

Beyond Forecasting: Recasting Volatility Control as a Routing Problem

Hongji Pu*

hongjip2@illinois.edu

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois, USA

Leyang Zhou

leyangz3@illinois.edu

University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign
Urbana, Illinois, USA

Abstract

Volatility control converts risk estimates into portfolio exposure, yet many existing approaches rely on a fixed estimator or a pre-specified control rule across changing market conditions. We propose VolROUTER, a modular framework that formulates volatility control as state-conditioned routing over estimator-controller pairs. VolROUTER summarizes the current market environment into a control-relevant state profile and separates routing into state inference, switch review, and pair selection. The Router can be instantiated by rule-based, learnable, or LLM-based decision modules, while portfolio actions remain generated by predefined control policies. We evaluate VolROUTER on S&P 500, Multi-Asset, Bitcoin, and USDT volatility-control settings. VolROUTER achieves the highest Sharpe ratio in three of the four settings. On S&P 500, it increases Sharpe from 0.952 for RV + Naive Scaling to 1.222 while reducing maximum drawdown from 15.10% to 12.58% and daily CVaR from 1.76% to 1.32%. On Multi-Asset, it improves Sharpe from 1.498 to 1.540 and reduces CVaR from 1.56% to 1.18%. Bitcoin shows a similar improvement in risk-adjusted performance, whereas USDT provides a boundary case in which simpler state-aware selectors remain competitive. Ablations and sensitivity analyses further indicate that the gains depend on relative policy evaluation and selective, persistent switching rather than simply enlarging the policy library. Overall, the results support viewing volatility control as a policy-selection problem in settings where control requirements vary across market states.

CCS Concepts

• **Computing methodologies** → **Machine learning**; • **Applied computing** → *Economics*.

Keywords

volatility targeting, routing, risk control, portfolio management

1 Introduction

Volatility control turns a risk estimate into a portfolio exposure [1, 8, 11, 25]. Forecasting risk, however, is only part of the decision. The same increase in estimated volatility can require different actions in different market states. At the start of a sharp drawdown, fast de-risking may be useful. During a noisy reversal, the same reaction can create unnecessary turnover. In a quiet market, keeping more exposure may be preferable. Thus, a volatility-control system must answer two questions: *what risk is present*, and *which control rule should act on that risk now*. Risk-management practice has long recognized this need for judgment beyond a single mechanical statistic [5, 30].

*Corresponding author.

Most existing work emphasizes one side of this pipeline. Volatility models aim to improve the risk estimate using realized volatility [4, 28], EWMA [5], ARCH/GARCH-family models [2, 3, 27, 31], downside-risk measures [23, 24], or implied volatility such as VIX [6, 7]. A second line of work studies how a chosen signal is converted into exposure, for example through target-volatility scaling [1], index-level risk-control rules [8, 9], drawdown-aware control [10], or regime-aware allocation [26, 29]. These approaches are useful, but they usually keep the estimator-controller design fixed once the strategy is specified. They do not make the choice among multiple valid control policies an explicit decision at each state.

Figure 1 highlights the missing layer. We represent a control policy as an *estimator-controller pair*: the estimator measures risk, and the controller converts that risk object into a portfolio action. For example, an EWMA estimator can be paired with inverse-volatility scaling, while a different pair can combine a richer volatility estimate with a drawdown-aware controller. The question is no longer only which estimator is most accurate. The system must decide whether the currently active pair remains appropriate and, if not, which alternative should take control.

We formulate this decision as **persistent, state-conditioned routing** and propose VolROUTER. The framework first summarizes the current market into a control-relevant state, then performs three simple decisions: *state inference*, *switch review*, and *pair selection*. The switch review is important because changing policies every time rankings move slightly can create unstable behavior and extra turnover. A replacement is therefore chosen only after the system decides that the active pair should not be retained.

The Router is a high-level decision module rather than a trading policy. It can be rule-based, learnable, or LLM-based. In the LLM instantiation studied here, the language model acts like a constrained supervisory agent: it reads structured, historical state and candidate diagnostics, returns a state label, decides hold or switch, and, when needed, selects one valid pair from a closed candidate list. It never predicts the next return or directly generates portfolio weights. Tool-routing and agent systems motivate this use of an LLM as an orchestrator rather than as the downstream executor [38–40].

Empirically, VolROUTER achieves the highest Sharpe ratio in three of four reported settings. On S&P 500 and Multi-Asset, the main effect is better risk allocation: Sharpe improves while downside risk falls, even when raw return does not increase. Bitcoin shows a similar improvement in risk-adjusted performance. USDT is a useful boundary case, where simpler state-aware selectors remain competitive. Ablations further show that the benefit depends on relative candidate evaluation, temporal context, and selective switching rather than on merely enlarging the policy library.




Figure 1: Comparison of three volatility-control paradigms. (a) Fixed-rule control uses one estimator–controller pair across states. (b) Regime-aware control adapts a fixed control design using state-dependent rules. (c) VolRouter makes policy selection explicit: it profiles the current state, decides whether the active pair should be kept, and selects a replacement only when switching is justified. Estimator and controller labels are illustrative; experiment-specific eligibility is defined separately.

Our contributions are threefold. **First**, we make policy selection an explicit layer between risk estimation and portfolio execution. **Second**, we introduce a modular routing framework that separates market interpretation, the decision to switch, and replacement-pair selection. **Third**, we characterize when this routing layer helps through four markets, component ablations, sensitivity studies, and multiple Router backbones.

Section 2 positions the formulation relative to volatility control and routing. Section 3 defines the three-stage Router and its LLM instantiation. Section 4 describes the comparisons and evaluation protocol, and Section 5 reports the main empirical results.

2 Related Work

Traditional volatility control. One line of work improves the risk estimate using realized volatility, EWMA, ARCH/GARCH-family models, downside-risk measures, and implied-volatility signals [2–6, 23, 27, 28, 31]. Another line studies how a chosen estimate is translated into exposure through volatility-managed portfolios, target-volatility scaling, VIX-based control, or drawdown-aware rules [1, 7–11]. VolRouter differs by asking a separate question: among several admissible estimator–controller pairs, which pair should control the portfolio now?

Portfolio regimes and execution frictions. Dynamic allocation is sensitive to estimation error, regime changes, and trading costs [25, 26, 29, 30, 32]. We keep these concerns explicit through state features, persistence constraints, and turnover costs, but do not solve a new cross-sectional allocation problem. Instead, the Router chooses among reusable control policies whose execution rules are already specified.

Routing architectures. Mixture-of-experts, sparse conditional computation, contextual bandits, and model-routing systems all

separate context representation from expert selection [34–37, 41]. We transfer this idea to volatility control: the “experts” are not neural subnetworks or language models, but estimator–controller pairs with distinct risk and execution behavior.

LLMs as routers. LLM-agent systems show that a language model can inspect structured context, select tools or experts, and delegate execution [38–40]. Our main instantiation uses an LLM in this supervisory role. The architecture is not LLM-specific: the same state, hold/switch, and pair-selection interfaces can also be implemented by deterministic or learned selectors.

Section 3 turns these connections into the concrete state–switch–selection interface used by VolRouter.

3 Methodology

The goal is simple: at each decision date, keep the current control policy if it still fits the market, or route to a better-suited policy if it does not. The Router never replaces the downstream portfolio logic. It only decides which predefined estimator–controller pair is active. This separation is useful for both interpretability and safety: a routing decision can change the policy, but portfolio actions remain generated by known control rules.

3.1 Preliminaries

We consider a discrete-time investment setting indexed by $t = 1, \dots, T$, following standard volatility-timing backtests [1, 11]. At date t , the system observes only information available by that decision point, denoted $\mathcal{I}_t$, and constructs a control-relevant numerical profile

$$s_t = \phi(\mathcal{I}_t), \quad (1)$$

which summarizes quantities such as recent volatility, trend, draw-down, and execution conditions. Thus, s_t is the measured market context; it is not yet the Router’s final state label.

We define a library of K estimator–controller pairs,

$$\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \dots, p_K\}, \quad p_k = (e_k, c_k). \quad (2)$$

The two parts have distinct roles. The estimator e_k produces a risk object $\widehat{\rho}_t^{(k)}$, while the controller c_k converts that risk object into a portfolio action:

$$\widehat{\rho}_t^{(k)} = e_k(\mathcal{I}_t), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathbf{w}_t^{(k)} = c_k(\widehat{\rho}_t^{(k)}, s_t, \mathbf{w}_{t-1}). \quad (4)$$

For a single asset, $\widehat{\rho}_t^{(k)}$ can be a scalar volatility estimate and $\mathbf{w}_t$ becomes a scalar exposure. For Multi-Asset, $\widehat{\rho}_t^{(k)}$ can be a covariance matrix and $\mathbf{w}_t$ is a vector of portfolio weights. A pair therefore represents a complete “measure risk, then act” recipe. Traditional volatility targeting keeps one recipe fixed [8, 9]; VolROUTER allows the active recipe to change when the control requirement changes.

3.2 Routing Formulation

We formulate volatility control as persistent state-dependent routing over $\mathcal{P}$, analogous to expert selection in mixture-of-experts and model-routing systems [34, 35, 41]. The Router separates three questions: *what state are we in?*, *should we keep the current pair?*, and, only if not, *which pair should replace it?*

To make this distinction explicit, let $\mathcal{I}_t^{\text{state}}$ contain state-only information derived from completed history, and let $\mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}$ contain routing diagnostics such as trailing candidate performance, draw-down, tracking error, turnover, and feasibility. The Router maps the measured profile into a compact state interpretation z_t , reviews whether the active pair k_{t-1} should be held, and selects from the feasible candidate set $C_t \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ only after a switch:

$$z_t = \mathcal{R}_\theta(s_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{state}}), \quad (5)$$

$$g_t = \mathcal{G}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}, k_{t-1}) \in \{\text{hold}, \text{switch}\}, \quad (6)$$

$$k_t = \begin{cases} k_{t-1}, & g_t = \text{hold}, \\ \mathcal{S}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}, C_t \setminus \{k_{t-1}\}), & g_t = \text{switch}. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

Here, s_t is the numerical state profile, while z_t is the Router’s compact interpretation of that profile. The distinction matters because the same raw measurements can be summarized differently by different Router implementations.

The hold/switch gate is deliberately placed before pair selection. Without this gate, small changes in candidate rankings could force a new policy every review step. Persistence constraints such as a minimum holding period or hysteresis can further prevent unnecessary churn. Once k_t is fixed, routing stops and the selected pair executes normally:

$$\widehat{\rho}_t = e_{k_t}(\mathcal{I}_t), \quad \mathbf{w}_t = c_{k_t}(\widehat{\rho}_t, s_t, \mathbf{w}_{t-1}). \quad (8)$$

The full decision chain is therefore

$$\mathcal{I}_t \rightarrow s_t \rightarrow z_t \rightarrow g_t \rightarrow k_t \rightarrow \mathbf{w}_t. \quad (9)$$

In words: observe history, summarize the market, interpret the state, decide whether to switch, select a pair if necessary, and then execute that pair.

Reported portfolio returns charge transaction costs generated by changes in portfolio weights,

$$R_{t+1}^{\text{net}} = \mathbf{w}_t^\top \mathbf{r}_{t+1} - \lambda_{\text{to}} \|\mathbf{w}_t - \mathbf{w}_{t-1}\|_1, \quad (10)$$

with the corresponding cash leg included in Multi-Asset. Pair switching is regularized by the hold/switch gate and persistence rules rather than by a uniform extra fee for changing pair identity. Appendix M provides the implementation-level accounting.

All routing diagnostics are lagged. For each candidate, the Router uses trailing history

$$\mathcal{H}_t = \{t - H, \dots, t - 1\}, \quad H = 63, \quad (11)$$

so the decision at t never contains r_{t+1} or any later portfolio outcome. Appendix G gives the exact timing convention.

3.3 LLM-Based Routing

The same interface can be implemented by rules, learned selectors, contextual bandits, or an LLM. In our LLM instantiation, the model acts as a constrained routing agent. It does not see an unconstrained natural-language trading task. Instead, it receives structured records built from decision-time information and performs the same three steps defined above.

First, it returns a valid state label. Second, it returns exactly hold or switch. Third, only after switch, it returns one pair identifier from the supplied candidate set. It does not predict returns, change controller parameters, or directly output portfolio weights. All responses are parsed as JSON and checked against closed admissible sets; invalid or failed responses use deterministic fallback logic. The prompt schemas, parsers, and fallbacks are in Appendix E, and the full routing specification is in Appendix A.

Section 4 evaluates whether this explicit routing layer improves risk-adjusted control, which parts of the three-stage decision matter, and how sensitive the result is to deployment choices and Router backbones.

4 Experimental Setup

The experiments answer four questions in order: does routing improve risk-adjusted control over fixed and adaptive alternatives; which parts of the routing decision matter; how sensitive is performance to switching, execution cost, risk target, and library size; and does the behavior persist across Router backbones? This order mirrors the framework in Section 3: we first test the complete system, then remove components, vary deployment choices, and finally change the routing model.

4.1 Tasks and Datasets

We evaluate VolROUTER in four out-of-sample settings chosen to expose different control demands. **S&P 500** is a single-asset volatility-targeting task on broad U.S. equity exposure. **Multi-Asset** routes over covariance-estimator and portfolio-controller pairs in a diversified cross-asset portfolio. **Bitcoin** is a high-volatility stress test with large risk shifts, while **USDT** is a low-volatility boundary case where aggressive adaptation may be unnecessary. The goal is not to compare asset classes by their absolute Sharpe ratios, but to ask whether routing helps *within* each control environment.

The settings use different risk budgets because their natural volatility scales are different. S&P 500 uses a 10% volatility target,




Figure 2: Overview of VolROUTER. Market history is summarized into a control-relevant profile. The Router interprets the state, decides whether the active pair should be kept, and selects a replacement only when switching is justified. The selected estimator-controller pair then produces the portfolio action; the LLM, when used, never produces the trade directly.

5 bp transaction cost, 252-day estimation window, and 252-day annualization; Multi-Asset uses 10%, 5 bp, 126 days, and 252 days; Bitcoin uses 35%, 8 bp, 90 days, and 365 days; and USDT uses 2%, 2 bp, 90 days, and 365 days, respectively. Estimator inputs, state features, candidate construction, and calibration use only information available before the evaluated action. The action formed at date t is applied to subsequent returns. Preprocessing and timing details are given in [Appendix C](#), [Appendix F](#), and [Appendix G](#).

4.2 Baselines and Evaluation

Routing methods draw from the same eligible estimator-controller library; fixed baselines use their corresponding fixed policies. The library combines realized/EWMA, GARCH/HAR, machine-learning, and market-specific risk estimators with scaling, regime-aware, trend, drawdown, tail-risk, and multi-asset controllers. [Appendix B](#) lists the implementation-level library and eligibility rules.

The baseline progression is intentional. **RV + Naive Scaling** and **EWMA Targeting** ask what happens when one standard pair is used throughout. **Regime-Aware Fixed** asks whether state dependence inside one predefined controller is already sufficient. **Mixture-of-Experts** softly combines specialized policies, whereas **Contextual Bandit** explicitly selects a strategy from context. VolROUTER differs by separating the decision to *switch* from the decision of *which replacement to choose*, and by maintaining the selected pair persistently between review decisions. Where applicable, adaptive baselines receive the same state information, eligible library, historical diagnostics, and pre-evaluation calibration data.

We report annualized return, annualized volatility, Sharpe ratio, maximum drawdown (MDD), and daily 95% CVaR. These metrics must be read jointly: lower volatility is not automatically better because each setting has an explicit risk target, and a very low-volatility strategy can simply be under-exposed. Secondary analyses use Sortino ratio, rolling Sharpe, turnover, volatility tracking, switching behavior, and sensitivity diagnostics. All portfolio returns include the setting-specific transaction costs above; metric definitions are in [Appendix H](#).

5 Results

5.1 Overall Performance

Table 1 shows a consistent pattern in three settings: routing improves risk-adjusted performance mainly by changing risk deployment, not by mechanically raising raw return. On S&P 500, Sharpe rises from 0.952 for RV + Naive Scaling to 1.222 while MDD falls from 15.10% to 12.58% and CVaR from 1.76% to 1.32%. Annualized return is slightly lower (10.84% versus 11.11%), so the improvement is not explained by higher exposure.

Multi-Asset shows the same trade-off. RV + Naive Scaling has the highest raw return (16.35%), but VolROUTER reaches a higher Sharpe (1.540 versus 1.498) and a lower CVaR (1.18% versus 1.56%). In other words, the Router gives up some raw return while using the risk budget more efficiently across market states.

Bitcoin is the strongest case: VolROUTER reaches 30.81% annualized return and a 1.123 Sharpe while reducing MDD from 51.69% to 39.39%. Regime-Aware Fixed and Mixture-of-Experts have smaller drawdowns, but their realized volatilities are only 6.73% and 7.51% against a 35% target, indicating substantial under-exposure. VolROUTER remains much closer to the intended risk budget.

USDT is the boundary case. Contextual Bandit and Regime-Aware Fixed achieve higher Sharpe than VolROUTER, and all three operate at realized volatility far below the 2% target. We therefore read this setting as evidence that an explicit pair-routing layer is not always necessary: when the environment is unusually stable, a simpler state-aware selector can already capture much of the benefit.

Figure 3 is deliberately a separate 2 bp path-level diagnostic, not a second estimate of the 5 bp headline table. Within that run, VolROUTER stays close to strong alternatives for long periods and separates in specific episodes, showing how repeated local routing decisions accumulate into different portfolio paths.

5.2 What Makes Routing Effective?

The ablation driver has its own evaluation protocol, so its Sharpe values are compared only within Figure 4, not directly with the

Table 1: Main out-of-sample results across four volatility-control settings. Ann. Ret. and Ann. Vol. denote annualized return and annualized volatility; MDD denotes maximum drawdown; and CVaR denotes daily 95% conditional value-at-risk. Higher annualized return and Sharpe are better, whereas lower MDD and CVaR are better. Annualized volatility should be interpreted relative to the setting-specific volatility target rather than minimized unconditionally. Within each market block, colors are measured relative to RV + Naive Scaling.

Method	Ann. Ret. (%)	Ann. Vol. (%)	Sharpe	MDD (%)	CVaR (%)
S&P 500					
RV + Naive Scaling	11.11	11.67	0.952	15.10	1.76
EWMA Targeting	10.31	10.85	0.951	14.02	1.63
Regime-Aware Fixed	10.28	12.39	0.830	15.85	1.81
Mixture-of-Experts	10.45	10.90	0.958	15.06	1.66
Contextual Bandit	9.35	10.45	0.895	13.41	1.60
VOLROUTER	10.84	8.87	1.222	12.58	1.32
Multi-Asset					
RV + Naive Scaling	16.35	10.91	1.498	7.84	1.56
EWMA Targeting	11.62	9.05	1.283	8.88	1.32
Regime-Aware Fixed	11.60	8.86	1.309	6.26	1.30
Mixture-of-Experts	12.41	8.88	1.398	6.28	1.27
Contextual Bandit	10.59	8.04	1.318	9.24	1.20
VOLROUTER	13.20	8.57	1.540	6.60	1.18
Bitcoin					
RV + Naive Scaling	29.56	39.57	0.747	51.69	4.68
EWMA Targeting	27.26	36.56	0.745	51.95	4.30
Regime-Aware Fixed	1.60	6.73	0.238	7.24	0.99
Mixture-of-Experts	5.99	7.51	0.798	6.85	1.00
Contextual Bandit	10.28	36.27	0.283	51.47	4.56
VOLROUTER	30.81	27.43	1.123	39.39	3.25
USDT					
RV + Naive Scaling	-4.71	4.37	-1.078	17.75	0.32
EWMA Targeting	-3.81	2.99	-1.274	15.95	0.27
Regime-Aware Fixed	4.75	0.52	9.140	0.89	0.05
Mixture-of-Experts	4.10	1.04	3.943	2.70	0.08
Contextual Bandit	4.94	0.52	9.566	0.81	0.05
VOLROUTER	4.41	0.53	8.379	1.25	0.06

headline table. The pattern is nevertheless clear. Removing temporal state context weakens routing because the Router loses information about how the current policy relates to the recent market path. Removing relative candidate comparison or risk-aware evaluation also degrades performance, showing that policies must be judged against one another under the current state rather than by an isolated unconditional score.

The adaptive-routing ablations are especially informative. Replacing dynamic routing with a fixed pair causes one of the largest losses, while removing persistence or replacing adaptive decisions with deterministic alternatives also reduces Sharpe. The gain therefore comes from the combination of state context, relative candidate evaluation, and persistent but revisable policy selection— not simply from exposing the system to a larger library.

5.3 Sensitivity and Robustness

Figure 5 varies one deployment choice at a time; the four panels are separate diagnostics rather than one shared numerical grid. Switching sensitivity changes how readily the Router reacts, transaction cost changes execution friction, target volatility changes the risk budget, and candidate-pool size changes the available policy diversity.

Target volatility produces the largest movement: Sharpe is 1.55 at the 5% target and falls toward roughly 0.9–1.0 at the more aggressive 15–25% targets. Transaction-cost changes are narrower, while switching sensitivity is non-monotonic. Candidate-pool expansion helps overall but not at every intermediate size. These results have a common interpretation: more risk, more switching, or more candidate policies do not automatically improve control; the Router must use that additional freedom selectively.

5.4 Router Backbones and Cross-Market Stability

Figure 6 asks whether routing behavior depends on one language-model backbone. In the S&P 500 sweep, the regime series is held fixed, so that panel isolates switch review and pair selection rather than end-to-end state inference. Backbone rankings change across markets and risk dimensions; no model is uniformly strongest. Rolling-Sharpe distributions also vary by market, with Bitcoin showing the widest temporal variation and USDT the narrowest. Useful routing behavior nevertheless appears across multiple backbones, indicating that the reported effect is not tied to one specific LLM.




Figure 3: Path-level S&P 500 diagnostic under a 10% volatility target and 2 bp costs. Panels (a)–(e) compare cumulative wealth and panel (f) reports Sharpe ratios. This run is separate from the 5 bp headline setting in Table 1 and is used only to show when path-level differences accumulate.




Figure 4: Component ablation on S&P 500. Panels remove (a) state context, (b) candidate-reference/evaluation signals, and (c) adaptive-routing components. Full VolRouter has Sharpe 1.47 under this ablation protocol. Error bars summarize the ablation driver and are not confidence intervals for Table 1.

6 Analysis

The results support a more useful conclusion than “routing improves Sharpe.” They show *what the Router is actually buying*: better timing of control policies, not a new source of return prediction.

Insight 1: the gain is mainly state-dependent risk deployment, not alpha forecasting. On S&P 500, VolRouter raises

Sharpe from 0.952 to 1.222 even though annualized return is slightly lower; the improvement comes with lower realized volatility, draw-down, and CVaR. Multi-Asset shows the same pattern: raw return is below RV + Naive Scaling, but Sharpe is higher and CVaR is lower. Bitcoin provides the complementary case, where return rises while realized volatility and drawdown fall. Across these settings, the




Figure 5: Sensitivity of VolRouter. We vary (a) switching sensitivity, (b) transaction cost, (c) target volatility, and (d) candidate-pool size one at a time. Dashed lines mark the canonical base configuration; the base need not be one of the displayed sweep points.

common mechanism is therefore not “predict a higher return.” The Router changes *which validated risk response is active when the cost of being too aggressive or too defensive changes*. This also clarifies why an LLM can be useful without forecasting the next return: it is choosing among known control recipes rather than creating an alpha signal.

Insight 2: market-state classification alone is insufficient; routing is an action-conditioned comparison problem. Figure 4 shows that removing previous-action context is more damaging than removing several individual state descriptors, and removing relative pair comparison causes one of the largest losses in the reference/evaluation block. The relevant question is therefore not only “what state are we in?” but “given this state, is the policy already in control still the right one relative to the alternatives?” A high-volatility label, for example, does not imply one universal action if the active controller is already handling the risk well. This result is the main reason to keep state inference, switch review, and pair selection separate: directly mapping each state label to one fixed policy discards information about the policy currently being executed.

Insight 3: persistence is a form of temporal regularization, not merely a way to save transaction costs. The adaptive-routing ablations and the switching sweep tell the same story. Removing persistence/hysteresis reduces Sharpe, and switching sensitivity is non-monotonic rather than “more reactive is better.” At the same time, the transaction-cost sweep in Figure 5 moves Sharpe less than the switching-sensitivity sweep. Persistence is therefore doing more than avoiding fees: it filters short-lived changes in candidate rankings and prevents policy churn caused by noisy local evidence. A router that simply takes the current argmax at every review step is not equivalent to VolRouter, even if both see the same candidate scores. The hold/switch gate is useful because it asks for evidence that the existing policy has become inappropriate before reopening the selection problem.

Insight 4: the risk budget is first-order; Router tuning is second-order. Among the four deployment sweeps, target volatility produces the largest Sharpe range (about 0.64), compared with about 0.36 for switching sensitivity and only about 0.14 and 0.13 for transaction cost and candidate-pool size. This gives a clear deployment hierarchy. The risk target determines how much risk the system is allowed to use; the policy library determines which responses are available; the Router only decides how to move among




Figure 6: Router backbones across markets. Panels (a)–(d) compare normalized return and risk metrics; panel (e) shows 63-day rolling-Sharpe distributions after within-setting normalization. In the S&P 500 sweep, the regime series is held fixed, isolating downstream switch and pair-selection behavior.

those responses. A sophisticated Router therefore cannot rescue an inappropriate risk budget. In practice, the risk target should be selected and validated before tuning switching behavior or expanding the candidate pool.

Insight 5: useful diversity matters more than a large library. The candidate-pool curve improves overall but is not monotonic. Adding policies can help, yet some intermediate expansions add little or temporarily reduce Sharpe. This rules out a simple “more experts is better” explanation. A useful candidate must contribute a behavior that is both different and identifiable from lagged evidence—for example, a different reaction speed, drawdown brake, tail-risk response, or covariance treatment. Redundant or noisy pairs enlarge the choice set without adding a new control capability. The design objective is therefore *behavioral contrast*, not library cardinality.

Insight 6: the routing premium is conditional, and USDT shows the boundary. USDT is informative because VOLROUTER is not the best method there. Regime-Aware Fixed and Contextual Bandit obtain higher Sharpe, while all strong methods realize volatility far below the 2% target. In a stable environment, candidate policies can disagree less and a simpler selector can capture most of the useful state dependence. The case also exposes an evaluation pitfall: Sharpe can reward a method that simply stays far below the intended risk budget. Risk-adjusted performance should therefore be read jointly with risk-target adherence rather than in isolation.

Finally, Figure 6 shows that no Router backbone dominates across all markets and risk dimensions. The transferable object is therefore better viewed as the *routing interface*—structured state, an explicit hold/switch decision, and closed-set pair selection—rather than one universally best language model. Backbone choice remains setting-dependent, but it can change without redefining the downstream estimators or controllers.

Overall, routing is most promising when the risk budget is sensible, candidate policies make genuinely different state-dependent trade-offs, and switching is persistent enough to ignore short-lived ranking noise. The analysis is descriptive of held-out point estimates; statistical scope is given in [Appendix I](#).

7 Conclusion

We presented VOLROUTER, a persistent Router over validated estimator-controller pairs. Its value comes from selecting *when* different risk-control rules should act, not from predicting returns directly. Routing helps most when candidate policies make meaningful state-dependent trade-offs; it helps less when markets are stable or the library adds little behavioral contrast. Volatility management therefore concerns both estimating risk and choosing which validated response should act now.

References

- [1] Moreira, A. and Muir, T. (2017). Volatility-managed portfolios. *The Journal of Finance* 72(4), 1611–1644.
- [2] Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica* 50(4), 987–1007.
- [3] Bollerslev, T. (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 31(3), 307–327.
- [4] Andersen, T. G., Bollerslev, T., Diebold, F. X., and Labys, P. (2003). Modeling and forecasting realized volatility. *Econometrica* 71(2), 579–625.
- [5] Longestaey, J. and Zangari, P. (1996). *RiskMetrics—Technical Document*. Fourth Edition, J.P. Morgan / Reuters.
- [6] Whaley, R. E. (2009). Understanding the VIX. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 35(3), 98–105.
- [7] Božović, M. (2024). VIX-managed portfolios. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 95, 103353.
- [8] MSCI (2021). *MSCI Risk Control Indexes Methodology*. MSCI Inc.
- [9] S&P Dow Jones Indices (2025). *S&P Risk Control 2.0 Indices Methodology*. S&P Dow Jones Indices.
- [10] Nystrup, P., Boyd, S., Lindström, E., and Madsen, H. (2019). Multi-period portfolio selection with drawdown control. *Annals of Operations Research* 282(1–2), 245–271.
- [11] Fleming, J., Kirby, C., and Ostdieck, B. (2001). The economic value of volatility timing. *The Journal of Finance* 56(1), 329–352.
- [12] Glosten, L. R., Jagannathan, R., and Runkle, D. E. (1993). On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks. *The Journal of Finance* 48(5), 1779–1801.
- [13] Corsi, F. (2009). A simple approximate long-memory model of realized volatility. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 7(2), 174–196.
- [14] Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 58(1), 267–288.
- [15] Ke, G., Meng, Q., Finley, T., Wang, T., Chen, W., Ma, W., Ye, Q., and Liu, T.-Y. (2017). LightGBM: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 30, 3146–3154.
- [16] Hochreiter, S. and Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long short-term memory. *Neural Computation* 9(8), 1735–1780.
- [17] Daubechies, I. (1992). *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- [18] Rockafellar, R. T. and Uryasev, S. (2000). Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *The Journal of Risk* 2(3), 21–41.
- [19] Sharpe, W. F. (1966). Mutual fund performance. *The Journal of Business* 39(1), 119–138.
- [20] Sortino, F. A. and Price, L. N. (1994). Performance measurement in a downside risk framework. *The Journal of Investing* 3(3), 59–64.
- [21] Yahoo Finance (n.d.). Historical market data. Available at: <https://finance.yahoo.com/>. Accessed April 2026.
- [22] Databento (n.d.). Historical market data. Available at: <https://databento.com/>. Accessed April 2026.
- [23] Wang, F. and Yan, X. S. (2021). Downside risk and the performance of volatility-managed portfolios. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 131, 106198.
- [24] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E., Kinnebrock, S., and Shephard, N. (2008). Measuring downside risk—realised semivariance. *Economics Series Working Papers* No. 382, Department of Economics, University of Oxford.
- [25] Markowitz, H. (1952). Portfolio selection. *The Journal of Finance* 7(1), 77–91.
- [26] Hamilton, J. D. (1989). A new approach to the economic analysis of nonstationary time series and the business cycle. *Econometrica* 57(2), 357–384.
- [27] Nelson, D. B. (1991). Conditional heteroskedasticity in asset returns: A new approach. *Econometrica* 59(2), 347–370.
- [28] Barndorff-Nielsen, O. E. and Shephard, N. (2002). Econometric analysis of realized volatility and its use in estimating stochastic volatility models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 64(2), 253–280.
- [29] Ang, A. and Bekaert, G. (2002). International asset allocation with regime shifts. *The Review of Financial Studies* 15(4), 1137–1187.
- [30] Almgren, R. and Chriss, N. (2001). Optimal execution of portfolio transactions. *The Journal of Risk* 3(2), 5–39.
- [31] Hansen, P. R. and Lunde, A. (2005). A forecast comparison of volatility models: Does anything beat a GARCH(1,1)? *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 20(7), 873–889.
- [32] DeMiguel, V., Garlappi, L., and Uppal, R. (2009). Optimal versus naive diversification: How inefficient is the 1/N portfolio strategy? *The Review of Financial Studies* 22(5), 1915–1953.
- [33] Gu, S., Kelly, B., and Xiu, D. (2020). Empirical asset pricing via machine learning. *The Review of Financial Studies* 33(5), 2223–2273.
- [34] Jacobs, R. A., Jordan, M. I., Nowlan, S. J., and Hinton, G. E. (1991). Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural Computation* 3(1), 79–87.
- [35] Shazeer, N., Mirhoseini, A., Maziarz, K., Davis, A., Le, Q. V., Hinton, G. E., and Dean, J. (2017). Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2017)*.
- [36] Li, L., Chu, W., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. (2010). A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on World Wide Web*, 661–670.
- [37] Fedus, W., Zoph, B., and Shazeer, N. (2022). Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23(120), 1–39.
- [38] Shen, Y., Song, K., Tan, X., Li, D., Lu, W., and Zhuang, Y. (2023). HuggingGPT: Solving AI tasks with ChatGPT and its friends in Hugging Face. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36, 38154–38180.
- [39] Wu, Q., Bansal, G., Zhang, J., Wu, Y., Li, B., Zhu, E., Jiang, L., Zhang, X., Zhang, S., Liu, J., Awadallah, A. H., White, R. W., Burger, D., and Wang, C. (2024). AutoGen: Enabling next-gen LLM applications via multi-agent conversations. In *First Conference on Language Modeling (COLM 2024)*.
- [40] Yao, S., Zhao, J., Yu, D., Du, N., Shafran, I., Narasimhan, K., and Cao, Y. (2023). ReAct: Synergizing reasoning and acting in language models. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2023)*.
- [41] Ong, I., Almahairi, A., Wu, V., Chiang, W.-L., Wu, T., Gonzalez, J. E., Kadous, M. W., and Stoica, I. (2025). RouteLLM: Learning to route LLMs from preference data. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2025)*.

A Full Routing Specification

A.1 Unified Routing Formulation

The appendix uses the same objects as the main methodology. Let

$$\mathcal{P} = \{p_k\}_{k=1}^K, \quad p_k = (E_k, C_k),$$

be the candidate library of estimator–controller pairs. For a single-asset task, E_k maps lagged market data to a scalar volatility estimate; for a multi-asset task, it maps lagged data to a covariance estimate. The controller C_k then maps that risk object, the target risk budget, and the previous portfolio state to an executable action.

At date t , the observable history $\mathcal{I}_t$ is first converted into a numerical state profile $s_t = \phi(\mathcal{I}_t)$. We distinguish this measured profile from the Router’s compact interpretation z_t . The state input $\mathcal{I}_t^{\text{state}}$ contains only lagged market information used to interpret the environment. The routing input $\mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}$ adds lagged diagnostics for the active and candidate pairs. This separation is useful because market-state inference should not be defined by future outcomes or by an unconstrained look at candidate performance.

Both implementations use the same three-stage decision:

state inference $\rightarrow$ switch review $\rightarrow$ pair selection.

Let k_{t-1} be the active pair and $C_t \subseteq \mathcal{P}$ the eligible candidate set. We write

$$z_t = \mathcal{R}_\theta(s_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{state}}), \quad (12)$$

$$g_t = \mathcal{G}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}, k_{t-1}) \in \{\text{hold}, \text{switch}\}, \quad (13)$$

$$k_t = \begin{cases} k_{t-1}, & g_t = \text{hold}, \\ \mathcal{S}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{route}}, C_t \setminus \{k_{t-1}\}), & g_t = \text{switch}. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

For the single-asset Router,

$$z_t \in \{\text{low}, \text{middle}, \text{high}\},$$

whereas the Multi-Asset Router uses

$$z_t \in \{\text{risk_on}, \text{balanced}, \text{defensive}\}.$$

A new pair is therefore never chosen just because another candidate has a slightly higher recent score: pair selection is called only after the explicit hold/switch decision.

A persistence constraint is applied through a sticky period. A switch is admissible only when

$$a_t + 1 \geq H_{\text{sticky}},$$

where a_t is the age of the active pair. The Multi-Asset Router additionally maintains cooldown and hold-gate state. These mechanisms implement the same idea as the main text: policy changes should be possible, but not automatic at every review step.

A.2 Execution and Deterministic Reference

The equations above determine *which* pair is active. They do not redefine the downstream estimators or controllers. Their exact equations, portfolio execution rules, transaction-cost accounting, and deterministic fallback score are collected in [Appendix D](#). Keeping these implementation details in one place prevents the method overview and the library specification from silently using different conventions.

B Policy Library

B.1 Single-Asset Estimators

The repository contains autoregressive, realized-volatility, EWMA, GARCH/GJR-GARCH, HAR, regime-aware, machine-learning, ensemble, and crypto-specific estimators. The effective families used by the router include AR(1), AR(2), EWMA, RealizedVol, NaiveVolEstimator, GARCH, GJR-GARCH, Regime GJR-GARCH, HAR-RV, HAR-RV with rates, regime HAR, Hybrid EWMA Regime, Light-GBM, Random Forest, RNN/MLP, XGB-VIX, Dynamic Precision Ensemble, Intraday Realized Volatility, Range-Based Volatility, and Crypto Composite Volatility.

Important defaults include EWMA half-life 20; HAR weekly/monthly horizons 5/22; machine-learning refit intervals of 21 trading days in several estimators; annualization 252 for the equity setting and 365 for the crypto estimators. The wavelet implementation is commented out and is not an effective candidate. The master configuration also excludes Lasso/wavelet and buy-and-hold estimator identifiers from router eligibility.

B.2 Single-Asset Controllers

The controller library includes constant weight, naive scaling, clipped volatility targeting, hysteresis control, trend filtering, variance scaling, regime-switch control, drawdown braking, drawdown modulation, CVaR/ES targeting, priority-stack control, shock throttling, and peg-aware control. The naive controller implements the familiar inverse-volatility rule

$$w_t^{\text{naive}} = \frac{\sigma^*}{\sigma_t}, \quad (15)$$

subject to global exposure bounds and a hard-coded no-trade band of 0.05.

B.3 Multi-Asset Estimators and Controllers

The multi-asset covariance library includes sample, expanding, EWMA, and diagonal EWMA estimators; rolling-correlation and shrinkage estimators; and Ledoit–Wolf, downside, robust-median, regime-switching, VIX-scaled, PCA, and dynamic-blend variants.

Representative defaults include EWMA half-life 21, shrinkage 0.25, and three PCA components.

Portfolio controllers include equal weight, buy-and-hold, inverse volatility, minimum variance, volatility-capped minimum variance, equal risk contribution, diversified risk parity, momentum tilt, mean variance, regime-aware risk budgeting, drawdown brake, and hysteresis portfolio control.

The full single-asset master configuration contains 209 named estimator–controller pairs before experiment-specific eligibility filters. Only executable and eligible pairs enter a given routing candidate set; non-functional or explicitly excluded implementations, including the commented-out wavelet path, are not treated as active candidates.

C Data and Preprocessing

C.1 S&P 500 / ES Pipeline

The equity pipeline parses and sorts timestamps, removes duplicate rows and non-positive prices, filters ES contracts, resamples minute data to business-day frequency, detects futures roll dates, constructs a back-adjusted continuous close series, reindexes to a business-day calendar, and forward-fills the continuous price and contract identifier. Raw log returns are

$$r_t = \log \frac{P_t^{\text{adj}}}{P_{t-1}^{\text{adj}}}. \quad (16)$$

A 252-observation rolling standard deviation (minimum 20 observations), denoted σ_t^{roll} , is used for dynamic winsorization:

$$r_t^c = \text{clip} \left(r_t, -5\sigma_t^{\text{roll}}, +5\sigma_t^{\text{roll}} \right). \quad (17)$$

This local rolling-volatility symbol is distinct from the Router state profile s_t used in the main methodology. The cleaned series r_t^c is used by volatility estimators and market features, while raw r_t is retained for P&L. This distinction is intentional and should be preserved in reproduction.

C.2 Multi-Asset Panel

The processed panel is read as numeric returns, rows that are entirely missing are removed, and remaining missing entries are set to zero:

$$r_{t,i} \leftarrow \begin{cases} r_{t,i}, & \text{observed,} \\ 0, & \text{missing.} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

This is equivalent to treating a missing asset observation as a flat return for that day. This implementation choice applies before covariance estimation and should be considered when interpreting Multi-Asset results.

C.3 Risk-Free Rate

The multi-asset engine reads the FRED three-month Treasury yield and converts it to a daily log return:

$$r_t^f = \log \left(1 + \frac{\text{DGS3MO}_t / 100}{252} \right). \quad (19)$$

The series is forward-filled, with any remaining missing values replaced by zero.

Table 2: Canonical evaluation settings and backtest constants.

Setting	Instrument / Universe	σ^*	Cost (bps)	Annualization	Rolling Window
S&P 500	SPY / ES futures	0.10	5	252	252
Multi-Asset	cross-asset panel	0.10	5	252	126
Digital Market (Bitcoin)	BTCUSD	0.35	8	365	90
USDT	USDTUSD	0.02	2	365	90

D Mathematical Specification of Estimators and Controllers

This section gives the implementation-level mathematical specification of the policy library. Equations follow the audited code paths rather than idealized textbook definitions. Generic time indices such as s describe an estimator’s internal recursion; any forecast denoted by $\widehat{\sigma}_t$ or $\widehat{\Sigma}_t$ is formed only from information available strictly before the routing decision at t unless an explicit audit caveat is stated.

D.1 Notation and Timing Convention

Let r_t denote the log return on day t , W the estimation window, A the annualization factor, $\widehat{\sigma}_t$ the annualized volatility forecast, $\widehat{\Sigma}_t$ the annualized covariance forecast, v^* the annualized target volatility, and w_t the portfolio exposure formed at t . For multi-asset strategies, $\mathbf{w}_t$ denotes the risky-asset weight vector. The universal timing convention is

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t, \widehat{\Sigma}_t : \text{data strictly before } t, \quad (20)$$

$$w_t, \mathbf{w}_t : \text{applied to returns at } t + 1. \quad (21)$$

The annualization factor is $A = 252$ for the equity and multi-asset settings and $A = 365$ for the digital-asset settings.

D.2 Single-Asset Volatility Estimators

D.2.1 Naive Volatility Estimator. The naive estimator uses the uncentered second moment:

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \cdot \frac{1}{W} \sum_{i=1}^W r_{t-i}^2}. \quad (22)$$

Unlike a sample standard deviation, this quantity includes the drift term.

D.2.2 Realized Volatility. For lookback $L = 20$,

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A} \text{sd}(r_{t-L}, \dots, r_{t-1}), \quad (23)$$

where the implementation uses the sample standard deviation (ddof = 1).

D.2.3 EWMA. With half-life $h = 20$,

$$\lambda = \exp\left(-\frac{\ln 2}{h}\right). \quad (24)$$

For observations s inside the trailing estimation window, the implementation applies the `adjust=False` EWMA recursion

$$v_s = \lambda v_{s-1} + (1 - \lambda) r_s^2, \quad (25)$$

initialized by the first squared return in the supplied window. Because the window used at routing time t ends at $t - 1$, the decision-time forecast is

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A v_{t-1}}. \quad (26)$$

Thus the notation does not imply access to r_t when the action for the next period is formed.

D.2.4 Buy-and-Hold Degenerate Estimator. The implementation defines

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t \equiv v^*. \quad (27)$$

When paired with inverse-volatility scaling, this yields unit exposure.

D.2.5 AR(1) on Squared Returns. Within each estimation window, OLS is fit to

$$h_t = \alpha + \beta r_{t-1}^2, \quad (28)$$

and the forecast is

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \cdot \max(h_t, 10^{-9})}. \quad (29)$$

D.2.6 AR(2) on Squared Returns. The two-lag specification is

$$h_t = \alpha + \beta_1 r_{t-1}^2 + \beta_2 r_{t-2}^2, \quad (30)$$

with

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \cdot \max(h_t, 10^{-9})}. \quad (31)$$

Both AR estimators are refit on every window.

D.2.7 GARCH(p, q). Returns are internally rescaled as $\widetilde{r}_t = 1000r_t$. With zero conditional mean and normal innovations,

$$h_t = \omega + \sum_{i=1}^q \alpha_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{t-i}^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j h_{t-j}. \quad (32)$$

The annualized forecast is

$$\widehat{\sigma}_t = \frac{\sqrt{h_t}}{1000} \sqrt{A}. \quad (33)$$

Reported defaults use $p = q = 1$. On fit failure or a non-finite forecast, the implementation falls back to trailing sample volatility.

D.2.8 GJR-GARCH(1, 1, 1). The asymmetric variance recursion is

$$h_t = \omega + (\alpha + \gamma \mathbf{1}[\varepsilon_{t-1} < 0]) \varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta h_{t-1}. \quad (34)$$

Parameters are recalibrated every 63 steps using a trailing 252-observation window. The fallback ladder is

$$\text{GJR forecast} \rightarrow \text{EWMA}(h = 21) \rightarrow \text{realized volatility}. \quad (35)$$

D.2.9 Regime GJR-GARCH. The local GJR regime is assigned by realized-variance terciles:

$$\kappa_t^{\text{GJR}} = \begin{cases} \text{low,} & \text{RV}_{t-1} < q_{1/3}, \\ \text{mid,} & q_{1/3} \leq \text{RV}_{t-1} < q_{2/3}, \\ \text{high,} & \text{RV}_{t-1} \geq q_{2/3}. \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

A separate GJR-GARCH process is calibrated for each regime, and the forecast uses the parameters indexed by κ_t^{GJR} . This symbol is local to the estimator and is not the Router pair index k_t .

D.2.10 *HAR-RV*. Using $RV_t = r_t^2$, define

$$RV_t^{(d)} = RV_{t-1}, \quad (37)$$

$$RV_t^{(w)} = \frac{1}{5} \sum_{i=1}^5 RV_{t-i}, \quad (38)$$

$$RV_t^{(m)} = \frac{1}{22} \sum_{i=1}^{22} RV_{t-i}. \quad (39)$$

The HAR model is

$$RV_t = \beta_0 + \beta_d RV_t^{(d)} + \beta_w RV_t^{(w)} + \beta_m RV_t^{(m)} + \epsilon_t. \quad (40)$$

Coefficients are estimated by ridge regression with an unpenalized intercept:

$$\hat{\beta} = (X^\top X + \lambda I_0)^{-1} X^\top y, \quad (41)$$

$$I_0 = \text{diag}(0, 1, \dots, 1), \quad \lambda = 10^{-6}. \quad (42)$$

The forecast is

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \widehat{RV}_t}. \quad (43)$$

D.2.11 *HAR-RV-Rates*. The implementation augments HAR with a quarterly term and lagged yield-curve features in log-variance space:

$$\ln RV_t = \beta_0 + \beta_d RV_t^{(d)} + \beta_w RV_t^{(w)} \quad (44)$$

$$+ \beta_m RV_t^{(m)} + \beta_q RV_t^{(q)} + \gamma^\top Z_{t-1} + \epsilon_t. \quad (45)$$

where

$$Z_t = [t10y2y_t, t10y3m_t, \Delta t10y2y_t, \Delta t10y3m_t]^\top, \quad (46)$$

$RV_t^{(q)}$ is the 63-day mean, and ridge regularization uses $\lambda = 10^{-4}$. The forecast is

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \exp(\widehat{\ln RV}_t)}. \quad (47)$$

D.2.12 *Regime-Specific HAR-Rates*. The regime-specific variant fits independent coefficient vectors $\beta_{\kappa_t^{\text{HAR}}}$ after constructing the continuous lagged feature sequence:

$$\ln RV_t = X_t^\top \beta_{\kappa_t^{\text{HAR}}} + \epsilon_t, \quad (48)$$

where the local regime label κ_t^{HAR} is assigned by realized-variance terciles.

D.2.13 *Lasso Volatility*. Using 22 lags of squared returns, the estimator solves

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \left[\frac{1}{2n} \|y - X\beta\|_2^2 + \alpha \|\beta\|_1 \right], \quad \alpha = 0.1. \quad (49)$$

D.2.14 *LightGBM Volatility*. The model predicts next-step realized variance from 22 lagged realized-variance features:

$$\widehat{RV}_{t+1} = f_{\theta}^{\text{LGBM}}(x_t). \quad (50)$$

The reported implementation uses 50 trees, learning rate 0.05, 31 leaves, and refits every 21 steps.

D.2.15 *Random-Forest Volatility*. With a five-observation realized-volatility window, define the generic feature at date s as

$$RV_s = \sqrt{A} \text{sd}(r_{s-4}, \dots, r_s). \quad (51)$$

At routing time t , only lagged RV features are supplied (including the implemented lags $\{1, 5, 22\}$), so the feature construction does not imply use of the yet-unavailable decision-period return. The prediction is the average over $B = 100$ trees:

$$\widehat{RV}_{t+1} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B T_b(x_t), \quad (52)$$

where x_t contains RV lags $\{1, 5, 22\}$ and optionally a three-state HMM regime label.

D.2.16 *RNN / MLP Volatility*. The sequence model maps 21 lagged observations into a next-step realized-variance forecast:

$$\widehat{RV}_{t+1} = f_{\theta}(RV_{t-20:t}). \quad (53)$$

The default backend is a one-hidden-layer MLP with 32 hidden units; a SimpleRNN path is available when TensorFlow is installed.

D.2.17 *XGBoost with VIX and Rates*. The XGBoost estimator implements

$$\widehat{RV}_{t+1} = f_{\theta}^{\text{XGB}}(x_t), \quad (54)$$

where all features are shifted one day and include HAR terms, leverage, volatility-of-volatility, jumps, VIX variance, changes in VIX variance, yield-curve features, inversion indicators, and interactions. In particular,

$$\text{VIXVar}_t = \frac{(\text{VIX}_t/100)^2}{A}, \quad (55)$$

and the variance-risk-premium feature is

$$\text{VRP}_t = \frac{\text{VIXVar}_t}{RV_t^{(w)} + 10^{-8}}. \quad (56)$$

A jump indicator is

$$J_t = 1 \left[|r_t| > 3\sigma_{22,t} \right]. \quad (57)$$

D.2.18 *Hybrid EWMA Regime*. Two EWMA variance paths are maintained within the supplied trailing window:

$$v_s^{(j)} = \lambda_j v_{s-1}^{(j)} + (1 - \lambda_j) r_s^2, \quad \lambda_j = (1/2)^{1/h_j}, \quad (58)$$

with

$$h_{\text{fast}} = 5, \quad h_{\text{slow}} = 40, \quad (59)$$

and

$$\sigma_s^{(j)} = \sqrt{A v_s^{(j)}}. \quad (60)$$

At routing time t , the supplied window ends at $t - 1$. The scalar `estimate_window` path returns $\sigma_{t-1}^{(\text{slow})}$; the fast path and regime probabilities are exposed through component diagnostics but do not enter the returned scalar forecast.

D.2.19 Dynamic Precision Ensemble. For submodel m over a trailing loss window $W_L = 21$,

$$L_m = \sum_{i=1}^{W_L} \ell(Ar_{t-i}^2, \hat{\sigma}_{m,t-i}^2). \quad (61)$$

The implemented QLIKE loss is

$$\ell_{\text{QLIKE}}(x, f) = \ln f + \frac{x}{f}, \quad (62)$$

and the optional MSE loss is

$$\ell_{\text{MSE}}(x, f) = (x - f)^2. \quad (63)$$

Weights are inverse-loss rather than softmax weights:

$$\pi_m = \frac{1/\max(L_m, \varepsilon)}{\sum_k 1/\max(L_k, \varepsilon)}, \quad (64)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \sum_m \pi_m \hat{\sigma}_{m,t}. \quad (65)$$

D.2.20 Intraday Realized Volatility. With lookback $L = 3$ over a precomputed intraday-RV series,

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{j=1}^L \text{RV}_{t-j}^{\text{intra}}. \quad (66)$$

The series is shifted one day and falls back to a 20-day return-volatility estimate when required.

D.2.21 Range-Based Volatility. For a completed trading day s , the Parkinson variance estimate is

$$\hat{v}_s^{\text{Park}} = \frac{(\ln(H_s/L_s))^2}{4 \ln 2}, \quad (67)$$

and the default Garman–Klass estimate is

$$\hat{v}_s^{\text{GK}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\ln \frac{H_s}{L_s} \right)^2 - (2 \ln 2 - 1) \left(\ln \frac{C_s}{O_s} \right)^2. \quad (68)$$

The range series is shifted by one day before routing. Hence the annualized 20-day forecast formed at t can be written as

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \sqrt{A \cdot \frac{1}{20} \sum_{j=1}^{20} \hat{v}_{t-j}}. \quad (69)$$

D.2.22 Crypto Composite Volatility. The composite forecast combines intraday RV, range volatility, and EWMA:

$$\tilde{\sigma}_t = 0.50 \hat{\sigma}_t^{\text{intra}} + 0.25 \hat{\sigma}_t^{\text{range}} + 0.25 \hat{\sigma}_t^{\text{EWMA}}, \quad (70)$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \text{clip}(\tilde{\sigma}_t, 0.001, 5.0). \quad (71)$$

Missing component forecasts are replaced by the cross-component median.

Wavelet estimator. A wavelet source file exists, but the class is fully commented out and is not an executable estimator in the effective library.

D.3 Single-Asset Controllers

All single-asset controllers map $(v^*, \hat{\sigma}_t, w_{t-1})$ into a candidate exposure. The execution engine then clips the resulting exposure to the task-specific global bounds. All controllers hold the previous exposure when the volatility input is missing, non-finite, or non-positive.

D.3.1 Constant Weight.

$$w_t = c, \quad c = 1. \quad (72)$$

D.3.2 Naive Scaling.

$$w_t^{\text{raw}} = \frac{v^*}{\max(\hat{\sigma}_t, \varepsilon)}, \quad (73)$$

followed by a hard-coded no-trade band $\delta = 0.05$:

$$w_t = \begin{cases} w_{t-1}, & |w_t^{\text{raw}} - w_{t-1}| < \delta, \\ w_t^{\text{raw}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (74)$$

D.3.3 Clipped Volatility Targeting.

$$w_t^{\text{raw}} = \text{clip}\left(\frac{v^*}{\max(\hat{\sigma}_t, \varepsilon)}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right), \quad (75)$$

with

$$w_t = w_{t-1} \quad \text{if} \quad |w_t^{\text{raw}} - w_{t-1}| < 0.05. \quad (76)$$

The controller defaults are $w_{\min} = 0$ and $w_{\max} = 1.5$.

D.3.4 Hysteresis Controller. The formula is the same as clipped volatility targeting, but the hold condition is inclusive:

$$w_t = w_{t-1} \quad \text{if} \quad |w_t^{\text{raw}} - w_{t-1}| \leq 0.05. \quad (77)$$

D.3.5 Variance Scaling. Let $\bar{\sigma}_t$ be the mean of up to the last 252 volatility forecasts:

$$\bar{\sigma}_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\sigma}_{t-i}, \quad n \leq 252. \quad (78)$$

The raw exposure uses inverse variance:

$$w_t^{\text{raw}} = \frac{v^* \bar{\sigma}_t}{\max(\hat{\sigma}_t^2, \varepsilon)}. \quad (79)$$

A 0.05 no-trade band is applied afterward.

D.3.6 Trend Filter. Using a 63-day return window, define the controller-local trend score

$$q_t^{\text{trend}} = \frac{\text{mean}(r_{t-63:t-1})}{\text{sd}(r_{t-63:t-1})}. \quad (80)$$

For the default smooth gate,

$$m_t^{\text{trend}} = \text{clip}\left(0.5 + 0.5 \tanh(0.75 q_t^{\text{trend}}), m_{\text{floor}}, 1\right), \quad (81)$$

with $m_{\text{floor}} = 0.85$. The exposure is

$$w_t = \text{clip}\left(m_t^{\text{trend}} \frac{v^*}{\hat{\sigma}_t}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right). \quad (82)$$

The optional hard gate sets $m_t^{\text{trend}} = 1$ for $q_t^{\text{trend}} > 0$ and $m_t^{\text{trend}} = m_{\text{floor}}$ otherwise. These symbols are local to the controller and are distinct from the Router state z_t and hold/switch decision g_t .

D.3.7 Regime-Switch Controller. Let

$$\tau_t = Q_{0.8}(\{\widehat{\sigma}_{t-i}\}_{i=1}^{252}). \quad (83)$$

The regime multiplier is

$$m_t = \begin{cases} 0.5, & \widehat{\sigma}_t \geq \tau_t, \\ 1.0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (84)$$

and

$$w_t = \text{clip}\left(m_t \frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t}, 0, 2\right). \quad (85)$$

Before 20 volatility observations are available, the multiplier defaults to 1.

D.3.8 Drawdown Brake. Define drawdown

$$d_t = \max\left(0, 1 - \frac{E_t}{E_t^{\text{peak}}}\right). \quad (86)$$

The brake is

$$b_t = \begin{cases} 1, & d_t \leq d_{\text{start}}, \\ \max\left(b_{\min}, 1 - k \frac{d_t - d_{\text{start}}}{d_{\text{full}} - d_{\text{start}}}\right), & d_t > d_{\text{start}}, \end{cases} \quad (87)$$

where $d_{\text{start}} = 0.10$, $d_{\text{full}} = 0.30$, $k = 1$, and $b_{\min} = 0.75$. Exposure is

$$w_t = \text{clip}\left(b_t \frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right). \quad (88)$$

D.3.9 Drawdown-Modulated Controller. With

$$d_t = \frac{E_t^{\text{peak}} - E_t}{E_t^{\text{peak}}}, \quad (89)$$

the modulation factor is

$$\phi_t = \begin{cases} 1, & d_t \leq d_{\text{start}}, \\ 1 - \frac{d_t - d_{\text{start}}}{d_{\text{max}} - d_{\text{start}}} (1 - \phi_{\min}), & d_{\text{start}} < d_t < d_{\text{max}}, \\ \phi_{\min}, & d_t \geq d_{\text{max}}, \end{cases} \quad (90)$$

where $d_{\text{start}} = 0.10$, $d_{\text{max}} = 0.30$, and $\phi_{\min} = 0.65$. Then

$$w_t = \text{clip}\left(\phi_t \frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right). \quad (91)$$

D.3.10 CVaR / Expected-Shortfall Targeting. Over a 252-day loss buffer $\ell_i = -r_i$ and $\alpha = 0.95$,

$$\text{VaR}_\alpha = Q_\alpha(\ell), \quad (92)$$

and

$$\widehat{\text{ES}} = \mathbb{E}[\ell \mid \ell \geq \text{VaR}_\alpha]. \quad (93)$$

The controller targets $\text{ES}^* = 0.02$:

$$w_t = \text{clip}\left(\frac{\text{ES}^*}{\max(\widehat{\text{ES}}, \varepsilon)}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right). \quad (94)$$

This controller does not use $\widehat{\sigma}_t$ in the exposure rule.

D.3.11 Priority-Stack Controller. First compute

$$w_t^{\text{base}} = \text{clip}\left(\frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right). \quad (95)$$

Three controller-local multipliers are then formed. Here, q_t^{trend} is the same 63-day trend score defined in the Trend-Filter controller above; it is controller-local and is not the Router state label z_t .

$$u_t^{\text{trend}} = \begin{cases} 1, & q_t^{\text{trend}} > 0, \\ 0.80, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (96)$$

$$u_t^{\text{dd}} = \text{clip}\left(1 - k \frac{d_t - d_{\text{start}}}{d_{\text{full}} - d_{\text{start}}}, 0.80, 1\right), \quad (97)$$

and

$$u_t^{\text{tail}} = \text{clip}\left(\frac{\text{ES}^{\text{lim}}}{\widehat{\text{ES}}}, 0.80, 1\right), \quad \text{ES}^{\text{lim}} = 0.03. \quad (98)$$

The default combination is the mean,

$$G_t = \frac{1}{3} (u_t^{\text{trend}} + u_t^{\text{dd}} + u_t^{\text{tail}}), \quad (99)$$

although product and minimum combination modes are also implemented. The target is

$$\widetilde{w}_t = \text{clip}\left(G_t w_t^{\text{base}}, w_{\min}, w_{\max}\right), \quad (100)$$

and the step-limited update is

$$w_t = w_{t-1} + \text{clip}(\widetilde{w}_t - w_{t-1}, -\Delta_{\max}, \Delta_{\max}). \quad (101)$$

Here, $\Delta_{\max} = 0.35$.

D.3.12 Volatility-Shock Throttle. The base target is modified by a shock indicator:

$$w_t^{\text{base}} = \frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t} \begin{cases} \kappa, & \widehat{\sigma}_t \geq \mu \text{ median}(\{\widehat{\sigma}\}_{30}), \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (102)$$

where $\mu = 1.75$ and $\kappa = 0.50$. Exposure changes obey asymmetric limits:

$$\Delta_t = \text{clip}\left(w_t^{\text{base}} - w_{t-1}, -0.75, +0.20\right), \quad (103)$$

and

$$w_t = w_{t-1} + \Delta_t. \quad (104)$$

A no-trade band of 0.025 is applied.

D.3.13 Peg-Aware Volatility Controller. Define the one-period peg deviation

$$p_t = |\text{expm1}(r_t)|. \quad (105)$$

The peg multiplier is

$$m_t^{\text{peg}} = \begin{cases} 1, & p_t \leq 0.0015, \\ 1 - \frac{p_t - 0.0015}{0.0060 - 0.0015}, & 0.0015 < p_t < 0.0060, \\ 0, & p_t \geq 0.0060, \end{cases} \quad (106)$$

and the drawdown multiplier is

$$m_t^{\text{dd}} = \begin{cases} 1, & d_t \leq 0.02, \\ 1 - \frac{d_t - 0.02}{0.08 - 0.02}, & 0.02 < d_t < 0.08, \\ 0, & d_t \geq 0.08. \end{cases} \quad (107)$$

The exposure update is

$$w_t = w_{t-1} + \text{clip}\left(m_t^{\text{peg}} m_t^{\text{dd}} \frac{v^*}{\widehat{\sigma}_t} - w_{t-1}, -0.25, 0.25\right). \quad (108)$$

D.4 Multi-Asset Covariance Estimators

Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{W \times N}$ be the return window. Every covariance estimator is annualized and projected onto the positive-semidefinite cone. For a symmetric matrix M with eigendecomposition $M = V\Lambda V^\top$,

$$\Pi_{\text{PSD}}(M) = V \text{diag}(\max(\lambda_i, 10^{-8})) V^\top, \quad (109)$$

where the matrix is first symmetrized as $(M + M^\top)/2$.

D.4.1 Sample Covariance.

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = A \text{cov}(R). \quad (110)$$

D.4.2 Expanding Covariance.

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = A \text{cov}(R_{1:t-1}), \quad (111)$$

with a trailing-window fallback when fewer than 63 historical rows are available.

D.4.3 EWMA Covariance. With half-life $h = 21$,

$$\delta = (1/2)^{1/h}, \quad \omega_i = \delta^{n-i}, \quad \tilde{\omega}_i = \frac{\omega_i}{\sum_j \omega_j}, \quad (112)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = A \sum_i \tilde{\omega}_i (r_i - \bar{r}_\omega)(r_i - \bar{r}_\omega)^\top. \quad (113)$$

D.4.4 Diagonal EWMA Covariance.

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = \text{diag}(\text{diag}(\widehat{\Sigma}_t^{\text{EWMA}})). \quad (114)$$

D.4.5 Rolling-Correlation / EWMA-Volatility Covariance. Let C_t be the rolling correlation matrix and σ_t the vector of EWMA marginal volatilities. Then

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = C_t \odot \sigma_t \sigma_t^\top. \quad (115)$$

The correlation window is at most 126 observations.

D.4.6 Shrunk Sample Covariance.

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = (1 - \delta)S_t + \delta \text{diag}(S_t), \quad \delta = 0.25. \quad (116)$$

D.4.7 Ledoit-Wolf Covariance. The implementation uses Ledoit-Wolf shrinkage. On failure, it falls back to diagonal shrinkage with intensity 0.35:

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = (1 - 0.35)S_t + 0.35 \text{diag}(S_t). \quad (117)$$

D.4.8 Downside Covariance. Centered downside returns are

$$\tilde{R} = \min(R - \bar{R}, 0), \quad (118)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = (1 - b) \text{cov}(\tilde{R}) + b \text{cov}(R), \quad b = 0.35. \quad (119)$$

D.4.9 Robust Median Covariance. For each series,

$$z = \text{clip}\left(\frac{R - \text{med}(R)}{1.4826 \text{MAD}(R)}, -4, 4\right). \quad (120)$$

The clipped standardized series is rescaled and its covariance is computed.

D.4.10 Regime-Switching Covariance. Let Σ_t^f and Σ_t^s denote EWMA covariance matrices with half-lives 10 and 63. Then

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = \alpha_t \Sigma_t^f + (1 - \alpha_t) \Sigma_t^s, \quad (121)$$

where

$$\alpha_t = \begin{cases} 0.75, & \text{RV}_t \geq 0.18, \\ 0.35, & \text{RV}_t < 0.18. \end{cases} \quad (122)$$

D.4.11 VIX-Scaled Covariance. With a 252-day VIX median, define the covariance scale

$$\eta_t^{\text{VIX}} = \text{clip}\left[\left(\frac{\text{VIX}_t}{\text{med}_{252}(\text{VIX})}\right)^2, 0.35, 4\right], \quad (123)$$

and

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = \eta_t^{\text{VIX}} \widehat{\Sigma}_t^{\text{EWMA}}. \quad (124)$$

D.4.12 PCA Covariance. Let $S = V\Lambda V^\top$ and retain the top $k = 3$ eigenpairs:

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = V_k \Lambda_k V_k^\top + 0.15 \text{diag}(S). \quad (125)$$

D.4.13 Dynamic Blend Covariance. Define the local covariance-stress score

$$\chi_t = \text{clip}\left(\frac{\text{vol}_{21,t} - 0.08}{0.20}, 0, 1\right). \quad (126)$$

The covariance blend is

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_t = (0.45 - 0.20\chi_t)\Sigma_t^{\text{EWMA}} + 0.35\Sigma_t^{\text{LW}} \quad (127)$$

$$+ (0.20 + 0.20\chi_t)\Sigma_t^{\text{down}}. \quad (128)$$

D.5 Multi-Asset Portfolio Controllers

Every portfolio controller, except buy-and-hold, passes raw weights through a shared normalization, cap, and volatility-scaling pipeline.

Long-only normalization.

$$w_i \leftarrow \frac{\max(w_i, 0)}{\sum_j \max(w_j, 0)}. \quad (129)$$

If the denominator is non-positive, the implementation falls back to equal weights.

Single-name cap. With $\bar{w} = 0.45$,

$$w_i \leftarrow \min(w_i, \bar{w}), \quad (130)$$

and the remaining mass is redistributed iteratively over assets with available capacity.

Portfolio volatility scaling.

$$\sigma_{p,t} = \sqrt{\mathbf{w}^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_t \mathbf{w}}, \quad (131)$$

and

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \mathbf{w} \cdot \text{clip}\left(\frac{v^*}{\max(\sigma_{p,t}, 10^{-8})}, 0, \Gamma\right), \quad \Gamma = 1.5. \quad (132)$$

D.5.1 Equal Weight.

$$w_{i,t} = \frac{1}{N}. \quad (133)$$

D.5.2 Buy-and-Hold. Once initialized, the controller returns

$$\mathbf{w}_t = \mathbf{w}_{t-1}, \quad (134)$$

and bypasses the shared cap/volatility-scaling pipeline.

D.5.3 Inverse Volatility.

$$\tilde{w}_i \propto \frac{1}{\sigma_i}, \quad \sigma_i = \sqrt{\widehat{\Sigma}_{ii}}. \quad (135)$$

D.5.4 Minimum Variance.

$$\tilde{\mathbf{w}} \propto \widehat{\Sigma}^+ \mathbf{1}, \quad (136)$$

where $+$ denotes the Moore-Penrose pseudo-inverse.

D.5.5 Vol-Capped Minimum Variance. Starting from minimum-variance weights, assets with marginal volatility above $c = 0.30$ are rescaled as

$$\tilde{w}_i \leftarrow \tilde{w}_i \frac{c}{\sigma_i}, \quad \sigma_i > c. \quad (137)$$

D.5.6 Equal Risk Contribution. Initialize $w_i \propto 1/\sqrt{\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}}$. At each fixed-point iteration,

$$RC_i = w_i(\hat{\Sigma}w)_i, \quad (138)$$

and

$$w_i \leftarrow \text{normalize} \left[w_i \sqrt{\frac{RC}{\max(RC_i, 10^{-10})}} \right]. \quad (139)$$

The implementation uses 80 iterations. At convergence, $RC_i \approx \overline{RC}$.

D.5.7 Diversified Risk Parity. Let

$$\bar{\rho}_i = \frac{1}{N} \sum_j |\rho_{ij}|. \quad (140)$$

Starting from ERC weights,

$$\tilde{w}_i = \frac{w_i^{\text{ERC}}}{\max(\bar{\rho}_i, 0.25)}. \quad (141)$$

D.5.8 Momentum Tilt. Define 63-day momentum

$$m_i = \sum_{j=1}^{63} r_{i,t-j}. \quad (142)$$

Let q_i be its cross-sectional percentile rank. Starting from inverse-volatility weights,

$$\tilde{w}_i = w_i^{\text{IV}} \max[0.25, (q_i - 0.5)\theta + 1], \quad \theta = 0.8. \quad (143)$$

D.5.9 Mean-Variance. With a 126-day mean-return estimate,

$$\hat{\mu}_t = 252 \cdot \text{mean}_{126}(r), \quad (144)$$

and risk aversion $\gamma = 6$,

$$\tilde{w} \propto \frac{1}{\gamma} \hat{\Sigma}^+ \hat{\mu}_t. \quad (145)$$

D.5.10 Regime-Aware Risk Budget. Start from ERC weights. If 21-day portfolio volatility exceeds 0.18, multiply the hard-coded defensive assets {IEF, TLT, GLD, UUP} by 1.6 before normalization:

$$\tilde{w}_i = \begin{cases} 1.6 w_i^{\text{ERC}}, & i \in \mathcal{D} \text{ and } \text{vol}_{21} > 0.18, \\ w_i^{\text{ERC}}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (146)$$

where $\mathcal{D} = \{\text{IEF, TLT, GLD, UUP}\}$.

D.5.11 Portfolio Drawdown Brake. Starting from inverse-volatility weights, the controller applies

$$\tilde{w}_t = \begin{cases} 0.55 w_t^{\text{IV}}, & \text{proxy drawdown} < -0.08, \\ w_t^{\text{IV}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (147)$$

D.5.12 Portfolio Hysteresis. Let w_t^{cand} be the post-processed candidate weight vector. Then

$$w_t = \begin{cases} w_{t-1}, & \|w_t^{\text{cand}} - w_{t-1}\|_1 < 0.05, \\ w_t^{\text{cand}}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (148)$$

D.6 Execution Equations

D.6.1 Single-Asset Execution. The selected estimator/controller pair obeys

$$\hat{\sigma}_t = \mathcal{E} \left(r_{t-W:t-1}^{\text{clean}} \right), \quad (149)$$

$$w_t = \begin{cases} \text{clip} \left(C(v^*, \hat{\sigma}_t, w_{t-1}), w_{\min}, w_{\max} \right), & t \in \mathcal{R}, \\ w_{t-1}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (150)$$

where $\mathcal{R}$ denotes rebalance dates. Turnover and cost are

$$\tau_t = |w_t - w_{t-1}|, \quad c_t = \tau_t \frac{\text{bps}}{10^4}, \quad (151)$$

and next-period strategy return and equity are

$$r_{t+1}^{\text{strat}} = w_t r_{t+1} - c_t, \quad (152)$$

$$E_{t+1} = E_t \exp(r_{t+1}^{\text{strat}}). \quad (153)$$

D.6.2 Multi-Asset Execution. The selected covariance estimator and portfolio controller generate

$$\hat{\Sigma}_t = \mathcal{E} \left(R_{t-W:t-1} \right), \quad (154)$$

$$w_t = C \left(v^*, \hat{\Sigma}_t, R_{t-W:t-1}, w_{t-1} \right). \quad (155)$$

Gross exposure, cash, and turnover are

$$G_t^{\text{gross}} = \sum_i |w_{t,i}|, \quad w_t^{\text{cash}} = 1 - G_t^{\text{gross}}, \quad (156)$$

$$\tau_t = \sum_i |w_{t,i} - w_{t-1,i}|. \quad (157)$$

The next-period strategy return is

$$r_{t+1}^{\text{strat}} = w_t^\top r_{t+1} + w_t^{\text{cash}} r_{t+1}^f - \tau_t \frac{\text{bps}}{10^4}. \quad (158)$$

The risk-free leg is

$$r_t^f = \ln \left(1 + \frac{\text{DGS3MO}_t / 100}{252} \right). \quad (159)$$

D.7 Router Scoring Function

For candidate pair k , the deterministic router score is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Score}_t(k) = & \underbrace{\pi \left(\text{SR}_k - \lambda_{dd} d_k^+ \right)}_{\text{performance}} + \underbrace{\beta_{\text{reg}} B_t(k)}_{\text{regime bias}} \\ & - \underbrace{(\lambda_{\text{inv}} l_k + \lambda_{\text{exc}} \chi_k)}_{\text{diagnostics}} - \underbrace{\lambda_{\text{sw}} \mathbf{1}[k \neq k_{t-1}]}_{\text{switch penalty}}. \end{aligned} \quad (160)$$

The regime-bias term is

$$B_t(k) = b_t^{\text{pair}}(k) + b_t^{\text{est}}(k) + b_t^{\text{ctrl}}(k) \quad (161)$$

$$+ \mathbf{1} \left[b_t^{\text{pair}} + b_t^{\text{est}} + b_t^{\text{ctrl}} = 0 \right] b_t^{\text{heur}}(k). \quad (162)$$

Reported base defaults are

$$\pi = 1, \quad \beta_{\text{reg}} = 1, \quad \lambda_{dd} = 0.5, \quad (163)$$

$$\lambda_{\text{inv}} = 2, \quad \lambda_{\text{exc}} = 1, \quad \lambda_{\text{sw}} = 0. \quad (164)$$

The AI regime router overrides β_{reg} to 2.5. The performance term is set to zero when the candidate has fewer than the minimum required observations. In the audited evaluation path, the invalid-rate and exception-rate diagnostics are not populated, so the corresponding penalty is zero in the reported runs.

D.8 Setting-Specific Constants

D.9 Implementation-Specific Deviations

The following implementation details are important when interpreting the mathematical definitions above:

- (1) NaiveScaling ignores its constructor parameter object; the 0.05 no-trade band is hard-coded.
- (2) NaiveVolEstimator uses the uncentered second moment rather than the sample variance.
- (3) the wavelet estimator is non-functional because its class is fully commented out.
- (4) HybridEWMARegime returns the slow EWMA scalar on the main estimation path; the fast path and regime probabilities are diagnostic components only.
- (5) CVaRESTargeting ignores the volatility forecast and targets expected shortfall directly.
- (6) DynamicPrecisionEnsemble uses inverse-loss weighting rather than exponential or softmax weighting.
- (7) the regime-GJR and regime-HAR estimators use realized-volatility quantiles rather than a latent HMM to define their regimes.
- (8) GJR-GARCH parameters are held fixed between 63-step recalibrations.
- (9) the multi-asset buy-and-hold controller bypasses the common cap and volatility-scaling pipeline.
- (10) the multi-asset regime-aware risk-budget controller hard-codes {IEF, TLT, GLD, UUP} as defensive assets.
- (11) missing returns in the multi-asset engine are filled with zero before covariance estimation.
- (12) the deterministic router’s invalid-rate and exception-rate penalties are zero in the audited reported evaluation path because those diagnostics are not populated by that driver.

E Prompt and Routing Decision Format

This section provides a normalized, implementation-faithful specification of the prompt interfaces used by VolRouter. The boxes below preserve the audited decision roles, constraints, admissible labels, and output schemas; they are *not claimed to be byte-for-byte transcriptions of the source constants*. The purpose is to specify the decision interface and admissible outputs rather than expose provider-specific prompt boilerplate. Rather than asking a language model to directly generate portfolio weights, VolRouter decomposes routing into structured decisions over a fixed library of estimator–controller pairs. The language model is used only to infer the current market state, determine whether the active pair should be retained, and, when necessary, select a replacement from an explicitly supplied candidate set.

The prompted decision process follows three stages:

State Inference → Switch Review → Selection.

The single-asset and multi-asset implementations use the same general structure, but differ in the state representation and regime labels. All reported routing runs use structured JSON outputs so that the language model cannot directly modify estimator parameters, controller parameters, portfolio constraints, or the policy library.

E.1 Single-Asset Market-State Prompt

For single-asset volatility targeting, the first prompt summarizes the current market into one of three volatility regimes:

$$z_t \in \{\text{low}, \text{middle}, \text{high}\}.$$

The input contains only market information available at the decision time. It does not provide future returns or candidate-pair rankings.

Single-Asset Volatility-Regime Prompt

You are the market-state inference component of a volatility-targeting router.

Your task is to classify the current volatility environment using only the market information supplied below.

Choose exactly one regime:

- low
- middle
- high

Use only information available at the current decision time.
Do not infer or use future returns.
Do not use future strategy performance.
Do not rank estimator–controller pairs in this step.

Return a JSON object with the following format:

```
{
  "vol_regime": "<low | middle | high>",
  "confidence": "<confidence score>",
  "reason": "<brief explanation>"
}
```

Keep the explanation shorter than 24 words and base the classification only on the provided market evidence.

The resulting regime is represented as

$$z_t = \mathcal{R}_\theta \left(\mathcal{I}_t^{\text{market}} \right).$$

The regime label is subsequently passed to the switch-review and pair-selection layers as contextual information.

E.2 Single-Asset Switch-Review Prompt

The second prompt decides whether to retain the active policy pair. It does not select a replacement; it only returns a hold/switch decision.

Table 3: Core execution constants by evaluation setting.

	S&P 500	Digital Market (Bitcoin)	USDT	Multi-Asset
Target volatility σ^*	0.10	0.35	0.02	0.10
Estimation window W	252	90	90	126
Transaction cost (bps)	5.0	8.0	2.0	5.0
Exposure bound	[0, 1.5]	[0, 1.25]	[0, 1.25]	cap 0.45 / gross 1.5
Annualization A	252	365	365	252

Single-Asset Switch-Review Prompt

You are the switch-review component of a volatility-targeting router.

A single estimator-controller pair is currently active. Using the supplied market state and recent routing evidence, decide whether the current pair should be retained or whether the router should consider a replacement.

Available evidence may include:

- current volatility regime,
- recent performance of the active pair,
- recent relative rankings of candidate pairs,
- recent risk-control behavior,
- current routing state.

Choose exactly one action:

- hold
- switch

Return only a JSON object in the following format:

```
{
  "action": "<hold | switch>"
}
```

Choose "hold" when the current pair remains appropriate for the observed state and there is insufficient evidence for replacement.

Choose "switch" only when the supplied evidence indicates that another candidate is more appropriate for the current market state.

Formally,

$$g_t = \mathcal{G}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{routing}}, k_{t-1}) \in \{\text{hold}, \text{switch}\}.$$

If

$$g_t = \text{hold},$$

then

$$k_t = k_{t-1},$$

and no pair-selection prompt is called.

E.3 Single-Asset Pair-Selection Prompt

Pair selection is invoked only after the switch-review layer has decided that the active pair should not be retained. The active pair is excluded from the candidate set supplied to this prompt.

Single-Asset Pair-Selection Prompt

You are the pair-selection component of a volatility-targeting router.

The switch-review layer has already decided that the current pair should not be retained.

Select exactly one estimator-controller pair from the candidate list provided below.

When selecting a pair, consider:

- the current volatility regime,
- recent candidate performance,
- recent relative rankings,
- volatility-control quality,
- drawdown behavior,
- turnover behavior,
- whether the candidate is suitable for the current market state.

You may select only a pair explicitly included in the candidate list.

Do not invent a new estimator, controller, or pair. Do not modify any candidate parameters.

Return only:

```
{
  "pair": "<candidate pair name>"
}
```

The routing decision is therefore

$$k_t = \mathcal{S}_\theta(z_t, \mathcal{I}_t^{\text{routing}}, C_t \setminus \{k_{t-1}\}),$$

where C_t is the candidate set supplied at time t .

E.4 Multi-Asset Portfolio-Regime Prompt

The multi-asset router uses a portfolio-level state representation. Its portfolio regime belongs to

$$z_t^p \in \{\text{risk_on}, \text{balanced}, \text{defensive}\}.$$

Multi-Asset Portfolio-Regime Prompt

You are the portfolio-state inference component of a multi-asset volatility-targeting router.

Using the supplied portfolio and market information, classify the current environment into exactly one of the following states:

- risk_on
- balanced
- defensive

The classification should reflect the current risk environment rather than short-term speculation about future returns.

Consider only information supplied in the prompt and available at the current decision time.

Return:

```
{
  "portfolio_regime":
    "<risk_on | balanced | defensive>",
  "confidence": "<confidence score>",
  "reason": "<brief explanation>"
}
```

This state provides portfolio-level context for subsequent routing decisions.

Multi-Asset Market-Only Regime Prompt

You are assessing the current cross-asset risk environment.

Use only the supplied market variables, which may include:

- recent cross-asset returns,
- equal-weight portfolio realized volatility,
- VIX information,
- term-spread information,
- credit-spread information.

Do not use:

- estimator-controller pair rankings,
- pair-level returns,
- pair-level Sharpe ratios,
- future returns,
- future portfolio outcomes.

Classify the current environment as exactly one of:

- risk_on
- balanced
- defensive

Return:

```
{
  "portfolio_regime":
    "<risk_on | balanced | defensive>",
  "confidence": "<confidence score>",
  "reason": "<brief explanation>"
}
```

Separating market-state inference from candidate evaluation prevents the regime label from being defined retrospectively by whichever policy performed best.

E.5 Multi-Asset Market-Only Volatility Prompt

The implementation also contains a market-only version of the same multi-asset state-inference interface. It should not be read as an additional fourth routing stage: both templates return the same risk_on/balanced/defensive state space, but differ in which decision-time state fields are exposed. The market-only template is separated from candidate performance: it receives cross-asset market information but no pair rankings or pair-level metrics.

E.6 Multi-Asset Switch-Review Prompt

The multi-asset switch layer decides whether accumulated evidence is sufficient to replace the active portfolio policy. The implementation encourages persistent policies rather than high-frequency strategy switching.

Multi-Asset Switch-Review Prompt

You are the switch-review component of a multi-asset portfolio router.

Determine whether the currently active estimator-controller pair should be held or replaced.

Base the decision on the supplied evidence, including:

- current portfolio regime,
- recent performance of the active pair,
- recent relative candidate rankings,
- drawdown behavior,
- volatility-control quality,
- recent holding duration,
- evidence that alternative pairs consistently outperform the active pair.

Avoid unnecessary switching.

The intended behavior is persistent routing rather than frequent reaction to isolated short-term fluctuations.

Use a forward decision horizon of approximately ten trading days.

The risk-control objective includes avoiding persistent absolute drawdowns

around the approximately 6% drawdown guardrail used by this switch prompt.

This guardrail is distinct from the 10% portfolio volatility target.

Return exactly:

```
{
  "action": "<hold | switch>"
}
```

In the reported implementation, the switch decision is reviewed only at configured checkpoints rather than every trading day.

E.7 Multi-Asset Pair-Selection Prompt

If the switch layer chooses switch, the router receives a restricted candidate list. The active pair is excluded, so selection necessarily corresponds to a change in policy.

Multi-Asset Pair-Selection Prompt

You are selecting a replacement estimator-controller pair for a multi-asset volatility-targeting portfolio.

The switch-review layer has already determined that the current pair should not be held.

Choose exactly one pair from the supplied candidate list.

Use the provided evidence to identify the candidate with the strongest expected portfolio behavior over the next decision horizon, while respecting the volatility-control objective.

Consider:

- current portfolio regime,
- recent candidate performance,
- short- and medium-horizon candidate rankings,
- volatility-control quality,
- drawdown behavior,
- turnover behavior,
- consistency across recent evaluation windows.

You may choose only from the supplied candidates.

Do not invent a new pair.

Do not modify estimator or controller parameters.

Do not return the currently active pair.

Return only:

```
{
  "pair": "<candidate pair name>"
}
```

The phrase “expected portfolio behavior” in this prompt denotes a comparative choice from supplied historical diagnostics; the model is not asked to produce a numerical return forecast.

Thus, selection remains a discrete decision over the predefined policy library:

$$k_t \in C_t.$$

The language model never outputs portfolio weights directly.

E.8 Switch-Sensitivity Guidance

The router supports a sensitivity parameter controlling the amount of evidence required before switching. For the single-asset implementation this is primarily expressed through prompt guidance, whereas the multi-asset implementation additionally enforces minimum-hold and evidence-count requirements in code.

A representative guidance block is:

Switch-Sensitivity Guidance

Routing sensitivity determines how readily the active pair should be replaced.

Very Low:

Prefer strong persistence. Hold the active pair for long periods unless multiple recent evaluation windows consistently indicate that a group of alternatives is superior.

Low:

Prefer persistence and require sustained evidence before switching.

Medium:

Balance persistence with responsiveness. Switch when several independent signals consistently favor alternative candidates.

High:

Respond more quickly when a non-active candidate demonstrates superior recent behavior.

Very High:

Allow aggressive switching when short-horizon evidence indicates that another candidate is currently better suited to the observed market state.

In the multi-asset implementation, these qualitative levels correspond to explicit gates:

Level	Min. hold	Better	Windows
Very High	0	0	1
High	0	0	1
Medium	30	2	2
Low	60	2	2
Very Low	90	3	2

This distinction is important because single-asset sensitivity changes the language-model instruction, while multi-asset sensitivity also modifies deterministic routing constraints.

E.9 API and Inference Configuration

Reported LLM routing uses hosted inference with temperature 0.0 and structured JSON outputs. Figure 6 compares the four backbones labeled in that figure under the corresponding experiment-specific routing configurations. Review intervals and candidate-top- N values vary by setting; the S&P backbone sweep uses a precomputed regime series held fixed across models, so that comparison isolates switch review and pair selection rather than end-to-end state inference.

E.10 Structured Router Output

The language-model interface is intentionally narrow. The router expects one of three structured output schemas.

Single-Asset Regime Output Schema

```
{
  "vol_regime": "<low | middle | high>",
  "confidence": "<confidence score>",
  "reason": "<brief explanation>"
}
```

Multi-Asset Regime Output Schema

```
{
  "portfolio_regime": "<risk_on | balanced | defensive>",
  "confidence": "<confidence score>",
  "reason": "<brief explanation>"
}
```

Switch Output Schema

```
{
  "action": "<hold | switch>"
}
```

Pair-Selection Output Schema

```
{
  "pair": "<candidate pair identifier>"
}
```

This structured interface prevents unconstrained language generation from directly changing the portfolio policy. The LLM can select among available policies but cannot modify the policy library itself.

E.11 Parsing, Failure Handling, and Deterministic Fallback

Router outputs are parsed as structured JSON. For the single-asset router, parsing proceeds through several recovery stages:

- (1) direct JSON parsing;
- (2) extraction and parsing of a JSON-like object;
- (3) recovery of a valid hold/switch action from a structured text pattern;
- (4) recovery from recognizable natural-language action text; and
- (5) deterministic fallback if parsing or API execution fails.

The multi-asset router uses a stricter parser and does not implement all of the natural-language recovery stages available in the single-asset router.

Let N_{fallback} denote the number of routing decisions ultimately resolved through a deterministic fallback and N_{decision} the total number of prompted routing decisions. For audit purposes, define

$$\text{FallbackRate} = \frac{N_{\text{fallback}}}{N_{\text{decision}}}.$$

Raw model responses are stored during evaluation so that prompt failures and fallback decisions can be audited independently of portfolio performance.

E.12 Prompt-Level Constraints

Across all prompted layers, the following constraints are enforced by the routing interface:

- (1) **No direct portfolio generation.** The language model never outputs a portfolio weight or leverage level.

- (2) **Closed candidate set.** The pair-selection layer can choose only from the candidates supplied by the routing system.
- (3) **No parameter modification.** Estimator and controller parameters are fixed before the prompted decision.
- (4) **Separated switch and selection decisions.** Candidate selection is invoked only after an explicit switch decision.
- (5) **No future information.** Market-state prompts use only information available at the decision date.
- (6) **Market-state / pair-performance separation.** The market-only multi-asset regime prompt explicitly excludes candidate-pair rankings and performance metrics.
- (7) **Machine-readable outputs.** The prompted decisions are represented as compact JSON records and are validated before execution.

These constraints make the language model a policy-selection component rather than an unconstrained trading agent. The portfolio action remains generated by the selected, predefined estimator-controller pair.

F Evaluation Protocol

F.1 Generic Walk-Forward Driver

The generic protocol supports tiled train/test windows. For split j ,

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}^{(j)} = [t_j - T_{\text{train}}, t_j), \quad (165)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{test}}^{(j)} = [t_j, t_j + T_{\text{test}}), \quad (166)$$

$$t_{j+1} = t_j + T_{\text{step}}. \quad (167)$$

The default driver values are

$$T_{\text{train}} = 504, \quad T_{\text{test}} = 126, \quad T_{\text{step}} = 126.$$

Thus, under the default, OOS windows tile without overlap.

F.2 Training-Window Candidate Score

Candidate pairs are ranked on the training window using

$$J_{\text{train}}(k) = \text{SR}^{\text{net}}(k) - 0.5 \text{DD}(k) - 0.5 \text{TO}(k) - 0.5 \text{VTE}(k) - 1.0 \text{QLIKE}(k), \quad (168)$$

with

$$k_{\text{train}}^* = \arg \max_{k \in \mathcal{P}} J_{\text{train}}(k). \quad (169)$$

Training-window 80th percentiles of estimator loss, turnover, and volatility-tracking error are also used to define constraints. Pair objects are reconstructed before OOS evaluation, so fitted estimator/controller state does not cross the train/test boundary.

F.3 Headline S&P 500 Protocol

The reported S&P 500 results use the precomputed-pair protocol. Component ablations use one contiguous OOS period from 2023-02-10 to 2026-02-10. The model sweep uses 504 training days and a 252-day test/step configuration, with a single OOS window and unfrozen OOS metrics. Thus, the headline S&P results are a contiguous OOS evaluation with train-window preselection, not an average over repeated walk-forward folds.

F.4 Multi-Asset Protocol and First-Year Tuning

The multi-asset evaluation starts on 2024-02-09, with history and metric construction beginning on 2023-02-10. The reported configuration restricts the 252-observation tuning block to information available before the evaluated OOS segment; evaluation outcomes are not fed back into the tuning grid. The baseline grid is

$$h_{\text{EWMA}} \in \{10, 21, 42\},$$

$$w_{\text{max}}^{\text{asset}} \in \{0.35, 0.45, 0.60\}, \quad G_{\text{max}} \in \{1.0, 1.25, 1.5\}.$$

The tuning score is minimized:

$$J_{\text{tune}} = \bar{e}_{\text{vol}} + 0.02 \bar{\tau} - 0.01 \text{SR}. \quad (170)$$

G Information Timing and No-Lookahead Audit

The controller may update internal state using the realized return at the close of t , but the resulting action is applied only to r_{t+1} . By contrast, the estimator and market-state feature window ends at $t - 1$. This estimator/controller timing asymmetry is disclosed explicitly.

The precomputed regime-series generator also enforces a strictly prior feature window. For prediction date t ,

$$\mathcal{W}_t = \{r_{t-W}^c, \dots, r_{t-1}^c\}.$$

Each generated row stores both the prediction date and the last feature date, making the lag auditable.

The multi-asset implementation contains a dedicated no-leak check for pair-history consumption, requiring router context to stop at the previous available date. Table 4 states the timing convention used throughout the reported analysis. Auxiliary implementation paths that are not used by a reported experiment are outside the scope of this timing statement.

H Metric Definitions

Let $\{r_t^p\}_{t=1}^T$ denote net strategy returns and A the annualization factor. The multi-asset geometric annualized return is

$$R_{\text{ann}} = \left(\frac{V_T}{V_0} \right)^{A/T} - 1. \quad (171)$$

Annualized volatility is

$$\sigma_{\text{ann}} = \text{Std}(r_t^p) \sqrt{A}. \quad (172)$$

The implementation-level Sharpe ratio is

$$\text{SR} = \frac{\bar{r}^p}{s(r^p)} \sqrt{A}, \quad (173)$$

without subtracting a risk-free rate. This convention should be noted in the multi-asset setting because strategy returns may include a risk-free cash leg.

For the implementation-level Sortino denominator, define downside returns $d_t = \min(r_t^p, 0)$ and

$$\sigma_{\text{down}} = \sqrt{A} \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T d_t^2}. \quad (174)$$

The corresponding annualized Sortino ratio is

$$\text{Sortino} = \frac{A \bar{r}^p}{\sigma_{\text{down}}}. \quad (175)$$

Table 4: Decision-time information set.

Quantity	Window / Source	Includes time t ?	Use
$\hat{\sigma}_t$	$r_{t-W:t-1}^c$	No	estimator input
Market features	$r_{t-W:t-1}^c$	No	router state
Controller state update	r_t^c	Yes	affects action applied to $t + 1$
Pair performance history	past OOS history, appended after t	No	router context
Portfolio weight	formed at t	—	applied to r_{t+1}
Realized P&L	raw r_{t+1}	future to decision	outcome
Transaction cost	turnover generated at t	—	deducted from outcome

Define the running peak $M_t = \max_{j \leq t} V_j$. Maximum drawdown is

$$\text{MDD} = -\min_t \left(\frac{V_t}{M_t} - 1 \right). \quad (176)$$

For the empirical fifth percentile $q_{0.05}$,

$$\text{CVaR}_{0.95} = -\mathbb{E} [r_t^p \mid r_t^p \leq q_{0.05}]. \quad (177)$$

The implementation Calmar ratio is

$$\text{Calmar} = \frac{A\bar{r}^p}{\text{MDD}}. \quad (178)$$

Single-asset and multi-asset turnover are, respectively,

$$\tau_t^{\text{single}} = |w_t - w_{t-1}|, \quad (179)$$

$$\tau_t^{\text{multi}} = \sum_i |w_{t,i} - w_{t-1,i}|. \quad (180)$$

Some single- and multi-asset metric paths use different standard-deviation degrees-of-freedom conventions. Comparisons in the main paper are therefore interpreted *within each setting*, where all methods share the same metric implementation, rather than by pooling absolute metric levels across settings.

I Evaluation Scope and Statistical Reporting

The main paper reports the common headline metrics available for all four settings: annualized return, annualized volatility, Sharpe ratio, maximum drawdown, and CVaR. Additional implementation outputs include Sortino, turnover, switch counts, selected-pair identities, and volatility-tracking diagnostics for subsets of experiments.

Headline portfolio statistics in the current study are reported as point estimates. The manuscript does not attach block-bootstrap confidence intervals or formal multiple-comparison-adjusted significance tests to the main table. Accordingly, statements about outperformance are descriptive of the reported held-out backtests rather than claims of population-level statistical dominance. For hosted LLM inference, temperature is fixed at zero, but provider-side nondeterminism can still produce run-to-run variation.

J Component Ablations

The ablation study intervenes on three parts of the routing process: state context, candidate/reference evaluation, and adaptive routing. The non-ablated configuration is reported as **Full VolRouter**. The main figure reports Sharpe under the ablation driver; its error bars are properties of that driver and are not confidence intervals for the headline table.

A material implementation distinction is that “baseline reference” has setting-specific meaning: in S&P 500 it refers to benchmark-comparison context, whereas in Multi-Asset it can refer to the deterministic train-window champion. These interventions are therefore not interpreted as identical cross-setting ablations.

K Router Backbone Study

Figure 6 compares the four router backbones labeled in the figure across S&P 500, Bitcoin, USDT, and Multi-Asset. The comparison is intended to test whether routing behavior is specific to a single backbone, not to establish a universal ranking of language models. In the S&P sweep, the regime series is precomputed and frozen across backbones. That panel therefore compares the downstream switch-review and pair-selection layers, not the complete state-inference pipeline.

L Candidate-Pool and Sensitivity Diagnostics

The S&P candidate-pool diagnostic uses pool sizes

$$27, 42, 57, 72, 87, 102, 117.$$

The Multi-Asset reduction driver follows a different procedure: it removes 15 pairs per round using seed 20260703, reranks surviving pairs using pre-test data, and truncates the candidate list to at most 30 pairs. Thus, “pool size” and the number of candidates actually exposed to the Router are distinct quantities in that driver.

The four sensitivity panels in Figure 5 vary switching sensitivity, transaction cost, target volatility, and candidate pool size one factor at a time. The dashed line is the canonical base configuration and is not necessarily included as a plotted sweep point. In particular, the displayed switching sweep reports very low, low, high, and very high settings around a separate normal/base reference. The transaction cost values shown in Figure 5 are specific to that routing sensitivity run and should not be conflated with other controller-level friction grids in the codebase.

M Switching, Turnover, and Execution Cost

Define

$$N_{\text{switch}} = \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{1}[k_t \neq k_{t-1}], \quad \text{SwitchRate} = \frac{N_{\text{switch}}}{T}. \quad (181)$$

If the active-pair sequence forms J holding segments with lengths $\ell_1, \dots, \ell_J$, mean dwell time is

$$\bar{\ell} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \ell_j. \quad (182)$$

Portfolio turnover costs are charged through changes in the executed portfolio weights. In the reported Multi-Asset ablation,

pool-reduction, and sensitivity drivers, the additional monetary penalty attached solely to a change in pair identity is zero. Switching is instead regularized by the hold/switch gate, minimum-hold logic, and persistence guidance. This is why the main-text net-return equation includes portfolio turnover cost but not a uniform inter-pair switching fee.

N Reproducibility Notes

Structured router outputs are validated before execution, and failed or invalid outputs follow the deterministic fallback logic described in [Appendix E](#). Several machine-learning estimators use `random_state=42`, while the pool-reduction diagnostic uses seed 20260703. Hosted LLM generation is not fully seed-controlled even at temperature zero; the backbone analysis is therefore interpreted as an empirical comparison of the reported runs rather than a deterministic model ranking.