

SEMI-DECISION-FOCUSED LEARNING WITH DEEP ENSEMBLES: A PRACTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ROBUST PORTFOLIO OPTIMIZATION

Juhyeong Kim

Seoul, Republic of Korea

nonconvexopt@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

I propose *Semi-Decision-Focused Learning*, a practical adaptation of Decision-Focused Learning for portfolio optimization. Rather than directly optimizing complex financial metrics, I employ simple target portfolios (Max-Sortino or One-Hot) and train models with a convex, cross-entropy loss. I further incorporate Deep Ensemble methods to reduce variance and stabilize performance. Experiments on two universes (one upward-trending and another range-bound) show consistent outperformance over baseline portfolios, demonstrating the effectiveness and robustness of my approach. Code is available at <https://github.com/sDFLwDE/sDFLwDE>.

1 INTRODUCTION

Machine learning technologies have transformed portfolio optimization, with numerous studies leveraging deep learning to automate and enhance the process. Recent work encompasses gradient-based learning methods (Zhang et al., 2020) and Reinforcement Learning approaches (Betancourt & Chen, 2021; Chaouki et al., 2020; Jang & Seong, 2023; Jiang et al., 2024; Koratamaddi et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2019; Acero et al., 2024; Sood et al.).

Zhang et al. (2020) introduced the Sharpe ratio as an objective function, exemplifying a Decision-Focused Learning approach. Although theoretically sound, directly optimizing the Sharpe ratio often proves challenging in practice. Because the ratio is non-convex with respect to portfolio weights, such optimization can be unstable and prone to converging on suboptimal solutions. Moreover, deep learning model parameters typically exhibit complex, non-linear relationships with outputs, exacerbating the non-convexity and instability issues.

Reinforcement Learning (RL) methods are also proposed for portfolio optimization. However, selecting appropriate RL algorithms and tuning their hyperparameters can be difficult. RL approaches are also inherently prone to uncertainty, leading to significant performance variability across different runs. Consequently, there is a pressing need for a more robust and practical machine learning strategy in portfolio optimization. One avenue for reducing predictive uncertainty is Deep Ensemble. Although ensembling increases computational overhead in proportion to the number of models, it significantly enhances prediction accuracy, calibration, and robustness (Gupta et al., 2022).

Contribution. I propose the Semi-Decision-Focused Learning framework, which refines Decision-Focused Learning into a practical method for decision-making tasks. My approach reformulates the problem as supervised learning, using a straightforward loss function and target.

I evaluate multiple deep sequence model architectures within this framework and observe variability in backtesting performance. To address this, I explore strategies to mitigate instability in portfolio optimization. Notably, I show that adopting a Deep Ensemble—aggregating and averaging predictions from multiple models—consistently reduces uncertainty and enhances overall portfolio optimization results.

2 METHOD

2.1 PRELIMINARIES

Decision-Focused Learning. Decision-Focused Learning directly optimizes decision-making objectives to solve a target problem. In contrast, Predict-then-Optimize or two-stage learning first predicts model parameters, then performs decision-making as a separate step. By unifying both stages under one objective, Decision-Focused Learning produces decisions that more closely align with the final task requirements. Predict-then-Optimize for portfolio optimization can be expressed with the following formulas:

$$\text{Stage 1 objective: } \hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \mathcal{L}(\hat{y}, y), \quad \hat{y} = f_{\theta}(x) \text{ (Prediction)}$$

$$\text{Stage 2 objective: } \hat{w} = \arg \max_w \mathcal{P}(w, \hat{y}) \text{ (Desion Making)}$$

Here, \mathcal{L} is a loss function such as the mean squared error. The parameter θ may represent the machine learning model’s weights, while y typically denotes the mean and covariance of returns. \mathcal{P} is a performance metric (e.g., Sharpe ratio), and w is the portfolio weights. Practitioners may impose constraints at the decision-making step. By contrast, Decision-Focused Learning unifies two stages and optimizes a single objective:

$$\text{Objective: } \hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta} \mathcal{P}(\hat{w}, y), \quad \hat{w} = f_{\theta}(x) \text{ (Model)}$$

Deep Ensemble. Deep Ensemble enhances output quality by aggregating the predictions of multiple deep learning models, each initialized independently. It has been shown to improve prediction performance, calibration, and robustness (Gupta et al., 2022). Conceptually, Deep Ensemble reduces the variance of the overall prediction. Suppose I have multiple models f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m . If I assume $\text{Var}[f_i(x)] = \sigma^2$ and $\text{Cov}[f_i, f_j] = \rho\sigma^2$ for $i \neq j$, then

$$\text{Var}[\bar{f}(x)] = \frac{\sigma^2(1 + (m-1)\rho)}{m}, \quad \text{where } \bar{f}(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x).$$

Details of this derivation appear in Appendix A.1. When $\rho < 1$, the correlation among individual model predictions is less than one, reducing the overall variance. This condition typically holds in a Deep Ensemble because each Deep Learning model is trained independently with different initializations and produces different outputs for the same input.

2.2 SEMI-DECISION-FOCUSED LEARNING WITH DEEP ENSEMBLE

Semi-Decision-Focused Learning. I introduce Semi-Decision-Focused Learning to achieve the benefits of Decision-Focused Learning in a stable, practical manner. My framework treats the decision-making task as a supervised learning problem by employing cross-entropy loss with a precomputed, hypothetically optimal portfolio as the target. Unlike Zhang et al. (2020), I use a cross-entropy loss function that is convex with respect to the model outputs. I refer to my approach as *Semi-Decision-Focused Learning* because, although the model is trained to perform decision-making, the loss function is not a direct performance metric of that decision-making task.

Nevertheless, random parameter initialization introduces inherent uncertainty in deep learning models, which can significantly affect portfolio optimization performance. To mitigate this, I use Deep Ensemble—aggregating predictions from multiple independent models—to stabilize outcomes. I compute ensemble portfolio weights that are less sensitive to any single model’s initialization.

3 EXPERIMENT

3.1 EXPERIMENT SETTINGS

Universe. I evaluate my portfolio optimization approach on two distinct universes. **Universe 1** comprises 24 equities that generally trend upward, while **Universe 2** consists of 84 equities that remain largely range-bound.

Target Portfolios. As described in Section 2.2, my framework relies on hypothetically optimal portfolios as training targets. I investigate two such portfolios. The first is a *Max-Sortino* portfolio, computed using the means and semi-variances of future returns. The second is a *One-Hot* portfolio that invests entirely in the equity with the highest future return. All portfolios in this study refer *Long-Only* portfolio. Each portfolio for the sample period is visualized in Appendix A.4

Models. I employ three widely used deep sequence architectures: LSTM (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997), Transformer (TRF) (Vaswani et al., 2017), and Mamba (Gu & Dao, 2024).

Additional Details. Further experimental settings are described in Appendix A.2.

3.2 EXPERIMENT RESULTS




Figure 1: **Backtesting Performance.** I perform backtesting under a 40 bp trading cost and a two-day lag for rebalancing. Each curve represents cumulative returns starting at 1 at the beginning of the backtesting period. Results reflect ensemble weights aggregated from 100 independently trained models. The y-axis represents cumulative returns.

| | Universe 1 | | | Universe 2 | | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | CR | SHR | SOR | CR | SHR | SOR |
| Baseline | | | | | | |
| Equal Weight | 3.014 | 0.884 | 1.391 | 1.749 | 0.416 | 0.653 |
| Value Weight | 4.462 | 0.860 | 1.362 | 1.728 | 0.354 | 0.566 |
| mSSRM PGA | 2.799 | 0.890 | 1.435 | 1.777 | 0.436 | 0.687 |
| DL4PO | 1.408 | 0.219 | 0.341 | 1.976 | 0.388 | 0.642 |
| My Method | | | | | | |
| Mamba Max-Sortino | 5.760 | 1.007 | 1.577 | 1.887 | 0.397 | 0.646 |
| TRF Max-Sortino | 4.013 | 0.981 | 1.546 | 1.870 | 0.447 | 0.713 |
| LSTM Max-Sortino | 7.123 | 0.938 | 1.510 | 1.817 | 0.352 | 0.574 |
| Mamba One-hot | 6.957 | 0.868 | 1.410 | 2.685 | 0.530 | 0.894 |
| TRF One-hot | 6.007 | 0.953 | 1.533 | 1.751 | 0.367 | 0.587 |
| LSTM One-hot | 6.848 | 0.755 | 1.237 | 1.659 | 0.257 | 0.430 |

Table 1: **Backtesting Performance.** I conduct portfolio optimization experiments on two universes. Each backtest uses an ensemble of 100 models. **CR** denotes cumulative return. **SHR** and **SOR** refer to the Sharpe and Sortino ratios, respectively (§A.3). Best performances are highlighted.

Figure 1 presents the backtesting performance metrics. **mSSRM PGA**, proposed by Lin et al. (2024), is treated as a maximum-Sharpe portfolio by setting m to the number of items in the universe without additional constraints. **DL4PO** is proposed by Lee et al. (2024) and represented as a Decision-Focused Learning baseline. I report the average performance of **DL4PO** over 100 independent runs. Table 3.2 demonstrates that these configurations yield higher cumulative returns than the baseline approaches. In addition, the Sharpe and Sortino ratios generally improve, underscoring the overall effectiveness of my proposed framework.




Figure 2: **Ensemble Effect.** I focus on the Mamba model with the one-hot target portfolio scheme due to its strong backtesting performance, low computational cost, and relatively high variability. I analyze the impact of Deep Ensemble by generating 1,000 model samples and bootstrapping them to compute ensemble weights. For each ensemble size, I randomly select model samples with replacement for 1,000 times, average their weights, and record the resulting backtesting performances of aggregated weights. The orange line in each boxplot denotes the median.

Figure 2 illustrates how Deep Ensemble improves portfolio optimization performance within my framework for the Mamba model. Cumulative returns consistently rise as the ensemble size doubles from 1 to 64, highlighting the benefits of ensembling for reducing variability and increasing returns. Both the Sharpe and Sortino ratios exhibit a clear upward trend. The narrowing interquartile range in each boxplot indicates that larger ensemble sizes further reduce variance and enhance stability.

4 RELATED WORKS

Portfolio Optimization. Recent studies have highlighted the potential of machine learning methods for portfolio optimization with a limited number of equities. Gradient-based approaches to Sharpe ratio maximization have been explored (Zhang et al., 2020), and Reinforcement Learning has frequently been applied to this problem (Betancourt & Chen, 2021; Chaouki et al., 2020; Jang & Seong, 2023; Jiang et al., 2024; Koratamaddi et al., 2021; Yu et al., 2019; Acero et al., 2024; Sood et al.). In addition, Lin et al. (2024) investigated a convex formulation for Sharpe ratio maximization.

Decision-Focused Learning. Decision-Focused Learning has been analyzed and compared to Predict-then-Optimize (Mandi et al., 2024). Recent studies have also applied Decision-Focused Learning in various domains (Tang & Khalil, 2023; Shah et al., 2022; Kong et al., 2023). Lee et al. (2024) proposes a Decision-Focused Learning objective in the portfolio optimization problem. Uysal et al. (2021) presents a unified approach to solving the portfolio optimization problem, aligning with the principles of Decision-Focused Learning.

Sequence & Time-Series Models. There has been extensive research on deep sequence models. Long short-term memory (LSTM) networks extend basic Recurrent Neural Networks by incorporating longer-term dependencies (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997). Transformers introduce an attention mechanism that selectively extracts information over a given time horizon (Vaswani et al., 2017). The Mamba model offers a linear-time alternative to Transformers, reducing computational complexity relative to the sequence length (Gu & Dao, 2024).

Deep Ensemble. Gupta et al. (2022) provided a theoretical investigation of ensembling in machine learning for classification tasks. Lakshminarayanan et al. (2017) studied the usage of Deep Ensemble on uncertainty estimation.

5 CONCLUSION

I propose a novel portfolio optimization method grounded in the Decision-Focused Learning framework. In experiments on two distinct investment universes, one trending generally upward and the other range-bound, my approach consistently outperforms various portfolio optimization baselines, indicating its robustness and superior performance across different market conditions.

To further enhance performance, I incorporate the Deep Ensemble method. My experiments show that increasing the ensemble size consistently yields better portfolio optimization results in the quality of the portfolio weight.

Limitation. I employ a cross-entropy loss in my semi-Decision-Focused Learning framework. However, this approach is only suitable for long-only portfolios. Practitioners can extend the framework to include short positions by adopting alternative loss functions.

The effectiveness of my framework also depends on the characteristics of the target portfolio. While I examined two portfolio types, their precision is not guaranteed to be optimal, and there may exist more suitable portfolio configurations for particular investment objectives.

Although Deep Ensemble markedly improves backtesting performance, it also multiplies the computational cost. Practitioners must therefore choose an ensemble size that balances performance gains against available computational resources.

Future Work. In this study, I focus on averaging weights within a Deep Ensemble. Moving forward, I intend to develop techniques that incorporate the uncertainty from the Deep Ensemble into the final portfolio construction. Although this direction diverges from my core Semi-Decision-Focused Learning framework, it may further improve the method’s real-world applicability.

Acknowledgments I would like to thank Sungyoon Choi, Hyunwoo Byun, and Yongmin Choi of Mirae Asset Global Investments for providing constructive feedback. I also thank Professor Yongjae Lee of Ulsan National Institute of Science and Technology for his thorough review of the manuscript and the additional literature review he conducted after the author notification.

REFERENCES

- Fernando Acero, Parisa Zehtabi, Nicolas Marchesotti, Michael Cashmore, Daniele Magazzeni, and Manuela Veloso. Deep reinforcement learning and mean-variance strategies for responsible portfolio optimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.16667>.
- Carlos Betancourt and Wen-Hui Chen. Deep reinforcement learning for portfolio management of markets with a dynamic number of assets. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 164:114002, 2021. ISSN 0957-4174. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.114002>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417420307776>.
- Ayman Chaouki, Stephen Hardiman, Christian Schmidt, Emmanuel Sérié, and Joachim de Lataillade. Deep deterministic portfolio optimization. *The Journal of Finance and Data Science*, 6: 16–30, 2020. ISSN 2405-9188. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfds.2020.06.002>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2405918820300118>.
- Werner Dinkelbach. On nonlinear fractional programming. *Management Science*, 13:492–498, 1967. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:119939254>.
- Albert Gu and Tri Dao. Mamba: Linear-time sequence modeling with selective state spaces, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.00752>.
- Neha Gupta, Jamie Smith, Ben Adlam, and Zelda E Mariet. Ensembles of classifiers: a bias-variance perspective. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022. ISSN 2835-8856. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=l1OQFVncY9>.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural Comput.*, 9(8): 1735–1780, November 1997. ISSN 0899-7667. doi: 10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735. URL <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>.
- Junkyu Jang and Nohyoon Seong. Deep reinforcement learning for stock portfolio optimization by connecting with modern portfolio theory. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 218:119556, 2023. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:255884248>.
- Yifu Jiang, Jose Olmo, and Majed Atwi. Deep reinforcement learning for portfolio selection. *Global Finance Journal*, 2024. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:271211136>.
- Lingkai Kong, Wenhao Mu, Jiaming Cui, Yuchen Zhuang, B. Aditya Prakash, Bo Dai, and Chao Zhang. Df2: Distribution-free decision-focused learning, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.05889>.
- Prahlad Koratamaddi, Karan Wadhvani, Mridul Gupta, and Sriram G. Sanjeevi. Market sentiment-aware deep reinforcement learning approach for stock portfolio allocation. *Engineering Science and Technology, an International Journal*, 24(4):848–859, 2021. ISSN 2215-0986. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jestch.2021.01.007>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2215098621000070>.
- Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Alexander Pritzel, and Charles Blundell. Simple and scalable predictive uncertainty estimation using deep ensembles. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/9ef2ed4b7fd2c810847ffa5fa85bce38-Paper.pdf.
- Junhyeong Lee, Inwoo Tae, and Yongjae Lee. Anatomy of machines for markowitz: Decision-focused learning for mean-variance portfolio optimization, 2024. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2409.09684>.
- Yizun Lin, Zhao-Rong Lai, and Cheng Li. A globally optimal portfolio for m-sparse sharpe ratio maximization. In *The Thirty-eighth Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=p54CYwdjVP>.

- Hong Liu, Zhiyuan Li, David Leo Wright Hall, Percy Liang, and Tengyu Ma. Sophia: A scalable stochastic second-order optimizer for language model pre-training. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=3xHDeA8Noi>.
- Jayanta Mandi, James Kotary, Senne Berden, Maxime Mulamba, Victor Bucarey, Tias Guns, and Ferdinando Fioretto. Decision-focused learning: Foundations, state of the art, benchmark and future opportunities. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 80:1623–1701, August 2024. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.15320. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1613/jair.1.15320>.
- Sanket Shah, Kai Wang, Bryan Wilder, Andrew Perrault, and Milind Tambe. Decision-focused learning without decision-making: Learning locally optimized decision losses. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 35, pp. 1320–1332. Curran Associates, Inc., 2022. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/file/0904c7edde20d7134a77fc7f9cd86ea2-Paper-Conference.pdf.
- William F. Sharpe. Mutual Fund Performance. *The Journal of Business*, 39:119–119, 1965. doi: 10.1086/294846. URL <https://ideas.repec.org/a/ucp/jnlbus/v39y1965p119.html>.
- Srijan Sood, Kassiani Papatirou, Marius Vaiciulis, Tucker Hybinette Balch, J. P. Morgan, and AI Research. Deep reinforcement learning for optimal portfolio allocation: A comparative study with mean-variance optimization. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:264432026>.
- Frank Alphonse Sortino and Lee N. Price. Performance measurement in a downside risk framework. 1994. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:155042092>.
- Bo Tang and Elias B. Khalil. Multi-task predict-then-optimize. In Meinolf Sellmann and Kevin Tierney (eds.), *Learning and Intelligent Optimization*, pp. 506–522, Cham, 2023. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-031-44505-7.
- Ayse Sinem Uysal, Xiaoyue Li, and John M. Mulvey. End-to-end risk budgeting portfolio optimization with neural networks, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.04636>.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/file/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Paper.pdf.
- Pengqian Yu, Joon Sern Lee, Ilya Kulyatin, Zekun Shi, and Sakyasingha Dasgupta. Model-based deep reinforcement learning for dynamic portfolio optimization. *ArXiv*, abs/1901.08740, 2019. URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:59291986>.
- Zihao Zhang, Stefan Zohren, and Stephen Roberts. Deep learning for portfolio optimization. *The Journal of Financial Data Science*, 2(4):8–20, August 2020. ISSN 2640-3943. doi: 10.3905/jfds.2020.1.042. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3905/jfds.2020.1.042>.

A APPENDIX

A.1 DERIVATION

Variance Reduction in Deep Ensemble. Assume $\mathbf{Var}[f_i(x)] = \sigma^2$ and $\mathbf{Cov}[f_i, f_j] = \rho\sigma^2$ for $i \neq j$. Define the ensemble predictor as

$$\bar{f}(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x).$$

I then derive:

$$\mathbf{Var}[\bar{f}(x)] = \mathbf{Var}\left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_i(x)\right] \tag{1}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^2 \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{Var}[f_i(x)] + \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbf{Cov}[f_i(x), f_j(x)] \right] \tag{2}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^2 \left[m\sigma^2 + 2\left(\frac{m(m-1)}{2}\right)\rho\sigma^2 \right] \tag{3}$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{m}\right)^2 \left[m\sigma^2 + m(m-1)\rho\sigma^2 \right] \tag{4}$$

$$= \frac{\sigma^2(1 + (m-1)\rho)}{m}. \tag{5}$$

Thus, if $\rho < 1$, the overall variance decreases as m increases.

A.2 EXPERIMENT DETAILS

Universe Selection. I evaluate my framework on two distinct universes: one with an overall upward trend and the other largely range-bound. Both universes include periods of significant market downturn. The backtesting period extends from November 2019 to November 2024, covering the market volatility observed during the COVID-19 era. Data can be obtained from Yahoo Finance. Tickers for each universe are listed below:

Universe 1:

AMZN, CHTR, INTC, CSCO, MSFT, ADBE, AMGN, AAPL, GILD, GOOGL, NFLX, NVDA, PEP, QCOM, COST, TMUS, PYPL, CMCSA, AMD, CELG, KHC, META, AVGO, TSLA

Universe 2:

SOXX, PBW, IDGT, IXJ, IBB, SMH, BBH, PSI, KNCT, XSD, PBE, XBI, FBT, EARTH, FDN, QCLN, SMOG, PBD, IGF, TAN, FAN, PNQI, ICLN, GRID, COPX, REMX, LIT, URA, NXTG, CARZ, SKYY, SOCL, KWEB, ROBO, AIRR, ARKW, ARKG, ARKQ, EMQQ, SBIO, HACK, IPAY, CIBR, FINX, SNSR, IBUY, MILN, BOTZ, FTXL, PAVE, SIMS, BLCN, LEGR, BLOK, KURE, ROBT, DRIV, SRVR, BATT, AIQ, ACES, ARTY, OGIG, QTUM, ESPO, ONLN, FDNI, IDRV, CNRG, EBIZ, SIXG, GNOM, CLOU, ARKF, IDNA, NERD, IHAK, WCLD, HERO, URNM, BUG, CTEC, BETZ, ION

Input. I use daily OHLCV (open, high, low, close, and volume) data at business-day frequency as input to my models. The data are transformed as follows:

$$O'_t = \ln\left(\frac{O_t}{C_t}\right), \quad H'_t = \ln\left(\frac{H_t}{C_t}\right), \quad L'_t = \ln\left(\frac{L_t}{C_t}\right), \quad C'_t = \ln\left(\frac{C_t}{C_{t-1}}\right), \quad V'_t = \ln(V_t).$$

I standardize these features and use a 252-day window as model input. Although larger window sizes could incorporate more information, my experiments indicate that any additional computational cost provides only marginal benefits.

Target Portfolios. For each month, I compute the target portfolio using that month’s log-returns. I then optimize the **Max-Sortino** portfolio through a convex formulation of the objective, guaranteeing a unique, globally optimal solution each month. Following Dinkelbach (1967), originally proposed for the maximum-Sharpe portfolio, I adapt the approach to the maximum-Sortino case by substituting the semi-variance matrix for the covariance matrix. The optimization problem is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{w}{\text{maximize}} && w^T \mu - y \sqrt{w^T \Sigma w} \\ & \text{subject to} && \mathbf{1}^T w = 1, \quad w \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where y is an auxiliary variable updated iteratively:

$$y^{(k)} = \frac{w^{(k)T} \mu - r_f}{\sqrt{w^{(k)T} \Sigma w^{(k)}}}.$$

I examine a **Max-Sortino** portfolio as my target portfolio to focus on minimizing downside risk. However, I use a semi-variance matrix as a substitute for the covariance matrix while following Dinkelbach (1967), which may compromise the reliability of the resulting portfolio. Consequently, I do not include this particular Max-Sortino portfolio as a baseline in my study.

Rolling. I employ a rolling prediction procedure to update the model for each month. Each update runs for 100 epochs, and I select the epoch with the lowest validation loss as the final model. The last month in each training window is reserved for validation.

Model Training. I maintain near-default hyperparameter settings for each model architecture, unless otherwise specified, to reduce potential backtest overfitting. Detailed configurations are provided in my accompanying code. I use the Sophia Optimizer (Liu et al., 2024) for its efficiency and precision.




Figure 3: **Diagram of the framework**

A.3 METRICS

Let r_i denote the daily log-return. The Sharpe ratio (SHR) (Sharpe, 1965) and Sortino ratio (SOR) (Sortino & Price, 1994) are computed as follows:

$$\text{SHR} = \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_i (r_i - \bar{r}_i)^2}{n-1}}}, \quad \text{SOR} = \frac{\bar{r}_i}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum_i \min(r_i - \bar{r}_i, 0)^2}{n-1}}}.$$

I do not specify a risk-free rate or a minimum acceptable return (MAR) in this study. Therefore, I use the mean return in place of the MAR in the Sortino ratio's denominator and calculate semi-variance as an alternative to Downside Deviation. I do not subtract the risk-free rate in the numerators of either the Sharpe or Sortino ratios. Also, Sharpe ratio and Sortino ratio are annualized by multiplying by the square root of the number of days.

A.4 TARGET PORTFOLIO




Figure 4: **Universe 1 Max-Sortino Portfolio**




Figure 5: **Universe 1 One-Hot Portfolio**




Figure 6: **Universe 2 Max-Sortino Portfolio**




Figure 7: **Universe 2 One-Hot Portfolio**

A.5 MODEL PORTFOLIO




Figure 8: Universe 1 Mamba Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 9: Universe 1 Transformer Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 10: Universe 1 LSTM Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 11: Universe 1 Mamba One-Hot Portfolio




Figure 12: Universe 1 Transformer One-Hot Portfolio




Figure 13: Universe 1 LSTM One-Hot Portfolio



Figure 14: Universe 2 Mamba Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 15: Universe 2 Transformer Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 16: Universe 2 LSTM Max-Sortino Portfolio




Figure 17: Universe 2 Mamba One-Hot Portfolio




Figure 18: Universe 2 Transformer One-Hot Portfolio




Figure 19: Universe 2 LSTM One-Hot Portfolio