

Deep Reinforcement Learning and Mean-Variance Strategies for Responsible Portfolio Optimization

Fernando Acero^{1,2}, Parisa Zehtabi¹, Nicolas Marchesotti¹, Michael Cashmore¹,
Daniele Magazzeni¹, Manuela Veloso¹

¹ J.P. Morgan AI Research ² University College London

Abstract

Portfolio optimization involves determining the optimal allocation of portfolio assets in order to maximize a given investment objective. Traditionally, some form of mean-variance optimization is used with the aim of maximizing returns while minimizing risk, however, more recently, deep reinforcement learning formulations have been explored. Increasingly, investors have demonstrated an interest in incorporating ESG objectives when making investment decisions, and modifications to the classical mean-variance optimization framework have been developed. In this work, we study the use of deep reinforcement learning for responsible portfolio optimization, by incorporating ESG states and objectives, and provide comparisons against modified mean-variance approaches. Our results show that deep reinforcement learning policies can provide competitive performance against mean-variance approaches for responsible portfolio allocation across additive and multiplicative utility functions of financial and ESG responsibility objectives.

Introduction

Responsible investing, often also referred to as Socially Responsible Investments (SRI) or Ethical Investments, has become an increasingly relevant theme in the investment management industry. Clients and capital owners have increasingly started to consider the *impact* of their investments as part of their investments due diligence decision-making process. To this end, portfolio managers have begun to leverage Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) information in their investment process and portfolio offerings. This has been further strengthened by increased focus on ESG reporting, sustainability and corporate responsibility by large corporations.

Mean-variance optimization (MVO), a cornerstone of Modern Portfolio Theory, is a framework to determine optimal capital allocation in portfolio optimization (Markowitz 1952). In its simplest form, it can be used to optimize expected returns for a desired risk level, or conversely to optimize risk for a desired return. The problem can be reformulated (as we detail in the Background section) to optimize for the Sharpe ratio or approximations thereof, resulting in




Figure 1: Efficient Frontiers for a sample of our evaluation data with and without constraints on portfolio ESG score. The ESG-Efficient Frontier always lies inside the Efficient Frontier (Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski 2021).

the so-called tangency portfolio (highlighted in Figure 1 as Max Sharpe).

Whilst hugely influential, various limitations of the original MVO approach have been previously identified, such as (i) high variability of optimal solutions to small changes in the inputs (expected return distributions) (Hurley and Brimberg 2015), (ii) the use of standard deviation of expected returns as a measure of risk which penalizes returns below and above the expectation, as opposed to a semi-deviation which only accounts for downside risk or the use of higher-order moments (Harvey et al. 2010), (iii) the lack of realistic factors impacting performance for portfolio managers such as transaction costs associated with frequent asset allocation adjustments (Lobo, Fazel, and Boyd 2007). Most of the limitations are a consequence of MVO being formulated as a Quadratic Program (QP), which can easily be solved to certifiable convergence – whereas incorporating modifications such as (ii) or (iii) may result in a general Nonlinear Program (NLP) which increases the difficulty of the optimization significantly and generally lacks optimality guarantees.

Reinforcement Learning (RL) is the machine learning paradigm for sequential decision-making. Recent literature has explored the use of Deep RL for multiple financial applications (Charpentier, Elie, and Remlinger 2021; Hambly, Xu, and Yang 2023; Ozbayoglu, Gudelek, and Sezer 2020).

With regards to portfolio optimization, Ye et al. (2020) propose a state-augmented RL framework for portfolio management which incorporates heterogeneous information for each asset as well as enhanced robustness against financial

market uncertainty. Jiang, Xu, and Liang (2017) propose a Deep RL framework for portfolio optimization which incorporates transaction costs and various neural network topologies, addressing the aforementioned limitation (ii) of MVO. Sood et al. (2023) offer a comparative study between Deep RL and MVO for portfolio allocation. Yu et al. (2019) explore the use of model-based RL with adversarial generative models for dynamic portfolio optimization. More generally, Liu et al. (2020, 2022) provide frameworks and benchmarks for data-driven financial RL, evaluated in automated trading and portfolio management settings.

ESG Portfolio Management. The integration of ESG criteria into financial portfolios has been extensively discussed in the portfolio management literature (Henriksson et al. 2019; Branch, Goldberg, and Hand 2019; Chen et al. 2021). The concept of the ESG-Efficient Frontier was introduced by Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski (2021), who studied the trade-off between financial and ESG performance of portfolios. In line with their results, we illustrate that trade-off for a sample of our evaluation data in Figure 1, which shows the ESG-Efficient Frontier for portfolios constrained to ESG scores at least 25% better than the average ESG score across investable assets. Lastly, we note that, although some authors have studied whether ESG objectives can drive or hurt portfolio returns (Halbritter and Dorfleitner 2015; Ouchen 2022), we consider these questions are beyond the scope of this work, as we are concerned with evaluating the potential for different ways to incorporate ESG objectives in Deep RL for portfolio optimization and its comparison to modified MVO approaches.

In this paper, we study the use of Deep RL and MVO for responsible portfolio optimization with various forms of objectives. Our contributions are as follows:

- We provide simple modifications to MVO formulations to accommodate for ESG objectives using additive utility, as a simplified version of previous work (Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski 2021) and a novel modification to an exact formulation (Cornuejols and Tütüncü 2006).
- We suggest a formulation for Deep RL to incorporate ESG objectives, using either additive or multiplicative utility to incorporate responsibility objectives in the reward function. We also propose a modification of the Differential Sharpe ratio to yield a Differential Sortino ratio.
- We perform a comprehensive evaluation of Deep RL and MVO strategies from the perspective of financial and responsibility objectives on recent evaluation data.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: we first provide relevant Background on MVO and RL, followed by our proposed approaches to Responsible Portfolio Optimization, discussing utility functions, MVO and RL. Then we describe our Experiments, followed by a discussion of Results. Lastly, we provide final remarks and directions for future work in our Conclusion.

Background

In this section we provide an overview of MVO and RL.

Mean-Variance Optimization

Modern Portfolio Theory was originally introduced as a mathematical framework for assembling a portfolio of assets to minimize the level of risk such that the expected returns are above some threshold (Markowitz 1952). Formally, the optimization problem is stated as:

$$\min_w w^T \Sigma w \quad (1)$$

s.t.

$$w^T \mu \geq \mu^* \quad (2)$$

$$w^T \mathbf{1} = 1 \quad (3)$$

$$w_i \geq 0 \quad (4)$$

where $w \in \mathbb{R}^N$ is the vector of weights denoting the distribution of N assets in the portfolio, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^N$ and $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ are beliefs about the future performance of the assets in the portfolio represented as expected mean and covariances respectively, and μ^* is some reference return usually taken as the risk-free return available in the market (e.g. short-term government securities). Constraint 2 enforces returns above a baseline, 3 implies the full portfolio amount has to be invested (without leverage), and 4 implies the portfolio is long-only (i.e. no short-selling of assets is allowed).

Practically, the mean-variance optimization problem is often reformulated to solve for the tangency portfolio, where the objective is to maximize the expected *Sharpe ratio* of the portfolio (excess returns over risk-free rate per unit of increase in risk), which is stated as:

$$\max_w \frac{\mu^T w - r_f}{\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w}} \quad (5)$$

subject to 3 and 4, where r_f is the return of the risk-free asset.

The objective in 5 is not convex, and several approaches have been used to solve it in spite of this, such as the bisection method, the Dinkelbach transform (Dinkelbach 1967), or the Schaible transform (Schaible 1974). However, those are iterative approaches. Alternatively, the following transform yields the optimal solution to 5 directly under mild assumptions as shown by Cornuejols and Tütüncü (2006): let $\hat{\mu}$ be given by $\hat{\mu}_i = \mu_i - r_f$ for each asset i , and let $y = \kappa w$ with $\kappa = \frac{1}{\hat{\mu}^T w}$. Then, $\sqrt{w^T \Sigma w} = \frac{1}{\kappa} \sqrt{y^T \Sigma y}$, and $\frac{1}{\hat{\mu}^T w} \Leftrightarrow \hat{\mu}^T y = 1$ given $\frac{y}{\kappa} = w$. Thus, 5 is equivalent to the quadratic program (QP):

$$\min_y y^T \Sigma y \quad (6)$$

s.t.

$$\hat{\mu}^T y = 1 \quad (7)$$

$$y^T \mathbf{1} = \kappa, \kappa > 0 \quad (8)$$

$$y_i \geq 0 \quad (9)$$

Reinforcement Learning

Reinforcement Learning lies at the intersection of machine learning and optimal control, and is concerned with how an agent ought to take actions in an environment in order to maximize expected future rewards (Sutton and Barto 2018). The sequential decision making problem is often formulated as a Markov Decision Process (MDP), defined as a 4-tuple $\langle \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{T}, \mathcal{R} \rangle$ where \mathcal{S} is the state space, \mathcal{A} is the action space, \mathcal{T} is the set of transition probabilities from states s_t to s_{t+1} when taking action a_t (i.e. the dynamics), and \mathcal{R} is the reward function. A discount factor γ is typically introduced to discount future rewards. We refer to a policy $\pi : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ parametrized by θ as π_θ .

Multiple taxonomies of RL algorithms have been proposed. A possible categorization is that of model-based or model-free algorithms, where model-based approaches solve planning problems by making use of a given model of the MDP or learning one from experience, whereas model-free approaches aim to learn a reactive control policy that directly maps state observations to actions. Alternatively, algorithms may be categorized as value-based and/or policy-based, depending on whether a policy (actor) and/or a value function (critic) is learned. Deep RL leverages neural networks as general function approximators and deep learning techniques for the policy or value function of RL algorithms.

Actor-critic algorithms are a popular approach amongst practitioners as they combine the advantage of policy-based methods and value-based methods: a parametric policy is explicitly learned via some estimate of the policy gradient, which uses advantage estimates that rely on a value function that is learned concurrently in order to reduce variance of the policy gradient estimates. Learning an explicit policy is useful as it can be used at test time directly, without performing any kind of optimization or querying of the gradient of a value function (in continuous state-action spaces) or the maximum of q-value function (in discrete state-action spaces). Policy gradient algorithms (Sutton et al. 1999) can be used for discrete or continuous action spaces, and usually optimize some form of the policy gradient:

$$\nabla_\theta \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T r_t \right] \approx \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=0}^T \Psi_t \nabla_\theta \log \pi_\theta(a_t | s_t) \right] \quad (10)$$

where Ψ_t can be the discounted returns of the trajectory or temporal-difference residual, but typically involves some advantage estimate in actor-critic algorithms (Schulman et al. 2016). A popular policy gradient algorithm is Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) (Schulman et al. 2017), which uses a clipped surrogate objective to (10) providing a lower bound on the unclipped objective. This approach avoids large policy updates which could be detrimental, and usually provides robust performance. For these reasons, we use PPO as our RL algorithm in an actor-critic fashion by learning a value function to produce advantage estimates using Generalized Advantage Estimation (GAE) to address the bias-variance trade-off in advantage estimates (Schulman et al. 2016).

Responsible Portfolio Optimization

We elaborate on different ways in which responsibility objectives can be introduced in portfolio optimization, followed by the problem formulations and methodologies we use to perform portfolio optimization with ESG objectives, namely mean-variance and RL approaches.

Incorporating Responsibility Objectives

Portfolio managers follow various methodologies to responsibly investing. *Integration* approaches explicitly and systematically include ESG issues in the investment decisions, *screening* methods apply filters based on rules as a pre- or post-processing, and *thematic* approaches tend to seek to contribute to a specific environmental or social outcome. Methods that do not incorporate responsibility objectives in the optimization problem are generally suboptimal as they modify inputs or solutions (Verheyden, Eccles, and Feiner 2016; Jin 2022; Qi and Li 2020).

Integration methods are the more principled approach, as they introduce a responsibility term in the objective function. Regardless of the financial objective used for portfolio optimization (e.g. Sharpe, Sortino, Information ratios), incorporating responsibility objectives such as ESG scores in the optimization process involves devising an appropriate utility function to reflect the motivation of an investor. Consider a financial objective $u_{\text{financial}}$ and a responsibility objective $u_{\text{responsible}}$. A general form for a utility function is $\mathcal{U} = f(u_{\text{financial}}, u_{\text{responsible}})$. A simple utility function of the additive form:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{additive}} = u_{\text{financial}} + u_{\text{responsible}} \quad (11)$$

is a possible candidate for representing the objective of a responsible investor. Objectives of this form are studied by Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski (2021), who use a bi-level approach to solve for objectives of this form for ESG-motivated investors. Their results demonstrate a trade-off between ESG and Sharpe ratio of the portfolio, which we partly replicate in Figure 1. We interpret this as the consequence of Pareto-optimal solutions in a bi-objective optimization problem with an additive objective function. These objectives are amenable to traditional mean-variance approaches as the utility function can remain convex. We note how an alternative approach is to introduce the responsibility objective in an multiplicative way, yielding utility functions of the form:

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{multiplicative}} = u_{\text{financial}} \cdot u_{\text{responsible}} \quad (12)$$

which may be desirable as it effectively scales the financial utility attained by a portfolio by a responsibility term. This objective is not convex and thus cannot be optimized for using QP formulations, which are used for mean-variance optimization, further motivating the use of RL for responsible portfolio optimization.

Mean-Variance Optimization with ESG objectives

Our formulation for MVO leverages the transformation proposed by Cornuejols and Tütüncü (2006) described in the

Background section, where the optimization objective is given by 6.

We formulate MVO problems that incorporate ESG terms into the objective function in an additive way in order to preserve the convexity of the objective to be able to use a QP solver. We denote the vector of responsibility scores for the assets in the portfolio as $s \in \mathbb{R}^N$, with different versions of this being $s|_{ESG}, s|_E, s|_S, s|_G$ depending on which responsibility score is considered. In order to account for varying levels of mean responsibility scores through time for assets in the portfolio, we propose to incorporate the objective $u_{\text{responsible}}$ based on the ratio of the score of our portfolio (the one using y weights for asset allocation) and the score of a uniform-allocation portfolio (the one that uses a uniform vector $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$ with entries $u_i = (1/N)\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ for asset allocation). The use of the ratio of the portfolio score over the uniform-allocation score is motivated by Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski (2021). We introduce a scaling coefficient α to control the desired investor sensitivity to the responsibility performance. Thus, our optimization formulation is:

$$\min_y y^T \Sigma y - \alpha \frac{y^T s}{u^T s} \quad (13)$$

subject to 7, 8, 9. Note the negative sign in front of the responsibility score term $\frac{y^T s}{u^T s}$, which is needed within the minimization problem in order to maximize the ratio of responsibility score of the portfolio over the uniform-allocation portfolio. We note how s in 13 can correspond to $s|_{ESG}, s|_E, s|_S, s|_G$ or linear combinations thereof depending on the investor preference. An alternative approach, based on a relaxation of the Sharpe ratio objective which is frequently used is defined as:

$$\max_w \mu^T w - \lambda w^T \Sigma w + \alpha \frac{w^T s}{u^T s} \quad (14)$$

subject to 3 and 4, where λ is a parameter that controls the risk-aversion of the investor and the responsibility objective is the same as in 13. This is a simplified form of the bi-level optimization of Pedersen, Fitzgibbons, and Pomorski (2021).

Following the material discussed in the Background section, it can be seen that the formulation in 13 provides a maximization of a linear combination of the Sharpe ratio and the responsibility score of the portfolio, and 14 a relaxed approximation thereof. The formulations in 13 or 14 may also be used to optimize for a combination of the (approximate) Sortino ratio and responsibility score, if a semicovariance matrix is used instead, instead of the sample covariance matrix Σ , yielding a mean-semivariance optimization. To do so, we follow the approximation proposed by Estrada (2008), which estimates the semicovariance matrix as:

$$\Sigma^- \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^N \min(r_i, r_f) \cdot \min(r_j, r_f) \quad (15)$$

where we use $-$ in the superscript to denote this is the semicovariance for returns below the benchmark (i.e. representing downside risk), r_i, r_j are returns of portfolio assets, and the risk-free return r_f is the benchmark return.

Deep Reinforcement Learning with ESG objectives

In order to train RL policies for portfolio optimization, we formulate MDPs similar to that of Sood et al. (2023), building upon the implementation of Liu et al. (2022). The state space includes the same μ and Σ as those used for mean-variance optimization, as well as the μ values corresponding to a lookback period of T days. Additionally, we include terms based on technical analysis indicators which provide the RL agent with additional features that may be useful nonlinear features of the price dynamics of an asset. The technical indicators used are Simple Moving Average (SMA), Moving Average Convergence Divergence (MACD), Relative Strength Index (RSI), Bollinger Bands, Commodity Channel Index (CCI), and Average Directional Index (ADX), similar to prior work (Liu et al. 2022). Lastly, the state space also includes responsibility scores $s|_{ESG}, s|_E, s|_S, s|_G$. The action space is the set of possible portfolio weights considering constraints 4 and 3.

The definition of the reward functions suitable for financial trading and portfolio optimization applications is not trivial, due to the fact that objectives such as the Sharpe or Sortino ratios are computed using moments estimated from samples over time, whereas RL is formulated as a sequential decision making problem and thus requires reward functions that reflect the sequential (step-by-step) nature of the process, as well as the fact that in RL the returns are additive on (discounted) rewards, whereas the Sharpe or Sortino ratios are not additive functions over time. To account for this, Moody et al. (1998) proposed the use of a *Differential Sharpe ratio*. This approach, which we consider more correct for RL than the naive (non-differential) approach, has been followed by some authors (Moody and Saffell 1998; Sood et al. 2023), but not all previous work (Liu et al. 2022). We use the Differential Sharpe ratio given by:

$$D_t := \frac{\partial S_t}{\partial \eta} = \frac{B_{t-1} \Delta A_t - \frac{1}{2} A_{t-1} \Delta B_t}{(B_{t-1} - A_{t-1}^2)^{3/2}} \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} A_t &= A_{t-1} + \eta \Delta A_t & \Delta A_t &= R_t - A_{t-1} \\ B_t &= B_{t-1} + \eta \Delta B_t & \Delta B_t &= R_t^2 - B_{t-1} \end{aligned}$$

for timescale η , derived from a first-order Taylor expansion in η (Moody et al. 1998). Note that in 16, R_t denotes the financial return of the portfolio (not to be mistaken for the returns in RL terminology, i.e. the discounted sum of rewards in the MDP). Inspired by the approximation proposed by Estrada (2008) for the semicovariance, we define the *Differential Sortino ratio* just as in 16 except that we let $\Delta B_t = \min(R_t, r_f) \cdot \min(R_t, r_f) - B_{t-1}$ where r_f refers to the benchmark return (risk-free return). Our reward functions are thus the Differential Sharpe or Differential Sortino ratios, depending on the objective chosen for $u_{\text{financial}}$. Additionally, we incorporate $u_{\text{responsible}}$ for ESG, E, S, G objectives with additive or multiplicative utilities as chosen.

Experiments

Our experiments use the same environment for both portfolio optimization strategies, henceforth referred to as MVO




Figure 2: Cumulative financial returns for RL, MVO_{Exact} , $MVO_{Relaxed}$ for various utility functions in evaluation period (for non-responsible results, *Add* in legend is redundant, due to zero responsibility objective).

and RL. Note that RL requires a training phase before rolling out the learned policy during evaluation, whereas MVO solves the optimization ad-hoc during evaluation. We refer to 13 as MVO_{Exact} and to 14 as MVO_{Relaxed} . We use data for 29 of the 30 stocks currently present in the Dow Jones Industrial Average as our investable universe (due to ESG data availability issues for one stock). We leverage public daily price data from *Yahoo! Finance*, and the corresponding monthly ESG, E, S, and G scores provided by *Sustainalytics*.

To evaluate financial performance, we report annualized returns for RL, MVO_{Exact} , and MVO_{Relaxed} for $u_{\text{financial}}$ being u_{Sharpe} and u_{Sortino} . To evaluate responsibility performance, we define the performance ratio p_r for each responsibility objective:

$$p_r|_i = \left(\frac{w^T s|_i}{u^T s|_i} - 1 \right) \quad \forall i \in [ESG, E, S, G] \quad (17)$$

which is positive for responsibility performance above the uniform-allocation portfolio and negative for performance below it. Our training data spans from 2014-01-01 to 2019-11-30, and the evaluation data from 2020-01-01 to 2021-11-30. We set $r_f = 0$ during evaluation as this was approximately the rate of return for short-term US government bonds during the evaluation period. For RL, we use $\eta = \frac{1}{252}$ based on trading days per year, and PPO hyperparameters are default from Raffin et al. (2021). For all strategies, we use $\alpha = 0.1$, and for MVO_{Relaxed} we use $\lambda = 10$.

We perform experiments with $u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sharpe}}$ and $u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sortino}}$ for both MVO approaches and for RL policies. Our experiments include a non-responsible setting (i.e. $\mathcal{U} = f(u_{\text{financial}})$), and responsible settings (i.e. $\mathcal{U} = f(u_{\text{financial}}, u_{\text{responsible}})$) with ESG, E, S, and G objectives for $u_{\text{responsible}}$. As previously discussed, for MVO approaches we only incorporate responsibility terms in an additive manner (i.e. $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\text{additive}}$) due to the convexity requirement, whereas for RL we use modified objectives that incorporate responsibility terms additively or multiplicatively (i.e. $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_{\text{multiplicative}}$) to the utility function as there are no convexity requirements for the rewards of an MDP in Deep RL.

We perform training and evaluation using a Linux machine with an 8-core Intel Xeon Platinum CPU and a 16GB Nvidia Tesla T4 GPU. Training for RL policies across all configurations required 6 hours of wall-clock time.

Results

Firstly, we note that the evaluation period spans nearly 2 years from January 2020, and thus is heavily affected by the effects of Covid-19 on financial markets. We purposefully use such a volatile regime to evaluate the performance of RL policies with data far from the training distribution.

We include cumulative financial returns for all strategies in Figure 2. Additionally, we provide annualized financial returns in Table 1 and average responsibility performance (average p_r) in Table 2.

As it can be seen in Figure 2, within RL results, multiplicative utility functions outperform additive utility functions in general for both u_{Sharpe} and u_{Sortino} financial objectives (in all cases except one). This highlights the value of

Table 1: Annualized financial returns for RL, MVO_{Exact} , MVO_{Relaxed} for various utility functions in evaluation period.

Utility Function		RL	MVO_{Exact}	MVO_{Relaxed}	
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sharpe}}$	u_{Sharpe}	11.77 %	19.29 %	-1.2 %	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{ESG}}$	10.76 %	22.77 %	17.32 %	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{ESG}}$	11.37 %	-	-	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{E}}$	12.53 %	1.16 %	-6.86 %	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{E}}$	11.65 %	-	-	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{S}}$	9.9 %	10.72 %	13.42 %	
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sortino}}$	u_{Sortino}	11.45 %	3.87 %	-1.39 %	
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{ESG}}$	11.6 %	10.89 %	25.08 %	
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} \cdot u_{\text{ESG}}$	12.03 %	-	-	
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{E}}$	11.05 %	0.65 %	-2.21 %	
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} \cdot u_{\text{E}}$	11.76 %	-	-	
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{S}}$	10.8 %	3.05 %	5.73 %	
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sharpe}}$	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{G}}$	10.47 %	11.01 %	5.12 %	
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{G}}$	11.62 %	-	-	
	$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sortino}}$	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{G}}$	11.14 %	2.33 %	13.49 %
		$u_{\text{Sortino}} \cdot u_{\text{G}}$	11.56 %	-	-

Table 2: Average $p_r|_i$ for RL, MVO_{Exact} , MVO_{Relaxed} for $i \in [ESG, E, S, G]$ in evaluation period. For non-responsible objectives we report $p_r|_{\text{ESG}}$.

Utility Function		RL	MVO_{Exact}	MVO_{Relaxed}
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sharpe}}$	u_{Sharpe}	-0.13 %	0.69 %	0.04 %
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{ESG}}$	0.9 %	4.29 %	11.69 %
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{ESG}}$	-0.03 %	-	-
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{E}}$	0.54 %	1.61 %	2.34 %
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{E}}$	0.08 %	-	-
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{S}}$	0.7 %	0.53 %	4.7 %
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sortino}}$	u_{Sortino}	-0.16 %	1.07 %	0.5 %
	$u_{\text{financial}} + u_{\text{ESG}}$	0.38 %	5.25 %	13.35 %
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} \cdot u_{\text{ESG}}$	-0.16 %	-	-
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{E}}$	0.1 %	2.14 %	3.02 %
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} \cdot u_{\text{E}}$	0.03 %	-	-
	$u_{\text{Sortino}} + u_{\text{S}}$	0.37 %	0.87 %	5.7 %
$u_{\text{financial}} = u_{\text{Sharpe}}$	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} + u_{\text{G}}$	0.1 %	1.17 %	2.74 %
	$u_{\text{Sharpe}} \cdot u_{\text{G}}$	-0.07 %	-	-




Figure 3: Distribution of $p_r|_{ESG}$ for RL, MVO_{Exact} , $MVO_{Relaxed}$ for ESG-responsible utility functions in evaluation period.

multiplicative utility functions for incorporating responsibility objectives, validating our motivation to study Deep RL policies for responsible portfolio allocation.

With regards to financial performance, annualized financial returns for RL policies are consistent across utility functions evaluated, as financial returns do not vary significantly (from 9.9% to 12.53%), whereas MVO_{Exact} and $MVO_{Relaxed}$ exhibit significantly more variation (from 0.65% to 22.77% and from -6.86% to 25.08% respectively). This increased variability in performance for MVO approaches is similar to the patterns observed by Sood et al. (2023) when comparing Deep RL and MVO for portfolio optimization. In addition, we also note how the results in Table 3 show that RL performs better in terms of maximum drawdown (computed across all utility functions) than MVO_{Exact} and $MVO_{Relaxed}$.

With regards to responsibility performance, average p_r is also not as varied across RL results, with the performance ratio for RL not being far from the benchmark performance of a uniform-allocation portfolio (p_r values range from -0.16% to 0.70%). Alternatively, MVO_{Exact} and $MVO_{Relaxed}$ provide better average responsibility performance, albeit with more variation (p_r values range from 0.53% to 5.25% and from 0.04% to 13.35% respectively). Additionally, as it can be seen in Figure 3, the distribution of daily p_r during the evaluation period is more concentrated for RL strategies compared to MVO_{Exact} and $MVO_{Relaxed}$ for both u_{Sharpe} and $u_{Sortino}$ objectives.

Moreover, when comparing the financial performance across various responsibility objectives shown in Table 1, we highlight an interesting phenomenon observed between ESG objectives and E,S,G objectives: the financial performance of RL is generally above that of MVO approaches for responsibility objectives u_E , u_S , u_G for both u_{Sharpe} and $u_{Sortino}$ financial objectives. However, this trend reverses for responsibility objective u_{ESG} . Whilst we have not been able to identify a unique reason to explain this, we believe this is likely a combination of RL underperforming and MVO overperforming for this case. This could be partly related to the fact that, at least for the provider we have used, ESG scores reported by the provider are not an average of E, S, and G scores reported at any given time. We leave it for further work to study whether this phenomenon occurs for other

Table 3: Maximum drawdown across all utility functions for RL, MVO_{Exact} , $MVO_{Relaxed}$.

	RL	MVO_{Exact}	$MVO_{Relaxed}$
Max Drawdown	-32.63 %	-33.71 %	-43.77 %

ESG data providers, as this might depend on the specific recipes used by a provider to generate their scores. Variability of results depending on data provider has been previously highlighted as a limitation of portfolio optimization involving ESG scores (Henriksson et al. 2019).

Conclusion

In this work we present a novel comparison between Deep RL and MVO strategies for responsible portfolio optimization, using various combinations of financial and ESG objectives. We formulate two modifications to mean-variance approaches which are similar to those proposed in previous work, and additionally we expand previous formulations for portfolio optimization using RL with responsibility objectives which are incorporated into the utility (reward) function in additive or multiplicative ways. We provide comprehensive comparisons between Deep RL and MVO strategies from the perspective of financial and responsibility objectives. Our results show that Deep RL is a competitive alternative to modified MVO approaches for responsible portfolio optimization, whilst exhibiting less variability.

As future work, we would like to incorporate additional elements to the RL formulations such as nonlinear transaction costs, cardinality constraints on the portfolio allocation, conditional value-at-risk, and other factors which are not suitable for mean-variance approaches due to convexity requirements. Evaluating such strategies in benchmarks that incorporate these more realistic limitations could highlight the potential of RL approaches for non-convex responsible portfolio optimization. We hope this work contributes towards the development of robust methodologies for responsible investing and its increased adoption, in order to contribute to positive societal impact of Artificial Intelligence in Finance.

Acknowledgments

Disclaimer. This paper was prepared for informational purposes by the Artificial Intelligence Research group of JP-Morgan Chase & Co. and its affiliates (“JP Morgan”), and is not a product of the Research Department of JP Morgan. JP Morgan makes no representation and warranty whatsoever and disclaims all liability, for the completeness, accuracy or reliability of the information contained herein. This document is not intended as investment research or investment advice, or a recommendation, offer or solicitation for the purchase or sale of any security, financial instrument, financial product or service, or to be used in any way for evaluating the merits of participating in any transaction, and shall not constitute a solicitation under any jurisdiction or to any person, if such solicitation under such jurisdiction or to such person would be unlawful.

References

- Branch, M.; Goldberg, L. R.; and Hand, P. 2019. A guide to ESG portfolio construction. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 45(4): 61–66.
- Charpentier, A.; Elie, R.; and Remlinger, C. 2021. Reinforcement learning in economics and finance. *Computational Economics*, 1–38.
- Chen, L.; Zhang, L.; Huang, J.; Xiao, H.; and Zhou, Z. 2021. Social responsibility portfolio optimization incorporating ESG criteria. *Journal of Management Science and Engineering*, 6(1): 75–85.
- Cornuejols, G.; and Tütüncü, R. 2006. *Optimization methods in finance*, volume 5. Cambridge University Press.
- Dinkelbach, W. 1967. On nonlinear fractional programming. *Management science*, 13(7): 492–498.
- Estrada, J. 2008. Mean-semivariance optimization: A heuristic approach. *Journal of Applied Finance (Formerly Financial Practice and Education)*, 18(1).
- Halbritter, G.; and Dorfleitner, G. 2015. The wages of social responsibility—where are they? A critical review of ESG investing. *Review of Financial Economics*, 26: 25–35.
- Hambly, B.; Xu, R.; and Yang, H. 2023. Recent advances in reinforcement learning in finance. *Mathematical Finance*, 33(3): 437–503.
- Harvey, C. R.; Liechty, J. C.; Liechty, M. W.; and Müller, P. 2010. Portfolio selection with higher moments. *Quantitative Finance*, 10(5): 469–485.
- Henriksson, R.; Livnat, J.; Pfeifer, P.; and Stumpp, M. 2019. Integrating ESG in portfolio construction. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 45(4): 67–81.
- Hurley, W. J.; and Brimberg, J. 2015. A note on the sensitivity of the strategic asset allocation problem. *Operations Research Perspectives*, 2: 133–136.
- Jiang, Z.; Xu, D.; and Liang, J. 2017. A deep reinforcement learning framework for the financial portfolio management problem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1706.10059*.
- Jin, I. 2022. ESG-screening and factor-risk-adjusted performance: The concentration level of screening does matter. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 12(4): 1125–1145.
- Liu, X.-Y.; Xia, Z.; Rui, J.; Gao, J.; Yang, H.; Zhu, M.; Wang, C.; Wang, Z.; and Guo, J. 2022. FinRL-Meta: Market environments and benchmarks for data-driven financial reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35: 1835–1849.
- Liu, X.-Y.; Yang, H.; Chen, Q.; Zhang, R.; Yang, L.; Xiao, B.; and Wang, C. D. 2020. FinRL: A deep reinforcement learning library for automated stock trading in quantitative finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09607*.
- Lobo, M. S.; Fazel, M.; and Boyd, S. 2007. Portfolio optimization with linear and fixed transaction costs. *Annals of Operations Research*, 152: 341–365.
- Markowitz, H. 1952. Portfolio Selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1): 77–91.
- Moody, J.; and Saffell, M. 1998. Reinforcement learning for trading. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 11.
- Moody, J.; Wu, L.; Liao, Y.; and Saffell, M. 1998. Performance functions and reinforcement learning for trading systems and portfolios. *Journal of forecasting*, 17(5-6): 441–470.
- Ouchen, A. 2022. Is the ESG portfolio less turbulent than a market benchmark portfolio? *Risk Management*, 24(1): 1–33.
- Ozbayoglu, A. M.; Gudelek, M. U.; and Sezer, O. B. 2020. Deep learning for financial applications: A survey. *Applied Soft Computing*, 93: 106384.
- Pedersen, L. H.; Fitzgibbons, S.; and Pomorski, L. 2021. Responsible investing: The ESG-efficient frontier. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 142(2): 572–597.
- Qi, Y.; and Li, X. 2020. On imposing ESG constraints of portfolio selection for sustainable investment and comparing the efficient frontiers in the weight space. *Sage Open*, 10(4): 2158244020975070.
- Raffin, A.; Hill, A.; Gleave, A.; Kanervisto, A.; Ernestus, M.; and Dormann, N. 2021. Stable-baselines3: Reliable reinforcement learning implementations. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1): 12348–12355.
- Schaible, S. 1974. Parameter-free convex equivalent and dual programs of fractional programming problems. *Zeitschrift für Operations Research*, 18: 187–196.
- Schulman, J.; Moritz, P.; Levine, S.; Jordan, M.; and Abbeel, P. 2016. High-Dimensional Continuous Control Using Generalized Advantage Estimation. In *Proceedings of the International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*.
- Schulman, J.; Wolski, F.; Dhariwal, P.; Radford, A.; and Klimov, O. 2017. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.06347*.
- Sood, S.; Papatirou, K.; Vaiciulis, M.; and Balch, T. 2023. Deep Reinforcement Learning for Optimal Portfolio Allocation: A Comparative Study with Mean-Variance Optimization.
- Sutton, R. S.; and Barto, A. G. 2018. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. The MIT Press, second edition.

Sutton, R. S.; McAllester, D.; Singh, S.; and Mansour, Y. 1999. Policy Gradient Methods for Reinforcement Learning with Function Approximation. In Solla, S.; Leen, T.; and Müller, K., eds., *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 12. MIT Press.

Verheyden, T.; Eccles, R. G.; and Feiner, A. 2016. ESG for all? The impact of ESG screening on return, risk, and diversification. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, 28(2): 47–55.

Ye, Y.; Pei, H.; Wang, B.; Chen, P.-Y.; Zhu, Y.; Xiao, J.; and Li, B. 2020. Reinforcement-learning based portfolio management with augmented asset movement prediction states. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 34, 1112–1119.

Yu, P.; Lee, J. S.; Kulyatin, I.; Shi, Z.; and Dasgupta, S. 2019. Model-based deep reinforcement learning for dynamic portfolio optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08740*.