

Estimation for a Class of Generalized State-Space Models:

Richard A. Davis and Gabriel Rodriguez-Yam
Colorado State University





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

Joint work with:





William Dunsmuir, University of New South Wales

Ying Wang, Dept of Public Health, W. Virginia

Example: Daily Asthma Presentations (1990:1993)



Example: Pound-Dollar Exchange Rates (Oct 1, 1981 – Jun 28, 1985; Koopman website)



- Motivating Examples
 - Time series of counts
 - Stochastic volatility
- Generalized state-space models
- Model setup and estimation
 - Exponential family
 - Estimation
 - Importance sampling
 - Approximation to the likelihood
- Simulation and Application
 - Time series of counts
 - Stochastic volatility
- How good is the posterior approximation?
 - Posterior mode vs posterior mean
- Application to estimating structural breaks
 - Poisson model
 - Stochastic volatility model

Generalized State-Space Models

Observations: $y^{(t)} = (y_1, \dots, y_t)$

States: $\alpha^{(t)} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t)$

Observation equation:

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t) := p(y_t | \alpha_t, \alpha^{(t-1)}, y^{(t-1)})$$

State equation:

-observation driven

$$p(\alpha_{t+1} | y^{(t)}) := p(\alpha_{t+1} | \alpha_t, \alpha^{(t-1)}, y^{(t)})$$

-parameter driven

$$p(\alpha_{t+1} | \alpha_t) := p(\alpha_{t+1} | \alpha_t, \alpha^{(t-1)}, y^{(t)})$$

Exponential Family Setup for Parameter-Driven Model

Time series data: Y_1, \dots, Y_n

Regression (explanatory) variable: \mathbf{x}_t

Observation equation:

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t) = \exp\{(\alpha_t + \beta^T \mathbf{x}_t) y_t - b(\alpha_t + \beta^T \mathbf{x}_t) + c(y_t)\}.$$

State equation: $\{\alpha_t\}$ follows an autoregressive process satisfying the recursions

$$\alpha_t = \gamma + \phi_1 \alpha_{t-1} + \phi_2 \alpha_{t-2} + \dots + \phi_p \alpha_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$.

Note: $\alpha_t = 0$ corresponds to standard generalized linear model.

Original primary objective: Inference about β .

Examples of parameter driven models

Poisson model for time series of counts

Observation equation:

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t) = \frac{e^{(\beta^T x_t + \alpha_t) y_t} e^{-e^{(\beta^T x_t + \alpha_t)}}}{y_t!}, \quad y_t = 0, 1, \dots,$$

State equation: State variables follow a Gaussian AR(1) process

$$\alpha_t = \phi \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$$

The resulting transition density of the state variables is

$$p(\alpha_{t+1} | \alpha_t) = n(\alpha_{t+1}; \phi \alpha_t, \sigma^2)$$

Remark: The case $\sigma^2 = 0$ corresponds to a log-linear model with Poisson noise.

Examples of parameter driven models-cont

A stochastic volatility model for financial data (Taylor '86):

Model:

$$Y_t = \sigma_t Z_t, \{Z_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0,1)$$

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

where $\alpha_t = 2 \log \sigma_t$.

The resulting observation and state transition densities are

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t) = n(y_t; 0, \exp(\alpha_t))$$

$$p(\alpha_{t+1} | \alpha_t) = n(\alpha_{t+1}; \gamma + \phi \alpha_t, \sigma^2)$$

Estimation Methods — Importance Sampling (Durbin and Koopman)

Model:

$$Y_t | \alpha_t, \mathbf{x}_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(\mathbf{x}_t^\top \beta + \alpha_t))$$

$$\alpha_t = \phi \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, \sigma^2)$$

Relative Likelihood: Let $\psi = (\beta, \phi, \sigma^2)$ and suppose $g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)$ is an approximating joint density for $Y_n = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)'$ and $\alpha_n = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)'$.

$$\begin{aligned} L(\psi) &= \int p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n) d\alpha_n \\ &= \int \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)} g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0) d\alpha_n \\ &= \int \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)} g(\alpha_n | y_n; \psi_0) g(y_n; \psi_0) d\alpha_n \\ \frac{L(\psi)}{L_g(\psi_0)} &= \int \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)} g(\alpha_n | y_n; \psi_0) d\alpha_n \end{aligned}$$

Importance Sampling (cont)


$$\begin{aligned}\frac{L(\psi)}{L_g(\psi_0)} &= \int \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)} g(\alpha_n | y_n; \psi_0) d\alpha_n \\ &= E_g \left[\frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{g(y_n, \alpha_n; \psi_0)} \mid y_n; \psi_0 \right] \\ &\sim \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n^{(j)}) p(\alpha_n^{(j)})}{g(y_n, \alpha_n^{(j)}; \psi_0)},\end{aligned}$$

where $\{\alpha_n^{(j)}; j = 1, \dots, N\} \sim \text{iid } g(\alpha_n | y_n; \psi_0)$.

Importance Sampling — example

Simulation example: $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(.7 + \alpha_t))$,

$$\alpha_t = .5 \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \quad \{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .3), \quad n = 200, \quad N = 1000$$



Estimation Methods — Approximation to the likelihood

General setup:

$$p(y_n, \alpha_n) \propto p(y_n | \alpha_n) \det(G_n)^{1/2} \exp\{-(\alpha_n - \mu)^T G_n (\alpha_n - \mu) / 2\}$$

where

$$G_n^{-1} = E(\alpha_n - \mu)^T (\alpha_n - \mu)$$

Likelihood:

$$L(\psi) = \int p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n) d\alpha_n$$

Consider a Gaussian approximation $p_a(\alpha_n | y_n) = \phi(\alpha_n; \mu_0, \Sigma_0)$ to the posterior

$$p(\alpha_n | y_n) \propto p(\alpha_n | y_n) p(\alpha_n)$$

Setting equal the respective posterior modes α_a^* and α^* of $p_a(\alpha_n | y_n)$ and $p(\alpha_n | y_n)$, we have $\mu_0 = \alpha^*$, where α^* is the solution of the equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_n} \log p(y_n | \alpha_n, \psi) - G_n (\alpha_n - \mu) = 0$$

Estimation Methods — Approximation to the likelihood (cont)

Matching Fisher information matrices:

$$\Sigma_0 = \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial \alpha^T} \log p(y_n | \alpha_n, \psi) \Big|_{\alpha_n = \alpha^*} + G_n \right)^{-1}$$

Approximating posterior:

$$p_a(\alpha_n | y_n, \psi) = \phi(\alpha_n, \alpha^*, \left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial \alpha^T} \log p(y_n | \alpha_n, \psi) \Big|_{\alpha_n = \alpha^*} + G_n \right)^{-1})$$

Notes:

1. This approximating posterior is identical to the importance sampling density used by Durbin and Koopman.
2. In traditional Bayesian setting, posterior is approximately p_a for large n (see Bernardo and Smith, 1994).
3. Obtain same result if one applies a Taylor series expansion to the joint likelihood and ignore terms of order > 2 .

Estimation Methods — Approximation to the likelihood (cont)

Approximate likelihood: Note that

$$p(\alpha_n | y_n) = \frac{p(y_n | \alpha_n) p(\alpha_n)}{L(\psi; y_n)},$$

which by solving for L in the expression,

$$p_a(\alpha_n^* | y_n, \psi) = p(\alpha_n^* | y_n, \psi),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_a(\psi; y_n) &= p(y_n | \alpha^*, \psi) p(\alpha^*, \psi) / p_a(\alpha^* | y_n, \psi) \\ &= \frac{|G_n|^{1/2} p(y_n | \alpha^*, \psi) \exp\{-(\alpha^* - \mu)^T G_n (\alpha^* - \mu) / 2\}}{\det\left(-\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha \partial \alpha^T} \log p(y_n | \alpha_n, \psi) \Big|_{\alpha^*} + G_n\right)^{1/2}} \end{aligned}$$

Simulation Results

Model: $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim \text{Pois}(\exp(.7 + \alpha_t))$, $\alpha_t = .5 \alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .3)$, $n = 200$

Estimation methods:

- Importance sampling (N=1000, ψ_0 updated a maximum of 10 times)

	beta	phi	sigma2
mean	0.6982	0.4718	0.3008
std	0.1059	0.1476	0.0899

- Approximation to likelihood

	beta	phi	sigma2
mean	0.7036	0.4579	0.2962
std	0.0951	0.1365	0.0784

Is the posterior distribution close to normal?

Compare posterior mean with posterior mode: Can compute the posterior mean using *SIR* (sampling importance-resampling) or particle filtering.

Posterior mode: The mode of $p(\alpha_n | y_n)$ is α^* found at the last iteration of AL.


Posterior mean: The mean of $p(\alpha_n | y_n)$ can be found using SIR.

Let $\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)}, \dots, \alpha^{(N)}$ be independent draws from the multivariate distr $p_a(\alpha_n | y_n)$. For N large, an approximate iid sample from $p(\alpha_n | y_n)$ can be obtained by drawing a random sample from $\alpha^{(1)}, \alpha^{(2)}, \dots, \alpha^{(N)}$ with probabilities

$$p_i = \frac{w_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N w_i}, \quad w_i = \frac{p(\alpha^{(i)} | y_n)}{p_a(\alpha^{(i)} | y_n)} \propto \frac{L(\psi; y_n, \alpha^{(i)})}{p_a(\alpha^{(i)} | y_n)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Posterior mean vs posterior mode?

Pound/US exchange rate data: blue = mean, red = mode



Application to Structural Breaks (Davis, Lee, Rodriguez-Yam)

State Space Model Setup:

Observation equation:

$$p(y_t | \alpha_t) = \exp\{\alpha_t y_t - b(\alpha_t) + c(y_t)\}.$$

State equation: $\{\alpha_t\}$ follows the piecewise AR(1) model given by

$$\alpha_t = \gamma_k + \phi_k \alpha_{t-1} + \sigma_k \varepsilon_t, \quad \text{if } \tau_{k-1} \leq t < \tau_k,$$

where $1 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_m < n$, and $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0,1)$.

Parameters:

m = number of break points

τ_k = location of break points

γ_k = level in k^{th} epoch

ϕ_k = AR coefficients k^{th} epoch

σ_k = scale in k^{th} epoch

Application to Structural Breaks—(cont)

Estimation: For $(m, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m)$ fixed, calculate the approximate likelihood evaluated at the “MLE”, i.e.,

$$L_a(\hat{\psi}; y_n) = \frac{|G_n|^{1/2}}{(K + G_n)^{1/2}} \exp\{y_n^T \alpha^* - 1^T \{b(\alpha^*) - c(y_n)\} - (\alpha^* - \mu)^T G_n (\alpha^* - \mu) / 2\},$$

where $\hat{\psi} = (\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_m, \hat{\phi}_1, \dots, \hat{\phi}_m, \hat{\sigma}_1^2, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_m^2)$ is the MLE.

Goal: Optimize an *objective function* over $(m, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m)$.

Implementation problems:

- choice of objective function?
- how to optimize over $(m, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m)$?

Solutions(?):

- use minimum description length (MDL) as an objective function
- use genetic algorithm for optimization

Application to Structural Breaks—(cont)

Minimum Description Length (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 store the data).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Code Length("data")} &= \text{CL("fitted model")} + \text{CL("data | fitted model")} \\ &\sim \text{CL("parameters")} + \text{CL("residuals")} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} MDL(m, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_m) \\ &= \underbrace{\log(m) + m \log(n) + 1.5 \sum_{j=1}^m \log(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1})}_{CL("Parameters")} - \underbrace{\sum_{j=1}^m \log(L_a(\hat{\psi}_j; y_{\tau_{j-1}:\tau_j}))}_{CL("residuals")} \end{aligned}$$

Generalization: AR(p) segments can have unknown order.

$$\begin{aligned} MDL(m, (\tau_1, p_1), \dots, (\tau_m, p_m)) \\ &= \log(m) + m \log(n) + 0.5 \sum_{j=1}^m (p_j + 2) \log(\tau_j - \tau_{j-1}) - \sum_{j=1}^m \log(L_a(\hat{\psi}_j; y_{\tau_{j-1}:\tau_j})) \end{aligned}$$

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

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

For example,

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

$t: 1$
 6
 11
 16

would correspond to a process as follows:

$$\text{AR}(2), t=1:5; \text{AR}(0), t=6:10; \text{AR}(0), t=11:15; \text{AR}(3), t=16:20$$

Implementation of Genetic Algorithm—(cont)

Generation 0: Start with L (200) random generated chromosomes, c_1, \dots, c_L with associated MDL values, $M(c_1), \dots, M(c_L)$.

Generation 1: A new child in the next generation is formed from the chromosomes c_1, \dots, c_L of the previous generation as follows:

- with probability π_c , *crossover* occurs.
 - two parent chromosomes c_i and c_j are selected at random with probabilities proportional to the ranks of $M(c_i)$.
 - k^{th} gene of child is $\delta_k = \delta_{i,k}$ w.p. $1/2$ and $\delta_{j,k}$ w.p. $1/2$
- with probability $1 - \pi_c$, *mutation* occurs.
 - a parent chromosome c_i is selected
 - k^{th} gene of child is $\delta_k = \delta_{i,k}$ w.p. π_1 ; -1 w.p. π_2 ; and p w.p. α_p

Implementation of Genetic Algorithm—(cont)



Execution of GA: Run GA for numerous generations or until *convergence*.

Various Strategies:

- include the *top* ten chromosomes from past generations in future generations.
- use multiple *islands*, in which populations run independently, and then allow *migration* after a fixed number of generations.

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:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.05 + .975\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .05)$, $t < 1500$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.25 + .900\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .25)$, $t > 1500$.
- GA estimate 1502, time 1049secs

SV Process Example

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



True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{2\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.175 + .977\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .1810)$, $t < 251$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{2\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.010 + .996\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0089)$, $t > 250$.
- GA estimate 251, time 269s



SV Process Example-(cont)

True model:

- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{2\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.175 + .977\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .1810)$, $t < 251$
- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{2\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.010 + .996\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0089)$, $t > 250$.

Fitted model based on no structural break:


- $Y_t | \alpha_t \sim N(0, \exp\{2\alpha_t\})$, $\alpha_t = -.0645 + .9889\alpha_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, $\{\varepsilon_t\} \sim \text{IID } N(0, .0935)$



Linear Process Example (Monthly Deaths & Serious Injuries, UK)

Data: Y_t = number of monthly deaths and serious injuries in UK, Jan '75 – Dec '84, ($t = 1, \dots, 120$)


Remark: Seat belt legislation introduced in Feb '83 ($t = 99$).



Linear Process Example (Monthly Deaths & Serious Injuries, UK)

Data: Y_t = number of monthly deaths and serious injuries in UK, Jan '75 – Dec '84, ($t = 1, \dots, 120$)

Remark: Seat belt legislation introduced in Feb '83 ($t = 99$).



Results from GA: 3 pieces; time = 4.4secs

Piece 1: ($t=1, \dots, 98$) IID; **Piece 2:** ($t=99, \dots, 108$) IID; **Piece 3:** $t=109, \dots, 120$ AR(1)

Summary Remarks

1. Importance sampling offers a nice clean method for estimation in parameter driven models.
2. Approximation to the likelihood is a non-simulation based procedure which may have great potential especially with large sample sizes and/or large number of explanatory variables.
3. Approximate likelihood approach is amenable to bootstrapping procedures for bias correction.
4. Posterior mode matches posterior mean reasonably well.
5. Approximate likelihood approach may be useful to the problem of structural break detection.