

# Identification and estimation of structural vector autoregressive models via LU decomposition

Masato Shimokawa<sup>1</sup> and Kou Fujimori<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1, 2</sup>Faculty of Economics and Law, Shinshu University.

## Abstract

Structural vector autoregressive (SVAR) models are widely used to analyze the simultaneous relationships between multiple time-dependent data. Various statistical inference methods have been studied to overcome the identification problems of SVAR models. However, most of these methods impose strong assumptions for innovation processes such as the uncorrelation of components. In this study, we relax the assumptions for innovation processes and propose an identification method for SVAR models under the zero-restrictions on the coefficient matrices, which correspond to sufficient conditions for LU decomposition of the coefficient matrices of the reduced form of the SVAR models. Moreover, we establish asymptotically normal estimators for the coefficient matrices and impulse responses, which enable us to construct test statistics for the simultaneous relationships of time-dependent data. The finite-sample performance of the proposed method is elucidated by numerical simulations. We also present an example of an empirical study that analyzes the impact of policy rates on unemployment and prices.

## 1 Introduction

Structural vector autoregressive (SVAR) models studied by Sims (1980), Bernanke (1986), and Blanchard and Quah (1988) are widely used to analyze time-dependent macroeconomic data. A basic SVAR model is expressed as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{v}_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^k$  is an intercept,  $\mathbf{A}_s$ ,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, p$  are  $k \times k$  coefficient matrices, and  $\{\mathbf{v}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is an innovation process. The term  $\mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t$  in the right-hand side represents the simultaneous relationships between the components of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ . When  $\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0$  is non-singular, we have the following ordinal vector autoregressive (VAR) representation:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{\eta} + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{B}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (1.2)$$

where

$$\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\mu}, \quad \mathbf{B}_s = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_s, \quad s = 1, \dots, p,$$

with  $\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0)^{-1}$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_t = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_t$ . We call (1.2) the reduced form of (1.1). Under some assumptions such as the stationarity of the process  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , we can construct an asymptotically normal estimator for  $\mathbf{B}_s, s = 1, \dots, p$  using methods such as ordinary least squares (OLS). Meanwhile, some restrictions are required to recover  $\mathbf{A}_s, s = 0, \dots, p$  from observable structures. Such identification problems have been discussed by several researchers. Typically, we consider zero restrictions, e.g., some specific components of  $\mathbf{A}_s, s = 0, 1, \dots, p$  are fixed to zero. Under some additional assumptions, a general identification method based on zero restrictions was proposed by Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010). Canova and De Nicolo (2002) and Uhlig (2005) proposed identification methods for SVAR models under the sign restriction of the coefficient matrices, i.e., the signs of some specific impulse responses are known. Hyvärinen et al. (2010) and Lanne et al. (2017) relaxed the restrictions on the coefficient matrices and developed other methods for non-Gaussian processes to allow flexible identification of structures.

To correctly interpret the analysis of SVAR models, it is necessary to impose appropriate restrictions based on prior knowledge and data background. Regarding this point, previous studies have focused on the restrictions on the coefficient matrices. Meanwhile, it is often assumed that  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t]$  is a diagonal matrix. However, the components of  $\mathbf{v}_t$  might be correlated if  $\mathbf{v}_t$  includes some unobservable exogenous variables and does not correspond to the unique shocks of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ . Because an invalid assumption may lead to misunderstandings in causal interpretations, it is imperative to consider other identification methods under less restrictive conditions on the innovation process.

In this study, under mild conditions on the innovation process, where  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t]$  is allowed to be a non-diagonal matrix, we propose an identification method based on zero restrictions on the coefficient matrices and LU decomposition for a sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{B} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}, \mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_p)$ .

Moreover, we establish asymptotically normal estimators for the coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}_s, s = 0, \dots, p$  and impulse responses, enabling us to construct test statistics for the hypothesis testing whose null hypothesis is that  $\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}$ , which can be used to verify whether the simultaneous relationships should be considered for the data  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ .

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we describe the model setup of SVAR models and present a motivational example. In Section 3, we propose the identification and estimation methods for  $\mathbf{A}_s, s = 0, 1, \dots, p$  via LU decomposition under appropriate restrictions. We also consider the impulse response estimation and hypothesis testing for  $\mathbf{A}_0$  in this section. The numerical simulations used to verify the asymptotic behavior of the estimators and test statistics are presented in Section 4. We further apply the proposed methods to analyze the impact of policy rates on employment and prices in this section. The proofs of the main theoretical results are presented in Section 5. We discuss the causal interpretations of the statistical inference for SVAR models in the Appendix.

## 2 SVAR models

### 2.1 Model setup and a motivational example

We consider the following model:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{v}_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ ,  $s = 0, 1, \dots, p$  are the coefficient matrices and  $\{\mathbf{v}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is an i.i.d. innovation process such that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_t] = \mathbf{0}$ . We suppose that  $\mathbf{A}_0$  is a  $k \times k$  lower-triangular matrix with all diagonal components being zero, which means that  $Y_{i,t}$  cannot be the direct cause of  $Y_{j,t}$  for  $i > j$ . Several researchers have assumed that  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t]$  is a diagonal matrix. Meanwhile, we consider the existence of contemporaneous confounding, indicating that  $\mathbf{v}_{i,t}$  and  $\mathbf{v}_{j,t}$ ,  $i \neq j$  are correlated. We now consider the following motivational example.

**Example 2.1.** Let  $\{W_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be an  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued unobservable i.i.d. sequence. We consider the following model:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{A}_W W_t + \mathbf{u}_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{A}_s$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, p \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 3}$  is a lower-triangular matrix with diagonal elements being zero, and  $\{\mathbf{u}_t\}$  is an  $\mathbb{R}^3$ -valued i.i.d. sequence independent of  $W_t$  with  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{u}_t] = \sigma_u^2 \mathbf{I}_3$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_W \in \mathbb{R}^{3 \times 1}$ . Thus, we can rewrite the model (2.2) as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{v}_t, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{A}_W W_t + \mathbf{u}_t.$$

Therefore,  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t]$  is not diagonal unless  $\mathbf{A}_W \mathbf{A}_W^\top$  is diagonal.

The SVAR model can be regarded as a special case of linear structural equation models, as described in the Appendix. For a linear structural equation model, we often consider a graphical representation. Suppose that we observe  $\mathbf{Y}_{1-p}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_T$  for some  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  and consider graph  $\mathbf{G}$  with the vertex set  $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \{Y_{i,s} : i = 1, \dots, k, s = 1 - p, \dots, T\} \cup \{W_s : s = 1 - p, \dots, T\}$ .




Figure 1: A graphical representation for the model (2.2) with  $p = 1$

Figure 1 shows graph  $\mathbf{G}$ , where the edges represent the nonzero components of  $\mathbf{A}_0$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_1$  and  $\mathbf{A}_W$ . Since the model structure does not depend on time, Figure 1 only shows the components of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ , their direct causes,  $W_t$ , and  $W_{t-1}$  included in the vertex set. Observe that  $W_t, t = 1 - p, \dots, T$  are (unobservable) contemporaneous confounding factors, which implies correlations between the components of the innovation process  $\{\mathbf{v}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ . If we suppose that the covariance matrix of the innovation process is non-diagonal, we cannot deal with such data using most of the conventional SVAR models.

If the matrix  $\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0$  is non-singular, then we have the reduced form of (2.1) as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{Q}\boldsymbol{\mu} + \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{v}_t, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0)^{-1}.$$

This reduced form is a typical VAR model. Thus, to ensure the unique existence of a stationary and ergodic solution to (2.1), it is sufficient to assume the following conditions.

**Assumption 2.2.** (i)  $\mathbf{A}_0$  is a lower-triangle matrix with the diagonal elements being zero.

(ii) The following polynomial

$$|\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_1 z - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_2 z^2 - \dots - \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_p z^p|, \quad z \in \mathbb{C}$$

is nonzero for all  $z \in \{\zeta \in \mathbb{C} : |\zeta| \leq 1\}$ .

Condition (i) of Assumption 2.2 guarantees that the model (2.1) has a directed acyclic graph (DAG) structure. Next, we consider the impulse response functions. Consider the following VAR(1) representation of (2.3):

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \boldsymbol{\Lambda}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\mathbf{Y}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{t-p+1}^\top)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = (\mathbf{e}_t^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top$ ,

$$\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_1 & \mathbf{B}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{B}_{p-1} & \mathbf{B}_p \\ \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{I}_k & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\mathbf{B}_s = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{A}_s$  for  $s = 1, \dots, p$ . We omit  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  here for simplicity because impulse responses do not depend on it. Under Assumption 2.2, we have the following moving average (MA) representation:

$$\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}^s \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-s}. \quad (2.4)$$

For the top  $k$  rows in (2.4), there exist  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_0 = \mathbf{I}_k$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ ,  $s = 1, 2, \dots$  such that

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \mathbf{e}_{t-s} = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \tilde{\mathbf{L}} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{t-s},$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  is a lower-unitriangular matrix obtained by the LU decomposition of  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{e}_t]$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_t = \tilde{\mathbf{L}}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_t$ . Notably,  $\boldsymbol{\Psi}_s$  coincides with the  $k \times k$  sub-matrix of  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda}^s$  corresponding to the first  $k$  columns and rows. Therefore, the orthogonalized impulse response  $\text{OIRF}_{ij}(s)$  and non-orthogonalized impulse response  $\text{IRF}_{ij}(s)$  are, respectively, given by

$$\text{OIRF}_{ij}(s) = \left( \boldsymbol{\Psi}_s \tilde{\mathbf{L}} \right)_{ij}, \quad \text{IRF}_{ij}(s) = (\boldsymbol{\Psi}_s)_{ij}.$$

By considering the SVAR model as a special case of linear structural equation models, the coefficient matrices and impulse responses can be regarded as causal effects (see the Appendix for the detail of such interpretations).

### 3 Identification and statistical inference of SVAR models

#### 3.1 Estimations of the coefficient matrices

In this section, we establish asymptotically normal estimators for the coefficient matrices of model (2.1).

We begin by considering the estimation method for the reduced form (2.3) of (2.1). We rewrite the model as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{A}_0 \mathbf{Y}_t + \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \mathbf{v}_t, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\mathbf{A} = (\boldsymbol{\mu}, \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_p)$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{t-1} = (1, \mathbf{Y}_{t-1}^\top, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{t-p}^\top)^\top$ . The reduced form can be represented as follows.

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{B} \mathbf{X}_{t-1} + \mathbf{e}_t, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{e}_t = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{v}_t$ . Suppose that we observe  $(\mathbf{Y}_{1-p}, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_T)$ . We define the data matrix  $\mathbf{Y}$  and the design matrix  $\mathbf{X}$  as follows:

$$\mathbf{Y} = (\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_T)^\top \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_0, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{T-1})^\top,$$

respectively. Let  $r = 1 + kp$  and  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{k \times r}$  be a compact parameter space of  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_*$  be the true value of  $\mathbf{B}$ . Then, we consider the following least squares estimators  $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$  for  $\mathbf{B}$  and  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{B})$ :

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T = \mathbf{Y}^\top \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})^{-1} = \left( \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Y}_t \mathbf{X}_{t-1}^\top \right) \left( \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1}^\top \right)^{-1},$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T = \text{vec}(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T) = \mathbf{b}_* + \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1}^\top \right)^{-1} \otimes \mathbf{I}_k \right\} \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1} \otimes \mathbf{e}_t \right),$$

where  $\mathbf{b}_* = \text{vec}(\mathbf{B}_*)$ . To establish the asymptotic behavior of the estimator  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$ , we assume the following conditions.

**Assumption 3.1.** (i) It holds that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{v}_t\|_2^4] < \infty, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

(ii)  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t]$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{t-1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1}^\top]$  are positive definite.

(iii) The true value  $\mathbf{B}_*$  is an interior point in the parameter space  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{k \times r}$ .

Then, we have the following asymptotic normality of  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *Under Assumptions 2.2 and 3.1, it holds that*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T - \mathbf{b}_*) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Gamma}^{-1} \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}), \quad T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_t \mathbf{e}_t^\top]$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{X}_{t-1} \mathbf{X}_{t-1}^\top]$ .

The proof can be found in, e.g., Lütkepohl (2013) or Hamilton (1994), therefore, we omit it.

Next, we introduce estimators for  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{A}$  using LU decomposition. Denote

$$\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2, \dots, \mathbf{a}_r).$$

where  $\mathbf{a}_1 = \boldsymbol{\mu}$ . The following condition is sufficient to construct estimators for  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{A}$  via LU decomposition and derive its asymptotic behavior.

**Assumption 3.3.** There exists a (known)  $k$ -tuple of distinct positive numbers  $(j_1, \dots, j_k)$  such that  $(\mathbf{a}_{j_1*}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{j_k*})$  is a non-singular upper-triangular matrix, where  $\mathbf{A}_*$  is the true value of  $\mathbf{A}$ .

Let  $g : \mathbb{R}^{k \times r} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  be the map defined as follows

$$g(\mathbf{C}) = (\mathbf{c}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{j_k}),$$

where  $\mathbf{c}_m$  is the  $m$ -th column of the matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ . Similarly to Rubio-Ramirez et al. (2010), we should impose zero restrictions for lower-triangular part of  $g(\mathbf{A})$  based on the data background (see Section 4.2 for a concrete example).

Note that  $g(\mathbf{B}) = \mathbf{Q}g(\mathbf{A})$ . For a nonsingular matrix  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  which allows an LU-decomposition with a lower-unitriangular matrix, we introduce the following notation:

$$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{L}(\mathbf{C})\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{C}).$$

Let  $\mathbf{q}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{a}$  be the vectorizations of  $\mathbf{Q}$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{A}$ , respectively, i.e.,

$$\mathbf{q} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{Q}), \quad \mathbf{a}_0 = \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_0), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{a} = \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}).$$

We define the estimators for  $\mathbf{q}$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{a}$  as follows.

$$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T = f_1(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T) := \text{vec}(\mathbf{L}_g(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T)),$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T} = f_2(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T) := \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{L}_g(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T)^{-1}),$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T = f_3(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T) := \left( \mathbf{I}_r \otimes \mathbf{L}_g(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T) \right)^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{b}}_T,$$

where  $\mathbf{L}_g := \mathbf{L} \circ g$ . The asymptotic normality of the estimators follows from the delta method.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 3.1, and 3.3 hold. Then, the following conditions hold:*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T - \mathbf{q}_*) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_1), \tag{3.3}$$

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T} - \mathbf{a}_{0*}) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_2), \tag{3.4}$$

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T - \mathbf{a}_*) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_3), \quad (3.5)$$

as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , where

$$\Sigma_l = \mathbf{J}_l \Sigma_b \mathbf{J}_l^\top$$

with  $\Sigma_b = \Gamma^{-1} \otimes \Sigma$  and

$$\mathbf{J}_l = \left. \frac{\partial f_l(\mathbf{b})}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right|_{\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}_*}, \quad l = 1, 2, 3.$$

The asymptotic covariance matrices are singular because some components are fixed at 0 or 1 by LU decomposition.

### 3.2 Estimation of impulse responses

Next, we construct estimators for the impulse response  $\text{IRF}_{ij}(h)$  for  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$  and  $h > 0$ . The matrix  $\Psi_h = (\text{IRF}_{ij}(h))_{i,j=1,\dots,k}$  satisfies

$$\Psi_h = [\Lambda^h]_k^k,$$

where  $[\Lambda^h]_k^k$  is the  $k \times k$  sub-matrix of  $\Lambda^h$  corresponding to the top  $k$  columns and rows. Therefore, there exists a differentiable map  $f_{4,h}$  such that  $f_{4,h}(\mathbf{b}) = \psi_h$ , where  $\psi_h = \text{vec}(\Psi_h)$ . We define an estimator for  $\psi_h$  by  $\hat{\psi}_{hT} = f_{4,h}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T)$ . The following proposition was proved by Lütkepohl (1990).

**Proposition 3.5.** *Suppose that assumptions 2.2, 3.1, and 3.3 hold. For every  $h > 0$ , it holds that*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_{hT} - \psi_{h*}) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{4,h}), \quad T \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\psi_{h*} = \text{vec}([\Lambda_*^h]_k^k)$ ,

$$\Lambda_* = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{1*} & \mathbf{B}_{2*} & \cdots & \mathbf{B}_{p-1*} & \mathbf{B}_{p*} \\ \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{I}_k & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\Sigma_{4,h} = \mathbf{J}_{4,h} \Sigma_b \mathbf{J}_{4,h}^\top$  with

$$\mathbf{J}_{4,h} = \left. \frac{\partial f_{4,h}(\mathbf{b})}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right|_{\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}_*}.$$

The general expression of each component of  $\mathbf{J}_{4,h}$  can be found in Lütkepohl (1990). Let  $\Psi_{h*}^o, h > 0$  be a matrix defined by

$$\Psi_{h*}^o = \Psi_{h*} \mathbf{Q}_*,$$



which corresponds to a “total effect” for a linear structural equation model as described in the Appendix. We define the estimator for  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{h^*,T}^{\circ} = \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{h^*}\mathbf{Q}_*)$  as follows.

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_{hT}^{\circ} = f_{5,h}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T) := \left( \mathbf{L}_g(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_T)^{\top} \otimes \mathbf{I}_k \right) f_{4,h}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T).$$

Because the map  $f_{5,h}$  for every  $h$  is differentiable, we obtain the following proposition based on the delta method.

**Proposition 3.6.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 3.1, and 3.3 hold. Then, it holds that*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_{hT}^{\circ} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_{h^*}^{\circ}) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5,h}), \quad T \rightarrow \infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{h^*}^{\circ} = \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Psi}_{h^*}\mathbf{Q}_*)$ ,  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  is the true value of  $\mathbf{Q}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{5,h} = \mathbf{J}_{5,h}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{b}}\mathbf{J}_{5,h}^{\top}$  with

$$\mathbf{J}_{5,h} = \left. \frac{\partial f_5(\mathbf{b})}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right|_{\mathbf{b}=\mathbf{b}_*}.$$

### 3.3 Tests for simultaneous relationships

In this section, we consider the following test:

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{A}_0 = O, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \mathbf{A}_0 \neq O. \quad (3.8)$$

Let  $\hat{\mathbf{e}}_t = \mathbf{Y}_t - \hat{\mathbf{B}}_T\mathbf{X}_{t-1}$  and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{bT} = \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{X}_{t-1}\mathbf{X}_{t-1}^{\top} \right)^{-1} \otimes \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \hat{\mathbf{e}}_t\hat{\mathbf{e}}_t^{\top} \right).$$

The estimators for  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_l, l = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{l,h}, l = 4, 5$  can be constructed as follows:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_l = \hat{\mathbf{J}}_l \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{b}} \hat{\mathbf{J}}_l^{\top}, \quad l = 1, 2, 3,$$

and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{l,h} = \hat{\mathbf{J}}_{l,h} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{b}} \hat{\mathbf{J}}_{l,h}^{\top}, \quad l = 4, 5$$

with

$$\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{lT} = \left. \frac{\partial f_l(\mathbf{b})}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right|_{\mathbf{b}=\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{lT}}, \quad l = 1, 2, 3$$

and

$$\hat{\mathbf{J}}_{l,hT} = \left. \frac{\partial f_{l,h}(\mathbf{b})}{\partial \mathbf{b}} \right|_{\mathbf{b}=\hat{\mathbf{b}}_{lT}}, \quad l = 4, 5.$$

The following lemma is obtained from the asymptotic normality of the estimators.

**Lemma 3.7.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 3.1, and 3.3 hold. For every  $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{k^2}$ , and  $\mathbf{w}_3 \in \mathbb{R}^{k(1+kp)}$ , let*

$$\begin{aligned} z_{1T}(\mathbf{w}_1) &:= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{w}_1^\top \hat{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{w}_1)^{-1/2} \mathbf{w}_1^\top (\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T - \mathbf{q}_*), \\ z_{2T}(\mathbf{w}_2) &:= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{w}_2^\top \hat{\Sigma}_2 \mathbf{w}_2)^{-1/2} \mathbf{w}_2^\top (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T} - \mathbf{a}_{0*}). \end{aligned}$$

and

$$z_{3T}(\mathbf{w}_3) := \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{w}_3^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{b}} \mathbf{w}_3)^{-1/2} \mathbf{w}_3^\top (\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T - \mathbf{b}_*).$$

Then, it holds that

$$z_{lT}(\mathbf{w}_l) \rightarrow^d N(0, 1), \quad T \rightarrow \infty, \quad l = 1, 2, 3. \quad (3.9)$$

Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ , we have  $\mathbf{Q}_* = \mathbf{I}_k$ ,  $\mathbf{A}_{0*} = \mathbf{O}$ , and  $g(\mathbf{B}_*) = g(\mathbf{A}_*)$  is a non-singular upper-triangular matrix. For a matrix  $\mathbf{C} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times (1+kp)}$ ,  $g(\mathbf{C}) \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$  is a sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{C}$ . We define the sub-vectors  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{sub}}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_{0\text{sub}}$  of  $\mathbf{q}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_0$ , which comprise the lower-triangular components of  $\mathbf{Q}$  and  $\mathbf{A}_0$ , except for diagonal components, respectively. Similarly, let  $\beta_{\text{sub}}$  be a sub-vector which comprises the lower-triangular components of  $g(\mathbf{B})$ , except for diagonal components. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{q}_{*\text{sub}} = \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{a}_{0*\text{sub}} = \mathbf{w}^\top \beta_{*\text{sub}} = 0$$

for every vector  $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^{k(k-1)/2}$ . Thus, we obtain the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.8.** *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 3.1, and 3.3 hold. For  $l = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{k(k-1)/2}$ , consider the following test statistics  $z_{lT}$*

$$\begin{aligned} z_{1T} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{1\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\mathbf{q}}_{T\text{sub}}, \\ z_{2T} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{2\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T\text{sub}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$z_{3T} = \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{b}\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\beta}_{T\text{sub}},$$

where  $\hat{\Sigma}_{1\text{sub}}$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_{2\text{sub}}$ , and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{b}\text{sub}}$  are sub-matrices of  $\hat{\Sigma}_1$ ,  $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ , and  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{b}}$  corresponding to sub-vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_{T\text{sub}}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T\text{sub}}$ , and  $\hat{\beta}_{T\text{sub}}$ , respectively.

(i) Under the null hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_0$ ,

$$z_{lT} \rightarrow^d N(0, 1), \quad T \rightarrow \infty, \quad l = 1, 2, 3.$$

(ii) Assume in addition that  $\mathbf{v}_1^\top \mathbf{q}_*, \mathbf{v}_2^\top \mathbf{a}_{0*}, \mathbf{v}_3^\top \mathbf{b}_* \neq 0$  under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ , then,

$$\mathbb{P}(|z_{lT}| > c) \rightarrow 1, \quad T \rightarrow \infty, \quad l = 1, 2, 3$$

for every  $c > 0$ .

**Remark 3.9.** Similarly to the example of the empirical study described in the next section, the number of observations of time series data that seems to satisfy stationarity tends to be small. However, SVAR models have at least  $k^2p$  parameters, and we often analyze the data such that the  $k^2p/T \not\rightarrow 0$ . To handle such data, we should consider central limit theorems or Gaussian approximations under high-dimensional settings, e.g., the case where  $k^2p/T \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, 1)$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . See Koike (2021), Chernozhukov et al. (2023) for the recent development of high-dimensional asymptotic theory, Fang et al. (2023) for the degenerate case, and Belloni and Oliveira (2018) for martingale high-dimensional central limit theorems.

## 4 Numerical studies

### 4.1 Simulations

In this section, we verify the finite-sample performances of the proposed estimators and test statistics. Because each component of  $f_l(\mathbf{b})$  and  $f_{l,h}(\mathbf{b})$  for  $l = 1, \dots, 5$  can be represented as a rational function of the components of  $\mathbf{b}$ , we can calculate their derivatives using, e.g., “PyTorch” in Python. In the sequel, we consider a stationary model with  $k = p = 5$ . The innovation process  $\{\mathbf{v}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is generated by the following model:

$$\mathbf{v}_t = \mathbf{A}_W \mathbf{W}_t + \mathbf{u}_t,$$

where  $\{\mathbf{W}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ ,  $\{\mathbf{u}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are two and five-dimensional mutually uncorrelated i.i.d. Laplace distributed with mean  $\mathbf{0}$  and variance 0.5, respectively, and

$$\mathbf{A}_W = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & -0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \\ -0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.4 & 0.6 \\ -0.4 & -0.6 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The true values of the coefficient matrices are shown with the heat maps (Figure 2), where the  $x$ -axis of the figure for  $g(\mathbf{A})$  represents the column number of  $\mathbf{A}$ .




Figure 2: Heat maps of the coefficient matrices

We calculate the proposed estimators and test statistics for 1000 replications.

First, we evaluate the performances of the estimators  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T}$ , and  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T$ , using the mean of empirical bias (MB) and mean of empirical mean absolute error (MMAE). Tables 1–3 summarize the results.

Table 1: Estimators of the coefficient matrices ( $T = 100$ )

	$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T}$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T$
MB	0.008	0.062	0.065	0.026
MMAE	0.11	0.155	0.16	0.138

Table 2: Estimators of the coefficient matrices ( $T = 200$ )

	$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T}$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T$
MB	0.004	0.043	0.049	0.019
MMAE	0.072	0.124	0.127	0.092

Table 3: Estimators of the coefficient matrices ( $T = 500$ )

	$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T}$	$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T$
MB	0.002	0.019	0.019	0.008
MMAE	0.043	0.079	0.077	0.053

We also calculate the estimators for impulse responses for  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . The results are summarized in Table 4–6. In summary, we can observe the consistency of the proposed estimators.

Table 4: Estimators for (controlled) total effects ( $T = 100$ )

	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}^o$
MB	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.030	0.031	0.032
MMAE	0.118	0.105	0.102	0.145	0.138	0.143

Table 5: Estimators for (controlled) total effects ( $T = 200$ )

	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}^o$
MB	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.019	0.023	0.022
MMAE	0.076	0.069	0.066	0.095	0.094	0.099

Table 6: Estimators for (controlled) total effects ( $T = 500$ )

	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}$	$\hat{\psi}_{1T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{2T}^o$	$\hat{\psi}_{3T}^o$
MB	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.007	0.008	0.008
MMAE	0.047	0.042	0.040	0.057	0.055	0.062

Next, we show the asymptotic normality of the proposed estimators  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T$ , and  $\hat{\psi}_{h,T}$  for  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . To do this, we introduce the following random variables.

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{1T} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_1 \mathbf{1}_{k^2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T - \mathbf{q}_*) \\
s_{2T} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_2 \mathbf{1}_{k^2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_{0T} - \mathbf{a}_{0*}) \\
s_{3T} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{1}_{kr}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_3 \mathbf{1}_{kr})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{kr}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{a}}_T - \mathbf{a}_*) \\
s_{5,hT} &= \sqrt{T}(\mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{5,h} \mathbf{1}_{k^2})^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{1}_{k^2}^\top (\hat{\psi}_{hT}^o - \psi_{h*}^o),
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_{k^2} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{k^2}$  and  $\mathbf{1}_{kr} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{kr}$ . Figures 3–8 show the histograms of the random variables over 1000 replications; the  $y$ -axis indicates the relative frequency of the statistics over the replications and the dashed line is the density function of the standard normal distribution. Moreover, Tables 7 and 8 show the empirical tail probabilities of the random variables. Even for the relatively small observations  $T = 100$ , the estimators are well approximated by the normal distribution.




Figure 3: Histograms of  $s_{iT}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 100$ )




Figure 4: Histograms of  $s_{iT}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 200$ )




Figure 5: Histograms of  $s_{iT}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 500$ )

Table 7: Empirical tail probabilities

	$ s_{1T}  > 1.96$	$ s_{2T}  > 1.96$	$ s_{3T}  > 1.96$
$T = 100$	0.100	0.048	0.030
$T = 200$	0.056	0.036	0.027
$T = 500$	0.061	0.047	0.039




Figure 6: Histograms of  $s_{5,hT}$  for  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 100$ )




Figure 7: Histograms of  $s_{5,hT}$  for  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 200$ )




Figure 8: Histograms of  $s_{5,hT}$  for  $h = 1, 2, 3$ . ( $T = 500$ )

Table 8: Empirical tail probabilities

	$ s_{5,1T}  > 1.96$	$ s_{5,2T}  > 1.96$	$ s_{5,3T}  > 1.96$
$T = 100$	0.048	0.056	0.035
$T = 200$	0.051	0.075	0.050
$T = 500$	0.044	0.078	0.069

Finally, we check the behaviors of the test statistics  $z_{iT}, i = 1, 2, 3$  with  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{k(k-1)/2}$  under the alternative hypothesis  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Figures 9–11 show the histograms of  $z_{iT}, i = 1, 2, 3$  under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  and the dashed line indicates the density function of the standard normal distribution. Moreover, the powers of the test statistics are summarized in Table 9. The consistency of the test also seems valid. In terms of the power, it may be better to use  $z_{3T}$  than  $z_{1T}$  and  $z_{2T}$  for the test.

Table 9: Power of the test statistics

	$z_{1T}$	$z_{2T}$	$z_{3T}$
$T = 100$	0.350	0.225	0.668
$T = 200$	0.554	0.459	0.925
$T = 500$	0.877	0.846	1.000






Figure 9: Distribution of test statistics under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  ( $T = 100$ )




Figure 10: Distribution of the test statistics under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  ( $T = 200$ )




Figure 11: Distribution of the test statistics under  $\mathcal{H}_1$  ( $T = 500$ )

## 4.2 Empirical studies

We analyze the impact of policy rates on unemployment and prices in U.S. from 1992 to 2018, which are quarterly data. We use the seasonally adjusted unemployment level data (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Unemployment Level [UNEMPLOY], retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/UNEMPLOY>, February 18, 2025), the seasonally adjusted core consumer price index data (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Food and Energy in U.S. City Average [CPILFESL], retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/CPILFESL>, February 18, 2025), and the federal funds effective rate (Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (US), Federal Funds Effective Rate [DFF], retrieved from FRED, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis; <https://fred.stlouisfed.org/series/DFF>, February 18, 2025). In the sequel, we modify the data and use the following notations.

- $Y_{1,t}$  : growth rate of the unemployment level (%).
- $Y_{2,t}$  : inflation rate (growth rate of the core consumer price index) (%).
- $Y_{3,t}$  : difference of federal funds effective rate (%).

Figure 12 shows the plot of the time series  $\{Y_{i,t}\}, i = 1, 2, 3$ .




Figure 12: Plot of time series  $Y_{i,t}, i = 1, 2, 3$

We apply the proposed method to the modified data. We choose the lag  $p = 4$ , which enables us to consider the correlations between the three time series up to one year ago. The estimated coefficient matrices of the reduced form are as follows (the number of

observations is  $T = 104$ ).

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{1T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.061 & 0.634 & -3.973 \\ -0.003 & 0.549 & -0.037 \\ -0.017 & -0.37 & 0.651 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{2T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.368 & 4.763 & -1.284 \\ -0.037 & -0.003 & 0.115 \\ 0.651 & 0.005 & 0.258 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{3T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.119 & 1.575 & 0.780 \\ -0.001 & 0.201 & 0.054 \\ -0.006 & 0.235 & -0.026 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{B}}_{4T} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.04 & -1.956 & 1.127 \\ -0.003 & -0.109 & -0.026 \\ 0.003 & -0.311 & -0.159 \end{pmatrix}$$

Figure 13 shows the estimated curve of the impulse responses and their 0.95 confidence intervals.




Figure 13: non-orthogonalized impulse response function

Note that lag  $s = 4$  means one year. Since we assume that  $Y_{3,t}$  does not affect  $Y_{1,t}$  and  $Y_{2,t}$  (this assumption derives from the ordering of the components of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ ), non-orthogonalized impulse responses in Figure 13 can be regarded as 'total effects' from Proposition A.8 in Appendix. We expect that a policy rate decrease will cause an improvement in unemployment. The upper curve of the significance interval in the left figure seems consistent with our intuition. Meanwhile, the lower curve in the right figure seems to well describe the impact of the policy rate on the prices because the prices may be depressed if the policy rate increases. However, given that the monetary policy from 1992 to 2018 had often been shifted about every three years, the long-term effects shown by estimated values are more reasonable than the edges of significance intervals. We checked the accuracy of the estimated model in terms of the standard deviation, root mean squared error, and adjusted R-squared coefficient, which are summarized in Table 10. The results indicate that the model is applicable to fit the data.

Table 10: Accuracy of the estimated model

	$\{\hat{Y}_{1,t}\}$	$\{\hat{Y}_{2,t}\}$	$\{\hat{Y}_{3,t}\}$
Standard deviation	3.557	0.130	0.306
Root mean squared error	3.631	0.092	0.260
Adjusted R-squared	0.416	0.611	0.552

To estimate the coefficient matrices  $\mathbf{A}_s, s = 0, 1, \dots, 4$  of the SVAR model, we consider the following assumptions corresponding to Assumption 3.3.

**Assumption 4.1.** (1) The difference of the policy rate  $\{Y_{3,t}\}_t$  does not depend on  $(Y_{1,t-4}, Y_{2,t-4})^\top$  directly.

(2)  $Y_{3,t}$  does not affect  $Y_{2,t+1}$  directly.

(3)  $Y_{3,t}$  affects  $Y_{3,t+1}$  directly.

(4)  $Y_{1,t}$  affects  $Y_{2,t+4}$  directly.

(5)  $Y_{3,t}$  affects  $Y_{1,t+4}$  directly.

**Remark 4.2.** Each assumption is considered based on the following background.

- (1) The policy rates are determined based on the behavior of the current economic indicators by the Federal Open Market Committee per about six weeks.
- (2) Prices of commodities are considered to be directly affected by production costs including wages of workers. In this study, we simply assume that the policy rates affect prices through unemployment level.
- (3) The policy rate tends to be gradually changing. Here, we attempt to approximate the causal structure by simplifying  $Y_{3,t}$  as a direct cause of  $Y_{3,t+1}$ .
- (4) The condition is a standard assumption because the relationship between inflation and unemployment is widely observed.
- (5) Naturally, the policy rate is considered to affect unemployment through various economic activities. In this study, we simply assume that  $Y_{3,t}$  is a direct cause of  $Y_{1,t+4}$ .

Under Assumption 4.1, we consider the following restrictions for  $\mathbf{A}_s, 0 \leq s \leq 4$ .

$$\mathbf{A}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ * & 0 & 0 \\ * & * & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & * \\ * & * & * \\ * & * & \dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{A}_4 = \begin{pmatrix} * & * & \dagger \\ \dagger & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where † and \* mean nonzero parameters and arbitrary  $\mathbb{R}$ -valued parameters, respectively. Then, the estimated coefficient matrices of the SVAR model are as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{0T} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.000 & 0.000 & 0.000 \\ -0.023 & 0.000 & 0.000 \\ -0.126 & 0.648 & 0.000 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_T = \begin{pmatrix} 1.000 & 0.000 & 0.000 \\ -0.023 & 1.000 & 0.000 \\ -0.141 & 0.648 & 1.000 \end{pmatrix} \\ \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{1T} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.061 & 0.634 & -3.973 \\ -0.002 & 0.564 & -0.130 \\ -0.008 & -0.646 & 0.176 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{2T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.368 & 4.763 & -1.284 \\ 0.006 & 0.226 & -0.029 \\ 0.053 & 0.781 & -0.113 \end{pmatrix} \\ \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{3T} &= \begin{pmatrix} 0.119 & 1.575 & 0.780 \\ 0.002 & 0.238 & 0.073 \\ 0.009 & 0.302 & 0.037 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{4T} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.040 & -1.956 & 1.127 \\ -0.004 & -0.155 & 0.000 \\ 0.000 & -0.486 & 0.000 \end{pmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we consider the following test

$$\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}, \quad \mathcal{H}_1 : \mathbf{A}_0 \neq \mathbf{O}.$$

Based on the test statistics  $z_{3T}$  defined in the previous section with  $\mathbf{v} = \mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{k(k-1)/2}$ , the results are summarized in Table 11.

Test statistics	$T$	$z$ -value	$p$ -value (two-sided test)
$z_{3T}$	104	-1.79	0.0734

We cannot reject the null hypothesis at a significance level of  $\alpha = 0.05$ . As described in Proposition A.8 in Appendix, when  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}$ , all non-orthogonalized impulse responses can be regarded not only as partial effects, but also as “total effects”. Therefore, if the null hypothesis is accepted, we can treat non-orthogonalized impulse responses from not only  $e_{k,t}$  but also  $e_{j,t}, j = 1, \dots, k - 1$  as indicators of the overall effects. However, given that we obtained a relatively small  $p$ -value for a small observations  $T = 104$ , we continue our discussion on the estimated value of the SVAR model. Because one of the purposes of the policy rate is to stabilize employment and prices, the signs of the third row of  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{0T}$  may be consistent with our intuition. The sign of the  $(2, 1)$  component of  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{0T}$  also seems reasonable because unemployment may cause a decline in wages, and hence, have a negative impact on prices. However, the absolute value of the  $(2, 1)$  component may be overestimated because prices are rigid. Although we simplified the causal structure, obtaining an  $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{0T}$  that aligns with intuition may serve as evidence that the model can approximate the structure to some extent.

In summary, the proposed model seems to describe the data structure. In particular, the non-orthogonalized impulse responses suggest that it may take about one year for the policy rate decrease to improve unemployment and policy rates increase may depress the prices in the short term. See the Appendix for the causal interpretation of the non-orthogonalized impulse responses.

## 5 Proofs

*Proof of Theorem 3.4.* It follows from the basic properties of the  $\text{vec}$  operator and the matrix Kronecker product that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{q}_* &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{Q}_*) = \text{vec}(\mathbf{L}_g(\mathbf{B}_*)) = f_1(\mathbf{b}_*) \\ \mathbf{a}_{0*} &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{A}_{0*}) = \text{vec}(\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{L}_g(\mathbf{B}_*)^{-1}) = f_2(\mathbf{b}_*) \\ \mathbf{a}_* &= \text{vec}(\mathbf{Q}_*^{-1}\mathbf{B}_*) = (\mathbf{I}_r \otimes \mathbf{L}_g(\mathbf{B}_*))^{-1} \mathbf{b}_* = f_3(\mathbf{b}_*).\end{aligned}$$

We show that the map  $\mathbf{L}$  is differentiable at  $g(\mathbf{B}_*) = g(\text{vec}^{-1}(\mathbf{b}_*))$ . For every matrix  $\mathbf{C} = (c_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$  that admits the LU decomposition, the corresponding lower-triangular matrix  $\mathbf{L}(\mathbf{C}) = (l_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$  and the upper-triangular matrix  $\mathbf{U}(\mathbf{C}) = (u_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq k}$  are solutions to the following equation:

$$\begin{pmatrix} c_{11} & c_{12} & c_{13} & \cdots & c_{1k} \\ c_{21} & c_{22} & c_{23} & \cdots & c_{2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{k1} & c_{k2} & c_{k3} & \cdots & c_{kk} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ l_{21} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ l_{31} & l_{32} & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ l_{k1} & l_{k2} & l_{k3} & \cdots & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & u_{13} & \cdots & u_{1k} \\ 0 & u_{22} & u_{23} & \cdots & u_{2k} \\ 0 & 0 & u_{33} & \cdots & u_{3k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & u_{kk} \end{pmatrix}.$$

We can observe that for every  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots, k$ ,  $l_{ij}$  and  $u_{ij}$  can be written as a rational function of some components of  $\mathbf{C}$ . Under our assumptions,  $\mathbf{Q}_*$  and  $g(\mathbf{A}_*)$  are non-singular lower and upper-triangular matrices, respectively, which implies that all leading principal sub-matrices are non-singular, therefore,  $g(\mathbf{B}_*) = \mathbf{Q}_*g(\mathbf{A}_*)$  admits the LU decomposition. Combining these facts, we obtain the differentiability of  $\mathbf{L}$  at  $g(\mathbf{B}_*)$ . Thus, we can apply the delta method to derive the conclusion.  $\square$

We omit the proof of Propositions 3.5, and 3.6 because they are direct consequences of the delta method.

*Proof of Theorem 3.8.* We provide the proof of the assertion (ii), because (i) is a direct consequence of Lemma 3.7.

We consider the case where  $l = 1$ . Note that

$$\{|z_{1T}| > c\} = \left\{ \left| \frac{z_{1T}}{\sqrt{T}} \right| > \frac{c}{\sqrt{T}} \right\} = \{A_T^+ > 0\} \cup \{A_T^- < 0\},$$

where

$$A_T^+ = \frac{z_{1T}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{c}{\sqrt{T}} \quad \text{and} \quad A_T^- = \frac{z_{1T}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{c}{\sqrt{T}}.$$

Noting that  $\hat{\Sigma}_1$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{q}}_T$  are consistent estimators for  $\Sigma_1$  and  $\mathbf{q}_*$ , respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{z_{1T}}{\sqrt{T}} &= (\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{1\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top (\hat{\mathbf{q}}_{\text{sub}} - \mathbf{q}_{*\text{sub}}) + (\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{1\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{q}_{*\text{sub}} \\ &= o_p(1) + (\mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_{1\text{sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{q}_{*\text{sub}}, \quad T \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$A_T^+ = A_T^- = o_p(1) + A, \quad T \rightarrow \infty,$$

with

$$A = (\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\text{1sub}} \mathbf{v})^{-1/2} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{q}_{*\text{sub}}.$$

By the continuous mapping theorem, we have  $1_{\{A_T^+ > 0\}} \xrightarrow{p} 1_{\{A > 0\}}$  and  $1_{\{A_T^- < 0\}} \xrightarrow{p} 1_{\{A < 0\}}$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, it follows from the dominated convergence theorem that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{P}(|z_{1T}| > c) &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \{ \text{P}(A_T^+ > 0) + \text{P}(A_T^- < 0) \} \\ &= \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \text{E} \left[ 1_{\{A_T^+ > 0\}} \right] + \text{E} \left[ 1_{\{A_T^- < 0\}} \right] \right\} \\ &= \text{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^+ > 0\}} \right] + \text{E} \left[ 1_{\{A^- < 0\}} \right] = 1, \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof for  $l = 1$ . The assertion for  $l = 2, 3$  can be proved similarly.  $\square$

## A Appendix: Causal interpretations of SVAR models

We discuss the causal interpretations of SVAR models based on linear structural equation models and their causal diagrams.

### A.1 Linear structural equation models and causal diagrams

As a preliminary step, we present the basic properties of linear structural equation models. Let  $\mathbf{V}$  be a set of a finite number of random variables. For every  $X \in \mathbf{V}$ , let  $\mathbf{PA}(X)$  be the parents of  $X$  defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{PA}(X) = \{Y \in \mathbf{V} : Y \text{ is a direct cause of } X\}.$$

Then, a linear structural equation model is expressed as follows:

$$X_i = \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{PA}(X_i)} a_{ij} X_j + u_i, \quad X_i \in \mathbf{V}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We call the constant  $a_{ij} \neq 0$  a path coefficient from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$ . The error term  $u_i$  is a direct cause of  $X_i$ , which cannot be represented by the random variables in  $\mathbf{V}$ . Then, we can consider the causal diagram studied by e.g., Wright (1921) and Pearl (2009),  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$  for (A.1), where the vertex set  $\mathbf{V}$  is a set of random variables and the set of edges  $\mathbf{E}$  corresponds to the path coefficients for pairs of  $\mathbf{V}$  and correlations among error terms. Similarly to Example 2.1, we regard correlations among error terms as the existence of common causes. In the sequel, we introduce some definitions associated with linear structural equation models.

**Definition A.1.** Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$  be a causal diagram for a linear structural equation model (A.1).

- (i) The direct effect from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  is the path coefficient  $a_{ij}$ , which is a directed edge from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$ . If such a directed edge does not exist, the direct effect is set to 0.
- (ii) The indirect effect from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  is the sum of the multiplications of the path coefficients corresponding to the directed paths except for the directed edge from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$ .
- (iii) The total effect  $\tau_{ij}$  from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  is the sum of the direct and indirect effects.

See Alwin and Hauser (1975) for the details of the causal effects defined above. We further define the following controlled total effect.

**Definition A.2.** Let  $\mathbf{G} = (\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{E})$  be a causal diagram for the linear structural equation model (A.1). For a vertex set  $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{V}$  such as  $\mathbf{S} \cap \{X_i, X_j\} = \emptyset$ , consider the subgraph  $\mathbf{G}'$  constructed by removing the edges whose terminals are vertices of  $\mathbf{S}$ . Then, the  $\mathbf{S}$ -controlled total effect  $\tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S})}$  means the total effect from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  restricted to the subgraph  $\mathbf{G}'$ .

The term “controlled” means “atomic intervention” (see Pearl (1995) for the detail). The following lemma provides the different representations of the linear structural equation model (A.1).

**Lemma A.3.** For every  $X_i \in \mathbf{V}$ , let  $\mathbf{AN}(X_i)$  be the ancestor set of  $X_i$  defined as follows:

$$\mathbf{AN}(X_i) = \{Y \in \mathbf{V} : \text{There exists at least one directed path from } Y \text{ to } X_i\}.$$

For the causal diagram  $\mathbf{G}$  associated with model (A.1), let  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  be a subgraph of  $\mathbf{G}$  constructed by removing bidirectional arrows corresponding to the correlations between error terms. Suppose that  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  is a directed acyclic graph (DAG). For every  $\mathbf{S} \subset \mathbf{V}$  such that  $X_i \notin \mathbf{S}$ , it holds that

$$X_i = \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{S}} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-j})} X_j + \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{AN}(X_i) \setminus \mathbf{S}} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S})} u_j + u_i, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where  $\mathbf{S}_{-j} = \mathbf{S} \setminus \{X_j\}$ .

*Proof.* Noting that  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  is a DAG, we can assume without loss of generality, that for any indices  $i < j$  of  $\mathbf{V} = \{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ ,  $X_j$  is not an ancestor of  $X_i$ . Thus, we have

$$X_i = \sum_{1 \leq i < j} a_{ij} X_j + v_i, \quad (\text{A.3})$$



where  $a_{ij}$  represents the direct effect from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  here, to discuss the general case. Substituting the model equation for the parent  $X_l$  of  $X_i$  in the summand of the right-hand side of (A.3), we have

$$X_i = \sum_{1 \leq j < i, j \neq l} a_{ij} X_j + a_{il} \left( \sum_{1 \leq j < l} a_{lj} X_j + v_l \right) + v_i. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

If  $a_{il} a_{lj} \neq 0$ , this coefficient corresponds to the directed path  $X_j \rightarrow X_l \rightarrow X_i$ . Because  $\mathbf{V}$  is finite and  $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}$  is a DAG, sequential substitution yields the conclusion.  $\square$

We call equality (A.2) the ancestor expansion of  $X_i$ . Then, we summarize the validity of the total effect and the controlled total effect as indicators of causal relationships. It follows from Lemma A.3 with  $\mathbf{S} = \{X_j\}$  that

$$X_i = \tau_{ij} X_j + \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{AN}(X_i) \setminus \{X_j\}} \tau_{ij|do(\{X_j\})} u_j + u_i.$$

Since we regard correlations among error terms as the existence of common causes,  $X_j$  cannot affect  $X_i$  through error terms. Therefore,  $\tau_{ij}$  can be interpreted as the effect of  $X_i$  caused by  $X_j$ . More generally, we have

$$X_i = \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{S}} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-j})} X_j + \sum_{X_j \in \mathbf{AN}(X_i) \setminus \mathbf{S}} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S})} u_j + u_i,$$

which implies that  $\tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-j})}$  is the effect for  $X_i$  caused by  $X_j$ s under the atomic intervention of all variables in  $\mathbf{S}_{-j}$ . In other words,  $\tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-j})}$  means the sum of effects from  $X_j$  to  $X_i$  that does not go through components of  $\mathbf{S}_{-j}$ . See Pearl (1998) for the details of such interpretations.

We provide a simple example.

**Example A.4.** Let  $\mathbf{V} = \{X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\}$ , and  $u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4$  be possibly correlated error terms. Then, we consider the following structural equation model:

$$\begin{cases} X_1 &= u_1 \\ X_2 &= a_{21} X_1 + u_2 \\ X_3 &= a_{31} X_1 + a_{32} X_2 + u_3 \\ X_4 &= a_{42} X_2 + a_{43} X_3 + u_4. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

The causal diagram for (A.5) is shown in Figure 14.




Figure 14: Causal diagram for (A.5)

The bidirectional arrow indicates that  $u_1$  and  $u_3$  are correlated. Note that this diagram is a DAG when we ignore the bidirectional arrow or, when  $u_1, \dots, u_4$  are mutually uncorrelated. For instance, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{31} &= a_{31} + a_{32}a_{21}, \\ \tau_{41} &= a_{42}a_{21} + a_{43}a_{32}a_{21} + a_{43}a_{31}, \\ \tau_{41|do(\{X_3\})} &= a_{42}a_{21}.\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Lemma A.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}X_4 &= a_{42}X_2 + a_{43}X_3 + u_4 \\ &= a_{42}(a_{21}X_1 + u_2) + a_{43}X_3 + u_4 \\ &= a_{42}a_{21}X_1 + a_{43}X_3 + a_{42}u_2 + u_4 \\ &= \tau_{42|do(\mathbf{S}_{-1})}X_1 + \tau_{42|do(\mathbf{S}_{-3})}X_3 + \tau_{42|do(\mathbf{S})}u_2 + u_4,\end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{S} = \{X_1, X_3\}$ .

## A.2 Causal interpretations of SVAR models

Notably, we have

$$Y_{i,t} = \sum_{j < i}^k a_{ij}^{(0)} Y_{j,t} + \sum_{s=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^k a_{ij}^{(s)} Y_{j,t-s} + v_{i,t}, \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where for  $s = 0, \dots, p$ ,  $a_{ij}^{(s)}$  is the  $(i, j)$ -th component of  $\mathbf{A}_s$ . This form (A.6) is the special case of the linear structural equation models (A.1) and the coefficients  $a_{ij}^{(s)}$ ,  $s = 0, \dots, p$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, k$  can be regarded as direct effects. The existence of the intercept  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  does not change the following interpretations, thus we omit it here for simplicity. Because the “error terms” of the linear structural equation model mean the direct causes that

cannot be represented by variables in  $\mathbf{V}$ , they depend on the choice of  $\mathbf{V}$ . Therefore, they are not necessarily equivalent to the innovation processes of SVAR models. For example, if we consider the case where  $\mathbf{V} = \{Y_{i,t} : i = 1, \dots, k\}$  for fixed  $t$ , then the error term is

$$\sum_{j=1}^k a_{ij}^{(s)} Y_{j,t-s} + v_{i,t},$$

which is not equal to the innovation process  $v_{i,t}$ . However, in the sequel, we consider a sufficiently large  $\mathbf{V}$  so that a finite number of error terms of  $\{Y_{i,t}\} \subset \mathbf{V}$  that play a key role coincide with the innovation process of the SVAR model.

Noticing that the reduced form

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{A}_s \mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{v}_t, \quad \mathbf{Q} = (\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0)^{-1}$$

corresponds to the ancestor expansion of (2.1) for

$$\mathbf{S} = \{Y_{j,t-s} : j = 1, \dots, k, s = 1, \dots, p\},$$

we have the following proposition.

**Proposition A.5.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.2-(i) holds.*

(i) *For model (2.3), it holds that the  $(i, j)$ -component of  $\mathbf{Q} \mathbf{A}_s$  coincides with  $\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}$ -controlled total effect from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$ , where*

$$\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)} = \{Y_{q,t-l} : q = 1, 2, \dots, k, l = 1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{Y_{j,t-s}\}.$$

(ii) *For model (2.3) and  $i \neq j$ , the total effect from  $Y_{j,t}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$  coincides with the  $(i, j)$ -th component of  $\mathbf{Q}$ .*

*Proof.* (i) Because  $\mathbf{I}_k - \mathbf{A}_0$  is non-singular, we obtain the reduced form (2.3) from (2.1). We obtain the conclusion by applying Lemma A.3 for  $\mathbf{S} = \{Y_{j,t-s} : j = 1, 2, \dots, k, s = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ .

(ii) For  $\mathbf{S} = \{Y_{j,t-s} : j = 1, 2, \dots, k, s = 1, 2, \dots, p\}$ , it holds that  $\tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S})}^{(0)} = \tau_{ij}^{(0)}$ , where the subscript (0) in the upper right represents the time difference between the cause  $Y_{j,t-0}$  and the effect  $Y_{i,t}$ . Because the matrix  $\mathbf{Q}$  is the coefficient of  $\mathbf{v}_t$  and the reduced form (2.3) coincides with the ancestor expansion of  $Y_{i,t}$  for  $\mathbf{S}$ , we have the conclusion. □

**Corollary A.6.** Let  $\{\mathbf{Y}_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  be a time series satisfying (2.3). For every permutation matrix  $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ , define  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Y}_t$ . Then, the  $(i, j)$  component of  $\mathbf{PQA}_s\mathbf{P}^\top$  coincides with the  $\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{-(j,s)}$ -controlled total effect from  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-s}$  to  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t$ , where

$$\tilde{\mathbf{S}}_{-(j,s)} = \{\tilde{Y}_{l,t-s} : l = 1, 2, \dots, k, s = 1, 2, \dots, p\} \setminus \{\tilde{Y}_{j,t-s}\}.$$

In addition, the  $(i, j)$  component of  $\mathbf{PQP}^\top$  for every  $i \neq j$  coincides with the total effect from  $\tilde{Y}_{j,t}$  to  $\tilde{Y}_{i,t}$ .

*Proof.* Noting that  $\mathbf{P}$  is orthogonal, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Y}_t &= \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{PQA}_s\mathbf{P}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Y}_{t-s} + \mathbf{PQP}^\top \mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}_t \\ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t &= \sum_{s=1}^p \mathbf{PQA}_s\mathbf{P}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_{t-s} + \mathbf{PQP}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{Y}_t$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{v}}_t = \mathbf{P}\mathbf{v}_t$ . Because  $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}_t$  is just a rearrangement of the components of  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ , the assertion follows from Proposition A.5.  $\square$

Therefore, the regression coefficients of the SVAR model correspond to the causal effects in the sense of linear structural equation models.

Meanwhile, the causal effects for general time series models are described by the Granger causality and impulse response functions. In the sequel, we consider the relationships between such concepts and the causal effects in the linear structural equation models. For the model (A.6), the time series  $\{Y_{j,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is called a Granger cause of  $\{Y_{i,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  if at least one coefficient  $a_{ij}^{(s)}$ ,  $s = 1, \dots, p$  is nonzero. By using Proposition A.5, we can interpret this Granger causality as the causality for the linear structural equation model (A.1).

**Proposition A.7.** *Consider the model (A.6). If  $\{Y_{j,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a Granger cause of  $\{Y_{i,t}\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ , there exists a directed edge from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  for some  $s = 1, 2, \dots, p$  to  $Y_{i,t}$  or a directed path from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$  depending only on the random variables at time  $t$ .*

We omit the proof because it is a direct application of Proposition A.5. It follows from Corollary A.6 that we can obtain the same interpretation of the Granger causality regardless of the order of the components of the  $\mathbf{Y}_t$ .

Proposition A.5 provides the interpretation of the impulse responses as follows.

**Proposition A.8.** *Suppose that Assumption 2.2 holds.*

- (i) *The non-orthogonalized impulse response  $\text{IRF}_{ij}(s)$  coincides with the  $\mathbf{S}_{-j}^s$ -controlled total effect from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$ , where*

$$\mathbf{S}_{-j}^s = \{Y_{l,t-s} : l \neq j\}.$$

*In particular, if  $\mathbf{A}_0 = \mathbf{O}$ , any  $\text{IRF}_{ij}(s)$  coincides with the total effect from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$ .*

(ii) Suppose that there is no contemporaneous confounding and the innovation term  $\mathbf{v}_t$  satisfies  $\text{Var}[\mathbf{v}_t] = \sigma_v^2 \mathbf{I}_k$  for some constant  $\sigma_v^2 > 0$ , then, the orthogonalized impulse response OIRF $_{ij}(s)$  coincides with the total effect from  $Y_{j,t-s}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$ .

*Proof.* For any  $h > 0$ , let

$$\mathbf{V} = \{Y_{j,t-s} : j = 1, 2, \dots, k, s = 0, 1, \dots, h+p\}, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\mathbf{S}^h = \{Y_{j,t-s} : j = 1, 2, \dots, k, s = h+1, \dots, h+p\}, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

and

$$\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}^h = \mathbf{S}^h \setminus \{Y_{j,t-s}\}. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

It follows from the ancestor expansion of  $Y_{i,t}$  for  $\mathbf{S}^h$  that

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{i,t} &= \sum_{Y_{j,t-s} \in \mathbf{S}^h} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}^h)}^{(s)} Y_{j,t-s} + \sum_{Y_{j,t-s} \in \mathbf{AN}(Y_{i,t}) \setminus \mathbf{S}^h} \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}^h)}^{(s)} v_{j,t-s} + v_{i,t} \\ &= \sum_{s=h+1}^{h+p} \sum_{j=1}^k \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}^h)}^{(s)} Y_{j,t-s} + \sum_{s=0}^h \sum_{j=1}^k \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}^h)}^{(s)} v_{j,t-s} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^h \sum_{j=1}^k \tau_{ij}^{(s)} v_{j,t-s} + \sum_{s=h+1}^{h+p} \sum_{j=1}^k \tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}^h)}^{(s)} Y_{j,t-s}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where  $\tau_{ij|do(\mathbf{S}^h)}^{(0)} = \tau_{ij}^{(0)} = 1$  if  $i = j$ . On the other hand, we have the following representation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y}_t &= \sum_{s=0}^h [\mathbf{\Lambda}^s]_k^k \mathbf{e}_{t-s} + [\mathbf{\Lambda}^{h+1}]_{kp}^k \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-h-1} \\ &= \sum_{s=0}^h [\mathbf{\Lambda}^s]_k^k \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{v}_{t-s} + [\mathbf{\Lambda}^{h+1}]_{kp}^k \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-h-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where for  $s \geq 0$ ,  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}^s]_k^k$  is the  $k \times k$  sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s$  corresponding to the top  $k$  columns and rows,  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}^s]_{kp}^k$  is the sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s$  comprising the top  $k$  rows of  $\mathbf{\Lambda}^s$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\mathbf{Y}_t^\top, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_{t-p+1}^\top)^\top$ ,

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{B}_1 & \mathbf{B}_2 & \cdots & \mathbf{B}_{p-1} & \mathbf{B}_p \\ \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{I}_k & \cdots & \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{O} & \mathbf{O} & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_k & \mathbf{O} \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\mathbf{B}_s = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{A}_s$  for  $s = 1, \dots, p$ . Because the two expressions (A.10) and (A.11) are derived from the same sequential substitutions, they are equivalent. Therefore, the assertion (ii)

is obvious because  $\tilde{\mathbf{L}} = \mathbf{Q}$  holds from  $\text{Var}[e_t] = \mathbf{Q}\sigma_v^2\mathbf{I}_k\mathbf{Q}^\top$ . Meanwhile, the coefficients of  $\mathbf{Y}_{t-h-1}$  correspond to the left block of  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}^{h+1}]_{kp}^k$ , which coincides with  $[\mathbf{\Lambda}^{h+1}]_k^k$ . Moreover, because  $Y_{j,t-h-1}$  does not have directed paths to  $Y_{j,t-s}, s > h + 1$ , the  $\mathbf{S}_{-(j,s)}^h$ -controlled total effect from  $Y_{t-h-1}$  to  $Y_{i,t}$  coincides with  $\mathbf{S}_{-j}^{h+1}$ -controlled total effect, where  $\mathbf{S}_{-j}^{h+1} = \{Y_{l,t-h-1} : l \neq j\}$ . Thus, the assertion (i) is proved.  $\square$

**Remark A.9.** The impulse responses are often interpreted as a shock caused by the innovation to the future realizations of endogenous variables (Hamilton (1994) and Sims (1980)). Meanwhile, Proposition A.8 provides the different perspectives as the (controlled) total effects from the endogenous variable  $Y_{j,t}$  to the future realization  $Y_{i,t+s}$  for some  $s$ . Particularly, it follows from Corollary A.6, Propositions A.7, and A.8 that we can regard Granger causality and non-orthogonalized impulse responses as indicators of causality even if contemporaneous confounding exists or the order of the components of the  $Y_t$  is unknown.

## Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Enago (www.enago.jp) for the English language review. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21K13271(K.F.).

## References

- Alwin, D. F. and Hauser, R. M. (1975). The decomposition of effects in path analysis. *American sociological review* 37–47.
- Belloni, A. and Oliveira, R. I. (2018). A high dimensional central limit theorem for martingales, with applications to context tree models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.02741*.
- Bernanke, B. S. (1986). Alternative explanations of the money-income correlation.
- Blanchard, O. J. and Quah, D. (1988). The Dynamic Effects of Aggregate Demand and Supply Disturbances. Working Paper 2737, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Canova, F. and De Nicolò, G. (2002). Monetary disturbances matter for business fluctuations in the G-7. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49 1131–1159.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Kato, K., and Koike, Y. (2023). High-dimensional data bootstrap. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application* 10 427–449.
- Fang, X., Koike, Y., Liu, S.-H., and Zhao, Y.-K. (2023). High-dimensional Central Limit Theorems by Stein’s Method in the Degenerate Case. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.17365*.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1994). *Time series analysis*. Princeton university press.

- Hyvärinen, A., Zhang, K., Shimizu, S., and Hoyer, P. O. (2010). Estimation of a structural vector autoregression model using non-gaussianity.. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**.
- Koike, Y. (2021). Notes on the dimension dependence in high-dimensional central limit theorems for hyperrectangles. *Japanese Journal of Statistics and Data Science* **4** 257–297.
- Lanne, M., Meitz, M., and Saikkonen, P. (2017). Identification and estimation of non-Gaussian structural vector autoregressions. *Journal of Econometrics* **196** 288–304.
- Lütkepohl, H. (1990). Asymptotic distributions of impulse response functions and forecast error variance decompositions of vector autoregressive models. *The review of economics and statistics* 116–125.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2013). *Introduction to multiple time series analysis*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Pearl, J. (1995). Causal diagrams for empirical research. *Biometrika* **82** 669–688.
- Pearl, J. (1998). Graphs, causality, and structural equation models. *Sociological Methods & Research* **27** 226–284.
- Pearl, J. (2009). *Causality*. Cambridge university press.
- Rubio-Ramirez, J. F., Waggoner, D. F., and Zha, T. (2010). Structural vector autoregressions: Theory of identification and algorithms for inference. *The Review of Economic Studies* **77** 665–696.
- Sims, C. A. (1980). Macroeconomics and reality. *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society* 1–48.
- Uhlig, H. (2005). What are the effects of monetary policy on output? Results from an agnostic identification procedure. *Journal of Monetary Economics* **52** 381–419.
- Wright, S. (1921). Correlation and Causation. *Journal of Agricultural Research* **20** 557–585.