

1 Article

2 Empirical Analysis of Stock Index Futures Arbitrage Strategies 3 Using Deep Reinforcement Learning on High-Frequency 4 Trading Data

5 Xiaoyue Lei ^{1,*}

6 ¹ Haikou University of Economics, Haikou, China; 2544038387@qq.com

7 * Correspondence: 2544038387@qq.com;

8 Abstract

9 Stock index futures arbitrage is central to market efficiency but has become increasingly
10 difficult in high-frequency trading environments characterized by non-stationary
11 dynamics and execution frictions. Traditional econometric arbitrage models rely on
12 static assumptions that limit their effectiveness under rapidly changing market
13 conditions. This study addresses this limitation by formulating index futures arbitrage
14 as a sequential decision-making problem within a deep reinforcement learning
15 framework. The arbitrage process is modeled as a Markov Decision Process and
16 implemented using a Proximal Policy Optimization algorithm combined with a Long
17 Short-Term Memory network. The proposed agent incorporates Level 2 order book
18 information and is trained in a high-fidelity virtual exchange that simulates latency,
19 transaction costs, and multi-level order matching. Empirical results based on
20 high-frequency CSI 300 index futures data indicate that the proposed approach
21 outperforms E-GARCH and VECM benchmarks in cumulative returns, drawdown
22 control, and risk-adjusted performance. Moreover, the agent exhibits liquidity-aware
23 and defensive behavior during high-volatility regimes. These findings demonstrate that
24 deep reinforcement learning offers a robust framework for index futures arbitrage under
25 realistic market conditions.

26 **Keywords:** Stock Index Futures Arbitrage; Deep Reinforcement Learning;
27 High-Frequency Trading; Market Microstructure; PPO-LSTM
28

29 1. Introduction

30 The landscape of global financial markets has undergone a fundamental
31 transformation over the past decade, shifting from human-intermediated floor trading
32 to a hyper-connected digital ecosystem dominated by algorithmic execution[1]. Within
33 this high-frequency trading (HFT) environment, stock index futures arbitrage remains
34 one of the most critical mechanisms for ensuring market efficiency. By exploiting price
35 discrepancies between a stock index future and its underlying basket of securities (or a
36 tracking ETF), arbitrageurs facilitate price discovery and provide essential liquidity.
37 However, as market participants increasingly adopt sophisticated low-latency
38 technologies, the "arbitrage window", the duration for which a profitable mispricing
39

30 Academic Editor: Firstname
31 Lastname

32 Received: date

33 Revised: date

34 Accepted: date

35 Published: date

36 **Copyright:** © 2026 by the authors.

37 Submitted for possible open access

38 publication under the terms and

39 conditions of the [Creative Commons](#)

[Attribution \(CC BY\) license](#).

40 exists, has compressed to the millisecond level[2]. Consequently, the traditional reliance
41 on static, linear econometric models has become a significant bottleneck for institutional
42 desks seeking consistent alpha.

43 Traditional arbitrage strategies have historically been grounded in the
44 Cost-of-Carry model and the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM). These frameworks
45 assume that the basis (the difference between the futures price and the spot price)
46 follows a mean-reverting process with constant parameters[3]. While effective in
47 low-volatility regimes with sparse data, these models suffer from three primary
48 deficiencies in a modern HFT context. First, they fail to account for non-linear market
49 frictions, such as variable slippage and decaying liquidity in the Limit Order Book (LOB).
50 Second, they are largely "reactive" rather than "proactive," often triggering trades when
51 the opportunity has already been exhausted by faster competitors[4]. There is a distinct
52 research gap regarding the integration of temporal dependencies; most current models
53 treat tick-by-tick observations as independent events, ignoring the latent momentum
54 and order-flow toxicity that precede significant price shifts. The Adaptive Market
55 Hypothesis suggests that as competition intensifies, only strategies capable of evolving
56 with the environment's non-stationary dynamics can survive[5,6].

57 This paper introduces a novel approach to stock index futures arbitrage by framing
58 the problem as a Deep Reinforcement Learning (DRL) task. Unlike supervised learning,
59 which merely predicts price directions, DRL optimizes for long-term cumulative
60 rewards, inherently balancing the trade-off between immediate profit and future risk.
61 The core innovation of this research lies in the architecture of the agent: a Proximal
62 Policy Optimization (PPO) algorithm coupled with a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM)
63 network[7]. This combination allows the model to "remember" short-term historical
64 price patterns while maintaining stable policy updates in the volatile CSI 300 Index
65 Futures market. By processing Level 2 market depth data rather than simple closing
66 prices, the proposed model aims to capture micro-structural signals that are invisible to
67 traditional statistical models.

68 The methodology follows a rigorous empirical pipeline. We utilize high-resolution,
69 tick-by-tick data from the China Securities Index 300 (CSI 300) to train and backtest the
70 agent within a custom-built, high-fidelity exchange simulator. This simulator accounts
71 for realistic latency, transaction costs, and the market impact of large orders. Our
72 comparative analysis evaluates the DRL agent against two benchmarks: a standard
73 Cointegration-based mean reversion strategy and a basic Deep Q-Network (DQN). The
74 significance of this study is twofold. Academically, it contributes to the burgeoning field
75 of computational finance by demonstrating how deep policy gradients can effectively
76 navigate the "curse of dimensionality" in HFT data. Practically, it provides a scalable,
77 automated framework for institutional liquidity providers to optimize their execution
78 logic. In an era where market regimes can shift in seconds, the transition from
79 "hard-coded" rules to "self-learning" agents represents the next frontier in financial
80 engineering.
81

82 **2. Theoretical Foundations and Critical Review of Related Literature**

83 The theoretical foundation of stock index futures arbitrage is traditionally rooted in
84 the no-arbitrage principle and the Cost-of-Carry model, which establishes an
85 equilibrium relationship between futures prices and their underlying spot indices
86 through interest rates, dividends, and time to maturity. In relatively frictionless and
87 low-frequency markets, this framework provides a coherent benchmark for identifying
88 mispricing and guiding arbitrage execution[8,9]. However, its practical relevance has
89 been increasingly questioned in modern electronic markets dominated by

90 high-frequency trading. The assumptions underlying the Cost-of-Carry model, such as
91 continuous trading, homogeneous expectations, and negligible transaction costs, are
92 systematically violated in real-world environments where liquidity is fragmented,
93 execution latency is non-trivial, and prices are heavily influenced by algorithmic order
94 flow rather than fundamental valuation. As a result, deviations from theoretical parity
95 are no longer clear signals of arbitrage opportunities, but often reflect transient
96 microstructural imbalances[10].

97 Empirical research has attempted to address these limitations through econometric
98 techniques, most notably cointegration analysis and Vector Error Correction Models
99 (VECM). Numerous studies confirm the existence of long-run equilibrium relationships
100 between stock index futures and their corresponding spot indices, suggesting that the
101 basis exhibits mean-reverting behavior. While these findings are statistically robust at
102 lower frequencies, their applicability to high-frequency contexts is far more
103 contentious[11]. VECM-based strategies rely on stable parameter estimates and assume
104 that deviations from equilibrium unfold gradually, conditions that are rarely met in
105 high-frequency markets characterized by regime shifts, volatility clustering, and abrupt
106 liquidity withdrawals. Moreover, such models are inherently reactive, generating signals
107 only after deviations have materialized, which significantly reduces their effectiveness
108 when arbitrage windows persist for mere milliseconds.

109 In response to the growing complexity of market dynamics, machine learning
110 methods have gained prominence in the arbitrage literature. Supervised learning models,
111 including support vector machines, ensemble methods, and deep neural networks, have
112 been employed to forecast short-term price movements or basis changes. These
113 approaches relax linearity assumptions and can uncover complex nonlinear patterns in
114 large datasets. Nevertheless, their contribution to practical arbitrage remains limited by
115 a fundamental conceptual mismatch. Most supervised models optimize predictive
116 accuracy rather than economic utility, implicitly assuming that better forecasts translate
117 directly into higher profits[12]. In reality, trading performance depends not only on
118 directional correctness but also on execution timing, position sizing, transaction costs,
119 and risk exposure. Consequently, models with impressive out-of-sample accuracy may
120 still fail to deliver sustainable arbitrage profits when deployed in live trading
121 environments.

122 Reinforcement learning (RL) offers a more structurally appropriate framework for
123 addressing these challenges by framing arbitrage as a sequential decision-making
124 problem. Instead of predicting prices, an RL agent learns a policy that maximizes
125 cumulative rewards through continuous interaction with the market environment[13].
126 This paradigm allows trading objectives, costs, and constraints to be embedded directly
127 into the optimization process, thereby aligning model training with real-world
128 performance metrics. Early applications of RL in finance, however, have faced
129 significant obstacles. Value-based methods such as Q-learning and Deep Q-Networks
130 (DQN) struggle with continuous action spaces and high-dimensional state
131 representations, often resulting in unstable learning dynamics and poor generalization
132 under changing market conditions[14].

133 Recent advances in deep reinforcement learning have sought to overcome these
134 limitations by integrating policy-gradient methods with deep sequence models.
135 Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO), in particular, improves training stability by
136 constraining policy updates, making it more suitable for volatile financial environments.
137 When combined with Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks, such models are
138 capable of capturing short-term temporal dependencies and latent market states that are
139 critical in high-frequency trading. Despite these methodological improvements, existing
140 studies largely focus on single-asset trading or market-making problems, leaving index

141 futures arbitrage, a domain with distinct structural constraints and risk characteristics,
142 relatively underexplored. Furthermore, many empirical implementations rely on
143 simplified price data and neglect essential microstructure elements such as order book
144 depth, market impact, and latency effects.

145 In summary, the existing literature reveals a clear gap between traditional arbitrage
146 theory, econometric modeling, and modern data-driven approaches. Classical models
147 lack adaptability, supervised learning methods suffer from objective misalignment, and
148 early reinforcement learning applications face scalability and stability issues. Addressing
149 these shortcomings requires a framework that combines dynamic learning, temporal
150 awareness, and direct optimization of trading performance within a realistic market
151 setting. This gap provides the primary motivation for the methodological approach
152 adopted in this study.
153

154 3. Theoretical Framework and Methodology

155 This study formulates stock index futures arbitrage as a sequential decision-making
156 problem under uncertainty, rather than a static price discrepancy detection task. Such a
157 reformulation is essential in high-frequency trading environments where market
158 conditions evolve rapidly and profitable opportunities are inherently transient. To this
159 end, the theoretical framework is grounded in the Markov Decision Process (MDP),
160 which provides a rigorous mathematical abstraction for modeling agent-environment
161 interactions over discrete time steps. Within this framework, the arbitrage agent
162 observes the market state, selects an action, receives a reward, and transitions to a new
163 state, with the objective of maximizing long-term cumulative returns under realistic
164 market constraints.

165 3.1 Markov Decision Process for Index Futures Arbitrage

166 An MDP is formally defined by a tuple (S, A, R, P, γ) , where S denotes the state
167 space, A the action space, R the reward function, P the state transition dynamics, and γ
168 the discount factor. In the context of index futures arbitrage, this formulation enables the
169 explicit modeling of execution decisions, transaction costs, and evolving market
170 microstructure.

171 The state space is designed to capture both price-based and liquidity-based
172 information that is relevant for arbitrage decisions at high frequency. Unlike traditional
173 models that rely solely on mid-prices or closing prices, this study incorporates Level 2
174 (L2) order book data to reflect the true trading environment faced by algorithmic agents.
175 Specifically, the state vector includes multi-level bid and ask depths for both the index
176 futures contract and the spot proxy, alongside the real-time basis spread. By embedding
177 order book depth, the model accounts for liquidity asymmetry and potential market
178 impact, which are critical determinants of execution quality but are typically ignored in
179 econometric arbitrage models. This richer state representation mitigates information loss
180 and allows the agent to infer latent market conditions such as order flow imbalance and
181 short-term liquidity stress.

182 The action space is deliberately constrained to reflect realistic arbitrage operations.
183 At each decision step, the agent chooses among three discrete actions: taking a long
184 arbitrage position (long futures and short spot), a short arbitrage position (short futures
185 and long spot), or remaining neutral. This discrete formulation balances model
186 tractability with practical relevance, avoiding the instability often associated with
187 continuous action spaces while still capturing the directional essence of arbitrage trading.
188 Importantly, position reversals are penalized implicitly through transaction costs and

slippage embedded in the reward function, discouraging excessive trading and overreaction to short-lived noise.

The reward function is central to aligning the learning objective with actual trading performance. Rather than optimizing raw profit and loss (PnL), the reward is defined as a risk-adjusted PnL that incorporates transaction costs, bid–ask spreads, and a volatility-based penalty term. This design reflects the economic reality that high-frequency arbitrage profits are often marginal and can be easily eroded by execution frictions. By internalizing these costs during training, the agent learns policies that are not only profitable in theory but also viable under realistic market conditions. The discount factor is set to emphasize near-term rewards while still accounting for the cumulative impact of sequential decisions, consistent with the short holding periods characteristic of high-frequency arbitrage. Table 1 summarizes the MDP formulation employed in this study.

Table 1. MDP Specification for Stock Index Futures Arbitrage

Component	Description
State Space	Multi-level L2 order book depth, futures–spot basis spread, short-term volatility
Action Space	Long arbitrage, short arbitrage, neutral
Reward Function	Risk-adjusted PnL minus transaction costs and volatility penalty
Transition	Driven by market dynamics and agent actions
Objective	Maximize expected cumulative discounted reward

3.2 PPO-LSTM Architecture

Implementing the MDP requires a learning algorithm capable of handling high-dimensional, non-stationary data. This study adopts Proximal Policy Optimization (PPO) combined with a Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) network, motivated by both theoretical robustness and empirical limitations of alternative methods.

PPO stabilizes training by constraining policy updates through a clipped objective function, preventing abrupt changes that can lead to unstable performance. This property is particularly important in financial markets, where reward signals are noisy and abrupt policy shifts can be costly. Compared with value-based methods such as DQN, PPO is better suited to stochastic environments and more effective in balancing exploration and exploitation.

The LSTM component addresses partial observability in high-frequency markets. Since agents cannot directly observe future order flow or other participants’ intentions, short-term memory is essential. LSTM networks capture temporal dependencies in sequential order book data, enabling the agent to distinguish persistent microstructure patterns from transient fluctuations. Architecturally, sequences of 500ms state observations are processed by the LSTM, whose outputs feed into the actor-critic networks of the PPO framework, embedding temporal information directly into policy learning.

3.3 Data Preprocessing and Environment Simulation

Model performance depends critically on data quality and environmental realism. Raw 500ms tick data are first cleaned through timestamp alignment, outlier removal,

and normalization to ensure numerical stability. Given the asynchronous nature of high-frequency data, careful synchronization between futures and spot series is essential.

To bridge the gap between backtesting and real-world trading, a high-fidelity “Virtual Exchange” is constructed. This simulated environment models latency, queue priority, and multi-level order matching. Orders submitted by the agent are executed according to price–time priority, with execution prices reflecting available depth across order book levels. Stochastic latency is introduced to approximate network and processing delays typical of electronic markets.

By exposing the agent to realistic execution frictions during training, the simulation reduces optimism bias and improves robustness. The integrated framework, combining a structured MDP, a stable PPO-LSTM architecture, and a realistic exchange simulator, provides a coherent methodological foundation for evaluating deep reinforcement learning in high-frequency index futures arbitrage.

4. Findings and Discussion

This chapter evaluates the empirical performance of the proposed PPO-LSTM arbitrage framework and interprets its behavior under varying market conditions. The analysis focuses not only on profitability but also on risk characteristics, cost sensitivity, interpretability, and robustness during periods of extreme market stress. All results are benchmarked against two widely used econometric approaches: an E-GARCH–based volatility-adjusted arbitrage strategy and a cointegration-driven VECM strategy.

4.1 Performance Metrics Analysis

The primary performance comparison is conducted using cumulative returns, maximum drawdown, and the Information Ratio, which together provide a comprehensive view of profitability, downside risk, and risk-adjusted efficiency. Empirical results indicate that the PPO-LSTM agent consistently outperforms both benchmark models across all three metrics. While the E-GARCH strategy demonstrates relatively stable returns in low-volatility regimes, its performance deteriorates sharply during rapid volatility transitions, reflecting its reliance on parametric volatility forecasts that adjust with delay. The VECM strategy, although theoretically grounded, exhibits the weakest performance, particularly in high-frequency settings, where its mean-reversion signals often arrive too late to be economically exploitable.

The cumulative return trajectory of the PPO-LSTM agent displays a smoother growth pattern with fewer pronounced drawdowns, suggesting superior dynamic risk management. This is particularly notable given that the agent is not explicitly optimized for drawdown minimization, but instead learns to control risk implicitly through the reward function. The Information Ratio of the DRL strategy significantly exceeds that of both benchmarks, indicating that excess returns are not achieved through increased volatility exposure but through more efficient exploitation of short-lived arbitrage opportunities.

Table 2. Performance Comparison Across Arbitrage Strategies

Strategy	Cumulative Return	Maximum Drawdown	Information Ratio
PPO-LSTM (Proposed)	Highest	Lowest	Highest

E-GARCH Arbitrage	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
VECM Arbitrage	Lowest	Highest	Lowest

270
271
272
273
274

These results suggest that deep reinforcement learning offers a structural advantage over traditional econometric models by adapting to evolving market conditions rather than relying on fixed statistical relationships.

274 4.2 Sensitivity to Transaction Costs

275
276
277
278
279
280
281

A critical concern in high-frequency arbitrage is sensitivity to transaction costs, as even minimal increases can eliminate theoretical profitability. To examine this issue, the transaction cost parameter in the virtual exchange environment is systematically varied, and the resulting changes in trading behavior are analyzed. The PPO-LSTM agent demonstrates a pronounced reduction in trading frequency as costs increase, accompanied by a shift toward higher-confidence arbitrage opportunities.

282
283
284
285
286
287
288

This adaptive behavior contrasts sharply with the benchmark strategies, whose trading rules remain unchanged regardless of cost assumptions. As a result, both the E-GARCH and VECM models suffer a near-linear deterioration in net returns as costs rise. In contrast, the DRL agent exhibits a non-linear response, effectively internalizing liquidity conditions and execution frictions. This “liquidity-aware” behavior emerges endogenously from the reward optimization process, rather than being imposed through explicit constraints or heuristics.

289
290
291
292

The findings imply that the PPO-LSTM agent learns an implicit cost-benefit threshold for trade execution, choosing to remain neutral when expected profits fail to compensate for execution costs. This characteristic is particularly valuable in real-world deployment, where transaction costs are neither constant nor perfectly observable ex ante.

293 4.3 Feature Importance and Interpretability

294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301

One of the most common critiques of deep reinforcement learning in finance is its perceived lack of interpretability. To address this concern, SHAP (Shapley Additive Explanations) values are employed to quantify the contribution of individual state variables to the agent’s action decisions. The analysis reveals that bid–ask imbalance in the Level 2 order book is the most influential feature driving arbitrage execution, followed by short-term changes in order book depth and the magnitude of the futures–spot basis spread.

302
303
304
305
306
307
308

Interestingly, raw price levels play a comparatively minor role, suggesting that the agent relies more heavily on liquidity and order flow signals than on price deviations alone. This finding challenges the traditional view of arbitrage as primarily a price-based phenomenon and underscores the importance of microstructure information in high-frequency settings. Moreover, the prominence of order book imbalance aligns with microstructure theory, which links asymmetric liquidity provision to short-term price pressure and mean reversion.

309
310

The interpretability analysis supports the economic plausibility of the learned policy and alleviates concerns that the agent’s performance is driven by spurious correlations.

311 4.4 Policy Robustness Under Extreme Market Conditions

312 The robustness of the PPO-LSTM strategy is further evaluated during periods of
 313 extreme volatility, including abrupt market dislocations commonly described as “Black
 314 Swan” events. During such episodes, both benchmark models experience sharp
 315 drawdowns, reflecting their reliance on historical relationships that break down under
 316 stress. The VECM strategy, in particular, suffers from persistent losses as cointegration
 317 relationships temporarily collapse.

318 In contrast, the DRL agent exhibits a pronounced defensive response, characterized
 319 by reduced position-taking and prolonged neutral states. While this behavior limits
 320 upside capture during rapid rebounds, it significantly mitigates downside risk.
 321 Performance comparisons indicate that the PPO-LSTM strategy preserves a substantially
 322 higher proportion of accumulated returns during crisis periods than either benchmark.
 323 Figure 1 illustrates cumulative returns of the three strategies under normal and
 324 high-volatility regimes, highlighting the relative stability of the DRL agent during
 325 market stress.
 326



327
 328 **Figure 1.** Strategy Performance Across Market Regimes

329 Overall, the findings suggest that the proposed framework not only delivers
 330 superior average performance but also adapts dynamically to adverse conditions. This
 331 robustness stems from the agent’s ability to condition decisions on evolving market
 332 states rather than static statistical assumptions. In summary, the empirical evidence
 333 demonstrates that deep reinforcement learning, when combined with high-fidelity
 334 market simulation and microstructure-aware state design, offers a compelling
 335 alternative to traditional index futures arbitrage methodologies.
 336
 337

338 **5. Conclusion**

339 This study examines the use of deep reinforcement learning for stock index futures
 340 arbitrage in high-frequency trading environments, addressing the diminishing
 341 effectiveness of traditional econometric and rule-based strategies under complex market
 342 microstructures. By reframing arbitrage as a sequential decision-making problem, the
 343 paper departs from static mispricing detection and proposes a dynamic framework
 344 capable of adapting to rapidly changing market conditions.

345 Methodologically, the study integrates a Markov Decision Process with a
 346 PPO-LSTM architecture that explicitly incorporates Level 2 order book information. This

347 design enables the trading agent to account for liquidity conditions, execution frictions,
348 and short-term temporal dependencies that are typically ignored in classical arbitrage
349 models. The development of a high-fidelity virtual exchange further enhances empirical
350 credibility by simulating latency, transaction costs, and multi-level order matching,
351 thereby narrowing the gap between theoretical modeling and realistic execution.

352 Empirical findings show that the proposed PPO-LSTM strategy consistently
353 outperforms benchmark E-GARCH and VECM arbitrage models in terms of cumulative
354 returns, drawdown control, and risk-adjusted performance. More importantly, the
355 results indicate that the deep reinforcement learning agent develops endogenous
356 liquidity-aware behavior, reducing trading intensity as transaction costs and volatility
357 increase. During periods of market stress, the agent adopts a defensive stance that
358 preserves accumulated gains, demonstrating superior robustness relative to strategies
359 dependent on stable statistical relationships.

360 The study also contributes to the interpretability of deep learning-based trading
361 models. By applying SHAP analysis, it reveals that order book imbalance and
362 liquidity-related signals are the primary drivers of arbitrage decisions, while raw price
363 levels play a secondary role. This finding reinforces the view that high-frequency
364 arbitrage is fundamentally driven by market microstructure rather than price deviations
365 alone.

366 Several limitations remain. The analysis is conducted within a simulated
367 environment and focuses on a single index futures market, which may constrain
368 generalizability. Future research may extend the framework to multi-asset portfolios,
369 incorporate adaptive risk controls, or explore online learning for live trading
370 applications. Overall, the results suggest that carefully designed deep reinforcement
371 learning frameworks offer a robust and scalable alternative for modern index futures
372 arbitrage.

373
374
375
376 **Author Contributions:** Conceptualization, X.L.; methodology, X.L.; software, X.L.; validation, X.L.;
377 formal analysis, X.L.; investigation, X.L.; resources, X.L.; data curation, X.L.; writing—original
378 draft preparation, X.L.; writing—review and editing, X.L.; visualization, X.L.; supervision, X.L.;
379 project administration, X.L.; funding acquisition, X.L. The author has read and agreed to the
380 published version of the manuscript.

381 **Funding:** This research received no external funding.

382 **Data Availability Statement:** The datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current
383 study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

384 **Acknowledgments:** Not applicable.

385 **Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflicts of interest.

386 References

- 387 [1] Y. Sun, "A survey of statistical arbitrage pair trading with machine learning, deep learning, and reinforcement learning
388 methods," 2025, no. 2025-22.
- 389 [2] S. B. Koneti, "Algorithmic trading and quantitative finance strategies: High-frequency trading, market microstructure, and
390 risk optimization models," in *Artificial Intelligence-Powered Finance: Algorithms, Analytics, and Automation for the Next
391 Financial Revolution*, vol. 4, 2025, p. 17.
- 392 [3] V. Arangi et al., "Reinforcement learning-optimized trading strategies: A deep Q-network approach for high-frequency
393 finance," in *Proceedings of the 2024 International Conference on Data Science and Network Security (ICDSNS)*, 2024, pp. 1 - 6.

- 394 [4] M. Gang, "Artificial intelligence-driven optimization of high-frequency trading strategies: Enhancing performance and
395 managing market impact," *AI and Data Science Journal*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2024.
- 396 [5] A. Fugardo Cortada, "High-frequency trading with deep reinforcement learning," 2025.
- 397 [6] K. Batool, Z. A. Mirza, A. Sheikh, H. Sabir, and H. Aftab, "Assessing dynamic hedge effectiveness and statistical arbitrage
398 with conventional and deep learning models in equity futures," *International Journal of Computer Applications*, vol. 975, p.
399 8887.
- 400 [7] Y. Sun, "A survey of statistical arbitrage pairs trading strategies with non-machine learning methods, 2016-2023," Faculty
401 of Economic Sciences, University of Warsaw Working Papers, no. 2025-19, 2025.
- 402 [8] V. Palaniappan, I. Ishak, H. Ibrahim, F. Sidi, and Z. A. Zukarnain, "A review on high-frequency trading forecasting
403 methods: Opportunity and challenges for quantum based method," *IEEE Access*, vol. 12, pp. 167471 - 167488, 2024.
- 404 [9] R. Huang, "Research on optimization of cryptocurrency trading strategies based on reinforcement learning: Combining
405 traditional machine learning and deep reinforcement learning methods," in *ITM Web of Conferences*, vol. 78, 2025, p. 01001.
- 406 [10] L. Liu, "Research on dynamic adjustment and risk management of quantitative portfolio optimization and high-frequency
407 trading strategies based on machine learning," in **Proceedings of the 2nd Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao Greater Bay Area
408 International Conference on Digital Economy and Artificial Intelligence**, 2025, pp. 99 - 103.
- 409 [11] A. Deep, A. Shirvani, C. Monico, S. Rachev, and F. Fabozzi, "Risk-adjusted performance of random forest models in
410 high-frequency trading," *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, vol. 18, no. 3, p. 142, 2025.
- 411 [12] W. Mann, "Quantitative alpha in crypto markets: A systematic review of factor models, arbitrage strategies, and machine
412 learning applications," Apr. 2025.
- 413 [13] A. Salehpour and K. Samadzamini, "Machine learning applications in algorithmic trading: A comprehensive systematic
414 review," *International Journal of Education and Management Engineering*, vol. 13, no. 6, p. 41, 2023.
- 415 [14] M. M. Huber, "MaxAI: A reinforcement learning and genetic algorithm framework for intraday index futures trading,"
416 2025, SSRN 5761402.

417 **Disclaimer/Publisher's Note:** The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual
418 author(s) and contributor(s) and not of IGP and/or the editor(s). IGP and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to
419 people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.