Testing for white noise in functional time series

Vaidotas Characiejus[1]

Joint work with Pramita Bagchi[2] and Holger Dette[2]

[1]Département de Mathématique, Université libre de Bruxelles, Belgium
<vaidotas.characiejus@ulb.ac.be>

[2]Fakultät für Mathematik, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

Leuven, September 28, 2017

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Outline

Motivation and background

New test for white noise

Finite sample performance

Conclusions and future work

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

When do want to test for white noise?

- ▶ The validity of a statistical method (testing whether the data is a simple random sample).
- ▶ The goodness of fit of a statistical model (testing whether the errors of the model are independent or uncorrelated).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Two approaches

- ▶ Time-domain tests based on autocovariances or autocorrelations.
- ▶ Frequency-domain tests based on spectral densities.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Autocovariances and autocorrelations

- $\{X_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is a stationary sequence of random variables.
- $\{\gamma_h\}_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are autocovariances defined by $\gamma_h = \text{Cov}(X_h, X_0)$, for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$.
- $\{\rho_h\}_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are autocorrelations defined by $\rho_h = \gamma_h/\gamma_0$ for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Time-domain approach

The idea is to investigate the autocovariances or autocorrelations and to check if $\gamma_h = 0$ or $\rho_h = 0$ for each $h \neq 0$.

Motivation and background · Classical problem
New test for white noise · Time-domain approach
Finite sample performance · Frequency-domain approach
Conclusions and future work · Functional time series

Estimating autocovariances

Definition

The sample autocovariance is defined by

$$\hat{\gamma}_h = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n-|h|} (X_{j+|h|} - \overline{X})(X_j - \overline{X})$$

for $|h| < n$, where $\overline{X} = n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{n} X_j$.

γ_h is estimated using $n - |h|$ observations with $|h| < n$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Estimating autocorrelations

Definition

The sample autocorrelation is defined by

$$\hat{\rho}_h = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_h}{\hat{\gamma}_0}$$

for $|h| < n$.

Motivation and background   Classical problem
New test for white noise   **Time-domain approach**
Finite sample performance   Frequency-domain approach
Conclusions and future work   Functional time series

The portmanteau test

Box and Pierce (1970) proposed to use the following test statistic

$$Q_{BP} = n \sum_{j=1}^{h} \hat{\rho}_j^2,$$

where the parameter h is called the lag truncation number.

If X_t's are iid random variables, then $Q_{BP} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_h^2$ as $n \to \infty$.

If X_t's are residuals of ARMA(p, q) model with iid errors, then $Q_{BP} \xrightarrow{d} \chi_{h-(p+q)}^2$ as $n \to \infty$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Univariate and multivariate cases

Univariate case

- ▶ Box and Pierce (1970), Pierce (1972), Davies, Triggs and Newbold (1977), Ljung and Box (1978), McLeod and Li (1983), Ljung (1986), Peña and Rodríguez (2002).

Multivariate case

- ▶ Chitturi (1974, 1976), Hosking (1980, 1981), Li and MacLeod (1981), Mahdi and MacLeod (2010).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Noncorrelation vs independence

- ► Box and Pierce (1970) proposed test works under the assumption of iid random variables.
- ► If the errors are uncorrelated but not independent, the test is not reliable (see Romano and Thombs (1996) and Francq, Roy and Zakoïan (2005)).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Frequency-domain approach

The idea is to compare the spectral density corresponding to the sequence of the random variables and the spectral density of white noise.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Spectral density

Definition

The spectral density is a discrete-time Fourier transform of $\{\gamma_h\}_{j \in \mathbb{Z}}$ given by

$$f(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_j e^{-i\omega j}$$

for each $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ provided that $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} |\gamma_j|$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

Motivation and background   Classical problem
New test for white noise   Time-domain approach
Finite sample performance   **Frequency-domain approach**
Conclusions and future work   Functional time series

Inverse of discrete-time Fourier transform

Proposition

Suppose that the sequence $\{\gamma_h\}_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is absolutely summable. Then

$$\gamma_h = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} f(\omega)e^{i\omega h}d\omega$$

for each $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, where $i = \sqrt{-1}$.

The spectral density f and $\{\gamma_h\}_{h\in\mathbb{Z}}$ form a Fourier pair.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Spectral density of white noise

If X_t's are uncorrelated, i.e. $\gamma_h = 0$ for each $h \neq 0$, then

$$f(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_j e^{-i\omega j} = \frac{\gamma_0}{2\pi}$$

for each $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$.

Motivation and background   Classical problem
New test for white noise   Time-domain approach
Finite sample performance   **Frequency-domain approach**
Conclusions and future work   Functional time series

Frequency-domain test for white noise

Hong (1996) proposes a test for white noise based on the divergence measure

$$Q^2(f, f_0) = 2\pi \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left| \frac{f(\omega)}{\gamma_0} - \frac{1}{2\pi} \right|^2 d\omega.$$

f is estimated using a kernel estimator and the appropriately standardised test statistic, under certain assumptions, is asymptotically standard normal if X_t's are iid.

Motivation and background   Classical problem
New test for white noise   Time-domain approach
Finite sample performance   **Frequency-domain approach**
Conclusions and future work   Functional time series

Frequency-domain approach

Developed by Durlauf (1991), Hong (1996), Deo (2000), Chen and Deo (2004), Dette, Kinsvater and Vetter (2010), Shao (2011).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Tests for functional time series

Time-domain tests for independence

- Gabrys and Kokoszka (2007), Gabrys, Horváth, and Kokoszka (2010);
- Horváth, Hušková, and Rice (2013).

Frequency-domain test for white noise

- Zhang (2016).

Motivation and background   Classical problem
New test for white noise   Time-domain approach
Finite sample performance   Frequency-domain approach
Conclusions and future work   **Functional time series**

Time-domain tests for functional observations

Gabrys and Kokoszka (2007)

- ▶ A portmanteau test of independence and identical distribution of functional observations.
- ▶ Based on the Karhunen–Loéve expansion.
- ▶ Need to choose the number of principal components p and the lag truncation number h.
- ▶ Extended by Gabrys, Horváth, Kokoszka (2010) to test for independence in the errors of a functional linear model.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Time-domain tests for functional observations (2)

Horváth, Hušková, and Rice (2013)

- ▶ A test that is based on the sum of the L^2 norms of the empirical correlation functions.
- ▶ There is no need to choose the number of principal components p and the lag parameter h goes to infinity as the sample size increases.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Frequency-domain tests for functional observations

Zhang (2016)

- A Cramér-von Mises type test based on the L^2 norm of the functional periodogram function.
- Does not involve the choices of the functional principal components or the lag truncation number.
- The approach is robust to dependence within white noise.
- The limiting distribution of the test statistic is non-pivotal and a block bootstrap procedure is needed to obtain the critical values.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Classical problem
Time-domain approach
Frequency-domain approach
Functional time series

Our test

- ▶ A frequency-domain test for white noise in functional time series.

- ▶ The asymptotic distribution of our test statistic is simple and our approach does not need bootstrap to obtain the critical values.

- ▶ We do not need to choose the number of functional principal components nor do we need to choose the lag truncation number.

- ▶ Our test is a generalisation of the test proposed by Dette, Kinsvater and Vetter (2010).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Functional time series

$\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are stationary $L^2[0, 1]$-valued random elements.

Definition

The autocovariance kernels $\{\gamma_h\}_{h \in \mathbb{Z}}$ of $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are defined by

$$\gamma_h(\tau, \sigma) = \text{Cov}[X_h(\tau), X_0(\sigma)]$$

for each $\tau, \sigma \in [0, 1]$ and $h \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

White noise and hypothesis

Definition

$\{X_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is white noise if X_t's are uncorrelated, i.e. if $\gamma_h = 0$ for each $h \neq 0$.

We are interested in testing the hypothesis that $\{X_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ is white noise.

Motivation and background | Definitions and notations
New test for white noise | Distance to white noise
Finite sample performance | Estimator of distance
Conclusions and future work | Rejection rule and power function

Spectral density kernel

Definition

The spectral density kernel is a discrete-time Fourier transform of $\{\gamma_h\}_{h \in \mathbb{Z}}$ defined by

$$f_\omega = \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_j e^{-i\omega j}$$

for $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ provided that $\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \|\gamma_j\|_2 < \infty$.

If X_t's are uncorrelated, then $f_\omega = \gamma_0/(2\pi)$.

The spectral density kernel is investigated by Panaretos and Tavakoli (2013).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Distance to white noise

We measure the distance between f_ω, $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$, and $\gamma_0/(2\pi)$ using the following distance function

$$m^2 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|f_\omega - \gamma_0/(2\pi)\|_2^2 d\omega.$$

Also, we have that

$$m^2 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|f_\omega\|_2^2 d\omega - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|\gamma_0\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{2\pi}\sum_{j \neq 0} \|\gamma_j\|_2^2.$$

The last equality clearly shows that the distance is equal to 0 if and only if X_t's are uncorrelated.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Hypothesis

The hypothesis that we test is as follows

$$H_0 \ : \ m^2 = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 \ : \ m^2 > 0.$$

To perform this test, we need an estimator of the distance m^2.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

fDFT and periodogram kernel

Definition

The functional discrete Fourier transform (fDFT) is defined as

$$\widetilde{X}_{\omega}^{(T)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi T}} \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} X_t e^{-i\omega t}$$

for $\omega \in [-\pi, \pi]$ and $T \geq 1$.

Definition

The periodogram kernel is defined as

$$p_{\omega}^{(T)}(\tau, \sigma) = [\widetilde{X}_{\omega}^{(T)}(\tau)][\overline{\widetilde{X}_{\omega}^{(T)}(\sigma)}]$$

for each $\tau, \sigma \in [0, 1]$, where $\bar{x}$ is the complex conjugate of $x \in \mathbb{C}$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Estimator of minimum distance

To estimate the distance m^2, we avoid direct estimation of the spectral density kernel and propose to use sums of inner-products and norms of the periodogram kernels.

The estimator of m^2 is defined as

$$\hat{m}_T = 2\pi \left[\frac{2}{T} \sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor} \langle p_{\omega_k}^{(T)}, p_{\omega_{k-1}}^{(T)} \rangle - \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor} [p_{\omega_k}^{(T)} + \bar{p}_{\omega_k}^{(T)}] \right\|_2^2 \right],$$

where ω_k are the Fourier frequencies defined by $\omega_k = 2\pi k / T$ for $1 \leq k \leq \lfloor T/2 \rfloor$ and $T \geq 1$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Intuition behind Riemann sums

Using the results of Panaretos and Tavakoli (2013), we obtain

$$\mathsf{E}\left[\frac{2}{T}\sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor}\langle p_{\omega_k}^{(T)}, p_{\omega_{k-1}}^{(T)}\rangle\right] \to \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\|f_\omega\|_2^2 \mathrm{d}\omega$$

and

$$\mathsf{E}\left\|\frac{1}{T}\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor}[p_{\omega_k}^{(T)} + \bar{p}_{\omega_k}^{(T)}]\right\|_2^2 \to \frac{1}{(2\pi)^2}\|\gamma_0\|_2^2$$

as $T \to \infty$.

Motivation and background   Definitions and notations
New test for white noise   Distance to white noise
Finite sample performance   **Estimator of distance**
Conclusions and future work   Rejection rule and power function

Intuition behind estimator

Recall that

$$m^2 = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|f_\omega\|_2^2 \mathrm{d}\omega - \frac{1}{2\pi}\|\gamma_0\|_2^2.$$

If

$$2\pi \, \mathsf{E}\Big[\frac{2}{T}\sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor T/2\rfloor} \langle p_{\omega_k}^{(T)}, p_{\omega_{k-1}}^{(T)}\rangle\Big] \approx \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \|f_\omega\|_2^2 \mathrm{d}\omega$$

and

$$2\pi \, \mathsf{E}\Big\| \frac{1}{T}\sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor T/2\rfloor} [p_{\omega_k}^{(T)} + \bar{p}_{\omega_k}^{(T)}]\Big\|_2^2 \approx \frac{1}{2\pi}\|\gamma_0\|_2^2,$$

we might expect that

$$\hat{m}_T \approx m^2.$$

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Asymptotic distribution of the estimator

Theorem

Suppose that

(i) $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ *is strictly stationary sequence of $L^2[0,1]$-valued random elements such that $\mathsf{E}\|X_0\|_2^k < \infty$ for each $k \geq 1$;*

(ii) $\int_0^1 \int_0^1 \sum_{t_1, t_2, t_3 \in \mathbb{Z}} |\mathsf{E}[X_{t_1}(\tau) X_{t_2}(\sigma) X_{t_3}(\tau) X_0(\sigma)]| d\tau d\sigma < \infty$;

(iii) $\sum_{t_1, \ldots, t_{k-1} \in \mathbb{Z}} (1 + |t_j|) \|\operatorname{cum}(X_{t_1}, \ldots, X_{t_{k-1}}, X_0)\|_2 < \infty$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$ and all $k \geq 2$.

Then

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{m}_T - m^2) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, v^2) \quad as \quad T \to \infty,$$

where v^2 is the asymptotic variance. Under the null hypothesis, v^2 is given by $v_{H_0}^2 = 8\pi^2 \|f_0\|_2^4$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Rejection rule

A consistent estimator of the asymptotic standard deviation under the null hypothesis is given by

$$\widehat{v_{H_0}} = \frac{4\pi}{T} \sum_{k=2}^{\lfloor T/2 \rfloor} \langle p_{\omega_k}^{(T)}, p_{\omega_{k-1}}^{(T)} \rangle$$

for $T \geq 1$.

The null hypothesis is rejected if

$$\hat{m}_T > \frac{\widehat{v_{H_0}}}{\sqrt{T}} z_{1-\alpha},$$

where $z_{1-\alpha}$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$-quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Definitions and notations
Distance to white noise
Estimator of distance
Rejection rule and power function

Approximation of the power function

We have that

$$P\left(\hat{m}_T > \frac{\widehat{v_{H_0}}}{\sqrt{T}} z_{1-\alpha}\right) \approx \Phi\left(\sqrt{T}\frac{m^2}{v} - \frac{v_{H_0}}{v} z_{1-\alpha}\right)$$

and this shows that our test is consistent.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Simulation study

- ▶ Simulation setup is similar to that of Zhang (2016).
- ▶ The sample size T is chosen to be equal to 128, 256, 512 or 1024.
- ▶ The number of the Monte Carlo replications is 1000.
- ▶ The data is generated on a grid on 1000 equispaced points in $[0, 1]$ for each functional observation.
- ▶ The periodogram kernels are calculated at 1000×1000 equispaced points in $[0, 1]^2$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Functional time series under the null hypothesis

We simulate iid

- ▶ standard Brownian motions;
- ▶ Brownian bridges.

We also simulate the FARCH(1) process defined as

$$X_t(\tau) = \varepsilon_t(\tau)\sqrt{\tau + \int_0^1 c_\psi \exp\left(\frac{\tau^2 + \sigma^2}{2}\right) X_{t-1}^2(\sigma)\mathrm{d}\sigma}$$

for $t \geq 1$ and $\tau \in [0, 1]$, where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$ are iid standard Brownian motions and $c_\psi = 0.3418$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Empirical rejection probabilities under the null

	Brownian motion			Brownian bridge			FARCH(1)		
T	10%	5%	1%	10%	5%	1%	10%	5%	1%
128	9.5	4.8	1.1	10.8	5.3	0.8	11.1	5.7	0.8
	(11.0)	(4.2)	(0.8)	(11.0)	(5.4)	(1.1)	(10.7)	(5.9)	(0.9)
256	9.6	5.1	1.3	10.3	5.4	0.9	10.9	5.5	0.7
	(10.0)	(4.2)	(0.9)	(9.5)	(4.8)	(0.7)	(11.1)	(5.2)	(0.9)
512	10.1	5.1	0.8	9.7	5.1	1.0	10.9	5.3	0.8
	(9.9)	(4.7)	(0.6)	(10.3)	(5.9)	(1.3)	(11.1)	(4.9)	(0.7)
1024	9.8	4.9	0.9	9.9	5.2	0.8	10.5	5.2	0.7
	(10.0)	(4.9)	(0.8)	(9.9)	(5.1)	(1.1)	(9.8)	(4.8)	(1.2)

The numbers in brackets give the corresponding results of the test of Zhang (2016)

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Functional time series under the alternative hypothesis

We simulate observations from the FAR(1) model

$$X_t - \mu = \rho(X_{t-1} - \mu) + \varepsilon_t$$

for $t \geq 1$, where $\rho : L^2[0,1] \to L^2[0,1]$ is an integral operator defined by

$$\rho f(\tau) = \int_0^1 \mathcal{K}(\tau, \sigma) f(\sigma) \mathrm{d}\sigma$$

for $f \in L^2[0,1]$ and $\tau \in [0,1]$ with some kernel $\mathcal{K} \in L^2[0,1]^2$ and iid errors $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t\in\mathbb{Z}}$.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Functional time series under the alternative hypothesis

We consider four different FAR(1) models where the errors are either Brownian motions or Brownian bridges and the kernel of the integral operator is either the Gaussian kernel

$$\mathcal{K}_G(\tau, \sigma) = c_G \exp\left(\frac{\tau^2 + \sigma^2}{2}\right)$$

or the Wiener kernel

$$\mathcal{K}_W(\tau, \sigma) = c_W \min(\tau, \sigma),$$

where the constants c_G and c_W are chosen such that the correspoding Hilbert-Schmidt norm is equal to 0.3.

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Empirical rejection probabilities under the alternative

ε_t	Brownian motion					
$\mathcal{K}$	Gaussian			Wiener		
T	10%	5%	1%	10%	5%	1%
128	82.6	80.7	65.9	87.6	82.4	66.9
	(86.1)	(83.7)	(58.5)	(89.9)	(83.1)	(59.7)
256	99.0	98.2	98.2	99.4	98.3	94.2
	(99.6)	(99.2)	(99.0)	(99.9)	(99.5)	(98.6)
512	99.8	99.6	99.6	99.9	99.9	99.6
	(99.7)	(99.5)	(99.0)	(99.9)	(99.8)	(99.1)
1024	100.0	99.9	99.7	100.0	100.0	99.8
	(100.0)	(100.0)	(99.8)	(100.0)	(99.8)	(99.5)

The numbers in brackets give the corresponding results of the test of Zhang (2016)

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Monte Carlo simulation
Performance under the null hypothesis
Performance under the alternative hypothesis

Empirical rejection probabilities under the alternative

ε_t	Brownian bridge					
$\mathcal{K}$	Gaussian			Wiener		
T	10%	5%	1%	10%	5%	1%
128	80.1 (79.2)	77.4 (68.3)	60.1 (54.4)	87.6 (80.2)	79.9 (65.8)	61.2 (58.1)
256	100.0 (100.0)	97.0 (98.2)	95.5 (97.2)	99.9 (100.0)	98.3 (99.1)	98.1 (98.8)
512	100.0 (100.0)	99.3 (98.7)	99.3 (98.1)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	98.8 (99.1)
1024	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (99.4)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)	100.0 (100.0)

The numbers in brackets give the corresponding results of the test of Zhang (2016)

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Concluding remarks
Future work

Concluding remarks

- ▶ We propose a frequency-domain based test for white noise (noncorrelation) in functional time series with a simple asymptotic distribution.
- ▶ Our test neither requires a choice of the lag truncation number nor the choice of the number of functional principal components.
- ▶ Critical values of the test statistic can be easily obtained, there is no need for bootstrap.
- ▶ The finite sample performance in testing for white noise is very similar to that of Zhang (2016).

Motivation and background
New test for white noise
Finite sample performance
Conclusions and future work

Concluding remarks
Future work

Future work

- ▶ Adapt the test for the situation when we do not observe the random elements directly but we only have residuals, i.e. adapt the test for model diagnostic checking.

- ▶ Establish the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic under simpler and weaker assumptions.