Portfolio Performance Manipulation and Manipulation-Proof Performance Measures

William Goetzmann[†], Jonathan Ingersoll[†],

Matthew Spiegel[†], Ivo Welch[‡]

March 15, 2006

[†] Yale School of Management, PO Box 208200, New Haven, CT 06520-8200
[‡] Brown University, Department of Economics Box B, Providence, RI 02912

Portfolio Performance Manipulation and

Manipulation-Proof Performance Measures

Abstract

Over the years numerous portfolio performance measures have been proposed. In general they are designed to capture some particular enhancement that might result from active management. However, if a principal uses a measure to judge an agent, then the agent has an incentive to game the measure. Our paper shows that such gaming can have a substantial impact on a number of popular measures even in the presence of extremely high transactions costs. The question then arises as to whether or not there exists a measure that cannot be gamed? As this paper shows there are conditions under which such a measure exists and fully characterizes it. This manipulation-proof measure looks like the average of a power utility function, calculated over the return history. The case for using our alternative ranking metric is particularly compelling in the hedge fund industry, in which the use of derivatives is unconstrained and manager compensation itself induces a non-linear payoff and thus encourages gaming.

Portfolio Performance Manipulation and
Manipulation-Proof Performance Measures

Fund managers naturally claim that they can provide superior performance. Investors must somehow verify these claims and discriminate among managers. In 1966, William Sharpe, using mean-variance theory, introduced the Sharpe ratio to do this in a quantifiable fashion. Together with its close analogues, the information ratio, the squared Sharpe ratio and M-squared, the Sharpe ratio is now widely used to rank investment managers and to evaluate the attractiveness of investment strategies in general. Other measures such as Jensen's alpha and the Henriksson-Merton market timing measure, although they evaluate other aspects of performance are also based on the same or similar theories.

If investors use performance measures to reward money managers, then money managers have an obvious incentive to manipulate their performance scores. Our paper contributes in two ways to this literature. First, it points out the vulnerability of traditional measures to a number of simple dynamic manipulation strategies. Second, it offers a formal definition of the properties that a manipulation-proof measure should have and derives such a measure.

For a measure to be manipulation proof, it must not reward information free trading. In this regard the existing set of measures suffer from two weaknesses. First, most were designed to be used in a world where asset and hence portfolio returns have "nice" distributions like the normal or lognormal. But, this ignores the fact that managers can potentially use derivatives (or trading strategies) to radically twist return distributions. Hedge fund returns, in particular, have distributions that can deviate substantially from normality, and the hedge fund industry is one in which performance measures like the Sharpe ratio are most commonly employed. Second, "exact" performance measures can be calculated only in theoretical studies (e.g., Leland (1999) and Ferson and Siegel (2001)); in general, they must be estimated. Since standard statistical techniques are designed for independent and identically distributed variables, it is possible to manipulate the existing measures by using dynamic strategies resulting in portfolios whose returns are not so distributed.

We show here that portfolios using dynamic strategies investing in index puts and calls can be used to manipulate the common portfolio measures. This is true even when only very liquid options are used and when transactions costs are extremely large. Numerical results are presented for the Sharpe ratio, Jensen's alpha, Treynor ratio, Appraisal ratio, generalized alpha, Sortino ratio (1991), Van der Meer, Plantinga and Forsey (1999) ratio, and the timing measures of Henriksson and Merton (1991), and Treynor and Mazuy (1966). In every case, the manipulations presented generate statistically and economically significant "better" portfolio scores even though all of the simulated trades can be carried out by an uninformed investor.

The paper describes general strategies for manipulating a performance measure. (1) Static manipulation of the underlying distribution to influence the measure. Such strategies can enhance scores even if the evaluator calculates the measure without any estimation error whatsoever. (2) Dynamic manipulation that induces time variation into the return distribution in order to influence measures that assume stationarity. This can enhance a portfolio's score even if the measure is calculated without any "estimation error" but without regard to the (unobservable) time variation in the portfolio's return distribution. (3) Dynamic manipulation strategies that focus on inducing estimation error. Since measures have to be estimated with real world data, there are strategies that can induce positive biases in the resulting values. As a simple example, imagine an evaluator who estimates a fund's Sharpe ratio by calculating its excess return's

standard deviation and average excess return over a 36 month period using monthly data. Further assume the fund manager simply wishes to maximize the expected value of the calculated Sharpe ratio. A simple strategy that accomplishes this has the fund sell an out of the money option in the first month, while investing the remaining funds in the risk free asset. If the option expires worthless the portfolio is then invested wholly in the risk free asset for the remaining 35 months. Whenever this happens the portfolio has a zero standard deviation, a positive excess return, and thus an infinite Sharpe ratio. Since there is a strictly positive probability that the option will expire worthless the expected value of the calculated Sharpe ratio must be infinity. Worse yet, as the paper shows even with goals other than maximizing the expected calculated performance value, and concern for other moments of the test statistic a manager can deliberately induce large economically significant measurement errors to his advantage. Also notice that increasing the frequency with which returns are observed does not shield the set of existing measures from this type of dynamic manipulation.

If the set of current measures are vulnerable to manipulation the question naturally arises as to whether a manipulation proof measure exists. To answer this question, one first needs to determine what "manipulation proof" means. This paper defines a manipulation proof performance measure (MPPM) as one that has three properties:

1. The score's value should not depend upon the portfolio's dollar value.
2. An uninformed investor cannot expect to enhance his *estimated* score by deviating from the benchmark portfolio. At the same time informed investors should be able to produce higher scoring portfolios and can always do so by taking advantage of arbitrage opportunities.
3. The measure should be consistent with standard financial market equilibrium conditions.

It turns out that these three requirements are enough to pin down the measure. The first simply implies that returns are sufficient statistics rather than dollar gains or losses. The second and third, however, provide a great deal more structure. As the earlier discussion indicates there are several ways to manipulate a performance measure and the second condition implies that a MPPM must be immune to all of them. In particular that means the manager cannot expect to benefit by trying to alter the score's estimation based upon observable data. To accomplish this goal the score must be (1) increasing in returns (to recognize arbitrage opportunities), (2) concave (to avoid increasing the score via simple leverage or adding unpriced risk), (3) time separable to prevent dynamic manipulation of the estimated statistic, and (4) have a power form to be consistent with an economic equilibrium. The resulting measure ($\hat{\Theta}$) suggested here is

$$\hat{\Theta} \equiv \frac{1}{(1-\rho)\Delta t} \ell n\left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[(1+r_{ft})^{-1}(1+r_{ft}+x_t) \right]^{1-\rho} \right). \tag{1}$$

The coefficient ρ can be thought of as the evaluator's "risk aversion" and should be selected to make holding the benchmark optimal for an uninformed manager. The variable Δt is the length of time between observations while T equals the total number of observations. These two variables (Δt and T) simply help normalize the measure's final calculation. The portfolio's return at time t is x_t, and the risk free asset's return is r_{ft}. Note the measure is easy to calculate and has an intuitive interpretation as the average per period welfare of a power utility investor in the

portfolio over the time period in question. As an example, consider a fund with returns of $-.1$, .05, .17, and $-.02$. Assume the risk free rate is .01. In this case $T=4$, r_{ft} is .01, and if ρ equals 2 then $\hat{\Theta}$ equals 1.036. For ρ equal to 3, $\hat{\Theta}$ equals 1.109.

Our paper was originally motivated by the question of whether the existing set of performance measures is sufficiently manipulation proof for practical use. This is particularly relevant in the presence of transactions costs, which may offset whatever "performance" gains a manager might hope to generate from trading for the purpose of manipulating the measure. Therefore, our paper explores how difficult it is to meaningfully game the existing measures. For the seven measures examined here — four ratios (Sharpe (1966), Sortino (1991), Leland (1999), and Van der Meer, Plantinga, and Forsey (1999)), and three regression intercepts (the CAPM alpha, Treynor and Mazuy (1966), and Henriksson and Merton (1981)) — the answer is not encouraging. Simple dynamic strategies that only relever the portfolio each measurement period or buy (very liquid) at the money options can produce seemingly spectacular results, even in the presence of very high transactions costs. For example, consider the Henriksson and Merton (1981) measure. A simple options trading scheme in the presence of transactions costs equal to 20% produces "very good" results. The final regression statistics report that the portfolio has returns that are superior to the market's nearly 65% of the time, and (using a 5% critical value) statistically significantly better 9% of the time. Obviously, lower and more realistic transactions costs only make matters worse. The other measures analyzed here are similarly susceptible to having their estimated values gamed.

Our results have a number of implications for investment management. Hedge funds and other alternative investment vehicles have broad latitude to invest in a range of instruments, including derivatives. Mitchell and Pulvino (2001) document that merger arbitrage, a common hedge fund strategy, generates returns that resemble a short put-short call payoff. Recent research by Agarawal and Naik (2001) shows that hedge fund managers in general follow a number of different styles that are nonlinear in the returns to relevant indices. In a manner similar to Henriksson and Merton, Agarawal and Naik use option-like payoffs as regressors to capture these non-linearities. In fact, option-like payoffs are inherent in the compensation-structure of the typical hedge fund contract. Goetzmann, Ingersoll and Ross (2001) show that the high water mark contract, the most common type in the hedge fund industry, effectively leaves the investor short 20% of a call option. The call is at-the-money each time it is "reset" by a payment and out-of-the money otherwise.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 1 discusses various ways in which the Sharpe ratio can be manipulated. Section 2 discusses the manipulation of a number of other measures including those using reward to variability (Section 2A) and the Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy market timing measures (Section 2B). Section 3 derives the manipulation proof performance measure, and Section 4 concludes.

1. Manipulation of the Sharpe Ratio

Although the Sharpe ratio is known to be subject to manipulation, it remains one of if not the most widely used and cited performance measures. It, therefore, makes a good example to introduce performance manipulation in more detail. Other measures are examined in the next section.

1A. Static Analysis

A number of papers have shown that by altering the distribution function governing returns the statistical mean and variance can be manipulated to increase the Sharpe ratio to some degree. Ferson and Siegel (2001) look at a fairly general case (that includes potentially private information) while Lhabitant (2000) shows how using just a couple of options can generate seemingly impressive values. Since the focus of this paper is on dynamic strategies and the development of a MPPM to prevent all sources of manipulation the only static result presented here is the characterization of the return distribution that maximizes the Sharpe ratio. Readers interested in additional details should consult one of the above cited articles.

The Appendix shows that Sharpe ratio maximizing portfolio in a complete market is characterized by a state i return in excess of the interest rate (x_i^{MSR}) of

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MSR}} = \overline{x}_{\mathrm{MSR}} \left[1 + \frac{1 - \hat{p}_i / p_i}{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2} \right]. \tag{2}$$

Here $\mathcal{S}_{MSR} \equiv \left[\sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i - 1 \right]^{1/2}$ is the maximum possible Sharpe ratio, and p_i and $\hat{p}_i$ are the true and risk-neutral probabilities of state i. Since the Sharpe ratio is invariant to leverage, we are free to specify the portfolio's mean excess return, $\overline{x}_{\mathrm{MSR}}$, at any level desired.

While the MSR has a number of interesting properties it is also true that one way to mitigate its impact on a fund's apparent performance is to sample returns more frequently. As one does so the percentage difference between the market portfolio's Sharpe ratio and that of the MSR goes to zero. However, as will be seen below frequent sampling does not help when managers use dynamic manipulation strategies and thus the paper now turns to this issue.

1B. Dynamic Analysis

Calculated values of the Sharpe ratio and virtually all other performance measures use statistics based on the assumption that the reported returns are independent and identically distributed. While this may be a good description of typical portfolio returns in an efficient market, it clearly can be violated if a portfolio's holdings are varied dynamically depending on its performance.

Consider a money manager who has been lucky or unlucky with an average realized return high or low relative to the portfolio's realized variance. The return distribution in the future will likely not be similar to the experience. Consequently, to maximize the Sharpe ratio, the portfolio can be modified to take into account the difference in the distributions between the realized and future returns just as if the returns distribution was not ex ante identically distributed each period. This dynamic manipulation makes the past and future returns dependent when computed by an unconditional measure.

To illustrate, suppose the manager has thus far achieved an historical average excess return of $\overline{x}_h$ with a standard deviation of σ_h. The portfolio's average excess return and standard deviation in the future are denoted by $\overline{x}_f$ and σ_f. Then its measured Sharpe ratio over the entire period will be will be

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{\gamma\bar{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\bar{x}_f}{\sqrt{\gamma(\bar{x}_h^2 + \sigma_h^2) + (1-\gamma)(\bar{x}_f^2 + \sigma_f^2) - [\gamma\bar{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\bar{x}_f]^2}}$$

$$= \frac{\gamma\bar{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\bar{x}_f}{\sqrt{\gamma\bar{x}_h^2(1 + 1/\mathcal{S}_h^2) + (1-\gamma)\bar{x}_f^2(1 + 1/\mathcal{S}_f^2) - [\gamma\bar{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\bar{x}_f]^2}} \tag{3}$$

where γ is the fraction of the total time period that has already passed, and $_h$ and $_f$ are the past and future Sharpe ratios.

By inspection, the overall Sharpe ratio is maximized by holding in the future a portfolio that maximizes the future Sharpe ratio, $\mathcal{S}_f = \mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}$. However, regardless of what Sharpe ratio can be achieved in the future, leverage is no longer irrelevant as it was in the static case. Maximizing the Sharpe ratio in (3), we see that the optimal leverage gives a target mean excess return of

$$\bar{x}_f^* = \begin{cases} \bar{x}_h(1 + \mathcal{S}_h^{-2})/(1 + \mathcal{S}_f^{-2}) & \text{for} \quad \bar{x}_h > 0 \\ \infty & \text{for} \quad \bar{x}_h \le 0. \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

If the manager has been lucky in the past and achieved a higher than anticipated Sharpe ratio, $\mathcal{S}_h > \mathcal{S}_f$, then the portfolio should be targeted in the future at a lower mean excess return (and lower variance) than it has realized. This allows the past good fortune to weigh more heavily in the overall measure.[1] Conversely, if the manager has been unlucky and $\mathcal{S}_h < \mathcal{S}_f$, then in the future, the portfolio should be targeted at a higher mean excess return than that so far realized. In the extreme, if the average excess return realized has been negative, then the manager should use as much leverage as possible (ideally infinite) to minimize the impact of the poor history.

The Sharpe ratio that can be achieved over the entire period is[2]

$$\mathcal{S} = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\dfrac{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 \mathcal{S}_h^2 + \gamma \mathcal{S}_h^2 + (1-\gamma)\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}{1 + (1-\gamma)\mathcal{S}_h^2 + \gamma \mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}} & \text{for} \quad \mathcal{S}_h > 0 \\ \mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}\sqrt{\dfrac{1-\gamma}{1 + \gamma \mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}} & \text{for} \quad \mathcal{S}_h \le 0. \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

Figure 1 plots the overall Sharpe ratio as a function of the realized historical Sharpe ratio for histories of different durations. The overall Sharpe ratio can, on average, be maintained above

---

[1] For a fixed Sharpe ratio, the overall mean is linear in the future leverage while the overall standard deviation is convex. The proportional changes in the mean and standard deviation with respect to future leverage are equal when the future and historical Sharpe ratios are equal. Therefore, when the historical Sharpe ratio is less than the future Sharpe ratio, increasing leverage increases the overall mean at a faster rate than the standard deviation and vice versa.

[2] Because the optimal future leverage is infinite when $\bar{x}_h \le 0$, the past Sharpe ratio does not affect the overall Sharpe ratio, and the value of the overall Sharpe ratio for $\mathcal{S}_h < 0$ is the same as for $\mathcal{S}_h = 0$.

(is forced below) the theoretical maximum, $\mathcal{S}_{MSR}$, whenever the past performance has been good (bad). The realized Sharpe ratio, of course, has the most impact when the past history is long ($\gamma \approx 1$).

<div align="center">[Insert Figure 1 here]</div>

As can be seen in the graph or from equation (5), the over-all Sharpe ratio is increasing and convex in the historical Sharpe ratio. Therefore, dynamic-Sharpe-ratio-maximizing strategies should, on average, be able to produce a Sharpe ratio higher than $\mathcal{S}_{MSR}$.[3]

Simulations show that dynamic manipulation of the Sharpe ratio can have a substantial effect. In a lognormal market with a risk premium of 12%, a manager re-levering his portfolio after thirty months of a five-year evaluation period can achieve a Sharpe ratio of 0.714. This is 18% higher than the static MSR (and 13% higher than the standard biased estimate of the same). In addition, dynamic manipulation works in exactly the same way for portfolios that have not been Sharpe optimized each period. Any portfolio with a Sharpe ratio of $\mathcal{S}_f$ can be levered as shown in (4) to achieve a higher average Sharpe ratio than this on average. For example, in the same lognormal market, if the market is relevered after 30 months, its Sharpe ratio improves on average from 0.597 to 0.672, an increase of 13%.

In addition, we have assumed here that a single measurement period is shorter than the time between rebalancings. If the portfolio manager can alter his portfolio within a single measurement period, then the distribution of a single return can be affected. For example, if a portfolio increases sharply in value during the first part of a measurement period, switching to a less aggressive position may make the ultimate measured return smaller and keep the Sharpe ratio high. Goetzmann, Ingersoll, and Ivkovic (2000) analyze the problem of performance measurement when the investment rebalancing period is shorter than the measurement period.

Particular circumstances may permit additional opportunities to dynamically manipulate the Sharpe ratio of a portfolio. Smoothing returns over time will leave the portfolio's mean return unchanged but decrease its variance so smoothing returns will increase the Sharpe ratio. Funds with illiquid assets whose prices are only reported occasionally may benefit here. Hedge funds or other portfolios with high-water mark performance fees will also benefit. A standard performance contract calls for expensing the performance fee monthly but paying it only annually, but unpaid fees can be "lost" based on poor later fund performance. This contractual provision moves recorded returns from periods of good performance to periods of poor performance and smoothes the reported returns.

1C. Jensen's Alpha and Related Measures

Several other performance measures are related to the Sharpe ratio. The most familiar of these is Jensen's alpha which is the intercept of the market model regression, $x_t = \alpha + \beta x_{mt} + \varepsilon_t$. If the CAPM holds, this intercept term should be zero when the regression is expressed in excess return form.

Jensen's alpha measures the marginal impact to the Sharpe ratio of adding a small

---

[3] Brown, et al (2004) provide evidence that some Australian money managers engage in a pattern of trading consistent with the behavior described here.

amount of an asset to the market.[4] Consequently, any portfolio with a Sharpe ratio in excess of the market's must have a positive alpha. In particular, the alphas of the maximal Sharpe ratio portfolios described above are[5]

$$\alpha_{\text{MSR}} = \bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}(1 - \mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2 / \mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2) > 0.$$

(6)

Clearly, alpha is subject to severe manipulation. A MSRP can be created with any desired leverage, so its alpha can in theory be made as large as desired by levering.

The Treynor (1965) ratio and the Treynor appraisal ratio were introduced in part to avoid the leverage problem inherent in alpha. The Treynor measure is the ratio of alpha to beta[6] while the appraisal measure is the ratio of alpha to residual standard deviation. Like the Sharpe measure, and unlike alpha, the two Treynor measures are unaffected by leverage.

Both Treynor measures indicate superior performance for the MSRP. The MSRP's two Treynor ratios are[7]

$$\mathcal{T}_{\text{MSR}} \equiv \frac{\alpha_{\text{MSR}}}{\beta_{\text{MSR}}} = \left(\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 / \mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2 - 1\right)\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}} > 0$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{MSR}} \equiv \frac{\alpha_{\text{MSR}}}{\sqrt{\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}} - \beta_{\text{MSR}} \cdot x_{\text{mkt}}]}} = \sqrt{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 - \mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2} > 0.$$

(7)

Any MSRP has the largest possible Treynor appraisal ratio, but Treynor ratios in excess of the MSRP's can be achieved by forming portfolios with positive alphas and betas close to zero.[8]

In addition, since the Sharpe ratio is subject to dynamic manipulation, alpha and both

---

[4] If asset i is combined with the market into a portfolio $wx_i + (1-w)x_{\text{mkt}}$, then $\left.(\partial \mathcal{S}/\partial w)\right|_{w=0} = \alpha_i / \sigma_{\text{mkt}}$.

[5] The beta of the maximal-Sharpe-ratio portfolio, x_{MSR}, is

$$\beta_{\text{MSR}} \equiv \frac{\text{Cov}[x_{\text{MSR}}, x_{\text{mkt}}]}{\text{Var}[x_{\text{mkt}}]} = \frac{\text{Cov}[x_{\text{MSR}}, x_{\text{mkt}}]}{\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}]} \frac{\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}]}{\text{Var}[x_{\text{mkt}}]} = \frac{\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}}}{\bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}} \frac{\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}]}{\text{Var}[x_{\text{mkt}}]} = \frac{\bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}}{\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}}} \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}$ is the Sharpe ratio of the market. The third equality follows since the MSRP is mean-variance efficient by definition so $\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}} = \bar{x}_{\text{MSR}} \cdot \text{Cov}[x_{\text{MSR}}, x_{\text{mkt}}]/\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}]$.

[6] Treynor's (1965) original definition of his measure was $r_f - \alpha/\beta$; however, α/β is now the commonly accepted definition.

[7] The Treynor ratio can be computed from the MSRP's α in equation (6) and its β in footnote 5. To compute the Treynor appraisal ratio, we use α and

$$\text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}} - \beta_{\text{MSR}} x_{\text{mkt}}] = \text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}] - 2\beta_{\text{MSR}}\, \text{Cov}[x_{\text{MSR}}, x_{\text{mkt}}] + \beta_{\text{MSR}}^2\, \text{Var}[x_{\text{mkt}}]$$

$$= \text{Var}[x_{\text{MSR}}] - \beta_{\text{MSR}}^2\, \text{Var}[x_{\text{mkt}}] = \frac{\bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2} - \left(\frac{\bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}}{\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}}} \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}\right)^2 \frac{\bar{x}_{\text{mkt}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2} = \frac{\bar{x}_{\text{MSR}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}\left(1 - \frac{\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}}^2}{\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2}\right).$$

[8] A portfolio that shorts β_{MSR} dollars in the market for every dollar in the MSRP will have a beta of zero and a positive alpha. Therefore, its Treynor ratio will be $+\infty$.

Treynor measures are as well and can be increased above these statically achieved values. The manipulation is illustrated in Figure 2. If returns have been above (below) average, then decreasing (increasing) the leverage in the future, will generate a market line for the portfolio with a positive alpha. Not surprisingly, this is very similar to the dynamic manipulation that produces a superior Sharpe ratio — leverage is decreased (increased) after good (bad) returns.

[Insert Figure 2 here]

Alpha-like measures can also be computed from models other than the CAPM. Under quite general conditions, the generalized alpha of an asset or portfolio in a single-period model is[9]

$$\alpha_p^{\text{gen}} = \bar{x}_p - B_p \bar{x}_m \qquad \text{where} \quad B_p = \frac{\text{Cov}[u'(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_m), \tilde{x}]}{\text{Cov}[u'(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_m), \tilde{x}_m]}. \qquad (8)$$

B_p is a generalized measure of systematic risk, r_f is the per-period (not-annualized) interest rate, and $u(\cdot)$ is the utility function of the representative investor holding the market. The systematic risk coefficient, B, can be estimated by regressing x on x_m using $u'(\cdot)$ as an instrumental variable. Ingersoll (1987) and Leland (1999) suggest using a power utility function where

$$u'(1+r_f+x_m) = (1+r_f+x_m)^{-\rho} \quad \text{with} \quad \rho = \frac{\ell n[\mathbb{E}(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_m)] - \ell n(1+r_f)}{\text{Var}[\ell n(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_m)]}. \qquad (9)$$

This generalized alpha gives a correct measure of mispricing assuming that the representative utility function is correctly matched to the market portfolio; that is, if the market portfolio does maximize the utility function employed. But this statement, tautological as it is, only applies to single-period or static manipulation. Even if the utility is correctly matched to the market, strategically rebalancing the portfolio over time can give an apparent positive alpha due to the deviation between the average and a properly conditioned expectation. The basic technique is the same — decrease (increase) leverage after good (bad) returns.

Beyond the single-factor CAPM, there are several alpha-like performance measures in use. These models augment the single factor CAPM model with additional risk factors such as the Fama-French factors. However, within the simulations discussed in the next sub-section, no such factors exist. The market returns are generated in an environment where (8) with $\alpha^{\text{gen}} = 0$ is the correct way to price. This single factor model should do at least as well in the simulated environment as any model with additional, but within the simulation, unpriced, factors. Similarly, if a multi-factor model were simulated, a multi-dimensional rebalancing of the portfolio should produce positive alphas. For this reason, the Chen and Knez (1996) measure and similar measures have not been examined.

1D. Manipulating the Sharpe Ratio and Alpha with Transactions Costs

In practice, a manager can change a portfolio's characteristics far more frequently than once during the typical measurement period. On the other hand, the costs of transacting may

---

[9] See Ingersoll (1987) for the derivation of this general measure of systematic risk.

eliminate the apparent advantage of many manipulation strategies. As we show below even very high transaction costs cannot prevent managers from manipulating the Sharpe ratio or other performance measures.

Determining the optimal dynamic manipulation strategies for all of the popular performance measures is beyond the scope of our paper. The optimal manipulation strategy depends on the size of the transaction costs, the complete set of returns to date within the evaluation period, the distribution of future returns, and the number of periods remaining in the evaluation period. However, for our purposes, an optimal strategy is not necessary. We only want to establish whether reasonably simple trading strategies can distort the existing measures even in the presence of transactions costs, and if so, by how much.

[Insert Table I here]

Table I shows the Sharpe ratio performance of a dynamically rebalanced portfolio. The portfolio is always invested 100% in the market with leverage; no derivatives are used to alter the distribution. The leverage starts at one. After the first year, the portfolio is levered at the beginning of each month so that the target mean is given by equation (4) though the leverage is also constrained to be between 0.5 and 1.5 so the portfolio will not be too extreme in nature. The leverage is achieved by buying or selling a synthetic forward contract consisting of a long position in calls and a short position in puts that are at-the-money in present value i.e., the strike price per dollar invested in the market is $e^{r\Delta t}$. Trades in these two options are assessed a round-trip transaction cost of 0%, 10%, or 20%.   The simulation consisted of 10,000 repetitions.

On average the dynamically-manipulated portfolio's Sharpe ratio is 13% higher than the market's and 7% higher than the MSRP's. In the 10,000 trials, the manipulated portfolio had a Sharpe ratio higher than the market's 82.6% of the time in the absence of transactions costs.[10] Even with a 20% round-trip transactions cost, the dynamically-manipulated portfolio still beat the market almost three-quarters of the time. It should be mentioned here that comparing these winning percentages to 50% is a conservative test of how good the manipulated Sharpe ratio is. The CAPM predicts that any portfolio's Sharpe cannot be bigger than the market's — not that it will be bigger or smaller with some measurement error.

The Sharpe-manipulated portfolio beats the market frequently, but is it substantially better statistically; that is, is the difference in the Sharpe ratios significant? In practice this question is seldom asked because Sharpe ratios are at least as difficult to estimate precisely as are mean returns.[11] However, differences between two Sharpe ratios can be more precisely estimated

---

[10] The frequency with which one portfolio beats another must be interpreted with caution when the "winning" portfolio holds derivatives. To illustrate, consider two portfolios that are almost identical. The only difference is the second portfolio sells derivative assets that have a positive payoff only rarely, like deep out-of-the-money options. The proceeds are invested in bonds. Whenever, the payoff event for the derivative does not occur, then the second portfolio's returns will be uniformly greater than the first portfolio's returns. This will lead to a "better" outcome for the second portfolio by almost any performance measure. Since the payoff event can be made as rare as desired with derivative contracts, any portfolio, even an ex ante optimal one, can be beaten often. In our simulations here only the leverage is changed so they are not subject to this problem

[11] Lo (2002) has shown that the asymptotic standard error of the Sharpe ratio of a portfolio with iid returns is $[(1+\mathcal{S}^2)/T]^{1/2}$ so the coefficient of determination is $\mathcal{S}^{-1}[(1+\mathcal{S}^2)/T]^{1/2}$. The coefficient of determination for the mean return is $\sigma T^{-1/2}\bar{x}^{-1} = \mathcal{S}^{-1}T^{-1/2}$. The former is larger by a factor of $(1+\mathcal{S}^2)^{1/2}$ so the same difference in percentage terms is less significant for a Sharpe ratio than it is for an average return.

if the underlying returns are correlated as would generally be true and is certainly true in our example. Statistical tests of portfolio returns generally assume that the returns are independent and identically distributed over time. Such is not the case here for the manipulated portfolio which makes deriving the distribution of the difference in the Sharpe ratios a difficult task. Furthermore, there is little point in doing so as our simulation is a constructed example, and the statistic we derive would be applicable only to that case.

Fortunately we need not do so. Our simulations give us a sample distribution of the differences, so we can easily determine how often the difference is k standard deviations above or below zero. For example, with no transactions costs, the difference between the manipulated Sharpe ratio and the market Sharpe ratio was more than 1.65 standard deviations above zero 20.4% of the time. It was never more than 1.65 standard deviations below zero. Were the difference normally distributed, each of these should have occurred 5% of the time. Of course, the differences between the Sharpe ratios is not normal, but this is still evidence that a properly constructed test would conclude that the difference was significant more often than chance would prescribe if the true expected difference were zero. Table I gives the percentages of times that the Sharpe ratio difference exceeds 1.65 standard deviations.

Using Jensen's alpha or one of the Treynor measures to evaluate performance gives even "better" results. The dynamic portfolio has an average annualized alpha over 2% and the alpha is positive more than 92% of the time in the absence of transactions costs. Even with 20% round-trip costs, the average alpha is still 1.6% and is positive over 85% of the time. The generalized alpha shows only slightly weaker performance for the manipulated portfolio. In the simulations we had the luxury of knowing the correct utility function, but superior performance as measured by the generalized alpha is insensitive to risk aversion assumed. Similar superior performance was found for risk aversions throughout the range 2 to 4. It is not surprising that the alphas can be manipulated more easily than the Sharpe ratios. The CAPM null hypothesis is that $\alpha = 0$. With measurement error positive and negative deviations are approximately equally likely. However, the CAPM null hypothesis on the Sharpe ratio is that it is less than the market's. The manipulation on the Sharpe ratio has to first make up this difference before beating it.

2. Manipulating Other Measures

2A. Reward-to-Variability Measures

Many other performance measures have been proposed over the years to correct perceived flaws in the Sharpe ratio or to extend or modify its measurement. Some of these measures use a benchmark portfolio — usually some market index. All of them are subject to the same type of manipulation that can be used on the Sharpe ratio. In this and the next sections we examine many of the more popular alternatives.

Modigliani and Modigliani's (1997) M-squared score is simply a restatement of the Sharpe ratio. The M-squared measure is the expected excess return that would be earned on a portfolio if it were levered so that its standard deviation was equal to that on the benchmark. Clearly maximizing the Sharpe ratio also maximizes the M-squared measure relative to any benchmark. Therefore, it is also subject to the same manipulation.

Sharpe's information ratio is another simple variation on the original Sharpe ratio. The

difference is that the excess returns are calculated relative to a risky benchmark portfolio rather than the risk-free rate. If x and x_b are the excess returns on the portfolio and the benchmark, the information ratio is

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{infomation}} = \frac{\overline{x} - \overline{x}_b}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(\tilde{x} - \tilde{x}_b)}} . \tag{10}$$

Since excess returns are the returns on zero net cost (or arbitrage) portfolios, they can be combined simply by adding them together without any weighting. Clearly the arbitrage portfolio that is a combination of the excess returns $\tilde{x}$ and $\tilde{x}_b$ has an information ratio with respect to the benchmark, $\tilde{x}_b$, numerically equal to the Sharpe ratio of $\tilde{x}$ alone; therefore, the information ratio is subject to the same manipulation as the Sharpe ratio. In particular, adding the MSRP excess returns to the market portfolio will achieve the highest possible information ratio relative to the market.

  One criticism commonly leveled against the Sharpe ratio is that very high returns are penalized because they increase the standard deviation more than the average. This is the reason the MSRP has bounded returns. To overcome this problem, it has been suggested to measure risk using only "bad" returns. In particular, Sortino (1991) and others have measured risk as the root-mean-square deviation below some minimum acceptable return. Van der Meer, Plantinga and Forsey (1999) have further suggested that the "reward" in the numerator should only count "good" returns. Sortino's downside-risk and van der Meer, Plantinga and Forsey's upside-potential Sharpe-like measures are

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{x}]}{\left(\mathbb{E}[\text{Min}^2(\tilde{x} - \underline{x}, 0)]\right)^{1/2}} \qquad \mathcal{U} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(\tilde{x} - \underline{x}, 0)]}{\left(\mathbb{E}[\text{Min}^2(\tilde{x} - \underline{x}, 0)]\right)^{1/2}} . \tag{11}$$

The minimal acceptable excess return, $\underline{x}$, is commonly chosen to be zero.[12]

  While these two measures do avoid the problem inherent in the Sharpe ratio of penalizing very good outcomes, they do this *too well* so that the highest possible returns are sought in lieu of all others. As shown in the Appendix, the Sortino downside-risk and VPF upside-potential maximizing portfolios are very similar. They both hold the MSRP, an extra very large investment in the state security for the state with the highest market return (the lowest likelihood ratio $\hat{p}_1/p_1 \leq \hat{p}_i/p_i$), and bonds.

---

[12] The minimum acceptable return is sometimes set to the portfolio's average return for the Sortino measure. This makes the denominator the semi-standard deviation. The average return should not be used like this for the VPF measure as the ratio is then invariant to a uniform upward shift in the entire probability distribution.

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MDR}} = \frac{\overline{x}}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2}\left[1-(1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2)\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}\right]+\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2}\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}x_i^{\mathrm{MSR}} \quad i<I \qquad x_I^{\mathrm{MDR}}=\frac{\overline{x}}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2}\left[1-\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}(1-\mathcal{D}^2)\right]$$

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MUP}}=\left[\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}\mathcal{U}^2-(1-\hat{p}_I)\right]^{-1}\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\left[x_i^{\mathrm{MSR}}-\overline{x}(1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2)\right] \quad i<I \qquad x_I^{\mathrm{MUP}}=\frac{\overline{x}}{p_I}\left[1-\frac{p_I(1-\hat{p}_I)}{\hat{p}_I\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MUP}}^2}\right] (12)$$

where $\qquad \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2 = 1+\frac{p_I^2}{\hat{p}_I^2}\sum_{i=1}^{I}\hat{p}_i^2/p_i-2\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I} \qquad$ and $\qquad \mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MUP}}^2=\frac{p_I^2}{\hat{p}_I^2}\sum_{i=1}^{I-1}\hat{p}_i^2/p_i$.

$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\mathrm{MUP}}$ are the largest possible Sortino downside risk and VPF upside potential ratios.

Figure 3 illustrates the maximal Sortino and VPF ratio portfolios. The one-month return on the market has a twenty-period binomial distribution that approximates a lognormal market with a continuously-compounded risk premium of 12% and a logarithmic volatility of σ = 20%.[13] There are twenty periods over the one month and twenty-one final states. Both port-folios achieve a very high return in the best market outcome state and have a negative excess returns in all but this best state.[14] The annualized Sortino and VPF ratios of the market are 1.00 and 2.86. The scores for the optimized Sortino ratio portfolio are over twice as high at 2.83 and 6.04. The same is true for the optimized VPF portfolio; it scores 2.76 and 6.17.

[Insert Figure 3 here]

Clearly the maximal Sortino and VPF ratio portfolios are far from optimal, and even a cursory examination of the period-by period returns would likely attract very negative attention. For example, both of these portfolios have Sharpe ratios that are less than a tenth that of the market. Conversely the MSRP has a Sortino and VPF ratio just a bit below that of the market.

The maximal-ratio strategies are also risky in a sampling sense. The best market state is likely to have only a small probability of occurring, and should it fail to occur during the evaluation period, the sample averages and therefore the ratios would be negative even in a bull market. On the other hand, should no below-$\underline{x}$ outcomes occur, both ratios would be infinite. Of course, the maximal-ratio portfolios need not be employed to manipulate the measures. The payoffs in Figure 2 indicate that a high ratio can probably be achieved merely by purchasing calls — the further out-of-the-money the better. For example, in our simulation environment, simply investing the entire portfolio in at-the-money market index calls each month has a Sortino ratio of 1.20 and a VPF ratio of 3.68 — substantially higher than the market's. Using ten percent out-of-the-money calls increases these ratios to 1.79 and 5.10.

As with the Sharpe ratio, dynamic manipulation can also increase the measure or increase the measure further when used along with static manipulations. One simple scheme can often achieve an infinite ratio when the minimal acceptable excess return is zero (or negative). If the first excess return is positive (which should be true more than one-half of the time), then holding

---

[13] A binomial market environment is used as an illustration here because in a lognormal market or any market with a continuous distribution, the maximal Sortino and VPF portfolios have an infinitesimal negative excess return except in the highest return "state". In this state, which occurs with zero probability in a market with a continuum of states, the return is infinite.

[14] For any choice of $\underline{x}$, both portfolios have returns less than $\underline{x}$ in all but the best state.

the risk-free asset for every other period will give a positive numerator and a denominator of zero resulting in an infinite measure.

To illustrate the dynamic manipulation possibilities of these two measures even with very restricted portfolios, we employ simulations similar to those used for the Sharpe ratio. If the historical returns up through time t_0 have an average excess return of $\overline{x}_h$ and a Sortino measure of $\mathcal{D}_h$, then the portfolio's measured Sortino ratio over the entire period will be

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{\gamma \overline{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\overline{x}_f}{\sqrt{\gamma \sum_{t<t_0} \text{Max}^2(-x_t, 0) + (1-\gamma)\sum_{t>t_0} \text{Max}^2(-x_t, 0)}} = \frac{\gamma \overline{x}_h + (1-\gamma)\overline{x}_f}{\sqrt{\gamma \overline{x}_h^2 \mathcal{D}_h^{-2} + (1-\gamma)\overline{x}_f^2 \mathcal{D}_f^{-2}}} \tag{13}$$

where the subscript f denotes future performance. As with the Sharpe ratio, the overall Sortino ratio is maximized by maximizing the Sortino ratio in the future and selecting the leverage so that

$$\overline{x}_f^* = \begin{cases} \overline{x}_h \, \mathcal{D}_f^2 / \mathcal{D}_h^2 & \text{for} \quad \overline{x}_h > 0 \\ \infty & \text{for} \quad \overline{x}_h \leq 0. \end{cases} \tag{14}$$

Table II shows the Sortino and VPF ratio performance of a dynamically rebalanced portfolio under the same conditions used for the Sharpe ratio. Again no derivative assets were used to statically manipulate the ratios. The market is held each month, and only the leverage is changed, each month after the 12th, as described in (14). The manipulated portfolios produce statistics that are superior to simply holding the market portfolio for both modified measures as well as the Sharpe ratio.[15] The Sortino ratio is higher than the market's more than 82% of the time even with 20% round-trip transactions costs. It is significantly higher at the 5% confidence level almost 14% of the time.

[Insert Table II here]

The Sharpe and VPF ratios are also higher nearly three-quarters of the time for this manipulation. The same manipulation produces good results for all three ratios because each of the ratios has the same general dynamic manipulation rule — decrease leverage after good luck (after the historical score has been high).

The best dynamic manipulation VPF ratio is almost the same. The target in the future is proportional to the upside realization in the past and the ratio of the squares of the expected and realized VPF measures; i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(\tilde{x}_f, 0)] = \text{Avg}[\text{Max}(x_h, 0)] \times \mathcal{U}_f^2 / \mathcal{U}_h^2$. The simulation results for the VPF measure manipulation are not presented here as they were very similar. Understandably, this manipulation produces somewhat higher average VPF ratios and beats the market's VPF ratio more often while producing somewhat lower Sortino ratios.

2B. Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy Timing Measures

---

[15] The simulations also show that for a base lognormal distribution, the sample Sortino and VPF ratios are almost certainly biased (like the Sharpe ratio for the MSRP and unlike (approximately) the Sharpe ratio for the market). The true Sortino and VPF ratios for the market are 1.002 and 2.844. The sample averages were 1.117 and 2.972 with standard errors of 0.00935 and 0.00831. So the sample averages were higher than the true values by more than 12 and 15 standard errors, respectively.

13

The timing measures of Treynor and Mazuy (1966) and Henriksson and Merton (1981) are bivariate regressions that use an extra market factor to capture managers' timing abilities (rather than to capture an additional source of risk). The regressions used are

$$\tilde{x}_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \tilde{m}_t + \gamma_2 \tilde{w}_t + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t \tag{15}$$

where $\tilde{x}_t$ and $\tilde{m}_t$ are the excess returns on the portfolio and the market and $\tilde{w}_t$ is the variable used to capture timing ability. The timing variables are $\tilde{w}_t \equiv \text{Max}(-\tilde{m}_t, 0)$ and $\tilde{w}_t \equiv \tilde{m}_t^2$ for HM and TM, respectively. The HM model is consistent with a manager who changes his portfolio leverage between two values depending on whether he forecasts that the market return will exceed the risk-free rate or not. As shown by Admati, Bhattacharya, Pfleiderer, and Ross (1986), the TM model is consistent with a manager whose target beta varies linearly with his market forecast.

Unlike the measures we have already considered, performance here is characterized by two numbers. In each case a positive γ_2 is an indication of market timing ability and a positive γ_0 is considered a sign of superior stock selection. However, as shown by Jagannathan and Korajczyk (1986), simple trading strategies including or mimicking options can produce positive γ_2's and negative γ_0's or vice versa.[16] An unequivocal demonstration of timing ability must, therefore, satisfy a joint test on the two coefficients.

Merton (1981) has shown that the total contribution of the manager's timing and selectivity in the HM model is $\gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 \mathcal{P}(1, \Delta t, e^{r\Delta t})$ per dollar invested. $\mathcal{P}(S, \tau, K)$ is the value of a τ-period put option on the market with a strike price of K. The intuition for this conclusion is that a market timer who could forecast perfectly whether or not the market return would exceed the interest rate and who adjusted his portfolio to be fully invested in the market or bonds could essentially provide such a put for free. In addition his selectivity ability would provide the present value of γ_0 per dollar invested. The total contribution is the amount by which the value of the protective put exceeds its average "cost" measured by the lowered present value of the extra average return.

Similarly, under the TM model, the total contribution of the manager's investment ability per dollar invested is given by the same formula where the value of a derivative contract that pays the square of the market's excess return replaces the put's value. This value is derived in Appendix D. The total contributed value, $\mathcal{V}$, of the money manager's contribution to timing and selectivity is

$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{HM}} = \gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 \mathcal{P}(1, \Delta t, e^{r\Delta t})$$
$$\mathcal{V}_{\text{TM}} = \gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 e^{r\Delta t}(e^{\sigma^2 \Delta t} - 1). \tag{16}$$

Unfortunately with a complete market of derivative assets, the TM and HM measures can be manipulated to any degree desired; that is, any values for the γ's can be achieved with many different portfolios. The minimum-variance portfolio that achieves any particular (positive) target values for γ_0 and γ_2 will be long in the MSRP and the "timing" put struck at-the-money in

---

[16] For example, buying (writing) calls produces a positive (negative) γ_2 and a negative (positive) γ_0. The MSRP also has a negative γ_2 and a positive γ_0. It should be noted that due to the γ_2 term in these regressions, γ_0 and γ_1 are not that standard Jensen's alpha and CAPM beta.

present value terms.[17] It might be short or long in the market and bonds depending on the targeted mean excess return and market beta.

[Insert Figure 4 here]

Figure 4 illustrates the payoffs on the minimum-variance zero-beta portfolios with a timing target of $\gamma_2 = 0.1$ and a selectivity target of $\gamma_0 = 10$ basis points per month. The environment is the same as before — a lognormal market with a risk premium of 12% per year and a volatility of 20%. The graph displays approximately the middle 95% of the return distribution. The timing returns fluctuate from local extremes near plus and minus 20% over the market range from −7% to +7%. In practice, of course, only scattered points on the curves would be seen, and the portfolio would probably be described as somewhat volatile but otherwise "normal."

Reexamining Figure 2 we see that the alpha-manipulating strategy that levers down after good returns and levers up after poor returns has a general convex shape. This strategy will likely produce a false positive timing performance. Simulations verify that this is true; however, while γ_2 and the total contribution as measured in (16) are positive, simply changing leverage also yields a (false) negative selection ability. Both γ_0 and γ_2 can be made positive if a call position is written against the portfolio since this produces an extra return when the market has a small return.

[Insert Table III here]

Table III shows the performance of a manipulated portfolio that holds the market and writes a ten percent out-of-the-money call on 2% of its holdings; that is, the portfolio shares only 98% of the market returns above 10% in any month. After one year, the leverage is changed every month to equal 0.5 or 1.5 if the fraction of months that the market's return was less than average was more or less than half. The resulting portfolio produces a total contributed value of around 98 to 156 basis points per year depending on transactions costs as measured by either HM or TM. Our simulations show that the total contributed value was positive about 65% to 70% of the time and significantly so (at the 5% level) 9% to 14% of the time. The results are not as strong as for the other measures, but this is not surprising. The HM and TM measures are timing measures specifically designed to for timing ability and should be able to better reject our dynamic manipulations than the other measures discussed so far.

The components of performance, selectivity and timing, do not have as strong an individual showing because the simulation was designed to produce over all good performance and the two measures are negatively correlated. Increasing the out-of-the-money call sales, for example, would increase γ_0 and decrease γ_2. However, each component if positive more than half of the time and significantly so more often than chance would allow.

3. Manipulation Proof Performance Measures

In the preceding sections of this paper, we have established that popular measures of

---

[17] See section D of the Appendix for a proof. For the Treynor-Mazuy measure the portfolio needs to be long in an exotic derivative contract paying the square of the market price rather than put options.

performance are susceptible to manipulation even when transaction costs are high. We have shown that manipulation requires no superior information and little technical sophistication. Simple schemes like trading puts and calls or simply altering a portfolio's leverage can often create performance that looks superior. Furthermore, even if money managers are not seeking to manipulate their performance numbers, competitive evolution may favor those managers whose strategies happen to look like our manipulation strategies if these measures are widely used. We have shown that these problems can be of concern even when evaluating well-diversified port-folios of equities, but increasingly money is being invested in hedge funds and other venues whose return distributions differ substantially from those historically found in all-equity funds. For such funds even more problems may arise.

Such problems could be avoided with a manipulation-free measure. But what does it mean for a measure to be manipulation-free? What exactly should it encourage a manager to do or not do? Intuitively, if a manager has no private information and markets are efficient, then holding some benchmark portfolio, possibly levered, should maximize the measure's expected value. The benchmark might be the market, but in some contexts other benchmarks could be appropriate. Static manipulation is the tilting of the portfolio away from the (levered) benchmark even when there is no informational reason to do so. Dynamic manipulation is altering the portfolio over time based on performance rather than new information. Our goal is to characterize a measure that punishes uninformed manipulation of both types.

Formally a performance measure is a function of the portfolio's probability distribution across the outcome states. That is, if $\mathbf{r}$ is the vector of returns across all the possible outcomes, then the performance measure is a real-valued function, $\Theta(\mathbf{r})$, of those returns. [18] In practice, of course, we do not know the true distribution, and the estimated performance measure must be a function of the returns realized over time. We will denote the estimated performance measure as $\hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t, s_t \rangle_{t=1}^{T}\right)$. [19] Each time period and its return, r_t, can, but need not, be identified with the state, s_t, that occurred. For example, estimating the Sharpe ratio requires knowing only the returns while to estimate Jensen's alpha we need to know the contemporaneous market return for each return.

One property that any manipulation-proof performance measure (MPPM) must have is that it recognizes arbitrage opportunities as good. If the portfolio-return distribution $\mathbf{r}_1$ dominates the portfolio return distribution $\mathbf{r}_2$, then the performance measure must rank it higher, $\Theta(\mathbf{r}_1) > \Theta(\mathbf{r}_2)$. This same property should hold for the estimated performance measure, though the dominance in this case may only be apparent as not all states may have been realized. We already know that the Sharpe ratio fails this simple test — if the returns in one or more states

---

[18] In principle, a performance measure could be pair or more of numbers (like γ_0 and γ_2 in the TM and HM models or mean and variance). In general, of course, such performance measures would not provide a complete ranking of portfolios. In one sense multi-valued performance measures would be harder to manipulate since they would provide more information. In another more practical sense, multi-valued performance measures would be easier to manipulate since without a complete ranking there would be more portfolios that the market benchmark did not beat. We confine our attention to single-valued performance measures like the Sharpe ratio.

[19] Using the time series of returns in the estimated performance measure $\hat{\Theta}$ to represent the true performance measure assumes that the realizations of portfolio returns (and states) are sufficiently independent and identically distributed over time so that the frequencies are will be equal to the ex ante probabilities in a sufficiently large sample..

are increased sufficiently, the ratio will decrease even though the return distribution unequivo-
cally improves based on the observed evidence.

However, this property while necessary is not sufficient to make a measure manipulation-
proof. To have a performance measure that is proof against dynamic manipulation, the function
must have a strong independence property such that the altering of some components does not
affect the relative ranking based on other components. A performance measure cannot be
dynamically manipulated only if the relative rankings of different futures are unaffected by the
particular history that has occurred.[20] Not that this does *not* say that the history does not affect
rankings only that two different futures can be compared independently of the past.

This independence property is known from utility theory where it is called (strong) utility
independence or strong utility separation. (See e.g., Debreu (1960).) Furthermore, a ranking
(i.e., ordinal) function has this independence property if and only if it has an additive represen-
tation. That is, the only possible MPPMs can be expressed as

$$\hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t, s_t\rangle_{t=1}^T\right) = \Upsilon\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^T \theta_t(r_t, s_t)\right). \tag{17}$$

The function $\Upsilon(\cdot)$ is any increasing function and is irrelevant for ranking; therefore, it can be take
to be the identify function except when otherwise more convenient. We chose to write the
argument as an average rather than a simple sum because most performance measures are based
on some kind of average. Each function θ_t must be increasing if $\hat{\Theta}$ is to satisfy the "arbitrage is
good" criterion.

Generally, each time period is treated identically, apart from any state dependence, so
that all θ_t are the same.[21] In this case, any performance measure free from dynamic manipulation
must be equivalent to a simple average of some, possibly state-dependent, function of returns.
Some simple performance measures that cannot be dynamically manipulated are the average
return, $\theta(r_t) = r_t$; the average market-adjusted return, $\theta(r_t, s_t) = r_t - m_t(s_t)$; and the geometric
average return, $\theta(r_t) = \ell n(1 + r_t)$.

Any function θ will create a performance measure, Θ, that is proof against dynamic
manipulation. To prevent static manipulation, θ must be strictly increasing, as previously noted,
and concave in the returns. If θ is not concave, then levering the portfolio by borrowing will
increase the measure as will simply adding unpriced risk. Concavity is a natural property to
demand since it is also necessary (and sufficient) if we want to rate as better the less risky (in a
Rothschild-Stiglitz sense) of two portfolios with the same average return.

This analysis shows that manipulation-proof evaluations of portfolios are computed as
the expectation, or in practice the average, of some function of returns. The natural set of perfor-
mance measure functions thus is the same as the set of common utility functions, in that both are
time-separable, increasing and concave. The only remaining question is what functions can be

---

[20] Precisely, the measure is proof against dynamic manipulation only if $\hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t^0\rangle_1^\tau, \langle r_t'\rangle_{\tau+1}^T\right) > \hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t^0\rangle_1^\tau, \langle r_t''\rangle_{\tau+1}^T\right)$ implies
$\hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t\rangle_1^\tau, \langle r_t'\rangle_{\tau+1}^T\right) > \hat{\Theta}\left(\langle r_t\rangle_1^\tau, \langle r_t''\rangle_{\tau+1}^T\right)$ for any history $\langle r_t\rangle_1^\tau$. This independence property must also hold for all
conditioning subsets.

[21] An identical treatment of each period's return is not a requirement for the measure to be manipulation proof. For
example, the time-dependent average, $\theta_t(r_t) = \delta^{T-t}r_t$ can be used. This puts extra emphasis on recent returns.

used.

Any measure Θ as defined in (17) with θ_t an increasing, concave function of the return is a manipulation-proof performance measure. But if we wish the measure to be consistent with a market in equilibrium, θ must be further restricted to have a power form. There are two justifications for this conclusion.

Since utility is defined over wealth or consumption, while performance measures are defined over returns, an MPPM that treats returns identically is consistent with expected utility theory only if the utility of returns is independent of wealth. This is true amongst additively separable utility functions only for power utility. Additionally as shown by Rubinstein (1976) and He and Leland (1993), if the market portfolio's rate of return is independent and identically distributed over time and markets are perfect, then the representative investor must have power utility.

The MPPM measure we choose here is

$$\hat{\Theta} \equiv \frac{1}{(1-\rho)\Delta t} \ell n \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \left[(1+r_{ft})^{-1}(1+r_{ft}+x_t) \right]^{1-\rho} \right). \tag{18}$$

where r_{ft} and x_t are the per-period (not annualized) interest rate and the excess return on the portfolio over period t. The function $\theta(\cdot)$ is similar to a power utility function with relative risk aversion of ρ.[22] We have transformed the measure (using Υ) so that $\hat{\Theta}$ can be interpreted as the annualized continuously-compounded excess return certainty equivalent of the portfolio. That is, a risk-free portfolio earning $\exp[\ell n(1+r_{ft})+\hat{\Theta}\Delta t]$ each period would also have a measured performance of $\hat{\Theta}$.

Finally, we want to associate the MPPM with some benchmark portfolio. This would typically be some market index. In the absence of any private information, we want the MPPM to score the chosen benchmark highly. If the benchmark portfolio has a lognormal distribution, then the parameter ρ should be selected so that

$$\rho = \frac{\ell n \left[\mathbb{E}(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_b) \right] - \ell n(1+r_f)}{\text{Var}\left[\ell n(1+r_f+\tilde{x}_b) \right]}. \tag{19}$$

Historically this number is about 2 to 4 for the CRSP value-weighted market portfolio depending on the time period and frequency of data used. We have used a relative risk aversion of 3 in our simulations.

Table IV shows the performance for our manipulated portfolios in our previous simulations. The MPPMs are determined for three different risk aversions, 2, 3, and 4.[23] The

---

[22] This measure is *not* the same as using power utility of terminal wealth. Power utility of terminal wealth would be $(1-\rho)^{-1}\prod(1+r_{ft}+x_t)^{1-\rho}$ or a monotonic transformation of this. Utility of terminal wealth is a valid MPPM but is not a useful risk-adjusted measure since for any particular realization of returns, it always rates as best whichever portfolio achieved the largest total accumulation regardless of the risk aversion assumed.

[23] The range of relative risk aversions in the market might be much wider than 2 to 4; however, this range is meant to capture the range of risk aversions that would be relevant for the construction of mutual funds or other well diversified portfolios. Relative risk aversions of 2 to 4 correspond to portfolios that would range from leveraged positions of 1.5 down to 0.75. This should encompass most portfolios that would be ranked.

simulation was constructed with a market portfolio in which the risk aversion was 3, so the numbers in that column are correct. In practice we would not know the correct risk aversion to use so the other MPPMs are given to check the sensitivity.

[Insert Table IV here]

The computed MPPMs show correctly that the manipulated portfolios are not as good as the market.[24] For example, the Sharpe-manipulated portfolio had a Sharpe ratio exceeding the market's 82.6% of the time and was significantly larger 20.4% of the time at the 5% confidence level. On the other hand, the MPPM measure shows that this portfolio beat the market only 46.3% of the time and was significantly (5% confidence) better only 0.4% of the time. Conversely it significantly underperformed the market 9.6% of the time as measured by the MPPM but only 1.4% of the time as measured by the Sharpe ratio. The average performance was 96 basis points below the market on a certainty equivalent basis.

The other portfolios show similar results. Their underperformances range from 87 to 126 basis points and they never beat the market more than 50% of the time. They significantly underperform the market more than 9% of the time and outperform it from 0.4% to 2.4% of the time. The results are similar for MPPMs computed assuming risk aversions of 2 or 4.

Of course, as well as penalizing poor performance, we would like an MPPM to recognize good performance when it occurs. Tables V and VI show the performance of money managers who try to provide stock selection and market timing, respectively.

Table V compares the annualized Sharpe ratio, alpha, and MPPM for informed and uninformed money manager managers. The informed money manager can provide an annual alpha of 1% at the cost of holding a portfolio with undiversified risk. The three panels show portfolios with annual residual risks of 20%, 2%, and 0.2%.[25] These are portfolios of approximately one, one hundred, and ten thousand component stocks. The uniformed manager holds similar under-diversified portfolios but has an alpha of zero. The table shows the average, standard deviation, and frequencies for the difference between the portfolio's and market's Sharpe ratios and MPPMs and for the portfolio's alpha.

The portfolio alphas are just as expected. They average 1% and 0% for the informed and uninformed managers. For the uninformed manager, they are significantly positive or negative just about the predicted 5%. For the informed manager they are significantly positive (negative) more (less) than 5% of the time regardless of the diversification — again as expected since alpha does not penalize for under-diversification.

For 10,000 stock portfolios all three of the measures show that the informed manager's portfolio is better than the market and the uniformed manager's portfolio is essentially identical to the market. For one hundred stock portfolios, the MPPM and Sharpe have almost the same results though the MPPM does marginally better at recognizing both informed and uninformed

---

[24] Only the zero-transactions-cost cases are reported. With transactions costs, the MPPM scores would be even lower.

[25] The logarithmic market return over a period of length Δt is $[\mu + \alpha - \frac{1}{2}(\sigma^2 + \upsilon^2)]\Delta t + (\sigma\tilde{\varepsilon} + \upsilon\tilde{\eta})\sqrt{\Delta t}$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ and $\tilde{\eta}$ are standard normal variables. The market's expected rate of return and log variance per unit time are μ and σ^2, respectively. The informed trader provides an α of 1% at a cost of a residual variation of υ of 20%, 2%, or 0.2%. The uninformed trader has the same residual variation with an α of zero.

managers. For one stock portfolios, the MPPM does substantially better at illustrating that the 1% alpha does not properly compensate for the lack of diversification.

Table VI compares the MPPM and Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy timing measures for informed an uninformed market timer. The informed market timer knows that a time varying mean explains a portion of the observed market variance. In the two panels, the informed trader information explains 0.1% and 1% of the market's variation, and he adjusts his leverage optimally.[26] The uninformed trader believes he has similar quality information, but does not so he adjusts his leverage to the same degree, but randomly.

The table shows the average, standard deviation, and frequencies for the timing coefficients, γ_2, and the total contributed value (as given in equation (16)) and the difference between the portfolio's and market's MPPMs. The HM and TM models are designed to recognize informed timing, but not to penalize uninformed timing. Thus, they show results consistent with the null hypothesis for the uniformed timer just as they would for a manager not trying to time at all. The MPPM, on the other hand, shows that uninformed timer is definitely hurting the portfolio's performance, and that the uninformed timer who thinks he has better information, hurts the portfolio more. The HM and TM measures recognize the informed trader more frequently because, unlike the MPPM, they do not penalize the portfolio's performance for the induced lack of complete intertemporal diversification.

4. Conclusion

Portfolio performance measurement has been a topic of interest within both the practitioner and academic communities for a long time. However, a reasonable concern among those that use a particular measure is whether or not the manager being evaluated might react by attempting to manipulate it. Several articles have noted that even when the evaluator knows the moments of the return distribution it is still possible to use informationless trades to boost the expected Sharpe ratio.

What has not been recognized is that because any performance measure must be estimated a fund manager can potentially game the estimation procedure as well. As this paper has shown, a manager that seeks to manipulate many of the more popular measures can indeed produce very impressive performance statistics. For example, a simple rebalancing strategy can yield a market beating Jensen's alpha 86% of the time even when transactions costs are set at an unrealistically high 20% of each dollar traded. But, these statistics are fraudulent in that they are produced entirely without private information. Indeed, most investors would probably prefer to hold the market index rather than the portfolios that manipulate the various measures tested in this paper.

If the current set of measures can be manipulated, can one then find one that cannot be

---

[26] The logarithmic market return over a period of length Δt is $(\mu + \tilde{s} - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t + \sigma\sqrt{(1-\delta^2)\Delta t}\,\tilde{\varepsilon}$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ is a standard normal variable. The market's unconditional expected rate of return and logarithmic variance per unit time are μ and σ^2, respectively. The information about the changing mean is in the signal, $\tilde{s}$, which is normally distributed with mean zero and variance $\delta^2\sigma^2/\Delta t$ where δ is the fraction of variation known to the informed trader. In the simulations, δ is set to 0.1% and 1%. The optimal market holding conditional on a signal, s, is equal to the conditional risk premium divided by the relative risk aversion times the conditional variance, $(\mu + s - r)/\rho(1-\delta^2)\sigma^2$. Since the unconditional risk premium is equal to the relative risk aversion times the unconditional variance, the optimal leverage conditional on a signal s is $(1+s/\rho\sigma^2)/(1-\delta^2)$.

and is simultaneously of some value to investors? This paper has shown that indeed such a measure exists. Manipulation-proof performance measures can be completely characterized (up to a monotonic transformation) as the weighted average of a utility-like function. Not only is it manipulation proof but it is no more difficult to calculate than the Sharpe ratio, and considerably easier to calculate than many of the other performance measures that have been proposed in the past to remedy the Sharpe ratio's shortcomings.

Appendix

A. The Maximal-Sharpe-Ratio Portfolio in a Complete Market

Consider a portfolio with excess return x_i in state i. The probability of state i is p_i. The Sharpe ratio of this portfolio is

$$\mathcal{S} = \frac{\sum p_i x_i}{\sqrt{\sum p_i x_i^2 - \left(\sum p_i x_i\right)^2}} \tag{A1}$$

This ratio is invariant to scaling so when maximizing it, we can fix the expected excess return at any positive value, $\sum p_i x_i = \bar{x} > 0$, with no loss of generality. Then maximizing the Sharpe ratio is equivalent to minimizing the mean squared return subject to an expected return of $\bar{x}$ with a cost of zero.

Form the Lagrangian[27]

$$\mathcal{L} = \tfrac{1}{2}\sum p_i x_i^2 + \lambda\left(\bar{x} - \sum p_i x_i\right) + \gamma\left(0 - \sum \hat{p}_i x_i\right) \tag{A2}$$

The first-order conditions for a minimum are

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_i} = p_i x_i^* - \lambda p_i + \gamma \hat{p}_i \qquad 0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = \bar{x} - \sum p_i x_i \qquad 0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma} = -\sum \hat{p}_i x_i \tag{A3}$$

The second-order condition for an interior minimum is also met.

Solving the first equation in (A3) gives the MSRP excess return in state i as

$$x_i^* = \lambda + \gamma \hat{p}_i / p_i . \tag{A4}$$

To determine the Lagrange multipliers, multiply (A4) by p_i and $\hat{p}_i$ and sum over states. Recognizing that $\sum p_i = \sum \hat{p}_i = 1$, gives

$$\bar{x} = \sum p_i x_i^* = \lambda \sum p_i + \gamma \sum \hat{p}_i = \lambda + \gamma$$
$$0 = \sum \hat{p}_i x_i^* = \lambda \sum \hat{p}_i + \gamma \sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i = \lambda + \gamma \sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i \tag{A5}$$

These equations can be solved to determine the multipliers values

$$\gamma = \frac{-\bar{x}}{\sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i - 1} \qquad \lambda = \bar{x} - \gamma \tag{A6}$$

---

[27] The zero-net-wealth budget constraint is expressed here using the risk-neutral probabilities in place of the state prices. Since the state price is $e^{-rT}\hat{p}_i$, a portfolio with a risk-neutral expected excess return of zero has a zero cost.

So the maximal-Sharpe-ratio portfolio is

$$x_i^* = \bar{x} + \gamma(\hat{p}_i/p_i - 1).$$ (A7)

The variance of the maximal-Sharpe ratio portfolio and the square of its Sharpe ratio are

$$\sigma_x^2 = \sum p(x_i^* - \bar{x})^2 = \sum p_i \gamma^2 (\hat{p}_i/p_i - 1)^2 = \gamma^2 \left[\sum \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 2\sum \hat{p}_i + \sum p_i \right]$$

$$= \gamma^2 \left[\sum \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 1 \right] = \bar{x}^2 \left[\sum \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 1 \right]^{-1}$$ (A8)

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 = \frac{\bar{x}^2}{\sigma_x^2} = \sum \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 1.$$

The maximal Sharp ratio portfolio is therefore

$$x_i^* = \bar{x} + \bar{x}\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^{-2}(1 - \hat{p}_i/p_i) \qquad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{S}_{MSR} = \left[\sum \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 1 \right]^{1/2}$$ (A9)

The sum in (A9) can be expressed as $\sum p_i(\hat{p}_i/p_i)^2 = \mathbb{E}[\hat{p}^2/p^2]$, so the square of the maximal Sharpe ratio is one less than the expectation of the square of the realized probability likelihood ratio.

B. Sortino (Downside Risk) and Van der Meer, Plantinga, and Forsey (Upside Potential) Measures

The Sortino's (1991) downside risk measure and Van der Meer, Plantinga and Forsey's (1999) upside potential measure both compute the risk term in the denominator by considering only excess returns below some minimum acceptable return, $\underline{x}$. The upside potential measure also only counts returns above this in the numerator. The two measures are

$$\mathcal{D} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[x]}{\left(\mathbb{E}[\text{Min}^2(x_i - \underline{x}, 0)] \right)^{1/2}} \qquad \mathcal{U} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(x_i - \underline{x}, 0)]}{\left(\mathbb{E}[\text{Min}^2(x_i - \underline{x}, 0)] \right)^{1/2}}.$$ (B1)

The usual choice for $\underline{x}$ is zero. In this case both ratios are invariant to leverage like the Sharpe ratio.[28] This is the choice we use in this paper.

---

[28] The measures are also invariant to leverage if $\underline{x}$ is set proportional to the average return. If it is equal to the mean return, the denominator of each measure is the semi-standard deviation, and this is sometimes done for the Sortino ratio. This is a poor choice for the VPF upside measure, though, as   is then invariant to a uniform upward shift in the entire portfolio distribution.

<u>The Sortino Downside-Risk Measure</u>

For $\underline{x} = 0$, the Sortino measure can be maximized exactly like the Sharpe ratio by fixing the mean excess return and minimizing the risk measure in the denominator. Forming the Lagranian

$$\mathcal{L} = \tfrac{1}{2}\sum p_i \, \mathrm{Min}^2(x_i,0) + \lambda\left(\bar{x} - \sum p_i x_i\right) + \gamma\left(0 - \sum \hat{p}_i x_i\right) \tag{B2}$$

and differentiating gives the first-order conditions as

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_i} = p_i \, \mathrm{Min}(x_i,0) - \lambda p_i + \gamma \hat{p}_i \qquad 0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda} = \bar{x} - \sum p_i x_i \qquad 0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \gamma} = -\sum \hat{p}_i x_i \tag{B3}$$

The second-order condition for an interior minimum is also met.

Note that the first condition in (B3) is independent of x_i when $x_i > 0$; therefore, it can be satisfied only if just a single state has a positive excess return (or two or more states with the same likelihood ratio have the same positive excess return). The state with a positive excess return must be that state with the smallest likelihood ratio, $\hat{p}_i / p_i$. Since the likelihood ratio is inversely proportional to the marginal utility in a state, the single state with the positive excess return is the state with the highest market return — denoted as state I. Using the first order conditions to solve for the Lagrange multipliers and the return in the highest return state, x_I, gives

$$\bar{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} p_i x_i = p_I x_I + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i = p_I x_I + \lambda(1 - p_I) + \gamma(1 - \hat{p}_I)$$

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \hat{p}_i x_i = \hat{p}_I x_I + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i = p_I x_I + \lambda(1 - \hat{p}_I) + \gamma \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i \tag{B4}$$

$$0 = -\lambda p_I - \gamma \hat{p}_I .$$

Solving these three equations for λ, γ, and x_I^{MDR}, and substituting back into the first equation in (B3) gives the down-side risk maximizing portfolio

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MDR}} = \gamma(\hat{p}_I / p_I - \hat{p}_i / p_i) \qquad i < I \qquad\qquad x_I^{\mathrm{MDR}} = \gamma\left[\hat{p}_I / p_I - \sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i\right] / \hat{p}_I$$

$$\text{where} \quad \gamma \equiv \bar{x}\left[2 - \hat{p}_I / p_I - (p_I / \hat{p}_I)\sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i\right]^{-1} . \tag{B5}$$

The square of the minimized downside risk in the denominator is

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Min}^2(\tilde{x},0)] = \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i x_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i(\lambda + \gamma\hat{p}_i/p_i)^2 = \lambda^2 \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i + 2\lambda\gamma \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i + \gamma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i$$

$$= \gamma^2 \frac{\hat{p}_I^2}{p_I^2}(1-p_I) - 2\gamma^2 \frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}(1-\hat{p}_I) + \gamma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i = \gamma^2 \left[\frac{\hat{p}_I^2}{p_I^2} - 2\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I} + \sum_{i=1}^{I} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \right] \qquad \text{(B6)}$$

$$= \overline{x}^2 \frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}\left[\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I} - 2 + \frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \right]^{-1}.$$

So the maximized squared Sortino downside risk measure is

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2 = \frac{\overline{x}^2}{\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Min}^2(\tilde{x},0)]} = 1 + \frac{p_I^2}{\hat{p}_I^2} \sum_{i=1}^{I} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i - 2\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}. \qquad \text{(B7)}$$

<u>The Van der Meer, Plantinga, and Forsey (Upside Potential) Measures</u>

Maximizing the upside potential measure is very similar. Again if the minimal acceptable return, $\underline{x}$, is zero the VPF upside-potential measure is invariant to leverage so to maximize it, we can fix the numerator, $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Max}(x_i,0)]$, and minimize the square of the denominator, $\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Min}^2(\tilde{x},0)]$. We form the Lagrangian and optimize

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\sum p_i \mathrm{Min}^2(x_i,0) + \lambda\left[N - \sum p_i \mathrm{Max}(x_i,0) \right] + \gamma\left(0 - \sum \hat{p}_i x_i \right)$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial\mathcal{L}}{\partial x_i} = \begin{cases} p_i x_i - \gamma\hat{p}_i & \text{for} \quad x_i < 0 \\ -\lambda p_i - \gamma\hat{p}_i & \text{for} \quad x_i > 0. \end{cases} \qquad \text{(B8)}$$

As with the maximized Sortino measure only one state can have a positive excess return, and it must be the state with the lowest likelihood ratio and the highest market return.

Using the first order conditions to solve for the Lagrange multiplier and the return in the highest return state, x_I^{MUP}, gives

$$0 = \sum_{i=1}^{I} \hat{p}_i x_i^{\mathrm{MUP}} = \hat{p}_I x_I^{\mathrm{MUP}} + \gamma\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \quad\Rightarrow\quad \gamma = -\hat{p}_I x_I\left[\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \right]^{-1} = -N\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \right]^{-1}. \quad \text{(B9)}$$

The denominator of the squared VPF ratio is

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Min}^2(\tilde{x},0)] = \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i x_i^2 = \gamma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i(\hat{p}_i/p_i)^2 = N^2 \frac{\hat{p}_I^2}{p_I^2}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} \hat{p}_i^2/p_i \right]^{-1}, \qquad \text{(B10)}$$

and the squared ratio itself is

$$\mathcal{U}^2 = \frac{N^2}{\mathbb{E}[\mathrm{Min}^2(\tilde{x},0)]} = \frac{p_I^2}{\hat{p}_I^2}\sum_{i=1}^{I-1}\hat{p}_i^2/p_i\,. \tag{B11}$$

For comparison purposes, it is better to express results in terms of the mean excess return rather than the numerator using

$$\overline{x} = \sum_{i=1}^{I} p_i x_i = p_I x_I + \sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i x_i = N + \gamma\sum_{i=1}^{I-1} p_i(\hat{p}_i/p_i) = N + \gamma(1-\hat{p}_I) = N - \frac{N}{\mathcal{U}^2}\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}(1-\hat{p}_I)\,. \tag{B12}$$

So the maximal upside potential portfolio is

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MUP}} = -\overline{x}\left[\mathcal{U}^2(\hat{p}_I/p_I)-(1-\hat{p}_I)\right]^{-1}\hat{p}_i/p_i \quad i < I \qquad\qquad x_I^{\mathrm{MUP}} = \frac{\overline{x}}{p_I}\left[1-\frac{p_I(1-\hat{p}_I)}{\hat{p}_I\mathcal{U}^2}\right]^{-1}\,. \tag{B13}$$

Comparing the maximal Sortino and VPF portfolios to the maximal Sharpe portfolio, we see that for all but for the highest return state the excess returns are linearly related

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MDR}} = \frac{\overline{x}}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2}\left[1-(1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2)\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}\right]+\frac{\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2}{\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{MDR}}^2}\frac{p_I}{\hat{p}_I}x_i^{\mathrm{MSR}} \qquad\text{for } i < I$$

$$x_i^{\mathrm{MUP}} = \left[\frac{\hat{p}_I}{p_I}\mathcal{U}^2-(1-\hat{p}_I)\right]^{-1}\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\left[x_i^{\mathrm{MSR}}-\overline{x}(1+\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2)\right] \qquad\text{for } i < I\,. \tag{B14}$$

Therefore the maximal-Sortino and maximal-VPF ratio portfolios are long positions in the MSRP with an extra long position in the state security paying off in the highest market return state combined with borrowing or lending.

C. Sharpe, Sortino, and VPF Ratios in a Lognormal Market

In this section of the appendix, we derive the Sharpe, Sortino, and VPF ratios in a lognormal market. We denote one plus the realized rate of return on the market benchmark portfolio by b and use this to index the continuous state space.

If the market return has a continuously-compounded expected rate of return μ and logarithmic variance of σ^2, the probability density for the return over a period of length Δt is

$$p(b) = \frac{1}{b\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\phi\left(\frac{\ell\mathrm{n}\,b-\left(\mu-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right) \tag{C1}$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal density function. The risk-neutral probability density, $\hat{p}(b)$, is the same with μ replaced by r, the continuously-compounded interest rate.

The Sharpe ratio of the market is

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{mkt}} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[b] - e^{r\Delta t}}{\left(\text{Var}[b]\right)^{1/2}} = \frac{e^{\mu\Delta t} - e^{r\Delta t}}{\left[e^{2\mu\Delta t}(e^{\sigma^2\Delta t} - 1)\right]^{1/2}} = \frac{1 - e^{-(\mu-r)\Delta t}}{(e^{\sigma^2\Delta t} - 1)^{1/2}}. \tag{C2}$$

The square of the downside risk in the denominator of the Sortino and VPF ratios is[29]

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Min}^2(b - e^{r\Delta t}, 0)] = \int_0^{e^{r\Delta t}} \left(e^{\ell n b} - e^{r\Delta t}\right)^2 p(b) db = \int_0^{e^{r\Delta t}} \left(e^{2\ell n b} - 2e^{r\Delta t}e^{\ell n b} + e^{2r\Delta t}\right) p(b) db$$

$$= e^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)\Delta t}\Phi\left(\frac{(r - \mu - \frac{3}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right) - 2e^{(\mu+r)\Delta t}\Phi\left(\frac{(r - \mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right) + e^{2r\Delta t}\Phi\left(\frac{(r - \mu + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right). \tag{C3}$$

The upside potential in the numerator of the VPF measures is

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(b - e^{r\Delta t}, 0)] = \int_{e^{r\Delta t}}^{\infty} \left(e^{\ell n b} - e^{r\Delta t}\right) dF(b)$$

$$= e^{\mu\Delta t}\Phi\left(\frac{(\mu - r + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right) - e^{r\Delta t}\Phi\left(\frac{(\mu - r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}}\right) \tag{C4}$$

For the maximal-ratio portfolios, analysis similar to that in Appendix A yields a maximal squared Sharpe ratio of

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 = \int \hat{p}^2(b)/p(b) db - 1 = \mathbb{E}[\hat{p}^2(b)/p^2(b)] - 1 \tag{C5}$$

for a portfolio with an excess return of $x^*(b) = \bar{x} + \gamma[\hat{p}(b)/p(b) - 1]$ where $\gamma = -\bar{x}/\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2$ as before. To determine the maximal Sharpe ratio portfolio, we need the likelihood ratio

$$\frac{\hat{p}(b)}{p(b)} = \exp\left\{-\frac{\left[\ell n b - \left(r - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)\Delta t\right]^2}{2\sigma^2\Delta t} + \frac{\left[\ell n b - \left(\mu - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)\Delta t\right]^2}{2\sigma^2\Delta t}\right\}$$

$$= b^{-(\mu-r)/\sigma^2} \exp\left[\left(\frac{\mu+r}{\sigma^2} - 1\right)\frac{\mu-r}{2}\Delta t\right]. \tag{C6}$$

The square of the maximal Sharpe ratio is

---

[29] For a normal random variable, z, with mean $\bar{z}$ and variance v^2, the upper and lower partial exponential moments are

$$\int_K^{\infty} e^{\xi z} dF(z) = \exp\left(\xi\bar{z} + \frac{1}{2}\xi^2 v^2\right)\Phi\left(\frac{K + \bar{z} + \xi v^2 - K}{v}\right) \qquad \int_0^K e^{\xi z} dF(z) = \exp\left(\xi\bar{z} + \frac{1}{2}\xi^2 v^2\right)\Phi\left(\frac{K - \bar{z} - \xi v^2}{v}\right).$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 = \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{p}^2(b)/p^2(b)\right] - 1 = \exp\left[\left(\frac{\mu+r}{\sigma^2}-1\right)(\mu-r)\Delta t\right]\mathbb{E}\left[b^{-2(\mu-r)/\sigma^2}\right] - 1. \tag{C7}$$

Because $\ell n\, b$ is normally distributed with mean $(\mu-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t$ and variance $\sigma^2\Delta t$, $\ell n\, b^\xi$ is also normally distributed with $\mathbb{E}[\ell n\, b^\xi] = \xi(\mu-\frac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t$ and variance $\text{Var}[\ell n\, b^\xi] = \xi^2\sigma^2\Delta t$. Using the moment generating function for a normal random variable,[30] the maximal Sharpe ratio is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}_{\text{MSR}}^2 &= \exp\left[\left(\frac{\mu+r}{\sigma^2}-1\right)(\mu-r)\Delta t\right] \times \exp\left[-2\frac{\mu-r}{\sigma^2}(\mu-\tfrac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t + \frac{2(\mu-r)^2}{\sigma^2}\Delta t\right] - 1 \\
&= \exp\left[\frac{(\mu-r)}{\sigma^2}\Delta t\left(\mu+r-\sigma^2-2r+\sigma^2\right)\right] - 1 = \exp\left[\frac{(\mu-r)^2}{\sigma^2}\Delta t\right] - 1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{C8}
$$

The maximal-Sortino ratio and maximal-VPF ratio portfolios will be degenerate with an infinite holding of the security for the highest return "state" and an infinitesimal holding of all other "state" securities. Both maximized ratios will be infinite as well. However, if we restrict attention to "well-formed" portfolios then the ratios can be computed.

For example, consider a call option with a strike price of H written on one dollar invested in the market. The payoff on this portfolio is $C(b) = \text{Max}(b - H, 0)$

The Sharpe, Sortino, and VPF ratios of the portfolio are

$$
\mathcal{S} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[C(b)] - C_0 e^{r\Delta t}}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[C^2(b)] - \mathbb{E}^2[C(b)]}}
$$

$$
\mathcal{D} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[C(b)] - C_0 e^{r\Delta t}}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}^2(C_0 e^{r\Delta t} - C(b), 0)]}} \qquad \mathcal{U} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(C(b) - C_0 e^{r\Delta t}, 0)]}{\sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}^2(C_0 e^{r\Delta t} - P(b), 0)]}}
\tag{C9}
$$

where C_0 is the cost of the option. The expectations in the Sharpe ratio are

$$\mathbb{E}[C(b)] = \int_H^\infty (b-H)p(b)db = e^{\mu\Delta t}\Phi(h_H) - H\Phi(h_H^-)$$

$$\mathbb{E}[C^2(b)] = \int_H^\infty (b-H)^2 p(b)db = e^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)\Delta t}\Phi(h_H^+) - 2He^{\mu\Delta t}\Phi(h_H) + H^2(h_H^-) \tag{C10}$$

$$\text{where} \quad h_K \equiv \frac{-\ell n\, K + (\mu+\tfrac{1}{2}\sigma^2)\Delta t}{\sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}} \qquad h_K^\pm \equiv h_K \pm \sigma\sqrt{\Delta t}.$$

The square of the risk measure in the denominators of the Sortino and VPF ratios is

---

[30] The moment generating function for a normal random variable, z, with mean $\bar{z}$ and variance σ_z^2 is $\psi(s) \equiv \mathbb{E}[\exp(sz)] = \exp(sz + \tfrac{1}{2}s^2\sigma_z^2)$.

$$\int_0^{C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H} \left[C_0 e^{r\Delta t} - \text{Max}(b-H,0) \right]^2 p(b)db = C_0^2 e^{2r\Delta t} \int_0^H p(b)db + \int_H^{C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H} (C_0 e^{r\Delta t}-b+H)^2 p(b)db$$

$$= C_0^2 e^{2r\Delta t}\Phi(-h_H^-) + (C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H)^2 \left[\Phi(h_H^-) - \Phi(h_{C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H}^-) \right] \qquad \text{(C11)}$$

$$- 2(C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H)e^{\mu\Delta t}\left[\Phi(h_H) - \Phi(h_{C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H}) \right] + e^{(2\mu+\sigma^2)\Delta t}\left[\Phi(h_H^+) - \Phi(h_{C_0 e^{r\Delta t}+H}^+) \right].$$

The numerator for the Sortino ratio is the same as for the Sharpe ratio. For the VPF ratio, it is

$$\int_{H+C_0 e^{r\Delta t}}^{\infty} (b-H-C_0 e^{r\Delta t})p(b)db = e^{\mu\Delta t}\Phi(h_{H+C_0 e^{r\Delta t}}) - (H+C_0 e^{r\Delta t})\Phi(h_{H+C_0 e^{r\Delta t}}^-). \qquad \text{(C12)}$$

D. Timing Measures: Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy

The Henriksson-Merton (HM) and Treynor-Mazuy (TM) measures are based on the regression

$$\tilde{x}_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1\tilde{m}_t + \gamma_2\tilde{w}_t + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t \qquad \text{(D1)}$$

where $\tilde{x}_t$ and $\tilde{m}_t$ are the excess returns on the portfolio and the market and $\tilde{w}_t$ is a variable used to capture timing ability. The variables used by HM and TM are $\tilde{w}_t \equiv \text{Max}(-\tilde{m}_t,0)$ and $\tilde{w}_t \equiv \tilde{m}_t^2$, respectively.

To achieve a good score on these measures we want both γ_0 and γ_2 as large as possible. For an OLS regression, the coefficients will be

$$\gamma_1 = \frac{\sigma_{xm}\sigma_w^2 - \sigma_{xw}\sigma_{mw}}{\sigma_m^2\sigma_w^2 - \sigma_{mw}^2} \qquad \gamma_2 = \frac{\sigma_{xw}\sigma_m^2 - \sigma_{xm}\sigma_{mw}}{\sigma_m^2\sigma_w^2 - \sigma_{mw}^2} \qquad \gamma_0 = \bar{x} - \gamma_1\bar{m} - \gamma_2\bar{w}. \qquad \text{(D2)}$$

The parameters, $\bar{m}, \bar{w}, \sigma_m^2, \sigma_w^2,$ and σ_{mw}, are fixed by the environment so the regression coefficients are determined by the portfolio's expected return and its covariances with the market and the timing variable, w. Since the expected return and the covariances are linear in the individual state returns, any values for $\bar{x}, \sigma_{xm},$ and σ_{xw} and hence the regression coefficients can be achieved with four or more assets.[31]

With more than four assets, we have extra degrees of freedom. It makes sense to find the minimum-variance portfolio that achieves a given HM or TM score. Therefore, we fix σ_{xm}, σ_{xw}, and $\bar{x}$ (which fixes γ_0, γ_1, and γ_2) and minimize the portfolio's variance. The optimization problem is

---

[31] If the CAPM holds, then the mean excess return would be proportional to its covariance with the market for all assets, and we would not be able to set them independently for a portfolio. As we have seen, the CAPM cannot hold in a market with sufficient number of derivative assets.

$$\text{Min} \quad \tfrac{1}{2}\sum p_i x_i^2$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \sigma_{xm} = \sum p_i x_i (m_i - \overline{m}) \quad \sigma_{xw} = \sum p_i x_i (w_i - \overline{w}) \quad \overline{x} = \sum p_i x_i \quad 0 = \sum \hat{p}_i x_i \tag{D3}$$

where the last constraint fixes the cost of the portfolio's excess returns to zero. Forming the Lagranian and minimizing gives

$$\mathcal{L} \equiv \tfrac{1}{2}\sum p_i x_i^2 + \lambda_1 \left[\sigma_{xm} - \sum p_i x_i (m_i - \overline{m})\right] + \lambda_2 \left[\sigma_{xw} - \sum p_i x_i (w_i - \overline{w})\right]$$

$$+ \lambda_3 \left[\overline{x} - \sum p_i x_i\right] + \lambda_4 \left[0 - \sum \hat{p}_i x_i\right]$$

$$0 = \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial x_i} = p_i x_i - \lambda_1 p_i (m_i - \overline{m}) - \lambda_2 p_i (w_i - \overline{w}) - \lambda_3 p_i - \lambda_4 \hat{p}_i \tag{D4}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad x_i = \lambda_1 (m_i - \overline{m}) + \lambda_2 (w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \hat{p}_i / p_i .$$

The optimizing portfolio in a complete market can be split into four parts. It will hold bonds, λ_1 units in the market, $-\lambda_4$ in the MSRP, and λ_2 units in a contract that pays w. For HM, the last will be a put option that is at-the-money in present value terms. For TM, it will be a derivative contract with paying off the squared excess market return.

The Lagrange multipliers that determine these positions are the solutions to the con-straints[32]

$$\overline{x} = \sum p_i x_i = \sum p_i \left[\lambda_1 (m_i - \overline{m}) + \lambda_2 (w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 q_i / p_i\right] = \lambda_3 + \lambda_4$$

$$\sigma_{xm} = \sum p_i (m_i - \overline{m}) x_i = \lambda_1 \sum p_i (m_i - \overline{m})^2 + \lambda_2 \sum p_i (m_i - \overline{m})(w_i - \overline{w})$$

$$+ \lambda_3 \sum p_i (m_i - \overline{m}) + \lambda_4 \sum \hat{p}_i (m_i - \overline{m})$$

$$= \lambda_1 \sigma_m^2 + \lambda_2 \sigma_{mw} - \lambda_4 \overline{m}$$

$$\sigma_{xw} = \sum p_i (w_i - \overline{w}) x_i = \lambda_1 \sum p_i (m_i - \overline{m})(w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_2 \sum p_i (w_i - \overline{w})^2 \tag{D5}$$

$$+ \lambda_3 \sum p_i (w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_4 \sum \hat{p}_i (w_i - \overline{w})$$

$$= \lambda_1 \sigma_{mw} + \lambda_2 \sigma_w^2 + \lambda_4 \sum \hat{p}_i (w_i - \overline{w})$$

$$0 = \sum \hat{p}_i x_s = \sum \hat{p}_i \left[\lambda_1 (m_i - \overline{m}) + \lambda_2 (w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \hat{p}_i / p_i\right]$$

$$= -\lambda_1 \overline{m} + \lambda_2 \sum \hat{p}_i (w_i - \overline{w}) + \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \sum \hat{p}_i^2 / p_i$$

Solving for the Lagrange multipliers we have

---

[32] Recall that the risk-neutral expectation of the excess market return m, $\sum \hat{p}_i m_i$ is zero. This is not true of w as it is not the value of a marketed asset. The sum $\sum \hat{p}_i (w_i - \overline{w})$ is the difference between the risk-neutral and true expectations of w, $\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\tilde{w}] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}]$. This is the negative of the forward risk-premium.

$$x_i = \overline{x} + \lambda_4\left(q_i/p_i - 1\right) + \lambda_1(m_i - \overline{m}) + \lambda_2 w_i$$

$$\lambda_1 = \frac{\sigma_{xm}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_w^2 - \Pi_w^2) - \sigma_{xw}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_{mw} - \overline{m}\Pi_w) + \overline{x}(\sigma_{mw}\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_w^2)}{\sigma_m^2(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_w^2 - \Pi_w^2) - \sigma_{mw}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_{mw} - \overline{m}\Pi_w) + \overline{m}(\sigma_{mw}\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_w^2)}$$

$$\lambda_2 = \frac{-\sigma_{xm}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_{mw} - \overline{m}\Pi_w) + \sigma_{xw}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_m^2 - \overline{m}^2) - \overline{x}(\sigma_m^2\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_{mw})}{\sigma_m^2(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_w^2 - \Pi_w^2) - \sigma_{mw}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_{mw} - \overline{m}\Pi_w) + \overline{m}(\sigma_{mw}\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_w^2)}$$

where
$$\lambda_3 = \overline{x} - \lambda_4$$

$$\lambda_4 = \frac{\sigma_{xm}(-\Pi_w\sigma_{mw} + \overline{m}\sigma_w^2) + \sigma_{xw}(\sigma_m^2\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_{mw}) - \overline{x}(\sigma_m^2\sigma_w^2 - \sigma_{mw}^2)}{\sigma_m^2(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_w^2 - \Pi_w^2) - \sigma_{mw}(\mathcal{S}_{\mathrm{MSR}}^2\sigma_{mw} - \overline{m}\Pi_w) + \overline{m}(\sigma_{mw}\Pi_w - \overline{m}\sigma_w^2)}$$

$$\Pi_w \equiv \hat{\mathbb{E}}[\tilde{w}] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{w}].$$

$$(D6)$$

The coefficient γ_2 is a measure of the managers timing ability while γ_0 measures stock selection ability.

Merton (1981) has shown that in the context of the HM model, the total contribution of the manager's timing and selectivity ability per dollar invested over a time interval Δt is $\gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 \mathcal{P}(1, \Delta t; e^{r\Delta t})$ where $\mathcal{P}(S, \tau; K)$ is the value of a put option with strike price K and time to maturity τ written on the market. The manager provides an extra average return of γ_0. The first term is the present value of this. (It is discounted at the risk-free rate since the extra return is not correlated with the market.) In addition, through timing the manager provides the fraction γ_2 of a protective put. The total contribution is the amount by which the value of the protective put exceeds its average "cost" measured by the lowered present value of the extra average return.

For the TM model the total contribution of timing and selectivity is

$$\text{total contribution}_{\mathrm{TM}} = \gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 e^{r\Delta t}(e^{\sigma^2\Delta t} - 1). \tag{D7}$$

The first term is the same as for the HM model. The second term is γ_2 multiplied by the present value of the squared excess return on the market. This is not an asset price, but its present value can be determined as follows. Let M_t denote the value of the market portfolio with $M_0 = 1$. We are interested in $w_t \equiv (M_t - e^{rt})^2 = M_t^2 - 2M_t e^{rt} + e^{2rt}$. For a lognormal market, the present value of w_t is

$$e^{-r\Delta t}\left(\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\tilde{M}_{\Delta t}^2] - 2e^{r\Delta t}\hat{\mathbb{E}}[\tilde{M}_{\Delta t}] + e^{2r\Delta t}\right) = e^{-r\Delta t}\left(e^{(2r+\sigma^2)\Delta t} - 2e^{r\Delta t}e^{r\Delta t} + e^{2r\Delta t}\right) = e^{r\Delta t}\left(e^{\sigma^2\Delta t} - 1\right) \tag{D8}$$

where $\hat{\mathbb{E}}$ denotes the risk-neutral expectation. As in the HM model, the manager's timing provides the fraction γ_2 of a derivative security; this time one that pays the square of the excess market return.

References

Admati, A., S. Bhattacharya, P. Pfleiderer, and S. Ross. 1986. "On Timing and Selectivity." *Journal of Finance* 41: 715−732.

Brown, S. J., D. R. Gallagher, O. W. Steenbeek, and P. L. Swan. 2004. "Double or Nothing: Patterns of Equity Fund Holdings and Transactions" Stern School of Management, NYU working paper.

Chen, Z. W. and P. J. Knez, 1996. "Portfolio Performance Measurement: Theory and Evidence" *Review of Financial Studies* 9 (Summer): 551−556.

Debreu, G., 1960. "Topological Methods in Cardinal Utility Theory" in *Mathematical Methods in the Social Sciences, 1959, Proceedings of the First Stanford Symposium* K. J. Arrow, S. Karlin, and P. Suppes (eds.) Stanford University Press.

Ferson, W., and A. Siegel, 2001, "The Efficient Use of Conditioning Information in Portfolios," *Journal of Finance* 3 (June): 967-982.

Goetzmann, W. N., J. E. Ingersoll, Jr. and S. A. Ross, 2003. "High Water Marks" *Journal of Finance* 58 (August): 1685−1717.

He, H. and H. Leland. 1993. "On Equilibrium Asset Price Processes" *The Review of Financial Studies* 6:593−617.

Henriksson, R. D., 1984. "Market Timing and Mutual Fund Performance" *Journal of Business* 57 (January): 73−96.

Henriksson, R. D., and R. C. Merton, 1981. "On Market Timing and Investment Performance. II. Statistical Procedures for Evaluating Forecasting Skills" *Journal of Business* 54 (October): 513−533.

Jagannathan, R. and R. Korajczyk. 1986. "Assessing the Market Timing Performance of Managed Portfolios." *Journal of Business* 59: 217−235.

Lhabitant, Francois-Serge, "Derivatives in Portfolio Management: Why Beating the Market is Easy," *Derivatives Quarterly*: 39-45.

Lo, A., 2002. "The Statistics of Sharpe Ratios" *Financial Analysts Journal* 58, (July/August):

Merton, R. C., 1981. "On Market Timing and Investment Performance. I. An Equilibrium Theory of Value for Market Forecasts" *Journal of Business* 54 (July): 363−406.

Mitchell, M., and T. Pulvino, 2001. "Characteristics of Risk and Return in Risk Arbitrage" *Journal of Finance* 56 (December): 2135−2175.

Modigliani, F., and L. Modigliani, 1997. "Risk-Adjusted Performance" *Journal of Portfolio Management* 23 (Winter): 45−54.

Rubinstein, M. 1976. "The Valuation of Uncertain Income Streams and the Pricing of Options" *The Bell Journal of Economics* 7: 407−425.

Sharpe, W. F., 1966. "Mutual Fund Performance." *Journal of Business* 39 (January): 119−138.

Sharpe, W. F., 1994. "The Sharpe Ratio" *Journal of Portfolio Management* 21 (Fall): 49−58.

Sortino, Frank, and Robert van der Meer. 1991. "Downside Risk." *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 17 (Summer): 27−31.

Treynor, J. 1965. "How to Rate Management of Investment Funds" *Harvard Business Review* 43 (January-February): 63−75.

Treynor, J., and K. Mazuy, 1966. "Can Mutual Funds Outguess the Market?" *Harvard Business Review* 44 (July-August): 131−136.

Table I	Dynamic Manipulation of the Sharpe Ratio and Related Performance Measures

The table presents the annualized Sharpe ratio, Jensen alpha, Treynor ratio, Treynor appraisal ratio, and generalized alpha for dynamically manipulated portfolios over a sixty-month period. The Sharpe ratio and Treynor appraisal ratio are annualized by multiplying the monthly measure by the square root of 12. The alpha, generalized alpha, and Treynor ratio are annualized by multiplying by 12. The measures are computed from 10,000 simulations. The average and the standard deviation of each measure are reported. The "freq." columns have two numbers showing the fraction of times that the portfolio showed superior performance ($\mathcal{S}>\mathcal{S}_{mkt}$ $\alpha>0$, $\mathcal{T}>0$, $\mathcal{A}>0$, or $\alpha^{gen}>0$) and the approximate fraction of times the portfolio showed superior performance that was significant at the 5% level. The latter number was estimated as the frequency with which the number was more than 1.65 standard deviations above the null value.

The portfolio is always invested in the market; only the leverage is changed. The initial leverage is one. After 12 months, the leverage is adjusted each month based on the performance history as described in equation (4) to set the target mean to $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_h (1+\mathcal{S}_h^{-2})/(1+\mathcal{S}_{mkt}^{-2})$; though leverage is restricted to lie between 0.5 and 1.5. The average and standard deviation of the leverage and resulting beta are also reported. Each adjustment in leverage requires paying a transaction cost which is computed as 0%, 10%, or 20% (round trip) of the value of the synthetic forward contracts (a call plus a put struck at-the-money in present value terms) needed to change the leverage.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%

Trans. Cost	Sharpe Ratio $\mathcal{S}$ mean (std dev)	freq $\mathcal{S}>\mathcal{S}_{mkt}$ signif	Jensen α mean (std dev)	freq. $\alpha>0$ signif.	Treynor Ratio $\mathcal{T}$ mean (std dev)	freq. $\mathcal{T}>0$ signif.	Appraisal Ratio $\mathcal{A}$ mean (std dev)	freq. $\mathcal{A}>0$ signif.	General alpha α^{gen} mean (std dev)	freq. $\alpha^{gen}>0$ signif.	Portfolio characteristics Lev.	Beta
0%	0.673 (0.439)	82.6% 20.4%	2.05% (1.51%)	92.4% 37.6%	2.39% (1.77%)	92.4% 37.6%	0.365 (0.259)	92.4% 40.7%	1.94% (1.54%)	90.6% 34.0%	0.955 (0.323)	0.939 (0.314)
10%	0.649 (0.425)	74.6% 13.3%	1.66% (1.56%)	86.4% 27.9%	1.91% (1.77%)	86.4% 28.5%	0.294 (0.266)	86.4% 30.3%	1.50% (1.60%)	82.7% 25.3%	0.960 (0.321)	0.943 (0.312)
20%	0.647 (0.427)	74.0% 13.1%	1.61% (1.55%)	85.8% 27.2%	1.86% (1.75%)	85.8% 27.6%	0.288 (0.263)	85.8% 29.0%	1.53% (1.59%)	83.1% 24.3%	0.965 (0.321)	0.947 (0.312)
Mkt	0.597 (0.454)	-----				True value of market Sharpe ratio = 0.597						

Table II	Dynamic Manipulation of the Sortino (1991) and Van der Meer, Plantinga, and Forsey (1999) Ratios

The table presents the annualized Sortino (1991), Van der Meer, Plantinga, and Forsey (1999) and Sharpe ratios for dynamically manipulated portfolios over a sixty-month (five-year) period. The ratios are annualized by multiplying the monthly ratios by the square root of 12. The measures are computed in 10,000 simulations. The average and the standard deviation of each measure are reported. The "freq." columns have two numbers showing the fraction of times that the portfolio showed superior performance with the ration larger than the market's ratio and the approximate fraction of times the portfolio showed superior performance that was significant at the 5% level. The latter number was estimated as the frequency with which the difference between the portfolio's ratio and the market's ratio was more than 1.65 standard deviations above zero.

The portfolio is always invested in the market; only the leverage is changed. The initial leverage is one. After 12 months, the leverage is adjusted each month based on the performance history as described in equation (14) to set the target mean to $\bar{x} = \bar{x}_h\, \mathcal{D}_{mkt}^2/\mathcal{D}_h^2$ for the Sortino portfolios and the target upside potential to $\mathbb{E}[\text{Max}(\tilde{x}_f,0)] = \text{Avg}[\text{Max}(\tilde{x}_h,0)]\,\mathcal{U}_{mkt}^2/\mathcal{U}_h^2$ for the VPF portfolios. In each case leverage is restricted to always lie between 0.5 and 1.5. The average and standard deviation of the leverage and resulting beta are also reported. Each adjustment in leverage requires paying a transaction cost which is computed as 0%, 10%, or 20% (round trip) of the value of the amount of a synthetic forward contract (a call plus a put struck at-the-money in present value terms) needed to change the leverage.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%

	Trans. Cost	Sortino Ratio		VPF Ratio		Sharpe Ratio		Portfolio characteristics	
		mean (std dev)	frequency: $\mathcal{D} > \mathcal{D}_{mkt}$ **signif.**	mean (std dev)	frequency: $\mathcal{U} > \mathcal{U}_{mkt}$ **signif.**	mean (std dev)	frequency: $\mathcal{S} > \mathcal{S}_{mkt}$ **signif.**	Lev	Beta
Sortino portfolios	0%	1.338 (0.932)	83.6% **16.6%**	3.155 (0.831)	76.2% **12.1%**	0.667 (0.419)	77.4% **15.3%**	0.885 (0.318)	0.876 (0.308)
	10%	1.314 (0.914)	83.1% **15.4%**	3.137 (0.813)	75.4% **11.8%**	0.659 (0.415)	76.4% **14.7%**	0.890 (0.320)	0.879 (0.309)
	20%	1.312 (0.921)	82.4% **13.8%**	3.134 (0.821)	74.8% **10.7%**	0.656 (0.419)	75.7% **13.2%**	0.891 (0.320)	0.881 (0.309)
VPF portfolios	0%	1.337 (0.994)	86.7% **13.5%**	3.178 (0.832)	83.3% **20.0%**	0.672 (0.422)	81.8% **16.4%**	0.896 (0.304)	0.881 (0.293)
	10%	1.304 (0.930)	87.1% **13.2%**	3.152 (0.817)	83.6% **21.7%**	0.685 (0.421)	81.9% **15.4%**	0.909 (0.306)	0.894 (0.295)
	20%	1.307 (0.936)	86.4% **12.3%**	3.154 (0.824)	82.5% **21.1%**	0.659 (0.426)	81.2% **14.5%**	0.903 (0.304)	0.887 (0.294)
Market		1.117 (0.935)	-----	2.972 (0.831)	-----	0.598 (0.454)	-----		
True mkt ratios		1.002	-----	2.844	-----	0.597	-----		

	Table III	**Dynamic Manipulation of the Henriksson-Merton (1991)** **and Treynor-Mazuy (1966) Timing Coefficients**

The table presents the Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy coefficients and total contributed value for dynamically manipulated portfolios over a sixty-month period. The coefficients are computed from the regression: $\tilde{x}_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \tilde{m}_t + \gamma_2 \tilde{w}_t + \tilde{\varepsilon}_t$ where $\tilde{x}_t$ and $\tilde{m}_t$ are the excess returns on the portfolio and the market, respectively. The timing variable is $\tilde{w}_t = \text{Max}(-\tilde{m}_t, 0)$ for HM and $\tilde{w}_t = \tilde{m}_t^2$ for TM. The total contributed value for the HM model is $\gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 \mathcal{P}$ where $\mathcal{P}$ is the value of a put on \$1 in the market at-the-money in present value terms. The total contributed value for the TM model is $\gamma_0 e^{-r\Delta t} + \gamma_2 e^{r\Delta t}(e^{\sigma^2 \Delta t} - 1)$.

The measures are computed in 10,000 simulations, and the average and the standard deviation are reported. (The standard errors of the averages are one hundredth of the standard deviation reported.) Also given is the fraction of times that the portfolio showed superior performance for each measure.

The portfolio is invested in the market with a 10% out-of-the-money call sold on 2% of the position. (I. e., the portfolio will achieve only 98% of the market appreciation above 10% each month. The initial leverage (ignoring the call) is one. After 12 months, the leverage is adjusted each month to equal 0.5 or 1.5 depending on whether the past market returns that were above or below average. The average and standard deviation of the leverage (ignoring the call) and resulting beta (including the call) are also reported. Each adjustment in leverage requires paying a transaction cost which is computed as 0% 10% or 20% (round trip) of the value of the synthetic forward contract (a call plus a put struck at-the-money in present value terms) needed to change the leverage. Each call sold every month also requires paying a transaction cost.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%

	Trans. Cost	Total Value ($\mathcal{V}$)		Selectivity (γ_0)		Timing (γ_2)		Portfolio characteristics	
		mean (std dev)	frequency $\mathcal{V} > 0$ **signif**	mean (std dev)	freq: $\gamma_0 > 0$ **signif.**	mean (std dev)	freq: $\gamma_2 > 0$ **signif.**	Leverage	Beta
Henriksson-Merton	0%	1.56% (3.03%)	71.0% **14.0%**	0.63% (5.01%)	56.1% **5.9%**	0.033 (0.245)	55.7% **6.7%**	1.07 (0.71)	1.05 (0.28)
	10%	1.30% (2.92%)	69.0% **11.4%**	0.32% (5.07%)	53.2% **5.7%**	0.036 (0.248)	56.0% **7.0%**	1.09 (0.71)	1.06 (0.27)
	20%	0.98% (2.84%)	64.9% **9.0%**	0.00% (5.10%)	50.6% **5.0%**	0.035 (0.248)	56.5% **6.9%**	1.09 (0.71)	1.07 (0.27)
Treynor-Mazuy	0%	1.56% (3.12%)	70.6% **13.67%**	1.24% (3.50%)	65.2% **10.2%**	0.007 (0.096)	52.6% **6.3%**	1.07 (0.71)	1.05 (0.28)
	10%	1.30% (3.01%)	68.3% **11.1%**	0.95% (3.47%)	61.8% **8.6%**	0.007 (0.097)	53.6% **6.3%**	1.09 (0.71)	1.06 (0.27)
	20%	0.98% (2.93%)	64.5% **9.0%**	0.63% (3.42%)	57.6% **7.3%**	0.007 (0.097)	53.5% **5.9%**	1.09 (0.71)	1.07 (0.27)

Table IV	The Manipulation-Proof Performance Measure

The table compares the manipulation-proof performance measure to the Sharpe, Sortino, and VPF ratios, the alphas, and the Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy timing measures for the various portfolios designed to dynamically manipulate those measures as presented in Tables I - III. The difference between the market's and the portfolio's MPPM are given for three representative risk aversions. The frequencies with which the portfolio beat the market according to the various measures including the MPPM are given along with the approximate frequencies with which the portfolio significantly (5%) outperformed or underperformed the market. The latter numbers are estimated as the frequency with which the difference in measures was more than 1.65 standard deviations above the null value.

The MPPM is defined in (18) as $\hat{\Theta} \equiv \ell n\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum\left[(1+r_{ft})^{-1}(1+r_{ft}+x_t)\right]^{1-\rho}\right)\Big/(1-\rho)\Delta t$.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%. This is consistent with a risk aversion of $\rho = 3$.

Measure the portfolio was designed to manipulate	Rating by own measure			Rating by Manipulation-Proof Performance Measure Θ								
				MPPM Θ ($\rho = 2$)			MPPM Θ ($\rho = 3$)			MPPM Θ ($\rho = 4$)		
	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −	avg $\Theta_{portf} - \Theta_{mkt}$	freq $\Theta_{portf} > \Theta_{mkt}$	freq signif +/−	avg $\Theta_{portf} - \Theta_{mkt}$	freq $\Theta_{portf} > \Theta_{mkt}$	freq signif +/−	avg $\Theta_{portf} - \Theta_{mkt}$	freq $\Theta_{portf} > \Theta_{mkt}$	freq signif +/−
Sharpe $\mathcal{S}$	82.6%	20.4%	1.4%	−0.84%	46.3%	0.2% 9.1%	−0.96%	46.3%	0.4% 9.6%	−1.08%	46.0%	0.5% 9.9%
alpha α	92.4%	37.6%	0.2%									
gen α^{gen}	90.6%	34.0%	0.3%									
Sortino $\mathcal{D}$	83.6%	16.6%	1.6%	−1.14%	42.0%	0.6% 9.9%	−1.04%	42.9%	1.0% 9.7%	−0.92%	44.9%	1.3% 8.9%
VPF $\mathcal{U}$	83.3%	20.0%	2.9%	−1.00%	46.5%	0.5% 10.3%	−0.87%	48.1%	0.9% 9.9%	−0.74%	49.7%	1.4% 9.2%
HM value $\mathcal{V}_{HM}$	71.0%	14.0%	2.2%	−0.62%	45.4%	3.1% 6.9%	−1.26%	38.5%	2.4% 9.2%	−1.91%	33.6%	1.7% 11.6%
TM value $\mathcal{V}_{TM}$	70.6%	13.7%	2.2%									

Table V	The Manipulation-Proof Performance Measure

The table compares the manipulation-proof performance measure to the Sharpe ratio and alpha for an informed trader who can create a portfolio with a positive alpha by taking on various levels of increased unsystematic risk.

The difference between the portfolio's and market's Sharpe ratios and the portfolio's alpha and MPPM, Θ, are reported. The frequencies with which the portfolio beat the market according to each are given along with the approximate frequencies with which the portfolio significantly (5%) outperformed or under-performed the market. The latter numbers are estimated as the frequency with which the measure was more than 1.65 standard deviations positive or negative.

The MPPM is defined in (18) as $\hat{\Theta} \equiv \ell n \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum \left[(1+r_{ft})^{-1}(1+r_{ft}+x_t) \right]^{1-\rho} \right) \Big/ (1-\rho)\Delta t$.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%. This is consistent with a risk aversion of $\rho = 3$.

Residual risk	Informed trader ($\alpha = 1\%$)					Uninformed trader ($\alpha = 0\%$)				
	avg excess	stand dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −	avg excess	stand dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −
annual logarithmic residual standard deviation = 20%										
Sharpe	−0.142	0.350	34.0%	2.0%	10.5%	−0.183	0.349	30.5%	1.6%	12.6%
alpha	1.01%	9.15%	56.0%	6.9%	3.6%	−0.01%	9.15%	48.9%	4.9%	4.6%
MPPM	−4.82%	9.02%	29.2%	1.4%	13.4%	−5.90%	9.12%	25.8%	1.1%	15.4%
annual logarithmic residual standard deviation = 2%										
Sharpe	0.048	0.045	85.0%	25.6%	0.4%	−0.004	0.046	47.1%	4.5%	5.4%
alpha	1.00%	0.93%	90.5%	36.5%	0.2%	−0.00%	0.93%	49.0%	4.8%	4.8%
MPPM	0.95%	0.90%	85.3%	27.1%	0.4%	−0.06%	0.91%	47.7%	4.4%	5.6%
annual logarithmic residual standard deviation = 0.2%										
Sharpe	0.048	0.006	100%	100%	0.0%	−0.000	0.005	49.6%	5.1%	4.8%
alpha	1.00%	0.18%	100%	100%	0.0%	−0.00%	0.18%	49.0%	5.1%	4.7%
MPPM	1.00%	0.09%	100%	100%	0.0%	−0.00%	0.09%	49.8%	5.1%	5.0%

Table VI	The Manipulation-Proof Performance Measure

The table compares the manipulation-proof performance measure to the Henriksson-Merton and Treynor-Mazuy timing measures for an informed market timer, whose information about a changing mean explains 0.1% or 1% of the market's variance, and an uninformed market timer who varies leverage randomly to the same degree. The average timing coefficient, γ_2 as defined in (15), and the average contributed value, $\mathcal{V}$ as defined in (16), are reported along with the MPPM, Θ. The frequencies with which the portfolio beat the market according to the three are given along with the approximate frequencies with which the portfolio significantly (5%) outperformed or underperformed the market. The latter numbers are estimated as the frequency with which the measure was more than 1.65 standard deviations positive or negative.

The MPPM is defined in (18) as $\hat{\Theta} \equiv \ell n\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum\left[(1+r_{ft})^{-1}(1+r_{ft}+x_t)\right]^{1-\rho}\right)\Big/(1-\rho)\Delta t$.

The market parameters are: risk free rate 5% per annum, market premium 12%, market standard deviation 20%. This is consistent with a risk aversion of $\rho = 3$.

|	informed timer (0.1%)					random timer				
	avg	st dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −	avg	st dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −
HM γ_2	0.052	0.185	61.5%	8.6%	2.7%	−0.002	0.187	49.3%	4.8%	4.8%
HM $\mathcal{V}$	0.07%	0.20%	63.2%	8.9%	2.4%	0.001%	0.203%	50.0%	5.0%	5.1%
TM γ_2	0.208	0.865	60.2%	7.8%	2.9%	−0.013	0.870	49.2%	4.9%	5.0%
TM $\mathcal{V}$	0.07%	0.20%	62.9%	9.0%	2.5%	0.001%	0.207%	50.1%	5.0%	5.0%
MPPM Θ	0.40%	2.35%	57.2%	6.8%	3.4%	−6.42%	9.23%	24.2%	0.9%	16.9%
	informed timer (1%)					random timer				
	avg	st dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −	avg	st dev	freq won	freq signif +	freq signif −
HM γ_2	0.512	0.591	81.3%	21.4%	0.7%	−0.003	0.598	49.7%	5.0%	5.1%
HM $\mathcal{V}$	0.68%	0.64%	85.8%	27.0%	0.4%	−0.01%	0.65%	49.1%	4.8%	4.9%
TM γ_2	2.037	2.747	77.8%	17.9%	1.0%	−0.004	2.78	49.9%	4.9%	5.0%
TM $\mathcal{V}$	0.69%	0.66%	85.8%	26.8%	0.4%	−0.01%	0.67%	49.3%	4.7%	4.9%
MPPM Θ	4.20%	7.53%	71.8%	13.2%	1.7%	−10.5%	12.2%	18.9%	0.5%	20.8%

Figure 1: Two-period Sharpe ratio optimization when the evaluator knows the portfolio's overall mean and variance. The horizontal axis represents the portfolio's historical Sharpe ratio during the time interval 0 to γ. After seeing these results, the manager can then rebalance the portfolio to optimize the Sharpe ratio calculated over the entire interval 0 to 1. The vertical axis displays the resulting expected Sharpe ratio from time 0 to time 1

Figure 2: Illustration of two-period alpha manipulation. The horizontal and vertical axes are the market's and the portfolio's excess returns. The portfolio is invested in the market though the leverage can be changed. In the past, the market return (○) has been higher than expected. To manipulate alpha, the leverage in the future should be decreased to $\lambda < 1$. Future returns (●) will lie on a shallower line. The estimated market line using all the data will have a slope between 1 and λ and a positive α. If history had produced below-average returns, the leverage should be increased in the future.

Maximized Ratio Portfolios

	Sharpe ratio	Sortino ratio	VPF ratio
Market Portfolio	0.597	1.000	2.859
MSR Portfolio	0.604	0.911	2.633
MDR Portfolio	0.051	2.826	6.037
MUP Portfolio	0.048	2.763	6.174

U (off scale) 2309%
D (off scale) 2208%

— Market Portfolio
S Maximal Sharpe Ratio Portfolio
D Maximal Downside-Risk (Sortino) Portfolio
U Maximal Upside-Potential (VPF) Portfolio

Figure 3: Comparison of Maximal Sortino and VPF Ratio Portfolios to the Market Portfolio. The x-axis is the market return. S, D, and U are the returns on maximal-Sharpe-ratio, maximal-downside-risk-ratio (Sortino), and maximal-upside-potential-ratio (VPF) portfolios. The market environment is a binomial model approximation to a lognormal market with a continuously-compounded risk premium of 12% and a logarithmic volatility of $\sigma = 20\%$. There are twenty periods over the one month.

Figure 4: Payoffs on "Optimal" Timing Portfolios The horizontal axis is the monthly excess market return. The two curves show the monthly excess returns on the Treynor-Mazuy and Henriksson-Merton optimized portfolios with minimum-variance, zero-beta, a selectivity coefficient of $\gamma_0 = 0.1\%$, and a timing coefficient of $\gamma_2 = 0.1$ from the regression: $x_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 m_t + \gamma_2 w_t + \varepsilon_t$. The market environment is a lognormal market with a continuously-compounded risk premium of 12% and a logarithmic volatility of $\sigma = 20\%$.

Old Complete **References**

Admati, A., S. Bhattacharya, P. Pfleiderer, and S. Ross. 1986. "On Timing and Selectivity." *Journal of Finance* 41: 715–732.

Agarwal, V and N. Y. Naik, 2001. "Performance Evaluation of Hedge Funds with Option-Based and Buy-and-Hold Strategies" London Business School Centre for Hedge Fund Research and Education working paper.

Brown, C. K., W. V. Harlow, and L. T. Starks. 1996. "Of Tournaments and Temptations: an Analysis of Managerial Incentives in the Mutual Fund Industry" *Journal of Finance* 51 (March): 85–110.

Brown, S. J., D. R. Gallagher, O. W. Steenbeek, and P. L. Swan. 2004. "Double or Nothing: Patterns of Equity Fund Holdings and Transactions" Stern School of Management, NYU working paper.

Brown, S. J., W. N. Goetzmann and J. M. Park, 2000. "Hedge Funds and the Asian Currency Crisis — Global Hedge Funds Did Not Move Exchange Rates" *Journal of Portfolio Management* 26 (Summer): 95–101.

Busse, J., 1999. "Volatility Timing in Mutual Funds: Evidence from Daily Returns" *Review of Financial Studies* 12 (Winter): 1009–1041.

Carpenter, J. N., 2000. "Does Option Compensation Increase Managerial Risk Appetite?" *Journal of Finance* 55 (October): 2311–2331.

Chen, Z. W. and P. J. Knez, 1996. "Portfolio Performance Measurement: Theory and Evidence" *Review of Financial Studies* 9 (Summer): 551–556.

Chevalier, J. and G. Ellison, 1997. "Risk Taking by Mutual Funds as a Response to Incentives" *Journal of Political Economy* 105 (December): 1167–1200.

Cochrane, J. and J. Saa-Requejo, 1999. "Good-deal Option Price Bounds with Stochastic Volatility and Stochastic Interest Rate" NBER working paper.

Calamos, N., 2003. *Convertible Arbitrage: Insight and Techniques for Successful Hedging*. John Wiley and Sons.

Debreu, G., 1960. "Topological Methods in Cardinal Utility Theory" in *Mathematical Methods in the Social Sciences, 1959, Proceedings of the First Stanford Symposium* K. J. Arrow, S. Karlin, and P. Suppes (eds.) Stanford University Press.

Dugan, L. J., T. M. Burton, and C. Mollenkamp, 2002. "Portrait of a Loss: Chicago Art Institute Learns Tough Lesson About Hedge Funds" *Wall Street Journal*, Feb. 2, 2002 A1.

Dybvig, P.H. and J. E. Ingersoll, 1982. "Mean-Variance Theory In Complete Markets" *Journal of Business* 55 (April): 233–251.

Dybvig, P.H. and S. A. Ross, 1982. "Portfolio Efficient Sets" *Econometrica* 50 (Nov): 1525-1546.

Ferson, W., and A. Siegel, 2001, "The Efficient Use of Conditioning Information in Portfolios," *Journal of Finance* 3 (June): 967-982.

Getmansky, M., A. Lo, and I. Makarov, 2003. "An Econometric Model of Serial Correlation and Illiquidity in Hedge Fund Returns" Sloan School of Management, MIT working paper.

Glosten, L. and R. Jagannathan, 1994. "A Contingent Claims Framework for Analyzing the Performance of Portfolio Managers" *Journal of Empirical Finance* 1 (January): 133−160.

Goetzmann, W. N., J. E. Ingersoll, Jr. and S. A. Ross, 2003. "High Water Marks" *Journal of Finance* 58 (August): 1685−1717.

Goodwin, Thomas H., 1998. "The Information Ratio" *Financial Analysts Journal* 54 (July-August): 34−43.

Grinblatt, M and S. Titman, 1992. "Performance Evaluation" *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Money and Finance* Newman, P., Milgate, M., and Eatwell, J. (Eds.) (Stockton Press, Volume 3 (N-Z)), 133−135.

He, H. and H. Leland. 1993. "On Equilibrium Asset Price Processes" *The Review of Financial Studies* 6:593−617.

Henriksson, R. D., 1984. "Market Timing and Mutual Fund Performance" *Journal of Business* 57 (January): 73−96.

Henriksson, R. D., and R. C. Merton, 1981. "On Market Timing and Investment Performance. II. Statistical Procedures for Evaluating Forecasting Skills" *Journal of Business* 54 (October): 513−533.

Jagannathan, R. and R. Korajczyk. 1986. "Assessing the Market Timing Performance of Managed Portfolios." *Journal of Business* 59: 217−235.

Lhabitant, Francois-Serge, "Derivatives in Portfolio Management: Why Beating the Market is Easy," *Derivatives Quarterly*: 39-45.

Lo, A., 2002. "The Statistics of Sharpe Ratios" *Financial Analysts Journal* 58, (July/August):

Low, C., 1999. "Implicit Timing and Pseudo-options in Stock Bull and Bear Markets" Yale School of Management working paper.

Merton, R. C., 1973. "An Intertemporal Capital Asset Pricing Model" *Econometrica* 41 (September) 867−887.

Merton, R. C., 1981. "On Market Timing and Investment Performance. I. An Equilibrium Theory of Value for Market Forecasts" *Journal of Business* 54 (July): 363−406.

Mitchell, M., and T. Pulvino, 2001. "Characteristics of Risk and Return in Risk Arbitrage" *Journal of Finance* 56 (December): 2135−2175.

Modigliani, F., and L. Modigliani, 1997. "Risk-Adjusted Performance" *Journal of Portfolio Management* 23 (Winter): 45−54.

Rubinstein, M. 1976. "The Valuation of Uncertain Income Streams and the Pricing of Options" *The Bell Journal of Economics* 7: 407−425.

Santa-Clara, P., and A. Saretto, 2004, "Option Strategies: Good Deals and Margin Calls" unpublished working paper Anderson School UCLA.

Sharpe, W. F., 1966. "Mutual Fund Performance." *Journal of Business* 39 (January): 119−138.

Sharpe, W. F., 1994. "The Sharpe Ratio" *Journal of Portfolio Management* 21 (Fall): 49−58.

Sortino, Frank, and Robert van der Meer. 1991. "Downside Risk." *Journal of Portfolio Management*, 17 (Summer): 27−31.

Spurgin, R. B., 2001. "How to Game Your Sharpe Ratio" *The Journal of Alternative Investments* 4 (Winter): 38−46.

Treynor, J. 1965. "How to Rate Management of Investment Funds" *Harvard Business Review* 43 (January-February): 63−75.

Treynor, J., and F. Black. 1973. "How to Use Portfolio Analysis to Improve Portfolio Selection" *The Journal of Business* 46 (January): 66−86.

Treynor, J., and K. Mazuy, 1966. "Can Mutual Funds Outguess the Market?" *Harvard Business Review* 44 (July-August): 131−136.

Weisman, A. B. 2002. "Informationless Investing and Hedge Fund Performance" *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 28 (Summer #4): 80−91.