

# Data-driven Multiperiod Robust Mean-Variance Optimization

Xin Hai & Gregoire Loeper & Kihun Nam

*Monash University  
Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia*

July 11, 2023

## Abstract

We study robust mean-variance optimization in multiperiod portfolio selection by allowing the true probability measure to be inside a Wasserstein ball centered at the empirical probability measure. Given the confidence level, the radius of the Wasserstein ball is determined by the empirical data. The numerical simulations of the US stock market provide a promising result compared to other popular strategies.

**Keywords:** Mean-Variance, Robust Portfolio Selection, Wasserstein Distance, Modern Portfolio Theory

## 1 Introduction

In this article, we study robust mean-variance optimization in multiperiod portfolio selection. In particular, we allow the true probability measure to be inside a Wasserstein ball specified by the empirical data and the given confidence level. We transform our optimization problem into a non-robust minimization problem with a penalty, which provides a tractable model for robust mean-variance optimization. This extends the single-period model of Blanchet et al. (2021) to a multiperiod model. Then, we apply our framework to the US stock market on five different 10-year intervals between 2002 and 2019, which provides Sharpe ratios competitive with the equal-weighted portfolio, the classical Markowitz portfolio, and various robust portfolio strategies.

Since the seminal result of Markowitz (1952) on the static mean-variance portfolio optimization, the portfolio optimization theory has received much attention from academics and the industry. Mean-variance optimization has become popular because it has a clear and informative target function, which contains explicit profit and risk terms and describes the trade-off between them. Unfortunately, the model is extremely sensitive to the mean and covariance of the underlying stocks, and both the empirical mean and covariance can deviate significantly from the true ones.

To solve this issue, robust formulations are developed in the literature, allowing the possibility that the true probability measure may differ from the empirical one. For example, Lobo and Boyd (2000) provided a worst-case robust analysis where the mean and covariance of returns belong to prescribed sets. Pflug and Wozabal (2007) studied the robust Markowitz problem when the true probability distribution is not perfectly known. They used a confidence set for the probability distribution to find the robustness. However, both papers did not provide guidance for an appropriate selection of the uncertainty set's size. In addition to the discrete-time portfolio selection problem,

Pham et al. (2022) proposed a separation principle for solving the robust mean-variance problem in continuous time, when the expected return and correlation matrix are ambiguous.

The conventional approach to obtain a robust solution involves 1) specification (shape and size) of an ambiguity set, which is the collection of candidate probability measures for the true probability measure, and 2) analysis of the worst-case scenario.

Typical choices for the ambiguity set are a set of measures equivalent to the empirical measure<sup>1</sup> (e.g., Hansen and Sargent, 2001), an inverse image of measurable function<sup>2</sup> (e.g., Lobo and Boyd, 2000; Tütüncü and Koenig, 2004), and a topological neighborhood of the empirical probability measure<sup>3</sup> (e.g., Fabozzi et al., 2007, Chapter 12; Hota et al., 2019; Fournier and Guillin, 2015). Each class of the ambiguity set has its strength and weakness.

The ambiguity set's size is important as well. If one allows too much uncertainty, the solution would be too conservative. Conversely, if the size of the ambiguity set is too small, then the robustness is lost. Therefore, choosing the appropriate size of the ambiguity set is important. Conventionally, the one performing the optimization chooses the ambiguity set's size based on separate statistical estimations. Recently, data-driven approaches, which combine the estimation and the optimization steps, were proposed in the literature. A short list includes Delage and Ye (2010), Esfahani and Kuhn (2018), and Blanchet et al. (2019b).

In particular, Blanchet et al. (2019a) studied the case where their ambiguity set is defined as a Wasserstein ball of probability measures. They proposed a systemic way of choosing the suitable radius of a Wasserstein ball for a given confidence level of true probability lying on the ball. Robust Wasserstein Profile Inference (RWPI) was used in Blanchet et al. (2021) to obtain a data-driven robust protocol for single-period mean-variance optimization. They transformed the robust mean-variance optimization into a non-robust mean-variance optimization with a penalty function, which is computationally tractable. In addition, they empirically compared their strategies with some popular methods and achieved better average returns against most models.

Two interesting questions remain. Can we use the method for multiperiod models, and how does the strategy perform compared to other strategies? We study these questions in this article.

A multiperiod robust mean-variance model is inherently different from the single-period one. First, the mean-variance optimization is not time-consistent. In other words, optimal control in a sub-interval is not necessarily the optimal control in the whole interval. As a result, we cannot iterate the single-period model to obtain the optimal control for the multiperiod model. Another difference is the information structure. Our optimal control (investment) has to be adapted to the filtration: our optimal control at a given time will depend on the historical data up to that time.

To circumvent the problem, we represent the optimal control as a function of historical stock prices and approximate it using the Taylor expansion. Then, the multiperiod mean-variance optimization problem transforms into a high-dimensional single-period problem. While the single-period problem we obtain is not the same as Blanchet et al. (2021) due to the adaptedness condition, one can check that the result in Blanchet et al. (2019a) can still be applied. As a result, we prove that the robust mean-variance optimization problem is equivalent to a non-robust optimization with a penalty term.

We perform numerical simulations on the top 100 US stocks' adjusted price data with and without transaction costs. We selected five ten-year periods 2002-2012, 2004-2014, 2006-2016, 2008-2018, and 2009-2019. We use the first two years to estimate the parameters and the other eight years to test the model. We compared the performance (the mean, the variance, and the Sharpe ratio) of the 2- and 3- period models with the equal-weighted portfolio, the classical Markowitz model, the single-period model in Blanchet et al. (2021), and the robust models used in Xing et al. (2014); Dai and Wang (2019); Xidonas et al. (2017); Fabozzi et al. (2007, Chapter 12); and Won and Kim (2020). To compare the  $n$ -period models with the single-period model, we split the portfolio

---

<sup>1</sup>for example, the drift of stock prices can be allowed in a certain set

<sup>2</sup>for example, the mean and variance can be allowed to be in certain specified intervals

<sup>3</sup>for example, the true probability measure is allowed to be in a Wasserstein ellipsoid containing the empirical probability measure

into  $n$  sub-portfolios starting at day one, day two,..., and day  $n$  and track the daily wealth of the portfolio.

The numerical results are impressive. The 2-period model outperforms most non-robust and robust strategies other than the 3-period model with and without the transaction costs. The only exception is the 2008-2018 simulation: the 2-period model showed the moderately high Sharpe ratio and outperformed the equal-weighted, NC, and SP strategies. For other simulations, the 2-period model showed the highest Sharpe ratio and the lowest risk. When we analyzed similarly for the 3-period model using the top 50 stocks, the 3-period model outperformed the single and 2-period models except for the 2004-2014 and 2009-2019 simulations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we formulate the robust mean-variance optimization model. Section 3 concerns the approximation for the multi-period investment strategy. Section 4 presents the feasible region to the optimal problem. We figure out a new method to consider transaction costs and rebalancing for our multi-period model in Section 5. In Section 6 we provide the numerical simulations and compare our 2-period model with some conventional methods. Section 7 shows the effect of the number of periods. Finally, Section 8 concludes the paper.

## 2 Problem Formulation

Consider a market with  $n$  risky assets and one risk-free asset without an interest rate. Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{F}, P^*)$  be a filtered probability space with  $n$  discrete stochastic processes  $\{S_t^i : t = 1, \dots, T\}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  and  $\mathbb{F}$  is the filtration generated by  $\{S^i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Here,  $S_t^i$  represents the  $i$ th risky asset price at time  $t$ . Let us denote  $R_t^i$  the return of risky asset  $i$  on the time interval  $(t-1, t]$  for  $t \in [1, T]$ , that is  $R_t^i = (S_t^i - S_{t-1}^i)/S_{t-1}^i$ . Then, we can define a  $nT$ -dimensional return vector  $\mathbf{R} = (R_1^1, \dots, R_1^n, R_2^1, \dots, R_2^n, \dots, R_T^1, \dots, R_T^n)$  that encodes the path of asset prices. Throughout this paper, any vector is understood to be a column vector and the transpose of  $\mathbf{R}$  is denoted by  $\mathbf{R}^\top$ .

Throughout the article, we use the notation  $\mathbf{1}$  for a vector of appropriate dimension where each element is 1. On the other hand,  $\mathbb{I}_E$  denotes the indicator function; that is, if  $E$  is satisfied, then its value is 1, and otherwise, zero. The norm  $\|\cdot\|_p$  denotes the  $l_p$  norm in the Euclidean space.

We let  $\pi_t^i$  be the amount of money invested in the  $i$ th risky asset on the time interval  $(t-1, t]$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi} = (\pi_1^1, \dots, \pi_1^n, \pi_2^1, \dots, \pi_2^n, \dots, \pi_T^1, \dots, \pi_T^n)$ . Since the filtration is generated by  $\{S^i : i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\pi}$  should be predictable, there exist measurable functions  $f^i : \{1, 2, \dots, T\} \times (\mathbb{R}^n)^T \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$  such that

- $f^i(T-t, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_T)$  does not depend on the last variables  $r_t, r_{t+1}, \dots, r_T$  and
- For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ ,

$$\pi_t^i = f^i(T-t, R_1, R_2, \dots, R_T).$$

In this article, we will use the second-order Wasserstein metric on the space of probability measures

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) := \left( \inf_{(X, Y) \in \mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu)} \mathbb{E}|X - Y|^2 \right)^{1/2},$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}(\mu, \nu) := \{(X, Y) : \mathbb{P} \circ X^{-1} = \mu, \mathbb{P} \circ Y^{-1} = \nu\}.$$

Now let us state our problem. For a given  $\delta > 0$ , we define an ambiguity set by  $\delta$ -neighborhood of  $Q$ ,

$$\mathcal{U}_\delta(Q) := \{P : W_2(P, Q) \leq \delta\},$$

where  $Q$  is the empirical probability we obtained from historical data,

$$Q(\cdot) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{R^{(i)}}(\cdot),$$

where  $(R^{(i)})_{i=1,2,\dots,N}$  are realizations of  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $\delta_{R^{(i)}}(\cdot)$  is the indicator function.

The feasible region of portfolio investment is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}^R := \left\{ \pi : \begin{array}{l} \min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} E_P [\pi^\top \mathbf{R}] \geq \bar{\alpha}, \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_t^i = 1 \\ \pi^i \text{ is predictable for each } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \\ \text{For given } t, \pi_t^i \text{ are analytic functions of } \mathbf{R} \text{ for each } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \end{array} \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

Here,  $\bar{\alpha}$  is the worst acceptable expected return.

**Remark 2.1.** It is reasonable to restrict our investment strategy function  $f^i(x, \cdot)$  to be integrable with respect to some probability measure  $\lambda$  since the investment in practice has constraints in their size. Since the set of polynomial is dense in  $L^1(\mathbb{R}^{nT}, \lambda)$ , any integrable investment strategies satisfying  $\min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} E_P [\pi^\top \mathbf{R}] \geq \bar{\alpha}$  can be approximated by the strategies in  $\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}^R$ . On the other hand, restricting our feasible region to polynomials enables us to apply the Taylor expansion technique to facilitate the computation.

For a given confidence level  $1 - \delta_0$ , the investor needs to solve the following optimization problem,

$$\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}^R} \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}} \left( \sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[\pi^\top \mathbf{R}] = \lambda} E_P \left[ (\pi^\top \mathbf{R})^2 - \lambda^2 \right] \right) \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\delta$  and  $\bar{\alpha}$  are chosen so that

$$\Pi_{P^*}^R \subset (\cup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(Q)} \Pi_P^R) \cap \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}^R$$

with probability more than  $1 - \delta_0$ . Here,  $\Pi_\mu^R$  is the set of all solution of (2.2) when  $Q$  and  $(\delta, \bar{\alpha})$  are replaced by  $\mu$  and  $(0, \lambda)$ , respectively.

In order to simplify the predictability condition on  $\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}^R$  to a computationally tractable model, we approximate the investment strategy using the Taylor series to approximate  $\pi^\top \mathbf{R} \approx A^\top M$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^n \pi_t^i = \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1$ . The  $A$  represents the coefficients of the Taylor series approximation of  $\pi^\top \mathbf{R}$  with respect to  $\mathbf{R}$  and  $M = (R_j^e, R_d^c R_j^e, R_b^a R_d^c R_j^e, \dots)$ , where  $a, c, e = 1, \dots, n$  and  $b, d, j = ts - s + 1, \dots, ts$ . Here,  $R_b^a$  stands for  $R_{ts-s+1}^1, \dots, R_{ts}^n$  and it is arranged in the order of ‘ $abcdej$ ’, which is the same in the terms  $R_d^c R_j^e$  and  $R_b^a R_d^c R_j^e$ : see Section 3 and 4 for detail. Then, we set

$$\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})} := \left\{ A : \min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} E_P [A^\top M] \geq \bar{\alpha}, \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1 \right\}. \quad (2.3)$$

Under such approximation, our problem (2.4) transforms to the following problem:

**Problem.** For a given confidence level  $1 - \delta_0$ , the investor needs to solve the following optimization problem,

$$\inf_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}} \left( \sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[A^\top M] = \lambda} E_P \left[ (A^\top M)^2 - \lambda^2 \right] \right), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\delta$  and  $\bar{\alpha}$  are chosen so that

$$\Pi_{P^*} \subset (\cup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(Q)} \Pi_P) \cap \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}$$

with probability more than  $1 - \delta_0$ . Here  $\Pi_P$  represents an optimal solution of the non-robust multi-period model under  $P$ .

In order to use Blanchet et al. (2021), we define  $\Pi_P$  as the set of all solutions  $A$  of

$$\min_A A^\top E_P[MM^\top]A \quad \text{subject to} \quad E_P[A^\top M] = \lambda \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^1 = 1 \text{ for each } t. \quad (2.5)$$

The  $(A_t^i)^1 := f_t^i$  represents the constant term of the Taylor series of  $\pi_t^i$ : see (3.12) and (3.14).

**Remark 2.2.** *The condition  $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^1 = 1$  is an approximation for the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^n \pi_t^i = \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1$  with Taylor series approximation of 0<sup>th</sup> order. Such approximation enables us to obtain  $\lambda_0^*$  in the first step of RWPI protocol in Section 2.1.*

Throughout this article, we assume the following technical conditions:

**Assumption 1.** *The problem (2.5) has a unique solution  $A$  under any  $P$ , that is  $\Pi_P = \{A\}$ .*

**Assumption 2.**  *$R$  has a probability density function and the underlying return time series  $\{\mathbf{R}_t : t \geq 0\}$  is a stationary, ergodic process satisfying  $E_{P^*}(\|\mathbf{R}\|_{2T}^{2T}) < \infty$  for each  $t \geq 0$ .*

**Assumption 3.** *For every measurable function  $h(\cdot)$ , we have*

$$N^{1/2}[E_Q(h(\mathbf{R})) - E_{P^*}(h(\mathbf{R}))] \Rightarrow N(\mathbf{0}, \text{Cov}[h(\mathbf{R})])$$

as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , where

$$\text{Cov}[h(\mathbf{R})] := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{P^*} \left( N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N h(\mathbf{R}^{(i)}) \right)$$

satisfying  $|h(w)| \leq k(1 + \|w\|_2^2)$  for some  $k > 0$ . Here, the  $N(\cdot, \cdot)$  represents the normal distribution under  $P^*$ .

**Assumption 4.** *For any matrix  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  and a vector  $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $\hat{\alpha} \neq \mathbf{0}$  or  $\hat{\beta} \neq \mathbf{0}$ ,*

$$P^*(\|\hat{\alpha}\mathbf{R} + \hat{\beta}\|_2 > 0) = 1.$$

**Assumption 5.** *Let  $S_t$  be the price of an asset at time point  $t$  in the  $L^2$  space. We define our return  $R_t = (S_t - S_{t-\Delta t})/S_{t-\Delta t}$  on the time period  $(t - \Delta t, t]$ . When  $\Delta t$  converges to 0, the return  $R_t$  also converges to 0.*

The following proposition enables us to apply the single-period result of Blanchet et al. (2021) to our problem.

**Proposition 2.3.** *Assumption 2, 3, and 4 also hold for  $M$  as well as  $R$ .*

*Proof.* We know that there exists the transformation function  $g(\cdot)$  from  $R$  to  $M$  for  $s$ -period satisfying  $M_t = g(\mathbf{R}_{ts-s+1}, \dots, \mathbf{R}_{ts})$ . According to Theorem 3.35 of White (2014), we know if  $\{\mathbf{R}_t\}$  is stationary and ergodic process, then  $\{M_t\}$  is also stationary and ergodic process satisfying the property  $E_{P^*}(\|M\|_2^2) < \infty$ .

On the other hand, Assumption 3 also holds for  $M$  if we let  $h = \tilde{h} \circ g$  in Assumption 3, where  $\tilde{h}$  is an arbitrary measurable function.

Assumption 4 also holds for  $M$ . For  $k$ -dimensional  $M$ , any matrix  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  and a vector  $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  such that  $\hat{\alpha} \neq \mathbf{0}$  or  $\hat{\beta} \neq \mathbf{0}$ , we have

$$P^*(\|\hat{\alpha}M + \hat{\beta}\|_2 > 0) = 1.$$

Since the PDF of  $M$  can be derived from the PDF of  $R$ ,

$$P^*(\hat{\alpha}x + \hat{\beta} = \mathbf{0}) = 0,$$

for any given  $\hat{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ ,  $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^k \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ , and any  $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ . This implies that

$$P^*(\|\hat{\alpha}M + \hat{\beta}\|_2 = 0) = 0.$$

This completes the proof. □

## 2.1 Specification of $\delta$ and $\bar{\alpha}$

We choose  $\delta$  as the minimum uncertainty level so that the optimal solution of the non-robust multiperiod model under  $P^*$  is in the plausible estimate of  $A^*$  with confidence level  $1 - \delta_0$  which the investor assigns. In other words, we define

$$\delta := \min \left\{ \varepsilon : P^* \left( A^* \in \bigcup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\varepsilon(Q)} \Pi_P \right) \geq 1 - \delta_0 \right\}$$

where  $\Pi_P$  is the set of all solutions of the non-robust multiperiod portfolio selection problem (2.5).

Likewise, for given  $\delta$ , we choose  $\bar{\alpha}$  as the maximum value that we do not rule out  $A^*$ , that is

$$\bar{\alpha} := \max \left\{ \alpha : P^* (A^* \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}) \geq 1 - \delta_0 \right\}.$$

In practice, one can use the framework illustrated in Blanchet et al. (2021) to find  $\delta$  and  $\bar{\alpha}$  for given data. For readers' convenience, we will describe it here.

**RWPI Protocol.** 1. Find  $(A^*, \lambda_0^*)$  by solving (2.5) for  $P = Q$  using the Lagrange multiplier method:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Sigma_N A^* - \lambda_0^* \mu_N - \left( \sum_{t=1}^T \lambda_t^* \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_t \right) &= \mathbf{0}, \\ (A^*)^\top \mu_N - \lambda &= 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^{*,i})^1 &= 1 \text{ for all } t = 1, 2, \dots, T \end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

where  $(\mu_N, \Sigma_N) := (E_Q[M], E_Q[MM^\top])$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{1}}_t := (\partial_A (\sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^1))^\top$ .

2. Let  $h(x) = x + 2(\lambda_0^*)^{-1} x x^\top A^*$ . For a random variable  $Z \sim N(0, \Upsilon_h)$  where

$$\Upsilon_h := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{P^*} (N^{-1/2} \sum_{k=1}^N h(M_k)),$$

we let

$$\delta^* := \min \left\{ \delta : P^* \left( \frac{\|Z\|_2^2}{4(1 - \mu_N^\top \Sigma_N^{-1} \mu_N)} \leq \delta N \right) \geq 1 - \delta_0 \right\}.$$

3. Let  $(m_j)_{j \geq 1}$  be the realizations of  $M$ . For a random variable  $\tilde{Z} \sim N(0, \Upsilon_{A^*})$  where

$$\Upsilon_{A^*} := \lim_{\bar{N} \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{P^*} \left( \bar{N}^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^{\bar{N}} (A^*)^\top m_j / \|A^*\|_2 \right),$$

let  $\bar{\alpha}^* := \lambda - \sqrt{\delta^*} \|A^*\|_2 \max \{s_0, s'_0\}$  where

$$\begin{aligned} s_0 &:= \min \left\{ s : P^* \left( \tilde{Z} \geq \sqrt{\delta^* \bar{N}} (1 - s_0) \right) \geq 1 - \delta_0 \right\} \\ s'_0 &:= \frac{\lambda + \sqrt{\delta^*} \|A^*\|_2 - (A^*)^\top \mu_N}{\sqrt{\delta^*} \|A^*\|_2} \end{aligned}$$

4.  $(\delta^*, \bar{\alpha}^*)$  is the proposed value.

**Remark 2.4.** Step 2 is proved for the case where  $(\mu_*, \sigma_*) := (E_P[M], E[MM^\top])$  and  $\bar{\lambda}_0$  defined in the proof instead of  $(\mu_N, \Sigma_N)$  and  $\lambda_0^*$ , but we use the empirical estimates to obtain  $\delta^*$ . In Step 3,  $\Upsilon_{A^*}$  is obtained asymptotically.

**Remark 2.5.** When we obtain the proposed  $\bar{\alpha}$  in Step 3, we ignore the condition  $\sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1$  in the restriction of the feasible set (2.3). However, we impose the condition when we perform the simulations in Section 5 to Section 7.

*Proof.* We don't need to prove Step 1 and Step 4. First, let us prove Step 3 assuming that we have obtained  $\delta^*$  in Step 2.

(Proof of Step 3) Instead of finding  $\bar{\alpha}^*$  directly, we will find the appropriate value for  $s_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta} \|A^*\|_2} (\lambda - \bar{\alpha})$ . Since

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} E_P[(A^*)^\top M] = (A^*)^\top \mu_N - \sqrt{\delta} \|A^*\|_2 \geq \bar{\alpha}$$

(see Section 4) and  $\lambda = (A^*)^\top E_{P^*}[M]$ , we have

$$(A^*)^\top (\mu_N - E_{P^*}(M)) \geq \|A^*\|_2 \sqrt{\delta} (1 - s_0).$$

Due to Proposition 1 in Blanchet et al. (2021), we know

$$N^{1/2} \left[ \frac{(A^*)^\top (\mu_N - E_{P^*}(M))}{\|A^*\|_2} \right] \Rightarrow \tilde{Z} \sim N(0, \Upsilon_{A^*}),$$

where

$$\Upsilon_{A^*} := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}_{P^*} \left( N^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^N (A^*)^\top m_j / \|A^*\|_2 \right).$$

Now one can choose  $s_0$  such that the following inequality (2.7) holds with the confident level  $1 - \delta_0$ ,

$$\tilde{Z} \geq \sqrt{\delta N} (1 - s_0). \quad (2.7)$$

Since

$$\frac{(A^*)^\top \mu_N - \lambda}{\|A^*\|_2} \geq \sqrt{\delta} (1 - s_0)$$

may not always hold, we define  $s'_0$  to be the value

$$\frac{(A^*)^\top \mu_N - \lambda}{\|A^*\|_2} = \sqrt{\delta} (1 - s'_0)$$

and let  $s = \max\{s_0, s'_0\}$ . For such  $s$ , our estimate for  $\bar{\alpha}$  becomes  $\lambda - \sqrt{\delta} \|A^*\|_2 s$ .

(Proof of Step 2) Let  $(\mu_*, \Sigma_*) = (E_{P^*}[M], E_{P^*}[MM^\top])$ . Assume that we have the solution of (2.5) when  $P = P^*$  and let  $(\bar{A}, \bar{\lambda}_0, (\bar{\lambda}_t)_{t=1,2,\dots,T})$  be its corresponding Lagrange equation given as

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Sigma_* \bar{A} - \bar{\lambda}_0 \mu_* - \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_t &= 0, \\ \bar{A}^\top \mu_* - \lambda &= 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n (\bar{A}_t^i)^1 &= 1 \text{ for all } t = 1, 2, \dots, T \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

Here, the well-definedness is guaranteed by the Assumption 1. Let

$$\bar{\mu} = \frac{1}{\lambda_0} \left( 2\Sigma_N \bar{A} - \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{1}}_t \right)$$

Following the idea of RWPI approach introduced in Blanchet et al. (2019a) and Section 4.1 of Blanchet et al. (2021), let the RWP function be

$$\mathcal{R}_N(\Sigma_N, \bar{\mu}) = \inf_P \{W_2(P, Q) : E_P[MM^\top] = \Sigma_N, E_P[M] = \bar{\mu} \}$$

where  $\bar{\mu} = h(\Sigma_N)$ . Then, our choice for  $\delta$  is given by

$$\delta^* := \inf \{\delta : P^*(\mathcal{R}_N(\Sigma_N, \bar{\mu}) \leq \delta) \geq 1 - \delta_0\}.$$

Note that, by the argument in the proof of Theorem 2 in Blanchet et al. (2021), we have

$$N\mathcal{R}_N(\Sigma_N, \mu_N) \Rightarrow \frac{\|Z\|_2^2}{4(1 - \mu_*^\top \Sigma_*^{-1} \mu_*)} \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

where  $Z$  is the distributional limit of  $N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i - \bar{\mu})$ . Note that, by multiplying (2.8) by  $\bar{A}^\top$  and substituting  $\lambda$  for  $\bar{A}^\top \mu_*$  and  $\bar{A}^\top \bar{\mu}$ , we obtain the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} 2\Sigma_* \bar{A} - \bar{\lambda}_0 \mu_* - \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t &= 0, & 2\bar{A}^\top \Sigma_* \bar{A} - \bar{\lambda}_0 \lambda - \bar{A}^\top \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t &= 0 \\ 2\Sigma_N \bar{A} - \bar{\lambda}_0 \bar{\mu} - \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t &= 0, & 2\bar{A}^\top \Sigma_N \bar{A} - \bar{\lambda}_0 \lambda - \bar{A}^\top \sum_{t=1}^T \bar{\lambda}_t \tilde{\mathbf{I}}_t &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

for some  $\bar{\lambda}_t$  and  $\lambda_t^*$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ . Therefore, if we let  $H_N := \Sigma_N - \Sigma_*$ , we have

$$\bar{\mu} - \mu_* = \frac{2}{\lambda_0} H_N \bar{A}.$$

By Proposition 2.3, for  $h_1(x) = x$  and  $h_2(x) = xx^\top$ , we have

$$N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i - \mu_*) \Rightarrow N(0, \Upsilon_{h_1}) \tag{2.9}$$

$$N^{1/2} H_N \Rightarrow N(0, \Upsilon_{h_2}) \tag{2.10}$$

Since

$$N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i - \bar{\mu}) = N^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^N (m_i - \mu_*) + N^{1/2} (\mu_* - \bar{\mu}) \sim Z_0 + \frac{2}{\lambda_0} Z_1 \bar{A}$$

for some  $Z_0 \sim N(0, \Upsilon_{h_1})$  and  $Z_1 \sim N(0, \Upsilon_{h_2})$ . Therefore,  $Z$  can be chosen so that

$$Z \sim N(0, \Upsilon_h)$$

with  $h(x) = x + 2\bar{\lambda}_0^{-1} x x^\top \bar{A}$ . Since  $\bar{\lambda}_0$  and  $\bar{A}$  can be approximated by  $\lambda_0^*$  and  $A^*$ , we proved the Step 2. □

### 3 Approximation for Investment Strategy

From our definition (2.3) of feasible region, there exist measurable functions  $f^i$

$$\pi_t^i = f^i(T - t, R_1, R_2, \dots, R_{t-1}, R_t, \dots, R_T), \tag{3.11}$$

which are analytic with respect to  $\mathbf{R}$ . Since  $f^i$  are analytic, we can use arbitrary order Taylor series to approximate  $f^i$ . Using Taylor series, we can transform the multi-period model to single period model.

Without losing generality, we will provide the framework for the second order Taylor series approximation. Since  $\pi^i$  should be predictable, when  $b \geq t$  or  $d \geq t$ , we let the components  $\partial f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0)/\partial x_d = 0$  and  $\partial^2 f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0)/\partial x_d \partial x_b = 0$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^i &\approx f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_d^c \mathbb{I}_{d \leq t-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_b^a \partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_b^a R_d^c \mathbb{I}_{b, d \leq t-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.12)$$

Here, for notational brevity, we use Einstein notation.<sup>4</sup> Then, the final wealth can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\top \mathbf{R} &= \pi_1^1 R_1^1 + \dots + \pi_1^n R_1^n + \dots + \pi_t^i R_t^i + \dots + \pi_T^1 R_T^1 + \dots + \pi_T^n R_T^n \\ &= f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_t^i + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_d^c R_t^i \mathbb{I}_{d \leq t-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_b^a \partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i \mathbb{I}_{b, d \leq t-1} \\ &= f_t^i \cdot R_t^i + g_{dt}^{ci} \cdot R_d^c R_t^i + h_{bdt}^{aci} \cdot R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_t^i &= f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0), \quad g_{dt}^{ci} = \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \mathbb{I}_{d \leq t-1}, \\ h_{bdt}^{aci} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_b^a \partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \mathbb{I}_{b, d \leq t-1} \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

This indicates a summation with the index running through the integral numbers  $a, c, i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $b, d, t = 1, \dots, T$  in the order of ‘ $abcdit$ ’.

Next, we try to transform the formulation of summation (3.13) to the formulation of vector product

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^\top \mathbf{R} &= f_t^i \cdot R_t^i + g_{dt}^{ci} \cdot R_d^c R_t^i + h_{bdt}^{aci} \cdot R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i \\ &= f_1^1 \cdot R_1^1 + \dots + f_T^n \cdot R_T^n + g_{1,1}^{1,1} \cdot R_1^1 R_1^1 + \dots + g_{T,T}^{n,n} \cdot R_T^n R_T^n \\ &+ h_{1,1,1}^{1,1,1} \cdot R_1^1 R_1^1 R_1^1 + \dots + h_{T,T,T}^{n,n,n} \cdot R_T^n R_T^n R_T^n \\ &= \left( f_t^i, g_{dt}^{ci}, h_{bdt}^{aci} \right)^\top \left( R_t^i, R_d^c R_t^i, R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} (f_t^i) &= (f_1^1, f_1^2, \dots, f_T^n), (g_{dt}^{ci}) = (g_{11}^{11}, g_{11}^{21}, \dots, g_{TT}^{nn}), (h_{bdt}^{aci}) = (h_{111}^{111}, h_{111}^{211}, \dots, h_{TTT}^{nnn}), (R_t^i) = (R_1^1, R_1^2, \dots, R_T^n), \\ (R_d^c R_t^i) &= (R_1^1 R_1^1, R_1^2 R_1^1, \dots, R_T^n R_T^n), (R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i) = (R_1^1 R_1^1 R_1^1, R_1^2 R_1^1 R_1^1, \dots, R_T^n R_T^n R_T^n). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the  $p$ -th component of a vector  $(v_{opq}^{lmn})_{l,m,n,o,p,q}$  is  $v_{bdt}^{aci}$  where,

$$\begin{aligned} t &= \left\lfloor \frac{p}{T^2 n^3} \right\rfloor, i = \left\lfloor \frac{p - (t-1)n^3 T^2}{n^2 T^2} \right\rfloor, d = \left\lfloor \frac{p - (t-1)n^3 T^2 - (i-1)n^2 T^2}{n^2 T} \right\rfloor, \\ c &= \left\lfloor \frac{p - (t-1)n^3 T^2 - (i-1)n^2 T^2 - (d-1)n^2 T}{nT} \right\rfloor, \\ b &= \left\lfloor \frac{p - (t-1)n^3 T^2 - (i-1)n^2 T^2 - (d-1)n^2 T - (c-1)nT}{n} \right\rfloor \end{aligned}$$

<sup>4</sup>When an index variable appears more than twice in a single term, it implies the summation of that term over all the values of the index.

$$a = p - (t-1)n^3T^2 - (i-1)n^2T^2 - (d-1)n^2T - (c-1)nT - (b-1)n$$

where  $\lceil x \rceil := \min \{z \in \mathbb{Z} : x \leq z\}$ .

Let vector  $A$  and vector  $M$  be

$$A = (f_t^i, g_{dt}^{ci}, h_{bdt}^{aci}), \quad M = (R_t^i, R_d^c R_t^i, R_b^a R_d^c R_t^i).$$

Therefore, our optimization problem (2.4) becomes

$$\inf_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}} \left( \sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[A^\top M] = \lambda} E_P \left[ (A^\top M)^2 - \lambda^2 \right] \right) \quad (3.16)$$

Fixing  $E_P[A^\top M] = \lambda$  is helpful because the inner maximization problem is now linear in  $P$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *The primal optimization problem given in (2.4) is equivalent to the following dual problem*

$$\inf_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2. \quad (3.17)$$

*Proof.* Let's focus on solving the following problem

$$\sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[A^\top M] = \lambda} E_P[(A^\top M)^2] \quad (3.18)$$

Let

$$l(A, \lambda) := E_Q[(A^\top M)^2] + 2(\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])E_Q[A^\top M] + \delta \|A\|_2^2 \quad (3.19)$$

$$+ 2\sqrt{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2} \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A}. \quad (3.20)$$

Then, Proposition A.3 Blanchet et al. (2021) tells you that, if  $\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2 \geq 0$ , the value of (3.18) is equal to  $l(A, \lambda)$ . According to the previous result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} l(A, \lambda) - \lambda^2 &= E_Q[(A^\top M)^2] - (E_Q[A^\top M])^2 + \{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2\} \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2} \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} \\ &= A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A + \{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2\} \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2} \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} \\ &= \left( \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} + \sqrt{\delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

So the middle optimization problem in (3.16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}} \left( \sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[\pi^\top \mathbf{R}] = \lambda} E_P \left[ (\pi^\top \mathbf{R})^2 - \lambda^2 \right] \right) &= \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}, \delta \|A\|_2^2 - (\lambda - E_Q[A^\top M])^2 \geq 0} [l(A, \lambda) - \lambda^2] \\ &= \left( \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

□

Note the optimal solution  $A$  has the restriction that some components are 0, but it does not change the value of our optimization problem (3.17): the proof in the Appendix A.

## 4 Feasible Region

In the previous section, we obtain our robust mean-variance optimization dual problem. Before solving the optimal solution  $A$  in (3.17), we need to present the feasible region for the problem.

Firstly, we notice that the ambiguity set  $\delta$  and the worst mean return target  $\bar{\alpha}$  in the feasible region  $\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}$  need to be chosen very carefully. On the one hand, if  $\delta$  is chosen too large, the model ambiguity becomes too much and the solution would be too conservative. On the other hand, if  $\delta$  is chosen too small, the effect of robustness will be too small to reflect the difference between the underlying and historical probability measures. Once  $\delta$  has been selected, choosing  $\bar{\alpha}$  is crucial, which needs to consider the size of  $\delta$ . It can protect the optimal solutions from being too aggressive and make the model more sensible. About the guidance on the choice of the size of  $\delta$  and  $\bar{\alpha}$ , we refer to Blanchet and Chen (2018).

Note that the optimal solution  $A$  in the feasible region  $\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}$  has some conditions. Firstly, we assume the investment of risky assets in each period is  $\sum_{i=1}^n \pi_t^i = 1$ . In order to do the numerical simulation, we know that  $\pi_t^i$  can be recovered from the data. We want to change  $\pi_t^i$  to the formulation of vector product

$$\pi_t^i \approx (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i.$$

In our paper, we previously use the second order Taylor expansion to  $\pi_t^i$  and have

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_t^i &\approx f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) + \frac{\partial}{\partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_d^c \mathbb{1}_{d \leq t-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_b^a \partial x_d^c} f^i(T-t, 0, \dots, 0) \cdot R_b^a R_d^c \mathbb{1}_{b, d \leq t-1} \\ &= (f_t^i, g_{dt}^{ci}, h_{bdt}^{aci})^\top (1, R_d^c, R_b^a R_d^c). \end{aligned}$$

By letting  $A_t^i = (f_t^i, g_{dt}^{ci}, h_{bdt}^{aci})$  and  $N_t^i = (1, R_d^c, R_b^a R_d^c)$ , we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \pi_t^i \approx \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1. \quad (4.22)$$

Next, note that  $A$  in the feasible region  $\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}$  has the other constraint, that is

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} [E_P(A^\top M)] \geq \bar{\alpha} \iff - \max_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} [E_P((-A)^\top M)] \geq \bar{\alpha}.$$

By the dual formulation in Proposition 1 of Blanchet et al. (2019a), we have

$$\max_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} [E_P((-A)^\top M)] = \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} [\gamma \delta + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \Phi_\gamma(m_i)] \quad (4.23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_\gamma(m_i) &= \sup_u \{(-A)^\top u - \gamma \|u - m_i\|_2^2\} \\ &= \sup_\Theta \{(-A)^\top (\Theta + m_i) - \gamma \|\Theta\|_2^2\} = \sup_\Theta \{(-A)^\top \Theta - \gamma \|\Theta\|_2^2\} - A^\top m_i \\ &= \sup_\Theta \{\|A\|_2 \|\Theta\|_2 - \gamma \|\Theta\|_2^2\} - A^\top m_i \\ &= \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{4\gamma} - A^\top m_i \end{aligned} \quad (4.24)$$

Then, (4.23) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} [E_P((-A)^\top M)] &= \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} \left\{ \gamma \delta + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{4\gamma} - A^\top m_i \right] \right\} \\
&= \inf_{\gamma \geq 0} \left\{ \gamma \delta + \frac{\|A\|_2^2}{4\gamma} - E_Q[A^\top M] \right\} \\
&= \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 - E_Q[A^\top M]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.25}$$

or

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q)} [E_P(A^\top M)] = E_Q[A^\top M] - \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \tag{4.26}$$

Therefore, we can have our feasible region

$$\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})} := \left\{ A : E_Q[A^\top M] - \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \geq \bar{\alpha}, \sum_{i=1}^n (A_t^i)^\top N_t^i = 1 \right\}. \tag{4.27}$$

## 5 Implementation of Multi-period Investment Strategy

When one implements a multi-period investment strategy, rebalancing of the portfolio becomes no longer trivial. Assume that we have  $T$ -period strategies

$$(\pi_t^{strategy} := f(T-t, R_1, R_2, \dots, R_T))_{t=1,2,\dots,T}$$

where  $f(T-t, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_T)$  only depends on the first  $t$  variables  $(T-t, r_1, r_2, \dots, r_{t-1})$ . We consider the backtesting of the strategy on the time  $(s \in \mathbb{Z} : 0 \leq s \leq N)$  where  $N \gg T$ . A naive implementation would be, for  $s, t \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $s = kT + t$  and  $1 \leq t \leq T$ ,

$$\pi_s^{naive} = f(T-t, R_{kT+1}, R_{kT+2}, \dots, R_{(k+1)T})$$

for all  $s \in [0, N]$ . However, this is not a good rebalancing strategy because, for example, at time  $T+1$ , the strategy does not use any information from time 2 to  $T$ . In addition, in our Taylor series approximation scheme, if there are differences between  $f(T-t, 0, 0, \dots, 0), t \in [1, T]$ , we will need to rebalance our portfolio even when the stock prices are constant. This will result in huge transaction fee by default.

In order to circumvent these problem, we equally divide our portfolio into  $T$  number of sub-portfolios which start at different times and follow the same naive strategy.

For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}, s, t \in \mathbb{N}, k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$  such that  $s = kT + t + (i-1)$  and  $1 \leq t \leq T$ , we define the target investment strategy

$$\pi_s := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^T f(T-t, R_{kT+i}, R_{kT+i+1}, \dots, R_{(k+1)T+i-1}) \mathbb{I}_{i \leq s}.$$

An example for  $T = 3$  is illustrated in Table 1.

Time $(t-1, t]$	Subportfolio $\pi^{(1)}$	Subportfolio $\pi^{(2)}$	Subportfolio $\pi^{(3)}$	Target Investment $\pi$
$t = 1$	$f(2, R_1, R_2, R_3)$	0	0	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_1^{(l)}$
$t = 2$	$f(1, R_1, R_2, R_3)$	$f(2, R_2, R_3, R_4)$	0	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_2^{(l)}$
$t = 3$	$f(0, R_1, R_2, R_3)$	$f(1, R_2, R_3, R_4)$	$f(2, R_3, R_4, R_5)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_3^{(l)}$
$t = 4$	$f(2, R_4, R_5, R_6)$	$f(0, R_2, R_3, R_4)$	$f(1, R_3, R_4, R_5)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_4^{(l)}$
$t = 5$	$f(1, R_4, R_5, R_6)$	$f(2, R_5, R_6, R_7)$	$f(0, R_3, R_4, R_5)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_5^{(l)}$
$t = 6$	$f(0, R_4, R_5, R_6)$	$f(1, R_5, R_6, R_7)$	$f(2, R_6, R_7, R_8)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_6^{(l)}$
$t = 7$	$f(2, R_7, R_8, R_9)$	$f(0, R_5, R_6, R_7)$	$f(1, R_6, R_7, R_8)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_7^{(l)}$
$t = 8$	$f(1, R_7, R_8, R_9)$	$f(2, R_8, R_9, R_{10})$	$f(0, R_6, R_7, R_8)$	$\frac{1}{3} \sum_{l=1}^3 \pi_8^{(l)}$

Table 1: Target investment for 3-period model

In practice, it is not plausible to rebalance portfolio daily because of the transaction costs. Therefore, we implement the strategy in the following way. At time 0, we invest  $\pi_1^* := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T f(k-1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and let it evolve until

$$\max_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| \frac{(\pi_1^*)^*(1+R_1^i)(1+R_2^i) \cdots (1+R_{t-1}^i) - \pi_t^i}{(\pi_1^*)^*(1+R_1^i)(1+R_2^i) \cdots (1+R_{t-1}^i)} \right| > 0.05. \quad (5.28)$$

When (5.28) happens, we rebalance our portfolio to align with our target investment strategy  $\pi$ . Again, we wait until the  $\pi^*$  deviates from  $\pi$  more than 5% and if it does, we rebalance our portfolio. We repeat the scheme until  $N$ . See the following algorithm.

#### Algorithm

- (i) At time 0, we let  $\pi_1^* := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T f(k-1, 0, \dots, 0)$  and  $\tau_0 = 1$ .
- (ii) For  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , define stopping times

$$\tau_k := \min \left\{ \tau_{k-1} < t \leq T : \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \left| \frac{(\pi_{\tau_{k-1}}^i)^*(1+R_1^i)(1+R_2^i) \cdots (1+R_{t-1}^i) - \pi_t^i}{(\pi_1^*)^*(1+R_1^i)(1+R_2^i) \cdots (1+R_{t-1}^i)} \right| > 0.05 \right\},$$

and let

$$(\pi_t^i)^* := \begin{cases} (\pi_{\tau_{k-1}}^i)^*(1+R_{\tau_{k-1}}^i)(1+R_{\tau_{k-1}+1}^i) \cdots (1+R_{t-1}^i), & \text{if } t \in (\tau_{k-1}, \tau_k) \\ \pi_{\tau_k} & \text{if } t = \tau_k \end{cases}.$$

- (iii) We let  $(\pi_t^*)_{t=1,2,\dots,N}$  be our investment strategy.

**Remark 5.1.** Note that the transaction costs of the above algorithm for time  $[1, T]$  is not optimised. However, since  $N \gg T$ , the investments  $\pi_t^*$  for  $t < T$  have virtually no effect on the performance of investment overall.

When we assume there exist transaction costs, we use the linear transaction costs of 0.2%. More precisely, our transaction costs are given by

$$TC = 0.002 \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}, \tau_k \leq T} \sum_{i=1}^n |(\pi_{\tau_{k-1}}^i)^*(1+R_{\tau_{k-1}}) - (\pi_{\tau_k}^i)^*|.$$

## 6 Empirical Studies

In this section, we consider the  $L^2$ -norm for our robust optimization model (3.17). We use the first-order Taylor expansion in (3.12) for our investment strategy<sup>5</sup> and compare its performance with those of well-known strategies.

<sup>5</sup>According to our simulation which is not included in this article, the second-order Taylor expansion model produces essentially the same performance as the first order Taylor expansion model.

The data provided by Bloomberg Terminal is used for the empirical study. We select 100 largest S&P 500 companies by market cap at five different time points, Feb 1 2002, Jun 1 2004, Jun 1 2006, Aug 1 2008, and June 1 2009. For each time point, we use the daily adjusted closing price data for the previous 2 years to estimate our parameters and simulate the strategies for the following 8 years. We assume the net investment of each period is a fixed constant. We compare the means, the standard deviations, and the Sharpe ratio of wealth returns of our robust 2-period model and other conventional methods with and without the transaction costs.

We choose Feb 1 2002 as the first start date because the 9/11 attacks happened in 2001. Start dates Jun 1 2004 and Jun 1 2006 are chosen because the financial crisis occurred within the sample interval and we can observe the impact of these data on the model. After the financial crisis ended and the stock market gradually returned to normal, we select the last two start dates Aug 1 2008 and June 1 2009.

## 6.1 Comparison of our model with conventional methods

In this section, we will compare the robust single and our 2-period models with other conventional methods like equal-weighted method, classical Markowitz model (Markowitz, 1952), and the maxmin utility of mean-variance (UM) method (Fabozzi et al., 2007, Chapter 12).

Let  $\mu_R = E_P[\mathbf{R}]$ ,  $\bar{\mu}_R = E_Q[\mathbf{R}]$ ,  $K_{RR} = E_P[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^\top]$ , and  $\bar{K}_{RR} = E_Q[\mathbf{R}\mathbf{R}^\top]$ . The classical Markowitz mean-variance problem is to solve

$$\max_w \left[ \mathbf{w}^\top \bar{\mu}_R - \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \bar{K}_{RR} \mathbf{w} \right] \quad s.t. \quad \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1,$$

where  $\gamma > 0$  is a risk-aversion coefficient. One way of making the classical Markowitz model robust is by allowing the uncertainty in the mean return. In other words, for a uncertainty set  $\mathcal{U}$ , we solve

$$\max_w \min_{\mu_R \in \mathcal{U}} \left[ \mathbf{w}^\top \mu_R - \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \bar{K}_{RR} \mathbf{w} \right] \quad s.t. \quad \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1.$$

For example, Fabozzi et al. (2007, Chapter 12) considered the uncertainty set

$$\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_\delta(\bar{\mu}_R) = \left\{ \mu_R : (\mu_R - \bar{\mu}_R)^\top K_{\mu_R}^{-1} (\mu_R - \bar{\mu}_R) \leq \delta^2 \right\}.$$

Here,  $K_{\mu_R}$  is the covariance matrix of the errors in the estimation of the expected (average) returns. Under the assumption that the returns in a given sample of size  $d$  are independent and identically distributed, we have  $K_\mu = \bar{K}_{RR}/d$ . The problem can be translated to its dual,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_w \quad & \mathbf{w}^\top \bar{\mu}_R - \frac{\gamma}{2} \mathbf{w}^\top \bar{K}_{RR} \mathbf{w} - \delta \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^\top K_{\mu_R} \mathbf{w}} \\ s.t. \quad & \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{6.29}$$

The  $\delta$  could be specified by assuming some confidence interval around the historical expected return. Let  $\sigma_d$  be the sample's standard deviation. Then, we let the  $\delta = 1.96$ , which corresponds to the 95% confidence interval for  $\mu_R$  by the Central Limit Theorem. We set  $d = 500$  (previous 2 year) and  $\gamma = 4$  for our simulations.

### Simulation Results

Table 2 shows the result of the optimal investment without transaction costs for the five methods.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000560395	0.014345112	0.620141254
Markowitz	0.000413440	0.010377771	0.632424947
UM	0.000426882	0.010438333	0.649199194
single-period	0.000545715	0.012848793	0.674223447
2-period	0.000385135	0.007563152	0.808371140
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000508735	0.014763839	0.547007214
Markowitz	0.000472901	0.010955220	0.685251078
UM	0.000482110	0.011082446	0.690576211
single-period	0.000423354	0.011642227	0.577255661
2-period	0.000447016	0.007866766	0.902044465
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000566047	0.014870618	0.604260345
Markowitz	0.000595641	0.009098311	1.039260405
UM	0.000609014	0.009163261	1.055061334
single-period	0.000521979	0.009156240	0.904975460
2-period	0.000516936	0.007580369	1.082548396
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000582780	0.014381476	0.643281588
Markowitz	0.000639435	0.007996818	1.269344515
UM	0.000647746	0.008006844	1.284233376
single-period	0.000624190	0.007845931	1.262911166
2-period	0.000629368	0.008288125	1.205447689
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000683486	0.009834511	1.103257959
Markowitz	0.000517496	0.006582772	1.247953883
UM	0.000531380	0.006568064	1.284305944
single-period	0.000637698	0.007654071	1.322583602
2-period	0.000555807	0.006527001	1.351793232

Table 2: 100 Stocks without transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy without transaction costs, starting from different dates.




Figure 1: 100 Stocks without transaction costs starting 2002.02.01




Figure 2: 100 Stocks without transaction costs starting 2004.06.01




Figure 3: 100 Stocks without transaction costs starting 2006.06.01




Figure 4: 100 Stocks without transaction costs starting 2008.08.01




Figure 5: 100 Stocks without transaction costs starting 2009.06.01

Table 3 is the comparison between the investment strategies with the transaction costs.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000545436	0.014333250	0.604086435
Markowitz	0.000398957	0.010382485	0.609992667
UM	0.000412398	0.010442989	0.626891504
single-period	0.000531535	0.012841564	0.657074519
2-period	0.000377872	0.007573274	0.792065680
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000504211	0.014754810	0.542474635
Markowitz	0.000463776	0.010955203	0.672030154
UM	0.000472937	0.011082582	0.677427621
single-period	0.000415804	0.011634557	0.567335551
2-period	0.000449246	0.007868584	0.906335002
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000562507	0.014862114	0.600824808
Markowitz	0.000584489	0.009120416	1.017330936
UM	0.000598274	0.009186519	1.033832131
single-period	0.000514421	0.009149157	0.892561938
2-period	0.000512448	0.007584638	1.072544490
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000582874	0.014372741	0.643777230
Markowitz	0.000637931	0.008029348	1.261229174
UM	0.000645801	0.008039414	1.275190017
single-period	0.000622847	0.007849569	1.259609801
2-period	0.000628367	0.008280399	1.204653856
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
equal-weighted	0.000667442	0.009817072	1.079273577
Markowitz	0.000515463	0.006605026	1.238862087
UM	0.000529484	0.006590397	1.275386958
single-period	0.000625088	0.007648792	1.297326189
2-period	0.000546146	0.006535765	1.326516534

Table 3: 100 Stocks with transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy with transaction costs, starting from different dates.




Figure 6: 100 Stocks with transaction costs starting 2002.02.01




Figure 7: 100 Stocks with transaction costs starting 2004.06.01




Figure 8: 100 Stocks with transaction costs starting 2006.06.01




Figure 9: 100 Stocks with transaction costs starting 2008.08.01




Figure 10: 100 Stocks with transaction costs starting 2009.06.01

## 6.2 Comparison of 2-period model and robust minimum variance methods

In this subsection, we use the daily adjusted closing price of the 100 largest S&P 500 companies by market cap and compare our 2-period model with different robust minimum variance single-period methods ( $T = 1$ ), which are Blanchet’s single-period model (Blanchet et al. (2021)), robust norm-constrained (NC) model (Xing et al. (2014)), and sparse and robust mean-variance (SP) model (Dai and Wang (2019)). The rebalancing of each strategy follows the same algorithm presented in Section 5.

Let us briefly summarize NC and SP models. We let  $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$  be the vector of portfolio weights,  $\bar{K}_{RR}$  be the sample covariance matrix which is the estimation of the asset return covari-

ance matrix  $K_{RR}$ . Xing et al. (2014) used the NC model as a robust method to control the sparsity or shrink of the estimated weights of assets. More precisely, they studied

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \mathbf{w}^\top \overline{K_{RR}} \mathbf{w} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 + \alpha \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq c \end{aligned} \quad (6.30)$$

where  $\alpha \geq 0$  is the penalty parameter and  $c$  is a constraint. They proved that the problem is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \mathbf{w}^\top \widehat{K_{RR}} \mathbf{w} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{1} \text{ and } \widehat{K_{RR}} = \overline{K_{RR}} - \lambda(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{v}^\top) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda\alpha(\mathbf{o}\mathbf{1}^\top + \mathbf{1}\mathbf{o}^\top), \end{aligned} \quad (6.31)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the penalty parameters determined by  $c$ ,  $\mathbf{v}$  is an  $n \times 1$  vector whose  $i$ th component is 1 if  $w_i$  is negative and is 0 otherwise, and  $\mathbf{o}$  is an  $n \times 1$  vector whose  $i$ th component is  $\text{sign}(w_i)$  if  $w_i$  has the largest absolute value, and is 0 otherwise. The vector  $\mathbf{o}$  is an  $n \times 1$  vector with the  $i$ -th component being  $o_i = (\text{rank}(|w_i|) - 1)\text{sign}(w_i)$ , and  $\text{rank}(|w_i|)$  is the rank of  $|w_i|$  in  $\{|w_1|, \dots, |w_n|\}$ . According to their simulation setup, we select risk aversion  $\lambda = 2$  and tuning parameter  $\alpha = 4$ .

SP model aimed to reduce the undesired impact of parameter uncertainty and estimation errors of the mean-variance portfolio model. They proposed a new sparse and robust portfolio optimization model

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \mathbf{w}^\top \overline{K_{RR}} \mathbf{w} + \frac{\tau}{T} \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \min_{E_P[\mathbf{R}] \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{w}^\top E_P[\mathbf{R}] = \rho \text{ and } \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (6.32)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}$  denotes the uncertainty set for  $E_P[\mathbf{R}]$  and  $\tau$  is a parameter that allows investors to adjust the relative importance of the  $l_1$  penalization in the optimization. For simplicity, let us consider the box uncertainty set  $\mathcal{M}_B = \{\mu : \mu = E_Q[\mathbf{R}] + \xi, |\xi_i| \leq \epsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ . Then, it is easy to verify the formulation is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \min_w \quad & \|\rho \mathbf{1} - R_{d \times n} \mathbf{w}\|_2^2 + \tau \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mathbf{w}^\top E_Q[\mathbf{R}] - \epsilon^\top |\mathbf{w}| = \rho \text{ and } \mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{w} = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (6.33)$$

where  $d$  is sample size,  $R_{d \times n}$  is  $d \times n$  matrix of which row  $t$  equals  $\mathbf{R}_t$ , and  $|\mathbf{w}| = (|w_1|, \dots, |w_n|)^\top$ . They choose  $\tau = 120$  for monthly data corresponds to 10 years. In our simulation, we set  $\tau = 500$  since we are using the daily data for 2 years to find  $\mathbf{w}$ .

## Simulation Results

Table 4 is the comparison between the investment strategies without the transaction costs.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000560395	0.014345112	0.620141255
SP	0.000548045	0.013289725	0.654637011
single-period	0.000545715	0.012848793	0.674223447
2-period	0.000385135	0.007563152	0.808371140
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000508735	0.014763839	0.547007214
SP	0.000509687	0.013512330	0.598789645
single-period	0.000423354	0.011642227	0.577255661
2-period	0.000447016	0.007866766	0.902044465
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000566047	0.014870618	0.604260345
SP	0.000564831	0.012963183	0.691684099
single-period	0.000521979	0.009156240	0.904975460
2-period	0.000516936	0.007580369	1.082548396
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000582780	0.014381476	0.643281589
SP	0.000606592	0.012224146	0.787731381
single-period	0.000624190	0.007845931	1.262911166
2-period	0.000629368	0.008288125	1.205447689
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000683486	0.009834511	1.103257959
SP	0.000656613	0.008177180	1.274694655
single-period	0.000637698	0.007654071	1.322583602
2-period	0.000555807	0.006527001	1.351793232

Table 4: 100 Stocks without transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy without transaction costs, starting from different dates.



Figure 11: 100 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2002.02.01



Figure 12: 100 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2004.06.01




Figure 13: 100 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2006.06.01




Figure 14: 100 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2008.08.01




Figure 15: 100 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2009.06.01

Table 5 is the comparison between the investment strategies with the transaction costs.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000545436	0.014333250	0.604086436
SP	0.000533860	0.013281575	0.638084474
single-period	0.000531535	0.012841564	0.657074519
2-period	0.000377872	0.007573274	0.792065680
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000504211	0.014754810	0.542474635
SP	0.000504155	0.013504141	0.592648936
single-period	0.000415804	0.011634557	0.567335551
2-period	0.000449246	0.007868584	0.906335002
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000562506	0.014862119	0.600824228
SP	0.000559966	0.012954736	0.686173440
single-period	0.000514421	0.009149157	0.892561938
2-period	0.000512448	0.007584638	1.072544490
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000582874	0.014372741	0.643777231
SP	0.000605829	0.012215743	0.787281677
single-period	0.000622847	0.007849569	1.259609801
2-period	0.000628367	0.008280399	1.204653856
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
NC	0.000667442	0.009817072	1.079273577
SP	0.000642856	0.008167310	1.249496006
single-period	0.000625088	0.007648792	1.297326189
2-period	0.000546146	0.006535765	1.326516534

Table 5: 100 Stocks with transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy with transaction costs, starting from different dates.



Figure 16: 100 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2002.02.01




Figure 17: 100 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2004.06.01



Figure 18: 100 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2006.06.01




Figure 19: 100 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2008.08.01




Figure 20: 100 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2009.06.01

### 6.3 Conclusion

In our simulations, the 2-period model performed competitively compared to equal-weighted, classical Markowitz, UM, NC, SP, and single-period model. The simulation results are similar whether there are transaction costs or not.

For the four simulations starting from 2002.02.01, 2004.06.01, 2006.06.01, and 2009.06.01, the 2-period model showed the highest Sharpe ratio and the lowest standard deviation. The only exception is the simulation starting from 2008.08.01 that the 2-period model showed the moderately high Sharpe ratio among all strategies and consistently outperformed the equal-weighted, NC, and SP strategies. On the other hand, qualitatively speaking, the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of the two period model generally have smaller magnitude from a peak to a trough compared to the other strategies.

While there is a limitation that we simulate these strategies only for three time frames, our empirical results provide a promising performance of 2-period model we suggested.

## 7 The Effect of the Number of Periods

We continue to think about multi-period without transaction costs and extend 2-period to the 3-period robust model under the first order Taylor expansion. Before doing the numerical simulations, we select the top 50 market cap of S&P 500 index companies at five different time points 2002.02.01, 2004.06.01, 2006.06.01, 2008.08.01, and 2009.06.01 from the data provided by Bloomberg Terminal.<sup>6</sup> We use these 50 companies' stock daily prices to calculate the daily return. Then we input these data into our 3-period robust model and get the optimal results. Then we compare our 2- and 3-period with the single-period method and study the effect of the number of periods.

We implement the rebalancing method and the transaction costs illustrated in Section 5.

### Simulation Results

Table 6 is the comparison between the investment strategies with different number of periods when there is no transaction costs.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000515459	0.013311754	0.614694581
2-period	0.000490590	0.009018402	0.863553332
3-period	0.000556922	0.009458527	0.934697764
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000467369	0.014623968	0.507335540
2-period	0.000552433	0.009214212	0.951747573
3-period	0.000537145	0.009232455	0.923580659
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000583143	0.011638202	0.795407933
2-period	0.000555751	0.008779726	1.004847740
3-period	0.000587899	0.009221986	1.011996474
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000666363	0.009507792	1.112580792
2-period	0.000647658	0.009150105	1.123620969
3-period	0.000699562	0.009448067	1.175394394
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000616230	0.007546618	1.296257439
2-period	0.000599220	0.007416430	1.282600767
3-period	0.000578595	0.007437629	1.234923724

Table 6: 50 Stocks without transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy without transaction costs, starting from different dates.

<sup>6</sup>We limit our number of stocks due to the computational cost for 3-period model.



Figure 21: 50 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2002.02.01




Figure 22: 50 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2004.06.01



Figure 23: 50 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2006.06.01




Figure 24: 50 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2008.08.01




Figure 25: 50 Stocks without transaction costs, starting 2009.06.01

Table 7 is the comparison between the investment strategies with the transaction costs.

2002.02.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000500910	0.013312917	0.597292435
2-period	0.000475919	0.009031897	0.836478401
3-period	0.000550335	0.009429044	0.926530660
2004.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000463723	0.014620126	0.503510369
2-period	0.000548167	0.009224016	0.943394049
3-period	0.000535506	0.009213172	0.922690207
2006.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000577600	0.011625840	0.788684216
2-period	0.000545246	0.008792993	0.984366355
3-period	0.000583867	0.009193292	1.008192565
2008.08.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000667794	0.009498350	1.116078218
2-period	0.000647608	0.009162976	1.121955506
3-period	0.000702317	0.009423333	1.183120873
2009.06.01	Mean (Daily)	Std Dev (Daily)	Sharpe (Annualized)
single-period	0.000604619	0.007545104	1.272087363
2-period	0.000590169	0.007421212	1.262415012
3-period	0.000572986	0.007426424	1.224797421

Table 7: 50 Stocks with transaction costs

The following plots are the rolling 1-year Sharpe ratios of each strategy with transaction costs, starting from different dates.



Figure 26: 50 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2002.02.01




Figure 27: 50 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2004.06.01



Figure 28: 50 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2006.06.01




Figure 29: 50 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2008.08.01




Figure 30: 50 Stocks with transaction costs, starting 2009.06.01

The following figure is the change in Sharpe ratio as the number of periods increases.




Figure 31: Sharpe ratio VS Number of periods

## Conclusion

According to our empirical studies, as the number of periods increases, the Sharpe ratio is likely to increase as well: see Figure 31(a) and Figure 31(b). The two exceptions are the simulations starting from 2004.06.01 and 2009.06.01. For the simulation starting from 2004.06.01, the 2-period model showed the best Sharpe ratio and single-period model showed the worst one. In the other case starting from 2009.06.01, the single-period model performed the best and 3-period model performed the worst.

As the number of periods in the model increases, the parameters we need to estimate and the computational cost increases dramatically. Depending on the in-sample data we used for parameter estimation, it is possible that 3-period performs worse than single- or 2-period model.

While we need more experiments, our simulations suggest 2- or 3-period is desirable in terms of the portfolio performance to apply our multiperiod model to the real-world data.

## 8 Conclusion

In this article, we study robust mean-variance optimization in multiperiod portfolio selection. We allow the true probability measure to be inside a Wasserstein ball that is specified by the empirical data and a given confidence level. We represent the optimal control as a function of historical stock prices and approximate it using Taylor expansion, which allows us to extend the single-period to a multiperiod model. Then, we apply our framework to some numerical simulations of the US stock market, which provides a promising result compared to other popular strategies.

## References

- J. Blanchet, Y. Kang, and K. Murthy. Robust wasserstein profile inference and applications to machine learning. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 56(3):830–857, 2019a.
- J. Blanchet, Y. Kang, K. Murthy, and F. Zhang. Data-driven optimal transport cost selection for distributionally robust optimization. In *2019 winter simulation conference (WSC)*, pages 3740–3751. IEEE, 2019b.
- J. Blanchet, L. Chen, and X. Y. Zhou. Distributionally robust mean-variance portfolio selection with wasserstein distances. *Management Science*, 2021.
- Z. Dai and F. Wang. Sparse and robust mean–variance portfolio optimization problems. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 523:1371–1378, 2019.
- E. Delage and Y. Ye. Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations research*, 58(3):595–612, 2010.
- P. M. Esfahani and D. Kuhn. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1):115–166, 2018.
- F. J. Fabozzi, P. N. Kolm, D. A. Pachamanova, and S. M. Focardi. *Robust portfolio optimization and management*. John Wiley & Sons, 2007.
- N. Fournier and A. Guillin. On the rate of convergence in wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162(3):707–738, 2015.
- L. Hansen and T. J. Sargent. Robust control and model uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 91(2):60–66, 2001.
- A. R. Hota, A. Cherukuri, and J. Lygeros. Data-driven chance constrained optimization under wasserstein ambiguity sets. In *2019 American Control Conference (ACC)*, pages 1501–1506. IEEE, 2019.
- M. S. Lobo and S. Boyd. The worst-case risk of a portfolio. *Unpublished manuscript. Available from [https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/pdf/risk\\_bnd.pdf](https://web.stanford.edu/~boyd/papers/pdf/risk_bnd.pdf)*, 2000.
- H. Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91, 1952.
- G. Pflug and D. Wozabal. Ambiguity in portfolio selection. *Quantitative Finance*, 7(4):435–442, 2007.
- H. Pham, X. Wei, and C. Zhou. Portfolio diversification and model uncertainty: A robust dynamic mean-variance approach. *Mathematical Finance*, 32(1):349–404, 2022.
- R. H. Tütüncü and M. Koenig. Robust asset allocation. *Annals of Operations Research*, 132(1):157–187, 2004.
- H. White. *Asymptotic theory for econometricians*. Academic press, 2014.
- J.-H. Won and S.-J. Kim. Robust trade-off portfolio selection. *Optimization and Engineering*, 21(3):867–904, 2020.
- P. Xidonas, C. Hassapis, J. Soulis, and A. Samitas. Robust minimum variance portfolio optimization modelling under scenario uncertainty. *Economic Modelling*, 64:60–71, 2017.
- X. Xing, J. Hu, and Y. Yang. Robust minimum variance portfolio with  $L$ -infinity constraints. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 46:107–117, 2014.

## Appendix A

We need to prove some components of  $A$  are 0 does not change the value of the optimization problem (3.17).

Our initial optimization problem is

$$\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \max_{\lambda \geq \bar{\alpha}} \left( \sup_{P \in \mathcal{U}_\delta(Q), E_P[\pi^\top \mathbf{R}] = \lambda} E_P \left[ (\pi^\top \mathbf{R})^2 - \lambda^2 \right] \right).$$

After using the Taylor expansion to the investment strategy, for given  $\pi$ , the middle and inner problems finally become

$$\left( \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \right)^2.$$

We know  $A$  has the restriction that its some components are 0. We can get  $\pi$  from  $A$  and historical data  $N$  (see Section 4). Then  $\pi \approx A^\top N$ .

So we can rewrite the outer problem as

$$\inf_{A \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \left( \sqrt{A^\top \text{Var}_Q(M)A} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \right)^2.$$

Denote  $A_0$  is all 0 components in  $A$  and the rest components of  $A$  is  $A_1$ . We rearrange the structure of  $A$  and  $M$  and keep the value of  $A^\top M$  unchanged.

Let  $A = (A_0, A_1)$  and  $M = (M_0, M_1)$ , where  $M_0$  is some components of  $M$  corresponding to  $A_0$  in  $A$ ,  $M_1$  is the rest components of  $M$  corresponding to  $A_1$  in  $A$ .  $A_0$  and  $M_0$ ,  $A_1$  and  $M_1$  have the same dimension respectively.

Therefore, the above middle and inner problems can be written as

$$\left( \sqrt{(A_0, A_1)^\top \text{Var}_Q((M_0, M_1))(A_0, A_1)} + \sqrt{\delta} \|(A_0, A_1)\|_2 \right)^2,$$

which is equal to

$$\left( \sqrt{A_1^\top \text{Var}_Q(M_1)A_1} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A_1\|_2 \right)^2.$$

For the feasible region (see Section 4)

$$\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})} := \left\{ A : E_Q[A^\top M] - \sqrt{\delta} \|A\|_2 \geq \bar{\alpha} \right\},$$

it becomes

$$\mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})} := \left\{ A_1 : E_Q[A_1^\top M_1] - \sqrt{\delta} \|A_1\|_2 \geq \bar{\alpha} \right\}.$$

So the final optimization problem is

$$\inf_{A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \left( \sqrt{A_1^\top \text{Var}_Q(M_1)A_1} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A_1\|_2 \right)^2$$

or

$$\inf_{A_1 \in \mathcal{F}_{(\delta, \bar{\alpha})}} \sqrt{A_1^\top \text{Var}_Q(M_1)A_1} + \sqrt{\delta} \|A_1\|_2.$$