

Lütkepohl, Helmut; Meitz, Mika; Netšunajev, Aleksei; Saikkonen, Pentti

Article — Published Version

Testing identification via heteroskedasticity in structural vector autoregressive models

The Econometrics Journal

Provided in Cooperation with:

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

Suggested Citation: Lütkepohl, Helmut; Meitz, Mika; Netšunajev, Aleksei; Saikkonen, Pentti (2021) : Testing identification via heteroskedasticity in structural vector autoregressive models, The Econometrics Journal, ISSN 1368-4221, Oxford University Press, Oxford, Vol. 24, Iss. 1, pp. 1-22,
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ectj/utaa008>

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/233855>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.



<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Erratum to: Testing Identification via Heteroskedasticity in Structural Vector Autoregressive Models

The originally published version of this article had errors in the numbering of some equations. In Section 2, Equation (2.2) was incorrectly marked as (2.3) and the following equations in this series were also wrong, i.e., (2.3) was marked as (2.4). This has now been corrected. Similarly, in In Section 3, Equation (3.1) was incorrectly marked as (3.4) and the following equations in this series were also wrong, i.e., (3.2) was marked as (2.5). This has also now been corrected.

OUP apologises for this error.