

Bayesian nonparametric sparse seemingly unrelated regression model (SUR)

Monica Billio^{1,a} Roberto Casarin^{1,a} Luca Rossini^{1*}

¹ Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy ^a GRETA Associati, Venice, Italy

March 26, 2022

Abstract

Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) models are used in studying the interactions among economic variables of interest. In a high dimensional setting and when applied to large panel of time series, these models have a large number of parameters to be estimated and suffer of inferential problems.

In order to avoid overparametrization and overfitting issues, we propose a hierarchical Dirichlet process prior for SUR models, which allows shrinkage of SUR coefficients toward multiple locations and identification of group of coefficients.

This new multiple shrinkage prior model allows us to extract network structures from panel data and to cluster the network edges. In the macroeconomic application, we show the presence of contagion changes over lags and identify strong and weak contagion effects between European (core and periphery countries) and rest-of-the-world countries.

Keywords: Bayesian nonparametrics; Bayesian model selection; shrinkage; Large vector autoregression; Network representation.

1 Introduction

In the last decade, high dimensional models and large datasets have increased their importance in economics (e.g., see Scott and Varian (2013)). The use of large dataset has been proved to improve the forecasts in large macroeconomic and financial models (see, Banbura et al. (2010), Carriero et al. (2013), Koop (2013), Stock and Watson (2012)). For analyzing and better forecasting them, seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) models have been introduced (Zellner, 1962, 1971), where the error terms are independent across time, but may have cross-equation contemporaneous correlations. SUR models require estimation of large number of parameters with few observations.

*Corresponding Authors: luca.rossini@unive.it (Luca Rossini), billio@unive.it (Monica Billio), r.casarin@unive.it (Roberto Casarin).

In order to avoid overparametrization, overfitting and dimensionality issues, Bayesian inference and suitable classes of prior distributions have been proposed.

In vector autoregressive (VAR) modeling (see Sims (1980, 1992)) Bayesian inference and related prior on the VAR parameters should be introduced to solve these problems (see Litterman (1980)). Litterman (1986), Doan et al. (1984) and Sims and Zha (1998) specify particular priors constraint on the VAR parameters for Bayesian VAR and Canova and Ciccarelli (2004) discuss prior choice for panel VAR models.

Unfortunately these classes of priors may be not effective in dealing with overfitting in very large SUR models. Thus, new priors have been proposed. George et al. (2008) introduced Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) and spike-and-slab prior distribution. Wang (2010) develops a sparse SUR model with Gaussian errors, where the coefficients shrink near zero in both the regression coefficients and the error precision matrix. Korobilis (2013) extend the use of SSVS to restricted VARs and particularly to select variables in linear and nonlinear VAR using MCMC methods (see Koop and Korobilis (2010) for an introduction). Ahelgebey et al. (2015, 2016) propose Bayesian graphical VAR (BGVAR) and sparse BGVAR. Both SSVS and BGVAR use two separate sets of restrictions for the contemporaneous and lagged interactions, where the SSVS uses the reduced-form model, while in the BGVAR the restrictions are directly used in the structural model and help to solve the identification problem of the SVAR using the graph structures. Furthermore, the two models differ in the computational part, where George et al. (2008) use a single-move Gibbs sampler, while Ahelgebey et al. (2015) focus on a collapsed and multi-move Gibbs sampler. Koop and Korobilis (2015) build on SSVS prior of George et al. (2008) a new parametric prior, which takes into account the panel descriptions and Korobilis (2016) proposed in the same way new parametric and semi-parametric priors for panel VAR.

In this paper, a novel Bayesian nonparametric hierarchical prior for multivariate time series is proposed, which allows shrinkage of the SUR coefficients to multiple locations using a Normal-Gamma distribution with location, scale and shape parameters unknown. In our sparse SUR (sSUR), some SUR coefficients shrink to zero, due to the shrinking properties of the lasso-type distribution at the first stage of our hierarchical prior, thus improving efficiency of parameters estimation, prediction accuracy and interpretation of the temporal dependence structure in the time series. We use a Bayesian Lasso prior, which allows us to reformulate the SUR model as a penalized regression problem, in order to determine which SUR coefficients shrink to zero (see Tibshirani (1996) and Park and Casella (2008)). For alternative shrinkage procedures, see also Zou and Hastie (2005) (elastic-net), Zou and Zhang (2009) (Adaptive elastic-net Lasso), Gefang (2014) (Doubly adaptive elastic-net Lasso).

As regards to the second stage of the hierarchy, we use a random mixture distribution of the Normal-Gamma hyperparameters, which allows for parameter parsimony through two components. The first component is a random Dirac point-mass distribution, which induces shrinkage for SUR coefficients; the second component is a Dirichlet process hyperprior, which allows for clustering of the SUR coefficients.

Up to our knowledge, our paper is the first sparse Bayesian nonparametric proposal in the time series literature. In fact, we substantially improve Bassetti et al. (2014),

which propose a vector of dependent Dirichlet process prior to capture similarities in clustering effects across time series and extend MacLehose and Dunson (2010) by proposing hierarchical dependent Dirichlet process hyperpriors.

Hence, after the seminal papers of Ferguson (1973), Lo (1984) and Sethuraman (1994), Dirichlet process priors and their multivariate extensions (e.g., see Müller et al. (2004), Griffin and Steel (2006), Hatjispyros et al. (2011), Hjort et al. (2010) for a review of Bayesian nonparametrics), are now widely used due to the availability of efficient algorithms for posterior computations (Escobar and West, 1995; MacEachern and Müller, 1998; Papaspiliopoulos and Roberts, 2008; Walker, 2007; Kalli et al., 2011), including, but not limited to applications in time series settings (Hirano, 2002; Chib and Hamilton, 2002; Rodriguez and ter Horst, 2008; Jensen and Maheu, 2010; Griffin, 2011; Griffin and Steel, 2011; Bassetti et al., 2014; Jochmann, 2015).

As regards to the posterior approximation, we develop a MCMC algorithm. We rely on slice sampling by Kalli et al. (2011), which is an improved version of the algorithm of Walker (2007) and on the paper of Hatjispyros et al. (2011), where they present an approach to modeling dependent nonparametric random density functions through mixture of DP model.

Another improvement of the paper is related to the extraction of network structures from panel data in the macroeconomic contagion application (Demirer et al., 2015; Diebold and Yilmaz, 2014). The network connectedness has a central role in the financial, systemic and credit risk measurement and helps us to understand fundamental macroeconomic risks (see Acharya et al. (2012), Billio et al. (2012) and Bianchi et al. (2015)). Our sparse Bayesian nonparametric prior allows us to catch the most relevant linkages between different units of the panel at different lags and for estimating the exact number of cluster in the network.

We show that the transmission of shocks from and to specific countries changes over the lags (Diebold and Yilmaz (2015), Barigozzi and Brownlees (2016), Brownlees and Engle (2016) and Diebold and Yilmaz (2016)). We find that at certain lag, core European countries (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany and Netherlands) appears to be the countries that transmit the highest percentage of shocks, while the periphery European countries (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain) receive more shocks from other countries.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our sparse Bayesian SUR model and the prior assumptions on the hyperparameters. In Section 3 we explain the computational details of the model and the Gibbs sampling, while Section 4 through simulated results illustrates the performance of the methodology compared to existing popular prior for VAR and SUR models. In Section 5 an empirical macroeconomic exercise on contagion shows interesting results from the proposed prior.

2 A sparse Bayesian SUR model

Zellner (1962) introduce the seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model and try to analyze individual relationships that are linked by the fact that their disturbances are

correlated. Hence, SUR models have many applications in different fields, for example demand functions can be estimated for different households for a given commodity or for different commodities.

In a SUR model with N units (or groups of cross-section observations) we consider a sequence of m_i -dimensional vectors of dependent variables, $\mathbf{y}_{i,t}$, that follow individual regressions:

$$\mathbf{y}_{i,t} = X_{i,t}\boldsymbol{\beta}_i + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{i,t}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where $X_{i,t}$ is the $(m_i \times n_i)$ -matrix of observations on n_i explanatory variables with a possible constant term for individual i at time t , $\boldsymbol{\beta}_i = (\beta_{i,1}, \dots, \beta_{i,n_i})'$ is a n_i -vector of unknown coefficients, and $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ is a random error. We write (1) in a stacked regression form:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = X_t\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{y}_t = (\mathbf{y}'_{1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{N,t})'$ is the $m \times 1$ vector of observations, with $m = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i$, $X_t = \text{diag}(X_{1,t}, \dots, X_{N,t})$ is the $m \times n$ matrix of observations on the explanatory variables at time t with $n = \sum_{i=1}^N n_i$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}'_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_N)'$, the n -vector of coefficients and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{1,t}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{N,t})'$ is the vector of errors distributed as $\mathcal{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_s$ are independent for $t \neq s$.

The use of SUR models is important to gain efficiency in estimation by combining different equations and to impose or test restrictions that involve parameters in different equations.

An important special case of the SUR model is the vector autoregressive (VAR) model. Due to the work of Sims (1980), VAR models have acquired a permanent place in the toolkit of applied macroeconomics to study the impact of a policy decision on the variables of interest. A VAR model of order p (VAR(p)) is defined as

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \mathbf{b} + \sum_{i=1}^p B_i \mathbf{y}_{t-i} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (3)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, T$, where $\mathbf{y}_t = (y_{1,t}, \dots, y_{m,t})'$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)'$ and B_i is a $(m \times m)$ matrix of coefficients. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{m,t})'$ follows a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Σ .

The VAR(p) can be obtained as a special case of (2) by setting $N = 1$, $m = m_1$ and writing (3) in a stacked regression form:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = (I_m \otimes \mathbf{x}'_t)\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_t = (1, y'_{t-1}, \dots, y'_{t-p})'$ is the vector of predetermined variables, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \text{vec}(B)$, where $B = (\mathbf{b}, B_1, \dots, B_p)$, \otimes is the Kronecker product and vec the column-wise vectorization operator that stacks the columns of a matrix in a column vector.

2.1 Prior assumption

The number of parameters to estimate in (2) is $q = r + (m+1)m/2$, with $r = \sum_{i=1}^N r_i$, $r_i = n_i$. For large value of m , q can be large and add some problems during

the estimation, such as overfitting, or unstable predictions and difficult-to-interpret descriptions of the temporal dependence. In order to avoid overparameterization issues and the overfitting problem a hierarchical strategy in prior specification has been suggested in the Bayesian dynamic panel modelling literature (e.g., Canova and Ciccarelli (2004), Kaufmann (2010), and Bassetti et al. (2014)). The hierarchical prior can be used to incorporate cross-equation interdependences and various degrees of information pooling across units (e.g., see Chib and Greenberg (1995) and Min and Zellner (1993)), while a different stream of literature is using instead a prior model which induces sparsity (e.g., MacLehose and Dunson (2010), Wang (2010)).

In this paper we combine the two strategies and define a hierarchical prior distribution which induces sparsity on the vector of coefficients β . In order to regularize (2) we incorporate a penalty using a lasso prior $f(\beta) = \prod_{j=1}^r \mathcal{NG}(\beta_j|0, \gamma, \tau)$, where $\mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu, \gamma, \tau)$ denotes the normal-gamma distribution with location parameter μ , shape parameter $\gamma > 0$ and scale parameter $\tau > 0$. The normal-gamma distribution has density function

$$f(\beta|\mu, \gamma, \tau) = \frac{\tau^{\frac{2\gamma+1}{4}} |\beta - \mu|^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}}{2^{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{\pi} \Gamma(\gamma)} K_{\gamma-\frac{1}{2}}(\sqrt{\tau} |\beta - \mu|),$$

where $K_\gamma(\cdot)$ represents the modified Bessel function of the second kind with the index γ (see Abramowitz and Stegun (1972)). The normal-gamma distribution has the double exponential distribution as a special case for $\gamma = 1$ and can be represented as a scale mixture of normals (see Andrews and Mallows (1974) and Griffin and Brown (2006)):

$$\mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu, \gamma, \tau) = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{N}(\beta|\mu, \lambda) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda|\gamma, \tau/2) d\lambda, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{Ga}(\cdot|a, b)$ denotes a gamma distribution¹.

The normal-gamma distribution in (5) induces shrinkage toward the prior mean of μ , but we can extend the lasso model specification by introducing a mixture prior with separate location parameter μ_j^* , separate shape parameter γ_j^* and separate scale parameter τ_j^* such that: $f(\beta) = \prod_{j=1}^r \mathcal{NG}(\beta_j|\mu_j^*, \gamma_j^*, \tau_j^*)$. In our paper, we favor the sparsity of the parameters through the use of carefully tailored hyperprior and we use a nonparametric Dirichlet process prior (DPP), which reduces the overfitting problem and the curse of dimensionality by allowing for parameters clustering due to the concentration parameter and the base measure choice.

Also, following Bassetti et al. (2014), we assume that N blocks of parameters can be exogenously defined. The blocks correspond to series from different countries which share a sparse component but have possibly different clustering features. Our

¹The gamma distribution of τ ($\tau \sim \mathcal{Ga}(a, b)$) used in this paper is parametrized as:

$$f(\tau|a, b) = \frac{b^a}{\Gamma(a)} \tau^{a-1} \exp(-b\tau) \mathbb{I}_{(0, +\infty)}(\tau)$$

framework can be extended to include dependence in the clustering features (Bassetti et al., 2014; Taddy, 2010; Griffin and Steel, 2011).

In our case we define $\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = (\boldsymbol{\mu}^*, \boldsymbol{\gamma}^*, \boldsymbol{\tau}^*)$ as the parameters of the Normal-Gamma distribution, and assume a prior \mathbb{Q}_l for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{lj}^*$, that is

$$\beta_j \stackrel{ind}{\sim} \mathcal{NG}(\beta_j | \mu_j^*, \gamma_j^*, \tau_j^*), \quad (6)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{lj}^* | \mathbb{Q}_l \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathbb{Q}_l, \quad (7)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, r_l$ and $l = 1, \dots, N$.

Following a construction of the hierarchical prior similar to the one proposed in Hatjispyros et al. (2011) we define the vector of random measures

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}_1(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) &= \pi_1 \mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) + (1 - \pi_1) \mathbb{P}_1(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1), \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{Q}_N(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_N) &= \pi_N \mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_N) + (1 - \pi_N) \mathbb{P}_N(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_N), \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with the same sparse component \mathbb{P}_0 in each equation and with the following hierarchical construction as previously explained,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\sim \delta_{\{(0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)\}}(d(\mu, \gamma, \tau)), \\ \mathbb{P}_l(d\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{DP}(\tilde{\alpha}, G_0), \quad l = 1, \dots, N, \\ \pi_l &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{Be}(\pi_l | 1, \alpha_l), \quad l = 1, \dots, N, \\ (\gamma_0, \tau_0) &\sim g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0), \\ G_0 &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu | c, d) \times g(\gamma, \tau | \nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\delta_{\{\boldsymbol{\psi}_0\}}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ denotes the Dirac measure indicating that the random vector $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ has a degenerate distribution with mass at the location $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$, and $g(\gamma_0, \tau_0)$ is the conjugate joint prior distribution (see Miller (1980)) with density

$$g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \propto \tau_0^{\nu_0 \gamma_0 - 1} p_0^{\gamma_0 - 1} \exp\{-s_0 \tau_0\} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)^{n_0}}, \quad (10)$$

and hyperparameters fixed such that $\nu_0 > 0$, $p_0 > 0$, $s_0 > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$. From Miller (1980), we construct the gamma two-parameters $g(\gamma, \tau) = g(\tau | \gamma)g(\gamma)$, where $g(\tau | \gamma) \sim \mathcal{Ga}(\nu_0 \gamma, s_0)$ and we marginalized out such that:

$$g(\gamma) = \int_0^\infty g(\gamma, \tau) d\tau = C \frac{\Gamma(\nu_0 \gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma)^{n_0}} \frac{p_0^{\gamma-1}}{s_0^{\nu_0 \gamma}}, \quad (11)$$

$$g(\tau | \gamma) = \frac{g(\gamma, \tau)}{g(\gamma)} = \frac{\tau^{\nu_0 \gamma - 1} e^{-s_0 \tau}}{\Gamma(\nu_0 \gamma)} s_0^{\nu_0 \gamma}, \quad (12)$$

with a normalizing constant C such that $1 = \int_0^\infty g(\gamma) d\gamma$. Based on MacLehose and Dunson (2010) and on our computational experiments, we assume the following

parameter setting for the sparse and nonsparse component in the gamma two parameters distribution, $g(\gamma, \tau)$,

$$\begin{aligned} v_0 = 30 \quad s_0 = 1/30 \quad p_0 = 0.5 \quad n_0 = 18, \\ v_1 = 3 \quad s_1 = 1/3 \quad p_1 = 0.5 \quad n_1 = 10. \end{aligned}$$




Figure 1: Probability density function $f(\gamma)$ for sparse ($v_0 = 30, s_0 = 1/30, p_0 = 0.5, n_0 = 18$, dashed line) and nonsparse ($v_1 = 3, s_1 = 1/3, p_1 = 0.5, n_1 = 10$, solid line) case.

As described in the hierarchical prior representations in (8) and in (9), with probability π (distributed as a beta²) a coefficient, β_j is shrunk toward zero as in standard lasso, while with probability $(1 - \pi)$ the coefficient is distributed as a $DP(\tilde{\alpha}, G_0)$. The amount of shrinkage is determined by the shape and scale parameter (γ, τ) , which moves as a two-parameters gamma (Miller (1980)).

The Dirichlet Process, $DP(\tilde{\alpha}, G_0)$, can be defined by using the stick-breaking representation (Sethuraman (1994)) given by:

$$\mathbb{P}_l(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} w_{lj} \delta_{\{\theta_{lj}\}}(\cdot) \quad l = 1, \dots, N. \quad (13)$$

Following the definition of the dependent stick-breaking processes, proposed by MacEachern (1999) and MacEachern (2001) the atoms θ_{lj} and the weights w_{lj} (for $l = 1, \dots, N$) are stochastically independent and satisfy the following hypothesis:

- θ_{lj} is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sequence of random elements with common probability distribution G_0 ($\theta_{lj} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} G_0$);

²The beta distribution for x ($x \sim \mathcal{Be}(a, b)$) used in this paper is parametrized as follows:

$$f(x|a, b) = \frac{1}{B(a, b)} x^{a-1} (1-x)^{b-1} \mathbb{I}_{[0,1]}(x)$$

where $B(a, b) = \Gamma(a)\Gamma(b)/\Gamma(a+b)$ and $a, b > 0$

- the weights (w_{lj}) are determined through the stick-breaking construction for $j > 1$, while for $j = 1$ $w_{l1} = v_{l1}$:

$$w_{lj} = v_{lj} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - v_{lk}) \quad l = 1, \dots, N$$

with $v_j = (v_{1j}, \dots, v_{Nj})$ independent random variables taking values in $[0, 1]^N$ distributed as a $\mathcal{Be}(1, \tilde{\alpha})$ such that $\sum_{j \geq 1} w_{lj} = 1$ almost surely for every $l = 1, \dots, N$.

After this definition, we are able to construct a random density function $f(\beta|\mathbb{P})$ based on an infinite mixture representation similar to the well known Dirichlet process mixture model (Lo (1984)):

$$f_l(\beta|\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_l) = \int K(\beta|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_l(d\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (14)$$

where $K(\beta|\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is a density for each $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, the so called density kernel and $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_l$ is a random measure. In our paper, the density kernel is defined as $K(\beta|\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})$. Following the definition of the density kernel and using the representation as infinite mixture, we have that, for each $l = 1, \dots, N$, the equation (14) has the following representation

$$\begin{aligned} f_l(\beta|\mathbb{Q}_l) &= \pi_l f(\beta|\mathbb{P}_0) + (1 - \pi_l) f(\beta|\mathbb{P}_l) = \pi_l \int \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \mathbb{P}_0(d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})) \\ &\quad + (1 - \pi_l) \int \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \mathbb{P}_l(d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})) \\ &= \pi_l \mathcal{NG}(\beta|0, \gamma_0, \tau_0) + (1 - \pi_l) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_{lk} \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu_{lk}, \gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \check{w}_{lk} \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\check{\theta}_{lk}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\check{w}_{lk} = \begin{cases} \pi_l, & k = 0 \\ (1 - \pi_l) w_{lk}, & k > 0 \end{cases} \quad \check{\theta}_{lk} = \begin{cases} (0, \gamma_0, \tau_0), & k = 0 \\ (\mu_{lk}, \gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}), & k > 0. \end{cases}$$

As regards to the choice of the prior for Σ , we model it by considering its restrictions induced by a graphical model structuring. A graph G is defined by the pair (L, E) , where L is the vertex set and E is the edge-set, or the set of linkages. In our case the prior over the graph structure is defined as a Bernoulli distribution with parameter ψ , which is the probability of having an edge. That is, a m node graph $G = (L, E)$, with $|L|$ the cardinality of the set of nodes and with $|E|$ edges has a prior probability:

$$p(G) \propto \prod_{i,j} \psi^{e_{ij}} (1 - \psi)^{(1-e_{ij})} = \psi^{|E|} (1 - \psi)^{T-|E|}, \quad (15)$$

with $e_{ij} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in E$ and $\binom{|T|+|L|}{2}$ is the maximum number of edges, while to induce sparsity we choose $\psi = 2/(p-1)$ which would provide a prior mode at p edges. Conditional on a specified graph G we assume a Hyper Inverse Wishart prior distribution for Σ that is:

$$\Sigma \sim \mathcal{HIW}_G(b, L), \quad (16)$$

where b means the degrees of freedom and L is the scale hyperparameters. The density function of the \mathcal{HIW} is represented in the Appendix A.

3 Computational details

In this section we will develop a Gibbs sampler algorithm in order to approximate the posterior distribution. For simplicity of notations we will focus on the bivariate case, $N = 2$ and consequently $l = 1, 2$, and, without loss of generality, we can extend the following representation to the multivariate case.

First of all, we focus on the slice latent variables for $l = 1, 2$ through the introduction of the latent variables, $u_{lj}, j = 1, \dots, r_1$, for f_l , which allows us to write the infinite mixture model in an easy way. Hence we represent the full conditional of β_{1j} as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\beta_{1j}, u_{1j} | (\mu_1, \gamma_1, \tau_1), w_1) &= \pi_1 \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < \tilde{w}_{1k}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{1j} | (0, \gamma_{1k}, \tau_{1k})) + \\ &+ (1 - \pi_1) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < w_{1k}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{1j} | \mu_{1k}, \gamma_{1k}, \tau_{1k}) \\ &= \pi_1 \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < \tilde{w}_0) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{1j} | (0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)) + \\ &+ (1 - \pi_1) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < w_{1k}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{1j} | \mu_{1k}, \gamma_{1k}, \tau_{1k}), \end{aligned}$$

where we introduce a variable \tilde{w}_{1k} such that we can apply the slice sampler and then we assume $\tilde{w}_{1k} = \tilde{w}_0 = 1$ if $k = 0$ and $\tilde{w}_{1k} = 0$ for $k > 0$ and, for simplicity of notations, we denote $(0, \gamma_{1,0}, \tau_{1,0}) = (0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)$.

Moving to the density function f_2 , we introduce the latent variables $u_{2j}, j = 1, \dots, r_2$, which allows us to write the following density:

$$\begin{aligned} f_2(\beta_{2j}, u_{2j} | (\mu_2, \gamma_2, \tau_2), w_2) &= \pi_2 \mathbb{I}(u_{2j} < \tilde{w}_0) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{2j} | (0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)) + \\ &+ (1 - \pi_2) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}(u_{2j} < w_{2k}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{2j} | \mu_{2k}, \gamma_{2k}, \tau_{2k}). \end{aligned}$$

The introduction of the slice variables (u_{1j}, u_{2j}) allows us to reduce the dimensionality of the problem from a mixture with an infinite number of components to a similar finite mixture model. In particular, letting

$$\mathcal{A}_{w_1}(u_{1j}) = \{k : u_{1j} < w_{1k}\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_1,$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{w_2}(u_{2j}) = \{k : u_{2j} < w_{2k}\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, r_2,$$

then it can be proved that the cardinality of the sets $(\mathcal{A}_{w_1}, \mathcal{A}_{w_2})$ is almost surely finite.

Therefore, we express f_1 and f_2 as an augmented random joint probability density function for β_{1j}, β_{2j} and u_{1j}, u_{2j}

$$\begin{aligned} f_l(\beta_{lj}, u_{lj} | (\mu_l, \gamma_l, \tau_l), w_l) &= \pi_l \mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < \tilde{w}_0) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{lj} | 0, \gamma_0, \tau_0) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_l) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_{w_l}(u_{lj})} \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{lk}, \gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}). \end{aligned}$$

We iterate the data augmentation principle for each f_l (with $l = 1, 2$) through the introduction of two auxiliary variables, the latent variables δ_{lj} ($j = 1, \dots, r_l$) and the allocation variables d_{lj} ($j = 1, \dots, r_l$). The first variable described above selects one of the two random measures \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_l , hence, when δ_{lj} is equal to one, we choose the sparse component \mathbb{P}_0 , while if it is zero, we choose the nonsparse component \mathbb{P}_l and we need to introduce the allocation variables. The second variable of interest, d_{lj} , selects the components of the Dirichlet mixture \mathbb{P}_l to which each single coefficient β_{lj} is allocated to. Then the density function can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} f_l(\beta_{lj}, u_{lj}, d_{lj}, \delta_{lj}) &= \left(\mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < \tilde{w}_{d_{lj}}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{lj} | 0, \gamma_0, \tau_0) \right)^{1-\delta_{lj}} \times \\ &\left(\mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < w_{ld_{lj}}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{ld_{lj}}, \gamma_{ld_{lj}}, \tau_{ld_{lj}}) \right)^{\delta_{lj}} \pi_l^{1-\delta_{lj}} (1 - \pi_l)^{\delta_{lj}}. \end{aligned}$$

From (5), we demarginalize the Normal-Gamma distribution by introducing a latent variable λ_{lj} for each β_{lj} such that the joint distribution has the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned} f_l(\beta_{lj}, \lambda_{lj}, u_{lj}, d_{lj}, \delta_{lj}) &= \\ &= \left(\mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < \tilde{w}_{d_{lj}}) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | 0, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_0, \tau_0/2) \right)^{1-\delta_{lj}} \times \\ &\left(\mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < w_{ld_{lj}}) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{ld_{lj}}, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_{ld_{lj}}, \tau_{ld_{lj}}/2) \right)^{\delta_{lj}} \pi_l^{1-\delta_{lj}} (1 - \pi_l)^{\delta_{lj}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we describe the joint posterior distribution based on the distribution previously defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} f(\Theta, \Sigma, \Lambda, U, D, V, \Delta | Y) &\propto \\ &\prod_{t=1}^T (2\pi |\Sigma|)^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) \times \\ &\prod_{j=1}^{r_1} f_1(\beta_{1j}, \lambda_{1j}, u_{1j}, d_{1j}, \delta_{1j}) \prod_{j=1}^{r_2} f_2(\beta_{2j}, \lambda_{2j}, u_{2j}, d_{2j}, \delta_{2j}) \times \\ &\prod_{k>1} \mathcal{Be}(v_{1k} | 1, \alpha) \mathcal{Be}(v_{2k} | 1, \alpha) \mathcal{HWW}_G(b, L) \times g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \times \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

$$\prod_{k>1} \mathcal{N}(\mu_{1k}|c, d)g(\gamma_{1k}, \tau_{1k}|\nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1)\mathcal{N}(\mu_{2k}|c, d)g(\gamma_{2k}, \tau_{2k}|\nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1).$$

The distribution defined in (17) is not tractable thus we apply Gibbs sampling to draw random numbers from it. We use the notation $U = \{u_{lj} : j = 1, 2, \dots, r_l \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$, $V = \{v_{lj} : j = 1, 2, \dots \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ to describe the latent variables and the stick-breaking components; $D = \{d_{lj} : j = 1, 2, \dots, r_l \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ and $\Delta = \{\delta_{lj} : j = 1, 2, \dots, r_l \text{ and } l = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ to describe the new variables that we have introduced in this section. The Gibbs sampler iterates over the following steps using the conditional independence between the different variables as seen in the appendix:

1. The stick-breaking and the latent variables U, V are updated given $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
2. The latent variable Λ is updated given $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, U, V, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
3. The parameters of the Normal-Gamma distribution Θ are updated given $[\beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
4. The coefficients β of the SUR model are updated given $[\Theta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
5. The matrix of variance-covariance Σ is updated given $[\Theta, \beta, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
6. The Graph G is updated given $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Delta, \pi, Y]$;
7. The allocation and the latent variables D, Δ are updated given $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, \pi, Y]$;
8. The probability of being sparse π is updated given $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Delta, Y]$.

The full conditional distributions of the Gibbs sampler and the sampling methods are discussed in Appendix A.

4 Simulation experiments

This section illustrates the performance of our Bayesian nonparametric sparse model with simulated data. We generate different datasets sample size $T = 100$ from a VAR model with lag $p = 1$:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = B\mathbf{y}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, 100,$$

where the dimension of \mathbf{y}_t and of the square matrix of coefficients B takes different values, $m = 20$ (small dimension), $m = 40$ (medium dimension), $m = 80$ (big dimension). Furthermore, the matrix of coefficients has different construction, from a block-diagonal to a random form, as follows:

	mean	mode
$m = 20$	9.48	9
$m = 40$	12.32	12
$m = 80$ (random)	11.49	11
$m = 80$ (blocks)	11.29	12

Table 1: Summary statistics of the number of clusters with different dimensions m .

- if $m = 20$, the matrix of coefficients $B = \text{diag}\{B_1, \dots, B_5\} \in \mathcal{M}_{(20,20)}$ is a block-diagonal matrix with blocks B_j ($j = 1, \dots, 5$) of (4×4) matrices on the main diagonal:

$$B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11,j} & \dots & b_{14,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{41,j} & \dots & b_{44,j} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the elements are randomly taken from an uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-1.4, 1.4)$ and then checked for the stationarity conditions;

- if $m = 40$, the matrix of coefficients $B = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_{10})$ is a block-diagonal matrix with blocks B_j of (4×4) matrices on the main diagonal:

$$B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11,j} & \dots & b_{14,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{41,j} & \dots & b_{44,j} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the elements are randomly taken from an uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-1.4, 1.4)$ and then checked for the stationarity conditions;

- if $m = 80$, we analyse two different situations, when
 - the matrix of coefficients $B = \text{diag}(B_1, \dots, B_{20})$ is a block-diagonal matrix with blocks B_j of (4×4) matrices on the main diagonal:

$$B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11,j} & \dots & b_{14,j} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ b_{41,j} & \dots & b_{44,j} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the elements are randomly taken from an uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-1.4, 1.4)$ and then checked for the stationarity conditions;

- the (80×80) matrix of coefficients has 150 elements randomly chosen from an uniform distribution $\mathcal{U}(-1.4, 1.4)$ and then checked for the stationarity conditions.

For all the cases, we run the Gibbs sampler algorithm described in Section 3 and sample from the posterior distribution via Monte Carlo methods with 5,000 iterations and a burn-in period of 500 iterations. Furthermore, we have chosen the

hyperparameters for the sparse and non-sparse components as in Section 2.1 and the hyperparameters of the Hyper-inverse Wishart as in Section 2.1, where the degree of freedom is $b_0 = 3$ and the scale matrix $L = \mathbb{I}_n$. Figure 2 and B.1 show the histograms for the posterior distribution of the number of clusters for each sample sizes, the comparison between the construction of our simulated outputs and the posterior of the number of clusters highlights the good fit of our Bayesian nonparametric hierarchical model, which is also confirmed by the mean and the mode of the number of cluster for every sample sizes (see Table 1).




Figure 2: Posterior distribution of the number of clusters for $m = 20$ (left) and for $m = 40$ (right).

Focusing on the posterior of the matrix of coefficients B , the proportion of elements whose true simulated values fall inside their 95% credible intervals is 0.96 (for $m = 20$), 0.983 (for $m = 40$), 0.9939 (for $m = 80$ in the block case) and 0.998 (for $m = 80$ in the random element case). We can compute the number of zeroes in the true simulated B , which are 325 ($m = 20$), 1452 ($m = 40$), 6105 and 6261 for $m = 80$ in the block and in the randomly case, respectively. If we compare these values with the posterior number of zeroes in the matrix B , which are 335 (for $m = 20$), 1461 (for $m = 40$), 6102 and 6192 for $m = 80$ in the block and in the randomly case, we have that the differences between them are small, which allows us to consider our approach feasible for the inference of sparse and nonsparse components.

Figure 3 and B.2 explain the posterior mean of the matrix of δ , which shows us the choice of the components between the two random measures \mathbb{P}_0 and \mathbb{P}_l . In particular, we have that the white color explains if the coefficient δ is equal to zero (i.e. sparse component), while the black one if the δ is equal to one, for nonsparse components. The representation in Figure 3 and B.2 correctly explain the sparsity in the matrix of coefficients through the definition of the matrix of the latent variable δ . In order to identificate the mixture components, we apply the least square clustering method proposed originally in Dahl (2006). The method is based on the choice of the nonsparse components and on the posterior pairwise probabilities of joint




Figure 3: Posterior mean of the matrix of δ for $m = 20$ (left) and for $m = 40$ (right)

classification $P(D_i = D_j|Y, \delta = 1)$. To estimate this matrix, we use the following pairwise probability matrix:

$$P_{ij} = \frac{1}{M_j} \sum_{l=1}^{M_j} \delta_{D_i^l}(D_j^l)$$

where we use every pair of allocation variables D_i^l and D_j^l , with $i, j = 1, \dots, T_{\text{nsp}}$, T_{nsp} is the number of nonsparse component and $l = 1, \dots, M_j$, where M_j is the number of MCMC iterations. We can detect the presence of different clusters from the co-clustering matrix based on the location atom, μ , generated at each iteration of the MCMC method and build up from the least square marginal clustering. The procedure is the clustering D^l sampled at the l -th iteration which minimizes the sum of squared deviations from the pairwise posterior probability:

$$l = \arg \min_{l \in \{1, \dots, M\}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\delta_{D_i^l}(D_j^l) - P_{ij} \right)^2$$

The definition of the pairwise posterior probabilities and of the co-clustering matrix for the atom locations μ allows us to build the weighted networks (see Figure 4 and Figure B.3), where the blue edges represent negative weights, while the red ones represent the positive weights. The curved edges follow a clockwise relations, which means that a node A is related to a node B if there is a clockwise curved edge between them and it allows us to explain the presence of different cliques in each simulated examples. As known, the representation with block matrices confirms the presence of different cliques, e.g. for $n = 20$ exactly 5 cliques, while increasing the dimensionality, augment the number of cliques.

We compare our prior with the Bayesian Lasso (Park and Casella (2008)), the Elastic-net (Zou and Hastie (2005)) and to a prior for imposing restrictions on the VAR based on Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) of George et al. (2008). For the




Figure 4: Weighted network for $m = 20$ (left) and for $m = 40$ (right), where the blue edges means negative weights and red ones represent positive weights.

SSVS, we use the default hyperparameters $\tau_1^2 = 0.0001$, $\tau_2^2 = 4$ and $\pi = 0.5$. We use the mean absolute deviation (MAD, Korobilis (2016)) for looking at the performance of the five different priors: our Bayesian nonparametric prior (BNP), Bayesian Lasso (B-Lasso), Elastic-net (E-Net), SSVS and OLS, unrestriced estimator, equivalent to diffuse prior.

If $\hat{\beta}$ is an estimate of B based on the five priors and $\tilde{\beta}$ is it true value from the DGP,

$$\text{MAD} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left| Z_k \hat{\beta}_k - Z_k \tilde{\beta}_k \right|$$

where n denotes the number of VAR coefficients and Z_k is the k -th column of $Z = (I_m \otimes \mathbf{x}')$. Table 2 shows that the best performance is obtained from our prior for each dimension m and all the priors are performing well related to OLS.

	BNP	B-Lasso	E-net	SSVS	OLS
$m = 20$	0.228	0.2513	0.2582	0.2938	0.3382
$m = 40$	0.2663	0.3145	0.3143	0.401	0.4835
$m = 80$ (random)	0.2294	0.3011	0.2951	0.5413	0.7048
$m = 80$ (block)	0.2916	0.3773	0.3743	0.5633	0.7290

Table 2: Mean absolute deviation statistics for different m .

5 Measuring contagion effects

We apply the proposed Bayesian nonparametric sparse model to a macroeconomic dataset and, following Diebold and Yilmaz (2015), we extract network structures to investigate the role of contagion effects between different cycles and the possible relations between GDP of different countries. Furthermore, we study the transmission of shocks and contagion between different countries at different lags.

Following the literature on international business cycles in large models (Kose et al., 2003, 2010; Del Negro and Otrok, 2008) we use a multi-country macroeconomic dataset to study the role of contagion effects between different cycles in the panel, while Francis et al. (2012) and Kaufmann and Schumacher (2012) investigate the role of global business cycles for many different countries in large factor models.

For our analysis, we use a VAR(p), with quarterly lags of interest ($p = 4$) and focus on the GDP growth rate, which is the first difference of the logarithm of each GDP series. We consider a dataset of the most important OECD countries, which will be described below, from the first quarter of 1961 to the second quarter of 2015 for a total of $T = 215$ observations.

Due to missing values in the GDP time series of some countries, we choose a subset of all the OECD countries, which is formed by the most industrialised countries, and in particular we focus on two big macroareas, the European one and the rest of the world, where the latter is formed by the countries from Asia, Oceania, North and Central America and Africa. Hereafter, we describe more in details the two macroareas:

- Rest of the World - Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico, South Africa, Turkey, United States;
- Europe - Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom;

Based on our empirical and computational experiments (see Section 4), we run the Gibbs sampling algorithm described in Section 3 for 10,000 iterations with a burn-in period of 1,000 iterations adopting the same priors of the simulation studies. The location of the posterior mode (value equals to 3) of the histograms in Figure 5 allows us to conclude that following our approach there is evidence in favour of three type of macroeconomic contagion effects between the countries in our panel. Figure 5 shows the MCMC samples for the probability of being sparse, π , which has posterior mean 0.87 providing evidence of high sparsity in the model.

Figure 6 shows the pairwise posterior probabilities P_{ij} that two coefficients β_i and β_j belong to the same cluster. We can detect the presence of three different clusters as seen also from the co-clustering matrix based on the location atom, μ , generated at each iterations of the MCMC method.

Figure 7 draws the weighted networks of the GDP connectivity between different countries with respect to different time lags (a) $t - 1$, (b) $t - 2$, (c) $t - 3$ and (d) $t - 4$. As seen from Figure 6, we have three types of relation: "negative", "positive" and "strong positive". Figure 7 shows the weighted networks at each lag, where blue edges




Figure 5: Posterior distribution of the number of clusters for the macroeconomic application (left) and the posterior sample (right) for the probability of being sparse π .




Figure 6: Pairwise posterior probabilities for the clustering (left) and Co-clustering matrix for the atoms μ (right).

represent negative weights and red ones positive weights, and nodes' size is based on the node degree, which is its number of links to other nodes.

In terms of the dynamical structure of the directional connectedness received from other countries (out-degree) or transmitted to other countries (in-degree), we have:

- at lag $t - 1$ and $t - 2$, core European countries (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany, Netherlands) appears to be the countries that transmit the highest percentage of shocks, while the periphery European countries (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain) receive more shocks from other countries. In the other lags, core European countries receive and transmit highest percentage of shocks;
- at lag $t - 1$, Japan appears to be the country exposed at the risk of receiving the highest percentage of shocks from other countries, followed by Spain and Australia;
- at lag $t - 1$, Australia is the country that can transmit the highest percentage of

shocks to other countries, followed by France, Germany and United Kingdom;

- at lag $t - 2$, a shock to Greece, France and Austria turns out to have a bigger effect on the economy;
- at lag $t - 3$ and $t - 4$, Germany and Italy have the highest in-degree and Netherlands have the highest out-degree.

In terms of magnitude of the contagion effects, Figure 7 shows that:

- at lag $t - 1$, a majority of positive effects between countries is explained, in particular European countries have positive linkages;
- at other lags, negative effects between rest-of-the-world countries are shown. As regard, lag $t - 3$ and $t - 4$, European countries have positive effects between them, while existence of negative effects between the rest-of-the-world countries and European countries is shown.

As regards to the contagion effects, Table 3 and Figure 7 show the network statistics extracted from the four different graphs.

- the average path length represents the average graph-distance between all pair of nodes, where connected nodes have graph distance 1. Between all the lags, the average path length reaches its minimum value meaning a faster shock transmission at lag $t - 3$;
- the lag $t - 1$ is more dense graph, density of the graph (0.122), and has the highest number of links (73), which means an highest presence of contagion effects between countries.
- the average degree of networks shows the presence of connectedness and transmission of shocks between countries. At lag $t - 1$, the average degree is equal to 2.92, which mean a network with higher shocks transmission.

	Links	Avg Degree	Density	Avg Path length
$t - 1$	73	2.92	0.122	3.423
$t - 2$	45	1.80	0.075	3.211
$t - 3$	41	1.64	0.068	2.479
$t - 4$	52	2.08	0.087	2.718

Table 3: The network statistics for the 4 different lags. The average path length represents the average graph-distance between all pairs of nodes. Connected nodes have graph distance 1.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we propose a novel Bayesian nonparametric prior for SUR models, which allows shrinkage of SUR coefficients toward multiple locations and identification




Figure 7: Weighted contagion networks of GDP for OECD countries at lag: (a) $t - 1$, (b) $t - 2$, (c) $t - 3$, (d) $t - 4$, where blue edges represent negative weights and red ones positive weights. Nodes' size is based on the node degree.

of groups of coefficients. We introduce a two-stage hierarchical distribution, which consists in a hierarchical Dirichlet process on the parameters of the Normal-Gamma distribution.

The proposed hierarchical prior is used to proposed a Bayesian nonparametric model for SUR models. We provide an efficient Monte Carlo Markov Chain algorithm for the posterior computations and the effectiveness of this algorithm is assesed in simulation and real data exercises.

These simulation studies illustrate the good performance of our model with different sample sizes and different constructions of the matrix of coefficients compared to existing priors in the literature.

The application to the GDP growth rates in OECD countries allows us to extract network structures from panel data and to cluster the network edges between panel units.

We measure contagion effects and the magnitude of them through network structures. In details, in terms of directional connectedness, we study the transmission of shocks from and to other countries at different lags.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all the conference participants for helpful discussions at: “9th Annual RCEA Bayesian Econometric Workshop” in Rimini; “Joint PhD Workshop Economics and Management” and “Internal Seminar” at Ca’ Foscari University of Venice; “Statistics Seminar” at University of Kent; “9th CFE” in London; “ISBA 2016 World Meeting” in Sardinia; “3rd BAYSM” at University of Florence and “7th ESOBE” at Ca’ Foscari University. We would like to thank also Stefano Tonellato, Dimitris Korobilis and Conception Ausin for their valuable comments to the manuscript and their constructive suggestions.

References

- Abramowitz, M., Stegun, I. A., 1972. Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables. Dover, New York.
- Acharya, V. V., Engle, R., Richardson, M., 2012. Capital shortfall: A new approach to ranking and regulating systemic risks. *American Economic Review* 102, 59–64.
- Ahelgebey, D. F., Billio, M., Casarin, R., 2015. Bayesian graphical models for structural vector autoregressive processes. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* Forthcoming.
- Ahelgebey, D. F., Billio, M., Casarin, R., 2016. Sparse graphical vector autoregression: A bayesian approach. *Annals of Economics and Statistics* Forthcoming.
- Andrews, D., Mallows, C., 1974. Scale mixtures of normal distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 36, 99–102.

- Banbura, M., Giannone, D., Reichlin, L., 2010. Large Bayesian vector autoregressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 25, 71–92.
- Barigozzi, M., Brownlees, C., 2016. NETS: Network estimation for time series. Working Paper.
- Bassetti, F., Casarin, R., Leisen, F., 2014. Beta-product dependent Pitman-Yor processes for Bayesian inference. *Journal of Econometrics* 180, 49–72.
- Bianchi, D., Billio, M., Casarin, R., Guidolin, M., 2015. Modeling contagion and systemic risk. Working Paper.
- Billio, M., Getmansky, M., Lo, A. W., Pelizzon, L., 2012. Econometric measures of connectedness and systemic risk in the finance and insurance sectors. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 104, 535–559.
- Brownlees, C., Engle, R., 2016. SRISK: A conditional capital shortfall measure of systemic risk. *The Review of Financial Studies* Forthcoming.
- Canova, F., Ciccarelli, M., 2004. Forecasting and turning point prediction in a Bayesian panel VAR model. *Journal of Econometrics* 120(2), 327–359.
- Carriero, A., Clark, T., Marcellino, M., 2013. Bayesian VARs: specification choices and forecast accuracy. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 25, 400–417.
- Chib, S., Greenberg, E., 1995. Hierarchical analysis of SUR models with extensions to correlated serial errors and time-varying parameter models. *Journal of Econometrics* 68, 339–360.
- Chib, S., Hamilton, B. H., 2002. Semiparametric Bayes analysis of longitudinal data treatment models. *Journal of Econometrics* 110, 67–89.
- Dagpunar, J., 1988. *Principles of Random Variate Generation*. Clarendon Oxford Science Publications.
- Dagpunar, J., 1989. An easily implemented generalised inverse Gaussian generator. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 18 (2), 703–710.
- Dahl, D. B., 2006. Model-based clustering for expression data via a Dirichlet process mixture model. In: Do, K.-A., Müller, P. P., Vannucci, M. (Eds.), *Bayesian Inference for Gene Expression and Proteomics*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 201–218.
- Del Negro, M., Otrok, C., 2008. *Dynamic factor models with time-varying parameters: measuring changes in international business cycles*. Fed New York.
- Demirer, M., Diebold, F. X., Liu, L., Yilmaz, K., 2015. Estimating global bank network connectedness. Manuscript MIT, University of Pennsylvania and Koc University.

- Devroye, L., 2014. Random variate generation for the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution. *Statistics and Computing* 24 (2), 239–246.
- Diebold, F. X., Yilmaz, K., 2014. On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *Journal of Econometrics* 182, 119–134.
- Diebold, F. X., Yilmaz, K., 2015. *Measuring the Dynamics of Global Business Cycle Connectedness*. Oxford University Press, pp. 45–89.
- Diebold, F. X., Yilmaz, K., 2016. Trans-atlantic equity volatility connectedness: U.s. and european trans-atlantic equity volatility connectedness: U.s. and european financial institutions, 2004–2014. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 14, 81–127.
- Doan, T., Litterman, R., Sims, C. A., 1984. Forecasting and conditional projection using realistic prior distributions. *Econometric Reviews* 3, 1–100.
- Escobar, M. D., West, M., 1995. Bayesian density estimation and inference using mixtures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90, 577–588.
- Ferguson, T. S., 1973. A Bayesian analysis of some nonparametric problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 1, 209–230.
- Francis, N., Owyang, M., Savascin, O., 2012. An endogenously clustered factor approach to international business cycles. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Working Paper.
- Gefang, D., 2014. Bayesian doubly adaptive elastic-net lasso for var shrinkage. *International Journal of Forecasting* 30, 1–11.
- George, E. I., Sun, D., Ni, S., 2008. Bayesian stochastic search for var model restrictions. *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 553–580.
- Giudici, P., Green, P., 1999. Decomposable graphical Gaussian model determination. *Biometrika* 86, 758–801.
- Griffin, J., Brown, P., 2006. Alternative prior distributions for variable selection with very many more variables than observations. Tech. rep., University of Warwick.
- Griffin, J. E., 2011. Inference in infinite superpositions of non-Gaussian Ornstein-Uhlenbeck processes using Bayesian nonparametric methods. *Journal of Financial Econometrics* 1, 1–31.
- Griffin, J. E., Steel, M. F. J., 2006. Order-based dependent Dirichlet processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101, 179–194.
- Griffin, J. E., Steel, M. F. J., 2011. Stick-breaking autoregressive processes. *Journal of Econometrics* 162, 383–396.

- Halphen, E., 1941. Sur un nouveau type de courbe de frequence. *Comptes Rendus des seances de l'Academie des Sciences*.
- Hatjispyros, S. J., Nicolieris, T. N., Walker, S. G., 2011. Dependent mixtures of Dirichlet processes. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 55, 2011–2025.
- Hirano, K., 2002. Semiparametric Bayesian inference in autoregressive panel data models. *Econometrica* 70(2), 781–799.
- Hjort, N. L., Holmes, C., Müller, P., Walker, S. G., 2010. *Bayesian Nonparametrics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoermann, W., Leydold, J., February 2013. Generating Generalized Inverse Gaussian random variates. *Research Report Series*.
- Jensen, J. M., Maheu, M. J., 2010. Bayesian semiparametric stochastic volatility modeling. *Journal of Econometrics* 157, 306–316.
- Jochmann, M., 2015. Modeling U.S. inflation dynamics: A Bayesian nonparametric approach. *Econometric Reviews* 34 (5), 537–558.
- Jones, B., Carvalho, C., Dobra, A., Hans, C., Carter, C., West, M., 2005. Experiments in stochastic computation for high-dimensional graphical models. *Statistical Science*, 388–400.
- Kalli, M., Griffin, J. E., Walker, S. G., 2011. Slice sampling mixture models. *Statistics and Computing* 21, 93–105.
- Kaufmann, S., 2010. Dating and forecasting turning points by Bayesian clustering with dynamic structure: a suggestion with an application to Austrian data. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 25, 309–344.
- Kaufmann, S., Schumacher, C., 2012. Finding relevant variables in sparse Bayesian factor models: economic applications and simulation results. *Discussion Paper Deutsche Bundesbank*.
- Koop, G., 2013. Forecasting with medium and large Bayesian VARs. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28, 177–203.
- Koop, G., Korobilis, D., 2010. Bayesian multivariate time series methods for empirical macroeconomics. *Foundations and Trends in Econometrics* 3, 267–358.
- Koop, G., Korobilis, D., 2015. Model uncertainty in panel vector autoregressions. *European Economic Review* 81, 115–131.
- Korobilis, D., 2013. VAR forecasting using Bayesian variable selection. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 28, 204–230.

- Korobilis, D., 2016. Prior selection for panel vector autoregressions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 101, 110–120.
- Kose, M. A., Otrok, C., Whiteman, C. H., 2003. International Business Cycles: World, region and country specific factors. *American Economic Review* 93, 1216–1239.
- Kose, M. A., Otrok, C., Whiteman, C. H., 2010. Understanding the evolution of world business cycles. *Journal of International Economics* 75, 110–130.
- Litterman, R., 1980. Techniques for forecasting with vector autoregressions. University of Minnesota, Ph.D. Dissertation.
- Litterman, R., 1986. Forecasting with Bayesian vector autoregressions-five years of experience. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 4, 25–38.
- Lo, A. Y., 1984. On a class of Bayesian nonparametric estimates: I. density estimates. *The Annals of Statistics* 12, 351–357.
- MacEachern, S. N., 1999. Dependent nonparametric processes. In: In ASA Proceedings of the Section on Bayesian Statistical Science, Alexandria, VA. American Statistical Association.
- MacEachern, S. N., 2001. Decision theoretic aspects of dependent nonparametric processes. In: George, E. (Ed.), *Bayesian Methods with Applications to Science, Policy and Official Statistics*. Creta: ISBA, pp. 551–560.
- MacEachern, S. N., Müller, P., 1998. Estimating mixtures of Dirichlet process models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 7, 223–238.
- MacLehose, R., Dunson, D., 2010. Bayesian semiparametric multiple shrinkage. *Biometrics* 66 (2), 455–462.
- Miller, R., 1980. Bayesian analysis of the two-parameter gamma distribution. *Technometrics* 22 (1).
- Min, C., Zellner, A., 1993. Bayesian and non-Bayesian methods for combining models and forecasts with applications to forecasting international growth rates. *Journal of Econometrics* 56, 89–118.
- Müller, P., Quintana, F., Rosner, G., 2004. A method for combining inference across related nonparametric Bayesian models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 66, 735–749.
- Papaspiliopoulos, O., Roberts, G., 2008. Retrospective Markov chain Monte Carlo for Dirichlet process hierarchical models. *Biometrika* 95, 169–186.
- Park, T., Casella, G., June 2008. The Bayesian Lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103 (482), 681–686.

- Rodriguez, A., ter Horst, E., 2008. Bayesian dynamics density estimation. *Bayesian Analysis* 3, 339–366.
- Scott, S. L., Varian, H. R., 2013. Predicting the present with Bayesian structural time series. *International Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation* 5 (1-2).
- Sethuraman, J., 1994. A constructive definition of the Dirichlet process prior. *Statistica Sinica* 2, 639–650.
- Sims, C. A., 1980. Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica* 48, 1–48.
- Sims, C. A., 1992. Interpreting the macroeconomic time series facts: The effects of monetary policy. *European Economic Review* 38, 975–1000.
- Sims, C. A., Zha, T., 1998. Bayesian methods for dynamic multivariate models. *International Economic Review* 39(4), 949–968.
- Stock, J. H., Watson, M. W., 2012. Generalized shrinkage methods for forecasting using many predictors. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 30 (4), 481–493.
- Taddy, M. A., 2010. An auto-regressive mixture model for dynamic spatial Poisson processes: Application to tracking the intensity of violent crime. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 105, 1403–1427.
- Tibshirani, R., 1996. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)*, 267–288.
- Walker, S. G., 2007. Sampling the Dirichlet mixture model with slices. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation* 36, 45–54.
- Wang, H., 2010. Sparse seemingly unrelated regression modelling: Applications in finance and econometrics. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 54 (11), 2866–2877.
- Zellner, A., 1962. An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests of aggregation bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 57, 500–509.
- Zellner, A., 1971. *An introduction to Bayesian inference in econometrics*. New York Wiley.
- Zou, H., Hastie, T., April 2005 2005. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 67, 301–320.
- Zou, H., Zhang, H. H., 2009. On the adaptive elastic-net with diverging number of parameters. *Annals of Statistics* 37, 1733–1751.

A Gibbs sampling details

We introduce the following notations, for $k \geq 1$, and $l = 1, 2$,

$$\mathcal{D}_{lk} = \{j \in 1, \dots, r_l : d_{lj} = k, \delta_{lj} = 1\},$$

$$\mathcal{D}^* = \{k | \mathcal{D}_{1k} \cup \mathcal{D}_{2k} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad D^* = \max_{l=1,2} \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, r_l\}} d_{lj},$$

where \mathcal{D}_k denotes the set of indexes of the coefficients allocated to the k -th component of the mixture and \mathcal{D}^* the set of indexes of the non-empty mixture components, while D^* is the number of stick-breaking components used in the mixture. As noted by Kalli et al. (2011), the sampling of infinitely many elements of Θ and V is not necessarily, since only the elements in the full conditional probability density functions of D, Δ are needed.

The maximum number of atoms and stick-breaking components to sample is $N^* = \max\{N_1^*, N_2^*\}$, where N_l^* is the smallest integer such that $\sum_{k=1}^{N_l^*} w_{lk} > 1 - u_l^*$, where $u_l^* = \min_{1 \leq j \leq r_l} \{u_{lj}\}$. In the following sections we explain in details all the steps of the Gibbs sampler, which is built on slice sampler algorithm (see Walker (2007) and Kalli et al. (2011)).

A.1 Update V,U

We treat V as three blocks of random length: $V = (V^*, V^{**}, V^{***})$, where

$$V^* = \{V_k : k \in \mathcal{D}^*\} = (v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kD^*}),$$

$$V^{**} = (v_{kD^*+1}, \dots, v_{kN^*}), \quad V^{***} = \{V_k : k > N^*\}.$$

In order to sample from the conditional distribution of (U, V) a further blocking is used:

- i) Sampling from the full conditional posterior distribution of V^* , is obtained by drawing v_{1k}, v_{2k} , with $k \leq D^*$ from the full conditionals

$$f(v_{1j} | \dots) \propto \mathcal{B}e \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \mathbb{I}(d_{1j} = d, \delta_{1j} = 1), \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \mathbb{I}(d_{1j} > d, \delta_{1j} = 1) \right),$$

$$f(v_{2j} | \dots) \propto \mathcal{B}e \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \mathbb{I}(d_{2j} = d, \delta_{2j} = 1), \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \mathbb{I}(d_{2j} > d, \delta_{2j} = 1) \right).$$

- ii) Sampling from the full conditional posterior distribution of U is obtain by simulating from, for $1 \leq j \leq r_1$,

$$f(u_{1j} | \dots) \propto \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < w_{1d_{1j}})^{\delta_{1j}} & \text{if } \delta_{1j} = 1, \\ \mathbb{I}(u_{1j} < 1)^{1-\delta_{1j}} & \text{if } \delta_{1j} = 0, \end{cases}$$

and, for $1 \leq j \leq r_2$,

$$f(u_{2j} | \dots) \propto \begin{cases} \mathbb{I}(u_{2j} < w_{2d_{2j}})^{\delta_{2j}} & \text{if } \delta_{2j} = 1, \\ \mathbb{I}(u_{2j} < 1)^{1-\delta_{2j}} & \text{if } \delta_{2j} = 0. \end{cases}$$

- iii) For (V^{**}, V^{***}) given $[\Theta, \Sigma, \Lambda, V^*, D, \Delta, Y]$, we need to sample only the elements of V^{**} from the prior distribution of the stick-breaking construction, that is, for each $l = 1, 2$,

$$f(v_{lj} | \dots) \propto \mathcal{B}e(1, \alpha).$$

A.2 Update the mixing parameters λ

We update the mixing parameters λ_{lj} ($l = 1, 2$), where the full conditional posterior distribution of λ_{lj} is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\lambda_{lj} | \dots) &\propto \lambda_{lj}^{-\frac{1}{2}(1-\delta_{lj})} \exp \left\{ \left(-\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \beta_{lj}^2 - \frac{\tau_0}{2} \lambda_{lj} \right) (1 - \delta_{lj}) \right\} \lambda_{lj}^{(\gamma_0-1)(1-\delta_{lj})} \times \\ &\times \lambda_{lj}^{-\frac{1}{2}\delta_{lj}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} (\beta_{lj} - \mu_{ld_{lj}})^2 \delta_{lj} \right\} \lambda_{lj}^{(\gamma_{ld_{lj}}-1)\delta_{lj}} \exp \left\{ \left(-\frac{\tau_{ld_{lj}}}{2} \lambda_{lj} \right) \delta_{lj} \right\} \\ &\propto \lambda_{lj}^{C_{lj}-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left[A_{lj} \lambda_{lj} + \frac{B_{lj}}{\lambda_{lj}} \right] \right\} \propto \mathcal{GiG}(A_{lj}, B_{lj}, C_{lj}), \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{GiG} stays for Generalize Inverse Gaussian of parameters $A_{lj} > 0$, $B_{lj} > 0$ and C_{lj} a real parameter (see Halphen (1941), Hoermann and Leydold (2013), Devroye (2014), Dagpunar (1988) and Dagpunar (1989)), which, in our case, are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} A_{lj} &= [(1 - \delta_{lj})\tau_0 + \delta_{lj}\tau_{ld_{lj}}], \quad B_{lj} = [(1 - \delta_{lj})\beta_{lj}^2 + \delta_{lj}(\beta_{lj} - \mu_{ld_{lj}})^2], \\ C_{lj} &= \left[(1 - \delta_{lj})\gamma_0 + \gamma_{ld_{lj}}\delta_{lj} - \frac{1}{2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We use the λ_{lj} just drawn for construct the matrix $\Lambda_l = \text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_l\}$, where $\text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_l\}$ returns a diagonal matrix with the elements of $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_l = (\lambda_{l1}, \dots, \lambda_{lr_l})'$ on the main diagonal. In practice we have two different matrix, $\Lambda_1 = \text{diag}\{\lambda_{11}, \dots, \lambda_{1r_1}\}$ and $\Lambda_2 = \text{diag}\{\lambda_{21}, \dots, \lambda_{2r_2}\}$.

A.3 Update Θ

We consider two different cases: the sparse one, where the parameters are $(\mu_0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)$, and the nonsparse case, where the parameters are $(\mu_k, \gamma_k, \tau_k)$, with $k \geq 1$. Since the prior for μ_0 has unit probability mass at 0, the full conditional distribution of μ_0 is $f(\mu_0 | \dots) = \delta_{\{0\}}(\mu_0)$. The full conditional distribution of the shape and scale parameters (γ_0, τ_0) is:

$$\begin{aligned} f((\gamma_0, \tau_0) | \dots) &\propto g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \prod_{j=1|\delta_{1j}=0}^{r_1} \left(\frac{(\tau_0/2)^{\gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)} \lambda_{1j}^{\gamma_0-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau_0}{2} \lambda_{1j} \right\} \right) \\ &\times \prod_{j=1|\delta_{2j}=0}^{r_2} \left(\frac{(\tau_0/2)^{\gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)} \lambda_{2j}^{\gamma_0-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau_0}{2} \lambda_{2j} \right\} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we assume that:

$$\begin{aligned} r_{1,0} &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} (1 - \delta_{1j}) = r_1 - r_{1,1}, & r_{1,1} &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_1} \delta_{1j}, \\ r_{2,0} &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} (1 - \delta_{2j}) = r_2 - r_{2,1}, & r_{2,1} &= \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} \delta_{2j}. \end{aligned}$$

The distribution in (A.1) has the same kernel of the prior distribution $g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \dots)$ given in (10), that is:

$$\begin{aligned} f((\gamma_0, \tau_0) | \dots) &\propto \tau_0^{\nu_0 \gamma_0 - 1} p_0^{\gamma_0 - 1} \exp\{-s_0 \tau_0\} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)^{n_0}} \times \\ &\times \frac{(\tau_0/2)^{r_{1,0} \gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)^{r_{1,0}}} \left(\prod_{j|\delta_{1j}=0} \lambda_{1j} \right)^{\gamma_0 - 1} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau_0}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{1j}=0} \lambda_{1j}\right\} \\ &\times \frac{(\tau_0/2)^{r_{2,0} \gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)^{r_{2,0}}} \left(\prod_{j|\delta_{2j}=0} \lambda_{2j} \right)^{\gamma_0 - 1} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau_0}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{2j}=0} \lambda_{2j}\right\} \\ &\propto g\left(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0 + r_{1,0} + r_{2,0}, p_0 \prod_{j|\delta_{1j}=0} \lambda_{1j} \prod_{j|\delta_{2j}=0} \lambda_{2j}, \right. \\ &\quad \left. s_0 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{1j}=0} \lambda_{1j} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{2j}=0} \lambda_{2j}, n_0 + r_{1,0} + r_{2,0}\right). \end{aligned}$$

In order to draw samples from g we apply here a collapsed Gibbs sampler. Samples from $f(\gamma)$ are obtained by a Metropolis-Hastings (MH) algorithm with the prior as proposal, we start with a value of $\gamma^* \sim \mathcal{Ga}(1/2, 2)$, we remind $q(\gamma)$ is the probability density function of γ and is distributed as a $\mathcal{Ga}(1/2, 2)$. The acceptance probability of the MH step is:

$$\alpha(\gamma^*, \gamma_{\text{old}}) = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{f(\gamma^*)q(\gamma_{\text{old}})}{f(\gamma_{\text{old}})q(\gamma^*)} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

The MH chain updates as follows:

$$\gamma_{\text{new}} = \begin{cases} \gamma_{\text{old}} & \text{if } u > \alpha(\gamma^*, \gamma_{\text{old}}), \\ \gamma^* & \text{if } u \leq \alpha(\gamma^*, \gamma_{\text{old}}), \end{cases}$$

where u is a random number from a standard uniform. Samples from the conditional $f(\tau | \gamma)$ are easily obtained since $f(\tau | \gamma)$ is a Gamma distribution.

In the nonsparse case, we generate samples $(\mu_{lk}, \gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk})$, $k = 1, \dots, N^*$, $l = 1, 2$, by applying a single move Gibbs sampler with full conditional distributions $f(\mu_{lk} | \dots)$ and $f(\gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk} | \dots)$. The full conditional

$$f(\mu_{lk} | \dots) \propto \mathcal{N}(\mu_{lk} | c, d) \prod_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{lk}, \lambda_{lj})$$

$$\propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2d} (\mu_{lk} - c)^2 \right\} \prod_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi \lambda_{lj}}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\lambda_{lj}} (\beta_{lj} - \mu_{lk})^2 \right\}$$

$$\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2d} (\mu_{lk} - c)^2 - \sum_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \frac{1}{2\lambda_{lj}} (\beta_{lj} - \mu_{lk})^2 \right\}$$

is proportional to the normal $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{E}_k, \tilde{V}_k)$ with parameters $\tilde{E}_k = \tilde{V}_k \left(\frac{c}{d} + \sum_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \frac{\beta_{lj}}{\lambda_{lj}} \right)$ and $\tilde{V}_k = \left(\frac{1}{d} + \sum_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \frac{1}{\lambda_{lj}} \right)^{-1}$.

On the other hand, the joint conditional posterior of (γ_{lk}, τ_{lk}) is:

$$f((\gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}) | \dots) \propto g(\gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk} | \nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1) \prod_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \left(\frac{(\tau_{lk}/2)^{\gamma_{lk}}}{\Gamma(\gamma_{lk})} \lambda_{lj}^{\gamma_{lk}-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau_{lk}}{2} \lambda_{lj} \right\} \right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where we have defined $r_{l,1k} = \sum_{j=1}^{r_l} \delta_{lj} \mathbb{I}(d_{lj} = k)$. Hence (A.3) can be reduced as

$$f((\gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}) | \dots) \propto \tau_{lk}^{\nu_1 \gamma_{lk} - 1} p_1^{\gamma_{lk} - 1} \exp\{-s_1 \tau_{lk}\} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma_{lk})^{n_1}} \times$$

$$\times \frac{(\tau_{lk}/2)^{r_{l,1k} \gamma_{lk}}}{\Gamma(\gamma_{lk})^{r_{l,1k}}} \left(\prod_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \lambda_{lj} \right)^{\gamma_{lk} - 1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{\tau_{lk}}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \lambda_{lj} \right\}$$

$$\propto g \left(\gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk} | \nu_1 + r_{l,1k}, p_1 \prod_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \lambda_{lj}, s_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j|\delta_{lj}=1, d_{lj}=k} \lambda_{lj}, n_1 + r_{l,1k} \right),$$

for $k \in \mathcal{D}^*$ and from the prior G_0 for $k \notin \mathcal{D}^*$. As in the sparse case, we apply a MH algorithm, with the acceptance probability as described in (A.2).

A.4 Update β

The full conditional posterior distribution of β is:

$$f(\beta_l | \dots) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_t \beta_l' X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t \beta_l + \right. \right.$$

$$\left. - 2\beta_l' \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t \right) \Big\} - \prod_{j=1}^n \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\beta_l^2}{\lambda_{lj}} (1 - \delta_{lj}) - \frac{1}{2\lambda_{lj}} (\beta_l - \mu_{d_{lj}})^2 \delta_{lj} \right\}$$

$$\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_t \beta_l' X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t \beta_l + \right. \right.$$

$$\left. - 2\beta_l' \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\beta_l' \Lambda_l^{-1} \beta_l - 2\beta_l' \Lambda_l^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^* \odot \boldsymbol{\delta}_l) \right) \Big\}$$

$$\sim \mathcal{N}_{r_l}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_l, M_l),$$

where

$$M_l = \left(\sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t + \Lambda_l^{-1} \right)^{-1},$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_l = M_l \left(\sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t + \Lambda_l^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^* \odot \boldsymbol{\delta}_l) \right),$$

and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^* = (\mu_{ld_{l1}}, \dots, \mu_{ld_{lr_l}})'$, $\boldsymbol{\delta}_l = (\delta_{l1}, \dots, \delta_{lr_l})'$.

A.5 Update Σ

Let $\mathcal{S} = \{S_1, \dots, S_{n_S}\}$ and $\mathcal{P} = \{P_1, \dots, P_{n_P}\}$ be the set of separators and of prime components, respectively, of the graph G . So the density of the hyper-inverse Wishart for Σ conditional on the graph G is:

$$p(\Sigma) = \prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} p(\Sigma_P) \left(\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} p(\Sigma_S) \right)^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where

$$p(\Sigma_P) \propto |\Sigma_P|^{-(b+2\text{Card}(P))/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_P^{-1} L_P) \right\}, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with L_P is the positive-definite symmetric diagonal block of L corresponding to Σ_P .

By using the sets \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{P} and since we are working with the decomposable graph, we know that the likelihood of the graphical gaussian model can be approximated as the ratio between the likelihood in the prime components and the likelihood in the separator components. So the posterior for Σ factorizes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\Sigma | \dots) &\propto \prod_{t=1}^T (2\pi)^{n/2} |\Sigma|^{-1/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) p(\Sigma) \\ &\propto |\Sigma|^{T/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\sum_t (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) \right) p(\Sigma) \\ &\propto \frac{\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\Sigma_P|^{-T/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\sum_t (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma_P^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) \right)}{\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |\Sigma_S|^{-T/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\sum_t (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma_S^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) \right)} \times \\ &\quad \frac{\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\Sigma_P|^{-(b+2\text{Card}(P))/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_P^{-1} L_P) \right\}}{\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |\Sigma_S|^{-(b+2\text{Card}(S))/2} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr}(\Sigma_S^{-1} L_S) \right\}} \\ &\propto \frac{\prod_{P \in \mathcal{P}} |\Sigma_P|^{-(b+2\text{Card}(P)+T)/2}}{\prod_{S \in \mathcal{S}} |\Sigma_S|^{-(b+2\text{Card}(S)+T)/2}} \\ &\quad \frac{\exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma_P^{-1} \left(\sum_t (y_t - X_t' \beta)' (y_t - X_t' \beta) + L_P \right) \right) \right)}{\exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left(\Sigma_S^{-1} \left(\sum_t (y_t - X_t' \beta)' (y_t - X_t' \beta) + L_S \right) \right) \right)}. \end{aligned}$$

So we have that the posterior distribution for Σ is drawn from:

$$p(\Sigma|\dots) \propto \mathcal{H}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{W}_G \left(b + T, L + \sum_{t=1}^T (y_t - X_t' \beta)' (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right).$$

A.6 Update Graph G

We apply a Markov chain Monte Carlo for multivariate graphical models for learning the graph structure G (see Giudici and Green (1999) and Jones et al. (2005)). We see due to the prior independence assumption of the parameters that:

$$p(\mathbf{y}|G) = \iint \prod_{t=1}^T (2\pi)^{-n/2} |\Sigma|^{-n/2} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta) \right) p(\beta) p(\Sigma|G) d\beta d\Sigma.$$

This integral is difficult to compute and evaluate analytically and we apply a Candidate's formula along the line of Chib and Greenberg (1995) and Wang (2010). Following Jones et al. (2005) we apply a local-move Metropolis-Hastings based on the conditional posterior $p(G|\dots)$. A candidate G' is sampled from a proposal distribution $q(G'|G)$ and accepted with probability

$$\alpha = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{p(G'|\mathbf{y})q(G|G')}{p(G|\mathbf{y})q(G'|G)} \right\}.$$

We use the add/delete edge move proposal of Jones et al. (2005).

A.7 Update D and Δ

The full conditionals of D are obtain by sampling from the two different cases, when $\delta_{lj} = 1$ and $\delta_{lj} = 0$ ($l = 1, 2$). Starting for $\delta_{lj} = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(d_{lj} = d, \delta_{lj} = 1 | \dots) &\propto (1 - \pi_l) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{ld}, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_{ld}, \tau_{ld}/2) \mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < w_{ld}) \\ &\propto \frac{(1 - \pi_l) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{ld}, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_{ld}, \tau_{ld}/2)}{\sum_{k \in A_{w_l}(u_{lj})} \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | \mu_{lk}, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_{lk}, \tau_{lk}/2)} \quad \forall d \in A_{w_l}(u_{lj}), \end{aligned}$$

for $\delta_{lj} = 1$, while we have

$$P(d_{lj} = d, \delta_{lj} = 0 | \dots) \propto \pi_l \mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < \tilde{w}_{ld}),$$

with $d \in A_{\tilde{w}}(u_{lj})$, where $A_{\tilde{w}}(u_{lj}) = \{k : u_{lj} < \tilde{w}_k\}$ which is equal to $\{0\}$, because $\tilde{w}_k = 0, \forall k > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} P(d_{lj} = d, \delta_{lj} = 0 | \dots) &\propto \begin{cases} \pi_l \mathbb{I}(u_{lj} < 1) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | 0, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_0, \tau_0/2) & \text{if } d = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } d > 0. \end{cases} \\ &\propto \pi_l \mathcal{N}(\beta_{lj} | 0, \lambda_{lj}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{lj} | \gamma_0, \tau_0/2) \quad \text{if } d = 0. \end{aligned}$$

A.8 Update $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2)$

We assume that the prior for π_l is $\mathcal{Be}(1, \alpha_l)$, so we have that the full conditional for π_l is,

$$f(\pi_l | \dots) \propto \mathcal{Be} \left(r_l + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{r_l} \mathbb{I}(\delta_{li} = 1), \alpha_l + \sum_{i=1}^{r_l} \mathbb{I}(\delta_{li} = 1) \right).$$

B Simulated and Real Data Results




Figure B.1: Posterior distribution of the number of clusters for $m = 80$, with random elements in the B matrix (left) and with block matrix (right).






Figure B.2: Posterior mean of the matrix of δ for $m = 80$ with random element (left) and with block matrix (right).



(a) $m=80$ with random numbers



(b) $m=80$ with block matrices

Figure B.3: Weighted network for $m = 80$ with random elements in the B matrix (left) and with block matrix (right), where the blue edges means negative weights and red ones represent positive weights.