

POLYNOMIAL PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION WITH PERTURBATION SAMPLE AVERAGE APPROXIMATION

LIU YANG, YI YANG, AND SUHAN ZHONG

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we study the polynomial portfolio optimization. It is a kind of portfolio selection model with high order moments and flexible risk preference parameters. The distributions of portfolio returns are typically unknown. So we introduce a perturbation sample average approximation of the reward function, which leads to a robust approximation of the polynomial portfolio optimization. The approximated problem can be solved globally with Moment-SOS relaxations. We summarize a semidefinite algorithm and give numerical examples to show the efficiency of the algorithm.

1. INTRODUCTION

Suppose a portfolio that consists of n assets. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$ denote the random rate of portfolio return and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ denote the investing proportion. The polynomial portfolio optimization (PPO) defined is

$$(1.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min & f(x) := \mathbb{E}[F(x, \xi)] \\ \text{s.t.} & x \in X, \end{cases}$$

where \mathbb{E} is the expectation operator, $F(x, \xi)$ is a polynomial loss function and $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ is the set of all feasible investment proportions. Suppose short selling is not allowed, then we select

$$X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x \geq 0, e^T x = 1\},$$

where $e = (1, \dots, 1)$ and the superscript T is the transpose operator. When short selling is allowed, we choose $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : e^T x = 1\}$. In this paper, we assume short selling is not allowed unless given extra conditions. Consider

$$(1.2) \quad F(x, \xi) = -\lambda_1 r(x, \xi) + \lambda_2 r_2(x, \xi) + \dots + (-1)^d \lambda_d r_d(x, \xi).$$

Here $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d)$ is a vector of risk preference parameters such that each $\lambda_i \geq 0$ and $e^T \lambda = 1$. The $r(x, \xi) := x^T \xi$ is function of portfolio return and

$$(1.3) \quad r_i(x, \xi) := (r(x, \xi) - \mathbb{E}[r(x, \xi)])^i, \quad i = 2, \dots, d.$$

Each $\mathbb{E}[r_i(x, \xi)]$ is called the i th *central moment* of $r(x, \xi)$. In particular, $\mathbb{E}[r_3(x, \xi)]$ is called *skewness* and $\mathbb{E}[r_4(x, \xi)]$ is called *kurtosis*. There are various portfolio loss functions. We would remark that our method does not depend on certain polynomial expressions of $F(x, \xi)$.

The portfolio selection problem is important in financial literature. The theory of Markowitz [24] is a fundamental work in this area. It quantifies the portfolio returns and risks by the mean and variance values of some random vector. So the

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 90C31, 90C05, 90C30.

Key words and phrases. portfolio selection model, high-order moments, Moment-SOS relaxation, perturbation sample average approximation.

Markowitz's model is also called the mean-variance (M-V) model. The M-V model is a popular portfolio selection model. However, the model can be very sensitive with input noises. Its performance is heavily dependent on the sampling quality. In addition, real world portfolio returns usually exhibit thick tails and asymmetry [12, 37]. Investors are interested in taking accounts of higher order moments in the decision making process [7]. Recently, higher order portfolio selection models are proposed such as the mean-variance-skewness (M-V-S) model [15] and the mean-variance-skewness-kurtosis (M-V-S-K) model [3]. Interestingly, these models can be seen as special cases of polynomial portfolio optimization, in a more general sense.

The PPO (1.1) is a stochastic polynomial optimization problem. Suppose f is known, then (1.1), as a polynomial optimization problem, can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations [16, 21]. However, it is difficult to compute f accurately in practice. This is because computing function expectation involves multi-dimensional integration. A natural approach is to apply *sample average approximation* (SAA) methods. That is, one can approximate f by the sample average function

$$F_N(x) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F(x, \xi^{(i)}),$$

where each $\xi^{(i)}$ is a random sample following the distribution of ξ . But this requires a huge size of samples to get a good approximation. In addition, the optimizer set may still not be well approximated if we replace f by F_N in (1.1), even if the coefficient vectors of f, F_N are close. And it can be computationally expensive to extract such an inaccurate optimizer, before updating F_N with new samples. To address these concerns, we consider using the *perturbation sample average approximation* (PSAA) method proposed in [28]. The PSAA model adds a convex regularization term to the standard SAA model. Compared to the standard SAA model, the PSAA method gives a more robust approximation of (1.1). With a proper choice of regularization parameter, the PSAA model can be globally solved by Moment-SOS relaxation at the initial relaxation order.

There are lots of research work focusing on portfolio optimization. Discussions on M-V models are given in [25, 35, 41]. Studies on higher order portfolio selection models are given in [22, 23, 32]. We also refer to [1, 5, 14] and references therein for other kinds of portfolio selection models. The portfolio selection problem is a special stochastic optimization problem. The *stochastic approximation* (SA) and SAA are two major approaches of solving stochastic optimization. We refer to [20, 36] for a comprehensive introduction to stochastic optimization.

Contribution. This article studies the polynomial portfolio optimization, which is given as in (1.1). We give a robust approximation of (1.1) with perturbation sample average approximation. This approximation can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations. We show theoretically and numerically that the optimizer set of PSAA model gives a good approximation of the optimizer set of original PPO. An efficient semidefinite algorithm is constructed based on our method. We would like to remark that our method can give a convincing approximation of global minimizer of PPO without any convex assumptions on the objective function. As far as we know, there is few work discussing about global optimality of nonconvex portfolio selection model, prior to our work. To sum up, our main contributions are the followings.

- First, we introduce a general portfolio selection model, called PPO, which is given as in (1.1). This model is flexible with arbitrary moment orders and different risk appetites.
- Second, we give a robust approximation of PPO with perturbation sample average approximation. The PSAA model is more computationally efficient compared to the standard SAA model. For proper samples and parameters, the optimizer set of PSAA is close to that of the original PPO.
- Third, we construct a Moment-SOS algorithm to solve the PSAA model globally. Numerical experiments are given to show the efficiency of our algorithm.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we review main results of polynomial optimization. In Section 3, we introduce the PSAA model of the PPO and the semidefinite algorithm. Numerical examples and applications are presented in Section 4. The conclusion is given in Section 5.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Notation. The symbol \mathbb{N} denotes the set of nonnegative integers, and \mathbb{R} denotes the set of real numbers. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\lceil t \rceil$ denotes the smallest integer that is bigger than or equal to t . The \mathbb{R}^n is the n -dimensional Euclidean space, and $\|\cdot\|$ stands for the Euclidean norm. For a point u and a scalar $R > 0$, the $B(u, R) = \{x : \|x - u\| \leq R\}$. We use $e = (1, \dots, 1)$ to denote the vector of all ones, and e_i to denote the vector of all zeros except the i th entry being one. Let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. Denote by $\mathbb{R}[x]$ the real polynomial ring in x , and denote by $\mathbb{R}[x]_d$ the set of polynomials of the highest degree d . For a polynomial f , we use $\deg(f)$ to denote its degree. For a tuple of polynomials $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, we denote $\deg(g) := \max\{\deg(g_1), \dots, \deg(g_m)\}$. A symmetric matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is said to be positive semidefinite or psd, if $x^T A x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We use $A \succeq 0$ to denote a matrix A is psd. For two sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, denote the distance

$$\mathbb{D}(A, B) := \sup_{u \in A} \inf_{v \in B} \|u - v\|.$$

For a given power vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we denote the monomial

$$x^\alpha := x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n},$$

where the degree $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n$. For a degree d , denote $\mathbb{N}_d^n := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^n : |\alpha| \leq d\}$. The symbol $[x]_d$ denotes the monomial vector

$$[x]_d := (1, x_1, \dots, x_n, x_1^2, \dots, x_n^d).$$

2.1. Polynomial optimization. A polynomial $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ is said to be sum-of-squares (SOS) if it can be written as $\sigma = p_1^2 + \cdots + p_k^2$ for some $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathbb{R}[x]$. We denote by $\Sigma[x]$ the set of all SOS polynomials and denote $\Sigma[x]_d := \Sigma[x] \cap \mathbb{R}[x]_d$ for every degree $d \in \mathbb{N}$.

Let $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ be a tuple of real polynomials in x . It determines a semi-algebraic set

$$(2.1) \quad K = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : g(x) \geq 0\}.$$

Denote the cone of nonnegative polynomials on K by

$$\mathcal{P}(K) := \{p \in \mathbb{R}[x] : p(x) \geq 0 (\forall x \in K)\}.$$

For a degree d , denote $\mathcal{P}_d(K) := \mathcal{P}(K) \cap \mathbb{R}[x]_d$. The quadratic module of g is

$$\text{QM}(g) = \Sigma[x] + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[x] + \cdots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[x].$$

For $k \geq \lceil \deg(g)/2 \rceil$, we denote the truncation

$$\text{QM}(g)_k = \Sigma[x]_{2k} + g_1 \cdot \Sigma[x]_{2k - \deg(g_1)} + \cdots + g_m \cdot \Sigma[x]_{2k - \deg(g_m)}.$$

The $\text{QM}(g)$ is a convex cone, and each $\text{QM}(g)_k$ is a convex cone in $\mathbb{R}[x]_{2k}$. For every k , the containment relations hold that

$$\text{QM}(g)_k \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{2k}(K), \quad \text{and} \quad \text{QM}(g)_k \subseteq \text{QM}(g)_{k+1} \subseteq \text{QM}(g).$$

The quadratic module $\text{QM}(g)$ is said to be *archimedean* if there is $p \in \text{QM}(g)$ such that $p \geq 0$ determines a compact set. Suppose $\text{QM}(g)$ is archimedean, then K must be compact. Conversely, it may not be true. However, given K is compact (i.e., $K \subseteq B(0, R)$ for some radius R), one can always set $\bar{g} := (g, R^2 - \|x\|^2)$ such that $\bar{g} \geq 0$ also determines K and $\text{QM}(\bar{g})$ is archimedean. It is clear that every $p \in \text{QM}(g)$ is nonnegative on K . Conversely, if a polynomial $p > 0$ over K , then $q \in \text{QM}(g)$ under the archimedean condition. This conclusion is often referenced as Putinar's Postivstellensatz [33]. Interestingly, under some optimality conditions, if $f \geq 0$ on K , we also have $f \in \text{QM}(g)$. This result is shown in [27].

Consider the polynomial optimization problem

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{cases} \min & p(x) \\ \text{s.t.} & g_1(x) \geq 0, \dots, g_m(x) \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

where p and each g_i are polynomials. Denote $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and let K be given as in (2.1). Suppose γ^* is the global optimal value of (2.2). Then $\gamma \leq \gamma^*$ if and only if $p(x) - \gamma \geq 0$ for every $x \in K$, i.e., $p(x) - \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(K)$. This implies a hierarchy of SOS relaxations of (2.2). For a degree $k \geq \max\{\lceil \deg(p)/2 \rceil, \lceil \deg(g)/2 \rceil\}$, the k th order SOS relaxation of (2.2) is

$$\begin{cases} \gamma_k := \max_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & p - \gamma \in \text{QM}(g)_k. \end{cases}$$

Its dual problem is the k th order moment relaxation. Under some archimedean conditions, it is shown in [16] that $\gamma_k \rightarrow \gamma^*$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$. The convergence properties of Moment-SOS relaxations are given in [13, 17]. In particular, the finite convergence is proved in [27] under some optimality conditions. The polynomial optimization has broad applications, see [4, 6, 29, 31]. We refer to [11, 19, 30] for more recent work related to polynomial optimization. For a detailed review for polynomial optimization, we refer to books [10, 18].

2.2. Localizing and moment matrices. Denote by $\mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_d^n}$ the real vector space that consists of truncated multi-sequences (tms) $y = (y_\alpha)_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n}$ of degree d . Each tms y defines a Riesz functional \mathcal{R}_y on $\mathbb{R}[x]_d$ by

$$\mathcal{R}_y \left(\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n} f_\alpha x^\alpha \right) := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n} f_\alpha y_\alpha.$$

For convenience, we denote that

$$(2.3) \quad \langle f, y \rangle := \mathcal{R}_y(f).$$

We say a tms $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_d^n}$ admits a measure μ supported on K if it satisfies $y_\alpha = \int x^\alpha d\mu$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_d^n$. A special case is that y admits the Dirac measure at the point $u = (u_1, \dots, u_n)$. Then for every power vector $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$, we have

$$y_\alpha = u_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots u_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

In particular, it holds that

$$u = (y_{e_1}, \dots, y_{e_n}).$$

The problem for checking whether or not a tms admits a measure is called the *truncated moment problem*. We refer to [2, 8, 26] for more details.

Let $q \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $t_0 = \lceil \deg(q)/2 \rceil$. For $k \geq t_0$ and a tms $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2k}^n}$, there exists a symmetric matrix $L_q^{(k)}[y]$ such that (note $\text{vec}()$ denotes the coefficient vector)

$$(2.4) \quad \text{vec}(a)^T (L_q^{(k)}[y]) \text{vec}(b) = \mathcal{R}_y(qab), \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{R}[x]_{k-t_0}.$$

The $L_q^{(k)}[y]$ is called the k th *localizing matrix* of q . For example, when $n = 3, k = 2$ and $q = x_1^2 + 2x_2x_3$, we have

$$L_q^{(2)}[y] = \begin{bmatrix} y_{200} + 2y_{011} & y_{300} + 2y_{111} & y_{210} + 2y_{021} & y_{201} + 2y_{012} \\ y_{300} + 2y_{111} & y_{400} + 2y_{211} & y_{310} + 2y_{121} & y_{301} + 2y_{112} \\ y_{210} + 2y_{021} & y_{310} + 2y_{121} & y_{220} + 2y_{031} & y_{211} + 2y_{022} \\ y_{201} + 2y_{012} & y_{301} + 2y_{112} & y_{211} + 2y_{022} & y_{202} + 2y_{013} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the special case that $q = 1$, we define the moment matrix

$$(2.5) \quad M_k[y] := L_1^{(k)}[y].$$

For example, when $n = 2, k = 1$, we have

$$M_1[y] = \begin{bmatrix} y_{00} & y_{10} & y_{01} \\ y_{10} & y_{20} & y_{11} \\ y_{01} & y_{11} & y_{02} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The moment and localizing matrices are useful in polynomial optimization. For a tuple of polynomials $g = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and a degree $k \geq \lceil \deg(g)/2 \rceil$, define

$$(2.6) \quad \mathcal{S}(g)_k := \{y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2k}^n} \mid M_k[y] \succeq 0, L_{g_1}^{(k)}[y] \succeq 0, \dots, L_{g_m}^{(k)}[y] \succeq 0\}.$$

The $\mathcal{S}(g)_k$ is a convex cone and it is the dual cone of $\text{QM}(g)_k$. It holds that

$$(\text{QM}(g)_k)^* = \mathcal{S}(g)_k, \quad (\mathcal{S}(g)_k)^* = \overline{\text{QM}(g)_k}.$$

In the above, the superscript $*$ denotes the dual cone and the overline symbol denotes the closure.

3. POLYNOMIAL PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION

For a portfolio consisting of n assets, let $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the random return and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the investing proportion. Assume short selling is not allowed, then the polynomial portfolio optimization is

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} & f(x) = \mathbb{E}[F(x, \xi)] \\ \text{s.t.} & x \geq 0, e^T x = 1, \end{cases}$$

where $F(x, \xi)$ is given as in (1.2). Note the constraint $x \geq 0$ can be ignored if short selling is allowed. For both cases, the constraining equation $e^T x = 1$ can be used to eliminate one variable, i.e.,

$$e^T x = 1 \iff x_n = 1 - (x_1 + \dots + x_{n-1}).$$

Let $\bar{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$ and denote

$$(3.2) \quad f_0(\bar{x}) := f(\bar{x}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}) = \mathbb{E}[F(\bar{x}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}, \xi)].$$

It is clear that the PPO (3.1) is equivalent to

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} \theta := \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f_0(\bar{x}) \\ \text{s.t. } \bar{x} \geq 0, 1 - e^T \bar{x} \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, when the short selling is allowed, the PPO is equivalent to the unconstrained optimization

$$(3.4) \quad \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f_0(\bar{x}).$$

The polynomial f is bounded from below on the feasible set of (3.1), which is closed and compact. A feasible point $u = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1})$ is the global minimizer of (3.3) if and only if $x^* = (u_1, \dots, u_{n-1}, 1 - e^T u)$ is the global minimizer of (3.1). Suppose $f_0(\bar{x})$ is solvable with an optimizer, then a similar conclusion holds for the PPO with short selling. Both (3.3)-(3.4) have fewer decision variables than the original PPO problems. So solving (3.3)-(3.4) saves computational expenses. In the following discussions, we focus on these reformulations (3.3)-(3.4).

3.1. PSAA model. In practice, the distribution of ξ is typically unknown. But it is natural to assume the truncated moment information of ξ can be well approximated by sampling and historic data. So we consider applying SAA methods to approximate $f_0(\bar{x})$ as in (3.2).

Suppose $\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(N)}$ are given samples that each identically follows the distribution of ξ . Define the sample average function

$$(3.5) \quad f_N(\bar{x}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N F(\bar{x}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}, \xi^{(i)}).$$

The construction of $f_N(\bar{x})$ guarantees that $f_0(\bar{x}) = \mathbb{E}[f_N(\bar{x})]$. If we further assume that every $\xi^{(i)}$ is independently identically distributed, then under some regularity conditions, we have

$$f_N(\bar{x}) \rightarrow f_0(\bar{x}) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty$$

with probability one. This result is implied from the Law of Large Numbers [34]. Then we can approximate (3.3) by the following optimization

$$(3.6) \quad \begin{cases} \theta_N := \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f_N(\bar{x}) \\ \text{s.t. } \bar{x} \geq 0, 1 - e^T \bar{x} \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

The above approximation is usually given from classic SAA methods. It is a deterministic polynomial optimization, which can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations, see in Subsection 2.1. It has good statistical properties. By [40, Theorem 5.2] and [40, Theorem 5.3], we have the following convergent result.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose θ, θ_N are the optimal values, and T, T_N are the nonempty optimizer sets of (3.3) and (3.6) respectively. Assume ξ has a compact support $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, and $\{\xi^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^N$ are independent identically distributed samples of ξ . Then $\theta_N \rightarrow \theta$ and $\mathbb{D}(T, T_N) \rightarrow 0$ with probability one, as $N \rightarrow \infty$.*

Proof. Let Δ denote the feasible set of (3.3) and (3.6). It is clear that Δ is closed compact. The $f_0(\bar{x})$ and each $f_N(\bar{x})$ are polynomials in \bar{x} , which are continuous in Δ . So both (3.3) and (3.6) are solvable with global minimizers and $T, T_N \subseteq \Delta$. Assume ξ is supported in a compact set Ω . For every $\bar{x} \in \Delta$, $F(\bar{x}, \xi)$ as a polynomial in ξ , is continuous and integrable over Ω . Therefore, the assumptions of [40, Theorem 5.2] and [40, Theorem 5.3] are all satisfied. The conclusions can be directly implied by these two theorems. \square

The conclusions of Theorem 3.1 depends on the compactness of the feasible set of (3.3). Suppose short selling is allowed, the PPO is equivalent to an unconstrained optimization, see as in (3.4). In this case, there is a major concern that whether or not the global optimizer set of the SAA model is close to that of the original PPO. In addition, it is not necessary to solve each SAA model very accurately, even for cases that short selling is not allowed. Because the performance of SAA model depends on the sampling quality and quantity, and to extract the global minimizer of (3.6) may require a high relaxation order. One can imagine the computational expenses be very high if we solve the SAA model (3.6) in each iteration. On the other hand, investors are mostly interested in the best investing proportions. These correspond to global minimizers of the equivalent PPO reformulations (3.3)-(3.4). So our goal is to get convincing approximations of global optimizers of PPO problems in an efficient way.

To achieve the goal, we consider using the perturbation sample average approximation method introduced in [28]. It adds a convex regularization term to the standard SAA model, which leads to some good computational properties. For $d_0 = \lceil \deg(f_N)/2 \rceil$, the PSAA model of (3.3) is

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} & f_N(\bar{x}) + \epsilon \|\bar{x}\|_{2d_0} \\ \text{s.t.} & \bar{x} \geq 0, 1 - e^T \bar{x} \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

In the above, f_N is given as in (3.5), $\epsilon > 0$ is a small parameter, and $[\bar{x}]_{2d_0}$ is the monomial vector

$$[\bar{x}]_{2d_0} = (1, x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, x_1^2, \dots, x_{n-1}^{2d_0}).$$

Similarly, the PSAA model for (3.4) is

$$(3.8) \quad \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}} f_N(\bar{x}) + \epsilon \|\bar{x}\|_{2d_0}.$$

It is worth to note that when $\epsilon = 0$, (3.7)-(3.8) are reduced to be standard SAA models. Suppose these standard SAA models are solvable with nonempty global minimizer sets, say $T_N^{(1)}, T_N^{(2)}$. Then for each $\epsilon > 0$, the PSAA models (3.7)-(3.8) are solvable with optimizer sets $\hat{T}_N^{(1)}, \hat{T}_N^{(2)}$ respectively. In addition, $\mathbb{D}(T_N^{(1)}, \hat{T}_N^{(1)}), \mathbb{D}(T_N^{(2)}, \hat{T}_N^{(2)})$ are close to zero when ϵ is sufficiently small. It implies that solving PSAA models can also return reliable approximations for the original solution set of PPO, if $T_N^{(i)}, i = 1, 2$ are good approximations.

We would like to remark that PSAA models (3.7)-(3.8) are more robust than SAA models in the sense of computational efficiency. The optimization problems (3.7)-(3.8) can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations. For the special case that $\epsilon = 0$, the relaxation order may be high to return a global minimizer. But for a proper choice of $\epsilon > 0$, (3.7)-(3.8) can be solved globally with a unique minimizer,

at the initial relaxation order. More details on this are given in the following subsection.

3.2. Moment-SOS relaxations. In this section, we study Moment-SOS relaxations for PSAA models. Denote the tuple of constraining polynomials in (3.7)

$$(3.9) \quad g(\bar{x}) := (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}).$$

Suppose a tms $y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2d_0}^{n-1}}$ satisfies $y = [\bar{x}]_{2d_0}$ for some point $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$, then

$$f_N(\bar{x}) + \epsilon \|\bar{x}\|_{2d_0} = \langle f_N, y \rangle + \epsilon \|y\|.$$

If \bar{x} is a feasible point for (3.7), equivalently $g(\bar{x}) \geq 0$, then we have

$$p(\bar{x}) = \langle p, y \rangle \geq 0, \quad \forall p \in \text{QM}(g)_{2d_0}.$$

This holds by the definition of $\text{QM}(g)_{2d_0}$. And it implies that

$$y \in \mathcal{S}(g)_{2d_0} = (\text{QM}(g)_{2d_0})^*,$$

where $\mathcal{S}(g)_{2d_0}$ is given as in (2.6). In other words, we have

$$M_{d_0}[y] \succeq 0, \quad L_{g_i}^{(d_0)}[y] \succeq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Here $M_{d_0}[y]$, $L_{g_i}^{(d_0)}[y]$ are moment and localizing matrices as in (2.4)-(2.5). It leads to the moment relaxation of (3.7):

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \langle f_N, y \rangle + \epsilon \|y\| \\ \text{s.t.} & y_0 = 1, M_{d_0}[y] \succeq 0, \\ & L_{g_i}^{(d_0)}[y] \succeq 0, i = 1, \dots, n, \\ & y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2d_0}^{n-1}}. \end{cases}$$

Its dual problem is the SOS relaxation

$$(3.11) \quad \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f_N - q - \gamma \in \text{QM}(g)_{d_0}, \\ & \|\text{vec}(q)\| \leq \epsilon, \\ & q \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]_{2d_0}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

In the above, $\text{vec}(q)$ denotes the coefficient vector of the polynomial q . The constraint $f_N - q - \gamma \in \text{QM}(g)_{d_0}$ means that $f_N - q - \gamma$, as a polynomial in \bar{x} , belongs to the truncated quadratic module $\text{QM}(g)_{d_0}$. Similarly, we can get the moment relaxation of (3.8):

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{cases} \min & \langle f_N, y \rangle + \epsilon \|y\| \\ \text{s.t.} & y_0 = 1, M_{d_0}[y] \succeq 0, \\ & y \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}_{2d_0}^{n-1}}. \end{cases}$$

The SOS relaxation of (3.8) is

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{cases} \max & \gamma \\ \text{s.t.} & f_N - q - \gamma \in \Sigma[x]_{2d_0}, \\ & \|\text{vec}(q)\| \leq \epsilon, \\ & q \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{x}]_{2d_0}, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}. \end{cases}$$

The optimization problems (3.10)-(3.13) are each equivalent to a linear conic optimization problem with a Cartesian product of semidefinite and second-order cones.

For an optimization, we say its relaxation is *tight* if the relaxation has the same optimal value of the original problem. Then we give a sufficient and necessary condition such that (3.10) is a tight relaxation of (3.7).

Theorem 3.2. *For given $\epsilon > 0$, suppose (3.10) is solvable with a global minimizer y^* . Then (3.10) is a tight relaxation of (3.7) if and only if $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[y^*] = 1$. Moreover, suppose $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[y^*] = 1$, then the $u = (y_{e_1}^*, \dots, y_{e_{n-1}}^*)$ is a global minimizer of (3.7).*

Proof. Let φ_1, φ_2 be optimal values of (3.7) and (3.10) respectively. Suppose u^* is the global minimizer of (3.7). Since $[u^*]_{2d_0}$ is feasible for (3.10), we have

$$\varphi_1 = \langle f_N, [u^*]_{2d_0} \rangle + \epsilon \| [u^*]_{2d_0} \| \geq \varphi_2.$$

Suppose y^* is the global minimizer of (3.10) such that $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[y^*] = 1$. Then $M_{d_0}[y^*] = [u]_{d_0}([u]_{d_0})^T$ for $u = (y_{e_1}^*, \dots, y_{e_{n-1}}^*)$. It implies that $y^* = [u]_{2d_0}$, and each $g_i(u) \geq 0$. This is because $L_{g_i}^{(d_0)}[y^*] \succeq 0$ and that $g_i(u)$ equals the (1, 1)th-entry of $L_{g_i}^{(d_0)}[y^*]$. Then the u is feasible for (3.7) and

$$\varphi_1 \leq f_N(u) + \epsilon \| [u]_{2d_0} \| = \langle f_N, y^* \rangle + \epsilon \| y^* \| = \varphi_2.$$

So $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$ and (3.10) is a tight relaxation of (3.7). Furthermore, we have $u = (y_{e_1}^*, \dots, y_{e_{n-1}}^*)$ is the global minimizer of (3.7).

Assume that $\varphi_1 = \varphi_2$, then $[u^*]_{2d_0}$ is a global minimizer of (3.10). Note (3.10) has a closed convex feasible set and a strictly convex objective function. So $y^* = [u^*]_{2d_0}$ is the unique global minimizer of (3.10) and we have $M_{d_0}[y^*] = [u^*]_{d_0}([u^*]_{d_0})^T$, which implies $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[y^*] = 1$. \square

Corollary 3.3. *For given $\epsilon > 0$, suppose (3.12) is solvable with a global minimizer \hat{y}^* . Then (3.12) is a tight relaxation of (3.8) if and only if $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[\hat{y}^*] = 1$. Moreover, suppose $\text{rank } M_{d_0}[\hat{y}^*] = 1$, then the $u = (\hat{y}_{e_1}^*, \dots, \hat{y}_{e_{n-1}}^*)$ is a global minimizer of (3.8).*

3.3. A semidefinite algorithm. Then we construct a semidefinite algorithm to get global optimizer approximations for the PPO (1.1). In particular, we assume that (1.1) has a global minimizer when the short selling is allowed. In other words, the portfolio loss function is bounded from below. This is a reasonable assumption in practice.

Algorithm 3.4. For the given sample points $\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(N)}$ and a small parameter $\epsilon > 0$, do the following:

- Step 0 Compute the sample average function $f_N(\bar{x})$ given as in (3.5). If short selling is not allowed, go to Step 1. Otherwise, go to Step 2.
- Step 1 Solve dual pairs (3.10)-(3.11). If (3.11) is infeasible, increase the value of the parameter ϵ (i.e., update $\epsilon = 2\epsilon$), until (3.10) has a global optimizer y^* . Then go to Step 3.
- Step 2 Solve dual pairs (3.12)-(3.13). If (3.13) is infeasible, increase the value of the parameter ϵ (i.e., update $\epsilon = 2\epsilon$), until (3.12) has a global optimizer y^* . Then go to Step 3.
- Step 3 Let $u = (y_{e_1}^*, y_{e_2}^*, \dots, y_{e_{n-1}}^*)$. Output a candidate solution x^* of (1.1)

$$x^* = (u, 1 - e^T u),$$

and terminate the algorithm.

In Algorithm 3.4, every optimization problem can be solved efficiently by MATLAB software `GloptiPoly3` [9] and `SeDuMi` [38]. In Step 3, the output point x^* is feasible for the original PPO. When the short selling is allowed, the $u + (1 - e^T u) = 1$. Suppose the short selling is not allowed. Since y^* is feasible for (3.11), then $u \geq 0$ and $1 - e^T u \geq 0$.

It is clear that there exists an $\epsilon_0 \geq 0$ such that for every $\epsilon \geq \epsilon_0$, the PSAA model (3.12) is solvable with a global optimizer. But the optimizer set of the PSAA model may be far away from the original optimizer of PPO, if ϵ has a big value. To get a good approximation of the original optimizer set, a preferable value of ϵ can be $\epsilon = \epsilon_1$ such that for every $0 \leq \epsilon < \epsilon_1$, the optimization (3.12) is not solvable. The computation of such an ϵ_1 is discussed in [28]. It is dependent on the coefficient vectors of $f_N(\bar{x})$. In numerical experiments, we usually select some small heuristic values of ϵ , i.e., $\epsilon = 0.01$ or $\epsilon = 0.001$.

4. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we give some numerical examples to explore the performance of Algorithm 3.4. The computation is implemented in MATLAB R2014a, in a computer with CPU 6th Generation Intel(R) Core(TM) i5-6500 CPU and RAM 8 GB. The MATLAB software `GloptiPoly3` [9] and `SeDuMi` [38] are used to solve PSAA models. For neatness of the paper, we only display four decimal digits to show computational results. In each example, for samples $\xi^{(1)}, \dots, \xi^{(N)}$, we denote sample average functions

(4.1)

$$r_{1,N} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r(\bar{x}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}, \xi^{(i)}), \quad r_{i,N}(\bar{x}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N r_i(\bar{x}, 1 - e^T \bar{x}, \xi^{(i)}), \quad i = 2, \dots, d,$$

where each $r_i(x, \xi)$ is given as in (1.3).

First, we use the following examples to show the robustness of the PSAA model.

Example 4.1. Suppose there are three stocks S_1, S_2 and S_3 in the market, which allow for short selling. Let $\xi = (\xi_1, \xi_2, \xi_3)$ denote the random return rates of S_1, S_2, S_3 respectively. Assume ξ_1, ξ_2, ξ_3 are independent and are normally distributed, i.e.

$$\xi_1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0.92, 1.8), \quad \xi_2 \sim \mathcal{N}(0.64, 1.2), \quad \xi_3 \sim \mathcal{N}(0.41, 1.4).$$

In the above, $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma)$ stands for a normal distribution with the mean value μ and the standard deviation σ . Consider the M-V-S model induced from (1.1)-(1.2) with order $d = 3$, the risk preference vector

$$\lambda = (0.2, 0.5, 0.3).$$

We compute the exact object function of the M-V-S model

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[-0.2r(x, \xi) + 0.5r_2(x, \xi) - 0.3r_3(x, \xi)] \\ &= -0.184x_1 - 0.128x_2 - 0.082x_3 + 0.9x_1^2 + 0.6x_2^2 + 0.7x_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

By eliminating x_3 by $1 - x_1 - x_2$, we get the equivalent model (3.3) as

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.618 - 1.502x_1 - 1.446x_2 + 1.6x_1^2 + 1.4x_1x_2 + 1.3x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, 1 - x_1 - x_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

where $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ denotes the investment proportion of stock S_1 and S_2 . Since the short selling is allowed, the feasible set is $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 1\}$,

thus $1 - x_1 - x_2$ is the investment proportion of stock S_3 . And the optimal value and solution of (4.2) is

$$f_{min} = 0.1089, \quad \bar{u}^* = (0.2957, 0.3969).$$

It implies that the best investment proportion is

$$u^* = (0.2957, 0.3969, 0.3074).$$

We make a sampling of ξ with the sample size $N = 1000$ and get

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1,N}(\bar{x}) &= 0.4216 + 0.4423x_1 + 0.2728x_2, \\ r_{2,N}(\bar{x}) &= 1.4253 - 2.8306x_1 - 2.7282x_2 + 3.1689x_1^2 + 2.6621x_1x_2 + 2.4906x_2^2, \\ r_{3,N}(\bar{x}) &= 0.0535 - 0.0975x_1 + 0.2576x_2 + 0.2974x_1^2 - 0.6222x_1x_2 - 0.4961x_2^2 \\ &\quad - 0.1243x_1^3 - 0.2888x_1^2x_2 + 0.6121x_1x_2^2 + 0.3540x_2^3, \end{aligned}$$

where $r_{i,N}(\bar{x})$ is given in (4.1). For the PSAA model (3.8), it has the objective function $f_N(\bar{x}) + \epsilon \|\bar{x}\|_4$, with

$$(4.3) \quad f_N(\bar{x}) = -0.2r_{1,N}(\bar{x}) + 0.5r_{2,N}(\bar{x}) - 0.3r_{3,N}(\bar{x}).$$

Applying Algorithm 3.4 to this PPO, we report all numerical results in Table 1. The ϵ is the regularization parameter. The ‘‘Solvable?’’ refers to the status of (3.10). The ‘‘Time’’ stands for the total CPU time of running Algorithm 3.4 with the unit second. The $x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$ denotes the candidate solution of (1.1) solved from Algorithm 3.4. The $f_N(\bar{x}^*)$ gives an approximation for the optimal value of (1.1).

TABLE 1. Numerical results for Example 4.1

ϵ	Solvable?	Time	$x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$	$f_N(\bar{x}^*)$
0	No	0.4796	not available	not available
0.006	Yes	0.3018	(0.2833, 0.4134, 0.3033)	0.0995
0.01	Yes	0.1037	(0.2833, 0.4124, 0.3043)	0.0995

From Table 1, we can see that the PSAA model (4.3) performs better for this problem, compared to the unperturbed case (i.e, $\epsilon = 0$). It gives reliable optimizers, while the classical SAA model (i.e, $\epsilon = 0$) does not return good ones.

Example 4.2. Assume that the short selling is not allowed. Let S_1, S_2, S_3 be three stocks that are normally distributed, whose expected returns (mean) and risks (covariance) are given as follows.

TABLE 2. The expected return and covariance of Example 4.2

stocks name	expected return	covariance		
		S_1	S_2	S_3
S_1	0.91	1.90	0.38	1.20
S_2	0.65	0.38	1.50	-0.80
S_3	0.49	1.20	-0.80	1.70

Consider the M-V model induced from (1.1)-(1.2) with order $d = 2$ and the risk preference vector

$$\lambda = (0.75, 0.25).$$

With data in Table 2, we compute the exact object function of the M-V model

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &= \mathbb{E}[-0.75r(x, \xi) + 0.25r_2(x, \xi)] \\ &= -0.6825x_1 - 0.4875x_2 - 0.3675x_3 + 0.475x_1^2 + 0.19x_1x_2 + 0.6x_1x_3 \\ &\quad + 0.375x_2^2 - 0.4x_2x_3 + 0.425x_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

By eliminating x_3 by $1 - x_1 - x_2$, we get the equivalent model (3.3) as

$$(4.4) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2} & 0.0575 - 0.565x_1 - 1.37x_2 + 0.3x_1^2 + 0.84x_1x_2 + 1.2x_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, 1 - x_1 - x_2 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

The $\bar{x} = (x_1, x_2)$ represents the investment proportion of the stocks S_1 and S_2 , thus $1 - x_1 - x_2$ represents the investment proportion of the stock S_3 . The (4.4) is a deterministic polynomial optimization problem, and we can solve for its optimal value and solution

$$f_{min} = -0.3455, \quad \bar{u}^* = (0.2794, 0.4730).$$

It implies that the best investment proportion is

$$u^* = (0.2794, 0.4730, 0.2476).$$

Then we generate random samples of ξ with different sizes. The sample averages for expected value and covariance of these examples are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 3. The sample mean and the sample covariance of Example 4.2

sample size	stock name	sample mean	sample covariance		
			S_1	S_2	S_3
$N = 1000$	S_1	0.8650	1.8961	-0.0156	0.0509
	S_2	0.6952	-0.0156	1.4958	0.0829
	S_3	0.5399	0.0509	0.0829	1.7187
$N = 100$	S_1	1.3768	2.1085	-0.3918	-0.0580
	S_2	0.7064	-0.3918	1.5020	-0.2511
	S_3	0.7678	-0.0580	-0.2511	1.8118

Applying Algorithm 3.4, we report all numerical results in Table 4. The $x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$ denotes the candidate solution of (1.1) solved from Algorithm 3.4. The $f_N(\bar{x}^*)$ gives an approximation for the optimal value of (1.1).

TABLE 4. Numerical results for Example 4.2

sample size	ϵ	$x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$	$f_N(\bar{x}^*)$	$f_N(\bar{x}^*) - f_{min}$	Time
$N = 1000$	0	(0.4412, 0.3859, 0.1729)	-0.3933	0.0478	0.2495
	0.001	(0.4410, 0.3857, 0.1734)	-0.3933	0.0478	0.2234
	0.01	(0.4389, 0.3839, 0.1772)	-0.3933	0.0478	0.2523
$N = 100$	0	(0.5811, 0.2531, 0.1657)	-0.6520	0.3065	0.2099
	0.001	(0.5807, 0.2532, 0.1661)	-0.6520	0.3065	0.2406
	0.01	(0.5770, 0.2534, 0.1696)	-0.6520	0.3065	0.2649

It is clear that the SAA and PSAA have close solutions when the parameter ϵ is small. If SAA gives a good approximation of the original PPO, then so as PSAA with a proper parameter.

In the following, we apply our approach to some real world data, when the true distributions are not known. In the following example, we study the real stock data from the Chinese stock market. A high order portfolio model is constructed in form of (1.1). We apply Algorithm 3.4 in this polynomial portfolio optimization problem to see its performance.

Example 4.3. We select 4 stocks from the Chinese stock market for portfolio investment, which are Linhai Stock (S_1), Shanghai Automotive (S_2), Hangzhou Iron and Steel (S_3), and CYTS (S_4). We collected weekly stock closing prices from March 3, 2006 to March 25, 2021 in the Choice software database. For $t = 1, \dots, N+1$ and for each $i = 1, \dots, 4$, we use $P_i^{(t)}$ to denote the price of S_i in week t . Then the stock return $\xi_i^{(t)}$ of S_i in week t can be computed as

$$\xi_i^{(t)} = (P_i^{(t+1)} - P_i^{(t)})/P_i^{(t)}.$$

The weekly return rates of these four stocks from March 3, 2006 to March 25, 2021 are plotted in the following figures. The subfigures (a)-(d) shows the weekly return for S_1 - S_4 respectively.




FIGURE 1. Scatter plot of the weekly return of the four stocks ($N=500$)

It is easy to observe that the distribution of each stock returns is not normally distributed. They tend to be asymmetric, leptokurtic and heavy-tailed. For instance, the kurtosis in Figure 1 is of a sharp peaks and fat tail character. Therefore, the M-V model, which only uses the first and the second order moments, may not be efficient to give a promising investing plan. This is because many good properties of M-V model relies on the assumption that the stock returns follow a normal

distribution. On the other hand, higher moments are important in measuring this probability distribution of the stock returns. For instance, the skewness can be used to measure the skew direction and degree of statistical data distribution. It also represents the asymmetric characteristics of statistical data. In financial literature, if the skewness is positive, it means that the positive returns are easy to generate. If the skewness is negative, it means that the potential risk is greater than the potential profit. Investors prefer the portfolio with a large skewness and dislike the yield with a large kurtosis.

Based on previous analysis, we consider a polynomial portfolio model given as in (1.1)-(1.2) with $d = 5$. Assume the short selling is not allowed.

(i) We choose the risk preference vector as

$$\lambda = (0.205, 0.213, 0.221, 0.200, 0.161).$$

With the sample size $N = 720$ and the parameter $\epsilon = 0.01$, the PSAA model is

$$(4.5) \quad \begin{cases} \min_{\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3} & f_N(\bar{x}) + \epsilon \|\bar{x}\|_6 \\ \text{s.t.} & x_1 \geq 0, x_2 \geq 0, x_3 \geq 0, \\ & 1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3 \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

In the above, x_1, x_2, x_3 denote the investment proportion of the stocks Linhai Stock, Shanghai Automotive, Hangzhou Iron and Steel respectively. Then $1 - x_1 - x_2 - x_3$ denotes the investment proportion of the stock CYTS. Applying Algorithm 3.3, we get the candidate solution for the original PPO, and an approximation for its optimal value:

$$x^* = (0.2517, 0.2560, 0.2447, 0.2436), \quad f_N(\bar{x}^*) = 0.0110.$$

(ii) Next, we consider different parameter vector $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5)$ to compare numerical results of different investors' preferences. In financial literature, the larger λ_i ($i = 2, 4$) imply investors are the more risk-averse. Conversely, the smaller λ_i ($i = 2, 4$), the more risk-appetite investors are. In particular, when $\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 = 1$, investors are extremely risk-averse and their only goal is to minimize the risk of their portfolio. When $\lambda_2 + \lambda_4 = 0$, investors are extremely fond of risk, and portfolio returns are the only factors that affect decision making. In our numerical experiments, we take three scenarios as follows:

$$\text{scenario 1} \quad \lambda = (0.2070, 0.2060, 0.2020, 0.2050, 0.1800).$$

$$\text{scenario 2} \quad \lambda = (0.0005, 0.8300, 0.0005, 0.1385, 0.0205).$$

$$\text{scenario 3} \quad \lambda = (0.5270, 0.0305, 0.2020, 0.0305, 0.2100).$$

The scenario 1, scenario 2, scenario 3 respectively reflect that the investor is risk neutral, risk aversion, and risk appetite. Applying Algorithm 3.4 in these three cases, we report all numerical results in Table 5. The $x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$ denotes the candidate solution of (1.1) solved from Algorithm 3.4. The $f_N(\bar{x}^*)$ gives an approximation for the optimal value of (1.1).

TABLE 5. Numerical results for Example 4.3

scenario	$x^* = (\bar{x}^*, 1 - e^T \bar{x}^*)$	$f_N(\bar{x}^*)$
1	(0.2517, 0.2600, 0.2447, 0.2436)	0.0110
2	(0.2522, 0.2527, 0.2393, 0.2559)	0.0127
3	(0.2526, 0.2742, 0.2440, 0.2293)	0.0095

To better explain that the different risk attitude leads to different investing plan, we selected the weekly return rates of the four stocks in the first 20 weeks. The volatility of the return rate can be observed from Figure 2.




FIGURE 2. The weekly return rates of the four stocks

From Figure 2 and Table 5, we can see that risk appetite investors invest more in Shanghai Automotive stock than risk neutral investors and risk averse investors. This is because the return rate of Shanghai Automotive stock is more volatile than the others. Risk averse investors invest more in CYTS stock than risk neutral investors and risk appetite investors, because the return rate of CYTS stock is stable and the risk is low.

5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, a general portfolio model with high-order moments is proposed, which can overcome the deficiencies of the M-V model and cater to investors with different risk appetites. The portfolio model is typically nonconvex. We construct a PSAA model that gives an efficient robust approximation to the portfolio model. It can be solved globally by Moment-SOS relaxations algorithm. This is described in Algorithm 3.4. Numerical experiments are given to show the efficiency of the algorithm.

Acknowledgement This work is supported by Natural Science Foundation of China (12071399, 12171145), Project of Scientific Research Fund of Hunan Provincial Science and Technology Department (2018WK4006), Project of Hunan National Center for Applied Mathematics (2020ZYT003).

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Black and R. Litterman, Global portfolio optimization, *Financial Analysts Journal* 1992, 48(5): 28-43.
- [2] R. Curto and L. Fialkow, Truncated K -moment problems in several variables, *Journal of Operator Theory*, 2005, 54: 189-226.
- [3] R. J. Davies, H. M. Kat and S. Lu, Fund of hedge funds portfolio selection: A multiple-objective approach, *Journal of Derivatives & Hedge Funds*, 2009, 15(2): 91-115.

- [4] J. Fan, J. Nie and A Zhou, Tensor eigenvalue complementarity problems, *Mathematical Programming*, 2018, 170(2): 507-539.
- [5] D. Goldfarb and G. Iyengar, Robust portfolio selection problems, *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 2003, 28(1): 1-38.
- [6] B. Guo, J. Nie and Z. Yang, Learning diagonal Gaussian mixture models and incomplete tensor decompositions, *Vietnam J. Math.*, 2022, 50(2): 421-446.
- [7] C. R. Harvey and A. Siddique, Conditional skewness in asset pricing tests, *The Journal of Finance*, 2000, 55(3): 1263-1295.
- [8] J. Helton and J. Nie, A semidefinite approach for truncated K -moment problem, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2012, 12(6): 851-881.
- [9] D. Henrion, J. B. Lasserre and J. Löfberg, GloptiPoly 3: moments, optimization and semidefinite programming, *Optimization Methods and Software*, 2009, 24(4-5):761-779.
- [10] D. Henrion, M. Korda and J. Lasserre, *Moment-SOS Hierarchy, The: Lectures In Probability, Statistics, Computational Geometry*, Control And Nonlinear Pdes. Vol. 4. World Scientific, 2020.
- [11] L. Huang, J. Nie and Y. X. Yuan, Homogenization for polynomial optimization with unbounded sets, *Mathematical Programming*, 2022: 1-41.
- [12] E. Jondeau, M. Rockinger, Conditional volatility, skewness, and kurtosis: existence, persistence, and comovements, *Journal of Operational Research*, 2014, 234 (2): 356-371.
- [13] E. Klerk and M. Laurent, On the Lasserre hierarchy of semidefinite programming relaxations of convex polynomial optimization problems, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2011, 21: 824-832.
- [14] P. Kolm, R. Tütüncü and F. Fabozzi, 60 years of portfolio optimization: Practical challenges and current trends, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2014, 234:356-371.
- [15] H. Konno and K. Suzuki, A mean-variance-skewness portfolio optimization model, *Journal of the Operations Research Society of Japan*, 1995, 38(2): 173-187.
- [16] J. B. Lasserre, Global optimization with polynomials and the problem of moments, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2001, 11(3): 796-817.
- [17] J. Lasserre, Convexity in semi-algebraic geometry and polynomial optimization, *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 2009, 19: 1995-2014.
- [18] J. Lasserre, *An introduction to polynomial and semi-algebraic optimization*, Vol. 52. Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- [19] T. Chen, J. Lasserre, V. Magron and E. Pauwels, A sublevel moment-sos hierarchy for polynomial optimization, *Computational Optimization and Applications*, 2022, 81(1):31-66.
- [20] G. Lan, *First-order and Stochastic Optimization Methods for Machine Learning*, Springer Nature, 2020.
- [21] M. Laurent, Sums of squares, moment matrices and optimization over polynomials, *Emerging Applications of Algebraic Geometry of IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, Springer, 2009, 149:157-270.
- [22] H. Levy and H. Markowitz, Approximating expected utility by a function of mean and variance, *American Economic Review*, 1979, 69(3):308-317.
- [23] D. Maringer and P. Parpas, Global optimization of higher order moments in portfolio selection, *Journal of Global optimization*, 2009, 43(2): 219-230.
- [24] H. Markowitz, Portfolio selection, *Journal of Finance*, 1952, 7: 77-91.
- [25] H. Markowitz, Mean-variance approximations to expected utility, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2014, 234:346-355.
- [26] J. Nie, The \mathcal{A} -truncated K -moment problem, *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 2014, 14(6):1243-1276.
- [27] J. Nie, Optimality conditions and finite convergence of Lasserre's hierarchy, *Mathematical Programming*, Ser. A, 2014, 146(1): 97-121.
- [28] J. Nie, L. Yang and S. Zhong, Stochastic polynomial optimization, *Optimization Methods and Software*, 2020, 35(2):329-347.
- [29] J. Nie and X. Tang, Convex generalized Nash equilibrium problems and polynomial optimization, *Mathematical Programming*, 2021: 1-34.
- [30] J. Nie and Z. Yang, The multi-objective polynomial optimization, *Preprint*, 2021. [arXiv: 2108.04336](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.04336)
- [31] J. Nie, L. Yang, S. Zhong and G. Zhou, Distributionally robust optimization with moment ambiguity sets, *Preprint*, 2021. [arXiv:2103.12315](https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12315)

- [32] Y. Niu and Y. Wang, Higher-order moment portfolio optimization via the difference-of-convex programming and sums-of-squares, *Preprint*, 2019. [arXiv:1906.01509](#)
- [33] M. Putinar, Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets, *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 1993, 42(3): 969-984.
- [34] S. Ross, *A First Course in Probability*, Pearson, 2010.
- [35] M. Rubinstein, Markowitz's "portfolio selection": A fifty-year retrospective, *Journal of Finance*, 2002, 57: 1041-1045.
- [36] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2021.
- [37] J. C. Singleton and J. Wingender, Skewness persistence in common stock returns, *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 1986: 335-341.
- [38] J. F. Sturm, Using SeDuMi 1.02, a MATLAB toolbox for optimization over symmetric cones, *Optimization methods and software*, 1999, 11(1-4): 625-653.
- [39] A. Shapiro, Monte Carlo sampling Methods, *Handbook in Operations Research and Management Science*, 2003, 10:353-425.
- [40] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2021.
- [41] M. Steinbach, Markowitz revisited: Mean-variance models in financial portfolio analysis, *SIAM Review*, 2001, 43(1):31-85.

LIU YANG, HUNAN KEY LABORATORY FOR COMPUTATION AND SIMULATION IN SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, XIANGTAN UNIVERSITY; SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES, XIANGTAN UNIVERSITY, XIANGTAN, HUNAN, CHINA, 411105.

Email address: yangl410@xtu.edu.cn

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTATIONAL SCIENCES XIANGTAN UNIVERSITY, XIANGTAN, HUNAN, CHINA, 411105.

Email address: 1623316302@qq.com

SUHAN ZHONG, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY, COLLEGE STATION, TX, USA, 77843-3368.

Email address: suzhong@tamu.edu