<u>ONE PERCENT PER WEEK STRATEGY: SOME TRADING HABITS</u>

by: Guy R. Fleury

In the ***One Percent Per Week Strategy: Some Trading Habits***, I will entertain the notion of what this particular trading strategy is telling us based on its trading history and how, in the future, it will behave similarly.

With this information and the strategy's demonstrated trading habits, we can make reasonable approximations on its future long-term outcome.

Even if the strategy has to handle the market's vagueries and randomness face-on, it will nonetheless manage to extract profits from its trading environment.

I will demonstrate that the trading rules applied over the strategy's past market data can be a valuable asset, enabling us to project where and how far it can go, and alleviate some of the fears associated with higher volatility stocks or ETFs.

Profits will exceed, and by far, the usual long-term market average return from such market benchmarks as the S&P 500 index or the DOW. SPY and DIA are tradable proxies tracking these two indexes daily.

In my previous article **One Percent Per Week Strategy: Trade Distribution**, I made the case this strategy had only four types of outcomes. The number of trades generated was sufficient to give them statistical significance and, indirectly, a probability measure.

Here is a copy of the trade distribution from the above-cited article.

Table #1: Trade Statistics – February 8th, 2025

Trade Type	Trade Outcome	Trade Result	# Trades	≈ Percent Of Total	Reason Position Sold	Average # Trades/Year
A	Positive	$>= 7\%$	135	≈ 17.26%	Above Profit Target	9.0
B	Positive	$> 0 < 7\%$	269	≈ 34.39%	On Friday's Close	17.9
C	Zero	$= 0$	222	≈ 28.38%	Break Even	14.8
D	Negative	< 0	156	≈ 19.94%	Losing Positions	10.4
		Total →	782			

All trades fell in one of the four trade types displayed above. A trade in this series of 782 trades could fall in one of the trade types with the shown statistics.

Based on the results shown, if you took a trade, you had a 17.26% chance of reaching your profit target or better, while you had a 19.94% chance of having a losing trade.

A $\pm\sigma$ would have the same expected value in a normal distribution with mean zero. For example, if you won or lost your trade at the same percentage level, you could get $(1+0.07)^{135} \times (1-0.07)^{156} = 0.1122$, an assured loss. Having only those two trade types at the same return level ± 0.07 would see a portfolio's value fall by -88.78%.

You need a better distribution of trades; the other two trade types will have to come into play to make this strategy worthwhile.

In essence, the strategy to be profitable needs all four trade outcomes since we do not know which type will come next.

A future return series could follow in line with Table #1. We could select randomly from the four trade types in the same proportion as reached in Table #1. And it would be sufficient to make future approximations of where that strategy might go.[1]

There is a sufficient number of trades to say that the strategy has a ”habit” of producing about 28% of its trades with no profits to show for the effort. Almost 3 in 10 trades generate nothing at all (Type-C trades). We also had some 20% of trades having losses (Type-D trades).

My version of the **One Percent Per Week** strategy works because it intervenes in the random-like evolution of TQQQ's unfolding price series. The intervention was simple, as can be attested by the trading rules applied. It is those trading rules that give us a long-term advantage.

If you look at what will happen over the next 15 years, your trading rules will continue to intervene similarly to what they have done over past market data.

You still will not know the outcome of next week's trade. Nor will you know the result of the next one, or any other for that matter. But that is not the point of interest.

What is is that over the long run, the trade distribution will resemble Table #1. Already, Table #2 below does show more than a hint that the statistics of Table #1 might hold.

I modified the original Wealth-Lab 8 **One Percent Per Week** strategy code[2] to adapt it to trading TQQQ, a 3x-leveraged ETF. From the start, we deal with an ETF having more volatility as it seeks to generate 3 times more in daily return than the QQQ ETF on which it is based.

The first question might be: won't the drawdowns be more severe than with QQQ or some other market average proxy like SPY? The answer is yes, evidently.

[1] For some projections, refer to **For Your Retirement, You Need To Win. It Is Not A Wish**.
[2] Refer to my free book **Gain Your Financial Freedom** which has a link to my program version.

The follow-up question should be: by how much? But a better question might be: is it tolerable, or will it be bearable? Won't this strategy, over the long run, blow up in our face? It would require that QQQ's stock holdings in the top 100 highest-valued stocks blow up for such a thing. For many reasons, even simple common sense will tell you that will not happen any time soon unless we have a mass extinction event.

You intend to play a game filled with randomness where the bet size and the price difference between shares bought and sold matter ($q_i \cdot \Delta p_i = \pm x_i$). All trades have the same profit or loss expression. If you make a thousand trades $N = 1000$, you can add the outcome of each: $X = \sum_1^N x_i$ and get the total profit generated. It will include all the profitable trades and all the losing trades.

As a trader and market participant, the objective is to make X as large as possible.

However, you do have some constraints. The first is your available trading capital, the second is your available time, and the third is the overall growth rate you can achieve over that time interval.

The future value formula for this is: $F(t) = F_0 \cdot (1 + \bar{g})^t$ where $\bar{g}$ is your investment's average growth rate applied on your initial capital F_0 over the number of years t.

The profit thing is easy to determine. We have it in $\pm x_i$ expressed above. But, x_i is an unknown for your next trade, or the next thousand for that matter. Anyone can count and add the result of a thousand trades, but you must reach that one thousand mark to get the total. It is as if each $\pm x_i$ results from something close to a long series of random-like phenomena that will take form as the number of trades increases.

Looking at the past 15 years (780 trades) of this trading strategy, we can extract information such as the average profit per trade: $\bar{x} = \frac{\sum_1^N x_i}{N}$. We could re-express it as: $X = \sum_1^N x_i = N \cdot \bar{x}$. Thereby making the outcome a simple multiplication of the average outcome. But again, you need to execute the 780 trades to know the average profit per trade $\bar{x}$.

Whatever your long-term objective, namely, X, it can be broken down into $N \cdot \bar{x}$, that you have one, 780 trades, or more.

Based on the above, you can predetermine your objective: X. You are left with answering *how* you will reach that goal and even exceed it.

Let's set the following objective: $\$50$ million by the time you retire at 65.

You could set any other goal and adapt the timing and initial capital to your circumstances. The equations used in this demonstration can easily be modified.

Say you have 20 years before retirement at 65. You could determine that:

$$F(t) = b_0 \cdot (1 + \bar{g})^{20} = \$50,000,000$$

where $\bar{g}$ is the average growth rate on your initial investment b_0 over the next 20 years. You only need to determine the average growth rate $\bar{g}$ and your initial stake to reach your objective. Based on the above formula, the more capital you start with, the lower the growth rate needs to be.[3]

Starting with $\$100$k, the above formula would require a growth rate of $\bar{g}$:

$$\left[\frac{\$50,000,000}{\$100,000}\right]^{1/20} - 1 = 0.3644$$

With $\$100$k, you could reach your objective in 20 years if you had an average yearly return on your investment of 36.44%. The question becomes: where will you find that 36.44% CAGR?

You have only 15 years to do the same job, then you will either have to raise your CAGR, your initial stake, or both. For example:

$$\left[\frac{\$50,000,000}{\$100,000}\right]^{1/15} - 1 = 0.5133$$

where you would need a 51.33% CAGR to do the same job in 15 years. We can easily imagine that the task becomes more difficult when we allocate less time.

You could achieve the same objective by putting more on the table to reduce the required growth rate.

$$\left[\frac{\$50,000,000}{\$500,000}\right]^{1/15} - 1 = 0.3593$$

Even easier if you allocate more time:

$$\left[\frac{\$50,000,000}{\$500,000}\right]^{1/20} - 1 = 0.25893$$

Such scenarios are available and relatively easy to achieve.

However, it is not what financial institutions offer.

The average long-term return on your stock portfolio might be more in the order of 10%. It has been the long-term market average over the past decades.

Your $\$100$k over the next 15 years at 10% gives: $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{15} = \$417,724$. Over the next 20 years $\$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.10)^{20} = \$672,749$. That is a far cry from

[3] Refer to: **Make Your First $\$50$M Before You Retire** for more on this.

the expectations given earlier. It does not even come close to your $50 million goal before you retire. You will have to do better than that. Otherwise, forget those lofty objectives and prepare to settle for much less.

And ***less*** should not be in your plans. You can do much better than that.

THE ONE PERCENT PER WEEK TRADING HABITS

Let's jump right into what might matter the most.

We have an equation for this portfolio strategy. In previous articles[4], I expressed it as:

$$0.51 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot \prod_{1}^{N} \cdot (1 \pm r_i) = 0.51 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.0451)^{403} \cdot (1 - 0.0273)^{378} \quad (1)$$

which totaled $\$76,597,221$. The simulation came in at $\$75,507,597$ (see Table #1 below). The difference comes mostly from rounding the percentage gain and loss in this compounding function. A reasonable approximation is better than none.

Updating the equation with the numbers of the February 21 simulation gives:

$$0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot \prod_{1}^{N} \cdot (1 \pm r_i) = 0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.0452)^{405} \cdot (1 - 0.0273)^{379} \quad (2)$$

totaling: $\$86,252,141$, which is relatively close to the outcome on the last line in Table #2 below.

Table #2: Cumulative Back Tests – From May 2024 to February 21, 2025

From Februay 2010											
Up to Sim Date	Total Profit ($)	Going CAGR (%)	# Trades	% win Per Trade	Winning Trades	Trade Win %	Win % Win	Losing Trades	Trade Loss %	Loss % Loss	Max % Drawdown
1-May-24	54,242,252	55.73	742	1.01	379	51.66	4.52	363	48.34	-2.73	-54.47
1-Jun-24	60,077,417	56.45	746	1.02	382	51.21	4.53	364	48.79	-2.68	-54.47
1-Jul-24	65,977,979	57.05	751	1.02	385	51.26	4.52	366	48.74	-2.66	-54.47
1-Aug-24	62,558,500	56.06	755	1.01	387	51.26	4.52	368	48.74	-2.68	-54.47
1-Sep-24	73,708,698	57.45	759	1.03	390	51.38	4.54	369	48.62	-2.68	-54.47
1-Oct-24	70,713,321	56.58	764	1.02	393	51.44	4.54	371	48.56	-2.71	-54.47
1-Nov-24	73,994,278	56.65	768	1.02	396	51.56	4.51	372	48.44	-2.70	-54.47
1-Dec-24	69,186,247	55.58	772	1.01	398	51.55	4.50	374	48.45	-2.71	-54.47
1-Jan-25	67,776,123	54.96	777	1.00	400	51.48	4.50	377	48.52	-2.72	-54.47
1-Feb-25	75,507,597	55.70	781	1.01	403	51.60	4.52	378	48.40	-2.73	-54.47
21-Feb-25	86,642,514	56.86	784	1.02	405	51.66	4.53	379	48.34	-2.72	-54.47

(**Click here to enlarge**)

We can validate the statistics in Table #1 with the portfolio metrics of the last simulation, as in Figure #1 below.

---

4 Refer to the equations in my article: **THE TQQQ 3x-LEVERAGED SCENARIO**.

Table #2 is the outcome of making the simulations month by month since May 2024. We have 11 simulations from February 2010 to the start of each month since May 2024. It is the same as performing a walk forward over those months since the program has been the same since May 2024. And therefore, all it sees is its unknown future price data.

> The main reason for performing those tests was to show that since last May, the portfolio metrics have not changed much and that the equation used continued to validate the portfolio's outcome.

Figure #1: Portfolio Metrics. 15 Years. WL8 Simulation. February 21, 2025

Metrics Report | Equity Curve

Select ScoreCard: Basic ScoreCard

	Strategy	Benchmark (Q...
Summary		
Starting Capital	100,000.00	100,000.00
Profit	86,642,514.88	1,120,534.25
Profit %	86,642.51%	1,120.53%
Profit Per Bar	15.21	14.83
APR	56.86%	18.11%
Std Dev of Annual Ret...	159.94%	20.72%
Exposure	52.18%	99.99%
Maximum Exposure	99.91%	100.00%
EAR	108.98%	18.12%
Alpha (α)	32.17	-
Beta (β)	1.39	-
Sharpe Ratio	1.27	0.97
Sortino Ratio	2.19	1.59
WL Score	49.62	11.66
Slope of Equity Curve	14,661.89	259.34
Interest, Commission...		
Commission Paid	0.00	0.00
Cash Interest Received	0.00	0.00
Margin Interest Paid	-0.00	-0.00
Maximum Margin Used	1.00	1.00
Dividends Received	0.00	0.00
Total Currency Adj	0.00	0.00

Metrics Report | Equity Curve

Select ScoreCard: Basic ScoreCard

	Strategy	Benchmark (Q...
Positions		
Position Count	784	1
Avg Profit	110,513.41	1,120,534.25
Avg Profit %	1.02%	1,120.86%
Profit Factor	1.63	-
Payoff Ratio	1.66	-
Avg Bars Held	3.36	3,780.00
Avg Trades Per Month	8.66	0.01
Avg Bars Held as % of...	0.09	99.97
Largest Bars Held as %...	0.13	99.97
NSF Position Count	0	0
NSF Ratio	0.00	0.00
Drawdown		
Max Drawdown	-22,726,223.93	-333,824.80
Max Drawdown Date	10/26/2023	12/28/2022
Max Drawdown %	-54.47%	-35.62%
Max Drawdown % Date	7/6/2010	12/28/2022
Recovery Factor	3.81	3.36
Profitable Positions		
Count	405	1
% Profitable	51.66%	100.00%
Avg Profit	555,450.37	1,120,534.25
Avg Profit %	4.53%	1,120.86%
Average Bars Held	3.05	3,780.00
Unprofitable Positions		
Count	379	0
% Unprofitable	48.34%	0.00%
Avg Loss	-364,946.93	-
Avg Loss %	-2.72%	-
Avg Bars Held	3.69	-

(**Click here to enlarge**)

We can make future projections using an equation like equation (3). And because we have a large number of trades, the past averages can serve as reasonable approximations of their future long-term averages.

Table #2 is remarkable in more ways than one. You have a 9-month walk forward on a trading strategy playing a highly volatile ETF, a 3x-leveraged ETF, no less. Over those 9 months, it kept its average portfolio metrics relatively stable. The win rate varied between 51.21% to 51.66%. It is less than a quarter of a trade over a year. The same goes for the percent win per winning trade, which started at 0.0452 and ended after its nine-month walk forward at 0.0453.

Looking at many walk-forwards, we often observe trading strategies slowing down, collapsing, and losing money.

We started with an average 1.01% per trade in May 2024 and 9 months later finished with an average gain per trade of 1.02%. The same goes for the CAGR, which started at 55.73% to finish at 56.86%.

We had 14.3 years from TQQQ's inception in 2010 to May 1, 2024. During those years, the strategy's portfolio metric averages had enough time to settle down. We had a 51.66% average win rate to achieve those results. Specifying that you were still relatively close to a 50/50 proposition.

It is almost daring to say that the program operated on a quasi-random price series. And yet, some of those long-term portfolio metrics only slightly oscillated around their respective long-term averages.

For example, the percent win per winning trade started at 4.52%, and 9 months later, was at an average percent win of 4.53% per winning trade. The same went for the average percent loss per losing trade, which started with an average loss per trade of -2.73% and finished with an average loss per trade of -2.72%.

All the while, the max percent drawdown stayed the same. From Figure #1 and Table #2, we have it at -54.47%. Remember what happened during the week of the Flash Crash in 2010. A "black swan" event that happened once, that was unpredictable, and from which you would not have escaped. The Flash Crash only lasted 39 minutes out of a 15-year trading period.

Programming for such an event would require finding out if it could have been predictable and what a solution could have been. Would you accept a massive stop-loss or try to profit from the opportunity and buy a falling knife? Wouldn't your portfolio be fully invested at such a time in the first place with no idle capital to buy more shares?

Based on Table #2, the strategy added 42 trades from May 2024 to February 21,

2025. During the period, this portfolio, which started with $\$$100k in 2010, saw its profit rise by more than $\$$32 million during the last 9 months. Even improving its May 24 CAGR of 55.73% to rise to 56.86% by February 21, 2025. Not only did it not fall after May 2024, it improved over those 9 added months.

We could anticipate next year's outcome by adding 52 more trades with the same hit rate, percent win per winning trade, and percent loss per losing trade. We would get something resembling equation (2):

$$0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot \prod_{1}^{N} \cdot (1 \pm r_i) = 0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.0452)^{405+27} \cdot (1 - 0.0273)^{379+25} \quad (3)$$

totaling: $\$142,438,244$. We added 52 trades (27 winning and 25 losing trades).

By the end of February 2026, this portfolio could reach close to $\$142$ million.

The assumption for this would be that the strategy would do about the same in the future as it did in the past.

That is not hard to assume; we have had 784 weeks (15+ years of market data) to reach those assumptions.

It raises the question: is this trading strategy over-optimized? It is a legitimate question that needs answers. Let's address some of those concerns.

- The strategy uses no fundamental or technical analysis data to make its trading decisions.
- Trades are taken at the open of the week's first trading day.
- There is a 5-day time limit on trades.
- The strategy exits a trade at its 7%+ profit target.
- If a position closes a trading day with a loss, it issues a break-even sell limit order the next day.
- Trades are liquidated on Friday's close if still opened, whether with a profit or a loss.

None of the above statements are part of an optimization technique. There will be an opening price on the first trading day of every week, the same for the closing of the week's last trading day.

It is not an optimization when "all" first trading days of the week will get you in a position. The optimization could be if you only selected some trades based on criteria that might or might not repeat.

How do you optimize when taking all possible opening trades, regardless of market conditions?

Where would be the random-like variation on that theme?

If you put a profit target at 7%, how could you optimize that 7%? It will stay at 7%, period. Furthermore, it is a preset sell limit order. It is hard-coded in the program and will always respond to its directive for every trade.

Then, is the 7% an optimized value? TQQQ can have 15% price variations in a week. I picked a profit target lower than about half the potential weekly variation. Making sure that some of those price moves hit their profit target.

Requesting a profit target of 20% might generate only a few times over those 15 years. I was interested in hitting the first stopping time more often.

Somehow, you are not overfitting this strategy? What would we be overfitting on? The trades are all fixed in time due to the code used and its trading procedures. You re-run the program, and you get the same answers. The strategy follows its acquired trading habits.

As Table #2 shows, as you add more trades, the portfolio metrics remain relatively stable. Yet, the code stayed the same for all the monthly simulations performed. There are no moving parts. The strategy has a hit rate of 51.66%. It states that it operates as if almost random.

There is no optimization or curve-fitting on something this close to a standard or Pareto distribution. Is taking a trade every first trading day of the week curve fitting or an optimization technique?

We have had 780 one-week trades over the last 15 years. Each one is independent of the other, and where each time, the strategy makes a bet that the price will rise during its one-week existence. Based on the trading rules, you can only exit a position in one of four hard-coded ways.

- If the price hits its 7% or 8%+ profit target, the position is closed (Type-A trades)
- If the profit is between 0 and 7%, the position will close on the Friday's close (Type-B trades)
- If the price goes below the Monday's close, a sell limit order is issued the next day at break-even (Type-C trades)
- If, by Friday's close, a position is still open and negative, it is sold at the close (Type-D trades)

There are no other methods to exit a trade.

Every trade had only one week to achieve its positive or negative percentage change.

Then, this strategy must suffer from survivorship bias. Sorry, but it cannot.

TQQQ is a 3x-leveraged ETF daily tracking QQQ as is any day of the week. As such, it will never deal with its future self in any way, shape, or form. Whatever the composition of QQQ on any particular trading day, TQQQ will only have that on which to mimic its trading. TQQQ's starting daily percentage change is reset every day.

So, this strategy has no optimization, curve fitting, or survivorship biases.

Nonetheless, the strategy does make a fundamental assumption. The US market is slightly biased upward over the long term. That has been so, for over 200 years and will most likely continue.

In a sense, the strategy is making the same bet as Mr. Buffett, a bet on the prosperity of America. And due to this slight upward bias, we have a hit rate of 51.66%, just a notch above a 50/50 proposition of a heads and tails game.

Still, we could improve on equation (2) by better managing the trade distribution. It was discussed in prior articles that a slight increase or decrease in certain types of trade could make quite a difference in the outcome of the strategy.[5]

We can improve any trading strategy. This one is no exception.

For example, we could add a single and very small number to the program. The program would behave slightly differently and impact equation (2). It would still execute its core function but could produce a higher return nonetheless.

It could be considered a form of optimization. However, you would be dealing with the outcome of an equation that directed your effort to a particular program area. It was not some anomaly, you only responded to the structure of its portfolio equation.

The program would not change much. I only added one number to the code but I did it where it could make a difference as shown in Figure #2.

We could express the outcome of Figure #2 on the same basis as equation (3):

$$0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot \prod_{1}^{N} \cdot (1 \pm r_i) = 0.52 \cdot \$100,000 \cdot (1 + 0.0455)^{401} \cdot (1 - 0.0264)^{383} \quad (4)$$

which totals: $\$103,442,432$, compared to the $\$104,553,288$ in Figure #2 below.

[5] Refer to **Gain Your Financial Freedom**.

It is not the only change one could bring to this trading strategy. A lot more could be modified to increase the overall strategy results.

How would you enhance equations (3) or (4)?

A question should arise: is it not optimization if you modify a portfolio's equation even so slightly since it produces more profits?

Figure #2: Portfolio Metrics. Plus A Tiny Modification. February 21, 2025

Metrics Report | Equity Curve

Select ScoreCard: Basic ScoreCard

	Strategy	Benchmark (Q...
Summary		
Starting Capital	100,000.00	100,000.00
Profit	104,553,288.21	1,120,534.25
Profit %	104,553.29%	1,120.53%
Profit Per Bar	15.95	14.83
APR	58.83%	18.11%
Std Dev of Annual Ret...	154.47%	20.72%
Exposure	51.01%	99.99%
Maximum Exposure	99.91%	100.00%
EAR	115.34%	18.12%
Alpha (α)	35.19	-
Beta (β)	1.33	-
Sharpe Ratio	1.30	0.97
Sortino Ratio	2.23	1.59
WL Score	52.07	11.66
Slope of Equity Curve	18,299.98	259.34
Interest, Commission...		
Commission Paid	0.00	0.00
Cash Interest Received	0.00	0.00
Margin Interest Paid	-0.00	-0.00
Maximum Margin Used	1.00	1.00
Dividends Received	0.00	0.00
Total Currency Adj	0.00	0.00

Metrics Report | Equity Curve

Select ScoreCard: Basic ScoreCard

	Strategy	Benchmark (Q...
Positions		
Position Count	784	1
Avg Profit	133,358.79	1,120,534.25
Avg Profit %	1.04%	1,120.86%
Profit Factor	1.62	-
Payoff Ratio	1.73	-
Avg Bars Held	3.26	3,780.00
Avg Trades Per Month	8.66	0.01
Avg Bars Held as % of...	0.09	99.97
Largest Bars Held as %...	0.13	99.97
NSF Position Count	0	0
NSF Ratio	0.00	0.00
Drawdown		
Max Drawdown	-27,968,153.01	-333,824.80
Max Drawdown Date	10/26/2023	12/28/2022
Max Drawdown %	-54.86%	-35.62%
Max Drawdown % Date	7/6/2010	12/28/2022
Recovery Factor	3.74	3.36
Profitable Positions		
Count	401	1
% Profitable	51.15%	100.00%
Avg Profit	684,591.68	1,120,534.25
Avg Profit %	4.55%	1,120.86%
Average Bars Held	3.01	3,780.00
Unprofitable Positions		
Count	383	0
% Unprofitable	48.85%	0.00%
Avg Loss	-443,780.61	-
Avg Loss %	-2.63%	-
Avg Bars Held	3.52	-

(**Click here to enlarge**)

What would be the rationale for not calling it optimization or curve fitting, for that matter? That is delicate. You did not use technical or fundamental data to increase that performance. You did not use some bizarre anomaly or any periodic phenomenon. You looked at the portfolio's equation and asked it to increase or reduce this or that trading habit.

It generated more profits as equations (3), (4), and Figure #2 can illustrate.

> The funny thing about the above strategy enhancement came from requesting more losses and telling the program to accept more of those losing trades at the expense of some winning trades. And it generated more profits (some $\$17$ million more).

There is always a better trading strategy, and the above modification demonstrates that even if it was just one number. I did not try to optimize; I knew where to put that number and what impact it would have. I asked the program to be slightly even more chicken than it was. And it simply followed equation (4).

Nonetheless, even if the trading rules applied could have been designed in 2010, that minor enhancement would not have been known at that time since it would have needed an understanding of equation (4), which is a representation of its long-term future.

However, we design trading strategies and simulate past market data to determine if they could have survived over the long term to apply them going forward.

We might not have known in 2010 what the enhancement could have done, but we know now what it could do. And the simulation comes in only to demonstrate that the added feature will probably also work in the future where it matters.

There is much more that can be done. I will leave that to you.

This is all good, but the real question is: since you will have to start from day one, how good will this be over the next 15+ years?

It could be answered by: how different will the future be compared to what we have seen and experienced? All I am giving you is that you will have to deal with an unknown stock market future that will mostly behave as it has for over 200 years.

The market will continue with the same habits it has had, and your program can also improve its trading habits. So, make your bet. I suggest making your own bet on America.

Do yourself a favor, study this trading strategy, learn from its habits, and improve it. You have the program code and can verify all of it. The ball is in your camp, and you can do it. Help a few friends, let them appraise the series of articles on the **One Percent Per Week** trading strategy. It should help them do more too.

Related Papers and Articles:

One Percent Per Week Strategy: Trade Distribution

THE TQQQ 3x-LEVERAGED SCENARIO

For Your Retirement, You Need To Win. It Is Not A Wish

You Can Make It Big, Real Big. If You Want ***With Excel template*.**

Make Your First $50M Before You Retire

Your Trading Rules Matter

Gain Your Financial Freedom ***Free book*.**

High Stock Portfolio Returns? Easy

Stock Trading Strategy Alpha Generation

There Is Always A Better Retirement Fund: **Part I**, and **Part II**

The One Percent a Week Stock Trading Program: **Part VII**, and **Part VIII**

The One Percent a Week Stock Trading Program: **Part V**, and **Part VI**

The One Percent a Week Stock Trading Program: **Part III**, and **Part IV**

The One Percent a Week Stock Trading Program: **Part I**, and **Part II**

The Long-Term Stock Trading Problem: **Part I**, and **Part II**

QQQ To The Rescue

Take the Money and Keep it – II

Use QQQ - Make the Money and Keep IT