

# Solution to P.S.4

March 13, 2012

## 1. solution

- Given that the third portfolio is a linear combination of portfolio 1 and portfolio 2, it is equivalent to prove that

$$U(\tilde{R}_3) > \omega \bar{U} + (1 - \omega) \bar{U} = \bar{U} \quad (1)$$

- defining  $x = \frac{\tilde{R}_p - \bar{R}_p}{\sigma_p}$ , then we have  $\tilde{R}_p = \bar{R}_p + x\sigma_p$ , where  $p = 1, 2, 3$ .  
Then suppose the individual is a vNM expected utility maximizer, then

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} U(\bar{R}_3 + x\sigma_3) f(x) dx > \omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} U(\bar{R}_1 + x\sigma_1) f(x) dx + (1 - \omega) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} U(\bar{R}_2 + x\sigma_2) f(x) dx \quad (2)$$

where  $f(x)$  is the density function.

- Note that for a given realization of  $x$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} U(\bar{R}_3 + x\sigma_3) &= U(\omega(\bar{R}_1 + x\sigma_1) + (1 - \omega)(\bar{R}_2 + x\sigma_2)) \\ &> \omega U(\bar{R}_1 + x\sigma_1) + (1 - \omega) U(\bar{R}_2 + x\sigma_2) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

because  $U(\cdot)$  is a concave function. Thus, multiplying each side of the inequalities by  $f(x)$ , which is always positive, preserves the direction of the inequality. Integrating over all the realizations of  $x$  gives the desired result in equation (2).

## 2. solution

- The logic here is extremely simple, we just need to prove when  $\omega = 0$  or 1 the efficient frontier is,

$$\bar{R}_p = \frac{\sigma_B \bar{R}_A - \sigma_A \bar{R}_B}{\sigma_B - \sigma_A} + \frac{\bar{R}_B - \bar{R}_A}{\sigma_B - \sigma_A} \sigma_p \quad (4)$$

because in this case  $\sigma_p = |\omega \sigma_A + (1 - \omega) \sigma_B| = \omega \sigma_A + (1 - \omega) \sigma_B$ .

- Then to prove it goes through the the pairs  $(\sigma_A, \bar{R}_A)$  and  $(\sigma_B, \bar{R}_B)$  , we could just substitute  $\sigma_A$  and  $\sigma_B$  into (4), and the conclusion could be proved using simple algebra.