# PREDICTING BANK DISTRESS IN THE UK WITH MACHINE LEARNING

# Joel Suss (Bank of England, London School of Economics) Henry Treitel (Bank of England)

## Summary:

- Using regulatory data, we compare classical statistical models with distress
- Implement rigorous, double-block randomisation CV procedure & quarter correlation)
- Random forest (RF) best based on AUC and Brier Score
- RF also best when varying the relative cost of false negatives (mi (wrongly predicting distress) for discrete decision thresholds
- Investigate drivers of bank distress using Shapley values and regr
- Explore simple ensembling techniques to demonstrate additiona
- Robustness checks: different time horizons (1,2,3 and 8 months),

### Data:

- Outcome measure: Subjective supervisory assessments of firm ri Total Probability score)
- 1-10 score, 8 or above considered high-risk and lab
- Predictors: financial ratios, balance sheet growth rates, macroeconomic variables (quarterly, 2006-2012)  $\bullet$

**Distribution of Arrow scores** 





	Fals
ith machine learning techniques for predicting bank	1.00
to account for hierarchical nature of data (intra-firm	0.75
issing actual cases of distress) & false positives	۲ 2 0.50
ression, and H-statistic (for interaction strength) al performance benefits ), rolling forecast CV, omitting pre Q3 2009 data.	0.25
isk (UK Financial Services Authority ARROW	0.00
belled distressed – i.e. converted to binary	

# **Cross-validation procedure**



### se negative & false positive error rates





### **Interaction strength (H-statistic)**

# **Shapley regression coefficients (standardized &** exponentiated)



# Mean absolute Shapley values



### **Relative misclassification costs**

