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Abstract

Time series of count with over-dispersion is the reality often encountered in many biomedical and public health applications. Statistical modelling of this type of series has been a great challenge. Rottenly, the Poisson and negative binomial distributions have been widely used in practice for discrete count time series data, their forms are too simplistic to accommodate features such as over-dispersion. Unable to account for these associated features while analyzing such data may result in incorrect and sometimes misleading inferences as well as detection of spurious associations. Therefore, the need for further investigation of count time series models suitable to fit count time series with over-dispersion of different level. The study therefore proposed a best model that can fit and forecast time series count data with different levels of over-dispersion and sample sizes Simulation studies were conducted using R statistical package, to investigate the performances of Autoregressive Conditional Poisson (ACP) and Poisson Autoregressive (PAR) models. The predictive ability of the models were observed at different steps ahead. The relative performance of the models were examined using Akaike Information criteria (AIC) and Hannan-Quinn Information Criteria (HQIC). Conclusively, the best model to fit was ACP at different sample sizes. The predictive abilities of the four fitted models increased as sample size and number of steps ahead were increased
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1 Introduction

Over-dispersion is a phenomenon that occurs in count data from binomial, poison or negative binomial distributions. Data is overdispersed, if the variance of the data distribution is greater than the mean. In other words, if the estimated dispersion after fitting is not near the assumed values, then the data may be overdispersed, the value is greater than the expected value. It is underdispersed, if the value is less than expected. It is generally caused by positive correlation between responses or by excess variation between response probabilities or counts. It also arises when there are violations in the distributional assumptions of the data [1]. Violations of Poisson assumptions usually result in over-dispersion, where the variance of the model exceeds the value of the mean. Excess or (deficiency) of zero counts result in over-dispersion. Violations of equidispersion indicate correlation in the data, which affect standard errors of the parameter estimates. Model fit is also affected [2].

In medical and health related research, data are often collected in the form of counts which are related to the number of times that an event of interest occurs. Because of their simplicity, one-parameter distributions for which the variance is directly determined by the mean are often used at least in the first method to model this data. However, the equal mean-variance relationship rarely happens with real-life data [3,4,5]. In most cases, the observed variance is larger than the assumed variance, which is known as over-dispersion. If the over-dispersion is ignored, statistical inference results in an inaccurate conclusion by underestimating the variability of the data [3]. If this dispersion is not taken into account, then using these models may lead to biased estimates of the parameters and consequently incorrect inferences about the parameters. Several statistical methods have been proposed for analysis of count data with over-dispersion. Many of them used negative binomial distribution to model the count data [6,7,8]. In their studies, they demonstrated the use of various models for overdispersed count data. These are Poisson, negative binomial, Quasi-Poisson, and Zero-inflated models. The models underestimated the standard errors and overstated the significance of some covariates.

Ndwiga et al. [9] confirmed the in appropriate use of negative binomial distributions and poison distributions in modelling count time series especially with over dispersion. The researcher further proposes the use of hurdle poison model for analysing data with over-dispersion. Qian et al. [10] considered modelling of heavy tailed count time series data on number of traded stock in 5 min for interval Empire District Electric Company using heavy tailed probabilities, he further recommend the use of INAR of order p to analyse heavy tailed count time series data. The commonly used INAR and ACP in aforementioned literature is of order one [INAR(1) and ACP(1,1)]. This study therefore, aimed at extending the order of the models in order to determining the best model to fit and forecast count data at different levels of over-dispersion, sample sizes and steps ahead.

2 Methodology

Data set were simulated in R statistical software with sample sizes of 30, 60, 90, … and 300, from poison and negative binomial distributions to produce count data with equidispersion and over-dispersion respectively. The two models under study, namely: PAR and ACP were fitted to the simulated data so as to examine the effect of the proportion of over-dispersion on their performances. Levels of over-dispersion were imposed with difference between means and variances to be 5, 10 and 20 from the simulated data on observation of yi in the different data sets generated, which were randomized and replicated 1000 times each for the respective selected sample sizes.

In simulation, we set our parameters to be $\theta_1 = 1$ $\theta_2 = 1$ to ensure discrete nature of count data generated. The response $Y_{it}$ in 3.1 were generated from poison and negative binomial distributions. The two models under study were considered to analyze how well each of the model fits the selected data sets having some degree of over dispersions and excess zeros.

Data were generated from linear second order of autoregressive function given as follows:

$$
Y_{it} = 0.2Y_{i(t-1)} + 0.4Y_{i(t-2)} + \epsilon_t
$$

t = 30, 60, 90, 120, 150, 180, 210, 240, 270, 300, i = 1,2, ..., 1000

Model 1. AR (2): $Y_{it} = 0.2Y_{i(t-1)} + 0.4Y_{i(t-2)} + \epsilon_t$
Where $Y_i$ will be simulated from poison and negative binomial families for equidispersion/excess zeros and over-dispersion respectively as follows:

The basic count model is the Poisson regression model which is based on the Poisson distribution with probability density function

$$\frac{\lambda^{y_i}e^{-\lambda_i}}{y_i!}, \text{ for } y_i = 0, 1, 2, ...$$

Thus, for the Poisson models $E(y_i) = V(y_i) = \mu_i$. The restrictive condition that the mean must equal the variance is often violated by overdispersed data (where variance exceeds the mean). As a result of that Poisson model is generally considered inappropriate for count data, which are usually highly skewed and overdispersed [11].

The over-dispersion is achieved from the Negative binomial distribution function given as follows;

$$p(y_i; \lambda_i, \alpha_i) = \frac{\Gamma(y_i + 1)}{\Gamma(y_i + 1)} \left( \frac{\lambda_i^y}{1 + \alpha_i \lambda_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha_i}} \left( \frac{\lambda_i}{1 + \alpha_i \lambda_i} \right)^{y_i}, i = 1, ..., 1000$$

Here, the dispersion parameter $\alpha_i > 0$, $\lambda_i = E(Y_i)$; and $V(Y_i) = \lambda_i + \alpha_i \lambda_i^2$

The Negative Binomial model can be used to impose the over-dispersion problem on $y_i$ by creating larger values of variances than means. Lawal [12] argued that the Negative Binomial (NB) model might be a suitable alternative to the Poisson model especially for overdispersed count data. This is because the NB model in this case would account for the heterogeneity in the data by introducing the dispersion parameter $\alpha$. In order to compare the modeling and forecasting accuracy of the models, AIC and HQIC criteria for performance evaluation procedure were used in this study. The model with the minimum criteria values were considered as the best for the fitting and forecasting. Note that a number of steps ahead were forecasted from each model.

### 2.1 Autoregressive Conditional Poison (ACP) model

The ACP Model proposed in this study has counts follow a Poisson distribution with an autoregressive mean. Let $F_t$ denote the information available on the series up to and including time $t$. In the simplest model, the counts are generated by a Poisson distribution

$$Y_t/F_{t-1} \sim P(y_t; \mu_t) = \frac{\mu^y e^{-\mu}}{y!}$$

with an autoregressive conditional intensity as in the ACD model of Engle and Russell [13] or the conditional variance in the GARCH (Generalised Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity) model of Bollerslev [14]:

$$E(Y_t/F_{t-1}) = \mu_t = \sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_j Y_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_j \mu_{t-j} + \omega$$

for positive $\alpha$’s, $\beta$’s and $\omega$.

We call this model the Autoregressive Conditional Poison (ACP $(p,q)$). The following properties of the unconditional moments of the ACP can be established.

Unconditional mean of the ACP $(p,q)$. Provided that
the ACP(p,q) is stationary and its unconditional mean is

\[ E(Y_t) = \mu = \frac{\omega}{1 - \sum_{j=0}^{\max (p,q)} (\alpha_j + \beta_j)} \]

This proposition shows that, as long as the sum of the autoregressive coefficients is less than 1, the model is stationary and the expression for its mean is identical to the mean of an ARMA process. For instance, the mean equation of ACP (1,1) is then given as:

\[ E(Y_t / F_{t-1}) = \mu_t = \omega + \alpha_1 Y_{t-1} + \beta_1 \mu_{t-1} \]

### 2.2 Poisson Autoregressive (PAR) model

The poison autoregressive or PAR (p) model can be define as

\[ p \left( \mathcal{Q}_{t} / s_t \right) = \frac{s_t q_t e^{-s_t}}{q_t!} \]

Where \( s_t \) is the conditional mean of the linear autoregressive AR process with \( E(q_t / Q_{t-1}) \) in (16)

This represent the measurement equation for the observed data. The one step ahead for the conditional PAR (p) model forecast is given by

\[ E(q_{t+1} / Q_{t}) = s_{t+1/t} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \rho_{i} s_{t-1} + \left( 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \rho_{i} \right) \mu \]

\[ \text{Var}(q_{t+1} / Q_{t}) = \frac{1 + \sigma_{t+1/t}}{\sigma_{t+1/t}} s_{t+1/t} \]

Where \( \rho, \delta, s_t \text{and } \sigma_t \) are the optimized values of a PAR series, the induced covariance \( X_t \) has the \( \mu = e^{s_t \delta} \). See [15].

#### 2.2.1 PAR (p) Forecast density for the one step ahead distribution

The PAR (p) forecast density is given by

\[ P(q_t / Q_{t-1}) = \int \Pr \left( q_t / \mathcal{Q}_{t} \right) \Pr \left( \mathcal{Q}_{t} / Q_{t-1} \right) d \mathcal{Q} \]

\[ = \int \mathcal{Q}_{t} q_t e^{-q_t} \frac{e^{-s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t}} \mathcal{Q}_{t}^{s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t}}}{\Gamma(s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t})} \]

\[ = \frac{\Gamma(s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t})}{\Gamma(q_t + 1) \Gamma(s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t})} (s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t})^{s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t}} \times (1 + \sigma_{t/t-1})^{s_{t/t-1} \mathcal{Q}_{t} + q_t} \]

This is a negative binomial distribution function with a gamma function \( \Gamma(\cdot) \).

The forecast function for the conditional mean and variance of a PAR (p) series realizations are based on the optimized values of \( \rho, \delta, s_t \text{and } \sigma_t \). The log-likelihood function for the PAR (p) model is given as
Using the linear autoregressive equation

\[ E(q_t/Q_{t-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \rho_i Q_{t-i} + \lambda \]

Where \( \rho_i \) and \( \lambda \) are real number values.

We can obtain AR (1) for \( q_t \) which yield PAR (1) model with a negative binomial predictive distribution, for order \( p \) can also be generated as well. There is no restriction for the linear AR process with respect to the density. The density choice resulted constraints to require admissible values.

3 Analyses, Results and Discussion

The results of simulation and analysis for relative performances of different orders of the ACP and PAR models based on the criteria of the assessment at different sample sizes and levels of over-dispersion are presented in Tables 1-10. The corresponding values of the tables are plotted in graphs for more clarity.

Fig. 1a. AIC of the fitted ACP (p, q) models when there is no over-dispersion

The AIC values tabulated in Table 1 and the values were shown in Fig. 1a and 1b for the ACP and PAR respectively, the ACP(2, 2) model performed well compared to ACP (2, 1) at all scenarios of sample sizes. The ACP (1, 1) and ACP (1, 2) gave similar results in most scenarios. As per the results of the AIC, ACP (2, 2) seems the preferred choice for equidispersed count time series data. Relatively, PAR (4) performed greatly in comparison to their PAR models followed closely by PAR (2) while PAR (1) performed poorly. Generally, ACP (2, 2) is the best among all at different sample sizes.
### Table 1. AIC values of the fitted models in the absence of over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | 30     | 60     | 90     | 120    | 150    | 180    | 210    | 240    | 270    | 300    |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| **Model**    | ACP(1,1) | ACP(1,2) | ACP(2,1) | ACP(2,2) | PAR(1) | PAR(2) | PAR(3) | PAR(4) |
|              | 4.665   | 4.869  | 4.549  | 4.208  | 59.488 | 57.829 | 58.890 | 55.230 |
|              | 4.764   | 4.645  | 4.601  | 4.134  | 107.906| 104.560| 104.920| 101.370|
|              | 4.639   | 4.661  | 4.607  | 4.519  | 150.541| 147.504| 145.983| 142.812|
|              | 4.694   | 4.6877 | 4.6379 | 4.6539 | 226.18 | 205.91 | 208.334| 203.193|
|              | 4.723   | 4.709  | 4.711  | 4.705  | 289.07 | 261.39 | 263.35 | 259.34 |
|              | 4.678   | 4.661  | 4.656  | 4.536  | 350.652| 312.037| 314.528| 306.787|
|              | 4.697   | 4.68   | 4.603  | 4.612  | 408.34 | 359.51 | 362.89 | 354.85 |
|              | 4.6647  | 4.6491 | 4.6172 | 4.6035 | 460.980| 407.40 | 409.740| 400.030|
|              | 4.633   | 4.625  | 4.612  | 4.6035 | 510.301| 456.533| 456.815| 436.834|
|              | 4.6018  | 4.594  | 4.6191 | 4.5243 | 555.605| 500.005| 505.011| 493.270|

### Table 2. HQIC of models performance when there is no over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | 30     | 60     | 90     | 120    | 150    | 180    | 210    | 240    | 270    | 300    |
|--------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| **Model**    | ACP(1,1) | ACP(1,2) | ACP(2,1) | ACP(2,2) | PAR(1) | PAR(2) | PAR(3) | PAR(4) |
|              | 152.923 | 152.823 | 154.505 | 151.497 | 61.281 | 59.622 | 58.890 | 55.230 |
|              | 291.968 | 291.892 | 294.462 | 294.454 | 107.060| 104.560| 104.920| 101.370|
|              | 423.519 | 423.148 | 423.978 | 423.954 | 150.541| 147.503| 145.985| 142.812|
|              | 569.806 | 567.047 | 568.601 | 538.327 | 226.18 | 205.91 | 208.334| 203.193|
|              | 715.264 | 711.275 | 709.826 | 701.812 | 289.07 | 261.39 | 263.35 | 259.34 |
|              | 849.148 | 844.178 | 841.957 | 831.718 | 350.652| 312.037| 314.528| 306.787|
|              | 993.675 | 988.272 | 985.563 | 980.457 | 408.34 | 359.51 | 362.89 | 354.85 |
|              | 1127.13 | 1117.579| 1118.652| 1108.31 | 460.980| 407.40 | 409.740| 400.030|
|              | 1258.695| 1253.854| 1252.291| 1242.015| 510.301| 456.533| 456.815| 436.834|
|              | 1388.477| 1380.763| 1381.776| 1371.521| 555.605| 500.005| 505.011| 493.270|
Fig. 1b. AIC of PAR Model across Sample Sizes when there is No Over-Dispersion

Fig. 2a. HQIC of the fitted ACP (p, q) models when there is no over-dispersion

Fig. 2b. HQIC of the Fitted PAR (p) Models When There is No Over-dispersion
The plot of HQIC values from Table 2 of the fitted APC (p, q) and PAR (p) models are displayed in Fig. 2a and 2b. ACP (2, 2) has the best fits across samples with no over-dispersion, followed by ACP (2, 1) which exhibits good performance closely to rest of the ACP models across sample sizes. The PAR (p) model HQIC values follows similar pattern with the earlier reported criterion with PAR (4) as the better fitted, having the minimum HQIC values across sample sizes, followed by improved PAR (2) especially at sample sizes above 240.

Fig. 3a. AIC of the fitted ACP (p, q) models when there is low over-dispersion

The average values of AIC of each model at various sample sizes when there is low over-dispersion are presented in Table 3. ACP (2,1) model exhibits great performance especially below the sample size of 250 followed by ACP (2, 2). When the sample size increases the performances of ACP (2, 2) and other models increase. In, PAR models, the trend shows PAR (4) as the most well performed followed by PAR (3) as reported by the AIC values. Generally ACP (2, 1) is the best among all the models.

Fig. 3b. AIC of the fitted PAR (p) models when there is low over-dispersion

Fig. 4a. HQIC of the fitted ACP (p, q) models when there is low over-dispersion
Table 3. AIC of performance of models when there is low over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | Models | 30  | 60  | 90  | 120 | 150 | 180 | 210 | 240 | 270 | 300 |
|--------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|              | ACP(1,1) | 4.946 | 4.942 | 5.001 | 4.867 | 4.818 | 4.882 | 4.908 | 4.983 | 4.823 | 4.854 |
|              | ACP(1,2) | 4.961 | 4.869 | 4.972 | 4.880 | 4.795 | 4.862 | 4.869 | 4.857 | 4.868 | 4.835 |
|              | ACP(2,1) | 4.939 | 4.960 | 4.875 | 4.857 | 4.813 | 4.849 | 4.839 | 4.928 | 4.908 | 4.819 |
|              | ACP(2,2) | 4.875 | 4.948 | 4.889 | 4.861 | 4.817 | 4.853 | 4.847 | 4.936 | 4.787 | 4.812 |
|              | PAR(1)  | 69.384 | 130.109 | 209.532 | 296.340 | 385.975 | 493.652 | 556.198 | 581.594 | 689.140 |
|              | PAR(2)  | 56.257 | 124.194 | 183.449 | 283.977 | 377.155 | 448.157 | 484.546 | 558.775 | 642.966 |
|              | PAR(3)  | 53.218 | 125.165 | 183.628 | 282.210 | 375.353 | 449.984 | 484.928 | 558.506 | 640.447 |
|              | PAR(4)  | 52.407 | 125.471 | 182.338 | 277.485 | 375.229 | 451.131 | 485.677 | 552.496 | 636.167 |

Table 4. HQIC of performance of models when there is low over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | Models | 30  | 60  | 90  | 120 | 150 | 180 | 210 | 240 | 270 | 300 |
|--------------|--------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
|              | ACP(1,1) | -5.748 | 1.6404 | 5.0758 | -25.616 | -15.41 | 7.3478 | -15.277 | -11.945 | -55.056 | -51.105 |
|              | ACP(1,2) | -8.118 | -8.7969 | 0.511 | -25.728 | -22.84 | 1.2982 | -25.519 | -72.293 | -33.616 | -60.073 |
|              | ACP(2,1) | -19.69 | -9.322 | -10.875 | -35.165 | -18.61 | -2.804 | -33.012 | -31.068 | -47.874 | -65.905 |
|              | ACP(2,2) | -19.17 | -6.1306 | -9.3957 | -31.294 | -20.86 | -3.688 | -33.271 | -31.044 | -74.047 | -71.685 |
|              | PAR(1)  | 71.177 | 133.386 | 213.564 | 300.868 | 313.28 | 391.154 | 499.065 | 561.808 | 587.374 | 695.07 |
|              | PAR(2)  | 58.05 | 127.471 | 187.481 | 288.505 | 285.655 | 380.334 | 453.569 | 490.156 | 564.555 | 648.895 |
|              | PAR(3)  | 55.011 | 128.442 | 187.661 | 286.738 | 287.014 | 380.531 | 455.397 | 490.538 | 564.286 | 646.376 |
|              | PAR(4)  | 54.200 | 128.748 | 186.370 | 282.013 | 286.047 | 380.408 | 456.544 | 491.287 | 558.276 | 642.096 |
Fig. 4b. HQIC of the fitted PAR (p) models when there is low over-dispersion

The values of HQIC of each model at various sample sizes when there is low over-dispersion are presented in Table 4. ACP (2,1) performed good at low sample sizes from the ACP models especially below the sample sizes of 120 followed by ACP (2,2) become best above sample size of 270 based on the minimum values of the HQIC criteria. When the sample size increases the performances of ACP (2, 2) and other models increase. Relatively, PAR (4) display good trend pattern across sample size followed by PAR (3) in closed linear trend in Fig. 4b based on the minimum reported HQIC values.

Fig. 5a. AIC of the fitted ACP (p, q) models when there is high over-dispersion

Fig. 5b. AIC of the fitted PAR (p) models when there is high over-dispersion

Table 5 shows the fitted performances of the ACP and PAR models to data simulated under high levels of over-dispersion with the average values of AIC of each model at various sample sizes. The results obtained were plotted on the graphs as shown in Fig. 5a and 5b respectively. However, the performance of the APC (2, 1) models supersedes others at the moderate sample size of 120 based on AIC criterion, whereas, ACP (1, 2) well performed above 120 sample sizes. In Fig. 5b, the PAR (3) model takes the lead at lower sample sizes below 120 while PAR (3) fitted best to the data with high over-dispersion when the sample size increases from 120.
Table 5. AIC of models' performance when there is high over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | Models | 30    | 60    | 90    | 120   | 150   | 180   | 210   | 240   | 270   | 300   |
|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|              | ACP(1,1) | 5.175 | 5.072 | 4.805 | 4.835 | 4.846 | 4.864 | 4.783 | 4.739 | 4.774 | 4.731 |
|              | ACP(1,2) | 5.274 | 4.874 | 4.820 | 4.834 | 4.834 | 4.847 | 4.766 | 4.727 | 4.763 | 4.719 |
|              | ACP(2,1) | 5.011 | 4.800 | 4.746 | 4.857 | 4.861 | 4.867 | 4.775 | 4.737 | 4.766 | 4.719 |
|              | ACP(2,2) | 5.274 | 4.932 | 4.863 | 4.874 | 4.865 | 4.871 | 4.779 | 4.742 | 4.772 | 4.724 |
|              | PAR(1)  | 74.58 | 130.144 | 188.625 | 260.059 | 347.376 | 395.961 | 478.435 | 530.096 | 581.229 | 672.386 |
|              | PAR(2)  | 66.098 | 130.388 | 180.997 | 260.824 | 344.699 | 394.287 | 470.679 | 491.140 | 582.200 | 672.578 |
|              | PAR(3)  | 60.095 | 124.167 | 178.072 | 257.294 | 334.585 | 378.622 | 469.404 | 491.978 | 595.877 | 671.328 |
|              | PAR(4)  | 61.299 | 126.373 | 181.082 | 258.406 | 332.904 | 377.198 | 468.359 | 487.501 | 560.898 | 670.636 |

Table 6. HQIC of Models' performance when there is high over-dispersion

| Sample Sizes | Models | 30    | 60    | 90    | 120   | 150   | 180   | 210   | 240   | 270   | 300   |
|--------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|              | ACP(1,1) | 13.060 | 11.130 | -41.367 | -48.402 | -50.405 | -47.201 | -74.308 | -102.14 | -114.93 | -127.6 |
|              | ACP(1,2) | 12.827 | -29.135 | -42.714 | -52.272 | -57.181 | -55.579 | -84.277 | -111.44 | -123.24 | -137.10 |
|              | ACP(2,1) | 1.726 | -27.167 | -40.049 | -47.56 | -53.465 | -53.56 | -83.409 | -110.08 | -122.81 | -138.93 |
|              | ACP(2,2) | 12.827 | -27.380 | -40.836 | -47.498 | -56.079 | -55.971 | -85.699 | -111.55 | -123.43 | -139.52 |
|              | PAR(1)  | 76.373 | 133.42 | 192.657 | 264.587 | 352.269 | 401.140 | 483.848 | 535.706 | 587.009 | 678.315 |
|              | PAR(2)  | 67.891 | 133.665 | 185.029 | 265.352 | 349.591 | 399.465 | 476.091 | 496.749 | 587.980 | 678.507 |
|              | PAR(3)  | 61.088 | 126.844 | 182.405 | 260.822 | 339.477 | 383.801 | 474.816 | 497.588 | 601.657 | 677.257 |
|              | PAR(4)  | 63.092 | 129.650 | 185.114 | 262.935 | 337.796 | 382.376 | 473.771 | 439.111 | 566.678 | 675.565 |
Table 6 shows the fitted performances of the ACP and PAR models to data simulated under high levels of over-dispersion with the average values of HQIC of each model at various sample sizes recorded. The results obtained were plotted on the graphs as shown in Fig. 6a and 6b respectively. The ACP (2,1) model takes the lead at lower sample sizes below 60 while ACP (1,2) at less than 180, APC (2, 2) fitted best to the data with high over-dispersion when the sample size increases from 180. Indeed, the ACP (2, 1) and ACP (2, 2) are best at lower and higher sample sizes respectively. More so, in Fig. 6b, PAR (3) model takes the lead at lower sample sizes below 150 while PAR (4) fitted best to the data with high over-dispersion when the sample size increases from 150. Indeed, the PAR (3) and PAR (4) are best performed at lower and higher sample sizes respectively.

3.1 Forecast ability of the selected best models

The predictive ability of the best three models selected from ACP and PAR where examined using Theil U statistics. Theil U statistics is the relative accuracy measure that compares forecasted results with the results of forecasting with minimal historical data it also requires the deviations to give more weight to large errors and to exaggerate errors, which can help eliminate methods with large errors. U>1 indicate that the forecasting technique is better than guessing, U = 1, indicate that the forecasting technique is as good as guessing, U<1 indicates that the forecasting technique is worse than guessing. The results for the Theil U test of the two best orders forecasted for at different steps ahead in the three models with different level of over-dispersions are presented in Table 4.21 and 4.22.

The relative forecast performance of the selected best models among APCs and PARs at different categories of dispersion using TheilU statistics were presented in table 7. ACP (2,2) has the best forecasting ability when
there is no and low overdispersions, while ACP (2,1) considered to be better in forecasting ability at high overdispersion than PAR models.

Table 7. Forecast performance of the models without over-dispersion, with over dispersion and there is low over dispersion using theil U statistic

| Steps Ahead | No Over Dispersion | High Over Dispersion | Low Over Dispersion |
|-------------|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|             | ACP (2,2)          | PAR (4)              | ACP (2,1)           | PAR (3)          | ACP (2,2)          | PAR (4) |
| 5           | 2.8411             | 2.5721               | 2.7249              | 1.9439           | 2.2642             | 1.3301   |
| 10          | 2.8142             | 2.5452               | 2.7065              | 1.9239           | 2.2439             | 1.3032   |
| 15          | 2.7873             | 2.5184               | 2.6843              | 1.9038           | 2.2246             | 0.2734   |
| 20          | 2.7604             | 1.4915               | 2.665               | 1.8838           | 2.2043             | 0.2044   |
| 25          | 2.7335             | 1.4646               | 2.6490              | 1.1086           | 2.1843             | 0.2255   |
| 30          | 2.7066             | 1.4377               | 2.6249              | 0.8385           | 2.1647             | 0.1565   |
| 35          | 2.6797             | 1.4108               | 2.6049              | 0.7667           | 2.1424             | 0.1376   |
| 40          | 2.6528             | 1.3839               | 2.5849              | 0.6123           | 2.1240             | 0.1218   |
| 45          | 2.6259             | 1.3570               | 2.5648              | 0.5901           | 2.1048             | 0.1149   |
| 50          | 2.59908            | 1.3301               | 2.5448              | 0.5736           | 2.0841             | 0.0880   |

4 Conclusion

This study discovered the highest performing model in fitting and forecasting different count time series data with different levels of over-dispersion is the ACP model based on all criteria of the assessment. The model has the speedy fitting capabilities at both high and low sample sizes. PAR models has the slowest fitting speed across sample sizes. Specifically, the ACP (2,2) has the highest performance followed by ACP (2,1) among all the models in fitting any time series count data with the underlying features reported in this research. The research focused on the simulated data and recommend for further application on real life data.
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