

Autoregressive order identification for VAR models with non-constant variance

HAMDI RAÏSSI *

October 29, 2018

Abstract: The identification of the lag length for vector autoregressive models by mean of Akaike Information Criterion (*AIC*), Partial Autoregressive and Correlation Matrices (PAM and PCM hereafter) is studied in the framework of processes with time varying variance. It is highlighted that the use of the standard tools are not justified in such a case. As a consequence we propose an adaptive *AIC* which is robust to the presence of unconditional heteroscedasticity. Corrected confidence bounds are proposed for the usual PAM and PCM obtained from the Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimation. We also use the unconditional variance structure of the innovations to develop adaptive PAM and PCM. It is underlined that the adaptive PAM and PCM are more accurate than the OLS PAM and PCM for identifying the lag length of the autoregressive models. Monte Carlo experiments show that the adaptive *AIC* have a greater ability to select the correct autoregressive order than the standard *AIC*. An illustrative application using US international finance data is presented.

Keywords: Time varying unconditional variance; VAR model; Model selection; *AIC*;

*IRMAR-INSA, 20 avenue des buttes de Coësmes, CS 70839, F-35708 Rennes Cedex 7, France.

Partial autoregressive matrices; Partial autoregressive matrices.

1 Introduction

The analysis of time series using linear models is usually carried out following three steps. First the model is identified, then estimated and finally we proceed to the checking of the goodness-of-fit of the model (see Brockwell and Davis (1991, chapters 8 and 9)). Tools for the three phases in the specification-estimation-verification modeling cycle of time series with constant unconditional innovations variance are available in any of the specialized softwares as for instance R, SAS or JMulTi. The identification stage is important for the choice of a suitable model for the data. In this step the partial autoregressive and correlation matrices (PAM and PCM hereafter) are often used to identify VAR models with stationary innovations (see Tiao and Box (1981)). Information criteria are also extensively used. In the framework of stationary processes numerous information criteria have been studied (see e.g. Hannan and Quinn (1979), Cavanaugh (1997) or Boubacar Mainassara (2012)). One of the most commonly used information criterion is the Akaike Information Criterion (*AIC*) proposed by Akaike (1973). Nevertheless it is widely documented in the literature that the constant variance assumption is unrealistic for many economic data. Reference can be made to Mc-Connell, Mosser and Perez-Quiros (1999), Kim and Nelson (1999), Stock and Watson (2002), Ahmed, Levin and Wilson (2002), Herrera and Pesavento (2005) or Davis and Kahn (2008). In this paper we investigate the lag length identification problem of autoregressive processes in the important case where the unconditional innovations variance is time varying.

The statistical inference of processes with non constant variance has recently attracted much attention. Horváth and Steinebach (2000), Sanso, Arago and Car-

rion (2004) or Galeano and Pena (2007) among other contributions proposed tests to detect variance and/or covariance breaks in the residuals. Francq and Gautier (2004) studied the estimation of ARMA models with time varying parameters, allowing a finite number of regimes for the variance. Mikosch and Stărică (2004) give some theoretical evidence that financial data may exhibit non constant variance. In the context of GARCH models reference can be made to the works of Kokoszka and Leipus (2000), Engle and Rangel (2008), Dahlhaus and Rao (2006) or Horvath, Kokoszka and Zhang (2006) who investigated the inference for processes with possibly unconditional time varying variance. In the multivariate framework Bai (2000), Qu and Perron (2007) or Kim and Park (2010) among others studied autoregressive models with unconditionally non constant variance. Aue, Hörmann, Horvath and Reimherr (2009) studied the break detection in the covariance structure of multivariate processes. Xu and Phillips (2008) studied the estimation of univariate autoregressive models whose innovations have a non constant variance. Patilea and Raïssi (2012) generalized their findings in the case of Vector AutoRegressive (VAR) models with time-varying variance and found that the asymptotic covariance matrix obtained if one take into account of the non constant variance can be quite different from the standard covariance matrix expression. As a consequence they also provided Adaptive Least Squares (ALS) estimators which achieve a more efficient estimation of the autoregressive parameters. Patilea and Raïssi (2011) proposed tools for checking the adequacy of the autoregressive order of VAR models when the unconditional variance is non constant.

In this paper modified tools for lag length identification in the case of multivariate autoregressive processes with time-varying variance are introduced. The unreliability of the use of the standard *AIC* for the identification step in VAR modeling in presence of non constant variance is first highlighted. Consequently a modified *AIC* based on the adaptive estimation of the non constant variance structure is proposed.

We establish the suitability of the adaptive AIC to identify the autoregressive order of non stationary but stable VAR processes through theoretical results and numerical illustrations. On the other hand it is also shown that the standard results on the OLS estimators of the PAM and PCM can be quite misleading. Consequently corrected confidence bounds are proposed. Using the adaptive approach more efficient estimators of the PAM and PCM are proposed. Therefore the identification tools proposed in this paper may be viewed as a complement of the above mentioned results on the estimation and diagnostic testing in the important framework of autoregressive models with non constant variance.

The structure of the paper is as follow. In Section 2 we define the model and introduce assumptions which give the general framework of our study. The asymptotic behavior of different estimators of the autoregressive parameters is given. We also describe the adaptive estimation of the variance. In Section 3 it is shown that the standard AIC is irrelevant for model selection when the innovations variance is not constant. The adaptive AIC is derived taking into account the time-varying variance in the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy. In Section 5 some Monte Carlo experiments results are given to examine the performances of the studied information criteria for VAR model identification in our non standard framework. We also investigate the lag length selection of a bivariate system of US international finance variables.

2 Estimation of the model

In this paper we restrict our attention to VAR models since they are extensively used for the analysis of multivariate time series (see e.g. Lütkepohl (2005)). Let us consider the d -dimensional autoregressive process (X_t) satisfying

$$X_t = A_{01}X_{t-1} + \cdots + A_{0p}X_{t-p_0} + u_t \quad (2.1)$$

$$u_t = H_t \epsilon_t,$$

where the A_{0i} 's, $i \in \{1, \dots, p_0\}$, are such that $\det(A(z)) \neq 0$ for all $|z| \leq 1$, with $A(z) = 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} A_{0i}z^i$ and $\det(\cdot)$ denotes the determinant of a square matrix. We suppose that $X_{-p+1}, \dots, X_0, \dots, X_n$ are observed with $p > p_0$. Now let us denote by $[\cdot]$ the integer part. For ease of exposition we shall assume that the process (ϵ_t) is iid multivariate standard Gaussian. Throughout the paper we assume that the following conditions on the unconditional variance structure of the innovations process (u_t) hold.

Assumption A1: *The $d \times d$ matrices H_t are positive definite and satisfy $H_{[Tr]} = G(r)$, where the components of the matrix $G(r) := \{g_{kl}(r)\}$ are measurable deterministic functions on the interval $(0, 1]$, such that $\sup_{r \in (0, 1]} |g_{kl}(r)| < \infty$, and each g_{kl} satisfies a Lipschitz condition piecewise on a finite number of some sub-intervals that partition $(0, 1]$. The matrix $\Sigma(r) = G(r)G(r)'$ is assumed positive definite for all r .*

The rescaling method of Dahlhaus (1997) is considered to specify the unconditional variance structure in Assumption **A1**. Note that one should formally use the notation $X_{t,n}$ with $0 < t \leq n$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Nevertheless we do not use the subscript n to lighten the notations. This specification allows to consider kinds of time-varying variance which are commonly considered in the literature as for instance abrupt shifts, smooth transitions or periodic heteroscedasticity. Note that Sensier and Van Dijk (2004) found that approximately 80% among 214 US macro-economic data they investigated exhibit a variance break. Stărică (2003) hypothesized that the returns

of the Standard and Poors 500 stock market index have a non constant unconditional variance. Then considering the framework given by **A1** is important given the strong empirical evidence of non-constant unconditional variance in many macroeconomic and financial data. Our assumption is similar to that of recent papers in the literature. For instance similar structure for the variance was considered by Xu and Phillips (2008) or Kim and Park (2010) among others. Our framework encompass the important case of piecewise constant variance as considered in Pesaran and Timmerman (2004) or Bai (2000). Finally it is important to underline that the framework induced by **A1** is different from the case of autoregressive processes with conditionally heteroscedastic but (strictly) stationary errors. For instance models like the GARCH or the All-Pass models cannot take into account for non constant unconditional variance in the innovations. The model identification problem for stationary processes which may display nonlinearities has been recently investigated by Boubacar Mainassara (2012) in a quite general framework.

In this part we introduce estimators of the autoregressive parameters. Let us rewrite (2.1) as follow

$$\begin{aligned} X_t &= (\tilde{X}'_{t-1} \otimes I_d)\theta_0 + u_t \\ u_t &= H_t\epsilon_t, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

where $\theta_0 = (\text{vec}(A_{01})', \dots, \text{vec}(A_{0p_0})')' \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0 d^2}$ is the vector of the true autoregressive parameters and $\tilde{X}'_{t-1} = (X'_{t-1}, \dots, X'_{t-p_0})'$. For a fitted autoregressive order $p \geq p_0$, the OLS estimator is given by

$$\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}}^{-1} \text{vec} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_X \right),$$

where

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{X}_{t-1}^p (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)' \otimes I_d \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Sigma}_X = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n X_t (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)',$$

and $\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p = (X'_{t-1}, \dots, X'_{t-p})'$. If we suppose that the true unconditional covariance matrices $\Sigma_t := H_t H_t'$ are known, we can define the following Generalized Least Squares (GLS) estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{GLS} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}}^{-1} \text{vec} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\underline{X}} \right), \quad (2.3)$$

with

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\underline{X}} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{X}_{t-1}^p (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)' \otimes \Sigma_t^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Sigma}_{\underline{X}} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \Sigma_t^{-1} X_t (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)'$$

Let us define $u_t(\theta) = X_t - \{(\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)' \otimes I_d\} \theta$ with $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{pd^2}$. Note that $\hat{\theta}_{GLS}$ maximizes the conditional log-likelihood function (up to a constant and divided by n)

$$\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta) = -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ln \{ \det(\Sigma_t) \} - u_t(\theta)' \Sigma_t^{-1} u_t(\theta), \quad (2.4)$$

(see Lütkepohl (2005, p 589)). If we assume that the innovations process variance is constant ($\Sigma_t = \Sigma_u$ for all t) and unknown, the standard conditional log-likelihood function

$$\mathcal{L}_{OLS}(\theta, \Sigma) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln(\det(\Sigma)) - \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{t=1}^n u_t(\theta)' \Sigma^{-1} u_t(\theta) \quad (2.5)$$

where Σ is a $d \times d$ invertible matrix, is usually used for the estimation of the parameters. The estimator obtained by maximizing \mathcal{L}_{OLS} with respect to θ corresponds to $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$. In this case the estimator of the constant variance Σ_u is given by $\hat{\Sigma}_u := n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \hat{u}_t \hat{u}_t'$ where $\hat{u}_t := u_t(\hat{\theta})$ are the residuals of the OLS estimation of (2.2).

In practice the assumption of known variance is unrealistic. Therefore we consider an adaptive estimator of the autoregressive parameters. We may first define adaptive estimators of the true unconditional variances $\Sigma_t := H_t H_t'$ as in Patilea and Raïssi (2012)

$$\check{\Sigma}_t = \sum_{i=1}^n w_{ti}(b) \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_i',$$

where the weights w_{ti} are given by

$$w_{ti}(b) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n K_{ti}(b) \right)^{-1} K_{ti}(b),$$

with b the bandwidth and

$$K_{ti}(b) = \begin{cases} K\left(\frac{t-i}{nb}\right) & \text{if } t \neq i \\ 0 & \text{if } t = i, \end{cases}$$

where $K(\cdot)$ is the kernel function which is such that $\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} K(z) dz = 1$. The bandwidth b is taken in a range $\mathcal{B}_n = [c_{min}b_n, c_{max}b_n]$ with $c_{max} > c_{min} > 0$ some constants and $b_n \downarrow 0$ at a suitable rate. Alternatively one can use different bandwidths cells for the $\check{\Sigma}_t$'s (see Patilea and Raïssi (2012) for more details). The results in this paper are given uniformly with respect to $b \in \mathcal{B}_n$. This justifies the approach which consists in selecting the bandwidth on a grid defined in a range using for example the cross validation criterion. Note also that the $\check{\Sigma}_t$'s are positive definite. Of course our results do not rely on a particular bandwidth choice procedure and are valid provided estimators of the Σ_t 's with similar asymptotic properties of the $\check{\Sigma}_t$'s are available. The non parametric estimator of the covariance matrices employed in this paper is similar to the variance estimators used in Xu and Phillips (2008) among others. Considering the $\check{\Sigma}_t$'s, we are in position to introduce the ALS estimators

$$\hat{\theta}_{ALS} = \check{\Sigma}_X^{-1} \text{vec} (\check{\Sigma}_X),$$

with

$$\check{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{X}_{t-1}^p (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)' \otimes \check{\Sigma}_t^{-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \check{\Sigma}_X = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \check{\Sigma}_t^{-1} X_t (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)'.$$

Now we have to state the asymptotic behavior of the estimators and introduce some notations. Define

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & \dots & A_{p-1} & A_p \\ I_d & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & & I_d & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $e_p(1)$ the vector of dimension p such that the first component is equal to one and zero elsewhere. Under **A1** it is shown in Patilea and Raïssi (2012) that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - \theta_0) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_3^{-1} \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3^{-1}), \quad (2.6)$$

with

$$\Lambda_2 = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \Delta^i (e_p(1) e_p(1)' \otimes \Sigma(r)) \Delta^{i'} \right\} \otimes \Sigma(r) dr,$$

$$\Lambda_3 = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \Delta^i (e_p(1) e_p(1)' \otimes \Sigma(r)) \Delta^{i'} \right\} \otimes I_d dr,$$

and

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_1^{-1}), \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$\Lambda_1 = \int_0^1 \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \Delta^i (e_p(1) e_p(1)' \otimes \Sigma(r)) \Delta^{i'} \right\} \otimes \Sigma(r)^{-1} dr.$$

In addition we may use the following consistent estimators for the covariance matrices:

$$\check{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}} = \Lambda_1 + o_p(1), \quad \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}} = \Lambda_3 + o_p(1) \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Lambda}_2 := n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{X}_{t-1}^p \tilde{X}_{t-1}^{p'} \otimes \hat{u}_t \hat{u}_t' = \Lambda_2 + o_p(1). \quad (2.8)$$

We make the following assumptions to state the asymptotic equivalence between the ALS and GLS estimators.

Assumption A1': Suppose that all the conditions in Assumption **A1** hold true. In addition $\inf_{r \in (0,1]} \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma(r)) > 0$ where for any symmetric matrix M the real value $\lambda_{\min}(M)$ denotes its smallest eigenvalue.

Assumption A2: (i) The kernel $K(\cdot)$ is a bounded density function defined on the real line such that $K(\cdot)$ is nondecreasing on $(-\infty, 0]$ and decreasing on $[0, \infty)$ and $\int_{\mathbb{R}} v^2 K(v) dv < \infty$. The function $K(\cdot)$ is differentiable except a finite number of points and the derivative $K'(\cdot)$ is an integrable function. Moreover, the Fourier Transform $\mathcal{F}[K](\cdot)$ of $K(\cdot)$ satisfies $\int_{\mathbb{R}} |s \mathcal{F}[K](s)| ds < \infty$.

(ii) The bandwidth b is taken in the range $\mathcal{B}_n = [c_{\min} b_n, c_{\max} b_n]$ with $0 < c_{\min} < c_{\max} < \infty$ and $b_n + 1/T b_n^{2+\gamma} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for some $\gamma > 0$.

(iii) The sequence ν_n is such that $n \nu_n^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Under these additional assumptions Patilea and Raïssi (2012) also showed that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{ALS} - \hat{\theta}_{GLS}) = o_p(1), \quad (2.9)$$

and

$$\check{\Sigma}_{[Tr]} \xrightarrow{P} \Sigma(r-) \int_{-\infty}^0 K(z) dz + \Sigma(r+) \int_0^{\infty} K(z) dz, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\Sigma(r-) := \lim_{\tilde{r} \uparrow r} \Sigma(\tilde{r})$ and $\Sigma(r+) := \lim_{\tilde{r} \downarrow r} \Sigma(\tilde{r})$. As a consequence $\hat{\theta}_{ALS}$ and

$\hat{\theta}_{GLS}$ have the same asymptotic behavior and we can also write $\check{\Sigma}_t = \Sigma_t + o_p(1)$, unless at the break dates where we have $\check{\Sigma}_t = \Sigma_t + O_p(1)$. Using these asymptotic results we underline the unreliability of the standard *AIC* and develop a criterion which is adapted to the case of non stationary but stable processes. Corrected confidence bounds for the PAM and PCM in our non standard framework are also proposed.

3 Derivation of the adaptive *AIC*

In the standard case (the variance of the innovations is constant with true variance Σ_u) the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy between the true model and the approximating model with parameter vector $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is given by

$$d_n(\hat{\theta}_{OLS}, \theta_0) = E_{\theta_0, \Sigma_u} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{OLS}(\theta, \Sigma_u)\} |_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_{OLS}}, \quad (3.1)$$

see Brockwell and Davis (1991, p 302). Akaike (1973) proposed the following approximately unbiased estimator of (3.1) to compare the discrepancies between competing $\text{VAR}(p)$ models

$$AIC(p) = -2\mathcal{L}_{OLS}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS}, \hat{\Sigma}_u) + \frac{2pd^2}{n},$$

where the term $2pd^2$ penalizes the more complicated models fitted to the data (see Lütkepohl (2005), p 147). The terms corresponding to the nuisance parameters are neglected in the previous expressions since they do not interfere in the model selection when the *AIC* is used. The identified model corresponds to the model which minimizes the *AIC*. However in our non standard framework it is clear that the \mathcal{L}_{OLS} cannot take into account the non constant variance in the observations. In addition if we assume that the variance of the innovations is constant $\Sigma_t = \Sigma_u$, we obtain

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - \theta_0) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \Lambda_4^{-1}), \quad (3.2)$$

with $\Lambda_4 = E(\tilde{X}_{t-1}\tilde{X}'_{t-1}) \otimes \Sigma_u^{-1}$, so that the following result is used for the derivation of the standard *AIC*

$$E_{\theta_0, \Sigma_u} \left\{ n(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - \theta_0)' \hat{\Lambda}_4 (\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - \theta_0) \right\} \approx pd^2,$$

for large n , where $\hat{\Lambda}_4 = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \tilde{X}_{t-1}^p (\tilde{X}_{t-1}^p)' \otimes \hat{\Sigma}_u^{-1}$ is a consistent estimator of Λ_4 . In view of (2.6) this property is obviously not verified in our case. Indeed Patilea and Raïssi (2012) pointed out that Λ_4 and $\Lambda_3^{-1} \Lambda_2 \Lambda_3^{-1}$ can be quite different. Therefore the standard *AIC* have no theoretical basis in our non standard framework and we can expect that the use of the standard *AIC* can be misleading in such a situation.

To remedy to this problem we shall use the more appropriate expression (2.4) in our framework for the Kullback-Leibler discrepancy between the fitted model and the true model

$$\Delta_n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}, \theta_0) = E_{\theta_0} \left\{ -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta) \right\} \Big|_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_{GLS}}. \quad (3.3)$$

Using a second order Taylor expansion of \mathcal{L}_{GLS} about $\hat{\theta}_{GLS}$ and since $\frac{\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS})}{\partial \theta} = 0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_0} \left\{ -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta_0) \right\} &= \frac{1}{n} E_{\theta_0} \left\{ n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0)' \hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{X}} (\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0) \right\} \\ &+ E_{\theta_0} \left\{ -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) \right\} + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

Using again the second order Taylor expansion and taking the expectation we also

write

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_0} [E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta)\} |_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_{GLS}}] &= \frac{1}{n} E_{\theta_0} \left[n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0)' E_{\theta_0} \left\{ \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} \right\} (\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0) \right] \\ &\quad + E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta_0)\} + o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

From (2.7) we have for large n

$$E_{\theta_0} \left[n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0)' \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} (\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0) \right] \approx pd^2$$

and

$$E_{\theta_0} \left[n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0)' E_{\theta_0} \left\{ \hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathbf{X}}} \right\} (\hat{\theta}_{GLS} - \theta_0) \right] \approx pd^2.$$

Noting that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\theta_0} [E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta)\} |_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_{GLS}}] &= E_{\theta_0} \left\{ -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) \right\} \\ &\quad + E_{\theta_0} [E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta)\} |_{\theta=\hat{\theta}_{GLS}}] - E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta_0)\} \\ &\quad + E_{\theta_0} \{-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\theta_0)\} - E_{\theta_0} \left\{ -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

and using (3.4) and (3.5), we see that the following criterion based on the GLS estimator

$$AIC_{GLS} = -2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) + \frac{2pd^2}{n}$$

is an approximately unbiased estimator of $\Delta_n(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}, \theta_0)$.

Nevertheless the AIC_{GLS} is infeasible since it depends on the unknown variance of the errors. Thereby we will use the adaptive estimation of the variance structure to propose a feasible selection criterion. Recall that

$$-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ln \{ \det(\Sigma_t) \} + u_t(\hat{\theta}_{GLS})' \Sigma_t^{-1} u_t(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}),$$

and define

$$-2\mathcal{L}_{ALS}(\hat{\theta}_{ALS}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \ln \{ \det(\check{\Sigma}_t) \} + u_t(\hat{\theta}_{ALS})' \check{\Sigma}_t^{-1} u_t(\hat{\theta}_{ALS}).$$

In view of (2.9) and (2.10) we have

$$-2\mathcal{L}_{GLS}(\hat{\theta}_{GLS}) = -2\mathcal{L}_{ALS}(\hat{\theta}_{ALS}) + o_p(1),$$

since we allowed for a finite number of variance breaks for the innovations. Therefore we can introduce the adaptive criterion

$$AIC_{ALS} = -2\mathcal{L}_{ALS}(\hat{\theta}_{ALS}) + \frac{2pd^2}{n},$$

which gives an approximately unbiased estimation of (3.3) for large n .

Finally note that if we suppose that (X_t) is cointegrated, Kim and Park (2010) showed that the long run relationships estimated by reduced rank are n -consistent. Therefore our approach for building information criteria can be straightforwardly extended to the cointegrated case since it is clear that the estimated long run relationships can be replaced by the true relationships in the preceding computations.

4 Identifying the lag length using partial autoregressive and partial correlation matrices

In this part we assume $p > p_0$, so that the cut-off property of the presented tools can be observed. Following the approach described in Reinsel (1993) chapter 3, one can use the estimators of the autoregressive parameters to identify the lag length of (2.1). Consider the regression of X_t on its past values

$$X_t = A_{01}X_{t-1} + \cdots + A_{0p}X_{t-p} + u_t. \quad (4.1)$$

We can remark that the partial autoregressive matrices $A_{0p_0+1}, \dots, A_{0p}$ are equal to zero. The PAM are estimated using OLS or ALS estimation. Confidence bounds for

the PAM can be proposed as follow. Let us introduce the $d^2(p-p_0) \times d^2p$ dimensional matrix $R = (0, I_{d^2(p-p_0)})$, so that from (2.6), (2.7) and (2.9) we write

$$\sqrt{n}R\hat{\theta}_{OLS} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, R\Lambda_3^{-1}\Lambda_2\Lambda_3^{-1}R') \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{n}R\hat{\theta}_{ALS} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, R\Lambda_1^{-1}R'), \quad (4.2)$$

where $R\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ and $R\hat{\theta}_{ALS}$ correspond to the OLS and ALS estimators of the null matrices $A_{0p_0+1}, \dots, A_{0p}$. Denote by v_i^{OLS} (resp. v_i^{ALS}) the asymptotic standard deviation of the i th component of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ (resp. $\hat{\theta}_{ALS}$) for $i \in \{d^2p_0 + 1, \dots, d^2p\}$ with obvious notations. From (4.2) the i -th component of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ (resp. $\hat{\theta}_{ALS}$) are usually compared with the 95% approximate asymptotic confidence bounds $\pm 1.96\hat{v}_i^{OLS}$ (resp. $\pm 1.96\hat{v}_i^{ALS}$) as suggested in Tiao and Box (1981), and where the \hat{v}_i^{OLS} 's and \hat{v}_i^{ALS} 's can be obtained using the consistent estimators in (2.8). Therefore the identified lag length for model (2.1) correspond to the higher order of the matrix A_{0i} which have an estimator of a component which is clearly beyond its confidence bounds about zero.

The identification of the lag length of standard VAR processes is usually performed using also the partial cross-correlation matrices which are the extension of the partial correlations of the univariate case. Consider the regressions

$$X_{t-p} = \phi_1 X_{t-p+1} + \dots + \phi_{p-1} X_{t-1} + w_t,$$

$$X_t = A_{01} X_{t-1} + \dots + A_{0p-1} X_{t-p+1} + u_t,$$

with $p > 1$. In our framework it is clear that the error process (w_t) is unconditionally heteroscedastic, and then we define $\underline{\Sigma}_w = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n E(w_t w_t')$ which converge under **A1**, and the consistent estimator of $\underline{\Sigma}_w$:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_w &= n^{-1} \sum_{t=p}^n X_{t-p} X'_{t-p} \\ &- \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{t=p}^n X_{t-p} (\tilde{X}_{t-p}^{p-1})' \right\} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{t=p}^n \tilde{X}_{t-p}^{p-1} (\tilde{X}_{t-p}^{p-1})' \right\}^{-1} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{t=p}^n \tilde{X}_{t-p}^{p-1} X'_{t-p} \right\}\end{aligned}$$

with obvious notations. The consistency of this estimator can be proved from standard computations and using lemmas 7.1-7.4 of Patilea and Raïssi (2012). We also define the 'long-run' innovations variance $\underline{\Sigma}_u = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n E(u_t u'_t)$ where the $E(u_t u'_t)$'s are non constant and the consistent estimator $\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_u = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \hat{u}_t \hat{u}'_t$ of $\underline{\Sigma}_u$ where we recall that the \hat{u}_t 's are the OLS residuals.

Several definitions for the partial cross-correlations are available in the literature. In the sequel we concentrate on the definition given in Ansley and Newbold (1979) which is used in the VARMAX procedure of the software SAS. We propose to extend the partial cross-correlation matrices in our framework as follow

$$P(p) = \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \text{vec} \left\{ n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n E(w_t u'_t) \right\} = \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \text{vec}(A_p) \quad (4.3)$$

and it is clear that for $p > p_0$ we have $P(p) = 0$. The expression (4.3) may be viewed as the 'long-run' relation between the X_t 's and the X_{t-p} 's corrected for the intermediate values for each date t . Consider the OLS and ALS consistent estimators

$$\hat{P}_{OLS}(p) = \left(\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \text{vec}(\tilde{R} \hat{\theta}_{OLS})$$

$$\hat{P}_{ALS}(p) = \left(\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_w^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \text{vec}(\tilde{R} \hat{\theta}_{ALS}),$$

where $\tilde{R} = (0, I_{d^2})$ is of dimension $d^2 \times d^2 p$, so that $\tilde{R} \hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ and $\tilde{R} \hat{\theta}_{ALS}$ correspond to the ALS and OLS estimators of A_p in (4.1). Using again (2.6), (2.7), (2.9) and from the consistency of $\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_u$ and $\hat{\underline{\Sigma}}_w$ we obtain

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{P}_{OLS}(p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \left(\tilde{R}\Lambda_3^{-1}\Lambda_2\Lambda_3^{-1}\tilde{R}'\right) \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right) \quad (4.4)$$

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{P}_{ALS}(p) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}\left(0, \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \left(\tilde{R}\Lambda_1^{-1}\tilde{R}'\right) \left(\underline{\Sigma}_u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \otimes \underline{\Sigma}_w^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)\right). \quad (4.5)$$

Hence approximate confidence bounds can be built using (4.4) and (4.5). Similarly to the partial autoregressive matrices the highest order p for which a cut-off is observed for an element of $\hat{P}_{OLS}(p)$ (resp. $\hat{P}_{ALS}(p)$) correspond to the identified lag length for the VAR model. Note that for $p = 1$ ($p_0 = 0$, so that the observed process is uncorrelated and $w_t = X_{t-1}$, $u_t = X_t$), we have $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n E(X_t X_t') = \underline{\Sigma}_w = \underline{\Sigma}_u$. In this case similar results to (4.4) and (4.5) can be used.

Let us end this section with some remarks on the OLS and ALS estimation approaches of the PAM and PCM. If we assume that the variance of the error process is constant, the result (3.2) is used to identify the autoregressive order using the partial autoregressive and correlation matrices obtained from the OLS estimation. However as pointed out in the previous section this standard result can be misleading in our framework. The simulations carried out in the next section show that the standard bounds are not reliable in our framework. From the real example below it appears that the OLS PAM and PCM with the standard confidence bounds seem to select a too large lag length. Note that since the tools presented in this section are based on the results (2.6), (2.7) and on the adaptive estimation of the autoregressive parameters, they are able to take into account changes in the variance.

In the univariate case the partial autocorrelation function is used for identifying the autoregressive order. In such a case the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_{ALS}$ does not depend on the variance structure (see equation (4.6) below). Hence the ALS

estimators of the partial autocorrelations do not depend on the variance function on the contrary to its OLS counterparts. In the general VAR case Patilea and Raïssi (2012) also showed that that $\Lambda_3^{-1}\Lambda_2\Lambda_3^{-1} - \Lambda_1^{-1}$ is positive semi-definite (the same result is available in the univariate case). Therefore the tools based on the ALS estimator are more accurate than the tools based on the OLS estimator for identifying the autoregressive order.

We illustrate the above remarks by considering the following simple case where we assume that $\Sigma(r) = \sigma(r)^2 I_d$ with $\sigma(\cdot)^2$ a real-valued function. The univariate stable autoregressive processes are a particular case of this specification of the variance. In this case we obtain

$$\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_4 = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \Delta^i (e_p(1)e_p(1)' \otimes I_d) \Delta^{i'} \right\} \otimes I_d \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\Lambda_2 = \int_0^1 \sigma(r)^4 dr \Lambda_1, \quad \Lambda_3 = \int_0^1 \sigma(r)^2 dr \Lambda_1,$$

so that we have

$$\Lambda_3^{-1}\Lambda_2\Lambda_3^{-1} = \frac{\int_0^1 \sigma(r)^4 dr}{\left(\int_0^1 \sigma(r)^2 dr\right)^2} \Lambda_1^{-1} \quad (4.7)$$

with $\int_0^1 \sigma(r)^4 dr \geq \left(\int_0^1 \sigma(r)^2 dr\right)^2$. Hence from (4.7) it is clear that the adaptive PAM and PCM are more reliable than the PAM and PCM obtained using the OLS approach. In addition from (4.6) the asymptotic behavior of the adaptive partial autoregressive and partial correlation matrices does not depend on the variance function. On the other hand we also see from (4.7) that the matrices Λ_4 and $\Lambda_3^{-1}\Lambda_2\Lambda_3^{-1}$ can be quite different.

5 Empirical results

For our empirical study the AIC_{ALS} is computed using an adaptive estimation of the variance as described in Section 2. The ALS estimators of the PAM and PCM are obtained similarly. In particular the bandwidth is selected using the cross-validation method. The OLS partial autoregressive and partial correlation matrices used with the standard confidence bounds are denoted by PAM_S and PCM_S . Similarly we also introduce the PAM_{OLS} , PAM_{ALS} and the PCM_{OLS} , PCM_{ALS} with obvious notations. In the simulation study part the infeasible and GLS tools are used only for comparison with the feasible ALS tools.

It is important to note that when the PAM and PCM are used, the practitioners base their decision on the visual inspection of these tools. Results concerning automatically selected lag lengths over the iterations using several PAM and PCM do not really reflect their ability to identify the lag length in practice. For instance it is well known that there are cases where some PAM or PCM are beyond the confidence bounds but not taken into account for the lag length identification. Therefore we provide instead some simulation results which assess the ability of the studied methods to provide reliable confidence bounds for the choice of the lag length. The use of the modified PAM and PCM is also illustrated in the real data study below.

For a given tool we assume in our experiments that when the selected autoregressive order is such that $p > 5$, the model identification is suspected to be not reliable. For instance the more complicated models may appear not enough penalized by the information criterion, or the number of estimated parameters becomes too large when compared to the number of observations. In such situations the practitioner is likely to stop the procedure.

5.1 Monte Carlo experiments

In this part $N = 1000$ independent trajectories of bivariate VAR(2) ($p_0 = 2$) processes of length $n = 50$, $n = 100$ and $n = 200$ are simulated with autoregressive parameters given by

$$A_{01} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0 & -0.7 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad A_{02} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.6 & 0 \\ 0 & -0.3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.1)$$

Recall that the process (ϵ_t) is assumed iid standard Gaussian. Two kinds of non constant volatilities are used. When the variance smoothly change in time we consider the following specification

$$\Sigma(r) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + \gamma_1 r)(1 + \rho^2) & \rho(1 + \gamma_1 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + \gamma_2 r)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \rho(1 + \gamma_1 r)^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + \gamma_2 r)^{\frac{1}{2}} & (1 + \gamma_2 r) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5.2)$$

In case of abrupt change the following variance specification is used

$$\Sigma(r) = \begin{pmatrix} (1 + f_1(r))(1 + \rho^2) & \rho(1 + f_1(r))^{\frac{1}{2}}\rho(1 + f_2(r))^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ \rho(1 + f_2(r))^{\frac{1}{2}}(1 + f_1(r))^{\frac{1}{2}} & (1 + f_2(r))(1 + \rho^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5.3)$$

with $f_i(r) = (\gamma_i - 1)\mathbf{1}_{(r \geq 1/2)}(r)$. In this case we have a common variance break at the date $t = n/2$. In all the experiments we take $\gamma_1 = 20$, $\gamma_2 = \gamma_1/3$ and $\rho = 0.2$. Note that the autoregressive parameters as well as the variance structure are inspired by the real data study below. More precisely the autoregressive parameters in (5.1) are taken close to the two first adaptive PAM obtained for the government securities and foreign direct investment system. In addition the ratio between the first and last adaptive estimation of the residual variance of the studied real data are of the same order of the ratio for the residual variance of the simulated series. The results are given in Tables 1-3 and 7-9 for the variance specification (5.2) and in Tables 4-6 and 10-12 when specification (5.3) is used. To facilitate the comparison of the

studied identification tools, the most frequently selected lag length for the studied information criteria and the correct order ($p_0 = 2$) are in bold type.

The small sample properties of the different information criteria for selecting the autoregressive order is first analyzed. According to Tables 1-6 we can remark that the AIC_{ALS} and AIC_{GLS} are selecting most frequently the true autoregressive order. However we note that the modified AIC have a slight tendency to select $p > p_0$. On the other hand we can see that the classical AIC selects too large lags lengths in our framework. This is in accordance with the fact that AIC is not consistent (see e.g. Paulsen (1984) or Hurvich and Tsai (1989)). We also note that the frequency of selected true lag length $p = p_0 = 2$ increase with n for the AIC_{GLS} and AIC_{ALS} . The infeasible AIC_{GLS} provide slightly better results than the AIC_{ALS} . As expected it can be seen that the difference between the AIC_{GLS} and AIC_{ALS} seems more marked when the processes display an abrupt variance change. Indeed note that from (2.10) the variance is not consistently estimated at the break dates. Nevertheless such bias is divided by n , and we note that the behavior of the AIC_{GLS} and AIC_{ALS} become similar as the samples increase in all the studied cases. According to our simulation results it appears that the adaptive AIC is more able to select the appropriate autoregressive order than the standard AIC when the underlying process is indeed a VAR process.

Now we turn to the analysis of the results for the PAM and PCM in Tables 7-12. Note that we used the 5% (asymptotic) confidence bounds in our study. From our results it emerges that the standard bounds do not provide reliable tools for the identification of the lag length when the variance is non constant. It can be seen that the frequencies of PAM and PCM with lag greater than p_0 beyond the standard bounds do not converge to 5%. On the other hand it is found that the PAM and PCM based on the OLS and adaptive approaches give satisfactory results. Indeed the frequencies of PAM and PCM with lag greater than p_0 beyond the standard and

adaptive bounds converge to 5%. As above we can remark that the results when the variance is smooth are better than the case where the variance exhibits an abrupt break. When the PAM and PCM are equal to zero it seems that the adaptive and OLS method give similar results. In accordance with the theoretical the more accurate adaptive method is more able than the OLS method to detect the significant PAM and PCM with lag smaller or equal to p_0 . We can draw the conclusion that the standard bounds have to be avoided in our non standard framework. The modified adaptive and OLS methods give reliable approaches for identifying the lag length of a VAR model with non constant variance. It emerges that the more elaborated adaptive approach is preferable.

5.2 Real data study

In this part we try to identify the VAR order of a bivariate system of variables taken from US international finance data. The first differences of the quarterly US Government Securities (GS hereafter) hold by foreigners and the Foreign Direct Investment (FDI hereafter) in the US in billions dollars are studied from January 1, 1973 to October 1, 2009. The length of the series is $n = 147$. The studied series are plotted in Figure 1 and can be downloaded from website of the research division of the federal reserve bank of Saint Louis: www.research.stlouisfed.org.

We first highlight some features of the studied series. The OLS residuals and the variances of the errors estimated by kernel smoothing are plotted in Figure 2. From Figure 1 it appears that the data do not have a random walk behavior, while from Figure 2 the estimated volatilities seem not constant. The residuals plotted in Figure 2 show that the variance of the first component of the residuals seems constant from January 1973 to October 1995 and then we may suspect an abrupt variance change. Similarly the variance of the second component of the residuals

seems constant from January 1973 to July 1998 and then we remark an abrupt variance change. Therefore it clearly appears that the standard homoscedasticity assumption turns out to be not realistic for the studied series.

We fitted VAR(p) models with $p \in \{1, \dots, 5\}$ to the data and computed the AIC and AIC_{ALS} for each p . In our VAR system the first component corresponds to the GS and the second corresponds to the FDI. From Table 13 the AIC is decreasing as p is increased so that the higher autoregressive order $p = 5$ is selected, while the minimum value for the AIC_{ALS} is attained for $p = 2$. If it is assumed that the studied processes follow a VAR model and since we noted that the variance of the studied processes seems non constant, it is likely that the AIC is not reliable and selects a too large autoregressive order. In view of our above results the model identification with the more parsimonious AIC_{ALS} seems more reliable. We also considered the PCM obtained from the standard, OLS and ALS estimation methods. The PCM are plotted in Figures 3 and 4 and it appear that we can identify $p = 2$ using the modified tools while $p = 3$ could be identified using the standard PCM . We also see that the standard and OLS confidence bounds can be quite different. The PAM are given below with the 95% confidence bounds into brackets. We base our lag length choice on the PAM which are clearly greater than its 95% confidence bounds (in bold type). The PAM_S give for the studied data:

$$\hat{A}_1^S = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.35}_{[\pm 0.16]} & 0.12_{[\pm 0.19]} \\ 0.06_{[\pm 0.14]} & -\mathbf{0.72}_{[\pm 0.16]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_2^S = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.55}_{[\pm 0.17]} & 0.08_{[\pm 0.23]} \\ 0.08_{[\pm 0.14]} & -\mathbf{0.27}_{[\pm 0.20]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_3^S = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.32}_{[\pm 0.18]} & 0.07_{[\pm 0.23]} \\ 0.15_{[\pm 0.16]} & -0.20_{[\pm 0.20]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_4^S = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.25}_{[\pm 0.17]} & 0.03_{[\pm 0.24]} \\ -0.04_{[\pm 0.15]} & -0.03_{[\pm 0.21]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_5^S = \begin{pmatrix} -0.06_{[\pm 0.17]} & -0.04_{[\pm 0.19]} \\ -0.02_{[\pm 0.15]} & -0.05_{[\pm 0.17]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We obtain the following PAM_{OLS}

$$\hat{A}_1^{OLS} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.35}_{[\pm 0.23]} & 0.12_{[\pm 0.23]} \\ 0.06_{[\pm 0.19]} & -\mathbf{0.72}_{[\pm 0.19]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_2^{OLS} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.55}_{[\pm 0.27]} & 0.08_{[\pm 0.35]} \\ 0.08_{[\pm 0.24]} & -0.27_{[\pm 0.36]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_3^{OLS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.32_{[\pm 0.31]} & 0.07_{[\pm 0.35]} \\ 0.15_{[\pm 0.18]} & -0.20_{[\pm 0.31]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_4^{OLS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.25_{[\pm 0.24]} & 0.03_{[\pm 0.26]} \\ -0.04_{[\pm 0.26]} & -0.03_{[\pm 0.27]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_5^{OLS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.06_{[\pm 0.25]} & -0.04_{[\pm 0.17]} \\ -0.02_{[\pm 0.19]} & -0.05_{[\pm 0.24]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

and the following PAM_{ALS}

$$\hat{A}_1^{ALS} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.42}_{[\pm 0.18]} & 0.06_{[\pm 0.24]} \\ 0.02_{[\pm 0.11]} & -\mathbf{0.70}_{[\pm 0.21]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_2^{ALS} = \begin{pmatrix} -\mathbf{0.58}_{[\pm 0.19]} & 0.07_{[\pm 0.30]} \\ 0.03_{[\pm 0.12]} & -0.26_{[\pm 0.26]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_3^{ALS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.21_{[\pm 0.21]} & 0.07_{[\pm 0.30]} \\ 0.08_{[\pm 0.13]} & -0.21_{[\pm 0.26]} \end{pmatrix} \quad \hat{A}_4^{ALS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.20_{[\pm 0.20]} & 0.06_{[\pm 0.31]} \\ 0.02_{[\pm 0.13]} & -0.01_{[\pm 0.27]} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{A}_5^{ALS} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.13_{[\pm 0.19]} & 0.06_{[\pm 0.26]} \\ -0.01_{[\pm 0.12]} & -0.07_{[\pm 0.22]} \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be seen that the PAM_{OLS} and PAM_{ALS} in the \hat{A}_i^{OLS} and \hat{A}_i^{ALS} for $i = 3, 4$ and 5 seem not significant, so that one can identify $p = 2$ using our modified tools. The cut-off at $p = 2$ is clearly marked for the PAM_{OLS} and PAM_{ALS} . If the PAM_S are used we note that one could select again $p = 3$ or even $p = 4$, and we note that the cut-off is not so clearly marked in this case. We also see that the 95% standard and OLS confidence bounds can be quite different. If the length was automatically selected using the PAM and PCM , larger lag lengths would have been chosen.

Indeed we note that some of the *PAM* and *PCM* are only slightly beyond the 95% confidence bounds (see for instance the $\hat{P}_{OLS}(3)$, $\hat{P}_{OLS}(4)$ or $\hat{P}_{ALS}(3)$ in Figures 3 and 4).

In general it emerges from our empirical study part that the standard identification tools lead to select large lag lengths for the VAR models with non constant variance. This may be viewed as a consequence to the fact that the standard tools are not adapted to our non standard framework. Note that the identification of the model is the first step of the VAR modeling of time series. In such situation the practitioner is likely to adjust a VAR model with a too large number of parameters which can affect the analysis of the series. The identification tools developed in this paper take into account for unconditional heteroscedasticity. From our real data study we found that the modified tools are more parsimonious.

References

- AHMED, S., LEVIN, A., AND WILSON, B.A. (2002) "Recent US macroeconomic stability: Good luck, good policies, or good practices?" *International Finance Discussion Papers*, The board of governors of the federal reserve system, 2002-730.
- AKAIKE, H. (1973) Information theory and an extension of the maximum likelihood principle, in: B.N. Petrov and F. Csaki, eds., *2nd International Symposium on Information Theory*, pp. 267-281. Akademia Kiado, Budapest.
- ANSLEY, C.F., AND NEWBOLD, P. (1979) Multivariate partial autocorrelations. *ASA Proceedings of the Business and Economic Statistics Section*, 349-353.
- AUE, A., HÖRMANN, S., HORVÁTH, L., AND REIMHERR, M. (2009) Break detec-

- tion in the covariance structure of multivariate time series models. *Annals of Statistics* 37, 4046-4087.
- BAI, J. (2000) Vector autoregressive models with structural changes in regression coefficients and in variance-covariance matrices. *Annals of Economics and Finance* 1, 303-339.
- BOUBACAR MAINASSARA, Y. (2012) Selection of weak VARMA models by Akaike's information criteria. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 33, 121-130.
- BROCKWELL, P.J., AND DAVIS, R.A. (1991) *Time Series: Theory and methods*. Springer, New York.
- CAVANAUGH, J.E. (1997) Unifying the derivations for the Akaike and corrected Akaike information criteria. *Statistics and Probability Letters* 33, 201-208.
- DAHLHAUS, R. (1997) Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes. *Annals of Statistics* 25, 1-37.
- DAHLHAUS, R., AND SUBBA RAO, S. (2006) Statistical inference for time-varying ARCH processes. *Annals of Statistics* 34, 1075-1114.
- DAVIS, S.J. AND KAHN, J.A. (2008) Interpreting the great moderation: Changes in the volatility of economic activity at the macro and micro levels. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 22, 155-180.
- ENGLE, R.F., AND RANGEL, J.G. (2008) The spline GARCH model for low-frequency volatility and its global macroeconomic causes. Working paper, Czech National Bank.
- FRANCQ, C., AND GAUTIER, A. (2004) Large sample properties of parameter least squares estimates for time-varying ARMA models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 25, 765-783.

- GALEANO, P., AND PENA, D. (2007) Covariance changes detection in multivariate time series. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 137, 194-211.
- HANNAN, E.J., AND QUINN, B.G. (1979) The determination of the order of an autoregression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 41, 190-195.
- HERRERA, A.M., AND PESAVENTO, E. (2005) The decline in the US output volatility: Structural changes and inventory investment. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 23, 462-472.
- HORVÀTH, L., KOKOSZKA, P. AND ZHANG, A. (2006) Monitoring constancy of variance in conditionally heteroskedastic time series. *Econometric Theory* 22, 373-402.
- HORVÀTH, L., AND STEINEBACH, J. (2000) Testing for changes in the mean or variance of a stochastic process under weak invariance. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 91, 365-376.
- HURVICH, C.M., AND TSAI, C.-L. (1989) Regression and time series model selection in small samples. *Biometrika* 76, 297-307.
- KIM, C.S., AND PARK, J.Y. (2010) Cointegrating regressions with time heterogeneity. *Econometric Reviews* 29, 397-438.
- KIM, C.J., AND NELSON, C.R. (1999) Has the U.S. economy become more stable? A bayesian approach based on a Markov-switching model of the business cycle. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 81, 608-616.
- KOKOSZKA, P., AND LEIPUS, R. (2000) Change-point estimation in ARCH models. *Bernoulli* 6, 513-539.
- LÜTKEPOHL, H. (2005) *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*. Springer, Berlin.

- MCCONNELL, M.M., MOSSER P.C. AND PEREZ-QUIROS, G. (1999) A decomposition of the increased stability of GDP growth. *Current Issues in Economics and Finance*, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.
- MIKOSCH, T., AND STĂRICĂ, C. (2004) Nonstationarities in financial time series, the long- range dependence, and the IGARCH effects. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86, 378-390.
- PATILEA, V., AND RAÏSSI, H. (2012) Adaptive estimation of vector autoregressive models with time-varying variance: application to testing linear causality in mean. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 142, 2891-2912.
- PATILEA, V., AND RAÏSSI, H. (2011) Corrected portmanteau tests for VAR models with time-varying variance. Working paper, Université européenne de Bretagne IRMAR-INSA.
- PAULSEN, J. (1984) Order determination of multivariate autoregressive time series with unit roots, *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 5, 115-127.
- PESARAN, H., AND TIMMERMAN, A. (2004) How costly is it to ignore breaks when forecasting the direction of a time series. *International Journal of Forecasting* 20, 411-425.
- QU, Z., AND PERRON, P. (2007) Estimating and testing structural changes in multivariate regressions. *Econometrica* 75, 459-502.
- REINSEL, G.C. (1993) *Elements of Multivariate Time Series Analysis*. Springer, New-York.
- SANSO, A., ARAGÓ, V., AND CARRION, J.L. (2004). Testing for changes in the unconditional variance of financial time series. *Revista de Economía Financiera* 4, 32-53.

- SENSIER, M., AND VAN DIJK, D. (2004) Testing for volatility changes in U.S. macroeconomic time series. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 86, 833-839.
- STĂRICĂ, C. (2003) Is GARCH(1,1) as good a model as the Nobel prize accolades would imply?. Working paper, <http://129.3.20.41/eps/em/papers/0411/0411015.pdf>.
- STOCK, J.H., AND WATSON, M.W. (2002) "Has the business cycle changed and why?", NBER Macroannual 2002, M. Gertler and K. Rogoff eds., MIT Press.
- TIAO, G.C., AND BOX, G.E.P. (1981) Modeling multiple times series with applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 76, 802-816.
- XU, K.L., AND PHILLIPS, P.C.B. (2008) Adaptive estimation of autoregressive models with time-varying variances. *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 265-280.

Appendix: Tables and Figures

Table 1: Frequency (in %) of selected lag length. The simulated processes are of length $n = 50$ with variance specified as in (5.2).

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	1.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	98.1
AIC_{ALS}	8.0	58.4	15.6	9.0	9.0
AIC_{GLS}	7.2	84.0	6.4	1.8	0.6

Table 2: The same as in Table 1 but for $n = 100$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AIC_{ALS}	2.4	78.1	11.9	5.5	2.1
AIC_{GLS}	0.2	86.6	9.8	2.4	1.0

Table 3: The same as in Table 1 but for $n = 200$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AIC_{ALS}	1.6	84.1	9.3	3.8	1.2
AIC_{GLS}	0.0	89.1	6.6	3.8	0.5

Table 4: Frequency (in %) of selected lag length. The simulated processes are of length $n = 50$ with variance specified as in (5.3).

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	3.3	0.2	0.4	0.7	95.4
AIC_{ALS}	19.2	44.7	16.6	11.3	8.2
AIC_{GLS}	7.5	79.8	8.3	3.0	1.4

Table 5: The same as in Table 4 but for $n = 100$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	99.5
AIC_{ALS}	19.3	63.7	11.2	4.3	1.5
AIC_{GLS}	0.3	84.6	9.9	3.5	1.7

Table 6: The same as in Table 4 but for $n = 200$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0
AIC_{ALS}	3.9	77.3	11.1	5.6	2.1
AIC_{GLS}	0.0	86.5	8.2	4.3	1.0

Table 7: Frequency (in %) of PAM and PCM for parameters $A_{0p}(1,1)$ beyond of their 95% asymptotic confidence bounds. The simulated processes are of length $n = 50$ with variance specified as in (5.2).

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	72.4	93.6	11.4	11.3	12.8
PAM_{OLS}	69.0	91.9	9.6	10.7	11.6
PAM_{ALS}	69.8	92.8	10.1	9.9	10.7
PAM_{GLS}	64.3	89.9	5.1	5.1	4.6
PCM_S	39.1	94.0	10.6	10.0	12.6
PCM_{OLS}	35.9	92.6	9.2	10.2	11.8
PCM_{ALS}	34.4	94.1	8.2	8.9	11.2
PCM_{GLS}	55.5	94.3	4.4	4.7	5.3

Table 8: The same as in Table 1 but for $n = 100$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	94.5	100.0	9.3	9.2	7.6
PAM_{OLS}	93.3	100.0	7.5	7.5	6.0
PAM_{ALS}	94.6	100.0	7.6	7.7	5.0
PAM_{GLS}	93.4	99.9	4.8	5.6	3.6
PCM_S	81.7	99.9	8.7	9.1	8.1
PCM_{OLS}	74.4	100.0	6.7	7.4	6.6
PCM_{ALS}	79.5	100.0	6.7	6.5	5.6
PCM_{GLS}	93.6	100.0	4.8	5.2	4.2

Table 9: The same as in Table 1 but for $n = 200$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	99.9	100.0	10.1	10.1	8.7
PAM_{OLS}	99.8	100.0	6.2	7.7	5.6
PAM_{ALS}	100.0	100.0	6.3	6.3	5.8
PAM_{GLS}	99.9	100.0	6.1	5.0	5.4
PCM_S	99.4	100.0	8.1	8.5	8.5
PCM_{OLS}	98.4	100.0	5.4	6.0	6.1
PCM_{ALS}	99.6	100.0	5.2	6.6	6.2
PCM_{GLS}	100.0	100.0	4.8	5.6	5.9

Table 10: Frequency (in %) of PAM and PCM for parameters $A_{0k}(1, 1)$ beyond of their 95% asymptotic confidence bounds. The simulated processes are of length $n = 50$ with variance specified as in (5.3).

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	66.4	89.2	16.9	18.4	19.0
PAM_{OLS}	58.4	84.1	10.8	15.4	14.3
PAM_{ALS}	63.0	88.6	11.4	11.1	12.3
PAM_{GLS}	56.9	85.9	15.1	8.5	7.4
PCM_S	38.2	90.3	17.1	17.3	19.9
PCM_{OLS}	22.9	85.5	10.7	13.5	13.6
PCM_{ALS}	27.4	89.3	10.0	10.4	13.0
PCM_{GLS}	51.6	92.9	13.4	10.4	6.9

Table 11: The same as in Table 10 but for $n = 100$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	91.4	99.6	16.3	16.1	15.5
PAM_{OLS}	83.9	98.5	8.7	9.5	8.2
PAM_{ALS}	89.7	99.6	7.9	8.7	6.9
PAM_{GLS}	90.6	99.8	11.8	8.8	6.0
PCM_S	76.7	99.7	14.5	15.5	14.2
PCM_{OLS}	52.3	99.1	8.0	8.6	8.6
PCM_{ALS}	66.1	99.8	7.9	7.9	7.2
PCM_{GLS}	92.4	100.0	10.4	9.4	6.2

Table 12: The same as in Table 10 but for $n = 200$.

p	1	2	3	4	5
PAM_S	99.4	100.0	16.5	16.3	16.1
PAM_{OLS}	97.9	100.0	6.1	7.1	5.9
PAM_{ALS}	99.9	100.0	8.8	7.7	5.9
PAM_{GLS}	99.8	100.0	10.9	9.5	7.3
PCM_S	98.2	100.0	14.9	14.8	15.4
PCM_{OLS}	90.2	100.0	5.8	7.2	5.9
PCM_{ALS}	98.6	100.0	6.9	6.6	6.3
PCM_{GLS}	100.0	100.0	8.4	7.8	7.4

Table 13: The quarterly foreign direct investment and government securities hold by foreigners for the U.S. in billions dollars ($n = 147$): The selected autoregressive order using AIC and AIC_{ALS} .

p	1	2	3	4	5
AIC	13.91	13.73	13.59	13.53	13.52
AIC_{ALS}	11.80	11.61	11.74	11.77	11.80




Figure 1: The differences of the government securities hold by foreigners (on the left) and of the foreign direct investment (on the right) in billions dollars ($n = 147$).




Figure 2: The \hat{u}_{1t}^2 's (full line) and the non parametric estimation of $\text{Var}(u_{1t})$ (dotted line) on the left and the same for the \hat{u}_{2t}^2 's and $\text{Var}(u_{2t})$ on the right.




Figure 3: The OLS partial correlation matrices. The 95% OLS confidence bounds (in full lines) are obtained from (4.4) while the 95% standard confidence bounds (in dotted lines) are obtained using (3.2).




Figure 4: The ALS partial correlation matrices. The 95% confidence bounds are obtained from (4.5)