

# Portfolio Construction Using Stratified Models

Jonathan Tuck

Shane Barratt

Stephen Boyd

February 10, 2022

## Abstract

In this paper we develop models of asset return mean and covariance that depend on some observable market conditions, and use these to construct a trading policy that depends on these conditions, and the current portfolio holdings. After discretizing the market conditions, we fit Laplacian regularized stratified models for the return mean and covariance. These models have a different mean and covariance for each market condition, but are regularized so that nearby market conditions have similar models. This technique allows us to fit models for market conditions that have not occurred in the training data, by borrowing strength from nearby market conditions for which we do have data. These models are combined with a Markowitz-inspired optimization method to yield a trading policy that is based on market conditions. We illustrate our method on a small universe of 18 ETFs, using three well known and publicly available market variables to construct 1000 market conditions, and show that it performs well out of sample. The method, however, is general, and scales to much larger problems, that presumably would use proprietary data sources and forecasts along with publicly available data.

## 1 Introduction

**Trading policy.** We consider the problem of constructing a trading policy that depends on some observable market conditions, as well as the current portfolio holdings. We denote the asset daily returns as  $y_t \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , for  $t = 1, \dots, T$ . The observable market conditions are denoted as  $z_t$ . We assume these are discrete or categorical, so we have  $z_t \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ . We denote the portfolio asset weights as  $w_t \in \mathbf{R}^n$ , with  $\mathbf{1}^T w_t = 1$ , where  $\mathbf{1}$  is the vector with all entries one. The trading policy has the form

$$\mathcal{T} : \{1, \dots, K\} \times \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^n,$$

where  $w_t = \mathcal{T}(z_t, w_{t-1})$ , *i.e.*, it maps the current market condition and previous portfolio weights to the current portfolio weights. In this paper we refer to  $z_t$  as the market conditions, since in our example it is derived from market conditions, but in fact it could be anything known before the portfolio weights are chosen, including proprietary forecasts or other data. Our policy  $\mathcal{T}$  is a simple Markowitz-inspired policy, based on a Laplacian regularized stratified model of the asset return mean and covariance; see, *e.g.*, [Mar52, GK99, BBD<sup>+</sup>17].

**Laplacian regularized stratified model.** We model the asset returns, conditioned on market conditions, as Gaussian,

$$y \mid z \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_z, \Sigma_z),$$

with  $\mu_z \in \mathbf{R}^n$  and  $\Sigma_z \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$  (the set of symmetric positive definite  $n \times n$  matrices),  $z = 1, \dots, K$ . This is a stratified model, with stratification feature  $z$ . We fit this stratified model, *i.e.*, determine the means  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K$  and covariances  $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_K$ , by minimizing the negative log-likelihood of historical training data, plus a regularization term that encourages nearby market conditions to have similar means and covariances. This technique allows us to fit models for market conditions which have not occurred in the training data, by borrowing strength from nearby market conditions for which we do have data. Laplacian regularized stratified models are discussed in, *e.g.*, [DWW14, SS16, THB19, TBB21, TB20, TB21]. One advantage of Laplacian regularized stratified models is they are interpretable. They are also auditable: we can easily check if the results are reasonable.

**This paper.** In this paper we present a single example of developing a trading policy as described above. Our example is small, with a universe of 18 ETFs, and we use market conditions that are publicly available and well known. Given the small universe and our use of widely available market conditions, we cannot expect much in terms of performance, but we will see that the trading algorithm performs well out of sample. Our example is meant only as a simple illustration of the ideas; the techniques we describe can easily scale to a universe of thousands of assets, and use proprietary forecasts in the market conditions.

**Outline.** We start by reviewing Laplacian regularized models in §2. In §3 we describe the data records and dataset we use. In §4 we describe the economic conditions with which we will stratify our return and risk models. In §5 and §6 we describe, fit, and analyze the stratified return and risk models, respectively. In §7 we give the details of how our stratified return and risk models are used to create the trading policy  $\mathcal{T}$ . We mention a few extensions and variations of the methods in §8.

## 1.1 Related work

A number of studies show that the underlying covariances of equities change during different market conditions, such as when the market performs historically well or poorly (a “bull” or “bear” market, respectively), or when there is historically high or low volatility [EHV94, LS01, AB03, AB04, Bor12]. Modeling the dynamics of underlying statistical properties of assets is an area of ongoing research. Many model these statistical properties as occurring in hard regimes, and utilize methods such as hidden Markov models [RTA98, HTF09, NML18] or greedy Gaussian segmentation [HNB19] to model the transitions and breakpoints between the regimes. In contrast, this paper assumes a hard regime model of our statistical parameters, but our chief assumption is, informally speaking, that similar regimes have similar statistical parameters.

Asset allocation based on changing market conditions is a sensible method for active portfolio management [AB02, AT11, NHML15, Pet15]. A popular method is to utilize convex optimization control policies to dynamically allocate assets in a portfolio, where the time-varying statistical properties are modeled as a hidden Markov model [NBLM19].

## 2 Laplacian regularized stratified models

In this section we review Laplacian regularized stratified models, focussing on the specific models we will use; for more detail see [TBB21, TB20]. We are given data records of the form  $(z, y) \in \{1, \dots, K\} \times \mathbf{R}^n$ , where  $z$  is the feature over which we stratify, and  $y$  is the outcome. We let  $\theta \in \Theta$  denote the parameter values in our model. The stratified model consists of a choice of parameter  $\theta_z$  for each value of  $z$ . In this paper, we construct two stratified models. One is for return, where  $\theta_z \in \Theta = \mathbf{R}^n$  is an estimate or forecast of return, and the other is for return covariance, where  $\theta_z \in \Theta = \mathbf{S}_{++}^n$  is the inverse covariance or precision matrix, and  $\mathbf{S}_{++}^n$  denotes the set of symmetric positive definite  $n \times n$  matrices. (We use the precision matrix since it is the natural parameter in the exponential family representation of a Gaussian, and renders the fitting problems convex.)

To choose the parameters  $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K$ , we minimize

$$\sum_{k=1}^K (\ell_k(\theta_k) + r(\theta_k)) + \mathcal{L}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K). \quad (1)$$

Here  $\ell_k$  is the loss function, that depends on the training data  $y_i$ , for  $z_i = k$ , typically a negative log-likelihood under our model for the data. The function  $r$  is the local regularizer, chosen to improve out of sample performance of the model.

The last term in (1) is the Laplacian regularization, which encourages neighboring values of  $z$ , under some weighted graph, to have similar parameters. It is characterized by  $W \in \mathbf{S}^K$ , a symmetric weight matrix with zero diagonal entries and nonnegative off-diagonal entries. The Laplacian regularization has the form

$$\mathcal{L}(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_K) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^K W_{ij} \|\theta_i - \theta_j\|^2,$$

where the norm is the Euclidean or  $\ell_2$  norm when  $\theta_z$  is a vector, and the Frobenius norm when  $\theta_z$  is a matrix. We think of  $W$  as defining a weighted graph, with edges associated with positive entries of  $W$ , with edge weight  $W_{ij}$ . The larger  $W_{ij}$  is, the more encouragement we give for  $\theta_i$  and  $\theta_j$  to be close.

When the loss and regularizer are convex, the problem (1) is convex, and so in principle is tractable [BV04]. The distributed method introduced in [TBB21], which exploits the properties that the first two terms in the objective are separable across  $k$ , while the last term is separable across the entries of the parameters, can easily solve very large instances of the problem.

A Laplacian regularized stratified model typically includes several hyper-parameters, for example that scale the local regularization, or scale some of the entries in  $W$ . We adjust these hyper-parameters by choosing some values, fitting the Laplacian regularized stratified model for each choice of the hyper-parameters, and evaluating the true loss function on a (held-out) validation set. (The true loss function is often but not always the same as the loss function used in the fitting objective (1).) We choose hyper-parameters that give the least, or nearly least, true loss on the validation data, biasing our choice toward larger values, *i.e.*, more regularization.

We make a few observations about Laplacian regularized stratified models. First, they are interpretable, and we can check them for reasonableness by examining the values  $\theta_z$ , and how they vary with  $z$ . At the very least, we can examine the largest and smallest values of each entry (or some function) of  $\theta_z$  over  $z \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ .

Second, we note that a Laplacian regularized stratified model can be created even when we have no training data for some, or even many, values of  $z$ . The parameter values for those values of  $z$  are obtained by borrowing strength from their neighbors for which we do have data. In fact, the parameter values for values of  $z$  for which we have no data are weighted averages of their neighbors. This implies a number of interesting properties, such as a maximum principle: Any such value lies between the minimum and maximum values of the parameter over those values of  $z$  for which we have data.

### 3 Dataset

Our example considers  $n = 18$  ETFs as the universe of assets,

AGG, DBC, GLD, IBB, ITA, PBJ, TLT, VNQ, VTI,  
 XLB, XLE, XLF, XLI, XLK, XLP, XLU, XLV, XLY.

Each data record has the form  $(y, z)$ , where  $y \in \mathbf{R}^{18}$  is the daily *active* return of each asset with respect to VTI, from market close on the previous day until market close on that day, and  $z$  represents the market condition known at the previous day’s market close, described later in §4. (The daily active return of each asset with respect to VTI is the daily return of that asset minus the daily return of VTI.) Henceforth, when we refer to return or risk we mean active return or active risk, with respect to our benchmark VTI. The benchmark VTI has zero active return and risk.

Our dataset spans March 2006 to December 2019, for a total of 3462 data points. We first partition it into two subsets. The first, using data from 2006–2014, is used to fit the return and risk models as well as to choose the hyper-parameters in the return and risk models and the trading policy. The second subset, with data in 2015–2019, is used to test the trading policy. We then randomly partition the first subset into two parts: a training set consisting of 80% of the data records, and a validation set consisting of 20% of the data records. Thus we have three datasets: a training data set with 1780 data points in the date range 2006–2014, a validation set with 445 data points also in the date range 2006–2014, and

	Volatility	Inflation	Mortgage
Volatility	1	-0.13	-0.14
Inflation	-	1	0.21
Mortgage	-	-	1

**Table 1:** Correlation of the market indicators over the training and validation period, 2006–2014.

a test dataset with 1237 data points in the date range 2015–2019. We use 9 years of data to fit our models and choose hyper-parameters, and 5 years of later data to test the trading policy. The return data in the training and validation datasets were winsorized (clipped) at their 1st and 99th percentiles. The return data in the test dataset was not.

## 4 Stratified market conditions

Each data record also includes the market condition  $z$  known on the previous day’s market close. To construct the market condition  $z$ , we start with three (real-valued) market indicators.


**Market implied volatility.** The volatility of the market is a commonly used economic indicator, with extreme values associated with market turbulence [FSS87, Sch89, AIL99, CCR20]. Here, volatility is measured by the 15-day moving average of the CBOE volatility index (VIX) on the S&P 500 [Exc20], lagged by an additional day.

**Inflation rate.** The inflation rate measures the percentage change of purchasing power in the economy [WS94, BLS96, BLS01, BC03, Hun03, Mah17]. The inflation rate is published by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics [oLS20] as the percent change of the consumer price index (CPI), which measures changes in the price level of a representative basket of consumer goods and services, and is updated monthly.

**30-year U.S. mortgage rates.** This metric is the interest rate charged by a mortgage lender on 30-year mortgages, and the change of this rate is an economic indicator correlated with economic spending [Cav16, SMS17]. The 30-year U.S. mortgage rate are published by the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, a public government-sponsored enterprise, and is generally updated weekly [FRED20].

These three economic indicators are not particularly correlated over the training and validation period, as can be seen in table 1.

**Discretization.** Each of these market indicators is binned into deciles, labeled  $1, \dots, 10$ . (The decile boundaries are computed using the data up to 2015.) The total number of stratification feature values is then  $K = 10 \times 10 \times 10 = 1000$ . We can think of  $z$  as a 3-tuple of deciles, in  $\{1, \dots, 10\}^3$ , or encoded as a single value  $z \in \{1, \dots, 1000\}$ .



**Figure 1:** Stratification feature values over time. The vertical line at 2015 separates the training and validation period (2006–2014) from the test period (2015–2019).

The market conditions over the entire dataset are shown in figure 1, with the vertical line at 2015 indicating the boundary between the training and validation period (2006–2014) and the test period (2015–2019). The average value of  $\|z_{t+1} - z_t\|_1$  (interpreting them as vectors in  $\{1, \dots, 10\}^3$ ) is around 0.26, meaning that on each day, the market conditions change by around 0.26 deciles on average.

**Data scarcity.** The market conditions can take on  $K = 1000$  possible values. In the training/validation datasets, only 224 of 1000 market conditions appear, so there are 776 market conditions for which there are no data points. The most populated market condition, which corresponds to market conditions (9, 0, 0), contains 84 data points. The average number of data points per market condition in the training/validation data is 2.23.

For over 77% of the market conditions, we have *no* training data. This scarcity of data means that the Laplacian regularization is critical in constructing models of the return and risk that depend on the market conditions.

In the test dataset, only 133 of the economic conditions appear. The average number of data points per market condition in the test dataset is 1.26. Only nine economic conditions appear in both the training/validation and test datasets. In the test data, there are only 397 days (about 32% of the 1237 test data days) in which the market conditions for that day were observed in the training/validation datasets.

**Regularization graph.** Laplacian regularization requires a weighted graph that tells us which market conditions are ‘close’. Our graph is the Cartesian product of three chain

graphs, which link each decile of each indicator to its successor (and predecessor). This graph on the 1000 values of  $z$  has 2700 edges. Each edge connects two adjacent deciles of one of our three economic indicators. We assign three different positive weights to the edges, depending on which indicator they link. We denote these as

$$\gamma_{\text{vol}}, \quad \gamma_{\text{inf}}, \quad \gamma_{\text{mort}}. \quad (2)$$

These are hyper-parameters in our Laplacian regularization. Each of the nonzero entries in the weight matrix  $W$  is one of these values. For example, the edge between  $(3, 1, 4)$  and  $(3, 2, 4)$ , which connects two values of  $z$  that differ by one decile in Inflation, has weight  $\gamma_{\text{inf}}$ .

## 5 Stratified return model

In this section we describe the stratified return model. The model consists of a mean return vector in  $\mu_z \in \mathbf{R}^{18}$  for each of  $K = 1000$  different market conditions, for a total of  $Kn = 18000$  parameters.

The loss in (1) is a Huber penalty,

$$\ell_k(\mu_k) = \sum_{t: z_t=k} \mathbf{1}^T H(\mu_k - y_t),$$

where  $H$  is the Huber penalty (applied entrywise above),

$$H(z) = \begin{cases} z^2, & |z| \leq M \\ 2M|z| - M^2, & |z| > M, \end{cases}$$

where  $M > 0$  is the half-width, which we fix at the reasonable value  $M = 0.01$ . (This corresponds to the 79th percentile of absolute return on the training dataset.) We use quadratic or  $\ell_2$  squared local regularization in (1),

$$r(\mu_k) = \gamma_{\text{ret,loc}} \|\mu_k\|_2^2,$$

where the positive regularization weight  $\gamma_{\text{ret,loc}}$  is another hyper-parameter.

The Laplacian regularization contains the three hyper-parameters (2), so overall our stratified return model has four hyper-parameters.

### 5.1 Hyper-parameter search

To choose the hyper-parameters for the stratified return model, we start with a coarse grid search, evaluating all combinations of

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{ret,loc}} &= 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, \\ \gamma_{\text{vol}} &= 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000, \\ \gamma_{\text{inf}} &= 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000, \\ \gamma_{\text{mort}} &= 1, 10, 100, 1000, 10000, \end{aligned}$$

Model	Train correlation	Validation correlation
Stratified return model	0.097	0.052
Common return model	0.018	-0.001

**Table 2:** Correlations to the true returns over the training set and the held-out validation set for the return models.

a total of 375 combinations, and selecting the hyper-parameter combination that yielded the largest correlation between the return estimates and the returns over the validation set. (Thus, our true loss is negative correlation of forecast and realized returns.) The hyper-parameters

$$(\gamma_{\text{ret,loc}}, \gamma_{\text{vol}}, \gamma_{\text{inf}}, \gamma_{\text{mort}}) = (0.01, 10, 10, 1000)$$

gave the best results over this coarse hyper-parameter grid search.

We then perform a finer hyper-parameter grid search, focusing on hyper-parameters around the best values from the coarse search. We test all combinations of

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{ret,loc}} &= 0.0075, 0.01, 0.0125, \\ \gamma_{\text{vol}} &= 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, \\ \gamma_{\text{inf}} &= 2, 5, 10, 20, 50, \\ \gamma_{\text{mort}} &= 200, 500, 1000, 2000, 5000, \end{aligned}$$

a total of 375 combinations. The final hyper-parameter values are

$$(\gamma_{\text{ret,loc}}, \gamma_{\text{vol}}, \gamma_{\text{inf}}, \gamma_{\text{mort}}) = (0.0075, 10, 50, 5000). \quad (3)$$

These can be roughly interpreted as follows. The large value for  $\gamma_{\text{mort}}$  tells us that our return model should not vary much with mortgage rate, and the smaller values for  $\gamma_{\text{vol}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{inf}}$  tells us that our return model can vary more with volatility and inflation.

## 5.2 Final stratified return model

Table 2 shows the correlation coefficient of the return estimates to the true returns over the training and validation sets, for the stratified return model and the common return model, *i.e.*, the empirical mean over the training set. The stratified return model estimates have a larger correlation with the realized returns in both the training set and the validation set. The common return model even has a slightly negative correlation with the true returns on the validation dataset.

Table 3 summarizes some of the statistics of our stratified return model over the 1000 market conditions, along with the common model value. We can see that each forecast varies considerably across the market conditions. Note that the common model values are the averages over the training data; the median, minimum, and maximum are over the 1000 market conditions.



Asset	Common	Median	Min	Max
AGG	-0.021	-0.071	-0.128	0.073
DBC	-0.056	-0.060	-0.158	0.106
GLD	-0.012	-0.012	-0.119	0.153
IBB	0.033	0.031	-0.098	0.139
ITA	0.022	0.031	-0.077	0.075
PBJ	0.006	0.005	-0.039	0.112
TLT	-0.000	-0.063	-0.173	0.110
VNQ	0.016	0.009	-0.301	0.071
XLB	0.001	0.010	-0.065	0.078
XLE	-0.005	0.014	-0.122	0.127
XLF	-0.019	-0.040	-0.398	0.055
XLI	0.007	0.010	-0.056	0.062
XLK	0.005	0.004	-0.059	0.090
XLP	0.005	-0.004	-0.041	0.070
XLU	-0.008	-0.018	-0.074	0.083
XLV	0.010	0.009	-0.033	0.065
XLY	0.013	0.004	-0.059	0.066

**Table 3:** Return predictions, in percent daily return. The first column gives the common return model; the second, third, and fourth columns give median, minimum, and maximum return predictions over the 1000 market conditions for the Laplacian regularized stratified model.

## 6 Stratified risk model

In this section we describe the stratified risk model, *i.e.*, a return covariance that depends on  $z$ . For determining the risk model, we can safely ignore the (small) mean return, and assume that  $y_t$  has zero mean. The model consists of  $K = 1000$  inverse covariance matrices  $\Sigma_k^{-1} = \theta_k \in \mathbf{S}_{++}^{18}$ , indexed by the market conditions. Our stratified risk model has  $Kn(n+1)/2 = 171000$  parameters.

The loss in (1) is the negative log-likelihood on the training set (scaled, with constant terms ignored),

$$\ell_k(\theta_k) = \text{Tr}(S_k \Sigma_k^{-1}) - \log \det(\Sigma_k^{-1})$$

where  $S_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{t: z_t=k} y_t y_t^T$  is the empirical covariance matrix of the data  $y$  for which  $z = k$ , and  $n_k$  is the number of data samples with  $z = k$ . (When  $n_k = 0$ , we take  $S_k = 0$ .) We found that local regularization did not improve the model performance, so we take local regularization  $r = 0$ . All together our stratified risk model has the three Laplacian hyper-parameters (2).

### 6.1 Hyper-parameter search

We start with a coarse grid search over all 125 combinations of

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{vol}} &= 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000, \\ \gamma_{\text{inf}} &= 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000, \\ \gamma_{\text{mort}} &= 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000, \end{aligned}$$

selecting the hyper-parameter combination with the smallest negative log-likelihood (our true loss) on the validation set. The hyper-parameters

$$(\gamma_{\text{vol}}, \gamma_{\text{inf}}, \gamma_{\text{mort}}) = (1, 1, 100)$$

gave the best results.

We then perform a fine search, focusing on hyper-parameter value near the best values from the coarse search. We evaluate all 125 combinations of

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\text{vol}} &= 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 5, \\ \gamma_{\text{inf}} &= 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 5, \\ \gamma_{\text{mort}} &= 20, 50, 100, 200, 500. \end{aligned}$$

For the stratified risk model, the final hyper-parameter values chosen are

$$(\gamma_{\text{vol}}, \gamma_{\text{inf}}, \gamma_{\text{mort}}) = (0.2, 5, 20).$$

It is interesting to compare these to the hyper-parameter values chosen for the stratified return model, given in (3). Since the losses for return and risk models are different, we can scale the hyper-parameters in the return and risk to compare them. We can see that they are not the same, but not too different, either; both choose  $\gamma_{\text{inf}}$  larger than  $\gamma_{\text{vol}}$ , and  $\gamma_{\text{mort}}$  quite a bit larger than  $\gamma_{\text{vol}}$ .

Model	Train loss	Validation loss
Stratified risk model	-10.64	-4.27
Common risk model	2.44	3.26

**Table 4:** Average negative log-likelihood (scaled, with constant terms ignored) over the training and validation sets for the stratified and common risk models.

Asset	Common	Median	Min	Max
AGG	1.313	0.864	0.537	4.236
DBC	1.289	0.998	0.725	3.950
GLD	1.665	1.194	0.866	5.613
IBB	0.914	0.796	0.634	1.920
ITA	0.619	0.549	0.474	1.421
PBJ	0.648	0.502	0.414	1.502
TLT	1.816	1.263	0.734	6.050
VNQ	1.328	0.769	0.643	3.730
XLB	0.772	0.623	0.491	2.148
XLE	1.024	0.793	0.628	3.117
XLF	1.190	0.602	0.378	3.479
XLI	0.499	0.432	0.360	1.008
XLK	0.515	0.453	0.380	1.241
XLP	0.760	0.569	0.424	1.682
XLU	0.883	0.724	0.614	2.155
XLV	0.703	0.499	0.417	1.560
XLY	0.536	0.433	0.350	1.386

**Table 5:** Forecasts of volatility, expressed in percent daily return. The first column gives the common model; the second, third, and fourth columns give median, minimum, and maximum volatility predictions over the 1000 market conditions for the Laplacian regularized stratified model.

## 6.2 Final stratified risk model

Table 4 shows the average negative log likelihood (scaled, with constant terms ignored) over the training and held-out validation sets, for both the stratified risk model and the common risk model, *i.e.*, the empirical covariance. We can see that the stratified risk model has substantially better loss on the training and validation sets.

Table 5 summarizes some of the statistics of our stratified return model asset volatilities, *i.e.*,  $((\Sigma_z)_{ii})^{1/2}$ , expressed as daily percentages, over the 1000 market conditions, along with the common model asset volatilities. We can see that the predictions vary considerably across the market conditions, with a few varying by a factor almost up to ten. Table 6 summarizes the same statistics for the correlation of each asset with AGG, an aggregate bond market ETF. Here we see dramatic variation, for example, the correlation between XLI (an industrials ETF) and AGG varies from -85% to +80% over the market conditions.

Asset	Common	Median	min	max
AGG	1	1	1	1
DBC	0.490	0.414	-0.285	0.959
GLD	0.683	0.522	-0.131	0.979
IBB	0.238	0.066	-0.669	0.888
ITA	0.021	-0.059	-0.896	0.842
PBJ	0.569	0.356	-0.058	0.918
TLT	0.934	0.888	0.749	0.995
VNQ	-0.345	0.007	-0.908	0.796
XLB	-0.213	-0.216	-0.802	0.826
XLE	-0.203	-0.166	-0.832	0.854
XLF	-0.520	-0.267	-0.946	0.105
XLI	-0.108	-0.117	-0.848	0.801
XLK	0.158	0.091	-0.749	0.864
XLP	0.717	0.561	0.228	0.938
XLU	0.555	0.427	0.010	0.945
XLV	0.600	0.390	-0.275	0.917
XLY	-0.059	-0.035	-0.833	0.534

**Table 6:** Forecasts of correlations with the aggregate bond index AGG. The first column gives the common model; the second, third, and fourth columns give median, minimum, and maximum correlation predictions over the 1000 market conditions for the Laplacian regularized stratified model.

## 7 Trading policy and backtest

### 7.1 Trading policy

In this section we give the details of how we use our stratified return and risk models to construct the trading policy  $\mathcal{T}$ .

At the beginning of each day  $t$ , we use the previous day's market conditions  $z_t$  to allocate our current portfolio according to the weights  $w_t$ , computed as the solution of the Markowitz-inspired problem [BBD<sup>+</sup>17]

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{maximize} && \mu_{z_t}^T w - \gamma_{\text{sc}} \kappa^T(w)_- - \gamma_{\text{tc}} \tau_t^T |w - w_{t-1}| \\ & \text{subject to} && w^T \Sigma_{z_t} w \leq \sigma^2, \quad \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \\ & && \|w\|_1 \leq L_{\text{max}}, \quad w_{\min} \leq w \leq w_{\max}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

with optimization variable  $w \in \mathbf{R}^{18}$ , where  $w_- = \max\{0, -w\}$  (elementwise), and the absolute value is elementwise. We describe each term and constraint below.

- *Return forecast.* The first term in the objective,  $\mu_{z_t}^T w$ , is the expected return under our forecast mean, which depends on the current market conditions.
- *Shorting cost.* The second term  $\gamma_{\text{sc}} \kappa^T(w)_-$  is a shorting cost, with  $\kappa \in \mathbf{R}_+^{18}$  the vector of shorting cost rates. (For simplicity we take the shorting cost rates as constant.) The positive hyper-parameter  $\gamma_{\text{sc}}$  scales the shorting cost term, and is used to control our shorting aversion.
- *Transaction cost.* The third term  $\gamma_{\text{tc}} \tau_t^T |w - w_{t-1}|$  is a transaction cost, with  $\tau_t \in \mathbf{R}_+^{18}$  the vector of transaction cost rates used on day  $t$ . We take  $\tau_t$  as one-half the average bid-ask spread of each asset for the previous 15 trading days (excluding the current day). We summarize the bid-ask spreads of each asset over the training and holdout periods in table 7. The positive hyper-parameter  $\gamma_{\text{tc}}$  scales the transaction cost term, and is used to control the turnover.
- *Risk limit.* The constraint  $w^T \Sigma_{z_t} w \leq \sigma^2$  limits the (daily) risk (under our risk model, which depends on market conditions) to  $\sigma$ , which corresponds to an annualized risk of  $\sqrt{250}\sigma$ .
- *Leverage limit.* The constraint  $\|w\|_1 \leq L_{\text{max}}$  limits the portfolio leverage, or equivalently, it limits the total short position  $\mathbf{1}^T(w)_-$  to no more than  $(L - 1)/2$ .
- *Position limits.* The constraint  $w_{\min} \leq w \leq w_{\max}$  (interpreted elementwise) limits the individual weights.

**Parameters.** Some of the constants in the trading policy (4) we simply fix to reasonable values. We fix the shorting cost rate vector to  $(0.0005)\mathbf{1}$ , *i.e.*, 5 basis points for each asset. We take  $\sigma = 0.0045$ , which corresponds to an annualized volatility of  $\sqrt{250}\sigma$ , around 7.1%.

Asset	Training/validation period	Holdout period
AGG	0.000298	0.000051
DBC	0.000653	0.000324
GLD	0.000112	0.000048
IBB	0.000418	0.000181
ITA	0.000562	0.000175
PBJ	0.000966	0.000637
TLT	0.000157	0.000048
VNQ	0.000394	0.000066
VTI	0.000204	0.000048
XLB	0.000310	0.000098
XLE	0.000181	0.000077
XLF	0.000359	0.000200
XLI	0.000295	0.000079
XLK	0.000324	0.000093
XLP	0.000298	0.000095
XLU	0.000276	0.000099
XLV	0.000271	0.000070
XLY	0.000334	0.000059

**Table 7:** One-half the mean bid-ask spread of each asset, over the training and validation periods and the holdout period.

We take  $L_{\max} = 2$ , which means the total short position cannot exceed one half of the portfolio value. (A portfolio with a leverage of 2 satisfying  $1^T w = 1$  is commonly referred to as a *150/50 portfolio*.) We fix the position limits as  $w_{\min} = -0.25\mathbf{1}$  and  $w_{\max} = 0.4\mathbf{1}$ , meaning we cannot short any asset by more than 0.25 times the portfolio value, and we cannot hold more than 0.4 times the portfolio value of any asset.

**Hyper-parameters.** Our trading policy has two hyper-parameters,  $\gamma_{\text{sc}}$  and  $\gamma_{\text{tc}}$ , which control our aversion to shorting and trading, respectively.

## 7.2 Backtests

Backtests are carried out starting from a portfolio of all VTI and a starting portfolio value of  $v = 1$ . On day  $t$ , after computing  $w_t$  as the solution to (4), we compute the value of our portfolio  $v_t$  by

$$r_{t,\text{net}} = r_t^T w_t - \kappa^T(w_t)_- - (\tau_t^{\text{sim}})^T |w_t - w_{t-1}|, \quad v_t = v_{t-1}(1 + r_{t,\text{net}}),$$

Here  $r_t \in \mathbf{R}^{18}$  is the vector of asset returns on day  $t$ ,  $r_t^T w_t$  is the gross return of the portfolio for day  $t$ ,  $\tau_t^{\text{sim}}$  is one-half the realized bid-ask spread on day  $t$ , and  $r_{t,\text{net}}$  is the net return of the portfolio for day  $t$  including shorting and transaction costs. In particular, *our backtests*

	Return	Risk
Train	11.2%	5.89%
Validation	12.2%	6.23%

**Table 8:** Annualized return and risk for the stratified model policy over the train and validation periods.

*take shorting and transaction costs into account.* Note also that in the backtests, we use the actual realized bid-ask spread on that day (which is not known at the beginning of the day) to determine the true transaction cost, whereas in the policy, we use the trailing 15 day average (which is known at the beginning of the day).

Our backtest is a bit simplified. Our simulation assumes dividend reinvestment. We account for the shorting and transaction costs by adjusting the portfolio return, which is equivalent to splitting these costs across the whole portfolio; a more careful treatment might include a small cash account. For portfolios of very high value, we would add an additional nonlinear transaction cost term, for example proportional to the  $3/2$ -power of  $|w_t - w_{t-1}|$  [BBD<sup>+</sup>17].

### 7.3 Hyper-parameter selection

To choose values of the two hyper-parameters in the trading policy, we carry out multiple backtest simulations over the training set. We evaluate these backtest simulations by their realized return (net, including costs) over the validation set.

We perform a grid search, testing all 625 pairs of 25 values of each hyper-parameter logarithmically spaced from 0.1 to 10. The annualized return on the validation set, as a function of the hyper-parameters, are shown in figure 2. We choose the final values


$$\gamma_{\text{sc}} = 2.61, \quad \gamma_{\text{tc}} = 2.15,$$

shown on figure 2 as a star.

These values are themselves interesting. Roughly speaking, we should plan our trades as if the shorting cost were more than 2.5 times the actual cost, and the transaction cost is more than double the true transaction cost. The blue and purple region at the bottom of the heat map indicates poor validation performance when the transaction cost parameter is too low, *i.e.*, the policy trades too much.

Table 8 gives the annualized return and risk for the policies over the train and validation periods.

**Common model trading policy.** We will compare our stratified model trading policy to a common model trading policy, which uses the constant return and risk models, along with the same Markowitz policy (4). In this case, none of the parameters in the optimization problem change with market conditions, and the only parameter that changes in different days is  $w_{t-1}$ , the previous day’s asset weights, which enters into the transaction cost.



**Figure 2:** Heatmap of the annualized return on the validation set as a function of the two hyper-parameters  $\gamma_{sc}$  and  $\gamma_{tc}$ . The star shows the hyper-parameter combination used in our trading policy.



	Return	Risk	Sharpe ratio	Maximum drawdown
Stratified model policy	2.30%	7.00%	0.33	12.2%
Common model policy	-2.82%	7.73%	-0.366	24.9%

**Table 9:** Annualized active return, active risk, active Sharpe ratios, and maximum drawdown of the active portfolio value for the three policies over the test period (2015–2019).

We also perform a grid search for this trading policy, over the same 625 pairs of the hyper-parameters. For the common model trading policy, we choose the final values

$$\gamma_{sc} = 0.12, \quad \gamma_{tc} = 1.47.$$

## 7.4 Final trading policy results


We re-fit our stratified risk and return models, utilizing all of the data in the training and validation sets, using the hyper-parameters selected in §5.1 and §6.1. We backtest our trading policy on the test dataset, which includes data from 2015–2019. We remind the reader that no data from this date range was used to create, tune, or validate any of the models, or to choose any hyper-parameters. For comparison, we also give results of a backtest using the constant return and risk models.

Figure 3 plots the economic conditions over the test period (top) as well as the active portfolio value (*i.e.*, value above the benchmark VTI) for our stratified model and common model. Buying and holding the benchmark VTI gives zero active return, and a constant active portfolio value of 1. The superior performance of the stratified model policy, *e.g.*, higher return and lower volatility, is evident in this plot.


Table 9 shows the annualized active return, annualized active risk, annualized active Sharpe ratio (return divided by risk), and maximum drawdown of the active portfolio value for the policies over the test period. We remind the reader that we are fully accounting for the shorting and transaction cost, so the turnover of the policy is accounted for in these backtest metrics.

The results are impressive when viewed in the following light. First, we are using a very small universe of only 18 ETFs. Second, our trading policy uses only three widely available market conditions, and indeed, only their deciles. Third, the policy was entirely developed using data prior to 2015, with no adjustments made for the next five years. (In actual use, one would likely re-train the model periodically, perhaps every quarter or year.)

**Comparison of stratified and constant policies.** In figure 4, we plot the asset weights of the stratified model policy (top) and of the common model policy (bottom), over the test period. (The variations in the common model policy holdings come from a combination of a daily rebalancing of the assets and the transaction cost model.) The top plot shows that the weights in the stratified policy change considerably with market conditions. The only assets that are shorted to a significant degree are AGG, GLD and TLT, and only during times of market turbulence. The common model policy is mainly concentrated in just seven assets,



**Figure 3:** Plot of economic conditions (top) and cumulative portfolio value for the stratified model and the common model (bottom) over the test period. The horizontal blue line is the cumulative portfolio value for buying and holding the benchmark VTI.



**Figure 4:** Asset weights of the stratified model policy (top) and of the common model policy (bottom), over the test period. The first time period asset weights, which are all VTI, are not shown.

AGG (bonds) GLD (gold), IBB (biotech), XLE (energy), XLF (financials), XLY (consumer discretionary), and VTI (which is effectively cash when considering active returns and risks), and never shorts any assets, *i.e.*, is long only. Moreover, the common model policy shorts AGG (to the position limit of -0.25) and TLT and XLF (by a much lesser degree).

**Factor analysis.** We fit a linear regression model of the active returns of the two policies over the test set to four of the Fama-French factors [FF92, FF93, Fre21]:

- $MKTRF$ , the value-weighted return of United States equities, minus the risk free rate,
- $SMB$ , the return on a portfolio of small size stocks minus a portfolio of big size stocks,
- $HML$ , the return on a portfolio of value stocks minus a portfolio of growth stocks, and

Factor	Stratified model policy	Common model policy
MKTRF	-0.033887	0.154132
SMB	0.165571	0.231877
HML	-0.233028	-0.457454
UMD	-0.127748	-0.108726
Alpha	0.000097	-0.000228

**Table 10:** The top four rows give the regression model coefficients of the active portfolio returns on the Fama-French factors; the fifth row gives the intercept or alpha value.

- *UMD*, the return on a portfolio of high momentum stocks minus a portfolio of low or negative momentum stocks.

We also include an intercept term, commonly referred to as alpha. Table 10 gives the results of these fits. Relative to the common model policy, the stratified model policy active returns are much less positively correlated to the market, shorter the size factor, longer the value factor, and shorter the momentum factor. Its active alpha is around 2.43% annualized. While not very impressive on its own, this alpha seems good considering it was accomplished with just 18 ETFs, and using only three widely available quantities in the policy.

## 8 Extensions and variations

We have presented a simple (but realistic) example only to illustrate the ideas, which can easily be applied in more complex settings, with a far larger universe, a more complex trading policy, and using proprietary forecasts of returns and quantities used to judge market conditions. We describe some extensions and variations on our method below.

**Multi-period optimization.** For simplicity we use a policy that is based on solving a single-period Markowitz problem. The entire method immediately extends to policies based on multi-period optimization. For example, we would fit separate stratified models of return and risk for the next 1 day, 5 day, 20 day, and 60 day periods (roughly daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly), all based on the same current market conditions. These data are fed into a multi-period optimizer as described in [BBD<sup>+</sup>17].

**Joint modeling of return and risk.** In this paper we created separate Laplacian regularized stratified models for return and risk. The advantage of this approach is that we can judge each model separately (and with different true objectives), and use different hyperparameter values. It is also possible to fit the return mean and covariance *jointly*, in one stratified model, using the natural parameters in the exponential family for a Gaussian,  $\Sigma^{-1}$  and  $\Sigma^{-1}\mu$ . The resulting log-likelihood is jointly concave, and a Laplacian regularized model can be directly fit.

**Low-dimensional economic factors.** When just a handful (such as in our example, three) base quantities are used to construct the stratified market conditions, we can bin and grid the values as we do in this paper. This simple stratification of market conditions preserves interpretability. If we wish to include more raw data in our stratification of market conditions, simple binning and enumeration is not practical. Instead we can use several techniques to handle such situations. The simplest is to perform dimensionality-reduction on the (higher-dimensional) economic conditions, such as principal component analysis [Pea01] or low-rank forecasting [BDB20], and appropriately bin these low-dimensional economic conditions. These economic conditions may then be related on a graph with edge weights decided by an appropriate method, such as nearest neighbor weights.

**Structured covariance estimation.** It is quite common to model the covariance matrix of returns as having structure, *e.g.*, as the sum of a diagonal matrix plus a low rank matrix [RSV12, FLL16]. This structure can be added by a combination of introducing new variables to the model and encoding constraints in the local regularization. In many cases, this structure constraint turns the stratified risk model fitting problem into a non-convex problem, which may be solved approximately.

**Multi-linear interpolation.** In the approach presented above, the economic conditions are categorical, *i.e.*, take on one of  $K = 1000$  possible values at each time  $t$ , based on the deciles of three quantities. A simple extension is to use multi-linear interpolation [WZ88, Dav97] to determine the return and risk to use in the Markowitz optimizer. Thus we would use the actual quantile of the three market quantities, and not just their deciles. In the case of risk, we would apply the interpolation to the precision matrix  $\Sigma_t^{-1}$ , the natural parameter in the exponential family description of a Gaussian.

**End-to-end hyper-parameter optimization.** In the example presented in this paper there are a total of nine hyper-parameters to select. We keep things simple by separately optimizing the hyper-parameters for the stratified return model, the stratified risk model, and the trading policy. This approach allows each step to be checked independently. It is also possible to simultaneously optimize all of the hyper-parameters with respect to a single backtest, using, for example, CVXPYlayers [AAB<sup>+</sup>19, ABBS20] to differentiate through the trading policy.

**Stratified ensembling.** The methods described in this paper can be used to combine or ensemble a collection of different return forecasts or signals, whose performance varies with market (or other) conditions. We start with a collection of return predictions, and combine these (ensemble them) using weights that are a function of the market conditions. We develop a stratified selection of the combining weights.

## 9 Conclusions

We argue that stratified models are interesting and useful in portfolio construction and finance. They can contain a large number of parameters, but unlike, say, neural networks, they are fully interpretable and auditable. They allow arbitrary variation across market conditions, with Laplacian regularization there to help us come up with reasonable models even for market conditions for which we have no training data. The maximum principle mentioned on page 4 tells us that a Laplacian regularized stratified model will never do anything crazy when it encounters values of  $z$  that never appeared in the training data. Instead it will use a weighted sum of other values for which we do have training data. These weights are not just any weights, but ones carefully chosen by validation.

The small but realistic example we have presented is only meant to illustrate the ideas. The very same ideas and method can be applied in far more complex and sophisticated settings, with a larger universe of assets, a more complex trading policy, and incorporating proprietary data and forecasts.

## Acknowledgements

The authors gratefully acknowledge discussions with and suggestions from Ronald Kahn, Raffaele Savi, and Andrew Ang. Jonathan Tuck is supported by the Stanford Graduate Fellowship in Science and Engineering.

## References

- [AAB<sup>+</sup>19] A. Agrawal, B. Amos, S. Barratt, S. Boyd, S. Diamond, and Z. Kolter. Differentiable convex optimization layers. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [AB02] A. Ang and G. Bekaert. International asset allocation with regime shifts. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 15(4):1137–1187, July 2002.
- [AB03] A. Ang and G. Bekaert. How do regimes affect asset allocation? Technical Report 10080, National Bureau of Economic Research, November 2003.
- [AB04] A. Ang and G. Bekaert. How regimes affect asset allocation. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 60(2):86–99, 2004.
- [ABBS20] A. Agrawal, S. Barratt, S. Boyd, and B. Stellato. Learning convex optimization control policies. In *Proceedings of the 2nd Conference on Learning for Dynamics and Control*, volume 120 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 361–373, 10–11 Jun 2020.
- [AIL99] R. Aggarwal, C. Inclan, and R. Leal. Volatility in emerging stock markets. *The Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 34(1):33–55, 1999.
- [AT11] A. Ang and A. Timmermann. Regime changes and financial markets. Technical Report 17182, National Bureau of Economic Research, June 2011.
- [BBD<sup>+</sup>17] S. Boyd, E. Busseti, S. Diamond, R. Kahn, K. Koh, P. Nystrup, and J. Speth. Multi-period trading via convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 3(1):1–76, 2017.
- [BC03] J. Boyd and B. Champ. Inflation and financial market performance: what have we learned in the last ten years? Technical Report 0317, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, 2003.
- [BDB20] S. Barratt, Y. Dong, and S. Boyd. Low rank forecasting. Manuscript, 2020.
- [BLS96] J. Boyd, R. Levine, and B. Smith. Inflation and financial market performance. Technical report, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, October 1996.
- [BLS01] J. Boyd, R. Levine, and B. Smith. The impact of inflation on financial sector performance. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 47(2):221 – 248, 2001.
- [Bor12] L. Borland. Statistical signatures in times of panic: markets as a self-organizing system. *Quantitative Finance*, 12(9):1367–1379, October 2012.
- [BV04] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.

- [Cav16] G. La Cava. Housing prices, mortgage interest rates and the rising share of capital income in the United States. BIS Working Papers 572, Bank for International Settlements, July 2016.
- [CCR20] D. Chun, H. Cho, and D. Ryu. Economic indicators and stock market volatility in an emerging economy. *Economic Systems*, 44(2):100788, 2020.
- [Dav97] S. Davies. Multidimensional triangulation and interpolation for reinforcement learning. In M. C. Mozer, M. Jordan, and T. Petsche, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 9*, pages 1005–1011. MIT Press, 1997.
- [DWW14] P. Danaher, P. Wang, and D. Witten. The joint graphical lasso for inverse covariance estimation across multiple classes. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 76(2):373–397, 2014.
- [EHV94] C. Erb, C. Harvey, and T. Viskanta. Forecasting international equity correlations. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 50(6):32–45, 1994.
- [Exc20] Chicago Board Options Exchange. CBOE volatility index. <http://www.cboe.com/vix>, 2020.
- [FF92] E. Fama and K. French. The cross-section of expected stock returns. *Journal of Finance*, 47(2):427–465, 1992.
- [FF93] E. Fama and K. French. Common risk factors in the returns on stocks and bonds. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 33(1):3–56, 1993.
- [FLL16] J. Fan, Y. Liao, and H. Liu. An overview of the estimation of large covariance and precision matrices. *The Econometrics Journal*, 19(1):C1–C32, 2016.
- [Fre21] K. French. Description of Fama/French factors. [https://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data\\_library.html#Research](https://mba.tuck.dartmouth.edu/pages/faculty/ken.french/data_library.html#Research), 2021.
- [FRED20] Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Federal Reserve Economic Data. 30-year fixed rate mortgage average in the United States (MORTGAGE30US). <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/MORTGAGE30US>, 2020.
- [FSS87] K. French, W. Schwert, and R. Stambaugh. Expected stock returns and volatility. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 19(1):3, 1987.
- [GK99] R. Grinold and R. Kahn. *Active Portfolio Management: A Quantitative Approach for Producing Superior Returns and Controlling Risk*. McGraw Hill New York, NY, 1999.
- [HNB19] D. Hallac, P. Nystrup, and S. Boyd. Greedy Gaussian segmentation of multi-variate time series. *Advances in Data Analysis and Classification*, 13(3):727–751, 2019.



- [HTF09] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer series in statistics. Springer, 2009.
- [Hun03] F.-S. Hung. Inflation, financial development, and economic growth. *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 12(1):45–67, 2003.
- [LS01] F. Longin and B. Solnik. Correlation structure of international equity markets during extremely volatile periods. *Journal of Finance*, 56(2):649–676, April 2001.
- [Mah17] H. Mahyar. The Effect Of Inflation On Financial Development Indicators In Iran (2000-2015). *Studies in Business and Economics*, 12(2):53–62, August 2017.
- [Mar52] H. Markowitz. Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance*, 7(1):77–91, 1952.
- [NBLM19] P. Nystrup, S. Boyd, E. Lindström, and H. Madsen. Multi-period portfolio selection with drawdown control. *Annals of Operations Research*, 282(1):245–271, November 2019.
- [NHML15] P. Nystrup, B. Hansen, H. Madsen, and E. Lindström. Regime-based versus static asset allocation: Letting the data speak. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, 42(1):103–109, 2015.
- [NML18] P. Nystrup, H. Madsen, and E. Lindström. Dynamic portfolio optimization across hidden market regimes. *Quantitative Finance*, 18(1):83–95, 2018.
- [oLS20] United States Bureau of Labor Statistics. Consumer price index. <https://www.bls.gov/cpi/>, 2020.
- [Pea01] K. Pearson. On lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 2(11):559–572, 1901.
- [Pet15] G. Petre. A case for dynamic asset allocation for long term investors. *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 29:41 – 55, 2015.
- [RSV12] E. Richard, P.-A. Savalle, and N. Vayatis. Estimation of simultaneously sparse and low rank matrices. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’12*, page 51–58, Madison, WI, USA, 2012. Omnipress.
- [RTA98] T. Ryden, T. Terasvirta, and S. Asbrink. Stylized facts of daily return series and the hidden Markov model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 13(3):217–244, 1998.
- [Sch89] W. Schwert. Why does stock market volatility change over time? *The Journal of Finance*, 44(5):1115–1153, 1989.

- [SMS17] G. Sutton, D. Mihaljek, and A. Subelytė. Interest rates and house prices in the United States and around the world. BIS Working Papers 665, Bank for International Settlements, October 2017.
- [SS16] T. Saegusa and A. Shojaie. Joint estimation of precision matrices in heterogeneous populations. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):1341–1392, 2016.
- [TB20] J. Tuck and S. Boyd. Fitting Laplacian regularized stratified Gaussian models. *arXiv*, 2020. Manuscript.
- [TB21] J. Tuck and S. Boyd. Eigen-stratified models. *Optimization and Engineering*, 2021.
- [TBB21] J. Tuck, S. Barratt, and S. Boyd. A distributed method for fitting Laplacian regularized stratified models. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2021. To appear.
- [THB19] J. Tuck, D. Hallac, and S. Boyd. Distributed majorization-minimization for Laplacian regularized problems. *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, 2019.
- [WS94] M. Wynne and F. Sigalla. The consumer price index. *Economic and Financial Policy Review*, 2:1–22, Feb 1994.
- [WZ88] A. Weiser and S. Zarantonello. A note on piecewise linear and multilinear table interpolation in many dimensions. *Mathematics of Computation*, 50(181):189–196, 1988.