

Clustering Time Series Which Dependence Measure? For Which Dependence?

Many bivariate dependence measures are available. Usually, they aim at measuring:

- any deviation from independence,
- any deviation from co/counter-monotonicity.

Motivation: What if

- we aim at specific dependence,
- and try to "ignore" some others?

Dependence to detect $(\rho_{ij} := 1)$



Dependence to ignore $(\rho_{ij} := 0)$

Problem: A dependence measure powerful enough to detect $y = f(x^2)$ will also detect y = g(x), f increasing, g decreasing.

Copulas & Dependence

• Sklar's Theorem:

$$F(x_i, x_j) = C_{ij}(F_i(x_i), F_j(x_j))$$

- C_{ij} , the copula, encodes the dependence structure
- Fréchet-Hoeffding bounds:

 $\max\{u_i + u_j - 1, 0\} \le C_{ij}(u_i, u_j) \le \min\{u_i, u_j\}$

- Bivariate dependence measures:
- deviation from lower and upper bounds
- Spearman's ρ_S , Gini's γ
- deviation from independence $u_i u_j$
- Spearman, Copula MMD, Schweizer-Wolff's σ , Hoeffding's Φ^2



Figure 1: (left) lower-bound copula, (mid) independence copula, (right) upper-bound copula

Optimal Copula Transport for Clustering Time Series

Gautier Marti^{1,2}, Frank Nielsen², Philippe Donnat¹ ¹Hellebore Capital Limited & ²Ecole Polytechnique

Optimal Transport

Wasserstein metrics:

$$W_p^p(\mu,\nu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu,\nu)} \int_{M \times M} d(x,y)^p d\gamma(x,y)$$

In practice, the distance W_1 is estimated on discrete
lata by solving the following linear program with

the Hungarian algorithm:

$$\begin{split} \text{EMD}(s_{1}, s_{2}) &:= \min_{f} \sum_{1 \leq k, l \leq n} \|p_{k} - q_{l}\| f_{kl} \\ \text{subject to} & f_{kl} \geq 0, \ 1 \leq k, l \leq n, \\ & \sum_{l=1}^{n} f_{kl} \leq w_{p_{k}}, \ 1 \leq k \leq n, \\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n} f_{kl} \leq w_{q_{l}}, \ 1 \leq l \leq n, \\ & \sum_{k=1}^{n} \sum_{l=1}^{n} f_{kl} = 1. \end{split}$$

It is called the Earth Mover Distance (EMD) in the CS literature.

EMD between Copulas



Copulas C_1, C_2, C_3 encoding a correlation of Figure 3: 0.5, 0.99, 0.9999 respectively; Which pair of copulas is the nearest? For Fisher-Rao, Kullback-Leibler, Hellinger and related divergences: $D(C_1, C_2) \leq D(C_2, C_3)$; $EMD(C_2, C_3) \leq D(C_2, C_3)$ $\operatorname{EMD}(C_1, C_2)$

Figure 4: Dependence estimators power as a function of the

noise for several deterministic patterns + noise. Their power is the percentage of times that they are able to distinguish between dependent and independent samples.

gure 2: Dependence is measured as the relative distance from independence to the nearest target-dependence

Our coefficient can robustly target complex dependence patterns such as the ones displayed in Fig. 4.

• x-axis measures the noise added to the sample • y-axis measures the frequency the coefficient is able to discern between the dependent sample and the independent one

Basic check: no coefficient can discern between the "dependent" sample (with no dependence) and the independent sample.

A target-oriented dependence coefficient

Build the independence copula $C_{\rm ind}$ Build the target-dependence copulas $\{C_k\}_k$ Compute the empirical copula C_{ij} from x_i, x_j

Benchmark: Power of Estimators

Clustering of Credit Default Swaps

• We use the two targets from Fig. 2 • Clustering distance: $D_{ij} = \sqrt{(1 - \text{TDC}(C_{ij}))/2}$

The methodology presented is

• non-parametric, robust, deterministic.

It has some scalability issues:

• in dimension, non-parametric density estimation; • in time, EMD is costly to compute.

Conclusion

Approximation schemes or parametric modelling can alleviate these issues.

Information

• Web: www.datagrapple.com • Email: gautier.marti@helleborecapital.com

Hellebore Capital Ltd

