

## 4. Results

The most relevant results of the analysis are shown and organized in this chapter as follows. As a first step, the number of states of the model is decided. Then, a model selection is performed for the given dataset in order to find which model is the most appropriate one, and which parameter should have a switching effect in the model. An analysis of residuals is carried out with the graphical in a later section as a means to validate the models. Next, the results of a non-parametric analysis are presented, and a comparison between Markov switching autoregressive model and the non-parametric analysis are made. The last two sections report the results of predicting a state of the new observations in each dataset, and an evaluation of a predict function using a simulated data.

### 4.1. States

To estimate the set of necessary parameters, an *MSwM*<sup>1</sup> package in R is used. More details about the package can be found in Appendix B.

A complete linear Markov switching autoregressive model in this thesis framework is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} y_t = & \beta_{0,S_t} + \beta_{RrcConnectionSetupComplete,S_t} X_{RrcConnectionSetupComplete,t} \\ & + \beta_{Paging,S_t} X_{Paging,t} + \beta_{X2HandoverRequest,S_t} X_{X2HandoverRequest,t} \\ & + \beta_{DuProdName,S_t} X_{DuProdName,t} + \beta_{Fdd/Tdd,S_t} X_{Fdd/Tdd,t} \\ & + \beta_{NumCells,S_t} X_{NumCells,t} + \phi_{1,S_t} y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{S_t} \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Markov switching autoregressive model is performed for each dataset with every parameter in the model has switching effects i.e., the coefficients can take on different values in different periods. The estimation is made under the assumptions of two or three states  $S_t \in S$ , where  $S = 1, 2, \dots, k$  and  $k = 2$  or  $3$ . These two numbers come from a hypothesis that the state of the CPU utilization might have two states (Normal and Bad, Normal and Good, Bad and Good) or three states (Normal, Bad, and Good). During the estimation, a normality assumption is also applied to the distribution of residuals.

---


<sup>1</sup><https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/MSwM/index.html>

Before performing the Markov switching autoregressive model, a standard linear regression model is fitted to the dataset first. It is found that one coefficient in the dataset of software release L16A is not defined because of singularity. Hence, DuProdName variable is dropped from Equation 4.1. BICs from fitting the Markov switching autoregressive model are shown in Table 4.1.

**Table 4.1.:** BIC of the model with two and three states. The left column gives the different datasets.

Software release	BIC	
	$k = 2$	$k = 3$
L16A	439.677	417.682
L16B	1,763.507	1,797.259
L17A	1,189.061	1,199.075


For the software release L16A, BIC suggests that the three-state Markov switching autoregressive model gives a better fit in comparison to the two-state model. Figure 4.1 presents that the Markov chain remains in State 1 for an extensive period of time before it switches to State 2. When the chain is in State 2, it stays there only a short time and then quickly moves back to State 1. There are a few switches between these two states in Figure 4.1. On the other hand, it is visible that there are more switches between states in Figure 4.2. One noticeable thing is that State 2 in the two-state model seems to be defined as State 1 in the three-state model instead. Moreover, the periods of State 1, which has a rather long duration, in the two-state model now contain plenty of switches between states in the three-state model.



**Figure 4.1.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L16A with two-state model


According to Table 4.1, the Markov switching autoregressive models with two states for the remaining two software releases, L16B and L17A, yield better results in favor of lower BICs.

## 4.1 States



**Figure 4.2.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L16A with three-state model


In Figure 4.3, the Markov chain has several periods where it switches back and forth between two states of the software release L16B. The durations of being in State 2 have a longer length compare with the durations of staying in State 1. Although the chain temporarily stays in State 1, it remains in this state for a few moments in the middle of the time period (observation 91-99 and 101-114) before turning to State 2. Apparently, there are more switches between states in the three-state model, especially in the beginning, middle, and at the end of the period. Figure 4.4 shows that the chain remains in State 3 over a considerable period as can be seen throughout observation 15-39, 42-67, and 140-170.




**Figure 4.3.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L16B with two-state model

There are a number of switches between states in the two-state model of the software release L17A. In Figure 4.5, when the Markov chain is in State 1, it continues to stay in its state for a while before leaving to State 2. Furthermore, it can be seen that the chain has a fairly short duration staying in State 2. After the chain visits State 2, it instantly switches back to State 1. Figure 4.6 presents the chain which has many switches between State 1 and State 2 in the first half of the time period. The chain for the three-state model also stays in State 2 significantly long from observation 104 until 129, which is the end of the time series.

The outputs from the models along with plots provide more interpretable results



**Figure 4.4.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L16B with three-state model




**Figure 4.5.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L17A with three-state model

when defining the model with three states in the software release L16B and L17A. In regards to this, the three-state models for each software release are further analyzed in the thesis.

## 4.2. Switching coefficients

The fitted Markov switching autoregressive models in sec. 4.1 only have state-dependent parameters i.e., coefficients of the regression with switching effects. Apparently, each coefficient can have either a switching or non-switching effect. A hypothesis for the switching/non-switching coefficients is that the variables considered as the test environment are possible to have non-switching effects. Markov switching autoregressive models are applied to each dataset again, but this time all combinations of switching/non-switching coefficients in the model are tried out. In this section, tables report the structure of the model, while plots present the state specifications from the chosen Markov switching autoregressive model. Further discussion and details about the selected model for the given dataset are provided in chapter 5. It should be noted that these three selected model will later be used throughout this



**Figure 4.6.:** The smoothed probabilities of the software release L17A with three-state model

thesis.


For the dataset of the software release L16A, DuProdName is not included in the model fitting as previously explained. Only two variables of the test environment are left to try whether it can have non-switching effect or not. The result is shown in Table 4.2. The second model has the highest BIC and even higher than the model with all switching coefficients. The first model, where both Fdd/Tdd and NumCells have switching effects, is selected to use with this dataset.

**Table 4.2.:** List of the model structure of the software release L16A with different switching coefficients along with its BIC. The line in bold indicates the selected model.

Model	Switching effect		BIC
	Fdd/Tdd	NumCells	
<b>1</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>413.408</b>
2	N	Y	438.371
3	Y	N	401.232

Figure 4.7 indicates the CPU utilization of the software release L16A and also shows the periods of the derived state from the model. It is not difficult to notice that State 2 has the longest duration to remain in its own state. When the chain moves to State 3, it immediately switches to the other states. In other words, the chain does not linger in State 3 during the time series period. In addition, this pattern happens to most of the durations in State 1, except in the beginning and almost at the end of the period where the chain tends to have a longer duration. There is also more chance from State 2 to switch to State 3 rather than switch to State 1.

For the software release L16B, Table 4.3 presents the results of fitting the model with different combinations of switching coefficients. Model 5 and 7 have higher BICs than the model which has switching effect in all coefficients. The second model,



**Figure 4.7.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L16A showing the periods where the observation is in the specific state.

Model 1: Fdd/Tdd and Numcells are non-switching coefficients.

where DuProdName and Fdd/Tdd are non-switching coefficients, has a smallest BIC. The chosen model for this dataset is the model which has only DuProdName with a non-switching coefficient or model 4.


**Table 4.3.:** List of the model structure of the software release L16B with different switching coefficients along with its BIC. The line in bold indicates the selected model.

Model	Switching effect			BIC
	DuProdName	Fdd/Tdd	NumCells	
1	N	N	N	1,787.528
2	N	N	Y	1,704.393
3	N	Y	N	1,784.384
<b>4</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>Y</b>	<b>1,776.102</b>
5	Y	N	N	1,806.385
6	Y	N	Y	1,725.865
7	Y	Y	N	1,804.487

Many switches between states can easily be seen in Figure 4.8. However, the state which has the longest duration to remain in its own state is State 3. It is visible that there are three durations where the chain stays in State 3 for a long time. Another noticeable behavior from this switching mechanism is that there is several switches between State 1 and State 2 in the beginning, middle, and at the end of the time period.

Table 4.4 presents the different models for the software release L17A. There is only model 2 that has a higher BIC than the model with all switching coefficients. The least BIC is from the first model that all three variables in the test environment have non-switching effects. This model is also chosen to be further used for this dataset.

### 4.3 Residual analysis



**Figure 4.8.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L16B showing the periods where the observation is in the specific state.

Model 4: DuProdName is non-switching coefficient.


**Table 4.4.:** List of the model structure of the software release L17A with different switching coefficients along with its BIC. The line in bold indicates the selected model.

Model	Switching effect			BIC
	DuProdName	Fdd/Tdd	NumCells	
<b>1</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>1,140.474</b>
2	N	N	Y	1,204.280
3	N	Y	N	1,152.740
4	N	Y	Y	1,184.643
5	Y	N	N	1,146.000
6	Y	N	Y	1,189.236
7	Y	Y	N	1,157.311

There exists several switches between three states in the beginning of the time series as shown in Figure 4.9. Around the end of the time series period, State 3 appears to have a longer duration and there is a fewer switches to State 1. State 2 seems to be the only state which has a fairly short duration for the chain to stay in the state. The plot also indicates that State 2 tends to switch to State 1 more often than switch to State 3.

### 4.3. Residual analysis

Pooled residuals of the selected Markov switching autoregressive model from sec. 4.2 are analyzed to see how well it fits an assumption of a normal distribution. A Quantile-Quantile (Q-Q) plot is an effective tool for assessing normality. Moreover, an Autocorrelation function (ACF) and a Partial Autocorrelation Function (PACF)




**Figure 4.9.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L17A showing the periods where the observation is in the specific state.

Model 1: DuProdName, Fdd/Tdd, and NumCells are non-switching coefficients.

of residuals are a useful technique to check on the independence of noise terms in the model. The Q-Q plot and the ACF/PACF plot play a significant role in the residual diagnostics. These plots of each dataset are shown below.

In Figure 4.10, the pooled residuals appear to fall in a straight line with some deviations in its tails. There is an evidence of autocorrelation in the residuals of this model, which can be seen in both ACF and PACF plot, at lag 8.




**Figure 4.10.:** The normal Q-Q plot and the ACF/PACF of pooled residuals of the software release L16A

In Figure 4.11, it is noticed that points form a straight line in the middle of the plot, but curve off at both ends. This is a characteristic of a heavy-tailed distribution. The data has more extreme values than it should be if the data truly comes from a normal distribution. In addition, both the ACF and PACF plot show that there is a small amount of autocorrelation remaining in the residuals. The statistically significant correlation of this model are at lags 6 and 10. The significant at lag 4 both in the ACF and PACF plot is slightly higher than two standard errors.




### 4.3 Residual analysis



**Figure 4.11.:** The normal Q-Q plot and the ACF/PACF of pooled residuals of the software release L16B

A Q-Q plot in Figure 4.12 suggests that a distribution of the pooled residuals may have a tail thicker than that of a normal distribution. It is visible that there are many extreme positive and negative residuals in the plot. Furthermore, the ACF plot of pooled residuals are significant for the first two lags, whereas the PACF plot is significant only at lag 2.



**Figure 4.12.:** The normal Q-Q plot and the ACF/PACF of pooled residuals of the software release L17A


## 4.4. Non-parametric analysis

An E-divisive method is applied to all three datasets. The method reports one cluster for the dataset of the software release L16A. There are five clusters found in both datasets of the software release L16B and L17A. Table 4.5 shows places in the time series data where the E-divisive algorithm is able to detect the significant changes.

**Table 4.5.:** The locations of the statistically significant change points from applying the E-divisive algorithm in each dataset

Software release	Change-point location
L16A	-
L16B	130, 135, 153, 170
L17A	9, 77, 82, 105


The CPU utilization of the software release L16A, L16B and L17A along with its estimated change points in the time series are plotted and shown in Figure 4.13, Figure 4.14 and Figure 4.15, respectively. The E-divisive method cannot identify any changes in the dataset of the software release L16A.




**Figure 4.13.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L16A

Four change points are identified from the method for the software release L16B and L17A. In Figure 4.14, the estimated change points for the dataset of the software release L16B are likely to occur around the same period of time, which are almost at the end of the time series data. The estimated points from the method are approximately at peaks and negative peaks.

On the contrary, the result of the dataset of the software release L17A, which is shown in Figure 4.15, has the estimated change points rather spread out. The E-divisive method discovers changes when the CPU utilization is about to drop or increase its value.



**Figure 4.14.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L16B. The red dashed vertical lines indicate the locations of estimated change points.




**Figure 4.15.:** The CPU utilization of the software release L17A. The red dashed vertical lines indicate the locations of estimated change points.

##### 4.4.1. Comparison between the Markov switching autoregressive model and the E-divisive

One noticeable thing is that the E-divisive method is able to identify the changes of the data less than the Markov switching autoregressive model. As mentioned previously, no estimated change points is discovered when applying the E-divisive algorithm to the dataset of the software release L16A. Thus, a comparison between two methods cannot be made for this dataset.


Figure 4.16 presents results of both switches from the Markov switching autoregressive model and change point locations from the E-divisive method. There is one location where the E-divisive method detects a change but the Markov switching autoregressive model does not show any switches. As can be seen, the E-divisive method appears to detect changes when State 2 switches to State 3. At observation 130, the E-divisive method discovers a switch in the state at the same time as Markov switching autoregressive model does. However, the E-divisive method identifies switches after and before the Markov switching autoregressive model does at observations 135 and 170, respectively.

For the dataset of the software release L17A, the E-divisive method reports a change



**Figure 4.16.:** The combined results of the Markov switching autoregressive model and the E-divisive method for the software release 16B

at observation 105 whereas no switch between states can be found from the result of the Markov switching autoregressive model. The E-divisive method is able to detect a switch from State 1 to State 3, and also a switch from State 3 to State 1 in Figure 4.17. It is visible that both two methods can detect the change at the same period of time at observations 77 and 82. The E-divisive method detects a change at observation 9 which is before there is a switch in the state from the result of the Markov switching autoregressive model.



**Figure 4.17.:** The combined results of the Markov switching autoregressive model and the E-divisive method for the software release 17A

## 4.5. Predicting the state

Now, an implemented predict function is applied to the test set in order to find the most probable state for new observations. For the software release L16A, there are 7 observations in a test set. In Figure 4.18, only two states, which are State 1 and State 2, are assigned for these observations. The first three observations are in State 2. Afterwards, observation tends to switch back and forth between states until the end. It is noticed that the last observation does not belong to any state.


## 4.5 Predicting the state

After applying a predict function to the test set, the function is unable to predict the most likely state for the last observation of the test set.




**Figure 4.18.:** The predicted state of the test set in the software release L16A

In total, there are 25 observations in a test set of the software release L16B. The result after applying the predict function to the test set is shown in Figure 4.19. Observation 15 is the only observation which is in State 2. Many switches between State 1 and State 2 can be seen from the plot. In addition, observation appears to stay in State 1 only a short time before moving to State 3, except for the first five observations.



**Figure 4.19.:** The predicted state of the test set in the software release L16B

Fifteen observations is in a test set of the software release L17A. Figure 4.20 presents a considerably long period for staying in State 2, which is from observation 10 to the end of the time series data. There are several switches between states happening in the plot. As can be seen, observation between 4 and 7 swaps between states fairly quick. Observation visits the particular state for one time and then move to the other states.



**Figure 4.20.:** The predicted state of the test set in the software release L17A

## 4.6. Assessing state prediction using a simulation technique

Markov switching autoregressive model is fitted with eighty percents of the observations from a simulated data, and the remaining is used as a test set to evaluate a performance of the model. The result of the model performance is shown in Table 4.6. There are two observations from the Bad state which are wrongly classified to the Normal state. Moreover, another two observations from the Good state are classified to the Normal state. The overall accuracy of the model is 0.96, and the misclassification rate is 0.04. One can see that the model is able to correctly predict the observations which have Bad and Good state.

**Table 4.6.:** Confusion matrix after applying the Markov switching autoregressive model to fit with the test set

		Predicted state		
		Bad	Normal	Good
Actual state	Bad	58	2	0
	Normal	0	30	0
	Good	0	2	8