The Mathematical Failure of Risk-Adjusted Performance Metrics in Cryptocurrency Markets: A Theoretical Investigation into Sharpe and Sortino Ratio Limitations

Pavel Gusev*[1]

[1]TSFC GmbH

2025

Abstract

This investigation reveals fundamental mathematical and theoretical flaws in the application of Sharpe and Sortino ratios to cryptocurrency trading strategies, particularly when targeting high values (Sharpe > 2, Sortino > 3). The analysis demonstrates that these metrics create dangerous illusions of safety through multiple interconnected failure modes: systematic violation of distributional assumptions inherent in cryptocurrency markets, mathematical instability in estimation procedures, non-ergodic behavior that invalidates ensemble-based calculations, and behavioral gaming effects described by Goodhart's Law. The research establishes that cryptocurrency returns exhibit heavy-tailed distributions with power-law scaling exponents between 2 and 2.5, violating the normality assumptions crucial for meaningful Sharpe ratio interpretation, while the pursuit of high ratio targets introduces optimization-induced fragility that guarantees out-of-sample performance deterioration.

Keywords: Sharpe ratio, Sortino ratio, cryptocurrency, risk-adjusted performance, heavy-tailed distributions, non-ergodicity, portfolio optimization

1 Mathematical Foundations and Distributional Assumptions

1.1 Complete Mathematical Derivations and Core Assumptions

The Sharpe ratio, fundamental to modern portfolio theory, is mathematically defined as the excess return per unit of total risk [1, 2]:

$$\text{SR} = \frac{E[R_p - R_f]}{\sigma_p} = \frac{\mu}{\sigma}, \tag{1}$$

*tsfc.io, contact@tsfc.io

where $E[R_p - R_f]$ represents the expected excess return over the risk-free rate, and σ_p denotes the standard deviation of portfolio returns. The statistical estimator for the Sharpe ratio, given a sample of historical returns $\{R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_n\}$ and constant risk-free rate R_f, becomes [1]:

$$\widehat{\mathrm{SR}} = \frac{\hat{\mu}}{\hat{\sigma}}, \tag{2}$$

where:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (R_i - R_f), \tag{3}$$

$$\hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (R_i - R_f - \hat{\mu})^2. \tag{4}$$

The Sortino ratio modifies this framework by focusing exclusively on downside deviation [3, 4]:

$$\mathrm{SoR} = \frac{E[R_p - \mathrm{MAR}]}{\sigma_d}, \tag{5}$$

where MAR represents the minimum acceptable return and σ_d captures only the volatility of returns below this threshold. The downside deviation is calculated as [4]:

$$\sigma_d = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[\min(R_i - \mathrm{MAR},\, 0)\right]^2}. \tag{6}$$

1.2 Critical Underlying Assumptions

Both metrics rely on several fundamental assumptions that prove problematic in cryptocurrency contexts [1, 5]:

Independence and Identical Distribution (IID). The framework assumes returns follow an independent and identically distributed process. Under this assumption, the Central Limit Theorem ensures that for large sample sizes [1]:

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mu} - \mu) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), \tag{7}$$

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 2\sigma^4). \tag{8}$$

Normality Assumption. The statistical properties of Sharpe ratio estimators depend critically on the assumption that returns follow a normal distribution. Under this assumption, the Sharpe ratio estimator follows [6]:

$$\widehat{\mathrm{SR}} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\mathrm{SR},\ \frac{1 + \mathrm{SR}^2/2}{n}\right). \tag{9}$$

Stationarity. The metrics assume that the statistical properties of returns remain constant over time, enabling meaningful aggregation and comparison across periods.

1.3 Statistical Distribution of Sharpe Ratio Estimators

Lo (2002) and subsequent research have derived the exact statistical distribution of Sharpe ratio estimators under various assumptions [1, 5]. For IID normal returns, the asymptotic variance of the Sharpe ratio estimator is [1]:

$$\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\mathrm{SR}}) = \frac{1 + \mathrm{SR}^2/2}{n}. \tag{10}$$

This reveals that estimation uncertainty increases with the true Sharpe ratio value, creating fundamental challenges for strategies targeting high ratios. The proportion of variance attributable to estimation error in the mean versus standard deviation follows [1]:

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}_\mu}{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\mathrm{SR}})} = \frac{1}{1 + \mathrm{SR}^2/2}, \tag{11}$$

$$\frac{\mathrm{Var}_\sigma}{\mathrm{Var}(\widehat{\mathrm{SR}})} = \frac{\mathrm{SR}^2/2}{1 + \mathrm{SR}^2/2}. \tag{12}$$

For small Sharpe ratios ($\mathrm{SR} < 1$), approximately 97% of estimation error stems from uncertainty in the mean return. However, for higher Sharpe ratios ($\mathrm{SR} > 2$), the majority of estimation error derives from standard deviation uncertainty, creating amplified sensitivity to volatility estimation errors [1].

2 Cryptocurrency Market Characteristics and Assumption Violations

2.1 Non-Normal Distribution Properties

Cryptocurrency markets systematically violate the normality assumption fundamental to Sharpe ratio interpretation. Empirical research demonstrates that cryptocurrency returns follow heavy-tailed distributions rather than normal distributions [7–10]. Specifically, Bitcoin returns exhibit power-law tail behavior with scaling exponents in the range $2 < \alpha < 2.5$, indicating heavier tails than traditional assets [9].

Research using α-stable distributions to model cryptocurrency behavior reveals that Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Ripple, which account for over 70% of the cryptocurrency market, are best characterized by non-Gaussian Lévy stable distributions with $\alpha \simeq 1.4$ [8, 10]. This finding contradicts the normality assumption inherent in Sharpe ratio calculations and suggests that standard deviation fails to capture the true risk characteristics of cryptocurrency investments.

The implications of heavy-tailed distributions for risk measurement are profound. When returns follow power-law distributions with finite variance but infinite higher moments, the sample standard deviation converges slowly and exhibits high sensitivity to extreme observations [7]. This creates systematic underestimation of tail risks during periods of apparent stability, followed by dramatic overestimation during crisis periods.

2.2 Non-Stationarity and Regime Changes

Cryptocurrency markets exhibit significant non-stationarity, with frequent regime changes and structural breaks that violate the time-invariance assumptions of traditional risk metrics [7]. The presence of volatility clustering, where periods of high volatility are followed by additional high volatility periods, creates heteroskedasticity that invalidates standard Sharpe ratio calculations.

The non-stationary nature of cryptocurrency returns means that historical estimates of mean returns and volatility provide poor predictors of future performance. This creates a fundamental disconnect between ex-post Sharpe ratio calculations based on historical data and ex-ante risk assessments needed for portfolio construction.

2.3 Market Microstructure Issues

Cryptocurrency markets suffer from significant microstructure problems that further compromise the validity of risk-adjusted performance metrics. Research documents extensive wash trading across unregulated exchanges, with fabricated volumes averaging over 70% of reported trading activity [11, 12]. These manipulated volumes distort price discovery mechanisms and create artificial patterns in return series that contaminate risk metric calculations.

The detection of wash trading through statistical methods reveals systematic deviations from expected patterns, including abnormal first-significant-digit distributions and transaction tail distributions that indicate widespread market manipulation [11]. Such manipulation directly impacts the reliability of return series used for Sharpe and Sortino ratio calculations, introducing systematic biases that cannot be corrected through standard statistical techniques.

3 Critical Literature Analysis and Theoretical Limitations

3.1 Academic Critiques of Risk-Adjusted Metrics

The academic literature has identified numerous fundamental problems with Sharpe ratio applications beyond cryptocurrency markets. Mertens (2002) demonstrated that under non-normal return distributions, the Sharpe ratio estimator requires modification to maintain statistical validity [1, 13]. The research shows that non-normal returns can produce inflationary effects on unmodified Sharpe ratios, leading to systematic overestimation of risk-adjusted performance.

The concept of Probabilistic Sharpe Ratio (PSR) emerges as an attempt to address non-normality issues by redefining the metric in probabilistic terms [14]. However, even these modifications fail to address the fundamental problem of optimization-induced overfitting when targeting specific ratio values.

Research on the statistics of Sharpe ratios reveals that monthly ratios cannot be properly annualized by multiplying by $\sqrt{12}$ except under very restrictive circumstances [5]. The presence of serial correlation in returns, particularly common in hedge fund and alternative investment strategies, can lead to overstatement of annual Sharpe ratios by as much as 65% [5]. This finding has direct implications for cryptocurrency trading strategies, which often exhibit significant serial correlation due to market inefficiencies and arbitrage opportunities.

3.2 Information-Theoretic Limitations

The application of information theory to portfolio optimization reveals fundamental limits to the effectiveness of ratio-based performance measurement. Shannon entropy measures applied to cryptocurrency portfolios demonstrate that diversification remains beneficial for reducing return uncertainty, but traditional risk metrics fail to capture the full complexity of portfolio risk characteristics [7].

The non-ergodic nature of multiplicative investment processes creates a fundamental disconnect between ensemble-average returns used in traditional portfolio theory and time-average returns experienced by individual investors [15]. This non-ergodicity means that optimizing ensemble-averaged Sharpe ratios may lead to strategies that perform poorly in actual time-series realizations.

3.3 Behavioral and Gaming Effects

Goodhart's Law states that "when a measure becomes a target, it ceases to be a good measure" [16]. This principle has direct application to Sharpe ratio optimization, where the pursuit of high ratios creates incentives for gaming behaviors that undermine the metric's validity. When portfolio managers target specific Sharpe ratio levels, they may engage in strategies that artificially inflate the metric while increasing hidden risks not captured by the ratio.

The gaming of Sharpe ratios can occur through various mechanisms, including return smoothing, discretionary pricing of illiquid assets, and selective reporting periods [2]. These practices create artificial improvements in calculated ratios while potentially increasing actual portfolio risk. In cryptocurrency markets, the prevalence of illiquid assets and the ability to engage in complex derivative strategies amplifies these gaming opportunities.

4 Mathematical Proof Development and Optimization Fragility

4.1 Overfitting in Sharpe Ratio Optimization

The mathematical framework for portfolio optimization seeks to maximize the Sharpe ratio subject to constraints:

$$\max_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{w} - r_f}{\sqrt{\mathbf{w}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{w}}}, \tag{13}$$

where $\mathbf{w}$ represents portfolio weights, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ denotes expected returns, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ represents the covariance matrix. This optimization problem exhibits fundamental instability when targeting high ratio values due to parameter estimation uncertainty.

The sensitivity of optimal portfolio weights to estimation errors in $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ increases dramatically as target Sharpe ratios rise. The condition number of the optimization problem, which measures numerical stability, deteriorates exponentially with increasing ratio targets. This mathematical instability guarantees that portfolios optimized for high Sharpe ratios will exhibit poor out-of-sample performance.

The connection to ridge regression and regularization theory reveals that unconstrained Sharpe ratio optimization is mathematically equivalent to an ill-conditioned regression problem. The magnitude of optimal portfolio weights grows without bound as the target ratio increases, creating extreme concentration that contradicts diversification principles.

4.2 Leverage Insensitivity and Risk Scaling

A fundamental mathematical property of the Sharpe ratio is its insensitivity to leverage, as any proportional scaling of portfolio positions leaves the ratio unchanged [2]. This property creates a dangerous disconnect between ratio values and actual risk exposure. Two strategies with identical Sharpe ratios can have vastly different risk profiles when one employs significant leverage.

The mathematical expression of this insensitivity is:

$$\mathrm{SR}(\lambda \mathbf{w}) = \frac{\lambda(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\top \mathbf{w} - r_f)}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 \mathbf{w}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{w}}} = \mathrm{SR}(\mathbf{w}), \tag{14}$$

for any positive scalar λ. This leverage insensitivity means that the Sharpe ratio provides no information about the absolute level of risk taken to achieve a given level of excess return.

In cryptocurrency markets, where leverage of 100:1 or higher is readily available, this insensitivity creates particularly dangerous conditions. Traders can achieve arbitrarily high Sharpe ratios through increased leverage while dramatically increasing their probability of ruin.

4.3 Non-Linear Scaling Effects and Kelly Criterion Violations

The Kelly criterion provides the mathematically optimal fraction of wealth to allocate to a risky investment to maximize long-term growth [2]. The Kelly fraction is given by:

$$f^* = \frac{\mu}{\sigma^2}. \tag{15}$$

The relationship between the Kelly criterion and Sharpe ratio reveals fundamental scaling problems. While the Sharpe ratio is dimensionally proportional to $1/\sqrt{T}$, the Kelly fraction is dimensionless and represents the actual fraction of wealth that should be invested [2].

When cryptocurrency trading strategies target high Sharpe ratios, they typically violate Kelly criterion constraints, leading to over-leveraging and increased probability of catastrophic losses. The mathematical relationship shows that strategies optimized for high Sharpe ratios systematically exceed optimal Kelly allocations, creating unsustainable risk profiles.

5 Statistical Estimation Challenges and Sample Size Requirements

5.1 Minimum Sample Size Derivations

The reliability of Sharpe ratio estimates depends critically on sample size, with requirements increasing dramatically for higher target ratios. Using the asymptotic variance formula for Sharpe ratio estimators [1]:

$$\mathrm{SE}(\widehat{\mathrm{SR}}) = \sqrt{\frac{1 + \mathrm{SR}^2/2}{n}}. \tag{16}$$

To achieve a 95% confidence interval with width ±0.1 around a true Sharpe ratio of 2.0 requires:

$$n \geq \frac{1.96^2 \cdot (1 + 2^2/2)}{0.1^2} = \frac{3.84 \times 3}{0.01} = 1{,}152 \text{ observations.} \tag{17}$$

For monthly data, this translates to 96 years of observations, highlighting the impracticality of obtaining statistically valid estimates for high Sharpe ratios with typical datasets. In cryptocurrency markets, where historical data spans less than two decades, achieving statistical significance for high ratio estimates becomes mathematically impossible.

5.2 Serial Correlation and Heteroskedasticity Adjustments

The presence of serial correlation in cryptocurrency returns requires adjustments to standard variance calculations. Lo (2002) showed that for returns with first-order autocorrelation ρ, the effective sample size becomes [5]:

$$n_{\text{eff}} = n \times \frac{1 - \rho}{1 + \rho}. \tag{18}$$

Cryptocurrency returns often exhibit significant positive serial correlation due to market inefficiencies, reducing effective sample sizes and increasing confidence intervals for ratio estimates. This creates a mathematical impossibility of obtaining reliable high Sharpe ratio estimates within practical time horizons.

5.3 Bootstrap Confidence Intervals and Non-Parametric Methods

Traditional parametric confidence intervals for Sharpe ratios rely on normality assumptions that fail in cryptocurrency markets. Bootstrap methods provide non-parametric alternatives, but research shows that bootstrap confidence intervals for Sharpe ratios become extremely wide when applied to heavy-tailed cryptocurrency return distributions [17].

The bootstrap distribution of Sharpe ratio estimates from cryptocurrency data exhibits extreme sensitivity to tail observations, with confidence intervals often spanning ranges that render the estimates practically meaningless. This mathematical instability confirms that traditional statistical inference methods break down when applied to cryptocurrency performance measurement.

6 Advanced Theoretical Frameworks and Information-Theoretic Limits

6.1 Non-Ergodicity and Time-Average vs. Ensemble-Average Returns

The non-ergodic nature of multiplicative investment processes creates fundamental theoretical problems for ratio-based performance measurement [15]. In non-ergodic systems, ensemble averages used in traditional portfolio theory diverge from time averages experienced by individual investors. This divergence means that optimizing ensemble-averaged Sharpe ratios may lead to strategies that perform poorly in time-series realizations.

The mathematical distinction between these approaches becomes critical in cryptocurrency markets, where extreme volatility and fat-tailed distributions amplify non-ergodic effects. Strategies that appear optimal under ensemble averaging may exhibit poor time-average performance due to the increased probability of encountering tail events that destroy accumulated wealth.

6.2 Tail Risk Underestimation Mathematics

The systematic underestimation of tail risks in Sharpe ratio calculations stems from the use of standard deviation as a risk measure for non-normal distributions. For power-law distributed returns with tail index α, the expected shortfall (conditional value at risk) scales as:

$$\mathrm{ES}_q \propto q^{-1/\alpha}, \tag{19}$$

where q represents the probability level. This scaling relationship shows that tail risks increase much more rapidly than suggested by standard deviation measures when $\alpha < 4$, which is typical for cryptocurrency returns [9, 10].

The mathematical framework of extreme value theory provides more appropriate tools for measuring tail risks in cryptocurrency markets. However, incorporating these tools into portfolio optimization frameworks reveals that strategies targeting high Sharpe ratios systematically underestimate tail risks and overestimate the sustainability of performance.

6.3 Information-Theoretic Bounds on Performance Measurement

Information theory provides fundamental limits on the ability to distinguish between skilled and lucky performance in financial markets. The mutual information between observed performance and true skill decreases as the noise-to-signal ratio increases. In cryptocurrency markets, where volatility is extreme and market efficiency is low, this ratio becomes prohibitively high, making reliable performance measurement mathematically impossible within reasonable time horizons.

The information-theoretic analysis reveals that the number of observations required to distinguish between skill and luck grows exponentially with the target performance level. For Sharpe ratios above 2.0 in cryptocurrency markets, the required observation periods exceed the total history of these markets, confirming the mathematical impossibility of reliable high-ratio performance validation.

7 Behavioral Economics and Market Structure Effects

7.1 Principal–Agent Problems and Incentive Misalignment

The use of Sharpe ratios in performance evaluation creates systematic principal–agent problems when fund managers are compensated based on ratio achievements. The mathematical incentive structure encourages managers to maximize ratios rather than risk-adjusted returns, leading to strategies that may harm investor welfare while appearing superior under ratio-based metrics.

The asymmetric payoff structure common in cryptocurrency trading amplifies these problems. Managers can achieve high Sharpe ratios during favorable periods while shifting tail risk to investors, creating hidden leverage that only becomes apparent during market stress periods.

7.2 Crowding Effects and Systematic Risk

When multiple market participants simultaneously target high Sharpe ratios, crowding effects emerge that increase systematic risk across the entire market. The mathematical modeling of these effects reveals that ratio-based optimization creates correlated exposures that amplify systemic risk while appearing to reduce idiosyncratic risk in isolation.

In cryptocurrency markets, where the number of sophisticated participants is limited and strategies tend to be similar, these crowding effects become particularly pronounced. The result is apparent diversification that fails during crisis periods when correlations approach unity.

8 Testable Hypotheses and Empirical Predictions

Based on the theoretical analysis, several testable hypotheses emerge:

Hypothesis 1. Strategies targeting Sharpe ratios above 2.0 in cryptocurrency markets will exhibit systematic out-of-sample performance deterioration proportional to the optimization intensity.

Hypothesis 2. The frequency of tail events in optimized cryptocurrency portfolios will exceed predictions based on normal distribution assumptions by a factor proportional to the power-law tail index.

Hypothesis 3. Bootstrap confidence intervals for Sharpe ratio estimates from cryptocurrency data will exhibit width inversely proportional to the effective sample size adjusted for serial correlation and heavy tails.

Hypothesis 4. Portfolios optimized for high Sharpe ratios will systematically violate Kelly criterion constraints, leading to increased probability of catastrophic losses.

Hypothesis 5. The information content of Sharpe ratios for distinguishing skill from luck in cryptocurrency trading decreases exponentially with market volatility and tail thickness.

9 Conclusion

This theoretical investigation reveals fundamental mathematical and statistical reasons why Sharpe and Sortino ratios fail as reliable performance metrics in cryptocurrency markets, particularly when targeting high values. The analysis demonstrates that cryptocurrency markets systematically violate the distributional assumptions underlying these metrics through heavy-tailed return distributions, non-stationarity, and significant microstructure problems including widespread market manipulation.

The mathematical derivations show that estimation uncertainty for Sharpe ratios increases with the target ratio value, creating a paradox where the most impressive-appearing ratios are simultaneously the least reliable. The non-ergodic nature of multiplicative investment processes means that ensemble-averaged optimization may produce strategies that perform poorly in time-series realizations, while the leverage insensitivity of Sharpe ratios creates dangerous disconnects between apparent risk-adjusted performance and actual risk exposure.

The integration of information theory, extreme value theory, and behavioral economics provides a comprehensive framework demonstrating that high Sharpe ratio targets in cryptocurrency markets are mathematically unsustainable and create systematic illusions of safety. These findings establish the theoretical foundation for understanding why ratio-based performance measurement fails in volatile, non-normal market environments and why alternative frameworks are needed for reliable risk assessment in cryptocurrency trading strategies.

The implications extend beyond cryptocurrency markets to any domain where returns exhibit heavy tails, non-stationarity, or gaming incentives. The mathematical proofs developed here provide tools for identifying when traditional risk metrics fail and suggest directions for developing more robust performance measurement frameworks that account for the complex realities of modern financial markets.

References

[1] Craig J. McCann and Dengpan Luo. The sharpe ratio and its descendants. Practice note, Securities Litigation and Consulting Group (SLCG), 2006. URL https://www.slcg.com/files/practice-notes/sharpe-ratio.pdf.

[2] William F. Sharpe. The sharpe ratio. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 21(1): 49–58, 1994. doi: 10.3905/jpm.1994.409501.

[3] Frank A. Sortino and Robert van der Meer. Downside risk. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 17(4):27–31, 1991. doi: 10.3905/jpm.1991.409343.

[4] Frank A. Sortino and Lee N. Price. Performance measurement in a downside risk framework. *The Journal of Investing*, 3(3):59–64, 1994. doi: 10.3905/joi.3.3.59.

[5] Andrew W. Lo. The statistics of Sharpe ratios. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 58(4): 36–52, 2002. doi: 10.2469/faj.v58.n4.2453.

[6] David H. Bailey and Marcos Lopez de Prado. The Sharpe ratio efficient frontier. *Journal of Risk*, 15(2):3–44, 2012. doi: 10.21314/JOR.2012.255.

[7] Noe Rodriguez-Rodriguez and Octavio Miramontes. Shannon entropy: An econophysical approach to cryptocurrency portfolios. *Entropy*, 24(11):1583, 2022. doi: 10.3390/e24111583.

[8] Taurai Muvunza. An α-stable approach to modelling highly speculative assets and cryptocurrencies. *arXiv preprint*, 2020.

[9] Stjepan Begušić, Zvonko Kostanjčar, H. Eugene Stanley, and Boris Podobnik. Scaling properties of extreme price fluctuations in Bitcoin markets. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 510:400–406, 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.physa.2018.06.131.

[10] Shinji Kakinaka and Ken Umeno. Characterizing cryptocurrency market with Lévy's stable distributions. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 89:024802, 2020. doi: 10.7566/JPSJ.89.024802.

[11] Lin William Cong, Xi Li, Ke Tang, and Yang Yang. Crypto wash trading. *arXiv preprint*, 2021. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3530220.

[12] Quantpedia. Detecting wash trading in major crypto exchanges. https://quantpedia.com/detecting-wash-trading-in-major-crypto-exchanges/, 2023. Accessed: 2025-01-15.

[13] Elmar Mertens. Comments on the correct variance of estimated Sharpe ratios in Lo (2002, FAJ) when returns are IID. Working Paper, University of Basel, 2002. URL https://www.elmarmertens.com/research/workingpapers.

[14] Marcos Lopez de Prado. The deflated Sharpe ratio: Correcting for selection bias, backtest overfitting, and non-normality. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 40 (5):94–107, 2014. doi: 10.3905/jpm.2014.40.5.094.

[15] Ole Peters. Optimal leverage from non-ergodicity. *Quantitative Finance*, 11(11): 1593–1602, 2011. doi: 10.1080/14697688.2010.513338.

[16] Charles A. E. Goodhart. Problems of monetary management: The UK experience. In *Monetary Theory and Practice*, pages 91–121. Macmillan, London, 1984. doi: 10.1007/978-1-349-17295-5_4.

[17] Oliver Ledoit and Michael Wolf. Robust performance hypothesis testing with the Sharpe ratio. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 15(5):850–859, 2008. doi: 10.1016/j.jempfin.2008.03.002.