

VecViz Aggregate Analytics Performance Summary Report

see vecviz.com for important disclosures, terms & conditions

7 July 2025

Table of contents

Introduction	3
VecViz Analytic Metrics Assessed	3
Assessment Criteria Overview	3
Vector Model Overview	4
Sigma Overview	5
Important considerations about the analytics and performance metrics presented in this report:	6
Aggregate VecViz Analytics “Report Card”	7
% of Each Metric’s Performance Objectives Met by Lookback Period Across All Applicable Horizons	7
% of Each Metric’s Performance Objectives Met by Horizon Across All Applicable Lookback Periods	8
% of Each Metric’s Performance Objectives Met Across All Horizons and Lookback Periods	8
Appendix 1: VaR Report Card Detail	9
Sigma Comparison Report Card:	9
Vector Model Statistical Testing Report Card:	9
Combined Summary Report Card By Objective:	11
Appendix 2: OaR Report Card Detail	13
Sigma Comparison Report Card:	13
Vector Model Statistical Testing Report Card:	13

Combined Summary Report Card By Objective:	15
Appendix 3: Expected Body Report Card Detail	17
Appendix 4: Option Fair Value Report Card Detail	20
Appendix 5: V-Score Report Card Detail	22
Appendix 6: Sigma Kupiec and Christoferson VaR tests.	26
Appendix 7: Sigma Kupiec and Christoferson OaR tests.	27



Introduction

Here we summarize the out of sample performance of VecViz's investment analytics. We do so at a high level, in terms of percentage of objectives met, in aggregate, across horizons and lookback periods.

All of VecViz's analytic metrics are derived from its Vector Model of price probability. The primary purpose of this report is of course to gauge how well the metrics are meeting their objectives. A secondary but also important objective is to help the reader determine if the performance of the metrics across horizons and lookback periods is reasonably consistent. This serves as an important check on both the metrics themselves and their respective evaluation methodologies.

Please see the "Important Considerations" section of this report for disclosure of at least some of the many ways this report likely falls short of its objective, and other important disclosures.

VecViz Analytic Metrics Assessed

- 1) Value at Risk (the 95th and 99th percentile downward)
- 2) Opportunity at Risk (the 95th and 99th percentile upward)
- 3) Expected Up and Down Body (the expected value between the current price and the forecasted 95th percentile price upward and downward, respectively)
- 4) Option Fair Values
- 5) V-Score rankings of expected forward price returns

Full Report Cards for each of these metrics can be found in the Appendix to this report. Charts, ticker level detail, and explanatory material supporting those Report Cards can be found in the metric specific Reports these report cards were excerpted from, which can be found in the "Reports" page of vecviz.com.

Assessment Criteria Overview

This report presents summary statistics that represent the % of objectives met for each of the metrics listed above. Each metric has 7 or more objectives, and each objective is evaluated across 16 horizon / lookback period combinations, utilizing ticker-model date level granularity, to a significant extent. The evaluation of most metrics in this report includes: 1) comparison to Gaussian / normal distribution based Sigma, as implemented by VecViz to reflect exponential time decay of observation weightings. The V-Score is an exception here - it is evaluated on



the basis of the consistency of its rankings with forward returns. 2) accuracy related metrics, such as mean absolute error. For example, we measure how close the actual breakage rate of 95% VaR forecasts was to the targeted 5.00% level. 3) the returns of metric oriented strategies. For example, we measure the impact of setting position sizes using Vector Model VaR instead of Sigma VaR on investment performance. The

Though the results are not incorporated into the Aggregate Summary report card presented in the section that follows, we also evaluate VaR and OaR on the basis of their Kupiec and Christoferson statistics, which are well established statistical tests of the consistency of their breakage rate with targeted levels and the independence of breakage events. The results of those tests are included in the Appendix of this document.

Vector Model Overview

The Vector Model uses systematic price channel identification and scoring in conjunction with machine learning to provide investors with volatility forecasts that reflect the asymmetric, jumpy, clustering, and price dependent behavior of realized and option implied volatility in the financial markets.

The sole input to Vector Model and the Sigma Model out of sample analytics are daily closing prices obtained from QuoteMedia.

The Vector Model was trained upon ~ 60,000 ticker model dates (TMD's) representing ~550 tickers (including equities, currencies, and commodities) and ~ 120 model dates spanning from March 9, 2002 to February 3, 2021. The Out of Sample period starts on 1/31/2022, nearly a full one year from the last model date included in the training data. All analytics discussed in this report are for model dates beyond January 31, 2022, making them fully out of sample.

This report includes Vector Model and Sigma model results for ~150 tickers. Only about twenty of these tickers were included in the Vector Model training data set discussed above. These tickers were selected using the following criteria at the time of selection: Top and Bottom 25 S&P 500 performers, Largest 25 publicly traded issuers in the LQD and HYG etf's, constituents of the Metals and Pharmaceuticals sector within the LQD and HYG etf's, and any other tickers that at the time drew significant financial media attention (Mag 7, meme-related stocks, bitcoin related stocks). We also included several major equity and debt-oriented ETF's. The complete Vector Model coverage universe discussed in this report includes the following tickers:

AA, AAP, AAPL, ABBV, ACGL, ADBE, AMAT, AMC, AMD, AMGN, AMZN, AVGO, AZN, AZO, BA, BAC, BALL, BBY, BHC, BHP, BIIB, BMY, BUD, BXP, CAH, CCL, CDNS, CHTR, CITI, CLF, CMA, CMCSA, CMG, CNC, COST, CPRT, CSCO, CSTM, CTLT, CVS, CYH, CZR, DHI, ELAN, EMB, ETRN, EXPE, FCX, FIS, FITB, FRA, FRCB, FSUGY, GBTC, GE, GILD, GLD, GME, GNRC, GOLD, GOOGL, GS, GSK, GT, GWW, HCA, HD, HLT, HON, HSBC, HYG, IEP, INTC, INTU, IRM, ISRG, JAZZ, JPM, KALU, KEY, KHC, LEN,



LLY, LNC, LQD, LUMN, LVS, LW, META, MNST, MOS, MRK, MS, MSFT, MSI, MSTR, MU, MUB, NAVI, NEM, NFLX, NVDA, NVS, NWL, ON, ORCL, ORLY, OXY, PCG, PEP, PHM, POST, PRGO, PWR, QCOM, QQQ, RIO, SBNY, SBUX, SIVBQ, SLV, SNY, SPY, T, TDG, TEVA, TFC, THC, TLT, TMUS, TRGP, TSLA, TXN, UAA, UNH, USB, VCSH, VFC, VICI, VNO, VST, VZ, WDC, WFC, WRK, WYNN, X, XOM, ZION, ZTS.

The Vector Model is described further in the FAQ and Blog of vecviz.com.

Sigma Overview

The core of Sigma, as presented alongside Vector Model output by VecViz, is the standard deviation of price-based returns that very likely gets discussed in any introductory book on risk or portfolio management. This is the same definition of volatility that is utilized in the Black Scholes option pricing formula.

Sigma's flaws as an estimate of forward volatility are well documented. Nevertheless, it remains perhaps the most popular metric for "risk" when it comes to investments, likely because of its simplicity and familiarity.

We present Sigma based on daily logarithmic price returns (akin to % changes in price), and a lookback period of two years. To enhance Sigma's accuracy, we apply a 6-month half-life rate of decay to the weightings applied to the daily returns used to calculate Sigma. This weighting scheme causes the most recent 6-month period to be weighted 8x the least recent 6-month period in the 2 year look back period.

Sigma is converted to probabilities by applying multipliers associated with the standard normal (i.e. Gaussian) distribution with a mean of 0 and sigma of 1.00. Thus, 95% OaR is assumed to be -1.645 sigma's lower than the current price and 99% OaR is presumed to be -2.326 sigma's lower than the current price.

Sigma based probability percentiles for longer time horizons are obtained by multiplying Sigma calculated from daily closing prices by the square root of the number of trading days in the given horizon. In doing so, we are assuming daily returns are independent and identically distributed. So, for example, the multiplier that converts daily horizon sigma to 1 year horizon sigma is the square root of 252 (~15.9).

All calculations for Sigma are based on the same pricing data obtained from QuoteMedia data used to calculate Vector Model OaR.

All Sigma estimates discussed in this report are for dates beyond January 31, 2022, the end of the training period for the Vector Model.

Please see the Expected Body Performance Report for how Expected Body analytics are calculated for Sigma, and the Option Fair Value Performance Report for how option fair values are calculated using Sigma in conjunction with the Black Scholes option pricing model. Both reports can be found in the "Reports" section of vecviz.com.



Important considerations about the analytics and performance metrics presented in this report:

- 1) Past performance is no guarantee of future results. None of the content in this report is investment advice or an offer to buy or sell securities. VecViz is not an SEC investment advisor or broker-dealer. The staff of VecViz actively transacts in securities tied to many of the tickers discussed in this report. See VecViz's Terms and Conditions for more context and detail at <https://vecviz.com/termsand-conditions/>
- 2) Read ““Let me warn you...” of the limitations of VecViz's Analytics.”, a blog entry on [vecviz.com](https://vecviz.com/let-me-warn-you-of-the-limitations-of-vecvizsanalytics/) (<https://vecviz.com/let-me-warn-you-of-the-limitations-of-vecvizsanalytics/>)
- 3) Given that VecViz's Vector model is a novel, non-parametric approach to probability, with the exception of the Kupiec and Christoferson tests we feel it is important that performance for every model date is reflected in this report, so that the behavior of Vector Model analytics can be as well understood as possible. That said, doing so clearly results in overlapping horizons beyond 1d in duration, and that results in understated volatility metrics and skewed values of metrics that incorporate volatility (such as Information Ratio and p-values for intercepts and slopes, i.e. Alpha and Beta). Thus please note that volatility oriented evaluation metrics should not be used for anything beyond comparison to similarly calculated evaluation metrics for other models, such as Sigma, or benchmarks, such as the SPY etf. Please also know that the data used for the Christoferson and Kupiec test was a subset of the overall dataset that was selected to have as many non-overlapping periods as possible from the start of the out of sample period on 1/31/2022 for each horizon.
- 4) We are not considering any incremental transaction costs that VecViz analytics may cause an investor to incur beyond what they would incur utilizing Sigma analytics for the same objectives.
- 5) We are not incorporating any borrowing charges or repo credits or margin related costs for implied levered long or “short” positions in any of the return related metrics.
- 6) All analytics presented in this report assumes that prices are floored at \$0.01. Since the coverage universe for this report includes only listed equities, that assumption is appropriate. However, if the Vector Model were applied to commodities or perhaps other potentially illiquid securities we would likely have to remove that floor for such tickers, and the resulting impact on model performance for such tickers has not yet been researched.

Thus, in summary, all metrics presented in this report are presented and are to be considered on a comparative basis. Do the bullish V-Score grouping outperform the bearish V-Score grouping? Do they outperform the benchmarks? How does their volatility and information ratio ($IR = \text{mean return} / \text{std dev}$) compare? These are the questions this report is structured to answer.



Aggregate VecViz Analytics “Report Card”

Encompasses VecViz’s VaR, OaR, Expected Body, Option Fair Value, and V-Score metrics:

% of All VecViz Analytic Objectives Met By Lookback Window vs. Trading Day Horizon, as of 2025-07-01



% of Each Metric’s Performance Objectives Met by Lookback Period Across All Applicable Horizons

Window	VaR	OaR	ExpBody	OptionFV	V-Score	AggScore	AsOfDate
30	60.71	53.57	56.25	55	70	59.11	2025-07-01
90	61.9	69.05	58.33	46.67	83.33	63.86	2025-07-01
365	71.43	77.14	37.5	56	40	56.41	2025-07-01
All	41.67	71.43	43.75	38.33	78.33	54.7	2025-07-01



% of Each Metric's Performance Objectives Met by Horizon Across All Applicable Lookback Periods

Horizon	VaR	OaR	ExpBody	OptionFV	V-Score	AggScore	AsOfDate
1	64.29	71.43	43.75	65	67.5	62.39	2025-07-01
10	66.07	66.07	54.69	45	75	61.37	2025-07-01
21	54.76	71.43	50	30	80	57.24	2025-07-01
63	50	78.57	40.62	55	40	52.84	2025-07-01
126	39.29	67.86	34.38	40	45	45.3	2025-07-01
252	50	71.43	43.75	40	80	57.04	2025-07-01

% of Each Metric's Performance Objectives Met Across All Horizons and Lookback Periods


Metric	% of Objectives Met	AsOfDate
VaR	57.14	2025-07-01
OaR	70.54	2025-07-01
ExpBody	46.09	2025-07-01
OptionFV	47.5	2025-07-01
V-Score	66.25	2025-07-01
AggScore	57.5	2025-07-01



Appendix 1: VaR Report Card Detail

Period examined: AllD = 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27 while 365D /90D/ 30D include the 365/90/30 days ended 2025-06-27, respectively.

Sigma Comparison Report Card:



Vector Model Statistical Testing Report Card:

The Kupiec Proportion of Failures test statistic (listed as VaR_kStat in the table below), and its probability (VaR_pValK) are used to test the null hypothesis that the Vector Model's VaR breakage rate is consistent with expectations. The test statistic is calculated by comparing the number of VaR breaks experienced to the expected number of breaks given the total number of observations and the specified probability level. Breakage is measured at the individual ticker-model date level. The probability of the Kupiec statistic occurring is obtained from the



chi-squared distribution. The lower the Kupiec statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that the Vector Model's VaR breakage rate is consistent with expectations.

The Christoferson VaR Violation Independence test statistic (listed as VaR_chrStat in the table below) and its probability (VaR_pValChr) are used to test the null hypothesis that the VaR model violations are independent. The test statistic focuses on consecutive breakages over time. We measure breakage at the portfolio level, with portfolio breakage for a given period defined as equally weighted ticker level breakage for that period being beyond expectation given the specified probability level. The probability of the Christoferson statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the Christoferson statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that the Vector Model's VaR breakage is independent.

Kupiec and Christoferson test results for Sigma VaR can be found in the Appendix.

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27. Note that for horizon periods greater than 1d we exclude enough model dates to assure no overlap between observation periods.

Model	Pctile	Horizon	VaR_kStat	VaR_pValK	VaR_chrStat	VaR_pValChr
Vector	95	1	102.05	0	6.12	0.01
Vector	95	10	67.87	0	0	0.95
Vector	95	21	16.14	0	0.38	0.54
Vector	95	63	9.04	0	0.12	0.72
Vector	95	126	0.1	0.75	0.68	0.41
Vector	95	252	0.73	0.39	nan	0
Vector	99	1	873.35	0	6.52	0.01
Vector	99	10	117.6	0	1.22	0.27
Vector	99	21	50.02	0	0.05	0.83
Vector	99	63	16.26	0	0.46	0.5
Vector	99	126	6.08	0.01	0.68	0.41
Vector	99	252	13.42	0	-0	1



Combined Summary Report Card By Objective:

Here we summarize the results by objective, starting with the Sigma comparison-based objectives, for which a sub-total is provided. Each lookback period, horizon and specified percentile receives equal weighting in these calculations.

Then summary results for the statistical tests are provided, with success defined as a p-value for the corresponding test statistic > 0.05 , and each horizon and specified percentile receiving equal weighting.”)

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27.

VaR and ROVBC Criteria	Average Score(%)
1. Closer to Target VaR Breakage Than Sigma (i.e., smaller MAE)	59.38
2. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	53.12
3. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	12.5
4. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma	87.5
5. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma VaR Diff.	75
6. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0 , Across Tickers and Model Dates	68.75
7. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0 , By Ticker, Across Model Dates	56.25
Overall Comparison to Sigma Average	58.93
Kupiec Test of VaR Proximity to Target	16.6667
Christoferson Test of VaR Date Independence	75

VaR and ROVBC Criteria by Fwd Hzn	1D	10D	21D	63D	126D	252D
1. Closer to Target VaR Breakage Than Sigma	75	62.5	50	25	75	50
2. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	87.5	50	66.67	50	0	0
3. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	0	0	33.33	25	25	0
4. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma	62.5	87.5	100	100	100	100
5. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma VaR Diff.	12.5	87.5	100	100	100	100
6. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0 , Across Tickers and Model Dates	62.5	75	100	75	50	0
7. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0 , By Ticker, Across Model Dates	25	75	100	50	50	0
TotalScore	46.43	62.5	78.57	60.71	57.14	35.71



VaR and ROVBC Criteria Across Lookback Window	30D	90D	365D	AllD
1. Closer to Target VaR Breakage Than Sigma	75	66.67	80	33.33
2. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	25	50	80	41.67
3. Less Volatile VaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	0	16.67	30	0
4. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma	50	83.33	90	100
5. Higher ROVBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma VaR Diff.	50	66.67	80	83.33
6. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0, Across Tickers and Model Dates	25	83.33	90	58.33
7. Alpha of ROVBC vs Sigma >0, By Ticker, Across Model Dates	25	83.33	80	33.33
TotalScore	35.71	64.29	75.71	50



Appendix 2: OaR Report Card Detail

Period examined: AllD = 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27 while 365D /90D/ 30D include the 365/90/30 days ended 2025-06-27, respectively.

Sigma Comparison Report Card:

% of OaR and ROLOBC Objectives Met By Lookback Window vs. Trading Day Horizon, as of 2025-07-01

95%tile_30d -	71%	71%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
99%tile_30d -	57%	86%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
95%tile_90d -	86%	71%	71%	nan%	nan%	nan%
99%tile_90d -	86%	57%	57%	nan%	nan%	nan%
95%tile_365d -	71%	86%	86%	86%	86%	nan%
99%tile_365d -	71%	86%	100%	100%	71%	nan%
95%tile_AllD -	57%	57%	71%	100%	100%	100%
99%tile_AllD -	57%	71%	86%	100%	100%	71%
	1.0	10.0	21.0	63.0	126.0	252.0

Vector Model Statistical Testing Report Card:

The Kupiec Proportion of Failures test statistic (listed as OaR_kStat in the table below), and its probability (OaR_pValK) are used to test the null hypothesis that the Vector Model's OaR breakage rate is consistent with expectations. The test statistic is calculated by comparing the number of OaR breaks experienced to the expected number of breaks given the total number of observations and the specified probability level. Breakage is measured at the individual ticker-model date level. The probability of the Kupiec statistic occurring is obtained from the



chi-squared distribution. The lower the Kupiec statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that the Vector Model's OaR breakage rate is consistent with expectations.

The Christoferson OaR Violation Independence test statistic (listed as OaR_chrStat in the table below) and its probability (OaR_pValChr) are used to test the null hypothesis that the OaR model violations are independent. The test statistic focuses on consecutive breakages over time. We measure breakage at the portfolio level, with portfolio breakage for a given period defined as equally weighted ticker level breakage for that period being beyond expectation given the specified probability level. The probability of the Christoferson statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the Christoferson statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that Vector Model OaR breakage is independent.

Kupiec and Christoferson test results for Sigma OaR can be found in the Appendix.

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27. Note that for horizon periods greater than 1d we exclude enough model dates to assure no overlap between observation periods.

Model	Pctile	Horizon	OaR_kStat	OaR_pValK	OaR_chrStat	OaR_pValChr
Vector	95	1	166.3	0	1.6	0.21
Vector	95	10	8.78	0	4.57	0.03
Vector	95	21	16.59	0	0.27	0.6
Vector	95	63	0	0.99	0.09	0.76
Vector	95	126	6.96	0.01	nan	0
Vector	95	252	0.05	0.83	nan	0
Vector	99	1	10.15	0	0.62	0.43
Vector	99	10	21.92	0	3.41	0.06
Vector	99	21	8.45	0	5.71	0.02
Vector	99	63	0.45	0.5	1.6	0.21
Vector	99	126	1.78	0.18	nan	0
Vector	99	252	2.4	0.12	nan	0



Combined Summary Report Card By Objective:

Here we summarize the results by objective, starting with the Sigma comparison-based objectives, for which a sub-total is provided. Each lookback period, horizon and specified percentile receives equal weighting in these calculations.

Then summary results for the statistical tests are provided, with success defined as a p-value for the corresponding test statistic > 0.05 , and each horizon and specified percentile receiving equal weighting.”)

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27.

OaR and ROLOBC Criteria	Average Score(%)
1. Closer to Target OaR Breakage Than Sigma	62.5
2. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	87.5
3. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	40.62
4. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma	75
5. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma OaR Diff.	90.62
6. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , Across Tickers and Model Dates	96.88
7. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , By Ticker, Across Model Dates	100
Overall Comparison to Sigma Average	79.02
Kupiec Test of VaR Proximity to Target	41.6667
Christoferson Test of OaR Date Independence	50

OaR and ROLOBC Criteria By Fwd Hzn	1D	10D	21D	63D	126D	252D
1. Closer to Target OaR Breakage Than Sigma	62.5	62.5	50	75	75	50
2. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	75	75	100	100	100	100
3. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	12.5	12.5	16.67	100	100	100
4. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma	50	75	100	100	50	100
5. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma OaR Diff.	100	87.5	83.33	100	100	50
6. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , Across Tickers and Model Dates	87.5	100	100	100	100	100
7. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , By Ticker, Across Model Dates	100	100	100	100	100	100
TotalScore	69.64	73.21	78.57	96.43	89.29	85.71




OaR and ROLOBC Criteria Across Lookback Window	30D	90D	365D	AllD
1. Closer to Target OaR Breakage Than Sigma	75	33.33	70	66.67
2. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Model Dates Than Sigma	0	100	100	100
3. Less Volatile OaR Breakage Across Tickers Than Sigma	25	0	60	50
4. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma	100	100	60	66.67
5. Higher ROLOBC Than Sigma, Adj. for Avg. VM-Sigma OaR Diff.	100	66.67	100	91.67
6. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , Across Tickers and Model Dates	100	100	100	91.67
7. Alpha of ROLOBC vs Sigma >0 , By Ticker, Across Model Dates	100	100	100	100
TotalScore	71.43	71.43	84.29	80.95



Appendix 3: Expected Body Report Card Detail

Period examined: AllD = 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27 while 365D /90D/ 30D include the 365/90/30 days ended 2025-06-27, respectively.

% of Expected Body Objectives Met By Lookback Window vs. Trading Day Horizon, as of 2025-07-01



EB Criteria	Average Score(%)
1. Smaller EUB MAE (mean absolute error)	0
2. Smaller EUB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	0
3. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across dates	18.75
4. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across tickers	18.75
5. Smaller EDB MAE	37.5
6. Smaller EDB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	50
7. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across dates	43.75
8. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across tickers	43.75
9. Greater ROEUB	75



EB Criteria	Average Score(%)
10. Greater ROEUB after adjusting for EUB magnitude	81.25
11. ROEUB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	93.75
12. ROEUB alpha across dates > 0	0
13. Greater ROEDB	75
14. Greater ROEDB after adjusting for EDB magnitude	75
15. ROEDB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	75
16. ROEDB alpha across dates > 0	50
Overall Average	46.09

EB and ROEB Criteria by Fwd Hzn	1D	10D	21D	63D	126D	252D
1. Smaller EUB MAE (mean absolute error)	0	0	0	0	0	0
2. Smaller EUB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across dates	50	25	0	0	0	0
4. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across tickers	0	25	33.33	50	0	0
5. Smaller EDB MAE	0	50	33.33	50	50	100
6. Smaller EDB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	50	50	33.33	50	50	100
7. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across dates	25	50	66.67	0	50	100
8. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across tickers	75	75	33.33	0	0	0
9. Greater ROEUB	100	50	66.67	100	50	100
10. Greater ROEUB after adjusting for EUB magnitude	100	75	100	100	50	0
11. ROEUB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	100	75	100	100	100	100
12. ROEUB alpha across dates > 0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Greater ROEDB	25	100	100	100	50	100
14. Greater ROEDB after adjusting for EDB magnitude	25	100	100	50	100	100
15. ROEDB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	75	100	100	50	50	0
16. ROEDB alpha across dates > 0	75	100	33.33	0	0	0
TotalScore	43.75	54.69	50	40.62	34.38	43.75



EB and ROEB Criteria by Lookback Window	30D	90D	365D	AllD
1. Smaller EUB MAE (mean absolute error)	0	0	0	0
2. Smaller EUB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	0	0	0	0
3. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across dates	50	33.33	0	16.67
4. Less adjusted EUB MAE Variability across tickers	0	66.67	20	0
5. Smaller EDB MAE	50	66.67	0	50
6. Smaller EDB MAE after 95%tile adjustment	100	100	0	50
7. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across dates	50	66.67	0	66.67
8. Less adjusted EDB MAE Variability across tickers	100	100	40	0
9. Greater ROEUB	50	33.33	80	100
10. Greater ROEUB after adjusting for EUB magnitude	50	100	80	83.33
11. ROEUB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	50	100	100	100
12. ROEUB alpha across dates > 0	0	0	0	0
13. Greater ROEDB	100	66.67	60	83.33
14. Greater ROEDB after adjusting for EDB magnitude	100	66.67	80	66.67
15. ROEDB alpha across tickers and dates > 0	100	100	80	50
16. ROEDB alpha across dates > 0	100	33.33	60	33.33
TotalScore	56.25	58.33	37.5	43.75


See the prior page for associated definitions of the criteria.



Appendix 4: Option Fair Value Report Card Detail

Period examined: AllD = 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27

% of Option Fair Value Objectives Met By Lookback Window vs. Trading Day Horizon, as of 2025-07-07



OFV Criteria	Average Score(%)
1. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: NTM	12.5
2. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: DOOTM	0
3. Smaller Max Loss By Date: NTM	56.25
4. Smaller Max Loss By Date:: DOOTM	100
5. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):NTM	68.75
6. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):DOOTM	100
7. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: NTM	6.25
8. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: DOOTM	56.25
9. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):NTM	12.5
10.Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):DOOTM	62.5
Overall Average	47.5



OFV Criteria	Average Score(%)					
--------------	------------------	--	--	--	--	--

OFV Criteria, Average Across Fwd Horizon	1D	10D	21D	63D	126D	252D
1. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: NTM	0	50	0	0	0	0
2. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: DOOTM	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Smaller Max Loss By Date: NTM	100	0	0	100	100	100
4. Smaller Max Loss By Date:: DOOTM	100	100	100	100	100	100
5. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):NTM	100	50	0	100	100	100
6. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):DOOTM	100	100	100	100	100	100
7. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: NTM	25	0	0	0	0	0
8. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: DOOTM	100	75	33.33	50	0	0
9. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):NTM	25	0	0	50	0	0
10.Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):DOOTM	100	75	66.67	50	0	0
Overall Average	65	45	30	55	40	40

OFV Criteria, Average Across Lookback Windows	30D	90D	365D	ALLD
1. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: NTM	50	33.33	0	0
2. Closer Zero Profit Proximity: DOOTM	0	0	0	0
3. Smaller Max Loss By Date: NTM	50	33.33	60	66.67
4. Smaller Max Loss By Date:: DOOTM	100	100	100	100
5. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):NTM	50	33.33	80	83.33
6. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Date (if any):DOOTM	100	100	100	100
7. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: NTM	0	0	20	0
8. Smaller Max Loss By Ticker: DOOTM	100	66.67	80	16.67
9. Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):NTM	0	0	40	0
10.Avg Excess P&L >Excess Max Loss By Ticker (if any):DOOTM	100	100	80	16.67
Overall Average	55	46.67	56	38.33



Appendix 5: V-Score Report Card Detail

Here we summarize the results to be found in the section that follows, “Historic Average Performance By V-Score Grouping”. We present here the % of the maximum score that can be obtained by applying the following criteria to the Average Returns and Information Ratios we calculate for each V-Score grouping / Model Date Lookback Period / Forward Time Horizon.

Average Price Return:

1. Positive V-Scores > Avg Ticker > NegV-Scores
2. Positive VaR Adjusted V-Scores > Avg Ticker > Negative VaR Adjusted V-Scores
3. Positive V-Score Rank Order corresponds to Price Returns
4. Negative V-Score Rank Order corresponds to Price Returns
5. The differential between Positive and Negative V-Scores is greater on a VaR adjusted basis than on an unadjusted basis.

Information Ratio (+1 if met):

1. Positive VaR Adjusted V-Scores > All Positive V-Scores
2. Negative VaR Adjusted V-Scores < All Negative V-Scores
3. Positive VaR Adjusted V-Scores > Avg Ticker
4. Negative VaR Adjusted V-Scores < Avg Ticker
5. Positive VaR Adjusted V-Scores > “SPY” etf


Ticker Exclusion Groupings:

1. None: all ~150 tickers covered included, none excluded
2. CryptMem: excludes MSTR, GBTC, AMC, GME
3. FailedBanks: excludes SIVBQ, SBNY, FRCB
4. SmallCap: excludes NAVI, LUMN, CYH, NWL, KALU, IEP, POST, GT, BHC
5. Mag7: excludes NVDA, NFLX, MSFT, AMZN, GOOGL, META, TSLA
6. Semi: excludes NVDA, AMD, AVGO, MU, AMAT, CDNS, TXN, ON, QCOM, INTC, WDC
7. Debt: excludes TLT, LQD, MUB, VCSH, HYG, EMB, FRA

Finally, an understanding of the relative frequency of each V-Score is key to understanding the V-Score’s performance and to its interpretation:

Period examined: All model dates from 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27





% of V-Score Objectives Met By Ticker Exclusion & Lookback Window vs. Trading Day Horizon, as of 2025-07-01

CryptMem_30d	90%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Debt_30d	70%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
FailedBanks_30d	90%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Mag7_30d	70%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
None_30d	90%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Semi_30d	80%	50%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
SmallCap_30d	90%	60%	nan%	nan%	nan%	nan%
CryptMem_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Debt_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
FailedBanks_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Mag7_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
None_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
Semi_90d	80%	90%	80%	nan%	nan%	nan%
SmallCap_90d	90%	90%	90%	nan%	nan%	nan%
CryptMem_365d	30%	70%	70%	40%	20%	nan%
Debt_365d	20%	70%	70%	40%	10%	nan%
FailedBanks_365d	30%	70%	80%	10%	10%	nan%
Mag7_365d	30%	60%	80%	20%	10%	nan%
None_365d	30%	70%	80%	10%	10%	nan%
Semi_365d	40%	80%	80%	30%	10%	nan%
SmallCap_365d	30%	80%	80%	20%	20%	nan%
CryptMem_All	70%	90%	80%	70%	80%	80%
Debt_All	70%	90%	80%	70%	80%	80%
FailedBanks_All	80%	90%	80%	70%	70%	60%
Mag7_All	70%	90%	70%	70%	70%	70%
None_All	70%	90%	80%	70%	80%	80%
Semi_All	80%	90%	80%	70%	50%	50%
SmallCap_All	80%	90%	90%	70%	80%	60%
	1	10	21	63	126	252

V-Score Criteria	Average Score(%)
1. PxRet: PosVS > AvgTicker > NegVS	76.79
2. PxRet: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker > VaRAAdjNegVS	81.25
3. PxRet: PosVS Rank Order	35.71
4. PxRet: NegVS Rank Order	13.39
5. PxRet: VaRAAdj_PosNegVSDiff > PosNegVSDiff	83.93
6. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > PosVS	73.21
7. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < NegVS	83.04
8. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker	76.79
9. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < AvgTicker	91.07
10. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > SPY	46.43
Overall Average	66.16



V-Score Criteria by Fwd Hzn	1D	10D	21D	63D	126D	252D
1. PxRet: PosVS > AvgTicker > NegVS	82.14	82.14	90.48	57.14	50	85.71
2. PxRet: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker > VaRAAdjNegVS	75	100	100	50	50	100
3. PxRet: PosVS Rank Order	28.57	50	23.81	0	42.86	100
4. PxRet: NegVS Rank Order	7.14	0	0	42.86	50	0
5. PxRet: VaRAAdj_PosNegVSDiff > PosNegVSDiff	78.57	100	100	64.29	50	100
6. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > PosVS	75	78.57	100	57.14	50	42.86
7. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < NegVS	96.43	75	100	71.43	50	100
8. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker	75	100	100	50	35.71	57.14
9. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < AvgTicker	100	100	100	78.57	50	100
10. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > SPY	53.57	71.43	80.95	0	0	0
TotalScore	67.14	75.71	79.52	47.14	42.86	68.57

V-Score Criteria by Lookback Window	30D	90D	365D	AllD
1. PxRet: PosVS > AvgTicker > NegVS	78.57	100	37.14	97.62
2. PxRet: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker > VaRAAdjNegVS	100	100	40	100
3. PxRet: PosVS Rank Order	50	52.38	0	52.38
4. PxRet: NegVS Rank Order	0	0	40	2.38
5. PxRet: VaRAAdj_PosNegVSDiff > PosNegVSDiff	100	100	48.57	100
6. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > PosVS	57.14	100	45.71	88.1
7. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < NegVS	42.86	100	71.43	97.62
8. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > AvgTicker	100	100	40	88.1
9. IR: VaRAAdjNegVS < AvgTicker	100	100	71.43	100
10. IR: VaRAAdjPosVS > SPY	42.86	90.48	37.14	33.33
TotalScore	67.14	84.29	43.14	75.95



```
#“{python} #| echo: false
```

Appendix 6: Sigma Kupiec and Christoferson VaR tests.

The Kupiec Proportion of Failures test statistic (listed as VaR_kStat in the table below), and its probability (VaR_pValK) are used to test the null hypothesis that the VaR model breakage is consistent with expectations. The test statistic is calculated by comparing the number of VaR breaks experienced to the expected number of breaks given the total number of observations and the specified probability level. Breakage was measured at the individual ticker-model date level. The probability of the Kupiec statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that Sigma's VaR breakage is consistent with expectations.

The Christoferson VaR Violation Independence test statistic (listed as VaR_chrStat in the table below) and its probability (VaR_pValChr) are used to test the null hypothesis that the VaR model violations are independent. The test statistic focuses on consecutive breakages over time. We measure breakage at the portfolio level, with portfolio breakage for a given period defined as equally weighted ticker level breakage for that period being beyond expectation given the specified probability level. The probability of the Christoferson statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that Sigma VaR breakage is independent.

Kupiec and Christoferson results for the Vector Model can be found in the Report Card section.
#“

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27. Note that for horizon periods greater than 1d we exclude enough model dates to assure no overlap between observation periods.

Model	Pctile	Horizon	VaR_kStat	VaR_pValK	VaR_chrStat	VaR_pValChr
Sigma	95	1	109.34	0	10.57	0
Sigma	95	10	3.81	0.05	0.13	0.72
Sigma	95	21	29.9	0	0.25	0.61
Sigma	95	63	12.46	0	nan	0
Sigma	95	126	19.23	0	nan	0
Sigma	95	252	13.73	0	nan	0
Sigma	99	1	427.53	0	30.42	0
Sigma	99	10	98.95	0	0.3	0.58
Sigma	99	21	0	0.98	1.67	0.2
Sigma	99	63	0	0.96	0.73	0.39
Sigma	99	126	0.31	0.58	nan	0
Sigma	99	252	0.44	0.51	nan	0



Appendix 7: Sigma Kupiec and Christoferson OaR tests.

The Kupiec Proportion of Failures test statistic (listed as OaR_kStat in the table below), and its probability (OaR_pValK) are used to test the null hypothesis that OaR model breakage is consistent with expectations. The test statistic is calculated by comparing the number of OaR breaks experienced to the expected number of breaks given the total number of observations and the specified probability level. Breakage was measured at the individual ticker-model date level. The probability of the Kupiec statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that Sigma OaR breakage is consistent with expectations.

The Christoferson OaR Violation Independence test statistic (listed as OaR_chrStat in the table below) and its probability (OaR_pValChr) are used to test the null hypothesis that the OaR model violations are independent. The test statistic focuses on consecutive breakages over time. We measure breakage at the portfolio level, with portfolio breakage for a given period defined as equally weighted ticker level breakage for that period being beyond expectation given the specified probability level. The probability of the Christoferson statistic occurring is obtained from the chi-squared distribution. The lower the statistic, the higher the p-Value, and the more likely that Sigma OaR breakage is independent.

Kupiec and Christoferson results for the Vector Model can be found in the Report Card section.

Period examined: 2022-01-31 through 2025-06-27. Note that for horizon periods greater than 1d we exclude enough model dates to assure no overlap between observation periods.

Model	Pctile	Horizon	OaR_kStat	OaR_pValK	OaR_chrStat	OaR_pValChr
Sigma	95	1	180.41	0	4.93	0.03
Sigma	95	10	1.81	0.18	1.41	0.23
Sigma	95	21	13.48	0	0.12	0.73
Sigma	95	63	10.02	0	0.34	0.56
Sigma	95	126	0.11	0.74	-0	1
Sigma	95	252	11.04	0	nan	0
Sigma	99	1	205.68	0	10.45	0
Sigma	99	10	29.55	0	0.03	0.86
Sigma	99	21	21.99	0	0.1	0.76
Sigma	99	63	20.56	0	nan	0
Sigma	99	126	9.52	0	nan	0
Sigma	99	252	21.78	0	nan	0

