Temi di Discussione

(Working Papers)

Forward-looking robust portfolio selection

by Sara Cecchetti and Laura Sigalotti

Temi di discussione
(Working papers)

Forward-looking robust portfolio selection

by Sara Cecchetti and Laura Sigalotti

The purpose of the Temi di discussione *series is to promote the circulation of working papers prepared within the Bank of Italy or presented in Bank seminars by outside economists with the aim of stimulating comments and suggestions.*

The views expressed in the articles are those of the authors and do not involve the responsibility of the Bank.

FORWARD LOOKING ROBUST PORTFOLIO SELECTION

by Sara Cecchetti* and Laura Sigalotti*

Abstract

In this paper we develop a portfolio optimization strategy based on the extraction of option-implied distributions and the application of robust asset allocation. We compute the option-implied probability density functions of the constituents of the Euro Stoxx 50 Index. To obtain the corresponding risk-adjusted densities, we estimate the risk aversion coefficient through a Berkowitz likelihood test. The correlation structure among the stocks is computed via an *ad hoc* technique, which provides a correction term for the historical correlations. We implement a robust portfolio construction, in order to incorporate the uncertainty about the estimation error for the expected returns in the optimization procedure.

Contents

_____

* Bank of Italy, Economic Outlook and Monetary Policy Department.

1   Introduction[1]

Modern portfolio theory was introduced by Markowitz (1952), who laid the foundations of mean-variance optimization. This strategy, which is still widely used in the financial industry despite the many criticisms that have been leveled against it, is based on the estimation of the first two moments of the probability density function of the asset returns. The standard way to estimate these moments is based on the use of historical data (see, among others, De Miguel, Garlappi and Uppal (2009), for a review of various estimators). It is well known that the estimation errors that inevitably arise when using such a backward-looking approach affect the calculation of the optimal portfolio, since mean-variance optimizers are very sensitive to small variations in expected returns.[2] An alternative methodology has been adopted by Kostakis, Panigirtzoglou and Skiadopoulos (2010), who developed a forward-looking approach based on the information extracted from option prices. They implement a strategy which uses option implied distributions of asset returns to calculate an optimal portfolio consisting of two assets, one risk-free and one risky. Once the risk-neutral implied distributions are extracted, they are converted into the related risk-adjusted (or real-word) distributions, that are required in the calculation of optimal portfolios. As the implied distributions reflect market participants' expectations, this approach is inherently forward-looking and may provide more accurate estimates of the distribution, and the related moments, to be used in the asset allocation problem.

In this paper, we aim at extending the strategy developed in Kostakis, Panigirtzoglou and Skiadopoulos (2010) to a portfolio of many risky assets. Among the different techniques developed in the finance literature to extract risk-neutral densities (see Bedoui and Hamdi (2010) for a review of these methods), we use the mixture of lognormals approach. Once the risk-neutral distributions are estimated, we convert them into the related risk-adjusted ones by assuming a power utility function, in which the risk-aversion coefficient is chosen so that it maximizes the forecasting ability of the risk-adjusted distributions (with respect to the future realizations of the underlying index), using an approach similar to the one followed by Bliss and Panigirtzoglou (2004).

It is worth noting that the generalization of the option-implied distribution approach to a portfolio of many risky assets is not straightforward. In fact, if we consider N stocks and N options written on them, the option prices convey information about the distribution of each stock price, but they do not provide any insight on the correlation structure among the N stock prices. The correlation structure could be inferred using historical data only, but this would give a matrix of covariances inconsistent with the option implied variances of the N stocks. In order to tackle this issue, we focus on a collection of stocks satisfying two conditions:

- each stock is the underlying asset of a quoted option (actually, we need a family

---

[2]See Ceria and Stubbs (2006) for details.

5

of call and put options for each stock, corresponding to different strikes);

- there exists a family of options written on an index made up of all the stocks in our set, with publicly available index weights.

In order to meet these requirements, we consider a portfolio consisting of the 50 stocks of the the Euro Stoxx 50 Index. Using market information about the options written on the index and its contituents, we derive the implied probability density functions of the index and the stocks, and hence, in particular, their variances. Through an *ad-hoc* technique we integrate the historical correlation matrix of the stock returns with the option-implied variances of the stocks and the index and derive a correlation structure that can be considered a proper estimation of the real-world covariance matrix of the stock returns; a similar approach, but in a different context, is used by Buss and Vilkov (2012). We first compute the risk-adjusted standard deviations of the stock returns, the risk-adjusted standard deviation of the index return and the historical correlation matrix of the stock returns. We observe that if the historical correlations were a correct estimate of the (unknown) option-implied correlations, then the option-implied variance of the index would be equal to the variance of the portfolio made up of the constituent stocks, calculated with the option-implied variances of the stocks and the historical correlations. In general these two variances are not equal, since the historical correlations are not a consistent estimate of the option-implied correlations. We then write the difference between the two variances as a proportion β of the option-implied index variance; this leads to an equation in which the only unknown is the correction constant β, which can be estimated numerically.

Finally, we implement a robust portfolio construction (see Ceria and Stubbs (2006), for a detailed description) to cope with the estimation errors in the estimates of the expected returns and their error-magnification effect. Mean-variance portfolios tend to exacerbate the estimation error problem by significantly overweighting assets with an upside error for the expected returns and underweighting assets with a downside error. Robust optimization considers the estimation errors for the mean returns directly in the optimization problem itself, in order to perform an asset allocation that is robust to these errors. The robust optimization approach takes a confidence region for the estimated mean returns, and performs a portfolio optimization accounting for the worst case scenario that could be realized in that confidence region.

Once we have implemented the robust portfolio construction, we compare our results to the efficient frontiers obtained with different methodologies. In particular, we compute the *true* frontier, the Markowitz estimated frontier and the Markowitz actual frontier, which are, respectively: the efficient frontier computed using true expected returns (unobservable and derived through an equilibrium argument); the efficient frontier obtained with estimated expected returns and Markowitz mean-variance portfolio selection; the frontier obtained by calculating true expected returns of the portfolios on the Markowitz estimated frontier. The robust portfolio construction is used to get both a robust estimated frontier and a robust actual frontier, which are compared to the previous ones.

In order to test the validity of our model, we compare the out-of-sample performance of the optimal portfolio based on our option-implied risk-adjusted covariance matrix to that of a portfolio obtained using the historical covariance matrix. In both cases we use robust optimization, which mitigates the estimation error in the mean returns, and we focus on the role of the two alternatives covariance matrices. The comparison relies on two standard performance criteria: the out-of-sample Sharpe Ratio and the Certainty-Equivalent (CEQ) return for the expected utility of a mean-variance investor. We find that the portofolio obtained with our risk-adjusted option-implied covariance significantly outperforms the allocation obtained with the historical covariance matrix, according to both performance criteria. This result suggests that our technique is indeed capable of incorporating more information into the estimate of the covariances, in comparison to an estimate based only on past data. The extraction of option-implied variances and the computation of the correction term for the correlations give a forward-looking covariance matrix, which leads to a better portfolio performance.

Finally, we compare the out-of-sample performance of our robust portfolio to those of the index buy-and-hold strategy and two alternative allocations: the equally-weighted portfolio of De Miguel, Garlappi and Uppal (2009) (in which we build a portfolio with all the N stocks in the index, by assigning weight $1/N$ to each one) and a momentum strategy, in which we select the G stocks with positive returns in the previous year and allocate a portfolio with weight $1/G$ on these stocks. We find that the performance of the equally weighted portfolio is comparable to that of our strategy, whereas the momentum and the index-buy-and-hold strategies have a much poorer performance, according to both the Sharpe Ratio and the CEQ.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the mixture of lognormals method that we apply to estimate the option-implied risk-neutral densities. Section 3 outlines the methodology adopted to convert the risk-neutral densities into the related risk-adjusted densities. In Section 4 we derive the option-implied risk-adjusted covariance matrix and Section 5 explains the robust optimization approach. The dataset used for the empirical application is described in Section 6 and the results are presented in Section 7. Finally, Section 8 presents the conclusions.

2 Option-Implied Risk Neutral Densities

2.1 The mixture of lognormals method

In the financial literature many methods have been proposed for the estimation of option-implied risk-neutral densities.[3] In particular, two methods have been widely studied and implemented. The first, know as the "smile interpolation approach", is based on the interpolation of the implied Black-Scholes volatility smile and requires no parametric assumptions on the risk-neutral densities. The starting point of this method is the result by Breeden and Litzenberger (1978), who prove that the second derivative of the price

---

[3]For a review and comparison of the different estimation methods, see Bedoui and Hamdi (2010).

of a call option with respect to the exercise price K, computed for a given value of the underlying price S, is equal to the risk neutral density f of the underlying asset, evaluated in S and discounted by the risk-free rate:

$$\frac{\partial^2 C(K)}{\partial K^2} = e^{-r(T-t)} f(S).$$

In order to determine $f(S)$ from the previous formula, we need a sufficiently smooth expression for C; Shimko (1993) showed that fitting the implied Black-Scholes volatility smiles gives much better results than interpolating observed call prices directly.

An alternative approach is to assume a specific parametric form for the risk-neutral density (RND) functions and adjust it to the market data. The parameters of the RNDs are calibrated through the use of observed option prices and nonlinear least squares. The most commonly used functional form for the RNDs is a mixture of two or more lognormals; this choice gives a density function that is sufficiently flexible to reflect characteristics such as excess kurtosis, asymmetry, and even bimodality.

In this paper we follow the parametric approach to estimate the option-implied probability density functions (PDFs), calibrating a mixture of lognormals[4] for the PDFs of the 50 stocks and the stock index. In what follows we briefly describe the mixture of lognormals method.

Let S_t be the price of an underlying asset which pays a continuous dividend D_t, which follows the dynamic

$$dD_t = \delta S_t dt, \tag{1}$$

δ being a positive constant. We also assume that the underlying asset follows the cum-dividend price dynamics of a generalized Black and Scholes model (BSMG), that is a geometric Brownian motion:

$$dS_t = \mu S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t, \tag{2}$$

where $\mu = r - \delta$, r is the continuously compounded risk-free rate and W_t is a standard Brownian motion.[5]

As is well known, the price at time t of a call option on such an underlying, with strike K and maturity T, is given by the expected value (under the risk-neutral probability measure) of the option at maturity, discounted at the risk-free interest rate:

$$C(S_t, K, T-t, r, \delta, \sigma) = S_t e^{-\delta(T-t)} \Phi(d_1) - K e^{-r(T-t)} \Phi(d_2),$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function, f is the risk-neutral density of the price S_T and

$$d_1 = \frac{\log\left(\frac{S_t}{K}\right) + \left(r - \delta - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2\right)(T-t)}{\sigma\sqrt{T-t}},$$

---

[4]See Bahra (1996), Melick and Thomas (1997) and Sodernlind (1997) for a detailed description.

[5]The ex-dividend dynamics of the underlying is $dS_t - dD_t = rS_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t$.

$$d_2 = d_1 - \sigma\sqrt{T-t}.$$

The random variable S_T follows a lognormal distribution with mean $m = (\log(S_t) + (r - \delta) - \sigma^2/2)(T-t)$ and variance $\sigma^2(T-t)$, i.e. its risk neutral density f satisfies

$$f(S_T) = l(S_T, m, \sigma) = \frac{1}{S_T\sqrt{2\pi\sigma^2(T-t)}}e^{-\frac{[\log(S_T)-m]^2}{2\sigma^2(T-t)}}.$$

A mixture of lognormals is defined as a convex combination of M lognormal densities in which the parameters m and σ can take different values:

$$q(S_T; \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i l(S_T, m_i, \sigma_i), \tag{3}$$

where θ represents the unknown parameters α_i, m_i, σ_i, for $i = 1, \ldots, M$.[6]

If the price S_T of the underlying asset follows a distribution given by equation (3), then the corresponding option price, for a given strike K and time to maturity $T-t$, is

$$C^{MIX}(S_t, K, r, T-t, \theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{M} \alpha_i[S_t e^{-\delta_i(T-t)}\Phi(d_{1,i}) - Ke^{-r(T-t)}\Phi(d_{2,i})],$$

where

$$d_{1,i} = \frac{\log\left(\frac{S_t}{K}\right) + \left(r - \delta - \frac{1}{2}\sigma_i^2\right)(T-t)}{\sigma_i\sqrt{T-t}},$$

$$d_{2,i} = d_1 - \sigma_i\sqrt{T-t}.$$

In this paper we use a mixture of two lognormals ($M = 2$). As we deal with market data for American options (both on the Euro Stoxx 50 Index and on the constituent stocks), the above formula has to be adjusted appropriately. In particular, for each option we calculate the early exercise premium by computing the Barone-Adesi correction term through an iterative procedure.[7] Then, we subtract the correction term from the market price of the American option to obtain the corresponding European option price, which is now matched to the value C^{MIX} obtained as follows:

$$C^{MIX}(S_t, K, r, T-t, \alpha, \delta_i, \sigma_i) = \alpha C^{BSM}(S_t, K, T-t, r, \delta_1, \sigma_1)$$
$$+(1-\alpha)C^{BSM}(S_t, K, T-t, r, \delta_2, \sigma_2),$$

where $C^{BSM}(S_t, K, T-t, r, \delta, \sigma)$ denotes the standard Black and Scholes (1973) formula for options on a dividend-paying underlying. Finally, we estimate the parameters $\alpha, \delta_1, \delta_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ that better replicate the observed market prices of the options.

---

[6]Of course, $\alpha_i > 0$, for each i, and $\sum_i \alpha_i = 1$.
[7]See Barone-Adesi and Whaley (1987) for details.

3 Option-Implied Risk Adjusted Densities

In the previous paragraph we described the method we used to extract the option-implied risk neutral densities from market data. In order to perform a portfolio optimization, we need to know the real-world probability density functions. To this end, we convert the RNDs into the corresponding risk-adjusted PDFs.

If there exists a representative agent with utility function $U(\cdot)$, then the link between the risk-neutral distribution measured at time t, $q_t(S_T)$, and the real-world distribution $p_t(S_T)$ of the asset price S_T, is given by

$$p_t(S_T) = \frac{q_t(S_T)}{\zeta(S_T)} \left(\int \frac{q_t(x)}{\zeta(x)} dx \right)^{-1}, \tag{4}$$

where

$$\zeta(S_T) = e^{-r(T-t)} \frac{U'(S_T)}{U'(S_t)} \tag{5}$$

is the so-called pricing kernel. Equation (5) follows from the first-order condition of the intertemporal expected utility maximization problem of the representative agent (see Ait-Sahalia and Lo (2000) for a detailed discussion). We assume that the representative agent maximizes a power utility function,[8] defined as

$$U(W) = \frac{W^{1-\gamma} - 1}{1 - \gamma}, \qquad \gamma \neq 1,$$

where γ is the coefficient of constant relative risk aversion (RRA) that must be estimated. According to our choice of the utility function, we compute the risk-adjusted density from the risk-neutral density as

$$p_t(S_T) = \frac{q_t(S_T) S_T^{\gamma}}{\int q_t(x) x^{\gamma} dx}. \tag{6}$$

In particular, we assume that the risk aversion coefficient is the same for the index and for all the constituent stocks, reflecting the view of a unique representative agent who decides how to allocate his investments among a class of assets. In the following paragraph we will describe the method we use to estimate the risk aversion coefficient γ, following the approach of Bliss and Panigirtzoglou (2004).

3.1 Option-Implied Risk Aversion coefficient estimates

In this paragraph we deal with the estimate of the optimal risk aversion coefficient γ. We consider options on the Euro Stoxx 50 Index, with monthly maturities ranging from 20 November 2009 to 17 June 2011, thus getting 20 admissible expiration dates. We fix a time-to-maturity of 78 days (0.21 years) and we consider the option prices on the dealing

---

[8]This choice guarantees the integrability of $x \mapsto q_t(x)/U'(x)$ when q_t is a mixture of lognormals. If we had adopted an exponential utility function, for instance, the corresponding function would have had an infinite integral.

date 78 days ahead of each maturity date. Having fixed a dealing date/maturity date pair, we extract the corresponding risk-neutral probability density functions using the mixture of lognormals method described in Section 2.1. For each value of the parameter γ, chosen in the range $\{0.5, 0.6, 0.7, \ldots, 9.8, 9.9, 10\}$, we convert the 20 RNDs into the corresponding risk-adjusted probability density functions, using Equation (6). For each γ we evaluate the forecasting ability of the corresponding risk-adjusted PDF, then we select the value of the risk aversion coefficient which maximizes the consistency of future realizations of the index price with the option-implied probability density functions. In what follows we describe the method used to select γ, which is based on a Berkowitz likelihood ratio statistic.[9]

Having fixed a maturity date T, the corresponding dealing date t and a value of γ, we extract the risk-adjusted probability density function $p_t^{(\gamma)}(\cdot)$ for the index price S_T using the procedure explained in the previous paragraphs (see Equation 6). If we use $q_t(\cdot)$ to denote the option implied risk neutral density, we know that $p_t^{(\gamma)}(\cdot)$ is given by

$$p_t^{(\gamma)}(S_T) = q_t(S_T) S_T^\gamma \Big(\int_0^{+\infty} q_t(x) x^\gamma dx \Big)^{-1}.$$

We want to test the hypothesis that the estimated PDFs $p_t^{(\gamma)}(\cdot)$ are equal to the true (unknown) PDFs $f_t(\cdot)$. At time t we forecast the future realizations of the index price at time T using the risk-adjusted density $p_t^\gamma(\cdot)$. At time T we observe the realized value of the price, which we denote here by X_t as a reminder that it has to be compared with its expected value computed at time t. The null hypothesis states that the realizations X_t are independent and that $p_t^\gamma(\cdot) = f_t(\cdot)$. If this hypothesis is verified, then the inverse probability transformations of the realizations

$$y_t = \int_{-\infty}^{X_t} p_t^{(\gamma)}(u) du \tag{7}$$

are $i.i.d. \sim U(0,1)$.

The Berkowitz likelihood ratio statistic allows to jointly testing for uniformity and independence. To implement this methodology we consider the transformation of y_t

$$z_t = \Phi^{-1}(y_t) = \Phi^{-1}\Big(\int_{-\infty}^{X_t} p_t^{(\gamma)}(u) du \Big), \tag{8}$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the normal cumulative density function. In order to test the independence and standard normality of the z_t, Berkowitz (2001) uses the maximum likelihood to estimate the following autoregressive model of order 1

$$z_t - \eta = \theta(z_{t-1} - \eta) + \epsilon_t, \tag{9}$$

---

[9]See Berkowitz (2001) for details.

and tests restrictions on the parameters of the AR(1) using a likelihood ratio test. Under the null hypothesis, the model has the following parameters: $\eta = 0$, $\theta = 1$, $\sigma^2 := Var(\epsilon_t) = 0$. The log-likelihood function for this model[10] is given by

$$L(\eta, \sigma^2, \theta) = -\frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2}\log[\sigma^2/(1-\theta^2)] - \frac{\{z_1 - [\eta/(1-\theta)]\}^2}{2\sigma^2/(1-\theta^2)}$$

$$-[(\tau-1)/2]\log(2\pi) - [(\tau-1)/2]\log(\sigma^2) - \sum_{t=2}^{\tau}[\frac{(z_t - \eta - \theta z_{t-1})^2}{2\sigma^2}].$$

Under the null hypothesis, the likelihood ratio statistic

$$LR_3 = -2[L(0,1,0) - L(\widehat{\eta}, \widehat{\sigma}^2, \widehat{\theta})]$$

follows a chi-squared distribution with 3 degrees of freedom, χ^2_3. The risk aversion parameter γ is chosen as the value which maximizes the p-value of the Berkowitz LR_3 statistic, which is a measure of the forecast ability of the correponding risk-adjusted PDFs.

As the presence of overlapping data may induce autocorrelation[11] and lead to the rejection of any value of γ, we selected a subsample of the time series, such that the maturity date of the n-th option is prior to the dealing date of the $(n+1)$-th option. We found that the p-value of the Berkowitz test is maximized for $\widehat{\gamma} = 1.5$. This value is not far from the option-implied risk aversion estimates obtained by Bliss and Panigirtzoglou (2004), who compute the representative agent's risk aversion at different horizons, getting values between 1.97 and 7.91. They consider forecast horizons ranging from 1 to 6 weeks and suggest that the risk-aversion coefficient tends to decrease as the time lapse increases. Since our forecast horizon is 11 weeks, the optimal value of $\widehat{\gamma} = 1.5$ seems reasonable.

3.2   Risk-Adjusted Expected Returns and Variances

Having estimated the risk aversion parameter γ, we assume that it reflects the representative agent's view for all the constituents of the Euro Stoxx 50 Index. Then, we use Equation (6) to compute the risk-adjusted densities $f_t^i(\cdot) = p_{t,i}^{\widehat{\gamma}}(\cdot)$ for the underlying prices S_T^i, where $i \in \{1, \ldots, 50\}$, $t = 31$ March 2011 and $T = 17$ June 2011.

To perform the asset allocation, we need to know the estimated expected returns and the estimated return variances, given by

$$\overline{\mu}_i = \mathbb{E}[\log(S_T^i) - \log(S_t^i)] = \int_0^{+\infty} \log(x)f_t^i(x)dx - \log(S_t^i) \qquad (10)$$

and

$$(\sigma^{RA}_i)^2 = Var(\log(S_T^i) - \log(S_t^i))$$
$$= \int_0^{\infty} (\log(x))^2 f_t^i(x)dx - \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \log(x)f_t^i(x)dx\right)^2. \qquad (11)$$

---

[10]See Hamilton (1994), Equation (5.2.9).
[11]See Bliss and Panigirtzoglou (2004).

The risk-adjusted density of the index price is denoted by f_t^{Ind}; its return variance equals

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind})^2 &= Var(\log(S_T{}^{Ind}) - \log(S_t{}^{Ind})) \\
&= \int_0^{+\infty} (\log(x))^2 f_t{}^{Ind}(x)dx - \left(\int_0^{+\infty} \log(x) f_t{}^{Ind}(x)dx \right)^2.
\end{aligned}
\tag{12}
$$

4 Option-Implied Risk Adjusted Covariance

We compute the risk-adjusted variance-covariance matrix for the individual stock returns in our portfolio, using the (risk-adjusted) standard deviations of the stock returns, the (risk-adjusted) standard deviation of the index returns and the historical correlation matrix of the stock returns. The historical correlations are estimated using six years of daily returns $R_{i,t}$ and the exponential weighted moving average method.[12] We develop an *ad hoc* method to combine the implied volatilities with the historical correlations, through the computation of a correction coefficient β. This technique leads to a correlation matrix that is inherently forward-looking and is based on a method introduced by Buss and Vilkov (2012) for the evaluation of equity risk.[13]

4.1 Historical correlation matrix

An exponentially weighted moving average applies weighting factors which decrease exponentially as the observations become more and more distant in time. As in RiskMetrics,[14] we consider a smoothing constant $\lambda = 0.94$ and compute the m-period[15] historical covariances between stocks i and j, measured at time $t + 1$, as

$$
\sigma^h{}_{ij,t+1} = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^m (R_{i,t+1-\tau} - \overline{R_i})(R_{j,t+1-\tau} - \overline{R_j})\lambda^{\tau-1}}{1 + \lambda + \lambda^2 + \ldots + \lambda^{m-1}},
\tag{13}
$$

where for each stock $\overline{R_i} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^m R_{i,t}$. Hence, the m-period historical variance of stock i, measured at time $t + 1$, is given by

$$
(\sigma^h{}_{i,t+1})^2 = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^m (R_{i,t+1-\tau} - \overline{R_i})^2 \lambda^{\tau-1}}{1 + \lambda + \lambda^2 + \ldots + \lambda^{m-1}}.
$$

The related correlations are given by

$$
\rho^h{}_{ij,t+1} = \frac{\sigma^h{}_{ij,t+1}}{\sigma^h{}_{i,t+1}\sigma^h{}_{j,t+1}},
\tag{14}
$$

where $\sigma^h{}_{i,t+1}$ is the historical standard deviation for stock i.

---

[12]See, among others, Mills and Markellos (2008).

[13]See also the paper by Chang, Christoffersen, Jacobs, Vainberg (2012), who use option implied variances to evaluate equity risk premia in a factor model setting.

[14]See RiskMetrics (1996).

[15]We consider daily data from 8 July 2005 to 1 April 2011, so that m=1495.

4.2 Implied Risk-Adjusted Correlation Matrix

Once we have calculated the historical correlations, we compute a perturbed correlation matrix which takes into account the option-implied estimates. We implement an *ad hoc* technique based on the estimate of a correction term for the historical correlations; a similar approach, but in a different context, is used by Buss and Vilkov (2012).

In general, option-implied pairwise correlations cannot be inferred from market data directly, since this would require market quotes for options on each pair of stocks. In order to reduce the dimensionality of the problem, we introduce a parametric form for the pairwise correlations and use the following identifying restriction:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2 &= \sum_i \sum_j w_i w_j \sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t} \rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t} \\
&= \sum_i w_i{}^2 (\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t})^2 + \sum_i \sum_{j \neq i} w_i w_j \sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t} \rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t},
\end{aligned}
\tag{15}
$$

where w_i are the index portfolio weights, $\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t}$ is the risk-adjusted implied standard deviation of the index, $\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t}$ is the risk-adjusted implied standard deviation of stock i and $\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}$ is the *implied correlation* between i and j (which we are going to estimate in this paragraph). Equation (15) states the equivalence between the option-implied variance of the index and the variance of the portfolio made of the constituent stocks, calculated with the option-implied stock variances and covariances.

If we replace the unknown correlations $\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}$ with the available historical estimates $\rho^h_{ij,t}$ in (15), the equality does not hold in general. We then write the difference between the left- and the right-hand sides as a proportion β_t of the option-implied index variance $(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2$:

$$
(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2 - \sum_i \sum_j w_i w_j \sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t} \rho^h_{ij,t} = \beta_t \times (\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2.
$$

Since $\sum_i w_i = 1$, this is equivalent to

$$
(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2 = \sum_i \sum_j w_i w_j \sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t} \left[\rho^h_{ij,t} + \beta_t \frac{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2}{\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t}} \right].
\tag{16}
$$

We denote the term in brackets as $\widehat{\rho^{RA}}_{ij,t} := \rho^h{}_{ij,t} + \beta_t \frac{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2}{\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t}}$. In Equation (16) it can be interpreted as the implied correlation between i and j, because it plays the role of $\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}$ in Equation (15). However, to obtain a positive definite correlation matrix taking values in the range $[-1, +1]$, we normalize $\widehat{\rho^{RA}}_{ij,t}$ in the spirit of the Dynamic Conditional Correlation model (Engle, 2002) and we define

$$
\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t} := \frac{\widehat{\rho^{RA}}_{ij,t}}{\sqrt{\widehat{\rho^{RA}}_{ii,t}} \sqrt{\widehat{\rho^{RA}}_{jj,t}}}.
\tag{17}
$$

Plugging Equation (17) in (15), we get

$$(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2 = \sum_i \sum_j w_i w_j \sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t} \sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t}$$

$$\times \frac{\rho^h{}_{ij,t} + \beta_t \times \frac{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2}{\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t}\sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t}}}{\sqrt{\rho^h{}_{ii,t} + \beta_t \times \frac{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2}{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t})^2}}\sqrt{\rho^h{}_{jj,t} + \beta_t \times \frac{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{Ind,t})^2}{(\sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t})^2}}}.$$

Since β_t is the only unknown variable in the previous expression, we can calculate it by implementing a numerical method in Matlab. Once we have obtained β_t, we can compute the implied risk-adjusted correlations $\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}$ as in (17) and consequently the implied covariances

$$\sigma^{RA}{}_{ij,t} = \rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}\sigma^{RA}{}_{i,t}\sigma^{RA}{}_{j,t}.$$

By Buss and Vilkov (2012),[16] the implied correlation matrix $\left(\rho^{RA}{}_{ij,t}\right)_{1\leq i,j\leq N}$ we constructed is positive definite if and only if $\beta_t \geq 0$. We will see that in the numerical implementation of this strategy we get a positive value for β_t, so the implied correlation matrix is positive definite, as required.

We proposed this *ad hoc* method to use all the available information, arising from the options on both the index and the 50 stocks. The option-implied risk-neutral densities do not provide any information about the correlation structure among the stocks, hence we decided to start from the historical correlation matrix given by an exponentially weighted moving average model. This historical correlation matrix is then modified by the introduction of a correction coefficient β_t, chosen so that it guarantees the matching between the option-implied volatility of the index and the volatility of the corresponding portfolio of stocks.

As an output of the numerical computations, we obtained that the optimal correction term is $\beta_t = 0.97$ per cent, for $t = 31$ March 2011.

5 Robust optimization

In this paragraph we show how we applied the robust portfolio construction to our setting. The robust optimization methodology has been developed to cope with estimation errors in the estimates of the expected returns and their error-magnification effects. It is well known that mean-variance portfolios tend to exacerbate the estimation error problem by significantly overweighting assets with an upside error and underweighting assets with a downside error. Robust optimization considers the estimation errors for the mean returns directly in the optimization problem itself, and aims at performing an asset allocation that is robust to these errors. The robust optimization approach fixes a confidence region for the estimated mean returns, and performs a portfolio optimization accounting for the worst case scenario that could be realized in that confidence region.

---

[16]see Buss and Vilkov (2012), Theorem 1.

We want to select the minimum-variance portfolio over all asset allocations which guarantee an expected return bigger than or equal to a fixed target $\bar{r}$. Let R be the N-dimensional random variable describing the random returns of the N available stocks. Let μ and $\Sigma = (\Sigma_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq N}$ be the mean vector and the variance-covariance matrix of the stock returns. Having fixed $\bar{r} > 0$, we aim at solving the following problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{w} \quad & w'\Sigma w \\
s.t. \quad & \mu'w \geq \bar{r} \\
& \mathbf{1}'w = 1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{18}
$$

It is well known that the estimation of expected returns is a particularly challenging problem, since errors in estimated mean returns are the main determinants of optimal portfolio estimation risk (they account for most of the estimation error, to a much greater extent than errors in estimated variances). A possible way to address this issue is to consider uncertainty in unknown parameters explicitly in the optimization problem. This approach, which is part of the robust optimization field, was introduced by Ben-Tal and Nemirovski (1997) for robust truss topology design. In what follows, we describe how robust optimization can be applied to our asset allocation problem, following the approach of Ceria and Stubbs (2006).

Since the true value of μ cannot be known with certainty, we model it as a random variable whose dispersion represents the possible estimation error. In particular, we assume that μ is normally distributed around its best guess π:

$$
\mu \sim N(\pi, Q),
\tag{19}
$$

where the N-dimensional matrix Q represents the uncertainty of the guess. Actually it is not necessary to assume normality: the same arguments hold with minor changes if we assume that the distribution of μ is elliptical.

Since we do not have any *a priori* information on the covariance matrix Q of the dispersion error, we can simply assume that Q is the n-dimensional identity matrix. Given the best guess vector π, with probability $\eta \in [0,1]$ the vector of actual expected returns lies inside the confidence region

$$
E = \{\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n : (\mu - \pi)'Q^{-1}(\mu - \pi) \leq \kappa^2\},
\tag{20}
$$

where $\kappa^2 = F_n^{-1}(1 - \eta)$ and F_n^{-1} is the inverse cumulative distribution function of a chi-squared distribution with N degrees of freedom. In the definition of E the variables Q and κ represent respectively the shape and the size of the ellipsoid. In particular we set $\kappa^2 = \text{Var}(\pi_1^0, \ldots, \pi_n^0)$, i.e. κ^2 is the cross-sectional variance of the mean returns.

Our goal is to perform a portfolio optimization which accounts for the worst-case scenario, hence we want to solve the following minimum-variance problem:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{w} \quad & w'\Sigma w \\
s.t. \quad & \min_{\mu \in E} \mu'w \geq \bar{r} \\
& \mathbf{1}'w = 1.
\end{aligned}
\tag{21}
$$

In the following paragraph we will describe the cutting plane algorithm we implemented to find a numerical solution of problem (21).

A key issue in the implementation of robust asset allocation is the determination of the *best guess* vector π, which is the starting point of the robust optimization method. In this paper the vector π is set through an equilibrium argument.[17] If there were no estimation error, i.e. $Q_{ij} = 0$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, then $\mu = \pi$ a.s. and the stock returns would follow the distribution

$$R \sim N(\pi, \Sigma).$$

In this scenario we could assume that all investors maximize a mean-variance trade-off and that the maximization is unconstrained; the investors' optimization problem would read as

$$\tilde{w} = \arg\max_{w} \{w'\pi - \lambda w'\Sigma w\},$$

where λ is the coefficient of risk aversion. By imposing the first order conditions, we find the following link between the equilibrium returns π and the optimal weights $\tilde{w}$:

$$\pi = 2\lambda\Sigma\tilde{w}. \tag{22}$$

In our portfolio optimization we will take λ equal to the value of the risk aversion coefficient γ we obtained in Section 3.1, i.e. the value which maximizes the forecasting ability of the densities implied in the index options. The weights $\tilde{w}$ will be equal to the weights of the stock index.

In the empirical part of this work, we computed the robust efficient frontier in two different ways: first of all we calculated the actual robust efficient frontier, in which the starting point of the robust optimization was the equilibrium vector π defined in (22). Then we computed the estimated robust efficient frontier, in which the starting point was the vector $\widehat{\pi}$, obtained as follows: we randomly generated a time-series of normally distributed returns (with mean π and variance Σ) and computed the average $\widehat{\pi}$ to use as an estimate of the expected returns.

5.1 The Cutting Plane approach

The solution to problem (21) is not straightforward, due to the presence of the first constraint: the admissible weights w must satisfy the nonlinear condition $\mu'w \geq \bar{r}$ for all μ belonging to the uncountable set E. In order to find a numerical solution to this problem, we implement a *cutting-plane algorithm*.

1. First of all, we set $\mu_0 = \pi$ and define $S_0 = \{\mu_0\}$. We then solve the constrained problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w} \quad & w'\Sigma w \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \mu'w \geq \bar{r} \text{ for all } \mu \in S_0, \quad \mathbf{1}'w = 1. \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

---

[17]See Idzorek (2004) and Meucci (2010).

Let w_0 be the solution of (23).

2. We want to determine the vector of expected returns that corresponds to the worst case scenario given the weights vector w_0. Accordingly, we determine $\mu_1 = \arg\min_\mu \{\mu' w_0 : \mu \in E\}$. There can be two outcomes:

   - either $\mu_1' w_0 \geq \bar{r}$, which implies that w_0 is a feasible solution for problem (21). In this case the algorithm ends and $\tilde{w} = w_0$ is the optimal weights vector;

   - or $\mu_1' w_0 < \bar{r}$, which implies that w_0 is not an admissible solution for problem (21), since it violates the first constraint. In this case the procedure continues with the updated constraints set $S_1 = \{\mu_0, \mu_1\}$. We find the solution w_1 of the optimization problem

$$\min_w \quad w' \Sigma w$$
$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mu' w \geq \bar{r} \text{ for all } \mu \in S_1, \quad \mathbf{1}' w = 1.$$

Note that the vector μ_1 can be computed analytically. In fact, μ_1 is the solution of the minimization problem

$$\min_{\mu \in E} \mu' w_0. \tag{24}$$

For a fixed $\mu \in E$, we set $v = Q^{-1/2}(\mu - \mu_0)$, so that $\mu = \mu_0 + Q^{1/2} v$. Note that μ belongs to E if and only if $(\mu - \mu_0)' Q^{-1}(\mu - \mu_0) \leq \kappa^2$; it follows that $\mu \in E$ is equivalent to $\|v\|_2 = v'v \leq \kappa^2$. Hence the minimum problem in (24) is equivalent to

$$\min_{\|v\|_2 \leq \kappa^2} (\mu_0 + Q^{-1/2} v)' w_0. \tag{25}$$

Problem (25) can be solved analytically and its unique solution is

$$v_1 = -\kappa \frac{Q^{1/2} w_0}{\|Q^{1/2} w_0\|}.$$

The corresponding vector μ_1 is the solution of problem (24):

$$\mu_1 = \mu_0 + Q^{1/2} v_1 = \mu_0 - \kappa \frac{Q w_0}{\sqrt{w_0' Q w_0}}. \tag{26}$$

3. When we reach the j-th iteration, we start with a constraints set $S_{j-1} = \{\mu_0, \ldots, \mu_{j-1}\}$ and a vector of weights w_{j-1} which solves the minimum-variance problem

$$\min_w \quad w' \Sigma w$$
$$\text{s.t.} \quad \mu' w \geq \bar{r} \text{ for all } \mu \in S_{j-1}, \quad \mathbf{1}' w = 1.$$

We then determine the worst-case expected returns $\mu_j = \arg\min_\mu \{\mu' w_{j-1} : \mu \in E\}$. We can find an explicit formula for μ_j arguing as above:

$$\mu_j = \mu_0 - \kappa \frac{Q w_{j-1}}{\sqrt{w_{j-1}' Q w_{j-1}}}.$$

18

We then look at the scalar product $\mu'_j w_{j-1}$ and get one of the following outcomes:

- if $\mu'_j w_{j-1} \geq \bar{r}$, then we have found the solution $\tilde{w} = w_{j-1}$ to problem (21) and the algorithm ends;

- otherwise, if $\mu'_j w_{j-1} < \bar{r}$, then we iterate the procedure.

For a general discussion of cutting-set methods for robust convex optimization and their convergence see Mutapcic and Boyd (2009).

5.2   Constraints on the portfolio weights

In general, mean-variance efficient portfolios constructed using sample moments often assign extremely negative and positive weights to a number of assets. Since negative portfolio weights (short positions) are difficult to implement in practice, many investors impose no-short-sale constraints (i.e., portfolio weights must be nonnegative). This choice finds empirical support in the paper of Jagannathan and Ma (2003), which shows how imposing appropriate constraints improves the efficiency of the constructed optimal portfolios. In particular, the authors show that constraining portfolio weights to be nonnegative is equivalent to shrinking the sample covariance matrix (i.e., reducing its large elements) and then forming the optimal portfolio without any restriction on its weights. They show that each of the no-short-sale constraints is equivalent to reducing the sample covariances of the corresponding asset with other assets by a certain amount. The intuition behind this result is that assets having high covariances with other stocks tend to get extreme negative portfolio weights. The paper also shows that imposing upper bounds on portfolio weights does not lead to a significant improvement in the out-of-sample performance of minimum risk portfolios when no-short-sale restrictions are already in place, but a constraint from above can help in the practical construction of the portfolio. Summarizing the authors' findings, we can say that constructing a minimum risk portfolio subject to the constraint that portfolio weights are positive (negative) is equivalent to constructing it without any constraint on portfolio weights after modifying the covariance matrix by shrinking the larger elements of the covariance matrix towards zero (towards one). The striking feature of minimum-variance portfolios with no-short-sale constraints is that in such portfolios investment is spread over only a few stocks, while imposing upper bounds on portfolio weights can ensure that optimal portfolios will contain a large enough collection of stocks.

In this paper we implement the asset allocation strategy in two different ways:[18] first, we impose no-short-sale restrictions and then we constrain the portfolio weights to

---

[18]In addition, we implemented the portfolio optimization without any constraint on the portfolio weights, but the results were highly unsatisfactory due to the presence of extremely positive and extremely negative weights, as expected.

be in the interval $[-1, 1]$. In the first case our minimum-variance problem (21) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{w} \quad & w'\Sigma w \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \min_{\mu \in E} \mu'w \geq \bar{r} \\
& \mathbf{1}'w = 1 \\
& w_i \geq 0 \qquad i =_1, \dots n,
\end{aligned}
\tag{27}
$$

while in the second case we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\min_{w} \quad & w'\Sigma w \\
\text{s.t.} \quad & \min_{\mu \in E} \mu'w \geq \bar{r} \\
& \mathbf{1}'w = 1 \\
& -1 \leq w_i \leq 1 \qquad i = 1, \dots n.
\end{aligned}
\tag{28}
$$

The two sets of results are discussed in Section 7.

6 The Dataset

The dataset consists of the stocks which compose the Euro Stoxx 50 Index. The index covers 50 stocks from 12 eurozone countries.[19] The 50 stocks in the index are generally very liquid. For each of them there are call and put options, with various strikes, quoted in the market (with the only exception of the stocks of the company CRH, for which there were no quoted options at the time we built our dataset). Since we were interested in a static asset allocation, we fixed a specific date (31 March 2011) as the initial time of our analysis, and for each stock we focused on the collection of options which expired in June 2011 (for most of the options the maturity date was 17 June, while for the options on stocks corresponding to Italian companies – Generali, Enel, Eni, Intesa San Paolo, Telecom Italia, Unicredit – the expiration date was 16 June). For each option the time-to-maturity was thus equal to 0.21 years.

Having fixed the expiration date, for each stock we gathered the data regarding call and put options written on that stock (strike price, underlying price and market value of the option)[20] as well as the information about the options written on the Euro Stoxx 50 Index. In the case of the index, we built a time series made up of 20 periods: we started from the family of options expiring on 17 June 2011 and quoted on 31 March 2011 and went backwards for 20 months, taking market prices of options on Euro Stoxx 50 having time to maturity equal to 0.21 years. This time series was used to determine the risk aversion coefficient γ (see Section 3). The market prices of the option expiring

---

[19] Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal and Spain.

[20] All the data are from Thomson Reuters Datastream.

on 17 June 2011 were also used in the construction of the variance/covariance matrix (see Section 4).

For the estimate of the historical correlation matrix, we used the daily prices of the 50 stocks making up the index from 8 July 2005 to 1 April 2011.

7   Empirical results

In order to measure the effect of the robust optimization methodology, we construct five efficient frontiers:

- estimated Markovitz efficient frontier: the efficient frontier obtained by using the estimated expected-return vector $\widehat{\pi}$ to compute the optimal portfolio according to the standard Markovitz mean-variance approach;

- estimated robust efficient frontier: the efficient frontier obtained by using the estimated expected-return vector $\widehat{\pi}$ to compute the optimal portfolio according to the robust optimization approach;

- true efficient frontier: the efficient frontier computed by using the true expected returns (unobservable, and represented by the equilibrium returns π) to compute the optimal portfolio;

- actual Markovitz efficient frontier: the efficient frontier obtained taking the portfolios on the estimated Markowitz efficient frontier and then calulating their expected returns using the true expected returns;

- actual robust efficient frontier: the efficient frontier obtained by using the true expected returns π to compute the optimal portfolio according to the Robust Optimization approach.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate these five efficient frontiers obtained when considering no-short-sale restrictions and lower and upper bound restrictions on the portfolio weights, respectively. As expected, in both cases it can be seen that when we use robust optimization the actual and the estimated frontiers lie closer to each other with respect to the related frontiers obtained with the standard Markovitz mean-variance optimization. This is because, by construction, the objective function in the robust optimization problem is based on reducing the distance between the predicted and the actual frontier.[21] In addition, by incorporating the estimation errors in the portfolio construction process, we significantly reduce their effects on the optimal portfolio. Moreover, what is remarkable is that the robust estimated and actual efficient frontiers are not only closer together, but also closer to the true efficient frontier.

Table 1 shows the number of stocks selected in the robust and Markovitz optimization problems, without and with a no-short-sale constraint, respectively (i.e., the number

---

[21]See Ceria and Stubbs (2006) for technical details.

**Figure 1** – Efficient frontiers obtained with no-short-sale constraint.

Table 1 – Number of stocks and weights for the different portfolios (1).
(1) LU refers to lower and upper bounds ±1, while NSS refers to no-short-sale constraints.

	Number of stocks	Minimum weight	Maximum weight
Robust LU	50	-0.0029	0.0416
Markovitz LU	50	-0.0196	0.1516
Robust NSS	48	0	0.0441
Markovitz NSS	36	0	0.2150

of stocks which are assigned a non-zero weight). This table also displays the minimum and maximum values for the asset weights. The results are obtained when setting the minimum expected annual return of the portfolio equal to 12.6 per cent, that is the historical mean return of the Euro Area Market General Index (computed by Datastream) over the last 30 years.

From Table 1 we can see that when we require the portfolio weights to be in the range $[-1, +1]$ in our optimization problems (both robust and Markovitz), we select all the available stocks in the index. In this case the weights reflect more extreme short and

Figure 2 – Efficient frontiers obtained without no-short-sale constraint.

Three-month portfolio efficient frontiers

long positions in the Markovitz portfolio rather than in the robust portfolio, as can be seen from the higher absolute value of both the minimum and the maximum weights. When we impose a no-short-sale constraint, on the other hand, the robust portfolio selects a larger number of stocks than the Markovitz portfolio. Moreover, the robust portfolio assigns more homogeneous weights to the selected stocks.

Finally, in order to evaluate the performance of our model, we consider two criteria:

- the out-of-sample *Sharpe Ratio*, defined as the sample mean of out-of-sample excess returns (over the risk-free rate), divided by their sample standard deviation:

$$SR_{out} = \frac{(\mu_{real} - r_f)^T w}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma_{real} w}} \tag{29}$$

where μ_{real} are the realized returns of the stocks in the portfolio, r_f is the risk-free rate, w is the weights vector, and Σ_{real} is the variance of the realized portfolio returns;

- the *Certainty-equivalent (CEQ) return*, defined as the risk-free rate that an investor is willing to accept rather than adopting a particular risky portfolio strategy; its

23

approximate value, commonly used by practitioners, is

$$CEQ = (\mu_{real} - r_f)^T w - \frac{\gamma}{2}(w^T \Sigma_{real} w). \tag{30}$$

Table 2 – The Sharpe ratio and CEQ for the robust portfolios obtained with the option-implied covariance matrix (portfolios 1 and 2) and the historical covariance matrix (portfolios 3 and 4).

	Option-implied cov LU (1)	Option implied cov NSS (2)	Historical cov LU (3)	Historical cov NSS (4)
Sharpe ratio	1.8	1.7	1.2	1.2
CEQ	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.2

Table 2 shows the values of the performance indicators for 4 different portfolios:

1. portfolio obtained with our trading strategy (option-implied risk-adjusted covariance matrix and robust optimization) and the constraint that the weights lie in $[-1, 1]$ (LU);

2. portfolio obtained with our trading strategy (option-implied risk-adjusted covariance matrix and robust optimization) and a no-short-sale constraint on the weights (NSS);

3. portfolio obtained using the historical covariance matrix, robust optimization and the constraint that the weights lie in $[-1, 1]$;

4. portfolio obtained using the historical covariance matrix, robust optimization and a no-short-sale constraint on the weights.

In Table 3 we show the values of the performance criteria obtained by implementing three simple trading strategies:

- *Index Buy-and-Hold*: this strategy considers the returns that would have been achieved by investing directly in the Euro Stoxx 50 Index on 31 March 2011 and selling it on 17 June 2011;[22]

- the $1/N$ *Portfolio Strategy*: this strategy, proposed by De Miguel, Garlappi and Uppal (2009), consists in selecting a portfolio with all the N stocks in the index, by assigning weight $1/N$ to each one;

- a *momentum strategy*: this strategy consists in selecting only the G stocks with positive returns in the previous year and allocating a portfolio with weights $1/G$ on those stocks.

Table 3 – The Sharpe ratio and CEQ for commonly used trading strategies (out-of-sample, annualized)

	Index Buy-and-Hold	Equally weighted portfolio	Momentum portfolio
Sharpe ratio	-1.4	1.8	0.8
CEQ	-0.3	0.3	0.1

From Table 2 we can see that our trading strategy (both with upper and lower bounds and with a no-short-sale constraint on the weights) shows a good performance according to both the Sharpe ratio and the CEQ. In particular, portfolios 1 and 2 significantly outperform the corresponding allocations obtained with the historical covariance matrix (portfolios 3 and 4).

Moreover, Table 3 indicates that the performance of the $1/N$-portfolio is comparable to that of our strategy, whereas the momentum portfolio and the index buy-and-hold have a much poorer performance, according to both the Sharpe ratio and the CEQ.

8   Conclusions

In this paper we propose a methodology which extends the forward-looking approach of Kostakis, Panigirtzoglou and Skiadopoulos (2010) to the case of a portfolio consisting of a variety of risky assets. We deal with the empirical implementation of a static asset allocation problem, using information extracted from the market prices of options written on the Euro Stoxx 50 Index and its constituents.

To estimate a correlation structure among the assets which is consistent with the related option-implied variances, we develop an ad hoc procedure to integrate the historical stock returns with the option implied distributions of the stocks and the index.

The asset allocation is performed using the robust optimization technique. This methodology has been developed to cope with estimation errors present in the estimates of expected returns and their error-magnification effect. Robust optimization, in fact, incorporates the estimation errors directly in the optimization problem, and performs an asset allocation that is robust to these errors.

In order to evaluate the results of our asset allocation, we use a comparison among five efficient frontiers constructed using different methodologies (estimated Markovitz efficient frontier, estimated robust efficient frontier, true efficient frontier, actual Markovitz efficient frontier and actual robust efficient frontier), in the spirit of Ceria and Stubbs (2006).

---

[22]Note that the Euro Stoxx 50 weights remained unvaried between these dates.

Finally, we compare the out-of-sample performance of our robust portfolios to the performance obtained with some alternative strategies. The performance is meaured using two standard criteria: the out-of-sample Sharpe ratio and the Certainty-Equivalent (CEQ) return for the expected utility of a mean-variance investor. Firstly, we implement the robust allocation using the estimated historical covariance matrix instead of the risk-adjusted matrix extracted from option data (as in the standard mean-variance optimization approach). We then compare the performance of our portofolio to the one obtained with three standard trading strategies: the Index Buy-and-Hold strategy, the *1/N portfolio* of De Miguel, Garlappi and Uppal (2009) and a momentum strategy. In both cases we see that our asset allocation gives satisfactory results; in particular, it significantly outperforms the portfolio based on historical covariances.

Starting from the results of this paper, we plan to extend them in further research. In particular, the robustness of our results could be checked by using different data sets, such as options with different start dates and different time horizons, or different stock indices; moreover it would be interesting to compare the performance of our portfolio in high and low volatility periods or in stressed and calm phases for the financial markets.

A major issue of this paper is the fact that the methodology developed to extract the covariance matrix from options data relies on little information on forward-looking correlations. In fact, the covariance matrix is built using only information on the option-implied volatilities of the stocks and the option-implied volatility of the index: options data do not convey any information about pairwise correlations. Nevertheless, the encouraging results of the paper suggest that applying our methodology to a family of stocks which are the constituents of a quoted index can give a portoflio that performs well, since we can use the information extracted from market data on the index to infer a consistent correlation structure among the stocks. Further analysis will focus on the development of a procedure which can integrate option-implied variances with the related covariances without requiring the existence of an overall quoted index, possibly through a multifactor model.

26

References

[1] Ait-Sahalia, Y. and Lo, A.W. (2000). *Nonparametric risk management and implied risk aversion.* Journal of Econometrics 94, 9-51.

[2] Bahra, B. (1996). *Probability distributions of future asset prices implied by option prices.* Bank of England Quarterly Bulletin, 299-311, August.

[3] Barone-Adesi, G. and Whaley, R.E. (1987). *Efficient analytical approximation of American option values.* Journal of Finance 42, 301-320.

[4] Bedoui, R. and Hamdi, H. (2010). *Implied Risk-neutral probability density functions from option prices: a comparison of estimation methods.* Working Paper, February 2010.

[5] Ben-Tal, A. and Nemirovski, A.S. (1997). *Robust truss topology design via semidefinite programming.* SIAM Journal on Optimization, 7(4):991-1016, 1997. 465-474.

[6] Berkovitz, J. (2001). *Testing density forecasts with applications to risk management.* Journal of Business and Economics Statistics 19, 465-474.

[7] Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973). *The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities.* Journal of Political Economy 81 (3), 637-654.

[8] Bliss, R. R. and Panigirtzoglou, N. (2004). *Option-implied risk aversion estimates.* Journal of Finance 59, 407-446.

[9] Breeden, D. and Litzenberger, R. (1978). *Prices of State Contingent Claims Implicit in Option Prices.* Journal of Business 51, 621-651.

[10] Buss, A. and Vilkov, G. (2012). *Measuring Equity Risk with Option-Implied Correlations.* Review of Financial Studies 25(10), 3113-3140.

[11] Ceria, S. and Stubbs, R. A. (2006). *Incorporating Estimation Errors Into Portfolio Selection: Robust Portfolio Construction.* Axioma Research Paper No. 003.

[12] Chang, B.Y., Christoffersen, P., Jacobs, K. and Vainberg, G. (2012). *Option-Implied Measures of Equity Risk.* Review of Finance 16, 385-428.

[13] De Miguel, V., Garlappi, L. and Uppal, R. (2009). *Optimal Versus Naive Diversification: How inefficient is the 1/N Portfolio Strategy?.* Review of Financial Studies 22, 1915-1953.

[14] Engle, R. F. (2002). *Dynamic Conditional Correlation: A Simple Class of Multivariate Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity Models.* Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 20, 339-350.

[15] Hamilton, J. D. (1994). *Time Series Analysis.* Princeton University Press.

[16] Idzorek, T. (2004). *A Step-by-Step Guide to the Black-Litterman Model.* Axioma Research Paper No. 003.

[17] Jagannathan, R. and Ma, T. (2003). *Risk Reduction in Large Portfolios: Why Imposing the Wrong Constraints Helps.* The Journal of Finance. August 2003

[18] Kostakis, A., Panigirtzoglou, N. and Skiadopoulos, G. (2010). *Asset Allocation with Option-Implied Distributions: A Forward-Looking Approach.* Working Paper, February 2010.

[19] Markovitz, H. (1952). *Portfolio selection.* The Journal of Finance, VII(1):77-91. March 1952.

[20] Meucci, A. (2010). *The Black-Litterman Approach: Original Model and Extensions.* The Encyclopedia of Quantitative Finance, Wiley (2010).

[21] Mills, T.C. and Markellos, R.N. (2008). *The econometric modelling of financial time series.* CUP - Cambridge University Press, 2008, third edition, 59.

[22] Mutapcic, A. and Boyd, S. (2009). *Cutting-set methods for robust convex optimization with pessimizing oracles.* Optimization Methods and Software, Vol. 24, No. 3, June 2009, 381-406.

[23] $Riskmetrics^{TM}$ (1996). $Riskmetrics^{TM}$ *- Technical Document.* Fourth edition, 1996.

RECENTLY PUBLISHED "TEMI" (*)

N. 890 – *Start-up banks' default and the role of capital*, by Massimo Libertucci and Francesco Piersante (November 2012).

N. 891 – *The predictive power of Google searches in forecasting unemployment*, by Francesco D'Amuri and Juri Marcucci (November 2012).

N. 892 – *A dynamic default dependence model*, by Sara Cecchetti and Giovanna Nappo (November 2012).

N. 893 – *Externalities in interbank network: results from a dynamic simulation model*, by Michele Manna and Alessandro Schiavone (November 2012).

N. 894 – *Incentives through the cycle: microfounded macroprudential regulation*, by Giovanni di Iasio and Mario Quagliariello (January 2013).

N. 895 – *What is a prime bank? A Euribor – OIS spread perspective*, by Marco Taboga (January 2013).

N. 896 – *Short-term GDP forecasting with a mixed frequency dynamic factor model with stochastic volatility*, by Massimiliano Marcellino, Mario Porqueddu and Fabrizio Venditti (January 2013).

N. 897 – *Collective action clauses: how do they weigh on sovereigns?*, by Alfredo Bardozzetti and Davide Dottori (January 2013).

N. 898 – *Firm size and judicial efficiency: evidence from the neighbour's Court*, by Silvia Giacomelli and Carlo Menon (January 2013).

N. 899 – *A spatial competitive analysis: the carbon leakage effect on the cement industry under the European Emissions Trading Scheme*, by Elisabetta Allevi, Giorgia Oggioni, Rossana Riccardi and Marco Rocco (January 2013).

N. 900 – *The causal effect of credit guarantees for SMEs: evidence from Italy*, by Alessio D'Ignazio and Carlo Menon (February 2013).

N. 901 – *Banking consolidation and bank-firm credit relationships: the role of geographical features and relationship characteristics*, by Enrico Beretta and Silvia Del Prete (February 2013).

N. 902 – *Evaluating the efficacy of European regional funds for R&D*, by Davide Fantino and Giusy Cannone (February 2013).

N. 903 – *Limited credit records and market outcomes*, by Margherita Bottero and Giancarlo Spagnolo (February 2013).

N. 904 – *Pure or wake-up-call contagion? Another look at the EMU sovereign debt crisis*, by Raffaela Giordano, Marcello Pericoli and Pietro Tommasino (April 2013).

N. 905 – *Family firms and the Great Recession: out of sight, out of mind?*, by Leandro D'Aurizio and Livio Romano (April 2013).

N. 906 – *Price discovery in the Italian sovereign bonds market: the role of order flow*, by Alessandro Girardi and Claudio Impenna (April 2013).

N. 907 – *Public-private wage differentials in euro area countries: evidence from quantile decomposition analysis*, by Domenico Depalo and Raffaela Giordano (April 2013).

N. 908 – *Asking income and consumption questions in the same survey: what are the risks?*, by Giulia Cifaldi and Andrea Neri (April 2013).

N. 909 – *Credit supply during a sovereign debt crisis*, by Marcello Bofondi, Luisa Carpinelli and Enrico Sette (April 2013).

N. 910 – *Geography, productivity and trade: does selection explain why some locations are more productive than others?*, by Antonio Accetturo, Valter Di Giacinto, Giacinto Micucci and Marcello Pagnini (April 2013).

N. 911 – *Trust and preferences: evidence from survey data*, by Giuseppe Albanese, Guido de Blasio and Paolo Sestito (April 2013).

"TEMI" LATER PUBLISHED ELSEWHERE

2009

F. PANETTA, F. SCHIVARDI and M. SHUM, *Do mergers improve information? Evidence from the loan market*, Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, v. 41, 4, pp. 673-709, **TD No. 521 (October 2004).**

M. BUGAMELLI and F. PATERNÒ, *Do workers' remittances reduce the probability of current account reversals?*, World Development, v. 37, 12, pp. 1821-1838, **TD No. 573 (January 2006).**

P. PAGANO and M. PISANI, *Risk-adjusted forecasts of oil prices*, The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics, v. 9, 1, Article 24, **TD No. 585 (March 2006).**

M. PERICOLI and M. SBRACIA, *The CAPM and the risk appetite index: theoretical differences, empirical similarities, and implementation problems*, International Finance, v. 12, 2, pp. 123-150, **TD No. 586 (March 2006).**

R. BRONZINI and P. PISELLI, *Determinants of long-run regional productivity with geographical spillovers: the role of R&D, human capital and public infrastructure,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 39, 2, pp.187-199, **TD No. 597 (September 2006).**

U. ALBERTAZZI and L. GAMBACORTA, *Bank profitability and the business cycle,* Journal of Financial Stability, v. 5, 4, pp. 393-409, **TD No. 601 (September 2006).**

F. BALASSONE, D. FRANCO and S. ZOTTERI, *The reliability of EMU fiscal indicators: risks and safeguards*, in M. Larch and J. Nogueira Martins (eds.), Fiscal Policy Making in the European Union: an Assessment of Current Practice and Challenges, London, Routledge, **TD No. 633 (June 2007).**

A. CIARLONE, P. PISELLI and G. TREBESCHI, *Emerging Markets' Spreads and Global Financial Conditions*, Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions & Money, v. 19, 2, pp. 222-239, **TD No. 637 (June 2007).**

S. MAGRI, *The financing of small innovative firms: the Italian case*, Economics of Innovation and New Technology, v. 18, 2, pp. 181-204, **TD No. 640 (September 2007).**

V. DI GIACINTO and G. MICUCCI, *The producer service sector in Italy: long-term growth and its local determinants,* Spatial Economic Analysis, Vol. 4, No. 4, pp. 391-425, **TD No. 643 (September 2007).**

F. LORENZO, L. MONTEFORTE and L. SESSA, *The general equilibrium effects of fiscal policy: estimates for the euro area*, Journal of Public Economics, v. 93, 3-4, pp. 559-585, **TD No. 652 (November 2007).**

Y. ALTUNBAS, L. GAMBACORTA and D. MARQUÉS, *Securitisation and the bank lending channel*, European Economic Review, v. 53, 8, pp. 996-1009, **TD No. 653 (November 2007).**

R. GOLINELLI and S. MOMIGLIANO, *The Cyclical Reaction of Fiscal Policies in the Euro Area. A Critical Survey of Empirical Research*, Fiscal Studies, v. 30, 1, pp. 39-72, **TD No. 654 (January 2008).**

P. DEL GIOVANE, S. FABIANI and R. SABBATINI, *What's behind "Inflation Perceptions"? A survey-based analysis of Italian consumers,* Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia, v. 68, 1, pp. 25-52, **TD No. 655 (January 2008).**

F. MACCHERONI, M. MARINACCI, A. RUSTICHINI and M. TABOGA, *Portfolio selection with monotone mean-variance preferences,* Mathematical Finance, v. 19, 3, pp. 487-521, **TD No. 664 (April 2008).**

M. AFFINITO and M. PIAZZA, *What are borders made of? An analysis of barriers to European banking integration*, in P. Alessandrini, M. Fratianni and A. Zazzaro (eds.): The Changing Geography of Banking and Finance, Dordrecht Heidelberg London New York, Springer, **TD No. 666 (April 2008).**

A. BRANDOLINI, *On applying synthetic indices of multidimensional well-being: health and income inequalities in France, Germany, Italy, and the United Kingdom*, in R. Gotoh and P. Dumouchel (eds.), Against Injustice. The New Economics of Amartya Sen, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, **TD No. 668 (April 2008).**

G. FERRERO and A. NOBILI, *Futures contract rates as monetary policy forecasts,* International Journal of Central Banking, v. 5, 2, pp. 109-145, **TD No. 681 (June 2008).**

P. CASADIO, M. LO CONTE and A. NERI, *Balancing work and family in Italy: the new mothers' employment decisions around childbearing*, in T. Addabbo and G. Solinas (eds.), Non-Standard Employment and Qualità of Work, Physica-Verlag. A Sprinter Company, **TD No. 684 (August 2008).**

L. ARCIERO, C. BIANCOTTI, L. D'AURIZIO and C. IMPENNA, *Exploring agent-based methods for the analysis of payment systems: A crisis model for StarLogo TNG,* Journal of Artificial Societies and Social Simulation, v. 12, 1, **TD No. 686 (August 2008).**

A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *Nonlinearities in the dynamics of the euro area demand for M1*, Macroeconomic Dynamics, v. 13, 1, pp. 1-19, **TD No. 690 (September 2008).**

L. FRANCESCO and A. SECCHI, *Technological change and the households' demand for currency*, Journal of Monetary Economics, v. 56, 2, pp. 222-230, **TD No. 697 (December 2008).**

G. Ascari and T. Ropele, *Trend inflation, taylor principle, and indeterminacy*, Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 41, 8, pp. 1557-1584, **TD No. 708 (May 2007).**

S. Colarossi and A. Zaghini, *Gradualism, transparency and the improved operational framework: a look at overnight volatility transmission*, International Finance, v. 12, 2, pp. 151-170, **TD No. 710 (May 2009).**

M. Bugamelli, F. Schivardi and R. Zizza, *The euro and firm restructuring*, in A. Alesina e F. Giavazzi (eds): Europe and the Euro, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, **TD No. 716 (June 2009).**

B. Hall, F. Lotti and J. Mairesse, *Innovation and productivity in SMEs: empirical evidence for Italy*, Small Business Economics, v. 33, 1, pp. 13-33, **TD No. 718 (June 2009).**

2010

A. Prati and M. Sbracia, *Uncertainty and currency crises: evidence from survey data*, Journal of Monetary Economics, v, 57, 6, pp. 668-681, **TD No. 446 (July 2002).**

L. Monteforte and S. Siviero, *The Economic Consequences of Euro Area Modelling Shortcuts*, Applied Economics, v. 42, 19-21, pp. 2399-2415, **TD No. 458 (December 2002).**

S. Magri, *Debt maturity choice of nonpublic Italian firms* , Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, v.42, 2-3, pp. 443-463, **TD No. 574 (January 2006).**

G. de Blasio and G. Nuzzo, *Historical traditions of civicness and local economic development,* Journal of Regional Science, v. 50, 4, pp. 833-857, **TD No. 591 (May 2006).**

E. Iossa and G. Palumbo, *Over-optimism and lender liability in the consumer credit market,* Oxford Economic Papers, v. 62, 2, pp. 374-394, **TD No. 598 (September 2006).**

S. Neri and A. Nobili, *The transmission of US monetary policy to the euro area,* International Finance, v. 13, 1, pp. 55-78, **TD No. 606 (December 2006).**

F. Altissimo, R. Cristadoro, M. Forni, M. Lippi and G. Veronese, *New Eurocoin: Tracking Economic Growth in Real Time,* Review of Economics and Statistics, v. 92, 4, pp. 1024-1034, **TD No. 631 (June 2007).**

U. Albertazzi and L. Gambacorta, *Bank profitability and taxation,* Journal of Banking and Finance, v. 34, 11, pp. 2801-2810, **TD No. 649 (November 2007).**

M. Iacoviello and S. Neri, *Housing market spillovers: evidence from an estimated DSGE model,* American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, v. 2, 2, pp. 125-164, **TD No. 659 (January 2008).**

F. Balassone, F. Maura and S. Zotteri, *Cyclical asymmetry in fiscal variables in the EU*, Empirica, **TD No. 671**, v. 37, 4, pp. 381-402 **(June 2008).**

F. D'Amuri, O. Gianmarco I.P. and P. Giovanni, *The labor market impact of immigration on the western german labor market in the 1990s,* European Economic Review, v. 54, 4, pp. 550-570, **TD No. 687 (August 2008).**

A. Accetturo, *Agglomeration and growth: the effects of commuting costs,* Papers in Regional Science, v. 89, 1, pp. 173-190, **TD No. 688 (September 2008).**

S. Nobili and G. Palazzo, *Explaining and forecasting bond risk premiums,* Financial Analysts Journal, v. 66, 4, pp. 67-82, **TD No. 689 (September 2008).**

A. B. Atkinson and A. Brandolini, *On analysing the world distribution of income*, World Bank Economic Review , v. 24, 1 , pp. 1-37, **TD No. 701 (January 2009).**

R. Cappariello and R. Zizza, *Dropping the Books and Working Off the Books,* Labour, v. 24, 2, pp. 139-162 ,**TD No. 702 (January 2009).**

C. Nicoletti and C. Rondinelli, *The (mis)specification of discrete duration models with unobserved heterogeneity: a Monte Carlo study,* Journal of Econometrics, v. 159, 1, pp. 1-13, **TD No. 705 (March 2009).**

L. Forni, A. Gerali and M. Pisani, *Macroeconomic effects of greater competition in the service sector: the case of Italy,* Macroeconomic Dynamics, v. 14, 5, pp. 677-708, **TD No. 706 (March 2009).**

V. Di Giacinto, G. Micucci and P. Montanaro, *Dynamic macroeconomic effects of public capital: evidence from regional Italian data,* Giornale degli economisti e annali di economia, v. 69, 1, pp. 29-66, **TD No. 733 (November 2009).**

F. Columba, L. Gambacorta and P. E. Mistrulli, *Mutual Guarantee institutions and small business finance,* Journal of Financial Stability, v. 6, 1, pp. 45-54, **TD No. 735 (November 2009).**

A. Gerali, S. Neri, L. Sessa and F. M. Signoretti, *Credit and banking in a DSGE model of the Euro Area,* Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 42, 6, pp. 107-141, **TD No. 740 (January 2010).**

M. Affinito and E. Tagliaferri, *Why do (or did?) banks securitize their loans? Evidence from Italy*, Journal

of Financial Stability, v. 6, 4, pp. 189-202, **TD No. 741 (January 2010)**.

S. FEDERICO, *Outsourcing versus integration at home or abroad and firm heterogeneity,* Empirica, v. 37, 1, pp. 47-63, **TD No. 742 (February 2010)**.

V. DI GIACINTO, *On vector autoregressive modeling in space and time,* Journal of Geographical Systems, v. 12, 2, pp. 125-154, **TD No. 746 (February 2010)**.

L. FORNI, A. GERALI and M. PISANI, *The macroeconomics of fiscal consolidations in euro area countries,* Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, v. 34, 9, pp. 1791-1812, **TD No. 747 (March 2010)**.

S. MOCETTI and C. PORELLO, *How does immigration affect native internal mobility? new evidence from Italy,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 40, 6, pp. 427-439, **TD No. 748 (March 2010)**.

A. DI CESARE and G. GUAZZAROTTI, *An analysis of the determinants of credit default swap spread changes before and during the subprime financial turmoil,* Journal of Current Issues in Finance, Business and Economics, v. 3, 4, pp., **TD No. 749 (March 2010)**.

P. CIPOLLONE, P. MONTANARO and P. SESTITO, *Value-added measures in Italian high schools: problems and findings*, Giornale degli economisti e annali di economia, v. 69, 2, pp. 81-114, **TD No. 754 (March 2010)**.

A. BRANDOLINI, S. MAGRI and T. M SMEEDING, *Asset-based measurement of poverty*, Journal of Policy Analysis and Management, v. 29, 2 , pp. 267-284, **TD No. 755 (March 2010)**.

G. CAPPELLETTI, *A Note on rationalizability and restrictions on beliefs,* The B.E. Journal of Theoretical Economics, v. 10, 1, pp. 1-11,**TD No. 757 (April 2010)**.

S. DI ADDARIO and D. VURI, *Entrepreneurship and market size. the case of young college graduates in Italy*, Labour Economics, v. 17, 5, pp. 848-858, **TD No. 775 (September 2010)**.

A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *Sectoral money demand and the great disinflation in the US*, Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking, v. 42, 8, pp. 1663-1678, **TD No. 785 (January 2011)**.

2011

S. DI ADDARIO, *Job search in thick markets*, Journal of Urban Economics, v. 69, 3, pp. 303-318, **TD No. 605 (December 2006)**.

F. SCHIVARDI and E. VIVIANO, *Entry barriers in retail trade*, Economic Journal, v. 121, 551, pp. 145-170, **TD No. 616 (February 2007)**.

G. FERRERO, A. NOBILI and P. PASSIGLIA, *Assessing excess liquidity in the Euro Area: the role of sectoral distribution of money,* Applied Economics, v. 43, 23, pp. 3213-3230, **TD No. 627 (April 2007)**.

P. E. MISTRULLI, *Assessing financial contagion in the interbank market: maximun entropy versus observed interbank lending patterns,* Journal of Banking & Finance, v. 35, 5, pp. 1114-1127, **TD No. 641 (September 2007)**.

E. CIAPANNA, *Directed matching with endogenous markov probability: clients or competitors?*, The RAND Journal of Economics, v. 42, 1, pp. 92-120, **TD No. 665 (April 2008)**.

M. BUGAMELLI and F. PATERNÒ, *Output growth volatility and remittances*, Economica, v. 78, 311, pp. 480-500, **TD No. 673 (June 2008)**.

V. DI GIACINTO e M. PAGNINI, *Local and global agglomeration patterns: two econometrics-based indicators,* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 41, 3, pp. 266-280, **TD No. 674 (June 2008)**.

G. BARONE and F. CINGANO, *Service regulation and growth: evidence from OECD countries,* Economic Journal, v. 121, 555, pp. 931-957, **TD No. 675 (June 2008)**.

R. GIORDANO and P. TOMMASINO, *What determines debt intolerance? The role of political and monetary institutions*, European Journal of Political Economy, v. 27, 3, pp. 471-484, **TD No. 700 (January 2009)**.

P. ANGELINI, A. NOBILI e C. PICILLO, *The interbank market after August 2007: What has changed, and why?*, Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 43, 5, pp. 923-958, **TD No. 731 (October 2009)**.

L. FORNI, A. GERALI and M. PISANI, *The Macroeconomics of Fiscal Consolidation in a Monetary Union: the Case of Italy,* in Luigi Paganetto (ed.), Recovery after the crisis. Perspectives and policies, VDM Verlag Dr. Muller, **TD No. 747 (March 2010)**.

A. DI CESARE and G. GUAZZAROTTI, *An analysis of the determinants of credit default swap changes before and during the subprime financial turmoil*, in Barbara L. Campos and Janet P. Wilkins (eds.), The Financial Crisis: Issues in Business, Finance and Global Economics, New York, Nova Science Publishers, Inc., **TD No. 749 (March 2010)**.

A. LEVY and A. ZAGHINI, *The pricing of government guaranteed bank bonds,* Banks and Bank Systems, v. 6, 3, pp. 16-24, **TD No. 753 (March 2010)**.

G. GRANDE and I. VISCO, *A public guarantee of a minimum return to defined contribution pension scheme members,* The Journal of Risk, v. 13, 3, pp. 3-43, **TD No. 762 (June 2010).**

P. DEL GIOVANE, G. ERAMO and A. NOBILI, *Disentangling demand and supply in credit developments: a survey-based analysis for Italy,* Journal of Banking and Finance, v. 35, 10, pp. 2719-2732, **TD No. 764 (June 2010).**

G. BARONE and S. MOCETTI, *With a little help from abroad: the effect of low-skilled immigration on the female labour supply,* Labour Economics, v. 18, 5, pp. 664-675, **TD No. 766 (July 2010).**

A. FELETTIGH and S. FEDERICO, *Measuring the price elasticity of import demand in the destination markets of italian exports,* Economia e Politica Industriale, v. 38, 1, pp. 127-162, **TD No. 776 (October 2010).**

S. MAGRI and R. PICO, *The rise of risk-based pricing of mortgage interest rates in Italy*, Journal of Banking and Finance, v. 35, 5, pp. 1277-1290, **TD No. 778 (October 2010).**

M. TABOGA, *Under/over-valuation of the stock market and cyclically adjusted earnings*, International Finance, v. 14, 1, pp. 135-164, **TD No. 780 (December 2010).**

S. NERI, *Housing, consumption and monetary policy: how different are the U.S. and the Euro area?*, Journal of Banking and Finance, v.35, 11, pp. 3019-3041, **TD No. 807 (April 2011).**

V. CUCINIELLO, *The welfare effect of foreign monetary conservatism with non-atomistic wage setters*, Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, v. 43, 8, pp. 1719-1734, **TD No. 810 (June 2011).**

A. CALZA and A. ZAGHINI, *welfare costs of inflation and the circulation of US currency abroad,* The B.E. Journal of Macroeconomics, v. 11, 1, Art. 12, **TD No. 812 (June 2011).**

I. FAIELLA, *La spesa energetica delle famiglie italiane*, Energia, v. 32, 4, pp. 40-46, **TD No. 822 (September 2011).**

R. DE BONIS and A. SILVESTRINI, *The effects of financial and real wealth on consumption: new evidence from OECD countries,* Applied Financial Economics, v. 21, 5, pp. 409–425, **TD No. 837 (November 2011).**

2012

F. CINGANO and A. ROSOLIA, *People I know: job search and social networks*, Journal of Labor Economics, v. 30, 2, pp. 291-332, **TD No. 600 (September 2006).**

G. GOBBI and R. ZIZZA, *Does the underground economy hold back financial deepening? Evidence from the italian credit market*, Economia Marche, Review of Regional Studies, v. 31, 1, pp. 1-29, **TD No. 646 (November 2006).**

S. MOCETTI, *Educational choices and the selection process before and after compulsory school*, Education Economics, v. 20, 2, pp. 189-209, **TD No. 691 (September 2008).**

F. LIPPI and A. NOBILI, *Oil and the macroeconomy: a quantitative structural analysis,* Journal of European Economic Association, v. 10, 5, pp. 1059-1083, **TD No. 704 (March 2009).**

S. FEDERICO, *Headquarter intensity and the choice between outsourcing versus integration at home or abroad*, Industrial and Corporate Chang, v. 21, 6, pp. 1337-1358, **TD No. 742 (February 2010).**

S. GOMES, P. JACQUINOT and M. PISANI, *The EAGLE. A model for policy analysis of macroeconomic interdependence in the euro area,* Economic Modelling, v. 29, 5, pp. 1686-1714, **TD No. 770 (July 2010).**

A. ACCETTURO and G. DE BLASIO, *Policies for local development: an evaluation of Italy's "Patti Territoriali",* Regional Science and Urban Economics, v. 42, 1-2, pp. 15-26, **TD No. 789 (January 2006).**

F. BUSETTI and S. DI SANZO, *Bootstrap LR tests of stationarity, common trends and cointegration,* Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation, v. 82, 9, pp. 1343-1355, **TD No. 799 (March 2006).**

S. NERI and T. ROPELE, *Imperfect information, real-time data and monetary policy in the Euro area,* The Economic Journal, v. 122, 561, pp. 651-674, **TD No. 802 (March 2011).**

G. CAPPELLETTI, G. GUAZZAROTTI and P. TOMMASINO, *What determines annuity demand at retirement?,* The Geneva Papers on Risk and Insurance – Issues and Practice, pp. 1-26, **TD No. 808 (April 2011).**

A. ANZUINI and F. FORNARI, *Macroeconomic determinants of carry trade activity,* Review of International Economics, v. 20, 3, pp. 468-488, **TD No. 817 (September 2011).**

M. AFFINITO, *Do interbank customer relationships exist? And how did they function in the crisis? Learning from Italy*, Journal of Banking and Finance, v. 36, 12, pp. 3163-3184, **TD No. 826 (October 2011).**

R. CRISTADORO and D. MARCONI, *Household savings in China,* Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies, v. 10, 3, pp. 275-299, **TD No. 838 (November 2011).**

V. DI GIACINTO, G. MICUCCI and P. MONTANARO, *Network effects of public transposrt infrastructure: evidence on Italian regions,* Papers in Regional Science, v. 91, 3, pp. 515-541, **TD No. 869 (July 2012).**

A. FILIPPIN and M. PACCAGNELLA, *Family background, self-confidence and economic outcomes,* Economics of Education Review, v. 31, 5, pp. 824-834, **TD No. 875 (July 2012).**

2013

F. BUSETTI and J. MARCUCCI, *Comparing forecast accuracy: a Monte Carlo investigation*, International Journal of Forecasting, v. 29, 1, pp. 13-27, **TD No. 723 (September 2009).**

FORTHCOMING

M. BUGAMELLI and A. ROSOLIA, *Produttività e concorrenza estera*, Rivista di politica economica, **TD No. 578 (February 2006).**

P. SESTITO and E. VIVIANO, *Reservation wages: explaining some puzzling regional patterns*, Labour, **TD No. 696 (December 2008).**

P. PINOTTI, M. BIANCHI and P. BUONANNO, *Do immigrants cause crime?*, Journal of the European Economic Association, **TD No. 698 (December 2008).**

F. CINGANO and P. PINOTTI, *Politicians at work. The private returns and social costs of political connections*, Journal of the European Economic Association, **TD No. 709 (May 2009).**

Y. ALTUNBAS, L. GAMBACORTA and D. MARQUÉS-IBÁÑEZ, *Bank risk and monetary policy,* Journal of Financial Stability, **TD No. 712 (May 2009).**

G. BARONE and S. MOCETTI, *Tax morale and public spending inefficiency,* International Tax and Public Finance, **TD No. 732 (November 2009).**

I. BUONO and G. LALANNE, *The effect of the Uruguay Round on the intensive and extensive margins of trade,* Journal of International Economics, **TD No. 743 (February 2010).**

G. BARONE, R. FELICI and M. PAGNINI, *Switching costs in local credit markets,* International Journal of Industrial Organization, **TD No. 760 (June 2010).**

E. COCOZZA and P. PISELLI, *Testing for east-west contagion in the European banking sector during the financial crisis,* in R. Matoušek; D. Stavárek (eds.), Financial Integration in the European Union, Taylor & Francis, **TD No. 790 (February 2011).**

E. GAIOTTI, *Credit availablility and investment: lessons from the "Great Recession",* European Economic Review, **TD No. 793 (February 2011).**

A. DE SOCIO, *Squeezing liquidity in a "lemons market" or asking liquidity "on tap"*, Journal of Banking and Finance, **TD No. 819 (September 2011).**

O. BLANCHARD and M. RIGGI, Why are the 2000s so different from the 1970s? A structural interpretation of changes in the macroeconomic effects of oil prices, Journal of the European Economic Association, **TD No. 835 (November 2011).**

S. FEDERICO, *Industry dynamics and competition from low-wage countries: evidence on Italy*, Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, **TD No. 879 (September 2012).**

F. D'AMURI and G. PERI, *Immigration, jobs and employment protection: evidence from Europe before and during the Great Recession,* Journal of the European Economic Association, **TD No. 886 (October 2012).**