

Robust Inference for Time Series Models: a Wavelet-Based Framework

Stéphane Guerrier
and Roberto Molinari

Abstract: We present a new framework for the robust estimation of latent time series models which is fairly general and, for example, covers models going from ARMA to state-space models. This approach provides estimators which are (i) consistent and asymptotically normally distributed, (ii) applicable to various classes of time series models, (iii) straightforward to implement and (iv) computationally efficient. The framework is based on the recently developed Generalized Method of Wavelet Moments (GMWM) and a new robust estimator of the wavelet variance. Compared to existing methods, the latter directly estimates the quantity of interest while performing better in finite samples and using milder conditions for its asymptotic properties to hold. Moreover, results are given showing the identifiability of the GMWM for various classes of time series models thereby allowing this method to consistently estimate many models (and combinations thereof) under mild conditions. Hence, not only does this paper provide an alternative estimator which allows to perform wavelet variance analysis when data are contaminated but also a general approach to robustly estimate the parameters of a variety of (latent) time series models. The simulation studies carried out confirm the better performance of the proposed estimators and the usefulness and broadness of the proposed methodology is shown using practical examples from the domains of economics and engineering with sample sizes up to 900,000.

Keywords and phrases: Wavelet variance, Time series, State-space models, Kalman filter, Signal processing, Multiscale and latent processes..

1. Introduction

The challenge of robust estimation for time series models is still a widely open issue. Many estimation methods have been proposed which provide in most cases tailor-made robust alternatives for the estimation of specific groups of time series models (see Appendix A for a short literature review). The proposals by [Genton and Ronchetti \[2003\]](#) or [Ortelli and Trojani \[2005\]](#), for example, are among the few relatively general methods which are able to robustly estimate a broader class of time series models. However, the shortage of these general methods and the absence of available robust estimation methods in the majority of statistical software testify how the theory and implementation for the robust analysis of time series require further investigation and development. This paper provides a fairly general framework which delivers estimators which enjoy suitable asymptotic properties, are computationally efficient and easy to implement. For example, being conceived for the robust estimation of latent

time series models, this method can also deliver robust estimators for the parameters of ARMA models as well as for those of certain state-space models. It does so by relying on the principle of the Generalized Method of Wavelet Moments (GMWM) which was recently proposed by [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#) and takes advantage of the quantity called Wavelet Variance (WV). This quantity is delivered from a wavelet decomposition of a time series on different scales. The WV at each of these scales is then used in the spirit of the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) where its theoretical form can be matched with its empirical counterpart.

Since the GMWM is based on the WV, a robust estimator of the WV delivers a robust version of the GMWM. This is possible given that the GMWM can be expressed as an indirect estimator based on an auxiliary estimator which, in this particular case, is the WV estimator. Generally speaking, if the auxiliary estimator is robust then so is the indirect estimator [see, for example, [Genton and Ronchetti, 2003](#)]. Unlike likelihood-based methodologies, for example, a robust GMWM can easily be implemented by bounding the quantity it is based on (i.e. the WV) and is computationally efficient even for considerably large samples. Indeed, the computational bottleneck of the method lies in the estimation of the WV which only requires a number of multiplications of order $T \log_2(T)$ (with T denoting the sample size), which is the same order as the widely used fast Fourier transform algorithm. Moreover, adding the robust step to this procedure only marginally decreases the computational speed. On the other hand, according to the type of time series, general likelihood based approaches may require the (robust) computation of innovations (of size T), using some types of filters at each optimisation step, that are added to the maximisation step in an EM-algorithm type of procedure. In addition to this, the proposed framework provides an important opportunity to develop a sufficiently general and simple methodology for the robust estimation of many time series models based on the identifiability results presented in this paper.

Given the general setting provided by the GMM and the results of [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#), it is clear that the properties of our approach are closely related to the properties of the estimator of the WV. For this reason this paper proposes a new robust estimator of WV which, by directly estimating this quantity, is consistent and asymptotically normally distributed under mild assumptions. This estimator is an alternative to the one put forward by [Mondal and Percival \[2012\]](#) who propose a robust M -estimator based on a logarithmic transformation of the data and turn this quantity into a location parameter, thereby developing the asymptotic properties for the estimator of this parameter which they then correct for bias and inversely transform to obtain an approximately unbiased and robust estimator of WV. Compared to the latter, we discuss the boundedness of the Influence Function (IF) of the estimator proposed in this work which relies on existing robust methodologies by extending “Huber’s Proposal 2” (HP2) for the robust estimation of the scale parameter in linear regression to the dependent data setting. Being based on weaker assumptions than [Mondal and Percival \[2012\]](#), it also compares favourably in finite samples. The proposed estimator is then used as the auxiliary estimator of the previously described time series

estimation method.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the WV in detail and describes the classical estimator of this quantity proposed by Percival [1995]. It then presents the proposed robust M -estimator of WV and its asymptotic properties. Section 3 briefly describes the GMWM methodology and then, in Section 3.1, provides some global identifiability results which allow the asymptotic properties of the GMWM to hold under very mild conditions thereby drastically reducing the conditions given in Guerrier et al. [2013]. Section 3.2 explains how the robustness properties of the proposed estimator of WV transfer to the GMWM estimator, delivering a robust approach to the estimation of the parameters of (latent) time series models with suitable asymptotic properties. Section 4 presents a simulation study for the estimation of the parameters of time series models. Finally, Section 5 shows the benefits of the proposed approach when applied to some real data concerning firstly sensor calibration in the domain of engineering applied to navigation systems and, finally, personal saving rates from the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis.

2. Wavelet Variance Estimation

In this section, we first present an overview of the classical WV estimation theory, whereas a more detailed presentation can be found in Percival and Walden [2000], Chapter 8. The second part of this section focuses on the robust approach, by first analysing the robustness properties of the classical WV through the time series adaptation of the IF given by Künsch [1984], and then by proposing a robust M -estimator based on Huber's Proposal 2 [Huber, 1981].

2.1. Classical Wavelet Variance estimation

The WV can be interpreted as the variance of a process after it has been subject to an approximate bandpass filter [Percival and Guttorp, 1994a]. Indeed, the WV can be built using wavelet coefficients issued from a Maximum Overlap Discrete Wavelet Transform (MODWT) (see e.g. Mallat, 1999 and Percival and Walden, 2000).

The wavelet coefficients are built using wavelet filters $(h_{j,l})$, $j = 1, \dots, J$, with finite $J \leq \lfloor \log_2(T) \rfloor \in \mathbb{N}^+$. The wavelet filters must satisfy

$$\sum_{l=0}^{L_j-1} h_{j,l} = 0, \quad \sum_{l=0}^{L_1-1} h_{1,l}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{l=-\infty}^{\infty} h_{1,l} h_{1,l+2m} = 0$$

where $L_j = (2^j - 1)(L_1 - 1) + 1$ is the length of the wavelet filters $(h_{j,l})$ (with L_1 being the length of the first level filter $h_{1,l}$) and m is a nonzero integer. Moreover, we have that $h_{j,l} = 0$ for $l < 0$ and $l \geq L_j$. Let $H_1(f) = \sum_{l=0}^{L_1-1} h_{1,l} e^{-i2\pi fl}$ be the transfer function of $h_{1,l}$. The j th level wavelet filters $(h_{j,l})$ can be obtained

by computing the inverse discrete Fourier transform of

$$H_j(f) = H_1(2^{j-1}f) \prod_{l=0}^{j-2} e^{-i2\pi 2^l f(L_1-1)} H_1(\frac{1}{2} - 2^l f).$$

The MODWT filters a sequence (Y_t) , $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ to obtain a sequence of MODWT wavelet coefficients $(W_{j,t})$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ as follows

$$W_{j,t} = \sum_{l=0}^{L_j-1} h_{j,l} Y_{t-l}.$$

The WV at dyadic scales $\tau_j = 2^j$ are defined as the variances of $(W_{j,t})$, i.e.

$$\nu_j^2 \equiv \text{var}(W_{j,t}). \quad (2.1)$$

Notice that the true WV at scale j (i.e. ν_j^2) is assumed not to depend on time. The condition for this property to hold is that the time series at hand is either stationary or non-stationary but with stationary backward differences of order d satisfying $d \leq L_1/2$. In addition, $(h_{j,l})$ must be based on a Daubechies wavelet filter (see [Daubechies, 1992](#) and [Percival and Walden, 2000](#)). This is due to the fact that Daubechies wavelet filters of width L_1 contain an embedded backward difference filter of order $L_1/2$. In the context of this paper we choose the wavelet decomposition based on the Haar filter which delivers stationarity for processes with $d \leq 1$ but other filters could theoretically be applied to ensure stationarity for $d > 1$.

Assuming that $\mathbb{E}[W_{j,t}] = 0$ (which is always true when (Y_t) is a stationary process), a consistent and unbiased estimator for ν_j^2 is given by the MODWT estimator defined in [Percival \[1995\]](#) as

$$\tilde{\nu}_j^2 = \frac{1}{T - L_j + 1} \sum_{t=L_j}^T W_{j,t}^2. \quad (2.2)$$

Theorem 1 of [Serroukh et al. \[2000\]](#) showed that under suitable conditions the MODWT estimator of the WV $\tilde{\nu}_j^2$ is consistent and asymptotically normally distributed for each scale τ_j . This result was extended by [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#) to the multivariate case, i.e. for $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}} = [\tilde{\nu}_j^2]$, $j = 1, \dots, J$

$$\sqrt{T}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{V})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = [\nu_j^2]_{j=1, \dots, J}$, $\mathbf{V} = [\sigma_{kl}^2]_{k,l}$ for $k, l = 1, \dots, J$, with $\sigma_{kl}^2 = 2\pi S_{kl}(0)$ and where

$$S_{kl}(f) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_{kl}(\tau) e^{-if\tau}$$

are the cross spectral densities with cross-covariances

$$\gamma_{kl}(\tau) = \text{cov}(W_{k,t}^2, W_{l,t+\tau}^2).$$

In particular, when (Y_t) is a Gaussian process, then the above cross-covariances simplify to

$$\gamma_{kl}(\tau) = \text{cov}^2(W_{k,t}, W_{l,t+\tau}).$$

The estimation of the elements σ_{kl}^2 for $k \neq l$ is in general not straightforward. Although [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#) proposed a closed form estimator of \mathbf{V} , they suggested to estimate the elements of \mathbf{V} by parametric bootstrap, diminishing the computational time compared to the analytical solution.

For sake of completeness, another estimator of WV can be used which is the one based on the Discrete Wavelet Transform (DWT). However, the MODWT is chosen in this paper because of its better properties in terms of efficiency which does not exclude that the results in this paper can be extended to the DWT estimator.

2.2. Robust Wavelet Variance estimation

Robust WV estimation can in principle be tackled in two ways: using robust wavelet filtering or using a robust method applied to the wavelet coefficients issued from a standard filtering. In the first scenario, most of the developments have been in the identically and independently distributed case (see e.g. [Appendix A](#)). When “robustifying” the filtering process, however, the assumptions refer to the properties of the original time series while our approach places its conditions directly on the wavelet coefficients issued from the filtering. Consequently, in this paper we use a robust method after a standard filtering has been applied to the time series [as in [Mondal and Percival, 2012](#)]. Following this, in order to propose a robust estimator of the WV we first need to understand the conditions under which it has a bounded IF. However, this is not a straightforward task since there is not a unique definition of an IF for time series as discussed by [Martin and Yohai \[1986\]](#). In the latter they put forward a definition of IF for time series which is based on the specification of a particular contamination model which can include various types of contamination models. Although adequate for measuring robustness in a time series setting, this IF is a functional on a distribution space as opposed to a finite-dimensional space for the classic IF [see [Hampel et al., 1986](#)] and would in practice require the specification of the outlier-generating process. Another definition of a conditional IF for time series was given by [Künsch \[1984\]](#) who adapted the classic IF definition to strictly stationary processes. As underlined in [Maronna et al. \[2006\]](#), although this IF definition is generally different from the definition given by [Martin and Yohai \[1986\]](#), there is a close relationship between the two. Considering the IF put forward by [Künsch \[1984\]](#), the existence and uniqueness of this IF was proven by [La Vecchia and Trojani \[2010\]](#) in a similar setting. In this context we therefore adopt this definition of conditional IF for the WV estimator which is given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1. *Let the WV estimator be generalized as an M-estimator which*

is defined as the solution for ν_j^2 of the following equation

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = 0$$

where $\psi(\cdot)$ is a function which can be unbounded or bounded with respect to $(W_{j,t})$ which is a strictly stationary and ergodic process. Then the IF of the estimator of WV is bounded only if $\psi(\cdot)$ is bounded.

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is straightforward and can be found in Appendix C.1. As mentioned earlier, Mondal and Percival [2012] also propose a robust M -estimator for the WV. However, this approach uses a log-transformation of the data with location parameter μ_0 for which the asymptotic properties of its estimator T_N are shown. The estimator T_N is then (approximately) corrected for bias and then transformed back to a scale parameter. In this paper the estimator which we propose requires no transformation of the wavelet coefficients and its asymptotic properties refer directly to the quantity we want to estimate, i.e. the WV. To introduce the proposed approach, a possible M -estimator is based on the so-called Weighted Maximum Likelihood Estimator (WMLE) [Field and Smith, 1994] given by the solution for ν_j^2 of the following expression

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \omega(W_{j,t}; \nu_j^2) s(W_{j,t}; \nu_j^2) - a(\nu_j^2) = 0$$

where $s(W_{j,t}; \nu_j^2)$ represents the score function, $a(\nu_j^2)$ is a consistency correction factor which depends on the distribution of $(W_{j,t})$ and the weights $\omega(\cdot)$ are chosen such that $\omega(W_{j,t}; \nu_j^2) s(W_{j,t}; \nu_j^2)$ is bounded, therefore guaranteeing robustness properties to the estimator. Using this WMLE form, Huber [1981] put forward the HP2 that was proposed for the scale parameter of the residuals in the linear regression framework under the classical assumption of a Gaussian distribution for the residuals. Since in general we suppose that $\mathbb{E}[W_{j,t}] = 0$, we use HP2 by defining $r_{j,t} = W_{j,t}/\nu_j$ as the standardized wavelet coefficients, and $\hat{\nu}_j^2$ is defined implicitly as the solution in ν_j^2 of

$$\frac{1}{M_j} \sum_{t=L_j}^T \omega^2(r_{j,t}; \nu_j^2, c) r_{j,t}^2 - a_\psi(c) = 0 \quad (2.3)$$

where c is a tuning constant defined further on, $r_{j,t}^2$ is the score function, $a_\psi(c)$ is the equivalent of $a(\nu_j^2)$ assuming $(r_{j,t})$ follow a standard Gaussian model (but other models could be considered) and $\omega(\cdot)$ represent the weights given to the observations which in this case are squared. The tuning constant c regulates the trade-off between robustness and efficiency, where $c \rightarrow \infty$ corresponds to the classical estimator (with $\omega(r_{j,t}; \nu_j^2, c) = 1, \forall t$, and $a_\psi(c) = 1$). A discussion about the choice of this constant can be found in Appendix B.

For the ψ -functions, we propose to use Beaton and Tukey [1974] biweight function with re-descending weights. The reason for this choice lies in the renown

high-breakdown point of these types of weights that can be particularly relevant in the present setting due to the wavelet filtering which can induce significant memory. The biweight ψ -function delivers the following weights $\omega(\cdot)$

$$\omega_{[Bi]}(r_{j,t}; \nu_j^2, c) = \begin{cases} \left(\left(\frac{r_{j,t}}{c} \right)^2 - 1 \right)^2 & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| \leq c \\ 0 & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| > c \end{cases}$$

and, if one supposes the normality for the wavelet coefficients, then the correction term is

$$\begin{aligned} a_{[Bi]}(c) &= \mathbb{E}_{\Phi} \left[\omega_{[Bi]}^2(r; \nu_j^2, c) r^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{c^8} \mu_c^{10} - \frac{4}{c^6} \mu_c^8 + \frac{6}{c^4} \mu_c^6 - \frac{4}{c^2} \mu_c^4 + \mu_c^2 \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

with μ_c^i being the i -th truncated moment under the standard normal distribution between $-c$ and c .

An alternative weight function is given by Huber's ψ -function which has well known properties and has easily tractable derivatives when developing its asymptotic properties. Its weights are given by

$$\omega_{[Hub]}(r_{j,t}; \nu_j^2, c) = \min \left(1; \frac{c}{r_{j,t}} \right). \quad (2.5)$$

When using the above weight functions, it is necessary to understand if they deliver functions which enable to identify the unknown parameter ν_j^2 and state that

$$\mathbb{E} [\psi(W_{j,t}, \kappa^2)] = 0$$

if and only if $\kappa^2 = \nu_j^2$ (i.e. there is a unique solution for ν_j^2). This condition is often called ‘‘global identifiability’’ and it is an essential condition to prove consistency and asymptotic normality of the estimator which is often assumed for simplicity [as, for example, in [Mondal and Percival, 2012](#)]. To verify global identifiability, let us set Condition **(C1)** below:

(C1) The process $(W_{j,t})$ is a zero-mean Gaussian process with variance $\nu_j^2 \in \{x \in \mathbf{R} \mid 0 < x < \infty\}$ and autocovariance sequence $(\varphi_W(h))$ such that $|\varphi_W(h)| = \mathcal{O}(\rho^k)$, $0 < \rho < 1$.

Condition **(C1)** is almost always verified regarding the mean and variance constraints since all stationary models deliver zero-mean wavelet coefficients $(W_{j,t})$ with finite WV ν_j^2 and many non-stationary models with stationary backward differences of order $d \leq L_1/2$ can also respect this condition. This is the case, for example, for all stationary ARMA and various state-space models. However, the assumption of a Gaussian model for $(W_{j,t})$ issued from the previously mentioned models is a relatively strong one but (apart from the case where (Y_t) is itself Gaussian) it is a frequently assumed condition for the wavelet coefficients and, according to the type of process, could be a reasonable approximation due to the averaging nature of the filter. Considering these observations, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 2.2. *Under Condition (C1) we have that ν_j^2 is identifiable using the Huber weight function.*

Moreover, let us define $\gamma \equiv c(\kappa^2/\nu_j^2)^{1/2}$. Then we also have the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Under Condition (C1) and for $\gamma > 3.5$, we have that ν_j^2 is identifiable using the Tukey biweight function.*

The condition of $\gamma > 3.5$ is very mild. Indeed, the result of Lemma 2.1 implies that the equation $\mathbb{E}[\psi(W_{j,t}, \kappa^2)] = 0$ has the unique solution $\kappa^2 = \nu_j^2$ if κ belongs to the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid 7\nu_j/2c < x < \infty\}$. In other words, the parameter ν_j^2 is identifiable if $c > 3.5$ so that it belongs to the previously defined set. Using the results of Theorem 2.3 further on, this condition is very reasonable as it is satisfied for any efficiency larger than approximately 2.5%, an efficiency which is already too low to make any sense in practice. The proofs of Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.1 can be found in Appendices C.2 and C.3.

As mentioned earlier, the reason for choosing the biweight function for this paper lies in its renown high breakdown point and its bias properties compared to the Huber function. Moreover, in Appendix D we compare Huber's and Tukey's weights in the way they control the bias induced by different types of contamination on the resulting WMLE. This study leads us to conclude that Tukey's weights appear to be more appropriate for overall bias reduction.

Having defined Condition (C1) to obtain identifiability, let us now set another condition for the wavelet coefficients $(W_{j,t})$ to prove consistency and asymptotic normality:

(C2) The vector process $\mathbf{W}_t = [W_{j,t}]_{j=1,\dots,J}$ is covariance ergodic.

This condition implies that sample mean and covariance converge in quadratic mean as $T \rightarrow \infty$. This is also not a strong condition since, considering condition (C1), we already assume that the original process (Y_t) on which the wavelet coefficients are built is stationary (or with stationary backward differences) and we simply add the condition of ergodicity which is frequent among Gaussian stationary processes (always being the case if the dependence among lagged observations disappears as the lags increase). Using this condition allows the ψ -functions applied to the wavelet coefficients to satisfy the uniform weak law of large numbers to prove consistency and asymptotic normality of the proposed WV estimator which are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\hat{\nu}$ be the implicit solution of*

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \nu) = \mathbf{0}$$

where

$$\Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu}) = \begin{bmatrix} \psi(W_{1,t}, \nu_1^2) \\ \vdots \\ \psi(W_{J,t}, \nu_J^2) \end{bmatrix}$$

and with

$$\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = \omega_\psi^2(r_{j,t}, \nu_j^2, c)r_{j,t}^2 - a_\psi(c) \quad (2.6)$$

defining a time-invariant function of \mathbf{W}_t . Then, under Conditions **(C1)** and **(C2)** and assuming that Lemma 2.1 holds when using the Tukey biweight function, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ based on Huber or Tukey ψ -functions is a consistent estimator for $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and its asymptotic distribution is given by

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{M}^{-T} \mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{M}^{-1})$$

where $\mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0})$ is the power spectral density of $\Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ and

$$\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} \Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \right].$$

The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix C.5. Hence, under the assumptions of Theorem 2.3, the proposed estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is consistent for $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and has a limiting multivariate Gaussian distribution.

3. Robust Time Series Models Estimation

The results of the previous section provide the basis for the robust estimation of state-space models. This is possible by taking advantage of the recently proposed GMWM introduced in Guerrier et al. [2013] which makes use of the WV in a GMM-type estimator. This method offers an alternative to the classical likelihood-based estimation for the parameters of standard time series models and is often the only feasible method for certain state-space models which, among others, are commonly used in engineering. The GMWM exploits the unique link that exists between the WV and the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ of the data generating process $F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ which is given by

$$\eta_j^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \equiv \nu_j^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} S_{W_j}(f) df = \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} |H_j(f)|^2 S_{F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}(f) df \quad (3.1)$$

where the notation $\eta_j^2(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is used to make it consistent with the notation $\hat{\eta}_j^2$ which denotes a generic estimator of WV (e.g. DWT, MODWT, etc.). Based on this relationship, the GMWM estimator is the result of the following generalized least squares optimization problem

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta}{\operatorname{argmin}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}))^T \boldsymbol{\Omega} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \quad (3.2)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ represent, respectively, the $J \times 1$ vectors of estimated WV and the WV implied by the model $F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. The weighting matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is positive definite and Guerrier et al. [2013] provide details on how this matrix should be chosen. More specifically, if the matrix is positive definite then the GMWM preserves its asymptotic properties and the importance of choosing $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ essentially consists in making the GMWM as efficient as possible. Indeed, the GMWM with the best efficiency is given by $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \mathbf{H}^{-1}$, where \mathbf{H} represents the covariance matrix of the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$.

In Guerrier et al. [2013] we can find the conditions under which the consistency and asymptotic normality of the GMWM estimator hold. Summarizing these conditions, the first two concern the consistency of the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ and of the estimator for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ (if this is estimated), after which conditions 3 to 11 basically deal with the global identifiability of the model parameters through the GMWM. These conditions are often hard to verify and are assumed in most cases, especially when dealing with latent processes. In Section 3.1 we remove all these conditions for a wide class of state-space models (which can be seen as *latent* processes) and give clearer conditions to prove the identifiability of other possible model parameters through the GMWM. This allows to then propose a robust method for time series models estimation in Section 3.2 which has suitable asymptotic properties, is computationally efficient and is general in scope based on the results presented in the following section.

3.1. Global Identifiability of the GMWM estimator

The consistency (and asymptotic normality) of the GMWM heavily rely on the global identifiability of the model parameters through the WV. This allows the estimating equation in (3.2) to have a unique minimizer which corresponds to the true parameter value. Given the importance of this condition for the asymptotic properties of the GMWM to hold, in this section we verify it for a broad class of time series models. To do so, let us define the basic time series models considered in this work as $(X_t^{(m)})$ (with m indicating a specific model) and show that also the sum of some combinations of these processes is identifiable. These combinations deliver numerous latent time series models which we define as $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^G X_t^{(i)}$ where G is the number of models included in the latent model. The considered models $(X_t^{(m)})$ are given below:

- (P1) *Gaussian White Noise* (WN) with parameter $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(1)}$.
- (P2) *Quantization Noise* (QN) (or rounding error, see e.g. Papoulis, 1991) with parameter $Q^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(2)}$.
- (P3) *Drift* with parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(3)}$.

- (P4) *Random walk* (RW) with parameter $\gamma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(4)}$.
- (P5) *Moving Average* MA(1) process with parameter $\varrho \in (-1, +1)$ and $\zeta^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(5)}$.
- (P6) *Auto-Regressive* AR(1) process with parameter $\rho \in (-1, +1)$ and $v^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. We denote this process as $X_t^{(k)}$, $k = 6, \dots, G$.

Considering these processes, we will now consider the latent process $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^G X_t^{(i)}$ and state the following conditions:

(C3) If (Y_t) is a latent process then all sub-processes are independent.

Condition **(C3)** allows us to have a more tractable problem for the identifiability of the parameters of a latent process. However, this assumption can eventually be relaxed or removed according to the specific models which are considered for estimation once the identifiability for these particular models is verified.

The basic approach to prove global identifiability of the function $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ can be done by verifying the conditions in Guerrier et al. [2013]. An approach that ensures that these conditions are simultaneously verified is to understand if the Jacobian matrix $\partial/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is of full column rank as a consequence of the following MacLaurin expansion

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) + \underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial\boldsymbol{\theta}} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\theta}=\boldsymbol{\theta}^*}}_{\mathbf{A}} \underbrace{(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)}_{\mathbf{b}} \quad (3.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ are two parameter vectors and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^* - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0\|$. Indeed, if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ we automatically have that $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ but if we have $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ then, if the matrix \mathbf{A} is full column rank, it means that only the vector $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{0}$ can make $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ implying that the only situation where this is possible is when $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. This approach is feasible if the expression of $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a simple one thereby delivering a Jacobian matrix $\partial/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ whose full column rank is verifiable by, for example, proving that its determinant $|\partial/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})| \neq 0$, $\forall \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. This is the approach that is used for some of the processes considered in this section. However, this approach becomes considerably challenging once the form of $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is slightly more complicated. For this reason, by denoting the AutoCoVariance Function (ACVF) as $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$, where h denotes the lag, the following lemma states the alternative sufficient conditions to prove the global identifiability of the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Lemma 3.1. *The WV $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is identifiable if all of the following three conditions are verified*

1. The ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ is such that $\sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} |\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)| < \infty$;
2. The spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$ has a unique mapping to $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$;
3. The parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ has a unique mapping to the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$.

The proof of this lemma can be found in Appendix C.7.1. The first condition is almost always satisfied for stationary time series models which are, for example, part of the class of m -dependent or strongly-mixing processes. The second condition is quite straightforward to verify based on the conditions given by Greenhall [1998] where the author discusses the specific cases where different spectral densities can deliver the same Allan variance (which is equivalent, up to a constant, to the Haar WV considered in this work). The last condition of this lemma is often a standard condition for the identifiability of the parameters of a time series model (especially when considering Gaussian time series). For example, the first and last condition are verified for a causal autoregressive process of order p (AR(p)) and the following lemma states the consequent identifiability of the parameters of this process for the GMWM .

Lemma 3.2. *The parameters of a causal AR(p) process are identifiable for the GMWM.*

The proof of this lemma can be found in Appendix C.7.2. Given the identifiability for this class of models, let us consider another class of models included within the process $Y_t = X_t^{(1)} + X_t^{(2)} + \sum_{i=6}^G X_t^{(i)}$ which represents the sum of a (P1) process, a (P2) process and K (P6) processes ($K = G - 5 < \infty$). Denoting ρ_i as the autoregressive parameter of the i^{th} (P6) process, the following theorem considers the identifiability of the parameters for this specific process.

Theorem 3.1. *Under condition (C3) and assuming $\rho_i \neq 0, \forall i$ and $\rho_i < \rho_j, \forall i < j$, we have that the parameters of the process $Y_t = X_t^{(1)} + X_t^{(2)} + \sum_{i=6}^G X_t^{(i)}$ are identifiable for the GMWM.*

The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix C.7.3. This theorem leads to a corollary for which we give the following condition:

(C4) The parameters of process $Y_t = X_t^{(1)} + \sum_{i=6}^G X_t^{(i)}$ have a unique mapping to the parameters of an ARMA(p,q) model.

This assumption does not appear to be an excessively strong one to make given the investigations made by Hamilton [1994] and Granger and Morris [1976] on the representation of ARMA(p,q) models through the sum of (P1) and (P6) processes. However, the proof that the above assumption holds for different combinations of process (P1) with a sum of (P6) processes is left for future research. An example where this assumption is satisfied is given by the sum of two (P6) processes which has a unique mapping to an ARMA(2,1) model (the proof can be found in Appendix C.7.4). In this setting, a direct consequence of Theorem 3.1 can be found in the following corollary.

Corollary 3.1. *Under the conditions of Theorem 3.1 and condition (C4), the parameters of an ARMA(p, q) model which can be represented as $Y_t = X_t^{(1)} + \sum_{i=6}^G X_t^{(i)}$ are identifiable for the GMWM.*

As mentioned earlier, this corollary is a direct result of the findings of Hamilton [1994] and Granger and Morris [1976] according to whom a sum of K (P6) processes (as well as of these with a (P1) process) is an ARMA(p, q) model where $p = K$ indicates the order of the autoregressive part (P6) and $q = K - 1$ the order of the moving average part. Considering the stated conditions, these results allow the parameters of a wide class of stationary models to be identifiable for the GMWM and therefore allow it to be a valid alternative to other time series estimation methods in these cases. Using the approach in (3.3), the following lemma states the identifiability for other sets of latent models.

Lemma 3.3. *Under condition (C3) the parameters of a latent process $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^4 X_t^{(i)}$ and of a latent process $Y_t = \sum_{i=3}^5 X_t^{(i)}$ are globally identifiable for the GMWM.*

This lemma, whose proof is given in Appendix C.7.5, allows to combine some stationary and non-stationary processes considered in this section. Indeed, excluding the (P6) process, the parameters of each stationary process can be identified together with those of the non-stationary ones. The reason why the process (P5) is never considered together with processes (P1) and (P2) is because these model combinations are not identifiable for the GMWM. In fact, while the GMWM is able to identify the parameters of a (P1) process and a (P2) process even when combined in a latent model, it is not able to do so when a (P5) process is combined with either or both of them. This is due mainly to the form of the Jacobian matrix of the autocovariance function of these processes since the columns can be represented as a linear combination of the others when considering a (P5) process.

The above results allow to considerably reduce the conditions in Guerrier et al. [2013] for the asymptotic properties of the GMWM to hold. Indeed, for the relatively wide class of models discussed in this section, the only conditions for the GMWM to be consistent, for example, are for the estimators $\hat{\nu}$ and $\hat{\Omega}$ (if estimated) to be consistent [conditions 1 and 2 in Guerrier et al., 2013]. The case of a latent model including a sum of (P6) processes with processes (P3) and (P4) has not been investigated here since the approach used to prove Theorem 3.1 is based on verifying the conditions in Lemma 3.1. In fact, the latter uses the ACVF to verify the identifiability and there is no exact definition of an ACVF for processes (P3) and (P4). However, if processes (P1) to (P5) are only included once in a latent model, the results of this section strongly suggest that the parameters of any latent model made by the combination of the processes considered in this section, excluding a combination of (P1) and/or (P2) with (P5), is identifiable for the GMWM. Theorem 3.1 and Lemma 3.3 support this idea based on the intuitive argument that the WV of the non-stationary processes (P3) and (P4) increases steadily at the larger scales which cannot be in any way approximated by the stationary processes considered here

since their WV decreases at these scales.

The GMWM is therefore globally identifiable for a relatively wide range of time series models and, as stated earlier, will be consistent and asymptotically normally distributed mainly due to the properties of the chosen WV estimator $\hat{\eta}$. In practice however, when considering a GMM-type setting, the method is limited by the number of observations since this will determine the number of scales made available from the wavelet decomposition. This means that if n is the number of parameters defining a process, then we must have $J \geq n$ (i.e. the number of WV moments is greater than or equal to the number of parameters to estimate). This condition is a standard condition for GMM-type estimators where identifiability is possible only if the number of moment conditions is equal to or larger than the number of parameters to estimate. This implies that, if we wish to estimate a relatively complicated model, we need a relatively long observed time series. Nevertheless, a model with 3 parameters, for example, can already be estimated with a time series of length $T \geq 8$ and one with 4 parameters can be estimated with a time series of length $T \geq 16$. This condition may not generally be a problem in practice and can be relaxed if we eventually decide to use additional moments as suggested in [Guerrier et al. \[2015\]](#). As a final note, this “limitation” can also be seen as an advantage for the GMWM given that the number of WV moments is limited since in practice we have a finite $J \leq \lfloor \log_2(T) \rfloor$ therefore allowing us to use all available moments (which well summarize the information for the considered processes) in order to easily estimate even for extremely large datasets. This is often not the case for traditional GMM methods for time series model estimation which usually, for practical purposes, select a subset of moments (e.g. specific lags of the ACVF).

Based on the above results, in the following section we combine the GMWM methodology with the robust WV estimator $\hat{\nu}$ proposed in [Section 2.2](#) to build a robust GMWM estimator.

3.2. Robust GMWM estimator

In this section we propose a robust framework for the robust estimation of latent time series models which is fairly general in scope based on the results in [Section 3.1](#). To introduce this approach, we have seen that in the classical setting the GMWM is estimated based on $\hat{\nu}$ which is itself estimated using the MODWT estimator in [\(2.2\)](#). However, the classical WV estimator can have unbounded bias when F_{θ} is contaminated with equivalent repercussions on the GMWM. Hence, as hinted by [Guerrier et al. \[2014\]](#), a robust GMWM can be built starting from a robust WV estimator. For this reason we use the estimator $\hat{\nu}$ proposed in [Section 2.2](#) whose robust and asymptotic properties transfer to the GMWM and we call this estimator the RGMWM. Following [Genton and Ronchetti \[2003\]](#), choosing the estimator $\hat{\nu}$ ensures robustness of θ , allowing the RGMWM estimator to be robust due to the bounded IF of $\hat{\nu}$. Another approach to be considered for the robustness of the GMWM is to bound the objective function in [\(3.2\)](#) as highlighted in [Ronchetti and Trojani \[2001\]](#) who show how

the IF of the GMM estimator $\hat{\theta}$ is directly proportional to the orthogonality function used for the estimation, which therefore needs to be bounded to obtain a robust GMM estimator. The latter approach is also a possibility to obtain a robust GMWM but it is not considered in this paper and is left for future research.

The use of the estimator $\hat{\nu}$ which specifically delivers the RGMWM allows the latter to inherit certain important properties. Despite most of them being fulfilled by the RGMWM, we set the following general conditions for a GMWM based on a robust auxiliary estimator $\hat{\eta}$ and true parameter vector θ_0 :

(C5) The WV estimator $\hat{\eta}$ is such that $\hat{\eta} - \eta(\theta_0) \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

(C6) The matrix Ω is positive definite and, if estimated by $\hat{\Omega}$, then $\hat{\Omega} \xrightarrow{P} \Omega$.

(C7) The function $\mathbf{h}(\theta_0) = \eta(\theta_0) - \eta(\theta)$ is globally identifiable.

(C8) The set Θ is compact.

(C9) The function $\mathbf{f}(\theta_0) = \hat{\eta} - \eta(\theta_0)$ is stochastically equicontinuous and the function $\mathbf{g}(\theta_0) = \eta(\theta_0) - \eta(\theta)$ is equicontinuous.

Condition (C5) is verified for the proposed robust estimator of WV $\hat{\nu}$ while condition (C7) basically contains conditions (C3) to (C11) of [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#) and has been verified for a wide set of latent (and non-latent) models in Section 3.1. Condition (C8) can be relaxed based on [Huber \[1967\]](#) and (C9) can be shown to hold according to the process of interest and using the boundedness of $\hat{\nu}$. Having defined these conditions, the consistency of the RGMWM is found in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Assuming the conditions for Theorem 2.3 hold as well as Conditions (C6) to (C9), then the RGMWM is a consistent estimator for θ_0 .*

Being based on the results of Section 2.2, the proof of Theorem 3.2 can be found in Appendix C.8. Finally, let us define $\mathbf{D}(\theta) \equiv \partial\eta(\theta)/\partial\theta$ and set another two conditions for the asymptotic normality of the RGMWM:

(C10) The matrix $\mathbf{D}(\theta)^T \Omega \mathbf{D}(\theta)$ is of full rank and for any sequence θ^* such that $\theta^* \xrightarrow{P} \theta_0$ we have that $\mathbf{D}(\theta^*) - \bar{\mathbf{D}} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ where $\bar{\mathbf{D}}$ is a sequence of matrices that do not depend on θ .

(C11) The function $\nu(\theta)$ is twice differentiable.

These conditions are also verified when considering the processes and results given in Section 3.1. Following these conditions, the next theorem states the

asymptotic normality of the RGMWM.

Theorem 3.3. *Assuming the conditions for Theorem 3.2 hold as well as Conditions (C10) and (C11), then the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ based on the RGMWM has the following asymptotic distribution*

$$\sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \right) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \left(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{B} \mathbf{V} \mathbf{B}^T \right)$$

where $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{M}_\psi^{-T} \mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{M}_\psi^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{B} = \left(\mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \right)^{-1} \mathbf{D}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)^T \boldsymbol{\Omega}$.

The proof of Theorem 3.3 can be found in Appendix C.9 and is also based on the results in Section 2.2.

A robust estimation of the WV therefore delivers a robust GMWM-based estimator (the RGMWM), allowing to estimate the parameters of many time series models when they suffer from contaminated observations. The result is a framework for robust inference for time series models which is considerably general in scope and straightforward to implement in practice.

4. Simulation Study

In this section we intend to investigate the robustness and finite sample properties of the proposed estimator RGMWM. A simulation study presenting the results for the proposed WV estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ can be found in Appendix E. The aim is to show that the estimators proposed in this paper have a reasonable performance in settings where there is no contamination and have an overall better performance than the classical (and possibly robust) alternatives when the data are contaminated. To do so, 500 samples of size 1000 were generated for each type of model described further on. Different types of contamination were used to study the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ and the RGMWM, going from scale-contamination to additive and replacement outliers as well as patchy outliers and level-shifts. Innovation-type contamination was not considered since it did not appear to affect the estimators much [see Maronna et al., 2006, for an overview of different contamination settings]. We denote the proportion of contaminated observations with ϵ and the size of contamination (i.e. the variance of the observations which replace or are added to the uncontaminated observations) with σ_ϵ^2 . Finally, when dealing with level-shifts, we denote μ_ϵ as the size of the shift in level.

To measure the performance of the estimators we choose to use robust and relative versions of the bias and the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) defined respectively as follows

$$\text{Bias}^* = \left| \text{med} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_i - \mu_{i,0}}{\mu_{i,0}} \right) \right|$$

and

$$\text{RMSE}^* = \sqrt{\text{med} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_i - \mu_{i,0}}{\mu_{i,0}} \right)^2 + \text{mad} \left(\frac{\hat{\mu}_i}{\mu_{i,0}} \right)^2}$$

with $\text{med}(\cdot)$ representing the median, $\text{mad}(\cdot)$ the median absolute deviation and $\hat{\mu}_i$ and $\mu_{i,0}$ represent the i^{th} element of the estimated and true parameter vectors respectively (the parameters being either the different scales of WV or the time series model parameters). The RMSE* is therefore related to the RMSE and can also be used to assess the accuracy of an estimator. In the uncontaminated settings only the RMSE* will be used to assess the overall behaviour of the estimators while in the contaminated setting a particular focus will be placed on the bias as well since this is the measure one aims to bound by using a robust estimator. The classical RMSE was also used allowing to reach equivalent conclusions but the RMSE* was preferred to better highlight the difference between methods.

The results in Appendix E show how the proposed WV estimator $\hat{\nu}$ compares favourably to the classic MODWT estimator (CL) and the estimator proposed by Mondal and Percival [2012] (MP) in the different contamination settings while being the best alternative in the uncontaminated ones. Having satisfactory results for the proposed estimator $\hat{\nu}$, in this section we focus on the study of the RGMWM which is mainly conceived for the robust estimation of *latent* time series models. Nevertheless, to compare it with other classic and robust estimators, we choose to study its behaviour mainly on standard ARMA models for which it is also a consistent estimator as shown in Section 3.2. In this perspective, we compare the proposed RGMWM estimator with:

- the Maximum Likelihood estimator (ML);
- the Quantile AutoRegression estimator (QAR) [see Koenker and Xiao, 2006];
- the Indirect Inference estimator based on the QAR (INDI) [see de Luna and Genton, 2001];
- the classical GMWM estimator (GMWM);
- the GMWM estimator based on the robust estimator of WV proposed by Mondal and Percival [2012] (MPWM).

Given the substantial absence of general routines in statistical software to robustly estimate time series, the QAR is the only immediately available estimator for AR(p) models. Based on this, the INDI represents an easy-to-implement albeit computationally intensive estimator for ARMA models. Nevertheless, when this estimator was used (using $H = 10$ as the number of simulations for indirect inference), more simulations had to be run to obtain a number of estimations which was comparable to the others since there were frequent convergence issues despite the testing of different optimization procedures. This issue was not improved by modifying the order of the auxiliary AR(p) model nor by increasing the number of simulations for indirect inference H which drastically increased the computational time. On the other hand, the RGMWM is based on the proposed WV estimator $\hat{\nu}$ for which we choose a tuning constant c that delivers a 60% efficiency with respect to the classic estimator CL. This level of efficiency therefore aims for a higher degree of robustness which approaches the degree provided by the median-type estimator MP used in the simulations in Mondal and Percival [2012]. This allows for a fairer comparison between the RGMWM

and MPWM estimators.

Since the additive-type contamination appears to generate a higher bias, the performance of these estimators is investigated on the following models and contamination settings:

- **AR(1)**: a zero-mean first-order autoregressive model with parameter vector $[\rho_1 \ v^2]^T = [0.9 \ 1]^T$, isolated outliers, $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 9$;
- **AR(2)**: a zero-mean second-order autoregressive model with parameter vector $[\rho_1 \ \rho_2 \ v^2]^T = [0.5 \ -0.3 \ 1]^T$, isolated outliers, $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 9$;
- **ARMA(1,2)**: a zero-mean autoregressive-moving average model with parameter vector $[\rho \ \varrho_1 \ \varrho_2 \ v^2]^T = [0.9 \ -0.1 \ 0.2 \ 1]^T$, and level-shift contamination with $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\mu_\epsilon = 5$;
- **ARMA(3,2)**: a zero-mean autoregressive-moving average model with parameter vector $[\rho_1 \ \rho_2 \ \rho_3 \ \varrho_1 \ \varrho_2 \ v^2]^T = [-0.2 \ 0.7 \ 0.3 \ 0.1 \ 0.5 \ 2]^T$, scale-based contamination, $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 100$;
- **SSM**: a state-space model (X_t) interpreted as a composite (latent) process in certain engineering applications. This model is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{(i)} &= \rho_{(i)} Y_{t-1}^{(i)} + W_t^{(i)} \\ W_t^{(i)} &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, v_{(i)}^2) \\ X_t &= \sum_{i=1}^3 Y_t^{(i)} + Z_t + R_t, \\ Z_t &\stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2), R_t \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(R_{t-1}, \gamma^2) \end{aligned}$$

with $R_0 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \gamma^2)$, parameter vector

$$[\rho_{(1)} \ v_{(1)}^2 \ \rho_{(2)} \ v_{(2)}^2 \ \rho_{(3)} \ v_{(3)}^2 \ \sigma^2 \ \gamma^2]^T = [0.9 \ 1 \ 0.99 \ 1 \ 0.3 \ 1 \ 2 \ 1]^T,$$

patchy outliers, $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 100$.

For each simulation the sample size is $T = 1,000$ which delivers $J = 9$ scales for the GMWM-type estimators. This is a limitation especially for the more complex models such as the **ARMA(3,2)** and **SSM** models where the number of parameters are 6 and 8, respectively. Given the sample size, these models will rely heavily on the larger scales for which the WV estimators are less efficient and we therefore expect a decreased performance of these estimators for these models. Finally, the ML was not considered for the estimation of the parameters of the **SSM** since, due also to numerical instability, it often delivers unreliable results [see Guerrier et al., 2013]. Figure 1 summarizes the results for the five processes. As in the case of the WV estimation in Appendix E, the RGMWM generally performs better than the MPWM in the simulated settings. Moreover, while the RGMWM is generally less efficient than the other robust estimators in the uncontaminated setting, it compares favorably in contamination settings, especially for the lower dimensional models (which is expected given the sample size). For the smaller models (e.g. **AR(1)**, **AR(2)** and **ARMA(1,2)**) it




FIG 1. Top row: RMSE* of the estimators in an uncontaminated setting. Middle row: RMSE* of the estimators in a contaminated setting. Bottom row: Bias* of the estimators in a contaminated setting.

can be seen how all estimators have a close performance in the uncontaminated setting (except for the MPWM) while the RGMWM has an overall better performance in the contaminated settings. For the higher-dimensional models the GMWM-based estimators are less efficient in the uncontaminated settings (as expected) but the RGMWM still generally performs better than the others in the contaminated settings. The RGMWM therefore appears to be a considerable improvement over the MPWM and can be considered as a valid alternative to existing robust methods with adequate theoretical properties and a high computational efficiency.

5. Two Case Studies

In this section we will investigate the performance of the proposed RGMWM estimator on two real data sets coming from engineering for navigation systems and economics. Another example showing the benefits of the proposed robust estimator of $WV \hat{\nu}$ in the domain of oceanography is given in Appendix G as well as another example of the RGMWM usefulness in the area of hydrology in Appendix H. A bootstrap version of the J-test [see Hansen, 1982b] was used, as suggested in Guerrier et al. [2013], to take a decision on which models were adequate, therefore selecting the models for which we could not reject the null hypothesis that they fit the data well.

5.1. Application to Inertial Sensors

The engineering dataset consists in the angular rate signal issued from a micro-electro-mechanical system gyroscope in static conditions. Due also to their low cost, these sensors are very common and are being increasingly used in the field of navigation engineering. The main goal of recording this kind of data is to improve the performance of the navigation sensors by identifying and estimating the parameters of the error model coming from the accelerometers and gyroscopes that compose the sensor. Once these parameters are estimated they are inserted in a (navigation) filter (usually an extended Kalman filter) which is integrated with the Global Positioning System (GPS) in order to improve the navigation precision. The latter hence greatly depends on the estimation of the parameters of the selected error model for the inertial sensor.

Figure 2 shows the error signal from the gyroscope along with the outliers in a portion of the signal identified via the weights given to the observations by the RGMWM estimator. As can be observed, there are outliers that would appear to be obvious by simply looking at the plot and could be treated by fault detection algorithms for navigation systems (see further on) but there are many others that lie within the part of the signal which one would not expect to contain outliers. Despite these numerous outliers, these are extremely low in proportion to the whole dataset ($\approx 0.4\%$) which contains a little under 900,000 observations (issued from an approximately 2.5 hours recording sampled at 100




FIG 2. *Top part: Inertial sensor time series. Bottom part: zoom-in on grey part of the time series with black points indicating extreme outliers identified through the weights of RGMWM.*

Hz). This may lead to think that estimations on this dataset would not be significantly influenced by outliers.

Nevertheless, to understand how influential these observations could be, we estimated the classical and robust WV from the signal represented in Figure 2. Using these estimates we then estimated an error model made by the sum of three latent first-order autoregressive models. This state-space model is among those suggested by Stebler et al. [2014] as being most appropriate to describe such signals. Table 2 in Appendix F shows the estimated parameters for the GMWM and RGMWM estimators together with their confidence intervals (the ML was not considered for the same reasons given in Section 4 for the SSM model). For both estimators the values of some ρ_i parameters are close to one suggesting that the AR(1) model could be considered as a random walk. Indeed, a model that was commonly used to describe these signals was the sum of a white noise process with a random walk. However, Stebler et al. [2014]

show how the use of sums of AR(1) models greatly improves the navigation performance over this model and the J-tests support this view by ruling out the models which included a random walk. Although the differences between the estimations do not appear to be large since the estimated level of contamination is low, a significant difference is to be noticed for the parameters of the first two autoregressive processes indicating that the contamination appears to have an impact on estimation and that robust methods should be preferred (assuming the Gaussian assumption holds). Even one (or few) slightly misestimated parameter(s) can be highly relevant in the context of navigation systems since these are fed into the filters which will progressively misestimate the position as the sensors work in “coasting mode” (i.e. without the GPS integration) and deliver the so-called “error accumulation”. Informally speaking this is due to the fact that these measurements are integrated several times and therefore their errors accumulate in time especially when no GPS observations are present to “reinitialize” the system [more details on this can be found, for example, in [Titterton and Weston, 1997](#)].

Moreover, our robust approach can be of great usefulness in the area of Fault Detection and Isolation (FDI) for inertial measurement units [see for example [Guerrier et al., 2012](#), and references therein] as shown in [Figure 2](#). In general, the task of FDI includes the detection of the presence of failures (or outliers) and the isolation of the component responsible of the irregularity. In the inertial navigation framework, FDI algorithms are used, for example, to ensure the safety of aircrafts or robots which deeply rely on inertial sensors. In fact, usual FDI methods in this area use various measurements coming from several sensors which entail a series of disadvantages. Although this is left for future research as some further adjustments would need to be put in place, our approach could be used as a basis for FDI by only using one signal coming from the sensor calibration procedure. One of the advantages of this approach is that it would have important impacts in terms of costs and constraints (e.g. weight, electric consumption, etc.) for robots or small unmanned aerial vehicles which are currently a major focus of technological and mechanical research.

5.2. Application to Personal Saving Rates

In this section we study the monthly seasonally adjusted Personal Saving Rates (PSR) data from January 1959 to May 2015 provided by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. The study of PSR is an essential part of the overall investigation on the health of national and international economies since, within more general economic models, PSR can greatly impact the funds available for investment which in turn determine the productive capacity of an economy. Understanding the behaviour of PSR is therefore an important step in correct economic policy decision making. In this sense, [Slacalek and Sommer \[2012\]](#) study the factors behind saving rates and investigate different models which, among others, are compared to the random-walk-plus-noise (local level) model (RWN). As opposed to the latter model, various time-varying models are proposed in the literature to explain precautionary PSR together with risk aversion

TABLE 1

Random Walk plus ARMA(2,1) model estimates for the PSR data. Estimated parameters with GMWM and RGMWM estimators with γ^2 being the random walk parameter, ρ_i the i^{th} autoregressive parameter, ϱ the moving average parameter and $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ the innovation variance of the ARMA(2,1) model. Confidence intervals (CI) based on the approach used in [Guerrier et al. \[2013\]](#).

	GMWM		RGMWM	
	Estimate	CI(·, 95%)	Estimate	CI(·, 95%)
γ^2	$7.95 \cdot 10^{-2}$	($3.67 \cdot 10^{-2}$; $1.11 \cdot 10^{-1}$)	$5.85 \cdot 10^{-2}$	($1.54 \cdot 10^{-2}$; $9.97 \cdot 10^{-2}$)
ρ_1	$1.64 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($5.93 \cdot 10^{-2}$; $2.89 \cdot 10^{-1}$)	$6.00 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($4.48 \cdot 10^{-1}$; $7.55 \cdot 10^{-1}$)
ρ_2	$3.06 \cdot 10^{-3}$	($-1.31 \cdot 10^{-1}$; $1.48 \cdot 10^{-1}$)	$1.84 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($3.10 \cdot 10^{-2}$; $2.46 \cdot 10^{-1}$)
ϱ	$2.43 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($2.02 \cdot 10^{-1}$; $2.81 \cdot 10^{-1}$)	$2.92 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($2.28 \cdot 10^{-1}$; $3.45 \cdot 10^{-1}$)
$\tilde{\sigma}^2$	$3.14 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($2.59 \cdot 10^{-1}$; $3.85 \cdot 10^{-1}$)	$1.32 \cdot 10^{-1}$	($8.59 \cdot 10^{-2}$; $1.80 \cdot 10^{-1}$)

in the light of different factors such as financial shocks or others [see, for example, [Videras and Wu, 2004](#), [Brunnermeier and Nagel, 2008](#)]. Nevertheless, as underlined in [Pankratz \[2012\]](#), modelling the time series with a stationary model, or a d^{th} -order non-stationary model such as an ARIMA, can be useful under many aspects such as, for example, to understand if a dynamic model is needed for forecasting and, if so, what kind of model is appropriate.

In this example, we consider the RWN model and, as in Section 5.1, we use the WV log-log plot and a J-test to understand what kind of model could fit the time series. By doing so, we find that a random walk plus an ARMA(2,1) fits the data well and therefore, in this case, we have that the “noise” in the RWN model is an ARMA(2,1). This can be seen in Figure 3 where, in the top part, the saving rate time series is represented along with the identified outliers and, in the bottom part, we see the log-log representation of the classic and robust estimated and model-implied WV respectively. Indeed, for the bottom part, the diagonal plots show the classic and robust estimations respectively, each with the estimated WV and the WV implied by the estimated model. The off-diagonal plots compare the classic and robust estimated WV (upper diagonal) and the WV implied by the GMWM and RGMWM model parameter estimates (lower diagonal). It can be seen how there is a significant difference between the classic and robust WV estimates, especially at the first scales where the confidence intervals of the estimated WV do not overlap (upper diagonal plot). This leads to a difference in the model-implied WV whose parameters have been estimated through the GMWM and RGMWM (lower diagonal plot).

The estimated parameters with the GMWM and RGMWM are given in Table 1 along with their respective confidence intervals. There are two main differences between the two estimations: (i) the estimates of the first autoregressive parameter ρ_1 and innovation variance $\tilde{\sigma}^2$ are significantly different; (ii) the second autoregressive parameter ρ_2 is not significant using the GMWM. These differences highlight how the conclusions concerning parameter values and model selection can considerably change when outliers are present in the data. Indeed, the choice of the model would then affect the decisions taken towards the selection of appropriate causal and dynamic models to better explain the behaviour




FIG 3. Top figure: Saving rates time series with different types of points indicating outliers identified through the weights of the RGMWM. Bottom figure: log-log scale WV plots for saving rates series; Top left: classic estimated WV superposed with model-implied WV based on the parameters estimated through the GMWM. Top right: classic and robust estimated WV with respective confidence intervals superposed. Bottom left: classic and robust model-implied WV based on the GMWM and RGMWM estimates respectively. Bottom right: robust estimated WV superposed with model-implied WV based on the parameters estimated through the RGMWM.

of saving rates and the economy as a whole. The selected model based on the robust fit can in fact be interpreted as a sum of latent models along the lines given in [Slacalek and Sommer \[2012\]](#) where the ARMA(2,1) can be seen as a

sum of two AR(1) models where each of them represents, for example, the reaction of PSR to changes in uncertainty (affected by unemployment) and interest rates, respectively, while the random walk describes the continuous fluctuations of target wealth which also drives PSR.

The additional benefit of the RGMWM estimator, as opposed to the median-type MPWM, is also to deliver weights that allow to identify outliers which may not be visible simply by looking at the time series (as highlighted in Section 5.1). As shown in the top part of Figure 3, the outliers identified by the RGMWM can be interpreted in the light of the national and global economic and political events. Limiting ourselves to the major identified outliers, the first one corresponds to a rise in the precautionary savings in the aftermath of the OPEC oil crisis and the 1974 stock market crash. In the months following October 1987 we can see an instability in the PSR with a rise and sudden fall linked to the “Black Monday” stock market crash which added to the savings and loans crisis which lasted to the early 1990s. This period also saw an economic recession where a rise in the saving rates, highlighted by the presence of high outliers, led to a drop in aggregate demand and bankruptcies. Finally, the various financial crises of the 21st century led to sudden and isolated rises in PSR as indicated again by the outliers.

6. Concluding remarks

This paper presented a new framework for the robust estimation of latent time series model called RGMWM which extends to various classes of time series models that are stationary or non-stationary with stationary backward differences. This framework provides estimators which are easy to implement, computationally efficient and have suitable asymptotic properties, being based on a new robust estimator for the WV proposed as an alternative to that put forward by [Mondal and Percival \[2012\]](#). As opposed to the latter, the estimator proposed in this paper is based on existing methods for the robust estimation of scale parameters and develops the relative theory for a large class of time series models. Moreover, the proposed estimator directly estimates the scale parameter itself with no need of bias correction and is Fisher consistent by construction.

The consistency and asymptotic normality of the RGMWM are reinforced based on the identifiability results presented in Section 3.1. In general the identifiability can also be assumed and indirect inference can be used for processes whose theoretical WV is not known, widening the class of models which can be robustly estimated. In the latter case, the approach proposed in [Ortelli and Trojani \[2005\]](#) can be used to also make this estimator more efficient. The simulation studies and the applied examples confirm that the robust estimators delivered via the proposed approach adequately bound the influence of outliers on the estimation procedure and compare satisfactorily to alternative estimators which, with a few exceptions, are numerically challenging or computationally intensive. This paper hence provides a contribution in the direction of developing a general theoretical framework to robust inference for (latent) time series models

as well as a method which is computationally efficient and straightforward to implement in practice.

Appendix A: Short literature review

A detailed discussion on robust estimation and inference methods for time series models can be found in [Maronna et al. \[2006\]](#), Chapter 8. Most of the literature in this domain has dealt with standard time series models such as autoregressive and/or moving average models. [Künsch \[1984\]](#) proposes optimal robust estimators of the parameters of autoregressive processes by studying the properties of their influence function [see also [Martin and Yohai, 1986](#)]. [Denby and Martin \[1979\]](#) develop a generalized M -estimator for the parameter of a first-order autoregressive process whereas [Bustos and Yohai \[1986\]](#), [Allende and Heiler \[1992\]](#) and [de Luna and Genton \[2001\]](#) extend the research to include moving average models using generalized M -estimation theory and indirect inference [see e.g. [Gourieroux et al., 1993](#)]. [Bianco et al. \[1996\]](#) propose a class of robust estimators for regression models with ARIMA errors based on τ -estimators of scale [[Yohai and Zamar, 1988](#)]. [Ronchetti and Trojani \[2001\]](#) develop a robust version of the generalized method of moments [proposed by [Hansen, 1982a](#)] for estimating the parameters of time series models in economics, and [Ortelli and Trojani \[2005\]](#) further develop a robust efficient method of moments. [Mancini et al. \[2005\]](#) propose optimal bias-robust estimators for a class of conditional location and scale time series models while [La Vecchia and Trojani \[2010\]](#) develop conditionally unbiased optimal robust estimators for general diffusion processes, for which approximation methods for computing integrals are needed. [Cizek \[2008\]](#) studies the properties of a two-step least weighted squares robust time-series regression estimator and [Agostinelli and Bisaglia \[2010\]](#) propose a weighted maximum likelihood estimator for ARFIMA processes, for which [Molinares et al. \[2009\]](#) propose an alternative estimator under additive outliers. [Sarnaglia et al. \[2010\]](#) suggest a robust estimation procedure for the parameters of the periodic AR model as an extension of the robust scale and covariance functions given in, respectively, [Rousseeuw and Croux \[1993\]](#) and [Ma and Genton \[2000\]](#).

Another means to obtain robust estimators for the parameters of a time series model when it can be written as a state-space model is by means of robust (Kalman) filtering. Robustification of the Kalman filter was originated with [Masreliez and Martin \[1977\]](#) and [Cipra \[1992\]](#) who propose robust modifications of exponential smoothing (see also [Cipra and Hanzak, 2011](#) and [Croux et al., 2010](#) for a multivariate version). For a robust version of the Holt-Winters smoother, see [Gelper et al. \[2010\]](#). [Muler et al. \[2009\]](#) develop a class of robust estimates for ARMA models that are closely related to robust filtering. Robust filtering can also possibly provide a way to robustly estimate the WV (although stronger assumptions on the underlying model would have to be made). However, in this case, the only attempt to studying the robustness properties of wavelet filtering has been made in the identically and independently distributed (iid) case where [Renaud \[2002\]](#) develops, among others, the IF of the Haar-based

wavelet coefficients and concludes that the IF depends on the location of the contaminated data with respect to the dyadic grid and can be infinite. As in the case of the wavelet coefficients, many classical filtering methods are unbounded and for this reason several robust local filters have been proposed so far since the median filter proposal from Tukey [1977]: Bruce et al. [1994] pre-process the estimation of the wavelet coefficients via a “fast and robust smooth/cleaner”; Krim and Schick [1999] derive a robust estimator of the wavelet coefficients based on minimax description length; Härdle and Gasser [1984] develop a locally weighted smoothing using M -estimation and Fried et al. [2007] propose a non-parametric, weighted repeated median filter. Sardy et al. [2001] propose a robust wavelet-based estimator using a robust loss-penalized function, for which appropriately choosing the smoothing parameter is an important robustness issue as revealed, for example, by Cantoni and Ronchetti [2001].

Appendix B: Choice of tuning constant c

Considering that Theorem 2.3 provides an expression for the variance of the proposed robust estimator, we can now add a brief discussion on the choice of the tuning constant c . The definition of this value is based on the desired level of efficiency compared to the classical estimator and varies according to the chosen ψ -function. Since the estimator in (2.3) is the result of a minimization under the standard Gaussian assumption (i.e. zero mean and unit variance), within this setting we can obtain expressions for the variance of both the classical estimator and the robust estimator, which we denote as σ_j^2 and $\tilde{\sigma}_j^2(c)$ respectively. In this setting we see that these expressions depend solely on c and therefore, for a general scale j and defining $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ as the desired level of efficiency, a possible rule to select the tuning constant c , given a specific ψ -function, is to find the solution in c to the expression

$$\frac{\sigma_j}{\tilde{\sigma}_j^2(c)} - \alpha = 0.$$

For example, choosing $\alpha = 0.95$ delivers a tuning constant $c \approx 7.88$ when using the Tukey ψ -function and $c \approx 2.38$ when using the Huber ψ -function (respectively $c \approx 4.97$ and $c \approx 1.22$ for $\alpha = 0.6$). The choice of the efficiency level is subjective and can be supported by a sensitivity analysis comparing the classical and the robust estimates starting from a low efficiency level (e.g. 0.5).

Appendix C: Proofs

C.1. Proof of Wavelet Variance Influence Function

Let $(Y_t), t \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a sequence generated by a model in a neighbourhood of F_θ , i.e. $F_\varepsilon = (1 - \varepsilon)F_\theta + \varepsilon\Delta_{\mathbf{z}}$, with small $\varepsilon > 0$. F_ε is the standard contamination model with $\Delta_{\mathbf{z}}$ the Dirac function at \mathbf{z} , since the maximal bias on a statistic (estimator)

is obtained when the contaminating distribution is a Dirac [see Hampel et al., 1986].

Very generally, let (x_t) represent an observed sequence of a random variable (X_t) following a model F_θ . An M -estimator is defined as the solution for λ of the following equation

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \psi(x_t, \lambda) = 0 \quad (\text{C-1})$$

where λ can be θ or a function of it (i.e. $\lambda(\theta)$) and $\psi(\cdot)$ is a function which can be unbounded or bounded. Considering F_ε as the data generating model, then $\hat{\lambda}(F_\varepsilon)$ (i.e. the estimator written as a functional of F_ε) is implicitly defined in

$$\mathbb{E}_{F_\varepsilon} \left[\psi \left(x_t, \hat{\lambda}(F_\varepsilon) \right) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{C-2})$$

In our case we consider the wavlet coefficients that can also be written as functionals of F_ε , namely $W_{j,t}(F_\varepsilon)$, and seek to estimate the WV considering F_ε , i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}_{F_\varepsilon} \left[\psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\varepsilon), \hat{\nu}_j^2(F_\varepsilon) \right) \right] = 0. \quad (\text{C-3})$$

Using the time series adaptation of the IF from Künsch [1984], the IF of $\hat{\nu}_j^2$ is obtained by taking the Gâteaux derivative of (C-3) with respect to ε when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0^+$, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left[(1 - \varepsilon) \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\varepsilon), \hat{\nu}_j^2(F_\varepsilon) \right) \right] \right]_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} + \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left[\varepsilon \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\varepsilon), \hat{\nu}_j^2(F_\varepsilon) \right) \right]_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} \\ &= - \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2 \right) \right] + \\ & \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial W_{j,t}^2} \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2, \nu_j^2 \right) \right]_{W_{j,t}^2 = W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta)} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left[W_{j,t}^2(F_\varepsilon) \right]_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} + \\ & \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_j^2} \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2 \right) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \varepsilon} \left[\hat{\nu}_j^2(F_\varepsilon) \right]_{\varepsilon \downarrow 0} + \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(\mathbf{z}), \nu_j^2 \right) \\ &= - \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2 \right) \right] + \\ & \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial W_{j,t}^2} \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2, \nu_j^2 \right) \right]_{W_{j,t}^2 = W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta)} \text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, W_{j,t}^2, F_\theta) + \\ & \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_j^2} \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2 \right) \right] \text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\nu}_j^2, F_\theta) + \psi \left(W_{j,t}^2(\mathbf{z}), \nu_j^2 \right) \equiv \mathbf{K} \end{aligned}$$

By the chain rule we have that $\text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\nu}_j^2, F_\theta) \propto \text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, W_{j,t}^2, F_\theta)$, therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K} &\propto -\mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} [\psi(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2)] + \\ &\mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial W_{j,t}^2} \psi(W_{j,t}^2, \nu_j^2) \right]_{W_{j,t}^2=W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta)} \text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\nu}_j^2, F_\theta) + \\ &\mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_j^2} \psi(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2) \right] \text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, \hat{\nu}_j^2, F_\theta) + \psi(W_{j,t}^2(\mathbf{z}, F_\theta), \nu_j^2) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

For consistent estimators of the WV, we have that $\mathbb{E}_{F_\theta}[\psi(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2)] = 0$. We finally get

$$\text{IF}(\mathbf{z}, \nu_j^2, F_\theta) \propto -\mathbf{D}^{-1} \psi(W_{j,t}^2(\mathbf{z}), \theta)$$

with

$$\mathbf{D} = \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial W_{j,t}^2} \psi(W_{j,t}^2, \nu_j^2) \right]_{W_{j,t}^2=W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta)} + \mathbb{E}_{F_\theta} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \nu_j^2} \psi(W_{j,t}^2(F_\theta), \nu_j^2) \right].$$

Since \mathbf{D} does not depend on the contamination mass \mathbf{z} , the IF of the estimator of the WV is bounded only if $\psi(\cdot)$ is bounded, thus concluding the proof. \square

C.2. Proof of Theorem 2.2

Let

$$X = \begin{cases} r_{j,t}^2 & \text{for } |r_{j,t}| \leq c \\ c^2 & \text{for } |r_{j,t}| > c \end{cases}$$

with $r_{j,t} = W_{j,t}/\kappa$, $\kappa^2 \in \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid 0 < x < \infty\}$ and let us consider the function $\mathbb{E}[\psi(W_{j,t}, \kappa^2)]$. For Huber weights we define $q(r_{j,t}, c) \equiv \mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)]$ where $a_\psi(c)$ is a constant for a given c . For global identifiability we need to prove that $q(r_{j,t}, c)$ has a unique solution in ν_j^2 and to do so we prove that its derivative is a strictly monotone function in κ^2 . Indeed, we have by definition that $\mathbb{E}[\psi(W_{j,t}, \kappa^2)] = 0$ if $\kappa^2 = \nu_j^2$ and if the derivative of $q(r_{j,t}, c)$ is strictly monotone then the solution is unique. Let us denote $\mathbb{P}[X]$ as the probability of X , $\alpha \equiv r_{j,t} \kappa/\nu_j$ and $\gamma \equiv c \kappa/\nu_j > 0$, then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)] &= \mathbb{E}[X] - a_\psi(c) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[X \mid |r_{j,t}| \leq c \right] \mathbb{P}[|r_{j,t}| \leq c] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[X \mid |r_{j,t}| > c \right] \mathbb{P}[|r_{j,t}| > c] - a_\psi(c) \\ &= \frac{\nu_j^2}{\kappa^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[X \frac{\kappa^2}{\nu_j^2} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma \right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} \\ &+ \frac{\nu_j^2}{\kappa^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[X \frac{\kappa^2}{\nu_j^2} \mid |\alpha| > \gamma \right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| > \gamma] \right\} - a_\psi(c). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $\Phi(\cdot)$ and $\phi(\cdot)$ as being the Gaussian distribution and density functions respectively, using the results of Dhrymes [2005] we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)] &= \frac{c^2}{\gamma^2} (2\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma\phi(\gamma) - 1) + 2c^2 (1 - \Phi(\gamma)) - a_\psi(c) = \\ &= c^2 \underbrace{\left(\frac{2\Phi(\gamma)}{\gamma^2} - \frac{2\phi(\gamma)}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma^2} - 2\Phi(\gamma) \right)}_{f(\gamma)} + 2c^2 - a_\psi(c).\end{aligned}$$

We define $g(\gamma) \equiv \mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)]$ which has a unique solution for γ if $f(\gamma)$ has a unique solution for γ . Hence, we focus on $f(\gamma)$ and take its derivative to understand if it is a strictly monotone function

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} f(\gamma) = \frac{2(1 - 2\Phi(\gamma))}{\gamma^3} + \frac{4\phi(\gamma)}{\gamma^2} - \frac{2\phi'(\gamma)}{\gamma} - 2\phi(\gamma)$$

where $\phi'(\gamma) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} \phi(\gamma) = -\gamma\phi(\gamma)$ which finally gives us

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} f(\gamma) = \frac{2}{\gamma^3} \underbrace{(2\gamma\phi(\gamma) + 1 - 2\Phi(\gamma))}_{\text{A}}. \quad (\text{C-4})$$

If we prove that the term A in (C-4) is strictly positive or negative, we prove that the derivative is too. By rewriting A we have

$$2\gamma\phi(\gamma) + 1 - 2\Phi(\gamma) = 2\gamma\phi(\gamma) + 2\Phi(0) - 2\Phi(\gamma) = 2(\gamma\phi(\gamma) + \Phi(0) - \Phi(\gamma))$$

and we prove that this is quantity is strictly negative since $\gamma\phi(\gamma) < \Phi(\gamma) - \Phi(0)$ given that $\gamma > 0$. \square

C.3. Proof of Lemma 2.1

Let

$$X = \begin{cases} \left(\left(\frac{r_{j,t}}{c} \right)^2 - 1 \right)^4 r_{j,t}^2 & \text{for } |r_{j,t}| \leq c \\ 0 & \text{for } |r_{j,t}| > c \end{cases}$$

and let κ belong to the set $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid c^* < x < \infty\}$ where c^* denotes a positive constant such that $c^* < \nu_j$. Let us again follow the same procedure and notations as used for the proof of global identifiability of the Huber weights. With $a_\psi(c)$ being this time the correction term for the Tukey biweight function, in this case

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)] &= \mathbb{E}[X] - a_\psi(c) = \mathbb{E}\left[X \mid |r_{j,t}| \leq c\right] \mathbb{P}[|r_{j,t}| \leq c] - a_\psi(c) \\
&= \frac{\nu_j^{10}}{\kappa^{10}c^8} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[r_{j,t}^{10} \frac{\kappa^{10}}{\nu_j^{10}} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma\right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{4\nu_j^8}{\kappa^8c^6} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[r_{j,t}^8 \frac{\kappa^8}{\nu_j^8} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma\right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{6\nu_j^6}{\kappa^6c^4} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[r_{j,t}^6 \frac{\kappa^6}{\nu_j^6} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma\right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{4\nu_j^4}{\kappa^4c^2} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[r_{j,t}^4 \frac{\kappa^4}{\nu_j^4} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma\right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{\nu_j}{\kappa} \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[r_{j,t} \frac{\kappa}{\nu_j} \mid |\alpha| \leq \gamma\right] \mathbb{P}[|\alpha| \leq \gamma] \right\} - a_\psi(c) \\
&= c^2 \left[\frac{1}{\gamma^{10}} \underbrace{(1890\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma(945 + 315\gamma^2 + 63\gamma^4 + 9\gamma^6 + \gamma^8)\phi(\gamma) - 945)}_{\mu_{10}^*} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{4}{\gamma^8} \underbrace{(210\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma(105 + 35\gamma^2 + 7\gamma^4 + \gamma^6)\phi(\gamma) - 105)}_{\mu_8^*} \\
&\quad + \frac{6}{\gamma^6} \underbrace{(30\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma(15 + 5\gamma^2 + \gamma^4)\phi(\gamma) - 15)}_{\mu_6^*} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{4}{\gamma^4} \underbrace{(6\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma(3 + \gamma^2)\phi(\gamma) - 3)}_{\mu_4^*} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \underbrace{(2\Phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma\phi(\gamma) - 1)}_{\mu_2} \right] - a_\psi(c).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we define $g(\gamma) \equiv \mathbb{E}[X - a_\psi(c)]$ and we know that $g(\gamma)$ has a unique solution in γ if the expression in square brackets in $g(\gamma)$ has a unique solution in γ . Hence, by taking the derivative we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial \gamma} g(\gamma) &= -\frac{\mu_{10}}{\gamma^{11}} + \frac{32}{\gamma^9} \mu_8 + \frac{1}{\gamma^{10}} (1890\phi(\gamma) \\
&\quad - ((1890 + 1890\gamma^2 + 630\gamma^4 + 126\gamma^6 + 18\gamma^8)\phi(\gamma) - \gamma\phi(\gamma)\mu_{10}^*)) \\
&\quad - \frac{4}{\gamma^8} (210\phi(\gamma) - ((210 + 210\gamma^2 + 70\gamma^4 + 14\gamma^6)\phi(\gamma) - \gamma\phi(\gamma)\mu_8^*)) \\
&\quad - \frac{36}{\gamma^7} \mu_6 + \frac{6}{\gamma^6} (30\phi(\gamma) - ((30 + 30\gamma^2 + 10\gamma^4)\phi(\gamma) - \gamma\phi(\gamma)\mu_6^*)) \\
&\quad + \frac{16}{\gamma^5} \mu_4 - \frac{4}{\gamma^4} (6\phi(\gamma) - ((6 + 6\gamma^2)\phi(\gamma) - \gamma\phi(\gamma)\mu_4^*)) \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{\gamma^3} \mu_2 + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} (2\phi(\gamma) - (2\phi(\gamma) - 2\gamma^2\phi(\gamma)))
\end{aligned}$$

whose value is strictly negative for $\gamma > 3.5$ thereby defining the value $c^* = 7\nu_j/2c$.
 \square

C.4. Technical Lemma on Bouligand-differentiable Huber weight function

To find the asymptotic distribution of the proposed robust WV estimator using the Huber ψ -function, let us take the score function defined in (2.3) in the form given in Theorem 2.1 and let us state the following technical lemma:

Lemma C.1. *The function $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ using Huber weights is Bouligand-differentiable as follows*

$$\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = \begin{cases} -\frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_j^4} & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| \leq c \\ 0 & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| > c \end{cases}$$

This is a useful result to prove the asymptotic properties of the proposed estimator when using Huber weights since it fulfils the chain rule and allows for a first-order expansion [see Christmann and Messem, 2008]. The proof of this lemma is given in the following section.

C.4.1. Proof of Lemma C.1

To prove the result in Lemma C.1 let us define $r_0 \equiv W_{j,t}/\sqrt{\nu_0^2}$ and $r \equiv W_{j,t}/\sqrt{\nu^2}$ where $\nu^2 = \nu_0^2 + h$. By the definition in Scholtes [2012], a function $f(\cdot)$ is Bouligand differentiable (B-differentiable) at point x_0 if it is directionally differentiable at this point and there exists a function $f'(\cdot)$ such that $f(x_0 + h) = f(x_0) + f'(x_0)h + o(h)$. Using the approach of Christmann and Messem [2008], we show that the function $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ is first degree B-differentiable using Huber weights. Below are the computations of the B-derivatives for the five cases of the Huber weight function:

1. Setting $r_0 = c$ we have:

- If $h \geq 0$ ($r \leq c$):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) &+ o(h) = \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= r^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) \\ &= \frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_0^2 + h} - \frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_0^2} \\ &= \frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_0^2} \left(\frac{-h}{\nu_0^2 + h} \right) \\ &= -\frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_0^2} \left(\frac{h}{\nu_0^2} - \frac{h^2}{\nu_0^2(\nu_0^2 + h)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= -\frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_0^4}h + \underbrace{\frac{W_{j,t}^2 h^2}{\nu_0^2(\nu_0^2 + h)}}_{o(h)} \equiv \Delta$$

- If $h < 0$ ($r > c$):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= c^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) = c^2 - c^2 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

2. Setting $r_0 = -c$ we have:

- If $h < 0$ ($r < -c$):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= c^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

- If $h \geq 0$ ($r \geq -c$):

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= r^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) \\ &= \dots = \Delta \end{aligned}$$

3. Setting $r_0 > c$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= c^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

4. Setting $r_0 < -c$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= c^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) = 0 \end{aligned}$$

5. Setting $-c < r_0 < c$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2)(h) + o(h) &= \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2 + h) - \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_0^2) \\ &= r^2 - a_\psi(c) - r_0^2 + a_\psi(c) \\ &= \dots = \Delta \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that the B-derivative of the function $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ is given by

$$\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = \begin{cases} -\frac{W_{j,t}^2}{\nu_j^4} & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| \leq c \\ 0 & \text{if } |r_{j,t}| > c \end{cases}$$

□

The approach used in this proof can be used to obtain expressions for the B-derivatives of other piecewise differentiable weight functions [see [Scholtes, 2012](#)]. It can be seen how it extends the classic derivative for $|r_0| < c$ also to the points ν_0^2 such that $|r_0| = c$. However, the Frchet differentiability of this function has also been discussed in [Clarke \[1986\]](#).

C.5. Proof of Theorem 2.3

Since $W_{j,t}$ is a strictly stationary ergodic process, then so is $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ which is a bounded and time-invariant function of it. Hence, $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ satisfies the uniform weak law of large numbers (UWLLN) under Theorem 4.1 of [Wooldridge \[1994\]](#). Given the global identifiability of the Huber and Tukey ψ -functions (see Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 2.1), we have that there is a unique minimum for the function $q(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = -\int \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) d\nu_j^2$ and, under the mild assumptions of a compact support for ν_j^2 in [Huber \[1967\]](#), the weak consistency of M -estimators [Theorem 4.3, [Wooldridge, 1994](#)] yields

$$\hat{\nu}_j^2 \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \nu_j^2.$$

Given this result and using Lemma C.1 when considering the Huber ψ -function, we can now apply a Maclaurin expansion around ν_j^2 obtaining

$$\sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \hat{\nu}_j^2) = \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) + \sum_{t=1}^T \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^{*2}) (\hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2) = 0$$

where

$$\|\nu_j^{*2} - \nu_j^2\| \leq \|\hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2\|. \quad (\text{C-5})$$

Multiplying by \sqrt{T} and rewriting yields

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2) = \underbrace{\left[-\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^{*2}) \right]}_{A_j}^{-1} \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)}_{B_j}. \quad (\text{C-6})$$

Let us start from term A_j in (C-6). We can rewrite this term as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^{*2}) &= -\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) - \\ &\quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \underbrace{[\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^{*2}) - \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)]}_{C_j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C-7})$$

Since $\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ is a time-invariant function of $W_{j,t}$, it is also a stationary and ergodic process [see [Wooldridge, 1994](#)]. Let us define $m_j = \mathbb{E}[-\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)]$, then by Birkhoff's ergodic theorem we know that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T -\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbb{E}[-\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)] = m_j.$$

As for term C_j in (C-7), it is also a stationary and ergodic process. Since $\hat{\nu}_j^2$ is a consistent estimator of ν_j^2 , by (C-5) so is ν_j^{*2} which yields $\mathbb{E}[C_j] = 0$ for $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Hence, by again using Birkhoff's ergodic theorem, we have that

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T [\psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^{*2}) - \psi'(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$$

which finally yields

$$A_j \xrightarrow{a.s.} m_j.$$

Let us now focus on term B_j in (C-6) and let us define $S_T = \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$, with $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ being a stationary ergodic process with $\mathbb{E}[S_T] = 0$ by definition and $\sigma_T^2 = \text{Var}[S_T] \rightarrow \infty$. Then, following Theorem 3 of Denker [1986], we have

$$\frac{S_t}{\sigma_T} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

if $\frac{S_T^2}{\sigma_T^2}$ is a uniformly integrable sequence. To show the latter, we use the criterion of Billingsley [2009] for uniformly integrable sequences based on which we need to prove that there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_T \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{S_T^2}{\sigma_T^2} \right|^{1+\delta} \right] < \infty.$$

Let us take $\delta = 1$ so that we have

$$\sup_T \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{S_T^4}{\sigma_T^4} \right] < \infty. \quad (\text{C-8})$$

Let us define $Z_t = \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ and let $\text{Var}[Z_t] = S_\psi(0) < \infty$ (i.e. the power spectral density of $\psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ at zero frequency is finite given that $\psi(\cdot)$ is a function of bounded variation). Let us consider the indices $i, j, k, l = 1, \dots, T$, representing four distinct time points. We know that the moments of Z_t are finite since they are bounded functions of Gaussian variables, hence $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i^4]|$ is also finite and is bounded by a quantity we denote as D . By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have that also $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i^3 Z_j]|$, $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i^2 Z_j^2]|$, $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i^2 Z_j Z_k]|$ and $|\mathbb{E}[Z_i Z_j Z_k Z_l]|$ are bounded by D . Considering the above bound D and defining k_t as the exponent for the t^{th} term in the expansion ($k_t = 0, \dots, 4, k_t \in \mathbb{N}$),

using the multinomial theorem we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[S_T^4] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^T Z_t \right)^4 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k_1+\dots+k_T=4} \underbrace{\binom{4}{k_1, \dots, k_T}}_{\leq 4!} Z_1^{k_1} \dots Z_T^{k_T} \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{k_1+\dots+k_T=4} 4! Z_1^{k_1} \dots Z_T^{k_T} \right] \\ &= \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_T=4} 4! \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [Z_1^{k_1} \dots Z_T^{k_T}]}_{\leq D} \leq \sum_{k_1+\dots+k_T=4} 4! \underbrace{D}_{\mathcal{O}(T^4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now let us define $C(T) = \frac{2}{T(T-1)} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\forall t' < t}^T \rho_{t,t'}$, with $\rho_{t,t'}$ being the correlation between Z_t and $Z_{t'}$ and $0 \leq |C(T)| \leq 1, \forall T$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[S_T]^2 &= \text{Var} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T Z_t \right]^2 = \left(\sum_i \text{Var}[Z_i] + 2 \sum_i \sum_{j < i} \text{Cov}[Z_i, Z_j] \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_i \text{Var}[Z_i] + 2 \sum_i \sum_{j < i} \rho_{i,j} \text{Var}[Z_i] \right)^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_i \text{Var}[Z_i] + 2 \sum_i \sum_{j < i} C(T) \text{Var}[Z_i] \right)^2 \\ &= (T \text{Var}[Z_i] + 2T(T-1)C(T) \text{Var}[Z_i])^2 \\ &= \underbrace{T^2 \text{Var}[Z_i]^2}_{\mathcal{O}(T^3)} + 4 \underbrace{T^2(T-1) \text{Var}[Z_i]^2 C(T)}_{\mathcal{O}(T^4)} + 4 \underbrace{T^2(T-1)^2 C(T)^2 \text{Var}[Z_i]^2}_{\mathcal{O}(T^4)}. \end{aligned}$$

Considering condition (C-8) and the order of the expressions in T , we therefore have

$$\sup_T \frac{T^4 24D}{T^2 \text{Var}[Z_t]^2 + 4T^3 \text{Var}[Z_t] C(T) + 4T^4 C(T)^2 \text{Var}[Z_t]^2} < \infty.$$

Hence we have that $\frac{S_t^2}{\sigma_T^2}$ is uniformly integrable, thereby giving us

$$B_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, S_\psi(0)).$$

Finally, we apply Slutsky's theorem on terms A_j and B_j to obtain

$$\sqrt{T} (\hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{S_\psi(0)}{m^2} \right). \quad (\text{C-9})$$

where $S_\psi(0)$ exists based on condition **(C1)** and Lemma 2 in [Serroukh et al. \[2000\]](#). Now let us define $U_j \equiv \hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2$. From **(C-6)** we have that

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\nu}_j^2 - \nu_j^2) = \sqrt{T}U_j = A_j^{-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$$

where, by the continuous mapping theorem, we have that $A_j^{-1} \xrightarrow{a.s.} m_j^{-1} \equiv C_j$ based on **(C-8)**. Now let $\sqrt{T}Q_j \equiv C_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$, $\mathbf{a} = [a_j]_{j=1, \dots, J} \in \mathbb{R}^J$ a vector of constants with at least one element different from zero and $\mathbf{Q} = [Q_j]_{j=1, \dots, J} \in \mathbb{R}^J$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{Q} &= \sum_{j=1}^J a_j C_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{j=1}^J a_j C_j \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T R_t \end{aligned}$$

where $R_t \equiv \sum_{j=1}^J a_j C_j \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$. Being a time-invariant function of $W_{j,t}$, we know that also R_t is a stationary and ergodic process with $\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T R_t \right] = 0$ and $\sigma_R^2 \equiv \text{Var} \left[\sum_{t=1}^T R_t \right] \xrightarrow{T} \infty$. By using the same argument as for Z_t we have that $(\sum_{t=1}^T R_t)^2 / \sigma_R^2$ is a uniformly integrable sequence. Based on these results and again following Theorem 3 of [Denker \[1986\]](#) we have that

$$\sqrt{T}\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{Q} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_Q^2).$$

Now let us take $B_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \psi(W_{j,t}, \nu_j^2)$ based on term B in **(C-6)** and consider

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \sum_{j=1}^J a_j (U_j - Q_j) &= \sum_{j=1}^J a_j \left(\sqrt{T}U_j - \sqrt{T}Q_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^J a_j (A_j^{-1} - C_j) B_j. \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_j^{-1} - C_j \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$, we have that $\sqrt{T} \sum_{j=1}^J a_j (U_j - Q_j) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. By finally defining $\mathbf{U} = [U_j]_{j=1, \dots, J}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{U} &= \sqrt{T} \sum_{j=1}^J a_j (Q_j + (U_j - Q_j)) \\ &= \underbrace{\sqrt{T}\mathbf{a}^T\mathbf{Q} + \sqrt{T} \sum_{j=1}^J a_j (U_j - Q_j)}_{\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0} \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_Q^2) \end{aligned}$$

following Slutsky's theorem. Given these results, by the Cramer-Wold theorem we have

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}_J(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$$

where, based on (C-9), it can be shown that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{M}^{-T} \mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{M}^{-1}$ with $\mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0})$ being the power spectral density of $\Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu})$ at zero-frequency and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbb{E} \left[-\frac{\partial}{\partial \boldsymbol{\nu}} \Psi(\mathbf{W}_t, \boldsymbol{\nu}) \right]$, thus concluding the proof. \square

C.6. Technical Lemmas for Global Identifiability of the GMWM

The technical lemmas for the GMWM global identifiability are the following:

Lemma C.2. *Let $\Phi(f) = S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)$, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$, then there is a unique mapping of the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$ to the WV $\boldsymbol{\nu}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ if it does not satisfy the condition $\Phi(2f) = 32^{-1}\Phi(f)$.*

Lemma C.3. *There is a unique mapping between the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ and the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$ for a process made by the sum of a (P1) process, a (P2) and K (P6) processes, $\forall K < \infty$.*

The proofs of these lemmas are below.

C.6.1. Proof of Lemma C.2

Theorem 2 of Greenhall [1998] states that two Phase Modulation (PM) spectra $\tilde{S}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f)$ and $\tilde{S}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)$ of degree ≤ 2 have the same Allan variance (AV) if and only if the signed PM spectrum $\tilde{\Phi}(f) = \tilde{S}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) - \tilde{S}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)$ satisfies $\tilde{\Phi}(2f) = \tilde{\Phi}(f)/8$ almost everywhere and

$$\int_1^2 f^2 \tilde{\Phi}(f) df = 0.$$

Therefore we only need one of these conditions not to be verified for there to be a unique mapping from the PM spectrum to the AV. Using relation (13) given in El-Sheimy et al. [2008] and the definition of the AV using the PM spectrum in equation (1) in Greenhall [1998], we have that

$$\tilde{S}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f) = (2\pi f)^2 S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$$

which, if we define $\Phi(f) = S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)$, implies that the first condition of Theorem 2 of Greenhall [1998] becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 4(2\pi f)^2(S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(2f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(2f)) &= \frac{(2\pi f)^2}{8}(S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)) \\ S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(2f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(2f) &= \frac{1}{32}(S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) - S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f)) \\ \Phi(2f) &= 32^{-1}\Phi(f). \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have that the function $\Phi(f)$ must not satisfy this condition for there to be a unique mapping from the spectrum to the AV. As shown by

Percival and Guttorp [1994b], the AV and the Haar WV are exactly the same quantity up to a constant and this implies that if the above condition is not satisfied then there is a unique mapping of the spectral density $S_{\theta}(f)$ also to the WV $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ thus concluding the proof. \square

C.6.2. Proof of Lemma C.3

For there to be a unique mapping from the ACVF to the spectral density $S_{\theta}(f)$ we need the sequence of autocovariances $(\varphi_{\theta})(h)_{h=-\infty}^{+\infty}$ to be absolutely summable [see, for example, Proposition 6.1 in Hamilton, 1994]. Given the parameter values for ρ_k , each of the K (P6) processes can be expressed as a causal linear process $Y_t^{(k)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j^{(k)} \epsilon_{t-j}^{(k)}$ where $\psi_j^{(k)}$ are fixed coefficients which respect $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j^{(k)}| < \infty$ and $\epsilon_t^{(k)} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \kappa_k^2)$. Their sum gives

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j^{(k)} \epsilon_{t-j}^{(k)} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^K \psi_j^{(k)} \epsilon_{t-j}^{(k)} \quad (\text{C-10})$$

and, given that the processes are independent by condition (C3), we have that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_j^{(k)} \epsilon_{t-j}^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(0, \underbrace{\sum_{k=1}^K (\psi_j^{(k)})^2 \kappa_k^2}_{\delta^2} \right).$$

We have that δ^2 can be re-expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \delta^2 &= (\psi_j^{(1)})^2 \kappa_1^2 + \kappa_1^2 \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{\kappa_k^2}{\kappa_1^2} (\psi_j^{(k)})^2 \\ &= \underbrace{\left((\psi_j^{(1)})^2 + \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{\kappa_k^2}{\kappa_1^2} (\psi_j^{(k)})^2 \right)}_{\tilde{\psi}_j^2} \kappa_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

We therefore have the equivalence of processes

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \psi_j^{(k)} \epsilon_{t-j}^{(k)} \iff \tilde{\psi}_j u_{t-j}, \quad u_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \kappa_1^2)$$

which implies that (C-10) can be written as $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\psi}_j u_{t-j}$. If we define $\mathbf{z} = \left[\psi_j^{(1)} \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \psi_j^{(2)} \frac{\kappa_3}{\kappa_1} \psi_j^{(3)} \dots \frac{\kappa_K}{\kappa_1} \psi_j^{(K)} \right]$, this gives us

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\tilde{\psi}_j| = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{(\psi_j^{(1)})^2 + \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{\kappa_k^2}{\kappa_1^2} (\psi_j^{(k)})^2} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{z}\|_2$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbf{z}\|_1 = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j^{(1)}| + \frac{\kappa_2}{\kappa_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j^{(2)}| + \dots + \frac{\kappa_K}{\kappa_1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j^{(K)}| < \infty$$

where $\|\mathbf{z}\|_2$ and $\|\mathbf{z}\|_1$ represent the L^2 norm and L^1 norm of \mathbf{z} respectively. This result implies that a sum of K (P6) processes have absolutely summable linear coefficients $(\tilde{\psi}_j)_{j=0}^{\infty}$ which implies that its autocovariances $(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h))_{h=-\infty}^{+\infty}$ are also absolutely summable. If we add the processes (P1) and (P2) to this reasoning, we have that their ACVF are given by

$$\varphi_{\sigma^2}(h) = \begin{cases} \sigma^2 & \text{if } h = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } h > 0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\varphi_{Q^2}(h) = \begin{cases} 2Q^2 & \text{if } h = 0 \\ -Q^2 & \text{if } h = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } h > 1 \end{cases}$$

where $\varphi_{\sigma^2}(h)$ and $\varphi_{Q^2}(h)$ represent the ACVF of the (P1) and (P2) process respectively. If added to the ACVF of the sum of K (P6) processes described earlier, it is straightforward to see that the resulting ACVF sequence is absolutely summable as well, thus concluding the proof. \square

The following sections present the proofs for the theorems and lemmas from the main manuscript.

C.7. GMWM Global Identifiability

To discuss the global identifiability of the GMWM, we consider the processes given in Section 3.1 in the main manuscript. To support the reader, we again describe these processes below while adding information on their respective theoretical WV:

(P1) *Gaussian White Noise* (WN) with parameter $\sigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This process is defined as

$$X_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

and has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(\sigma^2) = \frac{\sigma^2}{\tau_j}.$$

We denote this process as $X_t^{(1)}$.

(P2) *Quantization Noise* (QN) (or rounding error, see e.g. Papoulis, 1991) with parameter $Q^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. With $U_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ (i.e. a standard uniform variable), this process is defined as

$$X_t = \sqrt{12Q^2}(U_t - U_{t-1})$$

and has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(Q^2) = \frac{6Q^2}{\tau_j^2}.$$

We denote this process as $X_t^{(2)}$.

(P3) *Drift* with parameter $\omega \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This process is defined as:

$$X_t = \omega t$$

and has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(\omega) = \frac{\tau_j^2 \omega^2}{16}.$$

We denote this process as $X_t^{(3)}$.

(P4) *Random walk* (RW) with parameter $\gamma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This process is defined as:

$$X_t = \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma Z_t$$

where $Z_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(\gamma^2) = \frac{(\tau_j^2 + 2) \gamma^2}{12\tau_j}.$$

We denote this process as $X_t^{(4)}$.

(P5) *Moving Average* MA(1) process with non-zero parameter $\varrho \in (-1, +1)$ and $\varsigma^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This process is defined as:

$$X_t = \varrho Z_{t-1} + Z_t \text{ where } Z_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \varsigma^2)$$

and it has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(\varrho, \varsigma^2) = \frac{\frac{\tau_j}{2} \varphi(0) + (\tau_j - 3) \varphi(1)}{\frac{\tau_j^2}{4}}.$$

where $\varphi(\cdot)$ is a function of ϱ and ς^2 . We denote this process as $X_t^{(5)}$.

(P6) *Auto-Regressive* AR(1) process with non-zero parameter $\rho \in (-1, +1)$ and $v^2 \in \mathbb{R}^+$. This process is defined as:

$$X_t = \rho X_{t-1} + v Z_t \text{ where } Z_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

and it has the following implied Haar WV at scale τ_j :

$$\eta_j^2(\rho, v^2) = \frac{\left(\frac{\tau_j}{2} - 3\rho - \frac{\tau_j}{2}\rho^2 + 4\rho^{\frac{\tau_j}{2}+1} - \rho^{\tau_j+1}\right)v^2}{\frac{\tau_j^2}{2}(1-\rho)^2(1-\rho^2)}.$$

We denote this process as $X_t^{(k)}$, $k = 6, \dots, G$.

Considering the above definitions, the proofs for the main manuscript can be found in the following section.

C.7.1. Proof of Lemma 3.1

If there is a unique mapping from the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ to the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ it means that $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(h) = \varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(h) \forall h$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. Moreover, based on Proposition 6.1 in Hamilton [1994] we have that there is a unique mapping from the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ to the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$ if the sequence of autocovariances $(\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h))_{h=-\infty}^{\infty}$ is absolutely summable (i.e. $\sum_{h=-\infty}^{\infty} |\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)| < \infty$). Given that a composition of injective functions is also injective, if these conditions are respected it implies that $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(f) = S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1}(f) \forall f$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$. Finally, if there is a unique mapping from the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$ to the WV $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$, by the same composition argument we have that $\boldsymbol{\eta}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\eta}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) \forall j$ if and only if $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\theta}_1$ thus concluding the proof. \square

C.7.2. Proof of Lemma 3.2

To prove that there is a unique mapping between the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ of a causal AR(p) process and the Haar WV we verify the first two conditions of Lemma 3.1. Hence, we first underline that a causal AR(p) can be represented as a linear process $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j \epsilon_{t-j}$ which is absolutely summable (i.e. $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j| < \infty$) thereby allowing the ACVF $\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$ to have a unique mapping to the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$. Next we make use of Lemma C.2 and the spectral density of an AR(p) process that can be written as

$$S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f) = \frac{v^2}{|1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \rho_j e^{i2\pi j f}|^2}.$$

Defining the AR(p) parameter vectors $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_p, v^2)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\tilde{\rho}_1, \dots, \tilde{\rho}_p, \tilde{v}^2)^T$, for an AR(p) model we have that the condition of this lemma would be

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{v^2}{|1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \rho_j e^{i4\pi j f}|^2} = \frac{\tilde{v}^2}{|1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\rho}_j e^{i4\pi j f}|^2} \\ & = \frac{v^2}{32|1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \rho_j e^{i2\pi j f}|^2} = \frac{\tilde{v}^2}{32|1 - \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{\rho}_j e^{i2\pi j f}|^2} \end{aligned}$$

The expression on the left side of the equation can clearly not be re-expressed as the expression on the right side of the equation given that the spectral densities are not linear in f and a factor of 32 would need to be extracted from the absolute value in the denominator which, if re-expressed according to Euler's formula, would preserve the first term (i.e. 1) from which the number 32 cannot be extracted without changing $\Phi(f)$. Moreover, $\Phi(f)$ does not show a log-periodic modulation specified in Greenhall [1998] that would allow the condition to be fulfilled. Given that this condition is not fulfilled, based on Lemma C.2 we have that the WV of an AR(p) process is identifiable through the autocovariance function $\varphi_{\theta}(h)$. \square

C.7.3. Proof of Theorem 3.1

Let us define the process $Y_t^* = X_t^{(1)} + X_t^{(2)} + \sum_{i=6}^G X_t^{(i)}$ and, to start, let us just consider a sum of independent (P6) processes, which we denote simply as $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^K X_t^{(i)}$, for which a part of the ACVF sequence $(\varphi_{\theta}(h))_{h=0}^{\infty}$ with positive lags is given by

$$\varphi_{\theta}(h) = \sum_{i=1}^K \rho_i^h \frac{v_i^2}{1 - \rho_i^2}$$

where $\theta = [\rho_1 \sigma_1^2 \cdots \rho_K \sigma_K^2]$ represents the parameter vector containing the parameters of the K processes. The derivatives with respect to ρ_i and v_i^2 (i.e. the parameters of the i^{th} (P6) process) are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1^i(h) &\equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho_i} \varphi_{\theta}(h) = \frac{h\rho_i^{h-1}(1 - \rho_i^2) + 2\rho_i^{h+1}}{(1 - \rho_i^2)^2} v_i^2 \\ &= \frac{\rho_i^h (h + (2 - h)\rho_i^2)}{\rho_i(1 - \rho_i^2)^2} v_i^2 \\ \gamma_2^i(h) &\equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial v_i^2} \varphi_{\theta}(h) = \frac{\rho_i^h}{(1 - \rho_i^2)} \end{aligned}$$

which exist based on the parameter values defined for process (P6). These thereby deliver a Jacobian matrix A whose first $2K$ rows are

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_1^1(0) & \gamma_2^1(0) & \cdots & \gamma_1^K(0) & \gamma_2^K(0) \\ \gamma_1^1(1) & \gamma_2^1(1) & \cdots & \gamma_1^K(1) & \gamma_2^K(1) \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \gamma_1^1(H) & \gamma_2^1(H) & \cdots & \gamma_1^K(H) & \gamma_2^K(H) \end{pmatrix}$$

where $H = 2K - 1$ [in practice this matrix will always have at least as many rows as columns based on the results of Zhang, 2008]. To simplify notation, let us define $\gamma_1^i(h) = [\gamma_1^i(h)]_{h=0, \dots, H}$ and $\gamma_2^i(h) = [\gamma_2^i(h)]_{h=0, \dots, H}$ as being the columns of the matrix A and $|A|$ as being the determinant of A. Taking the determinant of the matrix A, we perform some column permutations and operations. First,

for more clarity in the proof, we permute the columns to obtain the following matrix determinant

$$|A| = (-1)^{K-1} |\gamma_1^1(h) \cdots \gamma_1^K(h) \gamma_2^1(h) \cdots \gamma_2^K(h)|.$$

Next we multiply each column by a different constant which leaves us with the modified columns

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\gamma}_1^i(h) &\equiv \gamma_1^i(h) \frac{\rho_i(1-\rho_i^2)^2}{v_i^2} = \rho_i^h(h + (2-h)\rho_i^2) = \rho_i^h h + (2-h)\rho_i^{h+2} \\ \tilde{\gamma}_2^i(h) &\equiv \gamma_2^i(h)(1-\rho_i^2) = \rho_i^h \end{aligned}$$

thereby leaving us with the determinant

$$|A| = (-1)^{K-1} \underbrace{\prod_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{v_i^2}{\rho_i(1-\rho_i^2)^3} \right)}_c |\tilde{\gamma}_1^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|$$

where $c \neq 0$. Now let us express $\tilde{\gamma}_1^i(h)$ as $\delta_1^i(h) + \delta_2^i(h)$ where $\delta_1^i(h) = [\rho_i^h h]_{h=0, \dots, H}$ and $\delta_2^i(h) = [(2-h)\rho_i^h \rho_i^2]_{h=0, \dots, H}$. Furthermore, let us define the set $\mathcal{S} = \{\{a_1, \dots, a_K\} | a_i \in \{1, 2\}, i = 1, \dots, K\}$ with $s \in \mathcal{S}$ being an element of this set and $s(i) = a_i$ being the i^{th} element of s (note that the cardinality of \mathcal{S} , and therefore s , is K). When using the ‘‘determinant as a sum of determinants’’ rule, we can split each column $\tilde{\gamma}_1^i(h)$ which, starting with $\tilde{\gamma}_1^1(h)$, creates a sum of the final nodes of a binary tree as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |A| &= c(|\delta_1^1(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^2(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)| \\ &\quad + |\delta_2^1(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^2(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|) \\ &= c(|\delta_1^1(h) \delta_1^2(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^3(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)| \\ &\quad + |\delta_1^1(h) \delta_2^2(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^3(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)| \\ &\quad + |\delta_2^1(h) \delta_1^2(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^3(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)| \\ &\quad + |\delta_2^1(h) \delta_2^2(h) \tilde{\gamma}_1^3(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|) \\ &= \dots \\ &= c \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\delta_{s(1)}^1(h) \cdots \delta_{s(K)}^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that each column $\delta_{s(i)}^i(h)$ with $s(i) = 2$ (i.e. $\delta_2^i(h)$) can be re-expressed as $\tilde{\delta}_2^i(h) = [(2-h)\rho_i^h \rho_i^2]_{h=0, \dots, H}$ and therefore, denoting $\tilde{\delta}_2^i(h) = [(2-h)\rho_i^h]_{h=0, \dots, H}$, we have that the determinant becomes

$$|A| = c \sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \underbrace{\left(\prod_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{1}_{s(i)=2} \rho_i^2 + \mathbb{1}_{s(i)=1}) \right)}_{c_s} |\tilde{\delta}_{s(1)}^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\delta}_{s(K)}^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|.$$

where $\tilde{\delta}_{s(i)}^i(h) = \mathbb{1}_{s(i)=2} \tilde{\delta}_2^i(h) + \mathbb{1}_{s(i)=1} \delta_1^i(h)$ and $\mathbb{1}_{s(i)=z}$ represents the indicator function which takes the value 1 if $s(i) = z$ and 0 otherwise. Following the

same procedure as before, let us express $\tilde{\delta}_2^i(h) = \delta_3^i(h) + \delta_4^i(h)$, where $\delta_3^i(h) = [2\rho_i^h]_{h=0,\dots,H} = 2\tilde{\gamma}_2^i(h)$ and $\delta_4^i(h) = [-\rho_i^h h]_{h=0,\dots,H} = -\delta_1^i(h)$. If we split the columns $\tilde{\delta}_2^i(h)$ into the sub-determinants (in the same way as for $\tilde{\gamma}_1^i(h)$) we have a binary tree for which each node has two children of which the one which includes the column $\delta_3^i(h)$ will be null since this column is a linear function of the column $\tilde{\gamma}_2^i(h)$. This implies that the only term which remains in each split is $\delta_4^i(h)$ which is simply the negative of $\delta_1^i(h)$ and there will be as many $\delta_4^i(h)$ columns as the original $\tilde{\delta}_2^i(h)$ columns. Given this structure, we have that the determinant becomes

$$|A| = c \underbrace{\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} c_s (-1)^{\sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{1}_{s(i)=2}}}_{c_{s^*}} \underbrace{|\delta_1^1(h) \cdots \delta_1^K(h) \tilde{\gamma}_2^1(h) \cdots \tilde{\gamma}_2^K(h)|}_{\lambda}.$$

We therefore have that the determinant λ is the determinant of the following matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1^0 0 & \rho_2^0 0 & \cdots & \rho_K^0 0 & \rho_1^0 & \rho_2^0 & \cdots & \rho_K^0 \\ \rho_1^1 1 & \rho_2^1 1 & \cdots & \rho_K^1 1 & \rho_1^1 & \rho_2^1 & \cdots & \rho_K^1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \rho_1^H H & \rho_2^H H & \cdots & \rho_K^H H & \rho_1^H & \rho_2^H & \cdots & \rho_K^H \end{pmatrix}$$

which is clearly full column rank. Indeed, the last K columns are those of a Vandermonde matrix with distinct elements $\rho_i \neq \rho_j, \forall i \neq j$, implying that the columns are linearly independent, while the first K columns are a Vandermonde matrix whose rows are multiplied by distinct constants thereby implying that also these columns are linearly independent. Moreover, the first K columns can be seen as functions of the last K columns which cannot however be expressed as a linear combination of the others. Therefore there is no column that can be expressed as a linear combination of the others implying that $\lambda \neq 0$. As for the term c_{s^*} it can be interpreted in a geometric manner since it represents the K -dimensional volume of a hyperrectangle with sides $(1 - \rho_i^2)$ given by

$$c_{s^*} = \prod_{i=1}^K (1 - \rho_i^2)$$

where $0 < \prod_{i=1}^K (1 - \rho_i^2) < 1$. If we permute the columns so as to respect the order of the parameters in the original vector θ , this finally delivers the determinant

$$|A| = \prod_{i=1}^K \left(\frac{v_i^2}{\rho_i (1 - \rho_i^2)^2} \right) \lambda \neq 0$$

thereby implying that the Jacobian matrix A is of full column rank and, consequently, that a sum of K (P6) processes is globally identifiable for the ACVF

$\varphi_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(h)$. Notice that if we were to add processes (P1) and (P2) to the above procedure, the only detail that would change is the matrix B. Indeed, considering the derivatives of their respective ACVFs, if they were inserted in the original matrix A these columns would remain unaffected by the operations thereby delivering the matrix

$$\tilde{B} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1^0 0 & \rho_2^0 0 & \cdots & \rho_K^0 0 & \rho_1^0 & \rho_2^0 & \cdots & \rho_K^0 & 1 & 2 \\ \rho_1^1 1 & \rho_2^1 1 & \cdots & \rho_K^1 1 & \rho_1^1 & \rho_2^1 & \cdots & \rho_K^1 & 0 & -1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \rho_1^H H & \rho_2^H H & \cdots & \rho_K^H H & \rho_1^H & \rho_2^H & \cdots & \rho_K^H & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

which is also clearly full rank with determinant $\tilde{\lambda} \neq 0$. This implies that the ACVF of a latent process made by the sum of K (P6) processes, a (P1) process and a (P2) process is identifiable through the parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Given this result, using Lemma C.3 we have that there is a one-to-one mapping between the ACVF and the spectral density $S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f)$. For a sum of K (P6) processes the latter is given by

$$S_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(f) = \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{v_j^2}{1 - 2\rho_j \cos(2\pi f) + \rho_j^2}.$$

If we consider the condition given in Lemma C.2, with ρ_j and v_j^2 denoting the elements of the true parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{v_j^2}{1 - 2\rho_j \cos(4\pi f) + \rho_j^2} - \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\tilde{v}_j^2}{1 - 2\tilde{\rho}_j \cos(4\pi f) + \tilde{\rho}_j^2} \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{v_j^2}{32(1 - 2\rho_j \cos(2\pi f) + \rho_j^2)} - \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{\tilde{v}_j^2}{32(1 - 2\tilde{\rho}_j \cos(2\pi f) + \tilde{\rho}_j^2)} \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\rho}_j$ and \tilde{v}_j^2 denote the elements of a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. This condition is clearly not respected since the left side of the equation cannot be expressed as the right side. Indeed, we would need to obtain $32(1 - 2\rho_j \cos(2\pi f) + \rho_j^2)$ from the expression $(1 - 2\rho_j \cos(4\pi f) + \rho_j^2)$ which is not possible. If we add processes (P1) and (P2) to this condition and denote the spectral density of the i^{th} (P6) process as α_i we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sigma^2 + \frac{4Q^2}{\tau} \sin^2(\pi 2f\tau) + \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i - \tilde{\sigma}^2 - \frac{4\tilde{Q}^2}{\tau} \sin^2(\pi 2f\tau) - \sum_{i=1}^K \tilde{\alpha}_i \\ &= \frac{\sigma^2}{32} + \frac{Q^2}{8\tau} \sin^2(\pi f\tau) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \alpha_i - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}^2}{32} - \frac{\tilde{Q}^2}{8\tau} \sin^2(\pi f\tau) - \frac{1}{32} \sum_{i=1}^K \tilde{\alpha}_i \end{aligned}$$

Also in this case, it is straightforward to see that the condition of Lemma C.2 is not respected either since the spectral density of process (P1) does not depend on f and is constant while that of process (P2) cannot be re-expressed in this form. Having verified all the conditions of Lemma 3.1, we have that the parameters of the process Y_t^* are globally identifiable for the GMWM. \square

C.7.4. Proof of Assumption 3.1 for an ARMA(2,1)

Let us denote the parameters of an ARMA(2,1) process as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = [\tilde{\rho}_1 \ \tilde{\rho}_2 \ \tilde{\varrho} \ \tilde{v}^2]^T$. Given the reparametrization of the sum of two (P6) processes to an ARMA(2,1) process given in Hamilton [1994] (equation 4.7.26, Section 4.7), we have that the parameters of an ARMA(2,1) process are given by

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\rho}_1 \\ \tilde{\rho}_2 \\ \tilde{\varrho} \\ \tilde{v}^2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \rho_1 + \rho_2 \\ -\rho_1\rho_2 \\ \frac{\rho_1 v_1^2 + \rho_2 v_2^2}{v_1^2 + v_2^2} \\ v_1^2 + v_2^2 \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\rho_1 \ v_1^2 \ \rho_2 \ v_2^2]^T$ is the vector of parameters for the sum of two (P6) processes. By taking the Jacobian $\mathbf{A} = \partial/\partial\boldsymbol{\theta} \ \mathbf{g}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ and using the reasoning given in (3.3), we have that the determinant of this matrix is given by

$$|\mathbf{A}| = \frac{(\rho_1 - \rho_2)^2}{v_1^2 + v_2^2}$$

which is always positive thereby implying that the matrix \mathbf{A} is of full rank and that there is a unique mapping from the parameters of a sum of two (P6) processes to those of an ARMA(2,1) process. \square

C.7.5. Proof of Lemma 3.3

The proof is straightforward for both classes of processes. Considering the process $Y_t = \sum_{i=1}^4 X_t^{(i)}$, if we take the first four consecutive WV scales (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = [\eta_1^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1), \dots, \eta_4^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)]$), we have that the determinant of the relative Jacobian matrix $|A_{4,4}| = 2^{205\omega}/4096$ which implies that it is of full rank. Considering the other process $Y_t = \sum_{i=3}^5 X_t^{(i)}$, with the same approach as the proof of the first process, if we take the first four consecutive WV scales (i.e. $\boldsymbol{\eta}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) = [\eta_1^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1), \dots, \eta_4^2(\boldsymbol{\theta}_1)]$), we have that the determinant of the relative Jacobian matrix $|A_{4,4}| = -2^{205\omega\varrho}/256$ which implies that it is of full rank. \square

C.8. Proof of Theorem 3.2

The proof of Theorem 3.2 is a direct result of Lemma 2.1 for which we have that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{P}} \boldsymbol{\nu}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$. Condition (C5) is verified under Theorem 2.3 and condition

(C7) is also verified for a wide range of models based on the results of Section 3.1. Assuming conditions (C6), (C8) and (C9), we have that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ based on the RGMWM is consistent since it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.1 in Harris and Mátyás [1999], thereby concluding the proof. \square

C.9. Proof of Theorem 3.3

The proof of Theorem 3.3 is a direct result of Theorem 2.3, for which we have that

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}} - \boldsymbol{\nu}) \xrightarrow[T \rightarrow \infty]{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}_J(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{M}^{-T} \mathbf{S}_\psi(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{M}^{-1}).$$

Given that condition (C11) is verified for the processes considered in Section 3.1 and assuming condition (C10), based on the proof of Theorem 3.2 we have that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ using the RGMWM is normally distributed since it satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.2 in Harris and Mátyás [1999]. This concludes the proof. \square

Appendix D: Robust Wavelet Variance Bias

Following Theorem 2.3, the proposed estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\nu}}$ is consistent under the standard Gaussian distribution for the wavelet coefficients which in turn depend on the observed series supposedly generated by a specific model F_θ .

If one supposes that the Gaussian distribution is at most a fair approximation of the data generating model, then the latter should be considered as belonging to a neighbourhood of the postulated model, say F_ϵ , also called the contaminated distribution. Under F_ϵ , the proposed estimator is hence biased, albeit that the bias is bounded as a result of the bounded ψ -functions. The size of the bias depends on the tuning constant c and the form of the ψ -function. Hence, by fixing the desired efficiency of the resulting estimator via an appropriate tuning constant c , the choice of the ψ -function could be seen as a bias-minimization problem.

This bias-minimization problem was considered by Huber [1981] within the “minimax” approach. Hampel et al. [1986] consider the (general) case of a contaminated distribution $F_\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)F_\theta + \epsilon H$, $0 \leq \epsilon < 1$ (in our case, F_θ denotes the standard Gaussian model). Let us also write the estimator defined through the function ψ as a functional of the underlying distribution, i.e. $T(F_\epsilon)$ or $T(F_\theta)$, and we suppose it to be Fisher consistent (i.e. $E_{F_\theta}[\psi(r_{j,t}; c)] = 0$, with $r_{j,t}$ being a standard Gaussian variable which represents the standardised wavelet coefficients in the context of this paper). Using a Von Mises expansion of $T(F_\epsilon)$ around $T(F_\theta)$, the (approximate) asymptotic bias of the estimator is expressed as

$$T(F_\epsilon) - T(F_\theta) \approx \epsilon \int \text{IF}(r, \psi, F_\theta) dH(r) \quad (\text{D-1})$$

where $\text{IF}(r, \psi, F_\theta)$ is the IF of the estimator and $r = r_{j,t}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$.

The bias of $T(\cdot)$ under a contaminated distribution F_ϵ is hence directly proportional to its IF under the contaminating distribution H . Therefore, given a

desired level of efficiency (i.e. having selected the tuning constant c), it is possible to select a ψ -function over another one by comparing their (approximate) bias.

The IF of an M -estimator is given by

$$\text{IF}(r, \psi, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = M^{-1}(\psi, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\psi(r, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \quad (\text{D-2})$$

where $M(\psi, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ for Fisher consistent M -estimators is defined as

$$M(\psi, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \int \psi(r, \boldsymbol{\theta})s^T(r, \boldsymbol{\theta})dF_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(r)$$

with $s(r, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ being the score function ($s(r, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = r^2$ in our case). Since $M(\psi, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ depends on the underlying ψ -function and is constant under a postulated model $F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, we will denote it generically as M_{ψ} . Using (D-1) yields the following approximate bias for the proposed estimator

$$B_{\psi}(H, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \epsilon M_{\psi}^{-1} \int \psi(r, \boldsymbol{\theta})dH(r). \quad (\text{D-3})$$

If $H = F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, the IF has value 0 and, consequently, so does the bias. As (D-3) shows, given a contaminating distribution H , the bias of the proposed estimator ultimately depends on the chosen ψ -function. The choice of the ψ -function can therefore be made based on the minimization of a risk-function which takes into account expression (D-3). A possible risk-function could simply be

$$\text{tr} (B_{\psi}(H, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})B_{\psi}^T(H, F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}})). \quad (\text{D-4})$$

To compare the bias-performance of the Huber and Tukey biweight ψ -functions (indexed with $[Hub]$ and $[Bi]$ respectively), we computed (D-4) for H being the dirac distribution with pointmass at $\delta \in [0, 10]$. The tuning constants for the two ψ -functions were chosen to guarantee 95% asymptotic efficiency at the normal model, yielding $c_{[Hub]} \cong 2.38$ and $c_{[Bi]} \cong 7.88$.

As the top part of Figure 4 highlights, the risk function of the $\psi_{[Bi]}$ -function peaks and descends becoming constant around $c_{[Bi]} \cong 7.88$, whereas the $\psi_{[Hub]}$ -function grows and remains constant after $c_{[Hub]} \cong 2.38$. Having approximately the same behavior until around $\delta = 5$ (with the $\psi_{[Bi]}$ -function's risk being greater over a small interval), the risk of the $\psi_{[Bi]}$ -function is constantly smaller, indicating that the latter function appears to have an overall better performance in terms of risk.

In the bottom of Figure 4 the risk function of the ψ -functions are computed with H being another zero-mean Gaussian distribution with $\sigma^2 \in (0, 30]$. It can again be seen how the risk of the two functions initially behave in a similar way whereas the $\psi_{[Bi]}$ -function's risk becomes constantly smaller compared to the one of the $\psi_{[Hub]}$ -function after a given magnitude of contamination. In addition, we can see how both functions deliver unbiased estimators when the contaminating distribution corresponds to the true distribution $F_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ (i.e. when the contaminating variance equals 1).




FIG 4. Top: theoretical risk function for a series of Dirac points. Bottom: theoretical risk function for a Gaussian contamination with different scale parameters

Appendix E: Simulation results for WV estimation

In the WV simulations we compare the proposed estimator of WV $\hat{\nu}$ based on Tukey's biweight function (RWV) with:

- the classical MODWT estimator (CL);
- the robust estimator proposed by [Mondal and Percival \[2012\]](#) (MP).

For $\hat{\nu}$ we chose a tuning constant c which delivered a 60% efficiency with respect to the classical estimator. This level of efficiency therefore aims for a higher degree of robustness which approaches the degree provided by the median-type estimator used in the simulations in [Mondal and Percival \[2012\]](#) hence allowing for a fairer comparison between their estimator and the one proposed in this paper.

To compare the above estimators, we investigate their performance on the first 4 scales of WV ($j = 1, \dots, 4$) on the following models and contamination:

- **WN**: a zero-mean white noise process with innovation variance $\sigma^2 = 1$ and with scale-based contamination at scale $j = 3$ with $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 9$;
- **RW**: a zero-mean random walk process with innovation variance $\gamma^2 = 1$ and with scale-based contamination at scale $j = 3$ with $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 100$;
- **AR(1)**: a zero-mean first-order autoregressive process with parameter vector $[\rho \ v^2]^T = [0.9 \ 1]^T$ and with replacement-type outliers with $\epsilon = 0.01$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 100$.
- **AR(4)**: a zero-mean fourth-order autoregressive process with parameter vector $[\rho_1 \ \rho_2 \ \rho_3 \ \rho_4 \ v^2]^T = [-0.6 \ -0.2 \ 0.1 \ 0.1 \ 0.5]^T$ and with additive-type outliers with $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 9$.

The results of the simulations for the different scales can be seen in [Figure 5](#) where the top row shows the observed RMSE* in the uncontaminated setting while the middle and last rows show the observed RMSE* and Bias* under contamination respectively.

The simulations highlight how the estimators all perform better at the first scales and, as expected, gradually become less precise as the scale increases given the lower number of wavelet coefficients. More specifically however it shows how the proposed WV estimator $\hat{\nu}$ is always the best alternative to the classical estimator CL in an uncontaminated setting whereas it is also the best estimator overall when the observed time series is contaminated.




FIG 5. Top row: RMSE* of the three WV estimators in an uncontaminated setting. Middle row: RMSE* of the three WV estimators in a contaminated setting. Bottom row: Bias* of the three WV estimators in a contaminated setting.

Appendix F: Additional Results from Application on Inertial Sensor Data

In this appendix we find other results for the application on the inertial sensor measurements studied in Section 5.1. Figure 6 shows the WV plots which are in the same spirit of those provided for the application in Section 5.2 and are interpreted in the same manner.




FIG 6. Log-log scale Wavelet Variance plots for the inertial sensor series. Top left: classic estimated WV superposed with model-implied WV based on the parameters estimated through the GMWM. Top right: classic and robust estimated WV with respective confidence intervals superposed. Bottom left: classic and robust model-implied WV based on GMWM and RGMWM estimates respectively. Bottom right: robust estimated WV superposed with model-implied WV based on the parameters estimated through the RGMWM.

It can be seen how the different estimations are significantly different at the lower scales where the outliers have more of an influence on estimations. The model-implied WV is plotted based on the parameter estimates of the GMWM and RGMWM which can be found in Table 2 below along with their respective confidence intervals. Given the length of the signal, it can be seen how some estimates are the same between methods and the confidence intervals are extremely tight, appearing to be identical to the estimate itself due to the rounding (see, for example, the estimates and confidence intervals for ρ_1 and ρ_2). Considering these details, we can remark that the parameters of the first two autoregressive processes are significantly different from each other underlining that although the percentage of outliers is considerably low, the contamination

appears to have an impact on the estimation process and robust methods should therefore be preferred.

TABLE 2
 State-space model estimates for the gyroscope data in static conditions. Estimated parameters with GMWM and RGMWM estimators with ρ_i being the i^{th} autoregressive parameter, v_i^2 the innovation variance of the i^{th} autoregressive model. Confidence intervals (CI) based on the approach used in Guerrier et al. [2013].

	GMWM		RGMWM	
	Estimate	CI(, 95%)	Estimate	CI(, 95%)
ρ_1	$8.9546 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$(8.9546 \cdot 10^{-2} ; 8.9546 \cdot 10^{-2})$	$1.4816 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$(1.4816 \cdot 10^{-1} ; 1.4816 \cdot 10^{-1})$
v_1^2	$7.8760 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$(7.8612 \cdot 10^{-5} ; 7.8909 \cdot 10^{-5})$	$5.5325 \cdot 10^{-5}$	$(5.5211 \cdot 10^{-5} ; 5.5439 \cdot 10^{-5})$
ρ_2	$9.9831 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$(9.9831 \cdot 10^{-1} ; 9.9831 \cdot 10^{-1})$	$9.9687 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$(9.9687 \cdot 10^{-1} ; 9.9687 \cdot 10^{-1})$
v_2^2	$2.5632 \cdot 10^{-10}$	$(2.0887 \cdot 10^{-10} ; 3.0377 \cdot 10^{-10})$	$1.0466 \cdot 10^{-9}$	$(9.4291 \cdot 10^{-10} ; 1.1504 \cdot 10^{-9})$
ρ_3	$9.9997 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$(9.9995 \cdot 10^{-1} ; 9.9999 \cdot 10^{-1})$	$9.9997 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$(9.9995 \cdot 10^{-1} ; 9.9999 \cdot 10^{-1})$
v_3^2	$1.1915 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$(7.5299 \cdot 10^{-12} ; 1.6300 \cdot 10^{-11})$	$1.3626 \cdot 10^{-11}$	$(8.7412 \cdot 10^{-12} ; 1.8511 \cdot 10^{-11})$

Appendix G: Ocean Measurements Wavelet Variance

A common example in the domain of wavelet-based analysis of time series is the vertical ocean shear measurements data taken from Percival and Walden [2000]. Although we cannot define it exactly as a time series, the ordering variable of the data is the ocean depth in function of which a series of measurements were taken. In particular this series concerns measurements of the velocity of water as a function of water depth (starting from 350 meters and going down to 1037.4 meters). These measurements are first-differenced over intervals of 10 meters and then low-pass filtered. Figure 7 shows us the classical and robust estimated WV for this dataset. It can be seen how both robust estimators give roughly equivalent estimations and how they lie well below the classical estimator confidence intervals at the smaller scales. Percival and Walden [2000] attribute this upward bias of the classical Haar-based WV to the phenomenon of leakage which is due to the poor finite sample approximation of the periodogram to the power spectral density. Hence, the proposed robust estimator $\hat{\nu}$ [as well as that proposed by Mondal and Percival, 2012], in this particular case, could be considered as an alternative to the use of other types of wavelets (i.e. the LA(8) filter in this case) for the reduction of this bias.




FIG 7. Estimated WV for the vertical ocean shear measurements series with the classical WV estimator (CL), the proposed estimator (RWV) and the robust estimator proposed by Mondal and Percival [2012] (MP).

Appendix H: Application to Precipitation Data

The monthly precipitation data from 1907 to 1972 is taken from [Hipel and McLeod \[1994\]](#) and is shown in the top panel of Figure 8. The modelling approach described in this section is the Environmental System Model (ESM) of a watershed which, despite being less used due to other more recent approaches [such as, for example, adaptive neural networks in [Tokar and Johnson, 1999](#)], can still be highly useful for practitioners who wish to have a straightforward and clear tool to describe and interpret phenomena linked to the water cycle. Moreover, the example clearly shows how our method can help detect dependence where classical methods may not due to contamination in the data (be this in the domain of hydrology or others). The goal of the ESM is to explain how water resources behave and are distributed throughout their cycles from the stage of precipitation to river flows. [Salas and Smith \[1981\]](#) describe how the precipitation model is the basis for the models of the following stages in the ESM. Three models are envisaged by [Salas and Smith \[1981\]](#) for the precipitation stage among which the independent precipitation (i.e. a white noise process) and the AR(1) model.




FIG 8. (Top panel) Monthly precipitation series from 1907 to 1972 taken from [Hipel and McLeod \[1994\]](#). (Bottom panels) Estimated autocorrelation function (left) and estimated partial autocorrelation function (right) of the precipitation series.

Analyzing the AutoCorrelation Function (ACF) and Partial AutoCorrelation Function (PACF) in the bottom panels of Figure 8 one would identify an independent precipitation model for the this dataset. However, an AR(1) model was fitted to understand if the independent model was reasonable.

Table 3 shows the estimated parameters for the AR(1) precipitation model. The latter model has different estimates between the classical estimators and the proposed robust one. In fact, the ML and GMWM estimates tend to agree with the independent model assumption where the confidence intervals (CI) for the autoregressive parameter include the value of zero, whereas the RGMWM detects a stronger dependence with the previous precipitation measurement and a smaller variance of the innovation process (with CI not overlapping those of the ML and GMWM). This could be due to the fact that the classical ACF and PACF are sensitive to outliers and may not detect this correlation structure [see Maronna et al., 2006].

TABLE 3
AR(1) estimates for the mean monthly precipitation data from 1907 to 1972 taken from Hipel and McLeod [1994]. Estimated parameters with ML, GMWM and RGMWM estimators with $\hat{\phi}$ being the estimated autoregressive parameter and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ the innovation variance. Confidence Intervals (CI) based on the approach used in Guerrier et al. [2013].

	$\hat{\phi}$	$\hat{\sigma}^2$
ML	$6.463 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.222 \cdot 10^{-1}$
CI	$[-5.702 \cdot 10^{-3}, 1.255 \cdot 10^{-1}]$	$[2.014 \cdot 10^{-1}, 2.413 \cdot 10^{-1}]$
GMWM	$5.384 \cdot 10^{-2}$	$2.205 \cdot 10^{-1}$
CI	$[-1.758 \cdot 10^{-2}, 1.255 \cdot 10^{-1}]$	$[1.984 \cdot 10^{-1}, 2.439 \cdot 10^{-1}]$
RGMWM	$3.892 \cdot 10^{-1}$	$1.016 \cdot 10^{-1}$
CI	$[3.008 \cdot 10^{-1}, 4.813 \cdot 10^{-1}]$	$[8.943 \cdot 10^{-2}, 1.133 \cdot 10^{-1}]$

If the ESM were to be used in this context, it would be greatly affected by a miss-specified model for the precipitation since it would condition the model choice and relative parameter estimation in the following phases of the water cycle. In this example, the choice of an independent precipitation model would have lead to a domino-effect in terms of model miss-specification and misestimation leading to possibly highly incorrect interpretations and conclusions.

References

- AGOSTINELLI, C. AND BISAGLIA, L. ARFIMA processes and outliers: a weighted likelihood approach, 2010.
- ALLENDE, H. AND HEILER, S. Recursive generalized m estimates for autoregressive moving-average models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 13:1–18, 1992.
- BEATON, A. E. AND TUKEY, J. W. The fitting of power series, meaning polynomials, illustrated on band-spectroscopic data. *Technometrics*, 16:147–185, 1974.

- BIANCO, A. M. AND GARCIA BEN, M. AND MARTINEZ, E. J. AND YOHAI, V. J. Robust procedures for regression models with ARIMA errors. In *Proceedings in Computational Statistics, COMPSTAT 96*, pages 27–38, Heidelberg, 1996. Physica-Verlag.
- BILLINGSLEY, P. *Convergence of probability measures*, volume 493. John Wiley & Sons, 2009.
- BRUCE, A. G. AND DONOHO, D. L. AND GAO, H. Y. AND MARTIN, R. D. Denoising and robust non-linear wavelet analysis. In *SPIE Proceedings, Wavelet Applications*, pages 325–336, 1994.
- BRUNNERMEIER, MARKUS K AND NAGEL, STEFAN. Do wealth fluctuations generate time-varying risk aversion? micro-evidence on individuals asset allocation (digest summary). *American Economic Review*, 98(3):713–736, 2008.
- BUSTOS, O. H. AND YOHAI, V. J. Robust estimates for arma models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81:155–168, 1986.
- CANTONI, E. AND RONCHETTI, E. Resistant selection of the smoothing parameter for smoothing splines. *Statistics and Computing*, 11:141–146, 2001.
- CHRISTMANN, ANDREAS AND MESSEM, ARNOUT VAN. Bouligand derivatives and robustness of support vector machines for regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9:915–936, 2008.
- CIPRA, T. Robust exponential smoothing. *Journal of Forecasting*, 11:57–69, 1992.
- CIPRA, T. AND HANZAK, T. Exponential smoothing for time series with outliers. *Kybernetika*, 4:165–178, 2011.
- CIZEK, P. Efficient robust estimation of time-series regression models. *Application of Mathematics*, 53:267–279, 2008.
- CLARKE, BRENTON R. Nonsmooth analysis and fréchet differentiability of m-functionals. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 73(2):197–209, 1986.
- CROUX, C. AND GELPER, S. AND MAHIEU, K. Robust exponential smoothing of multivariate time series. *Journal of Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 54:2999–3006, 2010.
- DAUBECHIES, I. *Ten Lectures on Wavelets*. SIAM, Philadelphia, 1992.
- DE LUNA, X. AND GENTON, M. G. Robust simulation-based estimation of arma models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 10(2):370–387, 2001.
- DENBY, L. AND MARTIN, R. D. Robust estimation of the first-order autoregressive parameter. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 74(365):140–146, 1979.
- DENKER, M. Uniform integrability and the central limit theorem for strongly mixing processes. *Dependence in probability and statistics*, 11:269–289, 1986.
- DHRYMES, J. Moments of truncated (normal) distributions. *Unpublished note*, 10:95–107, 2005.
- EL-SHEIMY, N. AND HOU, H. AND NIU, X. Analysis and modeling of inertial sensors using allan variance. *Instrumentation and Measurement, IEEE Transactions on*, 57(1):140–149, January 2008. ISSN 0018-9456.
- FIELD, C. AND SMITH, B. Robust estimation - a weighted maximum likelihood approach. *International Statistical Review*, 62:405–424, 1994.

- FRIED, R. AND EINBECK, J. AND GATHER, U. Weighted repeated median smoothing and filtering. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102:1300–1308, 2007.
- GELPER, S. AND FRIED, R. AND CROUX, C. Robust forecasting with exponential and Holt-Winters smoothing. *Journal of Forecasting*, 29:285–300, 2010.
- GENTON, M. G. AND RONCHETTI, E. Robust indirect inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(461):67–76, March 2003. ISSN 0162-1459.
- GOURIEROUX, C. AND MONFORT, A. AND RENAULT, E. Indirect inference. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 8:S85–S118, May 1993.
- GRANGER, C. W. AND MORRIS, M. J. Time Series Modelling and Interpretation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series A*, pages 246–257, 1976.
- GREENHALL, C.A. Spectral ambiguity of allan variance. *IEEE Transactions on Instrumentation and Measurement*, 47(3):623–627, June 1998.
- GUERRIER, S. AND MOLINARI, R. AND STEBLER, Y. Inadequacy of allan variance-based regression for time series model estimation and advancement of moments-based methods. *Submitted manuscript*, 2015.
- GUERRIER, S. AND MOLINARI, R. AND VICTORIA-FESER, M. P. Estimation of Time Series Models via Robust Wavelet Variance. *Austrian Journal of Statistics*, pages 267–277, 2014.
- GUERRIER, S. AND STEBLER, Y. AND SKALLOUD, J. AND VICTORIA-FESER, M. P. Wavelet variance based estimation for composite stochastic processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108(503):1021–1030, 2013.
- GUERRIER, S. AND WAegli, A. AND SKALLOUD, J. AND VICTORIA-FESER, M. P. Fault detection and isolation in multiple mems-imus configurations. *Aerospace and Electronic Systems, IEEE Transactions on*, 48(3):2015–2031, 2012.
- HAMILTON, J.D. *Time Series Analysis*, volume 10. Cambridge Univ Press, 1994.
- HAMPEL, F. R. AND RONCHETTI, E. M. AND ROUSSEEUW, P. J. AND STAHEL, W. A. *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. John Wiley, New York, 1986.
- HANSEN, L. P. Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 50(4):1029–1054, July 1982a. ISSN 0012-9682.
- HANSEN, LARS PETER. Large sample properties of generalized method of moments estimators. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, pages 1029–1054, 1982b.
- HÄRDLE, W. AND GASSER, T. Robust non-parametric function fitting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Ser. B*, 46:42–51, 1984.
- HARRIS, D. AND MÁTYÁS, L. Introduction to the Generalized Method of Moments Estimation. In László Mátyás, editor, *Generalized Method of Moments Estimation*, Themes in Modern Econometrics, pages 3–30. Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- HIPPEL, K. W. AND MCLEOD, A. I. *Time series modelling of water resources*

- and environmental systems. Elsevier, 1994.
- HUBER, P. J. *Robust Statistics*. John Wiley, New York, 1981.
- HUBER, PETER J. The behavior of maximum likelihood estimates under non-standard conditions. In *Proceedings of the fifth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability*, volume 1, pages 221–233, 1967.
- KOENKER, ROGER AND XIAO, ZHIJIE. Quantile autoregression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):980–990, 2006.
- KRIM, H. AND SCHICK, I. Minimax description length for signal denoising and optimized representation. 45:898–908, 1999.
- KÜNSCH, H. Infinitesimal robustness for autoregressive processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12:843–863, 1984.
- LA VECCHIA, D. AND TROJANI, F. Infinitesimal robustness for diffusions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105:703–712, 2010.
- LA VECCHIA, DAVIDE AND TROJANI, FABIO. Infinitesimal robustness for diffusions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(490):703–712, 2010.
- MA, Y. AND GENTON, M. Highly robust estimation of the autocovariance function. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 21:663–684, 2000.
- MALLAT, S. *A wavelet tour of signal processing*. Academic press, 1999. ISBN 012466606X.
- MANCINI, L. AND RONCHETTI, E. AND TROJANI, F. Optimal conditionally unbiased bounded-influence inference in dynamic location and scale models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100:628–641, 2005.
- MARONNA, R. A. AND MARTIN, R. D. AND YOHAI, V. J. *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods*. Wiley, Chichester, West Sussex, UK, 2006.
- MARTIN, R. D. AND YOHAI, V. J. Influence functionals for time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 14:781–818, 1986.
- MASRELIEZ, C. J. AND MARTIN, R. D. Robust Bayesian estimation for the linear model and robustifying the Kalman filter. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 22:361–371, 1977.
- MOLINARES, F. F. AND REISEN, V. A. AND CRIBARI-NETO, F. Robust estimation in longmemory processes under additive outliers. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139:2511–2525, 2009.
- MONDAL, D. AND PERCIVAL, D. B. M-estimation of wavelet variance. *Annals of The Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 64(1):27–53, 2012.
- MULER, N. AND PEA, D. AND YOHAI, V. J. Robust estimation for ARMA models. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:816–840, 2009.
- ORTELLI, C. AND TROJANI, F. Robust efficient method of moments. *Journal of Econometrics*, 128:6997, 2005.
- PANKRATZ, ALAN. *Forecasting with dynamic regression models*, volume 935. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- PAPOULIS, A. *Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Process*. McGraw-Hill, Inc., third edition edition, 1991.
- PERCIVAL, D. B. On estimation of the wavelet variance. *Biometrika*, 82:619–631, 1995.
- PERCIVAL, D. B. AND GUTTORP, P. Long-memory processes, the allan vari-

- ance and wavelets. *Wavelets in Geophysics*, 4:325–344, 1994a.
- PERCIVAL, D. B. AND WALDEN, A. T. *Wavelet Methods for Time Series Analysis*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 32 Avenue of the Americas, New York, NY 10013-2473, USA, 2000.
- PERCIVAL, DONALD B AND GUTTORP, PETER. Long-memory processes, the allan variance and wavelets. *Wavelets in geophysics*, 4:325–344, 1994b.
- RENAUD, O. Sensitivity and other properties of wavelet regression and density estimators. *Statistica Sinica*, 12:1275–1290, 2002.
- RONCHETTI, E. AND TROJANI, F. Robust inference with GMM estimators. *Journal of Econometrics*, 101:37–69, 2001.
- ROUSSEEUW, P. J. AND CROUX, C. Alternatives to the median absolute deviation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88:1273–1283, 1993.
- SALAS, J. D. AND SMITH, R. A. Physical basis of stochastic models of annual flows. *Water Resources Research*, 17(2):428–430, 1981.
- SARDY, S. AND TSENG, P. AND BRUCE, A. G. Robust wavelet denoising. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 49:1146–1152, 2001.
- SARNAGLIA, A. J. Q. AND REISEN, V. A. AND LÉVY-LEDUC, C. Robust estimation of periodic autoregressive processes in the presence of additive outliers. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 101:2168–2183, 2010.
- SCHOLTES, STEFAN. *Introduction to piecewise differentiable equations*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- SERROUKH, A. AND WALDEN, A. T. AND PERCIVAL, D. B. Statistical properties and uses of the wavelet variance estimator for the scale analysis of time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 95:184–196, 2000.
- SLACALEK, JIRI AND SOMMER, MARTIN. What drives household saving? 2012.
- STEBLER, Y. AND GUERRIER, S. AND SKALLOUD, J. AND VICTORIA-FESER, M. P. The generalised method of wavelet moments for inertial navigation filter design. *IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems*, 2014. To appear.
- TITTERTON, D.H. AND WESTON, J.L. *Strapdown Inertial Navigation Technology*. Peter Peregrinus Ltd, 1997.
- TOKAR, A SEZIN AND JOHNSON, PEGGY A. Rainfall-runoff modeling using artificial neural networks. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 4(3):232–239, 1999.
- TUKEY, J. W. *Exploratory Data Analysis*. Addison-Wesley, Massachussets, 1977. Preliminary editions: 1970, 1971.
- VIDERAS, JULIO AND WU, STEPHEN. The behavioral effects of financial shocks. 2004.
- WOOLDRIDGE, J. M. Estimation and inference for dependent processes. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:2639–2738, 1994.
- YOHAI, V. J. AND ZAMAR, R. H. High breakdown point estimates of regression by means of the minimization of an efficient scale. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83:406–413, 1988.
- ZHANG, N. F. Allan variance of time series models for measurement data. *Metrologia*, 45:549–561, 2008.