## Statistics 519, Winter Quarter 2020

## Problem Set 2

**Problem 4 (3 points for each for the 3 parts).** Suppose that  $\{X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  is a stationary process with zero mean and with ACVF  $\gamma_X(\cdot)$  and that we subsample it by taking every other value to form a new process defined by  $Y_t = X_{2t}$ ; i.e., the process  $\{\ldots, Y_{-2}, Y_{-1}, Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, \ldots\}$  is given by  $\{\ldots, X_{-4}, X_{-2}, X_0, X_2, X_4, \ldots\}$ 

- a. Show that  $\{Y_t\}$  is a stationary process, and determine its ACVF  $\gamma_Y(\cdot)$ .
- b. If  $\{X_t\}$  is an AR(1) process with parameters  $\phi$  and  $\sigma^2$  (excluding the possibilities  $\phi = 0$  and/or  $\sigma^2 = 0$ ), does the process  $\{Y_t\}$  have an ACVF matching that of either an AR(1) process, an MA(1) process or a white noise process? If so, determine the parameters of the matching process in terms of  $\phi$  and  $\sigma^2$ .
- c. If  $\{X_t\}$  is an MA(1) process with parameters  $\theta$  and  $\sigma^2$  (excluding the possibilities  $\theta = 0$  and/or  $\sigma^2 = 0$ ), does the process  $\{Y_t\}$  have an ACVF matching that of either an AR(1) process, an MA(1) process or a white noise process? If so, determine the parameters of the matching process in terms of  $\theta$  and  $\sigma^2$ .

**Problem 5 (2 points for each of the 5 parts).** (Here we expand upon a point made on overhead II–65, namely, that values in the sample autocorrelation function are not true correlations.) Suppose that we have two sets of numbers  $u_t$  and  $v_t$ , t = 1, ..., m, and that we form their sample correlation, for which the standard definition is

$$\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{m} (u_t - \bar{u})(v_t - \bar{v})}{\sqrt{\left[\sum_{t=1}^{m} (u_t - \bar{u})^2 \sum_{t=1}^{m} (v_t - \bar{v})^2\right]}},$$

where  $\bar{u} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} u_t$  and  $\bar{v} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{t=1}^{m} v_t$  are sample means. Given a time series  $x_t, t = 1, \ldots, n$ , a proper estimate of the lag h > 0 autocorrelation would be gotten by letting  $u_t = x_{t+h}, v_t = x_t$  and m = n - h, leading to

$$\tilde{\rho}_X(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (x_{t+h} - \bar{x}_{h+1:n}) (x_t - \bar{x}_{1:n-h})}{\sqrt{\left[\sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (x_{t+h} - \bar{x}_{h+1:n})^2 \sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (x_t - \bar{x}_{1:n-h})^2\right]}}, \text{ where } \bar{x}_{j:k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{k-j+1} \sum_{t=j}^k x_t.$$

By contrast, the sample autocorrelation is

$$\hat{\rho}_X(h) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^{n-h} (x_{t+h} - \bar{x})(x_t - \bar{x})}{\sum_{t=1}^n (x_t - \bar{x})^2} \text{ with } \bar{x} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n x_t,$$

which, in the context of stationary processes, has some intuitive appeal over  $\tilde{\rho}_X(h)$  (e.g., on average,  $\bar{x}$  should be a better estimate of the process mean than either  $\bar{x}_{h+1:n}$  or  $\bar{x}_{1:n-h}$ ). Suppose now that  $x_t = \alpha + \beta t$ , t = 1, ..., n, where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta \neq 0$  are constants.

- a. Derive an expression that describes how the scatter plot of  $x_{t+h}$  versus  $x_t$  depends upon  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and h. Make a plot of  $x_{t+70}$  versus  $x_t$ ,  $t = 1, \ldots, 30$ , for the specific case  $\alpha = 1$ ,  $\beta = 2$  and n = 100, and verify that your theoretical expression matches the plot.
- b. Derive an expression for  $\hat{\rho}_X(h)$  that is valid for the assumed  $\{x_t\}$  and  $h = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ . Use the function acf in R (or equivalent software) to create a plot of  $\hat{\rho}_X(h)$  versus  $h = 0, 1, \ldots, 99$  for the specific case  $\alpha = 1, \beta = 2$  and n = 100, and verify that your theoretical expression matches the plot. Two facts that might prove useful are  $\sum_{t=1}^{m} t = m(m+1)/2$  and  $\sum_{t=1}^{m} t^2 = m(m+1)(2m+1)/6$ .
- c. Based upon the expression derived in part b, argue that, for large n,  $\hat{\rho}_X(h)$  achieves a minimum value at approximately  $h = n/\sqrt{2}$  and that the minimum value is approximately  $1 \sqrt{2} \doteq -0.41$ . How well do these approximations match up with the plot called for in part b?
- d. Show that  $\tilde{\rho}_X(h) = 1$  for  $0 \le h \le n-1$ . Hint: argue that  $x_{t+h} \bar{x}_{h+1:n} = x_t \bar{x}_{1:n-h}$ .
- e. For the specific case considered in part a, how does  $\hat{\rho}_X(70)$  compare to  $\tilde{\rho}_X(70)$ ? Which one is the appropriate summary of the scatter plot requested in part a?

**Problem 6 (3 points for each of the 2 parts).** Given a time series  $\{x_t\}$ , let  $\{w_t\}$  be the output from a two-sided moving average filter:

$$w_t = \frac{1}{2q+1} \sum_{j=-q}^{q} x_{t-j},$$

where q is a nonnegative integer (see overhead III-26).

- a. Show that, if the time series is locally linear at t, i.e.,  $x_{t-j} = a + b(t-j)$  for  $j = -q, \ldots, q$ , then  $w_t = x_t$ .
- b. Suppose now that  $x_t$  is a realization of  $X_t = m_t + Z_t$ , where  $\{m_t\}$  is a deterministic trend and  $\{Z_t\} \sim WN(0, \sigma^2)$ . Under the assumption that  $m_{t-j} \approx a + b(t-j)$  for  $j = -q, \ldots, q$ , show that  $w_t$  is a realization of an approximately unbiased estimator of  $m_t$ , and determine the variance of this estimator.

Solutions are due **Friday**, January 24, at the beginning of the class.