

# MIXED CAUSALITY GRAPHS FOR CONTINUOUS-TIME STATE SPACE MODELS AND ORTHOGONAL PROJECTIONS

BY VICKY FASEN-HARTMANN<sup>a</sup>  AND LEA SCHENK<sup>b,\*</sup> 

*Institute of Stochastics, Karlsruhe Institute of Technology*

<sup>a</sup>*vicky.fasen@kit.edu*; <sup>b</sup>*lea.schenk@kit.edu*

In this paper we derive (local) causality graphs for the popular continuous-time state space models, including in particular multivariate continuous-time ARMA (MCARMA) processes. In these (local) causality graphs, vertices represent the components of the process, directed edges between the vertices indicate causal influences, and undirected edges indicate contemporaneous uncorrelatednesses between the component processes. We present sufficient criteria for state space models to satisfy the assumptions of [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) so that the (local) causality graphs are well defined and various causal Markov properties hold. Both directed and undirected edges in these graphs are characterised by orthogonal projections on well-defined linear spaces. To compute these orthogonal projections, we use the unique controller canonical form of a state space model, which exists under mild assumptions, to recover the input process from the output process. We are then able to derive some alternative representations of the output process and its highest derivative. Finally, we apply these representations to calculate the necessary orthogonal projections, which culminate in the characterisations of the edges in the (local) causality graph. These characterisations are interpretatively meaningful and are given by the parameters of the controller canonical form and the covariance matrix of the driving Lévy process.

**1. Introduction.** State space models are important tools in many scientific and engineering disciplines, including control theory, statistics and computational neuroscience. In this paper, we study the time-invariant  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued *state space model*  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  of dimension  $kp$ , that is characterised by a driving  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued Lévy process  $L = (L(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ , a state transition matrix  $\mathbf{A}^* \in M_{kp}(\mathbb{R})$ , an input matrix  $\mathbf{B}^* \in M_{kp \times k}(\mathbb{R})$ , and an observation matrix  $\mathbf{C}^* \in M_{kp \times k}(\mathbb{R})$ . Note that a  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued Lévy process  $L$  is a stochastic process with stationary and independent increments, it is continuous in probability, and satisfies  $L(0) = 0_k \in \mathbb{R}^k$  almost surely ([Sato, 2007](#)). A continuous-time state space model then consists of a state equation

$$dX(t) = \mathbf{A}^* X(t) dt + \mathbf{B}^* dL(t), \quad (1.1)$$

and an observation equation

$$Y_V(t) = \mathbf{C}^* X(t).$$

---

\* *Funding:* This work is supported by the project “digiMINT”, which is a part of the of the “Qualitätsoffensive Lehrerbildung”, a joint initiative of the Federal Government and the Länder which aims to improve the quality of teacher training. The programme is funded by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research. The authors are responsible for the content of this publication.

*MSC2020 subject classifications:* Primary 62H22, 62M20; Secondary 62M10, 60G25.

*Keywords and phrases:* contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, controller canonical form, Granger causality, Markov property, MCARMA process, graphs, orthogonal projections, state space models.

The  $\mathbb{R}^{kp}$ -valued process  $\mathcal{X} = (X(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is the input process and the  $\mathbb{R}^k$ -valued process  $\mathcal{Y}_V = (Y_V(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is the output process. It is well known that the solution of the state equation (1.1) is

$$X(t) = e^{\mathbf{A}^*(t-s)}X(s) + \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{A}^*(t-u)}\mathbf{B}^*dL(u), \quad s < t. \quad (1.2)$$

A special subclass of such state space models are the popular *multivariate continuous-time ARMA* (MCARMA) models (Marquardt and Stelzer, 2007; Schlemm and Stelzer, 2012a,b).

The aim of this paper is to construct a graphical model for state space models. The interest in graphical models for stochastic processes has increased significantly in recent years, see, e.g., Mogensen and Hansen (2022, 2020); Basu, Shojaie and Michailidis (2015); Eichler (2007, 2012); Didelez (2007, 2008); Fasn-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), although the use of graphical models to visualise and analyse dependence structures in stochastic models is quite old (Wright, 1921, 1934). A major reason for this surge in interest is the simplicity and clarity of graphical models in representing the dependence structure in stochastic models such that examples of practical applications are ubiquitous. A big advantage is their ease of implementation on computers, making them a powerful tool for the analysis of high-dimensional time series, as demonstrated, for example, in Eichler (2007). The state of the art of graphical models is presented in Maathuis et al. (2019).

In this paper, we use the approach of Fasn-Hartmann and Schenk (2023) to construct *causality graphs* and *local causality graphs* for state space models, and to derive analytic representations of the edges in both graphs by the model parameters. (Local) causality graphs are mixed graphs where the vertices  $V = \{1, \dots, k\}$  represent the different component series  $\mathcal{Y}_v = (Y_v(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ ,  $v \in V$ , of the output process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ . Directed edges reflect (local) Granger causality and undirected edges reflect (local) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness between the component series of the stochastic process. An attractive property of the (local) causality graph is that it satisfies several types of Markov properties under fairly general assumptions.

The mathematical notion of causality can be traced back to Granger (1969) and Sims (1972) and has since then been extended and applied in various fields, see Shojaie and Fox (2022) for an excellent survey. In our context of continuous-time stochastic processes, the notion of Granger causality and contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, as defined in Fasn-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), are based on conditional orthogonality relations of linear subspaces generated by subprocesses, similar to Eichler (2007) in discrete time. This setup is perfectly suitable for stationary stochastic processes, while the approaches of Eichler (2012) using conditional independence relations for stochastic processes in discrete time and those of Mogensen and Hansen (2022, 2020); Didelez (2007, 2008); Eichler, Dahlhaus and Dueck (2017) using conditional local independence are suitable for semimartingales and point processes. We refer to Fasn-Hartmann and Schenk (2023) for a detailed overview of graphical models for stochastic processes and the advantages of the different approaches.

The conditional orthogonality relations in the definition of (local) Granger causality and (local) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness can be expressed equivalently by orthogonal projections of the component processes  $Y_v(t+h)$  ( $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h \geq 0$ ,  $v \in V$ ) and their highest derivative, respectively, on well-defined linear subspaces. To the best of our knowledge, the orthogonal projections for multivariate state space models and their derivatives required in this paper have not yet been addressed in the existing literature. Although Rozanov (1967), III, 5, is devoted to the topic of predictions for general

stationary processes and touches briefly on univariate processes with a spectral density matrix which is a rational function, the representations in that book are based on a specific maximal decomposition of the spectral density matrix. This decomposition is generally not expressible as a simple formula, and so he only considers univariate examples. The orthogonal projections of univariate CARMA processes were discussed in the previous paper by [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#). They provide representations for the linear projection of a CARMA process at time  $t$  onto the entire linear space generated by the CARMA process up to time 0, and for the conditional expectation on the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the CARMA process up to time 0. A multivariate generalisation of the conditional expectation result using the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the whole MCARMA process up to time 0 can be found in [Basse-O'Connor et al. \(2019\)](#), Corollary 4.11, but the statement is not consistent with the comprehensible result of [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#). In any case, in this paper we require not only projections of  $Y_v(t+h)$  on the linear space of the past of the process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  up to time  $t$ , but also on linear subspaces generated by subprocesses, and additionally the projections of the highest derivatives of  $Y_v(t+h)$ .

In the context of *multivariate continuous-time AR* (MCAR) processes, which are a subclass of the MCARMA processes, the topic of orthogonal projections and the corresponding (local) causality graphs are discussed in [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#). Although MCAR processes are state space models, their techniques are not applicable, for example, to MCARMA( $p, q$ ) processes with  $q > 0$ , because of the much simpler structure of MCAR models. This structure allows, for example, the direct recovery of the input process  $\mathcal{X}$  from the output process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ . In particular, [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) use the orthogonal projections to develop (local) causality graphs for MCAR processes and give interpretations for the edges which correspond to other results in the literature; see, e.g., [Comte and Renault \(1996\)](#) for causality relations of MCAR processes and [Eichler \(2007\)](#) for discrete-time AR processes. The present paper can therefore be seen as an extension of [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) to a broader class of models and of course, we compare our results with those of that paper. We would like to point out here that, according to our knowledge, even for stochastic processes in discrete time, the literature on mixed graphical models restricts to AR processes ([Eichler, 2007, 2012](#)), there is not much known on mixed graphical models for the more complex ARMA processes satisfying some types of Markov properties.

In the present paper, the controller canonical form of a state space model plays an important role in calculating the orthogonal projections of  $Y_v(t+h)$  and its highest derivative, as highlighted in [Basse-O'Connor et al. \(2019\)](#). The controller canonical form of a MCARMA process has been studied in [Brockwell and Schlemm \(2013\)](#) and is the multivariate generalisation of the definition of a univariate CARMA process ([Brockwell, 2014](#)). In the case of the existence of a controller canonical form, we show that this representation is unique, which is essential for the unique characterisations of the edges in the (local) causality graph later in this paper; we will prove that the edges depend only on the model parameters of the controller canonical form and the covariance matrix of the driving Lévy process. A special feature of the controller canonical form is that under very general assumptions it can be used to recover the input process  $\mathcal{X}$  from the output process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ , i.e.,  $X(t)$  lies in the closed linear space generated by  $(Y_V(s))_{s \leq t}$ , which is known only for univariate CARMA processes ([Brockwell and Lindner, 2015](#), Theorem 2.2). In this case, we call  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  *invertible controller canonical state space* (ICCSS) process and we are able to calculate the necessary orthogonal projections to describe the (local) Granger causality and (local) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness relations of the underlying process, resulting in the characterisations of the edges in the (local) causality graph.

In conclusion, we show in this paper that not only for ICCSS processes, but also for most state space models, the (local) causality graph exists and satisfies several of the preferred Markov properties. In our opinion this is the first (mixed) graphical model for this popular and broad class of stochastic processes. However, for the explicit representation of the edges via (local) Granger causality and (local) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, we need the invertibility of the state space model and hence, the restriction to ICCSS processes. In addition, we derive new and important results for state space models, such as sufficient criteria for being an ICCSS model, alternative representations for  $Y_v(t+h)$  and its highest derivative depending on the linear past of  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  up to time  $t$  and an independent noise term, and, in particular, their orthogonal projections onto linear subspaces, which are the basis for linear predictions.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2, we introduce (local) causality graphs, the controller canonical form of a state space model, and ICCSS processes. We also present their basic properties that are important for this paper. In Section 3, we consider orthogonal projections of ICCSS processes and their highest derivatives onto linear subspaces generated by subprocesses, since the characterisations of the edges of the (local) causality graph are based on these orthogonal projections. These results lead then to the existence of the (local) causality graph and the characterisation of the directed and the undirected edges for ICCSS processes by their model parameters in Section 4. The proofs of the paper are moved to the appendix.

*Notation.* From now on we call the space of all real and complex  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional matrices  $M_k(\mathbb{R})$  and  $M_k(\mathbb{C})$ , respectively. Similarly,  $M_{k,d}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $M_{k,d}(\mathbb{C})$  denote real and complex  $(k \times d)$ -dimensional matrices. For  $\mathbf{A} \in M_{k,d}(\mathbb{C})$  we write  $\mathbf{A}^\top$  for the transpose of  $\mathbf{A}$  and for  $\mathbf{A} \in M_k(\mathbb{C})$  we write  $\mathbf{A} \geq 0$  if  $\mathbf{A}$  is positive semi-definite, and  $\mathbf{A} > 0$  if  $\mathbf{A}$  is positive definite. Furthermore,  $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$  are the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$ .  $I_k$  is the  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional identity matrix,  $0_{k \times d}$  is the  $(k \times d)$ -dimensional zero matrix and  $0_k$  is either the  $k$ -dimensional zero vector or the  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional zero matrix which should be clear from the context. The vector  $e_a \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is the  $a$ -th unit vector, as well as

$$\mathbf{E}_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0_{k(j-1) \times k} \\ I_k \\ 0_{k(p-j) \times k} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kp \times k}(\mathbb{R}), \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (1.3)$$

Furthermore, we write for  $p > q$ ,

$$\overline{\mathbf{E}}^\top = (I_{kq}, 0_{k(p-q) \times kq}) \in M_{kq \times kp}(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top = (0_{k \times k(q-1)}, I_k) \in M_{k \times kq}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (1.4)$$

The two-line marker indicates where the matrix has non-zero entries. Two lines at the top represent entries at the top (front of the transpose) of the matrix, while two lines at the bottom represent entries at the bottom (back of the transpose). For a matrix polynomial  $P(z)$  we write  $\mathcal{N}(P) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \det(P(z)) = 0\}$  and  $\deg(\det(P(z)))$  denotes the degree of the polynomial  $\det(P(z))$ . Finally, l.i.m. is the mean square limit.

**2. Preliminaries.** The topic of this paper is mixed (local) causality graphs for state space models. Therefore, in Section 2.1 we introduce (local) causality graphs and present the main results of [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) that are relevant to this paper. Then, in Sections 2.2 and 2.3, the controller canonical form of a state space model is introduced, and the invertibility of these processes is discussed.

2.1. *Mixed causality graphs.* Causality graphs are graphical models  $G_{CG} = (V, E_{CG})$  where the vertices  $V = \{1, \dots, k\}$  represent the different component series  $\mathcal{Y}_v = (Y_v(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$ ,  $v \in V$ , of a  $k$ -dimensional process  $\mathcal{Y}_V = (Y_V(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  with finite second moments. The latter are connected with both directed and undirected edges  $E_{CG}$ . A directed edge represents a Granger causal relationship between the components, while an undirected edge represents contemporaneous correlatedness. Therefore, we first present some notation which we require for the definitions of Granger causality and contemporaneous correlatedness. For any set  $S \subseteq V$ ,  $t, \tilde{t} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $t < \tilde{t}$ , we define the closed linear spaces

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t, \tilde{t}) = \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \in S} \gamma_{s,i} Y_s(t_i) : \gamma_{s,i} \in \mathbb{C}, t \leq t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq \tilde{t}, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}},$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t) = \overline{\left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s \in S} \gamma_{s,i} Y_s(t_i) : \gamma_{s,i} \in \mathbb{C}, -\infty < t_1 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq t, n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}}.$$

We further denote the orthogonal projection of  $X \in L^2$  on the closed linear subspace  $\mathcal{L} \subseteq L^2$  by  $P_{\mathcal{L}}(X) = P_{\mathcal{L}}X$ .

First, we establish definitions of Granger causality, which characterises the directed edges in the (local) causality graph.

DEFINITION 2.1. Let  $a, b \in S \subseteq V$  and  $a \neq b$ .

(a)  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  is *Granger non-causal* for  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  with respect to  $\mathcal{Y}_S$ , if and only if, for all  $0 \leq h \leq 1$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} Y_b(t+h) = P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S \setminus \{a\}}}(t)} Y_b(t+h) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

We shortly write  $\mathcal{Y}_a \not\rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_S$ .

(b) Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_v$  is  $j_v$ -times mean-square differentiable but the  $(j_v + 1)$  derivative does not exist for  $v \in V$ . The  $j_v$ -derivative is denoted by  $D^{(j_v)} \mathcal{Y}_v$ , where for  $j_v = 0$  we define  $D^{(0)} \mathcal{Y}_v = \mathcal{Y}_v$ . Then  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  is *local Granger non-causal* for  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  with respect to  $\mathcal{Y}_S$ , if and only if, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{l.i.m.}_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t+h) - D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t)}{h} \right) \\ &= \text{l.i.m.}_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_{S \setminus \{a\}}}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t+h) - D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t)}{h} \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

We shortly write  $\mathcal{Y}_a \not\rightarrow_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_S$ .

In words,  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  is Granger non-causal for  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  if the prediction of  $Y_b(t+h)$  based on the linear information available at time  $t$  provided by the past and present of  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is not diminished by removing the linear information provided by the past and present values of  $\mathcal{Y}_a$ . Local Granger non-causality considers the limiting case  $h \rightarrow 0$ , where the highest existing derivative of the process must be examined in order to obtain a non-trivial criterion; see as well the discussion in [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) for the motivation of these definitions.

REMARK 2.2. [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) originally defined Granger causality by conditional orthogonality of linear spaces generated by subprocess, and then showed that these definitions are equivalent to the definitions based on the orthogonal projections given above (see Theorem 3.4 and Remark 3.11 therein).

Next, the undirected edges are characterised by (linear) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness. The idea is simple: there is no undirected influence between  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  if and only if, given the amount of information provided by the past of  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  up to time  $t$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  are uncorrelated in the future. [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) introduce the following definitions.

DEFINITION 2.3. Let  $a, b \in S \subseteq V$  and  $a \neq b$ .

- (a)  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  are *contemporaneously uncorrelated* with respect to  $\mathcal{Y}_S$ , if and only if, for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( Y_a(t+h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} Y_a(t+h) \right) \overline{\left( Y_b(t+\tilde{h}) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} Y_b(t+\tilde{h}) \right)} \right] = 0.$$

We shortly write  $\mathcal{Y}_a \approx \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_S$ .

- (b) Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_v$  is  $j_v$ -times mean-square differentiable but the  $(j_v + 1)$ -th derivative does not exist for  $v \in V$ . Then  $\mathcal{Y}_a$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_b$  are *locally contemporaneously uncorrelated* with respect to  $\mathcal{Y}_S$ , if and only if for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( D^{(j_a)} Y_a(t+h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} D^{(j_a)} Y_a(t+h) \right) \overline{\left( D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t+h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} D^{(j_b)} Y_b(t+h) \right)} \right] = 0.$$

We shortly write  $\mathcal{Y}_a \approx_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_S$ .

REMARK 2.4. The original definition of contemporaneous uncorrelatedness in [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) is again by conditional orthogonality of linear spaces generated by subprocesses, and equivalent characterisations using orthogonal projections are given (see Lemma 4.2, Theorem 4.4, and Remark 4.8 therein).

Before defining the causality graphs with these terms and definitions, we introduce assumptions on the stochastic process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ , which are fulfilled, in particular, by most state space models (see Section 4).

ASSUMPTION A.

- (A.1) Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is wide-sense stationary and mean-square continuous.  
 (A.2) Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  has a positive definite spectral density matrix  $f_{\mathcal{Y}_V \mathcal{Y}_V}(\lambda)$  and there exists an  $0 < \varepsilon < 1$  such that

$$(1 - \varepsilon) I_\alpha - f_{Y_A Y_A}(\lambda)^{-1/2} f_{Y_A Y_B}(\lambda) f_{Y_B Y_B}(\lambda)^{-1} f_{Y_B Y_A}(\lambda) f_{Y_A Y_A}(\lambda)^{-1/2} \geq 0,$$

for almost all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and for all disjoint subsets  $A, B \subseteq V$ , where  $\alpha$  is the cardinality of  $A$ .

- (A.3) Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is purely non-deterministic, i.e., for all  $a \in V$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_V}(t)} Y_a(t+h) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

REMARK 2.5.

- (a) Assumption (A.1) is a basic requirement, otherwise, e.g., the spectral density in Assumption (A.2) is not well defined.

- (b) Assumption (A.2) ensures the linear independence and closeness of sums of linear spaces generated by subprocesses, i.e., for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $A, B \subseteq V$  with  $A \cap B = \emptyset$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{Y_A}(t) \cap \mathcal{L}_{Y_B}(t) = \{0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{Y_A}(t) + \mathcal{L}_{Y_B}(t) = \mathcal{L}_{Y_A}(t) \vee \mathcal{L}_{Y_B}(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (2.1)$$

- (c) Any process that is wide-sense stationary can be uniquely decomposed into a deterministic and a purely non-deterministic process, which are orthogonal to each other (Gladyshev (1958), Theorem 1). From the point of view of applications, deterministic processes are not important, so (A.3) is a natural assumption.

With this assumption we are able to define causality graphs.

DEFINITION 2.6. Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  satisfies Assumption A.

- (a) If we define  $V = \{1, \dots, k\}$  as the vertices and the edges  $E_{CG}$  via
- (i)  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a \not\rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V$ ,
  - (ii)  $a \dashrightarrow b \notin E_{CG} \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a \not\approx \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V$ ,
- for  $a, b \in V$  with  $a \neq b$ , then  $G_{CG} = (V, E_{CG})$  is called *causality graph* for  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ .
- (b) If we define  $V = \{1, \dots, k\}$  as the vertices and the edges  $E_{CG}^0$  via
- (i)  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}^0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a \not\rightarrow_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V$ ,
  - (ii)  $a \dashrightarrow b \notin E_{CG}^0 \Leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_a \not\approx_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V$ ,
- for  $a, b \in V$  with  $a \neq b$ , then  $G_{CG}^0 = (V, E_{CG}^0)$  is called *local causality graph* for  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ .

REMARK 2.7.

- (a) The assumptions are not necessary for the definition of the graphs, but they ensure that the usual Markov properties for mixed graphs are satisfied. Specifically, the causality graph satisfies the pairwise, the local, the block-recursive, the global AMP and the global Granger-causal Markov properties. In particular, the Assumption (A.3) ensures that the global AMP Markov property holds. The local causality graph satisfies the pairwise, the local and the block-recursive Markov property; for global Markov properties of the local causality graph, additional assumptions are required; see Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Proposition 5.20 and Proposition 5.21, respectively.
- (b) The local causality graph has fewer edges than the causality graph, and in general the graphs are not equal. The advantage of the local causality graph over the causality graph is that it allows to model more general graphs, whereas the causality graph satisfies the global AMP and the global causal Markov property, the local causality graph does not satisfy them in general, additional assumptions are necessary. For more details see Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023) again.

2.2. *Controller canonical state space models.* The aim of this paper is to derive (local) causality graphs for state space models. Therefore, we use the controller canonical form of a state space model and its uniqueness, which results in the unique characterisation of the edges in the (local) causality graph in Section 4. To define the controller canonical form of a state space model, we need some definitions and terminology. Therefore, note that each state space model  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  is associated with a rational matrix function

$$H(z) = \mathbf{C}^* (zI_{kp} - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{B}^*, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(\mathbf{A}^*), \quad (2.2)$$

called the *transfer function* of the state space model, and the triple  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  is an *algebraic realisation* of the transfer function of dimension  $kp$  (characterising the dimension  $(kp \times kp)$  of  $\mathbf{A}^*$ ). The triple  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  of dimension  $kp$  is said to be

*minimal* if there is no other algebraic realisation of  $H(z)$  with dimension less than  $kp$ . The transfer function is of importance because, due to the spectral representation theorem (Lax, 2002, Theorem 17.5), we are able to recover the kernel function of the output process of the state space model via

$$\mathbf{C}^* e^{\mathbf{A}^* t} \mathbf{B}^* = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma} e^{zt} H(z) dz, \quad t \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\Gamma$  is a closed contour in the complex numbers that winds around each eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{A}^*$  exactly once. The transfer function even uniquely determines the function  $\mathbf{C}^* e^{\mathbf{A}^* t} \mathbf{B}^*$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , (Schlemm and Stelzer, 2012b, Lemma 3.2). Kailath (1980) provides in Lemma 6.3-8 that there exist  $(k \times k)$ -dimensional matrix polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  such that

$$H(z) = Q(z)P(z)^{-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(\mathbf{A}^*), \quad (2.4)$$

is a *coprime* right polynomial fraction description of the transfer function, which in turn means that the matrix  $[P(z)^\top Q(z)^\top]^\top$  has full rank. In Lemma 6.3-3 Kailath (1980) even gives a construction for such a decomposition. However, without any additional assumption, the coprime polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  that satisfy (2.4) are not unique. Even if we assume additionally that  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  is minimal, resulting in  $\deg(\det(P(z))) = kp$  (Rugh, 1996, Theorem 17.5), then we can take any invertible matrix  $S \in M_k(\mathbb{R})$  such that the matrix polynomials  $P(z)S$  and  $Q(z)S$  also satisfy  $H(z) = Q(z)SS^{-1}P(z)^{-1}$ .

Despite the many different coprime polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  that satisfy (2.4), to the best of our knowledge, it remains unclear whether there is a coprime right polynomial fraction description with

$$P(z) = I_k z^p + A_1 z^{p-1} + \dots + A_p \quad \text{and} \quad Q(z) = C_0 + C_1 z + \dots + C_q z^q, \quad (2.5)$$

$A_1, A_2, \dots, A_p, C_0, C_1, \dots, C_q \in M_k(\mathbb{R})$ , and  $p, q \in \mathbb{N}_0$ ,  $p > q$ , i.e.,  $z^p$  is the highest power with prefactor  $I_k$ . In this representation  $\deg(\det(P(z))) = kp$  obviously holds. Note, the construction method of Kailath (1980) often gives a polynomial  $P(z)$  with higher order than  $p$ , but the prefactor of the highest power has a zero determinant. Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), Theorem 3.4, and Schlemm and Stelzer (2012a), Corollary 3.2, implicitly assume such a right polynomial fraction description (2.5) without discussing its existence. Since the existence of such a coprime right polynomial fraction description is essential for the forthcoming results, we always assume it additionally. In Example 2.12 we present likewise examples where this assumption is fulfilled.

For the purpose of this paper, not only the existence of a coprime right polynomial fraction description of the transfer function with polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5) is important, but also its uniqueness. In the next lemma we derive that this requirement is immediately satisfied under the existence assumption of  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$ .

**PROPOSITION 2.8.** *Let  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  be a state space model with transfer function  $H(z)$ . Suppose there exists a coprime right polynomial fraction description of  $H(z)$  with polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5) such that*

$$H(z) = \mathbf{C}^* (zI_{kp} - \mathbf{A}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{B}^* = Q(z)P(z)^{-1}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(\mathbf{A}^*).$$



Then  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are unique. Moreover, defining

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & I_k & 0_k & \cdots & 0_k \\ 0_k & 0_k & I_k & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0_k \\ 0_k & \cdots & \cdots & 0_k & I_k \\ -A_p & -A_{p-1} & \cdots & \cdots & -A_1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kp}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k \\ \vdots \\ 0_k \\ I_k \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kp \times k}(\mathbb{R}), \quad (2.6)$$

$$\mathbf{C} = (C_0 \ C_1 \ \cdots \ C_q \ 0_k \ \cdots \ 0_k) \in M_{k \times kp}(\mathbb{R}),$$

then  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}^*) = \sigma(\mathbf{A})$  and

$$H(z) = \mathbf{C} (zI_{kp} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B}, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(\mathbf{A}).$$

Finally,  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is a solution of the state space model  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  if and only if it is a solution of the state space model  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, L)$ . The state space model  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, L)$  is called controller canonical form.

In particular, of course, this implies that there exist no other minimal state space representation with matrices of the structure as in (2.6); this representation is unique. Since the solution of these two state space models is equal, we will henceforth assume, without loss of generality, that the state space model is given in the unique controller canonical form  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, L)$  as in (2.6).

A particular example of a state space model is the MCARMA model whose solution  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is a MCARMA process. The definition of a MCARMA process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is motivated by the idea that  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  solves the differential equation

$$P^*(D)DY_V(t) = Q^*(D)DL(t)$$

where  $D$  is the differential operator with respect to  $t$  and

$$P^*(z) = I_k z^{p^*} + P_1 z^{p^*-1} + \dots + P_{p^*} \text{ and } Q^*(z) = Q_0 z^{q^*} + Q_1 z^{q^*-1} + \dots + Q_{q^*} \quad (2.7)$$

with  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_{p^*}, Q_0, Q_1, \dots, Q_{q^*} \in M_k(\mathbb{R})$  are the AR (autoregressive) and the MA (moving average) polynomial. However, a Lévy process is not differentiable, so this is not a formal definition. The formal definition is given by a state space model (Marquardt and Stelzer, 2007) as follows.

DEFINITION 2.9. Define

$$\mathbf{A}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & I_k & 0_k & \cdots & 0_k \\ 0_k & 0_k & I_k & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0_k \\ 0_k & \cdots & \cdots & 0_k & I_k \\ -P_{p^*} & -P_{p^*-1} & \cdots & \cdots & -P_1 \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kp^*}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \mathbf{B}^* = \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_{p^*} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kp^* \times k}(\mathbb{R}),$$

$$\mathbf{C}^* = (I_k, 0_k, \dots, 0_k) \in M_{k \times kp^*}(\mathbb{R}),$$

where  $\beta_1 = \dots, \beta_{p^*-q^*-1} = 0_k$  and  $\beta_{p^*-j} = \sum_{i=1}^{p^*-j-1} P_i \beta_{p^*-j-i} + Q_{q^*-j}$  for  $j = q^*, \dots, 0$ . Then  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  is called a *multivariate continuous-time moving average model of order  $(p^*, q^*)$* , shortly MCARMA( $p^*, q^*$ ) model.

REMARK 2.10. A comparison of the triplets  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$  and  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  shows that the  $\text{MCAR}(p) = \text{MCARMA}(p, 0)$  model is already in controller canonical form. For  $\text{MCARMA}(p, q)$  models, Schlemm and Stelzer (2012a) showed the equivalence between state space models and  $\text{MCARMA}$  models in Corollary 3.4, and Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), Theorem 3.2, showed the equivalence between  $\text{MCARMA}$  models and controller canonical state space models. However, as mentioned above, both implicitly assume the existence of a coprime left (right) polynomial fractional description (2.4) with polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5), which is in our opinion not obvious. However, for univariate state space processes with  $k = 1$ , the existence of a coprime right polynomial fractional description is apparent (see proof of Proposition 3.1), so that any univariate state space model is a  $\text{CARMA}$  model and vice versa; additionally, any univariate state space model has a representation in controller canonical form.

A peculiarity of  $\text{MCARMA}$  models is that the AR polynomial  $P^*(z)$  and the MA polynomial  $Q^*(z)$  provide a left polynomial fraction description of the transfer function, i.e.,  $H(z) = P^*(z)^{-1}Q^*(z)$  (Marquardt and Stelzer (2007) or Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), Lemma 3.1). If the  $\text{MCARMA}$  model is minimal, this left polynomial fractional description is even coprime (Kailath, 1980, Theorem 6.5-1). The connection to the coprime right polynomial fraction description (2.4) with  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5) is given in the next lemma.

LEMMA 2.11. *Let an  $\text{MCARMA}(p^*, q^*)$  model be given with state space representation  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  as in Definition 2.9 and polynomials  $P^*(z)$  and  $Q^*(z)$  as in (2.7). Suppose  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  is minimal and there exists a coprime right polynomial fraction description (2.4) of the transfer function with polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5). Then  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are unique,  $p^* = p$ ,  $q^* = q$ ,  $Q_{q^*} = C_q$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(P^*) = \mathcal{N}(P)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(Q^*) = \mathcal{N}(Q)$ .*

EXAMPLE 2.12.

- (a) Consider a  $\text{MCARMA}(2, 1)$  model with coprime AR polynomial and MA polynomial given by

$$P^*(z) = \begin{pmatrix} (z+2)^2 & 0 \\ 0 & (z+2)^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Q^*(z) = \begin{pmatrix} z+1 & 0 \\ 0 & z+1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Since  $P^*(z)$  and  $Q^*(z)$  are diagonal matrix polynomials and are right coprime, the unique coprime right polynomial fraction description of the transfer function  $H(z)$  is given through  $P(z) = P^*(z)$  and  $Q(z) = Q^*(z)$ .

- (b) Consider a  $\text{MCARMA}(3, 1)$  model with coprime AR polynomial and MA polynomial given by

$$P^*(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1/4(2z+3)(2z^2+7z+7) & -1/4(z+2)(3z+5) \\ -(z+1)^2 & (z+1)^2(z+2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q^*(z) = - \begin{pmatrix} z+1 & 1/4 \\ 0 & z+3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the coprime right polynomial fractional description of  $H(z)$  is given by

$$P(z) = \begin{pmatrix} (z+2)^3 & 0 \\ 0 & (z+1)^3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Q(z) = - \begin{pmatrix} z+2 & 1 \\ 1 & z+2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

- (c) For  $\text{MCAR}(p)$  models,  $Q^*(z) = I_k$  holds. Thus,  $P(z) = P^*(z)$  and  $Q(z) = I_k$  always provide a coprime right polynomial fractional description of  $H(z)$ .

In particular, these examples show the existence of coprime right polynomial fraction descriptions (2.4) with polynomials as in (2.5). Since the aim of this paper is not the investigation of polynomial fraction descriptions, but the application of (local) causality graphs to state space models, we do not investigate this further and move on to the topic of the invertibility of a state model.

2.3. *Invertible controller canonical state space models.* Suppose  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is a solution to a state space model that has a controller canonical representation  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, L)$ . From now on, we assume that the driving Lévy process satisfies the following common assumption.

ASSUMPTION B. *The  $k$ -dimensional Lévy process  $\mathbf{L} = (L(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  satisfies  $\mathbb{E}L(1) = \mathbf{0}_k \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and  $\mathbb{E}\|L(1)\|^2 < \infty$  with  $\Sigma_L = \mathbb{E}[L(1)L(1)^\top]$ .*

Then the second moments of  $X(t)$  and thus of  $Y_V(t)$  exist (Brockwell and Schlemm, 2013, Lemma A.4), which is a basic requirement for the forthcoming considerations on the existence of (local) causality graphs.

Due to the state equation  $Y_V(t) = \mathbf{C}X(t)$ , we obtain the output process  $Y_V(t)$  directly from the input process  $X(t)$ . However, the recovery of  $X(t)$  from the output process  $(Y_V(s))_{s \leq t}$ , is not as obvious, because  $\mathbf{C}$  is not invertible. Only for  $q = 0$ , corresponding to a MCAR( $p$ ) model, the simple structure of  $\mathbf{C}$  allows to use the relation

$$\begin{aligned} D^{(j-1)}Y_V(t) &= X^{(j)}(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad \text{where} \\ X^{(j)}(t) &= (X_{(j-1)k+1}(t) \cdots X_{jk}(t))^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (2.8)$$

is the  $j$ -th  $k$ -block of  $X(t)$  and  $D^{(1)}Y_V(t), \dots, D^{(p-1)}Y_V(t)$  denote the mean-square derivatives of  $Y_V(t)$ . Therefore, in this case it is possible to recover  $X(t)$  from  $Y_V(t)$  and its derivatives  $D^{(1)}Y_V(t), \dots, D^{(p-1)}Y_V(t)$  via (2.8). However, for controller canonical state space models with  $q > 0$  we cannot apply this approach. Indeed, the structure of  $\mathbf{A}$  still yields

$$DX^{(j)}(t) = X^{(j+1)}(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, p-1,$$

and together with  $Y_V(t) = \mathbf{C}X(t) = C_0X^{(1)}(t) + \cdots + C_qX^{(q+1)}(t)$ , we obtain that

$$D^{(j-1)}Y_V(t) = \sum_{i=0}^q C_i X^{(j+i)}(t), \quad j = 1, \dots, p-q. \quad (2.9)$$

Consequently, the  $p$   $k$ -blocks cannot generally be recovered from these  $(p-q)$  equations.

REMARK 2.13.

(a) For the readers convenience, we define

$$\overline{\mathbf{C}} := \mathbf{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{\mathbf{C}} := (0_k, \dots, 0_k, C_0, \dots, C_q) \in M_{k \times kp}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (2.10)$$

From (2.9) we receive then the shorthands

$$Y_V(t) = \overline{\mathbf{C}}X(t) \quad \text{and} \quad D^{(p-q-1)}Y_V(t) = \underline{\mathbf{C}}X(t). \quad (2.11)$$

In particular, this implies that  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  and its components  $\mathcal{Y}_a$ ,  $a \in V$ , are  $(p-q-1)$  times mean-square differentiable.

- (b) A conclusion from (a) and [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#), Remark 2.6, is then that for  $a \in V$  and  $t \geq 0$ ,

$$D^{(1)}Y_a(t), \dots, D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t) \in \mathcal{L}_{Y_a}(t).$$

For controller canonical state space models as in (2.6) with  $q > 0$ , we overcome the challenge of recovering the state process from the output process under some mild assumptions. These assumptions are, e.g., satisfied in Example 2.12(a,b). Of course, due to  $q > 0$ , the class of MCAR( $p$ ) models are excluded in the following considerations. However, this is not an essential limitation, because the (local) causality graphs and the orthogonal projections, respectively for this case are already known ([Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk, 2023](#)). We first define causal *invertible* controller canonical state space models, which are a special subclass of controller canonical state space models.

**DEFINITION 2.14.** Let  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  be a state space model with controller canonical form  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, L)$  as in (2.6) and right coprime polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  as in (2.5) with  $p > q > 0$ . Suppose that

$$\text{rank}(C_q) = k, \quad \mathcal{N}(Q) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{N}(P) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}. \quad (2.12)$$

Then  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \bar{\mathbf{C}}, L)$  is called a *causal invertible controller canonical state space model* (ICCSS) of order  $(p, q)$  and the stationary solution  $\mathcal{Y}_V = (Y_V(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  of the ICCSS( $p, q$ ) model is called ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process.

**REMARK 2.15.**

- (a) Since  $\mathcal{N}(P) = \sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$  ([Marquardt and Stelzer, 2007](#), Corollary 3.8), there exists a unique stationary solution  $X(t)$  of the observation equation ([Sato and Yamazato, 1984](#), Theorem 4.1) which has the representation

$$X(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Hence, there exists as well a stationary version of the output process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ , which has the moving average representation

$$Y_V(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g(t-u) dL(u) \quad \text{with} \quad g(t) = \mathbf{C} e^{\mathbf{A}t} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{1}_{[0, \infty)}(t), \quad t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Throughout this paper, we are working with these stationary versions of  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ .

- (b) The assumptions on  $Q(z)$  are necessary to recover  $\mathcal{X}$  from  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  and to motivate the name ICCSS model, as we see in the remainder of this section.

Under Assumption (2.12), [Brockwell and Schlemm \(2013\)](#), Lemma 4.1, derive a stochastic differential equation for the first  $(kq)$  components of  $\mathcal{X}$ . This follows simply from combining the first  $q$   $k$ -blocks of the state transition equation  $dX(t) = \mathbf{A}X(t)dt + \mathbf{B}dL(t)$  with the observation equation  $Y(t) = \bar{\mathbf{C}}X(t)$  having the special structure of  $\mathbf{A}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$  in mind.

**LEMMA 2.16.** Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be a ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Denote the  $(kq)$ -dimensional upper truncated state vector  $\mathcal{X}^q = (X^q(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  of  $\mathcal{X}$  by

$$X^q(t) = \begin{pmatrix} X^{(1)}(t) \\ \vdots \\ X^{(q)}(t) \end{pmatrix}, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

where  $X^{(1)}(t), \dots, X^{(q)}(t)$  are the  $k$ -dimensional random vectors as defined in (2.8). Then  $\mathcal{X}^q$  satisfies

$$dX^q(t) = \mathbf{\Lambda}X^q(t)dt + \mathbf{\Theta}Y_V(t)dt, \quad (2.13)$$

where  $\sigma(\mathbf{\Lambda}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k & I_k & 0_k & \cdots & 0_k \\ 0_k & 0_k & I_k & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \ddots & 0_k \\ 0_k & \cdots & \cdots & 0_k & I_k \\ -C_q^{-1}C_0 & -C_q^{-1}C_1 & \cdots & \cdots & -C_q^{-1}C_{q-1} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kq}(\mathbb{R}), \quad \mathbf{\Theta} = \begin{pmatrix} 0_k \\ \vdots \\ 0_k \\ C_q^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \in M_{kq \times k}(\mathbb{R}).$$

REMARK 2.17.

- (a) Assumption (2.12) corresponds to the minimum-phase assumption in classical time series analysis (Hannan and Deistler, 2012) and implies Assumption A2 in Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), who even allow for rectangular matrices  $C_0, \dots, C_q$ . To see this, note that Assumption (2.12) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}(C_q^{-1}Q) &= \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \det(C_q^{-1}Q(z)) = 0\} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \det(Q(z)) = 0\} \\ &= \mathcal{N}(Q) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}, \end{aligned}$$

which is one of their assumptions. Furthermore, it holds that  $\sigma(\mathbf{\Lambda}) = \mathcal{N}(C_q^{-1}Q^*)$  (Marquardt and Stelzer, 2007, Lemma 3.8). Thus,  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$  has full rank and, due to the structure of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ , we obtain that  $C_q^{-1}C_0$  has full rank. It follows that  $C_0$  and  $(C_q)^\top C_0$  have full rank as well, which is the second assumption in Brockwell and Schlemm (2013).

- (b) If the AR polynomial  $P^*(z)$  and the MA polynomial  $Q^*(z)$  of a MCARMA model are left coprime, the Assumption (2.12) can equally be made for  $P^*(z)$  and  $Q^*(z)$ , respectively. Indeed,  $\mathcal{N}(Q^*) = \mathcal{N}(Q)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(P^*) = \mathcal{N}(P)$  by Lemma 2.11. Further, straightforward calculations of  $Q^*(z)P(z) = P^*(z)Q(z)$  give  $Q_q A_p = P_p C_q$ . For  $\mathcal{N}(P^*) = \mathcal{N}(P) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$  we have  $0 \notin \mathcal{N}(P^*)$  and therefore,  $\det(P_p) = \det(P^*(0)) \neq 0$ . Similarly  $\det(A_p) \neq 0$  follows, so  $P_p$  and  $A_p$  are invertible. Hence, if  $\mathcal{N}(P^*) = \mathcal{N}(P) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ , then  $Q_q$  has full rank if and only if  $C_q$  has full rank.

The differential equation (2.13) has the solution

$$X^q(t) = e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-s)}X^q(s) + \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-u)}\mathbf{\Theta}Y_V(u)du, \quad s < t, \quad (2.14)$$

(Brockwell and Schlemm, 2013, (4.3)). Therefore, we can compute  $X^q(t)$  based on the knowledge of the initial value  $X^q(s)$  and  $(Y_V(u))_{s \leq u \leq t}$ . In Proposition 3.1 and Proposition 3.5 we even show the integral representation

$$X^q(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-u)}\mathbf{\Theta}Y_V(u)du$$

$\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. and in the mean square, respectively. Hence,  $X^q(t)$  is even uniquely determined by the entire past  $(Y_V(s))_{s \leq t}$ , implying that the truncated state vector  $\mathcal{X}^q$  can be recovered from  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ . The remaining  $k$ -blocks  $\mathcal{X}^{(q+j)}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p-q$ , are obtained from  $\mathcal{X}^q$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  by differentiation as in Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), Lemma 4.2:

LEMMA 2.18. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be a ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then*

$$X^{(q+j)}(t) = \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \left[ \mathbf{\Lambda}^j X^q(t) + \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}^{j-1-m} \mathbf{\Theta} D^m Y_V(t) \right], \quad j = 1, \dots, p - q, t \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that there is a duplication of notation in [Brockwell and Schlemm \(2013\)](#), which can be seen by recalculating the induction start. We therefore give the corrected result in Lemma 2.18.

In summary, we are able to compute not only the truncated state vector  $X^q(t)$  but also the full state vector  $X(t)$  based on the knowledge of  $(Y_V(s))_{s \leq t}$ . This justifies calling the ICCSS process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  *invertible* if Assumption (2.12) holds.

**3. Orthogonal projections of ICCSS processes.** In this section, we derive the orthogonal projections of ICCSS processes and their derivatives which we require to characterise (local) Granger non-causality and (local) contemporaneous uncorrelatedness for ICCSS processes. First, we give alternative representations of  $Y_a(t+h)$  as well as  $D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h)$ ,  $a \in V$ , suitable for the calculation of orthogonal projections in Section 3.1. Note that we consider the process  $D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h)$  since, by Remark 3.7 below, it is the highest existing derivative of the ICCSS process which we require for the definition of local Granger non-causality and local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, respectively. In Section 3.2, we then present the corresponding orthogonal projections of both random variables on  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$ ,  $S \subseteq V$ . Furthermore, we discuss the limit of the projections of difference quotients.

3.1. *Representations of ICCSS processes and their derivatives.* The aim of this subsection is to develop a  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. representation of  $Y_a(t+h)$  and its  $(p-q-1)$ -th derivative  $D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h)$ ,  $a \in V$ . Therefore, we first introduce the  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. integral representation of the upper  $q$ -block truncation  $\mathcal{X}^q$ , which is a multivariate generalisation of [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#), Theorem 2.2.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then for all  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we have*

$$X^q(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-u)} \mathbf{\Theta} Y_V(u) du \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Due to the well-definedness of this integral, it is obvious that the following representations of  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  and its derivatives are well-defined as well.

THEOREM 3.2. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be a ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then for  $h \geq 0$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a \in V$ , it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} Y_a(t+h) &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-u)} \mathbf{\Theta} Y_V(u) du \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \mathbf{\Theta} D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, h) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \text{and} \\ D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}(t-u)} \mathbf{\Theta} Y_V(u) du \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \mathbf{\Theta} D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, h) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Here, we abbreviate

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) &= \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}}e^{\mathbf{A}h} \left( \overline{\overline{\mathbf{E}}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \Lambda^j \right), & \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}e^{\mathbf{A}h} \left( \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \Lambda^j \right), \\ \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) &= \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}}e^{\mathbf{A}h} \sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \Lambda^{j-1-m}, & \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}e^{\mathbf{A}h} \sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \Lambda^{j-1-m}, \\ \overline{\overline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, h) &= \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} \int_t^{t+h} e^{\mathbf{A}(t+h-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u), & \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, h) &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \int_t^{t+h} e^{\mathbf{A}(t+h-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u).\end{aligned}$$

where  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}}$  and  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}$  are defined in (2.10),  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{E}}}$  and  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}$  are defined in (1.4) and finally,  $\mathbf{E}_j$  is defined in (1.3),  $j = 1, \dots, p$ .

REMARK 3.3.

- (a) All abbreviations of deterministic functions and stochastic processes are marked with two lines at the bottom or top, depending on whether they contain  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}}$  or  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}$ .
- (b)  $\overline{\overline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, 0) = \underline{\underline{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}}(t, 0) = 0_k \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

REMARK 3.4. For an MCAR( $p$ ) process, [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#) state in Lemma 6.8 that

$$Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \sum_{m=0}^{p-1} \mathbf{E}_{m+1} D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} \int_t^{t+h} e^{\mathbf{A}(t+h-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (3.1)$$

Thus, if we want to compare our Theorem 3.2 to the results for MCAR( $p$ ) processes, we have to interpret

$$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \boldsymbol{\Theta} \hat{=} \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{m+1}, \quad m = 0, \dots, p-1, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \boldsymbol{\Theta} \hat{=} 0_{k \times k} \text{ if } u < t,$$

if  $q = 0$ . Then (3.1) can be seen as special case of Theorem 3.2. Let us briefly heuristically justify that this interpretation is reasonable. First of all, in  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \boldsymbol{\Theta}$  the summand  $j = m + 1$  is mainly relevant. For this summand we have with  $\Lambda^0 = I_k$  that

$$\overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{q+m+1} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Theta} = \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{q+m+1} C_q^{-1}. \quad (3.2)$$

If  $q = 0$  is inserted into  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ , all summands disappear due to the zero dimensionality of  $\Lambda^{j-1-m}$ ,  $j = m + 2, \dots, p - q$ , except for (3.2). With  $C_q = I_k$  it remains as claimed  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \boldsymbol{\Theta} \hat{=} \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{m+1}$  for  $m = 0, \dots, p - 1$ . For the second matrix function  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \boldsymbol{\Theta}$ ,  $u < t$ , we use similar arguments to show that it can be interpreted as a zero matrix. Although we get a non-zero matrix for  $t = u$ , this event is a Lebesgue null-set.

3.2. *Orthogonal projections of ICCSS processes and their derivatives.* The representations of  $Y_a(t+h)$  and  $D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h)$  in Theorem 3.2 suggest that for the orthogonal projection of the  $a$ -th component one time step into the future, on the one hand, the past  $(Y_S(s))_{s \leq t}$  of all components and on the other hand, the future of the Lévy process  $(L(s) - L(t))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  is relevant. However, for a formal proof we require that all integrals are defined in  $L^2$ . Therefore, we start to show that the integral representation of  $\mathcal{X}^q$  in Proposition 3.1 holds in  $L^2$ . The proof is based on the ideas of the proof of Theorem 2.8 in [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#) in the univariate setting.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then for  $a, v \in V$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  the integral*

$$\int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \in \mathcal{L}_{Y_v}(t)$$

*exists as  $L^2$ -limit. In particular,  $X^q(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du$  exists as  $L^2$ -limit.*

Before finally moving on to the orthogonal projections, we introduce one last alternative representation, this time for the difference quotient  $(D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t))/h$ . With this representation we can argue that  $D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)$  is indeed the maximum derivative of  $Y_a(t)$  which we need to use for local Granger noncausality and for local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness.

LEMMA 3.6. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then for  $h \geq 0$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $a \in V$  the representation*

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)}{h} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \\ & \quad + e_a^\top O(h) R_1 + e_a^\top O(h) R_2 + e_a^\top \frac{\underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h)}{h} \end{aligned}$$

*holds, where  $R_1, R_2$  are random vectors in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t) \subseteq L^2$ . The random variable  $e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h)/h$  is independent of the former summands and*

$$\lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ (e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h))^2 \right] = e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e_a \neq 0 \quad \text{but} \quad \lim_{h \downarrow 0} \frac{1}{h^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ (e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h))^2 \right] = \infty.$$

REMARK 3.7. An important consequence of Lemma 3.6 is that the mean-square limit of the difference quotient does not exist, and hence, for all components of the ICCSS process there are no mean-square derivatives higher than  $(p - q - 1)$ . Thus, for local Granger non-causality and local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, we must always analyse the  $(p - q - 1)$ -th derivative. It also becomes clear that in the definition of local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness one must divide by  $h$  and not by  $h^2$ .

Now, we specify the orthogonal projections.

THEOREM 3.8. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Suppose  $S \subseteq V$  and  $a \in V$ . Then for  $h \geq 0$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} Y_a(t+h) &= \sum_{v \in S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \\ & \quad + \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) \\ & \quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \right) \\ & \quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$



and

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) &= \sum_{v \in S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du \\
&\quad + \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t) \\
&\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du \right) \\
&\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\overline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}(\cdot)$ ,  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}(\cdot)$ ,  $\overline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}_m(\cdot)$ , and  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}_m(\cdot)$  are defined in Theorem 3.2.

The basic idea of the proof is simple: In the representation in Theorem 3.2, the terms  $Y_a(t)$ , its derivatives and integrals over the past are already in the linear space  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$  if  $a \in S$  (Remark 2.13 and Proposition 3.5) and are therefore projected onto themselves. Furthermore,  $(Y_S(s))_{s \leq t}$  and  $(L(s) - L(t))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  are independent such that  $e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}}(t, h)$  and  $e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}}(t, h)$ , respectively are independent of  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$  and are projected onto zero.

REMARK 3.9. When calculating the orthogonal projections, it becomes clear why we require Assumption (2.12), a sufficient assumption to recover  $X(t)$  from  $(Y_V(s))_{s \leq t}$ . Only then are we able to project the input process  $X(t)$  onto the linear space of the output process  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$ .

To apply local Granger non-causality and local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness to ICCSS processes, we also need the following orthogonal projections.

THEOREM 3.10. *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Suppose  $S \subseteq V$  and  $a \in V$ . Then for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&l.i.m._{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t)}{h} \right) \\
&= \sum_{v \in S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du + \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'_m(0) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t) \\
&\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du \right) \\
&\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'_m(0) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},
\end{aligned}$$

and for  $h \geq 0$ ,

$$D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}}(t, h) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

where  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}(\cdot)$ ,  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}_m(\cdot)$ , and  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  are defined in Theorem 3.2.  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'(0)$  and  $\underline{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}}'_m(0)$  denote the corresponding first derivatives in zero.

In this paper, for the derivation of the (local) causality graph for ICCSS processes, the special case  $S = V$  is most relevant, where a few terms simplify.

**COROLLARY 3.11.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$ . Then for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h \geq 0$  and  $a \in V$  the following projections hold.*

- (a)  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_V}(t)} Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \overline{\overline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$
- (b)  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_V}(t)} D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$
- (c)  $\text{l.i.m.}_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_V}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t)}{h} \right) = e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$

From Corollary 3.11(c), not only the existence of the limit becomes clear, but also that of the limit

$$\text{l.i.m.}_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t)}{h} \right) = P_{\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{Y}_S}(t)} \left( e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \right).$$

The existence of these limits is essential for the well-definedness of the local Granger non-causality and the local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness of the ICCSS process.

**REMARK 3.12.**

- (a) Although the derivation of the orthogonal projections for MCAR( $p$ ) processes differs from that for ICCSS( $p, q$ ) processes with  $q > 0$ , the results are consistent with [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#), Proposition 6.9 and Lemma 6.11 for MCAR processes, if we interpret  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta \triangleq 0_{k \times k}$  for  $u < t$  and  $\overline{\overline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta \triangleq \mathbf{C} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_m$  as in Remark 3.4.
- (b) The linear projections in Corollary 3.11(a) match the linear projections for univariate CARMA processes in [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#), Theorem 2.8. [Basse-O'Connor et al. \(2019\)](#) derives as well linear projections for MCARMA processes, but the results there differ to [Brockwell and Lindner \(2015\)](#).

**4. Causality graphs for ICCSS processes.** In this section, we derive (local) causality graphs for state space models and obtain as the main result the characterisation of the directed and the undirected edges in the (local) causality graph by the model parameters of the unique controller canonical form if this is an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) model with  $p > q > 0$ . To define the (local) causality graph for ICCSS processes according to Definition 2.6, certain requirements for the well-definedness must be met. We have already assumed that we use the stationary version of the ICCSS process throughout the paper. Furthermore, the continuity in the mean square of an ICCSS process is well known, it follows directly from [Cramér \(1940\)](#), Lemma 1, since the covariance function is continuous in 0. Therefore, we only need to make sure that the Assumptions (A.2) and (A.3) are satisfied.

**THEOREM 4.1.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $\Sigma_L > 0$ . Then  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  satisfies (A.2) and (A.3) and thus, the causality graph and the local causality graph are well defined and the Markov properties in Remark 2.7 hold.*

**REMARK 4.2.** In principle, more general state space models  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  also satisfy Assumption A. The proof of Theorem 4.1 shows that sufficient assumptions for the stationary state space process are that the driving Lévy process satisfies Assumption B,  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}^*) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ ,  $f_{\mathcal{Y}_V}(\lambda) > 0 \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , and  $\mathbf{C}^* \mathbf{B}^* \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^{*\top} \mathbf{C}^{*\top} > 0$ .

Then the (local) causality graphs are well defined as well, and the Markov properties in Remark 2.7 hold. However, in this general context we are not able to calculate the orthogonal projections needed to characterise the edges.

Let us now focus on the main results, i.e. the characterisations for the directed and the undirected edges in the (local) causality graph for ICCSS processes. First, we present the characterisations of the (local) Granger non-causality.

**THEOREM 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$  and  $\Sigma_L > 0$ . Let  $a, b \in V$  and  $a \neq b$ . Then the following characterisations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(a) } \mathcal{Y}_a \not\leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A}^\alpha (\overline{\mathbf{E}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^j) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\beta \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \\
&e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A}^\alpha (\sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{j-1-m}) \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0, \\
&\text{for } \alpha = 0, \dots, kp-1, \beta = 0, \dots, kq-1, m = 0, \dots, p-q-1. \\
\text{(b) } \mathcal{Y}_a \not\leftrightarrow_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A} (\overline{\mathbf{E}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^j) \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^\beta \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \\
&e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A} (\sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^{j-1-m}) \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0, \\
&\text{for } \beta = 0, \dots, kq-1, m = 0, \dots, p-q-1.
\end{aligned}$$

The basis for the proof of Theorem 4.3 are the following characterisations of the directed edges in Proposition 4.4. The characterisations in Proposition 4.4 are in turn developed from the definition of the directed edges in Section 2.1 and the orthogonal projections of the ICCSS process and its derivatives in Section 3.

**PROPOSITION 4.4.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$  and  $\Sigma_L > 0$ . Let  $a, b \in V$  and  $a \neq b$ . Then the following characterisations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(a) } \mathcal{Y}_a \not\leftrightarrow \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}t} \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0, \\
&\text{for } m = 0, \dots, p-q-1, 0 \leq h \leq 1, t \geq 0. \\
\text{(b) } \mathcal{Y}_a \not\leftrightarrow_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'(0) e^{\mathbf{A}t} \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'_m(0) \boldsymbol{\Theta} e_a = 0, \\
&\text{for } m = 0, \dots, p-q-1, t \geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

**REMARK 4.5.** The characterisations and thus, the directed edges in the (local) causality graph do not depend on the chosen Lévy process. Furthermore, the characterisation in Proposition 4.4(a) seems to depend on  $h$ . However, this is not the case as can be seen from Theorem 4.3(a). So it does not matter whether we define directed edges by looking at the time span  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  or by looking at the entire future  $h \geq 0$ . In terms of Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), there is no difference between Granger non-causality and global Granger non-causality for ICCSS processes.

Next, we present the characterisations of the undirected edges, i.e. contemporaneous uncorrelatedness.

**PROPOSITION 4.6.** *Let  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  be an ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process with  $p > q > 0$  and  $\Sigma_L > 0$ . Let  $a, b \in V$  and  $a \neq b$ . Then the following characterisations hold:*

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{(a) } \mathcal{Y}_a \approx \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_a^\top \int_0^{\min(h, \tilde{h})} \overline{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}(h-s)} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top e^{\mathbf{A}^\top (\tilde{h}-s)} \overline{\mathbf{C}}^\top ds e_b = 0, \\
&\text{for } 0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq 1. \\
&\Leftrightarrow e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A}^\alpha \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top)^\beta \overline{\mathbf{C}}^\top e_b = 0, \\
&\text{for } \alpha, \beta = 0, \dots, kp-1. \\
\text{(b) } \mathcal{Y}_a \approx_0 \mathcal{Y}_b \mid \mathcal{Y}_V &\Leftrightarrow e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\top e_b = e_a^\top C_q \Sigma_L C_q^\top e_b = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of this result again uses the orthogonal projections of the ICCSS process and its derivatives of Section 3 and the definition of undirected edges of Section 2.1. The assumption  $\Sigma_L > 0$  is only used for the second characterisation in Proposition 4.6(a). However, it was also important for the proof of Assumption A.

REMARK 4.7. The characterisations and thus, the undirected edges in the (local) causality graph depend on the chosen Lévy process only by  $\Sigma_L$ . Furthermore, the second characterisation in Proposition 4.6(a) shows that there is indeed no dependence on the lag  $h$  again. As for the directed edges, it does not matter whether we define undirected edges by looking at the time span  $0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq 1$  or by looking at the entire future  $h, \tilde{h} \geq 0$ . In terms of Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), there is no difference between contemporaneous uncorrelatedness and global contemporaneous uncorrelatedness for ICCSS processes.

We will now make some further comments on the characterisations in Proposition 4.4 and Proposition 4.6. In particular, we compare the characterisations with each other and with the results with the literature, additionally we give some interpretations.

REMARK 4.8.

- (a) The uniqueness of the polynomials  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  in (2.4) (see Proposition 2.8) leads to the uniqueness of the controller canonical state space representation, which in turn leads to the uniqueness of the edges in the (local) causality graph.
- (b) It can be shown by a simple calculation that  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{A}^{p-q} = \underline{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{A}$ . Comparing Theorem 4.3(a) and (b), we receive that Granger non-causality implies local Granger non-causality, which we know as well from the theory in Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023). Similarly,  $\overline{\mathbf{C}}\mathbf{A}^{p-q-1} = \underline{\mathbf{C}}$ , so comparing Proposition 4.6(a) and (b), we get that contemporaneous uncorrelatedness implies local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness, which is again in agreement with the theory. The relationships between Granger non-causality and local Granger non-causality, as well as contemporaneous uncorrelatedness and local contemporaneous uncorrelatedness in a general setting, are discussed in Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Lemma 3.12 and Lemma 4.9.

INTERPRETATION 4.9 (Causality graph). To interpret the directed and the undirected edges in the causality graph  $G_{CG}$ , we recall the representation of the  $b$ -th component

$$Y_b(t+h) = \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) + e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, h)$$

from Theorem 3.2.

- (a) *Directed edges*: A direct application of Proposition 4.4 gives that  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}$  if and only if neither  $Y_a(t)$ ,  $DY_a(t)$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)$  nor the integral over the past have any influence on  $Y_b(t+h)$ . In the representation of the  $b$ -th component  $Y_b(t+h)$ , the  $a$ -th component always vanishes because its coefficient functions are zero.
- (b) *Undirected edges*: Proposition 4.6 yields

$$a \text{ --- } b \notin E_{CG} \Leftrightarrow \mathbb{E}[e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, h) e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, \tilde{h})] = \mathbb{E}[e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(0, h) e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(0, \tilde{h})] = 0, \quad 0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq 1.$$

This means that the noise terms  $e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, h)$  and  $e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, \tilde{h})$  of  $Y_a(t+h)$  and  $Y_b(t+\tilde{h})$ , respectively, are uncorrelated for any  $t \geq 0$  and  $0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq 1$ .

INTERPRETATION 4.10 (Local causality graph). The interpretation of the directed and the undirected edges in the local causality graph  $G_{CG}^0$  is a lot more intricate, since the mean square limit of the difference quotient does not exist by definition and Remark 3.7, respectively, but the limit of the projections does. Therefore we again use the representation for  $b \in V$  of Lemma 3.6,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h) &:= \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t)}{h} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'_m(0) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \\ &\quad + e_b^\top O(h) R_1 + e_b^\top O(h) R_2 + \frac{e_b^\top \underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h)}{h}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h) &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}'_m(0) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \\ &\quad + e_b^\top O(h) R_1 + e_b^\top O(h) R_2. \end{aligned}$$

Although the  $L^2$ -limit of  $\mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$  does not exist, the  $L^2$ -limits of  $\sqrt{h} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$  and  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$  do exist.

- (a) *Directed edges*: By Proposition 4.4 we receive that  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}^0$  if and only if neither  $Y_a(t)$ ,  $DY_a(t), \dots, D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)$  nor the integral over the past have any influence on  $\mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$  if  $h$  is small. The same holds for  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$ . Given  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$ , the  $a$ -th component has no influence on the  $b$ -th component in the limit, because the corresponding coefficients are zero.
- (b) *Undirected edges*: By Proposition 4.6 we receive that  $a \dashrightarrow b \notin E_{CG}^0$  if and only if the limit

$$\begin{aligned} &h \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t, h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_V(t)} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t, h) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \times \left. \left( \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_V(t)} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h) e_b^\top \underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h) \right] \rightarrow e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e_b \end{aligned}$$

is zero. Hence, given  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$ ,  $\sqrt{h} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t, h)$  and  $\sqrt{h} \mathbf{D}_h^{(p-q-1)}Y_b(t, h)$  are uncorrelated in the limit. Equivalently, the noise terms  $e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h) / \sqrt{h}$  and  $e_b^\top \underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h) / \sqrt{h}$  are uncorrelated in the limit.

REMARK 4.11. We want to establish the relationship between our results for ICCSS processes and the results for MCAR processes in [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#).

- (a) Since the *undirected edges* are characterised only by the noise terms  $\bar{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h)$  and  $\underline{\underline{\varepsilon}}(t, h)$  and thus, have nothing to do with the inversion of the process, it is not surprising that the analogue characterisations for the undirected edges of the ICCSS( $p, q$ ) processes also hold for MCAR( $p$ ) processes.
- (b) In the characterisations of the *directed edges* of the ICCSS( $p, q$ ) process, the case  $q = 0$  cannot simply be inserted because several matrices become zero-dimensional.

However, if we interpret  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}(h)e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)}\boldsymbol{\Theta} \triangleq 0_{k \times k}$  if  $u < t$ , and  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h)\boldsymbol{\Theta} \triangleq \mathbf{C}e^{\mathbf{A}h}\mathbf{E}_m$  for  $m = 0, \dots, p-1$ , as in Remark 3.4, the characterisations of the directed edges for MCAR( $p$ ) processes can be seen as special case of Theorem 4.3 and Proposition 4.4.

*Conclusion.* In this paper, we have applied the concept of (local) causality graphs to state space models. For the state space models, we have assumed that they have a representation in controller canonical form satisfying the mild assumptions of (2.12) such that there exists a stationary invertible version of the state space model; the term invertible reflects that we are able to recover the state process from the observation process. These assumptions have been summarised under the acronym ICCSS( $p, q$ ) model with  $p > q > 0$ . The ICCSS processes satisfy the assumptions of the (local) causality graphs defined in Fassen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), so that the graphical models are well defined and several notions of causal Markov properties hold. However, the invertibility of the state process and the representation of the state space model in controller canonical form are not necessary for the existence of (local) causality graphs. The causality graphs exist for a much broader class of state space models but for the analytic representations of the edges these additional assumptions are useful. The characterisations of the edges of the ICCSS process require the knowledge of the orthogonal projections of the state process onto linear subspaces generated by subprocesses and for the derivation of these orthogonal projections the invertibility of the state process is important. The orthogonal projections depend on the model parameters of the controller canonical form and therefore, the edges of the (local) causality graph are also uniquely characterised by these model parameters.

## APPENDIX A: PROOFS OF SUBSECTION 2.2

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2.8. Assume that there exist two coprime right polynomial fraction descriptions of  $H(z)$  as in (2.5) so that

$$Q_1(z)P_1(z)^{-1} = H(z) = Q_2(z)P_2(z)^{-1}$$

Then, due to the coprimeness, there exists a matrix polynomial  $U(z)$ , where  $\det(U(z))$  is a non-zero real number (Rugh, 1996, Theorem 16.10), such that

$$P_1(z) = P_2(z)U(z). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Both  $P_1(z)$  and  $P_2(z)$  have the highest power  $I_k z^p$ , so that  $U(z) = I_k$ . Hence  $P_1(z) = P_2(z)$  and finally,  $Q_1(z) = Q_2(z)$ , which results in the uniqueness of the decomposition.

The fact that  $H(z)$  is equal to  $\mathbf{C}(zI_{kp} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{B}$  follows from the proof of Theorem 3.2 in Brockwell and Schlemm (2013).

Furthermore, the realisations  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$  and  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*)$  are minimal because  $P(z)$  and  $Q(z)$  are right coprime and  $\deg(\det(P(z))) = kp$ , see Theorem 6.5-1 of Kailath (1980). Then a consequence of Theorem 2.3.4 in Hannan and Deistler (2012) is that there exists a non-singular matrix  $T$  such that

$$\mathbf{A} = T\mathbf{A}^*T^{-1}, \quad \mathbf{B} = T\mathbf{B}^* \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}^*T^{-1},$$

and for  $s < t$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_V(t) &= \mathbf{C}^*e^{\mathbf{A}^*(t-s)}X(s) + \int_s^t \mathbf{C}^*e^{\mathbf{A}^*(t-u)}\mathbf{B}^*dL(u) \\ &= \mathbf{C}e^{\mathbf{A}(t-s)}(TX(s)) + \int_s^t \mathbf{C}e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)}\mathbf{B}dL(u). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is a solution of the state space model  $(\mathbf{A}^*, \mathbf{B}^*, \mathbf{C}^*, L)$  if and only if it is a solution of  $(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}, L)$ . Finally,  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) = \sigma(T\mathbf{A}^*T^{-1}) = \sigma(\mathbf{A}^*)$ .  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 2.11. The uniqueness follows directly from Proposition 2.8. Furthermore,  $p^* = p$  holds by Lemma 6.5-6 of Kailath (1980). Since  $P^*(z)^{-1}Q^*(z) = Q(z)P(z)^{-1}$  we have  $p^* - q^* = p - q$  and therefore  $q^* = q$ . Comparing the highest order coefficient in  $Q^*(z)P(z) = P^*(z)Q(z)$  gives  $Q_{q^*} = C_q$ . Finally, Lemma 6.3-8 in Kailath (1980) states that  $\mathcal{N}(P^*) = \mathcal{N}(P)$  and  $\mathcal{N}(Q^*) = \mathcal{N}(Q)$ .  $\square$

### APPENDIX B: PROOFS OF SECTION 3

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.1. The proof is divided in four steps. In the first three steps we derive some auxiliary results which lead in Step 4 to the proof of the statement. *Step 1:* First, we prove for all  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $v \in V$  the asymptotic behaviour

$$\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\varepsilon|u|} |Y_v(u)| = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Thus, we relate (B.1) back to Brockwell and Lindner (2015), Proposition 2.6, who prove this convergence for stationary univariate CARMA processes that are driven by univariate Lévy processes and whose AR polynomial has no zeros on the imaginary axis.

Therefore, let  $\varepsilon > 0$  and  $v \in V$ . Note that for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$Y_v(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \int_{-\infty}^t e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \mathbf{B} e_\ell dL_\ell(u) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k Y_v^\ell(t).$$

The process  $\mathcal{Y}_v^\ell = (Y_v^\ell(t))_{t \in \mathbb{R}}$  is the stationary solution of the state space model

$$dX(t) = \mathbf{A}X(t)dt + \mathbf{B}e_\ell dL_\ell(t) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_v^\ell(t) = e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}}X(t)$$

and has transfer function

$$H_v^\ell(z) = e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}}(zI_{kp} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \mathbf{B}e_\ell.$$

Then Kailath (1980) provides in Lemma 6.3-8 the existence of (right) coprime polynomials  $P_v^\ell(z)$  and  $Q_v^\ell(z)$  (polynomials with no common zeros) as in (2.5) so that  $H_v^\ell(z) = Q_v^\ell(z)/P_v^\ell(z)$ . Note that in the univariate setting the problem of the existence of a coprime right polynomial fraction description of the form (2.5) does not arise. Indeed, here  $1 \cdot p = \deg(\det(P_v^\ell(z))) = \deg(P_v^\ell(z))$  follows immediately, and the constant before the  $p$ -th power can be included in  $Q_v^\ell(z)$  without loss of generality, so that  $P_v^\ell(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $p$  that has a 1 as the leading coefficient. Thus, the classes of univariate CARMA processes and univariate causal continuous-time state space models are equivalent (Schlemm and Stelzer, 2012a, Corollary 3.4) implying that  $\mathcal{Y}_v^\ell$  is a univariate CARMA process driven by a univariate Lévy process. Now, Bernstein (2009), Definition 4.7.1, provides that the poles of  $H_v^\ell(z)$  are the roots of  $P_v^\ell(z)$  including multiplicity. In addition, Bernstein (2009), Theorem 12.9.16, yields that the poles of  $H_v^\ell(z)$  are a subset of  $\sigma(\mathbf{A})$  resulting in

$$\mathcal{N}(P_v^\ell) = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : P_v^\ell(z) = 0\} \subseteq \sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R},$$

which means that the AR polynomial  $P_v^\ell(z)$  has no zeros on the imaginary axis. Thus  $\mathcal{Y}_v^\ell$  satisfies the assumptions in Brockwell and Lindner (2015), Proposition 2.6, and we obtain for  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  that

$$\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\varepsilon|u|} Y_v^\ell(u) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

Therefore,

$$\lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\varepsilon|u|} Y_v(u) = \sum_{\ell=1}^k \lim_{|u| \rightarrow \infty} e^{-\varepsilon|u|} Y_v^\ell(u) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.},$$

and finally, the claim (B.1) follows.

*Step 2:* Next, we show that

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \int_s^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(u)| du \quad (\text{B.2})$$

exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda > 0$ .

From (B.1) we obtain that there exists some set  $\Omega_0 \in \mathcal{F}$  with  $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = 1$  such that for all  $\omega \in \Omega_0$  and  $\gamma > 0$  there exists a  $u_0(\omega) < 0$  with

$$e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}u} |Y_v(\omega, u)| = e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}|u|} |Y_v(\omega, u)| \leq \gamma \quad \forall u \leq u_0(\omega).$$

Then we obtain for  $s < u_0(\omega)$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_s^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(\omega, u)| du &= \int_{u_0(\omega)}^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(\omega, u)| du + \int_s^{u_0(\omega)} e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(\omega, u)| du \\ &\leq \int_{u_0(\omega)}^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(\omega, u)| du + \gamma e^{-\lambda t} \frac{2}{\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by dominated convergence the limit in (B.2) exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\lambda > 0$ .

*Step 3:* Eventually, we derive that not only the univariate integral (B.2) exists, but also

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \quad (\text{B.3})$$

exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . First, Assumption (2.12) provides that  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$  and thus,  $\text{spabs}(\mathbf{A}) := \max\{\Re(\lambda) : \lambda \in \sigma(\mathbf{A})\} < 0$ , where  $\Re(\lambda)$  denotes the real part of  $\lambda$ . Thus, there exists a  $-\lambda \in (\text{spabs}(\mathbf{A}), 0)$ . Then Bernstein (2009), Proposition 11.18.8, provides a constant  $c_1 > 0$  such that

$$\|e^{\mathbf{A}t}\| \leq c_1 e^{-\lambda t} \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Now, we obtain

$$\left\| \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \right\| \leq c_1 \|\Theta\| \sum_{v \in V} \int_s^t e^{-\lambda(t-u)} |Y_v(u)| du.$$

Due to (B.2) the limit of each of those addends exists, so (B.3) exists  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ .

*Step 4:* Finally, we are able to prove the statement of the proposition. Recall that due to (2.14) for  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $s < t$ ,

$$X^q(t) = e^{\mathbf{A}(t-s)} X^q(s) + \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du.$$

Since we assume that  $\mathcal{X}$  is the unique stationary solution of the stochastic differential equation (1.1),  $X^q$  is also strictly stationary and  $X^q(s)$  and  $X^q(0)$  have the same distribution for all  $s \in \mathbb{R}$ . Moreover, it follows from Assumption (2.12) that  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ . These properties lead to

$$e^{\mathbf{A}(t-s)} X^q(s) \rightarrow 0_{kq} \quad \text{as } s \rightarrow -\infty,$$

in distribution and in probability by Slutsky's lemma, since the limit is a degenerate random vector. In combination with (B.3) we receive for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$  the statement

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \left( e^{\mathbf{A}(t-s)} X^q(s) + \int_s^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \right) = \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad \square$$



PROOF OF THEOREM 3.2. Let  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $h \geq 0$  and  $a \in V$ . First of all, due to (2.11), we receive

$$Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} X(t+h) \quad \text{and} \quad D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} X(t+h).$$

From now on, the proofs for the two representations differ only in the choice of  $\bar{\mathbf{C}}$  and  $\underline{\mathbf{C}}$ , respectively. Therefore, we will only continue with the representation of  $Y_a(t+h)$ . Due to (1.2) we have

$$Y_a(t+h) = e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} \left( e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) + \int_t^{t+h} e^{\mathbf{A}(t+h-u)} \mathbf{B} dL(u) \right) = e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) + e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{e}}(t, h).$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) &= e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \left( X^q(t), X^{(q+1)}(t), \dots, X^{(p)}(t) \right)^\top \\ &= e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \bar{\mathbf{E}} X^q(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} X^{(q+j)}(t). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.18 and interchanging the summation order imply

$$\begin{aligned} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) &= e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \bar{\mathbf{E}} X^q(t) + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\mathbf{E}}^\top \left( \Lambda^j X^q(t) + \sum_{m=0}^{j-1} \Lambda^{j-1-m} \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \right) \\ &= e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{M}}(h) X^q(t) + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Finally, we obtain due to Proposition 3.1,

$$e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \bar{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

□

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.5. Let  $a, v \in V$  and define  $F(t) = e_a^\top e^{\mathbf{A}t} \Theta e_v$  for  $t \geq 0$ . First, for  $s, t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $s < t$ ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t-s}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n F \left( t-s-\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) Y_v \left( s+\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) = \int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

due to the definition of the integral. Using the theorem of dominated convergence, we show that this convergence also holds in the  $L^2$  sense. Indeed, from the triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du - \frac{t-s}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n F \left( t-s-\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) Y_v \left( s+\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) \right| \\ & \leq \int_s^t |F(t-u)| |Y_v(u)| du + \frac{t-s}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n \left| F \left( t-s-\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) \right| \left| Y_v \left( s+\ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) \right| \\ & \leq 2(t-s) \left( \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} |F(u)| \right) \left( \sup_{u \in [s, t]} |Y_v(u)| \right) \end{aligned}$$

follows. This majorant is integrable, because

$$\sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} |Y_v(u)| = \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} |e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}} X(u)| \leq \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} \|e_v^\top \bar{\mathbf{C}}\| \|X(u)\| \leq c \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} \|X(u)\|,$$

for some constant  $c \geq 0$  and thus,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} |Y_v(u)| \right)^2 \right] \leq c^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} \|X(u)\| \right)^2 \right] < \infty, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

due to Assumption B and Brockwell and Schlemm (2013), Lemma A.4. Furthermore,  $\sup_{u \in [0, t-s]} |F(u)| < \infty$  since  $F$  is a continuous function. In summary,

$$\int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du = \text{l.i.m.}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{t-s}{n} \sum_{\ell=1}^n F \left( t-s - \ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right) Y_v \left( s + \ell \frac{t-s}{n} \right).$$

For the second step of this proof we recall that for  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du = \lim_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

due to Proposition 3.1. Again, using the theorem of dominated convergence, we show that this convergence holds in the  $L^2$  sense. For  $s < t$  it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{-\infty}^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du - \int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du \right| &\leq \int_{t-s}^{\infty} |F(u)| |Y_v(t-u)| du \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |F(u)| \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |Y_v(t-u)|. \end{aligned}$$

To see that this majorant is in  $L^2$ , we use Fubini, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the stationarity of  $\mathcal{Y}_V$ . This yields to

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |F(u)| \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |Y_v(t-u)| \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |F(u)| \sup_{u \in [m, m+1]} |F(u)| \\ &\quad \times \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |Y_v(t-u)| \right)^2 \right] \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{u \in [m, m+1]} |Y_v(t-u)| \right)^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &= \left( \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |F(u)| \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |Y_v(u)| \right)^2 \right] < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where we used (B.6) and  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sup_{u \in [n, n+1]} |F(u)| < \infty$  by the definition of  $F$  and (B.4). In summary, we obtain

$$e_a^\top \int_{-\infty}^t e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du = \int_{-\infty}^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du = \text{l.i.m.}_{s \rightarrow -\infty} \int_s^t F(t-u) Y_v(u) du,$$

and the integral is in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_v}(t)$ . The existence of  $X^q(t)$  as an  $L^2$ -limit follows immediately from this.  $\square$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.6. Recall that due to Theorem 3.2 and  $\underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, 0) = 0_k \in \mathbb{R}^k$

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)}{h} \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) - \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(0)}{h} e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \\ &+ \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) - \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(0)}{h} \Theta D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \frac{\underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h)}{h} \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Replacing the matrix exponential with its power series, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) - \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(0)}{h} &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \frac{e^{\mathbf{A}h} - I_{kp}}{h} \left( \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^j \right) \\ &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0) + O(h) \left( \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^j \right), \\ \frac{\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) - \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(0)}{h} &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \frac{e^{\mathbf{A}h} - I_{kp}}{h} \sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^{j-1-m} \\ &= \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0) + O(h) \sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^{j-1-m}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Furthermore, we define

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \int_{-\infty}^t \left( \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}} + \sum_{j=1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^j \right) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du, \\ R_2 &= \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} \sum_{j=m+1}^{p-q} \mathbf{E}_{q+j} \underline{\underline{\mathbf{E}}}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}^{j-1-m} \Theta D^m Y_V(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

If we plug in (B.8) and (B.9) in (B.7) we obtain the stated representation. Moreover, from Proposition 3.5 we know that  $R_1$  is in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$  and from Remark 2.13 we receive that  $R_2$  is in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$  and  $(L(s) - L(t))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  are independent we receive that  $R_1, R_2 \in \mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)$  are independent of  $\underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h)$ . Finally,

$$\frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E} \left[ (e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h))^2 \right] = \frac{1}{h} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \int_0^h e^{\mathbf{A}u} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top e^{\mathbf{A}^\top u} du \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e_a \xrightarrow{h \downarrow 0} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e_a.$$

$\underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}$  is positive definite due to  $\Sigma_L > 0$  and  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}}$ ,  $\mathbf{B}$  being of full rank by Assumption (2.12). Therefore, the limit  $e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{B} \Sigma_L \mathbf{B}^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} e_a > 0$  and of course,  $\mathbb{E}[(e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h))^2]/h^2$  converges then to infinity.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3.8. Based on Theorem 3.2, the proofs of the two orthogonal projections differ only in the choice of  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}(\cdot)$  or  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(\cdot)$ ,  $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(\cdot)$  or  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(\cdot)$ , and  $\overline{\underline{\underline{\xi}}}(\cdot, \cdot)$  or  $\underline{\underline{\xi}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ . Thus, we only prove the representation of  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} Y_a(t+h)$ . Let  $h \geq 0$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $S \subseteq V$  and  $a \in V$ . From Theorem 3.2 recall that  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s.

$$Y_a(t+h) = \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \overline{\underline{\underline{\xi}}}(t, h).$$

We calculate the projections of the summands separately. For the first summand we get

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du \right) \\ &= \sum_{v \in S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \\ &\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \right), \end{aligned}$$

since, because of Proposition 3.5, the integrals are in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$  for  $v \in S$ . For the second summand we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \right) \\ &= \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) \right), \end{aligned}$$

because due to Remark 2.13 the derivatives of  $Y_v(t)$  for  $v \in S$  are in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)$ . For the third summand  $e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, h)$  we note that  $(Y_S(s))_{s \leq t}$  and  $(L(s) - L(t))_{t \leq s \leq t+h}$  are independent. We obtain immediately that  $P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} e_a^\top \overline{\mathbf{e}}(t, h) = 0$ . If we put all three summands together, we get the assertion.  $\square$

**PROOF OF THEOREM 3.10.** Let  $S \subseteq V$ ,  $a \in V$ ,  $h \geq 0$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ . First of all, due to Theorem 3.8 and similar ideas as in (B.5),

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \\ &= e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t). \end{aligned}$$

Then, due to

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t)}{h} \right) - e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \frac{e^{\mathbf{A}h} - I_{kp}}{h} X(t) - e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \left( \frac{e^{\mathbf{A}h} - I_{kp}}{h} - \mathbf{A} \right) c_{XX}(0) \left( \frac{e^{\mathbf{A}h} - I_{kp}}{h} - \mathbf{A} \right)^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}}^\top e_a = 0, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$\text{l.i.m.}_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)} Y_a(t)}{h} \right) = e_a^\top \underline{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

But then, together with [Brockwell and Davis \(1991\)](#), Proposition 2.3.2.(iv,vii), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)}{h} \right) \\ &= \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)}{h} \right) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{A} X(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

Again, similar to the proof of [\(B.5\)](#),

$$e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{C}}} \mathbf{A} X(t) = \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

We obtain replacing  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h)$  by  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0)$  and  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h)$  by  $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0)$  in the proof of [Theorem 3.8](#),

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \frac{D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t)}{h} \right) \\ &= \sum_{v \in S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du + \sum_{v \in S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) \\ & \quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'(0) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_v Y_v(u) du \right) \\ & \quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_S}(t)} \left( \sum_{v \in V \setminus S} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}'_m(0) \Theta e_v D^m Y_v(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

as claimed.

The second assertion follows directly from [Theorem 3.2](#) and [Theorem 3.8](#) giving

$$\begin{aligned} & D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) - P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} D^{(p-q-1)}Y_a(t+h) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h)^\top \Theta D^m Y_V(t) + e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h) \\ & \quad - \int_{-\infty}^t e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta Y_V(u) du - \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\mathbf{M}}}_m(h) \Theta D^m Y_V(t) \\ &= e_a^\top \underline{\underline{\xi}}(t, h). \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

## APPENDIX C: PROOFS OF SECTION 4

### PROOF OF [THEOREM 4.1](#).

(A.2) The proof of [Assumption \(A.2\)](#) is elaborate and has already been given in [Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk \(2023\)](#), Proposition 6.5, for MCAR( $p$ ) processes. It can be directly generalised to ICCSS( $p, q$ ) processes, so we do not give the full proof. We simply note that we only require that  $Q(i\lambda)P(i\lambda)^{-1}$  has full rank and  $\Sigma_L > 0$  to obtain that  $f_{Y_V Y_V}(\lambda) > 0$  for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Indeed, [Assumption \(2.12\)](#) provides that  $Q(i\lambda)$  is of full rank and  $\mathcal{N}(P) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ , so we directly receive that  $Q(i\lambda)P(i\lambda)^{-1}$  has

full rank as well. Furthermore, we require that  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$ , but this is true due to Assumption (2.12). Finally, it is a necessity that  $\mathbf{CB}\Sigma_L\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{C}^\top > 0$ . Again,  $\Sigma_L > 0$ ,  $\mathbf{C}$  is of full rank by Assumption (2.12), and  $\mathbf{B}$  is of full rank by definition, so  $\mathbf{CB}\Sigma_L\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{C}^\top > 0$ .

(A.3) For Assumption (A.3) we apply that  $\sigma(\mathbf{A}) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$  and hence

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow 0} P_{\mathcal{L}_X(t)} X(t+h) = \lim_{h \rightarrow 0} e^{\mathbf{A}h} X(t) = 0,$$

resulting in  $\mathcal{X}$  being purely nondeterministic. By Rozanov (1967), III, (2.1) and Theorem 2.1 this is equivalent to  $\bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_X(t) = \{0\}$ . Since  $\bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t) \subseteq \bigcap_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \mathcal{L}_X(t)$  the process  $\mathcal{Y}_V$  is purely nondeterministic as well.

Finally, the Markov properties follow from Fassen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Section 5; see also Fassen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Proposition 6.6 and Proposition 6.7 for MCAR( $p$ ) processes.  $\square$

Next, we prove Proposition 4.4 because the proof of Theorem 4.3 is based on Proposition 4.4.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.4.

(a) Recall that due to Definition 2.1 we have no directed edge  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}$ , if and only if, for  $0 \leq h \leq 1$ ,  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} Y_b(t+h) = P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} Y_b(t+h) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.}$$

From Theorem 3.8 we obtain for  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V}(t)} Y_b(t+h) &= \sum_{v \in V} \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in V} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t), \\ P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} Y_b(t+h) &= \sum_{v \in V \setminus \{a\}} \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta_{e_v} Y_v(u) du \\ &\quad + \sum_{v \in V \setminus \{a\}} \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_v} D^m Y_v(t) \\ &\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} \left( \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta_{e_a} Y_a(u) du \right) \\ &\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_a} D^m Y_a(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

We equate the two orthogonal projections and remove the coinciding terms. Then we receive that  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}$ , if and only if, for  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta_{e_a} Y_a(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_a} D^m Y_a(t) \\ &= P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} \left( \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{A}(t-u)} \Theta_{e_a} Y_a(u) du \right) \\ &\quad + P_{\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)} \left( \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta_{e_a} D^m Y_a(t) \right) \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \end{aligned}$$

The expression on the left hand side is in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_a}(t)$  and the expression on the right side is in  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t)$ . Since  $\mathcal{L}_{Y_V \setminus \{a\}}(t) \cap \mathcal{L}_{Y_a}(t) = \{0\}$  due to (2.1),  $a \rightarrow b \notin E_{CG}$ , if and only if, for  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  and  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ ,

$$\int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_a Y_a(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a D^m Y_a(t) = 0 \quad \mathbb{P}\text{-a.s.} \quad (\text{C.1})$$

In the following, we show that this characterisation is in turn equivalent to

$$e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\Lambda t} \Theta e_a = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a = 0, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

for  $m = 0, \dots, p-q-1$ ,  $0 \leq h \leq 1$ , and  $t \geq 0$ .

If (C.2) holds, we immediately obtain that (C.1) is valid. Now, suppose (C.1) holds. We convert the two summands in (C.1) into their spectral representation. Hence, note that due to Bernstein (2009), Proposition 11.2.2, and  $\sigma(\Lambda) \subseteq (-\infty, 0) + i\mathbb{R}$  the equality

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\lambda s} \mathbf{1}_{\{s \geq 0\}} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\Lambda s} \Theta e_a ds = e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) (i\lambda I_{kq} - \Lambda)^{-1} \Theta e_a, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R},$$

holds. Now Rozanov (1967) I, Example 8.3, provides the spectral representation of the first summand

$$\int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_a Y_a(u) du = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda t} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) (i\lambda I_{kq} - \Lambda)^{-1} \Theta e_a \Phi_a(d\lambda),$$

where  $\Phi_a(\cdot)$  is the random spectral measure from the spectral representation of  $\mathcal{Y}_a$ . For the second summand we substitute  $Y_a(t)$  as well as its derivatives (cf. Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Proposition 2.4) by their spectral representation. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{-\infty}^t e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\Lambda(t-u)} \Theta e_a Y_a(u) du + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a D^m Y_a(t) \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda t} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) (i\lambda I_{kq} - \Lambda)^{-1} \Theta e_a \Phi_a(d\lambda) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (i\lambda)^m e^{i\lambda t} \Phi_a(d\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Denoting  $\psi(\lambda, h) = e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) (i\lambda I_{kq} - \Lambda)^{-1} \Theta e_a + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a (i\lambda)^m$ , for  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $0 \leq h \leq 1$ , it follows that

$$0 = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\lambda t} \psi(\lambda, h) \Phi_a(d\lambda) \right|^2 \right] = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\psi(\lambda, h)|^2 f_{Y_a Y_a}(\lambda) d\lambda,$$

and hence,  $|\psi(\lambda, h)|^2 f_{Y_a Y_a}(\lambda) = 0$  for (almost) all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . But by Theorem 4.1,  $f_{Y_a Y_a}(\lambda) > 0$  for all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , which yields  $\psi(\lambda, h) = 0$  for  $0 \leq h \leq 1$  and (almost) all  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ . Bernstein (2009), (4.23), provides due to  $i\lambda \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \sigma(\Lambda)$  that

$$(i\lambda I_{kq} - \Lambda)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\chi_{\Lambda}(i\lambda)} \sum_{j=0}^{kq-1} (i\lambda)^j \Delta_j,$$

where  $\Delta_j \in M_{kq}(\mathbb{R})$ ,  $\Delta_{kq-1} = I_{kq}$ , and  $\chi_{\Lambda}(z) = z^{kq} + \gamma_{kq-1} z^{kq-1} + \dots + \gamma_1 z + \gamma_0$ ,  $z \in \mathbb{C}$ , is the characteristic polynomial of  $\Lambda$  with  $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{kq-1} \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\gamma_{kq} = 1$ , cf. Bernstein (2009), (4.4.3). Thus,

$$0 = \psi(\lambda, h) = \frac{1}{\chi_{\Lambda}(i\lambda)} \sum_{j=0}^{kq-1} (i\lambda)^j e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) \Delta_j \Theta e_a + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a (i\lambda)^m,$$

and multiplication by the characteristic polynomial yields

$$0 = \sum_{j=0}^{kq-1} (i\lambda)^j e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) \Delta_j \Theta e_a + \sum_{m=0}^{p-q-1} \sum_{\ell=0}^{kq} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a \gamma_\ell (i\lambda)^{\ell+m}.$$

In the first sum there are powers up to  $kq - 1$ , while in the second sum there are powers up to  $kq - 1 + p - q$ . For  $\ell = kq$  and  $m = 0, \dots, p - q - 1$  we receive in the second summand powers higher than  $kq$  and their prefactors have to be zero. Due to  $\gamma_{kp} = 1$  we receive then for  $m = 0, \dots, p - q - 1$ ,

$$e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h) \Theta e_a = 0.$$

Inserting this result into  $\psi(\lambda, h) = 0$  yields

$$0 = e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) (i\lambda I_{kq} - \mathbf{\Lambda})^{-1} \Theta e_a = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-i\lambda s} 1\{s \geq 0\} e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}s} \Theta e_a ds.$$

Together with the already known integrability, Pinsky (2009), Corollary 2.2.23, provides

$$e_b^\top \overline{\mathbf{M}}(h) e^{\mathbf{\Lambda}t} \Theta e_a = 0, \quad t \geq 0,$$

which finally concludes the proof of (a).

(b) Due to the similarity of the results in Theorem 3.8 and Theorem 3.10, we just have to replace  $\underline{\mathbf{M}}(h)$  by  $\underline{\mathbf{M}}'(0)$  and  $\underline{\mathbf{M}}_m(h)$  by  $\underline{\mathbf{M}}'_m(0)$  in the proof of (a).  $\square$

#### PROOF OF THEOREM 4.3.

(a) Based on the characterisations in Proposition 4.4(a), the same ideas as in the proof of Theorem 6.19(a) in Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023) can be carried out and therefore, the proof is omitted. First, we replace the matrix exponential  $e^{\mathbf{A}h}$  in Proposition 4.4(a) by powers of the matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  and second, we replace  $e^{\mathbf{A}h}$  by powers of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}$ .

(b) Follows in analogy to (a) using Proposition 4.4(b).  $\square$

#### PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4.6.

(a) Based on Corollary 3.11(a), the proof of the first characterisation in (a) can be done in the same way as the proof of Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Proposition 6.13(a). The second characterisation in (a) follows along the lines of the proof of Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Theorem 6.19(b).

(b) Based on Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.11(b), statement (b) can be proven analogously to Fasen-Hartmann and Schenk (2023), Proposition 6.13(b).  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- BASSE-O'CONNOR, A., NIELSEN, M. S., PEDERSEN, J. and ROHDE, V. (2019). Multivariate stochastic delay differential equations and CAR representations of CARMA processes. *Stoch. Process. their Appl.* **129** 4119–4143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2018.11.011>
- BASU, S., SHOJAIE, A. and MICHALIDIS, G. (2015). Network Granger causality with inherent grouping structure. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **16** 417–453.
- BERNSTEIN, D. (2009). *Matrix Mathematics: Theory, Facts, and Formulas*, 2. ed. Princeton University Press, Princeton. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400833344>
- BROCKWELL, P. (2014). Recent results in the theory and applications of CARMA processes. *Ann. Inst. Stat. Math.* **66** 647–685. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10463-014-0468-7>
- BROCKWELL, P. and DAVIS, R. (1991). *Time Series: Theory and Methods*, 2. ed. Springer, New York. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4419-0320-4>
- BROCKWELL, P. and LINDNER, A. (2015). Prediction of Lévy-driven CARMA processes. *J. Econom.* **189** 263–271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2015.03.021>



- BROCKWELL, P. and SCHLEMM, E. (2013). Parametric estimation of the driving Lévy process of multivariate CARMA processes from discrete observations. *J. Multivar. Anal.* **115** 217-251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmva.2012.09.004>
- COMTE, F. and RENAULT, E. (1996). Noncausality in continuous time models. *Econom. Theory* **12** 215-256. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466600006575>
- CRAMÉR, H. (1940). On the theory of stationary random processes. *Ann. Math.* **41** 215-230. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1968827>
- DIDELEZ, V. (2007). Graphical models for composable finite Markov processes. *Scand. J. Stat.* **34** 169-185. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9469.2006.00528.x>
- DIDELEZ, V. (2008). Graphical models for marked point processes based on local independence. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B.* **70** 245-264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2007.00634.x>
- EICHLER, M. (2007). Granger causality and path diagrams for multivariate time series. *J. Econom.* **137** 334-353. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2005.06.032>
- EICHLER, M. (2012). Graphical modelling of multivariate time series. *Probab. Theory Relat. Fields* **153** 233-268. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00440-011-0345-8>
- EICHLER, M., DAHLHAUS, R. and DUECK, J. (2017). Graphical modeling for multivariate Hawkes processes with nonparametric link functions. *J. Time Series Anal.* **38** 225-242. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsa.12213>
- FASEN-HARTMANN, V. and SCHENK, L. (2023). Causality in stationary continuous-time processes with applications to MCAR processes. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2308.08890>
- GLADYSHEV, E. G. (1958). On multi-dimensional stationary random processes. *Theory Probab. Appl.* **3** 425-428. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1103035>
- GRANGER, C. W. J. (1969). Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods. *Econometrica* **37** 424-438. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1912791>
- HANNAN, E. J. and DEISTLER, M. (2012). *The Statistical Theory of Linear Systems*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia. <https://doi.org/10.1137/1.9781611972191>
- KAILATH, T. (1980). *Linear systems*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs.
- LAX, P. D. (2002). *Functional analysis*. Wiley, New York.
- MAATHUIS, M., DRTON, M., LAURITZEN, S. L. and WAINWRIGHT, M. (2019). *Handbook of Graphical Models*. CRC Press, Boca Raton. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429463976>
- MARQUARDT, T. and STELZER, R. (2007). Multivariate CARMA processes. *Stoch. Process. their Appl.* **117** 96-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.spa.2006.05.014>
- MOGENSEN, S. W. and HANSEN, N. R. (2020). Markov equivalence of marginalized local independence graphs. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **48** 539-559. <https://doi.org/10.1214/19-AOS1821>
- MOGENSEN, S. W. and HANSEN, N. R. (2022). Graphical modeling of stochastic processes driven by correlated noise. *Bernoulli* **28** 3023-3050. <https://doi.org/10.3150/21-bej1446>
- PINSKY, M. A. (2009). *Introduction to Fourier Analysis and Wavelets*. American Mathematical Society, Providence. <https://doi.org/10.1090/gsm/102>
- ROZANOV, J. A. (1967). *Stationary Random Processes*. Holden-Day, San Francisco.
- RUGH, W. J. (1996). *Linear system theory*, 2. ed. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River.
- SATO, K. (2007). *Lévy Processes and Infinitely Divisible Distributions*, 2. ed. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge.
- SATO, K.-I. and YAMAZATO, M. (1984). Operator-self-decomposable distributions as limit distributions of processes of Ornstein-Uhlenbeck type. *Stochastic Process. Appl.* **17** 73-100. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4149\(84\)90312-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4149(84)90312-0)
- SCHLEMM, E. and STELZER, R. (2012a). Multivariate CARMA processes, continuous-time state space models and complete regularity of the innovations of the sampled processes. *Bernoulli* **18** 46-63. <https://doi.org/10.3150/10-BEJ329>
- SCHLEMM, E. and STELZER, R. (2012b). Quasi maximum likelihood estimation for strongly mixing state space models and multivariate Lévy-driven CARMA processes. *Electron. J. Stat.* **6** 2185-2234. <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-EJS743>
- SHOJAIE, A. and FOX, E. B. (2022). Granger Causality: A Review and Recent Advances. *Annu. Rev. Stat. Appl.* **9** 289-319. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-statistics-040120-010930>
- SIMS, C. A. (1972). Money, income, and causality. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **62** 540-552.
- WRIGHT, S. (1921). Correlation and causation. *J. Agric. Res.* **20** 557-585.
- WRIGHT, S. (1934). The method of path coefficients. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **5** 161-215. <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177732676>