Week 6: Tree Ensembles Assignment

ARIMA/GARCH + Random Forest & XGBoost for Portfolio Optimization

MSc Banking and Finance – FinTech Course

Due: we will discuss this in class..

1 Assignment Overview

Objective: Implement tree-based ensemble methods for portfolio optimization using Week 5 engineered features.

Deliverables:

- Jupyter Notebook (.ipynb) with code and analysis
- PDF Report (3-5 pages) summarizing findings
- Results file (.csv) with portfolio weights

2 Assignment Tasks

2.1 Task 1: Model Implementation & Comparison (30%)

Requirements:

- 1. Implement three models: Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, and XGBoost
- 2. Train each model on Week 5 features (use at least 15 features)
- 3. Perform 5-fold cross-validation for each model
- 4. Report MSE, R², and MAE for train and test sets
- 5. Conduct paired t-tests between models (report p-values)

Expected Output:

Model	Train R ²	Test R ²	MSE	p-value
Random Forest	0.XXX	0.XXX	0.XXXXXX	_
Gradient Boosting	0.XXX	0.XXX	0.XXXXXX	0.XXX
XGBoost	0.XXX	0.XXX	0.XXXXXX	0.XXX

2.2 Task 2: Hyperparameter Tuning (25%)

Requirements:

- 1. Select your best-performing model from Task 1
- 2. Define hyperparameter grid with at least 5 parameters
- 3. Use GridSearchCV with 5-fold cross-validation
- 4. Create validation curves for top 3 hyperparameters
- 5. Report optimal hyperparameters with justification

Minimum Grid Size:

- Random Forest: Test at least 36 combinations
- Gradient Boosting: Test at least 36 combinations
- XGBoost: Test at least 48 combinations

Justification: Explain why optimal values make sense (150-200 words).

2.3 Task 3: Feature Importance & SHAP (25%)

Requirements:

- 1. Extract built-in feature importance from your best model
- 2. Compute SHAP values for test set
- 3. Create SHAP summary plot
- 4. Compare built-in importance vs. SHAP importance (plot both)
- 5. Identify top 5 features and explain their impact (200-250 words)

Analysis Questions:

- Which features drive predictions most strongly?
- Do you observe any non-linear interactions?
- Are results financially interpretable?

2.4 Task 4: Portfolio Optimization & Backtesting (20%)

Requirements:

- 1. Use best model to generate portfolio weights for BTC, ETH, DOGE
- 2. Implement rolling-window backtesting (minimum 30-day window)
- 3. Compare three strategies:
 - Equal-weighted (1/3, 1/3, 1/3)
 - Week 5 Lasso-based portfolio
 - Week 6 Tree-based portfolio
- 4. Calculate: Sharpe ratio, max drawdown, win rate, total return
- 5. Visualize cumulative returns

Performance Table:

Strategy	Sharpe	Max DD	Win Rate	Total Ret.
Equal-Weighted	X.XX	-XX.X%	XX.X%	XX.X%
Lasso (Week 5)	X.XX	-XX.X%	XX.X%	XX.X%
Tree Ensemble	X.XX	-XX.X%	XX.X%	XX.X%

3 Bonus Tasks (Optional, +10%)

Choose **one** of the following:

3.1 Option A: Custom Ensemble Stacking

Combine Ridge (Week 5), Random Forest, and XGBoost predictions using optimal weights. Show improvement over individual models.

3.2 Option B: Regime Detection

Use decision tree splits to identify market regimes. Create separate portfolio strategies for each regime.

3.3 Option C: Early Stopping Analysis

Implement early stopping for Gradient Boosting/XGBoost. Plot training vs. validation error curves. Determine optimal number of iterations.

Week 6 Assignment Tree Ensembles

4 Evaluation Rubric

Criterion	Description	Points
Code Quality	Clean, documented, functional, follows best practices	20
Model Perfor-	All models trained, tuned, significant improvement shown	25
mance		
Analysis Depth	Insightful interpretations, connects theory to results	25
Statistical Rigor	Proper testing, cross-validation, significance tests	15
Visualizations	Professional, clear, informative plots	10
Report Quality	Well-written, organized, concise	5
Total		100
Bonus	(Optional)	+10

5 Quick Start Code Templates

5.1 Model Training

5.2 Hyperparameter Tuning

5.3 SHAP Analysis

```
import shap

explainer = shap.TreeExplainer(model)
shap_values = explainer.shap_values(X_test)
```

Week 6 Assignment Tree Ensembles

```
# Summary plot
shap.summary_plot(shap_values, X_test, feature_names=feature_names)
```

6 Detailed Grading Breakdown

6.1 Excellent (90-100%)

- All models properly implemented with comprehensive analysis
- Rigorous hyperparameter tuning with clear justification
- Deep SHAP interpretation connecting to finance theory
- Professional visualizations with publication quality
- Statistical tests properly conducted and interpreted

6.2 Good (75-89%)

- Models trained with adequate tuning
- SHAP analysis present with reasonable interpretation
- Clear visualizations and proper documentation
- Some statistical testing conducted

6.3 Satisfactory (60-74%)

- Basic implementation functional
- Minimal tuning and analysis
- Adequate visualizations
- Limited statistical validation

7 Common Mistakes to Avoid

- 1. Not using cross-validation Single train/test split is insufficient
- 2. Scaling features for trees Trees don't need StandardScaler
- 3. **Default hyperparameters** Always tune your models
- 4. **Ignoring overfitting** Monitor train-test gap
- 5. No SHAP analysis Feature importance alone is insufficient
- 6. Missing statistical tests Must compare models rigorously
- 7. Poor documentation Explain your code and decisions
- 8. Late submission Start early, deadline is firm

8 Resources

8.1 Documentation

- scikit-learn: https://scikit-learn.org/stable/
- XGBoost: https://xgboost.readthedocs.io/
- SHAP: https://shap.readthedocs.io/