# Time Series Analysis & Forecasting Using R

3. Transformations






- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7

- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7


# Per capita adjustments

```
global_economy |>
  filter(Country == "Australia") |>
  autoplot(GDP)
```



## Per capita adjustments

```
global_economy |>
  filter(Country == "Australia") |>
  autoplot(GDP / Population)
```



- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7

#### **Lab Session 6**


Consider the GDP information in global\_economy. Plot the GDP per capita for each country over time. Which country has the highest GDP per capita? How has this changed over time?

- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7

#### **Inflation adjustments**

```
print retail <- aus retail |>
 filter(Industry == "Newspaper and book retailing") |>
 group_by(Industry) |>
 index by(Year = year(Month)) |>
  summarise(Turnover = sum(Turnover))
aus_economy <- filter(global_economy, Country == "Australia")</pre>
print retail |>
 left join(aus economy, by = "Year") |>
 mutate(Adj_turnover = Turnover / CPI) |>
  pivot_longer(c(Turnover, Adj_turnover),
    names to = "Type", values to = "Turnover"
 ) |>
  ggplot(aes(x = Year, y = Turnover)) +
 geom_line() +
 facet grid(vars(Type), scales = "free v") +
 labs(x = "Years", y = NULL,
       title = "Turnover: Australian print media industry")
```

# **Inflation adjustments**



- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7

If the data show different variation at different levels of the series, then a transformation can be useful.

If the data show different variation at different levels of the series, then a transformation can be useful.

Denote original observations as  $y_1, \ldots, y_n$  and transformed observations as  $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ .

If the data show different variation at different levels of the series, then a transformation can be useful.

Denote original observations as  $y_1, \ldots, y_n$  and transformed observations as  $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ .

#### Mathematical transformations for stabilizing variation

Square root 
$$w_t = \sqrt{y_t}$$

Cube root 
$$w_t = \sqrt[3]{y_t}$$
 Increasing

Logarithm  $w_t = \log(y_t)$  strength

If the data show different variation at different levels of the series, then a transformation can be useful.

Denote original observations as  $y_1, \ldots, y_n$  and transformed observations as  $w_1, \ldots, w_n$ .


#### Mathematical transformations for stabilizing variation

Square root 
$$w_t = \sqrt{y_t}$$
   
Cube root  $w_t = \sqrt[3]{y_t}$  Increasing   
Logarithm  $w_t = \log(y_t)$  strength


Logarithms, in particular, are useful because they are more interpretable: changes in a log value are **relative** (**percent**) **changes** 




```
food <- aus_retail |>
  filter(Industry == "Food retailing") |>
  summarise(Turnover = sum(Turnover))
```




```
food |> autoplot(sqrt(Turnover)) +
labs(y = "Square root turnover")
```




```
food |> autoplot(Turnover^(1 / 3)) +
labs(y = "Cube root turnover")
```



```
food |> autoplot(log(Turnover)) +
  labs(y = "Log turnover")
```



```
food |> autoplot(-1 / Turnover) +
 labs(y = "Inverse turnover")
```



Each of these transformations is close to a member of the family of **Box-Cox transformations**:

$$w_t = \begin{cases} \log(y_t), & \lambda = 0; \\ (\operatorname{sign}(y_t)|y_t|^{\lambda} - 1)/\lambda, & \lambda \neq 0. \end{cases}$$


Each of these transformations is close to a member of the family of **Box-Cox transformations**:

$$w_t = \begin{cases} \log(y_t), & \lambda = 0; \\ (\operatorname{sign}(y_t)|y_t|^{\lambda} - 1)/\lambda, & \lambda \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

- $\blacksquare$  Actually the Bickel-Doksum transformation (allowing for  $y_t < 0$ )
- $\lambda$  = 1: (No substantive transformation)
- $\lambda = \frac{1}{2}$ : (Square root plus linear transformation)
- $\lambda$  = 0: (Natural logarithm)
- $\lambda = -1$ : (Inverse plus 1)

- This attempts to balance the seasonal fluctuations and random variation across the series.
- Always check the results.
- lacksquare A low value of  $\lambda$  can give extremely large prediction intervals.

```
food |> autoplot(box_cox(Turnover, 0.0895)) +
labs(y = "Box-Cox transformed turnover")
```



#### **Transformations**

- Often no transformation needed.
- Simple transformations are easier to explain and work well enough.
- Transformations can have very large effect on PI.
- If some data are zero or negative, then use  $\lambda > 0$ .
- log1p() can also be useful for data with zeros.
- Choosing logs is a simple way to force forecasts to be positive
- Transformations must be reversed to obtain forecasts on the original scale. (Handled automatically by fable.)

- 1 Per capita adjustments
- 2 Lab Session 6
- 3 Inflation adjustments
- 4 Mathematical transformations
- 5 Lab Session 7

#### **Lab Session 7**

- For the following series, find an appropriate transformation in order to stabilise the variance.
  - United States GDP from global\_economy
  - Slaughter of Victorian "Bulls, bullocks and steers" in aus\_livestock
  - Victorian Electricity Demand from vic\_elec.
  - Gas production from aus\_production
- Why is a Box-Cox transformation unhelpful for the canadian\_gas data?