An extension to the applicability of adaptive bandwidth choice

Dehao Dai*

June 10, 2022

Abstract

In this paper, we extend the applicability of the bandwidth choice method of Politis (2003) by relaxing the conditions of his Theorem 2.3.

1 Introduction

Assume X_1, \dots, X_N are data from the strictly stationary time series $\{X_n, n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}X_t$, and autocovariance $\gamma(k) = \mathbb{E}(X_t - \mu)(X_{t+|k|} - \mu)$; here both μ and $\gamma(\cdot)$ are unknown. Now we consider the problem of estimating the spectral density function $f(\omega) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ik\omega} \gamma(k)$, for $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ with kernel Λ_h . The corresponding kernel estimator may be written as:

$$\hat{f}(\omega) = \Lambda_h * I_N(\omega)$$

where $I_N(\omega) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{k=-N+1}^{N-1} e^{ik\omega} \hat{\gamma}(k)$ is the periodogram and * denotes convolution; here, the real number h is the bandwidth. In Politis (2003), the kernel $\Lambda_h(\omega)$ is defined as

$$\Lambda_h(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{k=-M}^{M} \lambda^T(k/M) e^{ik\omega}$$

where h = 1/M is regarded as the bandwidth and the function $\lambda^{T}(\cdot)$ has a trapezoidal shape symmetric around zero, i.e.

$$\lambda^{T}(t) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |t| \in [0, c] \\ \frac{1}{1-c}(1-|t|) & \text{if } t \in [c, 1] \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

^{*}Department of Mathematics, Univ. of California, San Diego; email: ddai@ucsd.edu

Note that λ^T depends on the breaking point c.

An alternative form to represent $\hat{f}(w)$ in Politis (2003) is the Fourier transform of the kernel, namely $\lambda_h(k) = \lambda^T(hk)$

$$\hat{f}(w) = (2\pi)^{-1} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{iwk} \lambda^{T}(kh) \hat{\gamma}(k)$$

where $\hat{\gamma}(k) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-|k|} (X_i - \bar{X}_N) (X_{i+|k|} - \bar{X}_N)$ is the lag-k sample autocovariance for |k| < N and $\hat{\gamma}(k)$ is defined to be zero for $|k| \ge N$.

Politis (2003) proposed the following empirical rule of picking M with c = 1/2.

EMPIRICAL RULE OF PICKING M: Let $\rho(k) = \gamma(k)/\gamma(0)$, and $\hat{\rho}(k) = \hat{\gamma}(k)/\hat{\gamma}(0)$. Let \hat{m} be the smallest positive integer such that $|\hat{\rho}(\hat{m}+k)| < c\sqrt{\log N/N}$, for $k = 1, ..., K_N$, where c > 0 is a fixed constant, and K_N is a positive, nondecreasing integer-valued function of N such that $K_N = o(\log N)$. Then, let $\hat{M} = \hat{m}/c = 2\hat{m}$.

Theorem 2.2 of Politis (2003) showed that the above empirical rule performs well in three cases for $\rho(k)$, namely (i) polynomial decay, (ii) exponential decay, and (iii) hard cut-off. In the next section, we complement his Theorem 2.2 by providing two weaker formulations of cases (i) and (ii).

2 Main result

Corollary: Assume conditions strong enough to ensure that for all finite n,

$$\max_{k=1,\dots,n} |\hat{\rho}(s+k) - \rho(s+k)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(1/\sqrt{N}) \tag{1}$$

uniformly in s, and

$$\max_{k=0,1,\dots,n-1} |\hat{\rho}(k) - \rho(k)| = O_{\mathbb{P}}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log N}{N}}\right). \tag{2}$$

Also assume that the sequence $\gamma(k)$ does not have more than K_N-1 zeros in its first k_0 lags (i.e., for $k=1,\ldots,k_0$).

(i) Assume that $\gamma(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} C_i k^{-d_i} \cos(a_i k + \theta_i)$ for $k > k_0$, and for some $C_i > 0$ and positive integers d_i and l, and some distinct constants $a_i \geq \frac{\pi}{K_N}, \theta_i \in [0, 2\pi]$ for all $i = 1, \dots, l$. Then,

$$\hat{M} \stackrel{P}{\sim} A_1 \left(\frac{N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2d}$$

for some positive constant A_1 , and $d = \min_{i \in [l]} \{d_i\}$.

(ii) Assume $\gamma(k) = \sum_{i=1}^{l} C_i \xi_i^k \cos(a_i k + \theta_i)$ for $k > k_0$, where $C > 0, |\xi| < 1, a_i \ge \frac{\pi}{K_N}, \theta_i \in [0, 2\pi]$ and positive integer l are some constants. Then,

$$\hat{M} \stackrel{P}{\sim} A_2 \log N$$

where $A_2 = -1/\log |\xi|$ with $|\xi| = \max_{i \in [l]} \{|\xi_i|\}$.

Proof of (i): First note that from the condition that the sequence $\gamma(k)$ does not have more that $K_N - 1$ zeros in its first k_0 lags with (1), it follows that $\hat{m} > k_0$ with high probability, so we can focus on the part of the correlogram to the right of k_0 , i.e., look at $\hat{\gamma}(k)$ for $k > k_0$ only.

Now condition $a_i \ge \pi/K_N$ implies that $K_N \ge \max\{\pi/a_i\}$, i.e. K_N is bigger than all the half-periods of the $\cos(a_i k + \theta)$ for $i = 1, \dots, l$. Hence, (2) implies that

$$\max_{k=1,\dots,K_N} |\hat{\rho}(\hat{m}+k)| \ge C(\hat{m}+K_N)^{-d} + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N}), \tag{3}$$

where $d = \min_{i \in [l]} \{d_i\}$, since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} C_i k^{-d_i} = C k^{-d} \left(\frac{C_L}{C} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq L}^{l} \frac{C_i}{C} k^{d-d_i} \right) \ge C k^{-d}$$

where $L = \arg\min_{i \in [l]} \{d_i\}$ and $C = \max_{i \in [l]} \{C_i\}$.

From part (i) assumption with (2), it follows that

$$|\hat{\rho}(k)| = |Ck^{-d}| + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N})$$
 uniformly in k,

where $d = \min_{i \in [l]} \{d_i\}$, i.e.,

$$|\hat{\rho}(\hat{m})| = |C\hat{m}^{-d}| + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N}). \tag{4}$$

The empirical rule for picking M implies that $|\hat{\rho}(\hat{m})| \geq c\sqrt{\log N/N}$, whereas

$$\max_{k=1,\cdots,K_N} |\hat{\rho}(\hat{m}+k)| < c\sqrt{\log N/N}.$$

Thus, the above two statements with (3) and (4)

$$A_1 \left(\frac{N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2d} - K_N \le \hat{m} \le A_1 \left(\frac{N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2d}$$

with high probability. Since $K_N = o(\log N)$,

$$\hat{M} \stackrel{P}{\sim} A_1 \left(\frac{N}{\log N}\right)^{1/2d},$$

where A_1 is some positive constant and $d = \min_{i \in [l]} \{d_i\}$.

Proof of (ii): It is similar to proof of part (i). First, Hence, (2) implies that

$$\max_{k=1,\dots,K_N} |\hat{\rho}(\hat{m}+k)| \ge C|\xi|^{\hat{m}+K_N} + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N}), \tag{5}$$

where $|\xi| = \max_{i \in [l]} \{|\xi_i|\}$, since

$$\sum_{i=1}^{l} C_{i} |\xi_{i}|^{k} = C |\xi|^{k} \left(\frac{C_{L}}{C} + \sum_{i=1, i \neq L}^{l} \frac{C_{i}}{C} \left| \frac{\xi_{i}}{\xi} \right|^{k} \right) \ge C |\xi|^{k}$$

where $L = \arg \max_{i \in [l]} \{C_i\}$ and $C = \max_{i \in [l]} \{C_i\}$.

From part (ii) assumption with (2), it follows that

$$|\hat{\rho}(k)| = |C\xi^k| + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N})$$
 uniformly in k,

where $|\xi| = \max_{i \in [l]} \{ |\xi_i| \}$, i.e.,

$$|\hat{\rho}(\hat{m})| = |C\xi^{\hat{m}}| + O_{\mathbb{P}}(\sqrt{\log N/N}). \tag{6}$$

Thus, the two statements of the empirical rule for picking M mentioned in part (i) with (5) and (6) implies

$$A_2 \log N - K_N \le \hat{m} \le A_2 \log N$$

with high probability. Thus,

$$\hat{M} \stackrel{P}{\sim} A_2 \log N$$

where $A_2 = -1/\log |\xi|$ with $|\xi| = \max_{i \in [l]} \{|\xi_i|\}$.

Note that a general sufficient condition guaranteeing eq. (1) and (2) has been given by Xiao & Wu (2012).

References

Politis, D. N. (2003), 'Adaptive Bandwidth Choice', *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* **15**(4-5), 517–533.

Politis, D. N. (2011), 'Higher-order accurate, positive semidefinite estimation of large-sample covariance and spectral density matrices', *Econometric Theory* **27**(4), 703–744.

Xiao, H. & Wu, W. B. (2012), 'Covariance matrix estimation for stationary time series', *The Annals of Statistics* **40**(1), 466–493.