



Long-Only Style Investing: Don't Just Mix, Integrate

Shaun Fitzgibbons

Vice President

Jacques Friedman

Principal

Lukasz Pomorski, Ph.D.

Vice President

Laura Serban, Ph.D.

Vice President

June 2016

We investigate two popular approaches to long-only style investing that are often considered as potential starting points for smart beta investors: the “portfolio mix” that builds a style portfolio from standalone style portfolios and the “integrated portfolio” that integrates styles directly in the portfolio construction process.

Our key finding is that integrating styles in long-only portfolio construction generates benefits by avoiding stocks with offsetting style exposures and including stocks with balanced positive style exposures.

AQR Capital Management, LLC
Two Greenwich Plaza
Greenwich, CT 06830

p: +1.203.742.3600
f: +1.203.742.3100
w: aqr.com

Executive Summary

We contrast two common approaches to long-only style investing: the “portfolio mix” and the “integrated portfolio.” Portfolio mix combines separate single style portfolios, each based on just one style ranking, while the integrated portfolio first aggregates style rankings into an overall score for each asset and then builds a portfolio based on this overall score. Our results suggest that long-only smart beta investors should consider integrating styles in portfolio construction.

We present theoretical arguments and empirical evidence that the integrated approach is a much more effective way to harvest long-only style premia. Compared to the portfolio mix, the integrated implementation:

- Improves the transfer of information into the portfolio by finding stocks with reasonably positive exposure to many styles rather than stocks with extreme positive exposure to one style that may simultaneously have extreme negative exposure to another style
- Incorporates information from the aggregated short-side of styles more efficiently than the portfolio mix (i.e., compared to the portfolio mix it is more likely not to hold stocks with poor style exposures)
- Improves trading efficiency and reduces turnover by netting trades that would have been executed in separately managed single style portfolios

Empirically, integration leads to first-order performance improvements. We demonstrate these benefits for long-only portfolios that seek exposure to value and momentum. In this simple application, integration adds about 1% p.a. to excess returns versus the cap-weighted

benchmark and increases the level of the information ratios by about 40% relative to the portfolio mix. Perhaps surprisingly, turnover savings are positive but modest in comparison, reaching about 10% per year (one-sided).

Our analysis indicates that the benefits of integration increase for mandates that seek to combine many styles, especially those with low or negative correlations to one another, and for mandates that target higher active risk.



1. Introduction

Portfolio implementation is critical, though often underappreciated, for investment success. We show how seemingly minor differences in portfolio construction can lead to major differences in portfolio efficacy for long-only style investing. Style portfolios, sometimes referred to as “smart beta,” are based on well-known and generally accepted factors, which can make implementation a distinguishing feature of success. Moreover, many style investors are long-only, a constraint that may lead to substantial portfolio distortions with suboptimal implementations.¹

We specifically look at different ways of combining style views, hence our focus is on investors who are interested in investing in more than one style. To frame our discussion, we consider an investor who already knows her preferred allocation across styles and how to define each style.² How might the multi-style portfolio be implemented? Perhaps the most obvious option is what we refer to as the “portfolio mix,” or building a portfolio by combining separate long-only portfolios for each individual style. This approach may seem appealing because it is simple and flexible, giving investors control over allocations across styles and allowing them to select different managers for different styles. An equally intuitive and

simple approach is selecting a manager who will create an “integrated portfolio” by first building an aggregate ranking of stocks that includes all the styles the investor cares about and the investor’s desired allocation across styles, and then using this ranking to build a multi-style, long-only portfolio in a single step.

We first demonstrate the differences in construction and resulting performance between the two approaches using a simple simulation framework. The simulations help to highlight the economic intuition for why integrating styles in portfolio construction is particularly appealing when individual styles are negatively correlated (as are momentum and value, or value and quality), when investors seek higher risk, or when they combine many different styles.

We next estimate how large such benefits may be in practice. We focus on value and momentum, two well-known styles, and analyze the efficacy of building multi-style portfolios using both the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio approaches.³

Integrating styles leads to first-order improvements in performance. Even at moderate levels of active risk of around 4%, the integrated portfolio outperforms the portfolio mix by about 1% per year and delivers a 40% higher information ratio.⁴ The portfolio mix, by construction, has returns that lie in between the returns that can be earned by the individual long-only style portfolios. The integrated portfolio, in contrast, may earn average returns that are higher than the highest return of individual single style portfolios. This initially surprising

¹ Many papers address high-level implementation decisions (e.g., combining multiple styles versus a single style; long-short versus long-only strategies; etc.), but fewer studies delve deeper into implementation. Israel, Jiang, and Ross (2015) review the range of implementation choices style investors may consider. Hunstad and Deckhayser (2014) analyze how efficiently style portfolios reflect their underlying styles. Using a different framework, Clarke, de Silva and Thorley (2015) and Bender and Wang (2016) address a similar question as we do, and also show that constructing a portfolio from factor sub-portfolios appears to be an inferior implementation choice.

² We take these choices as given, as there already are many excellent papers that discuss them. A sample from this large and growing literature may include Watson Wyatt (2007) (one of the first studies to propose what it termed “beta prime,” and what became known as “smart beta”), Chow et al. (2011), Amenc, Goltz, and Martellini (2013), Blitz et al. (2014), or Kahn and Lemmon (2014). We focus on equity applications here as style investing is increasingly prevalent in this space.

³ The value style favors investments that appear cheap based on their fundamental measures relative to price. The momentum style favors investments that have performed relatively well over the medium-term. The two styles are strongly negatively correlated which, as we will discuss, influences the benefits of integration.

⁴ The returns of the hypothetical portfolios discussed in this paper are net of estimated transaction costs but gross of fees and are computed over February 1993 to December 2015. Please see Section 3 for details on the construction of these portfolios.



result, seen also in Frazzini, Israel, Moskowitz, and Novy-Marx (2013), arises because integrated portfolios are able to achieve larger style exposures, which translate into substantially better investment returns.⁵

An additional, albeit smaller, advantage of the integrated portfolio construction is its potential to net trades. This benefit arises because separately managed standalone style portfolios may be simultaneously buying and selling the same stock, with no net exposure but with round-trip trading costs. We find that such netting may reduce turnover by as much as 5-10% per year (one sided).

Our results suggest that long-only smart beta investors should consider integrating styles in portfolio construction. We expect the benefits from integration to be substantial in all but a minority of cases. Such cases may include very low active risk: we show that investors targeting sub-1% tracking error will end up with very similar portfolios whether they integrate styles or not. Similarly, investors who combine styles that are very highly correlated (e.g., a book-to-market factor and an earnings-to-price factor) may gain relatively less from integrating styles. For most settings, however, integration benefits are too sizeable to be ignored.

2. Mix versus integration: What drives performance differences?

2.1. Simulation Setup

Before discussing performance implications of the two approaches, we first need to define what

we mean by “the portfolio mix” and the “integrated portfolio.” To illustrate these concepts, consider a manager interested in momentum and value (our discussion easily generalizes to more than two styles). For each stock in the investment universe, the manager can calculate the expected return forecasts based solely on momentum (ER_{mom}) or solely on value (ER_{val}). We assume the manager has a consistent process that translates stock-level expected returns and the target level of risk (tracking error, or TE) into a long-only portfolio, $Portfolio(ER, TE)$, for example via mean-variance optimization with a long-only and possibly other constraints. Now we can define the two implementations, assuming the same risk target TE_{target} .

- To build **the portfolio mix**, the manager builds two separate **standalone style** portfolios, one using just the momentum expected returns, and the other using just the value expected returns.⁶ Assuming the manager’s preferred weight on momentum is w_{mom} ,

$$Portfolio_{Mix} = w_{mom} \cdot Portfolio(ER_{mom}, TE_{target, mom}) + (1 - w_{mom}) \cdot Portfolio(ER_{val}, TE_{target, val})$$

- For **the integrated portfolio** the manager first combines information from both styles to form the overall expected return forecast for each stock,

$$ER_{Integrated} = w_{mom}ER_{mom} + (1 - w_{mom})ER_{val}$$

The manager then runs the portfolio construction process once:

$$Portfolio_{Integrated} = Portfolio(ER_{integrated}, TE_{target, integrated})$$

This seemingly minor difference in portfolio construction can lead to major differences in portfolio efficacy and ultimately returns. At some level, this is not too surprising. When making any

⁵ We estimate these benefits in a simple setting with only two styles, one signal per style, and very simple optimization. This deliberate simplicity likely understates potential gains from integration. Indeed, we found that combining three styles (value, momentum, and defensive) using a richer set of signals per style doubles the excess returns and the information ratio of the integrated portfolio relative to the mix. The tests, which use the same sample of stocks as the results presented in this paper, are available from the authors upon request.

⁶ Note that the TE target for the standalone styles needs to be larger than the intended target for the multistyle portfolio mix due to diversification between the styles.



decision, it is more efficient to consider all available information at the same time rather than apply it piecemeal. In our context, if we build a constrained momentum portfolio that ignores any information from the value style, and a constrained value portfolio that ignores all information about momentum, then we are effectively handicapping ourselves by leaving relevant data out of both decision processes.

To get a sense for why these portfolios differ, it helps to walk through a straightforward example. For this, we run a simulation, generating random momentum and value expected returns (assuming a correlation of -0.6 between the two) for 500 stocks. We can then visualize the individual stocks as scatter points in Figure 1, with coordinates corresponding to the value exposure (ER_{val}) on the horizontal axis and the momentum exposure (ER_{mom}) on the vertical axis. Stocks that are most desirable, with highest exposures to both styles, are in the top right (north-east) corner. We assume for simplicity that the investor wants equal exposure to both styles (our analysis easily generalizes to any other desired allocation to the two styles).

We begin with a very straightforward thresholding rule: we consider long-only portfolios that only hold stocks with highest style exposures (in later sections, we consider fully optimized portfolios). For example, the stand-alone value portfolio would only contain stocks with a high enough ER_{val} – stocks highlighted in yellow in Figure 1a. Similarly, the portfolio mix that combines value and momentum invests only in those stocks that have either high enough ER_{val} or high enough ER_{mom} . Graphically, these stocks are highlighted in Figure 1b. We build the mix so that it captures 25% of the total number of stocks. This means that the two standalone style portfolios hold relatively fewer stocks, which could be interpreted as running them at a higher TE target.

The integrated portfolio is based on a forecast of returns that takes both styles into account. This measure tilts towards stocks that look favorable on both factors, away from stocks that look unfavorable on both, and will be neutral on stocks where the styles disagree and offset one another. Figure 1c highlights in blue stocks with the highest overall return forecast, defined simply as the average exposure to the two styles. We chose the top quartile of stocks on this metric, such that the integrated portfolios in Figure 1c and the portfolio mix in Figure 1b hold the same number of stocks (in our simulations, this is equivalent to the portfolios having the same TE).

These simple graphical illustrations highlight important differences between the mix and the integrated portfolio. If a stock makes it into one of the standalone style portfolios, then it is held in the portfolio mix, even if it has a strong negative exposure to the other style. Thus, the mix may hold securities that have low or even negative overall expected returns because of style disagreement. We plot these “mix only” stocks in yellow in Figure 1d. Conversely, the “integrated only” stocks, plotted in blue, are held in the integrated portfolio even though they are in neither the momentum nor the value index. These are stocks that look decent according to both factors, even though they do not have a high enough style exposure to justify inclusion in a standalone style portfolio. A simple example here would be a stock that is cheap, though not among the cheapest, and that has had some positive momentum, although not so strong as to make that stock too expensive. Finally, both portfolios hold stocks, marked in green (i.e., yellow and blue overlapped), that have high exposure to one of the styles and are at least reasonably attractive on the other style as well. The punchline is that the integrated portfolio can better identify stocks with attractive returns and avoid stocks with inferior expected returns.




2.2 What do integration benefits depend on?

The above example suggests that the integrated portfolio leads to more efficient style exposures than those of the portfolio mix. The next step is to gauge (i) the magnitude of the efficiency gain we should expect, and (ii) what situations will lead to this choice being more/less important. In particular, we will show that the performance differences are larger when:

- The combined styles are negatively correlated, everything else equal
- Investors target relatively higher tracking error (TE), everything else equal
- More individual styles are being combined, everything else equal

We demonstrate this through simulation, choosing reasonable baseline parameters and

Figure 1: Overlap and differences in the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio. We use a random number generator to simulate 500 stocks with exposures to momentum and value, and build portfolio mix and integrated portfolios that each hold 25% of stocks. The plots, going clockwise from top left, highlight stocks in a standalone value-only portfolio (highlighted in yellow in Figure 1a); stocks in the portfolio mix (the combination of momentum and value; yellow stocks in Figure 1b); stocks in the integrated portfolio that builds an equally-weighted composite of value and momentum exposures (blue stocks in Figure 1c); and differences in the stocks in the integrated portfolio and in the portfolio mix (Figure 1d). In this last panel, stocks that are held only in the integrated portfolio are depicted in blue, stocks that are held only in the combination of standalone value-momentum portfolios are depicted in yellow, and stocks common to both approaches are in green (a blend of yellow and blue).



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations, some of which are disclosed in the back.



then illustrating the impact as we vary one parameter (e.g., the correlation between styles) while keeping other parameters constant. For simplicity, we assume that individual stocks have the same volatility (30%) and that they are uncorrelated beyond their style exposures. We further assume that the two styles are equally attractive, meaning that exposure to either style earns the same compensation. With these assumptions, we simulate our 500 stock universe and define the benchmark to be a portfolio that puts equal weight in every stock in the universe.

As discussed above, for the portfolio mix, we build standalone style portfolios by running separate optimizations for each style. Since we assume equal style efficacy, we mix the styles using the simple average of the underlying standalone style indexes.⁷ The construction of the integrated portfolio is a one-step procedure, optimizing the portfolio on its aggregated ERs from all styles.

2.2.1 Correlation

With these assumptions, we can assess how variations in the parameters change the attractiveness of the mix and of the integrated portfolio. The first quantity we focus on is the correlation between the two styles. We keep a consistent TE target (2.5%) and simulate two styles with ER correlation varying from -0.9 to 0.9. To meaningfully compare portfolio across these scenarios, we need to normalize the attractiveness of the styles for each value of the correlation. For example, if we simply decreased the correlation between styles without changing style attractiveness, the increased diversification

between styles would make all implementations more attractive. Thus, to make the comparisons cleaner, in all simulations we normalize the expected returns of individual styles such that the Sharpe ratio of an ideal long-short view (i.e., a completely unconstrained portfolio that fully incorporates all information the manager has) is 1.0. Figure 2a shows how the correlation affects portfolio information ratios.

First, the portfolio construction choice appears to be a first-order decision. Over much of the parameter space the integrated approach delivers substantially larger information ratios than the portfolio mix.

Second, the benefits of integration are particularly high when style correlation is negative. Standalone style portfolios are then more likely to hold stocks with offsetting exposures, neutralizing the benefits of the two styles. As the correlation increases, stocks selected on their exposure to one factor are increasingly likely to have a positive exposure to the other style as well. At the extreme, when the correlation reaches 1.00, the two styles are perfectly overlapping and the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio become identical. Recall that for the simulations presented in Figure 1, the correlation in exposures was assumed to be -0.6, which is broadly consistent with empirical data on momentum and value. Given this level of correlation, integration generates an information ratio that is about twice as high as that of the portfolio mix. The benefits will be lower for styles that are less strongly negatively correlated (e.g., quality and value), but will remain sizeable even for styles with zero to low positive correlation. We can pinpoint one specific reason why the information ratio increases so much. Figure 2b plots the contribution to portfolio risk from the long and the short side of the two styles. In the ideal implementation, a long-short style portfolio would not only invest in stocks with high ER, but

⁷ We run a standard mean-variance optimization, maximizing expected returns for a given TE target, and imposing the no shorting and full-investment constraints (the results are very similar for simple cutoff-based portfolios). One challenge here is that there is no simple analytical mapping between the standalone style portfolio TE targets and the resulting combined portfolio TE. As a result, we have to calibrate the standalone style TE target so as to arrive at an apples-to-apples (i.e. matched TE) comparison vs. the integrated portfolio.



Figure 2: Integration benefits increase when correlation between styles is low. We use a random number generator to simulate 500 stocks with exposures to momentum and value and build long-only portfolios that target individual styles (optimized on single-style exposures), a portfolio mix that equal-weights standalone style portfolios, and the integrated portfolio optimized on the aggregate score of stocks across both styles. Figure 2a shows how the information ratio of these portfolios depends on the correlation between styles, while Figure 2b presents the fraction of risk coming from stocks the styles find attractive and unattractive (the long- and the short-side of the theoretical view), as a function of the correlation between styles. In each of the scenarios we consider, the attractiveness of styles depends on the simulation parameters (here: the correlation between styles). For comparisons to be meaningful, for each simulation we normalize the parameters so that the theoretically ideal long-short portfolio incorporating the two styles has a Sharpe ratio of 1.00.

Figure 2a: Impact of Correlation Types





Figure 2b: Correlation and % of Factor Risk Coming From Long and from Short



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations, some of which are disclosed in the back.

would also short stocks with low ER. Of course, that is impossible for long-only portfolios. Since these portfolios can at most underweight stocks with low ER, we can expect them to derive most of their risk from the long side of styles. The figure indeed shows that views on which stocks are attractive drive well over half of portfolio risk for both approaches we consider. However, views on unattractive stocks (the short side of the view) are much better reflected in the integrated portfolio than in the portfolio mix. In fact, when the two styles are close to perfectly negatively correlated, the contribution of the short side reaches 50% for the integrated portfolio, close to the theoretical ideal.⁸ This is related to our earlier

discussion of how the integrated portfolio avoids buying stocks that look good on one dimension but have an offsetting exposure to the other style. Integration avoids such problematic offsets precisely by taking into account information from the styles' short sides that is being ignored in the mix construction.

2.2.2 Concentration

We next investigate concentration, or the level of risk targeted in the portfolio. We simulate the two styles with an ER correlation of -0.6 and build portfolios across a range of TE targets (0.2%-4.0%). Figure 3 indicates that the higher the


⁸ We note that for high correlations the contribution from the short side actually becomes negative. We estimate the contribution using a simple regression that relates active portfolio bets to the long and short sides of

the model. In other words, we are modelling a nonlinear phenomenon (optimization with a long only constraint) in a linear setting, which may lead to some estimation biases. We expect such biases to affect the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio similarly and not change the direction of the effect (i.e., integration capturing more risks from the short side).

target tracking error, the lower the IR of both the mix and the integrated portfolio. The decrease is a consequence of the long-only constraint. At very low levels of the tracking error, the constraint is not binding as all desired underweights are smaller than the respective stocks' benchmark weights and thus can be easily implemented in a long-only format. Consequently, the attractiveness of the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio is very similar for low values of TE. However, as target risk increases, long-only portfolios that seek higher risk need to become increasingly concentrated, distorting the active portfolio further and further away from the ideal long/short view. This distortion disproportionately hurts the portfolio mix, as it is imposed multiple times (once for each individual style portfolio; versus only once for the single integrated optimization).

While we focused here on a particular type of long-only portfolio implementation (selecting the highest expected return stocks in the universe

Figure 3. Integration benefits increase when investors seek more active risk. Using the same simulation framework as in Figure 2, we compare the IRs of the integrated portfolio and the portfolio mix as a function of the target TE.



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations, some of which are disclosed in the back.

subject to portfolio constraints whether through an optimization or simple thresholding rule), the benefits of integration would also accrue to other types of long-only portfolio constructions – for example, a portfolio that holds all the stocks in the universe, but whose tilts away from the cap weighted benchmark are informed by the signal. Furthermore, integration would also benefit, albeit to a lesser extent, a relaxed-constraint or long-short multi-style portfolio subject to trading or risk management constraints. The larger the distortion needed to satisfy the constraints, the more important it is to use all available information in portfolio construction decisions, leading to a widening advantage for the integrated implementation.⁹

2.2.3 Number of Styles

Finally, our examples so far were based on two styles only. In practice, investors may be interested in a larger number of styles – for example, managers such as AQR and Goldman Sachs offer multi-style strategies that combine value, momentum, quality and low beta/volatility, while MSCI offers multi-style products that combine value, momentum, size and quality. Thus, we simulate a varying number of (equally effective) styles, assuming for simplicity that they are uncorrelated to one another, and build portfolios targeting a consistent 2.5% TE (we again normalize the attractiveness of styles, as in Section 2.2.1). Intuitively, the benefits of integration should be greater when the number of the underlying styles is larger. For example, with more styles, it is more likely that a single-style portfolio includes stocks with unattractive exposures to at least one of the remaining styles. Figure 4 confirms that conjecture: the integrated portfolio is increasingly attractive relative to the mix when the number of

⁹ We note that this effect is not nearly as pronounced for long-short portfolios, which can increase risk by adjusting leverage rather than adjusting the actual portfolio holdings.



styles increases. For a portfolio taking 2.5% active risk, integrating three uncorrelated styles generates a 33% IR improvement versus a simple mix, and integrating six to seven styles doubles the IR.

Overall, we've highlighted a number of dimensions that influence how impactful style implementation is for the investor. The arguments we discussed hold in general, not only for the specific choices we made in the simulation. In particular, they hold for both the fully optimized portfolios and for simpler cutoff-based portfolios. In fact, we expect similar effects to arise more generally for any portfolio subject to constraints. Even fully-fledged long-short portfolios may have constraints on leverage, positions in individual securities or sectors, etc. These constraints will distort the portfolio away from the theoretically ideal view. Combinations of single-style portfolios similar to the mix approach effectively suffer these distortions every time a standalone portfolio is constructed. In

contrast, the integrated construction with its single optimization only distorts the portfolio once.


3. How large are integration benefits in practice?

We estimate the benefits of integration using the same two styles that we used for our simulation above: value and momentum. We build realistic simulations of long-only equity portfolios that seek exposure to these styles, incorporating trading costs and typical risk management considerations such as sector exposure constraints.

Since the focus of our paper is implementation, we employ the simplest and most popular signals for the two styles: for momentum, returns over the past year, skipping the most recent month; for value, the book-to-price ratio. These are arguably the best known signals for the two styles, and have been thoroughly vetted in the academic literature, for example, Fama and French (1992, 1993) for value and to Jegadeesh and Titman (1993) and Asness (1994) for momentum. We use the same signal construction as Asness et al. (2015) but build long-only instead of long-short portfolios.¹⁰

Our hypothetical portfolios are based on liquid, large stocks in developed countries (roughly the MSCI World benchmark universe) over the period from February, 1993 to December, 2015. To minimize any unintended differences between the two implementations, we use identical style signals, the same weighting scheme across styles, and similar optimization methodologies. Both implementations weight the value and momentum styles at 50% each, a weighting scheme designed to provide a balanced

Figure 4. Integration benefits increase when investors combine more styles. Using the same simulation framework as in Figure 2, we compare the IRs of the integrated portfolio and the portfolio mix as a function of the number of factors (investment styles) that are being combined in the portfolio. For this simulation, we assume individual factors are uncorrelated.



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations, some of which are disclosed in the back.

¹⁰ Asness et al. (2015) deploy 80% of their active risk budget within industry and 20% across industries, motivated by for example by Asness, Porter, and Stevens (2000). We use the same approach for comparability.



contribution to risk from each style. All portfolios are rebalanced monthly.

Table 1, Panel A presents the realized performance and efficiency characteristics of the long-only integrated portfolio relative to the simple mix and to the standalone single-style long-only portfolios. Importantly, the two alternative multi-style implementations are intentionally managed to take similar tracking error of 4% per year.

In spite of using identical signals and providing similar levels of active risk, the integrated portfolio outperforms the simple mix across every performance metric. Panel A shows that the annualized average excess return versus the benchmark, impressive as it is at 2.5%, for the portfolio mix, is dwarfed by the 3.6% excess return of the integrated construction. The difference in realized returns translates into an increase in information ratio from 0.6 for the portfolio mix to 0.9 for the integrated portfolio, a substantial 40% improvement.¹¹ These differences are economically meaningful and highly statistically significant. As we discussed earlier, the negative correlation between the two styles we consider here, value and momentum, contributes to the magnitude of the differences, but we would still expect to find substantial benefits of integration for styles that are not as highly negatively correlated (e.g., value, quality, and size), particularly when more than two styles are combined.

Perhaps a subtle point is that by construction the style mix will have better returns than the worst performing style, but will lag the best performing style in the mix over any given period.¹² In our

historical backtest, as indicated in Table 1, the portfolio mix posted better average returns than value, but lagged momentum. Impressively, the integrated approach not only outperformed the portfolio mix, but also outperformed either of the two standalone single style portfolios.

We can map these large return differences back to our theoretical reasoning in the prior section. We can attribute performance to the three groups of stocks we highlighted in Figure 1d: the stocks held in the integrated portfolio but not in the standalone style portfolios, the stocks that appear in the standalone style portfolios but not in the integrated portfolio, and the stocks common to both approaches. Table 1, Panel B shows that the portfolio of stocks that are unique to the integrated portfolio (the blue stocks in Figure 1d) earn a substantial alpha to the market, 3.2% annualized and highly statistically significant ($t\text{-stat} = 3.1$). In contrast, stocks that are held only in the mix (the yellow stocks in Figure 1d) have a much smaller alpha of 1.4% that is statistically insignificant ($t\text{-stat} = 1$). (The reported alphas are equal-weighted; portfolio-weighted results are very similar.) This confirms that stocks with balanced, positive exposures to both styles realize higher excess returns on average and hence are better bets than stocks that may have an extreme exposure to one style, but at best modest exposure to other factors.

The integrated portfolio differs not only in which stocks it holds, but also in the weight it assigns to its holdings. Most vividly, over half of the weight of the portfolio mix (52%) is in the yellow stocks in Figure 1d, whose excess returns are least attractive. Thus, not only does the portfolio mix include stocks with less alpha, but it also assigns a disproportionately large weight to such stocks. In contrast, the integrated approach avoids stocks with

¹¹ The improvement, sizeable though it is, is smaller than what we found in Section 2. This is because we now account for estimated transaction costs; unlike in the simulation, where we assumed we knew style exposures for each stock, we are estimating exposures from the data, etc.

¹² Frazzini et al. (2013) make a similar point in their paper. The portfolio mix is the weighted average of the long-only style portfolios it invests in,

and hence its return is a weighted average of the returns of its components.



Table 1: Comparing performance of the portfolio mix and the integrated approach. Panel A compares excess returns versus the MSCI World (Net) benchmark, tracking error, and information ratio (all net of estimated transaction costs but gross of management fees) for the standalone value and momentum portfolios and for the mix portfolio that combines them, as well as for the integrated style portfolio that integrates these two styles in portfolio construction. We also present the transfer coefficient (ex ante return correlation between the portfolio and a model) and the correlation between the portfolio and model weights, versus both the respective underlying model views (e.g., value only for the standalone value, or the multistyle value-momentum model for the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio). Portfolios are built over a universe similar to MSCI World, over the sample of February 1993 to December 2015. In Panel B, we compare performance of different groups of stocks presented in Figure 1d (reproduced here for ease of reference): yellow stocks held only in the index mix (i.e., in one of the standalone style portfolios, but not in the integrated portfolio), blue stocks held only in the integrated portfolio, and green stocks held in both the integrated portfolio and the portfolio mix. We report the average number of stocks in each group, the alpha of the equal-weighted portfolios of these stocks versus the MSCI World (Net) benchmark, and the weight of a given group of stocks in its respective portfolio.


Panel A: Portfolio mix versus integrated portfolio: Performance summary

	Value Standalone	Momentum Standalone	Portfolio Mix	Integrated Portfolio
Excess return	1.7%	3.4%	2.5%	3.6%
Tracking Error	7.9%	7.7%	4.1%	4.1%
Information Ratio	0.21	0.44	0.62	0.87
Transfer Coefficient	0.67	0.69	0.28	0.59
Portfolio-Model Correlation	0.25	0.18	0.11	0.32

Panel B: Various groupings of stocks: Alphas versus the cap-weighted market


	Yellow stocks (mix only)	Blue stocks (integrated only)	Green stocks (in both portfolios)
Average number of stocks	253.6	178.3	164.1
Alpha to MSCI World	1.4%	3.2%	4.2%
t-statistic	(0.96)	(3.09)	(3.67)
Average Weight in the respective portfolio	52%	45%	

Figure 1d: Comparing mix, integrated portfolio



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations, some of which are disclosed in the back.

Figure 5: Ex ante and realized benefits of integration as a function of target tracking error. Panel A shows the transfer coefficient (the ex-ante, risk model-based correlation between portfolio returns and the return of the underlying model view) of the portfolio mix and the integrated portfolio that seek exposure to value and momentum at different levels of realized tracking error. Panel B depicts the realized information ratio of these portfolios, again as a function of realized tracking error. Portfolios are built over a universe similar to MSCI World, over the period of February 1993 to December 2015. Information ratio is net of estimated transaction costs.



Source: AQR. Hypothetical performance results have certain inherent limitations.

insignificant alpha (the yellow stocks) and extends the pool of attractive stocks (the blue stocks in Figure 1d). This suggests that the main benefit of integration comes from improved capture of the underlying styles, as opposed to somehow identifying stocks with strictly better performance than those shared in the two approaches.

To further substantiate this claim, Table 1 also shows the transfer coefficient and the correlation of active weights between each portfolio and its corresponding ideal, unconstrained long-short underlying view.¹³ Higher values for these metrics correspond to more efficient signal implementation. The transfer coefficient for the integrated approach (0.6) is twice higher than that of the portfolio mix (0.3). Similarly, the active portfolio correlation to the long-short model view is three times higher for the integrated than for

the mix approach. Interestingly, the transfer coefficient and portfolio-view correlation of the integrated approach are similar to those of the standalone style portfolios, further confirming that the drawbacks of the portfolio mix construction are attributable to its two-stage approach to portfolio implementation.¹⁴

Finally, the mix and integrated implementation generate portfolios that are meaningfully different from each other. In Table 1 we focus on portfolios with the active risk of about 4%. For these portfolios, the annualized realized tracking error between their return series is 3.2% and the correlation of their monthly active return is just 0.53. Not surprisingly, the portfolios are even more dissimilar at higher active risk targets.

¹³ The transfer coefficient is the ex-ante (risk model-based) correlation between the portfolio return and the return on the theoretical long-short view. The correlation of active weights captures the similarity of the long-only portfolio's active weights to the weights of theoretical long-short view.

¹⁴ High transfer coefficients indicate standalone style portfolios are relatively easier to implement, e.g., require lower turnover or lower leverage of the ideal long-short view to reach a given level of TE. Of course, they poorly capture the full multistyle model, with transfer coefficients of only 0.1-0.2 and portfolio correlations below 0.2.



3.1 Targeting Higher Risk

Our prior discussion suggested that the portfolio mix becomes increasingly unattractive at higher levels of risk. To verify this, we build a frontier of integrated and mix portfolios, comparable in terms of their realized active risk, with realized TE from 1% to about 6%. We present the results in Figure 5, focusing both on ex ante improvements (Panel A, the transfer coefficient mentioned above) as well as improvements in realized performance (Panel B, the information ratio).

Achieving high levels of active risk is generally difficult for optimally diversified multi-style portfolios. However, it is considerably more challenging for the portfolio mix approach as the separate style portfolios need to target increasingly higher levels of active risk. For example, for the portfolio mix to realize TE of 4% the style standalone portfolios need to target TEs above 7%.¹⁵ Targeting such a high TE induces substantial portfolio distortions away from the unconstrained long-short view. Consequently, the transfer coefficient of the portfolio mix drops from about 0.7 at 1% TE to 0.2 towards the higher end of the risk frontier. In contrast, the transfer coefficient of the integrated approach not only is higher at each TE target, starting from 0.8 at the 1% TE, but it decreases more slowly as risk increases, to about 0.5 at higher TE levels.

Improvements are also readily apparent ex post. Panel B shows that the difference in realized information ratios is relatively small at low TEs – the integrated approach outperforms by 12% (1.33 vs 1.49) at 1% TE. The gap triples to 36% (0.64 vs 0.87) at 4% TE target, and becomes even wider at higher risk targets (e.g., 49% for 6% TE). Empirically the gap shrinks slightly around 4% TE, which we ascribe to noise in our data; even so

the improvements from integration are already sizeable in this TE region.

3.2 Turnover Netting

In addition to the performance implications we discuss above, integration of styles may improve trading efficiency. Rebalancing the portfolio mix could potentially involve selling a stock from one of the standalone style portfolios and buying the same stock in the other one. For example, a stock that is rapidly increasing in price could fall out of the value portfolio because it becomes too expensive, but could be included in the momentum portfolio precisely because of its price appreciation.

To assess how important this turnover netting may be, we compute the difference between the weighted average realized turnover of the standalone value and momentum portfolios and the turnover of a similarly weighted, combined portfolio of the two styles that first nets trades across the styles before going to the market. These savings will depend on portfolio constraints, particularly constraints on turnover and active risk. Not surprisingly, turnover savings are modest when overall turnover is constrained to be very low. The savings increase with the turnover constraint, reaching 5% one-sided for portfolios with annual turnover of around 100% and 10% one-sided for turnover unconstrained portfolios. That last number means that in the average year the portfolio mix buys 10% and sells 10% of its NAV in identical stocks, paying transaction costs and potential taxes on each side but without any change in style exposures at the overall portfolio level. Generally, such turnover savings from netting are larger for portfolios that include a larger number of weakly correlated styles as well as for portfolios that target lower active risk. The net returns implications of the avoidable turnover depend on the trading costs that the portfolio manager faces. Perhaps surprisingly, we find transaction costs savings to

¹⁵ The inability to target active risk directly at the overall portfolio level also results in larger time-varying realized active risk in the simple mix, which typically hurts portfolio performance.



be an order of magnitude lower than the alpha capture gains, although their impact would still be sizeable for small cap and emerging multi-style portfolios that face higher transaction costs.¹⁶

4. Conclusion

We investigate two popular approaches to long-only style investing that are often considered as potential starting points for smart beta investors: the “portfolio mix” that builds a style portfolio from standalone style portfolios and the “integrated portfolio” that integrates styles directly in the portfolio construction process.

Our key finding is that integrating styles in long-only portfolio construction has a first order effect on performance, generating benefits by avoiding stocks with offsetting style exposures and including stocks with balanced positive style exposures.

Empirically, integration improves excess returns by about 1% per year and increases the information ratio by 40% relative to the portfolio mix. These magnitudes are substantially larger than any plausible differences in headline fees between the two approaches. This means that when fees are evaluated per unit of return, the integrated approach is likely to be meaningfully more attractive to investors.

Importantly, the benefits, large as they are, do not mean that the portfolio mix will always lag the integrated portfolio. It is less attractive on average, but there may be periods when it outperforms. Ironically, such periods are likely to coincide with poor performance of the styles the portfolios are tracking. Since the integrated portfolio gives investors a more efficient exposure to these styles, it can be expected to underperform the mix when the styles themselves disappoint.

Finally, there are specific portfolio needs that may entice investors to invest in a portfolio mix (or, indeed in a standalone style portfolio). For example, some investors may prefer to hire different managers for different styles. For others, monitoring and performance may be easier with standalone styles or with their mix. Finally, some may want to time styles by dynamically changing the weights to the standalone style portfolios. Our results suggest that such considerations would need to be very important for investors to offset the direct performance benefits from integrating styles in long-only portfolio construction.

At a minimum, these results quantify the opportunity costs of using single styles, helping investors assess whether these other considerations are worth it.

¹⁶ For a more detailed discussion of transaction costs please see Frazzini, Israel, and Moskowitz (2015); for a discussion of tax efficiency of styles, please see and Israel and Moskowitz (2013).



References

- Amenc, Noel, Felix Goltz, Lionel Martellini, 2013, "Smart Beta 2.0," EDHEC-Risk Institute White Paper.
- Asness, Clifford S., 1994, "Variables That Explain Stock Returns," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago.
- Asness, Clifford S., Antti Iltanen, Ronen Israel, and Tobias J. Moskowitz, 2015, "Investing in Style," *Journal of Investment Management*, Vol. 13, No. 1, 27-63.
- Bender, Jennifer and Taie Wang, 2016, "Can the Whole Be More Than the Sum of the Parts? Bottom-Up versus Top-Down Multifactor Portfolio Construction," *Journal of Portfolio Management*, Vol. 42, No. 5, pp. 39-50.
- Blitz, David, Joop Huij, Simon Lansdorp, and Pim van Vliet, 2014, "Efficient Factor Investing Strategies," Robeco White Paper.
- Chow, Tzee-man, Jason Hsu, Vitali Kalesnik, Bryce Little, 2011, "A Survey of Alternative Equity Index Strategies," *Financial Analysts Journal*, Volume 67, No 5, 37-57.
- Clarke, Roger G., Harindra de Silva, and Steven Thorley, 2015, "Factor Portfolios and Efficient Factor Investing," *Analytic Investors White Paper*.
- Fama, E. and French, K. (1993). "Common Risk Factors in the Returns on Stocks and Bonds," *Journal of Financial Economics*, Volume 33, 3-56.
- Fama, E. and French, K. (1996). "Multifactor Explanations of Asset Pricing Anomalies," *Journal of Finance*, Volume 51, Number 1, 55-84.
- Frazzini, Andrea, Ronen Israel, and Tobias J. Moskowitz, 2015, "Trading Costs of Asset Pricing Anomalies," *AQR White Paper*.
- Frazzini, Andrea, Ronen Israel, Tobias J. Moskowitz, and Robert Novy-Marx, 2013, "A New Core Equity Paradigm," *AQR White Paper*.
- Hunstad, Michael and Jordan Dekhayser, 2014, "Evaluating the Efficiency of 'Smart Beta' Indexes," *Northern Trust White Paper*.
- Israel, Ronen, Sarah Jiang, and Adrienne Ross, 2015, "Craftsmanship Alpha: Why Craftsmanship Matters in Style Investing," *AQR White Paper*.
- Israel, Ronen and Tobias J. Moskowitz, 2013, "How Tax Efficient Are Equity Styles," *AQR White Paper*.
- Jegadeesh, Narasimhan. and Sheridan Titman, 1993, "Returns to Buying Winners and Selling Losers: Implications for Stock Market Efficiency," *Journal of Finance*, Volume 48, Number 1, 65-91.



Kahn, Ronald N. and Michael Lemmon, 2014, "Making Smart Decisions about Smart Beta," BlackRock White Paper.

Kahn, Ronald N. and Michael Lemmon, 2015, "The Asset Manager's Dilemma: How Smart Beta is Disrupting the Investment Management Industry," Financial Analysts Journal, Volume 72, Number 1.

Watson Wyatt, 2007, "2007 Global Pension Assets Study," Watson Wyatt Worldwide.



Disclosures

This document has been provided to you solely for information purposes and does not constitute an offer or solicitation of an offer or any advice or recommendation to purchase any securities or other financial instruments and may not be construed as such. The factual information set forth herein has been obtained or derived from sources believed by the author and AQR Capital Management, LLC ("AQR") to be reliable but it is not necessarily all-inclusive and is not guaranteed as to its accuracy and is not to be regarded as a representation or warranty, express or implied, as to the information's accuracy or completeness, nor should the attached information serve as the basis of any investment decision. This document is intended exclusively for the use of the person to whom it has been delivered by AQR, and it is not to be reproduced or redistributed to any other person. The information set forth herein has been provided to you as secondary information and should not be the primary source for any investment or allocation decision.

Past performance is not a guarantee of future performance

This paper is not research and should not be treated as research. This paper does not represent valuation judgments with respect to any financial instrument, issuer, security or sector that may be described or referenced herein and does not represent a formal or official view of AQR.

The views expressed reflect the current views as of the date hereof and neither the author nor AQR undertakes to advise you of any changes in the views expressed herein. It should not be assumed that the author or AQR will make investment recommendations in the future that are consistent with the views expressed herein, or use any or all of the techniques or methods of analysis described herein in managing client accounts. AQR and its affiliates may have positions (long or short) or engage in securities transactions that are not consistent with the information and views expressed in this paper.

The information contained herein is only as current as of the date indicated, and may be superseded by subsequent market events or for other reasons. Charts and graphs provided herein are for illustrative purposes only. The information in this paper has been developed internally and/or obtained from sources believed to be reliable; however, neither AQR nor the author guarantees the accuracy, adequacy or completeness of such information. Nothing contained herein constitutes investment, legal, tax or other advice nor is it to be relied on in making an investment or other decision.

There can be no assurance that an investment strategy will be successful. Historic market trends are not reliable indicators of actual future market behavior or future performance of any particular investment which may differ materially, and should not be relied upon as such. Target allocations contained herein are subject to change. There is no assurance that the target allocations will be achieved, and actual allocations may be significantly different than that shown here. This paper should not be viewed as a current or past recommendation or a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell any securities or to adopt any investment strategy.

The information in this paper may contain projections or other forward-looking statements regarding future events, targets, forecasts or expectations regarding the strategies described herein, and is only current as of the date indicated. There is no assurance that such events or targets will be achieved, and may be significantly different from that shown here. The information in this paper, including statements concerning financial market trends, is based on current market conditions, which will fluctuate and may be superseded by subsequent market events or for other reasons. Performance of all cited indices is calculated on a total return basis with dividends reinvested.

Diversification does not eliminate the risk of experiencing investment losses.

Broad-based securities indices are unmanaged and are not subject to fees and expenses typically associated with managed accounts or investment funds. Investments cannot be made directly in an index.

The investment strategy and themes discussed herein may be unsuitable for investors depending on their specific investment objectives and financial situation. Please note that changes in the rate of exchange of a currency may affect the value, price or income of an investment adversely.

Neither AQR nor the author assumes any duty to, nor undertakes to update forward looking statements. No representation or warranty, express or implied, is made or given by or on behalf of AQR, the author or any other person as to the accuracy and completeness or fairness of the information contained in this paper, and no responsibility or liability is accepted for any such information. By accepting this paper in its entirety, the recipient acknowledges its understanding and acceptance of the foregoing statement.

The data and analysis contained herein are based on theoretical and model portfolios and are not representative of the performance of funds or portfolios that AQR currently manages.

Hypothetical performance results (e.g., quantitative backtests) have many inherent limitations, some of which, but not all, are described herein. No representation is being made that any fund or account will or is likely to achieve profits or losses similar to those shown herein. In fact, there are frequently sharp differences between hypothetical performance results and the actual results



subsequently realized by any particular trading program. One of the limitations of hypothetical performance results is that they are generally prepared with the benefit of hindsight. In addition, hypothetical trading does not involve financial risk, and no hypothetical trading record can completely account for the impact of financial risk in actual trading. For example, the ability to withstand losses or adhere to a particular trading program in spite of trading losses are material points which can adversely affect actual trading results. The hypothetical performance results contained herein represent the application of the quantitative models as currently in effect on the date first written above and there can be no assurance that the models will remain the same in the future or that an application of the current models in the future will produce similar results because the relevant market and economic conditions that prevailed during the hypothetical performance period will not necessarily recur. There are numerous other factors related to the markets in general or to the implementation of any specific trading program which cannot be fully accounted for in the preparation of hypothetical performance results, all of which can adversely affect actual trading results. Discounting factors may be applied to reduce suspected anomalies. This backtest's return, for this period, may vary depending on the date it is run. Hypothetical performance results are presented for illustrative purposes only.

Gross performance results do not reflect the deduction of investment advisory fees, which would reduce an investor's actual return. For example, assume that \$1 million is invested in an account with the Firm, and this account achieves a 10% compounded annualized return, gross of fees, for five years. At the end of five years that account would grow to \$1,610,510 before the deduction of management fees. Assuming management fees of 1.00% per year are deducted monthly from the account, the value of the account at the end of five years would be \$1,532,886 and the annualized rate of return would be 8.92%. For a 10-year period, the ending dollar values before and after fees would be \$2,593,742 and \$2,349,739, respectively. AQR's asset based fees may range up to 2.85% of assets under management, and are generally billed monthly or quarterly at the commencement of the calendar month or quarter during which AQR will perform the services to which the fees relate. Where applicable, performance fees are generally equal to 20% of net realized and unrealized profits each year, after restoration of any losses carried forward from prior years.



