

# Machine Learning Engineer Nanodegree

---

## Capstone Project: Google Stock Price Prediction with Deep Learning Models

---

Masaharu KINOSHITA

e-mail: [k.masaharu0219@gmail.com](mailto:k.masaharu0219@gmail.com)

LinkedIn: [masaharu kinoshita](#) \*I prefer linkedin for communication with you.

Apr, 2019

project specifications: [review points](#)

### Agenda

---

**#1. Definition** ----- How do I establish this Problem?

**#2. Analysis** ----- How do I define problem solving and design my approach?

**#3. Methodology** -- How do I conduct this approach in terms of data science?

**#4. Results** ----- What do my approach result in?

**#5. Conclusions**

---

### #1. Definition

---

#### 1-1. Project Overview:

In this proposal, in order to verify how useful CNN is to solve time-series prediction problem, CNN, LSTM, and CNN+LSTM are build on stock datasets of Google obtained at kaggle. As you know, CNN is mainly used in the field of Image Recognition so far. CNN, however, has recently been said to be a valid method to solve time-series forecasting problem. In order to show that RNN, LSTM, and CNN+LSTM models are build on the google stock datasets and their score on the test datasets are compared with benchmark score of RNN, which is often used for time-series data, with MSE.

#### 1-2. Problem Statement:

In this proposal, usability of deep learning, especially CNN as an feature extractor, is verified.

Although CNN is known to be valid in the field of Image Recognition, few use-case of CNN are applied to finance problem, such as stock price predictions. This is because a lot of Algorithm Trading has employed technical index so far. These index, however, are commonly used and developed by humans. So, it can be said that there is some room to improve Trading Algorithm.

In this context, applying CNN to the finance problem and validation of its usefulness is meaningful as CNN has high potential to recognize patterns in given dataset and computational power has advanced so far.

In order to valid the usefulness of LSTM and CNN+LSTM are compared to the stock price predictions with metrics MSE. In addition to this, RNN is set as base-models. By comparing the four models with MSE, the usefulness of CNN are verified in the stock price problem.

## 1-3. Metrics:

As mentioned above, MSE is evaluation metrics. Needless to say, less MSE is better for stock price prediction. The reasons of employing MSE in this problem are the followings.

First, the target value, which is daily close stock price, is continuous. So, this is regression problem.

Second, more penalty is added to larger error with MSE compared to MAE by employing squared value.

Therefore, MSE is employed as evaluation metrics.

---

## #2. Analysis

---

```
# import libraries
import os
import time
import datetime
import warnings
import numpy as np
import pandas as pd
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from IPython.core.display import display as p
%matplotlib inline
warnings.filterwarnings('ignore')
base_path = os.getcwd()
```

### 2-1. Data Exploration

In this problem, google stock price datasets obtained [kaggle](#) are used. Stock datasets from 2014-03-27 to 2017-05-01 are used as train datasets. Stock datasets from 2017-05-01 to

2017-11-10 are used as test datasets.

### 1. train.csv

- number of rows: 780
- number of columns: 6

### 2. test.csv

- number of rows: 137
- number of columns: 6

### 3. columns and data types

- Date: date, index
- Open: float, feature
- High: float, feature
- Low: float, feature
- Volume: float, feature
- Close: float, target

```
# load stock datasets of google
## set file names:
train_name = 'train.csv'
test_name = 'test.csv'

## read data:
df_train = pd.read_csv(os.path.join(base_path, 'input', train_name))
df_train['Date'] = pd.to_datetime(df_train['Date'])
df_train = df_train.set_index('Date')
df_test = pd.read_csv(os.path.join(base_path, 'input', test_name))
df_test['Date'] = pd.to_datetime(df_test['Date'])
df_test = df_test.set_index('Date')

## shapes of train and test datasets:
print('Train datasets: ', df_train.shape)
print('Test datasets: ', df_test.shape)

y_train, y_test = df_train['Close'], df_test['Close']
X_train, X_test = df_train.drop('Close', axis=1), df_test.drop('Close', axis=1)

## data types of datasets:
print('---'*25)
print('dtypes of datasets: ')
print(df_train.info())

## heads of train and test datasets:
print('---'*25)
print('Train datasets:')
```

```

p(df_train.head())
print('Test datasets: ')
p(df_test.head())

## basic statistic info of datasets:
print('----'*25)
print('basic statistic of datasets: ')
print(X_train.describe())

```

Train datasets: (780, 5)

**Test datasets: (137, 5)**

dtypes of datasets:

<class 'pandas.core.frame.DataFrame'>

DatetimeIndex: 780 entries, 2014-03-27 to 2017-05-01

Data columns (total 5 columns):

Open 780 non-null float64

High 780 non-null float64

Low 780 non-null float64

Close 780 non-null float64

Volume 780 non-null int64

dtypes: float64(4), int64(1)

memory usage: 36.6 KB

**None**

Train datasets:

	Open	High	Low	Close	Volume	
Date						
2014-03-27	568.00	568.00	552.92	558.46	13052	
2014-03-28	561.20	566.43	558.67	559.99	41003	
2014-03-31	566.89	567.00	556.93	556.97	10772	
2014-04-01	558.71	568.45	558.71	567.16	7932	
2014-04-02	599.99	604.83	562.19	567.00	146697	

Test datasets:

	Open	High	Low	Close	Volume	
--	------	------	-----	-------	--------	--

Date					
2017-05-01	901.94	915.68	901.450	912.57	2115701
2017-05-02	909.62	920.77	909.453	916.44	1545245
2017-05-03	914.86	928.10	912.543	927.04	1498051
2017-05-04	926.07	935.93	924.590	931.66	1421984
2017-05-05	933.54	934.90	925.200	927.13	1911275

#### ----- basic statistic of datasets:


	Open	High	Low	Volume
count	780.000000	780.000000	780.000000	7.800000e+02
mean	659.798927	664.838887	654.095332	1.762739e+06
std	108.205845	108.556833	108.148483	9.887431e+05
min	494.650000	495.980000	487.560000	7.932000e+03
25%	550.000000	554.580000	544.177500	1.192554e+06
50%	660.105000	664.985000	653.235000	1.552158e+06
75%	757.755000	765.305000	750.522750	2.050637e+06
max	910.660000	916.850000	905.770000	1.116490e+07

## 2-2. Exploratory Visualization

In this section, the Close Price of train and test datasets, which is target value, are visualized. As shown below, the Close price of google are increasing from 2014-03-27 to 2017-11-10.

```
# visualization of train and test target datasets
plt.plot(X_train.index, y_train, label='train')
plt.plot(X_test.index, y_test, label='test')

plt.vlines(X_train.index.max(), ymin=y_train.min(), ymax=y_test.max(), linestyle='dashed')
plt.text(X_train.index.max(), y_train.max()*4/5, X_train.index.max().strftime('%Y-%m-%d'),
         label='Train End Date', color='red', fontweight='bold')
plt.xlabel('Date'); plt.ylabel('Close'); plt.title('The Close Price of Google from 2014-03-27 to 2017-11-10')
plt.xticks(rotation=30)
plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
plt.savefig('./img/'+ 'close_price_plot.png')
plt.show()
```





## 2-3. Algorithms and Techniques

In this paper, deep learning models performing well for time-series predictions, RNN, LSTM, CNN+LSTM, are used because the Close Price are relevant with the past stock information, which is our input data such as Open, High, Low, Volume columns. By applying RNN, LSTM, CNN+LSTM models to this time-series forecasting problem, how useful CNN is to solve time-series prediction problem is verified.

## 2-4. Benchmark

In this problem, RNN model is build to get base MSE as benchmark model. RNN, one of the famous deep learning models, is often used for time-series forecasting. This is an usual score with conventional method employing deep learning. As mentioned above, the metrics with which the benchmark model is measured is also MSE.

---

# #3. Methodology

---

## 3-1. Data Preprocessing

In this section, preprocessing datasets, especially normalization, is explained. In this problem,

the datasets are normalized within window datasets.

More concretely speaking, window datasets values are divided by the value of its first index, 0. After do that, the values divided are minus 1 in order to set the value range from -1.0 to 1.0. This normalization allows my deep learning models to learn more first and get properly regularization term effect. Actually, in this paper, no regularization approach are employed because this don't meet my goal which is to verify CNN potential for time-series forecasting. In this time, 10 is employed for the window length.

```
# preprocessing: normalization
## set window size
window = 10

## train data normalization
X_train_scls, y_train_scls= [], []
for i in range(X_train.shape[0] - window):
    X_tmp = X_train.iloc[i:i+window].copy()
    # normalized by first day in its window and minus 1 in order to set the value r
    X_tmp = X_tmp/X_tmp.iloc[0] - 1
    X_train_scls.append(X_tmp)

## test data normalization
X_test_scls, y_test_scls= [], []
for i in range(X_test.shape[0] - window):
    X_tmp = X_test.iloc[i:i+window].copy()
    # normalized by first day in its window and minus 1 in order to set the value r
    X_tmp = X_tmp/X_tmp.iloc[0] - 1
    X_test_scls.append(X_tmp)

X_train_fin = np.array([np.array(X_train_scl) for X_train_scl in X_train_scls])
y_train_fin = (y_train[window:].values / y_train[:-window].values) - 1

X_test_fin = np.array([np.array(X_test_scl) for X_test_scl in X_test_scls])
y_test_fin = (y_test[window:].values / y_test[:-window].values) - 1
print('X_train shape: ', X_train_fin.shape)
print('y_train shape: ', y_train_fin.shape)
```

```
X_train shape: (770, 10, 4)
y_train shape: (770,)
```

## 3-2. Implementation

The process for which metrics, algorithms, and techniques were implemented with the given datasets or input data has been thoroughly documented.

As for metrics, MSE are employed in order to give more penalty on larger error compared to

MAE because it is squared value.

As for algorithms and techniques, deep learning models are selected to perform well on this time-series problem. As mentioned above, RNN is employed as benchmark model. It is widely used for time-series prediction problem. According the convention, deep learning model with 7 layers which are composed of 6 RNN layers and 1 Dense is employed as benchmark model and trained on those datasets.

But, RNN model reaches the limit at about 0.0017 MSE on the test datasets although layers are stacked and increase number of epoch. As it is shown in the learning curve, RNN's curve reach the limit.

### 3-3. Refinement

So, LSTM which has capability to learn long-term dependencies are employed as second deep learning model. LSTM model is composed of 7 layers which are 6 layers LSTM and 1 Dense layer as the same as RNN.

After training, LSTM performs better on the test datasets than RNN and it achieves 0.00024 MSE in comparison with 0.017, benchmark score of RNN.

LSTM, however, takes long time to learn from the datasets because LSTM learn sequentially. Now, it takes about 196 sec. In the real business, time is also important in addition to prediction ability.

Lastly, 1-dimensional-CNN+LSTM is employed as the third deep learning model to predict as well as LSTM model and save learning time. As the same as the above two kinds of deep learning models, 1d-CNN+LSTM model is composed of 7 layers with 2 CNN layers, 4 LSTM layers and 1 Dense layers. After 1d-CNN+LSTM is trained, it is confirmed that its loss, MSE, is 0.00024 which is the same as the LSTM model and the training time is 134 sec which is shorter by 32 % than LSTM which takes 196 sec to learn from training datasets.

On top of that, recurrent dropout are employed especially for 1d-CNN+LSTM to acquire generalization performance. In this technique, it is well known that the popular dropout rate is set up at 50%. It may be good. In this paper, however, some knowledge obtained from my data scientist friends who is kagglers are employed for the strategy of setting dropout rate. What he said is that it is better to decrease the dropout rate with increasing layers because deep learning model is getting more abstract representation and it is needless to set 50%. Actually, this is rule of thumb, but it is valuable to try this technique to build deep learning model by myself.

As a result, 1d-CNN+LSTM realize perform as well as LSTM and better than benchmark model, RNN. In addition to this, the learning time of 1d-CNN+LSTM model is the shortest



amongst the three models.

```
# build model
from keras.models import Sequential
from keras.layers import Conv1D, RNN, SimpleRNN, LSTM, Dense, Dropout, MaxPooling1D

## set parameters
step_size = 10
input_size = 4
num_epochs = 40

## benchmark model; RNN
def build_rnn(input_shape=(step_size, input_size), loss='mean_squared_error', optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae']):
    model = Sequential()
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(SimpleRNN(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=False))
    model.add(Dense(1, activation='linear'))
    model.compile(loss=loss, optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae'])
    print('----'*25)
    print('rnn architecture: ')
    print(model.summary())
    print('\n')
    return model

## LSTM
def build_lstm(input_shape=(step_size, input_size), loss='mean_squared_error', optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae']):
    model = Sequential()
    model.add(LSTM(16, input_shape=(step_size, input_size), return_sequences=True))
    model.add(LSTM(16, return_sequences=True))
    model.add(LSTM(16, return_sequences=True))
    model.add(LSTM(16, return_sequences=True))
    model.add(LSTM(16, return_sequences=True))
    model.add(LSTM(16, return_sequences=False))
    model.add(Dense(1, activation='linear'))
    model.compile(loss=loss, optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae'])
    print('----'*25)
    print('lstm architecture: ')
    print(model.summary())
    print('\n')
    return model

## CNN+LSTM
def build_cnn_lstm(input_shape=(step_size, input_size), loss='mean_squared_error', optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae']):
    model = Sequential()
    model.add(Conv1D(32, kernel_size=3, strides=1, padding='same', activation='relu'))
    model.add(MaxPooling1D(3))
    # model.add(Dropout(.5))
    model.add(Conv1D(32, kernel_size=3, strides=1, padding='same', activation='relu'))
    model.add(MaxPooling1D(3))
    # model.add(Dropout(.4))
```

```

model.add(LSTM(16, recurrent_dropout=.5, return_sequences=True))
model.add(LSTM(16, recurrent_dropout=.4, return_sequences=True))
model.add(LSTM(16, recurrent_dropout=.3, return_sequences=True))
model.add(LSTM(16, recurrent_dropout=.2, return_sequences=False))
model.add(Dense(1, activation='linear'))
model.compile(loss=loss, optimizer=optimizer, metrics=['mae'])
print('----'*25)
print('cnn+lstm architecture: ')
print(model.summary())
print('\n')
return model

```

```

# compile RNN
rnn = build_rnn(input_shape=(step_size, input_size))

# compile LSTM
lstm = build_lstm(input_shape=(step_size, input_size))

# compile CNN+LSTM
cnn_lstm = build_cnn_lstm(input_shape=(step_size, input_size))

```

-----

rnn architecture:

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
=====		
simple_rnn_261 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 10, 16)	336
simple_rnn_262 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 10, 16)	528
simple_rnn_263 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 10, 16)	528
simple_rnn_264 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 10, 16)	528
simple_rnn_265 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 10, 16)	528
simple_rnn_266 (SimpleRNN)	(None, 16)	528
<b>dense_168 (Dense)</b>	<b>(None, 1)</b>	<b>17</b>
=====		

Total params: 2,993  
Trainable params: 2,993  
Non-trainable params: 0

None

-----

lstm architecture:

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
lstm_389 (LSTM)	(None, 10, 16)	1344
lstm_390 (LSTM)	(None, 10, 16)	2112
lstm_391 (LSTM)	(None, 10, 16)	2112
lstm_392 (LSTM)	(None, 10, 16)	2112
lstm_393 (LSTM)	(None, 10, 16)	2112
lstm_394 (LSTM)	(None, 16)	2112
<b>dense_169 (Dense)</b>	<b>(None, 1)</b>	<b>17</b>
Total params: 11,921		
Trainable params: 11,921		
Non-trainable params: 0		

None

-----  
cnn+lstm architecture:

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #
conv1d_160 (Conv1D)	(None, 10, 32)	416
max_pooling1d_136 (MaxPoolin	(None, 3, 32)	0
conv1d_161 (Conv1D)	(None, 3, 32)	3104
max_pooling1d_137 (MaxPoolin	(None, 1, 32)	0
lstm_395 (LSTM)	(None, 1, 16)	3136
lstm_396 (LSTM)	(None, 1, 16)	2112
lstm_397 (LSTM)	(None, 1, 16)	2112
lstm_398 (LSTM)	(None, 16)	2112
<b>dense_170 (Dense)</b>	<b>(None, 1)</b>	<b>17</b>
Total params: 13,009		
Trainable params: 13,009		
Non-trainable params: 0		

None

```

# deep learning models training:
## RNN trianing:
print('RNN training...')
start = time.time()
hist_rnn = rnn.fit(X_train_fin, y_train_fin, epochs=num_epochs, validation_data=(X_
elapsed_time_rnn = time.time() - start
print ("elapsed_time:{0}".format(elapsed_time_rnn) + "[sec]")
print('\n')

## LSTM trianing:
print('LSTM training...')
start = time.time()
hist_lstm = lstm.fit(X_train_fin, y_train_fin, epochs=num_epochs, validation_data=(
elapsed_time_lstm = time.time() - start
print ("elapsed_time:{0}".format(elapsed_time_lstm) + "[sec]")
print('\n')

## CNN+LSTM trianing:
print('CNN+LSTM training...')
start = time.time()
hist_cnn_lstm = cnn_lstm.fit(X_train_fin, y_train_fin, epochs=num_epochs, validatio
elapsed_time_cnn_lstm = time.time() - start
print ("elapsed_time:{0}".format(elapsed_time_cnn_lstm) + "[sec]")

```

```

RNN training...
Train on 770 samples, validate on 127 samples
Epoch 1/40
770/770 [=====] - 96s 125ms/step - loss: 0.0758 - mean_abs
Epoch 2/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0208 - mean_absolu
Epoch 3/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0116 - mean_absolu
Epoch 4/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0075 - mean_absolu
Epoch 5/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0059 - mean_absolu
Epoch 6/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0049 - mean_absolu
Epoch 7/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0043 - mean_absolu
Epoch 8/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0037 - mean_absolu
Epoch 9/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0033 - mean_absolu
Epoch 10/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0045 - mean_absolu
Epoch 11/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0030 - mean_absolu
Epoch 12/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0027 - mean_absolu

```

```
Epoch 13/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0025 - mean_absolu
Epoch 14/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0044 - mean_absolu
Epoch 15/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0032 - mean_absolu
Epoch 16/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0027 - mean_absolu
Epoch 17/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0024 - mean_absolu
Epoch 18/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0021 - mean_absolu
Epoch 19/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0022 - mean_absolu
Epoch 20/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 2ms/step - loss: 0.0023 - mean_absolu
Epoch 21/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0022 - mean_absolu
Epoch 22/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0023 - mean_absolu
Epoch 23/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0021 - mean_absolu
Epoch 24/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0029 - mean_absolu
Epoch 25/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 2ms/step - loss: 0.0025 - mean_absolu
Epoch 26/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0020 - mean_absolu
Epoch 27/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0020 - mean_absolu
Epoch 28/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0017 - mean_absolu
Epoch 29/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0017 - mean_absolu
Epoch 30/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0017 - mean_absolu
Epoch 31/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0024 - mean_absolu
Epoch 32/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean_absolu
Epoch 33/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0014 - mean_absolu
Epoch 34/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0014 - mean_absolu
Epoch 35/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0016 - mean_absolu
Epoch 36/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 2ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean_absolu
Epoch 37/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean_absolu
Epoch 38/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean_absolu
Epoch 39/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0013 - mean_absolu
Epoch 40/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean_absolu
```

elapsed\_time:139.41530799865723[sec]

LSTM training...

Train on 770 samples, validate on 127 samples

Epoch 1/40

770/770 [=====] - 87s 113ms/step - loss: 0.0020 - mean\_abs

Epoch 2/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 3/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 4/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 5/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 6/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0016 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 7/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0015 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 8/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0014 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 9/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0014 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 10/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0013 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 11/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0012 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 12/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0011 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 13/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 0.0011 - mean\_absolu

Epoch 14/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 9.4476e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 15/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 9.2023e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 16/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 8.6725e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 17/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 8.2316e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 18/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 4ms/step - loss: 8.1077e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 19/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 7.7750e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 20/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 4ms/step - loss: 7.6712e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 21/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 4ms/step - loss: 7.4117e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 22/40

770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 8.0967e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 23/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 7.0332e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 24/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 7.0735e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 25/40

770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 6.7579e-04 - mean\_ab

Epoch 26/40

```
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 6.3325e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 27/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 6.2791e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 28/40
770/770 [=====] - 3s 4ms/step - loss: 6.0447e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 29/40
770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 5.8215e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 30/40
770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 5.5936e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 31/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 5.5760e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 32/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 5.5554e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 33/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 5.3197e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 34/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 5.1462e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 35/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 5.0091e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 36/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 4.9489e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 37/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 4.8455e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 38/40
770/770 [=====] - 2s 3ms/step - loss: 4.7847e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 39/40
770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 4.4347e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 40/40
770/770 [=====] - 3s 3ms/step - loss: 5.0619e-04 - mean_ab
elapsed_time:196.04686617851257[sec]
```

CNN+LSTM training...

Train on 770 samples, validate on 127 samples

```
Epoch 1/40
770/770 [=====] - 82s 107ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean_abs
Epoch 2/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean_absolu
Epoch 3/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0020 - mean_absolu
Epoch 4/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean_absolu
Epoch 5/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean_absolu
Epoch 6/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0019 - mean_absolu
Epoch 7/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0018 - mean_absolu
Epoch 8/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 0.0012 - mean_absolu
Epoch 9/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 8.2203e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 10/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 7.5099e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 11/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 6.5946e-04 - mean_ab
```

```
Epoch 12/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 6.3470e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 13/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 5.5599e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 14/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 5.6145e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 15/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 5.3706e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 16/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.8281e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 17/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.8522e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 18/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.3345e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 19/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.2281e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 20/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.4170e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 21/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.1381e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 22/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.0365e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 23/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.8640e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 24/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 4.0363e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 25/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.5268e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 26/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.4890e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 27/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.4633e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 28/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.3661e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 29/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.3059e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 30/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.3688e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 31/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.2455e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 32/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.1792e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 33/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.2141e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 34/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.3410e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 35/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.0004e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 36/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.0495e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 37/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.1130e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 38/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 2.9565e-04 - mean_ab
Epoch 39/40
770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 3.0282e-04 - mean_ab
```



Epoch 40/40

770/770 [=====] - 1s 1ms/step - loss: 2.8299e-04 - mean\_ab  
elapsed\_time:133.61206912994385[sec]


```
# visualize learning curve
history_dict = {'rnn':hist_rnn, 'lstm':hist_lstm, 'cnn+lstm':hist_cnn_lstm}
elapsed_time_dict = {'rnn':elapsed_time_rnn, 'lstm':elapsed_time_lstm, 'cnn+lstm':e
for key, hist_value in history_dict.items():
    print(key.upper())
    fig = plt.figure(i, figsize=(10,5))

# loss: mse
plt.subplot(1, 2, 1)
plt.plot(range(num_epochs), hist_value.history['loss'], label='train')
plt.plot(range(num_epochs), hist_value.history['val_loss'], label='test')
plt.text(num_epochs/3., np.max(hist_value.history['loss'])/1.3, 'Minimum val lo
plt.text(num_epochs/3., np.max(hist_value.history['loss'])/1.4, "Training Time
plt.legend(frameon=False)
plt.xlabel('epoch')
plt.ylabel('Mean Squared Error')
plt.title('MSE')

# metrics: mae
plt.subplot(1, 2, 2)
plt.ylim(0., .1)
plt.plot(range(num_epochs), hist_value.history['mean_absolute_error'], label='t
plt.plot(range(num_epochs), hist_value.history['val_mean_absolute_error'], labe
plt.legend(frameon=False)
plt.xlabel('epoch')
plt.ylabel('Mean Absolute Error')
plt.title('MAE')
plt.savefig('./img/'+key+'_learning_curve.png')
plt.show()

print('Minimum val MSE: {:.5f}'.format(np.min(hist_value.history['val_loss'])))
print('Minimum val MAE: {:.5f}'.format(np.min(hist_value.history['val_mean_abso
print('----'*30)
```


RNN



Minimum val MSE: 0.00171

**Minimum val MAE: 0.02987**


LSTM



Minimum val MSE: 0.00024

**Minimum val MAE: 0.01256**

CNN+LSTM



## #4. Results

### 4-1. Model Evaluation and Validation

In this section, the final model's qualities such as its robustness are evaluated.

As shown in the above learning curves, the three models has generalized performance because they perform well on both train and test datasets in terms of MSE, which is metrics.

In addition to this, the parameter's value of each model is respectively visualized in the below distribution plots. The distribution graphs show that parametes value of network distribute from -0.5 to 0.5 although bias values distribute mostly around 0. This means that the deep learning models are a little bit redundancy network to solve this problem.

### 4-2. Justification

In this section, the final results are compared to the benchmark result and justification is made as to whether the final model and solution is significant enough to have adequately solved the problem.


MSEs of both LSTM and CNN+LSTM are smaller by approximately 86% on the given train and test datasets than the benchmark score, which is RNN's MSE.

In terms of learning speed, CNN+LSTM are shortest than RNN and LSTM.


From the above, it can be said that CNN+LSTM is valid approach to solve time-series forecasting.

```
# visualize parameters
import seaborn as sns
## RNN and LSTM
dl_dict = {'rnn':rnn, 'lstm':lstm, 'cnn+lstm':cnn_lstm}
for k, v in dl_dict.items():
    if k != 'cnn+lstm':
        print(k.upper())
        fig = plt.figure(figsize=(20, 5))
        for i, layer in enumerate([j for j in range(0, 7)]):
            plt.subplot(1, 7, i+1)
            w = v.layers[layer].get_weights()[0]
            b = v.layers[layer].get_weights()[1]
            sns.distplot(w.flatten(), kde=False, bins=20, label='weights')
            sns.distplot(b.flatten(), kde=False, bins=20, label='bias')
            plt.xlabel('value')
            plt.title('layer {0}'.format(i+1))
            plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
        plt.tight_layout()
        plt.savefig('./img/'+k+'_params_dist.png')
        plt.show()


## CNN + LSTM
print('CNN+LSTM')
fig = plt.figure(figsize=(20, 5))
for i, layer in enumerate([0, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]):
    plt.subplot(1, 7, i+1)
    w = cnn_lstm.layers[layer].get_weights()[0]
    b = cnn_lstm.layers[layer].get_weights()[1]
    sns.distplot(w.flatten(), kde=False, bins=20, label='weights')
    sns.distplot(b.flatten(), kde=False, bins=20, label='bias')
    plt.xlabel('value')
    plt.title('layer {0}'.format(i+1))
    plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.savefig('./img/cnn+lstm_params_dist.png')
plt.show()
```



## LSTM



## CNN+LSTM



# #5. Conclusion

## 5-1. Free-Form Visualization

In this section, a visualization has been provided that emphasizes an important quality about the project with thorough discussion.

In this paper, in order to verify how useful CNN is to solve time-series prediction problem, CNN, LSTM, and CNN+LSTM are build on stock datasets of Google obtained at kaggle and their predictions are compared with MSE. As a result, CNN+LSTM and LSTM's MSE are minimum adn CNN+LSTM's learning time is shortest amongst the three models. This shows that applying CNN to time-series forecasting is valid.

Predictions by each deep learning models are visualized below. As shown below and mentioned above, LSTM and CNN+LSTM performs much better than benchmark model, RNN. In contrast to RNN as benchmark model which has less robustness, LSTM and CNN+LSTM look to have more robustness and predict better.

As for learning time, CNN+LSTM model saves the most amongst the three model. This is because CNN can learn parallely in contrast to LSTM which learns sequentially.

In conclusion, employing CNN for time-series problem is valid in terms of prediction and learning speed compared to other deep learning models such as RNN and LSTM.

	<b>RNN</b>	<b>LSTM</b>	<b>CNN+LSTM</b>
MSE [-]	0.0017	0.00024	0.00024
TIME [sec]	139	196	134


```
# visualize predictions
sns.set()

## RNN, LSTM, CNN+LSTM preds vs actual
fig = plt.figure(figsize=(20, 10))
plt.plot(X_test.index, y_test.values, label='Test actual', color='green', linewidth=1)
plt.plot(X_test.iloc>window:.index, ((np.transpose(rnn.predict(X_test_fin))+1.)*y_test.values),
         color='gray', linewidth=.6, linestyle='-')
plt.plot(X_test.iloc>window:.index, ((np.transpose(lstm.predict(X_test_fin))+1.)*y_test.values),
         color='blue', linewidth=1., linestyle='-')
plt.plot(X_test.iloc>window:.index, ((np.transpose(cnn_lstm.predict(X_test_fin))+1.)*y_test.values),
         color='red', linewidth=1., linestyle='-')
plt.ylabel('Close Price'); plt.title('All Models Preds');
plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
plt.savefig('./img/all_models_preds.png')
plt.show()

## LSTM preds vs actual
fig = plt.figure(figsize=(20, 10))
plt.plot(X_test.index, y_test.values, label='Test actual', color='lightgreen')
plt.plot(X_test.iloc>window:.index, ((np.transpose(lstm.predict(X_test_fin))+1.)*y_test.values),
         color='blue', linewidth=1., linestyle='-')
plt.ylabel('Close Price'); plt.title('LSTM Preds');
plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
```

```
plt.savefig('./img/lstm_preds.png')
plt.show()

## CNN+LSTM preds vs actual
fig = plt.figure(figsize=(20, 10))
plt.plot(X_test.index, y_test.values, label='Test actual', color='lightgreen')
plt.plot(X_test.iloc>window:].index, ((np.transpose(cnn_lstm.predict(X_test_fin))+1
        color='red', linewidth=1., linestyle='-')
plt.ylabel('Close Price'); plt.title('CNN+LSTM Preds');
plt.legend(loc='best', frameon=False)
plt.savefig('./img/cnn_lstm_models_preds.png')
plt.show()
```





## 5-2. Reflection

In this section, the end-to-end problem solution and discusses one particular aspects of the project they found interesting or difficult.

In this paper, in order to verify how useful CNN is for time-series forecasting, RNN, LSTM, CNN+LSTM are build to predict Close price of Google from 4 features, open, high, low and volume. As a result, CNN+LSTM perform best in terms of MSE and Learning Speed.

As for preprocessing, window is set to 10 in this paper and the values are normalized in the window datasets. After do that, all the deep learning models with 7 layers are trained on the train datasets and evaluated on the test datasets.

As for found interesting and difficult, CNN was only used for image recognition in my learning experience. Now, it is interesting that CNN combined with LSTM is employed and CNN shows its capability to solve time-series datasets.

In contrast to this, it is difficult to win stock trading with machine learning. As shown above, preds of 1d-CNN+LSTM and LSTM are not usefull to win the stock trading.

Anyway, this experience to employing various deep learning models to solve this problem helps me to solve a problem with various approach.

## 5-3. Improvement

In this section, discussion is made as to how one aspect of the implementation could be improved.



In order to build algorithm trading system which predicts well and can win the stock price trading, there are three potential approaches.

- Change my data: Feature engineering with the existing models.
- Change my model and data: CNN and LSTM with one more dimension to learn the relationship between the other stock datasets such as Facebook, Apple etc. For simple example, CNN's RGB channel for image recognition is corresponding to Google, Apple, Facebook, and Amazon stock datasets.
- Change my model: In order to 'win' trading, Deep-Reinforcement approach is useful because it can learn policy with three actions of sell, stay, buy.

I appreciate your spending time on my paper.

Sincerely,

[Masaharu Kinoshita](#), a newly-fledged data scientist at IBM Japan