

AD-A165 187

PROPERTIES OF BATCH MEANS FROM STATIONARY ARMA
(AUTOREGRESSIVE MOVING AVERAGE) TIME SERIES(U) NAVAL
POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY CA K KANG ET AL FEB 86
NPS55-86-004


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 12/1

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1963-A

2

NPS55-86-004

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL

Monterey, California

AD-A165 187



DTIC FILE COPY

PROPERTIES OF BATCH MEANS FROM
STATIONARY ARMA TIME SERIES

KEEBOM KANG
BRUCE SCHMEISER

FEBRUARY 1986

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

Prepared for:
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, CA 93943-5100

CC

14

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL
MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA

Rear Admiral R. H. Shumaker
Superintendent

D. A. Schrady
Provost

The work reported herein was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research.

Reproduction of all or part of this report is authorized.


This report was prepared by:


BRUCE SCHMEISER
Adjunct Research Professor

Reviewed by:


ALAN R. WASHBURN
Chairman
Department of Operations Research

Released by:


KNEALE T. MARSHALL
Dean of Information
and Policy Sciences

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

1a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION UNCLASSIFIED			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) NPS55-86-004			7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION Naval Postgraduate School		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable) Code 55		7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) Monterey, CA 93943-5000		8a. NAME OF FUNDING/SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER	
8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS	
				PROGRAM ELEMENT NO	PROJECT NO
				TASK NO.	WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO.
11. TITLE (include Security Classification) PROPERTIES OF BATCH MEANS FROM STATIONARY ARMA TIME SERIES					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Kang, Keebom (University of Miami) and Schmeiser, Bruce W.					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical		13b. TIME COVERED FROM _____ TO _____		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1986, February	
15. PAGE COUNT 10					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP	aggregated time series, batch means, autoregressive, moving average, Monte Carlo, simulation		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number) → The batch means process arising from an arbitrary autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) process time series is derived. As side results, the variance and correlation structures of the batch means process as functions of the batch size and parameters of the original process are obtained. Except for the first-order ARMA process, for which a closed-form expression is obtained, the parameters of the batch-means process are determined numerically. <i>Monte Carlo method; simulation</i>					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT ☐ UNCLASSIFIED UNLIMITED ☒ SAME AS RPT ☐ DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Bruce W. Schmeiser			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) (408)646-2119		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL Code 55Sc

1. INTRODUCTION

Corresponding to any time series $\{X_i; i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ is the time series $\{\bar{X}_j; j = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, where

$$\bar{X}_j = b^{-1} \sum_{h=1}^b X_{(j-1)b+h} \quad (1)$$

is the j^{th} batch mean of size b . The batch-means process, or aggregated time series, is of interest when observations are actually batched (see, e.g., Telser [1967], Amemiya and Wu [1972], and Tiao [1972]), when calculations need to be simplified (see, e.g., Blackman and Tukey [1958, Sec. B. 17]), or when the process mean, $E(X)$, is to be estimated. The third context motivates our work.

Consider estimating $E(X)$ with the average of n observations. $\bar{X} = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i / n$. Using batch means to estimate the variance of the sample mean, $V(\bar{X})$, has long been considered (see, e.g., Conway [1963]). Brillinger (1973) shows that if the values of a process at a distance from each other are only weakly dependent, then the batch means are asymptotically independent and normally distributed. Thus, for large batch size b , $V(\bar{X})$ can be estimated using S_k^2 / k , where $k = \lfloor n / b \rfloor$, $S_k^2 = (k-1)^{-1} \left[\sum_{j=1}^k \bar{X}_j - k\bar{X}^2 \right]$, and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor function. (Moran [1965] discusses related estimators.) A nominal $100(1-\alpha)$ percent confidence interval on $E(X)$ is then $\bar{X} \pm t_{1-\alpha/2, k-1} S_k k^{-1/2}$, where $t_{1-\alpha/2, k-1}$ is the $1-(\alpha/2)$ quantile of Student's t distribution with $k-1$ degrees of freedom.

The batch means algorithms developed by Mechanic and McKay (1966), Fishman (1978), Law and Carson (1979), Schriber and Andrews (1979), and Adam (1983) empirically calculate measures of batch dependency for various batch sizes b in an attempt to determine a reasonably small value of b that yields batch means that are almost independent and normally distributed. These procedures require substantial calculation; Law and Carson (1979), for example, calculate first-order correlations based on 400 batches. That so many batches are required for accurate estimation of dependency measures is unfortunate, since Schmeiser (1982) shows that, for fixed n , additional batches beyond some small number (ten to thirty) do little to improve the statistical properties of the batch means confidence interval procedures. The results of Section 2 are motivated by the idea that knowledge of the relationship between $\{X_i\}$ and $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ can be used to measure properties of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ even for small values of k .

A second reason for studying the relationship between $\{X_i\}$ and $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ is to allow more efficient simulation studies of batch-means procedures. Studying the performance of several batch-means procedures in the context of various distributions assumptions for $\{X_i\}$ requires a large computational effort, especially when the large sample sizes required to simulate a system and the large number of replications required for meaningful conclusions are considered. A crude Monte Carlo method is to generate $X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n$ and calculate the batch means $\bar{X}_1, \bar{X}_2, \dots, \bar{X}_{\lfloor n/b \rfloor}$ for all values of b of interest. A computationally more efficient alternative is to derive the properties of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ from the properties of $\{X_i\}$ and to generate directly the batch means $\{\bar{X}_j\}$, as discussed in Section 4.

A third motivation is that direct insights might result from studying properties of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ as functions of the parameters of $\{X_i\}$. Particularly interesting is the sensitivity of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ to the underlying process and to the batch size b , as discussed in Kang (1984, Chapter 5).

Section 2 contains results relating batch-means processes to arbitrary stationary autoregressive moving-average (ARMA) processes. Section 3 considers the special case of the underlying process being ARMA (1,1). Section 4 is a summary containing an algorithm for determining the batch-means process from the underlying process.

2. BATCH MEANS OF STATIONARY ARMA PROCESSES

The ARMA (p, q) process $\{X_i\}$ by definition satisfies

$$\sum_{h=0}^p \phi_h X_{i-h} = \sum_{h=0}^q \theta_h \epsilon_{i-h} \quad (2)$$

where $\phi_0 \equiv 1$, $\theta_0 \equiv 1$, and the error terms ϵ_i are independent with zero mean and variance σ_ϵ^2 . The main result of this paper is Theorem 1, which states that batch-means processes arising from ARMA underlying processes are themselves ARMA and specifies the parameter values.

Theorem 1. *Consider the stationary ARMA (p, q) process of equation (2). Then $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ is the stationary ARMA $(p, \bar{q})$ process*

$$\sum_{h=0}^p \bar{\phi}_h \bar{X}_{j-h} = \sum_{h=0}^{\bar{q}} \bar{\theta}_h \bar{\epsilon}_{j-h}$$

where $\bar{\phi}_0 \equiv 1$, $\bar{\theta}_0 \equiv 1$, the batch-means error terms $\bar{\epsilon}_j$ are independent random variables with zero mean and variance σ_ϵ^2 , and $\bar{q}$, $\bar{\phi}_1, \bar{\phi}_2, \dots, \bar{\phi}_p$, and $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_{\bar{q}}$ are functions (of the parameters of the underlying process and the batch size b) given in Lemmas 1, 2, and 4, respectively.

The proof of Theorem 1 requires the following lemmas.

Lemma 1 (Anderson [1979a, p. 155]). *If the underlying process $\{X_i\}$ is a stationary ARMA (p, q) process, then the batch-means process $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ is a stationary ARMA $(p, \bar{q})$ process, where $\bar{q} = p - \lfloor (p - q)/b \rfloor$.*

Anderson uses the more complicated, but equivalent, expression $\bar{q} = \left\lfloor \frac{q - (p+1)(b-1)}{b} \right\rfloor$.

Lemma 1 has several direct implications, as discussed in the Appendix.

Lemma 2 (Amemiya and Wu [1972]). *The AR parameters $\bar{\phi}_1, \bar{\phi}_2, \dots, \bar{\phi}_p$ of the batch means process $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ are the coefficients of $B^1, B^2, \dots, B^p$ of $\prod_{h=1}^p (1 - \alpha_h^b B)$, respectively, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_p$ are the roots of the characteristic equation $\Phi(B) = \sum_{h=0}^p \phi_h B^{p-h} = 0$.*

Lemma 3. For any stationary process $\{X_i\}$, the lag- h autocorrelation of the batch-means process $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ is

$$\bar{\rho}_h \equiv \text{Corr}(\bar{X}_j, \bar{X}_{j+h}) = \left[\sum_{i=1}^b i \rho_{(h-1)b+i} + \sum_{i=1}^{b-1} i \rho_{(h-1)b+2b-i} \right] / [bc]$$

where $c = 1 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^{b-1} (1 - (h/b)) \rho_k$, $\rho_h \equiv R_h / R_0$, and $R_h \equiv E[(X_i - E X)(X_{i+h} - E X)]$ for $h = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ and $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$.

Proof. For any stationary process, the lag- h covariance of the batch means process is

$$\text{Cov}(\bar{X}_j, \bar{X}_{j+h}) = b^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^b \sum_{k=1}^b \text{Cov}(X_{(j-1)b+i}, X_{(j+h-1)b+k}) \quad (3)$$

(see, e.g., Kleijnen [1975, p. 507]), which is a special case of the covariance of linear combinations of random variables as discussed in Box and Jenkins (1976, pp. 28-29). Also, for any stationary process, each batch mean $\bar{X}_j$ has variance

$$\bar{R}_0 \equiv V(\bar{X}_j) = c R_0 / b \quad (4)$$

(see, e.g., Fishman [1973, p. 281]). The definition of correlation

$$\bar{\rho}_h \equiv \text{Cov}(\bar{X}_j, \bar{X}_{j+h}) / [V(\bar{X}_j)V(\bar{X}_{j+h})]^{1/2}$$

and equations (3) and (4) yield

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\rho}_h &= b^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^b \sum_{k=1}^b \text{Cov}[X_{(j-1)b+i}, X_{(j+h-1)b+k}] / [c R_0 / b] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^b \sum_{k=1}^b \text{Corr}[X_{(j-1)b+i}, X_{(j+h-1)b+k}] / [bc]. \end{aligned}$$

Counting like terms arising from stationarity yields the result. $\square$

Lemma 4 (Anderson [1971, p. 237]). Consider a stationary ARMA(p, q) process with known AR (autoregressive) parameters $\bar{\phi}_1, \bar{\phi}_2, \dots, \bar{\phi}_p$; variance $\bar{R}_0$, and autocorrelation coefficients $\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \dots, \bar{\rho}_q$. Then the MA (moving-average) parameters $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_q$ are determined.

Theorem 1 can now be proven using the four lemmas.

Proof of Theorem 1.

1. From Lemma 1, the AR and MA orders of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ are determined: in particular, $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ is an ARMA(p, q) process.
2. From Lemma 2, the AR parameters of $\{\bar{X}_j\}$ are determined.
3. The autocorrelations $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_{b(q+1)-1}$ of a stationary ARMA process can be calculated using the algorithm of Sweet and Mazaheri (1979).

4. Given the autocorrelations from Step 3, the batch-means variance $\bar{R}_0$ is determined by equation (4) and the batch-means autocorrelations $\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \dots, \bar{\rho}_{\bar{q}}$ are determined by Lemma 3.
5. The MA parameters $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_{\bar{q}}$ are then determined from Lemma 4. $\square$

The representation of the batch-means process is not unique. The batch-means MA parameters of Lemma 4 require the solution of a polynomial equation of order $2\bar{q}$ to determine $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_{\bar{q}}$. The $2\bar{q}$ roots can be partitioned $2^{\bar{q}}$ ways into two sets $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\bar{q}})$ and $(x_{\bar{q}+1}, x_{\bar{q}+2}, \dots, x_{2\bar{q}})$ such that $x_{\bar{q}+i} = 1/x_i$. All such subsets of size $\bar{q}$ from $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{2\bar{q}})$ determine $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_{\bar{q}}$ corresponding to stochastically equivalent processes. But there is a unique subset of size $\bar{q}$ having $|x_i| \leq 1$, and therefore $|x_{\bar{q}+i}| = |1/x_i| \geq 1$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \bar{q}$. Thus for the ARMA($p, \bar{q}$) process there exist $2^{\bar{q}} - 1$ non-invertible processes corresponding to a unique invertible process.

3. ARMA(1,1) BATCH MEANS

Now consider the special case of stationary first-order ARMA processes

$$X_i + \phi X_{i-1} = \epsilon_i + \theta \epsilon_{i-1} \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots \quad (5)$$

The low-order moments of $\{X_i\}$ are the zero mean, variance

$$R_0 = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 (1 + \theta^2 - 2\phi\theta) / (1 - \phi^2), \quad (6)$$

the lag-one autocorrelation

$$\rho_1 = (1 - \phi\theta)(\theta - \phi) / (1 + \theta^2 - 2\phi\theta), \quad (7)$$

and lag-h autocorrelations

$$\rho_h = (-\phi)\rho_{h-1} = (-\phi)^{h-1}\rho_1 \quad \text{for } h = 2, 3, \dots \quad (8)$$

Closed-form expressions for the parameters of the batch-means process are given in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. Consider the stationary ARMA(1,1) process of equation (5). The corresponding batch-means process is the stationary ARMA(1,1) process

$$\bar{X}_j + \bar{\phi} \bar{X}_{j-1} = \bar{\epsilon}_j + \bar{\theta} \bar{\epsilon}_{j-1} \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, \dots \quad (9)$$

where

$$\bar{\phi} = (-1)^{\bar{q}+1} \phi^{\bar{q}} \quad (10)$$

$$\bar{\theta} = \frac{(2\bar{\phi}\rho_1 + \bar{\phi}^2 - 1) \pm [(1 - \bar{\phi}^2)(1 - (2\bar{\phi}\rho_1 - \bar{\phi})^2)]^{1/2}}{2(\rho_1 + \bar{\phi})} \quad (11)$$

and

$$\sigma_{\bar{\epsilon}}^2 = \bar{R}_0 (1 - \bar{\phi}^2) / (\bar{\theta}^2 - 2\bar{\phi}\bar{\theta} + 1) \quad (12)$$

where

$$\bar{R}_0 = c R_0 / b \quad (13)$$

$$\bar{\rho}_1 = \rho_1(1 + \bar{\phi})^2 / [bc(1 + \phi)^2] \quad (14)$$

and

$$c = 1 + \{2\rho_1[(-\phi)^b + b(1 + \phi) - 1] / [b(1 + \phi)^2]\} \quad (15)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.

Equations (13), (14), and (15) follow from Lemma 3 and equation (4) via equation (8). Since $\{X_i\}$ is ARMA(1,1), $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is also ARMA(1,1) by Lemma 1: that is, equation (9) holds. Equation (10) is a special case of Lemma 2. Since $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is ARMA(1,1), equation (7) yields

$$\bar{\rho}_1 = (1 - \bar{\phi}\bar{\theta})(\bar{\theta} - \bar{\phi}) / (1 + \bar{\theta}^2 - 2\bar{\phi}\bar{\theta}).$$

Solving for $\bar{\theta}$ yields the two roots of equation (11). Since $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is an ARMA(1,1) process, equation (6) holds with the batch-means parameters:

$$\bar{R}_0 = \sigma_{\bar{\epsilon}}^2(1 + \bar{\theta}^2 - 2\bar{\phi}\bar{\theta}) / (1 - \bar{\phi}^2).$$

Solving for the variance of the batch-means error term, $\sigma_{\bar{\epsilon}}^2$, with either value of $\bar{\theta}$ from equation (11) yields equation (12). (But note that the value of $\sigma_{\bar{\epsilon}}^2$ depends on the choice of $\bar{\theta}$). $\square$

4. SUMMARY

Properties of batch means are studied under the assumption that the underlying process is ARMA(p, q). For ARMA(1,1) processes, closed-form expressions for the corresponding batch-means processes are obtained. A numerical procedure is developed for calculating the parameters of the ARMA batch-means process from the parameters of the underlying process and the batch size b . This procedure is stated concisely here for convenience.

ARMA(p, q) Procedure.

Given parameters $\phi_1, \phi_2, \dots, \phi_p, \theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_q$, error variance σ_{ϵ}^2 , and batch size b , calculate

1. $\bar{q} = p - [(p - q) / b]$
2. $\bar{\phi}_1, \bar{\phi}_2, \dots, \bar{\phi}_p$ using Lemma 2
3. $R_0, \rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_{b(\bar{q}-1)+1}$ from the Yule-Walker equations, probably using the algorithm of Sweet and Mazaheri (1979)
4. $c = 1 + 2 \sum_{h=1}^{b-1} (1 - (h/b)) \rho_h$

5. $\bar{R}_0$ from equation (4)
6. $\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \dots, \bar{\rho}_{\bar{q}}$ using Lemma 3
7. $\bar{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_2, \dots, \bar{\theta}_{\bar{q}}$ from Lemma 4
8. σ_{ϵ}^2 from equation (13) of Anderson (1971, p. 237).

A FORTRAN implementation of the ARMA(p, q) procedure is given in Kang (1984).

When the underlying process is ARMA(1,1), the following closed-form procedure can be used:

ARMA(1,1) Procedure.

Given parameters ϕ, θ , error variance σ_{ϵ}^2 , and batch size b , calculate

1. $\bar{q} = 1$
2. $\bar{\phi}$ from equation (10)
3. R_0 from equation (6), ρ_1 from equation (7)
4. c from equation (15)
5. $\bar{R}_0$ from equation (13)
6. $\bar{\rho}_1$ from equation (14)
7. $\bar{\theta}$ from equation (11)
8. σ_{ϵ}^2 from equation (12)

Notice in the ARMA(1,1) special case that calculation in step 3 of all $2b-1$ autocorrelations of the underlying process is not necessary.

If the underlying error terms ϵ_t are normally distributed, then the batch-means error terms $\bar{\epsilon}_j$ are also normally distributed (see, e.g., Johnson and Kotz [1971, p. 51]). Therefore, generation of random variates directly from the batch-means process is straightforward using equation (9), thereby avoiding the costly computations of aggregating observations from the underlying process. Initialization for steady-state results is straightforward for AR and MA processes, but initialization for ARMA is complicated unless the process is warmed-up by discarding some initial observations (Anderson [1979b]).

REFERENCES

- Adam, N. (1983). "Achieving a Confidence Interval for Parameters Estimated by Simulation," *Management Science* **29**, 856-866.
- Amemiya, T., and Wu, R.Y. (1972). "The Effect of Aggregation on Prediction in the Autoregressive Model," *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **67**, 628-632.
- Anderson, O.D. (1979a). *Time Series Analysis and Forecasting: The Box-Jenkins Approach*, London: Butterworths.
- Anderson, O.D. (1979b). "On Warming-up Time Series Simulations Generated by Box-Jenkins Models," *Journal of the Operational Research Society* **30**, 587-589.
- Anderson, T.W. (1971). *The Statistical Analysis of Time Series*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Blackman, R.B., and Tukey, J.W. (1958). *The Measurement of Power Spectra*, New York: Dover.
- Box, G.E.P., and Jenkins, G.M. (1976). *Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control*, San Francisco: Holden Day.
- Brillinger, D.R. (1973). "Estimation of the Mean of a Stationary Time Series by Sampling," *Journal of Applied Probability* **10**, 419-431.
- Conway, R.W. (1963). "Some Tactical Problems in Digital Simulation," *Management Science* **10**, 47-61.
- Fishman, G.S. (1973). *Concepts and Methods in Discrete Event Simulation*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Fishman, G.S. (1978). "Grouping Observations in Digital Simulation," *Management Science* **24**, 510-521.
- Johnson, N.L., and Kotz, S. (1970). *Distributions in Statistics: Continuous Univariate Distributions - 1*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kang, K. (1984). *Confidence Interval Estimation Via Batch Means and Time Series Modeling*. Ph.D. dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana.
- Kleijnen, J.P.C. (1975). *Statistical Techniques in Simulation, Part II*. New York: Marcel Dekker.
- Law, A.M., and Carson, J.S. (1979). "A Sequential Procedure for Determining the Length of a Steady State Simulation," *Operations Research* **27**, 1011-1025.
- Mechanic, H., and McKay, W. (1966). "Confidence Intervals for Averages of Dependent Data in Simulation II." Technical Report ASDD 17-202, IBM Corporation, Yorktown Heights, New York.
- Moran, P.A.P. (1975). "The Estimation of Standard Errors in Monte Carlo Simulation Experiments," *Biometrika* **62**, 1-4.

- Schmeiser, B.W. (1982). "Batch Size Effects in the Analysis of Simulation Output," *Operations Research* **30**, 556-568.
- Schriber, T.J., and Andrews, R.W. (1979). "Interactive Analysis of Simulation Output by the Method of Batch Means," *Proceedings of the Winter Simulation Conference*, 513-525.
- Sweet, A.L., and Mazaheri, F. (1979). "Computation of the Autocovariances of Stationary ARMA Processes," *Computers and Industrial Engineering* **3**, 313-320.
- Telser, L.G. (1967). "Discrete Samples and Moving Sums in Stationary Stochastic Processes," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **62**, 484-499.
- Tiao, G.C. (1972). "Asymptotic Behaviour of Temporal Aggregates of Time Series." *Biometrika* **59**, 525-531.

Accession For

1975-1981

1982-1984

1985-1987

1988-1990

1991-1993

1994-1996

1997-1999

2000-2002

2003-2005

2006-2008

2009-2011

2012-2014

2015-2017

2018-2020

2021-2023

2024-2026

2027-2029

2030-2032

2033-2035

2036-2038

2039-2041

2042-2044

2045-2047

2048-2050

2051-2053

2054-2056

2057-2059

2060-2062

2063-2065

2066-2068

2069-2071

2072-2074

2075-2077

2078-2080

2081-2083

2084-2086

2087-2089

2090-2092

2093-2095

2096-2098

2099-2101

2102-2104

2105-2107

2108-2110

2111-2113

2114-2116

2117-2119

2120-2122

2123-2125

2126-2128

2129-2131

2132-2134

2135-2137

2138-2140

2141-2143

2144-2146

2147-2149

2150-2152

2153-2155

2156-2158

2159-2161

2162-2164

2165-2167

2168-2170

2171-2173

2174-2176

2177-2179

2180-2182

2183-2185

2186-2188

2189-2191

2192-2194

2195-2197

2198-2199

2200-2202

2203-2205

2206-2208

2209-2211

2212-2214

2215-2217

2218-2220

2221-2223

2224-2226

2227-2229

2230-2232

2233-2235

2236-2238

2239-2241

2242-2244

2245-2247

2248-2250

2251-2253

2254-2256

2257-2259

2260-2262

2263-2265

2266-2268

2269-2271

2272-2274

2275-2277

2278-2280

2281-2283

2284-2286

2287-2289

2290-2292

2293-2295

2296-2298

2299-2301

2302-2304

2305-2307

2308-2310

2311-2313

2314-2316

2317-2319

2320-2322

2323-2325

2326-2328

2329-2331

2332-2334

2335-2337

2338-2340

2341-2343

2344-2346

2347-2349

2350-2352

2353-2355

2356-2358

2359-2361

2362-2364

2365-2367

2368-2370

2371-2373

2374-2376

2377-2379

2380-2382

2383-2385

2386-2388

2389-2391

2392-2394

2395-2397

2398-2399

2400-2402

2403-2405

2406-2408

2409-2411

2412-2414

2415-2417

2418-2420

2421-2423

2424-2426

2427-2429

2430-2432

2433-2435

2436-2438

2439-2441

2442-2444

2445-2447

2448-2450

2451-2453

2454-2456

2457-2459

2460-2462

2463-2465

2466-2468

2469-2471

2472-2474

2475-2477

2478-2480

2481-2483

2484-2486

2487-2489

2490-2492

2493-2495

2496-2498

2499-2501

2502-2504

2505-2507

2508-2510

2511-2513

2514-2516

2517-2519

2520-2522

2523-2525

2526-2528

2529-2531

2532-2534

2535-2537

2538-2540

2541-2543

2544-2546

2547-2549

2550-2552

2553-2555

2556-2558

2559-2561

2562-2564

2565-2567

2568-2570

2571-2573

2574-2576

2577-2579

2580-2582

2583-2585

2586-2588

2589-2591

2592-2594

2595-2597

2598-2599

2600-2602

2603-2605

2606-2608

2609-2611

2612-2614

2615-2617

2618-2620

2621-2623

2624-2626

2627-2629

2630-2632

2633-2635

2636-2638

2639-2641

2642-2644

2645-2647

2648-2650

2651-2653

2654-2656

2657-2659

2660-2662

2663-2665

2666-2668

2669-2671

2672-2674

2675-2677

2678-2680

2681-2683

2684-2686

2687-2689

2690-2692

2693-2695

2696-2698

2699-2701

2702-2704

2705-2707

2708-2710

2711-2713

2714-2716

2717-2719

2720-2722

2723-2725

2726-2728

2729-2731

2732-2734

2735-2737

2738-2740

2741-2743

2744-2746

2747-2749

2750-2752

2753-2755

2756-2758

2759-2761

2762-2764

2765-2767

2768-2770

2771-2773

2774-2776

2777-2779

2780-2782

2783-2785

2786-2788

2789-2791

2792-2794

2795-2797

2798-2799

2800-2802

2803-2805

2806-2808

2809-2811

2812-2814

2815-2817

2818-2820

2821-2823

2824-2826

2827-2829

2830-2832

2833-2835

2836-2838

2839-2841

2842-2844

2845-2847

2848-2850

<

APPENDIX

Although Lemma 1 is simple to state compactly, its implications are more clear when cases are considered individually:

If	and	then
$p > q$	$b < p - q$	$q \leq \bar{q} \leq p - 1$
	$b = p - q$	$\bar{q} = p - 1$
	$b > p - q$	$\bar{q} = p$
$p = q$		$\bar{q} = p$
$p < q$	$b < q - p$	$p + 2 \leq \bar{q} \leq q$
	$b = q - p$	$\bar{q} = p + 1$
	$b > q - p$	$\bar{q} = p + 1$

Many results can be stated immediately from examination of these individual cases. Five such results are:

Result 1. *If $\{X_i\}$ is $AR(p)$, then $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is $ARMA(p, \bar{q})$, as studied by Amemiya and Wu (1972). Additionally, $1 \leq \bar{q} \leq p$.*

Result 2. *If $\{X_i\}$ is $MA(q)$, then $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is $MA(\bar{q})$, where $1 \leq \bar{q} \leq q$.*

Result 3. *If $\{X_i\}$ is AR or $ARMA$ with batch size satisfying $0 \leq p - q < b$, then $\{\bar{X}_i\}$ is $ARMA(p, p)$.*

Result 4. *If $p \geq q$, then $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \bar{q} = p$.*

Result 5. *If $p < q$, then $\lim_{b \rightarrow \infty} \bar{q} = p + 1$.*

Of course, considering only the order of the batch-means process can be misleading. For example, Results 4 and 5 indicate that large batches lead to MA components of order p or $p + 1$; in particular, a batched $MA(q)$ process converges to an $MA(1)$ process. But large batches are asymptotically independent. The explanation is that $\bar{\theta}_1$ is approaching zero as batch size increases. An implication is that, even for this nicest case of ARMA underlying processes, estimation of the order of the batch-means process is likely to be difficult.

DISTRIBUTION LIST

	NO. OF COPIES
Library (Code 0142) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	2
Defense Technical Information Center Cameron Station Alexandria, VA 22314	2
Office of Research Administration (Code 012) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
Center for Naval Analyses 2000 Beauregard Street Alexandria, VA 22311	1
Operations Research Center, Room E40-164 Massachusetts Institute of Technology Attn: R. C. Larson and J. F. Shapiro Cambridge, MA 02139	1
Library (Code 55) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	1
Office of Naval Research Arlington, VA 22217	1
Keebom Kang Department of Industrial Engineering University of Miami Coral Gables, FL 33124	10
Bruce W. Schmeiser Code 55Sc Naval Postgraduate School Monterey, CA 93943-5000	10

DTIC

FILMED

4-86

END