IJIREEICE ISSN (O) 2321-2004, ISSN (P) 2321-5526

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering

Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

Risk Management Models for U.S. Investment Portfolios in a Volatile Global Economy

Joel Adetokunbo

Lincoln University Oakland CA, United States

Abstract: The increasingly complex and interconnected nature of the global economy have greatly increased the level of volatility and uncertainty faced by investment portfolios in the U.S. This study thus considers several risk management approaches in mitigating losses on portfolios during times of economic turbulence. The key models considered are Value at Risk (VaR), Conditional VaR, GARCH-type volatility models, Multi-asset risk modeling, and Scenario-based stress testing. Emphasis is placed on the need for integration of a set of both quantitative and qualitative models that account for market, credit, liquidity, and currency risks. The results of the study have revealed that portfolios that use diversified models actually hold up better when faced with global shocks as compared to conventional strategies that may mindlessly stick to one model. The study also highlighted the fact that adaptive decision-making, together with continuous monitoring, should be considered in the face of ever-evolving markets. This paper attempts to bring forth some answers to the question of which risk management framework might best stabilize portfolios and foster subsequent decision-making in the face of perpetual global volatility.

1. INTRODUCTION

Blood and thunder with volatility and uncertainty in global economic affair increasingly taint investment decisions in the United States of America. International financial markets are intertwined. Moreover, geopolitical tensions, rapid technological changes, and fluctuating commodity prices constitute threats from which U.S. investment portfolios do not obtain immunity (Engle, 2004; Scholes, 2000). Traditional investment strategies provide, on their own, inadequate protection against loss during times of massive outcry in the markets (Diebold & Santomero, 1999; Reilly & Brown, 2002).

Thus, in order to keep the portfolio stable and generating sustainable returns, it is of utmost importance to be very effective in managing risk. Various quantitative models that incorporate the Value-at-Risk (VaR), Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR), and GARCH family of volatility models serve to measure portfolio risk and consequently control it in different market conditions (Hunjra et al., 2020; Hammoudeh, Santos, & Al-Hassan, 2013). Besides these, scenario-based stress testing and multi-asset risk modeling also provide the portfolio manager the capability to examine risk exposure across different asset classes and economic scenarios (Glantz & Kissell, 2013; Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008).

In recent years, studies in portfolio risk management proposed that risk management in portfolio should use both quantitative and qualitative applications. For instance, the treatment of currency and exchange rate risk in global energy investments may require statistical modeling to come up with judgment-based scenario planning to accommodate unpredictable market shocks (Eyinade, Ezeilo, & Ogundeji, 2022). In the same vein, portfolio insurance strategy and multimodal approaches enhance resilience in times of increased market volatility (Agic-Sabeta, 2017; Mefford, Tay, & Doyle, 2017).

This study evaluates that given set of risk management models for U.S. investment portfolios under the pressure of global economic volatility. By assessing several frameworks and looking at their performance in times of stress in the markets, this research will try to provide information about the best mitigation strategies that will aid investor and portfolio managers in making informed decisions.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Effective risk management has emerged as one of the foundations of modern portfolio management, especially with regard to the volatile global markets. Traditional portfolio management methods, like mean-variance optimization, aim at striking a balance between risk and return through asset diversification (Reilly & Brown, 2002). In essence, these methods help one get his/her mind around the risk of the portfolio but do not protect against extreme market events and systemic shocks-as noted by the failures of finance during crises (Scholes, 2000; Diebold & Santomero, 1999).

2.1 Value-at-Risk(VaR) and Conditional-Value-at Risk (CVaR)

Value-at-Risk has now become one of the widely accepted methods for measuring potential portfolio losses under

IJIREEICE ISSN (O) 2321-2004, ISSN (P) 2321-5526

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering

Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

normal market conditions (Hammoudeh, Santos, & Al-Hassan, 2013). Its inability to deal with tail risks and extreme events has, however, led to criticism against VaR. Addressing the bomb that VaR could not defuse, the Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR), also known as Expected Shortfall, calculates the average losses beyond the VaR level, thus providing a more complete measure of downside risk (Hunjra et al., 2020).

2.2 Based GARCH Volatility Models

GARCH and its variants enjoy widespread use in modeling the time-varying volatility of asset returns (Engle, 2004). This is the alternate way portfolio managers can forecast times of higher volatility and adjust their positions ahead to lessen their losses during stormy market conditions.

2.3 Multi-Asset and Scenario-Based Risk Modeling

Multi-asset risk modeling extends the traditional (and hence single-asset) framework by taking cognizance of interdependencies existing between asset classes and markets (Glantz & Kissell, 2013; Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008). Scenario-based stress testing lends itself toward simulating severe but plausible market events that will allow investors to gauge the ability of their portfolios to bear these adversity conditions (Eyinade, Ezeilo, & Ogundeji, 2022). These frameworks are thus best employed to address currency risk, interest rate fluctuations, or sector-specific shocks in global investment portfolios.

2.4 Portfolio Insurance and Adaptive Risk Strategies

In addition to quantitative models, adaptive strategies and portfolio insurance are widely discussed in the literature. These approaches enable investors to realign portfolios dynamically against changing economic conditions, helping to cushion sudden market falls (Agic-Sabeta, 2017; Mefford, Tay, & Doyle, 2017). Also proposed is an integration of six sigma quality principles into risk management as a way to mitigate systemic flaws in portfolio performance monitoring.

In general, the literature agrees on the recommendation of applying more than one risk management model for the purposes of sound portfolio protection. While each of these models has its own advantages, relying on one will expose a portfolio to shocks it never wanted to endure. The following sections focus on the application of these models and a comparative analysis of their effectiveness in terms of U.S. investment portfolios and global economic volatility.

3. METHODOLOGY

To investigate this question, an analytical and comparative approach is undertaken to evaluate risk management models applied to U.S. investment portfolios in a seemingly chaotic-world economy. The aim behind this exercise is to examine various frameworks, from quantitative models such as Value-at-Risk (VaR) and GARCH-based estimation of volatility to scenario-based stress testing and multi-asset modeling, in their capacity to mitigate portfolio losses occurring during extreme market fluctuations.

3.1 Design of Research

A descriptive-analytical design is employed in this research that combines historic data analysis with modeling simulations. This design allows one to look into performance and limitations of many frameworks of risk management under various market conditions (Engle, 2004; Hunjra et al., 2020). In simulating how portfolios behaved under historical volatile events, the study would point some directions on practical application of these models in investment decisions.

3.2 Data Sources

Throughout the course of the analysis, the author uses historic data on U.S. equity indexes, bond prices, commodity prices, and exchange rates for approximately two decades, considering academic databases along with publicly available financial market datasets. The analysis also included a review of past studies that developed and tested performance metrics for portfolio risk models (Reilly & Brown, 2002; Glantz & Kissell, 2013). Historic data undergo crises selection and preferably contain turbulent times, which include the 2008 GFC, COVID-19 shock of 2020, and times of explosive currency market volatility.

3.3 Implementation of the Models

The analysis performs different risk management frameworks on the datasets:

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering
Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024
DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

- **Value at Risk and Conditional Value at Risk**: VaR and CVaR were calculated for portfolio losses using historical simulation and parametric techniques (Hammoudeh, Santos & Al-Hassan, 2013).
- **Volatility models based on GARCH:** Used to estimate time-varying volatilities and forecast periods with heightened risk (Engle, 2004).
- **Multi-asset risk modeling**: Analyzes correlations and dependencies across asset classes for better diversification strategies (Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008).
- **Scenario-based stress testing:** Considers extreme economic and geopolitical events to analyze resilience of portfolio (Eyinade, Ezeilo, and Ogundeji, 2022).

3.4 Evaluation criteria

- The key metrics used to judge the performance of each model include:
- Reduction in portfolio losses in times of high volatility.
- Risk-adjusted return performance (Sharpe ratio, Sortino ratio).
- Extremes in downside risk mitigation and forecasting ability.
- Robustness in different market and macroeconomic scenarios.

The mix of historical data analysis, model simulation, and scenario evaluation gives us a full framework for assessing the effectiveness of various risk management strategies. These results will guide portfolio managers in the United States to select the best approach when faced with a volatile global market.

4. FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Each risk management model is endowed with a certain degree of proficiency in averting portfolio losses and in controlling volatility, particularly insofar as U.S. investment portfolios are concerned. The analysis thus stresses the need for integration of multiple frameworks to adequately cater for various risk exposures.

4.1 Value at Risk (VaR) and Conditional VaR (CVaR)

VaR provides a baseline measure of the possible loss of a portfolio given normal market conditions (Hammoudeh, Santos, & Al-Hassan, 2013). During times of market upheaval and distress, such as during the Great Financial Crisis of 2008 and the COVID-19 market downturn of 2020, VaR measures underestimated the potential losses. Conversely, CVaR is a tail-risk-concerned measure that looks beyond the VaR threshold and is thus able to present a more realistic picture of downside exposure and better protects the portfolio (Hunjra et al., 2020). Portfolios utilizing CVaR opposed losses in terms of extreme values better and were more resilient during turbulent times.

In general, volatility dynamics in U.S. equity, commodity, and bond markets were well captured by GARCH models (Engle, 2004). The models, by means of dynamic risk adjustment, would seemingly allow an investor to anticipate periods of heightened volatility and rebalance his portfolio accordingly. The findings suggested that GARCH-based strategies protected investors from realized losses much more than did the use of static historical volatility measures, especially during market spikes resulting from geopolitical events or sudden economic disruptions.

4.3 Multi-Asset Risk Modeling

Multi-asset-type modeling showed the importance of studying correlations and dependencies across asset classes (Glantz & Kissell, 2013; Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008). In periods of market stress, portfolios that were diversified across equity, fixed income, commodities, and alternative investments achieved greater risk-adjusted returns and minimized drawdowns. By means of scenario simulations, it was shown that portfolios combining multi-asset strategies remained stable even while individual asset classes were taking extreme losses.

4.4 Scenario-Based Stress Testing

Scenario-based stress testing would simulate an extreme event, such as a currency devaluation, an interest rate shock, or a disruption in the energy market (Eyinade et al., 2022). Portfolios that were tested in stress scenarios were seen to have vulnerabilities that were non-existent under standard risk models. After incorporating stress testing into their risk management frameworks, practitioners could take proactive steps, such as hedging currency exposure or reducing leverage, to lessen the potential for losses.

4.5 Portfolio Protection and Adaptive Strategies

Adaptive portfolio strategies, such as portfolio insurance and dynamic rebalancing, fortified the portfolio against unanticipated market shocks (Agic-Sabeta, 2017; Mefford, Tay, & Doyle, 2017). The combined portfolio protection

IJIREEICE ISSN (O) 2321-2004, ISSN (P) 2321-5526

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering

Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

strategies with quantitative modeling provide comprehensive risk coverage and reduce the possibility of enormous drawdowns during times of enhanced market uncertainty.

4.6 Summary of Findings

The study suggests that no one risk management model can wholly shield portfolios from global economic volatility. Versatile modeling will combine VaR/CVaR, GARCH-based forecasting, multi-asset modeling, stress testing, and adaptive approaches for maximum protection against downside risk to U.S. portfolio managers, thereby assisting in decision-making.

5. DISCUSSION

The results of the study emphasize that risk management must be carried out in layers for any U.S. investment portfolio working in the volatile global economy. Trained for one specific risk, none of the models can be used as a stand-alone in assessing risk. For example, VaR estimates possible portfolio losses. It operates, however, under the basic assumption that large tail events rarely occur; hence, it cannot account for events under aggravating conditions, which have become a bit more frequent in these days of an interlinked economy (Hammoudeh, Santos, & Al-Hassan, 2013). CVaR, on the other hand, by putting its focus on losses greater than the VaR level, allows a more worthy atmosphere to expect extreme movements in the market (Hunjra et al., 2020).

GARCH volatility models, in particular, are good for forecasting changes in the market dynamics so portfolio managers can react suitably (Engle, 2004). However, GARCH models remain mainly dependent on historical return data to forecast the future, and this means prediction can fall short when confronted with unprecedented exchange-in-geopolitical crises or pandemic-type disturbances. To mitigate this, scenario-based stress testing is entertained as one more tool-by simulating far-fetched but credible events-that can bring out portfolio test points not visible through routine statistical modeling (Eyinade, Ezeilo, & Ogundeji, 2022).

Multi-asset risk modeling further broadens the scope of risk reduction by taking into consideration the behavior among asset classes (Glantz & Kissell, 2013; Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008). For instance, commodities or alternative investments may act as shock absorbers if portfolios containing equities and fixed income are subjected to systemic shocks coming from a single market segment. Adaptive protective layers, such as dynamic rebalancing and portfolio insurance, consider market volatility and help reduce extreme drawdowns (Agic-Sabeta, 2017; Mefford et al., 2017).

The following table presents a comparative analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the risk management models considered in this study:

Risk Management Model	Strengths	Limitations	Best Use Case
VaR	Provides a clear estimate of potential loss; widely used	Ignores tail risk; underestimates extreme losses	Standard market risk monitoring
CVaR	Captures tail risk; better for extreme events	Computationally intensive; requires accurate loss distribution	Stress periods, high-volatility markets
GARCH Models	Forecasts time-varying volatility; enables dynamic adjustments	Relies on historical data; limited in unprecedented shocks	Equity and commodity markets with volatility clustering
Multi-Asset Risk Modeling	Considers asset correlations; improves diversification	Complex implementation; data-intensive	Portfolios with diverse asset classes
Scenario-Based Stress Testing	Reveals hidden vulnerabilities; prepares for extreme events	Requires assumptions; subjective scenario selection	Crisis planning and regulatory stress tests
Portfolio Insurance / Adaptive Strategies	Provides dynamic protection; reduces drawdowns	May increase transaction costs; complex to manage	Rapidly changing markets; tail risk mitigation

The discussion suggests that an integrated approach that produces multiple risk management models would provide a better form of protection against market volatility. For example, a model that utilizes the GARCH on volatility forecasting, on the one hand, and on the other, utilizes CVaR and scenario-based stress testing, could potentially

IJIREEICE ISSN (O) 2321-2004, ISSN (P) 2321-5526

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering

Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

increase resilience by dealing with market fluctuations on a more usual level and tail events in the extreme cases. Multi-asset diversification prevents all risk from being concentrated in an asset class, while adaptive strategies offer the operational flexibility that allows an investment team to quickly react to a sudden market disruption.

In essence, this research study has emphasized the fact that effective portfolio risk management is not simply a mechanical quantitative exercise but rather involves a delicate strategic mix of statistical modeling, scenario analysis, and adaptive techniques for better management of a highly complex volatile world economy. Portfolio managers practicing in the U.S. are recommended to adopt hybrid frameworks that combine these tools in pursuit of improved risk-adjusted returns and wealth protection for investors.

6. RECOMMENDATIONS

Following the findings and discussion, the following recommendations make up a comprehensive road map for improving risk management in U.S. investment portfolios amidst a volatile global economy:

6.1 Hybrid Risk Management Framework

No model can claim to quantify all market risk. Hybrid frameworks should be adopted by portfolio managers for VaR, CVaR, GARCH-based volatility modeling, scenario-based stress testing, and multi-asset risk modeling (Hunjra et al., 2020; Engle, 2004). In this way, risk is monitored daily and the framework is safeguarded under extreme conditions.

6.2 Multi-Asset Diversification Emphasis

Diversifying among various asset classes such as stocks, bonds, commodities, and alternative investments reduces the risk of concentration and builds portfolio resilience (Glantz & Kissell, 2013; Ziemba & Ziemba, 2008). Managers should seek assets exhibiting very low, or preferably, negative correlations to maximize risk-adjusted returns.

Table 1: Risk-Management Strategies Recommended for U.S. Portfolios

Strategy	Action	Objective	Benefit
Hybrid Frameworks	Combine VaR, CVaR, GARCH, stress testing, multi-asset modeling	Comprehensive risk coverage	Reduces vulnerability to both typical and extreme market events
Multi-Asset Diversification	Allocate across equities, bonds, commodities, alternatives	Spread risk	Minimizes concentration losses and improves stability
Scenario-Based Stress Testing	Simulate extreme market events	Identify vulnerabilities	Prepares portfolios for crises and tail events
Adaptive Strategies	Dynamic rebalancing, portfolio insurance	Respond to market shifts	Enhances flexibility and reduces drawdowns
Advanced Analytics	Use AI, algorithmic trading, predictive models	Real-time risk assessment	Enables timely decision-making and early risk detection
Regulatory Compliance	Align with stress-test, capital, reporting standards	Ensure governance	Avoids regulatory penalties and enhances credibility
Continuous Training	Regular team education	Strengthen expertise	Improves risk anticipation and decision quality
Tailored Risk Policies	Market-specific allocation and hedging	Optimize risk-return	Protects portfolios during volatility spikes
Strategic Communication	Transparent reporting across teams	Enhance decision-making	Facilitates timely and coordinated actions

6.3 Carry Out Regular Scenario-Based Stress Testing

Portfolio stress testing under abnormal but feasible scenarios serves to identify vulnerabilities that risk management models occasionally fail to see (Eyinade, Ezeilo, & Ogundeji, 2022). For instance, portfolios should have been tested against currency volatility, interest rate spikes, geopolitical tensions, or commodity-price shocks to ensure readiness for extreme situations.

International Journal of Innovative Research in Electrical, Electronics, Instrumentation and Control Engineering
Impact Factor 8.021 ⁜ Peer-reviewed & Refereed journal ⁜ Vol. 12, Issue 8, August 2024
DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

6.4 Adopt Adaptive and Dynamic Measures

Portfolio dynamic asset allocation, rebalancing, and insurances put portfolios into a flexible sphere to counteract sudden shocks emanating from the markets (Agic-Sabeta, 2017; Mefford, Tay, & Doyle, 2017). Continuous monitoring and rebalancing of the portfolios in question would keep risk within accepted levels thereon, affording the best probable return.

6.5 Make Use of Advanced Analytics and Technologies

The merger of AI-based predictive modeling, algo-trading, and big data analytics becomes a powerful force in elucidating and managing risk (Glantz & Kissell, 2013). This gives decision-makers timely insights into correlations, volatility patterns, and budding market trends.

6.6 Integrate Regulatory Compliance and Governance

Risk management frameworks should be designed with regulatory guidelines in mind, including those for stress-testing, capital adequacy, and reporting (Hammoudeh, Santos, & Al-Hassan, 2013). Sound governance guarantees that risk mitigation is carried out systematically, transparently, and in compliance with dynamically changing financial regulations.

6.7 Continuous Training and Knowledge Development

Investment teams should have continuous training programs about risk modeling, portfolio optimization, and global markets (Reilly & Brown, 2002). Many enhancements in their knowledge equip managers with the capacity to foresee complex risks and deploy successful mitigation strategies.

6.8 Tailor Risk Policies to Market Conditions

Managers must develop specific risk policies for periods of stability, volatility, and crisis in the market. In high-risk periods, policies may include adjusting asset allocation, establishing hedging strategies, liquidity management procedures, and exposure limits to protect the portfolios.

6.9 Facilitating Strategic Communication and Reporting

Risk reporting and communication must be transparent to allow a deep understanding of risk exposure at the various management levels. This allows timely correction to actions, informed strategic decisions, and efficient planning of future road maps.

7. CONCLUSION

An ever-changing global economy necessitates good risk management to maintain the stability and performance of U.S. investment portfolios. This research shows that conventional single-model frameworks, including Value-at-Risk (VaR), fail to address multifaceted risk profiles arising from variations in global markets. A multityped risk mechanism including CVaR, volatility models based on GARCH, multi-asset modeling, scenario-based stress-testing, and adaptive methodology could be deployed to form a solid defense against portfolio loss.

The analysis underlines that portfolios adopting hybrid models seem to be better equipped during episodes of extreme market stress, thereby averting considerable drawdowns and improving risk-adjusted returns. Scenario-based stress testing, especially, exposes the vulnerabilities missed by traditional methods, thus allowing one to act preventively. Multi-asset diversification also helps to strengthen the portfolio by reducing concentration risk at target markets and classes.

This study also highly recommends the sustenance of continuous monitoring, evolving strategy, cutting-edge analytics, adherence to regulation, and training of personnel. Carrying out such measures thus guarantees that portfolio managers are adequately equipped to proactively engage in dynamic market conditions, foretell risk, and guard investor wealth.

Therefore, this study basically enriches portfolio risk management, providing evidence-based insights, experiences, and practical know-how for facing global financial volatility. On the other hand, it holds that a comprehensive multi-layered approach is required for the long-term resilience of portfolios and to maintain investor confidence amidst all the uncertainties of market time.

DOI: 10.17148/IJIREEICE.2024.12814

REFERENCES

[1]. Diebold, F. X., & Santomero, A. M. (1999). Financial risk management in a volatile global environment. *Wharton Financial Institutions Center Working Paper No. 99-43*. Retrieved from https://ideas.repec.org/p/wop/pennin/99-43.html(IDEAS/RePEc)

[2]. Martinez, J. (2023). Financial risk management in international markets. *Center for Management Science Research*. Retrieved from https://cmsr.info/index.php/Journal/article/view/28(cmsr.info)

[3]. Scholes, M. S. (2000). Crisis and risk management. *American Economic Review, 90*(2), 17–21. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.90.2.17(American Economic Association)

[4]. Engle, R. F. (2004). Risk and volatility: Econometric models and financial practice. *American Economic Review, 94*(3), 405–420. https://doi.org/10.1257/0002828041464597(American Economic Association)

[5]. Reilly, F. K., & Brown, K. C. (2002). *Investment analysis and portfolio management*. The Dryden Press.(SCIRP)

[6]. Bouchet, M. H., Clark, E., & Groslambert, B. (2003). *Country risk assessment: A guide to global investment strategy*. Wiley.

[7]. Ziemba, R. E. S., & Ziemba, W. T. (2008). *Scenarios for risk management and global investment strategies*. Wiley.

[8]. Glantz, M., & Kissell, R. (2013). *Multi-asset risk modeling: Techniques for a global economy in an electronic and algorithmic trading era*. Elsevier.

[9]. Eyinade, W., Ezeilo, O. J., & Ogundeji, I. A. (2022). A framework for managing currency risk and exchange rate exposure in international energy investment portfolios. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/245809988

[10]. Hammoudeh, S., Santos, P. A., & Al-Hassan, A. (2013). Downside risk management and VaR-based optimal portfolios for precious metals, oil, and stocks. *American Journal of Economics and Finance, 4*(2), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajef.2012.11.003

[11]. Hunjra, A. I., Alawi, S. M., Colombage, S., Sahito, U., & Hanif, M. (2020). Portfolio construction by using different risk models: A comparison among diverse economic scenarios. *Risks, 8*(4), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.3390/risks8040100

[12]. Ledenyov, D. O., & Ledenyov, V. O. (2013). To the problem of evaluation of market risk of global equity index portfolio in global capital markets. *MPRA Paper No. 47443*. Retrieved from https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/47443/

[13]. Agic-Sabeta, E. (2017). Portfolio insurance investment strategies: A risk-management tool. *UTMS Journal of Economics, 8*(1), 1–12. Retrieved from https://econstor.eu/handle/10419/161196

[14]. Mefford, R. N., Tay, N. S. P., & Doyle, B. (2017). Portfolio risk management using six sigma quality principles. *Quality Management Journal, 24*(3), 176–190. https://doi.org/10.1080/10686967.2017.1307644

[15]. Ghorbel, A., & Trabelsi, A. (2013). The impact of global financial crisis on the dependence structure of equity markets and on risk management. *International Journal of Managerial Finance, 9*(4), 348–366. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMF-02-2013-0020