Discussion of

*Who Benefits from Robo-advising? Evidence from Machine Learning*  
(Rossi and Utkus, 2019)

by Bart Zhou Yueshen, INSEAD

May 28, 2019
Overview

Robo-advising: Vanguard Personal Advisor Services, PAS

What PAS does

- about six months of rebalancing after signup
- bonds ↑↑, equity ↑, cash ↓↓
- almost all in mutual funds: index funds ↑↑, international ↑↑
- fees, expense ratios, turnover, and trading volume ↓↓
- fewer assets (more concentrated holdings), but in indices
- improved abnormal Sharpe ratio

Cross-section (who benefits)

- nine most relevant explanatory variables
- some nonmonotone effects
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1. Overall impression

Interesting paper!

- great data
- nice application of regression trees

But...

- results are largely descriptive
- not clear what the objectives are

Would be nice to have some “tensions”; e.g.,

- What PAS does: Good to know, but is there a benchmark?
- Who benefits: Implications for investors? For regulations? (How to improve? Who should stay away? ...)
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2. Things I’d like to know more about

- Selection into PAS

  - It takes 5~6 months for PAS to build the target portfolio
    - Why?
    - How? (Priority for which asset class?)
    - Cross-section on this build-up time?

- Is PAS target portfolio depending on the investment history pre-PAS?

- Why investments in ETF dropped?
2. Things I’d like to know more about

- Selection into PAS

- It takes 5~6 months for PAS to build the target portfolio
  - Why?
  - How? (Priority for which asset class?)
  - Cross-section on this build-up time?

- Is PAS target portfolio depending on the investment history pre-PAS?

- Why investments in ETF dropped?
2. Things I’d like to know more about

- Selection into PAS

- It takes 5~6 months for PAS to build the target portfolio
  - Why?
  - How? (Priority for which asset class?)
  - Cross-section on this build-up time?

- Is PAS target portfolio depending on the investment history pre-PAS?

- Why investments in ETF dropped?
2. Things I’d like to know more about

- Selection into PAS

- It takes 5~6 months for PAS to build the target portfolio
  ▶ Why?
  ▶ How? (Priority for which asset class?)
  ▶ Cross-section on this build-up time?

- Is PAS target portfolio depending on the investment history pre-PAS?

- Why investments in ETF dropped?
3. Comparing performance

Timing clarification

- abnormal Sharpe ratios 6 months before and after PAS
- 3-month horizon

Benchmark

- current choice: vw NYSE/AMEX/NASDAQ CRSP portfolio
- international exposure? (10%→33%)
- (rationale: to compare with the no-PAS status quo?)

Before v.s. after? With v.s. without?

- current comparison: same investor, before and after
- issue: selection (e.g., I’ve been unlucky for months; try PAS?)
- ideal comparison (to me): twins, one signed up for PAS, one did not
- propensity score matching?
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4. Boosted Regression Trees, BRT

What BRT does (roughly)

- finding an “optimal” partition of sample
  ... then regression within each subsample
- variable selection
- *can* partition on a same $X$ variable, hence nonmonotonicity

Advantages

- relatively mature/standard procedures and diagnostics
- possibility for researchers to be (more) agnostic
- insights on the importance of many regressors
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4. BRT (continued)

What BRT does not address
- identification / channel
- omitted variable problem

(Wanted narrative: PAS benefits XXX most)

Suggestion (with salt?)
- LHS: $\Delta AbnSharpe_i$ of all investors
  (currently, only those signed up for PAS)
- RHS: add dummy of PAS signup
  (and perhaps interactions with other X variables)

Overfitting problem
- currently: shrinkage + bagging + cross-validation
- check also robustness with Random Forest?
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- New evidence about Robo-advising
  - what they do (and how)
  - the cross-section of investors

- Thoughts
  - a bit more “tension” would make the paper more flavorful
  - the performance measure perhaps can be refined
  - BRT is useful but also has its limits
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