Business School

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Working Paper

2014-183

Forecasting the US Economy with a Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressive DSGE model

Stelios Bekiros
Alessia Paccagnini

http://www.ipag.fr/fr/accueil/la-recherche/publications-WP.html

IPAG Business School
184, Boulevard Saint-Germain
75006 Paris
France

IPAG working papers are circulated for discussion and comments only. They have not been peer-reviewed and may not be reproduced without permission of the authors.

Forecasting the US Economy with a Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressive DSGE model *

Stelios Bekiros[a,b,c†]

[a]IPAG Lab, IPAG Business School
[b]European University Institute (EUI)
[c]Rimini Centre for Economic Analysis (RCEA)

Alessia Paccagnini[‡]

Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca

Abstract

Although policymakers and practitioners are particularly interested in DSGE models, these are typically too stylized to be applied directly to the data and often yield weak prediction results. Very recently, hybrid DSGE models have become popular for dealing with some of the model misspecifications. Major advances in estimation methodology could allow these models to outperform well-known time series models and effectively deal with more complex real-world problems as richer sources of data become available. In this study we introduce a Bayesian approach to estimate a novel Factor Augmented DSGE model that extends the model of Consolo *et al.* [Consolo, A., Favero, C.A., and Paccagnini, A., 2009. On the Statistical Identification of DSGE Models. Journal of Econometrics, 150, 99-115]. We perform a comparative predictive evaluation of many different specifications of estimated DSGE models and various classes of VAR models, using datasets from the US economy. Simple and hybrid DSGE models are implemented, such as DSGE-VAR and tested against standard, Bayesian and Factor Augmented VARs. The results can be useful for macro-forecasting and monetary policy analysis.

JEL Classification: C32, C11, C15

Keywords: Forecasting, Marginal data density, DSGE-FAVAR

*The first author is supported by the Grant FP7-PEOPLE-2011-MC-CIG, N° 303854 under the 7th European Community Framework Programme. The second author acknowledges financial support from "Dote ricercatori": FSE, Regione Lombardia. The usual disclaimers apply.

†[a]IPAG Business School, 184 Boulevard Saint-Germain, 75006 Paris, France.; Tel.: +33 01 53 63 36 00 ; Fax: +33 01 45 44 40 46 ; [b] Department of Economics, Via della Piazzuola; 43, I-50133, Florence, Italy; Tel.: +39 055 4685 916; Fax: +39 055 4685 902; Tel.: +39 055 4685916; Fax: +39 055 4685 902; E-mail address: stelios.bekiros@eui.eu ; [c]RCEA, Via Patara, 3, 47900, Rimini, Italy;Tel.: +39 0541 434 142; Fax: +39 0541 55 431.

‡Department of Economics, Piazza Ateneo Nuovo 1, 20126 Milano, Italy; Tel.: +39-026-4483-046; Fax: +39-026-4483-085; email: alessia.paccagnini@unimib.it

1 Introduction

The dynamic stochastic general equilibrium models appear to be particularly suited for evaluating the consequences of alternative macroeconomic policies, as shown in the works of Smets and Wouters (2003, 2004), Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004), Adolfson *et al.* (2008) and Christiano *et al.* (2005). However, the calibrated dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models face many important challenges such as the fragility of parameter estimates, statistical fit and the weak reliability of policy predictions as reported in Stock and Watson (2001), Ireland (2004) and Schorfheide (2010). In recent years Bayesian estimation of DSGE models has become popular for many reasons, mainly because it is a system-based estimation approach that offers the advantage of incorporating assumptions about the parameters based on economic theory. These assumptions can reduce weak identification issues. Macroeconomists have extensively used Bayesian time series during the last 20 years. One reason is that Bayesian methods afford researchers the chance to estimate and evaluate a wide variety of macro models that frequentist econometrics often find challenging. The popularity of the Bayesian approach is also explained by the increasing computational power available to estimate and evaluate medium- to large-scale DSGE models using Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulators. These DSGE models can pose identification problems for frequentist estimation that no amount of data or computing power can overcome. New macro-research is also drawn to the estimation and evaluation framework of Bayesian statistics because DSGE models are often seen as abstractions of actual economies.

Recently, increasing efforts have been undertaken to use DSGE models for forecasting. DSGE models were not considered as forecasting tools until the works of Smets and Wouters (2003, 2004) on the predictability of DSGE models compared to alternative non-structural models. In the macroeconometric literature, hybrid or mixture DSGE models have become popular for dealing with some of the model misspecifications as well as the trade-off between theoretical coherence and empirical fit (Schorfheide, 2010). They are categorized in additive hybrid models and hierarchical hybrid models. The hybrid models provide a complete analysis of the data law of motion and better capture the dynamic properties of the DSGE models. In the recent literature, different attempts of hybrid models have been introduced for solving, estimating and forecasting with DSGEs. Sargent (1989) and Altug (1989) proposed augmenting a DSGE model with measurement error terms that follow a first order autoregressive process, known as the DSGE-AR approach. Ireland (2004) proposed a method that is similar to the DSGE-AR, but imposing no restriction on the measurement errors, assuming that residuals follow a first-order vector autoregression (DSGE-AR à l'Ireland). A different approach called DSGE-VAR was proposed by Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) and was based on the works DeJong *et al.* (1996) and Ingram and Whiteman (1994). The main idea behind the DSGE-VAR is the use of the VAR representation as an econometric tool for empirical validation, combining prior information derived from the DSGE model in estimation. However, it has several problems. One of the main problems in finding a statistical representation for the data by using a VAR, is overfitting due to the inclusion of too many lags and too many variables, some of which may be insignificant. The problem of overfitting results in multicollinearity and loss of degrees of freedom, leading to inefficient estimates and large out-of-sample forecasting errors. It is possible to overcome this problem by using the well-known "Minnesota" priors (Doan *et al.*, 1984). The use of "Minnesota" priors has been proposed to shrink the parameters space and thus overcome the curse of dimensionality. Following this idea in combining the DSGE model information and the VAR representation, two alternative econometric tools have been also introduced: the DSGE-FAVAR (Consolo *et al.*, 2009) and the Augmented VAR-DSGE model (Fernández-de-Córdoba and Torres, 2010). The main idea behind the Factor Augmented DSGE (DSGE-FAVAR) is the use of factors to improve the statistical identification in validating the models. Consequently, the VAR representation is replaced by a FAVAR model as the statistical benchmark.

In this paper, we conduct an exhaustive empirical exercise that includes the comparison of the out-of-sample predictive performance of estimated DSGE models with that of standard VARs, Bayesian VARs and Factor Augmented VARs estimated on the same data set for the US economy. We focus on many different specifications of the DSGE models, i.e., the simple DSGE, the DSGE-VAR and specifically on the Factor Augmented DSGE (DSGE-FAVAR) model with emphasis on Bayesian estimation.

We use time series data from 1960:Q4 to 2010:Q4 for the real GDP, the harmonized Consumer Price Index and the nominal short-term federal funds interest rate and we produce their forecasts for the out-of-sample testing period 1997:Q1-2010:Q4. The motivation comes from a group of recent papers that compares the forecasting performance of DSGE against VAR models, e.g., Smets and Wouters (2004), Ireland (2004), Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004), Del Negro *et al.* (2007), Adolfson *et al.* (2008), Christoffel *et al.* (2008), Rubaszek and Skrzypczynski (2008), Ghent (2009), Kolosa *et al.* (2009), Consolo *et al.* (2009) and Fernandez-de-Cordoba and Torres (2010) among others. The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the standard and Bayesian VAR as well as the Factor Augmented VAR model. In section 3 the simple DSGE model is analyzed, and the hybrid DSGE-VAR and DSGE-FAVAR models are described in detail. In section 4 the data are described and the empirical results of the comparative forecasting evaluation are illustrated and analyzed. Finally, section 5 concludes.

2 VAR Models

2.1 Classical VAR

As suggested by Sims (1980), the standard unrestricted VAR, has the following compact format

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{X}_t\mathbf{\Phi} + \mathbf{U} \tag{1}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_t$ is a $(T\times n)$ matrix with rows Y_t', and $\mathbf{X}$ is a $(T\times k)$ matrix ($k = 1+np, p =$number of lags) with rows $X_t' = [1, Y_{t-1}', ..., Y_{t-p}']$. $\mathbf{U}$ is a $(T\times n)$ matrix with rows u_t', $\mathbf{\Phi}$ is a $(k\times n) = [\Phi_0, \Phi_1, ..., \Phi_p]'$, while the one-step ahead forecast errors u_t have a multivariate $N(0, \Sigma_u)$ conditional on past observations of Y.

2.2 Bayesian VAR

The Bayesian VAR, as described in Litterman (1981), Doan *et al.* (1984), Todd (1984), Litterman (1986) and Spencer (1993) has become a widely popular approach to dealing with overparameterization. One of main problems in using VAR models is that many parameters need to be estimated, although some of them may be insignificant. Instead of eliminating longer lags, the BVAR imposes restrictions on these coefficients by assuming that they are more likely to be near zero than the coefficients on shorter lags. Obviously, if there are strong effects from less important variables, the data can counter this assumption. Usually, the restrictions are imposed by specifying normal prior distributions with zero means and small standard deviations for all coefficients, with a decreasing standard deviation as the lags increase. The only exception is the coefficient on a variable's first lag that has a mean of unity. Litterman (1981) used a diffuse prior for the constant. The means of the prior are popularly called the "Minnesota Priors" due to the development of the idea at the University of Minnesota and the Federal Reserve Bank at Minneapolis[1].

Formally speaking, these prior means can be written as follows

$$\Phi_i \sim N(1, \sigma^2_{\Phi_i}) \text{ and } \Phi_j \sim N(0, \sigma^2_{\Phi_j}), \tag{2}$$

[1] The basic principle behind the "Minnesota" prior is that all equations are centered around a random walk with drift. This idea has been modified by Kadiyala and Karlsson (1997) and Sims and Zha (1998). In Ingram and Whiteman (1994), a real business cycle model is used to generate a prior for a reduced form VAR, as a development of the "Minnesota" priors procedure. Also, a prior is placed on the parameters of a simple linearized DSGE, which is then compared with a Bayesian VAR in a forecasting exercise. Smets and Wouters (2003) extend this to medium scale New Keynesian models used in policy analysis. This approach has the advantage of providing information about which behavioural mechanisms produce forecast error or policy scenarios. However, it seems that it often fails to empirically fit compared to models with no behavioural structure. In Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) and Del Negro, Schorfheide, Smets and Wouters (2007), a DSGE prior is also developed for a VAR.

where Φ_i denotes the coefficients associated with the lagged dependent variables in each equation of the VAR, while Φ_j represents any other coefficient. The prior variances $\sigma^2_{\Phi_i}$ and $\sigma^2_{\Phi_j}$ specify the uncertainty of the prior means, $\Phi_i = 1$ and $\Phi_j = 0$, respectively. In this study, we impose their prior mean on the first own lag for variables in growth rate, such as a white noise setting (Del Negro and Schorfheide 2004; Adolfson *et al.* 2007; Banbura *et al.* 2010). Instead, for level variables, we use the classical Minnesota prior (Del Negro and Schorfheide 2004). The specification of the standard deviation of the distribution of the prior imposed on variable j in equation i at lag m, for all i, j and m, denoted by $S(i, j, m)$, is specified as follows

$$S(i,j,m) = [w \times g(m) \times F(i,j)] \frac{\hat{\sigma}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_j}, \tag{3}$$

where

$$F(i,j) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } i = j \\ k_{ij} \text{ otherwise, } 0 \leq k_{ij} \leq 1 \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

is the tightness of variable j in equation i relative to variable i and by increasing the interaction, i.e. it is possible for the value of k_{ij} to loosen the prior (Dua and Ray, 1995). The ratio $\frac{\hat{\sigma}_i}{\hat{\sigma}_j}$ consists of estimated standard errors of the univariate autoregression, for variables i and j. This ratio scales the variables to account for differences in the units of measurement, without taking into account the magnitudes of the variables. The term w measures the standard deviation on the first lag, and also indicates the overall tightness. A decrease in the value of w results in a tighter prior. The function $g(m) = m^{-d}$, $d > 0$ is the measurement of the tightness on lag m relative to lag 1, and is assumed to have a harmonic shape with a decay of d, which tightens the prior on increasing lags. Following the standard Minnesota prior settings, we choose the overall tightness (w) to be equal to 0.3, while the lag decay (d) is 1 and the interaction parameter (k_{ij}) is set equal to 0.5.

2.3 Factor Augmented VAR

A recent strand in the econometric literature mainly by Stock and Watson (2002), Forni and Reichlin (1996, 1998) and Forni *et al.* (1999, 2000) has shown that very large macroeconomic datasets can be properly modelled using dynamic factor models, where the factors can be considered as an "exhaustive summary of the information " in the data. The rationale underlying dynamic factor models is that the behavior of several variables is driven by few common forces, the factors, plus idiosyncratic shocks. Hence, the factors-approach can be useful in alleviating the omitted variable problem in empirical analysis using traditional small-scale models. Bernanke and Boivin (2003) and Bernanke *et al.* (2005) utilized factors in the estimation of VAR to generate a more general specification. Chudik and Pesaran (2011) illustrated how a VAR augmented by factors could help in keeping the number of estimated parameters under control without loosing relevant information.

Let $\mathbf{X}_t$ denote an $N \times 1$ vector of economic time series and $\mathbf{Y}_t$ a vector of $M \times 1$ observable macroeconomic variables which are a subset of $\mathbf{X}_t$. In this context, most of the information contained in $\mathbf{X}_t$ is captured by $\mathbf{F}_t$, a $k \times 1$ vector of unobserved factors. The factors are interpreted as an addition to the observed variables, as common forces driving the dynamics of the economy. The relation between the "informational" time series $\mathbf{X}_t$, the observed variables $\mathbf{Y}_t$ and the factors $\mathbf{F}_t$ is represented by the following dynamic factor model:

$$\mathbf{X}_t = \mathbf{\Lambda}^f \mathbf{F} + \mathbf{\Lambda}^y \mathbf{Y}_t + e_t \tag{5}$$

where $\mathbf{\Lambda}^f$ is a $N \times k$ matrix of factor loadings, $\mathbf{\Lambda}^y$ is a $N \times M$ matrix of coefficients that bridge the observable $\mathbf{Y}_t$ and the macroeconomic dataset, and e_t is the vector of $N \times 1$ error terms. These terms are mean zero, normal distributed, and uncorrelated with a small cross-correlation. In fact, the estimator allows for some cross-correlation in e_t that must vanish as N goes to infinity. This

representation nests also models where $\mathbf{X}_t$ depends on lagged values of the factors (Stock and Watson, 2002).

For the estimation of the FAVAR model equation (5), we follow the two-step principal components approach proposed by Bernanke *et al.* (2005). In the first step factors are obtained from the observation equation by imposing the orthogonality restriction $\mathbf{F}'\mathbf{F}/T = \mathbf{I}$.This implies that $\hat{\mathbf{F}} = \sqrt{T}\hat{\mathbf{G}}$, where $\hat{\mathbf{G}}$ are the eigenvectors corresponding to the K largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^{'}$, sorted in descending order. Stock and Watson (2002) showed that the factors can be consistently estimated by the first r principal components of $\mathbf{X}$, even in the presence of moderate changes in the loading matrix $\mathbf{\Lambda}$. For this result to hold it is important that the estimated number of factors, k, is larger or equal than the true number r. Bai and Ng (2000) proposed a set of selection criteria to choose k that are generalizations of the BIC and AIC criteria. In the second step, we estimate the FAVAR equation replacing $\mathbf{F}_t$ by $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_t$. Following Bernanke *et al.* (2005), $\mathbf{Y}_t$ is removed from the space covered by the principal components. In a recent paper, Boivin *et al.* (2009) impose the constraint that $\mathbf{Y}_t$ is one of the common components in the first step, guaranteeing that the estimated latent factors $\hat{\mathbf{F}}_t$ recover the common dynamics which are not captured by $\mathbf{Y}_t$. The authors, comparing the two methodologies, concluded that the results are similar. As in Bernanke *et al.* (2005) we partition the matrix $\mathbf{X}_t$ in two categories of information variables: slow-moving and fast-moving. Slow-moving variables (e.g., real variables such as wages or spending) do not respond contemporaneously to unanticipated changes in monetary policy, while fast-moving (e.g., interest rates) respond contemporaneously to monetary shocks. We proceed to extracting two factors from slow variables and one factor from fast variables and we call them respectively "slow factors" and "fast factor". As suggested by Bai and Ng (2000) we use information criteria to determine the number of factors but, as they are not so decisive, we limit the number of factors to three (two slows and one fast) to strike a balance between the variance of the original series explained by the principal components and the difference in the parameterization of the VAR and the FAVAR. It is also worth noting that the factors are not uniquely identified, but this is not a problem in our context because we will not attempt a structural interpretation of the estimated factors. Finally, having determined the number of factors, we specify a Factor Augmented VAR by considering only one-lag of the factors according to BIC criterion. The potential identification of the macroeconomic shocks can be performed according to Bernanke *et al.* (2005) using the Cholesky decomposition.

3 DSGE Models

After the seminal work of Smets and Wouters (2003, 2004) the DSGE models have been considered as forecasting tools in macroeconomic literature. Model validation, estimation and calibration are crucial issues in DSGE structure. The main problems are reported in Canova (1994). Calibrated DSGE models often yield fragile results, when traditional econometric methods are used for estimation (Smets and Wouters 2003; Ireland 2004). Following this idea of combining the DSGE model information and the VAR representation, among other models that have been proposed in the literature, in this study we use the DSGE-VAR and DSGE-FAVAR hybrid models.

Simple DSGE models with forward-looking features are usually referred to as a benchmarks in the literature. In a DSGE setup the economy is made up of four components. The first component is the representative household with habit persistent preferences. This household maximizes an additively separable utility function which is separable into consumption, real money balances and hours worked over an infinite lifetime. The household gains utility from consumption relative to the level of technology, real balances of money, and disutility from hours worked. The household earns interest from holding government bonds and earns real profits from the firms. Moreover, the representative household pays lump-sum taxes to the government. The second component is a perfectly competitive, representative final goods producer which is assumed to use a continuum of intermediate goods as inputs, and the prices for these inputs are given. The producers of these intermediate goods are monopolistic firms which use labour as the only input. The production technology is the same for all the monopolistic firms. Nominal rigidities are introduced in terms of price adjustment costs for the

monopolistic firms. Each firm maximizes its profits over an infinite lifetime by choosing its labour input and its price. The third component is the government which spends in each period a fraction of the total output, which fluctuates exogenously. The government issues bonds and levies lump-sum taxes, which are the main part of its budget constraint. The last component is the monetary authority, which follows a Taylor rule regarding the inflation target and the output gap. There are three economic shocks: an exogenous monetary policy shock (in the monetary policy rule), and two autoregressive processes, AR(1), which model government spending and technology shocks. To solve the model, optimality conditions are derived for the maximization problems. After linearization around the steady-state, the economy is described by the following system of equations

$$\tilde{x}_t = E_t[\tilde{x}_{t+1}] - \frac{1}{\tau}(\tilde{R}_t - E_t[\tilde{\pi}_{t+1}]) + (1-\rho_g)\tilde{g}_t + \rho_Z \frac{1}{\tau}\tilde{z}_t \tag{6}$$

$$\tilde{\pi}_t = \beta E_t[\tilde{\pi}_{t+1}] + \kappa[\tilde{x}_t - \tilde{g}_t] \tag{7}$$

$$\tilde{R}_t = \rho_R \tilde{R}_{t-1} + (1-\rho_R)(\psi_1 \tilde{\pi}_t + \psi_2 \tilde{x}_t) + \epsilon_{R,t} \tag{8}$$

$$\tilde{g}_t = \rho_g \tilde{g}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{g,t} \tag{9}$$

$$\tilde{z}_t = \rho_z \tilde{z}_{t-1} + \epsilon_{z,t}, \tag{10}$$

where x is the detrended output (divided by the non-stationary technology process), π is the gross inflation rate, and R is the gross nominal interest rate. The tilde denotes percentage deviations from a steady state or, in the case of output, from a trend path (King, 2000; Woodford, 2003). The model can be solved by applying the algorithm proposed by Sims (2002). Define the vector of variables $\tilde{Z}_t = \left(\tilde{x}_t, \tilde{\pi}_t, \tilde{R}_t, \tilde{g}_t, \tilde{z}_t, E_t\tilde{x}_{t+1}, E_t\tilde{\pi}_{t+1}\right)$ and the vector of shocks as $\epsilon_t = (\epsilon_{R,t}, \epsilon_{g,t}, \epsilon_{z,t})$. Therefore the previous set of equations, (6) - (10), can be recasted into a set of matrices $(\Gamma_0, \Gamma_1, C, \Psi, \Pi)$ accordingly to the definition of the vectors $\tilde{Z}_t$ and ϵ_t

$$\Gamma_0 \tilde{Z}_t = C + \Gamma_1 \tilde{Z}_{t-1} + \Psi \epsilon_t + \Pi \eta_t \tag{11}$$

where η_{t+1}, such that $E_t\eta_{t+1} \equiv E_t\left(y_{t+1} - E_t y_{t+1}\right) = 0$, is the expectations error.

As a solution to (11), we obtain the following transition equation as a policy function

$$\tilde{Z}_t = T(\theta)\,\tilde{Z}_{t-1} + R(\theta)\,\epsilon_t \tag{12}$$

and in order to provide the mapping between the observable data and those computed as deviations from the steady state of the model we set the following measurement equations as in Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta \ln x_t &= \ln \gamma + \Delta \tilde{x}_t + \tilde{z}_t \\ \Delta \ln P_t &= \ln \pi^* + \tilde{\pi}_t \\ \ln R_t^a &= 4\left[(\ln r^* + \ln \pi^*) + \tilde{R}_t\right] \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

which can be also casted into matrices as

$$Y_t = \Lambda_0(\theta) + \Lambda_1(\theta)\,\tilde{Z}_t + v_t \tag{14}$$

where $Y_t = (\Delta \ln x_t, \Delta \ln P_t, \ln R_t)'$, $v_t = 0$ and Λ_0 and Λ_1 are defined accordingly. For completeness, we write the matrices T, R, Λ_0 and Λ_1 as a function of the structural parameters in the model, $\theta = \left(\ln\gamma, \ln\pi^*, \ln r^*, \kappa, \tau, \psi_1, \psi_2, \rho_R, \rho_g, \rho_Z, \sigma_R, \sigma_g, \sigma_Z\right)'$. Such a formulation derives from the rational expectations solution. The evolution of the variables of interest, Y_t, is therefore determined by (12) and (14) which impose a set of restrictions across the parameters on the moving average (MA) representation. Given that the MA representation can be very closely approximated by a finite order VAR

Table 1: Prior Distributions for the DSGE model parameters

Name	Range	Density	Starting value	Mean	Standard deviation
$\ln \gamma$	$\mathbb{R}$	Normal	0.500	0.500	0.250
$\ln \pi^*$	$\mathbb{R}$	Normal	1.000	1.000	0.500
$\ln r^*$	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Gamma	0.500	0.500	0.250
κ	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Gamma	0.040	0.030	0.150
τ	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Gamma	3.000	3.000	0.500
ψ_1	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Gamma	1.500	1.500	0.250
ψ_2	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Gamma	0.300	0.125	0.100
ρ_R	$[0,1)$	Beta	0.400	0.500	0.200
ρ_G	$[0,1)$	Beta	0.800	0.800	0.100
ρ_Z	$[0,1)$	Beta	0.200	0.200	0.100
σ_R	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Inv.Gamma	0.100	0.100	0.139
σ_G	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Inv.Gamma	0.300	0.350	0.323
σ_Z	$\mathbb{R}^+$	Inv.Gamma	0.400	0.875	0.430

Note: The model parameters $\ln \gamma$, $ln\pi^*$, $\ln r^*$, σ_R, σ_g, and σ_z are scaled by 100 to convert them into percentages. The Inverse Gamma priors are of the form $p(\sigma|\nu, s) \propto \sigma^{-\nu-1} e^{-\nu s^2/2\sigma^2}$, where v=4 and s equals 0.2, 0.5, and 0.7, respectively. Approximately 1.5% of the prior mass lies in the indeterminacy region of the parameter space. The prior is truncated to restrict it to the determinacy region of the DSGE model, to avoid multiple equilibria typical in rational expectations models .

representation, Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) propose to evaluate the DSGE model by assessing the validity of the restrictions imposed by such a model with respect to an unrestricted VAR representation. The choice of the variables to be included in the VAR is however completely driven by those entering in the DSGE model regardless of the statistical goodness of the unrestricted VAR.

3.1 Estimation of linearized DSGE Models

Several econometric procedures have been proposed to parameterize and evaluate DSGE models. Kydland and Prescott (1982) use calibration, Christiano and Eichenbaum (1992) consider the generalized method of moments (GMM) estimation of equilibrium relationships, while Rotemberg and Woodford (1997) and Christiano *et al.* (2005) use the minimum distance estimation based on the discrepancy among VAR and DSGE model impulse response functions. Moreover the full-information likelihood-based estimation is considered by Altug (1989), McGrattan (1994), Leeper and Sims (1994) and Kim (2000). In last years, Bayesian estimation became very popular. According to An and Schorfheide (2007) there are essentially three main characteristics. First, the Bayesian estimation is system-based and fits the solved DSGE model to a vector of aggregate time series, as opposed to the GMM which is based on equilibrium relationships, such as the Euler equation for the consumption or the monetary policy rule. Second, it is based on the likelihood function generated by the DSGE model rather than the discrepancy between DSGE responses and VAR impulse responses. Third, prior distributions can be used to incorporate additional information into the parameter estimation.

Priors distributions are important to estimate DSGE models. According to An and Schorfheide (2007) priors might downweigh regions of the parameter space that are at odds with observations which are not contained in the estimation sample. Priors could add curvature to a likelihood function that is (nearly) flat for some parameters, given a strong influence to the shape of the posterior distribution. Table 1 lists the prior distributions for the structural parameters of the DSGE model which are adopted from Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004).

In the Bayesian framework, the likelihood function is reweighted by a prior density. The prior is useful to add information which is contained in the estimation sample. Since priors are always subject

to revisions, the shift from prior to posterior distribution can be considered as an indicator of the different sources of information. If the likelihood function peaks at a value that is at odds with the information that has been used to construct the prior distribution, then the marginal data density (MDD) of the DSGE model is defined as:

$$p(Y) = \int L(\theta|Y)p(\theta)d\theta$$

The marginal data density is the integral of the likelihood ($L(\theta|Y)$) taken according to the prior distribution ($p(\theta)$), that is the weighted average of likelihood where the weights are given by priors. The MDD can be used to compare different models M_i, $p(Y|M_i)$.We can rewrite the log-marginal data density as:

$$\begin{aligned}\ln(p(Y|M) &= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \ln p(y_t|Y^{t-1}, M) = \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^{T} \ln \left[\int p(y_t|Y^{t-1}, \theta, M)p(\theta|Y^{t-1}, M)d\theta \right]\end{aligned}$$

where $\ln(p(Y|M)$ can be interpreted as a predictive score (Good, 1952) and the model comparison based on posterior odds captures the relative one-step-ahead predictive performance. To compute the MDD, we consider the Geweke (1999) modified harmonic mean estimator. Harmonic mean estimators are based on the identity:

$$\frac{1}{p(Y)} = \int \frac{f(\theta)}{L(\theta|Y)p(\theta)} p(\theta|Y)d\theta$$

where $f(\theta)$ has the property that $\int f(\theta)d\theta = 1$ (Gelfand and Dey, 1994). Conditional on the choice of $f(\theta)$, an estimator is:

$$\widehat{p}_G(Y) = \left[\frac{1}{n_{sim}} \sum_{s=1}^{n_{sim}} \frac{f(\theta^{(s)})}{L(\theta^{(s)}|Y)p(\theta^{(s)})} \right]^{-1} \tag{15}$$

where $\theta^{(s)}$ is drawn from the posterior $p(\theta|Y)$. For a numerical approximation efficient, $f(\theta)$ should be chosen so that the summands are of equal magnitude. Geweke (1999) proposed to use the density of a truncated multivariate normal distribution:

$$\begin{aligned}f(\theta) &= \tau^{-1}(2\pi)^{-\frac{d}{2}}|V_\theta|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left[-0.5(\theta-\overline{\theta})'V_\theta^{-1}(\theta-\overline{\theta})\right] \\ &\quad \times I\left\{(\theta-\overline{\theta})'V_\theta^{-1}(\theta-\overline{\theta}) \leq F^{-1}_{\chi^2_d}(\tau\tau)\right\}\end{aligned}$$

In the above $\overline{\theta}$ and V_θ are the posterior mean and covariance matrix computed from the output of the posterior simulator, d is the dimension of the parameter vector, $F_{\chi^2_d}$ is the cumulative density function of a χ^2 random variable with d degrees of freedom, and $\tau \in (0,1)$. If the posterior of θ is in fact normal then the summands in eq. (15) are approximately constant.

3.2 DSGE-VAR

Building on the work by Ingram and Whiteman (1994), the DSGE-VAR approach of Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) was designed to improve forecasting and monetary policy analysis with VARs. Del

Negro-Schorfheide's (2004) approach is to use the DSGE model to build prior distributions for the VAR. Basically, the estimation initializes with an unrestricted VAR of order p

$$\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{\Phi}_0 + \mathbf{\Phi}_1 \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} + ... + \mathbf{\Phi}_p \mathbf{Y}_{t-p} + \mathbf{u}_t \tag{16}$$

In compact format:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Phi} + \mathbf{U} \tag{17}$$

$\mathbf{Y}$ is a $(T \times n)$ matrix with rows Y_t', $\mathbf{X}$ is a $(T \times k)$ matrix ($k = 1 + np, p$ =number of lags) with rows $X_t' = [1, Y_{t-1}', ..., Y_{t-p}']$, $\mathbf{U}$ is a $(T \times n)$ matrix with rows u_t' and Φ is a $(k \times n) = [\Phi_0, \Phi_1, ..., \Phi_p]'$.The one-step-ahead forecast errors u_t have a multivariate normal distribution $N(0, \Sigma_u)$ conditional on past observations of Y. The log-likelihood function of the data is a function of Φ and Σ_u

$$L(\mathbf{Y}|\Phi, \Sigma_u) \propto |\Sigma_u|^{-\frac{T}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} tr\left[\Sigma_u^{-1}\left(\mathbf{Y}'\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{\Phi}'\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{Y}'\mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Phi} + \mathbf{\Phi}'\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}\mathbf{\Phi}\right)\right]\right\} \tag{18}$$

The prior distribution for the VAR parameters proposed by Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) is based on the statistical representation of the DSGE model given by a VAR approximation. Let Γ_{xx}^*, Γ_{yy}^*, Γ_{xy}^* and Γ_{yx}^* be the theoretical second-order moments of the variables Y and X implied by the DSGE model, where

$$\begin{array}{c} \Phi^*(\theta) = \Gamma_{xx}^{*-1}(\theta)\,\Gamma_{xy}^*(\theta) \\ \Sigma^*(\theta) = \Gamma_{yy}^*(\theta) - \Gamma_{yx}^*(\theta)\,\Gamma_{xx}^{*-1}(\theta)\,\Gamma_{xy}^*(\theta) \end{array} \tag{19}$$

The moments are the dummy observation priors used in the mixture model. These vectors can be interpreted as the probability limits of the coefficients in a VAR estimated on the artificial observations generated by the DSGE model. Conditional on the vector of structural parameters in the DSGE model θ, the prior distributions for the VAR parameters $p(\Phi, \Sigma_u|\theta)$ are of the Inverted-Wishart (IW) and Normal forms

$$\begin{array}{c} \Sigma_u|\theta \sim IW\left(\left(\lambda T \Sigma_u^*(\theta), \lambda T - k, n\right)\right) \\ \mathbf{\Phi}|\Sigma_u, \theta \sim N\left(\mathbf{\Phi}^*(\theta), \Sigma_u \otimes \left(\lambda T \Gamma_{XX}(\theta)\right)^{-1}\right) \end{array} \tag{20}$$

where the parameter λ controls the degree of model misspecification with respect to the VAR: for small values of λ the discrepancy between the VAR and the DSGE-VAR is large and a sizeable distance is generated between the unrestricted VAR and DSGE estimators. Large values of λ correspond to small model misspecification and for $\lambda = \infty$ beliefs about DSGE misspecification degenerate to a point mass at zero. Bayesian estimation could be interpreted as estimation based on a sample in which data are augmented by a hypothetical sample in which observations are generated by the DSGE model, the so-called dummy prior observations (Theil and Goldberg, 1961; Ingram and Whiteman, 1994). Within this framework λ determines the length of the hypothetical sample. The posterior distributions of the VAR parameters are also of the Inverted-Wishart and Normal forms. Given the prior distribution, posterior distributions are derived by the Bayes theorem

$$\Sigma_u|\theta, \mathbf{Y} \sim IW\left(\left(\lambda+1\right)T\hat{\Sigma}_{u,b}(\theta), \left(\lambda+1\right)T - k, n\right) \tag{21}$$

$$\mathbf{\Phi}|\Sigma_u, \theta, \mathbf{Y} \sim N\left(\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_b(\theta), \Sigma_u \otimes \left[\lambda T \Gamma_{XX}(\theta) + \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}\right]^{-1}\right) \tag{22}$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_b(\theta) = \left(\lambda T \Gamma_{XX}(\theta) + \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}\left(\lambda T \Gamma_{XY}(\theta) + \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Y}\right) \tag{23}$$

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{u,b}(\theta) = \frac{1}{\left(\lambda+1\right)T}\left[\left(\lambda T \Gamma_{YY}(\theta) + \mathbf{Y}'\mathbf{Y}\right) - \left(\lambda T \Gamma_{XY}(\theta) + \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Y}\right)\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_b(\theta)\right] \tag{24}$$

where the matrices $\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_b(\theta)$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{u,b}(\theta)$ have the interpretation of maximum likelihood estimates of the VAR parameters based on the combined sample of actual observations and artificial observations generated by the DSGE. Equations (21) and (22) show that the smaller λ is, the closer the estimates are to the OLS estimates of an unrestricted VAR. Instead, the higher λ is, the closer the VAR estimates will be tilted towards the parameters in the VAR approximation of the DSGE model ($\hat{\mathbf{\Phi}}_b(\theta)$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{u,b}(\theta)$). In order to obtain a non-degenerate prior density (20), which is a necessary condition for the existence of a well-defined Inverse-Wishart distribution and for computing meaningful marginal likelihoods, λ has to be greater than λ_{MIN}

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{MIN} &\geq \frac{n+k}{T}; k = 1 + p \times n \\ p &= \text{lags} \\ n &= \text{endogenous variables.} \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the optimal lambda must be greater than or equal to the minimum lambda $\left(\hat{\lambda} \geq \lambda_{MIN}\right)$.

Essentially, the DSGE-VAR tool allows the econometrician to draw posterior inferences about the DSGE model parameters θ. Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) explain that the posterior estimate of θ has the interpretation of a minimum-distance estimator, where the discrepancy between the OLS estimates of the unrestricted VAR parameters and the VAR representation of the DSGE model is a sort of distance function. The estimated posterior of parameter vector θ depends on the hyperparameter λ. When $\lambda \to 0$, in the posterior the parameters are not informative, so the DSGE model is of no use in explaining the data. Unfortunately, the posteriors (22) and (21) do not have a closed form and we need a numerical method to solve the problem. The posterior simulator used by Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004) is the Markov Chain Monte Carlo Method and the algorithm used is the Metropolis-Hastings acceptance method. This procedure generates a Markov Chain from the posterior distribution of θ and this Markov Chain is used for Monte Carlo simulations. The optimal λ is given by maximizing the log of the marginal data density

$$\hat{\lambda} = \underset{\lambda \geqslant \lambda_{MIN}}{\arg\max} \ln p(\mathbf{Y}|\lambda)$$

According to the optimal lambda $\left(\hat{\lambda}\right)$, a corresponding optimal mixture model is chosen. This hybrid model is called DSGE-VAR$\left(\hat{\lambda}\right)$ and $\hat{\lambda}$ is the weight of the priors. It can also be interpreted as the restriction of the theoretical model on the actual data.

3.3 DSGE-FAVAR

Based on Bernanke *et al.* (2005), a FAVAR benchmark for the evaluation of a DSGE model will include a vector of observable variables and a small vector of unobserved factors extracted from a large data-set of macroeconomic time series, that capture additional economic information relevant to model the dynamics of the observables. In this study we implement the DSGE-FAVAR model of Consolo *et al.* (2009). The statistical representation has the following specification:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_t \\ \mathbf{F}_t \end{pmatrix} &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Phi}_{11}(L) & \mathbf{\Phi}_{12}(L) \\ \mathbf{\Phi}_{21}(L) & \mathbf{\Phi}_{22}(L) \end{bmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{Y}_{t-1} \\ \mathbf{F}_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_t^Y \\ \mathbf{u}_t^F \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{Y}_t &= (\Delta \ln x_t, \Delta \ln P_t, \ln R_t) \\ \mathbf{F}_t &= \left(F_{1t}^s, F_{2t}^s, F_{3t}^f\right) \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $\mathbf{Y}_t$ are the observable variables included in the simple DSGE model and $\mathbf{F}_t$ is a small vector of unobserved factors relevant to modelling the dynamics of $\mathbf{Y}_t$ (F_{1t}^s, F_{2t}^s are the two slow factors and

F_{3t}^f is the fast factor). The system reduces to the standard VAR when $\Phi_{12}(L) = 0$. Importantly, and differently from Boivin and Giannoni (2006), this FAVAR is not interpreted as the reduced form of a DSGE model at hand. In fact, in this case the restrictions implied by the DSGE model on a general FAVAR are very difficult to trace and model evaluation becomes even more difficult to implement. A very tightly parameterized theory model can have a very highly parameterized reduced form if one is prepared to accept that the relevant theoretical concepts in the model are a combination of many macroeconomic and financial variables. The DSGE-FAVAR is implemented in the same way as the DSGE-VAR.

4 Empirical results

We use quarterly data of the US economy from 1960:Q4 to 2010:Q4. The out-of sample period spans 1997:Q1 to 2010:Q4. The data for real output growth comes from the Bureau of Economic Analysis as Gross Domestic Product (GDP), while Consumer price index (CPI) data (seasonally adjusted, 1982-1984=100) are derived from the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Both series are taken in first difference logarithmic transformation. The interest rate series (FR rate) are constructed as in Clarida, Galì and Gertler (2000), namely for each quarter the interest rate is computed as the average federal funds rate during the first month of the quarter, including business days only. These three time series also represent the three equations of the DSGE model. The complete dataset is used to extract factors for FAVAR and DSGE-FAVAR models. In order to construct the FAVAR we extract factors from a balanced panel of 109 monthly and quarterly macroeconomic and financial time series, following the dataset built by Stock and Watson (2002). The dataset involves several measures of industrial production, interest rates, various price indices, employment and other important macroeconomic and also financial variables. In this set-up, the number of informational time series N is large (larger than time period T) and must be greater than the number of factors and observed variables in the FAVAR system ($k + M \ll N$). In the panel data used, there are some variables in monthly format, which are transformed into a quarterly data using end-of-period observations. All series have been transformed to induce stationarity. The series are taken as levels or transformed into logarithms, first or second difference (in level or logarithms) according to series characteristics [2]. Following Bernanke *et al.* (2005), we partition the data into two categories of information variables: slow and fast. Slow-moving variables (e.g., wages or spending) do not respond contemporaneously to unanticipated changes in monetary policy, while fast-moving variables (e.g., asset prices and interest rates) do respond contemporaneously to monetary shocks. Then we extract two factors from the slow variables and one factor from the fast variables. The methodology implemented to extract the factors is principal components. Stock-Watson (1998) showed that factors can be consistently estimated by the first r principal components of a matrix X, even in the presence of moderate changes in the loading matrix Λ. For this result to hold it is important that the estimated number of factors k, is larger than or equal to the true number, r. Bai and Ng (2000) propose a set of selection criteria to choose k that are generalizations of the BIC and AIC criteria. As they suggest, we use information criteria to determine the number of factors but, as they are not so decisive, we limit the number of factors to three to strike a balance between the variation in the original series explained by the principal components and the difference in the parameterization of the VAR and the FAVAR. It is also worth noting that the factors are not uniquely identified, but this is not a problem in our context because we will not attempt a structural interpretation of the estimated factors.

We compare the out-of-sample forecasting performance of VAR models including BVAR and FAVAR and of the DSGE class including DSGE-VAR, DSGE-FAVAR, in terms of the Root Mean Squared Forecast Error (RMSE) for the optimal lag specifications (one to four) selected by the Schwartz Bayesian information criterion (SIC). Most importantly, we compare the log of the marginal data densities (MDD). Based on the MDD a forecasting exercise is provided using a rolling procedure for h-steps-ahead. The GDP, CPI and FR rate forecasts are estimated for the out-of-sample testing period 1997:Q1

[2] The Appendix contains a detailed description of all series and their corresponding transformations.

- 2010:Q4. The forecasting investigation for the quarterly US data is performed over the one-, two-, three- and four-quarter-ahead horizon with a rolling estimation sample, based on the works of Marcellino (2004) and Brüggemann *et al.* (2008) for datasets of quarterly frequency. In particular, the models are re-estimated each quarter over the forecast horizon to update the estimate of the coefficients, before producing the quarter-ahead forecasts. Finally, in order to evaluate the models' forecast accuracy, we use the cross-model test statistic of Diebold and Mariano (1995).

First, we report estimation results for the log of Marginal Data Density (MDD). In particular, following Del Negro and Schorfheide (2006) we adopt the MDD as a measure of model fit, which arises naturally in the computation of posterior model odds. The prior distribution for the DSGE model parameters (θ), which are similar to the priors used by Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004), were already illustrated in Table 1. This MDD measure has two dimensions: goodness of in-sample fit on the one hand and a penalty for model complexity or degrees of freedom on the other hand. The DSGE-VAR and the DSGE-FAVAR are estimated with a different number of lags on the sample 1960:Q4 -1996:Q4. From 1997:Q1, we start our forecasting evaluation as implemented in Herbst and Schorfheide (2012). The parameter λ is chosen from a grid which is unbounded from above. In our empirical exercise, the log of the MDD is computed over a discrete interval, $\ln p(Y|\lambda, M)$. The minimum value, $\lambda_{\min} = \frac{n+k}{T}$, is model dependent and is related to the existence of a well-defined Inverse-Wishart distribution. For completeness, it is worth mentioning that $\lambda = 0$ refers to the VAR and the FAVAR model with no prior and it is not possible to compute the marginal likelihood in this particular case. Therefore, we can show the log of MDD for any value of λ larger than $\lambda_{\min}$. Importantly, $\lambda_{\min}$ depends on the degrees of freedom in the VAR or FAVAR and therefore, given estimation on the same number of available observations, $\lambda_{\min}$ for a DSGE-FAVAR will always be larger than $\lambda_{\min}$ for a DSGE-VAR[3].

Table 2: Optimal lambda for the DSGE-VAR and DGSE-FAVAR calculated with Markov Chain Monte Carlo and Metropolis Hastings method

	λ_{MIN}	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_{MIN}$	$\frac{\hat{\lambda}-\lambda_{MIN}}{\lambda_{MIN}}$	$\ln p(Y\|\hat{\lambda}, M)$	Bayes Factor vs M_1
DSGE-VAR(1)	0.05	0.12	0.07	1.40	-563.440	exp[37.26]
DSGE-VAR(2)	0.08	0.15	0.07	0.88	-536.929	exp[10.75]
DSGE-VAR(3) (M_1)	0.1	0.2	0.1	1	-526.180	1
DSGE-VAR(4)	0.12	0.25	0.13	1.08	-530.421	exp[4.24]
	λ_{MIN}	$\hat{\lambda}$	$\hat{\lambda} - \lambda_{MIN}$	$\frac{\hat{\lambda}-\lambda_{MIN}}{\lambda_{MIN}}$	$\ln p(Y\|\hat{\lambda}, M)$	Bayes Factor vs M_2
DSGE-FAVAR(1)	0.08	0.10	0.02	0.25	-546.742	exp[30.22]
DSGE-FAVAR(2)	0.1	0.15	0.05	0.5	-525.940	exp[9.42]
DSGE-FAVAR(3) (M_2)	0.12	0.20	0.08	0.67	-516.524	1
DSGE-FAVAR(4)	0.14	0.30	0.16	1.14	-522.191	exp[5.67]

Table 2 shows the main results related to the DSGE-VAR implemented using a different number of lags (from 1 up to 4). Each minimum λ (λ_{MIN}) is given by the features of the model (number of observations, number of endogenous variables, number of lags), and the optimal lambda ($\widehat{\lambda}$) is calculated using the Markov Chain Monte Carlo with Metropolis Hastings acceptance method (with 110,000 replications, we discard the first 10,000 ones). $\ln p(Y|M)$ is the log-MDD of the DSGE model specifications computed based on Geweke's (1999) modified harmonic mean estimator. The Bayes

[3] For the DSGE-VAR over the sample 1960:Q4-1996:Q4, the lambda grid is given by $\Lambda = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0,\ 0.05,\ 0.08,\ 0.10,\ 0.12,\ 0.15,\ 0.20,\ 0.25, \\ 0.30,\ 0.35,\ 0.40\ 0.5,\ 0.6,\ 0.7,\ 0.8,\ 0.9,\ 1,\ 10,\ 100 \end{array} \right\}$.
For the DSGE-FAVAR over the sample 1960:Q4-1996:Q4, the lambda grid is given by $\Lambda = \left\{ \begin{array}{c} 0,\ 0.08,\ 0.1,\ 0.12,\ 0.14,0.15,\ 0.2,\ 0.25, \\ 0.3,\ 0,35,\ 0.4,\ 0.5,\ 0.6,\ 0.7,\ 0.8,\ 0.9,\ 1,\ 10,\ 100 \end{array} \right\}$.
In both lambda intervals, we consider the λ_{MIN} across lags from 1 to 4.

factor (ratio of posterior odds to prior odds), as in An and Schorfheide (2007) helps us to understand the improvement of the log-MDD of a specific model. We compare different models against the benchmark model (M) maximizing the MDD. According to Table 2, we select the DSGE-VAR with 3 lags for the full sample 1960-1996. We repeat our exercise for the DSGE-FAVAR. We select one lag for the factors and we implement - as in case of the DSGE-VAR, - the DSGE-FAVAR with a different number lags from 1 to 4. As Table 2 shows, the DSGE-FAVAR with 3 lags is chosen. In Table 3, we compare the logarithm of the MDD of the hybrid models, DSGE-VAR and DSGE-FAVAR against the DSGE, the Bayesian VAR, the VAR and the Factor Augmented VAR. The DSGE-FAVAR with 3 lags shows the maximum MDD.

Table 3: Log of the Marginal Data Density and Bayes Factor for the sample 1960:Q4-1996:Q4

	$lnp(Y\|M)$
DSGE	-588.435
DSGE-VAR(3)	-526.180
DSGE-FAVAR(3)	**-516.524**
BVAR(1)	-570.244
BVAR(2)	-534.305
BVAR(3)	-524.858
BVAR(4)	-535.723
VAR(1)	-568.056
VAR(2)	-541.083
VAR(3)	-534.063
VAR(4)	-534.063
FAVAR(1)	-547.398
FAVAR(2)	-528.824
FAVAR(3)	-522.426
FAVAR(4)	-532.383

Table 4 reports the RMSE for all models and variables. An exhaustive exercise was conducted with one to four lags based on the Schwartz Bayesian information criterion (SIC). The results provide evidence that in general three lags is the optimal number for all models[4]. Overall, the results from RMSE are in accordance with those from the MDD estimation. In particular, for the GDP series the DSGE-FAVAR model provides the lowest RMSE for the first two forecasting horizons (i.e., one- and two-steps ahead) while the simple DSGE and the FAVAR outperform the other models for three- and four-quarters-ahead. The VAR, BVAR and DSGE-VAR models present similar predictive performance and on average they generate the highest forecast errors. Next, in case of the CPI variable, the DSGE-FAVAR model clearly outperforms all other models for all steps-ahead. The simple DGSE and the DSGE-VAR outrank with a few exceptions the other model classes. The VAR model seems slightly better than BVAR, whilst the FAVAR provides with relatively high scores for the RMSE especially for two-, three- and four-quarters-ahead. The results for the FR rate series provide further evidence of the DSGE-FAVAR superiority. Specifically, when comparing the RMSE scores of all model classes, DSGE-FAVAR is consistently the best performer in each forecasting horizon. The next lowest error is produced by the FAVAR model for all quarters-ahead.The DSGE model is better than DSGE-VAR for one- two- and three-step-ahead forecasts, while the DGSE-VAR provides with relatively lowest error in the fourth-quarter. Overall, the BVAR and the VAR models produce similar scores and they both underperform relatively to the other models.

[4]In case of BVAR the optimal number of lags was two, but the SIC score was very close to the one corresponding to three lags.

Table 4: Root Mean Square Forecast Error (RMSE) for GDP, CPI and FF rate

	VAR	BVAR	FAVAR	DSGE	DSGE-VAR	DSGE-FAVAR
GDP						
1	0.721	0.724	0.715	0.690	0.720	0.679
2	0.734	0.731	0.706	0.733	0.722	0.692
3	0.742	0.737	0.707	0.685	0.728	0.701
4	0.748	0.737	0.683	0.688	0.732	0.698
CPI						
1	0.953	0.940	0.995	0.841	0.955	0.792
2	0.929	0.927	1.046	0.849	0.920	0.781
3	0.897	0.906	1.061	0.790	0.890	0.778
4	0.890	0.908	1.050	0.954	0.886	0.779
FF rate						
1	4.176	4.122	2.067	3.397	4.135	1.926
2	4.096	4.115	2.549	3.570	3.985	1.979
3	4.055	4.155	2.890	3.108	3.951	2.037
4	4.150	4.268	2.607	4.314	4.043	2.007

Next, the Diebold-Mariano (DM) pairwise test is employed in order to evaluate the comparative forecast accuracy. The results are reported in Tables 5, 6 and 7. The Diebold-Mariano test is based on the squared prediction errors. The DM test statistics for GDP indicate that none of the models consistently outperforms any of the other for all quarter-ahead forecasts, namely their pairwise forecast comparison shows no statistically significant difference at the 5% and 1% level. Only in case of VAR vs. DSGE-VAR and BVAR vs. DSGE-VAR, for three-steps ahead, differential predictability is significant at the 5% level as well as for the VAR-BVAR pair for four-quarters-ahead. On the contrary for the CPI series, the DSGE-FAVAR model in any pair shows a distinctively significant predictability at 1% in all step-ahead forecasts. In fact, most models for all forecast horizons appear to have a significant pairwise predictability at the 1% level. Some exceptions include the pairs VAR-BVAR, VAR-DSGE-VAR and BVAR-DSGE for two- and four-steps-ahead. In accordance with the MDD and RMSE results, it is evident that in case of CPI the DSGE-FAVAR set-up outperforms the other models. Finally, in case of FR rate the DM results lead to a more diverse and variant assessment of differential predictability, albeit the majority of cases produce a statistically significant DM score. While it appears that no particular model consistently and comparatively outperforms any of the other, yet the DSGE-FAVAR presents significant scores at the 1% level in almost all pairwise comparisons. Specifically, the DSGE-FAVAR is superior when examined with the VAR, BVAR, simple DSGE and DSGE-VAR models and only when compared to FAVAR especially in one- and four-steps-ahead, it shows weak or no differential predictability. Overall, in all other cases except DSGE-FAVAR, many test statistics are not significant for four-quarters-ahead and the combined investigation of the MDD, RMSE and DM results is not indicative of a consistent outranking classification among the other investigated models for all forecasting horizons.

Table 5: Pairwise forecast comparison for the GDP with the Diebold-Mariano test

GDP	PERIODS			
	1	2	3	4
VAR vs BVAR	1.247	1.365	1.317	2.017
VAR vs FAVAR	0.928	0.524	0.320	0.628
VAR vs DSGE	1.134	0.105	1.544	1.457
VAR vs DSGE-VAR	0.525	1.891	2.163	2.067
VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	0.720	1.389	1.635	1.742
BVAR vs FAVAR	0.963	0.492	0.271	0.533
BVAR vs DSGE	1.181	0.218	1.469	1.322
BVAR vs DSGE-VAR	1.209	1.846	2.339	1.397
BVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	0.943	1.353	1.518	1.580
FAVAR vs DSGE	0.568	0.555	0.282	0.068
FAVAR vs DSGE-VAR	0.929	0.396	0.193	0.500
FAVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	0.945	0.225	0.078	0.184
DSGE vs DSGE-VAR	1.153	1.225	1.352	1.296
DSGE vs DSGE-FAVAR	1.267	1.839	1.304	0.711
DSGE-VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	0.716	1.112	1.348	1.592

Notes: The Diebold-Mariano (1995) test is based on squared prediction errors.

5 Conclusions

This study investigated and employed advanced Bayesian methods for estimating dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models. These models appear to be particularly suited for conducting policy evaluation, as shown in the works of Smets and Wouters (2003, 2004), Del Negro and Schorfheide (2004), Adolfson *et al.* (2008) and Christiano *et al.* (2005). However, calibrated DSGE models face many important challenges such as the fragility of parameter estimates, statistical fit and the weak reliability of policy forecasts as reported in Stock and Watson (2001), Ireland (2004) and Schorfheide (2010). In recent years Bayesian estimation has become popular mainly due to the increasing computational power available to estimate large-scale DSGE models using Markov chain Monte Carlo simulations. DSGE models can pose identification problems for frequentist estimation that no amount of data or computing power can overcome. New macroeconomic research is drawn to the application of Bayesian statistics because DSGE models are often seen as abstractions of actual economies.

We included a comparative evaluation of the out-of-sample predictive performance of many different specifications of estimated DSGE models and various classes of VAR models, using datasets from the US economy. Simple and hybrid DSGE models were implemented, such as DSGE-VARs and Factor Augmented DGSEs (DSGE-FAVAR), and tested against standard VARs, Bayesian VARs and Factor Augmented VARs (FAVAR). The investigated period spanned 1960:Q4 to 2010:Q4 for the real GDP, the harmonized CPI and the nominal short-term interest rate. We produced their forecasts for the out-of-sample testing period 1997:Q1-2010:Q4.

The results were evaluated with the use of Bayesian method of the marginal data density as well as the root mean squared forecast error. The Diebold-Mariano (1995) pairwise test was also employed to measure comparatively the differential forecastability. The best forecasting performance for the CPI and FF rate macroeconomic variables was consistently produced by the DSGE-FAVAR model, with few exceptions regarding the forecast horizons. For the GDP, different models provided with the most accurate forecasts depending on the forecast horizon and the statistical measure of predictability used. In particular, apart from the DSGE-FAVAR, the FAVAR and the simple DSGE models were the best performers, whilst BVAR and DSGE-VAR specifications provided with less satisfying forecasting results.

Policymakers and practitioners are particularly interested in DSGE models, yet these are typically

Table 6: Pairwise forecast comparison for the CPI with the Diebold-Mariano test

CPI	PERIODS			
	1	2	3	4
VAR vs BVAR	6.107	0.678	3.748	4.898
VAR vs FAVAR	2.243	3.900	4.404	4.215
VAR vs DSGE	5.142	5.532	3.298	2.071
VAR vs DSGE-VAR	2.039	2.513	2.963	0.995
VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	3.878	3.174	2.304	2.382
BVAR vs FAVAR	2.835	3.856	4.211	3.749
BVAR vs DSGE	4.879	5.630	3.510	1.537
BVAR vs DSGE-VAR	6.821	2.944	4.316	4.607
BVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	3.671	3.083	2.454	2.684
FAVAR vs DSGE	4.082	4.740	4.084	2.728
FAVAR vs DSGE-VAR	2.206	4.153	4.407	4.113
FAVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	3.529	3.622	3.445	3.433
DSGE vs DSGE-VAR	5.127	5.458	3.198	2.318
DSGE vs DSGE-FAVAR	2.311	1.741	0.584	2.442
DSGE-VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	3.881	2.914	2.210	2.323

Notes: As in Table 5

Table 7: Pairwise forecast comparison for the FF rate with the Diebold-Mariano test

FF rate	PERIODS			
	1	2	3	4
VAR vs BVAR	8.367	1.492	3.097	2.927
VAR vs FAVAR	5.133	1.914	1.107	1.317
VAR vs DSGE	9.078	4.832	3.601	1.607
VAR vs DSGE-VAR	8.407	4.480	4.138	3.505
VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	7.110	3.416	2.429	2.509
BVAR vs FAVAR	5.061	1.943	1.198	1.410
BVAR vs DSGE	9.102	4.878	3.728	0.416
BVAR vs DSGE-VAR	5.023	4.451	3.845	3.585
BVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	7.063	3.456	2.521	2.601
FAVAR vs DSGE	3.813	1.329	0.236	1.386
FAVAR vs DSGE-VAR	5.072	1.796	1.018	1.236
FAVAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	0.653	1.483	1.731	0.974
DSGE vs DSGE-VAR	9.047	4.877	3.516	2.377
DSGE vs DSGE-FAVAR	5.969	2.877	1.705	2.482
DSGE-VAR vs DSGE-FAVAR	7.060	3.313	2.350	2.435

Notes: As in Table 5

too stylized to be taken directly to the data and often yield weak prediction results. Very recently, hybrid models have become popular for dealing with some of the DSGE model misspecifications. Major advances in Bayesian estimation methodology as shown in this study, will allow these models to compete and outperform well-known time-series models (e.g., VARs) and effectively deal with more complex real-world problems as richer sources of data become available. The present comparative model validation can be useful to monetary policy analysis and macro-forecasting.

References

Adolfson M, Stefan L, Jesper L, Mattias V (2008) Evaluating an Estimated New Keynesian Small Open Economy Model, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 32(8), 2690-2721

Altug S (1989) Time-to-Build and Aggregate Fluctuations: Some New Evidence, International Economic Review, 30(4), 889-920

Bai J., Ng S. (2000) Determining the Number of Factors in Approximate Factor Models, Econometrica, 70.

Benati L, Surico P (2009) VAR Analysis and the Great Moderation, American Economic Review, 99(4), 1636-52

Bernanke B S., Boivin J. (2003) Monetary Policy in a Data-Rich Environment, Journal of Monetary Economics 50 (3), 525-546.

Bernanke B S., Boivin J. and Eliasz P. (2005) Measuring the Effects of Monetary Policy: A Factor-Augmented Vector Autoregressive (FAVAR) Approach, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, MIT Press, vol. 120(1), pages 387-422, January.

Boivin J, Giannoni MP (2006) DSGE Models in a Data-Rich Environment, NBER Working Papers 12772

Boivin J, Giannoni MP and Mihov I. (2009) Sticky Prices and Monetary Policy: Evidence from Disaggregated US Data, American Economic Review, American Economic Association, vol. 99(1), 350-84

Brüggemann R, H. Lütkepohl and M. Marcellino (2008) Forecasting euro area variables with German pre-EMU data, Journal of Forecasting, 27(6), 465–481

Canova F (1994) Statistical Inference in Calibrated Models, Journal of Applied Econometrics, 9, 123-144

Canova F, Gambetti L (2004) On the Time Variations of US Monetary Policy: Who is Right?, Money Macro and Finance (MMF) Research Group Conference.

Christiano, L. J., M. Eichenbaum, C. Evans (2005) Nominal Rigidities and the Dynamic effects of a Shock to Monetary Policy, Journal of Political Economy 113, 1-45.

Christoffel K, Günter C, Anders W (2008) The New Area-Wide Model of the Euro Area - A Micro-Founded Open-Economy Model for Forecasting and Policy Analysis, European Central Bank Working Paper Series n. 944

Chudik, A. and M. H. Pesaran (2009) Infinite Dimensional VARs and Factor Models, Working Paper Series 998, European Central Bank.

Clarida R, Galí J, Gertler M (2000) Monetary Policy Rules And Macroeconomic Stability: Evidence And Some Theory, The Quarterly Journal of Economics, 115(1), 147-180

Cogley TF, Sargent TJ (2005) Drift and Volatilities: Monetary Policies and Outcomes in the Post WWII U.S, Review of Economic Dynamics, 8(2), 262-302

Consolo A, Favero CA and Paccagnini A (2009) On the Statistical Identification of DSGE Models, Journal of Econometrics, 150, 99-115.

Dahlhaus R (1997) Fitting time series models to nonstationary processes, The Annals of Statistics, 25, 1-37

Dahlhaus R (2000) A likelihood approximation for locally stationary processes, The Annals of Statistics, 28, 1762-1794

DeJong D, Ingram B, Whiteman C (1996) A Bayesian Approach to Calibration, Journal of Business Economics and Statistics, 14, 1-9

Del Negro M, Schorfheide F (2004) Priors from General equilibrium Models for VARs, International Economic Review, 45, 643-673

Del Negro M, Schorfheide F, Smets F, Wouters R (2007) On the Fit of New-Keynesisan Models, Journal of Business, Economics and Statistics, 25(2), 124-162

Diebold FX, Mariano RS (1995) Comparing predictive accuracy, Journal of Business and Economic Statistics, 13(3), 253-263

Doan T, Litterman R, Sims C (1984) Forecasting and Conditional Projections Using Realistic Prior Distributions, Econometric Reviews, 3, 1-100

Dua P, Ray SC (1995) A BVAR model for the Connecticut Economy, Journal of Forecasting, 14(3), 167-180

Durbin J, Koopman SJ (2002) Time Series Analysis by State Space Methods, Oxford University Press

Fagan G., Henry J. and Mestre R. (2001) An area-wide model (AWM) for the euro area, Working Paper Series 42, European Central Bank.

Fernandez-Villaverde J (2009) The Econometrics of DSGE Models, NBER Working Paper 14677

Fernández-de-Córdoba G, Torres JL (2010) Forecasting the Spanish Economy with a DSGE Model: An Augmented VAR Approach, Journal of the Spanish Economic Association. Forthcoming

Forni M, Reichlin L. (1996): Dynamic Common Factors in Large Cross-Sections, Empirical Economics, 21, 27-42.

Forni M, Reichlin L. (1998): Let's Get Real: A Dynamic Factor Analytical Approach to Disaggregated Business Cycle, Review of Economic Studies, 65, 453-474.

Forni M, Hallin M, Lippi M and Reichlin L. (1999): Reference Cycles: The NBER Methodology Revisited, mimeo.

Forni M, Hallin M, Lippi M and Reichlin L. (2000): The Generalized Dynamic-Factor Model: Identification And Estimation, The Review of Economic and Statistics, MIT Press, vol. 82(4), pages 540-554, November.

Geweke J (1999) Using Simulation Methods for Bayesian Econometric Models: Inference, Development and Communication, Econometric Reviews 18(1), 1-126

Ghent A (2009) Comparing DSGE-VAR Forecasting Models: How Big are the Differences?, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 2009, 33(4), 864-882

Harvey AC (1990) Forecasting, structural time series and the Kalman filter, Cambridge University Press

Harvey AC (1986) Analysis and generalization of a multivariate exponential smoothing model, Management Science, 32, 374-380

Ingram B, Whiteman C (1994) Supplanting the Minnesota Prior - Forecasting Macroeconomics Time Series using Real Business Cycle Model Priors, Journal of Monetary Economics, 34, 497-510

Ireland P (2004) A Method for Taking Models to the Data, Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control, 28, 1205-1226

Justiniano A, Primiceri GE (2008) The Time-Varying Volatility of Macro-economic Fluctuations, American Economic Review, 98(3), 604-41

Kadiyala KR, Karlsson S (1997) Numerical Methods for Estimation and Inference in Bayesian VAR-Models, Journal of Applied Econometrics, 12(2), 99-132

Kalman RE (1960) A New Approach to Linear Filtering and Prediction. Journal of Basic Engineering, Transactions of the ASME Series D 82, 35-45

Kalman RE (1963) New Methods in Wiener Filtering Theory. In: Bogdanoff J.L., Kozin F. (eds.) Proceedings of the First Symposium of Engineering Applications of Random Function Theory and Probability, Wiley, New York, 270-388

Kim C-J, Nelson CR (1999) Has The U.S. Economy Become More Stable? A Bayesian Approach Based On A Markov-Switching Model Of The Business Cycle, The Review of Economics and Statistics, MIT Press, 81(4), 608-616

Kim C-J, Nelson CR (1999) State space models with Regime switching, MIT Press

King RG (2000) The New IS-LM Model: Language, Logic, and Limits, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond Economic Quarterly, 86, 45-103

Kolasa M, Rubaszek M, Skrzypczynski P (2009) Putting the New Keynesian DSGE Model to the Real-Time Forecasting Test, European Central Bank Working Paper Series n. 1110

Litterman RB (1981) A Bayesian Procedure for Forecasting with Vector Autoregressions, Working Paper, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

Litterman RB (1986) Forecasting with Bayesian Vector Autoregressions: Five Years of Experience, Journal of Business and Statistics 4(1), 25–38

Lubik TA, Schorfheide F (2004) Testing for Indeterminacy: An Application to U.S. Monetary Policy, American Economic Review, 94(1), 190-217

Marcellino, M. (2004) Forecasting EMU macroeconomic variables, International Journal of Forecasting, 20, 359–372

Marcellino, M., J. H. Stock and M.W. Watson (2003) Macroeconomic forecasting in the Euro area: Country specific versus area-wide information, European Economic Review, 47(1), 1–18

McConnell MM, Perez-Quiros G (2000) Output Fluctuations in the United States: What Has Changed since the Early 1980's? American Economic Review, 90(5), 1464-1476

Prado G.H, West M (2001) Bayesian time-varying autoregressions: Theory, methods and applications. Resenhas Journal, 4, 405-422

Primiceri GE (2005) Time Varying Structural Vector Autoregressions and Monetary Policy, The Review of Economic Studies, 72, 821-852

Rubaszek M, Skrzypczynski P (2008) On the Forecasting Perfomance of a Small-Scale DSGE Model, International Journal of Forecasting, 24, 498-512

Sargent T (1989) Two Models of Measurements and the Investment Accelerator, Journal of Political Economy, 97(2), 251-287

Schorfheide F (2010) Estimation and Evaluation of DSGE Models: Progress and Challenges, University of Pennsylvania

Schorfheide F, Sill K, Kryshko M (2010) DSGE Model-Based Forecasting of Non-Modelled Variables, International Journal of Forecasting, 26(2), 348-373

Sims CA (1980) Macroeconomics and reality, Econometrica, 48(1), 1-48

Sims, CA (2002) Solving Linear Rational Expectations Models, Computational Economics, 20 (1-2), 1-20

Sims CA, Zha T (1998) Bayesian Methods for Dynamic Multivariate Models, International Economic Review, 39, 949-968

Sims CA, Zha T (2006) Were There Regime Switches in U.S. Monetary Policy?, American Economic Review, 96(1), 54-81

Smets F, Wouters R (2003) An Estimated Stochastic Dynamic General Equilibrium Model of the Euro Area, Journal of the European Economic Association, 1, 1123-1175

Smets F, Wouters R (2004) Forecasting with a Bayesian DSGE model: an application to the Euro area, Working Paper No. 389, European Central Bank, Frankfurt

Spencer DE (1993) Developing a Bayesian Vector Autoregression Forecasting Model, International Journal of Forecasting 9(3), 407–421

Stock JH, Watson WM (2001) Vector autoregressions, Journal of Economic Perspectives, 15, 101-115

Stock JH, Watson WM (2002) Macroeconomic Forecasting Using Diffusion Indexe , Journal of Business Economics and Statistics, XX:II, 147-162.

Theil H, Goldberg AS (1961) On Pure and Mixed Estimation in Economics, International Economic Review, 2, 65-78

Todd RM (1984) Improving Economic Forecasting with Bayesian Vector Autoregression, Quarterly Review, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis

Woodford M (2003) Interest and Prices, Princeton University Press

Zellner A (1963) Estimation for seemingly unrelated regression equations: some exact finite sample results, Journal of the American Statistical Association, 58, 977-992

A Appendix

The source of the data is the Federal Reserve Economic Data - Federal Reserve Bank of Saint Louis (http://research.stlouisfed.org/fred2/). In order to construct the FAVAR we extract factors from a balanced panel of 109 monthly and quarterly macroeconomic and financial time series, following the dataset built by Stock and Watson (2002). The dataset involves several measures of industrial production, interest rates, various price indices, employment and other important macroeconomic and also financial variables. In the following Table, the first column has the series number, the second the series acronym, the third the series description, the fourth the transformation codes and the fifth column denotes a slow-moving variable with 1 and a fast-moving one with 0. The transformed series are tested using the Box-Jenkins procedure and the Dickey-Fuller test. Following Bernanke *et al.* (2005), the transformation codes are as follows: 1 - no transformation; 2 - first difference; 4 - logarithm; 5 - first difference of logarithm; 6 - second difference; 7 - second difference of logarithm.

Date	Long Description	Tcode	SlowCode
PAYEMS	Total Nonfarm Payrolls: All Employees	5	1
DSPIC96	Real Disposable Personal Income	5	1
NAPM	ISM Manufacturing: PMI Composite Index	1	1
UNRATE	Civilian Unemployment Rate	1	1
INDPRO	Industrial Production Index (Index 2007=100)	5	1
PCEPI	Personal Consumption Expenditures: Chain-type Price Index (Index 2005=100)	5	1
PPIACO	Producer Price Index: All Commodities (Index 1982=100)	5	1
FEDFUNDS	Effective Federal Funds Rate	1	0
IPDCONGD	Industrial Production: Durable Consumer Goods (Index 2007=100)	5	1
IPBUSEQ	Industrial Production: Business Equipment (Index 2007=100)	5	1
IPMAT	Industrial Production: Materials (Index 2007=100)	5	1
IPCONGD	Industrial Production: Consumer Goods (Index 2007=100)	5	1
IPNCONGD	Industrial Production: Nondurable Consumer Goods (Index 2007=100)	5	1
IPFINAL	Industrial Production: Final Products (Market Group) (Index 2007=100)	5	1
UNEMPLOY	Unemployed	5	1
EMRATIO	Civilian Employment-Population Ratio (%)	1	1
CE16OV	Civilian Employment	5	1
CLF16OV	Civilian Labor Force	5	1
CIVPART	Civilian Participation Rate (%)	1	1
UEMP27OV	Civilians Unemployed for 27 Weeks and Over	5	1
UEMPLT5	Civilians Unemployed - Less Than 5 Weeks	5	1
UEMP15OV	Civilians Unemployed - 15 Weeks & Over	5	1
UEMP15T26	Civilians Unemployed for 15-26 Weeks	5	1
UEMP5TO14	Civilians Unemployed for 5-14 Weeks	5	1
MANEMP	Employees on Nonfarm Payrolls: Manufacturing	5	1
USPRIV	All Employees: Total Private Industries	5	1
USCONS	All Employees: Construction	5	1
USFIRE	All Employees: Financial Activities	5	1
USTRADE	All Employees: Retail Trade	5	1
DMANEMP	All Employees: Durable Goods Manufacturing	5	1
USGOOD	All Employees: Goods-Producing Industries	5	1
USEHS	All Employees: Education & Health Services	5	1
USLAH	All Employees: Leisure & Hospitality	5	1
SRVPRD	All Employees: Service-Providing Industries	5	1
USINFO	All Employees: Information Services	5	1
USPBS	All Employees: Professional & Business Services	5	1
USTPU	All Employees: Trade, Transportation & Utilities	5	1
NDMANEMP	All Employees: Nondurable Goods Manufacturing	5	1
USMINE	All Employees: Natural Resources & Mining	5	1
USWTRADE	All Employees: Wholesale Trade	5	1
USSERV	All Employees: Other Services	5	1
AHEMAN	Average Hourly Earnings: Manufacturing	5	1
AHECONS	Average Hourly Earnings: Construction (NSA)	5	1
PPIIDC	Producer Price Index: Industrial Commodities (NSA)	5	1

PPIFGS	Producer Price Index: Finished Goods (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PPICPE	Producer Price Index: Finished Goods: Capital Equipment (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PPICRM	Producer Price Index: Crude Materials for Further Processing (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PPIITM	Producer Price Index: Intermediate Materials: Supplies & Components (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PPIENG	Producer Price Index: Fuels & Related Products & Power (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PPIFCG	Producer Price Index: Finished Consumer Goods (Index 1982=100)	5	1
PFCGEF	Producer Price Index: Finished Consumer Goods Excluding Foods (Index 1982=100)	5	1
CPIAUCSL	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items (Index 1982=100)	5	1
CPIAUCNS	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items (Index 1982-84=100)	5	1
CPILFESL	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Food & Energy (Index 1982-84=100)	5	1
CPILFENS	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Food & Energy (NSA Index 1982=100)	5	1
CPIUFDNS	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Food (NSA Index 1982=100)	5	1
CPIENGNS	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Energy (NSA Index 1982=100)	5	1
CPIENGSL	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Energy (Index 1982-1984=100)	5	1
CPILEGSL	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: All Items Less Energy (Index 1982-1984=100)	5	1
CPIMEDSL	Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers: Medical Care (Index 1982-1984=100)	5	1
PPIFCF	Producer Price Index: Finished Consumer Foods (Index 1982=100)	5	1
AAA	Moody's Seasoned Aaa Corporate Bond Yield	1	0
BAA	Moody's Seasoned Baa Corporate Bond Yield	1	0
M2SL	M2 Money Stock	6	0
M2NS	M2 Money Stock (NSA)	6	0
M1NS	M1 Money Stock (NSA)	6	0
M3SL	M3 Money Stock (DISCONTINUED SERIES)	6	0
GS5	5-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate	1	0
GS10	10-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate	1	0
GS1	1-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate	1	0
GS3	3-Year Treasury Constant Maturity Rate	1	0
TB3MS	3-Month Treasury Bill: Secondary Market Rate	1	0
TB6MS	6-Month Treasury Bill: Secondary Market Rate	1	0
HOUST	Housing Starts: Total: New Privately Owned Housing Units Started	5	0
PERMIT	New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits	5	0
HOUSTMW	Housing Starts in Midwest Census Region	5	0
HOUSTW	Housing Starts in West Census Region	5	0
HOUSTNE	Housing Starts in Northeast Census Region	5	0
HOUSTS	Housing Starts in South Census Region	5	0
PERMITS	New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits - South	5	0
PERMITMW	New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits - Midwest	5	0
PERMITW	New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits - West	5	0
PERMITNE	New Private Housing Units Authorized by Building Permits - Northeast	5	0
PDI	Personal Dividend Income	5	0
SPREAD1	3mo-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD2	6mo-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD3	1yr-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD4	2yr-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD5	3yr-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD6	5yr-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD7	7yr-FYFF	1	0
SPREAD8	10yr-FYFF	1	0
PCECC96	Real Personal Consumption Expenditures (Billions of Chained 2005 Dollars)	5	1
UNLPNBS	Nonfarm Business Sector: Unit Nonlabor Payments (Index 2005=100)	5	1
IPDNBS	Nonfarm Business Sector: Implicit Price Deflator (Index 2005=100)	5	1
OUTNFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Output (Index 2005=100)	5	1
HOANBS	Nonfarm Business Sector: Hours of All Persons (Index 2005=100)	5	1
COMPNFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Compensation Per Hour (Index 2005=100)	5	1
ULCNFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Unit Labor Cost (Index 2005=100)	5	1
COMPRNFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Real Compensation Per Hour (Index 2005=100)	5	1
OPHNFB	Nonfarm Business Sector: Output Per Hour of All Persons (Index 2005=100)	5	1
OPHPBS	Business Sector: Output Per Hour of All Persons (Index 2005=100)	5	1
ULCBS	Business Sector: Unit Labor Cost (Index 2005=100)	5	1
RCPHBS	Business Sector: Real Compensation Per Hour (Index 2005=100)	5	1
HCOMPBS	Business Sector: Compensation Per Hour (Index 2005=100)	5	1
OUTBS	Business Sector: Output (Ineex 2005=100)	5	1
HOABS	Business Sector: Hours of All Persons (Index 2005=100)	5	1
IPDBS	Business Sector: Implicit Price Deflator (Index 2005=100)	5	1
CP	Corporate Profits After Tax	5	0
SP500	S&P 500 Index	5	0