

The copyright © of this thesis belongs to its rightful author and/or other copyright owner. Copies can be accessed and downloaded for non-commercial or learning purposes without any charge and permission. The thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted as a whole without the permission from its rightful owner. No alteration or changes in format is allowed without permission from its rightful owner.



***SURE-AUTOMETRICS* ALGORITHM FOR MODEL SELECTION
IN MULTIPLE EQUATIONS**



NORHAYATI YUSOF

UUM

Universiti Utara Malaysia

**DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
UNIVERSITI UTARA MALAYSIA
2016**



Awang Had Salleh
Graduate School
of Arts And Sciences

Universiti Utara Malaysia

PERAKUAN KERJA TESIS / DISERTASI
(Certification of thesis / dissertation)

Kami, yang bertandatangan, memperakukan bahawa
(We, the undersigned, certify that)

NORHAYATI YUSOF

calon untuk Ijazah PhD
(candidate for the degree of)

telah mengemukakan tesis / disertasi yang bertajuk:
(has presented his/her thesis / dissertation of the following title):

"SURE-AUTOMETRIC\$ ALGORITHM FOR MODEL SELECTION IN MULTIPLE EQUATIONS"

seperti yang tercatat di muka surat tajuk dan kulit tesis / disertasi.
(as it appears on the title page and front cover of the thesis / dissertation).

Bahawa tesis/disertasi tersebut boleh diterima dari segi bentuk serta kandungan dan meliputi bidang ilmu dengan memuaskan, sebagaimana yang ditunjukkan oleh calon dalam ujian lisan yang diadakan pada: **26 April 2016.**

That the said thesis/dissertation is acceptable in form and content and displays a satisfactory knowledge of the field of study as demonstrated by the candidate through an oral examination held on:

April 26, 2016.

Pengerusi Viva:
(Chairman for VIVA)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Sharipah Soaad Syed Yahaya

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Luar:
(External Examiner)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ahmad Mahir Razali

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Luar:
(External Examiner)

Dr. Siti Meriam Zahari

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Pemeriksa Dalam:
(Internal Examiner)

Dr. Muhammad Mat Yusof

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Nama Penyelia/Penyelia-penyelia:
(Name of Supervisor/Supervisors)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Suzilah Ismail

Tandatangan
(Signature)

Tarikh:

(Date) April 26, 2016

Permission to Use

In presenting this thesis in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the University Library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for the copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purpose may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Requests for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part should be addressed to:

Dean of Awang Had Salleh Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

UUM College of Arts and Sciences

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Abstrak

Ketidaktentuan dalam proses pembinaan model dapat dijelaskan oleh pakar pemodelan kerana pengetahuan tersirat yang diperoleh melalui pengalaman menjalankan penyelidikan. Sementara itu, pengamal yang kebiasaannya bukan pakar dan kurang pengetahuan statistik akan berhadapan dengan kesukaran semasa proses pemodelan. Maka, algoritma yang disertai panduan langkah demi langkah adalah bermanfaat dalam pembinaan, pengujian dan pemilihan model. Bagaimanapun, kebanyakan algoritma pemilihan model seperti *Autometrics* hanya tertumpu pada pemodelan persamaan tunggal yang aplikasinya adalah terhad. Oleh itu, kajian ini bertujuan membangunkan algoritma bagi pemilihan model dalam persamaan berganda yang memfokuskan kepada model *Seemingly Unrelated Regression Equations (SURE)*. Algoritma tersebut dibangunkan dengan menyepadukan model *SURE* dan strategi carian oleh *Autometrics*; maka dinamakan *SURE-Autometrics*. Prestasinya dinilai dengan menggunakan ujikaji simulasi Monte Carlo berdasarkan lima model spesifikasi, tiga tahap kekuatan korelasi antara ralat, dan dua saiz sampel. Dua set *General Unrestricted Models (GUMS)* kemudiannya diformulasi dengan menambah beberapa pemboleh ubah tidak relevan terhadap model spesifikasi tersebut. Prestasi tersebut ditentukan melalui peratusan keupayaan algoritma *SURE-Autometrics* berupaya menyingkirkan pemboleh ubah tidak relevan dalam GUMS awalan yang terdiri daripada dua, empat dan enam persamaan. *SURE-Autometrics* juga ditentusahkan menggunakan dua set data sebenar melalui perbandingan ramalan ukuran ralat telahan dengan lima algoritma pemilihan model dan tiga prosedur bukan algoritma. Dapatan daripada uji kaji simulasi mencadangkan bahawa *SURE-Autometrics* berprestasi baik apabila bilangan persamaan dan bilangan pemboleh ubah relevan dalam model spesifikasi sebenar adalah minima. Aplikasi terhadap data sebenar menunjukkan bahawa beberapa model mampu meramal dengan tepat jika data tidak mempunyai masalah kualiti. Algoritma pemilihan model secara automatik ini adalah lebih baik berbanding prosedur bukan algoritma yang memerlukan pengetahuan dan masa tambahan. Kesimpulannya, prestasi pemilihan model bagi persamaan berganda menggunakan *SURE-Autometrics* bergantung pada kualiti data dan kompleksiti dalam model *SURE*.

Kata kunci: Pemilihan model, Algoritma *SURE-Autometrics*, *Seemingly unrelated regression equations*.

Abstract

The ambiguous process of model building can be explained by expert modellers due to their tacit knowledge acquired through research experiences. Meanwhile, practitioners who are usually non-experts and lack of statistical knowledge will face difficulties during the modelling process. Hence, algorithm with a step by step guidance is beneficial in model building, testing and selection. However, most model selection algorithms such as *Autometrics* only concentrate on single equation modelling which has limited application. Thus, this study aims to develop an algorithm for model selection in multiple equations focusing on seemingly unrelated regression equations (SURE) model. The algorithm is developed by integrating the SURE model with the *Autometrics* search strategy; hence, it is named as *SURE-Autometrics*. Its performance is assessed using Monte Carlo simulation experiments based on five specification models, three strengths of correlation disturbances and two sample sizes. Two sets of general unrestricted models (GUMS) are then formulated by adding a number of irrelevant variables to the specification models. The performance is measured by the percentages of *SURE-Autometrics* algorithm that are able to eliminate the irrelevant variables from the initial GUMS of two, four and six equations. The *SURE-Autometrics* is also validated using two sets of real data by comparing the forecast error measures with five model selection algorithms and three non-algorithm procedures. The findings from simulation experiments suggested that *SURE-Autometrics* performed well when the number of equations and number of relevant variables in the true specification model were minimal. Its application on real data indicated that several models are able to forecast accurately if the data has no quality problem. This automatic model selection algorithm is better than non-algorithm procedure which requires knowledge and extra time. In conclusion, the performance of model selection in multiple equations using *SURE-Autometrics* is dependent upon data quality and complexities of the SURE model.

Keywords: Model selection, *SURE-Autometrics* algorithm, Seemingly unrelated regression equations.

Acknowledgement

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.

Alhamdulillah, all praises to Allah for the strengths and His blessing for completing this thesis. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to my supervisor, Dr. Suzilah Ismail for her extraordinary support in this study, for her patience, motivation, enthusiasm, and immense knowledge. Her guidance really helps me in writing of this thesis.

Besides my supervisor, I would like to thanks my friends and colleagues for their encouragement and insightful comments.

My sincere acknowledgement also goes to my husband, Tengku Mohd Nazli Tengku Mansor, my families, and those who indirectly contributed to my research. I love you all.

Finally, I am very grateful with my employer, Universiti Utara Malaysia for giving me chances to pursue this study. Without their financial support and scholarship, this research would never end with success. Thank you very much.

Declaration Associated with the Thesis

Parts of this thesis have been presented and published for the following occasions:

1. Independence Test in *SURE-Autometrics* Algorithm
Presented at the *International Symposium on Forecasting (ISF)*, Prague, Czech Republic, June 27 – 29, 2011.
2. Lag Variable Reduction in Multiple Models Selection Algorithm
Published in the Proceedings of *International Conference on the Analysis and Mathematical Applications in Engineering and Science (AMAES)*, Curtin University, Sarawak Malaysia, January 19 – 22, 2014.
3. Assessing the Simulation Performances of Multiple Models Selection Algorithm
Published in the Proceedings of *5th International Conference on Computing and Informatics (ICOCI)*, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11 – 13, 2015.
4. Algorithmic Approaches in Model Selection of the Air Passengers Flows Data
Published in the Proceedings of *5th International Conference on Computing and Informatics (ICOCI)*, Istanbul, Turkey, August 11 – 13, 2015.
5. Analysis of *SURE-Autometrics* Algorithm Performance using Simulation Experiment
Journal of Information and Communication Technology (forthcomings)
6. Empirical Study of *SURE-Autometrics* via Air Passengers Flow Data
Journal of Advanced Digital Technology (forthcomings)

Table of Contents

Permission to Use	ii
Abstrak.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Acknowledgement	v
Declaration Associated with the Thesis.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xii
List of Appendices	xiii
List of Abbreviations	xiv
CHAPTER ONE INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background of the Study	1
1.2 Problem Statement.....	4
1.3 Objectives of the Study.....	6
1.4 Significance of the Study.....	7
1.5 Scope of the Study.....	7
1.6 Thesis Outline.....	7
CHAPTER TWO MODEL SELECTION ALGORITHM WITHIN THE GENERAL-TO-SPECIFIC APPROACH.....	9
2.1 Model Selection	9
2.2 Algorithm of Model Selection	13
2.3 General-to-Specific Modelling Approach.....	16
2.4 <i>PcGets</i> and <i>Autometrics</i> Algorithm	19
2.5 Multiple Equations Model	23
2.6 <i>SURE-PcGets</i> Algorithm	27
CHAPTER THREE <i>SURE-AUTOMETRICS</i> ALGORITHM.....	32
3.1 Framework of Algorithm Development.....	32
3.2 Phase 1: Initial General Unrestricted Model (GUMS)	34
3.2.1 Series of Diagnostic Tests.....	34

3.2.1.1 Test of normal distribution.....	35
3.2.1.2 Test of parameters constancy.....	36
3.2.1.3 Test of autocorrelation.....	36
3.2.1.4 Test of unconditional homoscedasticity.....	37
3.2.1.5 Test of conditional homoscedasticity.....	38
3.2.2 Test of Correlation Disturbances amongst Equations.....	38
3.2.2.1 Monte Carlo–quasi likelihood ratio test.....	40
3.2.2.2 Multivariate independence test.....	41
3.3 Phase 2: Pre-search Reduction.....	42
3.3.1 Closed Lag.....	44
3.3.2 Common Lag.....	45
3.3.3 Common– X Lag.....	46
3.3.4 Encompassing Test.....	46
3.4 Phase 3: Variable Reduction over Root Branches.....	47
3.4.1 The reduction principles.....	48
3.4.1.1 Pruning.....	48
3.4.1.2 Bunching.....	49
3.4.1.3 Chopping.....	50
3.5 Phase 4: Search for Nested Terminals.....	50
3.6 Phase 5: Selection of the Final Model.....	51
CHAPTER FOUR SIMULATION ASSESSMENT OF <i>SURE-AUTOMETRICS</i>	
.....	53
4.1 Experimental Frames.....	53
4.1.1 Artificial Dependent Variables.....	54
4.1.2 Initial General Unrestricted Model (GUMS).....	59
4.2 Measurement of <i>SURE-Autometrics</i> Performance.....	60
4.3 Simulation Results.....	61
4.3.1 Two Equations Model.....	61
4.3.2 Four Equations Model.....	67
4.3.3 Six Equations Model.....	72
4.4 Summary of Findings.....	76

CHAPTER FIVE EVALUATION OF <i>SURE-AUTOMETRICS</i> USING REAL DATA	83
5.1 Model Selection Procedures	83
5.2 Measures of Forecasting Errors	86
5.2.1 Error Measures.....	87
5.2.2 Equality Test.....	88
5.3 Air Passenger Flows Data.....	90
5.3.1 Estimated Models of the Six Routes.....	95
5.3.2 Air Passengers Flows excluding the UK-Japan Route	111
5.3.3 Air Passengers Flows excluding the UK-Japan and UK-Sweden Routes	114
5.4 National Growth Rates Data	116
5.4.1 Estimated Models of National Growth Rates	120
5.4.2 Forecast Accuracy of National Growth Rates	128
5.5 Summary of Findings.....	136
CHAPTER SIX CONCLUSION AND FUTURE RESEARCH.....	140
6.1 Conclusion	140
6.2 Suggestions for Further Research	151
REFERENCES.....	154
Appendix A <i>Autometrics</i> Algorithm.....	160
Appendix B <i>SURE-PcGets</i> Algorithm.....	162
Appendix C <i>SURE-Autometrics</i> Algorithm.....	165
Appendix D Data of Air Passengers Flows	168
Appendix E Data of National Growth Rates.....	174

List of Tables

Table 3.1 Pre-test Significance Values for $k_p = 1, 2, \dots, 5$	44
Table 3.2 Significance Values using Bunching Principle for $k_b = 1, 2, \dots, 5$	49
Table 4.1 True Specification Models used by <i>SURE-PcGets</i>	54
Table 4.2 True Specification Models of Two Equations ($m = 2$) by <i>SURE-Autometrics</i>	55
Table 4.3 True Specification Models of Four Equations ($m = 4$) by <i>SURE-Autometrics</i>	56
Table 4.4 True Specification Models of Six Equations ($m = 6$) by <i>SURE-Autometrics</i>	57
Table 4.5 Categories of Simulation Outcomes	60
Table 4.6 Simulation Results for $m = 2, n = 146, k = 39$	63
Table 4.7 Simulation Results for $m = 2, n = 146, k = 18$	63
Table 4.8 Simulation Results for $m = 2, n = 73, k = 39$	64
Table 4.9 Simulation Results for $m = 2, n = 73, k = 18$	64
Table 4.10 Simulation Results for $m = 4, n = 146, k = 39$	68
Table 4.11 Simulation Results for $m = 4, n = 146, k = 18$	68
Table 4.12 Simulation Results for $m = 4, n = 73, k = 39$	69
Table 4.13 Simulation Results for $m = 4, n = 73, k = 18$	69
Table 4.14 Simulation Results for $m = 6, n = 146, k = 39$	73
Table 4.15 Simulation Results for $m = 6, n = 146, k = 18$	73
Table 4.16 Simulation Results for $m = 6, n = 73, k = 39$	74
Table 4.17 Simulation Results for $m = 6, n = 73, k = 18$	74
Table 4.18 Simulation Experiment Conditions.....	77
Table 4.19 Percentages of Finding Correct Specification for $m = 2$ and $\rho = 0.9$	78
Table 4.20 Percentages of Finding Correct Specification for $m = 4$ and $\rho = 0.9$	79
Table 4.21 Percentages of Finding Correct Specification for $m = 6$ and $\rho = 0.9$	80
Table 5.1 The Selected Airports to Determine Price Tickets between Countries	92
Table 5.2 Estimated GUMS of Air Passengers' Flows using FGLS and OLS.....	94
Table 5.3 Estimated Models for UK-Germany Route	97
Table 5.4 Estimated Models for UK-Sweden Route	98
Table 5.5 Estimated Models for UK-Italy Route.....	99

Table 5.6 Estimated Models for UK-Japan Route	100
Table 5.7 Estimated Models for UK-US Route	101
Table 5.8 Estimated Models for UK-Canada Route	102
Table 5.9 Air Passengers' Forecasting Performances based on RMSE.....	104
Table 5.10 Air Passengers' Forecasting Performances based on GRMSE.....	105
Table 5.11 Estimated Models for UK-Germany without UK-Japan Route.....	106
Table 5.12 Estimated Models for UK-Sweden without UK-Japan Route.....	107
Table 5.13 Estimated Models for UK-Italy without UK-Japan Route	108
Table 5.14 Estimated Models for UK-US without UK-Japan Route.....	109
Table 5.15 Estimated Models for UK-Canada without UK-Japan Route.....	110
Table 5.16 Forecasting Performances (without UK-Japan) based on RMSE.....	112
Table 5.17 Forecasting Performances (without UK-Japan) based on GRMSE.....	113
Table 5.18 Forecasting Performances (without UK-Japan and UK-Sweden) based on RMSE.....	115
Table 5.19 Forecasting Performances (without UK-Japan and UK-Sweden) based on GRMSE.....	115
Table 5.20 Estimated GUMS of National Growth Rates using FGLS and OLS	119
Table 5.21 Estimated Models of Denmark Growth Rate.....	121
Table 5.22 Estimated Models of Ireland Growth Rate	122
Table 5.23 Estimated Models of Italy Growth Rate	123
Table 5.24 Estimated Models of Netherland Growth Rate.....	124
Table 5.25 Estimated Models of UK Growth Rate.....	125
Table 5.26 Estimated Models of US Growth Rate	126
Table 5.27 National Growth Rates' Forecasting Performances based on RMSE	129
Table 5.28 National Growth Rates' Forecasting Performances based on GRMSE...	130
Table 5.29 Measures of Forecast Error for Italy Growth Rate	131
Table 5.30 Forecasting Performances (without Italy) based on RMSE.....	133
Table 5.31 Forecasting Performances (without Italy) based on GRMSE.....	134
Table 5.32 Forecasting Performances (without Italy and US) based on RMSE.....	135
Table 5.33 Forecasting Performances (without Italy and US) based on GRMSE.....	136
Table 6.1 Experiment Conditions with Probabilities above 80%	145

List of Figures

Figure 2.1. Concept of GETS Modelling Approach. Adapted from “The Theory of Reduction” by D. F. Hendry and J. A. Doornik, 2014, Empirical Model Discovery and Theory Evaluation, p. 96. Copyright 2014 by the MIT Press.....	17
Figure 2.2. Search strategy in Autometrics. Adapted from “Autometrics” by J. A. Doornik, 2009, The Methodology and Practice of Econometrics, p. 93. Copyright 2009 by the Oxford University Press.....	22
Figure 3.1. SURE-Autometrics Development Framework.....	33
Figure 4.1. Overall Performances on Two Equations Model using Large Sample Size	65
Figure 4.2. Overall Performances on Two Equations Model using Small Sample Size	66
Figure 4.3. Overall Performances on Four Equations Model using Large Sample Size	71
Figure 4.4. Overall Performances on Four Equations Model using Small Sample Size	71
Figure 4.5. Overall Performances on Six Equations Model using Large Sample Size	75
Figure 4.6. Overall Performances on Six Equations Model using Small Sample Size	76
Figure 4.7. Overall Performances in Finding Correct Specifications	82
Figure 5.1. Number of Air Passengers for Six Routes.....	91

List of Appendices

Appendix A <i>Autometrics</i> Algorithm	160
Appendix B <i>SURE-PcGets</i> Algorithm.....	162
Appendix C <i>SURE-Autometrics</i> Algorithm	165
Appendix D Data of Air Passengers Flows	168
Appendix E Data of National Growth Rates.....	174



UUM
Universiti Utara Malaysia

List of Abbreviations

DGP	data-generating process
e.g.	for example
et al.	and others
etc.	and so forth
FGLS	feasible generalised least squares
GDP	gross domestic product
GETS	general-to-specific
GLS	generalised least squares
GRMSE	geometric root mean square error
GUM	general unrestricted model of single equation
GUMS	general unrestricted model of multiple equations
i.e.	that is
LM	Lagrange Multiplier
MC-QLR	Monte Carlo-Quasi Likelihood Ratio
MI	Multivariate independent
OLS	ordinary least squares
RMSE	root mean square error
SUM	specific unrestricted model of single equation
SUMS	specific unrestricted model of multiple equations
SURE	seemingly unrelated regression equations
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Statistical modelling normally has inexplicit processes due to a tacit or personal knowledge. This can be gained through experience where modellers combined their judgmental knowledge and theoretical studies at some point in the modelling process (Magnus & Morgan, 1999). Generally, the process commence with a model formulation which involves specification of identified variables and followed by estimation procedure. Then it is validated through a series of evaluations where re-specification will be required according to certain criteria such as diagnostic testing, goodness of fit and hypothesis testing of the parameters.

The specification of model involves choosing which variables to include or exclude from the model while maintaining the consistencies with the observed data. According to Magnus (1999), the selection of predictor variables could be based on two basic modelling approaches where it can possibly starts from a simple model and expand it, or from a general model which subsequently reduce to a more simplified form. The first approach is known as specific-to-general or bottom-up where it uses the theory to provide an initial specification. Then, it is refined by adding or subtracting the variables or substitutes the coefficients estimator according to modeller's prior belief or data exploration techniques such as Cochrane-Orcutt transformation. On the contrary, the second approach starts with a general model formulated based on information collected from theories, previous empirical research evidence, institutional knowledge, and common sense (Hendry & Doornik, 2014). This initial model which comprises of all the candidate variables is then refined by the

The contents of
the thesis is for
internal user
only

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, J. S., & Collopy, F. (1992). Error measures for generalising about forecasting methods: Empirical comparison. *International Journal of Forecasting*.
- Armstrong, J. S., & Fildes, R. (1995). On the Selection of Error Measures for Comparison among Forecasting Methods. *Journal of Forecasting*, 14, 67–71.
- Bartolomei, S. M., & Sweet, A. L. (1989). A note on a comparison of exponential smoothing methods for forecasting seasonal series. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 5, 111–116.
- Beasley, T. M. (2008). Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) models as a solution to path analytic models with correlated errors. *Multiple Linear Regression Viewpoints*, 34(1), 1–7.
- Bhatti, M. I., Al-Shanfari, H., & Hossain, M. Z. (2006). *Econometric Analysis of Model Selection and Model Testing*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Breiman, L. (1995). Better subset regression using the nonnegative garrote. *Technometrics*, 37, 373–384.
- Castle, J. L., Doornik, J. A., & Hendry, D. F. (2011). Evaluating automatic model selection. *Journal of Time Series Econometrics*, 3(1), 33.
- Castle, J. L., Qin, X., & Reed, W. R. (2013). Using model selection algorithms to obtain reliable coefficient estimates. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 27(2), 269–296. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6419.2011.00704.x>
- Chen, H., Wan, Q., & Wang, Y. (2014). Refined Diebold-Mariano Test Methods for the Evaluation of Wind Power Forecasting Models. *Energies*, 7(7), 4185–4198. <http://doi.org/10.3390/en7074185>
- Denton, F. T. (1985). Data Mining as an Industry. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 67(1), 124–127.
- Derksen, S., & Keselman, H. J. (1992). Backward, forward and stepwise automated subset selection algorithms: Frequency of obtaining authentic and noise variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, 45, 265–282.
- Doornik, J. A. (2008). Encompassing and automatic model selection. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 70, 915–925. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0084.2008.00536.x>
- Doornik, J. A. (2009). Autometrics. In J. L. Castle & N. Shephard (Eds.), *The Methodology and Practice of Econometrics: A Festschrift in Honour of David F. Hendry* (pp. 88–121). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Doornik, J. A., & Hendry, D. F. (2007). *Empirical Econometric Modelling using PcGive 12: Volume 1*. London: Timberlake Consultants Ltd.
- Dufour, J.-M., & Khalaf, L. (2002). Exact tests for contemporaneous correlation of

- disturbances in seemingly unrelated regressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 106, 143–170.
- Efroymson, M. A. (1960). Multiple Regression Analysis. *Mathematical Methods for Digital Computers*. New York: Wiley.
- Engle, R. F. (1982). Autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity with estimates of the variance of United Kingdom inflation. *Econometrica*, 50(4), 987–1007.
- Ericsson, N. R., & Kamin, S. B. (2009). Constructive Data Mining: Modeling Argentine Broad Money Demand. In J. L. Castle & N. Shephard (Eds.), *The Methodology and Practice of Econometrics: A Festschrift in Honour of David F. Hendry* (pp. 412–439). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Fernandez, S., Smith, C. R., & Wenger, J. B. (2007). Employment, privatization, and managerial choice: Does contracting out reduce public sector employment? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 26, 57–77.
- Fildes, R. (1992). The evaluation of extrapolative forecasting methods. *International Journal of Forecasting*.
- Fildes, R., Wei, Y., & Ismail, S. (2011). Evaluating the forecasting performance of econometric models of air passenger traffic flows using multiple error measures. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 27(3), 902–922.
<http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2009.06.002>
- Fisher, S. (1993). The role of macroeconomics factors in growth. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32, 485–512.
- Foster, D. P., & Stine, R. A. (2004). Variable selection in data mining: Building a predictive model for bankruptcy. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(466), 303–313.
- Garcia-Ferrer, A., Highfield, R. A., Palm, F., & Zellner, A. (1987). Macroeconomic Forecasting Using International Data. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 8(1), 53–67. Retrieved from
<http://core.kmi.open.ac.uk/download/pdf/6750786.pdf>
- Granger, C. W. J. (1999). *Empirical Modelling in Economics: Specification and Evaluation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Granger, C. W. J., & Hendry, D. F. (2005). A Dialogue Concerning A New Instrument for Econometric Modeling. *Econometric Theory*, 21, 278–297.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466605050164>
- Granger, C. W. J., Hendry, D. F., & Hansen, B. E. (2005). Challenges for econometric model selection. *Econometric Theory*, 21, 60–68.
<http://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466605050048>
- Greene, W. H. (2012). *Econometric Analysis* (7th ed.). Edinburgh Gate: Pearson Education Limited.
- Hansen, P. R. (2005). A test for superior predictive ability. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 23, 461–465.
- Harvey, D., Leybourne, S., & Newbold, P. (1997). Testing the equality of prediction

- mean squared errors. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 13, 281–291.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Friedman, J. (2001). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference and Prediction*. *Springer Series in Statistics*. New York: Springer.
- Hendry, D. F. (1980). Econometrics-Alchemy or Science? *Economica*, 47(188), 387–406.
- Hendry, D. F. (1995). *Dynamic Econometrics*. Oxford University Press.
- Hendry, D. F. (2001). Achievements and challenges in econometric methodology. *Journal of Econometrics*, 100(1), 7–10. [http://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076\(00\)00045-2](http://doi.org/10.1016/S0304-4076(00)00045-2)
- Hendry, D. F., & Doornik, J. A. (2014). *Empirical Model Discovery and Theory Evaluation: Automatic Selection Methods in Econometrics*. MIT Press.
- Hendry, D. F., & Krolzig, H.-M. (1999). Improving on “Data mining reconsidered” by K.D. Hoover and S.J. Perez. *Econometrics Journal*, 2, 202–219.
- Hendry, D. F., & Krolzig, H.-M. (2001). *Automatic Econometric Model Selection Using PcGets 1.0*. London: Timberlake Consultants Press.
- Hendry, D. F., & Krolzig, H.-M. (2003). New Developments in Automatic General-to-Specific Modeling. In *Econometrics and the Philosophy of Economics: Theory-data confrontations in economics* (pp. 379–419). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hendry, D. F., & Krolzig, H.-M. (2004). We ran one regression. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 66, 799–810.
- Hendry, D. F., & Krolzig, H.-M. (2005). The properties of automatic Gets modelling. *Economic Journal*, 115(502), C32–C61. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.0013-0133.2005.00979.x>
- Hendry, D. F., & Reade, J. J. (2008). *Modelling and forecasting using model averaging*. Working paper.
- Hoeting, J. A., Madigan, D., Raftery, A. E., & Volinsky, C. T. (1999). Bayesian Model Averaging: A Tutorial. *Statistical Science*, 14(4), 382–401.
- Hoover, K. D., & Perez, S. J. (1999). Data mining reconsidered: Encompassing and the general-to-specific approach to specification search. *Econometrics Journal*, 2, 167–191.
- Hoover, K. D., & Perez, S. J. (2000). Three attitudes towards data mining. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, 7(2), 195–210. <http://doi.org/10.1080/13501780050045083>
- Hyndman, R. J., & Koehler, A. B. (2006). Another look at measures of forecast accuracy. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 22(4), 679–688. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijforecast.2006.03.001>
- Ismail, S. (2005). *Algorithmic approaches to multiple time series forecasting*. University of Lancaster, Lancaster.

- Ismail, S., & Fildes, R. (2007). Algorithmic approaches to multiple time series forecasting. In *The 27th Annual International Symposium on Forecasting*. New York.
- Ismail, S., Yusof, N., & T-Muda, T.-Z. (2015). Algorithmic approaches in model selection of the air passengers flows data. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Computing and Informatics*, 32–37.
- Judge, G. G., Hill, R. C., Griffiths, W. E., Lütkepohl, H., & Lee, T.-C. (1988). *Introduction to the Theory and Practice of Econometrics* (2nd ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Kontoghiorghes, E. J. (2004). Computational methods for modifying seemingly unrelated regressions models. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 162(1), 247–261. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2003.08.024>
- Krolzig, H.-M. (2001). General-to-specific reductions of vector autoregressive process. *Econometrics Studies: A Festschrift in Honour of Joachim Frohn*. Münster: LIT.
- Krolzig, H.-M., & Hendry, D. F. (2001). Computer automation of general-to-specific model selection procedures. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 25, 831–866.
- Kurata, H. (2004). One-sided tests for independence of seemingly unrelated regression equations. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 90(2), 393–406. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2003.09.003>
- Lazim, M. A. (1995). *Econometric forecasting model and model evaluation: A case study of air passenger traffic flow*. Lancaster University. Retrieved from http://eprints.uitm.edu.my/3170/1/MOHAMAD_ALIAS_LAZIM_95.pdf
- Leamer, E. E. (1978). Specification searches: Ad hoc inference with non-experimental data. New York: Wiley.
- Leeb, H., & Pötscher, B. M. (2005). Model selection and inference: Facts and fiction. *Econometric Theory*.
- Leeb, H., & Pötscher, B. M. (2009). Model Selection. In T. G. Andersen, R. A. Davis, J.-P. Kreiss, & T. V. Mikosch (Eds.), *Handbook of Financial Time Series* (pp. 889–925). New York: Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Lovell, M. C. (1983). Data mining. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 65(1), 1–12.
- Magnus, J. R. (1999). The success of econometrics. *De Economist*, 147(1), 55–77.
- Magnus, J. R., & Morgan, M. S. (1997). Design of the Experiment. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 12(5), 459–465.
- Magnus, J. R., & Morgan, M. S. (1999). *Methodology and Tacit Knowledge: Two Experiments in Econometrics*. New York: John Wiley.
- Mariano, R. S. (2002). Testing forecast accuracy. *A Companion to Economic Forecasting*, (July), 284–298. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-008-9144-4>

- Miller, A. J. (1984). Selection of Subsets of Regression Variables. *Journal of Royal Statistical Society*, 147(3), 389–425.
- Miller, A. J. (2002). Subset selection in regression. In *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability* (Vol. 95). Florida: Chapman & Hall/ CRC.
- Mizon, G. E. (1995). Progressive modelling of macroeconomic time series: The LSE methodology. *Macroeconomics: Developments, Tensions, and Prospects*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Press.
- Mycielski, J., & Kurcewicz, M. (2004). *A specification search algorithm for cointegrated systems*. *Computing in Economics and Finance*. Retrieved from <http://econpapers.repec.org/RePEc:sce:scecf4:321>
- Oksanen, E. H. (1987). A Note On Seemingly Unrelated Regression Equations with Residual Vectors as Explanatory Variables. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 6, 103–105.
- Pagan, A. (1987). Three Econometric Methodologies: A Critical Appraisal. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 1(1), 3–24.
- Pant, P. N., & Starbuck, W. H. (1990). Innocents in the forecast: Forecasting and research methods. *Journal of Management*, 16, 433–460.
- Pérez-Amaral, T., Gallo, G. M., & White, H. (2003). A flexible tool for model building: The relevant transformation of the inputs network approach (RETINA). *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, (65), 821–838.
- Philips, P. C. B. (2003). Laws and limits of econometrics. *The Economic Journal*, 113, 26–52.
- Pindyck, R. S., & Rubinfeld, D. L. (1998). *Econometric Models and Economic Forecasts*. Boston, Massachusetts: Irwin/McGraw-Hill.
- Reade, J. J. (2007). Modelling and forecasting football attendances. *Oxonomics*, 2, 27–32. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1752-5209.2007.0015.x>
- Romano, J. P., Shaikh, A., & Wolf, M. (2008). Formalized data snooping based on generalized error rates. *Econometric Theory*, 24, 404–447.
- Santos, C., Hendry, D. F., & Johansen, S. (2007). Automatic selection of indicators in a fully saturated regression. *Computational Statistics*, 23(2), 317–335. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00180-007-0054-z>
- Schwartz, J. (2006). Family structure as a source of female and male homicide in the United States. *Homicide Studies*, 10(4), 253–278.
- Sims, C. A. (1980). Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica*, 48(1), 1–48.
- Srivastava, V. K., & Dwivedi, T. D. (1979). Estimation of seemingly unrelated regression equations: A brief survey. *Journal of Econometrics*, 10, 15–32.
- Srivastava, V. K., & Giles, D. E. A. (1987). *Seemingly Unrelated Regression Equations Models: Estimation and Inference*. *Statistics: Textbooks and Monographs*. New York: Marcel Dekker, Inc.
- Srivastava, V. K., & Maekawa, K. (1995). Efficiency properties of feasible

- generalized least squares estimators in SURE models under non-normal disturbances. *Journal of Econometrics*, 66(03630015), 99–121.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 58(1), 267–288.
- Timm, N. H. (2002). Seemingly Unrelated Regression Models. In *Applied Multivariate Analysis* (pp. 311–349). New York: Springer.
- Timm, N. H., & Al-Subaihi, A. A. (2001). Testing model specification in seemingly unrelated regression models. *Communications in Statistics: Theory and Methods*, 30(4), 579–590.
- Tsay, W.-J. (2004). Testing for contemporaneous correlation of disturbances in seemingly unrelated regressions with serial dependence. *Economic Letters*, 83, 69–76.
- Verzilli, C. J., Stallard, N., & Whittaker, J. C. (2005). Bayesian modelling of multivariate quantitative traits using seemingly unrelated regressions. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 38, 313–325. <http://doi.org/10.1002/gepi.20072>
- White, H. (2000). A Reality Check for Data Snooping. *Econometrica*, 68(5), 1097–1126.
- Whittingham, M. J., Stephens, P. A., Bradbury, R. B., & Freckleton, R. P. (2006). Why do we still use stepwise modelling in ecology and behaviour? *Journal of Animal Ecology*, 75(5), 1182–1189. <http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2006.01141.x>
- Yusof, N., & Ismail, S. (2011). Independence test in SURE-Autometrics algorithm. *Proceedings of the International Symposium on Forecasting*.
- Yusof, N., & Ismail, S. (2014). Lag variables reduction in multiple models selection algorithm. *Proceedings of the International Conference on the Analysis and Mathematical Applications in Engineering and Science*, 169–173.
- Yusof, N., Ismail, S., & T-Muda, T.-Z. (2015). Assessing the simulation performances of multiple model selection algorithm. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Computing and Informatics*, 25–31.
- Zellner, A. (1962). An Efficient Method of Estimating Seemingly Unrelated Regressions and Tests for Aggregation Bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 57(298), 348–368.
- Zellner, A. (1963). Estimators for seemingly unrelated regressions: Some exact finite sample results. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 58, 977–992.