0 Amendment

Response to 25%;

This is my corrective action.

1 Overview

1.1 Goal

The objective is to build and compare two factor-based long short allocation models with constraints on their betas.

The first strategy considers a target Beta in the interval [-0.5, 0.5] while the second has one in the interval [-2, +2].

The first operates similar to a Value-at-Risk Utility (Robust Optimization);

the second incorporates an Information Ratio.

Post optimization, I compare the model outcomes while evaluating their sensitivity to estimator length for the covariance matrix

and expected returns across market regimes.

1.2 Reallocation

The portfolios are reallocated weekly from '03-01-2007' to '03-31-2024';

Investment Universe \equiv ETFs ('Global World Economy');

Fama-French Three-Factor Model (Momentum, Value, Size);

Public Data.

1.3 Performance Evaluation

The performance / risk profiles are sensitive

to the target Beta and the market environment.

A low Beta indicates decorrelation;

a high Beta is the antithesis.

Portfolio Characteristics:

- Return : μ
- Vol : σ
- Skew : $(\mathbb{E}[(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma})^3]) = \frac{\mu_3}{\sigma_3} = \frac{\kappa_3}{\kappa_2^{3/2}}$
- VaR / ES
- Sharpe : $\frac{\mathbb{E}[R_a R_b]}{\sigma_a} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[R_a R_b]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{V}(R_a R_b)}}$

1.4 Simplification

Post Factor Model (FM) construction,

I use trend following estimators for μ .

The estimator quality depends on the look-back (LB) period; ::

• Long-Term Estimator (LTE):
$$LT \Rightarrow LB \in \{180 \text{ Days}\}.$$
 (1)

• Mid-Term Estimator (MTE):
$$MT \Rightarrow LB \in \{90 \text{ Days}\}.$$
 (2)

• Short-Term Estimator (STE) :
$$ST \Rightarrow LB \in \{40 \text{ Days}, 60 \text{ Days}\}.$$
 (3)

Term-Structure for Covariance $\Sigma \wedge \text{Expected Return } \mu$.

1.5 Synthesis

Optimal portfolio behavior constructed from

covariance and expected return estimators

will vary due to strategic and market differences.

$$S_{40}^{90} \equiv \hat{oldsymbol{\Sigma}} \Rightarrow 40 ext{ Days } \wedge \hat{oldsymbol{\mu}} \Rightarrow 90 ext{ Days}$$

Goal:

- Evaluate Hypothesis
- Demonstrate Robustness (Or Lack Thereof)
- Market Regime Stratification

2 Strategy

Theory \& Math

2.1 Strategic Formulation

Consider two strategies:

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} \max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n} \ \rho^T \omega - \lambda \sqrt{\omega^T \Sigma \omega} \\ -0.5 & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^m \omega_i \leq 0.5 \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i = 1, \quad -2 \leq \omega_i \leq 2, \end{aligned} \right.$$
 (5)

and

$$\begin{cases}
\max_{\omega \in \mathbb{R}^n} \frac{\rho^T \omega}{\text{TEV}(\omega)} - \lambda \sqrt{\omega^T \Sigma \omega} \\
-2 \le \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^m \omega_i \le 2 \\
\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i = 1, \quad -2 \le \omega_i \le 2,
\end{cases}$$
(6)

- $\Sigma \equiv \text{covariance matrix between security returns (FF3FM)};$
- $eta_i^m = rac{ ext{Cov}(r_i, r_M)}{\sigma^2(r_M)} \equiv ext{Beta of security } S_i ext{ (CAPM) s.t.}$ $eta_P^m = \sum_{i=1}^n eta_i^m \omega_i \equiv ext{Porfolio Beta};$
- TEV(ω) = $\sigma(r_P(\omega) r_{SPY}) \equiv$ Tracking Error Volatility; trivial derivation (reader exercise):

$$\sigma(r_P(\omega) - r_{\text{SPY}}) = \sqrt{\omega^{\mathsf{T}} \Sigma \omega - 2\omega^{\mathsf{T}} \text{Cov}(r, r_{\text{SPY}}) + \sigma_{\text{SPY}}^2}.$$
 (7)

2.2 Fama–French Three-Factor Model (FF3FM)

Definition:

$$r_i = r_f + eta_i^3 (r_M - r_f) + b_i^s r_{\mathrm{SMB}} + b_i^v r_{\mathrm{HML}} + lpha_i + \epsilon_i$$
 (8)

 $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i] = 0;$ \therefore

$$\rho_i = r_f + \beta_i^3 (\rho_M - r_f) + b_i^s \rho_{\text{SMB}} + b_i^v \rho_{\text{HML}} + \alpha_i$$
(9)

Estimated Coefficient Vector:

$$(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_i^3, \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_i^s, \hat{\boldsymbol{b}}_i^v)^{\mathsf{T}} \Leftarrow y_i = \rho_i - r_f \tag{10}$$

Linear Regression:

$$= \hat{\beta}_i^3(\rho_M - r_f) + \hat{\beta}_i^s r_{\text{SMB}} + \hat{b}_i^v \rho_{\text{HML}} + \epsilon_i$$
(11)

 $\beta_i^m \neq \beta_i^3$ | estimated via separate regression / computed directly.

2.3 Executive Summary Formulation

This section elaborates on the mathematical formulation established in Sections 2.1 but for executives (innumerate):

2.3.1 Strategy I Breakdown

1. Objective: Maximize returns while considering risk.

2. Constraints:

- The portfolio's beta must be between -0.5 and 0.5.
- The sum of the weights assigned to each asset in the portfolio must equal 1.
- Each individual weight can range from -2 to 2.

2.3.2 Strategy II Breakdown

1. **Objective**: Maximize returns relative to the portfolio's **tracking error volatility** (**TEV**), which measures how much the portfolio's returns deviate from a benchmark.

2. Constraints:

- The portfolio's beta must be between -2 and 2.
- The sum of the weights assigned to each asset in the portfolio must equal 1.
- Each individual weight can range from -2 to 2.

The next section establishes the necessary assumptions considered for strategic formulation and implementation.

3 Assumptions and (Analysis) Setup

3.1 Setup

To simplify, we will make the following assumptions for this experiment:

- 1. The portfolios will be reallocated weekly from the beginning of **March 2007** to the end of **March 2024**.
- 2. I define three cases:
 - Long-Term Look-Back Period : 120 Data Points for estimation of a Sample Covariance & Sample Mean; i.e., Scenario LT $\equiv S_{120}$.
 - Medium-Term Look-Back Period : 90 Data Points for estimation of a Sample Covariance & Sample Mean; i.e., Scenario MT $\equiv S_{90}$.
 - Short-Term Look-Back Period : 40 Data Points for estimation of a Sample Covariance & Sample Mean; i.e., Scenario $ST \equiv S_{40}$.
- 3. Consider two possible values for the **Target Beta** (again, *not* the colloquial slang term) : 0 & 1.
- 4. Consider two possible values for the λ (the *risk aversion parameter*; i.e., how much are you putting on black?) : 0.10 & 0.50.