arXiv:1702.04391v1 [stat.CO] 14 Feb 2017

Bootstrap-based inferential improvements in beta autoregressive moving average model

Bruna Gregory Palm* Fábio M. Bayer†

Abstract

We consider the issue of performing accurate small sample inference in beta autoregressive moving average model, which is useful for modeling and forecasting continuous variables that assumes values in the interval $(0,1)$. The inferences based on conditional maximum likelihood estimation have good asymptotic properties, but their performances in small samples may be poor. This way, we propose bootstrap bias corrections of the point estimators and different bootstrap strategies for confidence interval improvements. Our Monte Carlo simulations show that finite sample inference based on bootstrap corrections is much more reliable than the usual inferences. We also presented an empirical application.

Keywords: βARMA, beta distribution, bootstrap corrections, forecasting, small sample inference.


1 Introduction

Generally, autoregressive integrated moving average models (ARIMA) (Box et al., 2008) are used for modeling and forecasting of variables over time. However, these models become inappropriate when it is not reasonable to assume normality to the variable of interest y, as occurs with variables of type rates and proportions (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004), considering that these models does not take into account the bounded nature of the data. In such cases, the occurrences of y belong to the continuous interval $(0,1)$. Some examples of variables in the standard unit interval $(0,1)$ are: relative air humidity, proportion of defective items, percentage of stored energy, proportion of patients, mortality rate, etc. The use of ARIMA models can lead to predicted values outside the unit interval in which the variable is defined (Cribari-Neto and Zeileis, 2010). For example, forecasts of relative air humidity can reach values greater than 100% or mortality rates may have predicted values lower than 0%.

An alternative to adequately model the data would be to use transformations of the variable of interest, but this approach has certain limitations. In this case, the results would be interpreted in terms of the transformed variable and not in terms of the average of the variable of interest. Moreover, variables such as rates and proportions

*B. G. Palm is with the Departamento de Estatística, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, PE, Brazil, E-mail: brunagpalm@gmail.com
†F. M. Bayer is with the Departamento de Estatística and LACESM, Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, RS, Brazil, E-mail: bayer@ufsm.br

are typically asymmetrically distributed, leading to distorted inferential results in models assuming normality of the data (Cribari-Neto and Zeileis, 2010; Ferrari and Pinheiro, 2011). For those situations in which it is desired to model over time a continuous variable in the interval $(0,1)$, it was proposed the beta autoregressive moving average model (βARMA) (Rocha and Cribari-Neto, 2009). In this model, as well as in the beta regression model (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004), we assume that the variable of interest follows the beta distribution. The beta probability density function is very flexible and, unlike normal density, accommodates distributions that are symmetrical, asymmetrical, "J shaped", inverted "J shaped", among others. Figure 1 shows several forms of beta density shown in Equation (1), considering different parameter values of mean (μ) and precision (ϕ) that index it.



(a) $\phi = 20$ (b) $\phi = 120$

Figure 1: Beta probability density functions with varying parameters $\mu = 0.10, 0.30, 0.50, 0.70, 0.90$ for two values of ϕ.

The specific inferences about the βARMA model parameters are based on conditional maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) and the interval inferences are based on the asymptotic properties of these estimators. These inferential procedures are also considered in ARIMA models, in generalized linear models (GLM) (McCullagh and Nelder, 1989) and in beta regression (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004). MLE has good asymptotic properties, however, in small samples these approximations can be poor, generating distorted inferential results. Such distortions can occur both with respect to the bias of point estimators and in terms of coverage rate of confidence intervals. The biases of the MLE are on the order of n^{-1} (Cordeiro and Klein, 1994), where n is the sample size. Thus, in samples of moderate size bias can become problematic (Cordeiro and Cribari-Neto, 2014). In this sense, inferential corrections for small samples become important research topics. Details on inferences in large samples based on likelihood are discussed in Pawitan (2001).

This paper proposes corrections for point and interval estimators in the βARMA model. In particular, the bootstrap method (Efron, 1979) is considered to obtain bias-adjusted estimators and different strategies for improvement of the confidence intervals. The improved inference methods are also considered in an application to forecast a

real data of percentage of energy stored. Such corrections become crucial for generating predicted values closer to nominal values, as seen in Kim (2003). Similar works (but in other classes of models) are verified in the literature. An extensive discussion on applications of the bootstrap method in time series models is presented in Berkowitz and Kilian (2000). Bias correction by the bootstrap method in small samples in autoregressive models are studied in Inoue and Kilian (2002) and Kim (2003). Different bootstrap methods in time series are studied in Härdle et al. (2003) and evaluated in Politis (2003). Bootstrap point and interval corrections in the beta regression model are discussed in Ospina et al. (2006), compared to analytical adjustments. Cordeiro and Klein (1994) obtained analytical bias corrections to the MLE parameters in the ARMA models. Franco and Reisen (2007) consider different bootstrap approaches and bootstrap confidence intervals to improve the inferences about the memory parameter in fractionally autoregressive moving average model.

The organization of this paper is arranged as follows. Section 2 introduces the βARMA model, as well as link function, conditional log-likelihood function and large sample inferential details. Section 3 presents the inferential improvements in small samples by bootstrap methods. Section 4 describes the experiment of Monte Carlo simulation for finite sample size and presents the main numerical results and their discussion. Section 5 shows and discusses an application to real data, in order to compare the predictive performance of the models with corrected and uncorrected estimators. At last, Section 6 presents the conclusion of the work.

2 The beta autoregressive moving average model

The βARMA model was proposed by Rocha and Cribari-Neto (2009) and can be defined as follow. Let $y = (y_1,\ldots,y_n)^\top$ be a vector of n random variables, where each y_t, $t = 1,\ldots,n$, has conditional distribution, given by a set of previous information $\mathscr{F}_{t-1}$, following beta distribution with mean parameters μ_t and precision ϕ. The conditional density of y_t, given $\mathscr{F}_{t-1}$, is given by:

$$f(y_t \mid \mathscr{F}_{t-1}) = \frac{\Gamma(\phi)}{\Gamma(\mu_t\phi)\Gamma((1-\mu_t)\phi)} y_t^{\mu_t\phi-1}(1-y_t)^{(1-\mu_t)\phi-1}, \tag{1}$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function, $0 < \mu_t < 1$, and $\phi > 0$.

The conditional mean and conditional variance of y_t are respectively given by:

$$E(y_t \mid \mathscr{F}_{t-1}) = \mu_t,$$

$$var(y_t \mid \mathscr{F}_{t-1}) = V(\mu_t)/(1+\phi),$$

where $V(\mu_t) = \mu_t(1-\mu_t)$ is denoted by variance function and ϕ can be interpreted as a precision parameter. We note that the reciprocal of the precision parameter can be viewed as a dispersion parameter.

The βARMA(p,q) model is defined by the following structure:

$$g(\mu_t) = \alpha + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \varphi_i g(y_{t-i}) + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \theta_j r_{t-j}, \tag{2}$$

where $\alpha \in \Re$ is a constant, $\varphi's$ and $\theta's$ are, respectively, the autoregressive and moving average parameters, r_t is the moving average error term and $g(\cdot)$ is a strictly monotone link function and twice differentiable where $g : (0,1) \to \Re$, as in the beta regression model (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004), and p and q are the orders of the model. The usual link functions for models assuming beta distribution are the logit, probit and complementary log-log. It should be noted that the seminal βARMA model, proposed in Rocha and Cribari-Neto (2009), also considers a term which accommodates covariates in the model, similar to the regression model. In this paper we consider $r_t = y_t - \mu_t$ for the error term. In this case, the model input r_t is in scale of y, and the model output is in the scale of $g(y_t)$. This way, the stationary rules applied to ARMA models can not be valid. It can happens because the transfer function of the system, that transforms r_t into y_t, by a dynamic nonlinear relationship, can lead to uncontrollable system (Box et al., 2008).

Parameter estimation can be performed using the maximum likelihood method. Let the parameter vector be $\gamma = (\alpha, \varphi^\top, \theta^\top, \phi)^\top$, where $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_p)^\top$ and $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_q)^\top$. The MLE are obtained by maximizing the logarithm of the conditional likelihood function. The log-likelihood function for the parameter vector γ conditional to the m preliminary observations, where $m = \max(p,q)$, can be defined as:

$$\ell = \ell(\gamma; y) = \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} \log f(y_t \mid \mathscr{F}_{t-1}) = \sum_{t=m+1}^{n} \ell_t(\mu_t, \phi), \tag{3}$$

where $\ell_t(\mu_t, \phi) = \log\Gamma(\phi) - \log\Gamma(\mu_t\phi) - \log\Gamma((1-\mu_t)\phi) + (\mu_t\phi - 1)\log y_t + \{(1-\mu_t)\phi - 1\}\log(1-y_t)$.

For the maximization of the function in (3), the use of nonlinear optimization algorithms is required. The computational implementation of this work was performed using the quasi-Newton optimization algorithm known as BFGS (Press et al., 1992) with analytic first derivatives. The optimization algorithm requires initial values. The starting values of the constant (α) and the autoregressive (φ) parameters were selected from an ordinary least squares estimate from a linear regression, where $Y = (g(y_{m+1}), g(y_{m+2}), \ldots, g(y_n))^\top$ are the responses and the covariates matrix is given by

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & g(y_m) & g(y_{m-1}) & \cdots & g(y_{m-p}) \\ 1 & g(y_{m+1}) & g(y_m) & \cdots & g(y_{m-p+1}) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & g(y_{n-1}) & g(y_{n-2}) & \cdots & g(y_{n-p}) \end{bmatrix}.$$

For the parameter θ, the starting values are setted equal to zero. The initial value of ϕ is considered in the same way as

in the beta regression (Ferrari and Cribari-Neto, 2004). For more theoretical details regarding large sample inferences and matrix expressions to the score vector and the Fisher information matrix $(K(\gamma))$, see Rocha and Cribari-Neto (2009).

For inferences in large samples, it is necessary to know the matrix of asymptotic variances and covariances of MLE, given by the inverse of $K(\gamma)$. The joint Fisher information matrix for α, ϕ, φ, θ is not a diagonal block matrix, thus the parameters are not orthogonal. This feature makes the βARMA model different of the dynamic models based on GLM (Rocha and Cribari-Neto, 2009; Benjamin et al., 2003) and on ARIMA models. Under usual regularity conditions and for large sample sizes, the MLE have k-multivariate normal distribution, being $k = p+q+2$, defined by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\alpha} \\ \widehat{\phi} \\ \widehat{\varphi} \\ \widehat{\theta} \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathscr{N}_{(k)} \left(\begin{pmatrix} \alpha \\ \phi \\ \varphi \\ \theta \end{pmatrix}, K^{-1}(\gamma) \right),$$

where $\widehat{\alpha}$, $\widehat{\phi}$, $\widehat{\varphi}$ and $\widehat{\theta}$ are the maximum likelihood estimators of α, ϕ, φ and θ, respectively.

The MLE $\widehat{\gamma}$ and $K(\widehat{\gamma})$ are consistent estimator of γ and $K(\gamma)$, respectively. Assuming that $J(\gamma) = \lim_{n\to\infty} K(\gamma)/n$ exists and it is nonsingular, we have $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\gamma}-\gamma) \xrightarrow{\mathscr{D}} \mathscr{N}_k(0, J(\gamma)^{-1})$, with $\xrightarrow{\mathscr{D}}$ denoting convergence in distribution. Thus, if γ_r denotes the r-th component of γ, it follows that: $(\widehat{\gamma}_r - \gamma_r)\{K_{rr}^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma})\}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{\mathscr{D}} \mathscr{N}(0,1)$, where $K_{rr}^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma})$ is the r-th element of the diagonal of $K^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma})$. If $0 < \alpha < 1/2$ and z_δ represents the δ quantile of the distribution $\mathscr{N}(0,1)$, we have the following asymptotic confidence intervals for γ_r with confidence $100(1-\alpha)\%$, for $r = 1,\ldots,k$:

$$[\widehat{\gamma}_r - z_{1-\alpha/2}(K_{rr}^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma}))^{1/2}; \widehat{\gamma}_r + z_{1-\alpha/2}(K_{rr}^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma}))^{1/2}]. \tag{4}$$

These intervals will be considered in Section 3.2. These approximate confidence intervals can have distortions in small samples, because the asymptotic pivotal quantities used in their construction may have asymmetric distribution and nonzero mean (Ospina et al., 2006). In addition, these confidence intervals may include values outside the parameter space (Ospina et al., 2006; Cordeiro and Cribari-Neto, 2014). Further details on the asymptotic confidence intervals can be found in Davison and Hinkley (1997) and Efron and Tibshirani (1994).

In order to produce forecasts, the MLE of γ, $\widehat{\gamma}$, must be used to obtain estimates for μ_t, $\widehat{\mu}_t$ (Rocha and Cribari-Neto, 2009). This way, the mean response estimate at $n+h$, where $h = 1,2,\ldots$, is given by

$$\widehat{\mu}_{n+h} = g^{-1}\left(\widehat{\alpha} + \sum_{i=1}^{p} \widehat{\varphi}_i\,[g(y_{n+h-i})] + \sum_{j=1}^{q} \widehat{\theta}_j\,[r_{n+h-j}]\right), \tag{5}$$

where

$$[g(y_{n+h-i})] = \begin{cases} g(\widehat{\mu}_{n+h-i}), & \text{if } i < h, \\ g(y_{n+h-i}), & \text{if } i \geq h, \end{cases}$$

$$\left[r_{n+h-j}\right] = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } j < h, \\ \widehat{r}_{n+h-j}, & \text{if } j \geq h, \end{cases}$$

and $\widehat{r}_t = y_t - \widehat{\mu}_t$.

3 Inferential improvements in small samples

In general, the MLE are biased to their true parametric values when the sample size is small. In practice the bias is often ignored, in justification of being negligible compared to the standard error of the MLEs. The standard deviation of the estimator is of $n^{-1/2}$ order, while the bias is of n^{-1} order. However, in some models, the bias in small samples can be appreciable or have magnitude equal to the standard error of the estimator (Cordeiro and Cribari-Neto, 2014; Davison and Hinkley, 1997).

Aiming to reduce the problem of MLE bias in small samples, Cox and Snell (1968) proposed a very general analytical formula to determine the bias of order $O(n^{-1})$ of MLE in multi-parametric models. To determine it, we should know the inverse of the Fisher information matrix and cumulants of log-likelihood derivates up to third order with respect to the unknown parameters (Cordeiro and Klein, 1994). From the determination of the bias, we can set the second order MLE by:

$$\overline{\gamma} = \widehat{\gamma} - \widehat{B}(\widehat{\gamma}),$$

where $\widehat{B}(\cdot)$ is the bias $B(\cdot)$ evaluated in $\widehat{\gamma}$. The bias of the corrected estimator will be of order n^{-2}, that is,

$$E(\overline{\gamma}) = \gamma + O(n^{-2}).$$

However, analytical derivation as shown in Cox and Snell (1968) can be difficult to obtain, or even impossible to be determined to certain classes of models. The calculation of higher order moments and cumulants is rather complicated (Cordeiro and Cribari-Neto, 2014). In particular, in βARMA models where the parameters are not orthogonal, this analytical derivation is especially costly. In this sense, bootstrap corrections become good options for inferential improvements in small samples. In this approach, the bias estimation $B(\cdot)$ is numerically obtained through Monte Carlo simulations, bypassing analytical difficulties. Bootstrap bias-corrected estimators are discussed in more details in Section 3.1.

The bootstrap method is a computationally intensive method based on resampling, being useful for inferential corrections on small samples (Efron, 1979). Basically, there are two possible bootstrap approaches: parametric and nonparametric. In the nonparametric method the pseudo samples are generated from the originally observed data. For the parametric method, a parametric model is fitted to the original data and pseudo samples from this fitted model are generated (Davison and Hinkley, 1997; Efron and Tibshirani, 1994). In what follows we shall use the parametric bootstrap.

The parametric bootstrap method can be generalized as follows:

1. Suppose that $y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)^\top$ is a random sample that follows a distribution F with parametric vector γ;
2. From the original sample, obtain the estimates $\widehat{\gamma}$ of γ;
3. Generate B size n bootstrap samples $(y_1^*, \ldots, y_B^*)$ from $F(\widehat{\gamma})$;
4. For each bootstrap sample y_b^* compute $\widehat{\gamma}^*$;
5. Repeat steps 3 and 4 a very large number B of times, thus obtaining: $\widehat{\gamma}^{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{\gamma}^{*B}$;
6. Use the estimates $\widehat{\gamma}^{*b}$, with $b = 1, \ldots, B$, to calculate the desired quantities (mean, variance, confidence interval, etc).

3.1 Bias correction of point estimators

The MLE are asymptotically not biased, however, their bias in small samples can be considerable (Pawitan, 2001; Efron and Tibshirani, 1994). Through bootstrap method, we can estimate the bias of a point estimator. Once we have a good estimate of the bias of the estimator, we can build bias-corrected point estimators. The bias of the estimator $\widehat{\gamma}$ can be expressed as:

$$B(\widehat{\gamma}) = E[\widehat{\gamma}] - \gamma.$$

Using the steps of the bootstrap method previously presented, a bootstrap estimate of the bias can be obtained by

$$\widehat{B}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}) = \bar{\gamma}^* - \widehat{\gamma},$$

where $\bar{\gamma}^* = \frac{1}{B}\sum_{b=1}^{B} \widehat{\gamma}^{*b}$. Thus, we can obtain a corrected second order estimator (Efron, 1979; Davison and Hinkley, 1997):

$$\overline{\gamma} = \widehat{\gamma} - \widehat{B}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}) = \widehat{\gamma} - (\bar{\gamma}^* - \widehat{\gamma}) = 2\widehat{\gamma} - \bar{\gamma}^*. \tag{6}$$

This estimator has the same asymptotic properties as the usual MLE, but has less bias in small samples (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994).

3.2 Corrected confidence intervals

The general form for confidence intervals (CI) for γ is:

$$P_F[L \leq \gamma \leq U] \approx 1-\alpha,$$

where L and U are the lower and upper bounds of the confidence limits, respectively and $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$. In likelihood inferences, this interval requires large samples to guarantee the validity of the asymptotic approximations. In small samples their effectiveness can be seriously compromised (Efron, 1979; Davison and Hinkley, 1997).

An alternative to the construction of adequate confidence intervals in small samples, free of analytical complexities, is the bootstrap method. One advantage is the independence of the central limit theorem, because their precision measurements are obtained directly from the data. Bootstrap intervals are approximate as standard confidence intervals, despite the fact that better approximations can be offered (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994).

Confidence intervals for γ can be obtained in several ways. One of the most common ways is, as introduced earlier in Equation (4), given by:

$$[\widehat{\gamma} - z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}(\widehat{\gamma}); \widehat{\gamma} + z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}(\widehat{\gamma})], \tag{7}$$

where $\widehat{ep}(\widehat{\gamma})$ is the estimate of the standard error of $\widehat{\gamma}$, in which $\text{diag}\{(K^{-1}(\widehat{\gamma}))^{1/2}\}$ is usually used as approximation for $\widehat{ep}(\widehat{\gamma})$, when $\widehat{\gamma}$ is MLE.

Intervals in the way of Equations (4) and (7) are approximate, with coverage probability not exactly equal to $1-\alpha$, as desired (Efron, 1979). Using bootstrap, we can have a better estimate of the standard error of the estimator $\widehat{\gamma}$, given by:

$$\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}) = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{b=1}^{B}(\gamma^{*b} - \bar{\gamma}^{*})^2}{B-1}}. \tag{8}$$

The standard bootstrap confidence interval (CI_{boot}) is obtained through the bootstrap estimate of the standard error, given by (8), with coverage probability of approximately $1-\alpha$, given by:

$$[\widehat{\gamma} - z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}); \widehat{\gamma} + z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma})]. \tag{9}$$

The major advantage of this method is its algebraic simplicity for finding a CI for γ. A desired property of the intervals is the preservation of the range, which is not always satisfied in the standard bootstrap interval.

The bootstrap-t interval (CI_t) (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), also known as pivotal method is a generalization of the t-Student method, and is usually applied in location statistics as sampling mean, median, or sampling percentile. Let the α-th percentile of the t-distribution be denoted by $t_{(\alpha)}$, thus the CI_t is given by:

$$[\widehat{\gamma} - t_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}); \widehat{\gamma} + t_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma})].$$

The bootstrap percentile interval (CI_p) (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994) has the property of invariance to monotonic transformations. It is constructed from a finite number B of bootstrap replications of the estimator of the parameter of interest. Thus, the percentile confidence interval is given by:

$$[\widehat{\gamma}^{*B}_{(\alpha/2)}; \widehat{\gamma}^{*B}_{(1-\alpha/2)}],$$

being $\widehat{\gamma}^{*B}_{(\alpha/2)}$ the $(100 \cdot \alpha/2)$-th percentile of the resamplings $\widehat{\gamma}^{*b}$, that is, the $(B \cdot \alpha/2)$-th value of an ordering of B replications of $\widehat{\gamma}^{*b}$.

This work still considers another corrected confidence interval. The CI based on point unbiased estimator (CI_u) obtained through of the confidence interval given in (9) replacing the MLE by their bias-corrected versions given in (6). Thus, the CI_u is defined as:

$$[\overline{\gamma} - z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma}); \overline{\gamma} + z_{(1-\alpha/2)}\widehat{ep}_{boot}(\widehat{\gamma})].$$

The following Section evaluates the finite sample performances of different confidence intervals introduced in this Section, when used to make inferences about the parameters of the βARMA model.

4 Numerical evaluation

The evaluation of the point and interval estimators, corrected and uncorrected, of the βARMA model parameters was performed through Monte Carlo simulations. The computational implementation was developed using the `R` programming language (R Development Core Team, 2014). The number of Monte Carlo and bootstrap replications were set equal to $1,000$. The sample sizes considered were $n = 20, 30, 50, 100$.

The numerical results presented are based on the βARMA model with the mean structure given by the (2) and logit link function; i.e. $\text{logit}(\mu) = \log(\frac{\mu}{1-\mu})$. For the parameter values were considered different scenarios, namely:

- βAR(1) with $\alpha = 1$, $\varphi_1 = -0.5$ and $\phi = 20$;
- βAR(1) with $\alpha = 1$, $\varphi_1 = -0.5$ and $\phi = 120$;
- βMA(1) with $\alpha = -1$, $\theta_1 = 1$ and $\phi = 20$;
- βMA(1) with $\alpha = 1$, $\theta_1 = -0.5$ and $\phi = 120$;
- βARMA(1,1) with $\alpha = -0.5$, $\varphi_1 = 0.5$, $\theta_1 = 1$ and $\phi = 20$;
- βARMA(1,1) with $\alpha = 1$, $\varphi_1 = 0.5$, $\theta_1 = -1.5$ and $\phi = 120$.

For brevity, we will present the results of the scenarios with $\phi = 20$ in this section, due to similarities in the results. The results with $\phi = 120$ can be found in the Appendix.

Table 1: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βAR(1) model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\varphi}_1$	$\overline{\varphi}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
			$n = 20$			
Mean	0.991	1.000	−0.476	−0.494	24.135	19.122
Bias	−0.009	0.000	0.024	0.006	4.135	−0.878
RB	−0.896	−0.027	−4.735	−1.244	20.675	−4.392
SE	0.176	0.192	0.194	0.221	8.635	7.389
MSE	0.031	0.037	0.038	0.049	91.658	55.370
			$n = 30$			
Mean	0.988	0.995	−0.476	−0.490	22.976	19.813
Bias	−0.012	−0.005	0.024	0.010	2.976	−0.187
RB	−1.189	−0.487	−4.812	−2.066	14.882	−0.935
SE	0.140	0.149	0.151	0.165	6.906	6.275
MSE	0.020	0.022	0.023	0.027	56.558	39.410
			$n = 50$			
Mean	0.993	0.999	−0.485	−0.495	21.807	20.029
Bias	−0.007	−0.001	0.015	0.005	1.807	0.029
RB	−0.670	−0.126	−3.083	−1.048	9.037	0.146
SE	0.107	0.111	0.118	0.125	4.615	4.319
MSE	0.011	0.012	0.014	0.016	24.563	18.653
			$n = 100$			
Mean	0.996	0.999	−0.496	−0.502	20.605	19.767
Bias	−0.004	−0.001	0.004	−0.002	0.605	−0.233
RB	−0.408	−0.059	−0.800	0.435	3.027	−1.164
SE	0.077	0.078	0.082	0.085	2.995	2.868
MSE	0.006	0.006	0.007	0.007	9.334	8.278

In order to numerically evaluate the point estimators, it is necessary to use some measurements. From the $1,000$ Monte Carlo replications of the maximum likelihood estimators, usual and corrected, we calculate mean, bias, percentage relative bias (RB), standard error (SE) and mean square error (MSE). A graphical analysis of the behavior of the RB is performed through the graph of total relative bias, defined in Cribari-Neto and Soares (2003) as the sum of the absolute values of the individual relative biases. Thus, the total relative bias is an aggregate measure of the bias of the parameters estimates.

Table 1 presents the results of numerical evaluation of point estimators of the parameters of βAR(1) model. It is observed that the usual MLE $(\widehat{\alpha}, \widehat{\varphi}_1, \widehat{\phi})$ of the βAR(1) model parameters are considerably more biased than their corrected versions via bootstrap $(\overline{\alpha}, \overline{\varphi}_1, \overline{\phi})$. Is is also noticeable that the non corrected estimators of ϕ present themselves more biased than the estimators of the autoregressive structure in all sample sizes. For $n = 30$ we noted relative biases for $\widehat{\phi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ equal to 14.882 and -0.935, respectively. That is, the uncorrected estimator is about 15 times more biased than the proposed corrected estimator. Moreover, as expected, by the asymptotic properties of the MLE, the bias of all the estimators decrease as the sample size increases. We can verify graphically from Figure 2(a) that the total relative bias is considerably smaller in the corrected estimators and converges faster to zero. Regarding the MSE, we verify that it decreases as the sample size increases in all estimators, which is a numerical indicative of the consistency of the estimators.

Analyzing Table 2 we also verify that the usual MLE of the βMA(1) model are more biased than their corrected

Table 2: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βMA(1) model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\theta}_1$	$\overline{\theta}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
			$n = 20$			
Mean	−1.008	−1.007	0.747	1.112	23.843	20.752
Bias	−0.008	−0.007	−0.253	0.112	3.843	0.752
RB	0.792	0.731	−25.273	11.180	19.215	3.762
SE	0.135	0.135	1.551	1.606	7.800	8.046
MSE	0.018	0.018	2.468	2.593	75.609	65.306
			$n = 30$			
Mean	−1.002	−1.000	0.791	0.990	22.698	20.240
Bias	−0.002	0.000	−0.209	−0.010	2.698	0.240
RB	0.205	0.038	−20.921	−1.000	13.488	1.201
SE	0.107	0.107	1.078	1.080	6.121	6.105
MSE	0.011	0.012	1.206	1.167	44.747	37.333
			$n = 50$			
Mean	−1.005	−1.004	0.866	0.974	21.270	19.840
Bias	−0.005	−0.004	−0.134	−0.026	1.270	−0.160
RB	0.516	0.396	−13.422	−2.647	6.349	−0.798
SE	0.089	0.089	0.737	0.732	4.210	4.124
MSE	0.008	0.008	0.562	0.537	19.337	17.031
			$n = 100$			
Mean	−1.003	−1.002	0.948	0.992	20.655	19.818
Bias	−0.003	−0.002	−0.052	−0.008	0.655	−0.182
RB	0.284	0.179	−5.157	−0.803	3.273	−0.910
SE	0.061	0.061	0.526	0.524	2.910	2.811
MSE	0.004	0.004	0.280	0.274	8.895	7.932

versions via bootstrap. The parameter ϕ shows itself percentually more biased than the estimators of the parameters of the mean structure in the smaller sample sizes in their usual versions. There was decreasing in the bias for all corrected estimators, reaching at almost null bias in the parameter α in sample sizes $n = 20$ and $n = 30$. The difference of the relative bias between the estimators $\widehat{\phi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ is 6 times in the sample size $n = 20$, where $\widehat{\phi}$ presents RB equal to 19.215 and $\bar{\phi}$ of 3.762. This difference is even greater for $n = 30$, where the difference between $\widehat{\theta}$ and $\bar{\theta}$ is 20 times and between $\widehat{\phi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ of 13 times. Such estimates have relative bias of -20.921, -1.000, 13.488 and 1.201, respectively. The property of asymptotic non-bias of MLE is verified, since the bias decreases while sample size increases, as shown in Figure 2(b). It shows a decrease in the relative bias in the corrected estimators and the faster convergence for the parameter value.


Table 3 shows the results of the evaluation in the estimators of βARMA(1,1) model. Similarly to the cases βAR(1) and βMA(1), we observe lower values of bias for the corrected estimates compared to the usual ones. Corrected estimates were more accurate because they present lower value of bias. There is improvement through bias correction in almost all parameters, reaching an almost null value in sample size $n = 100$ for $\bar{\alpha}$ and $\bar{\varphi}_1$. The largest difference of percentage bias is between $\widehat{\phi}$ and $\bar{\phi}$ for $n = 20$, in which the uncorrected estimator has bias 11 times higher than the corrected one. Figure 2(c) shows the lower values of the total relative bias in the corrected estimates, beside the convergence to zero is faster. In addition to that, it is also observed that the asymptotic property of unbiasedness of MLE is satisfied, because the bias decreases as the sample size increases.

Table 3: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βARMA$(1,1)$ model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\varphi}_1$	$\overline{\varphi}_1$	$\widehat{\theta}_1$	$\overline{\theta}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
				$n = 20$				
Mean	−0.687	−0.594	0.313	0.404	1.566	1.677	22.350	20.195
Bias	−0.187	−0.094	−0.187	−0.096	0.566	0.677	2.350	0.195
RB	37.376	18.857	−37.435	−19.112	56.644	67.700	11.751	0.976
SE	0.370	0.500	0.315	0.469	2.049	2.949	7.722	8.060
MSE	0.172	0.259	0.134	0.229	4.517	9.155	65.150	64.997
				$n = 30$				
Mean	−0.647	−0.554	0.367	0.457	1.453	1.324	22.064	20.712
Bias	−0.147	−0.054	−0.133	−0.043	0.453	0.324	2.064	0.712
RB	29.389	10.874	−26.661	−8.577	45.287	32.384	10.322	3.562
SE	0.316	0.400	0.255	0.346	1.638	2.161	6.326	6.587
MSE	0.122	0.163	0.083	0.121	2.890	4.776	44.278	43.898
				$n = 50$				
Mean	−0.598	−0.526	0.410	0.477	1.317	1.155	21.310	20.333
Bias	−0.098	−0.026	−0.090	−0.023	0.317	0.155	1.310	0.333
RB	19.574	5.247	−17.930	−4.665	31.661	15.471	6.552	1.666
SE	0.222	0.254	0.187	0.225	1.145	1.328	4.883	5.046
MSE	0.059	0.065	0.043	0.051	1.412	1.788	25.563	25.568
				$n = 100$				
Mean	−0.539	−0.500	0.462	0.500	1.087	1.022	20.454	19.954
Bias	−0.039	0.000	−0.038	0.000	0.087	0.022	0.454	−0.046
RB	7.898	−0.010	−7.516	−0.083	8.736	2.166	2.271	−0.229
SE	0.152	0.159	0.128	0.136	0.846	0.879	3.251	3.229
MSE	0.025	0.025	0.018	0.018	0.723	0.772	10.776	10.427

We also verified the importance of correction in the MLE in the βARMA model. The usual estimates were biased in different scenarios and sample sizes. The corrected estimators proved considerably less biased compared to the usual uncorrected. In general, the estimates performed better in the autoregressive estimator than in the part of the moving averages. Such fact was already discussed in Ansley and Newbold (1980) in ARMA models, where it is found, by simulation studies, that inferences about parameters of moving averages are poor. It is also noticeable that the estimator of ϕ proved itself biased in the usual statistics in different simulated models in almost all sample sizes. Such fact is also verified in the beta regression model, where the estimators of the precision $(\widehat{\phi})$ are percentually more biased than those of the mean structure, and the bootstrap corrections in the MLE of ϕ greatly reduce the bias in the corrected estimates (Ospina et al., 2006). Thus, we recommend the use of corrected statistics rather than classical MLE to obtain better point estimators.

For the evaluation of interval estimation we calculate the coverage rates (CR) of each of the CI considered, with a significance of 5%. In each Monte Carlo replication we calculated the confidence interval and checked if the CI contains the true parameter or not. The coverage rate is given by the percentage of replications in which the CI contained the parameter. It is desirable that the CR value gets closer to the nominal coverage level 0.95. Here are presented only graphical summaries of the numerical results, considering the average of coverage rates (ACR). Such ACR are calculated from the average of the coverage rates of all parameters of each CI. Thus, we can verify the general behavior of confidence intervals, but not on each parameter independently. In this graphical analysis we lose



(a) βAR(1) model


(b) βMA(1) model

(c) βARMA(1,1) model

Figure 2: Total relative bias of the estimator in several scenarios.

some information, but we gain in interpretability.

Figure 3 shows graphically different ACR for the uncorrected and corrected estimators. In these results the lower distortion of the coverage rate of corrected CI becomes apparent when compared with the usual asymptotic CI. Only the βAR(1) model has reasonable results for the standard confidence interval. These results are in agreement with what is discussed in Inoue and Kilian (2002), where for models composed only for autoregressive parameter, the confidence interval shows good results. In other models the standard confidence intervals showed poor results, suggesting the necessity of corrections. The inferential difficulties on the parameters of the moving averages part are also verified in the classic article of Ansley and Newbold (1980), considering ARMA models. In all models, the bootstrap corrections proved better than the usual interval estimators. It can be concluded that the best corrected confidence interval is the CI_{boot}, once it presented values of coverage rates closer to 0.95 for all parameters in all sample sizes. It should be also noted that among the bootstrap confidence intervals, the CI_u showed the greatest distortion in relation to the cover rates, although it presented less distortion than asymptotic intervals.



(a) βAR(1) model

(b) βMA(1) model

(c) βARMA(1,1) model


Figure 3: Average coverage rates for several confidence intervals in different scenarios.

5 Application

This section presents an application to real data of the βARMA model with the corrected estimators proposed in Section 3. We considered comparisons among the forecast of the corrected βARMA, the uncorrected βARMA, and the classical ARMA model (Box et al., 2008). The data used refer to the percentage of energy stored in southern Brazil, in the period of January 2009 to January 2015, totaling 73 observations (ONS, 2014). The study of the amount of stored energy becomes an important aid to managers in the water resources and electricity areas. Such forecasts are useful to predict problems of lack or accumulation of energy, and could avoid waste. Thus, one can also control the expenses and, consequently, prices (Hong et al., 2014).

An implementation in `R` language (R Development Core Team, 2014) to fit βARMA model with the proposed corrected MLE and diagnostic tools is available at `http://www.ufsm.br/bayer/boot-barma.zip`. The file contains computer codes and also the dataset used in this empirical application.

The series mean equals 0.6955, its standard deviation being equal to 0.2078 and the coefficient of variation being equal to 0.0432. The maximal and minimal values are 0.9789 and 0.3461, respectively. The time series can be



(a) Original series

(b) Histogram

(c) Sampling ACF

(d) Sampling PACF

Figure 4: 0.346 Line chart, histogram and correlograms of the time series of percentage of stored energy.

observed graphically in Figure 4(a), while the histogram of the data is presented in Figure 4(b). The histogram shows an asymmetric behavior of the data distribution, reinforcing that the choice of a model that assumes normality, such as ARMA model, would be inappropriate. The sampling autocorrelation function (ACF) and the sampling partial autocorrelation function (PACF) are shown in Figures 4(c) and 4(d), respectively.

For the model selection it was considered a computationally exhaustive search with the objective of minimizing the Akaike information criterion (AIC) (Akaike, 1974). The search space was restricted to models with orders less than or equal to 6, that is, we considered $0 \leq p \leq 6$ and $0 \leq q \leq 6$. The βARMA$(1,1)$ model presented the lowest AIC value. The logit link function was considered.

Table 4 presents the fit of the selected model, considering the point and interval estimates (with $\alpha = 5\%$) corrected and uncorrected. The corrected CI considered was the CI_{boot}, because it was the CI that presented best numerical results in simulations. Zero does not belong to any 95% level confidence interval, and hence all the parameters are statistically significant at the 5% nominal level. Based on the numerical results, which showed considerable biases of MLE and the effectiveness of the bootstrap correction, it is suggested that the bias-corrected estimates result in a model closer to the unknown population model and, therefore, in a better fitted model.

Figure 5 shows some useful charts of the fitted βARMA$(1,1)$ model with corrected estimators and diagnostic analysis based on the standardized residuals. The investigation of graphical analysis shows acceptable fit, since the

Table 4: βARMA$(1,1)$ model adjusted for the stored energy data, considering corrected and uncorrected estimators.

Adjustments		α	φ_1	θ_1	ϕ
Usual MLE		0.3222	0.5746	2.4871	13.3225
Corrected MLE		0.2713	0.6503	2.4206	12.3485
CI	L	0.1483	0.4844	1.4205	9.0288
	U	0.4961	0.6647	3.5538	17.6162
CI_{boot}	L	0.0090	0.3693	0.6514	0.7387
	U	0.6354	0.7798	4.3229	25.9062

residual correlograms don't show autocorrelation significantly different from zero, the behavior of the standardized residuals is random around zero and within the interval of -3 to 3 and the predicted values are similar to the original data.

Aiming to empirically verify the importance of considering bias-corrected estimators, we carried out comparisons of the models in relation to actual and predicted values. These comparisons were performed by evaluating the mean square error (MSE), the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE) and the mean absolute scaled error (MASE) (Hyndman and Koehler, 2006). The MSE and the MAPE are traditional quality measures of prediction and MASE is indicated for values close to zero (Hyndman and Koehler, 2006). These measures evaluate the difference between the actual value and the predicted value and are defined respectively by:


$$\text{MSE} = \frac{1}{H}\sum_{h=1}^{H}(y_h - \widehat{\mu}_h)^2,$$

$$\text{MAPE} = \frac{1}{H}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\frac{|y_h - \widehat{\mu}_h|}{|y_h|}, \text{ and}$$

$$\text{MASE} = \frac{1}{H}\sum_{h=1}^{H}\left(\frac{|y_h - \widehat{\mu}_h|}{\frac{1}{h-1}\sum_{h=2}^{H}|y_h - y_{h-1}|}\right),$$

where y_h are the observed data, $\widehat{\mu}_h$ are the predicted values and $h = 1,\ldots,H$, with $H = 6$. Such measures were adjusted within and outside the interval of observations used for estimation. The calculation with data outside of the observational period was carried out considering the H last ocurrences reserved from the original data. Table 5 presents the actual and predicted values for the referred months for corrected and uncorrected βARMA models. Indeed, we considered the ARMA(1,1) model for a simple predictive capability comparison. It can be seen that the corrected βARMA model had predicted values closer to the observed data than the other two models. It is also noticeable that MSE, MAPE and MASE measures are smaller when the βARMA with corrected estimators are considered, highlighting the better fit.

Still, within the period analyzed, with 73 observations, the model with corrected estimators demonstrated more accurate results. In this case, the values of MSE, MAPE and MASE were, respectively, 0.0000, 0.1427 and 0.9290 for the βARMA with corrected estimators, 0.0002, 0.1473 and 0.9559 for the uncorrected βARMA model, and



(a) Predicted values (b) Standardized residual

(c) Residual ACF (d) Residual PACF

Figure 5: Charts of the fitted βARMA$(1,1)$ model with bias-corrected estimators.

0.0001, 0.1450 and 0.9556 for the ARMA model. In general, there are improvements in fit and forecasts for the model with corrected estimators. This can also be seen in works that consider another class of time series models, as in Kim (2003) and Kim and Durmaz (2012). The non corrected models demonstrated inferior quality measurements for both inside and outside used intervals fitting modeling. Therefore, the effectiveness of the proposed correction was verified.

6 Conclusions

The ARIMA modeling is commonly used for modeling and forecasting variables over time. However, these models become inappropriate when it is not reasonable to assume normality for the variable of interest y, specially when y belongs in the continuous interval $(0,1)$. For such situations, there is the βARMA model, assuming beta distribution for the variable of interest. The parameters of this model are estimated via maximization of the conditional log-likelihood function. These inferences have good results when the sample size is large, but can lead to inferential distortions in small samples. In the present paper were proposed bootstrap corrections for point and interval small sample inferences in the βARMA model. The evaluation of the corrections considered was developed through Monte

Table 5: Actual and predicted values for the different models.

Months	Observed data	Corrected βARMA	Uncorrected βARMA	Classical ARMA
February (2015)	0.5111	0.6166	0.6185	0.6228
March (2015)	0.3930	0.6411	0.6456	0.6445
April (2015)	0.3416	0.6567	0.6608	0.6593
May (2015)	0.3807	0.6667	0.6694	0.6693
June (2015)	0.6367	0.6730	0.6742	0.6762
July (2015)	0.9676	0.6772	0.6770	0.6808
	MSE	0.0818	0.0851	0.0869
	MAPE	0.4781	0.4841	0.4842
	MASE	1.3424	1.3575	1.3575

Carlo simulations and in an empirical application. The numerical results indicate that the corrected estimates are less biased, decreasing or nullifying the distortion problem in small samples. Moreover, we verified improvement in values of corrected confidence intervals. An application to real data was considered, observing predicted values closer to the actual values observed in the model with corrected estimators. Finally, we suggest the use of bootstrap corrections for small sample inferences in βARMA model.

Acknowledgements

We gratefully acknowledge partial financial support from Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado do Rio Grande do Sul (FAPERGS), Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq), and Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior (CAPES), Brazil.

References

Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, *19*(6), 716–723.

Ansley, C. F., Newbold, P. (1980). Finite sample properties of estimators for autorregressive moving average models. *Journal of Econometrics*, *13*(2), 159–183.

Benjamin, M. A., Rigby, R. A., Stasinopoulos, D. M. (2003). Generalized autoregressive moving average models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *98*(461), 214–223.

Berkowitz, J., Kilian, L. (2000). Recent developments in bootstrapping time series. *Econometric Reviews*, *19*(1), 1–48.

Box, G., Jenkins, G. M., Reinsel, G. (2008). *Time series analysis: forecasting and control*. Hardcover, John Wiley & Sons.

Cordeiro, G. M., Cribari-Neto, F. (2014). *An Introduction to Bartlett Correction and Bias Reduction*. Springer.

Cordeiro, G. M., Klein, R. (1994). Bias correction in ARMA models. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, *19*(3), 169–176.

Cox, D., Snell, E. (1968). A general definition of residuals (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, *30*(B), 248–278.

Cribari-Neto, F., Soares, A. C. N. (2003). Inferência em modelos heterocedásticos. *Revista Brasileira de Economia*, *57*(2), 319–335.

Cribari-Neto, F., Zeileis, A. (2010). Beta regression in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *34*(2).

Davison, A. C., Hinkley, D. V. (1997). *Bootstrap Methods and Their Application*. Cambridge University Press.

Efron, B. (1979). Bootstrap methods: Another look at the jackknife. *The Annals of Statistics*, *7*(1), 1–26.

Efron, B., Tibshirani, R. J. (1994). *An Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability 57.

Ferrari, S. L. P., Cribari-Neto, F. (2004). Beta regression for modelling rates and proportions. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, *31*(7), 799–815.

Ferrari, S. L. P., Pinheiro, E. C. (2011). Improved likelihood inference in beta regression. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, *81*(4), 431–443.

Franco, G. C., Reisen, V. A. (2007). Bootstrap approaches and confidence intervals for stationary and non-stationary long-range dependence processes. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, *375*(2), 546 – 562.

Härdle, W., , J., Horowitz, , Kreiss, J. (2003). Bootstrap methods for time series. *International Statistical Institute*, *71*(2), 435–459.

Hong, T., Pinson, P., Fan, S. (2014). Global energy forecasting competition 2012. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *30*(2), 357–363.

Hyndman, R. J., Koehler, A. B. (2006). Another look at measures of forecast accuracy. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *22*(4), 679–688.

Inoue, A., Kilian, L. (2002). Boostrapping autoregressive processes with possible unit roots. *Econometrica*, *70*(1), 377–391.

Kim, J. H. (2003). Forecasting autoregressive time series with bias-corrected parameter estimators. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *19*(3), 493–502.

Kim, J. H., Durmaz, N. (2012). Bias correction and out-of-sample forecast accuracy. *International Journal of Forecasting*, *28*(3), 575–586.

McCullagh, P., Nelder, J. (1989). *Generalized linear models*, 2nd edn. Chapman and Hall.

ONS (2014). Acompanhamento diário da operação hidroenergética do sistema interligado nacional. URL `http://www.ons.org.br/`.

Ospina, R., Cribari-Neto, F., Vasconcellos, K. L. P. (2006). Improved point and intervalar estimation for a beta regression model. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, *51*(2), 960–981.

Pawitan, Y. (2001). *In All Likelihood: Statistical Modelling and Inference Using Likelihood*. Oxford Science publications.

Politis, D. N. (2003). The impact of bootstrap methods on time series analysis. *Statistical Science*, *18*(2), 219–230.

Press, W., Teukolsky, S., Vetterling, W., Flannery, B. (1992). *Numerical recipes in C: The art of scientific computing*, 2nd edn. Cambridge University Press.

R Development Core Team (2014). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, ISBN 3-900051-07-0.

Rocha, A. V., Cribari-Neto, F. (2009). Beta autoregressive moving average models. *Test*, *18*(3), 529–545.

Appendix

In this appendix, we present the scenarios of simulations that were not discussed in the text. The numerical results of point and interval estimates of the βAR(1), βMA(1) and βARMA(1,1) models, with $\phi = 120$, are presented.

Table 6: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βAR(1) model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\varphi}_1$	$\overline{\varphi}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
			$n = 20$			
Mean	0.991	0.999	−0.484	−0.497	132.552	117.489
Bias	−0.009	−0.001	0.016	0.003	12.552	−2.511
RB	−0.937	−0.052	−3.293	−0.555	10.460	−2.093
SE	0.135	0.151	0.191	0.215	51.500	45.661
MSE	0.018	0.023	0.037	0.046	2809.835	2091.242
			$n = 30$			
Mean	0.996	1.004	−0.496	−0.508	126.536	118.625
Bias	−0.004	0.004	0.004	−0.008	6.536	−1.375
RB	−0.421	0.377	−0.816	1.596	5.447	−1.146
SE	0.110	0.119	0.153	0.167	36.908	34.315
MSE	0.012	0.014	0.023	0.028	1404.938	1179.397
			$n = 50$			
Mean	0.988	0.993	−0.484	−0.491	123.221	119.763
Bias	−0.012	−0.007	0.016	0.009	3.221	−0.237
RB	−1.204	−0.723	−3.285	−1.826	2.684	−0.198
SE	0.086	0.090	0.123	0.130	27.686	26.585
MSE	0.008	0.008	0.015	0.017	776.885	706.818
			$n = 100$			
Mean	0.994	0.997	−0.491	−0.495	119.835	119.197
Bias	−0.006	−0.003	0.009	0.005	−0.165	−0.803
RB	−0.600	−0.305	−1.862	−1.004	−0.137	−0.669
SE	0.059	0.060	0.082	0.084	18.211	17.908
MSE	0.003	0.004	0.007	0.007	331.653	321.338

Table 7: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βMA(1) model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\theta}_1$	$\overline{\theta}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
			$n = 20$			
Mean	−0.997	−0.998	0.647	1.017	132.965	125.316
Bias	0.003	0.002	−0.353	0.017	12.965	5.316
RB	−0.317	−0.181	−35.285	1.708	10.804	4.430
SE	0.056	0.057	1.431	1.554	55.179	52.205
MSE	0.003	0.003	2.172	2.417	3212.765	2753.588
			$n = 30$			
Mean	−0.998	−1.000	0.819	1.036	124.234	121.463
Bias	0.002	0.000	−0.181	0.036	4.234	1.463
RB	−0.154	−0.042	−18.099	3.567	3.528	1.219
SE	0.045	0.045	1.043	1.068	36.102	34.956
MSE	0.002	0.002	1.121	1.141	1321.289	1224.069
			$n = 50$			
Mean	−1.001	−1.002	0.897	0.998	120.438	121.343
Bias	−0.001	−0.002	−0.103	−0.002	0.438	1.343
RB	0.099	0.193	−10.320	−0.240	0.365	1.119
SE	0.036	0.036	0.798	0.787	26.607	26.554
MSE	0.001	0.001	0.648	0.620	708.098	706.913
			$n = 100$			
Mean	−0.998	−0.999	0.954	1.009	117.313	119.987
Bias	0.002	0.001	−0.046	0.009	−2.687	−0.013
RB	−0.155	−0.082	−4.599	0.910	−2.239	−0.011
SE	0.025	0.025	0.515	0.517	17.519	17.861
MSE	0.001	0.001	0.267	0.267	314.152	319.032

Table 8: Results of the Monte Carlo simulation for point estimation in βARMA$(1,1)$ model.

Measures	$\widehat{\alpha}$	$\overline{\alpha}$	$\widehat{\varphi}_1$	$\overline{\varphi}_1$	$\widehat{\theta}_1$	$\overline{\theta}_1$	$\widehat{\phi}$	$\overline{\phi}$
				$n = 20$				
Mean	1.298	1.161	0.350	0.423	−1.183	−1.367	135.242	135.016
Bias	0.298	0.161	−0.150	−0.077	0.317	0.133	15.242	15.016
RB	29.766	16.071	−30.048	−15.393	−21.131	−8.850	12.702	12.514
SE	0.678	0.851	0.346	0.442	4.571	6.356	52.549	60.639
MSE	0.549	0.750	0.143	0.201	20.998	40.410	2993.746	3902.615
				$n = 20$				
Mean	1.278	1.145	0.363	0.431	−0.721	−1.048	130.596	129.497
Bias	0.278	0.145	−0.137	−0.069	0.779	0.452	10.596	9.497
RB	27.815	14.541	−27.300	−13.784	−51.964	−30.111	8.830	7.914
SE	0.615	0.764	0.307	0.383	3.779	4.972	38.917	40.668
MSE	0.455	0.604	0.113	0.151	14.888	24.925	1626.789	1744.050
				$n = 50$				
Mean	1.227	1.095	0.389	0.454	−0.703	−1.129	124.484	123.994
Bias	0.227	0.095	−0.111	−0.046	0.797	0.371	4.484	3.994
RB	22.701	9.453	−22.292	−9.159	−53.110	−24.729	3.737	3.328
SE	0.509	0.594	0.252	0.295	2.825	3.357	27.700	28.962
MSE	0.310	0.362	0.076	0.089	8.613	11.404	787.386	854.771
				$n = 100$				
Mean	1.161	1.047	0.421	0.477	−0.856	−1.295	120.976	121.274
Bias	0.161	0.047	−0.079	−0.023	0.644	0.205	0.976	1.274
RB	16.141	4.689	−15.833	−4.564	−42.916	−13.688	0.813	1.062
SE	0.395	0.450	0.194	0.221	2.077	2.384	17.826	18.069
MSE	0.182	0.204	0.044	0.049	4.727	5.726	318.723	328.099

Table 9: Average coverage rates for several confidence intervals in βAR(1) model.

Intervals	α	φ_1	ϕ
	$n = 20$		
IC	0.947	0.951	0.947
CI_{boot}	0.931	0.938	0.979
CI_u	0.912	0.897	0.967
CI_p	0.964	0.971	0.936
CI_t	0.951	0.952	0.985
	$n = 30$		
IC	0.948	0.955	0.937
CI_{boot}	0.942	0.948	0.969
CI_u	0.924	0.925	0.957
CI_p	0.963	0.968	0.944
CI_t	0.953	0.953	0.975
	$n = 50$		
IC	0.945	0.946	0.936
CI_{boot}	0.942	0.938	0.956
CI_u	0.929	0.920	0.949
CI_p	0.954	0.956	0.940
CI_t	0.951	0.947	0.958
	$n = 100$		
IC	0.958	0.960	0.932
CI_{boot}	0.955	0.958	0.941
CI_u	0.953	0.953	0.943
CI_p	0.962	0.967	0.943
CI_t	0.958	0.960	0.946

Table 10: Average coverage rates for several confidence intervals in βMA(1) model.

Intervals	α	φ_1	ϕ
	$n = 20$		
IC	0.791	0.872	0.926
CI_{boot}	0.895	0.951	0.964
CI_u	0.896	0.936	0.947
CI_p	0.900	0.916	0.924
CI_t	0.913	0.963	0.972
	$n = 30$		
IC	0.815	0.873	0.934
CI_{boot}	0.933	0.946	0.963
CI_u	0.932	0.930	0.957
CI_p	0.935	0.919	0.944
CI_t	0.939	0.957	0.971
	$n = 50$		
IC	0.800	0.874	0.909
CI_{boot}	0.925	0.943	0.932
CI_u	0.927	0.931	0.941
CI_p	0.928	0.920	0.932
CI_t	0.939	0.949	0.936
	$n = 100$		
IC	0.808	0.899	0.916
CI_{boot}	0.944	0.939	0.920
CI_u	0.948	0.943	0.928
CI_p	0.943	0.947	0.919
CI_t	0.949	0.941	0.925

Table 11: Average coverage rates for several confidence intervals in βARMA(1,1) model.

Intervals	α	φ_1	θ_1	ϕ
	$n = 20$			
IC	0.770	0.762	0.690	0.936
CI_{boot}	0.867	0.880	0.884	0.960
CI_u	0.810	0.807	0.816	0.908
CI_p	0.888	0.912	0.935	0.923
CI_t	0.881	0.900	0.903	0.967
	$n = 30$			
IC	0.718	0.710	0.688	0.943
CI_{boot}	0.870	0.877	0.884	0.961
CI_u	0.813	0.814	0.857	0.936
CI_p	0.921	0.932	0.939	0.909
CI_t	0.881	0.888	0.899	0.967
	$n = 50$			
IC	0.718	0.708	0.715	0.932
CI_{boot}	0.905	0.902	0.925	0.947
CI_u	0.864	0.853	0.909	0.936
CI_p	0.930	0.929	0.947	0.933
CI_t	0.910	0.910	0.931	0.952
	$n = 100$			
IC	0.704	0.705	0.718	0.942
CI_{boot}	0.927	0.924	0.934	0.951
CI_u	0.877	0.877	0.907	0.945
CI_p	0.928	0.923	0.889	0.949
CI_t	0.928	0.929	0.934	0.955