Comprehensive Review of Quantitative Frameworks for Optimizing Fiscal Policy Response to Global Shocks

MELVIN J. OSHOMEGIE[1], OMODOLAPO EUNICE OGUNSOLA[2], BLESSING OLAJUMOKE FAROUNBI[3]
[1]*PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) Nigeria*
[2]*International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Nigeria*
[3]*Vetiva Capital, Lagos Nigeria*

Abstract- ***The increasing frequency and intensity of global economic shocks have underscored the importance of resilient fiscal policy frameworks. From financial crises to trade disruptions and pandemics, governments require adaptive tools to mitigate volatility and ensure macroeconomic stability. This paper presents a comprehensive review of quantitative frameworks for optimizing fiscal policy response to global shocks. It synthesizes theoretical foundations, empirical approaches, and policy applications while critically analyzing the effectiveness and limitations of different methodologies. By categorizing frameworks into econometric, simulation-based, and hybrid models, the study highlights their strengths and constraints in addressing issues of fiscal sustainability, countercyclical stabilization, and international spillovers. The methodology applies a structured literature review and comparative framework analysis, emphasizing the role of predictive modeling, scenario analysis, and dynamic policy simulation. Results demonstrate that hybrid models incorporating machine learning and traditional econometric structures offer superior adaptability under uncertainty. The discussion section explores policy trade-offs, model transparency, and political feasibility, arguing for multi-framework integration as a way forward. The paper concludes that future fiscal policy optimization requires a dynamic blend of quantitative rigor, computational innovation, and institutional adaptability.***

Keywords- ***Fiscal Policy, Quantitative Frameworks, Global Shocks, Econometrics, Simulation Models, Optimization)***

I. INTRODUCTION

Global economic shocks, characterized by their unpredictability, rapid transmission, and disruptive magnitude, have repeatedly tested the resilience of fiscal frameworks across countries [1], [2]. The collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the early 1970s, the twin oil shocks of 1973 and 1979, the Latin American debt crisis in the 1980s, the Asian financial crisis of 1997, the global financial crisis of 2008, and mounting trade disputes in the late 2010s all reveal the persistent vulnerability of national economies to external disruptions [3], [4]. These events demonstrate that fiscal policy, traditionally viewed as a domestic stabilizer, is increasingly shaped by global dynamics [5], [6], [7].

Fiscal responses to shocks often oscillate between countercyclical stimulus and fiscal consolidation. During recessions, governments may resort to expansionary measures such as stimulus spending, tax cuts, or subsidies to boost demand [8], [9]. Conversely, periods of recovery or capital inflows often push governments toward fiscal tightening, partly to reassure investors and ensure debt sustainability [10]. The success of these interventions depends not only on political choices but also on the quantitative frameworks that inform fiscal design and evaluation [11], [12].

The challenge lies in the inherent uncertainty of global shocks. Traditional Keynesian approaches stress the importance of countercyclical spending, yet empirical evidence suggests that fiscal multipliers vary considerably across contexts. Countries with high debt burdens, open economies, or rigid exchange rate regimes often experience diminished fiscal effectiveness. Furthermore, the spillover effects of

fiscal policy whether through capital markets, trade linkages, or investor sentiment complicate the design of purely domestic interventions [13], [14].

Quantitative frameworks serve as essential tools in navigating this complexity. By estimating fiscal multipliers, simulating policy scenarios, and projecting debt dynamics, these models offer structured approaches to decision-making under uncertainty. Yet no framework is flawless [15]. Structural econometric models may capture historical relationships but falter in the face of structural breaks. DSGE models provide micro-founded rigor but may underestimate nonlinearities during crises. Agent-based and hybrid models promise adaptability but suffer from transparency and computational intensity [16], [17].

Against this backdrop, this paper seeks to provide a comprehensive review of quantitative frameworks for optimizing fiscal policy response to global shocks. Unlike narrow assessments of specific models, this study adopts a comparative perspective, assessing strengths, weaknesses, and policy relevance across multiple approaches. In doing so, it contributes to both scholarly discourse and practical policymaking by highlighting pathways toward more adaptive fiscal frameworks [18], [19].

The remainder of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 surveys the literature, categorizing frameworks into econometric, DSGE, CGE, simulation-based, and hybrid approaches. Section 3 explains the methodology used in conducting the review. Section 4 presents results from comparative evaluation. Section 5 discusses broader implications for policy design. Section 6 concludes with insights on future directions.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature on fiscal responses to global shocks is extensive, reflecting multiple waves of theoretical and methodological evolution. Each wave has left a distinct imprint on the quantitative frameworks currently used in policymaking [20], [21].

2.1 Early Keynesian and Structural Approaches

The Keynesian revolution emphasized the role of government spending and taxation as tools for stabilizing aggregate demand. Structural econometric models (SEMs), inspired by Keynesian insights, dominated fiscal research in the mid-twentieth century [22], [23]. These models relied heavily on historical data to establish empirical relationships between fiscal variables (spending, taxation) and macroeconomic outcomes (output, employment, inflation). Their strength lay in empirical realism and accessibility to policymakers, but their reliance on stable historical relationships made them prone to breakdowns during crises [24], [25].

2.2 Rise of DSGE Models

The rational expectations revolution in the 1970s ushered in the dominance of DSGE models, which embedded intertemporal optimization and microeconomic foundations. These models assumed rational agents who optimize consumption, labor supply, and investment over time, while facing stochastic shocks [26]. Fiscal policy enters DSGEs either as rule-based adjustments (e.g., fiscal rules ensuring debt sustainability) or as discretionary interventions. DSGEs became particularly prominent within central banks and finance ministries, where they were used to simulate the effects of policy changes under various scenarios [27], [28].

Despite their rigor, DSGEs faced criticism for oversimplification. Assumptions of representative agents, perfect foresight, and smooth adjustment processes often produced unrealistic results during crises. For example, the inability of standard DSGEs to predict or explain the 2008 financial crisis underscored their limitations. Subsequent modifications introduced financial frictions, heterogeneous agents, and occasionally behavioral elements, but challenges remain [29], [30].

2.3 Computable General Equilibrium Models

CGE models, building on Walrasian equilibrium concepts, emphasize intersectoral linkages and international trade. They have been widely used to analyze fiscal policies in developing economies, especially those vulnerable to external shocks such as

commodity price fluctuations. Unlike DSGEs, CGEs often focus more on long-run equilibrium rather than short-term volatility [31], [32]. For instance, studies examining the fiscal implications of trade liberalization in Sub-Saharan Africa have relied on CGEs to estimate sectoral winners and losers. Their strength lies in capturing trade and structural effects, but their static assumptions make them less suitable for sudden crises [33], [34].

2.4 Simulation-Based and Agent-Based Models

In response to the limitations of equilibrium-based models, simulation approaches particularly agent-based models (ABMs) have gained attention. ABMs relax assumptions of rationality, homogeneity, and equilibrium, instead modeling economic systems as interactions among diverse agents with bounded rationality [35]. These models can capture emergent behaviors such as contagion, herd behavior, and nonlinear crisis dynamics. For fiscal policy, ABMs provide insights into how heterogeneous households and firms respond differently to tax cuts or spending increases. However, ABMs face challenges in calibration, validation, and policy transparency. Policymakers often prefer models with clear causal pathways, which ABMs sometimes obscure [36], [37], [38].

2.5 Machine Learning and Hybrid Frameworks

The last decade has seen increasing integration of machine learning (ML) into fiscal policy analysis. Algorithms such as random forests, support vector machines, and neural networks can detect patterns, structural breaks, and regime shifts in macroeconomic data. While ML alone may lack theoretical grounding, combining it with econometric or simulation-based frameworks creates powerful hybrid models. These hybrids enhance forecasting accuracy while maintaining some degree of theoretical interpretability [39].

For example, hybrid frameworks have been applied to estimate fiscal multipliers during crises, where traditional econometric methods struggle due to nonlinearities. By incorporating ML algorithms to detect nonlinear patterns, these models better capture shifts in fiscal effectiveness during downturns. Nevertheless, concerns about transparency and "black box" outcomes persist [40], [41], [42].

2.6 Empirical Findings on Fiscal Policy Effectiveness

Empirical evidence suggests that the effectiveness of fiscal policy varies significantly across contexts. Advanced economies with flexible exchange rates and strong institutions often experience higher fiscal multipliers than emerging markets with rigid macroeconomic frameworks [43]. Studies also highlight the importance of timing, composition, and credibility of fiscal interventions. Spending-based stimuli tend to produce larger multipliers than tax cuts, while investment-oriented expenditures have longer-lasting impacts compared to consumption subsidies [44], [45].

Moreover, cross-country spillovers amplify the importance of coordination. Expansionary fiscal policy in a large economy, such as the United States, can stimulate global demand, while contractionary measures may depress global output. Conversely, fiscal shocks in emerging economies often trigger capital flow volatility, exacerbating vulnerabilities [46], [47].

In summary, the literature reveals a steady evolution of quantitative frameworks, from empirically grounded SEMs to theoretically rigorous DSGEs, sector-focused CGEs, adaptive ABMs, and cutting-edge hybrid models [48], [49]. Each framework addresses specific policy questions but also carries inherent limitations, highlighting the need for integrated approaches.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study employs a structured literature review combined with comparative framework analysis. The methodology is designed to ensure systematic identification, classification, and evaluation of quantitative frameworks for fiscal policy optimization [50], [51].

3.1 Literature Identification

The review draws on peer-reviewed journal articles, working papers, policy briefs, and institutional reports. Searches were conducted across JSTOR, ScienceDirect, EconLit, and institutional repositories

(IMF, World Bank, OECD, BIS). Keywords included: "fiscal policy frameworks," "global shocks," "DSGE models," "agent-based modeling," "machine learning in economics," "fiscal multipliers," and "policy simulation". The time frame was restricted to 1980–2019 to capture both historical evolution and contemporary innovations [52], [53].

3.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they (a) developed or applied a quantitative framework to fiscal policy analysis, (b) explicitly addressed global or external shocks, and (c) provided empirical or simulation-based results. Exclusions included purely theoretical discussions without quantitative application, purely monetary models without fiscal components, and commentaries lacking methodological contribution [54], [55].

3.3 Framework Classification

Identified studies were categorized into five framework types: (1) structural econometric models, (2) DSGEs, (3) CGEs, (4) simulation-based/ABMs, and (5) hybrid models integrating ML or interdisciplinary methods [C53]. Classification followed methodological design rather than institutional source to avoid bias [56], [57].

3.4 Comparative Criteria

Frameworks were evaluated across four dimensions:

1. Predictive accuracy – ability to forecast fiscal outcomes under shocks [58].
2. Policy relevance – alignment with policymaker needs for clarity and applicability [59].
3. Adaptability – capacity to adjust to nonlinearities and structural breaks.
4. Computational feasibility – resource requirements for implementation

These criteria were informed by both academic benchmarks and practical policymaking needs [60], [61].

3.5 Synthesis

Findings were synthesized through comparative analysis, highlighting trends, strengths, weaknesses, and cross-framework complementarities [62], [63], [64]. Attention was given to identifying gaps in current approaches and potential for integration of computational innovations [65].

IV. RESULTS

The comparative analysis revealed differentiated strengths and weaknesses across frameworks.

4.1 Structural Econometric Models

SEMs remain valuable for estimating fiscal multipliers and medium-term debt dynamics. Their empirical grounding makes them accessible for ministries of finance in developing countries. However, they fail to capture sudden regime shifts, such as the collapse of financial markets in 2008 [66], [67], [68], [69].

4.2 DSGE Models

DSGEs remain the dominant tool in advanced economies and international institutions. Their strength lies in internal consistency, allowing simulation of intertemporal trade-offs. However, their reliance on equilibrium assumptions often underestimates the depth and persistence of crises. Attempts to incorporate financial frictions and heterogeneous agents have improved realism but increased complexity [70], [71], [72], [73].

4.3 CGE Models

CGE models excel in analyzing trade-related shocks and long-term sectoral impacts. They are widely used for climate-related fiscal assessments, such as carbon taxation and subsidy reforms. However, their inability to handle short-term volatility limits their application during crises [74], [75], [76], [77].

4.4 Simulation-Based and Agent-Based Models

ABMs outperform equilibrium models in capturing contagion and nonlinear crisis dynamics. Their ability to simulate heterogeneity among agents makes them relevant for distributional analysis of fiscal policy. Yet they remain underutilized in policymaking due to

opacity and computational burden [78], [79], [80], [81].

4.5 Hybrid Models

Hybrid frameworks integrating ML with econometric or DSGE structures provided the most promising results. These models demonstrated higher predictive accuracy during periods of structural change, such as the Eurozone debt crisis. They also offered flexible scenario simulations, combining empirical grounding with computational adaptability [82], [83], [84].

4.6 Context-Specific Findings

For advanced economies, frameworks with financial sector integration performed best. For emerging markets, external vulnerability models (such as CGEs with trade dynamics) were more relevant. Cross-country coordination efforts benefited most from multi-country DSGEs and CGEs [85], [86], [87].

V. DISCUSSION

The results highlight several important implications for fiscal policymaking under global shocks.

5.1 No "One-Size-Fits-All" Framework

Different shocks demand different frameworks. For commodity shocks, CGEs provide useful sectoral analysis, while for financial contagion, ABMs may capture nonlinear spillovers better. Thus, reliance on a single framework risks blind spots [87], [88], [89].

5.2 Transparency vs. Accuracy Trade-Off

Machine learning enhances predictive power but introduces transparency issues. Policymakers must balance the need for accuracy with the requirement for explainability, especially in democratic contexts where legitimacy depends on clear reasoning [90], [91].

5.3 Institutional Capacity Constraints

Implementing advanced DSGEs or hybrid ML models requires technical expertise and computational resources often lacking in low-income countries. Capacity-building, knowledge transfer, and simplified frameworks may be necessary [92], [93].

5.4 Global Coordination Needs

The international transmission of fiscal shocks underscores the need for coordination. Yet most frameworks are national in scope, underplaying spillovers. Developing multi-country simulation models could enhance global policy effectiveness [94], [95], [96].

5.5 Future Directions

The integration of hybrid models, scenario planning, and interdisciplinary insights (from behavioral economics and network theory) represents the most promising path forward [97], [98], [99]. Such approaches would enhance robustness under uncertainty, address nonlinearities, and better reflect real-world complexity.

CONCLUSION

This paper reviewed quantitative frameworks for optimizing fiscal policy response to global shocks. The analysis traced the evolution from early SEMs through DSGEs, CGEs, ABMs, and emerging hybrid models. Each framework offers distinct contributions, yet none is sufficient alone. The evidence suggests that hybrid frameworks, which combine theoretical rigor with computational adaptability, offer the most promising path forward [100], [101].

For policymakers, the key takeaway is the need for flexibility. Fiscal responses must be informed by multiple models, contextualized to national realities, and coordinated internationally. As global shocks become more frequent, the resilience of fiscal frameworks will depend not only on technical sophistication but also on institutional adaptability and political feasibility [102], [103].

Future research should focus on integrating machine learning into macroeconomic models, enhancing multi-country simulations, and improving the transparency of complex frameworks [104], [105]. Ultimately, optimizing fiscal policy in an era of global shocks requires a dynamic blend of quantitative rigor, interdisciplinary insights, and institutional resilience [106].

REFERENCES

[1] D. Caldara and C. Kamps, "What are the effects of fiscal policy shocks? A VAR-based comparative analysis," ECB working paper, 2008. [Online]. Available: https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/153311

[2] S. Basu and B. Bundick, "Uncertainty Shocks in a Model of Effective Demand," *Econometrica*, vol. 85, no. 3, pp. 937–958, 2017, doi: 10.3982/ECTA13960.

[3] R. Beetsma, M. Giuliodori, and F. Klaassen, "Trade spill-overs of fiscal policy in the European Union: a panel analysis," *Econ. Policy*, vol. 21, no. 48, pp. 640–687, 2006.

[4] A. B. Akonobi and C. O. Okpokwu, "Designing a Customer-Centric Performance Model for Digital Lending Systems in Emerging Markets," vol. 3, no. 4, 2019.

[5] B. Essama-Nssah, "The poverty and distributional impact of macroeconomic shocks and policies: A review of modeling approaches," 2005.

[6] C. Henry Olisakwe, L.Tuleun Tuleun, C Andrew. Eloka-Eboka, "Comparative study of Thevetia peruviana and Jatropha curcas seed oils as feedstock for Grease production." [Online]. Available

[7] A. SHARMA, B. I. ADEKUNLE, J. C. OGEAWUCHI, A. A. ABAYOMI, and O. ONIFADE, "IoT-enabled Predictive Maintenance for Mechanical Systems: Innovations in Real-time Monitoring and Operational Excellence," 2019,

[8] M. Goodfriend and R. G. King, "The New Neoclassical Synthesis and the Role of Monetary Policy," *NBER Macroecon. Annu.*, vol. 12, pp. 231–283, Jan. 1997, doi: 10.1086/654336.

[9] C. Betts and M. B. Devereux, "The international effects of monetary and fiscal policy in a two-country model," *Money Cap. Mobil. Trade Essays Honor Robert Mundell*, pp. 9–52, 2001.

[10] L. Forni, L. Monteforte, and L. Sessa, "The general equilibrium effects of fiscal policy: Estimates for the euro area," *J. Public Econ.*, vol. 93, no. 3–4, pp. 559–585, 2009.

[11] B. S. Bernanke, M. Gertler, and S. Gilchrist, "The financial accelerator in a quantitative business cycle framework," *Handb. Macroecon.*, vol. 1, pp. 1341–1393, 1999.

[12] J. C. Eberly, J. H. Stock, and J. H. Wright, "The federal reserve's current framework for monetary policy: A review and assessment," 2019, [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/w26002

[13] S. Hebous, "THE EFFECTS OF DISCRETIONARY FISCAL POLICY ON MACROECONOMIC AGGREGATES: A REAPPRAISAL: EFFECTS OF DISCRETIONARY FISCAL POLICY," *J. Econ. Surv.*, vol. 25, no. 4, pp. 674–707, Sept. 2011, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6419.2010.00659.x.

[14] S. Gaber, I. Gruevski, and V. Gaber, "The effects of discretionary fiscal policy on macroeconomic aggregates," *BEH-Bus. Econ. Horiz.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 33–40, 2013.

[15] T. Adenuga, A. T. Ayobami, and F. C. Okolo, "Laying the groundwork for predictive workforce planning through strategic data analytics and talent modeling," *IRE J.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 159–161, 2019.

[16] G. Bårdsen, Ø. Eitrheim, E. Jansen, and R. Nymoen, *The econometrics of macroeconomic modelling*. OUP Oxford, 2005. [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books?

[17] M. J. Lee, M. D. Laxton, M. M. Kumhof, and C. Freedman, *The case for global fiscal stimulus*. International Monetary Fund, 2009.

[18] D. Caldara and C. Kamps, "The analytics of SVARs: a unified framework to measure fiscal multipliers," *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 84, no. 3, pp. 1015–1040, 2017.

[19] C. A. Sims, "Statistical Modeling of Monetary Policy and Its Effects," *Am. Econ. Rev.*, vol. 102, no. 4, pp. 1187–1205, June 2012, doi: 10.1257/aer.102.4.1187.

[20] J. B. Taylor and J. C. Williams, "Simple and robust rules for monetary policy," in *Handbook of monetary economics*, vol. 3, Elsevier, 2010, pp. 829–859. [Online]. Available: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780444534545000037

[21] C. J. Erceg, L. Guerrieri, and C. Gust, "SIGMA: a new open economy model for policy analysis," 2006, [Online]. Available:

https://www.federalreserve.gov/econres/ifdp/sigma-a-new-open-economy-model-for-policy-analysis.htm

[22] M. P. Giannoni, "Robust optimal monetary policy in a forward-looking model with parameter and shock uncertainty," *J. Appl. Econom.*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 179–213, Jan. 2007, doi: 10.1002/jae.934.

[23] P. Krusell and A. A. Smith, "Quantitative macroeconomic models with heterogeneous agents," *Econom. Soc. Monogr.*, vol. 41, p. 298, 2006.

[24] N. Budina and S. Van Wijnbergen, "Quantitative approaches to fiscal sustainability analysis: a case study of Turkey since the crisis of 2001," *World Bank Econ. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 119–140, 2009.

[25] V. V. Chari, L. J. Christiano, and P. J. Kehoe, "Policy analysis in business cycle models," *Front. Bus. Cycle Res.*, vol. 12, 1995, [Online]. Available: https://books.google.com/books

[26] William Nii Ayitey Menson, John Olajide Olawepo, Tamara Bruno, Semiu Olatunde Gbadamosi, Nannim Fazing Nalda, Victor Anyebe, Amaka Ogidi, Chima Onoka, John Okpanachi Oko, Echezona Edozie Ezeanolue, "Reliability of self-reported Mobile phone ownership in rural north-Central Nigeria: cross-sectional study." [Online]. Available:

[27] K. Adam and R. M. Billi, "Optimal monetary policy under commitment with a zero bound on nominal interest rates," *J. Money Credit Bank.*, pp. 1877–1905, 2006.

[28] R. Reis, "Optimal monetary policy rules in an estimated sticky-information model," *Am. Econ. J. Macroecon.*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 1–28, 2009.

[29] C. Cantore, P. Levine, G. Melina, and J. Pearlman, "Optimal fiscal and monetary policy, debt crisis, and management," *Macroecon. Dyn.*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1166–1204, 2019.

[30] S. Schmitt-Grohé and M. Uribe, "Optimal fiscal and monetary policy in a medium-scale macroeconomic model: Expanded version." National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, Mass., USA, 2005. [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/w11417

[31] S. Schmitt-Grohé and M. Uribe, "Optimal Fiscal and Monetary Policy in a Medium-Scale Macroeconomic Model," *NBER Macroecon. Annu.*, vol. 20, pp. 383–425, Jan. 2005, doi: 10.1086/ma.20.3585431.

[32] V. V. Chari and P. J. Kehoe, "Optimal fiscal and monetary policy," *Handb. Macroecon.*, vol. 1, pp. 1671–1745, 1999.

[33] A. Nakov, "Optimal and simple monetary policy rules with zero floor on the nominal interest rate," *Thirteen. Issue June 2008 Int. J. Cent. Bank.*, 2018, [Online]. Available: https://www.ijcb.org/journal/ijcb08q2a3.pdf

[34] J. A. Parker, "On measuring the effects of fiscal policy in recessions," *J. Econ. Lit.*, vol. 49, no. 3, pp. 703–718, 2011.

[35] O. Okenwa, O. K., Uzozie, O. T., & Onaghinor, "Supply Chain Risk Management Strategies for Mitigating Geopolitical and Economic Risks." [Online]. Available: https://scholar.google.com/citations?

[36] A. Kormilitsina, "Oil price shocks and the optimality of monetary policy," *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 199–223, 2011.

[37] D. Laxton and P. Pesenti, "Monetary rules for small, open, emerging economies," *J. Monet. Econ.*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1109–1146, 2003.

[38] S. Leduc and K. Sill, "Monetary policy, oil shocks, and TFP: accounting for the decline in US volatility," *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 595–614, 2007.

[39] J. Galí, *Monetary policy, inflation, and the business cycle: an introduction to the new Keynesian framework and its applications*. Princeton University Press, 2015.

[40] P.-R. Agénor, *Monetary policy under flexible exchange rates: an introduction to inflation targeting*, vol. 124. World Bank Publications, 2000.

[41] E. Castelnuovo, "Monetary policy shocks and financial conditions: A Monte Carlo experiment," *J. Int. Money Finance*, vol. 32, pp. 282–303, 2013.

[42] R. Kollmann, "Monetary policy rules in the open economy: effects on welfare and business cycles," *J. Monet. Econ.*, vol. 49, no. 5, pp. 989–1015, 2002.

[43] M. Bodenstein, L. Guerrieri, and L. Kilian, "Monetary Policy Responses to Oil Price

Fluctuations," *IMF Econ. Rev.*, vol. 60, no. 4, pp. 470–504, Dec. 2012, doi: 10.1057/imfer.2012.19.

[44] P. Levine, "Monetary policy in an uncertain world: probability models and the design of robust monetary rules," *Indian Growth Dev. Rev.*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 70–88, 2012.

[45] M. T. Kiley and J. M. Roberts, "Monetary policy in a low interest rate world," *Brook. Pap. Econ. Act.*, vol. 2017, no. 1, pp. 317–396, 2017.

[46] B. McCallum and E. Nelson, "Monetary policy for an open economy: an alternative framework with optimizing agents and sticky prices," *Oxf. Rev. Econ. Policy*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 74–91, 2000.

[47] J. Gali and T. Monacelli, "Monetary policy and exchange rate volatility in a small open economy," *Rev. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 707–734, 2005.

[48] T. Kirsanova, C. Leith, and S. Wren-Lewis, "Monetary and fiscal policy interaction: the current consensus assignment in the light of recent developments," *Econ. J.*, vol. 119, no. 541, pp. F482–F496, 2009.

[49] D. S. Rickman, "MODERN MACROECONOMICS AND REGIONAL ECONOMIC MODELING," *J. Reg. Sci.*, vol. 50, no. 1, pp. 23–41, Feb. 2010, doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9787.2009.00647.x.

[50] S. J. Turnovsky, *Methods of macroeconomic dynamics*. Mit Press, 2000.

[51] A. J. Auerbach and Y. Gorodnichenko, "Measuring the output responses to fiscal policy," *Am. Econ. J. Econ. Policy*, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 1–27, 2012.

[52] K. Mertens and M. O. Ravn, "Measuring the impact of fiscal policy in the face of anticipation: a structural VAR approach," *Econ. J.*, vol. 120, no. 544, pp. 393–413, 2010.

[53] F. Fall and J.-M. Fournier, "Macroeconomic uncertainties, prudent debt targets and fiscal rules," 2015.

[54] G. Fagiolo and A. Roventini, "Macroeconomic policy in DSGE and agent-based models redux: New developments and challenges ahead," *Available SSRN 2763735*, 2016, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2763735

[55] J. Galsí and M. Gertler, "Macroeconomic modeling for monetary policy evaluation," *J. Econ. Perspect.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 25–45, 2007.

[56] M. Franta, "Macroeconomic effects of fiscal policy in the Czech Republic: Evidence based on various identification approaches in a VAR framework," *Czech Natl. Bank Work. Pap. Ser.*, vol. 13, p. 2012, 2012.

[57] U. Jermann and V. Quadrini, "Macroeconomic effects of financial shocks," *Am. Econ. Rev.*, vol. 102, no. 1, pp. 238–271, 2012.

[58] A. Dizioli and J. M. Schmittmann, *A macro-model approach to monetary policy analysis and forecasting for Vietnam*. International Monetary Fund, 2015.

[59] V. Wieland, T. Cwik, G. J. Müller, S. Schmidt, and M. Wolters, "A new comparative approach to macroeconomic modeling and policy analysis," *J. Econ. Behav. Organ.*, vol. 83, no. 3, pp. 523–541, 2012.

[60] A. Berg, P. D. Karam, and D. Laxton, "A practical model-based approach to monetary policy analysis-overview," 2006, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=901871

[61] S. Leduc and K. Sill, "A quantitative analysis of oil-price shocks, systematic monetary policy, and economic downturns," *J. Monet. Econ.*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 781–808, 2004.

[62] S. Adjemian, M. Darracq Pariès, and F. Smets, "A quantitative perspective on optimal monetary policy cooperation between the us and the euro area," 2008, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1105364

[63] L. Marattin, M. Marzo, and P. Zagaglia, "A welfare perspective on the fiscal–monetary policy mix: The role of alternative fiscal instruments," *J. Policy Model.*, vol. 33, no. 6, pp. 920–952, 2011.

[64] A. J. Auerbach, W. G. Gale, and B. H. Harris, "Activist fiscal policy," *J. Econ. Perspect.*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 141–164, 2010.

[65] J. J. Rotemberg and M. Woodford, "An Optimization-Based Econometric Framework for the Evaluation of Monetary Policy," *NBER*

Macroecon. Annu., vol. 12, pp. 297–346, Jan. 1997, doi: 10.1086/654340.

[66] J. J. Rotemberg and M. Woodford, "An optimization-based econometric framework for the evaluation of monetary policy: Expanded version." National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, Mass., USA, 1998. [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/t0233

[67] A. Turrini, W. Roeger, and I. P. Székely, "Banking crises, output loss, and fiscal policy," *CESifo Econ. Stud.*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 181–219, 2012.

[68] F. Bianchi and L. Melosi, "Dormant Shocks and Fiscal Virtue," *NBER Macroecon. Annu.*, vol. 28, pp. 1–46, Mar. 2014, doi: 10.1086/674588.

[69] J. Adda and R. W. Cooper, *Dynamic economics: quantitative methods and applications*. MIT press, 2003.

[70] J. E. Plasmans, J. Engwerda, B. Van Aarle, G. Di Bartolomeo, and T. Michalak, *Dynamic modeling of monetary and fiscal cooperation among nations*, vol. 8. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[71] G. Coenen *et al.*, "Effects of fiscal stimulus in structural models," *Am. Econ. J. Macroecon.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 22–68, 2012.

[72] Y. Mimir and E. Sunel, "External shocks, banks, and optimal monetary policy: A recipe for emerging market central banks," *58th Issue June 2019 Int. J. Cent. Bank.*, 2019, [Online]. Available: https://www.ijcb.org/journal/ijcb19q2a7.htm

[73] N. Stähler and C. Thomas, "FiMod—A DSGE model for fiscal policy simulations," *Econ. Model.*, vol. 29, no. 2, pp. 239–261, 2012.

[74] A. Silvestrini and A. Zaghini, "Financial shocks and the real economy in a nonlinear world: From theory to estimation," *J. Policy Model.*, vol. 37, no. 6, pp. 915–929, 2015.

[75] M. Shahid, A. Qayyum, and W. Shahid Malik, "Fiscal and monetary policy interactions in Pakistan using a dynamic stochastic general equilibrium framework," 2016, [Online]. Available: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/85549

[76] V. A. Muscatelli, P. Tirelli, and C. Trecroci, "Fiscal and monetary policy interactions: Empirical evidence and optimal policy using a structural New-Keynesian model," *J. Macroecon.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 257–280, 2004.

[77] "Fiscal Foresight and Information Flows," *Econometrica*, vol. 81, no. 3, pp. 1115–1145, 2013, doi: 10.3982/ECTA8337.

[78] M. M. Croce, H. Kung, T. T. Nguyen, and L. Schmid, "Fiscal policies and asset prices," *Rev. Financ. Stud.*, vol. 25, no. 9, pp. 2635–2672, 2012.

[79] J. A. Frenkel and A. Razin, *Fiscal policies and growth in the world economy*. MIT press, 1996.

[80] F. Gomes, A. Michaelides, and V. Polkovnichenko, "Fiscal policy and asset prices with incomplete markets," *Rev. Financ. Stud.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 531–566, 2013.

[81] G. Cuadra, J. M. Sanchez, and H. Sapriza, "Fiscal policy and default risk in emerging markets," *Rev. Econ. Dyn.*, vol. 13, no. 2, pp. 452–469, 2010.

[82] G. Halkos and E. Paizanos, "Fiscal policy and economic performance: A review of the theoretical and empirical literature," 2015, [Online]. Available: https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/67737

[83] E. G. Mendoza and P. Oviedo, "Fiscal policy and macroeconomic uncertainty in developing countries: The tale of the tormented insurer." National Bureau of Economic Research Cambridge, Mass., USA, 2006. [Online]. Available: https://www.nber.org/papers/w12586

[84] A. Spilimbergo, S. Symansky, O. J. Blanchard, and C. Cottarelli, "Fiscal policy for the crisis," *Available SSRN 1339442*, 2009, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1339442

[85] N. Gemmell, "Fiscal policy in a growth framework," WIDER Discussion Paper, 2001. [Online]. Available: https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/53009

[86] E. Canton, "Fiscal policy in a stochastic model of endogenous growth," *Econ. Model.*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 19–47, 2001.

[87] A. Brunila, M. Buti, and J. I. 'T Veld, "Fiscal Policy in Europe: How Effective Are Automatic Stabilisers?," *Empirica*, vol. 30, no.

1, pp. 1–24, Mar. 2003, doi: 10.1023/A:1022646912573.

[88] L. Coutinho, "Fiscal Policy in the New Open Economy Macroeconomics and Prospects for Fiscal Policy Coordination," *J. Econ. Surv.*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 789–822, Dec. 2005, doi: 10.1111/j.0950-0804.2005.00268.x.

[89] P. R. Mitchell, J. E. Sault, and K. F. Wallis, "Fiscal policy rules in macroeconomic models: principles and practice," *Econ. Model.*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 171–193, 2000.

[90] J.-T. Guo and K. J. Lansing, "Fiscal policy, increasing returns, and endogenous fluctuations," *Macroecon. Dyn.*, vol. 6, no. 5, pp. 633–664, 2002.

[91] F. Canova and E. Pappa, "Fiscal policy, pricing frictions and monetary accommodation," *Econ. Policy*, vol. 26, no. 68, pp. 555–598, 2011.

[92] T. Monacelli and R. Perotti, "Fiscal policy, the trade balance and the real exchange rate: Implications for international risk sharing," *Manuscr. IGIER Univ. Bocconi*, vol. 6, pp. 1–57, 2006.

[93] M.-G. Attinasi, M. Lalik, and I. Vetlov, *Fiscal spillovers in the euro area a model-based analysis*. European Central Bank, 2017. [Online]. Available: https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/162673/1/884727793.pdf

[94] T. Davig, E. M. Leeper, J. Galí, and C. Sims, "Fluctuating Macro Policies and the Fiscal Theory [with Comments and Discussion]," *NBER Macroecon. Annu.*, vol. 21, pp. 247–315, Jan. 2006, doi: 10.1086/ma.21.25554956.

[95] J. Buongiorno, "Forest sector modeling: a synthesis of econometrics, mathematical programming, and system dynamics methods," *Int. J. Forecast.*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 329–343, 1996.

[96] F. Gallego, K. Schmidt-Hebbel, and L. Servén, "General Equilibrium Dynamics of Foreign Shocks and Policy Changes in Chile," *Gen. Equilib. Models Chil. Econ.*, pp. 113–62, 2005.

[97] W. J. McKibbin and J. D. Sachs, *Global linkages: Macroeconomic interdependence and cooperation in the world economy*. Brookings Institution Press, 2011.

[98] F. Van Tongeren, H. Van Meijl, and Y. Surry, "Global models applied to agricultural and trade policies: a review and assessment," *Agric. Econ.*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 149–172, Nov. 2001, doi: 10.1111/j.1574-0862.2001.tb00060.x.

[99] M. H. Pesaran and M. R. Wickens, Eds., "Handbook of Applied Econometrics. Volume I: Macroeconomics," in *Handbook of Applied Econometrics. Volume I: Macroeconomics*, Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 1999, pp. 139–187. doi: 10.1111/b.9780631215585.1999.00008.x.

[100] K. Aoki, J. Proudman, and G. Vlieghe, "House prices, consumption, and monetary policy: a financial accelerator approach," *J. Financ. Intermediation*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 414–435, 2004.

[101] J. H. Lopez, K. Schmidt-Hebbel, and L. Servén, "How effective is fiscal policy in raising national saving?," *Rev. Econ. Stat.*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp. 226–238, 2000.

[102] M. Goodfriend, "How the world achieved consensus on monetary policy," *J. Econ. Perspect.*, vol. 21, no. 4, pp. 47–68, 2007.

[103] J. J. Pérez and P. Hiebert, "Identifying endogenous fiscal policy rules for macroeconomic models," *J. Policy Model.*, vol. 26, no. 8–9, pp. 1073–1089, 2004.

[104] S. Kim, "International transmission of US monetary policy shocks: Evidence from VAR's," *J. Monet. Econ.*, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 339–372, 2001.

[105] G. D. Rudebusch, "Is the Fed too timid? Monetary policy in an uncertain world," *Rev. Econ. Stat.*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 203–217, 2001.

[106] D. Beau, L. Clerc, and B. Mojon, "Macro-prudential policy and the conduct of monetary policy," 2012, [Online]. Available: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2132404