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#### Abstract

A new class of time series models, developed by Harvey and Kattuman (2020), is designed to predict variables which when cumulated are subject to an unknown saturation level. Such models are relevant for many disciplines, but the applications here are for deaths from coronavirus. When numbers are small a score-driven Negative Binomial model can be used. It is shown how such models can be estimated with the Time Series Lab - Score Edition software package and their specification assessed by statistical tests and graphics.
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## 1 Introduction

Following earlier work by Harvey (1984), Harvey and Kattuman (2020) develop time series models for predicting future values of a variable which when cumulated is subject to an unknown saturation level. Such models are relevant for many disciplines, but the examples here are in epidemiology and concern coronavirus.

The generalized logistic class of growth curves contains the logistic and Gompertz as special cases; see, for example, Panik (2014) and Daley and Gani (2001). They lead to a model in which the increase, $y_{t}$, at time $t$ depends on the cumulative total $Y_{t}$. Specifically

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln y_{t}=\rho \ln Y_{t-1}+\delta-\gamma t+\varepsilon_{t}, \quad \rho \geq 1, \quad \gamma>0, \quad t=2, \ldots, T, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $y_{t}=Y_{t}-Y_{t-1}$ and $\varepsilon_{t}$ is a serially independent Gaussian disturbance with mean zero and constant variance, $\sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}$, that is $\varepsilon_{t} \sim \operatorname{NID}\left(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon}^{2}\right)$. The cumulative number follows a logistic curve when $\rho=2$ and a Gompertz when $\rho=1$. Estimation is by OLS. Additional flexibility can be
introduced into the model by letting the deterministic trend be time-varying. Thus

$$
\ln y_{t}=\rho \ln Y_{t-1}+\delta_{t}+\varepsilon_{t}, \quad t=2, \ldots, T
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta_{t} & =\delta_{t-1}-\gamma_{t-1}+\eta_{t}, & & \eta_{t} \sim N I D\left(0, \sigma_{\eta}^{2}\right),  \tag{2}\\
\gamma_{t} & =\gamma_{t-1}+\zeta_{t}, & & \zeta_{t} \sim \operatorname{NID}\left(0, \sigma_{\zeta}^{2}\right),
\end{align*}
$$

and the normally distributed irregular, level and slope disturbances, $\varepsilon_{t}, \eta_{t}$ and $\zeta_{t}$, respectively, are mutually independent. When $\sigma_{\eta}^{2}=\sigma_{\zeta}^{2}=0$, the trend is deterministic, that is $\delta_{t}=\delta-\gamma t$ with $\delta=\delta_{0}$. When only $\sigma_{\zeta}^{2}$ is zero, the slope is fixed and the trend reduces to a random walk with drift. On the other hand, allowing $\sigma_{\zeta}^{2}$ to be positive, but setting $\sigma_{\eta}^{2}=0$ gives an integrated random walk (IRW) trend, which when estimated tends to be relatively smooth. Such a model can be handled using the STAMP package.

The Kalman filter can be by-passed by adopting the reduced form, which comes from the innovations form of the Kalman filter so that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln y_{t}=\rho \ln Y_{t-1}+\delta_{t t-1}+\varepsilon_{t}, \quad t=3, \ldots, T \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta_{t+1, t} & =\delta_{t t-1}-\gamma_{t t-1}+\alpha_{1} \varepsilon_{t} \\
\gamma_{t+1, t} & =\gamma_{t, t-1}+\alpha_{2} \varepsilon_{t}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\alpha_{1}$ and $\alpha_{2}$ are non-negative parameters. Unless $\rho$ is fixed, it may be hard to estimate in small samples. Restrictions on the trend, such as setting $\alpha_{1}=0$, may also be prudent.

## 2 Small numbers: the negative binomial distribution

When $y_{t}$ is small, it may be necessary to adopt a discrete distribution, particularly if some observations are zero. The best choice is the negative binomial which, when parameterized in terms of a time-varying mean, $\xi_{t t-1}$, and a fixed positive shape parameter, $v$, has probability mass function (PMF)

$$
p\left(y_{t}\right)=\frac{\Gamma\left(v+y_{t}\right)}{y_{t}!\Gamma(v)} \xi_{t t-1}^{y_{t}}\left(v+\xi_{t t-1}\right)^{-y_{t}}\left(1+\xi_{t t-1} / v\right)^{-v}, \quad y_{t}=0,1,2, \ldots
$$

with $\operatorname{Var}_{t-1}\left(y_{t}\right)=\xi_{t, t-1}+\xi_{t, t-1}^{2} / v$. An exponential link function ensures that $\xi_{t, t-1}$ remains positive and at the same time yields an equation similar to (1):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \xi_{t, t-1}=\rho \ln Y_{t-1}+\delta-\gamma t, \quad \rho \geq 1, \quad t=3, \ldots, T \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

A stochastic trend may be introduced into the model as in (3). The conditional score framework of Creal et al. (2013) and Harvey (2013) suggests

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \xi_{t t-1}=\rho \ln Y_{t-1}+\delta_{t, t-1}, \quad t=3, \ldots, T \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \delta_{t+1 \mid t}=\delta_{t, t-1}-\gamma_{t \mid t-1} \\
& \gamma_{t+1, t}=\gamma_{t, t-1}+\alpha u_{t}, \quad \alpha \geq 0
\end{aligned}
$$

but with $u_{t}=y_{t} / \xi_{t, t-1}-1$, which is the conditional score for $\ln \xi_{t, t-1}$, that is $v\left(y_{t}-\xi_{t \mid t-1}\right) /(v+$ $\left.\xi_{t \mid t-1}\right)$, divided by the information quantity. The dynamic Gompertz model has $\rho=1$.

Predictions of future observations and the saturation level can be obtained from the recursions

$$
\begin{align*}
\widehat{y}_{T+\ell \mid T} & =\widehat{\mu}_{T+\ell-1 \mid T}^{\rho} \exp \left(\delta_{T}\right) \exp (-\gamma \ell) \\
\widehat{\mu}_{T+\ell \mid T} & =\widehat{\mu}_{T+\ell-1 \mid T}+\widehat{y}_{T+\ell \mid T}, \quad \ell=1,2, \ldots \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\delta_{T}$ is the level at time $T$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{T \mid T}=Y_{T}$.

## 3 Germany

The negative binomial model, (4), with $\rho$ set to one, was estimated using data, including some zeroes, from ${ }^{1}$ March 11th 2020 up to, and including, May 6 th. The result was $\widetilde{\alpha}=0$ - corresponding to a deterministic trend - and $\widetilde{\gamma}=0.071$. The fit and the ACF of the scores are shown in Figure 1. Including the daily (seasonal) effect produces the fit in Figure 2; the $\alpha$ coefficient is estimated close to zero and can be fixed at zero to constrain the effect to be deterministic. As might be expected from the excellent fit, the log-likelihood is significantly increased. With the daily seasonal included, the likelihood increases from -278.88 to -267.95 . The parameter estimates are $\widetilde{\gamma}=0.070, \widetilde{\delta}_{T}=-4.14$ and $\widetilde{v}=13.25$. The final total is predicted to be 8714 . Further estimation details are given in the appendix.

[^0]Figure 1
German deaths with score-driven Negbin model


Figure 2
German deaths with Negbin and a daily effect


## 4 Sweden

Our series for deaths in Sweden starts on March 13th and ends on May 9th. There are zeroes near the beginning and the numbers are smaller than those in Germany. Again the trend $\alpha$ effectively is equal to zero. Including the daily effect is essential and as can be seen from Figure 3, the fit is again very good. The parameter estimates are $\widetilde{\gamma}=0.061, \widetilde{\delta}_{T}=-4.05$ and $\widetilde{v}=4.80$. The values of $\widetilde{\gamma}$ are $\tilde{\delta}_{T}$ are similar in magnitude to those reported for Germany. Further estimation details are given in the appendix. The final total is predicted to be 4188 . Given the much higher population of Germany this is relatively high and it could be ascribed to the less stringent lockdown in Sweden. However, it is not out of line with other countries ${ }^{2}$ like Italy and UK.

Figure 3
Deaths in Sweden and Negbin model
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# Time Series Lab output Germany 

Time Series Lab - Score Edition 1.10, Copyright © 2019-2020 Nlitn
Session started at 2020-05-15 15:48
—— MODEL DESCRIPTION ———âĂ工̌

## Database

Model number: TSL001
The database used is: C:/...
The selection sample is: $1-57(\mathrm{~N}=1, \mathrm{~T}=57$ with 0 missings)

## Distribution

The dependent variable is DGerDeath
The selected distribution is the Negative Binomial distribution with parameters:

| Parameters | Symbol | Time-varying | Domain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean | $\lambda$ | Yes | $>0$ |
| Dispersion | $r$ | No | $>0$ |

## Parameter specification

$\lambda=\exp ($ Level + Seasonal(7) $+\mathrm{X} \beta+$ Score(1) $)$
$r=$ constant

## Explanatory variables

Explanatory variable for location is: LGerDeaths_1

## Initialisation of intensity

Initialisation component: Level
Type of initialisation: Estimate

Parameter starting values:

| Parameter type | Value | Free/Fix |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Log intensity: IRW $\kappa$ | 0.0200 | Free |
| Log intensity: init | 4.8098 | Free |
| Log intensity: init slope | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: seasonal $\kappa$ | 0.0000 | Fixed |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 1 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 2 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 3 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 4 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 5 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 6 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: $\beta$ LGerDeaths_1 | 1.0000 | Fixed |
| Dispersion | 5.0000 | Free |
| Start estimation |  |  |


| it0 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -30.92671843 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| it10 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -5.40858290 |
| it20 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.93143812 |
| it30 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.77494383 |
| it40 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.71288976 |
| it50 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.70105712 |
| it58 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.70103452 |

Strong convergence using numerical derivatives Log-likelihood $=-267.958968 ; \mathrm{T}=57$

Optimized parameter values:

| Parameter type | Value | Free/Fix |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Log intensity: IRW $\kappa$ | $1.2477 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Free |
| Log intensity: init | -0.2255 | Free |
| Log intensity: init slope | -0.0700 | Free |
| Log intensity: seasonal $\kappa$ | 0.0000 | Fixed |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 1 | 0.1985 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 2 | 0.1362 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 3 | 0.3596 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 4 | -0.1108 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 5 | -0.1568 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 6 | -0.4515 | Free |
| Log intensity: $\beta$ LGGerDeaths_1 | 1.0000 | Fixed |
| Dispersion | 13.2604 | Free |
| Estimation process completed in 1.4288 seconds |  |  |


| Component intensity | Initial | Time ${ }^{\text {T }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | 1.9468 | 132.1634 |
| Composite signal | 0.6662 | 4.8840 |
| Integrated random walk | -0.2255 | -4.1437 |
| Slope | -0.0700 | -0.0700 |
| Seasonal | 0.1985 | 0.1985 |
| $\mathrm{X} \beta$ | 0.6931 | 8.8292 |

Summary statistics for residuals and score:

| Statistic | Residuals | Pearson | Score |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Observations | 57.000 | 57.000 | 57.000 |
| Obs no nan | 57.000 | 57.000 | 57.000 |
| Mean | 0.232 | -0.028 | -0.031 |
| Variance | 683.856 | 1.578 | 0.290 |
| Median | -0.634 | -0.014 | -0.004 |
| Minimum | -55.980 | -2.315 | -1.000 |
| Maximum | 75.269 | 6.208 | 2.788 |
| Skewness | 0.129 | 1.881 | 2.085 |
| Kurtosis | 0.384 | 8.656 | 11.331 |

Test for autocorrelation:

## Durbin-Watson

| Lag | Score | Pearson | Critical value |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2.278 | 2.362 | $1.50-2.50$ |
| Ljung-Box |  |  |  |
| Lag | Score | Pearson | Critical value |
| 3 | 2.294 | 2.880 | 3.841 |
| 4 | 2.741 | 2.958 | 5.991 |
| 5 | 3.302 | 4.992 | 7.815 |
| 6 | 3.661 | 5.233 | 9.488 |
| 7 | 4.325 | 5.456 | 11.070 |
| 8 | 5.262 | 7.582 | 12.592 |
| 9 | 8.253 | 8.491 | 14.067 |
| 10 | 8.404 | 8.659 | 15.507 |
| 11 | 8.440 | 8.664 | 16.919 |
| 12 | 8.868 | 9.217 | 18.307 |
| 13 | 8.870 | 9.217 | 19.675 |

# Time Series Lab output Sweden 

Time Series Lab - Score Edition 1.10, Copyright © 2019-2020 Nlitn
Session started at 2020-05-15 15:48
__ MODEL DESCRIPTION —__ _âĂT

## Database

Model number: TSL002
The database used is: C:/...
The selection sample is: $1-58(\mathrm{~N}=1, \mathrm{~T}=58$ with 0 missings)

## Distribution

The dependent variable is DSweDeath
The selected distribution is the Negative Binomial distribution with parameters:

| Parameters | Symbol | Time-varying | Domain |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Mean | $\lambda$ | Yes | $>0$ |
| Dispersion | $r$ | No | $>0$ |

## Parameter specification

$\lambda=\exp ($ Level + Seasonal(7) $+\mathrm{X} \beta+$ Score(1) $)$
$r=$ constant

## Explanatory variables

Explanatory variable for location is: LSweDeath_1

## Initialisation of intensity

Initialisation component: Level
Type of initialisation: Estimate

Parameter starting values:

| Parameter type | Value | Free/Fix |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Log intensity: IRW $\kappa$ | 0.0200 | Free |
| Log intensity: init | 4.0023 | Free |
| Log intensity: init slope | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: seasonal $\kappa$ | 0.0000 | Fixed |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 1 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 2 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 3 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 4 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 5 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 6 | 0.0000 | Free |
| Log intensity: $\beta$ LSweDeath_1 | 1.0000 | Fixed |
| Dispersion | 5.0000 | Free |
| Start estimation |  |  |


| it0 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -25.99268241 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| it10 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.35338492 |
| it20 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.17788034 |
| it30 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.08485481 |
| it40 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.07737987 |
| it50 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.07557205 |
| it60 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.07555992 |
| it64 | $\mathrm{f}=$ | -4.07555988 |

Strong convergence using numerical derivatives
Log-likelihood $=-236.382473 ; T=58$
Optimized parameter values:

| Parameter type | Value | Free/Fix |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Log intensity: IRW $\kappa$ | $1.3142 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Free |
| Log intensity: init | -0.5833 | Free |
| Log intensity: init slope | -0.0607 | Free |
| Log intensity: seasonal $\kappa$ | 0.0000 | Fixed |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 1 | 0.3624 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 2 | 0.3370 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 3 | -0.4809 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 4 | -1.2662 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 5 | 0.1173 | Free |
| Log intensity: init seasonal 6 | 0.4528 | Free |
| Log intensity: $\beta$ LSweDeath_1 | 1.0000 | Fixed |
| Dispersion | 4.7952 | Free |

Estimation process completed in 1.5124 seconds

|  |  | STATE INFORMATION ————ăĂŤ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Component intensity | Initial | Time T |
| Mean | 0.8018 | 74.5765 |
| Composite signal | -0.2209 | 4.3118 |
| Integrated random walk | -0.5833 | -4.0448 |
| Slope | -0.0607 | -0.0607 |
| Seasonal | 0.3624 | 0.3370 |
| X $\beta$ | 0.0000 | 8.0196 |
|  |  | âĂŤ DIAGNOSTICS |

Summary statistics for residuals and score:

| Statistic | Residuals | Pearson | Score |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Observations | 58.000 | 58.000 | 58.000 |
| Obs no nan | 58.000 | 58.000 | 58.000 |
| Mean | 0.531 | 0.050 | 0.198 |
| Variance | 610.383 | 1.302 | 3.770 |
| Median | -0.725 | -0.127 | -0.060 |
| Minimum | -60.800 | -1.810 | -1.000 |
| Maximum | 62.816 | 5.092 | 14.254 |
| Skewness | 0.261 | 1.554 | 6.519 |
| Kurtosis | 0.975 | 4.771 | 44.376 |

Test for autocorrelation:

| Durbin-Watson |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Lag | Score | Pearson | Critical value |
| 1 | 1.874 | 1.606 | $1.50-2.50$ |
| Ljung-Box |  |  |  |
| Lag | Score | Pearson | Critical value |
| 3 | 2.202 | 4.181 | 3.841 |
| 4 | 2.490 | 5.094 | 5.991 |
| 5 | 2.516 | 5.481 | 7.815 |
| 6 | 2.559 | 5.992 | 9.488 |
| 7 | 2.662 | 7.504 | 11.070 |
| 8 | 2.768 | 9.383 | 12.592 |
| 9 | 2.768 | 9.409 | 14.067 |
| 10 | 2.856 | 9.763 | 15.507 |
| 11 | 2.974 | 9.847 | 16.919 |
| 12 | 2.976 | 9.903 | 18.307 |
| 13 | 2.997 | 9.983 | 19.675 |

## Time Series Lab - Screen Shots








[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The data is given on the ECDC website.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ 'Swedes, especially of the older generation, have a genetic disposition to social distancing anyway.' [Former Swedish PM]

