

A contribution to the analysis of historical economic fluctuations (1870-2010): filtering, spurious cycles and unobserved component modelling

José Luis Cendejas · Félix-Fernando Muñoz (✉) · Nadia Fernández-de-Pinedo

Abstract: Time series filtering methods such as the Hodrick-Prescott (HP) filter, with a consensual choice of the smoothing parameter, eliminate the possibility of identifying long swing cycles (e.g., Kondratieff-type) or, alternatively, may distort periodicities that are in fact present in the data, giving rise, for example, to spurious Kuznets-type cycles. In this paper, we propose filtering Maddison's time series for the period 1870-2010 for a selection of developed countries using a less restrictive filtering technique that does not impose but rather estimates the cut-off frequency. In particular, we use unobserved component models that optimally estimate the smoothing parameter. Using this methodology, we identify cycles of periods mainly in the range of 4-7 years (Juglar-type cycles), as well as a number of patterns of cyclical convergence. Historical processes behind this last empirical finding are analyzed: peacetimes, monetary arrangements, trade and investment flows, and industrial boost, are confluent forces driving the economic dynamism. After 1950, a common business cycle factor grouping all economies is found, what is consistent with the consolidation of the so-called second globalization.

Keywords: historical business cycles, spectral analysis, unobserved component models, Maddison's time series

JEL: C32, E32, N1

J.L. Cendejas

Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales Francisco de Vitoria. Universidad Francisco de Vitoria. Pozuelo de Alarcón. 28223. Madrid. SPAIN

E-mail: joseluis.cendejas@iies-fv.es

F.-F. Muñoz (✉)

Departamento de Análisis Económico: Teoría Económica e Historia Económica. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. 28049. Madrid. SPAIN

E-mail: felix.munoz@uam.es. Tel.: (+34) 91 497 43 95. Fax: (+34) 91 497 70 69

N. Fernández-de-Pinedo

Departamento de Análisis Económico: Teoría Económica e Historia Económica. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid. 28049. Madrid. SPAIN

E-mail: nadia.pinedo@uam.es.

Acknowledgements: We acknowledge research funding from Instituto de Investigaciones Económicas y Sociales Francisco de Vitoria (Grant #6-2015); Spanish National Plan for Scientific and Technical Research and Innovation grants CSO2014-53293-R and HAR 2012-35965/His; and the research group IT807-13.

1. Introduction

In a recent and suggestive paper, Diebolt (2014) claims to have identified a Kuznets-type cycle from a cliometric exercise based on the spectral analysis of Maddison's GDP series (Maddison, 2009; Bolt and Zanden, 2013). To this end, he previously proceeded to filter GDP series with the Hodrick-Prescott (1997) filter, and the spectra are estimated from the cycle component (deviation from the HP trend). In these spectra, a frequency corresponding to Kuznets-type cycles (approximately 20 years; Kuznets 1930, 1961) dominates. He identifies as well a common component for the economies in the sample.¹ Finally, Diebolt attributes the existence of Kuznets cycles to a demographic cycle that would manifest in housing and infrastructure demand and discards explanations of Kondratieff-type.² An important problem with this filtering procedure is the possibility of inducing spurious cycles or other types of distortions in the filtered series when, for example, the smoothing parameter (in HP filter) is imposed *a priori* (e.g., Pedersen 2001). Indeed, historical events could influence the period of the recorded fluctuations, or cause structural changes in the parameters of the models employed (Darné and Diebolt 2004; Metz 2010). In this later case, a flexible and parsimonious parameter representation could help to avoid the aforementioned problems.

The main difficulty in the historical analysis of economic fluctuations, apart from the availability of reliable data, is the conceivable overlapping of waves of different periodicity (Schumpeter, 1939). In its origin, this was a fundamental question not satisfactorily resolved because of the insufficient statistical and computational tools (Nerlove et al. 1979). Although the beginnings of time series analysis took place in the thirties (Yule 1927; Slutsky 1937; Wold 1938), the main econometric agenda was until the seventies centered on the linear regression model and its extension to simultaneous equation modelling (Epstein 1987, Morgan 1990, Hendry and Morgan 1995). The restatement of time series analysis in economics under the Box-Jenkins (1970) paradigm caused the return to the former interest on unobserved components.³ The decomposition of economic time series in trend and cycle (in addition to the seasonal and the irregular components) is clearly related to notions of secular evolution (long swings), which is eventually linked to long-term growth, and business cycle dynamics. Fortunately, we dispose today of a panoply of techniques to efficiently address this problem (see Mills 2009); however, they are usually unknown and seldom applied in the analysis of historical time series.⁴

In this paper we propose estimating an unobserved component model to resolve this signal extraction problem, in which the smoothing parameter (a signal-to-noise ratio) is estimated optimally at the same time that the filtered components are obtained by means of the Kalman filter and the associated state space

¹ Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, the UK, and the USA. In what follows, we add Spain and Switzerland.

² Discarding these types of results is trivial, as a sample of 140 observations would scarcely allow finding three complete cycles with a 50-year period.

³ However, the Box-Jenkins methodology, based on differencing to achieve stationarity, eliminates long-term dynamics and obscures the cyclical one.

⁴ An example is Cendejas & Font (2015), in which the price series of Hamilton have been modelled and analysed to obtain estimations of the common cyclical content of the Spanish historical inflation.

expression of the model (Harvey 1989). This procedure does not introduce distortions by overweighting irrelevant frequencies or causing the appearance of inexistent cycles. Informally, we let the data “speak for themselves”.

We apply this univariate unobserved component model to a sample of Maddison’s GDP series.⁵ We find a classical business cycle of a duration in the range 4-7 years (Juglar-type cycles), and that there is no evidence of long swings or Kuznets-type cycles. Peacetimes, monetary arrangements, trade and investment flows, and industrial boost, are confluent processes driving the economic dynamism and producing a number of patterns of cyclical convergence in GDP series. Common factors capture the underlying common variation resulting from these patterns. Cyclical convergence is very strong after 1950, when cyclical phases between economies are synchronized (one factor grouping all the economies has been found), and the standard deviation of the cyclical period is approximately one year. This fact coincides with the second wave of the globalization and is supported by the periodicity established by economic historians (see for example Williamson 1996).

The rest of the paper is as follows. In Section 2, we expose, first, the univariate unobserved component modelling and its frequency domain implications; second, an outline of the usual static common factor methodology that we employ to explore the existence of common cycles from the components previously estimated; and third, a multivariate common factor model that embodies common cyclical variation. In Section 3, the cyclical components are estimated, the existence of common cyclical factors between economies is discussed and, according to this finding, the multivariate common factor model is estimated. In particular, an increasing cyclical coherence is found, especially after 1950. An explanation based on related economic history processes is provided.⁶ The paper ends with some concluding remarks.

2. Unobserved component modelling

The possibility of inducing periodicities not really present in the observed time series as a consequence of the filtering method has been known since the 30s. The so-called Yule-Slutsky effect (Yule, 1927; Slutsky 1937) consists in generating cyclical fluctuations only by summing and differencing a white noise process. Kuznets cycles of approximately twenty years have become a classical example of a “statistical artefact” (Adelman, 1965; Howrey, 1968). Kuznets transformed precisely the original series by averaging and differencing (Sargent 1979, pp. 248-251; Pedersen, 2001), causing the spectral gain of the implicit filter to show an important peak at the frequency of 20.25 years. In case of transforming a white noise process by

⁵ In this paper, no attempt is made to discuss the statistical work; it is known that the database employed could influence empirical results. Comparisons are always problematic and depend on the quality of the data (see Zarnowitz 1992).

⁶ As Demeulemeester and Diebolt (2011: 2) suggested, it is important to reintroduce history and historicity in metric analysis. In this paper, we have attempted to combine both sides with a dynamic perspective and we present an estimation method with an historical overview.

this filter, a cycle of this period will be found. For time series distinct from white noise, this filter would favor the appearance of periods of approximately 20 years.

This distortion, in which the filter contains a cycle that passes into the filtered series, must be distinguished from the effects derived from imposing a cut-off frequency on economic series with the typical spectral shape, that is, series that concentrate variance in low frequencies (Granger 1966). In this respect, Nelson and Kang (1981) show how trend removal of a random walk process induces pseudo-periodic behavior in the detrended series, and Nelson (1988) shows how a random walk could be incorrectly decomposed in a relatively smooth trend and in a cycle. Concerning mechanical detrending, when the smoothing parameter λ is imposed in the HP filter, Harvey and Jaeger (1993) show how this procedure gives rise to cyclical behavior, and propose structural models that simultaneously fit trend and cycle to avoid such pitfalls. Cogley and Nason (1995) argue in a similar way. In all these cases, the periodicity found in the filtered series is not strictly spurious because the filter does not have a cycle, although some leakage and compression distortions have taken place.⁷ In our view, in addition to the problem of correctly selecting the desired frequencies, it is important for these frequencies to be fundamental in business cycle dynamics. To address these questions, it is proposed here to let the data locate the frequency in which the cyclical period is concentrated by optimally estimating the parameters in an unobserved component model.

The univariate model

The univariate model estimated here is the *Integrated Random Walk* (IRW) trend model (Young 1984; Harvey, 1989, 2010; Kitawaga and Gersch, 1996). Its multivariate extension to a cyclical common factor model has been employed by Cendejas et al. (2014). The IRW model can be interpreted in terms of growth and acceleration of the variables involved, and it is consistent both with the classical business cycle (expansion and recession states depending on the sign of GDP growth) and endogenous growth theory, in which many models establish the stationary state as a constant growth state and, consequently, the transitional dynamics is a time path for which the second derivative is distinct from zero.

The univariate unobserved component model assumes that each of the observed series (which are expressed in logarithms) follows the equation

$$y_t = \mu_t + \varepsilon_t \tag{1a}$$

where μ_t is a non-stationary trend or level component and $\varepsilon_t \sim NID(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$. In general terms, μ_t can be considered the signal and ε_t the noise, so we are facing a signal extraction problem. The trend μ_t is assumed to change with g_{t-1}

⁷ An ideal band-pass filter would prevent these distortions by excluding absolutely the undesired frequencies (Pederse 2001; Gómez 2001; Harvey and Trimbu 2003).

$$\mu_t = \mu_{t-1} + g_{t-1} \quad (1b)$$

where g_{t-1} can be interpreted as the underlying growth rate of y_t , and therefore, changes in g_t , Δg_t , represent the acceleration of y_t

$$g_t = g_{t-1} + a_{t-1} \quad (1c)$$

where a_{t-1} is the acceleration. The acceleration a_t is characterized as white noise

$$a_t = \eta_t \quad (1d)$$

with $\eta_t \sim NID(0, \sigma_\eta^2)$ and uncorrelated with ε_t . Model (1a) to (1d) is the so-called IRW trend model or “smooth trend” model because of the absence of a noise term in (1b). The sign of the growth g_t could indicate the phase of expansion or recession under a classical business cycle notion. By incorporating an acceleration component, we also consider declines and upturns in the growth rate. Additionally, the acceleration component is related in the frequency domain with the so-called growth cycle (upturns and downturns with respect to a trend) usually estimated by filtering with the HP filter (see Appendix A). So, the IRW model serves as a unified and coherent framework for modelling both types of cyclical dynamics: classical and growth cycles.

In model (1), as well as in the HP filter, the signal-to-noise ratio $q = \frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}$ operates as a smoothing parameter and is the inverse of the smoothing parameter of the HP filter; that is, $\lambda = q^{-1}$. In particular, the lower is q (the higher is λ), the smoother is the trend component μ_t because the filter implied by the IRW model gives more weight to low frequencies when estimating the trend. Consequently, the detrended series, $y_t - \mu_t$, would incorporate a broader range of high frequencies. By imposing the value for $\lambda = 1600$ for quarterly series to obtain a cycle component, the range of frequencies is cutting out at a period of 9.9 years. For annual data, the usual value of $\lambda = 100$ divides the interval of frequencies at a period of 19.8 years. So, due to filtering by imposing λ , frequencies of a period longer than a certain duration will scarcely be present in the detrended series. In particular, if present, Kondratieff’s long swings will not be found in annual series after detrending with $\lambda = 100$. On the contrary, the leakage distortion mentioned earlier will favor the appearance of cycles of approximately 20 years.

To avoid the risk of detecting cycles of distorted period, it is proposed here to estimate the signal-to-noise ratio optimally and let the data locate the frequency in which the cyclical period is concentrated. The state space form of the model (1) (see Appendix B) allows the variances in q to be estimated by maximum likelihood by using the Kalman filter (Harvey, 1989; Durbin and Koopman, 2001) and to obtain the

predicted components (as conditioned by the information available up to $t - 1$), the filtered components (as conditioned by the information available up to t) and the smoothed components (using the full sample). If we are interested in post-sample or historical analysis, the smoothed components are more appropriate. These components are the trend, $\hat{\mu}_t$, the underlying growth rate, \hat{g}_t , the acceleration, \hat{a}_t , and the deviation respect to the trend, $\hat{C}_t^{HP} = y_t - \hat{\mu}_t$. The properties in the frequency domain, that is, the spectral gains of the filters implied by these four components are obtained in Appendix A.

The spectral gain of a filter measures the increase in amplitude of any specific frequency component of a time series. The gains corresponding to the four components are represented in Figure 1. In this figure, the spectral gains of the filters for the trend, growth and acceleration components (the latter coinciding with that of \hat{C}_t^{HP} when normalizing) have been represented as an example value $q = 0.01$ ($\lambda = 100$). The gains of the filters of \hat{g}_t and \hat{a}_t have been normalized in such a way that the gain is 1 in their maxima (ω_{\max} according to equation (A5) and π , respectively, with the original gains being $\frac{\sqrt{q}}{2}$ and q). With regard to $\hat{\mu}_t$ and \hat{C}_t^{HP} , their maximum gains are reached at the frequencies 0 and π with a gain of 1 in both cases. In view of this figure, the estimated components select the range of frequencies present in the observed series with the weights corresponding to the gain (not normalized) of the corresponding filter. For example, in the trend, the frequencies will remain mainly below a period of 19.8 years; in the growth component the frequencies around this period; and in the acceleration (or \hat{C}_t^{HP}) component above this period. When imposing the smoothing parameter λ in the HP filter, \hat{C}_t^{HP} may exclude frequencies that are important in the observed series. On the contrary, the estimation of λ leaves the data to locate the maximum gain in \hat{g}_t , that is, following a classical business cycle concept and, according to this period, the implied growth cycle \hat{C}_t^{HP} . This method simultaneously estimates both types of cycles, allowing a more coherent analysis.

[Figure 1 about here]

Static common factors

Once the unobserved components have been estimated, we employ the underlying growth rates for the different economies, \hat{g}_{it} , to explore the presence of common growth factors along the sample period. Common factors are the underlying common variations resulting from the existence of common patterns in \hat{g}_{it} . They are obtained by synthesizing in few variables (unobserved factors) the common information present in a wider set of variables. Let $y_t = (\hat{g}_{1t}, \hat{g}_{2t}, \dots, \hat{g}_{nt})'$ the vector of n underlying growth components. The vector y_t can be reduced to a simpler structure of m unobserved variables called factors

with $m < n$. In what follows, the standardized variables, $x_{it} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}} (\hat{g}_{it} - \bar{\hat{g}}_i)$, are considered, where $\bar{\hat{g}}_i$ and $\sigma_{\hat{g}_i}$ are the mean and the standard deviation, respectively, of \hat{g}_{it} . Each time series x_{it} can be written as

$$x_{it} = \lambda_{i1}f_{1t} + \lambda_{i2}f_{2t} + \dots + \lambda_{im}f_{mt} + v_{it} = \lambda_i' f_t + v_{it} \quad (2)$$

where λ_{ik} are the factor loadings, f_{kt} the factors, and v_{it} an idiosyncratic or specific error. In vector form,

$$x_t = \Lambda f_t + v_t \quad \text{with} \quad x_t = (x_{1t}, x_{2t}, \dots, x_{nt})', \quad \Lambda = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda_{11} & \lambda_{12} & \dots & \lambda_{1m} \\ \lambda_{21} & \lambda_{22} & \dots & \lambda_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \lambda_{n1} & \lambda_{n2} & \dots & \lambda_{nm} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{the matrix of factor loadings,}$$

$f_t = (f_{1t}, f_{2t}, \dots, f_{mt})'$ the vector of factors, and $v_t = (v_{1t}, v_{2t}, \dots, v_{nt})'$ the vector of errors. Under the orthogonal (or classical) factor model assumptions, model (2) can be estimated by maximum likelihood by assuming that $x_t \sim N(0_n, \Gamma)$,⁸ where $\Gamma = \Lambda \Lambda' + \Sigma$ is the correlation matrix of x_t , and

$\Sigma = E[v_t v_t'] = \text{diag}(\sigma_{v_i}^2)$. Estimates of Λ and Σ are obtained under the constraint $\Lambda' \Sigma^{-1} \Lambda = \Delta$, with Δ

a diagonal matrix. This condition assures the identification of the factor model. From Γ , a variance decomposition is obtained for every x_{it} . In the diagonal of Γ , the correlation of x_{it} (trivially equal to 1)

is $\rho(x_{it}, x_{it}) = c_i^2 + \sigma_{v_i}^2 = 1$, with $c_i^2 = \sum_{k=1}^m \lambda_{ik}^2$ the communality of x_{it} (the percentage of correlation

explained by the common factors), and $\sigma_{v_i}^2$ its uniqueness or specificity (the percentage of correlation not explained by the common factors).

The multivariate common factor model

From exploratory factor analysis, when the existence of a common factor grouping several economies could be accepted, a multivariate common factor model is estimated. The multivariate common factor model generalizes the IRW model by assuming common accelerations. So, equations (1a) and (1b) are merely sub-indexed accordingly

$$y_{i,t} = \mu_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (3a)$$

$$\mu_{i,t} = \mu_{i,t-1} + g_{i,t-1} \quad (3b)$$

⁸ The orthogonal (or classical) factor model is standard, see, for example, Tsay (2005: 426-429).

with $\varepsilon_{i,t} \sim NID(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2)$ and uncorrelated across i 's in all leads and lags, while the underlying growth components are assumed to follow

$$g_{i,t} = g_{i,t-1} + \gamma_i a_{t-1} + a_{i,t-1} \quad (3c)$$

Equation (3c) implies that changes in $g_{i,t}$, $\Delta g_{i,t}$, are the sum of a common acceleration component, a_t , shared with the other series in the model and an idiosyncratic or specific acceleration component, $a_{i,t}$. The parameter γ_i is the factor loading that acts as a scale factor that amplifies or reduces a_t (if positive; if negative, the variable would be countercyclical). Both acceleration components, a_t and $a_{i,t}$, are assumed to be white noise processes⁹

$$a_t = \eta_t \quad (3d)$$

$$a_{i,t} = \eta_{i,t} \quad (3e)$$

with $\eta_t \sim NID(0,1)$, $\eta_{i,t} \sim NID(0, \sigma_{\eta_i}^2)$, mutually uncorrelated and with respect to $\varepsilon_{i,t}$ in all leads and lags. The variance of η_t is normalized to unity to allow the identification of the model. The specification of equation (3c) is based on the unobserved component model with a common cyclical factor proposed by Stock and Watson (1989, 1991) to obtain a coincidental economic indicator from first log-difference time series.

Given that the signal is $\mu_{i,t} = \frac{\gamma_i \eta_{t-2} + \eta_{i,t-2}}{(1-L)^2}$ and analogously to equation (A1), the WK filter of the trend component is

$$\hat{\mu}_{i,t} = \frac{\frac{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2}}{\frac{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} + \sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2} y_{i,t} = \frac{q_i}{q_i + |1-L|^4} y_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

⁹ Alternatively, a_t and $a_{i,t}$ could follow autoregressive processes if some cyclical persistence is present. In this case, equations (3d) and (3e) would be $\phi(L)a_t = \eta_t$ and $\phi_i(L)a_{i,t} = \eta_{i,t}$ with $\phi(L)$ and $\phi_i(L)$ the respective autoregressive polynomials.

where the signal-to-noise ratio is now $q_i = \frac{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2} = q_i^c + q_i^s$, with the ratios $q_i^c = \frac{\gamma_i^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2}$ and $q_i^s = \frac{\sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2}$

expressing the signal-to-noise ratio decomposition due to the common and the specific components. In percentage terms

$$w_i^c + w_i^s = \frac{q_i^c}{q_i} + \frac{q_i^s}{q_i} = \frac{\gamma_i^2}{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2} + \frac{\sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2} = 1 \quad (5)$$

where the weightings, w_i^c and w_i^s , quantify the relative importance of the common and the specific variation on every unobserved component.

3. Empirical results and discussion

Hereafter, we present the estimation results¹⁰ of the univariate IRW model for the Maddison GDP series as well as the exploratory analysis of common factors together with an economic history interpretation. An important finding is the existence of a unique common factor grouping all the economies in the sample from 1950. This common factor allows the possibility to estimate the multivariate IRW model (3) and to analyze the importance of the common business cycle on the national ones.

	Full sample estimations			Sub-sample estimations			
	σ_{ε}^2	σ_{η}^2	$q = \frac{\sigma_{\eta}^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon}^2}$	Duration of the cycles (years)			
				1870-2010	1870-1914	1915-1949	1950-2010
Australia	4.3868 (0.8709)	4.8908 (1.3122)	1.1149 (0.4439)	5.8 (0.64)	8.5 (1.46)	(*)	7.1 (1.87)
Austria	24.8728 (5.4456)	26.6981 (8.2012)	1.0734 (0.5001)	5.9 (0.76)	3.8 (na)	5.8 (1.37)	5.3 (1.17)
Belgium	4.5933 (1.0842)	5.6593 (1.7976)	1.2321 (0.6128)	5.7 (0.79)	6.0 (2.38)	5.4 (1.59)	6.5 (1.19)
Canada	4.1827 (1.0997)	13.7857 (3.2229)	3.2959 (1.4322)	4.3 (0.57)	6.7 (1.66)	3.0 (1.12)	5.3 (1.35)
Denmark	6.1104 (1.1549)	1.9121 (0.7653)	0.3129 (0.1652)	8.2 (1.14)	18.3 (3.57)	8.2 (2.63)	7.5 (1.49)
Finland	4.3643 (1.2129)	10.0232 (2.9024)	2.2966 (1.1809)	4.7 (0.72)	6.3 (1.52)	5.0 (1.64)	2.9 (2.25)
France	12.1745 (2.4542)	14.1720 (3.8118)	1.1641 (0.4688)	5.8 (0.64)	(*)	5.4 (1.37)	5.0 (1.26)
Germany	10.6739 (4.3631)	47.3368 (14.4031)	4.4348 (2.9730)	3.9 (0.84)	9.1 (2.75)	3.6 (1.70)	9.1 (1.73)
Italy	1.5268 (0.9726)	19.9553 (4.8363)	13.0701 (10.9305)	2.5 (1.28)	11.2 (2.37)	(*)	6.4 (1.39)
Japan	19.6793 (3.6905)	11.8675 (3.7053)	0.6030 (0.2607)	6.9 (0.80)	29.6 (12.45)	6.1 (1.59)	4.5 (1.07)

¹⁰ The estimation results of Tables 1, 3 and 4 have been obtained by programming on Matlab R2010b ©. We have checked that some estimation differences appear depending on the Matlab version employed when running the code.

Netherlands	12.2482 (3.1892)	19.1989 (6.1466)	1.5675 (0.8275)	5.3 (0.79)	11.2 (3.71)	5.4 (1.88)	4.4 (1.10)
Norway	4.3379 (0.8548)	2.9147 (0.9394)	0.6719 (0.3060)	6.7 (0.82)	4.4 (1.47)	7.3 (1.74)	3.5 (1.19)
Spain	5.6170 (1.4850)	6.7703 (2.4701)	1.2053 (0.6992)	5.7 (0.92)	15.4 (4.89)	4.8 (1.75)	2.9 (1.08)
Sweden	3.3955 (0.6462)	2.2589 (0.6948)	0.6653 (0.2867)	6.7 (0.78)	15.9 (3.94)	6.1 (1.62)	5.5 (1.61)
Switzerland	13.1640 (2.4468)	1.6913 (0.8971)	0.1285 (0.0846)	10.3 (1.76)	35.1 (15.56)	9.0 (2.14)	4.1 (2.20)
UK	0.7992 (0.3031)	6.3568 (1.3476)	7.9541 (4.2523)	3.2 (0.65)	3.4 (1.26)	2.6 (1.55)	3.4 (2.34)
USA	4.3795 (1.2259)	17.5426 (3.9837)	4.0057 (1.7852)	4.0 (0.57)	10.5 (2.73)	(*)	6.1 (1.45)
			Mean period	5.6	12.2	5.6	5.3
			Standard deviation	1.9	9.1	1.8	1.7

Table 1. Full sample estimated variances of the univariate IRW model (1) and duration of the cycles derived from the estimated parameter q according to equation (A5) for full sample and sub-sample data. (*) In these cases, the important noisy content of the original data passes into the signal, causing $q > 16$ and preventing the period from being computed according to equation (A5).

Table 1 shows the full sample estimated variances of the univariate IRW model (1) and the periods (duration of the cycles) derived from the estimated parameter q according to equation (A5). Model (1) has also been estimated in sub-samples corresponding to pre-, inter- and post-war periods. Full sample estimations show a mean duration of 5.6 years with a standard deviation of 1.9 years. The range of durations is from the 2.5 years¹¹ of Italy to the 10.3 years of Switzerland. For this economy, the implied smoothing parameter value $\lambda = q^{-1} = 7.78$ (the larger in full sample estimations) shows the inadequacy of imposing $\lambda = 100$ when filtering annual data. The duration characteristics of long swings and Kuznets cycles are clearly excluded. A period in the range of 4 to 7 years is present in 13 of the 17 economies. For sub-samples, the mean duration increases to 12.2 years in the pre-war period with a high standard deviation of 9.1 years. These figures are very influenced by the long periods estimated for Denmark, Japan and Switzerland. The mean durations in the inter- and post-war periods are 5.6 and 5.3 years, respectively, with standard deviations of 1.8 and 1.7 years. When the Maddison original series are supposed to be more reliable (post-WWII period), the durations are within the range from 2.9 years (Finland and Spain) to 9.1 years (Germany). For the USA and the post-war sub-sample, our estimated period (6.1 years) is not very different from that of the NBER (5.7 for the period 1945-2009).¹²

¹¹ Some periods close to 2 years are influenced by the noisy content of the original data that passes into the signal. Consequently, the signal-to-noise ratio is high. For $q > 16$, the frequency exceeds π and the period would not be observable (Nyquist frequency).

¹² <http://www.nber.org/cycles.html>. In relation to the average duration of business cycles for 13 developed countries, Bergman *et al.* (1998) obtain some different results. This is a consequence of both the different filtering methodology (they use a band-pass filter that imposes a range of duration of the business cycle between 2 and 8 years) and the databases employed.

From 1870 to 1914, Switzerland experienced a long cycle coinciding with the higher growth rate (1.7% per year) among the developed European countries due to a combination of political stability, long term investment in industry, FDI (Puig and Castro 2009) and an emerging and solid financial system. Switzerland, as other small countries as Belgium, Denmark or Netherlands, owing to the small size of domestic markets, became an open economy by developing a competitive export sector and several forms of protectionism to secure Swiss industries the domestic market (David and Mach 2007: 220-222).¹³ Other economies also opened during this period. This is the case of Japan: the forced open up of Japanese domestic market during the first wave of globalization -in the Meiji Era- was spectacular. Total trade passed from 10% of GDP in 1870 to 30% in 1910 (Baldwin and Martin 1999 :15). Sweden (total trade 40% of GDP), Norway (69% GDP) or Denmark (60% of GDP) also experienced a great openness before the WWI. On the other side, protectionism and technology renewal were the measures taken by some Western economies to overcome the first adverse shocks -the depressions of 1873 and 1896- due to globalization (Fernández de Pinedo 2012: 52).¹⁴ Although the first globalization (1870-1914) consolidated, several cycles overlapped and developed countries had to cope with numerous crises that affected their economic structures while the gold standard was moving toward consolidation.

After the Franco-Prussian War and the reparations imposed on France, Germany favored the development of joint stock companies (1870) as well as the concentration and vertical integration of its firms. On the other hand, the territorial unification of 1871 led to a real estate boom and the emergence of banks, especially the rapid increase of companies converted to Banks (Maklerbanken or Baubanken) while trying to create a hierarchical banking structure based in Berlin (Kindleberger 2006: 125, 127). However, the stock market crash of 1873 became a depression, intensifying the process of cartelization since 1879 (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971: 41 & 44)¹⁵. On the other side, after the loss of Alsace (1871), France had to overcome also the crunch of 1873.¹⁶ Agricultural trade unions, agricultural credit societies and investment in inputs and machinery were able to trace the agrarian crisis. Public works program -Freycinet Plan- and the rise of the consumer goods industry also helped French performance along with a new tariff policy in 1881-1882 (Lavissee and Rambaud 1901: 774). But growth slowed down again between 1882 and 1886 as a result of the continued decline in prices, bankruptcies¹⁷ and a minor demand. The recovery of France was

¹³ As Sáiz (2014) pointed out Netherlands, Switzerland, and Denmark were patentless economies in nineteenth century that benefited from relaxed IPR regimes and thus become leaders in specific sectors.

¹⁴ The Spanish agriculture expelled thousands of migrants to the Americas but at the same time received a considerable amount of FDI from France and Germany (Puig and Castro 2009), although these investments favored foreign firm more than domestic ones.

¹⁵ At the turn of the century, the second energy revolution led the prominence to the electricity crisis causing a new wave of mergers, this time from the main electricity companies between 1902 and 1903 (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971: 45). The US orders decreased since 1906 and the crisis in the German textile sector arose in 1908 along with the one in the machinery industry in 1909 clearly showing a contraction of the German foreign trade and the declining reserves of the Reichsbank. However, the German production will focused on foreign markets achieving a surplus in its trade balance until 1913.

¹⁶ French agriculture had to face foreign competition since 1880 due to the fall in the cost of transport. Not only grain prices cutback. France transformed from being an exporter of wine to being an importer of 10 million hectoliters in 1890 despite attempts to prevent the phylloxera in the early 1850's. Agriculture setbacks were partly offset by the growth of the cattle industry and the rose in the consumption of meat (Lavissee and Rambaud 1901: 767).

¹⁷ Banque de Lyon et de la Loire, Union Générale.

slower coming from the scandal bankruptcy of the *Compagnie Universelle du Canal interocéanique Panama* (Bouvier 1964), and the failure of the Société des Métaux (1889).¹⁸ These setbacks led to a credit crunch and the establishment of the Méline protective tariff (1892). Investments in Russia favored the French industry in the form of orders until that capital invested vanished with the Russian Revolution.

USA was, after Germany, the second nation shaped by the railway and banking crisis of 1873 or Jay Cooke's panic (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971: 25). A new railway crisis in 1882-1884 meant the end of the railway boom as an instrument of growth and was replaced by pinch-primary sector (cotton and wheat), a very protectionist legislation (tariff McKinley 1890) and a commitment to silver¹⁹ (Kindelberger 2006: 284). After several crisis between 1903 and 1907,²⁰ a new banking system was created with the establishment of the Federal Reserve System, as well as new antitrust laws and tariff reductions that the Underwood Tariff of 1913 (Chang 2008: 54). All these setbacks did not prevent the USA to be the faster economy at this stage.

UK was not immune to the crisis of 1873, however, capital investments abroad were multiplied at the same time at the end of the century (Argentina, Australia, Canada) and allowed to finance imports. After several setbacks²¹ a process of concentration, of merging not only in manufacturing but also in the bank system took place. As a result, the leading UK commercial banks dominated the British financial market (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971: 46).

Table 2 shows the results of the estimation of the static factor models. The sample period has been split into the three major historical periods previously considered.²² The main results are coherent with those observed in Table 1. A noisier pre-war period goes hand-in-hand with the absence of a common factor grouping all economies. Two common factors have been found (Factor 1 and Factor 2). Factor 1 is significantly correlated with 10 of the 17 economies. The maximum correlations correspond to Germany (84%), Belgium (82%) and Austria (80%). The list of economies includes mainly continental Europe together with the USA and Canada, although, in these two cases, their communalities (the percentage of the variance explained by the factors) are small. Consequently, Factor 1 shows mainly a Central European business cycle. The second factor (Factor 2) significantly includes the Scandinavian economies (Norway, Sweden and perhaps, with a non-significant correlation, Finland), France, the UK and Spain. In general, the communalities show a moderate explanatory ability of the factor model coherent with the absence of global cyclical integration. The exceptions are Austria, Belgium, France and Germany, which exceed 50% mainly due to Factor 1. Factor 2 is mainly due to Norway and Sweden and could be interpreted as a

¹⁸ Bulletin Financier, p. 812. Revue des Sciences et des Lettres, 1/01/1889.

¹⁹ Sherman Silver Purchase Act.

²⁰ The so-called "Richman's panic" (1903-1904) which was originated in the steel trust and affected the mining and steel industry. Back in 1907, the urgent need of means of payment, the stock accumulation and the scarcity of gold, end up in a currency crisis that forced US banks to a suspension of payments. (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971: 48).

²¹ UK depression reached during the crisis of 1882 that last until 1886-1887. Then followed the collapse of Barings bank in 1890 due to becoming the financial agent of the poor economic performance of the Argentina Republic. The economy suffered again with the 1907 US crisis, particularly affecting the industry that started major strikes in the textile sector.

²² For a different periodization, see, among others, Foreman-Peck (2007) and Northrup (2005). The one employed here is fairly coincident with that of Maddison (2007).

peripheral factor grouping economies excluded from Factor 1 (negative loadings do not have any special interpretation in this context). When a third factor is added to the model, the communality increases minimally in some cases at the cost of some reduction in others; thus, no further integration, as a clear dependence on common factors, can be found (this also happened in the other periods). These factors and their relation with the estimated growth components, \hat{g}_t , can be seen in Figure 2.

	1870-1914			1915-1949			1950-2010		
	Factor 1 loadings	Factor 2 loadings	Communality	Factor 3 loadings	Factor 4 loadings	Communality	Factor 5 loadings	Factor 6 loadings	Communality
Australia	0.23	0.05	0.05	-0.19	0.56	0.35	0.49	0.62	0.63
Austria	0.80	-0.37	0.78	0.20	0.98	1.00	0.80	-0.31	0.73
Belgium	0.82	-0.07	0.67	0.85	-0.01	0.73	0.87	0.15	0.78
Canada	0.48	0.08	0.24	-0.28	0.36	0.21	0.61	0.58	0.71
Denmark	0.50	0.11	0.26	0.79	-0.18	0.66	0.75	0.17	0.59
Finland	0.46	0.24	0.27	0.47	0.25	0.29	0.69	0.33	0.58
France	0.65	0.54	0.71	1.00	0.00	1.00	0.99	-0.07	0.98
Germany	0.84	-0.02	0.70	-0.27	0.79	0.70	0.69	-0.32	0.58
Italy	0.35	-0.28	0.20	0.67	0.35	0.56	0.86	-0.13	0.76
Japan	0.02	0.04	0.00	-0.12	0.81	0.67	0.85	-0.28	0.80
Netherlands	0.22	-0.03	0.05	0.89	0.14	0.80	0.72	0.23	0.57
Norway	0.14	0.83	0.71	0.88	-0.03	0.77	0.50	0.31	0.35
Spain	0.17	0.36	0.16	-0.16	0.06	0.03	0.81	0.22	0.70
Sweden	-0.05	0.68	0.46	0.77	-0.04	0.60	0.71	0.38	0.65
Switzerland	0.33	-0.42	0.28	0.61	0.10	0.38	0.75	-0.16	0.59
UK	0.19	0.39	0.19	-0.35	0.48	0.36	0.40	0.63	0.56
USA	0.37	-0.19	0.17	-0.58	0.34	0.45	0.55	0.46	0.52

Table 2. Estimated factor models. In bold: correlation with the common factor statistically significant at the 0.01 level.

[Figure 2 about here]

Factors 1 and 2 represent both the outcome of the first globalization and of the second industrialization process that took place within the period 1870 to 1914, also known as the *Belle Époque*. Despite the first modern crisis of overproduction – the Great Depression of 1873 –²³ it seems that “positive shocks” had a much deeper impact on the growth trend than “negative shocks”. A considerable degree of economic

²³ Germany and the United States were affected by the crisis that started with the crack of Vienna on the 8th of May 1873 as a consequence of speculation, rising costs and declining corporate profitability. From Central Europe, the crisis moved to the Atlantic and reached the US in September 1873. The depression lasted until 1879. The industrial sector suffered markedly. Even the UK faced large bankruptcies, 13,130, only in 1879. Prices and wages dropped (Flamant and Singer-Kerel 1971).

openness, a solid international monetary system, and the consolidation of the central nation-states (Germany and Italy) favored stability and the integration of the international economy. It is necessary to emphasize that the period of greater liberalization of world economy – migrations, capital and trade – occurred between 1870 and 1914, a peacetime after the last European Wars (Napoleonic and Franco-Prussian wars). Industrial Enlightenment (Mokyr 2010) in Great Britain and the spread of the Industrial Revolution provoked a convergent trend between European economies. The first-comers (Belgium, France, and Switzerland) and the latecomers (Germany, Italy and Austria-Hungary) enjoy the *European Pax* (Craig and García-Iglesias 2010: 124) under an opened trade area²⁴ after the Cobden-Chevalier treaty of 1860, with a parallel leading role of the UK as the emerging “globocop” (Morris 2014: 25, 271) and its *Pax Britannica* in the seas. In addition to trade liberalization, monetary stability was reached after the majority of European industrialized countries and the US (1879) joined the Gold standard (Germany in 1872, Belgium, France and Switzerland in 1878, and Canada in 1853).

Increased productivity lowered production costs in agriculture and manufacture industry, and the impact of technical improvements and transport revolution, together with the opening of the Suez Canal (1869), prompted the decline in international freight rates as well as in domestic transport costs with the spread of railroads in Europe and the transcontinental railroad in the US (1869). Intra-European migration first and massive international migration from 1875 had an enormous impact on wage convergence. International flows of labor and capital permitted the US and Canada to join the club. Nordic countries (Factor 2) also caught up (Bruland and Smith 2010) from the 1870s, taking advantage of natural resources, world capital and labor markets as well as the flow of new technological know-how.²⁵ Nordic economies sent forth work populations to the US and received large amounts of capital from France and Germany from the mid-nineteenth century. In fact, France and the UK became major exporters of skilled labor, machinery and capital in the nineteenth century thanks to its preeminent industrial leadership.

[Figure 3 about here]

The second period (1915-1949) shows a higher correlation of the growth components with the estimated factors (Factor 3 and Factor 4). In general (except for Canada and Spain)²⁶, the communalities are greater than in the pre-war period as a consequence of common devastating shocks such as the World Wars and the depressions of 1920-21, 1929-1933 and 1937-38. The two factors include disjointed sets of economies. Factor 3 is identified with the growth component of France (correlation of 100%) and also includes

²⁴ “International trade is perhaps the most important form of engagement with the world economy” (Nayyar 2009: 14).

²⁵ Nordic countries, in addition to their cultural proximity, had a late and quick industrialization based on institutional reforms that eliminated restrictions on business, innovation and credit (bank system). They combined rich natural resources such as forest, ore deposits, fishing, land and oil with a late integration in the globalization process, in addition to mergers and acquisitions between big firms and, from WWII, the expansion of the public sector and welfare system (Henning et al. 2011). The impressive progress made Nordic countries “an overachiever” (O’Rourke and Williamson 1995: 8), although there were differences between countries, Sweden being the country that made the most rapid transition.

²⁶ The Spanish Civil War (1936-1939) may have affected this result.

Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland. Factor 4 is significantly correlated with Germany and also includes Australia, Austria, Japan and the UK. This grouping indicates the different cyclical patterns present, particularly from the 30s, as seen in Figure 3 when comparing both factors: they move in parallel until 1937; in this year, Factor 3 diminishes and recovers beginning in 1941, reaching a maximum in 1946. Factor 4 diminishes from 1940 until 1945 and then recovers. Thus, the different cyclical effects of WWII are shown by these factors, both in the years of the war and the immediate post-war (e.g., the negative and significant correlation of the USA with Factor 3).²⁷

The inability to create a stable international system after WWI finally results in WWII. War was an exogenous factor with negative effect on economic output (Feinstein et al. 2008) and represents a downturn that involves multiple countries with different trajectories. The state has to intervene in the economy to solve restructuring economic problems. The instauration of a war economy means that investments in strategic sectors (heavy industry, railway network, and the arms industry) had to be prioritized at the expense of light industry and agriculture. In accordance with the disruption of commerce and agricultural production and the destruction of infrastructure, convertibility is suspended, affecting balance of payments adjustments. Finally, the post-war recovery and reparations from WWI, as well as changes in frontiers, with new countries emerging and others disappearing (Singleton 2007: 11)²⁸ – all of this allows discussion of de-globalization (Williamson, 1996). Wars and the depression of the 1930s stopped capital, migration and goods flows (Siegfried 1937[1995]: 422), interrupting the tendencies that began in 1870. War is the opposite of peace, which “together with law and order, plays a key role in allowing the market to extend and creating increasing returns” (Foreman-Peck 2007:24).

Both wars had different final impacts on national economies. WWI interrupted the industrialization process of some countries due to the lack of foreign direct investment and technology imports. The United States and Japan, as well as peripheral countries, become the main beneficiaries of the European conflict after capturing markets abandoned by a Europe involved in war. The balance of economic power moved to the Pacific. WWI was a great business for certain economies. Between 1913 and 1929, the European neutrals (Nordic countries, the Netherlands, and Switzerland) experienced faster growth than the combatants. Switzerland between 1914 and 1949 made a transition to the second Industrial Revolution at fast speed especially in the machine tool industry (Donzé and Martí 2014), energy and financial sectors. The two WW greatly helped this specialization because of its neutrality and it overcame the monetary crisis thanks to a stable Swiss Franc (David and Mach 2007). Except for the UK, which was particularly vulnerable to the dislocation of international markets, the European Allies outperformed the former Central powers. War imposed output losses on many countries and altered the long-term rate of growth of the UK.

²⁷ Technology transfer of military origin to the civilian (Fernández-de-Pinedo and Muñoz 2014) was very important, as was the case of aviation, antibiotics, industrial restructuring, explosives industry and fertilizers.

²⁸ As Singleton noted, geography changed. France received Alsace and Lorraine from Germany, but “Poland was created out of land formerly belonging to the German, Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires. The heartland of the Austro-Hungarian Empire was divided into the independent nations of Austria, Hungary and Czechoslovakia. Russia was stripped of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia and Finland ...” (Singleton 2007).

When peace returned, the industrialization process accelerated, spurred by the recovery policies focusing on investments in modern technology (chemistry, electricity, cement). The recovery of the war was uneven. Financial costs and the economic consequences of the war prevented a return to the situation that prevailed in July 1914. Inflation and deficits were the main imbalances that affected in different ways the different countries in the early post-war years. The return to the gold standard at pre-war parities proved to be a difficult task for the European countries. Only neutrals and the UK achieved this objective. Finland, Belgium, France and Italy returned to gold with reduced parities and in fact enjoyed greater economic growth than the UK. Factor 3, by grouping these countries, would show the consequences of these adjustments on growth. Germany and Austria also returned to the gold standard after the large depreciations and the hyperinflation of 1920s.

When European production capacity returned to normal, both in agriculture and industry, the problem of overproduction emerged because the production capacity of non-European countries had greatly increased, and overproduction became chronic (Eichengreen 1992). The crisis lasted from three to four years, from 1929 to 1932-33. Protectionism since 1930 meant a return to quotas, import substitution policies and, in the case of some countries (Germany, Italy, Japan and Spain), tendencies toward economic autarky (Bouvier 1995: 381) and authoritarian regimes. As a result, economies tended to reduce imports and restrict capital flows and foreign trade was controlled by the state. The countries most affected were those that had been defeated in the war, while those only slightly affected were the Scandinavian countries: Denmark GDP did not decrease, and others only moderately decreased, such as Spain and Italy (Maddison, 2001). In general, small neutral countries such as Switzerland, the Netherlands, Denmark and Sweden managed to adapt to new models of competitiveness and discovered niche markets. Some of the great multinationals linked to these countries successfully managed to enter the world market and consolidate their positions in these years.

After the recovery from the Great Depression, both Germany and Japan began to prepare their economies for war. The unstable international market withdrew for the third time in less than thirty years. During WWII, the whole Continent, except four countries that remained neutral, was occupied. For the first time, their economies were unified under a single yoke. Hitler achieves a total economic and political reconstruction of Europe to make it self-sufficient. GDP did not increase throughout belligerent Europe, but the US doubled per capita income after recovering from the Great Depression.

[Figure 4 about here]

Finally, stage three (1950-2010) reflects the global convergence of Western Europe and Anglo-Saxon economies headed by the US and the return of a greater degree of economic openness as a consequence of the second globalization. In consequence, the post-war period is characterized by global cyclical integration as shown by the communalities in Table 2, in which values are more homogenous and, in most cases, higher than in the previous periods. Plots in Figure 4 show the increasing cyclical coherence during the period. Coherently, a common factor including all the economies is found (Factor 5), while the second factor of the model (Factor 6) captures some specific growth present in the Anglo-Saxon economies (Australia, Canada, UK and USA) mainly after the 80s (see Figure 4) as well as some Scandinavian specificity

(Finland, Norway and Sweden²⁹). Factor 5 is identified, as in the previous period, with the growth component of France and could be viewed as a precursor to a European Union business cycle. It is important to note its decreasing profile. Precisely when comparing both factors, Factor 6 shows the higher growth present in the mentioned economies from the 80s, which can be related to the liberalizing policies present in these economies.

After the post-war (see Factor 5), a convergent trend started with the European recovery plan (Marshall Plan 1948-1957) and the establishment of the Bretton Woods System (1944-1971). The regulation of trade through GATT in 1947, the Treaty of Rome, which established the European Community in 1957, and the European Free Trade Association two years later intensified economic integration. Japan and Western Europe did much better and greatly reduced the gap between their income and productivity levels with respect to those of the USA. In Western Europe, this catch-up process gave the opportunity to recuperate from the lost opportunities from the war. The Japanese catch-up process was spectacular. Japan, which had devoted a large part of its human and capital resources to military ends since the Meiji Period, had to complete de-militarization. This meant, as in the case of Germany, that its skills, organizational capacity and investment were devoted almost entirely to economic growth through capital intensive technology. Japan and Germany grew thanks to the connection industry-bank-R&D in the afterwards of the war, avoiding military spending. During the 1980s, the end of the cold war and the integration of Eastern Europe caused convergence to accelerate, while the merger of the EU market and the adoption of the Maastricht Treaty in 1991 deregulated economic activities. Regional integration spread through multilateral free trade agreements, and customs unions or common markets spread over the five continents. In spite of the several frequent international periods of stagnation and stock market bubbles from the 1970s (oil price shocks, the great inflation of the 1970s and 1980s and the recession of the 1990's) until the 2007 global financial crisis,³⁰ the convergence of the Western European, Japanese and Anglo-Saxon economies seems to be an incontestable fact

In sum, two relevant factors seem to influence trends:³¹ the relevance of international politics, understood as a process that enhances or boosts cooperation, and the significant role of the institutional framework, in particular as it is linked to international payment mechanisms and monetary arrangements, which in turn encourage trade.

Finally, to quantify the importance of this global business cycle factor in national economies, the multivariate common factor model (3) is estimated for the post-war period. In this way, we have a measure of the importance of the common factor grouping all the economies (i.e., a global factor) in business cycle dynamics. The estimation results are shown in Table 3. All the factor loadings are significantly distinct from zero, verifying the existence of a global common business cycle factor that displays the acceleration shared by all the economies in the sample. According to equation (5), the relative importance of this

²⁹ Not to forgive the Sweden banking crisis 1990-94, and the strong monetary policies and structural reforms that government had to undertake to recover.

³⁰ From the mid-1980s until 2007, the gradual reduction of inflationary trends in the industrialized world was referred to as the "Great Moderation" thanks to the reduction in the volatility in GDP growth in Australia, Canada, the US, the UK, Germany, Japan, France and Italy (Summers 2005).

³¹ For other approaches that examined business cycle fluctuations and monetary policy regimes, see Bergman et al. (1998); Milanovic (2005); and Piketty and Saez (2006).

common behavior has been computed, with the result that it exceeds 50% in 15 cases, the exceptions being Norway (24%) and Spain (21%); and exceeds 70% for 9 economies. The more important specific cyclical variation in decreasing order corresponds to Spain (79%), Norway (76%), Denmark (45%), UK (44%), USA (43%), Canada (43%) and Japan (42%). It must be noted that these estimates are averages for the period, and some progressive increase in the weighting of the common factor could have taken place in some cases. Across the specific components, $a_{i,t}$, some important positive correlations would support the possibility of estimating a minor common factor grouping Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, UK and the USA, which is consistent with the previous exploratory factor analysis. The periods obtained from q_i differ in some cases from those of Table 1. In general, the duration is lower than that of Table 1. In the range from 4 to 7 years, there are 5/14 economies; in the range 3 to 8, 11/14 economies. The mean duration is 3.9 years with a standard deviation of 1.2 years.

	$\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$	$\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$	γ_i	Importance of the common cycle w_i^c	Importance of the specific cycle w_i^s	$q_i = \frac{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2}$	Duration of the cycles (years)
Australia	1.4482 (0.5101)	0.2163 (0.2432)	0.7935 (0.2574)	0.74	0.26	0.5841 (0.3623)	6.9 (1.16)
Austria	0.5060 (0.1695)	0.6792 (0.2893)	1.8259 (0.2290)	0.83	0.17	7.9309 (3.4917)	3.2 (0.54)
Belgium	0.3240 (0.0954)	0.1380 (0.0831)	1.7747 (0.1654)	0.96	0.04	10.1459 (3.8023)	2.8 (0.48)
Canada	1.2840 (0.4146)	1.1422 (0.5643)	1.2345 (0.3022)	0.57	0.43	2.0764 (1.0414)	4.9 (0.71)
Denmark	1.3732 (0.4478)	0.9577 (0.5285)	1.0865 (0.2848)	0.55	0.45	1.5571 (0.9965)	5.3 (0.96)
Finland	0.4937 (0.3015)	2.6489 (1.0309)	2.7795 (0.3341)	0.74	0.26	21.0148 (13.9352)	(*)
France	0.1990 (0.0921)	0.0954 (0.1037)	1.4242 (0.1311)	0.96	0.04	10.6699 (5.3239)	2.8 (0.65)
Germany	0.8588 (0.2448)	0.4125 (0.2142)	1.4304 (0.2318)	0.83	0.17	2.8630 (1.3829)	4.4 (0.65)
Italy	0.5113 (0.2400)	0.8092 (0.4570)	1.4973 (0.2410)	0.73	0.27	5.9677 (4.1657)	3.5 (0.85)
Japan	0.5353 (0.2322)	1.9673 (0.7013)	1.6592 (0.2800)	0.58	0.42	8.8185 (4.9944)	3.0 (0.70)
Netherlands	0.7716 (0.5132)	0.7879 (0.8385)	1.6224 (0.2848)	0.77	0.23	4.4327 (3.6168)	3.9 (1.03)
Norway	0.2160 (0.1343)	1.6626 (0.5790)	0.7190 (0.2198)	0.24	0.76	10.0887 (8.4324)	2.9 (1.07)
Spain	0.6993 (0.3722)	3.7701 (1.3865)	0.9936 (0.3524)	0.21	0.79	6.8033 (4.8463)	3.3 (0.87)
Sweden	0.0286 (0.1008)	2.2499 (0.6843)	1.8686 (0.2093)	0.61	0.39	200.9064 (718.2435)	(*)

Switzerland	0.7762 (0.2231)	0.3520 (0.1945)	2.2028 (0.2365)	0.93	0.07	6.7049 (2.4734)	3.4 (0.45)
UK	0.2227 (0.1740)	1.8328 (0.7370)	1.5205 (0.2389)	0.56	0.44	18.6080 (17.3345)	(*)
USA	1.2222 (0.4274)	1.2140 (0.6266)	1.2780 (0.2986)	0.57	0.43	2.3296 (1.3728)	4.7 (0.82)
						Mean period	3.9
						Standard deviation	1.2

Table 3. Estimations for the multivariate IRW model (3), importance of the common cycle and duration of the cycle derived from the estimated parameter q_i according to equation (A5) for the post-war period 1950-2010 (Maddison data). (*) See note of Table 1.

These results have been compared with those obtained from the Penn World Tables (Feenstra *et al.*, 2013) for the same period (Table 4). Except for the year 1986, both common cycle components are broadly similar (see Figure 5). The importance of the common cyclical behavior is close when compared with the Maddison data except for Australia (56%), Finland (50%) and specially Spain (91%), which is now greater. With respect to the duration of the business cycle, the more important differences appear in Australia, Germany, Norway and Spain. The mean duration is 4.3 years with a standard deviation of 2.1 years.

[Figure 5 about here]

	$\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2$	$\sigma_{\eta_i}^2$	γ_i	Importance of the common cycle w_i^c	Importance of the specific cycle w_i^s	$q_i = \frac{\gamma_i^2 + \sigma_{\eta_i}^2}{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2}$	Duration of the cycles (years)
Australia	5.7894 (1.2992)	0.2382 (0.1828)	0.5554 (0.3021)	0.56	0.44	0.0944 (0.0682)	11.2 (2.07)
Austria	0.4269 (0.1332)	0.6109 (0.2372)	1.5472 (0.1324)	0.80	0.20	7.0381 (2.4765)	3.3 (0.43)
Belgium	0.5455 (0.1993)	0.6298 (0.3278)	2.5832 (0.1866)	0.91	0.09	13.3868 (6.6256)	2.5 (0.78)
Canada	2.2819 (0.6662)	1.6808 (0.7637)	1.3042 (0.2427)	0.50	0.50	1.4819 (0.6009)	5.4 (0.62)
Denmark	2.5442 (0.9533)	1.4476 (0.9821)	1.7049 (0.3828)	0.67	0.33	1.7114 (1.2414)	5.2 (1.07)
Finland	0.2636 (0.4079)	14.0641 (3.4046)	3.7689 (0.5403)	0.50	0.50	107.2302 (167.6622)	(*)
France	0.4928 (0.1596)	0.1807 (0.1575)	2.2143 (na)	0.96	0.04	10.3157 (3.5627)	2.8 (0.44)
Germany	0.4456 (0.2617)	1.3428 (0.7093)	2.1897 (0.1812)	0.78	0.22	13.7749 (9.4676)	2.4 (1.15)
Italy	1.1210 (0.3417)	0.8987 (0.4539)	2.2257 (0.2277)	0.85	0.15	5.2205 (1.3992)	3.7 (0.33)

Japan	1.5981 (0.4502)	5.6808 (1.1285)	2.0544 (0.2947)	0.43	0.57	6.1957 (na)	3.5 (na)
Netherlands	1.0617 (0.3334)	0.8571 (0.4411)	2.0645 (0.1355)	0.83	0.17	4.8217 (1.3122)	3.8 (0.34)
Norway	3.3826 (1.0939)	2.7158 (1.4159)	1.7177 (0.3830)	0.52	0.48	1.6751 (0.9879)	5.2 (0.88)
Spain	3.3707 (0.8671)	0.8587 (0.5136)	2.8887 (0.3274)	0.91	0.09	2.7303 (0.6682)	4.5 (0.33)
Sweden	1.8422 (0.6538)	1.4181 (0.8148)	1.8835 (0.2282)	0.71	0.29	2.6955 (1.4534)	4.5 (0.73)
Switzerland	0.5394 (0.2230)	1.5290 (0.5702)	2.5094 (0.1779)	0.80	0.20	14.5093 (6.3355)	2.3 (0.84)
UK	0.6026 (0.3312)	1.9644 (0.8697)	1.8762 (0.2934)	0.64	0.36	9.1023 (6.1012)	3.0 (0.83)
USA	1.6089 (0.4713)	1.4709 (0.6478)	1.0901 (0.3188)	0.45	0.55	1.6529 (0.9091)	5.2 (0.82)
Mean period							4.3
Standard deviation							2.1

Table 4. Estimations for the multivariate IRW model (3), the importance of the common cycle and duration of the cycle derived from the estimated parameter q_i according to equation (A5) for the post-war period 1950-2010 (Penn World Tables data, v 8.0). (*) See note of Table 1.

Factors such as wars, population changes, and technology, as well as political, monetary and financial variables, accompanied cycles. In the 1970's economies suffered strong inflationary processes as a consequence of a lax monetary policy after oil shocks (Fernández de Pinedo 2012: 55-56). Banking, debt and especially monetary crisis has shaken each decade from 1970's onwards, intensifying the number of bank failures in the following decades (Kinderberger 1978). Finland, Norway and Sweden suffer the monetary and banking crisis in 1990's, along with the persistent crisis in Japan from 1985 to 1990. But Eastern Europe and Russia also suffered in its transitional phase to capitalism. The values of national currencies were changed frequently from the 1970's (Kinderberger 1978). Western Europe reached certain stability when the 1st of January 1999 the euro became, along with the dollar and the yen, an international currency; but business and credit goes by, so did crises in a natural way.

4. Concluding remarks

As noted previously, HP filtering with *a priori* smoothing parameter implies a selection of frequencies that may distort the analysis of business cycle duration and phases by exclusion and/or leakage of frequencies. The estimation method proposed here avoids this problem by estimating the signal-to-noise ratio, that is, allows the data to "speak for themselves". Additionally, the IRW model (both univariate and multivariate) incorporates, in a coherent framework, the possibility of estimating simultaneously both the classical business cycle and the growth cycle implied by the estimated signal-to-noise ratio.

When applied to a sample of Maddison's GDP series, a classical business cycle of a duration in the range 4-7 years (Juglar-type cycles) is found, and there is no evidence of long swings or Kuznets-type cycles. Cyclical convergence is evident and very strong after 1950, when cyclical phases between economies are synchronized (one factor grouping all the economies has been found), and the standard deviation of the cyclical period is approximately one year.

In the pre-war and inter-war periods, a minor economic integration, the specific effects of the World Wars together with the more noisy content of the series, weaken the cyclical coherence. As O'Rourke and Williamson (1995: 7) noted, "global openness and convergence seem to be positively correlated; global autarky and convergence seem to be negatively correlated". Not all regions are synchronized with the national business cycles (Owyang et al. 2005), and not all economies are synchronized, but cyclical convergence seems to depend on capital and trade international flows if the effects of the industrial revolution (the first, second, and third) and the globalization process among national economies are considered.

Although European countries entered the nineteenth century with mercantilist policies that consolidated nation-states, a century later, all economies were linked by the need to validate international rules to regulate economic activity at a world level. Regional economic agreements in the interwar period (Oslo Group, Clearing Agreements, Rome or Ottawa Agreements or even Cartel Agreements) showed the crucial significance of cooperation over regional variations. The two world wars highlighted how easy it is to alter the domestic economic structure and international flows. Although the catch-up to modern economic growth followed diverse rhythms and timeframes, the negotiations before the end of WWII to gestate a world order and prevent another interwar period evidenced the importance of cooperation and multilateralism, both foundations of long globalization cycles.

Finally, although our estimations do not locate long swings, we cannot discard the existence of Kondratieff-type cycles (Metz 2011). Moreover, when investigating long-term processes affecting economic growth, some interesting extensions of this work would include the relationship between demographic stagnation (Gonzalo et al. 2013) and the decreasing profile of (per capita) growth rates along the post-war period. Some tentative hypothesis concerns the existence of a demographic dividend (e.g., Roa and Cendejas 2007). In any case, unobserved component modelling has proved to be a very useful tool for cliometric analysis due to the explicit consideration of long-term and medium-term (cycles) economic processes when the models are interpreted in the frequency domain.

References

- Adelman I (1965) Long cycles – fact or artifact? *American Economic Review* 60: 443-463
- Baldwin, RE, Martin, Ph (1999) Two waves of globalization: superficial similarities, fundamental differences. NBER 6904
- Bergman UM, Bordo MD, Jonung L. (1998) Historical Evidence on Business Cycles: The International Experience. In JC Fuhrer, S Schuh (Eds.), *Beyond Shocks: What Causes Business Cycles?* (pp. 65-113). Boston: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston
- Bértola, L (2005), A 50 años de la curva de Kuznets: crecimiento económico y distribución del ingreso en Uruguay y otras economías de nuevo asentamiento desde 1870. *Investigaciones de Historia Económica – Economic History Research* (3): 135 a 176
- Bolt J, Zanden JL v (2013) The First Update of the Maddison Project; Re-Estimating Growth Before 1820. Maddison Project URL: <http://www.ggd.net/maddison/maddison-project/publications/wp4.pdf>
- Bolt J, Zanden JL v (2014) The Maddison Project: collaborative research on historical national accounts. *The Economic History Review* 67(3): 627–651
- Bouvier J (1995) *Initiation au vocabulaire et aux mécanismes économiques contemporains, XIXe-XXe siècles*. Paris: Sede
- Bouvier J (1964) *Les deux scandales de Panama*. Paris: Gallimard-Julliard
- Box GEP, Jenkins G (1970) *Time Series Analysis, Forecasting and Control*. San Francisco, Holden Day
- Bruland, K, Smith, K (2010) Knowledge Flows and Catching-Up Industrialization in the Nordic Countries: The Roles of Patent Systems. In: H Odagiri, A Goto, A Sunami, RR Nelson (Eds.), *Intellectual Property Rights, Development, and Catch-Up* (pp. 63-95). Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Cendejas JL, Castañeda, JE, Muñoz, FF (2014) Business cycle, interest rate and money in the euro area: A common factor model. *Economic Modelling*. doi: 10.1016/j.econmod.2014.08.001
- Cendejas JL, Font C (2015) Convergence of inflation with a common cycle: estimating and modelling Spanish historical inflation from the 16th to the 18th centuries. *Empirical Economics*. doi: 10.1007/s00181-014-0840-8
- Chang HJ (2008) *Bad Samaritans: The Guilty Secrets of Rich Nations and the Threat to Global Prosperity*. London, Random House
- Cogley T, Nason JM (1995) Effects of the Hodrick-Prescott filter on trend and difference stationary time series: Implications for business cycle research. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 19(1-2): 253-278
- Craig L, García-Iglesias C (2010) Business cycles. In: S Broadberry, KH O'Rourke (Eds.) *The Cambridge Economic History of Modern Europe* (Vol. II). Cambridge: CUP
- Darné O, Diebolt C (2004) Unit Roots and Infrequent Large Shocks: New International Evidence on Output. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 51: 1449-1465
- David T, Mach A (2007) Institutions and economic growth: the successful experience of Switzerland, 1870 – 1950. In: Han-Joon Chang (ed) *Institutional change and economic development* (219-238). United Nations Univ. Press.
- Demeulemeester J.L, Dieblot C (2011) Renouveler la science économique néoclassique? Prendre l'historicité au sérieux, AFC WP2011-3
- Diebolt C (2014) Kuznets versus Kondratieff. An essay in historical macroeconometrics. *Cahiers d'Economie Politique - Papers in Political Economy* 67: 81-117. doi:10.3917/cep.067.0081
- Donzè P-Y, Marti, L (2014) La Suisse et l'essor de l'industrie japonaise, *SZG/RSH/RSS* 64 (1): 45-65
- Durbin J, Koopman SJ (2001) *Time Series Analysis by State Space Methods*. Oxford, Oxford University Press
- Eichengreen B (1992) *Golden Fetters: The Gold Standard and the Great Depression 1919–1939*. Oxford: OUP

- Epstein RJ (1987) *A History of Econometrics*. Amsterdam, North Holland
- Feenstra RC, Inklaar R, Timmer MP (2013) *The Next Generation of the Penn World Table*, available for download at www.ggd.net/pwt
- Feinstein CH, Temin P, Toniolo, G (2008) *The World Economy between the World Wars*. Oxford: OUP
- Fernández de Pinedo Fernández E (2012) ¿Una recesión asimétrica de nuevo tipo? *RAE: Revista Asturiana de Economía* (46): 47-60
- Fernández-de-Pinedo N, Muñoz FF (2014) Economía y conflicto: urgencias del presente y lecciones del pasado. *Cuadernos de economía: Spanish Journal of Economics and Finance*, 37 (105): 159-168
- Flamant M, Singer-Kerel, J (1971) *Crises et recessions économiques*. Paris: PUF
- Foreman-Peck J (2007) *European Historical Economics and Globalization*. *The Journal of Philosophical Economics*, I(1): 23-53
- Gómez V (2001) The use of Butterworth filters for trend and cycle estimation in economic time series. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 19(3): 365-373
- Gonzalo J, Muñoz FF, Santos DJ (2013) Using a rate equations approach to model world population trends. *Simulation*. doi: 10.1177/0037549712463736
- Granger CWJ (1966) The typical spectral shape of an economic variable. *Econometrica* 34(1): 150–161
- Harvey AC (1989) *Forecasting structural time series models and the Kalman filter*. Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press
- Harvey AC (2010) The local quadratic trend model. *Journal of Forecasting* 29(1-2): 94-108
- Harvey AC, Jaeger A (1993) Detrending, stylized facts, and the business cycle. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 8: 231–247
- Harvey AC, Trimbur TM (2003) General model-based filters for extracting cycles and trends in economic time series. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 85(2): 244-255
- Hendry DF, Morgan MS (1995) *The Foundations of Econometric Analysis*. Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press
- Henning M, Enflo K, Andersson FNG (2011) Trends and cycles in regional economic growth: How spatial differences shaped the Swedish growth experience from 1860–2009. *Explorations in Economic History* 48 (4): 538–555
- Hodrick RJ, Prescott EC (1997) Postwar U.S. Business Cycles: An Empirical Investigation. *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking* 29(1): 1-16
- Howrey EP (1968) A Spectrum Analysis of the Long-Swing Hypothesis. *International Economic Review*. doi: 10.2307/2525477
- Kalman RE (1960) A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems. *Transactions of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers. Journal of Basic Engineering, Series D* 82: 35–45
- Kindleberger ChP (1978) *Manias, Panics, and Crashes: A History of Financial Crises*. London, Macmillan
- Kindleberger ChP (2006) *A Financial History of Western Europe*, New York, Routledge
- King RG, Rebelo ST (1993) Low frequency filtering and real business cycles. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 17(1-2): 207-231
- Kitagawa G, Gersch W (1996) *Smoothness Priors Analysis of Time Series*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag
- Kolmogorov AN (1939) Sur l'interpolation et extrapolation des suites stationnaires, *Les Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des sciences*, 208, 2043-2045. Paris
- Kuznets S (1930[1967]) *Secular Movements in Production and Prices. Their Nature and their Bearing upon Cyclical Fluctuations*. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co. (Reprints of Economic Classics. Augustus M. Kelley, New York.)
- Kuznets S (1961) *Capital in the American Economy: Its Formation and Financing*. National Bureau of Economic Research. New York, Princeton University Press

- Lavisse E, Rambaud A (1901) *Histoire générale du IVe siècle à nos jours. Le Monde contemporain, 1870-1900*. Paris, A. Colin & Cie , Vol 12
- Maddison A (2001) *Monitoring the World Economy: A Millennial Perspective*. Paris, OECD
- Maddison A (2007) Fluctuations in the momentum of growth within the capitalist epoch. *Cliometrica*. doi:10.1007/s11698-007-0007-3
- Maddison A (2009) World Population, GDP and Per Capita GDP, A.D. 1–2003. URL: www.ggd.net/maddison
- Metz R (2010) Filter-design and model-based analysis of trends and cycles in the presence of outliers and structural breaks. *Cliometrica*. doi:10.1007/s11698-009-0036-1
- Metz R (2011) Do Kondratieff waves exist? How time series techniques can help to solve the problem. *Cliometrica*. doi:10.1007/s11698-010-0057-9
- Milanovic B (2005) Can We Discern the Effect of Globalization on Income Distribution? Evidence from Household Surveys. *World Bank Economic Review*, 19(1): 21-44
- Mills TC (2009) Modelling trends and cycles in economic time series: historical perspective and future developments. *Cliometrica*. doi:10.1007/s11698-008-0031-y
- Mokyr J (2010) *The enlightened economy: Britain and the industrial revolution, 1700-1850*. New Haven: Yale University Press
- Morgan MS (1990) *The History of Econometric Ideas*. Cambridge UK, Cambridge University Press
- Morris I (2014) *War! What Is It Good For?: Conflict and the Progress of Civilization from Primates to Robots*. New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux
- Nayyar D (2009) Developing countries in the World Economy: the future in the past? Paper presented at the UNU-WIDER, Annual lecture 12
- Nelson CR (1988) Spurious trend and cycle in the state space decomposition of a time series with a unit root. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 12(2-3): 475-488
- Nelson CR, Kang H (1981) Spurious Periodicity in Inappropriately Detrended Time Series. *Econometrica* 49(3): 741-51
- Nerlove M, Grether DM, Carvalho JL (1979) *Analysis of Economic Time Series*. New York, Academic Press
- Northrup D (2005) Globalization and the Great Convergence: Rethinking World History in the Long Term. *Journal of World History*, 16(3): 249-267
- O'Rourke K, Williamson J (1995) Open economy forces and late 19th century Scandinavian catch-up. NBER Working Paper n° 5112
- Owyang MT, Piger J, Wall HJ, (2005) Business cycle phases in U.S. States. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 87, 604-616
- Pedersen TM (2001) The HP filter, the Slutsky effect and the distortionary effects of filters. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control* 25(8): 1081-1101
- Piketty T, Saez E (2006) The Evolution of Top Incomes: A Historical and International Perspective. *American Economic Review*, 96(2): 200-205
- Puig, N, Castro, R (2009) Patterns of International Business in Spain, 1850- 2009. *Business History Review*, 83 (fall): 505–537
- Roa MJ, Cendejas JL (2007) Crecimiento económico, estructura de edades y dividendo demográfico. WP 390. Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE). Mexico DF
- Sáiz P (2014) Did patents of introduction encourage technology transfer? Long-term evidence from the Spanish innovation system. *Cliometrica* 8 (1): 49-78
- Sargent TJ (1979) *Macroeconomic theory*. New York, Academic Press
- Schumpeter JA (1939 [1989]) *Business Cycles. A theoretical, historical and statistical analysis of the capitalist process* (Reprint of the first abridged edition of 1964). Philadelphia, Porcupine Press

- Siegfried A (1937 [1995]) *La crise britannique du XXe siècle* (Paris, 1937 p. 90). In: J Bouvier *Initiation au vocabulaire et aux mécanismes économiques contemporains, XIXe-XXe siècles*. Paris: Sede
- Singleton J (2007) *Destruction and Misery ... The First World War*. In: MJ Oliver, DH Aldcroft (Eds.) *Economic Disasters of the Twentieth Century* (pp. 9-50). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar
- Slutzky E (1937) *The summation of random causes as the source of cyclic processes*. *Econometrica*. doi: 10.2307/1907241 [Original paper in Russian: 1927]
- Stock JH, Watson MW (1989) *New indexes of coincident and leading economic indicators*. NBER *Macroeconomics Annual*, pp. 351-394. Cambridge MA, MIT Press
- Stock JH, Watson MW (1991) *A probability model of the coincident economic indicators*. In: Lahiri K, Moore GH (eds.), *Leading Economic Indicators. New Approaches and Forecasting Records*, pp. 63-85. New York, Cambridge University Press
- Summers PM (2005) *What Caused the Great Moderation? Some Cross-Country Evidence*. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City *Economic Review*, Third Quarter, 5-30
- Tsay RS (2005) *Analysis of Financial Time Series*. 2nd ed., New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons.
- Whittle P (1983) *Prediction and Regulation by Linear Least-squares Methods*. 2nd edition revised. Oxford, Blackwell
- Wiener N (1949) *The Extrapolation, Interpolation and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series with Engineering Applications*. New York, John Wiley & Sons
- Williamson J (1996) *Globalization, convergence and history*. *The Journal of Economic History*, 56(June): 277- 306
- Wold H (1938) *A Study in the Analysis of Stationary Time Series*. Stockholm, Almqvist & Wiksell
- Young PC (1984) *Recursive Estimation and Time Series Analysis*. Berlin, Springer-Verlag
- Yule GU (1927) *On a method of investigating periodicities in disturbed series with special reference to Wolfer's sunspot numbers*. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series A*, 226: 267-98
- Zarnowitz V (1992) *Business Cycle: Theory, History, Indicators and Forecasting*. *Studies in Business Cycles*, 27. Chicago: University of Chicago Press for the NBER

FIGURES

Figure 1. Spectral gains of the filters of μ_t (in red), g_t (in blue) and a_t (in green) for $q = 0.01$. Horizontal axis: period in units of time.




Figure 2. Common factors and underlying growth for the period 1870-1914. Normalized scale.





Figure 2 (cont.).





Figure 3. Common factors and underlying growth for the period 1915-1949. Normalized scale.





Figure 3 (cont.).





Figure 4. Common factors and underlying growth for the period 1950-2010. Normalized scale.





Figure 4 (cont.).






Figure 5. Common business cycle factors (\hat{a}_t) from Maddison and PWT data for the period 1950-2010.



Appendix A: Spectral gains of the filters for the unobserved components

The spectral gain of a filter measures the increase in amplitude of any specific frequency component of a time series. It is obtained by the Wiener-Kolmogorov (WK) formula (Whittle, 1983). To this end, we depart from (1a), in which the signal $\mu_t = \frac{\eta_{t-2}}{(1-L)^2}$. The WK filter (of a doubly infinite realization of a time series) that provides the minimum mean squared error of the signal is given by the ratio of the autocovariance generating functions of the signal μ_t and the series y_t . For the trend component, the filter is

$$\hat{\mu}_t = \frac{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2}}{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} + \sigma_\varepsilon^2} y_t = \frac{q}{q + (1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} y_t = \frac{q}{q + |1-L|^4} y_t \quad (\text{A1})$$

where L^{-1} is the forward operator ($L^{-k} y_t = y_{t+k}$) and the convention $(1-L)(1-L^{-1}) = |1-L|^2$ is adopted.

The spectral gain of the filter of μ_t is obtained by doing $L = e^{-i\omega}$ in (A1), where $i = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary number and ω the frequency, obtaining

$$G_\mu(\omega) = \frac{q}{q + 4(1 - \cos \omega)^2}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

For the growth component g_t , (1a) is expressed as $y_{t+1} = \frac{g_t}{1-L} + \varepsilon_{t+1}$ with the signal $g_t = \frac{\eta_{t-1}}{1-L}$. The resulting WK filter is

$$\hat{g}_t = \frac{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{(1-L)(1-L^{-1})}}{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} + \sigma_\varepsilon^2} y_{t+1} = \frac{(1-L)(1-L^{-1})q}{q + (1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} y_{t+1} = \frac{|1-L|^2 q}{q + |1-L|^4} y_{t+1} \quad (\text{A3})$$

for which the spectral gain is

$$G_g(\omega) = \frac{2(1 - \cos \omega)q}{q + 4(1 - \cos \omega)^2} \quad (\text{A4})$$

This gain has a maximum at the frequency

$$\omega_{\max} = \arccos \left(1 - \left(\frac{q}{4} \right)^{1/2} \right) \quad (\text{A5})$$

For example, for $q = \lambda^{-1} = \{0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10\}$, the corresponding periods $p = \frac{2\pi}{\omega_{\max}}$ are $p = \{35.3, 19.8, 11.0, 6.0, 2.9\}$ units of time.

For the acceleration component, (1a) is expressed as $y_{t+2} = \frac{a_t}{(1-L)^2} + \varepsilon_{t+2}$ with the signal $a_t = \eta_t$; then, the WK filter is

$$\hat{a}_t = \frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{\frac{\sigma_\eta^2}{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} + \sigma_\varepsilon^2} y_{t+2} = \frac{(1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2 q}{q + (1-L)^2(1-L^{-1})^2} y_{t+2} = \frac{|1-L|^4 q}{q + |1-L|^4} y_{t+2} \quad (\text{A6})$$

In addition, in the frequency domain,

$$G_a(\omega) = \frac{4(1 - \cos \omega)^2 q}{q + 4(1 - \cos \omega)^2} \quad (\text{A7})$$

The HP filter is the optimal filter when the trend follows an IRW (King and Rebelo, 1993). In the context of HP filtering, the cycle (growth cycle) is defined as the deviation with respect to the trend $\varepsilon_t = y_t - \mu_t$, and the corresponding WK filter is

$$\hat{C}_t^{HP} = y_t - \hat{\mu}_t = \left(1 - \frac{q}{q + |1-L|^4} \right) y_t = \frac{|1-L|^4}{q + |1-L|^4} y_t \quad (\text{A8})$$

A comparison of (A2), (A4), (A7) and (A8) allows the verification of

$$G_{HP}(\omega) = \frac{4}{q} (1 - \cos \omega)^2 G_\mu(\omega) = \frac{2}{q} (1 - \cos \omega) G_g(\omega) = \frac{1}{q} G_a(\omega) \quad (\text{A9})$$

with $G_{HP}(\omega)$ the spectral gain of the HP filter given q .

Appendix B: State space representations of the univariate and the multivariate models

State space representation consists of two equations. The measurement equation relates the observed variable with the unobserved components and the observation noise. For IRW model (1), basically coincides with equation (1a)

$$[y_t] = [1 \ 0 \ 0] \begin{bmatrix} \mu_t \\ g_t \\ a_t \end{bmatrix} + [\varepsilon_t] \quad (\text{B1})$$

The state transition equation represents the dynamics of the unobserved components. According to equations (1b) to (1d), this is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu_t \\ g_t \\ a_t \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{t-1} \\ g_{t-1} \\ a_{t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \eta_t \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B2})$$

Gaussianity and orthogonality assumptions of the error terms imply that $\varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2)$ and

$\xi_t \sim N(0_{3 \times 1}, Q)$, where $\xi_t = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ \eta_t \end{bmatrix}$ and $Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_\eta^2 \end{bmatrix}$. By doing $H = [1 \ 0 \ 0]$, $\beta_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_t \\ g_t \\ a_t \end{bmatrix}$ and

$F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, the state space representation of the system (B1)-(B2) in compact form is

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} y_t = H \beta_t + \varepsilon_t \\ \beta_t = F \beta_{t-1} + \xi_t \end{array} \right\} \quad (\text{B3})$$

Estimation of the vector of variances $\{\sigma_\varepsilon^2, \sigma_\eta^2\}$ is obtained by maximizing the likelihood function of the one-step ahead prediction errors (Harvey, 1989; Durbin and Koopman, 2001).

For the multivariate IRW model (3) and for illustrative purposes, let us assume two time series, $i = 1, 2$, with specific acceleration components $a_{1,t}$ and $a_{2,t}$, and that the common acceleration component, a_t , follows an autoregressive model such as $a_t = \phi a_{t-1} + \eta_t$. From equation (3a), we have that the measurement equation relating observed variables with unobserved components is

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_{1,t} \\ y_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1,t} \\ g_{1,t} \\ \mu_{2,t} \\ g_{2,t} \\ a_t \\ a_{1,t} \\ a_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,t} \\ \varepsilon_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B4})$$

According to equations (3b) to (3e), the state transition equation, is

$$\begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1,t} \\ g_{1,t} \\ \mu_{2,t} \\ g_{2,t} \\ a_t \\ a_{1,t} \\ a_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \gamma_2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1,t-1} \\ g_{1,t-1} \\ \mu_{2,t-1} \\ g_{2,t-1} \\ a_{t-1} \\ a_{1,t-1} \\ a_{2,t-1} \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \eta_t \\ \eta_{1,t} \\ \eta_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} \quad (\text{B5})$$

Gaussianity and orthogonality assumptions of the error terms imply that $\varepsilon_t \sim N(0_{2 \times 1}, R)$ and

$$\xi_t \sim N(0_{7 \times 1}, Q), \text{ where } \varepsilon_t = \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,t} \\ \varepsilon_{2,t} \end{bmatrix}, \xi_t = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{4 \times 1} \\ \eta_t \\ \eta_{1,t} \\ \eta_{2,t} \end{bmatrix}, R = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_{\varepsilon_1}^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_{\varepsilon_2}^2 \end{bmatrix}, Q = \begin{bmatrix} 0_{4 \times 4} & 0_{4 \times 1} & 0_{4 \times 1} & 0_{4 \times 1} \\ 0_{1 \times 4} & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0_{1 \times 4} & 0 & \sigma_{\eta_1}^2 & 0 \\ 0_{1 \times 4} & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{\eta_2}^2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and}$$

$$0_{m \times n} \text{ is a } m \times n \text{ matrix of zeros. By doing } y_t = \begin{bmatrix} y_{1,t} \\ y_{2,t} \end{bmatrix}, H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \beta_t = \begin{bmatrix} \mu_{1,t} \\ g_{1,t} \\ \mu_{2,t} \\ g_{2,t} \\ a_t \\ a_{1,t} \\ a_{2,t} \end{bmatrix} \text{ and}$$

$$F = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \gamma_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & \gamma_2 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \phi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \text{ the state space representation of the system (B4)-(B5) in compact form}$$

follows the general form (B3). Estimation of the vector of parameters $\{\sigma_{\varepsilon_i}^2, \sigma_{\eta_i}^2, \gamma_i, \phi\}$ is obtained as previously outlined for the univariate model.