Optimization of High-Frequency Trading Systems

David Sweet
dsweet@andamooka.org

- ex, trading strategy: buy/sell for profit
- ex, execution system: fill an order for a customer

High-Frequency Trading

- Dynamics/signals on order of seconds
- Demanding computer, network, & software engineering
- Models, Statistics, Machine Learning
- Revenue-generating, agency execution

- ongoing “computerization” of trading — like every other industry
- “program trading” in 1980s
- “electronic/algorithmic trading” in 1990s & early 2000s
- “high-frequency trading” since then
- network includes telecom; microwave, millimeter wave

High-Frequency Trading

- Arbitrage: inter-asset, inter-exchange
- Liquidity Provision: passive, active
- Execution: reduce costs for customer

- all three strategies in existence “forever”
- started manually, improved with telecom, computers, algorithms
- still improving

HFT: Where is the value?

- HFT strategies make money because they make markets more efficient and market participants are willing to pay for that

- Brogaard, Hendershott, Riordan, High-Frequency Trading and Price Discovery, Rev Financ Stud (2014) 27 (8): 2267-2306.

- Hendershott, Jones, Menkveld, Does Algorithmic Trading Improve Liquidity?, Journal of Finance, Vol. LXVI No. 1, 2011

- arbitrage makes sure assets are priced fairly (“price discovery”), so you get a fair price when you trade
- liquidity provision reduces the spread (the cost of trading on an exchange)
- execution algos reduce costs of executing an order (spread, fees, market impact)
- HFT is a red herring; if everyone only traded once/day (i.e. extremely slowly) these strategies would still lower costs

A Trading Strategy

```
If signal > threshold then Buy

If -signal > threshold then Sell

If end of day, liquidate and stop
```

Rule set called a *policy*

threshold is a *parameter*

- Keep this example in mind as we go along
- policy answers, “What should I do now?”
- Best threshold value depends on cost to trade, signal quality, how fast signal changes (decorrelates), cost to liquidate at EOD, and your definition of strategy quality (pnl, pnl - risk, etc.)
- How do you find the best threshold? That’s the subject of this talk…

Optimization

- Measure *quality* of parameters by trading
- Measurement Costs: losses, risk, opportunity
- Goal 1: Find highest-quality parameters
- Goal 2: Minimize cost of measurement

- quality: pnl, pnl - risk
- Every day that you trade at a suboptimal parameter — even if you're making money — you're paying an opportunity cost. You've missed out on the extra money you would have made by trading at a better parameter setting.
- competing goals

Simulation?

- Simulation is cheap
- But: Market reacts to our actions
- But: Hidden liquidity is … hidden
- But: Latencies complicated
- Simulation not useful for parameter optimization

- easy to run hundreds or thousands of simulations to test different parameters
- matching engine processes our orders — even if they don’t get filled; takes time, changes market
- other traders (computers) see our orders/executions in public data and make different decisions than they would/could have
- Any visible queue can have hidden liquidity, too + dark pools = more hidden queues than visible; *most* queues are hidden
- 24% of US Equities traded volume dark/hidden [Rosenblatt's Monthly Dark Liquidity Tracker, December 2016]
- longer-term strategies can treat all of these effects as a small, noisy cost; but they are significant for HFT where profits/share are on par with these costs
- latencies possible at every network node; latencies correlated to each other and likely to your signals
- simulation still useful for testing code quality, studying optimization methodology, estimating some operational risks

A/B Test

- Compare two strategies (policies)
- Call them “Policy A” and “Policy B”
- Ex: threshold=1 vs. threshold=2
- Ex: “Trade through JPM” vs. “Trade through GS”

- can compare real-valued parameter values or categorical, non-parameterized design decisions

A/B Test

- Trade A and B side-by-side for N days
- N determined by noise level and desired precision

- Ask, “Is B better than A?”

Improving A/B

- Lower cost of measurements
- Compare more possibilities

- What if B is a *lot* better? Can't we stop early and lower the cost? [No, b/c your plan to deal with noise required N days.]
- What if we have more than two options to compare? A, B, C, …? A vs. B, then winner vs. C, then … This could take a long time (and be very expensive).
-


A/B Test
Design of Experiments
Multi-Armed Bandit
Response Surface Methodology
Contextual Bandit
Policy Search
Q-Learning
Actor-Critic

Design of Experiments

- Evaluate multiple parameters' settings
- Choose which parameter values to measure to keep information high and cost low

- ex: threshold = 1, 2, 3, …
- *not* JPM vs GS, however

Design of Experiments

Factorial

p1	p2	p3
-	-	-
+	-	-
-	+	-
-	-	+
+	+	-
+	-	+
-	+	+
+	+	+

Fractional Factorial

p1	p2	p3
-	-	-
+	+	-
+	-	+
-	+	+

- Factorial: all combinations, 2^n measurements
- Fraction Factorial: Try to assess each parameter independently by removing pair-wise correlation;
- avoid: “Hey! When I increased p1, quality improved!” “But when you increased p1 you also increased p2. So which parameters is responsible for the improvement?”
- Fewer measurements = lower cost



D.O.E. adds support for multiple parameter (MULTI) values and consideration of measurement cost (COST)

Response Surface Methodology

- Build a model (regression) from data collected via D.O.E.
- *Infer* the best parameters from model!
- Verify/Improve: D.O.E. around inferred-best

- The “best” parameters likely won’t be in the data set.
- Re-center the measurements around the inferred-best. Then take measurements to verify your inference.
- Repeat if desired until your inferred-best stops changing.
- This is an iterative (manual) optimization routine



RSM adds data efficiency by modeling quality vs. parameters (DEP).

Policy Search

- Automates RSM

    1) Model response surface

    2) Find inferred-best parameters

    3) Design next experiment

    4) Go to (1)

- many algorithms; good search terms: Bayesian Optimization, Efficient Global Optimization, Black-Box optimization with “expensive” objective functions
- (3) tries to optimally trade off the need to collect more data (to build a better model) which has a cost and the desire to trade at the optimal parameters; aka “exploration vs. exploitation”
- exploitation => higher revenue now; exploration => higher revenue in the future
- accounts for noise / uncertainty in each measurement, so each trading day can use a new experiment design; all data are combined optimally into RSM



- Policy Search adds a method to optimally design the next experiment (EXP).
- Includes “exploitation vs. exploration” trade-off when designing next experiment.
- Optimization & trading are now one continuous, on-going process. Compare this to A/B testing where there are two “phases”: run the experiment to learn what’s best, then use that information to trade.
- pay some measurement cost today for higher quality tomorrow

Multi-Armed Bandit: Problem Definition

- “one-armed bandit” == slot machine
- MAB: K arms, each with different, noisy payout
- Strategy to optimize total payout?

- MAB is a problem definition
- “MAB methods” are ways to solve that problem
- K=2 arms == a more efficient A/B test
- MAB cares about measurement cost
- MAB handles multiple choices: could be different parameter values (threshold=1,2,3) like DOE, but could also be qualitatively different choices (compare code revisions, hardware, order types, brokers)

Multi-Armed Bandit Methods

1. Pull each arm several times
   Q(arm) = mean(arm quality measurements)
   Thereafter only pull highest-Q arm

2. p=.9: pull highest-Q arm
   p=.1: pull random arm

3. Pull arm with highest Q + stddev(quality)

- (1) spends a lot of time measuring, but ultimately pulls the best
- (2) “explores” 10% of time to improve estimates, but usually (90% of time) pulls the one we think is best; but never stops exploring
- (3) expression makes exploration vs. exploitation explicit; adds more samples to the noisier estimates (more efficient exploration); eventually stops exploring (more efficient exploitation)



- MAB measures multiple options (MULTI)
- MAB is sensitive to cost of measurements (COST)
- MAB “designs” series of experiments (EXP)
- Compare to DOE:
    - DOE compares real-valued parameter values, designs one big, low-noise measurement
    - MAB compares arbitrarily-defined options, “designs” a series of small, noisy measurements

Contextual Bandit

- context (aka. state) == signals, time of day, product traded, etc.
- Q(arm, context) = regression model
- Fit model from measurements so far

- Follow same rules as MAB — 90%/10% or maximal mean+std, except means are replaced by conditional means, i.e. model's prediction of arm quality



- Contextual Bandit increases data efficiency by modeling arm quality vs. state (DES) and quality vs. arm (DEP)
- Notice shift in mindset: “arms” now intraday decisions instead of just candidates for where to fix parameters

Q-Learning

- What if “arms” were buy, sell, wait?
- Consecutive arm pulls not independent
- Q(t, arm, context) = qualityMeasurement(t)
  + qualityMeasurement(t+1)
  + qualityMeasurement(t+2)
  + …
- Q function determines the policy

- arm pulls were independent in MAB and Contextual MAB
- Q estimate now depends on future contexts *and* your future decisions
- fitting methods can be complex; won’t cover here
- Q determines whole trading strategy: Which arm has highest Q? (or highest Q + stddevQ, to include exploration)



- Q-Learning models sequences of decisions (SEQ) that are not independent



- Methods optimize policy parameters
- Don’t consider what policy is doing, just look at your measurement of quality
- Very flexible: Your strategy (policy) can be designed any way you like.
- Data is used efficiently by modeling quality vs. parameters.
- Generally works only with a small number of parameters (~5).

Methods look at policy step by step

Actions are discrete

Methods analyze actions individually



- To use Contextual Bandit or Q-Learning you need to write your strategy (policy) in a compatible way: You need a context (signals) and arms (buy, sell, hold).
- In return you get very efficient use of data through models of quality vs context.

Actor-Critic

- Combines Policy Search and Q-Learning
- Allows black-box policy
- More policy parameters
- Most efficient use of data

- data efficiency comes from modeling Q vs. context and policy parameters
- optimize policy parameters using model Q(arm, context, parameters) as objective instead of simpler model of Q(parameters)



- Themes, going from top to bottom:
  - increasing number of arms/parameters
  - increasing data efficiency: build more sophisticated models of the data collected so far
  - increasing exploration efficiency

Continuous Optimization

- Tune to real markets' complex dynamics
- Try more ideas, more quickly & efficiently
- Adapt to changing markets

Practical way to view strategy design: as a continuous, never-ending optimization