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Abstract

We propose an algorithm which predicts each subsequent time step relative to the previous time step of intractable short rate model (when adjusted for drift and overall distribution of previous percentile result) and show that the method achieves superior outcomes to the unbiased estimate both on the trained dataset and different validation data.
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1 Introduction

Short rate models have been a popular choice of nominal interest rate or credit spread models[6]. Exponential version of these models has a number of advantages including well observed relationships, like volatility that is proportional to level of interest rate, and non-negative interest rate conditions, which were useful until most recent past. However, the exponential formulation of short rate models also presents challenges due to absence of analytic formulas for pricing derivatives contracts[11].

The evaluation of path dependent options based on these models is typically performed by binomial trees[5].

In this paper we discuss an extension of the seminal Black-Karasinski model[2], where the mean reversion process is promoted to its own state variable. This has been previously studied[10]. The re-formulation of this model into two independent Vasicek processes then allows the model to be approximated by binomial trees[1]. Binomial trees are typically used to evaluate option payoffs at each branch, however this approach means that in the initial periods are painted in broad brush strokes, which is problematic for options with continuous exercise rights.

2 Background

Let a stochastic process with the following properties be denoted as $S_t$:

$$S_t = x_t + y_t,$$

where

$$x_t = x_0 e^{-\alpha_1 t} + \sigma \int_0^t e^{\alpha_1(s-t)}dZ_1(s), \text{ and}$$

$$y_t = y_0 e^{-\alpha_2 t} + \eta \int_0^t e^{\alpha_2(s-t)}dZ_2(s),$$

where all the parameters including $x_0$ and $y_0$ are known in advance. Then $S_t$ is normal with the mean

$$E[S_t] = x_0 e^{-\alpha_1 t} + y_0 e^{-\alpha_2 t},$$

and the variance

$$Var[S_t] = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\alpha_1} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_1 t}) - \frac{2\eta^2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} (1 - e^{-\alpha_1 t - \alpha_2 t}) + \frac{\eta^2}{2\alpha_2} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_2 t}).$$

Since the distribution is normal, best unbiased estimate is also normally distributed, and should not need moments beyond the first two. The formulation above is a kernel of an existing problem of short rate computation within two factor log-normal models:

$$r(t) = e^{x_t + y_t + \varphi(t)} \equiv e^{S_t + \varphi(t)}.$$
Given the distribution of \( r(t) \) we can deduce the distribution \( S_t \). The problem can be formulated as follows: given the distribution \( F_{S_t}(s) = \text{Prob}(S_t \leq s) \) find the distribution \( F_{S_{t+\delta t}}(s) \). We accept the hypothesis of stationarity of distribution of quantiles, i.e. \( F_{S_t}(s) = F_{S_{t+\delta t}}(s) \). However, this requires \( x_0, y_0 \) to be random which it cannot be. We use the data generated with the stochastic equations to train a neural network in order to test, whether on an average sample it can outperform the theoretical \( F_{S_{t+\delta t}}(s) \) prediction. The structure or approximation makes no assumption about the underlying distribution (e.g. that the underlying distribution is Gaussian, which would require only two quantiles to derive the distribution parameters).

The same Neural network can then outperform the Method of moments in a set generated from different parameters data.

3 Generating training and validation data

3.1 Basic definitions

In order to train the neural network to perform the same functions as stochastic equations, a large data series was generated. In order to improve the precision of computation in line with the possible evolution of paths, we use a branching technique, which increases the number of unique paths by a multiple of 4 at every timestep (discretization of continuous process).

3.2 Generating data from stochastic differential equations

We generate a large dataset (5,000 simulations based on \( 4^{12} \) individual realisations of the model, for each simulation). This is achieved by branching each of the outcomes in the previous step by multiple of 4 (i.e. 1st step has 4 results per simulation, the next 16 and so on, until 12th) - see Appendix 2 for more information. In order to derive formulation for our neural network we will have to reduce the model to quantiles at every timestep.

Given formulation of 2-factor Black-Karasinski model as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\ln(r(t))}{dt} &= \alpha_1 [\ln(m(t)) - \ln(r(t))] + \sigma_1 dZ_1, \\
\frac{d\ln(m(t))}{dt} &= \alpha_2 [\mu' - \ln(m(t))] + \sigma_2 dZ_2,
\end{align*}
\]

(6) (7)

where

\[dZ_1 dZ_2 = \rho' dt\]

and \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \sigma_1, \sigma_2 \) are constants. Define a new state variable where:

\[
u(t) = \alpha_1 \ln(m(t)) - \theta(t), \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(t) = \alpha_1 \ln(m(0)) e^{-\alpha_2 t} + \alpha_1 \mu' (1 - e^{-\alpha_2 t}).\]

It can be then seen that \( u(0) = 0 \). Then we can re-write the original equation as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\frac{d\ln(r(t))}{dt} &= [\theta(t) + u(t) - \alpha_1 \ln(r(t))] + \sigma_1 dZ_1, \quad \text{and} \\
\frac{du(t)}{dt} &= -\alpha_2 u(t) + \alpha_1 \sigma_2 dZ_2.
\end{align*}
\]
This is a so-called 2 factor Hull-White model. This then allows the G2++ formulation of the model, where the state variables are decoupled. The new formulation will have the following terms:

\begin{align}
\phi(t) &= \ln(r(0)) e^{-\alpha_1 t} + \int_0^t \theta(v) e^{-\alpha_1 (t-v)} \, dv, \\
\frac{dx_t}{dt} &= -\alpha_1 x_t dt + \sigma_1 dZ_1 + \frac{\sigma_2}{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} dZ_2, \\
\frac{dy_t}{dt} &= -\alpha_2 y_t dt + \frac{\sigma_2}{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} dZ_2.
\end{align}

Note, that (8) is a deterministic equation relative to time \( t \).

Reformulation of the above into two independent Vasicek equations is given in the next section. We’ve attempted to estimate the individual parameters of the joint distribution, however the process (i.e. decomposition and re-composition independent series) creates additional estimation error with its own noise. Hence in order to reduce the method derived error we will attempt to do the estimation on the joint series.

Explicitly this would mean that each percentile value of the outcome would need to be adjusted by the joint drift over the time step, and then amended for the standard deviation. However, having tested various possible drift functions, we came to conclusion that not introducing any drift to the previous percentile values gives the most stringent version of the test.

4 Method of Moments

4.1 Basic definitions

We have shown the decomposition of the 2-Factor Hull-White model into two SDEs with decoupled state variables. In order to make a comparison equivalent at every timestep we use the same number of quantiles based on the expected distribution of the two decoupled SDEs. We refer to the derivation of the quantiles from these expected distributions as method of moments. We use the moments of theoretical distribution to compare the results generated by running the discretized version of the model described in equations 6 & 7 via a process described in Appendix 2.

The hypothesis is that the previous \( t \) value of distribution carries all the information about how quantiles of the distribution look at the next time step \( t+1 \). In other words, quantiles of the previous timestep, once adjusted for mean movement, and conditional variance should not change over a timestep.

We should accept this hypothesis, as the variance of the process increases with predetermined amount \( \sigma \) (as per the model results distribution), so if we have previous distribution correctly standardized against the theoretical distribution in the previous step, the distribution of the next step would be best predicted by the percentile outcomes of the previous step.

We show this statement to be false, as up to a certain number of simulations, neural network is about to predict the next quantile of the distribution better than the method of moments.
4.2 Estimating next timestep with Method of Moments

Method of moments approach, in this paper, describes a theoretical measure: based on the theoretical standard deviation and mean of two independent Normal distributions we derive the quantiles of the distribution values. The expectations for the next step are easily derived using basic Euler scheme:

$$E[r_{t+\delta t}] = r_t e^{(\alpha_1 \delta t + \alpha_2 \delta t)} + \varphi(t + \delta t) - \varphi(t)$$

Standard deviation over a particular time step are derived from orthogonal decomposition of the above model into two independent Vasicek processes. This approach is standard when approximating the distribution of path with binomial trees. It is this result that allows us to condense the expectation of the deviation of the process to Normal distribution. This results in the following expression:

$$\ln(r(t)) = x(t) + y(t) + \varphi(t),$$

where

$$dx_t = -\alpha_1 x_t dt + \sigma dZ_1$$
$$dy_t = -\alpha_2 y_t dt + \eta dZ_2$$
$$\eta = \frac{\alpha_1 \sigma_1}{\alpha_1 - \alpha_2}$$
$$\sigma = \sqrt{\sigma_1^2 + \eta^2 - 2\rho \sigma_1 \eta}$$
$$\rho = \frac{\rho' \sigma_1 - \eta}{\sigma}$$

and from original formulation of the problem we know that $\rho' = 0$, allowing us to simplify equation (9).

Given a realization of the process $S_t$ from equation (4) at step $t$, we can index it by $e^{(\alpha_1 \delta t + \alpha_2 \delta t)}$ in order to arrive at the expected values over the timestep $t + \delta t$.

Having adjusted for the mean, we can then compute the realized quantiles from the theoretical standard deviation of the distribution effectively deriving the quantiles from the theoretical first two moments of the distribution. $X$ is an array of $F(r_t)(s)$ for $s = 0.05\%, \ldots, 100\%$ at $t = 2, \ldots, 12$. Then,

$$S_t(s) = \ln(X) - \varphi(t),$$

and

$$\tilde{S}_t(s) = S_{t,s} - \langle \ln(r_0), S_{t+1,s} \rangle,$$

where $\langle \ldots \rangle$ denotes an 2D array shifted by +1 along the t. Then,

$$F_{\tilde{S}_t}^{-1}(s) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, VAR[S_t]),$$

where $VAR[S_t]$ is defined as the covariance of the two processes.

$$VAR[S_t] = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\alpha_1} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_1 t}) - \frac{2\eta^2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} (1 - e^{-\alpha_1 t - \alpha_2 t}) + \frac{\eta \rho \sigma}{2\alpha_2} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_2 t})$$

using formula (9) we see that this can be reformulated into:

$$VAR[S_t] = \frac{\sigma^2}{2\alpha_1} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_1 t}) - \frac{2\eta^2}{\alpha_1 + \alpha_2} (1 - e^{-\alpha_1 t - \alpha_2 t}) + \frac{\eta^2}{2\alpha_2} (1 - e^{-2\alpha_2 t}).$$
5 Model formulation - Neural Network

5.1 Basic definitions

In order to show the possibility of additional information captured by looking at distribution as a whole we use the simplest neural net possible, and attempt not to overfit the data (e.g. by increasing the value of the nodes to 200). We verify the results against the mean scenario, and standardise it against stochastic errors for each timestep and percentile.

We can create a state space representation of required function of recurrent neural network as such:

$$ E \left[ \frac{F^{-1}}{S_{t+\delta t}}(s) | \frac{F^{-1}}{S_{t}}(s) \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{10} D_2 f(\sum_{j=1}^{200} D_1 f(F^{-1}_{S_{t}}(s)) + c_1) + c_2 $$

where $f(x) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-x}}$, optimising for $D_1$ matrices and $c$ vectors with stochastic gradient descend method [3]. Where $D_1$ is a 10 by 200 matrix, and $D_2$ is a 200 by a 10 matrix, and $c_1$ is a 10 parameter vector, and $c_2$ is a 200 parameter vector.

5.2 Neural Network Specification

We will then train a simple (single layer, 10 nodes) neural network to derive additional information (relying on the values of other percentiles) about the distribution from the percentiles of the previous timestep at time $t$ (i.e. $n=200$ values corresponding to 0.5% to 100% quantiles of the distribution), to predict the outcomes at time $t+\delta t$.

Such that the trained neural network is able to produce outcomes that lie within 1 standard deviation (this is relative error in graphs below) from true
Further refinements can be made to reduce the error (which is almost constant, relative to t).

We used MLPRegressors as they are one of the simplest building blocks for machine learning. This is a single hidden layer Multilayer Perceptron regressor, and limited the number of nodes in a single hidden layer to 10 regressors.

The network uses 10 sigmoid (we tested more nodes, and fewer gives poor fit, while more approaches Method of Moments errors) nodes to regress the input (in form of percentile values) against the output (percentile values at t+1). It fits the weights and intercepts to input quantiles to produce output (next timestep quantiles), and this is then repeated for each incremental month from 2nd to 12th, for all 5,000 scenarios.

The graphs below present the forecast error on average for each of the quantiles at 3rd, 6th, 9th and 12th timestep standardized by standard error for the 5,000 scenarios, on that dataset.

6 Simulation

As both processes utilize Brownian motion, we can use these quantiles directly to predict the future standardized percentiles. By relying on sigmoid/logistic function, we can use the fact that the normal distribution is relatively well approximated by the logistic equation in terms of CDF and derive the new values of CDF.
We evaluate the quality of fit on the mean of a process with different parameters (which is not part of training dataset). In Figure 11 we demonstrate the error of the two prediction methods, relative to stochastic error of each percentile at a particular time point (timestep) of prediction. In order to verify the veracity of the method we tested it against a different dataset (not used for training), and with 1000 trails on different $\sigma_1, \alpha_1, \sigma_2, \alpha_2, r_0$ values to verify that the method does indeed produce superior performance to the method of moments. (We have also tested a case where $\sigma_1, \alpha_1$ were changes, and in that case the performance of Neural Network was stronger across all time horizons).

### 7 Conclusion

Our results show that the stochastic error can be predicted up until certain number of simulations - at least on a single timestep basis. In other words, if we ran 4\textsuperscript{7} shocks at first timestep we may end up with method of moments beating the neural networks.

Compared with the method of moments the neural network produces lower RMSE for all calibrations except entirely new ones, and still is able to outperform the method of moments on a single timestep on sample size less than 16 thousand projections. In the re-calibration exercise, where the parameters experience small change, this is very useful, as it produces more accurate results. However, it may be possible to train the neural network to interpolate the structure of the distribution by training it on a range of calibrations.

Two things of note: the errors appears to have a constant structure which suggests training a time dependent neural net, or indeed a simple regression may further reduce the error. Alternatively, the fit of the method of moments is better around the mean, suggesting that a further improvement to predictive power of the model could be derived from putting more weight to the method of moments around the mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>time t=</th>
<th>Neural Network</th>
<th>Method of Moments</th>
<th>MoM out of sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00726</td>
<td>0.63372</td>
<td>0.57288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.01659</td>
<td>0.06242</td>
<td>0.06547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.00361</td>
<td>0.0608</td>
<td>0.06267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.00548</td>
<td>0.03186</td>
<td>0.03334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.00175</td>
<td>0.01015</td>
<td>0.01017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.00191</td>
<td>0.00623</td>
<td>0.00608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.00142</td>
<td>0.00431</td>
<td>0.00426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.00323</td>
<td>0.00317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.00058</td>
<td>0.00253</td>
<td>0.00247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.00081</td>
<td>0.00207</td>
<td>0.00212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.00132</td>
<td>0.00173</td>
<td>0.0017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: RMSE results for each time step
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Table of calibrated values

Here the mean reversion parameters are the log of $\mu$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Training</th>
<th>Validation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_1$</td>
<td>0.1759</td>
<td>0.1776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha_2$</td>
<td>0.0785</td>
<td>0.0819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_1$</td>
<td>0.3423</td>
<td>0.3407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_2$</td>
<td>0.2242</td>
<td>0.2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu$</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
<td>0.0377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate at $t=0$</td>
<td>0.0307</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Out of sample parameters
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Data generation

The dataset for training the model is generated by running the full formulation of the original equation of Black Karasinski and Euler discretization scheme reformulating equation

\[
\begin{align*}
d\ln(r(t)) &= \alpha_1 \left[ \ln(m(t)) - \ln(r(t)) \right] dt + \sigma_1 dZ_1 \\
d\ln(m(t)) &= \alpha_2 \left[ \mu' - \ln(m(t)) \right] dt + \sigma_2 dZ_2
\end{align*}
\]

we know $r_0$ from table in Appendix 1, hence we can compute the next step at $r_0 e^{d\ln(r(t))}$ following the Euler’s discretization scheme the step size is a month, as we are using 12 monthly sub periods over a year.

Since there is a linear mapping between a discretisation of a non-exponential stochastic equations (e.g. $dX = \alpha X dt + \sigma dZ$ to $X_{t+1} = X_t + \alpha X_t dt + \sigma N(0, \sqrt{dt})$ ) and the above formulation we can discretize the process to give:

\[
\begin{align*}
m_{t+1} &= e^{(\alpha_2 (\mu' - \ln(m_t)) dt + \sigma_2 N(0,1) \sqrt{dt}) + \ln(m_t))} \\
r_{t+1} &= e^{(\alpha_1 (\ln(m_t) - \ln(r_t)) dt + \sigma_1 N(0,1) \sqrt{dt}) + \ln(r_t))}
\end{align*}
\]

at monthly timestep $dt = 0.08333333333$ with four new results for $r_{t+1}$ generating from two Normal non-symmetric shocks for each node (total of 8 random numbers per every time steps), over 12 monthly timesteps. We record the percentiles over each time step. We do not record the full dataset because at the last timestep there are $4^{12}$ unique interest rate paths with floating rate precision for each trial which amounts to over 4GB of storage. We then simplify this data set by condensing this dataset to its percentiles (total of 200 from 0.5% to 100%)
We take advantage of the fact that values that are closer to the point of origin require less dispersion - i.e. there are fewer significantly different paths, but this number grows with time.
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