## <span id="page-0-0"></span>State Space Models and FFBS

1

[Time-Varying Coefficients](#page-0-0)

[State Space Models](#page-0-0)

제 ロン 제 御 에 제 활 시 제 끝 시 시 활 시 시

 $2990$ 

## Time-Varying Coefficients

Recall the hotels example where we regressed mothly observations of one hotel's occupancy rate on the overall downtown Chicago occupancy rate:



Here is the time series plot of the residuals.



The trend line is fit to the residuals using

$$
r_t = \alpha + \beta t + \epsilon
$$

The hotel might argue that, based on the plot, there could be some doubt about this simple specification.

To think about a more general model let

$$
r_t = \theta_t + \epsilon_t
$$

The trend model uses the very "tight" specification:

$$
\theta_t = \alpha + \beta t.
$$

We could be more flexible by transforming  $t$ :

$$
\theta_t = \alpha + \beta t + \gamma t^2.
$$

Clearly we have to impose some kind of "restriction" on the  $\{\theta_t\}$ . We do not what the "perfect" fit:  $r_t = \theta_t.$ 

But how can we avoid the nuisance of picking the transformations?

We can put a random-walk prior on the  $\{\theta_t\}$ :

$$
\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} + W_t, \quad W_t \sim N(0, W^2).
$$

If we pick W "small", then we can say each the  $\theta_t$  can be anything, but successive ones cannot be too different.

Our model (for the residuals) is:

$$
p(\theta_0, \theta, r) = p(\theta_0) p(\theta | \theta_0) p(r | \theta),
$$

where

$$
\theta=(\theta_1,\theta_2,\ldots,\theta_T), r=(r_1,r_2,\ldots,r_T),
$$

and,

$$
p(\theta | \theta_0) = \Pi_{t=1}^T p(\theta_t | \theta_{t-1}), \ \ p(r | \theta) = \Pi_{t=1}^T p(r_t | \theta_t).
$$

Using FFBS (forward filtering, backward sampling) we can get draws:

 $(\theta_0, \theta) | r$ .

I ran FFBS and got a nd  $\times$  T matrix where each row is a draw of  $\theta$ .

blue: median of  $\{\theta_t\}$  draws. green: 25% and 75% quantiles of  $\{\theta_t\}$  draws. red: 5% and 95% quantiles of  $\{\theta_t\}$  draws.



9

We can write a comprehensive model for the hotel data (rather than just the residuals):

$$
H_t = \theta_t + \beta C_t + v_t, \quad v_t \sim N(0, V).
$$
  

$$
\theta_t = \theta_{t-1} + W_t, \quad W_t \sim N(0, W).
$$

With priors:

$$
p(\theta_0), p(\beta), p(V), p(W).
$$

and draw:

$$
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}\n(\theta_0, \theta) & | & \dots \\
& \beta & | & \dots \\
& V & | & \dots \\
& W & | & \dots\n\end{array}
$$

We can think of this as a time-varying parameter model.

We can start with

$$
H_t = \theta + \beta C_t + v_t,
$$

and then let the intercept vary over time.

It is also very common to let the slope vary over time.

## State Space Models

We observe a time series  $\{X_t\}$ .

We imagine that the distribution of  $X_t$  depends on some unobserved "latent" state  $\theta_t$  which is evolving over time.

Our model consists of the observation equation:

 $p(X_t | \theta_t),$ 

and the state equation:

 $p(\theta_t | \theta_{t-1}).$ 

In addition, we need a prior on the initial state:  $p(\theta_0)$ .

The general picture:

0 1 2 t1 t t1 T XX X 1 2 X XX t1 t t1 <sup>T</sup> − + − + θ→ θ→ θ→ θ → θ→ θ → → θ ↓↓ ↓ ↓ ↓↓ " "

Each X is a "peek" at the corresponding  $θ$ .

If you margin out the θ's get a model in which future X's depend on past X's.