

M1 APE, Econometrics 2
Exercises: session 4
Stationary processes and forecasts

2019-2020

Exercise 1

Remember that in problem set 3 exercise 2, we saw that the equation defining (y_t) can be rewritten as $(1 - \frac{1}{3}L)(1 - \frac{1}{2}L)y_t = 0.5 + v_t$ and that (v_t) is the innovation process of (y_t) .

1) For a forecast horizon $h = 1$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t+1|t}^* &= \text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t) \\ &= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_t - \frac{1}{6}y_{t-1} + v_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t\right) \\ &= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_t - \frac{1}{6}y_{t-1} + \text{BLF}(v_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t) \\ y_{t+1|t}^* &= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_t - \frac{1}{6}y_{t-1} \quad \text{since } (v_t) \text{ is the innovation process of } (y_t) \end{aligned}$$

$$e_{t+1|t}^* = y_{t+1} - y_{t+1|t}^* = v_{t+1}$$

$$V(e_{t+1|t}^*) = V(v_{t+1}) = \sigma_v^2$$

2) For a forecast horizon $h = 2$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{t+2|t}^* &= \text{BLF}(y_{t+2}|\underline{y}_t) \\ &= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+1} - \frac{1}{6}y_t + v_{t+2}|\underline{y}_t\right) \\ &= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t) - \frac{1}{6}y_t + \text{BLF}(v_{t+2}|\underline{y}_t) \\ y_{t+2|t}^* &= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+1|t}^* - \frac{1}{6}y_t \quad \text{since } (v_t) \text{ is the innovation process of } (y_t) \end{aligned}$$

$$e_{t+2|t}^* = y_{t+2} - y_{t+2|t}^* = \frac{5}{6}(y_{t+1} - y_{t+1|t}^*) + v_{t+2} = \frac{5}{6}v_{t+1} + v_{t+2}$$

$$V(e_{t+2|t}^*) = \left(\frac{25}{36} + 1\right)\sigma_v^2 \quad \text{since } v_t \sim \text{WN}$$

$$V(e_{t+2|t}^*) = \frac{61}{36}\sigma_v^2$$

3) For a forecast horizon $h = 3$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
y_{t+3|t}^* &= \text{BLF}(y_{t+3}|\underline{y}_t) \\
&= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+2} - \frac{1}{6}y_{t+1} + v_{t+3}|\underline{y}_t\right) \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+2}|\underline{y}_t) - \frac{1}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t) + \text{BLF}(v_{t+3}|\underline{y}_t) \\
y_{t+3|t}^* &= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+2|t}^* - \frac{1}{6}y_{t+1|t}^* \quad \text{since } (v_t) \text{ is the innovation process of } (y_t)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
e_{t+3|t}^* &= y_{t+3} - y_{t+3|t}^* \\
&= \frac{5}{6}(y_{t+2} - y_{t+2|t}^*) - \frac{1}{6}(y_{t+1} - y_{t+1|t}^*) + v_{t+3} \\
&= \frac{5}{6}\left(\frac{5}{6}v_{t+1} + v_{t+2}\right) - \frac{1}{6}v_{t+1} + v_{t+3} \\
&= v_{t+3} + \frac{5}{6}v_{t+2} + \left(\frac{25}{36} - \frac{1}{6}\right)v_{t+1} \\
e_{t+3|t}^* &= v_{t+3} + \frac{5}{6}v_{t+2} + \frac{19}{36}v_{t+1}
\end{aligned}$$

$$V(e_{t+3|t}^*) = \left(1 + \frac{25}{36} + \left(\frac{19}{36}\right)^2\right)\sigma_v^2$$

4) *There is a typo in the text: read $h \geq 1$ (and $t \geq 2$)*

For $h = 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|y_t, \dots, y_1) &= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_t - \frac{1}{6}y_{t-1} + v_{t+1}|y_t, \dots, y_1\right) \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_t - \frac{1}{6}y_{t-1} + 0 \quad \text{since } \text{Cov}(v_{t+1}, y_{t-k}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 0 \\
&= \text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|\underline{y}_t)
\end{aligned}$$

For $h = 2$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{BLF}(y_{t+2}|y_t, \dots, y_1) &= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+1} - \frac{1}{6}y_t + v_{t+2}|y_t, \dots, y_1\right) \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|y_t, \dots, y_1) - \frac{1}{6}y_t + 0 \quad \text{since } \text{Cov}(v_{t+2}, y_{t-k}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 0 \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+1|t}^* - \frac{1}{6}y_t \\
&= \text{BLF}(y_{t+2}|\underline{y}_t)
\end{aligned}$$

For $h = 3$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{BLF}(y_{t+3}|y_t, \dots, y_1) &= \text{BLF}\left(0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+2} - \frac{1}{6}y_{t+1} + v_{t+3}|y_t, \dots, y_1\right) \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+2}|y_t, \dots, y_1) - \frac{1}{6}\text{BLF}(y_{t+1}|y_t, \dots, y_1) + 0 \quad \text{since } \text{Cov}(v_{t+3}, y_{t-k}) = 0 \quad \forall k \geq 0 \\
&= 0.5 + \frac{5}{6}y_{t+2|t}^* - \frac{1}{6}y_{t+1|t}^* \\
&= \text{BLF}(y_{t+3}|\underline{y}_t)
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to iterate and to see that $\text{BLF}(y_{t+h}|y_t, \dots, y_1) = \text{BLF}(y_{t+h}|\underline{y}_t)$ for any $h \geq 1$.

Remark: This property is true for any AR process, but not for an MA(q) or ARMA(p, q) process!

Exercise 2

1)i) We can compute a and b using the two conditions defining this linear predictor (forecast error of expectation 0 and of minimum variance).

The first condition yields:

$$\begin{aligned} E(X_{t+h} - (aX_t + b)) &= 0 \Leftrightarrow m - am - b = 0 \quad \text{as } (X_t) \text{ is stationary} \\ &\Leftrightarrow [b = m(1 - a)] \end{aligned}$$

Secondly, the variance of the forecast error can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{t+h} - (aX_t + b)) &= V(X_{t+h} - aX_t) \\ &= V(X_{t+h}) + (-a)^2 V(X_t) + 2 \times (-a) \times \text{Cov}(X_{t+h}, X_t) \\ &= (1 + a^2)\gamma(0) - 2a\gamma(h) \quad \text{as } (X_t) \text{ is stationary} \end{aligned}$$

Let $f(a) = (1 + a^2)\gamma(0) - 2a\gamma(h)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} f'(a) &= 0 \Leftrightarrow 2a\gamma(0) - 2\gamma(h) = 0 \Leftrightarrow a = \frac{\gamma(h)}{\gamma(0)} \Leftrightarrow [a = \rho(h)] \\ f''(a) &= 2\gamma(0) > 0 \quad \forall a \quad \text{so } a = \rho(h) \text{ is indeed a minimum} \end{aligned}$$

This predictor is thus obtained by choosing $a = \rho(h)$ and $b = m(1 - a) = m(1 - \rho(h))$.

ii) $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t) = \alpha X_t + \beta$ has been defined in the course by the two following properties:

$$\begin{cases} E(X_{t+h} - (\alpha X_t + \beta)) = 0 \\ \text{Cov}(X_{t+h} - (\alpha X_t + \beta), X_t) = 0 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} m - \alpha m - \beta = 0 \\ \gamma(h) - \alpha\gamma(0) = 0 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \beta = m(1 - \alpha) = m(1 - \rho(h)) = b \\ \alpha = \frac{\gamma(h)}{\gamma(0)} = \rho(h) = a \end{cases}$$

The previous linear predictor does coincide with $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t)$.

This explains why $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t)$ is named as *best* linear forecast: it is the best one since it is associated to a forecast error which has minimum variance.

Remark: The coefficients a , b , α and β obviously depend on the forecast horizon h and we should rather denote them a_h , b_h , α_h and β_h (but we don't, in order to have simpler notations).

2)i) We can compute a_0 , a_1 and b using the two conditions defining this linear predictor (forecast error of expectation 0 and of minimum variance).

The first condition yields:

$$\begin{aligned} E(X_{t+h} - (a_0X_t + a_1X_{t-1} + b)) &= 0 \Leftrightarrow m - a_0m - a_1m - b = 0 \quad \text{as } (X_t) \text{ is stationary} \\ &\Leftrightarrow [b = m(1 - a_0 - a_1)] \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Secondly, the variance of the forecast error can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} V(X_{t+h} - (a_0X_t + a_1X_{t-1} + b)) &= V(X_{t+h} - a_0X_t - a_1X_{t-1}) \\ &= V(X_{t+h}) + a_0^2 V(X_t) + a_1^2 V(X_{t-1}) \\ &\quad - 2a_0 \text{Cov}(X_{t+h}, X_t) - 2a_1 \text{Cov}(X_{t+h}, X_{t-1}) + 2a_0a_1 \text{Cov}(X_t, X_{t-1}) \\ &= (1 + a_0^2 + a_1^2)\gamma(0) - 2a_0\gamma(h) - 2a_1\gamma(h+1) + 2a_0a_1\gamma(1) \quad \text{as } (X_t) \text{ is stationary} \end{aligned}$$

Let $g(a_0, a_1) = (1 + a_0^2 + a_1^2)\gamma(0) - 2a_0\gamma(h) - 2a_1\gamma(h+1) + 2a_0a_1\gamma(1)$.

The first derivatives are:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial g}{\partial a_0}(a_0, a_1) &= 2a_0\gamma(0) - 2\gamma(h) + 2a_1\gamma(1) \\ \frac{\partial g}{\partial a_1}(a_0, a_1) &= 2a_1\gamma(0) - 2\gamma(h+1) + 2a_0\gamma(1)\end{aligned}$$

So the first order conditions yield:

$$\begin{aligned}&\begin{cases} a_0\gamma(0) - \gamma(h) + a_1\gamma(1) = 0 \\ a_1\gamma(0) - \gamma(h+1) + a_0\gamma(1) = 0 \end{cases} \quad (2) \\ \Leftrightarrow &\begin{cases} a_0 - \rho(h) + a_1\rho(1) = 0 \\ a_1 - \rho(h+1) + a_0\rho(1) = 0 \end{cases} \quad \text{dividing by } \gamma(0) (\neq 0) \\ \Leftrightarrow &\begin{cases} a_0 = \rho(h) - a_1\rho(1) \\ a_1(1 - \rho(1)^2) = \rho(h+1) - \rho(h)\rho(1) \end{cases} \\ \Leftrightarrow &\begin{cases} a_0 = \frac{\rho(h) - \rho(1)\rho(h+1)}{1 - \rho(1)^2} \\ a_1 = \frac{\rho(h+1) - \rho(1)\rho(h)}{1 - \rho(1)^2} \end{cases}\end{aligned}$$

This extremum is a global minimum if the Hessian matrix (the second derivatives matrix) is positive definite.

$$H_g(a_0, a_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 2\gamma(0) & 2\gamma(1) \\ 2\gamma(1) & 2\gamma(0) \end{pmatrix}$$

Sylvester's criterion states that a Hermitian matrix is positive definite if and only if its leading principal minors (the determinants of the upper-left successive submatrices) are all strictly positive. This is the case here:

- the upper left term of $H_g(a_0, a_1)$ is $2\gamma(0) > 0$
- $\det(H_g(a_0, a_1)) = 4(\gamma(0)^2 - \gamma(1)^2) > 0$, since by Schwarz inequality, $(\text{Cov}(X_t, X_{t-1}))^2 \leq V(X_t)V(X_{t-1})$

ii) $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t) = \alpha_0 X_t + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \beta$ has been defined by:

$$\begin{cases} E(X_{t+h} - (\alpha_0 X_t + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \beta)) = 0 \\ \text{Cov}(X_{t+h} - (\alpha_0 X_t + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \beta), X_t) = 0 \\ \text{Cov}(X_{t+h} - (\alpha_0 X_t + \alpha_1 X_{t-1} + \beta), X_{t-1}) = 0 \end{cases} \Leftrightarrow \begin{cases} \beta = (1 - \alpha_0 - \alpha_1)m \\ \gamma(h) = \alpha_0\gamma(0) + \alpha_1\gamma(1) \\ \gamma(h+1) = \alpha_0\gamma(1) + \alpha_1\gamma(0) \end{cases}$$

This system corresponds to the equation (1) and the system of two equations (2), so that $\alpha_0 = a_0$, $\alpha_1 = a_1$, $\beta = b$. We have thus proved that $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t, X_{t-1})$ is the best predictor of X_{t+h} as a linear function of X_t and X_{t-1} since it minimizes the variance of the forecast error.

Remarks:

- Again, all the coefficients obviously depend on the forecast horizon h and should actually be indexed by h , but we don't in order to have simpler notations.
- As it is written in the subject, the proof would be identical for $BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t, \dots, X_{t-p})$ which has been characterized in the course by
$$\begin{cases} BLF(X_{t+h}|X_t, \dots, X_{t-p}) = \alpha_0 X_t + \dots + \alpha_p X_{t-p} + \beta \\ E(X_{t+h} - (\alpha_0 X_t + \dots + \alpha_p X_{t-p} + \beta)) = 0 \\ \text{Cov}(X_{t+h} - (\alpha_0 X_t + \dots + \alpha_p X_{t-p} + \beta), X_{t-j}) = 0 \quad \forall j = \{0, \dots, p\} \end{cases}$$
and which can be proved to be the linear predictor which minimizes the forecast error variance. This property remains true for $BLF(X_{t+h}|\underline{X_t})$ but the proof is more complicated.