



**UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA**  
**FACULTY OF ARTS**  
Department of Economics

Working Paper No. 2011-04

# Covariate Unit Root Tests with Good Size and Power

**Sebastian Fossati**  
**University of Alberta**

May 2011

Copyright to papers in this working paper series rests with the authors and their assignees. Papers may be downloaded for personal use. Downloading of papers for any other activity may not be done without the written consent of the authors.

Short excerpts of these working papers may be quoted without explicit permission provided that full credit is given to the source.

The Department of Economics, The Institute for Public Economics, and the University of Alberta accept no responsibility for the accuracy or point of view represented in this work in progress.

# Covariate Unit Root Tests with Good Size and Power

Sebastian Fossati\*  
University of Alberta

This version: May 20, 2011

## Abstract

The selection of the truncation lag for covariate unit root tests is analyzed using Monte Carlo simulation. It is shown that standard information criteria such as the BIC or the AIC can result in tests with large size distortions. Modified information criteria can be used to construct tests with good size and power. An empirical illustration is provided.

*Keywords:* unit root tests, truncation lag, information criteria, vector autoregressions.

*JEL Codes:* C32, C12, C52.

---

\*Contact: Department of Economics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB T6G 2H4, Canada. Email: [sfossati@ualberta.ca](mailto:sfossati@ualberta.ca). Web: <http://www.ualberta.ca/~sfossati/>. I would like to thank Eric Zivot, Charles Nelson, Chang-Jin Kim, Richard Startz, and Drew Creal for helpful advice and support and Bruce Hansen and Michael Jansson for providing their Matlab code. I would also like to acknowledge financial support from the Buechel Memorial Fellowship and Grover and Creta Ensley Fellowship, which funded part of this research while I was a graduate student at the University of Washington.

# 1 Introduction

Hansen (1995) initiated a new direction in the search for unit root tests with better power considering a multivariate framework and showing that correlated stationary covariates can be used to obtain tests with higher power than univariate tests. He proposes a unit root test that uses the Dickey-Fuller regression equation and incorporates covariates to increase power (henceforth CADF test). Recent contributions to this literature, however, build on the findings in Elliott et al. (1996). In particular, Elliott and Jansson (2003) derive the power envelope for unit root tests with stationary covariates and propose a point-optimal test (henceforth EJ test) with maximal power against a point alternative. In addition, Pesavento (2006) introduces generalized least squares (GLS) detrending to the CADF test (henceforth CADF-GLS test) and shows that this yields near-optimal tests with small size distortions. The implementation of these tests requires the selection of a truncation lag ( $k$ ). In this paper, I consider the selection of  $k$  using information criteria for the covariate unit root tests proposed in Elliott and Jansson (2003) and Pesavento (2006). These tests have greater power than the CADF test and, hence, the test proposed in Hansen (1995) is not considered here. Using Monte Carlo simulations, I compare the performance of several information criteria for a variety of data generating processes (DGPs). The objective is to provide recommendations on how to construct covariate unit root tests with good size and power.

The truncation lag for the EJ test is selected in a first step where a vector autoregression (VAR) is estimated under the null of non-stationarity (Elliott and Jansson, 2003). Previous research on the selection of the truncation lag for VARs has focused on the accuracy of information criteria to detect the true value of  $k$  (Lütkepohl, 1985)

or fitting impulse-response functions (Ivanov and Kilian, 2005). In the case of the EJ test, simulation results show that using the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) or the Akaike information criterion (AIC) can result in covariate unit root tests with large size distortions. In contrast, a modified Akaike information criterion (MIC) for cointegration tests introduced in Qu and Perron (2007) yields big size improvements and powerful tests.

In the case of the CADF-GLS test, simulation results show that using the truncation lag selected by the BIC, AIC, or the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001) on the CADF-GLS regression equation can yield unit root tests with large size distortions. On the other hand, selecting the truncation lag on an univariate regression using the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001), as suggested in Pesavento (2006), yields tests with small size distortions. A consequence of this strategy, however, is that the lead and lag orders are constrained to be equal causing a small reduction in power when unnecessary leads and/or lags are added to the regression equation. A simple strategy that removes this constraint yields tests with improved power.

This paper contributes to the literature in several ways. First, it shows that practitioners should pay special attention to the selection of the truncation lag when constructing covariate unit root tests. The results for the EJ and CADF-GLS tests are similar to those found in the univariate literature by Schwert (1989), Ng and Perron (1995), Oke and Lyhagen (1999), and Ng and Perron (2001). Specifically, using the BIC or AIC to select the truncation lag can lead to tests with large size distortions. In two recent empirical applications of covariate unit root tests by Elliott and Pesavento (2006) and Amara and Papell (2006) the authors report selecting the truncation lag using the BIC rule. The large number of rejections in those papers (taken as evidence in favor of the purchasing power parity theory) is potentially biased as a consequence

of the use of this rule to select the lag order. Another contribution of this paper is to show that covariate unit root tests with good size and power are available when using the MIC of Qu and Perron (2007) to construct the EJ test and the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001) to construct the CADF-GLS test. In particular, in the case of models with a moving average root close to one, the standard BIC and AIC select lag lengths that are too small resulting in tests with important size distortions. On the other hand, the modified information criteria of Ng and Perron (2001) and Qu and Perron (2007) select higher lag orders, which is necessary for unit root tests to have good size (see Ng and Perron, 1995). In addition, this paper proposes a strategy to select the lead and lag orders for the CADF-GLS test that yields tests with better power. Finally, these results should also prove useful for the covariate unit root tests proposed in Fossati (2009) and Galvao (2009).

The paper proceeds as follows. In the next section, the test statistics and selection rules considered are reviewed. In section 3, the finite sample properties of the tests for different selection rules are analyzed using Monte Carlo simulation. In section 4, an empirical application to standard macroeconomic data shows the relevance of these results. Finally, section 5 concludes.

## 2 Test Statistics and Selection of the Truncation Lag

### 2.1 The EJ Test

Following Elliott et al. (2005), consider a data generating process for the  $(m + 1)$ -dimensional vector time series  $z_t = (y_t, x'_t)'$  of the form

$$y_t = \beta_{y,0} + \beta_{y,1}t + u_{y,t}, \quad (1)$$

$$x_t = \beta_{x,0} + \beta_{x,1}t + u_{x,t}, \quad (2)$$

and

$$A(L) \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \rho L)u_{y,t} \\ \Delta u_{x,t} \end{pmatrix} = e_t, \quad (3)$$

where  $y_t$  is univariate (and potentially non-stationary) and  $x_t$  is an integrated process of dimension  $(m \times 1)$  with elements not mutually cointegrated.  $A(L)$  is a matrix polynomial in the lag operator of order  $k$  with first element equal to the identity matrix and  $|A(r)| = 0$  has roots outside the unit circle. The vector  $e_t$  is assumed to be *i.i.d.*(0,  $\Sigma$ ).

The frequency zero correlation between the shocks to  $\Delta x_t$  and the quasi-differences of  $y_t$  can be captured through the parameter  $R^2$ . Consider the matrix  $\Omega$  given by

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_{yy} & \omega_{yx} \\ \omega_{xy} & \Omega_{xx} \end{pmatrix} = A(1)^{-1} \Sigma A(1)^{-1'}.$$

Then,  $R^2 = \omega_{yy}^{-1} \omega_{yx} \Omega_{xx}^{-1} \omega_{xy}$  with  $0 \leq R^2 < 1$ .

Elliott et al. (2005) show that this model has several VAR-type representations. Ignoring the deterministic terms, the model in equations (1)-(3) can be written as

$$A(L) \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \rho L)y_t, \\ X_t \end{pmatrix} = e_t, \quad (4)$$

where  $X_t = \Delta x_t$ . This representation corresponds to the one examined in Elliott and Jansson (2003). I consider four relevant cases for the deterministic part of the model: (1)  $\beta_{y,0} = 0$ ,  $\beta_{y,1} = 0$ , and  $\beta_{x,1} = 0$ ; (2)  $\beta_{y,1} = 0$ , and  $\beta_{x,1} = 0$ ; (3)  $\beta_{y,1} = 0$ ; (4) no restrictions. Note that  $\beta_{x,0}$  drops from the model when  $x_t$  is differenced. The first case then corresponds to a model with no deterministic terms. The second has no constant or trend in  $\Delta x_t$  but a constant in  $y_t$ . The third case includes a constant in  $\Delta x_t$  and a constant in  $y_t$ . Case 4 imposes no restrictions. These cases correspond to cases 1-4 considered by Elliott and Jansson (2003). Elliott and Jansson (2003) also consider the case where  $\Delta x_t$  has a constant and time trend (case 5) but this case seems unlikely when  $x_t$  is an integrated process.

The test for a unit root is a test of the hypothesis that  $\rho = 1$  versus the alternative that  $\rho < 1$ . Elliott and Jansson (2003) propose a feasible point-optimal test with a test statistic of the form

$$\tilde{\Lambda}(1, \bar{\rho}) = T \left[ \text{tr} \left( \tilde{\Sigma}(1)^{-1} \tilde{\Sigma}(\bar{\rho}) \right) - (m + \bar{\rho}) \right], \quad (5)$$

where  $\tilde{\Sigma}(r)$  are the covariance matrices of the residuals constructed by detrending the data under the null and the alternative and running  $\tilde{A}(L)\tilde{u}_t(r) = \tilde{e}_t(r)$  for  $r \in \{1, \bar{\rho}\}$  (see Elliott and Jansson, 2003; Elliott et al., 2005).  $\bar{\rho}$  is the value of  $\rho$  under the alternative and is given by  $\bar{\rho} = 1 + \bar{c}/T$ . They recommend using the same values of

$\bar{c}$  as in Elliott et al. (1996) as this corresponds to the worst case scenario, i.e. the covariates have no useful information. As a consequence,  $\bar{c} = -7$  for cases 1-3 and  $\bar{c} = -13.5$  for case 4. The test rejects for small values of  $\tilde{\Lambda}(1, \bar{\rho})$  and critical values reported in Elliott and Jansson (2003) depend on the value of  $R^2$ .

A critical step in the construction of unit root tests is the selection of the truncation lag when this is not known. Elliott and Jansson (2003) recommend choosing the number of lags using the BIC on a VAR estimated under the null of  $\rho = 1$ . The first step then implies running

$$A(L)\Delta z_t = d_t + e_t, \quad t = k + 2, \dots, T, \quad (6)$$

where  $\Delta z_t = [(1 - L)y_t, (1 - L)x_t']'$  for  $t > 1$  and  $\Delta z_1 = [y_1, 0]'$ , and  $d_t$  includes the deterministic terms. Given that  $x_t$  is in first difference, the first observation is treated as in Elliott et al. (2005) and set equal to zero. This VAR is also used to estimate  $R^2$ . Let  $\hat{\Sigma} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=k+2}^T \hat{e}_t \hat{e}_t'$  and  $\hat{\Omega} = \hat{A}(1)^{-1} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{A}(1)^{-1'}$ , then,  $\hat{R}^2 = \hat{\omega}_{yy}^{-1} \hat{\omega}_{yx} \hat{\Omega}_{xx}^{-1} \hat{\omega}_{xy}$ .

Following Ng and Perron (2005), I estimate each candidate model with the same number of effective observations  $N$  and determine the value of  $k$  as  $k = \arg \min_{k \in [0, k_{max}]}$   $IC(k)$ . Selection criteria for VARs have the form

$$IC(k) = \ln |\hat{\Sigma}_k| + \frac{C_T}{N} (\tau_{Tk}(r) + kn^2), \quad (7)$$

where  $\hat{\Sigma}_k = N^{-1} \sum_{t=k_{max}+2}^T \hat{e}_t \hat{e}_t'$ ,  $N = T - k_{max} - 1$ , and  $n = m + 1$  is the dimension of the VAR in equation (6). As in Elliott et al. (2005) the first observation is dropped in this step only. If  $C_T = \ln N$  and  $\tau_{Tk}(r) = 0$  we have the BIC, and if  $C_T = 2$  and  $\tau_{Tk}(r) = 0$  we have the AIC.

Information criteria such as the BIC and AIC, however, tend to select overly par-



simonious models possibly leading to tests with large size distortions in finite samples. A recent information criterion introduced in Qu and Perron (2007) extends the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001) for cointegration tests and yields tests with improved size properties. Following Elliott et al. (2005), the model in equations (1)-(3) can also be written as

$$\Delta z_t = \Pi z_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^k \Gamma_j \Delta z_{t-j} + e_t, \quad t = k+2, \dots, T, \quad (8)$$

where deterministic components may be included depending on the underlying process. This is precisely the VAR that needs to be estimated to compute the MIC proposed in Qu and Perron (2007). Consider the problem of testing for  $r$  against more than  $r$  cointegrating vectors, we can construct the likelihood ratio (LR) test statistic  $\tau_{Tk}(r) = -N \sum_{j=r+1}^n \log(1 - \hat{\lambda}_j)$  where  $\hat{\lambda}_j$  are the estimated eigenvalues of matrix  $\Pi$  in equation (8). To obtain an Akaike-type MIC for the EJ test I construct the cointegration LR test for zero cointegrating relations, i.e.  $r = 0$ . Then, if  $C_T = 2$  and  $\tau_{Tk}(r) = \tau_{Tk}(0)$  we have the MIC proposed in Qu and Perron (2007). A modified BIC can be constructed in a similar way. Note that, under the null, the rank of  $\Pi$  is zero and equation (8) reduces to equation (6). The term  $\tau_{Tk}(r)$  provides only a finite sample adjustment.

## 2.2 The CADF-GLS Test

Pesavento (2006) proposes the CADF-GLS test as an extension of the test proposed in Hansen (1995). The regression equation takes the form

$$\Delta y_t^d = \phi y_{t-1}^d + \sum_{j=-k}^k \pi'_{xj} \Delta x_{t-j}^d + \sum_{j=1}^k \pi_{yj} \Delta y_{t-j}^d + \epsilon_t, \quad t = k+2, \dots, T-k, \quad (9)$$

where  $y_t^d = y_t - d_t' \hat{\beta}^{GLS}$  with  $d_t = 0$  for case 1,  $d_t = 1$  for cases 2 and 3, and  $d_t = (1, t)$

for case 4.  $\hat{\beta}^{GLS}$  is the GLS estimate of  $\beta$  obtained from the least squares (OLS) regression of  $y_t(\bar{\rho})$  on  $d_t(\bar{\rho})$ , where the quasi-differenced series are  $y_t(\bar{\rho}) = (1 - \bar{\rho}L)y_t$  for  $t > 1$  and  $y_1(\bar{\rho}) = y_1$ .  $d_t(\bar{\rho})$  is obtained similarly.  $\Delta x_t^d$  is the OLS demeaned  $\Delta x_t$  where  $\Delta x_t = (1 - L)x_t$  for  $t > 2$  and  $\Delta x_1 = 0$ . Note that  $x_t$  is in first difference so the first observation is set equal to zero as in Elliott et al. (2005). The CADF-GLS test statistic is the t-statistic on  $\phi$ . Critical values for the unit root hypothesis are reported in Pesavento (2006) and depend on the value of  $R^2$ . Hansen (1995) suggests using a nonparametric estimator of the form

$$\hat{R}^2 = 1 - \left( \frac{\hat{\theta}_{21}^2}{\hat{\theta}_{11}\hat{\theta}_{22}} \right), \quad (10)$$

where

$$\hat{\Theta} = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\theta}_{11} & \hat{\theta}_{12} \\ \hat{\theta}_{21} & \hat{\theta}_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{i=-M}^M w(i/M) \frac{1}{T} \sum_t \hat{\nu}_{t-i} \hat{\nu}_t', \quad (11)$$

with  $\hat{\nu}_t = (\hat{\epsilon}_t + \sum_{j=-k}^k \hat{\pi}_{xj}' x_{t-j}^d, \hat{\epsilon}_t)'$ ,  $w(\cdot)$  is a kernel weight function, e.g. the Bartlett or Parzen kernels, and  $M$  is a bandwidth. In this paper, all estimations are performed using the Parzen kernel and a bandwidth determined following Andrews (1991).

For the CADF-GLS test, Pesavento (2006) recommends using the truncation lag selected by the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001) on an univariate regression on the GLS detrended  $y_t$ . Another option is to apply the selection rules directly to the output of the CADF-GLS regression equation. The information criteria considered are BIC, AIC, and the MIC of Ng and Perron (2001) on equation (9). Selection criteria for the CADF-GLS regression equation have the form

$$IC(k) = \ln \hat{\sigma}_k^2 + \frac{C_T}{N} (\tau_T(k) + k(2m + 1)), \quad (12)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_k^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{t=k_{max}+2}^{T-k_{max}} \hat{\epsilon}_t^2$ , and  $N = T - 2k_{max} - 1$ . Again, the first observation is treated as in Elliott et al. (2005) and dropped in this step. If  $C_T = \ln N$  and  $\tau_T(k) = 0$  we have the BIC, and if  $C_T = 2$  and  $\tau_T(k) = 0$  we have the AIC. For the MIC we need  $C_T = 2$  and the quantity  $\tau_T(k) = (\hat{\sigma}_k^2)^{-1} \hat{\phi}^2 \sum_{t=k_{max}+2}^{T-k_{max}} y_{t-1}^{d2}$ .

To avoid confusion, from now on I adopt the following notation. Criteria constructed using the EJ VAR and given by equation (7) are labeled with the subscript  $e$  ( $BIC_e, AIC_e, MIC_e$ ). Criteria constructed using the CADF-GLS regression equation and given by equation (12) are labeled with the subscript  $c$  ( $BIC_c, AIC_c, MIC_c$ ). Finally, criteria constructed using the univariate regression on the GLS detrended  $y_t$  as in Ng and Perron (2001) are labeled with the subscript  $u$  ( $BIC_u, AIC_u, MIC_u$ ).

### 3 Finite Sample Simulations

#### 3.1 Monte Carlo Design

In order to accommodate a wide variety of simulation exercises I assume a very general specification. The setup, which is used throughout, is to consider an error process generated by a VARMA(1,1) model of the form

$$(I_2 - AL) \begin{pmatrix} (1 - \rho L)u_{yt} \\ (1 - L)u_{xt} \end{pmatrix} = (I_2 + BL)e_t, \quad (13)$$

where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11} & b_{12} \\ b_{21} & b_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

$e_t \sim iid N(0, \Sigma)$  for  $t > 0$ ,  $e_t = 0$  for  $t \leq 0$ , and

$$\Sigma = (I_2 + B)^{-1}(I_2 - A) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & R \\ R & 1 \end{pmatrix} (I_2 - A)'(I_2 + B)^{-1'}. \quad (14)$$

I consider different degrees of correlation with  $R \in \{0, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ , and two sample sizes  $T \in \{100, 250\}$ . In all cases, the lower bound  $k_{min}$  is zero and the upper bound is selected using  $k_{max} = int[12(T/100)^{1/4}]$ . The results are based on 5,000 replications. For each sample an array of unit root test statistics are constructed. These include the ADF-GLS test and the point-optimal ( $P_T$ ) test of Elliott et al. (1996), the CADF-GLS test, and the EJ test.

Results presented in this paper include five reference models. The first model is a vector white noise process (henceforth VWN) where  $a_{ij} = b_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . The second model is a strongly autocorrelated VAR process (henceforth VAR<sub>1</sub>) where  $a_{11} = a_{22} = 0.8$  and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise while  $b_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . The third model is an infinite order VAR process (henceforth VMA<sub>1</sub>) where  $a_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$  while  $b_{11} = b_{22} = -0.8$  and  $b_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. The last two models consider the case where  $y_t$  Granger-causes  $x_t$ . The fourth model is a VAR process (henceforth VAR<sub>2</sub>) where  $a_{21} = 0.5$ ,  $a_{22} = 0.2$ , and  $a_{ij} = 0$  otherwise while  $b_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . The fifth model is an infinite order VAR process (henceforth VMA<sub>2</sub>) where  $a_{ij} = 0$  for all  $i$  and  $j$  while  $b_{21} = 0.5$ ,  $b_{22} = 0.2$ , and  $b_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. Five other models (in terms of the values of  $a_{ij}$  and  $b_{ij}$ ) were considered. Results are qualitatively similar and, hence, not reported.

### 3.2 Size and Power

I first examine the average number of lags selected by each procedure over the 5,000 simulations. The covariates are non-stationary, and I assume this is known, which implies that the tests are constructed with the covariates in first differences. The results for case 3 and  $T = 100$  are presented in Table 1. As we can observe, the BIC-type rules always choose the most parsimonious models and results are consistent for different values of  $R^2$ . In the case of the VAR models, the AIC- and MIC-type rules choose values of  $k$  in the same range and the selected lag orders are in general appropriate given the DGPs considered here. For the VMA models, however, the BIC- and AIC-type rules select models that appear to be too parsimonious given that the true order of the VAR is infinity. The MIC-type rules, on the other hand, choose more lags. Note, however, that the MIC-type rules choose notably different values of  $k$  even for the same model. These selection rules are evaluated in terms of the size and power of the tests next.

[ TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE ]

Table 2 shows the results for the size of the tests for case 3 and  $T = 100$ . In general, the tests have inflated sizes and the magnitude of the size distortions depends on the model and the selection rule considered. When the truncation lag is chosen using the BIC-type rules the tests can have very large size distortions. Note that, for a nominal size of 5%, the actual size can be as large as 81.8%. The AIC-type rules yield tests with actual size closer to the nominal size but still large distortions appear in the case of the  $VMA_1$  model. As shown in Ng and Perron (2001) and Qu and Perron (2007), in the case of models with a moving average root close to one, standard information criteria select lag lengths that are too small and can result in tests with important size

distortions.

[ TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE ]

In the case of the EJ test, the  $MIC_e$  yields substantial size improvements over the  $BIC_e$  and  $AIC_e$  recommended in Elliott and Jansson (2003). And while the  $MIC_u$  yields tests with larger size distortions in the case of the  $VAR_2$  and the  $VMA_2$  models when  $R^2$  is large, in the case of the  $VMA_1$  model, the  $MIC_u$  exhibits notable improvements. Finally, in the case of the  $VAR_1$  model, all selection criteria produce tests with large size distortions, particularly large as  $R^2$  increases. In the case of the CADF-GLS test, when the  $MIC_e$  is used to select  $k$  the test shows some improvements over the  $BIC_e$  and  $AIC_e$  but still remains largely over-sized in the case of the  $VMA_1$  model. When the  $MIC_u$  is used, the CADF-GLS test exhibits very small size distortions even in the case of the  $VMA_1$  model. The CADF-GLS test constructed using the  $MIC_u$  only yields tests with large size distortions when the models exhibit Granger causality and  $R^2$  is large.

I evaluate the size-adjusted power of the tests at  $\bar{\rho} = 1 + \bar{c}/T$ . For case 3 and  $T = 100$ ,  $\bar{c} = -7.0$  and  $\bar{\rho} = 0.93$ . Results reported in Table 3 show that when the covariates carry no useful information,  $R^2 = 0$ , the power of the tests is similar to that of their univariate counterparts and below the asymptotic 50%. Important power gains are available, however, as  $R^2$  increases. In the case of the EJ test, the  $MIC_e$  yields more powerful tests than the  $MIC_u$ . And, except for the case of the  $VAR_1$  model, the EJ test is more powerful than the CADF-GLS test. This difference in power is notably large in the case of the models that exhibit Granger causality. In the case of the  $VMA_1$  model, although power gains are only modest, the improvement compared to the univariate tests is still substantial.

[ TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE ]

The results presented above correspond only to one deterministic case (3), one sample size ( $T = 100$ ), and five of the ten models considered. The other five models show results that are, in general, better than the ones presented above. With respect to the other deterministic cases, the tests exhibit similar results for all cases. Finally, size distortions and power improve significantly for  $T = 250$  but the main results still hold: the BIC-type rules can still yield tests with actual size above 50% while the MIC-type rules yield powerful tests with smaller size distortions. In sum, the CADF-GLS test constructed with the truncation lag selected using the  $MIC_u$  shows smaller size distortions than the EJ test for most models considered here. Only in the case of the models where  $y_t$  Granger-causes  $x_t$  I find important size distortions. Although the EJ test has better power, size distortions can be large when the DGP exhibits strong autocorrelation.

### 3.3 Leads, Lags, and Power Loss in the CADF-GLS Test

The CADF test of Hansen (1995) requires the selection of a lag order for  $y_t$  and lead and lag orders for  $x_t$ . An extensive search considering all possible combinations of leads and lags, however, is only feasible when the maximum value of  $k$  is low. On the other hand, results in the previous section show that restricting the number of lags can imply tests with large size distortions. To avoid this problem, Pesavento (2006) restricts the lead and lag orders to be the same and looks for the optimal  $k$  considering a wide range of values and the  $MIC_u$ . A consequence of Pesavento's strategy is that unnecessary leads and/or lags will cause a power reduction in the tests. Aiming to construct tests with good size and better power properties, in this section I remove

this restriction and allow the lead and lag orders to be different. The unrestricted regression equation for the CADF-GLS test takes the form

$$\Delta y_t^d = \phi y_{t-1}^d + \sum_{j=-k_1}^{k_2} \pi'_{xj} \Delta x_{t-j}^d + \sum_{j=1}^{k_3} \pi_{yj} \Delta y_{t-j}^d + \epsilon_t, \quad t = \tilde{k} + 2, \dots, T - k_1, \quad (15)$$

where  $\tilde{k} = \max(k_2, k_3)$  and the rest is defined as in the previous section. Selection criteria in this case have the form

$$IC(k_1, k_2, k_3) = \ln \hat{\sigma}_{k_1, k_2, k_3}^2 + \frac{C_T}{N} (\tau_T(k_1, k_2, k_3) + (k_1 + k_2)m + k_3), \quad (16)$$

where  $\hat{\sigma}_{k_1, k_2, k_3}^2 = N^{-1} \sum_{t=\tilde{k}+2}^{T-k_1} \hat{\epsilon}_t^2$ , and  $N = T - k_1 - \tilde{k} - 1$ . If  $C_T = \ln N$  and  $\tau_T(k_1, k_2, k_3) = 0$  we have the BIC, and if  $C_T = 2$  and  $\tau_T(k_1, k_2, k_3) = 0$  we have the AIC. For the MIC we need  $C_T = 2$  and the quantity  $\tau_T(k_1, k_2, k_3) = (\hat{\sigma}_{k_1, k_2, k_3}^2)^{-1} \hat{\phi}^2 \sum_{t=\tilde{k}+2}^{T-k_1} y_{t-1}^{d2}$ .

Considering all possible combinations of lead and lag orders can result in a large number of candidate models. As a consequence, I consider two variations of this procedure that limit the total number of models to be evaluated. In the first case, the unrestricted case, I generate all possible combinations of lead and lag orders such that  $0 \leq k_i \leq k_{max}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  where  $k_{max} = \text{int}[12(T/100)^{1/4}]$  and use an information criterion to select the optimal orders. I will refer to these selection rules as the unrestricted  $\overline{BIC}_c$ ,  $\overline{AIC}_c$ , and  $\overline{MIC}_c$ . In the second case, the restricted case, I generate all possible combinations of lead and lag orders such that  $0 \leq k_i \leq k^*$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  with  $k^*$  selected using the  $MIC_u$  on an univariate regression and use an information criterion to select the optimal orders. I will refer to these selection rules as the restricted  $\overline{BIC}_c$ ,  $\overline{AIC}_c$ , and  $\overline{MIC}_c$ . While methods for selecting the best subset regression models as in Gatu et al. (2007), Hofmann et al. (2007), and Gatu et al. (2008) can be a useful



alternative, these methods are not considered here.

Table 4 shows the results for the size of the CADF-GLS test for case 3 and  $T = 100$ . Using the results of the  $MIC_u$  in Table 2 as reference we can see that the  $\overline{BIC}_c$  and  $\overline{AIC}_c$  yield tests with larger size distortions for the two variations considered here. Using the restricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  results in tests with similar size properties and no clear gains result from this modification. On the other hand, using the unrestricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  yields tests with excellent size properties. In this last case, the actual size is almost equal to the nominal 5% in most cases.

[ TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE ]

In terms of the size-adjusted power, the unrestricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  generates tests with very low power when compared to the other selection rules. Results presented in Table 5 also show that the restricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  yields more powerful tests when compared to the  $MIC_u$  and the unrestricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$ . These results show that size-adjusted power increases by (about) two percent for most models. As a consequence, restricting the lead and lag orders to be equal, as in Pesavento (2006), results in unnecessary leads and/or lags being estimated and causes a power reduction in the tests. This power reduction, however, does not appear to be large.

[ TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE ]

In sum, while it is possible to construct tests with almost exact size by using the unrestricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$ , this improvement comes at the expense of very large power reductions. On the other hand, the restricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  only exhibits small improvements over the  $MIC_u$  and, as a consequence, forcing the lead and lag orders to be the same does not result in an important power reduction in the tests.

## 4 Empirical Illustration

To illustrate the relevance of the results presented above, I apply the covariate unit root tests considered here to the United States inflation rate. Some possible covariates suggested by standard macroeconomic theory are: the unemployment rate, output, and the nominal interest rate. Inflation ( $\pi$ ) is the annualized quarterly inflation rate as 400 times the logged difference of successive quarters of the GDP deflator. Similarly, output ( $y$ ) is 400 times the logged real GDP such that  $\Delta y$  is the annualized quarterly growth rate. The unemployment rate ( $u$ ) is given by the average civilian unemployment rate of the quarter. The interest rate ( $i$ ) is the average secondary market 3-Month Treasury Bill rate of the quarter. All series are taken from FRED –FED St. Louis– for the period 1959.I – 2010.III. Figure 1 plots the aforementioned series together with their first differences. Table 6 presents univariate unit root tests constructed using the truncation lag determined by the  $MIC_u$  as in Ng and Perron (2001). Note that the selected number of lags differs widely for the series considered. The tests fail to reject the unit root hypothesis for inflation, output, and the interest rate. The evidence for the unemployment rate is mixed. All variables appear to be non-stationary or at least highly persistent so, following Hansen (1995), the covariates should be included in first differences.

[ FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE ]

[ TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE ]

Table 7 presents the covariate unit root tests for the inflation rate. Because the tests require that the covariates, in levels, are not cointegrated, the covariates are included one at a time. The tests are constructed for deterministic case 3 as the inflation rate

does not exhibit a clear trend and the covariates are included in first differences. First I construct the tests using the truncation lag selected using the  $BIC_e$  for the EJ test and the  $BIC_c$  for the CADF-GLS test (top panel in Table 7). In the case of the CADF-GLS test, the lead and lag orders are restricted to be the equal as in equation (9). We can see that the BIC-type rules choose very parsimonious models with lead and lag orders in the 1-3 range. The results are consistent for both tests and the unit root hypothesis is not rejected when the change in the unemployment rate and output growth are used as covariates. When the change in the interest rate is used as covariate both tests reject the unit root hypothesis at the 5% level. The change in the interest rate yields the tests with higher value of  $R^2$  and, therefore, is expected to generate the most powerful test. Practitioners unaware of the findings presented in this paper could be inclined to interpret the results in Table 7 as evidence of a stationary inflation rate. Failure to reject the null hypothesis of a unit root in the inflation rate when using other covariates or the univariate tests could be due to low power of the available tests, while the more powerful tests (those with higher  $R^2$ ) reject the unit root hypothesis. Now, the unit root hypothesis can also be rejected due to large size distortions and this distortions can be specially large when the tests are constructed using BIC-type rules to select the truncation lag. When the rules suggested here ( $MIC_e$  for the EJ test and restricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$  for the CADF-GLS test) are used to determine the lead and lag orders, the unit root hypothesis is not rejected for all covariates and we can conclude that the inflation rate appears to be I(1) (bottom panel in Table 7). As expected, these rules select models with higher lead and/or lag orders than those selected by the BIC-type rules.

[ TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE ]

## 5 Conclusion

This paper considered the selection of the truncation lag using information criteria for the covariate unit root tests proposed in Elliott and Jansson (2003) and Pesavento (2006). The focus was on the construction of tests with good size and power and the results are similar to those found in the univariate literature. In particular, an overly parsimonious model may lead to tests with large size distortions, while an over parameterized model may lead to tests with low power. Information criteria such as the BIC or the AIC tend to select truncation lags that are too small for some of the models considered, leading to tests with large size distortions. The MIC for cointegration tests proposed in Qu and Perron (2007) and the MIC for unit root tests proposed in Ng and Perron (2001), however, yield covariate unit root tests with good size and power. In the case of the CADF-GLS test, the results also showed that forcing the lead and lag orders to be equal, as in Pesavento (2006), can result in a small power reduction.

## References

- Amara, J., Papell, D.H., 2006. Testing for purchasing power parity using stationary covariates. *Applied Financial Economics* 16, 29-39.
- Andrews, D.W.K., 1991. Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica* 59(3), 817-858.
- Elliott, G., Jansson, M., 2003. Testing for unit roots with stationary covariates. *Journal of Econometrics* 115, 75-89.
- Elliott, G., Jansson, M., Pesavento, E., 2005. Optimal Power for Testing Potential Cointegrating Vectors With Known Parameters for Nonstationarity. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 23 (1), 34-48.
- Elliott, G., Pesavento, E., 2006. On the failure of purchasing power parity for bilateral exchange rates after 1973. *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 38 (6), 1405-1430.
- Elliott, G., Rothenberg, T.J., Stock, J., 1996. Efficient tests for an autoregressive unit root. *Econometrica* 64, 813-836.
- Fossati, S., 2009. Unit root testing with stationary covariates and a structural break in the trend function. Working Paper.
- Galvao, A., 2009. Unit root quantile autoregression testing using covariates. *Journal of Econometrics* 152, 165-178.
- Gatu, C., Yanev, P.I., Kontoghiorghes, E.J., 2007. A graph approach to generate all possible regression submodels. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 52, 799-815.

- Gatu, C., Kontoghiorghes, E.J., Gilli, M., Winker, P., 2008. An efficient branch-and-bound strategy for subset vector autoregressive model selection. *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control* 32, 1949-1963.
- Hansen, B.E., 1995. Rethinking the univariate approach to unit root testing: using covariates to increase power. *Econometric Theory* 11, 1148-1172.
- Hofmann, M., Gatu, C., Kontoghiorghes, E.J., 2007. Efficient algorithms for computing the best subset regression models for large-scale problems. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 52, 16-29.
- Ivanov, V., Kilian, L., 2005. A practitioner's guide to lag order selection for VAR impulse response analysis. *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics* 9(1), Article 2.
- Lütkepohl, H., 1985. Comparison of Criteria for Estimating the Order of a Vector Autoregressive Process. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 6, 35-52.
- Ng, S., Perron, P., 1995. Unit root tests in arma models with data-dependent methods for selection of the truncation lag. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90, 268-281.
- Ng, S., Perron, P., 2001. Lag length selection and the construction of unit root tests with good size and power. *Econometrica* 69 (6), 1519-1554.
- Ng, S., Perron, P., 2005. A note on the selection of time series models. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 67, 115-134.
- Oke, T., Lyhagen, J., 1999. Small-sample properties of some tests for unit root with

data-based choice of the degree of augmentation. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 30, 457-469.

Pesavento, E., 2006. Near-optimal unit root tests with stationary covariates with better finite sample size. Working Paper.

Qu, Z., Perron, P., 2007. A Modified Information Criterion for Cointegration Tests based on a VAR Approximation. *Econometric Theory* 23, 638-685.

Schwert, G.W., 1989. Tests for unit roots, a Monte Carlo investigation. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 7, 147-160.

Table 1: Average values of the selected truncation lag for case 3 and  $T = 100$ .

Model	$k$	$R^2$	$BIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$BIC_e$	$AIC_e$	$MIC_e$	$BIC_c$	$AIC_c$	$MIC_c$
VWN	0	0.00	0.05	0.84	0.00	0.27	0.53	0.01	0.97	0.74
		0.09	0.06	0.82	0.00	0.26	0.52	0.01	1.01	0.74
		0.25	0.05	0.81	0.00	0.26	0.53	0.01	0.91	0.69
		0.49	0.05	0.79	0.00	0.26	0.54	0.01	0.95	0.70
		0.81	0.06	0.83	0.00	0.25	0.52	0.01	1.04	0.98
VAR <sub>1</sub>	1	0.00	1.05	1.82	1.00	1.31	1.63	1.01	2.24	1.85
		0.09	1.05	1.81	1.00	1.32	1.63	1.01	2.26	1.85
		0.25	1.05	1.81	1.00	1.29	1.62	1.01	2.15	1.78
		0.49	1.06	1.79	1.00	1.32	1.63	1.01	2.24	1.83
		0.81	1.05	1.87	1.00	1.31	1.62	1.01	2.28	1.94
VMA <sub>1</sub>	$\infty$	0.00	1.83	6.36	1.93	4.62	6.43	0.50	3.24	5.36
		0.09	1.87	6.33	1.92	4.60	6.36	0.57	3.51	5.22
		0.25	1.84	6.30	1.91	4.58	6.45	0.66	3.73	5.12
		0.49	1.83	6.35	1.92	4.63	6.43	0.86	4.06	4.76
		0.81	1.81	6.38	1.92	4.58	6.45	1.18	4.38	3.94
VAR <sub>2</sub>	1	0.00	0.05	0.84	0.81	1.29	1.56	0.88	2.23	1.92
		0.09	0.06	0.82	0.94	1.29	1.55	0.97	2.24	1.92
		0.25	0.05	0.81	0.99	1.30	1.58	1.00	2.15	1.84
		0.49	0.05	0.79	1.00	1.30	1.59	1.01	2.11	1.82
		0.81	0.06	0.83	1.00	1.29	1.58	1.30	3.16	2.97
VMA <sub>2</sub>	$\infty$	0.00	0.05	0.84	0.78	1.37	1.60	0.87	2.13	1.86
		0.09	0.06	0.82	0.92	1.39	1.62	0.96	2.16	1.87
		0.25	0.05	0.81	0.99	1.40	1.66	1.01	2.22	1.93
		0.49	0.05	0.79	1.01	1.47	1.70	1.09	2.62	2.24
		0.81	0.06	0.83	1.01	1.51	1.70	1.69	3.90	3.64

Note:  $k$  is the order of the VAR representation for each VARMA model. For example, the VMA<sub>1</sub> model is an invertible VARMA(0,1) and can be represented as an infinite VAR.



Table 2: Size of the tests for case 3 and  $T = 100$ .

Model	$R^2$	$P_T$		EJ			ADF-GLS			CADF-GLS			
		$MIC_u$	$BIC_e$	$AIC_e$	$MIC_e$	$BIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$BIC_c$	$AIC_c$	$MIC_c$	$BIC_u$	$MIC_u$
VWN	0.00	0.038	0.062	0.063	0.059	0.064	0.053	0.057	0.078	0.089	0.067	0.079	0.058
	0.09	-	0.054	0.059	0.054	0.059	0.051	-	0.069	0.080	0.060	0.073	0.055
	0.25	-	0.059	0.060	0.059	0.061	0.057	-	0.079	0.086	0.068	0.080	0.067
	0.49	-	0.055	0.057	0.050	0.056	0.052	-	0.075	0.083	0.064	0.075	0.067
	0.81	-	0.049	0.055	0.049	0.055	0.054	-	0.062	0.069	0.055	0.062	0.061
VAR <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.065	0.070	0.075	0.082	0.072	0.083	0.053	0.084	0.097	0.066	0.086	0.065
	0.09	-	0.069	0.079	0.081	0.070	0.084	-	0.082	0.102	0.066	0.081	0.065
	0.25	-	0.096	0.103	0.104	0.099	0.107	-	0.094	0.108	0.080	0.095	0.076
	0.49	-	0.146	0.155	0.153	0.152	0.157	-	0.087	0.104	0.075	0.087	0.076
	0.81	-	0.316	0.316	0.303	0.318	0.316	-	0.066	0.081	0.058	0.066	0.062
VMA <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.038	0.643	0.294	0.169	0.575	0.123	0.107	0.818	0.481	0.161	0.547	0.087
	0.09	-	0.620	0.278	0.168	0.553	0.121	-	0.794	0.444	0.161	0.525	0.091
	0.25	-	0.575	0.259	0.158	0.527	0.113	-	0.752	0.391	0.146	0.494	0.085
	0.49	-	0.530	0.242	0.146	0.503	0.114	-	0.663	0.313	0.134	0.450	0.083
	0.81	-	0.588	0.296	0.194	0.533	0.146	-	0.368	0.165	0.083	0.307	0.074
VAR <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.038	0.074	0.081	0.069	0.019	0.025	0.057	0.083	0.102	0.070	0.024	0.027
	0.09	-	0.074	0.077	0.069	0.026	0.031	-	0.078	0.093	0.063	0.033	0.032
	0.25	-	0.082	0.083	0.075	0.042	0.042	-	0.084	0.094	0.072	0.054	0.049
	0.49	-	0.072	0.074	0.067	0.072	0.066	-	0.070	0.082	0.060	0.093	0.077
	0.81	-	0.063	0.068	0.057	0.165	0.137	-	0.059	0.079	0.049	0.214	0.170
VMA <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.038	0.070	0.080	0.068	0.027	0.030	0.057	0.097	0.097	0.078	0.034	0.032
	0.09	-	0.065	0.069	0.060	0.037	0.039	-	0.084	0.084	0.064	0.050	0.044
	0.25	-	0.068	0.075	0.068	0.066	0.058	-	0.083	0.083	0.067	0.083	0.070
	0.49	-	0.057	0.064	0.057	0.097	0.082	-	0.070	0.070	0.059	0.123	0.099
	0.81	-	0.055	0.067	0.056	0.172	0.142	-	0.069	0.069	0.051	0.229	0.180

Table 3: Size-adjusted power of the tests for case 3 and  $T = 100$ .

Model	$R^2$	$P_T$			EJ			ADF-GLS			CADF-GLS				
		$MIC_u$	$BIC_e$	$AIC_e$	$MIC_e$	$BIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$MIC_u$	$BIC_c$	$AIC_c$	$MIC_c$	$BIC_u$	$MIC_u$	
VWN	0.00	0.327	0.478	0.463	0.423	0.479	0.380	0.394	0.394	0.530	0.498	0.448	0.530	0.401	
	0.09	-	0.533	0.509	0.472	0.528	0.443	-	-	0.578	0.543	0.498	0.572	0.456	
	0.25	-	0.645	0.626	0.582	0.643	0.559	-	-	0.689	0.659	0.605	0.685	0.574	
	0.49	-	0.792	0.768	0.715	0.789	0.708	-	-	0.807	0.769	0.716	0.804	0.722	
	0.81	-	0.988	0.966	0.902	0.982	0.936	-	-	0.960	0.915	0.828	0.958	0.902	
VAR <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.315	0.295	0.289	0.277	0.298	0.258	0.310	0.310	0.389	0.379	0.318	0.387	0.309	
	0.09	-	0.315	0.304	0.293	0.318	0.280	-	-	0.428	0.403	0.349	0.429	0.351	
	0.25	-	0.356	0.356	0.345	0.360	0.335	-	-	0.503	0.480	0.418	0.503	0.432	
	0.49	-	0.412	0.411	0.394	0.410	0.395	-	-	0.617	0.582	0.514	0.616	0.545	
	0.81	-	0.405	0.413	0.397	0.410	0.423	-	-	0.815	0.759	0.652	0.812	0.758	
VMA <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.118	0.325	0.347	0.266	0.343	0.216	0.199	0.199	0.200	0.296	0.174	0.341	0.153	
	0.09	-	0.342	0.375	0.285	0.356	0.236	-	-	0.219	0.320	0.184	0.349	0.165	
	0.25	-	0.384	0.430	0.336	0.386	0.296	-	-	0.250	0.354	0.228	0.384	0.210	
	0.49	-	0.431	0.486	0.415	0.412	0.384	-	-	0.314	0.404	0.300	0.406	0.275	
	0.81	-	0.438	0.605	0.572	0.456	0.586	-	-	0.540	0.543	0.451	0.539	0.409	
VAR <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.327	0.423	0.476	0.432	0.169	0.198	0.394	0.394	0.459	0.459	0.377	0.190	0.204	
	0.09	-	0.513	0.517	0.475	0.174	0.221	-	-	0.530	0.500	0.424	0.237	0.245	
	0.25	-	0.626	0.602	0.553	0.266	0.309	-	-	0.630	0.594	0.522	0.357	0.360	
	0.49	-	0.766	0.736	0.679	0.537	0.540	-	-	0.743	0.696	0.617	0.632	0.595	
	0.81	-	0.961	0.932	0.871	0.826	0.827	-	-	0.900	0.822	0.715	0.817	0.796	
VMA <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.327	0.418	0.469	0.428	0.219	0.226	0.394	0.394	0.519	0.490	0.402	0.263	0.252	
	0.09	-	0.485	0.489	0.463	0.289	0.286	-	-	0.559	0.516	0.450	0.355	0.323	
	0.25	-	0.591	0.574	0.537	0.437	0.420	-	-	0.634	0.585	0.515	0.510	0.460	
	0.49	-	0.740	0.720	0.673	0.705	0.653	-	-	0.719	0.678	0.586	0.759	0.683	
	0.81	-	0.969	0.931	0.875	0.854	0.841	-	-	0.893	0.801	0.686	0.812	0.793	

Note: Power evaluated at  $\bar{\rho} = 0.93$  ( $\bar{\rho} = 1 + \bar{c}/T$  and  $\bar{c} = -7.0$ ).

Table 4: Size of the CADF-GLS test for case 3 and  $T = 100$ .

Model	$R^2$	$MIC_u$	Restricted			Unrestricted		
			$\overline{BIC}_c$	$\overline{AIC}_c$	$\overline{MIC}_c$	$\overline{BIC}_c$	$\overline{AIC}_c$	$\overline{MIC}_c$
VWN	0.00	0.058	0.077	0.075	0.061	0.080	0.101	0.049
	0.09	0.055	0.070	0.066	0.056	0.073	0.096	0.042
	0.25	0.067	0.079	0.075	0.065	0.081	0.105	0.051
	0.49	0.067	0.076	0.076	0.066	0.079	0.101	0.047
	0.81	0.061	0.062	0.064	0.058	0.063	0.087	0.044
VAR <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.065	0.081	0.080	0.061	0.080	0.111	0.042
	0.09	0.065	0.094	0.084	0.065	0.099	0.124	0.049
	0.25	0.076	0.092	0.090	0.074	0.097	0.125	0.052
	0.49	0.076	0.090	0.087	0.076	0.093	0.121	0.051
	0.81	0.062	0.065	0.065	0.057	0.070	0.103	0.049
VMA <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.087	0.578	0.323	0.094	0.612	0.336	0.078
	0.09	0.091	0.560	0.317	0.089	0.597	0.317	0.072
	0.25	0.085	0.536	0.291	0.081	0.563	0.297	0.063
	0.49	0.083	0.473	0.240	0.072	0.500	0.242	0.052
	0.81	0.074	0.255	0.130	0.045	0.273	0.142	0.036
VAR <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.027	0.033	0.034	0.023	0.068	0.112	0.036
	0.09	0.032	0.035	0.038	0.026	0.056	0.105	0.033
	0.25	0.049	0.056	0.057	0.047	0.073	0.100	0.045
	0.49	0.077	0.085	0.084	0.077	0.082	0.103	0.046
	0.81	0.170	0.181	0.176	0.170	0.095	0.099	0.046
VMA <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.032	0.042	0.043	0.030	0.075	0.113	0.035
	0.09	0.044	0.050	0.052	0.040	0.061	0.105	0.036
	0.25	0.070	0.077	0.077	0.067	0.074	0.100	0.048
	0.49	0.099	0.109	0.107	0.100	0.081	0.103	0.043
	0.81	0.180	0.186	0.183	0.179	0.078	0.098	0.046

Table 5: Size-adjusted power of the CADF-GLS test for case 3 and  $T = 100$ .

Model	$R^2$	$MIC_u$	Restricted			Unrestricted		
			$\overline{BIC}_c$	$\overline{AIC}_c$	$\overline{MIC}_c$	$\overline{BIC}_c$	$\overline{AIC}_c$	$\overline{MIC}_c$
VWN	0.00	0.401	0.527	0.481	0.414	0.531	0.476	0.315
	0.09	0.456	0.574	0.537	0.474	0.576	0.510	0.372
	0.25	0.574	0.681	0.649	0.599	0.686	0.596	0.442
	0.49	0.722	0.801	0.771	0.738	0.800	0.699	0.535
	0.81	0.902	0.957	0.938	0.921	0.954	0.849	0.669
VAR <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.309	0.402	0.380	0.312	0.407	0.389	0.254
	0.09	0.351	0.450	0.408	0.358	0.456	0.413	0.262
	0.25	0.432	0.518	0.491	0.444	0.527	0.462	0.310
	0.49	0.545	0.619	0.594	0.556	0.621	0.545	0.375
	0.81	0.758	0.823	0.806	0.777	0.816	0.702	0.488
VMA <sub>1</sub>	0.00	0.153	0.328	0.325	0.174	0.304	0.302	0.125
	0.09	0.165	0.340	0.322	0.173	0.316	0.315	0.135
	0.25	0.210	0.369	0.346	0.209	0.355	0.331	0.163
	0.49	0.275	0.409	0.391	0.244	0.389	0.369	0.196
	0.81	0.409	0.592	0.539	0.380	0.508	0.490	0.285
VAR <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.204	0.241	0.243	0.190	0.385	0.422	0.231
	0.09	0.245	0.301	0.293	0.252	0.458	0.460	0.293
	0.25	0.360	0.427	0.409	0.371	0.608	0.559	0.387
	0.49	0.595	0.676	0.650	0.612	0.792	0.690	0.512
	0.81	0.796	0.835	0.823	0.803	0.910	0.798	0.585
VMA <sub>2</sub>	0.00	0.252	0.300	0.296	0.238	0.429	0.442	0.255
	0.09	0.323	0.384	0.372	0.328	0.477	0.464	0.305
	0.25	0.460	0.532	0.513	0.473	0.616	0.561	0.390
	0.49	0.683	0.760	0.731	0.695	0.784	0.686	0.504
	0.81	0.793	0.838	0.821	0.805	0.925	0.795	0.584

Note: Power evaluated at  $\bar{\rho} = 0.93$  ( $\bar{\rho} = 1 + \bar{c}/T$  and  $\bar{c} = -7.0$ ).

Table 6: Univariate unit root tests.

	ADF	ADF-GLS	$P_T$	$MP_T$	$\hat{\rho}$	Lags	Trend
$\pi$	-1.950	-1.571	5.362	5.012	0.957	3	$c$
$u$	-1.981	-2.081*	3.021*	2.992*	0.970	12	$c$
$y$	-2.253	-1.363	16.239	14.876	0.985	2	$c, t$
$i$	-1.429	-1.210	7.295	7.022	0.983	13	$c$

Note: The number of lags for each specification is chosen using the  $MIC_u$  by Ng and Perron (2001).  $c$  denotes constant and  $t$  denotes time trend.  
 \* denotes rejection at 5% level.

Table 7: Covariate unit root tests for Inflation.

		EJ			CADF-GLS		
		$\Delta u$	$\Delta y$	$\Delta i$	$\Delta u$	$\Delta y$	$\Delta i$
$BIC_e / BIC_c$	Statistic	3.712	3.623	2.875*	-1.446	-1.589	-2.041*
	$R^2$	0.200	0.049	0.426	0.115	0.042	0.163
	Lags	1	1	3	[2,2,2]	[2,2,2]	[2,2,2]
$MIC_e / \overline{MIC}_c$	Statistic	6.144	4.844	4.082	-1.070	-1.144	-1.522
	$R^2$	0.009	0.119	0.388	0.149	0.053	0.180
	Lags	9	4	9	[1,1,3]	[0,3,3]	[2,0,3]

Note: The top panel tests are constructed using the  $BIC_e$  and  $BIC_c$ . The bottom panel tests are constructed using the  $MIC_e$  and the restricted  $\overline{MIC}_c$ . \* denotes rejection at 5% level.




Figure 1: Macroeconomic variables and their first differences. The inflation rate ( $\pi$ ), the unemployment rate ( $u$ ), output ( $y$ ), and the interest rate ( $i$ ). FRED IDs: GDPCTPI, UNRATE, GDPC96, and TB3MS. Shaded areas denote NBER recession dates.

# Department of Economics, University of Alberta

## Working Paper Series

<http://www.economics.ualberta.ca/WorkingPapers.aspx>

<b>2011-03:</b> New measures of the costs of unemployment: Evidence from the subjective well-being of 2.3 million Americans – Helliwell, <b>Huang</b>
<b>2011-02:</b> Childhood Determinants of Risk Aversion: The Long Shadow of Compulsory Education – <b>Hryshko</b> , Luengo-Prado,
<b>2011-01:</b> Will Biofuel Mandates Raise Food Prices? – <b>Chakravorty</b> , Hubert, Moreaux, Nostbakken
<b>2010-20:</b> Does the Retirement Consumption Puzzle Differ Across the Distribution: - Fisher, <b>Marchand</b>
<b>2010-19:</b> A Test of Monopoly Price Dispersion Under Demand Uncertainty – <b>Humphreys</b> , Soebbing
<b>2010-18:</b> Split Incentives and Energy Efficiency in Canadian Multi-Family Dwellings – <b>Maruejols</b> , <b>Young</b>
<b>2010-17:</b> Local Labor Market Impacts of Energy Boom-Bust-Boom in Western Canada - <b>Marchand</b>
<b>2010-16:</b> House Prices and Risk Sharing – <b>Hryshko</b> , Luengo-Prado, Sørensen
<b>2010-15:</b> Education vs. Optimal Taxation: The Cost of Equalizing Opportunities – <b>Stephens</b>
<b>2010-14:</b> The Economic Choice of Participation and Time Spent in Physical Activity and Sport in Canada – <b>Humphreys</b> , <b>Ruseski</b>
<b>2010-13:</b> Do Gamblers Think That Teams Tank? Evidence from the NBA – Soebbing, <b>Humphreys</b>
<b>2010-12:</b> Would Hotelling Kill the Electric Car? – <b>Chakravorty</b> , Leach, Moreaux
<b>2010-11:</b> Residential Land Use Regulation and the US Housing Price Cycle Between 2000 and 2009 – <b>Huang</b> , Tang
<b>2010-10:</b> Government Revenue Volatility in Alberta – <b>Landon</b> , <b>Smith C.</b>
<b>2010-09:</b> Sports Participation and Happiness: Evidence from U.S. Micro Data – <b>Huang</b> , <b>Humphreys</b>
<b>2010-08:</b> Does Financial and Goods Market Integration Matter for the External Balance? A Comparison of OECD Countries and Canadian Provinces – <b>Smith, C</b>
<b>2010-07:</b> Consumption Benefits and Gambling: Evidence from the NCAA Basketball Betting Market – <b>Humphreys</b> , Paul, Weinbach
<b>2010-06:</b> On Properties of Royalty and Tax Regimes in Alberta's Oil Sands – <b>Plourde</b>
<b>2010-05:</b> Prices, Point Spreads and Profits: Evidence from the National Football League - <b>Humphreys</b>
<b>2010-04:</b> State-dependent congestion pricing with reference-dependent preferences - <b>Lindsey</b>
<b>2010-03:</b> Nonlinear Pricing on Private Roads with Congestion and Toll Collection Costs – Wang, <b>Lindsey</b> , Yang
<b>2010-02:</b> Think Globally, Act Locally? Stock vs Flow Regulation of a Fossil Fuel – Amigues, <b>Chakravorty</b> , Moreaux
<b>2010-01:</b> Oil and Gas in the Canadian Federation – <b>Plourde</b>
<b>2009-27:</b> Consumer Behaviour in Lotto Markets: The Double Hurdle Approach and Zeros in Gambling Survey Data – <b>Humphreys</b> , <b>Lee</b> , <b>Soebbing</b>

Please see above working papers link for earlier papers

[www.economics.ualberta.ca](http://www.economics.ualberta.ca)