

# Variational Bayes Estimation of Discrete-Margined Copula Models with Application to Time Series

Rubén Loaiza-Maya and Michael Stanley Smith

First Version December 2017  
This Version December 23, 2021

Rubén Loaiza-Maya is a PhD student and Michael Smith is Chair of Management (Econometrics), both at Melbourne Business School, University of Melbourne. Correspondence should be directed to Michael Smith at `mike.smith@mbs.edu`.

# Variational Bayes Estimation of Discrete-Margined Copula Models with Application to Time Series

## Abstract

We propose a new variational Bayes estimator for high-dimensional copulas with discrete, or a combination of discrete and continuous, margins. The method is based on a variational approximation to a tractable augmented posterior, and is faster than previous likelihood-based approaches. We use it to estimate drawable vine copulas for univariate and multivariate Markov ordinal and mixed time series. These have dimension  $rT$ , where  $T$  is the number of observations and  $r$  is the number of series, and are difficult to estimate using previous methods. The vine pair-copulas are carefully selected to allow for heteroskedasticity, which is a feature of most ordinal time series data. When combined with flexible margins, the resulting time series models also allow for other common features of ordinal data, such as zero inflation, multiple modes and under- or over-dispersion. Using six example series, we illustrate both the flexibility of the time series copula models, and the efficacy of the variational Bayes estimator for copulas of up to 792 dimensions and 60 parameters. This far exceeds the size and complexity of copula models for discrete data that can be estimated using previous methods.

**Key Words:** Data Augmentation; Drawable vines; Heteroskedasticity; Multivariate ordinal and mixed time series; Sparse variational approximation; Stochastic gradient ascent.

# 1 Introduction

Copula models for  $m$  discrete-valued variables are difficult to estimate because their likelihood involves  $2^m$  evaluations of the copula function, so that it is computationally intractable for even moderate dimensions. To avoid this problem, Pitt et al. (2006) and Smith and Khaled (2012) propose using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) data augmentation, where a tractable augmented likelihood is employed instead. However, this approach becomes slow for copulas with higher dimensions and sample sizes. Gunawan et al. (2016) were the first to suggest using a variational Bayes (VB) estimator as an alternative. Their method — based on that in Tran et al. (2017) and labeled VBIL — uses an unbiased estimate to the intractable likelihood computed using importance sampling. However, as the copula dimension or the number of copula parameters increase, computing the unbiased estimate of the likelihood via importance sampling also makes this method computationally infeasible.

In this paper, we propose a new VB estimator for copulas with a substantially higher dimension and number of parameters than can be estimated by either MCMC data augmentation or VBIL. It uses a variational approximation to the tractable augmented likelihood of Smith and Khaled (2012), instead of the intractable likelihood. We label our method VBDA for ‘variational Bayes data augmentation’, and propose several variational approximations which balance computational efficiency against accuracy. While the new VBDA method is a general approach to estimate large copula models with one or more discrete margins, we employ it here to estimate multivariate times series copula models for ordinal, or a combination of continuous and ordinal (ie. ‘mixed’), time series variables. The models combine arbitrary time-invariant margins with a copula that captures serial and cross-sectional dependence jointly (Beare and Seo, 2015, Smith, 2015). These copulas are challenging to estimate because they have dimension  $rT$ , where  $T$  is the number of time series observations and  $r$  is the number of series. We first show that VBDA is accurate when compared to the exact posterior computed using (much slower) MCMC data augmentation for some univariate ( $r = 1$ ) ordinal time series. We then employ it to estimate multivariate times series copulas, where MCMC cannot be used in practice.

Ordinal time series data arise in many fields, such as criminology (Mohler et al., 2013), marketing (Ravishanker et al., 2016) and finance (Bien et al., 2011, Aktekin et al., 2013). These series often exhibit over- or under-dispersion, multiple modes, truncation and zero-inflation in the margin, along with serial correlation in the level and also conditional variance (ie. heteroskedasticity). There is an extensive literature on models that can capture one or more of these features in univariate series; see Harvey and Fernandes (1989) and Davis et al. (2016) for some examples. In contrast, extension to multiple series is difficult and less common; for examples, see Heinen and Rengifo (2007), Pedeli and Karlis (2011) and Aktekin et al. (2018). In comparison, time series copula models allow

for over- or under-dispersion, multiple modes, truncation and zero inflation in a time series through the choice of an arbitrary margin. They also extend readily to multiple ordinal or mixed time series. However, a major challenge is selecting a high-dimensional copula that can capture both persistence in the mean and heteroskedasticity parsimoniously. To do so, we employ a drawable vine (D-vine) (Aas et al., 2009), which Beare and Seo (2015) and Smith (2015) show is parsimonious for Markov and stationary multivariate time series. Following Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018), the component ‘pair-copulas’ are carefully selected to capture heteroskedasticity in the series. This is important because it is a feature exhibited by most ordinal time series.

Heinen and Rengifo (2007) use low-dimensional copulas to capture cross-sectional dependence between multiple ordinal-valued time series. However, this is different from what we propose here, where we employ intrinsically high-dimensional copulas to capture both serial and cross-sectional dependence jointly. In early work, (Joe, 1997, Sec. 8.2) outlined a copula-based Markov time series model for ordinal data, which Nikoloulopoulos and Mentzakis (2017) extend to multivariate panel data using a low-dimensional elliptical copula to capture contemporaneous cross-sectional dependence. While this model is parsimonious and tractable, it does not allow for direct dependence between lagged values of series. This is often important in the time series modeling of multivariate continuous data, and we find it is also important in our multivariate examples here.

The efficacy of both the VBDA estimator and the proposed copula time series model is illustrated using six example time series. The first three are monthly counts of murder, attempted murder and manslaughter in the Australian state of New South Wales. Univariate time series copula models show that both counts of murder and attempted murder exhibit serial dependence, including heteroskedasticity. When compared to the (effectively exact) posterior computed using MCMC data augmentation, the VBDA estimates prove highly accurate, yet are much faster to compute. The fourth example is a binary-valued time series simulated from an auto-logistic regression with very high serial dependence. This is an extreme test, for which MCMC data augmentation fails, yet VBDA gives good results. The VBDA estimator is then applied to a trivariate time series copula model of the three crime count series. The 792-dimensional copula captures a rich multivariate serial dependence structure, and is difficult to estimate using MCMC data augmentation in reasonable time. The last example illustrates the mixed margin case, where the bivariate serial dependence structure of monthly counts of U.S. bankruptcies and the VIX (which is a continuous-valued index of stock market volatility) is estimated. The marginal distribution of the VIX is highly irregular, making the copula model attractive because it can be modeled nonparametrically. The estimated 658-dimensional copula captures heteroskedasticity in both series, and indicates that the VIX is a leading indicator of U.S. bankruptcies. These copula models cannot be estimated using the VBIL

method as outlined in Gunawan et al. (2016) in reasonable time.

The paper outline is as follows. Section 2 outlines copula models for discrete data, and the D-vine copula for univariate time series. Section 3 presents our new VBDA method, including different variational approximations to the augmented posterior, MCMC data augmentation, and the four univariate examples. Section 4 extends the vine copula model to the case of multiple ordinal time series, and Section 5 to a mixture of ordinal and continuous series. Section 6 concludes.

## 2 Copula Model

### 2.1 Copula with Discrete Margins

Following Sklar (1959), the joint distribution function of a discrete-valued random vector  $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_T)$  can be written as

$$F(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = C(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_T)'$ ,  $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_T)'$ ,  $u_t = G_t(y_t)$ ,  $G_t$  is the marginal distribution function of  $Y_t$ , and  $C$  is a  $T$ -dimensional copula function that captures all dependence in  $\mathbf{Y}$ . In the copula modeling literature it is usual to select a parametric copula for  $C$ , with parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . Because  $Y_t \in S$  for a finite or countably infinite set  $S$ , then  $F$  at Equation (1) is only uniquely defined on its sample space (Genest and Nešlehová, 2007). Nevertheless,  $F$  remains well-defined for any given parametric copula function  $C$ . Let  $b_t = G_t(y_t)$ , and  $a_t = G_t(y_t^-)$  be the left-hand limit of  $G_t$  at  $y_t$ , then the corresponding probability mass function is

$$f(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \Delta_{a_1}^{b_1} \dots \Delta_{a_T}^{b_T} C(\boldsymbol{\omega}|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (2)$$

where the difference notation of (Nelsen, 2006, p. 43) is employed with vector of differencing variables  $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ . Direct computation of Equation (2) is impractical in higher dimensions because it involves evaluation of  $C$  a total of  $2^T$  times. However, following Smith and Khaled (2012), likelihood-based estimation can be undertaken by introducing a latent vector  $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_T)'$ , such that  $(\mathbf{Y}', \mathbf{U})'$  have augmented density

$$f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t), \quad (3)$$

with copula density  $c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{\partial^T}{\partial u_1, \dots, \partial u_T} C(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , and the indicator variable  $\mathcal{I}(X) = 1$  if  $X$  is true, and  $\mathcal{I}(X) = 0$  otherwise. (Note that an alternative notation to the indicator function here is  $\delta_{y_t}(G_t^-(u_t))$ , which is a Dirac mass at  $G_t^-(u_t)$ , with  $G_t^-$  the quantile function of  $Y_t$ .) The margin in  $\mathbf{y}$  of Equation (3) is the required mass function at Equation (2).

When there are multiple independent observations on  $\mathbf{Y}$ , as with the cross-sectional and longitudinal datasets considered in Smith and Khaled (2012), then the augmented likelihood is the product

of Equation (3) over the observations. For the time series case that is the focus of this paper, the augmented likelihood is given directly by Equation (3).

Last, we note that throughout the paper we denote copula densities with a ‘ $c$ ’, and density/mass functions that are posteriors with ‘ $p$ ’, variational approximations with ‘ $q$ ’, and all others with ‘ $f$ ’.

## 2.2 Time Series Copula

We consider the case where  $\{Y_t\}$  is a strongly stationary ordinal-valued stochastic process with Markov order  $p$ . Then  $G_t$  is time invariant and can be written as  $G$ , and the main challenge in using the copula model at Equation (1) is the selection of  $C$  to capture the serial dependence in the series. We note that ordinal time series usually exhibit persistence in both the mean and variance, so that  $C$  should capture this feature. To do so, we adopt a D-vine copula (Aas et al., 2009) with pair-copula components carefully selected to capture persistence in the first two moments.

In general, a D-vine copula density is equal to the product of  $T(T-1)/2$  bivariate copula densities called pair-copulas. However, when the series has Markov order  $p$ , the number of pair-copulas is much smaller. Moreover, when the series is also stationary, the number of unique pair-copulas is equal to the Markov order  $p$  (Beare and Seo, 2015, Smith, 2015). For  $s < t$ , by denoting  $u_{t|s} = F(u_t|u_s, \dots, u_{t-1})$ ,  $u_{s|t} = F(u_s|u_{s+1}, \dots, u_t)$  and  $u_{t|t} = u_t$ , this parsimonious D-vine copula density is

$$\begin{aligned} c^{DV}(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= \prod_{t=2}^T f(u_t|u_{\max(1,t-p)}, \dots, u_{t-1}) \\ &= \prod_{t=2}^T \prod_{k=1}^{\min(t-1,p)} c_{k+1}(u_{t-k|t-1}, u_{t|t-k+1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{p+1}\}$  and  $c_2, \dots, c_{p+1}$  are the pair-copula densities. Given  $\mathbf{u}$ , the arguments  $\{u_{t|s}, u_{s|t}; t = 2, \dots, T, s < t\}$  are computed using the recursive Algorithm 1 in Smith (2015).

Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018) show that  $c^{DV}$  is able to capture persistence in the variance if one or more  $c_k$  allows for concentration of the probability mass in the four quadrants of the unit square. To do so they suggest the following mixture of rotated copulas:

$$c^{MIX}(u, v; \boldsymbol{\gamma}) = wc^a(u, v; \boldsymbol{\gamma}^a) + (1-w)c^b(1-u, v; \boldsymbol{\gamma}^b), \quad 0 \leq w \leq 1. \quad (5)$$

Here,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \{\boldsymbol{\gamma}^a, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^b, w\}$ ,  $0 \leq w \leq 1$  is a weight, and  $c^a, c^b$  are two parametric bivariate copula densities with non-negative Kendall’s tau and parameters  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^a$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^b$  respectively. In our empirical work, for the mixture components  $c^a$  and  $c^b$  we employ the ‘convex Gumbel’ defined as follows. Let  $c^G(u, v; \tau)$  be the density of a Gumbel copula parameterized (uniquely) in terms of its Kendall tau value  $0 \leq \tau < 0.99$ . (Note that we bound  $\tau$  away from 1 to enhance numerical stability of the D-vine copula.) Then the convex Gumbel has a density  $c^{cG}$  equal to the convex combination of that of the

Gumbel and its rotation 180 degrees (ie. the survival copula), so that

$$c^{cG}(u, v; \tau, \delta) = \delta c^G(u, v; \tau) + (1 - \delta) c^G(1 - u, 1 - v; \tau),$$

with  $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$ . When employed for  $c^a$  and  $c^b$  in Equation (5), it gives a five parameter bivariate copula with  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^a = (\delta^a, \tau^a)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^b = (\delta^b, \tau^b)$ , and a density  $c^{MIX}$  that is equal to a mixture of all four 90 degree rotations of the Gumbel copula. We use independent uniform priors on the elements of  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  in our empirical work.

To measure the level of serial dependence captured by our copula model, we use the Spearman's correlation between  $Y_s$  and  $Y_t$  for  $s < t$ . Following Genest and Nešlehová (2007), for ordinal-valued variables this is

$$\rho_k = 3 \sum_{y_s \in S} \sum_{y_t \in S} g(y_s) g(y_t) (\bar{C}_k(b_s, b_t) + \bar{C}_k(b_s, a_t) + \bar{C}_k(a_s, b_t) + \bar{C}_k(a_s, a_t)) - 3,$$

where  $\bar{C}_k$  is the copula function of the distribution of  $(Y_s, Y_t)$ , which only varies with  $k = t - s$  when  $Y_t$  is stationary (Smith, 2015). This copula  $\bar{C}_k$  is constructed by simulating (many) draws of  $\mathbf{u}$  from  $c^{DV}$  using Algorithm 2 in Smith (2015), and then constructing the bivariate empirical copula from the draws of elements  $(u_s, u_{s+k})$ .

### 3 Bayesian Estimation

From Equation (3), the augmented posterior density is

$$p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y}) = \frac{f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta})}{f(\mathbf{y})} = \left( c(\mathbf{u} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) \right) / f(\mathbf{y}), \quad (6)$$

where  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is the prior and  $f(\mathbf{y})$  is the marginal likelihood. The augmented posterior above admits  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y})$  as one of its margins, and is tractable (up to proportionality). Smith and Khaled (2012) propose a MCMC data augmentation method for its (effectively exact) evaluation. However, this MCMC scheme is generally slow, and computationally infeasible for high-dimensional copulas. Variational Bayes (VB) is an alternative inferential method to MCMC, with both methods typically applicable to the same problems. Here, we use the augmented posterior above to develop a new VB estimator for  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y})$ .

#### 3.1 Variational Bayes Estimator

VB makes possible the estimation of copula models with discrete margins, even for copulas in high dimensions and with a large number of parameters. Here,  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y})$  is approximated by a tractable density  $q_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , called the variational approximation. Estimation consists of

finding values of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  that minimize the Kullback-Leibler divergence

$$\text{KL}(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) || p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y})) = \int \log \left( \frac{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})}{p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y})} \right) q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\mathbf{u}.$$

This can be shown (Jordan et al., 1999, Ormerod and Wand, 2010) to correspond to maximizing the lower bound of the logarithm of the marginal likelihood  $\log p(\mathbf{y})$ , given by

$$\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \int \log \left( \frac{p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u} | \boldsymbol{\theta})}{q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})} \right) q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} d\mathbf{u}.$$

In selecting  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ , it is common to assume independence between some or all parameters (McGrory and Titterton 2007, Wand et al., 2011), and we do so here between  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  and  $\mathbf{U}$ . The variational approximation we use has density

$$q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) = q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b}(\mathbf{u}), \quad (7)$$

where the density  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}$  has parameters  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$ , the density  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b}$  has support on  $[a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times [a_T, b_T)$  and parameters  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^b\}$ . The key to the success of our method is the specification of  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}$  and  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b}$ , which we discuss in detail later.

We follow Paisley et al. (2012), Nott et al. (2012), Hoffman et al. (2013), Ranganath et al. (2014) and others and use stochastic gradient ascent (SGA) methods to maximize  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ . This approach only requires that (i) generation from  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  is possible, and that (ii) the target distribution is tractable and can be evaluated up to proportionality. Condition (i) is met by our choices for  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}$  and  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^b}$  outlined below. Condition (ii) is met because the augmented posterior is tractable, whereas  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y})$  based on Equation (2) is not. To implement SGA, initial values for the parameters,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$ , are selected and then the lower bound is sequentially optimized by values  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(2)}, \dots$  obtained by the updating formula

$$\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k+1)} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)} + \rho^{(k)} \widehat{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)})}.$$

Here,  $\widehat{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)})}$  is an unbiased estimate of the lower bound's gradient  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)})$ , and  $\rho^{(k)}$  is the learning rate, set using the ADADELTA method described in the Appendix A. To compute the gradient, SGA methods resort to the "log-derivative trick" ( $E_q(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})) = 0$ ), and show that

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = E_q(\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) \{ \log h(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) - \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) \}) , \quad (8)$$

with  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y}) \propto f(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = h(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$ , and  $E_q$  is the expectation with respect to  $q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$ . Notice from Equation (8) that an unbiased estimate is  $\widehat{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})} = (g_{\lambda_1}, \dots, g_{\lambda_m})'$ , where

$$g_{\lambda_i} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S (\log h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s, \mathbf{u}_s) - \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s, \mathbf{u}_s)) \nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s, \mathbf{u}_s) ,$$

with  $m$  as the number of elements in  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ . An advantage of our choice of variational approximation is that the  $i$ th element of the gradient  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  simplifies to  $\nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) = \nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) +$



$\nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u})$ . For  $s = 1, \dots, S$ , the values  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_s \sim q_{\lambda^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  and  $\mathbf{u}_s = (u_{1,s}, \dots, u_{T,s}) \sim q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u})$  on  $[a_1, b_1) \times \dots \times [a_T, b_T)$ .

Algorithm 1 presents how the SGA optimization works within variational Bayes. Step (1b) is based on the work by Tran et al. (2017), which employs a vector of control variates,  $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ , for variance reduction of the unbiased estimate of the gradient. The stopping rule is commonly set as a fixed number of SGA steps taken (Ong et al., 2017).

---

Initialize  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(0)}$  and set  $k = 0$ .

1. (a) Generate  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}_s^{(k)}) \sim q_{\lambda^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  for  $s = 1, \dots, S$

(b) Estimate  $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}^{(k)} = (\varsigma_1^{(k)}, \dots, \varsigma_m^{(k)})'$  with

$$\varsigma_i^{(k)} = \frac{\text{Cov}([\log h(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}) - \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})] \nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}), \nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}))}{\text{Var}(\nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u}))}$$

$\text{Cov}(\cdot)$  and  $\text{Var}(\cdot)$  are sample estimates of covariance and variance based on the  $S$  samples from step (a).

(c)  $k = k + 1$ .

2. Repeat until some stopping rule is satisfied

(a) Generate  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}_s^{(k)}) \sim q_{\lambda^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  for  $s = 1, \dots, S$

(b) Compute  $\widehat{\nabla_{\lambda} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)})} = (g_{\lambda_1}^{(k)}, \dots, g_{\lambda_m}^{(k)})'$  with

$$g_{\lambda_i}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{S} \sum_{s=1}^S \left( \log h(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}_s^{(k)}) - \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}_s^{(k)}) - \varsigma_i^{(k-1)} \right) \nabla_{\lambda_i} \log q_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_s^{(k)}, \mathbf{u}_s^{(k)})$$

(c) Estimate  $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}^{(k)} = (\varsigma_1^{(k)}, \dots, \varsigma_m^{(k)})'$  as in Step 1(b).

(d) Compute  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)}$  using the ADADELTA method.

(e) Set  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k+1)} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)} + \Delta \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)}$ .

(f)  $k = k + 1$

---

**Algorithm 1:** Variational Bayes estimation algorithm with control variates and ADADELTA learning rate for an the augmented posterior.

### 3.2 Variational Approximation

Key to developing an effective VB estimator is the selection of  $q_{\lambda^a}$  and  $q_{\lambda^b}$  in Equation (7) that balance tractability and accuracy. We first outline three choices for  $q_{\lambda^b}$ , after which we then detail that for  $q_{\lambda^a}$ .

### 3.2.1 Approximation for $\mathbf{U}$

To guide our choice for  $q_{\lambda^b}$ , we derive the marginal posterior of  $\mathbf{U}$  in Theorem 1.

**Theorem 1** *If  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{U})$  have the augmented posterior density function at Equation (6), then:*

(a) *The joint density  $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}) = \tilde{c}(\mathbf{u}) \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) / f(\mathbf{y})$ , where  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{u}) = \int c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$  is a copula density and  $f(\mathbf{y})$  is the marginal likelihood; and,*

(b) *the marginal density  $p(u_t|\mathbf{y}) \propto \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) \int A(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta})p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})d\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , where*

$$A(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \Delta_{a_1}^{b_1} \cdots \Delta_{a_{t-1}}^{b_{t-1}} \Delta_{a_{t+1}}^{b_{t+1}} \cdots \Delta_{a_T}^{b_T} H(v_1, \dots, v_{t-1}, u_t, v_{t+1}, \dots, v_T|\boldsymbol{\theta}),$$

$$H(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})d\mathbf{u}_{s \neq t} \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_{s \neq t} = (u_1, \dots, u_{t-1}, u_{t+1}, \dots, u_T).$$

**Proof:** See Appendix B.

We make two observations on the posterior of  $\mathbf{U}$ . First, if the elements of  $\mathbf{Y}$  are independent, then  $\tilde{c}(\mathbf{u}) = 1$  is the density of an independence copula, and  $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}) \propto \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t)$ , so that each element is independent uniform. Second, as  $(b_t - a_t) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $t$ , then  $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}) \xrightarrow{d} \prod_{t=1}^T \delta_{u_t}(a_t)$ . That is, as the data  $\mathbf{Y}$  becomes ‘closer to continuous’, the posterior approaches a degenerate distribution with point mass at  $\mathbf{u} = (a_1, \dots, a_T)'$ .

Armed with these observations, our first choice is simply independent uniforms:

$$\text{VA1: } q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{b_t - a_t} \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t), \text{ so that } \boldsymbol{\lambda}^b = \emptyset.$$

We expect VA1 to be more accurate for data with low dependence (although we find it still works well for even quite dependent data). The next two approximations are based on normal distributions for a transformation of  $\mathbf{U}$ . Let  $Z_t = \Phi^{-1}((U_t - a_t)/(b_t - a_t))$ , and  $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_T)' \sim N(\boldsymbol{\eta}, \Omega)$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_T)'$  and  $\Phi$  the standard normal distribution function. The Jacobian of this transformation is  $J_{\mathbf{Z} \rightarrow \mathbf{U}} = \prod_{t=1}^T ((b_t - a_t)\phi(z_t))^{-1}$ , with  $\phi$  the standard normal density and  $z_t = \Phi^{-1}((u_t - a_t)/(b_t - a_t))$ . Our second choice for  $q_{\lambda^b}$  assumes  $\Omega = \text{diag}(\omega_1^2, \dots, \omega_T^2)$ , so that

$$\text{VA2: } q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{t=1}^T \frac{\phi_1(z_t; \eta_t, \omega_t^2)}{(b_t - a_t)\phi(z_t)}, \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\lambda}^b = \{\boldsymbol{\eta}, \log \omega_1, \dots, \log \omega_T\},$$

and  $\phi_1(z_t; \eta_t, \omega_t^2)$  is the density of a  $N(\eta_t, \omega_t^2)$  distribution evaluated at  $z_t$ . Note that VA2 nests VA1. We find this an effective mean field approximation that is accurate for a wide range of data, and very fast to work with.

For  $\mathbf{Y}$  that exhibits extreme dependence, our third choice allows for the elements of  $\mathbf{U}$  to be dependent<sup>1</sup> by adopting a non-diagonal (but sparse) precision matrix  $\Omega^{-1}$ . For time series copulas,

---

<sup>1</sup>We are grateful to an anonymous referee who suggested that this may be an important consideration.

we set  $\Omega^{-1} = LL'$ , with  $L$  a band one lower triangular Cholesky factor. This corresponds to an approximation  $q_{\lambda^b}$  with the dependence structure of a (non-stationary) first order Markov process for  $\{U_t\}$ . The density

$$\text{VA3: } q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \frac{\phi_T(\mathbf{z}; \boldsymbol{\eta}, (LL')^{-1})}{\prod_{t=1}^T (b_t - a_t) \phi(z_t)}, \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\lambda}^b = \{\boldsymbol{\eta}, L\},$$

where only the free elements of  $L$  are variational parameters. If the lower triangular first band of  $L$  contains only zeros, then VA3 reduces to VA2. Both approximations are fast to generate from by first generating  $\mathbf{z}$  from normals, and then transforming to  $\mathbf{u}$ . The gradients  $\nabla_{\lambda^b} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u})$  required to implement Steps 1(b) and 2(b) of Algorithm 1 are available in closed form; see Appendix C.

Note, as  $(b_t - a_t) \rightarrow 0$  for all  $t$ , all three approximations become exact. The accuracy of  $q_{\lambda^b}$  is important because it can also increase the accuracy of the variational approximation of  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})$ .

### 3.2.2 Approximation for $\theta$

Denoting the number of parameters in  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  as  $n$ , the most popular choice for  $q_{\lambda^a}$  is the density of a  $N(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$  distribution, because it is quick to generate from and the gradient  $\nabla_{\lambda^a} \log q_{\lambda^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is available in closed form (Oppen and Archambeau 2009, Challis and Barber 2013, Titsias and Lázaro-Gredilla 2014, Kucukelbir et al. 2016, Salimans et al. 2013). To ensure  $\Sigma$  is positive definite,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$  is typically a convenient re-parametrization of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\Sigma$ . In applications where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  has a large number of elements, a sparse representation of  $\Sigma$  helps to improve the accuracy of the gradient estimate and its speed of computation. We follow Ong et al. (2017), who suggest the factor representation of the covariance matrix  $\Sigma = B'B + D$ , where the matrix  $B$  is of dimension  $n \times K$ ,  $K$  is the number of factors and  $K \ll n$ . All the elements in the upper triangle of  $B$  are set to zero.  $D$  is a  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix such that  $D_{i,i} = d_i^2$ , where  $d_i$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  element of the vector  $\mathbf{d}$ . Ong et al. (2017) derives the gradient for this case, and shows it is fast to compute; see also Appendix C. In our empirical work, we compare the accuracy of the approximations for various values of  $K$  and find low values adequate.

### 3.2.3 Discussion of Alternative VB Approximations

Gunawan et al. (2016) suggest using an unbiased estimator of the intractable likelihood in Equation (2) computed using importance sampling. This involves drawing  $N_{IS}$  values of  $\mathbf{u}$ , at which  $c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is repeatedly evaluated. Whenever evaluating the copula density is computationally intensive — such as for  $c^{DV}$  here or with other high-dimensional or complex copulas — this will be many times slower than our approach.

Variational approximations to posteriors augmented with latent variables have proven successful in a number of other models; see Tan and Nott (2017), Hui et al. (2017) and Ong et al. (2017) for some recent examples. However, Neville et al. (2014) and others observe that assuming independence

between the latent variables in such an approximation may lead to poor inference in some circumstances. This motivates VA3, although in our empirical work VA2 proves almost as accurate and several times faster. Key to using VA3 for other copula models is the adoption of an appropriate parsimonious matrix  $\Omega$ , or its inverse. Last, we mention it is also possible to employ a Gaussian approximation with factor covariance structure for the vector  $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{Z})$ . This may improve the accuracy of the approximation for some copulas, but will introduce an extra  $KT$  variational parameters (ie. the extra factor loadings), slowing estimation down substantially. Our empirical work suggests that our proposed variational approximations strike a balance between computation time and accuracy.

### 3.3 Data Augmentation

We now outline MCMC data augmentation, tailored for the parsimonious D-vine copula in Section 2.2. Key to implementation is the evaluation of the conditional densities and distribution functions below. If  $t_0 = \max(t - p, 1)$  and  $t > 1$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} f(u_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1}) &= \prod_{k=1}^{\min(t-1, p)} c_{k+1}(u_{t-k}|u_{t-1}, u_{t|t-k+1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{k+1}) \text{ and} \\ F(u_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1}) &= h_{t_0, t} \circ h_{t_0+1, t} \circ \dots \circ h_{t-1, t}(u_t), \end{aligned}$$

where  $h_{s, t}(u) = h_{t-s+1}^1(u|u_{s|t-1}) = \frac{\partial}{\partial v} C_{t-s+1}(v, u) \Big|_{v=u_{s|t-1}}$  is the conditional pair-copula function. This is given in Appendix C1 of Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018) for the mixture copula defined at Equation (5).

The values  $\mathbf{u}$  are integrated out of the augmented posterior as part of an MCMC sampling scheme. The scheme generates from the conditional posteriors (1)  $p(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ , and (2)  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{u})$ . Given the values  $\mathbf{u}$ , step (2) can be undertaken using (adaptive) random walk Metropolis-Hastings (MH), where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_k$  is generated conditional on  $\{\boldsymbol{\theta} \setminus \boldsymbol{\theta}_k\}$  for  $k = 2, \dots, p+1$ . However, step (1) is more involved, with the latent variables  $\mathbf{u}$  generated jointly using a MH step. Smith and Khaled (2012) suggest using the proposal density  $\pi(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{t=2}^T \pi_t(u_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1})\pi_1(u_1)$ , where  $\pi_1(u_1) = \mathcal{I}(a_1 \leq u_1 < b_1)/(b_1 - a_1)$  and

$$\pi_t(u_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1}) \propto \frac{f(u_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1})\mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t)}{F(b_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1}) - F(a_t|u_{t_0}, \dots, u_{t-1})}.$$

Therefore, a proposal iterate  $\mathbf{u}^{\text{new}}$  can be obtained from  $\pi(\mathbf{u})$  by generating sequentially from the univariate densities  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_T$ . Each of these is a constrained univariate distribution with known distribution function, so that iterates can be generated easily using the inverse distribution method. An advantage of the proposal  $\pi$  is that the MH acceptance ratio is fast to compute. The probability of accepting  $\mathbf{u}^{\text{new}} = (u_1^{\text{new}}, \dots, u_T^{\text{new}})$  over the previous value  $\mathbf{u}^{\text{old}} = (u_1^{\text{old}}, \dots, u_T^{\text{old}})$  is

$$\min \left( 1, \prod_{t=2}^T \frac{F(b_t|u_{t_0}^{\text{new}}, \dots, u_{t-1}^{\text{new}}) - F(a_t|u_{t_0}^{\text{new}}, \dots, u_{t-1}^{\text{new}})}{F(b_t|u_{t_0}^{\text{old}}, \dots, u_{t-1}^{\text{old}}) - F(a_t|u_{t_0}^{\text{old}}, \dots, u_{t-1}^{\text{old}})} \right).$$

In general, this proposal works well. However, for challenging high-dimensional copulas with highly dependent binary-valued data  $\mathbf{Y}$ , we find that the acceptance rate for this step can be prohibitively low and the MCMC scheme can get stuck. We illustrate this empirically below. Throughout, we employ a burnin sample of 10,000 iterates, followed by a further 20,000 iterates from which we comp




Figure 1: Time series plots and relative frequency histograms of the four univariate ordinal time series. The four rows correspond (from top to bottom) to the Murder, Attempted Murder, Manslaughter and Auto-Logistic examples.

### 3.4 Examples

We illustrate the copula time series model, and the efficacy of the VB estimator, using four univariate time series examples. The first three are  $T = 264$  monthly counts of the crimes of Murder, Attempted

		$\tau^a > 0$	$\delta^a$	$\tau^b > 0$	$\delta^b$	$w$	Kendall's $\tau$
Murder	$c_2$	0.141	0.313	0.219	0.523	0.743	0.065
		(0.04,0.34)	(0.02,0.76)	(0.01,0.81)	(0.06,0.95)	(0.22,0.99)	(0.00,0.13)
	$c_3$	0.161	0.610	0.190	0.516	0.782	0.097
		(0.06,0.34)	(0.14,0.97)	(0.00,0.75)	(0.06,0.95)	(0.27,0.99)	(0.03,0.17)
	$c_4$	0.150	0.318	0.154	0.477	0.706	0.072
		(0.04,0.35)	(0.02,0.83)	(0.00,0.63)	(0.04,0.94)	(0.22,0.99)	(0.01,0.14)
Attempted Murder	$c_2$	0.354	0.560	0.327	0.436	0.952	0.328
		(0.27,0.43)	(0.17,0.91)	(0.01,0.89)	(0.04,0.93)	(0.84,0.99)	(0.24,0.41)
	$c_3$	0.227	0.771	0.232	0.541	0.876	0.180
		(0.15,0.33)	(0.46,0.98)	(0.01,0.78)	(0.07,0.95)	(0.60,0.99)	(0.12,0.25)
	$c_4$	0.155	0.676	0.225	0.512	0.810	0.099
		(0.05,0.29)	(0.21,0.97)	(0.01,0.75)	(0.05,0.95)	(0.33,0.99)	(0.03,0.17)
Manslaughter	$c_2$	0.195	0.484	0.208	0.491	0.628	0.052
		(0.03,0.50)	(0.04,0.94)	(0.01,0.69)	(0.05,0.94)	(0.12,0.97)	(-0.03,0.13)
	$c_3$	0.173	0.389	0.224	0.524	0.688	0.061
		(0.02,0.50)	(0.03,0.90)	(0.01,0.83)	(0.07,0.96)	(0.09,0.98)	(-0.01,0.14)
	$c_4$	0.170	0.431	0.180	0.512	0.665	0.062
		(0.03,0.42)	(0.04,0.91)	(0.01,0.66)	(0.05,0.94)	(0.14,0.98)	(-0.01,0.14)

Table 1: Posterior means of the pair-copula parameters for the D-vines fit to the three univariate crime count time series, computed using MCMC data augmentation. Each pair-copula is a mixture of two convex Gumbels, and the final column reports the posterior mean of the overall Kendall's  $\tau$  of each pair-copula.

Murder and Manslaughter in the Australian state of New South Wales (NSW) between January 1995 and December 2016. The data is sourced from the NSW Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research. The fourth is  $T = 200$  observations simulated from an auto-logistic regression with  $\Pr(Y_t = 1|y_{t-1}) = \text{logit}^{-1}(-2.197 + 4.394y_{t-1})$ . This last example is challenging because (i) the series is short, (ii) the data are binary-valued, (iii) there is very strong serial dependence, and (iv) there are many more 1's. Figure 1 gives the relative frequency histograms and time series plots of the four series.

We set  $p = 3$ , and fit the copula using  $c^{MIX}$  pair-copula components for  $c_2$ ,  $c_3$  and  $c_4$ . For  $c^a$  and  $c^b$  we chose convex Gumbels, so that  $\theta_k = \{\tau_k^a, \delta_k^a, \tau_k^b, \delta_k^b, w_k\}$  for  $k = 2, 3, 4$ . This  $T$ -dimensional D-vine copula has a total of  $n = 15$  parameters. We set  $G$  to the empirical distribution functions in Figure 1. To estimate the copula parameters we first use MCMC data augmentation to compute the exact posterior as outlined in Section 3.3. For the three crime series, between 22% and 71% of MH proposals were accepted, but for the Auto-Logistic example the sampler became stuck, and estimation failed. For the crime series, Table 1 reports the posterior means and intervals of the copula parameters. To summarize the serial dependence captured by the copula, Table 2 reports the posterior of the Spearman correlations  $\rho_k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, 3$  for the three crimes. Correlation

is strong for Attempted Murder, but not for Murder and Manslaughter. However, this measures correlation in the level of the series, and not more general dependence, such as in higher order moments. Figure 2 presents the log-densities of the pair-copulas at the posterior mean values. Most of these copula densities are far from uniform, indicating more general serial dependence exists in these series. The pair-copulas have probability mass in the off-diagonal corners of the unit square, which Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018) show is indicative of serial correlation in conditional variance (ie.




Figure 2: Log-density functions of the pair-copulas at the MCMC posterior mean parameter values for the univariate copula models fit to the three crime series. Columns one to three correspond to the pair-copulas  $c_2$ ,  $c_3$  and  $c_4$  respectively. Rows one to three correspond to Murder, Attempted Murder and Manslaughter, respectively



	$\rho_1$	$\rho_2$	$\rho_3$
Murder	0.094 (-0.01,0.19)	0.152** (0.05,0.25)	0.128** (0.03,0.22)
Attempted Murder	0.458*** (0.34,0.56)	0.427*** (0.33,0.52)	0.382*** (0.28,0.48)
Manslaughter	0.057 (-0.026,0.14)	0.073 (-0.01,0.16)	0.076 (-0.00,0.16)

Table 2: The posterior means of the pairwise Spearman correlations  $\rho_k$ , for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ , from the univariate time series copula models fit to the three monthly crime count time series. Correlations with approximate posterior intervals that do not contain zero at the 10%, 5% and 1% level are denoted with ‘\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*\*\*’, respectively. The values are computed via simulation from the vine copula, as outlined in Section 2.2.

The four D-vines were also estimated using VBDA. Because all parameters are bounded between 0 and 1, we transform them to the real line as  $\theta_k = \{\psi(\tau_k^a), \psi(\delta_k^a), \psi(\tau_k^b), \psi(\delta_k^b), \psi(w_k)\}$ , where  $\psi(a) = \log(\frac{a}{1-a})$ . Estimation was implemented separately for approximations VA1, VA2 and VA3, with  $K = 0, \dots, 15$  factors. Each estimator used 5000 SGA steps, and  $S = 500$  to estimate the gradient. The initial values for  $\lambda$  are  $\{B = 0, D = \sqrt{0.1}I_n, \mu = \mu_0, \eta = \mathbf{0}, L = I_n\}$ , where  $\mu_0$  is set to values where the pair-copulas are all independence pair-copulas. These initial values are used in all our empirical work, although the results are robust to changes in them. Figure 3(a,c,e,g) shows how the lower bound increases with  $K$ , and any increase is small for  $K \geq 3$ . Figure 3(b,c,f,h) plots the lower bound against SGA step when  $K = 3$ , suggesting that the SGA algorithm converges within 1000 steps in every case. For the three crime series, the lower bounds of VA2 and VA3 are almost indistinguishable. For the challenging Auto-Logistic example, VA3 — which allows for dependence in the latent variables — dominates. However, it is difficult to determine how much of the higher lower bound values are attributable to an increase in the accuracy of  $q_{\lambda^a}$ , as opposed to  $q_{\lambda^b}$ . Nevertheless, plots of the pair-copula densities (see Supplementary Materials) for each of VA1, VA2 and VA3 suggest that VA3 provides a meaningful improvement over VA1 and VA2. These also show the VBDA estimates suggest the series has Markov order one, and high serial dependence; which correspond to the known data generating process.

To illustrate the accuracy of VBDA for the three crime series, Figure 4 plots the posterior means and standard deviations of  $\theta$  from the preferred approximation (VA2 with  $K = 3$ ) against their (effectively exact) values computed via MCMC. Both moments of the VB approximations are close to those of the true posterior. Similar plots for VA1 and VA3 (see Supplementary Materials) suggest these are also reasonable approximations. The first three rows in Table 3 present the copula specifications and total estimation times for MCMC and VBDA for all examples. The computa-






Figure 3: Variational lower bound values  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  for the VBDA estimators of the univariate time series copula models. From top to bottom, the rows correspond to the Murder, Attempted Murder, Manslaughter and Auto-Logistic examples. The first column plots  $\mathcal{L}$  at the estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , against the number of factors  $K$  in the factor decomposition of  $\Sigma$ . The second column plots  $\mathcal{L}$  against VB step for the case of  $K = 3$  factors. In each panel, results are given for the VA1 (blue line), VA2 (red line) and VA3 (orange line) approximations.




Figure 4: Comparison of the parameter posterior means and standard deviations from the MCMC and VBDA methods for the three crime count time series. The first row compares the posterior means, while the second row the posterior standard deviations. Each column corresponds to a different crime series. VBDA was implemented with approximation VA2 and  $K = 3$  factors. Equivalent plots for VA1 and VA3 can be found in the Supplementary Material.

tions were undertaken on a Dell Precision workstation using Matlab, and in parallel using 8 workers for key computations for both estimators. The results show that VBDA is many times faster than MCMC data augmentation. Moreover, the main computation of the VBDA estimator is the repeated evaluation of  $h$  at Step 2(b). This is slow because computing the arguments of the pair-copulas is computationally intensive, and the VBDA method proves even faster for simpler copulas.

## 4 Multivariate Ordinal Time Series

In this section we extend the time series copula to capture the dependence in multiple ordinal-valued series.

Example	Copula	No. of Pair-Copulas	No. of Parameters	Time VBDA			Time MCMC
	Dimension			VA1	VA2	VA3	
Murder	264	3	15	0.75 h	0.83 h	2.30 h	13.85 h
Attempted Murder	264	3	15	0.76 h	0.83 h	2.32 h	14.51 h
Manslaughter	264	3	15	0.75 h	0.83 h	2.32 h	14.66 h
Auto-Logistic	200	3	15	0.62 h	0.68 h	1.53 h	Failed
Homicide	792	12	60	3.89 h	4.10 h	16.26 h	—
Bankruptcy/VIX	658	9	45	3.50 h	3.56 h	5.88 h	—

Table 3: Copula model specifications and estimation times for the six examples. The first four examples are univariate time series models, ‘Homicide’ is the trivariate time series model in Section 4.2, and ‘Bankruptcy/VIX’ is the bivariate time series model in Section 5.2. The dimension of the D-vine copula, the number of unique pair-copulas, and the number of unique copula parameters, are reported. The total times to estimate each model using our Matlab implementation (using 8 workers) are reported in hours. The MCMC estimates are based on 30000 sweeps, while the VBDA estimates are based on 5000 steps,  $S = 500$  and  $K = 3/15$  for the univariate/multivariate examples. Computation times for MCMC estimation of the multivariate time series are excessive and unreported, while the MCMC sampler failed to converge for the Auto-Logistic example.

## 4.1 Copula Model and Estimation

Consider an  $r$ -dimensional stationary stochastic process  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}$ , where  $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{1,t}, \dots, Y_{r,t})'$ , and each element  $Y_{i,t}$  is ordinal-valued with margin  $G_i$ . We assume a time series copula model with  $Tr$ -dimensional copula function. Then if  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_T)'$  and  $\mathbf{y}_t = (y_{1,t}, \dots, y_{r,t})'$ , we estimate it using the augmented likelihood

$$f(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) = c(\mathbf{u} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_{i,t} \leq u_{i,t} < b_{i,t}), \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathbf{u} = (\mathbf{u}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}'_T)'$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_t = (u_{1,t}, \dots, u_{r,t})'$ ,  $a_{i,t} = G_i(y_{i,t}^-)$  and  $b_{i,t} = G_i(y_{i,t})$ . The copula density  $c$  in Equation (9) captures both cross-sectional and serial dependence jointly. For this, Biller (2009) and Smith and Vahey (2016) use a Gaussian copula, with parameter matrix equal to the correlation matrix of a stationary vector autoregression. However, a Gaussian copula cannot capture the high level of persistence in the variance often exhibited in ordinal time series. Instead, we follow Beare and Seo (2015), Brechmann and Czado (2015), Smith (2015) and Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018) and again use a D-vine copula, but with a parsimonious form corresponding to a stationary Markov  $p$  multivariate series. The pair-copula components are of the form at Equation (5) to account for heteroskedasticity.

Smith (2015) shows that this D-vine has a density that can be factorized as

$$c^{DV}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathcal{K}_0(\mathbf{u}_1) \prod_{t=2}^T \left( \mathcal{K}_0(\mathbf{u}_t) \prod_{k=1}^{\min(t-1, p)} \mathcal{K}_k(\mathbf{u}_{t-k}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_t) \right). \quad (10)$$

The functionals  $\mathcal{K}_0, \dots, \mathcal{K}_p$  are each products of blocks of pair-copula densities, and do not vary with  $t$  for stationary series. They are defined as

$$\mathcal{K}_k(\mathbf{u}_{t-k}, \dots, \mathbf{u}_t) = \begin{cases} \prod_{l_1=1}^r \prod_{l_2=1}^{l_1-1} c_{l_2, l_1}^{(0)}(u_{j|i-1}, u_{i|j+1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{l_2, l_1}^{(0)}) & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \prod_{l_1=1}^r \prod_{l_2=1}^r c_{l_2, l_1}^{(k)}(u_{j|i-1}, u_{i|j+1}; \boldsymbol{\theta}_{l_2, l_1}^{(k)}) & \text{if } 1 \leq k \leq p, \end{cases}$$

where  $c_{l_2, l_1}^{(k)}$  is a bivariate pair-copula density with parameters  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{l_2, l_1}^{(k)}$ . When  $k = 0$ , there are  $r(r-1)/2$  of these associated with  $\mathcal{K}_0$ , and they collectively capture cross-sectional dependence between the  $r$  variables. For example, if they were each equal to the bivariate independence copula with density  $c_{l_2, l_1}^{(0)} = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{K}_0 = 1$  and the variables would be independent contemporaneously. When  $k > 0$ , there are  $r^2$  pair-copulas associated with block  $\mathcal{K}_k$  that capture serial dependence at lag  $k$ . In total, there are  $p(r^2) + r(r-1)/2$  unique pair-copulas, which is much less than the  $Tr(Tr-1)/2$  in an unconstrained D-vine. The indices of the pair-copula arguments are  $i = l_1 + r(t-1)$  and  $j = l_2 + r(t-k-1)$ , and the argument values  $\{u_{i|j}, u_{j|i}; i = 1, \dots, Tm, j < i\}$  are computed using the Algorithm 1 of Loaiza-Maya et al. (2018). Last, we note that if  $r = 1$ , then  $\mathcal{K}_0 = 1, i = t, j = t - k$  and  $\mathcal{K}_k = c_{1,1}^{(k)}(u_{t-k|t-1}, u_{t|t-k+1})$ , so that with the notation  $c_{k+1} \equiv c_{1,1}^{(k)}$ , the copula densities at Equations (4) and (10) are the same.

To measure the dependence between  $Y_{j,s} \in S_j$  and  $Y_{i,t} \in S_i$ , with  $k = t - s$ , we use the Spearman's correlation

$$\rho_{i,j,k} = -3 + 3 \sum_{y_{j,s} \in S_j} \sum_{y_{i,t} \in S_i} g_j(y_{j,s}) g_i(y_{i,t}) (\bar{C}_{j,i,k}(b_{j,s}, b_{i,t}) + \bar{C}_{j,i,k}(b_{j,s}, a_{i,t}) + \bar{C}_{j,i,k}(a_{j,s}, b_{i,t}) + \bar{C}_{j,i,k}(a_{j,s}, a_{i,t})) . \quad (11)$$

Here,  $g_i$  is the probability mass function corresponding to  $G_i$ , while  $\bar{C}_{j,i,k}(u_{j,s}, u_{i,t})$  is the copula function of the bivariate marginal of  $(Y_{j,s}, Y_{i,t})$ . The latter is computed by simulating from  $c^{DV}$  and then constructing the empirical copula function for  $\bar{C}_{j,i,k}$ .

The augmented posterior of this copula time series model is

$$p(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{y}) \propto c^{DV}(\mathbf{u} | \boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_{i=1}^r \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_{i,t} \leq u_{i,t} < b_{i,t}) . \quad (12)$$

Because of the very large number of elements in  $\mathbf{u}$ , estimation using MCMC is computationally infeasible for even moderate values of  $r$  and  $T$ . However, our VBDA estimator can be employed with the same variational approximations outlined in Section 3.2. We note that in our empirical work we employ VA3 as exactly outlined, although the sparse pattern of  $\Omega^{-1}$  can be further tailored to match the possible dependence structure of  $p(\mathbf{u} | \mathbf{y})$  for this case.

Parameters	D-Vine copula: $C^{MIX}$ with Convex Gumbel Components					
	$\tau^a > 0$	$\delta^a$	$\tau^b > 0$	$\delta^b$	$w$	Spearman
$\theta_{1,2}^{(0)}$	0.200	0.548	0.347	0.507	0.929	0.169 ( 0.109,0.230)
$\theta_{1,3}^{(0)}$	0.084	0.395	0.118	0.499	0.617	0.020 ( -0.026,0.079)
$\theta_{2,3}^{(0)}$	0.153	0.656	0.167	0.496	0.785	0.093 ( 0.035,0.159)
$\theta_{1,1}^{(1)}$	0.106	0.356	0.157	0.475	0.586	0.009 ( -0.055,0.073)
$\theta_{1,2}^{(1)}$	0.173	0.476	0.118	0.488	0.666	0.076 ( 0.014,0.154)
$\theta_{1,3}^{(1)}$	0.104	0.414	0.133	0.505	0.505	-0.006 ( -0.070,0.055)
$\theta_{2,1}^{(1)}$	0.205	0.706	0.167	0.482	0.842	0.154 ( 0.091,0.223)
$\theta_{2,2}^{(1)}$	0.341	0.623	0.220	0.474	0.932	0.306 ( 0.240,0.373)
$\theta_{2,3}^{(1)}$	0.153	0.499	0.110	0.528	0.528	0.023 ( -0.037,0.095)
$\theta_{3,1}^{(1)}$	0.130	0.476	0.097	0.477	0.512	0.012 ( -0.040,0.075)
$\theta_{3,2}^{(1)}$	0.172	0.417	0.143	0.485	0.698	0.084 ( 0.022,0.156)
$\theta_{3,3}^{(1)}$	0.150	0.555	0.136	0.498	0.568	0.028 ( -0.034,0.104)

Table 4: The VBDA posterior means of the pair-copula parameters for the D-Vine copula fitted to the three-dimensional crime series using approximation VA2 and  $K = 15$  factors. The posterior mean and 90% probability intervals are also given for the Spearman’s rho of each pair copula. Murder, Attempted Murder and Manslaughter counts are denoted as series 1, 2 and 3, respectively. Estimates for VA1 and VA3 are similar, and are given in the Supplementary Material.

## 4.2 Example: New South Wales Homicide

We consider a trivariate time series copula model for the NSW monthly crime counts, with the empirical distributions as univariate marginals. The copula density is given in Equation (10), where we set  $p = 1$  and adopt pair-copula densities of the form  $c^{MIX}$ . The dimension of the D-vine copula is  $3 \times 264 = 792$ , and Table 3 reports its specification. The copula parameters are estimated using the VB estimator with  $K = 0, 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 15, 40, 50$  factors. To estimate the gradient  $S = 500$  in Algorithm 1, and 5000 VB steps are used with  $K = 15$ . Figure 5 plots the variational lower bound against  $K$  in panel (a), and against the VB step when  $K = 15$  in panel (b), for VA1, VA2 and VA3. A total of  $K = 15$  factors appears sufficient, while both VA2 and VA3 give similar results, but dominate VA1. Table 4 reports the posterior means and intervals of  $\theta$  for VA2, although those for VA1 and VA3 are very similar and are reported in the Supplementary Material.

Table 5 reports the estimates of the pairwise Spearman correlations. The contemporaneous correlations ( $k = 0$ ) are given in the top two rows, and first order serial correlations ( $k = 1$ ) in the bottom rows. There is positive contemporaneous correlation between Attempted Murder and Murder, and also (weakly) with Manslaughter. There is first order serial correlation in Attempted Murder, but not

	Murder <sub>t</sub>	Attempted Murder <sub>t</sub>	Manslaughter <sub>t</sub>
<u><math>k = 0</math></u>			
Attempted Murder <sub>t</sub>	0.246*** (0.16,0.33)	-	-
Manslaughter <sub>t</sub>	0.055* (-0.01,0.13)	0.119*** (0.05,0.2)	-
<u><math>k = 1</math></u>			
Murder <sub>t-1</sub>	0.071* (-0.02,0.17)	0.219*** (0.12,0.33)	0.028 (-0.05,0.10)
Attempted Murder <sub>t-1</sub>	0.221*** (0.13,0.32)	0.470*** (0.39,0.55)	0.089** (0.01,0.18)
Manslaughter <sub>t-1</sub>	0.015 (-0.05,0.09)	0.104** (0.03,0.19)	0.046 (-0.02,0.13)

Table 5: The VBDA estimates of the Spearman pairwise correlations  $\rho_{i,j,k}$  for  $k = 0, 1$ , using approximation VA2. The estimates of the posterior means are reported, with the 90% posterior intervals below. These are computed from the copula model by simulation. Correlations with approximate posterior intervals that do not contain zero at the 10%, 5% and 1% level are denoted with ‘\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*\*\*’, respectively.




Figure 5: Variational lower bound values  $\mathcal{L}(\lambda)$  for the VBDA estimators of the trivariate time series Homicide example. Panel (a) plots  $\mathcal{L}$  at the estimate of  $\lambda$ , against the number of factors  $K$  in the factor decomposition of  $\Sigma$ . Panel (b) plots  $\mathcal{L}$  against VB step for the case of  $K = 15$  factors. In both panels results are given for the VA1 (blue line), VA2 (red line) and VA3 (orange line) approximations.




Figure 6: Logarithm of the pair-copula densities computed at the VBDA posterior mean parameter values for the trivariate Homicide example. For each density, the superscript indicates the lag in the second argument of the pair-copula, while the subscript labels 1, 2 and 3 correspond to the Murder, Attempted Murder and Manslaughter count series, respectively. Results are given for variational approximation VA2 with  $K = 3$  factors.

in the other two crimes. The most striking result is that Attempted Murder is positively correlated with Murder and Manslaughter one month later, suggesting it is a leading indicator of these two crimes. However, these correlations measure dependence in the level only. Figure 6 displays the logarithm of the 15 unique pair-copula densities. Most have mass in the off-diagonal corners of the unit square, indicating that the copula is capturing heteroskedasticity and ‘variance spill-overs’ between the three series. The 3 pair-copulas on the lefthand side capture contemporaneous cross-sectional dependence. The 9 pair-copulas on the righthand side capture first order serial dependence. For example,  $c_{2,1}^{(1)}$  is very far from uniform, and captures strong variance spill-over between Attempted Murder and Murder.

## 5 Mixed Multivariate Time Series

### 5.1 Copula Model and Estimation

Consider the case of a stochastic process  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}$ , where  $\mathbf{Y}_t = (Y_{1,t}, \dots, Y_{r,t})'$  consists of  $d$  ordinal and  $r-d$  continuous-valued variables, which we refer to as ‘mixed’. A copula model using the same D-vine with density  $c^{DV}$  at Equation (10) can be used to construct a flexible time series model. Without

	Bankruptcy <sub>t</sub>	VIX <sub>t</sub>
VIX <sub>t</sub>	0.102*** (0.04,0.16)	
Bankruptcy <sub>t-1</sub>	0.448*** (0.37,0.52)	0.075* (-0.01,0.16)
VIX <sub>t-1</sub>	0.200*** (0.14,0.27)	0.862*** (0.83,0.89)
Bankruptcy <sub>t-2</sub>	0.334*** (0.24,0.43)	0.079* (-0.02,0.18)
VIX <sub>t-2</sub>	0.238*** (0.16,0.31)	0.740*** (0.67,0.80)

Table 6: The VB posterior means of the Spearman unconditional pairwise correlations  $\rho_{i,j,k}$ , for  $k = 0, 1, 2$ , computed from the copula model via simulation. Correlations with (variational) posterior intervals that do not contain zero at the 10%, 5% and 1% level are denoted with ‘\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*\*\*’, respectively.

loss of generality, if the first  $d$  elements of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$  are ordinal, then Smith and Khaled (2012) suggest estimation of a copula model with mixed margins using the augmented density at Equation (9), but where  $f(y_{i,t}|u_{i,t}) = \mathcal{I}(u_{i,t} = G_i(y_{i,t}))$  is a point mass for  $i = d + 1, \dots, r$ . They discuss how to implement MCMC data augmentation, but this approach can be slow or computationally infeasible for values of  $Td$  that occur frequently in time series analysis.

Let  $\mathcal{C} = \{(i, t) : i = d + 1, \dots, r; t = 1, \dots, T\}$  denote the indices of the continuous-valued  $Y_{i,t}$ , and  $\mathbf{u}_D$  be the  $Td$  latents corresponding to the ordinal variables. Then VBDA can be employed using the variational approximations outlined in Section 3.2, but where  $q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \tilde{q}_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}_D) \prod_{(i,t) \in \mathcal{C}} \mathcal{I}(u_{i,t} = G_i(y_{i,t}))$ , and approximations VA1 to VA3 are considered for  $\tilde{q}_{\lambda^b}$ . Algorithm 1 can be used to approximate the augmented posterior, but where  $u_{i,t} = G_i(y_{i,t})$  are constants for  $(i, t) \in \mathcal{C}$ , and are not generated.

Equation (11) can be used to compute the Spearman correlation  $\rho_{i,j,k}$  between two ordinal-valued variables  $(Y_{j,s}, Y_{i,t})$  with  $k = t - s$  and  $s < t$ . If both variables are continuous-valued, then  $\rho_{i,j,k} = 12 \int \bar{C}_{i,j,k}(u, v) du dv - 3$ . But if  $Y_{j,s} \in S_j$  is ordinal and  $Y_{i,t}$  is continuous, then

$$\rho_{i,j,k} = 6 \sum_{y_{j,s} \in S_j} g_j(y_{j,s}) \int g_i(y_{i,t}) (\bar{C}_{j,i,k}(b_{j,s}, G_i(y_{i,t})) + \bar{C}_{j,i,k}(a_{j,s}, G_i(y_{i,t}))) dy_{i,t} - 3,$$

where the integral can be computed numerically. In all cases,  $\bar{C}_{i,j,k}$  is evaluated by simulation as previously.






Figure 7: Panel (a) plots the bankruptcy count and VIX time series. The left vertical axis displays the number of bankruptcies, while the right vertical axis displays the VIX values. Panel (b) plots the density estimates of VIX, conditional on three ranges of values for the number of bankruptcies. Denoting  $B$  as the number of bankruptcies, the ranges are  $B < 5$  (blue line density),  $4 < B < 7$  (red line density) and  $B > 6$  (yellow line density).




Figure 8: Variational lower bound values  $\mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  for the VBDA estimators of the bivariate time series of bankruptcy counts and VIX. Panel (a) plots  $\mathcal{L}$  at the estimate of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ , against the number of factors  $K$  in the factor decomposition of  $\Sigma$ . Panel (b) plots  $\mathcal{L}$  against VB step for the case of  $K = 15$  factors. In both panels results are given for the VA1 (blue line), VA2 (red line) and VA3 (orange line) approximations.

## 5.2 Example: Bankruptcy and the VIX

We study the dependence between the continuous-valued VIX index, which measures U.S. market volatility, and the number of public company bankruptcy cases filed in U.S. courts. We employ the monthly average value of the VIX obtained from the FRED website, while the bankruptcies are monthly counts sourced from the UCLA-LoPucki Bankruptcy Research Database. The time series are from December 1989 to April 2017, so that  $T = 329$ . A positive relationship between market volatility and bankruptcies has been documented previously (Bauer and Agarwal, 2014). Figure 7(a) plots both series, while Figure 7(b) displays the empirical distribution of the VIX, conditional on the number of bankruptcies. The positive correlation between the two series is apparent in both panels.

We employ the D-Vine copula model with  $p = 2$  and a total number of  $5 \times 9 = 45$  parameters; Table 3 reports the copula specification. Separate variational approximations with  $K = 0, 1, 2, 4, 5, 10, 15, 40, 45$  factor decompositions for  $\Sigma$  were estimated. The same values for  $S$  and number of VB steps were adopted as in Section 4.2. Figure 8(a) plots the lower bound against  $K$ , and it varies little for  $K \geq 15$ . This is consistent with the empirical results in Ong et al. (2017), who found that a higher number of factors are needed for the accurate approximation of more complex posteriors.

The copula parameter estimates are reported in the Online Appendix, while Table 6 reports the pairwise Spearman correlations. Both the number of bankruptcies and the VIX exhibit serial correlation, although the latter more so. The two series are positively correlated, both contemporaneously and in the lagged values. However, the lagged values of the VIX are more highly correlated with later bankruptcies, suggesting that the VIX is a leading indicator of public company bankruptcy filings. The fitted pair-copulas densities are plotted in the Online Appendix, and their form is consistent with heteroskedastic time series. For example,  $c_{2,1}^{(1)}$  and  $c_{1,2}^{(1)}$  have mass concentrated in all four corners, indicating positive cross-correlation in the variance of the two series at different lags; ie. volatility ‘spillover’.

## 6 Discussion

This paper makes two main contributions. The first is to propose a new VB estimator for copula models with discrete, or a combination of discrete and continuous, variables. The approach can be used to estimate copulas with a higher dimension and number of parameters than previous methods. We illustrate this using time series copulas of up to 792 dimensions and 60 parameters, although the method can be used to estimate copula models for cross-sectional, longitudinal or spatial data just as readily. The second main contribution of the paper is to propose a new time series model for multivariate ordinal-valued variables, where a copula captures serial and cross-sectional dependence

jointly. Our proposed copula is a parsimonious D-vine that can capture serial dependence in both the level and conditional variance, with the latter being an important feature in much ordinal data. The time series model is highly flexible, where any marginal features in a time series can be captured by an arbitrary distribution, and is easily extended to a combination of discrete and continuous-valued series.

Ordinal time series frequently exhibit both serial dependence in the level and heteroskedasticity. Few existing copulas can capture both jointly, yet the D-vine used here can do so for Markov and stationary series. An advantage of such copula time series models is that they allow for the more accurate modeling of data with multi-modal and irregular margins, as well as being readily extended to multivariate series. However, their estimation is computationally challenging using previous methods, and our VBDA estimator provides a new and effective solution, as illustrated by our examples.

In our VB approach, a key observation is that it is computationally advantageous to employ a variational approximation to the augmented posterior  $p(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})$ , rather than the intractable posterior  $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y})$ . This is consistent with Tan and Nott (2017), Hui et al. (2017) and Ong et al. (2017), who also find that variational approximations to the posterior of latent variables can also be computationally efficient in mixed effects generalized linear models. The empirical examples illustrate that the approximations proposed here provide a balance between computational efficiency and accuracy.

Last, we outline some promising directions for future research. First, Gunawan et al. (2018) give an augmented likelihood for copula models where the margins have mixed densities (not to be confused with a combination of continuous and discrete variables). Extending our VBDA approach to this case would provide a faster estimator than MCMC. Second, copula models for discrete spatial data are growing in popularity (Hughes, 2015, Oliveira, 2018). However, estimation is challenging for a large number of spatial locations, and VBDA provides a solution. When employing VA3,  $\Omega$  can be tailored to each case; for example, a natural choice for  $\Omega^{-1}$  for data located on a regular lattice is the precision matrix of a Gaussian Markov random field. Last, copulas constructed by inversion of existing distributions are popular, including those that have intractable copula functions  $C$  and densities  $c$ ; see Smith et al. (2012), Smith and Maneesoonthorn (2018) and Oh and Patton (2017) for examples. Extending our VBDA estimator to such intractable copula models for discrete data is an interesting extension.

## Appendix A ADADELTA

The learning rate  $\rho^{(k)}$  can be set using different methods. For example Tran et al. (2017) set it as a sequence with manually tuned parameters. Ong et al. (2016) propose an adaptive learning rate based on previous work by Ranganath et al. (2013). Here, we employ the ADADELTA method of Zeiler (2012), which provides reliable convergence of the SGA algorithm. This method consists of

individually updating the step size for each element in  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  as

$$\lambda_i^{(k+1)} = \lambda_i^{(k)} + \Delta \lambda_i^{(k)}$$

with  $\Delta \lambda_i^{(k)} = \rho_i^{(k)} g_{\lambda_i}^{(k)}$ ,  $g_{\lambda_i}^{(k)}$  denoting the  $i^{th}$  element of  $\widehat{\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \mathcal{L}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(k)})}$  and  $\rho_i^{(k)}$  is given by

$$\rho_i^{(k)} = \frac{\sqrt{E(\Delta_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k-1)} + \epsilon}}{\sqrt{E(g_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k)} + \epsilon}}$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a small scalar and  $E(\Delta_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k)}$  and  $E(g_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k)}$  are recursively updated as

$$\begin{aligned} E(\Delta_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k)} &= \zeta E(\Delta_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k-1)} + (1 - \zeta) \Delta \lambda_i^{(k)^2} \\ E(g_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k)} &= \zeta E(g_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(k-1)} + (1 - \zeta) g_{\lambda_i}^{(k)^2} \end{aligned}$$

For the VB applications here, Ong et al. (2017) is followed, and we set  $\epsilon = 10^{-6}$ ,  $\zeta = 0.95$ ,  $E(\Delta_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(0)} = 0$  and  $E(g_{\lambda_i}^2)^{(0)} = 0$ .

## Appendix B Proof of Theorem 1

The expression at (a) is obtained simply by integrating over Equation (6) with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ . To derive the expression at (b), first note that  $p(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y}) \propto \prod_{t=1}^T \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , so that

$$\begin{aligned} p(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y}) &= \int p(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{u}_{s \neq t} \\ &\propto \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) \int c(\mathbf{u}|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \prod_{s \neq t} \mathcal{I}(a_s \leq u_s < b_s) d\mathbf{u}_{s \neq t} \\ &= \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) A(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta}), \end{aligned}$$

where  $A(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is as defined in Theorem 1. Therefore,

$$p(u_t|\mathbf{y}) = \int p(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{y}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} \propto \mathcal{I}(a_t \leq u_t < b_t) \int A(u_t|\boldsymbol{\theta}) p(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{y}) d\boldsymbol{\theta},$$

which is intractable.

## Appendix C Derivatives

In this appendix we compute the gradient  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \log q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{u})$  to implement Steps 1(b) and 2(b) for Algorithm 1. To present these succinctly the following notation is introduced. For a matrix  $A$  of dimension  $n \times K$ , the function  $\text{vech}(\cdot)$  is defined as  $\text{vech}(A) = (A'_{1:n,1}, \dots, A'_{K:n,K})'$  with  $A_{k:n,k} = (A_{k,k}, \dots, A_{n,k})'$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$ . Also, the vector of diagonal entries of the square matrix  $Z$  is written as  $\text{diag}(Z)$ . Employing this notation, the vector of parameters  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a$  can be written as  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a = (\boldsymbol{\mu}', \mathbf{b}', \mathbf{d}')'$  with  $\mathbf{b} = \text{vech}(B)$ , and the gradient  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a} \log(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = (\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \log(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))', \nabla_{\mathbf{b}} \log(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))', \nabla_{\mathbf{d}} \log(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))')'$  where

$$\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \log(q_{\boldsymbol{\lambda}^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) = (B'B + D)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\mu})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_b \log(q_{\lambda^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) &= \text{vech} \left( - (B'B + D^2)^{-1} B + (B'B + D^2)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\mu})' (B'B + D^2)^{-1} B \right) \\ \nabla_d \log(q_{\lambda^a}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) &= \text{diag} \left( - (B'B + D^2)^{-1} D + (B'B + D^2)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\mu}) (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\mu})' (B'B + D^2)^{-1} D \right).\end{aligned}$$

Fast calculation of these gradients can be undertaken using the Woodbury formula; see Ong et al. (2017) for further details.

For VA1,  $\lambda^b = \emptyset$ , so that  $\nabla_{\lambda^b} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = 0$ . For VA2, if  $c_t = \log \omega_t$ , then

$$\log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \frac{1}{2} z_t^2 - c_t - \frac{(z_t - \eta_t)^2}{2 \exp(2c_t)} - \log(b_t - a_t) \right),$$

with derivatives  $\nabla_{c_t} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \exp(-2c_t)(z_t - \eta_t)^2 - 1$  and  $\nabla_{\eta_t} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = (z_t - \eta_t)/\omega_t^2$ . Last, for VA3, if  $\Omega^{-1} = LL'$ , then

$$\log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \log |L| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\eta})' LL' (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) + \sum_{t=1}^T \frac{1}{2} z_t^2 - \log(b_t - a_t),$$

with derivatives  $\nabla_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\eta})' LL'$ , and

$$\nabla_{\text{vec}(L)} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u}) = \text{vec}((L^{-1})')' - \frac{1}{2} ((\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\eta})' \otimes (\mathbf{z} - \boldsymbol{\eta})) (I_{T^2} + K_{T,T}) (L \otimes I_T)$$

where  $K_{T,T}$  is a commutation matrix. Note that the gradient is for a full factor  $L$ , although for the sparse  $L$  employed here we compute  $\nabla_{\text{vec}(L)} \log q_{\lambda^b}(\mathbf{u})$  using sparse matrix operations in Matlab, and only evaluate it for the non-zero elements of  $L$ . Last, to derive this derivative we have used the identity  $\frac{\partial}{\partial \text{vec}(A)} |A| = \text{vec}(|A|(A^{-1})')'$  for invertible square matrix  $A$ .

## References

- Aas, K., Czado, C., Frigessi, A., and Bakken, H. (2009). Pair-copula constructions of multiple dependence. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics*, 44(2):182 – 198.
- Aktekin, T., Polson, N., and Soyer, R. (2018). Sequential Bayesian Analysis of Multivariate Count Data. *Bayesian Analysis*, 13(2):385–409.
- Aktekin, T., Soyer, R., and Xu, F. (2013). Assessment of mortgage default risk via Bayesian state space models. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(3):1450–1473.
- Bauer, J. and Agarwal, V. (2014). Are hazard models superior to traditional bankruptcy prediction approaches? A comprehensive test. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 40:432–442.
- Beare, B. K. and Seo, J. (2015). Vine Copula Specifications for Stationary Multivariate Markov Chains. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 36(2):228–246.
- Bien, K., Nolte, I., and Pohlmeier, W. (2011). An inflated multivariate integer count hurdle model: an application to bid and ask quote dynamics. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 26(4):669–707.

- Billar, B. (2009). Copula-Based Multivariate Input Models for Stochastic Simulation. *Operations Research*, 57(4):878–892.
- Brechmann, E. C. and Czado, C. (2015). COPAR—multivariate time series modeling using the copula autoregressive model. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 31(4):495–514.
- Challis, E. and Barber, D. (2013). Gaussian Kullback-Leibler approximate inference. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):2239–2286.
- Davis, R. A., Holan, S. H., Lund, R., and Ravishanker, N. (2016). *Handbook of discrete-valued time series*. CRC Press.
- Genest, C. and Nešlehová, J. (2007). A primer on copulas for count data. *ASTIN Bulletin: The Journal of the IAA*, 37(2):475–515.
- Gunawan, D., Khaled, M. A., and Kohn, R. (2018). Mixed Marginal Copula Modeling. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, (forthcoming).
- Gunawan, D., Tran, M.-N., Suzuki, K., Dick, J., and Kohn, R. (2016). Computationally Efficient Bayesian Estimation of High Dimensional Copulas with Discrete and Mixed Margins. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.06174*.
- Harvey, A. C. and Fernandes, C. (1989). Time Series Models for Count or Qualitative Observations. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 7(4):407–417.
- Heinen, A. and Rengifo, E. (2007). Multivariate autoregressive modeling of time series count data using copulas. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 14(4):564–583.
- Hoffman, M. D., Blei, D. M., Wang, C., and Paisley, J. (2013). Stochastic Variational Inference. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14(1):1303–1347.
- Hughes, J. (2015). copcar: A Flexible Regression Model for Areal Data. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 23(3):733–755.
- Hui, F. K., Warton, D. I., Ormerod, J. T., Haapaniemi, V., and Taskinen, S. (2017). Variational Approximations for Generalized Linear Latent Variable Models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26(1):35–43.
- Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate models and multivariate dependence concepts*. CRC Press.
- Jordan, M. I., Ghahramani, Z., Jaakkola, T. S., and Saul, L. K. (1999). An introduction to variational methods for graphical models. *Machine learning*, 37(2):183–233.
- Kucukelbir, A., Tran, D., Ranganath, R., Gelman, A., and Blei, D. M. (2016). Automatic Differentiation Variational Inference. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.00788*.
- Loaiza-Maya, R., Smith, M. S., and Maneesoonthorn, W. (2018). Time Series Copulas for Heteroskedastic Data. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 33(3):332–354.
- McGrory, C. A. and Titterton, D. (2007). Variational approximations in Bayesian model selection for finite mixture distributions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 51(11):5352–5367.

- Mohler, G. et al. (2013). Modeling and estimation of multi-source clustering in crime and security data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(3):1525–1539.
- Nelsen, R. B. (2006). *An Introduction to Copulas (Springer Series in Statistics)*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc., Secaucus, NJ, USA.
- Neville, S. E., Ormerod, J. T., and Wand, M. P. (2014). Mean field variational bayes for continuous sparse signal shrinkage: Pitfalls and remedies. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 8:1113–1151.
- Nikoloulopoulos, A. K. and Mentzakis, E. (2017). A copula-based model for multivariate ordinal panel data: application to well-being composition. *arXiv preprint, arXiv:1604.05643v2*.
- Nott, D. J., Tan, S. L., Villani, M., and Kohn, R. (2012). Regression Density Estimation with Variational Methods and Stochastic Approximation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 21(3):797–820.
- Oh, D. H. and Patton, A. J. (2017). Modeling Dependence in High Dimensions With Factor Copulas. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 35(1):139–154.
- Oliveira, V. D. (2018). Models for Geostatistical Binary Data: Properties and Connections. *The American Statistician*, (forthcoming).
- Ong, V. M., Nott, D. J., Tran, M.-N., Sisson, S. A., and Drovandi, C. C. (2016). Variational Bayes with Synthetic Likelihood. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1608.03069*.
- Ong, V. M.-H., Nott, D. J., and Smith, M. S. (2017). Gaussian variational approximation with a factor covariance structure. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, (forthcoming).
- Oppel, M. and Archambeau, C. (2009). The Variational Gaussian Approximation Revisited. *Neural computation*, 21(3):786–792.
- Ormerod, J. T. and Wand, M. P. (2010). Explaining Variational Approximations. *The American Statistician*, 64(2):140–153.
- Paisley, J., Blei, D. M., and Jordan, M. I. (2012). In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-12)*, pages 1367–1374.
- Pedeli, X. and Karlis, D. (2011). A bivariate INAR (1) process with application. *Statistical modelling*, 11(4):325–349.
- Pitt, M., Chan, D., and Kohn, R. (2006). Efficient Bayesian inference for Gaussian copula regression models. *Biometrika*, 93(3):537–554.
- Ranganath, R., Gerrish, S., and Blei, D. (2014). Black Box Variational Inference. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 814–822.
- Ranganath, R., Wang, C., David, B., and Xing, E. (2013). An adaptive learning rate for stochastic variational inference. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 298–306.
- Ravishanker, N., Venkatesan, R., and Hu, S. (2016). Dynamic Models for Time Series of Counts with a Marketing Application. In Davis, R., Lund, R., Holan, S., and Ravishanker, N., editors, *Handbook of Discrete-Valued Time Series*, pages 425–446. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Oxford.



- Salimans, T., Knowles, D. A., et al. (2013). Fixed-Form Variational Posterior Approximation Through Stochastic Linear Regression. *Bayesian Analysis*, 8(4):837–882.
- Sklar, A. (1959). *Fonctions de Répartition À N Dimensions Et Leurs Marges*. Université Paris 8.
- Smith, M. and Khaled, M. (2012). Estimation of Copula Models With Discrete Margins via Bayesian Data Augmentation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(497):290–303.
- Smith, M. S. (2015). Copula modelling of dependence in multivariate time series. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 31(3):815 – 833.
- Smith, M. S., Gan, Q., and Kohn, R. J. (2012). Modelling dependence using skew t copulas: Bayesian inference and applications. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 27(3):500–522.
- Smith, M. S. and Maneesoonthorn, W. (2018). Inversion copulas from nonlinear state space models with an application to inflation forecasting. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 34(3):389–407.
- Smith, M. S. and Vahey, S. P. (2016). Asymmetric Forecast Densities for U.S. Macroeconomic Variables from a Gaussian Copula Model of Cross-Sectional and Serial Dependence. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 34(3):416–434.
- Tan, L. S. L. and Nott, D. J. (2017). Gaussian variational approximation with sparse precision matrices. *Statistics and Computing*, pages 1–17.
- Titsias, M. and Lázaro-Gredilla, M. (2014). Doubly stochastic variational Bayes for non-conjugate inference. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 1971–1979.
- Tran, M.-N., Nott, D. J., and Kohn, R. (2017). Variational Bayes With Intractable Likelihood. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, (In press).
- Wand, M. P., Ormerod, J. T., Padoan, S. A., and Fuhrwirth, R. (2011). Mean Field Variational Bayes for Elaborate Distributions. *Bayesian Analysis*, 6(4):847–900.
- Zeiler, M. D. (2012). ADADELTA: An Adaptive Learning Rate Method. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.5701*.