18-Feb-05 | 45.22 | 0.04458 | 18-Feb-05 | 552.5 | 0.0509 |
| 113 | 25-Feb-05 | 48.23 | 0.06656 | 25-Feb-05 | 597.5 | 0.0814 |
| 114 | 4-Mar-05 | 51.33 | 0.06428 | 4-Mar-05 | 622.75 | 0.0423 |
| 115 | 11-Mar-05 | 53.09 | 0.03429 | 11-Mar-05 | 656.75 | 0.0546 |
| 116 | 18-Mar-05 | 54.85 | 0.03315 | 18-Mar-05 | 649 | -0.0118 |
| 117 | 25-Mar-05 | 53.76 | -0.01987 | 25-Mar-05 | 628.75 | -0.0312 |
| 118 | 1-Apr-05 | 52.23 | -0.02846 | 1-Apr-05 | 614 | -0.0235 |
| 119 | 8-Apr-05 | 53.79 | 0.02987 | 8-Apr-05 | 612 | -0.0033 |
| 120 | 15-Apr-05 | 50.43 | -0.06247 | 15-Apr-05 | 616.25 | 0.0069 |
| 121 | 22-Apr-05 | 51.23 | 0.01586 | 22-Apr-05 | 633 | 0.0272 |
| 122 | 29-Apr-05 | 51.64 | 0.00800 | 29-Apr-05 | 619.25 | -0.0217 |
| 123 | 6-May-05 | 50.05 | -0.03079 | 6-May-05 | 635 | 0.0254 |
| 124 | 13-May-05 | 48.7 | -0.02697 | 13-May-05 | 603.75 | -0.0492 |
| 125 | 20-May-05 | 46.98 | -0.03532 | 20-May-05 | 632 | 0.0468 |
| 126 | 27-May-05 | 48.59 | 0.03427 | 27-May-05 | 667.75 | 0.0566 |
| 127 | 3-Jun-05 | 50.46 | 0.03849 | 3-Jun-05 | 675.25 | 0.0112 |
| 128 | 10-Jun-05 | 51.9 | 0.02854 | 10-Jun-05 | 666.25 | -0.0133 |
| 129 | 17-Jun-05 | 54.17 | 0.04374 | 17-Jun-05 | 724 | 0.0867 |
| 130 | 24-Jun-05 | 56.95 | 0.05132 | 24-Jun-05 | 744.5 | 0.0283 |
| 131 | 1-Jul-05 | 56.69 | -0.00457 | 1-Jul-05 | 673.5 | -0.0954 |
| 132 | 8-Jul-05 | 57.98 | 0.02276 | 8-Jul-05 | 675.5 | 0.0030 |
| 133 | 15-Jul-05 | 57.43 | -0.00949 | 15-Jul-05 | 721 | 0.0674 |
| 134 | 22-Jul-05 | 56.39 | -0.01811 | 22-Jul-05 | 669.25 | -0.0718 |
| 135 | 29-Jul-05 | 58.5 | 0.03742 | 29-Jul-05 | 671.75 | 0.0037 |
| 136 | 5-Aug-05 | 60.42 | 0.03282 | 5-Aug-05 | 658.5 | -0.0197 |
| 137 | 12-Aug-05 | 64.46 | 0.06687 | 12-Aug-05 | 643 | -0.0235 |
| 138 | 19-Aug-05 | 64.23 | -0.00357 | 19-Aug-05 | 597.25 | -0.0712 |
| 139 | 26-Aug-05 | 65.68 | 0.02258 | 26-Aug-05 | 591 | -0.0105 |
| 140 | 2-Sep-05 | 66.09 | 0.00624 | 2-Sep-05 | 588.5 | -0.0042 |
| 141 | 9-Sep-05 | 63.24 | -0.04312 | 9-Sep-05 | 580.5 | -0.0136 |
| 142 | 16-Sep-05 | 61.22 | -0.03194 | 16-Sep-05 | 571.25 | -0.0159 |
| 143 | 23-Sep-05 | 63.63 | 0.03937 | 23-Sep-05 | 574 | 0.0048 |
| 144 | 30-Sep-05 | 62.16 | -0.02310 | 30-Sep-05 | 573.25 | -0.0013 |
| 145 | 7-Oct-05 | 58.93 | -0.05196 | 7-Oct-05 | 564.25 | -0.0157 |
| 146 | 14-Oct-05 | 58.59 | -0.00577 | 14-Oct-05 | 589.5 | 0.0447 |
| 147 | 21-Oct-05 | 58.15 | -0.00751 | 21-Oct-05 | 572.25 | -0.0293 |
| 148 | 28-Oct-05 | 58.5 | 0.00602 | 28-Oct-05 | 565 | -0.0127 |
| 149 | 4-Nov-05 | 58.74 | 0.00410 | 4-Nov-05 | 580.5 | 0.0274 |
| 150 | 11-Nov-05 | 56.79 | -0.03320 | 11-Nov-05 | 593 | 0.0215 |
| 151 | 18-Nov-05 | 53.77 | -0.05318 | 18-Nov-05 | 569.75 | -0.0392 |
| 152 | 25-Nov-05 | 53.57 | -0.00372 | 25-Nov-05 | 554.25 | -0.0272 |
| 153 | 2-Dec-05 | 53.59 | 0.00037 | 2-Dec-05 | 562.75 | 0.0153 |
| 154 | 9-Dec-05 | 56.07 | 0.04628 | 9-Dec-05 | 568.75 | 0.0107 |
| 155 | 16-Dec-05 | 58.75 | 0.04780 | 16-Dec-05 | 592.25 | 0.0413 |
| 156 | 23-Dec-05 | 56.36 | -0.04068 | 23-Dec-05 | 613 | 0.0350 |
| 157 | 30-Dec-05 | 57.38 | 0.01810 | 30-Dec-05 | 602 | -0.0179 |
| 158 | 6-Jan-06 | 61.72 | 0.07564 | 6-Jan-06 | 600.5 | -0.0025 |
| 159 | 13-Jan-06 | 62.18 | 0.00745 | 13-Jan-06 | 565 | -0.0591 |
| 160 | 20-Jan-06 | 63.54 | 0.02187 | 20-Jan-06 | 568 | 0.0053 |


| 161 | 27-Jan-06 | 63.77 | 0.00362 | 27-Jan-06 | 589.25 | 0.0374 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 162 | 3-Feb-06 | 64 | 0.00361 | 3-Feb-06 | 594.75 | 0.0093 |
| 163 | 10-Feb-06 | 61.23 | -0.04328 | 10-Feb-06 | 582.25 | -0.0210 |
| 164 | 17-Feb-06 | 58.04 | -0.05210 | 17-Feb-06 | 601.25 | 0.0326 |
| 165 | 24-Feb-06 | 59.39 | 0.02326 | 24-Feb-06 | 577.25 | -0.0399 |
| 166 | 3-Mar-06 | 61.06 | 0.02812 | 3-Mar-06 | 593.25 | 0.0277 |
| 167 | 10-Mar-06 | 59.5 | -0.02555 | 10-Mar-06 | 578.25 | -0.0253 |
| 168 | 17-Mar-06 | 62.42 | 0.04908 | 17-Mar-06 | 576.5 | -0.0030 |
| 169 | 24-Mar-06 | 61.61 | -0.01298 | 24-Mar-06 | 573.75 | -0.0048 |
| 170 | 31-Mar-06 | 64.76 | 0.05113 | 31-Mar-06 | 571.5 | -0.0039 |
| 171 | 7-Apr-06 | 66.93 | 0.03351 | 7-Apr-06 | 557.75 | -0.0241 |
| 172 | 14-Apr-06 | 68.91 | 0.02958 | 14-Apr-06 | 563 | 0.0094 |
| 173 | 21-Apr-06 | 72.54 | 0.05268 | 21-Apr-06 | 569.75 | 0.0120 |
| 174 | 28-Apr-06 | 72.84 | 0.00414 | 28-Apr-06 | 587.25 | 0.0307 |
| 175 | 5-May-06 | 72.92 | 0.00110 | 5-May-06 | 594.5 | 0.0123 |
| 176 | 12-May-06 | 70.44 | -0.03401 | 12-May-06 | 600 | 0.0093 |
| 177 | 19-May-06 | 67.84 | -0.03691 | 19-May-06 | 587 | -0.0217 |
| 178 | 26-May-06 | 68.47 | 0.00929 | 26-May-06 | 582.5 | -0.0077 |
| 179 | 2-Jun-06 | 68.75 | 0.00409 | 2-Jun-06 | 609 | 0.0455 |
| 180 | 9-Jun-06 | 67.89 | -0.01251 | 9-Jun-06 | 585.75 | -0.0382 |
| 181 | 16-Jun-06 | 66.17 | -0.02534 | 16-Jun-06 | 600.25 | 0.0248 |
| 182 | 23-Jun-06 | 68.33 | 0.03264 | 23-Jun-06 | 580.5 | -0.0329 |
| 183 | 30-Jun-06 | 71.82 | 0.05108 | 30-Jun-06 | 594.75 | 0.0245 |
| 184 | 7-Jul-06 | 73.45 | 0.02270 | 7-Jul-06 | 602 | 0.0122 |
| 185 | 14-Jul-06 | 73.99 | 0.00735 | 14-Jul-06 | 602 | 0.0000 |
| 186 | 21-Jul-06 | 73.52 | -0.00635 | 21-Jul-06 | 577 | -0.0415 |
| 187 | 28-Jul-06 | 73.53 | 0.00014 | 28-Jul-06 | 576.5 | -0.0009 |
| 188 | 4-Aug-06 | 76.32 | 0.03794 | 4-Aug-06 | 577.5 | 0.0017 |
| 189 | 11-Aug-06 | 76.98 | 0.00865 | 11-Aug-06 | 551 | -0.0459 |
| 190 | 18-Aug-06 | 72.35 | -0.06015 | 18-Aug-06 | 547 | -0.0073 |
| 191 | 25-Aug-06 | 71.92 | -0.00594 | 25-Aug-06 | 543 | -0.0073 |
| 192 | 1-Sep-06 | 68.35 | -0.04964 | 1-Sep-06 | 538.5 | -0.0083 |
| 193 | 8-Sep-06 | 65.76 | -0.03789 | 8-Sep-06 | 537 | -0.0028 |
| 194 | 15-Sep-06 | 61.38 | -0.06661 | 15-Sep-06 | 549.75 | 0.0237 |
| 195 | 22-Sep-06 | 60.23 | -0.01874 | 22-Sep-06 | 549.25 | -0.0009 |
| 196 | 29-Sep-06 | 58.76 | -0.02441 | 29-Sep-06 | 547.5 | -0.0032 |
| 197 | 6-Oct-06 | 57.15 | -0.02740 | 6-Oct-06 | 564 | 0.0301 |
| 198 | 13-Oct-06 | 58.33 | 0.02065 | 13-Oct-06 | 591.5 | 0.0488 |
| 199 | 20-Oct-06 | 58.51 | 0.00309 | 20-Oct-06 | 606.5 | 0.0254 |
| 200 | 27-Oct-06 | 57.73 | -0.01333 | 27-Oct-06 | 635.5 | 0.0478 |
| 201 | 3-Nov-06 | 56.48 | -0.02165 | 3-Nov-06 | 649 | 0.0212 |
| 202 | 10-Nov-06 | 58.02 | 0.02727 | $10-\mathrm{Nov-06}$ | 651.25 | 0.0035 |
| 203 | 17-Nov-06 | 57.85 | -0.00293 | 17-Nov-06 | 660.5 | 0.0142 |
| 204 | 24-Nov-06 | 59.2 | 0.02334 | 24-Nov-06 | 684.25 | 0.0360 |
| 205 | 1-Dec-06 | 62.59 | 0.05726 | 1-Dec-06 | 677 | -0.0106 |
| 206 | 8-Dec-06 | 63.63 | 0.01662 | 8-Dec-06 | 656 | -0.0310 |
| 207 | 15-Dec-06 | 62.56 | -0.01682 | 15-Dec-06 | 657.5 | 0.0023 |
| 208 | 22-Dec-06 | 62.44 | -0.00192 | 22-Dec-06 | 659.5 | 0.0030 |
| 209 | 29-Dec-06 | 59.69 | -0.04404 | 29-Dec-06 | 683.5 | 0.0364 |
| 210 | 5-Jan-07 | 55.63 | -0.06802 | 5-Jan-07 | 668 | -0.0227 |
| 211 | 12-Jan-07 | 51.79 | -0.06903 | 12-Jan-07 | 706 | 0.0569 |
| 212 | 19-Jan-07 | 51.4 | -0.00753 | 19-Jan-07 | 717.75 | 0.0166 |
| 213 | 26-Jan-07 | 54.87 | 0.06751 | 26-Jan-07 | 710.5 | -0.0101 |
| 214 | 2-Feb-07 | 55.92 | 0.01914 | 2-Feb-07 | 736.75 | 0.0369 |
| 215 | 9-Feb-07 | 57.9 | 0.03541 | 9-Feb-07 | 749.25 | 0.0170 |
| 216 | 16-Feb-07 | 55.54 | -0.04076 | 16-Feb-07 | 767 | 0.0237 |
| 217 | 23-Feb-07 | 58.16 | 0.04717 | 23-Feb-07 | 778.25 | 0.0147 |


| 218 | 2-Mar-07 | 60.62 | 0.04230 | 2-Mar-07 | 739 | -0.0504 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 219 | 9-Mar-07 | 60.35 | -0.00445 | 9-Mar-07 | 746.5 | 0.0101 |
| 220 | 16-Mar-07 | 60.87 | 0.00862 | 16-Mar-07 | 753.5 | 0.0094 |
| 221 | 23-Mar-07 | 61.09 | 0.00361 | 23-Mar-07 | 769.5 | 0.0212 |
| 222 | 30-Mar-07 | 66.1 | 0.08201 | 30-Mar-07 | 761.25 | -0.0107 |
| 223 | 6-Apr-07 | 68.55 | 0.03707 | 6-Apr-07 | 760.5 | -0.0010 |
| 224 | 13-Apr-07 | 68.2 | -0.00511 | 13-Apr-07 | 738 | -0.0296 |
| 225 | 20-Apr-07 | 66.21 | -0.02918 | 20-Apr-07 | 723.25 | -0.0200 |
| 226 | 27-Apr-07 | 67.39 | 0.01782 | 27-Apr-07 | 723 | -0.0003 |
| 227 | 4-May-07 | 66.04 | -0.02003 | 4-May-07 | 733.5 | 0.0145 |
| 228 | 11-May-07 | 63.91 | -0.03225 | 11-May-07 | 750 | 0.0225 |
| 229 | 18-May-07 | 67.55 | 0.05696 | 18-May-07 | 792.5 | 0.0567 |
| 230 | 25-May-07 | 70.65 | 0.04589 | 25-May-07 | 812.5 | 0.0252 |
| 231 | 1-Jun-07 | 68.45 | -0.03114 | 1-Jun-07 | 817.5 | 0.0062 |
| 232 | 8-Jun-07 | 71.23 | 0.04061 | 8-Jun-07 | 821.5 | 0.0049 |
| 233 | 15-Jun-07 | 69.89 | -0.01881 | 15-Jun-07 | 847.25 | 0.0313 |
| 234 | 22-Jun-07 | 71.78 | 0.02704 | 22-Jun-07 | 797 | -0.0593 |
| 235 | 29-Jun-07 | 71.76 | -0.00028 | 29-Jun-07 | 850 | 0.0665 |
| 236 | 6-Jul-07 | 74.79 | 0.04222 | 6-Jul-07 | 864.75 | 0.0174 |
| 237 | 13-Jul-07 | 77.76 | 0.03971 | 13-Jul-07 | 908.75 | 0.0509 |
| 238 | 20-Jul-07 | 78.24 | 0.00617 | 20-Jul-07 | 850.25 | -0.0644 |
| 239 | 27-Jul-07 | 76.66 | -0.02019 | 27-Jul-07 | 815.5 | -0.0409 |
| 240 | 3-Aug-07 | 76.34 | -0.00417 | 3-Aug-07 | 839 | 0.0288 |
| 241 | 10-Aug-07 | 70.7 | -0.07388 | 10-Aug-07 | 850 | 0.0131 |
| 242 | 17-Aug-07 | 70.09 | -0.00863 | 17-Aug-07 | 811.5 | -0.0453 |
| 243 | 24-Aug-07 | 68.44 | -0.02354 | 24-Aug-07 | 849 | 0.0462 |
| 244 | 31-Aug-07 | 70.55 | 0.03083 | 31-Aug-07 | 868 | 0.0224 |
| 245 | 7-Sep-07 | 75.06 | 0.06393 | 7-Sep-07 | 891 | 0.0265 |
| 246 | 14-Sep-07 | 76.89 | 0.02438 | 14-Sep-07 | 941 | 0.0561 |
| 247 | 21-Sep-07 | 78.17 | 0.01665 | 21-Sep-07 | 979 | 0.0404 |
| 248 | 28-Sep-07 | 78.15 | -0.00026 | 28-Sep-07 | 991.25 | 0.0125 |
| 249 | 5-Oct-07 | 77.98 | -0.00218 | 5-Oct-07 | 940.5 | -0.0512 |
| 250 | 12-Oct-07 | 78.85 | 0.01116 | 12-Oct-07 | 976.75 | 0.0385 |
| 251 | 19-Oct-07 | 84.29 | 0.06899 | 19-Oct-07 | 983.25 | 0.0067 |
| 252 | 26-Oct-07 | 83.72 | -0.00676 | 26-Oct-07 | 995.5 | 0.0125 |
| 253 | 2-Nov-07 | 90.42 | 0.08003 | 2-Nov-07 | 1001.75 | 0.0063 |
| 254 | 9-Nov-07 | 93.54 | 0.03451 | 9-Nov-07 | 1043 | 0.0412 |
| 255 | 16-Nov-07 | 90.74 | -0.02993 | 16-Nov-07 | 1077.75 | 0.0333 |
| 256 | 23-Nov-07 | 94.01 | 0.03604 | 23-Nov-07 | 1100.25 | 0.0209 |
| 257 | $30-\mathrm{Nov-07}$ | 92.16 | -0.01968 | $30-\mathrm{Nov}-07$ | 1080 | -0.0184 |
| 258 | 7-Dec-07 | 89.09 | -0.03331 | 7-Dec-07 | 1119.75 | 0.0368 |
| 259 | 14-Dec-07 | 90.24 | 0.01291 | 14-Dec-07 | 1157 | 0.0333 |
| 260 | 21-Dec-07 | 90.82 | 0.00643 | 21-Dec-07 | 1177.5 | 0.0177 |
| 261 | 28-Dec-07 | 94.39 | 0.03931 | 28-Dec-07 | 1207.75 | 0.0257 |
| 262 | 4-Jan-08 | 96.5 | 0.02235 | 4-Jan-08 | 1249 | 0.0342 |
| 263 | 11-Jan-08 | 94.4 | -0.02176 | 11-Jan-08 | 1286 | 0.0296 |
| 264 | 18-Jan-08 | 90.03 | -0.04629 | 18-Jan-08 | 1264 | -0.0171 |
| 265 | 25-Jan-08 | 88.46 | -0.01744 | 25-Jan-08 | 1243 | -0.0166 |
| 266 | 1-Feb-08 | 91.77 | 0.03742 | 1-Feb-08 | 1287.25 | 0.0356 |
| 267 | 8-Feb-08 | 89.88 | -0.02059 | 8-Feb-08 | 1339 | 0.0402 |
| 268 | 15-Feb-08 | 94.98 | 0.05674 | 15-Feb-08 | 1373.75 | 0.0260 |
| 269 | 22-Feb-08 | 97.13 | 0.02264 | 22-Feb-08 | 1420 | 0.0337 |
| 270 | 29-Feb-08 | 99.1 | 0.02028 | 29-Feb-08 | 1522 | 0.0718 |
| 271 | 7-Mar-08 | 101.9 | 0.02825 | 7-Mar-08 | 1341 | -0.1189 |
| 272 | 14-Mar-08 | 107.69 | 0.05682 | 14-Mar-08 | 1340 | -0.0007 |
| 273 | 21-Mar-08 | 103.05 | -0.04309 | 21-Mar-08 | 1207 | -0.0993 |
| 274 | 28-Mar-08 | 102.05 | -0.00970 | 28-Mar-08 | 1267.25 | 0.0499 |


| 275 | 4-Apr-08 | 100.88 | -0.01146 | 4-Apr-08 | 1277 | 0.0077 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 276 | 11-Apr-08 | 106.6 | 0.05670 | 11-Apr-08 | 1332.5 | 0.0435 |
| 277 | 18-Apr-08 | 110.42 | 0.03583 | 18-Apr-08 | 1361.5 | 0.0218 |
| 278 | 25-Apr-08 | 114.34 | 0.03550 | 25-Apr-08 | 1325.75 | -0.0263 |
| 279 | 2-May-08 | 111.98 | -0.02064 | 2-May-08 | 1292.5 | -0.0251 |
| 280 | 9-May-08 | 119.84 | 0.07019 | 9-May-08 | 1349.5 | 0.0441 |
| 281 | 16-May-08 | 122.58 | 0.02286 | 16-May-08 | 1378 | 0.0211 |
| 282 | 23-May-08 | 126.47 | 0.03173 | 23-May-08 | 1368 | -0.0073 |
| 283 | 30-May-08 | 128.76 | 0.01811 | 30-May-08 | 1363.5 | -0.0033 |
| 284 | 6-Jun-08 | 126.33 | -0.01887 | 6-Jun-08 | 1457.5 | 0.0689 |
| 285 | 13-Jun-08 | 134.12 | 0.06166 | 13-Jun-08 | 1560 | 0.0703 |
| 286 | 20-Jun-08 | 132.08 | -0.01521 | 20-Jun-08 | 1532.5 | -0.0176 |
| 287 | 27-Jun-08 | 135.54 | 0.02620 | 27-Jun-08 | 1581.5 | 0.0320 |
| 288 | 4-Jul-08 | 141.07 | 0.04080 | 4-Jul-08 | 1658 | 0.0484 |
| 289 | 11-Jul-08 | 137.43 | -0.02580 | 11-Jul-08 | 1630.5 | -0.0166 |
| 290 | 18-Jul-08 | 135.05 | -0.01732 | 18-Jul-08 | 1470 | -0.0984 |
| 291 | 25-Jul-08 | 126.7 | -0.06183 | 25-Jul-08 | 1398.75 | -0.0485 |
| 292 | 1-Aug-08 | 124.43 | -0.01792 | 1-Aug-08 | 1357.75 | -0.0293 |
| 293 | 8-Aug-08 | 116.56 | -0.06325 | 8-Aug-08 | 1199 | -0.1169 |
| 294 | 15-Aug-08 | 110.16 | -0.05491 | 15-Aug-08 | 1211.5 | 0.0104 |
| 295 | 22-Aug-08 | 111.66 | 0.01362 | 22-Aug-08 | 1321 | 0.0904 |
| 296 | 29-Aug-08 | 112.4 | 0.00663 | 29-Aug-08 | 1332 | 0.0083 |
| 297 | 5-Sep-08 | 103.69 | -0.07749 | 5-Sep-08 | 1180 | -0.1141 |
| 298 | 12-Sep-08 | 97.28 | -0.06182 | 12-Sep-08 | 1490 | 0.2627 |
| 299 | 19-Sep-08 | 89.35 | -0.08152 | 19-Sep-08 | 1143.5 | -0.2326 |
| 300 | 26-Sep-08 | 100.91 | 0.12938 | 26-Sep-08 | 1164 | 0.0179 |
| 301 | 3-Oct-08 | 91.9 | -0.08929 | 3-Oct-08 | 992 | -0.1478 |
| 302 | 10-Oct-08 | 80.98 | -0.11882 | 10-Oct-08 | 910 | -0.0827 |
| 303 | 17-Oct-08 | 69.28 | -0.14448 | 17-Oct-08 | 894 | -0.0176 |
| 304 | 24-Oct-08 | 64.4 | -0.07044 | 24-Oct-08 | 863.75 | -0.0338 |
| 305 | 31-Oct-08 | 60.61 | -0.05885 | 31-Oct-08 | 925.25 | 0.0712 |
| 306 | 7-Nov-08 | 59.43 | -0.01947 | 7-Nov-08 | 911.75 | -0.0146 |
| 307 | 14-Nov-08 | 53.27 | -0.10365 | 14-Nov-08 | 878 | -0.0370 |
| 308 | 21-Nov-08 | 47.79 | -0.10287 | 21-Nov-08 | 840 | -0.0433 |
| 309 | 28-Nov-08 | 48.53 | 0.01548 | 28-Nov-08 | 883 | 0.0512 |
| 310 | 5-Dec-08 | 43.7 | -0.09953 | 5-Dec-08 | 783.5 | -0.1127 |
| 311 | 12-Dec-08 | 41.01 | -0.06156 | 12-Dec-08 | 854 | 0.0900 |
| 312 | 19-Dec-08 | 41.71 | 0.01707 | 19-Dec-08 | 868.25 | 0.0167 |
| 313 | 26-Dec-08 | 35.38 | -0.15176 | 26-Dec-08 | 951.75 | 0.0962 |
| 314 | 2-Jan-09 | 37.04 | 0.04692 | 2-Jan-09 | 970 | 0.0192 |
| 315 | 9-Jan-09 | 45.25 | 0.22165 | 9-Jan-09 | 1037.5 | 0.0696 |
| 316 | 16-Jan-09 | 42.38 | -0.06343 | 16-Jan-09 | 1020 | -0.0169 |
| 317 | 23-Jan-09 | 41.67 | -0.01675 | 23-Jan-09 | 1009 | -0.0108 |
| 318 | 30-Jan-09 | 44.2 | 0.06072 | 30-Jan-09 | 980 | -0.0287 |
| 319 | 6-Feb-09 | 43.64 | -0.01267 | 6-Feb-09 | 1001 | 0.0214 |
| 320 | 13-Feb-09 | 45.59 | 0.04468 | 13-Feb-09 | 955.5 | -0.0455 |
| 321 | 20-Feb-09 | 40.91 | -0.10265 | 20-Feb-09 | 862.5 | -0.0973 |
| 322 | 27-Feb-09 | 42.68 | 0.04327 | 27-Feb-09 | 874.5 | 0.0139 |
| 323 | 6-Mar-09 | 43.86 | 0.02765 | 6-Mar-09 | 879 | 0.0051 |
| 324 | 13-Mar-09 | 43.98 | 0.00274 | 13-Mar-09 | 882.5 | 0.0040 |
| 325 | 20-Mar-09 | 46.43 | 0.05571 | 20-Mar-09 | 952 | 0.0788 |
| 326 | 27-Mar-09 | 51.46 | 0.10834 | 27-Mar-09 | 917 | -0.0368 |
| 327 | 3-Apr-09 | 48.49 | -0.05771 | 3-Apr-09 | 995.5 | 0.0856 |
| 328 | 10-Apr-09 | 51.48 | 0.06166 | 10-Apr-09 | 1007 | 0.0116 |
| 329 | 17-Apr-09 | 51.59 | 0.00214 | 17-Apr-09 | 1051 | 0.0437 |
| 330 | 24-Apr-09 | 48.97 | -0.05079 | 24-Apr-09 | 1040.25 | -0.0102 |
| 331 | 1-May-09 | 49.92 | 0.01940 | 1-May-09 | 1102 | 0.0594 |


| 332 | 8-May-09 | 54.83 | 0.09836 | 8-May-09 | 1134 | 0.0290 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 333 | 15-May-09 | 56.39 | 0.02845 | 15-May-09 | 1130.5 | -0.0031 |
| 334 | 22-May-09 | 57.89 | 0.02660 | 22-May-09 | 1166 | 0.0314 |
| 335 | 29-May-09 | 62.2 | 0.07445 | 29-May-09 | 1184 | 0.0154 |
| 336 | 5-Jun-09 | 67.17 | 0.07990 | 5-Jun-09 | 1225.5 | 0.0351 |
| 337 | 12-Jun-09 | 69.88 | 0.04035 | 12-Jun-09 | 1245.5 | 0.0163 |
| 338 | 19-Jun-09 | 69.68 | -0.00286 | 19-Jun-09 | 1179 | -0.0534 |
| 339 | 26-Jun-09 | 67.58 | -0.03014 | 26-Jun-09 | 1201 | 0.0187 |
| 340 | 3-Jul-09 | 68.03 | 0.00666 | 3-Jul-09 | 1243 | 0.0350 |
| 341 | 10-Jul-09 | 60.39 | -0.11230 | 10-Jul-09 | 1128.25 | -0.0923 |
| 342 | 17-Jul-09 | 61.11 | 0.01192 | 17-Jul-09 | 1009.5 | -0.1053 |
| 343 | 24-Jul-09 | 66.56 | 0.08918 | 24-Jul-09 | 1021 | 0.0114 |
| 344 | 31-Jul-09 | 68.6 | 0.03065 | 31-Jul-09 | 1134 | 0.1107 |
| 345 | 7-Aug-09 | 73.99 | 0.07857 | 7-Aug-09 | 1184.5 | 0.0445 |
| 346 | 14-Aug-09 | 72.9 | -0.01473 | 14-Aug-09 | 1100 | -0.0713 |
| 347 | 21-Aug-09 | 71.52 | -0.01893 | 21-Aug-09 | 1023 | -0.0700 |
| 348 | 28-Aug-09 | 72.33 | 0.01133 | 28-Aug-09 | 1135.75 | 0.1102 |
| 349 | 4-Sep-09 | 67.6 | -0.06539 | 4-Sep-09 | 961 | -0.1539 |
| 350 | 11-Sep-09 | 69.17 | 0.02322 | 11-Sep-09 | 984.5 | 0.0245 |
| 351 | 18-Sep-09 | 68.85 | -0.00463 | 18-Sep-09 | 941 | -0.0442 |
| 352 | 25-Sep-09 | 66.96 | -0.02745 | 25-Sep-09 | 926 | -0.0159 |
| 353 | 2-Oct-09 | 65.9 | -0.01583 | 2-Oct-09 | 885 | -0.0443 |
| 354 | 9-Oct-09 | 67.87 | 0.02989 | 9-Oct-09 | 964 | 0.0893 |
| 355 | 16-Oct-09 | 72.29 | 0.06512 | 16-Oct-09 | 977.5 | 0.0140 |
| 356 | 23-Oct-09 | 77.24 | 0.06847 | 23-Oct-09 | 1005.5 | 0.0286 |
| 357 | 30-Oct-09 | 76.07 | -0.01515 | 30-Oct-09 | 978 | -0.0273 |
| 358 | 6-Nov-09 | 76.6 | 0.00697 | 6-Nov-09 | 948 | -0.0307 |
| 359 | 13-Nov-09 | 76.25 | -0.00457 | 13-Nov-09 | 984 | 0.0380 |
| 360 | 20-Nov-09 | 77.04 | 0.01036 | 20-Nov-09 | 1046 | 0.0630 |
| 361 | 27-Nov-09 | 76.52 | -0.00675 | 27-Nov-09 | 1053 | 0.0067 |
| 362 | 4-Dec-09 | 77.78 | 0.01647 | 4-Dec-09 | 1043 | -0.0095 |
| 363 | 11-Dec-09 | 73.14 | -0.05966 | 11-Dec-09 | 1035 | -0.0077 |
| 364 | 18-Dec-09 | 71.8 | -0.01832 | 18-Dec-09 | 1012 | -0.0222 |
| 365 | 25-Dec-09 | 73.35 | 0.02159 | 25-Dec-09 | 999.5 | -0.0124 |
| 366 | 1-Jan-10 | 77.19 | 0.05235 | 1-Jan-10 | 1039.75 | 0.0403 |
| 367 | 8-Jan-10 | 79.82 | 0.03407 | 8-Jan-10 | 1013 | -0.0257 |
| 368 | 15-Jan-10 | 78.31 | -0.01892 | 15-Jan-10 | 974 | -0.0385 |
| 369 | 22-Jan-10 | 74.28 | -0.05146 | 22-Jan-10 | 951.5 | -0.0231 |
| 370 | 29-Jan-10 | 71.88 | -0.03231 | 29-Jan-10 | 914 | -0.0394 |
| 371 | 5-Feb-10 | 72.54 | 0.00918 | 5-Feb-10 | 913.5 | -0.0005 |
| 372 | 12-Feb-10 | 70.85 | -0.02330 | 12-Feb-10 | 945 | 0.0345 |
| 373 | 19-Feb-10 | 75.8 | 0.06987 | 19-Feb-10 | 945 | 0.0000 |
| 374 | 26-Feb-10 | 76.23 | 0.00567 | 26-Feb-10 | 951 | 0.0063 |
| 375 | 5-Mar-10 | 77.86 | 0.02138 | 5-Mar-10 | 934.75 | -0.0171 |
| 376 | 12-Mar-10 | 79.36 | 0.01927 | 12-Mar-10 | 926 | -0.0094 |
| 377 | 19-Mar-10 | 79.05 | -0.00391 | 19-Mar-10 | 961.75 | 0.0386 |
| 378 | 26-Mar-10 | 78.38 | -0.00848 | 26-Mar-10 | 952 | -0.0101 |
| 379 | 2-Apr-10 | 80.59 | 0.02820 | 2-Apr-10 | 942 | -0.0105 |
| 380 | 9-Apr-10 | 83.88 | 0.04082 | 9-Apr-10 | 952.25 | 0.0109 |
| 381 | 16-Apr-10 | 85.23 | 0.01609 | 16-Apr-10 | 985.25 | 0.0347 |
| 382 | 23-Apr-10 | 84.61 | -0.00727 | 23-Apr-10 | 1000 | 0.0150 |
| 383 | 30-Apr-10 | 85.98 | 0.01619 | 30-Apr-10 | 989.5 | -0.0105 |
| 384 | 7-May-10 | 82.5 | -0.04047 | 7-May-10 | 951.25 | -0.0387 |
| 385 | 14-May-10 | 78.32 | -0.05067 | 14-May-10 | 948 | -0.0034 |
| 386 | 21-May-10 | 72.17 | -0.07852 | 21-May-10 | 941 | -0.0074 |
| 387 | 28-May-10 | 70.79 | -0.01912 | 28-May-10 | 937.75 | -0.0035 |
| 388 | 4-Jun-10 | 72.71 | 0.02712 | 4-Jun-10 | 935 | -0.0029 |


| 389 | 11-Jun-10 | 72.76 | 0.00069 | 11-Jun-10 | 946.25 | 0.0120 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 390 | 18-Jun-10 | 76.22 | 0.04755 | 18-Jun-10 | 961 | 0.0156 |
| 391 | 25-Jun-10 | 76.64 | 0.00551 | 25-Jun-10 | 957 | -0.0042 |
| 392 | 2-Jul-10 | 73.86 | -0.03627 | 2-Jul-10 | 962.75 | 0.0060 |
| 393 | 9-Jul-10 | 73.95 | 0.00122 | 9-Jul-10 | 1025.5 | 0.0652 |
| 394 | 16-Jul-10 | 75.7 | 0.02366 | 16-Jul-10 | 1019.5 | -0.0059 |
| 395 | 23-Jul-10 | 76.64 | 0.01242 | 23-Jul-10 | 1017 | -0.0025 |
| 396 | 30-Jul-10 | 77.24 | 0.00783 | 30-Jul-10 | 1052.5 | 0.0349 |
| 397 | 6-Aug-10 | 82.69 | 0.07056 | 6-Aug-10 | 1059 | 0.0062 |
| 398 | 13-Aug-10 | 78.21 | -0.05418 | 13-Aug-10 | 1052 | -0.0066 |
| 399 | 20-Aug-10 | 74.94 | -0.04181 | 20-Aug-10 | 1009.25 | -0.0406 |
| 400 | 27-Aug-10 | 72.82 | -0.02829 | 27-Aug-10 | 1022 | 0.0126 |
| 401 | 3-Sep-10 | 75.41 | 0.03557 | 3-Sep-10 | 1029.75 | 0.0076 |
| 402 | 10-Sep-10 | 77.17 | 0.02334 | 10-Sep-10 | 1023.5 | -0.0061 |
| 403 | 17-Sep-10 | 78.44 | 0.01646 | 17-Sep-10 | 1069 | 0.0445 |
| 404 | 24-Sep-10 | 78.38 | -0.00076 | 24-Sep-10 | 1126 | 0.0533 |
| 405 | 1-Oct-10 | 79.82 | 0.01837 | 1-Oct-10 | 1057 | -0.0613 |
| 406 | 8-Oct-10 | 83.87 | 0.05074 | 8-Oct-10 | 1135 | 0.0738 |
| 407 | 15-Oct-10 | 83.11 | -0.00906 | 15-Oct-10 | 1185 | 0.0441 |
| 408 | 22-Oct-10 | 81.43 | -0.02021 | 22-Oct-10 | 1199.5 | 0.0122 |
| 409 | 29-Oct-10 | 82.25 | 0.01007 | 29-Oct-10 | 1226 | 0.0221 |
| 410 | 5-Nov-10 | 85.6 | 0.04073 | 5-Nov-10 | 1273.5 | 0.0387 |
| 411 | 12-Nov-10 | 87.43 | 0.02138 | 12-Nov-10 | 1263 | -0.0082 |
| 412 | 19-Nov-10 | 83.94 | -0.03992 | 19-Nov-10 | 1201.5 | -0.0487 |
| 413 | 26-Nov-10 | 83.51 | -0.00512 | 26-Nov-10 | 1238.5 | 0.0308 |
| 414 | 3-Dec-10 | 88.1 | 0.05496 | 3-Dec-10 | 1300.25 | 0.0499 |
| 415 | 10-Dec-10 | 90.25 | 0.02440 | 10-Dec-10 | 1273 | -0.0210 |
| 416 | 17-Dec-10 | 90.91 | 0.00731 | 17-Dec-10 | 1298.75 | 0.0202 |
| 417 | 24-Dec-10 | 92.9 | 0.02189 | 24-Dec-10 | 1349.5 | 0.0391 |
| 418 | 31-Dec-10 | 93.17 | 0.00291 | 31-Dec-10 | 1393.75 | 0.0328 |
| 419 | 7-Jan-11 | 94.72 | 0.01664 | 7-Jan-11 | 1357.75 | -0.0258 |
| 420 | 14-Jan-11 | 97.09 | 0.02502 | 14-Jan-11 | 1406.5 | 0.0359 |
| 421 | 21-Jan-11 | 97.34 | 0.00257 | 21-Jan-11 | 1412.25 | 0.0041 |
| 422 | 28-Jan-11 | 96.62 | -0.00740 | 28-Jan-11 | 1398 | -0.0101 |
| 423 | 4-Feb-11 | 100.36 | 0.03871 | 4-Feb-11 | 1433.5 | 0.0254 |
| 424 | 11-Feb-11 | 99.9 | -0.00458 | 11-Feb-11 | 1416 | -0.0122 |
| 425 | 18-Feb-11 | 102.81 | 0.02913 | 18-Feb-11 | 1368 | -0.0339 |
| 426 | 25-Feb-11 | 110.49 | 0.07470 | 25-Feb-11 | 1365.5 | -0.0018 |
| 427 | 4-Mar-11 | 114.53 | 0.03656 | 4-Mar-11 | 1407.75 | 0.0309 |
| 428 | 11-Mar-11 | 114.45 | -0.00070 | 11-Mar-11 | 1326.5 | -0.0577 |
| 429 | 18-Mar-11 | 112.67 | -0.01555 | 18-Mar-11 | 1362.5 | 0.0271 |
| 430 | 25-Mar-11 | 115.41 | 0.02432 | 25-Mar-11 | 1358.25 | -0.0031 |
| 431 | 1-Apr-11 | 116.49 | 0.00936 | 1-Apr-11 | 1393.75 | 0.0261 |
| 432 | 8-Apr-11 | 123.03 | 0.05614 | 8-Apr-11 | 1392.25 | -0.0011 |
| 433 | 15-Apr-11 | 123.57 | 0.00439 | 15-Apr-11 | 1331.75 | -0.0435 |
| 434 | 22-Apr-11 | 122.74 | -0.00672 | 22-Apr-11 | 1380.5 | 0.0366 |
| 435 | 29-Apr-11 | 125.36 | 0.02135 | 29-Apr-11 | 1392.75 | 0.0089 |
| 436 | 6-May-11 | 119.56 | -0.04627 | 6-May-11 | 1325 | -0.0486 |
| 437 | 13-May-11 | 114.53 | -0.04207 | 13-May-11 | 1337 | 0.0091 |
| 438 | 20-May-11 | 112.02 | -0.02192 | 20-May-11 | 1380.25 | 0.0323 |
| 439 | 27-May-11 | 113.41 | 0.01241 | 27-May-11 | 1379.75 | -0.0004 |
| 440 | 3-Jun-11 | 115.68 | 0.02002 | 3-Jun-11 | 1414.5 | 0.0252 |
| 441 | 10-Jun-11 | 117.73 | 0.01772 | 10-Jun-11 | 1387.25 | -0.0193 |
| 442 | 17-Jun-11 | 116.79 | -0.00798 | 17-Jun-11 | 1333 | -0.0391 |
| 443 | 24-Jun-11 | 110.18 | -0.05660 | 24-Jun-11 | 1320.25 | -0.0096 |
| 444 | 1-Jul-11 | 109.03 | -0.01044 | 1-Jul-11 | 1322.25 | 0.0015 |
| 445 | 8-Jul-11 | 115.39 | 0.05833 | 8-Jul-11 | 1352 | 0.0225 |


| 446 | 15-Jul-11 | 117.72 | 0.02019 | 15-Jul-11 | 1385.75 | 0.0250 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 447 | 22-Jul-11 | 118.2 | 0.00408 | 22-Jul-11 | 1380.25 | -0.0040 |
| 448 | 29-Jul-11 | 117.7 | -0.00423 | 29-Jul-11 | 1354.25 | -0.0188 |
| 449 | 5-Aug-11 | 112.65 | -0.04291 | 5-Aug-11 | 1331.5 | -0.0168 |
| 450 | 12-Aug-11 | 105.3 | -0.06525 | 12-Aug-11 | 1337 | 0.0041 |
| 451 | 19-Aug-11 | 109.54 | 0.04027 | 19-Aug-11 | 1359.75 | 0.0170 |
| 452 | 26-Aug-11 | 111.06 | 0.01388 | 26-Aug-11 | 1414.75 | 0.0404 |
| 453 | 2-Sep-11 | 116.11 | 0.04547 | 2-Sep-11 | 1436 | 0.0150 |
| 454 | 9-Sep-11 | 115.97 | -0.00121 | 9-Sep-11 | 1416.5 | -0.0136 |
| 455 | 16-Sep-11 | 114.98 | -0.00854 | 16-Sep-11 | 1355.5 | -0.0431 |
| 456 | 23-Sep-11 | 111.98 | -0.02609 | 23-Sep-11 | 1258 | -0.0719 |
| 457 | 30-Sep-11 | 107.69 | -0.03831 | 30-Sep-11 | 1179 | -0.0628 |
| 458 | 7-Oct-11 | 104.03 | -0.03399 | 7-Oct-11 | 1158.01 | -0.0178 |
| 459 | 14-Oct-11 | 111.59 | 0.07267 | 14-Oct-11 | 1270 | 0.0967 |
| 460 | 21-Oct-11 | 111.47 | -0.00108 | 21-Oct-11 | 1212.01 | -0.0457 |
| 461 | 28-Oct-11 | 111.33 | -0.00126 | 28-Oct-11 | 1217 | 0.0041 |
| 462 | 4-Nov-11 | 109.84 | -0.01338 | 4-Nov-11 | 1212.01 | -0.0041 |
| 463 | 11-Nov-11 | 114.68 | 0.04406 | 11 -Nov-11 | 1166 | -0.0380 |
| 464 | 18-Nov-11 | 110.69 | -0.03479 | 18-Nov-11 | 1168.01 | 0.0017 |
| 465 | 25-Nov-11 | 106.67 | -0.03632 | 25-Nov-11 | 1106.01 | -0.0531 |
| 466 | 2-Dec-11 | 110.05 | 0.03169 | 2-Dec-11 | 1135.02 | 0.0262 |
| 467 | 9-Dec-11 | 109.31 | -0.00672 | 9-Dec-11 | 1107 | -0.0247 |
| 468 | 16-Dec-11 | 106.26 | -0.02790 | 16-Dec-11 | 1130 | 0.0208 |
| 469 | 23-Dec-11 | 107.72 | 0.01374 | 23-Dec-11 | 1163 | 0.0292 |
| 470 | 30-Dec-11 | 107.51 | -0.00195 | 30-Dec-11 | 1198.01 | 0.0301 |
| 471 | 6-Jan-12 | 112.51 | 0.04651 | 6-Jan-12 | 1189.01 | -0.0075 |
| 472 | 13-Jan-12 | 111.78 | -0.00649 | 13-Jan-12 | 1160 | -0.0244 |
| 473 | 20-Jan-12 | 109.6 | -0.01950 | 20-Jan-12 | 1187 | 0.0233 |
| 474 | 27-Jan-12 | 109.18 | -0.00383 | 27-Jan-12 | 1219 | 0.0270 |
| 475 | 3-Feb-12 | 111.2 | 0.01850 | 3-Feb-12 | 1232.01 | 0.0107 |
| 476 | 10-Feb-12 | 117.21 | 0.05405 | 10-Feb-12 | 1229 | -0.0024 |
| 477 | 17-Feb-12 | 119.79 | 0.02201 | 17-Feb-12 | 1267.01 | 0.0309 |
| 478 | 24-Feb-12 | 123.34 | 0.02964 | 24-Feb-12 | 1279 | 0.0095 |
| 479 | 2-Mar-12 | 124.88 | 0.01249 | 2-Mar-12 | 1328.01 | 0.0383 |
| 480 | 9-Mar-12 | 126.62 | 0.01393 | 9-Mar-12 | 1331.02 | 0.0023 |
| 481 | 16-Mar-12 | 126.22 | -0.00316 | 16-Mar-12 | 1374 | 0.0323 |

ods listing close;
data work.kaili(drop=date2);
set work.kaili(rename=(date1=date));
run;
proc surveyselect data=work.kaili out=temp2 reps $=481$ rate=1 method=srs noprint;
run;
proc corr data=temp2 kendall;
by replicate;
var oilprice sbprice;
where (replicate ge 2) and (id le replicate); ods output kendallcorr = ktb;
run;
proc sql;

```
    create table ktb2 as
    select replicate, sbprice as ktb
    from ktb
    where variable = "oilprice"
    ;
    create table ktb3 as
    select ktb as tau n
    from ktb2
    where replicate=481
    ;
    create table ktb4 as
    select ktb2.replicate, ktb2.ktb, ktb3.tau_n
    from ktb2, ktb3
    ;
quit;
data work.ktb_results;
        set work.ktb4;
        t = replicate*abs(ktb-tau_n)/sqrt(481);
run;
proc sort data=work.kt.b_results;
    by descending t;
run;
proc iml;
    use work.kaili;
            read all var {id oilprice sbprice} into xymat;
    close work.kaili;
    n = nrow(xymat);
    call sort(xymat,2);
    Funi = j(n,1,.);
    do i = 1 to n;
            Funi[i] = i/n;
    end;
    xymat = xymat||Funi;
    call sort(xymat,3);
    xymat = xymat||Funi;
    call sort(xymat,1);
    Fxy = j(n,1,.);
```

```
    do i = 1 to n;
    Fxy[i] = sum(xymat[,2] <= xymat[i,2] & xymat[,3] <=
xymat[i,3])/n;
    end;
    xymat = xymat||Fxy;
    create work.cdfs from xymat;
            append from xymat;
    close work.cdfs;
quit;
data work.ktb5;
    set work.ktb3;
    replicate = 1;
    ktb = .;
run;
data work.ktb4;
        retain replicate ktb tau_n;
        set work.ktb5 work.ktb4;
run;
data work.psi;
    merge work.ktb4 work.cdfs(rename=(coll=Replicate col2=oilprice
col3=SBprice col4=Fx col5=Fy col6=Fxy));
    by replicate;
    psi = 2*Fxy - Fx - Fy + 1 -tau_n;
run;
proc iml;
    use work.psi;
        read all var {psi} into x;
    close work.psi;
    n = nrow(x);
    sum3 = j(n-1,1,.);
    do j = 1 to n-1;
            temp = 0;
            do i = 1 to n-j;
            temp = temp + x[i]*x[i+j];
            if i = n-j then sum3[j] = temp;
    end;
end;
```

```
sum2=0;
do j = 1 to n-1;
if abs(j/floor(2*n**(1/3))) <= 1 then kernal = (1-
(j/floor(2*n**(1/3)))**2)**2;
    else kernal = 0;
    sum2 = sum2 + kernal*sum3[j];
        end;
        sum1 = x`*x;
        D2 = sum1/n + 2* sum2/n;
        print D2;
        use work.ktb_results;
            read var{t} into t;
        close work.ktb_results;
        print t;
TS = t/2/sqrt(D2);
    print TS;
            F=0;
        do i = 1 to 100000;
            F = F + (-1)**i * exp(-2*(i**2)*(TS**2));
        end;
        p = -F;
        print p;
quit;
data work.ktb_output;
    set work.ktb_results(drop=ktb tau_n);
    if _N_ gt 1 then delete;
run;
```


## APPENDIX B

## SAS Code for Simulations

```
libname Kaili "C:\Users\ld01373\Desktop\Kaili";
%let n1 = 1000;
%let n2 = 500;
%let r1 = 0.0;
%let r2 = 0.7;
%let nsim = 3;
%macro loop;
    %do i = 1 %to &nsim;
    dm 'log;clear;output;clear;';
data random (keep=id x y);
    c1 = sqrt(1-&r1**2);
    c2 = sqrt(1-&r2**2);
    do id = 1 to &n1 + &n2;
    x=rannor(0);
            if id le &n1 then y=&r1*x+cl*rannor(0);
            else y = &r2*x+c2*rannor(0);
        output;
        end;
        run;
proc surveyselect data=work.random out=temp2 reps = %eval(&n1 + &n2) rate=1
method=srs noprint;
run;
proc corr data=temp2 kendall;
    by replicate;
    var x y;
    where (replicate ge 2) and (id le replicate);
    ods output kendallcorr = ktb;
run;
proc sql;
    create table ktb2 as
    select replicate, (y+1)/2 as ktb
    from ktb
    where variable = "x"
    ;
    create table ktb3 as
    select ktb as tau_n
    from ktb2
    where replicate=&n1 + &n2
    ;
```

```
    create table kt.b4 as
    select ktb2.replicate, ktb2.ktb, ktb3.tau n
    from ktb2, ktb3
    ;
quit;
data work.ktb results;
    set work.ktb4;
    t = replicate*abs(ktb-tau_n)/sqrt(&n1 + &n2);
run;
proc sort data=work.ktb_results;
    by descending t;
run;
proc iml;
    use work.random;
            read all var {id x y} into xymat;
    close work.random;
    n = nrow(xymat);
    call sort(xymat,2);
    Funi = j(n,1,.);
    do i = 1 to n;
            Funi[i] = i/n;
    end;
    xymat = xymat||Funi;
    call sort(xymat,3);
    xymat = xymat||Funi;
    call sort(xymat,1);
    Fxy = j(n,1,.);
    do i = 1 to n;
            Fxy[i] = sum(xymat[,2] <= xymat[i,2] & xymat[,3] <=
xymat[i,3])/n;
    end;
    xymat = xymat||Fxy;
    create work.cdfs from xymat;
            append from xymat;
```

```
close work.cdfs;
```

```
quit;
data work.ktb5;
    set work.ktb3;
    replicate = 1;
    ktb = .;
run;
data work.ktb4;
    retain replicate ktb tau_n;
    set work.ktb5 work.ktb4;
run;
data work.psi;
    merge work.ktb4 work.cdfs(rename=(coll=Replicate col2=x col3=y col4=Fx
col5=Fy col6=Fxy));
    by replicate;
    psi = 2*Fxy - Fx - Fy + 1 -tau_n;
run;
proc iml;
    use work.psi;
            read all var {psi} into x;
    close work.psi;
    n = nrow(x);
    sum3 = j (n-1,1,.);
    do j = 1 to n-1;
        temp = 0;
        do i = 1 to n-j;
            temp = temp + x[i]*x[i+j];
            if i = n-j then sum3[j] = temp;
        end;
end;
sum2=0;
do j = 1 to n-1;
if abs(j/floor(2*n**(1/3))) <= 1 then kernal = (1-
(j/floor (2*n** (1/3)))**2)**2;
    else kernal = 0;
    sum2 = sum2 + kernal*sum3[j];
    end;
```

```
    sum1 = x`*x;
    D2 = sum1/n + 2* sum2/n;
    use work.ktb results;
        read vär{t} into t;
    close work.ktb_results;
TS = t/2/sqrt(D2);
            F=0;
    do i = 1 to 100000;
            F = F + (-1)**i * exp(-2*(i**2)*(TS**2));
    end;
    p = -F;
results_mat = D2||TS||p;
results_names="D2"||"TS"||"p-value";
create work.iml_results from results_mat [colname=results_names];
    append from results mat;
close work.iml_results;
    quit;
data
data work.final;
    set work.ktb results;
    set work.iml_results;
    n1 = &n1;
    n2 = &n2;
    r1 = &r1;
    r2 = &r2;
run;
proc append base=Kaili.Out data=work.final;
run;
%end;
%mend;
%loop;
```

