



BANCO CENTRAL DO BRASIL

Working Paper Series

139

**Selection of Optimal Lag Length in Cointegrated VAR
Models with Weak Form of Common Cyclical Features**

*Carlos Enrique Carrasco Gutiérrez, Reinaldo Castro Souza and
Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén*

June, 2007

ISSN 1518-3548
CGC 00.038.166/0001-05

| | | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|--------|-----|------|---------|
| Working Paper Series | Brasília | n. 139 | Jun | 2007 | P. 1-35 |
|----------------------|----------|--------|-----|------|---------|

Working Paper Series

Edited by Research Department (Depep) – E-mail: workingpaper@bcb.gov.br

Editor: Benjamin Miranda Tabak – E-mail: benjamin.tabak@bcb.gov.br

Editorial Assistant: Jane Sofia Moita – E-mail: jane.sofia@bcb.gov.br

Head of Research Department: Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo – E-mail: carlos.araujo@bcb.gov.br

The Banco Central do Brasil Working Papers are all evaluated in double blind referee process.

Reproduction is permitted only if source is stated as follows: Working Paper n. 139.

Authorized by Mário Mesquita, Deputy Governor for Economic Policy.

General Control of Publications

Banco Central do Brasil

Secre/Surel/Dimep

SBS – Quadra 3 – Bloco B – Edifício-Sede – M1

Caixa Postal 8.670

70074-900 Brasília – DF – Brazil

Phones: (5561) 3414-3710 and 3414-3567

Fax: (5561) 3414-3626

E-mail: editor@bcb.gov.br

The views expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Banco Central or its members.

Although these Working Papers often represent preliminary work, citation of source is required when used or reproduced.

As opiniões expressas neste trabalho são exclusivamente do(s) autor(es) e não refletem, necessariamente, a visão do Banco Central do Brasil.

Ainda que este artigo represente trabalho preliminar, citação da fonte é requerida mesmo quando reproduzido parcialmente.

Consumer Complaints and Public Enquiries Center

Address: Secre/Surel/Diate

Edifício-Sede – 2º subsolo

SBS – Quadra 3 – Zona Central

70074-900 Brasília – DF – Brazil

Fax: (5561) 3414-2553

Internet: <http://www.bcb.gov.br/?english>

Selection of Optimal Lag Length in Cointegrated VAR Models with Weak Form of Common Cyclical Features*

Carlos Enrique Carrasco Gutiérrez[†] Reinaldo Castro Souza[‡]
Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén[§]

The Working Paper should not be reported as representing the views of the Banco Central do Brasil. The views expressed in the papers are those of the author(s) and not necessarily reflect those of the Banco Central do Brasil.

Abstract

An important aspect of empirical research based on the vector autoregressive (VAR) model is the choice of the lag order, since all inference in the VAR model depends on the correct model specification. Literature has shown important studies of how to select the lag order of a nonstationary VAR model subject to cointegration restrictions. In this work, we consider an additional *weak form* (WF) restriction of common cyclical features in the model in order to analyze the appropriate way to select the correct lag order. Two methodologies have been used: the traditional information criteria (AIC, HQ and SC) and an alternative criterion ($IC(p, s)$) which select simultaneously the lag order p and the rank structure s due to the WF restriction. A Monte-Carlo simulation is used in the analysis. The results indicate that the cost of ignoring additional WF restrictions in vector autoregressive modelling can be high specially when SC criterion is used.

Keywords: Cointegration; Common Cyclical Features; Reduced Rank Model; Estimation; Information Criteria.

JEL Codes: C32, C53.

*Acknowledgments: We are grateful to comments and suggestions given by João Victor Issler, Wagner Gaglianone, Ricardo Cavalcanti, Luiz Renato Lima and participants of the Brazilian Econometric Meeting 2006. Special thanks are due to Alain Hecq for solving doubts and comments. The authors are responsible for any remaining errors in this paper. Carlos Enrique C. Gutiérrez acknowledges the support of CAPES-Brazil.

[†]Corresponding author, cgutierrez@fgvmail.br, Graduate School of Economics, FGV-EPGE-RJ, Brazil.

[‡]reinaldo@ele.puc-rio.br, DEE-PUC-RJ, Brazil

[§]osmani.guillen@bcb.gov.br, Banco Central do Brasil and Ibmecc-RJ, Brazil

1 Introduction

In the modelling of economic and financial time series, the vectorial autoregressive (VAR) model became a standard linear model used in empirical works. An important aspect of empirical research in the specification of the VAR models is the determination of the lag order of the autoregressive lag polynomial, since all inference in the VAR model depends on the correct model specification. In several contributions, the effect of lag length selection has been demonstrated: Lütkepohl (1993) indicates that selecting a higher order lag length than the true lag length causes an increase in the mean square forecast errors of the VAR and that underfitting the lag length often generates autocorrelated errors. Braun and Mittnik (1993) show that impulse response functions and variance decompositions are inconsistently derived from the estimated VAR when the lag length differs from the true lag length. When cointegration restrictions are considered in the model, the effect of lag length selection on the cointegration tests has been demonstrated. For example, Johansen (1991) and Gonzalo (1994) point out that VAR order selection may affect proper inference on cointegrating vectors and rank.

Recently empirical works have considered another kind of restrictions on the VAR model (e.g., Engle and Issler, 1995; Caporale, 1997; Mamingi and Sunday, 2003). Engle and Kozicki (1993) showed that VAR models can have another type of restrictions, called common cyclical features, which are restrictions on the short-run dynamics. These restrictions are defined in the same way as cointegration restrictions, while cointegration refers to relations among variables in the long-run, the common cyclical restrictions refer to relations in the short-run. Vahid and Engle (1993) proposed the *Serial Correlation Common Feature* (SCCF) as a measure of common cyclical feature. SCCF restrictions might be imposed in a covariance stationary VAR model or in a cointegrated VAR model. When short-run restrictions are imposed in cointegrated VAR models it is possible to define a weak version of SCCF restrictions. Hecq, Palm and Urbain (2006) defined a weak version of SCCF restrictions which they denominated it as *weak-form* (WF) common cyclical restric-

tions. A fundamental difference between SCCF and WF restrictions is in the form which each one imposes restrictions on the Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) representation¹. When SCCF are imposed, all matrices of a VECM have rank less than the number of variables analyzed. On the other hand with WF restrictions all matrices, except the long-run matrix, have rank less than a number of variables in analysis. Hence, WF restrictions impose less restriction on VECM parameters. Some advantages emerge when WF restrictions are considered. First, due to the fact that WF restrictions does not impose restrictions on the cointegration space; the rank of common cyclical features is not limited by the choice of cointegrating rank. Another advantage is that WF restrictions is invariant over reparametrization in VECM representation.

The literature has shown how to select an adequate lag order of a covariance stationary VAR model and an adequate lag order of a VAR model subject to cointegration restrictions. Among the classical procedures, there are the information criteria such as Akaike (AIC), Schwarz (SC) and Hannan-Quinn (HQ) (Lütkepohl, 1993). Kilian (2001) study the performance of traditional AIC, SC and HQ criterion of a covariance stationary VAR model. Vahid and Issler (2002) analyzed the standard information criterion in a covariance stationary VAR model subject to SCCF restriction and more recently Guillén, Issler and Athanasopoulos (2005) studied the standard information criterion in VAR models with cointegration and SCCF restrictions. However, when cointegrated VAR models contain additional weak form of common cyclical feature, there are no reported work on how to appropriately determine the VAR model order.

The objective of this paper is to investigate the performance of information criterion in selecting the lag order of a VAR model when the data are generated from a true VAR with cointegration and WF restrictions that is referred as the correct model. It will be carried out following two procedures: *a*) the use of standard criteria as proposed by Vahid and Engle (1993), referred here as IC (p), and *b*) the use of an

¹When a VAR model has cointegration restriction it can be represented as a VECM. This representation is also known as Granger Representation Theorem (Engle and Granger, 1987).

alternative procedure of model selection criterion (see, *Vahid and Issler, 2002; Hecq et al., 2006*) consisting in selecting simultaneously the lag order p and the rank s do to the weak form of common cyclical feature, which is referred to as $IC(p, s)^2$. The most relevant results can be summarized as follows. The information criterion that selects simultaneously the pair (p, s) has better performance than the model chosen by conventional criteria. The cost of ignoring additional WF restrictions in vector autoregressive modelling can be high specially when SC criterion is used.

The remaining of this work is organized as follows. Section 2 shows the econometric model. In section 3 the information criteria are mentioned. Monte Carlo simulation is shown in section 4 and the results in section 5. Finally, the conclusions are shown in section 6.

2 The Econometric Model

We show the VAR model with short-run and long-run restrictions. First, we consider a Gaussian vector autoregression of finite order p , so-called $VAR(p)$, such that:

$$y_t = \sum_{i=1}^p A_i y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (1)$$

where, y_t is a vector of n first order integrated series, $I(1)$, A_i , $i = 1, \dots, p$ are matrices of dimension $n \times n$, $\varepsilon_t \sim Normal(0, \Omega)$ and $\{\Omega, \text{ if } t = \tau \text{ and } 0_{n \times n}, \text{ if } t \neq \tau, \text{ where } \Omega \text{ is non singular}\}$. The model (1) could be written equivalently as; $\Pi(L) y_t = \varepsilon_t$ where L represents the lag operator and $\Pi(L) = I_n - \sum_{i=1}^p A_i L^i$ that when $L = 1$, $\Pi(1) = I_n - \sum_{i=1}^p A_i$. If cointegration is considered in (1) the $(n \times n)$ matrix $\Pi(\cdot)$ satisfies two conditions: a) $\text{Rank}(\Pi(1)) = r$, $0 < r < n$, such that $\Pi(1)$ can be expressed as $\Pi(1) = -\alpha\beta'$, where α and β are $(n \times r)$ matrices with full column rank, r . b) The characteristic equation $|\Pi(L)| = 0$ has $n - r$ roots equal to 1 and all other are outside the unit circle. These assumptions imply that y_t is cointegrated of order $(1, 1)$. The elements of α are the adjustment coefficients and the columns of β span the space of cointegration vectors. We can represent a VAR

²This is quite recent in the literature (see, *Hecq et al., 2006*).

model as VECM. Decomposing the polynomial matrix $\Pi(L) = \Pi(1)L + \Pi^*(L)\Delta$, where $\Delta \equiv (1 - L)$ is the difference operator, a Vector Error Correction Model (VECM) is obtained:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha\beta'y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} \Gamma_i \Delta y_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

where: $\alpha\beta' = -\Pi(1)$, $\Gamma_j = -\sum_{k=j+1}^p A_k$ for $j = 1, \dots, p-1$ and $\Gamma_0 = I_n$. The VAR(p) model can include additional short-horizon restrictions as shown by Vahid and Engle (1993). We consider an interesting WF restriction (as defined by Hecq, Palm and Urbain, 2006) that does not impose restrictions over long-run relations.

Definition 1 *Weak Form-WF holds in (2) if, in addition to assumption 1 (cointegration), there exists a $(n \times s)$ matrix $\tilde{\beta}$ of rank s , whose columns span the cofeature space, such that $\tilde{\beta}'(\Delta y_t - \alpha\beta'y_{t-1}) = \tilde{\beta}'\varepsilon_t$, where $\tilde{\beta}'\varepsilon_t$ is a s -dimensional vector that constitutes an innovation process with respect to information prior to period t , given by $\{y_{t-1}, y_{t-2}, \dots, y_1\}$.*

Consequently we considerate WF restrictions in the VECM if there exists a cofeature matrix $\tilde{\beta}$ that satisfies the following assumption:

Assumption 1 : $\tilde{\beta}' \Gamma_j = 0_{s \times n}$ for $j = 1, \dots, p-1$.

Imposing WF restrictions is convenient because it allows the study of both cointegration and common cyclical feature without the constraint $r + s \leq n$. We can rewrite the VECM with WF restrictions as a model of reduced-rank structure. In (2) let $X_{t-1} = [\Delta y'_{t-1}, \dots, \Delta y'_{t-p+1}]'$ and $\Phi = [\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_{p-1}]$, therefore we get:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha\beta'y_{t-1} + \Phi X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (3)$$

If assumption (1) holds matrices $\Gamma_i, i = 1, \dots, p$ are all of rank $(n - s)$ then we can write $\Phi = \tilde{\beta}_\perp \Psi = \tilde{\beta}_\perp [\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_{p-1}]$, where, $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ is $n \times (n - s)$ full column rank matrix, Ψ is of dimension $(n - s) \times n(p - 1)$, the matrices $\Psi_i, i = 1, \dots, p - 1$ all of rank $(n - s) \times n$. Hence, given assumption (1), there exists $\tilde{\beta}$ of $n \times s$ such that $\tilde{\beta}'\tilde{\beta}_\perp = 0$.

That is, $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ $n \times (n - s)$ is a full column rank orthogonal to the complement of $\tilde{\beta}$ with $rank(\tilde{\beta}, \tilde{\beta}_\perp) = n$. Rewriting model (3) we have:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha \beta' y_{t-1} + \tilde{\beta}_\perp (\Psi_1, \Psi_2, \dots, \Psi_{p-1}) X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (4)$$

$$= \alpha \beta' y_{t-1} + \tilde{\beta}_\perp \Psi X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (5)$$

Estimation of (5) is carried out via the switching algorithms (see, Hecq, 2006) that use the procedure in estimating reduced-rank regression models suggested by Anderson (1951). There is a formal connection between a reduced-rank regression and the canonical analysis as noted by Izenman (1975), Box and Tiao (1977), Tso (1980) and Veleu *et al.* (1986). When the multivariate regression has all of its matrix coefficients of full rank, it may be estimated by usual Least Square or Maximum-Likelihood procedures. But when the matrix coefficients are of reduced-rank they have to be estimated using the reduced-rank regression models of Anderson (1951). The use of canonical analysis may be regarded as a special case of reduced-rank regression. More specifically, the maximum-likelihood estimation of the parameters of the reduced-rank regression model may result in solving a problem of canonical analysis³. Therefore, we can use the expression $CanCorr\{X_t, Z_t|W_t\}$ that denotes the partial canonical correlations between X_t and Z_t : both sets concentrate out the effect of W_t that allows us to obtain canonical correlation, represented by the eigenvalues $\hat{\lambda}_1 > \hat{\lambda}_2 > \hat{\lambda}_3 \dots > \hat{\lambda}_n$. The Johansen test statistic is based on canonical correlation. In model (2) we can use the expression $CanCorr\{\Delta y_t, y_{t-1}|W_t\}$ where $W_t = [\Delta y_{t-1}, \Delta y_{t-2}, \dots, \Delta y_{t+p-1}]$ that summarizes the reduced-rank regression procedure used in the Johansen approach. It means that one extracts the canonical correlations between Δy_t and y_{t-1} : both sets concentrated out the effect of lags of W_t . In order to test for the significance of the r largest eigenvalues, one can rely on Johansen's trace statistic (6):

$$\xi_r = -T \sum_{i=r+1}^n Ln(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i^2) \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (6)$$

³This estimation is referred as *Full Information Maximum Likelihood* - FIML

where the eigenvalues $0 < \hat{\lambda}_n < \dots < \hat{\lambda}_1$ are the solution of: $|\lambda m_{11} - m_{10}^{-1} m_{00} m_{01}| = 0$, where m_{ij} , $i, j = 0, 1$, are the second moment matrices: $m_{00} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{u}_{0t} \tilde{u}'_{0t}$, $m_{10} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{u}_{1t} \tilde{u}'_{0t}$, $m_{01} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{u}_{0t} \tilde{u}'_{1t}$, $m_{11} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{u}_{1t} \tilde{u}'_{1t}$ of the residuals \tilde{u}_{0t} and \tilde{u}_{1t} obtained in the multivariate least squares regressions $\Delta y_t = (\Delta y_{t-1}, \dots, \Delta y_{t-p+1}) + u_{0t}$ and $y_{t-1} = (\Delta y_{t-1}, \dots, \Delta y_{t-p+1}) + u_{1t}$ respectively (see, Hecq *et al.*, 2006; Johansen, 1995). The result of Johansen test is a superconsistent estimated β . Moreover, we could also use a canonical correlation approach to determine the rank of the common features space due to WF restrictions. It is a test for the existence of cofeatures in the form of linear combinations of the variables in the first differences, corrected for long-run effects which are white noise (i.e., $\tilde{\beta}'(\Delta y_t - \alpha \beta y_{t-1}) = \tilde{\beta}' \varepsilon_t$ where $\tilde{\beta}' \varepsilon_t$ is a white noise). Canonical analysis is adopted in the present work in estimating, testing and selecting lag-rank of VAR models as shown in next sections.

3 Model Selection Criteria

In model selection we use two procedures to identify the VAR model order. The standard selection criteria, $IC(p)$ and the modified informational criteria, $IC(p, s)$, novelty in the literature, which consists on identifying p and s simultaneously.

The model estimation following the standard selection criteria, $IC(p)$, used by Vahid and Engle (1993) entails the following steps:

1. Estimate p using standard informational criteria: Akaike (AIC), Schwarz (SC) and Hanna-Quinn (HQ). We choose the lag length of the VAR in levels that minimize the information criteria.
2. Using the lag length chosen in the previous step, find the number of cointegration vector, r using Johansen cointegration test⁴.
3. Conditional on the results of cointegration analysis, a final VECM is estimated and then the multi-step ahead forecast is calculated.

⁴Cointegration rank and vectors are estimated using the FIML as shown in Johansen (1991).

The above procedure is followed when there is evidence of cointegration restrictions. We check the performance of $IC(p)$ when WF restrictions contain the true model. Additionally we check the performance of alternative selection criteria $IC(p, s)$. Vahid and Issler (2002) analyzed a covariance-stationary VAR model with SCCF restrictions. They showed that the use of $IC(p, s)$ has better performance than $IC(p)$ in VAR model lag order selection. In the present work we analyze cointegrated VAR model with WF restrictions in order to analyze the performance of $IC(p)$ and $IC(p, s)$ for model selection. The question investigated is: is the performance of $IC(p, s)$ superior to that of $IC(p)$? This is an important question we aim to answer in this work.

The procedure of selecting the lag order and the rank of the structure of short-run is carried out by minimizing the following modified information criteria (see Hecq, 2006).

$$AIC(p, s) = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^T \ln(1 - \lambda_i^2(p)) + \frac{2}{T} \times N \quad (7)$$

$$HQ(p, s) = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^T \ln(1 - \lambda_i^2(p)) + \frac{2 \ln(\ln T)}{T} \times N \quad (8)$$

$$SC(p, s) = \sum_{i=n-s+1}^T \ln(1 - \lambda_i^2(p)) + \frac{\ln T}{T} \times N \quad (9)$$

$$N = [n \times (n \times (p - 1)) + n \times r] - [s \times (n \times (p - 1) + (n - s))]$$

The number of parameters N is obtained by subtracting the total number of mean parameters in the VECM (i.e., $n^2 \times (p - 1) + nr$), for given r and p , from the number of restrictions the common dynamics imposes from $s \times (n \times (p - 1)) - s \times (n - s)$. The eigenvalues λ_i are calculated for each p . To calculate the pair (p, s) we assume that no restriction of cointegration exists, that is, $r = n$ (see Hecq, 2006). We fix p in model (3) and then find λ_i $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ using the program *cancorr*($\Delta y_t, X_{t-1} | y_{t-1}$). This procedure is followed for every p and in the end we choose the p and s that

minimizes the $IC(p, s)$. After selecting the pair (p, s) we can test the cointegration relation using the procedure of Johansen. Finally we estimate the model using the switching algorithms as shown in the next chapter. Notice that in this simultaneous selection, testing the cointegration relation is the last procedure to follow, so we are inverting the hierarchical procedure followed by Vahid and Engle (1993) where the first step is the selection of the number of cointegration relations. It may be an advantage specially when r is over-estimated. Few works have been dedicated to analyze the order of the VAR models considering modified $IC(p, s)$. As mentioned, Vahid and Issler (2002) suggested the use of $IC(p, s)$ to simultaneously choose the order p and a number of reduced rank structure s on covariance stationary VAR model subject to SCCF restrictions. However, no work has analyzed the order of the VAR model with cointegration and WF restrictions using a modified criterion, which is exactly the contribution of this paper.

To estimate the VAR model considering cointegration and WF restrictions we use the switching algorithms model as considered by Hecq (2006). Consider the VECM given by:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha \beta' y_{t-1} + \tilde{\beta}_\perp \Psi X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t \quad (10)$$

A full description of switching algorithms is presented below in four steps:

Step1 : Estimation of the cointegration vectors β .

Using the optimal pair (\bar{p}, \bar{s}) chosen by information criteria (7), (8) or (9), we estimate β (and so its rank, $r = \bar{r}$) using Johansen cointegration test.

Step2 : Estimation of $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ and Ψ .

Taking $\hat{\beta}$ estimated in step one, we proceed to estimate $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ and Ψ . Hence, we run a regression of Δy_t and of X_{t-1} on $\hat{\beta}' y_{t-1}$. We labeled the residuals as u_0 and u_1 , respectively. Therefore, we obtain a reduced rank regression:

$$u_0 = \tilde{\beta}_\perp \Psi u_1 + \varepsilon_t \quad (11)$$

where Ψ can be written as $\Psi = (C_1, \dots, C_{(\bar{p}-1)})$ of $(n - \bar{s}) \times n(\bar{p} - 1)$ and $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ of $n \times (n - \bar{s})$. We estimate (11) by FIML. Thus, we can obtain $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ and $\hat{\Psi}$.

Step3 : Estimate of the Maximum Likelihood (ML) function.

Given the parameters estimated in steps 1 and 2 we use a recursive algorithm to estimate the Maximum Likelihood (ML) function. We calculate the eigenvalues associated with $\hat{\Psi}$, $\hat{\lambda}_i^2$ $i = 1, \dots, \bar{s}$ and the matrix of residuals $\sum_{\bar{r}, s=\bar{s}}^{\max}$. Hence, we compute the ML function:

$$L_{\max, \bar{r} < n, s=\bar{s}}^0 = -\frac{T}{2} \left[\ln \left| \sum_{\bar{r} < n, s=\bar{s}}^{\max} \right| - \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{s}} \ln \left(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i^2 \right) \right] \quad (12)$$

If $\bar{r} = n$, we use instead of (12) the derived log-likelihood: $L_{\max, r=n, s=\bar{s}} = -\frac{T}{2} \ln \left| \sum_{\bar{r}=n, s=\bar{s}}^{\max} \right|$. The determinant of the covariance matrix for $\bar{r} = n$ cointegration vector is calculated by

$$\ln \left| \sum_{\bar{r}=n, s=\bar{s}}^{\max} \right| = \ln |m_{00} - m_{01}m_{11}^{-1}m_{10}| - \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{s}} \ln \left(1 - \hat{\lambda}_i^2 \right) \quad (13)$$

where m_{ij} refers to cross moment matrices obtained in multivariate least square regressions from Δy_t and X_{t-1} on y_{t-1} . In this case, estimation does not imply an iterative algorithm yet because the cointegrating space spans R^n .

Step4 : Reestimation of β .

We reestimate β to obtain a more appropriated value for the parameters.

In order to reestimate β we use the program *CanCorr* $\left[\Delta y_t, y_{t-1} \mid \hat{\Psi} X_{t-1} \right]$ and thus using the new $\hat{\beta}$ we can repeat step 2 to reestimate $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ and Ψ .

Then, we can calculate the new value of the ML function in the step 3.

Henceforth, we obtain $L_{\max, r=\bar{r}, s=\bar{s}}^1$ for calculating $\Delta L = \left(L_{\max, r=\bar{r}, s=\bar{s}}^1 - L_{\max, r=\bar{r}, s=\bar{s}}^0 \right)$.

We repeat steps 1 to 4 to choose $\tilde{\beta}_\perp$ and Ψ until convergence is reached (i.e., $\Delta L < 10^{-7}$). In the end, optimal parameters \bar{p} , \bar{r} and \bar{s} are obtained and it can be used for estimation and forecasting of a VECM with WF restrictions.

4 Monte-Carlo Design

One of the critical issues regarding Monte-Carlo experiments is the data generating processes. To build the data generating processes we consider a VAR model with three variables, one cointegration vector, and two cofeatures vectors (i.e., $n = 3$, $r = 1$ and $s = 2$, respectively). β and $\tilde{\beta}$ satisfy:

$$\beta = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 \\ 0.2 \\ -1.0 \end{bmatrix}, \tilde{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 0.1 \\ 0.0 & 1.0 \\ 0.5 & -0.5 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1t} \\ \varepsilon_{2t} \\ \varepsilon_{3t} \end{bmatrix} \sim N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1.0 & 0.6 & 0.6 \\ 0.6 & 1.0 & 0.6 \\ 0.6 & 0.6 & 1.0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

Consider the VAR(3) model: $y_t = A_1 y_{t-1} + A_2 y_{t-2} + A_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t$. The VECM representation as a function of the VAR level parameters can be written as:

$$\Delta y_t = (A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - I_3) y_{t-1} - (A_2 + A_3) \Delta y_{t-1} - A_3 \Delta y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \quad (14)$$

The VAR coefficients must simultaneously obey the restrictions: a) The cointegration restrictions: $\alpha \beta' = (A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - I_3)$; b) WF restrictions: $\tilde{\beta}' A_3 = 0$ (iii) $\tilde{\beta}' (A_2 + A_3) = 0$ and c) covariance-stationary condition. Considering the cointegration restrictions we can rewrite (14) as the following VAR(1):

$$\xi_t = F \xi_{t-1} + v_t \quad (15)$$

$$\xi_t = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta y_t \\ \Delta y_{t-1} \\ \beta' y_t \end{bmatrix}, F = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_2 + A_3) & -A_3 & \alpha \\ I_3 & 0 & 0 \\ -\beta(A_2 + A_3) & -\beta' A_3 & \beta' \alpha + 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } v_t = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_t \\ 0 \\ \beta' \varepsilon_t \end{bmatrix}$$

Thus, the equation (15) will be covariance-stationary if all eigenvalues of matrix F lie inside the unit circle. An initial idea to design the Monte-Carlo experiment may consist of constructing the companion matrix (F) and verify whether the eigenvalues of the companion matrix all lie inside the unit circle. This may be carried out by selecting their values from a uniform distribution, and then verifying whether or not the eigenvalues of the companion matrix all lie inside the unit circle. However, this strategy could lead to a wide spectrum of search for adequate values for the

companion matrix. Hence, we follow an alternative procedure. We propose an analytical solution to generate a covariance-stationary VAR, based on the choice of the eigenvalues, and then on the generation of the respective companion matrix. In the appendix we present a detailed discussion of the final choice of these free parameters, including analytical solutions. In our simulation, we constructed 100 data generating processes and for each of these we generate 1000 samples containing 1000 observations. In order to reduce the impact of initial values, we consider only the last 100 and 200 observations. All the experiments were conducted in the MatLab environment.

5 Results

Values in Table I represent the percentage of time that the model selection criterion, $IC(p)$, chooses that cell corresponding to the lag and number of cointegration vectors in 100000 realizations. The true lag-cointegrating vectors are identified by bold numbers and the selected lag-cointegration vectors chosen more times by the criterion are underlined. The results show that, in general, the AIC criterion choose more frequently the correct lag length for 100 and 200 observations. For example, for 100 observations, the AIC, HQ and SC criteria chose the true lag, p , 54.08%, 35.62% and 17.49% of the times respectively. Note that all three criteria chose more frequently the correct rank of cointegration ($r = 1$). When 200 observations are considered, the correct lag length was chosen 74.72%, 57.75% and 35.28% of the time for AIC, HQ and SC respectively. Again all three criteria selected the true cointegrated rank $r = 1$. Tables II contains the percentage of time that the simultaneous model selection criterion, $IC(p, s)$, chooses that cell, corresponding to the lag-rank and number of cointegrating vectors in 100,000 realizations. The true lag-rank-cointegration vectors are identified by bold numbers and the best lag-rank combination chosen more times by each criterion are underlined. The results show that, in general, the AIC criterion chooses more frequently lag-rank for 100 and 200 observations. For instance, for 100 observations, the AIC, HQ and SC criteria

choose more frequently the true pair $(p, s) = (3, 1)$, 56.34%, 40.85% and 25.20% of the times respectively. For 200 observations, AIC, HQ and SC criteria choose more frequently the true pair $(p, s) = (3, 1)$, 77.07%, 62.58% and 45.03% of the times respectively. Note that all three criteria choose more frequently the correct rank of cointegration ($r = 1$) in both samples.

The most relevant results can be summarized as follows:

- All criteria (AIC, HQ and SC) choose the correct parameters more often when using $IC(p, s)$.
- The AIC criterion has better performance in selecting the true model more frequently for both the $IC(p, s)$ and the $IC(p)$ criteria.
- When the size of the sample decreases the true value p is less frequently selected by all the traditional criteria.
- Table I shows that ignoring WF restrictions the standard SC has the worst performance in choosing the true value of p .

It is known that literature suggests the use of the traditional SC and HQ criteria in VAR model selection. The results of this work indicate that if additional WF restrictions are ignored, the standard SC and HQ criteria select few times the true value of p . That is, there is a cost of ignoring additional WF restrictions in the model specially when SC criterion is used. In general, the standard Schwarz or Hannan-Quinn selection criteria should not be used for this purpose in small samples due to the tendency of identifying an underparameterized model. In general, the use of these alternative criteria of selection, $IC(p, s)$ has better performance than the usual criteria, $IC(p)$, when the cointegrated VAR model has additional WF restriction.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we considered an additional *weak form* restriction of common cyclical features in a cointegrated VAR model in order to analyze the appropriate way for

selecting the correct lag order. These additional WF restrictions are defined in the same way as cointegration restrictions, while cointegration refers to relations among variables in the long-run, the common cyclical restrictions refer to relations in the short-run. Two methodologies have been used for selecting lag length; the traditional information criterion, $IC(p)$, and an alternative criterion ($IC(p, s)$) that selects simultaneously the lag order p and the rank structure s due to the WF restriction.

The results indicate that information criterion that selects the lag length and the rank order simultaneously has better performance than the model chosen by conventional criteria. When the WF restrictions are ignored there is a non trivial cost in selecting the true model with standard information criteria. In general, the standard Schwarz or Hannan-Quinn criteria selection criteria should not be used for this purpose in small samples due to the tendency of identifying an under-parameterized model.

In applied work, when the VAR model contains WF and cointegration restrictions, we suggest the use of $AIC(p, s)$ criteria for simultaneously choosing the lag-rank, since it provides considerable gains in selecting the correct VAR model. Since no work in the literature has been dedicated to analyze a VAR model with WF common cyclical restrictions, the results of this work provide new insights and incentives to proceed with this kind of empirical work.

References

- [1] Anderson TW. 1951. Estimating linear restrictions on regression coefficients for multivariate normal distributions. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **22**: 327-351. [Correction (1980) *Ann. Statist* **8** 1400.]
- [2] Bewley R, Yang M. 1998. On the size and power of system tests for cointegration. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* **80**: 675-679.

- [3] Box GE, Tiao GC. 1977. A canonical analysis of multiple time series. *Biometrika* **64**:355-365.
- [4] Brandner P, Kunst RM. 1990. Forecasting vector autoregressions - The influence of cointegration: A Monte Carlo Study. Research Memorandum NO 265, Institute for Advanced Studies, Vienna.
- [5] Braun PA, Mittnik S. 1993. Misspecifications in Vector Autoregressions and Their Effects on Impulse Responses and Variance Decompositions. *Journal of Econometrics* **59**, 319-41.
- [6] Caporale GM. 1997. Common Features and Output Fluctuations in the United Kingdom. *Economic-Modelling* **14**: 1-9.
- [7] Cubadda G. 1999. Common serial correlation and common business cycles: A cautious note. *Empirical Economics* **24**: 529-535.
- [8] Engle, Granger. 1987. Cointegration and error correction: representation, estimation and testing. *Econometrica* **55**:251-76.
- [9] Engle, Kozicki. 1993. Testing for common features. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* **11**: 369-395.
- [10] Engle, Issler JV. 1995. Estimating Common Sectoral Cycles. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **35**:83-113.
- [11] Guillén, Issler, Athanasopoulos. 2005. Forecasting Accuracy and Estimation Uncertainty using VAR Models with Short- and Long-Term Economic Restrictions: A Monte-Carlo Study. *Ensaaios Econômicos EPGE* **589**.
- [12] Hamilton JD. 1994. Time Series Analysis. Princeton University Press, New Jersey.
- [13] Hecq A, Palm FC, Urbain JP. 2006. Testing for Common Cyclical Features in VAR Models with Cointegration, *Journal of Econometrics* **132**: 117-141.

- [14] Hecq A. 2006. Cointegration and Common Cyclical Features in VAR Models: Comparing Small Sample Performances of the 2-Step and Iterative Approaches. Mimeo.
- [15] Hecq A. 2000. Common Cyclical Features in Multiple Time Series and Panel Data: Methodological Aspects and Applications.
- [16] Izenman AJ. 1975. Reduced rank regression for the multivariate linear model, *Journal of multivariate Analysis* **5**: 248-264.
- [17] Johansen S. 1988. Statistical analysis of cointegration vectors. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* **12**: 231-54.
- [18] Johansen S. 1995. Likelihood-based Inference in Cointegrated Vector Autoregressive Models. Oxford Univ. Press. Z .
- [19] Kilian L. 2001. Impulse response analysis in vector autoregressions with unknown lag order. *Journal of Forecasting* **20**: 161-179.
- [20] Lutkepohl H. 1993. Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis. Springer, New York. Z .
- [21] Mamingi N, Iyare SO. 2003. Convergence and Common Features in International Output: A Case Study of the Economic Community of West African States, 1975-1997. *Asian-African-Journal-of-Economics-and-Econometrics*. **3**: 1-16.
- [22] Reinsel GC, Velu RP. 1998. Multivariate Reduced-rank Regression. Springer, New York. Z.
- [23] Stock JH, Watson MW. 1988. Testing for common trends. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **83**:97-107.
- [24] Tiao GC, Tsay RS. 1985. A canonical correlation approach to modeling multivariate time series., *in Proceedings of the Business and Economic Statistics Section, American statistical Association*, 112-120.

- [25] Tiao GC, Tsay RS. 1989. Model specification in multivariate time series (with discussion). *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.* **51**: 157-213.
- [26] Tsay RS, Tiao GC. 1985. Use of canonical analysis in time series model identification. *Biometrika* 72 299 315. Z .
- [27] Tso MK 1981. Reduced rank regression and Canonical analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society* **43**: 183-189.
- [28] Vahid F, Issler JV. 2002. The Importance of Common Cyclical Features in VAR Analysis: A Monte Carlo Study. *Journal of Econometrics* **109**: 341-363.
- [29] Vahid F, Engle.1993. Common trends and common cycles. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* **8**: 341-360.
- [30] Velu RP, Reinsel GC, Wichern DW. 1986. Reduced rank models for multiple times series. *Biometrika* **73**: 105-118.

A Tables

Table I. Performance of information criterion, IC (p) in selecting the lag order p

| Frequency of lag(p) and cointegrating vectors (r) choice by different criteria for trivariate VAR model in levels when the true model have parameters: $p = 3$ and $r = 1$. | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------------------------------|---------------|-------|-------|
| | Selected Lag | Number of observations = 100 | | | | Number of observations = 200 | | | |
| | | Selected cointegrated vectors | | | | Selected cointegrated vectors | | | |
| | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| AIC(p) | 1 | 0,000 | 0,996 | 0,359 | 0,031 | 0,000 | 0,095 | 0,016 | 0,003 |
| | 2 | 0,002 | 32,146 | 1,136 | 0,048 | 0,000 | 17,073 | 0,686 | 0,033 |
| | 3 | 2,792 | 54,082 | 0,902 | 0,041 | 0,012 | 74,721 | 1,488 | 0,108 |
| | 4 | 0,737 | 4,068 | 0,091 | 0,003 | 0,005 | 4,177 | 0,081 | 0,006 |
| | 5 | 0,392 | 0,987 | 0,031 | 0,000 | 0,013 | 0,828 | 0,020 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,219 | 0,333 | 0,014 | 0,000 | 0,023 | 0,257 | 0,005 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,166 | 0,173 | 0,006 | 0,000 | 0,039 | 0,133 | 0,002 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,133 | 0,107 | 0,005 | 0,000 | 0,060 | 0,115 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| HQ(p) | 1 | 0,000 | 3,884 | 1,915 | 0,165 | 0,000 | 1,098 | 0,243 | 0,021 |
| | 2 | 0,002 | <u>52,593</u> | 1,907 | 0,080 | 0,000 | 37,390 | 1,614 | 0,098 |
| | 3 | 2,600 | 35,617 | 0,612 | 0,027 | 0,012 | 57,749 | 1,146 | 0,082 |
| | 4 | 0,065 | 0,189 | 0,007 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,158 | 0,004 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,059 | 0,037 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,009 | 0,082 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,073 | 0,025 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,016 | 0,076 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,059 | 0,019 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,030 | 0,070 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,053 | 0,011 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,044 | 0,055 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| SC(p) | 1 | 0,000 | 8,344 | 6,609 | 0,511 | 0,000 | 3,964 | 1,385 | 0,093 |
| | 2 | 0,003 | <u>61,966</u> | 2,279 | 0,105 | 0,000 | <u>55,156</u> | 2,776 | 0,169 |
| | 3 | 2,042 | 17,485 | 0,313 | 0,015 | 0,012 | 35,283 | 0,728 | 0,044 |
| | 4 | 0,049 | 0,045 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,083 | 0,002 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,071 | 0,025 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,007 | 0,076 | 0,001 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,057 | 0,016 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,013 | 0,063 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,036 | 0,009 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,025 | 0,056 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,017 | 0,003 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,027 | 0,035 | 0,001 | 0,000 |

Numbers represent the percentage times that the model selection criterion choice that cell corresponding to the lag and number of cointegration vectors in 100,000 realizations. The true lag-cointegrating vectors are identified by bold numbers

Table II. Performance of information criterion, $IC(p, s)$ in selecting p and s simultaneously

| Johansen Tested point. Vectors (r) | | 0 | | | 1 | | | 2 | | | 3 | | |
|--|---|-----------------------|-------|-------|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | Selected rank (s) | | | Selected lag (p) | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| Sample size = 100 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AIC(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 39,049 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 1,218 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,056 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,301 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 56,341 | 0,003 | 0,000 | 1,559 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,053 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,004 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,186 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,070 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,114 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,012 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,020 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,006 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| HQ(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,000 | <u>55,563</u> | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,888 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,081 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,267 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 40,855 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,207 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,043 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,088 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,005 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| SC(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,004 | 0,000 | 0,000 | <u>70,971</u> | 0,000 | 0,000 | 2,574 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,113 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,221 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 25,204 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,887 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,025 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| Sample size = 200 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AIC(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 18,797 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,681 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,038 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | <u>77,065</u> | 0,002 | 0,000 | 2,260 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,145 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,908 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,035 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,063 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,002 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,003 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| HQ(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 33,952 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,370 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,086 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | <u>62,576</u> | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,877 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,111 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,027 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,001 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| SC(p, s) | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| | 2 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | <u>50,983</u> | 0,000 | 0,000 | 2,351 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,146 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 3 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 45,028 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 1,416 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,076 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 4 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 5 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 6 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 7 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |
| | 8 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 | 0,000 |

Numbers represent the percentage times that the simultaneous model selection criterion $IC(p, s)$ choice that cell, corresponding to the lag-rank and number of cointegrating vectors in 100,000 realizations. The true lag-rank-cointegration vectors are identified by bold numbers and the best lag-rank-cointegration vectors chosen by criteria are identified by underline lines.

B VAR Restrictions for the DGPs

Let's consider the VAR(3) model :

$$y_t = A_1 y_{t-1} + A_2 y_{t-2} + A_3 y_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t \quad (16)$$

with parameters: $A_1 = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^1 & a_{12}^1 & a_{12}^1 \\ a_{21}^1 & a_{22}^1 & a_{22}^1 \\ a_{31}^1 & a_{32}^1 & a_{32}^1 \end{bmatrix}$, $A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^2 & a_{12}^2 & a_{12}^2 \\ a_{21}^2 & a_{22}^2 & a_{22}^2 \\ a_{31}^2 & a_{32}^2 & a_{32}^2 \end{bmatrix}$ and $A_3 =$

$\begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^3 & a_{12}^3 & a_{12}^3 \\ a_{21}^3 & a_{22}^3 & a_{22}^3 \\ a_{31}^3 & a_{32}^3 & a_{32}^3 \end{bmatrix}$ We consider the cointegration vectors $\beta = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{11} \\ \beta_{21} \\ \beta_{31} \end{bmatrix}$, the cofea-

tures vectors $\tilde{\beta} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\beta}_{11} & \tilde{\beta}_{12} \\ \tilde{\beta}_{21} & \tilde{\beta}_{22} \\ \tilde{\beta}_{31} & \tilde{\beta}_{32} \end{bmatrix}$ and the adjustment matrix $\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{11} \\ \alpha_{21} \\ \alpha_{31} \end{bmatrix}$. The

long-run relation is defined by $\alpha\beta' = (A_1 + A_2 + A_3 - I_3)$. The VECM representation is:

$$\Delta y_t = \alpha\beta' y_{t-1} - (A_2 + A_3)\Delta y_{t-1} - A_3\Delta y_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t \quad (17)$$

Considering the cointegration restrictions we can rewrite (17) as the following VAR(1)

$$\xi_t = F \xi_{t-1} + v_t \quad (18)$$

where $\xi_t = \begin{bmatrix} \Delta y_t \\ \Delta y_{t-1} \\ \beta' y_t \end{bmatrix}$, $F = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_2 + A_3) & -A_3 & \alpha \\ I_3 & 0 & 0 \\ -\beta(A_2 + A_3) & -\beta' A_3 & \beta' \alpha + 1 \end{bmatrix}$ and $v_t = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_t \\ 0 \\ \beta' \varepsilon_t \end{bmatrix}$

1) Short-run restrictions (WF)

Let us, $G = -[R_{21}K + R_{31}]$, $K = [(R_{32} - R_{31})/(R_{21} - R_{22})]$, $R_{j1} = \tilde{\beta}_{j1}/\tilde{\beta}_{11}$, $R_{j2} = \tilde{\beta}_{j2}/\tilde{\beta}_{12}$ ($j = 2, 3$) and $S = \beta_{11}G + \beta_{21}K + \beta_{31}$

(i) $\tilde{\beta}' A_3 = 0 \implies A_3 = \begin{bmatrix} -Ga_{31}^3 & -Ga_{32}^3 & -Ga_{33}^3 \\ -Ka_{31}^3 & -Ka_{32}^3 & -Ka_{33}^3 \\ -a_{31}^3 & -a_{32}^3 & -a_{33}^3 \end{bmatrix}$

(ii) $\tilde{\beta}'(A_2 + A_3) = 0 \implies \tilde{\beta}' A_2 = 0 \implies A_2 = \begin{bmatrix} -Ga_{31}^2 & -Ga_{32}^2 & -Ga_{33}^2 \\ -Ka_{31}^2 & -Ka_{32}^2 & -Ka_{33}^2 \\ -a_{31}^2 & -a_{32}^2 & -a_{33}^2 \end{bmatrix}$

2) Long-run restrictions (cointegration)

$$(iv) \beta'(A_2 + A_3) = [-(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3)S \quad -(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3)S \quad -(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3)S] \quad \text{and} \\ \beta'A_3 = [-a_{31}^3S \quad -a_{32}^3S \quad -a_{33}^3S]$$

$$(v) \beta'\alpha + 1 = \beta = [\beta_{11} \quad \beta_{21} \quad \beta_{31}] \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_{11} \\ \alpha_{21} \\ \alpha_{31} \end{bmatrix} + 1 = \beta_{11}\alpha_{11} + \beta_{21}\alpha_{21} + \beta_{31}\alpha_{31} + 1$$

Therefore, considering short- and long-run restrictions, the companion matrix F is represented as:

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} -(A_2 + A_3) & -A_3 & \alpha \\ I_3 & 0 & 0 \\ -\beta(A_2 + A_3) & -\beta'A_3 & \beta'\alpha + 1 \end{bmatrix} = \\ \begin{bmatrix} -G(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) & -G(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3) & -G(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3) & -Ga_{31}^3 & -Ga_{32}^3 & -Ga_{33}^3 & \alpha_{11} \\ -K(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) & -K(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3) & -K(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3) & -Ka_{31}^3 & -Ka_{32}^3 & -Ka_{33}^3 & \alpha_{21} \\ -(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) & -G(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3) & -(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3) & -a_{31}^3 & -a_{32}^3 & -a_{33}^3 & \alpha_{31} \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3)S & -(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3)S & -(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3)S & -a_{31}^3S & -a_{32}^3S & -a_{33}^3S & b \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\text{with } b = \beta'\alpha + 1 = \beta_{11}\alpha_{11} + \beta_{21}\alpha_{21} + \beta_{31}\alpha_{31} + 1$$

3) Restrictions of covariance-stationary in equation (18)

The equation (18) will be covariance-stationary, all eigenvalues of matrix F lie inside the unit circle. Therefore, the eigenvalues of the matrix F is a number λ such that:

$$|F - \lambda I_7| = 0 \quad (19)$$

The solution of (19) is:

$$\lambda^7 + \Omega\lambda^6 + \Theta\lambda^5 + \Psi\lambda^4 = 0 \quad (20)$$

where the parameters Ω , Θ , and Ψ are: $\Omega = G(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) + K(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3) + a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3 - b$,
 $\Theta = Ga_{31}^3 + Ka_{32}^3 - (a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3)b - Gb(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) - Kb(a_{32}^2 + a_{32}^3) + \alpha_{31}S(a_{33}^2 + a_{33}^3) +$

$S\alpha_{21}(a_{32}^2 + a_{33}^3) + S\alpha_{11}(a_{31}^2 + a_{31}^3) + a_{33}^3$ and $\Psi = -a_{33}^3b - Ga_{31}^3b - Ka_{32}^3b + \alpha_{31}a_{33}^3S + a_{32}^3S\alpha_{21} + a_{31}^3S\alpha_{11}$, and the first four roots are $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$. We calculated the parameters of matrices A_1 , A_2 and A_3 as function of roots (λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7) and free parameters. Hence we have three roots satisfying equation (20)

$$\lambda^3 + \Omega\lambda^2 + \Theta\lambda + \Psi = 0 \quad (21)$$

$$\text{for } \lambda_5, \text{ we have: } \lambda_5^3 + \Omega\lambda_5^2 + \Theta\lambda_5 + \Psi = 0 \quad \dots\dots\dots Eq1$$

$$\text{for } \lambda_6, \text{ we have: } \lambda_6^3 + \Omega\lambda_6^2 + \Theta\lambda_6 + \Psi = 0 \quad \dots\dots\dots Eq2$$

$$\text{for } \lambda_7, \text{ we have: } \lambda_7^3 + \Omega\lambda_7^2 + \Theta\lambda_7 + \Psi = 0 \quad \dots\dots\dots Eq3$$

Solving *Eq1*, *Eq2* and *Eq3* we have: $\Omega = -\lambda_7 - \lambda_6 - \lambda_5$, $\Theta = \lambda_6\lambda_7 + \lambda_6\lambda_5 + \lambda_5\lambda_7$ and $\Psi = -\lambda_5\lambda_6\lambda_7$. Equaling these parameters with relations above we have:

$$a_{31}^2 = -(-Ka_{32}^2 - Ka_{32}^2b + \alpha_{31}Sa_{33}^2 - \lambda^6\lambda^7 - \lambda^6 - \lambda^7 - a_{33}^2b - \lambda^5\lambda^6\lambda^7 + b - \lambda^5\lambda^7 - \lambda^5\lambda^6 - a_{33}^2 + Sa_{32}^2\alpha_{21} - \lambda^5)/(S\alpha_{11} - G - Gb)$$

$$a_{32}^3 = (-S^2\lambda^7\alpha_{11}\alpha_{31} - b^2\lambda^7G - \lambda^6Gb^2 + b\lambda^7S\alpha_{11} + \lambda^6S\alpha_{11}b - a_{31}^3S\alpha_{11}G + a_{31}^3S^2\alpha_{11}^2 - Ga_{31}^3bS\alpha_{11} - \lambda^5Gb^2 + \lambda^5S\alpha_{11}b - \lambda^7\lambda^6\alpha_{31}SG - \lambda^7\lambda^5\alpha_{31}SG - S^2\alpha_{11}\lambda^5\alpha_{31} - S^2\alpha_{11}\lambda^6\alpha_{31} + S\lambda^5Gb\alpha_{31} + S\alpha_{31}\lambda^6Gb - \lambda^5\lambda^7\lambda^6G + \lambda^6\lambda^7Gb + \lambda^5\lambda^7Gb + \lambda^5\lambda^6Gb - SGb^2\alpha_{31} + S^2\alpha_{11}b\alpha_{31} - S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{31}a_{33}^2 + S^2\alpha_{31}^2a_{33}^2G + SG^2a_{31}^3\alpha_{31} + S\alpha_{11}a_{33}^2b + Gb^3 - S\alpha_{11}b^2 - S^2\alpha_{11}Ka_{32}^2\alpha_{31} - S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{31}Ga_{31}^3 + S^2a_{32}^2\alpha_{21}G\alpha_{31} - Sa_{32}^2\alpha_{21}Gb + S\alpha_{31}G^2a_{31}^3b - S\alpha_{31}a_{33}^2Gb + S\alpha_{11}Ka_{32}^2b + S\lambda^7Gb\alpha_{31} - \lambda^5\lambda^6\alpha_{31}SG - \lambda^5\lambda^7\lambda^6\alpha_{31}SG + \lambda^5\lambda^7\lambda^6S\alpha_{11})/(S\alpha_{11}K\alpha_{31} - KG\alpha_{31} + bG\alpha_{21} - K\alpha_{31}Gb - S\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21} + G\alpha_{21})/S$$

$$a_{33}^3 = -(Kb^3G - \lambda^5Gb^2K + S\alpha_{11}\lambda^6K\lambda^7\lambda^5 + Kb\lambda^7S\alpha_{11} - Kb^2\lambda^7G - S^2\alpha_{21}\lambda^7\alpha_{11} + \lambda^6GbS\alpha_{21} + S\alpha_{21}\lambda^7Gb - \lambda^6Gb^2K + \lambda^6S\alpha_{11}Kb - \lambda^6S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21} + \lambda^5GbS\alpha_{21} + \lambda^5S\alpha_{11}Kb - \lambda^5S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21} - \lambda^7\lambda^6S\alpha_{21}G + Kb\lambda^7\lambda^6G + Kb\lambda^7\lambda^5G + Kb\lambda^5\lambda^6G - \lambda^7\lambda^6KG\lambda^5 - S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21}Ka_{32}^2 + S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21}b - S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21}a_{33}^2 + S^2\alpha_{21}^2a_{32}^2G - S\alpha_{11}Kb^2 + S\alpha_{21}G^2a_{31}^3 - S\alpha_{21}Gb^2 + S^2a_{31}^3Ka_{11}^2 - S^2\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21}Ga_{31}^3 + S^2\alpha_{21}a_{33}^2G\alpha_{31} + S\alpha_{11}K^2ba_{32}^2 + S\alpha_{11}Kba_{33}^2 - S\alpha_{11}a_{31}^3KG - S\alpha_{11}KbGa_{31}^3 - SKba_{33}^2G\alpha_{31} + S\alpha_{21}G^2a_{31}^3b - S\alpha_{21}\lambda^5\lambda^6G - S\alpha_{21}\lambda^5\lambda^7\lambda^6G - S\alpha_{21}Ka_{32}^2Gb - S\alpha_{21}\lambda^7\lambda^5G)/(S\alpha_{11}K\alpha_{31} - KG\alpha_{31} + bG\alpha_{21} - K\alpha_{31}Gb - S\alpha_{11}\alpha_{21} + G\alpha_{21})/S$$

We can calculate a_{31}^2 , a_{32}^3 and a_{33}^3 fixing the set $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0$ and sort independently from uniform distributions $(-0.9; 0.9)$ the values of a_{31}^3 , a_{32}^2 , a_{33}^2 , λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7 . Hencefore, each parameter of the matrices A_1 , A_2 and A_3 are defined and so we can generate the DGPs of VAR(3) model with cointegration and WF restrictions.

Banco Central do Brasil

Trabalhos para Discussão

Os Trabalhos para Discussão podem ser acessados na internet, no formato PDF, no endereço: <http://www.bc.gov.br>

Working Paper Series

Working Papers in PDF format can be downloaded from: <http://www.bc.gov.br>

- | | | |
|-----------|---|----------|
| 1 | Implementing Inflation Targeting in Brazil <i>Joel Bogdanski, Alexandre Antonio Tombini and Sérgio Ribeiro da Costa Werlang</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 2 | Política Monetária e Supervisão do Sistema Financeiro Nacional no Banco Central do Brasil <i>Eduardo Lundberg</i> | Jul/2000 |
| | Monetary Policy and Banking Supervision Functions on the Central Bank <i>Eduardo Lundberg</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 3 | Private Sector Participation: a Theoretical Justification of the Brazilian Position <i>Sérgio Ribeiro da Costa Werlang</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 4 | An Information Theory Approach to the Aggregation of Log-Linear Models <i>Pedro H. Albuquerque</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 5 | The Pass-Through from Depreciation to Inflation: a Panel Study <i>Ilan Goldfajn and Sérgio Ribeiro da Costa Werlang</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 6 | Optimal Interest Rate Rules in Inflation Targeting Frameworks <i>José Alvaro Rodrigues Neto, Fabio Araújo and Marta Baltar J. Moreira</i> | Jul/2000 |
| 7 | Leading Indicators of Inflation for Brazil <i>Marcelle Chauvet</i> | Sep/2000 |
| 8 | The Correlation Matrix of the Brazilian Central Bank's Standard Model for Interest Rate Market Risk <i>José Alvaro Rodrigues Neto</i> | Sep/2000 |
| 9 | Estimating Exchange Market Pressure and Intervention Activity <i>Emanuel-Werner Kohlscheen</i> | Nov/2000 |
| 10 | Análise do Financiamento Externo a uma Pequena Economia Aplicação da Teoria do Prêmio Monetário ao Caso Brasileiro: 1991–1998 <i>Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo e Renato Galvão Flôres Júnior</i> | Mar/2001 |
| 11 | A Note on the Efficient Estimation of Inflation in Brazil <i>Michael F. Bryan and Stephen G. Cecchetti</i> | Mar/2001 |
| 12 | A Test of Competition in Brazilian Banking <i>Márcio I. Nakane</i> | Mar/2001 |

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| 13 | Modelos de Previsão de Insolvência Bancária no Brasil <i>Marcio Magalhães Janot</i> | Mar/2001 |
| 14 | Evaluating Core Inflation Measures for Brazil <i>Francisco Marcos Rodrigues Figueiredo</i> | Mar/2001 |
| 15 | Is It Worth Tracking Dollar/Real Implied Volatility? <i>Sandro Canesso de Andrade and Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Mar/2001 |
| 16 | Avaliação das Projeções do Modelo Estrutural do Banco Central do Brasil para a Taxa de Variação do IPCA <i>Sergio Afonso Lago Alves</i> | Mar/2001 |
| | Evaluation of the Central Bank of Brazil Structural Model's Inflation Forecasts in an Inflation Targeting Framework <i>Sergio Afonso Lago Alves</i> | Jul/2001 |
| 17 | Estimando o Produto Potencial Brasileiro: uma Abordagem de Função de Produção <i>Tito Nícias Teixeira da Silva Filho</i> | Abr/2001 |
| | Estimating Brazilian Potential Output: a Production Function Approach <i>Tito Nícias Teixeira da Silva Filho</i> | Aug/2002 |
| 18 | A Simple Model for Inflation Targeting in Brazil <i>Paulo Springer de Freitas and Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos</i> | Apr/2001 |
| 19 | Uncovered Interest Parity with Fundamentals: a Brazilian Exchange Rate Forecast Model <i>Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos, Paulo Springer de Freitas and Fabio Araújo</i> | May/2001 |
| 20 | Credit Channel without the LM Curve <i>Victorio Y. T. Chu and Márcio I. Nakane</i> | May/2001 |
| 21 | Os Impactos Econômicos da CPMF: Teoria e Evidência <i>Pedro H. Albuquerque</i> | Jun/2001 |
| 22 | Decentralized Portfolio Management <i>Paulo Coutinho and Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Jun/2001 |
| 23 | Os Efeitos da CPMF sobre a Intermediação Financeira <i>Sérgio Mikio Koyama e Márcio I. Nakane</i> | Jul/2001 |
| 24 | Inflation Targeting in Brazil: Shocks, Backward-Looking Prices, and IMF Conditionality <i>Joel Bogdanski, Paulo Springer de Freitas, Ilan Goldfajn and Alexandre Antonio Tombini</i> | Aug/2001 |
| 25 | Inflation Targeting in Brazil: Reviewing Two Years of Monetary Policy 1999/00 <i>Pedro Fachada</i> | Aug/2001 |
| 26 | Inflation Targeting in an Open Financially Integrated Emerging Economy: the Case of Brazil <i>Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos</i> | Aug/2001 |
| 27 | Complementaridade e Fungibilidade dos Fluxos de Capitais Internacionais <i>Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo e Renato Galvão Flôres Júnior</i> | Set/2001 |

- 28 **Regras Monetárias e Dinâmica Macroeconômica no Brasil: uma Abordagem de Expectativas Racionais** Nov/2001
Marco Antonio Bonomo e Ricardo D. Brito
- 29 **Using a Money Demand Model to Evaluate Monetary Policies in Brazil** Nov/2001
Pedro H. Albuquerque and Solange Gouvêa
- 30 **Testing the Expectations Hypothesis in the Brazilian Term Structure of Interest Rates** Nov/2001
Benjamin Miranda Tabak and Sandro Canesso de Andrade
- 31 **Algumas Considerações sobre a Sazonalidade no IPCA** Nov/2001
Francisco Marcos R. Figueiredo e Roberta Blass Staub
- 32 **Crises Cambiais e Ataques Especulativos no Brasil** Nov/2001
Mauro Costa Miranda
- 33 **Monetary Policy and Inflation in Brazil (1975-2000): a VAR Estimation** Nov/2001
André Minella
- 34 **Constrained Discretion and Collective Action Problems: Reflections on the Resolution of International Financial Crises** Nov/2001
Arminio Fraga and Daniel Luiz Gleizer
- 35 **Uma Definição Operacional de Estabilidade de Preços** Dez/2001
Tito Nícias Teixeira da Silva Filho
- 36 **Can Emerging Markets Float? Should They Inflation Target?** Feb/2002
Barry Eichengreen
- 37 **Monetary Policy in Brazil: Remarks on the Inflation Targeting Regime, Public Debt Management and Open Market Operations** Mar/2002
Luiz Fernando Figueiredo, Pedro Fachada and Sérgio Goldenstein
- 38 **Volatilidade Implícita e Antecipação de Eventos de Stress: um Teste para o Mercado Brasileiro** Mar/2002
Frederico Pechir Gomes
- 39 **Opções sobre Dólar Comercial e Expectativas a Respeito do Comportamento da Taxa de Câmbio** Mar/2002
Paulo Castor de Castro
- 40 **Speculative Attacks on Debts, Dollarization and Optimum Currency Areas** Apr/2002
Aloisio Araujo and Márcia Leon
- 41 **Mudanças de Regime no Câmbio Brasileiro** Jun/2002
Carlos Hamilton V. Araújo e Getúlio B. da Silveira Filho
- 42 **Modelo Estrutural com Setor Externo: Endogenização do Prêmio de Risco e do Câmbio** Jun/2002
Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos, Sérgio Afonso Lago Alves e Gil Riella
- 43 **The Effects of the Brazilian ADRs Program on Domestic Market Efficiency** Jun/2002
Benjamin Miranda Tabak and Eduardo José Araújo Lima

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| 44 | Estrutura Competitiva, Produtividade Industrial e Liberação Comercial no Brasil <i>Pedro Cavalcanti Ferreira e Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho Guillén</i> | Jun/2002 |
| 45 | Optimal Monetary Policy, Gains from Commitment, and Inflation Persistence <i>André Minella</i> | Aug/2002 |
| 46 | The Determinants of Bank Interest Spread in Brazil <i>Tarsila Segalla Afanasieff, Priscilla Maria Villa Lhacer and Márcio I. Nakane</i> | Aug/2002 |
| 47 | Indicadores Derivados de Agregados Monetários <i>Fernando de Aquino Fonseca Neto e José Albuquerque Júnior</i> | Set/2002 |
| 48 | Should Government Smooth Exchange Rate Risk? <i>Ilan Goldfajn and Marcos Antonio Silveira</i> | Sep/2002 |
| 49 | Desenvolvimento do Sistema Financeiro e Crescimento Econômico no Brasil: Evidências de Causalidade <i>Orlando Carneiro de Matos</i> | Set/2002 |
| 50 | Macroeconomic Coordination and Inflation Targeting in a Two-Country Model <i>Eui Jung Chang, Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos and Joaúlio Rodolpho Teixeira</i> | Sep/2002 |
| 51 | Credit Channel with Sovereign Credit Risk: an Empirical Test <i>Victorio Yi Tson Chu</i> | Sep/2002 |
| 52 | Generalized Hyperbolic Distributions and Brazilian Data <i>José Fajardo and Aquiles Farias</i> | Sep/2002 |
| 53 | Inflation Targeting in Brazil: Lessons and Challenges <i>André Minella, Paulo Springer de Freitas, Ilan Goldfajn and Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos</i> | Nov/2002 |
| 54 | Stock Returns and Volatility <i>Benjamin Miranda Tabak and Solange Maria Guerra</i> | Nov/2002 |
| 55 | Componentes de Curto e Longo Prazo das Taxas de Juros no Brasil <i>Carlos Hamilton Vasconcelos Araújo e Osmani Teixeira de Carvalho de Guillén</i> | Nov/2002 |
| 56 | Causality and Cointegration in Stock Markets: the Case of Latin America <i>Benjamin Miranda Tabak and Eduardo José Araújo Lima</i> | Dec/2002 |
| 57 | As Leis de Falência: uma Abordagem Econômica <i>Aloisio Araujo</i> | Dez/2002 |
| 58 | The Random Walk Hypothesis and the Behavior of Foreign Capital Portfolio Flows: the Brazilian Stock Market Case <i>Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Dec/2002 |
| 59 | Os Preços Administrados e a Inflação no Brasil <i>Francisco Marcos R. Figueiredo e Thaís Porto Ferreira</i> | Dez/2002 |
| 60 | Delegated Portfolio Management <i>Paulo Coutinho and Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Dec/2002 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|
| 61 | O Uso de Dados de Alta Frequência na Estimação da Volatilidade e do Valor em Risco para o Ibovespa <i>João Maurício de Souza Moreira e Eduardo Facó Lemgruber</i> | Dez/2002 |
| 62 | Taxa de Juros e Concentração Bancária no Brasil <i>Eduardo Kiyoshi Tonooka e Sérgio Mikio Koyama</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 63 | Optimal Monetary Rules: the Case of Brazil <i>Charles Lima de Almeida, Marco Aurélio Peres, Geraldo da Silva e Souza and Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 64 | Medium-Size Macroeconomic Model for the Brazilian Economy <i>Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos and Sergio Afonso Lago Alves</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 65 | On the Information Content of Oil Future Prices <i>Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 66 | A Taxa de Juros de Equilíbrio: uma Abordagem Múltipla <i>Pedro Calhman de Miranda e Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 67 | Avaliação de Métodos de Cálculo de Exigência de Capital para Risco de Mercado de Carteiras de Ações no Brasil <i>Gustavo S. Araújo, João Maurício S. Moreira e Ricardo S. Maia Clemente</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 68 | Real Balances in the Utility Function: Evidence for Brazil <i>Leonardo Soriano de Alencar and Márcio I. Nakane</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 69 | r-filters: a Hodrick-Prescott Filter Generalization <i>Fabio Araújo, Marta Baltar Moreira Areosa and José Alvaro Rodrigues Neto</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 70 | Monetary Policy Surprises and the Brazilian Term Structure of Interest Rates <i>Benjamin Miranda Tabak</i> | Fev/2003 |
| 71 | On Shadow-Prices of Banks in Real-Time Gross Settlement Systems <i>Rodrigo Penaloza</i> | Apr/2003 |
| 72 | O Prêmio pela Maturidade na Estrutura a Termo das Taxas de Juros Brasileiras <i>Ricardo Dias de Oliveira Brito, Angelo J. Mont'Alverne Duarte e Osmani Teixeira de C. Guillen</i> | Maio/2003 |
| 73 | Análise de Componentes Principais de Dados Funcionais – Uma Aplicação às Estruturas a Termo de Taxas de Juros <i>Getúlio Borges da Silveira e Octavio Bessada</i> | Maio/2003 |
| 74 | Aplicação do Modelo de Black, Derman & Toy à Precificação de Opções Sobre Títulos de Renda Fixa <i>Octavio Manuel Bessada Lion, Carlos Alberto Nunes Cosenza e César das Neves</i> | Maio/2003 |
| 75 | Brazil's Financial System: Resilience to Shocks, no Currency Substitution, but Struggling to Promote Growth <i>Ilan Goldfajn, Katherine Hennings and Helio Mori</i> | Jun/2003 |

- 76 **Inflation Targeting in Emerging Market Economies** Jun/2003
Arminio Fraga, Ilan Goldfajn and André Minella
- 77 **Inflation Targeting in Brazil: Constructing Credibility under Exchange Rate Volatility** Jul/2003
André Minella, Paulo Springer de Freitas, Ilan Goldfajn and Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos
- 78 **Contornando os Pressupostos de Black & Scholes: Aplicação do Modelo de Precificação de Opções de Duan no Mercado Brasileiro** Out/2003
Gustavo Silva Araújo, Claudio Henrique da Silveira Barbedo, Antonio Carlos Figueiredo, Eduardo Facó Lemgruber
- 79 **Inclusão do Decaimento Temporal na Metodologia Delta-Gama para o Cálculo do VaR de Carteiras Compradas em Opções no Brasil** Out/2003
Claudio Henrique da Silveira Barbedo, Gustavo Silva Araújo, Eduardo Facó Lemgruber
- 80 **Diferenças e Semelhanças entre Países da América Latina: uma Análise de Markov Switching para os Ciclos Econômicos de Brasil e Argentina** Out/2003
Arnildo da Silva Correa
- 81 **Bank Competition, Agency Costs and the Performance of the Monetary Policy** Jan/2004
Leonardo Soriano de Alencar and Márcio I. Nakane
- 82 **Carteiras de Opções: Avaliação de Metodologias de Exigência de Capital no Mercado Brasileiro** Mar/2004
Cláudio Henrique da Silveira Barbedo e Gustavo Silva Araújo
- 83 **Does Inflation Targeting Reduce Inflation? An Analysis for the OECD Industrial Countries** May/2004
Thomas Y. Wu
- 84 **Speculative Attacks on Debts and Optimum Currency Area: a Welfare Analysis** May/2004
Aloisio Araujo and Marcia Leon
- 85 **Risk Premia for Emerging Markets Bonds: Evidence from Brazilian Government Debt, 1996-2002** May/2004
André Soares Loureiro and Fernando de Holanda Barbosa
- 86 **Identificação do Fator Estocástico de Descontos e Algumas Implicações sobre Testes de Modelos de Consumo** Maio/2004
Fabio Araujo e João Victor Issler
- 87 **Mercado de Crédito: uma Análise Econométrica dos Volumes de Crédito Total e Habitacional no Brasil** Dez/2004
Ana Carla Abrão Costa
- 88 **Ciclos Internacionais de Negócios: uma Análise de Mudança de Regime Markoviano para Brasil, Argentina e Estados Unidos** Dez/2004
Arnildo da Silva Correa e Ronald Otto Hillbrecht
- 89 **O Mercado de Hedge Cambial no Brasil: Reação das Instituições Financeiras a Intervenções do Banco Central** Dez/2004
Fernando N. de Oliveira

- 90 **Bank Privatization and Productivity: Evidence for Brazil** Dec/2004
Márcio I. Nakane and Daniela B. Weintraub
- 91 **Credit Risk Measurement and the Regulation of Bank Capital and Provision Requirements in Brazil – A Corporate Analysis** Dec/2004
Ricardo Schechtman, Valéria Salomão Garcia, Sergio Miki Koyama and Guilherme Cronemberger Parente
- 92 **Steady-State Analysis of an Open Economy General Equilibrium Model for Brazil** Apr/2005
Mirta Noemi Sataka Bugarin, Roberto de Goes Ellery Jr., Victor Gomes Silva, Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos
- 93 **Avaliação de Modelos de Cálculo de Exigência de Capital para Risco Cambial** Abr/2005
Claudio H. da S. Barbedo, Gustavo S. Araújo, João Maurício S. Moreira e Ricardo S. Maia Clemente
- 94 **Simulação Histórica Filtrada: Incorporação da Volatilidade ao Modelo Histórico de Cálculo de Risco para Ativos Não-Lineares** Abr/2005
Claudio Henrique da Silveira Barbedo, Gustavo Silva Araújo e Eduardo Facó Lemgruber
- 95 **Comment on Market Discipline and Monetary Policy by Carl Walsh** Apr/2005
Maurício S. Bugarin and Fábria A. de Carvalho
- 96 **O que É Estratégia: uma Abordagem Multiparadigmática para a Disciplina** Ago/2005
Anthero de Moraes Meirelles
- 97 **Finance and the Business Cycle: a Kalman Filter Approach with Markov Switching** Aug/2005
Ryan A. Compton and Jose Ricardo da Costa e Silva
- 98 **Capital Flows Cycle: Stylized Facts and Empirical Evidences for Emerging Market Economies** Aug/2005
Helio Mori e Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos
- 99 **Adequação das Medidas de Valor em Risco na Formulação da Exigência de Capital para Estratégias de Opções no Mercado Brasileiro** Set/2005
Gustavo Silva Araújo, Claudio Henrique da Silveira Barbedo, e Eduardo Facó Lemgruber
- 100 **Targets and Inflation Dynamics** Oct/2005
Sergio A. L. Alves and Waldyr D. Areosa
- 101 **Comparing Equilibrium Real Interest Rates: Different Approaches to Measure Brazilian Rates** Mar/2006
Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos and Márcio I. Nakane
- 102 **Judicial Risk and Credit Market Performance: Micro Evidence from Brazilian Payroll Loans** Apr/2006
Ana Carla A. Costa and João M. P. de Mello
- 103 **The Effect of Adverse Supply Shocks on Monetary Policy and Output** Apr/2006
Maria da Glória D. S. Araújo, Mirta Bugarin, Marcelo Kfoury Muinhos and Jose Ricardo C. Silva

- 104 Extração de Informação de Opções Cambiais no Brasil** Abr/2006
Eui Jung Chang e Benjamin Miranda Tabak
- 105 Representing Roommate's Preferences with Symmetric Utilities** Apr/2006
José Alvaro Rodrigues Neto
- 106 Testing Nonlinearities Between Brazilian Exchange Rates and Inflation Volatilities** May/2006
Cristiane R. Albuquerque and Marcelo Portugal
- 107 Demand for Bank Services and Market Power in Brazilian Banking** Jun/2006
Márcio I. Nakane, Leonardo S. Alencar and Fabio Kanczuk
- 108 O Efeito da Consignação em Folha nas Taxas de Juros dos Empréstimos Pessoais** Jun/2006
Eduardo A. S. Rodrigues, Victorio Chu, Leonardo S. Alencar e Tony Takeda
- 109 The Recent Brazilian Disinflation Process and Costs** Jun/2006
Alexandre A. Tombini and Sergio A. Lago Alves
- 110 Fatores de Risco e o Spread Bancário no Brasil** Jul/2006
Fernando G. Bignotto e Eduardo Augusto de Souza Rodrigues
- 111 Avaliação de Modelos de Exigência de Capital para Risco de Mercado do Cupom Cambial** Jul/2006
Alan Cosme Rodrigues da Silva, João Maurício de Souza Moreira e Myrian Beatriz Eiras das Neves
- 112 Interdependence and Contagion: an Analysis of Information Transmission in Latin America's Stock Markets** Jul/2006
Angelo Marsiglia Fasolo
- 113 Investigação da Memória de Longo Prazo da Taxa de Câmbio no Brasil** Ago/2006
Sergio Rubens Stancato de Souza, Benjamin Miranda Tabak e Daniel O. Cajueiro
- 114 The Inequality Channel of Monetary Transmission** Aug/2006
Marta Areosa and Waldyr Areosa
- 115 Myopic Loss Aversion and House-Money Effect Overseas: an Experimental Approach** Sep/2006
José L. B. Fernandes, Juan Ignacio Peña and Benjamin M. Tabak
- 116 Out-Of-The-Money Monte Carlo Simulation Option Pricing: the Joint Use of Importance Sampling and Descriptive Sampling** Sep/2006
Jaqueline Terra Moura Marins, Eduardo Saliby and Josete Florencio dos Santos
- 117 An Analysis of Off-Site Supervision of Banks' Profitability, Risk and Capital Adequacy: a Portfolio Simulation Approach Applied to Brazilian Banks** Sep/2006
Theodore M. Barnhill, Marcos R. Souto and Benjamin M. Tabak
- 118 Contagion, Bankruptcy and Social Welfare Analysis in a Financial Economy with Risk Regulation Constraint** Oct/2006
Aloísio P. Araújo and José Valentim M. Vicente

| | | |
|-----|---|----------|
| 119 | A Central de Risco de Crédito no Brasil: uma Análise de Utilidade de Informação <i>Ricardo Schechtman</i> | Out/2006 |
| 120 | Forecasting Interest Rates: an Application for Brazil <i>Eduardo J. A. Lima, Felipe Luduvic and Benjamin M. Tabak</i> | Oct/2006 |
| 121 | The Role of Consumer's Risk Aversion on Price Rigidity <i>Sergio A. Lago Alves and Mirta N. S. Bugarin</i> | Nov/2006 |
| 122 | Nonlinear Mechanisms of the Exchange Rate Pass-Through: a Phillips Curve Model With Threshold for Brazil <i>Arnildo da Silva Correa and André Minella</i> | Nov/2006 |
| 123 | A Neoclassical Analysis of the Brazilian "Lost-Decades" <i>Flávia Mourão Graminho</i> | Nov/2006 |
| 124 | The Dynamic Relations between Stock Prices and Exchange Rates: Evidence for Brazil <i>Benjamin M. Tabak</i> | Nov/2006 |
| 125 | Herding Behavior by Equity Foreign Investors on Emerging Markets <i>Barbara Alemanni and José Renato Haas Ornelas</i> | Dec/2006 |
| 126 | Risk Premium: Insights over the Threshold <i>José L. B. Fernandes, Augusto Hasman and Juan Ignacio Peña</i> | Dec/2006 |
| 127 | Uma Investigação Baseada em Reamostragem sobre Requerimentos de Capital para Risco de Crédito no Brasil <i>Ricardo Schechtman</i> | Dec/2006 |
| 128 | Term Structure Movements Implicit in Option Prices <i>Caio Ibsen R. Almeida and José Valentim M. Vicente</i> | Dec/2006 |
| 129 | Brazil: Taming Inflation Expectations <i>Afonso S. Bevilaqua, Mário Mesquita and André Minella</i> | Jan/2007 |
| 130 | The Role of Banks in the Brazilian Interbank Market: Does Bank Type Matter? <i>Daniel O. Cajueiro and Benjamin M. Tabak</i> | Jan/2007 |
| 131 | Long-Range Dependence in Exchange Rates: the Case of the European Monetary System <i>Sergio Rubens Stancato de Souza, Benjamin M. Tabak and Daniel O. Cajueiro</i> | Mar/2007 |
| 132 | Credit Risk Monte Carlo Simulation Using Simplified Creditmetrics' Model: the Joint Use of Importance Sampling and Descriptive Sampling <i>Jaqueline Terra Moura Marins and Eduardo Saliby</i> | Mar/2007 |
| 133 | A New Proposal for Collection and Generation of Information on Financial Institutions' Risk: the Case of Derivatives <i>Gilneu F. A. Vivan and Benjamin M. Tabak</i> | Mar/2007 |
| 134 | Amostragem Descritiva no Apreçamento de Opções Europeias através de Simulação Monte Carlo: o Efeito da Dimensionalidade e da Probabilidade de Exercício no Ganho de Precisão <i>Eduardo Saliby, Sergio Luiz Medeiros Proença de Gouvêa e Jaqueline Terra Moura Marins</i> | Abr/2007 |

- 135 Evaluation of Default Risk for the Brazilian Banking Sector** May/2007
Marcelo Y. Takami and Benjamin M. Tabak
- 136 Identifying Volatility Risk Premium from Fixed Income Asian Options** May/2007
Caio Ibsen R. Almeida and José Valentim M. Vicente
- 137 Monetary Policy Design under Competing Models of Inflation Persistence** May/2007
Solange Gouvea e Abhijit Sen Gupta
- 138 Forecasting Exchange Rate Density Using Parametric Models: the Case of Brazil** May/2007
Marcos M. Abe, Eui J. Chang and Benjamin M. Tabak