

Monthly GDP nowcasting with Machine Learning and Unstructured Data

Juan Tenorio^a, Wilder Perez^b

^a*Universidad Peruana de Ciencias Aplicadas, 2390 Prolongación Primavera, Santiago de Surco, 15023, Lima, Peru, pcejten@upc.edu.pe*

^b*Universidad Científica del Sur, Panamericana Sur Km 19, Chorrillos, 15067, Lima, Peru*

Abstract

In the dynamic landscape of continuous change, Machine Learning (ML) “nowcasting” models offer a distinct advantage for informed decision-making in both public and private sectors. This study introduces ML-based GDP growth projection models for monthly rates in Peru, integrating structured macroeconomic indicators with high-frequency unstructured sentiment variables. Analyzing data from January 2007 to May 2023, encompassing 91 leading economic indicators, the study evaluates six ML algorithms to identify optimal predictors. Findings highlight the superior predictive capability of ML models using unstructured data, particularly Gradient Boosting Machine, LASSO, and Elastic Net, exhibiting a 20% to 25% reduction in prediction errors compared to traditional AR and Dynamic Factor Models (DFM). This enhanced performance is attributed to better handling of data of ML models in high-uncertainty periods, such as economic crises.

Keywords: Real-time forecast, Machine Learning Algorithms, Big Data.

1. Introduction

Making decisions in real-time is a true challenge for policymakers, given that the primary barrier they face is the usual delay in the availability of updated information about macroeconomic aggregates. In most cases, the economic variables show a delay of between 30-45 days on average, including the time for revisions and retrospectives. To address the issue of extended delays in the publication of key economic aggregates, the concept of nowcasting is proposed, which aims to predict the present, the very near future and

the very recent past [1]. One of the most traditional nowcasting approaches is the Dynamic Factor Model (DFM) which is a widely used method in central banks to predict GDP [2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. For instance, [2] proposed a methodology to assess the marginal impact of the publication of monthly-updated data on forecasts of quarterly-published real Gross Domestic Product (GDP) growth. The method presented by these authors was able to track the real-time flow of information that central banks monitor by handling large datasets with staggered publication dates and updating primary forecasts each time new higher-frequency data is published. Another seminal study was proposed by [9] where they do real-time estimations of the current state of the US economy. This approach included data complexity and provided useful information about the relationship between macroeconomics and asset prices.

A critical challenge to that traditional approach is the increase in uncertainty in the estimates which use a limited set of variables, and often fall short. Nevertheless, the continuous stride forward in the new generation of high-frequency data has changed how prediction models face the uncertainty inherent in this information. As a result, in the recent few years, both central banks and international institutions have adopted methodological focuses that incorporate machine learning, and take advantage of the abundant quantity of data that come from search engines and social media such as [10], [11] and [8]. Those methods provide more accurate predictions by incorporating various variables and new sources of unstructured data. As described [12], these techniques are divided into two main brands, supervised and unsupervised ML. [12] explains that unsupervised MLs are looking for groups of observations that are similar in terms of their covariance. Thus, a “dimensionality reduction” can be performed. Unsupervised MLs commonly use videos, images, and text as a source of information, in techniques such as grouping *k-medias*. For instance, [13] applied pooling models to find “topics” in textual data. Another example is the paper written by [14]. Here, the author shows a weekly indicator of the economic activity for 46 OCDE countries and the G20 using search data from Google Trends. This document showcases the power of prediction of specific “topics”, including “bankruptcies”, “economic crises”, “investment”, “baggage” and “mortgages”. Calibration is performed using a neural network that captures nonlinear patterns, which are shown to be consistent with economic intuition using ML Shapley values interpretation tools. On the other side, the supervised ML algorithms as pointed out by [15] imply the use of a group of variables features o co vari-

ables to predict a specific indicator result. There is a variety of supervised ML methods regressions such as *LASSO*, *Ridge*, *Elastic Net*, *Random Forest*, *Regression Trees*, *Support Vector Machines*, *Neural Nets*, *Matrix Factorisation*, among others as *Model Averaging*.

Several studies highlight the advantages of supervised ML models to forecast macroeconomic series that overcome traditional methods. An application is the research of [16], who present a compilation of Machine Learning techniques and conventional time series methods to predict the Indian GDP. They estimate the ML in the DFM context with financial and economic uncertainty data. They estimate machine learning models such as Random Forest and Prophet along with conventional time series models such as ARIMA to nowcast Indian GDP, where hybrid models stand out. Likewise, the results from [10] showed better performance of the Ridge regression model to the nowcast GDP of New Zealand over a Dynamic Factor Model. [17] built and compared ML models to forecast the GDP of Indonesia. They evaluate six ML algorithms: Random Forest, LASSO, Ridge, Elastic Net, Neural Networks and Support Vector Machines. Their results make clear the outstanding performance of ML than auto-regressive models, especially the Random Forest model. Also, [11] test ML, DFM and static factor and MIDAS regressions models to nowcast the GDP rate growth of China. They find superior accuracy of ML compared to DFM. The ML model that deserves more attention was Ridge Regression, which overcame the others not only on prediction but also early anticipation of crises such as the global financial crisis and COVID-19. [18] compare models to the Netherlands economy between 1992 and 2018, where Random Forest algorithms stood out. [19] use novel variables such as Google Search and air quality. They run standard DFM and ML to European economies during normal times and crises. They show that most MLs significantly outperform the AR(1) reference model. They highlight that DFM tends to perform better in normal times, while many of the ML methods have excellent performance in identifying turning points.

Also, the recent literature has highlighted the relevance of incorporating Big Data due to its benefits of broadening the range and use of available data that can provide some valid information on the behaviour of the economy to anticipate certain economic indicators in real time [20]. As mentioned in [21], the digital era has allowed the emergence of news channels and social network technologies, mobile phones and online advertising, which are a new kind of source data, but without a pre-fixed format raises new challenges. This data

is available in formats like text, XML, email, images, videos, etc. In that sense, we can denominate these data as non-structured. [21] gives a general description of this type of data. A seminal example is the study of [15] which indicates how the search related to the “initial claims for unemployment” in Google Trends are good candidates to forecast unemployment, CPI and consumer confidence in countries such as the US, UK, Canada, Germany and Japan. They focus on immediate out-of-sample forecasting and extend the Bayesian structural time series model using the Hamiltonian sampler for variable selection. These authors obtain good results for unemployment, while for CPI or consumer confidence not so good.

A characteristic of these algorithms that is often highlighted resides in their capacity to formulate parametric selections in big data sets, which find their base in training a specific percentage of the model’s information. Hence, the objective of this document consists of exploring the benefits of using diverse machine learning methodologies. This will be done by combining the use of conventional leading indicators (structured data) and indicators of analysis of sentiment (non-structured data) to build a precise monthly indicator of Peru’s real GDP (Gross Domestic Product) growth. The data set consists of both local and international variables, which can be broken down into 53 structured variables in 38 non-structured variables, giving a total of 91 predictors. These predictive variables are examined according to the model, to evaluate the optimum performance of each variable between September 2014 and May 2023. Furthermore, following [22], an analysis of the evaluation of prediction accuracy will be performed using two models as benchmarks: the traditional autoregressive time series, and three specifications of dynamic factor models, also we assess the robustness of the results by building an additional DFM incorporating only the indicator of electricity commonly used by policymakers and consulting firms to track the economic activity, especially in Peru. This will facilitate an exhaustive evaluation of the performance of machine learning algorithms.

The results indicate that immediate predictions of the machine learning models are more solid in comparison with the benchmark auto-regressive model and DFM models. Specifically, the Random Forest, Gradient Boosting Machine, and Adaptive Lasso show performance with a superior ability to reduce the average error of projection in a range from 20%-25%. Additionally, it is corroborated that following the methodology proposed by [23], the utilization of the average value of projection of all the machine learning algorithms, adds a significant value to the RMSE, which positively contributes

to a more precise prediction of GDP. Even though other methodologies, such as *Ridge*, *LASSO* and *Elastic Net* do not reach the same level of predictive ability as the previously mentioned methodologies, they still outperform the control model in terms of performance. Further, the proof of predicting evaluation and exercises of consistency, confirm that most of the machine learning models improve the prediction significantly which falls in line with previous literature applied in other contexts [10, 15, 11].

This research document adds itself to the existing literature that highlights the success of machine learning applications in contrast to more traditional methodologies. However, given the lack of evidence in Latin America, and in particular in Peru¹ who built a joint leading indicator to tracking the Peruvian GDP with only 14 variables. [25] perform forward GDP estimation with a nonlinear neural network model. [26] proposed a leading indicator with the expectations survey. [27] estimated the growth rate of GDP based on electric production. Following to [28], [29] and [30] proposed a leading indicator to Peruvian GDP., surrounding the use of these algorithms in conjunction with non-structured data, this research project also highlights the need to bring to the forefront of the discussion what these models entail. Previous works applied to the Peruvian economy are focused on the anticipated estimation of monthly GDP growth based on a set of leading indicators (structured data). However, a scarce application of machine learning models and the inclusion of unstructured data in GDP forecasting is evident. In the Latin America case we found the work of [31], [10] and [32] who have shown through the implementation of diverse machine learning algorithms that these method's results are more adequate in carrying out forecasts in real-time when a large amount of information is at the researcher's disposal. Similarly, in the case of El Salvador and Belize, [31] implemented a large array of machine, learning methods to forecast the quarterly growth of GDP, using a large amount of predictive variables. The results of this research study concluded that the application of these tools represents a solid alternative to prediction, and its benefits suggest a recommendation for its use in other countries in the region. Additionally, other researchers have extended the application of the machine learning models to GDP, inflation, yield curve, and active prices. These efforts have yielded notable results in precise forecasting [33, 34].

¹See [24]

It is still important to highlight that these methods present challenges in their implementation, which have led to some major debates surrounding the topic. In fact, [35], as well as [36], when comparing multiple models of machine learning, find that the deposition of the forecasting is less significant in comparison with the statistical smoothing approaches, and the ARIMA models. These authors warn that the computational complexity that is inherent to the selection and use of variables in the machine learning model makes immediate forecasting difficult and less practical for policymakers.

Finally, the rest of this document is structured in several sections. Initially, a section focused on the methodology is presented in which details are given about the ML models and traditional models that were used and the data (structured and non-structured) sets. Afterwards, the results of the main estimations are displayed in a specific section 3, followed by the sections of robustness assessment and the conclusion.

2. Methodology

This section provides a brief description of the different regularization methods and decision trees used to select the best predictors for the monthly nowcasting model and to calibrate the hyperparameters, in a series from January 2007 to May 2023. The six methods that are used are Random Forest (RF), Gradient Boosting Machine (GBM), LASSO regression, Ridge, Elastic Net, and as a benchmark, an autoregressive (AR) and dynamic factor model (DFM) are utilized.

2.1. Autoregressive Model (AR)

As a starting point for our reference, we establish an autoregressive AR model for the monthly GDP growth (y_t), which reflects the value of a variable in terms of its previous values. A model of order 1, following these characteristics, exhibits the following structure:

$$y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 y_{t-1} + e_t \tag{1}$$

where β_0 is a constant term, β_1 is a parameter, and e_t is a term that represents the error and captures the randomness of the model.

2.2. Dynamic Factor Model (DFM)

DFMs are estimated in the form of state-space systems and can be estimated using the Kalman filter and various types of algorithms. The one of the most popular in the economic literature is the Expectation Maximization algorithm, due to its robust numerical properties following the proposal by [37], which is an efficient estimation to bigger datasets.

The canonical reference DFM can be described as follows:

$$x_t = C_0 f_t + e_t \quad e_t \sim N(0, R) \quad (2)$$

$$f_t = \sum_{j=1}^p A_j f_{t-j} + u_t \quad u_t \sim N(0, Q_0) \quad (3)$$

Where equation 2 is identified as the measurement equation and equation 3 as the transition equation, allowing the unobservable factor f_t to evolve as in a vector autoregressive model. These equations do not include trends or intercepts, as the included data must be stationary and standardized before estimation.

The matrix system is as follows:

x_t : a vector of $n \times 1$ observable time series at time $t : (x_t, \dots, x_{nt})'$, which allows for missing data.

f_t : a vector of $r \times 1$ factors at time $t : (f_t, \dots, f_{rt})'$.

C_0 : a matrix of $n \times r$ observable time series with lag j .

Q_0 : a matrix of $r \times r$ state covariances.

R : a matrix of $r \times r$ measurement covariances. This matrix is diagonal under the assumption that all covariances between the series are explained by the factors $E[x_{it} | x_{-i,t}, f_t] = c_{0i} f_t \forall i$, where c_{0i} is the $i - th$ row of C_0 .

This model can be estimated using a classical form of the Kalman Filter and the Maximum Likelihood estimation algorithm, after transforming it into a State Space model. In a VAR expression, it would be as follows:

$$x_t = C F_t + e_t \quad e_t \sim N(0, R) \quad (4)$$

$$F_t = A F_{t-1} + u_t \quad u_t \sim N(0, Q) \quad (5)$$

As a benchmark model, we use the efficient estimation of a Dynamic Factor Model via the EM Algorithm - on stationary data with time-invariant system matrices and classical assumptions while permitting missing data following the approach of [38].

2.3. Penalized Regression Models

These methodologies are employed to optimize the selection of predictor variables and control the model's complexity, which is crucial in preventing overfitting in high-dimensional settings. The literature suggests various forms of penalization to estimate the parameters β_j accurately. We will briefly explore the characteristics of the Ridge, Lasso, Elastic Net, and Adaptive Lasso models, emphasizing how these techniques allow for proper weighting of coefficients and how their application impacts the inclusion and relevance of variables in the final model.

2.3.1. Ridge Regression

The Ridge model is defined by adding a penalty based on the sum of squares of the coefficients of the predictor variables. This penalty compels the coefficients to be very small, preventing them from taking extremely high values, thus reducing the influence of less relevant variables. To estimate the coefficients $\hat{\beta}^{Ridge}$, the equation must be expressed as:

$$\min_{\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij}\beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2 \right) \quad (6)$$

Where y_i is the observed value of the dependent variable for observation i , x_{ij} is the value of predictor variable j in observation i , β_j is the coefficient associated with predictor variable j , p is the number of predictor variables, and λ is the regularization hyperparameter that controls the magnitude of the penalty. The sum of the terms β_j^2 in the penalty prevents the coefficients from reaching large values, thereby contributing to stability and reducing the risk of overfitting.

2.3.2. LASSO Regression

The LASSO (Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator) model, introduced by [39], employs a penalty based on the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients of the predictor variables. This penalty has the property of forcing some coefficients to exactly reach zero, resulting in the automatic selection of a subset of more relevant predictor variables and the elimination of less significant ones. The Lasso coefficients $\hat{\beta}^{Lasso}$ are estimated:

$$\min_{\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij}\beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j| \right) \quad (7)$$

The change lies in the hyperparameter λ which, by summing the absolute values of the coefficients $|\beta_j|$ in the penalty, leads to model selection and simplification by allowing some coefficients to be zero. This provides a more precise variable selection approach regarding the degree of importance of all variables.

2.3.3. Elastic Net Regression

The Elastic Net model appropriately combines the constraints of both the LASSO and Ridge models. In particular, [40] mention that its advantage lies in correcting the model when the number of regressors exceeds the number of observations ($p > n$), which improves variable grouping. The penalty includes both the sum of the absolute values of the coefficients and the sum of the squares of the coefficients of the predictor variables. The equation for estimating the coefficients $\hat{\beta}^{Enet}$ is expressed as:

$$\min_{\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij} \beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p (\alpha |\beta_j| + (1 - \alpha) \beta_j^2) \right) \quad (8)$$

where λ is the global regularization hyperparameter and α is the hyperparameter that controls the mix between Lasso ($\alpha = 1$) and Ridge ($\alpha = 0$) penalties. The combination of both penalties in the Elastic Net model allows for a higher degree of flexibility in variable selection and coefficient alignment.

2.3.4. Adaptive Lasso Regression

Following [41], the Adaptive LASSO model is a variant of the LASSO model that introduces a penalty approach which adaptively adjusts the magnitude of the penalties for each coefficient of the predictor variables. This adaptation allows for penalties to be different for different coefficients, potentially resulting in a more precise selection of relevant variables. [42], indicate that this process can be efficiently performed using the LARS algorithm. The equation for the Adaptive LASSO model ($\hat{\beta}^{AdL}$) is expressed as:

$$\min_{\beta} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^p x_{ij} \beta_j)^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p w_j |\beta_j| \right) \quad (9)$$

where λ is the regularization hyperparameter, and w_j is the adaptation factor for the coefficient β_j . It is important to note that the exact form of the adaptation factors w_j depends on the specific implementation and may

vary. In general, these factors are calculated based on the absolute values of the coefficients in previous iterations of the algorithm.

2.4. Decision Tree Models

Decision Tree models are machine learning algorithms that represent decisions and actions in the form of a tree. In this case, we will present two algorithms where each internal node of the tree represents a feature or attribute, and each branch represents a decision or rule based on that attribute. The training data is divided based on these decisions until it reaches leaf nodes, which correspond to the predictions, in our case, related to monthly GDP growth. Additionally, the use of these trees allows for an improvement in variable selection by handling non-linear relationships in the model.


2.4.1. Random forest

This method is based on constructing decision trees using variables from a matrix X and a random selection of features. Additionally, it involves randomly selecting subsets of data from X with replacement to train each tree in the ensemble, distinguishing it from other tree-based techniques. Each tree generates a prediction of the target variable (in this case, monthly GDP), and the final model selects the most voted prediction in the ensemble of trees [43]. According to [44], Random Forest has the advantage of combining predictions from multiple trees and selecting those with lower error, thereby reducing the influence of potential individual errors (if the correlation between trees is low). In summary, this method recursively divides the data in X into optimized regions and uses variable-based criteria to forecast the target variable, then calculates the dependent variable as the average of these regions.

$$\hat{f}(x) = \sum_m \hat{c}_m I(x \in X_r); \hat{c}_m = \text{avg}(y_i | x_i \in X_r) \quad (10)$$

The algorithm has certain advantages, such as being efficient in handling large datasets with many variables, providing an estimation of variable importance, and offering an unbiased estimation of generalization error during its construction [43]. However, it has disadvantages like difficulty in interpreting results beyond predictions and a computationally intensive demand for training and hyperparameter tuning. Therefore, for this model, it was necessary to fine-tune it through cross-validation, achieving better performance on unseen data.

Figure 1: Simple Representation of the Random Forest Algorithm



Source: Own elaboration

2.4.2. Gradient Boosting Machine


This algorithm builds a sequence of decision trees, where each tree is fitted to the residual errors of the previous tree. Therefore, each iteration obtains a new tree that minimizes the remaining error. These prediction models are trained using the errors from the accumulated set of weak predictions [45], indicates that weak models do not necessarily mean they are better than accurate models, as they have the advantage of being able to correct the overfitting problem. in a way that provides a progressive improvement in regression performance compared to the initial model [46].

In essence, each tree in this algorithm contributes its prediction, which is added to the sequence of predictions from previous trees in order to enhance the final prediction of the model. [47], mention that this method can be summarized by the following equation.

$$F(x) = \sum_{z=1}^Z F_z(x) \tag{11}$$

where z is the number of trees that cumulatively add up the errors from all preceding trees. That is, the first tree $y = F_1(x)$, then the second tree will be $F_2(x) = F_1(x) + e_1$ and so on, successively, to minimize $F(x)$ as the following expression:

Figure 2: Simple Representation of the Gradient Boosting Machine Algorithm



Source: According to [47]

$$L = \sum_z L(y_z, F_z(x)) \quad (12)$$

Therefore, as new decision trees are incorporated, the accuracy of the final projection improves gradually, resulting in more precise forecasts for monthly GDP.

2.5. Data

The model’s database comprises a variety of variables, ranging from macroeconomic and financial data to unstructured information related to sentiment or “trend” (See Tables 6, 7, and 8). This information set encompasses consumption indicators, such as credits, deposits, chicken sales, consumer surveys, and local activity indicators, including electricity production, hydrocarbons, economic expectations, and others. Investment indicators are also incorporated, such as internal cement consumption, capital goods imports, and so forth. A set of monetary indicators covering consumer and producer price indices, among others, is included. It is important to highlight the inclusion of sectoral variables related to fishing and agricultural production, which constitutes a unique feature compared to other nowcasting models. Furthermore, the database covers information on foreign trade, the labour market, and climate data.

In addition to conventional variables, we have incorporated unstructured data related to perception in various areas, such as the economy, consump-

tion, labour market, politics, tourism, government support, and natural phenomena. These variables can capture the general sentiment of the population and its potential influence on economic indicators. In particular, the use of massive search engines, such as Google, stands out as a powerful tool for providing real-time information. [48], have pointed out that the inclusion of online searches as variables provides substantial benefits to short-term forecasting models, especially in detecting periods of high volatility. This is demonstrated in the ability to anticipate both the recession caused by the COVID-19 pandemic and the subsequent period of economic recovery. Consequently, the effectiveness of this approach has been widely investigated and adopted by central banks and international institutions. Thus, we estimate 10 groups (See Table 6) of variables that aim to track Google search queries, which are updated daily and can be downloaded from Google Trends. The selection of these words (variables) aims to convey different aspects of the economy, such as the consumption-related group, which is constructed based on searches for words like “Kia”, “Restaurants”, “Toyota”, “Credits”, “Loans”, “Deals”, “Mortgages”, and “Cinema”. Once this textual data is converted into numerical data, the inclusion of these series is evaluated in the estimations of an optimal model using Gibbs sampling following the findings of [49] and using 50,000 iterations, an initial burning of 1,000 iterations, and constant beta priors (see Figure 10). This indicates that there is a high relevance of the group of unstructured variables such as the search frequency for “flights”, “perufflight_us”, “visa”, or “El Niño”, which would reflect the dynamics of tourism and climatic conditions, among others. Furthermore, we compare the results of this estimation with another one by reducing the sample to 2019 (see Figure 11), where unstructured data becomes more important when incorporating the pandemic period into the sample, which is in line with the findings of [10] and [14]. Additionally, a contemporaneous correlation analysis of these variables against the monthly GDP is also performed, obtaining that more than 50% of the unstructured sample correlates greater than 30%.

The data frequency ranges from daily to monthly records in constructing the model. Each variable was assessed in terms of its predictive ability regarding monthly GDP growth. Then, to facilitate comparison and analysis, we transformed these variables into annualized monthly percentage changes and standardized them. This standardization process allows us to maintain a common reference framework and ensure that different variables contribute equitably to the model.

Ultimately, we have a total set of 91 predictors spanning from January 2008 to May 2023. The evaluation and selection of optimal predictors will be conducted independently for each machine learning algorithm employed. This approach will enable us to refine the process of choosing the most efficient prediction model, thereby achieving enhanced performance.

2.6. Strategy of the forecast evaluation

The method that will assess the accuracy in the projection of each model will be done through the root mean square error (RMSE), following the equation:

$$RMSE = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - \hat{y}_t)^2} \quad (13)$$

where y_t represents the observed value of monthly GDP growth, \hat{y}_t is the forecasted value, and T is the total number of projections made. Following this initial assessment of prediction fit, we will employ the method proposed by [50] to determine if the projections generated by each machine learning model significantly differ from the *benchmark* model.

3. Results

This section begins by providing a brief description of the database training period, addresses hyperparameter optimization, and finishes with a thorough analysis of the results.

3.1. Estimation and hyperparameters calibration

To estimate machine learning models, the selection of hyperparameters plays a crucial role in terms of efficiency and accuracy. The optimal determination of these values requires the split of the sample data into three parts: i) a training set, ii) a validation set, and iii) a testing set. Initially, the model is estimated with the training set (in-sample) which turns out the first set of hyperparameters. Then, the search process of the optimal values that minimize the mean quadratic error of projections (MSE^2), through cross-

²Indicator that measures the average of the squared errors between the predictions of a model and the real values, without applying the square root, used for validation of parameters in ML models.

validation techniques. Once it is identified the optimal values, the accuracy of the model is evaluated in the testing set (*out-sample*).

Table 1: Strategy of testing estimations

Training dataset					Testing set				
2008m1-2014m08					2014m09-2023m5				
←→					↔				
Fold 1	Fold 2	Fold 3	Fold 4	Fold 5					

Source: Own elaboration

Table 2: Priors and hyperparameter ranges

Model	Hyperparameter	Range	Optimised Value
Lasso	Lambda	0.001 to 0.009	0.007
Ridge	Lambda	0.01 to 0.09	0.310
Elastic Net	Alpha	0.1 to 0.9	0.500
	Lambda	0.01 to 0.09	0.040
Adaptive Lasso	Lambda	0.01 to 0.09	0.670
	Omega	0.1 to 0.9	0.340
Random Forest	#árboles	1 to 400	281
Gradient	# árboles	1 to 5000	19
Boosting	Distribución	Normal	Bernoulli
Machine	Shrinkage	0.001 to 0.009	0.300

Source: Own elaboration

The cross-validation method is used to calculate the best hyperparameters with the validation set. This process involves training and validation of the ML model in 5 folds, by using every partition or fold as the validation set and the others as the training set on each iteration. Hence, we obtain 5 performance metrics, one by each fold, which are averaged. Also, to identify the optimal hyperparameters, we will run the cross-validation Bayesian optimization algorithm, following closely [51].

In addition, to prevent overfitting in the ML models the hyperparameters are bounded within ranges recommended by the reviewed literature (See [40]). This approach contributes significantly to the model’s ability to make robust predictions, allowing for more effective exploration in estimating monthly GDP growth without the risk of overfitting.

3.2. Model comparison

A comparison of the prediction performance of the ML and benchmark models for the test set from September 2009 to May 2023 is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Evaluation of model and benchmark forecasts
2014m09-2023m05

Model	RMSE	RMSE-R.AR ³	p-value
Lasso	0.26	0.10	0.014
Ridge	0.34	0.13	0.043
Elastic Net	0.28	0.11	0.039
Adaptive Lasso	0.68	0.27	0.126
Random Forest	0.45	0.18	0.089
Gradient Boosting Machine	0.17	0.07	0.016
DFM full ⁴	0.93	0.36	0.005
DFM best ⁵	0.72	0.28	0.004
DFM structured ⁶	1.05	0.41	0.003
AR	2.55	0.00	

Source: Own elaboration. 3/ $RMSE(Model)_i/RMSE(AR)$. 4/ DFM full, use the 91 variables within unstructured as well as structured data. 5/ DFM best, use the 19 variables within unstructured data as well as structured selected by the Gibbs sampling as best estimators to predict GDP. 6/ DFM structured, use only 56 structured variables.

In terms of the forecast evaluation using the RMSE, the ML models manage to significantly minimize the projection error in comparison with the benchmark AR model and the three different specifications of dynamic factor models ⁷. Between the models that stand out over the others, we get the *Gradient Boosting Machine*, *LASSO* and *Elastic Net* that archive to reduce the forecast error by around 20% to 25%. Also, Diebold-Mariano statistic ⁸ concludes that most of the ML models are statistically significant, in line with previous research. [10, 15, 11].


On the other hand, it is important to highlight that real-time forecasts presented in this document successfully anticipated the economic contraction caused by the COVID-19 pandemic in March 2020 in the Peruvian context,

⁷[38]

⁸[50]

and also accurately captured the subsequent economic recovery period in March of the following year, which supports the usefulness and effectiveness of using penalty models and/or decision trees to forecast economic variables.

Figure 3: ML model projection and GDP



Source: Own elaboration

3.3. Consistency

To test the consistency of the results and determine if the ML model projections contribute positively to the accuracy predictions of monthly GDP over the benchmark models, we use the [22] approach, but instead of using an official prediction, we replace it with a DFM estimation that incorporates the

electricity as main leading indicator, which popular among Economic Studies Department in Peru. We estimate the following regression model:

$$y_t = \beta_1 DFME_t + \beta_2 ML_{it} + e_t \quad (14)$$

Where y_t represents the real monthly GDP growth, $DFME_t$ is the dynamic factor model estimated with electricity production and ML_i is the out-sample prediction for each machine learning model. The results obtained indicate that all the projections of machine learning contribute significantly to the GDP projection, with the best model being the *Gradient Boosting Machine* according to the Akaike criterion. Likewise, analyzing the estimation errors of the models generated by equation 14, we applied the test proposed by [52] with a long run variance autocorrelation estimator from [50], to evaluate the fit gains in the estimates by including the results of the ML models. The p – value is shown in the last column of Table 4, where the alternative hypothesis is that the models in equation 14, which include the ML model projection, are more accurate than the predictions under the dynamic factor model alone. These values indicate a superior accuracy of the models incorporating Machine Learning at a 10% confidence level in the case of but at 5% in the others.

Table 4: β_2^e value and validation criteria

Models	Estimated	AIC	p -value	p -value (DM)
Lasso	0.714	520.32	0.000	0.079
Ridge	0.936	554.73	0.000	0.057
Elastic Net	0.839	549.80	0.000	0.055
Adaptive Lasso	0.703	517.49	0.000	0.046
Random Forest	0.783	534.20	0.000	0.049
Gradient Boosting Machine	0.810	492.09	0.000	0.041

Source: Own elaboration

4. Conclusions

In this article, we evaluated the prediction accuracy of the most popular Machine Learning algorithms to do the nowcasting of the monthly growth rate of Peruvian GDP. The analysis window was between 2008 and 2023 and works with several leading indicators to assess the dynamic of the GDP's

components measured by the expenditure and productive sector approach. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that we have enriched our approach by incorporating a sentiment data index built through Google Trends, that shown to be helpful to predict in advance economic activity. The Machine Learning approach allows the use of 91 variables simultaneously between structured data and no structured data, one of the documents that use a larger dataset used for the Peruvian GDP prediction case. The evaluation results and consistency exercise show evidence of the positive contribution of ML models and sentiment data improve significantly the model accuracy and allow the early detection of periods of high volatility, an aspect that conventional models often fail to capture.

Our results shed light on outperforming the machine learning over the AR and DFM models in prediction accuracy, which opens a new approach agenda on improvements in the forecast of relevant macroeconomic variables such as consumption, employment, and investment, among others.

In fact, as a pending agenda regard, we can point out three issues. First, there is a need to analyze the marginal prediction gains from the inclusion of unstructured data in reducing forecast error. Since our results have shown improvements in the accuracy. One question arises. Would the analyzed period between influence those results given that between 2004 and 2023 includes high volatility events such as the pandemic, the global financial crisis and various climate shocks in 2017 and 2023, where ML models with data do not structured ones gain greater predictive capacity by being able to track daily frequency data from Google Trend searches. This could be achieved by performing a variance analysis of the projection errors comparing ML models with other more traditional ones during a period of relative normality and other periods of crisis. Second, a fact we observed in the estimates of the unsynchronized availability of the variables (91), which represented challenges and difficulties, which raises the question of whether consistent results are equally obtained with a smaller number of variables, we estimate this in roughly 45% of the 91 variables of the dataset. This proportion could be evaluated in subsequent studies reducing the software requirements. Third, the treatment of the unstructured data could be improved. In this document, we use a simple and didactic management of no-structured data, but it might be considered monthly weighting of searched words in GoogleTrend to smooth the high variability related to this type of data.

Appendix A. List of non-structured and structured variables of model

Table A.5: List of non-structured variables

Unstructured variable details		
Units of Measure	Frequency	Source
Search Index (0 to 100)	Daily	Google Trends
Variables		
1.- Searched Words on Economic		
Inflación	Recesión	
2.- Searched Words on Consumption		
kia	toyota	Cinema
Restaurantes	Créditos	Préstamos
Hipotecarios	Ofertas	
3.- Searched Words on Labor Market		
Empleo	Desempleo	Trabajo
4.- Searched Words on Sectorial Industry		
Minería	Inversión	
5.- Searched Words on Current Situation		
Crisis Perú	Quiebra	Economía
Crisis económica		

Source: Own elaboration

Table A.6: List of structured variables included

No.	Variable	Units	Frequency
1	GDP	2007=100	Monthly
2	Credit	S/ Millions	Monthly
3	Credit	US\$ Millions	Monthly
4	Credit (constant exchange rate)	S/ Millions	Monthly
5	Consumer credits	S/ Millions	Monthly
6	Mortgage Loans	S/ Millions	Monthly
7	Deposits	S/ Millions	Monthly
8	Deposits	S/ Millions	Monthly
9	Sales of chickens	Metric Tons	Daily

Continued on next page

Table A.6 – Continued

No.	Variable	Units	Frequency
10	Consumer Confidence Index	Points	Monthly
11	Electricity Production	GWh	Monthly
12	Hydrocarbon Production	Millios	Daily
13	3-Month Economic Expectations	Points	Monthly
14	Oil	B/D	Daily
15	Natural Gas	MCF	Daily
16	Domestic Cement Consumption	Index	Weekly
17	Import of Intermediate Inputs	Index	Weekly
18	Import of Capital Goods	Index	Weekly
19	Employed Labor Force	Thousands	Monthly
20	Properly Employed Population ⁹	Thousands	Monthly
21	Non-Financial Gov. Expenditures	S/ Millions	Monthly
22	IAFO	Index	Monthly
23	Volume of Imported Inputs	Index	Monthly
24	Terms of Trade	Index	Monthly
25	IPX	Index	Monthly
26	IPM	Index	Monthly
27	General Stock Market Index ¹⁰	Percentages	Daily
28	Liquidity	Millions of Soles	Monthly
29	CPI	Index	Monthly
30	Non Food and Energy Price Index	Index	Monthly
31	Wholesale Price Index	Index	Monthly
32	Core CPI	Index	Monthly
33	Multilateral Real Exchange Rate	2009=100	Monthly
34	EMBIG Peru	Pbs	Daily
35	Oil WTI	Dollars per Barrel	Daily
36	USIPC	Index	Monthly
37	Industrial Production Index	YoY	Quarterly
38	Copper	cUS\$/lb.	Daily
39	Gold	US\$/oz.tr.	Daily
40	US Manufacturing PMI	Points	Monthly
41	FED Interest Rate (Upper Limit)	Percentages	Monthly
42	VIX Index	Percentages	Daily
43	Spread 2Y-5Y	Points	Monthly
44	China Industrial Production	YoY	Monthly

Continued on next page

Table A.6 – Continued

No.	Variable	Units	Frequency
45	PPI by All Commodities	1982=100	Monthly
46	ATSM	Degrees Celsius	Monthly
47	Anchovy Landing	Metric Tons	Daily
48	Logarithm of Anchovy Landing	Index	Daily
49	Anchovy Landing ¹¹	Index	Daily
50	Variation Anchovy Landing ¹²	YoY	Daily
51	Paddy Rice production	Tons	Monthly
52	Potato production	Tons	Monthly
53	Onion production	Tons	Monthly
54	Tomato production	Tons	Monthly

Note: All variables are included in the model in the form of annualized percentage variation

Source: Own elaboration

⁹Metropolitan Lima

¹⁰Lima

¹¹Seasonally Adjusted

¹²Seasonally Adjusted

Appendix B. Gibb sampling estimations

Figure B.4: Gibb sampling (2004-2023) - probability of inclusion in optimal model





Figure B.5: Gibb sampling (2004-2019) - probability of inclusion in optimal model



References

- [1] D. Giannone, L. Reichlin, M. Bańbura, M. Modugno, Now-casting and the real-time data flow, *Handbook of Economic Forecasting* 2 (2013) 195–237.
- [2] D. Giannone, L. Reichlin, D. Small, Nowcasting: The real-time informational content of macroeconomic data, *Journal of monetary economics* 55 (4) (2008) 665–676.
- [3] M. Bańbura, G. Rünstler, A look into the factor model black box: publication lags and the role of hard and soft data in forecasting gdp, *International Journal of Forecasting* 27 (2) (2011) 333–346.
- [4] J. H. Stock, M. W. Watson, New indexes of coincident and leading economic indicators, *NBER macroeconomics annual* 4 (1989) 351–394.
- [5] L. Longo, M. Riccaboni, A. Rungi, A neural network ensemble approach for gdp forecasting, *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 134 (2022) 104278.
- [6] B. Bok, D. Caratelli, D. Giannone, A. M. Sbordone, A. Tambalotti, Macroeconomic nowcasting and forecasting with big data, *Annual Review of Economics* 10 (2018) 615–643.
- [7] M. Rusnák, Nowcasting czech gdp in real time, *Economic Modelling* 54 (2016) 26–39.
- [8] M. González-Astudillo, D. Baquero, A nowcasting model for ecuador: Implementing a time-varying mean output growth, *Economic Modelling* 82 (2019) 250–263.
- [9] M. Evans, Where are we now? real-time estimates of the macro economy (2005).
- [10] A. Richardson, T. Mulder, Nowcasting new zealand gdp using machine learning algorithms (2018).
- [11] Q. Zhang, H. Ni, H. Xu, Nowcasting chinese gdp in a data-rich environment: Lessons from machine learning algorithms, *Economic Modelling* 122 (2023) 106204.

- [12] S. Athey, The impact of machine learning on economics, in: *The economics of artificial intelligence: An agenda*, University of Chicago Press, 2018, pp. 507–547.
- [13] D. M. Blei, A. Y. Ng, M. I. Jordan, Latent dirichlet allocation, *Journal of machine Learning research* 3 (Jan) (2003) 993–1022.
- [14] N. Woloszko, A weekly tracker of activity based on machine learning and google trends (2020).
- [15] H. Varian, Machine learning and econometrics, Slides package from talk at University of Washington (2014).
- [16] S. Ghosh, A. Ranjan, A machine learning approach to gdp nowcasting: An emerging market experience, *Buletin Ekonomi Moneter dan Perbankan* 26 (2023) 33–54.
- [17] N. D. Muchisha, N. Tamara, A. Andriansyah, A. M. Soleh, Nowcasting indonesia’s gdp growth using machine learning algorithms, *Indonesian Journal of Statistics and Its Applications* 5 (2) (2021) 355–368.
- [18] D. Kant, A. Pick, J. de Winter, Nowcasting gdp using machine learning methods (2022).
- [19] N. Suphaphiphat, Y. Wang, H. Zhang, A scalable approach using dfm, machine learning and novel data, applied to european economies (2022).
- [20] L. Einav, J. Levin, The data revolution and economic analysis, *Innovation Policy and the Economy* 14 (1) (2014) 1–24.
- [21] A. C. Eberendu, et al., Unstructured data: an overview of the data of big data, *International Journal of Computer Trends and Technology* 38 (1) (2016) 46–50.
- [22] C. Romer, D. Romer, The fomc versus the staff: where can monetary policymakers add value?, *American Economic Review* 98 (2) (2008) 230–235.
- [23] Armstrong, *Principles of forecasting: a handbook for researchers and practitioners*, Vol. 30, Springer, 2001.

- [24] J. Escobal D'Angelo, J. Torres, Un sistema de indicadores lideres del nivel de actividad para la economía peruana (2002).
- [25] J. Kapsoli Salinas, B. Bencich Aguilar, Indicadores lideres, redes neuronales y predicción de corto plazo (2002).
- [26] R. Etter, M. Graff, et al., A composite leading indicator for the peruvian economy based on the bcrp's monthly business tendency surveys, Tech. rep., Banco Central de Reserva del Perú (2011).
- [27] M. Martinez, R. Quineche, Un indicador lider para el nowcasting de la actividad económica del Perú, Tech. rep., Mimeo (2014).
- [28] S. B. Aruoba, F. X. Diebold, C. Scotti, Real-time measurement of business conditions, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 27 (4) (2009) 417–427.
- [29] F. J. P. Forero, O. J. G. Aguilar, R. F. G. Vargas, Un indicador lider de actividad real para el Perú (2016).
- [30] F. Pérez Forero, Nowcasting peruvian gdp using leading indicators and bayesian variable selection, Tech. rep., Banco Central de Reserva del Perú (2018).
- [31] J. J. Barrios, J. Escobar, J. Leslie, L. Martin, W. Peña, Nowcasting para predecir actividad económica en tiempo real: los casos de belice y el salvador (2021).
- [32] J. Döpke, U. Fritsche, C. Pierdzioch, Predicting recessions with boosted regression trees, *International Journal of Forecasting* 33 (4) (2017) 745–759.
- [33] M. C. Medeiros, G. F. Vasconcelos, Á. Veiga, E. Zilberman, Forecasting inflation in a data-rich environment: the benefits of machine learning methods, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 39 (1) (2021) 98–119.
- [34] S. Giglio, B. Kelly, D. Xiu, Factor models, machine learning, and asset pricing, *Annual Review of Financial Economics* 14 (2022) 337–368.
- [35] K. C. Green, S. Armstrong, Simple versus complex forecasting: The evidence, *Journal of Business Research* 68 (8) (2015) 1678–1685.

- [36] S. Makridakis, E. Spiliotis, V. Assimakopoulos, Statistical and machine learning forecasting methods: Concerns and ways forward, *PloS one* 13 (3) (2018) e0194889.
- [37] C. Doz, D. Giannone, L. Reichlin, A two-step estimator for large approximate dynamic factor models based on kalman filtering, *Journal of Econometrics* 164 (1) (2011) 188–205.
- [38] M. Bańbura, M. Modugno, Maximum likelihood estimation of factor models on datasets with arbitrary pattern of missing data, *Journal of applied econometrics* 29 (1) (2014) 133–160.
- [39] R. Tibshirani, Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 58 (1) (1996) 267–288.
- [40] H. Zou, T. Hastie, Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology* 67 (2) (2005) 301–320.
- [41] H. Zou, The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties, *Journal of the American statistical association* 101 (476) (2006) 1418–1429.
- [42] Z. Z. Liu, The doubly adaptive LASSO methods for time series analysis, The University of Western Ontario (Canada), 2014.
- [43] L. Breiman, Random forests, *Machine learning* 45 (2001) 5–32.
- [44] M. A. Tiffin, Seeing in the dark: A machine-learning approach to nowcasting in Lebanon, International Monetary Fund, 2016.
- [45] J. Brownlee, Bagging and random forest ensemble algorithms for machine learning, *Machine Learning Algorithms* (2016) 4–22.
- [46] A. Natekin, A. Knoll, Gradient boosting machines, a tutorial, *Frontiers in neurorobotics* 7 (2013) 21.
- [47] B. Boehmke, B. Greenwell, Chapter 12: Gradient boosting, *Hands-On Machine Learning with R* (2020).

- [48] S. L. Scott, H. R. Varian, Bayesian variable selection for nowcasting economic time series, in: *Economic analysis of the digital economy*, University of Chicago Press, 2015, pp. 119–135.
- [49] G. Garcia-Donato, M. A. Martinez-Beneito, On sampling strategies in bayesian variable selection problems with large model spaces, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108 (501) (2013) 340–352.
- [50] F. X. Diebold, R. S. Mariano, Comparing predictive accuracy, *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 13 (3) (1995) 253–263.
- [51] J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, R. P. Adams, Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms, *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [52] D. Harvey, S. Leybourne, P. Newbold, Testing the equality of prediction mean squared errors, *International Journal of forecasting* 13 (2) (1997) 281–291.