



November 13, 2019

Best Funds – Greater Risk but Greater Returns

By Robert Zuccaro, CFA

Most investors recognize that stocks provide greater rates of return than bonds. Most also acknowledge that greater risk is attendant to greater returns. This relationship also holds true for the relationship between small stocks and big stocks; small stocks return more than big stocks because risks associated with small stocks are greater.

The biggest battle on risk and return is often fought between the value and growth fund camps. The value camp maintains that value funds are less risky and provide higher rates of return than the growth approach. However, this does not reconcile well with Capital Asset Pricing Theory which specifies a strong correlation between risk and return. The higher the risk, the higher the return - the lower the risk, the lower the return.

For example, the little-known Wiesenberger Mutual Fund Indexes show that during 1958-2004 a \$100 investment in growth funds grew to \$9,380 and the same \$100 investment in value funds grew to a lesser \$7,046. Underscoring further the relationship between risk and return, the riskiest Wiesenberger asset class of aggressive growth funds produced a 1954 ending value of \$14,152.

Until 1998 only five or so mutual funds had achieved a triple-digit return of 100% or more in any year. In 1998, seven funds achieved this milestone and in 1999 an astounding 177 funds broke through the triple-digit threshold. Every one of these funds was a growth fund or sector fund; not a single one was a value fund.

A look at Table 1 showing the Top Ten performing mutual funds during 1987-2001 intimates a high-risk profile for each fund. Risks associated with these funds include high P/E, high beta and low diversification.

Table 1 – Top 10 Mutual Funds during 1987-2001

| Rank | Fund | Annualized Return |
|------|-----------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | Fidelity Select Electronics | 21.2% |
| 2 | Vanguard Health Care | 20.8 |
| 3 | Seligman Communication | 19.7 |
| 4 | Fidelity Select Software | 19.4 |
| 5 | Eaton Vance World Health | 18.8 |
| 6 | Fidelity Select Biotech | 18.6 |
| 7 | Fidelity Select Health Care | 18.4 |
| 8 | FPA Capital | 18.3 |
| 9 | Invesco Health Sciences | 18.1 |
| 10 | Invesco Leisure Inv | 16.2 |
| | S & P 500 Index | 13.7 |

Source: Money Magazine

In looking at the Top 10 Funds nearly 15 years later reveals that Capital Asset Pricing Theory still holds sway as shown in Table 2.

Table 2 – Top 10 Mutual Funds during 2006-2015

| Rank | Fund | Annualized Return |
|------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1 | ProFunds Biotechnology | 15.4% |
| 2 | Rowe Price Health Sciences | 14.6 |
| 3 | Rydex NASDAQ 100 2x Strategy | 13.8 |
| 4 | ProFunds Ultra NASDAQ 100 | 13.7 |
| 5 | Rowe Price Global Technology | 13.3 |
| 6 | Fidelity Select Retailing | 13.2 |
| 7 | Fidelity Select Software | 13.1 |
| 8 | ProFunds Internet Sector | 12.9 |
| 9 | Rowe Price Media & Telecom | 12.7 |

Source: InvestorPlace, 3/10/16

Pedigree.
Process.
Performance.



Once again, high risk health and technology funds were dominant among the top funds. In the most recent tabulation, two very high risk (leveraged) OTC 100 stock index funds made it into the Top 10. Above results are in sync with Capital Asset Pricing Theory.

The best performing funds will almost always be found in the riskier investment categories - not in every year or two, but over the long term. The very best funds will often be concentrated in one industry or sector and will tend to be less diversified than the typical fund. In sum, assuming greater risk can lead to greater rewards in the stock market.

Disclaimer

Golden Eagle Strategies, LLC (Formerly known as Target QR Strategies, LLC) is an investment adviser to private investment funds. This material is for general informational purposes only and does not constitute a solicitation or offer for any investment product or service. Certain information may be derived from third-party sources and is believed to be reliable, but its accuracy and completeness are not guaranteed. Opinions, estimates and projections constitute Golden Eagle Strategies' judgment and are subject to change without notice. Past performance is no guarantee of future results and it should not be assumed that any investment or strategy will be profitable or will equal the performance of any example or illustration. Different strategies will have varying risks, potential for return, and costs which should be understood prior to investing. Investing involves risks and you may incur a profit or a loss. The investments or investment strategies discussed herein may not be suitable for every investor. CFA is a registered trademark owned by CFA Institute. Data shown is through the date listed on article.