The difference between R's auto.arima and Robust Modeling. Think All Blacks vs Wallabies. Light years. Generational Gap. Neandrathal vs Human. Night and Day.

Posted on Jun 15, Posted by Tom Reilly Category Forecasting

Let's evaluate auto.arima vs a Robust Solution from an example by it's author, Rob Hyndman, in his $\frac{R \text{ text book}}{R \text{ text book}}$.

Do this exercise in R and see for yourself!

Now, this is only one example that we are discussing here, but it reveals so much about R's auto.arima. It's a "pick best" approach of models that minimizes the AIC with no attempt to diagnose other effects like outliers, changes in level/trend/seasonality. There are many other examples we have seen that show flaws in auto.arima as we have seen them discussed on crossvalidated.com.

The data set we are examining is found in Chapter 8.5 of Rob's book called "U.S. Consumption" and it is a quarterly dataset with 164 values. Rob observes no seasonality, so he forces the model to not look for seasonality. Now this might be true, but there is something else going on here that smells funny as the name of the software is "auto", but a human is intervening. Is it really necessary to have the need for this? What consequences would happen if the user wasn't there to do this we wondered? We explore that down below.

The auto.arima generated model is an MA3 with lags 1,2,3 and a constant. All coefficients are significant and the forecast looks good so everything is great, right? Well, not really.

Serie: usconsumption[,]] AND(0,0,3) with non-zero mean Coefficience: 0.2543 0.2560 0.2655 0.7562 s.c.0767 0.0779 0.0692 0.0694 sigma"2 estimated as 0.3856 log likelihood--154.73 AlC-19.46 AlCC-39.86 BIC-34.86 Tailing set erior measures: ME RMSE MAK MFF MAFE MAKE ACT: Training set -4.01373-05 0.050985 0.47364 MFF MAFE MAKE ACT:

The forecasts from a Robust application(Autobox) and auto.arima end up being just about the same, but the "style" and "process" from these two tools need to be highlighted as their are stark differences in the modeling assumptions and detection of other patterns. Box-Jenkins laid out a path of Identification, Estimation, Necessity and Sufficiency with perhaps model revision and then forecasting. Auto.arima is not following this path. Auto.arima's approach is a "one and done" approach where the model is identified and that it is it.

Let's see what is really going on in terms of methodology and what assumptions are made and what is missing in auto.arima. auto.arima's process leaves a set of residuals which are obviously NOT random. The residuals show artifacts from which information can be learned about the data and perhaps a better model. Here are the auto.arima's residuals which clearly show that the first half of the data is very different from the second half. Do residuals matter? Yes. The first thing you learn when studying time series is that if the <u>errors are not random</u> and show pattern(s) then your model is not sufficient and needs more work.

Residuals - usconsumption								
14 12- 09- 08- 03- 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00 00	91 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111 111						suals	
$I = \frac{1}{23}$ Fit The program has found a striction as a striction and the final model (here model	tically significant difference between older data reported a structural break in the parameters and the structural break in the parameters of the structural break in the structural break of the structural break in the structural break of the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break in the structural break			^{of 4)} Ağı Li Gəsəli i Aşləşlər İşamətəni yiperti filmə Alimotomi yiperti filmə yaşlar	iligittilgetolikgjal Eng athoionittigtichatilte Egystenschotoo (Ca	ti di anto in anto di a	idacin kainin (1207) In this with its eat	
ARIMA	(0,0,3) (2,0,2)[4] with n	on-zero	mean			
Coeff	icients:							
	ma1	ma2	ma3	sar1	sar2	sma1	sma2	inter
	0.2828	0.1664	0.2641	0.6339	-0.7818	-0.6314	0.8436	0.
s.e.	0.0774	0.0859	0.0675	0.0520	0.0388	0.0578	0.0698	0.
sigma	^2 estima	ated as	0.3444:	log lik	elihood=-	145.3		
AIC=3	08.73	AICc=309	.9 BIC	=336.63				
ARIMA(2,0,2) with non-z	zero mean				FRAGE BOOKTONIE	Supplements the	mediately	
Coefficients: ar1 ar2 1.4441 -0.6194 s.e. 0.2852 0.2200	ma1 ma2 intercept -1.2185 0.5618 0.7551 0.2621 0.1397 0.0940							
sigma^2 estimated as 0.	.3816: log likelihood=-153.9 4 BIG=338.4							

Tags feel free to comment and hear your thoughts!!