

Neural Augmented Kalman Filtering with Bollinger Bands for Pairs Trading

Amit Milstein, Haoran Deng, Guy Revach, Hai Morgenstern, and Nir Shlezinger

Abstract—Pairs trading is a family of trading techniques that determine their policies based on monitoring the relationships between pairs of assets. A common pairs trading approach relies on describing the pair-wise relationship as a linear Space State (SS) model with Gaussian noise. This representation facilitates extracting financial indicators with low complexity and latency using a Kalman Filter (KF), that are then processed using classic policies such as Bollinger Bands (BB). However, such SS models are inherently approximated and mismatched, often degrading the revenue. In this work, we propose KalmenNet-aided Bollinger bands Pairs Trading (KBPT), a deep learning aided policy that augments the operation of KF-aided BB trading. KBPT is designed by formulating an extended SS model for pairs trading that approximates their relationship as holding partial co-integration. This SS model is utilized by a trading policy that augments KF-BB trading with a dedicated neural network based on the KalmanNet architecture. The resulting KBPT is trained in a two-stage manner which first tunes the tracking algorithm in an unsupervised manner independently of the trading task, followed by its adaptation to track the financial indicators to maximize revenue while approximating BB with a differentiable mapping. KBPT thus leverages data to overcome the approximated nature of the SS model, converting the KF-BB policy into a trainable model. We empirically demonstrate that our proposed KBPT systematically yields improved revenue compared with model-based and data-driven benchmarks over various different assets.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantitative methods constitute the fundamental mathematical framework for analysis and prediction in financial markets [2], [3]. A common type of quantitative methods is algorithmic trading [4], which deals with decision-making carried out by an agent (i.e., a trader) for the purpose of maximizing a cumulative reward, most commonly achieving a high Profit and Loss (PNL) balance in the market. Quantitative trading schemes are typically comprised of two main stages: the agent first tracks a stochastic process that describes the prices of the assets of interest in order to extract useful trading indicators. Then, these financial indicators are used as a basis for decision making by setting a trading policy [5]–[7].

Quantitative trading requires a decision making mechanism given application time constraints, i.e., a trading policy that outputs a position based on the trading indicators. Such

policies are typically based on indicators obtained as statistical predictions of an asset price [8]. A popular classical policy is the *Bollinger Bands (BB)* [9], which is based on the intuition that if the price is much less than its mean, it will rise back to normal level and thus one should long this asset. Due to the fact that this method is not linear, it hedges the risk by constraining the investment.

Classical trading schemes such as BB work well for single *stationary* (and specifically, *mean-reverting*) processes [10]. It is therefore sought-after to look for stationary assets, though some schemes only look for the weaker condition of mean reverting, e.g., using the Ornstein–Uhlenbeck formula [11]. Accordingly, algorithmic tracking of financial processes is typically based on imposing a model on their temporal evolution [12]. A common approach imposes simple linear stochastic stationary model [13], often based on autoregressive and moving average models [14]. While assets are rarely stationary in real markets, their differences and *spread* (i.e., linear combination) are in some cases faithfully captured as being stationary, and thus such techniques are commonly adopted in *pairs trading* [4], [15]. The spread evolution and its relationship with the assets pair is often described using a Space State (SS) model [16]–[18], enabling tracking with a Kalman Filter (KF) [14, Ch. 10]. A core challenge with combining financial policies with algorithmic tracking based on such statistical models is that they typically require strong assumptions and prior financial knowledge. For instance, to utilize the KF for spread tracking, one has to faithfully capture the pairs trading as a linear Gaussian SS model. Such models often fail to capture complicated patterns of real world financial assets, which in turn leads to poor trading policies.

To overcome the drawbacks of classic model-based methods, recent years have witnessed a growing interest in the use of model-agnostic deep learning. Deep learning systems are used to capture the time evolution of financial assets [19], extract features for trading [20], and determine trading policies [21], see survey in [22]. Common deep learning architectures for financial modelling and prediction include recurrent neural networks (RNNs) [23], auto-encoders [24], anomaly detection [25] and attention models [26], [27]. Reinforcement Learning (RL) is considered for training deep trading policies [21], [28]–[32] to maximize the reward in an end-to-end fashion. In order to generate various inputs, it was proposed to use deep learning based natural language processing to analyze social media and news for trading [20], [23]. Despite their growing popularity, deep learning based quantitative methods are subject to several drawbacks. They are based on highly parameterized black boxes, giving rise to latency

Parts of this work were accepted for presentation in the 2023 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics Speech, and Signal Processing (ICASSP) as the paper [1]. A. Milstein and N. Shlezinger are with the School of ECE, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Israel (e-mail: amitmils@post.bgu.ac.il; nirshl@bgu.ac.il). H. Deng and G. Revach are with the Institute for Signal and Information Processing, D-ITET, ETH Zürich, Switzerland (e-mail: haodeng@student.ethz.ch; grevach@ethz.ch). H. Morgenstern is unaffiliated (e-mail: hai.morgenstern@gmail.com).

considerations. Moreover, deep learning based policies lack the interpretability and reliability of model-based methods, and do not incorporate established models which is core in pairs trading. In addition, these methods tend to have a long training time and require large volumes of data for training, which can constitute a limiting factor in high-frequency trading. This motivates designing trading techniques that simultaneously benefit from the approximated modelling adopted by classical trading schemes alongside the abstractness and capabilities of data-driven deep learning methods.

In this work, we propose KalmanNet-aided Bollinger bands Pairs Trading (KBPT), a pairs trading algorithm that combines SS model-based trading policies with deep learning tools, based on *model-based deep learning* methodology [33]–[35]. KBPT is derived by proposing a novel SS model representation for pairs trading obtained from assuming partial co-integration [17] combined with an autoregressive prior imposed on the spread. As opposed to previous SS model-based trading policies that utilize, e.g., KF with BB for setting the position, thus implicitly assuming that the SS model is Gaussian and accurate, we design our policy to particularly cope with the approximated nature of the SS model and its expected non-Gaussianity. This is achieved by having KBPT preserve the flow of KF-BB trading, retaining its structured modeling and interpretability, while augmenting the KF with a trainable RNN following the recently proposed KalmanNet [36]. The resulting neural augmentation, in which the specific computation of the KF that depends on the underlying stochasticity is learned, leverages data to track the spread in *partially* known and *non-Gaussian* SS models.

We propose a dedicated training scheme for KBPT that learns the pairs trading policy from sequences of past assets pairs. The learning method is based on a two-stage procedure, where we first train KalmanNet separately from the trading task as a form of pretraining. There, we overcome the fact that there is no ground-truth spread value by leveraging the interpretable architecture of KalmanNet, and particularly its internal prediction of the next observation which follows from the KF flow, for unsupervised learning [37]. Then, we train the overall trading policy, combining the neural augmented KalmanNet with a customized BB mapping that is differentiable, such that the tracking algorithm learns to produce features that are most useful in the sense of maximizing the PNL rather than accurately tracking the prices. By that, we gain the ability to cope with modeling mismatch, as the resulting architecture converts the model-based trading algorithm into a trainable discriminative model [38] that is trained end-to-end to maximize the PNL as a cumulative reward.

Our empirical study compares KBPT with both model-based trading and with deep RL-based policies for various assets pairs. There, we demonstrate the individual gains of each of the ingredients of KBPT, including the usefulness of the extended SS model underlying KBPT, as well as the superiority of the proposed hybrid algorithm in systematically achieving higher PNL compared with all considered benchmarks. Our work extends upon its preliminary findings reported in [1] in the proposal of the new partially co-integrated SS model,

the incorporation of a dedicated accumulated reward loss and the two-stage training methods, as well as in the extensive discussion, derivation, and experimental evaluations.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II covers preliminaries in model-based trading and formulates the problem; Section III describes the different SS models in pairs trading and presents our proposed model; Section IV details our proposed hybrid KBPT policy along with its learning procedure; Section V presents the empirical study of KBPT, contrasting it with both model-based and data-driven policies; while Section VI provides concluding remarks.

Throughout this paper we use boldface lower-case letters for vectors; e.g., \mathbf{x} , and boldface uppercase letters for matrices, e.g., for \mathbf{X} . We denote the step function as $\mathcal{U}(\cdot)$, with $\mathcal{U}(t) = 1$ for $t > 0$ and $\mathcal{U}(t) = 0$ for $t \leq 0$, while $\mathbb{E}\{\cdot\}$ is the notation for stochastic expectation. We use the term *stationary process* to refer to a stochastic process that is stationary in the wide sense. For consistency, the prices of all assets is given in USD.

II. PRELIMINARIES AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

In this section we formulate the considered model for pairs trading. To that aim, we first review necessary preliminaries in quantitative trading in Subsection II-A, and recall the BB policy in Subsection II-B. These preliminaries are then used to formulate the problem in Subsection II-C.

A. Trading Formulation

Trading strategies refer to the determining of investment policies based on the monitoring of financial assets. Accordingly, trading strategies can be generally divided into two stages: (i) tracking of the assets into financial indicators; and (ii) the trading policy that is based on these indicators [7].

1) *Tracking*: A crucial part of any trading scheme is constantly evaluating and analyzing the financial markets, individual securities, or sectors. Information such as price movements, volatility, liquidity, volume, momentum, and market breadth is valuable for making informed decisions in the trading market. Using this financial data, one can derive financial indicators which enable the trader to get insight on potential entry and exit points, assess risks, and ultimately optimize the investment strategy. Quantitative financial indicators can include technical indicators (e.g., moving averages, relative strength index) [39], fundamental indicators (e.g., earnings per share, price-to-earnings ratio), or macroeconomic indicators (e.g., GDP growth rate, inflation rate) [40].

To formulate this mathematically, we use d_t to denote the financial information (e.g., assets price) at time $t > 0$. A *financial tracker*, denoted φ , is a mapping of all the financial data accumulated until time t into financial indicators z_t , i.e.,

$$\varphi : \{d_\tau\}_{\tau \leq t} \mapsto z_t. \quad (1)$$

The financial indicator should provide sufficient information for the policy to dictate the current decision, as detailed next.

2) *Policy*: The policy component of a trading scheme, denoted by π , refers to the rules, guidelines, and principles that govern the decision-making process and the execution of trades. The policy component in general may encompass both

quantitative and qualitative aspects: Quantitative aspects can involve specific parameters, thresholds, or algorithms based on financial indicators or other mathematical models. Qualitative aspects consider factors such as market conditions, investor sentiment, news events, or expert judgment.

The policy is the last step of the trading scheme and it outputs the recommended actions for the trader to take in order to optimize profits. We refer to the return of each trade transaction the *reward*. In quantitative trading, the action at time t , denoted \mathbf{p}_t , is determined using a trading policy π based on the current indicator z_t as well as past actions and indicators, namely,

$$\pi : \{z_\tau\}_{\tau \leq t}, \{\mathbf{p}_\tau\}_{\tau < t} \mapsto \mathbf{p}_t. \quad (2)$$

We henceforth focus on settings where

- A1 The information d_t represents the price of an asset.
- A2 The actions correspond to long/short decisions on d_t , i.e., holding positive or negative quantities, respectively.

The action space in A2 indicates that \mathbf{p}_t encapsulates open and close decisions. We formulate this by writing $\mathbf{p}_t = [\text{op}_t, \text{cp}_t]$, where $\text{op}_t \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is the *open position policy* that signals if to short, hold or long the asset, respectively; and $\text{cp}_t \in \{0, 1\}$ is the *close position policy*, which gets the value 1 when an existing open position (e.g., from time $t-1$) needs to be closed. Otherwise, if a position needs to remain open or there is no open position, it gets the value of 0. The order in which positions are taken involves first checking if the closing criteria is met, and then checking whether to open one. We say that \mathbf{p}_t is an *active position* if $\text{op}_t = \pm 1$.

3) *Reward*: Under A1-A2, one can mathematically formulate the reward accumulated for an active position. To that aim, let t_i^o be the time the i th active position is taken and t_i^c the time it is closed. Accordingly, the reward obtained for the i th activity of of policy π with financial tracker φ , denoted by $r_i^{\varphi, \pi}$, is computed based the difference in the asset price over the activity period and whether it was long or short via

$$r_i^{\varphi, \pi} = \text{op}_{t_i^o} \cdot (d_{t_i^c} - d_{t_i^o}). \quad (3)$$

The reward in (3) can be positive or negative, i.e., profit or loss, respectively.

B. Bollinger Bands Trading Policy

A popular trading policy is based on BB, which is a simple and fundamental technique employed in a variety of trading schemes [9]. BB consists of 3 bands plotted around the asset's price – upper, middle, and lower – as illustrated in Fig. 1. The middle band is a simple Moving Average (MA), whose window size varies per application (in Fig. 1 we used a window of 20 samples). The top and bottom bands are plotted around the middle band where the distance can be based on the Standard Deviation (STD) of the MA. These are typically set at ± 1 STD around the MA, though the setting may vary depending on the application. Alternatively, one may use confidence intervals for forming such bands.

Using these bands, one can build a trading strategy. A natural approach to do so is applicable when d_τ is a stationary




Fig. 1. Asset price with Bollinger Bands illustration

price series. In this case, one can construct a financial tracker using the empirical z -score, i.e.,

$$z_t = \varphi(\{d_\tau\}_{\tau \leq t}) = \frac{d_t - \mu_t}{\sigma_t}, \quad (4)$$

where μ_t and σ_t are the empirical first and second order moments of d_t , respectively, estimated from $\{d_\tau\}_{\tau \leq t}$.

The BB policy is obtained by examining in which band z_t lies. In particular, if an open position is not currently being held, a short position is taken if the asset is being overbought, i.e. $z_t > 1$, and a long position if its being oversold, i.e. $z_t < -1$. To formulate this mathematically, we say that an open position is held at time t if the last open position time denoted

$$\tau_{\text{op}, t} \triangleq \max_{\tau < t: \text{op}_\tau = \pm 1} \tau, \quad (5)$$

is not smaller than the last close position time

$$\tau_{\text{cp}, t} \triangleq \max_{\tau \leq t: \text{cp}_\tau = 1} \tau. \quad (6)$$

The open position policy is thus determined as

$$\text{op}_t = (\mathcal{U}(-1 - z_t) - \mathcal{U}(z_t - 1)) \cdot \mathcal{U}(\tau_{\text{cp}, t} - \tau_{\text{op}, t}). \quad (7)$$

The reward in (3) is formulated for each *active position*, and not for each time instance. In some settings, e.g., when designing trading strategies using RL [31], [41], [42], one is often interested in obtaining *instantaneous rewards*. This achieved by closing a position after a single time step (though it can then re-opened and treated as a new active position, yielding an addition transaction cost, i.e., *friction* [18], which we omit for simplicity). Such an operation results in

$$\text{cp}_t = \mathcal{U}(|\text{op}_{t-1}|). \quad (8)$$

Alternatively, one can determine the close position based on the indicator, allowing a *cumulative reward* where a position can be held over multiple time steps. In this case, the closing of a position is a function of the indicator z_t . For instance, one can decide to close a currently open position if z_t has crossed




Fig. 2. Comparison between the trading actions of the cumulative trading policy (green) and an instantaneous trading policy along with the MA and upper BB limit. Here C closes a position, O opens a position, and CO closes and opens a position on the same day.

the middle or opposite band [4], [43], [44], i.e.,

$$cp_t = \mathcal{U}(-z_{t-1} \cdot z_t) \cdot (1 - \mathcal{U}(\tau_{cp,t} - \tau_{op,t})). \quad (9)$$

A comparison between the cumulative and instantaneous approaches is schematically illustrated in Fig. 2, where only the middle and upper Bollinger Bands are drawn for clarity. As depicted in Fig. 2, the instantaneous trading policy effectively makes profit based on the difference between the asset price when it crosses the upper band for the second time and the price of the asset on the following day. On the other hand, the profit made by the cumulative trading policy is the the price difference between the upper band and the MA of the asset.

There are several advantages in using BB for determining trading policies, that go beyond the profit-loss reward, and stem from the simplicity and interpretability of the scheme. First, the bands adjust to the volatility of the asset’s price, enabling to visually represent it. In addition, BB can be used to determine price reversal signals - when the price of the asset goes above the upper band or below the lower band it can indicate that the asset is being overbought or oversold, respectively, and therefore suggest that a trend reversal is a likely to occur. Moreover, BB can identify trends - if the price is constantly above the middle band it can suggest a uptrend or similarly a downtrend if its below the middle band [43].

C. Problem Formulation

We consider the design of a trading strategy for the task of *pairs trading*. Here, the financial information accumulated at each time instance t corresponds to a pair of assets denoted α_t and β_t . There is no underlying assumption on stationarity on the considered assets. Our goal is to jointly design a financial tracker φ along with a policy mapping π that maximizes the expected PNL. The PNL is defined as the sum of all rewards

accumulated up to time t , i.e.,

$$\text{PNL}_t^{\varphi, \pi} = \sum_{i: \tau_{cp_i} \leq \tau_{cp,t}} r_i^{\varphi, \pi}. \quad (10)$$

Accordingly, the trading strategy design problem is formulated as identifying

$$\varphi^*, \pi^* = \arg \max_{\varphi, \pi} \mathbb{E} \{ \text{PNL}_t^{\varphi, \pi} \}. \quad (11)$$

For design purposes, we are given access to a data set comprised of past financial information measurements corresponding to n_t past time indices. This dataset is given by

$$\mathcal{D} = \{ \alpha_\tau, \beta_\tau \}_{\tau=-n_t}^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

In order to leverage established BB techniques, which inherently rely on underlying stationarity, we exploit pairs trading modeling, where we extend the notions of Co-Integration (CI) and Partially Co-Integration (PCI) proposed in [16], [17], as detailed in the following Section III. This enables a hybrid model-based/data-driven design, as stated in Section IV.

III. PAIRS TRADING AS A STATE SPACE MODEL

The price of a single asset is rarely described as stationary and is typically a chaotic stochastic process. However, tracking some inherit statistical relationship between two assets is often much easier than tracking each asset individually, and consequently can be used for investment decision. This is the reasoning behind pairs trading, and its general form which consists of more than two assets [14, Ch. 10].

There are several frameworks for capturing statistical relationships in pairs trading. These include monitoring distances [45], adopting a CI model [16], as well as viewing pairs trading as a stochastic control setup [46]. A large volume of of research is dedicated to comparing these statistical models and their usefulness for pairs trading [18]. In this work, we adopt the PCI approach [17], which extends the CI model. The PCI model is suitable for tackling (11) due to its ability to capture both long-lasting and transient company shocks and their effect on the asset price, and its flexibility in describing temporal correlations in the pairwise relationship [17].

To describe this model, we first review the notion of CI and how it gives rise to a SS model for pairs trading in Subsection III-A. Then, in Subsection III-B we review the extended PCI model and present our SS representation for pairs trading that follows from the PCI model. The proposed extended SS model is used to derive KBPT in Section IV.

A. Co-Integration in Pairs Trading

We next review the notion of CI how it is specialized for pairs trading.

1) *Co-Integration*: To define CI, we first recall the definition of integration order (see, e.g., [14, Ch. 2.6]):

Definition 1 (Integration Order). *A time series x_t is said to be integrated with order p , and written as $x_t \sim I(p)$, if there exists a $(p+1) \times 1$ vector w such that $w^T x_t$ is a stationary time series, with $x_t \triangleq [x_t, x_{t-1}, \dots, x_{t-p}]$.*

The definition of CI generalizes Definition 1 by considering multivariate time sequences as follows:

Definition 2 (Co-Integration). A $(p + 1) \times 1$ multivariate time sequence $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t = [\mathbf{x}_t^{(1)}, \mathbf{x}_t^{(2)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_t^{(p+1)}]$ is said to obey a CI model of order p , denoted $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \sim \text{CI}(p)$, if there exists a $(p + 1) \times 1$ vector \mathbf{w} such that $\mathbf{w}^T \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is stationary.

Definition 2 clearly specializes Definition 1, as for a time series \mathbf{x}_t with integration order p , one can equivalently define the co-integrated multivariate time sequence $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ by having its τ th entry, denoted $\mathbf{x}_t^{(\tau)}$, set to $\mathbf{x}_t^{(\tau)} = \mathbf{x}_{t-\tau+1}$ for every $\tau \in \{1, \dots, p + 1\}$.

2) *Co-Integration in Pairs Trading*: CI is often used to model pairs trading. In this framework, the two assets α_t and β_t are assumed to obey a CI(1) model (see Def. 2). In particular, we define the *spread* time sequence s_t via

$$s_t = \beta_t - h \cdot \alpha_t - \mu, \quad (13)$$

and look for h and μ such that s_t is a zero-mean stationary time series. We refer to h as the *hedge ratio* and μ as the *equilibrium value*. These parameters are typically estimated by rewriting (13) as

$$\beta_t = s_t + h \cdot \alpha_t + \mu, \quad (14)$$

from which h and μ can be recovered from a set of pairs as in (12) via, e.g., least-squares [47]. Once h and μ are estimated, one can apply statistical tests to check for stationarity, e.g., Dicky-Fuller test [48] or Johansen test [49].

3) *Co-Integration SS Model*: An inherent limitation with the above form of CI modelling of pairs trading follows from the fact that h and μ are assumed to be static. In practice, they might drift, and the resulting model may not be reliable to serve as a basis for designing trading policies. However, the CI framework in (14) can be used to form a SS model that supports tracking of the hedge ratio and equilibrium values using, e.g., the KF.

The SS model for pairs trading with the CI framework assumes that h and μ are first-order Markov processes

$$h_t = h_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^h, \quad (15a)$$

$$\mu_t = \mu_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^\mu, \quad (15b)$$

where ϵ_t^h and ϵ_t^μ follow an i.i.d. Gaussian distribution. Accordingly, the relationship between the assets pairs in (14) is replaced with

$$\beta_t = s_t + h_t \cdot \alpha_t + \mu_t. \quad (15c)$$

The representation in (15) gives rise to a SS model as follows. The latent state vector is $\mathbf{x}_t = [h_t, \mu_t]^T$, the observation is set to be $y_t = \beta_t$, and the underlying dynamics of the SS model are

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{F}_t \cdot \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (16a)$$

$$y_t = \mathbf{g}_t^T \cdot \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{v}_t = [\alpha_t \quad 1] \mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{v}_t. \quad (16b)$$

In (16b), \mathbf{v}_t is modeled as white Gaussian observation noise, and the measurement noise is given by $\mathbf{e}_t \triangleq [\epsilon_t^h, \epsilon_t^\mu]^T$.

Formulating the evolution of the hedge ratio and equilibrium value as a linear Gaussian SS via (16) allows the tracking of these parameters using the KF. The KF is comprised of prediction and update stages, respectively given as

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1} = \mathbf{F}_t \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}, \quad \hat{y}_{t|t-1} = \mathbf{g}_t^T \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1}, \quad (17a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathcal{K}_t \cdot \Delta y_t + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1}, \quad \Delta y_t = y_t - \hat{y}_{t|t-1}. \quad (17b)$$

In (17b), \mathcal{K}_t is the Kalman gain (KG) computed from the second-order moments, and Δy_t is the innovation term.

By (15c), Δy_t can be written as

$$\Delta y_t = y_t - \hat{h}_{t|t-1} \alpha_t - \hat{\mu}_{t|t-1}, \quad (18)$$

and thus it describes the difference between the posterior and the prior. Using the fact that $y_t = \beta_t$ and substituting the time varying relationship between α_t and β_t from (18), we obtain that

$$\Delta y_t = s_t + \left((h_t - \hat{h}_{t|t-1}) + (\mu_t - \hat{\mu}_{t|t-1}) \right). \quad (19)$$

From (19) it follows that Δy_t is an estimate of the value of the spread corrupted by an additive term that represents the estimation error at time t . Thus, Δy_t can be used as an equivalent pair-wise asset, from which one can extract a useful indicator for BB as in (4), i.e.,

$$z_t = \frac{\Delta y_t}{\sigma_t^y}. \quad (20)$$

Here, σ_t^y is the STD of Δy_t (which is also tracked by the KF for computing the KG).

B. Partial Co-Integration in Pairs Trading

While the CI model for pairs trading gives rise to a simple KF-aided trading policy, it is limited in the sense that it does not incorporate any temporal statistical model on the spread time sequence, which is at the core of the financial indicator. Such a temporal statistical model is incorporated by extending the notion of CI into PCI [17]. In the following, we first recall the PCI definition, after which we review its associated SS model proposed in [17], and then further extend it to propose the SS model for pairs trading used in our derivation in Section IV.

1) *Partial Co-Integration*: An extended definition of CI is that of PCI [17]:

Definition 3 (Partial Co-Integration). A multivariate time sequence $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is said to obey a PCI model of order p, q , denoted $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_t \sim \text{PCI}(p, q)$, if there exists a vector \mathbf{w} such that the time series $\mathbf{w}^T \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ is combination of scalar time sequences that are integrated in time with orders q and $p - q$. Namely, it can be decomposed into $\mathbf{w}^T \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mu_t + s_t$ where $\mu_t \sim \text{I}(q)$ and $s_t \sim \text{I}(p - q)$.

Note that any CI multivariate time sequence (Definition 2) is also PCI and is obtained when $q = p = 0$, which results in $\mathbf{w}^T \bar{\mathbf{x}}_t$ being a stationary time series.

2) *Partial Co-Integration in Pairs Trading*: As suggested in [17], the PCI model can be used to generalize the CI

model for pairs trading. In this case, it is assumed that $[\beta_t, \alpha_t] \sim \text{PCI}(1, 1)$, i.e.,

$$\beta_t = s_t + h \cdot \alpha_t + \mu_t, \quad (21a)$$

where

$$s_t = \rho s_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^s, \quad (21b)$$

$$\mu_t = \mu_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^\mu. \quad (21c)$$

The PCI model for pairs trading preserves the notions of spread (s_t) and hedge ratio (h) - where in this model, the hedge ratio is constant unlike in the CI model which it was modeled as time varying. It introduces the parameter $\rho \in (-1, 1)$ as an autoregression coefficient, while $\epsilon_t^\mu, \epsilon_t^s$ are stationary signals, often modeled as mutually independent Gaussian white noises [17].

The PCI framework in (21) introduces two main degrees of freedom compared with the CI model in (14): (i) First, the CI model does not explicitly capture the temporal correlation in the spread time sequence s_t , where the PCI model incorporates such correlation via its autoregressive modelling and the parameter ρ ; (ii) PCI captures temporal variations in the equilibrium value μ_t , by modelling it as a random walk.

3) *Partial Co-Integration SS Model*: The SS model proposed in [17] for using the PCI representation in (21) for trading policies sets the latent state vector to be $\mathbf{x}_t = [\beta_t, s_t, \mu_t]^T$, the observation to be $\mathbf{y}_t = [\alpha_t, \beta_t]^T$, and the underlying dynamics of the SS model are

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{H}_t \mathbf{x}_t = \begin{bmatrix} h & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_t, \quad (22a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{x}_t &= \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{q}_t \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_t^\beta \\ \epsilon_t^s \\ \epsilon_t^\mu \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (22b)$$

In (22), \mathbf{q}_t is a multivariate white Gaussian noise.

Note that the SS model in (22), which is the one suggested in [17], differs from the CI-based SS model of (16) not only in its usage of the PCI model, but also in the fact that the spread is considered in the state vector, while the hedge ratio is assumed to be static. Accordingly, one can track the state using the KF (given in (17a)-(17b)) respectively, and use the tracked spread to form the indicator used for BB trading as

$$z_t = \frac{\hat{s}_t}{\sigma_t^s} \quad (23)$$

where σ_t^s is the STD of the spread.

4) *Proposed Partial Co-Integrated SS Model*: While the PCI model in (22) offers additional degrees of freedom in capturing temporal dependencies in the spread, it is associated with two main drawbacks: (i) the hedge ratio is modeled as being static, which, as stated before might not always be the case; and (ii) the model assumes that all the noises are Gaussian, i.i.d. and mutually independent. In financial data, this is rarely the case [14, Ch. 3]. Accordingly, we propose an alternative SS model for pairs trading which shares the improved temporal degrees of freedom of the PCI model, while accounting for the dynamic nature of the hedge ratio,

without imposing a specific distribution on the stochasticity.

Our proposed SS Model is similar to the CI SS model in (16), while we also add the assumed autoregressive behavior of the spread in (21b). Specifically, our latent space vector is $\mathbf{x}_t = [h_t, \mu_t, s_t]^T$, the observation is $y_t = \beta_t$, and the dynamics of the systems are modeled as

$$\mathbf{x}_t = \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho \end{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (24a)$$

$$y_t = \mathbf{g}_t^T \mathbf{x}_t + v_t = [\alpha_t \quad 1 \quad 1] \mathbf{x}_t + v_t. \quad (24b)$$

It is emphasized that we do not impose a specific distribution on the noise vectors \mathbf{e}_t and v_t , unlike in (16) and (22), where Gaussian noise are assumed.

IV. NEURAL AUGMENTED TRADING POLICY

We are interesting in exploiting the SS model representation in (24) for formulating a trading policy following established approaches combining KF and BB policies, e.g., [17]. However, the application of such methodologies gives rise to the following challenges:

- C1 *Modelling Stochasticity*: KF inherently assumes Gaussian noise. In financial data, this is unlikely to hold, and the noise tends to follow a heavy tailed distribution [50].
- C2 *Modelling Mismatches*: the models for \mathbf{F}_t and \mathbf{g}_t in (24), which follow from the PCI, are an approximation of the complex real-world dynamics governing pairs trading. Therefore, a model mismatch is inevitable.
- C3 *State Tracking*: Tracking based on KF is inherently designed to provide an accurate estimate of its state vector \mathbf{x}_t . Here, \mathbf{x}_t is comprised of model parameters that do not necessarily represent a physical quantity, but are rather intermediate variables used for trading policy. What one is really interested in is obtaining a representation that is most useful for pairs trading in the PNL sense. However, the conventional KF is by design tailored to optimize tracking the state, which are here assumed model parameters, though this might be sub-optimal for maximizing the PNL.

To enable pairs trading under C1-C3, we propose a hybrid model-based/data-driven algorithm based on neural augmentation of KF-BB pairs trading. We present the proposed KBPT and its training procedure in Subsections IV-A-IV-B, respectively, and a discussion is provided in Subsection IV-C

A. KalmanNet-aided Bollinger bands Pairs Trading

1) *High Level Design*: We design our pairs trading scheme to preserve the interpretable and reliable operation of the combination of KF with BB trading under our proposed SS model in (24). To cope with challenges C1-C2, we augment the operation of the KF, and specifically its computation of the KG, with a dedicated RNN, following the KalmanNet algorithm proposed in [36]. KalmanNet systematically uses the available model parameters \mathbf{F}_t and \mathbf{g}_t while using an RNN to bypass the need to track the statistical moments of the dynamics, allowing it to overcome C1-C2. To cope with




Fig. 3. KBPT pipeline.

C3, we leverage the trainability of KalmanNet to adapt the overall policy based on the PNL objective, i.e., to provide a financial indicator that is most useful for trading, rather than arising from the most accurate description of the state. This is not always possible with fully model-based methods, which inherently separate tracking from policy making, and thus the tracking method is invariant the main objective, i.e., maximizing the PNL.

2) *PCI SS Tracking with KalmanNet*: Our pairs trading scheme thus consists of three components, depicted in Fig. 3. The first component is KalmanNet, which takes as input the two assets used for pairs trading, tracks the state vector under the SS model of (24), and outputs the innovation Δy_t .

KalmanNet augments the model-based KF with an RNN to cope with model mismatch and non-linearities. The RNN, whose trainable parameters are denoted by θ is used to output the KG, denoted here $\mathcal{K}_t(\theta)$. Since the computation of the KG in the KF encapsulates the dependency on the distribution of the noise signals, replacing it with a trainable architecture bypasses the need to impose such a model and enables us to model complex, non-linear noises due to the underlying architecture of the RNN, while preserving the operation of the KF. Accordingly, the prediction and update stages of KalmanNet are given by

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1} = \mathbf{F}_t \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1}, \quad \hat{y}_{t|t-1} = \mathbf{g}_t^T \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1}, \quad (25a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}}_t = \mathcal{K}_t(\theta) \cdot \Delta y_t + \hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t|t-1}, \quad \Delta y_t = y_t - \hat{y}_{t|t-1}. \quad (25b)$$

The sole difference between (25) and (17) is that here in the update stage in (25b) utilizes the KG computed by the RNN, instead of computing it from knowledge of the underlying statistics. KalmanNet leverages the SS representation of pairs trading and maintains the low latency and complexity of KF-aided tracking while coping with its inevitable mismatches and approximation errors. The detailed architecture of the RNN is given in [36].

3) *BB-Based Trading*: The innovation produced by KalmanNet is passed to the indicator extractor which outputs its Z score, denoted z_t , via

$$z_t = \frac{\Delta y_t}{\hat{\sigma}_t}. \quad (26)$$

In (26), $\hat{\sigma}_t$ is the empirical STD of the innovation process calculated using a rolling window. In our experimental study reported in Section V we used a window size of 80 samples

based on empirical trials. The architecture of KalmanNet with the indicator extractor is depicted in Fig. 4.

The final component of our trading policy executes the BB trade policy on z_t . Its output is the position to take at time t denoted as p_t based on (7) for opening and (9) for closing. The resulting overall trading policy is summarized as Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: Neural Augmented KBPT at Time t

Init: RNN parameters θ

Input: Previous estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_{t-1} = [\hat{h}_{t-1}, \hat{\mu}_{t-1}, \hat{s}_{t-1}]^T$;
Assets β_t, α_t .

KalmanNet :

- 1 Predict $\hat{y}_{t|t-1}$ via (25a);
 - 2 Update estimate and compute Δy_t via (25b);
Indicator Extraction :
 - 3 Calculate feature z_t via (26);
Bollinger Bands :
 - 4 Compute p_t via (7) and (9) with z_t as argument;
-

4) *Reward*: The BB policy is stated in Subsection II-B for a single asset. Here, since we consider pairs trading, an open position taken for the i th transaction at time t_i^o implies open positions on α, β in the sum of 1\$. Its division between the assets is based on the current hedge ratio, i.e., $\hat{h}_{t_i^o}$. Similarly, when the position is closed at time t_i^c , we close the open positions on α, β according to the hedge $\hat{h}_{t_i^c}$. Accordingly, the reward of each asset in such a transaction is the sum of the rewards in α and in β , i.e.,

$$r_i^{\varphi, \pi} = r_i^{\varphi, \pi, \beta} + r_i^{\varphi, \pi, \alpha}. \quad (27)$$

To formulate the individual reward terms in (27), recall that $\text{op}_{t_i^o}$ is the position taken on the *spread*. Consequently, to set the position taken with respect to β and α individually it should be multiplied by $\zeta_{t_i^o} \triangleq \text{sign}(\beta_{t_i^o} - \hat{h}_{t_i^o} \alpha_{t_i^o})$ and $-\zeta_{t_i^o}$, respectively, to determine what position is taken on each *individual asset* given a position on the spread. The resulting reward terms are thus

$$r_i^{\varphi, \pi, \beta} = \left(\frac{\beta_{t_i^c}}{1 + |\hat{h}_{t_i^c}|} - \frac{\beta_{t_i^o}}{1 + |\hat{h}_{t_i^o}|} \right) \cdot \text{op}_{t_i^o} \cdot \zeta_{t_i^o}, \quad (28a)$$

$$r_i^{\varphi, \pi, \alpha} = \left(\frac{\hat{h}_{t_i^o} |\alpha_{t_i^o}|}{1 + |\hat{h}_{t_i^o}|} - \frac{\hat{h}_{t_i^c} |\alpha_{t_i^c}|}{1 + |\hat{h}_{t_i^c}|} \right) \cdot \text{op}_{t_i^o} \cdot \zeta_{t_i^o}. \quad (28b)$$

As in [4], [51], we consider pairs trading in which the hedge ratio h is allowed to changes over time. Accordingly, one is likely to have that $\hat{h}_{t_i^o} \neq \hat{h}_{t_i^c}$, implying that the trader may open and close with different quantities of each of the assets. In Subsection IV-C we further discuss this property.

B. Training Procedure

The trading policy is stated in Algorithm 1 for a given parameterization θ . The tuning of these parameters is carried based on a data set comprised of a sequence of measured asset pairs \mathcal{D} given in (12). To train θ , we use a two-step training procedure, which first trains KalmanNet separately from the trading task for stability, and then adapts the overall




Fig. 4. KalmanNet with indicator extraction for the BB trade policy.

architecture based on the PNL, thus tackling **C3**. These two steps are detailed next.

1) *Task-Ignorant Training*: This first step acts as a warm start. It tunes θ to be good initial values for training the the overall policy to maximize the PNL in Step 2. To that aim, we train only KalmanNet to the objective of optimizing the tracking of the state vector \mathbf{x}_t with stochastic gradient descent.

In its original formulation in [36], KalmanNet is trained in a supervised manner, i.e., using multiple trajectories of observations and their corresponding ground truth states. Such a scheme cannot be applied here as the state \mathbf{x}_t comprises modelling parameters for which one cannot provide ground truth. To overcome this challenge, we follow the unsupervised learning procedure proposed in [37], where the training loss is computed based on the predicted measurements, and not on the estimated state. The data set \mathcal{D} is used to construct the sequence $\{\mathbf{F}_t, \mathbf{g}_t, y_t\}$, where the prediction $\hat{y}_{t|t-1}$ is computed using (17a). The resulting loss used for training θ is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D},1}(\theta) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{(\alpha_t, \beta_t) \in \mathcal{D}} \|y_t - \hat{y}_{t|t-1}\|^2. \quad (29)$$

The training (step 1) procedure is summarized as Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2: Training Step 1

Init: Randomly initialize θ , step size $\eta_1 > 0$

Input: Initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = [\hat{h}_0, \hat{\mu}_0, \hat{s}_0]^T$;
Data set \mathcal{D} .

```

1 for each training epoch do
2   Divide  $\mathcal{D}$  into  $Q$  batches  $\{\mathcal{D}_q\}_{q=1}^Q$ ;
3   for each  $q$  do
4     for each  $t$  do
5       Predict  $\hat{y}_{t|t-1}$  via (25a);
6       Update estimate via (25b);
7       Compute  $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_q,1}(\theta)$  via (29);
8       Update  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta_1 \nabla \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{D}_q,1}(\theta)$ ;

```

2) *Training End-to-End*: In this second and last step, we train KalmanNet in an end-to-end manner based on the overall system task of pairs trading with full gradient descent. We adapt θ to maximize the PNL, namely, our loss function is

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\theta) = - \sum_{i=0}^N r_i^{\varphi, \pi}. \quad (30)$$

In (30), $r_i^{\varphi, \pi}$ is the i th reward given in (27) and N is the number of active position taken.

A core challenge to optimize the trainable parameters with respect to (30), stems from the non-differentiable nature of the policy in (7) and (9). This prevents using conventional deep learning optimizers based on gradient descent. We overcome this challenge by approximating (7) and (9) with a *differentiable mapping during training*. Accordingly, we replace the unit step function with a parametric surrogates [52], $\hat{U}_\rho(\cdot)$, i.e., we compute the positions using (7) and (9), while taking the gradient of (30) assuming their surrogate approximations

$$\text{op}_t = \left(\hat{U}_\rho(-1 - z_t) - \hat{U}_\rho(z_t - 1) \right) \cdot \hat{U}_\rho(\tau_{\text{cp},t} - \tau_{\text{op},t}), \quad (31)$$

and

$$\text{cp}_t = \hat{U}_\rho(-z_{t-1} \cdot z_t) \cdot (1 - \hat{U}_\rho(\tau_{\text{cp},t} - \tau_{\text{op},t})), \quad (32)$$

respectively. Following [52], we set the surrogate approximation $\hat{U}_\rho(\cdot)$ to be the cumulative distribution function of a zero-mean Gaussian random variable with variance γ^2 , i.e.,

$$\hat{U}_\rho(x) = \int_{\tau=-\infty}^x \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\gamma^2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau^2}{2\gamma^2}\right\} d\tau. \quad (33)$$

The differentiable nature and the simple derivative of the Gaussian function in (33) enables computing the gradients of (30) using backpropagation, converting Algorithm 1 into a discriminative trainable model [38]. The resulting second training step is summarized as Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3: Training Step 2

Init: Step size $\eta_2 > 0$

Input: Initial estimate $\hat{\mathbf{x}}_0 = [\hat{h}_0, \hat{\mu}_0, \hat{s}_0]^T$;

Data set \mathcal{D} ;

Pre-trained parameters θ from Step 1.

```
1 for each training Epoch do
2   for each t do
3     | Compute  $p_t$  via Algorithm 1 with  $\theta$ ;
4     | Compute  $\mathcal{L}_2(\theta)$  via (30);
5     | Compute  $\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\theta)$  with (7) and (9) approximated
6     | as (31) and (32), respectively;
7     | Update  $\theta \leftarrow \theta - \eta_2 \nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\theta)$  ;
```

C. Discussion

KBPT jointly exploits both the approximated SS model representation in (24) along with a principled augmentation of deep learning techniques. This hybrid model-based/data-driven framework utilizes the strength of each one the approaches – both classical techniques based on SS models as well as data-driven deep learning tools. On one hand, we have partial domain knowledge which we approximate using the PCI model of the system dynamics. This lets us maintain interpretability and transparency of the algorithm, which is crucial especially when one wants to invest based on such an algorithm. On the other hand, we use data and deep learning capabilities to elegantly overcome challenges *C1-C3*.

As empirically shown in Section V, our hybrid policy allows to surpass the performance of other fully model-based or fully data-driven frameworks. The fact that KBPT exploits the trainability of KalmanNet and learns its tracking mapping from data based on the PNL yields a tracking rule that does not necessarily give the most accurate tracking, but is useful for trading, which is our main objective. In addition, due to the interpretability of the framework, at each point in time, one can monitor the tracked latent state vector of the policy, and understand why each action was taken.

The integration of model-based deep learning techniques with financial decision making paves the way to a multitude of avenues for future exploration. Our derivation of Algorithm 1 does not account for the transaction cost of each buy/sell action. As this is often a major factor in deciding if to perform such an action, one can potentially add to the PNL function a penalty term for each transaction made. In that way, the second step of the training (Algorithm 3) will optimize with regards to the transaction costs. Nonetheless, it is empirically shown in Section V that even without explicitly accounting for transaction cost, KBPT still typically achieves its improved PNL with lesser number of trades compared with model-based and data-driven benchmarks. Another potential extension involves the usage of more than two assets. While we tackle the problem of pairs trading based on the statistical relation between two assets, one can generalize this approach and look for a relationship with multiple assets [14, Ch. 10].

Another aspect of trading that can benefit from our hybrid model-based/data-driven design is latency performance. Our

experimental study reported in Section V considers daily trading, which means an action is performed once a day. This framework can be implemented in high frequency trading, where a trader can perform hundreds of actions per day, and the latency of each step becomes a crucial factor. A core gain of such forms of model-based deep learning is their inference speed, which is often translated into much smaller latency compared with other deep learning models, and sometimes also compared with model-based processing, see, e.g., [53]. Likewise, training will be faster compared to fully data-driven approaches which is highly beneficial in a retraining regime. Therefore, we expect our framework to be well suited for high-frequency trading, leaving this study for future work.

Lastly, as discussed following (28), when the hedge ratio changes over time, one needs to sell/buy more/less assets than bought/sold when the position was opened. Such form of pairs trading of time-varying hedge ratio is not unique to our approach, and was also considered in, e.g., [4], [51]. A natural approach tackle this is have the trader posses a number of α and β assets from the start, i.e., not just during open positions. Since the assets are co-integrated, the temporal variations in the hedge ratio are expected to be small, therefore the number of assets needed to begin with will be small. Moreover, one can encourage KalmanNet to produce low variations in its tracked hedge by regularization, or even enforce it to be constant if starting with assets is to be avoided. We leave the exploration of this to future work.

V. EMPIRICAL EVALUATION

In this section, we numerically evaluate KBPT, comparing it with both SS model-based and data-driven benchmarks. Our experimental study is comprised of four data sets (detailed in Subsection V-A), and considers four benchmark trading policies (discussed in Subsection V-B). In our numerical evaluations we first assess the trading procedure and the individual contribution of each of its stages in Subsection V-C, after which we compare the PNL of KBPT with the considered benchmarks in Subsection V-D.

A. Experimental Data

We consider four different data sets representing different asset pairs. Each data set is composed of in-sample data (training set) and out-of-sample data (test set), where a sample consists of the daily opening prices of the two assets. The data sets are taken from [54] in such a way that the out-of-sample set starts one trading day after the end of the in-sample set.

We particularly use the following assets pairs

- 1) **Swiss Frank - Euro (CHF - EURO)** - Consists of 2000 in-sample pairs, ending on 23/06/2019, and 944 out-of-sample pairs, starting from 24/06/2019.
- 2) **Australian Dollar - South African Rand (AUD - ZAR)** - Consists of 2000 in-sample pairs, ending on 20/07/2017, and 1500 out-of-sample pairs, starting from 21/07/2017.
- 3) **Canada ETF - Australia ETF Period A (EWC - EWA - A)** - Consists of 2000 in-sample pairs, ending on 29/01/2010, and 1500 out-of-sample pairs, starting from 01/02/2010.




Fig. 5. Comparison of the PNL between the after the first training step to after the second on CHF - EURO pair

- 4) **Canada ETF - Australia ETF Period B (EWC - EWA - B)** - Consists of 2000 in-sample pairs, ending on 26/01/2017 and a 1500 out-of-sample pairs, starting from 27/01/2010.

These pairs were specifically selected due to the fact that they were found to be suitable for pairs trading, in the sense that they exhibit the CI property, see e.g., [4], [14], [51], [55].

B. Benchmarks

We compare KBPT (Algorithm 1) with both model-based and data-driven policies, using the following benchmarks:

- B1** KF with the CI SS model as detailed in Subsection III-A, followed by BB policy in (7) and (9).
- B2** KF with the PCI SS model as detailed in Subsection III-B, followed by BB policy in (7) and (9).
- B3** Neural augmented KF-BB policy based on the CI SS model, i.e., Algorithm 1 assuming the SS model of Subsection III-A instead of our proposed SS model of detailed in Subsection III-B.
- B4** A deep RL trading policy based on the Double Deep Q Network (DDQN) architecture proposed in [31], comprised of an input layer of 10 features, 2 fully connected layers of 50 neurons, and a 3 neurons output layer.

Benchmarks **B1** and **B2** represent conventional model-based policy, wherein **B2** is based on our proposed SS formulation. Benchmark **B4** is purely data-driven, while **B3** is a model-based/data-driven approach, which is based on our hybrid algorithm without incorporating the proposed SS formulation.

All data-driven algorithms, i.e., KBPT as well as Benchmarks **B3** and **B4**, were trained using the Adam optimizer [56], with hyperparameters chosen by empirical trials¹. For Kalman-Net, we used Architecture 2 of [36] for the KG RNN. In the model-based policies, i.e. **B1** and **B2**, we estimated the KF parameters, e.g., the variances of the noise signals, from data.

¹The source code and the complete set of hyperparameters used in our study is available at https://github.com/KalmanNet/KBPT_TSP.




Fig. 6. Comparison of the difference between the estimated and real observation (i.e. the second asset). $\hat{\beta}_t^{\text{Step1}}$ and $\hat{\beta}_t^{\text{Step2}}$ are the observations after the first and second step, respectively, and β_t is the true asset price .

Pair		Step 1	Step 2
CHF-EURO	MSE [dB]	-47.60	-35.64
	PNL [USD]	0.129	1.77
AUD-ZAR	MSE [dB]	-17.15	-3.28
	PNL [USD]	0.008	9.19
EWC-EWA-A	MSE [dB]	-12.8	-0.29
	PNL [USD]	-0.42	5.96
EWC-EWA-B	MSE [dB]	-11.61	-7.88
	PNL [USD]	1.89	3.51

TABLE I
COMPARISON OF AVERAGE MSE IN TRACKING THE ASSET AND FINAL PNL BETWEEN THE FIRST AND SECOND TRAINING STEPS

We intentionally used the test set and not on the training set, giving a further advantage to the model-based approaches, in order to improve their performance and show that even under these conditions, they are still outperformed by our neural augmented design. Likewise was done on the DDQN model of **B4**, which we trained and evaluated on the test set, giving it a clear advantage over our neural augmented design. Following [31], we trained it based on the instantaneous reward, allowing to obtain instantaneous loss for training.

C. Evaluation of Training Procedure

We commence our experimental study by numerically evaluating the contribution and usefulness of the different stages of the training procedure detailed in Subsection IV-B. We particularly focus on their effect on the tracking performance and overall trading PNL, as Step 1 (Algorithm 2) encourages accurate tracking of the assets, while its subsequent Step 2 (Algorithm 3) incorporates the PNL objective.

In Fig. 5 we evaluate KBPT applied to the EURO-CHF pair, comparing its PNL after trained only for tracking (Step 1) and after trained also for PNL (Step 2). Observing Fig. 5, we clearly see that the addition of Step 2 notably boosts the PNL, allowing to successfully cope with the challenge




Fig. 7. PNL vs day index: Swiss Franc - Euro.

in incorporating this key consideration noted in C3. It is emphasized though that training solely based on Step 2 (i.e., without preceding warm start via Step 1) makes learning much more challenging, and the training procedure often diverges.

To understand how training based on the PNL rather than for state estimation affects the tracking performance, we depict in Fig. 6 the difference between the estimated $\hat{\beta}_t$ after each step and the real β_t (which is the EURO price in USD). It is observed in Fig. 6 that (unsupervised) training based on the state estimation objective in Step 1 yields an accurate tracking of the assets. However, training based on the PNL degrades the tracking performance, outputting a surrogate value which is most useful for trading in the sense of maximizing the PNL. While Fig. 6 focuses only on the EURO-CHF data, Table I reports that tracking degradation (in mean-squared error (MSE)) is systematically converted into improved PNL in all of pairs after the second training step. This study demonstrates the validity of our proposed two-step training procedure, and how it enables learning to track in a manner that contributes to the desired PNL objective.

D. Evaluation of PNL

We proceed to evaluate the PNL and its evolution in time as achieved by KBPT and compared with benchmarks B1-B4 detailed in Subsection V-B. We first consider the CHF-EURO pair, and report the obtained PNL versus day index t in Fig. 7. Observing Fig. 7, we note that both trading policies following our model-based deep learning approaches, i.e., Algorithm 1 and B3, outperform both the black-box data-driven DDQN (B4) as well as the fully model based benchmarks B1 and B2. Comparing the PNL of Algorithm 1 with B3, as well as that of B2 with B1, it is consistently shown that our proposed PCI SS model allows achieving improved PNL, for both hybrid model-based/data-driven policies as well as purely model-based ones.

Moreover, we observe in Fig. 7 (as well as in the following Figs. 8-10) that the DDQN approach, which relies on highly parameterized deep networks trained via RL, achieves similar PNL values to that of the much simpler KF-BB policy. It




Fig. 8. PNL vs day index: Australian Dollar - South African Rand.

Pair		B1	B4
CHF-EURO	PNL [USD]	0.051	0.149
AUD-ZAR	PNL [USD]	0.27	1.11
EWC-EWA-A	PNL [USD]	0.62	1.09
EWC-EWA-B	PNL [USD]	0.43	1.57

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF FINAL PNL WITH INSTANTANEOUS REWARD

is noted that this is due to (i) the DDQN uses a constant hedge ratio; (ii) RL is notably facilitated when provided with instantaneous rewards, hence it is trained to provide policies based on an instantaneous reward. When the model-based KF-BB policy also determines its position based on the instantaneous rewards rather than the cumulative one, it is outperformed by the DDQN, as reported in Table II.

The findings reported in Fig. 7 are not unique to the CHF-EURO pair, and are also reproduced in Fig. 8. There, we report the PNL of a different pair which is also from the foreign exchange market, i.e., AUD - ZAR. We systematically observe both the superiority of a hybrid model-based/data-driven design, as well as the contribution of properly incorporating for expected variation profile of the spread via our SS model formulated in (24).

We demonstrate that the benefits of our design combining model-based deep learning with PCI-based SS modelling are consistent over different markets as well. In Figs. 9-10 we report the PNL of EWC-EWA which are two ETLs, under two different time periods. These results showcase that the benefits of our design in terms of imported PNL are consistent over time and over markets that are known to be faithfully described as obeying some level of co-integration.

The results reported so far evaluated trading in terms of PNL. In practice, one is often interested in additional trading statistics, including the number of trades, annual return, mean return per trade, average holding time, and average time between returns [17], [32]. In Table III we summarize these trading statistics of the different pairs achieved by benchmarks




Fig. 9. PNL vs day index: Canada ETF - Australia ETF Period A.




Fig. 10. PNL vs day index: Canada ETF - Australia ETF Period B.

B1-B4 and our KBPT. We show that our proposed trading policy performs less trades in the trading period but still achieves higher profit compared to that of other models. Although in our design we did not explicitly take into account the transaction cost by penalizing each trade transaction, we still obtained a trading policy that outperforms other trading policies and requires less transactions to do so.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We proposed KBPT, a hybrid model-based/data-driven trading policy that converts KF-BB pairs trading into a trainable architecture. It is based on an extended SS model obtained from assuming partial co-integration. KBPT utilizes the recent KalmanNet to learn to track while coping with the inherent mismatches in the underlying SS model. Training is done in a two-step manner combining unsupervised learning of KalmanNet with approximating the BB policy with a differentiable mapping. Our empirical results show that the proposed

policy notably improves KF-BB and deep RL policies while preserving interpretability, simplicity, and low latency.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Deng, G. Revach, H. Morgenstern, and N. Shlezinger, "Kalman-BOT: KalmanNet-Aided Bollinger Bands for Pairs Trading," in *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*, 2023.
- [2] H. M. Markowitz, "Foundations of portfolio theory," *The Journal of Finance*, vol. 46, pp. 469–477, 1991.
- [3] E. F. Fama and K. R. French, "The cross-section of expected stock returns," *the Journal of Finance*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 427–465, 1992.
- [4] E. Chan, *Algorithmic trading: winning strategies and their rationale*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013, vol. 625.
- [5] A. N. Akansu, S. R. Kulkarni, and D. M. Malioutov, *Financial signal processing and machine learning*. John Wiley & Sons, 2016.
- [6] M. L. De Prado, *Advances in financial machine learning*. John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
- [7] G. Nuti, M. Mirghaemi, P. Treleven, and C. Yingsaeree, "Algorithmic trading," *Computer*, vol. 44, no. 11, pp. 61–69, 2011.
- [8] N. Jegadeesh and S. Titman, "Returns to buying winners and selling losers: Implications for stock market efficiency," *The Journal of Finance*, 1993.
- [9] J. Bollinger, "Using Bollinger bands," *Stocks & Commodities*, vol. 10, no. 2, pp. 47–51, 1992.
- [10] J. M. Poterba and L. H. Summers, "Mean reversion in stock prices: Evidence and implications," *Journal of Financial Economics*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 27–59, 1988.
- [11] R. A. Maller, G. Müller, and A. Szimayer, "Ornstein–Uhlenbeck processes and extensions," *Handbook of financial time series*, pp. 421–437, 2009.
- [12] K. Benidis, Y. Feng, and D. P. Palomar, "Optimization methods for financial index tracking: From theory to practice," *Foundations and Trends® in Optimization*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 171–279, 2018.
- [13] R. S. Tsay, *Analysis of financial time series*. John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- [14] Y. Feng and D. P. Palomar, "A signal processing perspective on financial engineering," *Foundations and Trends® in Signal Processing*, vol. 9, no. 1–2, pp. 1–231, 2016.
- [15] R. Elliott, J. Van Der Hoek, and W. Malcolm, "Pairs trading," *Quantitative Finance*, vol. 5, pp. 271–276, 2005.
- [16] H. Puspangrum, "Pairs trading using cointegration approach," 2012.
- [17] M. Clegg and C. Krauss, "Pairs trading with partial cointegration," *Quantitative Finance*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 121–138, 2018.
- [18] C. Krauss, "Statistical arbitrage pairs trading strategies: Review and outlook," *Journal of Economic Surveys*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 513–545, 2017.
- [19] B. Lim and S. Zohren, "Time-series forecasting with deep learning: a survey," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, vol. 379, no. 2194, 2021.
- [20] X. Zhang, Y. Zhang, S. Wang, Y. Yao, B. Fang, and S. Y. Philip, "Improving stock market prediction via heterogeneous information fusion," *Knowledge-Based Systems*, vol. 143, pp. 236–247, 2018.
- [21] T. Spooner, J. Fearnley, R. Savani, and A. Koukorinis, "Market making via reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.04216*, 2018.
- [22] K. Benidis, S. S. Rangapuram, V. Flunkert, Y. Wang, D. Maddix, C. Turkmen, J. Gasthaus, M. Bohlke-Schneider, D. Salinas, L. Stella, F. X. Aubet, L. Callot, and T. Januschowski, "Deep learning for time series forecasting: Tutorial and literature survey," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 55, no. 6, pp. 1–36, 2022.
- [23] Y. Xu and S. B. Cohen, "Stock movement prediction from tweets and historical prices," in *Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2018, pp. 1970–1979.
- [24] W. Bao, J. Yue, and Y. Rao, "A deep learning framework for financial time series using stacked autoencoders and long-short term memory," *PLoS One*, vol. 12, no. 7, p. e0180944, 2017.
- [25] M. Ahmed, A. N. Mahmood, and M. R. Islam, "A survey of anomaly detection techniques in financial domain," *Future Generation Computer Systems*, vol. 55, pp. 278–288, 2016.
- [26] Y. Qin, D. Song, H. Chen, W. Cheng, G. Jiang, and G. W. Cottrell, "A dual-stage attention-based recurrent neural network for time series prediction," in *IJCAI*, 2017, pp. 2627–2633.
- [27] T. Zhu, J. Li, X. Liu, Y. Jiang, and S.-T. Xia, "Attention on attention sparse dense convolutional network for financial signal processing," in *IEEE ICASSP*, 2021, pp. 3300–3304.

Pair	Metric	B1	B2	B3	B4	KBPT
CHF-EURO	Number of trades	137	146	193	557	57
	Annual return [%]	6.4	6.4	42	6	70.8
	Mean return per trade [%]	0.12	0.11	1.72	0.02	3.11
	Average holding time per trade [days]	5.4	5.0	12.6	1	13.2
	Average time between returns [days]	6.1	5.7	14.1	1.6	15.0
AUD-ZAR	Number of trades	331	294	144	1054	88
	Annual return [%]	26.9	26.6	157	26.4	218.8
	Mean return per trade [%]	0.34	0.38	4.59	0.10	10.44
	Average holding time per trade [days]	3.6	4.1	8.9	1	14.9
	Average time between returns [days]	4.2	4.8	9.8	1.4	16.4
EWC-EWA-A	Number of trades	335	332	282	1071	275
	Annual return [%]	33.3	32.6	44.5	25.9	141.6
	Mean return per trade [%]	0.39	0.41	0.66	0.10	2.16
	Average holding time per trade [days]	3.5	4.46	5.1	1	4.1
	Average time between returns [days]	3.9	5.0	5.9	1.3	5.2
EWC-EWA-B	Number of trades	340	342	415	1126	278
	Annual return [%]	40.7	40.4	42.8	37.3	83.5
	Mean return per trade [%]	0.50	0.49	0.43	0.14	1.26
	Average holding time per trade [days]	3.6	3.07	3.2	1	4.5
	Average time between returns [days]	4.1	4.1	3.43	1.3	5.1

TABLE III

TRADE STATISTICS COMPARISON BETWEEN DIFFERENT MODELS ON DIFFERENT PAIRS. FOR THE AVERAGE TIME PER TRADE AND THE AVERAGE TIME BETWEEN RETURNS METRICS ONE CAN ARGUE WHICH VALUE IS PREFERRED, HENCE NO VALUE IS MARKED IN BOLD FONTS.

- [28] J. E. Moody and M. Saffell, "Reinforcement learning for trading," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 1998, pp. 917–923.
- [29] S. Sun, R. Wang, and B. An, "Reinforcement learning for quantitative trading," *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1–29, 2023.
- [30] A. Borodin, R. El-Yaniv, and V. Gogan, "Can we learn to beat the best stock," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 16, 2003.
- [31] A. Brim, "Deep reinforcement learning pairs trading with a double deep Q-network," in *IEEE Annual Computing and Communication Workshop and Conference (CCWC)*, 2020, pp. 0222–0227.
- [32] W. Han, J. Huang, Q. Xie, B. Zhang, Y. Lai, and M. Peng, "Mastering pair trading with risk-aware recurrent reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.00364*, 2023.
- [33] N. Shlezinger, J. Whang, Y. C. Eldar, and A. G. Dimakis, "Model-based deep learning," *Proc. IEEE*, vol. 111, no. 5, pp. 465–499, 2023.
- [34] N. Shlezinger, Y. C. Eldar, and S. P. Boyd, "Model-based deep learning: On the intersection of deep learning and optimization," *IEEE Access*, vol. 10, pp. 115 384–115 398, 2022.
- [35] N. Shlezinger and Y. C. Eldar, "Model-based deep learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04469*, 2023.
- [36] G. Revach, N. Shlezinger, X. Ni, A. L. Escoriza, R. J. G. van Sloun, and Y. C. Eldar, "KalmanNet: Neural Network Aided Kalman Filtering for Partially Known Dynamics," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 1532–1547, 2022.
- [37] G. Revach, N. Shlezinger, T. Locher, X. Ni, R. J. G. van Sloun, and Y. C. Eldar, "Unsupervised Learned Kalman Filtering," in *European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, 2022, pp. 1571–1575.
- [38] N. Shlezinger and T. Routtenberg, "Discriminative and generative learning for linear estimation of random signals [lecture notes]," *IEEE Signal Process. Mag.*, 2023.
- [39] C. J. Morrison, *A microeconomic approach to the measurement of economic performance: Productivity growth, capacity utilization, and related performance indicators*. Springer, 2012.
- [40] D. Pilinkus *et al.*, "Macroeconomic indicators and their impact on stock market performance in the short and long run: the case of the baltic states," *Technological and Economic Development of Economy*, no. 2, pp. 291–304, 2010.
- [41] M. Ayadi, S. S. Jadhav, B. W. Livingston, A. Mishra, and K. Womack, "Reinforcement learning for trading," *Journal of Financial Data Science*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2023.
- [42] S.-H. Kim, D.-Y. Park, and K.-H. Lee, "Hybrid deep reinforcement learning for pairs trading," *Applied Sciences*, vol. 12, no. 3, p. 944, 2022.
- [43] K. S. Kannan, P. S. Sekar, M. M. Sathik, and P. Arumugam, "Financial stock market forecast using data mining techniques," in *Proceedings of the International Multiconference of Engineers and Computer Scientists*, vol. 1, 2010, p. 4.
- [44] J. Stübinger and J. Bredthauer, "Statistical arbitrage pairs trading with high-frequency data," *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 650–662, 2017.
- [45] S. Bajalan, R. Eyvazlu, and G. Akbari, "Pair trading in tehran stock exchange based on smooth transition garch model," *Iranian Journal of Finance*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 7–28, 1999.
- [46] S. Mudchanatongsuk, J. A. Primbs, and W. Wong, "Optimal pairs trading: A stochastic control approach," in *IEEE American Control Conference (ACC)*, 2008, pp. 1035–1039.
- [47] G. Vidyamurthy, *Pairs Trading: quantitative methods and analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004, vol. 217.
- [48] 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*, vol. 74, no. 366a, pp. 427–431, 1979.
- [49] S. Johansen, "Estimation and hypothesis testing of cointegration vectors in gaussian vector autoregressive models," *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, pp. 1551–1580, 1991.
- [50] B. O. Bradley and M. S. Taqqu, "Financial risk and heavy tails," in *Handbook of heavy tailed distributions in finance*, 2003, pp. 35–103.
- [51] G. Orfanidis, "Mathematical aspects of pairs trading," 2020.
- [52] N. Shlezinger, A. Amar, B. Luijten, R. J. van Sloun, and Y. C. Eldar, "Deep task-based analog-to-digital conversion," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 70, pp. 6021–6034, 2022.
- [53] I. Buchnik, D. Steger, G. Revach, R. J. van Sloun, T. Routtenberg, and N. Shlezinger, "Latent-KalmanNet: Learned Kalman filtering for tracking from high-dimensional signals," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07827*, 2023.
- [54] Yahoo finance. [Online]. Available: <https://finance.yahoo.com>
- [55] J. Yu, "Cointegration approach for the pair trading based on the kalman filter," in *International Conference on Business Administration and Data Science (BADs)*. Atlantis Press, 2022, pp. 633–642.
- [56] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2015.