

# CONSTRAINED RANDOMISATION OF TIME SERIES FOR HYPOTHESIS TESTING

Thomas Schreiber and Andreas Schmitz

*Physics Department, University of Wuppertal, D-42097 Wuppertal, Germany*  
schreibe@theorie.physik.uni-wuppertal.de

**Abstract**— We propose a general scheme to create time sequences that fulfill given constraints but are random otherwise. Significance levels for nonlinearity tests are as usually obtained by Monte Carlo resampling. In a new scheme, constraints including multivariate, nonlinear, and nonstationary properties are implemented in the form of a cost function.

## I. INTRODUCTION

There are two distinct motivations to use a nonlinear approach when analysing time series data. It might be that the arsenal of linear methods has been exploited thoroughly but all the efforts left certain structures in the time series unaccounted for. It is also common that a system is known to include nonlinear components and therefore a linear description seems unsatisfactory in the first place. The latter reasoning is rather dangerous since the nonlinearity may not be reflected in a specific signal. In particular, we don't know if it is of any practical use to go beyond the linear approximation. Consequently, the application of nonlinear time series methods has to be justified by establishing nonlinearity in the time series data.

This paper will discuss formal statistical tests for nonlinearity. First, a suitable null hypothesis for the underlying process will be formulated covering all Gaussian linear processes and, in fact, a class that is somewhat wider. We will then test this null hypothesis by comparing a nonlinear parameter with its probability distribution for the null hypothesis which has to be estimated by a Monte Carlo resampling technique. This procedure is known in the nonlinear time series literature as the method of *surrogate data*, see Ref. [1]. Thus we have to face a two-fold task. We have to find a nonlinear parameter that is able to actually detect an existing deviation of the data from a given null hypothesis and we have to provide an ensemble of randomised time series that accurately represents the null hypothesis.

## II. DETECTING NONLINEARITY

Several quantities have been discussed that can be used to characterise nonlinear time series [2]. For the

purpose of nonlinearity testing we need such quantities that are particularly powerful in discriminating linear dynamics and weakly nonlinear signatures. Traditional measures of nonlinearity are derived from generalisations of the two-point autocovariance function or the power spectrum. One particularly useful third order quantity is  $\sum_{n=\tau+1}^N (s_n - s_{n-\tau})^3$  since it measures the asymmetry of a series under time reversal. When a nonlinearity test is performed with the question in mind if nonlinear deterministic modeling of the signal may be useful, it seems most appropriate to use a test statistic that is related to a nonlinear deterministic approach [3]. Widely used are test statistics which in some way or the other quantify the nonlinear predictability of the signal. Let  $\vec{x}_n = (s_{n-(m-1)\tau}, \dots, s_n)$  be the sequence of time delay embedding vectors obtained from the scalar time series  $s_n$ . The nonlinear prediction error can then be defined by  $\sqrt{\sum [\vec{x}_{n+1} - F(\vec{x}_n)]^2}$ . The prediction  $F$  over one time step is performed by averaging over the future values of all neighboring delay vectors  $\vec{x}_{n'}$  closer to  $\vec{x}_n$  than  $\epsilon$  in  $m$  embedding dimensions.

## III. SURROGATE DATA

Almost all measures of nonlinearity have in common that their probability distribution on finite data sets is not known analytically. It is therefore necessary to use a Monte Carlo resampling technique. Traditional bootstrap methods [4] use explicit model equations that have to be extracted from the data. This *typical realizations* approach can be very powerful for the computation of confidence intervals, provided the model equations can be extracted successfully. As discussed by Theiler and Prichard [5], the alternative approach of *constrained realizations* is more suitable for the purpose of hypothesis testing we are interested in here. It avoids the fitting of model equations by directly imposing the desired structures onto the randomised time series. However, the choice of possible null hypothesis is limited by the difficulty to impose arbitrary structures on otherwise random sequences. A general method has been recently proposed by one of the authors [6].

It is essential for the validity of the statistical test that the surrogate series are created properly. If they contain spurious differences to the measured data, these may be detected by the test and interpreted as signatures of nonlinearity. A simple case is the null hypothesis that the data consists of independent draws from a fixed probability distribution. Surrogate time series can be simply obtained by randomly shuffling the measured data. If we find significantly different serial correlations in the data and the shuffles, we can reject the hypothesis of independence.

### A. Fourier based methods

A step towards more interesting null hypotheses is to incorporate the structures reflected by linear two-point autocorrelations. A corresponding null hypothesis is that the data have been generated by some linear stochastic process with Gaussian increments. The statistical test is complicated by the fact that we don't want to test against one particular linear process only (one specific choice of ARMA coefficients), but against a whole class of processes. This is called a *composite* null hypothesis. The unknown coefficients are sometimes referred to as *nuisance parameters*. There are basically three directions we can take in this situation. First, we could try to make the discriminating statistic independent of the nuisance parameters. This approach has not been demonstrated to be viable for any but some very simple statistics. Second, we could determine which linear model is most likely realised in the data by a fit for the coefficients, and then test against the hypothesis that the data has been generated by this particular model. Surrogates are simply created by running the fitted model. The main drawback is that we cannot recover the *true* underlying process by any fit procedure.

The null hypothesis of an underlying Gaussian linear stochastic process can also be formulated by stating that all structure to be found in a time series is exhausted by computing first and second order quantities, the mean, the variance and the autocovariance function. This means that a randomised sample can be obtained by creating sequences with the same second order properties as the measured data, but which are otherwise random. When the linear properties are specified by the squared amplitudes of the Fourier transform (that is, the periodogram estimator of the power spectrum), surrogate time series are readily created by multiplying the Fourier transform of the data by random phases and then transforming back to the time domain.

The most obvious deviation from the Gaussian linear process is usually that the data don't follow a Gaussian distribution. There is a simple generalisation of the null hypothesis that explains deviations from the normal distribution by the action of a mono-

tone, static measurement function:  $s_n = s(x_n)$  where  $\{x_n\}$  is a realisation of an ARMA process. We want to regard a time series from such a process as essentially linear since the only nonlinearity is contained in the — in principle invertible — measurement function  $s(\cdot)$ .

The most commonly used method to create surrogate data sets for this null hypothesis essentially attempts to invert  $s(\cdot)$  by rescaling the time series  $\{s_n\}$  to conform with a Gaussian distribution. The rescaled version is then phase randomised (conserving Gaussianity on average) and the result is rescaled to the empirical distribution of  $\{s_n\}$ . Schreiber and Schmitz [7] argue that for short and strongly correlated sequences, this algorithm can yield an incorrect test due to a bias towards a flat spectrum. They propose a method which iteratively corrects deviations in spectrum and distribution. Alternatingly, the surrogate is filtered towards the correct Fourier amplitudes and rank-ordered to the correct distribution. The accuracy that can be reached depends on the size and structure of the data and is generally sufficient for hypothesis testing.

### B. General scheme

The above schemes are based on the Fourier amplitudes of the data which is appropriate in many cases. However, there remain some flaw, the strongest being the severely restricted class of testable null hypotheses. In the general approach of Ref. [6], constraints (e.g. autocorrelations) on the surrogate data are implemented by a cost function  $E(\{s_n\})$  which has a global minimum when the constraints are fulfilled. This cost function will be minimised by simulated annealing [8]. Starting with a random permutation of the original time series, the surrogate is modified by exchanging two points chosen at random. The modification will be accepted if it yields a lower value for the cost function or else with a probability  $p = \exp(-\Delta E/T)$ . The “system temperature”  $T$  will be lowered slowly to let the system settle down to a minimum.

The constraint that the autocovariances of the surrogate  $C'(\tau)$  should be the same as those of the data  $C(\tau)$  can be realised by specifying the discrepancy as a cost function, for example

$$E = \sum_{\tau=0}^{N-1} |C'(\tau) - C(\tau)|. \quad (1)$$

Now  $E(\{\tilde{s}_n\})$  is minimised among all permutations  $\{\tilde{s}_n\}$  of the original time series  $\{s_n\}$ . With an appropriate cooling scheme, the annealing procedure can reach any desired accuracy.

Constrained randomisation using combinatorial minimisation is a very flexible method since in principle arbitrary constraints can be realised. It can be




Figure 1: Simultaneous measurements of breath and heart rates, upper and middle traces. Lower trace: a surrogate heart rate series preserving the autocorrelation structure and the cross-correlation to the fixed breath rate series, as well as a spurious gap in the data. Auto- and cross-correlation together seems to explain some, but not all of the structure present in the heart rate series.

quite useful to be able to incorporate into the surrogates any feature of the data that is understood already or that is considered to be uninteresting. The price for the accuracy and generality of the method is its high computational cost.

#### IV. APPLICATIONS

**Heart rate**— Let us give an example for the flexibility of the approach, a simultaneous recording of the breath rate and the instantaneous heart rate of a human subject during sleep [9], see Fig. 1. An interesting question is, how much of the structure in the heart rate (middle) can be explained by linear dependence on the breath rate (upper). In order to answer this question, we need to make surrogates that have the same autocorrelation structure but also the same cross-correlation with respect to the fixed input signal, the breath rate. Accordingly, a constraint is used to fix the auto-covariance and the cross-covariance with the reference (breath) signal. While the linear cross-correlation with the breath rate explains the cyclic structure of the heart rate data, other features, in particular the asymmetry under time reversal, remain unexplained. Possible explanations include artefacts due to the peculiar way of deriving heart rate from inter-beat intervals, nonlinear coupling to the breath activity, nonlinearity in the cardiac system, and others.

**Financial data**— Let us study 1500 daily returns (until the end of 1996) of the *BUND Future*, a derived financial instrument of the German stock market. (Data by courtesy of Thomas Schürmann, WGZ-Bank Düsseldorf.) The sequence (Fig. 2, upper) is nonsta-




Figure 2: Nonstationary financial time series (top) and a surrogate (bottom) preserving the nonstationary structure quantified by running window estimates of the local mean and variance (middle).

tionary in the sense that the local mean and variance undergo changes on a time scale that is long compared to the fluctuations of the series itself. This property is known in the statistical literature as *heteroscedasticity* and modeled by the so-called GARCH and related models. Here, we want to avoid the construction of a parametric model but rather ask the question if the data is compatible with the null hypothesis of a correlated linear stochastic process with time dependent local mean and variance. We can answer this question in a statistical sense by creating surrogate time series that show the same linear correlations and the same time dependence of the running mean and variance as the data and comparing a nonlinear statistic between data and surrogates. Accordingly, a cost function is set up to match the autocorrelation function up to five days and the moving mean and variance in sliding windows of 100 days duration. Using a time-asymmetry statistic, the null hypothesis could not be rejected, suggesting that the above characterisation of the data is operationally complete.

**Unevenly sampled data**— Let us finally show how the new randomisation method can be used to test for nonlinearity in time series with time intervals of different sizes. Unevenly sampled data are quite common, examples include drill core data, astronomical observations or stock price notations. Most observables and algorithms cannot easily be generalised to this case which is particularly true for nonlinear time series methods. Interpolating the data to equally spaced sampling times is not recommendable for a test for nonlinearity since one could not *a posteriori* distinguish between genuine structure and nonlinearity introduced spuriously by the interpolation process.

Consider a time series sampled at times  $\{t_n\}$  that need not be equally spaced. The power spectrum can then be estimated by the Lomb periodogram  $P(\omega)$ ,




Figure 3: The down-sampled data set E with one corresponding surrogate. Gaps of different sizes prevents reasonable interpolation.

as discussed for example in Ref. [10]. For time series sampled at constant time intervals, the Lomb periodogram yields the standard squared Fourier transformation. Except for this particular case, it does not have any inverse transformation, which makes it impossible to use the standard surrogate data algorithms mentioned above. Therefore, we use the Lomb periodogram of the data as a constraint for the surrogates. It can be expressed as a cost function for example by:  $E = \sum_{k=1}^{N_f} |P'(k\omega_0) - P(k\omega_0)|$ . We use  $P$  at  $N_f$  equally spaced frequencies  $k\omega_0$ , other choices are possible. Consider a series [11] of the time-integrated intensity of light observed from a variable star, see Fig. 3. It consists of 17 parts with different numbers of points, the time range of which may overlap or show gaps of up to 10000 s. Between gaps, the (down-sampled) data is evenly sampled with  $\Delta = 120$  s, the total number of points is  $N = 2260$ . The linear null hypothesis was not rejected by the time reversibility statistic. One surrogate is shown in Fig. 3.

## V. DISCUSSION

We have set up a statistical hypothesis test of nonlinearity. How interesting its outcome is depends on the specific null hypothesis chosen. The most meaningful test can be performed if the null hypothesis is plausible enough so that we are prepared to believe it in the lack of evidence against it. In general, we will specify a set of observables we believe to be complete to describe the structure found in the data. The surrogates will then share these properties with the data and any significant discrepancy between data and surrogates can guide to a more complete understanding.

Recent efforts on the generalisation of randomisation schemes try to broaden the repertoire of null hypothesis we can test against. The hope is that we can eventually choose one that is general enough to be acceptable if we fail to reject it with the methods we

have. Still, we cannot prove that there isn't any structure in the data beyond what is covered by the null hypothesis. From a practical point of view, however, there is not much of a difference between structure that isn't there and structure that is undetectable with our observational means.

We like to thank Daniel Kaplan, James Theiler, Peter Grassberger and Holger Kantz for useful discussions. This work was supported by the SFB 237 of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

## References

- [1] J. Theiler, S. Eubank, A. Longtin, B. Galdrikian, and J.D. Farmer, "Testing for nonlinearity in time series: The method of surrogate data", *Physica D* 58 (1992) 77
- [2] T. Schreiber and A. Schmitz, "Discrimination power of measures for nonlinearity in a time series", *Phys. Rev. E* 55 (1997) 5443.
- [3] H. Kantz and T. Schreiber, "Nonlinear time series analysis", Cambridge University Press (1997).
- [4] B. Efron, "The jackknife, the bootstrap and other resampling plans", SIAM, Philadelphia, PA, 1982.
- [5] J. Theiler and D. Prichard, "Constrained-realization Monte-Carlo method for hypothesis testing", *Physica D* 94 (1996) 221.
- [6] T. Schreiber, "Constrained randomization of time series data", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 2105.
- [7] T. Schreiber and A. Schmitz, "Improved surrogate data for nonlinearity tests", *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 77 (1996) 635.
- [8] R. V. V. Vidal, ed., "Applied simulated annealing", Lecture notes in economics and mathematical systems 396, Springer, Berlin (1993).
- [9] D. R. Rigney, A. L. Goldberger, W. Ocasio, Y. Ichimaru, G. B. Moody, and R. Mark, "Multi-channel physiological data: Description and analysis", in *Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Science of Complexity*, Proc. Vol. XV, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1993.
- [10] W. H. Press, B. P. Flannery, S. A. Teukolsky, and W. T. Vetterling, "Numerical Recipes", second edition, §13.8., Cambridge University Press (1995).
- [11] J. Ch. Clemens, "Whole earth telescope observation of the White Dwarf Star PG 1159-035 (Data set E)", in *Santa Fe Institute Studies in the Science of Complexity*, Proc. Vol. XV, Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, 1993.