

# Interpretation and testing of point forecasts without directive

Patrick Schmidt\*

Computational Statistics, Heidelberg Institute for Theoretical Studies  
GSEFM, Goethe University Frankfurt

Matthias Katzfuss

Department of Statistics, Texas A&M University

August 8, 2022

## Abstract

Point forecasts can be interpreted as functionals (i.e., point summaries) of predictive distributions under a given directive. For example, if the directive consists of a quadratic loss function, the optimal point forecast is the mean of the predictive distribution. Knowing which functional was reported by the forecaster allows proper interpretation, evaluation, testing, and comparison of point forecasts. However, the directive under which point forecasts were produced is often unknown or it was nonexistent in the first place, meaning that the forecaster only implicitly reported a certain functional of the distribution representing the forecast uncertainty. Here we consider this situation of unknown directives, and we propose to estimate the unknown functional, which might vary over time as a function of certain state variables, using generalized method of moments. Focusing on two classes of flexible functionals, quantiles and expectiles, we show that our estimators are identifiable, consistent, and asymptotically normal. Using simulated data, we demonstrate that our approach is flexible, nicely interpretable, and more accurate than existing approaches. We also show that the GDP Greenbook forecasts of the Federal Reserve can be interpreted as evolving quantiles depending on the current growth rate. Interpreting point forecasts as functionals of predictive distributions allows us to incorporate results from the literature on probabilistic forecasts: We describe an approach for constructing density forecasts from a set of point forecasts. As example, we construct an improved GDP mean forecast.

---

\*The work of Patrick Schmidt has been funded by the European Union Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement no. 290976.

# 1 Introduction

Forecasts play an important role in economics and business. Predictions are often the basis of crucial decisions. Yet, they are fraught with uncertainty due to imperfect observation, understanding and modeling of the underlying economic mechanisms. To fully account for this uncertainty, it is increasingly recognized that forecasts should be probabilistic in nature. If forecasts are issued in the form of predictive distributions, it is straightforward to interpret them, test for optimality, or to compare them to other forecasts (see Gneiting and Katzfuss, 2014, for a recent review of probabilistic forecasting). However, point forecasts are still ubiquitous. Point forecasts can also be treated under the probabilistic framework by interpreting them as point summaries of density forecasts under a given directive. Elliott and Timmermann (2008) emphasize the importance of integrating economic forecasts in a decision-theoretical framework. Along this line of thought, a directive can be specified in terms of a functional (i.e., a point-valued summary of a distribution), or in terms of the risk (expected loss) that the functional minimizes. We call a loss function consistent for the functional that minimizes its expected loss. For example, it is well known that the linear loss function is consistent for the median. Often the subjective loss function of the forecaster and forecast user are not identical, or point forecasts are issued without any directives at all. In this case, the point forecast alone may be misleading (see Gneiting, 2011) and instead needs to be understood as a functional, a specific characteristic of the actual uncertainty.

We consider such point forecasts with unknown directive, for which the forecaster only implicitly reported a certain functional of the distribution representing the forecast uncertainty, and no loss function was explicitly specified. This situation arises, for example, in the case of forecasts by subject-matter experts, vague questions in surveys, and complex deterministic computer models (e.g., in numerical-exchange rate, inflation or asset-pricing forecasts). Another possibility is that the functional is explicitly stated by the forecast user, but the preferences of the forecaster differ. Such forecasts would be most informative if the forecast user knew the loss function or directive of the forecaster. Here, the goal is to estimate this directive from a time series of point forecasts and associated realizations. Once the directive has been estimated, the forecast can be coherently interpreted, improved, tested, or compared to other point or probability forecasts.

Past work on estimating a directive based on point forecasts and realizations has focused on the estimation of the loss function. Elliott et al. (2005) provide an identified generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator of the loss function for constant preferences and linear forecasting models. Patton and Timmermann (2007) apply the method to the Federal Reserve's gross domestic product (GDP) forecasts with a new class of loss functions, which consists of quadratic splines flexible with respect to a state variable. Recently, the class of piecewise linear and piecewise quadratic loss functions was used in various applications (Caunedo et al., 2013; Christodoulakis and Mamatzakis, 2008; Elliott et al., 2008; Pierdzioch et al., 2013a,b).

There are some issues with this focus on estimating the loss function. Loss functions cannot be identified based on data, because for most commonly used functionals, including the mean, median and other quantiles, there exist infinitely many consistent loss functions (see Gneiting, 2011). For example, while the absolute-error loss  $L(x, y) = |x - y|$  is consistent

for the median, so is any loss function of the form  $L(x, y) = |g(x) - g(y)|$ , where  $g$  is strictly increasing. In addition, other important functionals, such as the mode and the conditional value-at-risk, cannot be expressed as the Bayes rule with respect to any loss function for a broad class of probability distributions (see Gneiting, 2011; Heinrich, 2013).

Hence, instead of estimating the loss function itself, we propose here to identify the corresponding reported functional for a given time series of point forecasts and realizations. By restricting the class of potential functionals adequately, we ensure that our estimator is identified under any optimal forecasting model. As such, we generalize the findings of Elliott et al. (2005) to forecasts that are not required to be linear functions of the instrumental variables, and we include flexible forecasting directives as first proposed in Patton and Timmermann (2007).

In recent work, Patton (2014) showed that under misspecification the ranking of competing forecasts is not robust to different choices of consistent loss functions and therefore the forecaster should rather specify the loss function and not merely the functional. But, as we point out, only the functional can be identified by the time series of realizations and forecasts alone, and therefore the estimation of the single specific loss function is impossible, unless additional information is provided.

The parameterization of the functional provides several advantages: It is more flexible than the initial approach of Elliott et al. (2005) and allows construction of a whole set of specification tests. The results are also easier to interpret and to communicate to decision makers without statistical background. Further, it results in better calibrated tests than the approach in Patton and Timmermann (2007), as similar flexibility can be obtained with less parameters in an identified model. Further applications arise very intuitively in the interpretation of systematically biased forecasts as flexible quantiles, in the performance comparison between point and probability forecasts, and in the construction of density forecasts from multiple point forecasts. We show how the GDP forecast of the Federal Reserve can be interpreted as asymmetric evolving quantile of the underlying uncertainty and how to construct an improved mean forecast.

This manuscript is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe our methodology and provide proofs of identification and asymptotic normality of our estimators. In Section 3, we compare our methodology to the approach of Patton and Timmermann (2007) using similarly simulated data and the same GDP Greenbook forecasts of the Federal Reserve. We conclude in Section 4.

## 2 Our methodology

### 2.1 General setting and notation

Assume there is a time series  $\{Y_t : t = 1, 2, \dots\}$ . At every time point  $t$ , a forecaster attempts to predict  $Y_{t+1}$  based on information in the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(Y_1, \dots, Y_t, Z_1, \dots, Z_t)$ , which is generated by previous values of  $\{Y_t\}$  and the vector-valued instrumental variables  $\{Z_t\}$ . The forecaster's probability prediction is  $\mathcal{D}_t$ , but he or she only reports a point forecast  $X_t = \alpha_{\mathcal{D}_t}$ , which is a *functional* (i.e., a real-valued summary) of the probability prediction  $\mathcal{D}_t$ . We say a loss function  $L(x, y)$  is consistent for the functional  $\alpha$  relative to a class of

probability distributions  $\mathcal{P}$  if the Bayes rule of the loss function equals the functional

$$\alpha_{\mathcal{D}} = \arg \min_x \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[L(x, Y)] \quad \forall \mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

By this equation every loss function induces a functional. But not every functional can be defined by a consistent loss function. Further, for most commonly used functionals there exist indefinitely many consistent loss functions (see Gneiting, 2011).

We also allow the functional  $\alpha$  used by the forecaster to depend on the present situation, represented by the realization of the instrumental vector  $z_t$ . We call this a *flexible functional* with state variable  $z$  and sometimes write  $\alpha_{\mathcal{D}_t}(z_t)$ .

Now, crucially, we assume that we do not know which functional was used by the forecaster or what the predictive distributions  $\mathcal{D}_t$  were, only that they were ideal (i.e., that they constitute the true conditional distributions based on the information available to the forecaster at time  $t$ :  $\mathcal{D}_t = Y_t | \mathcal{F}_t$ ).

## 2.2 Summary of our approach

Given the sample  $(x_t, y_t, z_t)_{t=1,2,\dots,T}$  of forecasts, observations and instrumental variables, our goal is to estimate the functional. Our approach can be summarized as follows:

1. Pick a reasonable class of parameterized functionals  $\mathcal{T} := \{\alpha(z, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ , which should contain the true reported functional  $\alpha(z, \theta_0)$ . Two specific examples of such classes are described in Section 2.5 below.
2. For each functional, find an identification function  $g$ , such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[g(x, Y; z, \theta)] = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(z, \theta). \quad (1)$$

The right choice of identification functions are described in Section 2.3. Further restrict the class appropriately such that no other element fulfills the moment condition,

$$\nexists \theta_1 \in \Theta : \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[g(x, Y; z, \theta_1)] = 0 \text{ and } \theta_1 \neq \theta_0.$$

This guarantees that the system is uniquely identified.

3. Find  $\hat{\theta}$ , the consistent GMM estimator of  $\theta_0$ , and its asymptotic distribution, which implies the estimator  $\alpha(z, \hat{\theta})$  of the functional  $\alpha(z, \theta_0)$ . See Section 2.4 for more details.

## 2.3 Identification of functionals

The first step is to find an identification function  $g(x, y; z, \theta)$  for each functional  $\alpha(z, \theta)$  such that (1) holds. The following theorem states that such an identification function is given by the partial derivative of any loss function that is consistent for the functional  $\alpha(z, \theta)$ .

**Theorem 1** (Identification). *Assume  $\mathcal{D}$  is an ideal predictive distribution for  $Y$  with respect to the information  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$ , and the reported point forecast is the functional  $X = \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$ .*

Functional $\alpha$	Identification function $g(x, y, z)$
mean	$(x - y) \cdot w(z)$
median	$(\mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - \frac{1}{2}) \cdot w(z)$
$q$ -quantile	$(\mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - q) \cdot w(z)$
$\tau$ -expectile	$ \mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - \tau (x - y) \cdot w(z)$

Table 1: Commonly used functionals and their identification functions. The dimension of the  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable instrument  $w$  determines the number of moment conditions. Note that median and mean are special cases of quantiles and expectiles for  $q = 0.5$  and  $\tau = 0.5$ , respectively.

Then for any loss function  $L$  consistent for  $\alpha$  and satisfying Regularity Conditions 1, the following moment condition holds for any  $s \in \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}$  and any  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable instrumental variable  $W$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[L_{(x)}(s, Y) \cdot W] = 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $L_{(x)}(x, y) = \frac{\partial L(x, y)}{\partial x}$  denotes the derivative of  $L$  with respect to  $x$ .

Further, for any other consistent loss function  $\tilde{L}$  fulfilling Regularity Conditions 1, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{L}_{(x)}(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}[L_{(x)}(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0$$

for any  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable  $x$ .

The regularity conditions and proof are given in Appendix A.

We conclude from Theorem 1 that we can identify a functional by the partial derivative of any loss function that is consistent for the functional. Hence, there is no need to distinguish between loss functions that are consistent for the same functional. For any class of such loss functions we can choose the most convenient for our purpose. For the identification function  $g(x, Y; z, \theta) := L_{(x)}(x, Y) \cdot W$ , the implication of (1) holds:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[g(x, Y; z, \theta)] = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}(z, \theta).$$

The vector valued instrument  $W = (W_1, \dots, W_q)$  has to be  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable. We can choose any function of random variables known to the forecaster when he or she issued the prediction. Table 1 states possible identification functions for popular functionals.

The literature on the evaluation of point forecasts typically defines optimality or rationality of a point forecast in terms of minimizing the expected loss (Elliott et al., 2005; Patton and Timmermann, 2007). Our framework adds an additional level. As shown in the first half of the proof of Theorem 1 in Appendix A, the former concept of optimality emerges in our broader framework as the Bayes rule of an ideal predictive distribution. The inclusion of predictive densities allows a more profound analysis and interpretation: A point forecast can violate the optimality criteria either because the subjective loss of the forecaster is not consistent with the assumed forecasting directives, or because the subjective perception of uncertainty is not ideal (i.e., based on the available information the forecaster perceives a probability distribution different from the true conditional distribution).

For a characterization of elicitable functionals and their loss functions see Steinwart et al. (2014). Instead, we specify necessary conditions to distinguish between different functionals and how to construct well behaving estimators of the issued functional, based on the identification function.

## 2.4 Generalized method of moments estimation of flexible functionals

Given a class of flexible functionals  $\mathcal{T} = \{\alpha(z, \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$  and an identification function  $g$ , choose a vector of  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable instrumental variables  $w$ , and let  $\mathcal{V}_T = \{(x_t, y_t, z_t, w_{1,t}, \dots, w_{q,t}) : t = 1, \dots, T\}$  denote the set of all “data.” We obtain a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimate of  $\theta$  as

$$\hat{\theta}_T := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \|g_T(\theta, \mathcal{V}_T)\|, \quad (3)$$

the value that minimizes the norm of the empirical mean of the identification function,

$$g_T(\theta, \mathcal{V}_T) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T g(x_t, y_t; z_t, \theta) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T L_{(x)}(x_t, y_t; z_t, \theta) \cdot w_t.$$

Several choices for the norm  $\|\cdot\|$  in (3) are possible, but we will only consider the quadratic Euclidean norm  $\|x\|_{M_T} := x' M_T x$ , where the weighting matrix  $M_T$  is a consistent estimator of the inverse of the covariance matrix of the moment conditions based on the heteroskedasticity and auto-correlation consistent (HAC) covariance estimator proposed by Newey and West (1987, p. 703-708):

$$M_T^{-1} = \hat{S}(\hat{\theta}) = \sum_{t=-(T-1)}^{T-1} k_h(t) \Gamma_t(\hat{\theta}),$$

where  $k_h(s)$  is a kernel with bandwidth  $h$ , and  $\Gamma_t(\hat{\theta}) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_i g(\hat{\theta}, x_i) g(\hat{\theta}, x_{i+t})$ .

To find  $\hat{\theta}_T$  in (3), we apply the two-step GMM procedure proposed in Hansen (1982):

1. Compute  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} g_T(\theta)' g_T(\theta)$
2. Compute HAC matrix  $\hat{S}(\hat{\theta})$
3. Compute  $\hat{\theta}^* = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} g_T(\theta)' \hat{S}(\hat{\theta})^{-1} g_T(\theta)$

## 2.5 Specification models for quantiles and expectiles

We now focus on two classes of functionals, flexible quantiles and expectiles, for which we derive sufficient conditions for unique identification. We parameterize the forecasting behavior with specification models and derive the asymptotic theory for estimation of their parameters.

Assuming distributions with strictly increasing cumulative distribution functions for simplicity, the quantile function  $q_{\mathbb{P}}(x) : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of a distribution is defined as the inverse of the cumulative distribution function,  $F(y) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq y)$ . We let the argument of the quantile depend on the present situation by assuming it is a function  $m : (\mathbb{R}, \Theta) \rightarrow (0, 1)$  of the

$\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable  $z$  (and the parameter  $\theta$ ). Then, the class of flexible quantiles is given by

$$\mathcal{T}_q(m) := \{q(m(z, \theta)) | \theta \in \Theta\}.$$

Note that this includes the special case  $m(z, \theta) = \theta$ , which assumes that the forecaster states the  $\theta$ -quantile at every time point. This parameterization is computationally equivalent to previously implemented work (see Christodoulakis and Mamatzakis, 2008; Elliott et al., 2005; Pierdzioch et al., 2013a,b).

While quantiles are asymmetric generalizations of the median, expectiles are analogously defined as asymmetric generalizations of the mean. The  $\tau$ -expectile of the distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  with finite mean was first introduced in Newey and Powell (1987) as the unique solution  $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(\tau)$  to the equation

$$\frac{\tau}{1 - \tau} = \frac{\int_{-\infty}^{\mu(\tau)} (\mu(\tau) - y) d\mathbb{P}(y)}{\int_{\mu(\tau)}^{\infty} (y - \mu(\tau)) d\mathbb{P}(y)}.$$

If the second moment of  $\mathbb{P}$  is finite,  $\mu(\tau)$  equals the Bayes rule under the quad-quad loss function  $L_{\tau}(x, y) = |\mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - \tau|(x - y)^2$ . We define the class of flexible expectiles as

$$\mathcal{T}_e(m) := \{\mu(m(z, \theta)) | \theta \in \Theta\},$$

where the argument  $m$  is again a function of the  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable random variable  $z$  (and the parameter  $\theta$ ).

### 2.5.1 Consistency

The following theorem states that if we reduce the eligible functionals to the class of flexible quantiles  $\mathcal{T}_q(m)$  or expectiles  $\mathcal{T}_e(m)$  (i.e., we assume there exists a  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  such that the true forecasting directive is the  $m(z, \theta_0)$ -quantile or -expectile), the GMM estimator described in Section 2.4 is consistent.

**Theorem 2** (Consistency). *Let the time series  $(x_t, y_t)_{t=1,2,\dots}$  consist of realizations  $y$  and point forecasts  $x$  derived as flexible quantiles of an ideal predictive distribution:*

$$x = q_{Y|\mathcal{F}}(m(Z, \theta_0)),$$

where  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  is the true parameter and thus  $q(m(Z, \theta_0)) \in \mathcal{T}_q(m)$ . Under Regularity Conditions 2, and if the alternative models differ from the true model on a set with positive weight,

$$\mathbb{P}(m(Z, \theta_0) \neq m(Z, \theta)) > 0 \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta \text{ with } \theta \neq \theta_0,$$

there exists a  $\mathcal{F}_t$ -measurable instrumental variable  $w_t$  such that the GMM estimator specified in Section 2.4,

$$\hat{\theta}_T := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \|g_T(\theta, \mathcal{V}_T)\|,$$

is a consistent estimator of  $\theta_0$ .

Analogously, the estimator is consistent if the point forecast  $x$  is a flexible expectile of an ideal predictive distribution:

$$x = \mu_{Y|\mathcal{F}}(m(Z, \theta_0)),$$

where  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  is the true parameter and thus  $\tau(m(Z, \theta_0)) \in \mathcal{T}_e(m)$ .

The regularity conditions and the proof are given in Appendix B. Note that Theorem 2 only states a consistent estimator exists, but the correct choice of instrumental variables  $w$  and the specification model  $m$  can still be challenging.

The quantile-based estimator is invariant to strictly monotone transformations of the time series  $(x_t, y_t)$ , because the identification function for quantiles depends solely on  $\mathbf{1}(x \geq y)$  (see Table 1). The expectile-based estimator is less robust to data transformation, but still invariant to linear transformations of  $(x_t, y_t)$ , as can again be seen from the identification function for expectiles.

### 2.5.2 Asymptotic normality

Once the identification of the system is established, the GMM theory provides a range of useful asymptotic results for overidentified systems with more instruments than parameters to estimate.

**Proposition 1** (Asymptotic normality). *Under Regularity Conditions 2 and 3, the GMM estimator is asymptotically normally distributed,*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(0, (G'S^{-1}G)^{-1}),$$

where  $G := \mathbb{E}[g_\theta(X, Y; Z, \theta_0)]$  is the expectation of the partial derivative of the moment function and  $S := \text{Var}[g(X, Y; Z, \theta_0)]$  is its variance.

The regularity conditions and the proof are given in Appendix C. The moments  $S$  and  $G$  can generally be estimated easily by their empirical counterparts. While analyzing any specific model, we can plug in the model function  $m$  and obtain for the quantile class

$$G = \mathbb{E}[m_\theta(Z, \theta_0) \cdot W]$$

and analogously for expectiles

$$G = \mathbb{E}[m_\theta(Z, \theta_0) \cdot (X - Y) \cdot W].$$

### 2.5.3 Specification tests for forecasting behavior

The estimation of forecasting behavior models provides us with a whole set of tests. Here we would like to propose some useful models and testable hypotheses. The so-called test of overidentifying restrictions is commonly used to analyze rationality of a forecast. We define the test statistic

$$\begin{aligned} J_T(\theta) &:= Tg_T(\theta)' \hat{S}_T(\theta)^{-1} g_T(\theta) \\ &= \begin{cases} T(\mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - m(z_t, \theta))^2 w' \hat{S}_T(\theta)^{-1} w, & \text{for quantiles,} \\ T(\mathbf{1}(x \geq y) - m(z_t, \theta))^2 (x - y)^2 w' \hat{S}_T(\theta)^{-1} w, & \text{for expectiles.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

**Proposition 2.** *If the true reported functional is a flexible quantile  $q_{Y|\mathcal{F}}(m(Z, \theta_0))$  or a flexible expectile  $\tau_{Y|\mathcal{F}}(m(Z, \theta_0))$ , and if Regularity Conditions 2 and 3 hold, then the  $J$ -statistic is asymptotically chi-squared distributed,*

$$J_T(\hat{\theta}_T) \xrightarrow{D} \chi_{q-p}^2,$$



where the degrees of freedom are determined by the number of instruments  $q$  and the number of parameters  $p$ .

The regularity conditions and the proof are given in Appendix D.

Any restriction  $R(\theta_0) = 0$  for the model  $m(z, \theta)$ , where  $R : \Theta \mapsto \mathbb{R}^l$  is differentiable and  $R_\theta(\theta_0)\hat{S}_T(\theta_0)R_\theta(\theta_0)'$  nondegenerate, can be tested analogously with the Wald statistic

$$W_T(\theta) := TR(\theta)'(R_\theta(\theta)\hat{S}_T(\theta)R_\theta(\theta)')^{-1}R(\theta),$$

where  $R_\theta(\theta) = \partial R(\theta)/\partial \theta'$  is the derivative of  $R$  evaluated at  $\theta$ . It holds that

$$W_T(\hat{\theta}_T) \xrightarrow{D} \chi_l^2.$$

The model  $m(z, \theta) = \Psi(\theta_1 + z \cdot \theta_2)$ , where the logistic function  $\Psi(x) := (1 + \exp(-x))^{-1}$  ensures that the quantile or expectile is in the unit interval for any  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ , specifies the asymmetry of the issued functional with respect to some state variable  $z$ . Under the hypothesis that the forecasting behavior is not influenced by  $z$ ,

$$H_0 : \theta_0 \in \Delta \text{ with } \Delta := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \theta_2 = 0\},$$

it holds that

$$W_T(\hat{\theta}_T) \xrightarrow{D} \chi_1^2.$$

We also could be interested in structural changes in the risk assessment at time  $t_b \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ . The model

$$m(t, \theta) := \mathbf{1}(t > t_b)M(\theta_1) + \mathbf{1}(t \leq t_b)M(\theta_2)$$

facilitates tests for the hypothesis that there has been no structural break in the forecasting behavior:

$$H_0 : \theta_0 \in \Delta \text{ with } \Delta := \{\theta \in \Theta \mid \theta_1 - \theta_2 = 0\}.$$

Lastly, we would like to suggest a method to detect seasonality-based asymmetry in the forecasts. The according model is

$$m(t, \theta) := \theta_1 + \theta_2 \sin(2\pi t/\theta_3),$$

and it provides information about the constant term  $\theta_1$ , the magnitude  $\theta_2$ , and the period  $\theta_3$  of the seasonality effect.

Note that all of the described tests are joint tests of optimality and the specification model. While it may be insightful to model suboptimal forecasts, the interpretation of the results then becomes challenging.

## 2.6 Generating density forecasts from a set of point forecasts

Our approach of estimating the functional quoted in point forecasts allows us to integrate the point forecasts in the theoretical setting of probability forecasts.

As an example, consider a set of different point forecasts that we would like to combine into a probabilistic or density forecast. We propose an approach that takes into account that different forecasters might issue different (and potentially time-varying) functionals of their perceived uncertainty.

Specifically, assume that for each time point  $t$ , there exist  $n$  point forecasts  $x_t = (x_{1,t}, \dots, x_{n,t})$  of  $y_t$ . A commonly used approach for the generation of density forecasts from multiple point forecasts is based on statistical optimization of the resulting density with respect to past outcomes within a suitably chosen parametric class of probability distributions  $\mathcal{P}$  (e.g. Gaglianone and Lima, 2014; Granger and Ramanathan, 1984; Hall and Mitchell, 2007). We begin by estimating the quantiles or expectiles quoted by each forecaster,  $m(\hat{\theta}_1, z), \dots, m(\hat{\theta}_n, z)$ , respectively, and we compute the  $p$ -values  $p_1, \dots, p_n$  of the tests of overidentifying restrictions in (4) for each forecast. Letting  $F_{t,i}$  be the information available to forecaster  $i$  (which is unknown to us), we estimate the conditional distribution of  $Y_t | \{F_{t,1}, \dots, F_{t,n}\}$  as

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}} = \arg \min_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{i=1}^n w(p_i) \|q_{\mathbb{P}}(m(\hat{\theta}_i, z)) - x_i\|, \quad (5)$$

where  $w : [0, 1] \mapsto \mathbb{R}^+$  is a monotonically increasing weight function and  $q_{\mathbb{P}}(m)$  is the  $m$ -quantile of the distribution  $\mathbb{P}$ . (Expectile models can be integrated analogously.)

The crucial parameters for this density forecast are the probability class  $\mathcal{P}$ , the weight function  $w(\cdot)$  and the distance function between the forecast and the functional defined by the norm  $\|\cdot\|$ . We recommend choosing among appropriate options by minimizing the average probability score on past values as described in Gneiting et al. (2007).

While it is often assumed that discrepancies between the point forecasts are due to a high uncertainty in the underlying forecast probability distribution (e.g. Lahiri and Sheng, 2010), it is clear from our previous analysis that this is not necessarily the case. Two point forecasts consisting of different quantiles of a relatively “tight” probability distributions might be quite different, while two forecasts quoting the same functionals might be the same no matter how large the underlying uncertainty is.

We will illustrate the procedure above on the Federal Reserve’s GDP growth rates forecast modeled in Section 3.2, which has only  $n = 1$  forecaster and a closed-form solution for the class of Gaussian distributions.

## 3 Applications

In this section, we present applications of our methodology to simulated and real-world data. We compare our approach to the related method of Patton and Timmermann (2007), who allow for additional nodes in the loss function. This bears the risk of over-fitting as we will illustrate on simulated data generated in the same way as in the original article. Furthermore,

we illustrate the additional insights provided by our method on the same well-known dataset of gross domestic product (GDP) Greenbook forecasts of the Federal Reserve.

### 3.1 Simulation study

In this section, we illustrate that our approach based on identified functionals leads to well calibrated tests. For ease of comparison of our methodology to the approach of Patton and Timmermann (2007), we reproduce their simulation study. Each dataset  $y_1, \dots, y_T$  is generated from an AR(1)-GARCH(1,1)-model of the form

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t &= .5Y_{t-1} + \sigma_t \epsilon_t \quad \text{for } t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \\ \sigma_t^2 &= .1 + .8\sigma_{t-1}^2 + .1\sigma_{t-1}^2 \epsilon_{t-1}^2, \\ \epsilon_t &\stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \end{aligned}$$

We generate 3,000 datasets from this model for each of five different sample sizes  $T \in \{50, 100, 250, 500, 1000\}$ . For all data, we calculate the optimal predictions corresponding to two quadratic loss functions of the form

$$L(e, a) = \begin{cases} ae^2, & e > 0 \\ e^2, & e \leq 0 \end{cases}$$

where we set  $a = 1$  and  $a = 1.84$  to obtain a symmetric and an asymmetric forecast, respectively. Depending on the value of  $a$ , the reported functionals are

$$x_{t+1,t}^* = \arg \min_x \mathbb{E}_{P_{t+1,t}}[L(x, Y_{t+1})] = \begin{cases} \mu_{t+1,t}, & a = 1 \\ \mu_{t+1,t} - .25\sigma_{t+1,t}, & a = 1.84, \end{cases}$$

where  $\mu_{t+1,t}$  and  $\sigma_{t+1,t}$  denote the conditional expectation and standard deviation of  $P_{t+1,t}$ . This produces optimal forecasts that can be used to check the proper calibration of tests for optimality. Applying the standard GMM two-step estimator, we compare the tests of forecast optimality at level of significance  $\alpha = 0.05$  based on the test of overidentifying restrictions of the identified functional classes in (4) with the best performing spline test introduced in Patton and Timmermann (2007).<sup>1</sup> In both cases we analyze time invariant directives.

The results of the Monte Carlo simulation are presented in Figures 1 and 2. Under the null hypothesis of optimality, our quantile and expectile tests have rejection rates that are closer to the desired significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Roughly speaking, the spline-based test needs more than double the sample size to obtain the same test size as the functional-based tests. Interestingly, even the misspecified quantile estimator outperforms the spline test, although the issued functional is not nested in this class. Hence, it appears that our identified functionals provide a solution to the problem of the flexible spline test, which

---

<sup>1</sup>One modification was implemented: The nodes of the the splines are located at the conditional sample means  $\{\mathbb{E}[e_t|e_t < 0], 0, \mathbb{E}[e_t|e_t > 0]\}$  instead of the conditional sample medians  $\{\text{med}[e_t|e_t < 0], 0, \text{med}[e_t|e_t > 0]\}$ . When using the medians, the nodes of the spline are so close to zero that the resulting loss function is almost identical to the quad-quad loss, concealing the difference to the expectile-based test.




Figure 1: Size of the three tests for the simulated forecasts generated under symmetric and asymmetric loss. The rejection rate under the true hypothesis of an optimal forecaster indicates the size of the tests for different sample sizes  $T$ .

”appears to require large samples ( $T \geq 1000$ ) before the test’s size is close to its nominal value, and thus rejections obtained using this test must be interpreted with caution” (Patton and Timmermann, 2007). While the asymptotic properties of the test based on quantiles and expectiles are well defined, we cannot expect tests of overidentifying restrictions based on the non-identified spline estimator to construct well calibrated tests (see amongst others Stock and Wright, 2000).

A more detailed description of the behavior under the null hypothesis is provided by the  $p$ -value distribution of a test. Well calibrated tests are uniformly distributed on the unit interval. The histograms in Figure 2 indicate clearly that only the quantile and expectile based tests show this characteristic.

To show that our test is not only better sized but also robust against the alternative of a suboptimal forecaster as constructed in Patton and Timmermann (2007), we now compute two suboptimal predictions with normally distributed errors,

$$x_{t+1,t} = x_{t+1,t}^* + 0.25u_t, \quad u_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

For these suboptimal predictions, Figure 3 shows that the expectile-based test outperforms the spline-based test in this regard. Hence, our tests are not only better calibrated, but also robust against the alternative of a suboptimal forecaster. The advantage of the functional-based tests is even greater for more flexible models with more parameters, where the spline would require a large number of instruments to obtain an overidentified estimator (see Section 3.2).




Figure 2: For two sample sizes,  $p$ -value histograms for data simulated under the null hypothesis of optimality. The spline-based test (blue) shows clear signs of miscalibration, while the histograms for the quantile-based (green) and expectile-based (red) tests are closer to uniform.




Figure 3: Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) curves assessing the power of the three tests for simulated data. Curves closer to the upper left indicate well performing binary prediction models. The expectile-based test shows the best performance for all sample sizes.




Figure 4: For the GDP data, the estimated flexible  $m(y)$ -quantile plotted against the growth rate  $y$ , together with asymptotic pointwise confidence intervals for confidence levels 0.4 and 0.8 derived from the asymptotic normal distribution of the estimated parameter  $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\theta}_2)$ .

### 3.2 GDP Greenbook forecasts

For the quarterly real GDP growth forecasts of the Federal Reserve over the period 1968 to 1999 (125 observations), standard tests of optimality reject the rationality of the forecast. Patton and Timmermann (2007) model the loss function as a quadratic spline with three nodes whose asymmetry is allowed to change with respect to the current GDP value. Although the resulting estimated loss function explains the forecasting behavior very well and the according tests accept rationality of the forecast, the loss function is difficult to interpret and for most conditional distributions we cannot expect it to be identified, in the sense that there exists only one value in the parameter space which minimizes the target function. This leads to oversized tests as we have shown in Section 3.1 above.

Here, we interpret the forecasts as flexible quantiles of the forecaster's probability prediction. We assume that the quoted quantile changes with the GDP growth rate  $y$ , so we set  $m(z, \theta) = m(y, \theta) = \Psi(\theta_1 + y \cdot \theta_2)$ , where the logistic function  $\Psi(x) := (1 + \exp(-x))^{-1}$  ensures that the quantile is in the unit interval for any  $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ . As the instrumental variables  $w$  for the GMM estimator we choose  $w_t = (1, x_t, y_{t-1} - x_{t-1}, L_{(x)}(x_{t-1}, y_{t-1}))'$ .

Executing a test of overidentifying restrictions, we obtain a  $\chi^2_2$  test statistic of 0.80 corresponding to a  $p$ -value of 0.67. Consequently, there is no reason to reject rationality with respect to this flexible model of forecasted functionals.

Compared to the spline, we need only two instead of six parameters, and our (more




Figure 5: The predicted quantiles in the period from 1990Q4 to 2007Q4. The model was estimated with data from 1969Q4 up to 1999Q4. Starting in 2000Q1, the quantiles can be seen as out-of-sample predictions of the connection between the GDP growth forecasts and the true conditional distribution.

powerful) test does not reject the hypothesis of a rational forecast. The necessity of additional instruments for more parameters for splines is especially troublesome for such limited sample sizes.

As plotted in Figure 4, the forecasts can now be interpreted as flexible  $m(y, \hat{\theta})$ -quantiles that depend on the current growth rate  $y$ . Under flexible evaluation criteria, there is no evidence against optimality of the point forecast. The forecasts are more conservative during recessions. Hence, in addition to being able to say for which growth rate  $y$  the loss function penalized overpredictions more than underpredictions as in Patton and Timmermann (2007), we can quantify the amount of asymmetry in a nicely interpretable way in terms of the issued quantile. This is possible without further information about the forecaster's probability distribution.

Importantly, it is also possible to compute the asymptotic distribution of the estimated  $m(y, \theta)$ -quantile as discussed in Section 2.5.2. The estimator is asymptotically unbiased and the asymptotic variance is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}/T = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\sigma}_{1,1} & \hat{\sigma}_{1,2} \\ \hat{\sigma}_{1,2} & \hat{\sigma}_{2,2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.30 & -0.07 \\ -0.07 & 0.02 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

And so, asymptotically, we have

$$\Psi^{-1}(m(y, \theta_0)) = \theta_{0,1} + y \cdot \theta_{0,2} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\theta}_1 + y \cdot \hat{\theta}_2, \hat{\sigma}_{1,1} + y^2 \hat{\sigma}_{2,2} + 2y \hat{\sigma}_{1,2}).$$

As  $\Psi(\cdot)$  is strictly monotone, we can calculate pointwise confidence intervals for  $\theta_{0,1} + y \cdot \theta_{0,2}$  for varying values of  $y$  and transform them straightforwardly into confidence intervals for

	MSE	MFLL
$\hat{\mu}_t$	0.98	1
$x_t$	1	0.97

Table 2: Mean-squared error (MSE) and mean flexible lin-lin loss (MFLL) for the Federal Reserve’s GDP forecast  $x_t$  and the improved forecast  $\hat{\mu}$  for the out-of-sample period 2000 – 2007.

$m(y, \theta) = \Psi(\theta_1 + y \cdot \theta_2)$ . Figure 4 shows such confidence intervals. We implement the Wald test introduced in Section 2.5.3. Here the hypothesis that the forecaster does not change his or her behavior with respect to the current growth rate  $y$ ,

$$H_0 : \theta_0 \in \Delta \text{ with } \Delta := \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^2 \mid \theta_2 = 0\}$$

is clearly rejected ( $p$ -value  $< 0.01$ ). Thus, for the forecast to be rational, the underlying preferences need not only be asymmetric but also flexible with respect to a state variable.

Figure 5 illustrates the asymmetry in the forecast and its variation over time. The respective quantiles differ significantly from the median. The realized values after the year 2000 can be used to compute the issued quantile and analyze the predictive power of the model for future forecasts.

We estimate the predictive density as described in Section 2.6. For simplicity, we take  $\mathcal{P}$  to be the class of normal distributions with variance  $\sigma_t^2 = |y_{t-1} - y_{t-2}|$ . In this case, the optimization problem in (5) reduces to

$$\hat{\mu}_t = \arg \min_{\mu} \|q_{\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma_t)}(m(\hat{\theta}, y_{t-1})) - x_t\|,$$

which is solved by  $\hat{\mu}_t = x_t - q(m(\hat{\theta}, y_{t-1}))\sigma_t$ , where  $q(m)$  is the  $m$ -quantile of the standard normal distribution. That is, our estimated predictive density at time  $t$  is given by  $\mathcal{N}(\hat{\mu}_t, \sigma_t)$ , and the appropriate point forecast for a given loss function is given by the corresponding functional. The optimal point forecast under the mean-squared error,  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T e^2$ , is the mean of the distribution,  $\hat{\mu}_t = x_t - q(m(\hat{\theta}, y_{t-1}))\sigma_t$ . The original forecasts by the Federal Reserve were estimated to be the  $m(\hat{\theta}, y_{t-1})$ -quantiles of these forecasts distributions, which means that they are optimal under the flexible lin-lin loss,  $\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (m(\hat{\theta}, y_{t-1}) - \mathbf{1}(e < 0))e$ .

As shown in Table 2, in the out-of-sample time period 2000 – 2007 the Federal Reserve’s forecasts  $x_t$  indeed have lower flexible lin-lin loss, while the mean of our predictive density  $\hat{\mu}_t$  are outperforming the original forecast in terms of the mean-squared error.

## 4 Conclusions

For point forecasts with unknown directive, it is more general and accurate to estimate and test the functional quoted by the forecaster instead of the loss function. While the specific loss function cannot be identified without further information, we showed that the partial derivative of any consistent loss function may be used to estimate the functional. If no loss function is consistent for the quoted functional, more complicated approaches are necessary.



We defined the classes of flexible quantiles and expectiles and showed that under weak assumptions the parameters in these models can be consistently estimated. The asymptotic distribution of the GMM estimator and the overidentified test statistic can be used to construct flexible tests of forecast rationality and of specific model properties. In a simulation study, we illustrated that an existing spline-based test is over-sized and that this problem is alleviated by our new estimators, which show well calibrated  $p$ -value histograms for optimal forecasters. We further showed that the GDP forecasts of the Federal Reserve can be rationalized as flexible quantiles changing with the current growth rate, and we constructed a test which indicated that the asymmetry depends on the growth rate. Finally, we illustrated the power of this approach in a simple example by constructing an improved GDP mean forecast.

An important application of our approach is the comparison of a point forecast with unknown directive to other point or probability forecasts. In this situation, the same functional represented by the point forecast needs to be extracted from the probability forecast. The results of such a comparison might differ considerably depending on whether this functional is, for example, the median or the first quartile. We propose to estimate the functional represented by the point forecasts as described in Section 2, and then to extract the estimated functional from the probability predictions. The resulting two sets of point forecasts can be compared with any consistent loss function for the functional (see Gneiting, 2011).

## Acknowledgments

This manuscript is based on a Diploma thesis written by Patrick Schmidt at Universität Heidelberg under the supervision of Matthias Katzfuss and Tilmann Gneiting. We would like to thank Tilmann Gneiting and Fabian Krüger for many helpful comments and discussions.

## A Proof of Theorem 1

### Regularity Conditions 1.

1.  $L(x, Y)$  integrable for each  $x$  and every conditional distribution  $Y|\mathcal{P}$
2.  $L_{(x)}(x, y)$  exists for almost all  $y$
3. There exists an integrable function  $g : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$|L_{(x)}(x, y)| \leq g(y) \quad \forall x.$$

**Proof of Theorem 1.** If  $L$  is a consistent loss function for  $\alpha$ , it holds that

$$\alpha(\mathbb{P}) = \arg \min_{\hat{x}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[L(\hat{x}, Y)] \quad \forall \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}.$$

The ideal forecast  $\mathbb{P}$  constitutes the true conditional distribution of the target variable:  $\mathbb{P} = Y|\mathcal{F}$ . Consequently, the issued point forecast minimizes the conditional expectation of  $Y$ :

$$x = \arg \min_{\hat{x}} \mathbb{E}[L(\hat{x}, Y)|\mathcal{F}].$$

Under the assumption of a differentiable moment function with respect to  $x$ , it follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathbb{E}[L(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0.$$

If the partial derivative  $L_{(x)}(x, y)$  exists almost surely and has a integrable majorant it holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[L_{(x)}(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0.$$

Any  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable variable  $Z$  remains constant under the integral. Integration reveals the unconditional moment conditions

$$\mathbb{E}[L_{(x)}(x, Y) \cdot Z] = 0 \quad \forall Z \in \mathcal{F}.$$

With Osband's principle (Gneiting, 2011) we even deduce that for any other consistent loss function  $\tilde{L}$  fulfilling Assumptions 1, it holds that  $\tilde{L}_{(x)}(x, y) = h(x)L_{(x)}(x, y)$ . As  $h(x)$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable it follows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\tilde{L}_{(x)}(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0 \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}[L_{(x)}(x, Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0.$$

□

## B Proof of Theorem 2

### Regularity Conditions 2.

1. *The dimension of the parameter space  $\Theta$  is at least as big as the dimension of the instruments,  $q \geq k$ .*
2. *The parameter space  $\Theta$  is compact.*
3. *The model  $m(z, \theta)$  is continuous on  $\Theta$  for all  $z$ .*
4.  *$\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)]$  exists and is finite  $\forall \theta \in \Theta$ .*
5.  *$\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)]$  is continuous on  $\Theta$ .*
6. *The stochastic process  $\{V_t | t \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is ergodic and strictly stationary.*
7.  *$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|g(V_t, \theta)\|] < \infty \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

**Proof of Theorem 2.** We first prove the theorem for the class of quantiles We identify the function  $g(m(z, \theta), x, y, w)$  with  $g(v, \theta)$ , where  $v = (x, y, z, w)$ . The function  $g(v, \theta)$  is continuous in  $\theta$  for all  $v$  if the model  $m(z, \theta)$  is continuous in  $\theta$  for all  $z$ . With Theorem 1 follows that  $g(v, \theta_0)$  fulfills the moment condition

$$\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta_0)] = 0.$$

As for any  $\theta \in \Theta$  with  $\theta \neq \theta_0$  it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)|\mathcal{F}] &= \mathbb{E}[(m(z, \theta) - \mathbf{1}(x > Y)) \cdot w|\mathcal{F}] \\ &= (\mathbb{E}[m(z, \theta)|\mathcal{F}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}(x > Y)|\mathcal{F}]) \cdot w \\ &= (m(z, \theta) - \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{F}}(\alpha_Y|\mathcal{F}(m(z, \theta_0)) > Y)) \cdot w \\ &= (m(z, \theta) - m(z, \theta_0)) \cdot w, \end{aligned}$$

there exists an  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable instrument  $w$  (for example with  $w_1 := \mathbf{1}(m(z, \theta_0) > m(z, \theta_0))$ ) such that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)|\mathcal{F}]] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(m(z, \theta) - m(z, \theta_0)) \cdot w] \neq 0.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have a globally identified set of moment conditions. Under the regularity Assumptions 2 our estimator identifies the consistent GMM estimator and it holds that

$$\hat{\theta}_T \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

The proof for the class of expectiles can be derived analogously, except for the unique identification:

For the expectile-based model the moment condition

$$\mathbb{E}[g(V, \theta)|\mathcal{F}] = 0$$

is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{1}(x > Y) - m(z, \theta))(x - Y)|\mathcal{F}] = 0.$$

As  $z$  is  $\mathcal{F}$ -measurable the absolute value can be deducted easily and we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}(x > Y)(x - Y) - m(z, \theta)(x - Y)(1 - 2 \cdot \mathbf{1}(x < Y))|\mathcal{F}] = 0.$$

We write the expectation as probability integrand with  $\mathbb{P} = Y|\mathcal{F}$  and separate at the point  $Y = x$  and obtain

$$\int_{-\infty}^x (x - y)d\mathbb{P}(y) - m(z, \theta) \left( \int_{-\infty}^x (x - y)d\mathbb{P}(y) - \int_x^{\infty} (x - y)d\mathbb{P}(y) \right) = 0,$$

which is equivalent to

$$(1 - m(z, \theta)) \int_{-\infty}^x (x - y)d\mathbb{P}(y) = m(z, \theta) \int_x^{\infty} (y - x)d\mathbb{P}(y).$$

The last equation is the definition of the  $m(z, \theta)$ -expectile for the distribution  $\mathbb{P} = Y|\mathcal{F}$ . Consequently, the conditional moment condition holds if and only if  $x = \tau_{Y|\mathcal{F}}(m(z, \theta))$ . □

## C Proof of Proposition 1

### Regularity Conditions 3.

1.  $m_\theta(z, \theta)$  exists and is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $z$ .
2.  $m(z, \theta) \in (0, 1)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .
3.  $\mathbb{E}[g_\theta(X, Y; Z, \theta_0)]$  and  $\text{Var}[g(X, Y; Z, \theta_0)]$  exist and are finite.
4.  $S := \text{Var}[\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{\frac{1}{2}} g_T(\theta_0)]$  exists and is finite
5.  $\mathbb{E}[g_\theta(X, Y; Z, \theta_0)]$  is continuous on some neighborhood of  $\theta_0$

$$6. \sup_{\theta - \theta_0 < \epsilon} (\|T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T g_\theta(X, Y; Z, \theta)\|)$$

**Proof of Proposition 1.** We follow the general idea of Hall (2005).

As  $m_\theta(z, \theta)$  is continuous for each  $z$  it holds that  $g_\theta(v, \theta)$  exists and is continuous on  $\Theta$  for each  $v$ .  $\theta_0$  is an interior point of  $\Theta$  because  $m(z, \theta) \in (0, 1)$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . We apply the Mean Value Theorem to  $\hat{\theta}_T$  and  $\theta_0$  and obtain the expression

$$T^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_0) = N_T T^{\frac{1}{2}} g_T(\theta_0)$$

where  $N_T = -(G_T(\hat{\theta}_T)' M_T G_T(\bar{\theta}))^{-1} G_T(\hat{\theta}_T)' M_T$  converges for a  $\bar{\theta} = \hat{\theta}_T + \lambda(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_0)$  with  $\lambda \in (0, 1)$  in probability to the constant  $-(G_0' S^{-1} G_0)^{-1} G_0' S^{-1}$ . As the second term is asymptotically normally distributed with covariance matrix  $S$  the asymptotic distribution simplifies to

$$T^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, (G_0' S^{-1} G_0)^{-1}).$$

□

## D Proof of Proposition 2

**Proof of Proposition 2.** We follow the general idea of Hall (2005).

With Slutsky's Theorem it follows that  $J(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{p} T g_T(\hat{\theta})' S^{-1} g_T(\hat{\theta})$ . With the mean value theorem and as the asymptotic variance of  $g_T(\theta_0)$  is  $S$  and given asymptotic distribution of  $T^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta_0)$  it holds true that

$$M_T^{1/2} T^{1/2} g_T(\hat{\theta}_T) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, N M_T^{1/2} S M_T^{1/2} N')$$
 as  $T \rightarrow \infty$

with  $N = I_q - P(\theta_0)$ ,  $P(\theta_0) = F(\theta_0)[F(\theta_0)' F(\theta_0)]^{-1} F(\theta_0)'$  and  $F(\theta_0) =$

$W_T^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\partial g(z_t, \theta) / \partial \theta]$ . We choose  $\epsilon > 0$  sufficiently small such that  $g$  equals its first order Taylor expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} g(z, \theta) &= g(z, \theta_0) + [\partial g(z, \theta_0) / \partial \theta] (\theta - \theta_0) \\ \Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[g(Z, \theta)] &= \mathbb{E}[\partial g(Z, \theta_0) / \partial \theta] (\theta - \theta_0) \end{aligned}$$

As  $\theta$  has  $p$  dimensions and  $\mathbb{E}[g(Z, \theta)] \neq 0$ , the rank of the matrix  $\mathbb{E}[\partial g(Z, \theta_0) / \partial \theta]$  has to be  $p$ . It follows that

$$J_{0,T} \xrightarrow{d} n_q' [\mathbb{I}_q - P(\theta_0)] n_q,$$

where  $n_q$  denotes a  $q$  dimensional random vector with standard normal distribution. The rank of  $\mathbb{I}_q - P(\theta_0)$  is  $q - p$  as  $P(\theta_0) = F(\theta_0)[F(\theta_0)' F(\theta_0)]^{-1} F(\theta_0)'$  and the rank of  $F(\theta_0) = W^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\partial g(z_t, \theta) / \partial \theta]$  is  $p$  because the parameter is identified. As  $J_T$  shares his asymptotic distribution with  $J_{0,T}$  we just have to show that  $n_q' [\mathbb{I}_q - P(\theta_0)] n_q$  has a  $\chi_{q-p}^2$  distribution. See, for example, Rao (1973) for the proof that  $n_q' A n_q$  has a chi-square distribution with  $k$  degrees of freedom if  $A$  is idempotent with  $\text{rank}(A) = k$ . The projection matrix  $\mathbb{I}_q - P(\theta_0)$  obviously is idempotent and consequently it holds that

$$J_{0,T} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{q-p}^2.$$

□

## References

- Caunedo, J., DiCecio, R., Komunjer, I., and Owyang, M. T. (2013). Federal Reserve forecasts: asymmetry and state-dependence. Working Papers 2013-012, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.
- Christodoulakis, G. A. and Mamatzakis, E. C. (2008). An assessment of the eu growth forecasts under asymmetric preferences. *Journal of Forecasting*, 27(6):483–492.
- Elliott, G., Komunjer, I., and Timmermann, A. (2005). Estimation and testing of forecast rationality under flexible loss. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 72(4):1107–1125.
- Elliott, G., Komunjer, I., and Timmermann, A. (2008). Biases in macroeconomic forecasts: Irrationality or asymmetric loss? *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 6(1):pp. 122–157.
- Elliott, G. and Timmermann, A. (2008). Economic forecasting. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46(1):3–56.
- Gaglianone, W. P. and Lima, L. R. (2014). Constructing optimal density forecasts from point forecast combinations. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 29(5):736–757.
- Gneiting, T. (2011). Making and evaluating point forecasts. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(494):746–762.
- Gneiting, T., Balabdaoui, F., and Raftery, A. E. (2007). Probabilistic forecasts, calibration and sharpness. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69(2):243–268.
- Gneiting, T. and Katzfuss, M. (2014). Probabilistic Forecasting. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1(1):125–151.
- Granger, C. W. J. and Ramanathan, R. (1984). Improved methods of combining forecasts. *Journal of Forecasting*, 3(2):197–204.
- Hall, A. R. (2005). *Generalized Method of Moments*. Advanced Texts in Econometrics. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Hall, S. G. and Mitchell, J. (2007). Combining density forecasts. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 23(1):1 – 13.
- Hansen, L. P. (1982). Large sample properties of Generalized Method of Moments estimators. *Econometrica*, 50(4):1029–1054.
- Heinrich, C. (2013). The mode functional is not elicitable. *Biometrika*.
- Lahiri, K. and Sheng, X. (2010). Measuring forecast uncertainty by disagreement: The missing link. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(4):514–538.
- Newey, W. K. and Powell, J. L. (1987). Asymmetric least squares estimation and testing. *Econometrica*, 55(4):819–847.
- Newey, W. K. and West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semidefinite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, 55(3):703–708.
- Patton, A. J. (2014). Comparing possibly misspecified forecasts. Working Paper. Department of Economics, Duke University.
- Patton, A. J. and Timmermann, A. (2007). Testing forecast optimality under unknown loss. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102(480):1172–1184.

- Pierdzioch, C., Rülke, J.-C., and Stadtmann, G. (2013a). Oil price forecasting under asymmetric loss. *Applied Economics*, 45(17):2371–2379.
- Pierdzioch, C., Rülke, J.-C., and Tillmann, P. (2013b). Using forecasts to uncover the loss function of FOMC members. Technical report, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Faculty of Business Administration and Economics, Department of Economics.
- Rao, C. R. (1973). *Linear Statistical Inference and its Applications*. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, New York-London-Sydney, 2nd edition.
- Steinwart, I., Pasin, C., Williamson, R. C., and Zhang, S. (2014). Elicitation and identification of properties. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 35:1–45.
- Stock, J. H. and Wright, J. H. (2000). GMM with weak identification. *Econometrica*, 68(5):1055–1096.