

**MATH 287A Winter 2024 Final exam —due Friday March 22 by noon.**  
**Please submit your answers on GRADESCOPE—use code: NPJKJ6**

You may use your textbooks, notes and calculator but **do not collaborate with anybody on this exam**. The first 11 problems have equal weight; the 12th problem has double weight.

1. Let  $X_t$  be a mean zero, (weakly) stationary time series, with spectral density  $f(\lambda)$  that is positive for all  $\lambda$ . Define the *innovations*  $W_t = X_t - \hat{X}_t$  where  $\hat{X}_t$  is the projection of  $X_t$  on  $\overline{sp}\{X_s, s < t\}$ . Show that  $W_t$  is a white noise, and give an expression for its variance.
2. Let  $X_t = Y_t + W_t$  where the  $Y$  series is independent of the  $W$  series. Assume  $Y_t$  satisfies an AR(1) model (with respect to some white noise), and  $W_t$  satisfies a different AR(1) model (with respect to some other white noise). Show that  $X_t$  is not AR(1) but it is ARMA(p,q) and identify p and q. [Hint: show that the spectral density of  $X_t$  is of the form of an ARMA(p,q).]
3. Let  $Y_t$  be a mean zero, (weakly) stationary time series, with lag- $k$  autocovariance  $\gamma(k)$ . The **inverse autocovariance**  $\xi(k), k \in \mathbf{Z}$  is defined as the double sequence satisfying

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbf{Z}} \gamma(k) \xi(j - k) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0 \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

Consider the problem of optimal linear interpolation in which we have observed all the  $Y_t$  except  $Y_0$ . Show that  $P_{\overline{sp}(Y_t, t \neq 0)} Y_0 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} a_k (Y_k + Y_{-k})$ , where  $a_k = -\xi(k)/\xi(0)$ .

[HINT: verify the normal equations using the definition of inverse acf.]

4. Let  $Y_t$  satisfy a mean zero, causal AR( $p$ ). The claim is that the inverse autocovariance  $\xi(k)$  vanishes for  $k > p$ . Verify the claim in the case of an AR(1) model. [HINT: use problem 3.]
5. Let  $Y_t$  satisfy a mean zero, causal AR( $p$ ) model with innovation variance  $\sigma^2$ . Denote the autocovariance  $\gamma(k)$  and inverse autocovariance  $\xi(k)$ . Consider the  $n \times n$  Toeplitz matrices  $\Gamma_n$  and  $\Xi_n$  with  $ij$  element  $\gamma(i - j)$  and  $\xi(i - j)$  respectively. We want to investigate the claim that  $\Xi_n \approx \Gamma_n^{-1}$  for large  $n$ . In particular, we want to verify the claim that

$$\Gamma_n^{-1} = \Xi_n - \begin{bmatrix} A_p & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & B_p \end{bmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $A_p, B_p$  are two  $p \times p$  symmetric matrices, and  $\mathbf{0}$  denotes a matrix of zeros (with appropriate dimension). Verify eq. (1) in the special case of an AR(1) model, i.e.,  $p = 1$ .

HINT: Let  $|c| < 1$  and consider the matrix identity:

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & c & c^2 & \dots & c^{n-2} & c^{n-1} \\ c & 1 & c & \dots & c^{n-3} & c^{n-2} \\ c^2 & c & 1 & \dots & c^{n-4} & c^{n-3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c^{n-2} & c^{n-3} & c^{n-4} & \dots & 1 & c \\ c^{n-1} & c^{n-2} & c^{n-3} & \dots & c & 1 \end{bmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{1 - c^2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -c & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -c & 1 + c^2 & -c & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -c & 1 + c^2 & \dots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 + c^2 & -c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -c & 1 + c^2 & -c \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & -c & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

6. Denote  $\hat{\mu}_{blue}$  the BLUE (best linear unbiased estimator) of  $\mu = EX_t$  based on data  $X_1, \dots, X_n$  satisfying the AR(1) model:  $X_t - \mu = \rho(X_{t-1} - \mu) + Z_t$  where  $Z_t \sim iid(0, \sigma^2)$  and  $|\rho| < 1$ . Use the above matrix identity to compute  $\hat{\mu}_{blue}$  under an AR(1) model, and show that  $Var(\bar{X})/Var(\hat{\mu}_{blue}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , i.e., the sample mean  $\bar{X} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t$  is *asymptotically efficient*. [Hint: the formula for  $\hat{\mu}_{blue}$  is given in problem 7.2 of the book.]

7. **2-step-ahead prediction and iterated projection—case of AR(2).** Let  $X_t$  satisfy a mean zero, causal AR(2) model:  $X_t - \phi_1 X_{t-1} - \phi_2 X_{t-2} = Z_t$  where  $Z_t$  is the innovations white noise. The objective is to predict  $X_2$  given data  $X_s, s \leq 0$ . Let  $\hat{X}_1$  be the 1-step-ahead prediction, i.e., the projection of  $X_1$  on  $\bar{s}p\{X_s, s \leq 0\}$ , and recall that  $\hat{X}_1 = \phi_1 X_0 + \phi_2 X_{-1}$ . Show that  $P_{\bar{s}p(X_s, s \leq 0)} X_2 = \phi_1 \hat{X}_1 + \phi_2 X_0$ , i.e., use the one-step ahead formula twice: once to predict  $X_1$ , and then plug in  $\hat{X}_1$  instead of the unobserved  $X_1$  in the one-step ahead formula to predict  $X_2$ . [Hint: verify the normal equations using the suggested formula.]
8. **2-step-ahead prediction and iterated projection—general case.** Let  $X_t$  be a mean zero, weakly stationary time series with spectral density  $f(\lambda) > 0$  for all  $\lambda$ . The objective is to predict  $X_2$  given data  $X_s, s \leq 0$ . Let  $\hat{X}_1$  be the 1-step-ahead prediction, i.e., the projection of  $X_1$  on  $\bar{s}p\{X_s, s \leq 0\}$ , and denote  $\hat{X}_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_j X_{-j}$ . Show that  $P_{\bar{s}p(X_s, s \leq 0)} X_2 = a_0 \hat{X}_1 + a_1 X_0 + a_2 X_{-1} + \dots$ , i.e., you use the one-step ahead formula twice: once to predict  $X_1$ , and then plug in  $\hat{X}_1$  instead of the unobserved  $X_1$  in the one-step ahead formula to predict  $X_2$ . [Hint: use the AR( $\infty$ ) representation.]
9. From Ch. 5 of Brockwell and Davis, do problem 1.
10. From Ch. 5 of Brockwell and Davis, do problem 20.
11. **Kolmogorov's formula.** The proof of Theorem 5.8.1 in the book proceeds by approximating an AR( $\infty$ ) by a causal AR( $p$ ) with appropriately large order  $p$ , and then showing eq. (5.8.1) holds for all causal AR( $p$ ). Verify eq. (5.8.1) of Brockwell and Davis in the special case of a causal AR(1) model. [Hint: use the power series identity that is valid for all  $x \in (-1, 1)$ , i.e.,

$$\log(1 - 2x \cos(\lambda) + x^2) = -2 \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos(\lambda k)}{k} x^k$$

where  $\log$  is natural logarithm; hence,  $\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \log(1 - 2\phi \cos(\lambda) + \phi^2) d\lambda = 0$  if  $\phi \in (-1, 1)$ .]

12. **Spectral factorization**—this is a special case of the *Fejer-Riesz theorem*. Let  $\{X_t, t \in Z\}$  be a real-valued, mean zero, weakly stationary sequence with acf  $\gamma(k)$  and spectral density  $f(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_k \gamma(k) e^{ik\lambda}$ ; for simplicity, assume  $f(\lambda) > 0$  for all  $\lambda$ . If  $\gamma(k) = 0$  for  $|k| > \text{some } q$ , show that we can write  $f(\lambda) = \frac{\tau^2}{2\pi} |\theta(e^{i\lambda})|^2$  where  $\theta(z) = 1 + \theta_1 z + \dots + \theta_q z^q$  for some  $\tau^2 > 0$  and real coefficients  $\theta_i$ . In other words, show that if  $\gamma(k) = 0$  for  $|k| > q$ , then  $X_t$  has an MA( $q$ ) representation. [Hint: Define the agf  $G(z) = \sum_{k=-q}^q \gamma(k) z^k$  and hence  $f(\lambda) = (2\pi)^{-1} G(e^{i\lambda})$ .]
- Since  $\gamma(k) = \gamma(-k)$ , show that  $G(z) = G(1/z)$ . Use this to show that if  $z_j$  is a (complex) root of  $z^q G(z) = 0$ , then so is  $1/z_j$ .
  - Denote by  $z_1, \dots, z_k$  the roots of  $z^q G(z) = 0$  that have modulus bigger or equal to one. Argue that  $k = q$ , and that there are no roots with modulus equal to one (since  $f(\lambda) > 0$ ).
  - Express  $G(z) = C z^{-q} \prod_{j=1}^q [(z - z_j)(z - 1/z_j)]$  for some constant  $C$ . Use this expression to identify  $\tau^2$  and a polynomial  $\theta(z) = 1 + \theta_1 z + \dots + \theta_q z^q$  having all roots outside the unit circle, such that  $G(z) = \tau^2 \theta(z) \theta(1/z)$ .
  - MA( $q$ ) representation.** Show that  $\{X_t, t \in Z\}$  has an MA( $q$ ) representation with respect to its own innovations. [Hint: construct a *whitening* filter with transfer function  $1/\theta(z)$ , and use it to *whiten* the series  $\{X_t, t \in Z\}$ .]

NOTE: the Spectral factorization theorem stated above extends to the case  $q = \infty$  but the general proof is different (as is the general way of calculating the MA coefficients).