

# QAM Final Project

By Charles Rambo, Dhruv Chakervarti,  
Aadithya Narayanan, Michael Sun





# Introduction

**Research Objective:** Comparative Analysis of Various Allocation Strategies

Inspired by paper: “Optimal Versus Naive Diversification: How Inefficient is the  $1/N$  Portfolio Strategy?” by DeMiguel *et al.*

Evaluation criteria : expected excess returns, standard deviations, Sharpe ratios, certainty equivalent returns, and turnover rates

Table 1: Strategies

| #  | Model                                 | Abbreviation      |
|----|---------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. | $1/N$ with rebalancing                | eq or $1/N$       |
| 2. | Value-weighting                       | vw                |
| 3. | Mean-Variance efficient in-sample     | mv <sub>in</sub>  |
| 4. | Mean-Variance efficient out-of-sample | mv <sub>out</sub> |
| 5. | Naïve risk-parity                     | rp                |



# Sectors replicated & Data

Table 2: List of Data

| #  | Dataset and source  | $N$      | Abbreviation |
|----|---|----------|--------------|
| 1. | S & P Sector data<br>Source: S &P Dow Jones Indices   | $10 + 1$ | SPX          |
| 2. | Ten industry portfolios and the US equity market portfolio<br>Source: Ken French's Web site                           | $10 + 1$ | Industry     |
| 3. | SMB and HML portfolios and the US equity market portfolio<br>Source: Ken French's Web site                            | $2 + 1$  | MKT/SMB/HML  |
| 4. | Twenty size- and book-to-market portfolios and the US equity MKT<br>Source: Ken French's Web site                     | $20 + 1$ | FF-1-factor  |
| 5. | Twenty size- and book-to-market portfolios and the MKT, SMB, HML, and MOM portfolios<br>Source: Ken French's Web site | $20 + 4$ | FF-4-factor  |

Date Range: September 1989 to December 2019



# MVE In sample/ Out Sample & Risk Parity

- Mean Variance Efficient :

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}_t} \quad \mathbf{w}_t' \Sigma_t \mathbf{w}_t$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \mathbf{1} \cdot \mathbf{w}_t = 1.$$

- Naive Risk Parity:

$$w_t^i = \frac{1/\sigma_t^i}{1/\sigma_t^1 + 1/\sigma_t^2 + \dots + 1/\sigma_t^N}.$$



# Excess Returns & Standard Deviations

Table 3: Excess Returns

| Strategy    | SPX<br>$N = 11$ | Industry Portfolios<br>$N = 11$ | Mkt/SMB/HML<br>$N = 3$ | FF 1-factor<br>$N = 21$ | FF 4-factor<br>$N = 24$ | Mean        |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| $1/N$       | 0.006584        | 0.006820879                     | 0.002909               | 0.007769                | 0.007105                | 0.006237576 |
| $mve_{in}$  | 0.046232        | 0.011940283                     | 0.004402               | 0.025654                | 0.006833                | 0.019012257 |
| $mve_{out}$ | 0.015140        | 0.021819592                     | 0.003321               | 0.023020                | 0.105233                | 0.033706718 |
| vw          | 0.006841        | 0.006557692                     | 0.006558               | 0.006558                | 0.006558                | 0.006614538 |
| rp          | 0.006694        | 0.007302720                     | 0.002368               | 0.008547                | 0.007191                | 0.006420544 |

Table 4: Standard Deviation of Excess Returns

| Strategy    | SPX<br>$N = 11$ | Industry Portfolios<br>$N = 11$ | Mkt/SMB/HML<br>$N = 3$ | FF 1-factor<br>$N = 21$ | FF 4-factor<br>$N = 24$ | Mean        |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| $1/N$       | 0.04014436      | 0.03930094                      | 0.019409               | 0.050617                | 0.044485                | 0.03879126  |
| $mve_{in}$  | 0.10504217      | 0.15207191                      | 0.025830               | 0.049555                | 0.012363                | 0.068972416 |
| $mve_{out}$ | 0.16135713      | 0.36925550                      | 0.210896               | 0.161758                | 1.733706                | 0.527394526 |
| vw          | 0.04049606      | 0.04217485                      | 0.042175               | 0.042175                | 0.042175                | 0.041839182 |
| rp          | 0.03914803      | 0.03675082                      | 0.018359               | 0.050516                | 0.041462                | 0.03724717  |



# Sharpe Ratio

The Sharpe ratio of naïve risk-parity produces the largest Sharpe ratio, while  $1/N$  comes in second. The mean-variance-efficient portfolio out-of-sample produces a very low Sharpe ratio.

Table 5: Sharpe Ratios

| Strategy           | SPX<br>$N = 11$ | Industry Portfolios<br>$N = 11$ | Mkt/SMB/HML<br>$N = 3$ | FF 1-factor<br>$N = 21$ | FF 4-factor<br>$N = 24$ | Mean        |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| $1/N$              | 0.164018        | 0.17355510                      | 0.149891               | 0.153490                | 0.159727                | 0.16013622  |
| mve <sub>in</sub>  | 0.440128        | 0.07851735                      | 0.170433               | 0.517681                | 0.552708                | 0.35189347  |
| mve <sub>out</sub> | 0.093668        | 0.05909077                      | 0.015748               | 0.142310                | 0.060698                | 0.074302954 |
| vw                 | 0.161893        | 0.15548821                      | 0.155488               | 0.155488                | 0.155488                | 0.156769042 |
| rp                 | 0.170995        | 0.19870901                      | 0.128997               | 0.169190                | 0.173446                | 0.178085003 |



# Certainty Equivalent Returns (CEQ)

Formula for CEQ:

$$CEQ_k = \mu_k - \frac{\gamma}{2}(\sigma_k)^2.$$

Table 6: Certainty Equivalent Returns

| Strategy    | SPX<br>$N = 11$ | Industry Portfolios<br>$N = 11$ | Mkt/SMB/HML<br>$N = 3$ | FF 1-factor<br>$N = 21$ | FF 4-factor<br>$N = 24$ | Mean         |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| $1/N$       | 0.005778        | 0.0060485970                    | 0.002721               | 0.006488                | 0.006116                | 0.005980866  |
| $mve_{in}$  | 0.024096        | 0.0003773499                    | 0.004069               | 0.024426                | 0.006757                | 0.013242087  |
| $mve_{out}$ | 0.002077        | -0.0463552197                   | -0.018917              | 0.009937                | -1.397635               | -0.290178644 |
| vw          | 0.005948        | 0.005668333                     | 0.005668               | 0.005668                | 0.005668                | 0.005738083  |
| rp          | 0.005927        | 0.0066274083                    | 0.002200               | 0.007271                | 0.006332                | 0.005671482  |



# Turnover Rate

Formula:

$$\frac{1}{T-M} \sum_{t=1}^{T-M} \sum_{i=1}^N |w_t^i - w_{t-1}^i| \quad \text{where} \quad w_{t-1}^i = \begin{cases} 0, & t = 1 \\ \frac{w_{t-1}^i (1 + R_{t-1}^i)}{1 + w_{t-1}^i \cdot R_{t-1}^i}, & t > 1. \end{cases}$$

Table 7: Asset Turn-Over

| Strategy           | SPX<br>$N = 11$ | Industry Portfolios<br>$N = 11$ | Mkt/SMB/HML<br>$N = 3$ | FF 1-factor<br>$N = 21$ | FF 4-factor<br>$N = 24$ | Mean        |
|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| 1/N                | 0.006584        | 0.02194351                      | 0.023718               | 0.018814                | 0.022231                | 0.018658102 |
| mve <sub>in</sub>  | -               | -                               | -                      | -                       | -                       | -           |
| mve <sub>out</sub> | 26.845508       | 26.46202826                     | 6.078604               | 32.830331               | 46.131542               | 27.66960265 |
| vw                 | 0.000000        | 0.000000                        | 0.000000               | 0.000000                | 0.000000                | 0.000000    |
| rp                 | 0.071080        | 0.02829952                      | 1.996711               | 19.937500               | 22.927632               | 8.992244504 |





## Takeaways

The  $1/N$  was competitive with the other implementable strategies we considered. Though some strategies performed better in some circumstances, there was no clear winner. There seems to be no premium for sophistication.

# Thank You

By Charles Rambo, Dhruv Chakervarti,  
Aadithya Narayanan, Michael Sun

