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Frequency domain tests for the presence of a unit root are developed. Their limit distributions are derived under the assumption of weakly stationary errors and are free of nuisance parameters. Results on test consistency are also reported. Monte Carlo simulations are performed to study the size and power of the proposed tests in finite samples. The computations indicate that the frequency domain tests have stable size and good power in finite samples for a variety of error-generating mechanisms. We conclude that the frequency domain tests have some good performance characteristics in relation to time domain procedures, although they are also susceptible to size distortion when there is negative serial correlation in the errors.

1. Introduction

Testing for the presence of a unit root in autoregressive time series models has been a popular topic in both the recent econometric and statistical literature. The testing procedures outlined in Fuller (1976) and Dickey and Fuller (1979) under iid errors have become standard and have been employed in various empirical applications. Recent articles by Fuller (1984) and Dickey, Bell, and Miller (1986) review the literature in the field up to around 1985. Since then there has been a large and growing literature on time series with a unit root, and many new tests have been developed.
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Said and Dickey (1984), extending the $t$-ratio method of Dickey and Fuller (1979, 1981), proposed a test for the presence of a unit root in models with ARMA errors of an unknown order based on long autoregression. The same authors (1985) also applied the maximum likelihood method to develop tests for a unit root in ARIMA models of a known order and reported some simulations results. Phillips (1987) and Phillips and Perron (1988) took a semiparametric approach and developed unit root test statistics that were applicable to models with quite general weakly dependent errors. The relative performance of the Phillips–Perron and Said–Dickey (1984) test statistics are studied in Schwert (1987) and Phillips and Perron (1988). Asymptotic results favor the $Z(\delta)$ procedure of Phillips and Perron, but simulation results indicate that this method suffers size distortions in finite samples when there is negative serial correlation in the errors. Unfortunately, the Said–Dickey test also suffers size distortions and has lower power than the Phillips–Perron test when the errors follow moving average processes. Therefore there is a need for new procedures which overcome these deficiencies of existing tests.

The present paper adopts a frequency domain approach to develop tests for a unit root. The frequency domain (or spectral regression) approach has been used in the past to efficiently estimate the parameters in regression models with fixed or strictly exogenous regressors. Hannan's (1963) efficient estimator is the cornerstone of subsequent work. The rationale for the approach is that only minimal assumptions like stationarity and weak dependence are required for the theory to apply. Engle and Gardner (1976) took advantage of this feature to estimate a coefficient parameter in a standard regression model under various dynamic specifications for the errors. It was found that the frequency domain estimator performs quite well at moderate sample sizes. The spectral regression method was also applied to regression models with dynamic regression in Espasa and Sargan (1977) and Engle (1980). Readers are referred to Granger and Engle (1985) for a review of related applications. Recently, Phillips (1991) has shown that spectral regression methods may be successfully used in models with nonstationary regressors. In that paper the Hannan efficient estimator is used to obtain consistent and asymptotically efficient estimators of long-run equilibrium parameters in error correction models. We shall demonstrate that a similar approach works well in the present context of unit root tests.

The merits of frequency domain methods are numerous. First, the nonparametric treatment of the errors means that it is not necessary to be explicit about the dynamic specification of the errors. Second, the limit distributions of the frequency domain test statistics have no nuisance parameters since the problem of temporal dependence becomes one of heteroskedasticity in the frequency domain and this is eliminated by the GLS transform. Third, we may test the hypothesis of a root on the unit circle at zero frequency. Both full-band and limited-band spectral estimators can be employed for this purpose. Fourth, simulation results, which we will report in section 6, show that the full-band
frequency domain tests display good power and stable size for various errors specifications. But like the $Z(\hat{x})$ and Said–Dickey tests, the new tests also suffer size distortion when there is negative serial correlation in the errors.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our models and assumptions. Section 3 defines the tests in the frequency domain. Section 4 develops the limiting distribution theory. Section 5 considers consistency of the tests. Section 6 reports simulation results concerning the power and size of the new test statistics in finite samples. Section 7 concludes the paper. Appendix 1 explains how to calculate the Hannan efficient estimator, and appendix 2 contains proofs.

A few words on our notation: All the limits are taken as $T \to \infty$ unless otherwise specified. $W$ denotes a standard Brownian motion; $W, W_1, \int_0^1 r dW, \int_0^1 r W, \int_0^1 W^2, \int_0^1 W dW$ are understood to be $W(r), W(1), \int_0^1 r dW(r), \int_0^1 W^2(r) dr, \int_0^1 W(r) dr,$ and $\int_0^1 W(r) dW(r),$ respectively. Brownian motion with variance $\xi^2$ is written as $BM(\xi^2).$ $\sum_{t=1}^T$ is denoted simply as $\sum,$ unless otherwise specified. The symbol $\Rightarrow$ signifies weak convergence, and the symbols $\equiv$ stands for equality in distribution.

2. Preliminaries

The univariate time series models that concern us are

$$y_t = \alpha y_{t-1} + u_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \ldots, T,$$

$$y_t = \mu + \alpha y_{t-1} + u_t, \quad \text{(2)}$$

$$y_t = \mu + \beta t + \alpha y_{t-1} + u_t. \quad \text{(3)}$$

The error process $\{u_t\}$ is stationary with continuous spectral density $f_{uu}(\lambda) > 0$ over $-\pi < \lambda \leq \pi.$ We shall take an interest in testing for the presence of a unit root in models (1), (2), and (3) against the alternative of stationarity, so that the null and alternative hypotheses are $H_0: \alpha = 1$ and $H_1: |\alpha| < 1.$

We shall assume that the partial sum process $S_t = \sum_{j=1}^T u_j$ satisfies the invariance principle

$$T^{-1/2}S_{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Rightarrow B(r) \equiv BM(\xi^2), \quad 0 \leq r \leq 1,$$

where $\xi^2 = 2\pi f_{uu}(0) > 0$ is the 'long-run' variance of $u_t.$ We decompose $\xi^2$ as

$$\xi^2 = \sigma^2 + 2\gamma,$$

where

$$\sigma^2 = E(u_0^2), \quad \gamma = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} E(u_0 u_k). \quad \text{(5)}$$
and we define $\delta = \sigma^2 + \gamma$. The series that defines $\gamma$ in (5) is assumed to converge absolutely so that the spectrum $f_m(\lambda)$ is uniformly continuous over $[-\pi, \pi]$. Under condition (4), we have the following weak convergence of the sample covariance between $S_t$ and $u_t$, viz.

$$T^{-1} \sum S_t u_t \Rightarrow \int_0^1 BdB + \delta.$$  

(6)

The conditions under which (4) holds are quite weak. They involve rather mild moment and weak dependence requirements which are satisfied by a wide class of time series, including stationary ARMA models whose innovations have finite variance. These conditions are discussed in detail in earlier work [see Phillips (1987), and Phillips (1988) for a review].

3. Frequency domain estimators and unit root tests

The spectral estimates have the same general form:

$$\hat{f}_m(\lambda) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n=-M}^{M} k\left(\frac{n}{M}\right) C_{ab}(n) e^{-in\lambda},$$

where

$$C_{ab}(n) = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-n} a_t b_{t+n},$$

and where the convergence factor or lag window $k(x)$ is a bounded even function with $k(0) = 1$, vanishing outside the domain $[-1, 1]$. Using this general form, the frequency domain estimates of $\alpha$ for the regression models (1), (2), and (3) are defined as in Phillips (1991) and Hannan (1963) as follows, respectively:

$$\hat{\alpha} = \frac{Y_{1,1}}{X_{1,1}},$$  

(7)

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{(X_{1,1} Y_{1,1} - X_{1,1} Y_{1,1})(X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1}^2)}{(X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1}^2)} ,$$  

(8)

$$\alpha^* = \{(X_{1,1} Y_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1}) Y_{1,1} - (X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1}) Y_{1,1}$$

$$+ (X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1}^2) Y_{1,1}) (X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1})$$

$$+ X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1}^2 X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1})},$$  

(9)
where

\[
X_{11} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
X_{1t} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1t}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
X_{1y_t} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1y_t}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
X_{yt} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{yt}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
X_{1y_t} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1y_t}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
Y_{1y} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1y}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
Y_{yt} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{yt}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1},
\]

\[
Y_{1y} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1y}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1}.
\]

Note that the subscript '1' denotes a unit vector and 't' a vector of linear time trend.

Because our main concern lies in estimating the autoregressive coefficient and testing for a unit root, we may define the estimates of the autoregressive coefficient using detrended models. That is, we transform models (2) and (3) as

\[
\tilde{y}_t = \alpha \tilde{y}_{t-1} + \tilde{u}_t , \quad (2)'\]

\[
y_t^* = \alpha y_{t-1}^* + u_t^*, \quad (3)'\]

where

\[
y_t = \tilde{y}_0 + \tilde{y}_t , \quad \tilde{y}_0 = \tilde{g}_0 + \tilde{g}_1 t + \tilde{y}_t^* .
\]
Using these models, we may define the frequency domain estimates of \( \alpha \) as follows:

\[
\hat{\alpha}_D = \frac{Y_{yt}}{X_{yt}}, \tag{10}
\]

\[
\hat{\alpha}_T = \frac{Y_{yt^*}}{X_{yt^*}}, \tag{11}
\]

where the spectral density estimates are defined in the same way as before using the transformed variables \( y_t \) and \( y_{t^*} \). One merit of these estimators is that the number of estimated spectral densities is substantially reduced relative to the estimators \( \hat{\alpha} \) and \( \alpha^* \).

Under the null hypothesis the spectral density of \( y_t \) is

\[
f_{yy}(\lambda) = |1 - e^{-i\lambda}|^{-2} f_{uw}(\lambda),
\]

which has a pole at the origin \( (\lambda = 0) \) characterized by the local behavior \( f_{yy}(\lambda) \sim \lambda^2/2\pi \lambda^2 \) as \( \lambda \to 0 \). The singularity of \( f_{yy}(\lambda) \) at \( \lambda = 0 \) is of course the manifestation in the frequency domain of the nonstationarity in \( y_t \) under the null. Interestingly, although \( f_{yy}(\lambda) \) is undefined at \( \lambda = 0 \), we may still construct conventional spectral estimates at the origin. Upon restandardization, the estimate \( f_{yy}(0) \) is meaningful and converges weakly, but not in probability, to well-defined random elements. Correspondingly, we define

\[
f_{uw}(\lambda) = [1 - e^{i\lambda}]^{-1} f_{uw}(\lambda),
\]

\[
f_{yw}(\lambda) = |e^{i\lambda}|^2 f_{yy}(\lambda) = f_{yy}(\lambda),
\]

\[
f_{uw}(\lambda) = e^{i\lambda} f_{uw}(\lambda).
\]

None of these are defined at \( \lambda = 0 \), but the conventional spectral estimates likewise converge weakly to well-defined random elements upon suitable standardization.

In (7), (8), (9), (10), and (11), we use the fundamental frequencies

\[
\omega_j = \pi j/M, \quad j = -M + 1, \ldots, M,
\]

for \( M \) integer. The spectral estimates that appear in these formulae may then be regarded as applying within a band of width \( \pi/M \) centered on \( \omega_j \). Thus, to obtain \( f_{uw}(\omega_j) \) we may use the smoothed periodogram estimate

\[
\hat{f}_{uw}(\omega_j) = \frac{M}{T} \sum_{\lambda_{ij}} k(\omega_j) w_u(\lambda_{ij}) w_u(\lambda_{ij})^*,
\]
where \( k(\omega_j) \) is a lag window, \( w_u(\omega_j) = (2\pi T)^{-1/2} \sum u_i e^{i\omega_j t_i} \), and the summation is over \( \omega_j \in \mathbb{R} \) where \( \omega_j = \omega_j - \pi/2M, \omega_j + \pi/2M \). Then \( \hat{f}_u(\omega_j) \) is, in effect, a weighted average of \( m = [T/M] \) neighboring periodogram ordinates around the frequency \( \omega_j \), as interpreted in Hannan (1970, p. 274). As usual, we shall require the bandwidth parameter \( M \to \infty \), but in such a way that \( M = o(T^{1/2}) \) as \( T \to \infty \) [as in Hannan (1970, p. 489)].

The estimators we have defined are conventional spectral regression estimates and follow from formulae given in Hannan (1963). In popular parlance, they are the Hannan efficient estimates. What does differ from convention is the autoregressive context in which the estimates are being used and the asymptotic theory that applies to them. The autoregressive context is of importance since \( y_{t-1} \) and \( u_t \) are in general coherent series, due to the temporal dependence in \( u_t \). This is a major departure from the regression model context in which spectral regression estimators were first developed.

We may also formulate band spectrum estimators that employ only the zero frequency estimates. For instance, the band spectrum estimator for model (1) is simply

\[
\hat{\sigma}_0 = \hat{f}_{y,x}(0) / \hat{f}_{y,x}(0)
\]

Test statistics based on \( \hat{\sigma}_0 \) may also be constructed. They are \( T(\hat{\sigma}_0 - 1) \) and the spectral analogue of the \( t \)-ratio, \( t(\hat{\sigma}_0) = T(\hat{\sigma}_0 - 1) / \{ T\hat{f}_{y,x}(0)^{-1} \hat{f}_{w}(0) \}^{1/2} \). As we will show in section 5, these tests, in fact, do not possess good properties.

The test statistics we shall use are based on the full-band spectral estimates. They are \( T(\hat{\sigma} - 1) \), \( T(\hat{\sigma} - 1) \), \( T(\hat{\sigma} - 1) \), \( T(\hat{\sigma}_D - 1) \), and \( T(\hat{\sigma}_D - 1) \). We also consider the spectral analogues of the regression \( t \)-statistics associated with \( \hat{\sigma} \), \( \hat{\sigma} \), \( \hat{\sigma}_D \), and \( \hat{\sigma}_D \). These are given by

\[
t(\hat{\sigma}) = T(\hat{\sigma} - 1) / (TX^{-1})^{1/2},
\]

\[
t(\hat{\sigma}) = T(\hat{\sigma} - 1) / \{ T(X x_{1,1} x_{1,1} x_{1,1})^{-1} X_{1,1} \}^{1/2},
\]

\[
t(\hat{\sigma}^*) = T(\hat{\sigma}^* - 1) / \{ T(X x_{1,1} x_{1,1} x_{1,1} + X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1}) \}
\]

\[
+ X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} - X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1}
\]

\[
- X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} X_{1,1} \}^{1/2},
\]

\[
t(\hat{\sigma}_D) = T(\hat{\sigma}_D - 1) / (TX^{-1})^{1/2},
\]

\[
t(\hat{\sigma}_D^*) = T(\hat{\sigma}_D^* - 1) / (TX^{-1})^{1/2}.
\]
The variance estimates implicit in these $t$-ratios are based on the usual formulae for the estimated asymptotic variances of the spectral estimates. For instance, the variance estimate of $\hat{\alpha}$ is

$$\frac{1}{T} \left[ \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{n,j} (\omega_j) \hat{f}_{m}(\omega_j) \right]^{-1},$$

as in Hannan (1970, p. 442).

4. Asymptotic theory

Our attention will concentrate on the test statistics $T(\hat{\alpha} - 1), T(\hat{\alpha} - 1), T(\alpha^* - 1), T(\alpha^*_D - 1), T(\alpha_D - 1), t(\hat{\alpha}), t(\hat{\alpha}), t(\alpha^*), t(\alpha^*_D), \text{and } t(\alpha_D^*).$

**Theorem 1.** Suppose that the assumptions made in section 2 hold.

(a) For the regression model (1), under $\alpha = 1$,

(i) $T(\hat{\alpha} - 1) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 \sqrt{W} dW / \int_0^1 W^2,$

(ii) $t(\hat{\alpha}) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 \sqrt{W} dW / \left[ \int_0^1 W^2 \right]^{1/2}.$

(b) For the regression model (2), under $(\mu, \alpha) = (0, 1),$

(i) $T(\hat{\alpha} - 1), T(\hat{\alpha}_D - 1) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 \sqrt{\tilde{W}} dW / \int_0^1 \tilde{W}^2,$

(ii) $t(\hat{\alpha}), t(\hat{\alpha}_D) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 \sqrt{\tilde{W}} dW / \left[ \int_0^1 \tilde{W}^2 \right]^{1/2}.$

(c) For the regression model (3), under $(\beta, \alpha) = (0, 1),$

(i) $T(\alpha^* - 1), T(\alpha^*_D - 1) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 W^* dW / \int_0^1 W^{*2}.$

(ii) $t(\alpha^*), t(\alpha^*_D) \Rightarrow \int_0^1 W^* dW / \left[ \int_0^1 W^{*2} \right]^{1/2},$

where

$$\tilde{W} = W - \int_0^1 W,$$

$$W^* = W - 4 \left( \int_0^1 W - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 rW \right) + 6r \left( \int_0^1 W - 2 \int_0^1 rW \right).$$
Remarks
(i) The limit distributions given by (a)–(c) in the above theorem are all free of
nuisance parameters. So no serial correlation corrections such as those
employed in the tests of Phillips (1987) and Phillips and Perron (1988) are
needed. The serial dependence in the error process \( u_t \), of course, automati-
cally taken care of by the Fourier transformation of the data. What is of
additional interest is that no correction is needed for the fact that \( y_{t-1} \) and
\( u_t \) are coherent and even contemporaneously correlated when there is serial
dependence in \( u_t \). This is, as usual, explained by the fact that \( y_{t-1} \) is an
integrated process and the signal that it imparts is correspondingly an order
of magnitude larger (in \( T^{1/2} \)) than the covariance of \( y_{t-1} \) and \( u_t \).
(ii) For the estimates analyzed above, we need to estimate the error spectrum
\( \hat{f}_w(\lambda) \). Moreover, we use estimates of this spectrum at the \( 2M \) frequen-
cies \( \{ \omega_j : j = -M + 1, \ldots, M \} \). This is to be distinguished from the time
domain procedures in earlier work [see Phillips (1987) and Phillips and Perron
(1988)] where spectral estimates are required only at the origin to achieve
the appropriate semiparametric corrections. The regression leading to the
estimates above is, of course, a weighted regression across frequencies and
the heterogeneity in the spectrum over the frequencies \( \omega_j \) is used to obtain
efficient estimates in conventional weighted regression for stationary time
series.

5. Test consistency

Under \( H_1 \), \( y_t \) is stationary and it is of interest to examine the behavior of the
power functions of the tests as \( T \to \infty \). It is simplest to work with the band
spectral tests \( S(\hat{\sigma}_0) \) and \( t(\hat{\sigma}_0) \). We start by observing that under stationarity

\[
\hat{f}_{y_t}(0) \overset{p}\to f_{y_t}(0) = f_w(0)/(1 - \alpha)^2
\]

and

\[
\hat{f}_{u_t}(0) \overset{p}\to f_{u_t}(0) = f_w(0)/(1 - \alpha).
\]

Then

\[
\hat{\sigma}_0 = \sigma + \hat{f}_{u_t}(0)/\hat{f}_{y_t}(0) \overset{p}\to \sigma + (1 - \sigma) = 1.
\]

Thus, \( \hat{\sigma}_0 \) tends to unity even under the alternative hypothesis. This suggests that
the \( S(\hat{\sigma}_0) \) and \( t(\hat{\sigma}_0) \) tests are unlikely to have good power.
As $T \to \infty$, the power properties depend on the behavior of the spectral estimates $\hat{f}_{y_i}(0)$ and $\hat{f}_{y_{2},y_{2}}(0)$. Define the matrix of spectral estimates

$$g_T = \begin{bmatrix}
\hat{f}_{uu}(0) & \hat{f}_{uo}(0) \\
\hat{f}_{uo}(0) & \hat{f}_{oo}(0)
\end{bmatrix},$$

and, under $H_1$, set

$$g = \begin{bmatrix}
f_{uu}(0) & f_{uo}(0) \\
f_{uo}(0) & f_{oo}(0)
\end{bmatrix}$$

and

$$v = 2T/M \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k(x)^2 \, dx,$$

where $M$ is the bandwidth parameter and $k(\cdot)$ is the lag window employed in the spectral estimates in $g_T$. Then, from the asymptotic theory of spectral estimates for stationary time series [e.g., Hannan (1970, p. 289)], we have the following limit theory:

$$v^{1/2}(g_T - g) \Rightarrow N(0, V),$$

where

$$V = \left( \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} k(x) \, dx \right) g \otimes g.$$

Now we obtain

$$v^{1/2}(\hat{\phi}_0 - 1) \Rightarrow (1/f_{y_{2},y_{2}}(0)) A_{01} - (f_{uo}(0)/(f_{y_{2},y_{2}}(0))^2) A_{11},$$

$$= \frac{(1 - \alpha)^2}{f_{uu}(0)} \{ A_{01} - (1 - \alpha)A_{11} \},$$

where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix}
A_{00} & A_{01} \\
A_{10} & A_{11}
\end{bmatrix} = N(0, V).$$

We deduce that

$$T^{1/2}(\hat{\phi}_0 - 1) = O_p(M^{1/2}),$$
under $H_1$. It follows that a two-sided test of $H_0$ using the statistic $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$ is consistent as $T \to \infty$. But, in view of the symmetry of the limit distribution (12) about the origin, the power of a one-sided test of $H_0$ based on $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$ tends to 0.50. So this test of $H_0$ is inconsistent.

In a similar way we find that

$$t(\hat{\alpha}_0) = O_p(M^{1/2}) ,$$

under $H_1$. The power properties of the $t$-ratio test $t(\hat{\alpha}_0)$ would therefore seem to be worse than those of the coefficient-based test $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$. For example, when $M = O(T^{1/3})$, which is a bandwidth choice that minimizes a mean squared error criterion [see Bartlett (1966, p. 368)], we have $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1) = O_p(T^{1/5})$ and $t(\hat{\alpha}_0) = O_p(T^{1/10})$ under $H_1$.

Given these asymptotic results, neither $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$ nor $t(\hat{\alpha}_0)$ can be expected to yield good power for the usual one-sided tests of a unit root against stationary alternatives. Moreover, $t(\hat{\alpha}_0)$ can be expected to have even lower power than $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$.

The behavior of the full-band spectral tests is more complicated. Here we investigate the behavior of the statistics $T(\hat{\alpha} - 1)$ and $t(\hat{\alpha})$. Analysis of the other estimators follows analogously. The results depend on the manner of estimation of the error spectrum $f_{\omega}(\omega)$ as employed in $\hat{\alpha}$. If we use differences $u_t = \Delta y_t$ in constructing $f_{\omega}(\omega)$, then it is easy to see that, under the stationary alternative $H_1$,

$$\hat{f}_{\omega}\sim 0 \quad (13)$$

This means that the $\omega_j = 0$ term (i.e., $j = 0$) dominates both the numerator and denominator of $\hat{\alpha}$. Multiplying through the $\hat{f}_{\omega}\sim(\omega)$ in both numerator and denominator then shows that, under $H_1$,

$$\hat{\alpha} \sim \hat{f}_{\omega}\sim(\omega)/\hat{f}_{\omega}\sim(\omega) = \hat{\alpha}_0 ,$$

as $T \to \infty$. Thus, when the differences of $y_t$ are used to estimate $f_{\omega}$, we find that $\hat{\alpha}$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\hat{\alpha}_0$. Then the tests $T(\hat{\alpha} - 1)$ and $t(\hat{\alpha})$ behave like $T(\hat{\alpha}_0 - 1)$ and $t(\hat{\alpha}_0)$, respectively, and are therefore inconsistent.

However, when the error spectrum $f_{\omega}$ is estimated using regression residuals $\hat{u}_t = y_t - \hat{\alpha}_{OLS} y_{t-1}$, the results are quite different because (13) no longer applies. In general, because of serial dependence in the error process $u_t$, we find that the least squares coefficient $\hat{\alpha}_{OLS}$ is not consistent for $\alpha$, and hence $\hat{f}_{\omega}(\omega)$ is not consistent for $f_{\omega}(\omega)$. In fact, under the alternative for stationary and ergodic $y_t$, we have

$$\hat{\alpha}_{OLS} \sim E(y_t^2)/E(y_t^2) = \hat{\alpha}(\hat{\alpha}| < 1) ,$$
and then
\[
\tilde{f}_{\omega}(\omega) \overset{p}{\to} |1 - \tilde{\alpha}e^{i\omega t}|^2 f_{\omega}(\omega) = \tilde{f}_{\omega}(\omega).
\]

Intuitively, the spectral regression in this case amounts to estimating \(\tilde{\alpha}\) in the regression equation
\[
y_t = \tilde{\alpha}y_{t-1} + \epsilon_t.
\]

Since \(\hat{f}_{\omega}(\omega)\) is a consistent estimator of the spectral density \(\tilde{f}_{\omega}(\omega)\) for \(\epsilon_t = y_t - \tilde{\alpha}y_{t-1}\), it is easy to find, by using the same methods as in the proof of Lemma A.1, that \(\hat{\epsilon} \overset{p}{\to} \epsilon (|\alpha| < 1)\) under the alternative. Hence, we find that the tests based on \(T(\hat{\alpha} - 1)\) and \(t(\hat{\alpha})\) are consistent.

6. Experimental evidence

In this section, we report some simulation results investigating the power and size of frequency domain tests. The data were generated by models (1), (2), and (3) with the ARMA errors and with the initial value \(e_0 = 0\). The sequence \(\{e_t\}\) was generated as iid N(0, 1) by the IMSL subroutine RNNOA. The sample size is \(T = 100\), and 1,000 iterations were made to calculate the empirical power of the test statistics in one-sided tests. The nominal size was set to be 5%. Critical values at \(T = 100\) were taken from Fuller (1976, pp. 371, 373). It is assumed that \(\mu = 0\) for model (2) and \((\mu, \beta) = (0, 0)\) for model (3) both under the null and alternative.

Computation involved the following steps:

(a) Run an OLS regression in the time domain and compute residuals.
(b) Using the OLS residuals from step (a), calculate \(\tilde{f}_{\omega}(\lambda)\).
(c) Detrend the series by regression on time polynomials, as necessary.
(d) Compute \(\tilde{f}_{\omega,y}(\lambda)\) and \(\tilde{f}_{\omega,y,1}(\lambda)\) using the original series or the detrended series form step (c).
(e) Calculate the test statistics using the spectral density estimates from steps (b) and (d).

Note that step (c) is skipped for model (1). The IMSL subroutines SSWD and CSSWD were used to compute the spectral density estimates. The use of these subroutines and the calculation of Hannan’s efficient estimates are explained in detail in appendix 1.
The frequency domain test statistics we consider are $SC_1 = T(\hat{z} - 1)$, $ST_1 = t(\hat{z})$, $SC_2 = T(\hat{z}_{DT} - 1)$, $ST_2 = t(\hat{z}_{DT})$, $SC_3 = T(z_{DT}^* - 1)$, and $ST_3 = t(z_{DT}^*)$. The tests based on $\hat{z}$ and $z^*$ are asymptotically equivalent to those based on $\hat{z}_{DT}$ and $z_{DT}^*$. However, the tests using detrended series are more convenient in terms of computation, since we do not need to estimate as many spectral densities in computing these tests. We used the Tukey–Hanning window to estimate the spectral densities. We chose $M = \sqrt{T/2}$. As is discussed in Hannan (1970), we need $M/T \to 0$ and $M = O(T^{1/2})$. The above rule satisfies these conditions. Hence, for sample size $T = 100$, we set $M = 5$. Obviously, it would also be of interest to consider the performance of various data-based choices of $M$. But this is left for subsequent work.

In addition to the frequency domain tests, we report the empirical size and power of the Dickey–Fuller tests in table 5, which is based on 2,000 iterations. The finite sample performance of the frequency domain tests will be compared with that of the Dickey–Fuller tests with iid errors by using the computation results reported in table 5. More comprehensive simulation results are reported in Dickey, Bell, and Miller (1986).

In table 1(1), the size and power of the $SC_1$ and $ST_1$ tests under first-order moving average errors are reported. The nominal size is well maintained except when the moving average coefficients are negative, and the power is essentially the same as that of the Dickey–Fuller tests with iid errors (see table 5 for this). The experiments are extended to ARMA errors in parts (2), (3), and (4) of table 1. We observe that the nominal size is again well maintained except when the moving average coefficients are negative, or when the value of the AR coefficient of the error process is $-0.6$. The power is essentially the same as that of the Dickey–Fuller tests with iid errors as in part (1). We also report simulation results for the Said–Dickey (1984) $t$-test in table 2 to compare this with our frequency domain tests. The simulation results are based on 2,000 iterations. We find that the frequency domain tests are more powerful than the Said–Dickey test in general. However, the Said–Dickey test displays more stable size when the MA coefficient takes negative values. In table 3, we report the size and power of the $SC_2$ and $ST_2$ test. Again, we find that the power and size are virtually equivalent to those of the Dickey–Fuller tests with iid errors, and that there are size distortions when the moving average coefficients are negative. We may use $T(\hat{z} - 1)$ and $t(\hat{z})$ instead $SC_2$ and $ST_2$, but simulations (not reported here) showed these tests to be more susceptible to size distortions. In table 4, we report the performance of the $SC_3$ and $ST_3$ test. When the errors follow a first-order moving average process, we find that the power and size are almost equivalent to those of the Dickey–Fuller tests with iid errors, though again there are size distortions with zero and negative moving average coefficients. Also, we observe that the $SC_3$ and $ST_3$ become less powerful as the moving average coefficient takes larger positive values. When the errors follow an autoregressive process, we observe
Table 1
Monte Carlo power of $SC_1$ and $ST_1$ at $T = 100$ and $M = 5$.
Model: $y_t = 2y_{t-1} + u_t$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.2$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-0.5$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$-0.8$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) $u_t = \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.2$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) $u_t = 0.2u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\theta$</th>
<th>$x$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.5$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.2$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.0$</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(3) $u_t = -0.2u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1}$
Table 1 (continued)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\theta & \alpha = 0.85 & \alpha = 1.00 \\
\hline
0.5 & \begin{array}{ll}
SC_1 & 0.981 \\
ST_1 & 0.980 \\
\end{array} & \begin{array}{ll}
0.074 \\
0.073 \\
\end{array} \\
0.2 & \begin{array}{ll}
SC_1 & 0.997 \\
ST_1 & 0.994 \\
\end{array} & \begin{array}{ll}
0.120 \\
0.116 \\
\end{array} \\
-0.5 & \begin{array}{ll}
SC_1 & 1.000 \\
ST_1 & 1.000 \\
\end{array} & \begin{array}{ll}
0.715 \\
0.700 \\
\end{array} \\
-0.8 & \begin{array}{ll}
SC_1 & 1.000 \\
ST_1 & 1.000 \\
\end{array} & \begin{array}{ll}
0.999 \\
\end{array} \\
\end{array}
\]

(4) \( u_t = -0.6u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1} \)

Table 2

Monte Carlo power of the Said-Dickey \( \tau \)-test at \( T = 100 \).

Model: \( y_t = \alpha y_{t-1} + u_t \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[ \theta ]</th>
<th>[ l = 1 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 2 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 5 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 7 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 1 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 2 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 5 ]</th>
<th>[ l = 7 ]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ 0.5 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.236 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.023 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.039 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.039 ]</td>
<td>[ 1.000 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.901 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.616 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.358 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ 0.2 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.125 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.033 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.038 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.040 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.870 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.762 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.441 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.264 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ -0.5 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.205 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.068 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.040 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.040 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.994 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.986 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.163 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.107 ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ -0.8 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.825 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.431 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.163 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.097 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.934 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.978 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.471 ]</td>
<td>[ 0.236 ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) \( u_t = 0.2u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1} \)

(2) \( u_t = -0.2u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1} \)

(3) \( u_t = -0.6u_{t-1} + \epsilon_t + \theta \epsilon_{t-1} \)
that the nominal size is not well maintained, and that the power is lower than it is for moving average errors.

In summary, we find that the frequency domain tests show quite reasonable finite-sample performance in comparison with previous parametric tests under various error specifications. However, it needs to be borne in mind that the performance of the frequency domain tests is sensitive to how the Hannan efficient estimator is calculated. Different spectral windows (and different choices of bandwidth) will give different experimental results. Last, the $SC_3$ and $ST_3$ tests do not show good finite-sample performance when the errors follow an autoregressive process, which seems to accord with many other unit root tests, as the simulation results in DeJong, Nankervis, Savin, and Whiteman (1989) indicate.

7. Conclusion

We have proposed tests for a unit root that use frequency domain methods. The proposed test statistics do not involve nuisance parameters in their limiting distributions, and quite general temporal dependence is permitted for the errors. Simulation results show that the frequency domain tests have good power and reasonable size characteristics in finite samples, although, like previous parametric tests, there are size distortions under negative serially
Table 4
Monte Carlo power of $SC_3$ and $ST_3$ at $T = 100$ and $M = 5$.
Model: $y_t = \mu + \beta t + x_{t-1} + u_t, \mu = \beta = 0$

\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\hline
$\theta$ & $0.85$ & $1.00$ & \\
\hline

(1) $u_t = \varepsilon_t + \theta \varepsilon_{t-1}$

0.5 & $SC_3$ & 0.208 & 0.019 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.174 & 0.035 \\
0.2 & $SC_3$ & 0.333 & 0.038 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.281 & 0.051 \\
0.0 & $SC_3$ & 0.516 & 0.068 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.466 & 0.080 \\
-0.5 & $SC_3$ & 0.997 & 0.611 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.997 & 0.589 \\
-0.8 & $SC_3$ & 1.000 & 1.000 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 1.000 & 1.000 \\

(2) $u_t = \phi u_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$

0.5 & $SC_3$ & 0.046 & 0.004 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.033 & 0.015 \\
0.2 & $SC_3$ & 0.272 & 0.034 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.224 & 0.045 \\
-0.5 & $SC_3$ & 0.971 & 0.328 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 0.959 & 0.318 \\
-0.8 & $SC_3$ & 1.000 & 0.783 \\
 & $ST_3$ & 1.000 & 0.754 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

correlated errors. The tests are also conveniently robust to a wide class of dynamic specifications of the error terms, and hence can be used even when it is difficult to identify a parametric structure of the error process. We conclude, therefore, that the frequency domain tests have many convenient and appealing properties in relation to existing test procedures like the Said–Dickey $t$-test and the Phillips $Z(\alpha)$ and $Z(t)$ tests. They also have some interesting multivariate generalizations, which will be reported in later work.

Appendix 1: Calculating the Hannan efficient estimator

We used the IMSL subroutines SSWD and CSSWHD to calculate spectral densities. Following the notation of the IMSL Stat/Library, we report the values
of the major input parameters for the subroutines, which we used in order to obtain the simulation results of section 6.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NOBS} &= 100, \quad \text{XCNTR} = \text{YCNTR} = 0, \quad \text{NPAD} = \text{NOB} - 1, \\
\text{IFSCAL} &= 0, \\
\text{NF} &= 6, \quad F = [0, \pi/5, 2\pi/5, 3\pi/5, 4\pi/5, \pi], \quad TINT = 1, \quad ISWVER = 4, \\
\text{NM} &= 1, \quad M = 5.
\end{align*}
\]

Programs interrupt due to overflow when we calculate the zero frequency using the IMSL subroutines. This problem can be avoided by using the IBM subroutine ERRSET(207, 251, \( -1, 1 \)), which suppresses interrupts due to overflow.

After calculating the spectral densities at the fundamental frequencies, we calculated the test statistics using eq. (7), (10), and (11) and the corresponding definitions for the \( t \)-ratios. We exploited the symmetry of spectral densities to calculate the test statistics, and hence calculating spectral densities at negative frequencies is not required.
Appendix 2: Proofs

Lemma A.1. Suppose that \( \{u_t\} \) satisfies the conditions in Theorem 1. Then we have

(a) \( \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to 1/\zeta^2 \),

(b) \( T^{-2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M}^{M} \hat{f}_{n}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to 1/(3\zeta^2) \),

(c) \( T^{-1} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to 1/(2\zeta^2) \),

(d) \( T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to \int_0^1 \frac{W}{\zeta} \),

(e) \( T^{-3/2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{n}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to \int_0^1 rW/\zeta \),

(f) \( T^{-1} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to \int_0^1 W^2 \),

(g) \( T^{1/2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to W(1)/\zeta \),

(h) \( T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{n,\omega}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to \int_0^1 rdW/\zeta \),

(i) \( \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{n,\omega}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) \to \int_0^1 WdW \).

Proof. The proof is closely related to the proof of Theorem 3.1 of Phillips (1988a), and so we shall only give the essential details here. In addition, (d)–(h) use the weak convergence results in Phillips and Perron (1988).

(a) Using the Fourier series \( f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega) = (1/2\pi) \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g e^{ig\omega} \), we have

\[
\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uu}^{-1}(\omega_j) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} e^{ig\omega j/M} \hat{f}_{11}(\pi j/M)
\]

\[
= \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g C_{11}(g) k(g/M),
\]
where \( g + 2iM = g, -M + 1 \leq g \leq M \) for some integer \( l \), and \( C_{11}(g) = T^{-1} \sum_{l=-1}^{1} \). We have

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g = (2\pi f_{uv}(0))^{-1} = \zeta^{-2}.
\]

(A.1)

for all fixed \( g \) as \( T \to \infty \), and hence, \( M \to \infty \). From the Fourier series of \( f_{uv}(\lambda) \), we deduce that

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g = (2\pi f_{uv}(0))^{-1} = \zeta^{-2}.
\]

(A.2)

Since \( C_{11}(g) \to 1 \) for any fixed \( g \), (A.1) and (A.2) yield the required result.

(b) Writing

\[
T^{-2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uv}^{-1}(\omega_j)
\]

\[
= T^{-2} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} e^{i\pi j/M} \hat{f}_{11}(\pi j/M)
\]

\[
= T^{-2} \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g C_{11}(g) k(g/M),
\]

and noting that \( T^{-2} C_{11}(g) = T^{-3} \sum_{l=-1}^{1} t(t + g) \to \frac{1}{2} \), the result follows from (A.1) and (A.2).

(c) We have

\[
T^{-1} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{11}(\omega_j) f_{uv}^{-1}(\omega_j)
\]

\[
= T^{-1} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} e^{i\pi j/M} \hat{f}_{11}(\pi j/M)
\]

\[
= T^{-1} \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g C_{11}(g) k(g/M).
\]

The result follows, because \( T^{-1} C_{11}(g) \to \frac{1}{2} \).
(d) We have

\[
T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1j}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{aw}^{-1}(\omega_j)
= T^{-1/2} \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} e^{igxj/M} \hat{f}_{1j}(\pi j/M)
= T^{-1/2} \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g C_{1j}(g) k(g/M),
\]

and \(T^{-1/2} C_{1j}(g) = T^{-3/2} \sum y_{t-1+g} \Rightarrow \zeta \int_0^1 W.\) Hence the result follows.

(e) Simply note that \(T^{-3/2} C_{0j}(g) = T^{-3/2} \sum y_{t-1+x} \Rightarrow \zeta \int_0^1 W.\)

(f) This follows from \(T^{-1} C_{0j}(g) \Rightarrow \zeta^2 \int_0^1 W^2.\)

(g) Note that \(T^{1/2} C_{aw}(g) \Rightarrow \zeta W(1).\)

(h) The result follows from \(T^{-1/2} C_{aw}(g) \Rightarrow \zeta \int_0^1 rdW.\)

(i) Write

\[
\frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1j}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{aw}^{-1}(\omega_j) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} \left[ \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j=-M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1j}(\omega_j) e^{igxj} \right] d_g
= \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} d_g C_{1j}(g) k(g/M) d_g.
\]

Now we have \(C_{0j}(n) = T^{-1} \sum y_{t-1} u_{t+n} \Rightarrow \zeta^2 \int_0^1 WdW + \Delta(n + 1),\) where \(\Delta(n + 1) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Eu_0 u_{j+n+1}.\) Defining \(u_j = \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} u_{k+1+j} d_g,\) we have

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} \Delta(g + 1) d_g = \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} Eu_0 u_{j+n+1} d_g
= \left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} Eu_0 u_j. \tag{A.3}
\]
But, using the inverse transform, we have the representation \( E u_0 u_j = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{i\lambda j} f_{u_0}(\lambda) d\lambda \) for all \( j \), and

\[
f_{u_0}(\lambda) = \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} f_{u_0}(\lambda) e^{i(g+1)\lambda} \frac{d\theta}{2\pi} = f_{u_0}(\lambda) e^{i\lambda} 2\pi f_{u_0}(\lambda)^{-1} = 2\pi e^{i\lambda}.
\]

Thus,

\[
E(u_0 u_j) = 2\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{i(j+1)\lambda} d\lambda = \begin{cases} (2\pi)^2, & j = -1, \\
0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{A.4}
\]

Using (A.3) and (A.4), we deduce that

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} \Delta(g + 1) d\theta = 0. \tag{A.5}
\]

Also,

\[
\left[ \frac{1}{2\pi} \right]^2 \sum_{g=-\infty}^{\infty} \xi^2 \left( \int_{0}^{1} W dW \right) d\theta = \int_{0}^{1} W dW. \tag{A.6}
\]

Now the result follows using (A.1), (A.5), and (A.6).

**Proof of Theorem 1**

For the estimators \( \hat{\sigma}_{DT}, u_{DT}^* \) and the corresponding \( t \)-ratios, the stated results follow using the weak convergence results

\[
T^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-n+1} \tilde{y}_{t-1} \tilde{y}_{t-1+n} \Rightarrow \xi^2 \int_{0}^{1} \tilde{W}^2,
\]

\[
T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-n} \tilde{y}_{t-1} u_{t+n} \Rightarrow \xi^2 \int_{0}^{1} \tilde{W} dW + \Delta(n + 1),
\]

\[
T^{-2} \sum_{t=1}^{T-n+1} y_{t-1}^* y_{t-1+n}^* \Rightarrow \xi^2 \int_{0}^{1} W^* \, dW^2,
\]

\[
T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-n} y_{t-1}^* u_{t+n} \Rightarrow \xi^2 \int_{0}^{1} W \, dW + \Delta(n + 1),
\]
which we obtain working from Phillips (1988b, p. 85), and changing parts (f) and (i) of Lemma A.1 in an analogous way. The rest of the results are proven in the following:

(a) (i) As in Phillips (1988a) we have \( \max_{\omega_j} | \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j) - f_{uu}(\omega_j) | \to 0 \). Hence, we may replace \( \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j) \) with \( f_{uu}(\omega_j) \) for asymptotic analysis in what follows. Write

\[
T(\hat{\alpha} - 1) = Y_{y_iu}/(T^{-1}X_{1y_i}) ,
\]

where

\[
Y_{y_iu} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j = -M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{y_iu}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1} .
\]

The result follows from Lemma A.1.

(ii) This follows from part (a)(i) immediately.

(b) (i) Simply note that

\[
T(\hat{\alpha} - 1) = (X_{11} Y_{y_iu} - X_{1y_i} Y_{1u})/\{ T^{-1}(X_{11} X_{y_i,1y_i} - X_{1y_i}) \} ,
\]

and apply Lemma A.1. Here

\[
Y_{1u} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j = -M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1u}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1} .
\]

(ii) This follows from part (b)(i).

(c) (i) We have

\[
T(\hat{\alpha}^* - 1) = \{ T^{-2}(X_{11} X_{1y_i} - X_{1y_i} X_{11}) Y_{1u} - T^{-2}(X_{11} X_{1y_i} - X_{1y_i} X_{11}) Y_{y_i} \\
+ T^{-2}(X_{11} X_{1y_i} - X_{1y_i} X_{11}) Y_{y_iu} \\
/\{ T^{-3}(X_{11} X_{1y_i} X_{y_i,1y_i} + X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} + X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} \\
- X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} - X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} X_{1y_i} \} \} .
\]

where

\[
Y_{1u} = \frac{1}{2M} \sum_{j = -M+1}^{M} \hat{f}_{1u}(\omega_j) \hat{f}_{uu}(\omega_j)^{-1} .
\]

The result is an easy consequence of Lemma A.1.

(ii) This follows straightforwardly from part (c)(i).
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