

# A note on local parameter orthogonality for multivariate data and the Whittle algorithm for multivariate autoregressive models

Changle Shen<sup>1</sup>, Dong Li<sup>1</sup>, and Howell Tong<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Statistics and Data Science, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Data Science, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, London WC2A 2AE, U.K.*

## Abstract

This article extends the Cox–Reid local parameter orthogonality to a multivariate setting and shows that the extension can lead to the Whittle algorithm for multivariate autoregressive models.

**Keywords:** Local parameter orthogonality, multivariate autoregressive model, Whittle algorithm

## 1 Introduction

In their seminal paper, [Cox and Reid \(1987\)](#) initiated an approach to local parameter orthogonality. They focused on univariate data in the presence of one single parameter of interest, with their equation (4) playing the pivotal role. As far as we know, parallel developments for multivariate data have not attracted much attention. Additionally, question (viii) in Section 6 of their paper raised the possibility of generalizing their discussion to vector parameters of interest. In particular, their equation (4) has not been explicitly extended in the above two directions. In this note we aim to fill the gap. As a byproduct, we also

demonstrate that the extension can bring about substantial gains in computational efficiency for multivariate autoregressive (AR) modelling in the form of the celebrated [Whittle \(1963\)](#) algorithm.

Notations. Let  $\mathbf{0}_d$  denote the  $d$ -dimensional vector with all entries 0, where the subscript  $d$  may be suppressed if the dimension is clear from the context. Given a zero-mean  $d$ -dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{X}_t\}$ , we write  $\mathbf{\Gamma}_h = E(\mathbf{X}_t \mathbf{X}_{t-h}^\top)$  as its lag- $h$  cross-covariance matrix. Let  $\mathcal{N}_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$  be the  $d$ -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$  being its precision matrix. For any  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ , we let  $A_{(i,j)}$  be its  $(i,j)$ -th entry. We use  $\mathbf{E}_{i,j}$  to denote the  $d \times d$  matrix with the  $(i,j)$ -th entry being 1 and all other entries being 0; or equivalently,  $E_{i,j,(k,\ell)} = \delta_{i,k} \delta_{j,\ell}$ , where  $\delta_{i,j}$  is the Kronecker delta function.

## 2 Local parameter orthogonality for multivariate data

Let  $f_{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta})$  be the probability density function of an  $m$ -dimensional random vector  $\mathbf{X}$  coming from a parametric multivariate distribution with  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$  being the  $d$ -dimensional unknown parameters of interest. For a sample of size  $n$ , we write  $l(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{x}_{1:n})$  for the log-likelihood function, where  $\mathbf{x}_{1:n} = (\mathbf{x}_1^\top, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^\top)^\top$  is the  $n \times m$  matrix of observations. Following [Jeffreys \(1961\)](#)(pg. 207), for a partition of  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1^\top, \boldsymbol{\theta}_2^\top)^\top$  with  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$  and  $d_1 + d_2 = d$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$  is defined to be orthogonal to  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$  if the entries of the Fisher information matrix satisfy

$$I_{i,j}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{n} E \left\{ \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\partial \theta_i} \frac{\partial l(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\partial \theta_j} \right\} = -\frac{1}{n} E \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 l(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\partial \theta_i \partial \theta_j} \right\} = 0 \quad (1)$$

for any  $i = 1, \dots, d_1$  and  $j = d_1 + 1, \dots, d$ . If (1) holds at some point  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}$ , then  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$  are said to be locally orthogonal at  $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)}$ .

We now discuss the case in which  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1$  are the parameters of interest and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2$  are the nuisance parameters and we wish that via suitable transformations they become locally orthogonal. To avoid confusion, we write  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = \boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_{d_1})^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_2 = \boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{d_2})^\top$ . The following argument is a direct consequence of equation (4) in [Cox and Reid \(1987\)](#).

Suppose that we wish to deal with the problem that is reparameterized by  $(\boldsymbol{\psi}^\top, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top)^\top$  with transformation  $\underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = (\underline{\gamma}_1, \dots, \underline{\gamma}_{d_2})^\top$ :

$$\gamma_j = \underline{\gamma}_j(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}), \quad j = 1, \dots, d_2.$$

Then the log-likelihood function  $\underline{l}$  in terms of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  satisfies

$$\underline{l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}); \mathbf{x}_{1:n}) = l(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}; \mathbf{x}_{1:n}).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial l}{\partial \psi_i} &= \frac{\partial \underline{l}}{\partial \psi_i} + \sum_{r=1}^{d_2} \frac{\partial \underline{l}}{\partial \gamma_r} \frac{\partial \gamma_r}{\partial \psi_i}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 l}{\partial \psi_i \partial \lambda_j} &= \sum_{s=1}^{d_2} \frac{\partial^2 \underline{l}}{\partial \psi_i \partial \gamma_s} \frac{\partial \gamma_s}{\partial \lambda_j} + \sum_{r=1}^{d_2} \sum_{s=1}^{d_2} \frac{\partial^2 \underline{l}}{\partial \gamma_r \partial \gamma_s} \frac{\partial \gamma_s}{\partial \lambda_j} \frac{\partial \gamma_r}{\partial \psi_i} + \sum_{r=1}^{d_2} \frac{\partial \underline{l}}{\partial \gamma_r} \frac{\partial^2 \gamma_r}{\partial \psi_i \partial \lambda_j} \end{aligned}$$

for any  $i = 1, \dots, d_1$  and  $j = 1, \dots, d_2$ . By taking expectations, we have that the local orthogonality of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$  is equivalent to

$$\sum_{s=1}^{d_2} \frac{\partial \gamma_s}{\partial \lambda_j} \left( \underline{I}_{\psi_i, \gamma_s} + \sum_{r=1}^{d_2} \underline{I}_{\gamma_r, \gamma_s} \frac{\partial \gamma_r}{\partial \psi_i} \right) = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, d_1, \quad j = 1, \dots, d_2,$$

with the Fisher information matrix  $\underline{\mathbf{I}}$  calculated in the  $(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$  parametrization:

$$\underline{I}_{\psi_i, \gamma_s} = -\frac{1}{n} E \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \underline{l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}); \mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\partial \psi_i \partial \gamma_s} \right\}, \quad \underline{I}_{\gamma_r, \gamma_s} = -\frac{1}{n} E \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \underline{l}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \underline{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}); \mathbf{X}_{1:n})}{\partial \gamma_r \partial \gamma_s} \right\}.$$

Since the transformation from  $(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\lambda})$  to  $(\boldsymbol{\psi}, \boldsymbol{\gamma})$  has to be invertible, the local orthogonality condition can be written as

$$\sum_{r=1}^{d_2} \underline{I}_{\gamma_r, \gamma_s} \frac{\partial \gamma_r}{\partial \psi_i} = -\underline{I}_{\psi_i, \gamma_s}, \quad i = 1, \dots, d_1, \quad j, s = 1, \dots, d_2, \quad (2)$$

which is a generalization of equation (4) in [Cox and Reid \(1987\)](#) to the multivariate case.

### 3 The Whittle algorithm

One of the benefits of local parameter orthogonality is computational efficiency. We showcase this with a multivariate autoregressive model. Consider a zero-mean  $d$ -dimensional VAR( $p + 1$ ) model

$$\mathbf{X}_t + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \dots + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p} \mathbf{X}_{t-p} + \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1} \mathbf{X}_{t-p-1} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (3)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ 's are independent and identically distributed  $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ . Denote by

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1} = (\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,1} \vdots \cdots \vdots \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p} \vdots \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1})$$

the  $d \times d(p+1)$  parameter matrix of the VAR( $p+1$ ) model. Suppose that we wish to reparameterize  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1}$  to  $(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_p, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1})$  by transformations  $\underline{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p+1,s}$ :

$$\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,s} = \underline{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p+1,s}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_p, \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1}), \quad s = 1, \dots, p$$

such that the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_p$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1}$  are locally orthogonal. From equation (2), we require that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\ell=1}^d I_{p+1,r,(k,\ell),s,(i,j)}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1}) \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,r,(k,\ell)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} &= -I_{p+1,p+1,(u,v),s,(i,j)}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1}), \\ s = 1, \dots, p, \quad i, j, u, v = 1, \dots, d, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} I_{p+1,r,(k,\ell),s,(i,j)}(\boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1}) &= -E \left\{ \frac{\partial^2 \log f(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t; \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,r,(k,\ell)} \partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,s,(i,j)}} \right\} \\ &= E \{ \Lambda_{(k,i)} X_{t-r,\ell} X_{t-s,j} \} \\ &= \Lambda_{(k,i)} \Gamma_{s-r,(l,j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\ell=1}^d \Lambda_{(k,i)} \Gamma_{s-r,(l,j)} \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,r,(k,\ell)}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} = -\Lambda_{(u,i)} \Gamma_{s-p-1,(v,j)} \quad (5)$$

has to hold for all  $s = 1, \dots, p$  and  $i, j, u, v = 1, \dots, d$ .

Now for a backward VAR( $p$ ) modelling scheme with parameters  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_p$ , we have

$$\mathbf{X}_t + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p,1} \mathbf{X}_{t+1} + \cdots + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p,p} \mathbf{X}_{t+p} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t, \quad (6)$$

where the  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_t$ 's are independent and identically distributed  $\mathcal{N}_d(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_b)$ . By the Yule–Walker equations,

$$\sum_{r=1}^p \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p,p+1-r} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{s-r} = \sum_{r=1}^p \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p,r} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{r-p+1+s} = -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{s-p-1}, \quad s = 1, \dots, p, \quad (7)$$

which can be written entrywise as

$$\sum_{r=1}^p \sum_{\ell=1}^d \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Phi}}_{p,p+1-r,(i,\ell)} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{s-r,(l,j)} = -\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_{s-p-1,(i,j)}, \quad s = 1, \dots, p, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, d. \quad (8)$$

Equations (5) and (8) together yield a local orthogonal reparameterization of the VAR( $p+1$ ) model parameters (3) in terms of the VAR( $p$ ) model parameters (6). Specifically, we set

$$\Phi_{p+1,r} = \Phi_{p,r} + \Phi_{p+1,p+1} \tilde{\Phi}_{p,p+1-r}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p, \quad (9)$$

which are identical to the forward recursion equations of the Whittle (1963) algorithm for fitting multivariate autoregressive models. Then

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,r,(k,\ell)}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} = \tilde{\Phi}_{p,p+1-r,(v,\ell)} \delta_{u,k}. \quad (10)$$

Together with (8), (10) secures the orthogonality condition (5). Thus under the reparameterization (9),  $\Phi_p$  and  $\Phi_{p+1,p+1}$  are locally orthogonal, and their estimates are asymptotically independent.

In fact, assuming that transformations  $\underline{\Phi}_{p+1,s}$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, p$ , are linear, Whittle's forward recursion equations are the only possible transformation that ensures the local orthogonality condition (5). This is because (5) in a matrix form is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \Lambda \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,1}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 & \cdots & \Gamma_{p-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_{-p+1} & \cdots & \Gamma_0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\Lambda \mathbf{E}_{u,v} (\Gamma_{-p} \cdots \Gamma_{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \left( \frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,1}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} \quad \dots \quad \frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} \right) \\ &= -\mathbf{E}_{u,v} (\Gamma_{-p} \cdots \Gamma_{-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 & \cdots & \Gamma_{p-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_{-p+1} & \cdots & \Gamma_0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the  $(k, \ell)$ -th element of  $\partial \Phi_{p+1,r} / \partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$  is  $\partial \Phi_{p+1,r,(k,\ell)} / \partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}$ .

Meanwhile, equation (7) implies that

$$(\tilde{\Phi}_{p,p} \cdots \tilde{\Phi}_{p,1}) \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 & \cdots & \Gamma_{p-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_{-p+1} & \cdots & \Gamma_0 \end{pmatrix} = -(\Gamma_{-p} \cdots \Gamma_{-1}),$$

and thus

$$(\tilde{\Phi}_{p,p} \cdots \tilde{\Phi}_{p,1}) = -(\Gamma_{-p} \cdots \Gamma_{-1}) \begin{pmatrix} \Gamma_0 & \cdots & \Gamma_{p-1} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \Gamma_{-p+1} & \cdots & \Gamma_0 \end{pmatrix}^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Comparing equations (11) and (12), we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial \Phi_{p+1,r}}{\partial \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)}} = \mathbf{E}_{u,v} \tilde{\Phi}_{p,p+1-r}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p, \quad u, v = 1, \dots, d.$$

Note that when all entries of  $\Phi_{p+1,p+1}$  are 0, the VAR( $p+1$ ) model reduces to a VAR( $p$ ) model, and  $\Phi_{p+1,r} = \Phi_{p,r}$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{p+1,r} &= \Phi_{p,r} + \sum_{u=1}^d \sum_{v=1}^d \Phi_{p+1,p+1,(u,v)} \mathbf{E}_{u,v} \tilde{\Phi}_{p,p+1-r} \\ &= \Phi_{p,r} + \Phi_{p+1,p+1} \tilde{\Phi}_{p,p+1-r}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the forward recursion equation (9) of the Whittle algorithm.

Similar results for the backward recursion equation

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{p+1,r} = \tilde{\Phi}_{p,r} + \tilde{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1} \Phi_{p,p+1-r}, \quad r = 1, \dots, p,$$

can be obtained by applying the same arguments to the backward VAR( $p+1$ ) model

$$\mathbf{X}_t + \tilde{\Phi}_{p+1,1} \mathbf{X}_{t+1} + \cdots + \tilde{\Phi}_{p+1,p} \mathbf{X}_{t+p} + \tilde{\Phi}_{p+1,p+1} \mathbf{X}_{t+p+1} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t$$

and the forward VAR( $p$ ) model

$$\mathbf{X}_t + \Phi_{p,1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \cdots + \Phi_{p,p} \mathbf{X}_{t-p} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_t.$$

## References

- Cox, D. R. and Reid, N. (1987). Parameter orthogonality and approximate conditional inference, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **49**(1): 1–18.
- Jeffreys, H. (1961). *Theory of Probability*, 3 edn, Oxford University Press.
- Whittle, P. (1963). On the fitting of multivariate autoregressions, and the approximate canonical factorization of a spectral density matrix, *Biometrika* **50**(1-2): 129–134.