
DEEP CALIBRATION OF INTEREST RATES MODEL

✉ **Mohamed Ben Alaya**

LMRS, UMR 6085 CNRS
Université de Rouen Normandie
1 Rue Thomas Becket, 76130 Mont-Saint-Aignan
mohamed.ben-alaya@univ-rouen.fr

✉ **Ahmed Kebaier**

LaMME, CNRS, UMR 8071,
Univ Évry, Université Paris-Saclay
23 Bd. de France, 91037 Evry Cedex
ahmed.kebaier@univ-evry.fr

✉ **Djibril Sarr**

LAGA, UMR 7539 CNRS
Université Sorbonne Paris Nord
99 Av. Jean Baptiste Clément, 93430 Villetaneuse
sarr@math.univ-paris13.fr
djibril.sarr@fbh-associées.com

October 29, 2021

ABSTRACT

For any financial institution it is a necessity to be able to apprehend the behaviour of interest rates. Despite the use of Deep Learning that is growing very fast, due to many reasons (expertise, ease of use, ...) classic rates models such as CIR, or the Gaussian family are still being used widely. We propose to calibrate the five parameters of the G2++ model using Neural Networks. To achieve that, we construct synthetic data sets of parameters drawn uniformly from a reference set of parameters calibrated from the market. From those parameters, we compute Zero-Coupon and Forward rates and their covariances and correlations. Our first model is a Fully Connected Neural network and uses only covariances and correlations. We show that covariances are more suited to the problem than correlations. The second model is a Convolutional Neural Network using only Zero-Coupon rates with no transformation. The methods we propose perform very quickly (less than 0.3 seconds for 2 000 calibrations) and have low errors and good fitting.

Keywords Interest Rates models · Calibration · G2++ · Neural Networks · Deep Learning

1 Introduction

Governments, industries or banks, all have to handle behaviour of some *financial elements*. Whether it is to manage risks or to optimize investments returns, it is necessary to be able to understand, forecast and stress drivers of fair values assets for example. Among those drivers are interest rates (IR). They can affect for instance IR derivatives such as IR swaps, swaptions, cross-currency basis swaps and so on. IR models are widely used in banks and financial institutions to apprehend IRs behaviour. Many models exist. The Vasicek paved the way for those models [Vasicek, 1977]. It was then improved by many others. The Cox Ingersoll Ross Model (CIR) [Cox et al., 1985] is often employed as it is quite simple to use and to calibrate. However it is unifactorial which is a limit to its use. The Gaussian model G2++ [Brigo and Mercurio, 2006] allow 2 factors as it is a deterministically-shifted two-factor Vasicek model.

This document focuses on the calibration of the G2++ (2 factors Hull-White) using deep learning techniques (DL). More precisely we will propose 2 different approaches applied to different sets of relevant data to calibrate the G2++ model using Neural Networks (NN). This approach is expected to be at least as accurate as the *classic* ones (see section 2 for the state of the art), to perform faster and above all, to be easier to use regarding the treatments necessary on the data.

We recall the equations defining the the G2++ model:

$$\begin{aligned} dr(t) &= \phi(t) + x(t) + y(t) \\ dx(t) &= -K_x x(t)dt + \sigma_x dW_x, \quad x(0) = x_0 \\ dy(t) &= -K_y y(t)dt + \sigma_y dW_y, \quad y(0) = y_0 \quad \text{with } k_x, k_y, \sigma_x, \sigma_y > 0 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

In what follows, section 2 will give an overview of the state of the art regarding both calibration of IR models and the use of deep learning in finance. Then, section 3 will describe the models we propose in this article. For each model, we will also explain how the data set used for the training was constructed. The results obtained both in terms of accuracy and computational performance will be introduced in section 4.

2 State of The Art

This section will give a brief insight into the two main matters that are addressed in this document, firstly calibration of IR models and then applying deep learning to purposes in finance.

Regarding the first question, the state of the art shows many solutions, most of them seem to use financial derivatives, especially swaptions' prices. While for the second, the literature shows a growing interest in applying deep learning to finance and calibration of its models. However, as it is, options pricing seems to be getting more attention.

In what follows, regardless of the model, θ will define its parameters while θ^* will define calibrated parameters.

2.1 Interest rate models calibration

The accuracy of the model used for IR is highly dependent on the quality of the calibration. For the one factor Hull-White (HW) model, [Gurrieri et al., 2009] define the calibration as these 3 elements:

1. The choice of constant or time-dependent mean reversion and volatility.
2. The choice of products to calibrate to, and whether to calibrate locally or globally.
3. Whether to optimize on the mean reversion $a(t)$ and the volatility (t) together or separately, and in the latter case, how to estimate one independently of the other.

We can generalize this definition by extending the first and third points to not only the mean reversion and volatility but to any parameters required in the model. Each of these 3 points are important and will be discussed in a moderate to thorough manner.

Independently of these 3 points, in general, the calibration process implies the minimization of a theoretical value obtain from the model and the actual corresponding market observation. [Hull and White, 2001] for example uses numerical optimization techniques such as the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm to find the set of volatility parameters minimizing the error between the model's prices for cap & floor options and swaptions. The error used is the sum of the squares of the differences (SSD). I-e:

$$\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \sum_{i=1}^N (OP_i(\theta) - OP_i^{market})^2$$

$OP(\cdot)$ defining an option price. N defines the number of options that are included in the *calibration basket*.

The same idea of optimization process on swaption prices can also be seen in [Russo and Torri, 2019]. Where, instead of using the SSD, the relative error is used i-e:

$$\theta^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{OP_i(\theta) - OP_i^{market}}{OP_i^{market}} \right)^2}$$

[Schlenkrich, 2012] still calibrates the HW model on swaptions. The optimization process is done using Gauss Newton and an Adjoint Broyden quasi-Newton methods. The required derivatives being approximated by automatic differentiation techniques.

Other calibration methods address more specific and advanced questions. For instance in the current macroeconomic context with low to negative IRs, the methods above might not be well suited. [Russo and Fabozzi, 2017]

addresses the problem of negative IRs with a focus on the second point of our definition, the choice of products to calibrate to. More precisely, while they still use captions, they aim at finding the best swaption quotation. They come to the conclusion that calibrating the Hull-White model, the shift-extended CIR model or the Shift-extended squared Gaussian, using the shifted log-normal or normal volatility implies more stable quotations which in return gives more stable parameters. [Orlando et al., 2019] tackle the calibration of the CIR model with negative or near-zero IR values. Their approach consists in translating the IRs to positive values, keeping that way the initial volatility. The rate is shifted by a constant α (allowing one to keep the initial dynamic), i-e:

$$r_{shift}(t) = r_{real}(t) + \alpha$$

They use the 99th percentile of the empirical IR probability distribution as the constant. For the calibration process, instead of minimizing the error between theoretical and market data, the authors instead take advantage of the fact that likelihood of parameters in the CIR model are available (for example [Kladivko, 2007, Ben Alaya and Kebaier, 2013]).

2.2 Use of deep learning in finance

DL, especially (NN) is being more and more applied in most of fields including finance where many applications have been found. Many NN architecture types exists. According to [Huang et al., 2020] for example, feedforward neural networks (FNN) which are multiple layers of fully connected perceptrons ([Pal and Mitra, 1992]) and Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) ([Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997]) which are recurrent networks (NN that can process information in two directions instead one one like FNNs) are the architecture mainly used in forecasting (exchange rates, option prices, risks, stock markets, ...).

Also, DL can be used to replicate financial instruments or characteristic behaviours. [Heaton et al., 2016] for example, uses auto-encoders [Ng et al., 2011] which are neural architectures originally designed to automatically learn features from unlabeled data to replicate the inputs. The authors purpose is to replicate indexes such as the SP500. The same idea of replication can be also found with [Bloch, 2019] where the authors use a NN with dimensionality reduction through Principapl Component Analysis (PCA) to learn the dynamics of the implied volatility surface. Replicating dynamics of indexes or volatilities can be a first step into choosing an investment or a hedging strategy. However, DL can be used directly for both of these purposes.

Regarding investing strategies, [Heaton et al., 2017] uses an approach called "Deep Portfolios" which tries to understand the key factors driving asset prices, before generating the mean-variance efficient portfolio. As for hedging, [Buehler et al., 2019] with the "Deep hedging" approach uses reinforcement learning - which basically uses a reward system so the algorithm can learn from it's experience (in depth elements can be found with [Kaelbling et al., 1996]) to find the optimal hedge given available instruments in a factitious market driven by the Heston model.

Another application of DL in finance which is getting more and more attention is assets pricing. [Chen et al., 2020] for example appraoch combines 3 different architectures with different purposes, a FNN aiming at understanding non-linearities, a LSTM net to find set of economic state processes, that will help the model understand the macroeconomic conditions relevant for the asset pricing and finally a generative adversarial network (GAN) (about which the reader can learn more here [Creswell et al., 2018]) to identify the strategies with the most unexplained pricing information. The authors work added value, is also in their inclusion of the no-arbitrage assumption via a stochastic discount factor which they show helps performing well. [Jang et al., 2021] use a deep FNN to predict values of market options. Their performances are bettered by the fact that to overcome the lack of market data and unbalanced data sets, they pre-trained their network with data generated using parametric option pricing methods (Black-Scholes, Monte-Carlo, finite differences, and binomial tree).

Finally, another application of DL to finance, which is the main interset of the work being presented is calibration of financial models. [Pironneau, 2019] for example calibrated the Heston model for European options using FNN. While with a quite shallow architecture the author achieves good precision, the author has a stalling performance at some point. [Hernandez, 2016] also uses FNNs but to calibrate financial models in general and applies it to the one factor Hull-White model using swaptions prices. The author outperforms classic methods in terms of calibration times.

The approach we present is different than the two aforementioned calibration process using DL in both the input data (we do not use options prices) and architectures we propose. Indeed, depending on the input data, we will use either a FNN or Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) (see [Albawi et al., 2017] for details).

3 A systemic approach with Deep Calibration (DC) for interest rate models

In what follows, we will present two different approaches to calibrate IR models. Both the approaches actually are not model-dependent and could be applied to any model (financial or not) as long as what we call the Observable Quantity Of Interest (OQOI) which has to be a relevant information bearer, can be both observed (in the market in our financial context) and obtained through an analytical expression from our model.

One of the main concerns of our DC models is the ease of use, regarding data. We want to use easily available data in the market and data that wouldn't need much transformations. For the training of our DL models we decide to use in both approaches synthetic data. Many reasons are in that favour :

- The data set becomes of unlimited size ;
- We can modify the data to be more representative of a specific context (a stressed one for example) or we can decide to include many different contexts ;
- Unlike the other calibration papers mentioned previously, we can measure our error directly vis-à-vis the real parameters, we do not need the intermediary of another quantity like an option price.
- Our DL architectures get to actually learn what *drives* the IR model. Which means that when out-of-sample calibrating (out of the learning process) the DL model will find the parameters that really suit the IR model. If we used real world data instead, we would have found the parameters corresponding to the real world data closer to the IR model's. In other words, using synthetic data allows us to replicate the behaviour of the IR model we are currently calibrating.

The last point is of high importance as it will also helps us staying consistent with our aim of calibrating IR models rather than inferring IR dynamics - which has already been done using DL (see for example [Oh and Han, 2000, Jacovides, 2008, Vela, 2013])- . The main reasons to support this decision are the fact that, as of today, professional and researchers using IR forecasts have more mastery on IR models than they have on DL models since the former are widely used since now many decades. Also, IR models have many advantages, for example, it is quite straightforward to stress IR forecasts via classic models (through real world simulation for example or alterations of parameters).

The following two subsections in this chapter will present each approaches by explaining how analytical expressions allowing synthetic data generation is obtained, how said data set is constructed and which architecture is chosen. Both will - in different ways - use the risk neutral price of a Zero-Coupon (ZC) rate and / or the forward (FWD) rate.

We recall the expression of ZC bond price $P(.,.)$ at time t and maturity T (see [Brigo and Mercurio, 2006] for the proof):

$$P(t, T) = \frac{P^M(0, T)}{P^M(0, t)} \exp\{\mathcal{A}(t, T)\} \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(t, T) = \frac{1}{2}[V(t, T) - V(0, T) + V(0, t)] - \frac{1 - e^{-K_x(T-t)}}{K_x}x(t) - \frac{1 - e^{-K_y(T-t)}}{K_y}y(t)$$

With $P^M(0, T)$, the initial ZC market curve at maturity T and $V(.,.)$ verifying:

$$V(t, T) = \frac{\sigma_x^2}{K_x^2} \left[T - t + \frac{2}{K_x} e^{-K_x(T-t)} - \frac{1}{2K_x} e^{-2K_x(T-t)} - \frac{3}{2K_x} \right]$$

$$+ \frac{\sigma_y^2}{K_y^2} \left[T - t + \frac{2}{K_y} e^{-K_y(T-t)} - \frac{1}{2K_y} e^{-2K_y(T-t)} - \frac{3}{2K_y} \right]$$

$$+ 2\rho \frac{\sigma_x \sigma_y}{K_x K_y} \left[T - t + \frac{e^{-K_x(T-t)} - 1}{K_x} + \frac{e^{-K_y(T-t)} - 1}{K_y} - \frac{e^{-(K_x+K_y)(T-t)} - 1}{K_x + K_y} \right]$$

And since for the ZC rate $Z(.,.)$, we have $P(t, T) = e^{-(T-t)Z(t, T)}$:

$$Z(t, T) = -\frac{1}{T} \ln \left\{ \frac{P^M(0, T)}{P^M(0, t)} \right\} - \frac{1}{T} \{\mathcal{A}(t, T)\} \quad (3)$$

And for the FWD rate $f(.,.)$ we have $f(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T} \ln P(t, T)$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 f(t, T) &= -\frac{\partial}{\partial T} \ln P(t, T) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial T} A(t, T) \\
 &= -\frac{\sigma_x^2}{2K_x^2} \left[1 - 2e^{-K_x(T-t)} + e^{-2K_x(T-t)} \right] \\
 &\quad + \frac{\sigma_y^2}{2K_y^2} \left[1 - 2e^{-K_y(T-t)} + e^{-2K_y(T-t)} \right] \\
 &\quad + \rho \frac{\sigma_x \sigma_y}{k_x k_y} \left[1 - e^{-K_x(T-t)} + e^{-K_y(T-t)} - e^{-(K_x+K_y)(T-t)} \right] \\
 &\quad - e^{-k_x(T-t)} x(t) - e^{-K_y(T-t)} y(t)
 \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

3.1 Indirect Deep Calibration of the G2++ model

3.1.1 Covariances and Correlations as OQOI

For our first approach, we start from the observation that ZCs and FWDs rates indeed are easily observable in the market and an analytical expression can be drawn from most if not all IR models. However if we want to keep a simple Fully Connected Network (FCN) architecture, directly using them as our OQOI might be time consuming and less efficient. We decide to use *intermediary quantities* that will bear enough compressed information from the ZCs and FWDs curves to allow the DC. Good candidates for the OQOI could be correlation and covariance matrices of ZCs - and FWDs - variations. [Brigo and Mercurio, 2006] provides expressions of both correlations and covariances of ZCs and FWDs rates.

$$\begin{aligned}
 cov [dG(T_i), dG(T_j)] &= [X(T_i)X(T_j) + Y(T_i)Y(T_j) + \rho (X(T_i)Y(T_j) + X(T_j)Y(T_i))] \\
 cor [dG(T_i), dG(T_j)] &= \frac{cov [dG(T_i), dG(T_j)]}{\sqrt{[X^2(T_i) + Y^2(T_i) + 2\rho X(T_i)Y(T_i)] \cdot [X^2(T_j) + Y^2(T_j) + 2\rho X(T_j)Y(T_j)]}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

In the above expressions, depending on $G(T)$ which can be either the ZC or the FWD we have the expression of $X(\cdot)$ and $Y(\cdot)$

$$X(T) = \begin{cases} \sigma_x \frac{1-e^{-K_x T}}{K_x T} & \text{if } G(T) = Z(., T) \\ \sigma_x e^{-K_x T} & \text{if } G(T) = f(., T) \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

By symmetry, we get the expressions for $Y(T)$.

3.1.2 Data set construction

The data set construction is made in 5 steps:

1. Choosing reference parameters ;
2. Extending the reference parameters to define a range of acceptance and drawing the parameters within the corresponding intervals ;
3. Using equations 5 and 6, computing the set of covariances and correlations for ZCs and FWDs ;
4. Choosing the scaling transformations needed ;
5. And finally splitting the data set for training and validation.

Choice of reference parameters: We make a classic error minimisation calibration from market Euro ZCs, ranging from June 2019 to November 2020. The parameters obtained are the following:

K_x	K_y	σ_x	σ_y	ρ
0.07173132	0.08930784	0.09465584	0.094675523	-0.999318

Table 1: Reference parameters

Extension of reference parameters and random draws: The idea here is for a given $\gamma > 0$ to define intervals for each reference parameter v ranging from $v - \gamma v$ to $v + \gamma v$. As this wouldn't allow negative values for the correlation parameter, we decide for ρ to chose for the interval $[-\rho_{reference}, +\rho_{reference}]$.

Choosing $\gamma = \frac{2}{3}$ we get the intervals:

	K_x	K_y	σ_x	σ_y	ρ
MIN	0.02391044	0.02976928	0.03155195	0.03155851	-0.999318
MAX	0.1195522	0.1488464	0.15775973	0.15779254	0.999318

Table 2: Range of parameters

We decide to draw uniformly in each interval $N = 100\,000$ parameters. The obtained distributions are the following:




Figure 1: Generated parameters histograms

Computing covariances and correlations for ZCs and FWDs: Here the only question is which maturities are chosen for the computations. As for short terms, liquidity can affect the rates curves ([Covitz and Downing, 2007]), we decide to only use tenors from 1 year and above. As we are willing not to have too much features, we decide not to take long terms tenors, above 12 years. We finally take tenors from 1 to 12 years with a 1 year step.

The covariance and correlation matrices are transformed into vectors by keeping the triangular matrix (with the diagonal only for covariances) and stacking each columns. Hence obtaining an \mathbb{R}^{nf} array ($nf = 66$ for correlations and $nf = 78$ for covariances).

For three sets of randomly selected parameters, figure 2 below shows covariance of ZCs and figure 3 correlations of FWDs




Figure 2: Covariance of ZCs for random set of parameters




Figure 3: Correlation of FWDs for random set of parameters

Appendix A shows correlations and covariances from market ZCs. We can observe similar curves.

Scaling transformations: We have 3 possibilities, performing no transformation, performing them on both the features (covariances and correlations) and the targets (the parameters we are trying to find) or scaling only the features

or only the targets. The results presented in section 4 for the indirect calibration are obtained when scaling both the features and the labels as it gave better results.

The transformation used for a feature or a label u is the min-max scaler :

$$u_{transformed} = \frac{u - \min(u)}{\max(u) - \min(u)}$$

Splitting the data set: In fact, we now have 4 sets, each of 10 000 entries (correlations and covariances sets for ZCs and FWDs). Each of them will be randomly split into 2 subsets, one of 8 000 entries to train the model and one of 2 000 to test it.

3.1.3 The neural network architecture

As said previously we want here to keep a simple FCN architecture. Our NN has 5 linear layers : 1 input layer with n_f - the number of features - neurons, 3 hidden layers, the first one with $h_1 = 1\,000$ neurons, the second with $h_2 = 1\,500$, the last hidden layer with $h_3 = 1\,000$ neurons and finally 1 output layer of n_p - the number of parameters to calibrate ($n_p = 5$) - neurons. The first 3 layers are activated using a ReLU function and the last one as a prediction layer has no activation. To help prevent overfitting, we also include a dropout of probability 0.25 between the last hidden layer and the prediction layer.

The architecture can be represented as follow:




Figure 4: FCN Architecture of the Indirect Deep Calibration

Besides, we use mini-batches of size 1 000 and 1 000 epochs. The Adam algorithm ([Kingma and Ba, 2014]) for optimization is used without weight decay and with a learning rate of 0.001. The error to minimize is the MSE (Mean Squared Error):

$$MSE(y, \hat{y}) = \frac{1}{size(set)} \sum_{i=1}^{size(set)} (y_i - \hat{y}_i)^2$$

3.2 Direct Deep Calibration of the G2++ model

3.2.1 ZCs as OQOI

We now want to consider calibration directly using ZCs curves¹ which are direct market observation unlike the correlations and covs.

Many complications might occur, mostly regarding the dimensions. First of all, because when calibrating we generally want to apprehend an historical behaviour, it won't make much sense to use only observations from one date. Also, to get enough information, it will be better to still include many maturities. Altogether, it means that we will have to deal with matrices with one dimension conveying the temporal depth information and the other the maturities. A FCN won't be for suited this purpose and we will instead use CNNs.

3.2.2 Data set construction

The process is mostly the same as the one for the indirect DC. Only the step 3 (actual computation of the OQOI) changes².

Computing ZCs: We will use equation 3. However the expression of $\mathcal{A}(t, T)$ (see equation 2), holds a stochastic part in $x(t)$ and $y(t)$ which means that there won't be only one value for $Z(t, T)$. To get around this potential issue, instead of using 3D arrays, we will take the expectation of the ZCs rates computed.

If in equation 1, we set $x_0 = y_0 = 0$, it is straightforward to show that :

$$\mathbb{E}[Z(t, T)] = -\frac{1}{T} \ln \left[\frac{P^M(0, T)}{P^M(0, t)} \right] - \frac{1}{2T} [V(t, T) - V(0, T) + V(0, t)] \quad (7)$$

For the $P^M(0, t)$ curve, we take the Euro curve as of 2020/11/04. Unlike the indirect calibration and with a CNN we don't have issues with the number of tenors. Also even if when considering the initial market curve, we can observe an inhomogeneous behaviour on the first short tenors with respect to the long ones, we can expect that behaviour not to have a negative influence on the DC as long as we have enough tenors. We hence take the following set of maturities : {[1 Day, 1 Week], [1 Month, 2 Months, 3 Months, 6 Months, 9 Months], [1 Year, to 12 Years with a 1 Year step], [15Y to 50Y with a 5 Years steps]}. Finally, for the propagation, the step is 1 week and we make 105 steps of propagations (about 2 years). Our inputs will thus be in $\mathbb{R}^{nb_{steps} \times nb_{tenors}}$ with $nb_{steps} = 106$ and $nb_{tenors} = 28$




Figure 5: Initial Market data

¹We could have used FWDs, but the idea of the Direct DC is to reduce as much as possible the transformations to apply on the data, ZC curves are directly observed on the market which is not necessarily the case for FWDs.

²Regarding the scaling transformations, using the min-max scaler only on the targets gave better results

Figure 6 shows for a randomly selected set of parameters the generated ZCs rate curves for a set of projection dates.




Figure 6: Example of generated ZC curve

Appendix B shows market ZC rates. We can observe similar curves.

3.2.3 The neural network architecture

The architecture combining convolution and linear layers is still quite shallow. We start with a convolution layer of dimension (C=1, H=106, $n_f=28$), with a filter of size (7 x 7). The stride of the convolution is 2 and we also allow padding. Then we add a pooling layer of stride 2 also. Finally follows 2 linear layers, the first one with 100 neurons and the second one (which is the prediction layers) with still $n_p = 5$ layers. Here also we include in the second to last layer a dropout of probability 25%.




Figure 7: CNN Architecture of the Direct Deep Calibration

Similarly as the indirect DC, we use mini-batches of size 1 000 and Adam algorithm without weight decay is applied to the MSE. The learning rate is 0.0002 and the number of epochs 4 000.

4 Results obtained

Regarding accuracy, both algorithms lead to pretty good results, whilst time efficiency is also remarkable as calibration on the test set (2 000 entries) is performed in the indirect DC model in less than 0.30 seconds and less than 0.10 seconds for direct DC.

Table 3 below recapitulates the MSE obtained on the validation set for each parameters.

MSE	K_x	K_y	σ_x	σ_y	ρ
COV - ZC	3.5×10^{-4}	5.6×10^{-4}	7.7×10^{-4}	8.3×10^{-4}	8.2×10^{-2}
COV - FWD	3.5×10^{-4}	5.5×10^{-4}	7.6×10^{-4}	8.3×10^{-4}	8.2×10^{-2}
COR - ZC	7.5×10^{-4}	1.1×10^{-3}	1.3×10^{-3}	1.4×10^{-3}	2.0×10^{-1}
COR - FWD	7.4×10^{-4}	1.1×10^{-3}	1.3×10^{-2}	1.4×10^{-2}	2.4×10^{-2}
ZCs	4.0×10^{-4}	6.3×10^{-4}	9.8×10^{-4}	1.0×10^{-4}	15.2×10^{-2}

Table 3: Calibration errors on the validation set

Indirect DC: As one can expect, knowing the similarities between the FWDs and ZCs curves, the result with the indirect DC are really close for FWDs and ZCs.

The really interesting result we get is the fact that the error made using covariances is about half the error with correlations. It appears that they bring significantly more information for the calibration process.

We can verify this assertion numerically by observing the derivative curves of covariances and correlations w.r.t. to the parameters. We select - arbitrarily - the couple of maturities (5 Years, 7 Years) and a subset of 100 parameters for each of K_x , σ_y and ρ and we compute the derivatives. Figure 8, 10 and 12 show the derivatives of ZCs covariances for the sample of parameters. While 9, 11 and 13 show the derivatives of ZCs correlations for the same sample.

We directly see that the correlations derivatives quickly vanish for the three parameters. Meanwhile, for covariances, we only have the vanishing derivative for K_x but it occurs less quicker. For σ_y and ρ , we don't even have that behaviour.

COV-ZC(5Y, 7Y) derivative curve




Figure 8: Derivative of the COV ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt K_x

COR-ZC(5Y, 7Y) derivative curve




Figure 9: Derivative of the COR ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt K_x




Figure 10: Derivative of the COV ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt σ_y




Figure 11: Derivative of the COR ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt σ_y




Figure 12: Derivative of the COV ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt ρ




Figure 13: Derivative of the COR ZC (5Y, 7Y) wrt ρ

The results obtained with the indirect DC could be improved by focusing on the covariances, allowing more tenors and proceeding to a dimension reduction via auto-encoders or PCA (Principal Component Analysis). Also, deepening the network could also improve performances but might require to complexify the model to avoid overfitting, like regularization.

Direct DC: Compared, to the indirect DC with ZC covariances, the direct method leads to slightly less accurate calibrations. Even though the differences are not important, it actually makes sense. Indeed, the indirect DC benefits from information already extracted from the ZC curve. Improving this method would be of great use as it is for the researcher or the professional, the easiest to use. The first idea would be to have a deeper reflection on the tenors that really bring information, choosing them more wisely could lead to better results and better computational performances. Another lead could be to challenge the CNN architecture, as the data is more complex than indirect DC's inputs, choosing the right pooling and activation functions, the right hyper-parameters (including the number of layers, i-e the depth of the CNN) and so on could have a great impact on the accuracy.

While MSEs analysis allows to compare the different models, visualization allow to observe the fitting and assess whether the results seem good or not. Figure 14 shows the fitting on the validation data set for the indirect DC with a zoom on a randomly selected interval and figure 15 shows the fitting for the correlation of FWDs³. Finally figure 16 show the fitting for the direct DC.

³The zoom is not necessary since correlations results are clearly poor.




Figure 14: Indirect DC on ZCs Covariances: Fitting curve on K_x , σ_x , and ρ (original and Zoom)



Figure 15: Indirect DC on FWDs Correlations: Fitting curve on K_y , σ_y , and ρ




Figure 16: Indirect DC on FWDs Correlations: Fitting curve on K_y , σ_y , and ρ

5 Conclusion

Despite the growing use of DL and related Artificial Intelligence (AI) techniques in finance, analytical models, such as IR ones like the G2++ remain commonly used due to the expertise professional and researchers have developed over the years of these techniques. However, it doesn't quite mean that DL and AI in general, shouldn't try to improve our use of those models. In this paper we have shown that we could use DL to calibrate IR models.

Starting from parameters from a market classic calibration of the G2++ model, we have generated a synthetic data set of parameters by uniformly sampling around those reference parameters. Using results from the literature, the synthetic data set of parameters allowed use to compute 2 types of sets. The first one for the so called indirect DC consists of correlation and covariances of ZCs and FWDs. The second set serves the direct DC and consists of raw ZCs rate curves which are both observable on the market. For the first model we used a shallow FCN and for the second a shallow CNN.

We have shown that covariances gave more information to the NNs, as a consequence, the indirect DC using correlations made about double the errors of the covariance's indirect DC. The direct DC with ZCs like the indirect covariance gave a good accuracy. We also have identified improvements leads. For the first method, it could be useful to include more maturities and combine the model with another one for dimension reduction. For the second, we expect a better / deeper architecture and a good hyper-parameters tuning to results in smaller errors.

The errors and computational performances obtained allow us to conclude that using DL leads to very fast calibration and with low errors for the G2++ model - and subsequently for any other model fitting our requirements for the OQOI, i-e to be observable in the market and to hold an analytical expression -. Also as we aimed, the models are really effortless to use and only require very easily available data with few to none transformation to perform. As next step other than trying the improvements identified, it would be of high interest to apply our pre-trained models on other models such as option pricing ones for example or models with time-dependant parameters.

References

- Oldrich Vasicek. An equilibrium characterization of the term structure. *Journal of financial economics*, 5(2):177–188, 1977.
- John C. Cox, Jonathan E. Ingersoll, and Stephen A. Ross. A theory of the term structure of interest rates. *Econometrica*, 53(2):385–407, 1985. ISSN 00129682, 14680262. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1911242>.
- Damiano Brigo and Fabio Mercurio. *Interest rate models-theory and practice: with smile, inflation and credit*, volume 2. Springer, 2006.
- Sébastien Gurrieri, Masaki Nakabayashi, and Tony Wong. Calibration methods of hull-white model. Available at SSRN 1514192, 2009.
- John Hull and Alan White. The general hull–white model and supercalibration. *Financial Analysts Journal*, 57(6): 34–43, 2001.
- Vincenzo Russo and Gabriele Torri. Calibration of one-factor and two-factor hull–white models using swaptions. *Computational Management Science*, 16(1):275–295, 2019.
- Sebastian Schlenkrich. Efficient calibration of the hull white model. *Optimal Control Applications and Methods*, 33(3): 352–362, 2012.
- Vincenzo Russo and Frank J Fabozzi. Calibrating short interest rate models in negative rate environments. *The Journal of Derivatives*, 24(4):80–92, 2017.
- Giuseppe Orlando, Rosa Maria Mininni, and Michele Bufalo. Interest rates calibration with a cir model. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, 2019.
- Kamil Kladivko. Maximum likelihood estimation of the cox-ingersoll-ross process: the matlab implementation. *Technical Computing Prague*, 7(8), 2007.
- Mohamed Ben Alaya and Ahmed Kebaier. Asymptotic behavior of the maximum likelihood estimator for ergodic and nonergodic square-root diffusions. *Stochastic Analysis and Applications*, 31(4):552–573, 2013.
- Jian Huang, Junyi Chai, and Stella Cho. Deep learning in finance and banking: A literature review and classification. *Frontiers of Business Research in China*, 14:1–24, 2020.
- Sankar K Pal and Sushmita Mitra. Multilayer perceptron, fuzzy sets, classification. 1992.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- JB Heaton, Nicholas G Polson, and Jan Hendrik Witte. Deep learning in finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1602.06561*, 2016.
- Andrew Ng et al. Sparse autoencoder. *CS294A Lecture notes*, 72(2011):1–19, 2011.
- Daniel Alexandre Bloch. Neural networks based dynamic implied volatility surface. Available at SSRN 3492662, 2019.
- James B Heaton, Nick G Polson, and Jan Hendrik Witte. Deep learning for finance: deep portfolios. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 33(1):3–12, 2017.
- Hans Buehler, Lukas Gonon, Josef Teichmann, and Ben Wood. Deep hedging. *Quantitative Finance*, 19(8):1271–1291, 2019.
- Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael L Littman, and Andrew W Moore. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4:237–285, 1996.
- Luyang Chen, Markus Pelger, and Jason Zhu. Deep learning in asset pricing. Available at SSRN 3350138, 2020.
- Antonia Creswell, Tom White, Vincent Dumoulin, Kai Arulkumaran, Biswa Sengupta, and Anil A Bharath. Generative adversarial networks: An overview. *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine*, 35(1):53–65, 2018.
- Ji Hyun Jang, Jisang Yoon, Jungeun Kim, Jinmo Gu, and Ha Young Kim. Deepoption: A novel option pricing framework based on deep learning with fused distilled data from multiple parametric methods. *Information Fusion*, 70:43–59, 2021.
- Olivier Pironneau. Calibration of heston model with keras. 2019.
- Andres Hernandez. Model calibration with neural networks. Available at SSRN 2812140, 2016.
- Saad Albawi, Tareq Abed Mohammed, and Saad Al-Zawi. Understanding of a convolutional neural network. In *2017 International Conference on Engineering and Technology (ICET)*, pages 1–6. Ieee, 2017.
- Kyong Jo Oh and Ingoo Han. Using change-point detection to support artificial neural networks for interest rates forecasting. *Expert systems with applications*, 19(2):105–115, 2000.

- Andreas Jacovides. *Forecasting Interest Rates from the Term Structure: Support Vector Machines Vs Neural Networks*. PhD thesis, Citeseer, 2008.
- Daniel Vela. Forecasting latin-american yield curves: An artificial neural network approach. *Borradores de Economía*; No. 761, 2013.
- Dan Covitz and Chris Downing. Liquidity or credit risk? the determinants of very short-term corporate yield spreads. *The Journal of Finance*, 62(5):2303–2328, 2007.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.

A Market ZC Correlations and Correlations

We can observe similar ZC covariance and correlation curves to those simulated for our synthetic data set.




Figure 17: Covariance and Correlation of US treasury ZC Curve

B Market ZC Curve

We also observe similar ZC graphs to those simulated for our synthetic data set.




Figure 18: ZC Curve of the US treasury