

89.3.4. *Estimation and Testing in Linear Models with Singular Covariance Matrices* – Solution, proposed by Peter C.B. Phillips. Our model is:

$$y_t = Z_t\beta + u_t; \quad (t = 1, \dots, T) \quad (1)$$

with

$$R'u_t = 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

where

$$\Sigma R = 0.$$

For convenience, let the columns of R be orthonormal (if not, simply use $R(R'R)^{-1/2}$ instead). Construct the orthogonal matrix

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} S & R \\ n-r & r \end{bmatrix}$$

and use this transform (1) as follows:

$$C'y_t = C'Z_t\beta + C'u_t. \quad (2)$$

Here

$$C'u_t \equiv N\left(0, \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}\right)$$

with $\Sigma_s = S'\Sigma S$. Now

$$C'\Sigma C + \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}$$

and so

$$\Sigma + RR' = C \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} C'$$

and

$$(\Sigma + RR')^{-1} = C \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} C' = \Sigma^{-1}.$$

Take the first $n-r$ rows of (2) and write (in an obvious notation)

$$y_{st} = Z_{st}\beta + u_{st}.$$

Here $u_{st} \equiv N(0, \Sigma_s)$ and

$$p df(u_{st}) = (2\pi)^{(n-r)/2} |\Sigma_s|^{-1/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} u_{st}' \Sigma_s^{-1} u_{st}\right\}.$$

The likelihood is

$$p df(Y_s) = (2\pi)^{(n-r)T/2} |\Sigma_s|^{-T/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \Sigma_s^{-1} (y_{st} - Z_{st}\beta)' (y_{st} - Z_{st}\beta)\right\}. \quad (3)$$

Now consider

$$\begin{aligned} u_{st}' \Sigma_s^{-1} u_{st} &= (u_{st}' \ 0) \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} u_{st} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (u_{st}' \ 0) C' C \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_s^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} C' C \begin{pmatrix} u_{st} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= (u_{st}' \ 0) C' (\Sigma + RR')^{-1} C \begin{pmatrix} u_{st} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &= u_{st}' (\Sigma + RR')^{-1} u_{st} \end{aligned}$$

since $u'_i C = (u'_{st}, 0)$. Note also that

$$|\Sigma_s^{-1}| = \begin{vmatrix} \Sigma_s^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{vmatrix} = |(\Sigma + RR')^{-1}|$$

and thus the likelihood (3) may be written in the form

$$p df(Y_s) = (2\pi)^{(n-r)T/2} |\Sigma + RR'|^{-T/2} \times \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \Sigma_1^T (y_t - Z_t \beta)' (\Sigma + RR')^{-1} (y_t - Z_t \beta)\right\}. \quad (4)$$

To find the estimating equations for the MLE's $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\Sigma})$ we write the log likelihood as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = \text{const} - \left(\frac{T}{2}\right) \ln |\Sigma + RR'| \\ - \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \Sigma_1^T (y_t - Z_t \beta)' (\Sigma + RR')^{-1} (y_t - Z_t \beta) \end{aligned}$$

and note that we must maximize subject to $\Sigma R = 0$.

Set up the Lagrangean

$$\mathcal{L}^* = -T/2 \ln |\Sigma + RR'| - T/2 \text{tr}[(\Sigma + RR')^{-1} M] + \text{tr}(\Lambda \Sigma R)$$

with

$$M = T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T (y_t - Z_t \beta) (y_t - Z_t \beta)'$$

Take differentials, giving

$$\begin{aligned} -T/2 \text{tr}[(\Sigma + RR')^{-1} d\Sigma] + T/2 \text{tr}[(\Sigma + RR')^{-1} d\Sigma (\Sigma + RR')^{-1} M] \\ + \text{tr}(d\Sigma R \Lambda) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

and, of course, $\Sigma R = 0$. Then (5) gives us

$$(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} - (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} M (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} - \frac{2}{T} R \Lambda = 0 \quad (6)$$

so that

$$\frac{2}{T} \Lambda = (R'R)^{-1} R' (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} - (R'R)^{-1} R' (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} M (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}.$$

But $R'(\hat{\Sigma} + RR') = (R'R)R'$ so that $R'(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} = (R'R)^{-1}R'$. Thus

$$\frac{2}{T} \Lambda = (R'R)^{-2} R' - (R'R)^{-2} R' M (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}$$

and (6) gives us

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\Sigma} + RR' &= M + (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')R(R'R)^{-2}R'(\hat{\Sigma} + RR') \\ &\quad - (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')R(R'R)^{-2}R'M \\ &= M + RR' - R(R'R)^{-1}R'M.\end{aligned}$$

But $R'M = 0$ so that we have

$$\hat{\Sigma} = M = T^{-1}\Sigma_1^T(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})'. \quad (7)$$

Concentrating the likelihood function, we now have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{**} &= \text{const} - (T/2)\ln|\hat{\Sigma} + RR'| - T/2\text{tr}[(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}] \\ &= \text{const} - (T/2)\ln|\hat{\Sigma} + RR'| \quad (8)\end{aligned}$$

since

$$\begin{aligned}\text{tr}[(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}\hat{\Sigma}] &= \text{tr}[(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}((\hat{\Sigma} + RR') - RR')] \\ &= \text{tr}[I - (\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1}RR'] \\ &= \text{tr}[I - R(R'R)^{-1}R'].\end{aligned}$$

Differentiating (8), we have

$$-T/2\text{tr}[(M + RR')^{-1}dM] = 0$$

so

$$\text{tr}[(M + RR')^{-1}(T^{-1}\Sigma_1^TZ_t d\beta(y_t - Z_t\beta)')] = 0$$

and thus

$$\Sigma_1^T d\beta'Z_t'(M + RR')^{-1}(y_t - Z_t\beta) = 0$$

giving

$$\hat{\beta} = [\Sigma_1^TZ_t'(M + RR')^{-1}Z_t]^{-1}[\Sigma_1^TZ_t'(M + RR')^{-1}y_t].$$

Hence, the MLE $(\hat{\beta}, \hat{\Sigma})$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\beta} &= (\Sigma_1^TZ_t'\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}Z_t)^{-1}(\Sigma_1^TZ_t'\hat{\Sigma}^{-1}y_t) \\ \hat{\Sigma} &= T^{-1}\Sigma_1^T(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})'.\end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. An alternative approach is to work directly from (3), giving

$$\hat{\Sigma}_s = T^{-1}\Sigma_1^T(y_{st} - Z_{st}\beta)(y_{st} - Z_{st}\beta)'$$

and

$$\hat{\beta} = (\Sigma_1^TZ_{st}'\hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1}Z_{st})^{-1}(\Sigma_1^TZ_{st}'\hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1}y_{st}).$$

Then

$$\hat{\Sigma} = C \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_s & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{bmatrix} C' - RR' = S\hat{\Sigma}_s S' = T^{-1}\Sigma_1^T(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})(y_t - Z_t\hat{\beta})'$$

since

$$y_t = C \begin{pmatrix} y_{st} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = S y_{st}, \quad Z_t = C \begin{pmatrix} Z_{st} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = S Z_{st}$$

and, correspondingly,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &= (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' S \hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1} S' Z_t)^{-1} (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' S \hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1} S' y_t) \\ &= (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' \hat{\Sigma}^- Z_t)^{-1} (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' \hat{\Sigma}^- y_t) \end{aligned}$$

since

$$(\hat{\Sigma} + RR')^{-1} = C \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1} & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} C' = S \hat{\Sigma}_s^{-1} S' = \hat{\Sigma}^-.$$

Obviously, this is the shorter method. But both are of interest.

(b) The OLS estimates are:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta^* &= (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' Z_t)^{-1} (\Sigma_1^T Z_t' y_t) \\ \Sigma^* &= T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T (y_t - Z_t \beta^*) (y_t - Z_t \beta^*)'. \end{aligned}$$

Assume:

- (i) The elements of Z_t are bounded uniformly in t ;
- (ii) $T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t' Z_t \rightarrow K > 0$, $T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t' \Sigma Z_t \rightarrow V > 0$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}(\beta^* - \beta) &= (T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t' Z_t)^{-1} (T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t' y_t) \\ &\Rightarrow N(0, K^{-1} V K^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^* &= T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T u_t u_t' + T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t (\beta - \beta^*) u_t' \\ &\quad + T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T u_t (\beta - \beta^*)' Z_t' + T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T Z_t (\beta - \beta^*) (\beta - \beta^*)' Z_t' \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \Sigma. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta - \beta^* = o_p(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}(\Sigma^* - \Sigma) &\sim \sqrt{T}(T^{-1} \Sigma_1^T u_t u_t' - \Sigma) \\ &= T^{-1/2} \Sigma_1^T (u_t u_t' - \Sigma) \\ &\Rightarrow N(0, 2P_D(\Sigma \otimes \Sigma)) \end{aligned}$$

by the multivariate extension of the Lindeberg Lévy theorem.

(c) Note that the hypothesis

$$H_0: \beta' \Sigma \beta = 0$$

is equivalent to

$$H'_0: \beta = Ra \text{ for some } a$$

since R spans $N(\Omega)$. We can also write H'_0 in the form

$$H''_0: P_R \beta = \beta \text{ or } H'''_0: Q_R \beta = 0$$

where $Q_R = I - P_R = I - R(R'R)^{-1}R'$.

To test H'''_0 we use

$$W = \beta^{*'} Q_R [\Sigma_1^T Z_i' Z_i]^{-1} (\Sigma_1^T Z_i' \Sigma^* Z_i) (\Sigma_1^T Z_i' Z_i)^{-1} Q_R \beta^*.$$

Set

$$V_\beta^* = (\Sigma_1^T Z_i' Z_i)^{-1} (\Sigma_1^T Z_i' \Sigma^* Z_i) (\Sigma_1^T Z_i' Z_i)^{-1}$$

and then

$$(Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R)^- = (Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R + RR')^{-1}$$

and

$$W \Rightarrow \chi_{n-r}^2$$

where $Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R = Q_R K^{-1} V K^{-1} Q_R$ and $\text{rank}(Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R) = n - r$. (We assume Q_R reduces the rank of V_β by r and no more. This will be so if V_β has full rank $k = n$.)

Alternatively, take the matrix S whose columns span $R(R)^\perp$, so that, as before, $C = [S \ R]$ is orthogonal. Then

$$R(R) = R(S)^\perp = N(S')$$

and H'_0 is equivalent to

$$H_0^{iv}: S' \beta = 0.$$

(In effect, H_0''' is then H_0^{iv} with $Q_R = SS'$.) The Wald test is just

$$\begin{aligned} W &= (S' \beta^*)' (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' \beta^* \\ &= \beta^{*'} S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' \beta^* \\ &\Rightarrow \chi_s^2 \end{aligned}$$

where $s = n - r = k - r$ here.

Remark 2. This shows, incidentally, that another g inverse of $Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R$ is

$$(Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R)^- = S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S'$$

as

$$S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' = SS' S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' SS' = Q_R S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' Q_R$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R &= SS' V_\beta^* S (S V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' V_\beta^* SS' \\ &= SS' V_\beta^* SS' = Q_R V_\beta^* Q_R. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3. We could attempt to test H_0 directly by using $\beta^{*\prime} \Sigma^* \beta^*$ or, equivalently, $\Sigma^* \beta^*$. Write

$$\Sigma^* \beta^* = \Sigma^* (\beta^* - \beta).$$

This holds because, under the null H_0 , β satisfies $\Sigma \beta = 0$ and thus $\beta \in R(R)$, so that $\beta' \Sigma^* = 0$ (or, by construction, $R' \Sigma^* = 0$). Now as $T \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\sqrt{T} \Sigma^* \beta^* = \Sigma^* \sqrt{T} (\beta^* - \beta) \sim \Sigma^* \sqrt{T} (\beta^* - \beta) = \Sigma^* \sqrt{T} \beta^*$$

and then the Wald test is based on

$$\beta^{*\prime} \Sigma^* (\Sigma^* V_\beta^* \Sigma^*)^{-1} \Sigma^* \beta^* \sim \beta^{*\prime} \Sigma (\Sigma V_\beta^* \Sigma)^{-1} \Sigma \beta^*. \quad (9)$$

Now note that $\Sigma = S \Sigma_s S'$ and

$$\begin{aligned} S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' &= S \Sigma_s S' S \Sigma_s^{-1} (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} \Sigma_s^{-1} S' S \Sigma_s S' \\ &= S \Sigma_s S' (S \Sigma_s S' V_\beta^* S \Sigma_s S')^{-1} S \Sigma_s S' \\ &= \Sigma (\Sigma V_\beta^* \Sigma)^{-1} \Sigma \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

the middle line following because

$$\begin{aligned} [S \Sigma_s S' V_\beta^* S \Sigma_s S'] [S \Sigma_s^{-1} (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} \Sigma_s^{-1} S'] [S \Sigma_s S' V_\beta^* S \Sigma_s S'] \\ = S \Sigma_s S' V_\beta^* S \Sigma_s S' \\ = \Sigma V_\beta^* \Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We deduce from (9) and (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \beta^{*\prime} \Sigma^* (\Sigma^* V_\beta^* \Sigma^*)^{-1} \Sigma^* \beta^* \\ &= \beta^{*\prime} S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' \beta^* \end{aligned}$$

so that this test is again equivalent to the others.

Remark 4. The generalized inverse of (11) can also be written as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Sigma V_\beta^* \Sigma)^- &= S \Sigma_s^{-1} (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} \Sigma_s^{-1} S' \\ &= S \Sigma_s^{-1} S' S (S' V_\beta^* S)^{-1} S' S \Sigma_s^{-1} S' \\ &= \Sigma^- \Sigma (\Sigma V_\beta^* \Sigma)^- \Sigma \Sigma^-. \end{aligned}$$

EDITOR'S COMMENT

The following solution has been proposed by H. Peter Boswijk. It does not correspond to the problem as originally stated, since part 2 and part 3 of Boswijk's solution involve the ML estimators, whereas the problem was about least-squares estimators. However, it was felt that the reader might also be interested in this elegant solution in the ML case.