

# Optimal Hedge Fund Allocations

*Do higher moments matter?*

Jan-Hein Cremers, Mark Kritzman, and Sébastien Page

**H**edge funds have return peculiarities not commonly associated with traditional investment vehicles. Specifically, hedge funds seem more inclined to produce return distributions with significantly non-normal skewness and kurtosis. There is also growing acceptance of the notion that investor preferences are better represented by bilinear utility functions or S-shaped value functions than by neoclassical utility functions such as power utility. Many investors have therefore concluded that mean-variance optimization is not appropriate for forming portfolios that include hedge funds.<sup>1</sup>

We apply both mean-variance and full-scale optimization to form portfolios of hedge funds, given a wide range of assumptions about investor preferences. We find that higher moments of hedge funds do not meaningfully compromise the efficacy of mean-variance optimization if investors have power utility. We also find, however, that mean-variance optimization is not particularly effective for identifying optimal hedge fund allocations if preferences are bilinear or S-shaped. We show that investors with bilinear utility dislike kurtosis and that, contrary to conventional wisdom, investors with S-shaped preferences are attracted to kurtosis as well as negative skewness. Mean-variance optimization is insensitive to these preferences.<sup>2</sup>

## STATISTICAL SUMMARY OF HEDGE FUND RETURNS

We use monthly hedge fund returns for the ten-year period from January 1994 through December 2003 provided by the Center for International Securities and

**JAN-HEIN CREMERS** is a vice president at State Street Associates in Cambridge, MA.  
[jcremers@statestreet.com](mailto:jcremers@statestreet.com)

**MARK KRITZMAN** is president and CEO of Windham Capital Management, LLC, in Cambridge.  
[mkritzman@windhamcapital.com](mailto:mkritzman@windhamcapital.com)

**SÉBASTIEN PAGE** is a vice president at State Street Associates in Cambridge.  
[spage@statestreet.com](mailto:spage@statestreet.com)

Derivatives Markets (CISDM), which is associated with the Isenberg School of Management at the University of Massachusetts. The CISDM database includes 2,500 funds, with performance for some funds that date back to the early 1970s. We include only live funds with ten years of history for four hedge fund strategies: equity hedge, convertible arbitrage, event-driven, and merger arbitrage.

There are 25 funds in the equity hedge category that meet our criteria. These funds maintain a long position in equities perceived to be undervalued, and hedge these holdings by selling short individual stocks or stock index futures perceived to be overvalued or neutrally valued. Often the managers of these funds use leverage in order to enhance the expected return. These funds tend to experience more extreme outcomes, which results in a higher level of kurtosis than a normal distribution.

We include ten convertible arbitrage funds. These funds typically purchase convertible bonds and hedge the equity risk by selling the company's underlying common stock short. These funds display both higher levels of kurtosis than a normal distribution and negative skewness. The negative skewness implies that these funds produce a greater number of above-average returns than a normal distribution, but negative outcomes tend to be lower than what we would expect from a normal distribution.

We also include 19 event-driven funds. This hedge fund strategy is also referred to as corporate life cycle investing. These funds search for opportunities created by events such as spinoffs, mergers and acquisitions, bankruptcy reorganizations, recapitalizations, and share repurchases. They use long and short positions in common and preferred stock, debt securities, and options. Because they attempt to capitalize on significant events, their return distributions display higher-than-normal kurtosis. They are also negatively skewed on average.

Finally, we include seven merger arbitrage funds. These funds attempt to profit by acquiring the stock of companies that are takeover targets and by selling the stock of the acquiring companies. These funds also display higher-than-normal kurtosis.

Exhibit 1 shows the skewness and kurtosis for these funds, and indicates whether a fund passed the Jarque-Bera test for normality. A normal distribution has skewness equal to 0 and kurtosis equal to 3.<sup>3</sup>

## METHODOLOGY

We evaluate two approaches to portfolio formation: mean-variance optimization, and full-scale opti-

mization. Institutional investors typically use mean-variance optimization to form portfolios, in part because it requires knowledge of only the expected returns, standard deviations, and correlations of the portfolio's components. In principle, this approach is adequate if at least one of two conditions prevails: Either investors have quadratic utility, or portfolio returns are normally distributed.<sup>4</sup>

Neither of these assumptions is literally true. Quadratic utility assumes that investors are as averse to deviations above the mean as they are to deviations below the mean, and that they sometimes prefer less wealth to more wealth. And as we have just shown, hedge fund returns exhibit significant departures from normality.

Computational advances now allow us to perform full-scale optimization as an alternative to mean-variance optimization. Under this approach, we calculate a portfolio's utility for every period in our sample, considering as many asset mixes as necessary in order to identify the weights that yield the highest expected utility, given any utility function or S-shaped value function.

Suppose, for example, we wish to find the optimal blend between the two funds whose returns are displayed in Exhibit 2, assuming the investor has log wealth utility. We compute utility each period as  $\ln[(1 + R_A)W_A + (1 + R_B)W_B]$ , where  $R_A$  and  $R_B$  equal the returns of funds A and B, and  $W_A$  and  $W_B$  equal their weights.

We then shift the fund's weights using a numerical search procedure until we find the combination that maximizes expected utility, which in this example equals a 57.13% allocation to fund A and a 42.87% allocation to fund B. The expected utility of the portfolio reaches a maximum at 9.31%. This approach implicitly takes into account all the features of the empirical sample, including skewness, kurtosis, and any other peculiarities of the distribution.

We apply these two portfolio formation techniques, mean-variance and full-scale optimization, to identify optimal portfolios, assuming five descriptions of investor preferences:

1. Log wealth utility.
2. Bilinear utility with a -1% threshold.
3. Bilinear utility with a -5% threshold.
4. S-shaped value function with aversion to returns below 0%.
5. S-shaped value function with aversion to returns below 0.5%.

Log wealth utility was first proposed by Daniel Bernoulli in 1738 (see Bernoulli [1954] for a translation).

# EXHIBIT 1

## Higher Moments of Hedge Funds

| Equity Hedge | Skewness | Kurtosis | JB Test |
|--------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1            | -0.25    | 4.98     | Failed  |
| 2            | -0.14    | 3.61     | Passed  |
| 3            | -0.34    | 4.69     | Failed  |
| 4            | 0.43     | 4.77     | Failed  |
| 5            | 0.07     | 5.32     | Failed  |
| 6            | 0.00     | 4.75     | Failed  |
| 7            | 1.12     | 8.23     | Failed  |
| 8            | -0.77    | 4.73     | Failed  |
| 9            | -0.70    | 5.13     | Failed  |
| 10           | -0.42    | 3.70     | Passed  |
| 11           | 0.38     | 2.93     | Passed  |
| 12           | 0.27     | 4.23     | Failed  |
| 13           | 3.40     | 26.91    | Failed  |
| 14           | -0.87    | 6.33     | Failed  |
| 15           | -0.15    | 3.36     | Passed  |
| 16           | -0.17    | 6.35     | Failed  |
| 17           | -0.02    | 5.46     | Failed  |
| 18           | 0.49     | 6.35     | Failed  |
| 19           | -0.42    | 6.46     | Failed  |
| 20           | -0.22    | 5.72     | Failed  |
| 21           | 1.08     | 7.36     | Failed  |
| 22           | 0.56     | 4.08     | Failed  |
| 23           | 0.36     | 3.46     | Passed  |
| 24           | 0.91     | 8.70     | Failed  |
| 25           | 0.10     | 5.01     | Failed  |

| Convertible Arbitrage | Skewness | Kurtosis | JB Test |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1                     | -0.45    | 3.79     | Failed  |
| 2                     | -0.39    | 6.07     | Failed  |
| 3                     | -0.84    | 6.22     | Failed  |
| 4                     | -0.11    | 4.08     | Passed  |
| 5                     | -0.35    | 4.78     | Failed  |
| 6                     | 0.19     | 4.44     | Failed  |
| 7                     | -0.65    | 5.04     | Failed  |
| 8                     | -0.60    | 5.25     | Failed  |
| 9                     | -1.52    | 5.83     | Failed  |
| 10                    | -1.34    | 8.72     | Failed  |

| Event-Driven | Skewness | Kurtosis | JB Test |
|--------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1            | -1.00    | 7.60     | Failed  |
| 2            | 0.00     | 4.18     | Failed  |
| 3            | 1.43     | 14.72    | Failed  |
| 4            | 0.91     | 6.87     | Failed  |
| 5            | -1.72    | 8.89     | Failed  |
| 6            | 1.02     | 8.53     | Failed  |
| 7            | 0.16     | 5.07     | Failed  |
| 8            | -0.50    | 4.88     | Failed  |
| 9            | 0.29     | 3.92     | Passed  |
| 10           | -0.51    | 4.57     | Failed  |
| 11           | -0.66    | 4.28     | Failed  |
| 12           | -0.09    | 8.26     | Failed  |
| 13           | -0.37    | 3.75     | Passed  |
| 14           | -3.45    | 26.50    | Failed  |
| 15           | -0.46    | 6.26     | Failed  |
| 16           | -1.45    | 8.12     | Failed  |
| 17           | -0.09    | 3.98     | Passed  |
| 18           | -0.42    | 4.53     | Failed  |
| 19           | -0.14    | 5.30     | Failed  |

| Merger Arbitrage | Skewness | Kurtosis | JB Test |
|------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| 1                | -0.30    | 4.10     | Failed  |
| 2                | 0.91     | 8.40     | Failed  |
| 3                | -0.49    | 5.25     | Failed  |
| 4                | 0.95     | 6.20     | Failed  |
| 5                | -1.01    | 6.97     | Failed  |
| 6                | 0.17     | 4.92     | Failed  |
| 7                | 0.88     | 9.75     | Failed  |

| Summary               | Average Skewness | Average Kurtosis | Percent Failing JB |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Equity Hedge          | 0.19             | 6.10             | 80%                |
| Convertible Arbitrage | -0.61            | 5.42             | 90%                |
| Event-Driven          | -0.37            | 7.38             | 84%                |
| Merger Arbitrage      | 0.16             | 6.51             | 100%               |

## EXHIBIT 2

### Full-Scale Optimization for Log Wealth Investor

| Year             | Fund A Returns | Fund B Returns | Fund A Weight | Fund B Weight | Portfolio Utility                                                                      |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1                | 10.06%         | 16.16%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.1006) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.1616) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 1.1931\%$  |
| 2                | 1.32%          | -7.10%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.0132) \times 0.5713 + (1 - 0.0710) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = -0.2317\%$ |
| 3                | 37.53%         | 29.95%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.3753) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.2995) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 2.9477\%$  |
| 4                | 22.93%         | 0.14%          | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.2293) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.0014) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 1.2367\%$  |
| 5                | 33.34%         | 14.52%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.3334) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.1452) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 2.2533\%$  |
| 6                | 28.60%         | 11.76%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.2860) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.1176) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 1.9375\%$  |
| 7                | 20.89%         | -7.64%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 + 0.2089) \times 0.5713 + (1 - 0.0764) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 0.8305\%$  |
| 8                | -9.09%         | 16.14%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 - 0.0909) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.1614) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = 0.1715\%$  |
| 9                | -11.94%        | 7.26%          | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 - 0.1194) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.0726) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = -0.3777\%$ |
| 10               | -22.10%        | 14.83%         | 57.13%        | 42.87%        | $\ln[(1 - 0.2210) \times 0.5713 + (1 + 0.1483) \times 0.4287] \times 1/10 = -0.6470\%$ |
| Expected Utility |                |                |               |               | 9.3138%                                                                                |

This utility function assumes utility is equal to the natural logarithm of wealth, and is one of a broader family of utility functions called power utility. Power utility defines utility as  $1/\gamma \times \text{wealth}^\gamma$ . A log wealth utility function is a special case of power utility. As  $\gamma$  approaches 0, utility approaches the natural logarithm of wealth. A  $\gamma$  equal to  $1/2$  implies less risk aversion than log wealth, while a  $\gamma$  equal to  $-1$  implies greater risk aversion.<sup>5</sup>

This class of utility functions assumes investors prefer to expose the same proportion of their wealth to risk, regardless of how much wealth they have, which is to say they have constant relative risk aversion. Exhibit 3 shows a log wealth utility function.


A bilinear utility function changes abruptly at a particular wealth or return level, and is relevant for investors who are concerned with breaching a threshold.<sup>6</sup> Suppose an investor requires a minimum level of wealth to maintain a certain standard of living. The investor's lifestyle might change drastically if this threshold is penetrated. Or the investor will become insolvent if wealth breaches some threshold, or a particular decline in wealth may breach a covenant on a loan. In these and similar situations, a bilinear utility function as described below is more likely to describe one's attitude toward risk:

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} \ln(1 + x) & \text{for } x \geq \theta \\ 10 \times (x - \theta) + \ln(1 + \theta) & \text{for } x < \theta \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The kink is located at  $\theta$ , which in one case we set equal to a monthly return of  $-1\%$ , corresponding to about an  $11\%$  annual loss, and in the second case we set

## EXHIBIT 3

### Log Wealth Utility Function



equal to a  $-5\%$  monthly return, corresponding to a  $46\%$  annual loss. The first loss amount would be meaningful to most investors, and the second would be catastrophic. Exhibit 4 shows a bilinear utility function with the kink located at  $-5\%$ .

Proponents of behavioral finance have documented a number of contradictions in the neoclassical view of expected utility maximization. Kahneman and Tversky [1979], for example, find people focus on returns more than wealth levels and that they are risk-averse in the domain of gains but risk-seeking in the domain of losses. A typical investor confronted with a choice between a certain gain and an uncertain outcome with a higher expected value will choose the certain gain, but when confronted with a choice between a certain loss and an uncertain outcome with a lower expected value will choose the uncertain outcome. This behavior is captured by an S-shaped value function, which Kahnemann and Tversky model as follows:

$$U(x) = \begin{cases} -A(\theta - x)^{\gamma_1} & \text{for } x \leq \theta \\ +B(x - \theta)^{\gamma_2} & \text{for } x > \theta \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

subject to:

$$\begin{aligned} A, B &> 0 \\ 0 < \gamma^1, \gamma^2 &\leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

The portfolio's return is represented by  $x$ , and  $A$  and  $B$  are parameters that together control the degree of loss aversion and the curvature of the function for outcomes above and below the loss threshold,  $\theta$ . In our analysis, we scale the parameters to match the range of returns one might reasonably expect from investment in hedge funds.

In one case, we set the monthly loss threshold at 0%, which implies investors experience absolute loss aversion. In the second case, we set the monthly loss threshold equal to 0.5%, which corresponds to about a 6% annualized return. This higher threshold implies that investors experience loss aversion relative to a target return such as an actuarial interest rate assumption or a measure of purchasing power.

Exhibit 5 shows an S-shaped value function with a loss threshold of 0%.


Before carrying out the optimizations, we scale each of the monthly hedge fund returns by a constant in order to produce means that conform to the implied returns of equally weighted portfolios. We assume that returns implied by reasonable weights better reflect investor expectations than historical hedge fund returns, in light of the well-documented problems of survivorship bias and back-fill bias. This adjustment does not affect our comparisons, because we apply it to both the mean-variance and full-scale optimizations; hence the differences we find arise solely from the higher moments of the distributions and not their means.<sup>7</sup>

We then identify portfolios of hedge funds in each style category and across the entire sample of funds that maximize utility for each of these utility functions, based on full-scale optimization. This approach reveals the true utility-maximizing portfolios, given the precise shape of the empirical return distributions.

Next we apply mean-variance optimization to generate the efficient frontier of hedge funds in each category and across the entire sample. Within each category we evaluate the mean-variance efficient portfolio that has the same expected return as the true utility-maximizing portfolio.


## EXHIBIT 4

### Bilinear Utility Function



## EXHIBIT 5

### S-Shaped Value Function



| Parameters |      |          |            |            |
|------------|------|----------|------------|------------|
| A          | B    | $\theta$ | $\gamma_1$ | $\gamma_2$ |
| 2.25       | 1.50 | 1.00     | 0.20       | 0.10       |

## RESULTS

We use several metrics to evaluate the efficacy of mean-variance optimization. For all utility functions, we show the percentage difference in utility between the optimal portfolio determined by full-scale optimization and the mean-variance efficient portfolio with the same expected return. We also show for all utility functions the fraction of the portfolio that one would need to turn over in order to move from the mean-variance efficient portfolio to the true utility-maximizing portfolio.

For the bilinear utility functions, we show the fraction of returns that exceed the kinks, and for the S-shaped value functions the fraction of returns that exceed the inflection points, for both the mean-variance efficient portfolios and the true utility-maximizing portfolios. That we choose different critical levels for the bilinear and S-shaped functions may explain part of the differences we observe in the skewness and kurtosis associated with them, but the resulting shallow slope of the S-shaped value function's left side is a key assumption that deserves careful attention.

## EXHIBIT 6

### Percentage Difference in Utility

|                       | Log Wealth<br>Utility | Bilinear Utility |        | S-Shaped<br>Value Functions |          |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------------------|----------|
|                       |                       | At -5%           | At -1% | At 0%                       | At +0.5% |
| Equity Hedge          | 0.01%                 | 20.93%           | 11.61% | 30.76%                      | 61.28%   |
| Convertible Arbitrage | 0.00%                 | 4.37%            | 2.90%  | 9.67%                       | 14.55%   |
| Event-Driven          | 0.00%                 | 17.13%           | 32.62% | 12.58%                      | 23.65%   |
| Merger Arbitrage      | 0.00%                 | 7.51%            | 26.39% | 2.41%                       | 6.98%    |
| All Hedge Funds       | 0.01%                 | 25.77%           | 30.41% | 13.53%                      | 59.13%   |

## EXHIBIT 7

### Turnover Required to Shift from Mean-Variance to Full-Scale Efficiency

|                       | Log Wealth<br>Utility | Bilinear Utility |        | S-Shaped<br>Value Functions |          |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|--------|-----------------------------|----------|
|                       |                       | At -5%           | At -1% | At 0%                       | At +0.5% |
| Equity Hedge          | 4%                    | 21%              | 31%    | 40%                         | 53%      |
| Convertible Arbitrage | 0%                    | 66%              | 63%    | 56%                         | 40%      |
| Event-Driven          | 0%                    | 84%              | 30%    | 31%                         | 42%      |
| Merger Arbitrage      | 0%                    | 36%              | 42%    | 12%                         | 14%      |
| All Hedge Funds       | 15%                   | 34%              | 56%    | 57%                         | 55%      |

Our final set of results shows the higher moments of the mean-variance and true utility-maximizing portfolios. These results clearly demonstrate the superiority of full-scale optimization to mean-variance optimization when higher moments matter.

### Improvement in Utility

Exhibit 6 shows the percentage change in utility gained by shifting from the mean-variance efficient portfolio to the true utility-maximizing portfolio determined by full-scale optimization. For investors with log wealth utility, mean-variance optimization closely matches the results of full-scale optimization.

Other studies show that this result obtains for other variations of power utility as well (see, for example, Levy and Markowitz [1979] and Cremers, Kritzman, and Page [2003]). Mean-variance optimization performs well in these situations because power utility is relatively insensitive to higher moments.

This result, however, does not prevail for investors who have bilinear utility or S-shaped value functions. For investors with these preferences, mean-variance optimization results in significant loss of utility.

### Required Turnover

Exhibit 7 depicts the fraction of the mean-variance efficient portfolio one would need to trade in order to invest the portfolio in accordance with the full-scale optimal weights. Again, we find that mean-variance optimization performs well for log wealth investors, except for hedge funds across all four styles. Even in this case, though, the 15% departure from the optimal full-scale weights results in only slight utility loss.

The mean-variance exposures for investors with bilinear utility or S-shaped value functions differ substantially from the true utility-maximizing weights.

### Success Rate

Exhibit 8 shows the rate at which the mean-variance and full-scale portfolios succeed in producing outcomes above the critical levels. Again, for the bilinear utility function, the critical levels equal -1% and -5%, the location of the kinks. For the S-shaped value functions, the critical levels correspond to the returns at which the inflection point is located, which equal 0% and 0.5%.

There is no significant difference between the success rate of the full-scale portfolios and the mean-variance portfolios for the bilinear utility function. The most significant differences occur when investors are presumed to have an S-shaped value function with the inflection point

## EXHIBIT 8

### Success Rates

|                       | Log Wealth<br>Utility |    | Bilinear Utility |      |         |     | S-Shaped Value Functions |     |           |     |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|----|------------------|------|---------|-----|--------------------------|-----|-----------|-----|
|                       | MV                    | FS | At -5 %          |      | At -1 % |     | At 0 %                   |     | At +0.5 % |     |
|                       |                       |    | MV               | FS   | MV      | FS  | MV                       | FS  | MV        | FS  |
| Equity Hedge          | NA                    | NA | 99%              | 100% | 96%     | 97% | 75%                      | 88% | 63%       | 77% |
| Convertible Arbitrage | NA                    | NA | 82%              | 75%  | 98%     | 98% | 89%                      | 95% | 79%       | 86% |
| Event-Driven          | NA                    | NA | 99%              | 99%  | 95%     | 98% | 88%                      | 94% | 78%       | 87% |
| Merger Arbitrage      | NA                    | NA | 97%              | 98%  | 97%     | 98% | 95%                      | 97% | 83%       | 86% |
| All Hedge Funds       | NA                    | NA | 99%              | 99%  | 97%     | 97% | 84%                      | 91% | 65%       | 78% |

## EXHIBIT 9

### Skewness

|                       | Log Wealth |       | Bilinear Utility |       |         |       | S-Shaped Value Functions |       |           |       |
|-----------------------|------------|-------|------------------|-------|---------|-------|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
|                       | Utility    |       | At -5 %          |       | At -1 % |       | At 0 %                   |       | At +0.5 % |       |
|                       | MV         | FS    | MV               | FS    | MV      | FS    | MV                       | FS    | MV        | FS    |
| Equity Hedge          | -0.23      | -0.08 | -0.30            | -0.01 | 0.16    | 0.39  | -0.08                    | -0.34 | -0.20     | -0.34 |
| Convertible Arbitrage | 4.78       | 4.78  | -0.39            | 0.03  | -0.39   | 0.20  | -0.40                    | -0.32 | -0.38     | -0.80 |
| Event-Driven          | 1.02       | 1.02  | -1.08            | -0.24 | -1.48   | -0.60 | -1.58                    | -1.82 | -1.46     | -1.85 |
| Merger Arbitrage      | 0.17       | 0.17  | -0.05            | 0.04  | -1.09   | -0.06 | -1.02                    | -1.10 | -1.22     | -1.60 |
| All Hedge Funds       | -0.56      | -0.55 | 0.01             | 0.01  | -1.12   | 0.30  | -1.10                    | -1.98 | -0.95     | -1.12 |

set at 0.5%. In general, the full-scale portfolios perform much better than the mean-variance portfolios across all hedge fund strategies.

### Skewness

Exhibit 9 shows the skewness of the mean-variance and full-scale portfolios. On average, full-scale optimization reduces negative skewness when preferences are bilinear and increases it when they are S-shaped.

The bilinear utility functions have a steep slope below the kink; hence significantly negative outcomes are sharply penalized. The S-shaped value functions do not penalize very negative outcomes much more than marginally negative outcomes, and they place a premium on above-threshold outcomes.

Exhibit 10 contrasts the mean-variance and full-scale return distributions for investors with S-shaped preferences for the entire sample of hedge funds. It clearly shows that full-scale optimization increases negative skewness more than mean-variance optimization does.

### Kurtosis

Exhibit 11 reports the kurtosis of the mean-variance and full-scale portfolios. Again we see a contrast in the impact of full-scale optimization. Full scale-optimization reduces kurtosis, given bilinear utility, but not if investors have S-shaped value functions. Bilinear utility penalizes incrementally more negative results more severely than S-shaped value functions, and high kurtosis generates a high frequency of significantly negative results.

Exhibit 12 compares the return distributions produced by mean-variance and full-scale optimization for investors with bilinear utility, again for the entire sample of hedge funds. It shows that full-scale optimization reduces the kurtosis associated with negative returns, but not the kur-

tosis associated with positive returns.

## SUMMARY

Investors recognize that many hedge fund strategies produce significantly non-normal return distributions, which calls into question the efficacy of using mean-variance optimization to form portfolios

that include hedge funds. We directly measure the efficacy of mean-variance optimization by comparing it to full-scale optimization, given a variety of assumptions about investor preferences.

Our analysis yields several insights.


- Mean-variance optimization performs extremely well for investors with log wealth utility. This result obtains even though the distributions of the component hedge fund returns are significantly non-normal. Moreover, much of this non-normality survives into the mean-variance efficient portfolios, which implies that log wealth utility is fairly insensitive to higher moments.
- Mean-variance optimization performs poorly for investors with bilinear utility or S-shaped value functions. Full-scale optimization reduces kurtosis and negative skewness for investors with bilinear utility, and it maximizes the success rate for investors with S-shaped value functions.
- Negative skewness is not problematical, given S-shaped value functions, because it improves the success rate and because extreme negative results are not severely penalized.
- Kurtosis is also not problematical for investors with S-shaped value functions, again because these functions do not severely penalize extreme negative results.

These conclusions, of course, depend on the particular parameters chosen for the bilinear utility functions and S-shaped value functions. Different parameters may lead to different conclusions about the sensitivity of utility to skewness and kurtosis.

In any event, it is safe to assume that mean-variance optimization is suitable for investors with log wealth utility and other variations of power utility, even for allocations to funds with significantly non-normal distributions. We strongly recommend, however, that investors with

## EXHIBIT 10

S-Shaped Distribution— $\theta = 0$




## EXHIBIT 11

Kurtosis

|                       | Log Wealth |      | Bilinear Utility |      |        |      | S-Shaped Value Functions |       |           |       |
|-----------------------|------------|------|------------------|------|--------|------|--------------------------|-------|-----------|-------|
|                       | Utility    |      | At -5%           |      | At -1% |      | At 0%                    |       | At +0.5 % |       |
|                       | MV         | FS   | MV               | FS   | MV     | FS   | MV                       | FS    | MV        | FS    |
| Equity Hedge          | 4.70       | 4.65 | 4.17             | 3.65 | 2.39   | 2.44 | 2.86                     | 3.80  | 3.28      | 4.44  |
| Convertible Arbitrage | 4.78       | 4.78 | 5.34             | 4.67 | 4.18   | 3.41 | 5.38                     | 5.88  | 4.64      | 5.62  |
| Event-Driven          | 8.53       | 8.53 | 7.51             | 4.06 | 9.30   | 4.98 | 9.24                     | 12.56 | 9.18      | 11.67 |
| Merger Arbitrage      | 4.92       | 4.92 | 4.36             | 3.95 | 6.13   | 4.12 | 7.59                     | 8.70  | 7.07      | 8.95  |
| All Hedge Funds       | 3.86       | 3.85 | 6.46             | 3.62 | 6.55   | 2.98 | 6.62                     | 11.08 | 6.22      | 8.47  |

## EXHIBIT 12

Bilinear Distribution— $\theta = -5\%$



bilinear utility or S-shaped value functions use full-scale optimization when they form portfolios that include hedge funds or other assets with non-normal distributions.

## APPENDIX

### Optimal Portfolio Weights

Exhibits A-1 through A-5 show the specific weights resulting from mean-variance and full-scale optimization. By comparing these weights to the higher-moment measures shown in Exhibit 1, it is possible to gain insight about sensitivity of the various utility and value functions to higher moments.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The authors thank Richard Grinold, Jarrod Wilcox, and participants at the 2005 State Street Associates Research Retreat for helpful comments, and Paul A. Samuelson for suggesting full-scale optimization as an alternative to mean-variance optimization.

<sup>2</sup>On skewness and kurtosis, see, for example: Alexiev [2005], Anson [2002], Brooks and Kat [2002], Favre and Signer [2002], Fung and Hsieh [2000], Gregoriou and Gueyie [2003], Kat and Lu [2002], Lo [2001], and Lamm [2003]. On investor preferences, see, for example: Agarwal and Naik [2000, 2003], Berkelaar and Kouwenberg [2000], Cvitanic et al. [2003], Davies, Kat, and Lu [2003], Favre and Galeano [2000], Fisher and Statman [1997], Lhabitant and Learned [2002], and Statman [1999].

<sup>3</sup>The full-scale optimization approach is similar to Grinold's [1999] scenario-based approach, which maximizes expected utility for the entire distribution of outcomes. An alternative approach is to include higher moments in the objective function. See, for example, Harvey et al. [2003].

<sup>4</sup>The Jarque-Bera test is a non-parametric test of normality that is based on skewness and kurtosis. It is non-parametric in the sense that it tests for normality without specification of a particular mean or variance. The actual statistic is a sum of two independent parts, one built from the third moment, the other from the fourth moment. Each part is distributed as a standard normal. The Jarque-Bera statistic is their sum of squares, and thus should be compared to a chi-square distribution with two degrees of freedom.

<sup>5</sup>Although normality is almost always sufficient to justify mean-variance optimization, there are special cases when it is not sufficient. While it is true that all information about a normal distribution is captured by the first two moments, this information is not linear in variance. Kurtosis, for example, is proportional to variance squared; hence mean-variance analysis may fail to maximize utility for functions that are more sensitive to kurtosis than to variance. We thank Jarrod Wilcox for pointing this out to us.

<sup>6</sup>When  $\gamma$  equals  $-1$ , utility is expressed as  $1 - W^{\gamma}$ .

<sup>7</sup>We use the term *bilinear* loosely to refer to a kinked function that describes utility by one function above a particular threshold and by a different function below that threshold. We suggest purists who require linearity for both functions imagine a log scale for the function to the right of the threshold.

<sup>8</sup>These biases arise because managers are more likely to submit performance records for funds that have performed well than for funds that have performed poorly.

## EXHIBIT A-1

### Equity Hedge Optimal Portfolio Weights

| Fund | Log Wealth |       | Bilinear at -5 % |      | Bilinear at -1 % |       | S-Shaped at 0 % |       | S-Shaped at +0.5 % |       |
|------|------------|-------|------------------|------|------------------|-------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
|      | MV         | FS    | MV               | FS   | MV               | FS    | MV              | FS    | MV                 | FS    |
| 1    | 1.3%       | 1.7%  | 3.6%             | 3.8% | 0.4%             | 0.0%  | 2%              | 0.0%  | 3.0%               | 23.0% |
| 2    | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 4.5%             | 5.3% | 6.9%             | 9.4%  | 7%              | 6.4%  | 6.3%               | 3.8%  |
| 3    | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 5.6%             | 4.1% | 14.5%            | 16.6% | 10%             | 4.2%  | 8.4%               | 19.7% |
| 4    | 5.5%       | 5.5%  | 0.0%             | 4.5% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 0.1%  |
| 5    | 9.7%       | 9.6%  | 2.7%             | 2.9% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.2%               | 0.0%  |
| 6    | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 11.4%            | 4.7% | 13.4%            | 6.7%  | 13%             | 21.0% | 12.4%              | 23.4% |
| 7    | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 6.2%             | 4.3% | 12.7%            | 10.7% | 13%             | 7.7%  | 11.8%              | 0.0%  |
| 8    | 7.1%       | 6.6%  | 3.1%             | 2.8% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 1%              | 4.8%  | 1.5%               | 3.2%  |
| 9    | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 11.3%            | 4.5% | 30.7%            | 14.1% | 24%             | 9.6%  | 20.7%              | 4.6%  |
| 10   | 4.7%       | 4.1%  | 3.8%             | 2.9% | 0.9%             | 1.1%  | 2%              | 2.8%  | 2.9%               | 4.2%  |
| 11   | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 3.7%             | 4.7% | 1.4%             | 4.7%  | 3%              | 0.0%  | 3.0%               | 0.0%  |
| 12   | 4.9%       | 5.1%  | 3.6%             | 3.3% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 6.2%  | 1.6%               | 1.5%  |
| 13   | 0.9%       | 2.4%  | 3.5%             | 5.4% | 0.0%             | 1.2%  | 2%              | 1.9%  | 2.7%               | 0.0%  |
| 14   | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.0%             | 4.5% | 0.0%             | 13.1% | 0%              | 11.0% | 0.0%               | 1.4%  |
| 15   | 15.3%      | 15.6% | 2.2%             | 3.5% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 0.0%  |
| 16   | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 3.2%             | 3.2% | 0.0%             | 1.7%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.5%               | 0.0%  |
| 17   | 1.8%       | 2.4%  | 4.3%             | 3.2% | 3.4%             | 0.5%  | 5%              | 8.7%  | 5.3%               | 0.0%  |
| 18   | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 4.2%             | 7.1% | 10.1%            | 10.6% | 7%              | 7.9%  | 6.0%               | 4.8%  |
| 19   | 3.4%       | 1.4%  | 3.1%             | 2.6% | 0.0%             | 0.1%  | 1%              | 7.6%  | 1.9%               | 5.0%  |
| 20   | 8.4%       | 8.0%  | 1.9%             | 2.8% | 0.0%             | 4.6%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 0.0%  |
| 21   | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 4.6%             | 3.6% | 3.6%             | 2.8%  | 5%              | 0.4%  | 5.8%               | 0.5%  |
| 22   | 11.2%      | 11.9% | 2.8%             | 5.6% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.1%               | 0.6%  |
| 23   | 4.8%       | 5.3%  | 4.1%             | 4.3% | 0.4%             | 2.1%  | 2%              | 0.0%  | 3.0%               | 0.0%  |
| 24   | 11.7%      | 11.3% | 3.1%             | 3.1% | 0.0%             | 0.0%  | 0%              | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 2.5%  |
| 25   | 9.1%       | 8.9%  | 3.4%             | 3.1% | 1.6%             | 0.0%  | 2%              | 0.0%  | 2.7%               | 1.8%  |

## EXHIBIT A-2

### Convertible Arbitrage Optimal Portfolio Weights

| Fund | Log Wealth |        | Bilinear at -5% |       | Bilinear at -1% |       | S-Shaped at 0% |       | S-Shaped at +0.5 % |       |
|------|------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
|      | MV         | FS     | MV              | FS    | MV              | FS    | MV             | FS    | MV                 | FS    |
| 1    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 12.9%           | 1.0%  | 4.4%            | 2.8%  | 8.3%           | 19.4% | 6.0%               | 7.8%  |
| 2    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 3.5%            | 0.0%  | 9.5%            | 0.0%  | 9.8%           | 21.7% | 9.6%               | 11.9% |
| 3    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 0.2%  | 17.5%           | 35.5% | 13.0%          | 3.5%  | 15.7%              | 3.5%  |
| 4    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 10.7%           | 0.0%  | 3.1%            | 0.0%  | 7.4%           | 0.0%  | 4.9%               | 11.1% |
| 5    | 100.0%     | 100.0% | 22.5%           | 19.2% | 3.3%            | 0.0%  | 7.1%           | 2.7%  | 4.8%               | 1.5%  |
| 6    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 1.6%            | 61.4% | 10.2%           | 51.4% | 10.1%          | 37.1% | 10.2%              | 13.1% |
| 7    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 2.2%            | 0.0%  | 7.2%            | 2.2%  | 9.6%           | 1.5%  | 8.2%               | 25.4% |
| 8    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 6.2%  | 41.7%           | 4.7%  | 25.3%          | 0.0%  | 35.4%              | 11.8% |
| 9    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 38.1%           | 12.1% | 0.0%            | 3.4%  | 1.2%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 5.1%  |
| 10   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 8.6%            | 0.0%  | 3.0%            | 0.0%  | 8.3%           | 14.1% | 5.2%               | 8.8%  |

## EXHIBIT A-3

### Event-Driven Optimal Portfolio Weights

| Fund | Log Wealth |        | Bilinear at -5% |       | Bilinear at -1% |       | S-Shaped at 0% |       | S-Shaped at +0.5 % |       |
|------|------------|--------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|
|      | MV         | FS     | MV              | FS    | MV              | FS    | MV             | FS    | MV                 | FS    |
| 1    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 0.0%  | 24.2%           | 16.0% | 29.4%          | 39.9% | 23.4%              | 25.4% |
| 2    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 29.0%           | 0.0%  | 10.7%           | 9.4%  | 13.4%          | 5.7%  | 10.5%              | 11.6% |
| 3    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 18.4% | 3.7%            | 1.1%  | 3.5%           | 0.0%  | 3.8%               | 0.8%  |
| 4    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.5%            | 10.7% | 1.9%            | 12.8% | 0.5%           | 0.4%  | 2.1%               | 0.5%  |
| 5    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.7%            | 0.0%  | 0.0%            | 0.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 4.7%  |
| 6    | 100.0%     | 100.0% | 0.0%            | 1.1%  | 3.0%            | 3.7%  | 1.8%           | 3.9%  | 3.1%               | 2.1%  |
| 7    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 2.1%            | 25.4% | 0.3%            | 2.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.6%               | 4.3%  |
| 8    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 1.0%            | 0.0%  | 6.2%            | 0.0%  | 4.2%           | 6.1%  | 6.2%               | 0.0%  |
| 9    | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 9.4%            | 7.3%  | 4.2%            | 4.1%  | 3.1%           | 1.0%  | 4.3%               | 0.0%  |
| 10   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 0.0%  | 2.1%            | 0.5%  | 0.4%           | 0.0%  | 2.3%               | 12.0% |
| 11   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 0.0%  | 7.7%            | 9.7%  | 7.5%           | 0.0%  | 7.6%               | 0.0%  |
| 12   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 15.7%           | 6.5%  | 11.1%           | 22.6% | 12.5%          | 10.1% | 10.8%              | 0.0%  |
| 13   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 5.5%  | 0.4%            | 0.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.6%               | 0.0%  |
| 14   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 4.6%            | 0.0%  | 0.0%            | 0.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 10.8% |
| 15   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 30.3%           | 0.0%  | 13.7%           | 11.2% | 16.4%          | 32.7% | 13.6%              | 18.6% |
| 16   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 6.8%            | 0.0%  | 4.4%            | 0.0%  | 2.8%           | 0.0%  | 4.6%               | 6.0%  |
| 17   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 7.0%  | 0.0%            | 2.2%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%               | 3.3%  |
| 18   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 16.0% | 0.1%            | 0.9%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%  | 0.4%               | 0.0%  |
| 19   | 0.0%       | 0.0%   | 0.0%            | 2.2%  | 6.3%            | 3.7%  | 4.4%           | 0.0%  | 6.3%               | 0.0%  |

## EXHIBIT A-4

### Merger Arbitrage Optimal Portfolio Weights

| Fund | Log Wealth |       | Bilinear at -5% |       | Bilinear at -1% |       | S-Shaped at 0% |        | S-Shaped at +0.5% |       |
|------|------------|-------|-----------------|-------|-----------------|-------|----------------|--------|-------------------|-------|
|      | MV         | FS    | MV              | FS    | MV              | FS    | MV             | FS     | MV                | FS    |
| 1    | 14.5%      | 13.6% | 14.7%           | 11.7% | 14.7%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 14.8%             | 21.6% |
| 2    | 11.1%      | 0.0%  | 3.6%            | 0.0%  | 6.7%            | 18.5% | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 5.1%              | 0.0%  |
| 3    | 11.9%      | 14.3% | 6.5%            | 1.7%  | 8.7%            | 0.2%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 7.6%              | 7.4%  |
| 4    | 28.0%      | 0.0%  | 59.5%           | 62.2% | 46.8%           | 75.1% | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 53.5%             | 45.6% |
| 5    | 14.6%      | 52.7% | 15.4%           | 24.0% | 15.1%           | 0.0%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 15.3%             | 17.2% |
| 6    | 10.0%      | 7.9%  | 0.3%            | 0.0%  | 4.2%            | 5.8%  | 100.0%         | 100.0% | 2.1%              | 0.9%  |
| 7    | 9.9%       | 11.5% | 0.0%            | 0.3%  | 3.8%            | 0.3%  | 0.0%           | 0.0%   | 1.7%              | 7.2%  |

# EXHIBIT A-5

## All Funds—Optimal Portfolio Weights

| Fund | Log Wealth |       | Bilinear at -5% |      | Bilinear at -1% |      | S-Shaped at 0% |      | S-Shaped at +0.5% |       |
|------|------------|-------|-----------------|------|-----------------|------|----------------|------|-------------------|-------|
|      | MV         | FS    | MV              | FS   | MV              | FS   | MV             | FS   | MV                | FS    |
| EH1  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 0.1% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.0% | 3.4%              | 0.0%  |
| EH2  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 6.7% | 0.5%            | 8.4% | 0.7%           | 3.1% | 0.8%              | 2.1%  |
| EH3  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 2.1% | 1.7%            | 8.0% | 1.5%           | 1.8% | 0.8%              | 1.4%  |
| EH4  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.9%            | 1.8% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.2% | 3.8%              | 0.0%  |
| EH5  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 0.3% | 0.1%            | 0.0% | 0.4%           | 0.0% | 2.3%              | 1.4%  |
| EH6  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.4%            | 2.0% | 2.4%            | 1.8% | 2.6%           | 2.3% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| EH7  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 2.3% | 1.9%            | 3.0% | 2.1%           | 0.1% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| EH8  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.9%            | 0.0% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 2.3% | 4.3%              | 8.6%  |
| EH9  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.8%            | 1.1% | 0.0%            | 2.9% | 0.9%           | 1.6% | 0.0%              | 1.2%  |
| EH10 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 0.6% | 0.6%            | 0.0% | 0.6%           | 0.0% | 2.2%              | 0.0%  |
| EH11 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 4.0% | 0.0%            | 6.8% | 0.2%           | 0.0% | 2.5%              | 0.0%  |
| EH12 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.9%            | 1.9% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.4% | 2.8%              | 0.0%  |
| EH13 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 4.4% | 0.3%            | 4.1% | 0.6%           | 0.0% | 2.1%              | 0.0%  |
| EH14 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.4%            | 1.1% | 5.6%            | 2.5% | 4.6%           | 1.6% | 1.0%              | 0.2%  |
| EH15 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 3.3% | 0.4%            | 0.0% | 0.6%           | 0.0% | 2.0%              | 0.0%  |
| EH16 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 0.6% | 0.1%            | 0.0% | 0.5%           | 0.2% | 2.4%              | 0.2%  |
| EH17 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.0%            | 2.5% | 0.0%            | 0.5% | 0.0%           | 0.0% | 0.1%              | 0.0%  |
| EH18 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 4.6% | 1.2%            | 2.5% | 1.3%           | 2.2% | 1.3%              | 2.6%  |
| EH19 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 0.0% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 1.7% | 2.6%              | 4.9%  |
| EH20 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 0.0% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 1.5% | 4.2%              | 3.6%  |
| EH21 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 1.9% | 0.5%            | 0.0% | 0.8%           | 2.0% | 0.0%              | 2.0%  |
| EH22 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 5.0% | 0.5%            | 2.4% | 0.7%           | 0.0% | 2.5%              | 0.0%  |
| EH23 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 2.0% | 1.2%            | 1.8% | 1.4%           | 0.0% | 1.3%              | 0.0%  |
| EH24 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 0.0% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.0% | 4.1%              | 5.5%  |
| EH25 | 63.1%      | 64.6% | 1.7%            | 5.2% | 0.9%            | 0.0% | 1.1%           | 0.0% | 2.6%              | 2.4%  |
| CA 1 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.5%            | 0.5% | 0.7%            | 0.6% | 1.2%           | 5.7% | 0.0%              | 0.4%  |
| CA2  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 1.3% | 0.0%            | 3.8% | 0.0%           | 3.9% | 0.0%              | 0.2%  |
| CA3  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.3%            | 1.8% | 6.7%            | 4.0% | 5.6%           | 3.9% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| CA4  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.3%            | 1.1% | 3.0%            | 4.3% | 3.0%           | 0.7% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| CA5  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 2.7% | 0.3%            | 0.1% | 0.6%           | 0.9% | 3.4%              | 0.0%  |
| CA6  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.8%            | 1.8% | 8.1%            | 5.7% | 7.6%           | 1.7% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| CA7  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.3%            | 1.1% | 0.0%            | 1.4% | 0.0%           | 3.5% | 0.0%              | 1.4%  |
| CA8  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.0%            | 1.7% | 15.2%           | 4.7% | 14.2%          | 3.0% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| CA9  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.6%            | 1.2% | 0.0%            | 2.4% | 0.0%           | 2.1% | 3.1%              | 0.0%  |
| CA10 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.2%            | 0.6% | 0.0%            | 1.8% | 0.0%           | 2.9% | 0.0%              | 1.1%  |
| ED 1 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.2%            | 0.7% | 2.5%            | 1.7% | 2.6%           | 4.2% | 0.0%              | 1.6%  |
| ED2  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 2.3% | 3.0%            | 3.6% | 2.7%           | 4.7% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| ED3  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.1% | 1.4%            | 1.8% | 1.4%           | 0.0% | 1.7%              | 2.0%  |
| ED4  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.0% | 0.0%            | 2.6% | 0.3%           | 0.2% | 2.4%              | 0.0%  |
| ED5  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 0.3% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.8% | 6.1%              | 4.7%  |
| ED6  | 2.5%       | 2.5%  | 1.7%            | 0.0% | 0.1%            | 0.0% | 0.3%           | 0.4% | 2.6%              | 10.5% |
| ED7  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.0%            | 2.9% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.0% | 5.8%              | 0.0%  |
| ED8  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.4%            | 0.3% | 3.3%            | 0.0% | 3.3%           | 3.5% | 0.0%              | 0.1%  |
| ED9  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.7% | 0.0%            | 0.3% | 0.3%           | 0.0% | 2.3%              | 2.8%  |
| ED10 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.2% | 1.3%            | 0.4% | 1.4%           | 2.3% | 1.6%              | 2.4%  |
| ED11 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.5%            | 1.0% | 0.0%            | 0.6% | 0.2%           | 2.3% | 0.0%              | 3.5%  |
| ED12 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 1.8% | 1.1%            | 3.3% | 0.9%           | 3.2% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| ED13 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.2% | 0.1%            | 0.0% | 0.5%           | 0.0% | 2.9%              | 0.0%  |
| ED14 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.1%            | 0.0% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 3.9% | 3.4%              | 4.2%  |
| ED15 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.8%            | 0.7% | 7.9%            | 1.8% | 8.0%           | 3.3% | 0.0%              | 2.2%  |
| ED16 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 0.8% | 0.5%            | 0.0% | 0.8%           | 3.1% | 0.5%              | 0.0%  |
| ED17 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.4%            | 1.8% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 1.1% | 6.0%              | 1.7%  |
| ED18 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.9%            | 1.9% | 0.0%            | 0.0% | 0.0%           | 0.0% | 3.3%              | 0.0%  |
| ED19 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 1.5% | 0.6%            | 2.5% | 0.9%           | 1.3% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| MA 1 | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 2.0%            | 0.8% | 1.1%            | 0.0% | 1.1%           | 4.0% | 0.0%              | 2.8%  |
| MA2  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 1.3% | 0.0%            | 2.2% | 0.0%           | 1.7% | 0.4%              | 4.2%  |
| MA3  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.8%            | 1.1% | 0.0%            | 1.7% | 0.0%           | 2.7% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| MA4  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 0.0%            | 1.3% | 23.2%           | 4.2% | 20.3%          | 3.4% | 0.0%              | 0.0%  |
| MA5  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.6%            | 1.5% | 0.5%            | 0.0% | 0.8%           | 4.1% | 0.0%              | 4.3%  |
| MA6  | 34.4%      | 32.9% | 1.8%            | 4.3% | 0.3%            | 0.0% | 0.5%           | 0.0% | 3.2%              | 8.6%  |
| MA7  | 0.0%       | 0.0%  | 1.7%            | 0.1% | 0.8%            | 0.0% | 1.0%           | 0.5% | 2.1%              | 5.1%  |

## REFERENCES

- Agarwal, V., and N.Y. Naik. "Does Gain-Loss Analysis Outperform Mean-Variance Analysis? Evidence from Portfolios of Hedge Funds and Passive Strategies." IFA Working Paper, London Business School, 2000.
- . "Risks and Portfolio Decisions Involving Hedge Funds." Working paper, London Business School, 2003.
- Alexiev, J. "The Impact of Higher Moments on Hedge Fund Risk Exposure." Forthcoming, *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, Spring 2005.
- Anson, Mark J.P. "Symmetrical Performance Measures and Asymmetrical Trading Strategies: A Cautionary Example." *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, vol. 5, no. 1 (2002), pp. 81-85.
- Berkelaar, A., and R. Kouwenberg. "Optimal Portfolio Choice Under Loss Aversion." Econometric Institute Report, Working Paper EI 2000-08/A, 2000.
- Bernoulli, Daniel. "Exposition of a New Theory on the Measurement of Risk." *Econometrica*, 22 (1954), pp. 23-26. Translation of Bernoulli, "Specimen Theoriae Novae de Mensura Sortis," *Papers of the Imperial Academy of Science of St. Petersburg*, 5 (1738).
- Brooks, C., and H.M. Kat. "The Statistical Properties of Hedge Fund Return Index Returns and Their Implications for Investors." *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, vol. 5 (2002), pp. 26-44.
- Cremers, J.-H., M. Kritzman, and S. Page. "Portfolio Formation with Higher Moments and Plausible Utility." Revere Street Working Paper Series, Financial Economics 272-12, November 22, 2003.
- Cvitanić, J., A. Lazrak, L. Martellini, and F. Zapatero. "Optimal Allocation to Hedge Funds: An Empirical Analysis." *Quantitative Finance*, vol. 3 (2003), pp. 1-12.
- Davies, R.J., H.M. Kat, and S. Lu. "Higher Moment Portfolio Analysis with Hedge Funds." Working paper, University of Reading, 2003.
- Favre, L., and J.-A. Galeano. "Hedge Funds Allocation: Case Study of a Swiss Institutional Investor." *Hedgeworld*, June 2000.
- Favre, L., and A. Signer. "The Difficulties of Measuring the Benefits of Hedge Funds." *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, vol. 5, no. 1 (2002), pp. 31-42.
- Fisher, K.L., and M. Statman. "The Mean-Variance-Optimization Puzzle: Security Portfolios and Food Portfolios." *Financial Analysts Journal*, July/August 1997, pp. 41-50.
- Fung, W., and D. Hsieh. "Performance Characteristics of Hedge Funds and Commodity Funds: Natural versus Spurious Biases." *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, vol. 35 (2000), pp. 291-307.
- Gregoriou, G., and J.-P. Gueyie. "Risk-Adjusted Performance of Funds of Hedge Funds Using a Modified Sharpe Ratio." *The Journal of Wealth Management*, vol. 6, no. 3 (2003), pp. 77-84.
- Grinold, Richard C. "Mean-Variance and Scenario-Based Approaches to Portfolio Selection." *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, Winter 1999, pp. 10-22.
- Harvey, C.R., J.C. Lietchy, M.W. Lietchy, and P. Muller. "Portfolio Selection with Higher Moments." Working paper, 2003.
- Kahneman, D., and A. Tversky. "Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk." *Econometrica*, vol. 47 (1979), pp. 263-290.
- Kat, H.M., and S. Lu. "An Excursion into the Statistical Properties of Hedge Fund Returns." Working Paper #0016, Alternative Investment Research Centre, May 1, 2002.
- Lamm, R. McFall, Jr. "Asymmetric Returns and Optimal Hedge Fund Portfolios." *The Journal of Alternative Investments*, Fall 2003, pp. 9-21.
- Levy, Haim, and Harry M. Markowitz. "Approximating Expected Utility by a Function of Mean and Variance." *American Economic Review*, June 1979.
- Lhabitant, and Learned. "Hedge Fund Diversification—How Much is Enough?" *Journal of Alternative Assets*, Winter 2002.
- Lo, A.W. "Risk Management for Hedge Funds: Introduction and Overview." *Financial Analysts Journal*, vol. 57 (2001), pp. 16-33.
- Statman, M. "Behavioral Finance: Past Battles and Future Engagements." *Financial Analysts Journal*, November/December 1999, pp. 18-27.

To order reprints of this article, please contact Ajani Malik at [amalik@ijournals.com](mailto:amalik@ijournals.com) or 212-224-3205.

©Euromoney Institutional Investor PLC. This material must be used for the customer's internal business use only and a maximum of ten (10) hard copy print-outs may be made. No further copying or transmission of this material is allowed without the express permission of Euromoney Institutional Investor PLC. Copyright of Journal of Portfolio Management is the property of Euromoney Publications PLC and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.

The most recent two editions of this title are only ever available at <http://www.euromoneyplc.com>