

The Time-Varying Multivariate Autoregressive Index Model

Gianluca Cubadda¹, Stefano Grassi¹ and Barbara Guardabascio²

¹University of Rome ‘Tor Vergata’

²University of Perugia

January 19, 2022

Abstract

Many economic variables feature changes in their conditional mean and volatility, and Time Varying Vector Autoregressive Models are often used to handle such complexity in the data. Unfortunately, when the number of series grows, they present increasing estimation and interpretation problems. This paper tries to address this issue proposing a new Multivariate Autoregressive Index model that features time varying means and volatility.

Technically, we develop a new estimation methodology that mix switching algorithms with the forgetting factors strategy of [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#). This substantially reduces the computational burden and allows to select or weight, in real time, the number of common components and other features of the data using Dynamic Model Selection or Dynamic Model Averaging without further computational cost.

Using USA macroeconomic data, we provide a structural analysis and a forecasting exercise that demonstrates the feasibility and usefulness of this new model.

Keywords: Large datasets, Multivariate Autoregressive Index models, Stochastic volatility, Bayesian VARs.

1 Introduction

The availability of large datasets and instability of the economy has changed the nature of economic models. Time-varying parameter models are developed to capture the ever-changing economic environment. For example, [Cogley and Sargent \(2002\)](#) use a small VAR with time-varying coefficients, that follow a random walk dynamic (TVP-VAR), to detect features such as coefficient drift of the inflation-unemployment dynamics. Contributions on small TVP-VAR include [Cogley et al. \(2005\)](#), [Cogley and Sargent \(2005\)](#), [Primiceri \(2005\)](#) and [d'Agostino et al. \(2013\)](#).

The abundance of large data sets with macroeconomic variables has called for the development of larger TVP-VAR models. Motivated by the need for modelling instability in large systems, [Koop and Korobilis \(2013\)](#) (KK, henceforth) develop a computationally efficient estimation methodology for Large TVP-VAR models with stochastic volatility (TVP-VAR-SV). When a large number of predictors is included in the VAR system, the computational burden increases significantly. KK operationalize the model by using forgetting factors (see [Raftery et al., 2010](#)) and estimating the error covariance matrix dynamically using an exponentially weighted moving average (EWMA). Recently [Koop and Korobilis \(2014\)](#) extended the methodology to time-varying parameter factor augmented VAR with stochastic volatility (TVP-FAVAR-SV). Although the TVP-VAR-SV are overall easier to handle than TVP-FAVAR-SV in terms of the online estimation, it remains an open question if a small amount of common components might efficiently summarize the variation in the data for forecasting or economic analysis.

In this paper, we propose a new model that bridges TVP-VAR-SV and TVP-FAVAR-SV, with a new estimation strategy based on the results in KK. Specifically, to reduce the dimensionality, we draw from the recent developments in Multivariate Index Autoregressive (MAI) models, see [Carriero et al. \(2016\)](#), [Cubadda et al. \(2017\)](#), [Cubadda and Guardabascio \(2019\)](#), and [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#), among others. The MAI model, originally introduced by [Reinsel \(1983\)](#), is a bridge between reduced-rank VARs (see [Carriero et al., 2015](#) and the references therein) and the Dynamic Factor Model (DFM, see [Stock and Watson, 2016](#), [Lippi, 2019](#) and the references therein). On the one hand, it reduces the dimensionality by imposing a sort of reduced rank structure to the VAR, on the other, it allows for identifying few linear combinations of the variables, which are labelled as the indexes, whose lags are entirely responsible for the dynamics of the system.

Although the mathematical formulation of the MAI is similar to that of the DFM, an advantage of the former is that it does not require that the dimension of the system diverges to infinity in estimation. Hence, the MAI can be applied even to small or medium VARs. Moreover, the factor structure can be tested for and not simply imposed as in the DFM, and the estimation error of the indexes is explicitly accounted for, see [Cubadda and Guardabascio \(2019\)](#) for further details.

The contribution of the paper is twofold. The first is to propose a MAI with time-varying parameters and stochastic volatility (TVP-MAI-SV). A second contribution of the paper

is to develop approximate estimation methods for the TVP-MAI-SV which do not involve the use of Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) such as in [Carriero et al. \(2018\)](#) and [Carriero et al. \(2019\)](#). To achieve this result we propose mixing the switching algorithm, see [Cubadda et al. \(2017\)](#), with forgetting factors in the same spirit of [Koop and Korobilis \(2014\)](#).

Forgetting factors (also known as discount factors), have long been used with state-space models, see [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#). They do not require the use of MCMC methods and be useful in economic and financial applications, see [Dangl and Halling \(2012\)](#), and [Grassi et al. \(2017\)](#).

The new model is applied in two empirical applications. The first one is a variance decomposition on a large dataset composed of 215 time series. The analysis of economic uncertainty has a long history. A large literature investigates the relationship between uncertainty and growth by proving that both at the macro and micro level, uncertainty moves counter-cyclically: rising steeply in recessions and falling in booms. Evidence of counter-cyclical volatility is provided, among the others, for macro stock returns in [Schwert and William \(1989\)](#) for firm-level stock asset prices in [Campbell et al. \(2001\)](#), for consumption and income in [Storesletten et al. \(2004\)](#). Moreover, given the increase of uncertainty after major economic and political shocks and the recent 2008 financial crisis followed by the Great Recession, the interest of economists and policymakers become markedly focused on its effects on the economy. Moving from the seminal paper of [Bloom \(2009\)](#) that provides a structural framework to analyse the impact of uncertainty shocks, more recent literature starts analysing and measuring the macroeconomic and financial uncertainty and its impact on macroeconomic variables (see among the others [Bachmann et al., 2013](#), [Caggiano et al., 2014](#) and [Jo, 2015](#)).

However, measuring uncertainty effect on macroeconomics is difficult as most macro variables move together over the business cycle. This co-movement may face challenging identification problems which are generally overcome by estimating uncertainty in a preliminary step and then evaluating its impact on macroeconomic variables. Uncertainty measure is included together with a small set of macroeconomic variables in a VAR model computing the responses of the macro variables to the uncertainty shock (see among others [Bloom, 2009](#), [Caggiano et al., 2014](#), [Basu and Bundick, 2017](#), [Bachmann et al., 2013](#), [Jurado et al., 2015](#)). The use of small VAR models, to assess the effects of uncertainty, can make the results subject to the common omitted variable bias and non-fundamentality of the errors, besides providing results on the impact to just a few economic indicators. Differently from the previous literature, in line with [Carriero et al. \(2016\)](#), we focus on measures of uncertainty based on the volatility and we apply our TVP-MAI-SV on 215 macroeconomic and financial variables. The log predictive likelihood (log PL) is used to select among the number of indexes that following [Carriero et al. \(2016\)](#), [Ganguly and Breuer \(2010\)](#) and [Guglielminetti \(2016\)](#), are classified into 5 groups: *Financial*, *Labour Market*, *Nominal*, *Prices*, *Real*. We analyse how much volatility is explained by each index over time.

The second empirical application provides a forecasting exercise for three key macroeconomic variables, namely Real Gross Domestic Product (GDP), Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Effective Federal Funds Rate (IntRate). The point and density forecast evaluation show that the TVP-MAI-SV model has very promising out-of-sample properties compared with a set of univariate and multivariate competitors. In particular, the specification of the model with SV and constant parameters performs significantly well. This is in line with the results in [Chan and Eric \(2018\)](#) and [Chan et al. \(2020\)](#)

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 presents the MAI model and introduces the new TVP-MAI-SV. Section 3 discusses the new estimation approach. Section 4 contains the empirical application. Finally Section 5 draws some conclusions. All the derivations are reported in Appendix A and B.

2 From the MAI model to the TV-MAI

Let $\mathbf{y}_t \equiv (y_{1,t}, \dots, y_{N,t})'$ denote the N -vector of the time series of interest. In the fixed parameter framework, it is assumed that variables \mathbf{y}_t are generated by a stationary VAR of order p (VAR(p)):

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \Phi(L)\mathbf{y}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (1)$$

where $\Phi(L) = \sum_{h=0}^{p-1} \Phi_h L^h$ and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ are i.i.d. innovations with $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t) = 0$, $E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t') = H$ (positive definite) and finite fourth moments.

In order to reduce the number of parameters of model (1), [Reinsel \(1983\)](#) proposed to impose the following set of restrictions on the VAR mean parameters:

$$\Phi(L) = \beta(L)\boldsymbol{\omega}', \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ is full-rank $N \times q$ matrix with $q < N$, $\beta(L) = \sum_{h=0}^{p-1} \beta_h L^h$, and β_h is a $N \times q$ matrix for $h = 1, \dots, p$.

The rationale underlying assumption (2) is that the unrestricted VAR foresees N linearly independent mechanisms by which past information is transmitted to the system. However, since it is commonly believed that few common shocks generate most of macroeconomic fluctuations, it is reasonable to assume that there is a reduced number of channels through which variables are influenced by their past. In other words, this is exactly what Equation (2) states (see [Carriero et al., 2016](#) and [Cubadda and Guardabascio, 2019](#) for further details).

Notice that Assumption in Equation (2) is equivalent to postulating the following structure for series \mathbf{y}_t :

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \beta(L)\mathbf{f}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{f}_t = \boldsymbol{\omega}'\mathbf{y}_t$. [Reinsel \(1983\)](#) defines the q -dimensional series $\mathbf{f}_t = (f_{1,t}, \dots, f_{q,t})$ as the index variables and labels equation (3) as the MAI model.

An interesting property of the MAI is that the indexes themselves have a VAR(p) repre-

sentation. Indeed, if we premultiply by ω' both sides of equation (3) we get

$$\mathbf{f}_t = \alpha(L)\mathbf{f}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t,$$

where $\alpha(L) = \omega'\beta(L)$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \omega'\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$. This feature is in sharp contrast with reduced rank VAR models, where linear combinations of the variables do not generally admit a finite order VAR representation, see [Cubadda et al. \(2009\)](#), and highlights the analogy between the role of the indexes in the MAI and the factors in DFMs.

Recently, there has been a renewed interest in the MAI, [Carriero et al. \(2016\)](#) derived classical and Bayesian estimation of large MAIs and applied this modelling for structural analysis, [Cubadda et al. \(2017\)](#) proposed a multivariate realized volatility model that is endowed with an index structure. [Cubadda and Guardabascio \(2019\)](#) extended the model by allowing for individual AR structures, and [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#) offered a MAI with stochastic volatility and provide MCMC estimation.

We extend the traditional MAI model allowing the variation in both the mean and variance equation, the TVP-MAI-SV takes the form:

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \sum_{j=1}^q \boldsymbol{\beta}(L)_{j,t} f_{j,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{H}_t), \quad (4)$$

where $f_{j,t} = \sum_{k=1}^N \omega_{k,j} y_{k,t}$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}(L)_{j,t}$ is a polynomial N -vector of time varying coefficients that evolve as random walks for $j = 1, \dots, q$. Notice that, similarly in the literature on the TVP-FAVAR, we assume that the loadings of the indexes vary over time whereas the weights ω remain stable. Finally the $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ follows a multivariate stochastic volatility model given by \mathbf{H}_t .

The model given in Equation (4) is difficult to estimate with already existing methods, and to tackle this task we develop a new hybrid algorithm that is described below.

3 Estimation

The estimation of model in Equation (4) is based in a fast two-step algorithm which vastly reduces the computational burden. Subsection 3.1 presents the state space representation of TVP-MAI-SV and briefly explains the related estimation issues. Subsection 3.2 presents the new hybrid switching algorithm used to estimate the TVP-MAI-SV. Subsection 3.3 describes model selection. All the derivations are reported in Appendix A.

3.1 Bayesian Estimation

The model in Equation (4) can be casted in state space form as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{Z}_t \boldsymbol{\beta}_t + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t, & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{H}_t), \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_t &= \boldsymbol{\beta}_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_t, & \boldsymbol{\eta}_t &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{Q}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where \mathbf{y}_t is the vector of observed time series at time t , $\mathbf{Z}_t = I_N \otimes (f_{1,t}, \dots, f_{q,t})$ is the stack of all the indexes depending on the unknown $\boldsymbol{\omega}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t = (\beta'_{1,t}, \dots, \beta'_{q,t})'$ is an $Nq \times 1$ vector containing the time varying $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ s (states), which are assumed to follow a random walk dynamic. Finally the errors, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_t$ are assumed to be mutually independent at all leads and lags and \mathbf{H}_t features stochastic volatility.

The model in equation (5) is used in a number of recent paper, see among others [Primiceri \(2005\)](#), [Koop et al. \(2009\)](#) and [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#). Traditionally, it is estimated with both classical and Bayesian approaches. In the first case, the likelihood is efficiently calculated with the Kalman filter (KF) routine, see [Durbin and Koopman \(2001\)](#), and the time-varying parameters are automatically filtered as latent state variables, once that \mathbf{H}_t and \mathbf{Q} are estimated.

The Bayesian estimation method, which requires simulation based methods, such as the MCMC, involves the specification of \mathbf{H}_t and \mathbf{Q} together with the initial condition, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0|0}$, of the model parameters, for an introduction see [Koop \(2003\)](#). Although Bayesian algorithms are reliable in this context, as recently discussed in [Carriero et al. \(2018\)](#), they become computational intensive as the number of parameters increases and they become unfeasible when a large amount of models (e.g. different number of factors) have to be estimated.

To solve this issue we propose a new hybrid estimation technique, that uses the discount factor methodology proposed by [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#) (see Appendix A), to estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$ and \mathbf{H}_t , and a switching algorithm to estimate $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.

3.2 Hybrid algorithm for TVP-MAI-SV

The model in equation (5), has both static ($\boldsymbol{\omega}$) and dynamic parameters ($\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$). Following [Cubadda et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Koop and Korobilis \(2014\)](#) we combines the ideas of variance discounting methods with the switching algorithm in order to obtain analytical results for the posteriors of the “indexes” ($\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$) as well as the static parameters ($\boldsymbol{\omega}$). The model also features stochastic volatility and the algorithm needs to take it into account in the \mathbf{H}_t . The \mathbf{H}_t can be easily estimated using the EWMA filter.

The estimation starts from the same algorithm described in [Cubadda et al. \(2017\)](#) and introduces the time-varying parameters as follows:

- 1) Given (initial) estimates of $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ and \mathbf{H}_t , run the KF for model reported in equation (5) to get the optimal estimates of the latent states $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_t = (\hat{\beta}_{1,t}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_{Nq,t})$, see Appendix A;

- 2) Given the $\hat{\beta}_t$ and the ω , extract \mathbf{H}_t using an EWMA estimator for the measurement error covariance matrix:

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_t = \kappa \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{t-1} + (1 - \kappa) \hat{\varepsilon}_t \hat{\varepsilon}_t',$$

where $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = \mathbf{y}_t - \beta_t \mathbf{Z}_t$ is given as output from the Kalman filter. The EWMA decay factor κ requires to be selected, we discuss this issue in Section 4.

- 3) Premultiply by $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2}$ and apply the Vec operator to both the sides of Equation (4), then use the property $\text{Vec}(ABC) = (C' \otimes A)\text{Vec}(B)$ to get:

$$\text{Vec}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2} \mathbf{y}_t) = \sum_{h=1}^{p-1} (\mathbf{y}'_{t-h} \otimes \hat{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2} \hat{\beta}_{h,t}) \text{Vec}(\omega') + \text{Vec}(\hat{\mathbf{H}}_t^{-1/2} \varepsilon_t). \quad (6)$$

Given the previously obtained estimates of $\hat{\beta}_t$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_t$, estimate $\text{Vec}(\omega')$ with OLS in equation (6).

- 4) Repeat steps 1, 2 and 3 till numerical convergence occurs.

Few comments are in order. The above algorithm offers several advantages over the available alternatives, including computational simplicity, no need of a normalization condition on the parameters ω , over-identifying restrictions can be easily imposed on ω and optimization is explicit at each step. In order to speed up numerical convergence, it is important to take proper choices regarding various hyperparameters and initial conditions. As in [Koop and Korobilis \(2014\)](#), we choose fairly non-informative priors. The initial conditions for the time-varying parameters β_t and the time-varying covariance \mathbf{H}_t are set as follows: $\beta_0 \sim N(0, 4)$ and $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{I}_n$. Finally the initial conditions for ω are obtained from the eigenvectors that are associated with the first q principal components of series \mathbf{y}_t .

3.3 Dynamic model averaging and Dynamic model selection for the TVP-MAI-SV

The model discussed in Section 3.1 is just one of the \mathcal{M} possible models. Depending on the selection of several parameters (number of factors, forgetting factor, decay factor λ , time varying parameters β), many models can be switched over time. Considering the \mathcal{M} possible models equation (5) can be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)} \beta_t^{(k)} + \varepsilon_t^{(k)}, & \varepsilon_t^{(k)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{H}_t^{(k)}), \\ \beta_t^{(k)} &= \beta_{t-1}^{(k)} + \eta_t^{(k)}, & \eta_t^{(k)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{Q}^{(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)}$ and $\beta_t^{(k)}$ are, respectively, one of the possible set of indexes and time-varying parameters.

Looking at equation (7) is clear that there are potentially a large number of models at each

time point t . When faced with multiple models, it is common to use model selection or model averaging techniques, that in our framework have to be dynamic. More specifically in a model selection exercise, we want to allow for the selected model to change over time, thus doing Dynamic Model Selection (DMS). In a model averaging exercise, we want to allow for the weights used in the averaging process to change over time, thus leading to Dynamic Model Averaging (DMA). In this paper, we do both using the same approach of [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#), see Appendix A.

In DMS and DMA the main objective is to calculate $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ which is the probability that model j applies at time t , given information through time $t-1$. Once $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$ are obtained they can either be used to do model averaging or model selection.

DMS arises if, at each point in time, the model with the highest value for $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ is used. Note that $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ will vary over time and, hence, the selected model may switch over time. DMA arises if model averaging is done in period t using $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$ as weights. The contribution of [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#) is to develop a fast recursive algorithm for calculating $\pi_{t|t-1,j}$ that, given an initial condition: $\pi_{0|0,j}$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$, derives a model prediction equation using the forgetting factor α :

$$\pi_{t|t-1,j} = \frac{\pi_{t-1|t-1,j}^\alpha}{\sum_{j=1}^J \pi_{t-1|t-1,j}^\alpha},$$

and a model updating equation of

$$\pi_{t|t,j} = \frac{\pi_{t|t-1,j} f_j(y_t | y_{1:t-1})}{\sum_{j=1}^J \pi_{t|t-1,j} f_j(y_t | y_{1:t-1})},$$

where $f_j(y_t | y_{1:t-1})$ is the predictive likelihood of model j . The $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ is a forgetting factor that tunes the frequency of switch between models occurred over time. Low values of α corresponds to a rapid switch, high values give the opposite. Naturally $\alpha = 1$ brings to the conventional Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA).

Finally, the initial condition is set to the equal probability $\pi_{0|0,j} = 1/J, \forall j$.

4 Empirical application

We use the new TVP-MAI-SV to carry out both a structural and a forecasting exercise. Subsection 4.1 presents the dataset considered in our study. Structural Analysis is described in subsection 4.2. While, subsection 4.3 discusses the forecasting exercise.

4.1 Data description

The quarterly data used in the paper are download from Fred-Database and they run from 1960:1 to 2019:4. Following [Carriero et al. \(2016\)](#), [Ganguly and Breuer \(2010\)](#) and [Guglielminetti \(2016\)](#) and references therein, we classify the series into 5 groups: Real (RI), Nominal (NI), Labour Market (LMI), Prices (PI) and Financial (FI) indexes. A detailed description of all the 215 series as listed in each group are reported from Table 6 to Table 11 in Appendix B. All the variables are transformed to achieve stationarity and then standardized as specified in [McCracken and Ng \(2020\)](#).

For the structural exercise we use all the 215 series, for the forecasting exercise we follow KK and we use a selection of 25 series. Those are highlighted in bold in the Tables 6 to 11 of Appendix B.

4.2 Variance Decomposition

Following [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#) we carry out a variance decomposition analysis using the full dataset described in Appendix B. Before using the TVP-MAI-SV we proceed to select some of its key features such as: the number of indexes ranging from 1 to 5; different values for $\lambda = \{0.96, 0.97, \dots, 1\}$; and $\kappa = \{0.94, 0.96, \dots, 1\}$. This provides a total of 80 alternative specifications. Regarding the lag length we select 4 lags, see [Koop and Korobilis \(2013\)](#) and [Kapetanios et al. \(2019\)](#). We estimate all these specifications and rank them according to the log PL, as discussed in [Billio et al. \(2016\)](#) and computed as discussed in Appendix A.

Table 1 provides results for the best 5 specifications together with the worst 5 specifications we found over the total 80 specifications we searched over. The table contains the number of factors and the values of λ and κ that uniquely identifies a specification. Looking at the table the best specification contains 5 indexes, $\lambda = 0.99$ and a $\kappa = 0.94$. This parameter combination features a log PL equal to 488.1631. Figure 1 reports the five estimated indexes.

Generally speaking, indexes capture accurately both the Oil crisis in 1970s and the Great Financial Crisis of 2008. In more detail, it is evident the effect of the first oil Crisis in 1973 in which prices increased 400%, is well captured by the pick of the related Price Index (PI) at the beginning of the recession period, followed by a decreasing effect in Real Index (RI), Nominal Index (NI) and above all Labour Market Index (LMI). Differently, at the beginning of 1979, the second shock evolved more slowly, as producers, led by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), affirmed the concept of setting oil prices and establishing production quotas. Consequently, if we see an increase in the prices factor, the decreasing effect on the other components arrives later on in 80s. It is interesting that the financial crisis is well displayed by all the factors. Indeed, we appreciate an increase in the financial market associated with a large decrease of both real, nominal factors and an increase in prices. While we notice a slower decrease in the labour trend whose fully recovery seems to come long after.

Table 1: The Table reports: the model ranking (Ranking); the number of indexes (#Factors); the shrinkage parameter for the time-varying parameters (λ); the decay factor for the EWMA estimator (κ); and the log-predictive likelihood for each model (log PL). The second, third and fourth columns contain the factor, λ - κ combination that uniquely identifies a specification.

Ranking	# Factors	λ	κ	log PL
1	5	0.99	0.94	488.1631
2	4	1.00	0.94	487.7487
3	2	0.97	0.94	481.1135
4	3	1.00	0.94	478.4866
5	2	0.99	0.94	478.8624
...
76	4	0.97	1.00	-242.8570
77	2	0.97	1.00	-243.4300
78	3	0.96	1.00	-246.4240
79	4	0.96	1.00	-250.2354
80	5	0.96	1.00	-258.7879

The RI has a large volatility spike after the 1970s, observed in correspondence with the last Financial Crisis. The NI shows a smaller degree of time variation than the RI. The FI shows that financial uncertainty spikes during the recession with the Great Financial Crisis that dominates the others. To analyse the explained volatility of each component we report in Figure 2 the time-varying percentage shares of explain volatility by the idiosyncratic and common components. The Figure reports just the first series of Tables 6 to 10 in Appendix B.

Starting from the RI and the corresponding series GDP, it seems that the common component of volatility has increased its importance during 2000 with a big increase after the Great Recession. The fraction of volatility explained by the common component is much higher for the Nonfarm payroll, first series of LMI.


Moving to the FI and for the first series that is the Federal funds rate, the common component is quite high during the considered period. Interesting the percentage of common component change a lot with big increase in correspondence of the economic crisis.

4.3 Forecasting exercise

This section provides the out-of-sample performance of the TVP-MAI-SV against a set of standard competitors.

In this exercise we consider the 25 major quarterly U.S. macroeconomic variables as discussed in KK. The series are reported in bold from Table 6 to Table 10 in Appendix B. We focus on empirical results relating to three variables: CPI inflation, GDP growth and the Federal Funds rate and refer to these as the main variables.

Figure 1: *Estimated Indexes. NBER recession are reported with grey vertical bar. The name of the factor is also reported.*



The forecasting exercise is performed using an expanding window with an initial estimation sample runs from 1960:Q3 to 1972:Q4. The model is then recursively estimated on a forecast windows of 183 quarterly vintages (forecasting windows start from 1973:Q1 through 2020:Q1).

Imposing simple restriction, the TVP-MAI-SV of equation (5), encompasses some multivariate models:

- 1) The original MAI model, as in Reinsel (1983) and Carriero et al. (2016) when $\beta_t = \beta_{t-1}$ and \mathbf{H}_t are time invariant ($Q = 0$, $\kappa = 1$ and \mathbf{H}_t set to the OLS estimates $\forall t$).
- 2) The MAI-SV similar to Carriero et al. (2018) when $\beta_t = \beta_{t-1}$ is time invariant ($Q = 0$) but $\kappa = 1$ and \mathbf{H}_t evolves over time.
- 3) The TVP-MAI model without stochastic volatility when β_t is time varying ($Q \neq 0$) but \mathbf{H}_t is fixed and set to the OLS estimates.

In addition to the models discussed previously, Table 2 reports all the competitive models considered in our forecasting analyses.

The benchmark model is a TVP-VAR with four lags (\mathcal{M}_{15}), following KK, the optimal Minnesota shrinkage coefficient (γ) is set to 0.005. We also include VAR with 1 and 4 lags




Figure 2: Volatility shares (%): Common (red), Idiosyncratic (blue). The NBER recessions are reported with grey vertical lines. Each plot correspond to the first series reported in Tables 6 to Table 11 in Appendix B. (a) Real Gross Domestic Product, first series in Table 6 Appendix B. (b) 3-Month Treasury Bill first series in Table 8 Appendix B. (c) Nonfarm payroll first series in Table 9 Appendix B. (d) Consumer price index first series in Table 10 Appendix B. (e) Federal Funds rate first series in Table 11 Appendix B. (f) Fanchart of all the 217 series, with the mean as black(dotted) line.

estimated using OLS, a DFM and a random walk process(RW).

The TVP-MAI-SV require to specify the number of indexes, and the values of λ , κ and α . We consider the $q = \{1, 2, 3\}$ indexes and a range of values for the forgetting factor, $\lambda \in \{0.97, 0.98, 0.99, 1\}$ covering from rapid coefficient change to no change. For the decay factor, we consider the grid of values $\kappa \in \{0.96, 0.98, 1\}$. The number of indexes and the values of λ , and κ are selected dynamically using DMS or DMA, see Table 2. We fix the α to 0.99, other values are possible and the results are available from the authors upon request.

We assess the performance of our forecasts accuracy in term of point and density forecast following the evaluation framework of Chan et al. (2020). Let y_t^* denote the random

Table 2: The table reports all the models considered in the forecasting exercise plus the benchmark model. The first column is the abbreviation of the model. The second column provides a brief description of each model.

Abbreviation	Full Description
\mathcal{M}_1	TVP-MAI-SV. Number of indexes and the optimal value of the λ and κ are selected using DMA as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_2	TVP-MAI-SV. Number of indexes and the optimal value of the λ and κ are selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_3	MAI-SV, with fix $\beta_t(\lambda = 1)$. Number of indexes and the optimal value of κ are selected using DMA as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_4	MAI-SV, with fix $\beta_t(\lambda = 1)$. Number of indexes and the optimal value of κ are selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_5	TVP-MAI, with fix H ($\kappa = 1$). Number of indexes and the optimal value of the λ are selected using DMA as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_6	TVP-MAI, with fix H ($\kappa = 1$). Number of indexes and the optimal value of the λ are selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_7	MAI. Number of indexes are selected using DMA as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_8	MAI. Number of indexes are selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_9	Random Walk.
\mathcal{M}_{10}	Vector Autoregressive(1) estimated using the OLS.
\mathcal{M}_{11}	Vector Autoregressive(4) estimated using the OLS.
\mathcal{M}_{12}	Dynamic Factor Model
\mathcal{M}_{13}	TVP-VAR-SV with 4 lags and stochastic volatility. Optimal value of the shrinkage parameter is selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model $\lambda = 0.99$, $\kappa = 0.98$ and $\alpha = 0.99$. Benchmark model
\mathcal{M}_{14}	TVP-VAR-SV with 4 lags and stochastic volatility. Optimal value of the shrinkage parameter is selected using DMS as outlined in Koop and Korobilis (2013) . In this model λ is dynamically selected and $\kappa = 0.98$ and $\alpha = 0.99$.
\mathcal{M}_{15}	TVP-FAVAR-SV with 4 lags and 4 indexes as in Koop and Korobilis (2014) .

variables being forecast and \hat{y}_t be their realizations and the root mean squared forecast error (RMSFE) and mean absolute forecast error (MAFE) given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RMSFE}_{j,h}^k &= \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{T-h} y_{t+h}^* - \hat{y}_{j,t+h}^k}{T-h-t_0+1}}, \\ \text{MAFE}_{j,h}^k &= \frac{\sum_{t=t_0}^{T-h} |y_{t+h}^* - \hat{y}_{j,t+h}^k|}{T-h-t_0+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where $k = \{\mathcal{M}_1, \dots, \mathcal{M}_{15}\}$ is the model set, $h = \{1, \dots, H\}$ are the forecasting step ahead and $j = \{1, \dots, 3\}$ are the main variables.

To evaluate the density forecasts, we use the average log-predictive likelihood (ALPL) as described in [Korobilis \(2021\)](#) and [Chan et al. \(2020\)](#) as a broadest measure of density accuracy, see also [Geweke \(2005\)](#):

$$\text{ALPL}_{j,h}^k = \frac{\log p_{t+h}(y_{t+h}^* - \hat{y}_{j,t+h}^k)}{T-h-t_0+1}. \quad (9)$$

Table 3 to Table 5 report the ratios of each model's RMSFE and MAFE with respect to

the benchmark model. Entries smaller (bigger) than 1 indicate that the given model yields forecasts that are more (less) accurate than those from the baseline. The Tables also report the ALPL relative to the benchmark model. Values of ALPL higher (lower) than 1 signify better (worse) performance than the benchmark.

With three different variables, eight different forecast horizons and two different forecast metrics, virtually every model can be found to do well for some cases, but several observations can be made.

First, TVP-MAI-SV is one of the best models for all the main variables, improving upon its counterparts (MAI, TVP-MAI, MAI-SV) especially at the short horizon.

Second, an important pattern emerges from the Tables. Adding SV to the MAI improve significantly the point and density forecast performances, this finding is in line with [Carrierio et al. \(2019\)](#). On all Tables the \mathcal{M}_7 and \mathcal{M}_8 models show worse performance than models \mathcal{M}_1 , \mathcal{M}_2 , \mathcal{M}_3 and \mathcal{M}_4 . Moreover the \mathcal{M}_5 and \mathcal{M}_6 show the poor performance of TVP-MAI homoskedastic models. Tables 3-5 are a clear demonstration of the importance of allowing for heteroskedastic errors to get good RMSFE, MAFE and predictive likelihood. One final point regards the usefulness of adding time-varying parameters in the MAI-SV. The Tables show that the two models have comparable point forecast performance, the TVP-MAI-SV has always better predictive likelihood.

Overall, the results show that the TVP-MAI-SV guarantees safe forecasting compared with the other competitors such as the TVP-VAR-SV (see KK) and more similar models like the TVP-FAVAR-SV as described in [Koop and Korobilis \(2014\)](#).

5 Conclusions

Many economic variables features changing mean and volatility, TVP-VAR with stochastic volatility are commonly used to model those features. Starting from the recent MAI literature the paper introduces the TVP-MAI-SV that can handle large datasets. The paper introduces a new estimation methodology that substantially reduces the computational burden, and allows to select in real time, the number of indexes and other features of the data using DMS and DMA without further computational cost.

The paper proposes two empirical applications. The first provides a measure of uncertainty using the TVP-MAI-SV. We overcame endogeneity problems coming from the co-movement of macroeconomic variables by extracting a set of common unobservable factors representing the underlying aggregate uncertainty affecting the levels of the component variables. We get a rich set of volatility dynamics whose path provides interesting results in terms of common and idiosyncratic volatility changes.

The new switching algorithm, reduces the computational burden, allowing to apply to large databases (in our application we consider 215 series). From an economic point of view we were able to accurately capture both the Oil Crisis as well as the the Great Recession associated with much larger uncertainty shocks but no major changes in their effects on

Table 3: Point and density forecast results for GDP. Root Mean Squared Forecast Error (RMSFE) upper panel, Median Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE), middle panel, Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL) bottom panel. Results are reported relative to the benchmark specification (M_{13}) for which the values is equal to 1, RMSFE-MAFE lower (higher) than 1 signify better (worse) performance than the benchmark. ALPL higher (lower) then 1 signify better (worse) performance. The description of the model is reported in Table 2. — — — indicates divergence of the forecast.

Mean Square Forecast Error (MSFE)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	0.5989	0.6178	0.5892	0.5890	0.7296	0.7154	0.6322	0.6429	0.8208	1.0254	—	0.7875	1.0000	0.9621	0.8183
2	0.8072	0.8249	0.8071	0.8144	—	—	0.7610	0.7687	1.0886	1.6143	—	1.0306	1.0000	0.6719	0.8359
3	0.8600	0.8550	0.8761	0.8743	—	—	0.9973	1.0003	1.4003	—	—	1.0625	1.0000	0.9011	1.2530
4	0.7182	0.7177	0.7308	0.7319	—	—	0.7338	0.7429	1.3066	—	—	0.7727	1.0000	0.8035	0.7715
5	1.0631	1.0512	1.0708	1.0689	—	—	1.1704	1.1830	—	—	—	1.1073	1.0000	0.9719	1.1174
6	1.0669	1.0605	1.0625	1.0613	—	—	1.1639	1.1810	—	—	—	1.0810	1.0000	0.9716	1.0828
7	1.0644	1.0581	1.0619	1.0610	—	—	1.0745	1.0781	—	—	—	1.0817	1.0000	0.9738	1.0960
8	1.0607	1.0566	1.0535	1.0535	—	—	1.0864	1.0955	—	—	—	1.0806	1.0000	0.9716	1.1063

Mean Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	0.7548	0.7619	0.7570	0.7587	0.7605	0.7516	0.7452	0.7558	0.9040	0.7966	—	0.7948	1.0000	0.9898	0.8505
2	0.8596	0.8707	0.8622	0.8648	0.9452	0.9485	0.8468	0.8514	0.9964	0.9609	—	0.9345	1.0000	0.8203	0.9067
3	0.8783	0.8795	0.8910	0.8901	1.1748	1.1708	0.9266	0.9296	1.1909	1.2577	—	0.9486	1.0000	0.9363	0.9600
4	0.8187	0.8199	0.8276	0.8283	1.3873	1.3912	0.8298	0.8321	1.1560	1.3600	—	0.8291	1.0000	0.8865	0.8613
5	1.0076	1.0024	1.0085	1.0075	—	—	1.0399	1.0425	1.4274	—	—	1.0126	1.0000	0.9654	1.0453
6	1.0083	1.0051	1.0035	1.0035	—	—	1.0343	1.0363	1.4354	—	—	1.0063	1.0000	0.9629	1.0227
7	1.0048	1.0012	1.0019	1.0015	—	—	1.0121	1.0130	1.5180	—	—	1.0245	1.0000	0.9640	1.0284
8	0.9993	0.9957	0.9955	0.9953	—	—	0.9994	1.0042	1.5703	—	—	1.0126	1.0000	0.9589	1.0390

Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	1.7176	1.7277	1.6432	1.6455	1.3031	1.3031	1.3031	1.3031	1.3031	1.3031	1.0000	1.0046	1.4581	1.4581	1.4581
2	1.6248	1.6415	1.5459	1.5478	1.2565	1.2565	1.2573	1.2573	1.2575	1.2577	1.0000	0.9844	1.4621	1.4621	1.4621
3	1.5443	1.5535	1.4806	1.4803	1.2468	1.2468	1.2477	1.2477	1.2508	1.2515	1.0000	0.9807	1.4666	1.4666	1.4666
4	1.5332	1.5407	1.4712	1.4711	1.2321	1.2321	1.2339	1.2339	1.2368	1.2374	1.0000	0.9831	1.4566	1.4566	1.4566
5	1.5347	1.5430	1.4726	1.4725	1.2289	1.2289	1.2306	1.2306	1.2341	1.2349	1.0000	0.9821	1.4598	1.4598	1.4598
6	1.5264	1.5343	1.4634	1.4632	1.2206	1.2206	1.2226	1.2226	1.2253	1.2262	1.0000	0.9805	1.4576	1.4576	1.4576
7	1.5239	1.5319	1.4608	1.4606	1.2176	1.2176	1.2197	1.2197	1.2226	1.2235	1.0000	0.9798	1.4563	1.4563	1.4563
8	1.5143	1.5223	1.4514	1.4512	1.2087	1.2087	1.2109	1.2109	1.2139	1.2148	1.0000	0.9782	1.4474	1.4474	1.4474

Table 4: Point and density forecast results for CPI Inflation. Root Mean Squared Forecast Error (RMSFE) upper panel, Median Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE), middle panel, Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL) bottom panel. Results are reported relative to the benchmark specification (\mathcal{M}_{13}) for which the values is equal to 1, RMSFE-MAFE lower (higher) than 1 signify better (worse) performance than the benchmark. ALPL higher (lower) than 1 signify better (worse) performance. The description of the model is reported in Table 2. — — indicates divergence of the forecast.

Mean Square Forecast Error (MSFE)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	1.0061	0.9992	1.0415	1.0408	—	—	1.3206	1.3265	—	1.6301	—	0.8885	1.0000	0.9971	1.0621
2	0.8491	0.8644	0.8311	0.8330	—	—	0.9159	0.9197	—	1.1349	—	1.0564	1.0000	0.9398	0.7965
3	0.8939	0.9081	0.8812	0.8801	—	—	0.9126	0.9143	1.4230	1.4269	—	0.8852	1.0000	0.9248	0.9016
4	0.9667	0.9712	0.9639	0.9648	—	—	1.0104	1.0107	—	1.4161	—	0.9749	1.0000	0.9557	0.9908
5	1.0088	1.0114	1.0023	1.0034	—	—	0.9809	0.9770	—	—	—	1.0586	1.0000	0.9986	1.0296
6	0.9899	0.9923	0.9909	0.9908	—	—	1.0002	0.9998	—	—	—	1.0180	1.0000	0.9995	1.0184
7	0.9944	0.9941	0.9964	0.9965	—	—	1.0099	1.0094	—	—	—	1.0131	1.0000	0.9991	1.0029
8	1.0010	0.9999	0.9995	0.9996	—	—	1.0070	1.0066	—	—	—	0.9936	1.0000	0.9989	1.0069

Mean Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	0.9731	0.9670	0.9942	0.9945	1.1331	1.1567	1.0499	1.0485	1.6029	1.0888	—	0.9390	1.0000	0.9959	1.0039
2	0.9131	0.9233	0.9013	0.9027	1.1032	1.1091	0.9513	0.9564	1.4702	0.9717	—	1.0166	1.0000	0.9722	0.8789
3	0.9201	0.9278	0.9128	0.9133	1.3179	1.3263	0.9349	0.9382	1.1703	1.0347	—	0.9298	1.0000	0.9727	0.9459
4	0.9644	0.9675	0.9641	0.9642	1.8109	1.8308	1.0004	1.0019	1.4349	1.0776	—	0.9780	1.0000	0.9781	0.9875
5	0.9985	0.9992	0.9939	0.9945	—	—	0.9813	0.9794	1.5745	1.2265	—	1.0306	1.0000	0.9995	1.0213
6	0.9877	0.9899	0.9864	0.9864	—	—	0.9958	0.9954	1.3528	1.1740	—	1.0076	1.0000	0.9969	1.0027
7	0.9886	0.9898	0.9903	0.9903	—	—	1.0076	1.0082	1.4098	1.5174	—	1.0070	1.0000	0.9961	1.0055
8	0.9912	0.9904	0.9898	0.9898	—	—	0.9962	0.9965	1.6238	1.4867	—	0.9883	1.0000	0.9937	0.9818

Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL)															
H	\mathcal{M}_1	\mathcal{M}_2	\mathcal{M}_3	\mathcal{M}_4	\mathcal{M}_5	\mathcal{M}_6	\mathcal{M}_7	\mathcal{M}_8	\mathcal{M}_9	\mathcal{M}_{10}	\mathcal{M}_{11}	\mathcal{M}_{12}	\mathcal{M}_{13}	\mathcal{M}_{14}	\mathcal{M}_{15}
1	1.2543	1.2477	1.2441	1.2442	1.2681	1.2442	1.2681	1.2681	1.2681	1.2681	1.0000	1.0304	1.3009	1.3009	1.3009
2	1.1629	1.1525	1.1585	1.1553	1.2024	1.1553	1.2024	1.2002	1.1874	1.1871	1.0000	1.0189	1.3135	1.3135	1.3135
3	1.1704	1.1599	1.1652	1.1620	1.1837	1.1620	1.1837	1.1825	1.1846	1.1845	1.0000	1.0211	1.3233	1.3233	1.3233
4	1.1614	1.1475	1.1590	1.1555	1.1676	1.1555	1.1676	1.1669	1.1696	1.1696	1.0000	1.0155	1.3208	1.3208	1.3208
5	1.1446	1.1332	1.1441	1.1408	1.1342	1.1408	1.1342	1.1327	1.1363	1.1364	1.0000	1.0121	1.3106	1.3106	1.3106
6	1.1508	1.1398	1.1525	1.1491	1.1391	1.1491	1.1391	1.1372	1.1434	1.1435	1.0000	1.0124	1.3228	1.3228	1.3228
7	1.1443	1.1338	1.1469	1.1435	1.1321	1.1435	1.1321	1.1302	1.1372	1.1372	1.0000	1.0122	1.3175	1.3175	1.3175
8	1.1395	1.1291	1.1427	1.1393	1.1260	1.1393	1.1260	1.1240	1.1316	1.1317	1.0000	1.0121	1.3130	1.3130	1.3130

Table 5: Point and density forecast results for Federal Funds Rate. Root Mean Squared Forecast Error (RMSFE) upper panel, Median Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE), middle panel, Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL) bottom panel. Results are reported relative to the benchmark specification (M_{13}) for which the values is equal to 1, RMSFE-MAFE lower (higher) than 1 signify better (worse) performance than the benchmark. ALPL higher (lower) then 1 signify better (worse) performance. The description of the model is reported in Table 2. — — indicates divergence of the forecast.

Mean Square Forecast Error (MSFE)															
H	M_1	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9	M_{10}	M_{11}	M_{12}	M_{13}	M_{14}	M_{15}
1	1.0169	1.0492	0.9920	0.9975	0.9432	0.8942	1.2031	1.2534	1.6167	1.4448	—	—	1.0000	1.0257	1.0797
2	1.0618	1.0669	1.0672	1.0686	1.5283	1.5521	1.2092	1.2049	2.2307	1.6105	—	1.2776	1.0000	1.0070	1.1305
3	0.9844	0.9845	0.9880	0.9865	—	—	1.2535	1.2648	1.8044	1.6272	—	1.2062	1.0000	1.0036	1.1549
4	1.0058	1.0084	1.0063	1.0103	—	—	1.0891	1.0907	1.7889	—	—	1.1566	1.0000	0.9999	1.2485
5	0.9807	0.9824	0.9878	0.9873	—	—	1.0565	1.0628	1.6379	—	—	1.1301	1.0000	0.9958	1.0943
6	0.9935	0.9957	0.9969	0.9967	—	—	1.0894	1.0908	—	—	—	1.0798	1.0000	0.9901	1.1044
7	1.0107	1.0082	1.0066	1.0059	—	—	1.0662	1.0675	—	—	—	1.0645	1.0000	0.9906	0.9893
8	1.0005	1.0009	0.9973	0.9993	—	—	1.0577	1.0610	—	—	—	1.0392	1.0000	0.9927	1.0508

Mean Absolute Forecast Error (MAFE)															
H	M_1	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9	M_{10}	M_{11}	M_{12}	M_{13}	M_{14}	M_{15}
1	0.9849	1.0078	0.9626	0.9679	1.1551	1.1323	1.2447	1.2623	1.0871	1.2772	—	1.6658	1.0000	1.0376	1.0137
2	1.0021	1.0082	1.0000	1.0013	1.2102	1.2188	1.2064	1.2076	1.4070	1.3413	—	1.2075	1.0000	1.0369	1.1817
3	0.9946	0.9957	0.9893	0.9890	1.3053	1.3146	1.2017	1.2126	1.3457	1.2529	—	1.1237	1.0000	1.0325	1.0834
4	0.9819	0.9818	0.9783	0.9793	1.5724	1.5881	1.1179	1.1264	1.3241	1.3810	—	1.0762	1.0000	1.0282	1.0904
5	0.9721	0.9724	0.9659	0.9652	1.9735	1.9804	1.0762	1.0817	1.3743	1.3477	—	1.0754	1.0000	1.0220	1.0249
6	0.9789	0.9750	0.9715	0.9716	—	—	1.0784	1.0827	1.5579	1.5628	—	1.0099	1.0000	1.0202	1.0444
7	0.9795	0.9754	0.9718	0.9717	—	—	1.0756	1.0768	1.6735	1.6391	—	1.0108	1.0000	1.0189	0.9944
8	0.9715	0.9689	0.9672	0.9675	—	—	1.0400	1.0400	1.5535	—	—	0.9869	1.0000	1.0182	1.0296

Average Log Predictive Likelihood (ALPL)															
H	M_1	M_2	M_3	M_4	M_5	M_6	M_7	M_8	M_9	M_{10}	M_{11}	M_{12}	M_{13}	M_{14}	M_{15}
1	1.4291	1.4162	1.3453	1.3500	0.9299	0.9409	0.9169	0.9409	0.9169	0.9176	1.0000	1.0412	1.0197	—	—
2	1.3384	1.3295	1.2789	1.2839	0.9266	0.9297	0.9159	0.9297	0.9159	0.9177	1.0000	1.0100	0.9865	—	—
3	1.2732	1.2668	1.2203	1.2235	0.9336	0.9341	0.9168	0.9341	0.9168	0.9171	1.0000	1.0055	1.0096	—	—
4	1.2434	1.2339	1.2038	1.2063	0.9162	0.9166	0.9153	0.9166	0.9153	0.9167	1.0000	1.0038	1.0127	—	—
5	1.2209	1.2116	1.1935	1.1965	0.9207	0.9209	0.9155	0.9209	0.9155	0.9162	1.0000	1.0027	1.0282	—	—
6	1.2157	1.2065	1.1896	1.1920	0.9109	0.9061	0.9145	0.9061	0.9145	0.9160	1.0000	1.0035	1.0208	—	—
7	1.2187	1.2072	1.1935	1.1961	0.9170	0.9151	0.9155	0.9151	0.9155	0.9167	1.0000	1.0037	1.0357	—	—
8	1.2271	1.2171	1.1989	1.2013	0.9221	0.9190	0.9235	0.9190	0.9235	0.9249	1.0000	1.0032	1.0415	—	—

the economy.

The second empirical application shows the out-of-sample forecasting performance of the TVP-MAI-SV. Using both point and density forecast, we found that the TVP-MAI-SV model has good forecasting performance compared to a set of multivariate and univariate competitors.

Appendix A: Methodology

The model described in Section 2 allows for great flexibility e.g. different number of indexes over time. From a technical point of view, handling such a large number of combinations is not just computationally cumbersome but also memory intensive. [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#) recently proposed the forgetting factor methodology that allows for an online estimation of the time-varying parameters plus Dynamic Model Averaging (DMA) and Dynamic Model Selection (DMS).

Following the discussion in Subsection 3.3, let us consider K possible models at each time point t . The number of models is a combination of number of indexes, values of λ and values of κ . Considering all the possible combination will increase exponentially the number of models.

The state space model takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)} \boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t^{(k)}, & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t^{(k)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}_t^{(k)}), \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} &= \boldsymbol{\beta}_{t-1}^{(k)} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(k)}, & \boldsymbol{\eta}_t^{(k)} &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{Q}^{(k)}), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where \mathbf{y}_t is the vector of observed time series at time t , $\mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)}$ is the stack of all the indexes depending on the unknown $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ (i.e. $\mathbf{Z}_t = I_N \otimes (f_{1,t}, \dots, f_{q,t})$ and $\mathbf{f}_t = \boldsymbol{\omega}' \mathbf{y}_t$), $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)}$ is (possibly) an $Nq \times 1$ vector containing the time varying $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ s (states), which are assumed to follow a random walk dynamic, see Subsection 3.1. Finally $k = \{1, \dots, K\}$ indicates the possible models based on a specific “sub”- set of: indexes, values of λ and values of κ .

The contemporaneous estimation of these models can be computationally cumbersome and even be infeasible with maximum likelihood or MCMC methods. To overcome this issue [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#) introduce an approximated KF that avoid the calculation \mathbf{Q}_t using a hyperparameter λ . [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#) applied this methodology to forecast inflation, they also add the estimation of a time-varying \mathbf{H}_t via EWMA that requires a decay factor κ .

The main step in the Kalman filter recursions, for a give model k , is given by:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{t-1}^{(k)} | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)}), \quad (11)$$

where, $\mathbf{Y}_{t-1} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{t-1})$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)} = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{t-1}^{(k)} | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1})$ and $\Sigma_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)} = \text{Var}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{t-1}^{(k)} | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1})$. At each time point t , the algorithm iterates between: prediction equation, updating equation and the predictive density:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t|t-1}^{(k)}, \Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)}), \quad (12)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} | \mathbf{Y}_t \sim \mathcal{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t|t}^{(k)}, \Sigma_{t|t}^{(k)}), \quad (13)$$

$$\mathbf{y}_t | \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t|t-1}^{(k)}, \mathbf{H}_t^{(k)} + \mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)} \Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)} \mathbf{Z}_t^{(k)'}). \quad (14)$$

The quantity $\Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)}$ depends on the error variances: $\Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)} = \Sigma_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)} + \mathbf{Q}_t^{(k)}$. [Raftery et al. \(2010\)](#) proposed an approximation given by:

$$\Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} \Sigma_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)}. \quad (15)$$

Correspondingly, $\mathbf{Q}_t^{(k)} = (\frac{1}{\lambda} - 1) \Sigma_{t-1|t-1}^{(k)}$ with $\lambda \in (0, 1]$. The tuning parameter λ plays a crucial role in adjusting the effective memory of the algorithm, leading to a weighted estimation where data at i time points in the past has weight λ^i . For example, in the case of quarterly macroeconomic data, $\lambda = 0.99$ implies that observations five years ago receive approximately 80% as much weight as the last period of observation. This leads to a fairly stable model where coefficient change is gradual. When $\lambda = 1$, we have a constant parameter case.

It is well known that both macroeconomic and financial time series are characterized by heteroskedastic effects, therefore, following [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#) $\mathbf{H}_t^{(k)}$ is assumed to follow an EWMA:

$$\mathbf{H}_t = \kappa \mathbf{H}_{t-1}^{(k)} + (1 - \kappa) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t^{2(k)}. \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t^{(k)} = \mathbf{y}_t - \mathbf{Z}_t \boldsymbol{\beta}_t$ is given as output from the Kalman filter. The estimator that requires a value for the decay factor κ , following [Koop and Korobilis \(2013\)](#) the values for κ are in the region of (0.94, 0.98). Moreover, the initial condition $\hat{\Sigma}_0$ is set to the sample covariance matrix of \mathbf{y}_t .

To carry out the model selection dynamically we use the following posterior probabilities:

$$\begin{aligned} p(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t, \mathcal{M}_t | \mathbf{Y}_t) &= \sum_{k=1}^K p(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} | \mathcal{M}_t = k, \mathbf{Y}_t) p(\mathcal{M}_t = k | \mathbf{Y}_t) = \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^K p(\boldsymbol{\beta}_t^{(k)} | \mathcal{M}_t = k, \mathbf{Y}_t) \pi_{t|t,k}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We need expression for the $p(\mathcal{M}_t = k|Y_t)$, similar to the state equation recursion, we have the model prediction equation (18) and the the model updating equation (19):

$$\pi_{t|t-1,k} = \sum_{l=1}^K \pi_{t-1|t-1,l} p_{kl}, \quad (18)$$

$$\pi_{t|t,k} = \frac{\pi_{t|t-1,k} p_k(\mathbf{y}_t|Y_{t-1})}{\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_{t|t-1,l} p_l(\mathbf{y}_t|Y_{t-1})}. \quad (19)$$

where $p_k(\mathbf{y}_t|Y_{t-1})$ is the predictive density. We have to underline that the model prediction equation requires to estimate the $K \times K$ elements of p_{kl} , this is replaced by an approximation:

$$\pi_{t|t-1,k} = \frac{\pi_{t-1|t-1,k}^\alpha}{\sum_{l=1}^K \pi_{t-1|t-1,l}^\alpha}, \quad (20)$$

To interpret α let us take:

$$\pi_{t|t-1,k} \propto [\pi_{t-1|t-2,k} p_k(\mathbf{y}_{t-1}|Y_{t-2})]^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} [p_k(\mathbf{y}_{t-i}|Y_{t-i-1})]^\alpha. \quad (21)$$

where $p_k(\mathbf{y}_{t-i}|Y_{t-i-1})$ is the predictive density for the model k evaluated at \mathbf{y}_{t-i} with $i = 1, \dots, t-1$.

The forgetting factor $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ gives a measure of the model performance rate of decay, the forecast performance recorded i periods in the past has a significance equal to α^i . Note that when $\alpha = 0$ all models are equally probable for every t , the weights of the models remain unchanged from the prior, $\pi_{0|0,k} = 1/K$. Finally, [Koop and Korobilis \(2012\)](#) refer to the special case $\alpha = 1$ as Bayesian Model Averaging (BMA) which is very popular in macroeconomics and finance, see [Koop and Potter \(2004\)](#).

From the recursive iteration a prediction for every model k is obtained:

$$\mathbf{y}_t | \mathcal{M}_t = k, Y_{t-1} \sim \mathcal{N} \left(Z_t^{(k)} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t|t-1}^{(k)}, \mathbf{H}_t^{(k)} + Z_t^{(k)} \Sigma_{t|t-1}^{(k)} Z_t^{(k)'} \right). \quad (22)$$

DMA comes from a weighted average of all the the weights of the models that are the conditional probabilities $P(\mathcal{M}_t = k|Y_{t-1}) = \pi_{t|t-1,k}$ computed using the information up to time $t-1$ for $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$:

$$\mathbf{y}_{DMA_t} = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{y}_t | Y_{t-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_{t|t-1,k} Z_t^{(k)} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{t|t-1}^{(k)}. \quad (23)$$

DMS selects and uses, at time t the model with the highest predictive power capacity to make predictions of the dependent variable.

The definition of a prior for $\pi_{0|0,k}$ and $\beta_0^{(k)}$ is essential to implement DMA, DMS and BMA. A non-informative prior is chosen for both the states and the weights. In particular, $\pi_{0|0,k} = 1/K$ and $\beta_0^{(k)} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I})$ for $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots, K$. This means that, at the beginning, all models are equally likely.

Appendix B: Factor Identification and Volatility Decomposition

The structural analysis reported in Section 4 requires index identification. Following [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#) the structure of the ω matrix takes the following form:

$$\omega_* = \begin{bmatrix} \text{RI} & \text{NI} & \text{LMI} & \text{PI} & \text{FI} \\ \hline 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \omega_{2,RI} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \omega_{n_{RI},RI} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_{2,NI} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \omega_{n_{NI},NI} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_{2,LMI} & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_{n_{LMI},LMI} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{1,PI} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{n_{PI},PI} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{2,FI} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_{n_{FI},FI} \end{bmatrix}$$

where $n = \{n_{RI}, n_{NI}, n_{LMI}, n_{PI}, n_{FI}\}$, the first series load with a parameter equal to 1 and the rest are freely estimated. Please note that we have $q = 5$ factors.

Tables 6 to Table 10 contains the list of series that belong to each unknown factor. For example, Table 6 report the series belonging to the first factor, the GDP has loading equal

to 1 and the rest are freely estimated.

Equation (6), the OLS step of the SA algorithm in Section 3, can be re-written as:

$$\underbrace{(\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{T-p}) \text{Vec}(\mathbf{Y})}_{\mathbf{Y}_*} = \underbrace{(\mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{T-p}) \mathbf{X}}_{\mathbf{X}_*} \text{Vec}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) + \text{Vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t \mathbf{H}_t^{-1/2}),$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}'_T, \dots, \mathbf{Y}'_{p+1}]'$, $\mathbf{X} = \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} \beta_{j,t} \otimes \mathbf{Y}_{-j}$, $\mathbf{Y}_{-j} = \mathbf{L}^j \mathbf{Y}$, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t = (\varepsilon'_{T}, \dots, \varepsilon'_{p+1})'$.

Assuming that the matrix $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ has the following structure:

$$\boldsymbol{\omega} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\omega}_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \boldsymbol{\omega}_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & \boldsymbol{\omega}_q \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_i$ is an n_i -vector for $i = 1, \dots, q$ with $\sum_{i=1}^q n_i = n$. Then $\text{Vec}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = (\boldsymbol{\omega}'_1, 0'_n, \boldsymbol{\omega}'_2, 0'_n, \dots, \boldsymbol{\omega}'_q)'$ and can be factorized as follows $\text{Vec}(\boldsymbol{\omega}) = \mathbf{M} \boldsymbol{\omega}_*$ where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_* = (\boldsymbol{\omega}'_1, \boldsymbol{\omega}'_2, \dots, \boldsymbol{\omega}'_q)'$ and:

$$\mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{I}_{n_1} & 0_{n_1 \times n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n_1 \times n_q} \\ 0_{n \times n_1} & 0_{n \times n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n \times n_q} \\ 0_{n_2 \times n_1} & \mathbf{I}_{n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n_2 \times n_q} \\ 0_{n \times n_1} & 0_{n \times n_2} & \cdots & 0_{n \times n_q} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0_{n_q \times n_1} & 0_{n_q \times n_2} & \cdots & \mathbf{I}_{n_q} \end{bmatrix}.$$

It follows that the restricted OLS estimate of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_*$ is:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\omega}}_* = (\mathbf{M}' \mathbf{X}'_* \mathbf{X}_* \mathbf{M})^{-1} \mathbf{X}'_* \mathbf{M}' \mathbf{Y}_*.$$

Following [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#) and [Centoni and Cubadda \(2003\)](#) we have for the TVP-MAI-SV the following decomposition:

$$\mathbf{I}_n = \mathbf{H}_t \boldsymbol{\omega}'_* \boldsymbol{\xi}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}'_* + \boldsymbol{\omega}'_{*\perp} (\boldsymbol{\omega}_{*\perp} \mathbf{H}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}'_{*\perp})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{*\perp} \mathbf{H}_t^{-1}, \quad (24)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \boldsymbol{\omega}_* \mathbf{H}_t \boldsymbol{\omega}'_*$ and where $\boldsymbol{\omega}_{*\perp}$ is the $(n-r) \times n$ orthogonal matrix of $\boldsymbol{\omega}_*$, such that $\boldsymbol{\omega}_* \boldsymbol{\omega}'_{*\perp} = 0_{r \times (n-r)}$. Following [Carriero et al. \(2020\)](#) the total volatility \mathbf{H}_t can be decomposed into the volatility of the common and idiosyncratic components. Specifically:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_t &= \mathbf{H}_t^{com} + \mathbf{H}_t^{idio} \\ \mathbf{H}_t^{com} &= \mathbf{H}_t \boldsymbol{\omega}'_* \boldsymbol{\xi}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}_* \mathbf{H}_t \\ \mathbf{H}_t^{idio} &= \boldsymbol{\omega}'_{*\perp} (\boldsymbol{\omega}_{*\perp} \mathbf{H}_t^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}'_{*\perp})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{*\perp} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Appendix C: Dataset description

The quarterly data are download from Fred-Database and they run from 1960:1 to 2019:4. All the variables are transformed to achieve stationarity and then standardized using the Matlab code provided by FRED and available at the following web page <https://research.stlouisfed.org/econ/mccracken/fred-databases/>, see [McCracken and Ng \(2020\)](#). To simplify the reading the full dataset, composed by 215 series, it is divided into five tables that represents the factor found and discussed in Section 4.2. The series in bold are used in the forecasting exercise discussed in Section 4.3.

Table 6: Real Factor Composition. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Real Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in *McCracken and Ng (2020)*. The table reports for each series the abbreviation, the full name of the series and the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report, in bold, the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
<i>Group 1: NIPA</i>			
1	GDPC96	GDP	Real Gross Domestic Product, 3 Decimal (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
2	PCECC96	Consumption	Real Personal Consumption Expenditures (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
3	PINCOME		Personal Income
4	PCDGx	Cons:Dur	Real personal consumption expenditures: Durable goods (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
5	PCSVx	Cons:Svc	Real Personal Consumption Expenditures: Services (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
6	PCNDx	Cons:NonDur	Real Personal Consumption Expenditures: Services (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
7	FPIx	FixedInv	Real private fixed investment (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
8	Y033RC1Q027SBEx	GDPIG96	Software & Real Gross Private Domestic Investment (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
9	PNF1x	FixInv:NonRes	Real private fixed investment: Nonresidential (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
10	PRF1x	FixedInv:Res	Real private fixed investment: Residential (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
11	A014RE1Q156NBEA	Inv:Inventories	Shares of gross domestic product: Residential (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
12	GCEC1	Gov:Spending	Real Government Consumption Expenditures & Gross Investment (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
13	A823RL1Q225SBEA	Gov:Fed	Real Government Consumption Expenditures and Gross Investment: Federal (Percent Change from Preceding Period)
14	FGRECPTx	Real Gov Receipts	Real Federal Government Current Receipts (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated using PCE
15	SLCEX	Gov:State	Local & Real government state and local consumption expenditures (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
16	EXPGSC1	Exports	Real Exports of Goods & Services, 3 Decimal (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
17	IMPSCS1	Imports	Real Imports of Goods & Services, 3 Decimal (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
18	DPIC96	Disp-Income	Real Disposable Personal Income (Billions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
19	OUTNFB	Output:NFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Real Output (Index 2012=100)
20	OUTBS	Output:BS	Business Sector: Real Output (Index 2012=100)
21	B020RE1Q156NBEA		Shares of gross domestic product: Exports of goods and services (Percent)
22	B021RE1Q156NBEA		Shares of gross domestic product: Imports of goods and services (Percent)
<i>Group 2: Industrial Production</i>			
23	INDPRO	IP:Total index	Industrial Production Index (Index 2012=100)
24	IPFINAL	IP:Final products	Industrial Production: Final Products (Market Group) (Index 2012=100)
25	IPCONGD	IP:Consumer goods	Industrial Production: Consumer Goods (Index 2012=100)
26	IPMAT	IP:Materials	Industrial Production: Materials (Index 2012=100)
27	IPDMAT	IP:Dur gds materials	Industrial Production: Durable Materials (Index 2012=100)
28	IPNMAT	IP:Nondur gds materials	Industrial Production: Nondurable Materials (Index 2012=100)
29	IPDCONGD	IP:Dur Cons. Goods	Industrial Production: Durable Consumer Goods (Index 2012=100)
30	IPB5110SQ	IP:Auto	Industrial Production: Durable Goods: Automotive products (Index 2012=100)
31	IPNCONGD	IP:NonDur Cons God	Industrial Production: Nondurable Consumer Goods (Index 2012=100)
32	IPBUSEQ	IP:Bus Equip	Industrial Production: Business Equipment (Index 2012=100)
33	IPB51220SQ	IP:Energy Prds	Industrial Production: Consumer energy products (Index 2012=100)
34	CUMFNS	Capu Man.	Capacity Utilization: Manufacturing (SIC) (Percent of Capacity)
35	IPMANSICS		Industrial Production: Manufacturing (SIC) (Index 2012=100)
36	IPB51222S		Industrial Production: Residential Utilities (Index 2012=100)
37	IPFUELS		Industrial Production: Fuels (Index 2012=100)
38		PMI	Purchasing Managers Index

Table 7: Real Factor Composition continued. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Real Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in *McCracken and Ng (2020)*. The table reports for each series the abbreviation we use in the paper, the full name of the series, the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report in bold the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
Group 3: Earnings and Productivity			
39	CES3000000008x	Real AHE:MFG	Real Average Hourly Earnings of Production and Nonsupervisory Employees: Manufacturing (2012 Dollars per Hour), deflated by Core PCE
40	COMPRNFB	CPH:NFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Real Compensation Per Hour (Index 2012=100)
41	RCPHBS	CPH:Bus	Business Sector: Real Compensation Per Hour (Index 2012=100)
42	OPHNFB	OPH:nfb	Nonfarm Business Sector: Real Output Per Hour of All Persons (Index 2012=100)
43	OPHBS	OPH:Bus	Business Sector: Real Output Per Hour of All Persons (Index 2012=100)
44	ULCBS	ULC:Bus	Business Sector: Unit Labor Cost (Index 2012=100)
45	ULCNFB	ULC:NFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Unit Labor Cost (Index 2012=100)
46	UNLPNBS	UNLPay:nfb	Nonfarm Business Sector: Unit Nonlabor Payments (Index 2012=100)
47	CES06000000008		Average Hourly Earnings of Production and Nonsupervisory Employees: Goods-Producing (Dollars per Hour)
Group 4: Housing			
48	HOUST	Hstarts	Housing Starts: Total: New Privately Owned Housing Units Started (Thousands of Units)
49	HOUST5F	Hstarts ⁵ units	Privately Owned Housing Starts: 5-Unit Structures or More (Thousands of Units)
50	HOUSTMW	Hstarts:MW	Housing Starts in Midwest Census Region (Thousands of Units)
51	HOUSTNE	Hstarts:NE	Housing Starts in Northeast Census Region (Thousands of Units)
52	HOUSTS	Hstarts:S	Housing Starts in South Census Region (Thousands of Units)
53	HOUSTW	Hstarts:W	Housing Starts in West Census Region (Thousands of Units)
Group 5: Inventories, Orders and Sales			
54	CMRMTSPLx	MT Sales	Real Manufacturing and Trade Industries Sales (Millions of Chained 2012 Dollars)
55	RSAFSx	Ret. Sale	Real Retail and Food Services Sales (Millions of Chained 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
56	AMDMNOx	Orders (DurMfg)	Real Manufacturers' New Orders: Durable Goods (Millions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
57	AMDMUOx	UnfOrders(DurGds)	Real Value of Manufacturers' Unfilled Orders for Durable Goods Industries (Millions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
58	BUSINVx		Total Business Inventories (Millions of Dollars)
59	ISRATIOx		Total Business: Inventories to Sales Ratio
60		NAPMNOI	New Orders Manufacturing

Table 8: Nominal Factor Composition. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Nominal Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in [McCracken and Ng \(2020\)](#). The table reports for each series the abbreviation we use in the paper, the full name of the series, the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report in bold the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
<i>Group 1: Interest Rates</i>			
1	TB3MS		3-Month Treasury Bill: Secondary Market Rate (Percent)
2	TB6MS		6-Month Treasury Bill: Secondary Market Rate (Percent)
3	GS1		1-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate (Percent)
4	GS10		10-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate (Percent)
5	AAA		Moody's Seasoned Aaa Corporate Bond Yield [Ⓞ] (Percent)
6	BAA		Moody's Seasoned Baa Corporate Bond Yield [Ⓞ] (Percent)
7	BAA10YM		Moody's Seasoned Baa Corporate Bond Yield Relative to Yield on 10-Year Treasury Constant Maturity (Percent)
8	TB6M3Mx		6-Month Treasury Bill Minus 3-Month Treasury Bill, secondary market (Percent)
9	GS1TB3Mx		1-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Minus 3-Month Treasury Bill, secondary market (Percent)
10	GS10TB3Mx		10-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Minus 3-Month Treasury Bill, secondary market (Percent)
11	CPF3MTB3Mx		3-Month Commercial Paper Minus 3-Month Treasury Bill, secondary market (Percent)
12	GS5		5-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate
13	TB3SMFFM		3-Month Treasury Constant Maturity Minus Federal Funds Rate
14	T5YFFM		5-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Minus Federal Funds Rate
15	AAAFFM		Moody's Seasoned Aaa Corporate Bond Minus Federal Funds Rate
16	CP3M		3-Month AA Financial Commercial Paper Rate
17	COMPAPFF		3-Month Commercial Paper Minus Federal Funds Rate
<i>Group 2: Exchange Rates</i>			
18	EXUSUKx	Ex rate:UK	U.S. / U.K. Foreign Exchange Rate
19	EXSZUSx	Ex rate:Switz	Switzerland / U.S. Foreign Exchange Rate
20	EXJPUSx	Ex rate:Japan	Japan / U.S. Foreign Exchange Rate
21	EXCAUSx	EX rate:Canada	Canada / U.S. Foreign Exchange Rate
<i>Group 3: Money and Credit</i>			
22	BOGMBASEREALx		Monetary Base (Millions of 1982-84 Dollars), deflated by CPI
23	M1REAL		Real M1 Money Stock (Billions of 1982-84 Dollars), deflated by CPI
24	M2REAL		Real M2 Money Stock (Billions of 1982-84 Dollars), deflated by CPI
25	MZMREAL		Real MZM Money Stock (Billions of 1982-84 Dollars), deflated by CPI
26	BUSLOANSx		Real Commercial and Industrial Loans, All Commercial Banks (Billions of 2012 U.S. Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
27	CONSUMERx		Real Consumer Loans at All Commercial Banks (Billions of 2012 U.S. Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
28	NONREVSLx		Real Nonrevolving Credit Owned and Securitized, Outstanding (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
29	REALLNx		Real Real Estate Loans, All Commercial Banks (Billions of 2012 U.S. Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
30	TOTALSLx		Real Consumer Credit Outstanding (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
31	TOTRESNS		Total Reserves of Depository Institutions (Billions of Dollars)
32	NONBORRES		Reserves Of Depository Institutions, Nonborrowed (Millions of Dollars)
33	DTCOLNVHFNM		Consumer Motor Vehicle Loans Outstanding Owned by Finance Companies (Millions of Dollars)
34	DTCTHFNM		Total Consumer Loans and Leases Outstanding Owned and Securitized by Finance Companies (Millions of Dollars)
35	INVEST		Securities in Bank Credit at All Commercial Banks (Billions of Dollars)
36	BORROW		Total Borrowings of Depository Institutions
37	M1SL		M1 Money Stock
38	M2SL		M2 Money Stock

Table 9: Labour Market Factor Composition. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Labour Market Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in *McCracken and Ng (2020)*. The table reports for each series the abbreviation we use in the paper, the full name of the series, the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report in bold the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
<i>Group 1: Employment and Unemployment</i>			
1	PAYEMS	Emp:Nonfarm	All Employees: Total nonfarm (Thousands of Persons)
2	USPRIV	Emp:Private	All Employees: Total Private Industries (Thousands of Persons)
3	MANEMP	Emp:mfg	All Employees: Manufacturing (Thousands of Persons)
4	SRVPRD	Emp:Services	All Employees: Service-Providing Industries (Thousands of Persons)
5	USGOOD	Emp:Goods	All Employees: Goods-Producing Industries (Thousands of Persons)
6	DMANEMP	Emp:DurGoods	All Employees: Durable goods (Thousands of Persons)
7	NDMANEMP	Emp:Nondur Goods	All Employees: Nondurable goods (Thousands of Persons)
8	USCONS	Emp:Const	All Employees: Construction (Thousands of Persons)
9	USEHS	Emp:Edu&Health	All Employees: Education & Health Services (Thousands of Persons)
10	USFIRE	Emp:Finance	All Employees: Financial Activities (Thousands of Persons)
11	USINFO	Emp:Infor	All Employees: Information Services (Thousands of Persons)
12	USPBS	Emp:Bus Serv	All Employees: Professional & Business Services (Thousands of Persons)
13	USLAH	Emp:Leisure	All Employees: Leisure & Hospitality (Thousands of Persons)
14	USSERV	Emp:OtherSvcs	All Employees: Other Services (Thousands of Persons)
15	USMINE	Emp:Mining/NatRes	All Employees: Mining and logging (Thousands of Persons)
16	USTPU	Emp:Trade&Trans	Utilities (Thousands of Persons)
17	USGOVT	Emp:Gov	All Employees: Government (Thousands of Persons)
18	USTRADE	Emp:Retail	All Employees: Retail Trade (Thousands of Persons)
19	USWTRADE	Emp:Wholesal	All Employees: Wholesale Trade (Thousands of Persons)
20	CES9091000001	Emp:Gov(Fed)	All Employees: Government: Federal (Thousands of Persons)
21	CES9092000001	Emp:Gov (State)	All Employees: Government: State Government (Thousands of Persons)
22	CE16OV	Emp:Gov (Local)	All Employees: Government: Local Government (Thousands of Persons)
23	CIVPART	Emp:Total (HHSurve)	Civilian Employment (Thousands of Persons)
24	UNRATE	LF Part Rate	Civilian Labor Force Participation Rate (Percent)
25	UNRATE	Unemp Rate	Civilian Unemployment Rate (Percent)
26	UNRATESTx	Urate_ST	Unemployment Rate less than 27 weeks (Percent)
27	UNRATELTx	Urate_LT	Unemployment Rate for more than 27 weeks (Percent)
28	LNS140000012	Urate:Age16-19	Unemployment Rate - 16 to 19 years (Percent)
29	LNS140000025	Urate:Age;20 Men	Unemployment Rate - 20 years and over, Men (Percent)
30	LNS140000026	Urate:Age;20 Women	Unemployment Rate - 20 years and over, Women (Percent)
31	UEMPLT5	U:Dur;5wks	Number of Civilians Unemployed - Less Than 5 Weeks (Thousands of Persons)
32	UEMP5TO14	U:Dur;5-14wks	Number of Civilians Unemployed for 5 to 14 Weeks (Thousands of Persons)
33	UEMP15T26	U:dur;15-26wks	Number of Civilians Unemployed for 15 to 26 Weeks (Thousands of Persons)
34	UEMP27OV	U:Dur;27wks	Number of Civilians Unemployed for 27 Weeks and Over (Thousands of Persons)
35	LNS12632194	Emp:SlackWk	Employment Level - Part-Time for Economic Reasons, All Industries (Thousands of Persons)
36	HOABS	Emp:Hrs:Bus Sec	Business Sector: Hours of All Persons (Index 2012=100)
37	HOANBS	Emp:Hrs:nfb	Nonfarm Business Sector: Hours of All Persons (Index 2012=100)
38	AHMAN	AHMAN	Average Hourly Manufacturing
39	AWHMAN	AWH Man	Average Weekly Hours of Production and Nonsupervisory Employees: Manufacturing (Hours)
40	AWOTMAN	AWH Overtime	Average Weekly Overtime Hours of Production and Nonsupervisory Employees: Manufacturing (Hours)
41	HWIx	HelpWntd	Help-Wanted Index
42	UEMPMEAN	Urate	Average (Mean) Duration of Unemployment (Weeks)
43	CES0600000007	Urate	Average Weekly Hours of Production and Nonsupervisory Employees: Goods-Producing
44	HWIURATIOx	Urate	Ratio of Help Wanted/No. Unemployed
45	CLAIMSX	Urate	Initial Claims

Table 10: Prices Factor Composition. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Prices Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in *McCracken and Ng (2020)*. The table reports for each series the abbreviation we use in the paper, the full name of the series, the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report in bold the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
1	CPIAUCSL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items (Index 1982=84=100)
2	PCECTPI		Personal Consumption Expenditures: Chain-type Price Index (Index 2012=100)
3	PPIACO		Producer Price Index for All Commodities (Index 1982=100)
4	PCEPILFE		Personal Consumption Expenditures Excluding Food and Energy (Chain-Type Price Index) (Index 2012=100)
5	GDPCTPI		Gross Domestic Product: Chain-type Price Index (Index 2012=100)
6	GPDICTPI		Gross Private Domestic Investment: Chain-type Price Index (Index 2012=100)
7	IPDBS		Business Sector: Implicit Price Deflator (Index 2012=100)
8	DGDSRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Goods (chain-type price index)
9	DDURRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Services (chain-type price index)
10	DSERRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Durable goods (chain-type price index)
11	DNDGRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Nondurable goods (chain-type price index)
12	DHCERG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Services: Household consumption expenditures (chain-type price index)
13	DMOTRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Durable goods: Motor vehicles and parts (chain-type price index)
14	DFHRRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Furnishings and durable household equipment (chain-type price index)
15	DREQRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Durable goods: Recreational goods and vehicles (chain-type price index)
16	DODGRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Durable goods: Other durable goods (chain-type price index)
17	DFXARG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Food and beverages purchased for off-premises consumption (chain-type price index)
18	DCLORG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Nondurable goods: Clothing and footwear (chain-type price index)
19	DGOERG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Nondurable goods: Gasoline and other energy goods (chain-type price index)
20	DONGRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Nondurable goods: Other nondurable goods (chain-type price index)
21	DHUTRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Services: Housing and utilities (chain-type price index)
22	DHLCRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Services: Health care (chain-type price index)
23	DTRSRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Transportation services (chain-type price index)
24	DRCARG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Recreation services (chain-type price index)
25	DFSRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Services: Food services and accommodations (chain-type price index)
26	DIFSRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Financial services and insurance (chain-type price index)
27	DOTSRG3Q086SBEA		Personal consumption expenditures: Other services (chain-type price index)
28	CPILFESL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Food & Energy (Index 1982=84=100)
29	WPSFD49502		Producer Price Index by Commodity for Finished Consumer Goods (Index 1982=100)
30	WPSFD4111		Producer Price Index by Commodity for Finished Consumer Foods (Index 1982=100)
31	PPIHDC		Producer Price Index by Commodity Industrial Commodities (Index 1982=100)
32	WPSID61		Producer Price Index by Commodity Intermediate Materials: Supplies & Components (Index 1982=100)
33	WPU0561		Producer Price Index by Commodity for Fuels and Related Products and Powe (Index 1982=100)
34	OILPRICEex		Real Crude Oil Prices: West Texas Intermediate (WTI) - Cushing, Oklahoma (2012 Dollars per Barrel), deflated by Core PCE
35	WPSID62		Producer Price Index: Crude Materials for Further Processing (Index 1982=100)
36	PPICMM		Producer Price Index: Commodities: Metals and metal products: Primary nonferrous metals (Index 1982=100)
37	CPIAPPSL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Apparel (Index 1982=84=100)
38	CPITRNSL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Transportation (Index 1982=84=100)
39	CPIMEDSL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Medical Care (Index 1982=84=100)
40	CUSR0000SAC		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Commodities (Index 1982=84=100)
41	CUSR0000SAD		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Durables (Index 1982=84=100)
42	CUSR0000SAS		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Services (Index 1982=84=100)
43	CPIULFSL		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Food (Index 1982=84=100)
44	CUSR0000SAOL2		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Shelter (Index 1982=84=100)
45	CUSR0000SAOL5		Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All items less medical care (Index 1982=84=100)
46	NAPMPRI		CPI for All Urban Consumers: Owners' equivalent rent of residences (Index Dec 1982=100)

Table 11: Financial Factor Composition. The Table reports all the series used to extract the Financial Factor divided in groups. All variables are transformed to be approximately stationary as in *McCracken and Ng (2020)*. The table reports for each series the abbreviation we use in the paper, the full name of the series, the identifier in the FRED database. The Table also report in bold the series used in the forecasting exercise of Subsection 4.3

N. Var	FRED-CODE	MEMO	Description
<i>Group 1: Stock Markets</i>			
1	FEDFUNDS		Effective Federal Funds Rate (Percent)
2	NIKKEI225		Nikkei Stock Average
3	S&P:indust		S&P's Common Stock Price Index: Industrials
4	S&P div yield		S&P's Composite Common Stock: Dividend Yield
5	S&P PE ratio		S&P's Composite Common Stock: Price-Earnings Ratio
6	SP500		S&P's Common Stock Price Index: Composite
<i>Group 2: Household Balance Sheet</i>			
7	TABSHNOx	Real HHW:TASA	Real Total Assets of Households and Nonprofit Organizations (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
8	TLBSHNOx	Real HHW:LiabSA	Real Total Liabilities of Households and Nonprofit Organizations (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
9	LIABPIx	liab_PDISA	Liabilities of Households and Nonprofit Organizations Relative to Personal Disposable Income (Percent)
10	TNWBSHNOx	Real HHW:WSA	Real Net Worth of Households and Nonprofit Organizations (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
11	NWPIx	W_PDISA	Net Worth of Households and Nonprofit Organizations Relative to Disposable Personal Income (Percent)
12	TARESAX	Real HHW:TA_RESA	Real Assets of Households and Nonprofit Organizations excluding Real Estate Assets (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
13	HNOREMQ0275x	Real HHW:RESA	Real Real Estate Assets of Households and Nonprofit Organizations (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
14	CONSPix		Non-revolving consumer credit to Personal Income
15	TFAABSHNOx	Real HHW:FinSA	Real Total Financial Assets of Households and Nonprofit Organizations (Billions of 2012 Dollars), deflated by Core PCE
<i>Group 3: Non-Household Balance Sheet</i>			
16	TLBSNNCBx		Real Nonfinancial Corporate Business Sector Liabilities (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated by IPDBS
17	TLBSNNCBBDIx		Nonfinancial Corporate Business Sector Liabilities to Disposable Business Income (Percent)
18	TTAABSNNCBx		Real Nonfinancial Corporate Business Sector Assets (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated by IPDBS
19	TNWVBSNNCBx		Real Nonfinancial Corporate Business Sector Assets (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated IPDBS
20	TNWVBSNNCBBDIx		Nonfinancial Corporate Business Sector Net Worth to Disposable Business Income (Percent)
21	TLBSNNBx		Real Nonfinancial Noncorporate Business Sector Liabilities (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated by IPDBS
22	TLBSNNBBDIx		Nonfinancial Noncorporate Business Sector Liabilities to Disposable Business Income (Percent)
23	TABSNNBx		Real Nonfinancial Noncorporate Business Sector Assets (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated by IPDBS
24	TNWBSNNBx		Real Nonfinancial Noncorporate Business Sector Net Worth (Billions of 2012 Dollars), Deflated by IPDBS
25	TNWBSNNBBDIx		Nonfinancial Noncorporate Business Sector Net Worth to Disposable Business Income (Percent)
26	CNCFx		Real Disposable Business Income, Billions of 2012 Dollars (Corporate cash flow with IVA minus taxes on corporate income, deflated by Implicit Price Deflator for Business Sector IPDBS)

References

- Bachmann, R., Elstner, S., and Sims, E. (2013). Uncertainty and Economic Activity: Evidence from Business Survey Data. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 5:217–249.
- Basu, S. and Bundick, B. (2017). Uncertainty Shocks in a Model of Effective Demand. *Econometrica*, 85:937–958.
- Billio, M., Casarin, R., Ravazzolo, F., and Van Dijk, H. K. (2016). Interconnections Between Eurozone and US Booms and Busts Using a Bayesian Panel Markov-Switching VAR Model. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31:1352–1370.
- Bloom, N. (2009). The Impact of Uncertainty Shocks. *Econometrica*, 77:623–685.
- Caggiano, G., Castelnuovo, E., and Groshenny, F. (2014). Uncertainty Shocks and Unemployment Dynamics: An Analysis of Post-WWII US Recessions. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 67:78–92.
- Campbell, J. Y., Lettau, M., Burton, G. M., and Yexiao, X. (2001). Have Individual Stock Become More Volatile? An Empirical Exploration of Idiosyncratic Risk. *The Journal of Finance*, 56:1–43.
- Carriero, A., Clark, T., and Marcellino, M. (2018). Assessing International Commonality in Macroeconomic Uncertainty and Its Effects. Working paper, no. 18-05, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.
- Carriero, A., Corsello, F., and Marcellino, M. (2019). The Global Component of Inflation Volatility. Working paper, no. 13470, CEPR.
- Carriero, A., Corsello, F., and Marcellino, M. (2020). The Economic Drivers of Volatility and Uncertainty. Technical report, Bank of Italy Temi di Discussione (Working Paper) No. 1285.
- Carriero, A., Kapetanios, G., and Marcellino, M. (2016). Structural Analysis with Multivariate Autoregressive Index models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 192:332–348.
- Carriero, C., Clark, T., and Marcellino, M. (2015). Bayesian VARs: Specification Choices and Forecast Accuracy. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 30:46–73.
- Centoni, M. and Cubadda, G. (2003). Measuring the Business Cycle Effects of Permanent and Transitory Shocks in Cointegrated Time Series. *Economic Letters*, 80:45–51.
- Chan, J. C. C. and Eric, E. (2018). Bayesian Model Comparison for Time-Varying Parameter VARs with Stochastic Volatility. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 33:509–532.

- Chan, J. C. C., Eric, E., Hou, C., and Koop, G. (2020). Composite Likelihood Methods for Large Bayesian VARs with Stochastic Volatility. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 35:692–711.
- Cogley, T., Morozov, S., and Sargent, T. J. (2005). Bayesian Fan Charts for U.K. Inflation: Forecasting and Sources of Uncertainty in an Evolving Monetary System. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 29:1893–1925.
- Cogley, T. and Sargent, T. J. (2002). Evolving Post World War II U.S. Inflation Dynamics. *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2001*, pages 331–373.
- Cogley, T. and Sargent, T. J. (2005). Drifts and volatilities: Monetary Policies and Outcomes in the Post WWII US. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 8:262–302.
- Cubadda, G. and Guardabascio, B. (2019). Representation, Estimation and Forecasting of the Multivariate Index-Augmented Autoregressive Model. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 35:67–79.
- Cubadda, G., Guardabascio, B., and Hecq, A. (2017). A Vector Heterogeneous Autoregressive Index Model for Realized Volatility Measures. *International Journal of Forecasting*, 33:337–344.
- Cubadda, G., Hecq, A., and Palm, F. (2009). Studying Interactions without Multivariate Modeling. *Journal of Econometrics*, 148:25–35.
- d’Agostino, A., Gambetti, L., and Giannone, D. (2013). Macroeconomic Forecasting and Structural Change. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 28:82–101.
- Dangl, T. and Halling, M. (2012). Predictive Regressions with Time-Varying Coefficients. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 106:157–181.
- Durbin, J. and Koopman, S. J. (2001). *Time Series Analysis by State Space Methods*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Ganguly, E. and Breuer, B. J. (2010). Nominal Exchange Rate Volatility, Relative Price Volatility, and the Real Exchangerate. *Journal of International Money and Finance*.
- Geweke, J. (2005). *Contemporary Bayesian Econometrics and Statistics*. Wiley, New York, USA.
- Grassi, S., Nonejad, N., and Santucci de Magistris, P. (2017). Forecasting with the Standardized Self-Perturbed Kalman Filter. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 32:318–341.
- Guglielminetti, E. (2016). The Labor Market Channel of Macroeconomic Uncertainty. *Temi di discussione (Economic working papers)*, Bank of Italy, Economic Research and International Relations Area.

- Jo, S. (2015). The Effect of Oil Price Uncertainty on Global Real Economic Activity. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 46:1113–1135.
- Jurado, K., Ludvigson, S. C., and Ng, S. (2015). Measuring Uncertainty. *American Economic Review*, 105:1177–1216.
- Kapetanios, G., Marcellino, M., and Venditti, F. (2019). Large time-varying parameter vars: A nonparametric approach. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 34:1027–1049.
- Koop, G. (2003). *Bayesian Econometrics*. John Wiley and Sons Ltd, England.
- Koop, G. and Korobilis, D. (2012). Forecasting Inflation using Dynamic Model Averaging. *International Economic Review*, 53:867–886.
- Koop, G. and Korobilis, D. (2013). Large Time-Varying Parameter VARs. *Journal of Econometrics*, 177:185–198.
- Koop, G. and Korobilis, D. (2014). A New Index of Financial Conditions. *European Economic Review*, 71:101–116.
- Koop, G., LeonGonzalez, R., and Strachan, R. (2009). On the Evolution of the Monetary Policy Transmission Mechanism. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 33:997–1017.
- Koop, G. and Potter, S. (2004). Forecasting in Dynamic Factor Models using Bayesian Model Averaging. *Econometrics Journal*, 7:550–565.
- Korobilis, D. (2021). High-Dimensional Macroeconomic Forecasting Using Message Passing Algorithms. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 39:493–504.
- Lippi, M. (2019). Time-Domain Approach in High-Dimensional Dynamic Factor Models. In Press, O. U., editor, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Economics and Finance*. Oxford.
- McCracken, M. and Ng, S. (2020). A Quarterly Database for Macroeconomic Research. *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Working Paper*.
- Primiceri, G. (2005). Time Varying Structural Vector Autoregressions and Monetary Policy. *Review of Economic Studies*, 72:821–852.
- Raftery, A., Karny, M., and Ettl, P. (2010). Online Prediction Under Model Uncertainty Via Dynamic Model Averaging: Application to a Cold Rolling Mill. *Technometrics*, 52:52–66.
- Reinsel, G. (1983). Some Results on Multivariate Autoregressive Index Models. *Biometrika*, 70:145–156.

- Schwert, G. and William, G. (1989). Why Does Stock Market Volatility Change Over Time? *The Journal of Finance*, 44:1115–1153.
- Stock, J. and Watson, M. (2016). Dynamic Factor Models, Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressions and Structural Vector Autoregressions in Macroeconomics. In Taylor, J. and (eds.), H. U., editors, *Handbook of Macroeconomics, Vol. 2*. North Holland.
- Storesletten, K., Telmer, C., and Yaron, A. (2004). Consumption and Risk Sharing Over the Life Cycle. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 51:753–772.