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## Question A:

Corresponding to some important event within the sample $t=0,1 \ldots \ldots, T$ at time $t=\tau$ say, we split the sample for a return series $y_{t}$ in two parts: $t=$ $1, \ldots, \tau$ and $t=\tau+2, \ldots, T$ respectively, with initial values $y_{0}$ and $y_{\tau+1}$ for each sample part. Moreover, each part of the sample is modelled by an ARCH model.

We formalize this as the following split-type ARCH (spARCH) model, given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{t}=v_{t} \varepsilon_{t}, \quad \varepsilon_{t}=\sigma_{t} z_{t} . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $z_{t}$ i.i.d. $\mathrm{N}(0,1), \sigma_{t}^{2}=1-\alpha+\alpha \varepsilon_{t-1}^{2}$ and $v_{t}^{2}=\omega+\gamma \delta_{t}$, with $\delta_{t}=1$ for $t>\tau$ and $\delta_{t}=0$ otherwise. Moreover, for estimation we condition on the initial value $y_{0}$ in the first sample, and $y_{\tau+1}$ in the second sample.

Question A.1: Consider the process $y_{t}$ defined above, but only for the second part of the sample $t=\tau+2, \ldots, T$ and initial value $y_{\tau+1}$. Apply the drift criterion (include derivations) and show for which values of the parameters $(\omega, \gamma, \alpha)$ the process $\left(y_{t}\right)_{t=\tau+1, \ldots, T}$ is weakly mixing with a stationary solution with $E\left(y_{t}^{2}\right)<\infty$. Find $E\left(y_{t}^{2}\right)$ for this sample.

Question A.2: With $\theta=(\omega, \gamma, \alpha)$, show that the log-likelihood function $L_{T, 1}(\theta)$ for the sample $t=2, \ldots, \tau$ with $y_{1}$ fixed, is up to a constant given by,

$$
L_{T, 1}=-\sum_{t=2}^{\tau}\left(\log \sigma_{1 t}^{2}+y_{t}^{2} / \sigma_{1 t}^{2}\right)
$$

State in particular what $\sigma_{1 t}^{2}$ is. Next, state the log-likelihood function $L_{T, 2}(\theta)$ for the sample $t=\tau+2, \ldots, T$, with $y_{\tau+1}$ fixed, and give the log-likelihood function $L_{T}(\theta)$ for the full sample.

Define $s_{1}^{2}:=\frac{1}{\tau+1} \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} y_{t}^{2}$ and $s_{2}^{2}:=\frac{1}{T-\tau} \sum_{t=\tau+1}^{T} y_{t}^{2}$. Explain how you can use these in a two-step estimation procedure where you first find $\hat{\omega}, \hat{\gamma}$, and then in the second step, $\hat{\alpha}$. Comment on whether you expect this to be as good an estimator of $\theta=(\omega, \gamma, \alpha)$ as the MLE of $\theta$.

Question A.3: Show that the score for the second sample in terms of $\gamma$ evaluated at the true value $\theta_{0}=\left(\omega_{0}, \alpha_{0}, \gamma_{0}\right)$, is given by,
$S_{T, 2}(\gamma):=\left.\left(\partial L_{T, 2}(\theta) / \partial \gamma\right)\right|_{\theta=\theta_{0}}=\sum_{t=\tau+2}^{T}\left(1-z_{t}^{2}\right)\left(1-\alpha_{0}\right) /\left(\left(\omega_{0}+\gamma_{0}\right)\left(1-\alpha_{0}\right)+\alpha_{0} y_{t-1}^{2}\right)$.

Show that $(1 / \sqrt{T}) S_{T, 2}(\gamma) \xrightarrow{D} N(0,2 \kappa)$, where

$$
\kappa=E\left(\left(1-\alpha_{0}\right) /\left(\left(\omega_{0}+\gamma_{0}\right)\left(1-\alpha_{0}\right)+\alpha_{0} y_{t-1}^{2}\right)\right)^{2}<\infty .
$$

Question A.4. Consider Figure A. The top graph shows a return series $x_{t}$ for $t=1, \ldots, T$ with $T=1000$. Now, rather than the spARCH above, we apply the spline-GARCH model as given by,

$$
x_{t}=v_{t}^{*} \sigma_{t} z_{t},
$$

where $\log \left(v_{t}^{*}\right)^{2}=c+\sum_{j=1}^{k} \gamma_{j} 1\left(t>\tau_{j}\right)$, where $k$ denotes the number of knots, $1<\tau_{1}<\tau_{2} \ldots<\tau_{k-1}<\tau_{k}<T$ and $1\left(t>\tau_{j}\right)=1$ if $t>\tau_{j}$ and zero otherwise. Also $\sigma_{t}^{2}=1-a+a\left(x_{t-1} / v_{t-1}^{*}\right)^{2}+b \sigma_{t-1}^{2}$ and $z_{t}$ are i.i.d.N $(0,1)$.

The lower part in Figure A shows the estimated $\hat{h}_{t}:=\left(\hat{v}_{t}^{*} \hat{\sigma}_{t}\right)^{2}$ together with the spline $\hat{v}_{t}^{*}$ for $k=5$ knots. Comment on the return series $x_{t}$ in terms of the previous spARCH model. Comment on the Spline-GARCH estimated $\hat{h}_{t}$ and $\hat{v}_{t}^{* 2}$.

Table A provides some output from modeling $x_{t}$ as a classic $\operatorname{GARH}(1,1)$ model (where $v_{t}^{*}=1$ ). Comment on all the output in the table.


Figure A: Returns, $x_{t}$

| Table A |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\hat{a}=0.11$ | Normality test for standardized residuals: | p -value $=0.02$ |
| $\hat{b}=0.89$ | ARCH test: | p -value $=0.22$ |

## Question B:

Consider the threshold SV (TRSV) model as given by,

$$
\begin{align*}
y_{t} & =\sigma_{t} z_{t}  \tag{B.1}\\
\log \sigma_{t}^{2} & =\rho \delta_{t} \log \sigma_{t-1}^{2}+\xi_{t}, \tag{B.2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $z_{t}$ and $\xi_{t}$ are independent, with $z_{t}$ i.i.d. $\mathrm{N}(0,1)$ and $\xi_{t}$ i.i.dN $\left(0, \sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$. Moreover, $\delta_{t}=1\left(\left|\log \sigma_{t-1}^{2}\right| \leq \gamma\right)$, for some positive threshold parameter $\gamma>0$. That is, $\delta_{t}=1$ if $\left|\log \sigma_{t-1}^{2}\right| \leq \gamma$ and zero otherwise.

Question B.1: Show that $\log \sigma_{t}^{2}$ is weakly mixing and has a stationary representation for $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\gamma>0$. In particular, explain how it can be the case that $\rho=1$ is allowed in this case. Does this imply anything for joint evolution of $y_{t}$ and $\sigma_{t}^{2}$ ?

Question B.2: Set $Y_{t}:=\log y_{t}^{2}-\mu$, where $\mu=E \log z_{t}^{2}$. Moreover, set $X_{t}:=\log \sigma_{t}^{2}$. It follows that the system for $Y_{t}$ and $X_{t}$ can be written as,

$$
Y_{t}=X_{t}+\varepsilon_{t}, \quad X_{t}=g\left(X_{t-1}\right) X_{t-1}+\xi_{t} .
$$

Here $\varepsilon_{t}$ is i.i.d. $\left(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$. Moreover, $g\left(X_{t-1}\right)=\rho 1\left(\left|X_{t-1}\right| \leq \gamma\right)$.
Argue that $\varepsilon_{t}$ is not Gaussian, but that $\varepsilon_{t}$ is an iid sequence with mean zero and variance $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}=\pi^{2} / 2$.

Observe that with $Y_{1: t}=\left(Y_{1}, \ldots, Y_{t}\right), E\left(Y_{t} \mid Y_{1: t-1}\right)=X_{t \mid t-1}=E\left(X_{t} \mid Y_{1: t-1}\right)$. Hence one would be interested in computing $X_{t \mid t-1}=E\left(X_{t} \mid Y_{1: t-1}\right)$ as a function of $X_{t-1 \mid t-1}=E\left(X_{t-1} \mid Y_{1: t-1}\right)$.

However, the linear Kalman filter would not work here. Explain why.
Question B.3: Provide an outline of how you would find the MLE of $\theta=$ $\left(\rho, \gamma, \sigma_{\xi}^{2}\right)$ based on the particle filter.

In particular, relate your explanation to what happens below in the piece of code from ox.

```
DrawProposal(x_1)
{
decl x;
x = rho*x_1*(fabs(x_1)<=gamma) + sqrt(sigma)*rann(1,1);
return x;
}
```


## Question B.4:

Figure B below shows a return series $x_{t}, t=1,2, \ldots, T$, simulated from the model in (B.1)-(B.2) with $\rho=1$. Moreover, it shows two estimated conditional variance series: One series, $\hat{\sigma}_{t, G A R C H}^{2}$, is found by a simple linear $\operatorname{GARCH}(1,1)$ estimation for $x_{t}$. The other series, $\hat{\sigma}_{t, M L E}^{2}$, is the comparable variance estimated by MLE using the particle filter.

Comment on the return series and the estimated conditional variances.
Explain how $\hat{\sigma}_{t, M L E}^{2}$ could be obtained by a particle filter. Explain, in particular, the difference between the predicted and the filtered volatility. Elaborate.


Figure B

