

# Bayesian nonparametric sparse seemingly unrelated regression model (SUR)\*

Monica Billio<sup>†\*</sup>   Roberto Casarin<sup>†</sup>   Luca Rossini<sup>‡</sup>

<sup>†</sup> Ca' Foscari University of Venice, Italy   <sup>‡</sup> Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Italy

**Abstract.** Seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) models are useful in studying the interactions among different variables. In a high dimensional setting or when applied to large panel of time series, these models require a large number of parameters to be estimated and suffer of inferential problems.

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. We propose a two-stage hierarchical prior distribution, where the first stage of the hierarchy consists in a Lasso conditionally independent prior distribution of the Normal-Gamma family for the SUR coefficients. The second stage is given by a random mixture distribution for the Normal-Gamma hyperparameters, which allows for parameter parsimony through two components: the first one is a random Dirac point-mass distribution, which induces sparsity in the SUR coefficients; the second is a Dirichlet process prior, which allows for clustering of the SUR coefficients.

Our sparse SUR model with multiple locations, scales and shapes includes the Vector autoregressive models (VAR) and dynamic panel models as special cases. We consider an international business cycle applications to show the effectiveness of our model and inference approach. Our new multiple shrinkage prior model allows us to better understand shock transmission phenomena, to extract coloured networks and to classify the linkages strenght. The empirical results represent a different point of view on international business cycles providing interesting new findings in the relationship between core and pheriphery countries.

**Keywords:** Bayesian nonparametrics; Bayesian model selection; Shrinkage; Large vector autoregression; Network representation; Connectedness.

---

\*We would like to thank all the conference participants for helpful discussions at: “9th RCEA Bayesian Econometric Workshop” in Rimini; “Internal Seminar” at Ca' Foscari University; “Statistics Seminar” at University of Kent; “9th CFE” in London; “ISBA 2016” in Sardinia; “3rd BAYSM” at University of Florence, “7th ESOBE” in Venice, “10th CFE” in Seville, “7th ICEEE” in Messina, “Bomopav 2017” in Venice, “Big Data in Predictive Dynamic Econometric Modeling” at University of Pennsylvania and “11th BNP” in Paris. We benefited greatly from discussions with Conception Ausin, Francis Diebold, Pedro Galeano, Dimitris Korobilis and Stefano Tonellato. This research used the SCSCF multiprocessor cluster system at University Ca' Foscari.

\*Corresponding author: billio@unive.it (M. Billio). Other contacts: r.casarin@unive.it (R. Casarin) and luca.rossini@unibz.it (L. Rossini).

# 1 Introduction

In the last decade, high dimensional models and large datasets have increased their importance in economics (e.g., see Scott and Varian (2014)). 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. (2015), 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. In particular, SUR models require estimation of large number of parameters with few observations. 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, Bayesian inference and related priors on the VAR parameters can be introduced to solve these problems (see Litterman (1980), Sims (1980, 1992)). Litterman (1986), Doan et al. (1984) and Sims and Zha (1998) specify particular prior constraints 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) introduce Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) based on 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. See also Koop and Korobilis (2010) for an introduction.

Koop and Korobilis (2016) build on SSVS of George et al. (2008) a new parametric prior, which takes into account the panel descriptions and Korobilis (2016) proposes in the same way new parametric and semi-parametric priors for panel VAR. Ahelgebey et al. (2016a,b) propose Bayesian graphical VAR (BGVAR) and sparse BGVAR to deal with zero restrictions in VAR parameters. 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 which allows for solving the identification problem of the SVAR.

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 and for inference on the number of clusters.

Up to our knowledge, our paper is the first sparse Bayesian nonparametric proposal in the time series literature. In fact, we substantially improve Hirano (2002) by allowing for sparsity in the nonparametric autoregressive panel data model based on his Dirichlet process prior. We extend Bassetti et al. (2014), which propose a vector of dependent Dirichlet process prior to capture similarities in clustering effects across time series, and MacLehose and Dunson (2010) by proposing hierarchical dependent Dirichlet process hyperpriors.

We contribute to the literature on Bayesian nonparametric VAR models and Bayesian nonparametric shrinkage models. After the seminar papers of Ferguson (1973) and Lo (1984), Dirichlet process (DP) priors and their multivariate extensions are now widely used in time series analysis (see Hjort et al. (2010) for a review of Bayesian nonparametrics). Rodriguez and ter Horst (2008) use a dependent DP for a collection of distributions evolving in discrete time. Taddy and Kottas (2009) propose a Markov-switching finite mixture of of conditionally independent Dirichlet process mixtures, while Jensen and Maheu (2010) model the returns distributions with a Dirichlet process mixture of normals. Griffin and Steel (2011) propose a time-varying stick-breaking process in time series analysis generalizing Griffin and Steel (2006). In our paper, we focus on Bayesian SUR and VAR with a shrinkage and clustering prior.

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 contribution of the paper is related to the extraction of network structures from panel data (OECD countries) in the business shock transmission application (Demirer et al., 2017; 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), 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) appear to be the countries that receive more shocks from other countries, while the periphery European countries (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain) transmit the highest percentage of shocks.

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 sampling method and the network extraction. Moreover, through simulated results we illustrate the performance of the methodology and the efficiency gain with respect to existing popular priors for VAR and SUR models. In Section 4 an empirical business cycle exercise on shock transmission shows some interesting results obtained with our nonparametric model. Finally, Section 5 is reserved to concluding remarks.

## 2 A sparse Bayesian SUR model

### 2.1 SUR Models

Zellner (1962) introduces the seemingly unrelated regression (SUR) model and tries 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  $I$  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:

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

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  $t$ ,  $\beta_i = (\beta_{i,1}, \dots, \beta_{i,n_i})$  is a  $n_i$ -vector of unknown coefficients, and  $\varepsilon_{i,t}$  is a random error. We write equation (1) in a stacked regression form:

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

where  $\mathbf{y}_t = (\mathbf{y}'_{1,t}, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_{I,t})'$  is the  $(m \times 1)$  vector of observations, with  $m = \sum_{i=1}^I m_i$ ,  $X_t = \text{diag}(X_{1,t}, \dots, X_{I,t})$  the  $(m \times n)$  matrix of observations on the explanatory variables at time  $t$  with  $n = \sum_{i=1}^I n_i$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}'_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_I)'$ , the  $n$ -vector of coefficients and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{1,t}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{m,t})'$  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 works of Sims (1980, 1992), 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  $\mathbf{y}_t = (y_{1,t}, \dots, y_{m,t})'$  is the vector of observations,  $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_m)'$  the vector of constant and  $B_i$  a  $(m \times m)$  matrix of coefficients. We assume that  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{m,t})'$  follows an independent and identically distributed Gaussian distribution  $\mathcal{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ .

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

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

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  $\text{vec}$  the column-wise vectorization operator that stacks the columns of a matrix in a column vector.

## 2.2 Prior assumption

The number of parameters to estimate in equation (2) is  $q = n + (m + 1)m/2$ . 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 (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  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . In order to regularize equation (2) we incorporate a penalty using a lasso prior  $f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{NG}(\beta_j|0, \gamma, \tau)$ , where  $\mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu, \gamma, \tau)$  denotes the normal-gamma distribution with location parameter  $\mu$ , 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  $\gamma$  (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), Griffin and Brown (2006)):

$$\mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu, \gamma, \tau) = \int_0^{+\infty} \mathcal{N}(\beta|\mu, \lambda) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda|\gamma, \tau/2) d\lambda, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathcal{Ga}(\cdot|a, b)$  denotes a gamma distribution with mean  $a/b$  and variance  $a/b^2$ .

The normal-gamma distribution in equation (4) induces shrinkage toward the prior mean of  $\mu$ , but we can extend the lasso model specification by introducing a mixture prior with separate location parameter  $\mu_j^*$ , separate shape parameter  $\gamma_j^*$  and separate scale parameter  $\tau_j^*$  such that:  $f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \mathcal{NG}(\beta_j|\mu_j^*, \gamma_j^*, \tau_j^*)$ . 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.

Following Bassetti et al. (2014), we assume that  $M$  blocks of parameters can be exogenously defined. For example, in a panel VAR model the blocks of parameters correspond to series from different countries, i.e.  $M = I$ , which share a sparse component, but have possibly different clustering features. Also, in a VAR model

of order  $p$ , the parameter vector can be blocked following the different lags, i.e.  $M = p$ . This would allow for introducing lag-specific shrinking effects as in a Minnesota type prior. Our framework is quite general and flexible, but can be extended further to include dependence in the clustering features by employing beta-dependent Pitman-Yor or Dirichlet process priors (Bassetti et al., 2014; Taddy, 2010; Griffin and Steel, 2011). We leave these issues related to informative prior modelling for future research.

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  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^*$  of the form

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_{ij} &\stackrel{ind}{\sim} \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^*), \\ \boldsymbol{\theta}_{ij}^* | \mathbb{Q}_i &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathbb{Q}_i,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\beta_{ij}$  is the sub-block of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  and  $j = 1, \dots, n_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, M$ .

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

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Q}_1(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) &= \pi_1 \mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1) + (1 - \pi_1) \mathbb{P}_1(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_1), \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{Q}_M(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_M) &= \pi_M \mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_M) + (1 - \pi_M) \mathbb{P}_M(d\boldsymbol{\theta}_M),\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}_0(d\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\sim \delta_{\{(0, \gamma_0, \tau_0)\}}(d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})), \\ \mathbb{P}_i(d\boldsymbol{\theta}) &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{DP}(\tilde{\alpha}, H), \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \\ \pi_i &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{Be}(\pi_i | 1, \alpha_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, M, \\ (\gamma_0, \tau_0) &\sim g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0), \\ G &\sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu} | c, d) \times g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau} | \nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1),\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

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 (Miller (1980)) with density

$$g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \propto \tau_0^{\nu_0 \gamma_0 - 1} p_0^{\gamma_0 - 1} \exp\{-s_0 \tau_0\} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)^{n_0}},\tag{7}$$

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  $g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) = g(\boldsymbol{\tau} | \boldsymbol{\gamma})g(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ , where

$g(\tau|\gamma) \sim \mathcal{Ga}(\nu_0\gamma, s_0)$  and we marginalize out such that:

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

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

with a normalizing constant  $C$  such that  $1 = \int_0^\infty g(\gamma) d\gamma$ . Based on MacLehose and Dunson (2010), we assume the following parameter settings for the sparse and nonsparse component in the gamma two parameters distribution,  $g(\gamma, \tau)$ ,

$$v_0 = 30 \quad s_0 = 1/30 \quad p_0 = 0.5 \quad n_0 = 18,$$

$$v_1 = 3 \quad s_1 = 1/3 \quad p_1 = 0.5 \quad n_1 = 10.$$




Figure 1: Probability density function,  $g(\gamma)$ , for sparse (dashed line) and nonsparse (solid line) case, respectively.

As described in the hierarchical prior representation in equation (5) and (6), with probability  $\pi$  a coefficient,  $\beta_j$ , is shrunk toward zero as in standard lasso, while with probability  $(1 - \pi)$  the coefficient is distributed as a  $DP(\tilde{\alpha}, H)$ . The amount of shrinkage is determined by the shape and scale parameter  $(\gamma, \tau)$ , which moves as a two-parameters gamma (Miller (1980)).

The Dirichlet Process,  $DP(\tilde{\alpha}, H)$ , can be defined by using the stick-breaking



representation (Sethuraman (1994)) given by:

$$\mathbb{P}_i(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} w_{ij} \delta_{\{\theta_{ij}\}}(\cdot) \quad i = 1, \dots, M.$$

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

- $\theta_{ij}$  is an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sequence of random elements with common probability distribution  $H$  ( $\theta_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} H$ );
- the weights ( $w_{ij}$ ) are determined through the stick-breaking construction for  $j > 1$ , while for  $j = 1$   $w_{i1} = v_{i1}$ :

$$w_{ij} = v_{ij} \prod_{k=1}^{j-1} (1 - v_{ik}) \quad i = 1, \dots, M$$

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

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)):

$$f_i(\beta|\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i) = \int K(\beta|\boldsymbol{\theta}) \tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i(d\boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad (8)$$

where  $K(\beta|\boldsymbol{\theta})$  is a density for each  $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ , the so called density kernel and  $\tilde{\mathbb{P}}_i$  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, for each  $i = 1, \dots, M$ , the equation (8) has the following representation

$$\begin{aligned} f_i(\beta|\mathbb{Q}_i) &= \pi_i f(\beta|\mathbb{P}_0) + (1 - \pi_i) f(\beta|\mathbb{P}_i) = \pi_i \int \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \mathbb{P}_0(d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_i) \int \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau}) \mathbb{P}_i(d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\tau})) \\ &= \pi_i \mathcal{NG}(\beta|0, \gamma_0, \tau_0) + (1 - \pi_i) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} w_{ik} \mathcal{NG}(\beta|\mu_{ik}, \gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \check{w}_{ik} \mathcal{NG}(\beta | \check{\theta}_{ik}),$$

where

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

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

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

with  $e_{ij} = 1$  if  $(i, j) \in E$  and  $\kappa = \binom{|N|}{2}$  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  $\Sigma$  that is:

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

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

Finally, Figure 2 shows the graphical representation of our prior when  $M = 1$  with both the priors and hyperpriors representation as explained previously in the section.

## 3 Posterior inference

### 3.1 Sampling method

In this section we develop a Gibbs sampler algorithm for approximating the posterior distribution. For simplicity of notations we focus on the bivariate case,  $M = 2$  and consequently  $i = 1, 2$ , and, without loss of generality, we can extend the following representation to the more general case,  $i \geq 2$ .




Figure 2: Graphical representation of our prior with all hyperparameters when  $M = 1$ .

In order to develop a more efficient MCMC procedure, we follow a data augmentation approach. First of all, we introduce a set of slice latent,  $u_{ij}, j = 1, \dots, n_1$ , which allows us to represent the full conditional of  $\beta_{1j}$  as follows,

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

where  $\tilde{w}_{1k} = \tilde{w}_0 = 1$  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  $u_{2j}, j = 1, \dots, n_2$ , and consequently the following density:

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

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

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_{w_1}(u_{1j}) &= \{k : u_{1j} < w_{1k}\}, & j = 1, \dots, n_1, \\ \mathcal{A}_{w_2}(u_{2j}) &= \{k : u_{2j} < w_{2k}\}, & j = 1, \dots, n_2,\end{aligned}$$

then it can be proved that the cardinality of the sets  $(\mathcal{A}_{w_1}, \mathcal{A}_{w_2})$  is almost surely finite. Posterior draws for  $u_{ij}$  are easily obtained by slice sampling.

Therefore, we express  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  as an augmented random joint probability density function for  $(\beta_{1j}, \beta_{2j})$  and  $(u_{1j}, u_{2j})$

$$\begin{aligned}f_i(\beta_{ij}, u_{ij} | (\mu_i, \gamma_i, \tau_i), w_i) &= \pi_i \mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < \tilde{w}_0) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{ij} | 0, \gamma_0, \tau_0) \\ &+ (1 - \pi_i) \sum_{k \in \mathcal{A}_{w_i}(u_{ij})} \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{ik}, \gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik}).\end{aligned}$$

We iterate the data augmentation principle for each  $f_i$  (with  $i = 1, 2$ ) through the introduction of two set of allocation variables:  $\xi_{ij}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n_l$ ) for the sparse component and  $d_{ij}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, n_l$ ) for the non-sparse component of the random measure  $\mathbb{Q}_i$ . The first variable described above selects one of the two random measures  $\mathbb{P}_0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_i$ , hence, when  $\xi_{ij}$  is equal to one, we choose the sparse component  $\mathbb{P}_0$ , while if it is zero, we choose the nonsparse component  $\mathbb{P}_i$  and we need to introduce the second allocation variables as follows. The second variable,  $d_{ij}$ , selects the component of the Dirichlet mixture  $\mathbb{P}_i$  to which each single coefficient  $\beta_{ij}$  is allocated to. Then the density function can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}f_i(\beta_{ij}, u_{ij}, d_{ij}, \xi_{ij}) &= (\mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < \tilde{w}_{d_{ij}}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{ij} | 0, \gamma_0, \tau_0))^{1-\xi_{ij}} \times \\ &(\mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < w_{id_{ij}}) \mathcal{NG}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{id_{ij}}, \gamma_{id_{ij}}, \tau_{id_{ij}}))^{\xi_{ij}} \pi_i^{1-\xi_{ij}} (1 - \pi_i)^{\xi_{ij}}.\end{aligned}$$

From equation (4), we demarginalize the Normal-Gamma distribution by introducing a latent variable  $\lambda_{ij}$  for each  $\beta_{ij}$  such that the joint distribution has the following representation:

$$\begin{aligned}f_i(\beta_{ij}, \lambda_{ij}, u_{ij}, d_{ij}, \xi_{ij}) &= (\mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < \tilde{w}_{d_{ij}}) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij} | 0, \lambda_{ij}) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda_{ij} | \gamma_0, \tau_0/2))^{1-\xi_{ij}} \times \\ &(\mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < w_{id_{ij}}) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{id_{ij}}, \lambda_{ij}) \mathcal{Ga}(\lambda_{ij} | \gamma_{id_{ij}}, \tau_{id_{ij}}/2))^{\xi_{ij}} \pi_i^{1-\xi_{ij}} (1 - \pi_i)^{\xi_{ij}}.\end{aligned}$$

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

$$f(\Theta, \Sigma, \Lambda, U, D, V, \Xi | Y) \propto \prod_{t=1}^T (2\pi |\Sigma|)^{-1/2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} (y_t - X_t' \beta)' \Sigma^{-1} (y_t - X_t' \beta)\right) \times$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \prod_{j=1}^{n_1} f_1(\beta_{1j}, \lambda_{1j}, u_{1j}, d_{1j}, \xi_{1j}) \prod_{j=1}^{n_2} f_2(\beta_{2j}, \lambda_{2j}, u_{2j}, d_{2j}, \xi_{2j}) \times \\
& \prod_{k>1} \mathcal{B}e(v_{1k}|1, \alpha) \mathcal{B}e(v_{2k}|1, \alpha) \mathcal{H}IW_G(b, L) \times g(\gamma_0, \tau_0 | \nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \times \\
& \prod_{k>1} \mathcal{N}(\mu_{1k}|c, d) g(\gamma_{1k}, \tau_{1k} | \nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1) \mathcal{N}(\mu_{2k}|c, d) g(\gamma_{2k}, \tau_{2k} | \nu_1, p_1, s_1, n_1).
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

We obtain random samples from the distribution defined in equation (9) by Gibbs sampling. We use the notation  $U = \{u_{ij} : j = 1, 2, \dots, n_l \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}$ ,  $V = \{v_{ij} : j = 1, 2, \dots \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}$  for the slice variables and the stick-breaking components;  $D = \{d_{ij} : j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}$  and  $\Xi = \{\xi_{ij} : j = 1, 2, \dots, n_i \text{ and } i = 1, 2\}$  for the allocation variables that we have introduced in this section. We denote with  $\pi = (\pi_1, \pi_2)$  the prior restriction probabilities or probability of shrinking-to-zero the coefficient  $\beta$ . The Gibbs sampler iterates over the following steps using the conditional independence between the different variables as seen in Appendix A:

1. The slice and stick-breaking variables  $U$  and  $V$  are updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
2. The latent scale variables  $\Lambda$  are updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, U, V, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
3. The parameters of the Normal-Gamma distribution  $\Theta$  are updated given  $[\beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
4. The coefficients  $\beta$  of the SUR model are updated given  $[\Theta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
5. The matrix of variance-covariance  $\Sigma$  is updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
6. The graph  $G$  is updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Xi, \pi, Y]$ ;
7. The allocation variables  $D$  and  $\Xi$  are updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, \pi, Y]$ ;
8. The probability,  $\pi$ , of shrinking-to-zero the coefficient is updated given  $[\Theta, \beta, \Sigma, G, \Lambda, U, V, D, \Xi, Y]$ .

### 3.2 Network extraction

Pairwise Granger causality has been used to extract linkages and networks describing relationships between variables of interest, e.g. financial and macroeconomic

linkages (Billio et al., 2012; Barigozzi and Brownlees, 2016). The pairwise Granger causality approach does not consider conditioning on relevant covariates thus generating spurious causality effects. The conditional Granger approach includes relevant covariates, however the large number of variables relative to the number of data points can lead to overparametrization and consequently a loss of degree of freedom and inefficiency in correctly gauging the causal relationships (see (Ahelgebey et al., 2016a,b)). Our hierarchical prior combining Bayesian Lasso and Dirichlet process prior allows us to extract the network while reducing overfitting and curse of dimensionality problems.

We denote with  $G_l = (V_l, E_l)$  the graph at lag  $l$ , where  $V_l = \{1, \dots, n\}$  is the vertex set and  $i \in V_l$  the node associated with the variable  $y_{it}$ . We assume that there exists an edge  $\{i, j\} \in E_l$  between  $i, j \in V_l$  if  $B_{ij,l} \neq 0$ . The adjacency matrix  $A_l$  associated with  $G_l$  has  $(i, j)$ -th element

$$a_{ij,l} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \xi_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where  $\varphi(i, j) = n(i - 1) + j$  and  $\xi_{k,l}$  is the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate of the shrinking-to-zero indicator variable for the parameter  $\beta_{k,l}$ . The Dirichlet process prior allows us to assign the weights to the edges and to cluster them into groups. To this aim, we apply the least square clustering proposed originally in Dahl (2006). The method is based on the posterior pairwise probabilities of joint classification  $P(d_{il} = d_{jl} | Y, \xi_{i,l} = 1, \xi_{j,l} = 1)$  approximated as

$$p_{ij,l} = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{h=1}^H \delta_{d_{i,l}^h}(d_{j,l}^h), \quad (10)$$

where we use the allocation variables MCMC draws  $d_{i,l}^h$ , with  $h = 1, \dots, H$  and  $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{m}$ , where  $H$  is the number of MCMC iterations and  $\tilde{m}$  is the number of nonzero coefficient. We can detect the presence of different clusters from the co-clustering matrix based on the location atom,  $\mu_{kl}^{*,h}$ , generated at each iteration of the MCMC sampler and build up from the least square marginal clustering. The least square marginal clustering is the clustering  $\tilde{D}_l$ , which minimizes the sum of squared deviations from the pairwise posterior probability

$$\tilde{D}_l = \arg \min_{D \in \{D^1, \dots, D^H\}} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{m}} \left( \delta_{d_{il}^h}(d_{jl}^h) - p_{ij,l} \right)^2. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) allows us to define the weighted graph  $G_l = (V_l, E_l, C_l)$ , where  $C_l$

is the edge weights matrix with elements

$$c_{ij,l} = \begin{cases} \tilde{\mu}_{1l}^* & \text{if } \tilde{d}_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 1 \text{ and } \xi_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 0 \\ \tilde{\mu}_{2l}^* & \text{if } \tilde{d}_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 2 \text{ and } \xi_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \tilde{\mu}_{\tilde{K}l}^* & \text{if } \tilde{d}_{\varphi(i,j),l} = \tilde{K} \text{ and } \xi_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \xi_{\varphi(i,j),l} = 1 \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

$i, j = 1, \dots, m$ , indicating the strengthness of relationship between nodes, that is the magnitude of the linkages between economic variables. A better understanding of the connectivity patterns can be achieved using the edge weights matrix. The vertex out-degree,  $\omega_{il}^+$ , of the node  $i$  at lag  $l$  can be decomposed in  $\tilde{K}$  different strengthness levels

$$\omega_{il}^+ = \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij,l} = \sum_{k=1}^{\tilde{K}} \omega_{il,k}^+$$

where

$$\omega_{il,k}^+ = \sum_{j=1}^m a_{ij,l} \mathbb{I}(c_{ij,l} = \tilde{\mu}_{kl}^*)$$

Similarly, it is possible to decompose the vertex in-degree,  $\omega_{il}^-$ , of the node  $i$  at different lag  $l$ .

### 3.3 Simulation experiments

The nonparametric prior presented in Section 2 allows for shrinking and clustering the SUR coefficients. In order to assess the goodness of the prior we performed a simulation study of our Bayesian nonparametric sparse model. We consider different datasets with sample size  $T = 100$  from the VAR model of order one:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = B\mathbf{y}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_m(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma) \quad t = 1, \dots, 100,$$

where the dimension of  $\mathbf{y}_t$  and of the square matrix of coefficients  $B$  can take different values:  $m = 20$  (small dimension),  $m = 40$  (medium dimension) and  $m = 80$  (large dimension). Furthermore, we choose different settings of the matrix  $B$ , focusing on a block-diagonal structure with random entries of the blocks:

- the block-diagonal matrix  $B = \text{diag}\{B_1, \dots, B_{m/4}\} \in \mathcal{M}_{(m,m)}$  is generated with blocks  $B_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, m/4$ ) of  $(4 \times 4)$  matrices on the main diagonal:

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

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

- the random matrix  $B$  is a  $(80 \times 80)$  matrix with 150 elements randomly chosen from an uniform distribution  $\mathcal{U}(-1.4, 1.4)$  and then checked for the weak stationarity condition of the VAR.

For all the parameter settings, we iterated 5,000 times the Gibbs sampler described in Section 3 and discarded the first 500 samples following a graphical dispection of the posterior progressive averages. The remaining samples have been used to approximate the posterior distribution. Furthermore, we have chosen the hyperparameters for the sparse and non-sparse components as in Section 2.2 and the hyperparameters of the Hyper-inverse Wishart as in Section 2.2, where the degree of freedom parameter is  $b_0 = 3$  and the scale matrix is  $L = I_n$ . Figure 3 shows the approximate posterior distribution of the number of clusters for different sample sizes. In Table 1, we show the posterior mean and mode of the number of clusters for different sample sizes. The results show that our nonparametric approach identifies a cluster structure in the entries of the coefficient matrix, thus reducing from  $m^2 = 400$  to 9 the number of coefficients to estimate.

	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  $m$ .

Figure 4 exhibits the posterior mean of  $\Xi$ , which can be used to identify the allocation of the coefficients between the two random measures  $\mathbb{P}_0$  and  $\mathbb{P}_i$  and to build the adjacency matrix of the network. In particular, white and black color indicates that the coefficient  $\xi_{ij}$  is equal to zero (sparse component) and for one (nonsparse component), respectively.

The definition of the pairwise posterior probabilities and of the co-clustering matrix allows us to build the edge weights matrix,  $C_l$ , of the causality network at lag  $l$  (see equation 12). In Figure 5, the blue edges represent negative weights, while the red ones represent the positive weights. In each coloured graph the nodes represent the  $n$  variables of the VAR model, and a clockwise-oriented edge between two nodes  $i$  and  $j$  represents a non-null coefficient for the variable  $y_{j,t-1}$  in the  $i$ -th equation of the VAR. The representation with block matrices confirms the






Figure 3: Posterior distribution of the number of clusters for different model dimensions  $m = 20$  (panel (a)),  $m = 40$  (panel (b)) and  $m = 80$ , with block entries (panel (c)) and with random entries (panel (d)).

presence of different cliques, e.g. for  $n = 20$  exactly 5 cliques, while increasing the dimensionality augments the number of cliques.

We compare our prior with the Bayesian Lasso (Park and Casella (2008)), the Elastic-net (Zou and Hastie (2005)) and Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) of George et al. (2008). For the SSVS, we use the default hyperparameters values  $\tau_1^2 = 0.0001$ ,  $\tau_2^2 = 4$  and  $\pi = 0.5$ . We use the mean absolute deviation (MAD, Korobilis (2016)) for measuring the performance of the five different priors: our Bayesian nonparametric prior (BNP), Bayesian Lasso (B-Lasso), Elastic-net (E-Net), SSVS and OLS, unrestricted estimator, equivalent to diffuse prior.

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




Figure 4: Posterior mean of the matrix of  $\Xi$  for different model dimensions  $m = 20$  (panel (a)),  $m = 40$  (panel (b)) and  $m = 80$ , with block entries (panel (c)) and with random entries (panel (d)).

	BNP-Lasso	B-Lasso	EN	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 model dimension  $m$  (rows) and prior settings (columns): Bayesian nonparametric-Lasso (BNP-Lasso), Bayesian Lasso (B-Lasso), Elastic-Net (EN), Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) and diffuse conjugate (OLS).

DGP,

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




Figure 5: Weighted network for different model dimensions  $m = 20$  (panel (a)),  $m = 40$  (panel (b)) and  $m = 80$ , with block entries (panel (c)) and with random entries (panel (d)). Blue edges mean negative weights and red ones represent positive weights, while the edges are clockwise-oriented.

where  $n$  denotes the number of VAR coefficients and  $Z_k$  is the  $k$ -th column of  $Z = (I_m \otimes \mathbf{x}')$ . For each parameter setting we generate 500 independent datasets and apply the models under comparison. The average results are given in Table 2 and show that the best performance is obtained from our prior for each dimension  $m$  and all the priors are performing well related to OLS. The boxplots of the MAD

statistics for the 500 experiments are given in Figure 6. The results confirm the best performance of our prior with respect to the others. Although not shown here, we have performed the simulation study on other values of  $m$  obtaining results in line with the above ones.




Figure 6: Boxplot of MAD statistics in the Monte Carlo exercise when  $m = 20$  for our Bayesian nonparametric model (BNP-Lasso), Elastic-net (EN), Bayesian Lasso (BLA), Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS) and OLS.

## 4 Measuring business shock transmission effects

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 business shock transmission effects between different cycles in a panel of countries, while Francis et al. (2017) and Kaufmann and Schumacher (2017) investigate the role of global business cycles for many different countries in large factor models. We apply the proposed Bayesian nonparametric sparse model to a macroeconomic dataset and, following Diebold and Yilmaz (2015), we extract a network structure to investigate the business shock transmissions between different countries. Our model allows us: (i) to study the shock transmission mechanism at different lags; (ii) to identify the most relevant linkages between countries; (iii) to cluster the linkages into groups.

We use a VAR( $p$ ), with quarterly lags of interest and focus on the GDP growth rate, which is the first difference of the logarithm of each GDP series. Our dataset

includes 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 3.3), 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 prior settings of the simulation studies. Figure 7 shows the posterior histogram for the probability of being sparse,  $\pi$ , which has posterior mean 0.87 providing evidence of high sparsity in the model. This means that a small proportion of coefficient is not null and then is responsible of the transmission of shocks between countries. The posterior number of clusters in Figure 7 has a mode at 3 thus providing evidence of three types of macroeconomic shock transmission effects between the countries in our panel.




Figure 7: Posterior distributions of probability,  $\pi$ , of shrinking-to-zero the coefficient (left) and of the number of clusters (right) for the macroeconomic application.




Figure 8: Pairwise posterior probabilities for the clustering (left) and co-clustering matrix (right).

As seen from the overall lag co-clustering matrix in Figure 8, we find evidence of three types of linkage, customarily called “negative”, “positive” and “strong positive”. Figure 9 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)  $t - 4$ . In the weighted network, the blue edges represent negative weights, while the red ones represent the positive weights. In each coloured graph the nodes represent the  $m$  variables of the VAR model, and a clockwise-oriented edge from node  $j$  to node  $i$  represents a non-null coefficient for the variable  $y_{j,t-1}$  in the  $i$ -th equation of the VAR.

In terms of the dynamical structure of the directional connectedness received from other countries (in-degree) or transmitted to other countries (out-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 receive more shocks from other countries, while the periphery European countries (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal, Spain) transmit the highest percentage of shocks. In the other lags, core European countries receive and transmit highest percentage of shocks;
- at lag  $t - 1$ , Japan appears to be the country with the highest out-degree, meaning that it is exposed at the risk of transmitting the highest percentage of shocks to other countries, followed by Spain and Austria;
- at lag  $t - 1$ , Australia is the country with the highest in-degree, meaning that can receive the highest percentage of shocks from other countries, followed by France, Germany and United Kingdom;




Figure 9: Weighted shock transmission 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 and the edges are clockwise-oriented.

- 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 out-degree and Netherlands have the highest in-degree. In this case it means that they are central countries in the business shock transmission.

In terms of magnitude of the shock transmission effects, Figure 9 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.
- Netherlands, followed by Germany and United States, are central countries during the time transmission, while Mexico and Luxembourg appear to be of no importance in the analysis;
- the centrality of Austria and Spain appears at all lags, except the lag  $t - 3$ , while other countries, such as Japan, Australia, tend to lose importance during the shock transmissions.

## 5 Conclusions

This paper introduces a novel Bayesian nonparametric prior for SUR models, which allows both for shrinking SUR coefficients toward multiple locations and for identifying groups of coefficients. In particular, we propose a two-stage hierarchical prior distribution, which considers a hierarchical Dirichlet process on the parameters of the Normal-Gamma distribution and a Bayesian Lasso step. An efficient Monte Carlo Markov Chain algorithm has been developed for the posterior computations and our hierarchical prior allows us to extract the network. The effectiveness of this algorithm is assessed both in simulation and real data exercises.

The simulation studies illustrate the good performance of our model with different sample sizes and different parameter settings compared to existing priors in the literature, such as the Stochastic Search Variable Selection (SSVS, George et al. (2008)) and simple Bayesian Lasso (Park and Casella, 2008).

In the real data application, we study through a multi-country macroeconomic dataset the business shock transmission and our new multiple shrinkage prior allows us to extract a network structure to investigate the business shock transmission between different countries. In details, the main findings of the empirical application are the study of the shock transmission mechanism at different lags, the identification of the most relevant linkages among countries and the clustering of the linkages into groups. These results give us the opportunity to study the coloured networks, to classify the linkages strength and to find evidence of three types of macroeconomic



shock transmission effects: 'negative', 'positive' and 'strong positive'. Moreover, we find that at certain lag, core European countries (Austria, Belgium, Finland, France, Germany and Netherlands) appear to be the countries that receive more shocks from other countries, while the periphery European countries (Greece, Ireland, Italy, Portugal and Spain) transmit the highest percentage of shocks.

For future research lines, our approach can be extended to include dependence in the clustering features by employing Beta-dependent Pitman-Yor or Dirichlet process priors (e.g., see Bassetti et al. (2014), Griffin and Steel (2011)).

## References

- Abramowitz, M. and Stegun, I. A. (1972). *Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*. Dover, New York.
- Acharya, V. V., Engle, R., and Richardson, M. (2012). Capital Shortfall: A New Approach to Ranking and Regulating Systemic Risks. *American Economic Review*, 102(3):59–64.
- Ahelgebey, D. F., Billio, M., and Casarin, R. (2016a). Bayesian Graphical Models for Structural Vector Autoregressive Processes. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31(2):357–386.
- Ahelgebey, D. F., Billio, M., and Casarin, R. (2016b). Sparse Graphical Vector Autoregression: A Bayesian Approach. *Annals of Economics and Statistics*, 123:333–361.
- Andrews, D. and Mallows, C. (1974). Scale mixtures of normal distributions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 36(1):99–102.
- Banbura, M., Giannone, D., and Reichlin, L. (2010). Large Bayesian vector autoregressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(1):71–92.
- Barigozzi, M. and Brownlees, C. (2016). NETS: Network Estimation for Time Series. *Working Paper*.
- Bassetti, F., Casarin, R., and Leisen, F. (2014). Beta-product dependent Pitman-Yor processes for Bayesian inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 180(1):49–72.
- Bianchi, D., Billio, M., Casarin, R., and Guidolin, M. (2015). Modeling Contagion and Systemic Risk. *Working Paper*.
- Billio, M., Getmansky, M., Lo, A. W., and Pelizzon, L. (2012). Econometric measures of connectedness and systemic risk in the finance and insurance sectors. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 104(3):535–559.
- Brownlees, C. and Engle, R. (2016). SRISK: A Conditional Capital Shortfall Measure of Systemic Risk. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(1):48–79.
- Canova, F. and 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., and Marcellino, M. (2015). Bayesian VARs: Specification choices and forecast accuracy. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 30(1):46–73.

- Chib, S. and Greenberg, E. (1995). Hierarchical analysis of SUR models with extensions to correlated serial errors and time-varying parameter models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 68(2):339–360.
- 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., and Vannucci, M., editors, *Bayesian Inference for Gene Expression and Proteomics*, pages 201–218. Cambridge University Press.
- Del Negro, M. and Otrok, C. (2008). Dynamic factor models with time-varying parameters: measuring changes in international business cycles. *Federal Reserve Bank of New York*, (326).
- Demirer, M., Diebold, F. X., Liu, L., and Yilmaz, K. (2017). Estimating Global Bank Network Connectedness. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, forthcoming.
- Devroye, L. (2014). Random variate generation for the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(2):239–246.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. (2014). On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *Journal of Econometrics*, 182(1):119–134.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. (2015). *Measuring the Dynamics of Global Business Cycle Connectedness*, pages 45–89. Oxford University Press.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. (2016). Trans-Atlantic Equity Volatility Connectedness: U.S. and European Financial Institutions, 2004–2014. *Journal of Financial Econometrics*, 14(1):81–127.
- Doan, T., Litterman, R., and Sims, C. A. (1984). Forecasting and conditional projection using realistic prior distributions. *Econometric Reviews*, 3(1):1–100.
- Ferguson, T. S. (1973). A Bayesian Analysis of some Nonparametric Problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(2):209–230.

- Francis, N., Owyang, M., and Savascin, O. (2017). An endogenously clustered factor approach to international business cycles. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, pages 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.2577>.
- Gefang, D. (2014). Bayesian doubly adaptive elastic-net lasso for var shrinkage. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 30(1):1–11.
- George, E. I., Sun, D., and Ni, S. (2008). Bayesian stochastic search for VAR model restrictions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 142(1):553–580.
- Giudici, P. and Green, P. (1999). Decomposable graphical Gaussian model determination. *Biometrika*, 86(4):758–801.
- Griffin, J. and Brown, P. (2006). Alternative prior distributions for variable selection with very many more variables than observations. Technical report, University of Warwick.
- Griffin, J. E. and Steel, M. F. J. (2006). Order-based dependent Dirichlet processes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(473):179–194.
- Griffin, J. E. and Steel, M. F. J. (2011). Stick-breaking autoregressive processes. *Journal of Econometrics*, 162(2):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., and Walker, S. G. (2011). Dependent mixtures of Dirichlet processes. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 55(6):2011–2025.
- Hirano, K. (2002). Semiparametric Bayesian inference in autoregressive panel data models. *Econometrica*, 70(2):781–799.
- Hjort, N. L., Homes, C., Müller, P., and Walker, S. G. (2010). *Bayesian Nonparametrics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoermann, W. and Leydold, J. (2014). Generating Generalized Inverse Gaussian random variates. *Statistics and Computing*, 24(4):547–557.
- Jensen, J. M. and Maheu, M. J. (2010). Bayesian semiparametric stochastic volatility modeling. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157(2):306–316.
- Jones, B., Carvalho, C., Dobra, A., Hans, C., Carter, C., and West, M. (2005). Experiments in stochastic computation for high-dimensional graphical models. *Statistical Science*, 20(4):388–400.

- Kalli, M., Griffin, J. E., and Walker, S. G. (2011). Slice sampling mixture models. *Statistics and Computing*, 21(1):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(2):309–344.
- Kaufmann, S. and Schumacher, C. (2017). Identifying relevant and irrelevant variables in sparse factor models. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jae.2566>.
- Koop, G. (2013). Forecasting with medium and large Bayesian VARs. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 28(2):177–203.
- Koop, G. and Korobilis, D. (2010). Bayesian multivariate time series methods for empirical macroeconomics. *Foundations and Trends in Econometrics*, 3(4):267–358.
- Koop, G. and Korobilis, D. (2016). 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(2):204–230.
- Korobilis, D. (2016). Prior selection for panel vector autoregressions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 101:110–120.
- Kose, M. A., Otrok, C., and Whiteman, C. H. (2003). International Business Cycles: World, region and country specific factors. *American Economic Review*, 93(4):1216–1239.
- Kose, M. A., Otrok, C., and Whiteman, C. H. (2010). Understanding the evolution of world business cycles. *Journal of International Economics*, 75(1):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(1):25–38.
- Lo, A. Y. (1984). On a class of Bayesian nonparametric estimates: I. density estimates. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12(1):351–357.

- MacEachern, S. N. (1999). Dependent nonparametric processes. In *In ASA Proceedings of the Section on Bayesian Statistical Science, Alexandria, VA*, pages 50–55. American Statistical Association.
- MacEachern, S. N. (2001). Decision theoretic aspects of dependent nonparametric processes. In George, E., editor, *Bayesian Methods with Applications to Science, Policy and Official Statistics*, pages 551–560. Creta: ISBA.
- MacLehose, R. and 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):65–69.
- Min, C. and Zellner, A. (1993). Bayesian and non-Bayesian methods for combining models and forecasts with applications to forecasting international growth rates. *Journal of Econometrics*, 56(1-2):89–118.
- Park, T. and Casella, G. (2008). The Bayesian Lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):681–686.
- Rodriguez, A. and ter Horst, E. (2008). Bayesian dynamics density estimation. *Bayesian Analysis*, 3(2):339–365.
- Scott, S. L. and Varian, H. R. (2014). Predicting the present with Bayesian structural time series. *International Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation*, 5(1-2):4–23.
- Sethuraman, J. (1994). A constructive definition of the Dirichlet process prior. *Statistica Sinica*, 4:639–650.
- Sims, C. A. (1980). Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica*, 48(1):1–48.
- Sims, C. A. (1992). Interpreting the macroeconomic time series facts: The effects of monetary policy. *European Economic Review*, 36(5):975–1000.
- Sims, C. A. and Zha, T. (1998). Bayesian methods for dynamic multivariate models. *International Economic Review*, 39(4):949–968.
- Stock, J. H. and 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(492):1403–1417.
- Taddy, M. A. and Kottas, A. (2009). Markov switching Dirichlet process mixture regression. *Bayesian Analysis*, 4(4):793–816.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 58(1):267–288.
- Walker, S. G. (2007). Sampling the Dirichlet mixture model with slices. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 36(1):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(298):500–509.
- Zellner, A. (1971). *An introduction to Bayesian inference in econometrics*. New York Wiley.
- Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 67(2):301–320.
- Zou, H. and Zhang, H. H. (2009). On the adaptive elastic-net with diverging number of parameters. *Annals of Statistics*, 37(4):1733–1751.

## A Gibbs sampling details

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

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{ik} &= \{j \in 1, \dots, n_i : d_{ij} = k, \xi_{ij} = 1\}, \\ \mathcal{D}^* &= \{k | \mathcal{D}_{1k} \cup \mathcal{D}_{2k} \neq \emptyset\}, \quad D^* = \max_{i=1,2} \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, n_i\}} d_{ij}, \end{aligned}$$

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  $\Theta$  and  $V$  is not necessarily, since only the elements in the full conditional distributions of  $D$  and  $\Xi$  are needed.

The maximum number of atoms and stick-breaking components to sample is  $N^* = \max\{N_1^*, N_2^*\}$ , where  $N_i^*$  is the smallest integer such that  $\sum_{k=1}^{N_i^*} w_{ik} > 1 - u_i^*$ , where  $u_i^* = \min_{1 \leq j \leq n_i} \{u_{ij}\}$ . In the following sections we explain in details all the steps of the Gibbs sampler.

### A.1 Update the stick-breaking and slice variables $V$ and $U$

Following the slice sampler algorithm (see Walker (2007) and Kalli et al. (2011)), we treat  $V$  as three blocks of random length:  $V = (V^*, V^{**}, V^{***})$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} V^* &= \{V_k : k \in \mathcal{D}^*\} = (v_{k1}, \dots, v_{kD^*}), \\ V^{**} &= (v_{kD^*+1}, \dots, v_{kN^*}), \quad V^{***} = \{V_k : k > N^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} f(v_{1j} | \dots) &\propto \mathcal{B}e \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I}(d_{1j} = d, \xi_{1j} = 1), \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \mathbb{I}(d_{1j} > d, \xi_{1j} = 1) \right), \\ f(v_{2j} | \dots) &\propto \mathcal{B}e \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \mathbb{I}(d_{2j} = d, \xi_{2j} = 1), \alpha + \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \mathbb{I}(d_{2j} > d, \xi_{2j} = 1) \right). \end{aligned}$$

- ii) Sampling from the full conditional posterior distribution of  $U$  is obtain by simulating from, for  $1 \leq j \leq n_1$ ,

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



and, for  $1 \leq j \leq n_2$ ,

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

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

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

## A.2 Update the mixing parameters $\lambda$

We update the mixing parameters  $\lambda_{ij}$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ), where the full conditional posterior distribution of  $\lambda_{ij}$  is

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

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

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

We use the  $\lambda_{ij}$  just drawn for construct the matrix  $\Lambda_i = \text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i\}$ , where  $\text{diag}\{\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i\}$  returns a diagonal matrix with the elements of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_i = (\lambda_{i1}, \dots, \lambda_{in_i})'$  on the main diagonal. In practice we have two different matrix,  $\Lambda_1 = \text{diag}\{\lambda_{11}, \dots, \lambda_{1n_1}\}$  and  $\Lambda_2 = \text{diag}\{\lambda_{21}, \dots, \lambda_{2n_2}\}$ .

## A.3 Update the atoms $\Theta$

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  $\mu_0$  has unit probability mass at 0, the full conditional distribution of  $\mu_0$  is  $f(\mu_0|\dots) = \Xi_{\{0\}}(\mu_0)$ . The full conditional distribution of the shape and scale parameters  $(\gamma_0, \tau_0)$  is:

$$f((\gamma_0, \tau_0)|\dots) \propto g(\gamma_0, \tau_0|\nu_0, p_0, s_0, n_0) \prod_{j=1| \xi_{1j}=0}^{n_1} \left( \frac{(\tau_0/2)^{\gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)} \lambda_{1j}^{\gamma_0-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau_0}{2} \lambda_{1j}\right\} \right) \\ \times \prod_{j=1| \xi_{2j}=0}^{n_2} \left( \frac{(\tau_0/2)^{\gamma_0}}{\Gamma(\gamma_0)} \lambda_{2j}^{\gamma_0-1} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau_0}{2} \lambda_{2j}\right\} \right), \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where we assume that:

$$n_{1,0} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} (1 - \xi_{1j}) = n_1 - n_{1,1}, \quad n_{1,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_1} \xi_{1j}, \\ n_{2,0} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} (1 - \xi_{2j}) = n_2 - n_{2,1}, \quad n_{2,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \xi_{2j}.$$

The distribution in (A.1) has the same kernel of the prior distribution  $g(\gamma_0, \tau_0|\dots)$  given in (7), that is:

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

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  $\gamma^* \sim \mathcal{G}a(1/2, 2)$ , we remind  $q(\gamma)$  is the probability density function of  $\gamma$  and is distributed as a  $\mathcal{G}a(1/2, 2)$ . 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  $(\mu_{ik}, \gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik})$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N^*$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , by applying a single move Gibbs sampler with full conditional distributions  $f(\mu_{ik}|\dots)$  and  $f(\gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik}|\dots)$ . The full conditional

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mu_{ik}|\dots) &\propto \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ik}|c, d) \prod_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij}|\mu_{ik}, \lambda_{ij}) \\ &\propto \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi d}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2d}(\mu_{ik} - c)^2\right\} \prod_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda_{ij}}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\lambda_{ij}}(\beta_{ij} - \mu_{ik})^2\right\} \\ &\propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2d}(\mu_{ik} - c)^2 - \sum_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \frac{1}{2\lambda_{ij}}(\beta_{ij} - \mu_{ik})^2\right\} \end{aligned}$$

is proportional to the normal  $\mathcal{N}(\tilde{E}_k, \tilde{V}_k)$  with parameters  $\tilde{E}_k = \tilde{V}_k \left( \frac{c}{d} + \sum_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \frac{\beta_{ij}}{\lambda_{ij}} \right)$  and  $\tilde{V}_k = \left( \frac{1}{d} + \sum_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \frac{1}{\lambda_{ij}} \right)^{-1}$ . On the other hand, the joint conditional posterior of  $(\gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik})$  is:

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

where we have defined  $n_{i,1k} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \xi_{ij} \mathbb{I}(d_{ij} = k)$ . Hence (A.3) can be reduced as

$$\begin{aligned} f((\gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik})|\dots) &\propto \tau_{ik}^{\nu_1 \gamma_{ik} - 1} p_1^{\gamma_{ik} - 1} \exp\{-s_1 \tau_{ik}\} \frac{1}{\Gamma(\gamma_{ik})^{n_1}} \times \\ &\times \frac{(\tau_{ik}/2)^{n_{i,1k} \gamma_{ik}}}{\Gamma(\gamma_{ik})^{n_{i,1k}}} \left( \prod_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \lambda_{ij} \right)^{\gamma_{ik} - 1} \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau_{ik}}{2} \sum_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \lambda_{ij}\right\} \\ &\propto g\left(\gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik} \mid \nu_1 + n_{i,1k}, p_1 \prod_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \lambda_{ij}, s_1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j|\xi_{ij}=1, d_{ij}=k} \lambda_{ij}, n_1 + n_{i,1k}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for  $k \in \mathcal{D}^*$  and from the prior  $H$  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 the coefficients $\beta$

The full conditional posterior distribution of  $\beta$  is:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\beta_i | \dots) &\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_t \beta_i' X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t \beta_i - 2 \beta_i' \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t \right) \right\} \\
&\quad - \prod_{j=1}^n \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\beta_i^2}{\lambda_{ij}} (1 - \xi_{ij}) - \frac{1}{2 \lambda_{ij}} (\beta_i - \mu_{d_{ij}})^2 \xi_{ij} \right\} \\
&\propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_t \beta_i' X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t \beta_i - 2 \beta_i' \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t \right) - \frac{1}{2} (\beta_i' \Lambda_i^{-1} \beta_i - 2 \beta_i' \Lambda_i^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^* \odot \boldsymbol{\xi}_i)) \right\} \\
&\sim \mathcal{N}_{n_i}(\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i, M_i),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
M_i &= \left( \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} X_t + \Lambda_i^{-1} \right)^{-1}, \\
\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_i &= M_i \left( \sum_t X_t' \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{y}_t + \Lambda_i^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^* \odot \boldsymbol{\xi}_i) \right),
\end{aligned}$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^* = (\mu_{id_{i1}}, \dots, \mu_{id_{in_i}})'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = (\xi_{i1}, \dots, \xi_{in_i})'$ .

## A.5 Update the covariance matrix $\Sigma$

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  $\Sigma$  conditional on the graph  $G$  is:

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

where

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

with  $L_P$  is the positive-definite symmetric diagonal block of  $L$  corresponding to  $\Sigma_P$ .

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  $\Sigma$  factorizes as follows:

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

So we have that the posterior distribution for  $\Sigma$  is drawn from:

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

## A.6 Update the 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:

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

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 the allocation variables $D$ and $\Xi$

The full conditionals of  $D$  are obtained by sampling from the two different cases, when  $\xi_{ij} = 1$  and  $\xi_{ij} = 0$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ). Starting for  $\xi_{ij} = 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(d_{ij} = d, \xi_{ij} = 1 | \dots) &\propto (1 - \pi_i) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{id}, \lambda_{ij}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{ij} | \gamma_{id}, \tau_{id}/2) \mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < w_{id}) \\ &\propto \frac{(1 - \pi_i) \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{id}, \lambda_{ij}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{ij} | \gamma_{id}, \tau_{id}/2)}{\sum_{k \in A_{w_i}(u_{ij})} \mathcal{N}(\beta_{ij} | \mu_{ik}, \lambda_{ij}) \mathcal{G}a(\lambda_{ij} | \gamma_{ik}, \tau_{ik}/2)} \quad \forall d \in A_{w_i}(u_{ij}), \end{aligned}$$

for  $\xi_{ij} = 1$ , while we have

$$P(d_{ij} = d, \xi_{ij} = 0 | \dots) \propto \pi_i \mathbb{I}(u_{ij} < \tilde{w}_{id}),$$

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

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

## A.8 Update the prior restriction probabilities $\pi$

We assume that the prior for  $\pi_i$  is  $\mathcal{B}e(1, \alpha_i)$ , so we have that the full conditional for  $\pi_i$  is,

$$f(\pi_i | \dots) \propto \mathcal{B}e \left( n_i + 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{I}(\xi_{ii} = 1), \alpha_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{I}(\xi_{ii} = 1) \right).$$