

Assignment 4: Nonlinear (b11)

A. Colin Cameron U.C.-Davis

Data are at <http://cameron.econ.ucdavis.edu/bgpe2011>

1. Use data in file `mus10data.dta` and 2002 data (keep if `year02==1`)

We will do analysis similar to that in the slides, but with the two regressors `chronic` and `age`.

Note: Variable `age` is measured in tens of years!

(a) Perform Poisson regression of `docvis` on `chronic` and `age`, with heteroskedastic-robust standard errors computed. Are the regressors individually and jointly statistically significant at 5%?

(b) Use command `test` to test the hypothesis that one hundred years of aging has the same impact on doctor visits as having one (or more) chronic conditions.

(c) Use Stata add-on command `margins dydx(*)` to compute the average effect on the number of doctor visits of aging ten years.

(d) Use command `margins dydx(*)`, `atmean` to compute the effect of aging ten years on the number of doctor visits for an individual with average values of the regressors.

(e) Use command `margins dydx(*)`, `at()` to compute the effect of aging ten years on the number of doctor visits for a 50-year old with a chronic condition.

(f) Compare your answer in parts (c) and (d) to the average marginal effect obtained from OLS estimation of `docvis` on `chronic` and `age`.

(g) For the Poisson model, $E[y|\mathbf{x}] = \exp(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}) \Rightarrow \partial E[y|\mathbf{x}] / \partial \mathbf{x} = \exp(\mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta})\boldsymbol{\beta} = E[y|\mathbf{x}]\boldsymbol{\beta} \Rightarrow [\partial E[y|\mathbf{x}] / \partial \mathbf{x}] / E[y|\mathbf{x}] = \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Using this result, what is the estimated proportional impact of aging ten years on doctor visits?

2. If y takes only non-negative integer values and has geometric density with parameter λ then the density $f(y|\lambda)$ is

$$f(y) = \lambda^y(1 + \lambda)^{-(y+1)}, \quad y = 0, 1, \dots, \quad \lambda > 0.$$

Furthermore $E[y] = \lambda$ and $V[y] = \lambda(1 + \lambda)$.

Here we introduce regressors and suppose that in the true model the parameter λ depends on regressors according to

$$\lambda_i = E[y_i|\mathbf{x}_i] = \exp(\mathbf{x}_i'\boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is an unknown $K \times 1$ parameter vector and \mathbf{x}_i is a nonstochastic $K \times 1$ vector.

The data are assumed to be independent over i .

(a) Show that the log-likelihood function for this example is

$$Q(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i=1}^N \{y_i \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} - (y_i + 1) \ln(1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta}))\}.$$

(b) Show that the first-order conditions for the geometric MLE can be simplified to

$$\frac{\partial Q(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{y_i - \exp(\mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta})} \right) \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{0}.$$

(c) Given this result, do you think that correct specification of the conditional mean will be sufficient to ensure that the MLE is consistent? Give a brief explanation.

(d) Show that

$$E \left[\frac{\partial^2 Q(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'} \mid \mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N \right] = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{-\exp(\mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta})}{1 + \exp(\mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta})} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i'.$$

(e) Give the asymptotic distribution for the geometric MLE.

3. When $\gamma = h(\beta)$ where γ and β are scalars, the delta method yields $V[\hat{\gamma}] = \left(\frac{\partial \gamma}{\partial \beta}\right)^2 V[\hat{\beta}]$.

(a) Hence give the formula for a 95% confidence interval for e^{β} given knowledge of $\hat{\beta}$ and $se_{\hat{\beta}}$.

(b) Compute this for $e^{\beta_{age}}$ following the Poisson regression in question 1.

(c) Compare your answer to that from post-estimation command `nlcom exp(_b[age])`.

4. Stata command `ml` can be used to compute the MLE for a user-provided log-likelihood function. The following code does this for the Poisson MLE.

```
* 1. Poisson ML program lfpois defines the log-likelihood function ('lnf')
program define lfpois
    version 10.0
    args lnf theta1          // theta1=x'b, lnf=lnf(y)
    tempvar lnyfact mu
    local y "$ML_y1"        // Define y and mu so program is more readable
    generate double 'mu' = exp('theta1')
    quietly replace 'lnf' = -'mu' + 'y'*'theta1' - lnfactorial('y')
end
* 2. Command ml model defines y and x, and here asks for robust se's
ml model lf lfpois (docvis = chronic age), vce(robust)
* 3. Command ml maximize computes the estimator
ml maximize
```

Important: Note that ‘ ’ is left quote ‘ and right quote ’.

You need not understand the syntax in `lfpois` - just type out as is.

[Aside: `args` defines the program arguments; `tempvar` defines a temporary variable just used in this program; `local` defines a local macro; and the `args`, `tempvar` and `local` are from thereon referred to in single quotes as they are local to this program. The name of the dependent variable (in this example `docvis`) is stored in the global macro `ML_y1`. The global macro is then referred to with prefix `$`. In the program we define the local macro `y` to be text for the name of the global macro (hence the double quotes).]

(a) Run this program.

(b) Compare your results to those obtained using command `Poisson`.

5.(a) Use Stata command `ml` to estimate the MLE for the geometric regression of `docvis` on `chronic` and `age`. This is exactly the same as the program `lfpois` in question 4, except that you will need to replace the line

```
quietly replace 'lnf' = -'mu' + 'y'*'theta1' - lnfactorial('y')
```

with the corresponding expression for the log-density of the geometric (from question 2).

(b) Compare your results to those obtained using command `Poisson`.

(c) Which model do you prefer on the basis of fitted likelihood value: Poisson or geometric?

(d) Command `ml` uses the Newton-Raphson iterative method. Use your answers in question 2 to give the algebraic expressions for the Newton-Raphson method for the geometric. For simplicity use the expected Hessian $E[\mathbf{H}_s]$ rather than the Hessian \mathbf{H}_s .