

# Adaptive Student's t-distribution with method of moments moving estimator for nonstationary time series

Jarek Duda

Jagiellonian University, Golebia 24, 31-007 Krakow, Poland, Email: [dudajar@gmail.com](mailto:dudajar@gmail.com)

**Abstract**—The real life time series are usually nonstationary, bringing a difficult question of model adaptation. Classical approaches like ARMA-ARCH assume arbitrary type of dependence. To avoid such bias, we will focus on recently proposed agnostic philosophy of moving estimator: in time  $t$  finding parameters optimizing e.g.  $F_t = \sum_{\tau < t} (1 - \eta)^{t-\tau} \ln(\rho_\theta(x_\tau))$  moving log-likelihood, evolving in time. It allows for example to estimate parameters using inexpensive exponential moving averages (EMA), like absolute central moments  $E[|x - \mu|^p]$  evolving for one or multiple powers  $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$  using  $m_{p,t+1} = m_{p,t} + \eta(|x_t - \mu_t|^p - m_{p,t})$ . Application of such general adaptive methods of moments will be presented on Student's t-distribution, popular especially in economical applications, here applied to log-returns of DJIA companies. While standard ARMA-ARCH approaches provide evolution of  $\mu$  and  $\sigma$ , here we also get evolution of  $\nu$  describing  $\rho(x) \sim |x|^{-\nu-1}$  tail shape, probability of extreme events - which might turn out catastrophic, destabilizing the market.

**Keywords:** nonstationary time series, Student's t-distribution, adaptive models, methods of moments, heavy tails

## I. INTRODUCTION

Choosing a parametric family of probability distributions, e.g. Student's t-distribution here, there is usually focus on intuitively **static estimation**: optimization of a single set of parameters  $\theta$  for the entire dataset, usually through maximization of some of evaluation like  $F = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f(\theta, x_t)$ . For example log-likelihood in popular MLE (maximal likelihood estimation) using  $f(\theta, x) = \ln(\rho_\theta(x))$ , where  $\rho_\theta(x)$  is PDF (probability distribution function) for the assumed parametric family. This way all datapoints have equal  $1/T$  contributions, what seems a perfect choice for stationary time series.

In contrast, real life time series are often non-stationary, suggesting to use **adaptive estimation** [1] instead - with evolving parameters, like  $\theta_t = (\mu_t, \sigma_t, \nu_t)$  in Fig. 1 for Student's t-distribution we will focus on. Moving estimator for each time  $t$  will separately optimize  $\theta_t$  parameters based on the previous values  $\{x_\tau\}_{\tau < t}$  with weakening weights, to finally optimize:

$$F = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f(\theta_t, x_t) \quad \text{e.g. log-likelihood: } \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \ln(\rho_{\theta_t}(x_t)) \quad (1)$$

A natural approach to estimate  $\theta_t$  is optimizing analogous function  $F_t$ : using only the past values  $\{x_\tau\}_{\tau < t}$ , with exponentially weakening weights to get local behavior:

$$\theta_t = \arg \max_{\theta} F_t \quad \text{for } F_t = \sum_{\tau < t} \bar{\eta}^{t-\tau} \ln(\rho_\theta(x_\tau)) \quad (2)$$

for  $\bar{\eta} \in (0, 1)$  learning rate usually above 0.9, often replaced with  $\eta = 1 - \bar{\eta}$  for more convenient calculation.




Figure 1. Mathematica code used for moving estimation of all  $\theta = (\mu, \sigma, \nu)$  Student's t-distributions parameters (using  $M[\mu, p] = E[|(x-\mu)/\sigma|^p]$  moment formula (6)), and results of its application to century of daily log-returns of DJIA (Dow Jones Industrial Average) time series. The parameters were manually tuned for this case to maximize log-likelihood: mean  $\ln(\rho_t(x_t))$  showed at the bottom. We can see interesting evolution through this century which might be worth a deeper investigation, like  $\approx 5$  year period cyclic behavior of the center  $\mu$ , huge  $\approx 25 \times$  change of width  $\sigma$ , and a few nearly Gaussian  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  periods mostly during 1967-1983. While  $\mu$  describes the general up/down trend,  $\sigma$  is close to volatility, additional  $\nu$  complements it with kind of stability - probability of potentially catastrophic extreme events.

The above (2) moving MLE can be easily directly optimized




Figure 2. Log-likelihoods (mean  $\ln(\rho_t(x_t))$ ) evaluations for log-returns of century long DJIA time series, and 10 years for 29 individual companies. In horizontal axis there is  $1/\nu$  Student's t-distribution degrees of freedom (from Gauss to Cauchy distributions), for static parameters (orange), and adaptive  $\sigma$  scale parameter (blue, using  $p = 1$  power and  $\eta_2 = 0.05$  learning rate), all for  $\mu = 0$  center. We can see adaptation has allowed for less heavy tails (larger  $\nu$  in maximum). There are also shown analogously the best from  $\sigma$  adaptation for Exponential Power Distribution previous article [1] (gray). Red line shows evaluation of  $\sigma$  adaptation by standard GARCH(1,1) model - which is comparable with  $\nu = \infty$  Gaussian case, can be slightly worse or better, hence it might be worth to consider both.

for  $\sigma$  scale parameter of EPD (exponential power distribution)  $\rho(x) \sim \exp(-|x|^\kappa)$  [1] thin tail family containing e.g. Gauss and Laplace distributions, from **absolute central moments**:  $m_p = E[|x - \mu|^p]$ , for adaptation evolving with EMA (exponential moving average):

$$m_{p,t+1} = m_{p,t} + \eta(|x_t - \mu_t|^p - m_{p,t}) \quad (3)$$

using  $p = \kappa$  for EPD, and  $\mu_t$  as constant or also adapted using EMA. Here we will take it to Student's t-distribution, this time not through direct MLE due to lack of explicit formula, but through method of moments instead - estimating  $\sigma$  scale parameter from absolute central moment for a single power, or  $\nu$  degrees of freedom from such moments for two powers.

On example of 107 years Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) daily log-returns and 10 years for 29 its recent companies, there was tested such adaptive estimation especially of  $\sigma$ , leading to essentially better log-likelihood evaluation, here for Student's t-distribution slightly better than for EPD [1]. Also essentially better than standard methods of  $\sigma$  prediction like GARCH(1,1) [2] - from one side focused on Gaussian distribution, but also arbitrarily assumed dependencies - here replaced with agnostic philosophy of moving estimator optimizing local parameters.

Such adaptive estimation can be combined with other methods, which might be added in later versions of this article. For example online PCA [3] or adaptive linear regression [4] to combine information from multiple sources like companies

here or macroeconomical data - e.g. to improve prediction of the moments, used for parameter estimation here. Finally, as discussed in [1], we can use such parametric distributions for normalization  $y_t = \text{CDF}_t(x_t)$ , and then model slight distortion from uniform distribution of  $\{y_t\}$  with HCR (hierarchical correlation reconstruction) [5] modelling density as a linear combination, in static or adaptive (evolving in time) way.

## II. TIME SERIES USED FOR EVALUATION

There was used 1900-2007 daily Dow Jones index<sup>1</sup>, working on  $x_t = \ln(v_{t+1}/v_t)$  sequence of daily log-returns.

Figure 2 additionally contains such evaluation of log-returns for 29 out of 30 companies used for this index in September 2018. Daily prices for the last 10 years were downloaded from NASDAQ webpage ([www.nasdaq.com](http://www.nasdaq.com)) for all but DowDuPont (DWDP) - there were used daily close values for 2008-08-14 to 2018-08-14 period (2518 values) for the remaining 29 companies: 3M (MMM), American Express (AXP), Apple (AAPL), Boeing (BA), Caterpillar (CAT), Chevron (CVX), Cisco Systems (CSCO), Coca-Cola (KO), ExxonMobil (XOM), Goldman Sachs (GS), The Home Depot (HD), IBM (IBM), Intel (INTC), Johnson&Johnson (JNJ), JPMorgan Chase (JPM), McDonald's (MCD), Merck&Company (MRK), Microsoft (MSFT), Nike (NKE), Pfizer (PFE), Procter&Gampble (PG), Travelers (TRV),

<sup>1</sup>Source of DJIA time series: <http://www.idvbook.com/teaching-aid/datasets/the-dow-jones-industrial-average-data-set/>




Figure 3. Probability distribution function (PDF, asymptotically  $\sim |x|^{-\nu-1}$ ) and cumulative distribution function (CDF) for Student's t-distribution with fixed center  $\mu = 0$  and scale parameter  $\sigma = 1$ , but various shape parameter  $\nu$ . We get Gaussian distribution for  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ , Cauchy distribution for  $\nu = 1$ , and can also cover different types of heavy tails and bodies of distribution.

UnitedHealth Group (UNH), United Technologies (UTX), Verizon (VZ), Visa (V), Walmart (WMT), Walgreens Boots Alliance (WBA) and Walt Disney (DIS).

### III. STUDENT'S T-DISTRIBUTION AND ADAPTATION

The Student's t-distribution was first introduced by Friedrich Helmert in 1875 [6], and later in 1908 by William Sealy Gosset signed as "Student" [7], leading to the popular name.

Its basic application is for distribution of sum of  $\nu + 1$  i.i.d. Gaussian random variables: for the difference between the sample mean and the real mean. For  $\nu = 1$  it is Cauchy distribution, for large  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  it approaches Gaussian distribution.

Its PDF (probability density function), shown in Fig. 3, is:

$$\rho_{\mu\sigma\nu}(x) \equiv \rho(x) = \frac{\Gamma((\nu+1)/2)}{\sqrt{\nu\pi}\Gamma(\nu/2)} \left(1 + \frac{(x-\mu)^2}{\sigma^2\nu}\right)^{-\frac{\nu+1}{2}} \quad (4)$$

for  $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma, \nu \in \mathbb{R}^+$ ,  $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$  gamma function. Crucially, it has one over polynomial heavy tails  $\rho(x) \sim |x|^{-\nu-1}$  for  $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ , hence finite moments  $E[x^p]$  only for  $p < \nu$ .

Its CDF (cumulative distribution function) for  $\mu = 0, \sigma = 1$  is below, for the general case substitute  $x \rightarrow (x - \mu)/\sigma$ :

$$\int_{-\infty}^x \rho_{01\nu}(y) dy = \frac{1}{2} + x\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu+1}{2}\right) \frac{F_{1,2}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{\nu+1}{2}; \frac{3}{2}, -\frac{x^2}{\nu}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi\nu}\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu}{2}\right)} \quad (5)$$




Figure 4. Top: error dependence for choice of power  $p$  in  $\sigma$  estimation as  $\hat{\sigma} = \sqrt[p]{T^{-1} \sum_t |x_t - \hat{\mu}|^p} / M_{\nu p}$ . We can see that for Gaussian distribution but to improve prediction should reduce this  $p$  for lower  $\nu$  to  $p \approx \nu/6$ . Bottom: monotonous functions for  $\nu$  estimation for various choices of 2 powers  $p_1, p_2$ .

for  $F_{1,2}$  hypergeometric function.

#### A. Absolute central moments method

For method of moments we will use absolute central moments:  $E[|x - \mu|^p]$  for not necessarily integer power  $p \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Using Mathematica there was calculated moment formula as the below integral, finite for  $p < \nu$ :

$$M_{\nu p} = \sqrt[p]{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |x|^p \rho_{01\nu}(x) dx} = \sqrt[p]{\frac{\nu^{p/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu-p}{2}\right)}{\sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\nu/2)}} \quad (6)$$

Having a  $\{x_t\}_{t=1..T}$  data sample, fixing  $\nu$  and using some  $\mu$  estimator e.g. approximate  $\hat{\mu} = T^{-1} \sum_t x_t$  as just mean, the above formula gives simple  $\sigma$  estimator:

$$\hat{\sigma} = \frac{\sqrt[p]{T^{-1} \sum_t |x_t - \hat{\mu}|^p}}{M_{\nu p}} \quad (7)$$

The used  $p$  has to be in  $(0, \nu)$  range, where the possibility to use non-integer  $p$  might be crucial for the  $p < \nu$  requirement.

Additionally, using various  $p$  for such  $\sigma$  estimation has various uncertainty depending on  $\nu$ , as shown in Fig. 4 - suggesting to optimize  $p$  e.g. based on the used  $\nu$  range, or even modify  $p$  dynamically. For large  $\nu$  the optimal  $p$  is close to  $p = 2$  variance estimation, standard for  $\nu \rightarrow \infty$  Gauss distribution limit. For small  $\nu$  the optimal  $p$  is  $\approx \nu/6$ .



Numbers of extreme events for 107 years DJIA daily log-returns: data vs expected Student's t-distribution

event	$\sigma = \sqrt{\text{var}}$	adapt $\sigma$	$\nu=1$ Cauchy	$\nu=2$	$\nu=3$	$\nu=4$	$\nu=5$	$\nu=6$	$\nu=10$	$\nu=\infty$ Gauss
1 $\sigma$	5204	11191	14674.5	12404.3	11475.5	10973.6	10660.1	10445.8	10004.9	9312.75
2 $\sigma$	1170	3281	8662.86	5385.64	4089.08	3407.9	2991.82	2712.62	2153.87	1335.39
3 $\sigma$	422	916	6011.64	2881.83	1692.52	1172.26	883.383	704.617	391.623	79.2363
4 $\sigma$	194	316	4577.22	1678.5	822.02	473.402	302.982	208.935	73.9105	1.85904
5 $\sigma$	96	133	3688.17	1107.91	451.753	219.837	120.469	71.9738	15.7702	0.0168259
6 $\sigma$	58	74	3085.66	782.781	272.145	113.949	54.1823	28.3081	3.87726	0.000579107
7 $\sigma$	43	48	2651.23	581.226	175.691	64.3368	26.9056	12.4288	1.09049	7.51224 $\times 10^{-8}$
8 $\sigma$	29	37	2323.47	448.103	119.643	38.8551	14.4663	5.97148	0.345583	3.65158 $\times 10^{-11}$
9 $\sigma$	28	29	2067.54	355.759	84.9892	24.7656	8.29637	3.08961	0.121448	6.62459 $\times 10^{-15}$
10 $\sigma$	23	20	1862.22	289.16	62.4664	16.4942	5.01714	1.69989	0.0466518	4.4727 $\times 10^{-19}$
Above all 29349 days, below 4012 days 1967-1983 - no 6 $\sigma$ (extreme) events, much closer to Gaussian										
event	1967-1983	$\nu=1$ Cauchy	$\nu=2$	$\nu=3$	$\nu=4$	$\nu=5$	$\nu=6$	$\nu=10$	$\nu=\infty$ Gauss	
1 $\sigma$	1078	2006.	1695.67	1568.7	1500.09	1457.23	1427.94	1367.66	1273.05	
2 $\sigma$	204	1184.21	736.216	558.976	465.859	408.981	370.814	294.433	182.547	
3 $\sigma$	38	821.789	383.009	231.368	160.247	120.758	96.3209	53.5347	10.8316	
4 $\sigma$	13	625.795	229.45	112.37	64.7139	41.4175	28.5613	10.1036	0.25413	
5 $\sigma$	3	504.172	151.451	61.7545	30.0516	16.4681	9.8388	2.15578	0.00230009	

Figure 5. The actual and expected numbers of events  $|X - \mu| > k\sigma$ : for  $k = 1, \dots, 10$ , complete time series of 29349 values 1900-2007 (top) and restricted to 4012 values 1967-1983 (bottom). The marked green second column are numbers of values in the data, on the right there are expected numbers of events (length  $\times$  probability) for Student's t-distribution for various  $\nu$ . In the top table we see large numbers of extreme events, after using adaptive  $\sigma$  close to  $\nu \in (3, 5)$  Student's t-distribution. In contrast, the 1967-1983 range, suggested by  $\nu$  evolution in Fig. 1, has much lower  $\nu \sim 10$  probability of extreme events - suggesting more stable market. Fig. 6 shows more detailed  $\nu$  evolutions, what might be helpful with localizing, understand the crucial mechanisms, and maybe exploiting them to make the market more stable.

To estimate  $\nu$ , a natural direct way is to divide such averages for two different powers  $p_1, p_2$ :

$$\frac{M_{\nu p_1}}{M_{\nu p_2}} \approx \frac{p_1 \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_i |x_i - \hat{\mu}|^{p_1}}}{p_2 \sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_i |x_i - \hat{\mu}|^{p_2}}} \quad (8)$$

Choosing some  $p_1 \neq p_2$ , the  $M_{\nu p_1}/M_{\nu p_2}$  is monotonous with  $\nu$  (examples in Fig. 4), we can e.g. put its behavior into a table and interpolate based on the averages to estimate  $\nu$ , e.g. done as `find $\nu$`  in the code in Fig. 1.

However, analogously to  $1/(n-1)$  standard adjustment in variance estimator, (8) estimation seems biased - needs adjustment by calculating its expected value, preferably with an explicit formula (yet to be found). In Fig. 1 such slight adjustment was made by just adding (tuned) 0.9 to found  $\nu$ .

### B. Moving moments method estimator

Above methods of moments can be easily adapted for moving estimator by just replacing averages with exponential moving averages - uniform weights with exponentially weakening.

For the center  $\mu$  we can use just a basic adaptation below - it is optimal only for the Gaussian case ( $\nu \rightarrow \infty$ ), hence generally it could be slightly improved. However, for the discussed data the gains were already nearly negligible.

$$\mu_{t+1} = \mu_t + \eta_1 (x_t - \mu_t) \quad (9)$$

The most crucial is  $\sigma$  scale parameter adaptive estimation, as e.g. in ARCH family but in more agnostic way, here using (7) formula for a chosen  $p \in (0, 2)$  power ( $p < \min_i(\nu_i)$ ), this time with (central absolute) moments evolving in time:

$$m_{p,t+1} = m_{p,t} + \eta_2 (|x_t - \mu_t|^p - m_{p,t}) \quad (10)$$

Finally for  $\nu$  degrees of freedom estimation we can use (8) formula for analogously updated moments for some 2 different powers  $p_1, p_2$  and some  $\eta_3$  learning rate.

Figure 1 contains used Mathematica code for adaptation of all 3 parameters, with their evolution for DJIA time series.

Manual tuning has lead to 3 different learning rates there:  $\eta_1 = 0.003, \eta_2 = 0.05, \eta_3 = 0.005$ .

Figure 2 shows evaluation using fixed  $\mu = 0$  center and various fixed  $\nu$  for single MLE  $\sigma$  parameter, or  $\sigma$  adapted using (7) estimation with  $p = 1$  power and  $\eta_2 = 0.05$  learning rate - e.g. leading to log-likelihood worse only by  $\approx 0.004$  than for optimized evolution of all 3 parameters in Fig. 1. The  $\nu$  estimator needs adjustment - here done by just adding tuned parameter, hopefully to be improved, automatized in future.

The  $\nu$  evolution, unavailable in standard ARMA-ARCH approaches, evaluates local tail shapes, probability of potentially destabilizing extreme events - suggesting to call it **stability**, complementing popular **volatility** evaluation similar to  $\sigma$ . Figure 5 checks that indeed 1967-1983 range suggested in Fig. 1 has much thinner tails. Figure 6 shows  $\nu$  evolution for all the companies ( $\eta_3 = 0.005$ ) - such analysis might help to localize and understand stability influencing factors/mechanisms, which hopefully could be applied in future to reduce probability of potentially catastrophic extreme events.

## IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER WORK

This article introduces looking novel extensions of method of moments - both to absolute central moments with not necessarily natural powers (necessary to work with low  $\nu$ ), but more importantly as EMA moving estimators - for parameters evolving in time. Beside better log-likelihood evaluation, it provides evolution of these crucial parameters like in Fig. 1 - including  $\nu$  degrees of freedom evaluating probability of extreme events, which understanding might allow to introduce some market stabilizing mechanisms. For example it suggests search for mechanisms of drastic increase of  $\nu$  especially in 1967-1983 period for DJIA, confirmed in Fig. 5.

This is a general approach which might be worth taking also to other distributions like alpha-stable, and larger models. Also it is worth combining with other especially adaptive models, like online linear regression and HCR (hierarchical correlation reconstruction) - what is planned to be done in further versions of this article.

Examples of plans for further work:

- Improve estimators from moments - especially of  $\nu$ .
- Include asymmetry evolution e.g. through skewness, or  $m_p^+/m_p^-$  for  $m_p^\pm = E[\max(0, \pm x)^p]$ , for evolution calculated with exponential moving averages.
- Add further modelling, like dependence from other stocks, macronomical data, e.g. with adaptive linear regression [4], and HCR [5] to include subtle dependencies.
- Find various approaches for moving estimators for various distributions, e.g. gradient ascend approaches, maybe also including 2nd order information like in [8].
- The discussed approach has many hyperparameters like learning rates - often universal for similar data types, but it might be valuable to automatically optimize them, adapt through evolution.
- Understand mechanisms affecting  $\nu$  evolution, and hopefully apply them to improve marked stability.
- Test discussed approaches for different application like data compression, where log-likelihood improvement translates into nit/symbol savings.




Figure 6. Evolution of  $\nu$  parameter for all 1+29 cases with  $p_1 = 1$ ,  $p_2 = 1/2$  powers and  $\eta_3 = 0.005$  learning rate. It describes tail shape  $\rho(x) \sim |x|^{-\nu-1}$ , probability of extreme events - potentially catastrophic, which might destabilize the market, suggesting "stability" interpretation complementing standard "volatility" evaluation. Comparing the above evolutions with various historical events/factors might allow to understand and exploit them to improve market stability.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J. Duda, "Adaptive exponential power distribution with moving estimator for nonstationary time series," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2003.02149*, 2020.
- [2] T. Bollerslev, "Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity," *Journal of econometrics*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 307–327, 1986.
- [3] H. Cardot and D. Degras, "Online principal component analysis in high dimension: Which algorithm to choose?" *International Statistical Review*, vol. 86, no. 1, pp. 29–50, 2018.
- [4] J. Duda, "Parametric context adaptive laplace distribution for multimedia compression," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03238*, 2019.
- [5] —, "Exploiting statistical dependencies of time series with hierarchical correlation reconstruction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.04119*, 2018.
- [6] F. R. Helmert, "Über die berechnung des wahrscheinlichen fehlers aus einer endlichen anzahl wahrer beobachtungsfehler," *Z. Math. U. Physik*, vol. 20, no. 1875, pp. 300–303, 1875.
- [7] Student, "The probable error of a mean," *Biometrika*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 1908.
- [8] J. Duda, "Improving sgd convergence by tracing multiple promising directions and estimating distance to minimum," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11457*, 2019.