1. The third, fourth, and all higher central moments of the normal distribution are either zero or a function of the variance:

$$E\left[\left(\tilde{R}_p - E\left[\tilde{R}_p\right]\right)^n\right] = 0 \text{ for } n \text{ odd,}$$

and

$$E\left[\left(\tilde{R}_p - E\left[\tilde{R}_p\right]\right)^n\right] = \frac{n!}{(n/2)!} \left(\frac{1}{2}V\left[\tilde{R}_p\right]\right)^{n/2} \text{ for } n \text{ even.}$$

*Proof.* Moments of the Gaussian Distribution

n = 2k + 1

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tilde{R} - \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{R}\right]\right)^{n}\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} dx$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} d\left(x - \mu\right)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} d\left(x - \mu\right)$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} d\left(x - \mu\right)$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{0} \frac{\left(\mu - x\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(\mu - x\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} d\left(\mu - x\right)$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{\infty} \frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{\left(x - \mu\right)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} d\left(x - \mu\right)$$

$$= 0$$

n = 2k

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\tilde{R} - \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{R}\right]\right)^{n}\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{(x-\mu)^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} \exp\left\{-\frac{(x-\mu)^{2}}{2\sigma^{2}}\right\} dx$$

$$= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2k} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2}\right\} d\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= \left[-\frac{\sigma^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2k-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2}\right\}\right]_{-\infty}^{\infty}$$

$$+ (2k-1) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2k-2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2}\right\} d\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= (2k-1) (2k-3) \cdots 1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\sigma^{2k}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)^{2}\right\} d\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right)$$

$$= \frac{(2k)!}{2^{k}k!} \sigma^{2k}$$

$$= \frac{n!}{(n/2)!} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{V}ar\left[\tilde{R}\right]\right)^{n/2}$$

## 2. The Convexity of the Indifference Curves

For  $\lambda \in (0,1)$ , two distinguished portfolios  $\tilde{R}_1$  and  $\tilde{R}_2$  with  $\mathbb{E}\left[U\left(\tilde{R}_1\right)\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[U\left(\tilde{R}_2\right)\right]$  (implying on the same indifference curve  $\bar{U}$ ), and some third portfolio  $\tilde{R}_3$  satisfying  $\bar{R}_3 = \lambda \bar{R}_1 + (1-\lambda) \bar{R}_2$  and  $\sigma_3 = \lambda \sigma_1 + (1-\lambda) \sigma_2$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[U\left(\tilde{R}_{3}\right)\right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} U\left(\bar{R}_{3} + \sigma_{3}x\right) n\left(x\right) dx$$

$$\geq \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left[\lambda U\left(\bar{R}_{1} + \sigma_{1}x\right) + (1 - \lambda)\left(\bar{R}_{2} + \sigma_{2}x\right)\right] n\left(x\right) dx$$

$$= \lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\bar{R}_{1} + \sigma_{1}x\right) n\left(x\right) dx + (1 - \lambda)\lambda \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\bar{R}_{2} + \sigma_{2}x\right) n\left(x\right) dx$$

$$= \lambda \mathbb{E}\left[U\left(\tilde{R}_{1}\right)\right] + (1 - \lambda)\mathbb{E}\left[U\left(\tilde{R}_{2}\right)\right]$$

$$= \bar{U},$$

so that the portfolio  $\tilde{R}_3$  grants a higher level of utility and lies to the northwest of the indifference curve  $\bar{U}$ . So shows the convexity.

## 3. Note that the denominators of $\lambda$ and $\gamma$ , given by $\varsigma\delta-\alpha^2$ , are guaranteed to be positive when V is of full rank.

To see this, note that since V is positive definite, so is  $V^{-1}$ . Therefore the quadratic form  $(\alpha \bar{R} - \varsigma e)' V^{-1} (\alpha \bar{R} - \varsigma e) = \alpha^2 \varsigma - 2\alpha^2 \varsigma + \varsigma^2 \delta = \varsigma (\varsigma \delta - \alpha^2)$  is positive. But since  $\varsigma \equiv \bar{R}' V^{-1} \bar{R}$  is a positive quadratic form, then  $(\varsigma \delta - \alpha^2)$  must also be positive.

## Remark. 1) V is positive definite, so is $V^{-1}$ . But why?

We have learned the theorem: A is a symmetric positive definite if and only if all the eigenvalues of A are positive. V is positive definite, so that Av = rv and r > 0 (r is an eigenvalue and v is the corresponding eigenvector).

$$Av = rv$$

$$A^{-1}Av = A^{-1}rv$$

$$v = rA^{-1}v$$

$$A^{-1}v = \frac{1}{r}v$$

We can get  $A^{-1}$  has eigenvalue  $\frac{1}{r}$  which is always positive ( as r is the eigenvalue of A ).  $A^{-1}$  is positive definite from the theorem.

## 2) V is the covariance martrix of the return on the n assets and V is full rank. Why V is positive definite?

*Proof.* Denote  $\omega = (w_1, w_2, \cdots w_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\omega$  is a nonzero vector.

$$\omega' V \omega = \sum_{i,j} w_i w_j \sigma_{ij} 
= \sum_{i,j} \left( E \left\{ (R_i - ER_i) (R_j - ER_j) \right\} \right) w_i w_j 
= E \sum_{i,j} \left( w_i w_j \left\{ (R_i - ER_i) (R_j - ER_j) \right\} \right) 
= E \left( \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (R_i - ER_i) \right)^2 
= E \left( (w_1 R_1 + w_2 R_2 + \dots + w_n R_n) - ER_p \right)^2 \text{ where } R_p = w_1 R_1 + w_2 R_2 + \dots + w_n R_n 
= Var(R_p) \ge 0$$

 $Var(R_p) \neq 0$  as V is full rank. So we have V is positive definite.

4. To see that the slope of the hyperbola asymptotes to a magnitude of  $\sqrt{\varsigma\delta-\alpha^2/\delta}$  ,use  $\sigma_p^2=\frac{1}{\delta}+\frac{\delta\left(\bar{R}_p-\frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right)^2}{\varsigma\delta-\alpha^2}$  to substitute for  $\left(\bar{R}_p-\frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right)$  in  $\frac{\partial\bar{R}_p}{\partial\sigma_p}=\frac{\varsigma\delta-\alpha^2}{\delta\left(\bar{R}_p-\frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right)}\sigma_p$  to obtain  $\partial\bar{R}_p/\partial\sigma_p=\pm\sqrt{(\varsigma\delta-\alpha^2)}/\sqrt{\delta-1/\sigma_p^2}$ . Taking the limit of this expression as  $\sigma_p\to\infty$  gives the desired result.

Remark. Some students wonder that why the intercept of hyperbola asymptotes is  $R_{\mathbf{mv}} = \frac{\alpha}{\delta}$ .

We can imagine that the hyperbola asymptote intersects the efficient frontier at  $\sigma_p = \infty$ . Denote the intercept by  $R_{Int}$ .

We have:

$$\bar{R}_{p} = R_{Int} + \sqrt{\frac{\varsigma \delta - \alpha^{2}}{\delta}} \sigma_{p} \quad \to \quad R_{Int} + \sqrt{\frac{\varsigma \delta - \alpha^{2}}{\delta}} \bullet \sqrt{\frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{\delta \left(\bar{R}_{p} - \frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right)^{2}}{\varsigma \delta - \alpha^{2}}} \text{ as } \bar{R}_{P} \to \infty$$

$$\bar{R}_{p} - R_{Int} \quad \to \quad \sqrt{\frac{\varsigma \delta - \alpha^{2}}{\delta^{2}} + \left(\bar{R}_{p} - \frac{\alpha}{\delta}\right)^{2}} \text{ as } \bar{R}_{p} \to \infty$$

We have  $R_{Int} = \frac{\alpha}{\delta}$  which is  $R_{mv}$ .