



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

## **On a Testing Procedure for Model Selection**

Panaretos, John and Psarakis, Stelios

1991

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/6260/>  
MPRA Paper No. 6260, posted 13 Dec 2007 07:14 UTC

ON A TESTING PROCEDURE FOR MODEL SELECTION

J. Panaretos and S. Psarakis  
 University of Patras, Greece

ABSTRACT

In this paper a forecasting model selection scheme is considered which amounts to testing the predictive behaviour of a model by adopting Xekalaki and Katti's (1984) idea of assigning to its performance a score for each of a series of time points. The score reflects how close to, or how far from, the predictive value the observed actual value is. A statistical test is proposed for comparing the forecasting performances of two models.

Selecting the best of two competing models

Consider two linear models A and B of the form

$$Y_t = X_t(M) \beta_M + e_t(M)$$

where  $Y_t$  is an  $1 \times 1$  vector of observations on the dependent random variable,  $X_t(M)$  is an  $1 \times m_M$  matrix of known coefficients ( $1 \geq m_M, |X_t(M)X_t(M)'| \neq 0$ ),  $\beta_M$  is an  $m_M \times 1$  vector of regression coefficients, and  $e_t(M)$  is an  $1 \times 1$  vector of normal error random variables with  $E(e_t(M)) = 0$  and  $V(e_t(M)) = \sigma_M^2 I_t$  ( $\sigma_M^2 < \infty$ ). Here  $I_t$  is the  $1 \times 1$  identity matrix and  $M$  indexes the model (i.e.  $M=A$  or  $M=B$ ). Therefore, a prediction for the value of the dependent random variable for time  $t+1$  will be given by the statistic  $\hat{Y}_{t+1}^0(M) = X_{t+1}^0(M) \hat{\beta}_t(M)$ , where  $\hat{\beta}_t(M)$  is the least squares estimator of  $\beta_M$  at time  $t$ ,  $X_{t+1}^0(M)$  is a  $1 \times m_M$  vector at time  $t+1$ . Let  $Y_{t+1}^0$  be the observed value of the dependent random variable at time  $t+1$ . Then

$$\hat{Y}_{t+1}^0(M) - Y_{t+1}^0 = e_{t+1}^*(M) \text{ will follow the } N(0, \sigma_M^2) \quad (1)$$

and so  $|\hat{Y}_{t+1}^0(M) - Y_{t+1}^0| = |e_{t+1}^*(M)|$  will follow the folded normal distribution with mean  $\mu_f(M) = \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma_M$  and variance  $\sigma_f^2(M) = \sigma_M^2(1 - 2/\pi)$  (Leone et al. 1961). In other words

$$\begin{aligned} E(|e_t(A)|) &= \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma_A \quad \text{and} \\ E(|e_t(B)|) &= \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma_B \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Suppose that we score the performance of model  $M$  by

$|e_t(M)|$ . Then, our selection will be based on the model with the minimum score. A natural choice of hypotheses to test could be:

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: E(|e_t(A)|) &= E(|e_t(B)|) \\ H_1: E(|e_t(A)|) &< E(|e_t(B)|) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Because of (2) this is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: \sigma_A^2 &= \sigma_B^2 \\ H_1: \sigma_A^2 &< \sigma_B^2 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here we must note that

$$\text{Cov}(|e_t(A)| + |e_t(B)|, |e_t(A)| - |e_t(B)|) = (\sigma_A^2 - \sigma_B^2) \left(1 - \frac{2}{\pi}\right). \quad (5)$$

Set  $R_{t+} = |e_t(A)| + |e_t(B)|$  and  $R_{t-} = |e_t(A)| - |e_t(B)|$ . Then, because of (5) the set of hypotheses (4), is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: \text{Cov}(R_{t+}, R_{t-}) &= 0 \\ H_1: \text{Cov}(R_{t+}, R_{t-}) &< 0 \end{aligned}$$

or to

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: \rho_{R_{t+}, R_{t-}} &= 0 \\ H_1: \rho_{R_{t+}, R_{t-}} &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

The obvious choice of a test statistic would be

$$R = \frac{\left[ \frac{\sum R_{t+} R_{t-}}{n} - \bar{R}_{t+} \bar{R}_{t-} \right]}{\sqrt{\frac{\sum (R_{t+} - \bar{R}_{t+})^2}{n} \frac{\sum (R_{t-} - \bar{R}_{t-})^2}{n}}}$$

Then, under  $H_0$  the asymptotic distribution of  $\sqrt{n} R$  is normal with mean zero and variance  $\text{Var}(R_{t+}, R_{t-}) / \text{Var}(R_{t+})\text{Var}(R_{t-})$  (Lehmann (1986)). So, values of  $\sqrt{n} R$  in the left tail of the normal distribution will call for rejection of  $H_0$ , thus indicating that model A performs better than model B.

#### References

- Lehmann, E. L. (1986). "Testing Statistical Hypotheses". J. Wiley and Sons.
- Leone, F.C. Nelson, L.S. and Nottigham, R.B. (1961). "The Folded Normal Distribution". *Technometrics*, 3(4), 543-550.
- Xekalaki E. and Katti, S.K. (1984). "A Technique for Evaluating Forecasting models". *Biom. J.*, 26, 173-184.