

Structural Inference in Sparse High-Dimensional Vector Autoregressions

J. Krampe¹, E. Paparoditis², and C. Trenkler¹

¹ University of Mannheim; j.krampe@uni-mannheim.de, trenkler@uni-mannheim.de

² University of Cyprus; stathisp@ucy.ac.cy

Abstract

We consider statistical inference for impulse responses in sparse, structural high-dimensional vector autoregressive (SVAR) systems. We introduce consistent estimators of impulse responses in the high-dimensional setting and suggest valid inference procedures for the same parameters. Statistical inference in our setting is much more involved since standard procedures, like the delta-method, do not apply. By using local projection equations, we first construct a de-sparsified version of regularized estimators of the moving average parameters associated with the VAR system. We then obtain estimators of the structural impulse responses by combining the aforementioned de-sparsified estimators with a non-regularized estimator of the contemporaneous impact matrix, also taking into account the high-dimensionality of the system. We show that the distribution of the derived estimators of structural impulse responses has a Gaussian limit. We also present a valid bootstrap procedure to estimate this distribution. Applications of the inference procedure in the construction of confidence intervals for impulse responses as well as in tests for forecast error variance decomposition are presented. Our procedure is illustrated by means of simulations.

Keywords: Bootstrap, De-sparsified Estimator, Moving Average Representation, Sparse Models, Inference, Impulse Response, Forecast Error Variance Decomposition

1 Introduction

Structural analysis based on impulse responses and forecast error variance decompositions (FEVDs) is an important part of macroeconomic and financial time series analysis. Over the last two decades structural model approaches have become popular that consider a large number of variables, e.g., factor-augmented vector autoregressive (VAR) models (Bernanke et al., 2005), structural dynamic factor models (Forni et al., 2009; Stock and Watson, 2005), large Bayesian VARs (Banbura et al., 2010), and global VARs (Chudik and Pesaran, 2016). Such large-scale set-ups offer a number of advantages in comparison to small-scale models, e.g., low-dimensional VARs. In particular, they facilitate the measurement of the economic shocks of interest due to a lower degree of information deficiency and they permit to analyse the responses of a larger set of variables to the relevant shocks (Bernanke et al., 2005; Stock and Watson, 2016; Kilian and Lütkepohl, 2017, Ch. 16). Moreover, large-scale models allow to study interactions within networks of economically relevant sizes, see e.g., Demirer et al. (2018), Barigozzi and Hallin (2017), Barigozzi and Brownlees (2019). We contribute to this literature on structural analysis by providing

asymptotically valid inference approaches for structural impulse response analysis and forecast error variance decompositions in sparse high-dimensional VARs. In order to facilitate inference we suggest an asymptotically valid bootstrap approach in addition to the large sample Gaussian approximation.

It is debated whether macroeconomic and financial data are best represented by dense or sparse models (Giannone et al., 2018; Fava and Lopes, 2020). In some applications one may assume sparsity as done e.g., by Demirer et al. (2018) for high-dimensional VAR modelling of bank stock return volatilities. In such a set-up one can directly apply our inference procedures to the time series data under consideration. In many other cases a dense structure is more plausible. Then, one may consider a factor model with an idiosyncratic component that is assumed to have a sparse VAR representation. This leads to the combined ‘factor plus sparse VAR’ approach of Barigozzi and Hallin (2017) who have studied financial network links based on common and idiosyncratic volatility components. Similarly, Barigozzi and Brownlees (2019) pre-adjust for a common factor before applying their VAR-based network estimation approach (NETS) to a panel of stock return volatilities. In such applications our structural inference framework remains valid if the factors are assumed to be given. Then, one could, e.g., test whether (idiosyncratic) network links derived from variance decompositions can be regarded as relevant and thereby provide additional statistical information on the type of analysis conducted in Barigozzi and Hallin (2017) and Barigozzi and Brownlees (2019). Finally, our inference results open up the possibility of considering structural factor models in which the economic shocks of interest affect both the common component and the idiosyncratic component that has a sparse VAR structure.

Although high-dimensional modelling approaches provide a number of appealing advantages they also induce numerous challenges for inference. This is no different in our framework. We consider a stable, high-dimensional structural vector autoregressive (SVAR) system of order d . To keep model complexity tractable we impose approximate sparsity assumptions. We consider de-sparsified versions of ℓ_1 -penalized estimators as a vehicle for statistical inference in order to ensure that our estimators have Gaussian limiting distributions. However, for obtaining these limit results we cannot simply rely on related existing methods and results for reduced form VARs as briefly sketched in the following.

The structural impulse responses as well as the variance ratios obtained from forecast error variance decompositions are nonlinear functions of a high-dimensional parameter vector that comprises the VAR slope parameters and the distinct elements of the variance matrix of the reduced form innovations. However, the Gaussian limiting results for de-sparsified estimators of the VAR slope parameters, obtained e.g. by Krampe et al. (2021), just hold true for a finite subset of the parameters. Therefore, the usual delta method approach for obtaining the limiting distribution of the estimators of the structural parameters does not work in contrast to the case of low-dimensional VARs. Similarly, the high-dimensional set-up will render existing bootstrap approaches invalid in our framework. E.g., a simple model-based bootstrap with i.i.d. resampling from the estimated residuals will fail since the sample variance matrix of the residual vectors is not a consistent estimator of the variance matrix of the innovations in the high-dimensional case. The parametric bootstrap suggested by Krampe et al. (2021) for inference in reduced form VARs

does not work either since this approach cannot asymptotically imitate the fourth-order moments of the innovations that affect the limit distribution of the estimators of the structural parameters of interest.

We address the aforementioned challenges in the following way. First, we propose consistent ℓ_1 -regularized estimators of the structural impulse responses that serve as input for the de-sparsified estimation approach. The consistency property can be obtained from existing results based on rather weak assumptions and since no sparsity constraints need to be imposed on the contemporaneous impact matrix, common identification restrictions – like short-run, long-run, or sign-restrictions – can be employed; see e.g., Ramey (2016) for an extensive survey on various identification methods used in structural VARs. Second, for implementing inference we need to strengthen the approximate sparsity assumptions which now also involve the contemporaneous impact matrix. As a consequence, we focus on short-run identifying restrictions in order to avoid any conflict with necessary sparsity constraints. Third, we construct a new direct de-sparsified estimator of the entries in the moving average (MA) parameter matrices implied by the VAR process. This estimator is based on a local projection approach that avoids to deal with problems due to the nonlinearity of the relationship between the VAR and MA parameters. Eventually, the estimator of the MA parameters is appropriately combined with a non-regularized estimator of the contemporaneous impact matrix in order to obtain an estimator of the structural impulse response of interest. We proceed by showing that the combined estimator has a Gaussian limiting distribution for a finite set of structural parameters. The bootstrap procedure we propose relies on separating the innovations of the SVAR into a subset representing the structural shocks of interest and a second subset referring to additional shocks or measurement errors. Under independence of the two subsets of SVAR innovations, we show that the limit distribution of the structural impulse response estimators is consistently estimated by our bootstrap procedure.

Finally, we suggest to form confidence intervals for structural impulse responses based on quantiles obtained from the asymptotic or the bootstrap distribution of the de-sparsified estimators but anchored at the regularized estimators. This suggestion is motivated by the lower degree of variability of the regularized estimators in finite-samples. The latter feature also makes the regularized estimators to be the preferred choice for point estimation. The forecast error variance decompositions can be easily obtained from the regularized estimators of the structural impulse responses and asymptotically valid tests for hypotheses on the decompositions follow from our de-sparsified estimation approach. Therefore, our presentation focuses on the impulse response framework.

Our paper links to several strands of the literature on high-dimensional time series analysis. A number of papers propose approaches for statistical inference on structural impulse responses in dense high-dimensional frameworks. This includes, among others, Yamamoto (2019); Bai et al. (2016); Stock and Watson (2016) regarding factor-augmented VARs and structural dynamic factor models, Dees et al. (2007) in terms of global vector autoregressive models, and Banbura et al. (2010); Canova and Ciccarelli (2013) for large-scale (panel) Bayesian VARs. To the best of our knowledge, no structural inference methods exist for sparse high-dimensional systems. Our paper attempts to fill this gap.

By now, a quite large literature has emerged that deals with the problem of fitting sparse high-dimensional VAR models using ℓ_1 -penalized estimators; see among others Song and Bickel (2011), Han et al. (2015), Kock and Callot (2015), and Basu and Michailidis (2015). Moreover, high-dimensional VARs and predictive regression models estimated by lasso-type estimators have proven to be useful for forecasting; also in comparison to other estimation and model approaches like ridge and factor models. This applies even if the data generating process has a factor structure (Callot and Kock, 2014; Kascha and Trenkler, 2015; Medeiros and Vasconcelos, 2016; Smeekes and Wijler, 2018).

Recently, Chaudhry et al. (2017), Neykov et al. (2018), Zheng and Raskutti (2019), and Krampe et al. (2021) have considered inference on the autoregressive slope parameters of high-dimensional reduced form VAR systems which can also be used to derive (bootstrap-based) tests, for instance tests for Granger-causality. These papers rely on de-sparsified estimators that have been initially introduced and investigated in the i.i.d. regression (e.g. Zhang and Zhang, 2014; van de Geer et al., 2014).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the model framework. We describe in Section 3 how to obtain regularized estimators of the structural impulse responses. In Section 4 we suggest a de-sparsified estimator of the structural impulse responses based on the new direct de-sparsified estimator of the reduced form moving average parameters. Moreover, we derive the limiting distribution of the de-sparsified estimator of the structural impulse responses. We also show how this limiting distribution can be replicated by an asymptotically valid bootstrap scheme. Section 5 deals with structural inference suggesting different ways of obtaining confidence intervals for impulse responses and proposing tests for hypotheses on forecast error variance decompositions. We conduct numerical investigations on impulse response inference in Section 6. Section 7 concludes our findings while technical proofs and additional lemmas are deferred to an Appendix.

Throughout the paper the following notation is used. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|x\|_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{1}(x_j \neq 0)$, where $\mathbf{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function, $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p |x_j|$, $\|x\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p |x_j|^2$ and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_j |x_j|$. Furthermore, for a $r \times s$ matrix $B = (b_{i,j})_{i=1,\dots,r,j=1,\dots,s}$, $\|B\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s} \sum_{i=1}^r |b_{i,j}| = \max_j \|Be_j\|_1$, $\|B\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} \sum_{j=1}^s |b_{i,j}| = \max_i \|e_i^\top B\|_1$ and $\|B\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |e_i^\top Be_j|$, where $e_j = (0, \dots, 0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)^\top$ denotes a unit vector of appropriate dimension with the one appearing in the j th position. Denote the largest absolute eigenvalue of a square matrix B by $\rho(B)$ and let $\|B\|_2^2 = \rho(BB^\top)$. The p -dimensional identity matrix is denoted by I_p and for two matrices A and B , their Kronecker product is denoted by $A \otimes B$; see among others Appendix A.11 in Lütkepohl (2005). We define $\mathbb{L} = (e_1 \otimes I_p)$ and we denote by $I_{d,-\mathcal{J}} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times (d-|\mathcal{J}|)}$ a d -dimensional identity matrix after deleting all columns $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Here, \mathcal{J} is a subset of $\{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ and $I_{d,\mathcal{J}} = I_{d,-\mathcal{J}^C}$, where \mathcal{J}^C denotes the complement of the set \mathcal{J} . For a vector-valued times series $\{X_t\}$, we write $\{X_{t,\mathcal{J}} := I_{d,\mathcal{J}}^\top X_t\}$ for the sub-vector containing the components $j \in \mathcal{J}$ only.

2 Model Framework

Let $\{Y_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ be a stochastic process, where Y_t is a vector of p endogenous variables and Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_n is a time series stemming from $\{Y_t\}$. We consider a high-dimensional case such that p is allowed to

grow with the sample size n . Assume that $Y_t = \mu + X_t$, where μ is the intercept and $\{X_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a p -dimensional zero-mean stochastic process. We focus on the process $\{X_t\}$ only since mean-adjusting the time series does not affect the theoretical results derived in this paper. We assume that X_t is generated according to the following structural, sparse vector autoregressive model of order d , SVAR(d),

$$X_t = \sum_{j=1}^d A_j X_{t-j} + B u_t + D w_t = \sum_{j=1}^d A_j X_{t-j} + \varepsilon_t. \quad (1)$$

Here, A_1, \dots, A_d are sparse matrices, $u_t \in \mathbb{R}^{k_u}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k_u}$, $D \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-k_u)}$, and $\{(u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are independent and identically distributed random variables with $E(u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top = 0$ and $\text{Var}((u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top) = I_p$, in short, $(u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top \sim i.i.d.(0, I_p)$. Denote by $\Sigma_\varepsilon = E(\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_1^\top)$ the variance matrix of $\varepsilon_t = B u_t + D w_t$. Then, $\Sigma_\varepsilon = B B^\top + D D^\top = \Sigma_u + \Sigma_w$, with an obvious notation for Σ_u and Σ_w . We call $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ the (reduced form) innovation process. The random variables u_t represent the shocks of interest to the SVAR system while w_t are considered as additional shocks or measurement errors.

Now recall that if the system is stable, that is if $\det(\mathcal{A}(z)) \neq 0$ for all $z \leq 1$, where $\mathcal{A}(z) = I_p - \sum_{j=1}^d A_j z^j$, then X_t also possesses the representation

$$X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j (B u_{t-j} + D w_{t-j}) =: \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Theta_j u_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j D w_{t-j}, \quad (2)$$

with $\Psi_0 = I_p$ and $\Theta_j = \Psi_j B$. Expression (2) is commonly called the moving average representation of the SVAR(d) process. The following relationship between the coefficient matrices $\{A_j, j = 1, \dots, d\}$ and $\{\Psi_h, h = 0, 1, \dots\}$ holds true:

$$\Psi_h = \sum_{s=1}^{\min(d,h)} \Psi_{h-s} A_s \iff 0 = \sum_{s=0}^{\min(d,h)} \Psi_{h-s} A_s, \text{ where } A_0 = -I_p, k = 1, 2, \dots \quad (3)$$

Consider now a r th shock to the system, that is an increase by one standard deviation of the r th component of the random variable u_t , denoted by $u_{t;r}$. Then, $e_j^\top \Theta_h e_r =: \Theta_{h;jr}$ quantifies the effect of this increase on the variable j after h time points, i.e., on $X_{t+h;j}$. Given the stretch of observations X_1, \dots, X_n , our goal is to estimate the parameters $\Theta_{h;jr}$ for some values $h = 0, \dots, H$ and to do inference for the same set of parameters. The time horizon H is treated as fixed.

In this high dimensional set-up, the dimension of the system, the sparsity of the parameter matrices as well as the dimension k_u of the vector u_t , may grow with sample size and may depend among other things on the distribution of the innovations as well as on the application of interest. In this context, if only consistent estimation of the impulse responses is of interest, then we allow for row-wise, approximately sparse matrices A_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, and impose no sparsity restrictions on the innovation's variance matrix Σ_w or B , respectively. The precise assumptions needed in this case are stated in Assumption 1 of Section 3. However, for appropriate inference on the impulse responses, the sparsity setting turns out to be more restrictive. In particular, row- and column-wise approximate sparsity restrictions are imposed for the slope matrices A_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, and for the matrices B and Σ_w . The additional conditions required for inference are stated in Assumption 2 of Section 4.

In the following, we will also rely on the stacked SVAR(1) representation of a SVAR(d) system, i.e., on the representation $W_t = \mathbb{A}W_{t-1} + \mathbb{U}_t$, where

$$\mathbb{A} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & A_2 & \dots & A_d \\ I_p & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \dots & I_p & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{dp \times dp} \text{ and } \mathbb{U}_t = \mathbb{L}\varepsilon_t = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_t \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that using this representation, expression (3) also can be written as $\Psi_h = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^h \mathbb{L}$.

3 Regularized Estimators of Impulse Response Functions

In this section we derive an estimator of the impulse responses $\Theta_{h,jr} = e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r$ by combining a regularized estimator of the moving average matrix Ψ_h with a non-regularized estimator of the contemporaneous matrix B of the shocks u_t . The estimation of impulse responses is similar to the finite dimensional SVAR case with the major difference being that a regularized estimator of the VAR slope parameters A_j is used. Before presenting our results regarding the estimation error, we first state the assumptions needed. For this we adapt the concept of approximately sparse matrices discussed in Bickel and Levina (2008) and define the following class $\mathcal{U}(k, \zeta)$ of row-wise approximately sparse matrices,

$$\mathcal{U}(k, \zeta) = \{A = (a_{ij})_{i=1, \dots, p_1, j=1, \dots, p_2} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_1 \times p_2} : \max_i \sum_{j=1}^{p_2} |a_{ij}|^\zeta \leq k, \|A\|_2 \leq M < \infty\}.$$

Notice that for $\zeta = 0$ we are in the case of exact sparsity, where $\sum_{j=1}^{p_2} |a_{ij}|^\zeta$ counts the number of nonzero coefficients in the i th row of the matrix A . Allowing for ζ to vary in the interval $[0, 1)$ relaxes the exact sparsity assumption to a more flexible setting, called approximate sparsity. This setting is sometimes labelled as weak sparsity in the literature.

We next state our assumptions on the SVAR system. In these assumptions as well as later on in this paper the abbreviations g_n and \tilde{g}_n appear. These abbreviations refer to functions $g_n = g(p, d, q, n)$ and $\tilde{g}_n = g(p, q, n)$, respectively, where g is increasing in the dimension p and its particular form depends on the number of finite moments q of the innovations ε_t . These functions can be understood as the price paid by the regularization methods used and for allowing the dimension of the SVAR system to grow.

Assumption 1.

- (i) $(A_1, \dots, A_p) \in \mathcal{U}(k_A, \zeta)$, for some $\zeta \in [0, 1)$.
- (ii) There exists a $\varphi \in (0, 1)$ such that $\rho(\mathbb{A}) \leq \varphi$ and for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\|\mathbb{A}^m\|_2 = O(\varphi^m) \text{ and } \|\mathbb{A}^m\|_\infty = O(k_A \varphi^m).$$

- (iii) $\hat{A}_s^{(re)}$, $s = 1, \dots, d$, is a regularized estimator of A_s , $s = 1, 2, \dots, d$, with corresponding stacked form $\hat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)}$ and which satisfies

$$\|\hat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A}\|_\infty = O_P\left(k_A \left(\frac{g_n}{n}\right)^{(1-\zeta)/2}\right).$$

(iv) The sample covariance $\sum_{t=1}^n \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top / n$, satisfies for all $U, V \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with $\|U\|_2 = 1 = \|V\|_2$,

$$\|1/n \sum_{t=1}^n U(\varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top - \Sigma_\varepsilon) V^\top\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n})$$

(v) There exists some subset $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ with $|\mathcal{I}| = k_u$ such that for all $j \in \mathcal{I}$, it holds true that $e_j^\top \varepsilon_t = e_j^\top B u_t$ and the random vector $(e_j^\top \varepsilon_t)_{j \in \mathcal{I}}$ satisfies $\text{Var}((e_j^\top \varepsilon_t)_{j \in \mathcal{I}}) > 0$ and $\|\text{Var}((e_j^\top \varepsilon_t)_{j \in \mathcal{I}})^{-1}\|_\infty = O(k_u)$.

(vi) For all $j = 1, \dots, p$, it holds true that $E(e_j^\top \varepsilon_t)^q \leq C < \infty$ for some $q \geq 8$.

Assumption 1(i) specifies the row-wise approximate sparsity of the estimators of the SVAR slope parameters and Assumption 1(ii) specifies the stability conditions of the SVAR system.¹ The required rate in estimating the SVAR slope parameters is specified in part (iii) of Assumption 1. This assumption is flexible in the sense that the regularization method chosen determines the particular form of the function g_n . Desired rates are $g_n = \log(dp) + (ndp)^{2/q}$ in the case where only q moments are finite, and $g_n = \log(dp)$ in the case of sub-Gaussian innovations.² Candidates for the regularized estimators $\hat{A}_s^{(re)}$, which fulfill the desired rate condition in the sparse SVAR setting considered, are the (adaptive) lasso³ and the Dantzig Selector⁴. Based on finite sample results in simulations, see, e.g., Krampe and Paparoditis (2021), we recommend the use of the adaptive lasso for $\hat{A}_s^{(re)}$, which is built up row-wise. More specifically, the corresponding estimator for the i th row of (A_1, \dots, A_d) , denoted by $\hat{\beta}_i^{(re)}$, is obtained as

$$\hat{\beta}_i^{(re)} = \underset{c=(c_1, \dots, c_{dp})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{dp}}{\text{argmin}} \frac{1}{n-d} \sum_{t=d+1}^n (X_{t;i} - c^\top (X_{t-1}^\top, \dots, X_{t-d}^\top)^\top)^2 + \lambda_A \sum_{s=1}^{dp} \frac{|c_s|}{1/\sqrt{n} + |\hat{c}_{i,s}|}, \quad (4)$$

where $\hat{c}_i = (\hat{c}_{i,s}, s = 1, 2, \dots, dp)$ are the lasso estimators of β_i obtained as $\hat{c}_i = \underset{c \in \mathbb{R}^{dp}}{\text{argmin}} (n-d)^{-1} \sum_{t=d+1}^n (X_{t;i} - c^\top (X_{t-1}^\top, \dots, X_{t-d}^\top)^\top)^2 + \lambda_A \|c\|_1$ and λ_A is a regularization parameter. We notice here that a consistent estimation of the SVAR slope parameter also can be obtained without the i.i.d. assumption for the innovations ε_t ; see Masini et al. (2020) and Wong et al. (2020). Masini et al. (2020)

¹The sparsity assumption can be modified to group sparsity restrictions. It is important to note that under such group sparsity restrictions, a consistent estimation in the sense of part (iii) can be established.

²Note that in the i.i.d. Gaussian regression case with exact sparsity k_A , Bellec et al. (2018) obtain the optimal rate $\log(p/k_A)$ under some conditions for the lasso and the slope estimator.

³See, among others, Proposition 4.1 in Basu and Michailidis (2015) for the vectorized VAR with exact sparsity and Gaussian innovations, Proposition 3.3 therein for a row-wise estimation, Theorem 1 in Kock and Callot (2015) for the SVAR with exact sparsity and Gaussian innovations, and Section 4 in Kock and Callot (2015) for the adaptive lasso with exact sparsity and Gaussian innovations. Note that in Kock and Callot (2015) additional logarithmic terms of the sample size and the dimension occur. For the Lasso with exact sparsity and sub-Gaussian or sub-Weibull innovations see Corollary 4 or Corollary 9, respectively, in Wong et al. (2020). For the Lasso with approximate sparsity and sub-Gaussian or sub-Weibull innovations see Theorem 1 in Masini et al. (2020). Note that given an error bound to ℓ_2 -norm it is straightforward to derive an error bound with respect to the ℓ_1 -norm, see, among others, the proof of Proposition 4.1 in Basu and Michailidis (2015).

⁴See, among others, Theorem 1 in Han et al. (2015) for Gaussian innovations and Corollary 1 in Wu et al. (2016) for sub-Gaussian innovations. The result in Wu et al. (2016) are derived without assuming a specific sparsity setting. See Corollary 2 in Krampe and Paparoditis (2021) for a thresholded Dantzig selector under approximate sparsity. Note that in the error bounds derived for the Dantzig selector additionally occurs the term $\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1}\|_1$.

consider the case where these innovations are a martingale difference process, which covers, among other things, also the case of conditional heteroskedasticity.

Assumption 1(iv) specifies the entry-wise consistency needed for the sample covariance of the innovations. Note that no sparsity is assumed here for Σ_ε and that the entry-wise consistency of the sample covariance of the innovations follows immediately from the number of finite moments and \tilde{g}_n is the price paid for the increasing dimension. More specifically, if only q moments of the innovations are finite, then $\tilde{g}_n = \log(p) + (np)^{2/q}$ and this assumption follows by the Nagaev inequality for the independent case while for the dependent case we refer to, among others, Liu et al. (2013). In the case of sub-Gaussian innovations we have $\tilde{g}_n = \log(p)$. Assumption 1(v) ensures that, given the innovations, the raw shocks can be identified. Note that in a low-dimensional case, let us say for a system of dimension k_u , it is usually implicitly assumed that $\mathcal{I} = 1, \dots, k_u$. This means that this assumption generalizes in a direct way a corresponding condition in the low-dimensional case. Note that the rate at which the sparsity and the dimension of the SVAR system is allowed to grow with the sample size can be derived from the bounds presented in the theorems stated in this section.

The regularized estimated SVAR slope parameters $\hat{A}_1^{(re)}, \dots, \hat{A}_d^{(re)}$ with corresponding stacked form $\hat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)}$ can be used to obtain a (regularized) estimators of the moving average matrices $\Psi_h, h = 1, \dots, H$. For this, let $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} = \mathbb{L}^\top (\hat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^h \mathbb{L}$. Under Assumption 1 we then have

$$\|\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h\|_\infty = O_P\left(k_A^3 (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2}\right), \quad h = 1, \dots, H;$$

see Lemma 7 of the Appendix. Note that the stability Assumption 1(ii) ensures that $\|\Psi_h\|_\infty$ does not increases too fast while the sparsity assumptions are only imposed on the SVAR slope parameters and not on the corresponding moving average matrices Ψ_h . Furthermore, since the relationship between Ψ_h and \mathbb{A} is nonlinear, sparsity of the SVAR slope parameters A_s implies only in very special situations sparsity of the corresponding moving average matrices Ψ_h . For this reason, we do not use regularized estimators to directly estimate the coefficient matrices Ψ_h .

The innovations $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ can be estimated in the standard way as residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = X_t - \sum_{j=1}^d \hat{A}_j^{(re)} X_{t-j}$, $t = d+1, d+2, \dots, n$.⁵ As in the low-dimensional case, the matrix B describing the contemporaneous effect of the shock is identified only up to a rotation $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k_u \times k_u}$, i.e., the matrix B equals $B = \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})R$, where the set \mathcal{I} refers to the set described in Assumption 1(v). We denote by $\Theta_h R^{-1} = \Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$ the “raw” impulses responses where the term “raw” is used here to describe the situation where the true rotation is not yet identified.⁶ Furthermore, the matrix $BR^{-1} = \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$ can be consistently estimated entry-wise by using the sample covariance of the residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$. This, together with the estimated moving average matrices, lead to the following estimator of the raw impulses responses

$$\tilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)} = \hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} \left(\frac{1}{n-d} \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top \right) = \hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} \tilde{B}, \quad (5)$$

⁵We omit centering of the residuals in order to not overload the notation and the proofs. However, in practice we recommend to use centering.

⁶Note that with an additional normalization the “raw” impulse responses coincide with the “generalized” impulse responses.

with an obvious notation for \tilde{B} . Consistency of the above estimators is established in the following theorem.

Theorem 1. *Under Assumption 1 the estimator (5) of the raw impulse responses $e_j^\top \Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) e_r$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, $r = 1, \dots, k_u$, and $h = 0, \dots, H$, satisfies,*

$$e_j^\top (\tilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})) e_r = O_P \left(k_A^3 \left(\frac{g_n}{n} \right)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + k_A \left(\frac{\tilde{g}_n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right). \quad (6)$$

We mention here that the above consistency result for the raw impulse responses is obtained without imposing any sparsity assumptions on the contemporaneous part B or on the covariance matrix Σ_ε . Furthermore, $k_u = p$ is also allowed. Notice that the stability assumptions ensure that long-run effects also can be consistently estimated. Hence, one can follow the existing literature and impose identification restrictions, like short-run, long-run, or sign restrictions, see Kilian and Lütkepohl (2017). Note that for partial identification purposes only a column of the matrix R needs to be identified.

As regards identification, the raw impulse responses are restricted such that the rotation R can be identified. Replacing the raw impulse response with the above estimator leads to an estimator of R . To elaborate, let $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, h) : i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, h \in \{0, \dots, H\}\} = \{(i_1, h_1), \dots, (i_{k_u}, h_{k_u})\}$ be a set of indices corresponding to the variables and time horizons for which identification restrictions are imposed. Let the restrictions be formalized in a function $g_{\mathcal{R}} : \mathbb{R}^{d \times d \times (H+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{k_u \times k_u}$ such that $g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ gives the restrictions one wants to impose. The set \mathcal{R} needs to be set up in such a way that the following matrix of raw impulse responses

$$\Theta_{\mathcal{R}} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{i_1}^\top \Psi_{h_1} \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) \\ \vdots \\ e_{i_{k_u}}^\top \Psi_{h_{k_u}} \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) \end{pmatrix}$$

has full rank k_u .⁷ We then have $R = \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ and \hat{R} is an estimator of R obtained by replacing the raw impulse response $\Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$ by its estimator $\tilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)}$. Let $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)} = e_j^\top \tilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)} \hat{R} e_r$. The following theorem specifies the error rates in estimating the impulse responses of the r th shock following the procedure discussed so far.

Theorem 2. *Let $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k_u \times k_u}$ be a rotation matrix such that $B = \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) R$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, h) : i \in \{1, \dots, p\}, h \in \{0, \dots, H\}\}$ and $g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ be such that $R = \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ and $\rho(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1}) < 1/\alpha, \alpha > 0$. Then, under Assumption 1 the error in estimating the impulse responses $e_j^\top \Theta_h e_r, j = 1, \dots, p$ and $h = 0, \dots, H$, satisfies*

$$e_j^\top (\hat{\Theta}_h^{(re)} - \Theta_h) e_r = O_P \left(k_A k_u^{1/2} \|\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_2 \left[k_A^2 \left(\frac{g_n}{n} \right)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + \left(\frac{\tilde{g}_n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right] \right). \quad (7)$$

⁷If the Cholesky decomposition is used for identification, we set $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, 0) : i \in \mathcal{I}\}$. Then, $\Theta_{\mathcal{R}} = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$. Let $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) = PP^\top$, where P is the Cholesky factor. Then $g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})) = g_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})) = P$ and $R = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})^{-1} P = (P^{-1})^\top$. Consequently, \hat{R} is the inverse transposed Cholesky factor of $1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top$

If only short-run restrictions are used, i.e., when $\mathcal{R} = \{(i, h) : i = 1, \dots, p, h = 0\}$, then

$$e_j^\top (\hat{\Theta}_h^{(re)} - \Theta_h) e_r = O_P \left(k_A^3 \left(\frac{g_n}{n} \right)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + k_A k_u^{1/2} \|Cov(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_2 \left(\frac{\tilde{g}_n}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right). \quad (8)$$

The identified shocks are given by $\hat{u}_t = \hat{R}^\top \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}$.

4 De-Sparsified Estimators of Impulse Responses

Despite their consistency property, regularized estimators of impulse responses estimators are of limited use if one is interested in inferring properties of the corresponding theoretical coefficients. The reason for this lies in the fact that the (limiting) distribution of regularized estimators is unknown and difficult to investigate. In fact, findings in the much simpler i.i.d. case suggest that this unknown distribution would neither be Gaussian nor it is clear how can it be approximated using alternative approaches, like for instance, the bootstrap, see Knight and Fu (2000) and Chatterjee and Lahiri (2010). For this reason, we follow the alternative approach of developing de-sparsified estimators as has been proposed in the i.i.d. case by Zhang and Zhang (2014), see also van de Geer et al. (2014). In this section, we introduce de-sparsified or de-biased estimators of the impulse response coefficients $\Theta_{h,jr} = e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r$ which possesses a manageable limiting distribution and can, therefore, be used for statistical inference.

The general idea is to obtain a de-sparsified estimator for $\Theta_{h,jr}$ by combining a de-sparsified estimator of the regularized estimator of the moving average matrix Ψ_h with a non-regularized estimator of the contemporaneous part B . We first introduce de-sparsified estimators for the moving average parameter matrices. Then, we use these estimators to construct de-sparsified estimators of the impulse responses of interest. We derive the limiting distribution of these estimators and, finally, we present a valid bootstrap procedure for estimating this distribution.

4.1 De-Sparsified Moving-Average Parameter Matrices

In order to adapt the basic idea of de-sparsifying to the estimation of the parameter matrices $\{\Psi_h, h = 1, \dots, H\}$ we first reformulate the estimation of the coefficient matrix Ψ_h as a regression problem. This reformulation leads to a more direct estimator of Ψ_h compared to an estimator of the form $\hat{\Psi}_h = \mathbb{L}^\top (\hat{\mathbb{A}})^h \mathbb{L}$ as applies for $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)}$. First, recall the stacked form representation $W_t = \mathbb{A} W_{t-1} + \mathbb{L} \varepsilon_t$, where $W_t = (X_t^\top, X_{t-1}^\top, \dots, X_{t-d+1}^\top)^\top$. By recursive substitution, we obtain $W_{t+h} = \mathbb{A}^h W_t + \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \mathbb{A}^j \mathbb{L} \varepsilon_{t+h-j}$. Using $X_{t+h} = \mathbb{L}^\top W_{t+h}$ and $\Psi_j = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^j \mathbb{L}$ eventually leads to the representation

$$X_{t+h} = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^h W_t + \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \Psi_j \varepsilon_{t+h-j}, \quad (9)$$

where Ψ_h is the coefficient matrix of the regressor X_t in (9). Notice that expression (9) has also been used in the local projection approach considered by Jordà (2005). Our aim here, however, is not to transfer the idea of Jordà (2005) to the high-dimensional setting by applying some regularized type estimators to representation (9). Moreover, since Ψ_h is not necessarily sparse, the expression in equation (9) may

not even be helpful for deriving a direct (sparse) estimator of Ψ_h . Instead, we use representation (9) as a starting point to construct a de-sparsified estimator of Ψ_h .

Recall that the advantage of de-sparsifying is that it leads to a manageable limiting distribution of the estimator obtained and that this is achieved by introducing a bias-correction to an initial, regularized estimator. The name is motivated by the fact that the initial estimator is usually sparse, whereas the applied bias-correction leads to an estimator which is not sparse anymore. As will be seen later on, the initial estimator uses the relation $\mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^h \mathbb{L}$ with regularized VAR slope estimators $\hat{A}_1^{(re)}, \dots, \hat{A}_d^{(re)}$ as input. Furthermore, the obtained estimator of Ψ_h may not be sparse even if the VAR slope estimators $\hat{A}_j^{(re)}$ are sparse. Nevertheless, we still call the estimator obtained a de-sparsified estimator, since the initial estimators of the slope parameters used are regularized and the term “de-sparsified” is commonly used for estimators obtained by the procedure discussed in this section.

To proceed with our construction of the de-sparsified estimator of Ψ_h , let $U_{t+h} = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \Psi_j \varepsilon_{t+h-j}$. Note that $\{U_t, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a h -dependent process, i.e., U_{t_1} and U_{t_2} are independent if $|t_1 - t_2| > h$. Furthermore, U_{t+h} is independent from W_t . Let $\Xi_h = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^h \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (dp)}$. Then, (9) can be written in regression form as

$$X_{t+h} = \Xi_h W_t + U_{t+h}.$$

Now, recall the basic idea of de-sparsifying: Rotate the regressor W_t in such a way that orthogonality of the regressors is achieved and, as a consequence, ordinary least squares can be applied to estimate the components of the parameter matrix $\Xi_h = (\xi_{h,j}, j = 1, 2, \dots, p)$. Here $\xi_{h,j}$ denotes the j th row of the matrix Ξ_h and note that $\Xi_{h;jr} = \Psi_{h;jr}, j, r = 1, \dots, p$. Due to the high-dimension of the regression problem, however, only an approximate orthogonal rotation of the regressors can be achieved. To elaborate, define first the rotated regressors as the projections $\hat{Z}_{t;r} = \hat{\beta}_r^\top W_t$, where the coefficient vector $\hat{\beta}_r$ is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_r = (e_r^\top \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} e_r)^{-1} \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} e_r, \quad (10)$$

and $\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)$ is some estimator of the lag-zero autocovariance matrix $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ of $\{W_t\}$, which will be discussed later on. Notice that $\Gamma^{(st)}(0) = \text{Var}(W_t) = \text{Var}((X_1^\top, \dots, X_d^\top)^\top)$ is the lag-zero autocovariance matrix of the stacked VAR(d) process. Using the rotated regressors $\hat{Z}_{t;r}$ and motivated by a least squares estimator with orthogonal regressors, an estimator $\tilde{\Psi}_{h;jr}$ of the coefficient $\Psi_{h;jr} = \Xi_{h;jr}, j, r \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, of the matrix Ψ_h is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Psi}_{h;jr} &= \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} X_{t+h;j} \right) / \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_{t;r} \right) \\ &= \Psi_{h;jr} + \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_{t;r} \right)^{-1} \left(\xi_{h,j} I_{dp;-r} I_{dp;-r}^\top \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_t + \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} U_{t+h;j} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Observe that in the low-dimensional case ($p < n$), the “rotated regressor” $\hat{Z}_{t;r}$ can be constructed so that the condition $\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_t \equiv 0$ for all $j \neq r$ is satisfied. This implies that the first term within the last parentheses on the right hand side of equation (11) would disappear in this case. Since such

a construction is not possible in the high-dimensional case ($p > n$), the aforementioned term in (11) does not disappear. Therefore, this term introduces a bias of the estimator $\tilde{\Psi}_{h;jr}$ which, however, can be estimated using some (regularized) estimator $\hat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}$ of Ξ_h . As a consequence, this bias term can be removed from $\tilde{\Psi}_{h;jr}$. This procedure leads to a new estimator which is called de-biased or de-sparsified estimator of Ψ_h . This estimator, say $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Psi}_{h;jr}^{(de)} &= \tilde{\Psi}_{h;jr} - \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_{t;r} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} \hat{\Xi}_{h;j}^{(re)} I_{dp;-r} I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t \right) \\ &= \hat{\Psi}_{h;jr}^{(re)} + \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} W_{t;r} \right)^{-1} \left[\sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \hat{Z}_{t;r} (X_{t+h;j} - \hat{\Xi}_{h;j}^{(re)} W_t) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (12)$$

As we have seen, the derivation of the de-sparsified estimator $\hat{\Psi}_{h;jr}^{(de)}$ given above needs estimators of $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ and of Ξ_h . In general, the estimation of $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ and its inverse is a difficult task in the high-dimensional setting. However, in our setting this problem is more tractable and can be solved using the underlying VAR structure of the system. This VAR structure relates $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ to the slope parameters and to the variance matrix of the innovations. Hence, an estimator of $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ can be obtained by plugging given estimators of the parameter matrices A_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$, and of Σ_ε into the expression

$$\Gamma^{(st)}(0) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{A}^j \mathbb{L} \Sigma_\varepsilon \mathbb{L}^\top (\mathbb{A}^\top)^j = \text{vec}_{dp,dp}^{-1} \left((I_{(dp)^2} - \mathbb{A} \otimes \mathbb{A})^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbb{L} \Sigma_\varepsilon \mathbb{L}^\top) \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ refers to the operator of stacking the columns of a matrix to a vector and $\text{vec}_{r,s}^{-1}(\cdot)$ refers to the inverse operation, i.e., the one transforming the stacked columns back to a $r \times s$ matrix. For more details on the $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ operator we refer to the Appendix A.1.12.1 in Lütkepohl (2005). Similarly, estimation of Ξ_h is based on $\Xi_h = \mathbb{L} \mathbb{A}^h$. Properties of the estimators of $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$ and Ξ_h obtained in this way are stated in Lemma 7 and Lemma 10 of the Appendix.

To derive the asymptotic distribution of the de-sparsified estimator $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ given in (12), we need to impose some additional conditions on the underlying SVAR process, on its sparsity, including sparsity with respect to B and Σ_w , as well as on the consistency properties of the estimators of A_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, d$.

Assumption 2.

- (i) $\mathbb{A}^\top \in \mathcal{U}(k_A, \zeta)$, where ζ is as in Assumption 1(i).
- (ii) $\|\mathbb{A}^k\|_1 = O(k_A \varphi^k)$, where φ is as in Assumption 1(ii).
- (iii) The estimators \hat{A}_s , $s = 1, \dots, d$ with the stacked form $\hat{\mathbb{A}}$ satisfy

$$\|\hat{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{A}\|_l = O_P \left(k_A^{3/2} \left(\frac{g_n}{n} \right)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \right),$$

where $l \in \{1, \infty\}$.

- (iv) $B^\top \in \mathcal{U}(k_B, \beta)$, $\Sigma_w \in \mathcal{U}(k_D, \beta)$.

- (v) $\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1}\|_1 = O(k_\Gamma)$ and $\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1}\|_2 = O(1)$.

(vi) Let $\mathcal{R} = \{i : i \in \{1, \dots, p\}\}$ be a set of indices and $g_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ corresponding to short-run restrictions such that $R = (\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))^{-1} g_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$. These identification restrictions define a function $g_{\mathcal{R}}$ such that $Re_r = g_{\mathcal{R}}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))e_r =: g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}))$ and $g_{\mathcal{R},r}$ is continuously differentiable with derivative $\nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}$ satisfying $\nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})) \neq 0$ and for x in a neighborhood of $\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$ and some vector $u, \|u\|_2 = 1$ it holds true that $u^\top \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(x) = O(\|u\|_2 k_u^2 \|x\|_2)$.

(vii) $\max_{\|v\|_2=1} (E(v^\top \varepsilon_0)^q)^{1/q} \leq C < \infty$ for some $q \geq 8$ such that

$$\tilde{g}_n^{1/2} k_A^5 k_\Gamma (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} (k_u k_B + k_D) = o(1)$$

and

$$\tilde{g}_n^{1/2} k_A^{5/2} k_\Gamma [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] [k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta} = o(1).$$

Krampe and Paparoditis (2021) showed that the column-wise consistency required in Assumption 2(iii) can be achieved by thresholding initial (regularized) estimators of A_s , $s = 1, 2, \dots, d$, like those introduced in the discussion of Assumption 1(iii) in Section 3. To elaborate, let $\hat{A}_s^{(re)}$ be such a regularized estimator, for instance, the adaptive lasso estimator (4). Then, suitable candidates for \hat{A}_s satisfying Assumption 2(iii) are thresholded estimators denoted by $\hat{A}_s^{(thr)}$ which are given by

$$\hat{A}_s^{(thr)} = \text{THR}_\lambda(A_s^{(re)}) := \left(\text{THR}_\lambda(\hat{A}_{s;jr}^{(re)}) \right)_{j,r=1,\dots,p}, s = 1, \dots, d. \quad (14)$$

Here, $\hat{A}_{s;jr}^{(re)}$ denotes the (j, r) th element of \hat{A}_s and $\text{THR}_\lambda(\cdot)$ is a thresholding function with threshold parameter λ which acts by thresholding every element $\hat{A}_{s;jr}^{(re)}$ of the matrix $A_s^{(re)}$. Such a thresholding function can, for instance, be the adaptive lasso thresholding function given by $\text{THR}_\lambda^{al}(z) = z(1 - |\lambda/z|^\nu)_+$ with $\nu \geq 1$. Soft thresholding ($\nu = 1$) and hard thresholding ($\nu = \infty$) are boundary cases of this function, see also Rothman et al. (2009) and Cai and Liu (2011) for alternative choices of THR_λ . Notice that the additional thresholding step discussed above leads to sparse estimators of A_s , $s = 1, 2, \dots, d$. For details, we refer here to the proof of Theorem 6 given in the Appendix.

Regarding Assumption 2(iv) the following is mentioned. In order to estimate the covariance matrix Σ_ε of the innovations, we propose the following procedure. Based on the estimated residuals $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = X_t - \sum_{s=1}^d \hat{A}_s^{(re)} X_{t-j}$, we can estimate $\tilde{B} = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_w = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\hat{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{B} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}})(\hat{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{B} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}})^\top$. Assumption 2(iv) implies sparsity of the matrices B and Σ_w . This means that Σ_w can be estimated by thresholding $\hat{\Sigma}_w$. Since only B and not necessarily a rotated version of B is sparse, B is estimated by thresholding $\hat{B} := \tilde{B} \hat{R} = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top \hat{R}$. Note that \hat{R} in Section 3 was obtained without any form of regularization on B . Hence, the following regularized estimators of B and Σ_w , and consequently of Σ_ε , can be obtained,

$$\hat{B}^{(re)} = \text{THR}_{\lambda_B}(\hat{B}), \quad \hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)} = \text{THR}_{\lambda_w}(\hat{\Sigma}_w) \text{ and } \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} = \hat{B}^{(re)} (\hat{B}^{(re)})^\top + \hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)}. \quad (15)$$

Under these assumptions we can establish the following rates for the estimators introduced above,

$$\|\hat{B}^{(re)} - B\|_1 = O_P(k_B k_u^{(1-\beta)/2} [k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta})$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} - \Sigma_\varepsilon\|_l = O_P([k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}][k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta}), l \in [1, \infty];$$

see Lemma 9 of the Appendix for details.

Regarding Assumption 2(vi), first note that we focus on short-run identifying restrictions in order to avoid any conflict with necessary sparsity constraints. Furthermore, if $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{I}$, $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_{t,\mathcal{I}}) = PP^\top$, where P is the Cholesky factor, and the Cholesky decomposition is used for identification, we have $Re_r = (P^\top)^{-1}e_r$, i.e., $g_{\mathcal{R},r}(PP^\top) = (P^\top)^{-1}e_r$. The derivative of the Cholesky factor and the matrix inverse can be found in Lütkepohl (2005), p. 668-669; see also Remark 1 of the next section.

The next theorem is the main result of this subsection and establishes asymptotic normality of the de-sparsified estimator $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ proposed.

Theorem 3. *If Assumption 1 and 2 hold true, then for $h \in \{1, \dots, H\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $s.e._\Psi(j, h, v) \neq 0$ and $\|v\|_1 = O(k_B)$, we have that,*

$$\sqrt{n} \frac{e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v}{s.e._\Psi(j, h, v)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where

$$\widehat{s.e.}_\Psi(j, h, v)^2 = \sum_{t_1, t_2=0}^{h-1} \left(1 - \frac{h + d + |t_2 - t_1|}{n}\right) e_j^\top \widehat{\Psi}_{t_1} \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon \widehat{\Psi}_{t_2}^\top e_j v^\top \mathbb{L}^\top \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(t_2 - t_1) \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \mathbb{L} v$$

is an estimator of

$$s.e._\Psi(j, h, v)^2 = \sum_{t_1, t_2=0}^{h-1} e_j^\top \Psi_{t_1} \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_{t_2}^\top e_j v^\top \mathbb{L}^\top \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \Gamma^{(st)}(t_2 - t_1) \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \mathbb{L} v.$$

Furthermore, it holds true that

$$\begin{aligned} n \text{Cov}\left(e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_{h_1}^{(de)} - \Psi_{h_1}) v, e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_{h_2}^{(de)} - \Psi_{h_2}) v\right) \rightarrow \\ \sum_{t_1=0}^{h_1-1} \sum_{t_2=0}^{h_2-1} e_j^\top \Psi_{t_1} \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_{t_2}^\top e_j v^\top \mathbb{L}^\top \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \Gamma^{(st)}(h_2 - h_1 + t_2 - t_1) \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1} \mathbb{L} v \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{and } \|\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) e_r / \widehat{s.e.}_\Psi(j, h, e_r)\|_{\max} = O_P(\widetilde{g}_n^{1/2}).$$

As it is seen from the above theorem, the asymptotic variance $s.e._\Psi(j, h, v)^2$ of the de-sparsified estimator of the components of $\Psi_h^{(de)}$ only depends on the second-order moments of the process $\{X_t\}$ and of the innovations $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. Furthermore, this variance tends to increase with horizon h and since the underlying SVAR system is assumed to be stable, this variance converges to a finite limit as $h \rightarrow \infty$.

4.2 De-Sparsified Impulse Responses

In the previous subsection we have constructed de-sparsified estimators of the moving average parameter matrices Ψ_h , $h = 1, 2, \dots, H$. However, in structural impulse response analysis the parameters of interest are the elements $e_j^\top \Theta_h e_r = e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r$ of the matrices $\Theta_h = \Psi_h B$, $h = 0, \dots, H$, for some index $j \in$

$\{1, \dots, p\}$, which refers to the variable of interest and for some index r which refers to the shock of interest. Notice that in order to construct an estimator of Θ_h , $h = 0, \dots, H$, an estimator of the matrix B is also needed. Here we consider again the estimator $\hat{B} = \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t,\mathcal{I}}^\top \hat{R} / (n-d)$ and establish its asymptotic normality in Theorem 4 below.

Theorem 4. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, we have for $r \in \mathcal{I}$ and for any vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $s.e._B(v, r) \neq 0$ and $\|v\|_1 = O(k_A)$, that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{n} v^\top (\hat{B} - B) e_r}{\widehat{s.e.}_B(v, r)} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

Here

$$\widehat{s.e.}_B(v, r)^2 = \frac{1}{n-d} \sum_{t=d+1}^n \left(v^\top (\hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_t^\top - \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon) I_{d;\mathcal{I}} \hat{R} e_r + v^\top \tilde{B} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r} (I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}) \text{vec}(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{R}} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}) \right)^2,$$

is an estimator of

$$s.e._B(v, r)^2 = \text{Var} \left(v^\top \varepsilon_t u_{t;r} + \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}}^\top \text{vec}_{k_u, k_u}^{-1} (v^\top B R^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r} (I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})) R^{-1} u_t \right),$$

where $\nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(x) = \partial \text{vec } g_{\mathcal{R},r}(x) / \partial \text{vec}(x)^\top$ and if x is symmetric, then $\nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(x) = \partial \text{vec } g_{\mathcal{R},r}(x) / \partial \text{vech}(x)^\top L_{k_u}$. Notice that L_{k_u} is the elimination matrix, see Lütkepohl (2005, Ch. A.12.2) for details. Furthermore,

$$\|\sqrt{n}(\hat{B} - B) e_r / \widehat{s.e.}_B(v, r)\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}).$$

We note here that the asymptotic variance of $\hat{B} e_r$ also depends on the fourth-order moments of $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ and on the derivative of the function $g_{\mathcal{R},r}$. Observe that if $\{u_t\}$ and $\{w_t\}$ are not only uncorrelated but also mutually independent, then the fourth-order moments involved in the above expressions for $s.e._B(v, r)^2$, respectively, $\widehat{s.e.}_B(v, r)^2$, are those of the process $\{u_t\}$ only.

Remark 1. *If $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{I}$, $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_{t,\mathcal{I}}) = PP^\top$, where P is the Cholesky factor and the Cholesky decomposition is used for identification, we then have $s.e._B(v, r)^2 = \text{Var}(v^\top D w_t u_{t;r} + v^\top B P^\top (e_r^\top \otimes (PP^\top)^{-1}) L_{k_u}^\top (L_{k_u} (I_{k_u}^2 + K_{k_u k_u}) (P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u}^\top)^{-1} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top))$, where $K_{k_u k_u}$ is a commutation matrix, see Lütkepohl (2005, Ch. A.12.2). If additionally $p = k_u$, i.e., $\varepsilon_t = B u_t$, we then have $s.e._B(v, r)^2 = \text{Var}((e_r^\top \otimes v^\top) L_{k_u}^\top (L_{k_u} (I_{k_u}^2 + K_{k_u k_u}) (P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u}^\top)^{-1} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top))$. A proof of these assertions is given in the Appendix. Note further that the latter expression for the variance coincides with the variance of the contemporaneous effect in the low-dimensional case, see Proposition 3.6 and equation (3.7.8) in Lütkepohl (2005). Note the misprint in the aforementioned equation.*

Now, given asymptotically normal estimators of B and Ψ_h , we can construct a suitable estimator of the impulse response coefficient $\Theta_{h;jr} = e_j^\top \Theta_h e_r = e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r$, of interest. Observe that in the high-dimensional setting considered here, the statistic $e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} \hat{B}) e_r$ is not a suitable candidate for estimating $\Theta_{h;jr}$. This is due to the fact that the matrix estimators $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ and \hat{B} are not necessarily consistent with respect to some matrix norm. As a consequence, the error term $\sqrt{n} e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) (\hat{B} - B) e_r$, respectively,

its variance, may grow with the dimension p . In other words, the variance of $\sqrt{n}(e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} \hat{B}) e_r - e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r)$ may diverge. To overcome such problems, the following estimator of $\Theta_{h;jr}$ is introduced

$$\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} = e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} \hat{B}) e_r - e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)}) (\hat{B} - \hat{B}^{(re)}) e_r. \quad (16)$$

The second term in the above expression is included in order to correct and, therefore, to control for the estimation error $\sqrt{n}e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) (\hat{B} - B) e_r$. Notice that the estimator $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)}$ used in the above expression is the one discussed in Section 3 while $\hat{B}^{(re)}$ is the regularized estimator of B given in (15). Combining the results of Theorem 3 and Theorem 4, we can establish a Gaussian limit for the estimator $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)}$ given in (16). This result is stated in the following theorem.

Theorem 5. *Let $r \in \{1, \dots, k_u\}$ be the shock of interest and $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}, h \in \{0, \dots, H\}$. If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold true, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\widehat{s.e.}_\Theta(h, j, r)} (\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

where $\widehat{s.e.}_\Theta(h, j, r)^2 = \widehat{s.e.}_\Psi(j, h, \hat{B}^{(re)} e_r)^2 + \widehat{s.e.}_B(\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} e_j, r)^2$.

Similar to the low-dimensional case, for which the estimator of the variance of the innovations is asymptotically independent of the estimator of the slope parameters, we get here the result that the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)}$ is just the sum of the variances of the moving average estimator $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ and the estimator of contemporaneous impact matrix \hat{B} .

4.3 Bootstrapping De-Sparsified Impulse Responses

In addition to the asymptotic Gaussian approximation of the distribution of the de-sparsified estimator of $\Theta_{h;jr}$ given in (16), a bootstrap procedure is also proposed in this section to estimate this distribution. The limiting Gaussian distribution in Theorem 5 can be used to construct confidence intervals or to implement tests for hypotheses about the impulse responses $\Theta_{h;jr}$ of interest. However, the bootstrap can be an useful alternative to the limiting distribution for reasons beyond possible finite sample advantages. First, the bootstrap avoids a direct estimation of the standard deviation of the estimator $\hat{\Theta}_h^{(de)}$, what may be difficult depending on the particular approach used to identify the structural shocks. Second, if one wants to relax the i.i.d. assumption of the structural errors, like for instance by allowing for conditional heteroscedasticity in the innovations, the bootstrap can easily be adapted to take care of such a situation; see our comments after Theorem 6 below.

To appropriately implement a valid bootstrap procedure, we need to additionally assume that the processes $\{u_t\}$ and $\{w_t\}$ are not only uncorrelated but also mutually independent. To elaborate on the importance of this assumption, consider $\hat{\Theta}_h^{(de)}$ and recall that this estimator is based on the estimators $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ and \hat{B} . As we have seen in Theorem 4, the asymptotic variance of \hat{B} also depends on the fourth-order moments of $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. This means that a valid bootstrap procedure also has to correctly imitate the fourth-order moments of $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. However, in the high-dimensional case considered here, generating the pseudo

innovations by drawing with replacement from the estimated residuals $\{\hat{\varepsilon}_t\}$ does not lead to a valid procedure. This is due to the fact that, in our set-up, the sample covariance matrix $\sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_t^\top / (n-d)$ is not a consistent estimator of Σ_ε . Now, the assumption that $\{u_t\}$ and $\{w_t\}$ are mutually independent simplifies the problem, since only the fourth-order moments of the low-dimensional process $\{u_t\}$ affect the distribution of $\hat{\Theta}_h^{(de)}$ in this case. Consequently, only these fourth order moments have to be correctly imitated by the bootstrap and not those of the entire vector ε_t . This is achieved in the following algorithm by drawing with replacement from the corresponding set of estimated residuals \hat{u}_t .

Now, given estimators $\hat{A}_1^{(thr)}, \dots, \hat{A}_d^{(thr)}, \hat{B}^{(re)}$, and $\hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)}$ of the structural autoregressive model, the following bootstrap procedure can be used to consistently estimate the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr})$.

Step 1: Generate pseudo innovations $\{\varepsilon_t^* = \hat{B}^{(re)} u_t^* + w_t^*, t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$, where u_t^* is drawn with replacement from the set of estimated and centered residuals $\{\hat{u}_t, t = d+1, \dots, n\}$ and w_t^* are i.i.d. with $w_t^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)})$.

Step 2: Generate a pseudo time series $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$ using the model equation

$$X_t^* = \sum_{s=1}^d \hat{A}_s^{(thr)} X_{t-s}^* + \varepsilon_t^*, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, n$$

and some starting values $X_0^*, X_{-1}^*, \dots, X_{1-d}^*$, where a burn-in procedure can be used to eliminate the effects of starting values.

Step 3: Let $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)}$ be the same de-sparsified estimator of $\Theta_{h;jr}$ as the estimator $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)}$ given in (16), but based on the pseudo time series $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$.

Step 4: Approximate the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr})$ by the distribution of the bootstrap analogue $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)} - \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)})$, where $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)} = e_j^\top \mathbb{L}^\top (\hat{A}^{(thr)})^h \mathbb{L} \hat{B}^{(re)} e_r$.

Notice that thresholded estimators $\hat{A}_s^{(thr)}, s = 1, \dots, d$, are used in Step 2 of the bootstrap algorithm. This ensures that $\hat{A}_s^{(thr)}, s = 1, \dots, d$, are with high probability approximately sparse matrices, i.e., they fulfill Assumptions 1 and 2. In this way, the generated pseudo time series $X_1^*, X_2^*, \dots, X_n^*$ (asymptotically) stems from an approximately sparse SVAR(d) model which appropriately imitates the properties of the underlying SVAR(d) model. $\hat{\Theta}^{(boot)}$ is introduced in Step 4 in order to center the bootstrap distribution properly. Note that $\hat{\Theta}^{(boot)}$ is based on the thresholded estimators, that is, $\hat{\Theta}^{(boot)} \neq \hat{\Theta}^{(Re)}$, in general.

The following theorem establishes validity of the bootstrap procedure in consistently estimating the distribution of interest. In this theorem, Mallow's d_2 metric is used to measure the distance between two distributions. For two random variables X and Y with cumulative distribution functions F_X and F_Y , respectively, Mallow's distance between F_X and F_Y is defined as $d_2(X, Y) = \{\int_0^1 (F_X^{-1}(x) - F_Y^{-1}(x))^2 dx\}^{1/2}$, see Bickel and Freedman (1981).

Theorem 6. *Let $r \in \{1, \dots, k_u\}$ be the shock of interest and let $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ and $h \in \{0, \dots, H\}$. If Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, and $\{u_t\}$ and $\{w_t\}$ are mutually independent, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$d_2\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\widehat{s.e.}_{\Theta}(h, j, r)}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr}), \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\widehat{s.e.}_{\Theta}^*(h, j, r)}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)} - \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)})\right) = o_P(1).$$

The above theorem, enables the use of the bootstrap in order to construct confidence intervals or to perform statistical tests for the impulse responses $\Theta_{h;jr}$. Adaption of the bootstrap procedure proposed to the case of conditional heteroscedasticity of the structural shocks u_t can easily be done following Brüggemann et al. (2016). In particular, in this case, the i.i.d. bootstrap applied to generate the pseudo innovations u_t^* in Step 1 of the above algorithm can be replaced by, for instance, a version of the block bootstrap applied to the time series of estimated residuals \hat{u}_t , $t = d + 1, \dots, n$.

5 Inference procedures for Impulse Responses and FEVDs

5.1 Confidence Intervals for Impulse Responses

Recall, Theorem 5 establishes a Gaussian limit for the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr})$. By Theorem 6 we further have that the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr})$ is consistently estimated by the distribution of the bootstrap random variable $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)} - \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)})$. Denote by $q^*(\alpha)$ the α -quantile of this bootstrap distribution. Using the de-sparsified estimator, an asymptotically $1 - \alpha$ confidence intervals for $\Theta_{h;jr}$ can be constructed in the usual way as

$$[\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - q^*(1 - \alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - q^*(\alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}]. \quad (17)$$

Another possibility is to center the confidence intervals around the regularized estimator $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)}$, that is

$$[\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)} - q^*(1 - \alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)} - q^*(\alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}]. \quad (18)$$

The regularized estimator as well as the de-sparsified estimator are both point-wise consistent. In contrast to the regularized estimator and by construction, the variance of the de-sparsified estimator, however, does not decrease as the response horizon h increases. Notice that a decrease of the variance of $\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)}$ is expected since the corresponding true coefficients $\Theta_{h;jr}$ decrease exponentially fast to zero as the horizon h increases. Furthermore, our simulations also show that de-sparsified estimators have a larger variability than regularized estimators. For these reasons, the confidence interval (18) may overshoot the nominal level of $1 - \alpha$ in finite samples. Notice, however, that both confidence intervals have the same length $(q^*(1 - \alpha/2) - q^*(\alpha/2))/\sqrt{n}$. That means the gain in coverage of (18) is not accompanied with a loss in power since the length of the intervals is not affected by the particular centering used. Therefore, we recommend (18) as a confidence interval for $\Theta_{h;jr}$ in the high-dimensional setting.

The same arguments also apply if the confidence interval is constructed by using the asymptotic normality established in Theorem 5. This leads to the following confidence interval for $\Theta_{h;jr}$

$$[\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)} - \widehat{s.e.}_{\Theta}(h, j, r)q(1 - \alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}, \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(re)} + \widehat{s.e.}_{\Theta}(h, j, r)q(1 - \alpha/2)/\sqrt{n}], \quad (19)$$

where $q(1 - \alpha/2)$ denotes the $1 - \alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Using the adaptive lasso as a regularized estimator, the following algorithm summarizes the steps needed to construct confidence intervals for the impulse response coefficients of interest.

Step 1: Estimate $\hat{A}_s^{(re)}$, $s = 1, \dots, d$, by using the row-wise adaptive lasso (4) with tuning parameter λ_A . The threshold parameter λ_A is selected using BIC. Obtain $\hat{A}_s^{(thr)}$ by hard thresholding the adaptive lasso estimator with the same threshold parameter λ_A . Compute $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} = \mathbb{L}^\top (\hat{A}^{(re)})^h \mathbb{L}$, $h = 1, \dots, H$.

Step 2: Estimate the residuals by $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = X_t - \sum_{s=1}^d \hat{A}_s^{(re)} X_{t-s}$, $t = d+1, \dots, n$. Denote by $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t$ the centered residuals $\tilde{\varepsilon}_t = \hat{\varepsilon}_t - \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t / (n-d)$, and compute $\tilde{B} = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \tilde{\varepsilon}_t \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t:\mathcal{I}}^\top$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_w = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\tilde{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{B} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t:\mathcal{I}})(\tilde{\varepsilon}_t - \tilde{B} \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t:\mathcal{I}})^\top$.

Step 3: Set up restrictions \mathcal{R} , $j = 1, \dots, k_u$, such that $R = \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} g_{\mathcal{R}}(\Psi_0 \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t:\mathcal{I}}), \dots, \Psi_H \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t:\mathcal{I}}))$ and obtain an estimated rotation matrix \hat{R} with the estimated raw impulse responses $\tilde{\Theta}_h = \hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} \tilde{B}$, $h = 0, \dots, H$. Obtain then, $\hat{B} = \tilde{B} \hat{R}$ and the regularized impulse responses $\hat{\Theta}_h^{(re)} = \hat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} \hat{B}$.

Step 4: Compute $\hat{B}^{(re)} = \text{THR}_{\lambda_B}(\hat{B})$, $\hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)} = \text{THR}_{\lambda_w}(\hat{\Sigma}_w)$, and $\hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} = \hat{B}^{(re)} (\hat{B}^{(re)})^\top + \hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)}$. Use soft thresholding and cross-validation to select the threshold tuning parameters λ_B and λ_w . Given $\hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)}$ and $\hat{A}_s^{(thr)}$, $s = 1, \dots, d$, compute the estimator $\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)$ using expression (13) for $\Gamma^{(st)}(0)$.

Step 5: Compute for $h = 0, \dots, H$, $\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)}$ using (12) and $\hat{\Theta}_h^{(de)}$ using (16).

Step 6: Use the bootstrap algorithm of Section 4.3 to estimate the distribution of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)} - \hat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)})$ and use (18) as a confidence interval for $\Theta_{h;jr}$. Alternatively, the normal approximation (19) can be used to construct a confidence interval for the same parameter.

5.2 Forecast Error Variance Decompositions

The forecast error variance decomposition of variable j at horizon h and of shock i is defined as

$$w_{i,j}^h = \frac{\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} \Theta_{k;ij}^2}{\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} e_i^\top \Psi_k \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_k^\top e_i}, \quad (20)$$

see Section 4.2 in Kilian and Lütkepohl (2017). Note that by definition, $w_{i,j}^h$ gives the portion of explained variance of the linear h -step ahead prediction for variable i caused by the j th shock of $\{u_t\}$. Replacing the unknown quantities in (20) by the regularized estimators developed in the previous sections leads to the estimator

$$\hat{w}_{i,j}^{h,(re)} = \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} (\hat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(re)})^2 / \left(\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} e_i^\top \hat{\Psi}_k^{(re)} \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon (\hat{\Psi}_k^{(re)})^\top e_i \right),$$

of $w_{i,j}^h$, where $\hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon$ is the sample covariance of $\{\hat{\varepsilon}_t\}$. Notice that the above estimator is consistent under Assumption 1 and no sparsity assumption on B or Σ_ε , respectively, are required. Furthermore, the de-sparsified estimator $\hat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(de)}$ can be used to construct a valid test of hypotheses about the w_{ij}^h 's under Assumptions 1 and 2. In particular, the following testing problem can be considered:

$$H_0 : w_{i,j}^h \leq \delta \text{ versus } H_1 : w_{i,j}^h > \delta, \quad (21)$$

where we distinguish the cases $\delta = 0$ and $\delta > 0$ in the following.

If $\delta = 0$, a test can be easily constructed by using Theorem 5. With the covariance expression given in Theorem 3, the asymptotic normality of Theorem 5 can be extended to establish asymptotic normality of the vector $(\widehat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(de)})_{k=0,\dots,h-1}$. An asymptotically valid test at level α for the hypotheses given in (21) with $\delta = 0$ is then obtained by rejecting the null hypothesis if

$$\begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Theta}_{0;ij}^{(de)} & \dots & \widehat{\Theta}_{h-1;ij}^{(de)} \end{pmatrix} \widehat{\Sigma}_T^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Theta}_{0;ij}^{(de)} & \dots & \widehat{\Theta}_{h-1;ij}^{(de)} \end{pmatrix}^\top > q_{\chi_h^2}(1-\alpha)/n.$$

Here $q_{\chi_h^2}(1-\alpha)$ is the upper α quantile of the χ^2 -distribution with h degrees of freedom and the covariance matrix $\widehat{\Sigma}_T$ is obtained from Theorem 3 and Theorem 5 as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_T = \left(\widehat{\text{Cov}}_\Psi(j, r, h_1, h_2) + \widehat{s.e.}_B(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} e_j, r)^2 \right)_{h_1, h_2=0, \dots, h-1},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\text{Cov}}_\Psi(j, r, h_1, h_2) &= \sum_{t_1=0}^{h_1-1} \sum_{t_2=0}^{h_2-1} e_j^\top \widehat{\Psi}_{t_1}^{(re)} \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon (\widehat{\Psi}_{t_2}^{(re)})^\top e_j (\widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r)^\top \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{L}^\top (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(h_2 - h_1 + t_2 - t_1) (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \mathbb{L} \widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r. \end{aligned}$$

The case $\delta > 0$ is more involved. To construct an asymptotically α level test in this case, the randomness of the denominator in (20) should also be taken into account. This can be done as follows. Observe first that $\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} e_i^\top \Psi_k \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_k^\top e_i = \text{Var}(U_{t+h;j})$, where $U_{t+h} = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1} \Psi_j \varepsilon_{t+h-j}$; see the errors in expression (9). Hence, the denominator of $w_{i,j}^h$ can be estimated by the sample variance of $\widehat{U}_{t+h;i} = e_i^\top (X_{t+h} - \widehat{\Xi}_h^{(re)} W_t)$. This estimator is asymptotically normal by the same arguments as those used in Lemma 12 of the Appendix. We can then write $w_{i,j}^h = f_w(\Theta_{0;ij}, \dots, \Theta_{h-1;ij}, \text{Var}(U_{t+h;i}))$, where the function f_w is defined by $f_w(x_1, \dots, x_h, y) = \sum_{k=1}^h x_k^2/y$. Let ∇f_w be the vector of partial derivatives of f_w , that is, $\nabla f_w = (2x_1, \dots, 2x_h, -\sum_{k=1}^h x_k^2/y^2)$. We define

$$\widehat{w}_{i,j}^{h,(de)} = \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} (\widehat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(de)})^2 / \widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i})$$

and obtain, by using the delta-method, that $\sqrt{n}(\widehat{w}_{i,j}^{h,(de)} - w_{i,j}^h) / \widehat{\sigma}_{T,\delta} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where straightforward calculations show that⁸

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{T,\delta}^2 = \nabla \widehat{f}_w^\top \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\Sigma}_T & \widehat{\kappa} \\ \widehat{\kappa}^\top & \widehat{f}_{U^2}(0) \end{pmatrix} \nabla \widehat{f}_w.$$

Here, $\widehat{f}_{U^2}(0) = \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} \widehat{\Gamma}_{U^2}(k)(1 + \mathbf{1}(k > 0))$, where $\widehat{\Gamma}_{U^2}(k) = \widehat{\text{Cov}}(\widehat{U}_{t;i}^2, \widehat{U}_{t+k;i}^2)$ is the sample covariance of $\widehat{U}_{t;i}^2$ and $\widehat{U}_{t+k;i}^2$, and

$$\nabla \widehat{f}_w = \left(2\widehat{\Theta}_{0;ij}^{(de)}, \dots, 2\widehat{\Theta}_{h-1;ij}^{(de)}, -\sum_{k=1}^h (\widehat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(de)})^2 / (\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i}))^2 \right)^\top.$$

⁸Note that $\widehat{\kappa}$ is the asymptotic covariance of $n\text{Cov}(\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i}), \widehat{\Theta}_{h_1;ij}^{(de)})_{h_1=0, \dots, h}$ and we have $n\text{Cov}(\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i}), \widehat{\Theta}_{h_1;ij}^{(de)}) = n\text{Cov}(\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i}), e_i^\top \widehat{\Psi}_{h_1}^{(de)} B e_j) + n\text{Cov}(\widehat{\text{Var}}(\widehat{U}_{t+h;i}), e_i^\top \Psi_{h_1} (\widehat{B} \widehat{R} e_j + B \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon - \Sigma_\varepsilon) I_{I;\mathcal{I}}))) + o_P(1)$. With similar arguments as in the proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 the used expression for $\widehat{\kappa}$ follows.

The estimator $\hat{\kappa}$ appearing in the expression for $\hat{\sigma}_{T,\delta}^2$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\kappa} = & \left(\sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3=0}^{h-1} e_i^\top \hat{\Psi}_{k_1}^{(re)} \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon \mathbb{L}^\top (\hat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^{k_2} \times (\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \mathbb{L} \hat{B}^{(re)} e_i \right. \\ & \times e_j^\top \hat{\Psi}_{h_1}^{(re)} \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon (\hat{\Psi}_{k_3}^{(re)})^\top e_i \mathbb{1}(k_1 - h + k_3 - k_2 \geq 0) \\ & + \sum_{k=0}^{h-1} \widehat{\text{Cov}} \left((e_j^\top \hat{\Psi}_k^{(re)} \hat{\varepsilon}_t)^2, (e_i^\top \hat{\Psi}_{h_1}^{(re)} \hat{\varepsilon}_t)(\hat{u}_{t;j} \right. \\ & \left. \left. + e_i^\top \hat{\Psi}_{h_1}^{(re)} \tilde{B} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}) \text{vec}(\hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{R}} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})) \right) \right)_{h_1=0,\dots,h}.\end{aligned}$$

An asymptotically valid test at level α is then given by rejecting the null hypothesis $w_{i,j}^h \leq \delta$ if

$$\sum_{k=0}^{h-1} (\hat{\Theta}_{k;ij}^{(de)})^2 / \widehat{\text{Var}}(\hat{U}_{t+h;i}) > \delta + q(1 - \alpha) \hat{\sigma}_{T,\delta} / \sqrt{n}.$$

Here $q(1 - \alpha)$ denotes the upper α -quantile of the standard normal distribution.

Diebold and Yilmaz (2014) popularized the method of using forecast error variance decompositions to construct networks and for computing connectedness measures. They analyzed the connectedness of fifteen major US financial institutions. That is, they considered a low-dimensional framework and estimated the forecast error variance decompositions using (standard) vector autoregressive models. In a high-dimensional framework and based on sparse SVAR models, Demirer et al. (2018) and Barigozzi and Hallin (2017) analyzed the connectedness of many firms. Barigozzi and Hallin (2017) estimated $w_{i,j}^h$ by using a similar regularized estimator as $\hat{w}_{i,j}^{h,(re)}$ and obtained a network by defining an edge from component i to j if $\hat{w}_{i,j}^{h,(re)}$ exceeds some threshold. This means that a network of relevant connections between actors can be constructed by setting an edge from i to j , if $w_{i,j}^h > \tau$, where τ is a threshold of relevance. The test proposed above can be used to test, at some predefined level of statistical uncertainty, whether an edge is present or not. Controlling the false discovery rate as in Benjamini and Yekutieli (2001) and Fan and Han (2017), this testing approach can also be suitable to test multiple edges or even the entire network.

6 Numerical Results

In this section we investigate by means of simulations the finite sample performance of the procedures proposed to construct confidence intervals. The intervals are produced following the steps of the algorithm described at the end of Section 5.1, where the lag length is treated as known. All results presented in this section are based on implementations in *R* (R Core Team, 2021). To implement the adaptive lasso with BIC tuning parameter selection, we have modified an estimator of the *HDeconometrics* package (Garcia et al., 2017) that itself relies on the *glmnet* package (Simon et al., 2011). For $\hat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)}$ we used the packages *PDCSE* (Rothman, 2013) and for $\hat{B}^{(re)}$ we modified an estimator of *FinCovRegularization* (Yan and Lin, 2016).

For our numerical examples we consider two classes of structural VAR processes the specifications of which are defined below. The parameters of the VARs are generated at random for the 1,000 Monte

Carlo replications that we run for each specification. If not denoted otherwise, sparsity of a matrix is obtained by setting entries – beginning with the absolute smallest values – to zero such that the specified amount of sparsity is obtained. This results in exact sparsity.

Class 1: VAR(2), $p = 100, n = 100$, the slope matrix is sparse with $k_A = 5$ and the maximum eigenvalue of the slope (stacked) matrix is 0.9 but otherwise unstructured. $(u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian and $k_u = 4, \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, k_u\}$, sparsity parameters $k_B = 5, k_D = 5$, and the eigenvalues of Σ are in a range of 0.5 to 5 but otherwise unstructured. The shock of interest is $r = 4$. For this class, we consider the following modifications:

- A) $k_u = 8, k_B = 10, k_D = 10, r = 6$,
- B) $n = 200$,
- C) $k_A = 10$,
- D) t -distributed innovations with 10 degrees of freedom.

Class 2: VAR(3), $p = 100, n = 100$, the slope matrix is sparse with $k_A = 5$ and the maximum eigenvalue of the slope (stacked) matrix is 0.95 but otherwise unstructured. $(u_t^\top, w_t^\top)^\top$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian and $k_u = 4, \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, k_u\}$, sparsity parameters $k_B = 5, k_D = 5$, and the eigenvalues of Σ are in the range of 0.5 to 5 but otherwise unstructured. The shock of interest is $r = 4$. For this class, we consider the following modifications:

- A) $p = 200$,
- B) $n = 200$.

For instance, *Class 1 A+B* refers to DGPs generated with specification $d = 2, p = 100, n = 200, k_2(p) = 5, \rho = 0.9, k_u = 8, \mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, 8\}, r = 6, k_B = 10, k_D = 10$. In all cases considered, the Cholesky decomposition is used for identification with ordering $\{1, \dots, k_u\}$. As outlined in Section 5.1, the Gaussian approximation as well as the bootstrap distribution is used to construct confidence intervals at the level $1 - \alpha = 0.95$. The Gaussian approximation is denoted by *Gaussian* and the bootstrap approximation by *Boot*. The quantiles of the bootstrap distribution are based on 1,000 replicates. As mentioned in Section 5.1, the confidence intervals can be centered around the de-sparsified estimator as well as around the regularized estimator. We present results using both centering methods. Centering with the regularized estimator is indicated by *Re* while centering with the de-sparsified estimator is indicated by *De*.

Figure 1 provides a comparison of the different approaches used to construct confidence intervals for the DGPs of *Class 1*. As it can be seen, both approaches, *Gaussian* and *Boot*, give overall very similar results regarding the interval lengths and the coverage ratios (CR) of the confidence intervals. Variance estimation, i.e., the effect at impact, seems to be a difficult task as severe undercoverage ($\text{CR} \approx 0.75\%$) can occur for all methods considered. At impact *Boot* is wider which leads to slightly less undercoverage. Apart from $h = 0$, however, both approaches are close to or overshoot the nominal level. If the confidence




Figure 1: Average coverage ratios (dashed lines and left vertical axis) and lengths (solid lines and right vertical axis) of the confidence intervals for variable $j = r$, horizon $h = 0, 1, \dots, 20$ and SVARs of *Class 1* ($p = 100, n = 100, d = 2, \rho = 0.9, k_A = 5, k_u = 4, k_B = k_D = 5, r = 4$). The confidence intervals are constructed at the nominal level level 0.95 which indicated by the horizontal dashed line in black. *Boot De* and *Boot Re* as well as *Gaussian De* and *Gaussian Re* have the same length by construction, respectively.

intervals are centered around the de-sparsified estimator (*De*), then they are close to the nominal level (CR: 0.9 – 0.94). Thus, they are slightly too liberal. This is different for the confidence intervals centered around the regularized estimator (*Re*). Mostly, the *Re*-intervals have coverage ratios of 1 or close to 1 which is partly due to the construction used; see also the discussion in Section 5.1. However, the overcoverage is not associated with a loss in power since *De* and *Re* have the same interval lengths.

In the following, the presentation focuses on confidence intervals for variable $j = r$ constructed by *Boot Re* and *Boot De* only, that is, the bootstrap intervals centered around the regularized and de-sparsified estimators. Figure 2 shows a comparison of the different modifications of *Class 1*. Modifications on the innovations, a doubled dimension of the shocks and sparsity parameter of B and Σ_w (*Class 1 A*), or a different distribution (*Class 1 D*) do not affect considerably coverage ratios or interval lengths. However, a doubled sparsity parameter in the slope matrix (*Class 1 C*) decreases dramatically the coverage ratio at impact. Furthermore, the confidence intervals are on average 17% wider than in the previous cases. This effect shrinks if the sample size is also doubled. A doubled sample size and sparsity parameter of the slope matrix (*Class 1 B+C*) results in less undercoverage at impact and the confidence intervals are only 2% wider than the ones of *Class 1 B*. Compared to the base case, a doubled sample size (*Class 1 B*) improves coverage ratios at impact and decreases the length by the expected factor $1/\sqrt{2}$.

Figure 3 shows results for different modifications of *Class 2*. It seems that doubling the dimension of the system does not affect the coverage ratios. However, the lengths of the confidence intervals increase by an average of 12% in case of a sample size of $n = 100$ (*Class 2* vs. *Class 2 A*) and in case of $n = 200$




Figure 2: Average coverage ratios (dashed lines: *Boot Re*, dotted lines: *Boot De*, and left vertical axis) and lengths (solid lines and right vertical axis) of the confidence intervals for variable $j = r$ and horizon $h = 0, 1, \dots, 20$ constructed by *Boot Re* and *Boot De* for SVARs of *Class 1* ($p = 100, n = 100, d = 2, \rho = 0.9, k_A = 5, k_u = 4, k_B = k_D = 5, r = 4$) with modifications: *Case A*: $k_u = 8, k_B = 10, k_D = 10, r = 6$; *Case B*: $n = 200$; *Case C*: $k_A = 10$; *Case D*: t -distributed innovations with 10 degrees of freedom. The confidence intervals are constructed at level 0.95 as indicated by the horizontal dashed line in black. *Boot De* and *Boot Re* have the same length by construction.

(*Class 2 A+B* vs. *Class 2 B*) by 9%. Finally, let us compare the results for *Class 1* and *Class 2* shown in Figures 2 and 3, respectively. We see that a higher persistence and a larger lag length (*Class 2*) leads to confidence intervals which are wider on average by 22%. On the contrary, the coverage ratios are not much affected.

To sum up, the simulation results have shown that our approaches for obtaining confidence intervals for structural impulse responses performs well in finite sample situations. The intervals centered around the regularized estimator of the impulse response of interest have higher coverage without losing power in relation to the intervals centered around the de-sparsified estimator. This finding motivates our recommendation to use the regularized estimator for centering the intervals. The differences between the asymptotic Gaussian and the bootstrap approximations seem to be less relevant for the DGPs considered.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we have investigated how sparse SVAR models can be used to implement impulse response analysis and to obtain forecast error variance decompositions for large time series systems. We presented a consistent estimator for impulse responses and additionally showed how valid inference can be obtained using a de-sparsified approach. This approach can be used to construct confidence intervals for impulse responses or tests for forecast error variance decompositions. In some applications sparsity can




Figure 3: Average coverage ratios (dashed lines: *Boot Re*, dotted lines: *Boot De*, and left vertical axis) and lengths (solid lines and right vertical axis) of the confidence intervals for variable $j = r$ and horizon $h = 0, 1, \dots, 20$ constructed by *Boot Re* and *Boot De* for SVARs of *Class 2* ($p = 100, n = 100, d = 3, \rho = 0.95, k_A = 5, k_u = 4, k_B = k_D = 5, r = 4$) with modifications: *Case A*: $p = 200$ and *Case B*: $n = 200$. The confidence intervals are constructed at level 0.95 as indicated by the horizontal dashed line in black. *Boot De* and *Boot Re* have the same length by construction.

be a reasonable assumption. In this case, one can directly apply the inference procedures developed in this paper to analyse the time series at hand. In other applications, sparsity may only be a reasonable assumption after controlling for common factors. Therefore, studying inference in a combined factor plus sparse VAR approach as suggested by Barigozzi and Hallin (2017) or to include factors as a low-rank matrix within the estimation of the SVAR system are very interesting venues for future research. Further promising future work comprises extensions to time varying coefficients and VAR models with cointegrated time series.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to the editor, the associate editor, and three referees for their valuable and insightful comments that led to an improved manuscript. We also thank the participants of the 31th (EC)² Conference, the seminar of University of Tilburg, and the seminar of Maastricht University for very helpful comments. The research of the first and last authors was supported by the Research Center (SFB) 884 “Political Economy of Reforms” (Project B6), funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG). Furthermore, the first author acknowledges support by the state of Baden-Württemberg through bwHPC.

Appendix

Auxiliary results and proofs

Lemma 7. Let $\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} = \mathbb{L}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} \mathbb{L}$ be the estimator of $\Psi_h, h = 1, \dots, H$, where $\widehat{A}_1^{(re)}, \dots, \widehat{A}_d^{(re)}$ are regularized estimators of the VAR slope parameters with stacked form $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)}$. Furthermore, let $\widehat{\Xi}_h^{(re)} = \mathbb{L}^\top \widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)}$ be the estimator of $\Xi_h = (\Psi_h, -\sum_{j=0}^{l+1} \Psi_{h+1+l-j} A_j, l = 0, \dots, d-2) = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}, h = 1, \dots, H$. Let Assumption 2 (i), (ii), (iii) a), and (vi) hold true. Then,

$$\|\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h\|_\infty = O_P\left(k_A^3 \left(\frac{g_n}{n}\right)^{(1-\zeta)/2}\right) = \|\widehat{\Xi}_h^{(re)} - \Xi_h\|_\infty.$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Using the stacked form representation of the SVAR(d) system, $W_t = \mathbb{A}W_{t-1} + \mathbb{U}_t$ and because the process $\{W_t\}$ is stable due to Assumption 1(ii), we have the representation $W_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{A}^j \mathbb{U}_{t-j}$. Note further that, $X_t = \mathbb{L}^\top W_t$ and $\mathbb{U}_t = \mathbb{L} B u_t$. Since $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_j B u_{t-j} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^j \mathbb{L} B u_t$, we have $\Psi_k = \mathbb{L}^\top \mathbb{A}^k \mathbb{L}$. Note that for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ we have $(\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^j - \mathbb{A}^j = (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A} + \mathbb{A})(\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^{j-1} - \mathbb{A}^{j-1} + (\mathbb{A} - \widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})\mathbb{A}^{j-1}$. Using this recursive formula, we obtain $(\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^j - \mathbb{A}^j = \sum_{s=0}^{j-1} [(\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A}) + \mathbb{A}]^s (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A}) \mathbb{A}^{j-1-s}$. Note further that Assumption 1(ii) implies $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \|\mathbb{A}^s\|_\infty = O(k_A/(1-\varphi)) = O(k_A)$ and we have $\|((\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A}) - \mathbb{A})^s\|_\infty \leq \sum_{l=0}^s \|\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)} - \mathbb{A}\|_\infty^l \|\mathbb{A}^{s-l}\|_\infty$. Since $\|\mathbb{A} - \widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)}\|_\infty = O_P(k_A(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$, we have $\|\Psi_h - \widehat{\Psi}_h\| = \|\mathbb{L}^\top (\mathbb{A}^h - \widehat{\mathbb{A}}^h) \mathbb{L}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbb{A}^h - (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^h\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^3(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$ and similarly $\|\widehat{\Xi}_h^{(re)} - \Xi_h\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbb{A}^h - (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^{(re)})^h\|_\infty$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We have $\Theta_h R^{-1} = \Psi_h B H^{-1} = \Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})$. By Lemma 7 we have $\|\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^3(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$. For BH^{-1} consider the following. The residuals $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ can be estimated by $\widehat{\varepsilon}_t = X_t - \sum_{j=1}^d \widehat{A}_j^{(re)} X_{t-j} = \varepsilon_t + \sum_{j=1}^d (A_j - \widehat{A}_j^{(re)}) X_{t-j}$. Furthermore, note that under Assumption 1 (iii) the estimation error is of order $\|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_t^\top - 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top\|_{\max} = O_P(k_A^2((g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \sqrt{g_n/n}))$, see for instance equation (32) in Krampe and Paparoditis (2021). Consequently, we obtain $\|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_t^\top - \Sigma_\varepsilon\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{g_n/n} + k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)})$. With the estimated residuals, we can obtain the raw shocks, i.e., those shocks which are identified up to a rotation matrix $R \in \mathbb{R}^{k_u \times k_u}$, and the raw impulse response. Since $e_j^\top (\Theta_h R^{-1} - \widetilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)}) e_r = \|\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h\|_\infty \|BH^{-1}\|_{\max} + \|\Psi_h\|_\infty \|\widetilde{B} - BH^{-1}\|_{\max} + \|\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h\|_\infty \|\widetilde{B} - BH^{-1}\|_{\max}$, the assertion follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. First note that we have $e_j^\top (\widehat{\Theta}_h^{(re)} - \Theta_h) e_r = e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h) B e_r + e_j^\top \Psi_h (\widehat{B}^\dagger - B) e_r + e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h) (\widehat{B}^\dagger - B) e_r + e_j^\top \Psi_h \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}) (\widehat{R} - R) e_r + e_j^\top (\widetilde{\Theta}_h^{(re)} - \Theta_h R^{-1}) (\widehat{R} - R) e_r$, where $\widehat{B}^\dagger = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} R$. Then, since $1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} R e_s)^2 \xrightarrow{P} \text{Var}(u_{t,s}) = 1, s = 1, \dots, k_u$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and Assumption 1 (iii), we have $\|\widehat{B}^\dagger - B\|_{\max} = O_P(k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{g_n/n})$.

Let $\widetilde{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}} = \begin{pmatrix} e_{i_1}^\top \widetilde{\Theta}_{h_1}^{(Re)} \\ \vdots \\ e_{i_{k_u}}^\top \widetilde{\Theta}_{h_{k_u}}^{(Re)} \end{pmatrix}$ and let $H_{\mathcal{R}}$ denote the maximal horizon present in \mathcal{R} . We have $\|\widetilde{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}} - \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{k_u} \max_{0 \leq h \leq H_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\widetilde{\Theta}_h^{(Re)} - \Theta_h\|_{\max}$ and the same for the vectors of restrictions. Since $\rho(\Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1}) < \infty$, the same rate holds for $\|\widetilde{\Theta}_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1} - \Theta_{\mathcal{R}}^{-1}\|_2$. If $H_{\mathcal{R}} \geq 1$, i.e., in the case of (7), we have $\max_{0 \leq h \leq H_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\widetilde{\Theta}_h^{(Re)} - \Theta_h\|_{\max}$

is order of $O_P(\sqrt{k_u}(k_A^3(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + k_A\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}))$ whereas if $H_{\mathcal{R}} = 0$, i.e., in the case of (8), we have $\max_{0 \leq h \leq H_{\mathcal{R}}} \|\tilde{\Theta}_h^{(Re)} - \Theta_h\|_{\max} = \|\tilde{B} - \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{k_u}(k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}))$ and the assertion follows. \square

Remark 2. To quantify the dependence structure of the stochastic processes, we use the concept of functional/physical dependence, see Wu (2005, 2011). To elaborate, we write for a random variable X , we write $\|X\|_{E,q}$ for $(E|X|^q)^{1/q}$, where $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $Y_{t,i} = G_i(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t_1}, \dots)$, $i = 1, \dots, p, t \in \mathbb{Z}$, be a stochastic process generated causally by the i.i.d. processes $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ for some function $G = (G_1, \dots, G_p)$. We denote by $Y_{t,i}^{(k)} = G_i(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t-1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{t-k+1}, \varepsilon'_{t-k}, \varepsilon_{t-k-1}, \varepsilon_{t-k-2}, \dots)$ the process where ε_{t-k} is replaced by an i.i.d. copy of it. Furthermore, define the functional dependence coefficients in the following way. Let $\delta_{k,q,i} = \|Y_{0,i} - Y_{0,i}^{(k)}\|_{E,q}$, $k \geq 0$, $\Delta_{m,q,i} = \sum_{k=m}^{\infty} \delta_{k,q,i}$, $\|Y_i\|_{q,\alpha} = \sup_{m \geq 0} (m+1)^\alpha \Delta_{m,q,i}$, and $\nu_{q,i} = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (j^{q/2-1} \delta_{k,q,i})^{1/(q+1)}$. For one-dimensional processes, e.g. $\{Z_t\}$, we drop the index i in the subscript, i.e., we write $\delta_{k,q}, \Delta_{m,q}, \|Z\|_{q,\alpha}$ and ν_q .

The processes $\{X_t\}$ possesses under Assumption 2 the following causal representation $X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Psi_k \varepsilon_{t-j}$. Hence, for some vector v with $\|v\|_2 = 1$ and if $\|v^\top \Psi_k\|_2 > 0$, we have $\|v^\top (X_k - X_k')\|_{E,q} = \|v^\top \Psi_k (\varepsilon_k - \varepsilon'_k)\|_{E,q} \leq \|v^\top \Psi_k\|_2 \|v^\top \Psi_k / (\|v^\top \Psi_k\|_2) \varepsilon_1\|_{E,q} = O(\lambda^k)$, $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. Such a geometrical decay implies $\nu_q = O(1)$ for $\{v^\top X_t\}$ and some transformations of it, see also Lemma 11 in Krampe et al. (2021).

Lemma 8. Let $\{\Phi_j^{(k)}, j = 0, 1, \dots\}, k = 1, 2$ be linear filters with $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \|\Phi_j^{(k)}\|_2 = O(1), k = 1, 2$. Then under Assumption 1(iv)

$$\|1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \Phi_j^{(1)}(\varepsilon_{t-j} \varepsilon_{t-k}^\top - \mathbb{1}(j=k) \Sigma_\varepsilon) (\Phi_k^{(2)})^\top\|_{\max} = O(\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}).$$

Proof of Lemma 8. Since $\|1/n \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \Phi_j^{(1)} \varepsilon_{t-j} \varepsilon_{t-k}^\top (\Phi_k^{(2)})^\top\|_{\max} \leq \sum_{j,k=0}^{\infty} \|\Phi_j^{(1)}\|_2 \|\Phi_k^{(2)}\|_2 \times \|1/n \sum_{t=1}^n \Phi_j^{(1)} / \|\Phi_j^{(1)}\|_2 (\varepsilon_{t-j} \varepsilon_{t-k}^\top - \mathbb{1}(j=k) \Sigma_\varepsilon) (\Phi_k^{(2)})^\top / \|\Phi_k^{(2)}\|_2\|_{\max}$ and $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is i.i.d., the assertion follows by Assumption 1(iv), see also Section 2.2. in Wu et al. (2016). \square

Lemma 9. Let THR_λ be a threshold function with threshold value λ fulfilling the conditions (i) to (iii) in Section 2 in Cai and Liu (2011), see also Rothman et al. (2009). Then, let

$$\widehat{B}^{(re)} = \text{THR}_\lambda(\widehat{B}) \quad \text{and} \quad \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} = \widehat{B}^{(re)} (\widehat{B}^{(re)})^\top + \widehat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)},$$

where $\widehat{B} = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top \widehat{R}$ and $\widehat{\Sigma}_w^{(re)} = \text{THR}_\lambda(\widehat{\Sigma}_w)$, where $\widehat{\Sigma}_w = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \widetilde{B} \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}) (\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \widetilde{B} \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}})^\top$ and $\widetilde{B} = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top$ with $\widehat{\varepsilon}_t = X_t - \sum_{s=1}^d \widehat{A}_s^{(re)} X_{t-j}$ the estimated residuals.

Then, under Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 (iv), (v), the following assertions are true:

$$\|\widehat{B} - B\|_{\max} = O_P\left(\sqrt{k_u}[k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}]\right)$$

$$\|(\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)\|_\infty = O_P(k_u^{3/2}[k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}]),$$

$$\|(\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)\|_1 = O_P(k_B k_u^{(1-\beta)/2}[k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta}),$$

$$\|(\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)\|_2 = O_P(k_u^{(5-\beta)/4} \sqrt{k_B} [k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \widetilde{g}_n/n]^{1-\beta/2}),$$

$$\|\Sigma\|_\infty = O(k_u k_B + k_D), \|\Sigma\|_2 = O(1), \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} - \Sigma_\varepsilon\|_l &= O_P\left([k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \left[k_A^2(g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}\right]^{1-\beta}\right) \\ &=: O_P(k_2(p)(\widetilde{g}_n/n)^{(1-\beta)/2}), \quad l \in [1, \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 9. First note that $\|\widehat{B} - B\|_{\max} \leq \|\widehat{B} - \widehat{B}^\dagger\|_{\max} + \|\widehat{B}^\dagger - B\|_{\max}$, where $\widehat{B}^\dagger = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top R$ as in the proof of Theorem 2 and we have $\|\widehat{B}^\dagger - B\|_{\max} = O_P(k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n})$. Furthermore, $\|\widehat{B} - \widehat{B}^\dagger\|_{\max} \leq \|\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_2 \|\widehat{R} - R\|_2 + \|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_{\max} \|R - \widehat{R}\|_1$. Hence, since $\|\text{Cov}(\varepsilon_t, \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})\|_2 < M$ due to Assumption 2(iv) and by the arguments of the proof of Theorem 2, we have $\|\widehat{B} - B\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{k_u} (k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}))$. Since $B \in \mathbb{R}^{k_B \times k_u}$, the rates $\|\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B\|_l, l \in \{1, 2, \infty\}$ follows by the same arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1 in Cai and Liu (2011).

Furthermore, we have $\Sigma_\varepsilon = BB^\top + DD^\top$ and $B^\top \in \mathcal{U}(k_B, \beta)$, $DD^\top \in \mathcal{U}(k_D, \beta)$. That implies $\|BB^\top\|_\infty \leq \|B\|_\infty \|B^\top\|_\infty \leq k_u M \|B^\top\|_\infty = O(k_u k_B)$. Note that for some vector p -dimensional $v \in \mathcal{U}(k, q)$, we have $\|v\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^p |v_i| \mathbb{1}(|v_i| > \nu_q) + \sum_{i=1}^p |v_i| \mathbb{1}(|v_i| \leq \nu_q) \leq M |S_{\nu_q}| + \nu_q k = O(k)$, where $S_{\nu_q} = \{i = 1, \dots, p : |v_i| > \nu_q\}$ and $|S_{\nu_q}| \leq k/(\nu_q)^q$ and $\nu_q = qM/(1-q)$.

For DD^\top , let $V = I_p - BH^{-1}I_{p;\mathcal{I}}$ and $\widehat{V} = I_p - \widetilde{B}I_{p;\mathcal{I}}$ such that $V\varepsilon_t = w_t$ and $(\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \widetilde{B}\widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}) = \widehat{V}\widehat{\varepsilon}_t$. Furthermore, we have $\|V - \widehat{V}\|_\infty \leq \|BH^{-1} - \widetilde{B}\|_\infty \leq k_u \|BH^{-1} - \widetilde{B}\|_{\max} = O_P(k_u [\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n} + k_A^2(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)}])$, $\|V\|_2 = O(1)$, and $\|V\|_\infty = O(k_u)$. Then, since $\|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n V(\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \varepsilon_t)(\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \varepsilon_t)^\top V^\top\|_{\max} \leq \|V\|_\infty^2 \|\widehat{\mathbb{A}} - \mathbb{A}\|_\infty^2 \|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n W_t W_t^\top\|_{\max} = O_P(k_u^2 k_A^2(g_n/n)^{1-\zeta})$, where $W_t = (X_t^\top, X_{t-1}^\top, \dots, X_{t-d+1}^\top)^\top$, we have $\|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \widetilde{B}\widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}})(\widehat{\varepsilon}_t - \widetilde{B}\widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}})^\top - DD^\top\|_{\max} = \|1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{V}(\widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_t^\top - \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top) \widehat{V}^\top + \widehat{V} \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top \widehat{V}^\top - V \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top V^\top + D(w_t w_t^\top - I_p) D^\top\|_{\max} = O_P(k_u \times (k_A^2(g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}))$. Since $DD^\top \in \mathcal{U}(k_D, \beta)$, the assertion follows with the results above and again by the arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1 in Cai and Liu (2011). \square

Lemma 10. Let $\mathbb{L} = (e_1 \otimes I_p) \in \mathbb{R}^{dp \times p}$ as in Lemma 7. If Assumption 1 and Assumption 2 hold true, then the estimator of $\Gamma^{(st)}(h)$, given for $h \geq 0$ by

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(h) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (\widehat{\mathbb{A}})^{j+h} \mathbb{L} \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon^{(re)} \mathbb{L}^\top (\widehat{\mathbb{A}}^\top)^j = (\widehat{\mathbb{A}})^h \text{vec}_{dp}^{-1} \left((I_{(dp)^2} - \widehat{\mathbb{A}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbb{A}})^{-1} \text{vec}(\mathbb{L} \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon) \right), \quad (22)$$

and for $h < 0$ by $\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(h) = \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(-h)^\top$, satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(h) - \Gamma^{(st)}(h)\|_\infty &= O_P \left(k_A^2 \left(k_A^{2.5} (k_u k_B + k_D) (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \left[k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n} \right]^{1-\beta} \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(h) - \Gamma^{(st)}(h)\|_2 = O_P(k_A^{1.5} (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \left[k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n} \right]^{1-\beta}).$$

Furthermore, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1}\|_\infty = & O_P\left(k_\Gamma^2 k_A^2 \left(k_A^{2.5}(k_u k_B + k_D)(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \left[k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}\right]^{1-\beta}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)^{-1} - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1}\|_2 = O_P(k_A^{1.5}(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \left[k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}\right]^{1-\beta}).$$

Proof of Lemma 10. Note that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_I = O_P(k_A^{1.5}(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$. Then, we have by the arguments of Lemma 7, that $\sum_{j=0}^\infty \|(\widehat{\mathbf{A}})^j - \mathbf{A}^j\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^{3.5}(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$. Furthermore, we have $\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty \leq \|\sum_{j=0}^\infty (\mathbf{A}^j - (\widehat{\mathbf{A}})^j) \mathbb{L} \Sigma_\varepsilon (\mathbb{L}^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top)^j)\|_\infty + \|\sum_{j=0}^\infty (\widehat{\mathbf{A}})^j \mathbb{L} (\Sigma_\varepsilon - \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon) \mathbb{L}^\top (\mathbf{A}^\top)^j\|_\infty + \|\sum_{j=0}^\infty (\widehat{\mathbf{A}})^j \mathbb{L} \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon \mathbb{L}^\top ((\mathbf{A}^\top)^j - (\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^\top)^j)\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^{4.5}(k_u k_B + k_D)(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} + k_A^2 [k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}] \times [k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta})$, where the last equality follows by Assumption 2 and Lemma 9. The third assertion follows then due to $A^{-1} - B^{-1} = A^{-1}(B - A)B^{-1}$. Note that $\|\mathbf{A}^j\|_2 = O(\lambda^j)$ implies $\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_2 = O(1/(1 - \lambda)^2 \|\Sigma_\varepsilon\|_2)$. Furthermore, we have $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_2 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^\top - \mathbf{A}^\top\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_1 \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_\infty} = O_P(k_A^{1.5}(g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$. Following the same arguments above with the norm $\|\cdot\|_2$ leads to the second and fourth assertion. \square

Lemma 11. *If Assumption 1 and 2 hold true, we have for $h \in \{0, \dots, H\}, j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) \neq 0$ and $\|v\|_1 = O(k_B)$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v / s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} v^\top (I_p \otimes e_1)^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) \\ & + O_P\left(k_B(\widetilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_1 k_\Gamma \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n} \right. \\ & \left. + \|\Xi_h - \widehat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}\|_\infty (\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n})\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $s.e.\Psi(j, k, v)^2 = \sum_{t_1, t_2=0}^{k-1} e_j^\top \Psi_{t_1} \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_{t_2}^\top e_j v^\top \mathbb{L}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} (\Gamma^{(st)}(t_2 - t_1)) (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \mathbb{L} v$.

Proof of Lemma 11. Since $\sqrt{n}(e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v) / s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) = \sqrt{n}(e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v) / \|v\|_1 / s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) / \|v\|_1$ and $1/s.e.\Psi(j, h, v) / \|v\|_1 = O(\|(\Gamma^{(st)}(0))\|_2 \|(\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_2 \|v\|_1 / \|v\|_2) = O(k_2(p))$, we assume in the following that the vector is normalized, that is, $\|v\|_1 = 1$. Let $DN_{h,r,j} = \left(1/n \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_r^\top (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t W_t^\top e_j\right)$ and note that $\widehat{Z}_{t;r} = e_r (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t (e_r (\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} e_r)^{-1}$. $DN_{h,r,j}$ is the denominator and we show that it converges to one. By Lemma 8, we have $\max_r |DN_{h,r,r} - 1| = \max_r |1/n \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_r^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t W_t^\top e_r - 1| + \max_r |1/n \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_r^\top [(\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \Gamma^{(st)}(0) - I_{dp}] (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t W_t^\top e_r| = O_P(\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty \|(\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_\infty)$. Since $\Gamma > 0$, $(\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} > 0$, we have $\max_r |DN_{h,r,r}^{-1} - 1| = O_P(\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_k^{(de)} - \Psi_k) v = & \sqrt{n} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r \left(\sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \widehat{Z}_{t;r} W_{t;r} \right)^{-1} \left[\sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \widehat{Z}_{t;r} (U_{t+k;j} + (\Xi_{k;j,-r} - \widehat{\Xi}_{k;j,-r}^{(re)}) W_{t;-r}) \right] \\ = & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r e_r^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+k;j} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r (DN_{k,r,r}^{-1} - 1) e_r^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+k;j} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r e_r^\top ((\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}) W_t U_{t+k;j} \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r (DN_{k,r,r}^{-1} - 1) e_r^\top ((\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}) W_t U_{t+k;j} \\
& + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-k} \sum_{r=1}^p v_r DN_{k,r,r}^{-1} e_j^\top (\Xi_k - \hat{\Xi}_k^{(re)}) I_{dp;-r} I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t W_t^\top (\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} e_r = I + II + III + IV + V
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we show that II to V are of the specified order such that the assertion follows. By the results above and Lemma 8, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|II| & \leq \|v\|_1 \max_r |DN_{h,r,r}^{-1} - 1| \max_r |1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_r^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j}| = O_P(\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}), \\
|III| & \leq \|v\|_1 \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty \|(\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_\infty \max_r |1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_r^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j}| = \\
& O_P(\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}), \text{ and} \\
|IV| & = O_P(\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma (\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n})). \text{ Furthermore, we have} \\
|V| & \leq \|v\|_1 \|\Xi_h - \hat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}\|_\infty \left[\max_{s,r} |e_s^\top 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t W_t^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} e_r| + \max_{s,r} |e_s^\top 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \right. \\
& I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t W_t^\top [(\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}] e_r| + \max_{s,r} |DN_{h,s,s}^{-1} - 1| |1/\sqrt{n} e_s^\top \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t W_t^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} e_r| + \\
& \left. \max_{s,r} |DN_{h,s,s}^{-1} - 1| \max_{s,r} |e_s^\top 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} I_{dp;-r}^\top W_t W_t^\top [(\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}] e_r| \right] = \|\Xi_h - \hat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}\|_\infty [VI + \\
& VII + VIII + IX]
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\max_s e_s^\top I_{dp;-r}^\top = \max_{s \neq r} e_s^\top$ and $E e_s^\top W_t W_t^\top \Gamma^{(st)}(0)^{-1} e_r = 0$ for $s \neq r$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|VI| & = \max_{s \neq r} 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} e_s^\top W_t W_t^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} e_r = O_P(\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}), \\
|VII| & = \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0)(\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - I_{dp}\|_1 \times \|I_{dp;-r}^\top 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} W_t W_t^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n} k_\Gamma \|\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_1), \\
|VIII| & = O_P(\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}), \\
\text{and } |IX| & = O_P(\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma (\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty^2 k_\Gamma^2 \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n})).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n} e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v) & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} v^\top \mathbb{L}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v) \\
& + O_P\left(\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n} \right. \\
& \left. + \|\Xi_h - \hat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}\|_\infty (\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n})\right)
\end{aligned}$$

By plugging in the derived rates and dropping the terms of higher order, the assertion follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. By following the arguments of the proof of Lemma 10, we obtain $|\widehat{s.e. \Psi}(j, h, v/\|v\|_1)^2 - s.e. \Psi(j, h, v/\|v\|_1)^2| \leq O_P(2h(\|\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} - (\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_\infty + \|(\Gamma^{(st)}(0)) - (\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0))\|_\infty)$. Let $\tilde{v} = \mathbb{L}v$. Note $\|v\| = \|\tilde{v}\|$. With this and Lemma 11 we obtain $\sqrt{n} e_j^\top (\hat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) v / \widehat{s.e. \Psi}(j, h, v) = 1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v) + O_P\left(\|v\|_1/\|v\|_2 (\tilde{g}_n/\sqrt{n} + \|\hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_1 k_\Gamma (k_\Gamma + \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}) + \|\Xi_h - \hat{\Xi}_h^{(re)}\|_\infty (\sqrt{\tilde{g}_n} + \|\Gamma^{(st)}(0) - \hat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty k_\Gamma \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n}))\right)$.

Since h is fixed, $\{U_{t+h}\}$ is an M -dependent process, $M = h$, and U_{t+h} is independent to W_t for all t , we have that $\{\tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ possesses under Assumption 1, 2 also a geometrical decaying functional dependence coefficient and we have $\nu_q < \infty$ for the process $\{\tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v), t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v)) \\ = E(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t_1, t_2=d}^{n-h} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_{t_1} W_{t_2}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \tilde{v} U_{t_1+h;j} U_{t_2+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v)^2) \\ = E(\sum_{s_1, s_2=0}^{h-1} \sum_{i=-n+h+d+1}^{n-h-d-1} \frac{n-h-d-|i|}{s.e. \Psi(j, h, v)^2 n} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_0 W_i^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \tilde{v} e_j^\top \Psi_{s_1} \varepsilon_{h-s_1} \varepsilon_{h+i-s_2}^\top \Psi_{s_2}^\top e_j) \\ = \sum_{s_1, s_2=0}^{h-1} \frac{n-h-d-|s_2+s_1|}{s.e. \Psi(j, h, v)^2 n} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \Gamma^{(st)}(s_2-s_1) (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \tilde{v} e_j^\top \Psi_{s_1}^\top \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_{s_2} e_j = 1 + O(1/n). \end{aligned}$$

Note that W_t and U_{t+h} are independent for all t . Furthermore, Lyapounov's condition can be verified which gives $1/\sqrt{n} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} \tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j} / s.e. \Psi(j, h, v) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ via an extension of the central limit theorem for functional dependent random variables, Theorem 3 of Wu (2011), to triangular arrays; see also Theorem 27.3 of Billingsley (1995). To see that Lyapounov's condition holds, note the following calculation and Assumption 2(i),(vii)

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{s.e. \Psi(j, h, v/\|v\|_2)^4 n^2} \sum_{t=d}^{n-h} E(\tilde{v}^\top / \|v\|_2 (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} W_t U_{t+h;j})^4 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{s.e. \Psi(j, h, v/\|v\|_2)^4 n} E(\tilde{v}^\top / \|v\|_2 (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{A}^s \mathbb{U}_{-s})^4 E(\sum_{s=0}^{h-1} e_j^\top \Psi_s \varepsilon_{-s})^4 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{s.e. \Psi(j, h, v/\|v\|_2)^4 n} \left[\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \|\tilde{v}^\top / \|v\|_2 (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \mathbb{A}^s\|_2^4 \max_{\|w\|_2=1} E(w^\top \varepsilon_0)^4 + 3(\tilde{v}^\top (\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1} \tilde{v} / \|v\|_2^2) \right] \\ & \quad \times \left[\sum_{s=0}^{h-1} \|e_j^\top \Psi_s\|_2^4 \max_{\|w\|_2=1} E(w^\top \varepsilon_0)^4 + 3(\sum_{s=0}^{h-1} e_j^\top \Psi_s \Sigma_\varepsilon \Psi_s e_j)^2 \right] \\ & = O(1/n \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \|(\Gamma^{(st)}(0))^{-1}\|_2^4) \end{aligned}$$

The second assertions follows by Nagaev's inequality for dependent variables, see Theorem 2 in Liu et al. (2013) and see also Lemma 12 in Krampe et al. (2021). \square

Lemma 12. Under Assumption 1, 2 we have, for all vectors $v \in \mathbb{R}^{p k_u}$ and $s.e. \varepsilon(v) \neq 0$ and

$$(\|v\|_1 / s.e. \varepsilon(v) k_A^2 ((g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \sqrt{\tilde{g}_n/n})) = o_p(1),$$

$$\sqrt{n} v^\top \left(\text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - (\Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})) / s.e. \varepsilon(v) \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1),$$

where $s.e. \varepsilon(v)^2 = \text{Var}(\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{k_u} v_{i+(j-1)k_u} \varepsilon_{1;i;\mathcal{I}} e_j)$.

Proof of Lemma 12. Let $\text{vec}_{p, k_u}^{-1}(v) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k_u}$ be a matrix such that $\text{vec}(\text{vec}_{p, k_u}^{-1}(v)) = v$. Then, $v^\top \left(\text{vec}(\varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top) = \varepsilon_t^\top \text{vec}_{p, k_u}^{-1}(v) \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \right)$.

We have $\sqrt{n}v^\top (\text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top) - \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})/s.e._\varepsilon(v) = \sqrt{n}v^\top (\text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)/s.e._\varepsilon(v)) + \sqrt{n}v^\top (\text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})) \times 1/s.e._\varepsilon(v)) = I + II$. We first show that I is asymptotically negligible and then that II is asymptotically Gaussian.

We have

$$|I| \leq \frac{\|v\|_1}{s.e._\varepsilon(v)} \max_r |\sqrt{n}e_r^\top (\text{vec}(\frac{1}{(n-d)} \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top - \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top))| \\ = O_P(\|v\|_1/s.e._\varepsilon(v) \times k_A^2((g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)} + (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2} \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n})).$$

Furthermore, we have $II = \sqrt{n}/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{k_u} v_{i+(j-1)p} \times (\varepsilon_{t;i} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top e_j - e_i \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}} e_j)/s.e._\varepsilon(v)$. Since $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence, we obtain $\text{Var}(II) = \text{Var}(\sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{k_u} v_{i+(j-1)p} \varepsilon_{1;i} \varepsilon_{1;\mathcal{I}} e_j)/s.e._\varepsilon(v)^2 + O(1/n) = 1 + O(1/n)$. Let UDV^\top be a singular value decomposition of $\text{vec}_{p,k_u}^{-1}(v)$. Then, we obtain

$$\sum_{t=1}^n E \left(\sqrt{n}/((n-d)s.e._\varepsilon(v)) \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^{k_u} v_{i+(j-1)p} (\varepsilon_{t;i} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} e_j) \right)^4 = n^3/((n-d)s.e._\varepsilon(v))^4 E(\varepsilon_t^\top \text{vec}_{p,k_u}^{-1}(v) \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})^4 \\ = n^3/((n-d)s.e._\varepsilon(v))^4 E(\varepsilon_t^\top U D V^\top \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}})^4 \leq n^3 \|v\|_2^4/((n-d)s.e._\varepsilon(v))^4 \max_{\|u\|_2=1} E(u^\top \varepsilon_t)^8 = o(1).$$

Hence, Lyapounov's condition holds and the assertion follows by a central limit theorem for triangular arrays, see among others Theorem 27.3 of Billingsley (1995). \square

Proof of Theorem 4. First note that $\sqrt{n}v^\top (\widehat{B} - B)e_r = \sqrt{n}v^\top (\widetilde{B} - BH^{-1})Re_r + \sqrt{n}v^\top BH^{-1}(\widehat{R} - R)e_r + \sqrt{n}v^\top (\widetilde{B} - B)(\widehat{R} - R)e_r$. From the proof of Theorem 1,2, we have $\sqrt{n}v^\top (\widetilde{B} - B)(\widehat{R} - R)e_r = O_P(\|v\|_1(\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n}k_u(k_A^2(g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n})))$.

Due Assumption 2(vi) and the mean value theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{n}v^\top BH^{-1}(\widehat{R} - R)e_r = \sqrt{n}v^\top BH^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\widetilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon)(I_{k_u} \otimes I_{d;\mathcal{R}^\top}) \text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}),$$

where $\widetilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon = c/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{R}}^\top + (1-c)I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}$ for some $c \in (0,1)$. Furthermore, $\sqrt{n}v^\top (\widetilde{B} - BH^{-1})Re_r = (e_r^\top R^\top \otimes v^\top) \text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}})$. Note further that $\|v^\top BH^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\widetilde{\Sigma}_\varepsilon) - v^\top BH^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\Sigma_\varepsilon)\|_2 = O_P(\|v\|_2 k_u^3 \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n})$. Hence, we have $\sqrt{n}v^\top (\widehat{B} - B)e_r = \sqrt{n}[(e_r^\top R^\top \otimes v^\top) + v^\top BH^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(\Sigma_\varepsilon)(I_{k_u} \otimes I_{d;\mathcal{I}^\top})] \text{vec}(1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n \widehat{\varepsilon}_t \widehat{\varepsilon}_{t;\mathcal{I}} - \Sigma_\varepsilon I_{d;\mathcal{I}}) + o_P(1)$. The assertion follows by Lemma 12 if $\widehat{s.e.}_B(v, r)^2 = s.e._B(v, r)^2 + o_P(1)$. For this note that $\{e_t\}$ is an i.i.d. sequence with $\max_{\|u\|_2=1} E(u^\top \varepsilon_t)^q \leq C < \infty, q \geq 8$, see Assumption 2(vii), and for some vectors u, v we have $\text{Var}(1/n \sum_{t=1}^n (u^\top \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top v)^2) \leq 1/n C^2 \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2$. Furthermore, for some vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^{k_u^2}$ with $\text{vec}_{k_u, k_u}^{-1}(v) = UDV^\top$ as its singular value decomposition we obtain the following $E(1/n \sum_{t=1}^n (v \text{vec}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{R}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top))^4) \leq 1/n \sum_{j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4=1}^{k_u} |\prod_{i=1}^4 \sigma_{j_i}| E \prod_{i=1}^4 |\varepsilon_t^\top U e_{j_i} e_{j_i}^\top V^\top \varepsilon_t| \leq C^2 \|v\|_2^4 k_u^2/n$, where σ_j are the singular values of $\text{vec}_{k_u, k_u}^{-1}(v)$ and the last inequality follows by bounding the nuclear norm by the Frobenius norm.

With the previous results, the assertion $\|\sqrt{n}(\widehat{B} - B)e_r\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n})$ follows then directly by Assumption 1(iv). \square

Proof of Theorem 5. We have $(\widehat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr}) = e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} \widehat{B}) e_r - e_j^\top \Psi_h B e_r - e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)}) (\widehat{B} - \widehat{B}^{(re)}) e_r = e_j^\top [(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) B + \Psi_h (\widehat{B} - B) + (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) (\widehat{B} - B) - (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)}) (\widehat{B} - \widehat{B}^{(re)})] e_r = e_j^\top [(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) B + \Psi_h (\widehat{B} - B)] e_r + e_j^\top [(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) (\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B) + (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h) (\widehat{B} - B) - (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h) (\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)] e_r =: I + II$. Furthermore, we have by Hölder's inequality $\sqrt{n}|II| \leq \|\sqrt{n}e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h)\|_\infty \|(\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)e_r\|_1 + \|e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h)\|_1 \|\sqrt{n}(\widehat{B} - B)e_r\|_\infty + \|e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(re)} - \Psi_h)\|_1 \|\sqrt{n}(\widehat{B}^{(re)} - B)\|_\infty e_r\|_\infty o_P(1)$, where the last equality is due to Lemma 7, 9, Theorem 3, 4 and Assumption 2(vii). By the proofs of Theorem 3 and 4 we have $\text{Cov}(\sqrt{n}e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) B e_r, \sqrt{n}e_j^\top \Psi_h (\widehat{B} - B) e_r) = 1/n \text{Cov}(\sum_t W_t U_{t+h}, \sum_t \varepsilon_t \varepsilon_t^\top) + o_P(1) = o_P(1)$ since $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is i.i.d., and W_t and U_{t+h} are mutually independent. Hence, $\text{Var}(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(de)} - \Theta_{h;jr})) = n \text{Var}(e_j^\top [(\widehat{\Psi}_h^{(de)} - \Psi_h) B + \Psi_h (\widehat{B} - B)] e_r) + o_P(1) = s.e._\Psi(j, h, B e_r)^2 + s.e._B(\Psi_h e_j, r)^2$ and the assertion follows by Theorem 3 and 4. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. We show that, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\sqrt{n}/s.e._\Theta^*(h, j, r)(\widehat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{*(de)} - \widehat{\Theta}_{h;jr}^{(boot)}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ in probability, from which the assertion follows by the triangular inequality and Theorem 5. To show this, we can mainly follow the arguments of the proofs of Theorem 3, 4, and 5.

For this note first that for some approximate sparse p -dimensional vector $u \in \mathcal{U}(k, q)$, $q \in [0, 1]$ with regularized estimate \widehat{u} , $\|\widehat{u} - u\|_1 = O_P(k\lambda)$, we have for a thresholded version $\sum_{i=1}^p |\widehat{u}_i|^q \mathbf{1}(|u_i| \geq \lambda) = \sum_{i=1}^p |\widehat{u}_i|^q \mathbf{1}(|u_i| \geq \lambda)(\mathbf{1}(|\widehat{u}_i| \geq |u_i|) + \mathbf{1}(|\widehat{u}_i| > |u_i|)) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i|^q \mathbf{1}(|\widehat{u}_i| > |u_i|) + \sum_{i=1}^p (|u_i| + |\widehat{u}_i - u_i|)/|\widehat{u}_i|^{1-q} \mathbf{1}(|u_i| \geq \lambda)(\mathbf{1}(|\widehat{u}_i| \geq |u_i|) \leq \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i|^q + \sum_{i=1}^p |\widehat{u}_i - u_i|/\lambda^{1-q} = O_P(k)$. That means the thresholded version of \widehat{u} is again (with high probability) approximately sparse and its sparsity parameter is of the same order as the original one. Furthermore, note that $\{\varepsilon_t^*\}$ is generated as an i.i.d. sequence and it possesses at least as many finite moments as $\{\varepsilon_t\}$. Furthermore, Assumption 2 ensures that the largest absolute eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(thr)}$ is for n large enough smaller than one and, consequently, $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(thr)}$ fulfills with high probability Assumptions 1,2 and the pseudo time series possesses a geometric decaying functional dependence.

Furthermore, note that the $s.e._B v, r^2 = \text{Var}(v^\top (B u_t + D w_t) u_{t;r} + (u_t^\top B + w_t^\top D) I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \text{vec}_{k_u}^{-1}(v^\top B R^{-1} \nabla g_{\mathcal{R},r}(I_{d;\mathcal{R}}^\top \Sigma I_{d;\mathcal{I}}) R^{-1} u_t))$. Hence, if $\{u_t\}$ and $\{w_t\}$ are mutually independent, the fourth moments occurring in $s.e._B^2(v, r)$ are limited to $\{u_t\}$ only. We have $\text{Var}^*(\varepsilon_t^*) = \text{Var}^*(\widehat{B}^{(re)} u_t^* + w_t^*) = \widehat{B}^{(re)} (\widehat{B}^{(re)})^\top + \widehat{D D}^\top = \widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon$. Since $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_\varepsilon - \Sigma_\varepsilon\|_l = O_P([k_D k_u^{1-\beta} + k_B k_u^{(3-\beta)/2}][k_A^2 (g_n/n)^{1-\zeta} + \sqrt{\widetilde{g}_n/n}]^{1-\beta})$ and $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}^{(thr)} - \mathbf{A}\|_l = O_P(k_A^{1.5} (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$, we have that $\{X_t^*\}$ approximates well-enough the autocovariance of X_t which gives $s.e._\Psi^*(j, h, \widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r) = s.e._\Psi(j, h, \widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r) + o_P(1)$. Note that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{A}} - \mathbf{A}\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^{1.5} (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$ implies $\|\widehat{\Xi}^{(re)*} - \Xi\|_\infty = O_P(k_A^{3.5} (g_n/n)^{(1-\zeta)/2})$ and $\|\widehat{\Gamma}^{*(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty = O_P(\sqrt{k_A} \|\widehat{\Gamma}^{(st)}(0) - \Gamma^{(st)}(0)\|_\infty)$. Thus by the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem 3 and Lemma 11 with an additional $k_A^{0.5}$, we obtain in probability $\sqrt{n}e_j^\top (\widehat{\Psi}_h^{*(de)} - \widehat{\Psi}_h^{(boot)}) \widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r / s.e._\Psi^*(j, h, \widehat{B}^{(re)} e_r) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

Since $\{u_t^*\}$ is drawn i.i.d. from $\{\widehat{u}_t, t = d+1, \dots, n\}$, we have for $r, s \in \{1, \dots, k_u\}$ that $\text{Var}^*(u_{t;r}^* u_{t;s}^*) = 1/(n-d) \sum_{t=d+1}^n (\widehat{u}_{t;r} \widehat{u}_{t;s})^2 - e_r^\top e_s$. Thus, $\sum_{r,s} |\text{Var}^*(u_{t;r}^* u_{t;s}^*) - \text{Var}(u_{t;r} u_{t;s})| = O_P(k_u^2/\sqrt{n})$. Hence, also the fourth moment of $\{u_t\}$ is approximated well enough and we can follow the arguments of the proof of Theorem 4 to obtain $\sqrt{n}/s.e._B(\widehat{\Psi}^{(re)} e_j, r) \widehat{\Psi}^{(re)} e_j^\top (\widehat{B} - B) e_r \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The assertion follows then by

the arguments of the proof of Theorem 5. □

Proof of Remark 1. The assertion follows by rules for matrix differentiation. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
s.e._B(v, r)^2 &= \text{Var}(v^\top \varepsilon_t u_{t;r} + v^\top B P^\top \frac{\partial P^{-T} e_r}{\partial \text{vech}(P P^\top)} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)) \\
&= \text{Var}(v^\top \varepsilon_t u_{t;r} - v^\top B P^\top (e_r^\top \otimes I_{k_u})(P^{-1} \otimes (P^\top)^{-1}) K_{k_u k_u} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \text{vech}(P P^\top)} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)) \\
&= \text{Var}(v^\top \varepsilon_t u_{t;r} - v^\top B P^\top (e_r^\top \otimes I_{k_u})(P^{-1} \otimes (P^\top)^{-1}) K_{k_u k_u} \\
&\quad \times L_{k_u}^\top (L_{k_u}^\top (I_{k_u}^2 + K_{k_u k_u})(P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u})^{-1} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)) \\
&= \text{Var}(v^\top \varepsilon_t u_{t;r} - v^\top B P^\top (e_r^\top \otimes I_{k_u})(P^{-1} \otimes (P^\top)^{-1})(I_{k_u} \otimes P^{-1})(\mp I_{k_u^2} + K_{k_u k_u}) \\
&\quad \times (P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u}^\top (L_{k_u}^\top (I_{k_u}^2 + K_{k_u k_u})(P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u})^{-1} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)) \\
&= \text{Var}(v^\top D w_t u_{t;r} + v^\top B P^\top (e_r^\top \otimes (P P^\top)^{-1}) L_{k_u}^\top \\
&\quad \times (L_{k_u} (I_{k_u}^2 + K_{k_u k_u})(P \otimes I_{k_u}) L_{k_u}^\top)^{-1} \text{vech}(\varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}} \varepsilon_{t;\mathcal{I}}^\top)).
\end{aligned}$$

If $k_u = p$, we have $B = P$ and $\varepsilon_t = P u_t$. That means $I_p - B P^{-1} = 0$ and $B P^\top = P P^\top$ and the assertion follows. □

References

- Bai, J., Li, K., and Lu, L. (2016). Estimation and Inference of FAVAR Models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 34(4):620–641.
- Banbura, M., Giannone, D., and Reichlin, L. (2010). Large Bayesian vector auto regressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 25(1):71–92.
- Barigozzi, M. and Brownlees, C. (2019). Nets: Network estimation for time series. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 34(3):347–364.
- Barigozzi, M. and Hallin, M. (2017). A network analysis of the volatility of high dimensional financial series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)*, 66(3):581–605.
- Basu, S. and Michailidis, G. (2015). Regularized estimation in sparse high-dimensional time series models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(4):1535–1567.
- Bellec, P. C., Lecu  , G., Tsybakov, A. B., et al. (2018). Slope meets lasso: improved oracle bounds and optimality. *Annals of Statistics*, 46(6B):3603–3642.
- Benjamini, Y. and Yekutieli, D. (2001). The control of the false discovery rate in multiple testing under dependency. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1165–1188.
- Bernanke, B. S., Boivin, J., and Elias, P. (2005). Measuring the effects of monetary policy: A factor-augmented vector autoregressive (FAVAR) approach. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 120(1):387–422.

- Bickel, P. J. and Freedman, D. A. (1981). Some asymptotic theory for the bootstrap. *Ann. Statist.*, 9(6):1196–1217.
- Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2008). Covariance regularization by thresholding. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(6):2577–2604.
- Billingsley, P. (1995). Probability and measure. wiley series in probability and mathematical statistics.
- Brüggemann, R., Jentsch, C., and Trenkler, C. (2016). Inference in vars with conditional heteroskedasticity of unknown form. *Journal of econometrics*, 191(1):69–85.
- Cai, T. and Liu, W. (2011). Adaptive thresholding for sparse covariance matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(494):672–684.
- Callot, L. and Kock, A. (2014). *Oracle Efficient Estimation and Forecasting with the Adaptive Lasso and the Adaptive Group Lasso in Vector Autoregressions*. Oxford University press.
- Canova, F. and Ciccarelli, M. (2013). Panel vector autoregressive models: A survey. In *VAR Models in Macroeconomics—New Developments and Applications: Essays in Honor of Christopher A. Sims*, pages 205–246. Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Chatterjee, A. and Lahiri, S. (2010). Asymptotic properties of the residual bootstrap for lasso estimators. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 138(12):4497–4509.
- Chaudhry, A., Xu, P., and Gu, Q. (2017). Uncertainty assessment and false discovery rate control in high-dimensional Granger causal inference. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W., editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 684–693, International Convention Centre, Sydney, Australia. PMLR.
- Chudik, A. and Pesaran, M. H. (2016). Theory and practice of gvar modelling. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 30(1):165–197.
- Dees, S., Mauro, F. d., Pesaran, M. H., and Smith, L. V. (2007). Exploring the international linkages of the euro area: a global var analysis. *Journal of applied econometrics*, 22(1):1–38.
- Demirer, M., Diebold, F. X., Liu, L., and Yilmaz, K. (2018). Estimating global bank network connectedness. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 33(1):1–15.
- Diebold, F. X. and Yilmaz, K. (2014). On the network topology of variance decompositions: Measuring the connectedness of financial firms. *Journal of Econometrics*, 182(1):119–134.
- Fan, J. and Han, X. (2017). Estimation of the false discovery proportion with unknown dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B, Statistical methodology*, 79(4):1143.
- Fava, B. and Lopes, H. F. (2020). The illusion of the illusion of sparsity: An exercise in prior sensitivity.

- Forni, M., Giannone, D., Lippi, M., and Reichlin, L. (2009). Opening the black box: structural factor models with large cross sections. *Econometric Theory*, 23(5):1319–1347.
- Garcia, M. G., Medeiros, M. C., and Vasconcelos, G. F. (2017). Real-time inflation forecasting with high-dimensional models: The case of brazil. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 33(3):679–693.
- Giannone, D., Lenza, M., and Primiceri, G. E. (2018). Economic predictions with big data: The illusion of sparsity.
- Han, F., Lu, H., and Liu, H. (2015). A direct estimation of high dimensional stationary vector autoregressions. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16(1):3115–3150.
- Jordà, Ò. (2005). Estimation and inference of impulse responses by local projections. *American economic review*, 95(1):161–182.
- Kascha, C. and Trenkler, C. (2015). Forecasting vars, model selection, and shrinkage.
- Kilian, L. and Lütkepohl, H. (2017). *Structural vector autoregressive analysis*. Cambridge University Press.
- Knight, K. and Fu, W. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1356–1378.
- Kock, A. B. and Callot, L. (2015). Oracle inequalities for high dimensional vector autoregressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 186(2):325–344.
- Krampe, J., Kreiss, J.-P., and Paparoditis, E. (2021). Bootstrap based inference for sparse high-dimensional time series models. *Bernoulli*, 27(3):1441–1466.
- Krampe, J. and Paparoditis, E. (2021). Sparsity concepts and estimation procedures for high dimensional vector autoregressive models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*.
- Liu, W., Xiao, H., and Wu, W. B. (2013). Probability and moment inequalities under dependence. *Statistica sinica*, pages 1257–1272.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2005). *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Masini, R. P., Medeiros, M. C., and Mendes, E. F. (2020). Regularized estimation of high-dimensional vector autoregressions with weakly dependent innovations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.09002*.
- Medeiros, M. C. and Vasconcelos, G. F. (2016). Forecasting macroeconomic variables in data-rich environments. *Economics Letters*, 138:50–52.
- Neykov, M., Ning, Y., Liu, J., and Liu, H. (2018). A unied theory of confidence regions and testing for high-dimensional estimating equations. *Statistical Science*, 33(3):427–443.

- R Core Team (2021). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ramey, V. A. (2016). Macroeconomic shocks and their propagation. In *Handbook of macroeconomics*, volume 2, pages 71–162. Elsevier.
- Rothman, A. J. (2013). *PDSCE: Positive definite sparse covariance estimators*. R package version 1.2.
- Rothman, A. J., Levina, E., and Zhu, J. (2009). Generalized thresholding of large covariance matrices. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(485):177–186.
- Simon, N., Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2011). Regularization paths for cox’s proportional hazards model via coordinate descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 39(5):1–13.
- Smeeke, S. and Wijler, E. (2018). Macroeconomic forecasting using penalized regression methods. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 34(3):408 – 430.
- Song, S. and Bickel, P. J. (2011). Large vector auto regressions. *Preprint arXiv:1106.3915*.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2005). Implications of dynamic factor models for VAR analysis. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- Stock, J. H. and Watson, M. W. (2016). Dynamic factor models, factor-augmented vector autoregressions, and structural vector autoregressions in macroeconomics. In *Handbook of macroeconomics*, volume 2, pages 415–525. Elsevier.
- van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y., and Dezeure, R. (2014). On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202.
- Wong, K. C., Li, Z., and Tewari, A. (2020). Lasso guarantees for β -mixing heavy-tailed time series. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):1124 – 1142.
- Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(40):14150–14154.
- Wu, W. B. (2011). Asymptotic theory for stationary processes. *Statistics and its Interface*, 4(2):207–226.
- Wu, W.-B., Wu, Y. N., et al. (2016). Performance bounds for parameter estimates of high-dimensional linear models with correlated errors. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(1):352–379.
- Yamamoto, Y. (2019). Bootstrap inference for impulse response functions in factor-augmented vector autoregressions. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 34(2):247–267.
- Yan, Y. and Lin, F. (2016). *FinCovRegularization: Covariance Matrix Estimation and Regularization for Finance*. R package version 1.1.0.

- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014). Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 76(1):217–242.
- Zheng, L. and Raskutti, G. (2019). Testing for high-dimensional network parameters in auto-regressive models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 13(2):4977–5043.

Supplementary Material

	De								Re							
	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20
<i>Class 1</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.97	<i>0.79</i>	0.94	<i>0.96</i>	0.92	<i>1.02</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.99	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>0.96</i>	1.00	<i>1.02</i>
	0.78	<i>0.81</i>	0.97	<i>0.79</i>	0.93	<i>0.92</i>	0.91	<i>0.98</i>	0.78	<i>0.81</i>	0.98	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>0.92</i>	1.00	<i>0.98</i>
	1.00	<i>0.77</i>	0.98	<i>0.76</i>	0.93	<i>0.94</i>	0.92	<i>1.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.77</i>	0.99	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.94</i>	1.00	<i>1.00</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>A</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.78</i>	0.92	<i>0.96</i>	0.93	<i>1.03</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.99	<i>0.78</i>	1.00	<i>0.96</i>	1.00	<i>1.03</i>
	0.80	<i>0.79</i>	0.97	<i>0.78</i>	0.93	<i>0.91</i>	0.93	<i>0.97</i>	0.80	<i>0.79</i>	0.99	<i>0.78</i>	1.00	<i>0.91</i>	1.00	<i>0.97</i>
	0.99	<i>0.77</i>	0.98	<i>0.75</i>	0.93	<i>0.93</i>	0.93	<i>0.99</i>	0.99	<i>0.77</i>	0.99	<i>0.75</i>	1.00	<i>0.93</i>	1.00	<i>0.99</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>B</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.52</i>	0.93	<i>0.66</i>	0.93	<i>0.69</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.52</i>	1.00	<i>0.66</i>	1.00	<i>0.69</i>
	0.90	<i>0.42</i>	0.98	<i>0.52</i>	0.92	<i>0.64</i>	0.94	<i>0.67</i>	0.90	<i>0.42</i>	1.00	<i>0.52</i>	1.00	<i>0.64</i>	1.00	<i>0.67</i>
	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	0.98	<i>0.50</i>	0.93	<i>0.64</i>	0.92	<i>0.67</i>	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	1.00	<i>0.64</i>	1.00	<i>0.67</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>C</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.74</i>	0.93	<i>0.98</i>	0.90	<i>1.07</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>0.98</i>	1.00	<i>1.07</i>
	0.85	<i>0.77</i>	0.98	<i>0.74</i>	0.92	<i>0.94</i>	0.92	<i>1.02</i>	0.85	<i>0.77</i>	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>0.94</i>	1.00	<i>1.02</i>
	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	0.98	<i>0.72</i>	0.93	<i>0.96</i>	0.91	<i>1.05</i>	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	0.99	<i>0.72</i>	1.00	<i>0.96</i>	1.00	<i>1.05</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>D</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.79</i>	0.93	<i>0.96</i>	0.93	<i>1.03</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.99	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>0.96</i>	1.00	<i>1.03</i>
	0.76	<i>0.82</i>	0.97	<i>0.79</i>	0.92	<i>0.91</i>	0.92	<i>0.98</i>	0.76	<i>0.82</i>	0.99	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>0.91</i>	1.00	<i>0.98</i>
	1.00	<i>0.78</i>	0.97	<i>0.76</i>	0.93	<i>0.94</i>	0.92	<i>1.01</i>	1.00	<i>0.78</i>	0.99	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.94</i>	1.00	<i>1.01</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>B+C</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.55</i>	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.93	<i>0.70</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.55</i>	1.00	<i>0.67</i>	1.00	<i>0.70</i>
	0.70	<i>0.57</i>	0.98	<i>0.56</i>	0.94	<i>0.65</i>	0.92	<i>0.67</i>	0.70	<i>0.57</i>	0.98	<i>0.56</i>	1.00	<i>0.65</i>	1.00	<i>0.67</i>
	1.00	<i>0.53</i>	0.98	<i>0.53</i>	0.93	<i>0.66</i>	0.92	<i>0.68</i>	1.00	<i>0.53</i>	0.99	<i>0.53</i>	1.00	<i>0.66</i>	1.00	<i>0.68</i>
<i>Class 2</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.76</i>	0.93	<i>1.05</i>	0.90	<i>1.16</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>1.05</i>	1.00	<i>1.16</i>
	0.76	<i>0.84</i>	0.97	<i>0.76</i>	0.93	<i>1.02</i>	0.91	<i>1.12</i>	0.76	<i>0.84</i>	0.99	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>1.02</i>	1.00	<i>1.12</i>
	1.00	<i>0.76</i>	0.97	<i>0.73</i>	0.93	<i>1.03</i>	0.91	<i>1.14</i>	1.00	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>1.03</i>	1.00	<i>1.14</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>A</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.98	<i>0.84</i>	0.93	<i>1.17</i>	0.92	<i>1.30</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>1.17</i>	1.00	<i>1.30</i>
	0.75	<i>1.01</i>	0.98	<i>0.84</i>	0.94	<i>1.12</i>	0.90	<i>1.23</i>	0.75	<i>1.01</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>1.12</i>	1.00	<i>1.23</i>
	1.00	<i>0.85</i>	0.97	<i>0.82</i>	0.93	<i>1.15</i>	0.91	<i>1.27</i>	1.00	<i>0.85</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>	1.00	<i>1.15</i>	1.00	<i>1.27</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>B</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.97	<i>0.52</i>	0.93	<i>0.76</i>	0.91	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.52</i>	1.00	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>
	0.87	<i>0.40</i>	0.98	<i>0.51</i>	0.94	<i>0.75</i>	0.91	<i>0.82</i>	0.87	<i>0.40</i>	1.00	<i>0.51</i>	1.00	<i>0.75</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>
	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	0.97	<i>0.50</i>	0.94	<i>0.75</i>	0.92	<i>0.82</i>	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	1.00	<i>0.50</i>	1.00	<i>0.75</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>A+B</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	0.97	<i>0.55</i>	0.94	<i>0.83</i>	0.92	<i>0.92</i>	1.00	<i>0.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.55</i>	1.00	<i>0.83</i>	1.00	<i>0.92</i>
	0.88	<i>0.44</i>	0.98	<i>0.54</i>	0.94	<i>0.80</i>	0.91	<i>0.89</i>	0.88	<i>0.44</i>	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.80</i>	1.00	<i>0.89</i>
	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	0.97	<i>0.54</i>	0.94	<i>0.82</i>	0.92	<i>0.91</i>	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>	1.00	<i>0.91</i>

Table 1: Coverage ratios and lengths (in italic) of confidence intervals constructed by *Boot De* and *Boot Re*.

For each class, the first row is the average over the variables 1 to r-1, the second row over r, and the third over r+1 to 20.

	De								Re							
	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20	0	1	8	20
<i>Class 1</i>	1.00	<i>0.14</i>	0.95	<i>0.74</i>	0.92	<i>0.86</i>	0.87	<i>0.81</i>	1.00	<i>0.14</i>	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>0.86</i>	1.00	<i>0.81</i>
	0.74	<i>0.53</i>	0.95	<i>0.74</i>	0.92	<i>0.84</i>	0.86	<i>0.79</i>	0.74	<i>0.53</i>	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>
	0.93	<i>0.68</i>	0.95	<i>0.72</i>	0.91	<i>0.84</i>	0.86	<i>0.79</i>	0.93	<i>0.68</i>	0.99	<i>0.72</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>A</i>	1.00	<i>0.21</i>	0.96	<i>0.74</i>	0.91	<i>0.87</i>	0.87	<i>0.82</i>	1.00	<i>0.21</i>	0.99	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>0.87</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>
	0.74	<i>0.58</i>	0.96	<i>0.73</i>	0.92	<i>0.84</i>	0.87	<i>0.79</i>	0.74	<i>0.58</i>	0.99	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>
	0.93	<i>0.68</i>	0.95	<i>0.71</i>	0.92	<i>0.84</i>	0.87	<i>0.79</i>	0.93	<i>0.68</i>	0.99	<i>0.71</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>B</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.96	<i>0.54</i>	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.92	<i>0.66</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.99	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.67</i>	1.00	<i>0.66</i>
	0.88	<i>0.36</i>	0.95	<i>0.53</i>	0.92	<i>0.65</i>	0.93	<i>0.64</i>	0.88	<i>0.36</i>	1.00	<i>0.53</i>	1.00	<i>0.65</i>	1.00	<i>0.64</i>
	0.94	<i>0.48</i>	0.95	<i>0.51</i>	0.94	<i>0.64</i>	0.91	<i>0.63</i>	0.94	<i>0.48</i>	1.00	<i>0.51</i>	1.00	<i>0.64</i>	1.00	<i>0.63</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>C</i>	1.00	<i>0.21</i>	0.95	<i>0.73</i>	0.92	<i>0.93</i>	0.87	<i>0.90</i>	1.00	<i>0.21</i>	0.99	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>0.93</i>	1.00	<i>0.90</i>
	0.75	<i>0.56</i>	0.96	<i>0.72</i>	0.92	<i>0.91</i>	0.87	<i>0.87</i>	0.75	<i>0.56</i>	0.99	<i>0.72</i>	1.00	<i>0.91</i>	1.00	<i>0.87</i>
	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.96	<i>0.70</i>	0.92	<i>0.91</i>	0.86	<i>0.88</i>	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.99	<i>0.70</i>	1.00	<i>0.91</i>	1.00	<i>0.88</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>D</i>	1.00	<i>0.17</i>	0.95	<i>0.76</i>	0.91	<i>0.86</i>	0.87	<i>0.81</i>	1.00	<i>0.17</i>	0.99	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.86</i>	1.00	<i>0.81</i>
	0.74	<i>0.58</i>	0.96	<i>0.76</i>	0.92	<i>0.84</i>	0.87	<i>0.79</i>	0.74	<i>0.58</i>	0.99	<i>0.76</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>
	0.92	<i>0.73</i>	0.95	<i>0.73</i>	0.91	<i>0.84</i>	0.86	<i>0.80</i>	0.92	<i>0.73</i>	0.99	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.80</i>
<i>Class 1</i> <i>B+C</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.96	<i>0.54</i>	0.93	<i>0.66</i>	0.91	<i>0.65</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.98	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.66</i>	1.00	<i>0.65</i>
	0.78	<i>0.37</i>	0.96	<i>0.54</i>	0.94	<i>0.65</i>	0.91	<i>0.63</i>	0.78	<i>0.37</i>	0.98	<i>0.55</i>	1.00	<i>0.65</i>	1.00	<i>0.63</i>
	0.94	<i>0.49</i>	0.96	<i>0.53</i>	0.94	<i>0.64</i>	0.91	<i>0.63</i>	0.94	<i>0.49</i>	0.98	<i>0.53</i>	1.00	<i>0.64</i>	1.00	<i>0.63</i>
<i>Class 2</i>	1.00	<i>0.14</i>	0.97	<i>0.74</i>	0.93	<i>1.00</i>	0.85	<i>0.97</i>	1.00	<i>0.14</i>	1.00	<i>0.74</i>	1.00	<i>1.00</i>	1.00	<i>0.98</i>
	0.72	<i>0.52</i>	0.97	<i>0.73</i>	0.93	<i>0.98</i>	0.88	<i>0.96</i>	0.72	<i>0.52</i>	0.99	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>0.98</i>	1.00	<i>0.96</i>
	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.96	<i>0.71</i>	0.93	<i>0.97</i>	0.87	<i>0.95</i>	0.93	<i>0.67</i>	0.99	<i>0.71</i>	1.00	<i>0.97</i>	1.00	<i>0.95</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>A</i>	1.00	<i>0.15</i>	0.97	<i>0.80</i>	0.92	<i>1.08</i>	0.87	<i>1.06</i>	1.00	<i>0.15</i>	1.00	<i>0.80</i>	1.00	<i>1.09</i>	1.00	<i>1.06</i>
	0.70	<i>0.56</i>	0.96	<i>0.79</i>	0.93	<i>1.05</i>	0.86	<i>1.03</i>	0.70	<i>0.56</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>1.05</i>	1.00	<i>1.03</i>
	0.93	<i>0.73</i>	0.97	<i>0.78</i>	0.93	<i>1.06</i>	0.86	<i>1.04</i>	0.93	<i>0.73</i>	1.00	<i>0.78</i>	1.00	<i>1.06</i>	1.00	<i>1.04</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>B</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.96	<i>0.54</i>	0.94	<i>0.79</i>	0.91	<i>0.83</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.79</i>	1.00	<i>0.82</i>
	0.88	<i>0.36</i>	0.97	<i>0.54</i>	0.94	<i>0.78</i>	0.92	<i>0.81</i>	0.88	<i>0.36</i>	1.00	<i>0.54</i>	1.00	<i>0.78</i>	1.00	<i>0.81</i>
	0.93	<i>0.48</i>	0.96	<i>0.52</i>	0.94	<i>0.77</i>	0.91	<i>0.81</i>	0.93	<i>0.48</i>	1.00	<i>0.52</i>	1.00	<i>0.77</i>	1.00	<i>0.81</i>
<i>Class 2</i> <i>A+B</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	0.96	<i>0.59</i>	0.94	<i>0.86</i>	0.91	<i>0.90</i>	1.00	<i>0.07</i>	1.00	<i>0.59</i>	1.00	<i>0.86</i>	1.00	<i>0.90</i>
	0.87	<i>0.39</i>	0.97	<i>0.57</i>	0.94	<i>0.84</i>	0.91	<i>0.87</i>	0.87	<i>0.39</i>	1.00	<i>0.58</i>	1.00	<i>0.84</i>	1.00	<i>0.87</i>
	0.94	<i>0.53</i>	0.96	<i>0.57</i>	0.94	<i>0.85</i>	0.91	<i>0.89</i>	0.94	<i>0.53</i>	1.00	<i>0.57</i>	1.00	<i>0.85</i>	1.00	<i>0.89</i>

Table 2: Coverage ratios and lengths (in italic) of confidence intervals constructed by *Gaussian De* and *GaussianRe*. For each class, the first row is the average over the variables 1 to r-1, the second row over r, and the third over r+1 to 20.