

COWLES COMMISSION DISCUSSION PAPER: STATISTICS 382

NOTE: Cowles Commission Discussion Papers are preliminary materials circulated privately to stimulate private discussion and are not ready for critical comment or appraisal in publications. References in publications to Discussion Papers (other than mere acknowledgement by a writer that he has had access to such unpublished material) should be cleared with the author to protect the tentative character of these papers.

Comment on Goodman's Discussion Paper (Statistics 381)
"A Comment on Consistent Estimation In an Econometric Shock Model"

by Herman Wold

Statistical Institute
University of Uppsala

Uppsala, November 11, 1953

Dear Professor Goodman:

With great interest I have read your paper "A comment on consistent estimation in an econometric shock model" which I have received as Cowles Commission Discussion Paper: Statistics 381. Finding that the theorem of your paper is related to some of my own work, I gather that my approach is more general, whereas yours is more specific and therefore capable of giving more precise results. Reference will be made to three of my publications, viz. "A study in the analysis of stationary time series", Uppsala 1938 /ref.1/, "On prediction in stationary time series", AMS 1948 /ref.2/, and "Demand Analysis", Stockholm 1952 and New York 1953 /ref.3./.

In ref.1 I gave a general device for the estimation of the parameters in models of type

$$(1) \quad x_i = u_i + a_1 u_{i-1} + \dots + a_h u_{i-h} \quad \text{/your notation/}.$$

In the case $h = 1$ my estimate coincides with yours. The consistence of my estimate is a consequence of the ergodicity of the process x_i , a con-

sequence which is immediate in view of Birkhoff-Khinchine's theorem /page 35 in ref.1/, and which was elaborated in some detail in ref.2. A more detailed treatment, including a proof of the ergodicity of process x_1 , is found in ref.3 /see Chs. 9.4, 10.2 and 11.1/. My proof of the consistence is based upon the general property of ergodicity, while your proof makes use of the specific structure of the process x_1 . It would be possible to carry your analysis further, so as to obtain the standard error of the estimate z , a type of result which cannot be derived from the ergodicity /see page 35 in ref.1/.

It may be added that the estimates in question do not have the optimum properties of least-square or maximum-likelihood estimates. In his recent thesis, "Hypothesis testing in time series analysis", Uppsala 1951, Dr. P. Whittle has given a general method for the deduction of least-square estimates of the parameters in model(1). In the particular case $h = 1$ his estimate of parameter $a = a_1$ is obtained from the relation

$$a - 2a^2 r_1 + 2a^3 r_2 - 2a^4 r_3 + \dots = (1-a^2) (r_1 - 2ar_2 + 3a^2 r_3 - 4a^3 r_4 + \dots),$$

where r_1, r_2, \dots are the autocorrelation coefficients of the process x_1 /see also ref.3, Exercise 24 in Part III/.

Yours sincerely,

H. Wold