

# Auxiliary Likelihood-Based Approximate Bayesian Computation in State Space Models\*

Gael M. Martin<sup>†</sup>, Brendan P.M. McCabe<sup>‡</sup>, David T. Frazier<sup>†</sup>,  
Worapree Maneesoonthorn<sup>§</sup> and Christian P. Robert<sup>¶</sup>

December 4, 2018

## Abstract

A computationally simple approach to inference in state space models is proposed, using approximate Bayesian computation (ABC). ABC avoids evaluation of an intractable likelihood by matching summary statistics for the observed data with statistics computed from data simulated from the true process, based on parameter draws from the prior. Draws that produce a ‘match’ between observed and simulated summaries are retained, and used to estimate the inaccessible posterior. With no reduction to a low-dimensional set of sufficient statistics being possible in the state space setting, we define the summaries as the maximum of an auxiliary likelihood function, and thereby exploit the asymptotic sufficiency of this estimator for the auxiliary parameter vector. We derive conditions under which this approach - including a computationally efficient version based on the auxiliary score - achieves Bayesian consistency. To reduce the well-documented inaccuracy of ABC in multi-parameter settings, we propose the separate treatment of each parameter dimension using an integrated likelihood technique. Three stochastic volatility models for which exact Bayesian inference is either computationally challenging, or infeasible, are used for illustration. We demonstrate that our approach compares favorably against an extensive set of approximate and exact comparators. An empirical illustration completes the paper.

*Keywords:* Likelihood-free methods, stochastic volatility models, Bayesian consistency, asymptotic sufficiency, unscented Kalman filter,  $\alpha$ -stable distribution.

## 1 Introduction

Approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) serves as an effective, and sometimes unique tool, for conducting inference in models with intractable likelihoods, with there being no restriction on the

---

\*This research has been supported by Australian Research Council Discovery Grants No. DP150101728 and DP170100729. Supplementary material for this article (including computer code) is available on-line. We thank the Editor, Associate Editor and three anonymous referees for very detailed and constructive comments on earlier drafts of the paper.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics, Monash University, Australia. Corresponding author; email: gael.martin@monash.edu.

<sup>‡</sup>Management School, University of Liverpool, U.K.

<sup>§</sup>Melbourne Business School, University of Melbourne, Australia.

<sup>¶</sup>Université Paris-Dauphine, Centre de Recherche en Économie et Statistique, and University of Warwick.

area of application. (See Marin *et al.*, 2011, and Sisson and Fan, 2011, for reviews.) The technique circumvents direct evaluation of the likelihood function by selecting parameter draws that yield pseudo data - as simulated from the assumed model - that matches the observed data, with the matching based on summary statistics. If such statistics are sufficient, and if an arbitrarily small tolerance is used in the matching, the selected draws can be used to produce a posterior distribution that is exact up to simulation error; otherwise, an estimate of the *partial* posterior - defined as the density of the unknown parameters conditional on the summary statistics - is the only possible outcome.

The choice of statistics for use within ABC, in addition to techniques for determining the matching criterion, are clearly of paramount importance, with much recent research having been devoted to devising ways of ensuring that the information content of the chosen set of statistics is maximized, in some sense; e.g. Joyce and Marjoram (2008), Blum (2010) and Fearnhead and Prangle (2012). In this vein, Drovandi *et al.* (2011), Creel and Kristensen (2015), Creel *et al.*, (2015) and Drovandi *et al.* (2015), produce statistics via an *auxiliary* model selected to approximate the features of the true data generating process. This approach mimics, in a Bayesian framework, the principle underlying the frequentist methods of indirect inference (Gouriéroux *et al.*, 1993) and efficient method of moments (Gallant and Tauchen, 1996) using, as it does, the approximating model to produce feasible inference about an intractable true model. Whilst the price paid for the approximation in the frequentist setting is a possible reduction in efficiency, the price paid in the Bayesian case is posterior inference that is conditioned on statistics that are not sufficient for the parameters of the true model, and which amounts to only partial inference as a consequence.

Our paper continues in this spirit, but with focus now given to the application of auxiliary model-based ABC methods in a general state space model (SSM) framework and using the maximum of an auxiliary likelihood function as the (vector) summary statistic. Drawing on recent theoretical results on the properties of maximum likelihood estimation in misspecified SSMs (Douc and Moulines, 2012) we provide a set of conditions that ensures auxiliary likelihood-based ABC is *Bayesian consistent* in the state space setting, in the sense of producing draws that yield a degenerate distribution at the true vector of static parameters in the (sample size) limit. The conditions for this Bayesian consistency result to hold are cast explicitly in terms of auxiliary likelihood-based ABC, and exploit the properties of the auxiliary (and, hence, misspecified) maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) in the state space setting. As such, the results are both

distinct from, and complement, related asymptotic results in Li and Fearnhead (2018a,b) and Frazier *et al.* (2018) that pertain to the application of ABC using generic summaries that are not explicitly defined with reference to an auxiliary likelihood function or a specific model structure.

The use of maximum likelihood to estimate the auxiliary parameters allows the concept of asymptotic sufficiency to be invoked, thereby ensuring that - at least for large samples - maximum information is extracted from the auxiliary model in producing the summaries. A selection criterion based on the score of the auxiliary likelihood - evaluated at the MLE computed from the observed data - is shown to yield equivalent draws to the criterion based on the MLE itself, for large enough sample sizes. This equivalence is satisfied in both the exactly- and over-identified cases, and implies that the proximity to asymptotic sufficiency yielded by using the auxiliary MLE in an ABC algorithm is replicated by the use of the auxiliary score. ABC based on the score of an auxiliary SSM likelihood is also proven to be Bayesian consistent under regularity conditions. Given the enormous reduction in computational cost afforded by the score approach (avoiding as it does the need to optimize the auxiliary likelihood at each iteration of ABC) these theoretical results are critically important for the application of ABC in complex SSMs.

Finally, we propose a numerical approach to circumvent the issue of dimensionality that impacts on ABC techniques in multiple parameter settings. (See Blum, 2010, Fearnhead and Prangle, 2012, and Nott *et al.*, 2014). Specifically, we demonstrate numerically the improved accuracy that can be achieved by matching individual parameters via the corresponding scalar score of the integrated auxiliary likelihood, as an alternative to matching on the multi-dimensional score statistic as suggested, for example, in Drovandi *et al.* (2015).

We illustrate the proposed method in three classes of stochastic volatility model for financial asset returns. Two of the classes exemplify the case where the transition densities in the state process have a representation that is either challenging to embed within an exact algorithm or is unavailable analytically. The third class of model illustrates the case where the conditional density of returns given the latent volatility is unavailable. Examples from all three classes are then explored numerically, in artificial data scenarios. In one particular example, in which the exact marginal posteriors are accessible, the accuracy of auxiliary score-based ABC is explored, relative to a range of comparators that includes two particle marginal Metropolis Hastings (PMMH) algorithms. Additionally, in the supplementary material, we numerically verify Bayesian consistency of the auxiliary score-based approach for specific models in each of the three stochastic volatility classes. This being the first attempt made to verify the accuracy and asymptotic validity of

auxiliary likelihood-based ABC techniques in such complex settings, the results augur well for the future use of the method.

The paper proceeds as follows. In Section 2 we briefly summarize the basic principles of ABC as they would apply in a state space framework. In Section 3, we then proceed to demonstrate the theoretical properties of the auxiliary likelihood approach to ABC, including sufficient conditions for Bayesian consistency to hold, in this particular setting. The sense in which inference based on the auxiliary MLE is replicated by inference based on the auxiliary score is also described. In Section 4 we then consider the application of the auxiliary likelihood approach in the non-linear state space setting, using the three classes of stochastic volatility models for illustration.

Numerical accuracy of the proposed method, as applied to data generated artificially from one particular volatility model - the continuous-time Heston (1993) square root model - is then assessed in Section 5. Using a deterministic non-linear filtering technique (Ng *et al.*, 2013), exact posteriors for the parameters in the Heston model are attainable at an arbitrary level of numerical precision. The existence of these, numerically, exact posteriors allows us to conduct a meaningful comparison between the approximate posteriors yielded by ABC and the posteriors produced by PMMH methods, which are exact up to simulation error. Specifically, in the context of this model, we compare the accuracy of posterior estimates across 18 different competitors: 16 ABC-based comparators, including variants of our auxiliary score-based approach, and using various dimension reduction techniques - regression adjustment, the approach of Fearnhead and Prangle (2012), and our proposed integrated auxiliary likelihood method; plus two PMMH comparators, one based on the bootstrap particle filter (Andrieu *et al.*, 2010; Pitt *et al.*, 2012), and the other using an ABC filtering step within the MCMC chain (Dean *et al.*, 2014; Calvet and Czellar, 2015; Jasra, 2015). A key result is that a particular auxiliary score-based ABC estimate of the exact marginals is the most accurate method overall, including in comparison with both PMMH methods. Furthermore, in the supplementary material, we present additional numerical evidence supporting Bayesian consistency for the auxiliary-score based ABC approach in all three volatility models, while, in contrast, evidence for the consistency of various other ABC methods is mixed. An empirical illustration of the score-based method in a setting in which exact inference is essentially infeasible follows in Section 6, whilst Section 7 concludes. Technical proofs, additional numerical results, certain computational details and the computer code used to produce the numerical results are provided in the supplementary material.

## 2 ABC in state space models

### 2.1 An outline of ABC

The aim of ABC is to produce draws from an approximation to the posterior distribution of a vector of unknowns,  $\theta$ , given the  $T$ -dimensional vector of observed data  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_T)'$ ,

$$p(\theta|\mathbf{y}) \propto p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)p(\theta),$$

in the canonical case where both the prior,  $p(\theta)$ , and the likelihood,  $p(\mathbf{y}|\theta)$ , can be simulated. These draws are used, in turn, to approximate posterior quantities of interest, including marginal posterior moments, marginal posterior distributions and predictive distributions. The simplest (accept/reject) form of the algorithm (Tavaré *et al.*, 1997; Pritchard, 1999) proceeds as per Algorithm 1. The algorithm thus samples  $\theta$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  from the joint posterior:

---

**Algorithm 1** ABC accept/reject algorithm

---

- 1: Simulate  $\theta^i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , from  $p(\theta)$
- 2: Simulate  $\mathbf{z}^i = (z_1^i, z_2^i, \dots, z_T^i)'$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ , from the likelihood,  $p(\cdot|\theta^i)$
- 3: Select  $\theta^i$  such that:

$$d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}^i)\} \leq \varepsilon, \tag{1}$$

where  $\eta(\cdot)$  is a (vector) statistic,  $d\{\cdot\}$  is a distance criterion, and, given  $N$ , the tolerance level  $\varepsilon$  is chosen to be small.

---

$$p_\varepsilon(\theta, \mathbf{z}|\eta(\mathbf{y})) = \frac{p(\theta)p(\mathbf{z}|\theta)\mathbb{I}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{z}]}{\int_{\Theta} \int_{\mathbf{z}} p(\theta)p(\mathbf{z}|\theta)\mathbb{I}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{z}]d\mathbf{z}d\theta},$$

where  $\mathbb{I}_\varepsilon[\mathbf{z}] := \mathbb{I}[d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z})\} \leq \varepsilon]$  is one if  $d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z})\} \leq \varepsilon$  and zero else. Clearly, when  $\eta(\cdot)$  is sufficient and  $\varepsilon$  small,

$$p_\varepsilon(\theta|\eta(\mathbf{y})) = \int_{\mathbf{z}} p_\varepsilon(\theta, \mathbf{z}|\eta(\mathbf{y}))d\mathbf{z} \tag{2}$$

is a good approximation to the exact posterior,  $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$ , and draws from  $p_\varepsilon(\theta, \mathbf{z}|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  can be used to estimate features of that exact posterior. In practice however, the complexity of the models to which ABC is applied, including in the state space setting, is such that that a low-dimensional set of sufficient statistics is unavailable. Hence, as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  the draws can be used to estimate features of  $p(\theta|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  only.

Adaptations of the basic rejection scheme have involved post-sampling corrections of the draws using kernel methods (e.g. Beaumont *et al.*, 2002; Blum, 2010), or the insertion of MCMC and/or sequential Monte Carlo (SMC) steps (Marjoram *et al.*, 2003; Sisson *et al.*, 2007; Beaumont *et al.*, 2009; Wegmann *et al.*, 2009), to improve the accuracy with which  $p(\theta|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  is estimated, for any

given number of draws. Focus is also given to choosing  $\eta(\cdot)$  and/or  $d\{\cdot\}$  so as to render  $p(\theta|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  a closer match to  $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$ , in some sense; see Joyce and Marjoram (2008), Wegmann *et al.*, Blum (2010) and Fearnhead and Prangle (2012). In the latter vein, Drovandi *et al.* (2011) were the first to argue, in the context of a specific biological model, that the use of  $\eta(\cdot)$  comprised of the MLEs of the parameters of a well-chosen approximating model, may yield posterior inference that is conditioned on a large portion of the information in the data and, hence, be close to exact inference based on  $p(\theta|\mathbf{y})$ . It is the spirit of this approach that informs the current paper, but with our attention given to rendering the approach feasible in a general state space framework that encompasses a large number of the models that are of interest to practitioners.

## 2.2 Auxiliary likelihood-based ABC in SSMs: Basic approach

The stochastic process  $\{y_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  represents a stationary ergodic process taking values in a measure space  $(Y, \mathcal{F}_y)$ , with  $\mathcal{F}_y$  a Borel  $\sigma$ -field, specified according to an SSM that depends on an unobserved state process  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , taking values in a measure space  $(X, \mathcal{F}_x)$ , with  $\mathcal{F}_x$  a Borel  $\sigma$ -field. Whilst not necessary for what follows, we choose to illustrate our approach in the case where both  $x_t$  and  $y_t$  are scalars. Any extension to the vector case would incur a concurrent increase in the dimension of the unknown parameters on which the process generating  $x_t$  and  $y_t$  depends and an associated need to manage the impact of dimension on the ABC algorithm. However, no other aspect of what we propose would be materially altered.

The SSM is parameterized by a vector of unknown parameters  $\phi \in \Phi \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\phi}$ , with the parameter space  $\Phi$  assumed to be compact, and for each  $\phi$ , the state and observed sequences are generated according to the following measurement and state equations:

$$y_t = b(x_t, w_t, \phi), \tag{3}$$

$$x_t = G_\phi(x_{t-1}) + \Sigma_\phi(x_{t-1})v_t, \tag{4}$$

where  $\{w_t, v_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  are independent sequences of *i.i.d.* random variables,  $b(\cdot), \Sigma_\phi(\cdot), G_\phi(\cdot)$  are known, potentially nonlinear functions depending on  $\phi \in \Phi$ , and where  $\Sigma_\phi(\cdot) > 0$  for all  $\phi \in \Phi$ . For each  $\phi \in \Phi$ , we assume that equation (4) defines a transition density  $p(x_t|x_{t-1}, \phi)$  and that equation (3) gives rise to the conditional density of  $y_t$ . This allows us to state the measurement and transition densities respectively as:

$$p(y_t|x_t, \phi), \tag{5}$$

$$p(x_t|x_{t-1}, \phi), \tag{6}$$

for  $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$ , with  $x_0$  assumed to follow the stationary distribution of  $x_t$ . Throughout the remainder, we denote the ‘true value’ generating  $\{y_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  by  $\phi_0 \in \Phi$ , and denote by  $\mathbb{P}$  and  $\mathbb{E}$  the law and expectation of the stationary SSM associated with  $\phi_0$ .

The aim of the current paper is to use ABC principles to conduct inference about (5) and (6) through  $\phi$ . Our particular focus is situations where at least one of (5) or (6) is analytically unavailable, or computationally challenging, such that exact MCMC- or SMC-based techniques are infeasible or, at the very least, computationally burdensome. Three such classes of examples are later explored in detail, with all examples related to the modelling of stochastic volatility for financial returns, and with one example highlighting the case of a continuous-time volatility process.

ABC methods can be implemented within these types of settings so long as simulation from (5) and (6) is straightforward and appropriate ‘summaries’ of the data are available. We conduct ABC-based inference by relying on the structure of the SSM in (3) and (4) to generate a simplified version of the SSM, which we then use to produce informative summary measures for use in ABC. Specifically, we consider a simplified and, hence, misspecified version of equations (3) and (4), where

$$y_t = a(x_t, \epsilon_t, \beta), \tag{7}$$

$$x_t = H_\beta(x_{t-1}) + S_\beta(x_{t-1})e_t, \tag{8}$$

with  $\{\epsilon_t, e_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  independent sequences of *i.i.d.* random variables with well-behaved densities;  $a(\cdot), S_\beta(\cdot), H_\beta(\cdot)$  known functions of unknown parameters  $\beta \in \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$ ; and  $S_\beta(\cdot) > 0$  for all  $\beta$ . Together, we assume this specification ensures that  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  takes values in the measure space  $(X, \mathcal{F}_x)$  and leads to a known transition kernel  $Q_\beta : X \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ ,  $\mathcal{A} \in \mathcal{F}_x$ , which admits the known state-transition density  $q_\beta(\cdot, \cdot) : X \times X \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , and known conditional density  $g_\beta : X \times Y \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . That is, equations (7) and (8) yield the state density  $q_\beta(x_t, x_{t-1})$  and measurement density  $g_\beta(y_t, x_t)$  for the auxiliary model, with both  $q_\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$  and  $g_\beta(\cdot, \cdot)$  analytically tractable.

Defining the parametric family of the above misspecified SSM as

$$\mathcal{G} := \{(q_\beta(x, x'), g_\beta(y, x)) : \beta \in \mathcal{B}, y \in Y, x, x' \in X\},$$

we maintain that there is no reason to assume  $\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{G}$ . However, even if  $\mathbb{P} \notin \mathcal{G}$ , it will generally be the case that a well-chosen  $\mathcal{G}$  is capable of capturing many of the features associated with

the data generating process in equations (3) and (4). To this end, and in the spirit of indirect inference, we obtain summary statistics for ABC using the quasi-likelihood associated with the parametric family  $\mathcal{G}$ . Such a strategy requires defining the quasi-likelihood associated with the misspecified SSM, which, following Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993), amongst others, is hereafter referred to as the auxiliary likelihood. Defining  $\chi(\cdot)$  to be an initial probability measure on  $(X, \mathcal{F}_x)$ , we state the auxiliary likelihood for inference on  $\beta$  as

$$\ell(\mathbf{y}; \beta) = \int \cdots \int \chi(dx_0) g_\beta(y_0, x_0) \prod_{p=1}^T Q_\beta(x_{p-1}, dx_p) g_\beta(y_p, x_p).$$

From observations  $\mathbf{y}$ , the auxiliary MLE can then be obtained as

$$\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta); \quad L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta) = \log(\ell(\mathbf{y}; \beta)). \quad (9)$$

Given  $\eta(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$ , ABC can then proceed via Algorithm 1.

We note that, in the above setting, the full set of unknowns constitutes the augmented vector  $\theta = (\phi', \mathbf{x}'_c)'$  where, in the case when  $x_t$  evolves in continuous time,  $\mathbf{x}_c$  represents the infinite-dimensional vector comprising the continuum of unobserved states over the sample period. However, to fix ideas, we define  $\theta = (\phi', \mathbf{x}')'$ , where  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T)'$  is the  $T$ -dimensional vector comprising the time  $t$  states for the  $T$  observation periods in the sample.<sup>1</sup> Implementation of Algorithm 1 thus involves simulating  $\phi$  from the prior  $p(\phi)$ , followed by simulation of  $x_t$  via the process for the state, conditional on the draw of  $\phi$ , and subsequent simulation of artificial data  $z_t$  conditional on the draws of  $\phi$  and the state variable. Crucially, our attention is given to inference about  $\phi$  only; hence, only draws of  $\phi$  are retained (via the selection criterion) and those draws used to produce an estimate of the marginal posterior,  $p(\phi|\mathbf{y})$ . That is, from this point onward, when we reference a vector of summary statistics,  $\eta(\mathbf{y})$ , for instance,  $\eta(\mathbf{y}) = \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$ , it is the information content of that vector with respect to  $\phi$  that is of importance, and the asymptotic behaviour of  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  with reference to the true  $\phi_0$  that is under question. Similarly, in the numerical illustration in Section 5.2, it is the proximity of any particular (kernel-based estimate of)  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  explored therein to the exact  $p(\phi|\mathbf{y})$  that is documented. We comment briefly on state inference in Section 7.

---

<sup>1</sup>For example, in a continuous-time stochastic volatility model such values may be interpreted as end-of-day volatilities.

# 3 Auxiliary likelihood-based ABC in SSMs: Theory and computation

## 3.1 ‘Approximate’ asymptotic sufficiency

ABC is predicated on the use of ‘informative’ summaries in its implementation, with a vector of sufficient statistics being the only form of summary that replicates the information content of the full sample, and with the Pitman-Koopman-Darmois theorem establishing that sufficiency (via a set of statistics that is lower in dimension than the full sample) is attainable only for distributions that are members of the exponential family. For the general SSM described by (5) and (6) for any  $t$  - and with our particular focus being cases where either density does not have an analytical representation - the joint distribution of  $\mathbf{y}$  will, almost by default, not be in the exponential family, and sufficiency reduction will therefore not be feasible.<sup>2</sup>

On the other hand, limiting Gaussianity of the MLE for the parameters of (5) and (6) implies that, under regularity, the MLE (asymptotically) satisfies the factorization theorem and is thereby asymptotically sufficient for the parameters of that model. Denoting the log-likelihood function by  $L(\mathbf{y}; \phi)$ , maximizing  $L(\mathbf{y}; \phi)$  with respect to  $\phi$  yields  $\hat{\phi}$ , which could, *in principle*, be used to define  $\eta(\cdot)$  in an ABC algorithm. For large enough  $T$  (and for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ ) the algorithm would thus produce draws from the exact posterior. Indeed, in arguments that mirror those adopted by Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993) and Gallant and Tauchen (1996) for the indirect inference and efficient method of moments estimators respectively, if  $\eta(\cdot)$  is chosen to be the MLE of an auxiliary model that nests (or ‘smoothly embeds’) the true model in some well-defined way, asymptotic sufficiency for the true parameters will still be achieved; see also Gouriéroux and Monfort (1995) on this point.

Of course, if the SSM in question is such that the exact likelihood is accessible, the model is likely to be tractable enough to preclude the need for treatment via ABC, with the primary goal of this paper being the presentation of ABC methods in SSMs for which exact methods are essentially infeasible. Further, the quest for asymptotic sufficiency via a *nesting* auxiliary model conflicts with the quest for an accurate non-parametric estimate of the posterior using the ABC

---

<sup>2</sup>Even the simplest SSMs, with all components available, generate moving average-like dependence in the data. The linear Gaussian SSM is the leading case, and for which simple computations lead to an analytical link between the signal-to-noise ratio and the lack of sufficiency associated with any finite set of statistics calculated from the observations. The crux of the problem is that information in the sample does not ‘accumulate’ in the way required for reduction to a sufficient set of statistics of dimension smaller than  $T$  to be feasible (see, for example, Anderson, 1958, Chp. 6). The essence of this problem would characterize any SSM nested in (5) and (6), simply due to the presence of measurement error.

draws, given that the dimension of the parameter set in the auxiliary model is, by construction, likely to be large. Hence, in practice, the appropriate goal in using the auxiliary likelihood approach to ABC in the SSM context is to define, via (7) and (8), a sensible *parsimonious* approximation to the true model in (5) and (6), for which the associated likelihood function can be evaluated with computational ease and speed. Heuristically, if the approximating model is ‘accurate enough’ as a representation of the true model, such an approach will yield, via the ABC algorithm, an estimate of the posterior distribution that is conditioned on a statistic that is ‘close to’ being asymptotically sufficient for  $\phi$ . We certainly make no attempt in this paper to formalize this statement in any way. Nevertheless, we do view the notion of asymptotic sufficiency of the auxiliary MLE as being an intuitively compelling characteristic of the auxiliary likelihood-based approach to ABC, and the numerical results presented later provide some support for its importance in practice. More critically, however, pursuing the auxiliary likelihood route enables us to draw on regularity as it pertains to likelihood functions, and maximization thereof, to prove the Bayesian consistency of the resultant ABC posterior and, hence, the baseline accuracy of the inferences produced via this route.

### 3.2 Consistency of auxiliary likelihood-based ABC

For a given choice of auxiliary model in (7) and (8), with parameters  $\beta \in \mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$ ,  $d_\beta \geq d_\phi$ , and sample log-likelihood function  $L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta)$  defined in (9), ABC can use as summary statistics for inference on  $\phi$  the maximizers of  $L_a(\cdot; \beta)$ , based on  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)$ , which we represent respectively by

$$\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta) \text{ and } \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} L_a(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \beta).$$

Herein,  $\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)$  is the *i*th vector of pseudo data, with the dependence of  $\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)$  on the *i*th random draw  $\phi^i$  from the prior  $p(\phi)$  made explicit in the notation. Using  $\eta(\mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$  and  $\eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))$  as summary statistics, we can take as the distance criterion in (1),

$$d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))\} = \sqrt{\left[ \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) \right]' \mathbf{\Omega} \left[ \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) - \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) \right]}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  is some positive definite matrix.

As noted above, the use of a parsimonious (non-nesting) auxiliary model means that asymptotic sufficiency for  $\phi$  is not attainable. As such, beyond adhering to the principle of choosing an accurate approximating model and thereby attaining a summary statistic that is ‘not far from’ being asymptotically sufficient, we require some guarantee that  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  yields reasonable, and

statistically valid, inference in the complex SSMs that are our focus. To this end, we establish conditions under which auxiliary likelihood-based ABC attains a relatively weak - but no less important - form of validity, namely Bayesian consistency. Under such conditions the investigator can be assured that, at the very least, with a large enough sample size the ABC posterior will concentrate on the true parameter vector and provide valid inference in that sense.

In the ABC setting, Bayesian consistency requires that as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ , the estimated posterior based on the selected draws from  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  concentrates around the true parameter value generating the data; see Li and Fearnhead (2018a,b) and Frazier *et al.* (2018) for related discussion on asymptotic concepts as they pertain to ABC. With a slight abuse of terminology, from this point onwards we denote the ‘ABC posterior’ by  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$ , recognizing that the quantity produced via ABC is actually the kernel-based density estimate constructed from a given number of draws,  $N$ , from  $p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$  as defined in (2).

To understand the intuition underlying Bayesian consistency of ABC based on  $\eta(\mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$ , first define  $Z \subseteq Y$  to be the space of simulated data  $\mathbf{z}(\phi)$ , generated according to the probability measure  $P_z^\phi$ , and denote the prior measure of a set  $A \subset \Phi$  by  $\Pi(A)$ . We also make it explicit from this point onwards that Bayesian consistency depends on simultaneous asymptotics regarding  $T$  and  $\varepsilon$ . To formalize this we consider  $\varepsilon$  as a  $T$ -dependent sequence, denoted by  $\varepsilon_T$ , where  $\varepsilon_T \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Heuristically, Bayesian consistency of ABC would then follow from the following sequence of arguments. First, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , the criterion in (10) should satisfy (uniformly)

$$d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))\} \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{[\beta_0 - \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)]' \boldsymbol{\Omega} [\beta_0 - \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)]}, \quad (11)$$

where “ $\xrightarrow{P}$ ” denotes convergence in probability, and where

$$\beta_0 = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \{\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta)/T\}; \quad \mathbf{b}(\phi^i) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \left\{ \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} L_a(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \beta)/T \right\},$$

where  $\text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} X_T$  denotes the probability limit of  $X_T$ . Secondly,  $\phi^i = \phi_0$  should be the only value that satisfies  $\beta_0 = \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)$  and, as a consequence, the only value that satisfies

$$d\{\beta_0, \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)\} = \sqrt{[\beta_0 - \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)]' \boldsymbol{\Omega} [\beta_0 - \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)]} = 0. \quad (12)$$

Hence, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , for any  $\varepsilon_T > 0$  such that  $\Pi[\{\phi^i \in \Phi : d\{\beta_0, \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)\} \leq \varepsilon_T\}] > 0$ , the only value of  $\phi^i$  satisfying  $d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))\} \leq \varepsilon_T$  for all  $\varepsilon_T$  is  $\phi^i = \phi_0$ ; therefore, if  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$  is well-behaved, as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $\varepsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ , the ABC algorithm will only select draws arbitrarily close

to  $\phi_0$ . Put formally, the ABC posterior will be Bayesian consistent if, for any  $\delta > 0$  and  $A_\delta(\phi_0) := \{\phi \in \Phi : d\{\phi, \phi_0\} > \delta\}$ ,

$$\int_{A_\delta(\phi_0)} p_\varepsilon(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))d\phi = \int_{A_\delta(\phi_0)} \frac{\int_Z \mathbb{I} \left[ d\{\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}), \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi))\} \leq \varepsilon_T \right] P_z^\phi(d\mathbf{z})\Pi(d\phi)}{\int_\Phi \int_Z \mathbb{I} \left[ d\{\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}), \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi))\} \leq \varepsilon_T \right] P_z^\phi(d\mathbf{z})\Pi(d\phi)} = o_P(1), \quad (13)$$

as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ . Sufficient conditions needed to demonstrate the convergence in (13) can be split into two sets: the first controls the convergence of sample quantities; the second set comprises identification conditions. Let  $\ln^+(x) = \max\{0, \ln(x)\}$  and  $\ln^-(x) = -\min\{0, \ln(x)\}$ .

**Assumption A:**

(A1) The parameter spaces  $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\beta}$  and  $\Phi \subset \mathbb{R}^{d_\phi}$  are compact.

(A2) For any  $\phi \in \Phi$ ,  $z_t(\phi) \in Z \subseteq Y$ ,  $\{z_t(\phi), x_t(\phi)\}_{t=1}^T$  is a stationary and ergodic process, with  $(z_0(\phi), x_0(\phi))$  drawn in the stationary law.

(A3) For  $(x, x', \beta) \mapsto q_\beta(x, x')$  the density of the Markov transition kernel associated with the auxiliary model satisfies the following:

(A3.1)  $(x, x', \beta) \mapsto q_\beta(x, x')$  is a positive continuous function on  $X \times X \times \mathcal{B}$ .

(A3.2)  $\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{(x, x') \in X \times X} q_\beta(x, x') < \infty$ .

(A4) The conditional density  $(y, x, \beta) \mapsto g_\beta(y, x)$  associated with the auxiliary model satisfies the following conditions:

(A4.1) For each  $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ ,  $(y, x, \beta) \mapsto g_\beta(y, x)$  is positive and continuous on  $Y \times X \times \mathcal{B}$ .

(A4.2) For any  $\mathcal{K} \subset Y$ , compact, and any  $\beta \in \mathcal{B}$ ,  $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{y \in \mathcal{K}} \frac{g_\beta(y, x)}{\sup_{x' \in X} g_\beta(y, x')} = 0$ .

(A4.3) For  $z_0(\phi) \in Y$  as in (A2),  $\mathbb{E}_\phi \left[ \ln^+ \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \sup_{x \in X} g_\beta(z_0(\phi), x) \right] < \infty$ .

(A4.4) There exists a compact subset  $\mathcal{D} \subset X$  such that, for  $z_0(\phi) \in Y$  as in (A2),  $\mathbb{E}_\phi \left[ \ln^- \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} \inf_{x \in \mathcal{D}} g_\beta(z_0(\phi), x) \right] < \infty$ .

(A5)  $L_\infty(\phi^i; \beta) := \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} (1/T) L_a(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \beta)$  has unique maximum  $\mathbf{b}(\phi^i) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} L_\infty(\phi^i; \beta)$ , where  $\beta_0 = \mathbf{b}(\phi_0) = \arg \max_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} L_\infty(\phi_0; \beta)$ .

**Assumption I:**

(I1) The prior  $p(\phi)$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure and satisfies  $p(\phi_0) > 0$ .

(I2) The mapping  $\phi \mapsto \mathbf{b}(\phi)$  is continuous and satisfies  $\beta_0 = \mathbf{b}(\phi) \iff \phi = \phi_0$ .

(I3) For any  $\phi \in \Phi$ , there exist constants  $\kappa, C, u_0 > 0$  such that, for some sequence  $v_T \rightarrow \infty$  and all  $0 < u < u_0 v_T$ , for  $\|\cdot\|$  the Euclidean norm

$$P_z^\phi \left[ \left\| \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi)) - \mathbf{b}(\phi) \right\| > u \right] \leq C(\phi) u^{-\kappa} v_T^{-\kappa}, \text{ and } \int_\Phi C(\phi) \Pi(d\phi) < \infty.$$

**Remark 1:** Under correct specification of the model generating the data  $\mathbf{y}$ , Assumptions **(A1)**-**(A5)** ensure that  $\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}} |(1/T)L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta) - L_\infty(\phi_0; \beta)| = o_P(1)$ , for  $L_\infty(\phi_0; \beta)$  defined in **(A5)**, and that  $\|\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) - \beta_0\| = o_P(1)$ . In addition, Assumptions **(A1)**-**(A5)** are enough to ensure that  $\sup_{\phi^i \in \Phi} \|\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) - \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)\| = o_P(1)$ . The uniform convergence of  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))$  to  $\mathbf{b}(\phi^i)$  is crucial as it ensures that the simulated paths  $\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)$ , and the subsequent  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))$ , are well-behaved over  $\Phi$ . Assumptions **(I1)**-**(I3)** ensure the required concentration of the ABC posterior on sets containing the truth,  $\phi_0$ . In particular, Assumption **(I1)** ensures that the prior used within ABC places sufficient mass on the truth, and (some version of) this assumption is standard in the analysis of Bayesian consistency. Assumption **(I3)** is a type of deviation control for the estimated auxiliary parameters, and allows us precise control over certain remainder terms in the posterior decomposition.

The following theorem formally establishes Bayesian consistency of the ABC posterior in the SSM setting that is our interest herein.

**Theorem 1** *For all  $\delta > 0$ , if Assumptions **(A)** and **(I)** are satisfied, then, so long as  $\varepsilon_T = o(1)$  is such that  $\varepsilon_T^{d_\beta + \kappa} v_T^\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  is positive definite,*

$$\int_{A_\delta(\phi_0)} p_\varepsilon(\phi | \eta(\mathbf{y})) d\phi = o_P(1), \text{ for } \eta(\mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}), \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $A_\delta(\phi_0) := \{\phi \in \Phi : d\{\phi, \phi_0\} > \delta\}$ .<sup>3</sup>

**Remark 2:** We have presented the conditions for consistency, and proven Theorem 1, for the specific setting which is the focus here, namely where both the true and auxiliary models are SSMs. The sufficient conditions to ensure  $\eta(\mathbf{y}) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}) \xrightarrow{P} \beta_0$ , and, uniformly in  $\phi^i$ ,  $\eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) = \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i)) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{b}(\phi^i)$  - **(A1)** to **(A5)** - are based on the conditions invoked by Douc and Moulines (2012) to establish consistency of the MLE in misspecified SSMs. Whilst these authors use simple examples to illustrate their theory, in our ABC setting, in which the true data generating process is, by the very nature of the exercise, a challenging one, analytical verification of these conditions is typically not possible. Similarly, it would appear to be infeasible to verify **(I3)** analytically under the remaining maintained assumptions in the usual case in which  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{z}(\phi))$

---

<sup>3</sup>The distance in (10) essentially mimics the Wald criterion used in the indirect inference technique. Similar to the latter, in our Bayesian analyses, in which (10) is used to produce ABC draws,  $\mathbf{\Omega}$  can also be defined as the sandwich form of a variance-covariance estimator (Gleim and Pigorsch, 2013, and Drovandi *et al.*, 2015), or as the inverse of the (estimated) variance-covariance matrix for  $\beta$ , evaluated at  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$  (Drovandi *et al.*, 2011). In these cases it is more useful to denote the weighting matrix by  $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\mathbf{y}, \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}))$  and Bayesian consistency then requires, in addition to Assumptions **(A)** and **(I)**,  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\mathbf{y}, \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})) - \mathbf{\Omega}_\infty(\beta_0)\|_* \xrightarrow{P} 0$ , for some positive definite  $\mathbf{\Omega}_\infty(\beta_0)$ , where  $\|\mathbf{W}\|_* = \sqrt{\text{Trace}(\mathbf{W}'\mathbf{W})}$  for  $\mathbf{W}$  an arbitrary  $n \times m$  matrix.

is unavailable in closed form. Moreover, and in common to all simulation-based inference procedures, analytical verification of the identification condition in **(I2)** is infeasible as a general rule, and, hence, remains an open problem. Nevertheless, in the supplementary material we demonstrate numerically the Bayesian consistency of the auxiliary likelihood-based ABC method in all three classes of SSM that we investigate therein.<sup>4</sup>

### 3.3 Computationally Efficient ABC

#### 3.3.1 Score-based ABC implementation

With large computational gains,  $\eta(\cdot)$  in (1) can be defined using the score of the auxiliary model. (See Gouriéroux and Monfort, 1995, and Gallant and Tauchen, 1996 for the comparable point first being made in the indirect inference context.) That is, the score vector associated with the approximating model, when evaluated at the simulated data, and with  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$  substituted for  $\beta$ , will be closer to zero the ‘closer’ is the simulated data to the observed data. Hence, the distance in (1) can be replaced by

$$d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i))\} = \sqrt{\left[ \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})) \right]' \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \left[ \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})) \right]}, \quad (14)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \beta) = T^{-1} \frac{\partial L_a(\mathbf{z}(\phi^i); \beta)}{\partial \beta} \quad (15)$$

is the (average) score of the auxiliary likelihood,  $\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{y}; \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})) = 0$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  denotes a positive definite weighting matrix which, if an estimated quantity, satisfies comparable conditions to those specified in Footnote 3 for  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}(\cdot)$ . Implementation of ABC via (14) is faster (by orders of magnitude) than the approach based upon  $\eta(\cdot) = \widehat{\beta}(\cdot)$ , due to the fact that maximization of the auxiliary likelihood is required only once, in order to produce  $\widehat{\beta}(\cdot)$  from the observed data  $\mathbf{y}$ . All other calculations involve simply the evaluation of  $\mathbf{S}(\cdot; \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}))$  at the simulated data, with a numerical differentiation technique invoked to specify  $\mathbf{S}(\cdot; \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}))$ , when not known in closed form.

Similar to Theorem 1, we can demonstrate consistency of the ABC posterior based on the auxiliary score. This result requires similar assumptions to Theorem 1, but requires the following specific variants of Assumptions **(A5)**, and **(I2)** and **(I3)**.

- (A5')** (i)  $\mathbf{S}_\infty(\phi; \beta) := \text{plim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi); \beta)$  exists for all  $\phi$ , where  $\mathbf{S}_\infty(\phi^i; \beta) := (\partial/\partial\beta') L_\infty(\phi^i, \beta)$ ;  
(ii)  $\mathbf{S}_\infty(\phi; \beta_0) = 0$  if and only if  $\phi = \phi_0$ .

---

<sup>4</sup>We refer the interested reader to Lomdardi and Calzolari (2009) for discussion of the difficulties of verifying sufficient conditions for the asymptotic properties of indirect inference methods in general, as well as in more specific, contexts.

**(I2')** Let  $\zeta = (\phi', \beta')$ . For any  $\zeta \in \Phi \times \mathcal{B}$ , there exist some  $C_n = O_P(1)$  such that  $\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi_1); \beta_1) - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi_2); \beta_2)\| \leq C_n \|\zeta_1 - \zeta_2\|$ .

**(I3')** For any  $\phi \in \Phi$ , there exist constants  $\kappa, C, u_0 > 0$  such that, for some sequence  $v_T \rightarrow \infty$  and all  $0 < u < u_0 v_T$ ,

$$P_z^\phi [\|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{z}(\phi); \beta_0) - \mathbf{S}_\infty(\phi; \beta_0)\| > u] \leq C(\phi) u^{-\kappa} v_T^{-\kappa}, \text{ and } \int_{\Phi} C(\phi) \Pi(d\phi) < \infty.$$

**Theorem 2** *If Assumptions (A1)-(A4), (A5') and (I1), (I2'), (I3') are satisfied, then, so long as  $\varepsilon_T = o(1)$  is such that  $\varepsilon_T^{d_{\beta} + \kappa} v_T^\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ , and  $\Sigma$  is positive definite, Theorem 1 is satisfied with  $d\{\eta(\mathbf{y}), \eta(\mathbf{z}(\phi))\} = \sqrt{[\mathbf{S}(\phi; \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}))]' \Sigma [\mathbf{S}(\phi; \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}))]}$ .*

In the supplementary material we informally demonstrate that, in addition to the shared property of Bayesian consistency, for  $T \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\varepsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ , the score and MLE-based ABC selection criteria will yield equivalent draws of  $\phi$  and, hence, equivalent estimates of  $p(\phi|\mathbf{y})$ . As a consequence of this (asymptotic) validity of the score-based method, in Section 5 we focus entirely on this computationally efficient form of implementing auxiliary likelihood-based ABC.

### 3.3.2 Dimension reduction via an integrated likelihood technique

As highlighted by Blum (2010) (amongst others) the accuracy with which ABC draws estimate the so-called partial posterior,  $p(\phi|\eta(\mathbf{y}))$ , for any given tolerance  $\varepsilon$  and number of simulation draws  $N$ , will be less, the larger the dimension of  $\eta(\mathbf{y})$ . This ‘curse of dimensionality’ obtains even when the parameter  $\phi$  is a scalar, and relates solely to the dimension of  $\eta(\mathbf{y})$ . As elaborated on further by Nott *et al.* (2014), this problem is exacerbated as the dimension of  $\phi$  itself increases, firstly because an increase in the dimension of  $\phi$  brings with it a concurrent need for an increase in the dimension of  $\eta(\mathbf{y})$  and, secondly, because the need to estimate a multi-dimensional density (for  $\phi$ ) brings with it its own problems related to dimension.<sup>5</sup> This type of inaccuracy is, of course, distinct from the inaccuracy that results from the use of summary statistics that are not sufficient for  $\phi$ .

We discuss here a dimension reduction technique that is particularly apt when there is a natural link between the elements of the true and auxiliary parameter vectors, and the dimensions of the two vectors (assumed to be greater than one) are equivalent. In brief: let

---

<sup>5</sup>See Blum *et al.* (2013) for further elaboration on the dimensionality issue in ABC and a review of current approaches for dealing with the problem. See also Frazier *et al.* (2018) for some additional theoretical insights into the issue.

$\beta_{-j} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{j-1}, \beta_{j+1}, \dots, \beta_{d_\phi})'$  be the  $(d_\phi - 1)$ -dimensional parameter vector of auxiliary parameters, and  $\mathcal{B}_{-j} \subset \mathbb{R}^{(d_\phi-1)}$  be the parameter space associated with  $\beta_{-j}$ . Letting  $w(\beta_{-j}|\beta_j)$  denote a “weight function” for the auxiliary parameters  $\beta_{-j}$ , we can define the integrated auxiliary likelihood  $L_a^I(\mathbf{y}; \beta_j)$  as

$$L_a^I(\mathbf{y}; \beta_j) = \int_{\mathcal{B}_{-j}} L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta) w(\beta_{-j}|\beta_j) d\beta_{-j}. \quad (16)$$

For the given auxiliary model,  $L_a^I(\mathbf{y}; \beta_j)$  can be used to obtain a convenient *scalar* summary statistic for use in estimating the marginal posterior  $p(\phi_j|\mathbf{y})$  via ABC, using (for example) the integrated score,

$$\mathbf{S}^I(\mathbf{z}(\phi); \widehat{\beta}_j) = \frac{\partial \log(L_a^I(\mathbf{z}(\phi); \beta_j))}{\partial \beta_j} \Big|_{\beta_j = \widehat{\beta}_j},$$

evaluated at  $\widehat{\beta}_j = \arg \max_{\beta_j} L_a^I(\mathbf{y}; \beta_j)$ , where  $\phi_j$  represents the parameter in the data generating process that most closely matches the role played by  $\beta_j$  in the auxiliary model.<sup>6</sup> If the marginal posteriors only are of interest, then all  $d_\phi$  marginals can be estimated in this way, with  $d_\phi$  applications of  $(d_\phi - 1)$ -dimensional integration required at each step within ABC to produce the relevant score statistics. If the *joint* posterior of  $\phi$  were of interest, the sort of techniques advocated by Nott *et al.* (2014), amongst others, could be used to yield joint inference from the estimated marginal posteriors.<sup>7</sup>

In Section 5.2.2 we demonstrate the use of this method in the case where the auxiliary model is a discretized version of the true continuous-time model and, thus, there is a natural (and one-to-one) link between the two sets of parameters as a consequence. This is a very obvious case in which this particular dimension reduction technique is suitable. The small number of (true and auxiliary) parameters also means that the deterministic numerical integration that is required at each iteration of ABC in order to evaluate (16) and, hence, the integrated score for use in selecting each  $\phi_j$ , is not computationally prohibitive. We note that for a well-chosen auxiliary model, there is likely to be a *qualitative* link between the auxiliary and structural parameters (e.g. location, scale, tail behavior, persistence) that can be exploited to decide which univariate

---

<sup>6</sup>As this is an auxiliary likelihood, and thus does not need to have a strict interpretation as an actual likelihood, the weight function can be chosen to ensure that the integral in (16) can be calculated easily. In situations where the space  $\mathcal{B}_{-j}$  is relatively small, one can often take  $w(\beta_{-j}|\beta_j)$  to be unity, which is the approach taken in the numerical exercise in Section 5.1.

<sup>7</sup>In the case where  $\phi$  itself is a scalar and the number of parameters in an auxiliary model is greater than one, application of this technique would require a decision to be made as to which particular auxiliary parameter was the most informative for  $\phi$ . The marginal score for that element of  $\beta$  would be used as the single summary statistic in the ABC algorithm for selecting draws of  $\phi$ .

auxiliary score to use as the selection statistic for any given  $\phi_j$ . However, we do not pursue this avenue in any general sense in the paper.

## 4 Auxiliary likelihood-based ABC: A case study of financial volatility models

### 4.1 Overview

In response to the now well-established empirical characteristics of asset return volatility (see, Bollerslev *et al.*, 1992, for a comprehensive review) many alternative time-varying volatility models have been proposed, with continuous-time stochastic volatility (SV) models - often augmented by random jump processes - being particularly prominent of late. This focus on the latter form of models is due, in part, to the availability of (semi-) closed-form option prices, with variants of the SV model of Heston (1993) becoming the workhorse of the empirical option pricing literature. Given the challenging nature of the (non-central chi-squared) transitions in this model, Bayesian analyses of it have typically proceeded by invoking Euler discretizations for both the measurement and state processes and applying MCMC- or SMC-based techniques to that discretized model (e.g., Eraker, 2004; Johannes *et al.*, 2009). It has also featured in the indirect inference and efficient method of moments literatures, as a very consequence of the difficulty of evaluating the exact likelihood (e.g. Andersen *et al.*, 2002; Gallant and Tauchen, 2010). It is of interest, therefore, to explore the proposed ABC method in the context of this form of model, and this is the focus of Section 4.2.

In Sections 4.3 and 4.4 we then pursue two alternative volatility models in which the distinctly non-Gaussian features of the innovations to conditional returns are captured via the use of  $\alpha$ -stable processes (Carr and Wu, 2003; Lombradi and Calzolari, 2009; Peters *et al.*, 2012). With the  $\alpha$ -stable process not admitting a closed-form representation for the density function, models in which it appears present challenges for exact inference and are thus a prime candidate for analysis via ABC, in particular given that such processes *can* be simulated via the algorithm proposed in Chambers *et al.* (1976).

To facilitate the link between the general theoretical material presented thus far and the specific examples to follow, we use the notation  $\phi$  (similarly,  $\beta$ ) to denote the vector of parameters characterizing the true (auxiliary) model in each case, despite the interpretation of the parameters obviously differing from case to case. We also use  $y_t$  to denote the observation in each example,  $x_t$  to denote the latent state and  $w_t$  and  $v_t$  to denote the measurement and state error respectively,

as is consistent with the notation defined in (3) and (4).

## 4.2 Square root stochastic volatility

In this section we begin by assuming an observed (de-meaned) logarithmic return,  $r_t$ , with the square root model for the variance  $x_t$ ,

$$r_t = x_t^{1/2} \eta_t, \quad (17)$$

$$dx_t = (\phi_1 - \phi_2 x_t) dt + \phi_3 \sqrt{x_t} v_t, \quad (18)$$

where  $v_t = dW_t$  is a Brownian increment, and  $\eta_t$  is defined as an *i.i.d.* random variable with zero mean and variance 1. We observe a discrete sequence of returns, and our goal is to conduct Bayesian inference on the parameters governing the dynamics of volatility. We restrict the structural parameters as  $2\phi_1 \geq \phi_3^2$  to ensure positive volatility, and for some  $M, \varphi$ , we impose  $M \geq \phi_3, \phi_1, \phi_2 \geq \varphi > 0$ . With these restrictions,  $x_t$  is mean reverting and as  $t \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $x_t$  approaches a steady state gamma distribution, with  $\mathbb{E}[x_t] = \phi_1/\phi_2$  and  $\text{var}(x_t) = \phi_3^2 \phi_1 / 2\phi_2^2$ . The conditional distribution function for  $x_t$  is non-central chi-squared,  $\chi^2(2cx_t; 2q+2, 2u)$ , with  $2q+2$  degrees of freedom and non-centrality parameter  $2u$ . The transition density for  $x_t$ , conditional on  $x_{t-1}$ , is thus

$$p(x_t|x_{t-1}, \phi) = c \exp(-u - v) \left(\frac{v}{u}\right)^{q/2} I_q(2(uv)^{1/2}), \quad (19)$$

where  $c = 2\phi_2/\phi_3^2(1 - \exp(-\phi_2))$ ,  $u = cx_{t-1} \exp(-\phi_2)$ ,  $v = cx_t$ ,  $q = \frac{2\phi_1}{\phi_3^2} - 1$ , and  $I_q(\cdot)$  is the modified Bessel function of the first kind of order  $q$ .

With both the conditional density in (5) and the transition density in (6) being available for this model, likelihood-based inference is, in principle, feasible. However, we view the application of ABC in this setting as an attractive option to explore, in particular given the ability to *simulate* the process via its representation as a composition of (central) chi-squared and Poisson distributions. In Section 5.2, in order to produce an exact comparator for the ABC posterior estimate for this model, we exploit the availability of the transition densities in (19) and apply the non-linear filter of Ng *et al.* (2013) to evaluate the likelihood, thereafter normalizing the exact posterior using deterministic numerical integration techniques. We do not propose the latter as a computationally attractive (or readily generalizable) competitor to the ABC approach, simply using it in a one-off exercise for the purpose of evaluation.

For convenience, we take squares and logarithms of the measurement equation to define

$$y_t = \ln(r_t^2) - \omega = \ln(x_t) + w_t, \quad (20)$$

$$dx_t = (\phi_1 - \phi_2 x_t)dt + \phi_3 \sqrt{x_t} v_t, \quad (21)$$

where  $w_t = \ln(\eta_t^2) - \omega$ , with  $\omega = \mathbb{E}[\ln(\eta_t^2)]$ . To implement an auxiliary likelihood-based ABC algorithm, we initially adopt a Gaussian approximation for  $w_t$  in (20) and an Euler discretization for (21), yielding the approximating model,

$$y_t = \ln(x_t) + \epsilon_t, \quad (22)$$

$$x_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{t-1} + \beta_3 \sqrt{x_{t-1}} e_t, \quad (23)$$

where  $\epsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma_w^2)$ ,  $e_t$  is a truncated Gaussian variable with lower bound,  $e_t > \frac{-\beta_1}{\beta_3}$ , and we define the auxiliary parameters as  $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)'$ . Similar parameter restrictions to those imposed on the structural parameters  $\phi$  are required of the elements of  $\beta$ :  $M \geq \beta_1$ ,  $\beta_3 \geq \varphi > 0$ ,  $\varphi \leq \beta_2 \leq 1 - \varphi$ , and  $2\beta_1 \geq \beta_3^2$ . The equations in (22) and (23) play the role of (7) and (8) respectively.

The non-linearities that characterize both (22) and (23) imply that an analytical evaluation of the auxiliary likelihood via the Kalman filter (KF) is not feasible. Therefore, we use the augmented unscented KF (AUKF) (see Julier *et al.*, 1995) as an computationally efficient means of evaluating the  $L_a(\mathbf{y}; \beta)$  and, hence, of producing the auxiliary score as the matching statistic within ABC. The precise form of the auxiliary likelihood function thus depends on both the first-order Euler discretization of the continuous-time state process *and* the particular specifications used to implement the AUKF. General pseudo code for the AUKF is given in algorithmic form in the supplementary material, along with certain detailed implementation instructions. For comparison we also experiment with various alternative auxiliary models from the GARCH family. Further details of these models are provided in Section 5.2.1.

### 4.3 Conditionally $\alpha$ -stable returns with stochastic volatility

Let  $\{X_t^{\alpha, \gamma} : t \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$  be an  $\alpha$ -stable Lévy process with location  $\mu = 0$ , scale  $\sigma = 1$ , tail index  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , and skewness parameter  $\gamma \in [-1, 1]$ . Then  $X_t$  has independent and stationary increments  $dX_t^{\alpha, \gamma}$  such that  $dX_t^{\alpha, \gamma} \sim \mathcal{S}(\alpha, \gamma, 0, dt^{1/\alpha})$  and exhibits differing degrees of leptokurtosis and skewness depending on the values of  $\alpha$  and  $\gamma$ . The process is also self-similar in that the distribution of an  $\alpha$ -stable variable defined over any horizon has the same shape upon scaling.

Critically however, the density function has no closed-form representation. (See Samorodnitsky and Taqqu, 1994, Chapter 7.)

Recently, several authors have used  $\alpha$ -stable Lévy motion to model financial data. Notably, Carr and Wu (2003) model logarithmic returns on the S&P500 price index as  $\alpha$ -stable, with a view to capturing the lack of ‘flattening’ of the implied volatility smile as option maturity increases. In brief, the infinite variance (for the log return) implied by this model violates the conditions for a Gaussian central limit theorem and, hence, fits with the phenomenon of a smile that persists. At the same time, however, with the lower bound imposed for  $\gamma$ , the conditional expectation of the index itself remains finite, thereby enabling meaningful European option prices to be defined. Whilst the detailed derivations in their paper pertain to the case in which volatility is constant, recognition of the need to incorporate stochastic volatility prompts those authors to propose (as a vehicle for future research) an extended model in which the Heston (1993) model in (18) is adopted for the variance, with closed-form option pricing still being feasible as a consequence.

Most importantly, with the focus in Carr and Wu (2003) being on the estimation of risk neutral parameters via calibration of the model with market option prices, the lack of analytical form for the density of  $X_t$  is not a hindrance for inference. However, any attempt to conduct likelihood-based inference (including exact Bayesian inference) using spot returns *would* encounter this hurdle, with the conditional density in (5) being unavailable; and that is where ABC provides a useful alternative.

With this empirical motivation in mind, we thus explore the application of ABC to the model

$$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/\phi_4} w_t, \tag{24}$$

$$\ln x_t = \phi_1 + \phi_2 \ln x_{t-1} + \phi_3 v_t, \tag{25}$$

where  $w_t \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{S}(\phi_4, -1, 0, dt = 1)$ ,  $v_t$  is an *i.i.d.* random variable (independent of  $w_t$ ) with zero mean and variance 1, and to be consistent with our general notation, we denote the tail index  $\alpha$  by  $\phi_4$ . To ensure stationarity in the  $x_t$  process, we impose  $|\phi_2| < 1$ , and  $\phi_3$  is required to be strictly positive. As in Carr and Wu (2003), we restrict  $\phi_4 \in (1, 2]$  to ensure that  $y_t$  has support over the whole real line. Once again we assume discretely observed returns and, for the sake of illustration, work with a discrete-time autoregressive model for the logarithm of the variance, as given in (25). In particular, this allows us to illustrate ABC using the following simple auxiliary model based on a first-order generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedastic (GARCH(1,1)) model for

the latent standard deviation,

$$y_t = r_t = x_t \epsilon_t, \quad (26)$$

$$x_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{t-1} |\epsilon_{t-1}| + \beta_3 x_{t-1}, \quad (27)$$

where  $\epsilon_t \sim i.i.d. St(0, 1, \beta_4)$ . That is, the measurement error in the auxiliary model is a standardized Student  $t$  random variable with degrees of freedom parameter  $\beta_4$ . (See also Lombardi and Calzolari, 2009, and Garcia *et al.*, 2011, for the application of indirect inference to similar model scenarios.) The ARCH component of (27) is parameterized using absolute deviations (instead of squares) to mitigate numerical instabilities that can arise from extreme realizations of the  $\alpha$ -stable distribution. As with standard GARCH models, we impose positivity of  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  to ensure positivity of  $x_t$ , and ensure stationarity by restricting  $\beta_2 + \beta_3 < 1$ . Note that, by defining  $e_t = |\epsilon_{t-1}|$ , and with an appropriate transformation, the model in (26) and (27) can be placed in the state space form given in (7) and (8); but with the auxiliary likelihood function available in closed form in this case, the application of ABC is particularly straightforward and does not require filtering.<sup>8</sup>

#### 4.4 Stochastic volatility with $\alpha$ -stable errors

An alternative approach to modelling the stylized features of financial returns is to consider a stochastic volatility model for returns in which an  $\alpha$ -stable process drives the innovations to (log) volatility itself; see Lombardi and Calzolari (2009) once again. To that end, in this section we define the following model for the return,

$$r_t = x_t^{1/2} w_t, \quad (28)$$

$$\ln x_t = \phi_1 + \phi_2 \ln x_{t-1} + \phi_3 v_t, \quad (29)$$

where  $v_t \sim i.i.d. \mathcal{S}(\phi_4, -1, 0, dt = 1)$ , and  $w_t$  is an *i.i.d.* random variable (independent of  $v_t$ ) with zero mean and variance. Again, stationarity of  $x_t$  requires  $|\phi_2| < 1$ , and positivity of  $x_t$  requires  $\phi_3 > 0$ . Similar to the previous  $\alpha$ -stable example, we restrict  $\phi_4 \in (1, 2]$ . With this particular specification it is the transition density in (6) that is unavailable, rendering exact likelihood-based inference infeasible. In the spirit of Lombardi and Calzolari we base ABC on a

---

<sup>8</sup>Use of the square root volatility model in (25) would also of course be feasible, but the heteroscedastic nature of the variance model would demand an auxiliary model that reflected that feature, along the lines of (21), and hence, entail the use of filtering to evaluate the auxiliary likelihood.

(conventional) GARCH(1,1) auxiliary model for the latent variance:

$$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/2} \epsilon_t, \quad (30)$$

$$x_t = \beta_1 + \beta_2 x_{t-1} \epsilon_{t-1}^2 + \beta_3 x_{t-1}, \quad (31)$$

in which case the restrictions on  $\beta_1, \beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$ , as well as the computational burden of the ABC method, are comparable to that in Section 4.3.

## 5 Numerical assessment of auxiliary likelihood-based ABC

### 5.1 Overview

We undertake two numerical exercises in which the performance of the auxiliary likelihood-based approach to ABC is documented. As noted earlier, having established its asymptotic validity for this purpose, we use the auxiliary score to define the set of summary statistics, eschewing the direct use of the more computationally burdensome auxiliary MLE.<sup>9</sup> The first exercise, in Section 5.2, uses the model in (20) and (21) as the example, with a Gaussian assumption adopted for the conditional distribution of returns, with this model referred to as SV-SQ hereafter. With the exact posterior accessible in this case (via the deterministic non-linear filtering technique of Ng *et al.*, 2013) we are able to document the accuracy of a range of different ABC estimates of the exact marginal posterior densities, both with and without the use of dimension reduction of some sort. Both accept/reject and MCMC-based ABC algorithms are applied, as are algorithms based on a vector of statistics that does not exactly correspond to a (vector) auxiliary score. Two particle marginal Metropolis Hastings (PMMH) estimates of the exact marginals are also produced, for the purpose of comparison. A second numerical exercise, which is presented in the supplementary appendix due to space restrictions, explores the large sample behaviour of certain ABC posterior estimates, for all three classes of stochastic volatility model. In particular, in this additional exercise, we numerically verify the conclusions of Theorem 2 by demonstrating that the auxiliary-score based ABC estimates concentrate on the true parameter values as the sample size increases.

---

<sup>9</sup>As further motivation for this decision, we note that a small numerical exploration undertaken using certain specifications underpinning the numerical exercises documented in Section 5.2 produced computation times for the auxiliary MLE (as summary) that were approximately 60 times greater than corresponding computational times for the auxiliary score, simply due to the need to optimize the auxiliary likelihood function at each iteration of ABC.

## 5.2 Finite sample accuracy of marginal posterior density estimation: the SQ-SV model

### 5.2.1 Data generation and computational details

For the purpose of this illustration we simulate an ‘empirical’ sample of size  $T$  from the model in (20) and (21), with the parameters set to values that yield observations on both  $r_t$  and  $x_t$  that match the characteristics of (respectively) daily returns and daily values of realized volatility (constructed from 5 minute returns) for the S&P500 stock index over the 2003-2004 period: namely,  $\phi_1 = 0.004$ ;  $\phi_2 = 0.1$ ;  $\phi_3 = 0.062$ . Choosing this relatively calm period in the stock market as a reference point obviates the need to augment the SV-SQ model with random price jumps and/or a non-Gaussian conditional distribution, and enables the known form of the SV-SQ transition densities to be used in producing the exact comparator via the method of Ng *et al.* (2013). In brief, the algorithm of Ng *et al.* represents the recursive filtering and prediction distributions used to define the exact likelihood function as the numerical solutions of integrals defined over the support of  $w_t$  in (20), with deterministic integration used to evaluate the relevant integrals, and the exact transitions in (21) used in the specification of the filtering and up-dating steps. Whilst lacking the general applicability of an ABC-based approach, this deterministic filtering method is ideal for the particular model used in this illustration, and can be viewed as producing a very accurate estimate of the exact density, without any of the simulation error that would be associated with a PMMH-based comparator, for instance. We refer the reader to Ng *et al.* for more details of the technique. The likelihood function, evaluated via this method, is then multiplied by a uniform prior that imposes the restrictions:  $0.5 < \phi_2 < 1$ ;  $0.002 < \phi_1 < 0.025$ ,  $0.005 < \phi_3 < 0.89$  and  $2\phi_1 \geq \phi_3^2$ . The three marginal posteriors are produced via deterministic numerical integration (over the parameter space), with a very fine grid on  $\phi$  being used to ensure accuracy. These marginals are used as the benchmark for assessing the accuracy of all competing density estimates.

The auxiliary likelihood function (and score) of the approximating model defined by (22) and (23) is evaluated using the AUKF, in the manner described in Section 4.2 (and in the supplementary material). We also explore the performance of the auxiliary score method using a range of GARCH-type auxiliary models with closed-form likelihood functions, details of which are provided in Table 1. Hence, five alternative auxiliary models are explored in total. In all cases, the ABC score-based method uses the distance measure in (14). The weighting matrix  $\Sigma$  is set equal to the Hessian-based estimate of the variance-covariance matrix of the (joint) MLE

Table 1: Auxiliary models from the GARCH family. The abbreviations are defined as follows: GARCH-N: GARCH with normal error,  $\epsilon_t$ ; GARCH-T: GARCH with Student  $t$  error,  $\epsilon_t$ ; TGARCH-N: Threshold GARCH with normal error,  $\epsilon_t$ ; TGARCH-T: Threshold GARCH with Student  $t$  error,  $\epsilon_t$

Abbreviation	Auxiliary Model Specification		
GARCH-N	$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/2}\epsilon_t;$	$x_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_2x_{t-1};$	$\epsilon_t \sim N(0, 1)$
GARCH-T	$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/2}\epsilon_t;$	$x_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_2x_{t-1};$	$\epsilon_t \sim t(\nu)$
TARCH-N	$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/2}\epsilon_t;$	$x_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_2I_{(r_{t-1}<0)}x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_3x_{t-1};$	$\epsilon_t \sim N(0, 1)$
TARCH-T	$y_t = r_t = x_t^{1/2}\epsilon_t;$	$x_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_2I_{(r_{t-1}<0)}x_{t-1}\epsilon_t^2 + \beta_3x_{t-1};$	$\epsilon_t \sim t(\nu)$

of  $\beta$ , evaluated at the MLE computed from the observed data,  $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y})$ .

We compare the performance of the auxiliary score approaches with that of more conventional ABC methods based on summary statistics that may be deemed to be a sensible choice in this setting. For this purpose we propose a set of summary statistics that are sufficient (under Gaussianity) for an observable AR(1) process for the log of squared daily returns,  $y_t = \ln(r_t^2)$ , namely

$$s_1 = \sum_{t=2}^{T-1} y_t, \quad s_2 = \sum_{t=2}^{T-1} y_t^2, \quad s_3 = \sum_{t=2}^T y_t y_{t-1}, \quad s_4 = y_1 + y_T, \quad s_5 = y_1^2 + y_T^2. \quad (32)$$

For comparison we also compute the summaries from the raw (not transformed) returns data.

Four different dimension reduction techniques are also applied: 1) the integrated likelihood technique described in Section 3.3.2; 2) the linear regression adjustment method of Beaumont *et al.* (2002); 3) the neural network-based non-linear adjustment method of Blum and Francois (2010); and 4) the semi-automatic procedure of Fearnhead and Prangle (FP) (2012), based on polynomial basis functions up to the fourth order. Method 1) is applied in the case where the scores are constructed from the AUKF-based auxiliary likelihood function for (22) and (23), in which the dimensions of the true and auxiliary parameter sets are equal and selection of each true parameter is based on the marginal score of the *corresponding* parameter in the discretized approximation model. Method 2) is applied to the scores of each of the five different auxiliary models, and is also implemented jointly on the scores of all four GARCH models. Method 3) is also applied to the combined scores of the four GARCH models. Method 4) is applied to the combined GARCH-model scores, and, separately, to the summaries in (32) computed from both the transformed and raw data.

In addition to the above ABC approaches, in which the accept/reject form of Algorithm 1 is applied, we consider an implementation of ABC-MCMC (Marjoram *et al.*, 2003). ABC-MCMC replaces the discontinuous rejection step in Algorithm 1 with a random walk MH step, in order to

explore the posterior support more efficiently. To keep the extent of the numerical results within reason, we implement this alternative version of ABC only in the case of the four auxiliary GARCH models.

The AUKF evaluation of the likelihood function (and joint score) associated with (22) and (23) is performed using the GAUSS software, with the integration required to produce the marginal score function implemented using a numerical integration subroutine from C. All other computations are implemented in MATLAB and R.<sup>10</sup> Each instance of ABC is based on  $N = 50,000$  simulated draws from uniform priors on  $\phi_1$ ,  $\phi_2$  and  $\phi_3$  truncated as described above. Draws are retained that lead to distances within the 0.5% quantile of the overall simulated distances, which are intrinsic to each procedure.

Finally, two filtering-based methods are used to produce an estimate of the exact posterior via PMMH. The random walk MH algorithm is used, with the likelihood in the MH ratio computed by 1) the bootstrap particle filter; and 2) the ABC filter as per Fig.1 of Jasra *et al.* (2012). We denote the posteriors produced by these methods as PMMH-BPF and PMMH-ABCF, respectively. With the bootstrap filter requiring only simulation from the transitions in (19), up to simulation error arising from both the use of a finite number of particles and a finite number of (autocorrelated) MH draws, the PMMH-BPF can be viewed as providing ‘exact’ estimates of the marginal posteriors. The PMMH-ABCF might also be described as such, but only conditional on the tolerance used in the selection step being sufficiently close to zero. However PMMH-ABCF (as applied here) certainly implements ABC without data summarization and, hence, can be viewed as avoiding that *particular* disconnect from the exact posterior.<sup>11</sup> Both filtering-based estimates are produced from 10,000 draws following 5,000 burn-in draws, and with 3,000 particles used in each instance of likelihood estimation. The unknown parameters are drawn as a block, using truncated normal proposals formed based on the previous draw, adhering to the relevant model’s parameter restrictions and prior boundaries. The application of the ABC filter uses a tolerance that ensures that only simulated draws that are within 30% of the actual observation at any time  $t$  are retained.<sup>12</sup> The filtering-based computations are all performed in R, with code

---

<sup>10</sup>Computations related to estimation methods 4-7 in Table 3 are performed in MATLAB. Computations related to the dimension reduction techniques applied to the GARCH and AUKF scores (generated by MATLAB and GAUSS respectively), are undertaken using the R packages: `abc` (Csillery *et al.*, 2012) and `abctools` (Nunes and Prangle, 2015); with packages `EasyABC` (Jabot *et al.*, 2015) and `rugarch` (Ghalanos, 2018) used for the ABC-MCMC methods.

<sup>11</sup>Discussion of the asymptotic properties (including as the tolerance declines to zero) of algorithms that employ an ABC filtering step can be found in Jasra (2015).

<sup>12</sup>We computed the likelihood using the ABC filter over a range of tolerance levels, and selected the tolerance level at which point the likelihood estimate became stable.

provided in the supplementary material.

### 5.2.2 Numerical accuracy of marginal posterior estimates

To aid the reader, we begin by producing in Table 2 a key to the 18 methods we use to estimate the exact (marginal) posterior for each parameter in the SV-SQ model. In Table 3, we then summarize the accuracy of each approach by reporting the root mean squared error (RMSE) for a given parameter, computed as:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{G} \sum_{g=1}^G (\hat{p}_g - p_g)^2}, \quad (33)$$

where  $\hat{p}_g$  is the ordinate of the relevant density estimate (produced using kernel density methods) and  $p_g$  the ordinate of the exact posterior density, calculated using the deterministic filtering approach of Ng *et al.* (2013), at the  $g$ th grid-point in the support of the parameter. The RMSE associated with a given estimation method, for any particular parameter, is reported as a ratio of that method’s RMSE relative to the method with the smallest RMSE for that given parameter. The ranking of all 18 methods, in terms of the average RMSE across all three parameters, is reported in the final column of Table 3.

Whilst we do not claim to have exhausted all possibilities in this exercise, the broad sweep of techniques applied allows us to draw some conclusions regarding the nature of ABC density estimation in the state space setting. We summarize the key results as follows. (i) Application of the auxiliary score technique to the discretized version of the true continuous-time model, allied with the integrated likelihood approach to dimension reduction, yields the most accurate results overall, even in comparison with the ‘exact’ PMMH-BPF method. Indeed, the less computationally burdensome AUKF-AR and AUKF-AR-LL methods are both in the top third, in terms of ranking, indicating the importance of using - if possible - an auxiliary model that closely mimics the model assumed to have generated the observed data. (ii) The semi-automatic dimension reduction technique of Fearnhead and Prangle (2012) performs very well for two choices of base statistics, and are even superior to the ‘exact’ PMMH-BPF comparator in one case. The markedly better performance of FP-ABC-TRANS relative to FP-ABC-RAW highlights the fact that the accuracy of ABC depends *both* on the use of informative summaries, and the reduction of dimension, with the summaries in (32) being sufficient for an observable measure of volatility *only* when the data is transformed appropriately. In other words, the positive impact of dimension reduction cannot offset a poorly chosen set of statistics. (iii) Despite the previous remark,

Table 2: Summary description of the 18 posterior sampling methods. AR-ABC is accept/reject ABC (i.e. Algorithm 1). AUKF refers to the score of the auxiliary model in (22) and (23), evaluated using the AUKF. IN-AUKF refers to the integrated score for each parameter in the auxiliary model in (22) and (23), evaluated using the AUKF. The FP procedure uses fourth-order polynomial basis functions.

Abbreviation	Details of the posterior sampler
AUKF-AR	AR-ABC with the joint AUKF auxiliary score and no dimension reduction
AUKF-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the joint AUKF auxiliary score and linear reg. adj.
AUKF-AR-IN	AR-ABC with the integrated AUKF auxiliary score
GARCH-N-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the joint GARCH-N score and linear reg. adj.
GARCH-T-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the joint GARCH-T score and linear reg. adj.
TARCH-N-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the joint TGARCH-N score and linear reg. adj.
TARCH-T-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the joint TGARCH-T score and linear reg. adj.
Pooled-GARCH-AR-LL	AR-ABC with the scores from all four GARCH models and linear reg. adj.
Pooled-GARCH-AR-NN	AR-ABC with the scores from all four GARCH models and non-linear reg. adj.
GARCH-N-MCMC	ABC-MCMC with the joint GARCH-N score and no dimension reduction
GARCH-T-MCMC	ABC-MCMC with the joint GARCH-T score and no dimension reduction
TARCH-N-MCMC	ABC-MCMC with the joint TGARCH-N score and no dimension reduction
TARCH-T-MCMC	ABC-MCMC with the joint TGARCH-T score and no dimension reduction
FP-ABC-All	FP with all 16 scores from the four GARCH auxiliary models
FP-ABC-RAW	FP with the statistics in (32), computed from the raw data ( $y_t = r_t$ )
FP-ABC-TRANS	FP with the statistics in (32), computed from the transformed data ( $y_t = \ln(r_t^2)$ )
PMMH-ABC	PMMH with the ABC particle filter
PMMH-BPF	PMMH with the bootstrap particle filter

dimension reduction of some sort is seen to be important. Indeed use of the more sophisticated ABC-MCMC algorithm does not compensate for the lack of dimension reduction, which is evidenced by the fact that the ABC-MCMC methods occupy the lowest third of the rankings. (iv) The extra accuracy yielded by a non-linear regression adjustment, over and above a linear adjustment, is negligible.<sup>13</sup> (v) The score-based technique applied to simple auxiliary models from the GARCH class, as long as allied with dimension reduction, yields reasonably accurate estimates of the exact marginals and, in all but one case, more accurate estimates than the ABC method in which summarization of any kind is avoided (PMMH-ABC).

## 6 Empirical illustration: Conditionally $\alpha$ -stable returns with stochastic volatility

We complete the paper with a small empirical illustration, in which we highlight the particular benefit of using auxiliary likelihood-based ABC in the case where the measurement density is not

<sup>13</sup>The non-linear adjustment procedure was also applied to the scores of the individual GARCH auxiliary models. Again, the RMSE results were very similar to the corresponding results yielded by the linear regression adjustment method and were thus not presented.

Table 3: RMSE of estimated marginal posterior densities. Results are reported as the ratio of a method’s RMSE relative to the smallest RMSE for that given parameter. The ratio in bold indicates the most accurate method for each parameter. The final column ranks the methods according to their average RMSE over the marginal posteriors estimates.

Parameter:	$\phi_1$	$1 - \phi_2$	$\phi_3$	
Estimation method	Relative RMSE			Overall rank
1. AUKF-AR	1.9704	2.5427	1.3998	6
2. AUKF-AR-LL	1.8997	2.2830	1.3312	5
3. AUKF-AR-IN	<b>1.0000</b>	2.2004	1.3307	<b>1</b>
4. GARCH-N-AR-LL	2.2452	3.4830	1.2481	8
5. GARCH-T-AR-LL	2.0812	2.9282	<b>1.0000</b>	7
6. TARCH-N-AR-LL	2.5662	3.8728	1.3666	12
7. TARCH-T-AR-LL	2.3733	3.2770	1.0758	9
8. Pooled-GARCH-AR-LL	2.5496	3.5139	1.6371	13
9. Pooled-GARCH-AR-NN	2.7637	3.0090	1.5869	14
10. GARCH-N-ABC-MCMC	3.4765	5.0755	2.0844	17
11. GARCH-T-ABC-MCMC	3.3041	5.5014	2.2565	15
12. TARCH-N-ABC-MCMC	3.7154	5.4578	2.2127	18
13. TARCH-T-ABC-MCMC	3.4319	5.2219	1.9644	16
14. FP-ABC-All	1.7822	4.0849	1.0797	4
15. FP-ABC-RAW	2.4332	3.9050	1.2885	10
16. FP-ABC-TRANS	1.0759	<b>1.0000</b>	1.9254	2
17. PMMH-ABC	2.2587	3.5515	2.5745	11
18. PMMH-BPF	1.3584	2.8303	1.6552	3

available in closed form and a PMMH method in which evaluation of this density ordinate is used (such as the PMMH-BPF algorithm illustrated in Section 5.2) is not feasible. For the purpose of this illustration we employ the stochastic volatility model with conditionally  $\alpha$ -stable returns, defined in (24) and (25), using daily data on the S&P500 index. The returns data (sourced from Reuters) extend from 2 January 2013 to 7 February 2017, comprising 1033 observations, and are computed from open-to-close prices. We standardize the returns by dividing each observation by the sample standard deviation, and fix  $\phi_1 = 0$ .

We estimate the parameters  $\phi_2$ ,  $\phi_3$  and  $\phi_4$  by auxiliary score-based ABC, with the auxiliary model defined by the GARCH model in (26) and (27), and without the use of dimension reduction techniques. We elect to retain 500 ABC draws to estimate the ABC posterior densities from 331,882 ABC replications (with quantile selection guided by Frazier *et al.*, 2018, as described earlier). Given the lack of a closed-form measurement density, due to the  $\alpha$ -stable error term in (24), the PMMH-ABCF algorithm, as described in Section 5.2.1, is applied as a comparator.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>14</sup>Note that it is possible to approximate the  $\alpha$ -stable measurement density numerically and, hence, exploit this approximation in an application of a PMMH-BPF algorithm, as described in Section 5.2.1. However, this numerical approximation is very computationally burdensome: a single likelihood evaluation for this model using

The three unknown parameters are drawn as a block, using truncated normal proposals formed based on the previous draw. The marginal posteriors are approximated from 10,000 draws following 5,000 burn-in draws, and with 3000 particles used in each instance of likelihood estimation. For both ABC methods, we employ uniform priors:  $\phi_2 \sim U(0.7, 0.999)$ ,  $\phi_3 \sim U(0.001, 0.5)$ , and  $\phi_4 \sim U(1.2, 2)$ . The MH acceptance ratio for the PMMH-ABCF for this empirical illustration is 51%. Computation times for the auxiliary score-based and PMMH-ABCF algorithms are 4 hours and 12.5 hours, respectively.

Panels A, B and C of Figure 1 depict the posterior density estimates for  $\phi_2$ ,  $\phi_3$  and  $\phi_4$ , respectively, with the auxiliary score-based estimates plotted using a solid line and those produced by PMMH-ABCF plotted with a dashed line. The PMMH-ABCF estimate of the posterior of  $\phi_2$  is flat and mimics the prior, while the corresponding auxiliary score-based estimate is well concentrated and has a mode around an empirically plausible value of 0.95. There is also a stark contrast between the two posterior estimates for  $\phi_3$ , with the score-based estimate peaking around 0.25, while the PMMH-ABCF estimate peaks at the lower bound, suggesting a lack of convergence. The two estimated posteriors for  $\phi_4$ , the parameter of the  $\alpha$ -stable distribution, are more similar one to the other, both peaking at empirically plausible values between 1.96-1.98.

These results are encouraging evidence for the use of the auxiliary score technique in an empirically relevant example in which the only other feasible comparator is both three times slower and produces results that do not appear to be uniformly informative or reliable.

## 7 Conclusions and discussion

This paper has explored the application of approximate Bayesian computation (ABC) in the state space setting, in which auxiliary likelihood functions are used to generate the matching statistics. Bayesian consistency of the auxiliary likelihood-based method - including for the computationally efficient version based on the auxiliary score - has been established, under regularity conditions that exploit the state space structure of the auxiliary model. The idea of tackling the dimensionality issue via an integrated likelihood approach has been proposed and shown to yield improved accuracy in our numerical experiments. In a comprehensive numerical comparison with alternative methods of estimating exact posterior densities, the auxiliary-score based method is shown to perform very well, including in comparison with particle filtering-based algorithms. Its

---

the `stabledist` package in R taking approximately half an hour. The unbiasedness of the estimated likelihood function under this approximation would also have to be established, if one wished to claim that the PMMH-BPF chain retained the correct invariant distribution.




Figure 1: Posterior densities of the parameters of the stochastic volatility model with conditionally  $\alpha$ -stable returns (defined in (24) and (25)) for the S&P500 returns:  $\phi_2$  (Panel A),  $\phi_3$  (Panel B) and  $\phi_4$  (Panel C). The posterior densities generated by the auxiliary score-based method are plotted in solid lines, while those generated by PMMH-ABCF are plotted in dashed lines.

ability to produce plausible posterior estimates in an empirical setting is also demonstrated, with an alternative approach that applies ABC principles at the filtering level yielding results that are not empirically sensible.

Despite the focus of this paper being on inference about the static parameters in the state space model, there is nothing to preclude marginal inference on the states being conducted, at a second stage. Specifically, conditional on the (accepted) draws used to estimate  $p(\phi|\mathbf{y})$ , existing filtering and smoothing methods (including methods that exploit ABC at the filtering level) could be used to yield draws of the states, and (marginal) smoothed posteriors for the states produced via the usual averaging arguments. Such exploration is left for future work.

**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL:** The Supplementary Appendix contains: 1) the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2; 2) an informal demonstration of the equivalence of the auxiliary MLE-based approach to ABC and the corresponding approach based on the auxiliary score; 3) additional numerical exercises demonstrating the large sample behavior of ABC; and 4) implementation

details for the AUKF in the SV-SQ example. Gauss, C, Matlab and R code used to produce all numerical results in the paper have also been provided on-line.

## References

- [1] Andersen, T.G., Benzoni, L. and Lund, J. 2002. An Empirical Investigation of Continuous-Time Equity Return Models, *The Journal of Finance*, 57, 1239–1284.
- [2] Andrieu, C., Doucet, A. and Holenstein, R. 2010. Particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(3), pp. 269-342.
- [3] Beaumont, M.A., Cornuet, J-M., Marin, J-M. and Robert, C.P. 2009. Adaptive Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Biometrika* 96, 983-990.
- [4] Beaumont, M.A., Zhang, W. and Balding, D.J. 2002. Approximate Bayesian Computation in Population Genetics, *Genetics* 162, 2025-2035.
- [5] Blum, M.G.B. 2010. Approximate Bayesian Computation: a Nonparametric Perspective, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105, 1178-1187.
- [6] Blum, M.G.B., Nunes, M.A., Prangle, D. and Sisson, S.A. 2013. A Comparative Review of Dimension Reduction Methods in Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Statistical Science*, 28, 189-208.
- [7] Bollerslev, T., Chou, R.Y. and Kroner, K.F. 1992. ARCH Modelling in Finance: A Review of the Theory and Empirical Evidence, *Journal of Econometrics*, 52, 5-59.
- [8] Calvet, C. and Czellar, V. 2015. Accurate Methods for Approximate Bayesian Computation Filtering. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 13, 798-838.
- [9] Carr, P. and Wu, L. 2003. The Finite Moment Log Stable Process and Option Pricing. *Journal of Finance* LVIII, 753-777.
- [10] Chambers, J.M., Mallows, C. and Stuck, B.W., 1976. A Method for Simulating Stable Random Variables, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 71, 340-344.
- [11] Creel, M. and Kristensen, D. 2015. ABC of SV: Limited Information Likelihood Inference in Stochastic Volatility Jump-Diffusion Models, *Journal of Empirical Finance* 31, 85-108.
- [12] Creel, M., Gao, J., Hong, H. and Kristensen, D. 2015. Bayesian Indirect Inference and the ABC of GMM. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.07385>.

- [13] Csillery, K., Francois, O., and Blum, M.G.B. 2012. `abc`: An R Package for Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3, 475-479.
- [14] Dean, T. A., Singh, S. S., Jasra, A., and Peters, G. W. 2014. Parameter Estimation or Hidden Markov Models with Intractable Likelihoods. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 41, 970-987.
- [15] Douc, R. and Moulines, E. 2012. Asymptotic Properties of the Maximum Likelihood Estimation in Misspecified Hidden Markov Models, *Ann. Statist.* 40, 2697–2732.
- [16] Drovandi, C.C., Pettitt, A.N. and Faddy, M.J. 2011. Approximate Bayesian Computation Using Indirect Inference, *JRSS(C)*, 60 1 - 21.
- [17] Drovandi, C.C., Pettitt, A.N. and Lee, A. 2015. Bayesian Indirect Inference Using a Parametric Auxiliary Model. *Statistical Science*, Vol. 30, No. 1, 72-95.
- [18] Eraker, B. 2004. Do Stock Prices and Volatility Jump? Reconciling Evidence from Spot and Option Prices, *The Journal of Finance*, LIX: 1367-1403.
- [19] Fearnhead, P. and Prangle, D. 2012. Constructing Summary Statistics for Approximate Bayesian Computation: Semi-automatic Approximate Bayesian Computation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B.* 74: 419–474.
- [20] Frazier D.T., Martin G.M., Robert, C.P. and Rousseau, J. 2018. Asymptotic Properties of Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Biometrika*, 105, 593-607.
- [21] Garcia R., Renault, E. and Veredas, D. 2011. Estimation of Stable Distributions with Indirect Inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 161(3): 325-337.
- [22] Gallant, A.R. and Tauchen, G. 1996. Which Moments to Match, *Econometric Theory* 12, 657-681.
- [23] Gallant, A.R. and Tauchen, G. 2010. Simulated Score Methods and Indirect Inference for Continuous-time Models, *Handbook of Financial Econometrics*, Volume 1, Chapter 8, Elsevier.
- [24] Ghalanos, A. 2018. `rugarch`: Univariate GARCH models. R package version 1.4-0.
- [25] Gouriéroux, C. and Monfort, A. 1995. *Statistics and Econometric Models*. CUP.
- [26] Gouriéroux, C., Monfort, A. and Renault, E. 1993. Indirect Inference, *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 85, S85-S118.
- [27] Heston, S.L. 1993. A Closed-form Solution for Options with Stochastic Volatility with Applications to Bond and Currency Options, *The Review of Financial Studies*, 6, 327-343.

- [28] Jabot, T., Faure, T., Dumoulin, D. and Albert, C. 2015. **EasyABC**: Efficient Approximate Bayesian Computation Sampling Schemes. R package version 1.5. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=EasyABC>
- [29] Jasra, A, Singh, S, Martin, J. and McCoy, E. 2012. Filtering via Approximate Bayesian Computation. *Statistics and Computing* 22, 1223-1237.
- [30] Jasra, A. 2015. Approximate Bayesian Computation for a Class of Time Series Models. *International Statistical Review* 83, 405-435.
- [31] Johannes, M., Polson, N.G. and Stroud, J.R. 2009. Optimal Filtering of Jump-Diffusions: Extracting Latent States from Asset Prices, *Review of Financial Studies*, 22: 2759-2799.
- [32] Joyce, P. and Marjoram, P. 2008. Approximately Sufficient Statistics and Bayesian Computation. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 7, 1-16.
- [33] Julier, S.J., Uhlmann, J.K. and Durrant-Whyte, H.F. 1995. A New Approach for Filtering Nonlinear Systems. *Proceedings of the American Control Conference*, 1628-1632.
- [34] Li, W. and Fearnhead, P. 2018a. On the Asymptotic Efficiency of ABC Estimators, *Biometrika*, 105, 285-299.
- [35] Li, W. and Fearnhead, P. 2018b Convergence of Regression-Adjusted Approximate Bayesian Computation, *Biometrika*, 105, 301-318.
- [36] Lombardi, M.J. and Calzolari, G. 2009. Indirect Estimation of  $\alpha$ -stable Stochastic Volatility Models. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 53 2298-2308.
- [37] Marin, J-M., Pudlo, P., Robert C. and Ryder, R. 2011. Approximate Bayesian Computation Methods. *Statistics and Computing* 21, 289–291.
- [38] Marjoram, P., Molitor, J., Plagnol, V. and Tavaré, S. 2003. Markov Chain Monte Carlo Without Likelihoods, *Proceedings of the National Academie of Science USA* 100, 15324-15328.
- [39] Ng, J., Forbes, C.S., Martin, G.M. and McCabe, B.P.M. 2013. Non-parametric Estimation of Forecast Distributions in Non-Gaussian, Non-linear State Space Models, *International Journal of Forecasting* 29, 411-430
- [40] Nott D., Fan, Y., Marshall, L. and Sisson, S. 2014. Approximate Bayesian Computation and Bayes Linear Analysis: Towards High-dimensional ABC, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 23, 65-86.

- [41] Nunes, M. A., and Prangle, D. 2015. `abctools`: An R Package for Tuning Approximate Bayesian Computation Analyses. *The R Journal*, 7(2), 189-205.
- [42] Peters, G.W., Sisson, S.A. and Fan, Y. 2012. Likelihood-free Bayesian Inference for  $\alpha$ -Stable Models, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 65, 3743-3756.
- [43] Pitt, M.K., dos Santos Silva, R., Giordani, P. and Kohn, R. 2012. On Some Properties of Markov chain Monte Carlo Simulation Methods Based on the Particle Filter, *Journal of Econometrics*, 171(2), pp. 134-151.
- [44] Pritchard, J.K., Seilstad, M.T., Perez-Lezaun, A. and Feldman, M.W. 1999. Population Growth of Human Y Chromosomes: A Study of Y Chromosome Microsatellites, *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 16 1791-1798.
- [45] R Core Team 2013. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- [46] Samoradnitsky, G. and Taqqu, M.S. 1994. *Stable Non-Gaussian Random Processes: Stochastic Models with Infinite Variance*. Vol. 1. CRC press.
- [47] Sisson S. and Fan, Y. 2011. Likelihood-free Markov Chain Monte Carlo. In *Handbook of Markov Chain Monte Carlo* (Eds. Brooks, Gelman, Jones, Meng). Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- [48] Sisson, S., Fan, Y. and Tanaka, M. 2007. Sequential Monte Carlo without Likelihoods, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 104, 1760-1765.
- [49] Tavaré, S., Balding, D.J., Griffiths, R.C. and Donnelly, P. 1997. Inferring Coalescence Times from DNA Sequence Data, *Genetics* 145, 505-518.
- [50] Wegmann, D., Leuenberger, C. and Excoffier, L. 2009. Efficient Approximate Bayesian Computation Coupled with Markov chain Monte Carlo with Likelihood, *Genetics* 182, 1207-1218.