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Abstract
We propose two measures of the impact of calibration on the estimation of macroeconomic models. The first quantifies the amount of information introduced with respect to each estimated parameter as a result of fixing the value of one or more calibrated parameters. The second is a measure of the sensitivity of parameter estimates to perturbations in the calibration values. The purpose of the measures is to show researchers how much and in what way calibration affects their estimation results – by shifting the location and reducing the spread of the marginal posterior distributions of the estimated parameters. This type of analysis is often appropriate since macroeconomists do not always agree on whether and how to calibrate structural parameters in macroeconomic models. The methodology is illustrated using the models estimated in Smets and Wouters (2007) and Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2012).
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1. Introduction

It is a common practice in the empirical macroeconomic literature to mix estimation of some model parameters with calibration of others. The rationale behind this approach is either that some parameters are difficult to identify from available data, or that their values have been well-established elsewhere in the literature. While these may be reasonable arguments in some cases, the list of calibrated parameters often includes some for which the empirical evidence is far from settled, and whose values are simply taken from previous studies, often based on very different models and data patterns. Convenience and ease of estimation may be a more realistic explanation of the common practice of fixing some parameters a priori than the possession of true knowledge of their values. It is therefore important to understand the impact, if any, that parameter calibration has on model estimation.

The practice of mixing calibration and estimation can have two potentially important consequences. First, the values of the calibrated parameters may affect the point estimates of the free parameters.\footnote{Or, in Bayesian context, the location of the posterior distribution of the estimated parameters.} Thus, mis-calibration could result in biased estimates of some estimated parameters. Second, from the point of view of estimation calibration of some parameters is equivalent to assuming that their values are known. This may introduce information about parameters that are estimated. Put differently, by eliminating all uncertainty with respect to calibrated parameters, one may also remove some of the uncertainty about freely estimated parameters.

Clearly, not all free parameters are affected equally by calibration. In general, the size of the impact will depend on the interactions between free and calibrated parameters in the context of a given model. Except in very simple cases with a small number of parameters, it is generally difficult to identify, by intuition or heuristic reasoning alone, which estimated parameters will be
affected, in what way and by how much, as a result of calibrating one or more model parameters.

One possible way of quantifying the amount of information introduced by calibration is to re-estimate the model in the absence of calibration, and compare the resulting uncertainty with that of the restricted model. Similarly, the effect of changing the calibration values can be assessed by re-estimating the model multiple times conditional on different values of the fixed parameters. Whether or not these are reasonable ways to proceed depends on how feasible it is to estimate the larger unrestricted model, or to estimate multiple times the restricted model, and also how strongly one feels about the reasons for calibration in the first place. Note that estimating the unrestricted model is almost certain to result in point estimates of the previously fixed parameters that are different from the calibration values. This might be undesirable if one has strong views about what those values should be. Furthermore, the point estimates of at least some freely estimated parameters are likely to be different in the unrestricted model. This will complicate the comparison of the estimation uncertainty in the restricted and unrestricted cases.\footnote{It is straightforward to think of examples where, because of the choice of calibration values of the fixed parameters, the estimation uncertainty is much larger than it would be if those parameters were estimated instead. For instance, if two parameters are nearly unidentifiable when a third one is in a particular region of the parameter space, but very well identified elsewhere, estimation uncertainty will be much smaller if the unrestricted model is in a well-identified part of the parameter space, compared to a restricted model with calibrated value from the poorly identified region.}

The purpose of this paper is to present an alternative approach, which does not require estimating models more than once, and only uses the estimation results under the original calibration. The method is based on the asymptotic posterior distribution of the parameters in the unrestricted case, which we use to construct two different measures. The first is a measure of the amount of information gained with respect to each free parameter as a result of knowing the value of one or more calibrated parameters. It shows the reduction of asymptotic uncertainty as a percent of the uncertainty in the unrestricted
case. The second is a measure of the sensitivity of parameter estimates to perturbations in the values of different calibrated parameters. In particular, it shows the sign and the magnitude of the response of different estimated parameters to changes in the values of the calibrated ones.

The intuition behind our approach is simple: the effect of calibration will depend on how different parameters interact in a given model. From the point of view of estimation, these interactions are captured by the parameters' impact on the model log-likelihood function. Closely-related parameters are difficult to distinguish on the basis of their effect on the log-likelihood. Fixing one or more of them provides a lot of information about the other related parameters, which are also very responsive to changes in the calibration values. The opposite holds true for unrelated parameters whose effects on the likelihood function are orthogonal to each other. For instance, consider a standard business cycle model. In such models there are typically a few parameters that determine the steady state of the economy. Calibrating some of them will naturally have a stronger impact on the other steady state-related parameters, both in terms of location and spread of their posterior distribution. On the other hand, more weakly-related parameters, such as variance coefficients of shocks, are likely to be unaffected.

The measures we propose formalize this intuition. Specifically, we use the asymptotic Gaussianity of the posterior distribution of the model parameters, and study the effect of calibration by comparing the mean and variance of the distribution in the unrestricted case to the same moments in the restricted case, i.e. conditional on some parameters being known and fixed. Simple closed-form expressions show that the impact of calibration depends on the model-implied interdependence between free and calibrated parameters, which is captured by the correlation structure of the asymptotic posterior distribution.

From a Bayesian perspective, calibration of some model parameters could be interpreted as having very strong prior beliefs about the values of those parameters. In this sense, our paper is similar to Müller (2012), who proposed measures of prior sensitivity and prior informativeness in Bayesian models.
As Müller (2012) observes, “likelihood information about different parameters can be far from independent, so that the marginal posterior distributions crucially depend on the interaction of the likelihood with the whole prior.” The same argument shows that calibrating some parameters can have a significant impact on the posterior distributions of freely-estimated parameters. Unlike the sensitivity and informativeness measures in this paper, the measures of Müller (2012) cannot be applied to parameters that are held fixed during estimation since computing them requires sampling from the posterior distribution of the full parameter vector. As noted earlier, combining estimation, both frequentist and Bayesian, with calibration of some parameters is a rather common practice in the DSGE literature, which makes our contribution complementary to that of Müller (2012).³

In terms of methodology, our paper is most closely related to Andrews et al. (2017), who introduced a measure of sensitivity of parameter estimates to the empirical moments they are based on. The purpose of their analysis is to identify the most influential moments, which, if misspecified, could result in a large bias in the estimation results. Even though our measure of sensitivity is with respect to calibrated parameters and not moments, its derivation is based on the same idea: we use the joint asymptotic distribution of free and calibrated parameters, whereas Andrews et al. (2017) use the joint asymptotic distribution of free parameters and empirical moments. In both cases sensitivity is measured locally and can be used as an indicator of how robust the estimation results are to small perturbations in either the calibration values or the moment conditions. Our paper also shares Andrews et al. (2017) larger goal, namely, to

³ Our measures also have somewhat different interpretations from those of Müller (2012). In particular, we measure the amount of information due to calibration by comparing posterior uncertainty with and without calibration, while Müller (2012) compares the posterior to the prior uncertainty. Also, our sensitivity measure shows not only the magnitude of the effect of perturbations in the calibration values, but also the sign of the effect. Müller (2012) sensitivity only indicates the magnitude.
help increase the transparency of estimated structural models by providing easy-to-use tools for assessing the importance of different estimation assumptions. In the context of DSGE models, we believe it is important for researchers to discuss not only the reasons for and methods of calibration, but also the likely impact of calibration on the estimation results. The measures derived in this paper serve precisely that purpose and can be easily incorporated into the standard estimation output usually reported in empirical DSGE research.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 defines and motivates our measures of information gains and sensitivity. In Section 3 we illustrate the use of the proposed measures using two different DSGE models. The models are a new Keynesian model estimated in Smets and Wouters (2007), and a real business cycle model with news shocks estimated in Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2012). In each case we show how calibration used by the authors affects their estimation results. Section 4 offers some concluding remarks.

2. Methodology

This section describes the methodology we use to measure the impact calibration of some parameters has on the estimation of the remaining free parameters of a model. We assume the following setup: a researcher has a model that fully characterizes the density function $p_T(y_T|\theta)$ of a data vector $Y_T = (Y_1, \ldots, Y_T)$, as a function of a parameter vector $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^n$. The true value of $\theta$ is unknown, and is estimated using maximum likelihood or Bayesian methods subject to the restriction that some elements of $\theta$ are known, and are therefore held fixed in the estimation. Further, we assume that estimation of the full set of parameters is either not feasible or too costly. Hence, the objective is to characterize the consequences of calibration using only the estimates of the constrained model.
2.1. Asymptotic normality of the posterior distribution

A well-known property of Bayesian estimation procedures is that, asymptotically, they inherit the properties of the classical maximum likelihood estimator. This is because the variation in the prior distribution is dominated by the variation in the likelihood function, resulting in a posterior distribution whose shape moves arbitrarily close to the shape of the likelihood function. Hence, asymptotically, the posterior distribution is Gaussian centered at the maximum likelihood estimator with covariance matrix equal to the inverse of the expected Fisher’s information matrix. This result is commonly known as the Bernstein-Von Mises theorem, first established for independent data by Walker (1969), and extended to stationary time series by Heyde and Johnstone (1979) and Chen (1985), and to non-stationary time series by Phillips and Ploberger (1996) and Kim (1998).

More formally, suppose that \( \hat{\theta} \) is the maximum likelihood estimate of \( \theta \) and that \( \hat{I} \) is the expected Fisher’s information matrix evaluated at \( \hat{\theta} \), i.e.

\[
\hat{\theta} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\theta \in \Theta} p_T(y_T|\theta)
\]

(2.1)

\[
\hat{I} = -\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{1}{T} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\partial^2 \log p_T(y_T|\hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta \partial \theta'} \right]
\]

(2.2)

Let \( \pi(\theta) \) be the prior density of \( \theta \). Then, the posterior density is defined as

\[
\pi_T(\theta|Y_T) = \frac{p_T(Y_T|\theta)\pi(\theta)}{\int_{\Theta} p_T(Y_T|\theta)\pi(\theta) d\theta}
\]

(2.3)

Under suitable regularity conditions and for large \( T \), the posterior distribution of \( \theta \) is approximately equal to the normal density with mean \( \hat{\theta} \) and covariance matrix \( \hat{\Sigma} \) given by the inverse of the Fisher’s information matrix

\[
\pi_T(\theta|Y_T) \approx \mathcal{N} \left( \hat{\theta}, \hat{\Sigma} \right), \text{ where } \hat{\Sigma} = \hat{I}^{-1}/T
\]

(2.4)

Note that a natural implication of the asymptotic normality of the posterior distribution is that the posterior mean and mode are asymptotically the same, and, as the sample size grows, both converge to the maximum likelihood
estimator. Therefore, instead of MLE we could equivalently use the mean or the mode of the posterior distribution. Which one should be used in practice will depend on the point estimates one wishes to focus on.

2.2. Uncertainty reduction due to calibration

We will use the asymptotic distribution to determine the impact of parameter calibration on the posterior uncertainty of the free parameters. For this, we assume that the calibrated values are not “wrong”, in the sense of being different from the MLE (or posterior mean or mode) of the unrestricted model parameter values. Admittedly, this is a strong assumption, but we make it here in order to determine the pure effect calibration has on parameter uncertainty, i.e. in the absence of mis-calibration of the fixed parameters. We will consider the case of erroneous calibration later.

Our approach consists of comparing two covariance matrices – that of the asymptotic posterior distribution when all elements of $\theta$ are unknown, and the one of the asymptotic posterior distribution of a subset of $\theta$, conditional of the remaining parameters being known. For concreteness, let $\theta = [\theta_1^T, \theta_2^T]^T$ and partition $\Sigma$ and $I$ as follows:

$$
\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 
\Sigma_{\theta_1} & \Sigma_{\theta_1 \theta_2} \\
\Sigma_{\theta_2 \theta_1} & \Sigma_{\theta_2}
\end{bmatrix}, \quad I = \begin{bmatrix} 
I_{\theta_1} & I_{\theta_1 \theta_2} \\
I_{\theta_2 \theta_1} & I_{\theta_2}
\end{bmatrix}
$$

(2.5)

From (2.4), the asymptotic marginal posterior distribution of $\theta_1$ is

$$
\pi_T(\theta_1|Y_T) \approx N(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1})
$$

(2.6)

Now, suppose that $\theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2$ is known. The derivatives of the log-likelihood function with respect to $\theta_2$ are zero, hence the Fisher’s information matrix is given by $\hat{I}_{\theta_2}$. Therefore, the asymptotic posterior distribution of $\theta_1$ conditional on $\theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2$ is

$$
\pi_T(\theta_1|Y_T, \hat{\theta}_2) \approx N(\hat{\theta}_1, \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1|\theta_2}), \quad \text{where } \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1|\theta_2} = \hat{I}_{\theta_1}^{-1}/T
$$

(2.7)
An alternative expression for the covariance matrix in (2.7) is obtained by noting that \( \pi_T(\theta_1|Y_T, \hat{\theta}_2) \) is simply the conditional distribution of \( \theta_1 \) given \( \theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2 \). From (2.6) we know that the joint distribution of these two vectors (given \( Y_T \)) is asymptotically Gaussian. Therefore, when \( \theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2 \) is known, the variance of the conditional distribution of \( \theta_1 \) is:

\[
\hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1|\theta_2} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1} - \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1,\theta_2} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_2}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_2,\theta_1}
\] (2.8)

Unless \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1,\theta_2} = 0 \), i.e. \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) are asymptotically independent, the marginal covariance matrix \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1} \) is larger than the conditional covariance matrix \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1|\theta_2} \).

In other words, knowing \( \theta_2 \) reduces the uncertainty about the vector \( \theta_1 \) as a whole. To quantify the effect of fixing \( \theta_2 \) on the uncertainty about individual elements of \( \theta_1 \), we define a measure of the information gain (IG) with respect to a parameter \( \theta_i \) as the percent reduction in the asymptotic standard deviation of that parameter, i.e.:

\[
\text{IG}_{\theta_i}(\theta_2) = \left( \frac{\text{std}_{\theta_i} - \text{std}_{\theta_i|\theta_2}}{\text{std}_{\theta_i}} \right) \times 100,
\] (2.9)

where \( \text{std}_{\theta_i} \) and \( \text{std}_{\theta_i|\theta_2} \) are the square roots of the diagonal elements of \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1} \) and \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1|\theta_2} \), respectively. Since \( \text{std}_{\theta_i} \geq \text{std}_{\theta_i|\theta_2} > 0 \), the value of \( \text{IG}_{\theta_i}(\theta_2) \) lies in the range between 0 and 100, with \( \text{IG}_{\theta_i}(\theta_2) \approx 0 \) implying that knowledge of \( \theta_2 \) provides little or no information about \( \theta_i \), while \( \text{IG}_{\theta_i}(\theta_2) \approx 100 \) indicates that knowing \( \theta_2 \) removes most of the uncertainty about \( \theta_i \). We can see from (2.8) that the size of the information gain depends on how correlated \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_2 \) are. In particular, the information gain will be small if the elements of \( \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1,\theta_2} \) are close to zero, i.e. \( \theta_i \) and the parameters in \( \theta_2 \) are asymptotically close to being orthogonal. On the other hand, if one or more parameters in \( \theta_2 \) are strongly correlated with \( \theta_i \), knowing \( \theta_2 \) will provide a lot of information with respect to \( \theta_i \).

4. We can have information gain of 100% if a parameter \( \theta_i \) is only identifiable when one or more other parameters are fixed, i.e. \( \text{std}_{\theta_i|\theta_2} < \text{std}_{\theta_i} = \infty \). In that case \( \frac{\text{std}_{\theta_i} - \text{std}_{\theta_i|\theta_2}}{\text{std}_{\theta_i}} = \infty \) which we take to equal 1.
2.3. Sensitivity to errors in calibration

So far we have maintained the assumption that the calibrated parameter values are correct, i.e. they coincide with the values one would obtain if all model parameters were estimated freely. This, of course, is an unrealistic assumption and it is generally difficult to predict exactly how errors in the fixed parameters’ values affect the ones that are estimated. Here we present a simple method for gauging the sign and the relative magnitude of the bias in the estimated parameter as a result of errors in the calibration values. As before, we use the Gaussian approximation of the posterior distribution of $\theta$. Suppose that the value of $\theta_2$ is fixed at $\hat{\theta}_2 + \Delta \hat{\theta}_2$. From (2.4), it follows that the conditional mean of $\theta_1$ is:

$$E\left[ \theta_1 | \theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2 + \Delta \hat{\theta}_2 \right] = \hat{\theta}_1 + \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1 \theta_2} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_2}^{-1} \Delta \hat{\theta}_2$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.10)

Note that the first term on the right-hand side is the conditional mean of $\theta_1$ given $\theta_2 = \hat{\theta}_2$. Therefore, small deviations of $\theta_2$ in the neighborhood of $\hat{\theta}_2$ will shift the conditional mean of $\theta_1$ by approximately $S_{\theta_1 \theta_2} \Delta \hat{\theta}_2$, where the sensitivity matrix $S_{\theta_1 \theta_2}$ is defined as:

$$S_{\theta_1 \theta_2} = \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1 \theta_2} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_2}^{-1} = -\hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1}^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_2} \hat{\Sigma}_{\theta_1}$$, \hspace{1cm} (2.11)

where the second equality follows trivially from the properties of the inverse of partitioned matrices (see Exercise 5.16 in Magnus and Abadir (2005)).

For an arbitrary pair of parameters $\theta_i \in \theta_1$ and $\theta_j \in \theta_2$, the corresponding element $S_{\theta_i \theta_j}$ of the sensitivity matrix shows the effect of perturbing the value of calibrated parameter $\theta_j$ on the asymptotic posterior mean value of free parameter $\theta_i$.

The sensitivity measure in (2.11) is similar to the one proposed by Andrews et al. (2017) to measure the sensitivity of parameter estimates to reduced-form statistics. Instead of assessing the effect of calibration, Andrews et al. (2017) are interested in the estimation bias one can expect as a result of violations in certain identifying assumptions. These violations are interpreted as perturbations in the moment conditions on which a given estimation procedure,
such as the generalized method of moments, is based. Similar to the approach here, Andrews et al. (2017) derive their local sensitivity measure using the asymptotic Gaussian approximation of the joint distribution of structural parameters and moment conditions.

Figure 1: Two-parameter example. The figure shows how the conditional distribution of $\theta_1$ depends on the value of $\theta_2$.

2.4. A simple example

An illustration of the sensitivity and information gain measures for a two-parameter case is shown in Figure 1, where the joint distribution of $\theta = [\theta_1, \theta_2]$ is Gaussian with both means equal to zero, variances equal to 1, and correlation coefficient equal to .9. Sensitivity in this case is equal to .9, which implies that a change of $\theta_2$ from 0 to 1, i.e. a perturbation of one standard deviation, would shift the conditional mean of $\theta_1$ by $.9 \times 1 = .9$. This represents an increase by .9 standard deviations. The conditional distribution of $\theta_1$ is shown
in the figure in green. In addition to the shift in the mean, we see also that the dispersion of the conditional distribution is smaller than that of the unconditional distribution. Using the measure of information gain introduced earlier, we find that $IG_\theta(\theta_2) = 100 \times \frac{(1-0.9^2)}{1} = 81\%$.

We can derive further intuition on why in this example the value of $\theta_1$ increases in response to a positive perturbation in the value of $\theta_2$ by examining the local properties of the maximized likelihood function. Specifically, suppose that, instead of the mean of joint posterior distribution, $[0, 0]$ represents the unconstrained maximum of the log-likelihood function of $\theta$. The inverse of the covariance matrix is the Fisher's information matrix, which has ones in the diagonal and $-0.9$ in the off-diagonal positions. Since the information matrix is also the covariance matrix of the score vector, this implies that the correlation between the two elements of the score $\text{corr}(\partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_1, \partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_2) = -0.9$. Therefore, the two parameters on average affect the log-likelihood function in the opposite directions and of nearly the same magnitude. Since $\hat{\theta} = [0, 0]$ is the mode of the log-likelihood, any perturbation in $\theta_2$ away from 0 will lower the value of the log-likelihood distribution. To offset that change, $\theta_1$ has to move in the same direction as $\theta_2$. It is easy to show that, for small deviation $\Delta \theta_2$ in $\theta_2$, the optimal change $\Delta \theta_1$ in $\theta_1$ is given by:

$$\Delta \theta_1 = - \left( \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_1^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\partial^2 \ell(\hat{\theta})}{\partial \theta_1 \partial \theta_2} \right) \Delta \theta_2$$

(2.12)

This is the same expression as above except that in (2.10) the second derivatives of the log-likelihood function are replaced with their expected values. Hence, our sensitivity measure can be interpreted in terms of the required adjustment in the value of a free parameter in order to compensate for the effect of a perturbation in the value of a calibrated parameter.

This intuition can be extended to multi-parameter models: starting from the mode of the log-likelihood function, perturbation of one or more parameters away from their unrestricted optimal values can be partially offset by adjusting...
the remaining free parameters away from their unrestricted optimal values.\(^5\)
Since there are potentially many parameters that should be adjusted, the
optimal size of the adjustment of each one depends on the full correlation
structure, not just the pairwise correlations between free and calibrated
parameters.

3. Applications

We illustrate our information gain and sensitivity measures in two applications:
the medium-scale New Keynesian model of Smets and Wouters (2007), and
the real business cycle model with news shocks of Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe
(2012). In each case we take as given the division of the model parameters into
freely-estimated and calibrated ones as well as the estimation results reported
in those articles.


The Smets and Wouters (2007) (hereafter SW) model is a medium-scale closed-
economy New Keynesian model featuring price and wage rigidities, habit
formation, capital accumulation, investment adjustment cost, variable capital
utilization. The model is estimated with Bayesian methods using US data on
output growth, consumption growth, investment growth, real wage growth,
hours worked, inflation and the nominal interest rate. There are 41 parameters
in the model 36 of which are estimated and the other 5 are calibrated. The
calibrated parameters are: depreciation rate \((\delta)\), steady state wage mark-up
\((\lambda_w)\), exogenous spending-output ratio \((g_y)\), and the curvature parameters
of goods and labor market aggregators \((\varepsilon_p\) and \(\varepsilon_w)\). The reasons SW give
for calibrating these parameters are that \(\delta\) and \(g_y\) are difficult to estimate
with the observed series, while \(\lambda_w\), \(\varepsilon_p\) and \(\varepsilon_w\) are not identified. As has been

---

5. The offset will be only partial unless the log-likelihood function is flat at the mode, i.e. the
model is locally unidentified.
shown previously (see Iskrev (2010)), $\lambda_w$ is in fact identified, while two pairs of parameters – $(\xi_p, \varepsilon_p)$ and $(\xi_w, \varepsilon_w)$ are not separately identifiable. That is, in the linearized model $\xi_p$ cannot be distinguished from $\varepsilon_p$ and $\xi_w$ cannot be distinguished from $\varepsilon_w$. This implies that the covariance matrix of the asymptotic posterior distribution of the full set of parameters is singular and our measures of information gains and sensitivity are not defined. Therefore, here we will study the effect of fixing 3 of the 5 parameters, namely $\delta$, $\lambda_w$, and $g_y$, on the distribution of the 36 parameters which SW estimate, conditional on the curvature parameters of goods and labor market aggregators ($\varepsilon_p$ and $\varepsilon_w$) being both fixed at 10, as in the original article. We consider the same values for the calibrated parameters as in SW, shown in Table 1, while for the estimated parameters we take the posterior mean reported in the article – see Table 2. We use these values to compute our measures of sensitivity to and information gains from calibration.

The information gains due to calibration of $\delta$, $\lambda_w$, and $g_y$ are reported in panel (a) of Figure 2. The gains are zero or close to zero for 11 of the free parameters, and exceed 10% for 8 parameters. The largest information gains are with respect to the wage stickiness parameter $\xi_w$ – almost 60%, and with respect to the elasticity of labor supply $\sigma_c$ – about 40%. There are also significant gains of about 20% with respect to the discount factor $\bar{\beta}$ and the investment adjustment cost parameter $\phi$.

---

**Table 1. Calibrated parameters, SW (2007) model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\delta$ depreciation rate</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda_w$ steady state wage markup</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$g_y$ exogenous spending-output ratio</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_p$ curvature of goods market aggregator</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varepsilon_w$ curvature of labor market aggregator</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

6. Since lack of identification implies infinite variance of the asymptotic marginal posterior distribution, in the case of $\xi_p$ and $\xi_w$ we have information gains of 100% due to fixing $\varepsilon_p$ and $\varepsilon_w$, respectively.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{ga}$ productivity shock in government spending</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell$ steady state hours</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\bar{\pi}$ steady state inflation</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\beta$ normalized discount factor (^{(a)})</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mu_w$ MA wage markup</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_p$ MA price markup</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\alpha$ capital share</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\psi$ capacity utilization cost</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\varphi$ investment adjustment cost</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_c$ elasticity of intertemporal substitution</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\lambda$ habit</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\Phi$ fixed cost in production</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_w$ wage indexation</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_w$ wage stickiness</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\ell_p$ price indexation</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_p$ price stickiness</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_l$ elasticity of labor supply</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r\pi$ monetary policy response to inflation</td>
<td>2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{\Delta y}$ monetary policy response to change in output gap</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_y$ monetary policy response to output gap</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho$ interest rate smoothing</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_a$ AR productivity shock</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_b$ AR risk premium shock</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_g$ AR government spending shock</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_I$ AR investment specific shock</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_r$ AR monetary policy shock</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_p$ AR price markup shock</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_w$ AR wage markup shock</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$ trend growth rate</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_a$ standard deviation productivity shock</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_b$ standard deviation risk premium shock</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_g$ standard deviation government spending shock</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_I$ standard deviation investment specific shock</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_r$ standard deviation monetary policy shock</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_p$ standard deviation price markup shock</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_w$ standard deviation wage markup shock</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The values are of the mean of the posterior distribution of the Smets and Wouters (2007) model. \(^{(a)}\) $\tilde{\beta} = 100(\beta^{-1} - 1)$ where $\beta$ is the usual discount factor.

Table 2. Estimated parameters, SW (2007) model

To better understand how individual calibrated parameters contribute to the total information gains, in panels (b), (c), and (d) of the same figure we report the size of the gains from fixing only one of the three parameters at a time, either $\delta$, $\lambda_w$, or $g_y$, respectively, while keeping the other two parameters free. This exercise shows that most of the larger gains – those with respect to $\xi_w$, $\sigma_c$, $\varphi$, and $\tilde{\beta}$, are due to information obtained from knowing the value of $\lambda_w$.
Figure 2: Information gains from calibration. Panel (a) shows the gains from knowing the values of all calibrated parameters. Panels (b), (c), and (d) show the gains from knowing only one parameter at a time.
alone. Knowing the value of $\delta$ provides significant amount of information with respect to $\alpha$, $\psi$, and $\rho_a$. The least informative of the three calibrated parameters is $g_y$, which nonetheless contributes a substantial amount of information with respect to $\Phi$, $\sigma_g$ and $\psi$.

Turning to the sensitivity of the parameter estimates to changes in the calibration values, Figure 3 plots the values of our sensitivity measure. To make the values comparable, we scale sensitivity by the standard deviations of the parameters so that the displayed values show the change, in terms of standard deviations of the respective parameter, to a one standard deviation increase in the value of each calibrated parameter. The results closely mirror those in Figure 2. The largest impact is on the estimate of $\xi_w$, which drops by 0.9 standard deviations as a result of one standard deviation increase in $\lambda_w$. An increase in $\lambda_w$ also has a significant impact on the values of $\sigma_c$, $\varphi$, and $\bar{\beta}$, raising by more than .6 standard deviations the values of the first two parameters and reducing by almost .6 standard deviations the value of $\bar{\beta}$. As before, the strongest impact from a change in $\delta$ is on $\alpha$, $\psi$, and $\rho_a$, all of which decrease by about 0.5 standard deviations as a result of a one standard deviation increase in $\delta$. In the case of $g_y$, the impact is again most pronounced with respect to $\Phi$, $\psi$, and $\sigma_g$, whose values decline by between .3 and .4 standard deviations due to a one standard deviation increase in $g_y$.

Note that unlike the computation of the information gains with respect to a single parameter in panels (b), (c) and (d) of Figure 2, the sensitivity measures in Figure 3 are computed assuming that all calibrated parameters remain fixed, and only one of them is perturbed at a time. In particular, when one of the calibrated parameters is perturbed only the free parameters are allowed to respond, while the other two calibrated parameters are kept fixed. This was not the case in Figure 2. The distinction may be important, particularly when there is a strong interdependence among the calibrated parameters. For instance, if $\lambda_w$ and $g_w$ are free to adjust when $\delta$ is perturbed, there may be a much smaller response of the other free parameters since some of the effect of changing $\delta$ could be offset by the changes in $\lambda_w$ and $g_w$. On the other hand, if the calibrated
parameters are close to independent, changing one of them would lead to a small or no change in the other two, even if those were allowed to adjust. In Figure A1 of the Appendix we show the sensitivities when only one of the three calibrated parameters is fixed at a time. The results are very similar to those in Figure 3, implying that there is only weak interdependence among \( \lambda_w \), \( \delta \) and \( g_w \).

In the Appendix we also report pairwise conditional information gains and pairwise conditional sensitivity values, where for each pair of parameters the conditioning is on all remaining 37 parameters. The pairwise conditional gains (see Figure A2) show how much information about a given parameter \( \theta_i \) is gained if another parameter \( \theta_j \) is fixed, conditional on knowing all parameters except these two. There are some marked differences, especially between the conditional and unconditional gains from fixing \( \lambda_w \) (compare panel (c) in Figure 2 with panel (b) in Figure A2). Note that the gains with respect to \( \xi_w \) are very large both conditionally and unconditionally. However, the conditional information gains with respect to \( \mu_w \), \( \sigma_l \), \( \rho_w \), and \( \sigma_w \) are much larger than the unconditional gains for those parameters. In contrast, the unconditional gains with respect to \( \bar{\beta} \) and \( \sigma_c \) are significantly larger than the conditional ones.

These findings underscore the fact that in a multiparameter setting the effect of calibration cannot be easily characterized using simple bivariate relationships between individual calibrated and free parameters. Intuitively, one might expect that the effect will be greater for parameters which in the model are functionally closely related to the calibrated parameters. As the example in Section 2.4 reveals, in a bivariate setting strong correlation between the scores \( \partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_i \) and \( \partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_j \), which reflects similar functional roles of \( \theta_i \) and \( \theta_j \), would cause fixing one of the two parameters to have a large impact on the conditional distribution of the other. With more than two parameters, the negative of \( \text{corr}(\partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_i, \partial \ell(\theta)/\partial \theta_j) \) represents the conditional correlation.
between \(\theta_i\) and \(\theta_j\), given the remaining model parameters.\(^7\) Differences between the conditional and the marginal correlation structures can lead to very different conditional and unconditional information gains, as in the case of the gains due to fixing \(\lambda_w\). Consider Figure 4 where we show two sets of parameters that are strongly related to \(\lambda_w\). In particular, panel (a) displays a conditional correlation network of all parameters connected with \(\lambda_w\), while panel (b) shows a marginal correlation network of the parameters connected with \(\lambda_w\). In both cases we show only links between parameters whose correlation is greater or equal to \(\pm 0.4\) in absolute value.\(^8\) It can be seen that \(\mu_w, \sigma_t, \rho_w,\) and \(\sigma_w\) are strongly conditionally correlated with both \(\xi_w\) and \(\lambda_w\), as well as among each other. This explains the large pairwise conditional information gains in panel (b) of Figure A2, where the gains from fixing \(\lambda_w\) are conditional on all other parameters, and in particular \(\xi_w\), also being fixed. At the same time, the marginal correlations between \(\lambda_w\) and those four parameters are too weak to show in the graph in panel (b). This is mainly due to the fact that, because of their functional similarity in the model, \(\lambda_w\) and \(\xi_w\) are very strongly correlated both conditionally and unconditionally. As a result, fixing \(\lambda_w\) while keeping \(\xi_w\) free provides very little information with respect to \(\mu_w, \sigma_t, \rho_w,\) and \(\sigma_w\). On the other hand, the marginal correlations of \(\lambda_w\) with \(\sigma_c\) and \(\bar{\beta}\) are strong, in spite of the very weak conditional correlations. This implies that these two parameters benefit from fixing \(\lambda_w\) only indirectly – through other free parameters which are more closely linked to \(\lambda_w\) and whose uncertainty is impacted directly as a result of fixing that parameter. In the conditional case those parameters are already known and thus fixing \(\lambda_w\) contributes little (in the case of \(\sigma_c\)) or no (in the case of \(\bar{\beta}\)) additional information.

\(^7\) This follows from the fact that the covariance matrix of the scores is the precision matrix of the asymptotic posterior distribution, and thus it encodes the conditional correlations between pairs of parameters given the remaining parameters (see Cramér (1946)).

\(^8\) We use truncation to make the graphs more readable. The full set of marginal and conditional correlations can be found in Figure A8 in the Appendix.
The differences between conditional and unconditional sensitivities can be explained in a similar fashion. As can be seen by comparing Figures A3 and A1, the conditional sensitivities tend to be significantly larger than the unconditional ones. This is because in the conditional case only one parameter at a time is free to adjust so as to optimally offset the effect of changing the value of a given calibrated parameter. In the case of the unconditional sensitivities, all free parameters are allowed to move and thus the magnitudes of the optimal adjustments tend to be smaller.
 Calibration and the estimation of macroeconomic models

Figure 3: Sensitivity to changes in the calibrated parameters. Each panel shows the effect of a one-standard-deviation increase in the respective parameter on the value of each free parameter, in units of standard deviations.
Figure 4: Conditional and marginal correlation networks of parameters connected with $\lambda_w$. Both graphs show only edges between parameters whose conditional (panel (a)) or marginal (panel (b)) correlations are greater than or equal to .4 in absolute value. The lines thickness is proportional to the strength of correlation, and the color depends on its sign.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>parameter</th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_k)</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\alpha_h)</td>
<td>0.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\delta_0)</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\beta)</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h_{ss})</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_a)</td>
<td>0.9957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\mu_y)</td>
<td>1.0045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\sigma)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g_y)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Calibrated parameters, SGU (2012) model


The Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2012) (hereafter SGU) model is a medium-scale closed-economy real business cycle model augmented with real rigidities in consumption, investment, capital utilization, and wage setting. The model has seven fundamental shocks: to neutral productivity (stationary and non-stationary), to investment-specific productivity (stationary and non-stationary), government spending, wage markups and preferences. Each of the seven shocks is driven by three independent innovations, two anticipated and one unanticipated. More precisely, the process governing shock \(x_t\) is given by

\[
\ln(x_t/x) = \rho_x \ln(x_{t-1}/x) + \sigma^0_x \varepsilon^0_{x,t} + \sigma^4_x \varepsilon^4_{x,t-4} + \sigma^8_x \varepsilon^8_{x,t-8},
\]

(3.1)

where \(\varepsilon^j_{x,t}\) for \(j = 0, 4, 8\) are independent standard normal random variables. The anticipated innovations \(\varepsilon^4_{x,t-4}\) and \(\varepsilon^8_{x,t-8}\) are known to agents in periods \(t-4\) and \(t-8\), respectively. Thus, they can be interpreted as news shocks.

The model has 45 parameters, 10 of which are calibrated. Those are: capital and labor shares \((\alpha_k \text{ and } \alpha_h)\), steady-state depreciation rate \((\delta_0)\), subjective discount factor \((\beta)\), steady-state hours \((h_{ss})\), steady-state wage markup \((\mu)\), steady-state growth rate of price of investment \((\mu_a)\), steady-state gross per capita GDP growth rate \((\mu_y)\), intertemporal elasticity of substitution \((\sigma)\), and steady-state share of government consumption in GDP \((g_y)\). The values of these parameters are listed in Table 3. The remaining 35 parameters are estimated.
### Table 4. Estimated parameters, SGU (2012) model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>Frisch elasticity of labor supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\gamma$</td>
<td>wealth elasticity of labor supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>investment adjustment cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>habit in consumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\tau g}$</td>
<td>smoothness of trend in government spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_k$</td>
<td>AR stationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_k^a$</td>
<td>AR nonstationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_b$</td>
<td>AR government spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_b^a$</td>
<td>AR nonstationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\mu}$</td>
<td>AR wage markup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\tau}$</td>
<td>AR preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\rho_{\delta}$</td>
<td>AR stationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu a}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu a}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu a}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu x}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu x}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu x}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. nonstationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu f}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu f}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu f}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary investment-specific productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu z}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu z}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu z}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. stationary neutral productivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu l}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. wage markup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu l}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. wage markup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu l}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. wage markup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu g}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. government spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu g}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. government spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu g}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. government spending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu \delta}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu \delta}^4$</td>
<td>std. dev. preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu \delta}^8$</td>
<td>std. dev. preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\sigma_{\mu e}^0$</td>
<td>std. dev. measurement error in output</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Maximum likelihood estimates of Schmitt-Grohé and Uribe (2012)

using Bayesian methods and by maximum likelihood using US data on the growth rates of output, consumption, investment, government expenditure, the relative price of investment, total factor productivity, and hours worked. In our analysis we use the maximum likelihood estimates reported in SGU and reproduced in Table 4. Alternative results based on the median of the posterior distribution are presented in the Appendix.
Checking the rank condition for identification shows that the steady-state hours parameter $h_{ss}$ is not identified. Therefore, in our analysis we consider only the remaining nine calibrated parameters. In addition, unlike SGU who use de-meaned data, we assume that information from both the mean and the covariance structure of the seven observed variables is used. This is important since most of the calibrated parameters are related to the steady state of the model and information from the mean is important for their identification.

Figure 5 presents the information gains from calibration. As in Section 3.1, we report the gains from fixing all nine parameters (panel (a)), and the individual information gains from fixing only one parameter at a time (panels (b) to (f)). We do not report individual information gains from the calibration of $\alpha_k$, $\mu^e$, $\mu^y$ and $g_y$ since they are always less than 1%. The total information gains are less than 1% for 3 of the free parameters, and exceed 10% in the case of 7 parameters. The largest gains are about 50% – with respect to the consumption habit parameter $b$, and between 35% and 42% for the parameters of the investment adjustment cost ($\kappa$), capacity utilization cost ($\delta_2/\delta_1$), and the unanticipated innovations to the stationary investment-specific productivity shock ($\sigma_0^I$). There are also relatively large information gains of around 15% with respect to the Frisch elasticity of labor supply parameter ($\theta$), and the volatility parameters of two of the innovations to the wage markup shock ($\sigma_0^w$ and $\sigma_0^\beta$). Panels (b) to (f) of the same figure help identify the main sources of the overall information gains. The bulk of the information with respect to $b$ comes from knowing the value of $\sigma$, while $\delta_0$ is the most informative calibrated parameter with respect to $\kappa$, $\delta_2/\delta_1$, $\sigma_{0j}^I$, and $\theta$. Fixing the value of $\mu$ contributes the most for reducing the uncertainty about $\sigma_{0j}^\mu$ and $\sigma_{0}^\beta$, although $\delta_0$ is the most informative parameter to calibrate with respect to $\sigma_{0j}^\beta$. The calibration of $\beta$ improves the identification of $\kappa$, $\sigma_{0j}^\beta$, $\delta_2/\delta_1$, and $b$, while that of $\alpha_h$ is only marginally informative with respect to a few parameters, most notably $b$.

The results on sensitivity to calibration are presented in Figure 6. As before, we scale the sensitivity measure so that the values represent the change, in terms of standard deviations of each free parameter, as a result of a one standard
deviation increase in the value of a given calibrated parameter. Again, we do not show sensitivity results with respect to $\mu^a$, $\mu^y$ and $g_y$ as they are always smaller than 0.1 in absolute value. Similar to the information gain results, the largest sensitivities are with respect to $\delta_0$. In particular, $\theta$, $\kappa$, $\delta_2/\delta_1$, and $\sigma^0_z$ all decrease by more than 0.5 standard deviations as a result of one standard deviation increase in $\delta_0$. In the case of $\delta_2/\delta_1$ the sensitivity is more than 0.8 in absolute value. In addition, two parameters – $b$ and $\sigma^0_\mu$ also show sensitivity greater than 0.5 in absolute value – with respect to $\sigma$ and $\mu$, respectively.

4. Conclusion

Estimation of structural macroeconomic models often assumes the complete knowledge of some of their parameters. Whether or not this is a reasonable assumption to make is perhaps an open question. However, it is important to bear in mind that, even when it is well justified, calibration can have a substantial impact on the estimation results stemming from parameter interdependence, which is a common feature of macroeconomic models. It is therefore appropriate that researchers who estimate such models mixing calibration with estimation discuss not only the reasons for and methods of calibration, but also the impact it may have on their results.

In this paper we propose two new measures that can be used to shed light on the consequences of calibration. The first one shows how much information is introduced with respect to each freely estimated parameter as a result of calibration of one or more model parameters. The second measures the sensitivity of different parameter estimates to perturbations in the values of the calibrated parameters. By design, our measures capture the main ways in which calibration could influence estimation – by changing the location and reducing the spread of the marginal posterior distributions of the estimated parameters. Providing readers with information about these effects is important in recognition of the fact that there may be disagreements among researchers
both in terms of whether certain parameters can reasonably be assumed to be known, and regarding what their values should be. The main advantage of our measures is that they are easy to interpret and simple to compute without requiring additional estimation effort. This makes them straightforward to incorporate into the standard estimation output reported in empirical DSGE studies. At the same time, they also have the limitation of being local and hence valid only in the neighborhood of the original calibration values and parameter estimates. Needless to say, our measures are not appropriate to use as a substitute for a full-scale re-estimation of a model under alternative calibration assumptions.
Figure 5: Information gains from calibration. Panel (a) shows the gains from knowing the values of all calibrated parameters \((\alpha_k, \alpha_h, \delta_0, \beta, \mu, \mu_a, \mu_y, \sigma, g_y, \theta, \varrho, \kappa, \delta)\). Panels (b), (c), and (d) show the gains from knowing only one parameter at a time. All gains from fixing \(\alpha_k, \mu_a, \mu_y, \) or \(g_y\) are less than 1% and therefore are not displayed.
Figure 6: Sensitivity to changes in the calibrated parameters. Each panel shows the effect of a one-standard-deviation increase in the respective parameter on the value of each free parameter, in units of standard deviations.
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Figure A1: Sensitivity to changes in the calibrated parameters. Each panel shows the effect of a one-standard-deviation increase in the respective parameter on the value of each free parameter, in units of standard deviations. Only one parameter is held fixed at a time.
Figure A2: Pairwise conditional information gains. The values show the reduction of uncertainty about a parameter from knowing either the value of $\delta$, $\lambda$, or $g_y$, and conditional on knowing all other parameters.
Figure A3: Pairwise conditional sensitivities. The values show the effect, in units of standard deviations, of a one-standard-deviation increase in the value of $\delta$, $\lambda$, or $g_y$ on the value of each free parameter, assuming all remaining parameters are known and remain fixed.
**Figure A4:** Parameter correlations in the SW model. The lower triangle of the matrix shows the conditional correlation coefficients between each pair of parameters. The upper triangle shows the marginal correlation coefficients. The values are obtained from the joint asymptotic posterior distribution of the parameters evaluated at the posterior mean in SW. Correlation coefficients smaller than .1 in absolute value are not displayed.

Figure A5: Sensitivity to changes in the calibrated parameters. Each panel shows the effect of a one-standard-deviation increase in the respective parameter on the value of each free parameter, in units of standard deviations. Only one parameter is held fixed at a time.
Figure A6: Pairwise conditional information gains. The values show the reduction of uncertainty about a parameter from knowing either the value of \( \gamma \), \( \nu \), or \( \rho \), and conditional on knowing all other parameters.

(a) fixed \( \alpha \)
(b) fixed \( \delta \)
(c) fixed \( \mu \)
(d) fixed \( \sigma \)
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Figure A7: Pairwise conditional sensitivities. The values shows the effect, in units of standard deviations, of a one-standard-deviation increase in the value of $\delta$, $\lambda$, or $g_y$ on the value of each free parameter, assuming all remaining parameters are known and remain fixed.
Figure A8: Parameter correlations in the SGU model. The lower triangle of the matrix shows the conditional correlation coefficients between each pair of parameters. The upper triangle shows the marginal correlation coefficients. The values are obtained from the joint asymptotic posterior distribution of the parameters evaluated at the MLE in SW. Correlation coefficients smaller than .1 in absolute value are not displayed. Off-diagonal values of -1 or 1 are due to rounding errors.
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