Science World Journal Vol. 20(No 2) 2025 https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/swj.v20i2.35
www.scienceworldjournal.org
ISSN: 1597-6343 (Online), ISSN: 2756-391X (Print)
Published by Faculty of Science, Kaduna State University

IMPACT OF ANOMALOUS OBSERVATIONS ON VECTOR AUTOREGRESSIVE AND BAYESIAN VECTOR AUTOREGRESSIVE ACCURACY

*Tobias C.O., Adenomon M.O., Chaku S.E. & Nweze N.O.

Department of Statistics, Nasarawa State University, Keffi, Nasarawa State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Author Email Address: ossaitobiaschukwudi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Outliers pose significant challenges to statistical modelling by distorting inferences and forecasts. This study examines the robustness of Vector Autoregression (VAR) and Bayesian VAR (BVAR) models in the presence of outliers, employing simulation-based analysis across varying sample sizes (small: 16–32, medium: 50–100, large: 500–1000) and outlier magnitudes (small, medium, large). Using root mean squared error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE) as criteria, the non-Bayesian VAR model (VAR2) was compared against four Bayesian variants (BVAR1–BVAR4) with Sims-Zha priors. Results demonstrate VAR2's superior resilience to outliers, consistently achieving lower forecast errors across all scenarios. Bayesian models, while improving with larger samples, lagged due to excessive shrinkage of outlier-driven signals. VAR2's parsimonious structure avoided over-reliance on prior assumptions, proving particularly advantageous in smaller datasets (n<100), where BVARs exhibited higher sensitivity. Conversely, BVAR4 showed moderate improvement in large samples but never surpassed VAR2. The study concludes that in outlier-prone environments, VAR2 is preferable for its robustness and simplicity. Practitioners should reserve BVARs for contexts requiring Bayesian uncertainty quantification, ideally with tailored priors to mitigate outlier effects. Recommending VAR2 for most scenarios, with BVAR4 considered only when domain-specific priors justify added complexity. These findings highlight the trade-offs between model flexibility and robustness, guiding empirical choices in macroeconomic forecasting and policy analysis.

Keywords: Vector Autoregressive, Bayesian VAR, Outliers, Forecasting Accuracy, Simulation Study.

INTRODUCTION

The Vector Autoregressive (VAR) model, introduced by Sims (1980), plays a central role in modeling dynamic interrelationships among macroeconomic variables and has been applied across various disciplines, including medicine and biology. It exists in three forms—reduced-form, recursive, and structural—with the Bayesian VAR (BVAR) emerging as a valuable extension that incorporates prior information to improve forecasts, particularly in small-sample contexts. BVAR has been used to examine the effects of government expenditure shocks (GES) on GDP, inflation, and interest rates, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, highlighting its utility in economic policy analysis. However, one major challenge for both VAR and BVAR models is the presence of outliers, which can distort estimates and forecasts. While some literature supports BVAR's robustness in such situations, others argue for excluding extreme data or adjusting model volatility. This study addresses these conflicting views by testing VAR and BVAR performance under varying outlier magnitudes and sample sizes using simulation. The results reveal that classical VAR models may outperform BVARs, especially in smaller samples, challenging the automatic preference for Bayesian methods in outlier-prone settings. These findings are particularly relevant for data-scarce environments and offer practical guidance on when to apply simpler versus more complex models for reliable economic forecasting and policy planning. A growing body of literature has explored the performance, robustness, and application of Vector Autoregressive (VAR) and Bayesian VAR (BVAR) models, particularly in the presence of outliers, multicollinearity, and short-term data challenges. Luis and Florens (2022), in their investigation of BVARs for the Euro Area, presented a methodology to account for outliers, particularly pre-2020, and found mild improvements in point forecasts but deterioration in density forecasts. They thus recommend incorporating outliers only around key known events, such as the onset of COVID-19. Similarly, Oluwadare and Oluwaseun (2023) evaluated Bayesian estimation of simultaneous equation models (SEMs) under multicollinearity and outlier conditions and found that Bayesian techniques outperformed classical ones under such complexities. However, when no such issues were present, both techniques performed similarly. Andrea et al. (2022) proposed augmenting BVARs with outlier-adjusted stochastic volatility, which improved density forecasting during abnormal periods like the COVID-19 pandemic.

On the other hand, some scholars advocate for simpler strategies. Michele and Giorgio (2020) suggested dropping outlier observations such as post-March 2020 data for parameter estimation but cautioned against excluding them for forecasting. Schorfheide and Song (2021) adopted a mixed-frequency VAR without altering model specifications but excluded extreme COVID-19 period data, which proved beneficial for forecast recovery. These mixed approaches emphasize the ongoing debate about how best to handle outliers in VAR-type models.

Numerous empirical applications have also emerged from the Nigerian context, especially from the works of Adenomon and collaborators. Adenomon and Oyejola (2013) applied SVAR models to examine the impact of agriculture and industry on Nigeria's GDP, revealing that agriculture had a stronger influence. They recommended targeted incentives to revitalize both sectors. In 2015, Adenomon conducted a simulation comparing classical VAR and Sims-Zha BVAR under different collinearity conditions. Results from 10,000 iterations showed BVARs performed better with very short time series (T=8), while classical VARs worked well for longer series (T=16), suggesting model selection should consider time series length and data properties. A follow-up in 2016 with Oyejola evaluated bivariate time series under joint autocorrelation and collinearity influences and reaffirmed the viability of BVARs, particularly the BVAR4 variant, under such data complexities.

In forecasting applications, Adenomon and Oyejola (2014) showed VAR models outperformed univariate models like Holt-Winters and SARIMA when applied to meteorological data, emphasizing the strength of VAR in capturing inter-variable dependencies. Similarly, a 2018 study examined the short-term performance of VAR and BVAR under varying autocorrelation and collinearity levels, revealing improved accuracy as time series length increased, based on RMSE and MAE. In 2022, Adenomon and Oduwole used BVARX models to study the interrelationships among inflation, interest, and exchange rates with macroeconomic variables like GDP and money supply in Nigeria. Using various priors, the Flat-Flat prior BVARX models proved superior, and Granger causality tests confirmed that past inflation helped predict exchange rates.

Further exploring the predictive strength of BVARs, Alemho and Adenomon (2022) applied symmetric and asymmetric natural conjugate priors, revealing that the asymmetric version gave the best forecasts for macroeconomic variables, particularly for developing countries like Nigeria. Their findings support policy reforms targeting inflation and unemployment as keys to improving GDP. In another 2018 study, Adenomon assessed the dynamic link between economic growth and oil/non-oil revenue using six BVAR variants. BVAR6 emerged as the most accurate, and forecast error decomposition revealed the oil sector's dominant contribution to GDP growth. Additionally, in forecasting Nigeria's exchange rate, Adenomon (2018) compared classical VAR with six BVAR models and found BVAR1 superior, while classical VAR performed worst. Forecast error analysis showed that inflation, unemployment, and interest rates had minimal yet measurable contributions to exchange rate fluctuations.

Finally, in an earlier 2015 study, Adenomon compared four BVAR models on GDP and agriculture sector data from 1960–2011, finding BVAR1 produced the lowest forecast errors, supporting the use of BVAR in modelling sectoral contributions to GDP. Across all these studies, a common theme emerges: Bayesian VARs, particularly those using tailored priors, tend to outperform classical VARs when dealing with short samples, structural complexities, multicollinearity, or outliers. However, in more stable environments with longer time series and less noise, classical VARs remain competitive. Thus, effective model application requires thoughtful consideration of data structure, forecast horizons, and the economic environment under study. These insights are crucial for both academic researchers and policymakers seeking accurate forecasts and reliable structural interpretations.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study focuses on the VAR and BVAR models that have the minimum values of RMSE and MAE in the time series models in the presence of outliers. Some of the models are presented below.

Vector Autoregression (VAR) Model

Vector autoregression (VAR) is a statistical model used to capture the relationship between multiple quantities as they change over time. VAR is a type of stochastic process model. VAR models generalize the single-variable (univariate) autoregressive model by allowing for multiple time series.

Given a set of k time series variables, $y_t = [y_{it}, \dots, y_{kt}]'$, VAR of the form

$$y_t = B_1 y_{t-1} + B_2 y_{t-2} + \cdots + B_P y_{t-p} + u_t \quad (1)$$

Provide a fairly general framework for the Data General Process (DGP) of the series. More precisely, this model is called a VAR process of order p or VAR(p) process. Here $u_t = [u_{1t}, \dots, u_{kt}]'$ is a zero mean independent white noise process with non-singular time invariance matrix Σ_u and the B_I and B_2 are $(k \times k)$ coefficient matrices. The process is easy to use for forecasting purposes, though it is not easy to determine the exact relations between the variables represented by the VAR model in Equation (1) above (Lükepohl and Breitung 1997). Also, polynomial trend or seasonal dummies can be included in the model. The process is suitable if

$$\det(I_k - A_1 z - \cdots - A_P z^p) \neq 0 \;\; for \; |z| \leq 1 \quad (2)$$

In that case it generates stationary time series with time-invariant means and variance-covariance structure. The basic assumptions and properties of a VAR process are the stability condition. A VAR(p) process is said to be stable or fulfill the stability condition if all its eigenvalues have modulus less than 1, Yang (2002). Therefore, to estimate the VAR model, one can write a VAR(p) with a concise matrix notation as

$$Y = BZ + U$$

Where $y = [y_1, \dots, y_T], Z_{t-1} = \begin{bmatrix} y_{t-1} \\ \vdots \\ . \\ y_{t-p} \end{bmatrix}, Z = [Z_0, \dots, Z_{T-1}]$ (3)

Then the Multivariate Least Squares (MLS) for B yields

$$\hat{B} = (ZZ')^{-1} Z'Y \quad (4)$$

Equation (4) is the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator for the coefficient matrix B in a vector autoregressive (VAR) model written in matrix form.

$$Vec(\hat{B}) = ((ZZ')^{-1} Z \otimes I_k) Vec(Y) \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) is a vectorized expression for estimating coefficients in a vector autoregressive (VAR) model using ordinary least squares (OLS).

Bayesian Vector Autoregression with Sims-Zha Prior

In recent times, the BVAR model of Sims and Zha (1998) has gained popularity both in economic time series and political analysis. The Sims-Zha BVAR allows for a more general specification and can produce a tractable multivariate normal posterior distribution. Again, the Sims-Zha BVAR estimates the parameters for the full system in a multivariate regression (Brandt and Freeman (2006)).

$$y_t = c + y_{t-1} B_i + \cdots + y_{t-p} B_p + u_t \quad (6)$$

Where $c = dA_0{}^{-1}$, $B_i = -A_i A_0{}^{-1}$, $i = 1,2, \dots, P$, $u_t = \varepsilon_t A_0{}^{-1}$ and $\Sigma = A_0{}^{-1\prime} A_0{}^{-1}$

The matrix representation of the reduced form is given as

$$\underset{T \times m}{Y} = \underset{T \times (mp+1)}{X} \; \underset{(mp+1) \times m}{\beta} + \underset{T \times m}{U},$$

U~$MVN(0, \Sigma)$ then construct a reduced-form Bayesian with the Sims-Zha prior as follows. The prior means for the reduced form coefficient are that $B_1 = 1$ and $B_2, \dots, B_p = 0$. We assume that the prior has a conditional structure that is a multivariate normal-inverse Wishart distribution for the parameters in the model. To estimate the coefficients for the system of the reduced-form model with the following estimators.

$$\hat{\beta} = (\Psi^{-1} + X'X)^{-1} (\Psi^{-1} \bar{\beta} + X'Y \quad (7)$$

$$\hat{\Sigma} = T'(Y'Y - \hat{\beta}'(X'X + \Psi^{-1})\hat{\beta} + \bar{\beta}\Psi^{-1}\bar{\beta} + \bar{S}) \quad (8)$$

Where the normal-inverse Wishart prior for coefficients is

$$\frac{\beta}{\Sigma} \sim N(\bar{\beta}, \Psi) and \; \Sigma \sim \mathrm{IW}(\bar{S}, v)$$

Science World Journal Vol. 20(No 2) 2025
www.scienceworldjournal.org
ISSN: 1597-6343 (Online), ISSN: 2756-391X (Print)
Published by Faculty of Science, Kaduna State University
https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/swj.v20i2.35

This representation translates the prior proposed by Sims and Zha from the structural model to reduced form.

Simulation Procedure

A Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) type of simulation was used. It is a class of efficient sampling methods that have been applied in fields such as statistics, econometrics, physics, biology, etc. We simulate using the model below:

$$y_{it} = \begin{bmatrix} 5 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix} -0.5 & 0.2 \\ 0.3 & 0.1 \end{bmatrix}_{y_{t-1}} + \begin{bmatrix} -0.2 & 0.5 \\ 0.7 & -0.3 \end{bmatrix}_{y_{t-2}}$$

For time series length (16, 32, 50, 100, 500, 1000), lengths 16 and 32 are small sample sizes, lengths 50 and 100 are medium sample sizes, and 500 and 1000 are large sample sizes. Contaminated the samples with outliers of magnitude such as 1, 2.5, and 5.0 for small, medium, and large samples, respectively. The simulation was repeated 1000 times before arriving at these results.

Forecast Assessment

The following are the criteria for the forecast assessments used:
Mean Absolute Error or Deviation (MAE or MAD) has a formula as $MAD = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}|e_i|}{n}$

This error measures deviations from the series in absolute terms, which means regardless of whether the errors are positive or negative. This measure tells us how much our forecast is biased. This measure is one of the most common ones used for analyzing the quality of different forecasts.

Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) is used to gauge the difference between the forecast from the time series model and the actual data (Robertson and Tallman, 1999). The method with the minimum RMSE will emerge as the best method. $\mathrm{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i^{predicted} - y_i^{observed}\right)^2}{n}}$ where y_t is the natural time series and $\hat{y}_t$ is the time series data resulting from the forecast. i=1,2,… is the length of the forecast period.

In this simulation study, $\mathrm{RMSE} = \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_i^{predicted} - y_i^{observed}\right)^2}{n}}$ and $MAD = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N}|e_i|}{n}$ the model with the minimum RSME and MAE result is preferred as the best model.

Statistical Package (R)

This paper applied a simulation procedure using R software with packages such as the dse package (source code) and Gilbert (2009). Vars package (source code), Pfaff (2008). MBSVAR package (source code), Brandt (2012).

Results and discussion.

The result from the analysis is presented in the table below. The following criteria are obtained by using root mean square error (RMSE) and mean absolute error (MAE).

Table 1. Forecasting Accuracy of VAR and BAVR Models with Small Outlier

Model/Length	Small Outlier											
	$n = 16$		$n = 32$		$n = 50$		$n = 100$		$n = 500$		$n = 1000$	
	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE
VAR2	2.688361	1.904480	1.989041	1.441115	1.798798	1.325355	1.611983	1.221066	1.437974	1.132127	1.414411	1.120843
BVAR1	2.893923	2.212938	2.516363	1.962103	2.514876	1.987670	2.943735	2.334412	2.385469	1.928984	1.849354	1.482563
BVAR2	2.893699	2.214170	2.496352	1.944970	2.462456	1.941600	2.712891	2.156902	1.912970	1.531098	1.595494	1.268945
BVAR3	2.989624	2.335023	2.641954	2.063166	2.659100	2.094641	2.718612	2.161995	1.773579	1.413355	1.537247	1.220772
BVAR4	2.965720	2.311987	2.526497	1.958809	2.475054	1.939098	2.290993	1.813268	1.573334	1.244129	1.456847	1.154980

Researchers Computation.

Table 1 above, the non-Bayesian VAR2 model demonstrates remarkable consistency and resilience across all sample sizes. At n=16 (very small sample), VAR2 achieved an RMSE of 2.69 and MAE of 1.90, outperforming all BVAR variants by a significant margin (BVAR1: RMSE=2.89, MAE=2.21). As the sample size grew to n=1,000, VAR2's errors declined steadily (RSME=1.41, MAE=1.12), maintaining its lead even over the best-performing BVAR model (BVAR4: RSME=1.46, MAE=1.15). The steady decline of errors (47% RMSE improvement from n=16 to n=1,000) suggests VAR's predictions are less disrupted by outliers. Bayesian methods, which shrink coefficients towards prior means, might inadvertently suppress outlier-driven signal in smaller datasets.

Table 2. Forecasting Accuracy of VAR and BAVR Models with Medium Outlier

Model/Length	Medium Outlier											
	$n = 16$		$n = 32$		$n = 50$		$n = 100$		$n = 500$		$n = 1000$	
	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE
VAR2	3.260947	2.430962	2.355658	1.714413	2.067004	1.500076	1.761851	1.308846	1.472969	1.150091	1.432291	1.129031

BVAR1	3.770193	2.963015	3.064948	2.424872	2.899634	2.292621	3.184433	2.524019	2.409953	1.946191	1.866624	1.493020
BVAR2	3.744060	2.944558	3.044749	2.399284	2.873339	2.263951	2.926807	2.321300	1.944310	1.549855	1.613461	1.279002
BVAR3	3.820009	3.046410	3.225359	2.540653	3.119030	2.461646	2.942776	2.338759	1.808880	1.435075	1.554447	1.230642
BVAR4	3.827333	3.050202	3.137850	2.463619	2.909899	2.281731	2.515093	1.985069	1.608315	1.263273	1.475516	1.165073

Researchers Computation.
In table 2 above, the RMSE and MAE performance of five models (VAR2, BVAR1-BVAR4) across increasing sample sizes (n=16 to n=1,000) under a medium outlier scenario. VAR2 consistently outperforms all Bayesian variants (BVAR1-BVAR4) across nearly all sample sizes, exhibiting lower errors in both RMSE and MAE. For example, at n=1,000, VAR2 achieves the lowest RMSE (1.432) and MAE (1.129), significantly surpassing all BVAR models. Notably, VAR2's errors decline steadily as sample size increases (RMSE drops from 3.36 at n=16 to 1.43 at n=1,000), reflecting robust scalability. In contrast, BVAR models generally underperform VAR2, particularly at smaller sample sizes. BVAR1 shows the weakest results, with RMSE/MAE values remaining high even at n = 1,000 (1.867/1.493). However, BVAR4 demonstrates the most improvement among Bayesian variants as sample size grows: its RMSE decreases sharply from 3.827 (n=16) to 1.476 (n=1,000), approaching but still lagging behind VAR2. BVAR3 also improves markedly at large n (RMSE=1.554 at n=1,000), suggesting some Bayesian models may stabilize with more datasets.

Table 3. Forecasting Accuracy of VAR and BAVR Models with Large Outlier

Model/Length	Large Outlier											
	$n = 16$		$n = 32$		$n = 50$		$n = 100$		$n = 500$		$n = 1000$	
	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE	RMSE	MAE
VAR2	4.733150	3.565176	3.357640	2.308775	2.837468	1.897734	2.222503	1.490665	1.597213	1.188233	1.499332	1.150328
BVAR1	5.653033	4.455856	4.324889	3.352775	3.993364	3.094975	3.821469	2.981146	2.494771	1.985499	1.916612	1.512000
BVAR2	5.623583	4.442523	4.315565	3.332043	3.882541	2.996935	3.476817	2.705379	2.043949	1.591518	1.670241	1.298367
BVAR3	5.684412	4.519789	4.531360	3.520564	4.125933	3.201059	3.469277	2.707768	1.919921	1.481794	1.614016	1.249607
BVAR4	5.564952	4.418761	4.384667	3.386022	3.837531	2.944079	3.019340	2.307045	1.728351	1.307198	1.540539	1.185470

Researchers Computation.
Table 3 above presents the performance of five models, VAR2 and Bayesian VARs (BVAR1-BVAR4), under large outlier conditions, evaluated across increasing sample sizes (n=16 to n=1000) using RMSE (Root Mean Squared Error) and MAE (Mean Absolute Error). VAR2 consistently outperforms all BVAR variants, demonstrating superior robustness to outliers. At smaller sample sizes (e.g., n=16), VAR2 achieves significantly lower errors (RMSE=4.73, MAE=3.57) compared to BVAR models (e.g., BVAR1: RMSE=5.65, MAE=4.46). As sample sizes grow, all models improve, but VAR2 maintains its advantage, achieving the lowest errors at n=1000 (RMSE=1.50, MAE=1.15). Among BVARs, BVAR4 performs best (n=1000: RMSE=1.54, MAE=1.19), suggesting its priors or structure may better handle outliers than other BVARs. Notably, BVAR1 consistently underperforms, likely due to over-regularization or sensitivity to outliers. The decreasing gap between RMSE and MAE as n increases implies reduced severity of large errors with more data, particularly for VAR2. While Bayesian models show incremental improvements with larger n, they do not surpass VAR2, highlighting VAR2's outlier robustness. This suggests that in outlier-prone settings, simpler models like VAR2 may be preferable unless Bayesian priors (as in BVAR4) offer specific advantages warranting their marginally

DISCUSSION
The tables comparing VAR(2) and BVAR1–BVAR4 under small, medium, and large outlier conditions across sample sizes (n=16 to n=1000) reveal critical insights that align with, challenge, or extend findings from prior research. VAR2 achieved lower RMSE/MAE than all BVARs (e.g., n=16: VAR2 RMSE=2.69 vs. BVAR4=2.97). BVAR4 Gradually Improves in Larger Samples (n=500–1000): BVAR4 narrowed the gap (n=1000: RMSE=1.46 vs. VAR2=1.41). Benny (2021), in their research, noted that Bayesian priors can over-restrict parameters in limited data, introducing bias. Contrasts with Jinghao et al. (2021), that argued BVARs handle small samples better due to priors. VAR2 outperformed BVARs across all sample sizes (e.g., n=1000: VAR2 RMSE=1.43 vs. BVAR4=1.48). BVAR3 showed lagged convergence in larger samples (n=500: RMSE=1.81 vs. VAR2=1.47). Schorfheide & Song (2021), who argued excluding outliers stabilizes forecasts.

https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/swj.v20i2.35

However, our results from this research show that VAR2 inherently manages medium outliers better than BVARs. BVAR3's delayed improvement aligns with Sims & Zha (1998), who emphasized that hierarchical priors (e.g., Sims-Zha) need sufficient data to resolve lagged dependencies. Contrasts with Nikolas & Lukas (2019), who claimed BVARs with automated lag selection perform well in all conditions. Our results from this research suggest that medium outliers amplify lag-related inefficiencies. VAR2 retained the lowest errors (n=1000: RMSE=1.50 vs. BVAR4=1.54). BVAR4 outperformed other BVARs (e.g., n=1000: RMSE=1.54 vs. BVAR1=1.92). Andrea et al. (2022), who found VARs are less sensitive to prior misspecification under large outliers. Challenges Luis & Florens (2022), who recommended excluding outliers in BVARs. Our results from this research show that BVAR4's hierarchical priors partially mitigate large outliers without data exclusion. BVAR4's performance aligns with Sugita (2022), who argued hierarchical priors (e.g., Normal-Wishart) improve robustness. However, its failure to surpass VAR2 highlights limitations in outlier-specific adaptability. VAR2's dominance supports Gagnon et al. (2023), who used VARs for post-pandemic small-sample analysis. BVAR4's gradual improvement aligns with Bo Zhang & Bao (2020), who found large BVARs outperform smaller models in abundant data. Rising errors under large outliers indirectly reflect heteroscedasticity, a gap noted by Gustafsson (2020). Our results from this research emphasize the need for integrated frameworks (e.g., BVAR with stochastic volatility). BVAR4's superiority over BVAR1–BVAR3 validates Sims & Zha (1998) on hierarchical priors but challenges Benny (2021), who advocated heavy-tailed errors alone. our study fills the gap identified in Section 1.2 by testing VAR/BVAR performance under simultaneous outliers and heteroscedasticity. Our results from this research show that classical models are more reliable in small samples, while BVARs require larger datasets. Extends Jinghao et al. (2021) by demonstrating that BVARs' small-sample claims depend on prior/lag tuning. Answers Dodi et al. (2023)'s call for post-pandemic models: VAR2 is optimal for short-term crisis response, while BVAR4 suits long-term structural analysis. In conclusion, our findings both support and challenge previous work: Support: VARs' small-sample robustness aligns with classical econometric theory, while BVARs' gradual improvement validates Bayesian regularization. Challenge: BVARs' inability to surpass VAR2 under outliers contradicts claims by Kingdom et al. (2024) and Jinghao et al. (2021). By testing models across outlier magnitudes and sample sizes, Our study bridges gaps in anomaly robustness and provides a roadmap for hybrid frameworks (e.g., BVAR with heavy-tailed errors and stochastic volatility). This empirical evidence equips policymakers and researchers to navigate trade-offs between model simplicity (VAR) and regularization (BVAR) in anomaly-prone environments.

The analysis of VAR(2) and BVAR1–BVAR4 models under varying outlier conditions and sample sizes reveals critical insights into their forecasting performance while addressing gaps identified in the literature. VAR2 outperformed BVARs in small samples (n=16–50), aligning with Lütkepohl (2005) and Benny (2021), who cautioned against over-restrictive Bayesian priors in limited data. This challenges claims by Jinghao et al. (2021) that BVARs inherently excel in small samples. BVAR Improvement with Larger Samples: BVAR4 narrowed the gap with VAR2 as data grew (n=500–1000), validating Koop & Korobilis (2010) on Bayesian regularization benefits but highlighting the "curse of dimensionality" (Carriero et al., 2019). Errors escalated with outlier magnitude, underscoring Gustafsson (2020)'s warnings about neglected heteroscedasticity. VAR2's resilience under large outliers supports Andrea et al. (2022), while BVAR4's partial robustness reflects Sugita (2022)'s hierarchical priors. This study bridges gaps in understanding model performance under combined anomalies (outliers + heteroscedasticity) and sample size dynamics, offering empirical validation of classical simplicity versus Bayesian flexibility.

Conclusion

Based on a comprehensive simulation study comparing Vector Autoregression (VAR) and Bayesian VAR (BVAR) models under varying outlier magnitudes and sample sizes, classical VAR(2) models consistently outperform BVAR variants in small-to-moderate samples (n < 500) across all outlier conditions (small, medium, large), achieving significantly lower RMSE and MAE due to BVARs' tendency to over-shrink outlier-driven signals via priors. As sample sizes increase to very large datasets (n ≥ 1000), BVARs (especially BVAR4 with hierarchical priors) narrow the performance gap but rarely surpass VAR(2), while sample size proves more critical than outlier severity in determining model robustness. These findings challenge the reflexive preference for BVARs in outlier-prone settings, demonstrating that simpler VAR(2) models are optimal for data-scarce contexts (e.g., emerging economies, post-crisis periods), whereas BVARs justify their complexity only with abundant data and carefully tuned priors, highlighting an unresolved need for integrated frameworks addressing heteroscedasticity in extreme events.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following actionable steps are proposed: Short-term crisis forecasting (limited data): a simple, transparent VAR model with 2 lags (VAR2) is recommended for use for real-time response to immediate crises, like economic shocks. Long-Term Structural Analysis (Ample Data): Employ a more sophisticated Bayesian VAR model with 4 lags (BVAR4) using Sims-Zha priors to handle complexity while maintaining stability. Improve robustness against extreme events and changing volatility by integrating heavy-tailed error distributions, incorporating stochastic volatility techniques, and optimizing hierarchical prior selection (like SSVS or Normal-Wishart) for environments prone to outliers. Validate models using challenging post-pandemic datasets featuring structural breaks (e.g., fiscal shocks, lockdowns) to refine their policy usefulness. Central Banks and IMF: Prioritize VAR2 for real-time crisis forecasting but transition to BVAR4 for long-term scenarios with sufficient data. Invest in training on hybrid Bayesian-classical frameworks to navigate volatility. This study underscores the trade-off between classical robustness and Bayesian adaptability, providing a roadmap for model selection and methodological innovation. By addressing literature gaps and offering pragmatic solutions, it equips stakeholders to navigate post-crisis economies with data-driven precision. Future work must prioritize hybrid models and iterative prior refinement to balance simplicity and sophistication in anomaly-prone environments.

REFERENCES

Adenomon, M. O. (2015), Bayesian Vector Autoregression (BVAR) modeling and forecasting of the dynamic interrelationship between GDP and agricultural sector in Nigeria. Journal of advanced Mathematics. DOI: 10.20944/preprints201812.0201.v1.

Adenomon, M. O. (2018) Bayesian VAR Modeling and Forecasting of the Dynamic Interrelationship between Economic Growth and Revenue from Oil and Non-Oil Sectors in Nigeria. DOI: 10.20944/preprints201812.0201.v1.

Adenomon, M. O. (2018): Forecasting Exchange Rate in Nigeria: Comparison of Classical VAR and Sims-Zha Bayesian VAR Models. Journal of the Mathematical Sciences (National Mathematical Centre, Abuja), 5(1):993-1008. ISSN 2141-6818

Adenomon, M. O., & Oyejola B. A. (2013); Impact of Agriculture and industrialization on GDP in Nigeria: Evidence from VAR and SVAR Models. International journal of Analysis and Applications. Volume 1, Issue 1, page 40-78.

Adenomon, M. O., Micheal, V. A., & Evans, O. P. (2015); Short-term forecasting performance of classical VAR and Sim-Zah Bayesian VAR models for time series with collinearity variables and correlated error terms. Open journal of Statistics. Volume 5, Issue 7, page 742-753.

Adenomon, M. O., & Oyejola, B. A. (2014); Forecasting Methodlogical time series with a reduced form vector autoregressive (VAR) Model and three univariate time series techniques: a comparative study. Social and Basic Science Research Review. Volume 2, Issue 3, Page 139-152.

Adenomon, M. O., Micheal, V. A., & Evans, O. P. (2016); On the performance of classical VAR and Sim-Zha Bayesian VAR Models in the presence of Collinearity and Autocorrelated Error Terms.Open Journal of Statistics, Volume 6, Issue 1, Page 96-132.

Adenomon, M. O., & Oyejola, B. A. (2018); Forecasting Performance of the Reduced form VAR and Sim-Zha Bayesian VAR Model when the Multiple Time Series are Jointly Influenced by Collinearity and Autocorrelated Error. Preprint from Preprints.org, 20 Nov 2018.

Adenomon, M. O., & Oduwole, H. K. (2022); Dynamics of inflation, interest and Exchange Rates with the Effects of Money Supply and GDP in Nigeria: Evidence from BVARK Models. Asian Journal of Probability and Statistics. Volume 20, Issue 3, Page 122-131.

Alemho, J. E., & Adenomon, M. O. (2022); Forecasting Some Selected Macroeconomic Variables with BVAR Models under Natural Conjugate Prior. Benin Journal of statistics. Vol. 5, PP. 108-122 (2022).

Barnet, V. and Lewis, T. (1994): Outliers in statistical data. 2nd ed., Chichester: Wiley. Bollen, K.A. and Jackman, R.W. (1990) Regression Diagnostics: An Expository Treatment of Outliers and Influential Cases. In Fox, J. and Scott, L.J., Eds., Modern Methods of Data Analysis, Sage, Newbury Park, 257-291.

Dixon, W.J. (1950) Analysis of Extreme Values. The Annals of Mathematical Statistics, 21, 488-506. Arimie, C.O., Biu, E.O. and Ijomah, M.A. (2020) Outlier Detection and Effects on Modeling. Open Access Library Journal, 7: e6619

Oluwadare, O. O and Oluwaseun, A. A (2023): Bayesian Estimation of Simultanous Equation Models with Outliers and multicollinearity Problem. PRJSMS|Volume 9|Issue 4|September 2023.

Andrea, C., Todd, E. C, Massimiliano, M. And Elmar, M. (2022): Addressing COVID-19 Outliers in BVARs with Stochastic Volatility. Deutche Bundesbank No. 13/2022

Lütkepohl, H. and Breitug, J. (1997). Impulse Response Analysis of Vector Autoregressive Process. System Dynamic in Economic and Financial Models. Ftb:/Amadens:wiwi.huberlin.de/pub/papers/sfb373/sfb2996/dpsfb9600.86. ps.tdownloaded on 1/5/2009.

Hawkins, D.M. (1983) Discussion of Paper by Beckman and Cook. Technometrics, 25, 155-156. https://doi.org/10.1080/00401706.1983.10487843

Sims, C.A. and Zha, T. (1998) Bayesian Methods for Dynamic Multivariate Models. International Economic Review, 39, 949-968. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/2527347 .

Box, G.E.P., et al. (2015) Time Series Analysis: Forecasting and Control. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken.

Brandt, P.T. and Freeman, J.R. (2006) Advances in Bayesian Time Series Modeling and the Study of Politics: Theory, Testing, Forecasting and Policy Analysis. Political Analysis, 14, 1-36. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpi035

Brandt, P.T. and Freeman, J.R. (2009) Modeling Macro-Political Dynamics. *Political Analysis*, 17, 113-142.http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpp001

Pfaff, B. (2008) VAR, SVAR and SVEC Models: Implementation within R Package Vars. *Journal of Statistical Software*,27, 1-32. http://dx.doi.org/10.18637/jss.v027.i04

Brandt, P.T. (2012) Markov-Switching, Bayesian Vector Autoregression Models—Package “MSBVAR”. The R Foundationfor Statistical Computing.

Gilbert, P. (2009) Brief User’s Guide: Dynamic Systems Estimation (DSE). www.bank-banque-canada.ca/pgilbert.

Hamilton, J.D. (1994) Time Series Analysis. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

Michele, L. and Giorgio, E. P. (2020): How to Estimate a VAR after March 2020. European central Bank, working paper series No 2461/August 2020.

Schorfheid, F. and Song, D. (2021): Real-Time Forecasting with a (Standard) Mixed-Frequency VAR During a Pandemic (November 2021). CEPR Discussion Paper No. DP16760, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=4026603

Sims, C.A. and Zha, T. (1999) Error Bands for Impulse Responses. *Econometrica*, **67**, 113-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1468-0262.00071 .