

Meitz, Mika; Teräsvirta, Timo

Working Paper

Evaluating models of autoregressive conditional duration

SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance, No. 557

Provided in Cooperation with:

EFI - The Economic Research Institute, Stockholm School of Economics

Suggested Citation: Meitz, Mika; Teräsvirta, Timo (2004) : Evaluating models of autoregressive conditional duration, SSE/EFI Working Paper Series in Economics and Finance, No. 557, Stockholm School of Economics, The Economic Research Institute (EFI), Stockholm

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/56289>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Supplement to ‘Evaluating models of autoregressive conditional duration’ by Mika Meitz and Timo Teräsvirta

In this supplement we briefly summarize the results of the size simulations of our test statistics when instead of (43) the data generating process is

$$\begin{aligned}x_i &= \psi_i \varepsilon_i \\ \psi_i &= 0.05 + 0.09x_{i-1} + 0.90\psi_{i-1} \\ \varepsilon_i &\sim \text{i.i.d. exp}(1).\end{aligned}\tag{43*}$$

Otherwise the simulation exercise is identical to the one in Section 6.1 of our paper. The size discrepancies of our test are given in Figure 2*. Comparing them with the results in Figure 2 of the paper (note the different scale on the y -axis) indicates that the size distortions with the data generating processes (43) and (43*) are of the same magnitude. The only notable exception is the increase in the actual size for the test against the ACD(1,2) alternative.

Figure 2*: Results from size simulations of the tests. In the figures the size discrepancy (i.e. the actual size less the nominal size) is plotted against the nominal size. Both of them are measured in percentage points. Performed tests are the tests against ACD(2,1) and ACD(1,2) models, tests of no remaining ACD (of order one) in the standardized durations, and tests of no smooth transition ACD of orders one and two. Both the ordinary and robust versions of the tests are used. The three lines in each subfigure correspond to sample sizes 1000 (+), 5000 (×) and 10000 (*).

