Project Report

Jesse Lu

August 14, 2013

Contents

1 Main result: Quasi pareto-optimal portfolios

The main result of this project is the production of eight portfolio groups with reduced turnover. What makes each portfolio group unique is the number of signals used to generate the portfolios in each group; for this project this was varied from 1 to 128 signals. Furthermore, within a portfolio group, each portfolio is distinguished by its emphasis on maximizing either the annualized return, or information ratio. These results are presented in figure 1, as well as tables 1-3.

Surprisingly, these portfolios can exhibit large returns (up to 7.1) and large information ratios (up to 10.2) while keeping the turnover well below 0.2 in all cases. The method used to generate these portfolios is presented in the remainder of this report.



Figure 1: The main result of the project: quasi pareto-optimal portfolios with varying numbers of signals, where even small signal numbers can produce large returns with large information ratios. Here, each point represents a portfolio, while lines connect portfolios generated by models of the same number of signals. The variety of portfolios for each signal number group is due to differentiated weighting between maximizing either the annualized return or the information ratio.

n_{signals}	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128
	4.519	4.548	4.591	4.819	5.501	6.271	6.848	7.182
	4.075	3.574	3.500	3.922	4.876	5.767	6.406	6.768
	1.187	2.290	2.497	3.138	4.339	5.263	5.909	6.275
	1.241	1.824	2.127	2.869	4.086	5.020	5.654	6.011
	1.252	1.749	2.051	2.794	4.018	4.952	5.583	5.939

Table 1: Annualized returns of portfolios in figure 1.

n_{signals}	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128
	0.348	0.375	0.425	0.513	0.641	0.739	0.801	0.837
	0.533	0.661	0.848	1.149	1.500	1.864	2.054	2.161
	0.421	0.679	1.083	1.691	2.664	3.968	4.650	4.965
	0.416	0.655	0.999	1.759	3.466	6.304	8.300	8.933
	0.413	0.654	0.980	1.756	3.656	6.972	9.504	10.200

Table 2: Information ratios of portfolios in figure 1.

n_{signals}	1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128
	0.163	0.159	0.151	0.142	0.148	0.163	0.175	0.183
	0.131	0.123	0.116	0.114	0.130	0.153	0.170	0.179
	0.061	0.084	0.082	0.095	0.122	0.149	0.168	0.178
	0.058	0.073	0.071	0.090	0.120	0.148	0.168	0.177
	0.058	0.071	0.069	0.089	0.119	0.148	0.167	0.177

Table 3: Turnover of portfolios in figure 1.

2 Portfolio-creation strategy

We use the following two-part strategy for portfolio creation:

1. Obtain a near-optimal forward-biased portfolio, which is then used to
2. compute a reduced-order, backward-biased model which in turn is used to obtain a legitimate backward-biased portfolio.

More specifically, given a forward-biased portfolio X_{FB}, we compute a reduced q-order model M_q based on backward-biased data Y, such that

$$M_q Y \approx X_{\text{FB}}. \tag{1}$$

A legitimate, backward-biased portfolio X is obtained as

$$X = M_q Y. \tag{2}$$

For the results presented in this report, Y was simply the percent returns on stocks for the previous 5 days.

2.1 Testing forward-bias of of portfolios

Unfortunately, the forward-bias of portfolios can not yet be tested empirically. This is because the computation of a near-optimal forward-biased portfolio in the first step is quite computationally intensive.

However, inspection of the Y matrix (see `generate_Y.m`) reveals that it does not contain forward-biased information and so guarantees that $X = M_q Y$ is a backward-biased portfolio.

3 Finding the near-optimal forward-biased portfolio

3.1 Problem statement

The portfolio optimization problem can be simplified by substituting expressions for the relevant terms in the following way (implemented in `simulate_X.m`):

$$f_{ir}(x) = \frac{c^T x}{\text{std}(Ax)} \tag{3a}$$

$$f_{ret}(x) = a\frac{c^T x}{\|x\|_1} \tag{3b}$$

$$f_{tvr}(x) = \text{mean}\frac{C|Bx|}{C|x|} \tag{3c}$$

$$f_t(x) = \frac{\|Bx\|_1}{\|x\|_1} \tag{3d}$$

where for an m stocks by n days portfolio,

- $x \in \mathbf{R}^{mn}$ is a vector representing the portfolio,
- c, a, A, B and C are appropriate vector, scalar, or matrix quantities (see `simulation_matrices.m`), and
- $f_{ir}, f_{ret}, f_{tvr}, f_t \in \mathbf{R}^{mn} \to \mathbf{R}$ where f_t is an approximation of the turnover function, f_{tvr}.

The problem we want to solve is then

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && -f_{ret}(x) - \hat{\mu} f_{ir}(x) && \text{(4a)} \\ &\text{subject to} && f_{tvr}(x) \le 0.2 && \text{(4b)} \end{aligned}$$

That is to say, maximize the return and information ratio (with relative proportion affected by coefficient $\hat{\mu}$) while keeping the turnover below 0.2.

Note that for brevity, I have not included the expressions for c, a, A, B and C; however, one can deduce that such quantities must exist. For example, notice that $c^T x$ represents the total profit/loss; we know this expression must be valid for some c since the expression for the total profit/loss is linear. Lastly, notice that the portfolio is represented as a vector (x), rather than a matrix, in this section for notational convenience.

3.2 Problem simplification

We now simplify (4) in order to make it computationally tractable.

We first note that (4) is homogenous, meaning that it's solution depends only on the relative values of x. Therefore we can split the terms of $f_{tvr}(x)$ in the following way without loss of generality.

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{minimize} && -f_{ret}(x) - \hat{\mu} f_{ir}(x) && \text{(5a)} \\ &\text{subject to} && \|Bx\|_1 \le 0.2 && \text{(5b)} \\ & && \|x\|_1 = 1 && \text{(5c)} \end{aligned}$$

Turning our attention to the objective function we note that

$$f_{ret}(x) + \hat{\mu} f_{ir}(x) = \frac{c^T x}{\operatorname{std}(Ax)} + \hat{\mu} a c^T x \tag{6}$$

since $\|x\|_1 = 1$. This objective can be thought of as weighting two terms by $\hat{\mu}$; and we can alternatively weight the following two terms

$$\frac{c^T x}{\operatorname{std}(Ax)} + \hat{\mu} a c^T x \to (1/\mu) c^T x - \operatorname{std}(Ax) \tag{7}$$

while still obtaining the full range of pareto-optimal points; although the connection between μ and $\hat{\mu}$ is not immediately clear.

This now gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & (-1/\mu)c^T x + \text{std}(Ax) && \text{(8a)} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|Bx\|_1 \leq 0.2 && \text{(8b)} \\ & \|x\|_1 = 1 && \text{(8c)} \end{aligned}$$

which is still completely equivalent to (4).

We now implement the following generalization

$$\|x\|_1 = 1 \quad \rightarrow \quad \|x\|_1 \leq 1 \tag{9}$$

in order to make the problem convex[1]. Our reasoning behind this approximation is that although $\|x\|_1$ is no longer strictly confined to the value of 1, it most likely will end up with a quantity of 1 anyways because the $c^T x$ term in the objective function will always want to "push" $\|x\|_1$ to as large a value as possible.

While this approximation does inject error into our formulation, the benefits of convexity (i.e. the ability to efficiently compute the global minimum) far outweigh the costs. Actually, the cost of this approximation can be made negligible by twiddling the value of 0.2 in the $\|Bx\|_1 \leq 0.2$ constraint (using a simple algorithm like bisection for instance) in order to force $f_{tvr}(x) \leq 0.2$.

We have now simplified (4) into the following convex form

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & (-1/\mu)c^T x + \text{std}(Ax) && \text{(10a)} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|Bx\|_1 \leq 0.2 && \text{(10b)} \\ & \|x\|_1 \leq 1 && \text{(10c)} \end{aligned}$$

which can then be further approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{minimize} \quad & (-1/\mu)c^T x + \text{std}(Ax) && \text{(11a)} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \|Bx\|_2 \leq 0.2 && \text{(11b)} \\ & \|x\|_2 \leq 1 && \text{(11c)} \end{aligned}$$

if desired for stability purposes.

3.3 Solution method

We use the CVX package[2] to solve (11), which takes about 5 minutes on a desktop computer for the problem size given.

Note that because the problem in (11) is convex the global minimum can deterministically and efficiently be found. Furthermore, once found the optimal point can be proven to be globally optimal.

It is from this that we claim that the result of (11) would be optimal, if not for the two approximations used earlier. However, we also note that such a

[1] see Boyd and Vandenberghe, "Convex Optimization"

[2] `www.cvxr.com/cvx`

portfolio would be forward-biased, since the entire price history is available to the optimization program.

Lastly, we note that the use of a simple algorithm, such as bisection, can be coupled with this solution method in order to yield portfolios with an exact turnover as decided by the user.

4 Computing the reduced-order model

Although the portfolio obtained via the method presented in the previous section would not be valid because of forward-biasing, it is extremely useful in building a reduced-order model for creating a portfolio that is backward-biased only. The full-order version of this model, M, is computed via

$$MY = X_{\text{FB}} \tag{12a}$$

$$M = X_{\text{FB}} Y^{+} \tag{12b}$$

where for an m stocks and n days portfolio,

- $M \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times p}$ is the full-order model matrix,
- $Y \in \mathbf{R}^{p\times n}$ is the signals matrix which contains the backwards-looking signals (e.g. percent returns for past 5 days) which are fed into the model,
- $Y^{+} \in \mathbf{R}^{n\times p}$ is the pseudo-inverse of Y,
- $X_{\text{FB}} \in \mathbf{R}^{m\times n}$ is the matrix representing the near-optimal portfolio obtained from the previous section. Note that we now use a matrix convention for convenience.

To obtain a reduced q-order model, we simply take the q most significant singular components of M which can be computed via a singular value decomposition of M,

$$M = U\Sigma V^T = U\text{diag}(\sigma)V^T \tag{13a}$$

$$M_q = u_1\sigma_1 v_1^T + u_2\sigma_2 v_2^T + \cdots + u_q\sigma_q v_q^T. \tag{13b}$$

In this way, the reduced-order modeling matrix, M_q, has the same shape as M, but is only of order q. Thus, we say that M_q is a model with q signals, and when used, creates a q-signal portfolio.

5 Conclusion

We have produced a series of portfolios which exhibit both large annualized returns and large information ratios while keeping the turnover percentage below 0.2.

We describe our portfolio-generation method, which involves finding a near-optimal forward-biased portfolio from which we obtain a reduced-order model.

It is this reduced-order model that then allows us to calculate a legitimate backward-biased portfolio.

Lastly, we remark once again that although not empirically tested to be backward-biased, we guarantee such since the model uses only past data on percentage returns.