The Triangulation Problem: Portfolio Optimization Across Medtech, Biotech and Digital Health

OCT 22, 2025 • PAID

Disclaimer: The views and opinions expressed in this essay are solely my own and do n reflect the views, opinions, or positions of my employer or any affiliated organizations

Table of contents

Abstract

Portfolio construction in healthcare investing presents unique challenges that d conventional venture capital wisdom. This essay examines the structural tension inherent in balancing medtech, biotech, and digital health assets within a single arguing that superficial diversification often masks correlated risks while obscu the fundamental differences in capital efficiency, regulatory pathways, and value

creation timelines. Through analysis of burn rates, regulatory economics, reimbursement dynamics, and exit multiples, I propose a framework for portfoli optimization that acknowledges the distinct risk-return profiles of each sector w identifying genuine diversification opportunities. The central thesis challenges t assumption that sector allocation alone constitutes meaningful diversification, ii advocating for a more nuanced approach that considers regulatory arbitrage opportunities, capital velocity, and the asymmetric nature of biology risk versus technology risk.

Introduction

There exists a peculiar cognitive dissonance in healthcare venture capital, one th reveals itself most acutely during portfolio construction meetings. An investor w announce, with visible satisfaction, that their fund achieves diversification throu careful balance of medtech, biotech, and digital health investments. This statem typically arrives accompanied by a pie chart showing roughly equal allocation ac these three sectors, presented as evidence of sophisticated risk management. Th problem, of course, is that this tells us almost nothing about the actual risk prof the portfolio. It is rather like announcing that your personal investment portfoli diversified because you own stocks, bonds, and real estate without mentioning tl the stocks are all in one company, the bonds are all junk-rated, and the real estat consists entirely of vacation properties in the same coastal town. The label tells y the category but reveals nothing about the substance.

This essay concerns itself with what lies beneath these labels, with the structura realities that govern returns in healthcare investing, and with the uncomfortable that genuine portfolio optimization requires abandoning some cherished assump about how diversification actually works in this sector. The challenge stems fron fundamental asymmetry: while these three sectors share certain surface characteristics, they operate under radically different physics when it comes to c requirements, regulatory economics, technology maturity, and value creation pathways. Understanding these differences and their implications for portfolio

construction represents not merely an academic exercise but a practical necessit
generating returns in an increasingly competitive landscape.

The Illusion of Diversification

Consider two hypothetical portfolios, each containing ten investments split ever between medtech, biotech, and digital health. Portfolio A contains three biotech companies developing novel oncology therapeutics, one cell therapy platform, th Class III medical devices requiring premarket approval, one Class II device with ten-K clearance pathway, and three digital health companies building clinical de support tools requiring FDA review. Portfolio B contains three biotech compani spanning rare disease, central nervous system disorders, and metabolic conditio one gene therapy platform, two Class III devices in cardiovascular and neurolog Class II device in the exemption category, and three digital health companies bu non-clinical tools outside FDA jurisdiction. On paper, both portfolios show ider sector allocation. In reality, their risk profiles differ dramatically.

The distinction lies not in the sectors themselves but in the regulatory capital required, the correlation of technical risks, and the diversification of commercia pathways. Portfolio A concentrates regulatory risk in the most expensive and tin consuming approval pathways across all three sectors. The oncology therapeutic likely face similar Phase Three trial challenges, comparable endpoint difficultie correlated regulatory timelines. The Class III devices require the same premark approval process with its attendant clinical trial demands and regulatory uncert The digital health tools requiring FDA review face the agency's continued ambi about software regulation. Portfolio B, by contrast, distributes regulatory risk a different agencies, different divisions within FDA, different clinical requiremen and different timelines. The rare disease therapeutic might achieve accelerated approval pathways unavailable to the CNS drug. The gene therapy platform ope in a regulatory environment distinct from small molecule development. The Cla device in the exemption category bypasses clinical trials entirely. The non-clinic digital health tools face no FDA review whatsoever.

This example illustrates a broader principle: sector labels provide poor proxies f underlying risks that actually determine returns. What matters is not whether a investment qualifies as medtech or biotech or digital health but rather the speci constellation of regulatory, technical, commercial, and capital risks it embodies. digital health company requiring FDA approval for an algorithm that replaces physician judgment has more in common with a Class III medical device than wi consumer wellness app, despite both being categorized as digital health. A biote company developing a reformulation of an existing drug with decades of safety c faces fundamentally different risks than one pursuing a novel mechanism of acti despite both being biotechs. Portfolio optimization requires looking through th labels to the substance beneath.

The correlation problem extends beyond regulatory pathways to commercial dependencies. Digital health companies in the chronic disease management spac often depend on the same handful of commercial payers for reimbursement, face similar challenges proving medical cost offsets, and compete for attention from same chief medical officers at health plans. A portfolio concentrated in diabetes hypertension, and heart failure management tools might appear diversified by condition but faces highly correlated commercial risks. Similarly, medtech devic the surgical space often depend on the same hospital capital equipment budgets similar utilization pressures from value-based care, and compete in environmen where surgeon preference drives adoption. A portfolio spanning orthopedics, ca surgery, and neurosurgery might seem diverse but encounters correlated headwi from hospital consolidation and budget constraints.

Capital Efficiency and the Burning Question

The mathematics of venture returns creates an immediate tension in portfolios spanning biotech, medtech, and digital health. These sectors differ by order of magnitude in their capital requirements and corresponding exit expectations. A typical biotech investment requires seventy-five to one hundred fifty million dol reach meaningful value inflection points, usually Phase Two data or beyond. Me

devices generally need twenty-five to seventy-five million to achieve FDA clearar
approval and initial commercialization. Digital health companies can reach prod
market fit and early scale on five to twenty-five million. These capital requireme
differences create profound implications for portfolio construction.

From a pure return maximization perspective, capital efficiency favors digital he
dramatically. A fund investing five million for twenty percent of a digital health
company that exits at five hundred million returns forty-five million on that
investment. The same five million into twenty percent of a biotech company requ
one hundred million total to exit needs a billion-dollar exit to return the same fo
five million. The biotech investment faces ten times the execution risk, requires
times the follow-on capital, and needs double the exit value to generate equivale
returns. This analysis explains why pure financial optimization would suggest
avoiding biotech entirely in favor of capital-efficient digital health investments.

Yet this reasoning contains a fatal flaw: it ignores the competitive dynamics and
market saturation effects that compress returns when too much capital chases ca
efficient opportunities. Digital health has experienced precisely this dynamic ov
past five years. The sector attracted enormous capital inflows precisely because o
apparent capital efficiency, leading to overcrowding, multiple compression, and
deteriorating returns. Companies that might have exited at eight to twelve times
revenue in twenty eighteen now struggle to achieve four to six times revenue in
current markets. The efficient market hypothesis suggests that excess returns fr
capital efficiency should erode as capital flows to exploit them, and we observe e
this pattern in digital health.

Biotech presents the opposite dynamic. The sector's capital intensity creates nat
barriers to entry that limit competition and preserve returns for those willing to
accept the risk. A venture fund needs sufficient scale to write twenty to forty mi
dollar checks, sufficient reserves to support hundred-million-dollar financings
through multiple rounds, and sufficient risk tolerance to accept that most invest
will fail completely. These requirements exclude many investors and create struc
scarcity of capital relative to opportunity. The result is that successful biotech

investments can generate extraordinary returns precisely because so few investo
or will play the game.

This creates a portfolio optimization puzzle. Pure capital efficiency favors digita
health but leads to overcrowding and multiple compression. Pure return potenti
favors biotech but requires massive capital commitment and high failure rates. T
solution lies not in simple sector allocation but in strategic position-sizing basec
capital availability, risk tolerance, and market dynamics. A fund with five hundr
million under management faces different optimal allocation than a fund with o
hundred million or two billion. The five-hundred-million fund might allocate th
forty percent to biotech because it has sufficient scale to make meaningful
investments while maintaining diversification, forty to fifty percent to medtech a
middle ground, and twenty to thirty percent to digital health for capital efficien
faster return of capital. The one-hundred-million fund likely cannot support bic
investments at meaningful scale and might allocate seventy percent to digital he
and thirty percent to medtech. The two-billion fund might increase biotech allo
to fifty percent or more because it has sufficient capital to build genuinely diver
biotech portfolios while still maintaining positions in other sectors.

Regulatory Arbitrage as Alpha

The regulatory complexity of healthcare creates opportunities for what might be
termed regulatory arbitrage: the strategic exploitation of differences in approval
pathways, evidentiary requirements, and review timelines to generate asymmetri
returns. These opportunities exist at the boundaries between sectors and within
sectors where regulatory classification remains ambiguous or evolving. Identifyi
exploiting regulatory arbitrage represents a significant source of alpha in health
portfolio construction.

Consider the boundary between medtech devices and digital therapeutics. A sof
application that guides physical therapy exercises might qualify as a Class I devi
exempt from premarket review, a Class II device requiring five-ten-K clearance,
Class III device requiring premarket approval, depending on its specific claims a

intended use. The company that structures its regulatory strategy to achieve Cla Class II classification while maintaining therapeutic efficacy gains enormous competitive advantage. It reaches market faster, with less capital, and with lowe execution risk than competitors pursuing the same clinical problem through Cla devices or pharmaceutical approaches. For investors, identifying companies witl credible regulatory arbitrage strategies provides asymmetric return opportuniti

Similarly, the boundary between clinical decision support and diagnostic device creates arbitrage opportunities. The FDA has struggled for years to define consi standards for software that analyzes patient data and provides clinical recommendations. Some products clearly qualify as devices requiring premarket review, others clearly fall outside device definition, and a substantial gray area e in between. Companies operating in this gray area with sophisticated regulatory counsel can sometimes achieve market entry without FDA review, then establish clinical evidence and commercial traction before competitors navigating traditic device pathways even complete trials. The first-mover advantage in these situati often proves decisive.

The evolving regulatory landscape for digital health creates particularly rich arb opportunities. The FDA has attempted to provide clarity through guidance docu on clinical decision support, mobile medical applications, and software as a med device, but significant ambiguity remains. This ambiguity creates opportunity fc sophisticated companies to structure their products and claims to minimize regulatory burden while maximizing clinical impact. The key lies in understandi not just current regulations but the trajectory of regulatory evolution and the in dynamics of FDA review divisions.

From a portfolio perspective, regulatory arbitrage opportunities deserve weighti beyond their sector allocation because they offer genuinely differentiated return profiles. These investments combine the fast timelines and capital efficiency of c health with the defensibility and pricing power of regulated medical products. T exploit temporary market inefficiencies created by regulatory uncertainty and fi mover advantages in categories where standards remain fluid. A portfolio might allocate fifteen to twenty percent specifically to regulatory arbitrage opportuniti across sectors rather than treating them as simple sector bets.

The Reimbursement Riddle

Reimbursement dynamics present perhaps the most underappreciated dimensio healthcare portfolio optimization. The ability to secure sustainable payment at attractive margins determines commercial success across sectors, yet reimburse risk receives far less attention than regulatory or technical risk in most portfolic construction frameworks. This represents a significant analytical failure becaus reimbursement correlations often exceed regulatory or technical correlations, ar reimbursement failures frequently destroy value in companies that successfully navigate all other risks.

The fundamental reimbursement divide in healthcare separates products with established payment pathways from those requiring creation of new payment categories. Pharmaceutical products benefit from existing pharmacy benefits wi transparent formulary processes. Most medical devices fit into established proce codes with defined payment rates. Digital health tools, particularly those outsid traditional care delivery, often lack any reimbursement pathway whatsoever. Thi divide creates dramatically different risk profiles and capital requirements.

Products with established reimbursement pathways face primarily utilization ar pricing challenges. A new cancer drug must secure formulary access and compet price against existing therapies, but the fundamental payment mechanism exists new cardiac device must demonstrate sufficient clinical value to justify its cost compared to alternatives, but hospitals receive payment for the procedure. Thes challenges are meaningful but bounded. The company knows what evidence pay require, what economic analyses to conduct, and what decision-makers to influe Failure typically means lower pricing or slower adoption rather than complete commercial collapse.

Products requiring new reimbursement pathways face existential uncertainty. D therapeutics for behavioral health, remote monitoring programs for chronic dis algorithms that replace diagnostic tests – these innovations often lack any clear payment mechanism. Even after proving clinical efficacy and obtaining regulato clearance, companies must convince payers to create new benefit categories, hea systems to allocate budgets outside traditional channels, or patients to pay out-c pocket. This process can take five to ten years and frequently fails entirely, rega of clinical merit. The graveyard of digital health companies contains many with clinical evidence and FDA clearance that never solved the reimbursement riddle

From a portfolio optimization perspective, reimbursement pathway diversity pr more meaningful diversification than sector diversity. A portfolio concentrated i products requiring new payment categories faces highly correlated commercial r regardless of sector distribution. Even if investments span biotech, medtech, an digital health, if all require creating new reimbursement mechanisms, they all fa similar hurdles with the same key decision-makers at major payers. Conversely, portfolio concentrated in one sector but distributed across established payment pathways, emerging payment models, and innovative reimbursement strategies achieves more genuine diversification.

The optimal strategy typically involves a barbell approach: anchor the portfolio investments in established reimbursement pathways that provide baseline retur potential, then take targeted positions in reimbursement innovation where succ creates massive first-mover advantages. The anchor investments might represen to seventy percent of capital in therapeutics with clear pharmacy benefit covera devices with established procedural codes, or digital tools with proven payer contracts. The innovation positions might represent twenty to thirty percent in therapeutics establishing new benefit categories, novel value-based contracting models, or direct-to-patient offerings that bypass payers entirely. This barbell provides downside protection from the anchor while maintaining upside exposu reimbursement transformation.

Technology Risk vs. Biology Risk

The qualitative difference between technology risk and biology risk creates fundamental asymmetries in portfolio construction that pure sector allocation fa capture. These two risk categories differ not just in magnitude but in kind, with different failure modes, different risk mitigation strategies, and different implic for follow-on investment decisions.

Technology risk refers to uncertainty about whether a product can be built as envisioned, whether it will perform as intended, and whether it can scale reliabl This risk dominates digital health investments and represents a significant comp of medtech device development. Biology risk refers to uncertainty about how hu biological systems will respond to intervention, whether a therapy will demonstr efficacy in patients, and whether it will prove safe in diverse populations. This r dominates biotech investments and appears in medtech products with significan biological interaction.

The critical distinction lies in risk resolution dynamics. Technology risk typicall resolves progressively through iterative development, testing, and refinement. A digital health algorithm that performs poorly can be improved through addition training data, feature engineering, or architectural changes. A medical device wi reliability issues can be redesigned with different materials or manufacturing processes. Each iteration provides information that guides the next, creating a relatively smooth path from prototype to product. Failure modes tend to be incremental rather than binary – the product works somewhat but needs improv rather than failing completely.

Biology risk resolves discontinuously through binary clinical events. A Phase Tv trial either demonstrates efficacy or it does not. A device trial either shows safet reveals unacceptable adverse events. There is often limited opportunity for itera because each trial requires years and tens of millions of dollars. The informatior gained from failure frequently provides little guidance for success – the drug di work, but why remains unclear, and trying a different dose or patient populatior requires starting over. Failure modes tend to be absolute rather than incrementa

These different risk resolution dynamics create profoundly different investment dynamics. Technology risk investments can be staged with relatively small capit increments as technical milestones reduce uncertainty. An investor might put in hundred thousand at concept, two million after proof of concept, five million aft initial product development, and ten million after early commercial traction. Ea stage provides information that informs the next investment decision with relati short time horizons between decisions. The investor maintains optionality and c losses incrementally if progress proves insufficient.

Biology risk investments typically require much larger capital commitments ove longer periods with fewer decision points. An investor might put in ten million Series A to fund preclinical development and Phase One, knowing that the next meaningful inflection point comes three to four years later after Phase Two resu The long duration between investment and information creates pressure to com follow-on capital even when intermediate signals prove ambiguous. Cutting loss means accepting total capital loss rather than salvaging some return from partia successful technology.

From a portfolio optimization perspective, this asymmetry suggests concentratir technology risk investments and diversifying biology risk investments. The progressive resolution of technology risk means that a small number of investme can be monitored closely and supported through multiple iterations, with capita flowing to those showing progress. The binary nature of biology risk means that larger number of investments is necessary to overcome the statistical reality tha will fail completely. A portfolio might reasonably contain five to seven core digi health investments receiving intensive support and iteration versus fifteen to tw biotech investments designed as a diversified portfolio of binary bets.

Exit Dynamics and the Multiple Proble

Exit dynamics differ systematically across healthcare sectors in ways that profou affect portfolio optimization but receive insufficient attention in most allocatior frameworks. These differences manifest in multiple dimensions: exit valuations, timing, exit probability, and acquirer motivations. Understanding these patterns their implications represents essential knowledge for constructing portfolios wi optimal return potential.

Biotech exits predominantly occur through acquisition by large pharmaceutical companies seeking to augment their pipelines. These acquirers pay for probabili weighted future revenue, discounted back to present value. The mathematics typ involves projecting peak sales, applying a probability adjustment based on development stage, and paying roughly ten to twenty percent of probability-weig peak sales for late-stage assets or three to five percent for early-stage assets. Thi creates relatively predictable valuation ranges but also means that biotech exits cluster around major value inflection points: positive Phase Two data, Phase Th initiation, Phase Three results, or regulatory approval. Companies between thes milestones often struggle to exit at attractive valuations because acquirers disco for the remaining execution risk.

Medtech exits occur through both strategic acquisition and public markets, wit strategic acquisition remaining more common for earlier-stage companies. Strat acquirers typically pay for revenue at multiples ranging from three to eight time depending on growth rate, margin profile, competitive position, and strategic fit revenue-based valuation creates different dynamics than biotech's probability-weighted future value. Medtech companies can exit at attractive valuations befo reaching profitability as long as they demonstrate strong revenue growth and cle path to scale. However, revenue-based multiples also create a ceiling effect wher companies must reach substantial revenue scale to generate venture-scale exits. hundred million exit requires one hundred million in revenue at five times, whic represents a significant commercialization challenge.

Digital health exits demonstrate the most variability and the most dramatic mul compression over time. During the peak digital health boom of twenty twenty ar twenty twenty-one, some companies achieved ten to fifteen times revenue multip based on growth expectations and total addressable market narratives. Current multiples have compressed to three to six times revenue for most companies, wit only exceptional performers achieving higher multiples. This compression reflec market maturation, increased competition, and growing skepticism about digita health's ability to transform healthcare economics. Digital health exits increasin require demonstrated profitability or clear path to profitability, shifting the sect closer to traditional software valuation dynamics.

These different exit patterns create portfolio construction implications. Biotech investments require longer hold periods but can generate home-run returns fror single successful assets. Medtech investments typically generate solid but not exceptional returns with moderate hold periods. Digital health investments can capital quickly but face compressed multiples and increasingly require profitabi The optimal portfolio construction depends critically on fund lifecycle and retu requirements.

A fund in its early years with long investment horizon might overweight biotech relative to conventional allocation because it has time for clinical development a can capture multiple expansion as assets progress. A fund approaching the end c lifecycle might overweight digital health because it needs near-term liquidity an capital return. A fund targeting specific return profiles might construct portfoli backward from required exit values: if the fund needs three hundred million exi generate target returns, biotech investments make sense because they can achiev such exits from single assets, while digital health investments struggle to reach t scale without exceptional revenue achievement.

Construction Principles for the Modern Health Portfolio

Synthesizing these various dimensions into actionable portfolio construction principles requires moving beyond simple sector allocation to a more nuanced framework that explicitly addresses the underlying risk factors, capital dynamic return drivers. What follows represents not a prescriptive formula but rather a s principles that can guide portfolio optimization based on fund-specific constrai and objectives.

First, abandon sector allocation as a primary organizing principle. Sector labels provide weak signals about actual risk factors and return drivers. Instead, constr portfolios along dimensions that matter: regulatory capital requirements, reimbursement pathways, technology versus biology risk, exit valuation dynamic capital efficiency. A portfolio might reasonably contain sixty percent in establish reimbursement pathways regardless of sector, twenty percent in regulatory arbit opportunities across sectors, and twenty percent in reimbursement innovation. T allocation addresses actual risk factors rather than arbitrary sector categories.

Second, scale position sizes to capital requirements and risk profiles. Biotech investments with hundred-million-dollar capital requirements deserve different position sizing than digital health investments with twenty-million-dollar requirements. A fund might maintain twenty to twenty-five percent ownership i biotech companies with initial ten to fifteen million dollar investments and hund million total reserves, versus thirty to thirty-five percent ownership in digital he companies with initial three to five million dollar investments and twenty millio total reserves. This approach maintains consistent ownership economics while acknowledging different capital intensities.

Third, construct biotech portfolios as diversified pools of binary bets while maintaining concentrated positions in technology risk investments. Biotech's bi risk resolution and high failure rates require accepting that most investments w completely, making diversification essential. Fifteen to twenty biotech positions capture a winner even with eighty to ninety percent failure rates. Technology ris investments can be managed more actively with smaller portfolios because risk resolves progressively and capital can flow to winners. Five to seven core digital positions receiving intensive support often outperform broader diversification.

Fourth, explicitly allocate capital to regulatory arbitrage opportunities across se These opportunities provide genuinely asymmetric return profiles and deserve specific allocation rather than being subsumed into sector buckets. Ten to twent percent of portfolio explicitly targeting regulatory arbitrage can generate outsiz returns while providing true diversification from traditional sector investments.

Fifth, implement a barbell approach to reimbursement risk. Anchor the portfoli sixty to seventy percent in established reimbursement pathways that provide downside protection and steady returns, then take concentrated positions in reimbursement innovation where success creates first-mover advantages and ma returns. This barbell maintains portfolio stability while preserving upside expos

Sixth, stage capital deployment based on risk resolution dynamics. Technology r investments can be staged in small increments as technical milestones reduce uncertainty, maintaining optionality and minimizing capital at risk. Biology risk investments require larger upfront commitment to reach meaningful inflection p but should be structured to preserve capital for multiple shots on goal across a diversified portfolio.

Seventh, construct portfolios backward from exit requirements. Explicitly mode exit values are necessary to generate target returns, then allocate capital to secto investment profiles capable of reaching those values. If the portfolio requires th hundred to five hundred million exits, ensure sufficient allocation to biotech and later-stage medtech where such exits occur regularly. If the portfolio can succee fifty to one hundred fifty million exits, digital health and early-stage medtech be viable focus areas.

Eighth, adjust sector allocation based on fund lifecycle. Early-stage funds with l time horizons can overweight biotech and capture value creation through clinica development. Later-stage funds need near-term liquidity and should overweight digital health and commercial-stage medtech. Mid-lifecycle funds might mainta balanced exposure to manage both near-term return of capital and long-term ret on capital.

Ninth, recognize that optimal portfolio construction changes with market condi The dramatic multiple compression in digital health creates current opportuniti investors willing to accept lower exit multiples in exchange for capital efficiency faster liquidity. The sustained strength in biotech exits despite broader market volatility suggests maintaining or increasing biotech allocation. Portfolio optimi

represents a dynamic process requiring continuous adjustment to market condit
rather than static sector allocation.

Tenth, measure portfolio diversification along risk factor dimensions rather thar sector allocation. Evaluate whether investments face correlated regulatory risks, correlated reimbursement challenges, correlated commercial dependencies, and correlated technical uncertainties. True diversification means investments fail fo different reasons rather than investments residing in different sectors.

The ultimate goal of portfolio optimization in healthcare investing is not to achi some arbitrary sector balance but to construct a portfolio that maximizes risk-adjusted returns given specific fund constraints and market conditions. This req looking through sector labels to understand fundamental risk factors, explicitly addressing capital requirements and exit dynamics, and maintaining flexibility t adjust allocations as markets evolve. The triangulation problem of balancing me biotech, and digital health has no single solution but rather requires continuous optimization based on changing conditions and fund-specific circumstances. Th investors who succeed will be those who abandon simple sector allocation in fav more sophisticated frameworks that address the actual drivers of returns in healthcare investing.

Discussion about this post