## IEOR 4500 Maximizing the Sharpe ratio

Suppose we have the setting for a mean-variance portfolio optimization problem:

$$\mu$$
, the vector of mean returns (1)

$$Q$$
, the covariance matrix (2)

$$\sum_{j} x_{j} = 1, \text{ (proportions add to 1)}$$
(3)

$$Ax \ge b$$
, (other linear constraints). (4)

$$0 \leq x. \tag{5}$$

Note that we can use inequalities (4) to represent, in a generic way, many constraints, including upper bounds on variables (constraints of the form  $x_j \leq u_j$ ), as well as equations and general inequalities of the form " $\leq$ ".

As an alternative to the standard mean-variance problem, we consider a different optimization task. Let  $r_f$  be the risk-free interest rate. Consider:

maximize 
$$\frac{\mu^T x - r_f}{\sqrt{x^T Q x}}$$
s.t.
$$\sum_j x_j = 1,$$

$$Ax \ge b.$$

$$0 < x.$$
(6)

Problem (6) is difficult because of the nature of its objective. However, under a reasonable assumption, it can be reduced to a standard convex quadratic program.

The assumption we make is: there exists a vector x satisfying (3)-(5) such that

$$\mu^T x - r_f > 0.$$

This assumption is reasonable: it simply says that our universe of assets is able to beat the risk-free rate of return.

Our approach is as follows: given an asset vector x, define

$$f(x) = \frac{\mu^T x - r_f}{\sqrt{x^T Q x}}.$$

Since  $\sum_j x_j = 1$ ,

$$f(x) = \frac{\mu^T x - r_f}{\sqrt{x^T Q x}} = \frac{\mu^T x - r_f \sum_j x_j}{\sqrt{x^T Q x}} = \frac{\hat{\mu}^T x}{\sqrt{x^T Q x}},$$

where for each index j, we define  $\hat{\mu}_j = \mu_j - r_f$ .

Using this fact, we note:

**Observation:** For any vector x with  $\sum_j x_j = 1$ , and any scalar  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $f(\lambda x) = f(x)$ .

To see this, check that if we write  $y = \lambda x$ , then  $\sqrt{y^T Q y} = \lambda \sqrt{x^T Q x}$ , and similarly  $\hat{\mu}^T y = \lambda \hat{\mu}^T x.$ 

Now we can state our optimization problem. Let  $\hat{A}$  be the matrix whose i, j-entry is

$$a_{ij} - b_i$$

The problem we consider is:

maximize  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{y^T Q y}}$ (7)

$$^{T}y = 1, \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{\mu}^T y = 1, \tag{8}$$

$$\hat{A}y \ge 0. \tag{9}$$

$$0 \le y. \tag{10}$$

To see that problems (6) and (7) are indeed equivalent, suppose that  $\bar{y}$  is an optimal solution to (7). Notice that because of (8),  $\bar{y}$  is not identically zero, and so by (10),  $\sum_{j} \bar{y}_{j} > 0$ . Define the vector

$$\bar{x} = \frac{\bar{y}}{\sum_j \bar{y}_j}$$

Then, by construction,

$$\sum_j \bar{x}_j = 1.$$

Further, since y satisfies (9), then for any row i we have

$$\sum_{j} (a_{ij} - b_i) \bar{y}_j \ge 0,$$

or in other words,

$$\sum_{j} a_{ij} \bar{y}_j \ge (\sum_{j} \bar{y}_j) b_i,$$

and as a consequence,

$$\sum_{j} a_{ij} \bar{x}_j \ge b_i.$$

Therefore,  $\bar{x}$  is feasible for problem (6). Further, as we observed before,  $f(\bar{x}) = f(\bar{y}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{y^T Q y}}$ , since  $\hat{\mu}^T \bar{y} = 1$ .

In summary: the value of problem (6) is *at least* as large as the value of problem (7). The converse is proved in a similar way. So, indeed, (6) and (7) are equivalent.

So we just have to solve (7). But this is clearly equivalent to:

minimize 
$$y^T Q y$$
  
s.t.  
 $\hat{\mu}^T y = 1,$   
 $\hat{A} y \ge 0.$   
 $0 \le y,$ 

which is just a standard quadratic program.