

Structural Break Detection in Time Series Models

Richard A. Davis

Thomas Lee

Gabriel Rodriguez-Yam

Colorado State University

(<http://www.stat.colostate.edu/~rdavis/lectures>)


This research supported in part by:

- National Science Foundation
- IBM faculty award
- *EPA funded project* entitled: **S**pace-**T**ime **A**quatic **R**esources **M**odeling and **A**nalysis **P**rogram (**STARMAP**)

The work reported here was developed un STAR Research Assistance Agreements CR-829095 awarded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to Colorado State University. This presentation has not been formally reviewed by EPA. EPA does not endorse any products or commercial services mentioned in this presentation.

Illustrative Example


How many segments do you see?



Illustrative Example

Auto-PARM=Auto-Piecewise AutoRegressive Modeling

4 pieces, 2.58 seconds.



$\tau_1 = 51$

$\tau_2 = 157$

time $\tau_3 = 259$

- Introduction
 - Setup
 - Examples
 - AR
 - GARCH
 - Stochastic volatility
 - State space model
- Model Selection Using Minimum Description Length (MDL)
 - General principles
 - Application to AR models with breaks
- Optimization using Genetic Algorithms
 - Basics
 - Implementation for structural break estimation
- Simulation results
- Applications
- Simulation results for GARCH and SSM

Introduction

The Premise (in a general framework):

Base model: P_θ family or probability models for a stationary time series.

Observations: y_1, \dots, y_n

Segmented model: there exist an integer $m \geq 0$ and locations

$$\tau_0 = 1 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{m-1} < \tau_m = n + 1$$

such that

$$Y_t = X_{t,j}, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j,$$

where $\{X_{t,j}\}$ is a stationary time series with probability distr P_{θ_j} and $\theta_j \neq \theta_{j+1}$.

Objective: estimate

m = number of segments

τ_j = location of j^{th} break point

θ_j = parameter vector in j^{th} epoch

Examples

1. Piecewise AR model:

$$Y_t = \gamma_j + \phi_{j1}Y_{t-1} + \dots + \phi_{jp_j}Y_{t-p_j} + \sigma_j\varepsilon_t, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j,$$

where $\tau_0 = 1 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{m-1} < \tau_m = n + 1$, and $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is IID(0,1).

Goal: Estimate

m = number of segments

τ_j = location of j^{th} break point

γ_j = level in j^{th} epoch

p_j = order of AR process in j^{th} epoch

$(\phi_{j1}, \dots, \phi_{jp_j})$ = AR coefficients in j^{th} epoch

σ_j = scale in j^{th} epoch

Piecewise AR models (cont)

Structural breaks:

Kitagawa and Akaike (1978)

- fitting locally stationary autoregressive models using AIC
- computations facilitated by the use of the Householder transformation

Davis, Huang, and Yao (1995)

- likelihood ratio test for testing a change in the parameters and/or order of an AR process.

Kitagawa, Takanami, and Matsumoto (2001)

- signal extraction in seismology-estimate the arrival time of a seismic signal.

Ombao, Raz, von Sachs, and Malow (2001)

- orthogonal complex-valued transforms that are localized in time and frequency- smooth localized complex exponential (SLEX) transform.
- applications to EEG time series and speech data.

Motivation for using piecewise AR models:

Piecewise AR is a special case of a *piecewise stationary process* (see Adak 1998),

$$\tilde{Y}_{t,n} = \sum_{j=1}^m Y_t^j I_{[\tau_{j-1}, \tau_j)}(t/n),$$

where $\{Y_t^j\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ is a sequence of stationary processes. It is argued in Ombao et al. (2001), that if $\{Y_{t,n}\}$ is a locally stationary process (in the sense of Dahlhaus), then there exists a piecewise stationary process $\{\tilde{Y}_{t,n}\}$ with

$$m_n \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{with } m_n/n \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

that approximates $\{Y_{t,n}\}$ (in average mean square).

Roughly speaking: $\{Y_{t,n}\}$ is a locally stationary process if it has a time-varying spectrum that is approximately $|A(t/n, \omega)|^2$, where $A(u, \omega)$ is a continuous function in u .

Examples (cont)

2. Segmented GARCH model:

$$Y_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t,$$
$$\sigma_t^2 = \omega_j + \alpha_{j1} Y_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \alpha_{jp_j} Y_{t-p_j}^2 + \beta_{j1} \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \beta_{jq_j} \sigma_{t-q_j}^2, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j,$$

where $\tau_0 = 1 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_{m-1} < \tau_m = n + 1$, and $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is IID(0,1).

3. Segmented stochastic volatility model:

$$Y_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t,$$
$$\log \sigma_t^2 = \gamma_j + \phi_{j1} \log \sigma_{t-1}^2 + \dots + \phi_{jp_j} \log \sigma_{t-p_j}^2 + v_j \eta_t, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j.$$

4. Segmented state-space model (SVM a special case):

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t, \dots, \alpha_1, y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1) = p(y_t | \alpha_t) \text{ is specified}$$
$$\alpha_t = \gamma_j + \phi_{j1} \alpha_{t-1} + \dots + \phi_{jp_j} \alpha_{t-p_j} + \sigma_j \eta_t, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j.$$

Model Selection Using Minimum Description Length

Basics of MDL:

Choose the model which *maximizes the compression* of the data or, equivalently, select the model that *minimizes the code length* of the data (i.e., amount of memory required to encode the data).

M = class of operating models for $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$

$L_F(y)$ = code length of y relative to $F \in M$

Typically, this term can be decomposed into two pieces (*two-part code*),

$$L_F(y) = L(\hat{F}/y) + L(\hat{e} | \hat{F}),$$

where

$L(\hat{F}/y)$ = code length of the fitted model for F

$L(\hat{e} | \hat{F})$ = code length of the residuals based on the fitted model

Model Selection Using Minimum Description Length (cont)

Applied to the segmented AR model:

$$Y_t = \gamma_j + \phi_{j1}Y_{t-1} + \dots + \phi_{jp_j}Y_{t-p_j} + \sigma_j \varepsilon_t, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j,$$

First term $L(\hat{\mathbf{F}}/y)$:

$$\begin{aligned} L(\hat{\mathbf{F}}/y) &= L(m) + L(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_m) + L(p_1, \dots, p_m) + L(\hat{\psi}_1 | y) + \dots + L(\hat{\psi}_m | y) \\ &= \log_2 m + m \log_2 n + \sum_{j=1}^m \log_2 p_j + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{p_j + 2}{2} \log_2 n_j \end{aligned}$$

Encoding:

integer l : $\log_2 l$ bits (if l unbounded)

$\log_2 l_U$ bits (if l bounded by l_U)

MLE $\hat{\theta}$: $\frac{1}{2} \log_2 N$ bits (where N = number of observations used to compute $\hat{\theta}$; Rissanen (1989))

Second term $L(\hat{e} | \hat{\mathbf{F}})$: Using Shannon's classical results on information theory, Rissanen demonstrates that the code length of can be approximated by the **negative of the log-likelihood** of the fitted model, i.e., by

$$L(\hat{e} | \hat{\mathbf{F}}) \approx -\sum_{j=1}^m \log_2 L(\hat{\psi}_j | y)$$

For fixed values of $m, (\tau_1, \rho_1), \dots, (\tau_m, \rho_m)$, we define the MDL as

$$\begin{aligned} MDL(m, (\tau_1, \rho_1), \dots, (\tau_m, \rho_m)) \\ = \log_2 m + m \log_2 n + \sum_{j=1}^m \log_2 p_j + \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{p_j + 2}{2} \log_2 n_j - \sum_{j=1}^m \log_2 L(\hat{\psi}_j | y) \end{aligned}$$

The strategy is to find the best segmentation that minimizes

$MDL(m, \tau_1, \rho_1, \dots, \tau_m, \rho_m)$. To speed things up for AR processes, we use **Y-W estimates** of AR parameters and we replace

$$-\log_2 L(\hat{\psi}_j | y) \text{ with } \log_2(2\pi\hat{\sigma}_j^2) + n_j$$

Optimization Using Genetic Algorithms

Basics of GA:

Class of optimization algorithms that mimic natural evolution.

- Start with an initial set of *chromosomes*, or population, of possible solutions to the optimization problem.
- Parent chromosomes are randomly selected (proportional to the rank of their objective function values), and produce offspring using *crossover* or *mutation* operations.
- After a sufficient number of offspring are produced to form a second generation, the process then *restarts to produce a third generation*.
- Based on Darwin's *theory of natural selection*, the process should produce future generations that give a *smaller (or larger)* objective function.

Application to Structural Breaks—(cont)

Genetic Algorithm: Chromosome consists of n genes, each taking the value of -1 (no break) or p (order of AR process). Use natural selection to find a *near* optimal solution.

Map the break points with a chromosome c via

$$(m, (\tau_1, p_1), \dots, (\tau_m, p_m)) \longleftrightarrow c = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n),$$

where

$$\delta_t = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{if no break point at } t, \\ p_j, & \text{if break point at time } t = \tau_{j-1} \text{ and AR order is } p_j. \end{cases}$$

For example,

$$c = (2, -1, -1, -1, -1, 0, -1, -1, -1, -1, 0, -1, -1, -1, 3, -1, -1, -1, -1, -1)$$

t: 1	6	11	15
------	---	----	----

would correspond to a process as follows:


$$\text{AR}(2), t=1:5; \text{AR}(0), t=6:10; \text{AR}(0), t=11:14; \text{AR}(3), t=15:20$$

Simulation Examples-based on Ombao et al. (2001) test cases

1. Piecewise stationary with dyadic structure: Consider a time series following the model,

$$Y_t = \begin{cases} .9Y_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, & \text{if } 1 \leq t < 513, \\ 1.69Y_{t-1} - .81Y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t, & \text{if } 513 \leq t < 769, \\ 1.32Y_{t-1} - .81Y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t, & \text{if } 769 \leq t \leq 1024, \end{cases}$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0,1)$.




1. Piecewise stat (cont)

GA results: 3 pieces breaks at $\tau_1=513$; $\tau_2=769$. Total run time 16.31 secs


Fitted model:

	ϕ_1	ϕ_2	σ^2
1- 512:	.857		.9945
513- 768:	1.68	-0.801	1.1134
769-1024:	1.36	-0.801	1.1300

True Model



Fitted Model





Simulation Examples (cont)

2. Slowly varying AR(2) model:

$$Y_t = a_t Y_{t-1} - .81 Y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \quad \text{if } 1 \leq t \leq 1024$$

where $a_t = .8[1 - 0.5 \cos(\pi t / 1024)]$, and $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0,1)$.




2. Slowly varying AR(2) (cont)

GA results: 3 pieces, breaks at $\tau_1=293$, $\tau_2=615$. Total run time 27.45 secs


Fitted model:

	ϕ_1	ϕ_2	σ^2
1- 292:	.365	-0.753	1.149
293- 614:	.821	-0.790	1.176
615-1024:	1.084	-0.760	0.960

True Model




Fitted Model




2. Slowly varying AR(2) (cont)

In the graph below right, we average the spectrogram over the *GA fitted models* generated from each of the 200 simulated realizations.

True Model




Average Model



Examples

Speech signal: GREASY





Speech signal: GREASY

$n = 5762$ observations


$m = 15$ break points

Run time = 18.02 secs



Application to GARCH (cont)

Garch(1,1) model: $Y_t = \sigma_t \varepsilon_t, \quad \{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID}(0,1)$
 $\sigma_t^2 = \omega_j + \alpha_j Y_{t-1}^2 + \beta_j \sigma_{t-1}^2, \quad \text{if } \tau_{j-1} \leq t < \tau_j.$



CP estimate = 506



AG = Andreou and Ghysels (2002)

$$\sigma_t^2 = \begin{cases} .4 + .1Y_{t-1}^2 + .5\sigma_{t-1}^2, & \text{if } 1 \leq t < 501 \\ .4 + .1Y_{t-1}^2 + .6\sigma_{t-1}^2, & \text{if } 501 \leq t < 1000 \end{cases}$$

# of CPs	GA %	AG %
0	80.4	72.0
1	19.2	24.0
≥ 2	0.4	0.4

Count Data Example

Model: $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp\{\beta + \alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = \phi\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$





True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp\{.7 + \alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = .5\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .3)$, $t < 250$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp\{.7 + \alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.5\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .3)$, $t > 250$.
- GA estimate 251, time 267secs

SV Process Example

Model: $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = \gamma + \phi \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$





True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.05 + .975\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .05)$, $t \leq 750$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.25 + .900\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .25)$, $t > 750$.
- GA estimate 754, time 1053 secs

SV Process Example

Model: $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = \gamma + \phi \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$



True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.175 + .977\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .1810)$, $t \leq 250$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.010 + .996\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0089)$, $t > 250$.
- GA estimate 251, time 269s



SV Process Example-(cont)

True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{a_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.175 + .977\alpha_{t-1} + e_t$, $\{e_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .1810)$, $t \leq 250$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.010 + .996\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0089)$, $t > 250$.

Fitted model based on no structural break:



- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.0645 + .9889\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0935)$



SV Process Example-(cont)

Fitted model based on no structural break:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.0645 + .9889\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0935)$



Summary Remarks

1. *MDL* appears to be a good criterion for detecting structural breaks.
2. Optimization using a *genetic algorithm* is well suited to find a near optimal value of MDL.
3. This procedure extends easily to *multivariate* problems.
4. While estimating structural breaks for nonlinear time series models is *more challenging*, this paradigm of using *MDL together GA* holds promise for break detection in *parameter-driven* models and other nonlinear models.