

Medeiros, Marcelo Cunha; Veiga, Álvaro; Pedreira, Carlos Eduardo

Working Paper

Modelling exchange rates: Smooth transitions, neural networks, and linear models

Texto para discussão, No. 432

Provided in Cooperation with:

Departamento de Economia, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro

Suggested Citation: Medeiros, Marcelo Cunha; Veiga, Álvaro; Pedreira, Carlos Eduardo (2000) : Modelling exchange rates: Smooth transitions, neural networks, and linear models, Texto para discussão, No. 432, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro (PUC-Rio), Departamento de Economia, Rio de Janeiro

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/186676>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Modelling Exchange Rates: Smooth Transitions, Neural Networks, and Linear Models

Marcelo C. Medeiros

Dept. of Economics, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro

Álvaro Veiga and Carlos E. Pedreira

Dept. of Electrical Engineering, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro

March 15, 2001

Forthcoming in: IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, Special Issue on Financial Engineering

Abstract

The goal of this paper is to test for and model nonlinearities in several monthly exchange rates time series. We apply two different nonlinear alternatives, namely: the artificial neural network time series model estimated with Bayesian regularization and a flexible smooth transition specification, called the neuro-coefficient smooth transition autoregression. The linearity test rejects the null hypothesis of linearity in ten out of fourteen series. We compare, using different measures, the forecasting performance of the nonlinear specifications with the linear autoregression and the random walk models.

Keywords: Time series, smooth transition models, neural networks, Bayesian regularization, exchange rates.

Acknowledgments: The authors would like to thank Timo Teräsvirta, Renato Flôres, and Dick van Dijk for valuable comments, and the CNPq for the financial support. This work is part of the first author PhD. Thesis at the Department of Electrical Engineering, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro.

1 Introduction

During the last two decades many different nonlinear models have been proposed in the literature to model and forecast exchange rates. Several authors claimed that exchange rates are rather unpredictable, and that a random walk model is often a better predictor than concurrent nonlinear models. See for example, Chang and Osler (1999), Gencay (1999), Meese and Rose (1991), and Meese and Rose (1990). With this concern in mind, some questions should be raised: How relevant is the nonlinearity in the series? Is the nonlinearity uniformly spread? Are nonlinear models better predictors? If there are periods of the series with no nonlinearity, what is the lost (if any) of applying a nonlinear model? Without having the intention of solving these fundamental and complex questions, this paper addresses the problem by benchmarking two nonlinear alternatives against the linear AutoRegressive (AR) and the Random Walk (RW) models. Several monthly exchange rates time series are used. For similar papers, see Sarantis (1999) and Qi and Wu (to appear).

The nonlinear alternatives considered in this paper are the Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model (Kuan and White 1994) and a novel flexible model called the Neuro-Coefficient Smooth Transition AutoRegression (NCSTAR) (Medeiros and Veiga 2000b). The NCSTAR specification can be interpreted as a linear model where its coefficients are given by a single hidden layer feedforward neural network and has the main advantage of nesting several well-known nonlinear formulations, such as, the Self-Exciting Threshold AutoRegression (SETAR) (Tong 1978, Tong and Lim 1980), the Smooth Transition AutoRegression (STAR) (Chan and Tong 1986, Luukkonen, Saikkonen and Teräsvirta 1988, Teräsvirta 1994), and the ANN model. Furthermore, if the neural network is interpreted as a nonparametric universal approximation to any Borel-measurable function, the NCSTAR model is directly comparable to the Functional Coefficient AutoRegression (FAR) (Chen and Tsay 1993) and the Single-Index Coefficient Regression model (Xia and Li 1999). A modelling strategy for the NCSTAR model was developed in Medeiros and Veiga (2000a) and Medeiros and Veiga (to appear).

The plan of the paper is as follows. Section 2 discusses the NCSTAR model and briefly describes the modelling strategy. Section 3 outlines the neural network models with Bayesian regularization. The benchmark models are described in Section 4. Section 5 gives a description of an experiment comparing the forecasting performance of the NCSTAR and the neural network models with the benchmark

alternatives. The results are discussed in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 concludes.

2 The NCSTAR Model

2.1 Mathematical Formulation

Consider a linear model with time-varying coefficients expressed as

$$y_t = \boldsymbol{\phi}_t' \mathbf{z}_t + \varepsilon_t, \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\phi}_t = [\phi_t^{(0)}, \phi_t^{(1)}, \dots, \phi_t^{(p)}]'$ is a vector of real coefficients and $\mathbf{z}_t = [1, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t']'$. $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of lagged values of y_t and/or some exogenous variables. The random term ε_t is a normally distributed white noise with variance σ^2 . The time evolution of the coefficients $\phi_t^{(j)}$ of (1) is given by

$$\phi_t^{(j)} = \sum_{i=1}^h \lambda_{ji} F(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - \beta_i) - \lambda_{j0}, \quad j = 0, \dots, p, \quad (2)$$

where λ_{ji} and λ_{j0} are real coefficients.

The function $F(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - \beta_i)$ is the logistic function, where $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathbb{R}^q$ is a vector of input variables, $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = [\omega_{1i}, \dots, \omega_{qi}]'$ and β_i are real parameters. The norm of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is called the *slope parameter*. In the limit, when the slope parameter approaches infinity, the logistic function becomes a step function.

Note that (1) can be interpreted as a linear model where its coefficients are given by a single hidden layer feedforward neural network. The neural network architecture representing (2) is illustrated in Figure 1. The elements of \mathbf{x}_t , called the transition variables, can be formed by lagged values of y and/or any exogenous variables. In this paper, we assume that \mathbf{x}_t is formed by a subset of the elements of \mathbf{z}_t and that there are no exogenous variables in the model specification.

Equations (1) and (2) represent a time-varying model with a multivariate smooth transition structure defined by h hidden neurons.

[FIGURE 1 SOMEWHERE HERE]

Equation (1) can be rewritten as

$$y_t = G(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi) + \varepsilon_t = \alpha_0 + \sum_{j=1}^p \alpha_j y_{t-j} + \sum_{i=1}^h \lambda_{0i} F(\omega'_i \mathbf{x}_t - \beta_i) + \sum_{j=1}^p \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^h \lambda_{ji} F(\omega'_i \mathbf{x}_t - \beta_i) \right\} y_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (3)$$

or in vector notation

$$y_t = G(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi) + \varepsilon_t = \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{i=1}^h \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \mathbf{z}_t F(\omega'_i \mathbf{x}_t - \beta_i) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (4)$$

where $\Psi = [\boldsymbol{\alpha}', \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_h, \omega'_1, \dots, \omega'_h, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_h]'$ is a parameter vector with $(q+1) \times h + (p+1) \times (h+1)$ elements, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = [\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_p]'$ and $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i = [\lambda_{0i}, \dots, \lambda_{pi}]'$.

Note that model (4) is, in principle, neither globally nor locally identified. To ensure the identifiability of (4) we have to impose the following restrictions: $\beta_1 \leq \dots \leq \beta_h$ and $\omega_{1i} > 0$, $i = 1, \dots, h$. For details on identifiability concepts see, e. g., Sussman (1992), Kurková and Kainen (1994), Hwang and Ding (1997), Anders and Korn (1999), Trapletti, Leisch and Hornik (2000), and Medeiros and Veiga (2000a).

The NCSTAR model has the main advantage of nesting several well-known nonlinear formulations, such as, for example, the SETAR, STAR, and ANN models.

2.2 Modelling Cycle

In this section, we briefly outline a modelling technique based on statistical inference to build the NCSTAR model. For more details, see Medeiros and Veiga (2000a) and Medeiros and Veiga (to appear). This amounts to proceeding from a linear model to the smallest NCSTAR model and gradually towards larger ones through a sequence of Lagrange Multiplier (LM) tests. Finally, after the model has been estimated, it is evaluated by some misspecification tests. For similar ideas, see Tsay (1989), Teräsvirta (1994), and Eitrheim and Teräsvirta (1996). The modelling cycle can be summarized as follows:

1. Specification

- (a) Select the variables of the model.

- (b) Test linearity.
 - (c) If linearity is rejected, determine the number of hidden units.
2. Parameter estimation of the specified model.
 3. Model evaluation based on misspecification testing.
 - (a) Test for parameter constancy.
 - (b) Test for serial independence of the error term.
 - (c) Test for homoscedasticity of the error term .

These three stages are briefly described below.

2.2.1 Specification

2.2.1.1 Variable Selection. The first step of the specification stage is to select the variables of the model. In this step we will not distinguish between the variables in \mathbf{z}_t and \mathbf{x}_t in (4). Following Medeiros and Veiga (2000a), we adopt the simple procedure proposed by Rech, Teräsvirta and Tschernig (1999). Their proposal uses global parametric least squares estimation and is based on a polynomial expansion of the model. We provide a brief overview of the method. For more details see Rech et al. (1999).

Consider model (4). The first step is to expand function $G(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi)$ into a k -order polynomial expansion around an arbitrary fixed point in the sample space. After merging terms, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}
 G(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi) = & \boldsymbol{\pi}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{j_1=1}^p \sum_{j_2=j_1}^p \rho_{j_1 j_2} z_{j_1, t} z_{j_2, t} + \dots \\
 & \dots + \sum_{j_1=1}^p \dots \sum_{j_k=j_{k-1}}^p \theta_{j_1 \dots j_k} z_{j_1, t} \dots z_{j_k, t} + R(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi),
 \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

where $R(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \Psi)$ is the remainder and the θ 's, ρ 's, and $\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ are parameters. Note that the terms involving \mathbf{x}_t merged with the terms involving \mathbf{z}_t .

The second step is to regress y_t on all variables in the polynomial expansion and compute the value of a model selection criterion, such as, for example, the Akaike's information criterion (AIC). After that, remove one variable from the original model and regress y_t on all the remaining terms in the expansion

and compute the value of the AIC. Repeat this procedure by omitting each variable in turn. Continue by simultaneously omitting two regressors of the original model and proceed in that way until the polynomial expansion becomes a function of a single regressor. Choose the combination of variables that yields the lowest value of the AIC. The selected variables will compose the vector \mathbf{z}_t .

2.2.1.2 Testing Linearity. In practical nonlinear time series modelling, testing linearity plays an important role. In the context of model (4), testing linearity has two objectives. The first one is to verify if a linear model is able to adequately describe the data generating process. The second one refers to the variable selection problem. The linearity test is used to determine the elements of \mathbf{x}_t . After selecting the elements of \mathbf{z}_t with the procedure described above, we choose the elements of \mathbf{x}_t by running the linearity test described below setting \mathbf{x}_t equal to each possible subset of the elements of \mathbf{z}_t and choosing the one that minimize the p -value of the test.

In order to test for linearity, equation (4) is rewritten as

$$y_t = \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{i=1}^h \lambda_i' \mathbf{z}_t F(\gamma_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - c_i)) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (6)$$

where $\gamma_i = \|\boldsymbol{\omega}_i\|$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_i = \boldsymbol{\omega}_i/\gamma_i$, and $c_i = \beta_i/\gamma_i$, $i = 1, \dots, h$. The transition function $F(\gamma_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - c_i))$ is redefined as

$$F(\gamma_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - c_i)) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\gamma_i(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_i' \mathbf{x}_t - c_i))} - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (7)$$

Subtracting one-half from the logistic function is useful just in deriving linearity tests where it simplifies notation but not affect the argument. The models estimated in this paper do not contain that term.

Consider (6) with (7) and the testing of the hypothesis that y_t is a linear process. Note that $F(0) = 0$, implying the null hypothesis of linearity

$$H_0 : \gamma_i = 0, i = 1, \dots, h. \quad (8)$$

Hypothesis (8) offers a convenient starting point for studying the linearity problem in the LM (score) testing framework.

Note that model (6) is not identified under the null. A consequence of this complication is that

the standard asymptotic distribution theory for the likelihood ratio or other classical test statistics for testing (8) is not available. We solve the problem by replacing $F(\gamma_i(\tilde{\omega}'_i \mathbf{x}_t - c_i))$ by a third order Taylor expansion approximation about $\gamma_i = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, h$.

After rearranging terms, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
y_t = & \boldsymbol{\pi}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \theta_{ij} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{ij} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \theta_{ijk} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} x_{k,t} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \beta_{ijk} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} x_{k,t} + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \sum_{l=k}^q \theta_{ijkl} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} x_{k,t} x_{l,t} \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \sum_{l=k}^q \beta_{ijkl} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} x_{k,t} x_{l,t} + \varepsilon_t^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where $\varepsilon_t^* = \varepsilon_t + R(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \boldsymbol{\Psi})$. $R(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \boldsymbol{\Psi})$ is the combined remainder of the third-order Taylor expansion of the logistic functions. The vector $\mathbf{z}_t^* \in \mathbb{R}^{p-q}$ is formed by the elements of \mathbf{z}_t that are not in \mathbf{x}_t . The null hypothesis is defined as $H_0 : \theta_{ij} = 0, \beta_{ij} = 0, \theta_{ijk} = 0, \beta_{ijk} = 0, \theta_{ijkl} = 0$, and $\beta_{ijkl} = 0$.

From (9) it is seen that the test is just a test of a linear hypothesis in a linear model, so that standard asymptotic inference is available.

It is important to stress that the linearity test against a STAR model (Teräsvirta 1994) and the neural network linearity test (Teräsvirta, Lin and Granger 1993) are special cases of the test discussed here.

2.2.1.3 Determining the Number of Hidden Units. In a practical situation one wants to be able to test for the number of hidden units of the neural network. The basic idea is to start using the linearity test described above and test the linear model against the nonlinear alternative with only one hidden unit. If the linearity is rejected, then fit a model with one hidden unit and test for the second one. Proceed in that way until the first acceptance of the null hypothesis. The individual tests are based on linearizing the nonlinear contribution of the additional hidden neuron. Consider the general case in which the model contains h hidden units, and we want to know whether an additional unit is required or not. Write the model as

$$y_t = \boldsymbol{\alpha}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{i=1}^h \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \mathbf{z}_t F(\gamma_i(\tilde{\omega}'_i \mathbf{x}_t - c_i)) + F(\gamma_{h+1}(\tilde{\omega}'_{h+1} \mathbf{x}_t - c_{h+1})) + \varepsilon_t. \tag{10}$$

An appropriate null hypothesis is

$$H_0 : \gamma_{h+1} = 0. \quad (11)$$

Note that (10) is only identified under the alternative. Using a third order expansion and after rearranging terms, the resulting model is

$$\begin{aligned} y_t = & \boldsymbol{\pi}' \mathbf{z}_t + \sum_{i=1}^h \boldsymbol{\lambda}'_i \mathbf{z}_t F(\gamma_i (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}'_i \mathbf{x}_t - c_i)) \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \theta_{ij} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \beta_{ij} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \theta_{ijk} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} x_{k,t} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \beta_{ijk} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} x_{k,t} + \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{j=i}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \sum_{l=k}^q \theta_{ijkl} x_{i,t} x_{j,t} x_{k,t} x_{l,t} \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{p-q} \sum_{j=1}^q \sum_{k=j}^q \sum_{l=k}^q \beta_{ijkl} z_{i,t}^* x_{j,t} x_{k,t} x_{l,t} + \varepsilon_t^*. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

The null hypothesis is defined as $H_0 : \theta_{ij} = 0, \beta_{ij} = 0, \rho_{ij} = 0$. Again, standard asymptotic inference is available.

2.2.2 Parameter Estimation

After specifying the model, the parameters should be estimated by nonlinear least squares (NLS). Hence the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$ of (4) is estimated as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Psi}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}{\operatorname{argmin}} Q_T(\boldsymbol{\Psi}) = \underset{\boldsymbol{\Psi}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - G(\mathbf{z}_t, \mathbf{x}_t; \boldsymbol{\Psi}))^2. \quad (13)$$

Under some regularity conditions the estimates are consistent and asymptotically normal (Davidson and MacKinnon 1993).

The estimation procedure is carried together with the test for the number of hidden units. First we test for linearity against a model given by (4) with $h = 1$. If linearity is rejected we estimate the parameters of the nonlinear model and test for the second hidden unit. If the null hypothesis is rejected, we use the estimated values for the first hidden unit as starting values and use the procedure described in Medeiros and Veiga (2000a) to compute initial values for the second hidden unit. We proceed in that way until the first acceptance of the null hypothesis.

2.2.3 Model Evaluation

After the NCSTAR model has been estimated it has to be evaluated. This means that the assumptions under which the model has been estimated have to be checked. These assumptions include the hypothesis of no serial correlation, parameter constancy, and homoscedasticity. Testing for normality is also a common practice in econometrics. In this paper we use the tests discussed in Medeiros and Veiga (to appear). They are Lagrange multiplier (LM) type tests of parameter constancy against the alternative of smoothly changing ones, of serial independence of the error term, and homoscedasticity against the hypothesis that the variance smoothly changes between regimes. To test for normality we use the Jarque-Bera test (Jarque and Bera 1987).

3 Artificial Neural Networks and Bayesian Regularization

A feedforward Artificial Neural Network (ANN) time series model can be defined as

$$y_t = G(\mathbf{z}_t; \Psi) = \lambda_0 + \sum_{i=1}^h \lambda_i F(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i' \mathbf{z}_t - \beta_i) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (14)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = [\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_q]'$ and $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i = [\omega_{1i}, \dots, \omega_{pi}]'$ are vectors of real parameters, $\mathbf{z}_t = [1, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t']'$, $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector of lagged values of y_t , $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is assumed to be a sequence of independent, normally distributed random variables with zero mean and finite variance, and $F(\boldsymbol{\omega}_i' \mathbf{z}_t - \beta_i)$ is the logistic function. Note that model (14) is just a special case of the NCSTAR model.

In this paper we adopt the regularization approach to estimate the ANN models. The fundamental idea is to find a balance between the number of parameters and goodness of fit by penalizing large models. The objective function is modified in such a way that the estimation algorithm effectively prunes the network by driving irrelevant parameter estimates to zero during the estimation process. The parameter vector Ψ is estimated as

$$\hat{\Psi} = \underset{\Psi}{\operatorname{argmin}} \tilde{Q}_T(\Psi) = \underset{\Psi}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\eta Q_T(\Psi) + (1 - \eta) Q_T^*(\Psi)), \quad (15)$$

where $Q_T(\Psi) = \sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - G(\mathbf{z}_t; \Psi))^2$, $Q_T^*(\Psi)$ is the *regularization or penalty term*, and $\eta > 0$ is

often called the *decay constant*. The usual penalty is the sum of squared parameters

$$Q_T^*(\Psi) = \sum_{j=0}^p \lambda_j^2 + \sum_{i=1}^h \beta_i^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^h \omega_{ji}^2. \quad (16)$$

The forecasting ability of the ANN model can depend crucially on the decay constant η , especially with small in-sample periods. If η is too large, the network may still overfit, and if it is too small, the ANN model does not have an adequate fit in the estimation period. Usually, different types of parameters in the ANN model will usually require different decay constants for good forecasting ability.

One approach to determine the optimal regularization parameter η is the Bayesian framework of MacKay (1992), where the parameters of the network are assumed to be random variables with well-specified distributions. The regularization parameters are related to the unknown variances associated with these distributions and can be estimated with statistical techniques. Foresee and Hagan (1997) give a detailed discussion of the use of Bayesian regularization in combination with the Levenberg-Marquardt optimization algorithm. The main advantage of this method is that even if the ANN model is over-parametrized, the irrelevant parameter estimates are likely to be close to zero and the model behaves like a small network.

All the ANN models in this paper are estimated with Bayesian regularization in combination with the Levenberg-Marquardt algorithm. The starting-values for the parameters are selected by the Nguyen-Widrow rule (Nguyen and Widrow 1990).

4 Benchmark Models

In this section we outline two simple linear models that are often used as benchmark formulations in the financial time series literature.

4.1 The Random Walk Model

Consider the following Random Walk (RW) model for the level of the exchange rate series

$$p_t = \alpha + p_{t-1} + u_t, \quad (17)$$

where p_t is the price at the time instant t , α is a constant, and u_t is a random term identically distributed.

Taking the first difference of the logarithms, the resulting model becomes

$$y_t = \ln(p_t) - \ln(p_{t-1}) = c + \varepsilon_t, \quad (18)$$

where y_t is the return at time t and c is a constant. Usually ε_t is assumed to be a normally distributed random variable with zero mean and finite variance.

4.2 The Linear Autoregressive Model

A linear autoregressive (AR) model of order p for the returns is defined as

$$y_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 y_{t-1} + \dots + \alpha_p y_{t-p} + \varepsilon_t, \quad (19)$$

where $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p$ are real coefficients and ε_t is a identically normally distributed random variable with zero mean and finite variance. The order of the model is determined by inspection of the autocorrelation and partial autocorrelation functions (ACF and PACF).

5 The Experiment

To assess the practical usefulness of the NCSTAR and ANN models in comparison with the linear AR and RW models and to address the questions proposed in the Introduction, an experiment with 14 different monthly exchange rates time series is conducted. We have decided to work with monthly time series just to avoid to model any ARCH effect in the conditional variance of the series. It is well known that daily exchange rates are more volatile than the monthly ones and, of course, will have more non-linearity to model. The data are summarized in Table 1. The series were obtained from *Economagic* (www.economagic.com).

[TABLE 1 SOMEWHERE HERE]

Both in-sample and out-of-sample performance are considered. The first step is to test linearity in all series. We discard all the series that do not have evidence of nonlinearity according to the test described

in Section 2.2.1.2. For the series that turn out to be nonlinear we proceed estimating linear and nonlinear models, each of which are evaluated according to their in-sample explanatory power and out-of-sample forecasting ability. The forecasts made by each estimated model are compared according to the following statistics (described in Appendix A): nRMSE, MAE, MAD, and SIGN.

The forecasting experiment can be viewed of consisting of the following steps.

1. Split the sample into two subsamples: the estimation set ($t = 1, \dots, t_0$) and the forecasting set ($t = t_0 + 1, \dots, T$).
2. Estimate the parameters of each model using only the estimation set and analyse the in-sample performance of the estimated models.
3. For $t = t_0, \dots, T - 4$, compute the out-of-sample forecasts of 1- to 4-step-ahead, $\hat{y}_{t+k|t}$, and the associated forecast errors denoted by $\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}$, where k is the forecasting horizon. Multi-step forecasts for the nonlinear models are obtained by Monte-Carlo simulation as described in Appendix B
4. For each forecasting horizon, compute different performance measures.

6 Results

6.1 Specification and Estimation

Using the variables selected by the AIC and the linearity test described in Section 2.2.1.2, evidence of nonlinearity was found in ten series: Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Sweden, Spain, India, Sri Lanka, and Australia. However, linearity was strongly rejected only in Finland, Australia, Sri Lanka, and India. The results are summarized in Table 2.

[TABLE 2 SOMEWHERE HERE]

To check if the nonlinearity is uniformly spread over the in-sample period, we fix the specification of \mathbf{z}_t and \mathbf{x}_t and test linearity in a rolling window with 100 observations. The p -value of the linearity test for each sub-sample is shown in Figure 2. With the exception of the Sri Lanka, nonlinearity is only

significant in a few number of periods, specially in the beginning or in the end of the series. This is an interesting result and explains why linearity is not strongly rejected for most of the series considered here.

[FIGURE 2 SOMEWHERE HERE]

For those series that turned out to be nonlinear, we continue estimating the models.

The specification and estimation results for the NCSTAR models can be found in Table 3. This table shows, for each series, the estimated number of hidden units (h), the p -value of the LM test of serial correlation of order r in the residuals ($LM_F^{iid}(r)$), the p -value of the LM test of parameter constancy (LM_F^{pc}), the p -value of the LM test of homocedasticity (LM_F^{σ}), the p -value of the Jarque-Bera (JB) test of normality of the residuals, and, finally, the estimated residual standard deviation.

Analysing the results in Table 3, we observe that all the estimated models have uncorrelated errors at 0.01 level. Only Sweden and Australia have evidence of serial correlated errors (of order 1) at 0.05 level. The hypothesis of parameter constancy is rejected at 0.05 level but not at 0.01 level for France and Australia. The only case where the null hypothesis of homoscedasticity is rejected (at 0.05 level) is France. Due the fact that the null hypothesis of serial independence, parameter constancy, and homoscedasticity are not strongly rejected (see the p -values of the tests) we do not take this into account and we accept the estimated models as our final specifications. Figure 3 shows, for each model, the scatter plot of the transition function versus the linear combination of transition variables. With few exceptions, the transitions between regimes are rather smooth.

[FIGURE 3 SOMEWHERE HERE]

The specification and estimation results for the AR models are shown in Table 4. The columns show, respectively, the selected lags, the p -value of the Ljung-Box test of order 1,2, and 6, the p -value of the Jarque-Bera (JB) test of normality of the residuals, and the estimated residual standard deviation.

Observing Table 4, we note that all the linear models have uncorrelated errors.

In Table 5 we show the lags in the ANN models, the number of hidden units, the minimum value of the absolute correlation between the outputs of the hidden units of the estimated ANN models, and the residual standard deviation.

By inspection of Table 5, we observe that, with exception of Australia and Sri Lanka, the hidden units of the ANN models are heavily correlated pointing to the fact that a model with only one hidden unit will be enough to model the data. Although not shown here, the plots of the outputs of the hidden units of most of the estimated models indicate that the hidden neurons are almost linear. This can be also checked by comparing the standard deviation of the residuals from the ANN and AR models.

Additionally, we should stress that the standard deviation of residuals from the NCSTAR model is smaller than the ones from the linear AR and the ANN for all the series.

[TABLE 3 SOMEWHERE HERE]

[TABLE 4 SOMEWHERE HERE]

[TABLE 5 SOMEWHERE HERE]

6.2 Forecasting Experiment

The forecasting results are shown in Tables 6–8. Table 6 shows the number of series where each model is the best model according to the performance measures used here. Note that more than one model can be the “winner” for each series, specially according to the *SIGN* criterion.

For 1-step-ahead forecasts the linear AR model has the best performance in 50% of the cases when the nRMSE, the MAE, and the MAD are used as performance measures. According to SIGN, the results are mixed, with the RW model having a small advantage. For 2-, 3-, and 4-step-ahead forecasts the results are not very clear and there is no evidence of a “winner” model when the nRMSE and the MAE are considered. However, the RW model seems to be the best predictor of the SIGN. It is also important to notice that according to the MAD, that is a measure robust to outliers, the nonlinear models outperform the concurrent linear specifications in most of the cases.

To check if the forecasts produced by different models are statistically different or not, the number of series where model A (column) is better than model B (row) according to the modified Diebold-Mariano test (Diebold and Mariano 1995, Harvey, Leybourne and Newbold 1997) at a 0.05 level are shown in Tables 7 and 8 (See Appendix C for details). The results in Table 7 concern to the nRMSE test and the ones in Table 8 concern to the MAE test.

Observing Tables 7 and 8, we conclude that, in most of the series, the differences in the forecast performance between NCSTAR, ANN, AR, and RW models are not significant according to the Diebold-Mariano test. It is important to notice that the NCSTAR model is better than the AR and ANN specifications when the Siri-Lanka series is considered. This is not surprising, because that is the only series where the nonlinearity is uniformly spread. It is also important to observe that for 1-step-ahead forecasts and specially when the MAE is used as a comparison criterion, the results are quite supportive in favour of the linear and nonlinear specifications against the *naïve* RW model.

[TABLE 6 SOMEWHERE HERE]

[TABLE 7 SOMEWHERE HERE]

[TABLE 8 SOMEWHERE HERE]

7 Conclusions

This paper has presented and compared different alternatives to model and forecast monthly exchange rates time series. The models that have been used are the Neuro-Coefficient Smooth Transition AutoRegressive (NCSTAR) model, Artificial Neural Networks (ANN), linear AutoRegression (AR), and, the Random Walk (RW) formulation.

In conclusion, we can now answer the questions raised in the Introduction. How relevant is nonlinearity in the series? Nonlinearity is only relevant in some periods of the series, specially in the beginning or in the end of the sample. Is the nonlinearity uniformly spread? No, with the exception of the Siri-Lanka, the nonlinearity is concentrated in only a small sub-sample of the data. Are nonlinear models better predictors? Nonlinear models stand a better chance only in the cases where nonlinearity is uniformly spread. Otherwise, there is no significant differences in the forecasts made by a concurrent linear model. What is the lost (if any) of applying a nonlinear alternative when there is no evidence of nonlinearity? If a statistical procedure to build nonlinear models is used, probably the final estimated model will be close to a linear specification and the forecasting ability will be close to the one from a linear specification. In this paper we have used a statistical approach to build the NCSTAR model and the ANN formulations have been estimated with Bayesian regularization that tries to build a parsimonious model

based on Bayesian fundamentals. Concerning the predictability of exchange rates, we conclude that for 1-step-ahead forecasts and when the MAE is used as a performance metric, there are some supportive results in favor of linear and nonlinear models against the simple random walk.

References

- Anders, U. and Korn, O. (1999). Model selection in neural networks, *Neural Networks* **12**: 309–323.
- Chan, K. S. and Tong, H. (1986). On estimating thresholds in autoregressive models, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **7**: 179–190.
- Chang, P. H. K. and Osler, C. L. (1999). Methodical madness: Technical analysis and the irrationality of exchange-rate forecasts, *Economic Journal* **10**: 636–661.
- Chen, R. and Tsay, R. S. (1993). Functional coefficient autoregressive models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **88**: 298–308.
- Davidson, R. and MacKinnon, J. G. (1993). *Estimation and Inference in Econometrics*, Oxford University Press, New York, NY.
- Diebold, F. X. and Mariano, R. S. (1995). Comparing predictive accuracy, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* **13**: 253–263.
- Eitrheim, Ø. and Teräsvirta, T. (1996). Testing the adequacy of smooth transition autoregressive models, *Journal of Econometrics* **74**: 59–75.
- Foresee, F. D. and Hagan, M. . T. (1997). Gauss-newton approximation to Bayesian regularization, *IEEE International Conference on Neural Networks (Vol. 3)*, IEEE, New York, pp. 1930–1935.
- Gencay, R. (1999). Linear, non-linear and essential foreign exchange rate prediction with simple technical trading rules, *Journal of International Economics* **47**: 91–107.
- Granger, C. W. J. and Teräsvirta, T. (1993). *Modelling Nonlinear Economic Relationships*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

- Harvey, D., Leybourne, S. and Newbold, P. (1997). Testing the equality of prediction mean squared errors, *International Journal of Forecasting* **13**: 281–291.
- Hwang, J. T. G. and Ding, A. A. (1997). Prediction intervals for artificial neural networks, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **92**(438): 109–125.
- Jarque, C. M. and Bera, A. K. (1987). A test of normality of observations and regression residuals, *International Statistical Review* **55**: 163–172.
- Kuan, C. M. and White, H. (1994). Artificial neural networks: An econometric perspective, *Econometric Reviews* **13**: 1–91.
- Kurková, V. and Kainen, P. C. (1994). Functionally equivalent feedforward neural networks, *Neural Computation* **6**: 543–558.
- Luukkonen, R., Saikkonen, P. and Teräsvirta, T. (1988). Testing linearity against smooth transition autoregressive models, *Biometrika* **75**: 491–499.
- MacKay, D. J. C. (1992). Bayesian interpolation, *Neural Computation* **4**: 415–447.
- Medeiros, M. C. and Veiga, A. (2000a). A hybrid linear-neural model for time series forecasting, *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks* **11**(6): 1402–14012.
- Medeiros, M. C. and Veiga, A. (2000b). A flexible coefficient smooth transition time series model, *Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance 361*, Stockholm School of Economics.
- Medeiros, M. C. and Veiga, A. (to appear). Diagnostic checking in a flexible nonlinear time series model, *Journal of Time Series Analysis*.
- Meese, R. A. and Rose, A. K. (1990). Nonlinear, nonparametric, nonessential exchange rate estimation, *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* **80**: 192–196.
- Meese, R. A. and Rose, A. K. (1991). An empirical assessment of nonlinearities in models of exchange rate determination, *Review of Economic Studies* **58**: 603–619.

- Nguyen, D. and Widrow, B. (1990). Improving the learning speed of 2-layer neural networks by choosing initial values of the adaptive weights, *Proceedings of the International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, Vol. 3, pp. 21–26.
- Qi, M. and Wu, Y. (to appear). Exchange rates and fundamentals: Evidence from out-of-sample forecasting using neural networks, *Computational Finance 1999*, The MIT Press.
- Rech, G., Teräsvirta, T. and Tschernig, R. (1999). A simple variable selection technique for nonlinear models, *Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance 296*, Stockholm School of Economics.
- Sarantis, N. (1999). Modeling non-linearities in real effective exchange rates, *Journal of International Money and Finance* **18**(1): 27–45.
- Sussman, H. J. (1992). Uniqueness of the weights for minimal feedforward nets with a given input-output map, *Neural Networks* **5**: 589–593.
- Teräsvirta, T. (1994). Specification, estimation, and evaluation of smooth transition autoregressive models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **89**(425): 208–218.
- Teräsvirta, T., Lin, C. F. and Granger, C. W. J. (1993). Power of the neural network linearity test, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **14**(2): 309–323.
- Tong, H. (1978). On a threshold model, in C. H. Chen (ed.), *Pattern Recognition and Signal Processing*, Sijthoff and Noordhoff, Amsterdam.
- Tong, H. and Lim, K. (1980). Threshold autoregression, limit cycles and cyclical data (with discussion), *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **42**: 245–292.
- Trapletti, A., Leisch, F. and Hornik, K. (2000). Stationary and integrated autoregressive neural network processes, *Neural Computation* **12**: 2427–2450.
- Tsay, R. (1989). Testing and modeling threshold autoregressive processes, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **84**: 431–452.
- Xia, Y. and Li, W. K. (1999). On single-index coefficient regression models, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **94**(448): 1275–1285.

A Evaluating Forecasts

The performance measures used in this paper are the following.

1. Normalized root mean squared error (nRMSE):

$$nRMSE(k) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{T-4} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^2}{\hat{\sigma}_y^2}}, \quad (20)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_y^2$ is the estimated in-sample unconditional variance of the series.

2. Mean Absolute Error (MAE):

$$MAE(k) = \frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-4} |\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}| \quad (21)$$

3. Median Absolute Deviation (MAD):

$$MAD(k) = \text{median}(|\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t} - \text{median}(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t})|). \quad (22)$$

The MAD is as a measure that is robust to outliers.

4. The proportion of times the sign of excess returns is correctly forecasted (SIGN):

$$SIGN(k) = \frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-4} \delta_t, \quad (23)$$

where

$$\delta_t = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y_{t+k} \hat{y}_{t+k|t} \geq 0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

B Forecasting with Nonlinear Models

Multi-step forecasting with nonlinear models is more challenging than forecasting with linear models. See, for example, Granger and Teräsvirta (1993, Section 8.1) for a general discussion.

Consider the simple nonlinear model defined as

$$y_t = G(y_{t-1}; \Psi) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (24)$$

where $G(\cdot)$ is a nonlinear function with parameter vector Ψ . The term ε_t is an independent identically distributed random variable with zero mean and finite variance. The history of the process up to time t is called \mathfrak{S}_t .

Due the fact that $E(\varepsilon_{t+1}|\mathfrak{S}_t) = 0$, the optimal 1-step-ahead forecast of y_{t+1} is given by

$$\hat{y}_{t+1|t} = E(y_{t+1}|\mathfrak{S}_t) = G(y_t; \Psi), \quad (25)$$

which is equivalent to the optimal 1-step-ahead forecast when $G(\cdot)$ is linear.

For multi-step forecasts, the problem is much more complicated. For 2-step-ahead the optimal forecast is given by

$$\hat{y}_{t+2|t} = E(y_{t+2}|\mathfrak{S}_t) = E(G(y_{t+1}; \Psi)|\mathfrak{S}_t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} G(y_{t+1}; \Psi) f(\varepsilon_{t+1}) d\varepsilon_{t+1}, \quad (26)$$

where $f(\varepsilon_{t+1})$ is the density of ε_{t+1} . Usually the expression (26) is approximated by numerical techniques, such as, for example, Monte-Carlo or bootstrap.

The Monte-Carlo method is a simple simulation technique for obtaining multi-step forecasts. For model (24), the k -step-ahead forecast is defined as

$$\hat{y}_{t+k|t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \hat{y}_{t+k|t}^{(i)}, \quad (27)$$

where N is the number of replications and

$$\hat{y}_{t+k|t}^{(i)} = G(\hat{y}_{t+k-1|t}^{(i)}; \Psi) + \xi_{t+k|t}^{(i)}. \quad (28)$$

$\xi_{t+k|t}^{(i)}$ is a random number drawn from a normal distribution with the same mean and standard deviation as the in-sample estimated residuals.

In this paper we adopt the Monte Carlo method with 2000 replications to compute the multi-step

forecasts.

C The Diebold-Mariano Test

In order to test if the forecasts produced by two concurrent methods are statistically different or not, we use the Diebold-Mariano statistic (Diebold and Mariano 1995) with the correction proposed by Harvey et al. (1997). Suppose that a pair of k -steps-ahead, forecasts have produced the errors $(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^{(1)}, \hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^{(2)})$, $t = t_0, \dots, T - k$. The quality of the forecasts is measured based on a specified loss function $g(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t})$ of the forecast error. Defining

$$d_t = g(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^{(1)}) - g(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^{(2)}), \quad (29)$$

and

$$\bar{d} = \frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \sum_{t=t_0}^{T-4} d_t, \quad (30)$$

the Diebold-Mariano statistic is

$$S = [\hat{V}(\bar{d})]^{-1/2} \bar{d}, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\hat{V}(\bar{d}) = \frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \left[\hat{\gamma}_0 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \hat{\gamma}_i \right], \quad (32)$$

and

$$\hat{\gamma}_i = \frac{1}{T - t_0 - 3} \sum_{t=t_0+i}^{T-4} (d_t - \bar{d})(d_{t-i} - \bar{d}). \quad (33)$$

Under the null hypothesis, S is asymptotic normally distributed with zero mean and unit variance. However, the test is over-sized even in moderate samples. To circumvent this problem, Harvey et al. (1997) proposed the following statistic

$$S^* = \left[\frac{n + 1 - 2h + n^{-1}k(k-1)}{n} \right]^{1/2} S, \quad (34)$$

where $n = T - t_0 - k + 1$.

Under the null, S^* is assumed to have a Student's t distribution with $(n - 1)$ degrees of freedom.

In this paper we adopt the following loss functions.

$$g(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}) = \hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}^2, \text{ for the } nRMSE \text{ test; and}$$

$$g(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}) = |\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+k|t}|, \text{ for the } MAE \text{ test.}$$







Figure 1: Architecture of the neural network.




(a) Austria




(b) Belgium




(c) Finland




(d) France




(e) Germany




(f) Sweden




(g) Australia



(h) Spain




(i) Sri Lanka




(j) India


Figure 2: p -value of the linearity test.




(a) Austria




(b) Belgium




(c) Finland




(d) France




(e) Germany




(f) Sweden




(g) Australia



(h) Spain



(i) Sri-Lanka



(j) India

Figure 3: Scatter plot of transition function versus the linear combination of transition variables

Table 1: Data sets.

Series	Description	Period	T	t_0
1 - Austria	Austrian Schillings to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
2 - Belgium	Belgian Francs to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
3 - Denmark	Danish Kronas to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
4 - Finland	Finnish Markkas to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
5 - France	French Francs to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
6 - Germany	German Marks to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
7 - The Netherlands	Dutch Guilders to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
8 - Norway	Norwegian Kronas to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
9 - Sweden	Swedish Kronas to one US Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
10 - Spain	Spanish Pesetas to one US Dollar	Jan/1973–Jul/2000	330	274
11 - India	Indian Rupees to one US Dollar	Jan/1973–Jul/2000	330	274
12 - Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka Rupees to one US Dollar	Jan/1973–Jul/2000	330	274
13 - Australia	US Dollars to one Australian Dollar	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298
14 - United Kingdom	US Dollars to one British Pound	Jan/1971–Jul/2000	354	298

Table 2: Linearity test.

Series	Lags in \mathbf{z}_t	Lags in \mathbf{x}_t	p -value
1 - Austria	1, 4	1	0.0103
2 - Belgium	1, 2, 3	1, 3	0.0068
3 - Denmark	1	1	0.4470
4 - Finland	1, 2, 3, 4	2, 4	2.0191×10^{-5}
5 - France	1, 3, 6	3, 6	0.0019
6 - Germany	1, 4	1	0.0079
7 - The Netherlands	1	1	0.5078
8 - Norway	1	1	0.1300
9 - Sweden	1, 6	1	0.0059
10 - Spain	1, 3	1	0.0085
11 - India	1, 3, 5, 8	1, 3, 5, 8	2.5690×10^{-10}
12 - Sri Lanka	1, 2, 6, 8	8	0
13 - Australia	1, 4	1, 4	0.0001
14 - United Kingdom	1, 2	1	0.1961

Table 3: Specification and estimation results - NCSTAR model.

Series	h	$LM_F^{ind}(1)$	$LM_F^{ind}(2)$	$LM_F^{ind}(6)$	LM_F^{pc}	LM_F^σ	JB	$\hat{\sigma}$
Austria	1	0.7720	0.2933	0.6973	0.6270	0.8084	0.2314	0.0259
Belgium	1	0.4365	0.7502	0.2342	0.4537	0.1963	0.2208	0.0248
Finland	1	0.4330	0.2944	0.7634	0.4206	0.6865	0.0000	0.0216
France	2	0.9072	0.4074	0.1935	0.0262	0.6150	0.0078	0.0239
Germany	1	0.4232	0.3812	0.5026	0.6417	0.6425	0.1050	0.0258
Sweden	1	0.0293	0.0715	0.0240	0.5776	0.3946	0.0000	0.0216
Australia	1	0.0439	0.1281	0.3585	0.0144	0.0631	0.0000	0.0204
Spain	1	0.1706	0.2590	0.5155	0.3407	0.9207	0.0000	0.0242
Siri Lanka	2	0.6268	0.0758	0.0547	0.5389	0.8013	0.0000	0.0151
India	2	0.7260	0.4370	0.3675	0.1755	0.4691	0.0000	0.0130

Table 4: Specification and estimation results - AR model.

Series	Lags	$LB(1)$	$LB(2)$	$LB(6)$	JB	$\hat{\sigma}$
Austria	1	0.8040	0.5350	0.6140	0.0522	0.0264
Belgium	1	0.8170	0.3461	0.2820	0.0921	0.0257
Finland	1,2	0.8020	0.8832	0.8210	0.0000	0.0224
France	1,3	0.6774	0.3760	0.6700	0.0004	0.0254
Germany	1	0.7630	0.4420	0.6110	0.0630	0.0266
Sweden	1,2	0.8862	0.7781	0.4851	0.0000	0.0223
Australia	1,4	0.8100	0.8781	0.9823	0.0000	0.0213
Spain	1	0.8540	0.3660	0.3290	0.0000	0.0250
Siri Lanka	1,8	0.8720	0.8810	0.9360	0.0000	0.0179
India	1,8	0.4390	0.7100	0.5550	0.0000	0.0281

Table 5: Estimation results - ANN model.

Series	Lags	Hidden Units	$min(\hat{\Sigma})$	$\hat{\sigma}$
Austria	6	5	0.9680	0.0264
Belgium	6	5	0.9098	0.0256
Finland	6	5	0.9603	0.0224
France	6	5	0.9997	0.0254
Germany	6	5	0.9603	0.0266
Sweden	6	5	0.9835	0.0223
Australia	6	5	0.2395	0.0213
Spain	6	5	0.8734	0.0248
Siri Lanka	10	12	0.0156	0.0051
India	10	12	1.0000	0.0177

Table 6: Number of series where each model is the best model.

	1-step-ahead				2-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
nRMSE	1	2	5	2	2	1	3	4
MAE	2	2	5	1	2	0	5	3
MAD	2	1	5	2	3	5	1	1
SIGN	3	2	3	4	3	3	4	6
	3-step-ahead				4-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
nRMSE	2	2	4	2	4	2	3	1
MAE	3	1	2	4	2	1	3	4
MAD	6	2	0	2	4	3	1	2
SIGN	3	4	2	5	1	4	3	6

Table 7: Number of series where model A (column) is better than model B (row) according to the modified Diebold-Mariano test at a 0.05 level (nRMSE test).

	1-step-ahead				2-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
NCSTAR	–	0	0	0	–	0	3	0
ANN	1	–	1	1	1	–	1	1
AR	1	0	–	0	0	0	–	2
RW	0	2	3	–	0	0	0	–
	3-step-ahead				4-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
NCSTAR	–	0	1	0	–	0	1	1
ANN	1	–	1	2	1	–	1	0
AR	0	0	–	0	0	1	–	0
RW	0	0	0	–	0	0	0	–

Table 8: Number of series where model A (column) is better than model B (row) according to the modified Diebold-Mariano test at a 0.05 level (MAE test).

	1-step-ahead				2-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
NCSTAR	–	0	0	0	–	1	2	1
ANN	1	–	1	1	1	–	1	2
AR	1	0	–	0	0	0	–	1
RW	2	5	4	–	0	0	0	–
	3-step-ahead				4-step-ahead			
	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW	NCSTAR	ANN	AR	RW
NCSTAR	–	0	1	1	–	0	0	0
ANN	1	–	1	1	1	–	1	1
AR	0	0	–	1	0	0	–	0
RW	0	0	0	–	0	0	0	–