Trelan Hakeem-Barron 3/27/2020 library(TSA) ## Attaching package: 'TSA' ## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats': ## acf, arima ## The following object is masked from 'package:utils': ## tar library(forecast) ## Registered S3 method overwritten by 'quantmod': ## method ## as.zoo.data.frame zoo ## Registered S3 methods overwritten by 'forecast': method from ## fitted.Arima TSA fitted.fracdiff fracdiff plot.Arima TSA residuals.fracdiff fracdiff library(astsa) ## Attaching package: 'astsa' ## The following object is masked from 'package:forecast': ## gas load(url("http://goo.gl/Zqn3Ea")) plot(y01) 800 400 1980 1985 1990 2000 1995 Time Part A 1) $mymodel = tslm(y01 \sim season)$ s = summary(mymodel) ## ## Call: ## $tslm(formula = y01 \sim season)$ ## Residuals: Min 1Q Median Max ## -303.71 -137.45 -22.14 84.48 534.86 ## Coefficients: Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)## (Intercept) 430.65 38.01 11.330 < 2e-16 *** ## season2 -171.46 54.34 -3.156 0.00219 ** ## season3 -285.21 54.34 -5.249 1.03e-06 *** ## season4 -113.93 54.34 -2.097 0.03886 * ## Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1 ## Residual standard error: 186.2 on 89 degrees of freedom ## Multiple R-squared: 0.2436, Adjusted R-squared: 0.2181 ## F-statistic: 9.552 on 3 and 89 DF, p-value: 1.56e-05 A model has the form: $y(t) = 430.65 - 171.46 * season2 * x_{(2,t)} - 285.21 * season3 * x_{(3,t)} - 113.93 * season4 * x_{(4,t)}$ Where season2,season3,season4 are dummy variables (indicators of event) of quarterly 2,3, and 4 respectively. 2) Plot of residuals: plot(s\$residuals) 00 200 s\$residuals 0 -200 1980 1985 1990 1995 2000 Time The residuals are non-uniform with respect to zero, therefore only seasonality is not enough to forecast the time series. ACF: acf(s\$residuals) Series s\$residuals 0.8 9.0 0.4 ACF 0.2 0.0 -0.2 2 3 1 Lag The residuals are correlated. We can conclude that we got a rather bad model. This is also seen from the forecast graph below: 3) forecast(mymodel, h = 8)Point Forecast Lo 80 Hi 80 Lo 95 ## 2000 Q2 13.59674 504.7849 -118.76327 637.1449 ## 2000 Q3 145.4417 -100.15239 391.0358 -232.51240 523.3958 ## 2000 Q4 316.7215 71.12745 562.3156 -61.23256 694.6756 ## 2001 Q1 430.6478 185.26695 676.0286 ## 2001 Q2 ## 2001 Q3 145.4417 -100.15239 391.0358 -232.51240 523.3958 ## 2001 Q4 316.7215 71.12745 562.3156 -61.23256 694.6756 ## 2002 Q1 430.6478 185.26695 676.0286 53.02189 808.2736 plot(forecast(mymodel, h = 8))Forecasts from Linear regression model 1000 800 900 400 0 -200 1980 1985 1990 1995 2000 Part B 1) mymodel = arima(y01, order = c(1,1,1), seasonal = list(order = c(1,1,0), period = 4))mymodel ## ## arima(x = y01, order = c(1, 1, 1), seasonal = list(order = c(1, 1, 0), period = 4)) ## Coefficients: sar1 -0.1505 -0.9312 -0.0954 ## 0.0378 ## s.e. 0.1112 0.1121 ## sigma^2 estimated as 1675: log likelihood = -452.75, aic = 911.49 A model has the form: $(1-0.1505L)(1-L)(1-L^4)(1-0.0954L^4)y(t) = arepsilon_t - 0.9312arepsilon_{(t-1)}$ where L is Lag-operator. 2) sarima(y01, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 4)## initial value 4.101508 2 value 3.870196 ## iter ## iter 3 value 3.777895 4 value 3.759068 ## iter 5 value 3.746634 ## iter 6 value 3.732811 ## iter ## iter 7 value 3.723425 ## iter 8 value 3.723318 9 value 3.723002 ## iter 10 value 3.722990 ## iter 11 value 3.722989 ## iter 12 value 3.722989 ## iter 12 value 3.722989 ## iter 12 value 3.722989 ## final value 3.722989 ## converged ## initial value 3.727727 ## iter 2 value 3.727684 3 value 3.725999 ## iter 4 value 3.725918 ## iter ## iter 5 value 3.725913 ## iter 5 value 3.725913 ## iter 5 value 3.725913 ## final value 3.725913 ## converged Model: (1,1,1) (1,1,0) [4] **Standardized Residuals** 0 1 2 3 1985 1980 2000 1990 1995 Time **ACF of Residuals** Normal Q-Q Plot of Std Residuals tiles Quan ACF 0.2 nple 0 Theoretical Quantiles p values for Ljung-Box statistic 10 15 20 LAG (H) ## \$fit ## ## Call: ## stats::arima(x = xdata, order = c(p, d, q), seasonal = list(order = c(P, D, d)) Q), period = S), include.mean = !no.constant, transform.pars = trans, fixed = fixed, ## optim.control = list(trace = trc, REPORT = 1, reltol = tol)) ## ## Coefficients: ## ar1 ma1 sar1 -0.1505 -0.9312 -0.0954 ## ## s.e. 0.1112 0.0378 0.1121 ## sigma 2 estimated as 1675: log likelihood = -452.75, aic = 913.49 ## \$degrees_of_freedom ## [1] 85 ## \$ttable ## Estimate SE t.value p.value ## ar1 -0.1505 0.1112 -1.3530 0.1796 ## ma1 -0.9312 0.0378 -24.6289 0.0000 ## sar1 -0.0954 0.1121 -0.8512 0.3970 ## ## \$AIC ## [1] 10.03839 ## \$AICc ## [1] 10.04143 ## \$BIC ## [1] 10.14729 From the diagnostic graphs, it can be seen that the residues are evenly distributed relative to zero, do not correlate with each other (on the ACF plot, the blue lines do not intersect the black dashed lines), they are almost normally distributed (QC graph). But on the plot of p-values of the test at points 4, 6, 7, we see the dependence in this time series. 3) The model of part B is better than the model of part A, but it can be improved by choosing the right parameters. One solution to this problem is to use the auto.arima() function auto.arima(y01, max.p = 10, max.q = 10, max.P = 10,max.Q = 10, max.order = 10, $\max.d = 10$, max.D = 1, start.p = 0, start.q = 0, start.P = 0, start.Q = 0) ## Series: y01 ## ARIMA(1,1,2)(0,1,0)[4] ## ## Coefficients: ## ar1 ma1 ma2 0.4538 -1.6307 0.6648 ## s.e. 0.2911 0.2651 0.2548 ## sigma^2 estimated as 1671: log likelihood=-451.24 ## AIC=910.48 AICc=910.96 BIC=920.39 mymodel1 = sarima(y01, 1, 1, 2, 0, 1, 0, 4)## initial value 4.095531 ## iter 2 value 3.851306 ## iter 3 value 3.800430 ## iter 4 value 3.775081 ## iter 5 value 3.766119 ## iter 6 value 3.754070 7 value 3.743964 ## iter 8 value 3.742564 ## iter 9 value 3.742166 ## iter 10 value 3.740582 ## iter 11 value 3.734386 ## iter 12 value 3.733451 ## iter 13 value 3.733093 ## iter 14 value 3.733024 ## iter 15 value 3.733012 ## iter 15 value 3.733012 ## final value 3.733012 ## converged ## initial value 3.743154 ## iter 2 value 3.741420 ## iter 3 value 3.740849 ## iter 4 value 3.740752 ## iter 5 value 3.740740 ## iter 6 value 3.740708 ## iter 7 value 3.740519 ## iter 8 value 3.740437 ## iter 9 value 3.739239 ## iter 10 value 3.738196 ## iter 11 value 3.738071 ## iter 12 value 3.720726 ## iter 13 value 3.720151 ## iter 14 value 3.718658 ## iter 15 value 3.718014 ## iter 16 value 3.716807 ## iter 17 value 3.714008 ## iter 18 value 3.712567 ## iter 19 value 3.710484 ## iter 20 value 3.710120 ## iter 21 value 3.709396 ## iter 22 value 3.709070 ## iter 23 value 3.708925 ## iter 24 value 3.708913 ## iter 25 value 3.708887 ## iter 26 value 3.708850 ## iter 27 value 3.708850 ## iter 28 value 3.708833 ## iter 29 value 3.708820 ## iter 30 value 3.708818 ## iter 31 value 3.708799 ## iter 32 value 3.708795 ## iter 33 value 3.708794 ## iter 33 value 3.708794 ## final value 3.708794 ## converged Model: (1,1,2) (0,1,0) [4] **Standardized Residuals** 0-1980 1985 Time Normal Q-Q Plot of Std Residuals **ACF of Residuals** e Quantiles 0.4 ACF 0.2 nple 0 0 LAG Theoretical Quantiles p values for Ljung-Box statistic 10 15 20 LAG (H) mymodel1 ## \$fit ## Call: ## stats::arima(x = xdata, order = c(p, d, q), seasonal = list(order = c(P, D, d)) Q), period = S), include.mean = !no.constant, transform.pars = trans, fixed = fixed, optim.control = list(trace = trc, REPORT = 1, reltol = tol)) ## ## Coefficients: ## ar1 ma1 ma2 0.4538 -1.6307 0.6648 ## s.e. 0.2911 0.2651 0.2548 ## sigma^2 estimated as 1614: log likelihood = -451.24, aic = 910.48 ## \$degrees_of_freedom ## [1] 85 ## \$ttable Estimate SE t.value p.value ## ar1 0.4538 0.2911 1.5591 0.1227 ## ma1 -1.6307 0.2651 -6.1525 0.0000 ## ma2 0.6648 0.2548 2.6097 0.0107 ## ## \$AIC ## [1] 10.00529 ## \$AICc ## [1] 10.00832 ## \$BIC ## [1] 10.11418 A model has the form: $(1-0.4538L)(1-L)(1-L^4)y(t) = arepsilon_t - 1.6307arepsilon_{(t-1)} + 0.6648arepsilon_{(t-2)}$ where L is Lag-operator. Forecast: sarima.for(y01, 8, 1,1,2,0,1,0,4) 1000 800 y01 600 400 200 1980 1985 1990 1995 2000 Time ## \$pred Qtr2 485.1280 271.8816 713.4387 ## 2000 ## 2001 948.1090 511.9485 298.2147 739.5507 ## 2002 974.1206 ## \$se Qtr4 Qtr2 40.17085 40.79503 40.83724 ## 2000 ## 2001 40.84064 58.42494 58.63932 58.64117 ## 2002 58.71532 4) sarima.for(y01, 8, 1,1,1,1,1,0,4) 1000 800 y01 600 400 200 2000 1980 1985 1990 1995 Time ## \$pred Qtr1 Qtr2 Qtr3 Qtr4 473.6559 262.3243 711.7509 ## 2001 953.2184 498.9857 288.5629 737.7371 ## \$se Qtr1 Qtr2 Qtr3 Qtr4 ## ## 2000 40.92877 41.06489 41.19891 ## 2001 41.26407 57.11634 57.11924 57.37894 ## 2002 57.55873 Part C Of course, the model of part B is much better than the model of part A. This can be seen both in the forecast graph and in the diagnostic graphs of residuals.

Exam 3 Code