

# Portfolio Construction with Gaussian Mixture Returns and Exponential Utility via Convex Optimization

Eric Luxenberg      Stephen Boyd

May 11, 2022

## Abstract

We consider the problem of choosing an optimal portfolio, assuming the asset returns have a Gaussian mixture (GM) distribution, with the objective of maximizing expected exponential utility. In this paper we show that this problem is convex, and readily solved exactly using domain-specific languages for convex optimization, without the need for sampling or scenarios. We then show how the closely related problem of minimizing entropic value at risk can also be formulated as a convex optimization problem.

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Asset return distributions . . . . .	3
1.2	Mean-variance versus expected utility . . . . .	3
1.3	This paper . . . . .	5
1.4	Previous and related work . . . . .	5
1.5	Outline . . . . .	6
<b>2</b>	<b>Gaussian mixture return model</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Asset return distribution . . . . .	6
2.2	Portfolio return distribution . . . . .	6
2.3	Moment and cumulant generating functions . . . . .	7
<b>3</b>	<b>Portfolio optimization with exponential utility</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1	Expected exponential utility . . . . .	7
3.2	EGM portfolio construction . . . . .	8
3.3	Special cases . . . . .	9
3.4	Simple example . . . . .	10
3.5	High and low risk aversion limits . . . . .	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Portfolio optimization with entropic value at risk</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Entropic value at risk . . . . .	11
4.2	Convex formulation . . . . .	12
4.3	Special cases . . . . .	13
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Graph form representation of EVaR</b>	<b>19</b>
A.1	Graph form representation . . . . .	19
A.2	Graph form calculus . . . . .	19
A.3	Graph form of EVaR . . . . .	22

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Asset return distributions

There is a long history of researchers observing that the tails of asset returns are not well modeled by a Gaussian distribution, going back to the thesis of Fama in 1965 [Fam65], who observed that while somewhat symmetric, the tails of the return distribution were much heavier than those of a Gaussian distribution. Additionally, asset returns are skewed, violating normality [Neu12]. There is also long history of researchers proposing alternative distributions to model asset returns, including elliptical distributions [BK01], and Gaussian mixtures (GMs) [BT83, AB87], the focus of this paper.

GMs can in principle approximate any continuous distribution; for asset returns, it has been observed that good approximations can be obtained with just a handful of mixture components [Kon84]. We can interpret the components of a GM return distribution as market regimes, with a latent variable that represents the active regime, and a return distribution that is Gaussian, given the regime. Many authors have observed that the correlations among asset returns can change during different market regimes, for example, increased correlations during bear markets [CKK02, AB04, AB15]. A GM can model such regime-dependent correlation structures. Another desirable attribute of a GM is that it can model skewness in return distributions, for which many authors have argued real investors exhibit preferences [Ard67, SH80].

GM return models arise in a hidden Markov Gaussian model [RTÅ98] of returns, which models the regimes as Markovian, and the returns as Gaussian, given the regime. 1/ In such a model the means and covariances of the Gaussian components corresponding to the regimes are fixed, but the component weights change in each period [GD12]; but in each period, the asset return distribution, conditioned on the past returns, is GM, so the methods in this paper can be applied.

## 1.2 Mean-variance versus expected utility

**Mean-variance portfolio construction.** In mean-variance portfolio construction, pioneered by Markowitz [Mar52], portfolio construction is viewed as an optimization problem with two main objectives: the mean or expected return of the portfolio, and the risk, taken to be the variance of the portfolio return. These objectives are combined into a risk-adjusted return using a positive weight parameter, interpreted as setting the level of risk aversion. Mean-variance portfolio construction can be carried out analytically, when there are very simple constraints, or numerically, with realistic constraints, by solving a convex optimization problem such as a quadratic program [GK99, BV04, BBD<sup>+</sup>17, SBG<sup>+</sup>20]. With current convex optimization methods, mean-variance construction can be done reliably and quickly for up to thousands of assets, and many more when a factor risk model is used. These optimization problems can be solved in well under one second, allowing back-tests (what-if simulations, based on real or simulated data) to be carried out quickly [BBD<sup>+</sup>17, SBD<sup>+</sup>22, Mat].

One obvious criticism of mean-variance portfolio construction is that the (quadratic)

objective function penalizes returns that are well above the mean (a desirable event) just as much as returns that are well below the mean (an undesirable event) [HL70]. Another is that it only uses the first two moments of the return distribution, and so cannot take into account skewed or fat-tailed distributions. Nevertheless it is very widely used in practice. There is work in analyzing portfolios under higher order Taylor approximations of utilities [JR06], but these are not used in practice due to both semantic and computational complexity.

**Expected utility portfolio construction.** In work that predates mean-variance portfolio construction, Von Neumann and Morgenstern [vNMR44] introduced the notion of utility to model decision making with uncertain outcomes. A utility function specifies a value indexing an agent’s preference for each specific outcome; their theory posits that the agent makes a choice so as to maximize her expected utility.

Portfolio construction by expected utility maximization also frames the problem as an optimization problem. The trader specifies a utility function that is concave and increasing, and the objective (to be maximized) is the expected utility under the return distribution. This formulation avoids the awkward situation in mean-variance portfolio construction where high portfolio returns are considered bad. Expected utility maximization better captures the asymmetry in downside versus upside risks than mean-variance optimization. Since the return distribution is arbitrary, expected utility can directly handle return distributions with skew or fat tails.

Expected utility maximization, like mean-variance optimization, leads to a convex optimization problem, more specifically, a stochastic optimization problem [SDR21]. Almost all expected utility methods for constructing portfolios work with samples of the asset returns. This can be considered an advantage, since it means that such methods can work with any return distribution from which we can sample returns. The disadvantage is that sample-based optimization, while tractable, can be slow compared to mean-variance methods, and scales poorly with problem size.

There are several related portfolio construction methods that rely on return samples and stochastic convex optimization. One is based on conditional value at risk (CVaR) [RU00, RU02]. A more recently proposed method uses entropic value at risk (EVaR) [AJ12, Caj21], which we address in §4. Both of these are coherent measures of risk [ADEH99, Roc07], and result in convex stochastic optimization problems.

Sample based stochastic optimization methods are used in practice [Gri99], but far less often than methods based on mean-variance optimization, which do not involve samples. This is part because solving sample based stochastic convex optimization problems is tractable, but far more involved than solving the convex optimization problems that do not involve return samples, *e.g.*, mean-variance optimization or the methods proposed in this paper.

**Comparison.** These two main approaches, mean-variance optimization and expected utility maximization, are not as different as they might seem. Levy and Markowitz [LM79] show that maximizing a second order Taylor approximation of a utility function is equivalent to mean-variance optimization. So very roughly speaking, mean-variance optimization is the

second order approximation of expected utility optimization.

When the returns are Gaussian, and we use an exponential utility, mean-variance and expected utility optimization are not merely close, but exactly the same. It appears that Merton was the first to note this connection [Mer69], but his observation does not seem to be mentioned often after that (see also §3.3).

### 1.3 This paper

In this paper we consider a GM model for asset returns, and maximize expected utility with a generic utility function, the exponential utility [Sah93]. We refer to this type of portfolio construction as EGM, for exponential utility with Gaussian mixture returns. We show that the EGM portfolio construction problem can be solved exactly as a convex optimization problem, without the need for any samples from the distribution or other approximations. The EGM portfolio construction problem is not only convex, but is easily specified in just a few lines of code in domain-specific languages (DSLs) for convex optimization such as CVXPY [DB16], CVX [GB14], or CVXR [FNB20]. Thus EGM combines the efficiency, reliability, and scalability of mean-variance optimization with the ability of expected utility maximization to handle non-Gaussian returns and the asymmetry in our preferences. When the GM has only one component, our return model is Gaussian, and EGM reduces to mean-variance optimization. Thus we can think of EGM as an extension of mean-variance optimization, or as a special case of expected utility where the problem can be solved exactly, without any return samples.

We also show that EGM is closely related to portfolio construction methods based on the entropic value at risk (EVaR). With GM return model, we show that EVaR portfolio construction problem leads to a convex optimization problem that, like EGM, does not involve sample based stochastic optimization.

### 1.4 Previous and related work

**Portfolio construction with Gaussian mixture returns.** In [BSS08], Buckley et al. consider a two-component Gaussian mixture of tranquil and distressed regimes, and analyze several objectives, including Markowitz, Sharpe ratio, exponential utility, and lower partial moments. In §3.3.6 of their paper they derive the closed form expression for expected exponential utility under Gaussian mixture returns, but do not observe that maximizing exponential utility leads to a convex problem. Studying single period portfolios consisting of a risk free asset and a risky asset, Prigent and Kaffel analyze optimal portfolios under arbitrary utility functions, and show on historical data that GM return models lead to significantly different portfolios than those arising from a Gaussian return model [HKP14].

**EVaR portfolio construction.** In recent work [Caj21], Cajas develops a disciplined convex (DCP) formulation of EVaR, with return samples, which allows it to be used as either the objective or as a constraint in portfolio optimization problems specified using DSLs for convex optimization such as CVXPY. Since a return distribution that takes on a finite set of

values (*e.g.*, the empirical distribution of samples) is a special case of GM, we can consider EGM (with EVaR) as a generalization of Cajas' formulation.

## 1.5 Outline

We describe the GM return model in §2, and in §3 we show that portfolio optimization with exponential utility is a convex optimization problem. In §4 we show that the closely related function EVaR is also convex, so minimizing it, or adding a limit on it as a constraint, results in a convex optimization problem.

# 2 Gaussian mixture return model

## 2.1 Asset return distribution

We let  $r \in \mathbf{R}^n$  denote the return of  $n$  assets over some specific period. We model  $r$  as having a GM distribution with  $k$  components,

$$r \sim \mathbf{GM}(\{\mu_i, \Sigma_i, \pi_i\}_{i=1}^k),$$

where  $\pi_i \in \mathbf{R}$  are the (positive) component probabilities,  $\mu_i \in \mathbf{R}^n$  are the component means, and  $\Sigma_i \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$  are the (symmetric positive definite) component covariance matrices.

The GM return distribution includes two interesting special cases. When there is only one component, it reduces to Gaussian, with  $r \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \Sigma_1)$ . Another special case arises when  $\Sigma_1 = \dots = \Sigma_k = 0$ . Here  $r$  takes on only the values  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ , with probabilities  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k$ . We refer to this as a finite values return distribution.

## 2.2 Portfolio return distribution

Let  $w \in \mathbf{R}^n$  denote the weights in an investment portfolio, with  $\mathbf{1}^T w = 1$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the vector with all entries one. For  $w_i \geq 0$ ,  $w_i$  is the fraction of the total portfolio value invested in asset  $i$ ; for  $w_i < 0$ ,  $-w_i$  is the fraction of total portfolio value that is held in a short position in asset  $i$ . The portfolio return is  $R = w^T r$ . This scalar random variable is also GM with component probabilities  $\pi_i$ , and means and variances

$$\nu_i = w^T \mu_i, \quad \sigma_i^2 = w^T \Sigma_i w, \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

We observe that various quantities associated with the portfolio return  $R$  can be evaluated analytically, without the need for Monte Carlo or other sampling methods. For example its cumulative distribution function (CDF) is given by

$$\Phi_R(w, a) = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \Phi\left(\frac{a - \nu_i}{\sigma_i}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \Phi\left(\frac{a - w^T \mu_i}{(w^T \Sigma_i w)^{1/2}}\right), \quad (1)$$

where  $\Phi$  is the CDF of a standard Gaussian.

## 2.3 Moment and cumulant generating functions

Two other quantities we will encounter later are the moment generating function

$$M(w, t) = \mathbf{E} \exp(tR) = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp\left(t\nu_i + \frac{t^2}{2}\sigma_i^2\right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp\left(t\mu_i^T w + \frac{t^2}{2}w^T \Sigma_i w\right), \quad (2)$$

where we use  $\mathbf{E} \exp Z = \exp(\mu + \sigma^2/2)$  for  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ , and the cumulant generating function

$$\begin{aligned} K(w, t) &= \log \mathbf{E} \exp(tR) \\ &= \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp\left(t\nu_i + \frac{t^2}{2}\sigma_i^2\right) \right) \\ &= \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp\left(t\mu_i^T w + \frac{t^2}{2}w^T \Sigma_i w\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

We observe for future use the identity

$$K(w, t) = K(tw, 1), \quad (4)$$

*i.e.*, the parameter  $t$  simply multiplies the argument  $w$ .

## 3 Portfolio optimization with exponential utility

### 3.1 Expected exponential utility

Our objective is to choose  $w$  to maximize the expected exponential utility  $\mathbf{E} U_\gamma(R)$ , where

$$U_\gamma(a) = 1 - \exp(-\gamma a),$$

with  $\gamma > 0$  the risk aversion parameter. Using (2), we can express this as

$$\mathbf{E} U_\gamma(R) = 1 - \mathbf{E} \exp(-\gamma w^T r) = 1 - M(w, -\gamma).$$

It follows that we can maximize  $\mathbf{E} U_\gamma(R)$  by minimizing the moment generating function  $M(w, -\gamma)$ , or equivalently the cumulant generating function

$$K(w, -\gamma) = \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \exp \left( \log \pi_i - \gamma \mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right) \right). \quad (5)$$

**Convexity.** The function  $K(w, -\gamma)$  is a convex function of  $w$ . To see this, we note that for each  $i$ ,  $\log \pi_i - \gamma \mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} x^T \Sigma_i w$  is a convex quadratic function of  $w$ , and therefore convex. The function  $K(w, -\gamma)$  is the log-sum-exp function (also called the soft-max function),

$$S(u) = \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \exp u_i \right), \quad (6)$$

of these arguments. The log-sum-exp function is convex and increasing in all arguments, so the composition  $f_\gamma$  is convex [BV04, §3.1.5].

## 3.2 EGM portfolio construction

Our portfolio construction optimization problem has the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && K(w, -\gamma) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathcal{W}$  is a convex set of portfolio constraints. This is evidently a convex optimization problem. One implication is that we can efficiently solve this problem globally using a variety of methods.

**DSL specification.** The EGM problem (7) is not just convex. It is readily specified in domain-specific languages (DSLs) for convex optimization, since all such systems include the log-sum-exp function, and all such systems can handle the convex function composition rules that we used to establish convexity of  $K(w, -\gamma)$  in  $w$ . No special methods (or gradient or other derivatives) are needed; the function  $K(w, -\gamma)$  can be specified in a DSL by just typing it in as is. As a simple example, CVXPY code for specifying the EGM construction problem (7) and solving it, with a long only portfolio (*i.e.*,  $w \geq 0$ ), is given below. (This code snippet is also available at the repository [https://github.com/cvxgrp/exp\\_util\\_gm\\_portfolio\\_opt](https://github.com/cvxgrp/exp_util_gm_portfolio_opt).)

```

1 import cvxpy as cvx
2
3 def K(w):
4     u = cvx.vstack([cvx.log(pi[i])
5                     - gamma * mus[i] @ w
6                     + (gamma**2/2) * cvx.quad_form(w, Sigmas[i])])
7     return cvx.log_sum_exp(u)
8
9 w = cvx.Variable(n)
10 objective = cvx.Minimize(K(w))
11 constraints = [ w >= 0, cvx.sum(w) == 1 ]
12 egm_prob = cvx.Problem(objective, constraints)
13 egm_prob.solve()
14 w.value

```



Here it is assumed that `n`, `pi`, and `gamma` are constants corresponding to  $n$ ,  $\pi$  and  $\gamma$ , and `mus` and `Sigmas` are lists of the  $\mu_i$  and  $\Sigma_i$ , respectively. In lines 3–7 the objective  $K(w, -\gamma)$  is formed, and in lines 9–12 the EGM optimization problem is formed. The problem is solved in line 13, which populates `w.value` with optimal weights. In this simple example our portfolio constraint set  $\mathcal{W}$  is simple. One of the advantages of using a DSL is that more complex constraints can be added by just appending them to the list of constraints defined in line 11.

**Soft-max interpretation.** We can give an interpretation of the objective  $K(w, -\gamma)$  in (5) in terms of the soft-max function, which can be thought of as a smooth approximation to the max, since it satisfies

$$\max_i u_i \leq S(u) \leq \max_i u_i + \log k. \quad (8)$$

The objective (5) can be expressed as

$$K(w, -\gamma) = S(u), \quad u_i = \log \pi_i + \gamma \left( -\mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right), \quad i = 1, \dots, k.$$

We recognize  $-\mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w$  as the negative risk-adjusted return of the portfolio under the  $i$ th Gaussian component. Thus  $K(w, -\gamma)$  is the soft-max of these negative risk-adjusted returns, offset by the terms  $\log \pi_i$ , and scaled by  $\gamma$ . Roughly speaking, our objective is an approximation of the maximum of the negative risk-adjusted returns under the component distributions.

From (8) we have

$$K(w, -\gamma) \geq \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left( \log \pi_i - \gamma \mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right), \quad (9)$$

$$K(w, -\gamma) \leq \log k + \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left( \log \pi_i - \gamma \mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma^2}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right). \quad (10)$$

### 3.3 Special cases

**Gaussian returns.** When  $k = 1$  our GM return distribution reduces to Gaussian, and the problem (7) reduces to the standard Markowitz problem [Mar52, Mar59]

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \mu_1^T w - \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_1 w \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

**Finite values returns.** When  $\Sigma_i = 0$ , so  $r$  takes on only the values  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ , the problem (7) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp(-\gamma \mu_i^T w) \right) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

### 3.4 Simple example

To illustrate the difference between EGM and mean-variance portfolios, we construct a very simple example for which the two portfolios can be analytically found. We take a finite values distribution with  $n = 2$  assets and  $k = 2$  components, with  $\Sigma_1 = \Sigma_2 = 0$ ,

$$\mu_1 = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mu_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus  $r = (-1, 0)$  with probability  $\pi_1$  and  $r = (1, 0)$  with probability  $\pi_2$ . The first asset is risky, and the second is riskless, with zero return. We take  $\mathcal{W} = \mathbf{R}^2$ , so the only constraint on the portfolio weight is  $w_1 + w_2 = 1$ .

**Markowitz portfolio.** The mean and covariance of  $r$  are

$$\mu = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - 2\pi_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 4\pi_1(1 - \pi_1) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Markowitz optimal portfolio is

$$w_1^M = \frac{1 - 2\pi_1}{4\gamma\pi_1(1 - \pi_1)},$$

with  $w_2^M = 1 - w_1^M$ .

**EGM portfolio.** The EGM portfolio minimizes

$$\pi_1 \exp(\gamma w_1) + (1 - \pi_1) \exp(-\gamma w_1),$$

so the EGM portfolio is

$$w_1^E = \frac{\log(1/\pi_1 - 1)}{2\gamma},$$

with  $w_2^E = 1 - w_1^E$ .

**Comparison.** The two portfolios are the same for  $\pi_1 = 1/2$ , with  $w^M = w^E = (0, 1)$ . They are not too far from each other for other values of  $\pi_1$  and  $\gamma$ , but can differ substantially for others. For example with  $\pi_1 = 0.05$  and  $\gamma = 1$ , the Markowitz and EGM portfolios are

$$w^M = (4.74, -3.74), \quad w^E = (1.47, -.47).$$

The value at risk 5% is 4.74 for the Markowitz portfolio compared to 1.47 for the EGM portfolio.

### 3.5 High and low risk aversion limits

**High risk aversion limit.** Here we consider the case where  $\gamma \rightarrow \infty$ . Dividing (9) and (10) by  $\gamma$ , we find that

$$\frac{K(w, -\gamma)}{\gamma} = \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left( -\mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right) + O(1/\gamma).$$

So for large risk aversion parameter  $\gamma$ , the EGM portfolio construction problem (7) is approximately

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \max_{i=1, \dots, k} \left( -\mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \right) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus in the limit of high risk aversion, the EGM portfolio minimizes the maximum of the risk adjusted returns under each of the components, regardless of the  $\pi_i$ . This is similar to solving a minimax Markowitz problem, where we use as a risk model the maximum risk over a set of covariance matrices (see [BBD<sup>+</sup>17, §4.2, p. 30]).

**Low risk aversion limit.** Here we consider the case where  $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ . We start with the well known expansion

$$\frac{1}{\gamma} \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \exp \gamma z_i \right) = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i z_i + \frac{\gamma}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i z_i^2 - \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i z_i \right)^2 \right) + O(\gamma^2),$$

for any  $z_i$ . (We recognize the first term on the righthand side as the mean of  $z$ , and the second as  $\gamma/2$  times the variance of  $z$ , when  $z$  is a random variable taking values  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  with probabilities  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_k$ .) Substituting  $z_i = -\mu_i^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w$  we obtain

$$\frac{K(w, -\gamma)}{\gamma} = -\mu^T w + \frac{\gamma}{2} w^T \Sigma w + O(\gamma^2),$$

where  $\mu$  and  $\Sigma$  are the mean and covariance of  $r$ ,

$$\mu = \mathbf{E} r = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i \mu_i, \quad \Sigma = \mathbf{E} r r^T - (\mathbf{E} r)(\mathbf{E} r)^T = \sum_{i=1}^k \pi_i (\Sigma_i + (\mu_i - \mu)(\mu_i - \mu)^T).$$

This has a very nice interpretation: in the limit of small risk aversion, EGM reduces to Markowitz, using the mean and covariance of the return.

## 4 Portfolio optimization with entropic value at risk

### 4.1 Entropic value at risk

The traditional measure of downside risk is the value at risk (VaR) with probability  $\alpha$ , which is the  $(1 - \alpha)$  quantile of the negative return  $-R$ ,

$$\text{VaR}_\alpha(R) = -\inf\{x \in \mathbf{R} \mid \mathbf{Prob}(R \leq x) > \alpha\}.$$

(We are typically interested in values such as  $\alpha = 0.05$  or  $\alpha = 0.01$ .) For example if the value at risk of a portfolio with probability 5% is 15%, the probability of a loss exceeding 15% (*i.e.*,  $R \leq -0.15$ ) is 5%. Value at risk is interpretable and widely used, but it is not a coherent risk measure [RU00]. For example, VaR is not sub-additive, so the sum of two portfolios can have a higher VaR than the sum of the component VaRs. Several coherent risk measures have been proposed, including the conditional value at risk CVaR $_{\alpha}$  [RU00] and entropic value at risk EVaR $_{\alpha}$  [AJ12].

The entropic value at risk EVaR $_{\alpha}$  is the tightest Chernoff upper bound on VaR $_{\alpha}$ , which can be expressed in terms of the cumulant generating function as

$$\text{EVaR}_{\alpha}(R) = \inf_{\lambda > 0} \frac{K(w, -\lambda) - \log \alpha}{\lambda} \geq \text{VaR}_{\alpha}(R)$$

(It is also an upper bound on CVaR $_{\alpha}$ .) Cajas [Caj21] and Shen et al. [SAB22] describe convex optimization problems involving EVaR with the expectation replaced with its sample approximation.

**Minimum EVaR portfolio.** To minimize EVaR $_{\alpha}(R)$ , we solve the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \frac{K(w, -\lambda) - \log \alpha}{\lambda} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad \lambda > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

with variables  $w \in \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\lambda \in \mathbf{R}$ .

There is a close connection between this problem and the exponential utility maximization problem (7). Suppose that  $w^*$  and  $\lambda^*$  are optimal for (12). Then  $w^*$  is also optimal for the exponential utility problem (7), with risk aversion parameter  $\lambda^*$ . Thus we can think of minimizing EVaR $_{\alpha}(R)$  as simply choosing a value of the risk aversion parameter in EGM. (This choice of parameter depends on  $\alpha$ .) We will refer to portfolio construction using (12) also as EGM, since any such portfolio is optimal for EGM with some value of risk aversion, and also, conveniently, entropic and exponential both start with E.

## 4.2 Convex formulation

The problem (12) is not a convex optimization problem since the objective is not jointly convex in  $w$  and  $\lambda$ . But a change of variable can give us an equivalent convex problem. Instead of using the variable  $\lambda$ , we use the new variable  $\delta = 1/\lambda$ , and the problem (12) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \delta K(w/\delta, -1) - \delta \log \alpha \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad \delta > 0, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

with variables  $w \in \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\delta \in \mathbf{R}$ . (We use the identity (4) above.) This objective is jointly convex in the variables  $w$  and  $\delta$ , since it is the perspective function of  $K(w, -1)$ , which is convex in  $w$  [BV04, §3.2.6], so (13) is a convex optimization problem, which is readily solved. (The constraint  $\delta > 0$  is actually not needed, since the perspective function is defined to be  $+\infty$  if  $\delta \leq 0$ .)

Unfortunately, current DSLs for convex optimization do not automate the creation of the perspective of a function, so the problem (13) cannot simply be typed in; we must form the perspective function by hand, as outlined below in appendix A.

There are also simple methods that can be used to solve it, with a modest loss in efficiency, that are immediately compatible with DSLs. One method is alternating optimization, where we alternate between fixing  $\delta$  and optimizing over  $w$  (easy with current DSLs), and fixing  $w$  and optimizing over  $\delta$  (minimization of a scalar convex function, which can be done by many simple methods). To start we can replace  $K$  with the lower bound (9) (or the upper bound (10)), to obtain the approximate problem

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \max_i \left( \delta \log(\pi_i/\alpha) - \mu_i^T w + \frac{w^T \Sigma_i w}{2\delta} \right) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}, \quad \delta > 0. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

This problem is convex, and also immediately representable in DSLs using the quadratic-over-linear function for the last term in the objective. (Here too the constraint  $\delta > 0$  is redundant, since the quadratic-over-linear function is defined as  $+\infty$  if the denominator is not positive.)

### 4.3 Special cases

**Gaussian returns.** When  $k = 1$ , our GM return distribution is Gaussian and we have

$$\delta K(w/\delta, -1) - \delta \log \alpha = -\delta \log \alpha - \mu_1^T w + \frac{w^T \Sigma_1 w}{2\delta}, \tag{15}$$

with variables  $w$  and  $\gamma$ . This objective is readily minimized using DSLs, using the quadratic-over-linear function for the last term.

The value of  $\delta$  that minimizes this, with fixed  $w$ , is

$$\delta = \left( \frac{w^T \Sigma_1 w}{-2 \log \alpha} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Thus we see that for Gaussian returns, the portfolio that minimizes  $\text{EVaR}_\alpha$  is in fact Markowitz, with the specific choice of risk aversion parameter

$$\gamma = \left( \frac{-2 \log \alpha}{w^T \Sigma_1 w} \right)^{1/2}.$$

(This depends on  $w$ , so to find it we must solve the convex problem with objective (15).) We see that as  $\alpha$  decreases, the associated risk aversion increases, which makes sense.

Substituting the optimal value of  $\delta$  into the objective (15), we find that the objective is

$$-\mu_1^T w + (-2 \log \alpha)^{1/2} (w^T \Sigma_1 w)^{1/2},$$

plus a constant. Thus we maximize a risk adjusted return, using the standard deviation instead of the traditional variance as risk, and the very specific risk aversion constant  $(-2 \log \alpha)^{1/2}$ .

**Finite values returns.** When  $\Sigma_i = 0$ , so  $r$  takes on only the values  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_k$ , the problem (13) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{minimize} && \delta \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k (\pi_i / \alpha) \exp(-\mu_i^T w / \delta) \right) \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \in \mathcal{W}. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper we have shown that two specific portfolio construction problems, maximizing expected exponential utility and minimizing entropic value at risk, with a Gaussian mixture return model, can be formulated as convex optimization problems, and exactly solved with no need for return samples or Monte Carlo approximations. The resulting problems are not much harder to solve than a mean-variance problem, but have the advantage of directly handling return distributions with substantial skews or large tails.

Our focus in this paper is on the formulation of these portfolio construction problems as tractable convex optimization problems that do not need return samples. In a future paper we will report on practical portfolio construction using these methods.

## References

- [AB87] V. Akgiray and G. Booth. Compound distribution models of stock returns: An empirical comparison. *Journal of Financial Research*, 10(3):269–280, 1987.
- [AB04] A. Ang and G. Bekaert. How regimes affect asset allocation. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 60(2):86–99, 2004.
- [AB15] A. Ang and G. Bekaert. International Asset Allocation With Regime Shifts. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 15(4):1137–1187, 06 2015.
- [ADEH99] P Artzner, F Delbaen, J.-M. Eber, and D Heath. Coherent measures of risk. *Mathematical finance*, 9(3):203–228, 1999.
- [AJ12] A. Ahmadi-Javid. Entropic value-at-risk: A new coherent risk measure. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 155(3):1105–1123, 2012.
- [Ard67] F. Arditti. Risk and the required return on equity. *The Journal of Finance*, 22(1):19–36, 1967.
- [BBD<sup>+</sup>17] S. Boyd, E. Busseti, S. Diamond, R. Kahn, K. Koh, P. Nystrup, and J. Speth. Multi-period trading via convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00109*, 2017.
- [BK01] N. Bingham and R. Kiesel. Semi-parametric modelling in finance: theoretical foundations. *Quantitative Finance*, 1:1–10, 2001.
- [BSS08] I. Buckley, D. Saunders, and L. Seco. Portfolio optimization when asset returns have the Gaussian mixture distribution. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 185(3):1434–1461, 2008.
- [BT83] C. Ball and W. Torous. A simplified jump process for common stock returns. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative analysis*, 18(1):53–65, 1983.
- [BV04] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [Caj21] D. Cajas. Entropic portfolio optimization: a disciplined convex programming framework. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 01 2021.
- [CKK02] R. Campbell, K. Koedijk, and P. Kofman. Increased correlation in bear markets. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 58(1):87–94, 2002.
- [CS17] V. Chandrasekaran and P. Shah. Relative entropy optimization and its applications. *Mathematical Programming*, 161(1):1–32, 2017.

- [DB16] S. Diamond and S. Boyd. CVXPY: A python-embedded modeling language for convex optimization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2909–2913, 2016.
- [Fam65] E. Fama. The behavior of stock-market prices. *The Journal of Business*, 38(1):34–105, 1965.
- [FNB20] A. Fu, B. Narasimhan, and S. Boyd. CVXR: An R package for disciplined convex optimization. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 94(14):1–34, 2020.
- [GB08] M. Grant and S. Boyd. Graph implementations for nonsmooth convex programs. In *Recent advances in learning and control*, pages 95–110. Springer, 2008.
- [GB14] M. Grant and S. Boyd. CVX: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1. 2014.
- [GBY06] M. Grant, S. Boyd, and Y. Ye. Disciplined convex programming. In *Global optimization*, pages 155–210. Springer, 2006.
- [GD12] A. Gupta and B. Dhingra. Stock market prediction using hidden Markov models. In *2012 Students Conference on Engineering and Systems*, pages 1–4. IEEE, 2012.
- [GK99] R. Grinold and R. Kahn. *Active Portfolio Management: A Quantitative Approach for Producing Superior Returns and Selecting Superior Returns and Controlling Risk*. McGraw-Hill Library of Investment and Finance. Mcgraw-hill, 1999.
- [Gli00] F. Glineur. An extended conic formulation for geometric optimization. 2000.
- [Gri99] R. Grinold. Mean-variance and scenario-based approaches to portfolio selection. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 25(2):10–22, 1999.
- [HKP14] R. Hentati-Kaffel and J.-L. Prigent. Portfolio Optimization within Mixture of Distributions. Working Papers 01066105, HAL, September 2014.
- [HL70] G. Hanoch and H. Levy. Efficient portfolio selection with quadratic and cubic utility. *The Journal of Business*, 43(2):181–189, 1970.
- [JR06] E. Jondeau and M. Rockinger. Optimal portfolio allocation under higher moments. *European Financial Management*, 12(1):29–55, 2006.
- [Kon84] S. Kon. Models of stock returns—a comparison. *The Journal of Finance*, 39(1):147–165, 1984.
- [LM79] H. Levy and H. Markowitz. Approximating expected utility by a function of mean and variance. *The American Economic Review*, 69(3):308–317, 1979.
- [Mar52] H. Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7:77–91, 1952.



- [Mar59] H. Markowitz. *Portfolio Selection: Efficient Diversification of Investments*. Yale University Press, 1959.
- [Mat] MathWorks. Backtest investment strategies. <https://www.mathworks.com/help/finance/backtest-investment-strategies.html>, accessed 2022-04-25.
- [MB15] N. Moehle and S. Boyd. A perspective-based convex relaxation for switched-affine optimal control. *Systems and Control Letters*, 86:34–40, 2015.
- [Mer69] R. Merton. Lifetime portfolio selection under uncertainty: The continuous-time case. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 51:247–257, 1969.
- [Neu12] A. Neuberger. Realized Skewness. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 25(11):3423–3455, 09 2012.
- [NN94] Y. Nesterov and A. Nemirovskii. *Interior-point polynomial algorithms in convex programming*. SIAM, 1994.
- [Roc07] R. Rockafellar. Coherent approaches to risk in optimization under uncertainty. In *OR Tools and Applications: Glimpses of Future Technologies*, pages 38–61. INFORMS, 2007.
- [RTÅ98] T. Rydén, T. Teräsvirta, and S. Åsbrink. Stylized facts of daily return series and the hidden Markov model. *Journal of applied econometrics*, 13(3):217–244, 1998.
- [RU00] R. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev. Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of Risk*, pages 21–41, 04 2000.
- [RU02] R. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev. Conditional value-at-risk for general loss distributions. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 26(7):1443–1471, 2002.
- [SAB22] X. Shen, A. Ali, and S. Boyd. Minimizing oracle-structured composite functions. *Optimization and Engineering*, pages 1–35, 2022.
- [Sah93] A. Saha. Expo-power utility: A ‘flexible’ form for absolute and relative risk aversion. *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 75(4):905–913, 1993.
- [SBD<sup>+</sup>22] M. Schaller, G. Banjac, S. Diamond, A. Agrawal, B. Stellato, and S. Boyd. Embedded code generation with cvxpy, 2022.
- [SBG<sup>+</sup>20] B. Stellato, G. Banjac, P. Goulart, A. Bemporad, and S. Boyd. OSQP: an operator splitting solver for quadratic programs. *Mathematical Programming Computation*, 12(4):637–672, 2020.
- [SDR21] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński. *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*. SIAM, 2021.

- [SH80] R. Scott and P. Horvath. On the direction of preference for moments of higher order than the variance. *The Journal of finance*, 35(4):915–919, 1980.
- [UL93] J.-B. Urruty and C. Lemaréchal. *Convex analysis and minimization algorithms*. Springer-Verlag, 1993.
- [vNMR44] J. von Neumann, O. Morgenstern, and A. Rubinstein. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior (60th Anniversary Commemorative Edition)*. Princeton University Press, 1944.

# A Graph form representation of EVaR

## A.1 Graph form representation

In this section we show how to express the objective of (13) in graph form [GB08], which is the basic representation of a function in DSLs for convex optimization, that rely on disciplined convex programming (DCP) [GBY06]. In a recent paper Cajas gave a graph form description of EVaR, for the special case when  $\Sigma_i = 0$ , *i.e.*, for a finite values return model [Caj21]. Thus we are extending his formulation from a finite values return model to a GM return model.

The graph form of a function  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$  expresses the epigraph of  $f$  as the inverse image of a cone under an affine mapping. (For practical use, the cone must be a Cartesian products of cones supported by the solver.) The graph form of  $f$  is

$$\mathbf{epi} f = \{(x, t) \mid f(x) \leq t\} = \{(x, t) \mid \exists z Fx + Gz + td + e \in C\}, \quad (17)$$

where  $F \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times n}$ ,  $G \in \mathbf{R}^{p \times m}$ ,  $d \in \mathbf{R}^p$ , and  $e \in \mathbf{R}^p$  are the coefficients, and  $C \subseteq \mathbf{R}^p$  is a cone, typically a Cartesian product of simple, standard cones, such as the nonnegative cone, second-order cone, and exponential cone. Such a representation allows  $f$  to be used in any DSL based on DCP, in the objective or constraint functions.

Specifically we work out a graph form for the perspective

$$P(w, \delta) = \delta K(w/\delta),$$

where  $K = S(g_1, \dots, g_k)$ , with

$$g_i(w) = \log(\pi_i) - \mu_i^T w + \frac{1}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and  $S$  is the soft-max or log-sum-exp function (6).

## A.2 Graph form calculus

We view  $P$  as a composition of four operations: an affine pre-composition, then an affine post-composition, then composition, and finally, the perspective. We show here generic methods for carrying out these operations using graph form representations. The first three operations, affine pre-composition, affine post-composition, and composition, are known (and indeed, used in all DSLs for convex optimization); we give them here for completeness. The last one, the perspective transform, is not well known, but is mentioned in [MB15].

**Affine pre-composition.** Suppose  $f$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} f = \{(x, t) \mid \exists z Fx + Gz + td + e \in C\},$$

and  $g$  is the affine pre-composition  $g(x) = f(Ax + b)$ . Then  $g$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} g = \{(x, t) \mid \exists z FAx + Gz + td + (Fb + e) \in C\}. \quad (18)$$

**Affine post-composition.** Suppose  $f$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} f = \{(x, t) \mid \exists z Fx + Gz + td + e \in C\},$$

and  $h(x) = af(x) + b$ , where  $a \in \mathbf{R}_+$  and  $b \in \mathbf{R}$ . Then  $h$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} h = \{(x, t) \mid \exists z Fx + Gz + t(d/a) + (e - (b/a)d)\}. \quad (19)$$

**Composition.** Suppose that  $g_i$  are convex functions with graph forms

$$\mathbf{epi} g_i = \{(w, t_i) \mid \exists z_i F_i w + G_i z_i + t_i d_i + e_i \in C_i\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,$$

and  $S$  is a convex function with graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} S = \{(u, t) \mid \exists z_0 F_0 u + G_0 z_0 + td_0 + e_0 \in C_0\}.$$

We assume that  $S$  is increasing in each of its arguments, so the composition  $K = S(g_1, \dots, g_k)$  is convex. Then  $K$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} K = \left\{ (w, t) \mid \begin{array}{l} \exists z_0, t_i, z_i F_0(t_1, \dots, t_k) + G_0 z_0 + td_0 + e_0 \in C_0, \\ F_i w + G z_i + t_i d_i + e_i \in C_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, k \end{array} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

(We can stack the affine functions of  $(w, t)$ , and use the product cone  $C_0 \times \dots \times C_k$  as the cone in the representation of  $K$ .)

**Perspective.** Here we show how to construct a graph form of the perspective of a function given in graph form. The perspective of  $f : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  is the function  $p : \mathbf{R}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbf{R} \cup \{\infty\}$  defined by

$$p(x, s) = \begin{cases} sf(x/s) & s > 0 \\ 0 & s = 0, x = 0 \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(See [BV04, §3.2.6]) or [UL93, §IV.2.2].) Then  $p$  has graph form given by

$$\mathbf{epi} p = \{(x, s, t) \mid sf(x/s) \leq t\} = \{(x, s, t) \mid f(x/s) \leq t/s\}.$$

Substituting this expression into the graph form of  $f$  given in (17), we have

$$\mathbf{epi} p = \{(x, s, t) \mid \exists z F(x/s) + Gz + d(t/s) + e \in C\}.$$

Since  $s > 0$  and  $C$  is a cone, we have

$$F(x/s) + Gz + d(t/s) + e \in C \iff Fx + G(sz) + dt + se \in C.$$

Thus, introducing a new affine description

$$\tilde{F} = [ F \quad e ], \quad \tilde{e} = 0,$$

and with  $\tilde{z}$  a new auxilliary variable,  $p$  has graph form

$$\mathbf{epi} p = \{(x, s, t) \mid \exists \tilde{z} \tilde{F}(x, s) + G\tilde{z} + td + \tilde{e} \in C\}. \quad (21)$$

**Graph form of log-sum-exp.**

$$\begin{aligned}
S(x) \leq t &\iff \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(x_i) \right) \leq t \\
&\iff \log \left( \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(x_i - t) \right) \leq 0 \\
&\iff \sum_{i=1}^k \exp(x_i - t) \leq 1 \\
&\iff \sum_{i=1}^k u_i \leq 1, \quad (x_i - t, 1, u_i) \in C_{\text{exp}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k,
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$C_{\text{exp}} = \{(a, b, c) \mid e^{a/b} \leq c/b, b > 0\} \cup \{(a, 0, c) \mid a \leq 0, c \geq 0\}$$

is the exponential cone [Gli00, CS17], which is supported by several solvers. So  $S$  has graph form given by

$$\text{epi } S = \{(x, t) \mid \exists u \ F^{\text{LSE}}x + G^{\text{LSE}}u + td^{\text{LSE}} + e^{\text{LSE}} \in C^{\text{LSE}}\}, \quad (22)$$

with

$$F^{\text{LSE}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \hline e_1^T \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \hline e_k^T \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad G^{\text{LSE}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}^T \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline e_1^T \\ \vdots \\ \hline 0 \\ 0 \\ e_k^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad d^{\text{LSE}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \hline -1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad e^{\text{LSE}} = \begin{bmatrix} -1 \\ \hline 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ \hline 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$F^{\text{LSE}} \in \mathbf{R}^{(3k+1) \times k}, \quad G^{\text{LSE}} \in \mathbf{R}^{(3k+1) \times k}, \quad d^{\text{LSE}} \in \mathbf{R}^{3k+1}, \quad e^{\text{LSE}} \in \mathbf{R}^{3k+1},$$

and

$$C^{\text{LSE}} = \mathbf{R}_- \times C_{\text{exp}} \times \dots \times C_{\text{exp}}.$$

The horizontal dividers denote separate blocks. After the first row, blocks of size 3 are repeated  $k$  times.

**Graph form of quadratic.** To derive a graph form for the function  $f(x) = x^T x$  with  $x \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , we first observe that

$$x^T x \leq t \iff \left\| \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \frac{t-1}{2} \end{bmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq \frac{t+1}{2}.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbf{epi} f = \{(x, t) \mid F^{\text{quad}}x + td^{\text{quad}} + e^{\text{quad}} \in C_{\text{SOCP}}\}, \quad (23)$$

with  $F^{\text{quad}} \in \mathbf{R}^{(n+2) \times n}$ ,  $d^{\text{quad}} \in \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$ ,  $e^{\text{quad}} \in \mathbf{R}^{n+2}$  defined by

$$F^{\text{quad}} = \begin{bmatrix} I \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad d^{\text{quad}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad e^{\text{quad}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ -1/2 \\ 1/2 \end{bmatrix},$$

and where  $C_{\text{SOCP}} = \{(x, t) \mid \|x\|_2 \leq t\}$  is the second order cone [BV04, §4.4.2][NN94].

### A.3 Graph form of EVaR

Using the calculus outlined above, we can now develop a graph form of  $P$ , where  $P(w, \delta) = \delta K(w/\delta)$ . First, we use affine pre-composition to write

$$g_i(w) = \log(\pi_i) - \mu_i^T w + \frac{1}{2} w^T \Sigma_i w \leq t$$

as

$$f(A_i w + b_i) - \frac{1}{2} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \mu_i + \log(\pi_i) \leq t,$$

where

$$f(w) = w^T w, \quad A_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \Sigma_i^{1/2}, \quad b_i = -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \Sigma_i^{-1/2} \mu_i.$$

Thus, using our affine pre-composition expression (18) together with our graph form of the quadratic (23) and affine post-composition (19), we have

$$\mathbf{epi} g_i = \left\{ (w, t_i) \mid \exists z_i (F^{\text{quad}} A_i)w + t_i d^{\text{quad}} + e_i^{\text{quad}} \in C_{\text{SOCP}} \right\},$$

with

$$e_i^{\text{quad}} = F^{\text{quad}} b_i + e^{\text{quad}} + \left( \frac{1}{2} \mu_i^T \Sigma_i^{-1} \mu_i - \log(\pi_i) \right) d^{\text{quad}}.$$

Then, using the graph form of log-sum-exp given in (22) and the composition rule give in (20), we can write the composition in graph form as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{epi} K &= \left\{ (w, t) \mid \exists z_0, t_1, \dots, t_k \begin{array}{l} F^{\text{LSE}}(t_1, \dots, t_k) + G^{\text{LSE}} z_0 + td^{\text{LSE}} + e^{\text{LSE}} \in C^{\text{LSE}}, \\ F^{\text{quad}} A_i w + t_i d^{\text{quad}} + e_i^{\text{quad}} \in C_{\text{SOCP}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, k \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \{(w, t) \mid \exists z F^K w + G^K z + td^K + e^K \in C^K\}, \end{aligned}$$

with  $F^K \in \mathbf{R}^{(3k+1+k(k+2)) \times k}$ ,  $G^K \in \mathbf{R}^{(3k+1+k(n+2)) \times 2k}$ ,  $d^K \in \mathbf{R}^{3k+1+k(n+2)}$ ,  $e^K \in \mathbf{R}^{3k+1+k(n+2)}$  defined by

$$F^K = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ F^{\text{quad}} A_1 \\ \vdots \\ F^{\text{quad}} A_k \end{bmatrix}, \quad G^K = \begin{bmatrix} G^{\text{LSE}} & F^{\text{LSE}} \\ 0 & d^{\text{quad}} e_1^T \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & d^{\text{quad}} e_k^T \end{bmatrix}, \quad d^K = \begin{bmatrix} d^{\text{LSE}} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad e^K = \begin{bmatrix} e^{\text{LSE}} \\ e_1^{\text{quad}} \\ \vdots \\ e_k^{\text{quad}} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$C^K = C^{\text{LSE}} \times C^{\text{SOCP}} \times \dots \times C^{\text{SOCP}}.$$

Finally, using the perspective rule given in (21), the perspective of  $K$  has graph form given by

$$\{(w, \delta, t) \mid \delta K(w/\delta) \leq t\} = \{(w, \delta, t) \mid \exists z \tilde{F}^K(w, \delta) + G^K z + td^K \in C^K\},$$

with  $\tilde{F}^K = \begin{bmatrix} F^K & e^K \end{bmatrix}$ .

**CVXPY specification.** CVXPY code for EVaR portfolio optimization using the graph form of  $\delta K(w/\delta)$  is available at the repository [https://github.com/cvxgrp/exp\\_util\\_gm\\_portfolio\\_opt](https://github.com/cvxgrp/exp_util_gm_portfolio_opt)