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## Order Book and Message book

| Message book |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Time(sec) | Price(S) | Volume | Event Type | Direction |
| $k-1$ | 34203.011926972 | 585.68 | 18 | execution | ask |
| $k$ | 34203.011926973 | 585.69 | 16 | execution | ask |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| $k+4$ | 34203.011988208 | 585.74 | 18 | cancellation | ask |
| $k+5$ | 34203.011990228 | 585.75 | 4 | cancellation | ask |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |
| $k+8$ | 34203.012050158 | 585.70 | 66 | execution | bid |
| $k+9$ | 34203.012287906 | 585.45 | 18 | submission | bid |
| $k+10$ | 34203.089491920 | 586.68 | 18 | submission | ask |
| $k$ |  |  |  |  |  |

Order book

|  | Ask ${ }^{1}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bid}^{1}$ |  | Ask ${ }^{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bid}^{2}$ |  | $\mathrm{Ask}^{3}$ |  | $\mathrm{Bid}^{3}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Price | Vol. | Price | Vol. | Price | Vol. | Price | Vol. | Price | Vol. | Price | Vol. |  |
| $k-1$ | 585.69 | 16 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.71 | 118 | 585.40 | 50 | 585.72 | 2 | 585.38 | 22 |  |
| $k$ | 585.71 | 118 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.72 | 2 | 585.40 | 50 | 585.74 | 18 | 585.38 | 22 |  |
| ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... | ... |  |  |  |
| $k+4$ | 585.71 | 118 | 585.70 | 66 | 585.72 | 2 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.75 | 4 | 585.40 | 50 |  |
| $k+5$ | 585.71 | 118 | 585.70 | 66 | 585.72 | 2 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.80 | 100 | 585.40 | 50 | $\ldots$ |
|  |  | ... |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $k+8$ | 585.71 | 100 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.80 | 100 | 585.40 | 50 | 585.81 | 100 | 585.38 | 22 |  |
| $k+9$ | 585.71 | 100 | 585.45 | 18 | 585.80 | 100 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.81 | 100 | 585.40 | 50 |  |
| $k+10$ | 585.6 | 18 | 585.45 | 18 | 585.71 | 100 | 585.44 | 167 | 585.80 | 100 | 585.40 | 50 | ... |

## Architecture of Our Model Framework



## Random Forest



## Data Summary

- IVV Stock Prices in Year 2015 containing 89,869 datapoints.
- Minute-by-minute (Except beginning/End of trading days)
- We used the first $80 \%$ for Training Set and the last $20 \%$ for Test Set



## Features

| Basic Set |
| :--- |
| $v_{1}=\left\{P_{i}^{\text {ask }}, V_{i}^{\text {ask }}, P_{i}^{\text {bid }}, V_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$, |
| Time-insensitive Set Description $(i=$ level index $)$ <br> $v_{2}=\left\{\left(P_{i}^{\text {ask }}-P_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right),\left(P_{i}^{\text {ask }}+P_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right) / 2\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$, Description $(i=$ level index $)$ <br> $v_{3}=\left\{\max P_{i}^{\text {ask }}-\min P_{i}^{\text {ask }}, \max P_{i}^{\text {bid }}-\min P_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$, bid-ask spreads and mid- prices <br> $v_{4}=\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{i}^{\text {ask }}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} P_{i}^{\text {bid }}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{i}^{\text {ask }}, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} V_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right\}$, max-min price differences <br> $v_{5}=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(P_{i}^{\text {ask }}-P_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right), \sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(V_{i}^{\text {ask }}-V_{i}^{\text {bid }}\right)\right\}$, accumulated differences |


| Time-sensitive Set | Description $(i=$ level index $)$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $v_{6}=\left\{d P_{i}^{a s k} / d t, d P_{i}^{b i d} / d t, d V_{i}^{a s k} / d t, d V_{i}^{b i d} / d t\right\}_{i=1}^{n}$, | price and volume derivatives |
| $v_{7}=\left\{\lambda_{\Delta t}^{l a}, \lambda_{\Delta t}^{l b}, \lambda_{\Delta t}^{m a}, \lambda_{\Delta t}^{m b}, \lambda_{\Delta t}^{c a}, \lambda_{\Delta t}^{c b}\right\}$ | average intensity of each type |
| $v_{8}=\left\{\mathbf{1}_{\left\{\lambda_{\Delta t}^{l a}>\lambda_{\Delta T}^{l a}\right\}}, \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\lambda_{\Delta t}^{l b}>\lambda_{\Delta T}^{l b}\right\}}, \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\lambda_{\Delta t}^{m a}>\lambda_{\Delta T}^{m a}\right\}}, \mathbf{1}_{\left\{\lambda_{\Delta t}^{m b}>\lambda_{\Delta T}^{m b}\right\}}\right\}$, | relative intensity indicators |
| $v_{9}=\left\{d \lambda^{m a} / d t, d \lambda^{l b} / d t, d \lambda^{m b} / d t, d \lambda^{l a} / d t\right\}$, | accelerations(market/limit) |

## Label

- Originally, binary classification (mid-price change)
- Changed to three-way classification (spread crossing)

| Time | Bid | Ask | Upward | Downward | Label |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 207.29 | 207.32 | -0.07 | -0.02 | -1 |
| 2 | 207.25 | 207.27 | -0.01 | 0.02 | 0 |
| 3 | 207.26 | 207.27 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 1 |

Table: Labels using Upward cross and Downward Cross

- Our data: 26,105 ups $(+1), 37,870$ zeros $(0), 25,894$ downs $(-1)$ Evenly distributed


## Results

## Key Observations

- We notice that those features in the lower levels are more important than those higher ones
- Volume and number of orders are the most significant features

| Ranking | Features | Score |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | bids size 1 | 0.010127 |
| 2 | asks size 2 | 0.010027 |
| 3 | asks nord 0 | 0.010024 |
| 4 | asks size 1 | 0.009959 |
| 5 | bids nord 3 | 0.009956 |
| 6 | asks nord 3 | 0.009895 |



## Results

- Out of 17,973 entries, there are 1,947 ups ( +1 ), 14,715 zeros ( 0 ), 1,311 downs ( -1 ) in our predicted labels - biased towards zero
- Below shows the confusion matrix

|  |  | Prediction |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 | 0 | -1 |
|  | 1 | 420 | 4063 | 543 |
|  | 0 | 503 | 6579 | 829 |
|  | -1 | 388 | 4073 | 575 |

Table: Confusion Matrix of the Predictions

- Not good enough !! $\Rightarrow$ Set the threshold


## Trading Strategy

- Consider likelihoods that model predicts for each new data point
- If the highest likelihood is -1 or 1 and that likelihood is sufficiently large enough (above our threshold), then trade in that direction
- For example, if the threshold $=0.40$, only time 1 and time 2 have the likelihood above the threshold. However, we only open position at time 2 as our predicted label at time 1 is 0

| Time | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ | $\mathbf{- 1}$ | Predicted | Threshold | Position |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0.253 | 0.479 | 0.266 | 0 | Yes | No |
| 2 | 0.301 | 0.269 | 0.428 | -1 | Yes | Sell |
| 3 | 0.358 | 0.303 | 0.337 | 1 | No | No |
| Table: Likelihood of our random forest model |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Trading Strategy - Calculating Profit

- Once we open a position, we will close it in the next time step
- For example, total profit of the positions in the following table is $0+$ $(-0.02)+0.04=0.02$

| Time | Bid | Ask | Upward | Downward | Position | Profit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 207.29 | 207.32 | -0.07 | -0.02 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 207.25 | 207.27 | -0.01 | 0.02 | -1 | -0.02 |
| 3 | 207.26 | 207.27 | 0.04 | 0.08 | 1 | 0.04 |

## Results

- As the threshold increases, the number of total positions decreases



## Results

- Accuracy is measured as follows. If we our position is 1 , and the true label is either 1 or 0 , then we say it is accurate and vice versa for -1 .
- As the threshold increases, the accuracy also increases as well



## Results

- As the threshold increases, the profit also increases as well



## Next Steps

- Tuning Hyperparameters e.g. Max Depth, Number of Trees in Random Forest, Threshold etc.
- Try different prediction models such as SVM, Regression, Time Series
- Running the strategy using the simulator

