MSDS 451 — Programming Assignment 1 Report

Author: Vrishani Shah

Asset: AAPL

Abstract

This project predicts the **next-day direction** of returns for Apple Inc. (AAPL) using only **price-based features** constructed from daily OHLCV data. I engineered lags of close, range (high—low), net change (open—close), volume lags, and short-half-life EMAs, and avoided leakage by shifting all features so they contain only information available at time *t*. A compact subset was selected via **AIC-based all-subsets logistic** screening; final modeling used an **XGBoost** classifier with **time-series cross-validation** (TimeSeriesSplit with a 10-day gap) and randomized hyperparameter search. The best cross-validated accuracy from the randomized search was **0.4920**, while the **training** confusion matrix for a fixed XGBoost configuration showed ~79.6% accuracy (diagnostic only, not out-of-sample). Results are typical for one-day equity direction prediction with purely price-based features: signals are weak and noisy, but the pipeline is reproducible and leakage-safe.

1. Problem Description

- Objective. Binary classification: predict whether the next day's log return is **positive** (1) or **non-positive** (0).
- **Motivation.** At a one-day horizon, equities may exhibit weak momentum/volatility structure; the goal is to implement a rigorous pipeline (feature engineering, feature selection, time-series CV, tuning) that respects temporal ordering.
- Target.LogReturn = ln(Close_t / Close_{t-1}); Target = 1(LogReturn > 0).

2. Data & Feature Engineering

- Source. Yahoo! Finance via yfinance; CSV committed as data/msds getdata yfinance aapl.csv.
- **Frequency & Window.** Daily bars from **2000-01-03** to **2025-09-24** (original rows: **6,471**).
- Leakage controls. All features are based on past information (lags/EMAs), then drop_nulls() removes initial burn-in rows (effective rows used by the model in your run: 6,468; see confusion matrix totals).
- Features (15 total).
 - o Close lags: CloseLag1, CloseLag2, CloseLag3

- Range (HML) lags: HML = High Low, plus HMLLag1..3
- o Net change (OMC) lags: OMC = Open Close, plus OMCLag1..3
- Volume lags: VolumeLag1..3
- Short-half-life EMAs of CloseLag1: CloseEMA2, CloseEMA4, CloseEMA8

3. Research Design

- Cross-validation. TimeSeriesSplit(n_splits=5, gap=10) (forward-chaining, no shuffling). The 10-day gapfurther reduces subtle leakage from smoothing features.
- **Feature selection (AIC).** AIC-based all-subsets logistic screening was used to rank combinations, after which I fixed a compact subset used consistently in modeling:
 - o CloseLag3, HMLLag1, OMCLag2, OMCLag3, CloseEMA8.
- Model & tuning. Final estimator: XGBoost (binary:logistic).
 Hyperparameters tuned via RandomizedSearchCV over
 max_depth, min_child_weight, subsample, learning_rate,
 n estimators, using the same time-series CV object.
- **Metrics.** Fold-level **accuracy** for selection; final diagnostics include a confusion matrix (and ROC if probabilities are used).

4. Results

Best parameters:

}

4.1 Cross-Validation (Randomized Search)

• Best CV accuracy: 0.4920

```
"learning_rate": 0.08964522558051516,
"max_depth": 6,
"min_child_weight": 5,
"n_estimators": 881,
"subsample": 0.8014120643245294
```

4.2 Final Model (diagnostic on full sample)

Your notebook then fit a **fixed XGBoost** configuration (separate from the best CV params) and printed diagnostics on the **training** set. As expected, these are optimistic compared to CV:

Confusion matrix (Actual rows \times Predicted cols):

•	2337	•	750
•	570	•	2811
	1		

[2337570 7502811]Total = 6,468; training accuracy \approx 0.7959.

- Classification report: header printed; detailed line items weren't captured in the HTML export.
- **ROC AUC:** not computed in this run (requires using predict proba).

Interpretation. Cross-validated accuracy around **0.49–0.50** indicates little out-of-sample edge with pure price features for one-day direction on AAPL. The ~0.80 **training** accuracy reflects overfitting when evaluating on data used for fitting; the CV figure is the correct measure of generalization.

Discussion

- **Feature effects.** The chosen subset combines:
 - (i) CloseLag3 (short-lag momentum),
 - (ii) **HMLLag1** (range/volatility proxy),
 - (iii) OMC lags (intraday reversal/pressure), and
 - (iv) a smoothed trend via CloseEMA8.

This balances short-term direction and volatility/context while avoiding leakage.

- **Signal strength.** A **single-asset, one-day horizon** with price-only features typically yields weak signals; that's consistent with the CV result.
- Threats to validity. Non-stationarity (structural change) and class balance shifts. Time-ordered CV with a gap mitigates leakage but doesn't solve drift.
- What would likely help. Probability-based policies with thresholds, cost-aware backtesting, and context features(e.g., SPY/VIX lags) often provide incremental gains.

6. Conclusion & Future Work

The leakage-safe pipeline is reproducible and correct for a financial time series. On **AAPL**, a compact, price-only feature set yields **no reliable out-of-sample directional edge** over a 50/50 baseline. Next steps: (1) compute **ROC AUC** and calibrate probabilities, (2) add **market/context features**, (3) test **rolling re-tunes** for drift, and (4) run a **cost-aware**trading backtest with thresholding.

Reproducibility

- Environment. Python ≥3.10; key libraries: polars, scikit-learn, xgboost, matplotlib, seaborn.
- Random seeds.random state = 2025.
- **Pipeline safety.** All features are lagged; no pre-CV scaling outside a pipeline; **time-series CV** with a **gap** used throughout.
- Files. Notebook (.ipynb) and HTML export included; data CSV (data/msds_getdata_yfinance_aapl.csv) committed.

References

- yfinance (data), scikit-learn (CV & metrics), XGBoost (model), Polars (data ops).
- Hastie, Tibshirani, Friedman *Elements of Statistical Learning* (boosting, regularization).
- Hyndman, Athanasopoulos *Forecasting: Principles and Practice* (time-series evaluation).