

# Online Learning with Radial Basis Function Networks

**Gabriel Borrageiro**

*Department of Computer Science  
University College London  
Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK*

GABRIEL.BORRAGEIRO.20@UCL.AC.UK

**Nick Firoozye**

*Department of Computer Science  
University College London  
Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK*

N.FIROOZYE@UCL.AC.UK

**Paolo Barucca**

*Department of Computer Science  
University College London  
Gower Street, London, WC1E 6BT, UK*

P.BARUCCA@UCL.AC.UK

## Abstract

We investigate the benefits of feature selection, nonlinear modelling and online learning with forecasting in financial time series. We consider the sequential and continual learning sub-genres of online learning. Through empirical experimentation, which involves long term forecasting in daily sampled cross-asset futures, and short term forecasting in minutely sampled cash currency pairs, we find that the online learning techniques outperform the offline learning ones. We also find that, in the subset of models we use, sequential learning in time with online Ridge regression, provides the best next step ahead forecasts, and continual learning with an online radial basis function network, provides the best multi-step ahead forecasts. We combine the benefits of both in a precision weighted ensemble of the forecast errors and find superior forecast performance overall.

**Keywords:** online learning, transfer learning, radial basis function networks, financial time series, multi-step forecasting

## 1. Introduction

Financial time series are characterised by high serial autocorrelation and nonstationarity. The classic paper on the theory of option pricing by Black and Scholes (1973), assumes that stock prices follow a geometric Brownian motion through time, which produces a log-normal distribution of price returns. Merton (1976) modelled the dynamics of financial assets as a jump-diffusion process, which is now commonly used in financial econometrics. The jump-diffusion process implies that financial time series should observe small changes over time, so-called continuous changes, as well as occasional jumps. One approach for coping with nonstationarity, is to continuously learn. Continuous learning may be cast as an online learning problem. Online learning can be classified into three broad areas: sequential updating, states of nature or transitional learning, and continual learning.

Sequential learning in time is a self-explanatory concept and has a rich history. The Kalman filter (Kalman, 1960) is a state space model which was originally designed for tracking objects in time, such as airplanes or missiles, from noisy measurements, such as radar. Several approaches exist for sequential learning in nonstationary data. These include discounted least squares (Abraham and Ledolter, 1983) and exponentially weighted

recursive least squares (Liu et al., 2010). Barber et al. (2011) consider Bayesian approaches to time series modelling which are amenable to sequential learning.

Transitional learning includes reinforcement learning, which allows agents to interact with their environment, mapping situations to actions so as to maximise a numerical award. Well known online reinforcement learning algorithms include q-learning (Watkins, 1989) and sarsa (Rummery and Niranjan, 1994). The classical k-armed bandit problem, where one is faced with a choice amongst  $k$  possible options, is formulated as an online learning problem. After each choice, a reward is assigned. The interplay between hedonistic exploitation and potentially costly exploration, leads to a number of algorithms such as  $\epsilon$ -greedy, stochastic gradient ascent and upper confidence bound bandits (Sutton and Barto, 2018).

Continual learning is an area of study that asks how artificial systems might learn sequentially, as biological systems do, from a continuous stream of correlated data (Hadsell et al., 2020). They include gradient based methods (Kaplanis et al. 2018, Kirkpatrick et al. 2017), meta learning (Wang et al., 2017) and transfer learning (Yang et al., 2020). The goal of transfer learning is broadly to transfer knowledge from one model (the source) to another (the target). Sub-paradigms of transfer learning include inductive, where labelled data is available in the target domain, and transductive, where labelled data is available only in the source domain. Koshiyama et al. (2020) applies transfer learning to systematic trading strategy development, with goals of minimising backtest overfitting and generating higher risk adjusted returns.

In our paper, we aim to assess the benefits of predictive modelling, feature selection, online learning and nonlinear modelling. We limit the scope of our experimentation to financial time series, which at times exhibit high autocorrelation, nonstationarity and non-linearity. This behaviour might be classified as concept drift (Iwashita and Papa, 2019). On its own, the sequential learning approach to online learning might be sub-optimal to an approach that includes other forms of online learning such as transfer learning. The marquis model of this paper, an online learning radial basis function network, employs two models. The unsupervised learning step, which learns the hidden processing units, is capable of time series pattern recognition. The supervised learning step, which maps these hidden processing units to the output, employs sequential learning. The model thus straddles the continual learning and sequential learning domains. For this reason, we explore its benefits within forecasting financial time series.

Through empirical experimentation, we wish to ask several research questions and test several hypotheses. A first question would be, should predictive modelling consistently outperform model free approaches as it pertains to forecast accuracy? A second research question is, is there a benefit to doing feature selection? Related to this question, should we look at exogenous features? The likes of Chatfield (2019) caution against the indiscriminate use of exogenous features. A further research question is, even after making time series stationary, should online learning outperform offline learning? The hypothesis of a jump-diffusion process implies that even if returns are constructed, and tests such as the Dickey and Fuller (1979) imply data stationarity, occasional jumps might still occur, which render the offline learning models less useful. We expect a priori for the relationship between a set of predictors and a target to be changing over time, thus requiring some form of sequential learning. To test this hypothesis, we create some online learning models and measure their performance against some offline learning models.

Summarising our conclusions and results, our experiment demonstrates the added value of feature selection, nonlinear modelling and online learning, as it pertains to forecasting in financial time series. We find that short term forecasting is modelled well by sequential learning via online Ridge regression and long term forecasting is modelled well by continual learning via an online radial basis function network. Combining models of the two genres

via a precision weighted ensemble of the forecast errors, leads to a model which performs best overall.

## 2. Methods

We begin with an outline of our experimental design, then follow with a description of the data, the features that are constructed from it, and the models which use these features.

### 2.1 Experimental Design

We consider the goal of multi-step forecasting with financial time series. Multi-step forecasting has practical use within electronic trading. The market maker isn't certain of when his risk might be hedged as he is uncertain as to when the liquidity takers will trade. The speculator incurs uncertainty too. She is likely to trade when her predictive signal indicates a larger potential profit than the cost of executing a trade. Common to both is the variable holding times of risk. With this in mind, multi-step forecasting provides a benefit when the forecast horizon is unknown a priori. Our experiment broadly involves:

1. Obtaining a set of targets, where each target is a potential predictor for itself or another target.
2. Fractionally differencing each time series using the Hurst (1951) exponent to estimate the fractional difference parameter  $d$ , as described by McLeod and Hipel (1978).
3. Using the first half of the data as a training set and the second half as a test set.
4. Defining a set of models and a set of forecast horizons.
5. Defining a performance measure. Let  $y_{i+h}$  denote the target's value at time step  $i + h$ . Let  $\hat{y}_i(h)$  denote a model's forecast for  $y_{i+h}$  at time step  $i$ . The mean square prediction error for the  $h$ 'th forecast horizon is

$$mspe(h) = \frac{1}{n-h} \sum_{i=1}^{n-h} [y_{i+h} - \hat{y}_i(h)]^2.$$

The normalised mean square prediction error is then

$$nmspe_{model}(h) = \frac{mspe_{model}(h)}{mspe_{Markov(1)}(h)}.$$

The Markov(1) benchmark is described in the background models section 2.5.

6. Averaging the test set  $nmspe$  by model and forecast horizon, assessing results via visual plots (so-called *markouts*) and statistical summaries.

### 2.2 Data

There are two datasets that we experiment with. The first dataset includes daily sampled settlement prices for various front month cross-asset futures contracts. The dataset is freely available from the Chris database from Quandl. Here we consider forecasts out to 3 months ahead. We include time series for which there is 25 years of data. The first 12.5 years is used for all offline learning, including fractional difference parameter estimation, feature selection and model hyperparameter tuning. The remaining 12.5 years is used for out of sample forecasting. The attentive researcher might suggest that it is to be expected that the offline learning models would underperform the online learning models, as they have

effectively become 'stale'. A more realistic methodology might train the offline models once a week or once a month on a sliding window basis. In theory however, the data is made stationary via fractional differencing. Therefore model staleness should not be a function of time. Nevertheless, to address these concerns, we consider a second dataset which consists of cash currency pairs sampled minutely. The vendor, Dukascopy, allows us to extract a maximum of 5000 data points per currency pair. These data points consist of open, high, low and closing prices. Here we allow 2,500 samples for training and 2,500 samples for test. This is roughly a day and three quarters of testing per target. We consider forecasts out to 1 hour.

### 2.3 Features

Our feature set is limited to fractionally differenced time series, which form both the predictors and the targets. These are the fractionally differenced daily settlement prices for the futures data and the fractionally differenced minutely closing quotes for the cash currency (fx) pairs. Denote the autocovariance function as

$$\gamma(s, t) = cov(x_s, x_t) = E[(x_s - \mu)(x_t - \mu)].$$

A process is said to be *strictly stationary* if the probabilistic behaviour of a collection of values  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_k$  is identical to that of a time shifted set  $x_{1+h}, x_{2+h}, \dots, x_{k+h}$ . It is said to be *weakly stationary* if

1. Its mean is constant and does not depend on time.
2. Its variance is finite and its autocovariance function  $\gamma(s, t)$  depends only on  $s$  and  $t$  and only through their difference  $|s - t|$ .

The Dickey and Fuller (1979) test can be used to test for time series stationarity. Define the autoregressive(1) model with drift term

$$\Delta y_t(d) = \theta_0 + \theta_1 y_{t-1}(d) + \epsilon_t.$$

If  $\theta_1 = 0$ , the time series is said to contain a unit root. A unit root implies nonstationarity. The Dickey-Fuller critical values allow for the researcher to accept or reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$  that  $\theta_1 = 0$ . The standard regression t-values for the regression parameter estimates in the above model can be compared against these critical values.

If the relationship between the response and the predictors is changing dynamically over time, offline learning becomes largely unsuitable. Financial time series are usually differenced or log differenced to make them stationary. As a result however, the signal to noise ratio of the differenced time series drops significantly. A proxy for signal retention is to compute the correlation of the differenced time series with the original one. This correlation is usually around zero after first differences are taken. An alternative procedure which retains the "long memory" in the data generating process, whilst preserving data stationarity, is fractional differencing. Hosking (1981) considered the family of arima processes and generalized them to the arfima model, which permits the degree of differencing to take on fractional values. The fractional differencing operator is defined as an infinite binomial series expansion in powers of the backward-shift operator. Following Shumway (2011), we use the binomial expansion for  $d > -1$  to write

$$w_t = (1 - B)^d y_t = \sum_i^{\infty} \pi_i B^i y_t = \sum_i^{\infty} \pi_i y_{t-i},$$

where

$$\pi_i = \frac{\Gamma(i - d)}{\Gamma(i + 1)\Gamma(-d)}$$

and  $\Gamma(x + 1) = x\Gamma(x)$  is the gamma function. Brockwell and Davis (1991) show that for  $|d| < 0.5$ , the process becomes stationary.  $\pi_i$  can be estimated recursively

$$\pi_{i+1}(d) = \frac{(i - d)\pi_i(d)}{(i + 1)}.$$

This leads to a suitable fixed width sliding window procedure to compute the long memory process. Define

$$\mathbf{w}_t^T = [\pi_{t-k}(d), \dots, \pi_{t-1}(d), \pi_t(d)]^T$$

and

$$\mathbf{y}^T = [y_{t-k}, \dots, y_{t-1}, y_t]^T.$$

The fractionally differenced time series observed at time  $t$  is thus

$$y_t(d) = \mathbf{w}_t^T \mathbf{y}.$$

Hurst (1951) describes how long memory processes occur in hydrology. McLeod and Hipel (1978) outline a procedure to estimate  $d$  from the Hurst exponent.

---

**Algorithm 1:** fractional difference parameter estimation via Hurst's exponent

---

**Input:**  $\mathbf{y}$   
**Output:**  $d$

- 1  $\mu_y = \frac{1}{t} \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{y}_i$
- 2  $\sigma_y = [\frac{1}{t-1} \sum_{i=1}^t (\mathbf{y}_i - \mu_y)^2]^{0.5}$
- 3  $s_t = \sum_{i=1}^t \mathbf{y}_i - i\mu_y$
- 4  $lb = \min(0, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_t)$
- 5  $ub = \max(0, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_t)$
- 6  $r_t = ub - lb$
- 7  $\frac{r_t}{\sigma_y} = \left(\frac{t}{2}\right)^H$
- 8  $H = \frac{\log r_t - \log \sigma_y}{\log(t/2)}$
- 9  $d = H - 0.5$

---

## 2.4 Feature Selection

Hastie et al. (2009) provide an analysis and discussion of various feature selection approaches suitable for regression models. We perform feature selection by combining two algorithms, forward stepwise selection and variance inflation factor minimisation. The former is used to select predictive features, even in a high dimensional feature space setting, and the latter is used to prune any correlated features back. Correlated features are likely to result in greater prediction variance. In the algorithm that follows,  $\kappa$  is the maximum

variance inflation factor that is allowed,  $\mathbf{X}$  is the  $n \times p$  predictor matrix, and  $\mathbf{y}$  is the  $n \times 1$  target vector.

---

**Algorithm 2:** forward stepwise selection with variance inflation factors

---

**Require:**  $\kappa$   
**Initialise:**  $\mathbb{S} = [1, 2, \dots, p]$ ,  $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{v} = [0_1, 0_2, \dots, 0_p]$   
**Input:**  $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}$   
**Output:**  $\mathbb{S}$

- 1 **for**  $j \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $m$  **do**
- 2      $\bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n \mathbf{y}_i$
- 3      $\bar{x}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n \mathbf{X}_{ij}$
- 4      $\theta_j = \frac{\sum_i^n (\mathbf{y}_i - \bar{y})(\mathbf{X}_{ij} - \bar{x}_j)}{\sum_i^n (\mathbf{X}_{ij} - \bar{x}_j)^2}$
- 5      $\mathbf{r}_j = 1 - \frac{\sum_i^n (\mathbf{y}_i - \theta_j \mathbf{X}_{ij})^2}{\sum_i^n (\mathbf{y}_i - \bar{y})^2}$  //  $\mathbf{r}_j$  is  $R_{\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{X}_j}^2$ , the r-squared of a regression of  $\mathbf{y}$  onto  $\mathbf{X}_j$ .
- 6      $\mathbf{v}_j = \frac{1}{1 - R_{\mathbf{X}_j|\mathbf{X}_{-j}}^2}$  //  $\mathbf{X}_{-j}$  denotes all predictors excluding the  $j$ 'th one.
- 7 **end**
- 8 Sort  $\mathbf{r}$  from smallest to largest and use its sort index to sort  $\mathbb{S}$ .
- 9 **while**  $\forall \mathbf{v} \geq \kappa$  **do**
- 10     **for**  $j \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $m$  **do**
- 11         **if**  $\mathbf{v}_j \geq \kappa$  **then**
- 12             remove  $\mathbb{S}_j$
- 13             recompute  $\mathbf{v}$
- 14         **end**
- 15     **end**
- 16 **end**

---

## 2.5 Background Models

Our benchmark is a so-called Markov(1) model, which uses the last known price of the target to forecast future prices of the same target. In a sense, this is a model-free approach. From Ibe (2014), a random process  $X_t$ ,  $t \in T$ , is called a first-order Markov process, if for any  $t = 0 < 1 < \dots < n$ , the conditional cumulative distribution function of  $X_n$ , for given values of  $X_0, X_1, \dots, X_{n-1}$ , depends only on  $X_{n-1}$ . All subsequent models used in experimentation will be compared to this benchmark. Our univariate offline model is the autoregressive(1)

$$y_t = \theta_1 y_{t-1} + \epsilon.$$

We then create offline and online versions of the Ridge regression model (Hoerl, 1962), which make use our our feature selection algorithm. The online variant is estimated as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_t = \left[ \left( \sum_i^t \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T \right) + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right]^{-1} \sum_i^t \mathbf{x}_t y_t$$

where  $\lambda$  is the Ridge penalty. An equivalent update in state space form, is the recursive least squares estimator, which is a special case of the Kalman filter (Harvey, 1993).

---

**Algorithm 3:** recursive least squares

---

**Require:**  $\lambda$   
**Initialise:**  $(\mathbf{X}_0^T \mathbf{X}_0)^{-1} = (\lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1}$   
**Input:**  $\mathbf{x}_t, y_t$   
**Output:**  $\hat{y}_t$

- 1  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1} + (\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t (y_t - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{x}_t) / f_t$
- 2  $(\mathbf{X}_t^T \mathbf{X}_t)^{-1} = (\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1})^{-1} - (\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t \mathbf{x}_t^T (\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1})^{-1} / f_t$
- 3  $f_t = 1 + \mathbf{x}_t^T (\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_t$
- 4  $\hat{y}_t = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^T \mathbf{x}_t$

---

We expect a priori that financial time series will exhibit nonlinear behaviour at times. Tsay and Chen (2019) discusses the time-varying volatility or conditional heteroscedasticity of financial time series. Bollerslev (1986) created his generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedastic (garch) model to cope with such nonlinear, time-varying volatility. Our nonlinear offline learning model is the locally weighted regression model. Local learning, or instance based learning, is characterised by a local learning technique which retains a set of training data, and compares these "prototypes" to new inputs at prediction time. Thus a local fit is recomputed with each new prediction that must be made. The nonlinearity is induced by the kernel function. Let  $K_\sigma(\cdot)$  denote a kernel function, which is used to measure distance to a prototype. An example of such a function, one that gives asymptotically the smallest mean squared error (Wasserman, 2004), is the Epanechnikov (1969)

$$K_\sigma(x_*, x) = D\left(\frac{|x - x_*|}{\sigma}\right),$$

with

$$D(t) = \begin{cases} \frac{3}{4}(1 - t^2), & \text{if } |t| \leq 1. \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Locally weighted regression solves a separate weighted least-squares problem at each prototype  $x_*$

$$\min_{\alpha(x_*), \beta(x_*)} \sum_{i=1}^n K_\sigma(x_*, x_i) [y_i - \alpha(x_*) - \beta(x_*) x_i]^2.$$

The prediction estimate is thus  $\hat{f}(x_*) = \alpha(x_*) + \beta(x_*) x_*$ . The model can be extended to higher dimensional feature spaces and may be regularised, leading to the kernel Ridge regression model as described by Murphy (2012)

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{x}_*) = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}_*) \mathbf{X} + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}_*) \mathbf{y},$$


where

$$\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{x}_*) = \text{diag}(K_\sigma(\mathbf{x}_*, \mathbf{x}_i)).$$

Local learning has been considered before in time series forecasting as with Bontempi (1999), primarily as a non-parametric approach that is able to adapt to nonlinear data. Local learning is discussed in a multiple input multiple output modelling context by Bontempi (2008) and Ben Taieb et al. (2010). Multiple input multiple output modelling is concerned with sharing information across models that make an array of multi-step forecasts.

## 2.6 The Radial Basis Function Network

The online nonlinear model we use is the radial basis function network. The radial basis function network is a single layer network, where the hidden layer nodes play the role of the prototypes described in local learning. The number of prototypes  $m$ , is usually much smaller than the number of training examples  $n$ , used for example by locally weighted regression. Following Bishop (1995), the  $k^{th}$  output of the radial basis function network is



defined as:

$$y_k(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^m \theta_{kj} \phi_j(\mathbf{x}) + \theta_{k0}, \tag{1}$$

where  $\theta_{kj}$  is the weight going from the  $j^{th}$  basis function (hidden node) to the  $k^{th}$  output. In the case of a real-valued output,  $k = 1$ . The bias  $\theta_{k0}$  can be absorbed into the summation by defining an extra basis function  $\phi_0$  with an activation set to 1. Nonlinearity is introduced into the network via the Gaussian basis function

$$\phi_j(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\left(-\frac{\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2^2}{2\sigma_j^2}\right),$$

where  $\mathbf{x}$  is a  $p$ -dimensional input vector,  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$  is the centre of the basis function  $\phi_j(\cdot)$  and  $\sigma_j^2$  is its width. Bishop shows that the width  $\sigma_j^2$  can be replaced by a covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j$ , leading to basis functions of the form

$$\phi_j(\mathbf{x}) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_j^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)\right).$$

However, on experiments we conducted on an artificial time series generated from the Mackey-Glass differential delay equation

$$\frac{dx_t}{dt} = -\alpha x_t + \beta \frac{x_{t-\tau}}{1 + x_{t-\tau}^{10}},$$

we find that there is too much learning capacity introduced into the network, which isn't necessarily well controlled via regularisation, leading to poor generalisation.

Girosi and Poggio (1990) show that radial basis function networks have a "best approximation" property: in the set of approximating functions, that is, the set of functions corresponding to all possible choices of parameters, there is one function which has minimum approximating error. A seminal paper on radial basis function network properties is from Broomhead and Lowe (1988), and on its construction, by Moody and Darken (1989). The model can be trained in a fully supervised manner similar to backpropagation for neural networks. Khosravi (2011) describes such an approach, although he sets some weights between the inputs and hidden layer, rather than the traditional approach, which has weights from the hidden layer to the outputs. He calls this his *weighted rbfnet*, and finds improved accuracy on the UCI letter classification dataset and the HODA digit recognition dataset. Given that we will perform large scale experimentation, we adopt the Moody and Darken (1989) approach to network training, which is extremely fast. It involves an unsupervised learning step, using a clustering algorithm such as k-means to learn the hidden processing units, and a supervised learning step which maps the hidden processing units to the output. The supervised learning model is typically linear. Quadratic discriminant analysis would suffice for classification problems, and Ridge regression would suffice for real-valued outputs.

The k-means clustering algorithm, Lloyd (1982) and Macqueen (1967), updates the  $m$  basis centres  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$ , such that the total squared Euclidean distance between these centres and the predictor training examples is minimised:

$$E = \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{ji} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\|_2^2. \tag{2}$$

Here  $\delta_{ji}$  is 1 when the training exemplar  $\mathbf{x}_i$  belongs to the processing unit  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j$ , and 0 otherwise. A further advantage of this approach is that it is amenable to online learning. A partial or online update takes the form

$$\Delta\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \eta(\mathbf{x}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j),$$

where  $\eta$  is a learning rate. Billings et al. (1996) consider a modified method of Moody and Darken's to network training. They consider a large input space in  $\mathbf{X}$  and a large hidden network space in  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ , relying on orthogonal least squares and forward stepwise selection to select the hidden processing units. Finally, they employ recursive least squares to map the hidden processing units to the response on an online basis. They make the link between the nonlinear autoregressive moving average model with exogenous inputs (narmax) and their radial basis function network, and demonstrate an application to multiple input multiple output modelling in simulated dynamic time series. A downside of their approach is that there is likely to be a lot of redundancy in the input space, and in practical real-time application, it may be wasteful to compute many predictors, only to potentially throw them away during network training.

Kanazawa (2020) applies an offline radial basis function network based on Moody and Darken's technique, to macroeconomic data. He finds that the estimated impulse responses from the model, suggest that the response of macroeconomic variables to a positive supply shock, is substantially time variant. He also finds that the model outperforms benchmarks based on the vector autoregression and threshold-var estimators, but only with longer term forecasts, 10 steps ahead or more. Overall, he finds that the model can uncover the structure of data generated from the nonlinear new Keynesian model, even from a small sample of simulated data. We can draw parallels between this outcome and the concept of few shot learning (Wang et al., 2017), where the learner can rapidly generalize to new tasks containing only a few samples of supervised information. Interestingly, he employs

the renormalised radial basis function approach of Hastie et al. (2009)

$$h_j(x) = \frac{D(\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\| / \sigma_j)}{\sum_{k=1}^m D(\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_k\| / \sigma_k)},$$

which aims to fill any holes in regions of  $\mathbb{R}^p$  where the kernels have no appreciable support. In experimental analysis using a small subset of the Chris dataset, we find this approach to be less optimal in the generalisation sense, when compared to the simple method described by Moody and Darken to select basis function widths  $\sigma_j^2$ . This method involves computing a "global first nearest-neighbor" heuristic, which uses a uniform average width  $\sigma = \langle \Delta x_{\alpha\beta} \rangle$  for all hidden units, where  $\Delta x_{\alpha\beta}$  is the Euclidean distance in input space between unit  $\alpha$  and its nearest-neighbor  $\beta$ , and  $\langle \rangle$  indicates a global average over such pairs. We summarise the online radial basis function network algorithm:

---

**Algorithm 4:** the online radial basis function network

---

**Require:**  $\eta, \lambda$   
**Initialise:**  $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1} = (\lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1}, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1}^T y_{t-1} = \mathbf{0}$   
*//  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  is estimated offline initially via k-means as per equation 2*  
**Input:**  $\mathbf{x}_t, y_t$   
**Output:**  $\hat{y}_t$

- 1  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\mu}_j = \eta(\mathbf{x}_t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j)$   
*//  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_t)$  denotes the  $m$  basis functions  $[\phi_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \phi_m(\mathbf{x})]^T$*
- 2  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_t^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}_t = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1}^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_t) \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_t)^T$
- 3  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_t^T y_t = \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{t-1}^T y_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_t) y_t$
- 4  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = (\boldsymbol{\Phi}_t^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}_t + \lambda \mathbf{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Phi}_t^T y_t$
- 5  $\hat{y}_t = \boldsymbol{\theta}_t^T \boldsymbol{\Phi}(\mathbf{x}_t)$

---

There is overlap in the construction of the radial basis function network with a few other methods, which we will highlight, along with its differences. Clearly there is a relation between locally weighted regression, its regularised version, kernel Ridge regression, and the radial basis function network. However, the former are far from sparse, typically including as many basis centres as there are training examples, and are thus computationally infeasible for large datasets. The radial basis function network relates to the relevance vector machine of Tipping (1999), especially through its use of equation 1. Originally, the author created this model as a sparse, Bayesian alternative to the support vector machine (Vapnik, 1998). The sparsity is induced by defining an automatic relevance determination Gaussian prior (MacKay 1994, Neal 1996) over the model weights. The model parameters are estimated via iterative re-estimation of the individual weight priors  $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ , through expectation maximisation. Rasmussen and Quiñonero-candela (2005) make the link between the relevance vector machine and the Gaussian process model, where the former’s hyper-parameters are parameters of the latter’s covariance function. Being a local learning technique, Rasmussen and Quiñonero-candela highlight that whilst the relevance vector machine provides full predictive distributions for test cases, the predictive uncertainties have the unintuitive property that they get smaller the further you move away from the training cases. They propose to augment the relevance vector machine by an additional basis function centered at the test input, which adds extra flexibility at test time, thus improving generalisation performance.

The radial basis function network differs from these other models in several ways. Firstly, it is the model that scales best in a high dimensional feature space setting. The high dimension feature space is reduced through the unsupervised learning clustering step, which itself can be extremely fast to fit, and is amenable to sequential updating on an online basis. Secondly, it is exactly because of the unsupervised learning step, that the knowledge of the clustering model is transferred to the supervised learner. Thus there is added flexibility with

the radial basis function network, as the intrinsic nature of the feature space is learnt and made available to the upstream model. Fundamentally, our formulation of the radial basis function network, with our prior feature selection via our combined forward stepwise and variance inflation factor minimisation algorithm, removes redundant features upfront, prior to training of the supervised learner. The comparative models perform their redundant feature removal at training time, and are thus more computationally expensive to fit.

## 2.7 Precision Weighted Ensemble

We have one final model to include. As discussed, Moody and Darken estimate the hidden processing units of the radial basis function network via k-means. We can think of these clusters as long term characteristic behaviours of the predictors. As such they are intrinsically averaged across the training data and sequentially, online through the test data. They are therefore less responsive to any dynamic, sharp changes in the relationship between the predictors and the response. With this in mind, we explore the use of an online precision weighted ensemble of the forecast errors. The ensemble is comprised of an online Ridge regression model and an online radial basis function network. Denote for each forecast horizon  $h$ , the vector of these predictions as  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t(h)$ . The ensemble prediction  $\hat{z}_t(h)$  is weighted by the inverse of the covariance matrix of prediction errors.

---

**Algorithm 5:** precision weighted ensemble

---

**Initialise:**  $\mathbf{S}_0 = \mathbf{I}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_0(h) = \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t(h)$   
**Input:**  $y_t, \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t(h)$   
**Output:**  $\hat{z}_t(h)$

- 1  $\mathbf{e}_t = y_t - \hat{\mathbf{y}}_{t-1}(h)$
- 2  $\bar{\mathbf{e}} = \frac{1}{t} \sum_i^t \mathbf{e}_i$
- 3  $\mathbf{S}_t = \mathbf{S}_{t-1} + (\mathbf{e}_t - \bar{\mathbf{e}}_t)(\mathbf{e}_t - \bar{\mathbf{e}}_t)^T$
- 4  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_t = \text{diag}(\mathbf{S}_t^{-1}) / \text{trace}(\mathbf{S}_t^{-1})$
- 5  $\hat{z}_t(h) = \boldsymbol{\omega}_t^T \hat{\mathbf{y}}_t(h)$

---

Lines 2 and 3 in algorithm 5 are amenable to an exponential update, rather than retaining all past history. Denote  $\eta \in (0, 1]$  as the exponential forgetting factor and  $\bar{x}$  as the exponential average of a variable  $x$ , with  $\bar{x}_0 = x_0$ . The update takes the form

$$\bar{x}_t = \bar{x}_{t-1} - \eta(\bar{x}_{t-1} - x_t).$$

With such an update performed, then the precision weighted ensemble becomes much more sensitive to recent performance. This would help with financial time series, under the hypothesis of a jump-diffusion process.

## 3. Results

The plots that follow show normalised mean square prediction error by dataset, model and forecast horizon. This measure is a constant 1 for the Markov(1) benchmark. All models outperform this benchmark. Summary statistics are also generated for each dataset. These show Wald tests for the null hypothesis that the normalised mean square prediction error is no different from 1, that of the Markov(1) benchmark. We can reject this hypothesis at the 5% critical value for all models. Whilst the autoregressive(1) model does better than the Markov(1) benchmark, it underperforms the remaining models where feature selection has been performed. All online learning models outperform the offline learning models. Even the biased online Ridge outperforms the more powerful offline locally weighted regression.

With the daily cross-asset futures dataset, the online radial basis function network underperforms the Markov(1) benchmark at the 1 day ahead forecast, underperforms offline Ridge and offline locally weighted regression out to a two week forecast and underperforms online Ridge out to a three week forecast. From then on it does better than all but the precision weighted ensemble. The precision weighted ensemble shows the best results overall. The experiment involving the minutely sampled cash currency pairs has near identical results, albeit at shorter forecast horizons.

### 3.1 Daily Cross-asset Futures Results

The following plot shows forecast horizon in days along the horizontal axis and corresponding normalised mean square prediction error along the vertical axis. The online radial basis function network and the online precision weighted ensemble, show improved mean square prediction error relative to the Markov(1) benchmark as the forecast horizon increases. The other models show plateaued performance from around a 2 month forecast and beyond. With table 2, that shows the full results,  $n$  is the number of test samples,  $p$  is the total number of predictors available for feature selection and  $k$  is the median number of predictors chosen by our feature selection algorithm during training. The results by model are median test normalised mean square prediction errors. Note that ar(1) denotes the autoregressive(1) model, lwr denotes the locally weighted regression model, pwe denotes the precision weighted ensemble, and rbfnet denotes the radial basis function network.




Figure 1: *nmspe* versus forecast horizon for daily cross-asset futures

	offline ar(1)	offline lwr	offline ridge	online pwe	online rbfnet	online ridge
count	2898	2898	2898	2898	2898	2898
mean	0.912	0.854	0.851	0.798	0.815	0.823
std	0.092	0.144	0.130	0.046	0.097	0.040
min	0.789	0.729	0.723	0.524	0.470	0.741
25%	0.856	0.789	0.788	0.777	0.763	0.794
50%	0.887	0.827	0.827	0.799	0.807	0.819
75%	0.942	0.867	0.867	0.824	0.851	0.852
max	1.984	2.576	2.412	1.052	1.937	1.177
se	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001
t-value	-51.668	-54.726	-61.395	-235.115	-102.865	-241.309
crit-value	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
reject H0	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 1: summarised daily cross-asset futures test results

target	n	p	k	offline ar(1)	offline lwr	offline ridge	online pwe	online rbfnct	online ridge	contract	sector
CME ad1	6300	46	4	0.867	0.886	0.871	0.810	0.804	0.850	Australian dollar	currencies
CME bo1	6300	46	4	0.910	0.851	0.858	0.837	0.851	0.860	soybean oil	agriculture
CME bp1	6300	46	7	0.859	0.860	0.873	0.755	0.726	0.797	British pound	currencies
CME c1	6300	46	5	0.899	0.837	0.849	0.837	0.851	0.857	corn	agriculture
CME cd1	6300	46	7	0.875	0.913	0.907	0.787	0.883	0.831	Canadian dollar	currencies
CME cl1	6300	46	5	0.841	0.735	0.727	0.719	0.671	0.751	crude oil	energy
CME ed1	6300	46	3	1.051	0.866	0.857	0.858	0.897	0.860	eurodollar	interest rates
CME fc1	6300	46	4	0.888	0.824	0.827	0.805	0.806	0.854	feeder cattle	agriculture
CME fl1	6300	46	3	0.987	0.900	0.893	0.886	0.879	0.896	30 day federal funds	interest rates
CME fv1	6300	46	6	0.943	0.843	0.843	0.816	0.883	0.814	5 yr note	interest rates
CME gc1	6300	46	7	1.048	0.843	0.843	0.810	0.904	0.858	gold	metals
CME hg1	6300	46	6	0.938	0.866	0.880	0.825	0.799	0.871	copper	metals
CME ho1	6300	46	7	0.874	0.794	0.779	0.767	0.788	0.797	ny harbor ulsd	energy
CME jy1	6300	46	5	0.842	0.821	0.820	0.838	0.872	0.845	Japanese yen	currencies
CME kw1	6300	46	4	0.876	0.826	0.824	0.800	0.825	0.828	kc hrw wheat	agriculture
CME lb1	6300	46	4	0.804	0.773	0.779	0.809	0.765	0.794	random length lumber	commodities
CME lc1	6300	46	5	0.846	0.769	0.774	0.765	0.746	0.786	live cattle	agriculture
CME ln1	6300	46	4	0.793	0.775	0.784	0.764	0.778	0.775	lean hog	agriculture
CME md1	6300	46	11	1.089	1.228	1.176	0.824	0.808	0.855	e-mini S&P midcap 400	equities
CME mp1	6300	46	5	0.947	0.819	0.810	0.774	0.746	0.822	Mexican peso	currencies
CME ng1	6300	46	6	0.794	0.756	0.757	0.764	0.818	0.750	natural gas	energy
CME nk1	6300	46	7	1.022	0.893	0.877	0.790	0.814	0.810	nikkei/usd	equities
CME ol	6300	46	6	0.844	0.770	0.781	0.780	0.742	0.793	oats	agriculture
CME pa1	6300	46	3	0.944	0.882	0.884	0.835	0.742	0.875	palladium	metals
CME pl1	6300	46	7	0.890	0.818	0.822	0.747	0.731	0.813	platinum	metals
CME rr1	6300	46	4	0.876	0.810	0.814	0.778	0.788	0.818	rough rICE	agriculture
CME sl	6300	46	8	0.924	0.840	0.842	0.843	0.851	0.840	soybean	agriculture
CME sf1	6300	46	7	0.913	0.745	0.744	0.728	0.681	0.766	Swiss franc	currencies
CME si1	6300	46	5	0.918	0.798	0.804	0.790	0.816	0.823	silver	metals
CME sm1	6300	46	7	0.885	0.801	0.788	0.783	0.791	0.783	soybean meal	agriculture
CME sp1	6300	46	13	1.066	1.516	1.455	0.816	0.818	0.848	S&P 500	equities
CME ty1	6300	46	6	0.920	0.810	0.814	0.820	0.794	0.810	10 yr note	interest rates
CME us1	6300	46	6	0.914	0.844	0.846	0.813	0.778	0.825	U.S. treasury bond	interest rates
CME w1	6300	46	3	0.860	0.812	0.811	0.794	0.754	0.811	wheat	agriculture
ICE b1	6300	46	6	0.876	0.791	0.798	0.766	0.787	0.805	brent crude	energy
ICE cc1	6300	46	8	0.856	0.780	0.776	0.777	0.718	0.782	cocoa	agriculture
ICE ct1	6300	46	4	0.829	0.805	0.809	0.801	0.821	0.843	cotton no. 2	agriculture
ICE dx1	6300	46	10	0.859	0.878	0.871	0.786	0.747	0.804	us dollar index	currencies
ICE g1	6300	46	5	0.888	0.886	0.890	0.838	0.843	0.882	gas oil	energy
ICE kc1	6300	46	7	0.814	0.754	0.750	0.787	0.778	0.780	coffee c	agriculture
ICE oj1	6300	46	7	0.810	0.768	0.781	0.794	0.806	0.793	orange juICE	agriculture
ICE sb1	6300	46	7	0.839	0.769	0.782	0.802	0.794	0.799	sugar no. 11	agriculture
LIFFE c1	6300	46	7	0.875	0.797	0.803	0.806	0.815	0.812	cocoa	agriculture
LIFFE ll	6300	46	6	1.010	0.835	0.837	0.627	0.629	0.766	short sterling	interest rates
LIFFE rc1	6300	46	3	0.824	0.756	0.771	0.779	0.845	0.764	robusta coffee	agriculture
LIFFE s1	6300	46	6	1.055	0.852	0.852	0.816	0.981	0.845	euroswiss	interest rates

Table 2: full daily cross-asset futures test results

### 3.2 Minutely Cash Currency Results

The general shape of the normalised mean square prediction errors by forecast horizon for the minutely cash currency dataset, is similar to that of the daily cross-asset futures dataset. The average error for this dataset is around 3% lower than the Markov(1) benchmark, when compared to the other dataset. There are quite a few targets considered in this experiment, so this lower error is considered meaningful in a statistical sense. It is unclear however if this improvement is down to the asset class or the sampling rate of the data.




Figure 2: *nmspe* versus forecast horizon for minutely cash currency pairs

	offline ar(1)	offline lwr	offline ridge	online pwe	online rbfnet	online ridge
count	3480	3480	3480	3480	3480	3480
mean	0.829	0.795	0.794	0.758	0.774	0.783
std	0.065	0.066	0.066	0.048	0.084	0.047
min	0.668	0.647	0.650	0.630	0.618	0.655
25%	0.796	0.754	0.754	0.729	0.723	0.754
50%	0.822	0.789	0.786	0.757	0.765	0.784
75%	0.859	0.829	0.831	0.786	0.805	0.816
max	1.565	1.483	1.419	1.030	1.578	0.970
se	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
t-value	-155.997	-183.805	-185.057	-298.988	-158.529	-272.444
crit-value	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050	0.050
p-value	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
reject H0	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Table 3: summarised minutely cash currency test results

target	n	p	k	offline ar(1)	offline lwr	offline ridge	online pwe	online rbfnet	online ridge
AUDCAD	5003	58	7	0.815	0.737	0.736	0.696	0.636	0.737
AUDJPY	5003	58	3	0.815	0.810	0.816	0.757	0.733	0.832
AUDNZD	5003	58	6	0.800	0.756	0.754	0.706	0.697	0.751
AUDSGD	5003	58	5	0.772	0.743	0.747	0.739	0.715	0.760
AUDUSD	5003	58	3	0.829	0.818	0.821	0.786	0.789	0.838
CADJPY	5003	58	7	0.831	0.817	0.818	0.790	0.802	0.835
CHFJPY	5003	58	8	0.786	0.773	0.767	0.728	0.748	0.742
EURAUD	5003	58	7	0.842	0.802	0.800	0.807	0.767	0.801
EURCAD	5003	58	12	0.932	0.896	0.875	0.783	0.938	0.830
EURCHF	5003	58	9	0.847	0.792	0.789	0.803	0.797	0.774
EURDKK	5003	58	3	0.675	0.664	0.658	0.644	0.640	0.666
EURGBP	5003	58	5	0.811	0.767	0.770	0.752	0.730	0.768
EURHKD	5003	58	7	0.883	0.864	0.864	0.794	0.830	0.816
EURHUF	5003	58	5	0.806	0.727	0.737	0.706	0.706	0.730
EURJPY	5003	58	7	1.061	0.998	0.980	0.782	0.789	0.818
EURNOK	5003	58	6	0.724	0.700	0.718	0.674	0.669	0.699
EURNZD	5003	58	5	0.790	0.762	0.767	0.739	0.779	0.783
EURPLN	5003	58	10	0.727	0.659	0.671	0.662	0.666	0.672
EURRUB	5003	58	8	0.887	0.843	0.855	0.756	0.738	0.777
EURSEK	5003	58	6	0.832	0.793	0.792	0.729	0.730	0.785
EURSGD	5003	58	6	0.875	0.744	0.743	0.663	0.674	0.707
EURTRY	5003	58	9	0.835	0.743	0.743	0.736	0.688	0.762
EURUSD	5003	58	6	0.880	0.865	0.863	0.763	0.789	0.814
GBPAUD	5003	58	7	0.777	0.754	0.756	0.730	0.727	0.763
GBPCAD	5003	58	6	0.821	0.749	0.759	0.719	0.728	0.747
GBPCHF	5003	58	4	0.783	0.776	0.718	0.766	0.764	0.727
GBPJPY	5003	58	6	0.810	0.819	0.815	0.776	0.807	0.800
GBPNZD	5003	58	4	0.799	0.756	0.697	0.767	0.748	0.712
GBPUSD	5003	58	5	0.800	0.797	0.778	0.761	0.774	0.781
HKDJPY	5003	58	5	0.827	0.843	0.842	0.816	0.819	0.840
NZDCAD	5003	58	6	0.872	0.788	0.785	0.754	0.742	0.786
NZDJPY	5003	58	4	0.847	0.818	0.821	0.760	0.792	0.821
NZDUSD	5003	58	4	0.846	0.822	0.825	0.804	0.805	0.827
SGDJPY	5003	58	5	0.813	0.757	0.753	0.702	0.684	0.724
TRYJPY	5003	58	7	0.773	0.730	0.735	0.719	0.696	0.748
USDCAD	5003	58	3	0.851	0.837	0.839	0.818	0.808	0.853
USDCHF	5003	58	6	0.801	0.772	0.776	0.758	0.760	0.786
USDCNH	5003	58	5	0.858	0.790	0.773	0.730	0.716	0.766
USDDKK	5003	58	5	0.866	0.850	0.847	0.766	0.763	0.810
USDHKD	5003	58	5	0.772	0.760	0.738	0.770	0.784	0.760
USDHUF	5003	58	6	0.871	0.800	0.803	0.774	0.759	0.803
USDJPY	5003	58	5	0.828	0.836	0.836	0.799	0.861	0.837
USDMXN	5003	58	5	0.804	0.784	0.786	0.761	0.795	0.794
USDNOK	5003	58	5	0.821	0.804	0.801	0.740	0.728	0.765
USDPLN	5003	58	6	0.861	0.833	0.838	0.746	0.740	0.787
USDRUB	5003	58	4	0.786	0.767	0.776	0.742	0.717	0.786
USDSEK	5003	58	7	0.889	0.869	0.869	0.779	0.776	0.842
USDSGD	5003	58	4	0.809	0.791	0.793	0.742	0.781	0.784
USDTRY	5003	58	7	0.818	0.763	0.761	0.763	0.738	0.788
USDZAR	5003	58	8	0.792	0.787	0.795	0.756	0.831	0.759
XAGUSD	5003	58	4	0.761	0.741	0.743	0.724	0.737	0.768
XAUUSD	5003	58	5	0.802	0.783	0.788	0.783	0.757	0.782
ZARJPY	5003	58	5	0.780	0.732	0.759	0.719	0.753	0.727

Table 4: full minutely cash currency test results

## 4. Discussion

The performance measures shown in these plots and statistical summaries are very similar. A conclusion is that, independent of the sampling rate of the data, the models incur relative performance measures that are stable. All models perform better the Markov(1) benchmark, so we can reject the hypothesis of a model-free approach being suitable when forecasting financial time series. The next-step forecasting underperformance of the online radial basis function network is somewhat consistent with Kanazawa (2020)’s results, and confirms our hypothesis that k-means clustering of the hidden processing units is performing pattern matching in the continual learning sense. As such, more weight is unlikely to be given to more recent data, as might occur with a sequential learning approach. The online, sequential updating of the k-means derived hidden processing units, does adjust these basis centres, evidently not quickly enough though. If jumps occur, and the resulting price changes are structural rather than mean reverting, then continual learning will underperform approaches that assign more weight to recent data. We expected a priori for the online precision weighted ensemble to address these issues and the performance measures indicate so. It has the best one step ahead forecast performance and the best performance overall. The short term forecasting benefit of the online Ridge regression model and the long-term forecasting benefit of the online radial basis function network are combined well via the precision weighted error ensemble.

In terms of experimenting with additional supervised learning models to map the hidden processing units of the radial basis function network to the outputs, we looked at lasso regression (Tibshirani, 1996). We found that lasso produced very little or no weight shrinkage. The specific algorithm employed was cyclic coordinate descent (Hastie et al., 2015). This can be explained by our feature selection algorithm, which runs on the training set, and then is fed into the hidden processing units. The network size is selected on the basis of minimal training set generalised cross-validation error. In order to speed up the run time of the experiments, the possible hidden processing unit sizes were quantized to be one of [5, 10, 25, 50, 100, 250]. For the daily futures dataset, there are 46 predictors available. On average, the feature selection algorithm selects 6 features per target. The median network size selected is 50. Rather than observing feature compression, as might occur with lasso or pca, we are observing expanded, artificial feature creation. The fact that lasso performs very little shrinkage of the weights going from the hidden processing units to the outputs, indicates that each node in the network contains useful information in forecasting the response. It is their combination too, which is useful. As a result, we have saved ourselves considerable computation time in avoiding an expensive to compute feature selection algorithm such as best subset selection, as discussed in Hastie et al. (2009). Had we not performed the feature selection step as per algorithm 2, then we suspect that lasso would have performed much more shrinkage later on with the hidden processing units, and taken longer to do so.

In terms of future work, we consider using other clustering approaches to learn the hidden processing units of the radial basis function network. Gaussian mixture models may be used for density estimation and classification, and would be a suitable replacement for k-means. An advantage of the approach is that one may use its well-calibrated, probabilistic output in any decision making criteria. The approach is also amenable to Bayesian learning. Variational Bayes expectation maximisation is another option. Murphy (2012) shows that it is sparsity promoting, typically requiring fewer clusters than the predefined set required for a Gaussian mixture model.

More generally, we believe that continual learning with nonstationary time series is a relevant area of research. Although transfer learning is primarily concerned with transferring knowledge from a source domain to a target domain, and therefore may be used

in either an offline or online setting, an increasing number papers focus on online transfer learning. See for example Zhao et al. (2014), Salvalaio and de Oliveira Ramos (2019) and Wang et al. (2020). Our paper has contributed to the research of continual learning in financial time series. This is important as our experiment shows that continual learning provides a benefit with multi-step forecasting, above and beyond sequential learning. If we compare the local learning of the radial basis function network with the global learning technique of the feed-forward neural network, the latter suffers from catastrophic forgetting. Kirkpatrick et al. (2017) and Sukhov et al. (2020) look at ways of improving this issue, specifically at training networks that can maintain expertise on tasks that they have not experienced for a long time. The radial basis function network that we formulate, is naturally designed to measure the similarity between test samples and prototypes that capture past characteristics of the feature space. As such, the model is somewhat robust in mitigating catastrophic forgetting.

## 5. Conclusion

Financial time series exhibit the attributes of autocorrelation, nonstationarity and nonlinearity. The experiment we conduct on low frequency and high frequency sampled datasets, demonstrate the added value of feature selection, nonlinear modelling and online learning, in the pursuit of providing short term and long term forecasts with financial time series. We can conclude by saying that short term forecasting is modelled well by sequential online learning and long term forecasting is modelled well by continual learning. Combining models of the two genres via a precision weighted ensemble of the forecast errors, leads to a model which performs best overall.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Stephen Roberts, RAEng / Man Group Professor of Machine Learning at Oxford University, for his thoughts on online learning.

## References

- B. Abraham and J. Ledolter. *Statistical methods for forecasting*. Wiley, 1983.
- D. Barber, C. Taylan, and C. Silvia. *Bayesian Time Series Models*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- S. Ben Taieb, A. Sorjamaa, and G. Bontempi. Multiple-output modeling for multi-step-ahead time series forecasting. *Neurocomputing*, 73:1950–1957, 06 2010. doi: 10.1016/j.neucom.2009.11.030.
- S. A. Billings, C. F. Fung, , and W. Luo. *On-Line Supervised Adaptive Training Using Radial Basis Function Networks*. Department of Automatic Control and Systems Engineering, 1996.
- C. M. Bishop. *Neural networks for pattern recognition*. Oxford University Press, 1995.
- F. Black and M. Scholes. The pricing of options and corporate liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy*, 81(3):637–654, 1973.
- T. Bollerslev. Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, 31(3):307 – 327, 1986.
- G. Bontempi. *Local Learning Techniques for Modeling, Prediction and Control*. PhD thesis, Université Libre de Bruxelles, 12 1999.

- G. Bontempi. Long term time series prediction with multi-input multi-output local learning. *Proceedings of the 2nd European Symposium on Time Series Prediction (TSP), ESTSP08*, 01 2008.
- P. J. Brockwell and R. A. Davis. *Time series : theory and methods*. Springer-Verlag, 2nd ed edition, 1991.
- D. Broomhead and D. Lowe. Multivariable functional interpolation and adaptive networks. *Complex Syst.*, 2, 1988.
- C. Chatfield. *The analysis of time series : an introduction with R*. Chapman & Hall, CRC, seventh edition edition, 2019.
- D. A. Dickey and W. A. Fuller. Distribution of the estimators for autoregressive time series with a unit root. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(366):427, 1979.
- V. A. Epanechnikov. Non-parametric estimation of a multivariate probability density. *Theory of probability and its applications*, 14(1):153–158, 1969.
- F. Girosi and T. Poggio. Networks and the best approximation property. *Biological cybernetics*, 63(3):169–176, 1990.
- R. Hadsell, D. Rao, A. Rusu, and R. Pascanu. Embracing change: Continual learning in deep neural networks. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 24:1028–1040, 2020.
- A. Harvey. *Time series models*. Financial Times/Prentice Hall, 2nd ed. edition, 1993.
- T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The elements of statistical learning : data mining, inference, and prediction*. Springer series in statistics. Springer Verlag, second edition. edition, 2009.
- T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and M. Wainwright. *Statistical Learning with Sparsity: The Lasso and Generalizations*. CRC, 2015.
- A. Hoerl. Application of ridge analysis to regression problems. In *Chemical Engineering Progress*, 1962.
- J. Hosking. Fractional differencing. *Biometrika*, 68(1):165–176, 1981.
- H. E. Hurst. Long-term storage capacity of reservoirs. *Transactions of the American Society of Civil Engineers*, 116, pages 770–799, 1951.
- O. C. Ibe. Fundamentals of applied probability and random processes (second edition). In *Fundamentals of Applied Probability and Random Processes (Second Edition)*, pages xiv – xv. Academic Press, Boston, second edition edition, 2014.
- A. S. Iwashita and J. P. Papa. An overview on concept drift learning. *IEEE access*, 7:1532–1547, 2019.
- R. E. Kalman. A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Journal of Basic Engineering*, 82(1):35, 1960.
- N. Kanazawa. Radial basis functions neural networks for nonlinear time series analysis and time-varying effects of supply shocks. *Journal of macroeconomics*, 64:103210, 2020.
- C. Kaplanis, M. Shanahan, and C. Clopath. Continual reinforcement learning with complex synapses, 2018.

- H. Khosravi. A novel structure for radial basis function networks—wrbf. *Neural processing letters*, 35(2):177–186, 2011.
- J. Kirkpatrick, R. Pascanu, N. Rabinowitz, J. Veness, G. Desjardins, A. Rusu, K. Milan, J. Quan, T. Ramalho, A. Grabska-Barwinska, D. Hassabis, C. Clopath, D. Kumaran, and R. Hadsell. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 114:3521–3526, 2017.
- A. Koshiyama, S. B. Blumberg, S. Flennerhag, N. Firoozye, and P. Treleaven. Quantnet: Transferring learning across systematic trading strategies, 2020.
- W. Liu, J. C. Principe, and S. Haykin. *Kernel adaptive filtering a comprehensive introduction*. Wiley, 2010.
- S. Lloyd. Least squares quantization in pcm. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 28(2):129–137, 1982.
- D. J.C. MacKay. Bayesian non-linear modelling for the prediction competition. In *In ASHRAE Transactions, V.100, Pt.2*, pages 1053–1062. ASHRAE, 1994.
- J. Macqueen. Some methods for classification and analysis of multivariate observations. In *In 5-th Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, pages 281–297, 1967.
- A. I. McLeod and K. W. Hipel. Preservation of the rescaled adjusted range: 1. a reassessment of the hurst phenomenon. *Water resources research*, 14(3):491–508, 1978.
- R. C. Merton. Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(1):125 – 144, 1976.
- J. Moody and C. J. Darken. Fast learning in networks of locally-tuned processing units. *Neural computation*, 1:281–294, 1989.
- K. P. Murphy. *Machine learning a probabilistic perspective*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, 2012.
- R. M. Neal. *Bayesian learning for neural networks / by Radford M. Neal*. Lecture notes in statistics (Springer-Verlag) ; 118. Springer, New York, 1996. ISBN 9781461207450.
- C. E. Rasmussen and J. Quiñonero-candela. Healing the relevance vector machine through augmentation. In *In Proc. of ICML 22*, 2005.
- G. A. Rummery and M. Niranjan. On-line q-learning using connectionist systems. In *Technical Report CUED/F-INFENG/TR 166, Cambridge University Engineering Department*, 1994.
- B. K. Salvalaio and G. de Oliveira Ramos. Self-adaptive appearance-based eye-tracking with online transfer learning. In *2019 8th Brazilian Conference on Intelligent Systems (BRACIS)*, pages 383–388. IEEE, 2019.
- R. H. Shumway. *Time series analysis and its applications : with R examples*. Springer texts in statistics. Springer, 3rd ed. edition, 2011.
- S. Sukhov, M. Leontev, A. Miheev, and K. Sviatov. Prevention of catastrophic interference and imposing active forgetting with generative methods. *Neurocomputing (Amsterdam)*, 400:73–85, 2020.

- R. S. Sutton and A. G. Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. A Bradford Book, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2018.
- R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Methodological*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
- M. E. Tipping. The relevance vector machine. In *Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, NIPS’99*, page 652–658, Cambridge, MA, USA, 1999. MIT Press.
- R. S. Tsay and R. Chen. *Nonlinear time series analysis*. Wiley series in probability and statistics. Wiley, 2019.
- V. N. Vapnik. *Statistical learning theory*. Adaptive and learning systems for signal processing, communications, and control. Wiley, New York ; Chichester, 1998. ISBN 0471030031.
- J. X. Wang, Z. Kurth-Nelson, D. Tirumala, H. Soyer, J. Z. Leibo, R. Munos, C. Blundell, D. Kumanan, and M. Botvinick. Learning to reinforcement learn, 2017.
- X. Wang, X. Wang, and Z. Zeng. A novel weight update rule of online transfer learning. In *2020 12th International Conference on Advanced Computational Intelligence (ICACI)*, pages 349–355. IEEE, 2020.
- L. Wasserman. *All of statistics : a concise course in statistical inference*. Springer texts in statistics. Springer, 2004.
- C. J. Watkins. *Learning from Delayed Rewards*. PhD thesis, King’s College, Oxford, 1989.
- Q. Yang, Y. Zhang, W. Dai, and S. J. Pan. *Transfer Learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- P. Zhao, S. C. H. Hoi, J. Wang, and B. Li. Online transfer learning. *Artificial intelligence*, 216: 76–102, 2014.