

Internet Appendix for “Model Instability and Forecasting Performance”

Davide Pettenuzzo

Brandeis University*

Allan Timmermann

UCSD, CEPR, and CREATES†

May 5, 2015

A Posterior derivations

This not-for-publication appendix explains how we obtain parameter estimates for the models described in Section 2 of the paper, and shows how we use these to generate predictive densities.

A.1 Linear models

For the linear models the goal is to obtain draws from the joint posterior distribution $p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$, where \mathcal{Y}^t denotes all information available up to time t . Combining the priors in equations (2)-(4) of the paper with the likelihood function yields the following conditional posteriors:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \end{bmatrix} \Big| \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{V}}), \quad (\text{A-1})$$

and

$$\sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} \Big| \mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{G}(\bar{s}^{-2}, \bar{v}), \quad (\text{A-2})$$

*Brandeis University, Sachar International Center, 415 South St, Waltham, MA, Tel: (781) 736-2834. Email: dpettenu@brandeis.edu.

†University of California, San Diego, 9500 Gilman Drive, MC 0553, La Jolla CA 92093. Tel: (858) 534-0894. Email: atimmerm@ucsd.edu.

where

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbf{V}} &= \left[\underline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} + \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{x}_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau' \right]^{-1}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}} &= \bar{\mathbf{V}} \left[\underline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \underline{\mathbf{b}} + \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \mathbf{x}_\tau y_{\tau+1} \right], \\ \bar{v} &= \underline{v}_0 (t_0 - 1) + (t - 1).\end{aligned}\tag{A-3}$$

and

$$\bar{s}^2 = \frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} (y_{\tau+1} - \mu - \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{x}_\tau)^2 + (s_{y,t_0}^2 \times \underline{v}_0 (t_0 - 1))}{\bar{v}}.\tag{A-4}$$

A Gibbs sampler algorithm can be used to iterate back and forth between (A-1) and (A-2), yielding a series of draws for the parameter vector $(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2})$. Draws from the predictive density $p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ can then be obtained by noting that

$$p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t) = \int p(y_{t+1} | \mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2}, \mathcal{Y}^t) p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} | \mathcal{Y}^t) d\mu d\boldsymbol{\beta} d\sigma_\varepsilon^{-2}.\tag{A-5}$$

Draws from $p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ are obtained in two steps:

1. Draw μ , $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and σ_ε^{-2} from $p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the Gibbs sampler described above
2. Given μ , $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, and σ_ε^{-2} , draw

$$y_{t+1} | \mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_\varepsilon^{-2}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu + \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{x}_t, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)\tag{A-6}$$

A.2 Time-varying Parameter, Stochastic Volatility Models

Let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t$ be the time varying parameters, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_t = (\mu_t, \boldsymbol{\beta}_t')$, while $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_t\}$ and $h^t = \{h_1, \dots, h_t\}$ are the sequences of time-varying mean and log-volatility parameters up to time t . Finally, let $\Theta = (\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{Q}, \sigma_\xi^{-2}, \boldsymbol{\gamma}_\theta, \lambda_0, \lambda_1)$ be the time-invariant parameters of the TVP-SV model.

To obtain draws from the joint posterior distribution $p(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ for the TVP-SV model, we use the Gibbs sampler to draw recursively from the following conditional distributions:¹

1. $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^t | \Theta, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
2. $p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta} | \Theta_{-\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
3. $p(\mathbf{Q} | \Theta_{-\mathbf{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$

¹In standard set notation A_{-b} is the complementary set of b in A , i.e., $A_{-b} = \{x \in A : x \neq b\}$.

4. $p(h^t | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
5. $p(\sigma_\xi^{-2} | \Theta_{-\sigma_\xi^{-2}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
6. $p(\gamma_\theta | \Theta_{-\gamma_\theta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
7. $p(\lambda_0, \lambda_1 | \Theta_{-\lambda_0, \lambda_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$

We simulate from each of these blocks as follows. Starting with $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$, we focus on $p(\boldsymbol{\theta}^t | \Theta, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$. First, define $\tilde{y}_{\tau+1} = y_{\tau+1} - \mu - \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{x}_\tau$ and rewrite equation (6) in the paper as follows:

$$\tilde{y}_{\tau+1} = \mu_{\tau+1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{\tau+1} x_\tau + \exp(h_{\tau+1}) u_{\tau+1}. \quad (\text{A-7})$$

Given a set of values for μ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, $\tilde{y}_{\tau+1}$ is observable. This reduces (A-7) to the measurement equation of a standard linear Gaussian state space model with heteroskedastic errors. Thus the sequence of time varying parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$ can be drawn from (A-7) using the algorithm of [Carter and Kohn \(1994\)](#).

Second, conditional on $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$ we can draw $\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}$ from standard distributions for $p(\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta} | \Theta_{-\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu \\ \boldsymbol{\beta} \end{bmatrix} \Big| \Theta_{-\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim N(\bar{\mathbf{b}}, \bar{\mathbf{V}}), \quad (\text{A-8})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{V}} &= \left[\mathbf{V}^{-1} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{\exp(h_{\tau+1})^2} \mathbf{x}_\tau \mathbf{x}'_\tau \right]^{-1}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}} &= \bar{\mathbf{V}} \left[\mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{b} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{\exp(h_{\tau+1})^2} \mathbf{x}_\tau (y_{\tau+1} - \mu_{\tau+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{\tau+1} \mathbf{x}_\tau) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-9})$$

Third, note that

$$\mathbf{Q} | \Theta_{-\mathbf{Q}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, M'_i, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{IW}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}, \bar{v}_{\mathbf{Q}}), \quad (\text{A-10})$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{Q}} = \underline{\mathbf{Q}} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau+1} - \gamma'_\theta \boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau) (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau+1} - \gamma'_\theta \boldsymbol{\theta}_\tau)'. \quad (\text{A-11})$$

and $\bar{v}_{\mathbf{Q}} = (t-1) + v_{\mathbf{Q}}(t_0 - 1)$. Fourth, define $y_{\tau+1}^* = y_{\tau+1} - (\mu + \mu_{\tau+1}) - (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau+1})' \mathbf{x}_\tau$ and note that $y_{\tau+1}^*$ is observable conditional on $\mu, \boldsymbol{\beta}$, and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^t$. Next, rewrite equation (6) in the paper as

$$y_{\tau+1}^* = \exp(h_{\tau+1}) u_{\tau+1}. \quad (\text{A-12})$$

Squaring and taking logs on both sides of (A-12) yields a new state space system that replaces equations (6)-(8) in the paper with

$$y_{\tau+1}^{**} = 2h_{\tau+1} + u_{\tau+1}^{**}, \quad (\text{A-13})$$

$$h_{\tau+1} = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 h_{\tau} + \xi_{\tau+1}, \quad (\text{A-14})$$

where $y_{\tau+1}^{**} = \ln \left[(y_{\tau+1}^*)^2 \right]$, and $u_{\tau+1}^{**} = \ln (u_{\tau+1}^2) \sim \ln (\chi_1^2)$, with u_{τ}^{**} independent of ξ_s for all τ and s . Kim et al. (1998) employ a data augmentation approach and introduce a new state variable s_{τ} , $\tau = 1, \dots, t$, turning their focus on drawing from $p(h^t | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, s^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ instead of $p(h^t | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$.² Conditional on the additional state variable s_{τ} , the linear non-Gaussian state space representation in (A-13)-(A-14) can be written as an approximate linear Gaussian state space model:

$$u_{\tau+1}^{**} \approx \sum_{j=1}^7 q_j \mathcal{N}(m_j - 1.2704, v_j^2), \quad (\text{A-15})$$

where m_j , v_j^2 , and q_j , $j = 1, 2, \dots, 7$, are constants specified in Kim et al. (1998). In turn, (A-15) implies

$$u_{\tau+1}^{**} | s_{\tau+1} = j \sim \mathcal{N}(m_j - 1.2704, v_j^2), \quad (\text{A-16})$$

where $q_j = \Pr(s_{\tau+1} = j)$ is the probability of state j .

Conditional on s^t , we can rewrite the nonlinear state space system as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\tau+1}^{**} &= 2h_{\tau+1} + e_{\tau+1}, \\ h_{\tau+1} &= \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 h_{\tau} + \xi_{\tau+1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-17})$$

where $e_{\tau+1} \sim N(m_j - 1.2704, v_j^2)$ with probability q_j . We can use the algorithm of Carter and Kohn (1994) to draw the whole sequence of stochastic volatilities, h^t , for this linear Gaussian state space system.

Conditional on the sequence h^t , draws of states s^t can easily be obtained, noting that each of its elements can be independently drawn from the discrete density defined by

$$\Pr(s_{\tau+1} = j | y_{\tau+1}^{**}, h_{\tau+1}) = \frac{q_j f_{\mathcal{N}}(y_{\tau+1}^{**} | 2h_{\tau+1} + m_j - 1.2704, v_j^2)}{\sum_{l=1}^7 q_l f_{\mathcal{N}}(y_{\tau+1}^{**} | 2h_{\tau+1} + m_l - 1.2704, v_l^2)}. \quad (\text{A-18})$$

for $\tau = 1, \dots, t-1$ and $j = 1, \dots, 7$, and where $f_{\mathcal{N}}$ denotes the kernel of a normal density.

Fifth, the posterior distribution for $p(\sigma_{\xi}^{-2} | \Theta_{-\sigma_{\xi}^{-2}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ takes the form

$$\sigma_{\xi}^{-2} | \Theta_{-\sigma_{\xi}^{-2}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{G} \left(\left[\frac{\sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} (h_{\tau+1} - \lambda_0 - \lambda_1 h_{\tau})^2 + \underline{k}_{\xi} \underline{v}_{\xi} (t-1)}{(t-1) + \underline{v}_{\xi} (t_0 - 1)} \right]^{-1}, (t-1) + \underline{v}_{\xi} (t_0 - 1) \right). \quad (\text{A-19})$$

²Here $s^t = \{s_1, s_2, \dots, s_t\}$ denotes the history up to time t of the new state variable s .

Sixth, obtaining draws from $p(\gamma_{\theta} | \Theta_{-\gamma_{\theta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ and $p(\lambda_0, \lambda_1 | \Theta_{-\lambda_0, \lambda_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ is straightforward. As for $p(\gamma_{\theta} | \Theta_{-\gamma_{\theta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$, we separately draw each of its elements. The i -th element γ_{θ}^i is drawn from the following distribution

$$\gamma_{\theta}^i | \Theta_{-\gamma_{\theta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{m}_{\gamma_{\theta}}^i, \bar{V}_{\gamma_{\theta}}^i) \times \gamma_{\theta}^i \in (-1, 1) \quad (\text{A-20})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}_{\gamma_{\theta}}^i &= \left[\underline{V}_{-\gamma_{\theta}}^{-1} + \mathbf{Q}^{ii} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} (\theta_{\tau}^i)^2 \right]^{-1}, \\ \bar{m}_{\gamma_{\theta}}^i &= \bar{V}_{\gamma_{\theta}}^i \left[\underline{V}_{-\gamma_{\theta}}^{-1} \underline{m}_{\gamma_{\theta}} + \mathbf{Q}^{ii} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \theta_{\tau}^i \theta_{\tau+1}^i \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-21})$$

and \mathbf{Q}^{ii} is the i -th diagonal element of \mathbf{Q}^{-1} .

Finally, the distribution $p(\lambda_0, \lambda_1 | \Theta_{-\lambda_0, \lambda_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ takes the form

$$\lambda_0, \lambda_1 | \Theta_{-\lambda_0, \lambda_1}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \bar{m}_{\lambda_0} \\ \bar{m}_{\lambda_1} \end{bmatrix}, \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{\lambda} \right) \times \lambda_1 \in (-1, 1),$$

where

$$\bar{\mathbf{V}}_{\lambda} = \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{cc} \underline{V}_{\lambda_0}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{V}_{\lambda_1}^{-1} \end{array} \right] + \sigma_{\xi}^{-2} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ h_{\tau} \end{array} \right] [1, h_{\tau}] \right\}^{-1}, \quad (\text{A-22})$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} \bar{m}_{\lambda_0} \\ \bar{m}_{\lambda_1} \end{bmatrix} = \bar{\mathbf{V}}_{\lambda} \left\{ \left[\begin{array}{cc} \underline{V}_{\lambda_0}^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \underline{V}_{\lambda_1}^{-1} \end{array} \right] \begin{bmatrix} \underline{m}_{\lambda_0} \\ \underline{m}_{\lambda_1} \end{bmatrix} + \sigma_{\xi}^{-2} \sum_{\tau=1}^{t-1} \left[\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ h_{\tau} \end{array} \right] h_{\tau+1} \right\}. \quad (\text{A-23})$$

Using these results, draws from the predictive density $p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ can be obtained by noting than

$$\begin{aligned} p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t) &= \int p(y_{t+1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1}, h_{t+1}, \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t) \times p(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1}, h_{t+1} | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t) \\ &\quad \times p(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t | \mathcal{Y}^t) d\Theta d\boldsymbol{\theta}^{t+1} dh^{t+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-24})$$

Draws from $p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ are obtained in three steps:

1. Draw from $p(\Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the above Gibbs sampling algorithm;
2. Simulate the future volatility, h_{t+1} , and the future regression coefficients, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1}$ from the distributions

$$h_{t+1} | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 h_t, \sigma_{\xi}^2). \quad (\text{A-25})$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1} | \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\gamma'_{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}_t, \mathbf{Q}). \quad (\text{A-26})$$

3. Finally, given $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1}, h_{t+1}, \Theta, \mathcal{Y}^t$ draw

$$y_{t+1} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_{t+1}, h_{t+1}, \Theta, \boldsymbol{\theta}^t, h^t, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N} \left((\boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_{t+1}) + (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\beta}_{t+1})' \mathbf{x}_t, \exp(h_{t+1}) \right). \quad (\text{A-27})$$

A.3 MS Models

To obtain draws from the joint posterior distribution $p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ under the MS model, we use the Gibbs sampler to draw recursively from the following three conditional distributions:

1. $p(s^t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
2. $p(\Xi | s^t, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$
3. $p(\mathbf{P} | s^t, \Xi, \mathcal{Y}^t)$

We simulate from each of these blocks as follows. We follow [Chib \(1996\)](#) and rely on a multi-move sampler for the path of hidden states, s^t . We first rewrite $p(s^t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ as

$$p(s^t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) = \left[\prod_{\tau=1}^{t-1} p(s_\tau | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) \right] p(s_t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t). \quad (\text{A-28})$$

$p(s_t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ is the filtered probability distribution at $\tau = t$. [Chib \(1996\)](#) shows that

$$p(s_\tau | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) \propto p(s_{\tau+1} | s_\tau, \mathbf{P}) \times p(s_\tau | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau), \quad (\text{A-29})$$

where $p(s_\tau | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)$ is the filtered probability distribution at τ , and $p(s_{\tau+1} | s_\tau, \mathbf{P})$ is the transition probability from the Markov chain. Thus, to sample from $p(s^t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$, we first need to compute the sequence of filtered probability distributions $\{p(s_\tau | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)\}_{\tau=1}^t$, which can be obtained by recursively iterating through the following two steps for $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, t$:

$$p(s_\tau = l | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) = \sum_{k=1}^K p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau-1} = k, \mathbf{P}) p(s_{\tau-1} = k | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}), \quad (\text{A-30})$$

and, for $l = 1, \dots, K$,

$$p(s_\tau = l | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau) = \frac{p(y_\tau | s_\tau = l, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) p(s_\tau = l | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1})}{\sum_{k=1}^K p(y_\tau | s_\tau = k, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) p(s_\tau = k | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1})}. \quad (\text{A-31})$$

At $\tau = 1$ the filter is started with the initial distribution $p(s_0 | \mathbf{P})$, which we set equal to the steady state probabilities. Once the sequence of filtered probabilities $\{p(s_\tau | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)\}_{\tau=1}^t$

is available, we proceed as follows. First, we sample s_t from the filtered state probability distribution $p(s_t | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$. Next, for $\tau = t - 1, t - 2, \dots, 1$ we sample s_τ from the conditional distribution $p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$

$$p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) = \frac{p(s_{\tau+1} = l_m | s_\tau = l, \mathbf{P}) p(s_\tau = l | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^K p(s_{\tau+1} = l_m | s_\tau = k, \mathbf{P}) p(s_\tau = k | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)} \quad (\text{A-32})$$

where l_m is the state drawn in the previous step of the recursion for $s_{\tau+1}$. Note that for each $\tau = t - 1, t - 2, \dots, 1$, $p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ needs to be evaluated for all $l = 1, \dots, K$.

The state-specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_K, \sigma_1^{-2}, \dots, \sigma_K^{-2}$ are independent a posteriori and are drawn from the following distributions

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}_i | \sigma_i^{-2}, s^t, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}_i, \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i), \quad (\text{A-33})$$

and

$$\sigma_i^{-2} | \boldsymbol{\theta}_i, s^t, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{G}(\bar{s}_i^{-2}, \bar{v}_i), \quad (\text{A-34})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i &= \left[\underline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} + \sigma_i^{-2} \sum_{\tau: s_\tau = i} \mathbf{x}_\tau \mathbf{x}_\tau' \right]^{-1}, \\ \bar{\mathbf{b}}_i &= \bar{\mathbf{V}}_i \left[\underline{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \underline{\mathbf{b}} + \sigma_i^{-2} \sum_{\tau: s_\tau = i} \mathbf{x}_\tau y_{\tau+1} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-35})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_i &= \underline{v}_0 + n_i, \\ \bar{s}_i^{-2} &= \frac{\sum_{\tau: s_\tau = i} (y_{\tau+1} - \mu_i - \boldsymbol{\beta}'_i \mathbf{x}_\tau)^2 + (s_{y,t_0}^2 \times \underline{v}_0 n_i)}{\bar{v}_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A-36})$$

where $n_i = \#(s_\tau = i)$ counts the number of observations from regime i along the path of hidden states s^t . To cope with the label switching problem that arises with Markov switching models, we identify different regimes by imposing the following constraint on the regime-specific volatilities: $\sigma_1^2 < \sigma_2^2 < \dots < \sigma_K^2$.

Next, we draw the elements of the transition probability matrix \mathbf{P} from $p(\mathbf{P} | s^t, \Xi, \mathcal{Y}^t)$. Because the rows $\mathbf{p}_{i,\cdot}$ of \mathbf{P} are independent a posteriori, we draw each row separately from the following Dirichlet distribution:

$$\mathbf{p}_{i,\cdot} | s^t, \Xi, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{D}(e_{i1} + n_{i1}, \dots, e_{iK} + n_{iK}), \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (\text{A-37})$$

where $n_{ij} = \#(s_{\tau-1} = i, s_{\tau} = j)$ counts the numbers of transitions from i to j as given by the whole path of hidden states s^t .

Finally, draws from the predictive density $p(y_{t+1}|\mathcal{Y}^t)$ can be obtained by noting that

$$p(y_{t+1}|\mathcal{Y}^t) = \int p(y_{t+1}|s_{t+1}, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) \times p(s_{t+1}|s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) \times p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}|\mathcal{Y}^t) ds^{t+1} d\Xi d\mathbf{P}. \quad (\text{A-38})$$

To draw from $p(y_{t+1}|\mathcal{Y}^t)$, we proceed in three steps:

1. Draw from $p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}|\mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the above Gibbs sampling algorithm;
2. Simulate the time $t+1$ hidden state variable, s_{t+1} by drawing from $p(s_{t+1}|s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$. Note that $p(s_{t+1}|s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ equals the j -th row of \mathbf{P} , $\mathbf{p}_{j,\cdot}$, if $s_t = j$;
3. Draw from $p(y_{t+1}|s_{t+1}, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the distribution

$$y_{t+1}|s_{t+1}, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_{s_{t+1}} + \beta'_{s_{t+1}} \mathbf{x}_t, \sigma_{s_{t+1}}^2). \quad (\text{A-39})$$

A.4 CP Models

Draws from the joint posterior distribution $p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}|\mathcal{Y}^t)$ under the CP model are generated using a very similar set of steps as those used for the MS model. The key difference is of course the assumption of non-repeated regimes under the CP model. We follow [Chib \(1996\)](#) and [Chib \(1998\)](#) and rely on a multi-move sampler for the path of hidden states that is properly modified to deal with the constrained nature of the transition probability matrix \mathbf{P} . To sample from $p(s^t|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$, we first compute the whole sequence of filtered probability distributions $\{p(s_{\tau}|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau})\}_{\tau=1}^t$, which can be obtained by iterating through the following two steps recursively for $\tau = 1, 2, \dots, t$:

$$p(s_{\tau} = l|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) = \sum_{k=l-1}^l p(s_{\tau} = l|s_{\tau-1} = k, \mathbf{P}) p(s_{\tau-1} = k|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) \quad (\text{A-40})$$

for $l = 1, \dots, M$, and

$$p(s_{\tau} = l|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau}) = \frac{p(y_{\tau}|s_{\tau} = l, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) p(s_{\tau} = l|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1})}{\sum_{k=l-1}^l p(y_{\tau}|s_{\tau} = k, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1}) p(s_{\tau} = k|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau-1})} \quad (\text{A-41})$$

Specifically, at $\tau = 1$ the filter is started by setting the initial distribution $p(s_0|\mathbf{P})$ to a mass distribution that is concentrated at 1. Next, given the sequence of filtered probabilities $\{p(s_{\tau}|\Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^{\tau})\}_{\tau=1}^t$, we begin by setting $s_t = M$. Next, for $\tau = t-1, t-$

2, ..., 1 we sample s_τ from the conditional distribution $p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$, given by

$$p(s_\tau = l | s_{\tau+1}, \dots, s_t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) = \frac{p(s_{\tau+1} = l_m | s_\tau = l, \mathbf{P}) p(s_\tau = l | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)}{\sum_{k=l-1}^l p(s_{\tau+1} = l_m | s_\tau = k, \mathbf{P}) p(s_\tau = k | \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^\tau)}, \quad (\text{A-42})$$

where l_m is equal to the state drawn in the previous step of the recursion for $s_{\tau+1}$. The last of these distributions is degenerate at $s_1 = 1$. For a given sequence of states, the state-specific parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_M, \sigma_1^{-2}, \dots, \sigma_M^{-2}$ are drawn using similar steps as for the MS model.

To draw the elements of the transition probability matrix \mathbf{P} from $p(\mathbf{P} | s^t, \Xi, \mathcal{Y}^t)$, note that the diagonal elements of \mathbf{P} are independent a posteriori. We draw each of these separately from a Beta distribution

$$p_{ii} | s^t, \Xi, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{B}(\underline{a}_p + n_{ii}, \underline{b}_p + 1), \quad i = 1, \dots, M - 1, \quad (\text{A-43})$$

where $n_{ii} = \#(s_{\tau-1} = i, s_\tau = i)$ counts the numbers of transitions from i to i observed on the path of hidden states s^t , and $n_{ii+1} = 1$ by construction.

Draws from the predictive density $p(y_{t+1} | s_{t+1} = M, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ are obtained by conditioning on no breaks between the end of the sample, t , and the end of the forecasting horizon, $t + 1$. These are given by

$$p(y_{t+1} | s_{t+1} = M, \mathcal{Y}^t) = \int p(y_{t+1} | s_{t+1} = M, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t) \times p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P} | \mathcal{Y}^t) ds^t d\Xi d\mathbf{P}. \quad (\text{A-44})$$

To obtain draws for $p(y_{t+1} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$, we proceed in two steps:

1. Draw from $p(s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P} | \mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the above Gibbs sampling algorithm;
2. Draw from $p(y_{t+1} | s_{t+1} = M, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t)$ using the distribution

$$y_{t+1} | s_{t+1} = M, s^t, \Xi, \mathbf{P}, \mathcal{Y}^t \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_M + \boldsymbol{\beta}'_M \mathbf{x}_t, \sigma_M^2). \quad (\text{A-45})$$

References

- Carter, C. K. and R. Kohn (1994). On gibbs sampling for state space models. *Biometrika* 81(3), pp. 541–553.
- Chib, S. (1996). Calculating posterior distributions and modal estimates in markov mixture models. *Journal of Econometrics* 75(1), 79 – 97.
- Chib, S. (1998). Estimation and comparison of multiple change-point models. *Journal of Econometrics* 86(2), 221 – 241.
- Kim, S., N. Shephard, and S. Chib (1998). Stochastic volatility: Likelihood inference and comparison with arch models. *The Review of Economic Studies* 65(3), 361–393.