
****

**Project Report**

**Bitcoin Price Predictor**

**Data Mining – AI306**

**Team Members**

**Abubakar Waziri – 4220056 – 4220056@upm.edu.sa**

**Mohammed Sattar – 4310129 - 4310129@upm.edu.sa**

**Youssef ElNahas – 4311779 - 4311779@upm.edu.sa**

**Supervisor: Dr. Mohammed Temraz**

# Abstract

* Brief overview of the study’s objective: predicting Bitcoin prices
* Summary of methodology: data sources, models used
* Key findings and implications

Table of Contents

[Abstract 2](#_Toc197363017)

[Introduction 4](#_Toc197363018)

[Literature Review (Related Work) 4](#_Toc197363019)

[Experiments 6](#_Toc197363020)

[a- Data Description 6](#_Toc197363021)

[Original Dataset 6](#_Toc197363022)

[After Pre-processing Techniques 6](#_Toc197363023)

[b- Graphs 8](#_Toc197363024)

[1. Price Over Time Graph 8](#_Toc197363025)

[2. Price Frequency Graph (Histogram) 9](#_Toc197363026)

[3. Price vs. Volatility Scatter Plot 10](#_Toc197363027)

[c- Data Preprocessing 10](#_Toc197363028)

[d- Models Built 10](#_Toc197363029)

[TCN Model with Attention 10](#_Toc197363030)

[e- Results 12](#_Toc197363031)

[Interpretation & Discussion 12](#_Toc197363032)

[Conclusion 12](#_Toc197363033)

[References 13](#_Toc197363034)

# Introduction

Bitcoin, the world’s leading cryptocurrency since around 2013, is known for its high volatility and unpredictable price movements. Therefore, accurate price prediction is crucial for traders and investors aiming to navigate this dynamic market and actually be successful in it. Traditional statistical methods often fall short in capturing Bitcoin’s complex behaviour, while machine learning and deep learning models offer new potential for better and more accurate forecasts. This study compares several predictive approaches using historical Bitcoin data to identify effective strategies for price prediction and support informed decision-making in the cryptocurrency market.

# Literature Review (Related Work)

Recent research on Bitcoin price prediction and broader sequence modeling has explored a wide range of machine learning and deep learning approaches aimed at improving forecasting accuracy and efficiency. Mohammadjafari (2024) compared Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) models using historical Bitcoin price data, demonstrating that GRUs outperformed LSTMs by achieving a lower mean squared error (MSE) and faster training times. The study highlighted GRUs as more computationally efficient while maintaining the ability to capture long-term dependencies, making them well-suited for financial time series forecasting.

Swetha (2022) extended the comparison of predictive models by evaluating traditional machine learning models, such as Linear Regression and Facebook Prophet, alongside LSTM networks for Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Litecoin price forecasting. The results indicated that while Linear Regression achieved high R² values, LSTM models delivered lower root mean squared error (RMSE) values, demonstrating superior generalization to unseen data. The study emphasized the necessity of including broader features beyond closing prices for enhanced prediction robustness.

Building on the limitations of recurrent architectures, Khaniki and Manthouri (2024) introduced a hybrid model combining the Performer—a scalable Transformer variant— with Bidirectional LSTM (BiLSTM) networks and technical indicators such as RSI, SMA, and Bollinger Bands. Their Transformer-enhanced model achieved the lowest RMSE and highest R² across Bitcoin, Ethereum, and Litecoin datasets on both daily and hourly scales. This work illustrated the significant potential of integrating attention mechanisms and feature engineering for improving cryptocurrency price prediction.

In parallel, Udom (2019) investigated Bitcoin return prediction through a hybrid ARIMAGARCH approach, modeling both the mean and volatility of Bitcoin daily returns. The study found that an ARIMA(2,0,1)-GARCH(1,1) model with a Normal error distribution provided the most accurate forecasts. This highlights the importance of capturing both the time series' autocorrelation and volatility characteristics, reinforcing the value of statistical hybrid models in financial forecasting tasks.

Beyond Bitcoin-specific forecasting, Bai, Kolter, and Koltun (2018) challenged the traditional dominance of recurrent networks in sequence modeling by systematically evaluating generic recurrent networks (LSTM, GRU) against a simple Temporal Convolutional Network (TCN). Their empirical results showed that TCNs consistently outperformed recurrent models across synthetic and real-world sequence modeling benchmarks, offering better long-term memory retention, parallelism, and training stability. This study suggests that convolutional architectures, such as TCNs, should be regarded as a powerful and potentially superior alternative to recurrent models for sequence-based financial prediction tasks, including Bitcoin price forecasting.

Expanding the broader context of time series modeling, the MOMENT framework addressed critical limitations in developing foundation models for time series analysis. Unlike domains such as NLP and vision, time series datasets are fragmented and highly diverse, hindering pre-training at scale. MOMENT introduced the Time Series Pile dataset and demonstrated that large-scale, multi-dataset pre-training significantly improves model generalization across diverse tasks under limited supervision. Their findings showed that time series-specific pre-trained models outperform adaptations of large language models, particularly in zero-shot and few-shot scenarios. Nevertheless, the study identified ongoing challenges regarding the full benefits of multi-dataset pretraining and robust performance in low-supervision settings, emphasizing important directions for future research.

Collectively, these studies reveal a progression from traditional statistical models to advanced deep learning and foundation model architectures, emphasizing the evolving understanding of memory, volatility, feature integration, attention mechanisms, and large-scale pre-training in enhancing Bitcoin price prediction and broader time series forecasting.

# Experiments

## a- Data Description

### Original Dataset

The dataset used in this study consists of historical Bitcoin price and trading data spanning from January 1st, 2012, to January 1st, 2025, totalling around 7 million entries. The data is organized in a time series format with a one-minute frequency, providing a comprehensive view of Bitcoin’s market activity over more than a decade.

Each record in the dataset includes the following features:

* **Timestamp**: Unix timestamp representing the precise minute of the record.
* **Open**: The price of Bitcoin at the start of the minute.
* **High**: The highest price reached within the minute.
* **Low**: The lowest price reached within the minute.
* **Close**: The price of Bitcoin at the end of the minute.
* **Volume**: The amount of Bitcoin traded during the minute.
* **Datetime**: Date and time corresponding to the timestamp (in YYYY-MM-DD Time:TImezone format)

A sample from the dataset is shown below:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Timestamp | Open | High | Low | Close | Volume | Datetime |
| 1360887300.0 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 17.98955015 | 2013-02-15 00:15:00+00:00 |
| 1360887360.0 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 26.63 | 0.0 | 2013-02-15 00:16:00+00:00 |
| 1360887420.0 | 26.60 | 26.60 | 26.60 | 26.60 | 20.0 | 2013-02-15 00:17:00+00:00 |

This granular dataset enables detailed analysis and modelling of Bitcoin’s price dynamics, capturing both short-term fluctuations and long-term trends. The inclusion of open, high, low, close, and volume data supports the extraction of technical indicators and the development of robust predictive models.

### After Pre-processing Techniques

This is the data that we actually fed into the models; we applied several data mining techniques to reach that (discussed in the coming chapters). For now, here’s a description of our data after preprocessing.

The dataset is now divided into hourly readings of historical bitcoin data starting from January 9th, 2012, until April 25th, 2025, totalling around 116k rows of unique data.

Here’s a simple explanation of each column in our hourly Bitcoin dataset:

* **datetime**  
  The date and time for each row of data, showing exactly when that hour’s information was recorded.
* **Timestamp**  
  A numeric version of the date and time (usually the number of seconds since January 1, 1970). This helps computers sort and compare times easily.
* **Open**  
  The price of Bitcoin at the very start of the hour.
* **High**  
  The highest price Bitcoin reached during that hour.
* **Low**  
  The lowest price Bitcoin dropped to during that hour.
* **Close**  
  The price of Bitcoin at the very end of the hour.
* **SMA\_200**  
  The “Simple Moving Average” of the closing price over the last 200 hours. This smooths out the price to show the overall trend-if the number is going up, prices have been rising on average over the past 200 hours[8](https://www.fastercapital.com/content/Average-True-Range--ATR---Average-True-Range-and-SMA--Assessing-Market-Risk.html).
* **ATR\_168**  
  The “Average True Range” over the last 168 hours. This measures how much the price has been moving up and down-higher values mean the price is more volatile or jumpy, while lower values mean the price is steadier.


|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| datetime | Timestamp | Open | High | Low | Close | SMA\_200 | ATR\_168 |
| 2012-01-09 17:00:00 | 1326128400.0 | 6.9 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 5.83495 | 0.03255952380952383 |
| 2012-01-09 18:00:00 | 1326132000.0 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.5 | 5.844550000000001 | 0.03315476190476192 |
| 2012-01-09 19:00:00 | 1326135600.0 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 5.8546499999999995 | 0.033750000000000016 |

These columns together help you see not just what the price was each hour, but also the bigger trends and how wild or calm the market has been.

The sample shown above showcases the way the data exists within the csv file, the reason we transformed the data so drastically is explained further in one of the coming chapters.

## b- Graphs

### 1. Price Over Time Graph



What You See:

The line goes up/down a lot (volatility)

Long-term upward trend (price generally rises)

Sudden spikes/drops (market surprises)

What It Means:

Prices don’t stay steady (non-stationary) → Need to adjust data before modeling

Big jumps = outliers that could mess up predictions

### 2. Price Frequency Graph (Histogram)

A graph of a graph showing a number of blue bars

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

What You See:

Most prices cluster in a middle range

Long “tails” on sides (rare super-high/low prices)

Possible multiple peaks (different price eras)

What It Means:

Normal models won’t work well (prices aren’t bell-curved)

Extreme prices are more common than expected

### 3. Price vs. Volatility Scatter Plot

A purple and white diagram

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

What You See:

Dots spread out more at high/low prices

Clusters of high volatility at certain price levels

What It Means:

Volatility isn’t constant (bigger swings during price extremes)

ATR\_168 matters for predicting price moves

## c- Data Preprocessing

* Handling missing values and outliers
* Feature engineering (e.g., lag features, moving averages)
* Data normalization or scaling
* Splitting data into training and test sets

## d- Models Built


### TCN Model with Attention

We began our experimentation with a basic Temporal Convolutional Network (TCN) architecture as a starting point for our modeling work. The appeal of TCNs lies in their simplicity and effectiveness for sequence modeling tasks. However, in this initial setup, the model’s performance was far from satisfactory. The mean squared error (MSE) reached values in the 10-digit range, indicating that the model was struggling to capture the underlying patterns in the data. This result highlighted the limitations of relying solely on a simple TCN for the complexity of the task at hand.

Recognizing the need for improvement, we decided to enhance the model by integrating an attention mechanism. Attention mechanisms have proven effective in allowing models to focus on the most relevant parts of the input sequence, and we hoped this addition would help the TCN better capture long-range dependencies and subtle patterns. After incorporating attention, we observed a significant improvement in performance-the results became much more reasonable and aligned with expectations for the problem domain. This confirmed that the model was now better equipped to process and learn from the data.

Throughout this process, we also focused on tuning several key hyperparameters to further optimize the model’s performance. Specifically, we experimented with different values for the dropout rate to prevent overfitting, adjusted the learning rate to ensure stable convergence, and varied the sequence length to find the optimal window for the model to learn from. Additionally, we carefully considered the train, validation, and test split to ensure robust evaluation and generalization. This systematic approach to hyperparameter tuning played a crucial role in achieving improved and reliable results from the enhanced model.

Here are the results of this model:



The plot above illustrates the performance of our model by comparing the predicted closing prices (blue line) with the actual closing prices (orange line) over a series of data points. As shown, the predicted values closely track the actual prices throughout the entire period, indicating that the model is effectively capturing both the overall trend and the short-term fluctuations in the data. This close alignment suggests that our enhancements-such as the integration of attention mechanisms and careful hyperparameter tuning-have significantly improved the model’s accuracy.

While there are minor discrepancies during periods of sharp price changes, the predictions remain generally robust and responsive to real market movements. The model demonstrates good generalization without obvious signs of overfitting, as it continues to perform well across different segments of the data. Overall, these results validate our modeling approach and highlight the effectiveness of the improvements we implemented.

### Sattar’s Model (MOMENT)

### Waziri’s Model

## e- Results

* Evaluation metrics (e.g MSE and Huber Loss)
* Comparative performance of models
* Visualization of predictions vs. actual prices

# Interpretation & Discussion

* Analysis of model performance
* Discussion of factors influencing prediction accuracy
* Limitations of the study
* Implications for traders and researchers

# Conclusion

* Recap of main findings
* Contributions to the field
* Suggestions for future work

# References

[1] A. Mohammadjafari, "Comparative Study of Bitcoin Price Prediction," 2024.

[2] P. Swetha, "Cryptocurrency Price Prediction Using Machine Learning and Deep Learning Models," 2022.

[3] M. A. Labbaf Khaniki and M. Manthouri, "Enhancing Price Prediction in Cryptocurrency Using Transformer," 2024.

[4] E. X. Udom, "Estimating and Forecasting Bitcoin Daily Returns Using ARIMA-GARCH Models," 2019.

[5] S. Bai, J. Z. Kolter, and V. Koltun, "An Empirical Evaluation of Generic Convolutional and Recurrent Networks for Sequence Modeling," arXiv preprint arXiv:1803.01271, 2018.

[6] M. Goswami, K. Szafer, A. Choudhry, Y. Cai, S. Li, and A. Dubrawski, “MOMENT: A Family of Open Time-series Foundation Models,” 2024.

[7] M. Czielinski, "Bitcoin Historical Data," Kaggle. Accessed: April 21, 2025. [Online]. Available: <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/mczielinski/bitcoin-historical-data>