Stationarity of Inflation with Structural Changes: Evidence from Panel Unit Root Tests with Trend Shifts

Kyung So Im, Junsoo Lee, and Margie Tieslau*

July 30, 2010

Abstract

The question of whether or not inflation is non-stationary has serious implications for the empirical validity of many economic theories and, hence, for the effectiveness of policy tools that are based on these theories. However, the lack of a more powerful unit root test has hindered our ability to effectively analyze the inflation rate. In an attempt to exploit the power gains that naturally arise in the panel setting, researchers also have analyzed inflation using panel unit root tests. However, one important, but unresolved, issue is the inability of existing panel unit root tests to accurately assess the long-run properties of time series that tend to exhibit structural shifts in their mean and/or their trend. Since inflation rates across the globe are likely to exhibit changing means and/or trends over time, it is important to allow for this kind of behavior when testing for a unit root in this series. However, there currently is no panel unit root test that allows for heterogeneous breaks in both the level and trend of the series that also does not depend on the nuisance parameters indicating the locations of the breaks. We suggest a newly-devised panel unit root test that is the first of its kind to properly account for the possible existence of heterogeneous breaks in both the level and the trend of the series under investigation. In addition, our test corrects for the presence of cross-correlations in the innovations of the panel by applying the cross-sectionally augmented (CA) procedure of Pesaran (2007). We apply our test to the inflation rate series of 22 OECD countries and, unlike most previous studies that do not properly allow for breaks and do not consider the panel framework, our results provide strong evidence in favor of the notion that world-wide inflation rates are stationary.

JEL Classification: C12, C15, C22
Keywords: Panel Unit Root Tests, LM Test, Structural Breaks, Trend Breaks

* Kyung So Im, Senior Financial Economist, Division of Insurance and Research, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (tel: 202-898-6716; e-mail: kim@fdic.gov); Junsoo Lee, Professor, Department of Economics, Finance & Legal Studies, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487 (tel: 205-348-8978; e-mail: jlee@cba.ua.edu); Margie Tieslau (corresponding author), Associate Professor, Department of Economics, University of North Texas, 1155 Union Circle #311457, Denton, TX 76203 (tel: 940-565-2573; fax: 940-565-4426; e-mail: tieslau@unt.edu)

1. Introduction

This paper investigates the stationarity of inflation using a newly-devised panel unit root test that is the first of its kind to properly account for the possible existence of heterogeneous breaks in both the level and the trend of the series under investigation. The inflation rate is a key variable in many macroeconomic theories that are widely used to direct policy analyses and to guide decision making on a number of real-world issues across the globe. In most cases, these theories only are valid if inflation contains a unit root. Thus, the question of whether or not inflation is non-stationary has serious implications for the empirical validity of many economic theories and, hence, for the effectiveness of policy tools that are based on these theories. The problem is that existing unit root tests have fallen short in their ability to accurately assess the long-run time series properties of variables such as inflation, which tend to exhibit structural shifts in either their mean and/or their trend.

The lack of a more powerful unit root test that properly allows for breaks in both level and trend has hindered our ability to effectively analyze the inflation rate and, hence, many macroeconomic relationships that incorporate inflation. The earliest empirical research on inflation, which considered this issue without allowing for breaks, supported the notion that this series is non-stationary. This includes Nelson and Schwert (1977), Barsky (1987), Ball and Cecchetti (1990), and Kim (1993). With the publication of Perron's seminal paper in 1989, researchers began to recognize the importance of allowing for breaks when testing for unit roots. When allowing for breaks, some researchers began to conclude that inflation is stationary, although this finding may be called into question. Perron (1989), for example, concluded that the US CPI inflation rate is non-stationary, even when allowing for an exogenous level shift. Zivot and Adrews (1992) were the first to analyze inflation rates while allowing for an endogenously

determined break in the level of the series, and they were able to reject the null of a unit root in US CPI inflation. However, their test does not allow for a break under the null and, thus, their rejection of the null does not guarantee that the series is stationary. Similarly, Lumsdaine and Papell (1997), when allowing for breaks under only the alternative hypothesis, were able to reject the null of a unit root in inflation. Nunes, Newbold and Kuan (1997), however, were not able to reject the null of a unit root in inflation when allowing for breaks under both the null and alternative hypotheses. In addition, Culver and Papell (1997) applied both univariate and panel unit root tests to the inflation rate series of 13 OECD countries, but their panel tests did not allow for breaks. Until now, there has been no panel unit root test that can properly allow for breaks in both the level and trend of the series under investigation. The underlying problem is that panel unit root tests allowing for breaks are subject to the usual "nuisance parameter problem," which we discuss in more detail in the next section, and any panel test that ignores this problem can be invalid. To the best of our knowledge, there is no panel unit root test that allows for trend-breaks that also is invariant to the nuisance parameter.[1]

To resolve this problem, we derive a Lagrange multiplier (LM) based panel unit root test that makes use of a simple transformation that renders the test statistic invariant to both the location and the magnitude of breaks in the level or trend of the series in the panel. Thus, our test depends only on the number of breaks in the series, not their size or location and, therefore, has dramatically greater power than all existing tests. In addition, our test can correct for the presence of cross-correlations in the innovations of the panel, although this is not the main focus of our analysis. Any of the popular methods to correct for this correlation can be used along with

[1] Some practitioners' works have utilized panel unit root tests with trend-shifts but, unfortunately, the dependency on the nuisance parameter often is ignored in these papers. See, for example, Chan and Pauwels (2009), Breitung and Candelon (2005), Franscisco (2009), and Carrion-i Silvestre *et al*. (2005) among others.

our proposed test. In this regard, we demonstrate how to apply the cross-sectionally augmented CA) procedure of Pesaran (2007) to our tests as one possible means of correcting for cross-correlations.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a discussion of the importance of testing for a unit root in inflation and discusses the shortcomings of existing unit root tests in this setting. Section 3 contains the derivation of our new panel unit root test. Section 4 provides the empirical investigation wherein we use our panel LM test to analyze the inflation rate series of 22 OECD countries. Section 5 provides concluding remarks.

2. Issues in Testing for Stationarity of Inflation

The inflation rate (or the overall price index) is a key variable in many important macroeconomic theories and market relationships such as the traditional capital asset pricing model, the Phillips curve, the Fisher effect, and the law of one price. Applied economists who test these theories and analysts who use these relationships to direct policy have a strong interest in the time series properties of the inflation rate. For example, many governmental agencies, academic institutions and private-sector firms produce inflation rate forecasts that are used for a variety of economic analyses. In particular, the US Congressional Budget Office uses inflation forecasts to score bills proposed by congress in order to provide valuable information on the projected costs of such legislation. Furthermore, many central banks world wide rely on their knowledge of the time series properties of inflation when conducting monetary policy and inflation rate targeting. In addition, the empirical methodology used to test for convergence often is applied to new member states of the European Union (EU) to determine whether or not they have met the inflation criterion, as set out in the Maastricht Treaty (see, for example, Siklos

2010). Thus, a critical element in measuring the success of the EU and the euro relies on knowledge of the order of integration of inflation.

Most of the theories and analyses mentioned above are based on the notion that inflation is non-stationary and, hence, the validity of these analyses hinges critically on empirical evidence of a unit root in inflation. This fact is reinforced by Juselius (2006, p. 365) who notes that "… [the] inflation rate being empirically I(1) and, hence, the price level I(2), has strong implications for how to empirically specify many important economic relationships." As a result, it is imperative that the correct inference be made when testing for a unit root in inflation. It is well known, however, that traditional unit root tests have very low power and so it might not be easy to come to the right conclusion regarding the order of integration of this series.

Researchers have pursued two general avenues in an attempt to improve on the low power of unit root tests. One approach is to allow for structural breaks in unit root tests. Perron (1989) was the first to show that ignoring existing structural breaks when testing for a unit root in a single time series can lead to a significant loss of power. To that end, Perron developed a unit root test based on the Dickey-Fuller (DF) framework that allowed for a structural break in the data. Perron's work in this area is particularly relevant for applied researchers since many economic time series tend to display structural breaks. It is especially important to address the question of whether or not inflation is non-stationary while allowing for breaks since this series typically exhibits changing trends as it responds to various shocks in the economy. For example, many countries experienced periods of markedly increasing inflation rates in the postwar period—during the first oil shock, for example, while this trend reversed itself in more recent decades with much of the global economy experiencing relatively low rates of inflation—for example, during the "oil glut" of the early 1980s and the low global inflation rates of the 1990s.

The second approach in the quest to improve on the power of the unit root test has been to design tests in the panel framework. Levin, Lin and Chou (2002) and Im, Pesaran and Shin (2003, IPS hereafter) were among the first to consider the unit root test in the panel framework. This approach is especially advantageous when trying to improve on the power of the unit root test since it offers larger degrees of freedom and it allows the researcher to take advantage of information in cross-country relationships that possibly might exist in the data. This is most relevant when conducting country-level tests for a unit root in inflation since there are likely to be spill-over effects from one country to another with regard to inflation rate dynamics. It is important to keep in mind, however, that any panel unit root test that does not allow for breaks suffers from the same loss of power that is experienced in the univariate unit root test setting. Thus, the ideal approach is to devise a panel unit root test that allows for breaks.

Until now, there has been no panel unit root test that can properly allow for breaks in both the level and trend of the series under investigation. It might seem natural to consider extending the univariate unit root test proposed by Perron (1989) to produce a counterpart panel unit root test that allows for breaks. For example, one may be tempted to modify the IPS test, or other such tests, to include dummy variables in the testing equation for each cross section unit in the panel in order to control for the effects of structural changes. However, this approach is problematic. In order to apply an IPS-type test in the situation with structural changes, one would need to compute the expected values and variances of the DF t-statistics for *all possible* different break locations in the sample. This task would be extremely cumbersome in practice. The source of the problem in this case is that the distribution of the individual test statistic, say, for instance, Perron's augmented DF type t-statistic, depends on the nuisance parameters indicating the location of the break(s). In the case of the univariate unit root test, Perron handled the location

parameter issue by simulating critical values for his test at various break-point locations. Although this provides a good solution to handle the location parameter in the case of one break in the univariate setting, it would be extremely difficult, perhaps impossible, to simulate critical values in the panel framework for all possible combinations of break-point locations for each cross section unit. This difficulty has been one of the main reasons for the lack of development of panel unit root tests that allow for structural changes.

Some researchers simply have ignored this "nuisance parameter" problem and use the same expected values and variances of the IPS tests, regardless of where the breaks are located. But this approach is invalid. Alternatively, in the case of the univariate unit root tests, some researchers circumvented the "nuisance parameter" problem by assuming that breaks can occur *only* under the alternative, not under the null. Under this scenario one may be tempted to conclude that the tests do not depend on the break location parameters under the null. But this conclusion is invalid, for two reasons. First, when not allowing for a break under the null, a rejection of the null does not guarantee that the series in question is stationary. Instead, it can imply a unit root with breaks under the null; see Nunes, Newbold and Kuan (1997) and Lee and Strazicich (2001). Second, the aforementioned authors also showed that not allowing for breaks under the null can lead to serious size distortions and spurious rejections under the null. In light of Perron (1989) and others, any valid unit root tests must not be affected by the presence or absence of breaks under the null. Otherwise, the tests will not be invariant to the magnitude of breaks and the critical values of the tests will be dependent upon these magnitudes. These findings extend, similarly, to unit root tests in the panel framework; any panel unit root test that depends on a nuisance parameter will be subject to the same spurious rejections of the unit root null.

Amsler and Lee (1995) proposed a reasonable solution to the nuisance parameter problem in the special case of a univariate unit root test with level shifts. They showed that the asymptotic distribution of the Lagrange Multiplier (LM) test does not depend on the size or location of any level shifts and, thus, is free of nuisance parameters. This is true even when a finite number of dummy variables for level shifts are included in the LM unit root testing regression. This so-called "invariance property" of the LM test makes it unnecessary to simulate critical values for the test at all possible break-point locations, as must be done in any DF-based unit root test. Im, Lee and Tieslau (2005, ILT hereafter) further extended this work to derive a panel LM unit root test that allows for a finite number of level shifts. As with the univariate LM-based unit root tests, the panel LM-based unit root test of ILT offers an operating advantage over the DF-based panel unit root tests in that the test is free from the nuisance parameter problem.

However, there is a problem of using this approach in the panel framework when allowing for breaks in the *trend* of a series: the "invariance property" of the LM test does not hold if the series under investigation exhibits breaks in its trend. Thus, there are no appropriate panel unit root tests that allow for breaks in *both* the intercept *and slope* of a series. This leaves a tremendous void for researchers using time series data since many such variables typically display breaks in both their level and trend. In the presence of trend shifts, the popular unit root tests are subject to the nuisance parameter problem—both the DF-type tests and the LM-type tests (although it is clear that the DF-type tests are known to be *more* sensitive to the nuisance parameters than the LM-type tests; see Nunes (2004) for example).

It is important to note that, as of yet, no one has addressed the question of whether or not inflation contains a unit root while allowing for trend breaks under both the null and alternative while also using a test statistic that is invariant to the break-point location. This is a crucial

shortcoming of all previous analyses. We hope to improve on prior studies by applying our new test to this issue.

3. New Panel Unit Root Tests with Trend Shifts

Since it is essential that our new panel unit root test allows for the possible presence of breaks in both the level and trend of the series, the crucial task in developing this test is to make it free of the nuisance parameter that indicates the location of breaks—especially in the presence of trend shifts. The approach that we have taken to accomplish this is to base our test on the univariate LM unit root test.[2] While it is possible to consider a DF-type test in this setting, we employ the LM-based test because it is less sensitive to nuisance parameter problems. We describe the details of our test in the paragraphs that follow.

When developing a unit root test, one may consider a time series using the unobserved components representation, $y_t = \delta' Z_t + e_t$, where $e_t = \beta e_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, and the unit root null hypothesis is $\beta = 1$. In this setting, Z_t contains deterministic terms that include dummy variables to capture level and trend shifts. For example, if $Z_t = [1, t]'$, this produces the model upon which the no-break test can be derived. The model allowing for a break only in the mean of the series, or the "crash" model, as initially examined in Perron (1989), can be described by $Z_t = [1, t, D_t]'$, where $D_t = 1$ for $t \geq T_B+1$ and zero otherwise, and T_B denotes the time period of the break. The trend-break, or "changing growth" model, can be described by $Z_t = [1, t, DT_t^*]'$, where $DT_t^* = t - T_B$ for $t \geq T_B+1$, and zero otherwise. When $Z_t = [1, t, D_t, DT_t^*]'$ we have the most general model with both level and trend breaks. To allow for multiple breaks, we can employ additional dummy variables with $Z_t = [1, t, D_{1t},.., D_{Rt}, DT_{1t}^*,.., DT_{Rt}^*]$, where $D_{jt} = 1$ for $t \geq T_{Bj+1}$,

[2] Our approach also makes use of the transformation suggested by Park and Sung (1994).

j=1,..,R, and zero otherwise, and $DT_{jt}^* = t - T_{Bj}$ for $t \geq T_{Bj+1}$ and zero otherwise. This more general model is the most widely utilized in applied analyses, and will be the focus of our paper.

The Dickey-Fuller testing regression controls for the deterministic term Z_t directly in the testing regression, $\Delta y_t = \delta' Z_t + \beta y_{t-1}$ + error, where $\delta = [\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_{3j}', \delta_{4j}']'$, j=1, ...,R. However, the LM testing regression utilizes a two step procedure. In the first step, we obtain the detrended series

$$\tilde{y}_t = y_t - \tilde{\psi} - Z_t \tilde{\delta}. \tag{1}$$

Here, $\tilde{\delta}$ is the coefficient in the following regression using differences of Δy_t and ΔZ_t:

$$\Delta y_t = \delta' \Delta Z_t + u_t, \tag{2}$$

and $\tilde{\psi}$ is the restricted MLE of ψ, where $\tilde{\psi} = y_1 - Z_1 \tilde{\delta}$. Subtracting $\tilde{\psi}$ in (1) makes the initial value of the de-trended series begin at zero with $\tilde{y}_1 = 0$, but letting $\tilde{\psi} = 0$ leads to the same result. It is important to note that in the de-trending procedure (1), the de-trending coefficient $\tilde{\delta}$ was obtained in regression (2) using first differenced data. This two-step detrending method is also used in the DF-GLS type tests of Elliott, Rothenberg and Stock (1996), who suggested using a quasi-differences rather than first differences.[3] The remaining procedure is the same. In the second step, the unit root test statistics are then obtained from the following regression:

[3] When (3) is replaced with $y_t^* = \delta' Z_t^* + u_t$, where $y_t^* = y_t - (1\text{-}c/T)y_{t-1}$, $Z_t^* = Z_t - (1\text{-}c/T)Z_{t-1}$, and c takes on a small value, we can obtain the DF-GLS type tests. As a special case when $c = 0$, we have the LM type test. The DF-GLS type test also can be considered and it can be marginally more powerful than the corresponding LM test. However, note that both the LM and DF-GLS tests adopt the same detrending method using (3), which is the main source of power gains. One technical difficulty of the DF-GLS test in the panel setting is that we would need to obtain different values of c for different model specifications (different combinations of N and T, and different break locations) in order to obtain valid critical values in finite samples. This task is somewhat troublesome. Moreover, the value of c is often obtained asymptotically when T is 500 or 1,000. Therefore, the focus of our paper is on the LM-type test.

$$\Delta y_t = \delta' \Delta Z_t + \phi \tilde{y}_{t-1} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j \, \Delta \tilde{y}_{t-j} + e_t \,, \tag{3}$$

Also note that ΔZ_t is used in (3) rather than Z_t, in which case the DF type test can be obtained. Then, the dummy variable D_t becomes $\Delta D_t = B_t$, which is a point dummy variable. The point dummy variable will not affect the asymptotic distribution of the test, but it should not be omitted in the testing regression.[4] In the above regression, augmented lagged terms are included to allow for serially correlated and heterogeneously distributed innovations.

The LM unit root test statistic is defined by t-statistic for the null hypothesis $\phi = 0$. We denote the resulting test statistic as $\tilde{\tau}$. The asymptotic distribution of the test statistics is obtained from the following result.

Proposition 1: Suppose that the data generating process implies $y_t = \delta' Z_t + e_t$, where $e_t = \beta e_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, with $Z_t = [1, t, D_{1t},.., D_{Rt}, DT_{1t}^*,.., DT_{Rt}^*]$ for the model with level and trend-breaks. We define $V_i^*(r)$, which is the weak limit of the partial sum residual process $\tilde{S}_t$ in (1), as follows:

$$V_i^*(r) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_1^*}\, V_1(r/\lambda_1) & for\ r \le \lambda_1 \\ \sqrt{\lambda_2^*}\, V_2\left[(r-\lambda_1)/(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)\right] & for\ \lambda_1 < r \le \lambda_2 \\ \vdots & \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{R+1}^*}\, V_{R+1}\left[(r-\lambda_R)/(1-\lambda_R)\right] & for\ \lambda_R < r \le 1 \end{cases} . \tag{4}$$

Then, we have

$$\tilde{\tau} \to -\frac{1}{2}\, \omega \left[\sum_{j=1}^{R+1} \lambda_i^{*2} \int_0^1 \underline{V}_i(r)^2 dr \right]^{-1/2} \quad , \tag{5}$$

[4] The one point dummy variable $\Delta D_t = B_t$ is asymptotically negligible. Thus, it is easy to ignore this variable. However, this term should not be omitted, even in the Dickey-Fuller type testing regression with break, as was done correctly in Perron (1989). Lee and Stzazicich (2001) showed that the tests ignoring this term tend to diverge and critically depend on the nuisance parameter.

where λ_i^* denotes the fraction of sub-samples in each regime such that $\lambda_1^* = T_{B1}/T$, $\lambda_i^* = (T_{Bi} - T_{Bi-1})/T$, $i = 2,..,R$, and $\lambda_{R+1}^* = (T - T_{BR})/T$. Here, $\underline{V}_i$ (r) is the projection of the process $V_i(r)$ on the orthogonal complement of the space spanned by the trend break function $dz(\lambda^*, r)$, as defined over the interval $r \in [0, 1]$. $V_i(r) = W_i(r) - rW_i(1)$ with a Wiener process $W_i(r)$ for $i = 1,.., R$.[5]

Proof: See the Appendix A.

The result in (4) shows that, in contrast to the model with level shifts in Amsler and Lee (1995), the asymptotic distributions of the test statistics with trend breaks depend on the nuisance parameters, λ_i^*. However, we can adopt an approach similar to that in Park and Sung (1994) where the dependency of the test statistic on the nuisance parameter can be removed with the following transformation:

$$\tilde{y}_t^* = \begin{cases} \dfrac{T}{T_{B_1}}\tilde{y}_t & for\ t \le T_{B_1} \\ \dfrac{T}{T_{B_2} - T_{B_1}}\tilde{y}_t & for\ T_{B_1} < t \le T_{B_2} \\ \vdots & \\ \dfrac{T}{T - T_{B_R}}\tilde{y}_t & for\ T_{B_R} < t \le T \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

We then replace $\tilde{y}_{t-1}$ with $\tilde{y}_{t-1}^*$ in the testing regression and change (3) to:

$$\Delta y_t = \delta' \Delta Z_t + \phi\, \tilde{y}_{t-1}^* + \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j\, \Delta \tilde{y}_{t-j} + e_t\ . \tag{7}$$

Theorem 1: Let $\tilde{\tau}^*$ be the t-statistic for $\phi = 0$. Then, the asymptotic distributions of these test statistics will be invariant to the nuisance parameter λ:

[5] In the above, the argument $r_i^* = (r - \lambda_i)/(\lambda_i - \lambda_{i-1})$ is defined over the range between λ_{i-1} and λ_i, which has been transformed into r defined over the range 0 to 1.

$$\tilde{\tau}^* \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{R+1}\int_0^1 \underline{V}_i(r)^2 dr\right]^{-1/2}, \tag{8}$$

where $\underline{V}_i(r)$ is defined in Proposition 1.

Proof: See the Appendix A.

The above result shows that the transformed unit root test statistic $\tilde{\tau}^*$ no longer depends on the nuisance parameter λ_j in the trend-break model, although information on λ is required to construct the test statistic. Following the transformation, the asymptotic distribution of $\tilde{\tau}^*$ only depends on the number of trend breaks, since the distribution is given as the sum of R independent stochastic terms. With one trend-break (R = 1), the distribution of $\tilde{\tau}^*$ is the same as that of the untransformed test $\tilde{\tau}$ using λ = 1/2, regardless of the actual location of the break(s). Similarly, with two trend-breaks (R = 2), the distribution of $\tilde{\tau}^*$ is the same as that of the untransformed test $\tilde{\tau}$ using λ_1 = 1/3 and λ_2 = 2/3. In general, for the case of R multiple breaks, the same analogy holds: the distribution of $\tilde{\tau}^*$ is the same as that of the untransformed test $\tilde{\tau}$ using $\lambda_j = j/(R+1)$, j = 1,.., R. Therefore, we do not need to simulate new critical values at all possible break point combinations. Instead, we only need critical values that correspond to the number of breaks, R. In Table 1, we reproduced and provided the critical values of exogenous tests for R = 1,.., 4 and T = 50, 100, 200, 500 and 1,000, respectively, via Monte Carlo simulations. These critical values can be used when the break locations are known, or they are estimated consistently.[6]

[6] In this paper, as in ILT (2005), we do not consider using the critical values of the endogenous break tests. We maintain the assumption that the break location parameters can be estimated consistently. The usual method of minimizing the sum of squared residuals and the standard information criteria can be used in this context. Perron and Zhu (2005) show that break estimates are consistent both under the null

As we will see, the above invariance results will prove helpful in constructing panel LM unit root tests with unknown trend breaks. However, the invariance result does not mean that one can adopt an incorrect number and/or placement of breaks, even under the null. In fact, it is essential to include both the correct number and location of breaks when performing unit root tests. This is true for two reasons. First, unit root tests lose power under the stationary alternative hypothesis if the number and/or placement of breaks is incorrect. Second, as noted by Perron (1989), the usual augmented DF tests will be biased against rejecting the null when the stationary alternative is true and a structural break is ignored. This also will hold for LM tests with trend breaks.

We now develop our new panel LM test statistic with trend shifts. Our testing procedure is similar to that of ILT, but we utilize the transformed LM unit root statistic given in (11). Since our test is set in the panel framework, we add the subscript "i" to equation (11), highlighting the fact that we run the testing regression for each cross-section unit:

$$\Delta y_{i,t} = \delta_t' \Delta Z_{i,t} + \phi_i \, \tilde{y}_{i,t-1}^{\,*} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_{ij} \, \Delta \tilde{y}_{i,t-j} + e_{it} \, , \; i = 1,.., N \qquad (7)'$$

In this expression, $\tilde{y}_{i,t-1}^{\,*}$ is as defined in (8). We then denote the resulting test statistic as $\tilde{\tau}_i^{\,*}$. The test statistic is based on the following null hypothesis,

H_0: $\phi_i = 0$ for all i

against the alternative hypothesis

H_1: $\phi_i < 0$, for some i.

---

and alternative. Furthermore, it has been shown that univariate unit root tests assuming consistency of the estimated breaks perform better than endogenous tests; see Perron (2006), and Kim and Perron (2009) for example. Using the critical values of the endogenous tests in a panel setting would yield aggravated size distortions since small biases in the estimates of the break parameters in the univariate tests would add up in the panel setting as N increases, even if these biases are negligible in the univariate setting.

We can construct the t-bar statistic using the average of the test statistics. The panel LM statistic for the above hypothesis can be obtained as the standardized statistic of the following average test statistic:

$$\bar{t} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{\tau}_i^{*}. \tag{8}$$

The distribution of $\bar{t}$ depends on T, but is free of other parameters under the null hypothesis. We denote the expected value and variance of $\bar{t}$ under the null hypothesis as E($\bar{t}$) and V($\bar{t}$). Note that the critical values of $\bar{t}$ do not vary much over N. In fact, our simulation results confirm that the critical values are almost invariant to different values of N in the data generating process. However, we note that the effect of the autocorrelation structure cannot be downplayed. As such, we compute the values of E($\bar{t}$) and V($\bar{t}$) for various combinations of N and T (sample size), p (truncation lag), and R (number of breaks), via stochastic simulations using 500,000 replications. These are reported in Table 2.

As noted above, our test statistics do not depend on the location of breaks. As such, it is not necessary to obtain different values of the means and variances at different break locations. This is the key feature of our proposed panel test statistic; under any other method, it is not easy to formulate a valid test statistic if the test depends on the location(s) of the break(s).

Formally, our panel test statistic follows a standard normal distribution:

$$LM(\tilde{\tau}^{*}) = \frac{\sqrt{N}\left[\bar{t} - \tilde{E}\left(\bar{t}\right)\right]}{\sqrt{\tilde{V}\left(\bar{t}\right)}} \tag{9}$$

where $\tilde{E}(\bar{t})$ and $\tilde{V}(\bar{t})$ are the estimated values of the average of the means and variances of $\bar{t}$, say E($\bar{t}$) and Var($\bar{t}$), as reported in Table 2, which correspond to the estimated parameter values of p and R. That is, we compute these values as:

$$\widetilde{E}(\bar{t}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E(\bar{t}(\widetilde{R}_i, \widetilde{p}_i)) \tag{10}$$

and:

$$\widetilde{V}(\bar{t}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} Var(\bar{t}(\widetilde{R}_i, \widetilde{p}_i)),$$

where $(\widetilde{R}_i, \widetilde{p}_i)$ are the estimated values of the number of breaks and the number of truncation lags in the testing regression for the i-th cross-section unit. Thus, we allow for different numbers of breaks and truncation lags in different cross-section units. Note that we utilize the transformed test statistic $\widetilde{\tau}_i^*$ using the estimated break locations and the number of breaks $(\widetilde{R}_i)$ for each cross-section unit. Therefore, our suggested panel statistic utilizes endogenously determined values of all parameters and it is free of nuisance parameters. In the Appendix B, we examine the performance of our suggested test to confirm that it is robust to different locations of trend-breaks. Overall, we show evidence that our suggested test is robust to different locations of trend-shifts. No existing tests have this crucially important feature.

On the Issue of Cross-Correlations

The earliest panel unit root tests assumed zero correlations in the innovations across the panel. However, some degree of correlation is very likely to exist in cross-country studies and, therefore, an assumption of zero correlation is highly unrealistic. Several methods have been proposed as a means of dealing with such correlations. To begin with, IPS proposed cross-section demeaning of each series in the panel as a way of partially dealing with cross correlations in the panel. However, this approach may not be effective in the presence of pair-wise correlations among cross-section units. As such, Choi (2006) generalized the de-meaning procedure and proposed a two-way error components model as a means of controlling for cross-correlations in the panel. The method suggested by Choi (2006) easily can be adopted in our

framework. In the case of heterogeneous panels, however, the two-way error components model might be too restrictive. This led Bai and Ng (2002), Phillips and Sul (2003) and Moon and Perron (2004) to propose common factor models as a means of correcting for cross correlations. Others have suggested the use of seemingly unrelated regression to correct this problem. Alternatively, one may consider using the cross-sectionally augmented (CA) procedure suggested by Pesaran (2007). Each of the above-mentioned methods for dealing with cross correlations in the innovations of the panel has both merits and caveats, depending on the situation. Any one of these methods could be used in conjunction with our proposed test without affecting the properties and relative performance of the test. However, providing the details of each of these extensions (or comparing the performance of these tests in correcting for cross-correlations) is beyond the scope of this paper.

We do, however, wish to illustrate the application of the CA procedure of Pesaran (2007) to our testing framework. This procedure is simpler but most effective. Specifically, we assume that the error term in (7)′ has the single-factor structure given by

$$e_{it} = \gamma_i f_t + u_{it} \tag{11}$$

where f_t is the unobserved common effect. Then, we consider the following testing regression which is augmented by the cross-section averages of lagged levels and first-differences of the individual series

$$\Delta y_{i,t} = \delta_i' \Delta Z_{i,t} + \phi_i \tilde{y}^*_{i,t-1} + g\,\bar{y}^*_{t-1} + h\Delta\bar{y}^*_t + \sum_{j=1}^{p} g_{ij}\Delta\bar{y}^*_{t-j} + \sum_{j=1}^{p} d_{ij}\Delta\tilde{y}_{i,t-j} + u_{it}\,. \tag{12}$$

We use the t-statistic on ϕ_i, denoted as $\tilde{\tau}_i^{**}$, to construct the mean statistic $\bar{t}$ as in (8).

Finding critical values that do not depend on nuisance parameters is again the key issue. Note that Pesaran (2007) suggests using the mean statistic, as given in (8), for a formal panel test statistic, and provides its critical values for various combinations of N and T. Similarly, we

suggest using the critical values for various combinations of N and T, but we utilize both the means and variances of $\bar{t}$.[7] Then, one can use the standardized statistic in (9), which follows a standard normal distribution. There is one more technical issue that will affect the performance of the test: the means and variances of the test statistic vary significantly over different AR truncation orders (p). As such, it is important to use the means and variances of $\bar{t}$ for each different value of p, as in IPS (2003) and ILT (2005). Accordingly, we simulate new critical values for the means and variances for various combinations of N and T and for different numbers of beaks, R. These values are provided in Table 3 and were obtained via stochastic simulations using 50,000 replications.

4. Results on Stationarity of Inflation

We now apply our panel LM unit root test to the CPI inflation rates of 22 OECD countries[8] to address the question of whether or not the inflation rate is stationary. Our testing procedure begins by computing the transformed univariate LM unit root test statistics (allowing for trend breaks) for the inflation rate series of each country. We apply the two-step procedure suggested by Lee and Strazicich (2009) which begins by jointly determining from the data whether or not breaks exist and, if they do, their location, while also determining the optimal lag length "p" that is needed to correct for autocorrelation in the errors. We begin by allowing for two trend breaks[9] and perform a grid search over all possible break point locations, while

[7] We observe that the mean statistic $\bar{t}$ in (13) does not vary over different values of N in our case. On the other hand, we observe that the variance changes significantly over different combinations of N and T. Thus, we suggest using the critical values of both the means and variances of $\bar{t}$ for various combinations of N and T.

[8] The complete list of countries is given in Table 4. The data were taken from the OECD's Main Economic Indicators CD ROM, September 2007. Inflation rates were computed by first differencing the logged CPI series.

[9] A series with more than two breaks might best be modeled as a non-linear process and, thus, we restrict our analysis to consider only up to two breaks.

simultaneously determining the optimal lag length "*p*". We eliminate 10% of the end points of the sample for possible break locations. This procedure makes use of the "maximum F test," which is described in Lee and Strazicich (2009). In short, we first search for the optimal lag length for each of the model specifications using various combinations of break locations. Then, the break locations are determined by maximizing the significance of the coefficients of dummy variables in the model specification utilizing the optimal lag length value. If two trend breaks are found to exist in the inflation series of a given country, we then move to step 2 of the testing procedure in which we test for a unit root in the series using the transformed two-break LM unit root test statistic.

If we can reject the presence of two trend breaks in the inflation series of a given country, we repeat the entire 2-step procedure again where, now, step 1 determines whether or not a single trend break exists and, if so, where it is located. If one trend break is found to exist in the inflation series of a given country, we then move to step 2 and test for a unit root in this series using the transformed one-break LM unit root test statistic.

If no trend breaks are found to exist in the inflation series of a given country, we then employ the procedure suggested by Lee and Strazicich (2003), which tests for a unit root while allowing for up to two breaks in the *level* of the series. Since the distribution of the LM unit root test is invariant to the location of any existing level shifts, there is no need to employ the transformation of Park and Sung (1994) in this instance. If no breaks of any kind are found to exist in the inflation series of a given country, we compute the no-break LM unit root test of Schmidt and Phillips (1992) for that country.

After computing all of the univariate LM unit root tests allowing for the optimal number and type of breaks, we then use these statistics to compute the standardized panel LM unit root

test statistic, as described in equation (14). Since the asymptotic distribution of this test statistic is standard normal, the critical values of the test follow the usual z-scores of the standard normal distribution.

We report the results of the univariate LM unit root tests in Table 4. We also report the optimal break point locations for each country and we note that all countries were found to have two trend breaks. The break dates identified by our procedure seem quite reasonable. For example, 17 of the 22 countries under investigation experienced their first break during the period from 1972 to 1977, a well-known period of high global inflation coinciding with the first oil crisis and the collapse of the Bretton Woods Accord. All of the remaining five countries experienced their first break during the period from 1981 to 1986, during the time of the so-called "oil glut."

Not surprisingly, seven of the countries under investigation here experienced their second break during this same period, while Greece experienced its second break during the 1979 energy crisis—the beginning of a period of declining growth in Greece. Nine countries experienced their second break from 1990 to 1992. This is of interest since 1990 marked a high point of average global inflation rates over the postwar period and it was at this time when central banks across the globe began to embrace inflation targeting. World-wide average inflation rates declined significantly over the early 1990s. In particular, it is interesting to note that New Zealand experienced its second break in 1990, shortly after its central bank began its policy of inflation targeting. Similarly, Canada experienced its second break in 1991, which coincides with the period during which its central bank first adopted inflation targeting.

Based on the univariate LM unit root tests, the inflation rates for 16 of 22 countries were found to be stationary at the 10% level of significance or better. We conjecture that the failure to

reject the null of a unit root in the remaining series may be due to the relatively low power of the univariate test, which may be improved by moving to the panel framework. To examine this issue, Table 5 reports the panel LM unit root test statistics. The first statistic does not correct for cross-correlations while the second one does by applying Pesaran's CA procedure to our panel LM test. The null of a unit root is strongly rejected in both cases, supporting the notion that these series are stationary with occasional trend breaks. Since the power of the unit root test greatly increases in the panel setting, it is not surprising that we find strong evidence of stationarity using the panel test statistic while we do not find this result uniformly in all series when testing in the univariate setting. This result supports the notion that inflation rates in these OECD countries are stationary with occasional trend breaks.

5. Conclusion

This paper re-examines the question of whether or not inflation rates are stationary using a newly developed panel unit root test that allows for heterogeneous breaks, under both the null and the alternative, in both the level and trend of the series under investigation. Any unit root tests that do not allow for such breaks will be subject to serious size distortions and, hence, cannot be relied upon to give conclusive evidence as to whether or not a unit root exists. Our panel unit root test, which is based on the univariate LM unit root test in combination with the transformation suggested by Park and Sung (1994), is free of the usual nuisance parameter problem that plagues all existing DF-type unit root tests that allow for breaks in the trend of the series. As such, our analysis provides more reliable information on the issue of whether or not inflation rates contain a unit root. We find clear evidence in favor of the notion that world-wide inflation rates are stationary.

REFERENCES:

Amsler, C. and J. Lee, 1995, "An LM Test for a Unit Root in the Presence of a Structural Change," *Econometric Theory*, 11, 359–368.

Bai, J. and S. Ng, 2002, "Determining the Number of Factors in Approximate Factor Models," *Econometrica*, 70, 191–221.

Barsky, R.B., 1987, "The Fisher Hypothesis and the Forecastability and Persistence of Inflation," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 19, 3–24.

Ball, L. and S.G. Cecchetti, 1990, "Inflation and Uncertainty at Short and Long Horizons," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 215–254.

Breitung, J. and B. Candelon, 2005, "Purchasing Power Parity during Currency Crises: A Panel Unit Root Test under Structural Breaks," *Review of World Economics*, 124–140.

Carrion-i Silvestre, J. L., del Barrio-Castro, T., and Lopez-Bazo, E. 2005, "Breaking the Panels: an Application to the GDP Per Capita," *Econometrics Journal*, 8:159–175.

Chan, F. and L. Pauwels, 2009, "Unit Roots and Structural Breaks in Panels: Does the Model Specification Matter?" Working Paper, University of Sydney, Australia.

Choi, I., 2006, "Combination Unit Root Tests for Cross-Sectionally Correlated Panels," in Econometric Theory and Practice: Frontiers of Analysis and Applied Research, edited by Dean Corbae, Steven Durlauf and Bruce E. Hansen.

Culver, S. and D. Pappel, 1997, "Is There A Unit Root In The Inflation Rate? Evidence From Sequential Break and Panel Data Models," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 12, 435–333.

Elliott, T.J. Rothenberg and J.H. Stock, 1996, "Efficient Tests for an Autoregressive Unit Root," *Econometrica*, 64, 813–836.

Franscisco, M., 2009, "Testing Unit Roots in Panel Data Allowing For Structural Breaks," Universidad de Murcia, Spain.

Im, K.-S., J. Lee and M. Tieslau, 2005, "Panel LM Unit-Root Tests with Level Shifts," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 67, 393–419.

Im, K.-S., H. Pesaran and Y. Shin, 2003, "Testing for Unit Roots in Heterogeneous Panels," *Journal of Econometrics*, 115, 53–74.

Juselius, K., 2006, "The Cointegrated VAR Model: Methodology and Applications" Oxford University Press: New York, NY.

Kim, C.-J., 1993, "Unobserved-Component Time Series Models with Markov-Switching Heteroskedasticity: Changes in Regime and the Link Between Inflation Rates and Inflation Uncertainty," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 11, 341–349.

Kim, D. and P. Perron, 2009, "Unit Root Tests Allowing for a Break in the Trend Function at an Unknown Time Under Both the Null and Alternative Hypothesis," *Journal of Econometrics*, 148, 1–13.

Lee, J., and M. Strazicich, 2001, "Break Point Estimation and Spurious Rejections with Endogenous Unit Root Tests," *The Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 63, 535–558.

Lee, J., and M. Strazicich, 2003, "Minimum LM Unit Root Tests with Two Structural Breaks," *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 85, 1082–1089.

Lee, J., and M. Strazicich, 2009, "LM Unit Root Tests with Trend Breaks at Unknown Dates," mimeo.

Levin, A. C.-F. Lin and C.-S. J. Chu (2002) "Unit Root Tests in Panel Data: Asymptotic and Finite-Sample Properties," *Journal of Econometrics*, 108, 1–24.

Lumsdaine, R. L. and D. H. Papell, 1997, "Multiple Trend Breaks and the Unit Root Hypothesis," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 79, 212–218.

Moon, R. H. and B. Perron, 2004, "Testing for a Unit Root in Panels with Dynamic Factors," *Journal of Econometrics*, 122, 81–126.

Nelson, C.R. and G.W. Schwert, 1977, "Short–Term Interest Rates as Predictors of Inflation: On Testing the Hypothesis that the Real Rate of Interest is Constant," *American Economic Review*, 67, 478–486.

Nunes, L., P. Newbold and C. Kuan, 1997, "Testing for Unit Roots with Breaks: Evidence on the Great Crash and the Unit Root Hypothesis Reconsidered," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 59, 435–448.

Nunes, L.C., 2004, "LM-Type Tests for a Unit Root Allowing for a Break in Trend," Working Paper, Universidade Nova de Lisboa.

Park, J.Y. and J. Sung, 1994, "Testing for Unit Roots in Models with Structural Change," *Econometric Theory*, 10 (December), 917–936.

Perron, P., 1989, "The Great Crash, the Oil Price Shock, and the Unit Root Hypothesis," *Econometrica*, 57, 1361–1401.

Perron, P., 2006, "Dealing with Structural Breaks," in the Palgrave Handbook of Econometrics, Volume 1: Econometric Theory, edited by T. C. Mills and K. Patterson.

Perron, P., and X. Zhu, 2005, "Structural Breaks with Deterministic and Stochastic Trends," *Journal of Econometrics*, 129, 65–119.

Pesaran, M.H., 2007, "A Simple Panel Unit Root Test in the Presence of Cross-Section Dependence," *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 22, 265–312.

Phillips, P.C.B. and D. Sul, 2003, "Dynamic Panel Estimation and Homogeneity Testing Under Cross Section Dependence," *Econometrics Journal*, 6, 217–259.

Schmidt, P. and P. Phillips, 1992, "LM Tests for a Unit Root in the Presence of Deterministic Trends," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 54, 257–287.

Siklos, P.L., 2010, "Meeting Maastricht: Nominal Convergence of the New Member States Toward EMU," *Economic Modelling*, 27, 507–515.

Zivot, Eric and D.W.K. Andrews, 1992, "Further Evidence on the Great Crash, the Oil-Price Shock, and the Unit-Root Hypothesis," *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 11, 251–270.

TABLE 1: CRITICAL VALUES FOR THE *TRANSFORMED* UNIVARIATE LM UNIT ROOT TEST

	sig. level	Sample Size				
R	(%)	*T*=50	*T*=100	*T*=200	*T*=500	*T*=1000
1	1	−4.604	−4.363	−4.261	−4.206	−4.176
	5	−3.950	−3.792	−3.716	−3.675	−3.662
	10	−3.635	−3.501	−3.443	−3.410	−3.402
2	1	−5.365	−4.980	−4.799	−4.698	−4.687
	5	−4.661	−4.379	−4.261	−4.191	−4.175
	10	−4.338	−4.097	−3.997	−3.934	−3.921
3	1	−6.092	−5.510	−5.302	−5.140	−5.127
	5	−5.362	−4.931	−4.752	−4.634	−4.620
	10	−5.019	−4.635	−4.484	−4.382	−4.361

Notes: R = # of breaks.

TABLE 2: MEANS AND VARIANCES FOR THE PANEL LM UNIT ROOT TEST

PANEL A: R=0

	p=0		p=1		p=2		p=3		p=4		p=5		p=6		p=7		p=8	
T	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
25	−1.99	0.38	−1.99	0.39	−1.91	0.38	−1.90	0.41	−1.82	0.43	−1.80	0.47	−1.71	0.51	−1.69	0.58	−1.60	0.65
50	−1.98	0.36	−1.97	0.36	−1.93	0.35	−1.93	0.37	−1.89	0.37	−1.89	0.38	−1.84	0.38	−1.83	0.39	−1.78	0.40
100	−1.97	0.34	−1.97	0.34	−1.95	0.34	−1.95	0.34	−1.93	0.34	−1.93	0.34	−1.90	0.34	−1.90	0.35	−1.88	0.35
200	−1.98	0.34	−1.97	0.34	−1.96	0.34	−1.96	0.34	−1.95	0.34	−1.95	0.34	−1.94	0.34	−1.93	0.34	−1.93	0.34

PANEL B: R=1

	p=0		p=1		p=2		p=3		p=4		p=5		p=6		p=7		p=8	
T	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
25	−2.69	0.40	−2.73	0.40	−2.67	0.37	−2.68	0.42	−2.59	0.50	−2.57	0.62	−2.44	0.73	−2.35	0.89	−2.18	1.04
50	−2.67	0.37	−2.68	0.36	−2.65	0.34	−2.67	0.34	−2.63	0.34	−2.64	0.36	−2.59	0.37	−2.58	0.41	−2.52	0.44
100	−2.65	0.34	−2.66	0.34	−2.64	0.33	−2.65	0.32	−2.63	0.32	−2.64	0.32	−2.62	0.31	−2.62	0.32	−2.60	0.32
200	−2.64	0.33	−2.64	0.33	−2.63	0.32	−2.64	0.32	−2.63	0.31	−2.63	0.31	−2.63	0.31	−2.63	0.31	−2.62	0.31

PANEL C: R=2

	p=0		p=1		p=2		p=3		p=4		p=5		p=6		p=7		p=8	
T	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
50	−3.22	0.37	−3.27	0.35	−3.26	0.32	−3.30	0.33	−3.27	0.35	−3.28	0.40	−3.21	0.45	−3.18	0.53	−3.08	0.59
100	−3.19	0.34	−3.21	0.33	−3.21	0.31	−3.23	0.30	−3.23	0.30	−3.24	0.30	−3.23	0.29	−3.24	0.30	−3.22	0.31
200	−3.17	0.33	−3.18	0.32	−3.18	0.32	−3.19	0.31	−3.19	0.30	−3.20	0.30	−3.20	0.29	−3.21	0.29	−3.20	0.28

PANEL D: R=3

	p=0		p=1		p=2		p=3		p=4		p=5		p=6		p=7		p=8	
T	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
50	−3.72	0.39	−3.82	0.35	−3.84	0.31	−3.90	0.35	−3.87	0.43	−3.86	0.55	−3.73	0.64	−3.64	0.76	−3.47	0.86
100	−3.66	0.35	−3.71	0.33	−3.72	0.30	−3.76	0.29	−3.76	0.28	−3.79	0.29	−3.78	0.29	−3.80	0.32	−3.77	0.36
200	−3.63	0.33	−3.65	0.32	−3.66	0.31	−3.68	0.30	−3.68	0.29	−3.71	0.28	−3.71	0.27	−3.72	0.27	−3.72	0.26

Notes: R = # of breaks; p = order of autocorrelation; T = # of time periods

TABLE 3: MEANS AND VARIANCES FOR THE PANEL LM UNIT ROOT TEST USING PESARAN'S CROSS-SECTIONALLY AUGMENTED (CA) PROCEDURE

PANEL A: *R* = 0

		p=0		*p*=1		*p*=2		*p*=3		*p*=4		*p*=5		*p*=6		*p*=7		*p*=8	
N	*T*	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
10	30	-2.14	0.86	-2.10	1.04	-1.96	1.17	-1.90	1.40	-1.75	1.57	-1.66	1.81	-1.48	2.07				
10	50	-2.15	0.75	-2.12	0.83	-2.05	0.91	-2.02	1.00	-1.94	1.09	-1.90	1.21	-1.81	1.29	-1.76	1.39	-1.67	1.46
10	100	-2.15	0.69	-2.14	0.72	-2.10	0.75	-2.09	0.80	-2.05	0.83	-2.03	0.87	-2.00	0.90	-1.98	0.94	-1.94	0.97
10	200	-2.15	0.66	-2.15	0.67	-2.13	0.67	-2.12	0.69	-2.11	0.70	-2.10	0.71	-2.08	0.73	-2.08	0.75	-2.06	0.76
20	30	-2.14	0.96	-2.09	1.23	-1.96	1.45	-1.89	1.75	-1.74	1.95	-1.65	2.20	-1.48	2.45				
20	50	-2.14	0.81	-2.12	0.93	-2.04	1.04	-2.01	1.19	-1.93	1.31	-1.89	1.47	-1.81	1.57	-1.76	1.70	-1.66	1.78
20	100	-2.15	0.73	-2.14	0.79	-2.10	0.84	-2.09	0.90	-2.05	0.94	-2.04	1.00	-2.00	1.05	-1.99	1.12	-1.95	1.17
20	200	-2.15	0.70	-2.15	0.71	-2.13	0.73	-2.12	0.74	-2.11	0.77	-2.10	0.79	-2.08	0.82	-2.08	0.85	-2.06	0.88
30	30	-2.14	1.09	-2.09	1.43	-1.96	1.74	-1.89	2.16	-1.74	2.37	-1.65	2.61	-1.48	2.80				
30	50	-2.14	0.90	-2.12	1.08	-2.05	1.22	-2.01	1.46	-1.93	1.64	-1.89	1.85	-1.81	1.98	-1.76	2.17	-1.66	2.20
30	100	-2.15	0.80	-2.14	0.87	-2.10	0.93	-2.09	1.01	-2.06	1.08	-2.04	1.17	-2.00	1.24	-1.99	1.33	-1.95	1.42
30	200	-2.15	0.77	-2.15	0.79	-2.13	0.81	-2.12	0.84	-2.11	0.87	-2.10	0.91	-2.08	0.95	-2.08	0.99	-2.06	1.02
50	30	-2.14	1.30	-2.09	1.85	-1.96	2.33	-1.89	2.95	-1.74	3.13	-1.65	3.50	-1.48	3.57				
50	50	-2.15	1.09	-2.12	1.34	-2.05	1.59	-2.02	1.92	-1.94	2.15	-1.90	2.44	-1.81	2.62	-1.76	2.86	-1.67	2.93
50	100	-2.15	0.91	-2.14	1.00	-2.10	1.09	-2.09	1.21	-2.05	1.32	-2.04	1.44	-2.00	1.55	-1.98	1.70	-1.94	1.82
50	200	-2.15	0.88	-2.15	0.93	-2.13	0.98	-2.12	1.03	-2.11	1.09	-2.10	1.14	-2.08	1.19	-2.08	1.25	-2.06	1.30
70	30	-2.14	1.58	-2.09	2.34	-1.96	3.05	-1.89	3.80	-1.74	4.09	-1.65	4.49	-1.48	4.45				
70	50	-2.15	1.25	-2.12	1.59	-2.05	1.95	-2.02	2.37	-1.94	2.74	-1.90	3.18	-1.81	3.37	-1.76	3.59	-1.67	3.69
70	100	-2.15	1.07	-2.14	1.20	-2.10	1.32	-2.09	1.48	-2.05	1.62	-2.04	1.81	-2.00	1.96	-1.98	2.14	-1.94	2.28
70	200	-2.15	0.99	-2.15	1.06	-2.13	1.12	-2.12	1.18	-2.11	1.25	-2.10	1.32	-2.08	1.39	-2.08	1.47	-2.06	1.54
100	30	-2.14	1.94	-2.09	3.00	-1.96	3.96	-1.89	5.13	-1.74	5.56	-1.65	5.87	-1.48	5.82				
100	50	-2.15	1.52	-2.12	1.99	-2.05	2.45	-2.01	3.05	-1.93	3.51	-1.90	4.02	-1.81	4.35	-1.76	4.79	-1.67	4.76
100	100	-2.15	1.28	-2.14	1.47	-2.10	1.65	-2.09	1.90	-2.05	2.09	-2.04	2.35	-2.00	2.57	-1.99	2.85	-1.95	3.06
100	200	-2.15	1.17	-2.15	1.25	-2.13	1.33	-2.12	1.42	-2.10	1.51	-2.10	1.61	-2.08	1.70	-2.07	1.80	-2.06	1.90
200	30	-2.14	3.25	-2.09	5.33	-1.96	7.16	-1.89	9.26	-1.74	9.86	-1.65	10.5	-1.48	9.82				
200	50	-2.15	2.42	-2.12	3.37	-2.05	4.27	-2.02	5.37	-1.94	6.27	-1.90	7.33	-1.81	7.90	-1.77	8.52	-1.67	8.52
200	100	-2.15	2.04	-2.14	2.40	-2.10	2.75	-2.09	3.18	-2.05	3.60	-2.04	4.07	-2.00	4.50	-1.98	4.97	-1.95	5.35
200	200	-2.15	1.82	-2.15	1.98	-2.13	2.13	-2.12	2.30	-2.11	2.48	-2.10	2.68	-2.08	2.87	-2.07	3.08	-2.06	3.28

Notes: R = # of breaks; p = order of autocorrelation; N = # of cross-section units; T = # of time periods

PANEL B: *R* = 1

		p=0		*p*=1		*p*=2		*p*=3		*p*=4		*p*=5		*p*=6		*p*=7		*p*=8	
N	*T*	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
10	32	-2.76	0.69	-2.72	0.77	-2.55	0.79	-2.45	0.91	-2.24	1.09	-2.10	1.43	-1.86	1.93				
10	50	-2.76	0.60	-2.74	0.64	-2.65	0.66	-2.61	0.70	-2.50	0.73	-2.44	0.80	-2.31	0.86	-2.23	1.00	-2.09	1.14
10	100	-2.76	0.54	-2.75	0.56	-2.71	0.57	-2.70	0.59	-2.65	0.60	-2.64	0.62	-2.59	0.62	-2.57	0.64	-2.52	0.65
10	200	-2.75	0.53	-2.75	0.53	-2.73	0.53	-2.73	0.54	-2.71	0.54	-2.71	0.54	-2.69	0.55	-2.68	0.55	-2.66	0.55
20	32	-2.76	0.70	-2.72	0.82	-2.55	0.87	-2.45	0.97	-2.24	1.16	-2.10	1.52	-1.85	2.08				
20	50	-2.76	0.61	-2.74	0.67	-2.65	0.70	-2.61	0.75	-2.50	0.78	-2.44	0.84	-2.31	0.91	-2.23	1.05	-2.09	1.23
20	100	-2.76	0.54	-2.75	0.56	-2.71	0.57	-2.70	0.58	-2.66	0.60	-2.64	0.62	-2.59	0.63	-2.57	0.66	-2.52	0.69
20	200	-2.76	0.51	-2.75	0.52	-2.74	0.52	-2.73	0.53	-2.71	0.54	-2.71	0.55	-2.69	0.56	-2.68	0.58	-2.66	0.59
30	32	-2.76	0.74	-2.72	0.89	-2.55	0.93	-2.45	1.03	-2.24	1.21	-2.10	1.62	-1.86	2.24				
30	50	-2.76	0.61	-2.74	0.67	-2.65	0.72	-2.61	0.80	-2.50	0.83	-2.44	0.90	-2.31	0.97	-2.23	1.13	-2.09	1.29
30	100	-2.76	0.55	-2.75	0.59	-2.71	0.60	-2.70	0.64	-2.66	0.66	-2.64	0.69	-2.59	0.70	-2.57	0.72	-2.52	0.75
30	200	-2.76	0.52	-2.75	0.53	-2.74	0.54	-2.73	0.55	-2.71	0.57	-2.71	0.58	-2.69	0.59	-2.68	0.60	-2.66	0.61
50	32	-2.76	0.85	-2.72	1.08	-2.55	1.11	-2.45	1.17	-2.24	1.37	-2.10	1.85	-1.85	2.56				
50	50	-2.76	0.70	-2.74	0.81	-2.65	0.88	-2.61	0.95	-2.50	0.98	-2.44	1.03	-2.31	1.10	-2.23	1.31	-2.10	1.48
50	100	-2.76	0.59	-2.75	0.64	-2.71	0.67	-2.70	0.73	-2.66	0.76	-2.64	0.80	-2.59	0.83	-2.57	0.85	-2.52	0.85
50	200	-2.76	0.53	-2.75	0.55	-2.73	0.56	-2.73	0.58	-2.71	0.59	-2.70	0.62	-2.69	0.64	-2.68	0.66	-2.66	0.67
70	32	-2.76	0.94	-2.72	1.22	-2.55	1.26	-2.45	1.35	-2.24	1.53	-2.10	2.09	-1.86	2.98				
70	50	-2.76	0.75	-2.74	0.89	-2.65	0.99	-2.61	1.08	-2.50	1.12	-2.44	1.20	-2.31	1.27	-2.23	1.49	-2.09	1.71
70	100	-2.76	0.62	-2.75	0.68	-2.71	0.74	-2.70	0.81	-2.66	0.85	-2.64	0.92	-2.59	0.95	-2.57	0.97	-2.52	0.98
70	200	-2.76	0.58	-2.75	0.60	-2.73	0.62	-2.73	0.65	-2.71	0.66	-2.71	0.69	-2.69	0.72	-2.68	0.74	-2.66	0.76
100	32	-2.76	1.07	-2.72	1.46	-2.55	1.50	-2.45	1.60	-2.24	1.82	-2.10	2.46	-1.86	3.47				
100	50	-2.76	0.83	-2.74	1.04	-2.65	1.19	-2.61	1.29	-2.50	1.31	-2.44	1.39	-2.31	1.51	-2.23	1.77	-2.09	2.01
100	100	-2.76	0.68	-2.75	0.76	-2.71	0.82	-2.70	0.91	-2.66	0.97	-2.64	1.03	-2.59	1.06	-2.57	1.10	-2.52	1.11
100	200	-2.76	0.62	-2.75	0.65	-2.73	0.68	-2.73	0.73	-2.71	0.76	-2.70	0.80	-2.68	0.84	-2.68	0.87	-2.66	0.90
200	32	-2.76	1.55	-2.72	2.27	-2.55	2.35	-2.45	2.38	-2.24	2.73	-2.10	3.73	-1.86	5.28				
200	50	-2.76	1.14	-2.74	1.57	-2.65	1.85	-2.61	2.03	-2.50	2.01	-2.44	2.09	-2.31	2.24	-2.23	2.66	-2.10	3.08
200	100	-2.76	0.88	-2.75	1.04	-2.71	1.18	-2.70	1.35	-2.66	1.49	-2.64	1.63	-2.59	1.69	-2.57	1.75	-2.52	1.76
200	200	-2.76	0.78	-2.75	0.85	-2.73	0.92	-2.73	0.99	-2.71	1.06	-2.71	1.13	-2.69	1.20	-2.68	1.28	-2.66	1.33

Notes: R = # of breaks; p = order of autocorrelation; N = # of cross-section units; T = # of time periods

PANEL C: *R* = 2

		p=0		*p*=1		*p*=2		*p*=3		*p*=4		*p*=5		*p*=6		*p*=7		*p*=8	
N	*T*	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
10	35	-3.30	0.63	-3.29	0.66	-3.12	0.66	-3.02	0.86	-2.79	1.12	-2.56	1.51	-2.22	2.03				
10	50	-3.29	0.57	-3.29	0.58	-3.20	0.56	-3.15	0.59	-3.02	0.67	-2.95	0.82	-2.78	0.96	-2.64	1.15	-2.42	1.36
10	100	-3.27	0.50	-3.28	0.50	-3.24	0.50	-3.23	0.50	-3.19	0.50	-3.17	0.51	-3.12	0.51	-3.10	0.53	-3.04	0.56
10	200	-3.25	0.49	-3.26	0.48	-3.24	0.47	-3.24	0.47	-3.23	0.46	-3.23	0.46	-3.21	0.46	-3.21	0.47	-3.19	0.46
20	35	-3.30	0.65	-3.29	0.68	-3.12	0.67	-3.02	0.86	-2.79	1.21	-2.56	1.70	-2.22	2.25				
20	50	-3.28	0.55	-3.29	0.57	-3.19	0.55	-3.15	0.59	-3.03	0.66	-2.95	0.81	-2.78	1.00	-2.64	1.25	-2.41	1.49
20	100	-3.26	0.48	-3.27	0.49	-3.24	0.49	-3.23	0.49	-3.19	0.50	-3.17	0.51	-3.12	0.50	-3.10	0.54	-3.04	0.58
20	200	-3.26	0.46	-3.26	0.46	-3.25	0.46	-3.25	0.45	-3.23	0.46	-3.23	0.46	-3.21	0.46	-3.21	0.47	-3.19	0.47
30	35	-3.30	0.65	-3.29	0.67	-3.13	0.68	-3.03	0.91	-2.79	1.26	-2.56	1.81	-2.22	2.40				
30	50	-3.28	0.57	-3.29	0.60	-3.20	0.59	-3.15	0.62	-3.03	0.69	-2.95	0.88	-2.79	1.09	-2.64	1.40	-2.42	1.66
30	100	-3.27	0.48	-3.27	0.49	-3.24	0.49	-3.23	0.51	-3.19	0.50	-3.18	0.52	-3.12	0.53	-3.10	0.56	-3.04	0.59
30	200	-3.26	0.45	-3.26	0.45	-3.25	0.45	-3.25	0.45	-3.23	0.45	-3.23	0.45	-3.21	0.46	-3.21	0.46	-3.19	0.46
50	35	-3.30	0.71	-3.29	0.77	-3.13	0.74	-3.03	1.02	-2.79	1.44	-2.56	2.10	-2.22	2.75				
50	50	-3.28	0.61	-3.29	0.66	-3.19	0.64	-3.15	0.64	-3.03	0.74	-2.95	0.93	-2.78	1.19	-2.64	1.54	-2.42	1.95
50	100	-3.27	0.50	-3.27	0.52	-3.24	0.53	-3.23	0.55	-3.19	0.54	-3.17	0.56	-3.12	0.57	-3.10	0.60	-3.04	0.63
50	200	-3.26	0.47	-3.26	0.48	-3.25	0.49	-3.25	0.49	-3.23	0.48	-3.23	0.49	-3.21	0.50	-3.21	0.51	-3.19	0.51
70	35	-3.30	0.76	-3.29	0.83	-3.12	0.78	-3.02	1.07	-2.79	1.59	-2.56	2.37	-2.22	3.30				
70	50	-3.28	0.64	-3.29	0.70	-3.20	0.69	-3.15	0.70	-3.03	0.78	-2.95	1.01	-2.78	1.34	-2.64	1.82	-2.42	2.34
70	100	-3.27	0.52	-3.27	0.55	-3.24	0.56	-3.23	0.58	-3.19	0.59	-3.17	0.60	-3.12	0.61	-3.10	0.63	-3.04	0.67
70	200	-3.26	0.49	-3.26	0.50	-3.25	0.51	-3.25	0.51	-3.23	0.52	-3.23	0.54	-3.21	0.55	-3.21	0.55	-3.19	0.55
100	35	-3.30	0.86	-3.29	0.96	-3.12	0.86	-3.03	1.19	-2.79	1.84	-2.56	2.85	-2.22	3.98				
100	50	-3.28	0.68	-3.29	0.78	-3.20	0.78	-3.15	0.79	-3.03	0.90	-2.95	1.19	-2.78	1.63	-2.64	2.21	-2.42	2.78
100	100	-3.27	0.54	-3.27	0.58	-3.24	0.62	-3.23	0.66	-3.19	0.68	-3.18	0.69	-3.12	0.69	-3.10	0.72	-3.04	0.77
100	200	-3.26	0.49	-3.26	0.51	-3.25	0.52	-3.25	0.54	-3.23	0.55	-3.23	0.58	-3.21	0.59	-3.21	0.60	-3.19	0.60
200	35	-3.30	1.12	-3.29	1.33	-3.12	1.18	-3.02	1.64	-2.79	2.60	-2.56	4.26	-2.22	6.22				
200	50	-3.28	0.84	-3.29	1.07	-3.19	1.06	-3.15	1.05	-3.03	1.17	-2.95	1.64	-2.78	2.30	-2.64	3.27	-2.42	4.36
200	100	-3.27	0.64	-3.27	0.74	-3.24	0.80	-3.23	0.85	-3.19	0.87	-3.17	0.90	-3.12	0.91	-3.10	0.95	-3.04	1.02
200	200	-3.26	0.56	-3.26	0.61	-3.25	0.65	-3.25	0.69	-3.23	0.73	-3.23	0.76	-3.21	0.78	-3.21	0.80	-3.19	0.80

Notes: R = # of breaks; p = order of autocorrelation; N = # of cross-section units; T = # of time periods

PANEL D: *R* = 3

		p=0		*p*=1		*p*=2		*p*=3		*p*=4		*p*=5		*p*=6		*p*=7		*p*=8	
N	*T*	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.	Mean	Var.
10	38	-3.79	0.61	-3.84	0.61	-3.69	0.66	-3.60	1.03	-3.27	1.35	-2.95	1.77	-2.50	2.16				
10	50	-3.76	0.56	-3.80	0.54	-3.72	0.52	-3.68	0.61	-3.53	0.82	-3.40	1.05	-3.13	1.24	-2.90	1.53	-2.59	1.73
10	100	-3.72	0.48	-3.75	0.47	-3.72	0.45	-3.73	0.44	-3.69	0.44	-3.67	0.46	-3.62	0.49	-3.59	0.53	-3.52	0.60
10	200	-3.70	0.46	-3.71	0.45	-3.70	0.43	-3.71	0.43	-3.70	0.42	-3.70	0.42	-3.69	0.42	-3.69	0.41	-3.67	0.40
20	38	-3.79	0.61	-3.84	0.59	-3.69	0.66	-3.60	1.03	-3.27	1.44	-2.95	1.93	-2.51	2.38				
20	50	-3.76	0.55	-3.80	0.53	-3.72	0.50	-3.68	0.60	-3.53	0.81	-3.39	1.10	-3.13	1.34	-2.90	1.62	-2.59	1.87
20	100	-3.72	0.46	-3.74	0.45	-3.72	0.43	-3.73	0.42	-3.69	0.42	-3.68	0.44	-3.62	0.48	-3.59	0.54	-3.52	0.61
20	200	-3.70	0.44	-3.71	0.43	-3.70	0.42	-3.71	0.41	-3.70	0.41	-3.70	0.40	-3.69	0.40	-3.69	0.39	-3.67	0.40
30	38	-3.79	0.63	-3.83	0.60	-3.69	0.67	-3.60	1.07	-3.27	1.46	-2.95	2.05	-2.51	2.61				
30	50	-3.76	0.55	-3.80	0.54	-3.72	0.49	-3.68	0.62	-3.53	0.83	-3.39	1.14	-3.13	1.43	-2.90	1.78	-2.59	2.08
30	100	-3.72	0.46	-3.74	0.46	-3.72	0.44	-3.72	0.45	-3.69	0.44	-3.68	0.46	-3.62	0.47	-3.59	0.53	-3.52	0.60
30	200	-3.70	0.42	-3.71	0.42	-3.70	0.41	-3.71	0.40	-3.70	0.40	-3.70	0.40	-3.69	0.40	-3.69	0.40	-3.67	0.40
50	38	-3.79	0.66	-3.84	0.64	-3.69	0.66	-3.60	1.16	-3.27	1.64	-2.95	2.36	-2.51	2.98				
50	50	-3.76	0.58	-3.80	0.57	-3.72	0.54	-3.68	0.65	-3.53	0.88	-3.39	1.25	-3.12	1.60	-2.89	2.01	-2.58	2.41
50	100	-3.72	0.47	-3.74	0.47	-3.72	0.46	-3.73	0.46	-3.69	0.46	-3.68	0.48	-3.62	0.51	-3.59	0.58	-3.52	0.67
50	200	-3.70	0.43	-3.71	0.43	-3.70	0.43	-3.71	0.43	-3.70	0.42	-3.70	0.42	-3.69	0.42	-3.69	0.43	-3.67	0.43
70	38	-3.79	0.68	-3.84	0.66	-3.69	0.70	-3.60	1.24	-3.27	1.85	-2.95	2.73	-2.51	3.54				
70	50	-3.76	0.59	-3.80	0.60	-3.72	0.56	-3.68	0.68	-3.53	0.96	-3.39	1.41	-3.12	1.83	-2.89	2.34	-2.58	2.80
70	100	-3.72	0.49	-3.74	0.49	-3.72	0.48	-3.73	0.47	-3.69	0.47	-3.67	0.50	-3.62	0.55	-3.59	0.62	-3.52	0.71
70	200	-3.70	0.43	-3.71	0.44	-3.70	0.44	-3.71	0.44	-3.70	0.44	-3.70	0.44	-3.69	0.44	-3.69	0.43	-3.67	0.43
100	38	-3.79	0.74	-3.84	0.70	-3.69	0.75	-3.60	1.42	-3.27	2.18	-2.95	3.22	-2.51	4.15				
100	50	-3.76	0.64	-3.80	0.65	-3.72	0.61	-3.68	0.72	-3.53	1.07	-3.39	1.60	-3.12	2.16	-2.89	2.79	-2.59	3.34
100	100	-3.72	0.50	-3.74	0.51	-3.72	0.51	-3.73	0.52	-3.69	0.51	-3.68	0.53	-3.62	0.56	-3.59	0.66	-3.52	0.78
100	200	-3.70	0.44	-3.71	0.44	-3.70	0.44	-3.71	0.45	-3.70	0.45	-3.70	0.46	-3.69	0.46	-3.69	0.46	-3.67	0.46
200	38	-3.79	0.93	-3.84	0.90	-3.69	0.93	-3.60	1.85	-3.27	3.08	-2.95	4.86	-2.51	6.40				
200	50	-3.76	0.76	-3.80	0.83	-3.72	0.73	-3.68	0.92	-3.53	1.45	-3.39	2.31	-3.13	3.15	-2.89	4.21	-2.59	5.27
200	100	-3.72	0.56	-3.74	0.63	-3.72	0.64	-3.72	0.64	-3.69	0.62	-3.68	0.64	-3.62	0.71	-3.59	0.84	-3.52	1.04
200	200	-3.70	0.49	-3.71	0.51	-3.70	0.53	-3.71	0.56	-3.70	0.57	-3.70	0.57	-3.69	0.57	-3.69	0.58	-3.67	0.57

Notes: R = # of breaks; p = order of autocorrelation; N = # of cross-section units; T = # of time periods

TABLE 4: UNIVARIATE LM UNIT ROOT TESTS ON INFLATION

Country:	Univariate LM Stat	Optimal Lag	Break Locations
Australia	–6.371***	7	1972, 1991
Austria	–6.738***	8	1972, 1982
Belgium	–7.084***	1	1972, 1988
Canada	–4.680**	7	1982, 1991
Finland	–9.007***	8	1976, 1992
France	–0.972	8	1973, 1985
Germany	–5.655***	5	1981, 1990
Greece	–4.399*	7	1974, 1979
Italy	–8.119***	8	1972, 1984
Japan	–4.278	8	1973, 1977
Korea	–4.213	7	1981, 1987
Luxembourg	–7.082***	7	1972, 1984
Netherlands	–4.306	3	1973, 1988
New Zealand	–5.881***	8	1977, 1990
Norway	–7.202***	7	1983, 1990
Portugal	–5.778***	2	1976, 1992
South Africa	–5.999***	8	1972, 1992
Spain	–3.162	2	1975, 1986
Sweden	–7.370***	8	1985, 1990
Switzerland	–4.158	7	1975, 1996
United Kingdom	–6.889***	2	1973, 1984
United States	–7.531***	1	1976, 1983

TABLE 5: PANEL LM UNIT ROOT TESTS ON INFLATION

1. Panel LM Test Statistic = –10.679***
2. Panel LM Test CA Statistic = **-5.156*****

Notes: *Significant at 10%; **Significant at 5%; ***Significant at 1%

APPENDIX A

Proof of Proposition 1

For the proof of the asymptotic distribution of the test statistic, we first consider the case with $R = 1$ and then extend the result to multiple breaks. We define: $D_{1t} = 1$ for $t \leq T_B$ and 0 otherwise; and $D_{2t} = 1$ for $t \geq T_B+1$ and 0 otherwise. Similarly, we let $DT_{1t}^* = t$ for $t \leq T_B$ and 0 otherwise; and $DT_{1t}^* = t\text{-}T_B$ for $t \geq T_B+1$ and 0 otherwise. Then, the first step testing regression (3) can be alternatively written as:

$$\Delta y_t = \delta_1 B_{1t} + \delta_2 B_{2t} + \delta_3 D_{1t} + \delta_4 D_{2t} + u_t \,. \tag{A.1}$$

Since B_{jt} are asymptotically negligible, we may drop these variables without a loss of generality:

$$\Delta y_t = \delta_3 D_{1t} + \delta_4 D_{2t} + u_t \,.$$

For $t \leq T_B$, we obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}_3 = \frac{1}{T_B\text{-}1} \sum_{i=2}^{T_B} \Delta y_t = \frac{1}{T_B\text{-}1} \sum_{i=2}^{T_B} (\delta_3 D_{1t} + \delta_4 D_{2t} + u_t) = \delta_3 + \frac{1}{T_B\text{-}1} \sum_{i=2}^{T_B} u_t \,,$$

and

$$\sqrt{T}\,(\tilde{\delta}_3\text{-}\delta_3) \;\rightarrow \sigma\, W(\lambda)\,/\lambda \,. \tag{A.2}$$

Further, for $r \leq \lambda$, by defining $r^* = r/\lambda$, $r^* \in [0, 1]$, we have:

$$W(r) - r\,W(\lambda)\,/\lambda = W(r^*\lambda) - r^*\lambda W(\lambda)\,/\lambda = \sqrt{\lambda}\,[W(r^*) - r^* W(1)] \,,$$

where we define

$$V_1(r^*) \equiv W(r/\lambda) - (r/\lambda)W(1) = W(r^*) - r^* W(1). \tag{A.3}$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}_4 = \frac{1}{T\text{-}T_B} \sum_{i=T_B+1}^{T} \Delta y_t = \frac{1}{T\text{-}T_B} \sum_{i=T_B+1}^{T} (\delta_3 D_{1t} + \delta_4 D_{2t} + u_t) = \delta_4 + \frac{1}{T\text{-}T_B} \sum_{i=T_B+1}^{T} u_t \,,$$

and

$$\sqrt{T}\,(\tilde{\delta}_4\text{-}\delta_4) \;\rightarrow \sigma\, W(1\text{-}\lambda)\,/(1\text{-}\lambda) = \sigma\sqrt{1\text{-}\lambda}\; W(1).$$

Further, for $r > \lambda$, by defining $r^+ = (r\text{-}\lambda)/(1-\lambda)$, $r^+ \in [0,1]$, we have

$$W(r) - (r\text{-}\lambda)W(1\text{-}\lambda)/(1\text{-}\lambda) = W(r^+(1\text{-}\lambda)) - r^+(1\text{-}\lambda)W(1\text{-}\lambda)/(1\text{-}\lambda)$$

$$= \sqrt{1\text{-}\lambda}\,[W(r^+) - r^+\, W(1)],$$

where we define

$$V_2(r^+) \equiv W((r\text{-}\lambda)/(1-\lambda)) - ((r\text{-}\lambda)/(1-\lambda))W(1) = W(r^+) - r^+W(1). \qquad \text{(A.4)}$$

Combining (A.3) and (A.4), we obtain

$$V^*(r) = \sqrt{\lambda}\; V_1(r/\lambda) \qquad \text{for } r \le \lambda\,,$$

$$\sqrt{1\text{-}\lambda}\; V_2((r\text{-}\lambda)(1-\lambda)) \qquad \textit{for } r > \lambda\,.$$

Then, it is easy to see that

$$T^{-2}\sum_{i=2}^{T}\tilde{S}_t^{\,2} \rightarrow \sigma^2\int_0^1 V(\mathrm{r})^2\,dr = \sigma^2\Big[\lambda\int_0^{\lambda} V(r/\lambda)^2\,dr + (1\text{-}\lambda)\int_{\lambda}^1 V((r\text{-}\lambda)/(1-\lambda))^2\,dr\Big]$$

$$=\sigma^2\Big[\lambda^2\int_0^1 V_1(r^*)^2\,dr^* + (1\text{-}\lambda)^2\int_0^1 V_2(r^+)^2\,dr^+\Big].$$

In the case of multiple breaks, we consider λ_t^* as defined in Proposition 1 and can easily show the expression for $V_i(r)$ as:

$$V_i^*(r) = \begin{cases} \sqrt{\lambda_1^*}\,V_1(r/\lambda_1) & \textit{for } r \le \lambda_1 \\ \sqrt{\lambda_2^*}\,V_2[(r-\lambda_1)/(\lambda_2-\lambda_1)] & \textit{for } \lambda_1 < r \le \lambda_2 \\ \;\;\ldots\ldots & \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{R+1}^*}\,V_{R+1}[(r-\lambda_R)/(1-\lambda_R)] & \textit{for } \lambda_{\mathrm{R}} < r \le 1 \end{cases} \qquad . \qquad \text{(A.5)}$$

Thus, using a common argument r we get:

$$T^{-2}\sum_{i=2}^{T}\tilde{S}_t^{\,2} \;\rightarrow\; \sigma^2\int_0^1 V(r)^2\,dr$$

$$= \sigma^2 \left[\lambda_1^* \int_0^{\lambda_1^*} V(r/\lambda_1^*)^2\, dr + \lambda_2^* \int_{\lambda_1^*}^{\lambda_2^*} V((r-\lambda_1^*)/(\lambda_2^*-\lambda_1^*)^2\, dr\right.$$

$$\left. + \;....\; + \;\lambda_{R+1}^* \int_{\lambda_R^*}^{1} V((r-\lambda_R^*)/(1-\lambda_R^*)^2\, dr\right]$$

$$= \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{R+1} \lambda_i^{*2} \int_0^1 V_i(r)^2\, dr\,.$$

For the distribution of the test statistic, we examine regression (4) and obtain:

$$\tilde{\phi} = (\tilde{S}_1{}' M_{\Delta Z}\, \tilde{S}_1)^{-1} (\tilde{S}_1{}' M_{\Delta Z}\, \Delta y)\,, \tag{A.6}$$

where $\tilde{S}_1 = (\tilde{S}_1,.., \tilde{S}_{T-1})'$, $\Delta Z = (\Delta Z_2,..,\Delta Z_T)'$, $\Delta y = (\Delta y_2,..,\Delta y_T)'$, and $M_{\Delta Z} = I - \Delta Z(\Delta Z'\Delta Z)^{-1}\Delta Z'$.

It can be shown that:

$$T^{-2}\, \tilde{S}_1{}' M_{\Delta Z}\, \tilde{S}_1 \rightarrow \sigma^2 \sum_{i=1}^{R+1} \lambda_i^{*2} \int_0^1 \underline{V}_i\,(r)^2\, dr\,. \tag{A.7}$$

Here, $\underline{V}_i(r)$ is the projection of the process $V_i\,(r)$ on the orthogonal complement of the space spanned by the trend break function $dz(\lambda^*, r)$ as defined over the interval $r \in [0,1]$. That is,

$$\underline{V}_i(r) = V_i\,(r) - dz(\lambda, r)\tilde{\delta}\;,$$

with

$$\tilde{\delta} = \underset{\delta}{argmin} \int_0^1 (V_i(r) - dz(\lambda, r)\delta)^2 dr.$$

We can show that for the second term in (A.6):

$$T^{-1}\, \tilde{S}_1{}' M_{\Delta Z}\, \Delta y = T^{-1}\, \tilde{S}_1{}' M_{\Delta Z}\, \varepsilon = T^{-1}\, \tilde{S}_1{}'\, \underline{\varepsilon} \rightarrow -0.5\sigma_\varepsilon^2, \tag{A.8}$$

where $\underline{\varepsilon} = M_{\Delta Z}\, \varepsilon$. Combining this result with (A.7) we obtain

$$\tilde{\rho} = T\, \tilde{\phi} \;\rightarrow -0.5(\sigma_\varepsilon^2/\sigma^2)\, [\sum_{i=1}^{R+1} \lambda_i^{*2} \int_0^1 \underline{V}^*_i(r)^2\, dr]^{-1}\,.$$

Accordingly, the limiting distribution of $\tilde{\tau}$ is obtained as:

$$\tilde{\tau} \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}\,\omega\,[\sum_{i=1}^{R+1}\lambda_i^{*2}\int_0^1 \underline{V}^*_i(r)^2 dr]^{-1/2}\,.$$

Proof of Theorem 1

When $\tilde{S}_t$ is divided by the fraction of each sub-sample, it is easy to see that:

$$T^{-2}\sum_{i=2}^{T}\tilde{S}_t^{*2} \rightarrow \sigma^2\,[\,(1/\lambda_1^*)^2\lambda_1^*\int_0^{\lambda_1^*} V(r/\lambda_1^*)^2\,dr$$

$$+\,(1/\lambda_2^*)^2\lambda_2^*\int_{\lambda_1^*}^{\lambda_2^*} V((r-\lambda_1^*)/(\lambda_2^*-\lambda_1^*)^2\,dr$$

$$+\;\ldots\;+\;(1/\lambda_R^*)^2\lambda_{R+1}^*\int_{\lambda_R^*}^{1} V((r-\lambda_R^*)/(1-\lambda_R^*)^2\,dr]$$

$$=\sigma^2\sum_{i=1}^{R+1}\int_0^1 V_i(r)^2\,dr\,,$$

where $\tilde{S}_1^* = (\tilde{S}_1^*,..,\tilde{S}_{T-1}^*)'$ is used. Accordingly, we get:

$$T^{-2}\,\tilde{S}_1^{*\prime}M_{\Delta Z}\,\tilde{S}_1^* \rightarrow \sigma^2\sum_{i=1}^{R+1}\int_0^1 \underline{V}_i(r)^2\,dr. \tag{A.9}$$

Then, it can be shown that the asymptotic distributions of $\tilde{\tau}^*$ become invariant to the nuisance parameter λ as follows:

$$\tilde{\tau}^* \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}\,[\sum_{i=1}^{R+1}\int_0^1 \underline{V}_i(r)^2 dr]^{-1/2}\,. \tag{A.10}$$

APPENDIX B.

We provide finite sample Monte Carlo simulation results on the panel LM unit root tests with trend breaks. Our goal is to verify the theoretical results presented in the main text, and to examine the general performance of the tests. To perform our simulations, pseudo-iid $N(0,1)$ random numbers were generated using the Gauss procedure RNDNS and all calculations were conducted using the Gauss software version 8.0. For simplicity, we let $Z_t = [1, t, D_t, DT_t^*]'$ and $\delta = [\delta_1, \delta_2, \delta_3, \delta_4]'$ so that δ_3 is the level shift coefficient and δ_4 is the trend break coefficient. We also let $\lambda = T_B/T$ denote the fraction of the series before the break occurs at $t = T_B + 1$. The initial values y_0 and ε_0 are assumed to be random, and we assume that $\sigma_\varepsilon^2 = 1$. All simulation results are calculated using 20,000 replications. The size (frequency of rejections under the null when $\beta = 1$) and power (frequency of rejections under the alternative when $\beta = 0.9$) of the tests are evaluated using 5% critical values.

In Appendix Table 1, we report the size and power properties of the univariate unit root tests for different break magnitudes and locations. In each case, we wish to examine how the transformed test ($\tilde{\tau}^*$) and untransformed test ($\tilde{\tau}$) behave under the null and alternative hypotheses. In particular, we wish to examine if the transformed test ($\tilde{\tau}^*$) is invariant to the size and location of breaks. The results reported in Appendix Table 1 show that both tests have reasonably good size under the null. While they show mild size distortions in some cases, there is no clear pattern of significant size distortions. This is an encouraging finding and supports our proposition that the size properties are fairly invariant to different locations and magnitudes of level and trend breaks. Comparing the size properties of the transformed test with the untransformed test we see little difference, although the transformed test has marginally more accurate size than the untransformed test. Thus, the (untransformed) LM test is fairly less sensitive to the location of

In Appendix Table 2, we report the size and power properties of the panel unit root tests for different break magnitudes and locations. The motivation for this simulation is the same as that of the univariate tests. We wish to confirm that the transformed panel tests $LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$, which are based on the transformed univariate tests, $\tilde{\tau}_i^*$, are robust to different break locations. To show this, we set the break location parameter $\lambda = 0.3$. We also consider the untransformed tests $LM(\tilde{\tau})$, which are based on the untransformed test statistics $\tilde{\tau}$. Since $LM(\tilde{\tau})$ depends on the break location, we will need to use the mean and variances that correspond to correct break locations. However, we still use the same mean and variances of the transformed test statistics to see how they behave under the null and alternative hypotheses. Moreover, we also examine the panel LM unit root tests without breaks under the heading of "LM no break" as well as the IPS tests without breaks under the heading of "DF no break," respectively. The results reported in Appendix Table 2 show that the transformed test $LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$ has reasonably good size under the null. In addition, the power property seems reasonable. While the test shows mild size distortions in some cases, there is no clear pattern of significant size distortions. These results are gratifying

The results in Appendix Table 3 are based on the case where the break location is given randomly at any location. We use the uniform distribution for the break location (λ) between 0.15 and 0.85. The pattern of the results is not much different from that in Appendix Table 2. The transformed panel LM tests are mostly robust to different break locations and the untransformed tests show size distortions and loss of power. The panel tests without breaks exhibit a considerable loss of power.

APPENDIX TABLE 1: SIZE & POWER OF UNIVARIATE LM UNIT ROOT TEST
5% REJECTION RATES

			T=100				T=500			
DGP			Size (β=1.0)		Power (β=1.0)		Size (β=1.0)		Power (β=1.0)	
δ_3	δ_4	λ	$\tilde{\tau}^*$	$\tilde{\tau}$	$\tilde{\tau}^*$	$\tilde{\tau}$	$\tilde{\tau}^*$	$\tilde{\tau}$	$\tilde{\tau}^*$	$\tilde{\tau}$
2	0.5	0.3	0.043	0.039	0.138	0.137	0.045	0.044	0.973	0.991
		0.5	0.054	0.054	0.149	0.149	0.048	0.048	0.995	0.995
		0.8	0.040	0.034	0.120	0.120	0.050	0.038	0.874	0.996
5	0.5	0.3	0.049	0.042	0.131	0.128	0.041	0.036	0.976	0.991
		0.5	0.053	0.053	0.149	0.149	0.050	0.050	0.996	0.996
		0.8	0.039	0.031	0.130	0.134	0.044	0.028	0.872	0.996
2	1	0.3	0.042	0.041	0.134	0.132	0.049	0.041	0.970	0.990
		0.5	0.048	0.048	0.147	0.147	0.053	0.053	0.994	0.994
		0.8	0.043	0.030	0.125	0.128	0.048	0.029	0.880	0.994
5	1	0.3	0.046	0.040	0.129	0.133	0.044	0.040	0.975	0.993
		0.5	0.047	0.047	0.148	0.148	0.048	0.048	0.994	0.994
		0.8	0.040	0.031	0.122	0.125	0.048	0.033	0.870	0.997
5	1.5	0.3	0.043	0.038	0.137	0.127	0.051	0.042	0.972	0.992
		0.5	0.052	0.052	0.148	0.148	0.045	0.045	0.995	0.995
		0.8	0.043	0.033	0.120	0.132	0.050	0.031	0.873	0.998
10	1.5	0.3	0.048	0.038	0.136	0.132	0.050	0.045	0.972	0.990
		0.5	0.051	0.051	0.144	0.144	0.048	0.048	0.995	0.995
		0.8	0.044	0.034	0.121	0.122	0.051	0.033	0.870	0.994
5	3	0.3	0.046	0.040	0.137	0.134	0.050	0.041	0.974	0.992
		0.5	0.048	0.048	0.149	0.149	0.048	0.048	0.994	0.994
		0.8	0.041	0.029	0.131	0.126	0.054	0.034	0.876	0.997

Notes: T = # of time periods; δ_3 = intercept coefficient; δ_4 = break coefficient (magnitude of the break); λ = break location; $\tilde{\tau}^*$ = transformed univariate test statistic; $\tilde{\tau}$ = untransformed univariate test statistic.

APPENDIX TABLE 2: SIZE & POWER OF PANEL LM UNIT ROOT TEST
5% REJECTION RATES, δ_4 = 0.5, λ = 0.3

		T=25		*T*=50		*T*=100		*T*=250	
N	Test	size	power	size	power	size	power	size	power
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.047	0.068	0.036	0.148	0.044	0.659	0.051	1.000
10	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.035	0.059	0.025	0.109	0.015	0.613	0.018	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.000	0.024	0.001
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.032	0.059	0.029	0.240	0.048	0.950	0.042	1.000
25	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.019	0.035	0.008	0.132	0.011	0.927	0.008	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.006	0.001	0.131	0.468
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.017	0.051	0.026	0.370	0.035	0.999	0.041	1.000
50	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.008	0.027	0.003	0.169	0.003	0.997	0.003	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.004	0.492	1.000
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.014	0.063	0.015	0.607	0.025	1.000	0.036	1.000
100	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.002	0.018	0.000	0.228	0.000	1.000	0.000	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.017	0.039	0.904	1.000

Notes: δ_4 = break coefficient (magnitude of the break); λ = break location; T = # of time periods; N = # of cross sections; $LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$ = transformed panel LM test statistic allowing for level and trend breaks; $LM(\tilde{\tau})$ = untransformed panel LM test statistic allowing for level and trend breaks; "LM no break" = a conventional LM-type panel unit root test without allowing for breaks; "DF no break" = a conventional Dickey-Fuller-type panel unit root test without allowing for breaks.

APPENDIX TABLE 3: SIZE & POWER OF PANEL LM UNIT ROOT TEST
5% REJECTION RATES, δ_4 = 0.5; λ = RANDOMLY DETERMINED

		T=25		T=50		T=100		T=250	
N	Test	size	power	size	power	size	power	size	power
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.034	0.047	0.050	0.165	0.043	0.676	0.054	1.000
10	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.024	0.035	0.026	0.127	0.020	0.640	0.026	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.005	0.000	0.024	0.001
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.017	0.036	0.030	0.228	0.038	0.945	0.050	1.000
25	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.008	0.021	0.009	0.140	0.007	0.924	0.007	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.016	0.037	0.020	0.353	0.039	0.999	0.036	1.000
50	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.004	0.017	0.005	0.161	0.002	0.998	0.002	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	$LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$	0.006	0.029	0.016	0.579	0.025	1.000	0.043	1.000
100	$LM(\tilde{\tau})$	0.001	0.005	0.000	0.239	0.000	1.000	0.000	1.000
	LM no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	DF no break	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

Notes: δ_4 = break coefficient (magnitude of the break); λ = break location; T = # of time periods; N = # of cross sections; $LM(\tilde{\tau}^*)$ = transformed panel LM test statistic allowing for level and trend breaks; $LM(\tilde{\tau})$ = untransformed panel LM test statistic allowing for level and trend breaks; "LM no break" = a conventional LM-type panel unit root test without allowing for breaks; "DF no break" = a conventional Dickey-Fuller-type panel unit root test without allowing for breaks.