

Off to the Races:
A Comparison of Machine Learning and
Alternative Data for Predicting Economic Indicators
by
J. Chen, A. Dunn, K. Hood, A. Driessen, and A. Batch

Discussion by
Francis X. Diebold
University of Pennsylvania

CRIW 2019, Bethesda

March 14, 2019



Econometrics / Statistics Perspectives

Cross-section:

Econometrics: $\hat{\beta}$ (“causal estimation”)

ML: $\hat{y}(= x' \hat{\beta})$ (“prediction”)

Time-series:

Econometrics: \hat{y} (“prediction”)

(Time series econometrics \leftrightarrow predictive dynamic econometric modeling)

ML: \hat{y} (“prediction”) (???)

So what's new in ML?

Time Series Econometrics (TSE) vs. ML

Significant TSE / ML overlap:

- Acknowledge misspecification throughout
- Seek good out-of-sample predictive approximations
 - Use the relevant loss function
 - Shrinkage
 - Selection
- Forecast combination (“ensemble averaging”)

ML goes farther in some important directions:

- High dimensionality
- Nonlinearity
- Interesting new procedures

Time Series Econometrics (TSE) vs. ML

But TSE Goes Much Farther in Important Macroeconometric Directions...

- Trend
- Seasonality
- Serial correlation & cycles
- Workhorse linear models (VAR, ...)
- Summarizing voluminous results
(Impulse-response fns, variance decomps, Granger causality, ...)
- Customized reduced-rank linear models (DFM, FAVAR, ECM, ...)
- Customized nonlinear models (regime-switching, volatility)
 - Structural evolution and breaks
 - Quantifying forecast uncertainty

In the Trenches, Down and Dirty...

$$GDP \supset CE \supset PCE \supset PCES \supset PCES_i$$

This paper is interested in *PCES*.

PCES is partly based on the Quarterly Survey of Services (QSS).
(The *PCES_i* are informed by the *QSS_i* only from release 3 onward.)

One would like to make the QSS more timely, by nowcasting.

Do ML nowcasting "regressions" of QSS components on timely *x*'s:

$$QSS_{it} \rightarrow x_{1t}, \dots, x_{Kt}, \quad i = 1, \dots, 188$$

x's include both BLS data (from CES and CPI)
and private data (First Data credit cards and Google Trends)

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's
6. Factor structure? Principal-component regression?

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's
6. Factor structure? Principal-component regression?
7. What about trend?

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's
6. Factor structure? Principal-component regression?
7. What about trend?
8. What about seasonality? Seasonal autoregressive lags? Seasonal differencing?

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's
6. Factor structure? Principal-component regression?
7. What about trend?
8. What about seasonality? Seasonal autoregressive lags? Seasonal differencing?
9. ML emphasis on non-linearity probably is not highly relevant

Issues / Comments / Questions

1. Why does the paper focus exclusively on PCES? Just an example? Least timely and hence most room for improvement?
2. Top-down vs. bottom-up. Try it both ways.
3. I worry about use of private x 's in constructing public data
4. "Cherry picking" of x 's is odd in an ML exploration (and performs poorly)
5. Include lags of x 's, as well as lags of *all* QSS_i 's
6. Factor structure? Principal-component regression?
7. What about trend?
8. What about seasonality? Seasonal autoregressive lags? Seasonal differencing?
9. ML emphasis on non-linearity probably is not highly relevant
10. ML emphasis on ensemble averaging probably *is* highly relevant (e.g., random forests)