

Orthogonal samples for estimators in time series

Suhasini Subba Rao

Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University

College Station, TX, U.S.A.

`suhasini@stat.tamu.edu`

September 15, 2018

Abstract

Inference for statistics of a stationary time series often involve nuisance parameters and sampling distributions that are difficult to estimate. In this paper, we propose the method of orthogonal samples, which can be used to address some of these issues. For a broad class of statistics, an orthogonal sample is constructed through a slight modification of the original statistic, such that it shares similar distributional properties as the centralised statistic of interest. We use the orthogonal sample to estimate nuisance parameters of weighted average periodogram estimators and L_2 -type spectral statistics. Further, the orthogonal sample is utilized to estimate the finite sampling distribution of various test statistics under the null hypothesis. The proposed method is simple and computationally fast to implement. The viability of the method is illustrated with various simulations.

Keywords Nuisance parameters, orthogonal transformations, statistical tests, time series.

1 Introduction

In classical statistics, given the correct distribution it is often possible to define estimators and pivotal quantities which do not depend on any nuisance parameters, examples include the studentized t-statistic and log-likelihood ratio statistic. In time series analysis, due to dependence in the data and that the underlying distribution of the process is usually unknown, such statistics rarely arise. However, for inference it is necessary to estimate the variance of statistic which can often involve a complicated function of higher order cumulants. For the past 30 years, the standard approach to the estimation of nuisance parameters and

finite sample distributions of statistics is to use the bootstrap. This is a simple method for mimicing the behaviour of the time series. There exists many methods for constructing the bootstrap. Classical examples include the block-type bootstrap (see Künsch [1989], Politis and Romano [1994], Romano and Thombs [1996], Politis et al. [1999], Lahiri [2003], Kirch and Politis [2011] and Kreiss and Lahiri [2012]), fixed-b bootstrap, which accounts for the influence of bandwidth in the block bootstrap (see Kiefer and Vogel [2005] and Shao and Politis [2013]), sieve bootstrap (see Kreiss [1992], Kreiss et al. [2010] and Jentsch and Politis [2013]) frequency domain bootstrap (Hurvich and Zeger [1987], Franke and Härdle [1992] and Dahlhaus and Janas [1996]) linear process bootstrap (McMurray and Politis [2010] and Jentsch and Politis [2015]) and moving average bootstrap (see Krampe et al. [2016]). An alternative, is the method of self-normalisation proposed in Lobato [2001] and Shao [2009], where the limiting distribution is non-standard but free of nuisance parameters.

The purpose of this paper is to propose an alternative method to nuisance parameters estimation and pivotal statistics. We make no claims that the proposed method is better than any of the excellent methods mentioned above, but we believe it may be worth further investigation. In many respects our approach is very classical. It is motivated by Fisher's definition of an ancillary variable from the 1930s and by the innovations in spectral analysis for time series developed during the 1950's and 1960's. An ancillary variable, is a statistic whose sampling distribution does not depend on the parameters of interest yet holds important information about the statistic of interest. For example, if $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are iid random variables with mean μ and variance σ^2 and \bar{X} is the sample mean, then $X_i - \bar{X}$ can be considered as an ancillary variable since its sampling distribution does not change with μ , however, since $\text{var}[X_i - \bar{X}] = (n - 1)\sigma^2/n$ it does contain information about the variance σ^2 . Thus the ancillary variables, $\{X_i - \bar{X}\}_{i=1}^n$, are used to estimate the variance of the sample mean. Ancillary variables rarely occur in time series analysis, however, our aim is to show that several estimators give rise to *asymptotic* ancillary variables, which can be used to estimate the variance of the estimator of interest and construct pivotal quantities. Since the asymptotic ancillary variables constructed in this paper are uncorrelated to each other in this paper we call them an *orthogonal sample*.

To illustrate the proposed method we consider a well known example in time series, where implicitly the notion of an orthogonal sample. Let $\{X_t\}$ be a stationary, short memory, time series with mean μ , autocovariance function $\{c(j)\}$ and spectral density function $f(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} c(j) \exp(ij\omega)$ and $i = \sqrt{-1}$. We observe $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$ and use the sample mean \bar{X}_T as the estimator of the spectral density function. It is well know that the variance of the sample mean is asymptotically equal to the long run variance $\text{var}[\sqrt{T}\bar{X}_T] \approx \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} c(j)$. We recall that $\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} c(j) = 2\pi f(0)$, thus estimation of the long run variance is equivalent to estimating the spectral density function at frequency zero. A classical estimator of the spectral density

is the local average of the periodogram as a spectral density function (see Bartlett [1950] and Parzen [1957]). Applying this to long run variance estimation, this means using $2\pi\widehat{f}(0)$ as an estimator of $2\pi f(0)$, where

$$\widehat{f}(0) = \frac{2\pi}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M |J_T(\omega_k)|^2 \text{ with } J_T(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t \exp(it\omega_k) \text{ and } \omega_k = \frac{2\pi k}{T}.$$

We now take a step back and consider this estimator from a slightly different perspective, which fits with the notion of an ancillary variable, discussed above. We observe (i) $\sqrt{2\pi}J_T(0) = \sqrt{T}\bar{X}$ (ii) $E[J_T(\omega_k)] = 0$ if $1 \leq k < T/2$, $\text{cov}[J_T(\omega_{k_1}), J_T(\omega_{k_2})] = O(T^{-1})$ (if $k_1 \neq k_2$) and (iii) if ω_k is in a "neighbourhood" of zero $\text{var}[J_T(\omega_k)] \approx f(0)$. Thus $M \ll T$ $\{J_T(\omega_k)\}_{k=1}^M$ can be considered as an orthogonal sample to the sample mean $\sqrt{2\pi}J_T(0)$; it contains no mean information but shares the same (asymptotic) variance as the sample mean. Furthermore, if it can be shown that the random vector $\{J_T(\omega_k)\}_{k=0}^M$ is asymptotically normal (cf. Brockwell and Davis [1991]), then for fixed M we have the asymptotically pivotal statistic

$$\frac{\sqrt{T}(\bar{X} - \mu)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{M} \sum_{k=1}^M |J_T(\omega_k)|^2}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} t_{2M}, \text{ as } T \rightarrow \infty \quad (1)$$

where t_{2M} denotes a t-distribution with $2M$ degrees of freedom.

The objective in this paper is to generalize the notion outlined above to a broad class of estimators. Our main focus is the class of weighted average periodogram estimators which take the form

$$A_T(\phi) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) |J_T(\omega_k)|^2, \quad (2)$$

which was first introduced in Parzen [1957] and includes the sample autocovariance function, spectral density estimators and Whittle likelihood estimators. We briefly summarize the paper. In Section 2 we define the orthogonal sample associated with $A_T(\phi)$ which shares similar properties to the centralised $A_T(\phi)$, in particular the same variance. Using the orthogonal sample we obtain an estimator of the variance and define an asymptotically pivotal statistic analogous to (1). In Section 2.3 we present some simulations to assess the viability of the approach. In Section 2.4 we apply orthogonal samples to the estimation of mean and variance of L_2 -spectral statistics (which are often quite complicated). In Section 3 we address the issue of testing. Specifically, since the orthogonal sample shares similar sampling properties with the centralised version of the statistic, it can be used to estimate the finite sample distribution, and critical values, of the statistic under the null that the mean of the statistic is zero. Thus we use the orthogonal sample to estimate the distribution

of the test statistic under the null. In Section 4 we propose an average square criterion to select the number of terms in the orthogonal sample. Evaluation of the orthogonal sample requires only $O(T \log T)$ computing operations, which makes the procedure extremely fast.

The purpose of this paper is to propose a methodology and does not purport to be rigorous. However, some proofs are given in the supplementary material.

2 Orthogonal samples and its applications

2.1 Notation and assumptions

A time series $\{X_t\}$ is said to be p th-order stationary if all moments up to the p th moment are invariant to shift (for example, a strictly stationary time series with finite p -order moment satisfies such a condition). We denote the covariance and s order cumulant as $c(j) = \text{cov}(X_t, X_{t+j})$ and $\kappa_s(j_1, \dots, j_{s-1}) = \text{cum}(X_t, X_{t+j_1}, \dots, X_{t+j_{s-1}})$. Furthermore, we define the spectral density and s -order spectral density functions as

$$f(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} c(j) e^{ij\omega} \text{ and } f_s(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_{s-1}) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^s} \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_{s-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} \kappa_s(j_1, \dots, j_{s-1}) e^{i(j_1\omega_1 + \dots + j_{s-1}\omega_{s-1})}.$$

To simplify notation we will assume that $\{X_t\}$ is a zero mean time series, noting that the same methodology also works when the mean of $\{X_t\}$ is constant since the DFT of a constant mean is zero at most frequencies. We let $\Re X$ and $\Im X$ denote the real and imaginary parts of the variable X .

Assumption 2.1 (*p th-order stationary and cumulant conditions*) *The time series $\{X_t\}_t$ is p -order stationary, with $E|X_t|^p < \infty$ and for all $2 \leq s \leq p$ and $1 \leq i \leq s$*

$$\sum_{j_1, \dots, j_{s-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |j_i|) |\kappa_s(j_1, \dots, j_{s-1})| < \infty.$$

2.2 Construction of orthogonal samples and pivotal statistics

In this section the main focus will be on $A_T(\phi)$ (defined in (2)). We start by reviewing some of the well known sampling properties of $A_T(\phi)$. If $\{X_t\}$ is a fourth order stationary time series which satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = 4$, then it can be shown that $A_T(\phi)$ is a mean squared consistent estimator of $A(\phi)$, where

$$A(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(\omega) f(\omega) d\omega.$$

Clearly, depending on the choice of ϕ , $A_T(\phi)$ estimates several parameters of interest and we give some examples below.

Example 2.1 (a) The sample autocovariance function at lag j , with $\phi(\omega) = \exp(ij\omega)$, corresponds to

$$\hat{c}_T(j) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \exp(ij\omega_k) |J_T(\omega_k)|^2 = \tilde{c}_T(j) + \tilde{c}_T(T-j) = \tilde{c}_T(j) + O_p\left(\frac{|j|}{T}\right), \quad (3)$$

with $\tilde{c}_T(j) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-|j|} X_t X_{t+|j|}$.

(b) The spectral density estimator with $\phi(\omega) = b^{-1}W(\frac{\omega-\omega_k}{b})$.

(c) In order to test for goodness of fit of a model with spectral density function $g(\omega; \theta)$, Milohoj [1981] proposed estimating the j th autocovariance function of the residuals obtained by fitting the linear model corresponding to $g(\omega; \theta)$ using

$$\hat{\gamma}_T(j) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{\exp(ij\omega_k)}{g(\omega_k; \theta)} |J_T(\omega_k)|^2.$$

In this case $\hat{\gamma}_T(j) = A_T(e^{ij\cdot} g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1})$ and $\phi(\omega) = e^{ij\omega} g(\omega; \theta)^{-1}$.

(d) The Whittle likelihood estimator (which is asymptotically equivalent to the quasi-Gaussian likelihood), where $\hat{\theta}_T = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}_T(\theta)$ with

$$\mathcal{L}_T(\theta) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \left(\frac{|J_T(\omega_k)|^2}{f(\omega_k; \theta)} + \log f(\omega_k; \theta) \right)$$

and Θ is a compact parameter space. For the purpose of estimation and testing usually the derivative of the likelihood is required, where

$$\nabla_{\theta} \mathcal{L}_T(\theta) = A_T(\phi) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \frac{1}{f(\omega_k; \theta)} \nabla_{\theta} f(\omega_k; \theta) \quad (4)$$

and $\phi(\omega) = \nabla_{\theta} f(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1}$.

Under stationarity and some additional mixing-type and regularity conditions it is easily shown that $T\text{var}[A_T(\phi)] = V(0) + O(T^{-1})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} V(0) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega)^2 \left(|\phi(\omega)|^2 + \phi(\omega) \overline{\phi(-\omega)} \right) d\omega + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(\omega_1) \overline{\phi(\omega_2)} f_4(\omega_1, -\omega_1, -\omega_2) d\omega_1 d\omega_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

It is clear that the variance has a complicated structure and cannot be directly estimated. Instead, we obtain an orthogonal sample associated with $A_T(\phi)$ to estimate $V(0)$. To construct the orthogonal sample we recall some of the pertinent features of the orthogonal

sample associated with the sample mean; $\{\sqrt{2}\Re J_T(\omega_k), \sqrt{2}\Im J_T(\omega_k); k = 1, \dots, M\}$ is a ‘near uncorrelated’ sequence which has similar distributional properties as a centralised version of $\sqrt{T/2\pi}\bar{X}_T = J_T(0)$. Returning to $A_T(\phi)$ we observe that it is a weighted average of the periodogram $|J_T(\omega_k)|^2$. We now compare $|J_T(\omega_k)|^2$ with $J_T(\omega_k)\overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}$. Using Theorem 4.3.2, Brillinger [1981], it is clear that $|J_T(\omega_k)|^2$ and $\{\sqrt{2}\Re J_T(\omega_k)\overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}, \sqrt{2}\Im J_T(\omega_k)\overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}\}$ are estimating very different quantities (the spectral density and zero respectively). However, they are almost uncorrelated and in the case that r is small and $k > 0$ they have approximately the same variance. This suggests that in order to construct the orthogonal sample associated with $A_T(\phi)$ we replace $|J_T(\omega_k)|^2$ with $J_T(\omega_k)\overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}$ and define

$$A_T(\phi; r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})} \quad r \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (6)$$

Note that $A_T(\phi; 0) = A_T(\phi)$. In the following lemmas we show that $\{\sqrt{2}\Re A_T(\phi; r), \sqrt{2}\Im A_T(\phi; r)\}_{r=1}^M$ is an orthogonal sample to $A_T(\phi)$. We first show that in general $A_T(\phi; 0)$ and $A_T(\phi; r)$ ($r > 0$) have differing means.

Lemma 2.1 *Suppose that $\{X_t\}$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = 2$ and $\phi(\cdot)$ is a Lipschitz continuous bounded function. Then we have*

$$E[A_T(\phi; r)] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(\omega) f(\omega) d\omega + O(T^{-1}) & r = 0 \\ O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r < T/2 \end{cases}$$

PROOF In the Supplementary material. □

Despite these terms having different expectations in the following lemma and corollary we show that they share similar second order properties.

Theorem 2.1 *Suppose $\{X_t\}$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = 4$ and the function $\phi : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a Lipschitz continuous bounded function.*

(i) *Then we have*

$$T\text{var}[A_T(\phi)] = T\text{var}[A_T(\phi; 0)] = V(0) + O(T^{-1})$$

$$T\text{cov}[\Re A_T(\phi; r_1), \Re A_T(\phi; r_2)] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}V(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r_1 = r_2 (= r) \\ O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r_1 \neq r_2 \leq T/2 \end{cases}$$

$$T\text{cov}[\Im A_T(\phi; r_1), \Im A_T(\phi; r_2)] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2}V(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r_1 = r_2 (= r) \\ O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r_1 \neq r_2 \leq T/2 \end{cases}$$

and

$$T\text{cov}[\Re A_T(\phi; r_1), \Im A_T(\phi; r_2)] = O(T^{-1}) \quad 0 < r_1, r_2 \leq T/2$$

(ii) Suppose, further that Assumption 2.1 holds with $p = 8$, then we have

$$\text{cov}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_1)|^2, |\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_2)|^2] = \begin{cases} V(\omega_r)^2 + O(T^{-1}) & 0 < r_1 = r_2 (= r) \\ O(T^{-1}) & 0 \leq r_1 < r_2 < T/2 \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V(\omega_r) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega)f(\omega + \omega_r) \left(|\phi(\omega)|^2 + \phi(\omega)\overline{\phi(-\omega - \omega_r)} \right) d\omega + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi(\omega_1)\overline{\phi(\omega_2)} f_4(\omega_1, -\omega_1 - \omega_r, -\omega_2) d\omega_1 d\omega_2. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

PROOF In the Supplementary material. \square

We observe that Assumption 2.1 with $p = 4$ implies that the spectral density function $f(\cdot)$ and fourth order spectral density function $f_4(\cdot)$ are Lipschitz continuous over each variable. These observations immediately lead to the following result.

Corollary 2.1 *Suppose Assumption 2.1 with $p = 4$ holds and ϕ is Lipschitz continuous. Let $V(\cdot)$ be defined as in (8). Then we have*

$$|V(\omega_r) - V(0)| \leq K|r|T^{-1},$$

where K is a finite constant that does not depend on r or T .

Theorem 2.1(i) and Lemma 2.1 together imply for $M \ll T$, that the sequence $\{\sqrt{2}\Re A_T(\phi; r), \sqrt{2}\Im A_T(\phi; r); r = 1, \dots, M\}$ are ‘near uncorrelated’ random variables with approximately the same variance, $V(0)$. Based on these observations we propose the following estimator of $V(0)$

$$\widehat{V}_M(0) = \frac{T}{2M} \sum_{r=1}^M (2|\Re A_T(\phi; r)|^2 + 2|\Im A_T(\phi; r)|^2) = \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\phi; r)|^2. \quad (9)$$

Below we obtain the orthogonal samples associated with the estimators described in Example 2.1.

Example 2.2 (a) *We recall that the sample covariance is*

$$A_T(e^{ij\cdot}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T |J_T(\omega_k)|^2 e^{ij\omega_k} \approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-j} X_t X_{t+j}$$

and the orthogonal sample is approximately

$$A_T(e^{ij\cdot}; r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T |J_T(\omega_k)|^2 e^{ij\omega_k} \approx \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-j} X_t X_{t+j} e^{-it\omega_r}.$$

Thus the sample covariance is a sample mean, and, as expected, the orthogonal sample is analogous to the DFT $J_T(\omega_k)$, but with $X_t X_{t+j}$ replacing X_t .

- In general, unlike the sample covariance given above, $A_T(\phi)$ will not be a “mean-like”, but a quadratic form $A_T(\phi) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,\tau=1}^T \Phi_T(t-\tau) X_t X_\tau$, where $\Phi_T(t-\tau) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) e^{i(t-\tau)\omega_k}$. Straightforward calculations show that the corresponding orthogonal sample can be written as $A_T(\phi; r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t,\tau=1}^T \Phi_T(t-\tau) X_t X_\tau e^{-i\tau\omega_r}$.

(b) The orthogonal sample for the spectral density estimator is

$$\widehat{f}(\omega; r) = \frac{1}{bT} \sum_{k=1}^T W \left(\frac{\omega - \omega_k}{b} \right) J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}.$$

Note that since $\phi = \frac{1}{b} W \left(\frac{\omega - \omega_k}{b} \right)$ is not a bounded function (over b) the rates in Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 do not hold, and some adjustment of the rate is necessary.

(c) The orthogonal sample for $\widehat{\gamma}_T(j)$ is $A_T(e^{ij \cdot} g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1}; r) = T^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^T e^{ij\omega_k} g(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1} J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}$.

(d) If the aim to test $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ versus $H_A : \theta \neq \theta_0$ using the score test based on the Whittle likelihood, $\sqrt{T} \nabla_{\theta_0} \mathcal{L}_T(\theta)$, then we require an estimator of the variance

$$V = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{T} \nabla_{\theta_0} \mathcal{L}_T(\theta)] = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{var}[\sqrt{T} A_T(\nabla_{\theta_0} f(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1})].$$

In this case the orthogonal sample is

$$A_T(\nabla_{\theta_0} f(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1}; r) = T^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^T \nabla_{\theta_0} f(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1} J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}.$$

We return to the Whittle likelihood considered in Example 2.1(d). In the above example, we use the Whittle likelihood for hypothesis testing. However, the Whittle likelihood is also used in estimation, where $\widehat{\theta}_T = \arg \min \mathcal{L}_T(\theta)$ is an estimator of the true parameter, θ_0 . By using (4) and the Taylor series expansion it is well known that

$$\sqrt{T} (\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, W_{\theta_0}^{-1} V_{\theta_0} W_{\theta_0}^{-1}),$$

where $W_{\theta_0} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega)^{-2} \nabla_{\theta_0} f_{\theta}(\omega; \theta) \nabla_{\theta_0} f_{\theta}(\omega; \theta)' d\omega$ and $V_{\theta_0} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T \text{var}[A_T(\nabla_{\theta_0} f(\omega_k; \theta)^{-1})]$. However, θ_0 is unknown, and we only have an estimator $\widehat{\theta}_T$. Instead, we replace θ_0 with $\widehat{\theta}_T$ and use

$$A_T(\nabla_{\widehat{\theta}_T} f(\omega_k; \widehat{\theta})^{-1}; r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \nabla_{\widehat{\theta}_T} f(\omega_k; \widehat{\theta})^{-1} J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})}$$

as the orthogonal sample and

$$\widehat{V}_{\widehat{\theta}, M}(0) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{k=1}^T \nabla_{\widehat{\theta}_T} f(\omega_k; \widehat{\theta})^{-1} J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})} \right|^2 \quad (10)$$

as an estimator of $V_{\theta}(0) = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T \text{var}[A_T(\nabla_{\theta} f(\cdot; \theta)^{-1})]$.

It is straightforward to generalize this idea to estimate $V_\theta(0) = \text{var} \left[\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi_\theta) \right]$, where θ_0 is unknown and only an estimator $\hat{\theta}_T$ of θ_0 is observed. We suggest using

$$\widehat{V}_{\hat{\theta}, M}(0) = \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\phi_{\hat{\theta}}; r)|^2, \text{ where } A_T(\phi_{\hat{\theta}}; r) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k; \hat{\theta}) J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})} \quad (11)$$

as an estimator of $V_\theta = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T \text{var}[A_T(\phi_\theta)]$.

In Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, below, we show that $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ and $\widehat{V}_{\hat{\theta}, M}(0)$ are consistent estimators of the variance. But, in most applications variance estimation is mainly required in the construction of confidence intervals or test hypothesis. In which case the main object of interest is the studentized statistic

$$T_M = \frac{\sqrt{T}[A_T(\phi) - A(\phi)]}{\sqrt{\widehat{V}_M(0)}}. \quad (12)$$

Since $\widehat{V}_M(0)$, is a consistent estimator of $V(0)$ as $M/T \rightarrow \infty$ with $M, T \rightarrow \infty$, under suitable conditions we would expect $T_M \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$. However, such an approximation does not take into account that $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ is an estimator of the variance. We want a better finite sample approximation that takes into account that M is fixed. This requires the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2 *Let us suppose that $\{X_t\}$ is a stationary α -mixing time series, where the α -mixing coefficient $\alpha(t)$ is such that $\alpha(t) \leq K|t|^{-s}$ (for $|t| \neq 0$), where $s > 6$ and $K < \infty$ and for some $r > 4s/(s - 6)$ we have $E|X_t|^r < \infty$.*

Let $A_T(\phi)$ and $A_T(\phi; r)$ be defined as in (2) and (6) respectively. We assume that $\phi : [0, 2\pi] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ has a bounded second derivative and $A_T(\phi)$ is a real-valued random variable. Let $A_{M,T} = (A_T(\phi; 1), \dots, A_T(\phi; M))'$. Then for M fixed we have

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{V(0)}} \begin{pmatrix} A_T(\phi) - A(\phi) \\ \sqrt{2}\Re A_{M,T} \\ \sqrt{2}\Im A_{M,T} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{2M+1}), \quad (13)$$

where I_{2M+1} denotes the identity matrix of dimension $2M + 1$.

PROOF The proof immediately follows from Theorem 2.1, Lee and Subba Rao [2016].

Note that the stated conditions imply that Assumption 2.1 holds with $p = 4$, see Statulevicius and Jakimavicius [1988], Theorem 3, part (2) and Remark 3.1, Neumann [1996]. \square

Using the asymptotic independence of $\Re A_{M,T}$ and $\Im A_{M,T}$ (proved in the above theorem) we observe for fixed M

$$M \frac{\widehat{V}_M(0)}{V(0)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \chi_{2M}^2$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where χ_{2M}^2 denotes a chi-square distribution with $2M$ degrees of freedom. Furthermore, since $A_T(\phi)$ is independent of $\Re A_{M,T}$ and $\Im A_{M,T}$ for fixed M we have

$$T_M \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} t_{2M} \quad (14)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$, where T_M is defined in (12) and t_{2M} denotes the t -distribution with $2M$ degrees of freedom.

Remark 2.1 *The above method can be generalized to estimate the covariance between several estimators which take the form (2). Let $\mathbf{A} = (A(\phi_1), \dots, A(\phi_p))$ denote a p -dimensional parameter and $\mathbf{A}_T = (A_T(\phi_1), \dots, A_T(\phi_p))$ their corresponding estimators. Further, let $\mathbf{A}_T(r) = (A_T(\phi_1; r), \dots, A_T(\phi_p; r))$ denote the orthogonal sample vector associated with \mathbf{A}_T . It can be shown that $\text{var}[\sqrt{T}\mathbf{A}_T] = \Sigma + O(T^{-1})$ where*

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_{j_1, j_2} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega)^2 \left[\phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega)} + \phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(-\omega)} \right] d\omega + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_{j_1}(\omega_1) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega_2)} f_4(\omega_1, -\omega_1, -\omega_2) d\omega_1 d\omega_2. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Based on similar ideas to those presented above we can estimate the variance Σ with

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_M = \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M (\Re \mathbf{A}_T(r) \mathbf{A}_T(r)^* + \Im \mathbf{A}_T(r) \mathbf{A}_T(r)^*)$$

where $\mathbf{A}_T(r)^*$ denote the complex conjugate and transpose of $\mathbf{A}_T(r)$. Furthermore the statistic

$$T(\mathbf{A}_T - \mathbf{A})' \widehat{\Sigma}_M^{-1} (\mathbf{A}_T - \mathbf{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} T_{p, 2M}^2,$$

where $T_{p, 2M}^2$ denotes Hotelling's T -squared distribution with $2M$ -degrees of freedom.

Finally, we show that $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ is a mean square consistent estimator of V .

Lemma 2.2 *Suppose Assumption 2.1 with $p = 8$ is satisfied and ϕ is Lipschitz continuous. Let $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ be defined as in (9). Then we have $|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(0)] - V(0)| = O(M/T)$ and*

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{V}_M(0) - V(0) \right)^2 = O \left(\frac{M^2}{T^2} + \frac{1}{M} \right). \quad (16)$$

PROOF In the Supplementary material. □

It is interesting to note that the estimator of $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ is analogous to kernel estimators in nonparametric regression, where M plays the role of window width (bandwidth multiplied by the length of time series). From Lemma 2.2 we observe if M is large, then $\widehat{V}_M(0)$ can

have a large bias. On the other hand, if M is small the bias is small but the variance is large. However, by using a small M , we can correct for the large variance by using the t -distribution approximation given in (14). The only real cost of using small M are slightly larger critical values (due to using a t -distribution with a small number of degrees of freedom).

Using the above we show that $\widehat{V}_{\widehat{\theta}, M}(0)$ consistently estimates V_θ .

Lemma 2.3 *Suppose Assumption 2.1 with $p = 8$ is satisfied. Let $\widehat{\theta}_T$ be a consistent estimator of θ such that $|\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta| = O_p(T^{-1/2})$, $\sup_{\theta, \omega} |\frac{\partial \phi(\omega; \theta)}{\partial \omega}| < \infty$ and $\sup_{\theta, \omega} |\frac{\partial^2 \phi(\omega; \theta)}{\partial \theta^2}| < \infty$. Let $\widehat{V}_{\widehat{\theta}, M}(0)$ be defined as in (11). Then we have*

$$\left| \widehat{V}_{\widehat{\theta}, M}(0) - V_\theta \right| = O_p \left(\frac{M}{T} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \right),$$

where $V_\theta = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T \text{var}[A_T(\phi_\theta)]$.

PROOF In the Supplementary material. □

Example 2.3 *We apply the above result to show consistency of the variance estimator in (10) (corresponding to the Whittle likelihood estimator). We observe that if $f(\omega; \theta)$ is uniformly bounded away from zero and uniformly bounded from above for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$, and its first and second derivatives with respect to θ and ω are uniformly bounded, then (10) is a consistent estimator of V_θ if $M/T \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$.*

2.3 Example 1

We illustrate the result in (14) with some simulations. Let $\widehat{c}_T(1) = A_T(e^{i \cdot})$ denote the estimator of the covariance at lag one (defined in (3)) and $\{A_T(e^{i \cdot}; r)\}$ the corresponding orthogonal sample. We use $M = 5$ and define the studentized statistic

$$T_{10} = \frac{A_T(e^{i \cdot}) - c(1)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{5} \sum_{r=1}^5 |A_T(e^{i \cdot}; r)|^2}}. \quad (17)$$

We focus on models where there is no correlation, thus $c(j) = 0$ for $j \neq 0$, but possible higher order dependence. Let $\{X_t\}$ be an uncorrelated time series defined by

$$X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} 0.6^j \varepsilon_{t-j} - \frac{0.6}{1 - 0.6^2} \varepsilon_{t+1} \quad (18)$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ are uncorrelated random variables. The models we consider are

- (i) $\{X_t\}$ are independent, identically distributed (iid) normal random variables
- (ii) $\{X_t\}$ satisfies (18) where the innovations ε_t are iid t -distributed random variables with 5df (thus $\{X_t\}$ is an uncorrelated, non-causal linear time series with a finite fourth moment)




Figure 1: X_t are iid standard normal random variables. Left: $T = 100$. Right $T = 200$.

- (iii) $\{X_t\}$ satisfies (18) where the innovations ε_t satisfy the ARCH(1) representation $\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t Z_t$ with $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + 0.7\varepsilon_{t-1}^2$ and $\{Z_t\}$ are Gaussian random variables. $\{X_t\}$ is a nonlinear, uncorrelated time series whose fourth moment is not finite, thus $A_T(e^i)$ will not have a finite variance.

For each model a time series of size $T = 100$ and 200 is generated and T_{10} evaluated (see equation (17)). This is done over 1000 replications. The QQplot of T_{10} against the quantiles of a t -distribution with 10 df are given in Figures 1 (for model (i)) 2 (for model (ii)) and 3 (for model (iii)). It is reassuring to see that even when the sample size is relatively small ($T = 100$), for model (i) and (ii), the finite sample distribution of T_{10} is close to t_{10} . Furthermore, the small deviation seen in the tails when $T = 100$ is reduced when the sample size is increased to $T = 200$. For model (iii) $E[X_t^4]$ is not finite, thus $E|A_T(e^i; r)|^2$ is not finite and the assumptions which underpin (14) do not hold. This is apparent in Figure 3, where the t -distribution seems inappropriate. It is interesting to investigate what the distribution of T_{10} is in this case and we leave this for future research.

2.4 Example 2

Suppose that $\{X_t\}$ and $\{Y_t\}$ are two time series which are jointly stationary and with univariate spectral densities f_X and f_Y respectively. We now apply the above methodology to testing for equality of spectral densities i.e. $H_0 : f_X(\omega) = f_Y(\omega)$ for all $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$ against $H_A : f_X(\omega) \neq f_Y(\omega)$ for some ω (with non-zero measure). Eichler [2008] and Dette and Paparoditis [2009] propose testing for equality of the spectral densities using an L_2 -distance,




Figure 2: X_t satisfies (18) where the innovations are from t-distribution with 5df. Left: $T = 100$. Right $T = 200$.




Figure 3: X_t satisfies (18) where the innovations are an ARCH process (the fourth moment does not exist). Left: $T = 100$. Right $T = 200$.

this requires estimators for f_X and f_Y . Define

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{f}_X(\omega_l; r) &= \frac{1}{bT} \sum_{k=1}^T W\left(\frac{\omega_l - \omega_k}{b}\right) J_{X,T}(\omega_k) \overline{J_{X,T}(\omega_{k+r})} \\ \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_l; r) &= \frac{1}{bT} \sum_{k=1}^T W\left(\frac{\omega_l - \omega_k}{b}\right) J_{Y,T}(\omega_k) \overline{J_{Y,T}(\omega_{k+r})},\end{aligned}$$

where $J_{X,T}(\omega_k)$ and $J_{Y,T}(\omega_k)$ denote the DFT of $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\{Y_t\}_{t=1}^T$ respectively and $W(\cdot)$ is a spectral window. It is clear that $\widehat{f}_X(\omega_l) = \widehat{f}_X(\omega_l; 0)$ and $\widehat{f}_Y(\omega_l) = \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_l; 0)$ are estimators of the spectral density and, from Example 2.2(b), $\widehat{f}_X(\omega_l; r)$ and $\widehat{f}_Y(\omega_l; r)$ ($r \neq 0$) are the corresponding orthogonal sample.

An obvious method for testing equality of the spectral densities is to use the L_2 -statistic

$$S_T = \frac{2}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T/2} \left| \widehat{f}_X(\omega_j) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_j) \right|^2, \quad (19)$$

where $\widehat{f}_T(\omega)$ and $\widehat{f}_T(\omega)$ are estimators of the spectral density function. Let μ_T and σ_T^2 denote the mean and variance of S_T under the null hypothesis. Under the null hypothesis and suitable mixing conditions it can be shown that

$$\frac{S_T - \mu_T}{\sigma_T} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{as } T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (20)$$

Expressions for μ_T and σ_T^2 can be deduced from Eichler [2008], Theorem 3.11. However, these expressions are rather complicated. Alternatively, a rather painless method is to use the orthogonal sample to estimate the mean and variance. The critical insight, is that under the null hypothesis

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k)] = 0.$$

However, regardless of whether the null holds or not, $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k; r)] = O(T^{-1})$ and $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k; r)] = O(T^{-1})$, thus

$$\mathbb{E}[\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k; r) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k; r)] \approx 0.$$

Therefore under the null both $\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k)$ and $\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k; r) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k; r)$ share (approximately) the same mean. Furthermore, $\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k)$, $\sqrt{2}\Re[\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k; r) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k; r)]$ and $\sqrt{2}\Im[\widehat{f}_X(\omega_k; r) - \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_k; r)]$ asymptotically have the same variance. We now build the orthogonal sample associated with S_T . Let

$$\begin{aligned}S_{R,T}(r) &= \frac{4}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T/2} |\Re \widehat{f}_X(\omega_j; r) - \Re \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_j; r)|^2 \\ \text{and } S_{I,T}(r) &= \frac{4}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{T/2} |\Im \widehat{f}_X(\omega_j; r) - \Im \widehat{f}_Y(\omega_j; r)|^2.\end{aligned}$$

Tedious calculations show that if $M \ll T$, then $\{S_{R,T}(r), S_{I,T}(r)\}_{r=1}^M$ have asymptotically the same mean and variance. Furthermore, if the null is true then the mean and variance of $\{S_{R,T}(r), S_{I,T}(r)\}_{r=1}^M$ and S_T are asymptotically the same. Let

$$\mathbf{S}_{T,M} = (S_T, S_{R,T}(1), S_{I,T}(1), \dots, S_{R,T}(M), S_{I,T}(M)),$$

then under sufficient mixing conditions it can be shown that

$$\sigma_T^{-1} (\mathbf{S}_{T,M} - \mu_T \mathbf{1}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, I_{2M+1}), \quad (21)$$

as $b \rightarrow 0$, $bT \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is a $(2M + 1)$ -dimensional vector of ones. We estimate the mean and variance μ_T and σ_T^2 using the sample mean and variance of the orthogonal sample $\{S_{R,T}(r), S_{I,T}(r)\}_{r=1}^M$. In particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}_T &= \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{r=1}^M [S_{R,T}(r) + S_{I,T}(r)] \\ \text{and } \hat{\sigma}_T^2 &= \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{r=1}^M [(S_{R,T}(r) - \hat{\mu}_T)^2 + (S_{I,T}(r) - \hat{\mu}_T)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Under the null it can be shown that $\hat{\mu}_T$ and $\hat{\sigma}_T^2$ consistently estimate μ_T and σ_T^2 if $M/T \rightarrow 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$. This implies that under the null

$$\frac{S_T - \hat{\mu}_T}{\hat{\sigma}_T} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad \text{as } M, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Of course, in practice M is fixed, and $\text{var}[S_T - \hat{\mu}_T] \approx (1 + \frac{1}{2M})\sigma_T^2$. Thus a better finite sample approximation uses (21) to give

$$\frac{S_T - \hat{\mu}_T}{\sigma_T} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}\left(0, \left[1 + \frac{1}{2M}\right]\right).$$

This together with $(2M - 1)\hat{\sigma}_T^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \chi_{2M-1}^2$, which is asymptotically independent of $S_T - \mu_T$, gives that

$$\frac{S_T - \hat{\mu}_T}{\hat{\sigma}_T} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2M}\right)^{1/2} t_{2M-1}. \quad (23)$$

However, for finite T , S_T is positive and the finite sample distribution of S_T tends to be right skewed. To make S_T more normal Chen and Deo [2004] (see also Terrell [2003]), propose the power transform, S_T^β , where $0 < \beta < 1$, which makes the distribution of S_T^β more normal than S_T . Since S_T is asymptotically normal (see (20)) by using Chen and Deo [2004] we have

$$\frac{S_T^\beta - \mu_{(\beta)}(\mu_T, \sigma_T)}{\sigma_{(\beta)}(\sigma_T)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} N(0, 1)$$

where

$$\mu_{(\beta)}(\mu_T, \sigma_T) = \mu_T^\beta + \frac{1}{2}\beta(\beta - 1)\mu_T^{\beta-2}\sigma_T^2 \text{ and } \sigma_{(\beta)}(\sigma_T) = \beta\mu_T^{\beta-1}\sigma_T.$$

Since μ_T and σ_T are unknown we replace the above by the estimators defined in (22). Using the same arguments as those used in the derivation of (23) we have

$$\frac{S_T^\beta - \mu_{(\beta)}(\widehat{\mu}_T, \widehat{\sigma}_T)}{\sigma_{(\beta)}(\widehat{\sigma}_T)} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2M}\right)^{1/2} t_{2M-1}. \quad (24)$$

Chen and Deo [2004] propose selecting β to minimize the skewness of the statistic, so that the centralized third-order moment is zero. Following the same calculations as those used in Chen and Deo [2004] this means using

$$\beta = 1 - \frac{\mu_T \mathbb{E}[S_T - \mu_T]^3}{3\sigma_T^4}. \quad (25)$$

However, as the three terms (mean, variance and centralized third moment) are unknown we estimate them using the orthogonal sample $\{S_{R,T}(r), S_{I,T}(r)\}_{r=1}^M$.

We illustrate the above procedure with some simulations. Following Dette and Paparoditis [2009], we use the linear bivariate time series

$$X_t = 0.8X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad \text{and} \quad Y_t = 0.8Y_{t-1} + \delta Y_{t-2} + \eta_t,$$

where $\{(\varepsilon_t, \eta_t)\}_t$ are iid bivariate Gaussian random variables with $\text{var}[\varepsilon_t] = 1$, $\text{var}[\eta_t] = 1$ and $\text{cov}[\varepsilon_t, \eta_t] = \rho$. If $\delta = 0$ then the spectral densities of $\{X_t\}$ and $\{Y_t\}$ are the same and the null hypothesis is true. For the alternative hypothesis we use $\delta = 0.1$ and -0.1 . We use the test statistic S_T defined in (19) and (24), where the spectral density is estimated using the Daniell kernel. We use (i) $\beta = 0.25$ and (ii) an estimate of (25) (which we denote as $\widehat{\beta}$). In the simulations we use $T = 128, 512$ and 1024 over 500 replications.

The results are reported in Table 1, where all the tests are done at the 5% level. From Table 1 we see that under the null the test statistic seems to retain the 5% level relatively well when $T = 512$ and $T = 1024$. There is, however, some over rejection when $T = 128$. We see that for $\rho = 0.1$ and -0.1 (the alternative is true), that the test has power which grows as T grows. We note that the estimated power transform $\widehat{\beta}$ tends, on average, to be larger than 0.25. Thus the distribution of $S_T^{\widehat{\beta}}$ tends to be more right skewed than $S_T^{0.25}$. This may explain why the proportion of rejection levels under the null using $S_T^{\widehat{\beta}}$ are a little larger than those with $S_T^{0.25}$. Comparing our results to those reported in Dette and Paparoditis [2009], we see their frequency bootstrap procedure performs a little better. There are two possible explanations for this (i) they use a different test statistic, based on ratios (ii) the power transform may make the test a little conservative in rejecting the null. However, it

ρ	δ	$T = 128$ and $b = 0.15$		$T = 512$ and $b = 0.1$		$T = 1024$ and $b = 0.1$	
		$\hat{\beta}$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\beta = 0.25$	$\hat{\beta}$	$\beta = 0.25$
0.9	0.0	14.4	9.6	6.2	5.4	5.6	4.8
	0.1	54.4	39.6	93.2	91.2	100	99.6
	-0.1	32.8	24.2	74.8	73.8	95.6	97.8
0.5	0.0	13.6	8.4	5	4	3.2	3
	0.1	32.8	27.2	57.4	51.6	81.8	81.2
	-0.1	16.6	12.4	30.2	27.6	48	47
0.0	0.0	12.8	8.6	4.4	3.8	4.8	4.4
	0.1	26.8	20.4	47.2	43	72.4	70
	-0.1	13.2	9.2	19.4	17.7	33	31.6
-0.5	0.0	12.2	8	7.4	5.2	3.6	2.8
	0.1	31.6	24.8	54	49.2	80	80.4
	-0.1	16.8	13.0	23.8	20.8	43.8	43.6
-0.9	0.0	10.8	8	7.6	5.8	4.6	4.2
	0.1	56.8	45.6	90	87.4	98.4	98.4
	-0.1	32.6	24.8	74.2	69.6	93.4	94

Table 1: When $T = 128$ we use $M = 6$, when $T = 512$ we use $M = 12$ and when $T = 1024$ we use $M = 18$.

is interesting to note that a procedure with very little computational expensive performs relatively well even against bootstrap procedures.

In the following section, we look again at the issue of testing. We have seen that by construction the orthogonal sample has approximately the same variance as the statistic of interest. Furthermore, in many testing procedures, under the null, both the test statistic and the orthogonal sample have the same distribution. In this section, this property was exploited to estimate the mean and variance of the test statistic. This in conjunction with the t-distribution (with the appropriate number of degrees of freedom) was used to obtain the p-value of the test statistic. An alternative approach is to use the orthogonal sample to estimate the sampling distribution of the test statistic under the null hypothesis. We investigate this in the following section.

3 Testing in Time Series

Many test statistics in time series can be formulated in terms of the parameters $\{A(\phi_j)\}_j$ for some particular set of functions $\{\phi_j\}$, where under the null hypothesis $A(\phi_j) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, L$ and under the alternative $A(\phi_j) \neq 0$. This motivates the popular ℓ_2 test statistic

$$S_T = T \sum_{j=1}^L |A_T(\phi_j)|^2.$$

In this section we use orthogonal samples to estimate the distribution of S_T under the null hypothesis.

By using the results in Section 2 and Remark 2.1, equation (15), we observe that $\{A_T(\phi_j)\}_{j=1}^L$ and for small r $\{\sqrt{2}\Re A_T(\phi_j; r)\}_{j=1}^L$ and $\{\sqrt{2}\Im A_T(\phi_j; r)\}_{j=1}^L$ asymptotically have the same variance matrix. In addition, under the null hypothesis that $A(\phi_j) = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, L$, asymptotically $\{\sqrt{2}\Re A_T(\phi_j; r), \sqrt{2}\Im A_T(\phi_j; r)\}$ and $A_T(\phi_j)$ have the same mean and limiting Gaussian distribution. This suggests that the distribution of S_T under the null can be approximated by the empirical distribution of the corresponding orthogonal sample. Based on the above observations we define the orthogonal sample associated with S_T as

$$S_{T,R}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Re A_T(\phi_j; r)|^2 \text{ and } S_{T,I}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Im A_T(\phi_j; r)|^2 \text{ for } 1 \leq r \leq M.$$

In the theorem below we show that under the null hypothesis $H_0 : A(\phi_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq L$, the asymptotic sampling properties of S_T , $S_{T,R}(r)$ and $S_{T,I}(r)$ are equivalent.

Theorem 3.1 *Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds with $p = 16$. Furthermore, we assume $\{\phi_j\}$ are Lipschitz continuous functions and $\Re A_T(\phi_j) = A_T(\phi_j)$. Let V_{j_1, j_2} be defined as*

$$\begin{aligned} V_{j_1, j_2} &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega)^2 \left[\phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega)} + \phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(-\omega)} \right] d\omega + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_{j_1}(\omega_1) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega_2)} f_4(\omega_1, -\omega_1, -\omega_2) d\omega_1 d\omega_2 + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

(i) The mean

(a) Under the null hypothesis that $A(\phi_j) = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq L$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_T] = \sum_{j=1}^L V_{j,j} + O(T^{-1}).$$

However, if for at least one $1 \leq j \leq L$ $A(\phi_j) \neq 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[Q_T] = O(T)$.

(b) Under both the null and alternative and for $0 < r < T/2$ we have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{T,R}(r)] = \sum_{j=1}^L V_{j,j} + O(|r|T^{-1}) \text{ and } \mathbb{E}[S_{T,I}(r)] = \sum_{j=1}^L V_{j,j} + O(|r|T^{-1}).$$

(ii) The covariance

(a) Under the null hypothesis, $\text{var}[S_T] = 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2}^2 + O(T^{-1})$

(b) Under both the null and alternative hypothesis where $1 \leq r_1, r_2 < T/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}[S_{T,R}(r_1), S_{T,R}(r_2)] &= \begin{cases} 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2}^2 + O(|r|T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 (= r) \neq 0 \\ O(T^{-1}) & \end{cases} \\ \text{cov}[S_{T,I}(r_1), S_{T,I}(r_2)] &= \begin{cases} 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2}^2 + O(|r|T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 (= r) \neq 0 \\ O(T^{-1}) & \end{cases} \\ \text{cov}[S_{T,R}(r_1), S_{T,I}(r_2)] &= O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) Higher order cumulants Suppose Assumption 2.1 holds with the order $2p$. Let cum_p denote the p th order cumulant of a random variable. Then under the null hypothesis

$$|\text{cum}_p(S_T) - \text{cum}_p(S_{T,R}(r))| = O(|r|T^{-1}), \quad |\text{cum}_p(S_T) - \text{cum}_p(S_{T,I}(r))| = O(|r|T^{-1}).$$

We observe that the above theorem implies under the null, S_T , $S_{T,R}(r)$ and $S_{T,I}(r)$ asymptotically have equivalent mean, variance and higher order cumulants. Furthermore, under the alternative the asymptotic mean and variance of $S_{T,R}$ and $S_{T,I}$ are finite and bounded with $M \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore motivated by these results we define the empirical distribution

$$\widehat{F}_{M,T}(x) = \frac{1}{2M} \left(\sum_{r=1}^M [I(S_{T,R}(r) \leq x) + I(S_{T,I}(r) \leq x)] \right). \quad (26)$$

To do the test we use $\widehat{F}_{M,T}(x)$ as an approximation of the distribution of S_T under the null hypothesis. We reject the null at the $\alpha\%$ -level if $1 - \widehat{F}_{M,T}(S_T) < \alpha\%$. We note that under the alternative that at least one $j = 1, \dots, L$ $A(\phi_j) \neq 0$, then $S_T = O_p(T)$. By Theorem 3.1(ii) the variance of $S_{T,R}(r)$ and $S_{T,I}(r)$ is finite and uniformly bounded for all r and T . This implies that $1 - \widehat{F}_{M,T}(S_T) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ as M and $T \rightarrow \infty$, thus giving the procedure power. To show a Glivenko-Cantelli type result of the form $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |\widehat{F}_{M,T}(x) - F(x)| \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0$ as $M \rightarrow \infty$ and $T \rightarrow \infty$, where F denotes the limiting distribution of Q_T under the null hypothesis (F is a generalised chi-squared) is beyond the scope of the current paper. Based on the simulations in Section 3.3, we conjecture that this result is true.

We now apply this procedure to test for uncorrelatedness and goodness of fit.

3.1 A Portmanteau test for uncorrelatedness

Let us suppose we observe the stationary time series $\{X_t\}$. The classical test for serial correlation assumes that under the null hypothesis the observations are independent, identically distributed (iid) random variables. In this case the classical Box-Pierce statistic is defined as

$$\tilde{Q}_T = \frac{T}{\tilde{c}_T(0)^2} \sum_{j=1}^L |\tilde{c}_T(j)|^2, \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{c}_T(j)$ is defined in Example 2.1(a). If the null holds, then \tilde{Q}_T is asymptotically a chi-square distribution with L degrees of freedom. However, if the intention is to test for uncorrelatedness without the additional constraint of independence, then it can be shown that

$$T\text{cov}[\tilde{c}_T(j_1), \tilde{c}_T(j_2)] = c(0)^2\delta_{j_1, j_2} + c(0)^2\delta_{j_1, j_2}\delta_{j_1, 0} + \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \kappa_4(j_1, k, k + j_2), \quad (28)$$

where δ_{j_1, j_2} is the dirac-delta function (see Brockwell and Davis [1991], Chapter 7, for the derivation in the case of a linear time series and Romano and Thombs [1996] in the general case). Consequently, under the null of uncorrelatedness, the distribution of \tilde{Q}_T is not a standard chi-square.

Diebold [1986], Weiss [1986], Robinson [1991], Bera and Higgins [1993] and Escanciano and Lobato [2009] avoid some of these issues by placing stronger conditions on the time series and assume that under the null hypothesis the time series are martingales differences (thus uncorrelated). This implies that the fourth order cumulant term in (28) is zero in the case that $j_1 \neq j_2$, which induces asymptotic uncorrelatedness between the sample covariances. Based on this observation they propose the robust Portmanteau test

$$Q_T^* = T \sum_{j=1}^L \frac{|\tilde{c}_T(j)|^2}{\hat{\tau}_j}, \quad (29)$$

where $\hat{\tau}_j = \frac{1}{n-j} \sum_{t=j+1}^n (X_t - \bar{X})^2 (X_{t-j} - \bar{X})^2$. Under the null of martingale differences Q_T^* is asymptotically has χ^2 -distributed with L -degrees of freedom. However, if the intention is to test for uncorrelatedness, *without* additional assumptions on the structure, then, even under the null, Q_T^* will have a generalised chi-squared distribution, whose parameters are difficult to estimate. This problem motivated Romano and Thombs [1996] (using the block bootstrap) and Lobato [2001] (who developed the method of self-normalisation) to test for uncorrelatedness under these weaker conditions.

We will use orthogonal samples to estimate the distribution of Portmanteau statistic under the null that $H_0 : c(j) = 0$ for all $1 \leq j \leq L$. We recall from Example 2.1(a) that $A_T(e^{ij})$ is an estimator of the autocovariance $\hat{c}_T(j)$. Therefore, to test for uncorrelatedness at lag $j = 1, \dots, L$ we define the test statistic

$$Q_T = T \sum_{j=1}^L |A_T(e^{ij})|^2. \quad (30)$$

Using $\{\sqrt{2}\Re A_T(e^{ij}; r), \sqrt{2}\Im A_T(e^{ij}; r); r = 1, \dots, M\}$ we define the orthogonal sample associated with Q_T as

$$Q_{T,R}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Re A_T(e^{ij}; r)|^2 \text{ and } Q_{T,I}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Im A_T(e^{ij}; r)|^2 \text{ for } 1 \leq r \leq M.$$

The above orthogonal sample is used to define the empirical distribution, like that defined in (26), we denote this as $\widehat{F}_{Q,M,T}(x)$. We reject the null at the $\alpha\%$ -level if $1 - \widehat{F}_{Q,M,T}(Q_T) < \alpha\%$. Results of the corresponding simulation study is given in Section 3.3, where we apply the proposed methodology to a wide class of uncorrelated processes.

3.2 Testing for goodness of fit

In this section we describe how orthogonal samples can be applied to testing for goodness of fit. Given that f is the spectral density of the observed time series, our objective is to test $H_0 : f(\omega) = g(\omega; \theta)$ for all $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$ against $H_A : f(\omega) \neq g(\omega; \theta)$ for some $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$. Typically this is done by fitting the model to the data and applying the Portmanteau test to the residuals – in either the time or frequency domain (cf. Milhoj [1981], Hong [1996]). In Example 2.1(c) it was observed that $A_T(e^{ij\cdot}g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1})$ is an estimator of the covariance of the residuals at lag j . Under the null hypothesis that g is the true spectral density, then the residual covariance $A_T(e^{ij\cdot}g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1})$ is estimating zero. Using this observation Milhoj [1981] defines the statistic

$$G_T = T \sum_{j=1}^L |A_T(e^{ij\cdot}g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1})|^2 \quad (31)$$

to test for goodness of fit. Using G_T we define the orthogonal sample

$$G_{T,R}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Re A_T(e^{ij\cdot}g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1}; r)|^2 \text{ and } G_{T,I}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Im A_T(e^{ij\cdot}g(\cdot; \theta)^{-1}; r)|^2.$$

Using Theorem 3.1, under the null hypothesis, G_T , $G_{T,R}(r)$ and $G_{T,I}(r)$ asymptotically share the same sampling properties when r is small. We use (26) to define the corresponding empirical distribution, which we denote as $\widehat{F}_{G,M,T}(x)$. We reject the null, that the spectral density is $g(\cdot)$ at the $\alpha\%$ -level if $1 - \widehat{F}_{G,M,T}(G_T) < \alpha\%$.

3.3 Simulations

In the following section we assess the tests described above through some simulations. All tests are done at the $\alpha = 5\%$ and $\alpha = 10\%$ nominal levels. The methods are compared to the block bootstrap method, where to obtain the bootstrap critical values 1000 bootstrap samples were taken. Throughout this section we let $\{Z_t\}$ and $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ denote independent, identically distributed standard normal random variables and chi-square with one degree of freedom random variables respectively.

3.4 Example 3: Testing for uncorrelatedness

In this section we illustrate the test for uncorrelatedness using the orthogonal sample method described in Section 3.1. We use the test statistic Q_T (defined in (30)), using $L = 5$, and obtain the critical values using the empirical distribution function, $\widehat{F}_{Q,M,T}$ defined in

(26). We compare our method with the regular Box-Pierce statistic (defined in (27)) and the robust Portmanteau test statistic defined in (29), for both these methods we obtained the critical values using the χ^2 distribution with five degrees of freedom. In addition, we compare our method to the results of the bootstrap test where the critical values are obtained using the block bootstrap procedure. Namely, the critical values for Q_T are obtained using the centralised empirical distribution constructed with samples from the block bootstrap procedure, with block bootstrap length $B = 5, 10$ and 20 .

To select M in the orthogonal sample method we use the average squared criterion described in Section 4. More precisely, we focus on the sample covariance at lag one and choose $M = \arg \min_{M \in \mathcal{S}} C_\phi(M)$, where

$$C_\phi(M) = \frac{4}{T} \sum_{r=1}^{T/4} \left(\frac{|\sqrt{T} A_T(e^i; r)|^2}{\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)} - 1 \right)^2 \quad \text{with} \quad \widehat{V}_M(\omega_r) = \frac{T}{M} \sum_{s=1+r}^{M+r} |A_T(e^i; s)|^2. \quad (32)$$

and $\mathcal{S} = \{10, \dots, 30\}$.

Models under the null of no correlation

The first two models we consider are iid random variables which follow a standard normal distribution and a t-distribution with five degrees of freedom. The third model is the two-dependent model $X_{3,t} = Z_t Z_{t-1}$. The fourth model we consider is the non-linear, non-martingale, uncorrelated model, defined in Lobato [2001], where $X_{4,t} = Z_{t-1} Z_{t-2} (Z_{t-1} + Z_t + 1)$. The fifth model we consider is the ARCH(1) process $X_{5,t}$, where

$$X_{5,t} = \sigma_{5,t} Z_t \quad \sigma_{5,t}^2 = 1 + 0.8 X_{5,t-1}^2.$$

The sixth model is $X_{6,t} = |X_{5,t}| V_t$ where $\{X_{5,t}\}$ and $\{V_t\}$ are independent of each other, $X_{5,t}$ is the ARCH process described above and V_t is an uncorrelated non-causal time series defined by

$$V_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a^j \varepsilon_{t-j} - \frac{a}{1-a^2} \varepsilon_{t+1},$$

where $a = 0.8$. The seventh model we consider is a ‘pseudo-linear’ non-causal, uncorrelated time series with ARCH innovations defined by

$$X_{7,t} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_1^j U_{1,t-j} - \frac{b_1}{1-b_1^2} U_{1,t+1}, \quad U_{1,t} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} b_2^j U_{2,t-j} - \frac{b_2}{1-b_2^2} U_{2,t+1}$$

where $U_{2,t} = \sigma_{2,t} Z_t$ with $\sigma_t = 1 + 0.5 U_{2,t-1}^2$, $b_1 = -0.8$ and $b_2 = -0.6$. Finally, the eighth model we consider is the periodically stationary model defined in Politis et al. [1997],

$X_{7,t} = s_t X_{3,t}$ and s_t is a deterministic sequence of period 12, where the elements are $\{1, 1, 1, 2, 3, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 4, 6\}$ (this time series does not satisfy our stationary assumptions). We used the sample sizes $T = 100$ and $T = 500$.

The results are given in Tables 2 and 3. We observe that overall the orthogonal sampling method keeps to the nominal level, with a mild inflation of the type I error for independent data (normal and t-distribution). It is likely that this is because the 5th and 10th quantile is estimated using a maximum of 60 points, since the order selection set is $\mathcal{S} = \{10, \dots, 30\}$ (often it is a lot less than 60). It is a little surprising that the type I errors for model $\{X_{t,4}\}$ lie far below the nominal level. As expected, the regular Box-Pierce statistic keeps the nominal level well for the iid data, but cannot control the type I error when the data is uncorrelated but not iid. Suprisingly, the robust Portmanteau test is able to keep the type I error in most cases, the exception being the pseudo-linear model, $X_{7,t}$, where there is a mild inflation of the type I error. In the case of the Block Bootstrap for $T = 100$ the performance depends on the size of the block. For $B = 5$ and $B = 10$ the type I error is below the nominal level, whereas for $B = 20$ the type I error tends to be around and above the nominal level. However, when $T = 500$ the block bootstrap is consistently below the nominal level for $B = 5, 10$ and 20 . This suggests a larger block length should be used. It is quite possible that more accurate critical values, which are less sensitive to block length, can be obtained using the fixed- b bootstrap. However, the fixed- b bootstrap was not included in the study as the aim in this section is to compare different procedures which are simple and fast to implement using routines that already exist in R.

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Regular \tilde{Q}_T		Robust Q_T^*		Block Bootstrap					
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
Normal	6.52	11.1	4.1	8.34	5.42	10.18	0.0	0.1	1.14	4.36	5.14	11.94
t_5	6.34	11.42	4.08	8.46	4.92	10.5	0.0	0.08	0.96	4.12	4.74	10.70
$X_{3,t} = Z_t Z_{t-1}$	5.02	9.44	10.66	16.64	4.38	9.52	0.14	0.66	1.2	4.68	4.14	11.14
$X_{4,t}$	0.86	1.82	3.5	4.86	1.1	2.32	0.06	0.3	0.22	1.0	0.64	2.26
$X_{5,t}$	4.26	8.14	23.56	31.6	5.4	9.98	0.14	1.06	1.22	4.96	3.54	11.00
$X_{6,t}$	3.16	6.42	17.64	24.22	4.20	8.38	0.08	0.4	0.6	2.92	2.08	7.78
$X_{7,t}$	5.1	10.46	13.22	20.46	6.88	12.8	0.16	0.86	1.18	5	4.56	11.88
$X_{8,t}$	4.46	8.36	8.2	13.18	3.5	8.38	0.04	0.58	0.74	4	3.1	10.48

Table 2: Test for uncorrelatedness, under the null hypothesis, $T = 100$ over 5000 replications.

Models under the alternative of correlation

To assess the empirical power of the test we consider three different models. The first model is the Gaussian autoregressive process $Y_{1,t}$, where $Y_{1,t} = -0.2Y_{1,t-1} + Z_t$. The second model

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Regular \tilde{Q}_T		Robust Q_T^*		Block Bootstrap					
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
Normal	5.9	11.1	4.56	9.44	4.74	9.86	0.08	0.44	1.48	4.22	3.7	8.78
t_5	6.1	10.82	4.8	9.58	4.92	9.98	0.04	0.34	1.24	4.18	3.3	8.66
$X_{3,t} = Z_t Z_{t-1}$	5.00	9.82	15.26	22.26	4.9	9.16	0.7	2.52	2.5	6.56	3.6	9.16
$X_{4,t}$	1.0	1.86	30.52	38.56	5.6	11.16	1.56	4.48	2.72	7.94	3.1	10.02
$X_{5,t}$	3.76	7.06	49.86	58.76	4.82	9.34	1.06	4.10	2.08	6.9	2.52	7.96
$X_{6,t}$	2.88	6.22	42.48	50.46	3.64	7.24	0.64	2.4	1.24	4.68	1.5	6.62
$X_{7,t}$	4.48	8.88	20.38	28.32	6.02	11.46	0.78	2.58	1.52	5.04	2.78	7.5
$X_{8,t}$	5.28	9.46	15.08	20.46	4.12	8.54	1.28	3.82	3.04	7.36	4.34	9.92

Table 3: Test for uncorrelatedness, under the null hypothesis, $T = 500$ over 5000 replications.

is $Y_{2,t} = Y_{1,t}|U_{2,t}|$, where $\{Y_{1,t}\}$ and $\{U_{t,2}\}$ are independent of each other, $\{Y_{1,t}\}$ is defined above and $\{U_{t,2}\}$ is the ARCH model defined in the previous section. Finally, the third model is $Y_{3,t} = U_{3,t}|U_{2,t}|$, where $\{U_{2,t}\}$ and $\{U_{3,t}\}$ are independent of each other, $\{U_{t,2}\}$ is the ARCH model defined in the previous section and $\{U_{3,t}\}$ is the Gaussian autoregressive process $U_{3,t} = 0.5U_{4,t-1} + Z_t$. We used the sample sizes $T = 100$, $T = 200$ and $T = 500$.

The result are given in Tables 4, 5 and 6. The power for most of the methods are relatively close. Though it is not surprising that the regular Box-Pierce statistic has the largest power, since it also has the largest inflated type I errors. Overall, in terms of power, the orthogonal sampling test and the robust Portmanteau test tend to have more power than the Block Bootstrap test, especially when the sample size is small.

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Regular \tilde{Q}_T		Robust Q_T^*		Block Bootstrap					
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$Y_{1,t}$	27.06	38.88	29.52	40.84	28.60	40.50	2.62	9.4	14.12	29.34	25.74	43.22
$Y_{2,t}$	12.68	20.58	21.78	30.6	11.08	18.68	0.5	3.3	3.94	13.84	9.96	24.02
$Y_{3,t}$	55.7	68.6	71.94	79.58	61.8	72.32	18.36	41.46	41.62	65.14	52.86	74.30

Table 4: Test for uncorrelatedness, under the alternative hypothesis, $T = 100$ over 5000 replications.

3.5 Example 4: Goodness of fit test

In this section we illustrate the goodness of fit test using the method described in Section 3.2 to test $H_0 : f(\omega) = g(\omega; \theta)$ for all $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$ against $H_A : f(\omega) \neq g(\omega; \theta)$ for some $\omega \in [0, 2\pi]$. We use the test statistic G_T (defined in (31)), with $L = 5$. We obtain the critical values using the estimated distribution function, $\hat{F}_{G,M,T}$ defined in (26). We compare our method to the results of the bootstrap test where the critical values are obtained using the

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Regular \tilde{Q}_T		Robust Q_T^*		Block Bootstrap					
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$Y_{1,t}$	54.70	67.64	58	69.06	55.78	67.18	18.58	36.16	41.10	59.84	48.64	66.54
$Y_{2,t}$	21.98	32.4	37.44	47.18	18.04	27.68	4.14	13.32	11.34	27.04	16.30	33.74
$Y_{t,3}$	87.04	92.64	95.72	97.28	85.84	91.22	74.5	87.96	84.42	93.74	84.54	94.58

Table 5: Test for uncorrelatedness under the alternative hypothesis, $T = 200$ over 5000 replications.

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Regular \tilde{Q}_T		Robust Q_T^*		Block Bootstrap					
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$Y_{1,2}$	94.86	97.44	95.94	97.84	95.24	97.60	82.30	91.74	92.96	96.48	93.76	97.28
$Y_{2,t}$	49.50	60.58	69.60	77.24	37	49.90	29.92	45.30	41.48	58.28	42.2	60.98
$Y_{3,t}$	98.86	99.36	99.94	99.98	98.5	99.16	99.2	99.68	98.98	99.82	97.94	99.82

Table 6: Test for uncorrelatedness under the alternative hypothesis, $T = 500$ over 5000 replications.

block bootstrap procedure. We use the block bootstrap length $B = 5, 10, 20, 30$ and 40 .

To select M in the orthogonal sample method, we focus on $j = 1$ and use $M = \arg \min_{M \in \mathcal{S}} C_\phi(M)$, where $C_\phi(M)$ is defined similar to (32) and $\mathcal{S} = \{10, \dots, 30\}$.

Models under the null hypothesis

The first model is the Gaussian autoregressive process

$$X_{0.6,t}^G = 0.6X_{0.6,t-1}^G + Z_t,$$

where $\{Z_t\}$ are iid standard normal random variables, with spectral density $f(\omega) = g(\omega; \theta) = (2\pi)^{-1}|1 - 0.6e^{i\omega}|^2$. The second model is the non-Gaussian autoregressive process

$$X_{0.6,t}^X = 0.6X_{0.6,t-1}^X + \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_t$ are chi-square distributed random variables with one degree of freedom. The spectral density is $f(\omega) = g(\omega; \theta) = 2(2\pi)^{-1}|1 - 0.6e^{i\omega}|^2$. The third model is the non-Gaussian autoregressive process

$$X_{0.9,t}^X = 0.9X_{0.9,t-1}^X + \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is defined above with spectral density $f(\omega) = g(\omega; \theta) = 2(2\pi)^{-1}|1 - 0.9e^{i\omega}|^2$. We used the sample sizes $T = 100$ and $T = 500$.

The result are given in Tables 7 and 8. We observe that the orthogonal sampling method keeps to the nominal level for both $T = 100$ and $T = 500$, with an underestimation of

the type I error for model $\{X_{0,9,t}^X\}$. On the other hand for $T = 100$, the block bootstrap underestimates the nominal level when the block is too small ($B = 5$ and 10) and over inflates the type I error when the block is too large ($B = 40$ and sometimes $B = 30$). The ideal block length seems to be somewhere between $B = 20$ to 40 . In the case that $T = 500$, the nominal level is underestimated for all the block lengths considered.

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Block Bootstrap									
	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20		B=30		B=40	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	2.32	4.94	0.00	0.00	0.18	0.96	2.18	7.06	4.66	11.24	8.64	17.84
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	2.24	4.4	0	0.02	0.04	0.26	0.94	3.48	2.24	6.82	4.94	13.00
$X_{0.9,t}^X$	0.96	1.74	0	0	0	0.02	0.04	0.26	0.2	0.96	0.56	2.64

Table 7: Goodness of fit test, under the null, T=100 over 5000 replications

Model	Orthogonal Q_T		Block Bootstrap									
	5%	10%	B=5		B=10		B=20		B=30		B=40	
	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	5.24	10.28	0	0	0.08	0.52	1.54	3.92	2.48	6	3.32	7.62
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	5.2	9.78	0	0	0.02	0.16	0.52	1.84	0.04	0.14	2.12	6.68
$X_{0.9,t}^X$	2.24	4.84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.04	0.62	0.04	0.62

Table 8: Goodness of fit test, under the null, T=500 over 5000 replications

Models under the alternative hypothesis

To access the empirical power of the test we use realisations from the same models considered in the null, namely $X_{0.6,t}^G$, $X_{0.6,t}^X$ and $X_{0.9,t}^X$ (their corresponding spectral density functions are given in the previous section). To each of these models we fit the spectral density function $g(\omega; \phi, \sigma) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sigma^2 |1 - \phi \exp(i\omega)|^{-2}$ for different values of ϕ and σ (though σ will always be correctly specified). We used the sample sizes $T = 100$, $T = 200$ and $T = 500$.

The result are given in Tables 9, 10 and 11. For all the sample sizes considered, the power of the Block bootstrap test increases with the block length, though we recall that the largest block size the type I errors were highly inflated. Overall, the power of the orthogonal sample test is comparable (and often larger) than the power of the block bootstrap tests with the larger blocks.

4 Selection of M

In many respects, by using the t_{2M} -distribution to approximate the distribution of T_M in (14) we are able to adjust to the choice of M . However, one may view the choice of M as a little adhoc. Therefore, the purpose of this section is to propose an average square criterion

Model	Null	Orthogonal Q_T		Block Bootstrap									
				B=5		B=10		B=20		B=30		B=40	
		5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.3$	60.4	71.24	1.98	11.32	35.42	55.12	53.24	70.78	61.2	76.5	68.62	80.34
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.3$	64.32	76.12	1.3	8.68	33.2	56.12	54.24	74.58	62.4	80.42	71.06	84.14
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.45$	15.1	22.28	0	0	1.94	7.24	10.94	22.06	15.9	28.62	23.14	36.36
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.45$	13.98	22.38	0	0	0.82	3.96	6.42	16.78	10.72	23.6	17.9	32.74
$X_{0.9,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.7$	41.14	51.82	0	0	3.2	10.28	17.54	36	25.54	45.58	36.24	56.44

Table 9: Goodness of fit test, under the alternative, T=100 over 5000 replications

Model	Null	Orthogonal Q_T		Block Bootstrap									
				B=5		B=10		B=20		B=30		B=40	
		5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.3$	92.88	96.5	39.62	63.78	85.76	93.20	91.22	95.72	93.36	97.04	93.48	97.40
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.3$	96.04	98.5	33.5	62.1	88.86	96.02	93.9	98.4	95.14	98.80	95.66	98.92
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.45$	38.38	49.5	0	0.1	8.88	20.38	27.16	42.2	33.52	48.28	39.08	53.82
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.3$	40.46	53.08	0	0	6.04	15.86	21.28	38.98	27.34	46.52	34.24	53.28
$X_{0.9,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.7$	91.44	94.78	0	0	29.9	49.5	70.4	84.94	80.98	91	85.78	93.9

Table 10: Goodness of fit test, under the alternative, T=200 over 5000 replications

Model	Null	Orthogonal Q_T		Block Bootstrap									
				B=5		B=10		B=20		B=30		B=40	
		5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%	5%	10%
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.3$	99.98	100	98.88	99.72	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.3$	99.98	100	99.2	99.92	100	100	100	100	99.92	100	99.92	100
$X_{0.6,t}^G$	$\sigma = 1, \phi = 0.45$	86.90	92.52	0.18	1.54	48.88	65.62	77.36	86.7	81	89.93	82.58	90.72
$X_{0.6,t}^X$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.45$	89.92	94.22	0.06	0.56	42.16	61.88	75.60	87.44	81.94	90.8	84.24	92.26
$X_{0.9,t}^G$	$\sigma = \sqrt{2}, \phi = 0.7$	99.96	99.98	0	0	94.46	98.12	99.86	99.96	99.9	99.98	99.92	99.98

Table 11: Goodness of fit test, under the alternative, T=500 over 5000 replications

for selecting M . Our proposed method is based on the results derived in Section 2. Using Theorem 2.1 we note that $\{\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r); 1 \leq r < T/2\}$ is an almost uncorrelated, zero mean sequence with variance $\text{var}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)] = V(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1})$ (where $V(\omega_r)$ is defined in (8)). These observations together with (7) imply that

$$\left(\frac{|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2}{V(\omega_r)} - 1 \right) \quad 1 \leq r < T/2, \quad (33)$$

is an almost uncorrelated sequence with mean zero and variance one. We use this sequence as the building blocks of the average criterion. In order to select M we extend the estimator defined in (9) to all frequencies $V(\omega_r)$. More precisely, we use $\widehat{V}(\omega_r)$ as an estimator of

$V(\omega_r)$ where

$$\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r) = \frac{T}{M} \sum_{s=1+r}^{M+r} |A_T(\phi; s)|^2,$$

noting that for $r = 0$ we have the estimator defined in (9). Furthermore, by construction $\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)$ is asymptotically uncorrelated to $|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2$ (see Theorem 2.1). The suggested scheme is based on choosing the M which minimises the mean squared error of $\{\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r); r = 1, \dots, T/p\}$. This is analogous to bandwidth selection in nonparametric regression. The choice of p determines over which frequencies the selection should be done (i) $p = 2$ corresponds to global bandwidth selection (ii) whereas large p means focusing on estimation close to $r = 0$. If there is not too much variability in the function $V(\omega_r)$ then the selection of M should not be sensitive to the choice of p . We define the average squared error

$$\mathcal{C}_\phi(M) = \frac{p}{T} \sum_{r=1}^{T/p} \left(\frac{|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2}{\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)} - 1 \right)^2.$$

To select M we use $\widehat{M} = \arg \min_{M \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$, where \mathcal{S} is the set over which we do the selection.

To understand what $\mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$ is estimating and why it may be a suitable criterion, we make a Taylor expansion of $\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)^{-1}$ about $\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^{-1}$ to give

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2}{\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)} - 1 \right) \\ \approx & \frac{|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2 - \mathbb{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^2} \left(\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r) - \mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)] \right) \\ & + \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation squared of the above and using that $|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|$ and $\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)$ are asymptotically uncorrelated we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2}{\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)} - 1 \right)^2 \\ \approx & \frac{\text{var}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^2} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^2} \right)^2}_{\text{variance}} \underbrace{\text{var}(\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r))}_{\text{variance}} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{\mathbb{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)|^2]}{\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]} - 1 \right)^2}_{\text{bias}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$ is estimating

$$\sum_{r=1}^{T/p} \left\{ \frac{\text{var}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)^2]}{\text{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^2} + \left(\frac{\text{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)^2]}{\text{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]^2} \right)^2 \text{var}(\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)) + \left(\frac{\text{E}[|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r)^2]}{\text{E}[\widehat{V}_M(\omega_r)]} - 1 \right)^2 \right\}.$$

Thus $\mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$ is balancing bias and variance. If M is small, the bias is small but the variance is large, conversely if M large the bias is large but the variance is small. It seems reasonable to choose the M which balances these two terms. To illustrate how the criterion behaves, in Figure 4 we plot $\mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$ over M , for $\phi(\omega) = e^{i\omega}$ (which corresponds to the statistic which estimates the autocovariance at lag one). As expected $\mathcal{C}_\phi(M)$ is large when M is both small and large. In this example, selecting M anywhere between 7 and 13 seems to be reasonable.




Figure 4: The average squared criterion for the sample autocovariance function $\mathcal{C}_{e^i}(M)$ ($p = 4$) at lag one for the Gaussian autoregressive time series $X_t = 1.5X_{t-1} - 0.75X_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t$ where $T = 200$.

Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have introduced the method of orthogonal samples for estimating nuisance parameters in time series. We have applied the method to some popular statistics in time series. Through simulations we have compared this method to well established methods in the literature, such as the bootstrap. Our simulations demonstrate that orthogonal samples does not consistently outperform the bootstrap (there were situations where the bootstrap performed better and others where orthogonal samples performed better). However, this was not the intention of the paper. An advantage of the proposed method is that it is extremely

fast to implement. It can be argued that since computing power is growing year on year, this is no longer an important issue. However, data sets are also increasingly size. Given the growing complexity of modern data sets, it is the author's view that orthogonal samples may be worth further investigation.

Acknowledgements

This work has been partially supported by the National Science Foundation, DMS-1513647.

References

- M.S. Bartlett. Periodogram analysis and continuous spectra. *Biometrika*, 37:1–16, 1950.
- A. K. Bera and M. L. Higgins. ARCH models: Properties, estimation and testing. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 7:305–362, 1993.
- D.R. Brillinger. *Time Series, Data Analysis and Theory*. SIAM, San Francisco, 1981.
- P. J. Brockwell and R. A. Davis. *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. Springer, New York, 1991.
- W.W. Chen and R. S. Deo. Power transformations to induce normality and their applications. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*, 66:117–130, 2004.
- R. Dahlhaus and D. Janas. A frequency domain bootstrap for ratio statistics in time series analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 24:1934–1963, 1996.
- H. Dette and E. Paparoditis. Bootstrapping frequency domain tests in multivariate time series with an application to comparing spectral densities. *J. Royal Statistical Society (B)*, 71:831–857, 2009.
- F. Diebold. Testing for serial correlation in the presence of heteroskedasticity. *Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Business and Economics Statistics Section*, pages 323–328, 1986.
- M. Eichler. Testing nonparametric and semi-parametric hypothesis in vector stationary processes. *J. Multivariate Statistics*, 99:968–1009, 2008.
- J. C. Escanciano and I. N Lobato. An automatic Portmanteau test for serial correlation. *Journal of Econometrics*, 151:140–149, 2009.
- J. Franke and W. Härdle. On bootstrapping kernel spectral estimates. *Ann. Statist.*, 20: 121–145, 1992.

- Y. Hong. Consistent testing for serial correlation on unknown form. *Econometrica*, 64: 837–864, 1996.
- C. Hurvich and S. Zeger. Frequency domain bootstrap methods for time series. *New York University, Graduate School of Business Administration*, 1987.
- C. Jentsch and D.N. Politis. Valid resampling of higher order statistics using linear process bootstrap and autoregressive bootstrap. *Communication in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, 42:1277–1293, 2013.
- C. Jentsch and D.N. Politis. Covariance matrix estimation and linear process bootstrap for multivariate time series of possibly increasing dimension. *Annals of Statistics*, 43: 1117–1140, 2015.
- N. M. Kiefer and T.J. Vogel. A new asymptotic theory for heteroskedasticity-autocorrelation robust tests. *Econometric Theory*, 21:1130–1164, 2005.
- C. Kirch and D. N. Politis. Tft-bootstrap: Resampling time series in the frequency domain to obtain replicates in the time domain. *Annals of Statistics*, 39:1427–1440, 2011.
- J. Krampe, J.-P. Kreiss, and E. Paparoditis. Estimated wold representation and spectral density driven bootstrap for time series. *Preprint*, 2016.
- J.-P. Kreiss. *Bootstrapping and Related Techniques*, chapter Bootstrap procedures for AR(∞)-processes, pages 107–113. Springer, 1992.
- J-P. Kreiss and S. N. Lahiri. *Handbook of Statistics, volume 30*, chapter Bootstrap methods for time series, pages 3–26. Elsevier, 2012.
- J.-P. Kreiss, E. Paparoditis, and D. N. Politis. On the range and validity of the autoregressive sieve bootstrap. *Annals of Statistics*, 39:2103–2130, 2010.
- H. R. Künsch. The jackknife and the bootstrap for general stationary observations. *Annals of Statistics*, 17:1217–1241, 1989.
- S. N. Lahiri. *Resampling Methods for Dependent Data*. Springer, New York, 2003.
- J. Lee and S. Subba Rao. A note on quadratic forms of nonstationary processes. *Under revision*, 2016.
- I. N. Lobato. Testing that a dependent process is uncorrelated. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96:1066–1076, 2001.

- T.L. McMurray and D.N. Politis. Banded and tapered estimates for autocovariance matrices and the linear process bootstrap. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 31:471–482, 2010.
- A. Milhoj. A test of fit in time series. *Biometrika*, 68:177–188, 1981.
- M. Neumann. Spectral density estimation via nonlinear wavelet methods for stationary nongaussian time series. *J. Time Series Analysis*, 1996.
- E. Parzen. On consistent estimates of the spectrum of a stationary time series. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28:329–348, 1957.
- D. N. Politis, J. P. Romano, and M. Wold. Subsampling for heteroskedastic time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 81:281–318, 1997.
- D. N. Politis, J. P. Romano, and M. Wolf. *Subsampling*. Springer, New York, 1999.
- D.N. Politis and J. P. Romano. The stationary bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89:1303–1313, 1994.
- R. M. Robinson. Testing for strong serial correlation and dynamic conditional heteroskedasticity in multiple regression. *Journal of Econometrics*, 47:67–84, 1991.
- J. P. Romano and L. A. Thombs. Inference for autocorrelations under weak assumptions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91:590–600, 1996.
- X. Shao. Confidence intervals for spectral mean and ratio statistics. *Biometrika*, 96:107–117, 2009.
- X. Shao and D.N. Politis. Fixed b-subsampling and block bootstrap: improved confidence intervals based on p-value calibration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society (B)*, 75:323–343, 2013.
- V. Statulevicius and Jakimavicius. Estimates of semiinvariant and centered moments of stochastic processes with mixing: I. *Lithuanian Math. J.*, 28:226–238, 1988.
- G. R. Terrell. The wilson-hilferty transform is locally saddlepoint. *Biometrika*, 57:445–453, 2003.
- A. Weiss. ARCH and Bilinear time series models. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 4:69–70, 1986.

Supplementary material

To prove the results we make heavy use of the following well known result. Suppose that the time series $\{X_t\}$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = s$. Then we have

$$\text{cum}[J_T(\omega_{k_1}), \dots, J_T(\omega_{k_s})] = \frac{1}{T^{s/2-1}} I_{k_1+\dots+k_s \in T\mathbb{Z}} f_s(\omega_{k_1}, \dots, \omega_{k_{s-1}}) + O(T^{-s/2}), \quad (34)$$

see Brillinger [1981], Theorem 4.3.2, for the details.

A Proofs for Section 2

PROOF of Lemma 2.1 This immediately follows from (34) and the Lipschitz continuity of f and ϕ which allows the sum to be replaced by an integral. \square

PROOF of Theorem 2.1(i) We first derive expressions for $\text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), A_T(\phi; r_2)]$ and $\text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)}]$ from which we can deduce the covariance of $\Re A_T(\phi; r)$ and $\Im A_T(\phi; r)$.

To simplify notation we denote $J_k = J_T(\omega_k)$. By using indecomposable partitions and (34) we have

$$\begin{aligned} & T \text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), A_T(\phi; r_2)] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \overline{\phi(\omega_{k_2})} \text{cov}[J_{k_1} \overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, J_{k_1} \overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \overline{\phi(\omega_{k_2})} \left(\text{cov}[J_{k_1}, J_{k_2}] \text{cov}[\overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, \overline{J_{k_2+r_2}}] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{cov}[J_{k_1}, \overline{J_{k_2+r_2}}] \text{cov}[\overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, J_{k_2}] + \text{cum}[J_{k_1}, \overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, \overline{J_{k_2}}, J_{k_2+r_2}] \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) \overline{\phi(\omega_k)} f(\omega_k) f(\omega_{k+r_1}) \delta_{r_1=r_2} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) \overline{\phi(-\omega_{k+r})} f(\omega_k) f(\omega_{k+r_1}) \delta_{r_1=r_2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \overline{\phi(\omega_{k_2})} f_4(\omega_{k_1}, -\omega_{k_1+r}, -\omega_{k_2}) \delta_{r_1, r_2} \Big) + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that if $r_1 \neq r_2$, then $|T \text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), A_T(\phi; r_2)]| = O(T^{-1})$. On the other hand if $r_1 = r_2$ we replace the sum above with an integral to give $T \text{var}[A_T(\phi; r_1)] = V(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1})$.

We apply the same arguments to $T \text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)}]$ to give

$$\begin{aligned}
& T \text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)}] \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \phi(\omega_{k_2}) \text{cov}[J_{k_1} \overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, \overline{J_{k_1} J_{k_1+r_1}}] \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \phi(\omega_{k_2}) \left(\text{cov}[J_{k_1}, \overline{J_{k_2}}] \text{cov}[\overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, J_{k_2+r_2}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \text{cov}[J_{k_1}, \overline{J_{k_2+r_2}}] \text{cov}[\overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, J_{k_2+r_2}] + \text{cum}[J_{k_1}, \overline{J_{k_1+r_1}}, \overline{J_{k_2}}, J_{k_2+r_2}] \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) \phi(-\omega_k) f(\omega_k) f(\omega_{k+r_1}) \delta_{r_1=-r_2 \text{ or } T-r_2} + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \phi(\omega_k) \phi(-\omega_{k+r_1}) f(\omega_k) f(\omega_{k+r_1}) \delta_{r_1=-r_2 \text{ or } T-r_2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k_1, k_2=1}^T \phi(\omega_{k_1}) \phi(\omega_{k_2}) f_4(\omega_{k_1}, -\omega_{k_1+r_1}, -\omega_{k_2}) \delta_{r_1=-r_2 \text{ or } T-r_2} \Big) + O(T^{-1}).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $0 < r_1, r_2 < T/2$, the above implies that $T \text{cov}[A_T(\phi; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)}] = O(T^{-1})$.

Finally, by using the identities $\Re A_T(\phi; r) = \frac{1}{2}(A_T(\phi; r_1) + \overline{A_T(\phi; r_1)})$ and $\Im A_T(\phi; r) = \frac{-i}{2}(A_T(\phi; r_1) - \overline{A_T(\phi; r_1)})$ and the above the result immediately follows. \square

In order to prove Theorem 2.1(ii) we require the following result.

Lemma A.1 *Suppose that the time series $\{X_t\}$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = 2n$. Then we have*

$$\text{cum}[\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_1), \dots, \sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_n)] = O\left(\frac{1}{T^{n/2-1}}\right).$$

PROOF The proof immediately follows from using indecomposable partitions and (34). \square

We make use of Lemma A.1 below.

PROOF of Theorem 2.1(ii) To prove (7) we note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}[|\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_1)|^2, |\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_2)|^2] = \left| \text{cov}[\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_2)] \right|^2 \\
& + \left| \text{cov}[\sqrt{T} A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T} \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)}] \right|^2 + T^2 \text{cum}_4 \left(A_T(\phi; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_1)}, A_T(\phi; r_2), \overline{A_T(\phi; r_2)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we see that (7) follows immediately from the above, Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 2.2. \square

PROOF of Lemma 2.2 By using Corollary 2.1 we can show that

$$|\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(0)] - V(0)| = O(M/T). \quad (35)$$

To prove (16) we use the classical variance bias decomposition

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\widehat{V}_M(0) - V(0) \right)^2 = \text{var}[\widehat{V}_M(0)] + \left[\mathbb{E}[\widehat{V}_M(0)] - V(0) \right]^2.$$

To bound $\text{var}[\widehat{V}_M(0)]$ we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\text{var}[\widehat{V}_M(0)] &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{r_1, r_2=1}^M \left\{ \left| \text{cov}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_2)] \right|^2 + \left| \text{cov}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_2)] \right|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \text{cum} \left(\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_1), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_2), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi; r_2) \right) \right\} \\ &= O(M^{-1} + T^{-1}),\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows immediately from (7). Altogether by using the above and (35), we obtain desired result. \square

PROOF of Lemma 2.3 By using a Taylor expansion we have

$$A_T(\phi_{\widehat{\theta}}; r) = A_T(\phi_{\theta}; r) + \left(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta \right) A_T(\nabla_{\theta} \phi_{\theta}; r) + \left(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta \right)^2 \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^T \nabla_{\theta}^2 \phi(\omega_k; \theta) \Big|_{\theta=\bar{\theta}_k} J_T(\omega_k) \overline{J_T(\omega_{k+r})},$$

where $\bar{\theta}_k$ lies between θ and $\widehat{\theta}$. Thus

$$\left| A_T(\phi_{\widehat{\theta}}; r) - A_T(\phi_{\theta}; r) - \left(\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta \right) A_T(\nabla_{\theta} \phi_{\theta}; r) \right| = O_p(T^{-2}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{V}_{\widehat{\theta}, M}(0) &= \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\phi_{\theta}; r)|^2 + \underbrace{|\widehat{\theta}_T - \theta|^2}_{O_p(T^{-1})} \underbrace{\frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\nabla_{\theta} \phi_{\theta}; r)|^2}_{=O_p(1), \text{ by Lemma 2.2}} + O_p(T^{-1}) \\ &= \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\phi_{\theta}; r)|^2 + O_p(T^{-1}).\end{aligned}\tag{36}$$

By using Lemma 2.2 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{T}{M} \sum_{r=1}^M |A_T(\phi_{\theta}; r)|^2 - V_{\theta}(0) \right\}^2 = O(M^{-1} + M/T),$$

thus by using this and (36) we obtain the result. \square

B Proofs for Section 3.1

To prove Theorem 3.1 we use the following definition

$$\begin{aligned}V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r) &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\omega) f(\omega + \omega_r) \left(\phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega)} + \phi_{j_1}(\omega) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(-\omega - \omega_r)} \right) d\omega + \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \phi_{j_1}(\omega_1) \overline{\phi_{j_2}(\omega_2)} f_4(\omega_1, -\omega_1 - \omega_r, -\omega_2) d\omega_1 d\omega_2 + O(T^{-1}).\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma facilitates the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma B.1 *Suppose that the time series $\{X_t\}$ satisfies Assumption 2.1 with $p = 16$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} T\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; 0), A_T(\phi_{j_2}; 0)] &= V_{j_1, j_2} + O(T^{-1}) \\ T\text{cov}\left[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; 0), \overline{A_T(\phi_{j_2}; 0)}\right] &= V_{j_1, j_2} + O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

For all $0 < r_1, r_2 < T/2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)] &= \begin{cases} V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 \\ O(T^{-1}) & r_1 \neq r_2 \end{cases} \\ T\text{cov}\left[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)}\right] &= O(T^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

For all $0 \leq r_1, r_2, r_3, r_4 < T/2$ we have

$$T^2\text{cum}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2), A_T(\phi_{j_3}; r_3), A_T(\phi_{j_4}; r_4)] = O(T^{-1}). \quad (39)$$

For $0 < r < T/2$ and $0 < r_1, r_2 < T/2$ we have

$$T^2\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1)^2, A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)^2] = \begin{cases} 2V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r)^2 + O(T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 (= r) \\ O(T^{-1}) & r_1 \neq r_2 \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

$$T^2\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1)^2, A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)\overline{A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)}] = O(T^{-1}) \quad (41)$$

$$T^2\text{cov}[|A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1)|^2, |A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)|^2] = \begin{cases} V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r)^2 + O(T^{-1}) \\ O(T^{-1}) \end{cases} \quad (42)$$

Finally

$$|V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r) - V_{j_1, j_2}| \leq K|r|T^{-1}, \quad (43)$$

where K is a finite constant.

PROOF The proof of (37) and (38) is identical to the proof of Theorem 2.1, thus we omit the details. The proof of (39) follows from Lemma A.1, thus we omit the details. To prove (40) we use indecomposable partitions to decompose the term in the product of covariances and a fourth order cumulant term. Specifically

$$\begin{aligned} &T^2\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r)^2, A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r_2)^2] \\ &= 2T^2|\text{cov}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_2)]|^2 + T^2\text{cum}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_1), \overline{A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_2)}, \overline{A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r_2)}]. \end{aligned}$$

By using (38) we obtain (40). A similar proof applies to (41) and (42).

Finally, to prove (43) we simply use the Lipschitz continuity of f , f_4 and ϕ_j . Thus we have proved the result. \square

PROOF of Theorem 3.1 To prove (i), we note that under both the null and alternative the following expansion is valid

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[S_T] &= T \sum_{j=1}^L \mathbb{E} |(A_T(\phi_j) - \mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)] + \mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)])|^2 \\
&= T \sum_{j=1}^L \mathbb{E} |(A_T(\phi_j) - \mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)] + \mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)])|^2 \\
&= T \sum_{j=1}^L \text{var}[A_T(\phi_j)] + \sum_{j=1}^L |\mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)]|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Using that under the null $\mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)] = 0$, and substituting this into the above we have

$$\mathbb{E}[S_T] = T \sum_{j=1}^L \text{var}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_j)] = \sum_{j=1}^L V_{j,j} + O(T^{-1}),$$

where the last line follows from (38). This gives (ia). To prove (ib) we note that

$$\mathbb{E}[S_{T,R}(r)] = \frac{T}{2} \sum_{j=1}^L \text{var} \left[A_T(\phi_j; r) + \overline{A_T(\phi_j; r)} \right] + \frac{T}{2} \sum_{j=1}^L \left| \mathbb{E} \left(A_T(\phi_j; r) + \overline{A_T(\phi_j; r)} \right) \right|^2.$$

Under both the null and alternative $\mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j; r)] = O(T^{-1})$ for $0 < r < T/2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[S_{T,R}(r)] &= \frac{T}{2} \sum_{j=1}^L \left(2\text{var}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_j; r)] + 2\Re\text{cov}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_j; r), \overline{\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_j; r)}] \right) + O(T^{-1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^L V_{j,j} + O(T^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

thus proving (ib).

To prove (ia) we note that since $A_T(\phi_j)$ is real and under the null $\mathbb{E}[A_T(\phi_j)] = 0$, then expanding $\text{var}[S_T]$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{var}[S_T] &= T^2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L \text{cov} \left(|\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_{j_1})|^2, |\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_{j_2})|^2 \right) \\
&= T^2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L \left(2\text{cov}[\sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_{j_1}), \sqrt{T}A_T(\phi_{j_2})]^2 + \right. \\
&\quad \left. T^2 \text{cum}[A_T(\phi_{j_1}), A_T(\phi_{j_1}), A_T(\phi_{j_1}), A_T(\phi_{j_2}), A_T(\phi_{j_1})] \right) \\
&= 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2}^2 + O(T^{-1}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (38) and (39). Thus proving (iia).

We now prove (iib), where we derive an expression for $\text{cov}[|\Re A_T(\phi_{j_1}; r)|^2, |\Re A_T(\phi_{j_2}; r)|^2]$. To simplify notation let $A_T(r) = A_T(\phi_j; r)$. Using this notation we write $\Re A_T(\phi_j; r) = \frac{1}{2}(A_T(r) + \overline{A_T(r)})$ and

$$|\Re A_T(\phi_j; r)|^2 = \frac{1}{4} \left(A_T(r)^2 + A_T(r)\overline{A_T(r)} + \overline{A_T(r)}A_T(r) + \overline{A_T(r)}^2 \right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \text{cov}[|\Re A_T(\phi_j; r_1)|^2, |\Re A_T(\phi_j; r_2)|^2] &= \frac{1}{16} \text{cov} \left[A_T(r_1)^2 + A_T(r_1)\overline{A_T(r_1)} + \overline{A_T(r_1)}A_T(r_1) + \overline{A_T(r_1)}^2, \right. \\ &\quad \left. A_T(r_2)^2 + A_T(r_2)\overline{A_T(r_2)} + \overline{A_T(r_2)}A_T(r_2) + \overline{A_T(r_2)}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by using (40)-(42) we have

$$\text{cov}[|\sqrt{T}\Re A_T(\phi_j; r_1)|^2, |\sqrt{T}\Re A_T(\phi_j; r_2)|^2] = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2}(\omega_r) + O(T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 \\ O(T^{-1}) & r_1 \neq r_2 \end{cases}$$

Now we recall that $S_{T,R}(r) = 2T \sum_{j=1}^L |\Re A_T(\phi_j; r)|^2$, thus by using the above and (43) we have

$$\text{cov}[S_{T,R}(r_1), S_{T,R}(r_2)] = \begin{cases} 2 \sum_{j_1, j_2=1}^L V_{j_1, j_2} + O(T^{-1} + |r|T^{-1}) & r_1 = r_2 (= r) \\ O(T^{-1}) & r_1 \neq r_2. \end{cases}$$

The same arguments apply to $\text{cov}[S_{T,R}(r_1), S_{T,R}(r_2)]$ and $\text{cov}[S_{T,R}(r_1), S_{T,I}(r_2)]$, which gives us (iib).

To prove (iii) we use the same method used to prove (ii) together with Lemma A.1. \square