Title

dfactor — Dynamic-factor models

Syntax

`dfactor` *obs_eq* [*fac_eq*] [*if*] [*in*] [, *options*]

obs_eq specifies the equation for the observed dependent variables, and it has the form

(*depvars* = [*exog_d*] [, *sopts*])

fac_eq specifies the equation for the unobserved factors, and it has the form

(*facvars* = [*exog_f*] [, *sopts*])

depvars are the observed dependent variables. *exog_d* are the exogenous variables that enter into the equations for the observed dependent variables. (All factors are automatically entered into the equations for the observed dependent variables.) *facvars* are the names for the unobserved factors in the model. You may specify the names of existing variables in *facvars*, but `dfactor` treats them only as names and takes no notice that they are also variables. *exog_f* are the exogenous variables that enter into the equations for the factors.

options	Description
Model	
`constraints(`*constraints*`)`	apply specified linear constraints
SE/Robust	
`vce(`*vcetype*`)`	*vcetype* may be `oim` or `robust`
Reporting	
`level(`*#*`)`	set confidence level; default is `level(95)`
`nocnsreport`	do not display constraints
display_options	control column formats, row spacing, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
Maximization	
maximize_options	control the maximization process; seldom used
`from(`*matname*`)`	specify initial values for the maximization process; seldom used
Advanced	
`method(`*method*`)`	specify the method for calculating the log likelihood; seldom used
`coeflegend`	display legend instead of statistics

sopts	Description
Model	
`noconstant`	suppress constant term from the equation; allowed only in *obs_eq*
`ar(`*numlist*`)`	autoregressive terms
`arstructure(`*arstructure*`)`	structure of autoregressive coefficient matrices
`covstructure(`*covstructure*`)`	covariance structure

arstructure	Description
`diagonal`	diagonal matrix; the default
`ltriangular`	lower triangular matrix
`general`	general matrix

covstructure	Description
`identity`	identity matrix
`dscalar`	diagonal scalar matrix
`diagonal`	diagonal matrix
`unstructured`	symmetric, positive-definite matrix

method	Description
`hybrid`	use the stationary Kalman filter and the De Jong diffuse Kalman filter; the default
`dejong`	use the stationary De Jong method and the De Jong diffuse Kalman filter

You must `tsset` your data before using `dfactor`; see [TS] **tsset**.
exog_d and *exog_f* may contain factor variables; see [U] **11.4.3 Factor variables**.
depvars, *exog_d*, and *exog_f* may contain time-series operators; see [U] **11.4.4 Time-series varlists**.
`by`, `fp`, `rolling`, and `statsby` are allowed; see [U] **11.1.10 Prefix commands**.
`coeflegend` does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] **20 Estimation and postestimation commands** for more capabilities of estimation commands.

Menu

Statistics > Multivariate time series > Dynamic-factor models

Description

`dfactor` estimates the parameters of dynamic-factor models by maximum likelihood. Dynamic-factor models are flexible models for multivariate time series in which unobserved factors have a vector autoregressive structure, exogenous covariates are permitted in both the equations for the latent factors and the equations for observable dependent variables, and the disturbances in the equations for the dependent variables may be autocorrelated.

Options

Model

`constraints(`*constraints*`)` apply linear constraints. Some specifications require linear constraints for parameter identification.

`noconstant` suppresses the constant term.

`ar(`*numlist*`)` specifies the vector autoregressive lag structure in the equation. By default, no lags are included in either the observable or the factor equations.

`arstructure(diagonal|ltriangular|general)` specifies the structure of the matrices in the vector autoregressive lag structure.

`arstructure(diagonal)` specifies the matrices to be diagonal—separate parameters for each lag, but no cross-equation autocorrelations. `arstructure(diagonal)` is the default for both the observable and the factor equations.

`arstructure(ltriangular)` specifies the matrices to be lower triangular—parameterizes a recursive, or Wold causal, structure.

`arstructure(general)` specifies the matrices to be general matrices—separate parameters for each possible autocorrelation and cross-correlation.

`covstructure(identity | dscalar | diagonal | unstructured)` specifies the covariance structure of the errors.

`covstructure(identity)` specifies a covariance matrix equal to an identity matrix, and it is the default for the errors in the factor equations.

`covstructure(dscalar)` specifies a covariance matrix equal to σ^2 times an identity matrix.

`covstructure(diagonal)` specifies a diagonal covariance matrix, and it is the default for the errors in the observable variables.

`covstructure(unstructured)` specifies a symmetric, positive-definite covariance matrix with parameters for all variances and covariances.

SE/Robust

`vce(`*vcetype*`)` specifies the estimator for the variance–covariance matrix of the estimator.

`vce(oim)`, the default, causes `dfactor` to use the observed information matrix estimator.

`vce(robust)` causes `dfactor` to use the Huber/White/sandwich estimator.

Reporting

`level(`*#*`)`; see [R] **estimation options**.

`nocnsreport`; see [R] **estimation options**.

display_options: `noomitted`, `vsquish`, `noemptycells`, `baselevels`, `allbaselevels`, `nofvlabel`, `fvwrap(`*#*`)`, `fvwrapon(`*style*`)`, `cformat(`*%fmt*`)`, `pformat(`*%fmt*`)`, and `sformat(`*%fmt*`)`; see [R] **estimation options**.

Maximization

maximize_options: `difficult`, `technique(`*algorithm_spec*`)`, `iterate(`*#*`)`, `[no]log`, `trace`, `gradient`, `showstep`, `hessian`, `showtolerance`, `tolerance(`*#*`)`, `ltolerance(`*#*`)`, `nrtolerance(`*#*`)`, and `from(`*matname*`)`; see [R] **maximize** for all options except `from()`, and see below for information on `from()`. These options are seldom used.

`from(`*matname*`)` specifies initial values for the maximization process. `from(b0)` causes `dfactor` to begin the maximization algorithm with the values in `b0`. `b0` must be a row vector; the number of columns must equal the number of parameters in the model; and the values in `b0` must be in the same order as the parameters in `e(b)`. This option is seldom used.

Advanced

`method(`*method*`)` specifies how to compute the log likelihood. `dfactor` writes the model in state-space form and uses `sspace` to estimate the parameters; see [TS] **sspace**. `method()` offers two methods for dealing with some of the technical aspects of the state-space likelihood. This option is seldom used.

`method(hybrid)`, the default, uses the Kalman filter with model-based initial values when the model is stationary and uses the De Jong (1988, 1991) diffuse Kalman filter when the model is nonstationary.

`method(dejong)` uses the De Jong (1988) method for estimating the initial values for the Kalman filter when the model is stationary and uses the De Jong (1988, 1991) diffuse Kalman filter when the model is nonstationary.

The following option is available with `dfactor` but is not shown in the dialog box:

`coeflegend`; see [R] **estimation options**.

Remarks and examples

stata.com

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

An introduction to dynamic-factor models

`dfactor` estimates the parameters of dynamic-factor models by maximum likelihood (ML). Dynamic-factor models represent a vector of k endogenous variables as linear functions of $n_f < k$ unobserved factors and some exogenous covariates. The unobserved factors and the disturbances in the equations for the observed variables may follow vector autoregressive structures.

Dynamic-factor models have been developed and applied in macroeconomics; see Geweke (1977), Sargent and Sims (1977), Stock and Watson (1989, 1991), and Watson and Engle (1983).

Dynamic-factor models are very flexible; in a sense, they are too flexible. Constraints must be imposed to identify the parameters of dynamic-factor and static-factor models. The parameters in the default specifications in `dfactor` are identified, but other specifications require additional restrictions. The factors are identified only up to a sign, which means that the coefficients on the unobserved factors can flip signs and still produce the same predictions and the same log likelihood. The flexibility of the model sometimes produces convergence problems.

`dfactor` is designed to handle cases in which the number of modeled endogenous variables, k, is small. The ML estimator is implemented by writing the model in state-space form and by using the Kalman filter to derive and implement the log likelihood. As k grows, the number of parameters quickly exceeds the number that can be estimated.

A dynamic-factor model has the form

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{y}_t &= \mathbf{P}\mathbf{f}_t + \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{x}_t + \mathbf{u}_t \\
\mathbf{f}_t &= \mathbf{R}\mathbf{w}_t + \mathbf{A}_1\mathbf{f}_{t-1} + \mathbf{A}_2\mathbf{f}_{t-2} + \cdots + \mathbf{A}_{t-p}\mathbf{f}_{t-p} + \boldsymbol{\nu}_t \\
\mathbf{u}_t &= \mathbf{C}_1\mathbf{u}_{t-1} + \mathbf{C}_2\mathbf{u}_{t-2} + \cdots + \mathbf{C}_{t-q}\mathbf{u}_{t-q} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t
\end{aligned}
$$

where the definitions are given in the following table:

Item	Dimension	Definition
$\mathbf{y}_t$	$k \times 1$	vector of dependent variables
$\mathbf{P}$	$k \times n_f$	matrix of parameters
$\mathbf{f}_t$	$n_f \times 1$	vector of unobservable factors
$\mathbf{Q}$	$k \times n_x$	matrix of parameters
$\mathbf{x}_t$	$n_x \times 1$	vector of exogenous variables
$\mathbf{u}_t$	$k \times 1$	vector of disturbances
$\mathbf{R}$	$n_f \times n_w$	matrix of parameters
$\mathbf{w}_t$	$n_w \times 1$	vector of exogenous variables
$\mathbf{A}_i$	$n_f \times n_f$	matrix of autocorrelation parameters for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$
$\boldsymbol{\nu}_t$	$n_f \times 1$	vector of disturbances
$\mathbf{C}_i$	$k \times k$	matrix of autocorrelation parameters for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, q\}$
$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$	$k \times 1$	vector of disturbances

By selecting different numbers of factors and lags, the dynamic-factor model encompasses the six models in the table below:

Dynamic factors with vector autoregressive errors	(DFAR)	$n_f > 0$	$p > 0$	$q > 0$
Dynamic factors	(DF)	$n_f > 0$	$p > 0$	$q = 0$
Static factors with vector autoregressive errors	(SFAR)	$n_f > 0$	$p = 0$	$q > 0$
Static factors	(SF)	$n_f > 0$	$p = 0$	$q = 0$
Vector autoregressive errors	(VAR)	$n_f = 0$	$p = 0$	$q > 0$
Seemingly unrelated regression	(SUR)	$n_f = 0$	$p = 0$	$q = 0$

In addition to the time-series models, `dfactor` can estimate the parameters of SF models and SUR models. `dfactor` can place equality constraints on the disturbance covariances, which `sureg` and `var` do not allow.

Some examples

▷ Example 1: Dynamic-factor model

Stock and Watson (1989, 1991) wrote a simple macroeconomic model as a DF model, estimated the parameters by ML, and extracted an economic indicator. In this example, we estimate the parameters of a DF model. In [TS] **dfactor postestimation**, we extend this example and extract an economic indicator for the differenced series.

We have data on an industrial-production index, `ipman`; real disposable income, `income`; an aggregate weekly hours index, `hours`; and aggregate unemployment, `unemp`. We believe that these variables are first-difference stationary. We model their first-differences as linear functions of an unobserved factor that follows a second-order autoregressive process.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/dfex
(St. Louis Fed (FRED) macro data)
. dfactor (D.(ipman income hours unemp) = , noconstant) (f = , ar(1/2))
searching for initial values ..................
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -675.18934
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -667.47825
  (output omitted )
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -662.09507
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -662.09507
Dynamic-factor model
Sample: 1972m2 - 2008m11                        Number of obs     =        442
                                                Wald chi2(6)      =     751.95
Log likelihood = -662.09507                     Prob > chi2       =     0.0000
```

	Coef.	OIM Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
f						
f						
L1.	.2651932	.0568663	4.66	0.000	.1537372	.3766491
L2.	.4820398	.0624635	7.72	0.000	.3596136	.604466
D.ipman						
f	.3502249	.0287389	12.19	0.000	.2938976	.4065522
D.income						
f	.0746338	.0217319	3.43	0.001	.0320401	.1172276
D.hours						
f	.2177469	.0186769	11.66	0.000	.1811407	.254353
D.unemp						
f	-.0676016	.0071022	-9.52	0.000	-.0815217	-.0536816
var(De.ipman)	.1383158	.0167086	8.28	0.000	.1055675	.1710641
var(De.inc~e)	.2773808	.0188302	14.73	0.000	.2404743	.3142873
var(De.hours)	.0911446	.0080847	11.27	0.000	.0752988	.1069903
var(De.unemp)	.0237232	.0017932	13.23	0.000	.0202086	.0272378

```
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

For a discussion of the atypical iteration log, see example 1 in [TS] **sspace**.

The header in the output describes the estimation sample, reports the log-likelihood function at the maximum, and gives the results of a Wald test against the null hypothesis that the coefficients on the independent variables, the factors, and the autoregressive components are all zero. In this example, the null hypothesis that all parameters except for the variance parameters are zero is rejected at all conventional levels.

The results in the estimation table indicate that the unobserved factor is quite persistent and that it is a significant predictor for each of the observed variables.

dfactor writes the DF model as a state-space model and uses the same methods as sspace to estimate the parameters. Example 5 in [TS] **sspace** writes the model considered here in state-space form and uses sspace to estimate the parameters.

◁

❑ Technical note

The signs of the coefficients on the unobserved factors are not identified. They are not identified because we can multiply the unobserved factors and the coefficients on the unobserved factors by negative one without changing the log likelihood or any of the model predictions.

Altering either the starting values for the maximization process, the maximization technique() used, or the platform on which the command is run can cause the signs of the estimated coefficients on the unobserved factors to change.

Changes in the signs of the estimated coefficients on the unobserved factors do not alter the implications of the model or the model predictions.

❑

▷ Example 2: Dynamic-factor model with covariates

Here we extend the previous example by allowing the errors in the equations for the observables to be autocorrelated. This extension yields a constrained VAR model with an unobserved autocorrelated factor.

We estimate the parameters by typing

```
. dfactor (D.(ipman income hours unemp) = , noconstant ar(1)) (f = , ar(1/2))
searching for initial values .............
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -654.19377
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -627.46986
  (output omitted)
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -610.28846
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -610.28846

Dynamic-factor model

Sample: 1972m2 - 2008m11                          Number of obs    =        442
                                                  Wald chi2(10)    =     990.91
Log likelihood = -610.28846                       Prob > chi2      =     0.0000

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             |                 OIM
             |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
f            |
           f |
         L1. |   .4058457   .0906183     4.48   0.000     .2282371    .5834544
         L2. |   .3663499   .0849584     4.31   0.000     .1998344    .5328654
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
De.ipman     |
     e.ipman |
         LD. |  -.2772149    .068808    -4.03   0.000    -.4120761   -.1423538
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
De.income    |
    e.income |
         LD. |  -.2213824   .0470578    -4.70   0.000    -.3136141   -.1291508
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
De.hours     |
     e.hours |
         LD. |  -.3969317   .0504256    -7.87   0.000     -.495764   -.2980994
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
De.unemp     |
     e.unemp |
         LD. |  -.1736835   .0532071    -3.26   0.001    -.2779675   -.0693995
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.ipman      |
           f |   .3214972    .027982    11.49   0.000     .2666535    .3763408
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.income     |
           f |   .0760412   .0173844     4.37   0.000     .0419684     .110114
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.hours      |
           f |   .1933165   .0172969    11.18   0.000     .1594151    .2272179
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.unemp      |
           f |  -.0711994   .0066553   -10.70   0.000    -.0842435   -.0581553
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
var(De.ipman)|   .1387909   .0154558     8.98   0.000     .1084981    .1690837
var(De.inc~e)|   .2636239   .0179043    14.72   0.000     .2285322    .2987157
var(De.hours)|   .0822919   .0071096    11.57   0.000     .0683574    .0962265
var(De.unemp)|   .0218056   .0016658    13.09   0.000     .0185407    .0250704
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

The autoregressive (AR) terms are displayed in error notation. `e.`*varname* stands for the error in the equation for *varname*. The estimate of the pth AR term from *y1* on *y2* is reported as `L`*p*`e.`*y1* in equation `e.`*y2*. In the above output, the estimated first-order AR term of `D.ipman` on `D.ipman` is -0.277 and is labeled as `LDe.ipman` in equation `De.ipman`.

◁

The previous two examples illustrate how to use `dfactor` to estimate the parameters of DF models. Although the previous example indicates that the more general DFAR model fits the data well, we use these data to illustrate how to estimate the parameters of more restrictive models.

▷ Example 3: A VAR with constrained error variance

In this example, we use `dfactor` to estimate the parameters of a SUR model with constraints on the error-covariance matrix. The model is also a constrained VAR with constraints on the error-covariance matrix, because we include the lags of two dependent variables as exogenous variables to model the dynamic structure of the data. Previous exploratory work suggested that we should drop the lag of `D.unemp` from the model.

```
. constraint 1 [cov(De.unemp,De.income)]_cons  = 0
. dfactor (D.(ipman income unemp) = LD.(ipman income), noconstant
> covstructure(unstructured)), constraints(1)
searching for initial values ............
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood =  -569.3512
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -548.76963
  (output omitted )
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -535.12973
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -535.12973
Dynamic-factor model
Sample: 1972m3 - 2008m11                          Number of obs    =       441
                                                  Wald chi2(6)     =     88.32
Log likelihood = -535.12973                       Prob > chi2      =    0.0000
 ( 1)  [cov(De.income,De.unemp)]_cons = 0
```

	Coef.	OIM Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
D.ipman						
ipman LD.	.206276	.0471654	4.37	0.000	.1138335	.2987185
income LD.	.1867384	.0512139	3.65	0.000	.086361	.2871158
D.income						
ipman LD.	.1043733	.0434048	2.40	0.016	.0193015	.1894451
income LD.	-.1957893	.0471305	-4.15	0.000	-.2881634	-.1034153
D.unemp						
ipman LD.	-.0865823	.0140747	-6.15	0.000	-.1141681	-.0589964
income LD.	-.0200749	.0152828	-1.31	0.189	-.0500285	.0098788
var(De.ipman)	.3243902	.0218533	14.84	0.000	.2815584	.3672219
cov(De.ipman, De.income)	.0445794	.013696	3.25	0.001	.0177358	.071423
cov(De.ipman, De.unemp)	-.0298076	.0047755	-6.24	0.000	-.0391674	-.0204478
var(De.inc~e)	.2747234	.0185008	14.85	0.000	.2384624	.3109844
cov(De.inc~e, De.unemp)	0	(constrained)				
var(De.unemp)	.0288866	.0019453	14.85	0.000	.0250738	.0326994

```
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

The output indicates that the model fits well, except that the lag of first-differenced income is not a significant predictor of first-differenced unemployment.

◁

❏ Technical note

The previous example shows how to use `dfactor` to estimate the parameters of a SUR model with constraints on the error-covariance matrix. Neither `sureg` nor `var` allows for constraints on the error-covariance matrix. Without the constraints on the error-covariance matrix and including the lag of `D.unemp`,

```
. dfactor (D.(ipman income unemp) = LD.(ipman income unemp),
> noconstant covstructure(unstructured))
  (output omitted )

. var D.(ipman income unemp), lags(1) noconstant
  (output omitted )
```

and

```
. sureg (D.ipman  LD.(ipman income unemp), noconstant)
>       (D.income LD.(ipman income unemp), noconstant)
>       (D.unemp  LD.(ipman income unemp), noconstant)
  (output omitted )
```

produce the same estimates after allowing for small numerical differences.

❏

▷ Example 4: A lower-triangular VAR with constrained error variance

The previous example estimated the parameters of a constrained VAR model with a constraint on the error-covariance matrix. This example makes two refinements on the previous one: we use an unconditional estimator instead of a conditional estimator, and we constrain the AR parameters to have a lower triangular structure. (See the next technical note for a discussion of conditional and unconditional estimators.) The results are

```
. constraint 1 [cov(De.unemp,De.income)]_cons  = 0
. dfactor (D.(ipman income unemp) = , ar(1) arstructure(ltriangular) noconstant
> covstructure(unstructured)), constraints(1)
searching for initial values ............
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -543.89836
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -541.47455
  (output omitted )
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -540.36159
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -540.36159
Dynamic-factor model
Sample: 1972m2 - 2008m11                          Number of obs    =        442
                                                  Wald chi2(6)     =      75.48
Log likelihood = -540.36159                       Prob > chi2      =     0.0000
 ( 1)  [cov(De.income,De.unemp)]_cons = 0
```

	Coef.	OIM Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
De.ipman						
e.ipman LD.	.2297308	.0473147	4.86	0.000	.1369957	.3224659
De.income						
e.ipman LD.	.1075441	.0433357	2.48	0.013	.0226077	.1924805
e.income LD.	-.2209485	.047116	-4.69	0.000	-.3132943	-.1286028
De.unemp						
e.ipman LD.	-.0975759	.0151301	-6.45	0.000	-.1272304	-.0679215
e.income LD.	-.0000467	.0147848	-0.00	0.997	-.0290244	.0289309
e.unemp LD.	-.0795348	.0482213	-1.65	0.099	-.1740469	.0149773
var(De.ipman)	.3335286	.0224282	14.87	0.000	.2895702	.377487
cov(De.ipman, De.income)	.0457804	.0139123	3.29	0.001	.0185127	.0730481
cov(De.ipman, De.unemp)	-.0329438	.0051423	-6.41	0.000	-.0430226	-.022865
var(De.inc~e)	.2743375	.0184657	14.86	0.000	.2381454	.3105296
cov(De.inc~e, De.unemp)	0	(constrained)				
var(De.unemp)	.0292088	.00199	14.68	0.000	.0253083	.0331092

```
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

The estimated AR terms of `D.income` and `D.unemp` on `D.unemp` are −0.000047 and −0.079535, and they are not significant at the 1% or 5% levels. The estimated AR term of `D.ipman` on `D.income` is 0.107544 and is significant at the 5% level but not at the 1% level.

◁

❑ Technical note

We obtained the unconditional estimator in example 4 by specifying the `ar()` option instead of including the lags of the endogenous variables as exogenous variables, as we did in example 3. The unconditional estimator has an additional observation and is more efficient. This change is analogous to estimating an AR coefficient by `arima` instead of using `regress` on the lagged endogenous variable. For example, to obtain the unconditional estimator in a univariate model, typing

```
. arima D.ipman, ar(1) noconstant technique(nr)
  (output omitted)
```

will produce the same estimated AR coefficient as

```
. dfactor (D.ipman, ar(1) noconstant)
  (output omitted)
```

We obtain the conditional estimator by typing either

```
. regress D.ipman LD.ipman, noconstant
  (output omitted)
```

or

```
. dfactor (D.ipman = LD.ipman, noconstant)
  (output omitted)
```

❑

▷ Example 5: A static factor model

In this example, we fit regional unemployment data to an SF model. We have data on the unemployment levels for the four regions in the U.S. census: `west` for the West, `south` for the South, `ne` for the Northeast, and `midwest` for the Midwest. We treat the variables as first-difference stationary and model the first-differences of these variables. Using `dfactor` yields

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r13/urate
(Monthly unemployment rates in US Census regions)

. dfactor (D.(west south ne midwest) = , noconstant ) (z = )
searching for initial values .............
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood =  872.72029
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =  873.04781
  (output omitted)
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood =   873.0755
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =   873.0755

Dynamic-factor model

Sample: 1990m2 - 2008m12                        Number of obs     =        227
                                                Wald chi2(4)      =     342.56
Log likelihood =   873.0755                     Prob > chi2       =     0.0000

------------------------------------------------------------------------------
             |                 OIM
             |      Coef.   Std. Err.      z    P>|z|     [95% Conf. Interval]
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.west       |
           z |   .0978324   .0065644    14.90   0.000     .0849664    .1106983
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.south      |
           z |   .0859494   .0061762    13.92   0.000     .0738442    .0980546
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.ne         |
           z |   .0918607   .0072814    12.62   0.000     .0775893     .106132
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
D.midwest    |
           z |   .0861102   .0074652    11.53   0.000     .0714787    .1007417
-------------+----------------------------------------------------------------
  var(De.west)|   .0036887   .0005834     6.32   0.000     .0025453    .0048322
 var(De.south)|   .0038902   .0005228     7.44   0.000     .0028656    .0049149
    var(De.ne)|   .0064074   .0007558     8.48   0.000     .0049261    .0078887
var(De.mid~t)|   .0074749   .0008271     9.04   0.000     .0058538     .009096
------------------------------------------------------------------------------
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

The estimates indicate that we could reasonably suppose that the unobserved factor has the same effect on the changes in unemployment in all four regions. The output below shows that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that these coefficients are the same.

```
. test [D.west]z = [D.south]z = [D.ne]z = [D.midwest]z

 ( 1)  [D.west]z - [D.south]z = 0
 ( 2)  [D.west]z - [D.ne]z = 0
 ( 3)  [D.west]z - [D.midwest]z = 0

           chi2(  3) =    3.58
         Prob > chi2 =    0.3109
```

◁

▷ Example 6: A static factor with constraints

In this example, we impose the constraint that the unobserved factor has the same impact on changes in unemployment in all four regions. This constraint was suggested by the results of the previous example. The previous example did not allow for any dynamics in the variables, a problem we alleviate by allowing the disturbances in the equation for each observable to follow an AR(1) process.

```
. constraint 2 [D.west]z = [D.south]z
. constraint 3 [D.west]z = [D.ne]z
. constraint 4 [D.west]z = [D.midwest]z
. dfactor (D.(west south ne midwest) = , noconstant ar(1)) (z = ),
> constraints(2/4)
searching for initial values .............
(setting technique to bhhh)
Iteration 0:   log likelihood =  828.22533
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =  874.84221
  (output omitted)
Refining estimates:
Iteration 0:   log likelihood =  880.97488
Iteration 1:   log likelihood =  880.97488

Dynamic-factor model

Sample: 1990m2 - 2008m12                         Number of obs      =       227
                                                 Wald chi2(5)       =    363.34
Log likelihood =  880.97488                      Prob > chi2        =    0.0000
 ( 1)  [D.west]z - [D.south]z = 0
 ( 2)  [D.west]z - [D.ne]z = 0
 ( 3)  [D.west]z - [D.midwest]z = 0
```

	Coef.	OIM Std. Err.	z	P>|z|	[95% Conf.	Interval]
De.west						
e.west						
LD.	.1297198	.0992663	1.31	0.191	-.0648386	.3242781
De.south						
e.south						
LD.	-.2829014	.0909205	-3.11	0.002	-.4611023	-.1047004
De.ne						
e.ne						
LD.	.2866958	.0847851	3.38	0.001	.12052	.4528715
De.midwest						
e.midwest						
LD.	.0049427	.0782188	0.06	0.950	-.1483634	.1582488
D.west						
z	.0904724	.0049326	18.34	0.000	.0808047	.1001401
D.south						
z	.0904724	.0049326	18.34	0.000	.0808047	.1001401
D.ne						
z	.0904724	.0049326	18.34	0.000	.0808047	.1001401
D.midwest						
z	.0904724	.0049326	18.34	0.000	.0808047	.1001401
var(De.west)	.0038959	.0005111	7.62	0.000	.0028941	.0048977
var(De.south)	.0035518	.0005097	6.97	0.000	.0025528	.0045507
var(De.ne)	.0058173	.0006983	8.33	0.000	.0044488	.0071859
var(De.mid~t)	.0075444	.0008268	9.12	0.000	.0059239	.009165

```
Note: Tests of variances against zero are one sided, and the two-sided
    confidence intervals are truncated at zero.
```

The results indicate that the model might not fit well. Two of the four AR coefficients are statistically insignificant, while the two significant coefficients have opposite signs and sum to about zero. We suspect that a DF model might fit these data better than an SF model with autocorrelated disturbances.

◁

Stored results

`dfactor` stores the following in `e()`:

Scalars

`e(N)`	number of observations
`e(k)`	number of parameters
`e(k_aux)`	number of auxiliary parameters
`e(k_eq)`	number of equations in `e(b)`
`e(k_eq_model)`	number of equations in overall model test
`e(k_dv)`	number of dependent variables
`e(k_obser)`	number of observation equations
`e(k_factor)`	number of factors specified
`e(o_ar_max)`	number of AR terms for the disturbances
`e(f_ar_max)`	number of AR terms for the factors
`e(df_m)`	model degrees of freedom
`e(ll)`	log likelihood
`e(chi2)`	χ^2
`e(p)`	significance
`e(tmin)`	minimum time in sample
`e(tmax)`	maximum time in sample
`e(stationary)`	`1` if the estimated parameters indicate a stationary model, `0` otherwise
`e(rank)`	rank of VCE
`e(ic)`	number of iterations
`e(rc)`	return code
`e(converged)`	`1` if converged, `0` otherwise

Macros

`e(cmd)`	`dfactor`
`e(cmdline)`	command as typed
`e(depvar)`	unoperated names of dependent variables in observation equations
`e(obser_deps)`	names of dependent variables in observation equations
`e(covariates)`	list of covariates
`e(indeps)`	independent variables
`e(factor_deps)`	names of unobserved factors in model
`e(tvar)`	variable denoting time within groups
`e(eqnames)`	names of equations
`e(model)`	type of dynamic-factor model specified
`e(title)`	title in estimation output
`e(tmins)`	formatted minimum time
`e(tmaxs)`	formatted maximum time
`e(o_ar)`	list of AR terms for disturbances
`e(f_ar)`	list of AR terms for factors
`e(observ_cov)`	structure of observation-error covariance matrix
`e(factor_cov)`	structure of factor-error covariance matrix
`e(chi2type)`	`Wald`; type of model χ^2 test
`e(vce)`	*vcetype* specified in `vce()`
`e(vcetype)`	title used to label Std. Err.
`e(opt)`	type of optimization
`e(method)`	likelihood method
`e(initial_values)`	type of initial values
`e(technique)`	maximization technique
`e(tech_steps)`	iterations taken in maximization technique(s)
`e(datasignature)`	the checksum
`e(datasignaturevars)`	variables used in calculation of checksum
`e(properties)`	`b V`

`e(estat_cmd)`	program used to implement `estat`
`e(predict)`	program used to implement `predict`
`e(marginsok)`	predictions allowed by `margins`
`e(marginsnotok)`	predictions disallowed by `margins`
Matrices	
`e(b)`	coefficient vector
`e(Cns)`	constraints matrix
`e(ilog)`	iteration log (up to 20 iterations)
`e(gradient)`	gradient vector
`e(V)`	variance–covariance matrix of the estimators
`e(V_modelbased)`	model-based variance
Functions	
`e(sample)`	marks estimation sample

Methods and formulas

`dfactor` writes the specified model as a state-space model and uses `sspace` to estimate the parameters by maximum likelihood. See Lütkepohl (2005, 619–621) for how to write the DF model in state-space form. See [TS] **sspace** for the technical details.

References

De Jong, P. 1988. The likelihood for a state space model. *Biometrika* 75: 165–169.

——. 1991. The diffuse Kalman filter. *Annals of Statistics* 19: 1073–1083.

Geweke, J. 1977. The dynamic factor analysis of economic time series models. In *Latent Variables in Socioeconomic Models*, ed. D. J. Aigner and A. S. Goldberger, 365–383. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

Lütkepohl, H. 2005. *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*. New York: Springer.

Sargent, T. J., and C. A. Sims. 1977. Business cycle modeling without pretending to have too much a priori economic theory. In *New Methods in Business Cycle Research: Proceedings from a Conference*, ed. C. A. Sims, 45–109. Minneapolis: Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis.

Stock, J. H., and M. W. Watson. 1989. New indexes of coincident and leading economic indicators. In *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1989*, ed. O. J. Blanchard and S. Fischer, vol. 4, 351–394. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

——. 1991. A probability model of the coincident economic indicators. In *Leading Economic Indicators: New Approaches and Forecasting Records*, ed. K. Lahiri and G. H. Moore, 63–89. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Watson, M. W., and R. F. Engle. 1983. Alternative algorithms for the estimation of dymanic factor, MIMIC and varying coefficient regression models. *Journal of Econometrics* 23: 385–400.

Also see

[TS] **dfactor postestimation** — Postestimation tools for dfactor

[TS] **arima** — ARIMA, ARMAX, and other dynamic regression models

[TS] **sspace** — State-space models

[TS] **tsset** — Declare data to be time-series data

[TS] **var** — Vector autoregressive models

[R] **regress** — Linear regression

[R] **sureg** — Zellner's seemingly unrelated regression

[U] **20 Estimation and postestimation commands**