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Abstract
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1 Introduction

A central endeavour in empirical macroeconomics is the study of the dynamic causal effects that structural shocks have on macroeconomic variables. Since Sims (1980), this has typically accomplished with Structural VARs (SVARs). An almost always maintained assumption in the SVAR literature is that of ‘invertibility’, or ‘fundamentalness’ of the structural shocks, given the chosen model. If this assumption holds, all the structural shocks can be recovered from the current and lagged values of the observables included in the VAR. In fact, under invertibility the VAR innovations are a linear combination of all the contemporaneous structural shocks and, given the variance-covariance matrix of the residuals, causal effects are identified up to an orthogonal matrix that defines the contemporaneous relationships. A lot of creativity in the SVAR literature has been devoted to the formulation of appropriate identifying assumptions to inform the choice of this orthogonal matrix. The structural moving average, obtained by inverting the identified SVAR, allows inference on the dynamic causal effects of the structural shocks, represented in the form of impulse response functions (IRFs).

In contrast with standard statistical identifications, an important advancement in the more recent practice has seen the adoption of instrumental variables for the identification of structural shocks. These instruments – that can be thought of as noisy observations of the shocks of interest –, can be used either in conjunction with Structural VARs – as external instruments (SVAR-IV, also called Proxy-SVARs) or as internal instruments and part of the endogenous information set (sometimes referred to as Hybrid VARs) –, or with direct regression methods, such as Jordà (2005)’s Local Projections (LP-IV), with or without controls.

This paper introduces the conditions for identification with external instruments in Structural VARs under the assumption of partial invertibility of the shock of interest, which relates to the empirically relevant case in which the researcher is only interested in

---

1This rapidly expanding research programme, surveyed in Ramey (2016), has produced, among other applications, a number of instruments for the identification of the effects of monetary policy (e.g. Romer and Romer, 2004; Gürkaynak et al., 2005; Gertler and Karadi, 2015; Clonie and Hürtgen, 2016; Miranda-Agrippino and Rico, 2017; Paul, 2017; Hansen et al., 2019; Altavilla et al., 2019), fiscal spending (e.g. Ramey, 2011; Ricco et al., 2016; Ramey and Zubairy, 2018), tax (e.g. Romer and Romer, 2010; Mertens and Ravn, 2012; Cloyne, 2013; Leeper et al., 2013; Mertens and Montiel-Olea, 2018), government asset purchases (Fieldhouse and Mertens, 2017; Fieldhouse et al., 2018), oil (e.g. Hamilton, 2003; Kilian, 2008; Känzig, 2019), productivity news shocks Arezki et al. (2017), and technology news shocks (e.g. Miranda-Agrippino et al., 2018).
‘partially’ identifying the system, that is, in estimating the dynamic effects of just one (or a subset) of the structural shocks that can be assumed to be recoverable from the VAR residuals. In doing this we generalise results in Stock and Watson (2018) that discuss the conditions for identification in both SVAR-IV and LP-IV under the assumption of full invertibility, but also observe that identification can be achieved with IV methods under partial invertibility.\footnote{Stock and Watson (2018) note that direct methods, such as local projections, do not need to explicitly assume invertibility of the system under strict exogeneity of the instrument at all leads and lags. However, if lagged observables are required as control variables for an instrument that violates the lead-lag exogeneity condition, then, in general, the same invertibility conditions of a structural VAR are required. Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018b) discuss the cases in which invertibility can be dispensed with for identification of LP-IV with controls and Hybrid VARs.}

We show that, in general, fairly weak conditions are required to achieve identification. In particular, other than the standard relevance and contemporaneous exogeneity conditions, under partial invertibility the instrument has to fulfil a limited lead-lag exogeneity condition that ensures that the VAR innovations and the instrument are related only via the contemporaneous structural shock of interest. Importantly, the condition allows the instrument to be contaminated by leads and lags of other partially invertible shocks without compromising the correct identification of the shock of interest. Our results allow to extend the application of SVAR-IV (and LP-IV with controls) to the many empirically relevant cases in which while some of the structural disturbances may be non-invertible, the shock of interest is arguably invertible.

We make three contributions. First, we show that under partial invertibility a covariance-stationary stochastic vector process admits a ‘semi-structural’ representation that is the sum of two terms, orthogonal to one another. The first one only depends on the current realisations of the partially invertible shocks. The second instead combines leads and lags of the remaining non-invertible shocks. This result implies that if the VAR lag order correctly captures the autocorrelation structure of the Wold representation, the impulse response functions obtained from the partially identified structural moving average are the dynamic causal effects of the shock of interest.

Second, we show that under partial invertibility SVAR-IV methods (and LP-IV with controls) achieve identification under much weaker conditions on the external instrument than LP-IV without controls. The existence of a semi-structural representation allows the instrument to be contaminated by leads or lags (but not contemporaneous realisations) of any of the other invertible shocks in the system. We call this requirement a limited
lead-lag exogeneity condition. We also derive an explicit formula for the bias in the IRFs that arises when the instrument violates the conditions for identification. Finally, we extend results in Stock and Watson (2018) and Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018b) to show that given an instrumental variable for the shock of interest, Structural VARs and Local Projection methods achieve indentification under the same set of conditions, albeit in different settings. Hence, the choice of the empirical specification has to depend on the bias-variance trade-off of the specific application and sample at hand.

Third, we discuss identification of causal effects in the empirically likely cases in which the VAR is misspecified along some dimensions – e.g. inappropriate lag order, missing moving average components, missing variables, and missing higher order terms –, and hence fails to correctly capture the data generating process. While in these cases the dynamic responses will generally be biased, if one can still assume that the VAR is partially invertible in the shock of interest, the impact effects are correctly identified provided that the limited lead-lag exogeneity of the instrument hold. This result provides empirical researchers with a simple heuristic to gauge the contamination of an instrument versus the misspecification of the chosen model. If one can assume partial invertibility across different specifications of an empirical model, an instrument that fulfils the conditions for identification delivers stable impact responses but unstable IRFs across models. In this case, increasing the number of lags and/or using a larger information set can help stabilising the dynamics responses by providing a better approximation of the Wold representation. Conversely, an instrument that violates the lead-lag exogeneity condition is likely to deliver also unstable impact responses across different models.

We provide an application of our results using artificial data from a stylised standard New-Keynesian DSGE model with price stickiness and four shocks – monetary policy, government spending, technology, and an inflation-specific shock. The simulated system is by construction partially invertible in the monetary policy shock – i.e. the residuals of the Taylor rule. However, due to the introduction of technology news (see e.g. Beaudry and Portier, 2006; Barsky and Sims, 2011), and fiscal foresight (see Ramey, 2011; Leeper et al., 2013), a VAR in output growth, inflation, government spending and the policy interest rate fails the ‘poor man’s invertibility condition’ of Fernandez-Villaverde et al. (2007), and is hence unable to recover all the four shocks. We use this simulated environment to study the identification of monetary policy shocks with external instruments. Our results
validate our discussion. Under partial invertibility, an instrument contaminated by leads or lags of an invertible shock correctly recovers impacts and dynamic responses to the shock of interest, provided that the VAR correctly captures the variables’ dynamics. If, instead, the instrument is contaminated by a non-invertible shock, the degree of distortion in the estimated IRFs depends on how pervasive the contaminating shock is, that is, on how much of the variance in the system it accounts for.

Lastly, we provide an empirical application of our results by examining popular instruments for the identification of monetary policy shocks in monthly VARs for US data. We consider two VARs for which we assume partial invertibility of conventional monetary policy shocks, and three variants of the high-frequency instruments popularised by Gürkaynak et al. (2005). We show that two of these are likely to fail the limited lead-lag exogeneity condition, and as a consequence recover impact responses of output and prices that are strongly dependent on the VAR of choice. The third instrument, constructed as in Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco (2017) with a pre-whitening step to remove correlation with other shocks, recovers impact responses that are invariant to the VAR specification and composition.

This paper builds and expands on the econometric literature supporting the use of IV in macroeconomics. The SVAR-IV techniques were first introduced by Stock (2008), and then explored in Stock and Watson (2012) and Mertens and Ravn (2013). The use of instrumental variables for identification in direct regressions (LP-IV), with or without controls, has been proposed independently by Jordà et al. (2015) and Ramey and Zubairy (2018). The econometric conditions for instruments’ validity in the direct regression without control variables have first appeared in lecture notes by Mertens (2014). Stock and Watson (2018) have provided a unified discussion of the use of external instruments in macroeconomics, discussed the conditions for instruments validity with control variables and relation to full invertibility, and explored the connections between SVAR-IV and LP-IV methods. Recently, Arias et al. (2018) have proposed algorithms for exact finite sample inference for SVAR-IV when multiple instruments are employed to identify more than one shock.

This paper adds to the small but important econometric literature that has strived to clarify the conditions and limits under which macroeconomic structural shocks and their dynamic effects can be identified in empirical reduced form models (for a recent discus-
sion see Canova and Ferroni, 2019). A strand of this literature has focused on the link between the conditions for invertibility of structural shocks and the information included in VARs, e.g. Giannone and Reichlin (2006), Forni and Gambetti (2014), and Canova and Hamidi Sahneh (2017). A more recent literature has furthered our understanding of the identification problem when the system is not fully invertible but the shocks of interest can be revealed by linear combinations of current and past observations (i.e. are ‘partially invertible’), can be revealed only to some degree of approximation (i.e. are ‘approximately invertible’, as in Sims and Zha, 2006), or can be recovered using future observables as well (the ‘recoverability’ concept proposed by Chahrour and Jurado, 2017). Our work slots into this effort by clarifying conditions for IV identification in SVAR models under partial invertibility (our results readily generalise to the case of approximate invertibility). In doing this, this paper is close in spirit to Forni et al. (2019) that studies the conditions under which a SVAR is informative enough to estimate the dynamic effects of a shock, and to Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018b) that clarify the equivalence of SVAR and LP methods, and address the validity of external instrument identification in the invertible and non-invertible cases. While we share the emphasis on partial invertibility (referred to in Forni et al. 2019 as informational sufficiency), our paper focuses on the recent debate on the use of IV in empirical macro, and on its interaction with misspecifications in the modelling choices. Differently from Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018b), we focus on the conditions under which partially invertible shock are identifiable with SVAR with external instruments. However, we do not discuss the important issue of the inference on forecast variance decompositions with instrumental variables, for which bounds are provided by Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018a).

The paper is organised as follows. In Section 2 we review the concepts of full invertibility and fundamentalness and some other useful results in the literature; a reader familiar with these concepts can skip the section. Sections 3 to 5 collect our main results. In Section 3 we discuss partial invertibility, and prove the existence of a semi-structural representation for covariance-stationary vector processes. We lay out the conditions for the identification of structural shocks in SVAR-IV under partial invertibility of the shock of interest in Section 4, while Section 5 compares the conditions for SVAR-IV with those required in LP-IV with controls. In Section 6 we discuss the challenges to identification and estimation of the IRFs in the case of misspecified systems. We apply the concepts dis-
cussed in this paper to artificial data from a NK-DSGE in Sections 7, and in an empirical application in Section 8. Finally, Section 9 concludes.

2 Non-Fundamental Representations

To introduce the concept of non-fundamentalness, let us consider a covariance-stationary $n \times 1$ vector stochastic process $Y_t$, for $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, with rational spectral density and belonging to a Hilbert space $L^2(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P).$ We define the Hilbert space generated by all the observations of $Y_t$ up to time $t$ as $\mathcal{H}_t^Y = \text{span}\{Y_{t-j}, j \geq 0\}$. The process $Y_t$ is a linear process and a VARMA(p,q) if it is stationary solution of the stochastic difference equation

$$\Phi(L)Y_t = \Psi(L)u_t \quad u_t \sim \mathcal{WN}(0, \Sigma_u),$$

where $\Phi(L)$ and $\Psi(L)$ are generic autoregressive (AR) and moving average (MA) filters of order $p$ and $q$ respectively

$$\Phi(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{p} \Phi_i L^i, \quad \Psi(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{q} \Psi_i L^i,$$

and $u_t$ are the stochastic disturbances of the data generating process (i.e. the ‘structural shocks’ in the economic jargon), generally assumed to be orthogonal or orthonormal processes. If the process is causal – i.e., $\text{det}(\Phi(L))$ has all roots outside the unit circle, $\text{det}(\Phi(z)) \neq 0 \forall z = \zeta_i$ such that $|\zeta_i| < 1$ –, then it can be written as a (possibly infinite) MA in the structural shocks $u_t$

$$Y_t = \Theta(L)u_t, \quad u_t \sim \mathcal{WN}(0, \Sigma_u).$$

Definition 1 (Invertibility and Fundamentalness). Let $Y_t$ be defined as in Eq. (1), and with structural MA representation as in Eq. (3).

---

3In the economic literature, the issue of non-fundamentalness (see Rozanov, 1967; Hannan, 1970) was first pointed out by Hansen and Sargent (1980, 1991) in a purely theoretical setting, while Lippi and Reichlin (1993, 1994) provided the first empirical application. Other more recent contributions on fundamentalness in macro models are in Chari et al. (2004), Christiano et al. (2007) and Fernandez-Villaverde et al. (2007). A useful review is in Alessi et al. (2011).
(i) If $\det(\Psi(z))$ – and hence $\det(\Theta(z))$ – has all roots outside the unit circle, i.e.
\[
\det(\Theta(z)) \neq 0, \quad \forall z = \zeta_i \text{ s.t. } |\zeta_i| < 1, \tag{4}
\]
then the process in Eq. (1) is said to be invertible, and $u_t$ are said to be $Y_t$-fundamental (i.e. $\mathcal{H}_t^Y = \mathcal{H}_t^u$ and the stochastic disturbances can be recovered from current and past realisation of the process $Y_t$). $Y_t$ can be written in VAR form as
\[
A(L)Y_t = \Theta_0u_t, \tag{5}
\]
where $\Theta_0$ is an $n$-dimensional matrix.

(ii) If $\det(\Theta(z))$ has at least one root inside the unit circle, then the process in Eq. (1) is ‘non-invertible’, and $u_t$ is said to be $Y_t$-non-fundamental (i.e. $\mathcal{H}_t^Y \subset \mathcal{H}_t^u$).

(iii) If $\det(\Theta(L))$ has at least one root on the unit circle, the process is said to be non-invertible, but $u_t$ are $Y_t$-fundamental ($\mathcal{H}_t^Y = \mathcal{H}_t^u$).

The Wold Representation Theorem guarantees that $Y_t$ always admits a Wold decomposition of the form
\[
Y_t = C(L)\nu_t \quad \nu_t \sim WN(0, \Sigma_\nu), \tag{6}
\]
where $C(L) = \sum_j C_jL^j$ is a causal (i.e. no terms with $C_j \neq 0$ for $j < 0$), time-independent, square summable filter with $C_0 = I_n$.\footnote{The Wold Theorem guarantees that any weakly stationary process $Y_t$ can be written as $Y_t = \eta_t + C(L)\nu_t$, where $\eta_t$ is a purely deterministic component. Without loss of generality, in what follows we disregard the possible presence of deterministic terms in order to focus on purely non-deterministic processes.} $\nu_t$ is the Wold innovation process – an uncorrelated sequence – to $Y_t$
\[
\nu_t = Y_t - Proj(Y_t|Y_{t-1}, Y_{t-2}, \ldots), \tag{7}
\]
that, by definition, belongs to the space generated by present and past values of $Y_t$ (i.e. $\mathcal{H}_t^\nu = \mathcal{H}_t^Y$, since we are assuming $Y_t$ to be a purely non-deterministic process). Given the invertibility of $C(L)$, we can rewrite Eq. (6) in VAR form
\[
A(L)Y_t = \nu_t \quad A_0 = I_n. \tag{8}
\]
If the Wold representation has absolute summable coefficients, then it admits a VAR representation with coefficient matrices that decay to zero rapidly; hence, it can be well approximated by a finite order VAR. This is always the case for causal finite-order ARMA processes.

If the structural shocks $u_t$ are $Y_t$-fundamental, then $u_t$ and $\nu_t$ generate the same space ($\mathcal{H}_t^u = \mathcal{H}_t^\nu$, $\forall t$). This implies that
\[
\nu_t = \Theta_0 u_t ,
\]
where $\Theta_0$ is non-singular. Hence, the structural disturbances $u_t$ can be determined from current and lagged values of $Y_t$
\[
u_t = \text{Proj}(u_t|Y_t, Y_{t-1}, \ldots).
\]

If, however, the process is not invertible, and $u_t$ is not $Y_t$-fundamental, the space generated by the VAR innovations does not coincide with that spanned by the structural shocks, i.e. $\mathcal{H}_t^\nu \subset \mathcal{H}_t^u$.\(^5\) The following result guarantees that the Wold and the structural MA representations (Eq. 3) are connected by a class of transformations generated by means of Blaschke matrices.

**Theorem 1 (Non-fundamental Representations).** Let $Y_t$ be a covariance-stationary vector process with rational spectral density, i.e. an ARMA process. Let $Y_t = C(L)\nu_t$ be a fundamental representation of $Y_t$, i.e.

(i) $\nu_t$ is a white noise vector;

(ii) $C(L)$ is a matrix of rational functions in $L$ with no poles of modulus smaller or equal to unity (Causality);

(iii) $\text{det}(C(L))$ has no roots of modulus smaller than unity (Invertibility).

Let $Y_t = \Theta(L)u_t$ be any other MA representation, i.e. one which fulfils (i), and (ii), but not necessarily (iii). Then
\[
\Theta(L) = C(L)B(L) ,
\]
where $B(L)$ is a Blaschke matrix.

\(^5\)Non-fundamentalness also naturally arises in systems in which the dimension of the vector $Y_t$ (and hence of $\nu_t$) is smaller than that of $u_t$. We provide a discussion of a related case when examining the implications of misspecifications in VAR models in Section 6.
Blaschke matrices are filters capable to flip the roots of a fundamental representation inside the unit circle (see Lippi and Reichlin, 1994). A complex-valued matrix $B(z)$ is a Blaschke matrix if: (i) It has no poles inside the unit circle; (ii) $B(z)^{-1} = B^*(z^{-1})$, where $*$ indicates the complex conjugation. The following result guarantees that any Blaschke matrix can be written as the product of orthogonal matrices, and matrices with a Blaschke factor as one of their entries.

**Theorem 2 (Blaschke Factors).** Let $B(z)$ be an $n \times n$ Blaschke matrix, then $\exists m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\exists \zeta_i \in \mathbb{C}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ such that

$$B(z) = \prod_{i=1}^{m} K(\zeta_i, z)R_i,$$

where $R_i$ are orthogonal matrices, i.e. $R_iR_i^* = \mathbb{I}_n$, and

$$K(\zeta_i, z) = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{I}_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{z - \zeta_i}{1 - \zeta_i^* z} \end{pmatrix},$$

are matrices with a Blaschke factor as one of the entries.

The above results indicate that in general we can connect the structural and the Wold representation using a Blaschke matrix $B(L)$, that is

$$Y_t = \Theta(L)u_t = \Theta(L)B(L)^{-1}B(L)u_t = C(L)\nu_t,$$

where $B(L)$ flips the roots of the Wold fundamental representation inside the unit circle to obtain the structural MA. Hence,

$$\nu_t = B(L)u_t,$$

where we incorporate into $B(L)$ possibly also a constant scale matrix. In the case in which the structural representation is invertible, $B(L)$ is just $\Theta_0$.

It is important to observe that, as it is clear from Eqs. (11-12), Blaschke factors may be acting only on a subset of the shocks. The remaining shocks can be recovered from current and past realisations of the variables, and are hence invertible. We discuss this

---

See Lippi and Reichlin (1994) for a proof of Theorems 1 and 2.
relevant case in the next section.

3 Partial Invertibility

The property of invertibility guarantees identifiability of the dynamic effects of all the structural disturbances in a correctly specified VAR. In such a case, the problem of identification amounts to finding the correct matrix $\Theta_0$ that connects the VAR residuals to the structural shocks as in Eq. (9). However, phenomena such as anticipation and foresight of economic shocks, which are often a feature of rational expectation models, can generate non-invertible representations (see e.g. Leeper et al., 2013). In such cases, the search for the correct Blaschke matrix can be a daunting problem (see Lippi and Reichlin, 1994).

In most empirical applications, however, often only one or a subset of the structural innovations is of interest. For example, one may want to identify only a monetary policy shock, or an oil price shock. This is the case of ‘partial identification’, when only a subset of the column entries of the matrix that maps the Wold residuals into the structural shocks has to be recovered. In such a setting, the relevant condition is that of partial invertibility in the subset of the shocks of interest.

Definition 2 (Partial Invertibility). Let $Y_t$ be a covariance-stationary $n \times 1$ vector stochastic process, with rational spectral density, solution to the ARMA equation $\Phi(L)Y_t = \Psi(L)u_t$, where $u_t$ is an $n \times 1$ vector of stochastic disturbances (structural shocks) with $u_t \sim WN(0, I_n)$. $Y_t$ admits a Wold representation of the form $Y_t = C(L)\nu_t$ for a vector of innovations $\nu_t \sim WN(0, \Sigma)$. Without loss of generality, let $u_1^t$ denote the first entry of $u_t$. The structural shock $u_1^t$ is invertible and $Y_t$-fundamental if

$$u_1^t = \text{Proj}(u_1^t|Y_t, Y_{t-1}, \ldots).$$ (15)

Hence, $u_1^t$ is a linear combination of the innovations $\nu_t$, that is, there exists an $n$-dimensional vector $\lambda$ such that

$$u_1^t = \lambda'\nu_t.$$ (16)

For a given VAR model, the property of partial invertibility guarantees that one or, more generally, some of the structural shocks, $u_t^{1:m} = (u_1^t, \ldots, u_m^t)'$ for $m < n$, can be
correctly recovered as a linear combination of the estimated innovations.\(^7\) While seldom acknowledged, partial invertibility is always implicitly assumed in the empirical macroeconomic literature concerned with evaluating the effects of a specific type of shock – e.g. monetary policy shocks, spending shocks, etc.

The following proposition guarantees the existence of a representation for the covariance stationary vector process \(Y_t\) as an infinite moving average of the invertible shocks \(u_{t}^{1:m}\), and of the \(n - m\) linear combinations of the Wold innovations orthogonal to \(u_{t}^{1:m}\). This is a key result that allows for the study of the propagation of structural shocks in reduced-form VAR models.

**Proposition 1 (Semi-structural Moving Average Representation).** Let the \(n\)-dimensional covariance stationary vector process \(Y_t\) be solution to

\[
\Phi(L)Y_t = \Psi(L)u_t \quad u_t \sim \mathcal{WN}(0, I_n),
\]

where \(u_t\) is an \(n\)-dimensional vector of structural innovations, and let \(\Psi(L)\) be a non-invertible moving average filter, i.e. \(\det(\Psi(z)) = 0\) for some \(\zeta_i\) such that \(|\zeta_i| < 1\). Let the Wold representation of \(Y_t\) be equal to

\[
Y_t = C(L)\nu_t \quad \nu_t \sim \mathcal{WN}(0, \Sigma_\nu).
\]

where \(\Sigma_\nu\) is the positive definite variance-covariance matrix of Wold innovations. If the system is partially invertible in the shocks \(u_i^t\), for \(i = 1, \ldots, m\), i.e. there exist \(m\) vectors \(\lambda_i\) such that \(\lambda_i^t \nu_t = u_i^t\), then \(Y_t\) admits a semi-structural moving average representation of

\(^7\)The notion of partial invertibility – i.e. \(u_i^t = \text{Proj}(u_i^t|Y_t^\infty)\) – can be generalised by considering a continuous measure of the degree of invertibility – i.e. approximate invertibility – that is the case in which \(0 \neq u_i^t - \text{Proj}(u_i^t|Y_t^\infty) \neq u_i^t\) (see Sims and Zha, 2006 and Forni et al., 2019). In such a case, a measure of the degree of invertibility is provided by

\[
\delta_i = \frac{\text{Var}(u_i^t) - \text{Var}(\text{Proj}(u_i^t|Y_t^\infty))}{\text{Var}(u_i^t)}.
\]

For values close to 1 (i.e. close to partial invertibility), the IRFs obtained from a VAR model can be close the the true ones. A even weaker condition than invertibility is that of recoverability \(u_i^t = \text{Proj}(u_i^t|H_{\infty}^Y)\), i.e. the shock of interest is recoverable from all leads and lags of the endogenous variables (see Chahrour and Jurado, 2017).
the form

\[ Y_t = C(L)\Sigma_{\nu} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \lambda_i u_t^i + C(L)\Sigma_{\nu} \tilde{\lambda} \xi_t , \]  

(19)

where \( \xi_t \) is an \((n - m) \times 1\) vector of linear combinations of Wold innovations that is orthogonal to all \( u_t^i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \), i.e. \( \mathbb{E}(u_t^i \xi_t') = 0 \).

**Proof.** Let us consider a non singular \( n \times n \) matrix \( \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & \tilde{\lambda} \end{pmatrix} \), where \( \lambda \) is an \( n \times m \) matrix, and \( \tilde{\lambda} \) is an \( n \times (n - m) \) matrix such that

\[ \Lambda' \nu_t = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_t' \\ \xi_t' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u_t^{1:m} \\ \xi_t \end{pmatrix} \]

(20)

and

\[ \Lambda' \Sigma_{\nu} \Lambda = \mathbb{E} \left[ \nu_t \nu_t' \right] \Lambda = \mathbb{E} \left[ \begin{pmatrix} u_t^{1:m} \\ \xi_t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_t^{1:m'} \\ \xi_t' \end{pmatrix} \right] = I_n . \]

(21)

Eq. (20) allows \( \Lambda \) to enforce the partial invertibility of \( \nu_t \) in \( u_t^{1:m} \), while Eq. (21) guarantees that \( \Lambda \) performs an orthogonalisation of the Wold innovations, such that \( \mathbb{E}(u_t^i \xi_t') = 0 \forall i = 1, \ldots, m \).

It is possible to constructively prove the existence of such a matrix \( \Lambda \). Since \( \Sigma_{\nu} \) is a symmetric positive-definite real matrix, we can use the Spectral Theorem to write (see, e.g., Sudipto and Roy, 2014)

\[ \Sigma_{\nu} = QDQ' , \]

where \( D \) is a diagonal matrix with the \( n \) distinct eigenvalues of \( \Sigma_{\nu} \) along the main diagonal, and \( Q \) is an orthogonal matrix whose columns are the corresponding eigenvectors. Given that all the eigenvalues are positive, we can further decompose \( \Sigma_{\nu} \) as

\[ \Sigma_{\nu} = QD^{1/2}H(QD^{1/2}H)' , \]

for a generic orthogonal matrix \( H \), parametrised by \( n(n - 1)/2 \) free parameters. Hence, a generic matrix \( \Lambda \) can be expressed as \( \Lambda = QD^{-1/2}H \).

It is always possible to choose a column of \( \Lambda \) to be equal to \( \lambda_1 \), by fixing \( n - 1 \) of the free parameters in \( H \). The assumptions of partial invertibility and of unit variance of the structural shocks impose a constraint on \( \lambda_1 \), i.e. \( \lambda_1' \Sigma_{\nu} \lambda_1 = \lambda_1' \mathbb{E}[\nu_t \nu_t'] \lambda_1 = \mathbb{E}[u_t^1] = 1 \). This leaves \( (n - 1)(n - 2)/2 \) free parameters of \( H \) spanning the residual group of rotations.
It is possible to proceed in a similar manner to fix the remaining \( m - 1 \) columns in the sub-matrix \( \lambda \). In fact, the assumption of partial invertibility of the second shock \( u_t^2 \) imposes the constraint \( \lambda_2' \Sigma \nu \lambda_2 = 1 \), while the assumption of orthogonality with the shock \( u_t^1 \) imposes an additional constraint \( \lambda_1' \Sigma \nu \lambda_1 = 0 \), hence it is necessary to employ \( n - 2 \) of the residual parameters of \( H \), leaving a residual group of rotation with \( (n - 2)(n - 3)/2 \) parameters. Proceeding in similar steps for the remaining \( m - 2 \) partially invertible shocks, one obtains the desired matrix \( \Lambda \).\(^8\) The remaining \( (m - 1)(m - 2)/2 \) free parameters of \( H \) span the \( \mathcal{O}(m - 1) \) residual group of rotations in the subspace of \( \mathbb{R}^n \) formed by the vectors \( \tilde{\lambda}_i \), \( i = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \) conjugate to all the \( \lambda_i \) with respect to \( \Sigma \nu \), i.e. such that \( \lambda' \Sigma \nu \tilde{\lambda}_i = 0 \). Hence, while \( \Lambda \) always exists, it is not unique.

Since \( \Sigma \nu = (\Lambda \Lambda')^{-1} \), it follows that \( \Sigma \nu \Lambda \Lambda' = I_n \). Using this identity, it is possible to write

\[
Y_t = C(L)\nu_t = C(L)\Sigma \nu \Lambda \Lambda' \nu_t = C(L)\Sigma \nu \lambda u_t^1 + C(L)\Sigma \nu \tilde{\lambda} \xi_t ,
\]

that is the representation in Eq. (19).

Proposition 1 guarantees that any covariance-stationary vector process \( Y_t \) that is solution to Eq. (17) admits the semi-structural MA representation in Eq. (19). In their paper, in Definition 4, Forni et al. (2019) propose a moving average equation similar to Equation (19) in the \( m = 1 \) case. Differently from this definition, Proposition 1 is a representation result that guarantees the existence of such a moving average representation of the process.

The first term of Eq. (19) depends on the realisations of the invertible shocks \( u_t^i \) for \( i = 1, \ldots, m \). The second term is instead a function of \( n - m \) linear combinations of the Wold innovations orthogonal to the invertible shocks, \( \xi_t \). Due to the action of the Blaschke factors, \( \xi_t \) will be a convolution of past, current and future non-invertible shocks. It is worth stressing that, while the requirement that \( \xi_t \) and the invertible shocks \( u_t^{1:m} \) are orthogonal is important, \( \xi_t \) does not need to span the space of all the non invertible structural shocks. Hence, while the representation in Eq. (19) always exists,

\(^8\)More generally, any \( T \) such that

\[
T' \Sigma \nu T = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}
\]

for \( D \) diagonal and \( M = M' \) will produce a decomposition of the form of Eq. (19). It is possible to construct such a matrix from the matrix \( \Lambda \) defined above as \( T = W \Lambda \), for any \( W \) such that \( W'W = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix} \).
it is not unique, since $\xi_t$ can be redefined by selecting different values for the residuals 
$(m-1)(m-2)/2$ free parameters of $H$.

Importantly, this result implies that if the VAR has a correctly specified lag order, 
under partial invertibility, the ‘partially’ identified SVAR impulse response functions 
$C(L)\Sigma_{\nu}\lambda_i u^i_t$ are the dynamic causal effects of the identified $m$ invertible shocks.

**Remark 1.** Under partial invertibility, the map between structural shocks and Wold innovations is of the form

$$\nu_t = B(L)u_t = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2(L) \end{pmatrix} u_t,$$

where $b_1$ is a $n \times m$ matrix, and $b_2(L)$ is a matrix of dimensions $n \times (n-m)$ that contains Blaschke factors, and $m$ is the number of partially invertible shocks.

**Proof.** This is a straightforward, since

$$\nu_t = B(L)u_t = \Sigma_{\nu}\Lambda \begin{pmatrix} u^{1:m}_t \\ \xi_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2(L) \end{pmatrix} u_t$$

where the first equality follows from Theorem 1, while the second from Proposition 1. Since $b_1$ has to be equal to the first $m$ columns of $\Sigma_{\nu}\Lambda = (\Lambda')^{-1}$, it follows that it is a vector of constants, while $b_2(L)$ contains Blaschke factors mapping non-invertible shocks into the Wold residuals.

**4 IV Identification under Partial Invertibility**

Let us consider a partially invertible VAR with reduced-form representation as in Eq. (8), 
repeated below for convenience

$$A(L)Y_t = \nu_t \quad A_0 = 1_n.$$  

(8)

Given an external instrument $z_t$, it is possible to identify $u^1_t$ and its effects on $Y_{t+h}$, $h = 0, \ldots, H$, under the conditions in the following proposition.

**Proposition 2 (Identification in SVAR-IV under Partial Invertibility).** Let $u^{1:m}_t$ 
denote the $m$ invertible structural shocks in the system, and $u^{n+1:m}_t$ the remaining $n-m$ 
non-invertible shocks. Let $z_t$ be an instrument for the shock of interest $u^1_t$, and define 
$z^+_t = z_t - \text{Proj}(z_t[H_{1-1}^\perp])$. If $z_t$ satisfies the following conditions:
(i) $E[u_t^1 z_t] = \alpha$ (Relevance)

(ii) $E[u_t^{2n} z_t^1] = 0$ (Contemporaneous Exogeneity)

(iii) $E[u_{t-j}^{m+1} z_t^1] = 0$ for all $j \neq 0$ for which $E[u_{t-j}^{m+1} \nu_t'] \neq 0$. (Limited Lead-Lag Exogeneity)

then the instrument can be used to estimate dynamic causal effects of $u_t^1$ onto $Y_t$, up to a scale.

Proof. Recall that $\Sigma_\nu \Lambda' = I_n$, for $\Lambda$ defined as in Proposition 1, and let $\lambda_1$ denote the first column of $\Lambda$. Using the property of partial invertibility in Eq. (20) we can write

$$E[\nu_t z_t] = E[\Sigma_\nu \Lambda' \nu_t z_t] = \Sigma_\nu \Lambda E \begin{pmatrix} u_t^1 \\ u_t^{2m} \\ \xi_t \end{pmatrix} z_t = \Sigma_\nu \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \ldots & \lambda_m \\ \lambda \end{pmatrix} E \begin{pmatrix} u_t^1 z_t \\ u_t^{2m} z_t \\ \xi_t z_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Conditions (i) and (ii) set $E[u_t^1 z_t] = \alpha$ and $E[u_t^{2m} z_t^1] = E[u_t^{2m} z_t] = 0$ respectively. We now need to prove that $E[\xi_t z_t] = 0$. Recall first that $E[\xi_t u_t^{1m}] = 0$, which follows directly from the definition of $\Lambda$. Second, note that $E[\xi_t u_t^{1m}] = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, m$ and $\forall j \neq 0$ since $E[\xi_t u_t^{1m}] = \lambda' E[\nu_t u_t^{1m}] \lambda' = 0$. This follows from the Wold theorem that guarantees that the innovations $\nu_t$ are an uncorrelated white noise sequence. Hence, $\xi_t$ and $z_t$ do not correlate via past or future realisations of the invertible shocks. Finally, observe that Condition (ii) and (iii) together require that $E[u_{t-j}^{m+1} z_t^1] = 0$ for all $j$ for which $E[u_{t-j}^{m+1} \nu_t'] \neq 0$. Since $\xi_t = \xi_t - \text{Proj}(\hat{X} \nu_t | H_{t-1}^t) = \xi_t$ by the definition of $\nu_t$, it follows that $E[\xi_t z_t] = E[\xi_t^1 z_t] = E[\xi_t^1 z_t^1] = 0$. Hence, $\xi_t$ and $z_t$ do not correlate via leads or lags of the non-invertible shocks either, leading to $E[\xi_t z_t] = 0$. It follows that

$$E[\nu_t z_t] = \alpha \Sigma_\nu \lambda_1.$$

Given the assumption of partial invertibility, the system can be written in the semi-structural representation of Eq. (19) in Proposition 1. Hence the SVAR-IV correctly estimates the relative dynamic causal effects of $u_t^1$ onto $Y_t$ (i.e. up to a relative scale $\alpha$).

Conditions (i) and (ii) are the conventional validity conditions for instrumental variables (IV) that are standard in the micro and macro literatures (see Stock and Watson,
Condition (iii) arises because of the dynamics, and requires that if there are any non-invertible shocks, they do not correlate with the component of the instrument that is orthogonal to past $Y_t$, at any leads and lags. Conversely, leads and lags (but not contemporaneous values) of other partial invertible shocks can contaminate the instrument without compromising the identification of the impact effects $\Sigma_\nu \lambda_1$, since they do not enter the VAR residuals.\(^9\)

If the system is invertible in all the structural shocks and the VAR correctly captures the data generating process of $Y_t$, then the third condition is trivially satisfied, since $\nu_t$ are a linear combination only of the contemporaneous structural shocks $u_t$. Conversely, when all the remaining shocks are non-invertible, Condition (iii) implies a stronger lead-lag exogeneity condition that applies to all the shocks but the partially invertible one. In the more general case in which only some of the remaining shocks are non-invertible, Proposition 2 ensures that identification with an external instrument is possible as long as the instrument is contaminated only by the past and future realisations of the invertible shocks. It is worth stressing that while Condition (iii) is a relatively stronger condition than that required for a fully invertible SVAR (where lead-lag exogeneity is not required), it is still a much weaker one than the strong lead-lag exogeneity condition required for identification in LP-IV without controls.

When Conditions (ii) or (iii) are violated, the instrument is contaminated by the contemporaneous realisations of any other shock or by leads and lags of some of the non-invertible shocks. This results in a bias in the estimated impulse response functions. We formalise this observation in the following remark.\(^10\)

**Remark 2 (Violation of the Exogeneity Conditions).** Let $z_t$ be an instrument for the invertible shock $u^1_t$ that satisfies Condition (i) but possibly fails Condition (ii) and Condition (iii) of Proposition 2, due to contamination by lags, leads or contemporaneous realisations of a non-invertible shock $u^\ell_t$, i.e.

$$z_t = \alpha u^1_t + \sum_{k \in K} \beta_k u^\ell_{t-k} .$$

\(^9\)Interestingly, leads, lags or even contemporaneous realisations of the non-invertible shocks can contaminate $z_t$, but only via their ‘projectable’ component $\text{Proj}(u^{m+n+1:m+n}_t | H^Y_{t-1}) \neq u^{m+n+1:m+n}_t$ that lives in the space spanned by past realisations of $Y_t$.

\(^10\)A related result is in Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018a) that discuss the bias that arises in SVAR-IV methods when the shock of interest is non-invertible.
Given a well specified VAR, the innovations of the Wold representation can be mapped into the structural shocks as

$$\nu_t = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2(L) \end{pmatrix} u_t,$$

where $b_1$ is $n \times m$ and $b_2(L)$ is an $n \times (n - m)$ matrix that incorporates Blaschke factors, due to the presence of non-invertible shocks. The estimated IRFs for variable $i$, to shock 1, at horizon $h$, are biased and of the form

$$\widetilde{IRF}_{i1}^h = IRF_{i1}^h + \left[ C_h \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{k \in K} b_{2,j,f} \frac{\beta_k}{\alpha} \delta_{jk} \right]_{i1},$$

where $IRF_{i1}^h$ are the IRFs to the shock $u_1^t$ at horizon $h$, and the second term is a bias. $C_h$ are the matrix coefficients of the Wold representation at lag $h$, and $b_{2,j,f}$ is the $1$ column of the matrix of coefficients of the polynomial $b_2(L)$ at lag $j$. $\delta_{jk}$ is the Kronecker’s delta.

Proof. Given a well specified VAR, the Wold representation is

$$Y_t = C(L)\nu_t,$$

where

$$\nu_t = \Sigma_\nu \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} u_{1:m}^t \\ \xi_t \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b_1 & b_2(L) \end{pmatrix} u_t$$

from Theorem 1 and Proposition 1. In this case

$$\mathbb{E}[\nu_t \xi_t] = \Sigma_\nu \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E}[u_{1:m}^t \xi_t] \\ \mathbb{E}[\xi_t \xi_t] \end{pmatrix} = \alpha b_{1,1} + \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{k \in K} b_{2,j,f} \beta_k \delta_{jk},$$

where the Kronecker’s delta singles out the common leads or lags of $u_t^f$ that appear both in the instrument and the column $I$ of the matrix $b_2(L)$. By normalising for the coefficient of correlation $\alpha$ and multiplying for the matrix $C_h$ of lag $h$ of the Wold representation one finds

$$\widetilde{IRF}_{i1}^h = \left[ C_h b_{1,1} + C_h \sum_{j \in J} \sum_{k \in K} b_{2,j,f} \frac{\beta_k}{\alpha} \delta_{jk} \right]_{i1},$$

which is the expression in Eq. (24).

A few elements of Eq. (24) are worth highlighting. First, all else equal, the size of the bias in the estimated IRFs depends on how much the instrument correlates with the
(leads, lags and contemporaneous realisations of the) contaminating shock as compared to the shock of interest – i.e. on the ratios $\frac{b_k}{\alpha}$. Second, the bias depends on the number of lags that are common to those contaminating the instrument (Eq. 23) and those that appear in the Blaschke matrix $b_2(L)$. Finally, and importantly, the bias depends on the relative order of magnitude of the coefficients $b_{2,j}$ as compared to $b_1$. These relate to the variance of variable $i$ that is accounted for by the shock of interest and the contaminating shock. For example, very small values of $b_{2,j}$ relative to $b_1$ imply that shock $u^h_1$ explains a small share of the variance of the variable $i$, and hence the distortion is likely to be small.

For comparison, if the instrument correlated with leads, lags and contemporaneous realisations of another invertible shock, the equivalent of Eq. (24) would read

$$\tilde{IRF}_{i1}^h = IRF_{i1}^h + \left[C_h b_{1,j} \frac{\beta_0}{\alpha}\right]_{i1},$$ (25)

for $u^h_1$ invertible. In fact, only a violation of Condition (ii) would matter, i.e. the contamination by contemporaneous realisations.

5 SVAR-IV under Partial Invertibility and LP-IV

In empirical applications, when doubts arise regarding the correct VAR specification, a direct estimation approach in the form of local projections (LP) is often suggested. However, as discussed in Stock and Watson (2018), in LP without control variables identification is achieved only under a strict lead-lag exogeneity condition (i.e. $\mathbb{E}[u^{2n}_{t+j} z_t] = 0$ for all $j \neq 0$) that is potentially violated in practice.

In the empirically likely case in which the instrument satisfies the contemporaneous exogeneity condition but is not strictly lead-lag exogenous due to correlation with past shocks, the standard practice is to incorporate lagged macro variables in the LP regression, in order to control for these lagged shocks (LP-IV). In this case, Stock and Watson (2018) provide a ‘no-free lunch’ result, by showing that the conditions for validity of IV identification are in general equivalent to assuming full invertibility of a VAR that incorporates the same information set. In this section we generalise this result to the case of partial invertibility, and show that LP and SVAR methods generally identify shocks under the same conditions.
Consider the standard set up for LP-IV with controls

\[ Y_{i,t+h} = \Theta_{h,i1} \hat{Y}_t^1 + \gamma'_h W_t + \zeta_{h,i,t+h}^h, \tag{26} \]

where \( W_t \) denotes a generic set of control variables, \( \Theta_{h,i1} \) are the causal responses of \( Y_{i,t+h} \) to \( u^1_t \) at horizon \( h \), \( \hat{Y}_t^1 \) is the fitted value of \( Y_t^1 \) from the first-stage regression on the external instrument \( z_t \), and \( \zeta_{h,i,t+h}^h \) are serially correlated projection residuals. The conditions for identification in the LP-IV case are (see Stock and Watson, 2018)

(i) \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t-1}^1 z_{t}^1] = \alpha \) (Relevance)

(ii) \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t-2n}^1 z_{t}^1] = 0 \) (Contemporaneous Exogeneity)

(iii) \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t-j}^1 z_{t}^1] = 0 \) for all \( j \neq 0 \) (Lead-Lag Exogeneity)

where \( x_t^1 = x_t - \text{Proj}(x_t | W_t) \) for a given \( x_t \), and \( W_t = \text{span}\{W_t\} \).

The following proposition shows that an instrument that correctly identifies the shock of interest (up to a normalisation) in a SVAR-IV under partial invertibility, will also generally identify the same shock in LP-IV when \( W_t \equiv H^Y_t \), and vice versa. Conversely, an instrument that identifies a non-invertible shock in LP-IV will also identify that same shock in a SVAR if used as an internal instrument, i.e. in a SVAR specified on \( (z'_t Y'_t)' \) (see also Plagborg-Møller and Wolf, 2018b). This specification is sometimes referred to as hybrid VAR (SVAR-H) in the empirical literature (see e.g. Ramey, 2016).

**Proposition 3 (Relation between SVAR-IV under Partial Invertibility and LP-IV).** Let \( Z \) be the set of scalar stochastic processes \( z_t \) that satisfy LP-IV Conditions (i) and (ii) – i.e. \( \mathbb{E}[u_t^1 z_t] = \alpha \) and \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t}^{2n} z_t] = 0 \) – but satisfy Condition LP-IV (iii) \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t-j} z_t] = 0 \) only for \( j < 0 \) and not for \( j > 0 \). Let \( \tilde{Z} \subseteq Z \) be such that any \( z_t \in \tilde{Z} \) satisfies the LP-IV conditions for \( W_t \equiv H^Y_t \). Assume that \( \text{Proj}(u_t | H^Y_{t-1}) = 0 \). \( z_t \) is an element of \( \tilde{Z} \) if and only if it identifies the shock of interest in a Structural VAR in \( Y_t \).

**Proof.** Let us consider the LP-IV conditions for \( W_t \equiv H^Y_t \). Condition LP-IV (ii) is trivially equivalent to Condition SVAR-IV (ii), since \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t}^{2n} z_t^1] = \mathbb{E}[u_{t}^{2n} z_t^1] \). Condition LP-IV (iii) holds in its stronger LP-IV (iii) form, i.e. \( \mathbb{E}[u_{t-j} z_t] = 0 \), for \( j < 0 \), by assumption. For all the invertible shocks \( i \) in the system, LP-IV (iii) is trivially satisfied,
since \( u'_{t-j} = \text{Proj}(u'_{t-j}|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) \), and hence \( u'_{t-j} = 0 \), for all \( j > 0 \). In this case, LP-IV\(^\perp\) (iii) does not enforce any restriction on \( z_t \), which can hence correlate with the lags of the invertible shocks. This corresponds to the case in which SVAR-IV (iii) is not active, since \( \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}u'_i] = 0 \). In the case of the non-invertible shocks, \( u'_{t-j} \neq \text{Proj}(u'_{t-j}|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) \) for \( j \geq 1 \). Thus, \( \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}z^i_t] = 0 \) implies that \( z_t \) can only correlate with the ‘projectable component of the shock’ i.e. \( \text{Proj}(u'_{t-j}|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) \). In this case, LP-IV\(^\perp\) (iii) implies \( \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}z^i_t] = \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}z^i_t] = 0 \), and coincides with SVAR-IV (iii) for \( \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}u'_i] \neq 0 \). Hence, conditions (ii) and (iii) for LP-IV\(^\perp\) and SVAR-IV are equivalent.\(^{11}\) Condition LP-IV\(^\perp\) (i) requires \( \mathbb{E}[u'_{t-j}z^i_t] = \mathbb{E}[(u'_t - \text{Proj}(u'_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}))z_t] = \alpha \). If \( u'_t \) is invertible, this is equivalent to \( \mathbb{E}[u'_t z_t] = \alpha \). Hence, under invertibility of the shock of interest, and with \( \mathcal{W}_t \equiv \mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1} \), the conditions for LP-IV\(^\perp\) and SVAR-IV are equivalent.

If \( u'_t \) is non-invertible, \( \text{Proj}(u'_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_t) \neq u'_t \) while \( \text{Proj}(u'_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) = 0 \) by assumption.\(^{12}\) In such a case, the conditions for identification in LP-IV\(^\perp\) are satisfied, while those for SVAR-IV are violated. It is easy to realise that \( z_t \) correctly identifies the impact effects when used as an external instrument in a Structural VAR since \( z^i_t \) correlates with \( u'_t \) only at time \( t \). However, a SVAR-IV would not correctly capture the dynamic effects of the non-invertible shock due to the presence of the Blashke factor \( b(L) \). In this case, correct identification of the IRFs can still be obtained with a Cholesky identification in a VAR that includes the instrument as an endogenous variable ordered first (see discussion in Plagborg-Møller and Wolf, 2018b).\(^{13}\) Indeed, the shock of interest becomes invertible in a VAR that includes \( z_t \).

Table 1 summarises the content of the proposition and the previous discussion and compares SVARs and LP methods in terms of their ability to correctly estimate the relative impulse response functions of the shock of interest \( u'_t \) on a given set of variables \( Y_t \), given an instrumental variable \( z_t \). The rows in the table consider different properties

---

\(^{11}\)This is almost trivial, since both methods require that \( z^i_t \) does not correlate with the residuals of the projection of \( Y_t \) onto its past via any other shock except for the one of interest.

\(^{12}\)Two cases are in principle possible: (a) \( \text{Proj}(u'_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) \neq 0 \); and (b) \( \text{Proj}(u'_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}) = 0 \). Case (a) implies that \( u'_t \) affects past realisations of \( Y_t \) or, equivalently, that \( Y_t \) depends on future realisations of \( u'_t \). This is not an econometrically interesting case – the shock at time \( t \) would have affected \( Y \) before time \( t - \), and one could just redefine the \( t \) index to allow the shock to affect the system only from time \( t \) onwards.

\(^{13}\)The intuition was first proposed in Ramey (2011) by observing that the inclusion of a measure of fiscal news shock in a standard VAR can make shocks that are non-invertible in a small information set, invertible in a larger one.
**Table 1: Estimation of the Dynamic Causal Effects of $u^1_t$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Lead-Lag Exogeneity</th>
<th>$u^1_t$ invertible</th>
<th>$u^1_t$ non-invertible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z_t] = 0 \forall i &amp; j \neq 0$</td>
<td>LP-IV</td>
<td>LP-IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVAR-IV</td>
<td>SVAR-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Lead-Lag Exogeneity but Contamination by Past Shocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z_t] \neq 0$ for some $j &gt; 0$ ($= 0$ for $j &lt; 0$)</td>
<td>LP-IV⊥</td>
<td>LP-IV⊥</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but $\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z^⊥<em>t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[u^i</em>{t-j}\nu^i_t] = 0$</td>
<td>SVAR-IV</td>
<td>SVAR-H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SVAR-H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited Lead-Lag Exogeneity but Contamination by Future Shocks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z_t] \neq 0$ for some $j &lt; 0$</td>
<td>SVAR-IV</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but $\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z^⊥<em>t] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[u^i</em>{t-j}\nu^i_t] = 0$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violation of Limited Lead-Lag Exogeneity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathbb{E}[u^i_{t-j}z^⊥<em>t] \neq 0$, $j &gt; 0$ and $i$ s.t. $\mathbb{E}[u^i</em>{t-j}\nu^i_t] \neq 0$</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table reports the methods that are able to correctly estimate the dynamic effects of $u^1_t$ on a given vector $Y_t$ depending on whether $u^1_t$ is invertible or not, and on the properties of the instrument $z_t$ (in rows). ⊥ denotes orthogonality with respect to $\mathcal{H}^Y_{t-1}$. It is assumed that the conditions of Relevance ($\mathbb{E}[u^1_tz_t] = \alpha$) and Contemporaneous Exogeneity ($\mathbb{E}[u^1_tz^⊥_t] = 0$) hold throughout.

A few comments are in order. First, conditional on the same choice of the information set and instrument, generally SVAR-IV and LP-IV with controls can identify a shock under the same set of conditions. We think of this as a ‘no free lunch’ result as in Stock and Watson (2018). Hence, the choice between LP and SVAR methods should not be based on considerations relative to the instrument, but rather on the specific empirical constraints dictated by the availability of the sample and variables of interests, and in light of the different finite-sample bias-variance properties of the two methods, as observed by Plagborg-Møller and Wolf (2018b).
Second, SVAR-IV allow for identification under partial invertibility also in those cases in which the instrument correlates with future invertible shocks, while this is never possible for LP-IV with or without controls (nor for SVARs that include the instrument ordered first). However, these cases are empirically unlikely.

Third, the three available methods, LP-IV with controls, SVAR-IV and SVAR with internal instruments should deliver similar responses in most but not all of the relevant empirical situations. Hence, they could in principle be used to test for violations of the conditions for identification.

6 An Observation on VAR Misspecifications

In Section 4, we discussed how the contamination of the instrument biases both the impact and the dynamic responses. In this section, we show that as long as partial invertibility and the conditions for identification of Proposition 2 hold, model misspecification biases the dynamic responses but does not prevent the correct identification of the impact effects of the shock of interest. Canova and Ferroni (2019) provide a background to and complement our discussion by analysing how VAR misspecification challenges the identification of structural shocks, and provide detailed examples using DSGE models.

Let us consider a purely nondeterministic, stationary VARMA(p,q) process

\[ Y_t = \begin{pmatrix} y_{1,t} \\ y_{2,t} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_{11}(L) & \Phi_{12}(L) \\ \Phi_{21}(L) & \Phi_{22}(L) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} y_{1,t} \\ y_{2,t} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Psi_{11}(L) & \Psi_{12}(L) \\ \Psi_{21}(L) & \Psi_{22}(L) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,t} \\ u_{2,t} \end{pmatrix}. \] (27)

Fitting a VAR(k) to \( y_{1,t} \) corresponds to imposing some or all of the following restrictions

\[ \Phi_{11,i} = 0, \quad i = k + 1, k + 2, \ldots p, \] (28)
\[ \Phi_{12,i} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots p, \] (29)
\[ \Psi_{11,i} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots q, \] (30)
\[ \Psi_{12,i} = 0, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots q. \] (31)

Let us consider the case in which only some of these restrictions are not reflected in the data generating process. The first restriction (conditional on the others being true) corresponds to understating the VAR lag order, with \( k < p \). The second restriction
instead implies the exclusion of relevant variables \( y_{2,t} \). This is also a trivial case of non-invertibility due to the number of variables being smaller than the number of shocks. Finally, the last two restrictions correspond to disregarding the MA structure of the process. Braun and Mittnik (1993) discuss and quantify the asymptotic biases resulting from these misspecifications.

We now examine what these misspecifications imply for the identification of the shock of interest \( u_{1,t} \), under the assumption of partial invertibility. Let us assume that a condition of partial invertibility for \( u_{1,t} \) on the subvector \( y_{1,t} \) holds, i.e.

\[
    u_{1,t} = \text{Proj}(u_{1,t} \mid y_{1,t}, y_{1,t-1}, \ldots).
\] (32)

This condition guarantees that \( u_{1,t} \) can be obtained from the linear projection of \( y_{1,t} \) onto its lags (potentially infinitely many).

Let us now consider the case of a too short lag order. In this case, the autoregressive coefficients are biased and inconsistent. However, if the system contains sufficiently many lags to fulfill the partial invertibility condition in Eq. (32), then identification of the impact effects is still obtained. Hence, while impact responses of the variables to the shocks of interest are correctly estimated, their dynamics are distorted even asymptotically. Exactly the same logic applies to the case of a misspecified moving average component, that can always be mapped into a VAR with infinitely many lags. It is worth observing that while in the first case (Eq. 28) more lags trivially resolve the issue, in the second case (Eqs. 30-31) longer lags only asymptotically approximate the correct Wold representation.

Consider now the case of omitted variables (Eq. 29). If Eq. (32) holds for the subset of variables \( y_{1,t} \), then also in this case the impact effect are correctly retrieved, while the IRFs at longer horizons are distorted. However, interestingly, in this case too longer lags would asymptotically capture the correct dynamics of the system, and hence asymptotically recover the true IRFs. To see this, note that the Wold Representation Theorem implies that also \( y_{1,t} \) has an invertible MA representation. For the \( n_1 \)-dimensional subprocess \( y_{1,t} = JY_t \), where \( J_t = (I_{n_1}, 0_{n-n_1}) \) is a selector matrix, we can write

\[
    \Phi_{11}(L)y_{1,t} = -\Phi_{12}(L)y_{2,t} + \Psi_1(L)u_t. \] (33)

If \( Y_t \) is covariance-stationary, \( y_{1,t} \) is also covariance stationary, with first and second
moments respectively equal to $\mathbb{E}(y_{1,t}) = J\mathbb{E}(Y_t)$, and $\Gamma_{y_1}(h) = J\Gamma_Y(h)J'$, where $\Gamma(h)$ is the autocovariance of $Y_t$ at lag $h$. The Wold Representation Theorem also guarantees the existence of an ARMA representation of the form

$$
\tilde{\Phi}_1(L)y_{1,t} = \tilde{\Psi}_1(L)\nu_{1,t}.
$$

The structural innovations $u_t$ are trivially non-invertible in $y_{1,t}$. In fact, the $n$ innovations $u_t$ are compounded and reduced to the $n_1 < n$ innovations $\nu_{1,t}$, which do not have a meaningful structural interpretation. If, however, the system is partially invertible and Eq. (32) holds, then the impact effects of the shock of interest $u^t_1$ are correctly estimated; moreover, the existence of a Wold representation guarantees that the dynamics of the system are asymptotically approximated by infinitely many lags of $y_{1,t}$ only. It is worth noting that direct methods with controls (Jordà, 2005) can in principle be used to improve over VAR estimates in all these cases in which VARs can only asymptotically approximate the true dynamics of the system.

Interestingly, these observations provide a simple way to gauge the contamination of an instrument versus the misspecification of the chosen model – two dimensions along which structural identification may be problematic and deliver unstable results. In fact, if one can assume partial invertibility across different specifications of an empirical model, an instrument that fulfils the conditions for identification of Proposition 2 delivers stable impact responses but unstable IRFs across models. In this case, increasing the number of lags and/or selectively adding variables that may be of importance for the transmission of the shock should help stabilising the dynamics responses. The intuition for this is that additional controls may be important for the transmission of the structural shocks. Conversely, an instrument that violates the lead-lag exogeneity condition is likely to also deliver unstable impact responses across different models. In principle, a formal statistical test could be devised to discriminate between the two cases; this, however, is beyond the scope of this paper. We provide empirical support to these remarks in the following sections.

\footnote{In this case, the use of a much larger information set can help resolving the issue. The intuition is that structural shocks are likely to be fundamental and invertible in larger models, hence improving the performance of contaminated instruments (see Giannone and Reichlin, 2006).}
7 Partial Invertibility in a Simulated System

We use a stylised New Keynesian DSGE model that features (i) a representative infinitely-lived household that chooses between consumption and leisure; (ii) firms that produce a continuum of goods using a Cobb-Douglas technology to aggregate capital and labour; (iii) a government that consumes a share of output for wasteful public spending; and (iv) a central bank that sets the interest rate using a Taylor rule with smoothing. There are four stochastic disturbances that generate fluctuations in the economy, namely, a monetary policy shock $u_r^t$, a government spending shock $u_g^t$, a technology shock $u_a^t$, and an inflation-specific shock $u_\pi^t$.

The processes for technology, spending, inflation, and the policy rate are defined as follows. Log technology $a_t$ evolves with a news component as

$$a_t = \rho_a a_{t-1} + \sigma_a u_{at-4}^a, \tag{35}$$

where $u_a^a$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed technology news shock. Similarly, an element of fiscal foresight characterises the spending process $g_t$, that evolves according to

$$g_t = \rho_g g_{t-1} + u_{gt-4}^g, \tag{36}$$

where $u_g^g$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed spending shock. The monetary authority sets the nominal interest rate using a Taylor rule with smoothing

$$r_t = \rho_r r_{t-1} + (1 - \rho_r) \left( \phi_\pi \pi_{t} + \phi_y \Delta y_t \right) + \sigma_r u_r^r, \tag{37}$$

where $\pi_t$ is the average inflation rate over the last four periods, $\Delta y_t$ is the average growth rate of output, and $u_r^r$ is a white noise i.i.d. normally distributed monetary policy shock. Finally, price dynamics are governed by a New Keynesian Phillips Curve, as follows

$$\pi_t = \gamma_\pi \pi_{t-1} + \beta E_t \pi_{t+1} + \frac{(1 - \theta_\pi)(1 - \theta_\pi \beta)}{\theta_\pi} mc_t + u_\pi^\pi, \tag{38}$$

where $mc_t$ are marginal costs, and $u_\pi^\pi$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed inflation-specific shock. All the model details, including the calibrated parameters, are reported in Appendix A.
We consider a VAR(4) in the policy rate, inflation, output, and government spending. Under the chosen set of parameters, the model fails the ‘poor man’s invertibility condition’ of Fernandez-Villaverde et al. (2007), hence, the four structural shocks cannot all be recovered from a VAR in the observables. However, the specification of the Taylor rule ensures that the monetary policy shock is partially invertible from a VAR(4) in \([r_t, \pi_t, y_t]’\). Table 2 reports the degree of invertibility \(\delta_i\) of each of the structural shocks in the model, as defined in Sims and Zha (2006) and calculated following Forni et al. (2019) as

\[
\delta_i = \frac{\text{var}[u^i_t - \text{Proj}(u^i_t|\mathcal{H}^Y_t)]}{\sigma^2_{u^i_t}},
\]

(39)

where \(\sigma^2_{u^i_t}\) denotes the variance of the shock \(u^i_t\), and \(\mathcal{H}^Y_t\) denotes the space spanned by the vector of observables \(Y_t\) and its lags. \(\delta_i\) is a deterministic function of the model’s deep parameters, and measures the unexplained variance of the orthogonal projection of each of the structural shocks onto the VAR residuals. A value of 0 implies that the shock is invertible from the VAR, whereas increasing values of \(\delta_i\) imply non-fundamentalness and an increasing degree of non-invertibility.

Table 2 shows that the value of \(\delta_i\) for technology is very close to 1, confirming the inability of the VAR to recover this structural shock. The inflation and spending shocks are also non-invertible, but with a higher degree of invertibility. The monetary policy shock is the only invertible shock in the system. The four shocks play a different role in driving economic fluctuations in the model. Table 3 reports the share of variance of the four observables that is accounted for by each of the four shocks in the model. We note that the government spending shock plays a negligible role.

In Figure 1 we report the distribution of \(\delta_i\) for each of the shocks across simulations from the model, and compare it against the model implied ones (green dashed lines). Specifically, we simulate from the model 5,000 economies each of sample size \(T = 300\) periods. For each set of simulated data, we then estimate a VAR(4) in the four observ-
Table 3: Variance Decomposition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$u_t^y$</th>
<th>$u_t^g$</th>
<th>$u_t^α$</th>
<th>$u_t^π$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>output</td>
<td>16.45</td>
<td>77.01</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spending</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>61.91</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inflation</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>51.34</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>67.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policy rate</td>
<td>25.32</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>14.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Share of variance accounted for by each shock. Numbers may not add up to 100 due to non-zero correlation of simulated shocks in small samples.

Figure 1: Degree of Invertibility of the Structural Shocks

Note: Distribution of $δ_i$ across 5000 simulated economies. $δ_i = 0$ denotes invertibility; $δ_i = 1$ denotes insufficient information for shocks invertibility. VAR(4). Green dashed lines are the model-implied values of $δ_i$.

In Eq. (40) the shock is perfectly observable. This is the case discussed in Stock and Watson (2018). The instrument in Eq. (41) is contaminated by classic white noise measurement error, and the second lag of the monetary policy shock. The instruments in Eqs. (42-43) both fail the limited lead-lag exogeneity condition of Proposition 1. In fact,
Figure 2: Impact Responses to Monetary Policy Shock

Note: Impact responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(4) in four observables. \( z_{0,t} \): observed shock case; \( z_{1,t} \): instrument correlates with monetary policy shock only; \( z_{2,t} \): instrument also correlates with past spending shocks; \( z_{3,t} \) instrument correlates also with past technology shocks. Grey vertical lines are 2 standard deviations error bars from the distribution of impact responses across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size \( T = 300 \) periods. True impact (blue circle), median across simulations (orange square), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green triangle).

while \( z_{2,t} \) is contaminated by lagged spending shocks, \( z_{3,t} \) correlates with lagged technology shocks. In all cases, \( \varsigma_t \) is a normally distributed random measurement error with zero mean and variance equal to that of the structural shocks. A VAR(4) is partially invertible in the monetary policy shock and also captures the model’s dynamics sufficiently well. Hence, we use \( p = 4 \) as the benchmark case.\(^{15}\)

Impact responses for output and inflation recovered from the four instruments and a VAR(4) are in Figure 2.\(^{16}\) In each subplot, we use blue circles for the model’s responses (true), orange squares for the median across simulations, and green triangles for the simulation which is the closest to the median (best).\(^{17}\) The error bars are two standard deviations intervals constructed from the distribution across simulations. A few elements are worth highlighting. As also noted in Stock and Watson (2018), when the shock is observable (\( z_{0,t} \)), the assumption of full invertibility can be dispensed with for the validity of SVAR-IV. However, the shock is correctly recovered also under the milder conditions introduced in Proposition 2. In fact, correct impact responses are recovered also with \( z_{1,t} \). The introduction of a measurement error in \( z_{1,t} \) widens the distribution of

\(^{15}\)In the Appendix we also report the extreme cases of \( p = 1 \) and \( p = 2 \) where the model is more severely misspecified and the identification becomes more challenging.

\(^{16}\)IRFs are normalised such that the impact response of the policy rate to a monetary policy shock equals that of the model.

\(^{17}\)We select the simulation whose IRFs minimise the sum of square deviations from median IRFs over the first 12 periods. The choice allows to put more weight at shorter horizons where responses display richer dynamics. Changing the truncation horizon yields qualitatively similar results.
impact responses across simulations, but recovers the correct impact effects. The picture changes substantially when we consider the case of $z_{3,t}$. In this case, the instrument correlates with lagged non-invertible technology shocks which the data in the VAR cannot provide sufficient information for by construction. This results in severely biased impact responses. An interesting case arises when the instrument also correlates with lagged spending shocks ($z_{2,t}$). The spending shock is not invertible in the system; however, as noted, it is responsible for a negligible share of the variance of the simulated variables. In this case the impact responses recovered are close to the true ones, consistently with what observed in Remark 2.

The argument extends in an equivalent way to responses at farther away horizons. Figure 3 reports IRFs over 48 periods estimated using $z_{1,t}$ (Panel A, top), $z_{2,t}$ (Panel B, centre), and $z_{3,t}$ (Panel C, bottom). In the first two cases the model responses lie within the bands generated across the simulations. Conversely, the responses of all variables lie outside of the simulation confidence regions when the shock is identified using $z_{3,t}$.

In this exercise we have used data simulated from a NK-DSGE to show that if the conditions in Proposition 2 are satisfied, full invertibility is not necessary for the identification of invertible shocks in SVAR-IVs. Furthermore, even when the instrument violates the limited lead-lag exogeneity condition, the extent to which the estimated IRFs are distorted depends on the share of variance that is accounted for by the non-invertible shocks that contaminates the instrument.
Notes: Impulse responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(4) in four observables. Instrument correlates with monetary policy shock only (Panel A). Instrument correlates with monetary policy shock and lagged spending shocks (Panel B). Instrument correlates with monetary policy shock and lagged technology shocks (Panel C). Grey shaded areas denote 90th quantiles of the distribution of IRFs across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size $T = 300$ periods. Model responses (true, blue solid), median across simulations (orange dashed), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green dash-dotted).
8 IV Identification of Monetary Policy Shocks

In this section, we look at the empirical identification of monetary policy shocks and use the results in the previous sections to shed light on the distortions to both the impact effects and the dynamic responses that arise from either the contamination of the instrument, or the misspecification of the chosen VAR. In particular, we consider different instruments for monetary policy shocks, some of which may be contaminated, and different VARs, some of which are likely to be misspecified.

We consider three external instruments, all constructed from the high-frequency surprises of Gürkaynak et al. (2005), that measure monetary policy innovations through the surprise reactions of federal funds futures markets around FOMC announcements, following the insight of Kuttner (2001). The first of these instruments is constructed by measuring high-frequency surprises around all the scheduled FOMC meetings between 1990 and 2012. This is equivalent to the instrument used in e.g. Stock and Watson (2018) and Caldara and Herbst (2018), and we denote it by $z_{A,t}$. The second instrument is a monthly moving average of high-frequency surprises around all FOMC announcements from 1990 to 2012. This is the instrument originally proposed in Gertler and Karadi (2015), denoted $z_{B,t}$. The third external instrument is the residual of a projection of high-frequency surprises around all FOMC meetings onto their lags and Fed Greenbook forecasts from 1990 to 2009. This is the instrument in Miranda-Agrippino and Ricco (2017), denoted $z_{C,t}$. This projection can be seen as a pre-whitening step that removes the contamination by other past and contemporaneous shocks related to the state of the economy induced by the presence of a signalling channel of monetary policy (see e.g. Melosi, 2017).

Table 4 reports Granger causality tests for the three instruments on the first ten macroeconomic and financial factors estimated from the monthly dataset in McCracken and Ng (2015). For each instrument we estimate the following regression

$$z_t = \theta_0 + \theta_1 z_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{10} \theta_{f_j} f_{j,t-1} + v_t$$ (44)

at monthly frequency and over the sample 1990-1:2009-12. The numbers in the table are Wald test statistics for the null that the factors’ coefficients are jointly equal to zero, i.e. H0: $\theta_{f_1} = \ldots = \theta_{f_{10}} = 0$. Test results suggest a possible contamination of the instruments $z_{A,t}$ and $z_{B,t}$ by lagged macroeconomic shocks, with p-values well beyond the rejection
Table 4: Contamination of Monetary Policy Instruments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$z_{A,t}$</th>
<th>$z_{B,t}$</th>
<th>$z_{C,t}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$F_{(10,227)}$</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0240)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{(10,226)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0002)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F_{(10,215)}$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0669)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$N$</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Wald test statistics. Regressions include a constant and one lag of the dependent variable. Sample 1990:2009. p-values in parentheses.

We evaluate the effect of the instruments’ contamination on the estimation of the IRFs in an empirical setup that encompasses standard monetary VARs such as those in Coibion (2012) and Gertler and Karadi (2015). Our benchmark VAR is monthly and estimated with 12 lags from 1979-1 to 2012-12. The variables included are the one-year government bond rate as the policy variable, an index of industrial production, the unemployment rate, the consumer price index, a commodity price index, and the excess bond premium (EBP) of Gilchrist and Zakrašek (2012).18 Stock and Watson (2018) show that in this system there is no statistically significant evidence against the null hypothesis of invertibility.19

We also consider a VAR estimated over the same sample that omits the unemployment rate, the EBP variable, and the commodity price index, and includes only 2 lags. This VAR is likely to be misspecified, but is compatible with a central bank setting the interest rate using a simple Taylor rule, hence conventional monetary policy shocks are potentially invertible in this smaller VAR. In all cases, we estimate the impact responses from a regression of the VAR innovations onto one of the above instruments, while IRFs are retrieved from the coefficients of the VAR. Responses are normalised such that the policy rate increases by 1% on impact.

We start by looking at the impact responses retrieved by the three instruments in the two VARs, reported in Figure 4. The top row collects results for the baseline VAR, while

---

18Data for bond yields, industrial production, and the consumer price index are from the St Louis FRED Database, the commodity price index is from the Commodity Research Bureau, the EBP data are from the Federal Reserve Board.

19Stock and Watson (2018) do not reject the null of invertibility in a system that includes industrial production, the index of consumer prices, the one year interest rate and the excess bond premium variable. The test is however sensitive to the number of lags included (Plagborg-Møller and Wolf, 2018b).
**Figure 4: Impact Responses to Monetary Policy Shocks – 1979:2012**

**Notes:** Baseline VAR(12) in all variables, top panel (A). Misspecified VAR(2) in three variables, bottom panel (B). VARs estimated with standard macroeconomic priors. Identification in all cases uses the full length of the instruments. $z_{A,t}$: high-frequency surprises at scheduled FOMC meetings; $z_{B,t}$: moving average of high-frequency surprises within the month; $z_{C,t}$: residuals of $z_{A,t}$ on Fed Greenbook forecasts. Shaded areas denote 90% posterior coverage bands.

The misspecified VAR is in the bottom row. Comparing the impact responses for each given instrument across VARs we note that while those estimated with $z_{C,t}$ are stable across models, those recovered under either $z_{A,t}$ or $z_{B,t}$ vary and are statistically different. Modal impact responses of production to a contractionary monetary policy shock go from being not significant to strongly positive at almost 2% under $z_{B,t}$, and from -1% to essentially zero under $z_{A,t}$. The impact response under $z_{C,t}$ is largely unchanged.

We then turn to the full dynamic responses reported in Figure 5. Despite the differences in the estimated impact effects, the responses in the baseline VAR are qualitatively coherent; all instruments identify a monetary policy shock that eventually triggers an economic recession and lowers prices. However, the picture changes quite materially when the misspecified VAR is used (bottom row of Figure 5).\(^{20}\)

\(^{20}\)These findings hold across different samples. Figure B.4 in the Appendix reports IRFs from VARs
Notes: Baseline VAR(12) in all variables, top panel (A). Misspecified VAR(2) in three variables, bottom panel (B). VARs estimated with standard macroeconomic priors. Identification in all cases uses the full length of the instruments. \( z_{A,t} \): sum of high-frequency surprises within the month; \( z_{B,t} \): moving average of high-frequency surprises within the month; \( z_{C,t} \): residuals of \( z_{A,t} \) on Fed Greenbook forecasts. Shaded areas denote 90% posterior coverage bands.

Using the simple heuristic developed in Section 6, we can infer that the dependence of the impact effects on the model specification is likely due to both \( z_{A,t} \) and \( z_{B,t} \) violating the limited lead-lag exogeneity condition, i.e. they correlate with other shocks, likely related to developments in financial markets and the real economy, that the trivariate VAR(2) is not able to control for.\(^{21}\) In fact, a possible interpretation for these results is that the instruments \( z_{A,t} \) and \( z_{B,t} \) may be contaminated by structural shocks that are non-invertible in the trivariate VAR, but which become invertible in the larger system. In such a case, the IRFs obtained in the smaller system are distorted due to the bias induced by the estimated from 1990-1, date that coincides with the start date of the three instruments.

\(^{21}\)The first factor used in Table 4 is typically regarded as a synthetic measure of economic activity, see e.g. McCracken and Ng (2015). Other than a barometer for financial markets’ health levels, the EBP has strong predictive power for an array of measures of economic activity, and is hence likely to account also for other omitted variables (see e.g. Gilchrist and Zakrajšek, 2012; Gertler and Karadi, 2015).
violation of both the limited lead-lag and the contemporaneous exogeneity conditions, as in Eq. (24). By adding financial variables to the system, some of the non-invertible shocks become invertible. Hence, the extent of the bias is much reduced and only due to the violation of the contemporaneous exogeneity conditions, as in Eq. (25).

Interestingly, the dynamic responses obtained with $z_{C,t}$ are largely similar across the two VARs, which, using the same heuristic, indicates an overall small degree of model misspecification.

9 Conclusions

This paper provides conditions for identification with external instruments in Structural VARs under the assumption of partial invertibility. This property requires that only one or a subset of the structural shocks in the system are invertible, and hence recoverable from the residuals of the chosen empirical model.

We show that, under partial invertibility, correct identification of the dynamic causal effects of interest is obtained in SVAR-IV methods (and LP-IV with controls) if the instrument satisfies a limited lead-lag exogeneity condition, on top of the standard IV validity conditions of relevance and contemporaneous exogeneity. This limited lead-lag exogeneity condition allows to achieve correct identification even when the instrument correlates with other invertible shocks in the system. Overall, the conditions for identification used in this paper are weaker than both the standard full invertibility condition typically required for SVAR-IV, and also the strong lead-lag exogeneity condition needed for LP-IV without controls. Importantly, they allow to extend the range of empirical settings in which SVAR-IV and LP-IV with controls can be used.

Lastly, we show that the identification of impact effects is possible even in the presence of model misspecification of different nature. In this case, an empirical trade-off between efficiency and accuracy of the impulse response functions arises, and the use of larger information sets, or of direct methods, can help producing more robust inference.
Appendix

A Model

The economy is populated by a representative infinitely-lived household seeking to maximise

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t U(C_t, H_t),$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.1)

with a period utility

$$U(C_t, H_t) = \frac{C_t^{1-\sigma}}{1-\sigma} - \frac{H_t^{1+\varphi}}{1+\varphi},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.2)

where $\sigma$ is the risk aversion parameter, $\varphi$ is the Frisch elasticity, and $H_t$ are hours worked. $C_t$ is a consumption bundle defined as

$$C_t \equiv \left( \int_0^1 C_t(i)^{1-\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\epsilon}},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.3)

where $C_t(i)$ is the quantity of good $i$ consumed by the household in period $t$. A continuum of goods $i \in [0, 1]$ exists. The log-linearised households optimality conditions are given by the Euler equation

$$c_t = \mathbb{E}[c_{t+1}] - \frac{1}{\sigma} \left( r_t - \mathbb{E}[\pi_{t+1}] \right),$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.4)

and by the labour supply schedule

$$w_t = \frac{1}{\varphi} h_t + \sigma c_t,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.5)

where $w_t$ is the labour wage on a competitive labour market. Agents maximise their intertemporal utility subject to a flow budget constraint. Agents can hold bonds or firms capital, and a no arbitrage condition between bonds and capital holds

$$\frac{1}{\beta} (r_t - \mathbb{E}[\pi_{t+1}]) = \frac{1}{\beta - (1-\delta)} \mathbb{E}[\pi_{t+1}],$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.6)

where $\delta$ is the rate of depreciation of capital. Firms produce differentiated goods $j \in [0, 1]$ by using a Cobb-Douglas technology to aggregate capital and labour

$$Y_t(j) = A_t K_{t-1}(j)^{\alpha} H_t(j)^{1-\alpha},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A.7)
where, importantly, log technology $a_t \equiv \log(A_t)$ has a news component

$$a_t = \rho_a a_{t-1} + \sigma_a u^a_{t-1}, \quad (A.8)$$

where $u^a_t$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed technology shock. The static optimality condition on the production inputs delivers the linearised relation

$$w_t + h_t = k_{t-1} + z_t. \quad (A.9)$$

The log-linearised production function of the firms is

$$y_t = a_t + \alpha k_{t-1} + (1 - \alpha) h_t. \quad (A.10)$$

Firms set prices in a staggered way à la Calvo (1983) with an indexation mechanisms of the type proposed by Galì and Gertler (1999). Thus, each period, a measure $1 - \theta$ of firms reset their prices, while prices for a fraction $\theta$ of the firms are $P_t(j) = P_{t-1} \gamma_{t-1}$. $\theta$ is an index of price stickiness. The firms that can reset their prices maximise the expected sum of profits

$$\max_{P_t(j)} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} (\beta \theta)^\tau \left( P_t^*(j) \left( \frac{P_t - 1 + \tau}{P_{t-1}} \right)^\gamma - MC_{t+\tau} \right) Y_{t+\tau}(j), \quad (A.11)$$

where $MC_t$ are the real marginal costs in period $t$. The first order conditions from this problem, combined with the aggregate price equation, form a hybrid New Keynesian Phillips Curve

$$\pi_t = \gamma \pi_{t-1} + \beta \mathbb{E}[\pi_{t+1}] + \lambda mc_t, \quad \lambda \equiv \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{1 - \beta \theta}{\theta} \right) + u^\pi_t, \quad (A.12)$$

where $u^\pi_t$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed inflation-specific shock, and marginal costs evolve as

$$mc_t = \alpha z_t + (1 - \alpha) w_t - a_t. \quad (A.13)$$

The linearised law of motion for firms capital is

$$I_t = K_{t+1} - (1 - \delta)K_t, \quad (A.14)$$
where $K_t$ is physical capital and $I_t$ is investment. The log-linearisation of this equation yields
\begin{equation}
  i_t = k_t - (1 - \delta) k_{t-1} .
\end{equation}

(A.15)

A fiscal authority absorbs a share of output into wasteful government spending
\begin{equation}
  G_t = (1 - \rho_g)G + \rho_g G_{t-1} e^{u^g_{t-4}}
\end{equation}

(A.16)

the log-linearised equation for government spending is
\begin{equation}
  g_t = \rho_g g_{t-1} + u^g_{t-4} ,
\end{equation}

(A.17)

where $u^g_t$ is an i.i.d. normally distributed government demand shock. At the steady state $G = gY$. A monetary authority sets the nominal interest rate using a monetary rule with a smoothing term
\begin{equation}
  r_t = \rho_r r_{t-1} + (1 - \rho_r) \left( \phi_\pi \pi_t + \phi_y \Delta y_t \right) + \sigma_r u^r_t ,
\end{equation}

(A.18)

where $\pi_t$ and $\Delta y_t$ are, respectively, average inflation and the average rate of output growth over the last four periods, and $u^r_t$ is a white noise i.i.d. normally distributed monetary policy shock. The monetary policy innovation can be recovered from current and past values of the policy rate, inflation and output. Finally, the aggregate economy clears
\begin{equation}
  Y_y = C_t + I_t + G_t .
\end{equation}

(A.19)

Table A.1 reports the calibration for this benchmark NK model. For this set of parameters the model fails the ‘poor man’s invertibility condition’ of Fernandez-Villaverde et al. (2007).

---

\footnote{In order to have smoother impulse response functions, without introducing autocorrelation in the shock processes, we added an ad hoc quadratic adjustment of the form $i_t = k_t - (1 - \delta) k_{t-1} + (k_t - (1 - \delta) k_{t-1})^2$.}
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>share of capital in output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>discount factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>depreciation of capital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>risk aversion consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>labor disutility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>share of public spending in output</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>price stickiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>indexation parameter (NK Phillips curve backward term)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\epsilon$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>substitutability goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_r$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>monetary policy smoothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_g$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>monetary policy output growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\phi_r$</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>monetary policy inflation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_a$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>productivity autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_g$</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>public spending autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_a$</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_r$</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B  Additional Charts

**Figure B.1: Responses to MP Shock – Simulation & VAR(1)**

(A) Impact Responses: All Instruments

**Note:** Impact responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(1) in four observables. $z_{0,t}$: observed shock case; $z_{1,t}$: instrument correlates with monetary policy shock only; $z_{2,t}$: instrument also correlates with past spending shocks; $z_{3,t}$: instrument correlates also with past technology shocks. Grey vertical lines are 2 standard deviations error bars from the distribution of impact responses across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size $T = 300$ periods. True impact (blue circle), median across simulations (orange square), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green triangle).

(B) $z_{1,t}$: external instrument correlates with monetary policy shock only

**Notes:** Impulse responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(1) in four observables. Instrument correlates with monetary policy shocks only. Grey shaded areas denote 90th quantiles of the distribution of IRFs across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size $T = 300$ periods. Model responses (true, blue solid), median across simulations (orange dashed), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green dash-dotted).
Figure B.2: Responses to MP Shock – Simulation & VAR(2)

**Note:** Impact responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(2) in four observables. $z_{0,t}$: observed shock case; $z_{1,t}$: instrument correlates with monetary policy shock only; $z_{2,t}$: instrument also correlates with past spending shocks; $z_{3,t}$: instrument correlates also with past technology shocks. Grey vertical lines are 2 standard deviations error bars from the distribution of impact responses across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size $T = 300$ periods. True impact (blue circle), median across simulations (orange square), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green triangle).

**Notes:** Impulse responses to monetary policy shock from partially-invertible DSGE identified with external instruments and estimated with a VAR(2) in four observables. Instrument correlates with monetary policy shocks only. Grey shaded areas denote 90th quantiles of the distribution of IRFs across 5,000 simulated economies of sample size $T = 300$ periods. Model responses (true, blue solid), median across simulations (orange dashed), minimum distance from median (best) simulation (green dash-dotted).
Figure B.3: Impact Responses to Monetary Policy Shocks – 1990:2012

Notes: Baseline VAR(12) in all variables, top panel (A). Misspecified VAR(2) in three variables, bottom panel (B). VARs estimated with standard macroeconomic priors. Identification in all cases uses the full length of the instruments. $z_{A,t}$: high-frequency surprises at scheduled FOMC meetings; $z_{B,t}$: moving average of high-frequency surprises within the month; $z_{C,t}$: residuals of $z_{A,t}$ on Fed Greenbook forecasts. Shaded areas denote 90% posterior coverage bands.
Figure B.4: Responses to Monetary Policy Shocks – 1990:2012

Notes: Baseline: VAR(12) in all variables. Misspecified: VAR(2) in three variables. VARs estimated with standard macroeconomic priors. Identification in all cases uses the full length of the instruments. $z_{A,t}$: sum of high-frequency surprises within the month; $z_{B,t}$: moving average of high-frequency surprises within the month; $z_{C,t}$: residuals of $z_{A,t}$ on Fed Greenbook forecasts. Shaded areas denote 90% posterior coverage bands.
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