

Properties of stationary cyclical processes

Łukasz Lenart*

Department of Mathematics,
Krakow University of Economics,
ul. Rakowicka 27, 31-510 Krakow, Poland,
email: lukasz.lenart@uek.krakow.pl

Abstract

The paper investigates the theoretical properties of zero-mean stationary time series with cyclical components, admitting the representation $y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t$, with $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$ and $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ following some bivariate process. We diagnose that in the extant literature on cyclic time series, a prevalent assumption of Gaussianity for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ imposes inadvertently a severe restriction on the amplitude of the process. Moreover, it is shown that other common distributions may suffer from either similar defects or fail to guarantee the stationarity of y_t . To address both of the issues, we propose to introduce a direct stochastic modulation of the amplitude and phase shift in an almost periodic function. We prove that this novel approach may lead, in general, to a stationary (up to any order) time series, and specifically, to a zero-mean stationary time series featuring cyclicity, with a pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function that may even decay at a very slow rate. The proposed process fills an important gap in this type of models and allows for flexible modeling of amplitude and phase shift.

*Łukasz Lenart was financed from the funds granted to the Krakow University of Economics.

1 Introduction

While the concept of stationary time series is generally well-established in the literature, there remains a gap in the theory regarding zero-mean stationary time series $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ (we simplify to $\{y_t\}$) that exhibit cyclic features with unknown frequencies. Namely, little attention seems to be paid to the theoretical properties of the underlying *amplitude process*, whose statistical characteristics (e.g., expectation, if exists) can measure the maximum distance between extreme deviations of the observed process. For instance, in existing Gaussian processes with pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function (see Hannan et al. (1970), Proietti and Maddanu (2024)), the relationship between the expectation and standard deviation of the *amplitude process* is linear, which appears very restrictive. This arises from the fact that the *amplitude process* is not directly defined, and therefore, its statistical properties are consequences of the assumptions made, often intended to ensure stationarity or facilitate statistical inference (e.g., Gaussianity). The main theoretical limitations (in terms of flexibility) for the amplitude process in existing approaches stem from both the assumption of Gaussianity and the manner in which such cyclical models are specified. Below, we delve into details. In particular, Subsection 1.1 discusses existing zero-mean stationary processes with cyclic behaviors of unknown frequencies, highlighting their theoretical properties, limitations and potential extensions. In Subsection 1.2 we focus on the ambiguity of the amplitude process specification, a problem apparently absent from the existing literature. The following subsection reviews other, non-stationary approaches to modeling cyclical data. Subsection 1.4 presents what is the main contribution of this work, namely a novel specification of the cyclic process, which enhances the flexibility of the amplitude process. Finally, Subsection 1.5 outlines the structure of our paper.

Before we move one, let us clarify the sense in which the term *stationary* is used throughout the paper. In general, a time series $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is said to be *stationary up to order m* if for any $s \leq m$, and $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_s \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, the moment

$E(y_{t+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \dots y_{t+\tau_s})$ exists and does not depend on time t :

$$E(y_{t+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \dots y_{t+\tau_s}) = E(y_{\tau_1} y_{\tau_2} \dots y_{\tau_s}) < \infty. \quad (1)$$

In particular, by referring to a process as stationary, we mean a time series that is stationary up to order two (or "weakly stationary", or "stationary in a wide sense").

1.1 Processes review

Modeling cyclic phenomena has a long history. The pioneering work of Yule (1927) provides important theoretical preliminaries for modeling cyclic data by introducing disturbances to the right-hand side of the trigonometric identity $A \sin \theta t = 2A \cos \theta \sin \theta(t-1) - A \sin \theta(t-2)$, where $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$, and $A \in \mathbb{R}$. Ultimately, the approach yields a non-stationary AR(2) process $\{u_t\}$ of the form $u_t = 2 \cos \theta u_{t-1} - u_{t-2} + \epsilon_t$, with a white noise $\{\epsilon_t\}$ and complex roots $e^{i\theta}$ and $e^{-i\theta}$.

Although the above-mentioned process is non-stationary, it has prompted research for a stationary version; see Kendall (1945) for some early-stage developments and review of then existing other approaches. In Hannan (1964), a stationary seasonal cycle process was defined as $y_t = \alpha_t \cos \tilde{\lambda} t + \beta_t \sin \tilde{\lambda} t$, where $\tilde{\lambda}$ is a seasonal frequency and α_t and β_t are uncorrelated first-order zero-mean Gaussian autoregressive processes with the same autoregressive coefficient ρ (where $|\rho| < 1$) and the same variance of the underlying white noises. However, the frequency $\tilde{\lambda}$ does not necessarily have to be seasonal to ensure the stationarity of such a process, which was quickly adopted in future research.

In the decades to follow, new concepts of stationary cyclic processes were theoretically investigated. Hannan et al. (1970) proposes a process that is the sum $\sum_{j=1}^K z_{t,j}$ of K cyclical components:

$$z_{t,j} = \alpha_{t,j} \cos \lambda_j t + \beta_{t,j} \sin \lambda_j t, \quad (2)$$

where for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the frequency $\lambda_j \in (0, \pi]$ is seasonal, and $[\alpha_{t,j} \ \beta_{t,j}]$ is a

bivariate stationary Gaussian process. However, similarly to the single-frequency case, each λ_j can be actually any frequency within the interval $(0, \pi]$, without losing the stationarity of the process.

Next, in Harvey (1985), Harvey (1990), and Harvey and Jaeger (1993), a *stochastic cycle* model with a Gaussian ARMA(2, 1) representation was developed. Harvey and Trimbur (2003) and Trimbur (2006) generalized the concept to an *nth-order stochastic cycle* model with a Gaussian ARMA($2n, 2n - 1$) representation. Yet some other alternative specifications with ARMA representations based on Gaussian white noise were considered in Luati and Proietti (2010). Further, Woodward et al. (1998) and Smallwood and Beaumont (2003) consider a *k-factor Gegenbauer ARMA (GARMA)* model. Finally, Proietti and Maddanu (2024) extended the approach presented in 2 with a non-seasonal frequency and with α_t and β_t being independent fractionally differenced white noise processes (see Anděl (1986)) with Gaussian white noises with the same variance. A brief characterization of each of the above-mentioned models is given in Section 3.

All of the above concepts share a common feature: they are (or can be, as we demonstrate it later in this work) represented as (see Hannan et al. (1970), Proietti and Maddanu (2024)):

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t, \quad (3)$$

where $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ forms a zero-mean bivariate stationary Gaussian process. This representation naturally allows for interpretation of the amplitude and phase shift in terms of the bivariate Gaussian process $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$. Based on (3), the amplitude process can be defined as:

$$\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2}, \quad (4)$$

which means that the basic characteristics (at a fixed time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$), such as expectation and standard deviation, result from the properties of the distribution of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$. From a practical standpoint, for a zero-mean stationary cyclic process to be sufficiently flexible in empirical modeling, basic characteristics such as the expectation and standard

deviation of the amplitude fluctuations (as in Equation 4) should not be closely related to each other. In other words, the model specification should enable these quantities to behave freely, with no restraints stemming from their interrelations.

To highlight the problem, note that the assumption $[\alpha_t \beta_t] \sim N_2(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_2)$ in representation (3), ensuring the stationarity of $\{y_t\}$ and AMP_t , gives $\mu_{\text{AMP}} = E(\text{AMP}_t) = \sigma_{\text{AMP}} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \sigma$, where (we omit the straightforward calculations) $\sigma_{\text{AMP}} = \sqrt{E(\text{AMP}_t - \mu_{\text{AMP}})^2} = \sqrt{\frac{4-\pi}{2}} \sigma$ is the amplitude's standard deviations. Both quantities, characterizing quite distinct aspects (location and dispersion) of the amplitude process, are driven by the common parameter of σ , which is very restrictive ($\frac{\mu_{\text{AMP}}}{\sigma_{\text{AMP}}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$), and in empirical modeling may affect statistical inference (e.g. push towards non-stationarity). For that matter, we argue that it can be seen in the empirical results obtained recently by Maddanu and Proietti (2022) (see Figure 6 therein, presenting the amplitude process), Proietti and Maddanu (2024) (see Figure 3 therein, presenting the amplitude process), and by Koopman and Azevedo (2008), Harvey et al. (2007) (see Figure 9 therein), Woodward et al. (1998), for example. Conceivably, it may be due to these strong limitations that these models have not gained much popularity in applications, apart from a few studies in the area of business cycles analysis, where fluctuations are generally very irregular, with time-varying, irregular amplitude and phase shift. Moreover, it's worth noticing already that some natural generalizations, such as the bivariate Student's t -distribution, skew normal distributions, and other typical distributions, present no valid a solution to the problem, as they exhibit similar strong relations between the expectation and standard deviation of the amplitude process or leads to loss of stationarity, as will be demonstrated in Section 3. Then, we will propose a way to overcome the issue by specifying a novel way for construction of zero-mean stationary cyclic process.

As already argued above, examination of the moments' structure of the amplitude process (and the phase shift, as well) has missed the researchers' scope of attention so far. However, interestingly enough, pertinent derivations have already preoccupied researchers of an unrelated area of electrical and electronics engineering, where, in

general, for a bivariate random variable $[X \ Y]$, the stochastic properties of the amplitude, defined as $\sqrt{X^2 + Y^2}$, and phase shift, $\arctan(X/Y) + \mathbb{I}\{X < 0\}\pi$, are of key interest; see, e.g., Nadarajah et al. (2016), Lai and Balakrishnan (2009), and references therein. Some of distributions considered in Lai and Balakrishnan (2009) are also of our interest later in this work.

To end this subsection, let us note that similar arguments and considerations as the ones raised above with respect to the amplitude would also apply to the phase shift. Nonetheless, for the sake of our current work's volume, we defer these for future research, and focus here only on some theoretical developments for the amplitude process.

1.2 The amplitude process ambiguity

Another issue pertaining to zero-mean stationary processes, one that has not been raised in the existing literature (to the best of our knowledge), is the ambiguity of the amplitude, arising from the fact that for any fixed frequency $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$, any zero-mean stationary process $\{y_t\}$ can be represented in infinitely many ways as

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t, \quad (5)$$

with

$$[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]' = \mathbf{R}(-t\lambda)[y_t \ y_t^*]' = \begin{bmatrix} y_t \cos \lambda t - y_t^* \sin \lambda t \\ y_t \sin \lambda t + y_t^* \cos \lambda t \end{bmatrix}', \quad (6)$$

where $\{y_t^*\}$ is any real valued process and $\mathbf{R}(z)$ is a rotation matrix of the form $\mathbf{R}(z) = \begin{bmatrix} \cos z & \sin z \\ -\sin z & \cos z \end{bmatrix}$, with $z \in \mathbb{R}$. Based on the above representation, the amplitude process related to the frequency λ for any stationary process $\{y_t\}$ is $\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2} = \sqrt{y_t^2 + y_t^{*2}}$. To illustrate the ambiguity problem, let us consider a simple example below.

Example 1.1. Let $\{y_t\}$ follow a simple AR(1) process: $y_t = \rho y_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, where $|\rho| < 1$,

and ϵ_t is a zero-mean Gaussian white noise with variance $\sigma^2 > 0$. Three cases of the process y_t^* can be considered:

- C1 For $y_t^* = ay_t$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the amplitude process is a stationary (up to any order) process of the form $\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{1+a^2}|y_t|$ (with the unconditional rescaled chi distribution with one degree of freedom). Here, $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ is a zero-mean process but not stationary, as the second-order (and higher-order) moment structure is time-dependent (calculations are omitted);
- C2 Assume now that $y_t^* = \rho y_{t-1} + \epsilon_t^*$, where ϵ_t^* is a zero-mean Gaussian white noise with variance σ^2 and independent from ϵ_t . Then, the amplitude process is a stationary (up to any order) process with the unconditional rescaled chi distribution with two degrees of freedom. Elementary calculations (omitted for brevity) show that $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ is also stationary up to any order.
- C3 Finally, assume that $y_t^* = y_{t-1}^* + \epsilon_t$. Then, the amplitude process $\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{y_t^{*2} + y_t^{*2}}$ is not stationary, and neither is $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$.

To limit possible specifications of the amplitude, in this paper, we will require both the amplitude process AMP_t and $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ to be stationary. In particular, we derive the conditions for y_t^* under which $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ is a zero-mean stationary process.

1.3 Other non-stationary cyclic processes

It should be duly noted that there exist other approaches to modeling cyclical fluctuations, which reach beyond the class of stationary time series by either introducing some amplitude or phase shift modulations or employing the idea of almost periodicity (also referred to as cyclostationarity). Regarding the latter, a function $f(t) : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called almost periodic if for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a positive integer L_ϵ such that among any L_ϵ consecutive integers, there is an integer p_ϵ for which $\sup_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} |f(t+p_\epsilon) - f(t)| < \epsilon$ (see Corduneanu (1989)). Cyclic features can be modeled by means of almost periodically correlated (APC) time series (nonstationary, in general), the class of which encompasses,

among others, periodically correlated (PC) series as well covariance stationary sequences (the latter being the object of interest in this work). We say that a time series $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ with finite second moments is PC with a period length $T > 1$ if the mean function $\mu(t) = E(y_t)$ and the autocovariance function $B(t, \tau) = \text{cov}(y_t, y_{t+\tau})$ are both periodic at $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ with the same period length T (for any $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$). Meanwhile, for an APC time series, it is assumed that the mean and autocovariance functions are almost periodic functions of t . The above approach assumes almost periodicity in the first and second moments, which is beyond the scope of our interest in this work. Although the APC and PC processes have been quite popular in the relevant literature, with the examples including Antoni (2009), Gardner et al. (2006), Napolitano (2012), our current attention focuses solely on *stationary* time series of a cyclical nature, i.e., with a zero mean and a *pseudo-cyclical* autocovariance function.

Another common approach to modeling cyclicity is by means of amplitude-modulated (AM) time-warped (TW) APC processes (see Napolitano and Gardner (2016), Napolitano (2017), Gardner (2018), Napolitano (2019), Napolitano (2022)) by considering $y(t) = a(t)x(\psi(t))$, where $a(t)$ is a deterministic time-varying amplitude, $x(t)$ is a continuous-time PC process with a real-valued period length $T_0 > 0$, and $\psi(t) = t + \epsilon(t)$, with $\epsilon(t)$ being some slowly varying and differentiable function. In Gardner (2018), it was assumed that $a(t) \equiv 1$. The generalization to any deterministic function $a(t)$ was developed in Napolitano (2022) in electrocardiogram modeling. Some related approaches were considered in Das and Genton (2021). Another approach with a time-variable (irregular) rhythm was developed recently in Lupenko (2023). The common feature of these approaches is the use of purely deterministic functions to modulate the amplitude or period length (time-warped function). The main problem with these generalizations, however, is the lack of theoretical results relating to the possibility of statistical inference. Arguably, they also seem rather sophisticated and thus has found only few applications so far.

1.4 Cyclic process proposition

In this paper, to address the flexibility and ambiguity of the amplitude process, we have decided to model directly the magnitude and phase shift of cyclical fluctuations. Specifically, the flexibility of our specification draws from an explicit modeling the mean and standard deviation of the amplitude process. We achieve this goal directly by introducing zero-mean stochastic processes $\{A_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ (to disrupt the amplitude a) and $\{P_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ (to disrupt the phase shift ψ) in the almost periodic function $a \sin(\lambda(t + \psi))$, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, with an unknown frequency $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$. Specifically, our proposition takes the form:

$$y_t = (a + A_t) \sin[\lambda(t + \psi + P_t)], \quad (7)$$

and can be proven a zero-mean, stationary (up to any order m) time series with a pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function, under suitable conditions derived in this article. We devote Section 4 to discuss the properties of our process in detail, and demonstrate that it is fit for for adequate modeling of the amplitude and phase shift.

Notice that our model structure (7) does not represent something actually distinct from representation (3), as elementary calculations show that

$$\begin{aligned} y_t &= (a + A_t) \sin(\lambda(\psi + P_t)) \cos \lambda t + (a + A_t) \cos(\lambda(\psi + P_t)) \sin \lambda t \\ &= \tilde{\alpha}_t \cos \lambda t + \tilde{\beta}_t \sin \lambda t, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $[\tilde{\alpha}_t \ \tilde{\beta}_t] = [R_t \sin \theta_t \ R_t \cos \theta_t] = R_t [\sin \theta_t \ \cos \theta_t]$, $\theta_t = \lambda(\psi + P_t)$ and $R_t = a + A_t$. If R_t and θ_t are assumed to be mutually independent, and that θ_t follows a uniform distribution on the interval $(0, 2\pi)$, then through some elementary calculations it can be shown that the characteristic function of $[\tilde{\alpha}_t \ \tilde{\beta}_t]$ at point $\mathbf{z} = [z_1 \ z_2] \in \mathbb{R}^2$ depends only on $\|\mathbf{z}\| = \sqrt{z_1^2 + z_2^2}$. However, here we do not assume in our proposed model that the distribution of $[\tilde{\alpha}_t \ \tilde{\beta}_t]$ is Gaussian, for it would impose a very strong restriction. As a solution, we focus solely on the distribution of $[\tilde{\alpha}_t \ \tilde{\beta}_t]$ that results from the ones assumed for A_t and P_t .

1.5 Article structure

The structure of the article is as follows. Section 2 presents the theoretical background for zero-mean, stationary processes with a pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function, filling an important gap in the literature. Next, in Section 3, based on the results from Section 2, we characterize existing stationary processes with a pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function, identify possible problems and limitations, and diagnose their causes. In Section 4, we propose a novel concept of a stochastic cycle, along with a comprehensive exposition of its theoretical properties, with a particular emphasis on stationarity (up to order m), autocovariance function and power spectral density function. Finally, note that the proofs of all the theorems formulated in the paper, are deferred to the Appendix.

2 Theoretical results

2.1 Single-frequency case

We begin with the process

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t, \quad (9)$$

featuring a single frequency $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$, under general assumptions regarding the bivariate process $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$, not necessarily ensuring stationarity of $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$ and $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be defined as*

$$y_t = [\alpha_t \ \beta_t] \cdot [\cos \lambda t \ \sin \lambda t]' = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t, \quad (10)$$

where $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ is a bivariate stationary time series with 1×2 mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu} = [\mu_1 \ \mu_2]$ and 2×2 covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\tau) = E\left(\left([\alpha_{t+\tau} \ \beta_{t+\tau}] - \boldsymbol{\mu}\right)'([\alpha_t \ \beta_t] - \boldsymbol{\mu})\right) = [\omega_{ij}(\tau)]_{2 \times 2}$, $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ given by (10) is:

i) an APC process with an almost periodic mean function

$$\mu_y(t) = E(y_t) = [\mu_1 \ \mu_2] \cdot [\cos \lambda t \ \sin \lambda t]' = \mu_1 \cos \lambda t + \mu_2 \sin \lambda t, \quad (11)$$

and an almost periodic covariance function of the form

$$\begin{aligned} E((y_t - \mu_y(t))(y_{t+\tau} - \mu_y(t + \tau))) \\ = [\cos \lambda t \quad \sin \lambda t] \mathbf{\Omega}(\tau) [\cos \lambda(t + \tau) \quad \sin \lambda(t + \tau)]'; \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

ii) a zero-mean stationary process if and only if for any $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{11}(\tau) = \omega_{22}(\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_{12}(\tau) = -\omega_{21}(\tau). \quad (13)$$

Note that the mean function (11) is constant if and only if $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0$. Moreover, $\{y_t\}$ is stationary only if $\omega_{11}(\tau) = \omega_{22}(\tau)$ and $\omega_{12}(\tau) = -\omega_{21}(\tau)$. Then, we easily obtain $E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = \omega_{11}(\tau) \cos \lambda \tau + \omega_{12}(\tau) \sin \lambda \tau$, which is a more general result than the one commonly found in the literature (see Harvey and Trimbur (2003), Trimbur (2006), Proietti and Maddanu (2024)), where it is additionally (and unintentionally) assumed that $\omega_{12}(\tau) = 0$, which is only one from a sufficient but not necessary condition for the stationarity of $\{y_t\}$. However, this is not the only sufficient condition, as the remark below shows.

Remark 2.1. Note that independence is not the only sufficient condition for the stationarity up to order $m > 2$, and the shape of the distribution for $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ plays a crucial role here. Let us consider a few simple examples of independent random variables α_t and β_t below, for which the independence guarantees only the stationarity up to order 2 and not necessarily higher.

- *Skewed distribution* with zero expected value, variance equal to one and skewness equal to $\zeta \neq 0$. Elementary calculations (omitted here) yield $E(y_t^3) = \zeta (\sin^3(\lambda t) + \cos^3(\lambda t))$, which depends on t , indicating that $\{y_t\}$ is not a stationary time series up to order 3.
- *Logistic distribution* with zero mean and variance $\frac{\pi^2 \nu^2}{3}$ features (we omit the calculations) $E(y_t^4) = \frac{1}{30} \pi^4 \nu^4 (\cos(4\lambda t) + 13)$, which depends on time t , implying that such a process is not stationary up to order 4.

- *Irwin–Hall distribution* (which is the distribution of a sum of n independent random variables that are uniformly distributed on the same interval $(-a, a)$; see Johnson et al. (1995)) features $E(y_t^4) = \frac{1}{30}a^4n(10n - \cos(4\lambda t) - 3)$, which depends on t , indicating that such a process is not stationary up to order 4.
- *Scale mixture of the normal distributions* (see Andrews and Mallows (1974)). Assume that α_t and β_t are independent and follow the same unconditional distribution, which belongs to the scale mixture of normal distributions with a stochastic representation of the form $R \cdot N$, where N and R are independent random variables, with N following the standard Gaussian distribution and R following a continuous distribution on the interval (a, b) , where $0 \leq a < b \leq \infty$. This class includes such distributions as the Student’s t distribution, the slash distribution, and many others. Assuming that $E(R^4) < \infty$, elementary calculations yield: $E(y_t^4) = 1 + E[(R_1^2 - R_2^2)^2 \cos^4(\lambda t)]$, where R_1 and R_2 are independent random variables with the same distribution as R . This formula demonstrates that $E(y_t^4)$ depends on t , indicating that no distribution belonging to this class ensures stationarity up to order 4 (except for the limiting case of $a \rightarrow b > 0$, under which α_t and β_t tend toward the Gaussian case).

The fundamental issue we face with the above two-dimensional distributions for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ is that, upon rotating the vector $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ by angle λt with the rotation matrix $\mathbf{R}(\lambda t)$, the resulting distribution of $[\tilde{\alpha}_t \ \tilde{\beta}_t] = \mathbf{R}(\lambda t)[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ changes in t and thus is time-dependent. We find that (and elaborate on that in what follows) a solution to this problem lies in assuming such a probability distribution for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ that remains invariant under rotation by any angle. Examples of such distributions include those with their probability density function at $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ being proportional to $f(x^2 + y^2)$, where $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a real-valued function. This leads to a well-known class of the spherical distributions (see Fang and Zhang (1990), Gupta et al. (2013), Fang (2018)).

The following theorem shows that the only distribution for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ such that α_t and

β_t are independent, and y_t is stationary up to any order, is the Gaussian distribution.

Theorem 2.2. *Take any $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$. If α_t and β_t are mutually independent for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, and the process $y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t$ is stationary up to any order, then α_t and β_t have the same Gaussian distribution.*

In the following theorem, we formulate the condition for the distribution of the bivariate process $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ which ensure the strict stationarity for $\{y_t\}$.

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that for any positive integer m and any $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_s) \in \mathbb{Z}^s$ such that $s \leq m$ and $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots < \tau_s$, the probability distribution function of the vector $\mathbf{S}_{t, \boldsymbol{\tau}} = [\alpha_{t+\tau_1} \ \beta_{t+\tau_1} \ \alpha_{t+\tau_2} \ \beta_{t+\tau_2} \dots \alpha_{t+\tau_s} \ \beta_{t+\tau_s}]$ at point $(x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*, \dots, x_s, x_s^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{2s}$ does not depend on t and has the form $f_{\boldsymbol{\tau}}(x_1^2 + x_1^{*2}, x_2^2 + x_2^{*2}, \dots, x_s^2 + x_s^{*2})$, where $f_{\boldsymbol{\tau}} : (x_1, x_1^*, x_2, x_2^*, \dots, x_s, x_s^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{2s} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then the time series y_t is strictly stationary.*

The following theorem addresses the properties of the $\{y_t\}$ process when α_t and β_t are dependent and given by linear filters based on coordinates of spherically distributed bivariate IID sequence.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\alpha_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k \epsilon_t$ and $\beta_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k \epsilon_t^*$, with $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |\psi_k| < \infty$, where $[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]$ is IID with a zero-mean spherical distribution with the probability distribution function $f(x^2 + y^2)$ at $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$, where $f : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is some real-valued function. Then,*

i) $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ follows a spherical distribution;

ii) the process $y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t$ can be represented as $y_t = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k [\cos(\lambda k) \zeta_{t-k} + \sin(\lambda k) \zeta_{t-k}^*]$, where $[\zeta_t \ \zeta_t^*]' = \mathbf{R}(\lambda t) [\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]'$ is a zero-mean white noise with the same probability distribution function as $[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]'$;

iii) for any positive integer m , if $E|\epsilon_t|^m < \infty$, then y_t is stationary up to order m ;

iv) y_t is strictly stationary.

Notice, however, that should one opt for the components to be independent, then there exists only one such spherical distribution: the multivariate normal distribution (with zero mean and the same variance for both coordinates) which is known as Maxwell's theorem.

2.2 Amplitude process properties and inverse coefficient of variation

As already mentioned in Subsection 1.2, if the process $\{y_t\}$ is stationary, then the representation of the form (10) is not unique even if we require that $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ is a zero-mean stationary process. We take this into account in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $\{y_t\}$ be any zero-mean stationary time series. Then, for any frequency $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$, the process $\{y_t\}$ can be represented as*

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t, \quad (14)$$

where $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ is a zero-mean stationary process of the form

$$[\alpha_t \beta_t]' = \mathbf{R}(-t\lambda)[y_t y_t^*]' \quad (15)$$

and $[y_t y_t^*]$ is a bivariate zero-mean stationary process with the covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Gamma}(\tau) = E\left([y_{t+\tau} y_{t+\tau}^*]' [y_t y_t^*]\right) = [\gamma_{ij}(\tau)]_{2 \times 2}$ such that for any $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have $\gamma_{11}(\tau) = \gamma_{22}(\tau)$ and $\gamma_{12}(\tau) = -\gamma_{21}(\tau)$. In addition,

$$\mathbf{\Omega}(\tau) = E([\alpha_{t+\tau} \beta_{t+\tau}]' [\alpha_t \beta_t]) = \mathbf{\Gamma}(\tau)\mathbf{R}(-\lambda\tau). \quad (16)$$

In particular, if for $\tau_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that $\gamma_{11}(\tau_0) \sin \lambda\tau_0 = \gamma_{12}(\tau_0) \cos \lambda\tau_0$, then $\mathbf{\Omega}(\tau_0)$ is a diagonal matrix of the form

$$\mathbf{\Omega}(\tau_0) = (\gamma_{11}(\tau_0) \cos \lambda\tau_0 + \gamma_{12}(\tau_0) \sin \lambda\tau_0)\mathbf{I}_2. \quad (17)$$

From the theorem above it follows that the amplitude process related to the frequency λ takes the form

$$\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2} = \sqrt{y_t^2 + y_t^{*2}}, \quad (18)$$

which means that the distribution of amplitude process at time t is determined only by the distribution of y_t and y_t^* or, equivalently, the distribution of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$.

Apart from the conditions for $\{[\alpha_t \ \beta_t] : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ ensuring the stationarity of $\{y_t\}$, it seems natural to consider that the amplitude process $\{\sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2} : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a stationary process, as well. Therefore, based on the theorem above, we formulate the following assumption.

Assumption 2.1. *Let $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ be a zero-mean stationary bivariate process such that $\{y_t\}$ given by (9) is stationary and the amplitude process $\text{AMP}_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2}$ is stationary with continuous probability distribution at time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ given by $f_t(x, x^*)$ at point $(x, x^*) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.*

Under Assumption 2.1 let $f_t(x, x^*)$ be the probability distribution function (pdf) of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ at time t . Then, the pdf of the amplitude AMP_t is simply

$$f_{\text{AMP}_t}(\xi) = \int_0^{2\pi} \xi f_t(\xi \cos \theta, \xi \sin \theta) d\theta, \quad (19)$$

where $\xi \in [0, \infty)$. If we additionally assume that the distribution of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ at time t is spherical such that $f_t(x, x^*) = g_t(x^2 + x^{*2})$ for some $g_t : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, then we have

$$f_{\text{AMP}_t}(\xi) = 2\pi\xi g_t(\xi^2). \quad (20)$$

Under Assumption 2.1, we introduce the notation: $\mu_{\text{AMP}} = E(\text{AMP}_t)$ and $\sigma_{\text{AMP}}^2 = \text{Var}(\text{AMP}_t)$. Then, the inverse of a common coefficient of variation of the amplitude does not depend on t and can be written as

$$\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = \frac{\mu_{\text{AMP}}}{\sigma_{\text{AMP}}}. \quad (21)$$

If ICV_{AMP} is a constant not depending on any parameters, then (21) yields a strictly linear relation between the amplitude's mean and standard deviation. Notably, this is exactly the case under the typical choice of a bivariate zero-mean, uncorrelated and common-variance Gaussian distribution for $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$. Then, the amplitude follows simply a chi distribution with two degrees of freedom, and thus

$$\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4 - \pi}}, \quad (22)$$

which introduces an extremely tight, deterministic relation between the amplitude's first two moments.

Remark 2.2. In relation to the Gaussian case mentioned above, let us assume that second order zero-mean IID process $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ has continuous bivariate distribution with a probability density function $f(x, x^*) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} g(\frac{x}{\sigma}, \frac{x^*}{\sigma})$ depending only on one, scale parameter $\sigma > 0$, with the density $g(x, y)$ not depending on any parameters, such that $E(\frac{\alpha_t^2}{\sigma^2}) = E(\frac{\beta_t^2}{\sigma^2}) = 1$. Then, it is easy to show that ICV_{AMP} is constant and assumes the form $\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = \frac{C_g}{\sqrt{2 - C_g^2}}$, where $C_g = E\left(\sqrt{\frac{\alpha_t^2}{\sigma^2} + \frac{\beta_t^2}{\sigma^2}}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \sqrt{x_1^2 + x_2^2} g(x_1, x_2) dx_1 dx_2$ does not depend on σ . To sum up, any $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ with distribution depending only on one scale parameter can introduces strong limitations in modeling the amplitude of cyclical fluctuations.

In view of the above, one may seek for alternative specifications of the distribution of $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ (uncorrelated but not necessarily independent). Below, we consider a few such alternatives, presenting the resulting pdf's and inverse coefficients of variation of the amplitude, and discussing their limitations. Cases A-D concern situations that can easily degenerate into the case of the Gaussian distribution for $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$. The final case (E) discusses statistical properties of the polar coordinates for $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ in examples that do not reduce to the Gaussian case.

A. *Student's t-distribution.* If $[\alpha_t \beta_t]$ follows a bivariate Student's t -distribution with $\nu > 2$ degrees of freedom and a diagonal covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_2$ (see Kotz and

Nadarajah (2004)), then $\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = \text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(\nu) = \pi \sqrt{\frac{1}{\frac{2\pi(\nu-2)\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu-2}{2}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\frac{\nu-1}{2}\right)^2} - \pi^2}}$ can be

shown to be an increasing function of $\nu > 2$ (we omit derivation), such that

$\lim_{\nu \rightarrow 0^+} \text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(\nu) = 0$ and $\lim_{\nu \rightarrow \infty} \text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(\nu) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$ and thus still restricting

severely the flexibility of both the mean and standard deviation of the amplitude.

B. *Kotz-type elliptical distribution.* Following Lai and Balakrishnan (2009) (see Section 13.6.1 therein, with $\rho = 0$ to ensure a zero correlation, although the coordinates remain dependent), one can easily obtain that

$$f_{\text{AMP}}(\xi) = 2s\xi^{2N-1}r^{N/s}e^{-r\xi^{2s}}/\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{s}\right),$$

which is a generalized gamma distribution with the pdf given by $f_{\text{AMP}}(\xi) = \tilde{\gamma}e^{-\left(\frac{\xi-\mu}{\tilde{\beta}}\right)^{\tilde{\gamma}}}\left(\frac{\xi-\mu}{\tilde{\beta}}\right)^{\tilde{\alpha}\tilde{\gamma}}(\xi-\mu)^{-1}/\Gamma(\tilde{\alpha})$, with shape parameters $\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{N}{s}$ and $\tilde{\gamma} = 2s$, a scale parameter $\tilde{\beta} = \left(\frac{1}{r}\right)^{\frac{1}{2s}}$, and a location parameter $\mu = 0$. Straightforward calculations lead to the following expression for the inverse coefficient of variation:

$$\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{s} + \frac{1}{2s}\right)^2}{\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{s} + \frac{1}{s}\right)\Gamma\left(\frac{N}{s}\right) - \Gamma\left(\frac{N}{s} + \frac{1}{2s}\right)^2}} \quad (23)$$

and can take any value from R_+ . The formula reveals no strong restrictions between the mean and standard deviation of the amplitude distribution. Despite this apparent advantage, there exist no such approaches in the literature that would yield the Kotz-type elliptical distribution for the amplitude of $\{y_t\}$. Incidentally, also note that under $N = s = 1$, the Kotz-type elliptical distribution reduces to the bivariate Gaussian distribution (with ICV_{AMP} given by (21)). Therefore, the former represents a generalization of the normal case. For an illustration, Figure 1 depicts the pdf of a Kotz-type elliptical distribution under $r = 1$, $N = 20$, $s = 1$.

C. *Gumbel-type elliptical distribution* (see Section 13.6.3 in Lai and Balakrishnan




Figure 1: Pdf of the Kotz-type elliptical distribution (Lai and Balakrishnan (2009), Section 13.6.1) with $r = 1$, $N = 20$, $s = 1$.

(2009), with $\rho = 0$ to ensure a zero correlation, although the coordinates remain dependent). The pdf of the Gumbel-type elliptical distribution, under a zero correlation is

$$f(x, x^*) = \frac{ab \exp(-a(x^2 + x^{*2})) \exp(-b \exp(-a(x^2 + x^{*2})))}{\pi(1 - \exp(-b))}, \quad (24)$$

where $a > 0$ and $b > 0$ are the scale and shape parameters, respectively, while the pdf of the amplitude takes the form

$$f_{\text{AMP}}(\xi) = \frac{2\pi ab\xi \exp(-b \exp(-a\xi^2) - a\xi^2)}{\pi(1 - \exp(-b))}. \quad (25)$$

Since a accounts for the scale of the distribution, ICV_{AMP} depends here only on a single parameter of b (and therefore, restricting the flexibility), and can be shown to be an increasing function thereof (we drop technical details). Moreover, it can also be shown to reduce to $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$ as $b \rightarrow 0^+$, which results from the fact that the Gumbel-type elliptical distribution generalizes the Gaussian distribution (although in a different manner than the two distributions discussed earlier). It follows that $\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(b) > \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$, which means that the ratio of the amplitude's mean to standard deviation is higher than in the normal case.

D. *Mixture of Gaussian distributions.* Conceivably, another possible solution to

a highly restrictive Gaussian distribution can be a finite mixture of normal distributions. To that end, let us assume that the joint distribution of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ is a mixture of 2^{m+1} bivariate Gaussian distributions for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, each featuring the same covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$. On the other hand, the mean vectors $\boldsymbol{\mu}_j = (\mu_{1,j}, \mu_{2,j})$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m+1$ are component-specific, but evenly distributed on a circle centered at $(0, 0)$ and radius $\mu > 0$ (see examples in Figure 2). Elementary calculations show that Assumption 2.1 i) holds, which ensures the stationarity of $\{y_t\}$ given by (9). Under the Gaussianity, by (20) and some elementary calculations, we get

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{AMP}}(\xi) &= \frac{\xi}{2^{m+1}} \sum_{j=1}^{2^{m+1}} \int_0^{2\pi} \frac{\exp\left(-\frac{(\xi \sin(\theta) + \mu_{2,j})^2}{2\sigma^2} - \frac{(\xi \cos(\theta) + \mu_{1,j})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)}{2\pi\sigma^2} d\theta \\ &= \frac{\xi e^{-\frac{2\mu^2 + \xi^2}{2\sigma^2}} I_0\left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\mu\xi}{\sigma^2}\right)}{\sigma^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where $I_n(\cdot)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind. Note that the distribution of the amplitude here does not depend on the number m of the mixture components. Some tedious algebra leads to the following formula for ICV_{AMP} (represented here in terms of the ratio $k = \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$):

$$\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{\frac{4e^{k^2}(k^2+1)}{\pi\left(k^2 I_1\left(\frac{k^2}{2}\right) + (k^2+1)I_0\left(\frac{k^2}{2}\right)\right)^2 - 1}}}, \quad (27)$$

which can be shown to be increasing with $k \in \mathbb{R}_+$ (we skip technicalities). Moreover, $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0^+} \text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$, which means that $\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(k) > \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$. To conclude, although a mixture of bivariate normals appears to lend some flexibility to the amplitude, the inverse of its coefficient of variation is actually a function of a ratio of two parameters. Moreover, and similarly to the Gumbel-type elliptical distribution, the value of ICV_{AMP} is restricted to be higher than $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}} \approx 1.91$.

E. *A proposition of distribution by polar coordinates.* Finally, instead of considering




Figure 2: Mixture of bivariate normal distributions with $m = 1, 2$ (top panel), and $m = 3, 4$ (bottom panel), radius $\mu = 3$, and $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{5}$.

various distributions for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ (as done above), we propose to move from the process representation: $y_t = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t + \beta_t \sin \lambda t$, to the equivalent representation: $y_t = A_t \sin(\lambda t + \theta_t) = A_t \sin \theta_t \cos \lambda t + A_t \cos \theta_t \sin \lambda t$, and specify such a distribution for $[A_t \ \theta_t]$, (where $A_t = \sqrt{\alpha_t^2 + \beta_t^2}$ is the amplitude, and θ_t is the phase shift) that ensures the stationarity of y_t . To that end, we assume that θ_t follows a $Beta(n, m)$ distribution (for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$) on the interval $(0, 2\pi)$, while A_t is any stationary process. Additionally, we assume that A_t and θ_t are mutually independent for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. To ensure the stationarity of y_t , the following set of conditions is necessary (see Theorem 2.1 ii):

- i) $E(A_t \sin \theta_t) = E(A_t \cos \theta_t) = 0$,
- ii) $E(A_t^2 \sin^2 \theta_t) = E(A_t^2 \cos^2 \theta_t)$,
- iii) $E(A_t^2 \sin \theta_t \cos \theta_t) = 0$.

Elementary analytical calculations shows that i)-iii) hold if and only if $m = n = 1$, which gives a uniform distribution for θ_t on the interval $(0, 2\pi)$. Then, the random variables $\cos \theta_t$ and $\sin \theta_t$ follow a $Beta(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ distribution on the interval $(-1, 1)$. Below we consider a few examples for A_t (points E.1-E.3).

E.1. Assume that A_t is Gaussian process with mean μ and standard deviation σ , then (after elementary calculations) the distribution of a bivariate random variable $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t] = [A_t \sin \theta_t \ A_t \cos \theta_t]$ can be shown to have the following pdf:

$$f(x, x^*) = \frac{e^{-\frac{(\sqrt{x^2+x^{*2}}-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}}{2\pi^{3/2}\sigma\sqrt{2x^2+2x^{*2}}}. \quad (28)$$

For an illustration, Figure 3 presents the pdf for $\mu = 4$ and $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. The




Figure 3: PDF given by (28) with $\mu = 4$ and $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$.

amplitude process is $AMP_t = |A_t|$, which gives the following expression for the inverse coefficient of variation (as a function of $k = \frac{\mu}{\sigma}$):

$$ICV_{AMP}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{\left(\text{kerf}\left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}e^{-\frac{k^2}{2}}\right)^2}{-\left(\text{kerf}\left(\frac{k}{\sqrt{2}}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}}e^{-\frac{k^2}{2}}\right)^2 + k^2 + 1}},$$

where $\text{erf}(z) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_0^z e^{-t^2} dt$ is the error function. As a function of k , the above expression is an continuous function on the real line, increasing over $(0, \infty)$

and decreasing over $(-\infty, 0)$. Moreover, $\lim_{k \rightarrow 0} \text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}}(k) = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi-2}} \approx 1.32$, which is lower than in cases C and D.

- E.2. Incidentally, notice that to ensure that the amplitude is positive, one can specify it as $A_t = e^{B_t}$, where B_t is a Gaussian stationary process with an unconditional mean μ and standard deviation σ . Therefore, A_t follows a log-normal distribution, for which the inverse coefficient of variation is simply $\text{ICV}_{\text{AMP}} = 1/\sqrt{e^{\sigma^2} - 1}$, admitting any value in R_+ .
- E.3. To generalize, A_t can in fact be specified as any stochastic process with such a time-invariant unconditional distribution defined on R_+ that its inverse coefficient of variation admits any value in R_+ (it is straightforward to check that it is the case for, e.g., a gamma distribution, inverse gamma distribution, Nakagami distribution, and others).

In conclusion, assuming a bivariate uncorrelated Gaussian distribution for $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ is patently a deficient approach. This result also holds for any dependent bivariate distributions featuring only a single scale parameter. As shown in the examples A-D, the problem arises from the distribution of the $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ variable and the resulting properties of the amplitude, which do not prove sufficient in terms of their flexibility. A sole exception to this a somewhat gloom perspective is the Kotz-type elliptical distribution (Point B). Although the distribution itself is of quite a limited popularity, and the formula of ICV_{AMP} exhibits some complexity (see (23)), the latter can take any value from R_+ , and thus does not suffer from the restraints afflicting the other distributions. The last example (Point E) takes a different and our novel approach, where the distributional assumptions are made in terms of the polar coordinates instead of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$. Owing to that, the amplitude's inverse coefficient of variation can lower than in Cases C and D or take any positive real value. At the end of this part, we emphasize that in this work, we construct a cyclic process for which amplitude process and phase shift distributions are defined directly and hence such characteristics as analyzed here inverse-coefficient

of variation for amplitude process can take any positive value.

2.3 Some results related to multi-frequency case

In this subsection we shift our focus to the multi-frequency framework, with a set of frequencies $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_K \leq \pi$. The theorem below provides explicit formulae for the autocovariance function and power spectral density of a such cyclic process.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the bivariate random processes $[\alpha_{t,j} \ \beta_{t,j}]$ are mutually uncorrelated and have a covariance matrix of the form $E([\alpha_{t+\tau,j} \ \beta_{t+\tau,j}]' [\alpha_{t,j} \ \beta_{t,j}]) = \gamma_j(\tau) \mathbf{I}_2$, and a diagonal power spectral density matrix of the form $\mathbf{f}_j(\omega) = f_j(\omega) \mathbf{I}_2$. Then, for any $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_K \leq \pi$, the zero-mean stationary process $\{y_t\}$ defined as*

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^K (\alpha_{t,j} \cos \lambda_j t + \beta_{t,j} \sin \lambda_j t), \quad (29)$$

has the autocovariance function

$$\gamma_y(\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_j(\tau) \cos \lambda_j \tau, \quad (30)$$

and the power spectral density function

$$f_y(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^K (f_j(\omega - \lambda_j) + f_j(\omega + \lambda_j)). \quad (31)$$

The above theorem generalizes results presented in Proietti and Maddanu (2024), where the autocovariance function and power spectral density were derived in a very special case that we discuss in more detail in Section 3 (see also some introductory remarks in Section 1).

Remark 2.3. The power spectral mass concentration under certain frequencies λ_j in (31) can be boosted (see Harvey and Trimbur (2003) and Trimbur (2006) in the context

of the n th-order stochastic cycle). To adopt the idea into our framework, it is enough to take $\alpha_{t,j} = \tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(n)}$ and $\beta_{t,j} = \tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(n)}$, where $\{\tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(n)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(n)}\}$ are defined recursively as

$$\tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(s)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i \alpha_{t-i,j}^{(s-1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(s)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i \beta_{t-i,j}^{(s-1)}, \quad (32)$$

for $s = 2, 3, \dots, n$, with $\tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(1)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i \epsilon_{t-i,j}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(1)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i \epsilon_{t-i,j}^*$, where $\{\epsilon_{t,j}\}$ and $\{\epsilon_{t,j}^*\}$ are uncorrelated white noises sharing the same variance σ_j . Finally, by $f_{1,j}(\omega)$ we denote the power spectral density function of $\{\tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(1)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(1)}\}$. Then, based on the theorem above, and using some elementary calculations, we get that the power spectral density of $\{y_t\}$ for $\alpha_{t,j} = \tilde{\alpha}_{t,j}^{(n)}$ and $\beta_{t,j} = \tilde{\beta}_{t,j}^{(n)}$ has the form

$$f_y(\omega) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^K (f_{1,j}^n(\omega - \lambda_j) + f_{1,j}^n(\omega + \lambda_j)). \quad (33)$$

We continue with a theorem concerning the representation of any zero-mean stationary process in the form

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^K \alpha_{j,t} \cos \lambda_j t + \beta_{j,t} \sin \lambda_j t, \quad (34)$$

with $[\alpha_{j,t} \ \beta_{j,t}]$ being bivariate processes mutually independent for $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$. This indicates the ambiguity of defining the amplitude of fluctuations also for many frequencies.

Theorem 2.7. *Let $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be any zero-mean stationary time series with an MA(∞) representation*

$$y_t = \Psi(L)\epsilon_t, \quad (35)$$

where $\Psi(L) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \psi_j L^j$, $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\psi_j| < \infty$ and where $\{\epsilon_t\}$ is a sequence of zero-mean IID random variables which distribution being a marginal distribution for some bivariate spherical distribution with characteristic function $\phi(\|\mathbf{z}\|)$ at $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Then, for any frequencies $0 < \lambda_1 \leq \lambda_2 \leq \dots \leq \lambda_K \leq \pi$, the process $\{y_t\}$ can be represented in

infinitely many ways as

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^K \alpha_{j,t} \cos \lambda_j t + \beta_{j,t} \sin \lambda_j t, \quad (36)$$

where $[\alpha_{j,t} \beta_{j,t}]$ are zero-mean bivariate processes, mutually independent for $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, and having spherical distributions independent of t .

We close this subsection with a theorem establishing a vector autoregression (VAR) representation of the cyclical process $\{y_t\}$ and stationarity up to any order, allowing for dependencies between cyclic components.

Theorem 2.8. Let $y_t = \sum_{j=1}^K z_{j,t}$, where $z_{j,t} = \alpha_{j,t} \cos \lambda_j t + \beta_{j,t} \sin \lambda_j t$, and $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots, \lambda_K \leq \pi$. Assume that for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the processes $\{\alpha_{j,t}\}$ and $\{\beta_{j,t}\}$ are stationary autoregressive processes of order $p_j \in \mathbb{N}$ with the same characteristic polynomial $\Phi_j(L) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{p_j} \phi_{j,i} L^i$, that is

$$\begin{cases} \Phi_j(L)\alpha_{j,t} &= \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \Phi_j(L)\beta_{j,t} &= \epsilon_{j,t}^*, \end{cases}$$

where $[\epsilon_{j,t} \ \epsilon_{j,t}^*]$ is IID bivariate random sequence with some spherical distribution. Then

- i) for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the process $\{z_{j,t}\}$ is a coordinate of a bivariate VAR(p_j) process of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} z_{j,t} \\ z_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{i=1}^{p_j} \left(\phi_{j,i} \mathbf{R}(i\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} z_{j,t-i} \\ z_{j,t-i}^* \end{bmatrix} \right) + \mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \epsilon_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix}; \quad (37)$$

- ii) assuming that the joint distribution of $\epsilon_t = [\epsilon_{1,j} \ \epsilon_{1,t}^* \ \epsilon_{2,j} \ \epsilon_{2,t}^* \ \dots \ \epsilon_{K,j} \ \epsilon_{K,t}^*]$ has a pdf at point $(x_1, y_1, x_2, y_2, \dots, x_K, y_K) \in \mathbb{R}^{2K}$ given by $g(x_1^2 + y_1^2, x_2^2 + y_2^2, \dots, x_K^2 + y_K^2)$, where $g : [0, \infty)^K \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and that for some positive integer m we have that $E|\epsilon_{j,t}|^m < \infty$, for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, then $\{y_t\}$ is stationary up to order m .

2.4 The concept of strongly pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function

In the literature related to stationary processes, a zero-mean stationary time series $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ displaying cyclic features (with either one frequency λ or a set of frequencies $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_K) \in (0, \pi]^K$) is typically referred to as *cyclical* (e.g., a *cyclical long memory process*, *cyclical component*, *cyclical pattern*, or a *cyclical model*; see, e.g., Arteche and Robinson (2000), Proietti and Maddanu (2024), Hyndman et al. (2008)). Another common term of reference is a process with '*pseudocyclical*' behaviour (see Trimbur (2006)). Nevertheless, the definition of a cyclical property in the zero-mean stationary case has not been explicitly linked to characteristics such as the autocovariance or spectral density function. Below, we formulate a formal definition in relation to the autocovariance function, through the concept of a *strongly pseudocyclical autocovariance function*.

Definition 2.1. *We say that a zero-mean weakly stationary process $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ has strongly pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function with K different frequencies: $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_K \in (0, \pi]$ if its autocovariance function satisfies*

$$E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = \sum_{j=1}^K a_{j,\tau} \cos \lambda_j \tau + b_{j,\tau} \sin \lambda_j \tau, \quad (38)$$

where the sequences $\{a_{j,\tau}\}_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}}$ and $\{b_{j,\tau}\}_{\tau \in \mathbb{Z}}$ are such that for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$

$$\lim_{|\tau| \rightarrow \infty} a_{j,\tau} = \lim_{|\tau| \rightarrow \infty} b_{j,\tau} = 0$$

and there exists $\tau_0 > 0$ such that both $|a_{j,\tau}|$ and $|b_{j,\tau}|$ are a non-increasing function at $\tau > \tau_0$.

To illustrate the above-stated definition, let us consider a simple process of the form:

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos \omega_1 t + \beta_t \sin \omega_1 t, \quad (39)$$

where $\alpha_t = \xi_t \cos \omega_2 t + \xi'_t \sin \omega_2 t$ and $\beta_t = \eta_t \cos \omega_2 t + \eta'_t \sin \omega_2 t$, $\omega_1, \omega_2 \in (0, \pi]$ and

$\xi_t = \rho\xi_{t-1} + \kappa_t$, $\xi'_t = \rho\xi'_{t-1} + \kappa'_t$, $\eta_t = \rho\eta_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, $\eta'_t = \rho\eta'_{t-1} + \epsilon'_t$, $|\rho| < 1$. For $[\kappa_t \ \kappa'_t \ \epsilon_t \ \epsilon'_t]$ we assume that follows a Gaussian white noise with a covariance matrix $\sigma^2\mathbf{I}_4$. Hence, by Theorem 2.6, the autocovariance functions of the processes α_t and β_t are the same: $\gamma(\tau) = \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \cos \omega_2\tau$. The same theorem yields also the autocovariance function of y_t : $\gamma_y(\tau) = \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \cos \omega_2\tau \cos \omega_1\tau = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \cos(\omega_1 + \omega_2)\tau + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2} \cos |\omega_1 - \omega_2|\tau$, the formula of which reveals the relation of this autocovariance function to two (unless coinciding) frequencies $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in (0, \pi]$ related to $\omega_1 + \omega_2$ and $\omega_1 - \omega_2$. Specifically, $\lambda_2 = |\omega_1 - \omega_2|$, with $a_{2,\tau} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2}$ and $b_{2,\tau} = 0$. If $\omega_1 + \omega_2 \leq \pi$, then $\lambda_1 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 \in (0, \pi]$, with $a_{1,\tau} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2}$ and $b_{1,\tau} = 0$. Otherwise, that is if $\omega_1 + \omega_2 > \pi$, then $\lambda_1 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 - \pi \in (0, \pi]$, with $a_{1,\tau} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\rho^{|\tau|}\sigma^2}{1-\rho^2}$ and $b_{1,\tau} = 0$.

In the next section, we will verify for which cyclical processes the properties of the strongly pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function match the definition of 2.1.

3 Review of existing cyclical processes

To the best of our knowledge, the literature on cyclical zero-mean stationary processes is scarce, and few such processes have been proposed so far. In this section we review them and examine briefly their properties, including also (whenever possible to show) their strongly pseudo-cyclical autocovariance functions (according to Definition 2.1). The review covers Hannan's model (see Hannan et al. (1970)), stochastic cycle model (see Harvey (1985)), nth-order stochastic cycle (see Harvey and Trimbur (2003)), elliptical and spherical stochastic cycles (see Luati and Proietti (2010)), k-factor GARMA model (Woodward et al. (1998)), and fractional sinusoidal waveform process (see Proietti and Maddanu (2024)).

3.1 Hannan's model and its generalization

In Hannan et al. (1970), the following model with time-varying amplitude and phase shift was proposed for seasonal time series:

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^6 (\alpha_{j,t} \cos(t\lambda_j) + \beta_{j,t} \sin(t\lambda_j)), \quad (40)$$

where $\lambda_j = 2\pi j/12$ and $\alpha_{j,t} = \rho_j \alpha_{j,t-1} + \eta_{j,t}$, $\beta_{j,t} = \rho_j \beta_{j,t-1} + \tilde{\eta}_{j,t}$, with $[\eta_{j,t} \tilde{\eta}_{j,t}]$ being a Gaussian white noise with the covariance matrix $\sigma_j^2 \mathbf{I}_2$. Equation (40) can be generalized to any number $K \in \mathbb{N}$ of cyclical components $\{z_{j,t}\}$, each related to the corresponding frequency $\lambda_j \in (0, \pi]$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, with $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2 < \dots, \lambda_K \leq \pi$:

$$y_t = \sum_{j=1}^K \overbrace{(\alpha_{j,t} \cos(t\lambda_j) + \beta_{j,t} \sin(t\lambda_j))}^{z_{j,t}}, \quad (41)$$

with $\alpha_{j,t}$ and $\beta_{j,t}$ being mutually independent and stationary Gaussian processes sharing the same autocovariance function $\gamma_j(\tau)$. Our Theorem 2.6 provides the autocovariance function (which is strongly pseudo-cyclical here) and power spectral density function of $\{y_t\}$ given by (41). Under the Gaussianity assumption, for each component $z_{j,t}$, the related amplitude features the inverse coefficient of variation of the form (22), which limits possible applications.

3.2 Stochastic cycle model

After the work of Hannan et al. (1970), an equivalent model to (41) for a univariate time series $\{y_t\}$ was introduced and developed by Harvey (1985), Harvey (1990), Harvey and Jaeger (1993). In the cited works, this equivalent formulation of each $z_{j,t}$ in (41) is referred to as a *stochastic cycle* $\{c_{j,t}\}$ (related to the frequency λ_j), and it has an ARMA(2, 1) representation of the form:

$$(1 - 2\tilde{\rho}_j \cos \lambda_j L + \tilde{\rho}_j^2 L^2) c_{j,t} = \kappa_{j,t} - \tilde{\rho}_j \cos \lambda_j \kappa_{j,t-1} + \tilde{\rho}_j \sin \lambda_j \kappa_{j,t-1}^*, \quad (42)$$

where $|\bar{\rho}_j| < 1$, L denotes the backshift operator (i.e., for some stochastic process x_t and any integer k we have $x_t L^k = x_{t-k}$), and $[\kappa_{j,t} \kappa_{j,t}^*]$ is a Gaussian white noise with a covariance matrix $\sigma_{\kappa_j}^2 \mathbf{I}_2$. Furthermore, the stochastic cycle $\{c_{j,t}\}$ can be represented as an coordinate of a relevant bivariate VAR(1) process, with its 2×2 autoregressive matrix being a rotation matrix, which follows easily from our Theorem 2.8 under $K = 1$ and $p_1 = 1$. Based on the same theorem, we conclude that the stochastic cycle, although largely popularized and commonly employed in business cycle analyses, does not bring anything new and is equivalent to a simple generalization of Hannan's model, given by (41) under $K = 1$. Hence, the relevant inverse coefficient of variation continues to share the Gaussian case restraint (see (22)).

3.3 n th-order stochastic cycle

To obtain a 'smoother' stochastic cycle (by stronger mass concentration around certain frequencies for power spectral density function), the concept of an *n th-order stochastic cycle* was introduced in Harvey and Trimbur (2003) (and later developed by Trimbur (2006)). This generalized cycle $\{\psi_{n,t}\}$ admits the following ARMA($2n, 2n - 1$) representation:

$$(1 - 2\rho \cos \lambda L + \rho^2 L^2)^n \psi_{n,t} = \sum_{j=0}^n A_j(L) (\kappa_t \cos \lambda j - \kappa_t^* \sin \lambda j), \quad (43)$$

where $|\rho| < 1$, $A_j(L) = L^{n-1+j} \binom{n}{j} (-\rho)^j$, and $[\kappa_t \kappa_t^*]$ is a Gaussian white noise with a covariance matrix $\sigma_{\kappa}^2 \mathbf{I}_2$. The exact form of the autocovariance function was shown in Trimbur (2006):

$$E(\psi_{n,t} \psi_{n,t+\tau}) = a_{\tau}(\rho) \cos \lambda \tau, \quad (44)$$

where $\lim_{|\tau| \rightarrow \infty} a_{\tau}(\rho) = 0$. The spectral density function follows immediately from (43). The amplitude of the n th-order stochastic cycle is $\sqrt{\psi_{n,t}^2 + \psi_{n,t}^{*2}}$, where $\psi_{n,t}$ and $\psi_{n,t}^*$ are zero-mean Gaussian ARMA($2n, 2n - 1$) processes with the same parameters and mutually independent Gaussian white noises (see Section 3 in Trimbur (2006)). Hence, again, the inverse coefficient of variation of the amplitude suffers from the Gaussian case

restraint (see (22)). Therefore, arguably, although the n th-order stochastic cycle can result in a ‘smoother’ stochastic cycle (for an increasing n), and thus a ‘smoother’ amplitude process, the expectation of the latter equals the amplitude’s standard deviation times $\sqrt{\frac{\pi}{4-\pi}}$ (see (22)), which is the very same strong limitation as for the ($n = 1$) stochastic cycle.

3.4 Elliptical and spherical stochastic cycles

The stochastic cycle and n th-order stochastic cycle are related to a VAR representation, where the autoregression (or, transition) matrix is associated with rotation along a circle in the plane. In Luati and Proietti (2010), the original transition matrix was replaced by the motion of a point along an ellipse. Still, the process remains Gaussian and admits an ARMA(2,1) representation. Even though it introduces a different structure of the ARMA model (than the n th-order stochastic cycle), by the representation given by Theorem 2.7, we get again a linear relation between the expectation and standard deviation of the amplitude.

3.5 k -factor GARMA model

In Woodward et al. (1998) and Smallwood and Beaumont (2003), the following stationary model of a long-memory k -factor GARMA (Gegenbauer ARMA) specification was investigated:

$$\psi(L) \prod_{j=1}^K (1 - 2u_j L + L^2)^{c_j} y_t = \theta(L) \epsilon_t, \quad (45)$$

with frequencies $f_j = \frac{1}{2\pi \cos u_j}$, $j = 1, \dots, K$. For a GARMA process, the exact form of its spectral density can be derived. However, one of the main limitations is the lack of a closed form expression for the autocovariance function (although it seems likely that it admits a pseudo-cyclical autocovariance function of the form (38)). Despite the fact that the k -factor GARMA model has not been defined on the basis of the representation (34), it is still Gaussian with an MA(∞) representation and hence, drawing on Theorem 2.7, for each of the frequencies $0 < f_1 < f_2 < \dots < f_K \leq \pi$, the relevant cyclic component

can be represented in such a way that again, a linear relation between the amplitude's expectation and standard deviation emerges.

3.6 Fractional sinusoidal waveform process

Motivated by the k -factor GARMA model, the following fractional sinusoidal waveform process was proposed in Proietti and Maddanu (2024) (see also earlier work: Maddanu and Proietti (2022)):

$$y_t = \alpha_t \cos(\lambda t) + \beta_t \sin(\lambda t), \quad (46)$$

where $\alpha_t = (1 - L)^{-d} \kappa_t$ and $\beta_t = (1 - L)^{-d} \kappa_t^*$, with $0 < d < 1/2$ and $[\kappa_t \ \kappa_t^*]$ being a Gaussian white noise with a covariance matrix $\sigma_\kappa^2 \mathbf{I}_2$. Note that although the theoretical properties of the model were presented in the cited paper for the single-frequency case, a multiple-frequency model (obtained straightforwardly as a sum of such independent components) was considered in the empirical part of the study.

The autocovariance function of the model (46) assumes the form:

$$E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = \sigma_\kappa^2 \frac{\Gamma(1 - 2d)\Gamma(d + \tau)}{\Gamma(1 + \tau - d)\Gamma(1 - d)} \cos \lambda \tau, \quad (47)$$

which is strongly pseudo-cyclical. The spectral density function features a vertical asymptote at the frequency λ , was evaluated in the cited work and can be also obtained using our general Theorem 2.6. The linear relation between expectation and standard deviation of amplitude process is obvious here.

4 New stochastic cycle concept and its statistical properties

In this section, we present a novel specification of a zero-mean cyclic stationary process, already mentioned in Section 1.4. We focus here on the single-frequency model, since generalizing it into the multi-frequency case (as the sum of independent components, each corresponding to a given frequency) is straightforward.

For convenience, let us remind the equation of our model proposed by equation (7):

$$y_t = (a + A_t) \sin[\lambda(t + \psi + P_t)].$$

In what follows we assume that $\psi = 0$ (or the sake of parameter identification), and that the amplitude process A_t is stationary up to order m . On the other hand, the phase shift process P_t can be considered either stationary (resulting in oscillations around a constant cycle length) or non-stationary (specifically, integrated of order one). Before we formulate two relevant theorems, handling the two cases, respectively, let us define that a process $\{y_t\}$ is an Almost Periodically Correlated up to order m (henceforth denoted as APC(m)) if for any $s \leq m$, and $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_s \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, the moment $E(y_{t+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \dots y_{t+\tau_s})$ exists and is an almost periodic function of t . Obviously, the APC(m) class contains the class of stationary time series up to order m .

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\{A_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a time series with zero mean and stationary up to order m , and let $\{P_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a stationary Gaussian time series. Assume also that the processes $\{A_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{P_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are independent. Then, for any $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$, the process $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of the form*

$$y_t = (a + A_t) \sin[\lambda(t + P_t)]$$

is an APC(m) time series, such that for any positive integer $s \leq m$ and any sequence of integers $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_s$, we have

$$E \left(\prod_{j=1}^s y_{t+\tau_j} \right) = \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor}}{2^s} a_{\tau} \sum_{(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_s) \in \mathbf{P}} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Var} \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^s e_j P_{t+\tau_j} \right)} f \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^s e_j (t + \tau_j) \right) \prod_{j=1}^s e_j,$$

where $\mathbf{P} = \{-1, 1\}^s$, f is the sine (or cosine) function if s is odd (even, respectively), and

$$a_{\tau} = E \left(\prod_{j=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_j}) \right). \quad (48)$$

The theorem above shows the exact form of all moments up to m , which are almost periodic functions of time $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, any spectral characteristics related with the second and higher-order spectra for $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ can be evaluated. However, since $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is as an APC process and thus nonstationary (which may be somewhat surprising under the assumed stationarity of both A_t and P_t), we ditch that specification from further analysis, and focus on the following case, featuring a nonstationary P_t , which (again, to one's surprise) yields a stationary $\{y_t\}$, instead.

Theorem 4.2. *Let $\{A_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a time series with zero mean and stationary up to order m , and let $\{P_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ follow an $ARIMA(p, 1, q)$ model with a Gaussian white noise. Assume also that the processes $\{A_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{P_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are independent. Then, for any $\lambda \in (0, \pi]$, the process $\{y_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ of the form*

$$y_t = (a + A_t) \sin[\lambda(t + P_t)]$$

is zero-mean and stationary up to order m , such that for any positive integer $s > 1$ and any sequence of integers $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_s$, we have $E\left(\prod_{j=1}^s y_{t+\tau_j}\right) = 0$ if s is odd and

$$E\left(\prod_{j=1}^s y_{t+\tau_j}\right) = \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor \frac{s}{2} \rfloor}}{2^s} a_{\tau} \sum_{(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_s) \in P_0} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}\left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^s e_j P_{t+\tau_j}\right)} \cos\left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^s e_j \tau_j\right) \prod_{j=1}^s e_j \quad (49)$$

if s is even, where $P_0 = \{(e_1, e_2, \dots, e_s) \in \{-1, 1\}^s : \sum_{j=1}^s e_j = 0\}$ and

$$a_{\tau} = E\left(\prod_{j=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_j})\right). \quad (50)$$

It follows from Theorem 4.2 that the skewness (if exists) of the process y_t is zero, which is a somewhat surprising result here. What is more, for any positive integer k , we have (upon existence)

$$E(y_t^{2k}) = E\left((a + A_t)^{2k}\right), \quad (51)$$

which gives the kurtosis of y_t :

$$\text{Kurt}(y_t) = \frac{E((a + A_t)^4)}{(E((a + A_t)^2))^2}. \quad (52)$$

Under an assumption that A_t is Gaussian with variance σ_A^2 , the kurtosis simplifies to

$$\text{Kurt}(y_t) = 3 - \frac{2a^4}{(a^2 + \sigma_A^2)^2} = 3 - \frac{2}{\left(1 + \left(\frac{\sigma_A}{a}\right)^2\right)^2}, \quad (53)$$

which is lower than for the normal distribution, is an increasing function of the argument $\frac{\sigma_A}{a}$, and is bounded from below by 1.

Theorem 4.2 enables some special cases to consider. For example, if $\{P_t\}$ follows ARIMA(0, 1, 0) (i.e., a random walk: $P_t = P_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, where ϵ_t is a zero-mean Gaussian white noise with a variance σ^2), and A_t is stationary with an autocovariance function $\gamma_A(\tau) = \text{Cov}(A_t, A_{t+\tau})$, then for $s = 2$ we get $P_0 = \{(-1, 1), (1, -1)\}$. Hence, for any $(e_1, e_2) \in P_0$, and any $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2$, one obtains

$$\text{Var} \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 e_j P_{t+\tau_j} \right) = \lambda^2 (\tau_2 - \tau_1) \sigma^2$$

and

$$\cos \left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^2 e_j \tau_j \right) = \cos(\lambda(\tau_2 - \tau_1)).$$

In consequence, for any $\tau \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = 2(a^2 + \gamma_A(\tau)) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2|\tau|\sigma^2} \cos(\lambda|\tau|). \quad (54)$$

Appendix

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof of i) is elementary, so we skip the details. To show ii), let us assume first that y_t is a zero-mean stationary time series. To derive (13) notice now that to ensure $E(y_t) = 0$ (see 11), we easily obtain that $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$. To show the remaining equalities from (13) note that the first derivative (at t) of the autocovariance

function of $\{y_t\}$ has the following form (under $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$):

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dE(y_t y_{t+\tau})}{dt} &= \lambda (\omega_{22}(\tau) - \omega_{11}(\tau)) \sin(\lambda(2t + \tau)) \\ &\quad + \lambda (\omega_{12}(\tau) + \omega_{21}(\tau)) \cos(\lambda(2t + \tau)), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

and should be equal to zero to ensure the stationarity of $\{y_t\}$. This condition is met only under $\omega_{12}(\tau) = -\omega_{21}(\tau) \wedge \omega_{22}(\tau) = \omega_{11}(\tau)$, which concludes this part of the proof.

Conversely, if $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \wedge \omega_{12}(\tau) = -\omega_{21}(\tau) \wedge \omega_{22}(\tau) = \omega_{11}(\tau)$ then one easily gets that $E(y_t) = 0$ with the autocovariance function $E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = \omega_{11}(\tau) \cos \lambda\tau + \omega_{12}(\tau) \sin \lambda\tau$, which does not depend on t . This concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2. To show that α_t and β_t are both zero-mean Gaussian, it is sufficient to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have:

$$E(\alpha_t^{2k}) = E(\beta_t^{2k}) = \frac{2^k \sigma^{2k} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + k)}{\sqrt{\pi}}, \quad E(\alpha_t^{2k-1}) = E(\beta_t^{2k-1}) = 0. \quad (56)$$

We prove this by mathematical induction.

For $k = 1$, the above moment formula is obvious to ensure stationarity up to order 2 (see Theorem 2.1). Assume now that formula (56) holds true up to some $k > 1$. Then, under stationarity up to order $2k + 1$ for y_t , the moment $E(y_t^{2k+1})$ cannot depend on t . For this moment, we simply obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_t^{2k+1}) &= \sum_{s=0}^{2k+1} E(\alpha_t^s) E(\beta_t^{2k+1-s}) \cos^s(\lambda t) \sin^{2k+1-s}(\lambda t) \\ &= E(\alpha_t^{2k+1}) \cos^{2k+1}(\lambda t) + E(\beta_t^{2k+1}) \sin^{2k+1}(\lambda t), \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

which does not depend on t if and only if $E(\alpha_t^{2k+1}) = E(\beta_t^{2k+1}) = 0$. Under stationarity

up to order $2(k+1)$ for y_t , we consider:

$$\begin{aligned}
E(y_t^{2(k+1)}) &= \sum_{s=0}^{2(k+1)} \binom{2(k+1)}{s} E(\alpha_t^s) E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)-s}) \cos^s(\lambda t) \sin^{2(k+1)-s}(\lambda t) \\
&= \sum_{r=0}^{k+1} \binom{2(k+1)}{2r} E(\alpha_t^{2r}) E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)-2r}) \cos^{2r}(\lambda t) \sin^{2(k+1)-2r}(\lambda t) \\
&= E(\alpha_t^{2(k+1)}) \cos^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) + E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)}) \sin^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) \\
&\quad + \sum_{r=1}^k \binom{2(k+1)}{2r} \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + r) \Gamma(\frac{3}{2} + k - r)}{\pi} \cos^{2r}(\lambda t) \sin^{2(k+1)-2r}(\lambda t) \\
&= E(\alpha_t^{2(k+1)}) \cos^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) + E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)}) \sin^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) \\
&\quad - \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(k + \frac{3}{2}) (\sin^{2k+2}(t) + \cos^{2k+2}(t) - 1)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \\
&= \left(E(\alpha_t^{2(k+1)}) - \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + k + 1)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \cos^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) \\
&\quad + \left(E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)}) - \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + k + 1)}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) \sin^{2(k+1)}(\lambda t) \\
&\quad + \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + k + 1)}{\sqrt{\pi}},
\end{aligned}$$

which does not depend on t if and only if $E(\alpha_t^{2(k+1)}) = E(\beta_t^{2(k+1)}) = \frac{2^{k+1} \sigma^{2(k+1)} \Gamma(\frac{1}{2} + k + 1)}{\sqrt{\pi}}$.

This completes the proof of formula (56) and, therefore, the entire proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.3. Let m be any positive integer and let $\boldsymbol{\tau} = (\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$ such that $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < \dots < \tau_m$. For the vector $\mathbf{y}_{t,\boldsymbol{\tau}} = [y_{t+\tau_1} \ y_{t+\tau_2}^* \ y_{t+\tau_2} \ y_{t+\tau_2}^* \ \dots \ y_{t+\tau_m} \ y_{t+\tau_m}^*]$, where $y_t^* = \alpha_t \cos \lambda t - \beta_t \sin \lambda t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}'_{t,\boldsymbol{\tau}} &= \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda\tau_1), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda\tau_m)) \cdot \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda t), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda t)) \cdot \mathbf{S}'_{t,\boldsymbol{\tau}} \\
&= \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda\tau_1), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda\tau_m)) \cdot \mathbf{A} \cdot \mathbf{S}'_{t,\boldsymbol{\tau}},
\end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda t), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda t))$. To finish the proof, it is enough to show that the distribution of $\mathbf{A} \mathbf{S}'_{t,\boldsymbol{\tau}}$ does not depend on t . Since the matrix \mathbf{A} is orthonormal, the

Jacobian of the transformation $[z_1 \ z_1^* \ z_2 \ z_2^* \ \dots \ z_m \ z_m^*]' = \mathbf{A}[x_1 \ x_1^* \ x_2 \ x_2^* \ \dots \ x_m \ x_m^*]'$ is one. Elementary calculations give that $z_j^2 + z_j^{*2} = x_j^2 + x_j^{*2}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Hence the probability distribution function of $\mathbf{A}\mathbf{S}'_{t,\tau}$ at point $(z_1, z_1^*, z_2, z_2^*, \dots, z_m, z_m^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{2m}$ is $f_{\tau}(z_1^2 + z_1^{*2}, z_2^2 + z_2^{*2}, \dots, z_m^2 + z_m^{*2})$, which concludes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4. To show i), it is enough to show that the characteristic function of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ at $\mathbf{t} = [t_1, t_2] \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a function of $\|\mathbf{t}\| = \sqrt{t_1^2 + t_2^2}$. By $\psi_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{t}\|)$ we denote the characteristic function of $[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]$ at point $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Notice that the characteristic function of $[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]$ at \mathbf{t} is

$$\phi(\mathbf{t}) = E(e^{i\mathbf{t}[\alpha_t \ \beta_t]'}) = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} E(e^{i\psi_k \mathbf{t}[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]'}) = \prod_{k=0}^{\infty} \phi_{\epsilon}(|\psi_k| \cdot \|\mathbf{t}\|), \quad (59)$$

which ends the proof of i).

To show ii) note that using elementary algebra it can be shown that since the rotation matrix is orthogonal (with its determinant equal one), the probability distribution function of $[\zeta_t \ \zeta_t^*]$ at point $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is $f(x^2 + y^2)$ (we omit technical details). Now define $y_t^* = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k [\cos(\lambda k) \zeta_{t-k} - \sin(\lambda k) \zeta_{t-k}^*]$ and notice that

$$\begin{aligned} [y_t \ y_t^*]' &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k \mathbf{R}(\lambda k) [\zeta_{t-k} \ \zeta_{t-k}^*]' = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k \mathbf{R}(\lambda k) \mathbf{R}(\lambda(t-k)) [\epsilon_{t-k} \ \epsilon_{t-k}^*]' \\ &= \mathbf{R}(\lambda t) \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \psi_k [\epsilon_{t-k} \ \epsilon_{t-k}^*]' = \mathbf{R}(\lambda t) [\alpha_t \ \beta_t^*]', \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

which ends the proof of ii).

To show iii), it is sufficient to use the representation from ii). We skip technical details.

This ends the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.5. One easily checks that (14) holds if (15) is substituted into into

the former. To prove the stationarity, note that for any $t, \tau \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E([\alpha_t \ \beta_t]'[\alpha_{t+\tau} \ \beta_{t+\tau}]) &= \mathbf{R}(\lambda t) E([y_t \ y_t^*]'[y_{t+\tau} \ y_{t+\tau}^*]) \mathbf{R}(-\lambda t) \mathbf{R}(-\lambda \tau) \\ &= \mathbf{\Gamma}(\tau) \mathbf{R}(-\lambda \tau), \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

which concludes this part of the proof. Proving (17) is elementary, therefore we omit this part of the proof. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Note that since y_t is zero-mean and $[\alpha_{t,j} \ \beta_{t,j}]$ are mutually uncorrelated, one gets

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_y(\tau) &= E(y_t y_{t+\tau}) = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K (\alpha_{t+\tau,j} \cos[\lambda(t+\tau)] + \beta_{t+\tau,j} \sin[\lambda(t+\tau)]) (\alpha_{t,j} \cos \lambda t + \beta_{t,j} \sin \lambda t) = \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^K \gamma_j(\tau) \cos \lambda_j \tau. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the power spectral density of y_t is given by

$$\begin{aligned} f_y(\omega) &= \sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_y(\tau) \cos \omega \tau = \sum_{j=1}^K \sum_{\tau=-\infty}^{\infty} \gamma_j(\tau) \cos \lambda_j \tau \cos \omega \tau \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^K (f_j(\lambda_j + \omega) + f_j(\lambda_j - \omega)), \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.7. Let $[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*]$ have spherical distribution with characteristic function at $z \in \mathbb{R}^2$ given by $\phi(\|z\|)$. Then we have decomposition $[\epsilon_t \ \epsilon_t^*] = \sum_{j=1}^K [\epsilon_{j,t} \ \epsilon_{j,t}^*]$, where $\{[\epsilon_{j,t} \ \epsilon_{j,t}^*]\}$ ($j = 1, 2, \dots, K$) is sequence of zero-mean IID random vectors, mutually independent and having spherical distribution given by characteristic function $\phi^{k_j}(\|z\|)$, with $k_j > 0$ and $\sum_{j=1}^K k_j = K$. Then, we define processes $[y_{j,t} \ y_{j,t}^*] = \Psi(L)[\epsilon_{j,t} \ \epsilon_{j,t}^*]$, which are also mutually independent for $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$. Next, for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, we

define:

$$[\alpha_{j,t} \ \beta_{j,t}]' = \mathbf{R}(-\lambda_j t)[y_{j,t} \ y_{j,t}^*]'. \quad (62)$$

Elementary calculations yield (36). This ends the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.8. To show i) notice that for any $j = 1, 2, \dots, K$, a single component $z_{j,t}$ satisfies the bivariate model equation:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} z_{j,t} \\ z_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix} &= \mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{j,t} \\ \beta_{j,t} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_j} \phi_{j,i} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{j,t-i} \\ \beta_{j,t-i} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \epsilon_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{p_j} \phi_{j,i} \mathbf{R}(-t\lambda_j + i\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} z_{j,t-i} \\ z_{j,t-i}^* \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \epsilon_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix} \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{p_j} \phi_{j,i} \mathbf{R}(i\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} z_{j,t-i} \\ z_{j,t-i}^* \end{bmatrix} + \mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \epsilon_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{R}(t\lambda_j) \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{j,t} \\ \epsilon_{j,t}^* \end{bmatrix}$ is a bivariate white noise with the same distribution as $[\epsilon_{j,t} \ \epsilon_{j,t}^*]'$.

To show ii) notice that from i) the vector $[z_{1,t} \ z_{1,t}^* \ z_{2,t} \ z_{2,t}^* \ \dots \ z_{K,t} \ z_{K,t}^*]$ admits a VAR representation with the white noise of the form $\text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda_1 t), \mathbf{R}(\lambda_2 t), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda_K t))\epsilon_t'$ and having the same pdf as ϵ_t' , which is a consequence of the orthogonality of the matrix $\text{diag}(\mathbf{R}(\lambda_1 t), \mathbf{R}(\lambda_2 t), \dots, \mathbf{R}(\lambda_K t))$ (with its determinant equal one). \square

We continue with the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$. Then $E(\sin X) = e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}} \sin(\mu)$, and $E(\cos X) = e^{-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}} \cos(\mu)$.*

Proof. We omit an elementary proof. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let P_t follows an ARIMA($p, 1, q$) model of the form:*

$$(1 - L)\Psi(L)P_t = \Theta(L)\epsilon_t, \quad (63)$$

where ϵ_t is a white noise. Let s be any positive integer, $\{\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_s\}$ be any sequence of integers, and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_s\}$ be any sequence of real numbers. Then, for the process $Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}} = \sum_{k=1}^s b_k P_{t+\tau_k}$, we have the following ARIMA representation:

$$(1 - L)\Psi(L)Q_t = \Theta(L) \left(\sum_{k=1}^s b_k L^{\tilde{\tau}-\tau_k} \right) \epsilon_t, \quad (64)$$

where $\tilde{\tau} = \max_{i=1,2,\dots,s} \{\tau_i\}$.

Proof. Note that $P_t = P_{t-1} + \frac{\Theta(L)}{\Psi(L)}\epsilon_t$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}} &= \sum_{k=1}^s b_k P_{t+\tau_k} = \sum_{k=1}^s b_k P_{t+\tau_k-1} + \sum_{k=1}^s b_k \frac{\Theta(L)}{\Psi(L)} \epsilon_{t+\tau_k} \\ &= Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}-1} + \sum_{k=1}^s b_k \frac{\Theta(L)}{\Psi(L)} \epsilon_{t+\tau_k}. \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Therefore,

$$(1 - L)Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}} = \sum_{k=1}^s b_k \frac{\Theta(L)}{\Psi(L)} \epsilon_{t+\tau_k}, \quad (66)$$

and finally,

$$(1 - L)\Psi(L)Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}} = \Theta(L) \left(\sum_{k=1}^s b_k L^{\tilde{\tau}-\tau_k} \right) \epsilon_{t+\tilde{\tau}}, \quad (67)$$

which ends the proof upon noticing that $Q_{t+\tilde{\tau}} = L^{-\tilde{\tau}}Q_t$ and $\epsilon_{t+\tilde{\tau}} = L^{-\tilde{\tau}}\epsilon_t$ □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $s(t)$ be any real-valued function, and W_t be any ARIMA($p, 1, q$) process with a Gaussian error term ϵ_t : $(1 - L)\Psi(L)W_t = \Theta(L)\epsilon_t$. Then,*

$$E(\sin(s(t) + W_t)) = E(\cos(s(t) + W_t)) = 0.$$

Proof. Let $W_t = W_{t-1} + \tilde{\epsilon}_t$, where $\tilde{\epsilon}_t = \frac{\Theta(L)}{\Psi(L)}\epsilon_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j \epsilon_{t-j}$ is a zero-mean Gaussian stationary time series. Then, for any positive integer d , we have $W_t = W_{t-d} + \epsilon_{d,t}^*$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{d,t}^* &= \sum_{s=0}^{d-1} \tilde{\epsilon}_{t-s} = \sum_{s=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j \epsilon_{t-s-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \phi_j \sum_{s=0}^{d-1} \epsilon_{t-(s+j)} \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} \left(\sum_{j=0}^k \phi_k \right) \epsilon_{t-k}}_{\zeta_{d,t}^{(1)}} + \underbrace{\sum_{k=d}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \phi_k \right) \epsilon_{t-k}}_{\zeta_{d,t}^{(2)}} \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

is a zero-mean Gaussian random variable. Note that

$$\epsilon_{d,t}^* | \mathcal{F}_{t-d} \sim N(\zeta_{d,t}^{(2)}, \sigma_d^2), \quad (69)$$

where $\sigma_d^2 = \text{Var}(\zeta_{d,t}^{(1)})$ does not depend on t and (skipping technical details)

$$\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_d^2 = \infty. \quad (70)$$

Hence, by a simple trigonometric identity, and employing (69) with Lemma 4.1, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned} |E(\sin(s(t) + W_t))| &= \left| E \left(\sin[s(t) + W_{t-d} + \epsilon_{d,t}^*] \right) \right| \\ &= \left| E \left(\sin[s(t) + W_{t-d}] \cos(\epsilon_{d,t}^*) + \cos[s(t) + W_{t-d}] \sin(\epsilon_{d,t}^*) \right) \right| \\ &= \left| E \left(\sin[s(t) + W_{t-d}] E(\cos(\epsilon_{d,t}^*) | t-d) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \cos[s(t) + W_{t-d}] E(\sin(\epsilon_{d,t}^*) | t-d) \right) \right| \\ &= e^{-\frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}} \left| E \left(\sin[s(t) + W_{t-d}] \cos(\zeta_{d,t}^{(2)}) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \cos[s(t) + W_{t-d}] \sin(\zeta_{d,t}^{(2)}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq 2e^{-\frac{\sigma_d^2}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Taking the limit $d \rightarrow \infty$ of both sides of the above inequality, and employing (70), we obtain $E(\sin(s(t) + W_t)) = 0$. The proof for $E(\cos(s(t) + W_t))$ is analogous. This ends the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.1. This result is a natural consequence of the product-to-sum identity and Lemma 4.1. Therefore, only major steps are shown. Since A_t and P_t are independent, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E(y_{y+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \cdots y_{t+\tau_s}) &= E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_k}) \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]\right) \\ &= \underbrace{E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_k})\right)}_I \underbrace{E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]\right)}_{II}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

Applying now the product-to-sum identity and Lemma 4.1 to term II, we get

$$\begin{aligned} II &= E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]\right) = \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}}{2^s} \sum_{e \in P} E\left(f\left(\sum_{j=1}^s e_j \lambda(t + \tau_j) + \sum_{j=1}^s e_j P_{t+\tau_j}\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}}{2^s} \sum_{e \in P} e^{-\frac{1}{2} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{j=1}^s e_j P_{t+\tau_j}\right)} f\left(\lambda \sum_{j=1}^s e_j (t + \tau_j)\right), \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

where $\mathbf{e} = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_s) \in \{-1, 1\}^s$ and f is a sine function if s is odd, and a cosine function otherwise. This ends the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We split the proof into two steps. First, we show that $E(y_t) = 0$, and then, we prove that for any integer $s \geq 2$ and any integers $\tau_1 \leq \tau_2 \leq \dots \leq \tau_s$, the expectation $E(y_{y+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \cdots y_{t+\tau_s})$ exists and does not depend on t .

Step 1. Note that $E(y_t) = aE(\sin[\lambda t + \lambda P_t])$. Hence, using Lemma (4.3), we obtain $E(y_t) = 0$.

Step 2. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
E(y_{y+\tau_1} y_{t+\tau_2} \cdots y_{t+\tau_s}) &= E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_k}) \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]\right) \\
&= E\left(\underbrace{\prod_{k=1}^s (a + A_{t+\tau_k})}_I\right) E\left(\underbrace{\prod_{k=1}^s \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]}_{II}\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

Since A_t is stationary up to order m , the term I does not depend on t . To finish this step it is enough to show that the term II also does not depend on t . To that end, notice that using the product-to-sum identity we get

$$\begin{aligned}
II &= E\left(\prod_{k=1}^s \sin[\lambda(t + \tau_k + P_{t+\tau_k})]\right) = \\
&= \frac{(-1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}}{2^s} \sum_{e \in P} E\left(\underbrace{f\left(\overbrace{\sum_{j=1}^s e_j \lambda(t + \tau_j)}^{III_e} + \overbrace{\sum_{j=1}^s e_j P_{t+\tau_j}}^{S_\tau}\right)}_{II_e}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

where $e = (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_s) \in \{-1, 1\}^s$ and f is a sine function if s is odd, and a cosine function otherwise. Thus, to finish the proof of Step 2, it suffices to show that II_e does not depend on t for any $e \in P$. To that end, two cases are considered:

Case 1. If $\sum_{j=1}^s e_j = 0$, then s is even and III_e does not depend on t , and by Lemma 4.2, the time series S_τ is a zero-mean Gaussian ARMA process. Therefore, the exact form of II_e follows from Lemma 4.1, and it does not depend on t . The function f is a cosine function here, and hence, by this Lemma, we get

$$II_e = E(\cos(III_e + S_e)) = \sqrt{e^{-\text{var}(S_e)}} \cos(III_e), \tag{76}$$

which finishes the proof of Case 1.

Case 2. If $\sum_{j=1}^s e_j \neq 0$, then by Lemma 4.2, the time series S_τ is an ARIMA($p_\tau, 1, q_\tau$) process. Thus, resorting to Lemma 4.3 results in $II_e = 0$.

This ends the proof of Step 2 and completes the entire proof. □

References

- Anděl, J. (1986). Long memory time series models. *Kybernetika*, 22(2):105–123.
- Andrews, D. F. and Mallows, C. L. (1974). Scale mixtures of normal distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 36(1):99–102.
- Antoni, J. (2009). Cyclostationarity by examples. *Mechanical Systems and Signal Processing*, 23(4):987–1036.
- Arteche, J. and Robinson, P. M. (2000). Semiparametric inference in seasonal and cyclical long memory processes. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 21(1):1–25.
- Corduneanu, C. (1989). *Almost Periodic Functions*. New York: Chelsea.
- Das, S. and Genton, M. G. (2021). Cyclostationary processes with evolving periods and amplitudes. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:1579–1590.
- Fang, K. and Zhang, Y. (1990 - 1990). *Generalized multivariate analysis / Fang Kai-Tai, Zhang Yao-Ting*. Science Press, Beijing.
- Fang, K. W. (2018). *Symmetric multivariate and related distributions*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Gardner, W. A. (2018). Statistically inferred time warping: Extending the cyclostationarity paradigm from regular to irregular statistical cyclicity in scientific data. *EURASIP Journal on Advances in Signal Processing*, 2018:1–25.
- Gardner, W. A., Napolitano, A., and Paura, L. (2006). Cyclostationarity: Half a century of research. *Signal processing*, 86(4):639–697.
- Gupta, A. K., Varga, T., Bodnar, T., et al. (2013). *Elliptically contoured models in statistics and portfolio theory*. Springer.

- Hannan, E. (1964). The estimation of a changing seasonal pattern. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 59(308):1063–1077.
- Hannan, E. J., Terrell, R., and Tuckwell, N. (1970). The seasonal adjustment of economic time series. *International Economic Review*, 11(1):24–52.
- Harvey, A. C. (1985). Trends and cycles in macroeconomic time series. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 3(3):216–227.
- Harvey, A. C. (1990). *Forecasting, structural time series models and the Kalman filter*. Cambridge university press.
- Harvey, A. C. and Jaeger, A. (1993). Detrending, stylized facts and the business cycle. *Journal of applied econometrics*, 8(3):231–247.
- Harvey, A. C. and Trimbur, T. M. (2003). General model-based filters for extracting cycles and trends in economic time series. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85(2):244–255.
- Harvey, A. C., Trimbur, T. M., and Van Dijk, H. K. (2007). Trends and cycles in economic time series: A bayesian approach. *Journal of Econometrics*, 140(2):618–649.
- Hyndman, R., Koehler, A. B., Ord, J. K., and Snyder, R. D. (2008). *Forecasting with exponential smoothing: the state space approach*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Johnson, N. L., Kotz, S., and Balakrishnan, N. (1995). *Continuous univariate distributions, volume 2*, volume 289. John wiley & sons.
- Kendall, M. G. (1945). On the analysis of oscillatory time-series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, 108(1/2):93–141.
- Koopman, S. J. and Azevedo, J. V. E. (2008). Measuring Synchronization and Convergence of Business Cycles for the Euro area, UK and US. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 70(1):23–51.

- Kotz, S. and Nadarajah, S. (2004). *Multivariate t -distributions and their applications*. Cambridge university press.
- Lai, C. D. and Balakrishnan, N. (2009). *Continuous bivariate distributions*. Springer.
- Luati, A. and Proietti, T. (2010). Hyper-spherical and elliptical stochastic cycles. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 31(3):169–181.
- Lupenko, S. (2023). The rhythm-adaptive fourier series decompositions of cyclic numerical functions and one-dimensional probabilistic characteristics of cyclic random processes. *Digital Signal Processing*, 140:104104.
- Maddanu, F. and Proietti, T. (2022). Modelling persistent cycles in solar activity. *Solar Physics*, 297(1):13.
- Nadarajah, S., Chu, J., and Jiang, X. (2016). Distributions of amplitude and phase for bivariate distributions. *AEU-International Journal of Electronics and Communications*, 70(9):1249–1258.
- Napolitano, A. (2012). *Generalizations of cyclostationary signal processing: spectral analysis and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Napolitano, A. (2017). Time-warped almost-cyclostationary signals: Characterization and statistical function measurements. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 65(20):5526–5541.
- Napolitano, A. (2019). *Cyclostationary processes and time series: theory, applications, and generalizations*. Academic Press.
- Napolitano, A. (2022). Modeling the electrocardiogram as oscillatory almost-cyclostationary process. *IEEE Access*, 10:13193–13209.
- Napolitano, A. and Gardner, W. A. (2016). Algorithms for analysis of signals with time-warped cyclostationarity. In *2016 50th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, pages 539–543. IEEE.

- Proietti, T. and Maddanu, F. (2024). Modelling cycles in climate series: The fractional sinusoidal waveform process. *Journal of Econometrics*, 239(1):105299. Climate Econometrics.
- Smallwood, A. and Beaumont, P. (2003). Multiple frequency long memory models. Technical report, Discussion Paper, Department of Economics, University of Oklahoma.
- Trimbur, T. M. (2006). Properties of higher order stochastic cycles. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 27(1):1–17.
- Woodward, W. A., Cheng, Q. C., and Gray, H. L. (1998). A k-factor gamma long-memory model. *Journal of time series analysis*, 19(4):485–504.
- Yule, G. U. (1927). Vii. on a method of investigating periodicities disturbed series, with special reference to wolfer’s sunspot numbers. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Containing Papers of a Mathematical or Physical Character*, 226(636-646):267–298.