Vanguard

Vanguard research

October 2022

# Rational rebalancing: An analytical approach to multiasset portfolio rebalancing decisions and insights


- Investors' portfolios should align with their goals and risk preferences, which makes the rebalancing of the asset allocation in a portfolio an important practice. Among the numerous rebalancing methods, is one more risk-return-efficient and cost-effective than others?
- In this paper, we present a novel approach for determining an optimal multiasset portfolio rebalancing method by maximizing the *utility of post-transaction-cost portfolio wealth*. Rather than analyzing just one historical period, we simulate a distribution of asset returns and a distribution of dynamic transaction costs, which is vital in assessing the rebalancing policy. The utility-based approach enables the determination of a risk-return-efficient, cost-effective rebalancing method while quantifying how much better it is than other alternatives.
- We find that optimal methods involve rebalancing that is neither too frequent, such as monthly or quarterly calendar-based methods, nor too infrequent, such as rebalancing every two years. Implementing an annual rebalancing strategy is optimal for investors who don't participate in tax-loss harvesting or maintain tight tracking to a benchmark portfolio, such as passive funds-of-funds. Most of the efficiency of these rebalancing strategies is generated by harvesting equity risk premium, while allowing reasonable portfolio drifts.



**Authors**

Yu Zhang, Ph.D.

Harshdeep Ahluwalia

Allison Ying

Michael Rabinovich

Aidan Geysen



For institutional and sophisticated investors only. Not for public distribution.

## Introduction

### Why rebalance?

Vanguard believes that the asset allocation decision—which takes into account an investor's risk tolerance, time horizon, and financial goals—is the most important decision in the portfolio-construction process.

The primary function of portfolio rebalancing is to keep portfolio risk in alignment with the investor's risk tolerance.

Absent rebalancing, portfolio allocations will drift from their intended target as the returns of its assets diverge, leading to much higher portfolio risk. For instance, a portfolio with 60% equities and 40% fixed income at the end of 1989, if never rebalanced, would have had 80% in equities at the end of 2021, as shown in **Figure 1**—in stark contrast to an annually rebalanced portfolio.

FIGURE 1.

**Asset allocation of never rebalanced versus annually rebalanced 60/40 portfolio**




**Notes:** The 60% equity/40% bond portfolio return data are from December 31, 1989, through December 31, 2021. This figure compares the equity weights for never-rebalanced portfolios and portfolios rebalanced at the end of every year. The equity weight for the 60%/40% portfolio could drift between roughly 50% and 80% if never rebalanced. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the Dow Jones Wilshire 5000 Index from the beginning of 1990 through April 2005 and the MSCI US Broad Market Index thereafter, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA.

**Sources:** Vanguard calculations, based on data from DataStream.

**Figure 2** illustrates the additional amount of risk inherent in an 80% stock/20% bond portfolio relative to the intended allocation of 60% stocks/40% bonds.

Meaningful deviations during periods of heightened volatility may cause investors to abandon their portfolio because of a misalignment with their risk tolerance, leading them to lock in their losses. From a behavioral perspective, rebalancing also plays a vital role in helping an investor maintain discipline in the investing strategy and aims to remove emotions from decision-making during market turmoil. This makes rebalancing an important part of investing.

When it comes to rebalancing, there are several methods to choose from. A rebalancing strategy is composed of *frequency*, *threshold*, and *destination* decisions.

- **Frequency** refers to how often the portfolio allocation should be monitored. Monitoring frequency can be daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, semiannually, annually, and so on.
- **Threshold** dictates how far the asset allocation is allowed to deviate from the target. For example, a threshold of 1%, or 2%, and so on.
- Finally, **destination** informs how far back toward the target the portfolio will be rebalanced; that is, one can choose to trade all the way back to the target allocation, halfway back between the target and the threshold, or back to the edge of the threshold.

FIGURE 2.

**The mixture of assets defines the spectrum of risk**




**Notes:** Return data are from January 1, 1926, through December 31, 2021. The figure shows maximum and minimum annual returns for a given asset allocation portfolio over the time horizon. The portfolios were rebalanced monthly. Results are displayed on a pretax basis. U.S. bonds are represented by the Standard & Poor's High Grade Corporate Index from 1926 to 1968; the Citigroup High Grade Index from 1969 to 1972; the Lehman Brothers U.S. Long Credit AA Index from 1973 to 1975; Barclays U.S. Aggregate Bond Index from 1976 to 2009, and the Spliced Barclays U.S. Aggregate Float Adjusted Bond Index thereafter. U.S. equities are represented by the Standard & Poor's 90 from 1926 to 1957; the Standard & Poor's 500 Index from 1957 to 1974; the Wilshire 5000 Index from 1975 to 2005; the MSCI US Broad Market Index through 2013, and the CRSP US Total Market Index thereafter.

**Source:** Vanguard calculations.

Investors, advisors, and asset managers employ three popular methods for rebalancing portfolios that incorporate choices on frequency, threshold, and destination. **Figure 3** describes the rebalancing methods that are analyzed in this paper.

1. **Calendar-based rebalancing:** A calendar-based rebalancing approach designates a frequency for rebalancing portfolio exposures back to the target asset allocation. The more-frequent calendar rebalancing methods result in low tracking error and higher transaction costs, absent cash flows to aid in rebalancing.
2. **Threshold-based rebalancing:** This method allows portfolio allocations to drift within a tolerance threshold, with rebalancing triggered only when the threshold is breached. One major drawback of threshold-based rebalancing is that it requires that the portfolio be monitored daily and is thus not practical for investors who manage their own portfolios. The smaller the threshold, the lower the tracking error and the higher the transaction cost.
3. **Calendar- and threshold-based rebalancing:** This combines the calendar-based and threshold-based rebalancing approaches. The asset allocation weights are monitored according to calendar frequency, though trading in the portfolio takes place only if the asset weights in the portfolio exceed a rebalancing threshold.

Given the numerous rebalancing strategies that could be implemented, is one strategy more risk-return-efficient and cost-effective than others?

In this paper, we present a novel approach for determining an optimal multiasset portfolio rebalancing strategy. Rather than analyzing just one historical period, we simulate a distribution of asset returns (in a way similar to the Vanguard Capital Markets Model®, or VCMM) that encompasses multiple periods and a distribution of dynamic transaction costs that captures the important feature of these costs—that they increase with market volatility, a vital consideration in selecting the rebalancing policy. The utility-based optimization approach enables the determination of a risk-return-, cost-efficient rebalancing method, while also quantifying how much better it is than other rebalancing options.

This paper has four parts. In the first section, we provide a brief review of the literature. In the second section, we offer an overview of our return and transaction-cost forecasting model. In the third section, we describe the utility-based decision-making framework. In the fourth section, we highlight important insights obtained via the quantitative approach and analytics.

FIGURE 3.
**Common rebalancing methods and their characteristics**

| Components | Calendar-based | Threshold-based | Combination rule (calendar and threshold) |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Frequency** | Calendar-based monitoring frequency | Daily monitoring | Calendar-based monitoring frequency |
| **Threshold** | 0% | Various thresholds tested | Various thresholds tested |
| **Destination** | Back to target | Back to target | Back to target |
| **Strategies tested** | Daily, weekly, biweekly, monthly, quarterly, semiannual, annual, biennial, every 2.5 years, no rebalancing | 1% threshold to 15% threshold in 1% increments | • Monthly and 1% threshold to monthly and 15% in 1% increments<br>• Quarterly and 1% threshold to quarterly and 15% in 1% increments<br>• Semiannual and 1% threshold to semiannual and 15% in 1% increments<br>• Annual and 1% threshold to annual and 15% in 1% increments |

**Source:** Vanguard.

## Improving the analysis behind rebalancing decisions

There is a vast variation in literature on rebalancing research. In general, research correctly highlights the importance of rebalancing a portfolio. However, deeper insights and conclusions about rebalancing vary quite a bit and can be classified as:

- Research that concludes there is no optimal method, such as Zilbering et al. (2015) and Czasonis, Pradhan, and Turkington (2020).
- Research that recommends an optimal rebalancing method based on one specific period of returns, such as Harjoto and Jones (2006), De Juan et al. (2018), and Plaxco and Arnott (2002).
- Research that recommends an optimal rebalancing method based on simulation-based returns but static transaction costs, like Buetow et al. (2002), Masters (2003), Donohue and Yip (2003), Sun et al. (2006), and Kritzman, Myrgren, and Page (2009).
- Research that recommends an optimal rebalancing method based on simulation-based returns and dynamic transaction costs, such as Jones and Stine (2010), Chan and Ramkumar (2011), and Norges Bank Investment Management (2012). Our research falls into this category.

Below are a few disadvantages of first three approaches:

1. **No optimal method:** When there is no decision-making framework or historical-period-dependent analysis, there sometimes is no specific recommendation. We find that this approach fails to identify inefficient rebalancing methods and is not ideal.
2. **One-specific-period-dependent analysis:** History provides very few samples for assessing rebalancing. Anchoring conclusions to just one return path, with only a few volatile events, could lead to erroneous decisions. Instead, the analysis should incorporate the uncertainty of future returns, making a distribution of capital market assumptions an important input. In this paper, we use a smaller-scale version of the VCMM to create a distribution of daily asset returns, because threshold-based methods require daily return simulations. The important features of this probabilistic model are highlighted in the following section.
3. **Ignoring transaction costs or assuming static transaction costs:** Most studies omit transaction costs or assume that transaction costs are static. Neither is a reasonable approach, especially for a portfolio of ETFs or individual securities, whose costs are likely to include bid-ask spreads and brokerage commissions.[1] First, we find that transaction costs are not static through time but are sensitive to market volatility and can increase tenfold during periods of market turmoil. Thus, it is vital to include dynamic transaction costs in the rebalancing analysis. Rather than assuming static transaction cost, we model the costs as a function of market volatility, which is an important predictive factor. Second, we forecast a bell curve of transaction costs, as we would asset returns.

**IMPORTANT: The projections and other information generated by the VCMM regarding the likelihood of various investment outcomes are hypothetical in nature, do not reflect actual investment results, and are not guarantees of future results. Distribution of return outcomes from VCMM are derived from 10,000 simulations for each modeled asset class. Simulations as of June 2022. Results from the model may vary with each use and over time.**

1 For mutual funds, transaction costs are paid by all investors implicitly because of the purchase or sale of securities within the fund.

A simulation-based analytical approach can offer deeper insights than a historical single-path-based analysis. As discussed later in the paper, the probabilistic approach offers richer insights into how well rebalancing approaches perform in different environments and quantifies the attribution of rebalance benefit among transaction costs and market-driven factors.

## The forecasting engine

In this paper, we take a probabilistic approach to forecasting asset returns and transaction costs. In doing so, we leverage more than a decade-long body of research at Vanguard, vis-à-vis the proprietary VCMM, to forecast returns, volatilities, and correlations. The key features of the asset return forecasting model we used are described below:

1. **Distributional framework:** Forecasting a *range* of possible asset returns, volatilities, and correlations allows for a deeper assessment of risk-return trade-offs relative to forecasting a *single* value. It enables investors to make objective decisions about rebalancing.
2. **Nonnormal distributions:** It's well known that asset returns are nonnormal, with tail returns more likely than a normal distribution would suggest. This useful characteristic is captured in our simulations.
3. **Forecasting fundamental factors:** As a first step, the model forecasts the drivers of asset returns, such as interest rates, inflation, economic growth, equity price/earnings (P/E) ratio, and market volatility. These forecasts are dynamic, because the evolution of one fundamental affects another.
4. **Return forecasts are fundamentals-driven:** As a second step, asset returns and transaction costs are modeled as functions of the fundamental factors described above. For instance, equity return is a sum of dividend yield, percentage change in P/E ratio, and earnings growth, which can be expressed in terms of P/E ratio forecasts.
5. **Volatility clustering:** The model incorporates the volatility clustering feature of equities, because periods of high equity volatility tend to be clustered together. This vital feature is embedded using a GARCH (generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity) model.
6. **Forecasting jointly:** The model forecasts asset returns and transaction costs jointly via a regression-based Monte Carlo approach, thereby preserving any cross-correlation between them.
7. **Transaction costs:** Transaction costs are modeled as a function of bid-ask spreads, which are sensitive to market volatility. In times of market turmoil, bid-ask spreads spike, as illustrated in **Figure 4**. Rather than assuming static bid-ask spreads and transaction costs, we model them as sensitive to market volatility and other macro-economic variables. This results in an adjusted-$R^2$ of more than 87%. ($R^2$ is a measure of how much of the transaction cost variability can be explained by the above-mentioned independent variables.)

For a detailed overview of the VCMM, refer to Davis et al. (2014) and Davis et al. (2022).

FIGURE 4.

## Transaction costs are sensitive to market volatility




**Notes:** Bid-ask spread data are from January 1, 2016, through June 30, 2020. The figure shows the actual and the fitted, or predicted, bid-ask spread over the time horizon. Volatility is the 10-day trailing volatility of the daily returns based on the closing price of the Standard & Poor's 500 Index. A basis point is one-hundredth of a percentage point.

**Sources:** Vanguard calculations, based on data from FactSet.

## The decision-making framework

When rebalancing methods are compared, a qualitative assessment requires judgment on the trade-offs, which can be difficult when higher-return assets have higher volatility. In other words, if one rebalancing rule provides a higher return, although with greater volatility, should it be preferred? One of the benefits of a utility-based approach is that it allows us to compare utility across different rebalancing rules, in an objective way, instead of through inconclusive risk-return comparisons.

Similar to the Vanguard Asset Allocation Model[2] (VAAM) (Aliaga et al., 2019), we implement a utility-based optimization framework to help evaluate different rebalancing strategies and determine the optimal strategy. Our framework selects the rebalancing strategy that maximizes the expected utility of an investor's after-transaction-cost wealth at the end of a given investment period (10 years, for example).

That is, for a given asset allocation, the rebalancing strategy that has the highest utility score is the optimal strategy.

The overview of the framework is illustrated in **Figure 5**, while the technical details of the utility function are discussed in the **Appendix** section **A-1**. In addition to the optimal choice, several interesting portfolio analytics are produced, such as distribution of return, volatility, Sharpe ratios, transaction costs, tracking error, number of rebalancing events, event size, and turnover.

The optimization framework requires the following inputs: 1) asset return distribution, 2) transaction cost distribution, 3) the investor's risk aversion, and 4) constraints (optional). The utility-based optimization framework also allows for embedding constraints, if needed. For instance, a constraint on the maximum expected transaction costs or a maximum allowable tracking error can easily be implemented within this framework.

FIGURE 5.
**The optimization process for assessing rebalancing strategies**




**Source:** Vanguard.

**2** U.S. patent pending.

## Insights

Using our novel framework, we determine which rebalancing strategy is most risk-return- and cost-efficient. While doing so, we are also able to quantify how much better one strategy is than another. Additionally, we decompose how much of the benefit is achieved from lower transaction costs versus how much is market-driven. Finally, we discuss whether the optimal rebalancing methods gain most of the advantage in highly volatile market environments or in normal environments.

Before discussing our findings, we briefly discuss a few considerations that we have not accounted for and how those factors would affect the direction of the results.

- **Cash flows:** Guiding cash flows from periodic contributions into assets that are underweighted is a great way to rebalance a portfolio naturally and efficiently. Similarly, withdrawals from portfolios can be used to rebalance. Therefore, accounting for cash flows in the analysis would lead to even less-frequent rebalancing or wider thresholds than the optimal ones.
- **Tax-loss harvesting:** For investors engaging in tax-loss harvesting, one would expect more-frequent portfolio monitoring. Harvesting tax losses can reduce one's tax liabilities. This advantage is expected to make up for the slightly higher transaction costs from frequent rebalancing. Thus, our findings would not be applicable when tax-loss harvesting is being implemented, where rebalancing decisions are more personalized.
- **Taxes:** Rebalancing a portfolio typically results in the sale of assets that have appreciated in value; this increase in value leads to an overweighting in their allocation, thereby triggering a rebalancing event. During such events, capital gains would be taxable if the assets are held in taxable accounts. Broadly speaking, we expect a similar or even a less-frequent rebalancing strategy to be optimal, because accounting for taxes would result in a higher tax burden, thereby increasing the cost of rebalancing.

## Calendar-based rebalancing

Calendar-based methods are simple and easy to implement. Among calendar-based rebalancing rules, we find that a portfolio rebalanced annually is optimal for various stock/bond allocations. For instance, annual rebalancing scores the highest on an optimality scale for a 60% stock/40% bond portfolio, as shown in **Figure 6**, compared with other calendar-based methods.

In general, too-frequent or too-infrequent rebalancing is not risk-return- and cost-efficient, as indicated by the hump shape in Figure 6. Too-frequent rebalancing strategies incur higher transaction costs and have larger tax implications within taxable accounts. Indeed, our framework identifies daily calendar-based rebalancing as the most inefficient.

On the other hand, rebalancing too infrequently, such as once every 2.5 years or never rebalancing, causes the portfolio to drift too far from the target allocation over time, resulting in a disconnect with the investor's risk tolerance.

A utility-based decision-making framework forestalls this disconnect. Annual rebalancing hits the sweet spot in terms of cost versus benefit, while staying in line with the investor's risk preference.

The benefit of one rebalancing rule over another can be quantified in terms of certainty fee equivalent (CFE), which is the optimality scale in Figure 6. The CFE is the fee that would make the investor indifferent if given a choice between the optimal solution with a fee and a sub-optimal one without any fee. In other words, it's the benefit of an optimal strategy. For example, we find that the CFE of annual rebalancing is 51 basis points (0.51%) when compared with daily rebalancing.

## Threshold-based rebalancing

Threshold-based rebalancing is sometimes used by asset managers of multiasset funds where maintaining low tracking error is an objective. For instance, if an expected tracking error less than or equal to 20 basis points is desired, then a threshold-based rebalancing of 3% is optimal for a 60/40 portfolio.

FIGURE 6.

**Calendar-based rebalancing methods**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from our forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for a 60/40 portfolio under various rebalancing strategies shown above. The optimality index is the "certainty fee equivalent," or the benefit of selecting the optimal rebalancing strategy relative to daily rebalancing or, conversely, the fee an investor would be willing to pay relative to daily rebalancing. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

## Calendar- and threshold-based rebalancing

**Figure 7** shows that under calendar- and threshold-based rules, less-frequent rebalancing, such as annually with a 1% threshold strategy, is the most efficient. Note that there is no material difference in using any threshold between 1% or 2% along with the annual frequency. We observed that monthly with threshold rebalances are less efficient, but still are better than never rebalancing. Less-frequent calendar and threshold methods are also relatively easy for investors to implement.

## Rebalancing in a constrained case

In some cases, a constrained rebalancing solution, such as one with a maximum expected tracking error, is required to meet certain investment objectives.

FIGURE 7.

**Calendar- and threshold-based rebalancing without constraints**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for a 60/40 portfolio under various rebalancing strategies shown above. The optimality index is the "certainty fee equivalent," or the benefit of selecting the optimal rebalancing strategy relative to never rebalancing or, conversely, the fee an investor would be willing to pay relative to never rebalancing. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

For instance, **Figure 8** shows that among all rebalancing strategies *with an expected tracking error of less than 15 basis points*, monthly and 1% is optimal. Note that there is no material difference among monthly and 1%, monthly, and 2% threshold rebalancing. Our framework is flexible enough to incorporate other types of constraints.

**Figure 9** highlights the relationship between the tracking error and the transaction cost in this constrained scenario. The 2% threshold-based rebalancing is expected to have a lower transaction cost than monthly and 1% and monthly rebalancing strategies.

FIGURE 8.
**Constrained case**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for a 60/40 portfolio under various rebalancing strategies shown above. The optimality scale is the "certainty fee equivalent," or the benefit of selecting the optimal rebalancing strategy relative to daily rebalancing or, conversely, the fee an investor would be willing to pay relative to daily rebalancing. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

FIGURE 9.
**The relationship between transaction cost and tracking error in the constrained case**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine for a 60/40 portfolio. Daily, Weekly, Biweekly, and Monthly refer to frequency; the percentages refer to threshold; and monthly and 1% is the measure under the calendar and threshold method. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

### Which method is optimal overall?

Which rebalancing method is the optimal one among the various calendar, threshold, and calendar-and-threshold choices? Is the optimal choice consistent across various ranges of asset allocation? **Figure 10** shows that annual rebalancing (or annual rebalancing with a threshold of 1% or 2%) is the optimal strategy for various asset allocations tested. From an ease-of-implementation perspective, annual rebalancing is a reasonable recommendation. It also results in lower transaction costs, and it aligns with an investor's risk tolerance.

We also compared the optimal rebalancing strategy with popular rebalancing strategies, such as quarterly with a 5% threshold, quarterly calendar-based, and monthly calendar-based. Annual rebalancing outperforms the popular strategies when it comes to statistical significance. Its benefit over quarterly rebalancing with a 5% threshold is between 6 and 14 basis points, its benefit over quarterly rebalancing (with no threshold) is between 10 and 16 basis points, and its benefit over monthly rebalancing (with no threshold) is between 21 and 28 basis points.

To sum up, our recommendation for most investors—those who aren't participating in tax-loss harvesting or don't require minimal tracking error to a benchmark portfolio—is to follow the annual rebalancing method.

FIGURE 10.

**Optimal rebalancing methods**

| Equity allocation | The optimal rebalancing method and those not materially different (CFE<=2bps) | CFE (annual relative to quarterly–5% rebalance) | CFE (annual relative to quarterly rebalance) | CFE (annual relative to monthly rebalance) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **35%** | Annual; annual and 1/2/3/4/5% | 6 bps | 11 bps | 25 bps |
| **40%** | Annual; annual and 1/2/3% | 9 bps | 10 bps | 21 bps |
| **50%** | Annual; annual and 1/2/3% | 12 bps | 11 bps | 22 bps |
| **60%** | Annual; annual and 1/2/3/4/5% | 12 bps | 14 bps | 27 bps |
| **70%** | Annual; biennial; annual and 1/2/3/4/5/6% | 14 bps | 16 bps | 28 bps |
| **80%** | Annual; biennial; annual and 1/2/3/4/5/6/7% | 14 bps | 16 bps | 27 bps |
| **90%** | Annual; biennial; annual and 1/2% | 11 bps | 14 bps | 21 bps |

**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for various portfolios and rebalancing strategies shown above. The "certainty fee equivalent" is the benefit of selecting the optimal rebalancing strategy relative to another rebalancing method or, conversely, the fee an investor would be willing to pay relative to another rebalancing method. "Bps" equals basis points. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

### The advantage of less-frequent rebalancing

How much of the benefit of annual rebalancing comes from a lower transaction cost, compared with a more-frequent calendar-based model such as monthly rebalancing? **Figure 11** shows that 10% to 20% of the benefit can be attributed to lower transaction costs. The remaining 80% to 90% can be attributed to market-driven reasons such as harvesting the equity risk premium by rebalancing less frequently. As noted before, annual rebalancing is optimal even taking into account the allocation drift that may be experienced, as our framework ensures it is in line with the investor's risk tolerance.

### Rebalancing during volatile environments

Should a portfolio be rebalanced during periods of high equity market volatility? That is, should fixed income be sold and proceeds be used to purchase equities? To answer this question, we group simulations into quintiles of equity market volatility and assess whether annual rebalancing is more efficient than a monthly rebalancing approach.

FIGURE 11.

**Benefit attribution of optimal rebalancing methods**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for various portfolios and rebalancing strategies shown above. The analysis decomposes how much of the expected benefit arises from lower transaction cost versus the benefit from market returns between annual rebalancing versus a monthly rebalancing rule. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

**Figure 12** shows the CFE of annual rebalancing versus monthly rebalancing observed during the five quintiles based on volatility. We find that the less-frequent rebalancing is efficient during periods of market turmoil, as shown by the high 1.52% CFE (indicated by the optimality scale) for the annual rebalancing strategy. While one may get lucky in occasionally timing a monthly rebalance when the equity markets recover right after the rebalancing event, our analysis shows that, on average, it's not efficient to rebalance frequently, especially during periods of high volatility. As we have illustrated in Figure 4, transaction costs rise during volatile environments, which makes rebalancing an expensive action.

Second, one may rebalance in one direction and then have to reverse the transaction because the market fluctuated in the opposite direction, which can happen during these periods of turmoil. Using a less-frequent rebalancing strategy is instead quite efficient because it avoids high transaction costs and unnecessary trades.

FIGURE 12.
**Benefits of less-frequent rebalancing during volatile markets**




**Notes:** Results are based on simulations from the forecasting engine and maximization of post-transaction-cost wealth for a 60/40 portfolio by grouping the simulations according to the volatility of the portfolio returns. U.S. bonds are represented by the Bloomberg U.S. Aggregate Bond Index, non-U.S. bonds by the Bloomberg Global Aggregate ex-U.S. Index, U.S. equities by the MSCI US Broad Market Index, and non-U.S. equities by the MSCI All Country World Index ex USA. Data are as of June 2022.

**Source:** Vanguard.

## Conclusions

We propose a framework for determining a risk-return-, cost-efficient rebalancing strategy by maximizing the expected utility of post-transaction-cost wealth. The framework requires forecasting a distribution of asset returns and transaction costs, which are critical factors in assessing rebalancing.

We find that optimal rebalancing methods are neither too frequent, such as monthly or quarterly calendar-based methods, nor too infrequent, such as rebalancing only every two years. Implementing an annual rebalancing is optimal for investors who don't participate in tax-loss harvesting or for whom maintaining tight tracking to the multiasset benchmark portfolio is not a concern.

Most of the efficiency of the optimal rebalancing strategies is generated by market-driven reasons such as harvesting the equity risk premium. Our analysis models ETF transaction costs and can be directly applied to ETF-based portfolios. Applications of our analysis to mutual funds or funds-of-funds may not be exact, as they do not incur explicit transaction costs, but they do include implicit transaction costs incurred from trading individual securities and futures and may also include purchase and redemption fees.

## References


Aliaga-Díaz, Roger, Giulio Renzi-Ricci, Ankul Daga, and Harshdeep Ahluwalia, 2019. *Vanguard Asset Allocation Model: An Investment Solution for Active-Passive-Factor Portfolios*. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Vanguard Group.

Buetow, Gerald W., Ronald Sellers, Donald Trotter, Elaine Hunt, and Willie A. Whipple, 2002. The Benefits of Rebalancing. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 28(2): 23–32.

Chan, Lydia J., and Sunder R. Ramkumar, 2011. Tracking Error Rebalancing. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 37(4): 54–66.

Czasonis, Megan, Prabodh Pradhan, and David Turkington, 2020. *The Realities of Rebalancing: What Is the Best Approach?* State Street Associates; available at https://www.opiniopro.com/2020/04/state-street-global-advisors/the-realities-of-rebalancing/.

Davis, Joseph, Roger Aliaga-Díaz, Harshdeep Ahluwalia, Frank Polanco, and Christos Tasopoulos, 2014. *Vanguard Global Capital Markets Model*. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Vanguard Group.

Davis, Joseph H., Qian Wang, Edoardo Cilla, and Kevin DiCiurcio, 2022 (forthcoming). *Vanguard Global Capital Markets Model 4.0*. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Vanguard Group.

De Juan, Michael, Laura A. Di Poce, and Daniel Phillips, 2018. *Portfolio Rebalancing: How and How Often?* Northern Trust; available at https://www.northerntrust.com/documents/commentary/portfolio-rebalancing-strategy-commentary.pdf.

Donohue, Christopher, and Kenneth Yip, 2003. Optimal Portfolio Rebalancing With Transaction Costs. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 29(4): 49–63.

Harjoto, Maretno A., and Frank J. Jones, 2006. Rebalancing Strategy for Stocks and Bonds Asset Allocation. *The Journal of Wealth Management* 9(1): 37–44.

Jones, Samuel Kyle, and Joe Bert Stine, 2010. Expected Utility and the Non-Normal Returns of Common Portfolio Rebalancing Strategies. *Journal of Asset Management* 10(6): 406–419.

Kritzman, Mark, Simon Myrgren, and Sebastien Page, 2009. Optimal Rebalancing: A Scalable Solution. *Journal of Investment Management* 7(1): 9–19.

Masters, Seth J., 2003. Rebalancing. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 29(3): 52–57.

Norges Bank Investment Management Discussion Note, 2012. *Empirical Analysis of Rebalancing Strategies*. March 30; available at www.nbim.no/en/publications/discussion-notes/2012/empirical-analysis-of-rebalancing-strategies/.

Plaxco, Lisa M., and Robert D. Arnott, 2002. Rebalancing a Global Policy Benchmark. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 28(2): 9–22.

Sun, Walter, Ayres Fan, Li-Wei Chen, Tom Schouwenaars, and Marius A. Albota, 2006. Optimal Rebalancing for Institutional Portfolios. *The Journal of Portfolio Management* 32(2): 33–43.

Zilbering, Yan, Colleen M. Jaconetti, and Francis M. Kinniry Jr., 2015. *Best Practices for Portfolio Rebalancing*. Valley Forge, Pa.: The Vanguard Group.

## Appendix

**IMPORTANT: The projections and other information generated by the simulations (similar to VCMM) regarding the likelihood of various investment outcomes are hypothetical in nature, do not reflect actual investment results, and are not guarantees of future results. The model's results will vary with each use and over time.**

The projections are based on a statistical analysis of historical data. Future returns may behave differently from the historical patterns captured in the model. More important, the model may be underestimating extreme negative scenarios unobserved in the historical period on which the model estimation is based.

The model is a proprietary financial simulation tool. The model forecasts distributions of future daily returns for a wide array of broad asset classes. Those asset classes include U.S. and international equity markets, several maturities of the U.S. Treasury and corporate fixed income markets, and international fixed income markets. The theoretical and empirical foundation for the model is that the returns of various asset classes reflect the compensation investors require for bearing different types of systematic risk (beta).

At the core of the model are estimates of the dynamic statistical relationship between risk factors and asset returns, obtained from statistical analysis based on available daily financial and economic data. Using a system of estimated equations, the model then applies a Monte Carlo simulation method to project the estimated interrelationships among risk factors and asset classes as well as uncertainty and randomness over time. The model generates a large set of simulated outcomes for each asset class over several time horizons. Forecasts are obtained by computing measures of central tendency in these simulations. Results produced by the tool will vary with each use and over time.

### Appendix A-1: The utility-based decision-making framework

The model uses a Constant Relative Risk Aversion (CRRA) utility function as specified below.

$$Utility(w) = \frac{w^{(1-r)}}{(1-r)}$$

*w = End portfolio wealth (after-transaction costs)*

*r = Risk aversion coefficient*

The CRRA utility function outlined above is a power utility function that considers an investor's risk aversion, defined as an investor's aversion to an uncertainty of outcomes. A risk-averse investor prefers a degree of certainty. An investor with low risk aversion tolerates the uncertainty for a better outcome. Our model can generate results with any user-inputted risk aversion coefficient. Resulting utility scores in our analysis are negative because we assume that end portfolio wealth is always positive (wealth intuitively doesn't go below zero) and the investor's risk aversion coefficient is greater than 1.

## Important Information

VIGM, S.A. de C.V. Asesor en Inversiones Independiente ("Vanguard Mexico") registration number: 30119-001-(14831)-19/09/2018. The registration of Vanguard Mexico before the Comisión Nacional Bancaria y de Valores ("CNBV") as an Asesor en Inversiones Independiente is not a certification of Vanguard Mexico's compliance with regulation applicable to Advisory Investment Services (Servicios de Inversión Asesorados) nor a certification on the accuracy of the information provided herein. The supervision scope of the CNBV is limited to Advisory Investment Services only and not all services provided by Vanguard Mexico.

This material is solely for informational purposes and does not constitute an offer or solicitation to sell or a solicitation of an offer to buy any security, nor shall any such securities be offered or sold to any person, in any jurisdiction in which an offer, solicitation, purchase or sale would be unlawful under the securities law of that jurisdiction. Reliance upon information in this material is at the sole discretion of the recipient.

Securities information provided in this document must be reviewed together with the offering information of each of the securities which may be found on Vanguard's website: https://www.vanguardmexico.com/institutional/products/en/list/overview or www.vanguard.com

Vanguard Mexico may recommend products of The Vanguard Group Inc. and its affiliates and such affiliates and their clients may maintain positions in the securities recommended by Vanguard Mexico.

ETFs can be bought and sold only through a broker and cannot be redeemed with the issuing fund other than in very large aggregations. Investing in ETFs entails stockbroker commission and a bid-offer spread which should be considered fully before investing. The market price of ETF Shares may be more or less than net asset value.

All investments are subject to risk, including the possible loss of the money you invest. Investments in bond funds are subject to interest rate, credit, and inflation risk. Governmental backing of securities applies only to the underlying securities and does not prevent share-price fluctuations. High-yield bonds generally have medium- and lower-range credit quality ratings and are therefore subject to a higher level of credit risk than bonds with higher credit quality ratings.

There is no guarantee that any forecasts made will come to pass. Past performance is no guarantee of future results.

Prices of mid- and small-cap stocks often fluctuate more than those of large-company stocks. Funds that concentrate on a relatively narrow market sector face the risk of higher share-price volatility. Stocks of companies are subject to national and regional political and economic risks and to the risk of currency fluctuations, these risks are especially high in emerging markets. Changes in exchange rates may have an adverse effect on the value, price or income of a fund.

The information contained in this material derived from third-party sources is deemed reliable, however Vanguard Mexico and The Vanguard Group Inc. are not responsible and do not guarantee the completeness or accuracy of such information.

This document should not be considered as an investment recommendation, a recommendation can only be provided by Vanguard Mexico upon completion of the relevant profiling and legal processes.

This document is for educational purposes only and does not take into consideration your background and specific circumstances nor any other investment profiling circumstances that could be material for taking an investment decision. We recommend getting professional advice based on your individual circumstances before taking an investment decision.

These materials are intended for institutional and sophisticated investors use only and not for public distribution.

Materials are provided only for the recipient's exclusive use and shall not be distributed to any other individual or entity. Broker-dealers, advisers, and other intermediaries must determine whether their clients are eligible for investment in the products discussed herein.

The information contained herein does not constitute an offer or solicitation and may not be treated as such in any jurisdiction where such an offer or solicitation is against the law, or to anyone for whom it is unlawful to make such an offer or solicitation, or if the person making the offer or solicitation is not qualified to do so.

THESE MATERIALS ARE PROVIDED AT THE REQUEST OF AND FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF RECIPIENT AND CONTAIN HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION, WHICH SHALL NOT BE REPRODUCED OR TRANSMITTED TO ANY THIRD PARTIES WITHOUT VANGUARD'S PRIOR WRITTEN CONSENT. THE CONTENTS OF THESE MATERIALS SHALL NOT BE UNDERSTOOD AS AN OFFER OR SOLICITATION TO BUY OR SELL SECURITIES IN BRAZIL AND VANGUARD IS NOT MAKING ANY REPRESENTATION WITH RESPECT TO THE ELIGIBILITY OF ANY RECIPIENT OF THESE MATERIALS TO ACQUIRE THE INTERESTS IN THE SECURITIES DESCRIBED HEREIN UNDER THE LAWS OF BRAZIL. SUCH SECURITIES HAVE NOT BEEN REGISTERED IN BRAZIL AND NONE OF THE INTERESTS IN SUCH SECURITIES MAY BE OFFERED, SOLD, OR DELIVERED, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY, IN BRAZIL OR TO ANY RESIDENT OF BRAZIL EXCEPT PURSUANT TO THE APPLICABLE LAWS AND REGULATIONS OF BRAZIL.

PROVIDED AT THE REQUEST OF AND FOR THE EXCLUSIVE USE OF THE RECIPIENT. THE CONTENTS OF THIS DOCUMENT SHALL NOT BE UNDERSTOOD AS AN OFFER OR SOLICITATION TO BUY OR SELL SECURITIES IN BRAZIL AND VANGUARD IS NOT MAKING ANY REPRESENTATION WITH RESPECT TO THE ELIGIBILITY OF ANY RECIPIENT OF THIS DOCUMENT TO INVEST IN SECURITIES DESCRIBED HEREIN.

This document is provided at the request of and for the exclusive use of the recipient and does not constitute, and is not intended to constitute, a public offer in the Republic of Colombia, or an unlawful promotion of financial/capital market products. The offer of the financial products described herein is addressed to fewer than one hundred specifically identified investors. The financial products described herein may not be promoted or marketed in Colombia or to Colombian residents, unless such promotion and marketing is made in compliance with Decree 2555/2010 and other applicable rules and regulations related to the promotion of foreign financial/capital market products in Colombia.

The financial products described herein are not and will not be registered before the Colombian National Registry of Securities and Issuers (Registro Nacional de Valores y Emisores - RNVE) maintained by the Colombian Financial Superintendency, or before the Colombian Stock Exchange. Accordingly, the distribution of any documentation in regard to the financial products described here in will not constitute a public offering of securities in Colombia.

The financial products described herein may not be offered, sold or negotiated in Colombia, except under circumstances which do not constitute a public offering of securities under applicable Colombian securities laws and regulations; provided that, any authorized person of a firm authorized to offer foreign securities in Colombia must abide by the terms of Decree 2555/2010 to offer such products privately to its Colombian clients.

The distribution of this material and the offering of securities may be restricted in certain jurisdictions. The information contained in this material is for general guidance only, and it is the responsibility of any person or persons in possession of this material and wishing to make application for securities to inform themselves of, and to observe, all applicable laws and regulations of any relevant jurisdiction. Prospective applicants for securities should inform themselves of any applicable legal requirements, exchange control regulations and applicable taxes in the countries of their respective citizenship, residence or domicile.

This offer conforms to General Rule No. 336 of the Chilean Financial Market Commission (Comisión para el Mercado Financiero). The offer deals with securities not registered under Securities Market Law, nor in the Securities Registry nor in the Foreign Securities Registry of the Chilean Financial Market Commission, and therefore such securities are not subject to its oversight. Since such securities are not registered in Chile, the issuer is not obligated to provide public information in Chile regarding the securities. The securities shall not be subject to public offering unless they are duly registered in the corresponding Securities Registry in Chile. The issuer of the securities is not registered in the Registries maintained by the Chilean Financial Market Commission, therefore it is not subject to the supervision of the Chilean Financial Market Commission or the obligations of continuous information.

Esta oferta se acoge a la norma de carácter general No. 336 de la Comisión para el Mercado Financiero. La oferta versa sobre valores no inscritos bajo la Ley de Mercado de Valores en el Registro de Valores o en el Registro de Valores extranjeros que lleva la Comisión para el Mercado Financiero, por lo que tales valores no están sujetos a la fiscalización de ésta. Por tratarse de valores no inscritos, no existe la obligación por parte del emisor de entregar en Chile información pública respecto de esos valores. Los valores no podrán ser objeto de oferta pública mientras no sean inscritos en el Registro de Valores correspondiente. El emisor de los valores no se encuentra inscrito en los Registros que mantiene la Comisión para el Mercado Financiero, por lo que no se encuentra sometido a la fiscalización de la Comisión para el Mercado financiero ni a las obligaciones de información continua.

The securities described herein have not been registered under the Peruvian Securities Market Law (Decreto Supremo No 093-2002-EF) or before the Superintendencia del Mercado de Valores (the "SMV"). There will be no public offering of the securities in Peru and the securities may only be offered or sold to institutional investors (as defined in Appendix I of the Institutional Investors Market Regulation) in Peru by means of a private placement. The securities offered and sold in Peru may not be sold or transferred to any person other than an institutional investor unless such securities have been registered with the Registro Público del Mercado de Valores kept by the SMV. The SMV has not reviewed the information provided to the investor. This material is for the exclusive use of institutional investors in Peru and is not for public distribution.

The financial products described herein may be offered or sold in Bermuda only in compliance with the provisions of the Investment Business Act 2003 of Bermuda. Additionally, non-Bermudian persons may not carry on or engage in any trade or business in Bermuda unless such persons are authorized to do so under applicable Bermuda legislation. Engaging in the activity of offering or marketing the financial products described herein in Bermuda to persons in Bermuda may be deemed to be carrying on business in Bermuda.

Vanguard does not intend, and is not licensed or registered, to conduct business in, from or within the Cayman Islands, and the interests in the financial products described herein shall not be offered to members of the public in the Cayman Islands.

The financial products described herein have not been and will not be registered with the Securities Commission of The Bahamas. The financial products described herein are offered to persons who are non-resident or otherwise deemed non-resident for Bahamian Exchange Control purposes. The financial products described herein are not intended for persons (natural persons or legal entities) for which an offer or purchase would contravene the laws of their state (on account of nationality or domicile/registered office of the person concerned or for other reasons). Further, the offer constitutes an exempt distribution for the purposes of the Securities Industry Act, 2011 and the Securities Industry Regulations, 2012 of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas.

This document is not, and is not intended as, a public offer or advertisement of, or solicitation in respect of, securities, investments, or other investment business in the British Virgin Islands ("BVI"), and is not an offer to sell, or a solicitation or invitation to make offers to purchase or subscribe for, any securities, other investments, or services constituting investment business in BVI. Neither the securities mentioned in this document nor any prospectus or other document relating to them have been or are intended to be registered or filed with the Financial Services Commission of BVI or any department thereof.

This document is not intended to be distributed to individuals that are members of the public in the BVI or otherwise to individuals in the BVI. The funds are only available to, and any invitation or offer to subscribe, purchase, or otherwise acquire such funds will be made only to, persons outside the BVI, with the exception of persons resident in the BVI solely by virtue of being a company incorporated in the BVI or persons who are not considered to be "members of the public" under the Securities and Investment Business Act, 2010 ("SIBA").

Any person who receives this document in the BVI (other than a person who is not considered a member of the public in the BVI for purposes of SIBA, or a person resident in the BVI solely by virtue of being a company incorporated in the BVI and this document is received at its registered office in the BVI) should not act or rely on this document or any of its contents.

Any person who receives this document in the BVI (other than a person who is not considered a member of the public in the BVI for purposes of SIBA, or a person resident in the BVI solely by virtue of being a company incorporated in the BVI and this document is received at its registered office in the BVI) should not act or rely on this document or any of its contents.

This document does not constitute an offer or solicitation to invest in the securities mentioned herein. It is directed at professional / sophisticated investors in the United States for their use and information. The financial products describe herein are only available for investment by non-U.S. investors, and this document should not be given to a retail investor in the United States. Any entity responsible for forwarding this material, which is produced by VIGM, S.A. de C.V., Asesor en Inversiones Independiente in Mexico, to other parties takes responsibility for ensuring compliance with applicable securities laws in connection with its distribution.

"Bloomberg®, Bloomberg Global Aggregate Index USD Hedged and Bloomber U.S. Corporate Bond Index are service marks of Bloomberg Finance LP and its affiliates, including Bloomberg Index Services Limited ("BISL"), the administrator of the index (collectively, "Bloomberg") and have been licensed for use for certain purposes by Vanguard.

**Connect with Vanguard®**

Vanguard®

© 2022 The Vanguard Group, Inc. All rights reserved.