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## Cross-referencing the documentation

When reading this manual, you will find references to other Stata manuals. For example,
[U] 26 Overview of Stata estimation commands
[R] regress
[D] reshape
The first example is a reference to chapter 26, Overview of Stata estimation commands, in the User's Guide; the second is a reference to the regress entry in the Base Reference Manual; and the third is a reference to the reshape entry in the Data Management Reference Manual.

All the manuals in the Stata Documentation have a shorthand notation:

| [GSM] | Getting Started with Stata for Mac |
| :--- | :--- |
| [GSU] | Getting Started with Stata for Unix |
| [GSW] | Getting Started with Stata for Windows |
| [U] | Stata User's Guide |
| [R] | Stata Base Reference Manual |
| [BAYES] | Stata Bayesian Analysis Reference Manual |
| [D] | Stata Data Management Reference Manual |
| [FN] | Stata Functions Reference Manual |
| [G] | Stata Graphics Reference Manual |
| [IRT] | Stata Item Response Theory Reference Manual |
| [XT] | Stata Longitudinal-Data/Panel-Data Reference Manual |
| [ME] | Stata Multilevel Mixed-Effects Reference Manual |
| [MI] | Stata Multiple-Imputation Reference Manual |
| [MV] | Stata Multivariate Statistics Reference Manual |
| [PSS] | Stata Power and Sample-Size Reference Manual |
| [P] | Stata Programming Reference Manual |
| [SEM] | Stata Structural Equation Modeling Reference Manual |
| [SVY] | Stata Survey Data Reference Manual |
| [ST] | Stata Survival Analysis Reference Manual |
| [TS] | Stata Time-Series Reference Manual |
| [TE] | Stata Treatment-Effects Reference Manual: |
| [I] | Sotential Outcomes/Counterfactual Outcomes |
| Stata Glossary and Index |  |
| [M] | Mata Reference Manual |

## Title

intro - Introduction to longitudinal-data/panel-data manual

## Description Also see

## Description

This manual documents the xt commands and is referred to as [XT] in cross-references.
Following this entry, [XT] xt provides an overview of the xt commands. The other parts of this manual are arranged alphabetically. If you are new to Stata's xt commands, we recommend that you read the following sections first:
[XT] xt Introduction to xt commands
[XT] xtset Declare a dataset to be panel data
[XT] xtreg Fixed-, between-, and random-effects, and population-averaged linear models

Stata is continually being updated, and Stata users are always writing new commands. To find out about the latest cross-sectional time-series features, type search panel data after installing the latest official updates; see [R] update.

## Also see

[U] 1.3 What's new
$[\mathrm{R}]$ intro - Introduction to base reference manual

## Title

xt - Introduction to xt commands
Description Remarks and examples References Also see

## Description

The xt series of commands provides tools for analyzing panel data (also known as longitudinal data or in some disciplines as cross-sectional time series when there is an explicit time component). Panel datasets have the form $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$, where $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ is a vector of observations for unit $i$ and time $t$. The particular commands (such as xtdescribe, xtsum, and xtreg) are documented in alphabetical order in the entries that follow this entry. If you do not know the name of the command you need, try browsing the second part of this description section, which organizes the xt commands by topic. The next section, Remarks and examples, describes concepts that are common across commands.

The xtset command sets the panel variable and the time variable; see [XT] xtset. Most xt commands require that the panel variable be specified, and some require that the time variable also be specified. Once you xtset your data, you need not do it again. The xtset information is stored with your data.

If you have previously tsset your data by using both a panel and a time variable, these settings will be recognized by xtset, and you need not xtset your data.

If your interest is in general time-series analysis, see [U] 26.19 Models with time-series data and the Time-Series Reference Manual. If your interest is in multilevel mixed-effects models, see [U] 26.21 Multilevel mixed-effects models and the Multilevel Mixed-Effects Reference Manual.

## Setup

xtset Declare data to be panel data
Data management and exploration tools
xtdescribe Describe pattern of xt data
xtsum Summarize xt data
xttab Tabulate xt data
xtdata Faster specification searches with xt data
xtline Panel-data line plots

## Linear regression estimators

| xtreg | Fixed-, between-, and random-effects, and population-averaged linear models |
| :--- | :--- |
| xtregar | Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance |
| xtgls | Panel-data models by using GLS |
| xtpcse | Linear regression with panel-corrected standard errors |
| xthtaylor | Hausman-Taylor estimator for error-components models |
| xtfrontier | Stochastic frontier models for panel data |
| xtrc | Random-coefficients regression |
| xtivreg | Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models |

## Unit-root tests

xtunitroot Panel-data unit-root tests

## Dynamic panel-data estimators

xtabond Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
xtdpd Linear dynamic panel-data estimation
xtdpdsys Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation

## Censored-outcome estimators

xttobit Random-effects tobit models
xtintreg Random-effects interval-data regression models

## Binary-outcome estimators

xtlogit Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
xtprobit Random-effects and population-averaged probit models
xtcloglog Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models
Ordinal-outcome estimators
xtologit Random-effects ordered logistic models
xtoprobit Random-effects ordered probit models

## Count-data estimators

xtpoisson Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models
xtnbreg Fixed-effects, random-effects, \& population-averaged negative binomial models

## Survival-time estimators

xtstreg Random-effects parametric survival models

## Generalized estimating equations estimator

xtgee Population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE

## Utility

quadchk
Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation

## Remarks and examples

Consider having data on $n$ units-individuals, firms, countries, or whatever-over $T$ periods. The data might be income and other characteristics of $n$ persons surveyed each of $T$ years, the output and costs of $n$ firms collected over $T$ months, or the health and behavioral characteristics of $n$ patients collected over $T$ years. In panel datasets, we write $x_{i t}$ for the value of $x$ for unit $i$ at time $t$. The xt commands assume that such datasets are stored as a sequence of observations on $(i, t, x)$.

For a discussion of panel-data models, see Baltagi (2013), Greene (2012, chap. 11), Hsiao (2014), and Wooldridge (2010). Cameron and Trivedi (2010) illustrate many of Stata's panel-data estimators.

For an introduction to linear, nonlinear, and dynamic panel-data analysis in Stata, we offer NetCourse 471, Introduction to Panel Data Using Stata; see http://www.stata.com/netcourse/nc471.html.

## > Example 1

If we had data on pulmonary function (measured by forced expiratory volume, or FEV) along with smoking behavior, age, sex, and height, a piece of the data might be

```
. list in 1/6, separator(0) divider
```

| pid | yr_visit | fev | age | sex | height | smokes |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1071 | 1991 | 1.21 | 25 | 1 | 69 | 0 |
| 1071 | 1992 | 1.52 | 26 | 1 | 69 | 0 |
| 1071 | 1993 | 1.32 | 28 | 1 | 68 | 0 |
| 1072 | 1991 | 1.33 | 18 | 1 | 71 | 1 |
| 1072 | 1992 | 1.18 | 20 | 1 | 71 | 1 |
| 1072 | 1993 | 1.19 | 21 | 1 | 71 | 0 |

The xt commands need to know the identity of the variable identifying patient, and some of the xt commands also need to know the identity of the variable identifying time. With these data, we would type
. xtset pid yr_visit
If we resaved the data, we need not respecify xtset.

## - Technical note

Panel data stored as shown above are said to be in the long form. Perhaps the data are in the wide form with 1 observation per unit and multiple variables for the value in each year. For instance, a piece of the pulmonary function data might be

| pid | sex | fev91 | fev92 | fev93 | age91 | age92 | age93 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1071 | 1 | 1.21 | 1.52 | 1.32 | 25 | 26 | 28 |
| 1072 | 1 | 1.33 | 1.18 | 1.19 | 18 | 20 | 21 |

Data in this form can be converted to the long form by using reshape; see [D] reshape.

## > Example 2

Data for some of the periods might be missing. That is, we have panel data on $i=1, \ldots, n$ and $t=1, \ldots, T$, but only $T_{i}$ of those observations are defined. With such missing periods-called unbalanced data-a piece of our pulmonary function data might be . list in $1 / 6$, separator(0) divider

| pid | yr_visit | fev | age | sex | height | smokes |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1071 | 1991 | 1.21 | 25 | 1 | 69 | 0 |
| 1071 | 1992 | 1.52 | 26 | 1 | 69 | 0 |
| 1071 | 1993 | 1.32 | 28 | 1 | 68 | 0 |
| 1072 | 1991 | 1.33 | 18 | 1 | 71 | 1 |
| 1072 | 1993 | 1.19 | 21 | 1 | 71 | 0 |
| 1073 | 1991 | 1.47 | 24 | 0 | 64 | 0 |

Patient ID 1072 is not observed in 1992. The xt commands are robust to this problem.

- Technical note

In many of the entries in [XT], we will use data from a subsample of the NLSY data (Center for Human Resource Research 1989) on young women aged 14-26 years in 1968. Women were surveyed in each of the 21 years 1968-1988, except for the six years 1974, 1976, 1979, 1981, 1984, and 1986. We use two different subsets: nlswork.dta and union.dta.

For nlswork.dta, our subsample is of 4,711 women in years when employed, not enrolled in school and evidently having completed their education, and with wages in excess of $\$ 1 /$ hour but less than $\$ 700 /$ hour.

| (National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women $14-26$ years of age in 1968) describe |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contains data obs: | $\begin{aligned} & \text { from htt] } \\ & 28,534 \end{aligned}$ | ://www.st | -press. | /data/r14/nlswork.dta <br> National Longitudinal Survey. <br> Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968 |
| vars: | 21 |  |  | 27 Nov 2014 08:14 |
| size: | 941,622 |  |  |  |
| variable name | storage type | display <br> format | value <br> label | variable label |
| idcode | int | \%8.0g |  | NLS ID |
| year | byte | \%8.0g |  | interview year |
| birth_yr | byte | \%8.0g |  | birth year |
| age | byte | \%8.0g |  | age in current year |
| race | byte | \%8.0g | racelbl | race |
| msp | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if married, spouse present |
| nev_mar | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if never married |
| grade | byte | \%8.0g |  | current grade completed |
| collgrad | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if college graduate |
| not_smsa | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if not SMSA |
| c_city | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if central city |
| south | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if south |
| ind_code | byte | \%8.0g |  | industry of employment |
| occ_code | byte | \%8.0g |  | occupation |
| union | byte | \%8.0g |  | 1 if union |
| wks_ue | byte | \%8.0g |  | weeks unemployed last year |
| ttl_exp | float | $\% 9.0 \mathrm{~g}$ |  | total work experience |
| tenure | float | \%9.0g |  | job tenure, in years |
| hours | int | \%8.0g |  | usual hours worked |
| wks_work | int | \%8.0g |  | weeks worked last year |
| ln_wage | float | \%9.0g |  | ln(wage/GNP deflator) |

Sorted by: idcode year

| . summarize |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| idcode | 28,534 | 2601.284 | 1487.359 | 1 | 5159 |
| year | 28,534 | 77.95865 | 6.383879 | 68 | 88 |
| birth_yr | 28,534 | 48.08509 | 3.012837 | 41 | 54 |
| age | 28,510 | 29.04511 | 6.700584 | 14 | 46 |
| race | 28,534 | 1.303392 | .4822773 | 1 | 3 |
| msp | 28,518 | .6029175 | .4893019 | 0 | 1 |
| nev_mar | 28,518 | .2296795 | .4206341 | 0 | 1 |
| grade | 28,532 | 12.53259 | 2.323905 | 0 | 18 |
| collgrad | 28,534 | .1680451 | .3739129 | 0 | 1 |
| not_smsa | 28,526 | .2824441 | .4501961 | 0 | 1 |
| c_city | 28,526 | .357218 | .4791882 | 0 | 1 |
| south | 28,526 | .4095562 | .4917605 | 0 | 1 |
| ind_code | 28,193 | 7.692973 | 2.994025 | 1 | 12 |
| occ_code | 28,413 | 4.777672 | 3.065435 | 1 | 13 |
| union | 19,238 | .2344319 | .4236542 | 0 | 1 |
| wks_ue | 22,830 | 2.548095 | 7.294463 | 0 | 76 |
| ttl_exp | 28,534 | 6.215316 | 4.652117 | 0 | 28.88461 |
| tenure | 28,101 | 3.123836 | 3.751409 | 0 | 25.91667 |
| hours | 28,467 | 36.55956 | 9.869623 | 1 | 168 |
| wks_work | 27,831 | 53.98933 | 29.03232 | 0 | 104 |
| ln_wage | 28,534 | 1.674907 | .4780935 | 0 | 5.263916 |

Many of the variables in the nlswork dataset are indicator variables, so we have used factor variables (see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables) in many of the examples in this manual. You will see terms like c.age\#c.age or 2. race in estimation commands. c.age\#c.age is just age interacted with age, or age-squared, and 2.race is just an indicator variable for black (race $=2$ ).

Instead of using factor variables, you could type

```
. generate age2 = age*age
. generate black = (race==2)
```

and substitute age 2 and black in your estimation command for c.age\#c.age and 2.race, respectively.

There are advantages, however, to using factor variables. First, you do not actually have to create new variables, so the number of variables in your dataset is less.

Second, by using factor variables, we are able to take better advantage of postestimation commands. For example, if we specify the simple model

```
. xtreg ln_wage age age2, fe
```

then age and age 2 are completely separate variables. Stata has no idea that they are related-that one is the square of the other. Consequently, if we compute the average marginal effect of age on the $\log$ of wages,

```
. margins, dydx(age)
```

then the reported marginal effect is with respect to the age variable alone and not with respect to the true effect of age, which involves the coefficients on both age and age2.

If instead we fit our model using an interaction of age with itself for the square of age,

```
. xtreg ln_wage age c.age#c.age, fe
```

then Stata has a deep understanding that the coefficients age and c.age\#c.age are related. After fitting this model, the marginal effect reported by margins includes the full effect of age on the log of income, including the contribution of both coefficients.

```
. margins, dydx(age)
```

There are other reasons for preferring factor variables; see $[R]$ margins for examples.
For union.dta, our subset was sampled only from those with union membership information from 1970 to 1988. Our subsample is of 4,434 women. The important variables are age ( $16-46$ ), grade (years of schooling completed, ranging from 0 to 18), not_smsa ( $28 \%$ of the person-time was spent living outside a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA), and south ( $41 \%$ of the person-time was in the South). The dataset also has variable union. Overall, $22 \%$ of the person-time is marked as time under union membership, and $44 \%$ of these women have belonged to a union.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. describe
Contains data from http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union.dta
    obs: 26,200 NLS Women 14-24 in 1968
    vars: 8 4 May 2014 13:54
    size: 235,800
```

| variable name | storage <br> type | display <br> format | value <br> label |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Sorted by: idcode year
. summarize

| Variable | Obs | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| idcode | 26,200 | 2611.582 | 1484.994 | 1 | 5159 |
| year | 26,200 | 79.47137 | 5.965499 | 70 | 88 |
| age | 26,200 | 30.43221 | 6.489056 | 16 | 46 |
| grade | 26,200 | 12.76145 | 2.411715 | 0 | 18 |
| not_smsa | 26,200 | .2837023 | .4508027 | 0 | 1 |
| south | 26,200 | .4130153 | .4923849 | 0 | 1 |
| union | 26,200 | .2217939 | .4154611 | 0 | 1 |
| black | 26,200 | .274542 | .4462917 | 0 | 1 |

In many of the examples where the union dataset is used, we also include an interaction between the year variable and the south variable-south\#c.year. This interaction is created using factorvariables notation; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.

With both datasets, we have typed

```
. xtset idcode year
```

- Technical note

The xtset command sets the $t$ and $i$ index for xt data by declaring them as characteristics of the data; see $[\mathrm{P}]$ char. The panel variable is stored in _dta[iis] and the time variable is stored in _dta[tis].

- Technical note

Throughout the entries in [XT], when random-effects models are fit, a likelihood-ratio test that the variance of the random effects is zero is included. These tests occur on the boundary of the parameter space, invalidating the usual theory associated with such tests. However, these likelihood-ratio tests have been modified to be valid on the boundary. In particular, the null distribution of the likelihoodratio test statistic is not the usual $\chi_{1}^{2}$ but is rather a $50: 50$ mixture of a $\chi_{0}^{2}$ (point mass at zero) and a $\chi_{1}^{2}$, denoted as $\bar{\chi}_{01}^{2}$. See Gutierrez, Carter, and Drukker (2001) for a full discussion.
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## Also see

[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data

## Title

quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples |  |  |

## Description

quadchk checks the quadrature approximation used in the random-effects estimators of the following commands:

```
xtcloglog
xtintreg
xtlogit
xtologit
xtoprobit
xtpoisson, re with the normal option
xtprobit
xtstreg
xttobit
```

quadchk refits the model for different numbers of quadrature points and then compares the different solutions. quadchk respects all options supplied to the original model except or, vce(), and the maximize_options.

## Quick start

Check quadrature approximation using the default range of quadrature points quadchk

As above, but use 8 and 16 quadrature points
quadchk 816
As above, but suppress the iteration log and output of the refitted models
quadchk 8 16, nooutput
Refit the model instead of using original estimates
quadchk 816 , nooutput nofrom

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation

## Syntax

```
quadchk [# # # # ] [, nooutput nofrom]
```

$\#_{1}$ and $\#_{2}$ specify the number of quadrature points to use in the comparison runs of the previous model. The default is to use approximately $2 n_{q} / 3$ and $4 n_{q} / 3$ points, where $n_{q}$ is the number of quadrature points used in the original estimation.

## Options

nooutput suppresses the iteration $\log$ and output of the refitted models.
nofrom forces the refitted models to start from scratch rather than starting from the previous estimation results. Specifying the nofrom option can level the playing field in testing estimation results.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
What makes a good random-effects model fit?
How do I know whether I have a good quadrature approximation?
What can I do to improve my results?

## What makes a good random-effects model fit?

Some random-effects estimators in Stata use adaptive or nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature to compute the log likelihood and its derivatives. As a rule, adaptive quadrature, which is the default integration method, is much more accurate. The quadchk command provides a means to look at the numerical accuracy of either quadrature approximation. A good random-effects model fit depends on both the goodness of the quadrature approximation and the goodness of the data.

The accuracy of the quadrature approximation depends on three factors. The first and second are how many quadrature points are used and where the quadrature points fall. These two factors directly influence the accuracy of the quadrature approximation. The number of quadrature points may be specified with the intpoints() option. However, once the number of points is specified, their abscissas (locations) and corresponding weights are completely determined. Increasing the number of points expands the range of the abscissas and, to a lesser extent, increases the density of the abscissas. For this reason, a function that undulates between the abscissas can be difficult to approximate.

Third, the smoothness of the function being approximated influences the accuracy of the quadrature approximation. Gauss-Hermite quadrature estimates integrals of the type

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} f(x) d x
$$

and the approximation is exact if $f(x)$ is a polynomial of degree less than the number of integration points. Therefore, $f(x)$ that are well approximated by polynomials of a given degree have integrals that are well approximated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature with that given number of integration points. Both large panel sizes and high $\rho$ can reduce the accuracy of the quadrature approximation.

A final factor affects the goodness of the random-effects model: the data themselves. For high $\rho$, for example, there is high intrapanel correlation, and panels look like observations. The model becomes unidentified. Here, even with exact quadrature, fitting the model would be difficult.

## How do I know whether I have a good quadrature approximation?

quadchk is intended as a tool to help you know whether you have a good quadrature approximation. As a rule of thumb, if the coefficients do not change by more than a relative difference of $10^{-4}$ $(0.01 \%)$, the choice of quadrature points does not significantly affect the outcome, and the results may be confidently interpreted. However, if the results do change appreciably - greater than a relative difference of $10^{-2}(1 \%)$-then quadrature is not reliably approximating the likelihood.

## What can I do to improve my results?

If the quadchk command indicates that the estimation results are sensitive to the number of quadrature points, there are several things you can do. First, if you are not using adaptive quadrature, switch to adaptive quadrature.

Adaptive quadrature can improve the approximation by transforming the integrand so that the abscissas and weights sample the function on a more suitable range. Details of this transformation are in Methods and formulas for the given commands; for example, see [XT] xtprobit.

If the model still shows sensitivity to the number of quadrature points, increase the number of quadrature points with the intpoints () option. This option will increase the range and density of the sampling used for the quadrature approximation.

If neither of these works, you may then want to consider an alternative model, such as a fixedeffects, pooled, or population-averaged model. Alternatively, a different random-effects model whose likelihood is not approximated via quadrature (for example, xtpoisson, re) may be a better choice.
$>$ Example 1
Here we synthesize data according to the model

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(y) & =0.05 x_{1}+0.08 x_{2}+0.08 x_{3}+0.1 x_{4}+0.1 x_{5}+0.1 x_{6}+0.1 \epsilon \\
z & = \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } y \geq 0 \\
0 & \text { if } y<0\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the intrapanel correlation is 0.5 and the x 1 variable is constant within panels. We first fit a random-effects probit model, and then we check the stability of the quadrature calculation:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/quad1
. xtset id
    panel variable: id (balanced)
. xtprobit z x1-x6
    (output omitted)
```

Random-effects probit regression Number of obs $=6,000$
Group variable: id
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian Obs per group:
Number of groups $=300$
$\begin{array}{rr}\min = & 20 \\ \operatorname{avg}= & 20.0 \\ \max = & 20\end{array}$
Integration method: mvaghermite
Log likelihood = -3347.1097

| $\min$ | $=$ | 20 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| avg | $=$ | 20.0 |
| $\max$ | $=$ | 20 |
| Integration pts. | $=$ | 12 |
| Wald chi2(6) | $=$ | 29.24 |
| Prob $>$ chi2 | $=$ | 0.0001 |


| z | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| x1 | .0043068 | .0607058 | 0.07 | 0.943 | -.1146743 | .1232879 |
| x2 | .1000742 | .066331 | 1.51 | 0.131 | -.0299323 | .2300806 |
| x3 | .1503539 | .0662503 | 2.27 | 0.023 | .0205057 | .2802021 |
| x4 | .123015 | .0377089 | 3.26 | 0.001 | .0491069 | .196923 |
| x5 | .1342988 | .0657222 | 2.04 | 0.041 | .0054856 | .263112 |
| x6 | .0879933 | .0455753 | 1.93 | 0.054 | -.0013325 | .1773192 |
| _cons | .0757067 | .060359 | 1.25 | 0.210 | -.0425948 | .1940083 |
| /lnsig2u | -.0329916 | .1026847 |  |  | -.23425 | .1682667 |
| sigma_u | .9836395 | .0505024 |  |  | .889474 | 1.087774 |
| rho | .4917528 | .0256642 |  |  | .4417038 | .5419677 |

LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) = 1582.67
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.000$

| ```Refitting model intpoints() = 8 (output omitted) Refitting model intpoints() = 16 (output omitted)``` |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Quadrature check |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fitted quadrature 12 points | Comparison quadrature 8 points | Comparison quadrature 16 points |  |
| Log | -3347.1097 | -3347.1153 | -3347.1099 |  |
| likelihood |  | -. 00561484 | -. 00014288 | Difference |
|  |  | $1.678 \mathrm{e}-06$ | $4.269 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 0043068 | . 0043068 | . 00430541 |  |
| x1 |  | 8.983e-15 | -1.388e-06 | Difference |
|  |  | $2.086 \mathrm{e}-12$ | -. 00032222 | Relative difference |
| z : | . 10007418 | . 10007418 | . 10007431 |  |
| x2 |  | $2.540 \mathrm{e}-15$ | $1.362 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $2.538 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $1.361 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 15035391 | . 15035391 | . 15035406 |  |
| x3 |  | $6.356 \mathrm{e}-15$ | $1.520 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $4.227 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $1.011 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 12301495 | . 12301495 | . 12301506 |  |
| x4 |  | $4.149 \mathrm{e}-15$ | $1.099 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $3.373 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $8.931 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 13429881 | . 13429881 | . 13429896 |  |
| x5 |  | $4.913 \mathrm{e}-15$ | $1.471 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $3.658 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $1.096 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Relative difference |
| z : | . 08799332 | . 08799332 | . 08799346 |  |
| x6 |  | $3.345 \mathrm{e}-15$ | $1.363 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $3.801 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $1.549 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 07570675 | . 07570675 | . 07570423 |  |
| _cons |  | $1.964 \mathrm{e}-14$ | -2.516e-06 | Difference |
|  |  | $2.594 \mathrm{e}-13$ | -. 00003323 | Relative difference |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { lnsig2u: } \\ \quad \text { _cons } \end{array}$ | -. 03299164 | -. 03299164 | -. 03298184 |  |
|  |  | $7.268 \mathrm{e}-14$ | $9.798 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Difference |
|  |  | -2.203e-12 | -. 00029699 | Relative difference |

We see that the largest difference is in the x 1 variable with a relative difference of $0.03 \%$ between the model with 12 integration points and 16 . This example is somewhat rare in that the differences between eight quadrature points and 12 are smaller than those between 12 and 16 . Usually the opposite occurs: the model results converge as you add quadrature points. Here we have an indication that perhaps some minor feature of the model was missed with eight points and 12 but seen with 16 . Because all differences are very small, we could accept this model as is. We would like to have a largest relative difference of about $0.01 \%$, and this is close. The differences and relative differences are small, indicating that refitting the random-effects probit model with a few more integration points will yield a satisfactory result. Indeed, refitting the model with the intpoints (20) option yields completely satisfactory results when checked with quadchk.

Nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature does not yield such robust results.

. quadchk, nooutput
Refitting model intpoints() $=8$
Refitting model intpoints() = 16

|  | Quadrature check |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fitted quadrature 12 points | Comparison quadrature 8 points | Comparison quadrature 16 points |  |
| Log | -3349.6926 | -3354.6372 | -3348.3881 |  |
| likelihood |  | -4.9446636 | 1.3045063 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00147615 | -. 00038944 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 11567633 | . 16153998 | . 07007833 |  |
| x1 |  | . 04586365 | -. 045598 | Difference |
|  |  | . 39648262 | -. 39418608 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 10055552 | . 10317831 | . 09937417 |  |
| x2 |  | . 00262279 | -. 00118135 | Difference |
|  |  | . 02608297 | -. 01174825 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 1542187 | . 15465369 | . 15150516 |  |
| x3 |  | . 00043499 | -. 00271354 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00282062 | -. 0175954 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 12576159 | . 12880254 | . 1243974 |  |
| x4 |  | . 00304096 | -. 00136418 | Difference |
|  |  | . 02418032 | -. 01084739 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 13660028 | . 13475211 | . 13707075 |  |
| x5 |  | -. 00184817 | . 00047047 | Difference |
|  |  | -. 01352978 | . 00344411 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 08703252 | . 08568342 | . 08738135 |  |
| x6 |  | $-.0013491$ | $.00034883$ |  |
|  |  | $-.0155011$ | $.00400809$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 10983928 | . 11031299 | . 09654975 |  |
| _cons |  | . 00047371 | -. 01328953 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00431274 | -. 12099067 | Relative difference |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { lnsig2u: } \\ \text { _cons } \end{array}$ | -. 07918212 | -. 18133821 | -. 05815644 |  |
|  |  | -. 10215609 | . 02102568 | Difference |
|  |  | 1.2901408 | -. 26553572 | Relative difference |

Here we see that the x 1 variable (the one that was constant within panel) changed with a relative difference of nearly $40 \%$ ! This example clearly demonstrates the benefit of adaptive quadrature methods.

## > Example 2

Here we rerun the previous nonadaptive quadrature model, but using the intpoints(120) option to increase the number of integration points to 120 . We get results close to those from adaptive quadrature and an acceptable quadchk. This example demonstrates the efficacy of increasing the number of integration points to improve the quadrature approximation.

| Random-effects probit regression | Number of obs | = | 6,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: id | Number of groups | = | 300 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | = | 20 |
|  | avg | = | 20.0 |
|  | max | = | 20 |
| Integration method: ghermite | Integration pts. | = | 120 |
|  | Wald chi2(6) | = | 29.24 |
| Log likelihood = -3347.1099 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0001 |


| $z$ | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| x1 | .0043059 | .0607087 | 0.07 | 0.943 | -.114681 | .1232929 |
| x2 | .1000743 | .0663311 | 1.51 | 0.131 | -.0299322 | .2300808 |
| x3 | .1503541 | .0662503 | 2.27 | 0.023 | .0205058 | .2802023 |
| x4 | .1230151 | .0377089 | 3.26 | 0.001 | .049107 | .1969232 |
| x5 | .134299 | .0657223 | 2.04 | 0.041 | .0054856 | .2631123 |
| x6 | .0879935 | .0455753 | 1.93 | 0.054 | -.0013325 | .1773194 |
| _cons | .0757054 | .0603621 | 1.25 | 0.210 | -.0426021 | .1940128 |
| /lnsig2u | -.0329832 | .1026863 |  |  | -.2342446 | .1682783 |
| sigma_u | .9836437 | .0505034 |  |  | .8894764 | 1.08778 |
| rho | .491755 | .0256646 |  |  | .4417052 | .5419706 |
| LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) $=1582.67$ |  |  | Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.000$ |  |  |  |

. quadchk, nooutput
Refitting model intpoints() $=80$
Refitting model intpoints() = 160

|  | Quadrature check |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fitted quadrature 120 points | Comparison quadrature 80 points | Comparison quadrature 160 points |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Log } \\ & \text { likelihood } \end{aligned}$ | -3347.1099 | -3347.1099 | -3347.1099 |  |
|  |  | -. 00007138 | $2.440 \mathrm{e}-07$ | Difference |
|  |  | $2.133 \mathrm{e}-08$ | -7.289e-11 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 00430592 | . 00431318 | . 00430553 |  |
| x1 |  | $7.259 \mathrm{e}-06$ | -3.871e-07 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00168592 | -. 00008991 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 10007431 | . 10007415 | . 10007431 |  |
| x 2 |  | -1.519e-07 | $5.585 \mathrm{e}-09$ | Difference |
|  |  | -1.517e-06 | $5.580 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Relative difference |
| $z$ : | . 15035406 | . 15035407 | . 15035406 |  |
| x3 |  | $1.699 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $7.636 \mathrm{e}-09$ | Difference |
|  |  | $1.130 \mathrm{e}-07$ | $5.078 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 12301506 | . 12301512 | . 12301506 |  |
| x4 |  | $6.036 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $5.353 \mathrm{e}-09$ | Difference |
|  |  | $4.907 \mathrm{e}-07$ | $4.352 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 13429895 | . 13429962 | . 13429896 |  |
| x5 |  | 6.646e-07 | $4.785 \mathrm{e}-09$ | Difference |
|  |  | $4.949 \mathrm{e}-06$ | 3.563e-08 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 08799345 | . 08799334 | . 08799346 |  |
| x6 |  | -1.123e-07 | $3.049 \mathrm{e}-09$ | Difference |
|  |  | -1.276e-06 | $3.465 \mathrm{e}-08$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 07570536 | . 07570205 | . 07570442 |  |
| _cons |  | -3.305e-06 | -9.405e-07 | Difference |
|  |  | -. 00004365 | -. 00001242 | Relative difference |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { lnsig2u: } \\ \quad \text { _cons } \end{array}$ | -. 03298317 | -. 03298909 | -. 03298186 |  |
|  |  | -5.919e-06 | $1.304 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Difference |
|  |  | . 00017945 | -. 00003952 | Relative difference |

## Example 3

Here we synthesize data the same way as in the previous example, but we make the intrapanel correlation equal to 0.1 instead of 0.5 . We again fit a random-effects probit model and check the quadrature:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/quad2
xtset id
    panel variable: id (balanced)
. xtprobit z x1-x6
Fitting comparison model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -4142.2915
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -4120.4109
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -4120.4099
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -4120.4099
Fitting full model:
rho = 0.0 log likelihood = -4120.4099
rho = 0.1 log likelihood = -4065.7986
rho = 0.2 log likelihood = -4087.7703
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -4065.7986
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -4065.3157
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -4065.3144
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -4065.3144
Random-effects probit regression Number of obs = 6,000
Group variable: id
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
Number of groups = 300
Obs per group:
Integration pts. = 12
Wald chi2(6) = 39.43
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

Number of obs $=6,000$

| $\min =$ | 20 |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\operatorname{avg}=$ | 20.0 |
| $\max =$ | 20 |


| z | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| x1 | .0246943 | .025112 | 0.98 | 0.325 | -.0245243 | .0739129 |
| x2 | .1300123 | .0587906 | 2.21 | 0.027 | .0147847 | .2452398 |
| x3 | .1190409 | .0579539 | 2.05 | 0.040 | .0054533 | .2326284 |
| x4 | .139197 | .0331817 | 4.19 | 0.000 | .0741621 | .2042319 |
| x5 | .077364 | .0578454 | 1.34 | 0.181 | -.036011 | .1907389 |
| x6 | .0862028 | .0401185 | 2.15 | 0.032 | .007572 | .1648336 |
| _cons | .0922653 | .0244392 | 3.78 | 0.000 | .0443653 | .1401652 |
| /lnsig2u | -2.343939 | .1575275 |  |  | -2.652687 | -2.035191 |
| sigma_u | .3097563 | .0243976 |  |  | .2654461 | .3614631 |
| rho | .0875487 | .0125839 |  |  | .0658236 | .1155574 |

LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) = 110.19
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.000$

| Refitting model intpoints() $=8$ <br> Refitting model intpoints() = 16 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quadrature check |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fitted quadrature 12 points | Comparison quadrature 8 points | Comparison quadrature 16 points |  |
| Log | -4065.3144 | -4065.3144 | -4065.3144 |  |
| likelihood |  | -2.268e-08 | $6.366 \mathrm{e}-12$ | Difference |
|  |  | $5.578 \mathrm{e}-12$ | -1.566e-15 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 02469427 | . 02469427 | . 02469427 |  |
| x1 |  | -7.290e-12 | -8.007e-12 | Difference |
|  |  | -2.952e-10 | -3.242e-10 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 13001229 | . 13001229 | . 13001229 |  |
| x 2 |  | -3.131e-11 | -6.880e-13 | Difference |
|  |  | -2.408e-10 | -5.292e-12 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 11904089 | . 11904089 | . 11904089 |  |
| x3 |  | -1.291e-11 | -3.030e-13 | Difference |
|  |  | -1.085e-10 | -2.545e-12 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 13919697 | . 13919697 | . 13919697 |  |
| x4 |  | $2.885 \mathrm{e}-12$ | $1.693 \mathrm{e}-13$ | Difference |
|  |  | $2.072 \mathrm{e}-11$ | $1.216 \mathrm{e}-12$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 07736398 | . 07736398 | . 07736398 |  |
| x5 |  | -1.160e-11 | -4.556e-13 | Difference |
|  |  | -1.500e-10 | -5.890e-12 | Relative difference |
| z: | . 08620282 | . 08620282 | . 08620282 |  |
| x6 |  | $1.181 \mathrm{e}-11$ | $3.190 \mathrm{e}-13$ | Difference |
|  |  | $1.370 \mathrm{e}-10$ | $3.701 \mathrm{e}-12$ | Relative difference |
| z: | . 09226527 | . 09226527 | . 09226527 |  |
| _cons |  | -5.700e-12 | -1.837e-11 | Difference |
|  |  | -6.177e-11 | -1.991e-10 | Relative difference |
| lnsig2u: <br> _cons | -2.3439389 | -2.3439389 | -2.3439389 |  |
|  |  | -5.892e-09 | -2.172e-10 | Difference |
|  |  | $2.514 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $9.267 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Relative difference |

Here we see that the quadrature approximation is stable. With this result, we can confidently interpret the results. Satisfactory results are also obtained in this case with nonadaptive quadrature.

## Title

vce_options - Variance estimators

| Description | Syntax | Options | Remarks and examples |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Methods and formulas | Reference | Also see |  |

## Description

This entry describes the vce_options, which are common to most xt estimation commands. Not all the options documented below work with all xt estimation commands; see the documentation for the particular estimation command. If an option is listed there, it is applicable.

The vce() option specifies how to estimate the variance-covariance matrix (VCE) corresponding to the parameter estimates. The standard errors reported in the table of parameter estimates are the square root of the variances (diagonal elements) of the VCE.

## Syntax

estimation_cmd $\ldots[$, vce_options $\ldots]$
vce_options Description
vce (oim) observed information matrix (OIM)
vce (opg) outer product of the gradient (OPG) vectors
vce(robust) Huber/White/sandwich estimator
vce(cluster clustvar)
vce(bootstrap [, bootstrap_options]) bootstrap estimation
vce(jackknife [, jackknife_options]) jackknife estimation

```
nmp
scale(x2| dev |phi|#)
use divisor \(N-P\) instead of the default \(N\) override the default scale parameter; available only with population-averaged models
```


## Options

$\sqrt{\text { SE/Robust }}$
vce (oim) is usually the default for models fit using maximum likelihood. vce (oim) uses the observed information matrix (OIM); see [R] ml.
vce (opg) uses the sum of the outer product of the gradient (OPG) vectors; see [R] ml. This is the default VCE when the technique (bhhh) option is specified; see $[R]$ maximize.
vce (robust) uses the robust or sandwich estimator of variance. This estimator is robust to some types of misspecification so long as the observations are independent; see [U] 20.21 Obtaining robust variance estimates.

If the command allows pweights and you specify them, vce(robust) is implied; see [U] 20.23.3 Sampling weights.
vce(cluster clustvar) specifies that the standard errors allow for intragroup correlation, relaxing the usual requirement that the observations be independent. That is to say, the observations are independent across groups (clusters) but not necessarily within groups. clustvar specifies to which group each observation belongs, for example, vce(cluster personid) in data with repeated observations on individuals. vce(cluster clustvar) affects the standard errors and variancecovariance matrix of the estimators but not the estimated coefficients; see [U] 20.21 Obtaining robust variance estimates.
vce(bootstrap [, bootstrap_options]) uses a nonparametric bootstrap; see [R] bootstrap. After estimation with vce (bootstrap), see [R] bootstrap postestimation to obtain percentile-based or bias-corrected confidence intervals.
vce (jackknife [, jackknife_options]) uses the delete-one jackknife; see [R] jackknife.
nmp specifies that the divisor $N-P$ be used instead of the default $N$, where $N$ is the total number of observations and $P$ is the number of coefficients estimated.
scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ) overrides the default scale parameter. By default, scale(1) is assumed for the discrete distributions (binomial, negative binomial, and Poisson), and scale(x2) is assumed for the continuous distributions (gamma, Gaussian, and inverse Gaussian).
scale (x2) specifies that the scale parameter be set to the Pearson chi-squared (or generalized chisquared) statistic divided by the residual degrees of freedom, which is recommended by McCullagh and Nelder (1989) as a good general choice for continuous distributions.
scale (dev) sets the scale parameter to the deviance divided by the residual degrees of freedom. This option provides an alternative to scale (x2) for continuous distributions and for over- or underdispersed discrete distributions.
scale(phi) specifies that the scale parameter be estimated from the data. xtgee's default scaling makes results agree with other estimators and has been recommended by McCullagh and Nelder (1989) in the context of GLM. When comparing results with calculations made by other software, you may find that the other packages do not offer this feature. In such cases, specifying scale (phi) should match their results.
scale(\#) sets the scale parameter to \#. For example, using scale(1) in family (gamma) models results in exponential-errors regression (if you assume independent correlation structure).

## Remarks and examples

When you are working with panel-data models, we strongly encourage you to use the vce(bootstrap) or vce(jackknife) option instead of the corresponding prefix command. For example, to obtain jackknife standard errors with xtlogit, type


If you wish to specify more options to the bootstrap or jackknife estimation, you can include them within the vce() option. Below we refit our model requesting bootstrap standard errors based on 300 replications, we set the random-number seed so that our results can be reproduced, and we suppress the display of the replication dots.


## Technical note

To perform jackknife estimation on panel data, you must omit entire panels rather than individual observations. To replicate the output above using the jackknife prefix command, you would have to type

```
jackknife, cluster(id): xtlogit y x1 x2, fe
(output omitted)
```

Similarly, bootstrap estimation on panel data requires you to resample entire panels rather than individual observations. The vce(bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) options handle this for you automatically.

## Methods and formulas

By default, Stata's maximum likelihood estimators display standard errors based on variance estimates given by the inverse of the negative Hessian (second derivative) matrix. If vce (robust), vce (cluster clustvar), or pweights are specified, standard errors are based on the robust variance estimator (see [U] 20.21 Obtaining robust variance estimates); likelihood-ratio tests are not appropriate here (see [SVY] survey), and the model $\chi^{2}$ is from a Wald test. If vce (opg) is specified, the standard errors are based on the outer product of the gradients; this option has no effect on likelihood-ratio tests, though it does affect Wald tests.

If vce(bootstrap) or vce(jackknife) is specified, the standard errors are based on the chosen replication method; here the model $\chi^{2}$ or $F$ statistic is from a Wald test using the respective replicationbased covariance matrix. The $t$ distribution is used in the coefficient table when the vce (jackknife) option is specified. vce (bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) are also available with some commands that are not maximum likelihood estimators.

## Reference

McCullagh, P., and J. A. Nelder. 1989. Generalized Linear Models. 2nd ed. London: Chapman \& Hall/CRC.


#### Abstract

Also see [R] bootstrap - Bootstrap sampling and estimation [R] jackknife - Jackknife estimation [R] ml - Maximum likelihood estimation [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands


## Title

xtabond - Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtabond fits a linear dynamic panel-data model where the unobserved panel-level effects are correlated with the lags of the dependent variable, known as the Arellano-Bond estimator. This estimator is designed for datasets with many panels and few periods, and it requires that there be no autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors.

## Quick start

Arellano-Bond estimation of y on x 1 and x 2 using xtset data xtabond y x1 x2

One-step estimator with robust standard errors
xtabond y x1 x2, vce(robust)
Two-step estimator with bias-corrected robust standard errors
xtabond y x1 x2, vce(robust) twostep
Arellano-Bond estimation also including 2 lagged values of y
xtabond y x1 x2, lags(2)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Dynamic panel data (DPD) $>$ Arellano-Bond estimation

## Syntax

xtabond depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [, options]

## options

Model
noconstant
diffvars(varlist)
inst (varlist)
lags(\#)
maxldep(\#)
maxlags(\#)
twostep
Predetermined
pre(varlist[...])
Endogenous
endogenous (varlist [...])
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
artests(\#)
display_options
coeflegend

Description
suppress constant term
already-differenced exogenous variables
additional instrument variables
use \# lags of dependent variable as covariates; default is lags (1)
maximum lags of dependent variable for use as instruments
maximum lags of predetermined and endogenous variables for use as instruments
compute the two-step estimator instead of the one-step estimator
predetermined variables; can be specified more than once
endogenous variables; can be specified more than once
vcetype may be gmm or robust
set confidence level; default is level (95)
use \# as maximum order for AR tests; default is artests (2)
control spacing and line width
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars and all varlists, except pre (varlist [ . .] ) and endogenous (varlist [...]), may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists. The specification of depvar may not contain time-series operators.
by, statsby, and xi 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.

## Options

$\qquad$ Model

## noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.

diffvars (varlist) specifies a set of variables that already have been differenced to be included as strictly exogenous covariates.
inst (varlist) specifies a set of variables to be used as additional instruments. These instruments are not differenced by xtabond before including them in the instrument matrix.
lags(\#) sets $p$, the number of lags of the dependent variable to be included in the model. The default is $p=1$.
maxldep(\#) sets the maximum number of lags of the dependent variable that can be used as instruments. The default is to use all $T_{i}-p-2$ lags.
maxlags(\#) sets the maximum number of lags of the predetermined and endogenous variables that can be used as instruments. For predetermined variables, the default is to use all $T_{i}-p-1$ lags. For endogenous variables, the default is to use all $T_{i}-p-2$ lags.
twostep specifies that the two-step estimator be calculated.

Predetermined
pre (varlist [, lagstruct(prelags, premaxlags) $]$ ) specifies that a set of predetermined variables be included in the model. Optionally, you may specify that prelags lags of the specified variables also be included. The default for prelags is 0 . Specifying premaxlags sets the maximum number of further lags of the predetermined variables that can be used as instruments. The default is to include $T_{i}-p-1$ lagged levels as instruments for predetermined variables. You may specify as many sets of predetermined variables as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set of predetermined variables may have its own number of prelags and premaxlags.

Endogenous
endogenous(varlist [, lagstruct(endlags, endmaxlags)]) specifies that a set of endogenous variables be included in the model. Optionally, you may specify that endlags lags of the specified variables also be included. The default for endlags is 0 . Specifying endmaxlags sets the maximum number of further lags of the endogenous variables that can be used as instruments. The default is to include $T_{i}-p-2$ lagged levels as instruments for endogenous variables. You may specify as many sets of endogenous variables as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set of endogenous variables may have its own number of endlags and endmaxlags.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory and that are robust to some kinds of misspecification; see Remarks and examples below.
vce (gmm), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized method of moments estimation.
vce (robust) uses the robust estimator. After one-step estimation, this is the Arellano-Bond robust VCE estimator. After two-step estimation, this is the Windmeijer (2005) WC-robust estimator.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
artests(\#) specifies the maximum order of the autocorrelation test to be calculated. The tests are reported by estat abond; see [XT] xtabond postestimation. Specifying the order of the highest test at estimation time is more efficient than specifying it to estat abond, because estat abond must refit the model to obtain the test statistics. The maximum order must be less than or equal to the number of periods in the longest panel. The default is artests(2).
display_options: vsquish and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
The following option is available with xtabond but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

Linear dynamic panel-data models include $p$ lags of the dependent variable as covariates and contain unobserved panel-level effects, fixed or random. By construction, the unobserved panel-level effects are correlated with the lagged dependent variables, making standard estimators inconsistent. Arellano and Bond (1991) derived a consistent generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator for the parameters of this model; xtabond implements this estimator.

Anderson and Hsiao (1981, 1982) propose using further lags of the level or the difference of the dependent variable to instrument the lagged dependent variables that are included in a dynamic panel-data model after the panel-level effects have been removed by first-differencing. A version of this estimator can be obtained from xtivreg (see [XT] xtivreg). Arellano and Bond (1991) build upon this idea by noting that, in general, there are many more instruments available. Building on HoltzEakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988) and using the GMM framework developed by Hansen (1982), they identify how many lags of the dependent variable, the predetermined variables, and the endogenous variables are valid instruments and how to combine these lagged levels with first differences of the strictly exogenous variables into a potentially large instrument matrix. Using this instrument matrix, Arellano and Bond (1991) derive the corresponding one-step and two-step GMM estimators, as well as the robust VCE estimator for the one-step model. They also found that the robust two-step VCE was seriously biased. Windmeijer (2005) worked out a bias-corrected (WC) robust estimator for VCEs of two-step GMM estimators, which is implemented in xtabond. The test of autocorrelation of order $m$ and the Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions derived by Arellano and Bond (1991) can be obtained with estat abond and estat sargan, respectively; see [XT] xtabond postestimation.

The Arellano-Bond estimator is designed for datasets with many panels and few periods, and it requires that there be no autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors. For a related estimator that uses additional moment conditions, but still requires no autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors, see [XT] xtdpdsys. For estimators that allow for some autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors, at the cost of a more complicated syntax, see [XT] xtdpd.
> Example 1: One-step estimator
Arellano and Bond (1991) apply their new estimators and test statistics to a model of dynamic labor demand that had previously been considered by Layard and Nickell (1986) using data from an unbalanced panel of firms from the United Kingdom. All variables are indexed over the firm $i$ and time $t$. In this dataset, $\mathrm{n}_{i t}$ is the $\log$ of employment in firm $i$ at time $t, \mathrm{w}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the real product wage, $\mathrm{k}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the gross capital stock, and $\mathrm{ys}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of industry output. The model also includes time dummies yr1980, yr1981, yr1982, yr1983, and yr1984. In table 4 of Arellano and Bond (1991), the authors present the results they obtained from several specifications.

In column al of table 4, Arellano and Bond report the coefficients and their standard errors from the robust one-step estimators of a dynamic model of labor demand in which $\mathrm{n}_{i t}$ is the dependent variable and its first two lags are included as regressors. To clarify some important issues, we will begin with the homoskedastic one-step version of this model and then consider the robust case. Here is the command using xtabond and the subsequent output for the homoskedastic case:
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/abdata
. xtabond n l(0/1).w l(0/2). (k ys) yr1980-yr1984 year, lags(2) noconstant
Arellano-Bond dynamic panel-data estimation Number of obs $=611$
Group variable: id
Time variable: year


| n | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6862261 | . 1486163 | 4.62 | 0.000 | . 3949435 | . 9775088 |
| L2. | -. 0853582 | . 0444365 | -1.92 | 0.055 | -. 1724523 | . 0017358 |
| W | -. 6078208 | . 0657694 | -9.24 | 0.000 | -. 7367265 | -. 4789151 |
| L1. | . 3926237 | . 1092374 | 3.59 | 0.000 | . 1785222 | . 6067251 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 3568456 | . 0370314 | 9.64 | 0.000 | . 2842653 | . 4294259 |
| L1. | -. 0580012 | . 0583051 | -0.99 | 0.320 | -. 172277 | . 0562747 |
| L2. | -. 0199475 | . 0416274 | -0.48 | 0.632 | -. 1015357 | . 0616408 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 6085073 | . 1345412 | 4.52 | 0.000 | . 3448115 | . 8722031 |
| L1. | -. 7111651 | . 1844599 | -3.86 | 0.000 | -1.0727 | -. 3496304 |
| L2. | . 1057969 | . 1428568 | 0.74 | 0.459 | -. 1741974 | . 3857912 |
| yr1980 | . 0029062 | . 0212705 | 0.14 | 0.891 | -. 0387832 | . 0445957 |
| yr1981 | -. 0404378 | . 0354707 | -1.14 | 0.254 | -. 1099591 | . 0290836 |
| yr1982 | -. 0652767 | . 048209 | -1.35 | 0.176 | -. 1597646 | . 0292111 |
| yr1983 | -. 0690928 | . 0627354 | -1.10 | 0.271 | -. 1920521 | . 0538664 |
| yr1984 | -. 0650302 | . 0781322 | -0.83 | 0.405 | -. 2181665 | . 0881061 |
| year | . 0095545 | . 0142073 | 0.67 | 0.501 | -. 0182912 | . 0374002 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1980
D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

The coefficients are identical to those reported in column a1 of table 4, as they should be. Of course, the standard errors are different because we are considering the homoskedastic case. Although the moment conditions use first-differenced errors, xtabond estimates the coefficients of the level model and reports them accordingly.

The footer in the output reports the instruments used. The first line indicates that xtabond used lags from 2 on back to create the GMM-type instruments described in Arellano and Bond (1991) and Holtz-Eakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988); also see Methods and formulas in [XT] xtdpd. The second and third lines indicate that the first difference of all the exogenous variables were used as standard instruments. GMM-type instruments use the lags of a variable to contribute multiple columns to the instrument matrix, whereas each standard instrument contributes one column to the instrument matrix. The notation $L$ (2/.).n indicates that GMM-type instruments were created using lag 2 of $n$ from on back. (L $(2 / 4) . \mathrm{n}$ would indicate that GMM-type instruments were created using only lags 2,3 , and 4 of $n$.)

After xtabond, estat sargan reports the Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions.

```
. estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
    HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
    chi2(25) = 65.81806
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

Only for a homoskedastic error term does the Sargan test have an asymptotic chi-squared distribution. In fact, Arellano and Bond (1991) show that the one-step Sargan test overrejects in the presence of heteroskedasticity. Because its asymptotic distribution is not known under the assumptions of the vce (robust) model, xtabond does not compute it when vce (robust) is specified. The Sargan test, reported by Arellano and Bond (1991, table 4, column a1), comes from the one-step homoskedastic estimator and is the same as the one reported here. The output above presents strong evidence against the null hypothesis that the overidentifying restrictions are valid. Rejecting this null hypothesis implies that we need to reconsider our model or our instruments, unless we attribute the rejection to heteroskedasticity in the data-generating process. Although performing the Sargan test after the two-step estimator is an alternative, Arellano and Bond (1991) found a tendency for this test to underreject in the presence of heteroskedasticity. (See [XT] xtdpd for an example indicating that this rejection may be due to misspecification.)

By default, xtabond calculates the Arellano-Bond test for first- and second-order autocorrelation in the first-differenced errors. (Use artests () to compute tests for higher orders.) There are versions of this test for both the homoskedastic and the robust cases, although their values are different. Use estat abond to report the test results.

```
. estat abond
Arellano-Bond test for zero autocorrelation in first-differenced errors
\begin{tabular}{|c|cc|}
\hline Order & \(z\) & Prob > z \\
\hline 1 & -3.9394 & 0.0001 \\
2 & -.54239 & 0.5876 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
HO: no autocorrelation
```

When the idiosyncratic errors are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), the first-differenced errors are first-order serially correlated. So, as expected, the output above presents strong evidence against the null hypothesis of zero autocorrelation in the first-differenced errors at order 1. Serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at an order higher than 1 implies that the moment conditions used by xtabond are not valid; see [XT] xtdpd for an example of an alternative estimation method. The output above presents no significant evidence of serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at order 2.

## > Example 2: A one-step estimator with robust VCE

Consider the output from the one-step robust estimator of the same model:

| Arellano-Bond dynamic panel-data estimation | Number of obs |  | 611 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: id | Number of groups |  | 140 |
| Time variable: year |  |  |  |
|  | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | $=$ | 4 |
|  | avg |  | 4.364286 |
|  | max | - | 6 |
| Number of instruments $=41$ | Wald chi2(16) |  | 1727.45 |
|  | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 | One-step results

(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6862261 | . 1445943 | 4.75 | 0.000 | . 4028266 | . 9696257 |
| L2. | -. 0853582 | . 0560155 | -1.52 | 0.128 | -. 1951467 | . 0244302 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 3926237 | . 1679931 | 2.34 | 0.019 | . 0633632 | . 7218842 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | -. 0580012 | . 0731797 | -0.79 | 0.428 | -. 2014308 | . 0854284 |
| L2. | -. 0199475 | . 0327126 | -0.61 | 0.542 | -. 0840631 | . 0441681 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 6085073 | . 1725313 | 3.53 | 0.000 | . 2703522 | . 9466624 |
| L1. | -. 7111651 | . 2317163 | -3.07 | 0.002 | -1.165321 | -. 2570095 |
| L2. | . 1057969 | . 1412021 | 0.75 | 0.454 | -. 1709542 | . 382548 |
| yr1980 | . 0029062 | . 0158028 | 0.18 | 0.854 | -. 0280667 | . 0338791 |
| yr1981 | -. 0404378 | . 0280582 | -1.44 | 0.150 | -. 0954307 | . 0145552 |
| yr1982 | -. 0652767 | . 0365451 | -1.79 | 0.074 | -. 1369038 | . 0063503 |
| yr1983 | -. 0690928 | . 047413 | -1.46 | 0.145 | -. 1620205 | . 0238348 |
| yr1984 | -. 0650302 | . 0576305 | -1.13 | 0.259 | -. 1779839 | . 0479235 |
| year | . 0095545 | . 0102896 | 0.93 | 0.353 | -. 0106127 | . 0297217 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1980
D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

The coefficients are the same, but now the standard errors match that reported in Arellano and Bond (1991, table 4, column a1). Most of the robust standard errors are higher than those that assume a homoskedastic error term.

The Sargan statistic cannot be calculated after requesting a robust VCE, but robust tests for serial correlation are available.

```
. estat abond
Arellano-Bond test for zero autocorrelation in first-differenced errors
\begin{tabular}{|c|cc|}
\hline Order & \(z\) & Prob > z \\
\hline 1 & -3.5996 & 0.0003 \\
2 & -.51603 & 0.6058 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

HO: no autocorrelation
The value of the test for second-order autocorrelation matches those reported in Arellano and Bond (1991, table 4, column a1) and presents no evidence of model misspecification.

## > Example 3: The Wald model test

xtabond reports the Wald statistic of the null hypothesis that all the coefficients except the constant are zero. Here the null hypothesis is that all the coefficients are zero, because there is no constant in the model. In our previous example, the null hypothesis is soundly rejected. In column al of table 4, Arellano and Bond report a chi-squared test of the null hypothesis that all the coefficients are zero, except the time trend and the time dummies. Here is this test in Stata:

```
. test l.n l2.n w l.w k l.k l2.k ys l.ys l2.ys
(1) L.n = 0
( 2) L2.n = 0
( 3) w = 0
(4) L.w = 0
(5) k = 0
(6) L.k = 0
( 7) L2.k = 0
( 8) ys = 0
(9) L.ys = 0
(10) L2.ys = 0
    chi2( 10) = 408.29
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```


## Example 4: A two-step estimator with Windmeijer bias-corrected robust VCE

The two-step estimator with the Windmeijer bias-corrected robust VCE of the same model produces the following output:


Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6287089 | . 1934138 | 3.25 | 0.001 | . 2496248 | 1.007793 |
| L2. | -. 0651882 | . 0450501 | -1.45 | 0.148 | -. 1534847 | . 0231084 |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 3112899 | . 2030006 | 1.53 | 0.125 | -. 086584 | . 7091638 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 0140994 | . 0924575 | 0.15 | 0.879 | -. 167114 | . 1953129 |
| L2. | -. 0402484 | . 0432745 | -0.93 | 0.352 | -. 1250649 | . 0445681 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 5919243 | . 1730916 | 3.42 | 0.001 | . 252671 | . 9311776 |
| L1. | -. 5659863 | . 2611008 | -2.17 | 0.030 | -1.077734 | -. 0542381 |
| L2. | . 1005433 | . 1610987 | 0.62 | 0.533 | -. 2152043 | . 4162908 |
| yr1980 | . 0006378 | . 0168042 | 0.04 | 0.970 | -. 0322978 | . 0335734 |
| yr1981 | -. 0550044 | . 0313389 | -1.76 | 0.079 | -. 1164275 | . 0064187 |
| yr1982 | -. 075978 | . 0419276 | -1.81 | 0.070 | -. 1581545 | . 0061986 |
| yr1983 | -. 0740708 | . 0528381 | -1.40 | 0.161 | -. 1776315 | . 02949 |
| yr1984 | -. 0906606 | . 0642615 | -1.41 | 0.158 | -. 2166108 | . 0352896 |
| year | . 0112155 | . 0116783 | 0.96 | 0.337 | -. 0116735 | . 0341045 |

```
Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(2/.).n
    Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1980
    D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year
```

Arellano and Bond recommend against using the two-step nonrobust results for inference on the coefficients because the standard errors tend to be biased downward (see Arellano and Bond 1991 for details). The output above uses the Windmeijer bias-corrected (WC) robust VCE, which Windmeijer (2005) showed to work well. The magnitudes of several of the coefficient estimates have changed, and one even switched its sign.

The test for autocorrelation presents no evidence of model misspecification:

```
. estat abond
Arellano-Bond test for zero autocorrelation in first-differenced errors
\begin{tabular}{|r|cc|}
\hline Order & \(z\) & Prob > z \\
\hline 1 & -2.1255 & 0.0335 \\
2 & -.35166 & 0.7251 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
HO: no autocorrelation
```

Manuel Arellano (1957- ) was born in Elda in Alicante, Spain. He earned degrees in economics from the University of Barcelona and the London School of Economics. After various posts in Oxford and London, he returned to Spain as professor of econometrics at Madrid in 1991. He is a leading expert on panel-data econometrics.
Stephen Roy Bond (1963- ) earned degrees in economics from Cambridge and Oxford. Following various posts at Oxford, he now works mainly at the Institute for Fiscal Studies in London. His research interests include company taxation, dividends, and the links between financial markets, corporate control, and investment.

## > Example 5: Including an estimator for the constant

Thus far we have been specifying the noconstant option to keep to the standard Arellano-Bond estimator, which uses instruments only for the difference equation. The constant estimated by xtabond is a constant in the level equation, and it is estimated from the level errors. The output below illustrates that including a constant in the model does not affect the other parameter estimates.
. xtabond n l(0/1).w $\mathrm{l}(0 / 2) .(\mathrm{k}$ ys) yr1980-yr1984 year, lags(2) twostep vce (robust)
Arellano-Bond dynamic panel-data estimation Number of obs $=\quad 611$
Group variable: id
Time variable: year

|  | $\min =$ | 4 |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| avg | $=$ | 4.364286 |  |
| max | $=$ | 6 |  |
| Number of instruments $=$ | 42 | $=$ | 1104.72 |
|  | Wald chi2(16) | $=$ | 0.0000 |

Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6287089 | . 1934138 | 3.25 | 0.001 | . 2496248 | 1.007793 |
| L2. | -. 0651882 | . 0450501 | -1.45 | 0.148 | -. 1534847 | . 0231084 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 3112899 | . 2030006 | 1.53 | 0.125 | -. 086584 | . 7091638 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 0140994 | . 0924575 | 0.15 | 0.879 | -. 167114 | . 1953129 |
| L2. | -. 0402484 | . 0432745 | -0.93 | 0.352 | -. 1250649 | . 0445681 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 5919243 | . 1730916 | 3.42 | 0.001 | . 252671 | . 9311776 |
| L1. | -. 5659863 | . 2611008 | -2.17 | 0.030 | -1.077734 | -. 0542381 |
| L2. | . 1005433 | . 1610987 | 0.62 | 0.533 | -. 2152043 | . 4162908 |
| yr1980 | . 0006378 | . 0168042 | 0.04 | 0.970 | -. 0322978 | . 0335734 |
| yr1981 | -. 0550044 | . 0313389 | -1.76 | 0.079 | -. 1164275 | . 0064187 |
| yr1982 | -. 075978 | . 0419276 | -1.81 | 0.070 | -. 1581545 | . 0061986 |
| yr1983 | -. 0740708 | . 0528381 | -1.40 | 0.161 | -. 1776315 | . 02949 |
| yr1984 | -. 0906606 | . 0642615 | -1.41 | 0.158 | -. 2166108 | . 0352896 |
| year | . 0112155 | . 0116783 | 0.96 | 0.337 | -. 0116735 | . 0341045 |
| _cons | -21.53725 | 23.23138 | -0.93 | 0.354 | -67.06992 | 23.99542 |

[^0]Including the constant does not affect the other parameter estimates because it is identified only by the level errors; see [XT] xtdpd for details.

## > Example 6: Including predetermined covariates

Sometimes we cannot assume strict exogeneity. Recall that a variable, $x_{i t}$, is said to be strictly exogenous if $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $t$ and $s$. If $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right] \neq 0$ for $s<t$ but $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $s \geq t$, the variable is said to be predetermined. Intuitively, if the error term at time $t$ has some feedback on the subsequent realizations of $x_{i t}, x_{i t}$ is a predetermined variable. Because unforecastable errors today might affect future changes in the real wage and in the capital stock, we might suspect that the $\log$ of the real product wage and the $\log$ of the gross capital stock are predetermined instead of strictly exogenous. Here we treat w and k as predetermined and use lagged levels as instruments.


Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 8580958 | . 1265515 | 6.78 | 0.000 | . 6100594 | 1.106132 |
| L2. | -. 081207 | . 0760703 | -1.07 | 0.286 | -. 2303022 | . 0678881 |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 5961712 | . 1497338 | 3.98 | 0.000 | . 3026982 | . 8896441 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | -. 1537048 | . 1220244 | -1.26 | 0.208 | -. 3928681 | . 0854586 |
| L2. | -. 1025833 | . 0710886 | -1.44 | 0.149 | -. 2419143 | . 0367477 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 6936392 | . 1728623 | 4.01 | 0.000 | . 3548354 | 1.032443 |
| L1. | -. 8773678 | . 2183085 | -4.02 | 0.000 | -1.305245 | -. 449491 |
| yr1980 | -. 0072451 | . 017163 | -0.42 | 0.673 | -. 0408839 | . 0263938 |
| yr1981 | -. 0609608 | . 030207 | -2.02 | 0.044 | -. 1201655 | -. 0017561 |
| yr1982 | -. 1130369 | . 0454826 | -2.49 | 0.013 | -. 2021812 | -. 0238926 |
| yr1983 | -. 1335249 | . 0600213 | -2.22 | 0.026 | -. 2511645 | -. 0158853 |
| yr1984 | -. 1623177 | . 0725434 | -2.24 | 0.025 | -. 3045001 | -. 0201352 |
| year | . 0264501 | . 0119329 | 2.22 | 0.027 | . 003062 | . 0498381 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/.).L.w L(1/.).L2.k
Standard: D.ys LD.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D. year

The footer informs us that we are now including GMM-type instruments from the first lag of L.w on back and from the first lag of L2.k on back.

- Technical note

The above example illustrates that xtabond understands pre(w, lag(1, .)) to mean that L.w is a predetermined variable and pre $(\mathrm{k}, \operatorname{lag}(2,)$.$) to mean that \mathrm{L} 2 . \mathrm{k}$ is a predetermined variable. This is a stricter definition than the alternative that $\operatorname{pre}(w, \operatorname{lag}(1,)$.$) means only that w$ is predetermined but includes a lag of w in the model and that pre $(\mathrm{k}, \operatorname{lag}(2,)$.$) means only that$ k is predetermined but includes first and second lags of k in the model. If you prefer the weaker definition, xtabond still gives you consistent estimates, but it is not using all possible instruments; see [XT] xtdpd for an example of how to include all possible instruments.
> Example 7: Including endogenous covariates
We might instead suspect that w and k are endogenous in that $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right] \neq 0$ for $s \leq t$ but $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $s>t$. By this definition, endogenous variables differ from predetermined variables only in that the former allow for correlation between the $x_{i t}$ and the $\epsilon_{i t}$ at time $t$, whereas the latter do not. Endogenous variables are treated similarly to the lagged dependent variable. Levels of the endogenous variables lagged two or more periods can serve as instruments. In this example, we treat w and k as endogenous variables.


Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6640937 | . 1278908 | 5.19 | 0.000 | . 4134323 | . 914755 |
| L2. | -. 041283 | . 081801 | -0.50 | 0.614 | -. 2016101 | . 1190441 |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | -. 7143942 | . 13083 | -5.46 | 0.000 | -. 9708162 | -. 4579721 |
| L1. | . 3644198 | . 184758 | 1.97 | 0.049 | . 0023008 | . 7265388 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 5028874 | . 1205419 | 4.17 | 0.000 | . 2666296 | . 7391452 |
| L1. | -. 2160842 | . 0972855 | -2.22 | 0.026 | -. 4067603 | -. 025408 |
| L2. | -. 0549654 | . 0793673 | -0.69 | 0.489 | -. 2105225 | . 1005917 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 5989356 | . 1779731 | 3.37 | 0.001 | . 2501148 | . 9477564 |
| L1. | -. 6770367 | . 1961166 | -3.45 | 0.001 | -1.061418 | -. 2926553 |
| yr1980 | -. 0061122 | . 0155287 | -0.39 | 0.694 | -. 0365478 | . 0243235 |
| yr1981 | -. 04715 | . 0298348 | -1.58 | 0.114 | -. 1056252 | . 0113251 |
| yr1982 | -. 0817646 | . 0486049 | -1.68 | 0.093 | -. 1770285 | . 0134993 |
| yr1983 | -. 0939251 | . 0675804 | -1.39 | 0.165 | -. 2263802 | . 0385299 |
| yr1984 | -. 117228 | . 0804716 | -1.46 | 0.145 | -. 2749493 | . 0404934 |
| year | . 0208857 | . 0103485 | 2.02 | 0.044 | . 0006031 | . 0411684 |

```
Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(2/.).L.w L(2/.).L2.k
    Standard: D.ys LD.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984
                        D.year
```

Although some estimated coefficients changed in magnitude, none changed in sign, and these results are similar to those obtained by treating w and k as predetermined.

The Arellano-Bond estimator is for datasets with many panels and few periods. (Technically, the large-sample properties are derived with the number of panels going to infinity and the number of periods held fixed.) The number of instruments increases quadratically in the number of periods. If your dataset is better described by a framework in which both the number of panels and the number of periods is large, then you should consider other estimators such as those in [XT] xtivreg or xtreg, fe in [XT] xtreg; see Alvarez and Arellano (2003) for a discussion of this case.

## D Example 8: Restricting the number of instruments

Treating variables as predetermined or endogenous quickly increases the size of the instrument matrix. (See Methods and formulas in [XT] xtdpd for a discussion of how this matrix is created and what determines its size.) GMM estimators with too many overidentifying restrictions may perform poorly in small samples. (See Kiviet 1995 for a discussion of the dynamic panel-data case.)

To handle these problems, you can set a maximum number of lagged levels to be included as instruments for lagged-dependent or the predetermined variables. Here is an example in which a maximum of three lagged levels of the predetermined variables are included as instruments:

(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 931121 | . 1456964 | 6.39 | 0.000 | . 6455612 | 1.216681 |
| L2. | -. 0759918 | . 0854356 | -0.89 | 0.374 | -. 2434425 | . 0914589 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | -. 6475372 | . 1687931 | -3.84 | 0.000 | -. 9783656 | -. 3167089 |
| L1. | . 6906238 | . 1789698 | 3.86 | 0.000 | . 3398493 | 1.041398 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 3788106 | . 1848137 | 2.05 | 0.040 | . 0165824 | . 7410389 |
| L1. | -. 2158533 | . 1446198 | -1.49 | 0.136 | -. 4993028 | . 0675962 |
| L2. | -. 0914584 | . 0852267 | -1.07 | 0.283 | -. 2584997 | . 0755829 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 7324964 | . 176748 | 4.14 | 0.000 | . 3860766 | 1.078916 |
| L1. | -. 9428141 | . 2735472 | -3.45 | 0.001 | -1.478957 | -. 4066715 |
| yr1980 | -. 0102389 | . 0172473 | -0.59 | 0.553 | -. 0440431 | . 0235652 |
| yr1981 | -. 0763495 | . 0296992 | -2.57 | 0.010 | -. 1345589 | -. 0181402 |
| yr1982 | -. 1373829 | . 0441833 | -3.11 | 0.002 | -. 2239806 | -. 0507853 |
| yr1983 | -. 1825149 | . 0613674 | -2.97 | 0.003 | -. 3027928 | -. 0622369 |
| yr1984 | -. 2314023 | . 0753669 | -3.07 | 0.002 | -. 3791186 | -. 083686 |
| year | . 0310012 | . 0119167 | 2.60 | 0.009 | . 0076448 | . 0543576 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/3).L.w L(1/3).L2.k
Standard: D.ys LD.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

## > Example 9: Missing observations in the middle of panels

xtabond handles data in which there are missing observations in the middle of the panels. In this example, we deliberately set the dependent variable to missing in the year 1980:

```
. replace n=. if year==1980
(140 real changes made, 140 to missing)
. xtabond n l(0/1).w l(0/2).(k ys) yr1980-yr1984 year, lags(2) noconstant
> vce(robust)
note: yr1980 dropped from div() because of collinearity
note: yr1981 dropped from div() because of collinearity
note: yr1982 dropped from div() because of collinearity
note: yr1980 dropped because of collinearity
note: yr1981 dropped because of collinearity
note: yr1982 dropped because of collinearity
Arellano-Bond dynamic panel-data estimation Number of obs = 115
Group variable: id Number of groups = 101
Time variable: year
```


One-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | Robust <br> Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 1790577 | . 2204682 | 0.81 | 0.417 | -. 253052 | . 6111674 |
| L2. | . 0214253 | . 0488476 | 0.44 | 0.661 | -. 0743143 | . 1171649 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | -. 2513405 | . 1402114 | -1.79 | 0.073 | -. 5261498 | . 0234689 |
| L1. | . 1983952 | . 1445875 | 1.37 | 0.170 | -. 0849912 | . 4817815 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 3983149 | . 0883352 | 4.51 | 0.000 | . 2251811 | . 5714488 |
| L1. | -. 025125 | . 0909236 | -0.28 | 0.782 | -. 203332 | . 1530821 |
| L2. | -. 0359338 | . 0623382 | -0.58 | 0.564 | -. 1581144 | . 0862468 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 3663201 | . 3824893 | 0.96 | 0.338 | -. 3833451 | 1.115985 |
| L1. | -. 6319976 | . 4823958 | -1.31 | 0.190 | -1.577476 | . 3134807 |
| L2. | . 5318404 | . 4105269 | 1.30 | 0.195 | -. 2727775 | 1.336458 |
| yr1983 | -. 0047543 | . 024855 | -0.19 | 0.848 | -. 0534692 | . 0439606 |
| yr1984 | 0 | (omitted) |  |  |  |  |
| year | . 0014465 | . 010355 | 0.14 | 0.889 | -. 0188489 | . 0217419 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1983
D.yr1984 D.year

There are two important aspects to this example. First, xtabond reports that variables have been dropped from the model and from the div() instrument list. For xtabond, the div() instrument list is the list of instruments created from the strictly exogenous variables; see [XT] xtdpd for more about the $\operatorname{div}()$ instrument list. Second, because xtabond uses time-series operators in its computations,
if statements and missing values are not equivalent. An if statement causes the false observations to be excluded from the sample, but it computes the time-series operators wherever possible. In contrast, missing data prevent evaluation of the time-series operators that involve missing observations. Thus the example above is not equivalent to the following one:


One-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 7210062 | . 1321214 | 5.46 | 0.000 | . 4620531 | . 9799593 |
| L2. | -. 0960646 | . 0570547 | -1.68 | 0.092 | -. 2078898 | . 0157606 |
| W |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 482322 | . 1647185 | 2.93 | 0.003 | . 1594797 | . 8051642 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | -. 104598 | . 088597 | -1.18 | 0.238 | -. 278245 | . 069049 |
| L2. | -. 0272055 | . 0379994 | -0.72 | 0.474 | -. 101683 | . 0472721 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 4655989 | . 1864368 | 2.50 | 0.013 | . 1001895 | . 8310082 |
| L1. | -. 8562492 | . 2187886 | -3.91 | 0.000 | -1.285067 | -. 4274315 |
| L2. | . 0896556 | . 1440035 | 0.62 | 0.534 | -. 192586 | . 3718972 |
| yr1981 | -. 0711626 | . 0205299 | -3.47 | 0.001 | -. 1114005 | -. 0309247 |
| yr 1982 | -. 1212749 | . 0334659 | -3.62 | 0.000 | -. 1868669 | -. 0556829 |
| yr 1983 | -. 1470248 | . 0461714 | -3.18 | 0.001 | -. 2375191 | -. 0565305 |
| yr1984 | -. 1519021 | . 0543904 | -2.79 | 0.005 | -. 2585054 | -. 0452988 |
| year | . 0203277 | . 0108732 | 1.87 | 0.062 | -. 0009833 | . 0416387 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1981
D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

The year 1980 is dropped from the sample, but when the value of a variable from 1980 is required because a lag or difference is required, the 1980 value is used.

## Stored results

xtabond stores the following in $e()$ :
Scalars

| $e(N)$ | number of observations |
| :--- | :--- |
| $e\left(N \_g\right)$ | number of groups |
| $e\left(d f \_m\right)$ | model degrees of freedom |
| $e\left(g \_\min \right)$ | smallest group size |
| $e\left(g \_a v g\right)$ | average group size |
| $e(g-\max )$ | largest group size |
| $e(t \min )$ | minimum time in sample |
| $e\left(t \_\max \right)$ | maximum time in sample |

$e$ (chi2)
e(arm\#)
e(artests)
e(sig2)
e(rss)
e(sargan)
e(rank)
e(zrank)
$\chi^{2}$
test for autocorrelation of order \#
number of AR tests computed
estimate of $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$
sum of squared differenced residuals
Sargan test statistic
rank of $e(V)$
rank of instrument matrix
Macros

```
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
```

e(depvar)
e(twostep)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(system)
e(hascons)
e(transform)
e(diffvars)
e(datasignature)
e(properties)
e(estat_cmd)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
Matrices
e(b)
xtabond
command as typed
name of dependent variable
twostep, if specified
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
system, if system estimator
hascons, if specified
specified transform
already differenced variables
checksum from datasignature
b V
program used to implement estat
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
e(V)
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

A dynamic panel-data model has the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_{j} y_{i, t-j}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{w}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \quad i=1, \ldots, N \quad t=1, \ldots, T_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
the $\alpha_{j}$ are $p$ parameters to be estimated,
$\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of strictly exogenous covariates, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ is a $k_{1} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated, $\mathbf{w}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of predetermined and endogenous covariates, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$ is a $k_{2} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated, $\nu_{i}$ are the panel-level effects (which may be correlated with the covariates), and $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. over the whole sample with variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$.

The $\nu_{i}$ and the $\epsilon_{i t}$ are assumed to be independent for each $i$ over all $t$.
By construction, the lagged dependent variables are correlated with the unobserved panel-level effects, making standard estimators inconsistent. With many panels and few periods, estimators are constructed by first-differencing to remove the panel-level effects and using instruments to form moment conditions.
xtabond uses a GMM estimator to estimate $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{p}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$, and $\beta_{2}$. The moment conditions are formed from the first-differenced errors from (1) and instruments. Lagged levels of the dependent variable, the predetermined variables, and the endogenous variables are used to form GMM-type instruments. See Arellano and Bond (1991) and Holtz-Eakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988) for discussions of GMM-type instruments. First differences of the strictly exogenous variables are used as standard instruments.
xtabond uses xtdpd to perform its computations, so the formulas are given in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtdpd.
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## Also see

[XT] xtabond postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtabond
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtdpd - Linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtdpdsys - Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtabond postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtabond

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins | estat |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Methods and formulas | Also see |  |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are of special interest after xtabond:
Command Description

| estat abond | test for autocorrelation |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat sargan | Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions |

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:
Command Description

| estat summarize |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat vce | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) <br> estimates <br> cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> hausman <br> lincom |
| margins | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| nlcom | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| predictnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, xb e stdp difference]

## Options for predict

Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
e calculates the residual error.
stdp calculates the standard error of the prediction, which can be thought of as the standard error of the predicted expected value or mean for the observation's covariate pattern. The standard error of the prediction is also referred to as the standard error of the fitted value. stdp may not be combined with difference.
difference specifies that the statistic be calculated for the first differences instead of the levels, the default.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of responses for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic
Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| e | not allowed with margins |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## estat

## Description for estat

estat abond reports the Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation in the first-differenced residuals. estat sargan reports the Sargan test of the overidentifying restrictions.

## Menu for estat

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for estat

Test for autocorrelation
estat abond [, artests(\#)]

Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
estat sargan

## Option for estat abond

artests(\#) specifies highest order of serial correlation to be tested. By default, the tests computed during estimation are reported. The model will be refit when artests(\#) specifies a higher order than that computed during the original estimation. The model can only be refit if the data have not changed.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

```
estat abond
estat sargan
```


## estat abond

estat abond reports the Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at order $m$. Rejecting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at order zero does not imply model misspecification because the first-differenced errors are serially correlated if the idiosyncratic errors are independent and identically distributed. Rejecting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at an order greater than one implies model misspecification; see example 5 in [XT] xtdpd for an alternative estimator that allows for idiosyncratic errors that follow a first-order moving average process.

After the one-step system estimator, the test can be computed only when vce (robust) has been specified. (The system estimator is used to estimate the constant in xtabond.)

See Remarks and examples in [XT] xtabond for more remarks about estat abond that are made in the context of the examples analyzed therein.

## estat sargan

The distribution of the Sargan test is known only when the errors are independent and identically distributed. For this reason, estat sargan does not produce a test statistic when vce (robust) was specified in the call to xtabond.

See Remarks and examples in [XT] xtabond for more remarks about estat sargan that are made in the context of the examples analyzed therein.

## Methods and formulas

See [XT] xtdpd postestimation for the formulas.

## Also see

[XT] xtabond - Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtcloglog — Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options for RE model | Options for PA model | Remarks and examples | Stored results |
| Methods and formulas | References | Also see |  |

## Description

xtcloglog fits population-averaged and random-effects complementary $\log -\log$ (cloglog) models for a binary dependent variable. Complementary log-log models are typically used when one of the outcomes is rare relative to the other.

## Quick start

Random-effects complementary log-log regression of y on x 1 and x 2 using xtset data xtcloglog y x1 x2

Add indicators for levels of categorical variable a and interact x 1 with x 2 xtcloglog y x1 x2 c.x1\#c.x2 i.a

As above, but suppress iteration $\log$
xtcloglog y x1 x2 c.x1\#c.x2 i.a, nolog
Population-averaged model with an exchangeable correlation structure
xtcloglog y x1 x2 c.x1\#c.x2 i.a, pa
Random-effects model with bootstrap standard errors
xtcloglog y x1 x2 c.x1\#c.x2 i.a, vce(bootstrap)
Population-averaged model with an autoregressive correlation structure of order 1
xtcloglog y x1 x2 c.x1\#c.x2 i.a, pa corr (ar 1)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Binary outcomes $>$ Complementary log-log regression (RE, PA)

## Syntax

Random-effects (RE) model
xtcloglog depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, re RE_options]

Population-averaged (PA) model

$$
\text { xtcloglog depvar }[\text { indepvars }][\text { if }][\text { in }][\text { weight }] \text {, pa [PA_options }]
$$

## RE_options Description

## Model

noconstant
re
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
asis
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level (\#)
noskip
eform
nocnsreport
display_options

Integration
intmethod (intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use random-effects estimator; the default
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
retain perfect predictor variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
report exponentiated coefficients
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## PA_options Description

## Model

noconstant<br>pa<br>offset (varname)<br>asis

Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
scale(parm)

Reporting
level(\#)
eform
display_options

Optimization
optimize_options
coeflegend
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics
correlation
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report exponentiated coefficients
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$
overrides the default scale parameter;
parm may be x 2 , dev, phi, or \#
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#

## Description

exchangeable; the default
independent
unstructured
user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

A panel variable must be specified. For xtcloglog, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. $f p$ is allowed for the random-effects model.
vce (bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model, and iweights are allowed for the random-effects model; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
re requests the random-effects estimator, which is the default.
offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see $[R]$ probit.

SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtcloglog, re and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level(\#), noskip; see [R] estimation options.
eform displays the exponentiated coefficients and corresponding standard errors and confidence intervals.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\% fint), pformat (\% fit ), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Integration
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate (\#), [no $]$ log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance (\#), nrtolerance (\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtcloglog but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for PA model

Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
pa requests the population-averaged estimator.
offset (varname); see [R] estimation options
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit.

Correlation
corr (correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).
When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).
If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr (fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp, scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
eform displays the exponentiated coefficients and corresponding standard errors and confidence intervals.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\% fint), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Optimization }}$
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate (\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate (100).
tolerance (\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance $(1 \mathrm{e}-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.

The following option is available with xtcloglog but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtcloglog may be used to fit a population-averaged model or a random-effects complementary $\log -\log$ (cloglog) model. There is no command for a conditional fixed-effects model, as there does not exist a sufficient statistic allowing the fixed effects to be conditioned out of the likelihood. Unconditional fixed-effects cloglog models may be fit with cloglog with indicator variables for the panels. However, unconditional fixed-effects estimates are biased. We do not discuss fixed-effects further in this entry.

By default, the population-averaged model is an equal-correlation model; that is, xtcloglog, pa assumes corr (exchangeable). Thus, xtcloglog, pa is a shortcut command for fitting the population-averaged model using xtgee; see [XT] xtgee. Typing

```
. xtcloglog ..., pa ...
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. xtgee ..., ... family(binomial) link(cloglog) corr(exchangeable)
```

Also see [XT] xtgee for information about xtcloglog.
By default or when re is specified, xtcloglog fits, via maximum likelihood, the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t} \neq 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)=P\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}, \nu_{i}$ are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $P(z)=1-\exp \{-\exp (z)\}$.
Underlying this model is the variance-components model

$$
y_{i t} \neq 0 \Longleftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}>0
$$

where $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. extreme-value (Gumbel) distributed with the mean equal to Euler's constant and variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}=\pi^{2} / 6$, independently of $\nu_{i}$. The nonsymmetric error distribution is an alternative to logit and probit analysis and is typically used when the positive (or negative) outcome is rare.

## > Example 1

Suppose that we are studying unionization of women in the United States and are using the union dataset; see [XT] xt. We wish to fit a random-effects model of union membership:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtcloglog union age grade not_smsa south##c.year
```

Random-effects complementary log-log model Number of obs $=26,200$
Group variable: idcode
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian Obs per group:

| $\min$ | $=$ | 1 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\operatorname{avg}$ | $=$ | 5.9 |
| $\max$ | $=$ | 12 |
| $\mathrm{ts}$. | $=$ | 12 |
|  | $=$ | 248.58 |
|  | $=$ | 0.0000 |


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | .0128659 | .0119004 | 1.08 | 0.280 | -.0104586 | .0361903 |
| grade | .06985 | .0138135 | 5.06 | 0.000 | .042776 | .096924 |
| not_smsa |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.south |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| year | -.198416 | .0647943 | -3.06 | 0.002 | -.3254104 | -.0714215 |
| -.0006432 | .0123569 | -0.05 | 0.958 | -.0248623 | .0235759 |  |
| south\#c. year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0164259 | .006065 | 2.71 | 0.007 | .0045387 | .0283132 |
| _cons | -3.269158 | .659029 | -4.96 | 0.000 | -4.560831 | -1.977485 |
| /lnsig2u | 1.24128 | .0461705 |  |  | 1.150787 | 1.331772 |
| sigma_u | 1.860118 | .0429413 |  |  | 1.77783 | 1.946214 |
| rho | .677778 | .0100834 |  |  | .6577057 | .6972152 |

LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) $=6009.36$
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.000$
The output includes the additional panel-level variance component, which is parameterized as the log of the standard deviation, $\ln \sigma_{\nu}$ (labeled $\operatorname{lns} i g 2 \mathrm{u}$ in the output). The standard deviation $\sigma_{\nu}$ is also included in the output, labeled sigma_u, together with $\rho$ (labeled rho),

$$
\rho=\frac{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}}
$$

which is the proportion of the total variance contributed by the panel-level variance component.
When rho is zero, the panel-level variance component is not important, and the panel estimator is no different from the pooled estimator (cloglog). A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output, which formally compares the pooled estimator with the panel estimator.

As an alternative to the random-effects specification, you might want to fit an equal-correlation population-averaged cloglog model by typing

```
. xtcloglog union age grade not_smsa south##c.year, pa
Iteration 1: tolerance = . }1187839
Iteration 2: tolerance = . 01424628
Iteration 3: tolerance = . 00075278
Iteration 4: tolerance = . 00003195
Iteration 5: tolerance = 1.661e-06
Iteration 6: tolerance = 8.308e-08
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GEE population-averaged model & & Number of obs & = & 26,200 \\
\hline Group variable: & idcode & Number of groups & = & 4,434 \\
\hline Link: & cloglog & Obs per group: & & \\
\hline Family: & binomial & min & = & 1 \\
\hline Correlation: & exchangeable & avg & = & 5.9 \\
\hline & & max & = & 12 \\
\hline & & Wald chi2(6) & = & 234.66 \\
\hline Scale parameter: & 1 & Prob > chi2 & = & 0.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | .0153737 | .0081156 | 1.89 | 0.058 | -.0005326 | .03128 |
| grade | .0549518 | .0095093 | 5.78 | 0.000 | .0363139 | .0735897 |
| not_smsa | -.1045232 | .0431082 | -2.42 | 0.015 | -.1890138 | -.0200326 |
| 1.south | -1.714868 | .3384558 | -5.07 | 0.000 | -2.378229 | -1.051507 |
| year | -.0115881 | .0084125 | -1.38 | 0.168 | -.0280763 | .0049001 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0149796 | .0041687 | 3.59 | 0.000 | .0068091 | .0231501 |
| _cons | -1.488278 | .4468005 | -3.33 | 0.001 | -2.363991 | -.6125652 |

## > Example 2

In $[R]$ cloglog, we showed these results and compared them with cloglog, vce(cluster id). xtcloglog with the pa option allows a vce (robust) option so we can obtain the population-averaged cloglog estimator with the robust variance calculation by typing

```
xtcloglog union age grade not_smsa south##c.year, pa vce(robust)
```

(output omitted)

| GEE population-averaged model |  | Number of obs | = | 26,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: | idcode | Number of groups | = | 4,434 |
| Link: | cloglog | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: | binomial | min | $=$ | 1 |
| Correlation: | exchangeable | avg | = | 5.9 |
|  |  | max | = | 12 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(6) |  | 157.24 |
| Scale parameter: | 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |
|  | (Std. Err. | sted for clusteri | g | idcode) |


|  | Semirobust <br> union |  |  |  | Coef. | Std. Err. | z |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |  |  |  |  |
| age | .0153737 | .0079446 | 1.94 | 0.053 | -.0001974 | .0309448 |  |
| grade | .0549518 | .0117258 | 4.69 | 0.000 | .0319697 | .077934 |  |
| not_smsa | -.1045232 | .0548598 | -1.91 | 0.057 | -.2120465 | .0030001 |  |
| 1.south | -1.714868 | .4864999 | -3.52 | 0.000 | -2.66839 | -.7613455 |  |
| year | -.0115881 | .0085742 | -1.35 | 0.177 | -.0283932 | .005217 |  |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0149796 | .0060548 | 2.47 | 0.013 | .0031124 | .0268468 |  |
| _cons | -1.488278 | .4924738 | -3.02 | 0.003 | -2.453509 | -.5230472 |  |

These standard errors are similar to those shown for cloglog, vce(cluster id) in [R] cloglog.

## - Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtcloglog likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtcloglog, re stores the following in e():
Scalars
$e(N)$
$e\left(N_{n}\right)$
$e\left(N_{-c}\right)$
$e(k)$
e(k_aux)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(ll_0)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(N_clust)
e(rho)
e(sigma_u)
e(n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e(p)$
$e$ (rank)
e(rankO)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros

```
    e(cmd)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(ivar)
    e(model)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(title)
    e(clustvar)
    e(offset)
    e(chi2type)
    e(chi2_ct)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(intmethod)
    e(distrib)
    e(opt)
    e(which)
    e(ml_method)
    e(user)
    e(technique)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
number of observations
number of groups
number of completely determined observations
number of parameters
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in e(b)
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
number of clusters
$\rho$
panel-level standard deviation
number of quadrature points
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of e(V)
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
xtcloglog
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
re
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
name of cluster variable
linear offset variable
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector

```
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
```

Functions
e(sample)
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators model-based variance
marks estimation sample
xtcloglog, pa stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rc)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(nmp)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtcloglog, pa reports the population-averaged results obtained using xtgee, family(binomial) link(cloglog) to obtain estimates.

For the random-effects model, assume a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
$$

where

$$
F(y, z)= \begin{cases}1-\exp \{-\exp (z)\} & \text { if } y \neq 0 \\ \exp \{-\exp (z)\} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, with the definition of $g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\right. \\
&\left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.
The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The $\log$ likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the intmethod (ghermite) option, where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left\{y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

## xtcloglog, re and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce (robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtcloglog postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtcloglog
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtlogit - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
[XT] xtprobit - Random-effects and population-averaged probit models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] mecloglog - Multilevel mixed-effects complementary log-log regression
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] cloglog - Complementary log-log regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtcloglog postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtcloglog
Postestimation commands predict margins Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtcloglog:
Command Description

| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| :--- | :--- |
| *estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) <br> estimates |
| cataloging estimation results |  |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> hausman <br> lincom |
| Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |  |
| lrtest | likelihood-ratio test <br> margins |
| marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal |  |
| effects |  |

[^1]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as probabilities, linear predictions, standard errors, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

Random-effects (RE) model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, RE_statistic nooffset]
```

Population-averaged (PA) model
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]

| RE_statistic | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Main | linear prediction; the default |
| xb | marginal probability of a positive outcome |
| pr | probability of a positive outcome |
| $\mathrm{pu0}$ | standard error of the linear prediction |

PA_statistic Description

## Main

| mu | predicted probability of depvar; considers the offset (); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | predicted probability of depvar |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | standard error of the linear prediction |
| score | first derivative of the log likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ |

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

Main
xb calculates the linear prediction, which is $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ if offset() was not specified when the model was fit and $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$ if offset () was specified. This is the default for the random-effects model.
pr calculates the probability of a positive outcome that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the probability is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
puO calculates the probability of a positive outcome, assuming that the random effect for that observation's panel is zero $\left(\nu_{i}=0\right)$. This may not be similar to the proportion of observed outcomes in the group.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
mu and rate both calculate the predicted probability of depvar. mu takes into account the offset (). rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset().mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtcloglog. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of responses for probabilities and linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

Random-effects (RE) model
statistic Description

| pr | marginal probability of a positive outcome; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| puO | probability of a positive outcome |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

Population-averaged (PA) model
statistic Description
mu predicted probability of depvar; considers the offset(); the default
rate predicted probability of depvar
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction
stdp not allowed with margins
score not allowed with margins
Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see $[\mathrm{R}]$ margins.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1: Average marginal effects

In example 1 of [XT] xtcloglog, we fit the model

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtcloglog union age grade not_smsa south##c.year, pa
    (output omitted)
```

Here we use margins to determine the average effect each regressor has on the probability of a positive response in the sample.

```
. margins, dydx(*)
```



|  | Delta-method |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | dy/dx | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| age | .0028297 | .0014952 | 1.89 | 0.058 | -.000101 | .0057603 |
| grade | .0101144 | .0017498 | 5.78 | 0.000 | .0066848 | .013544 |
| not_smsa | -.0192384 | .0079304 | -2.43 | 0.015 | -.0347818 | -.0036951 |
| 1.south | -.0913197 | .0073101 | -12.49 | 0.000 | -.1056473 | -.0769921 |
| year | -.0012694 | .001534 | -0.83 | 0.408 | -.004276 | .0017371 |

Note: dy/dx for factor levels is the discrete change from the base level.
We see that an additional year of schooling (covariate grade) increases the probability that a woman belongs to a union by an average of about one percentage point.

## Also see

[XT] xtcloglog — Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtdata - Faster specification searches with xt data

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Methods and formulas | Also see |

## Description

xtdata produces a transformed dataset of the variables specified in varlist or of all the variables in the data. Once the data are transformed, Stata's regress command may be used to perform specification searches more quickly than xtreg; see [R] regress and [XT] xtreg. Using xtdata, re also creates a variable named constant. When using regress after xtdata, re, specify noconstant and include constant in the regression. After xtdata, be and xtdata, fe, you need not include constant or specify regress's noconstant option.

## Quick start

Convert data to a form suitable for random-effects estimation using xtset data xtdata, re

As above, but convert only variables v1, v2 and v3
xtdata v1 v2 v3, re
Convert all variables beginning with prefix to a form suitable for fixed-effects estimation xtdata prefix*, fe

Convert data for between estimation if the dataset has changed since last save xtdata, be clear

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Faster specification searches with xt data

## Syntax

xtdata [varlist] [if] [in] [, options]
options Description

Main
re
ratio(\#)
be
fe
nodouble clear
convert data to a form suitable for random-effects estimation ratio of random effect to pure residual (standard deviations)
convert data to a form suitable for between estimation
convert data to a form suitable for fixed-effects (within) estimation
keep original variable type; default is to recast type as double
overwrite current data in memory
A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.

## Options

$\qquad$ Main
re specifies that the data be converted into a form suitable for random-effects estimation. re is the default if be, fe , or re is not specified. ratio() must also be specified.
ratio(\#) (use with xtdata, re only) specifies the ratio $\sigma_{\nu} / \sigma_{\epsilon}$, which is the ratio of the random effect to the pure residual. This is the ratio of the standard deviations, not the variances.
be specifies that the data be converted into a form suitable for between estimation.
fe specifies that the data be converted into a form suitable for fixed-effects (within) estimation.
nodouble specifies that transformed variables keep their original types, if possible. The default is to recast variables to double.
Remember that xtdata transforms variables to be differences from group means, pseudodifferences from group means, or group means. Specifying nodouble will decrease the size of the resulting dataset but may introduce roundoff errors in these calculations.
clear specifies that the data may be converted even though the dataset has changed since it was last saved on disk.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt and [XT] xtreg, please do so.
The formal estimation commands of xtreg-see [XT] xtreg-do not produce results instantaneously, especially with large datasets. Equations (2), (3), and (4) of [XT] xtreg describe the data necessary to fit each of the models with OLS. The idea here is to transform the data once to the appropriate form and then use regress to fit such models more quickly.

## $>$ Example 1

We will use the example in [XT] xtreg demonstrating between-effects regression. Another way to estimate the between equation is to convert the data in memory to the between data:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. generate age2=age^2
(24 missing values generated)
```

. generate ttl_exp2 = ttl_exp^2
. generate tenure2=tenure^2
( 433 missing values generated)
. generate byte black = race==2
. xtdata ln_w grade age* ttl_exp* tenure* black not_smsa south, be clear
. regress ln_w grade age* ttl_exp* tenure* black not_smsa south

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs | = | 4,697 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | $\mathrm{F}(10,4686)$ | = | 450.23 |
| Model | 415.021613 | 10 | 41.5021613 | Prob > F | = | 0.0000 |
| Residual | 431.954995 | 4,686 | . 092179896 | R -squared | = | 0.4900 |
|  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared | = | 0.4889 |
| Total | 846.976608 | 4,696 | . 180361288 | Root MSE | = | . 30361 |


| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P>\|t| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| grade | .0607602 | .0020006 | 30.37 | 0.000 | .0568382 | .0646822 |
| age | .0323158 | .0087251 | 3.70 | 0.000 | .0152105 | .0494211 |
| age2 | -.0005997 | .0001429 | -4.20 | 0.000 | -.0008799 | -.0003194 |
| (output omitted) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| south | -.0993378 | .010136 | -9.80 | 0.000 | -.1192091 | -.0794665 |
| _cons | .3339113 | .1210434 | 2.76 | 0.006 | .0966093 | .5712133 |

The output is the same as that produced by xtreg, be; the reported $R^{2}$ is the $R^{2}$ between. Using xtdata followed by just one regress does not save time. Using xtdata is justified when you intend to explore the specification of the model by running many alternative regressions.

## Technical note

When using xtdata, you must eliminate any variables that you do not intend to use and that have missing values. xtdata follows a casewise-deletion rule, which means that an observation is excluded from the conversion if it is missing on any of the variables. In the example above, we specified that the variables be converted on the command line. We could also drop the variables first, and it might even be useful to preserve our estimation sample:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork, clear
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. generate age2=age^2
(24 missing values generated)
. generate ttl_exp2 = ttl_exp^2
. generate tenure2=tenure^2
(433 missing values generated)
. generate byte black = race==2
. keep id year ln_w grade age* ttl_exp* tenure* black not_smsa south
. save xtdatasmpl
file xtdatasmpl.dta saved
```


## > Example 2

xtdata with the fe option converts the data so that results are equivalent to those from estimating by using xtreg with the fe option.

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs F(8, 28082) <br> Prob > F <br> R-squared <br> Adj R-squared <br> Root MSE |  | 28,091 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | 412.443881 | 8 | 51.5554852 |  |  | 0.0000 |
| Residual | 1976.12232 | 28,082 | . 070369714 |  |  | 0.1727 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1724 |
| Total | 2388.5662 | 28,090 | . 085032617 |  |  | . 26527 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err . | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| grade | 0 (omitted) |  |  |  | . 0299415 | . 0420558 |
| age | . 0359987 | . 0030903 | 11.65 | 0.000 |  |  |
| age2 | -. 000723 | . 0000486 | -14.88 | 0.000 | -. 0008183 | -. 0006277 |
| ttl_exp | . 0334668 | . 0027061 | 12.37 | 0.000 | . 0281627 | . 0387708 |
| ttl_exp2 | . 0002163 | . 0001166 | 1.86 | 0.064 | -. 0000122 | . 0004447 |
| tenure | . 0357539 | . 0016871 | 21.19 | 0.000 | . 0324472 | . 0390606 |
| tenure2 | -. 0019701 | . 0001141 | -17.27 | 0.000 | -. 0021937 | -. 0017465 |
| black | 0 | (omitted) |  |  |  |  |
| not_smsa | -. 0890108 | . 0086982 | -10.23 | 0.000 | -. 1060597 | -. 0719619 |
| south | -. 0606309 | . 0099761 | -6.08 | 0.000 | -. 0801845 | -. 0410772 |
| _cons | 1.03732 | . 0443093 | 23.41 | 0.000 | . 9504716 | 1.124168 |

The coefficients reported by regress after xtdata, fe are the same as those reported by xtreg, fe, but the standard errors are slightly smaller. This is because no adjustment has been made to the estimated covariance matrix for the estimation of the person means. The difference is small, however, and results are adequate for a specification search.

## > Example 3

To use xtdata, re, you must specify the ratio $\sigma_{\nu} / \sigma_{\epsilon}$, which is the ratio of the standard deviations of the random effect and pure residual. Merely to show the relationship of regress after xtdata, re to xtreg, re, we will specify this ratio as $0.25790526 / 0.29068923=0.88721987$, which is the number xtreg reports when the model is fit from the outset; see the random-effects example in [XT] xtreg. For specification searches, however, it is adequate to specify this number more crudely, and, when performing the specification search for this manual entry, we used ratio(1).

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtdatasmpl, clear
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xtdata, clear re ratio(.88721987)
```

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| $\min$ | $5 \%$ | theta |  |  |
| 0.2520 | 0.2520 | 0.5499 | 0.7016 | 0.7206 |

xtdata reports the distribution of $\theta$ based on the specified ratio. If these were balanced data, $\theta$ would have been constant.

When running regressions with these data, you must specify the noconstant option and include the variable constant:

| Source | SS | df | MS | Number of obs$F(11,28080)$ |  | 28,091 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Model | 13271.7208 | 11 | 1206.52007 | Prob > F |  | 0.0000 |
| Residual | 2368.74223 | 28,080 | . 084356917 | R -squared |  | 0.8486 |
|  |  |  |  | Adj R-squared |  | 8485 |
| Total | 15640.463 | 28,091 | . 556778435 | Root MSE |  | . 29044 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | $P>\|t\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| grade | . 0646499 | . 0017812 | 36.30 | 0.000 | . 0611587 | . 0681411 |
| age | . 0368059 | . 0031195 | 11.80 | 0.000 | . 0306915 | . 0429203 |
| age2 | -. 0007133 | . 00005 | -14.27 | 0.000 | -. 0008113 | -. 0006153 |
| (output omitted) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| south | -. 0868922 | . 0073032 | -11.90 | 0.000 | -. 1012068 | -. 0725775 |
| constant | . 2387206 | . 049469 | 4.83 | 0.000 | . 141759 | . 3356822 |

Results are the same coefficients and standard errors that xtreg, re estimated in example 4 of [XT] xtreg. The summaries at the top, however, should be ignored, as they are expressed in terms of (4) of [XT] xtreg, and, moreover, for a model without a constant.

## - Technical note

Using xtdata requires some caution. The following guidelines may help:

1. xtdata is intended for use only during the specification search phase of analysis. Results should be estimated with xtreg on unconverted data.
2. After converting the data, you may use regress to obtain estimates of the coefficients and their standard errors. For regress after xtdata, fe, the standard errors are too small, but only slightly.
3. You may loosely interpret the coefficient's significance tests and confidence intervals. However, for results after xtdata, fe and re, an incorrect (but close to correct) distribution is assumed.
4. You should ignore the summary statistics reported at the top of regress's output.
5. After converting the data, you may form linear, but not nonlinear, combinations of regressors; that is, if your data contained age, it would not be correct to convert the data and then form age squared. All nonlinear transformations should be done before conversion. (For xtdata, be, you can get away with forming nonlinear combinations ex post, but the results will not be exact.)

## Technical note

The xtdata command can be used to help you examine data, especially with scatter.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtdatasmpl, clear
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xtdata, be
. scatter ln_wage age, title(Between data) msymbol(o) msize(tiny)
```


. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtdatasmpl, clear (National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women $14-26$ years of age in 1968)
. xtdata, fe
. scatter ln_wage age, title(Within data) msymbol(o) msize(tiny)


```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtdatasmpl, clear
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. scatter ln_wage age, title(Overall data) msymbol(o) msize(tiny)
```



## Methods and formulas

(This section is a continuation of the Methods and formulas of [XT] xtreg.)
xtdata, be, fe, and re transform the data according to (2), (3), and (4), respectively, of [XT] xtreg, except that xtdata, fe adds back in the overall mean, thus forming the transformation

$$
\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\bar{x}_{i}+\overline{\bar{x}}
$$

xtdata, re requires the user to specify $r$ as an estimate of $\sigma_{\nu} / \sigma_{\epsilon} . \theta_{i}$ is calculated from

$$
\theta_{i}=1-\frac{1}{\sqrt{T_{i} r^{2}+1}}
$$

## Also see

[XT] xtsum - Summarize xt data

## Title

xtdescribe - Describe pattern of xt data

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Reference | Also see |

## Description

xtdescribe describes the participation pattern of cross-sectional time-series (xt) data.

## Quick start

Describe the 9 most common participation patterns of xtset data xtdescribe

Describe up to 15 of the most common participation patterns
xtdescribe, patterns(15)
As above, but list all participation patterns
xtdescribe, patterns(1000)
Describe patterns only for study subjects, denoted by binary variable insample $=1$ xtdescribe if insample

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Describe pattern of xt data

## Syntax

xtdescribe [if] [in] [, options]
options Description
Main
patterns(\#) maximum participation patterns; default is patterns(9)
width (\#) display \# width of participation patterns; default is width (100)
A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
by is allowed; see [D] by.

## Options

$\qquad$ Main
patterns (\#) specifies the maximum number of participation patterns to be reported; patterns (9) is the default. Specifying patterns (50) would list up to 50 patterns. Specifying patterns (1000) is taken to mean patterns $(\infty)$ : all the patterns will be listed.
width(\#) specifies the desired width of the participation patterns to be displayed; width(100) is the default. If the number of times is greater than width(), then each column in the participation pattern represents multiple periods as indicated in a footnote at the bottom of the table. The actual width may differ slightly from the requested width depending on the span of the time variable and the number of periods.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] $\mathbf{x t}$, please do so.
xtdescribe describes the cross-sectional and time-series aspects of the data in memory.
> Example 1
In [XT] xt, we introduced data based on a subsample of the NLSY data on young women aged $14-26$ years in 1968. Here is a description of the data used in many of the [XT] xt examples:

xtdescribe tells us that we have 4,711 women in our data and that the idcode that identifies each ranges from 1 to 5,159 . We are also told that the maximum number of individual years over which we observe any woman is 15 , though the year variable spans 21 years. The delta or periodicity of year is one unit, meaning that in principle we could observe each woman yearly. We are reassured that idcode and year, taken together, uniquely identify each observation in our data. We are also shown the distribution of $T_{i} ; 50 \%$ of our women are observed 5 years or less. Only $5 \%$ of our women are observed for 13 years or more.

Finally, we are shown the participation pattern. A 1 in the pattern means one observation that year; a dot means no observation. The largest fraction of our women (still only $2.89 \%$ ) was observed in the single year 1968 and not thereafter; the next largest fraction was observed in 1988 but not before; and the next largest fraction was observed in 1985, 1987, and 1988.

At the bottom is the sum of the participation patterns, including the patterns that were not shown. We can see that none of the women were observed in six of the years (there are six dots). (The survey was not administered in those six years.)

We could see more of the patterns by specifying the patterns() option, or we could see all the patterns by specifying patterns(1000).

## > Example 2

The strange participation patterns shown above have to do with our subsampling of the data, not with the administrators of the survey. Here are the data from which we drew the sample used in [XT] xt:


We have multiple observations per year. In the pattern, 2 indicates that a woman appears twice in the year, 3 indicates 3 times, and so on - X indicates 10 or more, should that be necessary.

In fact, this is a dataset that was itself extracted from the NLSY, in which $t$ is not time but job number. To simplify exposition, we made a simpler dataset by selecting the last job in each year.

## Example 3

When the number of periods is greater than the width of the participation pattern, each column will represent more than one period.


We have data for 30 patients who were observed hourly between 4:00 PM on March 9, 2007, and 11:00 PM on March 10, a span of 32 hours. We have complete records for 21 of the patients. The footnote indicates that each column in the pattern represents two periods, so for four patients we
have an observation taken at either 4:00 PM or 5:00 PM on March 9, but we do not have observations for both times. There are three patients for whom we are missing both the 10:00 PM and 11:00 PM observations on March 10, and there are two patients for whom we are missing the $4: 00 \mathrm{PM}$ and 5:00 PM observations for March 9.

## Reference

Cox, N. J. 2007. Speaking Stata: Counting groups, especially panels. Stata Journal 7: 571-581.

## Also see

[XT] xtsum - Summarize xt data
[XT] xttab - Tabulate xt data
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## Description

xtdpd fits a linear dynamic panel-data model where the unobserved panel-level effects are correlated with the lags of the dependent variable. The command can fit Arellano-Bond and Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond models like those fit by xtabond and xtdpdsys. However, it also allows models with low-order moving-average correlation in the idiosyncratic errors or predetermined variables with a more complicated structure than allowed for xtabond or xtdpdsys.

## Quick start

Arellano-Bond model of y on L. y and x with the first difference of x as an instrument for the difference equation using xtset data
xtdpd y L. y $x, \operatorname{div}(x) \operatorname{dgmmiv}(y)$
Add the first difference of the lag of $x$ as an instrument for the level equation
xtdpd y L.y $x$, div(x) dgmmiv(y) lgmmiv(x)
Use lags 3 to 5 of $x$ as instruments for the difference equation

```
xtdpd y L.y x, div(x) dgmmiv(y, lagrange(3 5))
```


## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Dynamic panel data (DPD) $>$ Linear DPD estimation

## Syntax

$$
\text { xtdpd depvar }[\text { indepvars }][\text { if }][\text { in }], \text { dgmmiv(varlist }[\ldots])[\text { options }]
$$

options
Description
Model

* $\operatorname{dgmmiv}(\operatorname{varlist}[\ldots])$

GMM-type instruments for the difference equation; can be specified more than once
$\underline{\operatorname{lgmmiv}}($ varlist $[\ldots])$
iv(varlist [...])
$\operatorname{div}(\operatorname{varlist}[\ldots])$
liv(varlist)
noconstant
twostep
hascons
fodeviation
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) vcetype may be gmm or robust
Reporting
level(\#)
artests(\#)
display_options
coeflegend
GMM-type instruments for the level equation;
can be specified more than once
can be specified more than once can be specified more than once
standard instruments for the level equation only; can be specified more than once

## suppress constant term

set confidence level; default is level (95)
control spacing and line width
display legend instead of statistics
standard instruments for the difference and level equations;
standard instruments for the difference equation only;
compute the two-step estimator instead of the one-step estimator
check for collinearity only among levels of independent variables; by default checks occur among levels and differences
use forward-orthogonal deviations instead of first differences
use \# as maximum order for AR tests; default is artests (2)

* $\operatorname{dgmmiv}()$ is required.

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
depvar, indepvars, and all varlists may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, statsby, and xi 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.

## Options

dgmmiv (varlist $[$, lagrange ( flag $[$ llag $])]$ ) specifies GMM-type instruments for the difference
equation. Levels of the variables are used to form GMM-type instruments for the difference
equation. All possible lags are used, unless lagrange (flag llag) restricts the lags to begin with
flag and end with llag. You may specify as many sets of GMM-type instruments for the difference
equation as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set may have its own
flag and llag. dgmmiv() is required.
lgmmiv (varlist $[, \operatorname{lag}(\#)]$ ) specifies GMM-type instruments for the level equation. Differences of
the variables are used to form GMM-type instruments for the level equation. The first lag of the
differences is used unless $\operatorname{lag}(\#)$ is specified, indicating that \#th lag of the differences be used. You may specify as many sets of GMM-type instruments for the level equation as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set may have its own lag.
iv(varlist [, nodifference]) specifies standard instruments for both the differenced and level equations. Differences of the variables are used as instruments for the differenced equations, unless nodifference is specified, which requests that levels be used. Levels of the variables are used as instruments for the level equations. You may specify as many sets of standard instruments for both the differenced and level equations as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size.
$\operatorname{div}($ varlist $[$, nodifference $])$ specifies additional standard instruments for the difference equation. Specified variables may not be included in iv() or in liv(). Differences of the variables are used, unless nodifference is specified, which requests that levels of the variables be used as instruments for the difference equation. You may specify as many additional sets of standard instruments for the difference equation as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size.
liv (varlist) specifies additional standard instruments for the level equation. Specified variables may not be included in $\operatorname{iv}()$ or in $\operatorname{div}()$. Levels of the variables are used as instruments for the level equation. You may specify as many additional sets of standard instruments for the level equation as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size.
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
twostep specifies that the two-step estimator be calculated.
hascons specifies that xtdpd check for collinearity only among levels of independent variables; by default checks occur among levels and differences.
fodeviation specifies that forward-orthogonal deviations be used instead of first differences. fodeviation is not allowed when there are gaps in the data or when $\operatorname{lgmmiv}()$ is specified.

SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory and that are robust to some kinds of misspecification; see Methods and formulas.
vce (gmm), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized method of moments estimation.
vce (robust) uses the robust estimator. For the one-step estimator, this is the Arellano-Bond robust VCE estimator. For the two-step estimator, this is the Windmeijer (2005) WC-robust estimator.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
artests(\#) specifies the maximum order of the autocorrelation test to be calculated. The tests are reported by estat abond; see [XT] xtdpd postestimation. Specifying the order of the highest test at estimation time is more efficient than specifying it to estat abond, because estat abond must refit the model to obtain the test statistics. The maximum order must be less than or equal to the number of periods in the longest panel. The default is artests(2).
display_options: vsquish and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
The following option is available with xtdpd but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xtabond and [XT] xtdpdsys, you should do so before continuing.
Linear dynamic panel-data models include $p$ lags of the dependent variable as covariates and contain unobserved panel-level effects, fixed or random. By construction, the unobserved panel-level effects are correlated with the lagged dependent variables, making standard estimators inconsistent. xtdpd fits a dynamic panel-data model by using the Arellano-Bond (1991) or the Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond $(1995,1998)$ estimator.

Consider the dynamic panel-data model

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_{j} y_{i, t-j}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{w}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \quad i=\{1, \ldots, N\} ; \quad t=\left\{1, \ldots, T_{i}\right\} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
the $\alpha_{1}, \ldots, \alpha_{p}$ are $p$ parameters to be estimated,
$\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of strictly exogenous covariates,
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ is a $k_{1} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated,
$\mathbf{w}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of predetermined covariates,
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$ is a $k_{2} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated,
$\nu_{i}$ are the panel-level effects (which may be correlated with $x_{i t}$ or $w_{i t}$ ), and
and $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. or come from a low-order moving-average process, with variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$.
Building on the work of Anderson and Hsiao (1981, 1982) and Holtz-Eakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988), Arellano and Bond (1991) derived one-step and two-step GMM estimators using moment conditions in which lagged levels of the dependent and predetermined variables were instruments for the difference equation. Blundell and Bond (1998) show that the lagged-level instruments in the Arellano-Bond estimator become weak as the autoregressive process becomes too persistent or the ratio of the variance of the panel-level effect $\nu_{i}$ to the variance of the idiosyncratic error $\epsilon_{i t}$ becomes too large. Building on the work of Arellano and Bover (1995), Blundell and Bond (1998) proposed a system estimator that uses moment conditions in which lagged differences are used as instruments for the level equation in addition to the moment conditions of lagged levels as instruments for the difference equation. The additional moment conditions are valid only if the initial condition $E\left[\nu_{i} \Delta y_{i 2}\right]=0$ holds for all $i$; see Blundell and Bond (1998) and Blundell, Bond, and Windmeijer (2000).
xtdpd fits dynamic panel-data models by using the Arellano-Bond or the Arellano-Bover/BlundellBond system estimator. The parameters of many standard models can be more easily estimated using the Arellano-Bond estimator implemented in xtabond or using the Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond system estimator implemented in xtdpdsys; see [XT] xtabond and [XT] xtdpdsys. xtdpd can fit more complex models at the cost of a more complicated syntax. That the idiosyncratic errors follow a low-order MA process and that the predetermined variables have a more complicated structure than accommodated by xtabond and xtdpdsys are two common reasons for using xtdpd instead of xtabond or xtdpdsys.

The standard GMM robust two-step estimator of the VCE is known to be seriously biased. Windmeijer (2005) derived a bias-corrected robust estimator for two-step VCEs from GMM estimators known as the WC-robust estimator, which is implemented in xtdpd.

The Arellano-Bond test of autocorrelation of order $m$ and the Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions derived by Arellano and Bond (1991) are computed by xtdpd but reported by estat abond and estat sargan, respectively; see [XT] xtdpd postestimation.

Because xtdpd extends xtabond and xtdpdsys, [XT] xtabond and [XT] xtdpdsys provide useful background.

## > Example 1: An Arellano-Bond estimator

Arellano and Bond (1991) apply their new estimators and test statistics to a model of dynamic labor demand that had previously been considered by Layard and Nickell (1986), using data from an unbalanced panel of firms from the United Kingdom. All variables are indexed over the firm $i$ and time $t$. In this dataset, $\mathrm{n}_{i t}$ is the $\log$ of employment in firm $i$ inside the United Kingdom at time $t$, $\mathrm{w}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the real product wage, $\mathrm{k}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the gross capital stock, and $\mathrm{ys}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of industry output. The model also includes time dummies yr1980, yr1981, yr1982, yr1983, and yr1984. To gain some insight into the syntax for xtdpd, we reproduce the first example from [XT] xtabond using xtdpd:


One-step results

| n | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6862261 | . 1486163 | 4.62 | 0.000 | . 3949435 | . 9775088 |
| L2. | -. 0853582 | . 0444365 | -1.92 | 0.055 | -. 1724523 | . 0017358 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 3926237 | . 1092374 | 3.59 | 0.000 | . 1785222 | . 6067251 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | -. 0580012 | . 0583051 | -0.99 | 0.320 | -. 172277 | . 0562747 |
| L2. | -. 0199475 | . 0416274 | -0.48 | 0.632 | -. 1015357 | . 0616408 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 6085073 | . 1345412 | 4.52 | 0.000 | . 3448115 | . 8722031 |
| L1. | -. 7111651 | . 1844599 | -3.86 | 0.000 | -1.0727 | -. 3496304 |
| L2. | . 1057969 | . 1428568 | 0.74 | 0.459 | -. 1741974 | . 3857912 |
| yr1980 | . 0029062 | . 0212705 | 0.14 | 0.891 | -. 0387832 | . 0445957 |
| yr1981 | -. 0404378 | . 0354707 | -1.14 | 0.254 | -. 1099591 | . 0290836 |
| yr1982 | -. 0652767 | . 048209 | -1.35 | 0.176 | -. 1597646 | . 0292111 |
| yr1983 | -. 0690928 | . 0627354 | -1.10 | 0.271 | -. 1920521 | . 0538664 |
| yr1984 | -. 0650302 | . 0781322 | -0.83 | 0.405 | -. 2181665 | . 0881061 |
| year | . 0095545 | . 0142073 | 0.67 | 0.501 | -. 0182912 | . 0374002 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

Unlike most instrumental-variables estimation commands, the independent variables in the varlist are not automatically used as instruments. In this example, all the independent variables are strictly exogenous, so we include them in $\operatorname{div}()$, a list of variables whose first differences will be instruments for the difference equation. We include the dependent variable in $\operatorname{dgmmiv}()$, a list of variables whose lagged levels will be used to create GMM-type instruments for the difference equation. (GMM-type instruments are discussed in a technical note below.)

The footer in the output reports the instruments used. The first line indicates that xtdpd used lags from 2 on back to create the GMM-type instruments described in Arellano and Bond (1991) and Holtz-Eakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988). The second line says that the first difference of all the variables included in the $\operatorname{div}()$ varlist were used as standard instruments for the difference equation.

## Technical note

GMM-type instruments are built from lags of one variable. Ignoring the strictly exogenous variables for simplicity, our model is

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{i t}=\alpha_{1} n_{i t-1}+\alpha_{2} n_{i t-2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

After differencing we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta n_{i t}=\Delta \alpha_{1} n_{i t-1}+\Delta \alpha_{2} n_{i t-2}+\Delta \epsilon_{i t} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation (3) implies that we need instruments that are not correlated with either $\epsilon_{i t}$ or $\epsilon_{i t-1}$. Equation (2) shows that L2. n is the first lag of n that is not correlated with $\epsilon_{i t}$ or $\epsilon_{i t-1}$, so it is the first lag of $n$ that can be used to instrument the difference equation.

Consider the following data from one of the complete panels in the previous example:

```
. list id year n L2.n dl2.n if id==140
```

|  | id | year | n | L2 n | $\begin{array}{r} \text { L2D. } \\ \mathrm{n} \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1023. | 140 | 1976 | . 4324315 | . |  |
| 1024. | 140 | 1977 | . 3694925 | . |  |
| 1025. | 140 | 1978 | . 3541718 | . 4324315 | . |
| 1026. | 140 | 1979 | . 3632532 | . 3694925 | -. 0629391 |
| 1027. | 140 | 1980 | . 3371863 | . 3541718 | -. 0153207 |
| 1028. | 140 | 1981 | . 285179 | . 3632532 | . 0090815 |
| 1029. | 140 | 1982 | . 1756326 | . 3371863 | -. 026067 |
| 1030. | 140 | 1983 | . 1275133 | . 285179 | -. 0520073 |
| 1031. | 140 | 1984 | . 0889263 | . 1756326 | -. 1095464 |

The missing values in L2D.n show that we lose 3 observations because of lags and the difference that removes the panel-level effects. The first nonmissing observation occurs in 1979 and observations on n from 1976 and 1977 are available to instrument the 1979 difference equation. The table below gives the observations available to instrument the differenced equation for the data above.

| Year of <br> difference errors | Years of <br> instruments | Number of <br> instruments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1979 | $1976-1977$ | 2 |
| 1980 | $1976-1978$ | 3 |
| 1981 | $1976-1979$ | 4 |
| 1982 | $1976-1980$ | 5 |
| 1983 | $1976-1981$ | 6 |
| 1984 | $1976-1982$ | 7 |

The table shows that there are a total of 27 GMM-type instruments.
The output in the example above informs us that there were a total of 41 instruments applied to the difference equation. Because there are 14 standard instruments, there must have been 27 GMM-type instruments, which matches our above calculation.

## Example 2: An Arellano-Bond estimator with predetermined variables

Sometimes we cannot assume strict exogeneity. Recall that a variable $x_{i t}$ is said to be strictly exogenous if $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $t$ and $s$. If $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right] \neq 0$ for $s<t$ but $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $s \geq t$, the variable is said to be predetermined. Intuitively, if the error term at time $t$ has some feedback on the subsequent realizations of $x_{i t}, x_{i t}$ is a predetermined variable. In the output below, we use xtdpd to reproduce example 6 in [XT] xtabond.


Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 8580958 | . 1265515 | 6.78 | 0.000 | . 6100594 | 1.106132 |
| L2. | -. 081207 | . 0760703 | -1.07 | 0.286 | -. 2303022 | . 0678881 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | -. 6910855 | . 1387684 | -4.98 | 0.000 | -. 9630666 | -. 4191044 |
| L1. | . 5961712 | . 1497338 | 3.98 | 0.000 | . 3026982 | . 8896441 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 6936392 | . 1728623 | 4.01 | 0.000 | . 3548354 | 1.032443 |
| L1. | -. 8773678 | . 2183085 | -4.02 | 0.000 | -1.305245 | -. 449491 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 4140654 | . 1382788 | 2.99 | 0.003 | . 1430439 | . 6850868 |
| L1. | -. 1537048 | . 1220244 | -1.26 | 0.208 | -. 3928681 | . 0854586 |
| L2. | -. 1025833 | . 0710886 | -1.44 | 0.149 | -. 2419143 | . 0367477 |
| yr1980 | -. 0072451 | . 017163 | -0.42 | 0.673 | -. 0408839 | . 0263938 |
| yr1981 | -. 0609608 | . 030207 | -2.02 | 0.044 | -. 1201655 | -. 0017561 |
| yr1982 | -. 1130369 | . 0454826 | -2.49 | 0.013 | -. 2021812 | -. 0238926 |
| yr1983 | -. 1335249 | . 0600213 | -2.22 | 0.026 | -. 2511645 | -. 0158853 |
| yr1984 | -. 1623177 | . 0725434 | -2.24 | 0.025 | -. 3045001 | -. 0201352 |
| year | . 0264501 | . 0119329 | 2.22 | 0.027 | . 003062 | . 0498381 |

```
Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/.).L.w L(1/.).L2.k
    Standard: D.ys LD.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984
                        D.year
```

The footer informs us that we are now including GMM-type instruments from the first lag of L.w on back and from the first lag of L2.k on back.

## Example 3: A weaker definition of predetermined variables

As discussed in [XT] xtabond and [XT] xtdpdsys, xtabond and xtdpdsys both use a strict definition of predetermined variables with lags. In the strict definition, the most recent lag of the variable in pre() is considered predetermined. (Here specifying pre(w, $\operatorname{lag}(1,$.$) ) to xtabond means that$ L.w is a predetermined variable and pre ( $\mathrm{k}, \operatorname{lag}(2,)$.$) means that L2.k is a predetermined$ variable.) In a weaker definition, the current observation is considered predetermined, but subsequent
lags are included in the model. Here w and k would be predetermined instead of L. w and L2.w. The output below implements this weaker definition for the previous example.


Two-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | WC-Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 6343155 | . 1221058 | 5.19 | 0.000 | . 3949925 | . 8736384 |
| L2. | -. 0871247 | . 0704816 | -1.24 | 0.216 | -. 2252661 | . 0510168 |
| w |  |  | -6.35 | 0.000 | -. 9421973 | -. 4979287 |
| L1. | . 238069 | . 1223186 | 1.95 | 0.052 | -. 0016712 | . 4778091 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | . 5999718 | . 1653036 | 3.63 | 0.000 | . 2759827 | . 923961 |
| L1. | -. 5674808 | . 1656411 | -3.43 | 0.001 | -. 8921314 | -. 2428303 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | -. 0019641 | . 0772814 | -0.03 | 0.980 | -. 1534329 | . 1495047 |
| L2. | -. 0231165 | . 0487317 | -0.47 | 0.635 | -. 1186288 | . 0723958 |
| yr1980 | -. 006209 | . 0162138 | -0.38 | 0.702 | -. 0379875 | . 0255694 |
| yr1981 | -. 0398491 | . 0313794 | -1.27 | 0.204 | -. 1013516 | . 0216535 |
| yr1982 | -. 0525715 | . 0397346 | -1.32 | 0.186 | -. 1304498 | . 0253068 |
| yr1983 | -. 0451175 | . 051418 | -0.88 | 0.380 | -. 145895 | . 05566 |
| yr1984 | -. 0437772 | . 0614391 | -0.71 | 0.476 | -. 1641955 | . 0766412 |
| year | . 0173374 | . 0108665 | 1.60 | 0.111 | -. 0039605 | . 0386352 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/.).w L(1/.).k
Standard: D.ys LD.ys D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

As expected, the output shows that the additional 18 instruments available under the weaker definition can affect the magnitudes of the estimates. Applying the stricter definition when the true model was generated by the weaker definition yielded consistent but inefficient results; there were some additional moment conditions that could have been included but were not. In contrast, applying the weaker definition when the true model was generated by the stricter definition yields inconsistent estimates.

## > Example 4: A system estimator of a dynamic panel-data model

Here we use xtdpd to reproduce example 2 from [XT] xtdpdsys in which we used the system estimator to fit a model with predetermined variables.


One-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | Robust Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 913278 | . 0460602 | 19.83 | 0.000 | . 8230017 | 1.003554 |
| - ${ }^{\text {w }}$ | -. 728159 | . 1019044 | -7.15 | 0.000 | -. 9278879 | -. 5284301 |
| L1. | . 5602737 | . 1939617 | 2.89 | 0.004 | . 1801156 | . 9404317 |
| L2. | -. 0523028 | . 1487653 | -0.35 | 0.725 | -. 3438775 | . 2392718 |
| k | . 4820097 | . 0760787 | 6.34 | 0.000 | . 3328983 | . 6311212 |
| L1. | -. 2846944 | . 0831902 | -3.42 | 0.001 | -. 4477442 | -. 1216446 |
| L2. | -. 1394181 | . 0405709 | -3.44 | 0.001 | -. 2189356 | -. 0599006 |
| yr1980 | -. 0325146 | . 0216371 | -1.50 | 0.133 | -. 0749226 | . 0098935 |
| yr1981 | -. 0726116 | . 0346482 | -2.10 | 0.036 | -. 1405207 | -. 0047024 |
| yr1982 | -. 0477038 | . 0451914 | -1.06 | 0.291 | -. 1362772 | . 0408696 |
| yr1983 | -. 0396264 | . 0558734 | -0.71 | 0.478 | -. 1491362 | . 0698835 |
| yr1984 | -. 0810383 | . 0736648 | -1.10 | 0.271 | -. 2254186 | . 063342 |
| year | . 0192741 | . 0145326 | 1.33 | 0.185 | -. 0092092 | . 0477574 |
| _cons | -37.34972 | 28.77747 | -1.30 | 0.194 | -93.75253 | 19.05308 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/.).L2.w L(1/.).L2.k
Standard: D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year
Instruments for level equation
GMM-type: LD.n L2D.w L2D.k
Standard: _cons
The first lags of the variables included in lgmmiv() are used to create GMM-type instruments for the level equation. Only the first lags of the variables in $\operatorname{lgmmiv}()$ are used because the moment conditions using higher lags are redundant; see Blundell and Bond (1998) and Blundell, Bond, and Windmeijer (2000).
> Example 5: Allowing for MA(1) errors
All the previous examples have used moment conditions that are valid only if the idiosyncratic errors are i.i.d. This example shows how to use xtdpd to estimate the parameters of a model with first-order moving-average [MA(1)] errors using the Arellano-Bond estimator, the Arellano-Bover/BlundellBond system estimator, or any other consistent GMM estimator you want to specify. For simplicity, we assume that the independent variables are strictly exogenous. Also, to highlight the fact that we can specify the instrument list flexibly, we only include the levels and first lags of the exogenous variables in the instrument list. An Arellano-Bond estimator, for instance, would have included levels and first and second lags of the exogenous variables.

We begin by noting that the Sargan test rejects the null hypothesis that the overidentifying restrictions are valid in the model with i.i.d. errors.

```
. xtdpd L(0/1).n L(0/2).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year,
> div(L(0/1).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year) dgmmiv(n) hascons
    (output omitted)
- estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
        HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
        chi2(24) = 49.70094
        Prob > chi2 = 0.0015
```

Assuming that the idiosyncratic errors are MA(1) implies that only lags three or higher are valid instruments for the difference equation. (See the technical note below.)


One-step results

| n | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L 1. | .8696303 | .2014473 | 4.32 | 0.000 | .4748008 | 1.26446 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -L. | -.5802971 | .0762659 | -7.61 | 0.000 | -.7297756 | -.4308187 |
| L. | .2918658 | .1543883 | 1.89 | 0.059 | -.0107296 | .5944613 |
| L 2. | -.5903459 | .2995123 | -1.97 | 0.049 | -1.177379 | -.0033126 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | .3428139 | .0447916 | 7.65 | 0.000 | .2550239 | .4306039 |
| L 1. | -.1383918 | .0825823 | -1.68 | 0.094 | -.3002502 | .0234665 |
| L 2. | -.0260956 | .1535855 | -0.17 | 0.865 | -.3271177 | .2749265 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| yr1980 | -.0036873 | .0301587 | -0.12 | 0.903 | -.0627973 | .0554226 |
| yr1981 | .00218 | .0592014 | 0.04 | 0.971 | -.1138526 | .1182125 |
| yr1982 | .0782939 | .0897622 | 0.87 | 0.383 | -.0976367 | .2542246 |
| yr1983 | .1734231 | .1308914 | 1.32 | 0.185 | -.0831193 | .4299655 |
| yr1984 | .2400685 | .1734456 | 1.38 | 0.166 | -.0998787 | .5800157 |
| year | -.0354681 | .0309963 | -1.14 | 0.253 | -.0962198 | .0252836 |
| _cons | 73.13706 | 62.61443 | 1.17 | 0.243 | -49.58496 | 195.8591 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(3/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

Instruments for level equation
Standard: _cons
The results from estat sargan no longer reject the null hypothesis that the overidentifying restrictions are valid.

```
. estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
    HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
    chi2(18) = 20.80081
    Prob > chi2 = 0.2896
```

Moving on to the system estimator, we note that the Sargan test rejects the null hypothesis after fitting the model with i.i.d. errors.

```
. xtdpd L(0/1).n L(0/2).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year,
> div(L(0/1).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year) dgmmiv(n) lgmmiv(n) hascons
    (output omitted)
. estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
    HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
    chi2(31) = 59.22907
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0017
```

Now we fit the model using the additional moment conditions constructed from the second lag of n as an instrument for the level equation.

```
. xtdpd L(0/1).n L(0/2).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year,
> div(L(0/1).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year) dgmmiv(n, lag(3 .)) lgmmiv(n, lag(2))
> hascons
Dynamic panel-data estimation Number of obs = 751
Group variable: id Number of groups = 140
Time variable: year
```



```
One-step results
```

| n | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{n} \\ \mathrm{~L} 1 . \end{array}$ | . 9603675 | . 095608 | 10.04 | 0.000 | . 7729794 | 1.147756 |
| - ${ }_{\text {w }}$ | -. 5433987 | . 068835 | -7.89 | 0.000 | -. 6783128 | -. 4084845 |
| L1. | . 4356183 | . 0881727 | 4.94 | 0.000 | . 262803 | . 6084336 |
| L2. | -. 2785721 | . 1115061 | -2.50 | 0.012 | -. 4971201 | -. 0600241 |
| - | . 3139331 | . 0419054 | 7.49 | 0.000 | . 2317999 | . 3960662 |
| L1. | -. 160103 | . 0546915 | -2.93 | 0.003 | -. 2672963 | -. 0529096 |
| L2. | -. 1295766 | . 0507752 | -2.55 | 0.011 | -. 2290943 | -. 030059 |
| yr1980 | -. 0200704 | . 0248954 | -0.81 | 0.420 | -. 0688644 | . 0287236 |
| yr1981 | -. 0425838 | . 0422155 | -1.01 | 0.313 | -. 1253246 | . 040157 |
| yr1982 | . 0048723 | . 0600938 | 0.08 | 0.935 | -. 1129093 | . 122654 |
| yr1983 | . 0458978 | . 0785687 | 0.58 | 0.559 | -. 1080941 | . 1998897 |
| yr1984 | . 0633219 | . 1026188 | 0.62 | 0.537 | -. 1378074 | . 2644511 |
| year | -. 0075599 | . 019059 | -0.40 | 0.692 | -. 0449148 | . 029795 |
| _cons | 16.20856 | 38.00619 | 0.43 | 0.670 | -58.28221 | 90.69932 |

```
Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(3/.).n
    Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983
        D.yr1984 D.year
Instruments for level equation
    GMM-type: L2D.n
    Standard: _cons
```

The estimate of the coefficient on L.n is now .96. Blundell, Bond, and Windmeijer (2000, 63-65) show that the moment conditions in the system estimator remain informative as the true coefficient on L.n approaches unity. Holtz-Eakin, Newey, and Rosen (1988) show that because the large-sample
distribution of the estimator is derived for fixed number of periods and a growing number of individuals there is no "unit-root" problem.

The results from estat sargan no longer reject the null hypothesis that the overidentifying restrictions are valid.

```
. estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
    HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
    chi2(24) = 27.22585
    Prob > chi2 = 0.2940
```


## - Technical note

To find the valid moment conditions for the model with MA(1) errors, we begin by writing the model

$$
n_{i t}=\alpha n_{i t-1}+\boldsymbol{\beta} x_{i t}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}+\gamma \epsilon_{i t-1}
$$

where the $\epsilon_{i t}$ are assumed to be i.i.d.
Because the composite error, $\epsilon_{i t}+\gamma \epsilon_{i t-1}$, is $\mathrm{MA}(1)$, only lags two or higher are valid instruments for the level equation, assuming the initial condition that $E\left[\nu_{i} \Delta n_{i 2}\right]=0$. The key to this point is that lagging the above equation two periods shows that $\epsilon_{i t-2}$ and $\epsilon_{i t-3}$ appear in the equation for $n_{i t-2}$. Because the $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d., $n_{i t-2}$ is a valid instrument for the level equation with errors $\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}+\gamma \epsilon_{i t-1}$. ( $n_{i t-2}$ will be correlated with $n_{i t-1}$ but uncorrelated with the errors $\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}+\gamma \epsilon_{i t-1}$.) An analogous argument works for higher lags.

First-differencing the above equation yields

$$
\Delta n_{i t}=\alpha \Delta n_{i t-1}+\boldsymbol{\beta} \Delta x_{i t}+\Delta \epsilon_{i t}+\gamma \Delta \epsilon_{i t-1}
$$

Because $\epsilon_{i t-2}$ is the farthest lag of $\epsilon_{i t}$ that appears in the difference equation, lags three or higher are valid instruments for the differenced composite errors. (Lagging the level equation three periods shows that only $\epsilon_{i t-3}$ and $\epsilon_{i t-4}$ appear in the equation for $n_{i t-3}$, which implies that $n_{i t-3}$ is a valid instrument for the current difference equation. An analogous argument works for higher lags.)

## Stored results

xtdpd stores the following in e() :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e\left(t \_\right.$min $)$
$e\left(t \_\right.$max $)$
e(chi2)
e(arm\#)
$e$ (artests)
e(sig2)
e(rss)
e(sargan)
$e$ (rank)
e(zrank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(twostep)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(system)
e(hascons)
e(transform)
e(diffvars)
e(datasignature)
e(properties)
e(estat_cmd)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

Consider dynamic panel-data models of the form

$$
y_{i t}=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_{j} y_{i, t-j}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{w}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where the variables are as defined as in (1).
$\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{w}$ may contain lagged independent variables and time dummies.

Let $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{L}=\left(y_{i, t-1}, y_{i, t-2}, \ldots, y_{i, t-p}, \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \mathbf{w}_{i t}\right)$ be the $1 \times K$ vector of covariates for $i$ at time $t$, where $K=p+k_{1}+k_{2}, p$ is the number of included lags, $k_{1}$ is the number of strictly exogenous variables in $x_{i t}$, and $k_{2}$ is the number of predetermined variables in $w_{i t}$. (The superscript $L$ stands for levels.)

Now rewrite this relationship as a set of $T_{i}$ equations for each individual,

$$
\mathbf{y}_{i}^{L}=\mathbf{X}_{i}^{L} \boldsymbol{\delta}+\nu_{i} \boldsymbol{\iota}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}
$$

where $T_{i}$ is the number of observations available for individual $i ; \mathbf{y}_{i}, \boldsymbol{\iota}_{i}$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}$ are $T_{i} \times 1$, whereas $\mathbf{X}_{i}$ is $T_{i} \times K$.

The estimators use both the levels and a transform of the variables in the above equation. Denote the transformed variables by an ${ }^{*}$, so that $\mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}$ is the transformed $\mathbf{y}_{i}^{L}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{i}^{*}$ is the transformed $\mathbf{X}_{i}^{L}$. The transform may be either the first difference or the forward-orthogonal deviations (FOD) transform. The $(i, t)$ th observation of the FOD transform of a variable $\mathbf{x}$ is given by

$$
x_{i t}^{*}=c_{t}\left\{x_{i t}-\frac{1}{T-t}\left(x_{i t+1}+x_{i t+2}+\cdots+x_{i T}\right)\right\}
$$

where $c_{t}^{2}=(T-t) /(T-t+1)$ and $T$ is the number of observations on x ; see Arellano and Bover (1995) and Arellano (2003).

Here we present the formulas for the Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond system estimator. The formulas for the Arellano-Bond estimator are obtained by setting the additional level matrices in the system estimator to null matrices.

Stacking the transformed and untransformed vectors of the dependent variable for a given $i$ yields

$$
\mathbf{y}_{i}=\binom{\mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}}{\mathbf{y}_{i}^{L}}
$$

Similarly, stacking the transformed and untransformed matrices of the covariates for a given $i$ yields

$$
\mathbf{X}_{i}=\binom{\mathbf{X}_{i}^{*}}{\mathbf{X}_{i}^{L}}
$$

$\mathbf{Z}_{i}$ is a matrix of instruments,

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{i}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathbf{Z}_{d i} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{D}_{i} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{i}^{d} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{Z}_{L i} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{L}_{i} & \mathbf{I}_{i}^{L}
\end{array}\right)
$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_{d i}$ is the matrix of GMM-type instruments created from the dgmmiv() options, $\mathbf{Z}_{L i}$ is the matrix of GMM-type instruments created from the $\operatorname{lgmmiv}()$ options, $\mathbf{D}_{i}$ is the matrix of standard instruments created from the $\operatorname{div}()$ options, $\mathbf{L}_{i}$ is the matrix of standard instruments created from the $\operatorname{liv}()$ options, $\mathbf{I}_{i}^{d}$ is the matrix of standard instruments created from the iv() options for the differenced errors, and $\mathbf{I}_{i}^{L}$ is the matrix of standard instruments created from the iv() options for the level errors.
$\operatorname{div}(), \operatorname{liv}()$, and $\operatorname{iv}()$ simply add columns to instrument matrix. The GMM-type instruments are more involved. Begin by considering a simple balanced-panel example in which our model is

$$
y_{i t}=\alpha_{1} y_{i, t-1}+\alpha_{2} y_{i, t-2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

We do not need to consider covariates because strictly exogenous variables are handled using div(), $i v()$, or $\operatorname{liv}()$, and predetermined or endogenous variables are handled analogous to the dependent variable.

Assume that the data come from a balanced panel in which there are no missing values. After first-differencing the equation, we have

$$
\Delta y_{i t}=\alpha_{1} \Delta y_{i, t-1}+\alpha_{2} \Delta y_{i, t-2}+\Delta \epsilon_{i t}
$$

The first 3 observations are lost to lags and differencing. If we assume that the $\epsilon_{i t}$ are not autocorrelated, for each $i$ at $t=4, y_{i 1}$ and $y_{i 2}$ are valid instruments for the differenced equation. Similarly, at $t=5$, $y_{i 1}, y_{i 2}$, and $y_{i 3}$ are valid instruments. We specify $\operatorname{dgmmiv}(\mathrm{y})$ to obtain an instrument matrix with one row for each period that we are instrumenting:

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{d i}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
y_{i 1} & y_{i 2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & y_{i 1} & y_{i 2} & y_{i 3} & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & y_{i 1} & \ldots & y_{i, T-2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

Because $p=2, \mathbf{Z}_{d i}$ has $T-p-1$ rows and $\sum_{m=p}^{T-2} m$ columns.
Specifying lgmmiv(y) creates the instrument matrix

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{L i}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
\Delta . y_{i 2} & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
0 & \Delta . y_{i 3} & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & \Delta . y_{i\left(T_{i}-1\right)}
\end{array}\right)
$$

This extends to other lag structures with complete data. Unbalanced data and missing observations are handled by dropping the rows for which there are no data and filling in zeros in columns where missing data are required. Suppose that, for some $i$, the $t=1$ observation was missing but was not missing for some other panels. dgmmiv( $y$ ) would then create the instrument matrix

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{d i}=\left(\begin{array}{ccccccccccccc}
0 & 0 & 0 & y_{i 2} & y_{i 3} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & y_{i 2} & y_{i 3} & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & y_{i 2} & \ldots & y_{i T-2}
\end{array}\right)
$$

$\mathbf{Z}_{d i}$ has $T_{i}-p-1$ rows and $\sum_{m=p}^{\tau-2} m$ columns, where $\tau=\max _{i} \tau_{i}$ and $\tau_{i}$ is the number of nonmissing observations in panel $i$.

After defining

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{Q}_{x z}=\sum_{i} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z}_{i} \\
\mathbf{Q}_{z y}=\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{y}_{i} \\
\mathbf{W}_{1}=\mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z}^{\prime} \\
\mathbf{A}_{1}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{H}_{1 i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right)^{-1}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\mathbf{H}_{1 i}=\left(\begin{array}{cc}
\mathbf{H}_{d i} & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{H}_{L i}
\end{array}\right)
$$

the one-step estimates are given by

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1}=\mathbf{W}_{1}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{1} \mathbf{Q}_{z y}
$$

When using the first-difference transform $\mathbf{H}_{d i}$, is given by

$$
\mathbf{H}_{d i}=\left(\begin{array}{cccccc}
1 & -.5 & 0 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
-.5 & 1 & -.5 & \ldots & 0 & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 1 & -.5 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & -.5 & 1
\end{array}\right)
$$

and $\mathbf{H}_{L i}$ is given by 0.5 times the identity matrix. When using the FOD transform, both $\mathbf{H}_{d i}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{L i}$ are equal to the identity matrix.

The transformed one-step residuals are given by

$$
\widehat{\epsilon}_{1 i}^{*}=\mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{*}
$$

which are used to compute

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{1}^{2}=\{1 /(N-K)\} \sum_{i}^{N} \widehat{\epsilon}_{1 i}^{*} \widehat{\epsilon}_{1 i}^{*}
$$

The GMM one-step VCE is then given by

$$
\widehat{V}_{\mathrm{GMM}}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1}\right]=\widehat{\sigma}_{1}^{2} \mathbf{W}_{1}^{-1}
$$

The one-step level residuals are given by

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{L}=\mathbf{y}_{i}^{L}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{L}
$$

Stacking the residual vectors yields

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}=\binom{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{*}}{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{L}}
$$

which is used to compute $\mathbf{H}_{2 i}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}$, which is used in

$$
\mathbf{A}_{2}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{H}_{2 i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right)^{-1}
$$

and the robust one-step VCE is given by

$$
\widehat{V}_{\text {robust }}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1}\right]=\mathbf{W}_{1}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{1} \mathbf{A}_{2}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z}^{\prime} \mathbf{W}_{1}^{-1}
$$

$\widehat{V}_{\text {robust }}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1}\right]$ is robust to heteroskedasticity in the errors.
After defining

$$
\mathbf{W}_{2}=\mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{2} \mathbf{Q}_{x z}^{\prime}
$$

the two-step estimates are given by

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2}=\mathbf{W}_{2}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{2} \mathbf{Q}_{z y}
$$

The GMM two-step VCE is then given by

$$
\widehat{V}_{\mathrm{GMM}}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2}\right]=\mathbf{W}_{2}^{-1}
$$

The GMM two-step VCE is known to be severely biased. Windmeijer (2005) derived the Windmeijer bias-corrected (WC) estimator for the robust VCE of two-step GMM estimators. xtdpd implements this WC-robust estimator of the VCE. The formulas for this method are involved; see Windmeijer (2005). The WC-robust estimator of the VCE is robust to heteroskedasticity in the errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtdpd postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtdpd
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtabond - Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtdpdsys - Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[R] gmm - Generalized method of moments estimation
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtdpd postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtdpd

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins | estat |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Methods and formulas | Reference | Also see |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are of special interest after xtdpd:
Command Description

| estat abond | test for autocorrelation |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat sargan | Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions |

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:
Command Description

| estat summarize |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat vce | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) <br> estimates <br> cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> hausman <br> lincom |
| margins | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| nlcom | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| predictnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, xb e stdp difference]

## Options for predict

Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
e calculates the residual error.
stdp calculates the standard error of the prediction, which can be thought of as the standard error of the predicted expected value or mean for the observation's covariate pattern. The standard error of the prediction is also referred to as the standard error of the fitted value. stdp may not be combined with difference.
difference specifies that the statistic be calculated for the first differences instead of the levels, the default.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of responses for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic

## Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| e | not allowed with margins |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## estat

## Description for estat

estat abond reports the Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation in the first-differenced residuals. estat sargan reports the Sargan test of the overidentifying restrictions.

## Menu for estat

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for estat

Test for autocorrelation

```
estat abond [, artests(#)]
```

Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions

```
estat sargan
```


## Option for estat abond

artests (\#) specifies highest order of serial correlation to be tested. By default, the tests computed during estimation are reported. The model will be refit when artests(\#) specifies a higher order than that computed during the original estimation. The model can only be refit if the data have not changed.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
estat abond
estat sargan

## estat abond

The moment conditions used by xtdpd are valid only if there is no serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors. Testing for serial correlation in dynamic panel-data models is tricky because one needs to apply a transform to remove the panel-level effects, but the transformed errors have a more complicated error structure than the idiosyncratic errors. The Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation reported by estat abond tests for serial correlation in the first-differenced errors.

Because the first difference of independent and identically distributed idiosyncratic errors will be autocorrelated, rejecting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation at order one in the first-differenced errors does not imply that the model is misspecified. Rejecting the null hypothesis at higher orders implies that the moment conditions are not valid. See example 5 in [XT] xtdpd for an alternative estimator that allows for idiosyncratic errors that follow a first-order moving average process.

After the one-step system estimator, the test can be computed only when vce (robust) has been specified.

## estat sargan

Like all GMM estimators, the estimator in xtdpd can produce consistent estimates only if the moment conditions used are valid. Although there is no method to test if the moment conditions from an exactly identified model are valid, one can test whether the overidentifying moment conditions are valid. estat sargan implements the Sargan test of overidentifying conditions discussed in Arellano and Bond (1991).

Only for a homoskedastic error term does the Sargan test have an asymptotic chi-squared distribution. In fact, Arellano and Bond (1991) show that the one-step Sargan test overrejects in the presence of heteroskedasticity. Because its asymptotic distribution is not known under the assumptions of the vce (robust) model, xtdpd does not compute it when vce(robust) is specified.

## Methods and formulas

The notation for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{*}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}, \mathbf{H}_{1 i}, \mathbf{H}_{2 i}, \mathbf{X}_{i}, \mathbf{Z}_{i}, \mathbf{W}_{1}, \mathbf{W}_{2}, \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{*}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{*}\right], \mathbf{A}_{1}, \mathbf{A}_{2}, \mathbf{Q}_{x z}$, and $\widehat{\sigma}_{1}^{2}$ has been defined in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtdpd.

The Arellano-Bond test for zero $m$ th-order autocorrelation in the first-differenced errors is given by

$$
A(m)=\frac{s_{0}}{\sqrt{s_{1}+s_{2}+s_{3}}}
$$

where the definitions of $s_{0}, s_{1}, s_{2}$, and $s_{3}$ vary over the estimators and transforms.

We begin by defining $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{1 i}^{*}=\mathrm{L} m . \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{*}$, with the missing values filled in with zeros. Letting $j=1$ for the one-step estimator, $j=2$ for the two-step estimator, $c=$ GMM for the GMM VCE estimator, and $c=$ robust for the robust VCE estimator, we can now define $s_{0}, s_{1}, s_{2}$, and $s_{3}$ :

$$
\begin{gathered}
s_{0}=\sum_{i} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{* /} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{j i}^{*} \\
s_{1}=\sum_{i} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{* \prime} \mathbf{H}_{j i} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{*} \\
s_{2}=-2 \mathbf{q}_{j i} \mathbf{W}_{j}^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{x z} \mathbf{A}_{j} \mathbf{Q}_{z u} \\
s_{3}=\mathbf{q}_{j x} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{c}\left[\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right] \mathbf{q}_{j x}^{\prime}
\end{gathered}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{q}_{j x}=\left(\sum_{i} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{* \prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)
$$

and $\mathbf{Q}_{z u}$ varies over estimator and transform.
For the Arellano-Bond estimator with the first-differenced transform,

$$
\mathbf{Q}_{z u}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{H}_{j i} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{*}\right)
$$

For the Arellano-Bond estimator with the FOD transform,

$$
\mathbf{Q}_{z u}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{fod}}\right)
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{Q}_{\mathrm{fod}}=\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
-\sqrt{\frac{T_{i}+1}{T_{i}}} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\sqrt{\frac{T_{i}-1}{T_{i}}} & \sqrt{\frac{T_{i}}{T_{i}-1}} & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \cdot & . & \vdots \\
0 & \cdots & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} & -\sqrt{\frac{2}{1}}
\end{array}\right) \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{*}
$$

and * implies the first-differenced transform instead of the FOD transform.
For the Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond system estimator with the first-differenced transform,

$$
\mathbf{Q}_{z u}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{j i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{j i}^{* \prime} \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{j i}^{*}\right)
$$

After a one-step estimator, the Sargan test is

$$
S_{1}=\frac{1}{\widehat{\sigma}_{1}^{2}}\left(\sum_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{1 i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right) \mathbf{A}_{1}\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \widehat{\epsilon}_{1 i}\right)
$$

The transformed two-step residuals are given by

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{2 i}^{*}=\mathbf{y}_{i}^{*}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{*}
$$

and the level two-step residuals are given by

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{2 i}^{L}=\mathbf{y}_{i}^{L}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{L}
$$

Stacking the residual vectors yields

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{2 i}=\binom{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{2 i}^{*}}{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{2 i}^{L}}
$$

After a two-step estimator, the Sargan test is

$$
S_{2}=\left(\sum_{i} \widehat{\epsilon}_{2 i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right) \mathbf{A}_{2}\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \widehat{\epsilon}_{2 i}\right)
$$

## Reference

Arellano, M., and S. Bond. 1991. Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. Review of Economic Studies 58: 277-297.

## Also see

[XT] xtdpd - Linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtdpdsys - Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
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| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
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## Description

xtdpdsys fits a linear dynamic panel-data model where the unobserved panel-level effects are correlated with the lags of the dependent variable. This model is an extension of the Arellano-Bond estimator that accommodates large autoregressive parameters and a large ratio of the variance of the panel-level effect to the variance of idiosyncratic error. This is known as the Arellano-Bover/BlundellBond system estimator. This estimator is designed for datasets with many panels and few periods. This method assumes that there is no autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors and requires that the panel-level effects be uncorrelated with the first difference of the first observation of the dependent variable.

## Quick start

Dynamic panel-data regression of $y$ on $x$ with default Arellano-Bond instruments and lagged difference of $y$
xtdpdsys y x
Add the lagged difference of $x$ as an instrument
xtdpdsys y $x$, pre(x)
Set the maximum number of lags of the dependent variable used as instruments to 2
xtdpdsys $y$ x, maxldep(2)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Dynamic panel data (DPD) $>$ Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond estimation

## Syntax

$$
\text { xtdpdsys depvar }[\text { indepvars }][\text { if }][\text { in }][\text {, options }]
$$

## options

Model

## noconstant

lags(\#)
maxldep(\#)
maxlags(\#)
twostep
Predetermined pre(varlist[...])

Endogenous endogenous (varlist[...])

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
artests(\#)
display_options
coeflegend

Description
suppress constant term
use \# lags of dependent variable as covariates; default is lags (1) maximum lags of dependent variable for use as instruments maximum lags of predetermined and endogenous variables for use as instruments
compute the two-step estimator instead of the one-step estimator
predetermined variables; can be specified more than once
endogenous variables; can be specified more than once
vcetype may be gmm or robust
set confidence level; default is level (95)
use \# as maximum order for AR tests; default is artests(2) control spacing and line width
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use [XT] xtset.
indepvars and all varlists, except pre(varlist [...]) and endogenous (varlist [...]), may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists. The specification of depvar may not contain time-series operators. by, statsby, and xi 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.

## Options

$\underset{\text { noconstant; see }[R] \text { estimation options. }}{\text { Model }}$
lags(\#) sets $p$, the number of lags of the dependent variable to be included in the model. The default is $p=1$.
maxldep(\#) sets the maximum number of lags of the dependent variable that can be used as instruments. The default is to use all $T_{i}-p-2$ lags.
maxlags (\#) sets the maximum number of lags of the predetermined and endogenous variables that can be used as instruments. For predetermined variables, the default is to use all $T_{i}-p-1$ lags. For endogenous variables, the default is to use all $T_{i}-p-2$ lags. twostep specifies that the two-step estimator be calculated.

Predetermined
pre (varlist $[$, lagstruct (prelags, premaxlags) $]$ ) specifies that a set of predetermined variables be included in the model. Optionally, you may specify that prelags lags of the specified variables also be included. The default for prelags is 0 . Specifying premaxlags sets the maximum number of further lags of the predetermined variables that can be used as instruments. The default is to include $T_{i}-p-1$ lagged levels as instruments for predetermined variables. You may specify as many sets of predetermined variables as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set of predetermined variables may have its own number of prelags and premaxlags.

Endogenous
endogenous(varlist [, lagstruct(endlags, endmaxlags)]) specifies that a set of endogenous variables be included in the model. Optionally, you may specify that endlags lags of the specified variables also be included. The default for endlags is 0 . Specifying endmaxlags sets the maximum number of further lags of the endogenous variables that can be used as instruments. The default is to include $T_{i}-p-2$ lagged levels as instruments for endogenous variables. You may specify as many sets of endogenous variables as you need within the standard Stata limits on matrix size. Each set of endogenous variables may have its own number of endlags and endmaxlags.

SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory and that are robust to some kinds of misspecification; see Methods and formulas in [XT] xtdpd.
vce (gmm), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized method of moments estimation.
vce (robust) uses the robust estimator. For the one-step estimator, this is the Arellano-Bond robust VCE estimator. For the two-step estimator, this is the Windmeijer (2005) WC-robust estimator.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
artests(\#) specifies the maximum order of the autocorrelation test to be calculated. The tests are reported by estat abond; see [XT] xtdpdsys postestimation. Specifying the order of the highest test at estimation time is more efficient than specifying it to estat abond, because estat abond must refit the model to obtain the test statistics. The maximum order must be less than or equal the number of periods in the longest panel. The default is artests(2).
display_options: vsquish and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
The following option is available with xtdpdsys but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xtabond, you may want to do so before continuing.
Linear dynamic panel-data models include $p$ lags of the dependent variable as covariates and contain unobserved panel-level effects, fixed or random

Consider the dynamic panel-data model

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_{j} y_{i, t-j}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{w}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \quad i=1, \ldots, N \quad t=1, \ldots, T_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
the $\alpha_{j}$ are $p$ parameters to be estimated,
$\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of strictly exogenous covariates,
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ is a $k_{1} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated,
$\mathbf{w}_{i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of predetermined or endogenous covariates,
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$ is a $k_{2} \times 1$ vector of parameters to be estimated,
$\nu_{i}$ are the panel-level effects (which may be correlated with the covariates), and
$\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. over the whole sample with variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$.

The $\nu_{i}$ and the $\epsilon_{i t}$ are assumed to be independent for each $i$ over all $t$.
By construction, the lagged dependent variables are correlated with the unobserved panel-level effects, making standard estimators inconsistent. Arellano and Bond (1991) derived a consistent generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator for this model. With many panels and few periods, the Arellano-Bond estimator is constructed by first-differencing to remove the panel-level effects and using instruments to form moment conditions.

Blundell and Bond (1998) show that the lagged-level instruments in the Arellano-Bond estimator become weak as the autoregressive process becomes too persistent or the ratio of the variance of the panel-level effects $\nu_{i}$ to the variance of the idiosyncratic error $\epsilon_{i t}$ becomes too large. Building on the work of Arellano and Bover (1995), Blundell and Bond (1998) proposed a system estimator that uses moment conditions in which lagged differences are used as instruments for the level equation in addition to the moment conditions of lagged levels as instruments for the difference equation. The additional moment conditions are valid only if the initial condition $E\left[\nu_{i} \Delta y_{i 2}\right]=0$ holds for all $i$; see Blundell and Bond (1998) and Blundell, Bond, and Windmeijer (2000).
xtdpdsys fits dynamic panel-data estimators with the Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond system estimator. This estimator is designed for datasets with many panels and few periods. This method assumes that there is no autocorrelation in the idiosyncratic errors and requires the initial condition that the panel-level effects be uncorrelated with the first difference of the first observation of the dependent variable. Because xtdpdsys extends xtabond, [XT] xtabond provides useful background.

## > Example 1: A dynamic panel model

In their article, Arellano and Bond (1991) apply their estimators and test statistics to a model of dynamic labor demand that had previously been considered by Layard and Nickell (1986), using data from an unbalanced panel of firms from the United Kingdom. All variables are indexed over the firm $i$ and time $t$. In this dataset, $\mathrm{n}_{i t}$ is the $\log$ of employment in firm $i$ at time $t, \mathrm{w}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the real product wage, $\mathrm{k}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the gross capital stock, and $\mathrm{ys}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of industry output. The model also includes time dummies yr1980, yr1981, yr1982, yr1983, and yr1984.

For comparison, we begin by using xtabond to fit a model to these data.
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/abdata
. xtabond n L(0/2).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year, vce(robust)
Arellano-Bond dynamic panel-data estimation Number of obs $=\quad 611$
Group variable: id
Time variable: year

Number of instruments $=40$
Number of groups = 140

Obs per group:

| $\min =$ | 4 |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| avg | $=$ | 4.364286 |
| $\max$ | $=$ | 6 |
| Wald chi2(13) | $=$ | 1318.68 |
| Prob $>$ chi2 | $=$ | 0.0000 |

One-step results
(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on id)

| n | Coef. | Robust Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }^{n}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . 6286618 | . 1161942 | 5.41 | 0.000 | . 4009254 | . 8563983 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 2891446 | . 140946 | 2.05 | 0.040 | . 0128954 | . 5653937 |
| L2. | -. 0443653 | . 0768135 | -0.58 | 0.564 | -. 194917 | . 1061865 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -- | . 3556923 | . 0603274 | 5.90 | 0.000 | . 2374528 | . 4739318 |
| L1. | -. 0457102 | . 0699732 | -0.65 | 0.514 | -. 1828552 | . 0914348 |
| L2. | -. 0619721 | . 0328589 | -1.89 | 0.059 | -. 1263743 | . 0024301 |
| yr1980 | -. 0282422 | . 0166363 | -1.70 | 0.090 | -. 0608488 | . 0043643 |
| yr1981 | -. 0694052 | . 028961 | -2.40 | 0.017 | -. 1261677 | -. 0126426 |
| yr 1982 | -. 0523678 | . 0423433 | -1.24 | 0.216 | -. 1353591 | . 0306235 |
| yr1983 | -. 0256599 | . 0533747 | -0.48 | 0.631 | -. 1302723 | . 0789525 |
| yr1984 | -. 0093229 | . 0696241 | -0.13 | 0.893 | -. 1457837 | . 1271379 |
| year | . 0019575 | . 0119481 | 0.16 | 0.870 | -. 0214604 | . 0253754 |
| _cons | -2.543221 | 23.97919 | -0.11 | 0.916 | -49.54158 | 44.45514 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w L2D.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982
D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

Instruments for level equation
Standard: _cons

Now we fit the same model by using xtdpdsys:


One-step results

| n | Coef. | Robust <br> Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{n} \\ \mathrm{~L} 1 . \end{array}$ | . 8221535 | . 093387 | 8.80 | 0.000 | . 6391184 | 1.005189 |
| w | -. 5427935 | . 1881721 | -2.88 | 0.004 | -. 911604 | -. 1739831 |
| L1. | . 3703602 | . 1656364 | 2.24 | 0.025 | . 0457189 | . 6950015 |
| L2. | -. 0726314 | . 0907148 | -0.80 | 0.423 | -. 2504292 | . 1051664 |
| k | . 3638069 | . 0657524 | 5.53 | 0.000 | . 2349346 | . 4926792 |
| L1. | -. 1222996 | . 0701521 | -1.74 | 0.081 | -. 2597951 | . 015196 |
| L2. | -. 0901355 | . 0344142 | -2.62 | 0.009 | -. 1575862 | -. 0226849 |
| yr1980 | -. 0308622 | . 016946 | -1.82 | 0.069 | -. 0640757 | . 0023512 |
| yr1981 | -. 0718417 | . 0293223 | -2.45 | 0.014 | -. 1293123 | -. 014371 |
| yr1982 | -. 0384806 | . 0373631 | -1.03 | 0.303 | -. 1117111 | . 0347498 |
| yr1983 | -. 0121768 | . 0498519 | -0.24 | 0.807 | -. 1098847 | . 0855311 |
| yr1984 | -. 0050903 | . 0655011 | -0.08 | 0.938 | -. 1334701 | . 1232895 |
| year | . 0058631 | . 0119867 | 0.49 | 0.625 | -. 0176304 | . 0293566 |
| _cons | -10.59198 | 23.92087 | -0.44 | 0.658 | -57.47602 | 36.29207 |

Instruments for differenced equation
GMM-type: L(2/.).n
Standard: D.w LD.w L2D.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982
D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

Instruments for level equation
GMM-type: LD.n
Standard: _cons
If you are unfamiliar with the L(). () notation, see [U] 13.10 Time-series operators. That the system estimator produces a much higher estimate of the coefficient on lagged employment agrees with the results in Blundell and Bond (1998), who show that the system estimator does not have the downward bias that the Arellano-Bond estimator has when the true value is high.

Comparing the footers illustrates the difference between the two estimators; xtdpdsys includes lagged differences of n as instruments for the level equation, whereas xtabond does not. Comparing the headers shows that xtdpdsys has seven more instruments than xtabond. (As it should; there are 7 observations on LD.n available in the complete panels that run from 1976-1984, after accounting for the first two years that are lost because the model has two lags.) Only the first lags of the variables are used because the moment conditions using higher lags are redundant; see Blundell and Bond (1998) and Blundell, Bond, and Windmeijer (2000).
estat abond reports the Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation in the first-differenced errors. The moment conditions are valid only if there is no serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.

Because the first difference of independent and identically distributed idiosyncratic errors will be autocorrelated, rejecting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation at order one in the first-differenced errors does not imply that the model is misspecified. Rejecting the null hypothesis at higher orders implies that the moment conditions are not valid. See [XT] xtdpd for an alternative estimator in this case.

```
. estat abond
Arellano-Bond test for zero autocorrelation in first-differenced errors
\begin{tabular}{|c|cc|}
\hline Order & \(z\) & Prob > z \\
\hline 1 & -4.6414 & 0.0000 \\
2 & -1.0572 & 0.2904 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
HO: no autocorrelation
```

The above output does not present evidence that the model is misspecified.

## > Example 2: Including predetermined covariates

Sometimes we cannot assume strict exogeneity. Recall that a variable $x_{i t}$ is said to be strictly exogenous if $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $t$ and $s$. If $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right] \neq 0$ for $s<t$ but $E\left[x_{i t} \epsilon_{i s}\right]=0$ for all $s \geq t$, the variable is said to be predetermined. Intuitively, if the error term at time $t$ has some feedback on the subsequent realizations of $x_{i t}, x_{i t}$ is a predetermined variable. Because unforecastable errors today might affect future changes in the real wage and in the capital stock, we might suspect that the $\log$ of the real product wage and the $\log$ of the gross capital stock are predetermined instead of strictly exogenous.


| n | Robust |  |  | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| L1. | . 913278 | . 0460602 | 19.83 | 0.000 | . 8230017 | 1.003554 |
| -- ${ }^{\text {W }}$ | -. 728159 | . 1019044 | -7.15 | 0.000 | -. 9278879 | -. 5284301 |
| L1. | . 5602737 | . 1939617 | 2.89 | 0.004 | . 1801156 | . 9404317 |
| L2. | -. 0523028 | . 1487653 | -0.35 | 0.725 | -. 3438775 | . 2392718 |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --. | .4820097 -.2846944 | . 0760787 | 6.34 -3.42 | 0.000 0.001 | .3328983 -.447742 | .6311212 -.1216446 |
| L2. | -. 1394181 | . 0405709 | -3.44 | 0.001 | -. 2189356 | -. 0599006 |
| yr1980 | -. 0325146 | . 0216371 | -1.50 | 0.133 | -. 0749226 | . 0098935 |
| yr1981 | -. 0726116 | . 0346482 | -2.10 | 0.036 | -. 1405207 | -. 0047024 |
| yr1982 | -. 0477038 | . 0451914 | -1.06 | 0.291 | -. 1362772 | . 0408696 |
| yr1983 | -. 0396264 | . 0558734 | -0.71 | 0.478 | -. 1491362 | . 0698835 |
| yr1984 | -. 0810383 | . 0736648 | -1.10 | 0.271 | -. 2254186 | . 063342 |
| year | . 0192741 | . 0145326 | 1.33 | 0.185 | -. 0092092 | . 0477574 |
| _cons | -37.34972 | 28.77747 | -1.30 | 0.194 | -93.75253 | 19.05308 |

```
Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(2/.).n L(1/.).L2.w L(1/.).L2.k
    Standard: D.yr1980 D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year
Instruments for level equation
    GMM-type: LD.n L2D.w L2D.k
    Standard: _cons
```

The footer informs us that we are now including GMM-type instruments from the first lag of L.w on back and from the first lag of L2.k on back for the differenced errors and the second lags of the differences of w and k as instruments for the level errors.

## Technical note

The above example illustrates that xtdpdsys understands pre(wh, lag(2,.)) to mean that L2. w and $\mathrm{L} 2 . \mathrm{k}$ are predetermined variables. This is a stricter definition than the alternative that pre ( w $\mathrm{k}, \operatorname{lag}(2,)$.$) means only that \mathrm{w} \mathrm{k}$ are predetermined but to include two lags of w and two lags of k in the model. If you prefer the weaker definition, xtdpdsys still gives you consistent estimates, but it is not using all possible instruments; see [XT] xtdpd for an example of how to include all possible instruments.

## Stored results

xtdpdsys stores the following in e() :
Scalars

| $e(N)$ | number of observations |
| :--- | :--- |
| $e\left(N \_g\right)$ | number of groups |
| $e\left(d f \_m\right)$ | model degrees of freedom |
| $e\left(g \_\min \right)$ | smallest group size |
| $e\left(g \_\right.$avg $)$ | average group size |
| $e\left(g \_\max \right)$ | largest group size |
| $e(t \min )$ | minimum time in sample |
| $e(t \max )$ | maximum time in sample |

$e(c h i 2)$
e(arm\#)
$e$ (artests)
e(sig2)
e(rss)
e(sargan)
e(rank)
e(zrank)
$\chi^{2}$
test for autocorrelation of order \#
number of AR tests computed
estimate of $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$
sum of squared differenced residuals
Sargan test statistic
rank of $e(V)$
rank of instrument matrix
Macros

```
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
```

e(depvar)
e(twostep)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(system)
e(hascons)
e(transform)
e(datasignature)
e(properties)
e(estat_cmd)
$e$ (predict)
e(marginsok)
Matrices
e(b) coefficient vector
$e(V) \quad$ variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtdpdsys uses xtdpd to perform its computations, so the formulas are given in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtdpd.
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## Also see

[XT] xtdpdsys postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtdpdsys
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtabond - Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtdpd - Linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtdpdsys postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtdpdsys

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins | estat |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Methods and formulas | Reference | Also see |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are of special interest after xtdpdsys:
Command Description

| estat abond | test for autocorrelation |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat sargan | Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions |

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:
Command Description

| estat summarize |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| estat vce | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) <br> estimates <br> cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> hausman <br> lincom |
| margins | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| nlcom | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| predictnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, xb e stdp difference]

## Options for predict

Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
e calculates the residual error.
stdp calculates the standard error of the prediction, which can be thought of as the standard error of the predicted expected value or mean for the observation's covariate pattern. The standard error of the prediction is also referred to as the standard error of the fitted value. stdp may not be combined with difference.
difference specifies that the statistic be calculated for the first differences instead of the levels, the default.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of responses for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic

## Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| e | not allowed with margins |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## estat

## Description for estat

estat abond reports the Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation in the first-differenced residuals. estat sargan reports the Sargan test of the overidentifying restrictions.

## Menu for estat

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for estat

Test for autocorrelation

```
estat abond [, artests(#)]
```

Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions

```
estat sargan
```


## Option for estat abond

artests(\#) specifies highest order of serial correlation to be tested. By default, the tests computed during estimation are reported. The model will be refit when artests(\#) specifies a higher order than that computed during the original estimation. The model can only be refit if the data have not changed.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
estat abond
estat sargan

## estat abond

The moment conditions used by xtdpdsys are valid only if there is no serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors. Testing for serial correlation in dynamic panel-data models is tricky because one needs to apply a transform to remove the panel-level effects, but the transformed errors have a more complicated error structure than the idiosyncratic errors. The Arellano-Bond test for serial correlation reported by estat abond tests for serial correlation in the first-differenced errors.

Because the first difference of independent and identically distributed idiosyncratic errors will be serially correlated, rejecting the null hypothesis of no serial correlation in the first-differenced errors at order one does not imply that the model is misspecified. Rejecting the null hypothesis at higher orders implies that the moment conditions are not valid. See example 5 in [XT] xtdpd for an alternative estimator that allows for idiosyncratic errors that follow a first-order moving average process.

After the one-step system estimator, the test can be computed only when vce (robust) has been specified.

## estat sargan

Like all GMM estimators, the estimator in xtdpdsys can produce consistent estimates only if the moment conditions used are valid. Although there is no method to test if the moment conditions from an exactly identified model are valid, one can test whether the overidentifying moment conditions are valid. estat sargan implements the Sargan test of overidentifying conditions discussed in Arellano and Bond (1991).

Only for a homoskedastic error term does the Sargan test have an asymptotic chi-squared distribution. In fact, Arellano and Bond (1991) show that the one-step Sargan test overrejects in the presence of heteroskedasticity. Because its asymptotic distribution is not known under the assumptions of the vce (robust) model, xtdpdsys does not compute it when vce (robust) is specified. See [XT] xtdpd for an example in which the null hypothesis of the Sargan test is not rejected.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/abdata
. xtdpdsys n L(0/2).(w k) yr1980-yr1984 year
(output omitted)
. estat sargan
Sargan test of overidentifying restrictions
    HO: overidentifying restrictions are valid
    chi2(33) = 63.63911
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0011
```

The output above presents strong evidence against the null hypothesis that the overidentifying restrictions are valid. Rejecting this null hypothesis implies that we need to reconsider our model or our instruments, unless we attribute the rejection to heteroskedasticity in the data-generating process. Although performing the Sargan test after the two-step estimator is an alternative, Arellano and Bond (1991) found a tendency for this test to underreject in the presence of heteroskedasticity.

## Methods and formulas

The formulas are given in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtdpd postestimation.

## Reference

Arellano, M., and S. Bond. 1991. Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. Review of Economic Studies 58: 277-297.

## Also see

[XT] xtdpdsys - Arellano-Bover/Blundell-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtfrontier - Stochastic frontier models for panel data

Description<br>Menu<br>Options for time-invariant model<br>Remarks and examples<br>Methods and formulas<br>Also see

## Quick start

Syntax
Options for time-varying decay model
Stored results
References

## Description

xtfrontier fits stochastic production or cost frontier models for panel data where the disturbance term is a mixture of an inefficiency term and the idiosyncratic error. xtfrontier can fit a timeinvariant model, in which the inefficiency term is assumed to have a truncated-normal distribution, or a time-varying decay model, in which the inefficiency term is modeled as a truncated-normal random variable multiplied by a function of time.
xtfrontier expects that the dependent variable and independent variables are on the natural logarithm scale; this transformation must be performed before estimation takes place.

## Quick start

Stochastic production frontier regression of $\ln y$ on $\ln x 1$ and $\ln x 2$ with time-invariant inefficiency using xtset data
xtfrontier lny lnx1 lnx2, ti
Stochastic cost frontier regression of lny on $\ln x 1$ and $\ln x 2$ with time-invariant inefficiency xtfrontier lny $\operatorname{lnx} 1 \ln x 2$, ti cost

Time-varying decay model for production xtfrontier lny lnx1 lnx2, tvd

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Frontier models

## Syntax

Time-invariant model
xtfrontier depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], ti [ti_options]

Time-varying decay model
xtfrontier depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], tvd [tvd_options]
ti_options
Model
noconstant
ti
cost
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE
vce(vcetype) vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
Reporting
level(\#)
nocnsreport
display_options
Description
suppress constant term use time-invariant model
fit cost frontier model
apply specified linear constraints keep collinear variables
set confidence level; default is level (95)
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Maximization

maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics
tvd_options
Description
Model
noconstant
tvd
cost
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level (\#)
nocnsreport
display_options
suppress constant term
use time-varying decay model
fit cost frontier model
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified. For xtfrontier, tvd, a time variable must also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, fp, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
fweights and iweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for time-invariant model

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
ti specifies that the parameters of the time-invariant technical inefficiency model be estimated. cost specifies that the frontier model be fit in terms of a cost function instead of a production function. By default, xtfrontier fits a production frontier model. constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.

SE
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec) iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from (init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtfrontier but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for time-varying decay model

Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
tvd specifies that the parameters of the time-varying decay model be estimated.
cost specifies that the frontier model be fit in terms of a cost function instead of a production function. By default, xtfrontier fits a production frontier model.
constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.

## SE

vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% fimt), sformat (\% firt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtfrontier but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
Introduction
Time-invariant model
Time-varying decay model

## Introduction

Stochastic production frontier models were introduced by Aigner, Lovell, and Schmidt (1977) and Meeusen and van den Broeck (1977). Since then, stochastic frontier models have become a popular subfield in econometrics; see Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) for an introduction. xtfrontier fits two stochastic frontier models with distinct specifications of the inefficiency term and can fit both production- and cost-frontier models.

Let's review the nature of the stochastic frontier problem. Suppose that a producer has a production function $f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$. In a world without error or inefficiency, in time $t$, the $i$ th firm would produce

$$
q_{i t}=f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)
$$

A fundamental element of stochastic frontier analysis is that each firm potentially produces less than it might because of a degree of inefficiency. Specifically,

$$
q_{i t}=f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \xi_{i t}
$$

where $\xi_{i t}$ is the level of efficiency for firm $i$ at time $t$; $\xi_{i}$ must be in the interval $(0,1]$. If $\xi_{i t}=1$, the firm is achieving the optimal output with the technology embodied in the production function $f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$. When $\xi_{i t}<1$, the firm is not making the most of the inputs $\mathbf{z}_{i t}$ given the technology embodied in the production function $f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$. Because the output is assumed to be strictly positive (that is, $q_{i t}>0$ ), the degree of technical efficiency is assumed to be strictly positive (that is, $\xi_{i t}>0$ ).

Output is also assumed to be subject to random shocks, implying that

$$
q_{i t}=f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \xi_{i t} \exp \left(v_{i t}\right)
$$

Taking the natural $\log$ of both sides yields

$$
\ln \left(q_{i t}\right)=\ln \left\{f\left(\mathbf{z}_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}+\ln \left(\xi_{i t}\right)+v_{i t}
$$

Assuming that there are $k$ inputs and that the production function is linear in logs, defining $u_{i t}=-\ln \left(\xi_{i t}\right)$ yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \left(q_{i t}\right)=\beta_{0}+\sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_{j} \ln \left(z_{j i t}\right)+v_{i t}-u_{i t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because $u_{i t}$ is subtracted from $\ln \left(q_{i t}\right)$, restricting $u_{i t} \geq 0$ implies that $0<\xi_{i t} \leq 1$, as specified above.

Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) provide a detailed version of this derivation, and they show that performing an analogous derivation in the dual cost function problem allows us to specify the problem as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \left(c_{i t}\right)=\beta_{0}+\beta_{q} \ln \left(q_{i t}\right)+\sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_{j} \ln \left(p_{j i t}\right)+v_{i t}-s u_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $q_{i t}$ is output, the $z_{j i t}$ are input quantities, $c_{i t}$ is cost, the $p_{j i t}$ are input prices, and

$$
s=\left\{\begin{aligned}
1, & \text { for production functions } \\
-1, & \text { for cost functions }
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

Intuitively, the inefficiency effect is required to lower output or raise expenditure, depending on the specification.

## - Technical note

The model that xtfrontier actually fits has the form

$$
y_{i t}=\beta_{0}+\sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_{j} x_{j i t}+v_{i t}-s u_{i t}
$$

so in the context of the discussion above, $y_{i t}=\ln \left(q_{i t}\right)$ and $x_{j i t}=\ln \left(z_{j i t}\right)$ for a production function; for a cost function, $y_{i t}=\ln \left(c_{i t}\right)$, the $x_{j i t}$ are the $\ln \left(p_{j i t}\right)$, and $\ln \left(q_{i t}\right)$. You must perform the natural logarithm transformation of the data before estimation to interpret the estimation results correctly for a stochastic frontier production or cost model. xtfrontier does not perform any transformations on the data.

As shown above, the disturbance term in a stochastic frontier model is assumed to have two components. One component is assumed to have a strictly nonnegative distribution, and the other component is assumed to have a symmetric distribution. In the econometrics literature, the nonnegative component is often referred to as the inefficiency term, and the component with the symmetric distribution as the idiosyncratic error.

Equation (2) is a variant of a panel-data model in which $v_{i t}$ is the idiosyncratic error and $u_{i t}$ is a time-varying panel-level effect. Much of the literature on this model has focused on deriving estimators for different specifications of the $u_{i t}$ term. Kumbhakar and Lovell (2000) provide a survey of this literature.
xtfrontier provides estimators for two different specifications of $u_{i t}$. To facilitate the discussion, let $N^{+}\left(\mu, \sigma^{2}\right)$ denote the truncated-normal distribution, which is truncated at zero with mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^{2}$, and let $\stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim}$ stand for independent and identically distributed.

Consider the simplest specification in which the inefficiency term $u_{i t}$ is a time-invariant truncatednormal random variable. In the time-invariant model, $u_{i t}=u_{i}, u_{i} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N^{+}\left(\mu, \sigma_{u}^{2}\right), v_{i t} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N\left(0, \sigma_{v}^{2}\right)$, and $u_{i}$ and $v_{i t}$ are distributed independently of each other and the covariates in the model. Specifying the ti option causes xtfrontier to estimate the parameters of this model.

In the Battese-Coelli (1992) parameterization of time effects, the inefficiency term is modeled as a truncated-normal random variable multiplied by a specific function of time. In the time-varying decay specification,

$$
u_{i t}=\exp \left\{-\eta\left(t-T_{i}\right)\right\} u_{i}
$$

where $T_{i}$ is the last period in the $i$ th panel, $\eta$ is the decay parameter, $u_{i} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N^{+}\left(\mu, \sigma_{u}^{2}\right), v_{i t} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N\left(0, \sigma_{v}^{2}\right)$, and $u_{i}$ and $v_{i t}$ are distributed independently of each other and the covariates in the model. Specifying the tvd option causes xtfrontier to estimate the parameters of this model.

## Time-invariant model

## > Example 1

xtfrontier, ti provides maximum likelihood estimates for the parameters of the time-invariant decay model. In this model, the inefficiency effects are modeled as $u_{i t}=u_{i}, u_{i} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N^{+}\left(\mu, \sigma_{u}^{2}\right)$, $v_{i t} \stackrel{\mathrm{id}}{\sim} N\left(0, \sigma_{v}^{2}\right)$, and $u_{i}$ and $v_{i t}$ are distributed independently of each other and the covariates in the model. In this example, firms produce a product called a widget, using a constant-returns-toscale technology. We have 948 observations- 91 firms, with 6-14 observations per firm. Our dataset contains variables representing the quantity of widgets produced, the number of machine hours used in production, the number of labor hours used in production, and three additional variables that are the natural logarithm transformations of the three aforementioned variables.

We fit a time-invariant model using the transformed variables:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtfrontier1
. xtfrontier lnwidgets lnmachines lnworkers, ti
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -1473.8703
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -1473.0565
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -1472.6155
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -1472.607
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -1472.6069
Time-invariant inefficiency model 
\begin{tabular}{rlr} 
& \(\min =\) & 6 \\
\(\operatorname{avg}=\) & 10.4 \\
Log likelihood \(=-1472.6069\) & \(\max =\) & 14 \\
& & \(=\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| lnwidgets | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| lnmachines | .2904551 | .0164219 | 17.69 | 0.000 | .2582688 | .3226415 |
| lnworkers | .2943333 | .0154352 | 19.07 | 0.000 | .2640808 | .3245858 |
| _cons | 3.030983 | .1441022 | 21.03 | 0.000 | 2.748548 | 3.313418 |
| /mu | 1.125667 | .6479217 | 1.74 | 0.082 | -.144236 | 2.39557 |
| /lnsigma2 | 1.421979 | .2672745 | 5.32 | 0.000 | .898131 | 1.945828 |
| /ilgtgamma | 1.138685 | .3562642 | 3.20 | 0.001 | .4404204 | 1.83695 |
| sigma2 | 4.145318 | 1.107938 |  |  | 2.455011 | 6.999424 |
| gamma | .7574382 | .0654548 |  |  | .6083592 | .8625876 |
| sigma_u2 | 3.139822 | 1.107235 |  |  | .9696821 | 5.309962 |
| sigma_v2 | 1.005496 | .0484143 |  |  | .9106055 | 1.100386 |

In addition to the coefficients, the output reports estimates for the parameters sigma_v2, sigma_u2, gamma, sigma2, ilgtgamma, lnsigma2, and mu. sigma_v2 is the estimate of $\sigma_{v}^{2}$. sigma_u2 is the estimate of $\sigma_{u}^{2}$. gamma is the estimate of $\gamma=\sigma_{u}^{2} / \sigma_{S}^{2}$. sigma2 is the estimate of $\sigma_{S}^{2}=\sigma_{v}^{2}+\sigma_{u}^{2}$. Because $\gamma$ must be between 0 and 1, the optimization is parameterized in terms of the logit of
$\gamma$, and this estimate is reported as ilgtgamma. Because $\sigma_{S}^{2}$ must be positive, the optimization is parameterized in terms of $\ln \left(\sigma_{S}^{2}\right)$, and this estimate is reported as lnsigma2. Finally, mu is the estimate of $\mu$.

## Technical note

Our simulation results indicate that this estimator requires relatively large samples to achieve any reasonable degree of precision in the estimates of $\mu$ and $\sigma_{u}^{2}$.

## Time-varying decay model

xtfrontier, tvd provides maximum likelihood estimates for the parameters of the time-varying decay model. In this model, the inefficiency effects are modeled as

$$
u_{i t}=\exp \left\{-\eta\left(t-T_{i}\right)\right\} u_{i}
$$

where $u_{i} \stackrel{\text { iid }}{\sim} N^{+}\left(\mu, \sigma_{u}^{2}\right)$.
When $\eta>0$, the degree of inefficiency decreases over time; when $\eta<0$, the degree of inefficiency increases over time. Because $t=T_{i}$ in the last period, the last period for firm $i$ contains the base level of inefficiency for that firm. If $\eta>0$, the level of inefficiency decays toward the base level. If $\eta<0$, the level of inefficiency increases to the base level.
$>$ Example 2
When $\eta=0$, the time-varying decay model reduces to the time-invariant model. The following example illustrates this property and demonstrates how to specify constraints and starting values in these models.

Let's begin by fitting the time-varying decay model on the same data that were used in the previous example for the time-invariant model.

| Iteration 0: log likelihood = -1551.3798 | (not concave) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 1: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-1502.2637$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 2: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-1476.3093$ | (not concave) |  |  |
| Iteration 3: $\quad \mathrm{log}$ likelihood $=-1472.9845$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 4: $\quad \mathrm{log}$ likelihood $=-1472.5365$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 5: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-1472.529$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 6: log likelihood $=-1472.5289$ |  |  |  |
| Time-varying decay inefficiency model | Number of obs | = | 948 |
| Group variable: id | Number of groups | = | 91 |
| Time variable: t | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | = | 6 |
|  | avg | = | 10.4 |
|  | max | = | 14 |
|  | Wald chi2(2) | = | 661.93 |
| Log likelihood = -1472.5289 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| lnwidgets | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| lnmachines | .2907555 | .0164376 | 17.69 | 0.000 | .2585384 | .3229725 |
| lnworkers | .2942412 | .0154373 | 19.06 | 0.000 | .2639846 | .3244978 |
| _cons | 3.028939 | .1436046 | 21.09 | 0.000 | 2.74748 | 3.310399 |
| /mu | 1.110831 | .6452809 | 1.72 | 0.085 | -.1538967 | 2.375558 |
| /eta | .0016764 | .00425 | 0.39 | 0.693 | -.0066535 | .0100064 |
| /lnsigma2 | 1.410723 | .2679485 | 5.26 | 0.000 | .885554 | 1.935893 |
| /ilgtgamma | 1.123982 | .3584243 | 3.14 | 0.002 | .4214828 | 1.82648 |
| sigma2 | 4.098919 | 1.098299 |  |  | 2.424327 | 6.930228 |
| gamma | .7547265 | .0663495 |  |  | .603838 | .8613419 |
| sigma_u2 | 3.093563 | 1.097606 |  |  | .9422943 | 5.244832 |
| sigma_v2 | 1.005356 | .0484079 |  |  | .9104785 | 1.100234 |

The estimate of $\eta$ is close to zero, and the other estimates are not too far from those of the time-invariant model.

We can use constraint to constrain $\eta=0$ and obtain the same results produced by the timeinvariant model. Although there is only one statistical equation to be estimated in this model, the model fits five of Stata's [R] ml equations; see [R] ml or Gould, Pitblado, and Poi (2010). The equation names can be seen by listing the matrix of estimated coefficients.

```
. matrix list e(b)
e(b)[1,7]
    lnwidgets: lnwidgets: lnwidgets: lnsigma2: ilgtgamma: mu:
y1 rrrrrern
eta:
```

To constrain a parameter to a particular value in any equation, except the first equation, you must specify both the equation name and the parameter name by using the syntax
constraint \# [eqname] _b [varname] = value or
constraint \# [eqname] coefficient $=$ value
where eqname is the equation name, varname is the name of the variable in a linear equation, and coefficient refers to any parameter that has been estimated. More elaborate specifications with
expressions are possible; see the example with constant returns to scale below, and see $[\mathrm{R}]$ constraint for general reference.

Suppose that we impose the constraint $\eta=0$; we get the same results as those reported above for the time-invariant model, except for some minute differences attributable to an alternate convergence path in the optimization.

```
. constraint 1 [eta]_cons = 0
. xtfrontier lnwidgets lnmachines lnworkers, tvd constraints(1)
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -1540.7124 (not concave)
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -1515.7726
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -1473.0162
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -1472.9223
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -1472.6254
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -1472.607
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -1472.6069
```

| Time-varying decay inefficiency model | Number of obs | 948 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: id | Number of groups | 91 |
| Time variable: t | Obs per group: |  |
|  | min | 6 |
|  | avg | 10.4 |
|  | max | 14 |
|  | Wald chi2(2) | 661.76 |
| Log likelihood = -1472.6069 | Prob > chi2 | 0.0000 |

    ( 1) [eta]_cons \(=0\)
    | lnwidgets | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| lnmachines | .2904551 | .0164219 | 17.69 | 0.000 | .2582688 | .3226414 |
| lnworkers | .2943332 | .0154352 | 19.07 | 0.000 | .2640807 | .3245857 |
| _cons | 3.030963 | .1440995 | 21.03 | 0.000 | 2.748534 | 3.313393 |
| /mu | 1.125507 | .6480444 | 1.74 | 0.082 | -.1446369 | 2.39565 |
| /eta | 0 | (omitted) |  |  |  |  |
| /lnsigma2 | 1.422039 | .2673128 | 5.32 | 0.000 | .8981155 | 1.945962 |
| /ilgtgamma | 1.138764 | .3563076 | 3.20 | 0.001 | .4404135 | 1.837114 |
| sigma2 | 4.145565 | 1.108162 |  |  | 2.454972 | 7.000366 |
| gamma | .7574526 | .0654602 |  |  | .6083575 | .862607 |
| sigma_u2 | 3.140068 | 1.107459 |  |  | .9694878 | 5.310649 |
| sigma_v2 | 1.005496 | .0484143 |  |  | .9106057 | 1.100386 |

## Stored results

xtfrontier stores the following in e() :
Scalars

```
e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(k)
    e(k_eq)
    e(k_eq_model)
    e(k_dv)
    e(df_m)
    e(ll)
    e(g_min)
    e(g_avg)
    e(g_max)
    e(sigma2)
    e(gamma)
    e(Tcon)
    e(sigma_u)
    e(sigma_v)
    e(chi2)
    e(p)
    e(rank)
    e(ic)
    e(rc)
    e(converged)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(function)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
(e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(V)

Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
number of observations
number of groups
number of parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
sigma2
gamma
1 if panels balanced; 0 otherwise
standard deviation of random error
$\chi^{2}$
model significance
rank of e(V)
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise

## xtfrontier

command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
production or cost
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
type of optimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$ (up to 20 iterations)
number of equations in overall model test
minimum number of observations per group
average number of observations per group
maximum number of observations per group
standard deviation of technical inefficiency
ti, after time-invariant model; tvd, after time-varying decay model
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators

## Methods and formulas

xtfrontier fits stochastic frontier models for panel data that can be expressed as

$$
y_{i t}=\beta_{0}+\sum_{j=1}^{k} \beta_{j} x_{j i t}+v_{i t}-s u_{i t}
$$

where $y_{i t}$ is the natural logarithm of output, the $x_{j i t}$ are the natural logarithm of the input quantities for the production efficiency problem, $y_{i t}$ is the natural logarithm of costs, the $x_{i t}$ are the natural logarithm of input prices for the cost efficiency problem, and

$$
s=\left\{\begin{aligned}
1, & \text { for production functions } \\
-1, & \text { for cost functions }
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

For the time-varying decay model, the log-likelihood function is derived as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln L= & -\frac{1}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} T_{i}\right)\left\{\ln (2 \pi)+\ln \left(\sigma_{S}^{2}\right)\right\}-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(T_{i}-1\right) \ln (1-\gamma) \\
& -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \left\{1+\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t}^{2}-1\right) \gamma\right\}-N \ln \{1-\Phi(-\widetilde{z})\}-\frac{1}{2} N \widetilde{z}^{2} \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \left\{1-\Phi\left(-z_{i}^{*}\right)\right\}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} z_{i}^{* 2}-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \frac{\epsilon_{i t}^{2}}{(1-\gamma) \sigma_{S}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\sigma_{S}=\left(\sigma_{u}^{2}+\sigma_{v}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}, \gamma=\sigma_{u}^{2} / \sigma_{S}^{2}, \epsilon_{i t}=y_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \eta_{i t}=\exp \left\{-\eta\left(t-T_{i}\right)\right\}, \widetilde{z}=\mu /\left(\gamma \sigma_{S}^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}$, $\Phi()$ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal distribution, and

$$
z_{i}^{*}=\frac{\mu(1-\gamma)-s \gamma \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t} \epsilon_{i t}}{\left[\gamma(1-\gamma) \sigma_{S}^{2}\left\{1+\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t}^{2}-1\right) \gamma\right\}\right]^{1 / 2}}
$$

Maximizing the above $\log$ likelihood estimates the coefficients $\eta, \mu, \sigma_{v}$, and $\sigma_{u}$.
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## Also see

[XT] xtfrontier postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtfrontier
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[R] frontier - Stochastic frontier models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtfrontier postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtfrontier

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtfrontier:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lincom | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| margins | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| marginsplot |  |
| nlcom | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | pairwise comparisons of estimates <br> predictnl <br> pwcompare <br> test |
| testnl | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, standard errors, and technical efficiencies.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic]
statistic Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
$\mathrm{u} \quad$ minus the natural log of the technical efficiency via $E\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)$
$\mathrm{m} \quad$ minus the natural $\log$ of the technical efficiency via $M\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)$
te the technical efficiency via $E\left\{\exp \left(-s u_{i t}\right) \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right\}$
where

$$
s=\left\{\begin{aligned}
1, & \text { for production functions } \\
-1, & \text { for cost functions }
\end{aligned}\right.
$$

## Options for predict

xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
u produces estimates of minus the natural $\log$ of the technical efficiency via $E\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)$.
m produces estimates of minus the natural $\log$ of the technical efficiency via the mode, $M\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)$. te produces estimates of the technical efficiency via $E\left\{\exp \left(-s u_{i t}\right) \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right\}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic Description
xb
stdp
u
m not allowed with margins
te not allowed with margins

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

$>$ Example 1
A production function exhibits constant returns to scale if doubling the amount of each input results in a doubling in the quantity produced. When the production function is linear in logs, constant returns to scale implies that the sum of the coefficients on the inputs is one. In example 2 of [XT] xtfrontier, we fit a time-varying decay model. Here we test whether the estimated production function exhibits constant returns:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtfrontier1
. xtfrontier lnwidgets lnmachines lnworkers, tvd
    (output omitted)
. test lnmachines + lnworkers = 1
( 1) [lnwidgets]lnmachines + [lnwidgets]lnworkers = 1
    chi2( 1) = 331.55
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

The test statistic is highly significant, so we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that this production function does not exhibit constant returns to scale.

The previous Wald $\chi^{2}$ test indicated that the sum of the coefficients does not equal one. An alternative is to use lincom to compute the sum explicitly:
. lincom lnmachines + lnworkers
( 1) [lnwidgets]lnmachines + [lnwidgets]lnworkers $=0$

| lnwidgets | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1)$ | .5849967 | .0227918 | 25.67 | 0.000 | .5403256 | .6296677 |

The sum of the coefficients is significantly less than one, so this production function exhibits decreasing returns to scale. If we doubled the number of machines and workers, we would obtain less than twice as much output.

## Methods and formulas

Continuing from the Methods and formulas section of [XT] xtfrontier, estimates for $u_{i t}$ can be obtained from the mean or the mode of the conditional distribution $f(u \mid \epsilon)$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)=\widetilde{\mu}_{i}+\widetilde{\sigma}_{i}\left\{\frac{\phi\left(-\widetilde{\mu}_{i} / \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}\right)}{1-\Phi\left(-\widetilde{\mu}_{i} / \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}\right)}\right\} \\
& M\left(u_{i t} \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right)= \begin{cases}-\widetilde{\mu}_{i}, & \text { if } \widetilde{\mu}_{i}>=0 \\
0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\mu}_{i} & =\frac{\mu \sigma_{v}^{2}-s \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t} \epsilon_{i t} \sigma_{u}^{2}}{\sigma_{v}^{2}+\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t}^{2} \sigma_{u}^{2}} \\
\widetilde{\sigma}_{i}^{2} & =\frac{\sigma_{v}^{2} \sigma_{u}^{2}}{\sigma_{v}^{2}+\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \eta_{i t}^{2} \sigma_{u}^{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

These estimates can be obtained from predict newvar, u and predict newvar, m, respectively, and are calculated by plugging in the estimated parameters.
predict newvar, te produces estimates of the technical-efficiency term. These estimates are obtained from

$$
E\left\{\exp \left(-s u_{i t}\right) \mid \epsilon_{i t}\right\}=\left[\frac{1-\Phi\left\{s \eta_{i t} \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}-\left(\widetilde{\mu}_{i} / \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}\right)\right\}}{1-\Phi\left(-\widetilde{\mu}_{i} / \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}\right)}\right] \exp \left(-s \eta_{i t} \widetilde{\mu}_{i}+\frac{1}{2} \eta_{i t}^{2} \widetilde{\sigma}_{i}^{2}\right)
$$

Replacing $\eta_{i t}=1$ and $\eta=0$ in these formulas produces the formulas for the time-invariant models.

## Also see

[XT] xtfrontier - Stochastic frontier models for panel data
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtgee fits population-averaged panel-data models. In particular, xtgee fits generalized linear models and allows you to specify the within-group correlation structure for the panels.

See $[R]$ logistic and $[R]$ regress for lists of related estimation commands.

## Quick start

Population-averaged linear regression of y on x 1 and x 2
xtgee $y$ x1 x2
As above, but estimate time-varying intragroup correlations xtgee y x1 x2, corr (unstructured)

As above, but estimate a common second-order autoregression structure for the within-panel correlation xtgee $y \mathrm{x} 1 \mathrm{x} 2$, corr (ar 2)

Population-averaged negative binomial regression of y2 on x 3 and x 4 equivalent to xtnbreg , pa xtgee $y 2$ x3 x4, family(nbinomial 1)

Population-averaged logistic regression of y3 on $x 5$ and $x 6$ when $y 3$ is the number of events out of 10 trials
xtgee $y 3$ x5 x6, family(binomial 10)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Generalized estimating equations (GEE) $>$ Generalized estimating equations (GEE)

## Syntax

xtgee depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
options

Model
family (family)
link (link)
Model 2
exposure (varname)
offset (varname)
noconstant
asis
force
Correlation
corr (correlation)
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
rgf
scale (parm)
Reporting
level(\#)
eform
display_options

Description
distribution of depvar
link function
include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
suppress constant term
retain perfect predictor variables
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
within-group correlation structure
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$
multiply the robust variance estimate by $(N-1) /(N-P)$
overrides the default scale parameter; parm may be x2, dev, phi, or \#
set confidence level; default is level(95)
report exponentiated coefficients
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
control the optimization process; seldom used
suppress display of header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics

Optimization
optimize_options
nodisplay
coeflegend

A panel variable must be specified. Correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4 varlists.
by, mfp, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
vce (bootstrap) and vce (jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
nodisplay and coeflegend do not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.
family
Description
gaussian
igaussian
binomial[\#|varname]
poisson
nbinomial[\#]
gamma

Gaussian (normal); family (normal) is a synonym inverse Gaussian
Bernoulli/binomial
Poisson
negative binomial gamma
link
identity
log
logit
probit
cloglog
power [\#]
opower [\#]
nbinomial
reciprocal

Link function/definition
identity; $y=y$
$\log ; \ln (y)$
logit; $\ln \{y /(1-y)\}$, natural $\log$ of the odds
probit; $\Phi^{-1}(y)$, where $\Phi()$ is the normal cumulative distribution
cloglog; $\ln \{-\ln (1-y)\}$
power; $y^{k}$ with $k=\# ; \#=1$ if not specified
odds power; $\left[\{y /(1-y)\}^{k}-1\right] / k$ with $k=\#$; \# = 1 if not specified
negative binomial; $\ln \{y /(y+\alpha)\}$
reciprocal; $1 / y$
correlation
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#

Description
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

## Options

$\xrightarrow{\text { Model }}$
family (family) specifies the distribution of depvar; family (gaussian) is the default.
link (link) specifies the link function; the default is the canonical link for the family() specified (except for family (nbinomial)).

Model 2
exposure (varname) and offset(varname) are different ways of specifying the same thing. exposure() specifies a variable that reflects the amount of exposure over which the depvar events were observed for each observation; $\ln$ (varname) with coefficient constrained to be 1 is entered into the regression equation. offset () specifies a variable that is to be entered directly into the log-link function with its coefficient constrained to be 1 ; thus, exposure is assumed to be $e^{\text {varname }}$. If you were fitting a Poisson regression model, family (poisson) link(log), for instance, you would account for exposure time by specifying offset() containing the log of exposure time.
noconstant specifies that the linear predictor has no intercept term, thus forcing it through the origin on the scale defined by the link function.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit. This option is only allowed with option family (binomial) with a denominator of 1.
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

## Correlation

corr (correlation) specifies the within-group correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).

When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).
If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr(fixed myr).

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
vce (robust) specifies that the Huber/White/sandwich estimator of variance is to be used in place of the default conventional variance estimator (see Methods and formulas below). Use of this option causes xtgee to produce valid standard errors even if the correlations within group are not as hypothesized by the specified correlation structure. Under a noncanonical link, it does, however, require that the model correctly specifies the mean. The resulting standard errors are thus labeled "semirobust" instead of "robust" in this case. Although there is no vce (cluster clustvar) option, results are as if this option were included and you specified clustering on the panel variable.
nmp; see [XT] vce_options.
rgf specifies that the robust variance estimate is multiplied by $(N-1) /(N-P)$, where $N$ is the total number of observations and $P$ is the number of coefficients estimated. This option can be used only with family (gaussian) when vce(robust) is either specified or implied by the use of pweights. Using this option implies that the robust variance estimate is not invariant to the scale of any weights used.
scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.
eform displays the exponentiated coefficients and corresponding standard errors and confidence intervals as described in [R] maximize. For family (binomial) link(logit) (that is, logistic regression), exponentiation results in odds ratios; for family (poisson) link(log) (that is, Poisson regression), exponentiated coefficients are incidence-rate ratios.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\% fimt), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Optimization }}$
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate (\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate(100).
tolerance (\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance $(1 e-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following options are available with xtgee but are not shown in the dialog box: nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses display of the header and coefficients. coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

For a thorough introduction to GEE in the estimation of GLM, see Hardin and Hilbe (2013). More information on linear models is presented in Nelder and Wedderburn (1972). Finally, there have been several illuminating articles on various applications of GEE in Zeger, Liang, and Albert (1988); Zeger and Liang (1986), and Liang (1987). Pendergast et al. (1996) surveys the current methods for analyzing clustered data in regard to binary response data. Our implementation follows that of Liang and Zeger (1986).
xtgee fits generalized linear models of $y_{i t}$ with covariates $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$

$$
g\left\{E\left(y_{i t}\right)\right\}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad y \sim F \text { with parameters } \theta_{i t}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, m$ and $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}$, where there are $n_{i}$ observations for each group identifier $i . g()$ is called the link function, and $F$ is the distributional family. Substituting various definitions for $g()$ and $F$ results in a wide array of models. For instance, if $y_{i t}$ is distributed Gaussian (normal) and $g()$ is the identity function, we have

$$
E\left(y_{i t}\right)=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad y \sim N()
$$

yielding linear regression, random-effects regression, or other regression-related models, depending on what we assume for the correlation structure.

If $g()$ is the logit function and $y_{i t}$ is distributed Bernoulli (binomial), we have

$$
\operatorname{logit}\left\{E\left(y_{i t}\right)\right\}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad y \sim \text { Bernoulli }
$$

or logistic regression. If $g()$ is the natural $\log$ function and $y_{i t}$ is distributed Poisson, we have

$$
\ln \left\{E\left(y_{i t}\right)\right\}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad y \sim \text { Poisson }
$$

or Poisson regression, also known as the log-linear model. Other combinations are possible.
You specify the link function with the link() option, the distributional family with family(), and the assumed within-group correlation structure with corr().

The binomial distribution can be specified as case 1 family (binomial), case 2 family (binomial \#), or case 3 family (binomial varname). In case 2 , \# is the value of the binomial denominator $N$, the number of trials. Specifying family (binomial 1) is the same as specifying family (binomial); both mean that $y$ has the Bernoulli distribution with values 0 and 1 only. In case 3 , varname is the variable containing the binomial denominator, thus allowing the number of trials to vary across observations.

The negative binomial distribution must be specified as family (nbinomial \#), where \# denotes the value of the parameter $\alpha$ in the negative binomial distribution. The results will be conditional on this value.

You do not have to specify both family() and link(); the default link() is the canonical link for the specified family() (excluding family(nbinomial)):

| Family | Default link |
| :--- | :--- |
| family (binomial) | link(logit) |
| family (gamma) | link(reciprocal) |
| family (gaussian) | link(identity) |
| family(igaussian) | link(power -2) |
| family(nbinomial) | link(log) |
| family (poisson) | link(log) |

The canonical link for the negative binomial family is obtained by specifying link(nbinomial). If you specify both family() and link(), not all combinations make sense. You may choose among the following combinations:

|  | Gaussian | Inverse <br> Gaussian | Binomial | Poisson | Negative <br> Binomial | Gamma |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Identity | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Log | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Logit |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Probit |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| C. log-log |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Power | x | x | x | x | x | x |
| Odds Power |  |  | x |  |  |  |
| Neg. binom. | x |  |  |  | x |  |
| Reciprocal |  | x | x |  | x |  |

You specify the assumed within-group correlation structure with the corr () option.
For example, call $\mathbf{R}$ the working correlation matrix for modeling the within-group correlation, a square $\max \left\{n_{i}\right\} \times \max \left\{n_{i}\right\}$ matrix. corr() specifies the structure of $\mathbf{R}$. Let $\mathbf{R}_{t, s}$ denote the $t, s$ element.

The independent structure is defined as

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The corr (exchangeable) structure (corresponding to equal-correlation models) is defined as

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ \rho & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The corr (arg) structure is defined as the usual correlation matrix for an $\operatorname{AR}(g)$ model. This is sometimes called multiplicative correlation. For example, an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ model is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ \rho^{|t-s|} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The corr (stationary $g$ ) structure is a stationary $(g)$ model. For example, a stationary (1) model is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ \rho & \text { if }|t-s|=1 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The corr (nonstationary $g$ ) structure is a nonstationary $(g)$ model that imposes only the constraints that the elements of the working correlation matrix along the diagonal be 1 and the elements outside the $g$ th band be zero,

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ \rho_{t s} & \text { if } 0<|t-s| \leq g, \rho_{t s}=\rho_{s t} \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

corr (unstructured) imposes only the constraint that the diagonal elements of the working correlation matrix be 1 .

$$
\mathbf{R}_{t, s}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } t=s \\ \rho_{t s} & \text { otherwise, } \rho_{t s}=\rho_{s t}\end{cases}
$$

The corr (fixed matname) specification is taken from the user-supplied matrix, such that

$$
\mathbf{R}=\text { matname }
$$

Here the correlations are not estimated from the data. The user-supplied matrix must be a valid correlation matrix with 1s on the diagonal.

Full formulas for all the correlation structures are provided in the Methods and formulas below.

## - Technical note

Some family(), link(), and corr() combinations result in models already fit by Stata:

| family() | link() | corr() | Other Stata estimation command |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| gaussian | identity | independent | regress |
| gaussian | identity | exchangeable | xtreg, re |
| gaussian | identity | exchangeable | xtreg, pa |
| binomial | cloglog | independent | cloglog (see note 1) |
| binomial | cloglog | exchangeable | xtcloglog, pa |
| binomial | logit | independent | logit or logistic |
| binomial | logit | exchangeable | xtlogit, pa |
| binomial | probit | independent | probit (see note 2) |
| binomial | probit | exchangeable | xtprobit, pa |
| nbinomial | log | independent | nbreg (see note 3) |
| poisson | log | independent | poisson |
| poisson | $l o g$ | exchangeable | xtpoisson, pa |
| gamma | log | independent | streg, dist(exp) nohr (see note 4) |
| family | $l i n k$ | independent | glm, irls (see note 5) |

## Notes:

1. For cloglog estimation, xtgee with corr (independent) and cloglog (see [R] cloglog) will produce the same coefficients, but the standard errors will be only asymptotically equivalent because cloglog is not the canonical link for the binomial family.
2. For probit estimation, xtgee with corr (independent) and probit will produce the same coefficients, but the standard errors will be only asymptotically equivalent because probit is not the canonical link for the binomial family. If the binomial denominator is not 1 , the equivalent maximum-likelihood command is glm with options family (binomial \#) or family (binomial varname) and link(probit); see [R] probit and [R] glm.
3. Fitting a negative binomial model by using xtgee (or using glm) will yield results conditional on the specified value of $\alpha$. The nbreg command, however, estimates that parameter and provides unconditional estimates; see $[R]$ nbreg.
4. xtgee with corr (independent) can be used to fit exponential regressions, but this requires specifying scale (1). As with probit, the xtgee-reported standard errors will be only asymptotically equivalent to those produced by streg, dist (exp) nohr (see [ST] streg) because log is not the canonical link for the gamma family. xtgee cannot be used to fit exponential regressions on censored data.

Using the independent correlation structure, the xtgee command will fit the same model fit with the glm, irls command if the family-link combination is the same.
5. If the xtgee command is equivalent to another command, using corr (independent) and the vce (robust) option with xtgee corresponds to using the vce (cluster clustvar) option in the equivalent command, where clustvar corresponds to the panel variable.
xtgee is a generalization of the glm, irls command and gives the same output when the same family and link are specified together with an independent correlation structure. What makes xtgee useful is

- the number of statistical models that it generalizes for use with panel data, many of which are not otherwise available in Stata;
- the richer correlation structure xtgee allows, even when models are available through other xt commands; and
- the availability of robust standard errors (see [U] 20.21 Obtaining robust variance estimates), even when the model and correlation structure are available through other xt commands.

In the following examples, we illustrate the relationships of xtgee with other Stata estimation commands. Remember that, although xtgee generalizes many other commands, the computational algorithm is different; therefore, the answers you obtain will not be identical. The dataset we are using is a subset of the nlswork data (see [XT] xt); we are looking at observations before 1980.

## Example 1

We can use xtgee to perform ordinary least squares by regress:



| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| grade | .0724483 | .0014229 | 50.91 | 0.000 | .0696594 | .0752372 |
| age | .1064874 | .0083644 | 12.73 | 0.000 | .0900935 | .1228812 |
| c.age\#c.age | -.0016931 | .0001655 | -10.23 | 0.000 | -.0020174 | -.0013688 |
| _cons | -.8681487 | .1024896 | -8.47 | 0.000 | -1.069025 | -.6672728 |

When nmp is specified, the coefficients and the standard errors produced by the estimators are the same. Moreover, the scale parameter estimate from the xtgee command equals the MSE calculation from regress; both are estimates of the variance of the residuals.

## > Example 2

The identity link and Gaussian family produce regression-type models. With the independent correlation structure, we reproduce ordinary least squares. With the exchangeable correlation structure, we produce an equal-correlation linear regression estimator.
xtgee, fam(gauss) link(ident) corr (exch) is asymptotically equivalent to the weighted-GLS estimator provided by xtreg, re and to the full maximum-likelihood estimator provided by xtreg, mle. In balanced data, xtgee, fam(gauss) link(ident) corr (exch) and xtreg, mle produce the same results. With unbalanced data, the results are close but differ because the two estimators handle unbalanced data differently. For both balanced and unbalanced data, the results produced by xtgee, fam(gauss) link(ident) corr (exch) and xtreg, mle differ from those produced by xtreg, re. Below we demonstrate the use of the three estimators with unbalanced data. We begin with xtgee; show the maximum likelihood estimator xtreg, mle; show the GLS estimator xtreg, re; and finally show xtgee with the vce(robust) option.

| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Number of obs | 16,085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number of groups = | 3,913 |
| Link: identity |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |
| Family: |  | Gau | ian | $\min =$ | 1 |
| Correlation: |  | exchang | ble | avg | 4.1 |
|  |  |  |  | max | 9 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald chi2(3) | 2918.26 |
| Scale parameter: |  | . 14 | 586 | Prob > chi2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\| \quad[95 \%$ Conf. | Interval] |
| grade | . 0717731 | . 00211 | 34.02 | 0.000 .0676377 | . 0759086 |
| age | . 1077645 | . 006885 | 15.65 | 0.000 .0942701 | . 1212589 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0016381 | . 0001362 | -12.03 | $0.000-.001905$ | -. 0013712 |
| _cons | -. 9480449 | . 0869277 | -10.91 | $0.000-1.11842$ | -. 7776698 |

```
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age, mle
Fitting constant-only model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -5868.3483
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -5858.8833
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -5858.8244
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -4591.9241
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -4562.4406
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -4562.3526
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -4562.3525
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
```

Random-effects ML regression Number of obs $=16,085$
Group variable: idcode Number of groups $=$ 3,913
Obs per group:
$\min =\quad 1$
$\operatorname{avg}=\quad 4.1$
$\max =\quad 9$
LR chi2(3) $=2592.94$
Log likelihood $=-4562.3525$
Prob $>$ chi2 $=0.0000$

| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| grade | .0717747 | .002142 | 33.51 | 0.000 | .0675765 | .075973 |
| age | .1077899 | .0068266 | 15.79 | 0.000 | .0944101 | .1211697 |
| c.age\#c.age | -.0016364 | .000135 | -12.12 | 0.000 | -.0019011 | -.0013718 |
| _cons | -.9500833 | .086384 | -11.00 | 0.000 | -1.119393 | -.7807737 |
| /sigma_u | .2689639 | .0040854 |  |  | .2610748 | .2770915 |
| /sigma_e | .2669944 | .0017113 |  |  | .2636613 | .2703696 |
| rho | .5036748 | .0086449 |  |  | .4867329 | .52061 |

LR test of sigma_u=0: chibar2(01) $=4996.22$
Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.000$

| Random-effects GLS regression Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number | $f$ obs | 16,085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | f groups | 3,913 |
| R-sq: |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |  |
| within $=0.0983$ |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
| between $=0.2946$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4.1 |
| overall $=0.2076$ |  |  |  |  | max | 9 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | 2(3) | 2875.02 |
| $\operatorname{corr}$ (u_i, X) $=0$ (assumed) |  |  |  | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| grade | . 0717757 | . 0021666 | 33.13 | 0.000 | . 0675294 | . 0760221 |
| age | . 1078042 | . 0068125 | 15.82 | 0.000 | . 0944519 | . 1211566 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0016355 | . 0001347 | -12.14 | 0.000 | -. 0018996 | -. 0013714 |
| _cons | -. 9512118 | . 0863139 | -11.02 | 0.000 | -1.120384 | -. 7820397 |
| sigma_u | . 27383747 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 26624266 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 51405959 | (fraction of variance due to $u_{\text {_ }} \mathrm{i}$ ) |  |  |  |  |


| GEE population-averaged model |  | Number of obs | $=$ | 16,085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: | idcode | Number of groups | = | 3,913 |
| Link: | identity | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: | Gaussian | min | $=$ | 1 |
| Correlation: | exchangeable | avg | = | 4.1 |
|  |  | max |  | 9 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(3) |  | 2031.28 |
| Scale parameter: | . 1416586 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |
| (Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on idcode) |  |  |  |  |


|  | Robust <br> ln_wage |  |  |  |  | Coef. |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |  |  |
| grade | .0717731 | .0023341 | 30.75 | 0.000 | .0671983 | .0763479 |
| age | .1077645 | .0098097 | 10.99 | 0.000 | .0885379 | .1269911 |
| c.age\#c.age | -.0016381 | .0001964 | -8.34 | 0.000 | -.002023 | -.0012532 |
| _cons | -.9480449 | .1195009 | -7.93 | 0.000 | -1.182262 | -.7138274 |

In [R] regress, regress, vce(cluster clustvar) may produce inefficient coefficient estimates with valid standard errors for random-effects models. These standard errors are robust to model misspecification. The vce (robust) option of xtgee, on the other hand, requires that the model correctly specify the mean and the link function when the noncanonical link is used.

## Stored results

xtgee stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rank)
e(rc)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(nmp)
e(properties)
e(estat_cmd)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions

```
e(sample) marks estimation sample
```


## Methods and formulas

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:
Introduction
Calculating GEE for GLM
Correlation structures
Nonstationary and unstructured

## Introduction

xtgee fits generalized linear models for panel data with the GEE approach described in Liang and Zeger (1986). A related method, referred to as GEE2, is described in Zhao and Prentice (1990) and Prentice and Zhao (1991). The GEE2 method attempts to gain efficiency in the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by specifying a parametric model for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and then assumes that the models for both the mean and dependency parameters are correct. Thus there is a tradeoff in robustness for efficiency. The preliminary work of Liang, Zeger, and Qaqish (1992), however, indicates that there is little efficiency gained with this alternative approach.

In the GLM approach (see McCullagh and Nelder [1989]), we assume that

$$
\begin{aligned}
h\left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i, j}\right) & =x_{i, j}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\beta} \\
\operatorname{Var}\left(y_{i, j}\right) & =g\left(\mu_{i, j}\right) \phi \\
\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i}=E\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}\right) & =\left\{h^{-1}\left(x_{i, 1}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right), \ldots, h^{-1}\left(x_{i, n_{i}}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\mathbf{A}_{i} & =\operatorname{diag}\left\{g\left(\mu_{i, 1}\right), \ldots, g\left(\mu_{i, n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
\operatorname{Cov}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}\right) & =\phi \mathbf{A}_{i} \quad \text { for independent observations. }
\end{aligned}
$$

In the absence of a convenient likelihood function with which to work, we can rely on a multivariate analog of the quasiscore function introduced by Wedderburn (1974):

$$
\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \operatorname{Var}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i}\right)=0
$$

We can solve for correlation parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ by simultaneously solving

$$
\mathbf{S}_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\alpha})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\alpha}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{H}_{i}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{W}_{i}-\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}\right)=0
$$

In the GEE approach to GLM, we let $\mathbf{R}_{i}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$ be a "working" correlation matrix depending on the parameters in $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ (see the Correlation structures section for the number of parameters), and we estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by solving the GEE,

$$
\mathbf{U}(\boldsymbol{\beta})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i}}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{V}_{i}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i}\right)=0
$$

where $\quad \mathbf{V}_{i}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})=\mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}_{i}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2}$

To solve this equation, we need only a crude approximation of the variance matrix, which we can obtain from a Taylor series expansion, where

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Cov}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}\right) & =\mathbf{L}_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i} \mathbf{D}_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{L}_{i}+\phi \mathbf{A}_{i}=\tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i} \\
\mathbf{L}_{i} & =\operatorname{diag}\left\{\partial h^{-1}(u) / \partial u, u=x_{i, j}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\beta}, j=1, \ldots, n_{i}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

which allows that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{i} & \approx\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{i} \widehat{\mathbf{L}}_{i}^{-1}\left\{\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i}\right)\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}-\widehat{\phi} \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_{i}\right\} \widehat{\mathbf{L}}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z}_{i}\right)^{-1} \\
\widehat{\phi} & =\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\left(y_{i, j}-\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}\right)^{2}-\left(\widehat{\mathbf{L}}_{i, j}\right)^{2} \mathbf{Z}_{i, j}^{\mathrm{T}} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_{i} \mathbf{Z}_{i, j}}{g\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Calculating GEE for GLM

Using the notation from Liang and Zeger (1986), let $\mathbf{y}_{i}=\left(y_{i, 1}, \ldots, y_{i, n_{i}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be the $n_{i} \times 1$ vector of outcome values, and let $\mathbf{X}_{i}=\left(x_{i, 1}, \ldots, x_{i, n_{i}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$ be the $n_{i} \times p$ matrix of covariate values for the $i$ th subject $i=1, \ldots, m$. We assume that the marginal density for $y_{i, j}$ may be written in exponential family notation as

$$
f\left(y_{i, j}\right)=\exp \left[\left\{y_{i, j} \theta_{i, j}-a\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)+b\left(y_{i, j}\right)\right\} \phi\right]
$$

where $\theta_{i, j}=h\left(\eta_{i, j}\right), \eta_{i, j}=x_{i, j} \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Under this formulation, the first two moments are given by

$$
E\left(y_{i, j}\right)=a^{\prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right), \quad \operatorname{Var}\left(y_{i, j}\right)=a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right) / \phi
$$

In what follows, we let $n_{i}=n$ without loss of generality. We define the quantities, assuming that we have an $n \times n$ working correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i} & =\operatorname{diag}\left(d \theta_{i, j} / d \eta_{i, j}\right) & & n \times n \text { matrix } \\
\mathbf{A}_{i} & =\operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\} & & n \times n \text { matrix } \\
\mathbf{S}_{i} & =\mathbf{y}_{i}-a^{\prime}\left(\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}\right) & & n \times 1 \text { matrix } \\
\mathbf{D}_{i} & =\mathbf{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i} \mathbf{X}_{i} & & n \times p \text { matrix } \\
\mathbf{V}_{i} & =\mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2} & & n \times n \text { matrix }
\end{aligned}
$$

such that the GEE becomes

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{V}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{S}_{i}=0
$$

We then have that

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j+1}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}-\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \mathbf{D}_{i}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)\right\}^{-1}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \mathbf{S}_{i}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)\right\}
$$

where the term

$$
\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \mathbf{D}_{i}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)\right\}^{-1}
$$

is what we call the conventional variance estimate. It is used to calculate the standard errors if the vce (robust) option is not specified. This command supports the clustered version of the Huber/White/sandwich estimator of the variance with panels treated as clusters when vce (robust) is specified. See [P] _robust, particularly Maximum likelihood estimators and Methods and formulas. Liang and Zeger (1986) also discuss the calculation of the robust variance estimator.

Define the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{D} & =\left(\mathbf{D}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, \mathbf{D}_{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\right) \\
\mathbf{S} & =\left(\mathbf{S}_{1}^{\mathrm{T}}, \ldots, \mathbf{S}_{m}^{\mathrm{T}}\right)^{\mathrm{T}} \\
\tilde{\mathbf{V}} & =n m \times n m \text { block diagonal matrix with } \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i} \\
\mathbf{Z} & =\mathbf{D} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\mathbf{S}
\end{aligned}
$$

At a given iteration, the correlation parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and scale parameter $\phi$ can be estimated from the current Pearson residuals, defined by

$$
\widehat{r}_{i, j}=\left\{y_{i, j}-a^{\prime}\left(\widehat{\theta}_{i, j}\right)\right\} /\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\widehat{\theta}_{i, j}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2}
$$

where $\widehat{\theta}_{i, j}$ depends on the current value for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. We can then estimate $\phi$ by

$$
\widehat{\phi}^{-1}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2} /(N-p)
$$

As this general derivation is complicated, let's follow the derivation of the Gaussian family with the identity link (regression) to illustrate the generalization. After making appropriate substitutions, we will see a familiar updating equation. First, we rewrite the updating equation for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ as

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j+1}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}-\mathbf{Z}_{1}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{2}
$$

and then derive $\mathbf{Z}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{2}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Z}_{1}= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \mathbf{D}_{i}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left\{\mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2}\right\}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{i} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i} \mathbf{X}_{i} \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \operatorname{diag}\left\{\frac{\partial \theta_{i, j}}{\partial(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta})}\right\} \operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}\left[\operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2}\right]^{-1} \\
& \quad \operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\} \operatorname{diag}\left\{\frac{\partial \theta_{i, j}}{\partial(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta})}\right\} \mathbf{X}_{i} \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{I I}(\mathbf{I I I})^{-1} \mathbf{I I} \mathbf{X}_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}_{i}=\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{Z}_{2}= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{D}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \tilde{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \mathbf{S}_{i}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \boldsymbol{\Delta}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{A}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left\{\mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \mathbf{A}_{i}^{1 / 2}\right\}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \operatorname{diag}\left\{\frac{\partial \theta_{i, j}}{\partial(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta})}\right\} \operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}\left[\operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2} \mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \operatorname{diag}\left\{a^{\prime \prime}\left(\theta_{i, j}\right)\right\}^{1 / 2}\right]^{-1} \\
& \quad\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right) \\
= & \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{I I}(\mathbf{I I I})^{-1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\mathrm{T}}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}\right)=\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \widehat{s}_{j}
\end{aligned}
$$

So, we may write the update formula as

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j+1}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j}-\left(\mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\mathrm{T}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{s}}_{j}
$$

which is the same formula for GLS in regression.

## Correlation structures

The working correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}$ is a function of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and is more accurately written as $\mathbf{R}(\boldsymbol{\alpha})$. Depending on the assumed correlation structure, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ might be

| Independent | no parameters to estimate |
| :--- | :--- |
| Exchangeable | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a scalar |
| Autoregressive | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a vector |
| Stationary | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a vector |
| Nonstationary | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a matrix |
| Unstructured | $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a matrix |

Also, throughout the estimation of a general unbalanced panel, it is more proper to discuss $\mathbf{R}_{i}$, which is the upper left $n_{i} \times n_{i}$ submatrix of the ultimately stored matrix in $e(R), \max \left\{n_{i}\right\} \times \max \left\{n_{i}\right\}$.

The only panels that enter into the estimation for a lag-dependent correlation structure are those with $n_{i}>g$ (assuming a lag of $g$ ). xtgee drops panels with too few observations (and mentions when it does so).

## Independent

The working correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}$ is an identity matrix.

## Exchangeable

$$
\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \sum_{k=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j} \widehat{r}_{i, k}-\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left\{n_{i}\left(n_{i}-1\right)\right\}} / \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2}\right)}{\sum_{i=1}^{m} n_{i}}
$$

and the working correlation matrix is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{s, t}= \begin{cases}1 & s=t \\ \alpha & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

## Autoregressive and stationary

These two structures require $g$ parameters to be estimated so that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is a vector of length $g+1$ (the first element of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is 1 ).

$$
\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2}}{n_{i}}, \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}-1} \widehat{r}_{i, j} \widehat{r}_{i, j+1}}{n_{i}}, \ldots, \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}-g} \widehat{r}_{i, j} \widehat{r}_{i, j+g}}{n_{i}}\right) /\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2}}{n_{i}}\right)
$$

The working correlation matrix for the AR model is calculated as a function of Toeplitz matrices formed from the $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ vector; see Newton (1988). The working correlation matrix for the stationary model is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{s, t}= \begin{cases}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{1,|s-t|} & \text { if }|s-t| \leq g \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

## Nonstationary and unstructured

These two correlation structures require a matrix of parameters. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ is estimated (where we replace $\widehat{r}_{i, j}=0$ whenever $i>n_{i}$ or $j>n_{i}$ ) as

$$
\boldsymbol{\alpha}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} m\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
N_{1,1}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 1}^{2} & N_{1,2}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 1} \widehat{r}_{i, 2} & \cdots & N_{1, n}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 1} \widehat{r}_{i, n} \\
N_{2,1}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 2} \widehat{r}_{i, 1} & N_{2,2}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 2}^{2} & \cdots & N_{2, n}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, 2} \widehat{r}_{i, n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
N_{n, 1}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, n} \widehat{r}_{i, 1} & N_{n, 2}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, 2} & \cdots & N_{n, n}^{-1} \widehat{r}_{i, n}^{2}
\end{array}\right) /\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widehat{r}_{i, j}^{2}}{n_{i}}\right)
$$

where $N_{p, q}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} I(i, p, q)$ and

$$
I(i, p, q)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if panel } i \text { has valid observations at times } \mathrm{p} \text { and } \mathrm{q} \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $N_{i, j}=\min \left(N_{i}, N_{j}\right), \quad N_{i}=$ number of panels observed at time $i$, and $n=$ $\max \left(n_{1}, n_{2}, \ldots, n_{m}\right)$.

The working correlation matrix for the nonstationary model is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{s, t}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } s=t \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{s, t} & \text { if } 0<|s-t| \leq g \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The working correlation matrix for the unstructured model is given by

$$
\mathbf{R}_{s, t}= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } s=t \\ \boldsymbol{\alpha}_{s, t} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

such that the unstructured model is equal to the nonstationary model at lag $g=n-1$, where the panels are balanced with $n_{i}=n$ for all $i$.
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## Also see

[XT] xtgee postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtgee
[XT] xtcloglog - Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models
[XT] xtlogit - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
[XT] xtnbreg — Fixed-effects, random-effects, \& population-averaged negative binomial models
[XT] xtpoisson - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models
[XT] xtprobit - Random-effects and population-averaged probit models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] glm - Generalized linear models
[R] logistic - Logistic regression, reporting odds ratios
[ $R$ ] regress - Linear regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtgee postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtgee

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins estat |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Also see |  |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation command is of special interest after xtgee:
Command Description
estat wcorrelation
estimated matrix of the within-group correlations

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:
Command Description
contrast contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates
estat summarize
estat vce
estimates
*forecast
hausman
lincom
margins marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects
marginsplot graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.)
nlcom
predict predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures
predictnl
pwcompare
test Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses
testnl Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses
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## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as predicted values, probabilities, linear predictions, standard errors, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

statistic Description

```
Main
    mu predicted value of depvar; considers the offset() or exposure(); the default
    rate predicted value of depvar
    pr(n) probability Pr(yit =n) for family(poisson) link(log)
    pr(a,b) probability Pr}(a\leq\mp@subsup{y}{it}{}\leqb) for family(poisson) link(log
    xb linear prediction
    stdp standard error of the linear prediction
    score first derivative of the log likelihood with respect to \mp@subsup{\mathbf{x}}{it}{}\boldsymbol{\beta}
```

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

Main
mu , the default, and rate calculate the predicted value of depvar. mu takes into account the offset () or exposure() together with the denominator if the family is binomial; rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset() or exposure() when you fit the xtgee model and you did not specify family (binomial \#) or family (binomial varname), meaning the binomial family and a denominator not equal to one.

Thus mu and rate are the same for family (gaussian) link(identity).
mu and rate are not equivalent for family (binomial pop) link(logit). Then mu would predict the number of positive outcomes and rate would predict the probability of a positive outcome.
$m u$ and rate are not equivalent for family (poisson) link(log) exposure (time). Then mu would predict the number of events given exposure time and rate would calculate the incidence rate-the number of events given an exposure time of 1.
$\operatorname{pr}(n)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=n\right)$ for family(poisson) link(log), where $n$ is a nonnegative integer that may be specified as a number or a variable.
$\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(a \leq y_{i t} \leq b\right)$ for family (poisson) $\operatorname{link}(\log )$, where $a$ and $b$ are nonnegative integers that may be specified as numbers or variables;
$b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$;
$\operatorname{pr}(20,$.$) calculates \operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t} \geq 20\right)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(20, b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t} \geq 20\right)$ in observations for which $b \geq$. and calculates
$\operatorname{Pr}\left(20 \leq y_{i t} \leq b\right)$ elsewhere.
$\operatorname{pr}(., b)$ produces a syntax error. A missing value in an observation of the variable $a$ causes a missing value in that observation for $\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$.
xb calculates the linear prediction.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset(varname), exposure(varname), family(binomial \#), or family (binomial varname) when you fit the model. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset or exposure variable and the binomial denominator. Thus predict ..., mu nooffset produces the same results as predict ..., rate.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for predicted values, probabilities, and linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
```


statistic Description

| mu | predicted value of depvar; considers the offset() or exposure(); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | predicted value of depvar |
| $\operatorname{pr}(n)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=n\right)$ for family (poisson) link(log) |
| $\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(a \leq y_{i t} \leq b\right)$ for family (poisson) link(log) |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## estat

## Description for estat

estat wcorrelation displays the estimated matrix of the within-group correlations.

## Menu for estat

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for estat

estat wcorrelation [, compact format (\% fmt) ]

## Options for estat

compact specifies that only the parameters (alpha) of the estimated matrix of within-group correlations be displayed rather than the entire matrix.
format (\% $\% m t$ ) overrides the display format; see [D] format.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1

xtgee can estimate rich correlation structures. In example 2 of [XT] xtgee, we fit the model

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork2
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xtgee ln_w grade age c.age#c.age
    (output omitted)
```

After estimation, estat wcorrelation reports the working correlation matrix $\mathbf{R}$ :

| Estimated within-idcode correlation matrix R: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r2 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| r3 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r4 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |  |
| r5 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |
| r6 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | 1 |
| r7 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 |
| r8 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 |
| r9 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 |
|  | c7 | c8 | c9 |  |  |  |
| r7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r8 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| r9 | . 4851356 | . 4851356 | 1 |  |  |  |

The equal-correlation model corresponds to an exchangeable correlation structure, meaning that the correlation of observations within person is a constant. The working correlation estimated by xtgee is 0.4851 . (xtreg, re, by comparison, reports 0.5141 ; see the xtreg command in example 2 of [XT] xtgee.) We constrained the model to have this simple correlation structure. What if we relaxed the constraint? To go to the other extreme, let's place no constraints on the matrix (other than its being symmetric). We do this by specifying correlation(unstructured), although we can abbreviate the option.

| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Number | $f$ obs | 16,085 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group and tim | vars: | idcode year identity |  | Number | $f$ groups | 3,913 |
| Link: |  |  |  | Obs per | group: |  |
| Family: |  | Gaussian |  |  | min | 1 |
| Correlation: |  | unstructured |  |  | avg | 4.1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 9 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | 2(3) | 2405.20 |
| Scale parameter: |  | . 1418513 |  | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| grade | . 0720684 | . 002151 | 33.50 | 0.000 | . 0678525 | . 0762843 |
| age | . 1008095 | . 0081471 | 12.37 | 0.000 | . 0848416 | . 1167775 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0015104 | . 0001617 | -9.34 | 0.000 | -. 0018272 | -. 0011936 |
| _cons | -. 8645484 | . 1009488 | -8.56 | 0.000 | -1.062404 | -. 6666923 |


| Estimated within-idcode correlation matrix R : |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r2 | . 4354838 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| r3 | . 4280248 | . 5597329 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r4 | . 3772342 | . 5012129 | . 5475113 | 1 |  |  |
| r5 | . 4031433 | . 5301403 | . 502668 | . 6216227 | 1 |  |
| r6 | . 3663686 | . 4519138 | . 4783186 | . 5685009 | . 7306005 | 1 |
| r7 | . 2819915 | . 3605743 | . 3918118 | . 4012104 | . 4642561 | . 50219 |
| r8 | . 3162028 | . 3445668 | . 4285424 | . 4389241 | . 4696792 | . 5222537 |
| r9 | . 2148737 | . 3078491 | . 3337292 | . 3584013 | . 4865802 | . 4613128 |
|  | c7 | c8 | c9 |  |  |  |
| r7 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r8 | . 6475654 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| r9 | . 5791417 | . 7386595 | 1 |  |  |  |

This correlation matrix looks different from the previously constrained one and shows, in particular, that the serial correlation of the residuals diminishes as the lag increases, although residuals separated by small lags are more correlated than, say, AR(1) would imply.

## $>$ Example 2

In example 1 of [XT] xtprobit, we showed a random-effects model of unionization using the union data described in [XT] xt. We performed the estimation using xtprobit but said that we could have used xtgee as well. Here we fit a population-averaged (equal correlation) model for comparison:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
```

. xtgee union age grade i.not_smsa south\#\#c.year, family(binomial) link(probit)
Iteration 1: tolerance $=$. 12544249
Iteration 2: tolerance $=$. 0034686
Iteration 3: tolerance $=.00017448$
Iteration 4: tolerance $=8.382 \mathrm{e}-06$
Iteration 5: tolerance $=3.997 \mathrm{e}-07$

GEE population-averaged model

| Group variable: Link: | idcode probit | Obs per group: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Family: | binomial |  | min | 1 |
| Correlation: | exchangeable |  | avg | 5.9 |
|  |  |  | max | 12 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(6) |  | 242.57 |
| Scale parameter: | 1 | Prob > chi2 |  | 0.0000 |


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | .0089699 | .0053208 | 1.69 | 0.092 | -.0014586 | .0193985 |
| grade | .0333174 | .0062352 | 5.34 | 0.000 | .0210966 | .0455382 |
| 1.not_smsa | -.0715717 | .027543 | -2.60 | 0.009 | -.1255551 | -.0175884 |
| 1.south | -1.017368 | .207931 | -4.89 | 0.000 | -1.424905 | -.6098308 |
| year | -.0062708 | .0055314 | -1.13 | 0.257 | -.0171122 | .0045706 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0086294 | .00258 | 3.34 | 0.001 | .0035727 | .013686 |
| _cons | -.8670997 | .294771 | -2.94 | 0.003 | -1.44484 | -.2893592 |

Let's look at the correlation structure and then relax it:

```
. estat wcorrelation, format(%8.4f)
```

Estimated within-idcode correlation matrix R:

|  | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 | c7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| r1 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| r2 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r3 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| r4 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| r5 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| r6 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |
| r7 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |
| r8 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 |
| r9 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 |
| r10 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 |
| r11 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 |
| r12 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 |
|  | c8 | c9 | c10 | c11 | c12 |  |  |
| r8 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| r9 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r10 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| r11 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| r12 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 0.4615 | 1.0000 |  |  |

We estimate the fixed correlation between observations within person to be 0.4615 . We have many data (an average of 5.9 observations on 4,434 women), so estimating the full correlation matrix is feasible. Let's do that and then examine the results:

| GEE population-averaged model |  | Number of obs |  | 26,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group and time vars: | idcode year | Number of groups |  | 4,434 |
| Link: | probit | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: | binomial | min | = | 1 |
| Correlation: | unstructured | avg | = | 5.9 |
|  |  | max | - | 12 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(6) |  | 198.45 |
| Scale parameter: | 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | .0096612 | .0053366 | 1.81 | 0.070 | -.0007984 | .0201208 |
| grade | .0352762 | .0065621 | 5.38 | 0.000 | .0224148 | .0481377 |
| 1.not_smsa | -.093073 | .0291971 | -3.19 | 0.001 | -.1502983 | -.0358478 |
| 1.south | -1.028526 | .278802 | -3.69 | 0.000 | -1.574968 | -.4820839 |
| year | -.0088187 | .005719 | -1.54 | 0.123 | -.0200278 | .0023904 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0089824 | .0034865 | 2.58 | 0.010 | .002149 | .0158158 |
| _cons | -.7306192 | .316757 | -2.31 | 0.021 | -1.351451 | -.109787 |

. estat wcorrelation, format(\%8.4f)
Estimated within-idcode correlation matrix $R$ :

|  | c1 | c2 | c3 | c4 | c5 | c6 | c7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| r1 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| r2 | 0.6667 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r3 | 0.6151 | 0.6523 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| r4 | 0.5268 | 0.5717 | 0.6101 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| r5 | 0.3309 | 0.3669 | 0.4005 | 0.4783 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| r6 | 0.3000 | 0.3706 | 0.4237 | 0.4562 | 0.6426 | 1.0000 |  |
| r7 | 0.2995 | 0.3568 | 0.3851 | 0.4279 | 0.4931 | 0.6384 | 1.0000 |
| r8 | 0.2759 | 0.3021 | 0.3225 | 0.3751 | 0.4682 | 0.5597 | 0.7009 |
| r9 | 0.2989 | 0.2981 | 0.3021 | 0.3806 | 0.4605 | 0.5068 | 0.6090 |
| r10 | 0.2285 | 0.2597 | 0.2748 | 0.3637 | 0.3981 | 0.4909 | 0.5889 |
| r11 | 0.2325 | 0.2289 | 0.2696 | 0.3246 | 0.3551 | 0.4426 | 0.5103 |
| r12 | 0.2359 | 0.2351 | 0.2544 | 0.3134 | 0.3474 | 0.3822 | 0.4788 |
|  | c8 | c9 | c10 | c11 | c12 |  |  |
| r8 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| r9 | 0.6714 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| r10 | 0.5973 | 0.6325 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| r11 | 0.5625 | 0.5756 | 0.5738 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| r12 | 0.4999 | 0.5412 | 0.5329 | 0.6428 | 1.0000 |  |  |

As before, we find that the correlation of residuals decreases as the lag increases, but more slowly than an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process.

## - Example 3

In this example, we examine injury incidents among 20 airlines in each of 4 years. The data are fictional, and, as a matter of fact, are really from a random-effects model.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/airacc
. generate lnpm = ln(pmiles)
. xtgee i_cnt inprog, family(poisson) eform offset(lnpm) nolog
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GEE population-averaged model & & Number of obs & = & 80 \\
\hline Group variable: & airline & Number of groups & = & 20 \\
\hline Link: & log & Obs per group: & & \\
\hline Family: & Poisson & min & = & 4 \\
\hline Correlation: & exchangeable & avg & = & 4.0 \\
\hline & & max & = & 4 \\
\hline & & Wald chi2(1) & = & 5.27 \\
\hline Scale parameter: & 1 & Prob > chi2 & = & 0.0217 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| i_cnt | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| inprog | .9059936 | .0389528 | -2.30 | 0.022 | .8327758 | .9856487 |
| -cons | .0080065 | .0002912 <br> lnpm | 1 | -132.71 | 0.000 | .0074555 |
| (offset) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

. estat wcorrelation
Estimated within-airline correlation matrix $R$ :

|  | c1 | c2 | c3 | $c 4$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r2 | .4606406 | 1 |  |  |
| r3 | .4606406 | .4606406 | 1 |  |
| r4 | .4606406 | .4606406 | .4606406 | 1 |

Now there are not really enough data here to reliably estimate the correlation without any constraints of structure, but here is what happens if we try:


| i_cnt | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| inprog | .9791082 | .0345486 | -0.60 | 0.550 | .9136826 | 1.049219 |
| -cons | .0078716 | .0002787 <br> lnpm | 1 | -136.82 | 0.000 | .0073439 |
| (offset) |  |  |  |  |  |  |

. estat wcorrelation
Estimated within-airline correlation matrix $R$ :

|  | $c 1$ | $c 2$ | $c 3$ | $c 4$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r2 | .5700298 | 1 |  |  |
| r3 | .716356 | .4192126 | 1 |  |
| r4 | .2383264 | .3839863 | .3521287 | 1 |

There is no sensible pattern to the correlations.
We created this dataset from a random-effects Poisson model. We reran our data-creation program and this time had it create 400 airlines rather than 20 , still with 4 years of data each. Here are the equal-correlation model and estimated correlation structure:

| GEE population-averaged model |  | Number of obs | = | 1,600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: | airline | Number of groups | = | 400 |
| Link: | log | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: | Poisson | min | $=$ | 4 |
| Correlation: | exchangeable | avg | = | 4.0 |
|  |  | max | = | 4 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(1) | = | 111.80 |
| Scale parameter: | 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| i_cnt | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| inprog | .8915304 | .0096807 <br> _cons <br> lnpm | -10.57 | 0.000 | .8727571 | .9107076 |

. estat wcorrelation
Estimated within-airline correlation matrix $R$ :

|  | c1 | $c 2$ | $c 3$ | $c 4$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r2 | .5291707 | 1 |  |  |
| r3 | .5291707 | .5291707 | 1 |  |
| r4 | .5291707 | .5291707 | .5291707 | 1 |

The following estimation results assume unstructured correlation:

| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Number of obs Number of groups Obs per group: |  | 1,600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group and time vars: Link: |  | airline time |  |  |  | 400 |
|  |  | log |  |  |  |  |
| Family: |  | Poisson |  |  | min | 4 |
| Correlation: |  | unstructured |  |  | avg | 4.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 4 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch |  | 113.43 |
| Scale parameter: |  | 1 |  | Prob > |  | 0.0000 |
| i_cnt | IRR | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| inprog | . 8914155 | . 0096208 | -10.65 | 0.000 | . 8727572 | . 9104728 |
| _cons | . 0071402 | . 0000628 | -561.50 | 0.000 | . 0070181 | . 0072645 |
| lnpm | 1 | (offset) |  |  |  |  |

. estat wcorrelation
Estimated within-airline correlation matrix R:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $c 1$ | $c 2$ | $c 3$ | $c 4$ |
| r1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| r2 | .4733189 | 1 |  |  |
| r3 | .5240576 | .5748868 | 1 |  |
| r4 | .5139748 | .5048895 | .5840707 | 1 |

The equal-correlation model estimated a fixed correlation of 0.5292 , and above we have correlations ranging between 0.4733 and 0.5841 with little pattern in their structure.

## Also see

[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtgls - Fit panel-data models by using GLS

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtgls fits panel-data linear models by using feasible generalized least squares. This command allows estimation in the presence of $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ autocorrelation within panels and cross-sectional correlation and heteroskedasticity across panels.

## Quick start

GLS regression of y on x 1 , x 2 , and indicators for levels of categorical variable a using xtset data xtgls y x1 x2 i.a

With heteroskedastic but uncorrelated errors across panels xtgls y x1 x2 i.a, panels(heteroskedastic)

With heteroskedastic and correlated errors across panels
xtgls y x1 x2 i.a, panels(correlated)
Three-stage GLS with a common first-order autocorrelation within panels

```
xtgls y x1 x2 i.a, panels(correlated) corr(ar1)
```

As above, but let autocorrelation structure be panel-specific
xtgls y x1 x2 i.a, panels(correlated) corr (psar1)
As above, but estimate by iterated GLS

```
xtgls y x1 x2 i.a, panels(correlated) corr(psar1) igls
```


## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Contemporaneous correlation $>$ GLS regression with correlated disturbances

## Syntax

xtgls depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
options
Model
noconstant
panels(iid)
panels(heteroskedastic)
panels (correlated)
corr (independent)
corr (ar1)
corr (psar1)
rhotype (calc)
igls
force
SE
nmk
Reporting
level(\#)
display_options

Description
suppress constant term
use i.i.d. error structure
use heteroskedastic but uncorrelated error structure
use heteroskedastic and correlated error structure
use independent autocorrelation structure
use AR1 autocorrelation structure
use panel-specific AR1 autocorrelation structure
specify method to compute autocorrelation parameter; see Options for details; seldom used
use iterated GLS estimator instead of two-step GLS estimator estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
normalize standard error by $N-k$ instead of $N$
set confidence level; default is level (95)
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

Optimization
optimize_options
coeflegend

A panel variable must be specified. For correlation structures other than independent, a time variable must be specified. A time variable must also be specified if panels (correlated) is specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset. indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
aweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

[^3]panels(heteroskedastic) specifies a heteroskedastic error structure with no cross-sectional correlation.
panels (correlated) specifies a heteroskedastic error structure with cross-sectional correlation. If $p(c)$ is specified, you must also specify a time variable (use xtset). The results will be based on a generalized inverse of a singular matrix unless $T \geq m$ (the number of periods is greater than or equal to the number of panels).
corr (corr) specifies the assumed autocorrelation within panels.
corr (independent) specifies that there is no autocorrelation. This is the default.
corr (ar1) specifies that, within panels, there is $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ autocorrelation and that the coefficient of the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process is common to all the panels. If $c(\operatorname{ar} 1)$ is specified, you must also specify a time variable (use xtset).
$\operatorname{corr}$ (psar1) specifies that, within panels, there is $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ autocorrelation and that the coefficient of the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process is specific to each panel. psar1 stands for panel-specific $\operatorname{AR}(1)$. If $c(p s a r 1)$ is specified, a time variable must also be specified; use xtset.
rhotype (calc) specifies the method to be used to calculate the autocorrelation parameter:
regress regression using lags; the default
dw Durbin-Watson calculation
freg regression using leads
nagar Nagar calculation
theil Theil calculation
tscorr time-series autocorrelation calculation
All the calculations are asymptotically equivalent and consistent; this is a rarely used option.
igls requests an iterated GLS estimator instead of the two-step GLS estimator for a nonautocorrelated model or instead of the three-step GLS estimator for an autocorrelated model. The iterated GLS estimator converges to the MLE for the corr (independent) models but does not for the other corr () models.
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.
nmk specifies that standard errors be normalized by $N-k$, where $k$ is the number of parameters estimated, rather than $N$, the number of observations. Different authors have used one or the other normalization. Greene $(2012,280)$ remarks that whether a degree-of-freedom correction improves the small-sample properties is an open question.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat ( $\%$ fint) , pformat ( $\% \mathrm{fmt}$ ), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate(\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate (100).
tolerance(\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance ( $1 \mathrm{e}-7$ ) is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
The following option is available with xtgls but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

Introduction<br>Heteroskedasticity across panels<br>Correlation across panels (cross-sectional correlation)<br>Autocorrelation within panels

## Introduction

Information on GLS can be found in Greene (2012), Maddala and Lahiri (2006), Davidson and MacKinnon (1993), and Judge et al. (1985).

If you have many panels relative to periods, see [XT] xtreg and [XT] xtgee. xtgee, in particular, provides capabilities similar to those of xtgls but does not allow cross-sectional correlation. On the other hand, xtgee allows a richer description of the correlation within panels as long as the same correlations apply to all panels. xtgls provides two unique features:

1. Cross-sectional correlation may be modeled (panels (correlated)).
2. Within panels, the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ correlation coefficient may be unique (corr (psar1)).
xtgls allows models with heteroskedasticity and no cross-sectional correlation, but, strictly speaking, xtgee does not. xtgee with the vce (robust) option relaxes the assumption of equal variances, at least as far as the standard error calculation is concerned.

Also, xtgls, panels(iid) corr (independent) nmk is equivalent to regress.
The nmk option uses $n-k$ rather than $n$ to normalize the variance calculation.
To fit a model with autocorrelated errors (corr (ar1) or corr (psar1)), the data must be equally spaced in time. To fit a model with cross-sectional correlation (panels (correlated)), panels must have the same number of observations (be balanced).

The equation from which the models are developed is given by

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, m$ is the number of units (or panels) and $t=1, \ldots, T_{i}$ is the number of observations for panel $i$. This model can equally be written as

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{y}_{1} \\
\mathbf{y}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{y}_{m}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{X}_{1} \\
\mathbf{X}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{X}_{m}
\end{array}\right] \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{1} \\
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{m}
\end{array}\right]
$$

The variance matrix of the disturbance terms can be written as

$$
E\left[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime}\right]=\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{1,1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{1,1} & \sigma_{1,2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{1,2} & \cdots & \sigma_{1, m} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{1, m} \\
\sigma_{2,1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{2,1} & \sigma_{2,2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{2,2} & \cdots & \sigma_{2, m} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{2, m} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\sigma_{m, 1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{m, 1} & \sigma_{m, 2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{m, 2} & \cdots & \sigma_{m, m} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{m, m}
\end{array}\right]
$$

For the $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{i, j}$ matrices to be parameterized to model cross-sectional correlation, they must be square (balanced panels).

In these models, we assume that the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the same for all panels and consider a variety of models by changing the assumptions on the structure of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$.

For the classic OLS regression model, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
E\left[\epsilon_{i, t}\right] & =0 \\
\operatorname{Var}\left[\epsilon_{i, t}\right] & =\sigma^{2} \\
\operatorname{Cov}\left[\epsilon_{i, t}, \epsilon_{j, s}\right] & =0 \quad \text { if } t \neq s \text { or } i \neq j
\end{aligned}
$$

This amounts to assuming that $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ has the structure given by

$$
\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma^{2} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \sigma^{2} \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \sigma^{2} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]
$$

whether or not the panels are balanced (the $\mathbf{0}$ matrices may be rectangular). The classic OLS assumptions are the default panels(iid) and corr (independent) options for this command.

## Heteroskedasticity across panels

In many cross-sectional datasets, the variance for each of the panels differs. It is common to have data on countries, states, or other units that have variation of scale. The heteroskedastic model is specified by including the panels(heteroskedastic) option, which assumes that

$$
\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{1}^{2} \mathbf{I} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\
\mathbf{0} & \sigma_{2}^{2} \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \mathbf{0} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \cdots & \sigma_{m}^{2} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]
$$

## > Example 1

Greene (2012, 1112) reprints data in a classic study of investment demand by Grunfeld and Griliches (1960). Below we allow the variances to differ for each of the five companies.

| Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Coefficients: generalized least squares } \\ \text { Panels: } & \text { heteroskedastic } \\ \text { Correlation: } & \text { no autocorrelation }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated covariances <br> Estimated autocorrelations <br> Estimated coefficients |  | $\begin{aligned} & = \\ & = \\ & = \end{aligned}$ |  | Number of obs |  | 100 |
|  |  | 0 | Number of groups |  | 5 |
|  |  | 3 | Time | iods | 20 |
| Estimated coefficients |  |  | Wald | 2(2) | 865.38 |
|  |  | Prob | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| invest | Coef. |  | Std. Err | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| market | . 0949905 | . 007409 | 12.82 | 0.000 | . 0804692 | . 1095118 |
| stock | . 3378129 | . 0302254 | 11.18 | 0.000 | . 2785722 | . 3970535 |
| _cons | -36.2537 | 6.124363 | -5.92 | 0.000 | -48.25723 | -24.25017 |

## Correlation across panels (cross-sectional correlation)

We may wish to assume that the error terms of panels are correlated, in addition to having different scale variances. The variance structure is specified by including the panels (correlated) option and is given by

$$
\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{1}^{2} \mathbf{I} & \sigma_{1,2} \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \sigma_{1, m} \mathbf{I} \\
\sigma_{2,1} \mathbf{I} & \sigma_{2}^{2} \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \sigma_{2, m} \mathbf{I} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\sigma_{m, 1} \mathbf{I} & \sigma_{m, 2} \mathbf{I} & \cdots & \sigma_{m}^{2} \mathbf{I}
\end{array}\right]
$$

Because we must estimate cross-sectional correlation in this model, the panels must be balanced (and $T \geq m$ for valid results). A time variable must also be specified so that xtgls knows how the observations within panels are ordered. xtset shows us that this is true.

## Example 2

| ```panel variable: company (strongly balanced) time variable: time, 1 to 20 delta: 1 unit``` |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| . xtgls invest market stock, panels(correlated) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coefficients: generalized least squaresPanels:Correlation: neteroskedastic with cross-sectional correlationno autocorrelation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated covariances Estimated autocorrelations Estimated coefficients |  | $=15$ |  | Number | f obs | 100 |
|  |  | = |  | Number | f groups | 5 |
|  |  | = |  | Time | iods | 20 |
| Estimated co |  |  |  | Wald | (2) | 1285.19 |
|  |  |  |  | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| invest | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| market | . 0961894 | . 0054752 | 17.57 | 0.000 | . 0854583 | . 1069206 |
| stock | . 3095321 | . 0179851 | 17.21 | 0.000 | . 2742819 | . 3447822 |
| _cons | -38.36128 | 5.344871 | -7.18 | 0.000 | -48.83703 | -27.88552 |

The estimated cross-sectional covariances are stored in e(Sigma).

```
. matrix list e(Sigma)
symmetric e(Sigma)[5,5]
    _ee _ee2 _ee3 _ee4 _ee5
_ee 9410.9061
_ee2 -168.04631 755.85077
_ee3 -1915.9538 -4163.3434 34288.49
_ee4 -1129.2896 -80.381742 2259.3242 633.42367
_ee5 258.50132 4035.872 -27898.235 -1170.6801 33455.511
```


## > Example 3

We can obtain the MLE results by specifying the igls option, which iterates the GLS estimation technique to convergence:

| . xtgls invest market stock, panels (correlated) iglsIteration 1: tolerance $=.2127384$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ```Iteration 2: tolerance = . }2281 (output omitted)``` |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 1046: tolerance $=1.000 \mathrm{e}-07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Coefficients: generalized least squares |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panels: heteroskedastic with cross-sectional correlation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Correlation: no autocorrelation |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated covariances |  | = |  | Numbe | $f$ obs | 100 |
| Estimated autocorrelations |  | = |  | Numbe | f groups | 5 |
| Estimated coefficients |  | $=$ |  | Time | iods | 20 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald | 2(2) | 558.51 |
| Log likelihood |  | $=-515.422$ |  | Prob $>$ | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| invest | Coef. | Std. Err | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| market | . 023631 | . 004291 | 5.51 | 0.000 | . 0152207 | . 0320413 |
| stock | . 1709472 | . 0152526 | 11.21 | 0.000 | . 1410526 | . 2008417 |
| _cons | -2.216508 | 1.958845 | -1.13 | 0.258 | -6.055774 | 1.622759 |

Here the $\log$ likelihood is reported in the header of the output.

## Autocorrelation within panels

The individual identity matrices along the diagonal of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ may be replaced with more general structures to allow for serial correlation. xtgls allows three options so that you may assume a structure with corr (independent) (no autocorrelation); corr(ar1) (serial correlation where the correlation parameter is common for all panels); or corr (psar1) (serial correlation where the correlation parameter is unique for each panel).

The restriction of a common autocorrelation parameter is reasonable when the individual correlations are nearly equal and the time series are short.

If the restriction of a common autocorrelation parameter is reasonable, this allows us to use more information in estimating the autocorrelation parameter to produce a more reasonable estimate of the regression coefficients.

When you specify corr (ar1) or corr (psar1), the iterated GLS estimator does not converge to the MLE.

## Example 4

If corr (ar1) is specified, each group is assumed to have errors that follow the same $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process; that is, the autocorrelation parameter is the same for all groups.

```
. xtgls invest market stock, panels(hetero) corr(ar1)
Cross-sectional time-series FGLS regression
Coefficients: generalized least squares
Panels: heteroskedastic
Correlation: common AR(1) coefficient for all panels (0.8651)
```

| Estimated covariances | $=$ | 5 | Number of obs | $=$ | 100 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Estimated autocorrelations | $=$ | 1 | Number of groups | $=$ | 5 |
| Estimated coefficients | $=$ | 3 | Time periods | $=$ | 20 |
|  |  |  | Wald chi2(2) | $=$ | 119.69 |
|  |  | Prob > chi2 | $=$ | 0.0000 |  |


| invest | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| market | .0744315 | .0097937 | 7.60 | 0.000 | .0552362 | .0936268 |
| stock | .2874294 | .0475391 | 6.05 | 0.000 | .1942545 | .3806043 |
| _cons | -18.96238 | 17.64943 | -1.07 | 0.283 | -53.55464 | 15.62987 |

## Example 5

If corr (psar1) is specified, each group is assumed to have errors that follow a different $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process.


## Stored results

xtgls stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N) number of observations
    e(N_g) number of groups
    e(N_t) number of periods
    e(N_miss) number of missing observations
    e(n_cf) number of estimated coefficients
    e(n_cv) number of estimated covariances
    e(n_cr) number of estimated correlations
    e(df_pear) degrees of freedom for Pearson \chi }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2
    e(chi2) \chi
    e(df) degrees of freedom
    e(g_min) smallest group size
    e(g_avg) average group size
    e(g_max) largest group size
    e(rank) rank of e(V)
    e(rc) return code
```

Macros
e(cmd) xtgls
e(cmdline) command as typed
e(depvar) name of dependent variable
e(ivar) variable denoting groups
$e$ (tvar) variable denoting time within groups
e(coefftype) estimation scheme
e(corr) correlation structure
e(vt) panel option
e(rhotype) type of estimated correlation
e(wtype) weight type
$e$ (wexp) weight expression
$e$ (title) title in estimation output
e(chi2type) Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
e (rho) $\rho$
e(properties) b V
e(predict) program used to implement predict
$e($ asbalanced) factor variables fvset as asbalanced
$e($ asobserved) factor variables fvset as asobserved
Matrices
e(b) coefficient vector
e(Sigma) $\quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ matrix
$e$ (V) variance-covariance matrix of the estimators

Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

The GLS results are given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathrm{GLS}} & =\left(\mathbf{X}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \\
\widehat{\operatorname{Var}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathrm{GLS}}\right) & =\left(\mathbf{X}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{-1} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

For all our models, the $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ matrix may be written in terms of the Kronecker product:

$$
\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m \times m} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{T_{i} \times T_{i}}
$$

The estimated variance matrix is obtained by substituting the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ for $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, where

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{i, j}=\frac{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{i}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{j}}{T}
$$

The residuals used in estimating $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ are first obtained from OLS regression. If the estimation is iterated, residuals are obtained from the last fitted model.

Maximum likelihood estimates may be obtained by iterating the FGLS estimates to convergence for models with no autocorrelation, corr (independent).

The GLS estimates and their associated standard errors are calculated using $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1}$. As Beck and Katz (1995) point out, the $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ matrix is of rank at most $\min (T, m)$ when you use the panels (correlated) option. For the GLS results to be valid (not based on a generalized inverse), $T$ must be at least as large as $m$, as you need at least as many period observations as there are panels.

Beck and Katz (1995) suggest using OLS parameter estimates with asymptotic standard errors that are corrected for correlation between the panels. This estimation can be performed with the xtpcse command; see [XT] xtpcse.
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## Title

xtgls postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtgls

Postestimation commands predict margins Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtgls:

| Command | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| *estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| *1rtest | likelihood-ratio test |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |
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## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

$$
\text { predict }[\text { type }] \text { newvar }[\text { if }][\text { in }][\text {, xb stdp }]
$$

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics > Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
statistic
Description
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
stdp not allowed with margins

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than $e(b)$.
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Also see

[XT] xtgls - Fit panel-data models by using GLS
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xthtaylor - Hausman-Taylor estimator for error-components models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xthtaylor fits a random-effects model for panel data in which some of the covariates are correlated with the unobserved individual-level random effects. The command implements the Hausman-Taylor estimator by default, but the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator is available for balanced panels.

## Quick start

Hausman-Taylor model of y as a function of time-varying exogenous variable x 1 , time-invariant binary variable a, and time-varying endogenous variable $x 2$ using xtset data xthtaylor y x1 x2 a, endog(x2)

As above, and verify that a is the only time-invariant variable in the model
xthtaylor y x1 x2 a, endog(x2) constant(a)
Add time-invariant $x 3$ as an endogenous covariate, but do not verify that a and $x 3$ are the only time-invariant variables
xthtaylor $y$ x1 $x 2$ a $x 3$, endog( $x 2$ x3)
As above, but use Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator for balanced panels
xthtaylor $y$ x1 x2 a $x 3$, endog(x2 x3) am

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Endogenous covariates $>$ Hausman-Taylor regression (RE)

## Syntax

xthtaylor depvar indepvars [if] [in] [weight], endog(varlist) [options]
options
Description
Model
noconstant

* endog (varlist)
constant ( varlist $_{\mathrm{ti}}$ )
varying (varlist ${ }_{\mathrm{tv}}$ )
amacurdy
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
suppress constant term
explanatory variables in indepvars to be treated as endogenous independent variables that are constant within panel
independent variables that are time varying within panel
fit model based on Amemiya and MaCurdy estimator
vcetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife

Reporting
level (\#)
small
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report small-sample statistics

* endog (varlist) is required.

A panel variable must be specified. For xthtaylor, amacurdy, a time variable must also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
depvar, indepvars, and all varlists may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, statsby, and xi are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
iweights and fweights are allowed unless the amacurdy option is specified. Weights must be constant within panel; see [U] 11.1.6 weight.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

$\sqrt{\text { Model }}$
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
endog (varlist) specifies that a subset of explanatory variables in indepvars be treated as endogenous variables, that is, the explanatory variables that are assumed to be correlated with the unobserved random effect. endog() is required.
constant ( varlist $_{\mathrm{ti}}$ ) specifies the subset of variables in indepvars that are time invariant, that is, constant within panel. By using this option, you assert not only that the variables specified in $v_{\text {arlist }}^{\mathrm{ti}}$ are time invariant but also that all other variables in indepvars are time varying. If this assertion is false, xthtaylor does not perform the estimation and will issue an error message. xthtaylor automatically detects which variables are time invariant and which are not. However, users may want to check their understanding of the data and specify which variables are time invariant and which are not.
varying (varlist $t_{\mathrm{tv}}$ ) specifies the subset of variables in indepvars that are time varying. By using this option, you assert not only that the variables specified in varlist $t_{\mathrm{tv}}$ are time varying but also that all other variables in indepvars are time invariant. If this assertion is false, xthtaylor does not perform the estimation and will issue an error message. xthtaylor automatically detects which variables are time varying and which are not. However, users may want to check their understanding of the data and specify which variables are time varying and which are not.
amacurdy specifies that the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator be used. This estimator uses extra instruments to gain efficiency at the cost of additional assumptions on the data-generating process. This option may be specified only for samples containing balanced panels, and weights may not be specified. The panels must also have a common initial period.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce(conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for this Hausman-Taylor model.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtpoisson, re and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtpoisson.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
small specifies that the $p$-values from the Wald tests in the output and all subsequent Wald tests obtained via test use $t$ and $F$ distributions instead of the large-sample normal and $\chi^{2}$ distributions. By default, the $p$-values are obtained using the normal and $\chi^{2}$ distributions.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
Consider a random-effects model of the form

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{X}_{2 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\mathbf{Z}_{1 i} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}+\mathbf{Z}_{2 i} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}+\mu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where
$\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of observations on exogenous, time-varying variables assumed to be uncorrelated with $\mu_{i}$ and $\epsilon_{i t}$;
$\mathbf{X}_{2 i t}$ is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of observations on endogenous, time-varying variables assumed to be (possibly) correlated with $\mu_{i}$ but orthogonal to $\epsilon_{i t}$;
$\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ is a $1 \times g_{1}$ vector of observations on exogenous, time-invariant variables assumed to be uncorrelated with $\mu_{i}$ and $\epsilon_{i t}$;
$\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}$ is a $1 \times g_{2}$ vector of observations on endogenous, time-invariant variables assumed to be (possibly) correlated $\mu_{i}$ but orthogonal to $\epsilon_{i t}$;
$\mu_{i}$ is the unobserved, panel-level random effect that is assumed to have zero mean and finite variance $\sigma_{\mu}^{2}$ and to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) over the panels;
$\epsilon_{i t}$ is the idiosyncratic error that is assumed to have zero mean and finite variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$ and to be i.i.d. over all the observations in the data;
$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}, \boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}$, and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}$ are $k_{1} \times 1, k_{2} \times 1, g_{1} \times 1$, and $g_{2} \times 1$ coefficient vectors, respectively; and $i=1, \ldots, n$, where $n$ is the number of panels in the sample and, for each $i, t=1, \ldots, T_{i}$.

Because $\mathbf{X}_{2 i t}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}$ may be correlated with $\mu_{i}$, the simple random-effects estimators-xtreg, re and xtreg, mle-are generally not consistent for the parameters in this model. Because the within estimator, xtreg, fe, removes the $\mu_{i}$ by mean-differencing the data before estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$, it is consistent for these parameters. However, in the process of removing the $\mu_{i}$, the within estimator also eliminates the $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ and the $\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}$. Thus it cannot estimate $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}$ nor $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}$. The Hausman-Taylor and Amemiya-MaCurdy estimators implemented in xthtaylor are designed to resolve this problem.

The within estimator consistently estimates $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$. Using these estimates, we can obtain the within residuals, called $\widehat{d}_{i}$. Intermediate, albeit consistent, estimates of $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}$-called $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{1 \mathrm{IV}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{2 \mathrm{IV}}$, respectively—are obtained by regressing the within residuals on $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}$, using $\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ as instruments. The order condition for identification requires that the number of variables in $\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}, k_{1}$, be at least as large as the number of elements in $\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}, g_{2}$ and that there be sufficient correlation between the instruments and $\mathbf{Z}_{2 i}$ to avoid a weak-instrument problem.

The within estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$ and the intermediate estimates $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{1 \text { IV }}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{2 \text { IV }}$ can be used to obtain sets of within and overall residuals. These two sets of residuals can be used to estimate the variance components (see Methods and formulas for details).

The estimated variance components can then be used to perform a GLS transform on each of the variables. For what follows, define the general notation $\breve{w}_{i t}$ to represent the GLS transform of the variable $w_{i t}, \bar{w}_{i}$ to represent the within-panel mean of $w_{i t}$, and $\widetilde{w}_{i t}$ to represent the within transform of $w_{i t}$. With this notational convention, the Hausman-Taylor (1981) estimator of the coefficients of interest can be obtained by the instrumental-variables regression

$$
\begin{equation*}
\breve{y}_{i t}=\breve{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\breve{\mathbf{X}}_{2 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\breve{\mathbf{Z}}_{1 i} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}+\breve{\mathbf{Z}}_{2 i} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}+\breve{\mu}_{i}+\breve{\epsilon}_{i t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

using $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t}, \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{2 i t}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{2 i}$, and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ as instruments.
For the instruments to be valid, this estimator requires that $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i}$. and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ be uncorrelated with the random-effect $\mu_{i}$. More precisely, the instruments are valid when

$$
\operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i .} \mu_{i}=0
$$

and

$$
\operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{Z}_{1 i} \mu_{i}=0
$$

Amemiya and MaCurdy (1986) place stricter requirements on the instruments that vary within panels to obtain a more efficient estimator. Specifically, Amemiya and MaCurdy (1986) assume that $\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}$ is orthogonal to $\mu_{i}$ in every period; that is, $\operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \mu_{i}=0$ for $t=1, \ldots, T$. With this restriction, they derive the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator as the instrumental-variables regression of (1) using instruments $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t}, \widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{2 i t}, \mathbf{X}_{1 i t}^{*}$, and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$. The order condition for the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator is now $T k_{1}>g_{2}$. xthtaylor uses the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator when the amacurdy option is specified.

Although the estimators implemented in xthtaylor and xtivreg (see [XT] xtivreg) use the method of instrumental variables, each command is designed for different problems. The estimators implemented in xtivreg assume that a subset of the explanatory variables in the model are correlated with the idiosyncratic error $\epsilon_{i t}$. In contrast, the Hausman-Taylor and Amemiya-MaCurdy estimators that are implemented in xthtaylor assume that some of the explanatory variables are correlated with the individual-level random effects, $u_{i}$, but that none of the explanatory variables are correlated with the idiosyncratic error, $\epsilon_{i t}$.

## > Example 1

This example replicates the results of Baltagi and Khanti-Akom (1990, table II, column HT) using 595 observations on individuals over 1976-1982 that were extracted from the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID). In the model, the log-transformed wage lwage is assumed to be a function of how long the person has worked for a firm, wks; binary variables indicating whether a person lives in a large metropolitan area or in the south, smsa and south; marital status is ms; years of education, ed; a quadratic of work experience, exp and exp2; occupation, occ; a binary variable indicating employment in a manufacture industry, ind; a binary variable indicating that wages are set by a union contract, union; a binary variable indicating gender, fem; and a binary variable indicating whether the individual is African American, blk.

We suspect that the time-varying variables $\exp$, $\exp 2$, wks, ms, and union are all correlated with the unobserved individual random effect. We can inspect these variables to see if they exhibit sufficient within-panel variation to serve as their own instruments.

| Variable |  | Mean Std. Dev. |  | Min | Max | Observations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| exp | overall | 19.85378 | 10.96637 | 1 | 51 | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4165 |
|  | between |  | 10.79018 | 4 | 48 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 595 |
|  | within |  | 2.00024 | 16.85378 | 22.85378 | $\mathrm{T}=$ | 7 |
| exp2 | overall | 514.405 | 496.9962 | 1 | 2601 | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4165 |
|  | between |  | 489.0495 | 20 | 2308 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 595 |
|  | within |  | 90.44581 | 231.405 | 807.405 | $\mathrm{T}=$ | 7 |
| wks | overall | 46.81152 | 5.129098 | 5 | 52 | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4165 |
|  | between |  | 3.284016 | 31.57143 | 51.57143 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 595 |
|  | within |  | 3.941881 | 12.2401 | 63.66867 | $\mathrm{T}=$ | 7 |
| ms | overall | . 8144058 | . 3888256 | 0 | 1 | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4165 |
|  | between |  | . 3686109 | 0 | 1 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 595 |
|  | within |  | . 1245274 | -. 0427371 | 1.671549 | $\mathrm{T}=$ | 7 |
| union | overall | . 3639856 | . 4812023 | 0 | 1 | $\mathrm{N}=$ | 4165 |
|  | between |  | . 4543848 | 0 | 1 | $\mathrm{n}=$ | 595 |
|  | within |  | . 1593351 | -. 4931573 | 1.221128 | $\mathrm{T}=$ | 7 |

We are also going to assume that the exogenous variables occ, south, smsa, ind, fem, and blk are instruments for the endogenous, time-invariant variable ed. The output below indicates that although fem appears to be a weak instrument, the remaining instruments are probably sufficiently correlated to identify the coefficient on ed. (See Baltagi and Khanti-Akom [1990] for more discussion.)

|  | fem | blk | OCC | south | smsa | ind | ed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fem | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| blk | 0.2086 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Occ | -0.0847 | 0.0837 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| south | 0.0516 | 0.1218 | 0.0413 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| smsa | 0.1044 | 0.1154 | -0.2018 | -0.1350 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| ind | -0.1778 | -0.0475 | 0.2260 | -0.0769 | -0.0689 | 1.0000 |  |
| ed | -0.0012 | -0.1196 | -0.6194 | -0.1216 | 0.1843 | -0.2365 | 1.0000 |

We will assume that the correlations are strong enough and proceed with the estimation. The output below gives the Hausman-Taylor estimates for this model.


Note: TV refers to time varying; TI refers to time invariant.
The estimated $\sigma_{\mu}$ and $\sigma_{\epsilon}$ are 0.9418 and 0.1518 , respectively, indicating that a large fraction of the total error variance is attributed to $\mu_{i}$. The $z$ statistics indicate that several the coefficients may not be significantly different from zero. Whereas the coefficients on the time-invariant variables fem and blk have relatively large standard errors, the standard error for the coefficient on ed is relatively small.

Baltagi and Khanti-Akom (1990) also present evidence that the efficiency gains of the AmemiyaMaCurdy estimator over the Hausman-Taylor estimator are small for these data. This point is especially important given the additional restrictions that the estimator places on the data-generating process. The output below replicates the Baltagi and Khanti-Akom (1990) results from column AM of table II.

| Amemiya-MaCurdy estimation |  |  |  | Number | obs | 4,165 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | groups | 595 |
| Time variable: t |  |  |  | Obs pe | group: |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | min | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  | avg | 7 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 7 |
| Random effects u_i ~ i.i.d. |  |  |  | Wald ch | (12) | 6879.20 |
|  |  |  |  | Prob > | i2 | 0.0000 |
| lwage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| TVexogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| occ | -. 0208498 | . 0137653 | -1.51 | 0.130 | -. 0478292 | . 0061297 |
| south | . 0072818 | . 0319365 | 0.23 | 0.820 | -. 0553126 | . 0698761 |
| smsa | -. 0419507 | . 0189471 | -2.21 | 0.027 | -. 0790864 | -. 0048149 |
| ind | . 0136289 | . 015229 | 0.89 | 0.371 | -. 0162194 | . 0434771 |
| TVendogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| exp | . 1129704 | . 0024688 | 45.76 | 0.000 | . 1081316 | . 1178093 |
| exp2 | -. 0004214 | . 0000546 | -7.72 | 0.000 | -. 0005283 | -. 0003145 |
| wks | . 0008381 | . 0005995 | 1.40 | 0.162 | -. 0003368 | . 002013 |
| ms | -. 0300894 | . 0189674 | -1.59 | 0.113 | -. 0672649 | . 0070861 |
| union | . 0324752 | . 0148939 | 2.18 | 0.029 | . 0032837 | . 0616667 |
| TIexogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| fem | -. 132008 | . 1266039 | -1.04 | 0.297 | -. 380147 | . 1161311 |
| blk | -. 2859004 | . 1554857 | -1.84 | 0.066 | -. 5906468 | . 0188459 |
| TIendogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ed | . 1372049 | . 0205695 | 6.67 | 0.000 | . 0968894 | . 1775205 |
| _cons | 2.927338 | . 2751274 | 10.64 | 0.000 | 2.388098 | 3.466578 |
| sigma_u | . 94180304 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 15180273 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 97467788 | (fraction of variance due to $u_{\text {_ }} \mathrm{i}$ ) |  |  |  |  |

Note: TV refers to time varying; TI refers to time invariant.

## Technical note

We mentioned earlier that insufficient correlation between an endogenous variable and the instruments can give rise to a weak-instrument problem. Suppose that we simulate data for a model of the form

$$
y=3+3 x_{1 a}+3 x_{1 b}+3 x_{2}+3 z_{1}+3 z_{2}+u_{i}+e_{i t}
$$

and purposely construct the instruments so that they exhibit little correlation with the endogenous variable $z_{2}$.
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xthtaylor1
. correlate ui z1 z2 x1a x1b x2 eit
(obs=10,000)

|  | ui | z1 | z2 | x1a | x1b | x2 | eit |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| ui | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| z1 | 0.0268 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| z2 | 0.8777 | 0.0286 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |  |
| x1a | -0.0145 | 0.0065 | -0.0034 | 1.0000 |  |  |  |
| x1b | 0.0026 | 0.0079 | 0.0038 | -0.0030 | 1.0000 |  |  |
| x2 | 0.8765 | 0.0191 | 0.7671 | -0.0192 | 0.0037 | 1.0000 |  |
| eit | 0.0060 | -0.0198 | 0.0123 | -0.0100 | -0.0138 | 0.0092 | 1.0000 |

In the output below, weak instruments have serious consequences on the estimates produced by xthtaylor. The estimate of the coefficient on $z 2$ is three times larger than its true value, and its standard error is rather large. Without sufficient correlation between the endogenous variable and its instruments in a given sample, there is insufficient information for identifying the parameter. Also, given the results of Stock, Wright, and Yogo (2002), weak instruments will cause serious size distortions in any tests performed.


Note: TV refers to time varying; TI refers to time invariant.

## $>$ Example 2

Now let's consider why we might want to specify the constant ( $v_{a r l i s t_{\mathrm{t}}}$ ) option. For this example, we will use simulated data. In the output below, we fit a model over the full sample. Note the placement in the output of the coefficient on the exogenous variable x 1 c .
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xthtaylor2
. xthtaylor yit x1a x1b x1c x2 z1 z2, endog(x2 z2)

| Hausman-Taylor estimation | Number of obs | = | 10,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: id | Number of groups | $=$ | 1,000 |
|  | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | $=$ | 10 |
|  | avg | = | 10 |
|  | max | = | 10 |
| Random effects u_i ~ i.i.d. | Wald chi2(6) | = | 10341.63 |
|  | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| yit | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TVexogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x1a | 3.023647 | .0570274 | 53.02 | 0.000 | 2.911875 | 3.135418 |
| x1b | 2.966666 | .0572659 | 51.81 | 0.000 | 2.854427 | 3.078905 |
| x1c | .2355318 | .123502 | 1.91 | 0.057 | -.0065276 | .4775912 |
| TVendogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x2 | 14.17476 | 3.128385 | 4.53 | 0.000 | 8.043234 | 20.30628 |
| TIexogenous |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| z1 | 1.741709 | .4280022 | 4.07 | 0.000 | .9028398 | 2.580578 |
| TIendogenous <br> z2 | 7.983849 | .6970903 | 11.45 | 0.000 | 6.617577 | 9.350121 |
| _cons | 2.146038 | .3794179 | 5.66 | 0.000 | 1.402393 | 2.889684 |
| sigma_u | 5.6787791 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | 3.1806188 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | .76120931 | (fraction of variance due to u_i) |  |  |  |  |

Note: TV refers to time varying; TI refers to time invariant.
Now suppose that we want to fit the model using only the first eight periods. Below, x1c now appears under the TIexogenous heading rather than the TVexogenous heading because x 1 c is time invariant in the subsample defined by $\mathrm{t}<9$.


Note: TV refers to time varying; TI refers to time invariant.
To prevent a variable from becoming time invariant, you can use either constant (varlist ${ }_{\mathrm{t}}$ ) or varying (varlist $t_{\mathrm{tv}}$ ). constant ( varlist $_{\mathrm{ti}}$ ) specifies the subset of variables in varlist that are time invariant and requires the remaining variables in varlist to be time varying. If you specify constant ( varlist $_{\mathrm{ti}}$ ) and any of the variables contained in varlist $t_{\mathrm{ti}}$ are time varying, or if any of the variables not contained in varlist ${ }_{\mathrm{ti}}$ are time invariant, xthtaylor will not perform the estimation and will issue an error message.

```
. xthtaylor yit x1a x1b x1c x2 z1 z2 if t<9, endog(x2 z2) constant(z1 z2)
x1c not included in constant().
r(198);
```

The same thing happens when you use the varying (varlist ${ }_{\text {tv }}$ ) option.

## Stored results

xthtaylor stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
        e(N)
        e(N_g)
        e(df_m)
        e(df_r)
        e(g_min)
        e(g_avg)
        e(g_max)
    e(Tcon)
    e(N_clust)
    e(sigma_u)
    e(sigma_e)
    e(chi2)
    e(rho)
    e(F)
    e(Tbar)
    e(rank)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(TVexogenous)
e(TIexogenous)
e(TVendogenous)
e(TIendogenous)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(clustvar)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
residual degrees of freedom (small only)
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
1 if panels balanced; 0 otherwise
number of clusters
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
$\chi^{2}$
$\rho$
model $F$ (small only)
harmonic mean of group sizes
rank of $e(V)$
xthtaylor
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups, amacurdy only
exogenous time-varying variables
exogenous time-invariant variables
endogenous time-varying variables
endogenous time-invariant variables
weight type
weight expression
Hausman-Taylor or Amemiya-MaCurdy
name of cluster variable
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
b V
program used to implement predict

Matrices
e(b)
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
Functions
e(sample)
marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

Consider an error-components model of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{X}_{2 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\mathbf{Z}_{1 i} \delta_{1}+\mathbf{Z}_{2 i} \delta_{2}+\mu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and, for each $i, t=1, \ldots, T_{i}$, of which $T_{i}$ periods are observed; $n$ is the number of panels in the sample. The covariates in $\mathbf{X}$ are time varying, and the covariates in $\mathbf{Z}$ are time invariant. Both $\mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{Z}$ are decomposed into two parts. The covariates in $\mathbf{X}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{1}$ are assumed to be uncorrelated with $\mu_{i}$ and $e_{i t}$, whereas the covariates in $\mathbf{X}_{2}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{2}$ are allowed to be correlated with $\mu_{i}$ but not with $\epsilon_{i t}$. Hausman and Taylor (1981) suggest an instrumental-variable estimator for this model.

For some variable $w$, the within transformation of $w$ is defined as

$$
\widetilde{w}_{i t}=w_{i t}-\bar{w}_{i .} \quad \bar{w}_{i .}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} w_{i t}
$$

Because the within estimator removes $\mathbf{Z}$, the within transformation reduces the model to

$$
\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{2 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i t}
$$

The within estimators $\widehat{\beta}_{1 w}$ and $\widehat{\beta}_{2 w}$ are consistent for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$, but they may not be efficient. Also, note that the within estimator cannot estimate $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}$.

From the within estimator, we can be obtain an estimate of the idiosyncratic error component, $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$, as

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}=\frac{\mathrm{RSS}}{N-n}
$$

where RSS is the residual sum of squares from the within regression and $N$ is the total number of observations in the sample.

Using the results of the within estimation, we can define

$$
\bar{d}_{i t}=\bar{y}_{i t}-\bar{X}_{1 i t} \widehat{\beta}_{1 w}-\bar{X}_{2 i t} \widehat{\beta}_{2 w}
$$

where $\bar{y}_{i t}, \bar{X}_{1 i t}$, and $\bar{X}_{2 i t}$ contain the panel level means of these variables in all observations.
Regressing $\bar{d}_{i t}$ on $\mathbf{Z}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{2}$, using $\mathbf{X}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{1}$ as instruments, provides intermediate, consistent estimates of $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{2}$, which we will call $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{1 \mathrm{IV}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{2 \mathrm{IV}}$.

Using the within estimates, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{1 \mathrm{IV}}$, and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{2 \mathrm{IV}}$, we can obtain an estimate of the variance of the random effect, $\sigma_{\mu}^{2}$. First, let

$$
\widehat{e}_{i t}=\left(y_{i t}-\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{1 w}-\mathbf{X}_{2 i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2 w}-\mathbf{Z}_{1 i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{1 \mathrm{IV}}-\mathbf{Z}_{2 i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{2 \mathrm{IV}}\right)
$$

Then define

$$
s^{2}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}}\left(\frac{1}{T_{i}} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \widehat{e}_{i t}\right)^{2}
$$

Hausman and Taylor (1981) showed that, for balanced panels,

$$
\operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^{2}=T \sigma_{\mu}^{2}+\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}
$$

For unbalanced panels,

$$
\operatorname{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} s^{2}=\bar{T} \sigma_{\mu}^{2}+\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}
$$

where

$$
\bar{T}=\frac{n}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{T_{i}}}
$$

After we plug in $\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}$, our consistent estimate for $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$, a little algebra suggests the estimate

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}=\left(s^{2}-\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}\right)(\bar{T})^{-1}
$$

Define $\widehat{\theta}_{i}$ as

$$
\widehat{\theta}_{i}=1-\left(\frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}+T_{i} \widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

With $\widehat{\theta_{i}}$ in hand, we can perform the standard random-effects GLS transform on each of the variables. The transform is given by

$$
w_{i t}^{*}=w_{i t}-\widehat{\theta}_{i} \bar{w}_{i}
$$

where $\bar{w}_{i}$. is the within-panel mean.
We can then obtain the Hausman-Taylor estimates of the coefficients in (2) and the conventional VCE by fitting an instrumental-variables regression of the GLS-transformed $y_{i t}^{*}$ on $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{*}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{i t}^{*}$, with instruments $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}, \overline{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i \text {, }}$, and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$.

We can obtain Amemiya-MaCurdy estimates of the coefficients in (2) and the conventional VCE by fitting an instrumental-variables regression of the GLS-transformed $y_{i t}^{*}$ on $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{*}$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{i t}^{*}$, using $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$, $\breve{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t}$, and $\mathbf{Z}_{1 i}$ as instruments, where $\breve{\mathbf{X}}_{1 i t}=\mathbf{X}_{1 i 1}, \mathbf{X}_{1 i 2}, \ldots, \mathbf{X}_{1 i T_{i}}$. The order condition for the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator is $T k_{1}>g_{2}$, and this estimator is available only for balanced panels.
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## Also see

[XT] xthtaylor postestimation - Postestimation tools for xthtaylor
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xthtaylor postestimation - Postestimation tools for xthtaylor

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| References | Also see |  |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xthtaylor:
Command Description


## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as fitted values, standard errors, combined residuals, predictions, random-error components, and idiosyncratic error components.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic]
statistic
Description

| Main | $\mathbf{X}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\mathbf{Z}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, fitted values; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| xb | standard error of the fitted values |
| stdp | $\widehat{\mu}_{i}+\widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}$, the combined residual |
| ue | $\mathbf{X}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\mathbf{Z}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, prediction including effect |
| ${ }^{*}$ xbu | $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, the random-error component |
| ${ }^{*} \mathrm{u}$ | $\widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}$, prediction of the idiosyncratic error component |
| ${ }^{*} \mathrm{e}$ |  |

Unstarred statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict . . if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample. Starred statistics are calculated only for the estimation sample, even when if e(sample) is not specified.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction, that is, $\mathbf{X}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
ue calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\mu}_{i}+\widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}$.
xbu calculates the prediction of $\mathbf{X}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}+\widehat{\nu}_{i}$, the prediction including the random effect.
u calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, the estimated random effect.
e calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for fitted values.

## Menu for margins

Statistics > Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic Description

| xb | $\mathbf{X}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\mathbf{Z}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, fitted values; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| ue | not allowed with margins |
| xbu | not allowed with margins |
| u | not allowed with margins |
| e | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1

Continuing with example 1 of [XT] xthtaylor, we use hausman to test whether we should use the Hausman-Taylor estimator instead of the fixed-effects estimator. We follow the empirical illustration in Baltagi (2013, sec. 7.5), but we fit the model without including the exp2 and wks variables.

We first fit the model with xthtaylor and then with xtreg, fe:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/psidextract
. xthtaylor lwage occ south smsa ind exp ms union fem blk ed,
> endog(exp ms union ed)
    (output omitted)
. estimates store eq_ht
. xtreg lwage occ south smsa ind exp ms union fem blk ed, fe
(output omitted)
. estimates store eq_fe
```

We can now use hausman to compare the two estimators, but we need to specify the df() to indicate the degrees of freedom for the $\chi^{2}$ statistic, which would be determined by the overidentifying restrictions in the Hausman-Taylor estimation. In this case, there are three degrees of freedom because there are four time-varying exogenous variables (occ, south, smsa, ind) that can be used as instruments for only one time-invariant endogenous variable (ed).

```
hausman eq_fe eq_ht, df(3)
                __ Coefficients -_
\begin{tabular}{r|crrr} 
& \begin{tabular}{c}
\((b)\) \\
eq_fe
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
(B) \\
eq_ht
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c}
\((b-B)\) \\
Difference
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
sqrt (diag(V_b-V_B)) \\
S.E.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline occ & -.0239323 & -.0231694 & -.0007629 & .0002395 \\
south & -.0037282 & .0062699 & -.0099982 & .0124188 \\
smsa & -.0436251 & -.0433518 & -.0002733 & .0042296 \\
ind & .021184 & .0156376 & .0055465 & .0025159 \\
exp & .0965738 & .0964748 & .0000991 & .000063 \\
ms & -.0299908 & -.0300703 & .0000795 & .000321 \\
union & .0349156 & .0348494 & .0000662 & .0006336 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from xtreg \(B=\) inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from xthtaylor
Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic
\(\operatorname{chi2}(3)=(b-B) \cdot\left[\left(V \_b-V \_B\right)^{\wedge}(-1)\right](b-B)\)
\(=\quad 5.22\)
Prob>chi2 = 0.1567
(V_b-V_B is not positive definite)
```

The $p$-value for the test provides evidence favoring the null hypothesis; therefore, in this case, the Hausman-Taylor estimation is adequate.

Notice that the variance-covariance matrix for the difference (b-B) is not positive definite. As Greene (2012, 237) points out, this kind of result is due to finite-sample conditions. He also states that Hausman considers it preferable to take the test statistic as zero and, therefore, not to reject the null hypothesis.

## > Example 2

We now want to determine whether the Amemiya-MaCurdy estimator produces significant efficiency gains with respect to the Hausman-Taylor estimator. We refit the two models, and we use the Hausman test again:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/psidextract
. xthtaylor lwage occ south smsa ind exp ms union fem blk ed,
> endog(exp ms union ed)
    (output omitted)
. estimates store eq_ht
. xthtaylor lwage occ south smsa ind exp ms union fem blk ed,
> endog(exp ms union ed) amacurdy
    (output omitted)
```

estimates store eq_am

```
hausman eq_ht eq_am
Coefficients -
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrr} 
& \begin{tabular}{c}
\((b)\) \\
eq_ht
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
(B) \\
eq_am
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c}
\((b-B)\) \\
Difference
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
sqrt (diag(V_b-V_B)) \\
S.E.
\end{tabular} \\
\hline occ & -.0231694 & -.023354 & .0001846 & .0006485 \\
south & .0062699 & .0060857 & .0001842 & .0010641 \\
smsa & -.0433518 & -.0434638 & .0001121 & .0006297 \\
ind & .0156376 & .0156602 & -.0000226 & .000492 \\
exp & .0964748 & .0962147 & .00026 & .0000694 \\
ms & -.0300703 & -.0303139 & .0002436 & .0006735 \\
union & .0348494 & .0345742 & .0002752 & .0006471 \\
fem & -.1277756 & -.1287857 & .0010101 & .0036717 \\
blk & -.2911574 & -.291645 & .0004876 & .0082831 \\
ed & .1390257 & .1380699 & .0009558 & .005436 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from xthtaylor \(B=\) inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from xthtaylor
Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic
\[
\operatorname{chi2}(10)=(b-B)^{\prime}\left[\left(V_{-} b-V_{-} B\right)^{\wedge}(-1)\right](b-B)
\]
\[
=\quad 14.42
\]
Prob>chi2 \(=0.1548\)
```

The result indicates that we should use the more efficient estimation produced by the AmemiyaMaCurdy estimator.
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## Also see

[XT] xthtaylor - Hausman-Taylor estimator for error-components models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtintreg - Random-effects interval-data regression models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtintreg fits a random-effects regression model in which the dependent variable may be measured as point data, interval data, left-censored data, or right-censored data. The dependent variable must be specified using two depvars that indicate how the dependent variable was measured. The user can request that a likelihood-ratio test comparing the panel interval regression model with the pooled model be conducted at estimation time.

## Quick start

Regression on x of an interval-measured dependent variable with lower endpoint y_lower and upper endpoint $y$ _upper using xtset data
xtintreg y_lower y_upper x
Add indicators for levels of categorical variable a as covariates
xtintreg y_lower y_upper x i.a
Perform likelihood-ratio test against pooled model
xtintreg y_lower y_upper x i.a, intreg

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Censored outcomes $>$ Interval regression (RE)

## Syntax

xtintreg depvar ${ }_{\text {lower }}$ depvar $_{\text {upper }}$ [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
The values in depvar ${ }_{\text {lower }}$ and depvar ${ }_{\text {upper }}$ should have the following form:

| Type of data |  | depvar $_{\text {lower }}$ | depvar $_{\text {upper }}$ |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| point data | $a=[a, a]$ | $a$ | $a$ |
| interval data | $[a, b]$ | $a$ | $b$ |
| left-censored data | $(-\infty, b]$ | $\cdot$ | $b$ |
| right-censored data | $[a,+\infty)$ | $a$ | $\cdot$ |
| missing |  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |

## options

Description
Model
noconstant
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
noskip
intreg
nocnsreport
display_options

## Integration

intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
perform likelihood-ratio test against pooled model
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; see $[R]$ maximize
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar ${ }_{\text {lower }}$, depvar ${ }_{\mathrm{upper}}$, and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
iweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

$\qquad$
Model tions.

SE
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level(\#), noskip; see [R] estimation options.
intreg specifies that a likelihood-ratio test comparing the random-effects model with the pooled (intreg) model be included in the output.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Integration
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtintreg but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtintreg may be used to fit a random-effects interval regression model. Consider the linear regression model with panel-level random effects

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}$. The random effects, $\nu_{i}$, are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}\right)$ independently of $\nu_{i}$. The observed data consist of the couples, $\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}\right)$, such that all that is known is that $y_{1 i t} \leq y_{i t} \leq y_{2 i t}$, where $y_{1 i t}$ is possibly $-\infty$ and $y_{2 i t}$ is possibly $+\infty$.

## > Example 1: Random-effects interval regression

We begin with the nlswork dataset described in [XT] xt and create two fictional dependent variables, where the wages are instead reported sometimes as ranges. The wages have been adjusted to 1988 dollars and have further been recoded such that some of the observations are known exactly, some are left-censored, some are right-censored, and some are known only in an interval.

We wish to fit a random-effects interval regression model of adjusted (log) wages. We specify the intreg option to test our random-effects model against our pooled estimator.


The results from an interval regression can be interpreted as we would those from a linear regression. Because the dependent variable is log transformed, the coefficients can be interpreted in terms of a percentage change. We see, for example, that on average, union members make $12.3 \%$ more than nonunion members.

The output also includes the overall and panel-level variance components (labeled sigma_e and sigma_u, respectively) together with $\rho$ (labeled rho),

$$
\rho=\frac{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}+\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}
$$

which is the proportion of the total variance contributed by the panel-level variance component.
When rho is zero, the panel-level variance component is unimportant, and the panel estimator is not different from the pooled estimator. A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output. This test formally compares the pooled estimator (interval regression) with the panel estimator. In this case, we reject the null hypothesis that there are no panel-level effects.

## - Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtintreg likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtintreg stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(N_unc)
    e(N_lc)
    e(N_rc)
    e(N_int)
    e(N_cd)
    e(k)
    e(k_aux)
    e(k_eq)
    e(k_eq_model)
    e(k_dv)
    e(df_m)
    e(ll)
    e(ll_0)
    e(chi2)
    e(chi2_c)
    e(rho)
    e(sigma_u)
    e(sigma_e)
    e(n_quad)
    e(g_min)
```

e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(rank0)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(offset1)
e(chi2type)
e(chi2_ct)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(intmethod)
e(distrib)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of e(V)
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
xtintreg
command as typed
names of dependent variables
variable denoting groups
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
offset
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

Assuming a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$, we have the joint (unconditional of $\nu_{i}$ ) density of the observed data for the $i$ th panel

$$
\begin{aligned}
& f\left\{\left(y_{1 i 1}, y_{2 i 1}\right), \ldots,\left(y_{1 i n_{i}}, y_{2 i n_{i}}\right) \mid \mathbf{x}_{1 i}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right\}= \\
& \qquad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, \Delta_{i t}\right)= \begin{cases}\left(\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\epsilon}\right)^{-1} e^{-\left(y_{1 i t}-\Delta_{i t}\right)^{2} /\left(2 \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}\right)} & \text { if }\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}\right) \in C \\ \Phi\left(\frac{y_{2 i t}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right) & \text { if }\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}\right) \in L \\ 1-\Phi\left(\frac{y_{1 i t}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right) & \text { if }\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}\right) \in R \\ \Phi\left(\frac{y_{2 i t}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{y_{1 i t}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right) & \text { if }\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}\right) \in I\end{cases}
$$

where $C$ is the set of noncensored observations ( $y_{1 i t}=y_{2 i t}$ and both nonmissing), $L$ is the set of left-censored observations ( $y_{1 i t}$ missing and $y_{2 i t}$ nonmissing), $R$ is the set of right-censored observations ( $y_{1 i t}$ nonmissing and $y_{2 i t}$ missing ), $I$ is the set of interval observations ( $y_{1 i t}<y_{2 i t}$ and both nonmissing), and $\Phi()$ is the cumulative normal distribution.

The panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, using the definition of $g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{align*}
L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i}\right. & \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}} \\
& \left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right] \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.
The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$ we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The log likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature if the intmethod (ghermite) option is specified. For nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the following formula for the log likelihood is used in place of (1).

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log f\left\{\left(y_{1 i 1}, y_{2 i 1}\right), \ldots,\left(y_{1 i n_{i}}, y_{2 i n_{i}}\right) \mid \mathbf{x}_{1 i}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \sigma_{\nu} a_{m}^{*}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. Panel size can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{1 i t}, y_{2 i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.
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## Also see

[XT] xtintreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtintreg
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xttobit - Random-effects tobit models
$[R]$ intreg - Interval regression
[R] tobit - Tobit regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtintreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtintreg

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtintreg:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lincom | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| margins | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| marginsplot | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| predictnl | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| pwcompare | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, standard errors, probabilities, and expected values.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

statistic Description

| Main |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| stdp | standard error of the linear prediction |
| stdf | standard error of the linear forecast |
| $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| $\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ | $E(y \mid a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| ystar $(a, b)$ | $E\left(y^{*}\right), y^{*}=\max \{a, \min (y, b)\}$, marginal with respect to the random effect |

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample)... if wanted only for the estimation sample.
where $a$ and $b$ may be numbers or variables; $a$ missing ( $a \geq$.) means $-\infty$, and $b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$; see [U] 12.2.1 Missing values.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ using the estimated fixed effects (coefficients) in the model. This is equivalent to fixing all random effects in the model to their theoretical (prior) mean value of zero.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction. It can be thought of as the standard error of the predicted expected value or mean for the observation's covariate pattern. The standard error of the prediction is also referred to as the standard error of the fitted value.
stdf calculates the standard error of the linear forecast. This is the standard error of the point prediction for 1 observation. It is commonly referred to as the standard error of the future or forecast value. By construction, the standard errors produced by stdf are always larger than those produced by stdp; see Methods and formulas in [R] regress.
$\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $\operatorname{Pr}\left(a<y<b \mid \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, which is the probability that $y$ would be observed in the interval $(a, b)$, given the current values of the predictors, $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$. The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function. In the discussion that follows, these two conditions are implied.
$a$ and $b$ may be specified as numbers or variable names; $l b$ and $u b$ are variable names;
$\operatorname{pr}(20,30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<30)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(l b, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(l b<y<u b)$; and
$\operatorname{pr}(20, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<u b)$.
$a$ missing $(a \geq$.$) means -\infty ; \operatorname{pr}(., 30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(-\infty<y<30)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(l b, 30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(-\infty<y<30)$ in observations for which $l b \geq$.
(and calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(l b<y<30)$ elsewhere).
$b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$; $\operatorname{pr}(20,$.$) calculates \operatorname{Pr}(+\infty>y>20)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(20, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(+\infty>y>20)$ in observations for which $u b \geq$.
(and calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<u b)$ elsewhere).
$\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $E\left(y \mid a<y<b, \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, which is the expected value of $y$ conditional on $y$ being in the interval $(a, b)$, meaning that $y$ is truncated. $a$ and $b$ are specified as they are for $\operatorname{pr}()$. The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function.
ystar $(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $E\left(y^{*} \mid \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, where $y^{*}=a$ if $y \leq a, y^{*}=b$ if $y \geq b$, and $y^{*}=y$ otherwise, meaning that $y^{*}$ is the censored version of $y . a$ and $b$ are specified as they are for pr() . The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtintreg. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions, probabilities, and expected values.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [\underline{predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]}]
```

statistic Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| $\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ | $E(y \mid a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| ystar $(a, b)$ | $E\left(y^{*}\right), y^{*}=\max \{a, \min (y, b)\}$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| stdf | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see $[R]$ margins.

## Remarks and examples

> Example 1: Average marginal probabilities at specified covariate values
In example 1 of [XT] xtintreg, we fit a random-effects model of wages. Say that we want to know how union membership status affects the probability that a worker's wage will be "low", where low means a $\log$ wage that is less than the 20th percentile of all observations in our dataset. First, we use centile to find the 20th percentile of $\ln$ _wage:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork5
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xtintreg ln_wage1 ln_wage2 i.union age grade not_smsa south##c.year, intreg
    (output omitted)
. centile ln_wage, centile(20)
\begin{tabular}{c|rcccr}
\multirow{2}{*}{ Variable } & Obs & & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ —ercentile Binom. Interp. - Centile } & [95\% Conf. Interval] \\
\hline ln_wage & 28,534 & 20 & 1.301507 & 1.297063 & 1.308635
\end{tabular}
```

Now we use margins to obtain the effect of union status on the probability that the log of wages is in the bottom $20 \%$ of women. Given the results from centile that corresponds to the log of wages being below 1.30. We evaluate the effect for two groups: 1) women age 30 living in the south in 1988 who graduated high school, but had no more schooling, and 2) the same group of women, but who are instead college graduates (grade=16).


For the first group of women, according to our fitted model, being in a union lowers the probability of being classified as a low-wage worker by almost 7.6 percentage points. Being a college graduate attenuates this effect to just under 3.7 percentage points.

## Methods and formulas

Methods and formulas for calculating the available predictions are given in Methods and formulas of [XT] xttobit postestimation.

## Also see <br> [XT] xtintreg - Random-effects interval-data regression models

[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models

Description
Syntax
Options for FE model
Stored results
References

## Quick start

Options for RE model
Options for FD model
Methods and formulas Also see

## Menu

Options for BE model
Remarks and examples
Acknowledgment

## Description

xtivreg offers five different estimators for fitting panel-data models in which some of the right-hand-side covariates are endogenous. These estimators are two-stage least-squares generalizations of simple panel-data estimators for exogenous variables. xtivreg with the be option uses the twostage least-squares between estimator. xtivreg with the fe option uses the two-stage least-squares within estimator. xtivreg with the re option uses a two-stage least-squares random-effects estimator. There are two implementations: G2SLS from Balestra and Varadharajan-Krishnakumar (1987) and EC2SLS from Baltagi. The Balestra and Varadharajan-Krishnakumar G2SLS is the default because it is computationally less expensive. Baltagi's EC2SLS can be obtained by specifying the ec2sls option. xtivreg with the fd option requests the two-stage least-squares first-differenced estimator.

See Baltagi (2013) for an introduction to panel-data models with endogenous covariates. For the derivation and application of the first-differenced estimator, see Anderson and Hsiao (1981).

## Quick start

Random-effects linear panel-data model with outcome $y$, exogenous $x 1$, and $x 2$ instrumented by $x 3$ using xtset data

```
xtivreg y x1 (x2 = x3)
```

Use fixed-effects estimator and include indicators for each level of categorical variable a
xtivreg y x1 i.a (x2 = x3), fe
Use between-effects estimator and include indicators for levels of b as instruments
xtivreg y x1 i.a (x2 = x3 i.b), be
First-differenced model of $y$ as a function of $x 1$ and $x 2$ and the lag of $y$ instrumented by its third lag xtivreg y x1 x2 (L.y = L3.y), fd

## Menu

Statistics > Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Endogenous covariates > Instrumental-variables regression (FE, RE, BE, FD)

## Syntax

GLS random-effects (RE) model
xtivreg depvar $\left[\right.$ varlist $\left._{1}\right] \quad\left(\right.$ varlist $_{2}=$ varlist $\left._{\mathrm{iv}}\right)$ [if] [in] [, re RE_options]

Between-effects (BE) model
xtivreg depvar $\left[\right.$ varlist $\left._{1}\right]\left(\right.$ varlist $_{2}=$ varlist $\left._{\mathrm{iv}}\right)[$ if $][\mathrm{in}]$, be $[$ BE_options $]$

Fixed-effects (FE) model
xtivreg depvar $\left[\right.$ varlist $\left._{1}\right]\left(\right.$ varlist $_{2}=$ varlist $\left._{\mathrm{iv}}\right)$ [if] [in], fe [FE_options]
First-differenced (FD) estimator
xtivreg depvar $\left[\right.$ varlist $\left._{1}\right]\left(\right.$ varlist $_{2}=$ varlist $\left._{\mathrm{iv}}\right)$ [if][in], fd [FD_options $]$

RE_options Description
Model
re
ec2sls
nosa
regress
SE/Robust

Reporting
level(\#)
first
small
theta
display_options
coeflegend
vce(vcetype) vcetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
use random-effects estimator; the default
use Baltagi's EC2SLS random-effects estimator
use the Baltagi-Chang estimators of the variance components
treat covariates as exogenous and ignore instrumental variables
set confidence level; default is level(95)
report first-stage estimates
report $t$ and $F$ statistics instead of $Z$ and $\chi^{2}$ statistics
report $\theta$
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
display legend instead of statistics

BE_options Description

Model
be
regress
SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) vcetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife

Reporting
level(\#)
first
small
display_options
coeflegend

FE_options
Description
Model
fe
regress
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
first
small
display_options
coeflegend
use fixed-effects estimator
treat covariates as exogenous and ignore instrumental variables
vcetype may be conventional, $\underline{\text { robust, }}$ cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report first-stage estimates
report $t$ and $F$ statistics instead of $Z$ and $\chi^{2}$ statistics
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
display legend instead of statistics

Description

## Model

noconstant
fd
regress
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level (\#)
first
small
display_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use first-differenced estimator
treat covariates as exogenous and ignore instrumental variables
vcetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report first-stage estimates
report $t$ and $F$ statistics instead of $Z$ and $\chi^{2}$ statistics
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, and display of omitted variables
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified. For xtivreg, $f d$, a time variable must also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
varlist $_{1}$ and varlist $_{\mathrm{iv}}$ may contain factor variables, except for the fd estimator; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables. depvar, $^{\text {arlist }}{ }_{1}$, varlist ${ }_{2}$, and varlist ${ }_{\mathrm{iv}}$ may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists. by 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.

## Options for RE model

$\square$ Model
re requests the G2SLS random-effects estimator. re is the default.
ec2sls requests Baltagi's EC2SLS random-effects estimator instead of the default Balestra and Varadharajan-Krishnakumar estimator.
nosa specifies that the Baltagi-Chang estimators of the variance components be used instead of the default adapted Swamy-Arora estimators.
regress specifies that all the covariates be treated as exogenous and that the instrument list be ignored. Specifying regress causes xtivreg to fit the requested panel-data regression model of depvar on varlist ${ }_{1}$ and varlist $t_{2}$, ignoring varlist $_{\mathrm{iv}}$.
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, re in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtreg.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
first specifies that the first-stage regressions be displayed.
small specifies that $t$ statistics be reported instead of $Z$ statistics and that $F$ statistics be reported instead of $\chi^{2}$ statistics.
theta specifies that the output include the estimated value of $\theta$ used in combining the between and fixed estimators. For balanced data, this is a constant, and for unbalanced data, a summary of the values is presented in the header of the output.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtivreg but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for BE model

$\qquad$ Model
be requests the between regression estimator.
regress specifies that all the covariates be treated as exogenous and that the instrument list be ignored. Specifying regress causes xtivreg to fit the requested panel-data regression model of depvar on varlist ${ }_{1}$ and varlist ${ }_{2}$, ignoring varlist $_{\mathrm{iv}}$.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, fe in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtreg.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
first specifies that the first-stage regressions be displayed.
small specifies that $t$ statistics be reported instead of $Z$ statistics and that $F$ statistics be reported instead of $\chi^{2}$ statistics.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtivreg but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for FE model

$\qquad$ Model
fe requests the fixed-effects (within) regression estimator.
regress specifies that all the covariates be treated as exogenous and that the instrument list be ignored. Specifying regress causes xtivreg to fit the requested panel-data regression model of depvar on varlist ${ }_{1}$ and varlist $t_{2}$, ignoring varlist $_{\mathrm{iv}}$.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, fe in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtreg.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
first specifies that the first-stage regressions be displayed.
small specifies that $t$ statistics be reported instead of $Z$ statistics and that $F$ statistics be reported instead of $\chi^{2}$ statistics.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% firt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtivreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for FD model

[^6]SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, fe in Methods and formulas of [XT] xtreg.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
first specifies that the first-stage regressions be displayed.
small specifies that $t$ statistics be reported instead of $Z$ statistics and that $F$ statistics be reported instead of $\chi^{2}$ statistics.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, cformat(\%fmt), pformat(\%fmt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtivreg but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
Consider an equation of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\mathbf{Y}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\gamma}+\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t}=\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\delta}+\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$y_{i t}$ is the dependent variable;
$\mathbf{Y}_{i t}$ is an $1 \times g_{2}$ vector of observations on $g_{2}$ endogenous variables included as covariates, and these variables are allowed to be correlated with the $\nu_{i t}$;
$\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}$ is an $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of observations on the exogenous variables included as covariates;
$\mathbf{Z}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{Y}_{i t} \mathbf{X}_{i t}\right]$;
$\gamma$ is a $g_{2} \times 1$ vector of coefficients;
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $k_{1} \times 1$ vector of coefficients; and
$\delta$ is a $K \times 1$ vector of coefficients, where $K=g_{2}+k_{1}$.
Assume that there is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of observations on the $k_{2}$ instruments in $\mathbf{X}_{2 i t}$. The order condition is satisfied if $k_{2} \geq g_{2}$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \mathbf{X}_{2 i t}\right]$. xtivreg handles exogenously unbalanced panel data. Thus define $T_{i}$ to be the number of observations on panel $i, n$ to be the number of panels and $N$ to be the total number of observations; that is, $N=\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_{i}$.
xtivreg offers five different estimators, which may be applied to models having the form of (1). The first-differenced estimator (FD2SLS) removes the $\mu_{i}$ by fitting the model in first differences. The within estimator (FE2SLS) fits the model after sweeping out the $\mu_{i}$ by removing the panel-level means from each variable. The between estimator (BE2SLS) models the panel averages. The two random-effects estimators, G2SLS and EC2SLS, treat the $\mu_{i}$ as random variables that are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) over the panels. Except for (FD2SLS), all of these estimators are generalizations of estimators in xtreg. See [XT] xtreg for a discussion of these estimators for exogenous covariates.

Although the estimators allow for different assumptions about the $\mu_{i}$, all the estimators assume that the idiosyncratic error term $\nu_{i t}$ has zero mean and is uncorrelated with the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$. Just as when there are no endogenous covariates, as discussed in [XT] xtreg, there are various perspectives on what assumptions should be placed on the $\mu_{i}$. If they are assumed to be fixed, the $\mu_{i}$ may be correlated with the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$, and the within estimator is efficient within a class of limited information estimators. Alternatively, if the $\mu_{i}$ are assumed to be random, they are also assumed to be i.i.d. over the panels. If the $\mu_{i}$ are assumed to be uncorrelated with the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$, the GLS random-effects estimators are more efficient than the within estimator. However, if the $\mu_{i}$ are correlated with the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$, the random-effects estimators are inconsistent but the within estimator is consistent. The price of using the within estimator is that it is not possible to estimate coefficients on time-invariant variables, and all inference is conditional on the $\mu_{i}$ in the sample. See Mundlak (1978) and Hsiao (2014) for discussions of this interpretation of the within estimator.

## > Example 1: Fixed-effects model

For the within estimator, consider another version of the wage equation discussed in [xT] xtreg. The data for this example come from an extract of women from the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth that was described in detail in [XT] xt. Restricting ourselves to only time-varying covariates, we might suppose that the $\log$ of the real wage was a function of the individual's age, age ${ }^{2}$, her tenure in the observed place of employment, whether she belonged to union, whether she lives in metropolitan area, and whether she lives in the south. The variables for these are, respectively, age, c.age\#c.age, tenure, union, not_smsa, and south. If we treat all the variables as exogenous, we can use the one-stage within estimator from xtreg, yielding


All the coefficients are statistically significant and have the expected signs.
Now suppose that we wish to model tenure as a function of union and south and that we believe that the errors in the two equations are correlated. Because we are still interested in the within estimates, we now need a two-stage least-squares estimator. The following output shows the command and the results from fitting this model:


Although all the coefficients still have the expected signs, the coefficients on age and not_smsa are no longer statistically significant. Given that these variables have been found to be important in many other studies, we might want to rethink our specification.

If we are willing to assume that the $\mu_{i}$ are uncorrelated with the other covariates, we can fit a random-effects model. The model is frequently known as the variance-components or error-components model. xtivreg has estimators for two-stage least-squares one-way error-components models. In the one-way framework, there are two variance components to estimate, the variance of the $\mu_{i}$ and the variance of the $\nu_{i t}$. Because the variance components are unknown, consistent estimates are required to implement feasible GLS. xtivreg offers two choices: a Swamy-Arora method and simple consistent estimators from Baltagi and Chang (2000).

Baltagi and Chang (1994) derived the Swamy-Arora estimators of the variance components for unbalanced panels. By default, xtivreg uses estimators that extend these unbalanced Swamy-Arora estimators to the case with instrumental variables. The default Swamy-Arora method contains a degree-of-freedom correction to improve its performance in small samples. Baltagi and Chang (2000) use variance-components estimators, which are based on the ideas of Amemiya (1971) and Swamy and Arora (1972), but they do not attempt to make small-sample adjustments. These consistent estimators of the variance components will be used if the nosa option is specified.

Using either estimator of the variance components, xtivreg offers two GLS estimators of the random-effects model. These two estimators differ only in how they construct the GLS instruments from the exogenous and instrumental variables contained in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \mathbf{X}_{2 i t}\right]$. The default method, G2SLS, which is from Balestra and Varadharajan-Krishnakumar, uses the exogenous variables after they have been passed through the feasible GLS transform. In math, G2SLS uses $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{*}$ for the GLS instruments, where $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{*}$ is constructed by passing each variable in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$ through the GLS transform in
(3) given in Methods and formulas. If the ec2sls option is specified, xtivreg performs Baltagi's EC2SLS. In EC2SLS, the instruments are $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$, where $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$ is constructed by passing each of the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$ through the within transform, and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$ is constructed by passing each variable through the between transform. The within and between transforms are given in the Methods and formulas section. Baltagi and Li (1992) show that, although the G2SLS instruments are a subset of those contained in EC2SLS, the extra instruments in EC2SLS are redundant in the sense of White (2001). Given the extra computational cost, G2SLS is the default.

## Example 2: GLS random-effects model

Here is the output from applying the G2SLS estimator to this model:

| G2SLS random-effects IV regression Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number | f obs | 19,007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | groups | 4,134 |
| R-sq: |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |  |
| within $=0.0664$ |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
| between $=0.2098$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4.6 |
| overall $=0.1463$ |  |  |  |  | max | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | (5) | 1446.37 |
| corr (u_i, X) | $=0$ (assumed) |  |  | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| tenure age | . 1391798 | . 0078756 | 17.67 | 0.000 | . 123744 | . 1546157 |
|  | . 0279649 | . 0054182 | 5.16 | 0.000 | . 0173454 | . 0385843 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0008357 | . 0000871 | -9.60 | 0.000 | -. 0010063 | -. 000665 |
| not_smsa | -. 2235103 | . 0111371 | -20.07 | 0.000 | -. 2453386 | -. 2016821 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| _cons | 1.337684 | . 0844988 | 15.83 | $0.000 \quad 1.172069$ |  | 1.503299 |
| sigma_usigma_erho | . 36582493 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . 63031479 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . 25197078 (fraction of variance due to u_i) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instrumented: Instruments: | tenure |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | age c.age\# | age not_s | sa 2.rac | union b | rth_yr sou |  |

We have included two time-invariant covariates, birth_yr and 2.race. All the coefficients are statistically significant and are of the expected sign.

Applying the EC2SLS estimator yields similar results:

| EC2SLS random-effects IV regression Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number | obs | 19,007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | groups | 4,134 |
| R-sq: |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |  |
| within $=0.0898$ |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
| between $=0.2608$ |  |  |  |  |  | 4.6 |
| overall $=0.1926$ |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | (5) | 2721.92 |
| corr (u_i, X) | $=0$ (assumed) |  |  | Prob > | i2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| tenure | . 064822 | . 0025647 | 25.27 | 0.000 | . 0597953 | . 0698486 |
| age | . 0380048 | . 0039549 | 9.61 | 0.000 | . 0302534 | . 0457562 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0006676 | . 0000632 | -10.56 | 0.000 | -. 0007915 | -. 0005438 |
| not_smsa | -. 2298961 | . 0082993 | -27.70 | 0.000 | -. 2461625 | -. 2136297 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| _cons | 1.110564 | . 0606538 | 18.31 | 0.000 | . 9916849 | 1.229443 |
| sigma_u | . 36582493 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 63031479 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 25197078 (fraction of variance due to u_i) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instrumented: Instruments: | tenure |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | age c.age | age not_s | sa 2.rac | union b | th_yr sou |  |

Fitting the same model as above with the G2SLS estimator and the consistent variance components estimators yields

| G2SLS random-effects IV regression Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number | obs | 19,007 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number | groups | 4,134 |
| R-sq: |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |  |
| within $=0.0664$ |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
| between $=0.2098$ |  |  |  |  | avg | 4.6 |
| overall $=0.1463$ |  |  |  |  | max | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | (5) | 1446.93 |
| corr (u_i, X) | $=0$ (assumed) |  |  | Prob > | i2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| tenure | . 1391859 | . 007873 | 17.68 | 0.000 | . 1237552 | . 1546166 |
| age | . 0279697 | . 005419 | 5.16 | 0.000 | . 0173486 | . 0385909 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0008357 | . 0000871 | -9.60 | 0.000 | -. 0010064 | -. 000665 |
| not_smsa | -. 2235738 | . 0111344 | -20.08 | 0.000 | -. 2453967 | -. 2017508 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { race } \\ & \text { black } \end{aligned}$ | -. 2078733 | . 0125751 | -16.53 | 0.000 | -. 2325201 | -. 1832265 |
| _cons | 1.337522 | . 0845083 | 15.83 | 0.000 | 1.171889 | 1.503155 |
| sigma_u | . 36535633 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 63020883 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 2515512 | (fraction | of vari | ce due to | u_i) |  |
| Instrumented: tenure |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instruments: | age c.age\# | age not_s | sa 2.ra | union b | th_yr sou |  |

## > Example 3: First-differenced estimator

The two-stage least-squares first-differenced estimator (FD2SLS) has been used to fit both fixed-effect and random-effect models. If the $\mu_{i}$ are truly fixed-effects, the FD2SLS estimator is not as efficient as the two-stage least-squares within estimator for finite $T_{i}$. Similarly, if none of the endogenous variables are lagged dependent variables, the exogenous variables are all strictly exogenous, and the random effects are i.i.d. and independent of the $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$, the two-stage GLS estimators are more efficient than the FD2SLS estimator. However, the FD2SLS estimator has been used to obtain consistent estimates when one of these conditions fails. Anderson and Hsiao (1981) used a version of the FD2SLS estimator to fit a panel-data model with a lagged dependent variable.

Arellano and Bond (1991) develop new one-step and two-step GMM estimators for dynamic panel data. See [XT] xtabond for a discussion of these estimators and Stata's implementation of them. In their article, Arellano and Bond (1991) apply their new estimators to a model of dynamic labor demand that had previously been considered by Layard and Nickell (1986). They also compare the results of their estimators with those from the Anderson-Hsiao estimator using data from an unbalanced panel of firms from the United Kingdom. As is conventional, all variables are indexed over the firm $i$ and time $t$. In this dataset, $\mathrm{n}_{i t}$ is the log of employment in firm $i$ inside the United Kingdom at time $t, \mathrm{w}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the real product wage, $\mathrm{k}_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of the gross capital stock, and ys ${ }_{i t}$ is the natural $\log$ of industry output. The model also includes time dummies yr1980, yr1981, yr1982, yr1983, and yr1984. In Arellano and Bond (1991, table 5, column e), the authors present the results from applying one version of the Anderson-Hsiao estimator to these data. This example reproduces
their results for the coefficients, though standard errors are slightly different because Arellano and Bond are using robust standard errors from GMM while we obtain our robust standard errors from 2SLS.

| First-differenced IV regression |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: id | Number of obs | = | 471 |
| Time variable: year | Number of groups | = | 140 |
| R-sq: | Obs per group: |  |  |
| within $=0.0141$ | min | $=$ | 3 |
| between $=0.9165$ | avg | = | 3.4 |
| overall $=0.9892$ | max | = | 5 |
|  | Wald chi2(14) | = | 259.49 |
| corr (u_i, Xb) $=0.9239$ | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |

(Std. Err. adjusted for 140 clusters in id)

| D.n | Coef. | Robust Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| n ${ }^{\text {n }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LD. | 1.422765 | 1.019992 | 1.39 | 0.163 | -. 5763824 | 3.421913 |
| L2D. | -. 1645517 | . 1300598 | -1.27 | 0.206 | -. 4194643 | . 0903609 |
| w |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1. | -. 7524675 | . 2341305 | -3.21 | $0.001$ | $-1.211355$ | $-.29358$ |
| LD. | . 9627611 | . 7828358 | $1.23$ | $0.219$ | -. 5715688 | $2.497091$ |
| k |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LD. | -. 3248778 | . 3933448 | -0.83 | 0.409 | -1.095819 | . 4460637 |
| L2D. | -. 0953947 | . 1257672 | -0.76 | 0.448 | -. 3418938 | . 1511045 |
| ys |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LD. | -1.361881 | . 8980497 | -1.52 | 0.129 | -3.122026 | . 3982639 |
| L2D. | . 3212993 | . 4234835 | 0.76 | 0.448 | -. 508713 | 1.151312 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { yr1981 } \\ \text { D1. } \end{array}$ | -. 0574197 | . 0323419 | -1.78 | 0.076 | -. 1208088 | . 0059693 |
| yr 1982 D1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1. | -. 0882952 | . 0580339 | -1.52 | 0.128 | -. 2020395 | . 0254491 |
| yr1983 <br> D1. | -. 1063153 | . 0934136 | -1.14 | 0.255 | -. 2894026 | . 0767719 |
| D1. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| yr1984 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| D1. | -. 1172108 | . 1150944 | -1.02 | 0.308 | -. 3427917 | . 1083701 |
| _cons | . 0161204 | . 025376 | 0.64 | 0.525 | -. 0336155 | . 0658564 |
| sigma_u | . 29069213 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 34152632 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 42011045 | (fraction | f varia | ce due | u_i) |  |
| Instrumented: | L.n |  |  |  |  |  |
| Instruments: | L2.n w L.w k L.k L2.k ys L.ys L2.ys yr1981 yr1982 yr1983yr1984 L3.n |  |  |  |  |  |

## Stored results

xtivreg, re stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(df_rz)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e (Tcon)
e(N_clust)
e(sigma)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(chi2)
$e($ rho $)$
e(F)
e(m_p)
e(thta_min)
e(thta_5)
e(thta_50)
e(thta_95)
e(thta_max)
e(Tbar)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(insts)
e(instd)
e(model)
e(small)
e(clustvar)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
$e$ (properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
residual degrees of freedom
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
1 if panels balanced; 0 otherwise
number of clusters
ancillary parameter (gamma, lnormal)
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
$R$-squared for within model
$R$-squared for overall model
$R$-squared for between model
$\chi^{2}$
$\rho$
model $F$ (small only)
$p$-value from model test
minimum $\theta$
$\theta$, 5th percentile
$\theta$, 50th percentile
$\theta$, 95th percentile
maximum $\theta$
harmonic mean of group sizes
rank of e(V)

## xtivreg

command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
instruments
instrumented variables
g2sls or ec2sls
small, if specified
name of cluster variable
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
predictions disallowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
xtivreg, be stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(mss)
    e(df_m)
    e(rss)
    e(df_r)
    e(df_rz)
    e(g_min)
    e(g_avg)
    e(g_max)
    e(rs_a)
    e(r2_w)
    e(r2_o)
    e(r2_b)
    e(N_clust)
    e(chi2)
    e(chi2_p)
    e(F)
    e(rmse)
    e(rank)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
$e(c m d)$
$e(c m d l i n e)$
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(insts)
e(instd)
e(model)
e(small)
e(clustvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
xtivreg
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
instruments
instrumented variables
be
small, if specified
name of cluster variable
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
predictions disallowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved

Matrices
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance

Functions

```
e(sample) marks estimation sample
```

xtivreg, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(rss)
e(df_r)
e(df_rz)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(N_clust)
e(sigma)
e(corr)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(chi2)
e(df_b)
e(chi2_p)
e(rho)
$e(F)$
e(F_f)
e(F_fp)
e(df_a)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(insts)
e(instd)
e(model)
e(small)
e(clustvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample)
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
residual sum of squares
residual degrees of freedom (small only)
residual degrees of freedom for the within-transformed regression
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
number of clusters
ancillary parameter (gamma, lnormal)
$\operatorname{corr}\left(u_{i}, \mathrm{Xb}\right)$
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
$R$-squared for within model
$R$-squared for overall model
$R$-squared for between model
model Wald (not small)
degrees of freedom for $\chi^{2}$ statistic
$p$-value for model $\chi^{2}$ test
$\rho$
$F$ statistic (small only)
$F$ for $H_{0}: u_{i}=0$
$p$-value for $F$ for $H_{0}: u_{i}=0$
degrees of freedom for absorbed effect
rank of e(V)
xtivreg
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
instruments
instrumented variables
fe
small, if specified
name of cluster variable
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
predictions disallowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
marks estimation sample
xtivreg, fd stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(rss)
e(df_r)
e(df_rz)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(N_clust)
e(sigma)
e(corr)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(chi2)
e(df_b)
e(chi2_p)
e(rho)
e(F)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(insts)
e(instd)
e(model)
e(small)
e(clustvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)

Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

Consider an equation of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\mathbf{Y}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\gamma}+\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t}=\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\delta}+\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where
$y_{i t}$ is the dependent variable;
$\mathbf{Y}_{i t}$ is an $1 \times g_{2}$ vector of observations on $g_{2}$ endogenous variables included as covariates, and these variables are allowed to be correlated with the $\nu_{i t}$;
$\mathbf{X}_{1 i t}$ is an $1 \times k_{1}$ vector of observations on the exogenous variables included as covariates;
$\mathbf{Z}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{Y}_{i t} \mathbf{X}_{i t}\right]$;
$\gamma$ is a $g_{2} \times 1$ vector of coefficients;
$\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $k_{1} \times 1$ vector of coefficients; and
$\delta$ is a $K \times 1$ vector of coefficients, where $K=g_{2}+k_{1}$.
Assume that there is a $1 \times k_{2}$ vector of observations on the $k_{2}$ instruments in $\mathbf{X}_{2 i t}$. The order condition is satisfied if $k_{2} \geq g_{2}$. Let $\mathbf{X}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \mathbf{X}_{2 i t}\right]$. xtivreg handles exogenously unbalanced panel data. Thus define $T_{i}$ to be the number of observations on panel $i, n$ to be the number of panels, and $N$ to be the total number of observations; that is, $N=\sum_{i=1}^{n} T_{i}$.

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:
xtivreg, fd
xtivreg, fe
xtivreg, be
xtivreg, re

## xtivreg, fd

As the name implies, this estimator obtains its estimates and conventional VCE from an instrumentalvariables regression on the first-differenced data. Specifically, first differencing the data yields

$$
y_{i t}-y_{i t-1}=\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t}-\mathbf{Z}_{i, t-1}\right) \delta+\nu_{i t}-\nu_{i, t-1}
$$

With the $\mu_{i}$ removed by differencing, we can obtain the estimated coefficients and their estimated variance-covariance matrix from a two-stage least-squares regression of $\Delta y_{i t}$ on $\Delta \mathbf{Z}_{i t}$ with instruments $\Delta \mathbf{X}_{i t}$.
$R^{2}$ within is reported as $\left[\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}\right]^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ between is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ overall is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.

## xtivreg, fe

At the heart of this model is the within transformation. The within transform of a variable $w$ is

$$
\widetilde{w}_{i t}=w_{i t}-\bar{w}_{i .}+\bar{w}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{w}_{i .}=\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} w_{i t} \\
& \bar{w}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} w_{i t}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $n$ is the number of groups and $N$ is the total number of observations on the variable.
The within transform of (2) is

$$
\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{i t}+\widetilde{\nu}_{i t}
$$

The within transform has removed the $\mu_{i}$. With the $\mu_{i}$ gone, the within 2SLS estimator can be obtained from a two-stage least-squares regression of $\widetilde{y}_{i t}$ on $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{i t}$ with instruments $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$.

Suppose that there are $K$ variables in $\mathbf{Z}_{i t}$, including the mandatory constant. There are $K+n-1$ parameters estimated in the model, and the conventional VCE for the within estimator is

$$
\frac{N-K}{N-n-K+1} V_{I V}
$$

where $V_{I V}$ is the VCE from the above two-stage least-squares regression. The robust and cluster-robust variance-covariance matrices are the robust and cluster-robust variance-covariance matrices from a two-stage least-squares regression of $\widetilde{y}_{i t}$ on $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{i t}$ with instruments $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$.

From the estimate of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, estimates $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ of $\mu_{i}$ are obtained as $\widehat{\mu}_{i}=\bar{y}_{i}-\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$. Reported from the calculated $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ is its standard deviation and its correlation with $\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$. Reported as the standard deviation of $\nu_{i t}$ is the regression's estimated root mean squared error, $s^{2}$, which is adjusted (as previously stated) for the $n-1$ estimated means.
$R^{2}$ within is reported as the $R^{2}$ from the mean-deviated regression.
$R^{2}$ between is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{Z}} \widehat{i}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ overall is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
At the bottom of the output, an $F$ statistics against the null hypothesis that all the $\mu_{i}$ are zero is reported. This $F$ statistic is an application of the results in Wooldridge (1990).

## xtivreg, be

After passing (2) through the between transform, we are left with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{y}_{i}=\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\delta}+\mu_{i}+\bar{\nu}_{i} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\bar{w}_{i}=\frac{1}{T_{i}} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} w_{i t} \quad \text { for } w \in\{y, \mathbf{Z}, \nu\}
$$

Similarly, define $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i}$ as the matrix of instruments $\mathbf{X}$ it after they have been passed through the between transform.

The BE2SLS estimator of (3) obtains its coefficient estimates and its VCE, a two-stage least-squares regression of $\bar{y}_{i}$ on $\bar{Z}_{i}$ with instruments $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i}$ in which each average appears $T_{i}$ times.
$R^{2}$ between is reported as the $R^{2}$ from the fitted regression.
$R^{2}$ within is reported as $\left[\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}\right]^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ overall is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.

## xtivreg, re

Per Baltagi and Chang (2000), let

$$
u=\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t}
$$

be the $N \times 1$ vector of combined errors. Then under the assumptions of the random-effects model,

$$
E\left(u u^{\prime}\right)=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} \operatorname{diag}\left[I_{T_{i}}-\frac{1}{T_{i}} \iota_{T_{i}} \iota_{T_{i}}^{\prime}\right]+\operatorname{diag}\left[w_{i} \frac{1}{T_{i}} \boldsymbol{\iota}_{T_{i}} \boldsymbol{\iota}_{T_{i}}^{\prime}\right]
$$

where

$$
\omega_{i}=T_{i} \sigma_{\mu}^{2}+\sigma_{\nu}^{2}
$$

and $\iota_{T_{i}}$ is a vector of ones of dimension $T_{i}$.
Because the variance components are unknown, consistent estimates are required to implement feasible GLS. xtivreg offers two choices. The default is a simple extension of the Swamy-Arora method for unbalanced panels.

Let

$$
u_{i t}^{w}=\widetilde{y}_{i t}-\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{w}
$$

be the combined residuals from the within estimator. Let $\widetilde{u}_{i t}$ be the within-transformed $u_{i t}$. Then

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \widetilde{u}_{i t}^{2}}{N-n-K+1}
$$

Let

$$
u_{i t}^{b}=y_{i t}-\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{b}
$$

be the combined residual from the between estimator. Let $\bar{u}_{i}^{b}$. be the between residuals after they have been passed through the between transform. Then

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \bar{u}_{i t}^{2}-(n-K) \widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}}{N-r}
$$

where

$$
r=\operatorname{trace}\left\{\left(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}^{\prime} \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}\right)^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z}_{\mu} \mathbf{Z}_{\mu}^{\prime} \overline{\mathbf{Z}}_{i}\right\}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{Z}_{\mu}=\operatorname{diag}\left(\iota_{T_{i}} \iota_{T_{i}}^{\prime}\right)
$$

If the nosa option is specified, the consistent estimators described in Baltagi and Chang (2000) are used. These are given by

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \widetilde{u}_{i t}^{2}}{N-n}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} \bar{u}_{i t}^{2}-n \widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}}{N}
$$

The default Swamy-Arora method contains a degree-of-freedom correction to improve its performance in small samples.

Given estimates of the variance components, $\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}$, the feasible GLS transform of a variable $w$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
w^{*}=w_{i t}-\widehat{\theta}_{i t} \bar{w}_{i} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\bar{w}_{i .}=\frac{1}{T_{i}} \sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} w_{i t} \\
\widehat{\theta}_{i t}=1-\left(\frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}}{\widehat{\omega}_{i}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\omega}_{i}=T_{i} \widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}
$$

Using either estimator of the variance components, xtivreg contains two GLS estimators of the random-effects model. These two estimators differ only in how they construct the GLS instruments from the exogenous and instrumental variables contained in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}=\left[\mathbf{X}_{1 i t} \mathbf{X}_{2 i t}\right]$. The default method, G2SLS, which is from Balestra and Varadharajan-Krishnakumar, uses the exogenous variables after they have been passed through the feasible GLS transform. Mathematically, G2SLS uses $\mathbf{X}^{*}$ for the GLS instruments, where $\mathbf{X}^{*}$ is constructed by passing each variable in $\mathbf{X}$ though the GLS transform in (4). The G2SLS estimator obtains its coefficient estimates and VCE from an instrumental variable regression of $y_{i t}^{*}$ on $\mathbf{Z}_{i t}^{*}$ with instruments $\mathbf{X}_{i t}^{*}$.

If the ec2sls option is specified, xtivreg performs Baltagi's EC2SLS. In EC2SLS, the instruments are $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i} t$ and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$, where $\widetilde{X}_{i t}$ is constructed by each of the variables in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$ throughout the GLS transform in (4), and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$ is made of the group means of each variable in $\mathbf{X}_{i t}$. The EC2SLS estimator obtains its coefficient estimates and its VCE from an instrumental variables regression of $y_{i t}^{*}$ on $\mathbf{Z}_{i t}^{*}$ with instruments $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{X}}_{i t}$.

Baltagi and Li (1992) show that although the G2SLS instruments are a subset of those in EC2SLS, the extra instruments in EC2SLS are redundant in the sense of White (2001). Given the extra computational cost, G2SLS is the default.

The standard deviation of $\mu_{i}+\nu_{i t}$ is calculated as $\sqrt{\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}}$.
$R^{2}$ between is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{Z}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ within is reported as $\left[\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{Z}}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}\right]^{2}$.
$R^{2}$ overall is reported as $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
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## Also see

[XT] xtivreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtivreg
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtabond - Arellano-Bond linear dynamic panel-data estimation
[XT] xthtaylor - Hausman-Taylor estimator for error-components models
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
$[\mathrm{R}]$ ivregress - Single-equation instrumental-variables regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtivreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtivreg

Postestimation commands predict margins Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtivreg:

| Command | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| * contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized prediction |
| * pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

[^7]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as fitted values and predictions.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

For all but the first-differenced estimator
predict [type] newvar $[$ if $][$ in $][$, statistic $]$

## First-differenced estimator

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, FD_statistic]
statistic Description
Main

| xb | $\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, fitted values; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| ue | $\widehat{\mu}_{i}+\widehat{\nu}_{i t}$, the combined residual |
| ${ }^{*}$ xbu | $\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\delta}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, prediction including effect |
| ${ }^{*}$ u | $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, the fixed- or random-error component |
| ${ }^{*} \mathrm{e}$ | $\widehat{\nu}_{i t}$, the overall error component |

Unstarred statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict . . . if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample. Starred statistics are calculated only for the estimation sample, even when if e(sample) is not specified.

FD_statistic Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad \mathbf{x}_{j} \mathbf{b}$, fitted values for the first-differenced model; the default
e
$e_{i t}-e_{i t-1}$, the first-differenced overall error component
These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample)... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction, that is, $\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$.
ue calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\mu}_{i}+\widehat{\nu}_{i t}$. This is not available after the first-differenced model.
xbu calculates the prediction of $\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, the prediction including the fixed or random component.
This is not available after the first-differenced model.
u calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$, the estimated fixed or random effect. This is not available after the first-differenced model.
e calculates the prediction of $\widehat{\nu}_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for fitted values.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

For all but the first-differenced estimator
statistic Description

| xb | $\mathbf{Z}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$, fitted values; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| ue | not allowed with margins |
| xbu | not allowed with margins |
| u | not allowed with margins |
| e | not allowed with margins |

First-differenced estimator
statistic Description
$\mathrm{xb} \quad \mathbf{x}_{j} \mathbf{b}$, fitted values for the first-differenced model; the default
e not allowed with margins

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Also see

[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtline - Panel-data line plots

| Description | Quick start | Menu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Syntax | Options for graph by panel | Options for overlaid panels |
| Remarks and examples | Also see |  |

## Description

xtline draws line plots for panel data.

## Quick start

Matrix of line plots of y against time variable tvar with panel identifier pvar xtline $y$, $i(p v a r) ~ t(t v a r)$

Same as above, but using xtset data
xtline y
As above, but overlay line plots for each panel identifier pvar xtline y, overlay

Add "My Title" to graph showing a matrix of line plots xtline y, byopts(title(My Title))

Add "My Title" to graph of overlaid line plots xtline y, overlay title(My Title)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Line plots

## Syntax

Graph by panel

```
xtline varlist [if] [in] [, panel_options]
```

Overlaid panels
xtline varname [if] [in], overlay [overlaid_options]
panel_options
Main
i $\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{i}\right)$
$\mathrm{t}{\text { ( } \text { varname }_{t} \text { ) }}^{\text {( }}$
Plot
cline_options
Add plots
addplot (plot)

Description
use varname $_{i}$ as the panel ID variable
use varname ${ }_{t}$ as the time variable
affect rendition of the plotted points connected by lines
add other plots to the generated graph
Y axis, Time axis, Titles, Legend, Overall
twoway_options
byopts(byopts)
any options other than by () documented in [G-3] twoway_options affect appearance of the combined graph
overlaid_options
Main
overlay
i $\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{i}\right)$
t (varname $_{t}$ )
Plots
plot\#opts (cline_options) affect rendition of the \# panel line
Add plots
addplot (plot) add other plots to the generated graph
Y axis, Time axis, Titles, Legend, Overall
twoway_options
any options other than by () documented in [G-3] twoway_options

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified. Use xtset (see [XT] xtset) or specify the $i()$ and $t()$ options. The $t()$ option allows noninteger values for the time variable, whereas xtset does not.

## Options for graph by panel


#### Abstract

Main $\mathrm{i}\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{i}\right)$ and $\mathrm{t}\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{t}\right)$ override the panel settings from xtset; see [XT] xtset. varname ${ }_{i}$ is allowed to be a string variable. varname $t_{t}$ can take on noninteger values and have repeated values within panel. That is to say, it can be any numeric variable that you would like to specify for the $x$-dimension of the graph. It is an error to specify i() without $t()$ and vice versa.


$\qquad$ Plot
cline_options affect the rendition of the plotted points connected by lines; see [G-3] cline_options.
$\qquad$ Add plots
addplot (plot) provides a way to add other plots to the generated graph; see [G-3] addplot_option.
$\sqrt{\mathrm{Y} \text { axis, Time axis, Titles, Legend, Overall }}$
twoway_options are any of the options documented in [G-3] twoway_options, excluding by (). These include options for titling the graph (see [G-3] title_options) and for saving the graph to disk (see [G-3] saving_option).
byopts (byopts) allows all the options documented in [G-3] by_option. These options affect the appearance of the by-graph. byopts() may not be combined with overlay.

## Options for overlaid panels

$\qquad$ Main
overlay causes the plot from each panel to be overlaid on the same graph. The default is to generate plots by panel. This option may not be combined with byopts() or be specified when there are multiple variables in varlist.
$\mathrm{i}\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{i}\right)$ and $\mathrm{t}\left(\right.$ varname $\left._{t}\right)$ override the panel settings from xtset; see [XT] xtset. varname ${ }_{i}$ is allowed to be a string variable. varname $_{t}$ can take on noninteger values and have repeated values within panel. That is to say, it can be any numeric variable that you would like to specify for the $x$-dimension of the graph. It is an error to specify i() without $t()$ and vice versa.

Plots
plot\#opts(cline_options) affect the rendition of the \#th panel (in sorted order). The cline_options can affect whether and how the points are connected; see [G-3] cline_options.

Add plots
addplot (plot) provides a way to add other plots to the generated graph; see [G-3] addplot_option.
$\qquad$ Y axis, Time axis, Titles, Legend, Overall
twoway_options are any of the options documented in [G-3] twoway_options, excluding by (). These include options for titling the graph (see [G-3] title_options) and for saving the graph to disk (see [G-3] saving_option).

## Remarks and examples

> Example 1
Suppose that Tess, Sam, and Arnold kept a calorie log for an entire calendar year. At the end of the year, if they pooled their data together, they would have a dataset (for example, xtline1.dta) that contains the number of calories each of them consumed for 365 days. They could then use xtset to identify the date variable and treat each person as a panel and use xtline to plot the calories versus time for each person separately.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/xtline1
. xtset person day
    panel variable: person (strongly balanced)
        time variable: day, 01jan2002 to 31dec2002
            delta: 1 day
. xtline calories, tlabel(#3)
```



Specify the overlay option so that the values are plotted on the same graph to provide a better comparison among Tess, Sam, and Arnold.
. xtline calories, overlay


## Also see

[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[G-2] graph twoway - Twoway graphs
[TS] tsline - Plot time-series data

## Title

xtlogit - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models

| Description | Quick start | Menu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Syntax | Options for RE model | Options for FE model |
| Options for PA model | Remarks and examples | Stored results |
| Methods and formulas | References | Also see |

## Description

xtlogit fits random-effects, conditional fixed-effects, and population-averaged logit models for a binary dependent variable. The probability of a positive outcome is assumed to be determined by the logistic cumulative distribution function. Results may be reported as coefficients or odds ratios.

## Quick start

Random-effects model of $y$ as a function of $x 1, x 2$, and indicators for levels of categorical variable a using xtset data
xtlogit y x1 x2 i.a
As above, but report odds ratios
xtlogit y x1 x2 i.a, or
Conditional fixed-effects model
xtlogit y x1 x2 i.a, fe
Population-averaged model with robust standard errors
xtlogit y x1 x2 i.a, pa vce(robust)
Random-effects model with cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar
xtlogit y x1 x2 i.a, vce(cluster cvar)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Binary outcomes $>$ Logistic regression (FE, RE, PA)

## Syntax

Random-effects (RE) model
xtlogit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, re RE_options]

Conditional fixed-effects (FE) model
xtlogit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], fe [FE_options]

Population-averaged (PA) model

$$
\text { xtlogit depvar }[\text { indepvars }][\text { if }][\text { in }][\text { weight }] \text {, pa [PA_options }]
$$

RE_options
Model
noconstant
re
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
asis
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
or
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options

## Integration

intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
nodisplay
coeflegend

Description
suppress constant term
use random-effects estimator; the default
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
retain perfect predictor variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report odds ratios
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
suppress display of header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics

Description

## Model

fe
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear

SE
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
or
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options
use fixed-effects estimator
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 apply specified linear constraints keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report odds ratios
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Maximization

maximize_options
nodisplay
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
suppress display of header and coefficients display legend instead of statistics

PA_options
Description
Model
noconstant
pa
offset (varname)
asis

Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
scale (parm)

Reporting
level(\#)
or
display_options

## Optimization

optimize_options
nodisplay
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use population-averaged estimator
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
retain perfect predictor variables
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife
use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$
overrides the default scale parameter;
parm may be x 2 , dev, phi, or \#
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report odds ratios
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
control the optimization process; seldom used
do not display the header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics
correlation
Description
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

A panel variable must be specified. For xtlogit, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. $f p$ is allowed for the random-effects and fixed-effects models.
vce (bootstrap) and vce (jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model, and iweights are allowed for the fixed-effects and random-effects models; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
nodisplay and coeflegend do not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

```
Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
re requests the random-effects estimator, which is the default.
offset(varname) constraints(constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit.
```

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtlogit, re and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
or reports the estimated coefficients transformed to odds ratios, that is, $e^{b}$ rather than $b$. Standard errors and confidence intervals are similarly transformed. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated. or may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.
noskip; see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see $[\mathrm{R}]$ estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Integration
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from (init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with xtlogit but are not shown in the dialog box: nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients.
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for FE model

$\qquad$ Model
fe requests the fixed-effects estimator. offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ SE
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
or reports the estimated coefficients transformed to odds ratios, that is, $e^{b}$ rather than $b$. Standard errors and confidence intervals are similarly transformed. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated or may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.
noskip; see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see $[\mathrm{R}]$ estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate (\#), [no]log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from (init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with xtlogit but are not shown in the dialog box: nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients. coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for PA model

Model
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
pa requests the population-averaged estimator.
offset (varname); see [R] estimation options.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit.

## Correlation

corr(correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).

When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).

If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr (fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp, scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.
or reports the estimated coefficients transformed to odds ratios, that is, $e^{b}$ rather than $b$. Standard errors and confidence intervals are similarly transformed. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated. or may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Optimization
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate(\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate(100).
tolerance(\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance $(1 \mathrm{e}-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following options are available with xtlogit but are not shown in the dialog box: nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients. coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtlogit fits random-effects, conditional fixed-effects, and population-averaged logit models. Whenever we refer to a fixed-effects model, we mean the conditional fixed-effects model. depvar equal to nonzero and nonmissing (typically depvar equal to one) indicates a positive outcome, whereas depvar equal to zero indicates a negative outcome.

By default, the population-averaged model is an equal-correlation model; that is xtlogit, pa assumes corr (exchangeable). Thus, xtlogit is a convenience command for fitting the populationaveraged model using xtgee; see [XT] xtgee. Typing

```
. xtlogit ..., pa ...
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. xtgee ..., ... family(binomial) link(logit) corr(exchangeable)
```

It is also a convenience command if you want the fixed-effects model. Typing

```
. xtlogit ..., fe ...
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. clogit ..., group(varname_i) ...
```

See also [XT] xtgee and [R] clogit for information about xtlogit.

By default or when re is specified, xtlogit fits via maximum likelihood the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t} \neq 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)=P\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}, \nu_{i}$ are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $P(z)=\{1+\exp (-z)\}^{-1}$.
Underlying this model is the variance components model

$$
y_{i t} \neq 0 \Longleftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}>0
$$

where $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. logistic distributed with mean zero and variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}=\pi^{2} / 3$, independently of $\nu_{i}$.

## > Example 1

We are studying unionization of women in the United States and are using the union dataset; see [XT] xt. We wish to fit a random-effects model of union membership:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtlogit union age grade not_smsa south##c.year
```

| Random-effects logistic regression | Number of obs | = | 26,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: idcode | Number of groups | = | 4,434 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | $=$ | 1 |
|  | avg | = | 5.9 |
|  | max | = | 12 |
| Integration method: mvaghermite | Integration pts. | = | 12 |
|  | Wald chi2(6) | = | 227.46 |
| Log likelihood = -10540.274 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| age | . 0156732 | . 0149895 | 1.05 | 0.296 | -. 0137056 | . 045052 |
| grade | . 0870851 | . 0176476 | 4.93 | 0.000 | . 0524965 | . 1216738 |
| not_smsa | -. 2511884 | . 0823508 | -3.05 | 0.002 | -. 4125929 | -. 0897839 |
| 1.south | -2.839112 | . 6413116 | -4.43 | 0.000 | -4.096059 | -1.582164 |
| year | -. 0068604 | . 0156575 | -0.44 | 0.661 | -. 0375486 | . 0238277 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| _cons | -3.009365 | . 8414963 | -3.58 | 0.000 | -4.658667 | -1.360062 |
| /lnsig2u | 1.749366 | . 0470017 |  |  | 1.657245 | 1.841488 |
| sigma_u | 2.398116 | . 0563577 |  |  | 2.290162 | 2.511158 |
| rho | . 6361098 | . 0108797 |  |  | . 6145307 | . 6571548 |

The output includes the additional panel-level variance component. This is parameterized as the log of the variance $\ln \left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$ (labeled $\ln s i g 2 \mathrm{u}$ in the output). The standard deviation $\sigma_{\nu}$ is also included in the output and labeled sigma_u together with $\rho$ (labeled rho),

$$
\rho=\frac{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}}
$$

which is the proportion of the total variance contributed by the panel-level variance component.

When rho is zero, the panel-level variance component is unimportant, and the panel estimator is no different from the pooled estimator. A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output. This test formally compares the pooled estimator (logit) with the panel estimator.

As an alternative to the random-effects specification, we might want to fit an equal-correlation logit model:

| Iteration 1: tolerance $=$. 1487877 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 2: tolerance $=.00949342$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: tolerance $=.00040606$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 4: tolerance $=.00001602$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 5: tolerance $=6.628 \mathrm{e}-07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Number | $f$ obs | 26,200 |
| Group variable: |  |  |  | Number | $f$ groups | 4,434 |
| Link: |  |  | it | Obs per | group: |  |
| Family: bin |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
| Correlation: |  | exchangeable |  |  |  | 5.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | 2(6) | 235.08 |
| Scale parameter: |  |  | 1 | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| age | . 0165893 | . 0092229 | 1.80 | 0.072 | -. 0014873 | . 0346659 |
| grade | . 0600669 | . 0108343 | 5.54 | 0.000 | . 0388321 | . 0813016 |
| not_smsa | -. 1215445 | . 0483713 | -2.51 | 0.012 | -. 2163505 | -. 0267384 |
| 1.south | -1.857094 | . 372967 | -4.98 | 0.000 | -2.588096 | -1.126092 |
| year | -. 0121168 | . 0095707 | -1.27 | 0.205 | -. 030875 | . 0066413 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 0160193 | . 0046076 | 3.48 | 0.001 | . 0069886 | . 0250501 |
| _cons | -1.39755 | . 5089508 | -2.75 | 0.006 | -2.395075 | -. 4000247 |

## > Example 2

xtlogit with the pa option allows a vce (robust) option, so we can obtain the population-averaged logit estimator with the robust variance calculation by typing

| GEE population-averaged model |  | Number of obs | = | 26,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: | idcode | Number of groups | = | 4,434 |
| Link: | logit | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: | binomial | min | $=$ | 1 |
| Correlation: | exchangeable | avg | = | 5.9 |
|  |  | max | = | 12 |
|  |  | Wald chi2(6) |  | 154.88 |
| Scale parameter: | 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |
| (Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on idcode) |  |  |  |  |


|  |  | Robust |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| age | .0165893 | .008951 | 1.85 | 0.064 | -.0009543 | .0341329 |
| grade | .0600669 | .0133193 | 4.51 | 0.000 | .0339616 | .0861722 |
| not_smsa | -.1215445 | .0613803 | -1.98 | 0.048 | -.2418477 | -.0012412 |
| 1.south | -1.857094 | .5389238 | -3.45 | 0.001 | -2.913366 | -.8008231 |
| year | -.0121168 | .0096998 | -1.25 | 0.212 | -.0311282 | .0068945 |
| south\#c. year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0160193 | .0067217 | 2.38 | 0.017 | .002845 | .0291937 |
| _cons | -1.39755 | .5603767 | -2.49 | 0.013 | -2.495868 | -.2992317 |

These standard errors are somewhat larger than those obtained without the vce (robust) option.

Finally, we can also fit a fixed-effects model to these data (see also [R] clogit for details):

. xtlogit union age grade not_smsa south\#\#c.year, fe
note: multiple positive outcomes within groups encountered.
note: 2,744 groups ( 14,165 obs) dropped because of all positive or
all negative outcomes.
Iteration 0: log likelihood $=-4516.5881$
Iteration 1: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-4510.8906$
Iteration 2: log likelihood $=-4510.888$
Iteration 3: log likelihood $=-4510.888$
Conditional fixed-effects logistic regression Number of obs $=12,035$
Group variable: idcode Number of groups $=1,690$

## - Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtlogit likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtlogit, re stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(N_cd)
    e(k)
    e(k_aux)
    e(k_eq)
    e(k_eq_model)
    e(k_dv)
    e(df_m)
    e(ll)
    e(ll_0)
    e(ll_c)
    e(chi2)
    e(chi2_c)
    e(N_clust)
    e(rho)
    e(sigma_u)
    e(n_quad)
    e(g_min)
    e(g_avg)
    e(g_max)
    e(p)
    e(rank)
    e(rank0)
    e(ic)
    e(rc)
    e(converged)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(clustvar)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(chi2_ct)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(intmethod)
e(distrib)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
$e$ (technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
$e$ (asobserved)
number of observations
number of groups
number of completely determined observations
number of parameters
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
number of clusters
$\rho$
panel-level standard deviation
number of quadrature points
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
xtlogit
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
re
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
name of cluster variable
linear offset variable
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
$\max$ or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved

Matrices

```
    e(b)
    e(Cns)
    e(ilog)
    e(gradient)
    e(V)
    e(V_modelbased)
```

coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
Functions
e(sample)
marks estimation sample
xtlogit, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(N_drop)
e(N_group_drop)
e(k)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(r2_p)
e(ll)
e(11_0)
e(chi2)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(group)
e(multiple)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginsnotok)
e(marginsdefault)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
number of observations
number of groups
number of observations dropped because of all positive or all negative outcomes
number of groups dropped because of all positive or all negative outcomes
number of parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
pseudo $R$-squared
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
$\chi^{2}$
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
clogit
xtlogit
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
fe
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
linear offset variable
LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
name of group() variable
multiple if multiple positive outcomes within groups
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
predictions disallowed by margins
default predict() specification for margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved

Matrices

```
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
    e(V)
```

Functions
Functions
e(sample)
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
marks estimation sample
xtlogit, pa stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
$e(d f-m)$
e(chi2)
$e(p)$
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
$e(r c)$
Macros
$e(c m d)$
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(nmp)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtlogit reports the population-averaged results obtained using xtgee, family(binomial) link(logit) to obtain estimates. The fixed-effects results are obtained using clogit. See [XT] xtgee and $[R]$ clogit for details on the methods and formulas.

If we assume a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
$$

where

$$
F(y, z)= \begin{cases}\frac{1}{1+\exp (-z)} & \text { if } y \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{1+\exp (z)} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

The panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, with the definition of $g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\right. \\
&\left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.
The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The $\log$ likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the intmethod (ghermite) option, where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left\{y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

## xtlogit, re and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce (robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtlogit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtlogit
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtcloglog - Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtprobit - Random-effects and population-averaged probit models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] melogit - Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression
[ME] meqrlogit - Multilevel mixed-effects logistic regression (QR decomposition)
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
$[\mathrm{R}]$ clogit - Conditional (fixed-effects) logistic regression
$[\mathrm{R}]$ logistic - Logistic regression, reporting odds ratios
[R] logit - Logistic regression, reporting coefficients
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtlogit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtlogit
Postestimation commands predict margins Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtlogit:
Command Description

| trast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| :---: | :---: |
| ```*estat ic estat summarize estat vce estimates``` | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) summary statistics for the estimation sample variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) cataloging estimation results |
| $\dagger$ forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| * lrtest margins | likelihood-ratio test marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictio |
| pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |
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## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, probabilities, standard errors, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

Random-effects model
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, RE_statistic nooffset]

Fixed-effects model
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, FE_statistic nooffset]

Population-averaged model

```
predict [type]newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]
```

RE_statistic Description

## Main

$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
$\mathrm{pr} \quad$ marginal probability of a positive outcome
puO probability of a positive outcome assuming that the random effect is zero
stdp standard error of the linear prediction

FE_statistic Description
Main
pc1
xb
stdp
puO probability of a positive outcome assuming that the fixed effect is zero
predicted probability of a positive outcome conditional on one positive outcome within group; the default linear prediction
standard error of the linear prediction

The predicted probability for the fixed-effects model is conditional on there being only one outcome per group. See $[\mathrm{R}]$ clogit for details.

PA_statistic
Description
Main
mu
rate
xb
stdp
score
predicted probability of depvar; considers the offset()
predicted probability of depvar
linear prediction
standard error of the linear prediction

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict . . . if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

Main
xb calculates the linear prediction. This is the default for the random-effects model.
pc 1 calculates the predicted probability of a positive outcome conditional on one positive outcome within group. This is the default for the fixed-effects model.
mu and rate both calculate the predicted probability of depvar. mu takes into account the offset(), and rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset (). mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
pr calculates the probability of a positive outcome that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the probability is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
pu0 calculates the probability of a positive outcome, assuming that the fixed or random effect for that observation's panel is zero $\left(\nu_{i}=0\right)$. This may not be similar to the proportion of observed outcomes in the group.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtlogit. This option modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

Random-effects model
statistic Description

| pr | marginal probability of a positive outcome; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| puO | probability of a positive outcome assuming that the random effect is zero |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

## Fixed-effects model

statistic Description
puO probability of a positive outcome assuming that the fixed effect is zero; the default
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction
pc1 not allowed with margins
stdp not allowed with margins

Population-averaged model
statistic

## Description

| mu | predicted probability of depvar; considers the offset() |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | predicted probability of depvar |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1: Conducting hypothesis tests

In example 1 of [XT] xtlogit, we fit a random-effects model of union status on the person's age and level of schooling, whether she lived in an urban area, and whether she lived in the south. In fact, we included the full interaction between south and year to capture both the overall effect of residing in the south and a separate time-trend for southerners. To test whether residing in the south affects union status, we must determine whether 1. south and south\#c.year are jointly significant. First, we refit our model, store the estimation results for later use, and use test to conduct a Wald test of the joint significance of those two variables' parameters:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtlogit union age grade not_smsa south##c.year
    (output omitted)
. estimates store fullmodel
. test 1.south 1.south#c.year
( 1) [union]1.south = 0
( 2) [union]1.south#c.year = 0
    chi2( 2) = 143.93
    Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

The test statistic is clearly significant, so we reject the null hypothesis that the coefficients are jointly zero and conclude that living in the south does significantly affect union status.

We can also test our hypothesis with a likelihood-ratio test. Here we fit the model without south\#\#c.year and then call lrtest to compare this restricted model to the full model:

```
. xtlogit union age grade not_smsa
(output omitted)
. lrtest fullmodel .
Likelihood-ratio test LR chi2(3) = 146.55
(Assumption: . nested in fullmodel) Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
```

These results confirm our finding that living in the south affects union status.

## Also see

[XT] xtlogit - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtnbreg — Fixed-effects, random-effects, \& population-averaged negative binomial models

| Description | Quick start | Menu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Syntax | Options for RE/FE models | Options for PA model |
| Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |

## Description

xtnbreg fits random-effects and conditional fixed-effects overdispersion models where the random effects or fixed effects apply to the distribution of the dispersion parameter. The dispersion is the same for all observations in the same panel. In the random-effects model, the dispersion varies randomly from group to group, such that the inverse of one plus the dispersion follows a Beta distribution. In the fixed-effects model, the dispersion parameter in a group can take on any value.
xtnbreg also fits a population-averaged negative binomial model for a nonnegative count dependent variable with overdispersion.

## Quick start

Random-effects negative-binomial regression of y on x and indicators for levels of categorical variable a using xtset data
xtnbreg y x i.a
As above, but report incidence-rate ratios
xtnbreg y x i.a, irr
Conditional fixed-effects model with exposure variable evar
xtnbreg y x i.a, fe exposure(evar)
Population-averaged model with robust standard errors
xtnbreg y x i.a, pa vce(robust)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Count outcomes $>$ Negative binomial regression (FE, RE, PA)

## Syntax

Random-effects (RE) and conditional fixed-effects (FE) overdispersion models
xtnbreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, [re|fe] RE/FE_options]

Population-averaged (PA) model
xtnbreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], pa [PA_options]

RE/FE_options
Description
Model
noconstant
re
fe
exposure (varname)
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE
vce(vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
irr
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options
suppress constant term; not available with fe use random-effects estimator; the default use fixed-effects estimator include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1 include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 apply specified linear constraints keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report incidence-rate ratios perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test do not display constraints control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## PA_options Description

## Model <br> noconstant <br> pa <br> exposure (varname) <br> offset (varname)

Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
scale (parm)
Reporting
level(\#)
irr
display_options

## Optimization

optimize_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use population-averaged estimator
include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$ overrides the default scale parameter; parm may be x2, dev, phi, or \#
set confidence level; default is level(95)
report incidence-rate ratios
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and
factor-variable labeling
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics
correlation
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#

Description
exchangeable independent unstructured user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

A panel variable must be specified. For xtnbreg, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. fp is allowed for the random-effects and fixed-effects models.
vce (bootstrap) and vce (jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model, and iweights are allowed in the random-effects and fixed-effects models; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE/FE models

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
re requests the random-effects estimator, which is the default.
fe requests the conditional fixed-effects estimator.
exposure(varname), offset (varname), constraints(constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ SE
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
irr reports exponentiated coefficients $e^{b}$ rather than coefficients $b$. For the negative binomial model, exponentiated coefficients have the interpretation of incidence-rate ratios.
noskip; see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no $]$ log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#),
nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtnbreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for PA model

$\square$
Model noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options. pa requests the population-averaged estimator. exposure(varname), offset(varname); see [R] estimation options.

Correlation
corr(correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).

When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).
If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr (fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp, scale(x2|dev|phi|\#); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
irr reports exponentiated coefficients $e^{b}$ rather than coefficients $b$. For the negative binomial model, exponentiated coefficients have the interpretation of incidence-rate ratios.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Optimization
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate(\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate (100).
tolerance (\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped tolerance $(1 e-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following option is available with xtnbreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtnbreg fits random-effects overdispersion models, conditional fixed-effects overdispersion models, and population-averaged negative binomial models. Here "random effects" and "fixed effects" apply to the distribution of the dispersion parameter, not to the $\mathbf{x} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ term in the model. In the random-effects and fixed-effects overdispersion models, the dispersion is the same for all elements in the same group (that is, elements with the same value of the panel variable). In the random-effects model, the dispersion varies randomly from group to group, such that the inverse of one plus the dispersion follows a $\operatorname{Beta}(r, s)$ distribution. In the fixed-effects model, the dispersion parameter in a group can take on any value, because a conditional likelihood is used in which the dispersion parameter drops out of the estimation.

By default, the population-averaged model is an equal-correlation model; xtnbreg, pa assumes corr (exchangeable). Thus, xtnbreg is a convenience command for fitting the population-averaged using xtgee; see [XT] xtgee. Typing

```
. xtnbreg ..., ... pa exposure(time)
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. xtgee ..., ... family(nbinomial) link(log) corr(exchangeable) exposure(time)
```

See also [XT] xtgee for information about xtnbreg.
By default, or when re is specified, xtnbreg fits a maximum-likelihood random-effects overdispersion model.
$>$ Example 1
You have (fictional) data on injury "incidents" incurred among 20 airlines in each of 4 years. (Incidents range from major injuries to exceedingly minor ones.) The government agency in charge of regulating airlines has run an experimental safety training program, and, in each of the years, some airlines have participated and some have not. You now wish to analyze whether the "incident" rate is affected by the program. You choose to estimate using random-effects negative binomial regression, as the dispersion might vary across the airlines for unidentified airline-specific reasons. Your measure of exposure is passenger miles for each airline in each year.
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/airacc
. xtnbreg i_cnt inprog, exposure(pmiles) irr
Fitting negative binomial (constant dispersion) model:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Iteration 0: } & \text { log likelihood }=-293.57997 \\ \text { Iteration 1: } & \text { log likelihood }=-293.57997\end{array}$
(output omitted)
Fitting full model:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Iteration 0: } & \text { log likelihood }=-295.72633 \\ \text { Iteration 1: } & \text { log likelihood }=-270.49929 \quad \text { (not concave) } \\ \text { (output omitted) }\end{array}$ (output omitted)
Random-effects negative binomial regression Number of obs $=80$
Group variable: airline $\quad$ Number of groups $=\quad 20$

Random effects u_i ~ Beta Obs per group:



In the output above, the $/ \ln \_r$ and $/ \ln \_s$ lines refer to $\ln (r)$ and $\ln (s)$, where the inverse of one plus the dispersion is assumed to follow a $\operatorname{Beta}(r, s)$ distribution. The output also includes a likelihood-ratio test, which compares the panel estimator with the pooled estimator (that is, a negative binomial estimator with constant dispersion).

You find that the incidence rate for accidents is not significantly different for participation in the program and that the panel estimator is significantly different from the pooled estimator.

We may alternatively fit a fixed-effects overdispersion model:

| Conditional FE negative binomial regression | Number of obs | = | 80 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: airline | Number of groups | = | 20 |
|  | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | = | 4 |
|  | avg | = | 4.0 |
|  | max | = | 4 |
|  | Wald chi2(1) | = | 2.11 |
| Log likelihood = -174.25143 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.1463 |


| i_cnt | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| inprog | .9062669 | .0613917 | -1.45 | 0.146 | .793587 | 1.034946 |
| -cons | .0329025 | .0331262 | -3.39 | 0.001 | .0045734 | .2367111 |
| ln(pmiles) | 1 | (exposure) |  |  |  |  |

## Example 2

We rerun our previous example, but this time we fit a robust equal-correlation population-averaged model:

| Iteration 1: tolerance $=.02499392$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 2: tolerance $=$. 0000482 |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: tolerance $=2.929 \mathrm{e}-07$ |  |  |  |
| GEE population-averaged model | Number of obs | = | 80 |
| Group variable: airline | Number of groups | $=$ | 20 |
| Link: log | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: negative binomial (k=1) | min | $=$ | 4 |
| Correlation: exchangeable | avg | = | 4.0 |
|  | max | = | 4 |
|  | Wald chi2(1) | = | 1.28 |
| Scale parameter: 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.2571 |

(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on airline)

| i_cnt | IRR | Semirobust <br> Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| inprog | .927275 | .0617857 | -1.13 | 0.257 | .8137513 | 1.056636 |
| (cons | .0080211 | .0004117 | -94.02 | 0.000 | .0072535 | .00887 |

We compare this with a pooled estimator with clustered robust-variance estimates:

```
. nbreg i_cnt inprog, exposure(pmiles) irr vce(cluster airline)
Fitting Poisson model:
Iteration 0: log pseudolikelihood = -293.57997
Iteration 1: log pseudolikelihood = -293.57997
Fitting constant-only model:
Iteration 0: log pseudolikelihood = -335.13615
Iteration 1: log pseudolikelihood = -279.43327
Iteration 2: log pseudolikelihood = -276.09296
Iteration 3: log pseudolikelihood = -274.84036
Iteration 4: log pseudolikelihood = -274.81076
Iteration 5: log pseudolikelihood = -274.81075
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: log pseudolikelihood = -274.56985
Iteration 1: log pseudolikelihood = -274.55077
Iteration 2: log pseudolikelihood = -274.55077
\begin{tabular}{lllr} 
Negative binomial regression & Number of obs & \(=\) & 80 \\
& & Wald chi2(1) & \(=\) \\
Dispersion & \(=\) mean & Prob > chi2 & \(=\) \\
Log pseudolikelihood \(=-274.55077\) & & Pseudo R2 & \(=\)
\end{tabular}
```

(Std. Err. adjusted for 20 clusters in airline)

| i_cnt | IRR | Robust <br> Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| inprog | .9429015 | .0713091 | -0.78 | 0.437 | .8130032 | 1.093555 |
| (n(pmiles) | .007956 | .0004237 <br> (exposure) | -90.77 | 0.000 | .0071674 | .0088314 |
| /lnalpha | -2.835089 | .3351784 |  |  | -3.492027 | -2.178151 |
| alpha | .0587133 | .0196794 |  |  | .0304391 | .1132507 |

## Stored results

xtnbreg, re stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(k)
e(k_aux)
$e\left(k \_\right.$eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(ll_0)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e(r)$
e(s)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(rank0)
e(ic)
e(rc)
$e$ (converged)
Macros

```
    e(cmd)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(ivar)
    e(model)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(title)
    e(offset)
    e(chi2type)
    e(chi2_ct)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(method)
    e(distrib)
    e(opt)
    e(which)
    e(ml_method)
    e(user)
    e(technique)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(V)

Functions
e(sample)
number of observations
number of groups
number of parameters
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
value of $r$ in $\operatorname{Beta}(r, s)$
value of $s$ in $\operatorname{Beta}(r, s)$
significance
rank of e(V)
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise

## xtnbreg

command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
re
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
linear offset variable
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
estimation method
Beta; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
marks estimation sample
xtnbreg, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(k)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(r2_p)
e(11)
e(11_0)
e(chi2)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(method)
e(opt)
e(which)
$e\left(m l \_m e t h o d\right)$
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(V)
Functions
e(sample)
number of observations
number of groups
number of parameters
number of equations in e(b)
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
pseudo $R$-squared
log likelihood
$\log$ likelihood, constant-only model
$\chi^{2}$
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
xtnbreg
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
fe
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
linear offset variable
LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
requested estimation method
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
marks estimation sample
xtnbreg, pa stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rc)
```

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(nmp)
e(nbalpha)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)

Matrices

```
e(b)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
```

Functions

```
e(sample) marks estimation sample
```


## Methods and formulas

xtnbreg, pa reports the population-averaged results obtained by using xtgee, family (nbinomial) link (log) to obtain estimates. See [XT] xtgee for details on the methods and formulas.

For the random-effects and fixed-effects overdispersion models, let $y_{i t}$ be the count for the $t$ th observation in the $i$ th group. We begin with the model $y_{i t} \mid \gamma_{i t} \sim \operatorname{Poisson}\left(\gamma_{i t}\right)$, where $\gamma_{i t} \mid \delta_{i} \sim$ $\operatorname{gamma}\left(\lambda_{i t}, \delta_{i}\right)$ with $\lambda_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\operatorname{offset}_{i t}\right)$ and $\delta_{i}$ is the dispersion parameter. This yields the model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i t}=y_{i t} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \delta_{i}\right)=\frac{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}+y_{i t}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}\right) \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)}\left(\frac{1}{1+\delta_{i}}\right)^{\lambda_{i t}}\left(\frac{\delta_{i}}{1+\delta_{i}}\right)^{y_{i t}}
$$

(See Hausman, Hall, and Griliches [1984, eq. 3.1, 922]; our $\delta$ is the inverse of their $\delta$.) Looking at within-panel effects only, we find that this specification yields a negative binomial model for the $i$ th group with dispersion (variance divided by the mean) equal to $1+\delta_{i}$, that is, constant dispersion within group. This parameterization of the negative binomial model differs from the default parameterization of nbreg, which has dispersion equal to $1+\alpha \exp (\mathbf{x} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $)$; see [R] nbreg.

For a random-effects overdispersion model, we allow $\delta_{i}$ to vary randomly across groups; namely, we assume that $1 /\left(1+\delta_{i}\right) \sim \operatorname{Beta}(r, s)$. The joint probability of the counts for the $i$ th group is

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i 1}=y_{i 1}, \ldots, Y_{i n_{i}}=y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)=\int_{0}^{\infty} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i t}=y_{i t} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \delta_{i}\right) f\left(\delta_{i}\right) d \delta_{i} \\
=\frac{\Gamma(r+s) \Gamma\left(r+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right) \Gamma\left(s+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)}{\Gamma(r) \Gamma(s) \Gamma\left(r+s+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}+y_{i t}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}\right) \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)}
\end{array}
$$

for $\mathbf{X}_{i}=\left(\mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)$ and where $f$ is the probability density function for $\delta_{i}$. The resulting log likelihood is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln L= & \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}\left[\ln \Gamma(r+s)+\ln \Gamma\left(r+\sum_{k=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i k}\right)+\ln \Gamma\left(s+\sum_{k=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i k}\right)-\ln \Gamma(r)-\ln \Gamma(s)\right. \\
& \left.-\ln \Gamma\left(r+s+\sum_{k=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i k}+\sum_{k=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i k}\right)+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}}\left\{\ln \Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}+y_{i t}\right)-\ln \Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}\right)-\ln \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\lambda_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\operatorname{offset}_{i t}\right)$ and $w_{i}$ is the weight for the $i$ th group (Hausman, Hall, and Griliches 1984, eq. 3.5, 927).

For the fixed-effects overdispersion model, we condition the joint probability of the counts for each group on the sum of the counts for the group (that is, the observed $\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}$ ). This yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i 1}=y_{i 1}\right. & \left., \ldots, Y_{i n_{i}}=y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}, \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} Y_{i t}=\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right) \\
& =\frac{\Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right) \Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}+1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}+y_{i t}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}\right) \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

The conditional log likelihood is

$$
\begin{aligned}
\ln L= & \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}\left[\ln \Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right)+\ln \Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}+1\right)-\ln \Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}}\left\{\ln \Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}+y_{i t}\right)-\ln \Gamma\left(\lambda_{i t}\right)-\ln \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

See Hausman, Hall, and Griliches (1984) for a more thorough development of the random-effects and fixed-effects models. Also see Cameron and Trivedi (2013) for a good textbook treatment of this model.
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## Also see

[XT] xtnbreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtnbreg
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtpoisson - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] menbreg - Multilevel mixed-effects negative binomial regression
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] nbreg - Negative binomial regression
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## Title

xtnbreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtnbreg
Postestimation commands predict margins Methods and formulas
Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtnbreg:
Command Description

| trast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| :---: | :---: |
| ```*estat ic estat summarize estat vce estimates``` | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) summary statistics for the estimation sample variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) cataloging estimation results |
| $\dagger$ forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| * lrtest | likelihood-ratio test |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictio |
| pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

[^9]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, standard errors, numbers of events, incidence rates, probabilities, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

Random-effects (RE) and conditional fixed-effects (FE) overdispersion models
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, RE/FE_statistic nooffset]

Population-averaged (PA) model
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]

## RE/FE_statistic Description

Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
nu0 predicted number of events; assumes fixed or random effect is zero
iru0
pr0(n)
$\operatorname{pr0}(a, b)$
predicted incidence rate; assumes fixed or random effect is zero probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero; only allowed after xtnbreg, re
probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero; only allowed after xtnbreg, re

PA_statistic
Description
Main
$\mathrm{mu} \quad$ predicted number of events; considers the offset(); the default
rate predicted number of events
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
score first derivative of the log likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb calculates the linear prediction. This is the default for the random-effects and fixed-effects models. mu and rate both calculate the predicted number of events. mu takes into account the offset (), and rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset().mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
nu0 calculates the predicted number of events, assuming a zero random or fixed effect.
iru0 calculates the predicted incidence rate, assuming a zero random or fixed effect.
$\operatorname{prO}(n)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero, where $n$ is a nonnegative integer that may be specified as a number or a variable (only allowed after xtnbreg, re).
$\operatorname{pr} 0(a, b)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero, where $a$ and $b$ are nonnegative integers that may be specified as numbers or variables (only allowed after xtnbreg, re);
$b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$;
$\operatorname{prO}(20,$.$) calculates \operatorname{Pr}(y \geq 20)$;
$\operatorname{pr} 0(20, b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(y \geq 20)$ in observations for which $b \geq$. and calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20 \leq y \leq b)$ elsewhere.
$\operatorname{pr0}(., b)$ produces a syntax error. A missing value in an observation on the variable $a$ causes a missing value in that observation for $\operatorname{pr} 0(a, b)$.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtnbreg. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions, numbers of events, incidence rates, and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
```



Random-effects (RE) and conditional fixed-effects (FE) overdispersion models
statistic Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default <br> nuO |
| :--- | :--- |
| predicted number of events; assumes fixed or random effect is zero |  |
| $\operatorname{prO}(n)$ | predicted incidence rate; assumes fixed or random effect is zero <br> probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero; <br> only allowed after xtnbreg, re |
| $\operatorname{prO}(a, b)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero; <br> only allowed after xtnbreg, re |
| $\operatorname{stdp}$ | not allowed with margins |

Population-averaged (PA) model
statistic Description

| mu | predicted number of events; considers the offset (); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | predicted number of events |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Methods and formulas

The probabilities calculated using the $\operatorname{prO}(n)$ option are the probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=n\right)$ for a RE model assuming the random effect is zero. A negative binomial model is an overdispersed Poisson model, and the nominal overdispersion can be calculated as $\delta=s /(r-1)$, where $r$ and $s$ are as given in the estimation results. Define $\mu_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\operatorname{offset}_{i t}\right)$. Then the probabilities in $\operatorname{pr0}(n)$ are calculated as the probability that $y_{i t}=n$, where $y_{i t}$ has a negative binomial distribution with mean $\delta \mu_{i t}$ and variance $\delta(1+\delta) \mu_{i t}$.

## Also see

[XT] xtnbreg - Fixed-effects, random-effects, \& population-averaged negative binomial models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtologit — Random-effects ordered logistic models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtologit fits random-effects ordered logistic models. The actual values taken on by the dependent variable are irrelevant, although larger values are assumed to correspond to "higher" outcomes. The conditional distribution of the dependent variable given the random effects is assumed to be multinomial with success probability determined by the logistic cumulative distribution function.

## Quick start

Random-effects ordered logistic model of $y$ as a function of $x$ using xtset data xtologit y x

Add indicators for levels of categorical variable a
xtologit y x i.a
As above, but report odds ratios
xtologit y x i.a, or
With cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar xtologit y x i.a, vce(cluster cvar)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Ordinal outcomes $>$ Logistic regression (RE)

## Syntax

```
xtologit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
```

options

## Description

## Model

offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
or
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options

Integration
intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
startgrid(numlist)
nodisplay
coeflegend
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report odds ratios
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
improve starting value of the random-intercept parameter by performing a grid search
suppress display of header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, fp, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
fweights, iweights, and pweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight.
startgrid(), nodisplay, and coeflegend do not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

## Model <br> offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.

SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtologit and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
or reports the estimated coefficients transformed to odds ratios, that is, $e^{b}$ rather than $b$. Standard errors and confidence intervals are similarly transformed. This option affects how results are displayed, not how they are estimated. or may be specified at estimation or when replaying previously estimated results.
noskip, nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Integration
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints (\#); see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate (\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with xtologit but are not shown in the dialog box:
startgrid(numlist) performs a grid search to improve the starting value of the random-intercept parameter. No grid search is performed by default unless the starting value is found to not be feasible; in this case, xtologit runs startgrid(0.1110) and chooses the value that works best. You may already be using a default form of startgrid() without knowing it. If you see xtologit displaying Grid node 1 , Grid node $2, \ldots$ following Grid node 0 in the iteration log, that is xtologit doing a default search because the original starting value was not feasible.
nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients.
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtologit fits random-effects ordered logistic models. Ordered logistic models are used to estimate relationships between an ordinal dependent variable and a set of independent variables. An ordinal variable is a variable that is categorical and ordered, for instance, "poor", "good", and "excellent", which might indicate a person's current health status or the repair record of a car. If there are only two outcomes, see [XT] xtlogit, [XT] xtprobit, and [XT] xtcloglog. This entry is concerned only with more than two outcomes.

## > Example 1

We use the data from the "Television, School, and Family Smoking Prevention and Cessation Project" (Flay et al. 1988; Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal 2012, chap. 11), where schools were randomly assigned into one of four groups defined by two treatment variables. Students within each school are nested in classes, and classes are nested in schools. In this example, we ignore the variability of classes within schools; see example 2 of [ME] meologit for a model that incorporates the additional class-level variance component. The dependent variable is the tobacco and health knowledge score (thk) collapsed into four ordered categories. We regress the outcome on the treatment variables and their interaction and control for the pretreatment score.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/tvsfpors
. xtset school
    panel variable: school (unbalanced)
. xtologit thk prethk cc##tv
Fitting comparison model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2212.775
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -2125.509
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2125.1034
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -2125.1032
Refining starting values:
Grid node 0: log likelihood = -2136.2426
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2136.2426 (not concave)
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -2120.2577
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2119.7574
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -2119.7428
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -2119.7428
Random-effects ordered logistic regression Number of obs =
Group variable: school
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
```



```
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrrrr}
\hline thk & Coef. & Std. Err. & z & P>|z| & [95\% Conf. Interval] \\
\hline prethk & .4032892 & .03886 & 10.38 & 0.000 & .327125 & .4794534 \\
1.cc & .9237904 & .204074 & 4.53 & 0.000 & .5238127 & 1.323768 \\
1.tv & .2749937 & .1977424 & 1.39 & 0.164 & -.1125744 & .6625618 \\
cc\#tv & & & & & & \\
1 1 & -.4659256 & .2845963 & -1.64 & 0.102 & -1.023724 & .0918728 \\
\hline /cut1 & -.0884493 & .1641062 & -0.54 & 0.590 & -.4100916 & .233193 \\
/cut2 & 1.153364 & .165616 & 6.96 & 0.000 & .8287625 & 1.477965 \\
/cut3 & 2.33195 & .1734199 & 13.45 & 0.000 & 1.992053 & 2.671846 \\
\hline /sigma2_u & .0735112 & .0383106 & & & .0264695 & .2041551 \\
\hline LR test vs. ologit model: chibar2(01) \(=10.72\) & & Prob >= chibar2 \(=0.0005\)
\end{tabular}
```

The estimation table reports the parameter estimates, the estimated cutpoints ( $\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}, \kappa_{3}$ ), and the estimated panel-level variance component labeled sigma2_u. The parameter estimates can be interpreted just as the output from a standard ordered logistic regression would be interpreted; see $[R]$ ologit. For example, we find that students with higher preintervention scores tend to have higher postintervention scores.

Underneath the parameter estimates and the cutpoints, the table shows the estimated variance component. The estimate of $\sigma_{u}^{2}$ is 0.074 with standard error 0.038 . The reported likelihood-ratio test shows that there is enough variability between schools to favor a random-effects ordered logistic regression over a standard ordered logistic regression.

- Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtologit likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtologit stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N) number of observations
e( $\mathrm{N} \_$g) number of groups
e(k)
e(k_aux)
number of parameters
e(k_eq)
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
e(k_dv)
e(k_cat)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(11_0)
e(ll_c)
number of categories
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(N_clust)
e(sigma_u)
$e$ (n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e(p)$
e(rank)
e(rank0)
e(ic)
$e(r c)$
e(converged)
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
number of clusters
panel-level standard deviation
number of quadrature points
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of e(V)
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
Macros

```
e(cmd)
    e(cmd2)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(covariates)
    e(ivar)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(title)
    e(clustvar)
```

e(offset) linear offset variable
meglm
xtologit
command as typed
name of dependent variable
list of covariates
variable denoting groups
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
name of cluster variable

```
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(intmethod)
e(distrib)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginswtype)
e(marginswexp)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(cat)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)

Functions
e(sample)

Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
$\max$ or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
weight type for margins
weight expression for margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
category values
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtologit fits via maximum likelihood the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}>k \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)=H\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}-\kappa_{k}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}, \nu_{i}$ are independent and identically distributed $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $\kappa$ is a set of cutpoints $\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}, \ldots, \kappa_{K-1}$, where $K$ is the number of possible outcomes; and $H(\cdot)$ is the logistic cumulative distribution function.

From the above, we can derive the probability of observing outcome $k$ for response $y_{i t}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{i t k} \equiv \operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=k \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) & =\operatorname{Pr}\left(\kappa_{k-1}<\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \leq \kappa_{k}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{Pr}\left(\kappa_{k-1}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}<\epsilon_{i t} \leq \kappa_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right) \\
& =H\left(\kappa_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right)-H\left(\kappa_{k-1}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right) \\
& =\frac{1}{1+\exp \left(-\kappa_{k}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}-\frac{1}{1+\exp \left(-\kappa_{k-1}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\kappa_{0}$ is taken as $-\infty$ and $\kappa_{K}$ is taken as $+\infty$. Here $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ does not contain a constant term, because its effect is absorbed into the cutpoints.

We may also express this model in terms of a latent linear response, where observed ordinal responses $y_{i t}$ are generated from the latent continuous responses, such that

$$
y_{i t}^{*}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

and

$$
y_{i t}=\left\{\begin{array}{llr}
1 & \text { if } & y_{i t}^{*} \leq \kappa_{1} \\
2 & \text { if } & \kappa_{1}<y_{i t}^{*} \leq \kappa_{2} \\
\vdots & & \\
K & \text { if } & \kappa_{K-1}<y_{i t}^{*}
\end{array}\right.
$$

The errors $\epsilon_{i t}$ are distributed as logistic with mean zero and variance $\pi^{2} / 3$ and are independent of $\nu_{i}$.
Given a set of panel-level random effects $\nu_{i}$, we can define the conditional distribution for response $y_{i t}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right) & =\prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i t k}^{I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right)} \\
& =\exp \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left\{I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right) \log \left(p_{i t k}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } y_{i t}=k \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

For panel $i, i=1, \ldots, M$, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{y}_{i}=\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}}\right)^{\prime}$ is

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

and the panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by mean-variance adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. The method of calculating the posterior mean and variance and using those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ is described in detail in Naylor and Smith (1982) and Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $j$ th iteration. That is, at the $j$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
l_{i, j} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, j-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, j-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, j-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, j-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)}{l_{i, j}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, j}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)}{l_{i, j}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}\right)^{2}
$$

This is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, j}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration.

The $\log$ likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature with the option intmethod(ghermite), where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left\{y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

## xtologit and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce (robust) or vce (cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtologit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtologit
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtoprobit - Random-effects ordered probit models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] meologit - Multilevel mixed-effects ordered logistic regression
[R] logistic - Logistic regression, reporting odds ratios
[R] logit - Logistic regression, reporting coefficients
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtologit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtologit

Postestimation commands predict margins Remarks and examples
Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtologit:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lincom | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| lrtest | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> margins |
| marginsplot estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations |  |
| of coefficients |  |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, probabilities, and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] {stub*|newvar|newvarlist } [if ] [in] [, statistic
    outcome(outcome) nooffset]
```

statistic
Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
$\mathrm{pr} \quad$ marginal probability of the specified outcome (outcome())
pu0 probability of the specified outcome (outcome()) assuming that the random effect is zero
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
If you do not specify outcome(), pr and pu0 (with one new variable specified) assume outcome(\#1).
You specify one or $k$ new variables with pr and puO, where $k$ is the number of outcomes.
You specify one new variable with xb and stdp.
These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
pr calculates predicted probabilities that are marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the probabilities are calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support. Unless otherwise specified, pr defaults to the first outcome.
pu0 calculates predicted probabilities, assuming that the random effect for that observation's panel is zero ( $\nu_{i}=0$ ). Unless otherwise specified, pu0 defaults to the first outcome.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
outcome (outcome) specifies the outcome for which the predicted probabilities are to be calculated. outcome() should contain either one value of the dependent variable or one of \#1, \#2, ..., with \#1 meaning the first category of the dependent variable, \#2 meaning the second category, etc.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtologit. This option modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

statistic Description

| default | marginal probability for each outcome |
| :--- | :--- |
| pr | marginal probability of the specified outcome (outcome()) <br> probability of the specified outcome (outcome()) assuming that the random <br> effect is zero |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

pr and puO default to the first outcome.
Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see $[R]$ margins.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1: Predicted marginal probabilities

In example 1 of [XT] xtologit, we modeled the tobacco and health knowledge score (thk)—coded $1,2,3,4$-among students as a function of two treatments (cc and tv) using a random-effects ordered logistic model. Here we refit the model, obtain the predicted probabilities for all 4 outcomes, and list the first 10 observations.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/tvsfpors
. xtset school
    panel variable: school (unbalanced)
. xtologit thk prethk cc##tv
    (output omitted)
. predict pr*, pr
(using 12 quadrature points)
. list thk pr1-pr4 in 1/10
```

|  | thk | pr1 | pr2 | pr3 | pr4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | 3 | .1427312 | .2191935 | .281714 | .3563613 |
| 2. | 4 | .0695318 | .1343722 | .2459221 | .5501739 |
| 3. | 3 | .0695318 | .1343722 | .2459221 | .5501739 |
| 4. | 4 | .1003876 | .1756773 | .2724781 | .4514571 |
| 5. | 4 | .1003876 | .1756773 | .2724781 | .4514571 |
| 6. | 3 | .0695318 | .1343722 | .2459221 | .5501739 |
| 7. | 2 | .1427312 | .2191935 | .281714 | .3563613 |
| 8. | 4 | .0695318 | .1343722 | .2459221 | .5501739 |
| 9. | 4 | .0476276 | .0990209 | .2082012 | .6451503 |
| 10. | 4 | .1003876 | .1756773 | .2724781 | .4514571 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

For each observation, our best guess for the predicted outcome is the one with the highest predicted probability. For example, for the very first observation in the table above, we would choose outcome 4 as the most likely to occur.

## Also see

[XT] xtologit - Random-effects ordered logistic models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtoprobit — Random-effects ordered probit models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtoprobit fits random-effects ordered probit models. The actual values taken on by the dependent variable are irrelevant, although larger values are assumed to correspond to "higher" outcomes. The conditional distribution of the dependent variable given the random effects is assumed to be multinomial, with success probability determined by the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

## Quick start

Random-effects ordered probit model of $y$ as a function of $x$ using xtset data xtoprobit y x

Add indicators for levels of categorical variable a
xtoprobit y x i.a
With cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar xtoprobit y x i.a, vce(cluster cvar)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Ordinal outcomes $>$ Probit regression (RE)

## Syntax

xtoprobit depvar $[$ indepvars $][$ if $][$ in $][$ weight $]$ [, options]
options
Description

Model
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options

Integration
intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
startgrid(numlist)
nodisplay
coeflegend
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 apply specified linear constraints keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
improve starting value of the random-intercept parameter by performing a grid search
suppress display of header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, $f p$, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
fweights, iweights, and pweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight.
startgrid(), nodisplay, and coeflegend do not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

```
Model
offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
```

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtoprobit and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
noskip, nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat ( $\%$ fint) , pformat ( $\% \mathrm{fmt}$ ), sformat ( $\% f m t$ ), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Integration }}$
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no $]$ log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance (\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with xtoprobit but are not shown in the dialog box:
startgrid(numlist) performs a grid search to improve the starting value of the random-intercept parameter. No grid search is performed by default unless the starting value is found to not be feasible; in this case, xtoprobit runs startgrid( 0.1110 ) and chooses the value that works best. You may already be using a default form of startgrid() without knowing it. If you see xtoprobit displaying Grid node 1 , Grid node $2, \ldots$ following Grid node 0 in the iteration log, that is xtoprobit doing a default search because the original starting value was not feasible.
nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients.
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtoprobit fits random-effects ordered probit models. Ordered probit models are used to estimate relationships between an ordinal dependent variable and a set of independent variables. An ordinal variable is a variable that is categorical and ordered, for instance, "poor", "good", and "excellent", which might indicate a person's current health status or the repair record of a car. If there are only two outcomes, see [XT] xtprobit, [XT] xtlogit, and [XT] xtcloglog. This entry is concerned only with more than two outcomes.

## > Example 1

We use the data from the "Television, School, and Family Smoking Prevention and Cessation Project" (Flay et al. 1988; Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal 2012, chap. 11), where schools were randomly assigned into one of four groups defined by two treatment variables. Students within each school are nested in classes, and classes are nested in schools. In this example, we ignore the variability of classes within schools; see example 2 of [ME] meoprobit for a model that incorporates the additional class-level variance component. The dependent variable is the tobacco and health knowledge score (thk) collapsed into four ordered categories. We regress the outcome on the treatment variables and their interaction and control for the pretreatment score.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/tvsfpors
. xtset school
        panel variable: school (unbalanced)
. xtoprobit thk prethk cc##tv
Fitting comparison model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2212.775
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -2127.8111
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2127.7612
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -2127.7612
Refining starting values:
Grid node 0: log likelihood = -2149.7302
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -2149.7302 }\quad\mathrm{ (not concave)
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -2123.5143
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -2122.2896
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -2121.7949
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -2121.7716
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -2121.7715
Random-effects ordered probit regression Number of obs =
Group variable: school
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
Number of obs & \(=\) & 1,600 \\
Number of groups \(=\) & 28
\end{tabular}
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
Obs per group:
\begin{tabular}{rlr}
\(\min\) & \(=\) & 18 \\
\(\operatorname{avg}\) & \(=\) & 57.1 \\
\(\max\) & \(=\) & 137 \\
ts. & \(=\) & 12 \\
& \(=\) & 128.05 \\
& \(=\) & 0.0000
\end{tabular}
```

| thk | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| prethk | .2369804 | .0227739 | 10.41 | 0.000 | .1923444 | .2816164 |
| 1.cc | .5490957 | .1255108 | 4.37 | 0.000 | .303099 | .7950923 |
| 1.tv | .1695405 | .1215889 | 1.39 | 0.163 | -.0687693 | .4078504 |
| cc\#tv |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 1 | -.2951837 | .1751969 | -1.68 | 0.092 | -.6385634 | .0481959 |
| /cut1 | -.0682011 | .1003374 | -0.68 | 0.497 | -.2648587 | .1284565 |
| /cut2 | .67681 | .1008836 | 6.71 | 0.000 | .4790817 | .8745382 |
| /cut3 | 1.390649 | .1037494 | 13.40 | 0.000 | 1.187304 | 1.593995 |
| /sigma2_u | .0288527 | .0146201 |  |  | .0106874 | .0778937 |

LR test vs. oprobit model: chibar2(01) = 11.98 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0003

The estimation table reports the parameter estimates, the estimated cutpoints ( $\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}, \kappa_{3}$ ), and the estimated panel-level variance component labeled sigma2_u. The parameter estimates can be interpreted just as the output from a standard ordered probit regression would be interpreted; see $[R]$ oprobit. For example, we find that students with higher preintervention scores tend to have higher postintervention scores.

Underneath the parameter estimates and the cutpoints, the table shows the estimated variance component. The estimate of $\sigma_{u}^{2}$ is 0.029 with standard error 0.015 . The reported likelihood-ratio test shows that there is enough variability between schools to favor a random-effects ordered probit regression over a standard ordered probit regression.

## Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtoprobit likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtoprobit stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e( $\mathrm{N} \_\mathrm{g}$ )
e(k)
e(k_aux)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(k_cat)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(11_0)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(N_clust)
e(sigma_u)
e(n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(rankO)
e(ic)
$e(r c)$
e(converged)

Macros

```
e(cmd)
    e(cmd2)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(covariates)
    e(ivar)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(title)
    e(clustvar)
    e(offset)
    e(chi2type)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(intmethod)
    e(distrib)
    e(opt)
    e(which)
    e(ml_method)
    e(user)
    e(technique)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(marginsok)
    e(marginswtype)
    e(marginswexp)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(cat)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)

Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtoprobit fits via maximum likelihood the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}>k \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)=\Phi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}-\kappa_{k}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}, \nu_{i}$ are independent and identically distributed $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $\kappa$ is a set of cutpoints $\kappa_{1}, \kappa_{2}, \ldots, \kappa_{K-1}$, where $K$ is the number of possible outcomes; and $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

From the above, we can derive the probability of observing outcome $k$ for response $y_{i t}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
p_{i t k} \equiv \operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=k \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) & =\operatorname{Pr}\left(\kappa_{k-1}<\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \leq \kappa_{k}\right) \\
& =\operatorname{Pr}\left(\kappa_{k-1}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}<\epsilon_{i t} \leq \kappa_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right) \\
& =\Phi\left(\kappa_{k}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right)-\Phi\left(\kappa_{k-1}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}-\nu_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\kappa_{0}$ is taken as $-\infty$, and $\kappa_{K}$ is taken as $+\infty$. Here $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ does not contain a constant term, because its effect is absorbed into the cutpoints.

We may also express this model in terms of a latent linear response, where observed ordinal responses $y_{i t}$ are generated from the latent continuous responses, such that

$$
y_{i t}^{*}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

and

$$
y_{i t}=\left\{\begin{array}{llr}
1 & \text { if } & y_{i t}^{*} \leq \kappa_{1} \\
2 & \text { if } & \kappa_{1}<y_{i t}^{*} \leq \kappa_{2} \\
\vdots & & \\
K & \text { if } & \kappa_{K-1}<y_{i t}^{*}
\end{array}\right.
$$

The errors $\epsilon_{i t}$ are distributed as standard normal with mean zero and variance one and are independent of $\nu_{i}$.

Given a set of panel-level random effects $\nu_{i}$, we can define the conditional distribution for response $y_{i t}$ as

$$
\begin{aligned}
f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right) & =\prod_{k=1}^{K} p_{i t k}^{I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right)} \\
& =\exp \sum_{k=1}^{K}\left\{I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right) \log \left(p_{i t k}\right)\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
I_{k}\left(y_{i t}\right)= \begin{cases}1 & \text { if } y_{i t}=k \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

For panel $i, i=1, \ldots, M$, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{y}_{i}=\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}}\right)^{\prime}$ is

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

and the panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by mean-variance adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. The method of calculating the posterior mean and variance and using those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ is described in detail in Naylor and Smith (1982) and Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $j$ th iteration. That is, at the $j$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
l_{i, j} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, j-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, j-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, j-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, j-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)}{l_{i, j}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, j}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, j-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, j-1}\right)}{l_{i, j}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}\right)^{2}
$$

This is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, j}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, j}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration.

The $\log$ likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature with the option intmethod(ghermite), where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left\{y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(y_{i t}, \boldsymbol{\kappa}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

## xtoprobit and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce(robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtoprobit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtoprobit
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtologit - Random-effects ordered logistic models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] meoprobit - Multilevel mixed-effects ordered probit regression
[R] probit - Probit regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtoprobit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtoprobit
Postestimation commands predict margins Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtoprobit:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lincom | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| lrtest | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> margins |
| marginsplot estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations |  |
| of coefficients |  |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, probabilities, and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] {stub*|newvar|newvarlist } [if] [in] [, statistic
    outcome(outcome) nooffset]
```

statistic
Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
$\mathrm{pr} \quad$ marginal probability of the specified outcome (outcome())
pu0 probability of the specified outcome (outcome()) assuming that the random effect is zero
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
If you do not specify outcome(), pr and pu0 (with one new variable specified) assume outcome(\#1).
You specify one or $k$ new variables with pr and pu0, where $k$ is the number of outcomes.
You specify one new variable with xb and stdp.
These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
pr calculates predicted probabilities that are marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the probabilities are calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support. Unless otherwise specified, pr defaults to the first outcome.
pu0 calculates predicted probabilities, assuming that the random effect for that observation's panel is zero ( $\nu_{i}=0$ ). Unless otherwise specified, pu0 defaults to the first outcome.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
outcome (outcome) specifies the outcome for which the predicted probabilities are to be calculated. outcome() should contain either one value of the dependent variable or one of \#1, \#2, $\ldots$, with \#1 meaning the first category of the dependent variable, \#2 meaning the second category, etc.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtoprobit. This option modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

statistic
Description
default marginal probability for each outcome
pr marginal probability of the specified outcome (outcome())
pu0 0 probability of the specified outcome (outcome()) assuming that the random effect is zero
xb linear prediction
stdp
not allowed with margins
pr and puO default to the first outcome.
Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

> Example 1: Predicted marginal probabilities
In example 1 of [XT] xtoprobit, we modeled the tobacco and health knowledge score (thk)—coded $1,2,3,4$-among students as a function of two treatments (cc and tv) using a random-effects ordered probit model. Here we refit the model, obtain the predicted probabilities for all 4 outcomes, and list the first 10 observations.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/tvsfpors
xtset school
    panel variable: school (unbalanced)
. xtoprobit thk prethk cc##tv
    (output omitted)
. predict pr*, pr
(using 12 quadrature points)
. list thk pr1-pr4 in 1/10
```

|  | thk | pr1 | pr2 | pr3 | pr4 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | 3 | .1409978 | .2254197 | .2750568 | .3585258 |
| 2. | 4 | .0614014 | .1479641 | .2488757 | .5417588 |
| 3. | 3 | .0614014 | .1479641 | .2488757 | .5417588 |
| 4. | 4 | .0951857 | .187463 | .2685807 | .4487706 |
| 5. | 4 | .0951857 | .187463 | .2685807 | .4487706 |
| 6. | 3 | .0614014 | .1479641 | .2488757 | .5417588 |
| 7. | 2 | .1409978 | .2254197 | .2750568 | .3585258 |
| 8. | 4 | .0614014 | .1479641 | .2488757 | .5417588 |
| 9. | 4 | .0378048 | .1108411 | .2188475 | .6325067 |
| 10. | 4 | .0951857 | .187463 | .2685807 | .4487706 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

For each observation, our best guess for the predicted outcome is the one with the highest predicted probability. For example, for the very first observation in the table above, we would choose outcome 4 as the most likely to occur.

## Also see

[XT] xtoprobit — Random-effects ordered probit models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtpcse - Linear regression with panel-corrected standard errors

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| Acknowledgments | References | Also see |  |

## Description

xtpcse calculates panel-corrected standard error (PCSE) estimates for linear cross-sectional timeseries models where the parameters are estimated by either OLS or Prais-Winsten regression. When computing the standard errors and the variance-covariance estimates, xtpcse assumes that the disturbances are, by default, heteroskedastic and contemporaneously correlated across panels.

See [XT] xtgls for the generalized least-squares estimator for these models.

## Quick start

Linear regression of y on x 1 and x 2 with panel-corrected standard errors and assuming no within-panel autocorrelation using xtset data
xtpcse y x1 x2
As above, but specify a common first-order autocorrelation within panels
xtpcse y x1 x2, correlation(ar1)
Within-panel heteroskedastic errors but no contemporaneous correlation between panels xtpcse y x1 x2, hetonly

Let autocorrelation structure be panel-specific estimated by time-series methods
xtpcse y x1 x2, correlation(psar1) rhotype(tscorr)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Contemporaneous correlation $>$ Regression with panel-corrected standard errors (PCSE)

## Syntax

xtpcse depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, options]
options
Model
noconstant
correlation(independent)
correlation(ar1)
correlation(psar1)
rhotype (calc)
np1
hetonly
independent
by/if/in
casewise
pairwise
SE
nmk
Reporting
level (\#)
detail
display_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use independent autocorrelation structure
use AR1 autocorrelation structure
use panel-specific AR1 autocorrelation structure
specify method to compute autocorrelation parameter;
seldom used
weight panel-specific autocorrelations by panel sizes
assume panel-level heteroskedastic errors
assume independent errors across panels
include only observations with complete cases include all available observations with nonmissing pairs
normalize standard errors by $N-k$ instead of $N$
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report list of gaps in time series
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
iweights and aweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

[^10]correlation(psar1) specifies that, within panels, there is first-order autocorrelation and that the coefficient of the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process is specific to each panel. psar1 stands for panel-specific $\operatorname{AR}(1)$.
rhotype (calc) specifies the method to be used to calculate the autocorrelation parameter. Allowed strings for calc are

| regress | regression using lags; the default <br> regression using leads |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{\mathrm{tseg}}{\mathrm{dw}}$ | time-series autocorrelation calculation |
| dw | Durbin-Watson calculation |

All the above methods are consistent and asymptotically equivalent; this is a rarely used option.
np1 specifies that the panel-specific autocorrelations be weighted by $T_{i}$ rather than by the default $T_{i}-1$ when estimating a common $\rho$ for all panels, where $T_{i}$ is the number of observations in panel $i$. This option has an effect only when panels are unbalanced and the correlation(ar1) option is specified.
hetonly and independent specify alternative forms for the assumed covariance of the disturbances across the panels. If neither is specified, the disturbances are assumed to be heteroskedastic (each panel has its own variance) and contemporaneously correlated across the panels (each pair of panels has its own covariance). This is the standard PCSE model.
hetonly specifies that the disturbances are assumed to be panel-level heteroskedastic only with no contemporaneous correlation across panels.
independent specifies that the disturbances are assumed to be independent across panels; that is, there is one disturbance variance common to all observations.
by/if/in
casewise and pairwise specify how missing observations in unbalanced panels are to be treated when estimating the interpanel covariance matrix of the disturbances. The default is casewise selection.
casewise specifies that the entire covariance matrix be computed only on the observations (periods) that are available for all panels. If an observation has missing data, all observations of that period are excluded when estimating the covariance matrix of disturbances. Specifying casewise ensures that the estimated covariance matrix will be of full rank and will be positive definite.
pairwise specifies that, for each element in the covariance matrix, all available observations (periods) that are common to the two panels contributing to the covariance be used to compute the covariance.

The casewise and pairwise options have an effect only when the panels are unbalanced and neither hetonly nor independent is specified.

## SE

nmk specifies that standard errors be normalized by $N-k$, where $k$ is the number of parameters estimated, rather than $N$, the number of observations. Different authors have used one or the other normalization. Greene $(2012,280)$ remarks that whether a degree-of-freedom correction improves the small-sample properties is an open question.
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
detail specifies that a detailed list of any gaps in the series be reported.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtpcse but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtpcse is an alternative to feasible generalized least squares (FGLS) - see [XT] xtgls-for fitting linear cross-sectional time-series models when the disturbances are not assumed to be independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). Instead, the disturbances are assumed to be either heteroskedastic across panels or heteroskedastic and contemporaneously correlated across panels. The disturbances may also be assumed to be autocorrelated within panel, and the autocorrelation parameter may be constant across panels or different for each panel.

We can write such models as

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, m$ is the number of units (or panels); $t=1, \ldots, T_{i} ; T_{i}$ is the number of periods in panel $i$; and $\epsilon_{i t}$ is a disturbance that may be autocorrelated along $t$ or contemporaneously correlated across $i$.

This model can also be written panel by panel as

$$
\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{y}_{1} \\
\mathbf{y}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{y}_{m}
\end{array}\right]=\left[\begin{array}{c}
\mathbf{X}_{1} \\
\mathbf{X}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\mathbf{X}_{m}
\end{array}\right] \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left[\begin{array}{c}
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{1} \\
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{2} \\
\vdots \\
\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{m}
\end{array}\right]
$$

For a model with heteroskedastic disturbances and contemporaneous correlation but with no autocorrelation, the disturbance covariance matrix is assumed to be

$$
E\left[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime}\right]=\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\left[\begin{array}{cccc}
\sigma_{11} \mathbf{I}_{11} & \sigma_{12} \mathbf{I}_{12} & \cdots & \sigma_{1 m} \mathbf{I}_{1 m} \\
\sigma_{21} \mathbf{I}_{21} & \sigma_{22} \mathbf{I}_{22} & \cdots & \sigma_{2 m} \mathbf{I}_{2 m} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\sigma_{m 1} \mathbf{I}_{m 1} & \sigma_{m 2} \mathbf{I}_{m 2} & \cdots & \sigma_{m m} \mathbf{I}_{m m}
\end{array}\right]
$$

where $\sigma_{i i}$ is the variance of the disturbances for panel $i, \sigma_{i j}$ is the covariance of the disturbances between panel $i$ and panel $j$ when the panels' periods are matched, and $\mathbf{I}$ is a $T_{i}$ by $T_{i}$ identity matrix with balanced panels. The panels need not be balanced for xtpcse, but the expression for the covariance of the disturbances will be more general if they are unbalanced.

This could also be written as

$$
E\left[\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime}\right]=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m \times m} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{T_{i} \times T_{i}}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the panel-by-panel covariance matrix and $\mathbf{I}$ is an identity matrix.
See [XT] xtgls for a full taxonomy and description of possible disturbance covariance structures.
xtpcse and xtgls follow two different estimation schemes for this family of models. xtpcse produces OLS estimates of the parameters when no autocorrelation is specified, or Prais-Winsten (see [TS] prais) estimates when autocorrelation is specified. If autocorrelation is specified, the estimates of the parameters are conditional on the estimates of the autocorrelation parameter(s). The estimate of the variance-covariance matrix of the parameters is asymptotically efficient under the assumed covariance structure of the disturbances and uses the FGLS estimate of the disturbance covariance matrix; see Kmenta (1997, 121).
xtgls produces full FGLS parameter and variance-covariance estimates. These estimates are conditional on the estimates of the disturbance covariance matrix and are conditional on any autocorrelation parameters that are estimated; see Kmenta (1997), Greene (2012), Davidson and MacKinnon (1993), or Judge et al. (1985).

Both estimators are consistent, as long as the conditional mean $\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$ is correctly specified. If the assumed covariance structure is correct, FGLS estimates produced by xtgls are more efficient. Beck and Katz (1995) have shown, however, that the full FGLS variance-covariance estimates are typically unacceptably optimistic (anticonservative) when used with the type of data analyzed by most social scientists-10-20 panels with 10-40 periods per panel. They show that the OLS or Prais-Winsten estimates with PCSEs have coverage probabilities that are closer to nominal.

Because the covariance matrix elements, $\sigma_{i j}$, are estimated from panels $i$ and $j$, using those observations that have common time periods, estimators for this model achieve their asymptotic behavior as the $T_{i} \mathrm{~s}$ approach infinity. In contrast, the random- and fixed-effects estimators assume a different model and are asymptotic in the number of panels $m$; see [XT] xtreg for details of the random- and fixed-effects estimators.

Although xtpcse allows other disturbance covariance structures, the term PCSE, as used in the literature, refers specifically to models that are both heteroskedastic and contemporaneously correlated across panels, with or without autocorrelation.
> Example 1: Controlling for heteroskedasticity and cross-panel correlation
Grunfeld and Griliches (1960) analyzed a company's current-year gross investment (invest) as determined by the company's prior year market value (mvalue) and the prior year's value of the company's plant and equipment (kstock). The dataset includes 10 companies over 20 years, from 1935 through 1954, and is a classic dataset for demonstrating cross-sectional time-series analysis. Greene $(2012,1112)$ reproduces the dataset.

To use xtpcse, the data must be organized in "long form"; that is, each observation must represent a record for a specific company at a specific time; see [D] reshape. In the Grunfeld data, company is a categorical variable identifying the company, and year is a variable recording the year. Here are the first few records:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/grunfeld
. list in 1/5
```

|  | company | year | invest | mvalue | kstock | time |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | 1 | 1935 | 317.6 | 3078.5 | 2.8 | 1 |
| 2. | 1 | 1936 | 391.8 | 4661.7 | 52.6 | 2 |
| 3. | 1 | 1937 | 410.6 | 5387.1 | 156.9 | 3 |
| 4. | 1 | 1938 | 257.7 | 2792.2 | 209.2 | 4 |
| 5. | 1 | 1939 | 330.8 | 4313.2 | 203.4 | 5 |

To compute PCSEs, Stata must be able to identify the panel to which each observation belongs and be able to match the periods across the panels. We tell Stata how to do this matching by specifying
the panel and time variables with xtset; see [XT] xtset. Because the data are annual, we specify the yearly option.

```
. xtset company year, yearly
    panel variable: company (strongly balanced)
        time variable: year, 1935 to 1954
            delta: 1 year
```

We can obtain OLS parameter estimates for a linear model of invest on mvalue and kstock while allowing the standard errors (and variance-covariance matrix of the estimates) to be consistent when the disturbances from each observation are not independent. Specifically, we want the standard errors to be robust to each company having a different variance of the disturbances and to each company's observations being correlated with those of the other companies through time.

This model is fit in Stata by typing


## > Example 2: Comparing the FGLS and PCSE approaches

xtgls will produce more efficient FGLS estimates of the models' parameters, but with the disadvantage that the standard error estimates are conditional on the estimated disturbance covariance. Beck and Katz (1995) argue that the improvement in power using FGLS with such data is small and that the standard error estimates from FGLS are unacceptably optimistic (anticonservative).

The FGLS model is fit by typing


The coefficients between the two models are close; the constants differ substantially, but we are generally not interested in the constant. As Beck and Katz observed, the standard errors for the FGLS model are $50 \%-100 \%$ smaller than those for the OLS model with PCSE.

If we were also concerned about autocorrelation of the disturbances, we could obtain a model with a common $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ parameter by specifying correlation(ar1).


The estimate of the autocorrelation parameter is high (0.906), and the standard errors are larger than for the model without autocorrelation, which is to be expected if there is autocorrelation.

## > Example 3: Controlling for cross-panel correlation and autocorrelation

Let's estimate panel-specific autocorrelation parameters and change the method of estimating the autocorrelation parameter to the one typically used to estimate autocorrelation in time-series analysis.


Beck and $\operatorname{Katz}(1995,121)$ make a case against estimating panel-specific AR parameters, as opposed to one AR parameter for all panels.

## > Example 4: Controlling for heteroskedasticity only; not quite PCSEs

We can also diverge from PCSEs to estimate standard errors that are panel corrected, but only for panel-level heteroskedasticity; that is, each company has a different variance of the disturbances. Allowing also for autocorrelation, we would type


With this specification, we do not obtain what are referred to in the literature as PCSEs. These standard errors are in the same spirit as PCSEs but are from the asymptotic covariance estimates of OLS without allowing for contemporaneous correlation.

## Stored results

xtpcse stores the following in e() :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(N_gaps)
e(n_cf)
$e\left(n_{n} c v\right)$
$e\left(n \_c r\right)$
e(n_sigma)
e(mss)
e(df)
e(df_m)
e(rss)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(r2)
e(chi2)
e (p)
e(rmse)
e(rank)
e(rc)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(panels)
e(corr)
e(rhotype)
e(rho)
e(cons)
e(missmeth)
e(balance)
e(chi2type)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
$e$ (predict)
e(marginsok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Sigma)
e(rhomat)
e(V)
Functions e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

If no autocorrelation is specified, the parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are estimated by oLS; see [R] regress. If autocorrelation is specified, the parameters $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are estimated by Prais-Winsten; see [TS] prais.

When autocorrelation with panel-specific coefficients of correlation is specified (by using option correlation(psar1)), each panel-level $\rho_{i}$ is computed from the residuals of an OLS regression across all panels; see [TS] prais. When autocorrelation with a common coefficient of correlation is specified (by using option correlation(ar1)), the common correlation coefficient is computed as

$$
\rho=\frac{\rho_{1}+\rho_{2}+\cdots+\rho_{m}}{m}
$$

where $\rho_{i}$ is the estimated autocorrelation coefficient for panel $i$ and $m$ is the number of panels.
The covariance of the OLS or Prais-Winsten coefficients is

$$
\operatorname{Var}(\boldsymbol{\beta})=\left(\mathbf{X}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{X}\left(\mathbf{X}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ is the full covariance matrix of the disturbances.
When the panels are balanced, we can write $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ as

$$
\boldsymbol{\Omega}=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{m \times m} \otimes \mathbf{I}_{T_{i} \times T_{i}}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the $m$ by $m$ panel-by-panel covariance matrix of the disturbances; see Remarks and examples.
xtpcse estimates the elements of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ as

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{i j}=\frac{\epsilon_{i}^{\prime} \epsilon_{j}}{T_{i j}}
$$

where $\epsilon_{i}$ and $\epsilon_{j}$ are the residuals for panels $i$ and $j$, respectively, that can be matched by period, and where $T_{i j}$ is the number of residuals between the panels $i$ and $j$ that can be matched by time period.

When the panels are balanced (each panel has the same number of observations and all periods are common to all panels), $T_{i j}=T$, where $T$ is the number of observations per panel.

When panels are unbalanced, xtpcse by default uses casewise selection, in which only those residuals from periods that are common to all panels are used to compute $\widehat{S}_{i j}$. Here $T_{i j}=T^{*}$, where $T^{*}$ is the number of periods common to all panels. When pairwise is specified, each $\widehat{S}_{i j}$ is computed using all observations that can be matched by period between the panels $i$ and $j$.
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[^11]
## Title

xtpcse postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtpcse

Postestimation commands predict margins Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtpcse:
\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{ll}\text { Command } & \text { Description } \\
\hline \text { contrast } & \text { contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates } \\
\text { estat summarize } & \begin{array}{l}\text { summary statistics for the estimation sample } \\
\text { estat vce }\end{array} \\
\text { variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) } \\
\text { estimates } & \begin{array}{l}\text { cataloging estimation results } \\
\text { dynamic forecasts and simulations } \\
\text { fincom }\end{array}
$$ <br>
point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br>

of coefficients\end{array}\right]\)| marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal |
| :--- |
| effects |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, xb stdp]
```

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic Description
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction, the default
stdp not allowed with margins

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Also see

[XT] xtpese - Linear regression with panel-corrected standard errors
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtpoisson - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models

| Description | Quick start | Menu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Syntax | Options for RE model | Options for FE model |
| Options for PA model | Remarks and examples | Stored results |
| Methods and formulas | References | Also see |

## Description

xtpoisson fits random-effects, conditional fixed-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models. These models are typically used for a nonnegative count dependent variable.

## Quick start

Random-effects Poisson regression of y on x and indicators for levels of categorical variable a using xtset data
xtpoisson y x i.a
Conditional fixed-effects model with exposure variable evar
xtpoisson y x i.a, fe exposure (evar)
Population-averaged model with robust standard errors
xtpoisson y x i.a, pa vce(robust)
As above, but report incidence-rate ratios
xtpoisson y x i.a, pa vce(robust) irr

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Count outcomes $>$ Poisson regression (FE, RE, PA)

## Syntax

Random-effects (RE) model
xtpoisson depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, re RE_options]

Conditional fixed-effects (FE) model
xtpoisson depvar [indepvars][if][in][weight], fe [FE_options]

Population-averaged (PA) model
xtpoisson depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], pa [PA_options]
RE_options Description

Model
noconstant
re
exposure (varname)
offset (varname)
normal
constraints (constraints)
collinear
suppress constant term
use random-effects estimator; the default include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1 include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 use a normal distribution for random effects instead of gamma apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife

Reporting
level(\#)
irr
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report incidence-rate ratios
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

Integration
intmethod (intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

FE_options
Description

## Model

fe
exposure (varname)
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
irr
nocnsreport
display_options
use fixed-effects estimator
include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1 include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1 apply specified linear constraints keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report incidence-rate ratios
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Maximization

maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## PA_options Description

## Model

noconstant
pa
exposure (varname)
offset (varname)
Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
scale (parm)

Reporting
level(\#)
irr
display_options

Optimization
optimize_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
use population-averaged estimator
include $\ln$ (varname) in model with coefficient constrained to 1
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$
overrides the default scale parameter;
parm may be x2, dev, phi, or \#
set confidence level; default is level (95)
report incidence-rate ratios
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## correlation

exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#

## Description

exchangeable
independent
unstructured
user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

A panel variable must be specified. For xtpoisson, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. $f p$ is allowed for the random-effects and fixed-effects models.
vce(bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model, and iweights are allowed for the random-effects and fixed-effects models; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

## Model <br> noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.

re, the default, requests the random-effects estimator.
exposure (varname), offset (varname); see [R] estimation options.
normal specifies that the random effects follow a normal distribution instead of a gamma distribution. constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtpoisson, re and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
irr reports exponentiated coefficients $e^{b}$ rather than coefficients $b$. For the Poisson model, exponentiated coefficients are interpreted as incidence-rate ratios.
noskip; see $[R]$ estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints (\#); see [R] estimation options. normal must also be specified.
$\qquad$ Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtpoisson but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for FE model

$\qquad$ Model
fe requests the fixed-effects estimator.
exposure(varname), offset (varname), constraints(constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (robust) invokes a cluster-robust estimate of the VCE in which the ID variable specifies the clusters.
$\sqrt{\text { Reporting }}$
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
irr reports exponentiated coefficients $e^{b}$ rather than coefficients $b$. For the Poisson model, exponentiated coefficients are interpreted as incidence-rate ratios.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fit), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate (\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from (init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtpoisson but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for PA model

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
pa requests the population-averaged estimator.
exposure(varname), offset (varname); see [R] estimation options.

Correlation
corr (correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).
When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).

If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr (fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp, scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
irr reports exponentiated coefficients $e^{b}$ rather than coefficients $b$. For the Poisson model, exponentiated coefficients are interpreted as incidence-rate ratios.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% firt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Optimization }}$
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate(\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate(100).
tolerance(\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance ( $1 \mathrm{e}-6$ ) is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following option is available with xtpoisson but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtpoisson fits random-effects, conditional fixed-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models. Whenever we refer to a fixed-effects model, we mean the conditional fixed-effects model. These models are typically used for a nonnegative count dependent variable but may be used for any dependent variable in natural logs. For more information about the assumptions of the Poisson model, see $[R]$ poisson.

By default, the population-averaged model is an equal-correlation model; xtpoisson, pa assumes corr (exchangeable). Thus, xtpoisson is a convenience command for fitting the populationaveraged model using xtgee; see [XT] xtgee. Typing

```
. xtpoisson ..., ... pa exposure(time)
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. xtgee ..., ... family(poisson) link(log) corr(exchangeable) exposure(time)
```

Also see [XT] xtgee for information about xtpoisson.
By default or when re is specified, xtpoisson fits via maximum likelihood the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i t}=y_{i t} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)=F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}$, and $F(x, z)=\operatorname{Pr}(X=x)$, where $X$ is Poisson distributed with mean $\exp (z)$. In the standard random-effects model, $\nu_{i}$ is assumed to be i.i.d. such that $\exp \left(\nu_{i}\right)$ is gamma with mean one and variance $\alpha$, which is estimated from the data. If normal is specified, $\nu_{i}$ is assumed to be i.i.d. $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$.

## $>$ Example 1

We have data on the number of ship accidents for five different types of ships (McCullagh and Nelder 1989, 205). We wish to analyze whether the "incident" rate is affected by the period in which the ship was constructed and operated. Our measure of exposure is months of service for the ship, and in this model, we assume that the exponentiated random effects are distributed as gamma with mean one and variance $\alpha$.
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/ships
. xtpoisson accident op_75_79 co_65_69 co_70_74 co_75_79, exp(service) irr
Fitting Poisson model:

| Iteration 0: log likelihood $=-147.37993$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 1: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-80.372714$ |  |  |
| Iteration 2: $\quad \mathrm{log}$ likelihood $=-80.116093$ |  |  |
| Iteration 3: log likelihood $=-80.115916$ |  |  |
| Iteration 4: log likelihood $=-80.115916$ |  |  |
| Fitting full model: |  |  |
| Iteration 0: log likelihood $=-79.653186$ |  |  |
| Iteration 1: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-76.990836$ | (not concave) |  |
| Iteration 2: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-74.824942$ |  |  |
| Iteration 3: $\quad$ log likelihood $=-74.811243$ |  |  |
| Iteration 4: $\quad \mathrm{log}$ likelihood $=-74.811217$ |  |  |
| Iteration 5: $\quad \mathrm{log}$ likelihood $=-74.811217$ |  |  |
| Random-effects Poisson regression | Number of obs = | 34 |
| Group variable: ship | Number of groups | 5 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gamma | Obs per group: |  |
|  | $\min =$ | 6 |
|  | avg = | 6.8 |
|  | $\max =$ | 7 |
|  | Wald chi2(4) | 50.90 |
| Log likelihood = -74.811217 | Prob > chi2 = | 0.0000 |


| accident | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| op_75_79 | 1.466305 | .1734005 | 3.24 | 0.001 | 1.162957 | 1.848777 |
| co_65_69 | 2.032543 | .304083 | 4.74 | 0.000 | 1.515982 | 2.72512 |
| co_70_74 | 2.356853 | .3999259 | 5.05 | 0.000 | 1.690033 | 3.286774 |
| co_75_79 | 1.641913 | .3811398 | 2.14 | 0.033 | 1.04174 | 2.58786 |
| _cons | .0013724 | .0002992 | -30.24 | 0.000 | .0008952 | .002104 |
| (n) (service) | 1 | (exposure) |  |  |  |  |
| /lnalpha | -2.368406 | .8474597 |  |  | -4.029397 | -.7074155 |
| alpha | .0936298 | .0793475 |  |  | .0177851 | .4929165 |

LR test of alpha=0: chibar2(01) $=10.61$
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.001$
The output also includes a likelihood-ratio test of $\alpha=0$, which compares the panel estimator with the pooled (Poisson) estimator.

We find that the incidence rate for accidents is significantly different for the periods of construction and operation of the ships and that the random-effects model is significantly different from the pooled model.

We may alternatively fit a fixed-effects specification instead of a random-effects specification:

| Iteration 0: log likelihood $=-80.738973$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 1: log likelihood = -54.857546 |  |  |  |
| Iteration 2: log likelihood = -54.641897 |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: log likelihood $=-54.641859$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 4: log likelihood $=-54.641859$ |  |  |  |
| Conditional fixed-effects Poisson regression | Number of obs | = | 34 |
| Group variable: ship | Number of groups | = | 5 |
|  | Obs per group: |  |  |
|  | min | = | 6 |
|  | avg | = | 6.8 |
|  | max | = | 7 |
|  | Wald chi2(4) | = | 48.44 |
| Log likelihood = -54.641859 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |


| accident | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| op_75_79 | 1.468831 | .1737218 | 3.25 | 0.001 | 1.164926 | 1.852019 |
| co_65_69 | 2.008002 | .3004803 | 4.66 | 0.000 | 1.497577 | 2.692398 |
| co_70_74 | 2.26693 | .384865 | 4.82 | 0.000 | 1.625274 | 3.161912 |
| co_75_79 | 1.573695 | .3669393 | 1.94 | 0.052 | .9964273 | 2.485397 |
| ln(service) | 1 | (exposure) |  |  |  |  |

Both of these models fit the same thing but will differ in efficiency, depending on whether the assumptions of the random-effects model are true.

We could have assumed that the random effects followed a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, instead of a "log-gamma" distribution, and obtained

| Random-effects Poisson regression Group variable: ship |  |  |  | Numbe | f obs | 34 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Numb | f groups | 5 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian |  |  |  | Obs p | group: |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | min | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 6.8 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 7 |
| Integration method: mvaghermite |  |  |  | Integ | ion pts. | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald | (4) | 50.95 |
| Log likelihood = -74.780982 |  |  |  | Prob | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| accident | IRR | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| op_75_79 | 1.466677 | . 1734403 | 3.24 | 0.001 | 1.163259 | 1.849236 |
| co_65_69 | 2.032604 | . 3040933 | 4.74 | 0.000 | 1.516025 | 2.725205 |
| co_70_74 | 2.357045 | . 3998397 | 5.05 | 0.000 | 1.690338 | 3.286717 |
| co_75_79 | 1.646935 | . 3820235 | 2.15 | 0.031 | 1.045278 | 2.594905 |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text {-cons } \\ \ln (\text { service }) \end{array}$ | . 0013075 | . 0002775 | -31.28 | 0.000 | . 0008625 | . 001982 |
|  | 1 | (exposure) |  |  |  |  |
| /lnsig2u | -2.351868 | . 8586262 | -2.74 | 0.006 | -4.034745 | -. 6689918 |
| sigma_u | . 3085306 | . 1324562 |  |  | . 1330045 | . 7156988 |
| LR test of sigma_u=0: chibar2 (01) = $10.67 \quad$ Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.001$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The output includes the additional panel-level variance component. This is parameterized as the log of the variance $\ln \left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$ (labeled $\ln s i g 2 \mathrm{u}$ in the output). The standard deviation $\sigma_{\nu}$ is also included in the output labeled sigma_u.

When sigma_u is zero, the panel-level variance component is unimportant and the panel estimator is no different from the pooled estimator. A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output. This test formally compares the pooled estimator (poisson) with the panel estimator. Here $\sigma_{\nu}$ is significantly greater than zero, so a panel estimator is indicated.

## Example 2

This time we fit a robust equal-correlation population-averaged model:

| . xtpoisson accident op_75_79 co_65_69 co_7 <br> > vce(robust) eform | co_75_79, exp(service) pa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 1: tolerance $=.04083192$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 2: tolerance $=.00270188$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: tolerance $=.00030663$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 4: tolerance $=.00003466$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 5: tolerance $=3.891 \mathrm{e}-06$ |  |  |  |
| Iteration 6: tolerance $=4.359 \mathrm{e}-07$ |  |  |  |
| GEE population-averaged model | Number of obs |  | 34 |
| Group variable: ship | Number of groups | = | 5 |
| Link: log | Obs per group: |  |  |
| Family: Poisson | min | $=$ | 6 |
| Correlation: exchangeable | avg | = | 6.8 |
|  | max |  | 7 |
|  | Wald chi2(4) |  | 252.94 |
| Scale parameter: 1 | Prob > chi2 | = | 0.0000 |

(Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on ship)

|  | Robust |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| accident | IRR | Std. Err. | z | P>\|z| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| op_75_79 | 1.483299 | .1197901 | 4.88 | 0.000 | 1.266153 | 1.737685 |
| co_65_69 | 2.038477 | .1809524 | 8.02 | 0.000 | 1.712955 | 2.425859 |
| co_70_74 | 2.643467 | .4093947 | 6.28 | 0.000 | 1.951407 | 3.580962 |
| co_75_79 | 1.876656 | .33075 | 3.57 | 0.000 | 1.328511 | 2.650966 |
| ln(service) | .0010255 | .0000721 | -97.90 | 0.000 | .0008935 | .001177 |

We may compare this with a pooled estimator with clustered robust-variance estimates:


## Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtpoisson, re normal likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtpoisson, re stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(N_cd)
    e(k)
    e(k_aux)
    e(k_eq)
    e(k_eq_model)
    e(k_dv)
    e(df_m)
    e(11)
    e(11_0)
    e(ll_c)
    e(chi2)
    e(chi2_c)
    e(N_clust)
    e(sigma_u)
    e(alpha)
    e(g_min)
    e(g_avg)
    e(g_max)
    e(p)
    e(rank)
    e(rankO)
    e(ic)
    e(rc)
    e(converged)
```

Macros
number of observations
number of groups
number of completely determined observations
number of parameters
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in e(b)
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
number of clusters
panel-level standard deviation
value of alpha
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise

```
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(clustvar)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(chi2_ct)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(method)
e(distrib)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(predict)
e(asobserved)
```

xtpoisson
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
re
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
name of cluster variable
linear offset variable
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
requested estimation method
Gamma; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization
type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables $f$ vset as asobserved

Matrices

```
    e(b)
    e(Cns)
    e(ilog)
    e(gradient)
    e(V)
    e(V_modelbased)
```

        coefficient vector
        constraints matrix
    iteration \(\log\)
    gradient vector
    variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
    model-based variance
    Functions
e(sample)
marks estimation sample
xtpoisson, re normal stores the following in e():
Scalars

| e(N) | number of observations |
| :---: | :---: |
| e(N_g) | number of groups |
| e(N_cd) | number of completely determined 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 |
| $e\left(d f \_m\right)$ | model degrees of freedom |
| e(ll) | log likelihood |
| e(ll_0) | log likelihood, constant-only model |
| e(ll_c) | log likelihood, comparison model |
| e(chi2) | $\chi^{2}$ |
| e(chi2_c) | $\chi^{2}$ for comparison test |
| e(N_clust) | number of clusters |
| e(sigma_u) | panel-level standard deviation |
| e(n_quad) | number of quadrature points |
| e(g_min) | smallest group size |
| e(g_avg) | average group size |
| e(g_max) | largest group size |
| $e(p)$ | significance |
| e(rank) | rank of e(V) |
| e(rank0) | rank of e(V) for constant-only model |
| e(ic) | number of iterations |
| $e(r c)$ | return code |
| e(converged) | 1 if converged, 0 otherwise |

Macros

```
    e(cmd)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(ivar)
    e(model)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
```

    e(title)
    e(clustvar)
    e(offset)
    e(offset1)
    e(chi2type)
    e(chi2_ct)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(intmethod)
    e(distrib)
    e(opt)
    e(which)
    e(ml_method)
    e(user)
    e(technique)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
    Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
xtpoisson, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars

```
        e(N)
    e(N_g)
    e(k)
    e(k_eq)
    e(k_eq_model)
    e(k_dv)
    e(df_m)
    e(11)
    e(ll_0)
    e(ll_c)
    e(chi2)
    e(g_min)
    e(g_avg)
    e(g_max)
    e(p)
    e(rank)
    e(ic)
    e(rc)
    e(converged)
```

number of observations
number of groups
number of parameters
number of equations in e(b)
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise

Macros

```
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(method)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e (V)
xtpoisson
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
fe
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
linear offset variable
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
$v$ cetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
requested estimation method
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
Functions
e(sample)
marks estimation sample
xtpoisson, pa stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rc)

```
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
\chi
significance
degrees of freedom for Pearson }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2
\chi ^ { 2 } \text { test of deviance}
\chi ^ { 2 } \text { test of deviance dispersion}
deviance
deviance dispersion
scale parameter
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
rank of e(V)
target tolerance
achieved tolerance
return code
```

Macros

```
    e(cmd)
    e(cmd2)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(ivar)
    e(tvar)
    e(model)
    e(family)
    e(link)
    e(corr)
    e(scale)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(offset)
    e(chi2type)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(nmp)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(marginsnotok)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
```

Matrices
e(b)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

xtpoisson, pa reports the population-averaged results obtained by using xtgee, family (poisson) link(log) to obtain estimates. See [XT] xtgee for details about the methods and formulas.
xtpoisson, fe with robust standard errors implements the formula presented in Wooldridge (1999). The formula is a cluster-robust estimate of the VCE in which the ID variable specifies the clusters.

Although Hausman, Hall, and Griliches (1984) wrote the seminal article on the random-effects and fixed-effects models, Cameron and Trivedi (2013) provide a good textbook treatment. Allison (2009, chap. 4) succinctly discusses these models and illustrates the differences between them using Stata.

For a random-effects specification, we know that

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \alpha_{i}, \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)=\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right\} \exp \left(\alpha_{i} \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)
$$

where $\lambda_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$. We may rewrite the above as [defining $\epsilon_{i}=\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right)$ ]

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \epsilon_{i}, \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right) & =\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\left(\lambda_{i t} \epsilon_{i}\right)^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right\} \exp \left(-\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t} \epsilon_{i}\right) \\
& =\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \exp \left(-\epsilon_{i} \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right) \epsilon_{i}^{\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}}
\end{aligned}
$$

We now assume that $\epsilon_{i}$ follows a gamma distribution with mean one and variance $1 / \theta$ so that unconditional on $\epsilon_{i}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right) & =\frac{\theta^{\theta}}{\Gamma(\theta)}\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp \left(-\epsilon_{i} \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right) \epsilon_{i}^{\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}} \epsilon_{i}^{\theta-1} \exp \left(-\theta \epsilon_{i}\right) d \epsilon_{i} \\
& =\frac{\theta^{\theta}}{\Gamma(\theta)}\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \int_{0}^{\infty} \exp \left\{-\epsilon_{i}\left(\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right)\right\} \epsilon_{i}^{\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}-1} d \epsilon_{i} \\
& \left.=\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \frac{\Gamma\left(\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)}{\Gamma(\theta)}\left(\frac{\theta}{\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}}\right)\right)^{\theta}\left(\frac{1}{\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

for $\mathbf{X}_{i}=\left(\mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)$.
The $\log$ likelihood (assuming gamma heterogeneity) is then derived using

$$
\begin{aligned}
& u_{i}=\frac{\theta}{\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}} \quad \lambda_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \\
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i 1}=y_{i 1}, \ldots, Y_{i n_{i}}=y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)=\frac{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}^{y_{i t}} \Gamma\left(\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)}{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}!\Gamma(\theta)\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right)^{\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}}} u_{i}^{\theta}\left(1-u_{i}\right)^{\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}}
\end{aligned}
$$

such that the log likelihood may be written as

$$
\begin{array}{r}
L=\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}\left\{\log \Gamma\left(\theta+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)-\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \log \Gamma\left(1+y_{i t}\right)-\log \Gamma(\theta)+\theta \log u_{i}\right. \\
\left.+\log \left(1-u_{i}\right) \sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)-\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right) \log \left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \lambda_{i t}\right)\right\}
\end{array}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.

Alternatively, if we assume a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
$$

where

$$
F(y, z)=\exp \{-\exp (z)+y z-\log (y!)\}
$$

The panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, with the definition of $g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\right. \\
&\left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.

The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The log likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the intmethod (ghermite) option, where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left\{y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

For a fixed-effects specification, we know that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i t}=y_{i t} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}\right) & =\exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\} \exp \left(\alpha_{i}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}} / y_{i t}! \\
& =\frac{1}{y_{i t}!} \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} y_{i t}\right\} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}} \\
& \equiv F_{i t}
\end{aligned}
$$

Because we know that the observations are independent, we may write the joint probability for the observations within a panel as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i 1}=y_{i 1}, \ldots,\right. \\
& \left.\qquad Y_{i n_{i}}=y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right) \\
& \\
& =\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{1}{y_{i t}!} \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} y_{i t}\right\} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}} \\
& \\
& =\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} \sum_{t} y_{i t}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

and we also know that the sum of $n_{i}$ Poisson independent random variables, each with parameter $\lambda_{i t}$ for $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}$, is distributed as Poisson with parameter $\sum_{t} \lambda_{i t}$. Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{Pr}\left(\sum_{t} Y_{i t}=\sum_{t} y_{i t} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)= \\
& \quad \frac{1}{\left(\sum_{t} y_{i t}\right)!} \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} \sum_{t} y_{i t}\right\}\left\{\sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{\sum_{t} y_{i t}}
\end{aligned}
$$

So, the conditional likelihood is conditioned on the sum of the outcomes in the set (panel). The appropriate function is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\operatorname{Pr}\left(Y_{i 1}\right. & \left.=y_{i 1}, \ldots, Y_{i n_{i}}=y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{X}_{i}, \sum_{t} Y_{i t}=\sum_{t} y_{i t}\right)= \\
& {\left[\left(\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!}\right) \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} \sum_{t} y_{i t}\right\}\right] / } \\
& \quad\left[\frac{1}{\left(\sum_{t} y_{i t}\right)!} \exp \left\{-\exp \left(\alpha_{i}\right) \sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)+\alpha_{i} \sum_{t} y_{i t}\right\}\left\{\sum_{t} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{\sum_{t} y_{i t}}\right] \\
= & \left(\sum_{t} y_{i t}\right)!\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!\left\{\sum_{k} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i k} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{y_{i t}}}
\end{aligned}
$$

which is free of $\alpha_{i}$.

The conditional log likelihood is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\log \prod_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}\right)!\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \frac{\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{y_{i t}}}{y_{i t}!\left\{\sum_{\ell=1}^{n_{\ell}} \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i \ell} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{y_{i t}}}\right]^{w_{i}} \\
& =\log \prod_{i=1}^{n}\left\{\frac{\left(\sum_{t} y_{i t}\right)!}{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}!} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} p_{i t}^{y_{i t}}\right\}^{w_{i}} \\
& =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i}\left\{\log \Gamma\left(\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t}+1\right)-\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} \log \Gamma\left(y_{i t}+1\right)+\sum_{t=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t} \log p_{i t}\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
p_{i t}=e^{\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}} / \sum_{\ell} e^{\mathbf{x}_{i \ell} \boldsymbol{\beta}}
$$

## xtpoisson, re and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce(robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtpoisson postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtpoisson
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtnbreg - Fixed-effects, random-effects, \& population-averaged negative binomial models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] mepoisson - Multilevel mixed-effects Poisson regression
[ME] meqrpoisson - Multilevel mixed-effects Poisson regression (QR decomposition)
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] poisson - Poisson regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtpoisson postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtpoisson

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Methods and formulas | Also see |  |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtpoisson:

| Command | Description |
| :---: | :---: |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| ```*estat ic estat summarize estat vce estimates``` | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) summary statistics for the estimation sample variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) cataloging estimation results |
| $\dagger$ forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| * lrtest margins | likelihood-ratio test marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combination of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |

[^12]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, standard errors, numbers of events, incidence rates, probabilities, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

Random-effects (RE) model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, RE_statistic nooffset]
```

Fixed-effects (FE) model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, FE_statistic nooffset]
```

Population-averaged (PA) model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]
```


## RE_statistic Description

Main
xb linear prediction; the default
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
$\mathrm{n} \quad$ predicted number of events marginal with respect to the random effect;
only allowed after xtpoisson, re normal
nu0 predicted number of events assuming the random effect is zero
iru0 predicted incidence rate assuming the random effect is zero
$\operatorname{prO}(n) \quad$ probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero
$\operatorname{pr} 0(a, b) \quad$ probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero

FE_statistic Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
nu0 predicted number of events assuming the fixed effect is zero
iru0 predicted incidence rate assuming the fixed effect is zero

Main
mu
rate
xb
$\operatorname{pr}(n)$
$\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$
stdp
score
predicted number of events; considers the offset (); the default
predicted number of events
linear prediction
probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$
probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$
standard error of the linear prediction
first derivative of the $\log$ likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict . . . if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

 mu and rate both calculate the predicted number of events. mu takes into account the offset (), and rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset ().mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
n calculates the predicted number of events marginally with respect to the random effect, which means that the statistic is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support. This option is only allowed after xtpoisson, re normal.
nu0 calculates the predicted number of events, assuming a zero random or fixed effect.
iru0 calculates the predicted incidence rate, assuming a zero random or fixed effect.
$\operatorname{prO}(n)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero, where $n$ is a nonnegative integer that may be specified as a number or a variable (only allowed after xtpoisson, re).
$\operatorname{pr} 0(a, b)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero, where $a$ and $b$ are nonnegative integers that may be specified as numbers or variables (only allowed after xtpoisson, re);
$b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$;
$\operatorname{pr0}(20,$.$) calculates \operatorname{Pr}(y \geq 20)$;
$\operatorname{pr} 0(20, b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(y \geq 20)$ in observations for which $b \geq$. and calculates
$\operatorname{Pr}(20 \leq y \leq b)$ elsewhere.
$\operatorname{prO}(., b)$ produces a syntax error. A missing value in an observation of the variable $a$ causes a missing value in that observation for $\operatorname{prO}(a, b)$.
$\operatorname{pr}(n)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$, where $n$ is a nonnegative integer that may be specified as a number or a variable (only allowed after xtpoisson, pa).
$\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$ calculates the probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ (only allowed after xtpoisson, pa). The syntax for this option is analogous to that used with $\operatorname{prO}(a, b)$.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtpoisson. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions, numbers of events, incidence rates, and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...)...] [options]
```

Random-effects ( $R E$ ) model

| statistic | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| xb | linear prediction; the default after xtpoisson, re |
| n | predicted number of events marginal with respect to the random effect; the default |
| $\mathrm{nu0}$ | predicted number of events assuming the random effect is zero |
| $\operatorname{iru0}$ | predicted incidence rate assuming the random effect is zero |
| $\operatorname{pr0}(n)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ assuming the random effect is zero |
| $\operatorname{pr0}(a, b)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ assuming the random effect is zero |
| $\operatorname{stdp}$ | not allowed with margins |

Fixed-effects (FE) model
statistic Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| nuO | predicted number of events assuming the fixed effect is zero |
| iru0 | predicted incidence rate assuming the fixed effect is zero |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

Population-averaged (PA) model
statistic Description

| mu | predicted number of events; considers the offset(); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | predicted number of events |
| xb | linear prediction |
| $\mathrm{pr}(n)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}(y=n)$ |
| $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$ | probability $\operatorname{Pr}(a \leq y \leq b)$ |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

$>$ Example 1: Predicted number of events and incidence rate with no random effect
In example 1 of [XT] xtpoisson, we fit a random-effects model of the number of accidents experienced by five different types of ships on the basis of when the ships were constructed and operated. Here we obtain the predicted number of accidents for each observation, assuming that the random effect for each panel is zero:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/ships
. xtpoisson accident op_75_79 co_65_69 co_70_74 co_75_79, exposure(service) irr
(output omitted)
. predict n_acc, nu0
(6 missing values generated)
. summarize n_acc
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrrrr} 
Variable & Obs & Mean & Std. Dev. & Min & Max \\
\hline n_acc & 34 & 13.52307 & 23.15885 & .0617592 & 83.31905
\end{tabular}
```

From these results, you may be tempted to conclude that some types of ships are safe, with a predicted number of accidents close to zero, whereas others are dangerous, because 1 observation is predicted to have more than 83 accidents.

However, when we fit the model, we specified the exposure(service) option. The variable service records the total number of months of operation for each type of ship constructed in and operated during particular years. Because ships experienced different utilization rates and thus were exposed to different levels of accident risk, we included service as our exposure variable. When comparing different types of ships, we must therefore predict the number of accidents, assuming that all ships faced the same exposure to risk. To do that, we use the iru0 option with predict:

```
. predict acc_rate, iru0
. summarize acc_rate
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrrrr} 
Variable & Obs & Mean & Std. Dev. & Min & Max \\
\hline acc_rate & 40 & .002975 & .0010497 & .0013724 & .0047429
\end{tabular}
```

These results show that if each ship were used for 1 month, the expected number of accidents is 0.002975 . Depending on the type of ship and years of construction and operation, the incidence rate of accidents ranges from 0.00137 to 0.00474 .

## Methods and formulas

The probabilities calculated using the $\operatorname{prO}(n)$ option are the probability $\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=n\right)$ for a RE model assuming the random effect is zero. Define $\mu_{i t}=\exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\right.$ offset $\left._{i t}\right)$. The probabilities in $\operatorname{pr} 0(n)$ are calculated as the probability that $y_{i t}=n$, where $y_{i t}$ has a Poisson distribution with mean $\mu_{i t}$. Specifically,

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t}=n\right)=(n!)^{-1} \exp \left(-\mu_{i t}\right)\left(\mu_{i t}\right)^{n}
$$

Probabilities calculated using the $\operatorname{pr}(n)$ option after fitting a PA model are also calculated as described above.

## Also see

[XT] xtpoisson - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged Poisson models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtprobit — Random-effects and population-averaged probit models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options for RE model | Options for PA model | Remarks and examples | Stored results |
| Methods and formulas | References | Also see |  |

## Description

xtprobit fits random-effects and population-averaged probit models for a binary dependent variable. The probability of a positive outcome is assumed to be determined by the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

## Quick start

Random-effects probit model of y as a function of x 1 , x 2 , and indicators for levels of categorical variable a using xtset data
xtprobit y x1 x2 i.a
Population-averaged model with robust standard errors
xtprobit y x1 x2 i.a, pa vce(robust)
As above, but specify an autoregressive correlation structure of order 1
xtprobit y x1 x2 i.a, pa vce(robust) corr (ar 1)
Random-effects model with cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar xtprobit y x1 x2 i.a, vce(cluster cvar)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Binary outcomes $>$ Probit regression (RE, PA)

## Syntax

Random-effects (RE) model
xtprobit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight] [, re RE_options]

Population-averaged (PA) model
xtprobit depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], pa [PA_options]
RE_options
Description

## Model

noconstant
re
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
asis
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options
suppress constant term
use random-effects estimator; the default
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
retain perfect predictor variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Integration

intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints(\#)
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
Maximization
maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## PA_options Description

## Model

noconstant<br>pa<br>offset (varname)<br>asis

Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
scale(parm)

Reporting
level(\#)
display_options
set confidence level; default is level (95)
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Optimization

optimize_options
coeflegend
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## correlation

## Description

| exchangeable | exchangeable <br> independent |
| :--- | :--- |
| independent | unstructured |
| $\underline{\text { unstructured }}$ | user-specified |
| fixed matname | autoregressive of order \# |
| ar \# | stationary of order \# |
| stationary \# | nonstationary of order \# |
| nonstationary \# |  |

A panel variable must be specified. For xtprobit, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. $f p$ is allowed for the random-effects model.
vce(bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model, and iweights are allowed for the random-effects model; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
re requests the random-effects estimator. re is the default if neither re nor pa is specified. offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see $[R]$ estimation options.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtprobit, re and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.

## Reporting

level(\#), noskip; see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Integration }}$
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtprobit but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for PA model

Model
noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
pa requests the population-averaged estimator.
asis forces retention of perfect predictor variables and their associated, perfectly predicted observations
and may produce instabilities in maximization; see $[\mathrm{R}]$ probit. and may produce instabilities in maximization; see [R] probit.
corr (correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).
When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).
If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr (fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced.
This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp, scale(x2|dev $\mid$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.

Reporting
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\% fint), pformat (\% fint), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Optimization
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate(\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate (100).
tolerance(\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance $(1 e-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following option is available with xtprobit but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtprobit may be used to fit a population-averaged model or a random-effects probit model. There is no command for a conditional fixed-effects model, as there does not exist a sufficient statistic allowing the fixed effects to be conditioned out of the likelihood. Unconditional fixed-effects probit models may be fit with the probit command with indicator variables for the panels. However, unconditional fixed-effects estimates are biased. We do not discuss fixed-effects further in this entry.

By default, the population-averaged model is an equal-correlation model; that is, xtprobit, pa assumes corr (exchangeable). Thus, xtprobit is a convenience command for obtaining the population-averaged model using xtgee; see [XT] xtgee. Typing

```
. xtprobit ..., pa ...
```

is equivalent to typing

```
. xtgee ..., ... family(binomial) link(probit) corr(exchangeable)
```

See also [XT] xtgee for information about xtprobit.
By default or when re is specified, xtprobit fits via maximum likelihood the random-effects model

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i t} \neq 0 \mid \mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)=\Phi\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}, \nu_{i}$ are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $\Phi$ is the standard normal cumulative distribution function.

Underlying this model is the variance components model

$$
y_{i t} \neq 0 \Longleftrightarrow \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}>0
$$

where $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. Gaussian distributed with mean zero and variance $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}=1$, independently of $\nu_{i}$.
> Example 1: Random-effects model
We are studying unionization of women in the United States and are using the union dataset; see [XT] xt. We wish to fit a random-effects model of union membership:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtprobit union age grade i.not_smsa south##c.year
Fitting comparison model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -13864.23
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -13545.541
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -13544.385
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -13544.385
Fitting full model:
rho = 0.0 log likelihood = -13544.385
rho = 0.1 log likelihood = -12237.655
rho = 0.2 log likelihood = - 11590.282
rho = 0.3 log likelihood = -11211.185
rho = 0.4 log likelihood = -10981.319
rho = 0.5 log likelihood = -10852.793
rho = 0.6 log likelihood = -10808.759
rho = 0.7 log likelihood = -10865.57
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -10807.712
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -10599.332
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -10552.287
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -10552.225
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -10552.225
Group variable: idcode
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
```

Random-effects probit regression Number of obs $=26,200$
Number of groups $=4,434$
Obs per group:


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| age | . 0082967 | . 0084599 | 0.98 | 0.327 | -. 0082843 | . 0248778 |
| grade | . 0482731 | . 0099469 | 4.85 | 0.000 | . 0287776 | . 0677686 |
| 1.not_smsa | -. 139657 | . 0460548 | -3.03 | 0.002 | -. 2299227 | -. 0493913 |
| 1.south | -1.584394 | . 358473 | -4.42 | 0.000 | -2. 286989 | -. 8818002 |
| year | -. 0039854 | . 0088399 | -0.45 | 0.652 | -. 0213113 | . 0133406 |
| south\#c.year 1 | . 0134017 | . 0044622 | 3.00 | 0.003 | . 0046559 | . 0221475 |
| _cons | -1.668202 | . 4751819 | -3.51 | 0.000 | -2.599542 | -. 7368628 |
| /lnsig2u | . 6103616 | . 0458783 |  |  | . 5204418 | . 7002814 |
| sigma_u | 1.35687 | . 0311255 |  |  | 1.297217 | 1.419267 |
| rho | . 6480233 | . 0104643 |  |  | . 6272511 | . 6682502 |

The output includes the additional panel-level variance component, which is parameterized as the log of the variance $\ln \left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$ (labeled $\ln s i g 2 \mathrm{u}$ in the output). The standard deviation $\sigma_{\nu}$ is also included in the output (labeled sigma_u) together with $\rho$ (labeled rho), where

$$
\rho=\frac{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1}
$$

which is the proportion of the total variance contributed by the panel-level variance component.

When rho is zero, the panel-level variance component is unimportant, and the panel estimator is not different from the pooled estimator. A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output. This test formally compares the pooled estimator (probit) with the panel estimator.

## - Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Refitting model intpoints }()=8 \\ & \text { Refitting model intpoints }()=16 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Quadrature check |  |  |  |  |
|  | Fitted quadrature 12 points | Comparison quadrature 8 points | Comparison quadrature 16 points |  |
| Log | -10552.225 | -10554.496 | -10552.399 |  |
| likelihood |  | -2.2712569 | -. 17396615 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00021524 | . 00001649 | Relative difference |
| union: | . 00829671 | . 00828745 | . 00831488 |  |
| age |  | -9.265e-06 | . 00001817 | Difference |
|  |  | -. 0011167 | . 00218987 | Relative difference |
| union: | . 0482731 | . 04860277 | . 04826287 |  |
| grade |  | . 00032967 | -. 00001023 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00682917 | -. 00021188 | Relative difference |
| union: | -. 13965702 | -. 14057441 | -. 13953521 |  |
| 1. not_smsa |  | -. 00091739 | . 00012181 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00656891 | -. 00087218 | Relative difference |
| union: | -1.5843944 | -1.5909857 | -1.5843375 |  |
| 1.south |  | -. 00659135 | . 00005689 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00416017 | -. 00003591 | Relative difference |
| union: | -. 00398535 | -. 00397811 | -. 00400181 |  |
| year |  | $7.237 \mathrm{e}-06$ | -. 00001646 | Difference |
|  |  | -. 00181578 | . 00412982 | Relative difference |
| union: | . 01340169 | . 01344457 | . 01340388 |  |
| 1. south\#c. $\sim r$ |  | . 00004288 | $2.193 \mathrm{e}-06$ | Difference |
|  |  | . 00319946 | . 0001636 | Relative difference |
| union: | -1.6682022 | -1.6757524 | -1.6665327 |  |
| _cons |  | -. 00755024 | . 00166948 | Difference |
|  |  | . 00452597 | -. 00100077 | Relative difference |
| lnsig2u: | . 61036163 | . 61780789 | . 60974814 |  |
| _cons |  | . 00744626 | -. 00061349 | Difference |
|  |  | . 01219976 | -. 00100513 | Relative difference |

The results obtained for 12 quadrature points were closer to the results for 16 points than to the results for eight points. Although the relative and absolute differences are a bit larger than we would like, they are not large. We can increase the number of quadrature points with the intpoints() option; if we choose intpoints(20) and do another quadchk we will get acceptable results, with relative differences around $0.01 \%$.

This is not the case if we use nonadaptive quadrature. Then the results we obtain are

Number of obs $=\quad 26,200$

Number of groups $=4,434$
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
Obs per group:

|  | min | $=$ | 1 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| avg | $=$ | 5.9 |  |
| max | $=$ | 12 |  |
| Integration method: ghermite | Integration pts. | $=$ | 12 |
| Log likelihood $=-10560.876$ | Wald chi2 (6) | $=$ | 218.99 |
|  | Prob $>$ chi2 | $=$ | 0.0000 |


| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | .0093488 | .0083385 | 1.12 | 0.262 | -.0069945 | .025692 |
| grade | .0488014 | .0101168 | 4.82 | 0.000 | .0289728 | .06863 |
| 1.not_smsa | -.1364862 | .0462831 | -2.95 | 0.003 | -.2271995 | -.045773 |
| 1.south | -1.592711 | .3576715 | -4.45 | 0.000 | -2.293734 | -.8916877 |
| year | -.0053723 | .0087219 | -0.62 | 0.538 | -.0224668 | .0117223 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0136764 | .0044532 | 3.07 | 0.002 | .0049482 | .0224046 |
| _cons | -1.575539 | .4639881 | -3.40 | 0.001 | -2.484939 | -.6661388 |
| /lnsig2u | .5615976 | .0432021 |  |  | .476923 | .6462722 |
| sigma_u | 1.324187 | .0286038 |  |  | 1.269295 | 1.381453 |
| rho | .6368221 | .0099918 |  |  | .617021 | .6561699 |

LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) $=5967.02$
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.000$
We now check the stability of the quadrature technique for this nonadaptive quadrature model. We expect it to be less stable.


Once again, the results obtained for 12 quadrature points were closer to the results for 16 points than to the results for eight points. However, here the convergence point seems to be sensitive to the number of quadrature points, so we should not trust these results. We should increase the number of quadrature points with the intpoints () option and then use quadchk again. We should not use the results of a random-effects specification when there is evidence that the numeric technique for calculating the model is not stable (as shown by quadchk).

Generally, the relative differences in the coefficients should not change by more than $1 \%$ if the quadrature technique is stable. See [XT] quadchk for details. Increasing the number of quadrature points can often improve the stability, and for models with high rho we may need many. We can also switch between adaptive and nonadaptive quadrature. As a rule, adaptive quadrature, which is the default integration method, is much more flexible and robust.

Because the xtprobit, re likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## > Example 2: Equal-correlation model

As an alternative to the random-effects specification, we can fit an equal-correlation probit model:

| Iteration 1: tolerance $=.12544249$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 2: tolerance $=.0034686$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: tolerance $=.00017448$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 4: tolerance $=8.382 \mathrm{e}-06$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 5: tolerance $=3.997 \mathrm{e}-07$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Number | f obs | 26,200 |
| Group variable: |  |  | de | Number | f groups | 4,434 |
| Link: |  |  | it | Obs per | group: |  |
| Family: |  | bin | ial |  | min | 1 |
| Correlation: |  | exchangeable |  |  | avg | 5.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | (6) | 242.57 |
| Scale parameter: |  |  | 1 | Prob > | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| age | . 0089699 | . 0053208 | 1.69 | 0.092 | -. 0014586 | . 0193985 |
| grade | . 0333174 | . 0062352 | 5.34 | 0.000 | . 0210966 | . 0455382 |
| 1.not_smsa | -. 0715717 | . 027543 | -2.60 | 0.009 | -. 1255551 | -. 0175884 |
| 1. south | -1.017368 | . 207931 | -4.89 | 0.000 | -1.424905 | -. 6098308 |
| year | -. 0062708 | . 0055314 | -1.13 | 0.257 | -. 0171122 | . 0045706 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 0086294 | . 00258 | 3.34 | 0.001 | . 0035727 | . 013686 |
| _cons | -. 8670997 | . 294771 | -2.94 | 0.003 | -1.44484 | -. 2893592 |

## > Example 3: Population-averaged model

In example 3 of $[\mathrm{R}]$ probit, we showed the above results and compared them with probit, vce(cluster id). xtprobit with the pa option allows a vce(robust) option, so we can obtain the population-averaged probit estimator with the robust variance calculation by typing

| GEE population-averaged model |  |  |  | Numbe | f obs | 26,200 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: |  |  | de | Numbe | f groups | 4,434 |
| Link: |  |  | it | Obs p | group: |  |
| Family: |  | bin | ial |  | min | 1 |
| Correlation: |  | exchangeable |  |  |  | 5.9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 12 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald | (6) | 156.33 |
| Scale parameter: |  |  | 1 | Prob | hi2 | 0.0000 |
|  |  | (Std. Err. adjusted for clustering on idcode) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Semirobust |  |  |  |  |
| union | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| age | . 0089699 | . 0051169 | 1.75 | 0.080 | -. 001059 | . 0189988 |
| grade | . 0333174 | . 0076425 | 4.36 | 0.000 | . 0183383 | . 0482965 |
| 1.not_smsa | -. 0715717 | . 0348659 | -2.05 | 0.040 | -. 1399076 | -. 0032359 |
| 1. south | -1.017368 | . 3026981 | -3.36 | 0.001 | -1.610645 | -. 4240906 |
| year | -. 0062708 | . 0055745 | -1.12 | 0.261 | -. 0171965 | . 0046549 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | . 0086294 | . 0037866 | 2.28 | 0.023 | . 0012078 | . 0160509 |
| _cons | -. 8670997 | . 3243959 | -2.67 | 0.008 | -1.502904 | -. 2312955 |

These standard errors are similar to those shown for probit, vce(cluster id) in $[R]$ probit.

## $>$ Example 4: Random-effects model with stable quadrature

In a previous example, we showed how quadchk indicated that the quadrature technique was numerically unstable. Here we present an example in which the quadrature is stable.

In this example, we have (synthetic) data on whether workers complain to managers at fast-food restaurants. The covariates are age (in years of the worker), grade (years of schooling completed by the worker), south (equal to 1 if the restaurant is located in the South), tenure (the number of years spent on the job by the worker), gender (of the worker), race (of the worker), income (in thousands of dollars by the restaurant), genderm (gender of the manager), burger (equal to 1 if the restaurant specializes in hamburgers), and chicken (equal to 1 if the restaurant specializes in chicken). The model is given by
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/chicken
. xtprobit complain age grade south tenure gender race income genderm burger
> chicken, nolog
Random-effects probit regression $\quad$ Number of obs $=2,763$
Group variable: restaurant Number of groups = 500
Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian
Obs per group:

| $\min$ | $=$ | 3 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| $\operatorname{avg}$ | $=$ | 5.5 |
| $\max$ | $=$ | 8 |
| ts. | $=$ | 12 |
|  | $=$ | 126.59 |
|  | $=$ | 0.0000 |


| complain | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: | ---: |
| age | -.0430409 | .0130211 | -3.31 | 0.001 | -.0685617 | -.01752 |
| grade | .0330934 | .0264572 | 1.25 | 0.211 | -.0187618 | .0849486 |
| south | .1012 | .0707196 | 1.43 | 0.152 | -.037408 | .2398079 |
| tenure | -.0440079 | .0987099 | -0.45 | 0.656 | -.2374758 | .14946 |
| gender | .3318499 | .0601382 | 5.52 | 0.000 | .2139812 | .4497185 |
| race | .3417901 | .0382251 | 8.94 | 0.000 | .2668703 | .4167098 |
| income | -.0022702 | .0008885 | -2.56 | 0.011 | -.0040117 | -.0005288 |
| genderm | .0524577 | .0706585 | 0.74 | 0.458 | -.0860305 | .1909459 |
| burger | .0448931 | .0956151 | 0.47 | 0.639 | -.1425091 | .2322953 |
| chicken | .1904714 | .0953067 | 2.00 | 0.046 | .0036737 | .3772691 |
| _cons | -.2145311 | .6240549 | -0.34 | 0.731 | -1.437656 | 1.008594 |
| /lnsig2u | -1.704494 | .2502057 |  |  | -2.194888 | -1.214099 |
| sigma_u | .4264557 | .0533508 |  |  | .333723 | .5449563 |
| rho | .1538793 | .0325769 |  |  | .1002105 | .2289765 |

LR test of rho=0: chibar2(01) $=29.91$
Prob >= chibar2 $=0.000$
Again we would like to check the stability of the quadrature technique of the model before interpreting the results. Given the estimate of $\rho$ and the small size of the panels (between 3 and 8 ), we should find that the quadrature technique is numerically stable.

```
. quadchk, nooutput
Refitting model intpoints() = 8
Refitting model intpoints() = 16
```

|  | Quadrature check |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Fitted quadrature 12 points | Comparison quadrature 8 points | Comparison quadrature 16 points |  |
| Log | -1318. 2088 | -1318.2088 | -1318.2088 |  |
| likelihood |  | -2.002e-06 | -1.194e-09 | Difference |
|  |  | $1.519 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $9.061 \mathrm{e}-13$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | -. 04304086 | -. 04304086 | -. 04304086 |  |
| age |  | -3.896e-10 | -2.625e-12 | Difference |
|  |  | 9.051e-09 | $6.100 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 0330934 | . 0330934 | . 0330934 |  |
| grade |  | $2.208 \mathrm{e}-11$ | $1.867 \mathrm{e}-12$ | Difference |
|  |  | $6.673 \mathrm{e}-10$ | $5.643 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 10119998 | . 10119999 | . 10119998 |  |
| south |  | $2.369 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $3.957 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Difference |
|  |  | $2.341 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $3.910 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | -. 04400789 | -. 0440079 | -. 04400789 |  |
| tenure |  | -3.362e-09 | -2.250e-11 | Difference |
|  |  | $7.640 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $5.114 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 33184986 | . 33184986 | . 33184986 |  |
| gender |  | $3.190 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $2.546 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Difference |
|  |  | $9.612 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $7.673 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 34179006 | . 34179007 | . 34179006 |  |
| race |  | 3.801e-09 | 2.990 e-11 | Difference |
|  |  | $1.112 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $8.749 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | -. 00227021 | -. 00227021 | -. 00227021 |  |
| income |  | -4.468e-11 | -9.252e-13 | Difference |
|  |  | $1.968 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $4.075 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 05245769 | . 05245769 | . 05245769 |  |
| genderm |  | $1.963 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $4.481 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Difference |
|  |  | $3.742 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $8.542 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | . 04489311 | . 04489311 | . 04489311 |  |
| burger |  | $4.173 \mathrm{e}-10$ | $6.628 \mathrm{e}-12$ | Difference |
|  |  | $9.296 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $1.476 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: chicken | . 19047138 | . 19047139 | . 19047138 |  |
|  |  | $3.096 \mathrm{e}-09$ | $4.916 \mathrm{e}-11$ | Difference |
|  |  | $1.625 \mathrm{e}-08$ | $2.581 \mathrm{e}-10$ | Relative difference |
| complain: | -. 21453112 | -. 21453111 | -. 21453112 |  |
| _cons |  | $1.281 \mathrm{e}-08$ | 2.682e-10 | Difference |
|  |  | -5.972e-08 | -1.250e-09 | Relative difference |
| lnsig2u: | -1.7044935 | -1.7044934 | -1.7044935 |  |
| _cons |  | $1.255 \mathrm{e}-07$ | -4.135e-10 | Difference |
|  |  | -7.365e-08 | 2.426e-10 | Relative difference |

The relative and absolute differences are all small between the default 12 quadrature points and the result with 16 points. We do not have any coefficients that have a large difference between the default 12 quadrature points and eight quadrature points.

We conclude that the quadrature technique is stable. Because the differences here are so small, we would plan on using and interpreting these results rather than trying to rerun with more quadrature points.

## Stored results

xtprobit, re stores the following in $e()$ :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(N_cd)
e(k)
e(k_aux)
$e\left(k \_\right.$eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(ll_0)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(N_clust)
$e$ (rho)
e(sigma_u)
$e$ (n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e (p)
e(rank)
e(rank0)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(clustvar)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(chi2_ct)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(intmethod)
e(distrib)
e(opt)
number of observations
number of groups
number of completely determined observations
number of parameters
number of auxiliary parameters
number of equations in $e(b)$
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
number of clusters
$\rho$
panel-level standard deviation
number of quadrature points
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
significance
rank of $e(V)$
rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
xtprobit
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
re
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
name of cluster variable
linear offset variable
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization

```
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
```

Matrices

```
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
```

Functions
e(sample)
$\max$ or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators model-based variance
marks estimation sample
xtprobit, pa stores the following in e() :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rc)
Macros
e(cmd)
$e$ (cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(nmp)
e(properties)
e(predict)
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
$\chi^{2}$
significance
degrees of freedom for Pearson $\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ test of deviance
$\chi^{2}$ test of deviance dispersion
deviance
deviance dispersion
scale parameter
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
rank of $e(V)$
target tolerance
achieved tolerance
return code
xtgee
xtprobit
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
pa
binomial
probit; link function
correlation structure
x2, dev, phi, or \#; scale parameter
weight type
weight expression
linear offset variable
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
nmp, if specified
b V
program used to implement predict

```
    e(marginsnotok) predictions disallowed by margins
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
Matrices
    e(b)
    e(Cns)
    e(R)
    e(V)
    e(V_modelbased)
Functions
    e(sample) marks estimation sample
```


## Methods and formulas

xtprobit reports the population-averaged results obtained by using xtgee, family (binomial) link (probit) to obtain estimates.

Assuming a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$

$$
\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
$$

where

$$
F(y, z)= \begin{cases}\Phi(z) & \text { if } y \neq 0 \\ 1-\Phi(z) & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $\Phi$ is the cumulative normal distribution.
The panel-level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel-level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel-level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, with the definition of $g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{aligned}
& L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\right. \\
&\left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.
The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$, we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The $\log$ likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the intmethod (ghermite) option, where $\rho=\sigma_{\nu}^{2} /\left(\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+1\right)$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left\{y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+a_{m}^{*}\left(\frac{2 \rho}{1-\rho}\right)^{1 / 2}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. The number of periods (panel size) can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.

## xtprobit, re and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce (robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtprobit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtprobit
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtcloglog - Random-effects and population-averaged cloglog models
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtlogit - Fixed-effects, random-effects, and population-averaged logit models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] meprobit - Multilevel mixed-effects probit regression
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] probit - Probit regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtprobit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtprobit
Postestimation commands predict margins Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtprobit:
Command Description

| trast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| :---: | :---: |
| ```*estat ic estat summarize estat vce estimates``` | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) summary statistics for the estimation sample variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) cataloging estimation results |
| $\dagger$ forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test |
| lincom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations of coefficients |
| * lrtest margins | likelihood-ratio test marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations of coefficients |
| predict | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures |
| predictnl | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictio |
| pwcompare | pairwise comparisons of estimates |
| test | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses |
| testnl | Wald tests of nonlinear hypotheses |
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## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, probabilities, standard errors, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

Random-effects model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, RE_statistic nooffset]
```

Population-averaged model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]
```

| RE_statistic | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| Main | linear prediction; the default |
| xb | marginal probability of a positive outcome |
| pr | probability of a positive outcome |
| $\mathrm{pu0}$ | standard error of the linear prediction |
| stdp |  |

PA_statistic Description

## Main

| mu | probability of depvar; considers the offset (); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | probability of depvar |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | standard error of the linear prediction |
| score | first derivative of the log likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ |

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

## Main

xb calculates the linear prediction. This is the default for the random-effects model.
pr calculates the probability of a positive outcome that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the probability is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
puO calculates the probability of a positive outcome, assuming that the random effect for that observation's panel is zero ( $\nu_{i}=0$ ). This probability may not be similar to the proportion of observed outcomes in the group.
mu and rate both calculate the predicted probability of depvar. mu takes into account the offset (), and rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset(). mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtprobit. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions and probabilities.

## Menu for margins

Statistics > Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

Random-effects model
statistic
Description
$\mathrm{pr} \quad$ marginal probability of a positive outcome; the default
puO probability of a positive outcome
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction
stdp not allowed with margins

Population-averaged model
statistic Description

| mu | probability of depvar; considers the offset (); the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | probability of depvar |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1: Calculating average marginal effects

In example 2 of [XT] xtprobit, we fit a population-averaged model of union status on the woman's age and level of schooling, whether she lived in an urban area, whether she lived in the south, and the year observed. Here we compute the average marginal effects from that fitted model on the probability of being in a union.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/union
(NLS Women 14-24 in 1968)
. xtprobit union age grade i.not_smsa south##c.year, pa
    (output omitted)
. margins, dydx(*)
Average marginal effects Number of obs = 26,200
Model VCE : Conventional
Expression : Pr(union != 0), predict()
dy/dx w.r.t. : age grade 1.not_smsa 1.south year
```

|  | Delta-method |  |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | dy/dx | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| age | .0025337 | .0015035 | 1.69 | 0.092 | -.0004132 | .0054805 |
| grade | .0094109 | .0017566 | 5.36 | 0.000 | .005968 | .0128537 |
| 1. not_smsa | -.0199744 | .0075879 | -2.63 | 0.008 | -.0348464 | -.0051023 |
| 1. south | -.0910805 | .0073315 | -12.42 | 0.000 | -.10545 | -.076711 |
| year | -.000938 | .0015413 | -0.61 | 0.543 | -.0039589 | .0020828 |

Note: dy/dx for factor levels is the discrete change from the base level.
On average, not living in a metropolitan area (not_smsa $=1$ ) lowers the probability of being in a union by about two percentage points.

## Also see

[XT] xtprobit - Random-effects and population-averaged probit models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtrc - Random-coefficients model

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtrc fits the Swamy (1970) random-coefficients linear regression model, which does not impose the assumption of constant parameters across panels. Average coefficient estimates are reported by default, but panel-specific coefficients may be requested.

## Quick start

Random-coefficients regression of y on x 1 and x 2 using xtset data
xtrc y x1 x2
As above, but report panel-specific best linear predictors
xtrc y x1 x2, betas
Multiple-imputation estimates of random-coefficients regression using mi xtset data mi estimate: xtrc y x

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Random-coefficients regression by GLS

## Syntax

xtrc depvar indepvars $[$ if $][$ in $][$, options $]$
options Description

Main
noconstant
offset (varname)
SE
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
betas
display_options
coeflegend
suppress constant term
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1

A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
vce(bootstrap) and vce(jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

Main
noconstant, offset (varname); see [R] estimation options

SE
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
betas requests that the group-specific best linear predictors also be displayed.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% firt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtrc but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

In random-coefficients models, we wish to treat the parameter vector as a realization (in each panel) of a stochastic process. xtrc fits the Swamy (1970) random-coefficients model, which is suitable for linear regression of panel data. See Greene (2012, chap. 11) and Poi (2003) for more information about this and other panel-data models.

## $>$ Example 1

Greene $(2012,1112)$ reprints data from a classic study of investment demand by Grunfeld and Griliches (1960). In [XT] xtgls, we use this dataset to illustrate many of the possible models that may be fit with the xtgls command. Although the models included in the xtgls command offer considerable flexibility, they all assume that there is no parameter variation across firms (the cross-sectional units).

To take a first look at the assumption of parameter constancy, we should reshape our data so that we may fit a simultaneous-equation model with sureg; see $[R]$ sureg. Because there are only five panels here, this is not too difficult.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/invest2
. reshape wide invest market stock, i(time) j(company)
(note: j = 1 2 3 4 5)
Data long \(\rightarrow\) wide
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Number of obs. & 100 & -> & 20 & \\
\hline Number of variables & 5 & -> & 16 & \\
\hline j variable (5 values) & company & -> & (dropped) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{xij variables:} \\
\hline & invest & -> & invest1 invest2 & invest5 \\
\hline & market & -> & market1 market2 & . market5 \\
\hline & stock & -> & stock1 stock2 & stock5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

. sureg (invest1 market1 stock1) (invest2 market2 stock2)
> (invest3 market3 stock3) (invest4 market4 stock4) (invest5 market5 stock5)
Seemingly unrelated regression

| Equation | Obs | Parms | RMSE | "R-sq" | chi2 | P |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| invest1 | 20 | 2 | 84.94729 | 0.9207 | 261.32 | 0.0000 |
| invest2 | 20 | 2 | 12.36322 | 0.9119 | 207.21 | 0.0000 |
| invest3 | 20 | 2 | 26.46612 | 0.6876 | 46.88 | 0.0000 |
| invest4 | 20 | 2 | 9.742303 | 0.7264 | 59.15 | 0.0000 |
| invest5 | 20 | 2 | 95.85484 | 0.4220 | 14.97 | 0.0006 |


|  | Coef . | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Con | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| invest1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| market1 | . 120493 | . 0216291 | 5.57 | 0.000 | . 0781007 | . 1628853 |
| stock1 | . 3827462 | . 032768 | 11.68 | 0.000 | . 318522 | . 4469703 |
| _cons | -162.3641 | 89.45922 | -1.81 | 0.070 | -337.7009 | 12.97279 |
| invest2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| market2 | . 0695456 | . 0168975 | 4.12 | 0.000 | . 0364271 | . 1026641 |
| stock2 | . 3085445 | . 0258635 | 11.93 | 0.000 | . 2578529 | . 3592362 |
| _cons | . 5043112 | 11.51283 | 0.04 | 0.965 | -22.06042 | 23.06904 |
| invest3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| market3 | . 0372914 | . 0122631 | 3.04 | 0.002 | . 0132561 | . 0613268 |
| stock3 | . 130783 | . 0220497 | 5.93 | 0.000 | . 0875663 | . 1739997 |
| _cons | -22.43892 | 25.51859 | -0.88 | 0.379 | -72.45443 | 27.57659 |
| invest4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| market4 | . 0570091 | . 0113623 | 5.02 | 0.000 | . 0347395 | . 0792788 |
| stock4 | . 0415065 | . 0412016 | 1.01 | 0.314 | -. 0392472 | . 1222602 |
| _cons | 1.088878 | 6.258805 | 0.17 | 0.862 | -11.17815 | 13.35591 |
| invest5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| market5 | . 1014782 | . 0547837 | 1.85 | 0.064 | -. 0058958 | . 2088523 |
| stock5 | . 3999914 | . 1277946 | 3.13 | 0.002 | . 1495186 | . 6504642 |
| _cons | 85.42324 | 111.8774 | 0.76 | 0.445 | -133.8525 | 304.6989 |

Here we instead fit a random-coefficients model:
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/invest2
. xtrc invest market stock
Random-coefficients regression $\quad$ Number of obs 100
Group variable: company
Number of groups $=5$

Obs per group:

| $\min$ | $=$ | 20 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| avg | $=$ | 20.0 |
| $\max$ | $=$ | 20 |
| Wald chi2(2) | $=$ | 17.55 |
| Prob > chi2 | $=$ | 0.0002 |


| invest | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| market | .0807646 | .0250829 | 3.22 | 0.001 | .0316031 | .1299261 |
| stock | .2839885 | .0677899 | 4.19 | 0.000 | .1511229 | .4168542 |
| _cons | -23.58361 | 34.55547 | -0.68 | 0.495 | -91.31108 | 44.14386 |
| Test of parameter constancy: | $\operatorname{chi2}(12)$ | $=603.99$ | Prob $>$ chi2 $=0.0000$ |  |  |  |

Just as the results of our simultaneous-equation model do not support the assumption of parameter constancy, the test included with the random-coefficients model also indicates that the assumption is not valid for these data. With large panel datasets, we would not want to take the time to look at a simultaneous-equations model (aside from the fact that our doing so was subjective).

## Stored results

$x t r c$ stores the following in $e()$ :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(df_chi2c)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e$ (rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(title)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Sigma)
e(beta_ps)
e(V)
e(V_ps)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

In a random-coefficients model, the parameter heterogeneity is treated as stochastic variation. Assume that we write

$$
\mathbf{y}_{i}=\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, m$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}$ is the coefficient vector $(k \times 1)$ for the $i$ th cross-sectional unit, such that

$$
\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}=\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i} \quad E\left(\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}\right)=\mathbf{0} \quad E\left(\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}^{\prime}\right)=\boldsymbol{\Sigma}
$$

Our goal is to find $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$.

The derivation of the estimator assumes that the cross-sectional specific coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}$ is the outcome of a random process with mean vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$,

$$
\mathbf{y}_{i}=\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}=\mathbf{X}_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}\right)+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}=\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left(\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}\right)=\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\omega_{i}
$$

where $E\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i}\right)=\mathbf{0}$ and

$$
E\left(\boldsymbol{\omega}_{i} \boldsymbol{\omega}_{i}^{\prime}\right)=E\left\{\left(\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}\right)\left(\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}+\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i}\right)^{\prime}\right\}=E\left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i} \epsilon_{i}^{\prime}\right)+\mathbf{X}_{i} E\left(\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i} \boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}^{\prime}\right) \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}=\sigma_{i}^{2} \mathbf{I}+\mathbf{X}_{i} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}=\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i}
$$

Stacking the $m$ equations, we have

$$
\mathbf{y}=\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\omega}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Pi} \equiv E\left(\boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}^{\prime}\right)$ is a block diagonal matrix with $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i}, i=1 \ldots m$, along the main diagonal and zeros elsewhere. The GLS estimator of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is then

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}=\left(\sum_{i} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_{i}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{W}_{i} \mathbf{b}_{i}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{W}_{i}=\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}+\mathbf{V}_{i}\right)^{-1}\right\}^{-1}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}+\mathbf{V}_{i}\right)^{-1}
$$

$\mathbf{b}_{i}=\left(\mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{y}_{i}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{i}=\sigma_{i}^{2}\left(\mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1}$, showing that the resulting GLS estimator is a matrix-weighted average of the panel-specific OLS estimators. The variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is

$$
\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}+\mathbf{V}_{i}\right)^{-1}
$$

To calculate the above estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for the unknown $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ and $\mathbf{V}_{i}$ parameters, we use the two-step approach suggested by Swamy (1970):

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{b}_{i} & =\text { OLS panel-specific estimator } \\
\widehat{\sigma}_{i}^{2} & =\frac{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{i}^{\prime} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{i}}{n_{i}-k} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i} & =\widehat{\sigma}_{i}^{2}\left(\mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1} \\
\overline{\mathbf{b}} & =\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{b}_{i} \\
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} & =\frac{1}{m-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{b}_{i} \mathbf{b}_{i}^{\prime}-m \overline{\mathbf{b}} \overline{\mathbf{b}}^{\prime}\right)-\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}
\end{aligned}
$$

The two-step procedure begins with the usual OLS estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}$. With those estimates, we may proceed by obtaining estimates of $\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ (and thus $\widehat{\mathbf{W}}_{i}$ ) and then obtain an estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Swamy (1970) further points out that the matrix $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ may not be positive definite and that because the second term is of order $1 /(m T)$, it is negligible in large samples. A simple and asymptotically expedient solution is simply to drop this second term and instead use

$$
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}=\frac{1}{m-1}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \mathbf{b}_{i} \mathbf{b}_{i}^{\prime}-m \overline{\mathbf{b}} \overline{\mathbf{b}}^{\prime}\right)
$$

As discussed by Judge et al. $(1985,541)$, the feasible best linear predictor of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i} & =\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}\left(\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}+\widehat{\sigma}_{i}^{2} \mathbf{I}\right)^{-1}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i}-\mathbf{X}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right) \\
& =\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1}+\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\right)^{-1}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}+\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{i}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The conventional variance of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i}$ is given by

$$
\operatorname{Var}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{i}\right)=\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})+\left(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{A}_{i}\right)\left\{\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}-\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\right\}\left(\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{A}_{i}\right)^{\prime}
$$

where

$$
\mathbf{A}_{i}=\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1}+\widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\right)^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}^{-1}
$$

To test the model, we may look at the difference between the OLS estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, ignoring the panel structure of the data and the matrix-weighted average of the panel-specific olS estimators. The test statistic suggested by Swamy (1970) is given by

$$
\chi_{k(m-1)}^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{m}\left(\mathbf{b}_{i}-\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{*}\right)^{\prime} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\left(\mathbf{b}_{i}-\overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{*}\right) \quad \text { where } \quad \overline{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{*}=\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m} \widehat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1}\right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{m} \hat{\mathbf{V}}_{i}^{-1} \mathbf{b}_{i}
$$

Johnston and DiNardo (1997) have shown that the test is algebraically equivalent to testing

$$
H_{0}: \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}=\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}=\cdots=\boldsymbol{\beta}_{m}
$$

in the generalized (groupwise heteroskedastic) xtgls model, where $\mathbf{V}$ is block diagonal with $i$ th diagonal element $\Pi_{i}$.
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## Also see

[XT] xtrc postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtrc
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] mixed - Multilevel mixed-effects linear regression
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtrc postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtrc

Postestimation commands predict margins Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtrc:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) <br> estimates <br> cataloging estimation results <br> forecast <br> hausman <br> lincom |
|  | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combination <br> of coefficients |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> nlcom |
| point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations |  |
| of coefficients |  |
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## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

statistic Description

Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad$ linear prediction; the default
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
group(group) linear prediction based on group group
These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction using the mean parameter vector.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
group (group) calculates the linear prediction using the best linear predictors for group group.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtrc. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \mathbf{b}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \mathbf{b}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic Description

| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| group(group) | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Also see

[XT] xtrc - Random-coefficients model
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models

| Description | Quick start | Menu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Syntax | Options for RE model | Options for BE model |
| Options for FE model | Options for MLE model | Options for PA model |
| Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| Acknowledgments | References | Also see |

## Description

xtreg fits regression models to panel data. In particular, xtreg with the be option fits randomeffects models by using the between regression estimator; with the fe option, it fits fixed-effects models (by using the within regression estimator); and with the re option, it fits random-effects models by using the GLS estimator (producing a matrix-weighted average of the between and within results). See [XT] xtdata for a faster way to fit fixed- and random-effects models.

## Quick start

Random-effects linear regression by GLS of y on x 1 and xt 2 using xtset data xtreg y x1 x2

As above, but estimate by maximum likelihood
xtreg y x1 x2, mle
Fixed-effects model with cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar
xtreg y x1 x2, fe vce(cluster cvar)
Population-averaged model with an exchangeable within-panel correlation structure
xtreg y x1 x2, pa
As above, but specify an autoregressive correlation structure of order 1
xtreg y x1 x2, pa corr (ar 1)
Between-effects model
xtreg y x1 x2, be

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Linear models $>$ Linear regression (FE, RE, PA, BE)

## Syntax

GLS random-effects (RE) model

```
xtreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [, re RE_options]
```

Between-effects (BE) model

$$
\text { xtreg depvar }[\text { indepvars }][\text { if }][\text { in }] \text {, be }[\text { BE_options }]
$$

Fixed-effects (FE) model

```
xtreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], fe [FE_options]
```

ML random-effects (MLE) model

```
xtreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], mle [MLE_options]
```

Population-averaged (PA) model

```
xtreg depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], pa [PA_options]
```

RE_options Description
Model

| re | use random-effects estimator; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| sa | use Swamy-Arora estimator of the variance components |
| SE/Robust |  |
| vce(vcetype) | vetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or <br> jackknife |

Reporting
level(\#) set confidence level; default is level (95)
theta report $\theta$
display_options control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
coeflegend
display legend instead of statistics

BE_options
Description

## Model

be
use between-effects estimator
wls use weighted least squares
SE
vce(vcetype) vcetype may be conventional, bootstrap, or jackknife
Reporting
level(\#)
display_options
coeflegend
set confidence level; default is level (95)
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
display legend instead of statistics
FE_options Description

| Model | use fixed-effects estimator |
| :--- | :--- |
| fe |  |
| SE/Robust | vcetype may be conventional, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, <br> or jackknife |

Reporting
level(\#) set confidence level; default is level (95)
display_options
coeflegend
display legend instead of statistics

MLE_options Description
Model
noconstant
mle
SE
vce(vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
display_options
suppress constant term
use ML random-effects estimator
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

## Maximization

maximize_options
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

## PA_options Description

## Model

noconstant
pa
offset (varname)
suppress constant term
use population-averaged estimator
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
Correlation
corr (correlation)
force
within-panel correlation structure
estimate even if observations unequally spaced in time
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)
nmp
rgf
vcetype may be conventional, robust, bootstrap, or jackknife use divisor $N-P$ instead of the default $N$
multiply the robust variance estimate by $(N-1) /(N-P)$
overrides the default scale parameter; parm may be x 2 , dev, phi, or \#
Reporting
level(\#)
display_options
set confidence level; default is level (95)
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling

Optimization
optimize_options
coeflegend
control the optimization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics
correlation
exchangeable
independent
unstructured
fixed matname
ar \#
stationary \#
nonstationary \#

## Description

exchangeable
independent
unstructured
user-specified
autoregressive of order \#
stationary of order \#
nonstationary of order \#

A panel variable must be specified. For xtreg, pa, correlation structures other than exchangeable and independent require that a time variable also be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, mi estimate, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. $f p$ is allowed for the between-effects, fixed-effects, and maximum-likelihood random-effects models.
vce (bootstrap) and vce (jackknife) are not allowed with the mi estimate prefix; see [MI] mi estimate.
aweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the fixed-effects model. iweights, fweights, and pweights are allowed for the population-averaged model. iweights are allowed for the maximum-likelihood random-effects (MLE) model. See [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options for RE model

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, re in Methods and formulas.

Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
theta specifies that the output include the estimated value of $\theta$ used in combining the between and fixed estimators. For balanced data, this is a constant, and for unbalanced data, a summary of the values is presented in the header of the output.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for BE model

$\square$ Model
be requests the between regression estimator.
wls specifies that, for unbalanced data, weighted least squares be used rather than the default ols. Both methods produce consistent estimates. The true variance of the between-effects residual is $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}+T_{i} \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$ (see xtreg, be in Methods and formulas below). WLS produces a "stabilized" variance of $\sigma_{\nu}^{2} / T_{i}+\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$, which is also not constant. Thus the choice between OLS and WLS amounts to which is more stable.

Comment: xtreg, be is rarely used anyway, but between estimates are an ingredient in the randomeffects estimate. Our implementation of xtreg, re uses the OLS estimates for this ingredient, based on our judgment that $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}$ is large relative to $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$ in most models. Formally, only a consistent estimate of the between estimates is required.
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

## Reporting

level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for FE model

Model
fe requests the fixed-effects (within) regression estimator.

SE/Robust
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtreg, fe in Methods and formulas.

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

The following option is available with xtreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Options for MLE model

Model
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
mle requests the maximum-likelihood random-effects estimator.
$\qquad$ SE
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
$\qquad$ Reporting
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: iterate(\#), [no]log, trace, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), and from(init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xtreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see [R] estimation options.

## Options for PA model

$\qquad$ Model
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
pa requests the population-averaged estimator. For linear regression, this is the same as a random-effects estimator (both interpretations hold).
xtreg, pa is equivalent to xtgee, family (gaussian) link(id) corr (exchangeable), which are the defaults for the xtgee command. xtreg, pa allows all the relevant xtgee options such as vce(robust). Whether you use xtreg, pa or xtgee makes no difference. See [XT] xtgee. offset(varname); see [R] estimation options.

Correlation
corr (correlation) specifies the within-panel correlation structure; the default corresponds to the equal-correlation model, corr (exchangeable).
When you specify a correlation structure that requires a lag, you indicate the lag after the structure's name with or without a blank; for example, corr (ar 1) or corr (ar1).

If you specify the fixed correlation structure, you specify the name of the matrix containing the assumed correlations following the word fixed, for example, corr(fixed myr).
force specifies that estimation be forced even though the time variable is not equally spaced. This is relevant only for correlation structures that require knowledge of the time variable. These correlation structures require that observations be equally spaced so that calculations based on lags correspond to a constant time change. If you specify a time variable indicating that observations are not equally spaced, the (time dependent) model will not be fit. If you also specify force, the model will be fit, and it will be assumed that the lags based on the data ordered by the time variable are appropriate.

## SE/Robust

vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (conventional), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.
vce (conventional), the default, uses the conventionally derived variance estimator for generalized least-squares regression.
nmp; see [XT] vce_options.
rgf specifies that the robust variance estimate is multiplied by $(N-1) /(N-P)$, where $N$ is the total number of observations and $P$ is the number of coefficients estimated. This option can be used with family (gaussian) only when vce(robust) is either specified or implied by the use of pweights. Using this option implies that the robust variance estimate is not invariant to the scale of any weights used.
scale (x2 $|\operatorname{dev}|$ phi $\mid \#$ ); see [XT] vce_options.

## Reporting

level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap (\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\% fint), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\%fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

Optimization
optimize_options control the iterative optimization process. These options are seldom used.
iterate (\#) specifies the maximum number of iterations. When the number of iterations equals \#, the optimization stops and presents the current results, even if convergence has not been reached. The default is iterate (100).
tolerance (\#) specifies the tolerance for the coefficient vector. When the relative change in the coefficient vector from one iteration to the next is less than or equal to \#, the optimization process is stopped. tolerance $(1 e-6)$ is the default.
nolog suppresses display of the iteration log.
trace specifies that the current estimates be printed at each iteration.
The following option is available with xtreg but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
See Baltagi (2013, chap. 2) and Wooldridge (2016, chap. 14) for good overviews of fixed-effects and random-effects models. Allison (2009) provides perspective on the use of fixed- versus random-effects estimators and provides many examples using Stata.

Consider fitting models of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In this model, $\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}$ is the error term that we have little interest in; we want estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta} . \nu_{i}$ is the unit-specific error term; it differs between units, but for any particular unit, its value is constant. In the pulmonary data of [XT] xt, a person who exercises less would presumably have a lower forced expiratory volume (FEV) year after year and so would have a negative $\nu_{i}$.
$\epsilon_{i t}$ is the "usual" error term with the usual properties (mean 0 , uncorrelated with itself, uncorrelated with $\mathbf{x}$, uncorrelated with $\nu$, and homoskedastic), although in a more thorough development, we could decompose $\epsilon_{i t}=v_{t}+\omega_{i t}$, assume that $\omega_{i t}$ is a conventional error term, and better describe $v_{t}$.

Before making the assumptions necessary for estimation, let's perform some useful algebra on (1). Whatever the properties of $\nu_{i}$ and $\epsilon_{i t}$, if (1) is true, it must also be true that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{y}_{i}=\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\bar{y}_{i}=\sum_{t} y_{i t} / T_{i}, \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}=\sum_{t} \mathbf{x}_{i t} / T_{i}$, and $\bar{\epsilon}_{i}=\sum_{t} \epsilon_{i t} / T_{i}$. Subtracting (2) from (1), it must be equally true that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right)=\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left(\epsilon_{i t}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

These three equations provide the basis for estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. In particular, xtreg, fe provides what is known as the fixed-effects estimator-also known as the within estimator-and amounts to using OLS to perform the estimation of (3). xtreg, be provides what is known as the between estimator and amounts to using OLS to perform the estimation of (2). xtreg, re provides the random-effects estimator and is a (matrix) weighted average of the estimates produced by the between and within estimators. In particular, the random-effects estimator turns out to be equivalent to estimation of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(y_{i t}-\theta \bar{y}_{i}\right)=(1-\theta) \alpha+\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\theta \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left\{(1-\theta) \nu_{i}+\left(\epsilon_{i t}-\theta \bar{\epsilon}_{i}\right)\right\} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\theta$ is a function of $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}$ and $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$. If $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}=0$, meaning that $\nu_{i}$ is always $0, \theta=0$ and (1) can be estimated by OLS directly. Alternatively, if $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}=0$, meaning that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is $0, \theta=1$ and the within estimator returns all the information available (which will, in fact, be a regression with an $R^{2}$ of 1 ).

For more reasonable cases, few assumptions are required to justify the fixed-effects estimator of (3). The estimates are, however, conditional on the sample in that the $\nu_{i}$ are not assumed to have a distribution but are instead treated as fixed and estimable. This statistical fine point can lead to difficulty when making out-of-sample predictions, but that aside, the fixed-effects estimator has much to recommend it.

More is required to justify the between estimator of (2), but the conditioning on the sample is not assumed because $\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i}$ is treated as an error term. Newly required is that we assume that $\nu_{i}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$ are uncorrelated. This follows from the assumptions of the OLS estimator but is also transparent: were $\nu_{i}$ and $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$ correlated, the estimator could not determine how much of the change in $\bar{y}_{i}$, associated with an increase in $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$, to assign to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ versus how much to attribute to the unknown correlation. (This, of course, suggests the use of an instrumental-variable estimator, $\overline{\mathbf{z}}_{i}$, which is correlated with $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$ but uncorrelated with $\nu_{i}$, though that approach is not implemented here.)

The random-effects estimator of (4) requires the same no-correlation assumption. In comparison with the between estimator, the random-effects estimator produces more efficient results, albeit ones with unknown small-sample properties. The between estimator is less efficient because it discards the over-time information in the data in favor of simple means; the random-effects estimator uses both the within and the between information.

All of this would seem to leave the between estimator of (2) with no role (except for a minor, technical part it plays in helping to estimate $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}$ and $\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}$, which are used in the calculation of $\theta$, on which the random-effects estimates depend). Let's, however, consider a variation on (1):

$$
y_{i t}=\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

In this model, we postulate that changes in the average value of $\mathbf{x}$ for an individual have a different effect from temporary departures from the average. In an economic situation, $y$ might be purchases of some item and $\mathbf{x}$ income; a change in average income should have more effect than a transitory change. In a clinical situation, $y$ might be a physical response and $\mathbf{x}$ the level of a chemical in the brain; the model allows a different response to permanent rather than transitory changes.

The variations of (2) and (3) corresponding to ( $1^{\prime}$ ) are

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{y}_{i} & =\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i} \\
\left(y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right) & =\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\left(\epsilon_{i t}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

That is, the between estimator estimates $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and the within $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$, and neither estimates the other. Thus even when estimating equations like (1), it is worth comparing the within and between estimators. Differences in results can suggest models like ( $1^{\prime}$ ), or at the least some other specification error.

Finally, it is worth understanding the role of the between and within estimators with regressors that are constant over time or constant over units. Consider the model

$$
y_{i t}=\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{s}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\mathbf{z}_{t} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

This model is the same as (1), except that we explicitly identify the variables that vary over both time and $i$ ( $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$, such as output or FEV); variables that are constant over time ( $\mathbf{s}_{i}$, such as race or sex); and variables that vary solely over time ( $\mathbf{z}_{t}$, such as the consumer price index or age in a cohort study). The corresponding between and within equations are

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{y}_{i} & =\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\mathbf{s}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}+\overline{\mathbf{z}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}+\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i} \\
\left(y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right) & =\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}+\left(\mathbf{z}_{t}-\overline{\mathbf{z}}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}+\left(\epsilon_{i t}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

In the between estimator of $\left(2^{\prime \prime}\right)$, no estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}$ is possible because $\overline{\mathbf{z}}$ is a constant across the $i$ observations; the regression-estimated intercept will be an estimate of $\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{z}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}$. On the other hand, it can provide estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$. It can estimate effects of factors that are constant over time, such as race and sex, but to do so it must assume that $\nu_{i}$ is uncorrelated with those factors.

The within estimator of ( $3^{\prime \prime}$ ), like the between estimator, provides an estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{1}$ but provides no estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$ for time-invariant factors. Instead, it provides an estimate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{3}$, the effects of the time-varying factors. The within estimator can also provide estimates $u_{i}$ for $\nu_{i}$. More correctly, the estimator $u_{i}$ is an estimator of $\nu_{i}+\mathbf{s}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{2}$. Thus $u_{i}$ is an estimator of $\nu_{i}$ only if there are no time-invariant variables in the model. If there are time-invariant variables, $u_{i}$ is an estimate of $\nu_{i}$ plus the effects of the time-invariant variables.

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

## Assessing goodness of fit

$R^{2}$ is a popular measure of goodness of fit in ordinary regression. In our case, given $\widehat{\alpha}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ estimates of $\alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, we can assess the goodness of fit with respect to (1), (2), or (3). The prediction equations are, respectively,

$$
\begin{align*}
\widehat{y}_{i t} & =\widehat{\alpha}+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\
\widehat{\bar{y}}_{i} & =\widehat{\alpha}+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\
\widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}=\left(\widehat{y}_{i t}-\widehat{\bar{y}}_{i}\right) & =\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}
\end{align*}
$$

xtreg reports " $R$-squares" corresponding to these three equations. $R$-squares is in quotes because the $R$-squares reported do not have all the properties of the OLS $R^{2}$.

The ordinary properties of $R^{2}$ include being equal to the squared correlation between $\widehat{y}$ and $y$ and being equal to the fraction of the variation in $y$ explained by $\widehat{y}$-formally defined as $\operatorname{Var}(\widehat{y}) / \operatorname{Var}(y)$. The identity of the definitions is from a special property of the OLS estimates; in general, given a prediction $\widehat{y}$ for $y$, the squared correlation is not equal to the ratio of the variances, and the ratio of the variances is not required to be less than 1.
xtreg reports $R^{2}$ values calculated as correlations squared, calling them $R^{2}$ overall, corresponding to ( $1^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ); $R^{2}$ between, corresponding to ( $2^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ); and $R^{2}$ within, corresponding to ( $3^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ). In fact, you can think of each of these three numbers as having all the properties of ordinary $R^{2}$ 's, if you bear in mind that the prediction being judged is not $\widehat{y}_{i t}$, $\widehat{\bar{y}}_{i}$, and $\widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}$, but $\gamma_{1} \widehat{y}_{i t}$ from the regression $y_{i t}=\gamma_{1} \widehat{y}_{i t}$; $\gamma_{2} \widehat{\bar{y}}_{i}$ from the regression $\bar{y}_{i}=\gamma_{2} \widehat{\bar{y}}_{i}$; and $\gamma_{3} \widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}$ from $\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\gamma_{3} \widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}$.

In particular, xtreg, be obtains its estimates by performing OLS on (2), and therefore its reported $R^{2}$ between is an ordinary $R^{2}$. The other two reported $R^{2}$,s are merely correlations squared, or, if you prefer, $R^{2}$ 's from the second-round regressions $y_{i t}=\gamma_{11} \widehat{y}_{i t}$ and $\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\gamma_{13} \widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}$.
xtreg, fe obtains its estimates by performing OLS on (3), so its reported $R^{2}$ within is an ordinary $R^{2}$. As with be, the other $R^{2}$ 's are correlations squared, or, if you prefer, $R^{2}$ 's from the second-round regressions $\overline{y_{i}}=\gamma_{22} \widehat{\bar{y}}_{i}$ and, as with be, $\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\gamma_{23} \widehat{\widetilde{y}}_{i t}$.
xtreg, re obtains its estimates by performing OLS on (4); none of the $R^{2}$ 's corresponding to ( $1^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ), $\left(2^{\prime \prime \prime}\right)$, or ( $3^{\prime \prime \prime}$ ) correspond directly to this estimator (the "relevant" $R^{2}$ is the one corresponding to (4)). All three reported $R^{2}$,s are correlations squared, or, if you prefer, from second-round regressions.

## xtreg and associated commands

## > Example 1: Between-effects model

Using nlswork.dta described in [XT] xt, we will model ln_wage in terms of completed years of schooling (grade), current age and age squared, current years worked (experience) and experience squared, current years of tenure on the current job and tenure squared, whether black (race $=2$ ), whether residing in an area not designated a standard metropolitan statistical area (SMSA), and whether residing in the South.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
```

To obtain the between-effects estimates, we use xtreg, be. nlswork.dta has previously been xtset idcode year because that is what is true of the data, but for running xtreg, it would have been sufficient to have xtset idcode by itself.


The between-effects regression is estimated on person-averages, so the " $\mathrm{n}=4697$ " result is relevant. xtreg, be reports the "number of observations" and group-size information: describe in [XT] xt showed that we have 28,534 "observations" - person-years, really - of data. If we take the subsample that has no missing values in ln_wage, grade, ..., south leaves us with 28,091 observations on person-years, reflecting 4,697 persons, each observed for an average of 6.0 years.

For goodness of fit, the $R^{2}$ between is directly relevant; our $R^{2}$ is 0.4900 . If, however, we use these estimates to predict the within model, we have an $R^{2}$ of 0.1591 . If we use these estimates to fit the overall data, our $R^{2}$ is 0.3695 .

The $F$ statistic tests that the coefficients on the regressors grade, age, ..., south are all jointly zero. Our model is significant.

The root mean squared error of the fitted regression, which is an estimate of the standard deviation of $\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i}$, is 0.3036.

For our coefficients, each year of schooling increases hourly wages by $6.1 \%$; age increases wages up to age 26.9 and thereafter decreases them (because the quadratic $a x^{2}+b x+c$ turns over at $x=-b / 2 a$, which for our age and c.age\#c. age coefficients is $0.0323158 /(2 \times 0.0005997) \approx 26.9)$; total experience increases wages at an increasing rate (which is surprising and bothersome); tenure on the current job increases wages up to a tenure of 12.1 years and thereafter decreases them; wages of blacks are, these things held constant, (approximately) $5.6 \%$ below that of nonblacks (approximately because 2.race is an indicator variable); residing in a non-SMSA (rural area) reduces wages by $18.6 \%$; and residing in the South reduces wages by $9.9 \%$.

## > Example 2: Fixed-effects model

To fit the same model with the fixed-effects estimator, we specify the fe option.

```
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp tenure
> c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, fe
note: grade omitted because of collinearity
note: 2.race omitted because of collinearity
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Fixed-effects (within) regression & Number of obs & = & 28,091 \\
\hline Group variable: idcode & Number of groups & - & 4,697 \\
\hline R-sq: & Obs per group: & & \\
\hline within \(=0.1727\) & min & = & 1 \\
\hline between \(=0.3505\) & avg & = & 6.0 \\
\hline overall \(=0.2625\) & max & = & 15 \\
\hline & \(F(8,23386)\) & = & 610.12 \\
\hline corr (u_i, Xb) \(=0.1936\) & Prob > F & = & 0.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ln_wage & Coef. & Std. Err. & t & \(P>|t|\) & [95\% Con & Interval] \\
\hline grade & 0 & (omitted) & & & & \\
\hline age & . 0359987 & . 0033864 & 10.63 & 0.000 & . 0293611 & . 0426362 \\
\hline c.age\#c.age & -. 000723 & . 0000533 & -13.58 & 0.000 & -. 0008274 & -. 0006186 \\
\hline ttl_exp & . 0334668 & . 0029653 & 11.29 & 0.000 & . 0276545 & . 039279 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { c.ttl_exp\# } \\
& \text { c.ttl_exp }
\end{aligned}
\] & . 0002163 & . 0001277 & 1.69 & 0.090 & -. 0000341 & . 0004666 \\
\hline tenure & . 0357539 & . 0018487 & 19.34 & 0.000 & . 0321303 & . 0393775 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
c.tenure\# \\
c.tenure
\end{tabular} & -. 0019701 & . 000125 & -15.76 & 0.000 & -. 0022151 & -. 0017251 \\
\hline race black & 0 & (omitted) & & & & \\
\hline not_smsa & -. 0890108 & . 0095316 & -9.34 & 0.000 & -. 1076933 & -. 0703282 \\
\hline south & -. 0606309 & . 0109319 & -5.55 & 0.000 & -. 0820582 & -. 0392036 \\
\hline _cons & 1.03732 & . 0485546 & 21.36 & 0.000 & . 9421496 & 1.13249 \\
\hline sigma_u & . 35562203 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{(fraction of variance due to u_i)}} \\
\hline sigma_e & . 29068923 & & & & & \\
\hline rho & . 59946283 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

The observation summary at the top is the same as for the between-effects model, although this time it is the "Number of obs" that is relevant.

Our three $R^{2}$ 's are not too different from those reported previously; the $R^{2}$ within is slightly higher ( 0.1727 versus 0.1591 ), and the $R^{2}$ between is a little lower ( 0.3505 versus 0.4900 ), as expected, because the between estimator maximizes $R^{2}$ between and the within estimator $R^{2}$ within. In terms of overall fit, these estimates are somewhat worse ( 0.2625 versus 0.3695 ).

If the unobserved time-invariant component $\nu$ is not correlated with the regressors, estimates from the fixed-effects model are consistent but inefficient relative to estimates from the random-effects model. In this case, the interpretation of sigma_u in the coefficient table is the same for the fixed-effects and random-effects models. However, sigma_u is a nuisance parameter when $\nu$ is correlated with the covariates.

Here both grade and 2.race were omitted from the model because they do not vary over time. Because grade and 2.race are time invariant, our estimate $u_{i}$ is an estimate of $\nu_{i}$ plus the effects of grade and 2. race, so our estimate of the standard deviation is based on the variation in $\nu_{i}$, grade, and 2.race. On the other hand, had 2.race and grade been omitted merely because they were collinear with the other regressors in our model, $u_{i}$ would be an estimate of $\nu_{i}$, and 0.355622 would be an estimate of $\sigma_{\nu}$. (xtsum and xttab allow you to determine whether a variable is time invariant; see [XT] xtsum and [XT] xttab.)

Regardless of the status of $u_{i}$, our estimate of the standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$ is valid (and, in fact, is the estimate that would be used by the random-effects estimator to produce its results).

Our estimate of the correlation of $u_{i}$ with $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ suffers from the problem of what $u_{i}$ measures. We find correlation but cannot say whether this is correlation of $\nu_{i}$ with $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ or merely correlation of grade and 2.race with $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$. In any case, the fixed-effects estimator is robust to such a correlation, and the other estimates it produces are unbiased.

So, although this estimator produces no estimates of the effects of grade and 2.race, it does predict that age has a positive effect on wages up to age 24.9 years (compared with 26.9 years estimated by the between estimator); that total experience still increases wages at an increasing rate (which is still bothersome); that tenure increases wages up to 9.1 years (compared with 12.1); that living in a non-SMSA reduces wages by $8.9 \%$ (compared with a more drastic $18.6 \%$ ); and that living in the South reduces wages by $6.1 \%$ (as compared with $9.9 \%$ ).
> Example 3: Fixed-effects models with robust standard errors
If we suspect that there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic error term $\epsilon_{i t}$, we could specify the vce (robust) option:


Although the estimated coefficients are the same with and without the vce(robust) option, the robust estimator produced larger standard errors and a $p$-value for c.ttl_exp\#c.ttl_exp above the conventional $10 \%$. The $F$ test of $\nu_{i}=0$ is suppressed because it is too difficult to compute the robust form of the statistic when there are more than a few panels.

## - Technical note

The robust standard errors reported above are identical to those obtained by clustering on the panel variable idcode. Clustering on the panel variable produces an estimator of the VCE that is robust to cross-sectional heteroskedasticity and within-panel (serial) correlation that is asymptotically equivalent to that proposed by Arellano (1987). Although the example above applies the fixed-effects estimator, the robust and cluster-robust VCE estimators are also available for the random-effects estimator. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss these robust and cluster-robust VCE estimators for the fixed-effects and random-effects estimators. More details are available in Methods and formulas.

## > Example 4: Random-effects model

Refitting our log-wage model with the random-effects estimator, we obtain

| Random-effects GLS regression Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Number of obs Number of groups |  |  | 28,091 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 4,697 |
| R-sq: |  |  |  |  |  |  | Obs per group: |  |  |  |
| within $=0.1715$ |  |  |  |  | min | = | 1 |
| between $=0.4784$ |  |  |  |  | avg | = | 6.0 |
| overall $=0.3708$ |  |  |  |  | max | = | 15 |
|  |  |  |  | Wald ch | $2(10)$ | = | 9244.74 |
| corr (u_i, X) | = 0 (assumed) |  |  | Prob > | chi2 | $=$ | 0.0000 |
| min 5\% |  | \% |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \min \\ 0.2520 & 0 . \end{array}$ | 0.5499 | 0.7016 | 0.7206 |  |  |  |  |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | P> $\|z\|$ | [95\% Con | nf. | Interval] |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { grade } \\ \text { age } \end{array}$ | . 0646499 | . 0017812 | 36.30 | 0.000 | . 0611589 |  | . 0681409 |
|  | . 0368059 | . 0031195 | 11.80 | 0.000 | . 0306918 |  | . 0429201 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0007133 | . 00005 | -14.27 | 0.000 | -. 0008113 |  | -. 0006153 |
| ttl_exp | . 0290208 | . 002422 | 11.98 | 0.000 | . 0242739 |  | . 0337678 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { c.ttl_exp\# } \\ & \text { c.ttl_exp } \end{aligned}$ | . 0003049 | . 0001162 | 2.62 | 0.009 | . 000077 |  | . 0005327 |
| tenure | . 0392519 | . 0017554 | 22.36 | 0.000 | . 0358113 |  | . 0426925 |
| c.tenure\# <br> c.tenure | -. 0020035 | . 0001193 | -16.80 | 0.000 | -. 0022373 |  | -. 0017697 |
| race |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| black | -. 053053 | . 0099926 | -5.31 | 0.000 | -. 0726381 |  | -. 0334679 |
| not_smsa | -. 1308252 | . 0071751 | -18.23 | 0.000 | -. 1448881 |  | -. 1167622 |
| south | -. 0868922 | . 0073032 | -11.90 | 0.000 | -. 1012062 |  | -. 0725781 |
| _cons | . 2387207 | . 049469 | 4.83 | 0.000 | . 1417633 |  | . 3356781 |
| sigma_u | . 25790526 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | . 29068923 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho | . 44045273 | (fraction | of varian | ce due t | u_i) |  |  |

According to the $R^{2}$ 's, this estimator performs worse within than the within fixed-effects estimator and worse between than the between estimator, as it must, and slightly better overall.

We estimate that $\sigma_{\nu}$ is 0.2579 and $\sigma_{\epsilon}$ is 0.2907 and, by assertion, assume that the correlation of $\nu$ and x is zero.

All that is known about the random-effects estimator is its asymptotic properties, so rather than reporting an $F$ statistic for overall significance, xtreg, re reports a $\chi^{2}$. Taken jointly, our coefficients are significant.
xtreg, re also reports a summary of the distribution of $\theta_{i}$, an ingredient in the estimation of (4). $\theta$ is not a constant here because we observe women for unequal periods.

We estimate that schooling has a rate of return of $6.5 \%$ (compared with $6.1 \%$ between and no estimate within); that the increase of wages with age turns around at 25.8 years (compared with 26.9 between and 24.9 within); that total experience yet again increases wages increasingly; that the effect of job tenure turns around at 9.8 years (compared with 12.1 between and 9.1 within); that being black reduces wages by $5.3 \%$ (compared with $5.6 \%$ between and no estimate within); that living in a non-SMSA reduces wages $13.1 \%$ (compared with $18.6 \%$ between and $8.9 \%$ within); and that living in the South reduces wages $8.7 \%$ (compared with $9.9 \%$ between and $6.1 \%$ within).

## > Example 5: Random-effects model fit using ML

We could also have fit this random-effects model with the maximum likelihood estimator:

| Fitting constant-only model: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Iteration 0: log likelihood = -12663.954 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 1: log likelihood $=-12649.756$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 2: log likelihood $=-12649.614$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: log likelihood $=-12649.614$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fitting full model: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 0: log likelihood $=-8922.145$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 1: log likelihood $=-8853.6409$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 2: log likelihood $=-8853.4255$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Iteration 3: log likelihood = -8853.4254 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Random-effects ML regression |  |  |  | Numbe | $f$ obs | 28,091 |
| Group variable: idcode |  |  |  | Numbe | groups | 4,697 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian |  |  |  | Obs p | group: |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | min | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | avg | 6.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | max | 15 |
|  |  |  |  | LR ch | 10) | 7592.38 |
| Log likelihood = -8853.4254 |  |  |  | Prob | hi2 | 0.0000 |
| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| grade | . 0646093 | . 0017372 | 37.19 | 0.000 | . 0612044 | . 0680142 |
| age | . 0368531 | . 0031226 | 11.80 | 0.000 | . 030733 | . 0429732 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0007132 | . 0000501 | -14.24 | 0.000 | -. 0008113 | -. 000615 |
| ttl_exp | . 0288196 | . 0024143 | 11.94 | 0.000 | . 0240877 | . 0335515 |
| c.ttl_exp\# |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| tenure | . 0394371 | . 0017604 | 22.40 | 0.000 | . 0359868 | . 0428875 |
| c.tenure\# |  |  |  |  |  | -. 0017709 |
| race |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| black | -. 0533394 | . 0097338 | -5.48 | 0.000 | -. 0724172 | -. 0342615 |
| not_smsa | -. 1323433 | . 0071322 | -18.56 | 0.000 | -. 1463221 | -. 1183644 |
| south | -. 0875599 | . 0072143 | -12.14 | 0.000 | -. 1016998 | -. 0734201 |
| _cons | . 2390837 | . 0491902 | 4.86 | 0.000 | . 1426727 | . 3354947 |
| /sigma_u | . 2485556 | . 0035017 |  |  | . 2417863 | . 2555144 |
| /sigma_e | . 2918458 | . 001352 |  |  | . 289208 | . 2945076 |
| rho | . 4204033 | . 0074828 |  |  | . 4057959 | . 4351212 |
| LR test of sigma_u=0: chibar2 $(01)=7339.84 \quad$ Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.000$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

The estimates are nearly the same as those produced by xtreg, re-the GLS estimator. For instance, xtreg, re estimated the coefficient on grade to be 0.0646499 , xtreg, mle estimated 0.0646093 , and the ratio is $0.0646499 / 0.0646093=1.001$ to three decimal places. Similarly, the standard errors are nearly equal: $0.0017811 / 0.0017372=1.025$. Below we compare all 11 coefficients:

|  | Coefficient ratio |  |  | SE ratio |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Estimator | mean | min. | max. | mean | min. | max. |
| xtreg, mle (ML) | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. |
| xtreg, re (GLS) | .997 | .987 | 1.007 | 1.006 | .997 | 1.027 |

## Example 6: Population-averaged model

We could also have fit this model with the population-averaged estimator:

```
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp tenure
> c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, pa
Iteration 1: tolerance = . }031056
Iteration 2: tolerance = . 00074898
Iteration 3: tolerance = .0000147
Iteration 4: tolerance = 2.880e-07
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline GEE population-a & & Number of obs & = & 28,091 \\
\hline Group variable: & idcode & Number of groups & = & 4,697 \\
\hline Link: & identity & Obs per group: & & \\
\hline Family: & Gaussian & min & \(=\) & 1 \\
\hline Correlation: & exchangeable & avg & = & 6.0 \\
\hline & & max & = & 15 \\
\hline & & Wald chi2(10) & = & 9598.89 \\
\hline Scale parameter: & . 1436709 & Prob > chi2 & = & 0.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | z | $P>\|z\|$ | [95\% Conf | Interval] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| grade | . 0645427 | . 0016829 | 38.35 | 0.000 | . 0612442 | . 0678412 |
| age | . 036932 | . 0031509 | 11.72 | 0.000 | . 0307564 | . 0431076 |
| c.age\#c.age | -. 0007129 | . 0000506 | -14.10 | 0.000 | -. 0008121 | -. 0006138 |
| ttl_exp | . 0284878 | . 0024169 | 11.79 | 0.000 | . 0237508 | . 0332248 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { c.ttl_exp\# } \\ & \text { c.ttl_exp } \end{aligned}$ | . 0003158 | . 0001172 | 2.69 | 0.007 | . 000086 | . 0005456 |
| tenure | . 0397468 | . 0017779 | 22.36 | 0.000 | . 0362621 | . 0432315 |
| c.tenure\# <br> c.tenure | -. 002008 | . 0001209 | -16.61 | 0.000 | -. 0022449 | -. 0017711 |
| race <br> black | -. 0538314 | . 0094086 | -5.72 | 0.000 | -. 072272 | -. 0353909 |
| not_smsa | -. 1347788 | . 0070543 | -19.11 | 0.000 | -. 1486049 | -. 1209526 |
| south | -. 0885969 | . 0071132 | -12.46 | 0.000 | -. 1025386 | -. 0746552 |
| _cons | . 2396286 | . 0491465 | 4.88 | 0.000 | . 1433034 | . 3359539 |

These results differ from those produced by xtreg, re and xtreg, mle. Coefficients are larger and standard errors smaller. xtreg, pa is simply another way to run the xtgee command. That is, we would have obtained the same output had we typed

```
. xtgee ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south
(output omitted because it is the same as above)
```

See [XT] xtgee. In the language of xtgee, the random-effects model corresponds to an exchangeable correlation structure and identity link, and xtgee also allows other correlation structures. Let's stay with the random-effects model, however. xtgee will also produce robust estimates of variance, and we refit this model that way by typing

```
. xtgee ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, vce(robust)
(output omitted, coefficients the same, standard errors different)
```

In the previous example, we presented a table comparing xtreg, re with xtreg, mle. Below we add the results from the estimates shown and the ones we did with xtgee, vce(robust):

|  |  | Coefficient ratio |  |  | SE ratio |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Estimator |  | mean | min. | max. | mean | min. | max. |
| xtreg, mle | (ML) | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. | 1. |
| xtreg, re | (GLS) | .997 | .987 | 1.007 | 1.006 | .997 | 1.027 |
| xtreg, pa | (PA) | 1.060 | .847 | 1.317 | .853 | .626 | .986 |
| xtgee, vce(robust) | (PA) | 1.060 | .847 | 1.317 | 1.306 | .957 | 1.545 |

So, which are right? This is a real dataset, and we do not know. However, in example 2 in [XT] xtreg postestimation, we will present evidence that the assumptions underlying the xtreg, re and xtreg, mle results are not met.

## Stored results

xtreg, re stores the following in e() :
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
$e$ (Tcon)
e(sigma)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(N_clust)
e(chi2)
e (p)
e(rho)
$e$ (thta_min)
e(thta_5)
e(thta_50)
e(thta_95)
$e$ (thta_max)
e(rmse)
e(Tbar)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(clustvar)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(sa)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(bf)
e(theta)
e(V)
e(VCEf)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
xtreg, be stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(typ)
e(mss)
$e\left(d f \_m\right)$
e(rss)
e(df_r)
e(ll)
e(ll_0)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(Tcon)
$e(r 2)$
e(r2_a)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(F)
e(rmse)
e(Tbar)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(title)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
$e(V) \quad$ variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
xtreg, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(mss)
e(df_m)
e(rss)
e(df_r)
e(tss)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(Tcon)
e(sigma)
e(corr)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2)
e(r2_a)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(ll)
e(ll_0)
e(N_clust)
e(rho)
e(F)
e(F_f)
$e\left(d f \_a\right)$
e(df_b)
e(rmse)
e(Tbar)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(clustvar)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
number of observations
number of groups
model sum of squares
model degrees of freedom
residual sum of squares
residual degrees of freedom
total sum of squares
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
1 if $T$ is constant
ancillary parameter (gamma, lnormal)
$\operatorname{corr}\left(u_{i}, \mathrm{Xb}\right)$
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
$R$-squared
adjusted $R$-squared
$R$-squared for within model
$R$-squared for overall model
$R$-squared for between model
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
number of clusters
$\rho$
$F$ statistic
$F$ for $u_{i}=0$
degrees of freedom for absorbed effect
numerator degrees of freedom for $F$ statistic
root mean squared error
harmonic mean of group sizes
rank of e(V)

## xtreg

command as typed
name of dependent variable variable denoting groups
fe
weight type
weight expression
name of cluster variable
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions disallowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
model-based variance
xtreg, mle stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(11)
e(11_0)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(rho)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(title)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(chi2type)
e(chi2_ct)
e(distrib)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
log likelihood, comparison model
$\chi^{2}$
$\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
$\rho$
rank of $e(V)$
xtreg
command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
ml
weight type
weight expression
title in estimation output
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
Gaussian; the distribution of the RE
b V
program used to implement predict
predictions disallowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators
Functions
xtreg, pa stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(df_pear)
e(chi2_dev)
e(chi2_dis)
e(deviance)
e(dispers)
e(phi)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(tol)
e(dif)
e(rc)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(family)
e(link)
e(corr)
e(scale)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(offset)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(rgf)
e(nmp)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(marginsnotok)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(R)
e(V)
e(V_modelbased)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

The model to be fit is

$$
y_{i t}=\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ and, for each $i, t=1, \ldots, T$, of which $T_{i}$ periods are actually observed.

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { xtreg, fe } \\
& \text { xtreg, be } \\
& \text { xtreg, re } \\
& \text { xtreg, mle } \\
& \text { xtreg, pa }
\end{aligned}
$$

## xtreg, fe

xtreg, fe produces estimates by running OLS on

$$
\left(y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}+\overline{\bar{y}}\right)=\alpha+\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}+\overline{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}+\left(\epsilon_{i t}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}+\bar{\nu}\right)+\overline{\bar{\epsilon}}
$$

where $\bar{y}_{i}=\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} y_{i t} / T_{i}$, and similarly, $\overline{\bar{y}}=\sum_{i} \sum_{t} y_{i t} /\left(n T_{i}\right)$. The conventional covariance matrix of the estimators is adjusted for the extra $n-1$ estimated means, so results are the same as using OLS on (1) to estimate $\nu_{i}$ directly. Specifying vce(robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce (robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation induced by the within transform.

From the estimates $\widehat{\alpha}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, estimates $u_{i}$ of $\nu_{i}$ are obtained as $u_{i}=\bar{y}_{i}-\widehat{\alpha}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Reported from the calculated $u_{i}$ are its standard deviation and its correlation with $\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Reported as the standard deviation of $e_{i t}$ is the regression's estimated root mean squared error, $s$, which is adjusted (as previously stated) for the $n-1$ estimated means.

Reported as $R^{2}$ within is the $R^{2}$ from the mean-deviated regression.
Reported as $R^{2}$ between is $\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ overall is $\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}\right)^{2}$.

## xtreg, be

xtreg, be fits the following model:

$$
\bar{y}_{i}=\alpha+\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\bar{\epsilon}_{i}
$$

Estimation is via OLS unless $T_{i}$ is not constant and the wls option is specified. Otherwise, the estimation is performed via WLS. The estimates and conventional VCE are obtained from regress for both cases, but for WLS, [aweight= $T_{i}$ ] is specified.

Reported as $R^{2}$ between is the $R^{2}$ from the fitted regression.
Reported as $R^{2}$ within is $\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ overall is $\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}\right)^{2}$.

## xtreg, re

The key to the random-effects estimator is the GLS transform. Given estimates of the idiosyncratic component, $\widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}$, and the individual component, $\widehat{\sigma}_{u}^{2}$, the GLS transform of a variable $z$ for the random-effects model is

$$
z_{i t}^{*}=z_{i t}-\widehat{\theta}_{i} \bar{z}_{i}
$$

where $\bar{z}_{i}=\frac{1}{T_{i}} \sum_{t}^{T_{i}} z_{i t}$ and

$$
\widehat{\theta}_{i}=1-\sqrt{\frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}}{T_{i} \widehat{\sigma}_{u}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}}}
$$

Given an estimate of $\widehat{\theta}_{i}$, one transforms the dependent and independent variables, and then the coefficient estimates and the conventional variance-covariance matrix come from an OLS regression of $y_{i t}^{*}$ on $\mathbf{x}_{i t}^{*}$ and the transformed constant $1-\widehat{\theta}_{i}$. Specifying vce (robust) or vce (cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [ P ] _robust; in particular, see Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there are many clusters and the disturbances are uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.

Stata has two implementations of the Swamy-Arora method for estimating the variance components. They produce the same results in balanced panels and share the same estimator of $\sigma_{e}^{2}$. However, the two methods differ in their estimator of $\sigma_{u}^{2}$ in unbalanced panels. We call the first $\widehat{\sigma}_{u \bar{T}}^{2}$ and the second $\widehat{\sigma}_{\mathrm{uSA}}^{2}$. Both estimators are consistent; however, $\widehat{\sigma}_{\mathrm{uSA}}^{2}$ has a more elaborate adjustment for small samples than $\widehat{\sigma}_{u \bar{T}}^{2}$. (See Baltagi [2013], Baltagi and Chang [1994], and Swamy and Arora [1972] for derivations of these methods.)

Both methods use the same function of within residuals to estimate the idiosyncratic error component $\sigma_{e}$. Specifically,

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}=\frac{\sum_{i}^{n} \sum_{t}^{T_{i}} e_{i t}^{2}}{N-n-K+1}
$$

where

$$
e_{i t}=\left(y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}+\overline{\bar{y}}\right)-\widehat{\alpha}_{w}-\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}+\overline{\overline{\mathbf{x}}}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{w}
$$

and $\widehat{\alpha}_{w}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{w}$ are the within estimates of the coefficients and $N=\sum_{i}^{n} T_{i}$. After passing the within residuals through the within transform, only the idiosyncratic errors are left.

The default method for estimating $\sigma_{u}^{2}$ is

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{u \bar{T}}^{2}=\max \left\{0, \frac{S S R_{b}}{n-K}-\frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}}{\bar{T}}\right\}
$$

where

$$
S S R_{b}=\sum_{i}^{n}\left(\bar{y}_{i}-\widehat{\alpha}_{b}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{b}\right)^{2}
$$

$\widehat{\alpha}_{b}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{b}$ are coefficient estimates from the between regression and $\bar{T}$ is the harmonic mean of $T_{i}$ :

$$
\bar{T}=\frac{n}{\sum_{i}^{n} \frac{1}{T_{i}}}
$$

This estimator is consistent for $\sigma_{u}^{2}$ and is computationally less expensive than the second method. The sum of squared residuals from the between model estimate a function of both the idiosyncratic component and the individual component. Using our estimator of $\sigma_{e}^{2}$, we can remove the idiosyncratic component, leaving only the desired individual component.

The second method is the Swamy-Arora method for unbalanced panels derived by Baltagi and Chang (1994), which has a more precise small-sample adjustment. Using this method,

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\mathrm{uSA}}^{2}=\max \left\{0, \frac{S S R_{b}-(n-K) \widehat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}}{N-t r}\right\}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
\operatorname{tr}=\operatorname{trace}\left\{\left(\mathbf{X}^{\prime} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^{\prime} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}\right\} \\
\mathbf{P}=\operatorname{diag}\left\{\left(\frac{1}{T_{i}}\right) \boldsymbol{\iota}_{T_{i}} \boldsymbol{\iota}_{T_{i}}^{\prime}\right\} \\
\mathbf{Z}=\operatorname{diag}\left[\boldsymbol{\iota}_{T_{i}}\right]
\end{gathered}
$$

$\mathbf{X}$ is the $N \times K$ matrix of covariates, including the constant, and $\iota_{T_{i}}$ is a $T_{i} \times 1$ vector of ones.
The estimated coefficients $\left(\widehat{\alpha}_{r}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{r}\right)$ and their covariance matrix $\mathbf{V}_{r}$ are reported together with the previously calculated quantities $\widehat{\sigma}_{e}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{u}$. The standard deviation of $\nu_{i}+e_{i t}$ is calculated as $\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_{e}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{u}^{2}}$.

Reported as $R^{2}$ between is $\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ within is $\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ overall is $\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}\right)^{2}$.

## xtreg, mle

The log likelihood for the $i$ th unit is

$$
\begin{aligned}
l_{i}=-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_{e}^{2}}\right. & {\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}}\left(y_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)^{2}-\frac{\sigma_{u}^{2}}{T_{i} \sigma_{u}^{2}+\sigma_{e}^{2}}\left\{\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}}\left(y_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)\right\}^{2}\right] } \\
& \left.+\ln \left(T_{i} \frac{\sigma_{u}^{2}}{\sigma_{e}^{2}}+1\right)+T_{i} \ln \left(2 \pi \sigma_{e}^{2}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

The mle and re options yield essentially the same results, except when total $N=\sum_{i} T_{i}$ is small ( 200 or less) and the data are unbalanced.

## xtreg, pa

See [XT] xtgee for details on the methods and formulas used to calculate the population-averaged model using a generalized estimating equations approach.
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## Also see

[XT] xtreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtreg
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtgls - Fit panel-data models by using GLS
[XT] xtivreg - Instrumental variables and two-stage least squares for panel-data models
[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] mixed - Multilevel mixed-effects linear regression
[MI] estimation - Estimation commands for use with mi estimate
[R] areg - Linear regression with a large dummy-variable set
$[R]$ regress - Linear regression
[TS] forecast - Econometric model forecasting
[TS] prais - Prais-Winsten and Cochrane-Orcutt regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtreg

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins | xttest0 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Methods and formulas | References | Also see |

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are of special interest after xtreg:
Command Description
xttest0 Breusch and Pagan LM test for random effects

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| * estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| $\dagger$ | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| *lrtest | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> margins |
| effects |  |

[^15]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as fitted values, standard errors, predicted values, linear predictions, and equation-level scores.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

For all but the population-averaged model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

Population-averaged model

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, PA_statistic nooffset]
```

statistic Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad \alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$, fitted values; the default
stdp standard error of the fitted values
ue $\quad u_{i}+e_{i t}$, the combined residual
${ }^{*}$ xbu $\quad \alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+u_{i}$, prediction including effect
*u $\quad u_{i}$, the fixed- or random-error component
${ }^{*} \mathrm{e} \quad e_{i t}$, the overall error component
Unstarred statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict . . . if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample. Starred statistics are calculated only for the estimation sample, even when if e(sample) is not specified.

PA_statistic Description

Main
mu
rate
xb linear prediction
score
stdp standard error of the linear prediction
predicted value of depvar; considers the offset ()
predicted value of depvar
first derivative of the $\log$ likelihood with respect to $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb calculates the linear prediction, that is, $\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$. This is the default for all except the populationaveraged model.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction. For the fixed-effects model, this excludes the variance due to uncertainty about the estimate of $u_{i}$.
mu and rate both calculate the predicted value of depvar. mu takes into account the offset(), and rate ignores those adjustments. mu and rate are equivalent if you did not specify offset().mu is the default for the population-averaged model.
ue calculates the prediction of $u_{i}+e_{i t}$.
xbu calculates the prediction of $\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+u_{i}$, the prediction including the fixed or random component. u calculates the prediction of $u_{i}$, the estimated fixed or random effect.
e calculates the prediction of $e_{i t}$.
score calculates the equation-level score, $u_{i t}=\partial \ln L\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) / \partial\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}\right)$.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) for xtreg, pa. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for fitted values, probabilities, and linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics > Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]
```

For all but the population-averaged model
statistic Description

| xb | $\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$, fitted values; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| ue | not allowed with margins |
| xbu | not allowed with margins |
| u | not allowed with margins |
| e | not allowed with margins |

Population-averaged model
statistic

| mu | probability of depvar; considers the offset() |
| :--- | :--- |
| rate | probability of depvar |
| xb | linear prediction |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| score | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b).
For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## xttest0

## Description for xttest0

xttest0, for use after xtreg, re, presents the Breusch and Pagan (1980) Lagrange multiplier test for random effects, a test that $\operatorname{Var}\left(\nu_{i}\right)=0$.

## Menu for xttest0

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Linear models $>$ Lagrange multiplier test for random effects

## Syntax for xttest0

xttest0

## Remarks and examples

> Example 1
Continuing with our xtreg, re estimation example (example 4) in xtreg, we can see that xttesto will report a test of $\nu_{i}=0$. In case we have any doubts, we could type

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, re theta
    (output omitted)
. xttest0
Breusch and Pagan Lagrangian multiplier test for random effects
    ln_wage[idcode,t] = Xb + u[idcode] + e[idcode,t]
    Estimated results:
\begin{tabular}{r|cc} 
& Var & sd \(=\) sqrt(Var) \\
\hline ln_wage & .2283326 & .4778416 \\
e & .0845002 & .2906892 \\
u & .0665151 & .2579053
\end{tabular}
        Test: Var(u) = 0
                            chibar2(01) = 14779.98
                            Prob > chibar2 = 0.0000
```


## > Example 2

More importantly, after xtreg, re estimation, hausman will perform the Hausman specification test. If our model is correctly specified, and if $\nu_{i}$ is uncorrelated with $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$, the (subset of) coefficients that are estimated by the fixed-effects estimator and the same coefficients that are estimated here should not statistically differ:

```
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, re
    (output omitted)
```

```
. estimates store random_effects
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race not_smsa south, fe
    (output omitted)
. hausman . random_effects
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & (b) & \begin{tabular}{l}
ients \\
(B) random_eff~s
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{gathered}
(b-B) \\
\text { Difference }
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { sqrt }\left(\operatorname{diag}\left(V \_b-V \_B\right)\right) \\
\text { S.E. }
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline age & . 0359987 & . 0368059 & -. 0008073 & . 0013177 \\
\hline c.age\#c.age & -. 000723 & -. 0007133 & -9.68e-06 & . 0000184 \\
\hline ttl_exp & . 0334668 & . 0290208 & . 0044459 & . 001711 \\
\hline c.ttl_exp\# & & & & \\
\hline c.ttl_exp & . 0002163 & . 0003049 & -. 0000886 & . 000053 \\
\hline tenure & . 0357539 & . 0392519 & -. 003498 & . 0005797 \\
\hline c.tenure\# & & & & \\
\hline c.tenure & -. 0019701 & -. 0020035 & . 0000334 & . 0000373 \\
\hline not_smsa & -. 0890108 & -. 1308252 & . 0418144 & . 0062745 \\
\hline south & -. 0606309 & -. 0868922 & . 0262613 & . 0081345 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from xtreg
            B = inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from xtreg
    Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic
        chi2(8) = (b-B)'[(V_b-V_B)^(-1)](b-B)
                        = 149.43
            Prob>chi2 = 0.0000
```

We can reject the hypothesis that the coefficients are the same. Before turning to what this means, note that hausman listed the coefficients estimated by the two models. It did not, however, list grade and 2.race. hausman did not make a mistake; in the Hausman test, we compare only the coefficients estimated by both techniques.

What does this mean? We have an unpleasant choice: we can admit that our model is misspecified-that we have not parameterized it correctly-or we can hold that our specification is correct, in which case the observed differences must be due to the zero correlation of $\nu_{i}$ and the $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ assumption.

## Technical note

We can also mechanically explore the underpinnings of the test's dissatisfaction. In the comparison table from hausman, it is the coefficients on not_smsa and south that exhibit the largest differences. In equation $\left(1^{\prime}\right)$ of [XT] xtreg, we showed how to decompose a model into within and between effects. Let's do that with these two variables, assuming that changes in the average have one effect, whereas transitional changes have another:

```
. egen avgnsmsa = mean(not_smsa), by(id)
. generate devnsma = not_smsa -avgnsmsa
(8 missing values generated)
. egen avgsouth = mean(south), by(id)
. generate devsouth = south - avgsouth
(8 missing values generated)
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp tenure c.tenure#
> c.tenure 2.race avgnsm devnsm avgsou devsou
Random-effects GLS regression Number of obs = 28,091
Group variable: idcode Number of groups = 4,697
R-sq:
        within = 0.1723
        between = 0.4809
        overall = 0.3737
    Obs per group:
        min = 1
        avg = 6.0
        max = 15
        Wald chi2(12) = 9319.56
corr(u_i, X) = 0 (assumed) Prob > chi2 = 0.0000
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ln_wage & Coef. & Std. Err & z & \(\mathrm{P}>|\mathrm{z}|\) & [95\% Con & Interval] \\
\hline grade & . 0631716 & . 0017903 & 35.29 & 0.000 & . 0596627 & . 0666805 \\
\hline age & . 0375196 & . 0031186 & 12.03 & 0.000 & . 0314072 & . 043632 \\
\hline c.age\#c.age & -. 0007248 & . 00005 & -14.50 & 0.000 & -. 0008228 & -. 0006269 \\
\hline ttl_exp & . 0286543 & . 0024207 & 11.84 & 0.000 & . 0239098 & . 0333989 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { c.ttl_exp\# } \\
& \text { c.ttl_exp }
\end{aligned}
\] & . 0003222 & . 0001162 & 2.77 & 0.006 & . 0000945 & . 0005499 \\
\hline tenure & . 0394423 & . 001754 & 22.49 & 0.000 & . 0360044 & . 0428801 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
c.tenure\# \\
c.tenure
\end{tabular} & -. 0020081 & . 0001192 & -16.85 & 0.000 & -. 0022417 & -. 0017746 \\
\hline race black & -. 0545936 & . 0102101 & -5.35 & 0.000 & -. 074605 & -. 0345821 \\
\hline avgnsmsa & -. 1833237 & . 0109339 & -16.77 & 0.000 & -. 2047537 & -. 1618937 \\
\hline devnsma & -. 0887596 & . 0095071 & -9.34 & 0.000 & -. 1073931 & -. 070126 \\
\hline avgsouth & -. 1011235 & . 0098789 & -10.24 & 0.000 & -. 1204858 & -. 0817611 \\
\hline devsouth & -. 0598538 & . 0109054 & -5.49 & 0.000 & -. 081228 & -. 0384797 \\
\hline _cons & . 2682987 & . 0495778 & 5.41 & 0.000 & . 171128 & . 3654694 \\
\hline sigma_u & . 2579182 & & & & & \\
\hline sigma_e & . 29068923 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{(fraction of variance due to u_i)}} \\
\hline rho & . 44047745 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

We will leave the reinterpretation of this model to you, except that if we were really going to sell this model, we would have to explain why the between and within effects are different. Focusing on residence in a non-SMSA, we might tell a story about rural people being paid less and continuing to get paid less when they move to the SMSA. Given our panel data, we could create variables to measure this (an indicator for moved from non-SMSA to SMSA) and to measure the effects. In our assessment of this model, we should think about women in the cities moving to the country and their relative productivity in a bucolic setting.

In any case, the Hausman test now is

```
. estimates store new_random_effects
. xtreg ln_w grade age c.age#c.age ttl_exp c.ttl_exp#c.ttl_exp
> tenure c.tenure#c.tenure 2.race avgnsm devnsm avgsou devsou, fe
(output omitted)
. hausman . new_random_effects
```

                            —— Coefficients ———
    |  | $(\mathrm{b})$ | $(\mathrm{B})$ <br> new_random~s | $(\mathrm{b}-\mathrm{B})$ <br> Difference | sqrt (diag(V_b-V_B)) <br> S.E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| age | .0359987 | .0375196 | -.0015209 | .0013198 |
| c.age\#c.age |  |  |  |  |
| ttl_exp | -.000723 | -.0007248 | $1.84 \mathrm{e}-06$ | .0000184 |
| c.ttl_exp\# | .0334668 | .0286543 | .0048124 | .0017127 |
| c.ttl_exp <br> tenure | .0002163 | .0003222 | -.0001059 | .0000531 |
| c.tenure\# <br> c.tenure <br> devnsma <br> devsouth | -.0357539 | .0394423 | -.0036884 | .0005839 |

b = consistent under Ho and Ha; obtained from xtreg
$B=$ inconsistent under Ha, efficient under Ho; obtained from xtreg
Test: Ho: difference in coefficients not systematic
$\operatorname{chi2}(8)=(b-B)^{\prime}\left[\left(V \_b-V \_B\right)^{\wedge}(-1)\right](b-B)$
$=\quad 92.52$
Prob>chi2 = 0.0000
We have mechanically succeeded in greatly reducing the $\chi^{2}$, but not by enough. The major differences now are in the age, experience, and tenure effects. We already knew this problem existed because of the ever-increasing effect of experience. More careful parameterization work rather than simply including squares needs to be done.

## Methods and formulas

xttest0 reports the Lagrange multiplier test for random effects developed by Breusch and Pagan (1980) and as modified by Baltagi and Li (1990). The model

$$
y_{i t}=\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}
$$

is fit via OLS, and then the quantity

$$
\lambda_{\mathrm{LM}}=\frac{(n \bar{T})^{2}}{2}\left(\frac{A_{1}^{2}}{\left(\sum_{i} T_{i}^{2}\right)-n \bar{T}}\right)
$$

is calculated, where

$$
A_{1}=1-\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T_{i}} v_{i t}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i} \sum_{t} v_{i t}^{2}}
$$

The Baltagi and Li modification allows for unbalanced data and reduces to the standard formula

$$
\lambda_{\mathrm{LM}}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\frac{n T}{2(T-1)}\left\{\frac{\sum_{i}\left(\sum_{t} v_{i t}\right)^{2}}{\sum_{i} \sum_{t} v_{i t}^{2}}-1\right\}^{2}, & \widehat{\sigma}_{u}^{2} \geq 0 \\
0 & ,
\end{array} \widehat{\sigma}_{u}^{2}<0\right.
$$

when $T_{i}=T$ (balanced data). Under the null hypothesis, $\lambda_{\mathrm{LM}}$ is distributed as a $50: 50$ mixture of a point mass at zero and $\chi^{2}(1)$.
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xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
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## Description

xtregar fits cross-sectional time-series regression models when the disturbance term is firstorder autoregressive. xtregar offers a within estimator for fixed-effects models and a GLS estimator for random-effects models. xtregar can accommodate unbalanced panels whose observations are unequally spaced over time.

## Quick start

Random-effects model of $y$ on $x 1$ with an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ disturbance using xtset data xtregar y x1

Add x 2 and x 3 as covariates and perform Baltagi-Wu LBI test xtregar y x1 x2 x3, lbi

Fixed-effects model using the within estimator and observations where tvar is greater than 2,000 xtregar y x1 x2 x3 if tvar > 2000, fe

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Linear models $>$ Linear regression with AR(1) disturbance (FE, RE)

## Syntax

GLS random-effects (RE) model
xtregar depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [, re options]

Fixed-effects (FE) model
xtregar depvar [indepvars] [if] [in] [weight], fe [options]
options
Description
Model
re
fe
rhotype(rhomethod)
rhof (\#)
twostep
Reporting
level(\#) set confidence level; default is level(95)
lbi
display_options
coeflegend
use random-effects estimator; the default use fixed-effects estimator specify method to compute autocorrelation; seldom used use \# for $\rho$ and do not estimate $\rho$ perform two-step estimate of correlation
perform Baltagi-Wu LBI test
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable and a time variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
fweights and aweights are allowed for the fixed-effects model with rhotype(regress) or rhotype (freg), or with a fixed rho; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

$\qquad$ Model
re requests the GLS estimator of the random-effects model, which is the default. fe requests the within estimator of the fixed-effects model.
rhotype(rhomethod) allows the user to specify any of the following estimators of $\rho$ :
\(\left.\begin{array}{ll}dw \& \rho_{\mathrm{dw}}=1-d / 2, where d is the Durbin-Watson d statistic <br>
regress \& \rho_{\mathrm{reg}}=\beta from the residual regression \epsilon_{t}=\beta \epsilon_{t-1} <br>
freg \& \rho_{\mathrm{freg}}=\beta from the residual regression \epsilon_{t}=\beta \epsilon_{t+1} <br>
tscorr \& \rho_{\mathrm{tscorr}}=\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \epsilon_{t-1} / \epsilon^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, where \boldsymbol{\epsilon} is the vector of residuals and \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-1} is the vector <br>

of lagged residuals\end{array}\right]\)| theil | $\rho_{\text {theil }}=\rho_{\mathrm{tscorr}}(N-k) / N$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\text { nagar }}$ | $\rho_{\text {nagar }}=\left(\rho_{\mathrm{dw}} N^{2}+k^{2}\right) /\left(N^{2}-k^{2}\right)$ |
| $\underline{\text { onestep }}$ | $\rho_{\text {onestep }}=\left(n / m_{c}\right)\left(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t-1} / \epsilon^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\right)$, where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is the vector of residuals, $n$ is the <br> number of observations, and $m_{c}$ is the number of consecutive pairs of residuals |

dw is the default method. Except for onestep, the details of these methods are given in [TS] prais. prais handles unequally spaced data. onestep is the one-step method proposed by Baltagi and Wu (1999). More details on this method are available below in Methods and formulas.
rhof(\#) specifies that the given number be used for $\rho$ and that $\rho$ not be estimated.
twostep requests that a two-step implementation of the rhomethod estimator of $\rho$ be used. Unless a fixed value of $\rho$ is specified (with the rhof() option), $\rho$ is estimated by running prais on the de-meaned data. When twostep is specified, prais will stop on the first iteration after the equation is transformed by $\rho$-the two-step efficient estimator. Although it is customary to iterate these estimators to convergence, they are efficient at each step. When twostep is not specified, the FGLS process iterates to convergence as described in the Methods and formulas of [TS] prais.
level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
lbi requests that the Baltagi-Wu (1999) locally best invariant (LBI) test statistic that $\rho=0$ and a modified version of the Bhargava, Franzini, and Narendranathan (1982) Durbin-Watson statistic be calculated and reported. The default is not to report them. $p$-values are not reported for either statistic. Although Bhargava, Franzini, and Narendranathan (1982) published critical values for their statistic, no tables are currently available for the Baltagi-Wu LBI. Baltagi and Wu (1999) derive a normalized version of their statistic, but this statistic cannot be computed for datasets of moderate size. You can also specify these options upon replay.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon (style), cformat (\% fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.

The following option is available with xtregar but is not shown in the dialog box:
coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
Introduction
The fixed-effects model
The random-effects model

## Introduction

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
xtregar fits cross-sectional time-series regression models when the disturbance term is first-order autoregressive. The models of interest are described by

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\alpha+\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \quad i=1, \ldots, N ; \quad t=1, \ldots, T_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon_{i t}=\rho \epsilon_{i, t-1}+\eta_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

and where $|\rho|<1$ and $\eta_{i t}$ is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_{\eta}^{2}$.

In the fixed-effects model, the $\nu_{i}$ are assumed to be correlated with the covariates $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$, whereas in the random-effects model they are assumed to follow an i.i.d. process with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_{\eta}^{2}$ and to be uncorrelated with the $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$.

Similar to other linear panel-data models, any $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$ that do not vary over $t$ are collinear with the $\nu_{i}$ and will be dropped from the fixed-effects model. In contrast, the random-effects model can accommodate covariates that are constant over time.
xtregar offers a within estimator for the fixed-effect model and the Baltagi-Wu (1999) GLS estimator of the random-effects model. Both of these estimators offer several estimators of $\rho$.

The Baltagi-Wu (1999) GLS estimator extends the balanced panel estimator in Baltagi and Li (1991) to a case of exogenously unbalanced panels with unequally spaced observations. Specifically, the dataset contains observations on individual $i$ at times $t_{i j}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n_{i}$. The difference $t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}$ plays an integral role in the estimation techniques used by xtregar.

For this reason, you must specify the delta() option when you xtset panelvar timevar if, for example, you have quarterly data with a monthly timevar recorded every three months instead of a quarterly timevar; see [XT] xtset.

## The fixed-effects model

Let's examine the fixed-effect model first. The basic approach is common to all fixed-effects models. The $\nu_{i}$ are treated as nuisance parameters. We use a transformation of the model that removes the nuisance parameters and leaves behind the parameters of interest in an estimable form. Subtracting the group means from (1) removes the $\nu_{i}$ from the model

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t_{i j}}-\bar{y}_{i}=\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i t_{i j}}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \boldsymbol{\beta}+\epsilon_{i t_{i j}}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\bar{y}_{i}=\frac{1}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} y_{i t_{i j}} \quad \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}=\frac{1}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \mathbf{x}_{i t_{i j}} \quad \bar{\epsilon}_{i}=\frac{1}{n_{i}} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \epsilon_{i t_{i j}}
$$

After the transformation, (3) is a linear $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ model, potentially with unequally spaced observations. (3) can be used to estimate $\rho$. Given an estimate of $\rho$, we must do a Cochrane-Orcutt transformation on each panel and then remove the within-panel means and add back the overall mean for each variable. OLS on the transformed data will produce the within estimates of $\alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

## > Example 1: Fixed-effects model

Let's use the Grunfeld investment dataset to illustrate how xtregar can be used to fit the fixedeffects model. This dataset contains information on 10 firms' investment, market value, and the value of their capital stocks. The data were collected annually between 1935 and 1954. The following output shows that we have xtset our data and gives the results of running a fixed-effects model with investment as a function of market value and the capital stock.

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/grunfeld
. xtset
    panel variable: company (strongly balanced)
        time variable: year, 1935 to 1954
        delta: 1 year
. xtregar invest mvalue kstock, fe
FE (within) regression with AR(1) disturbances Number of obs = 190
Group variable: company Number of groups = 10
R-sq: Obs per group:
    within = 0.5927 min = 19
    between = 0.7989 年 avg = 19.0
    overall =0.7904 }\quad\operatorname{max}=\quad1
```



```
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline invest & Coef. & Std. Err. & t & \(P>|t|\) & [95\% Con & Interval] \\
\hline mvalue & . 0949999 & . 0091377 & 10.40 & 0.000 & . 0769677 & . 113032 \\
\hline kstock & . 350161 & . 0293747 & 11.92 & 0.000 & . 2921935 & . 4081286 \\
\hline _cons & -63.22022 & 5.648271 & -11.19 & 0.000 & -74.36641 & -52.07402 \\
\hline rho_ar & . 67210608 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{4}{*}{(fraction of variance because of u_i)}} \\
\hline sigma_u & 91.507609 & & & & & \\
\hline sigma_e & 40.992469 & & & & & \\
\hline rho_fov & . 8328647 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Because there are 10 groups, the panel-by-panel Cochrane-Orcutt method decreases the number of available observations from 200 to 190 . The above example used the default dw estimator of $\rho$. Using the tscorr estimator of $\rho$ yields


## - Technical note

The tscorr estimator of $\rho$ is bounded in $[-1,1]$. The other estimators of $\rho$ are not. In samples with short panels, the estimates of $\rho$ produced by the other estimators of $\rho$ may be outside $[-1,1]$. If this happens, use the tscorr estimator. However, simulations have shown that the tscorr estimator is biased toward zero. dw is the default because it performs well in Monte Carlo simulations. In the example above, the estimate of $\rho$ produced by tscorr is much smaller than the one produced by dw.

## Example 2: Using xtset

xtregar will complain if you try to run xtregar on a dataset that has not been xtset:

```
. xtset, clear
. xtregar invest mvalue kstock, fe
must specify panelvar and timevar; use xtset
r(459);
```

You must xtset your data to ensure that xtregar understands the nature of your time variable. Suppose that our observations were taken quarterly instead of annually. We will get the same results with the quarterly variable t 2 that we did with the annual variable year.

```
. generate t = year - 1934
. generate t2 = tq(1934q4) + t
. format t2 %tq
. list year t2 in 1/5
```

| year | t2 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 1935 | 1935q1 |
| 1936 | 1935q2 |
| 1937 | 1935q3 |
| 1938 | 1935q4 |
| 1939 | 1936q1 |

. xtset company t2
panel variable: company (strongly balanced)
time variable: t2, 1935q1 to 1939q4
delta: 1 quarter
. xtregar invest mvalue kstock, fe
FE (within) regression with AR(1) disturbances Number of obs $=190$
Group variable: company $\quad$ Number of groups $=10$
R-sq: Obs per group:
within $=0.5927 \quad \min =\quad 19$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { between }=0.7989 & \mathrm{avg}= \\ 19.0\end{array}$
overall $=0.7904 \quad \max =\quad 19$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { corr (u_i }, \mathrm{Xb})=-0.0454 & \mathrm{~F}(2,178) & = & 129.49 \\ \text { Prob }>\mathrm{F} & = & 0.0000\end{array}$

| invest | Coef. | Std. Err. | t | P>\|t| | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| mvalue | .0949999 | .0091377 | 10.40 | 0.000 | .0769677 | .113032 |
| kstock | .350161 | .0293747 | 11.92 | 0.000 | .2921935 | .4081286 |
| _cons | -63.22022 | 5.648271 | -11.19 | 0.000 | -74.36641 | -52.07402 |
| rho_ar | .67210608 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_u | 91.507609 |  |  |  |  |  |
| sigma_e | 40.992469 |  |  |  |  |  |
| rho_fov | .8328647 | (fraction of variance because of u_i) |  |  |  |  |
| F test that all u_i=0: $F(9,178)=11.53$ | Prob > F = 0.0000 |  |  |  |  |  |

In all the examples thus far, we have assumed that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is first-order autoregressive. Testing the hypothesis of $\rho=0$ in a first-order autoregressive process produces test statistics with extremely complicated distributions. Bhargava, Franzini, and Narendranathan (1982) extended the DurbinWatson statistic to the case of balanced, equally spaced panel datasets. Baltagi and Wu (1999) modify their statistic to account for unbalanced panels with unequally spaced data. In the same article, Baltagi and Wu (1999) derive the locally best invariant test statistic of $\rho=0$. Both these test statistics have extremely complicated distributions, although Bhargava, Franzini, and Narendranathan (1982) did publish some critical values in their article. Specifying the lbi option to xtregar causes Stata to calculate and report the modified Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson and the Baltagi-Wu LBI.

## > Example 3: Testing for autocorrelation

In this example, we calculate the modified Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson statistic and the BaltagiWu LBI. We exclude periods 9 and 10 from the sample, thereby reproducing the results of Baltagi
and Wu (1999, 822). p-values are not reported for either statistic. Although Bhargava, Franzini, and Narendranathan (1982) published critical values for their statistic, no tables are currently available for the Baltagi-Wu (LBI). Baltagi and Wu (1999) did derive a normalized version of their statistic, but this statistic cannot be computed for datasets of moderate size.


## The random-effects model

In the random-effects model, the $\nu_{i}$ are assumed to be realizations of an i.i.d. process with mean 0 and variance $\sigma_{\nu}^{2}$. Furthermore, the $\nu_{i}$ are assumed to be independent of both the $\epsilon_{i t}$ and the covariates $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$. The latter of these assumptions can be strong, but inference is not conditional on the particular realizations of the $\nu_{i}$ in the sample. See Mundlak (1978) for a discussion of this point.

## > Example 4: Random-effects model

By specifying the re option, we obtain the Baltagi-Wu GLS estimator of the random-effects model. This estimator can accommodate unbalanced panels and unequally spaced data. We run this model on the Grunfeld dataset:

modified Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson $=.71380994$
Baltagi-Wu LBI $=1.0134522$
The modified Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson and the Baltagi-Wu LBI are the same as those reported for the fixed-effects model because the formulas for these statistics do not depend on fitting the fixed-effects model or the random-effects model.

## Stored results

xtregar, re stores the following in e():
Scalars

| e(N) | number of observations |
| :---: | :---: |
| e(N_g) | number of groups |
| e(df_m) | model degrees of freedom |
| e(g_min) | smallest group size |
| e(g_avg) | average group size |
| e(g_max) | largest group size |
| e(d1) | Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson |
| e(LBI) | Baltagi-Wu LBI statistic |
| e(N_LBI) | number of obs used in e(LBI) |
| $e(T c o n)$ | 1 if $T$ is constant |
| e(sigma_u) | panel-level standard deviation |
| e(sigma_e) | standard deviation of $\eta_{i t}$ |
| e(r2-w) | $R$-squared for within model |
| e(r2_o) | $R$-squared for overall model |
| e(r2_b) | $R$-squared for between model |
| e(chi2) | $\chi^{2}$ |
| e(rho_ar) | autocorrelation coefficient |
| $e\left(r h o \_f o v\right) ~$ | $u_{i}$ fraction of variance |
| $e($ thta_min) | minimum $\theta$ |
| e(thta_5) | $\theta$, 5th percentile |
| e(thta_50) | $\theta$, 50th percentile |
| e(thta_95) | $\theta$, 95th percentile |
| $e($ thta_max) | maximum $\theta$ |
| $e$ (Tbar) | harmonic mean of group sizes |
| $e$ (rank) | rank of e(V) |

Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(model)
e(rhotype)
e(dw)
e(chi2type)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)

## xtregar

command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
re
method of estimating $\rho_{\text {ar }}$
LBI, if requested
Wald; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
Matrices
e(b)
coefficient vector
e(V)
VCE for random-effects model
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
xtregar, fe stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(df_m)
e(mss)
e(rss)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(d1)
e(LBI)
e(N_LBI)
e(Tcon)
e(corr)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
e(r2_a)
e(r2_w)
e(r2_o)
e(r2_b)
e(11)
e(ll_0)
e(rho_ar)
e(rho_fov)
e(F)
e(F_f)
e(df_r)
$e\left(d f \_a\right)$
e(df_b)
e(rmse)
e(Tbar)
e(rank)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(ivar)
e(tvar)
e(wtype)
e(wexp)
e(model)
e(rhotype)
e(dw)
e(properties)
e(predict)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
e(b)
e(V)
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample
number of observations
number of groups
model degrees of freedom
model sum of squares
residual sum of squares
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson
Baltagi-Wu LBI statistic
number of obs used in e(LBI)
1 if $T$ is constant
$\operatorname{corr}\left(u_{i}, \mathrm{Xb}\right)$
panel-level standard deviation
standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
adjusted $R$-squared
$R$-squared for within model
$R$-squared for overall model
$R$-squared for between model
log likelihood
log likelihood, constant-only model
autocorrelation coefficient
$u_{i}$ fraction of variance
$F$ statistic
$F$ for $u_{i}=0$
residual degrees of freedom
degrees of freedom for absorbed effect
numerator degrees of freedom for $F$ statistic
root mean squared error
harmonic mean of group sizes
rank of e(V)

## xtregar

command as typed
name of dependent variable
variable denoting groups
variable denoting time within groups
weight type
weight expression
fe
method of estimating $\rho_{\text {ar }}$
LBI, if requested
b V
program used to implement predict
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimators

## Methods and formulas

Consider a linear panel-data model described by (1) and (2). The data can be unbalanced and unequally spaced. Specifically, the dataset contains observations on individual $i$ at times $t_{i j}$ for $j=1, \ldots, n_{i}$.

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:
Estimating $\rho$
Transforming the data to remove the $A R(1)$ component The within estimator of the fixed-effects model The Baltagi-Wu GLS estimator The test statistics

## Estimating $\rho$

The estimate of $\rho$ is always obtained after removing the group means. Let $\widetilde{y}_{i t}=y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}$, let $\widetilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i t}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}$, and let $\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i t}=\epsilon_{i t}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}$.

Then, except for the onestep method, all the estimates of $\rho$ are obtained by running Stata's prais on

$$
\widetilde{y}_{i t}=\widetilde{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i t}
$$

See [TS] prais for the formulas for each of the methods.
When onestep is specified, a regression is run on the above equation, and the residuals are obtained. Let $e_{i t_{i j}}$ be the residual used to estimate the error $\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i t_{i j}}$. If $t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}>1, e_{i t_{i j}}$ is set to zero. Given this series of residuals

$$
\widehat{\rho}_{\text {onestep }}=\frac{n}{m_{c}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=2}^{T} e_{i t} e_{i, t-1}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T} e_{i t}^{2}}
$$

where $n$ is the number of nonzero elements in $e$ and $m_{c}$ is the number of consecutive pairs of nonzero $e_{i t} \mathrm{~s}$.

## Transforming the data to remove the $\mathrm{AR}(1)$ component

After estimating $\rho$, Baltagi and Wu (1999) derive a transformation of the data that removes the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ component. Their $C_{i}(\rho)$ can be written as

$$
y_{i t_{i j}}^{*}= \begin{cases}\left(1-\rho^{2}\right)^{1 / 2} y_{i t_{i j}} & \text { if } t_{i j}=1 \\ \left(1-\rho^{2}\right)^{1 / 2}\left\{y_{i, t_{i j}} \frac{1}{\left(1-\rho^{2\left(t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}\right)}\right)^{1 / 2}}-y_{i, t_{i, j-1}} \frac{\rho^{\left(t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}\right)}}{\left(1-\rho^{2\left(t_{i, j}-t_{i, j-1}\right)}\right)^{1 / 2}}\right\} & \text { if } t_{i j}>1\end{cases}
$$

Using the analogous transform on the independent variables generates transformed data without the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ component. Performing simple OLS on the transformed data leaves behind the residuals $\mu^{*}$.

## The within estimator of the fixed-effects model

To obtain the within estimator, we must transform the data that come from the $\mathrm{AR}(1)$ transform. For the within transform to remove the fixed effects, the first observation of each panel must be dropped. Specifically, let

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
\breve{y}_{i t_{i j}} & =y_{i t_{i j}}^{*}-\bar{y}_{i}^{*}+\overline{\bar{y}}^{*} & \forall j>1 \\
\breve{\mathbf{x}}_{i t_{i j}} & =\mathbf{x}_{i t_{i j}}^{*}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{*}+\overline{\mathbf{x}}^{*} & \forall j>1 \\
\breve{\epsilon}_{i t_{i j}} & =\epsilon_{i t_{i j}}^{*}-\bar{\epsilon}_{i}^{*}+\bar{\epsilon}^{*} & & \forall j>1
\end{array}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \bar{y}_{i}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} y_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{n_{i}-1} \\
& \overline{\bar{y}}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} y_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} n_{i}-1} \\
& \overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} \mathbf{x}_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{n_{i}-1} \\
& \overline{\mathbf{x}}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} \mathbf{x}_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} n_{i}-1} \\
& \bar{\epsilon}_{i}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} \epsilon_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{n_{i}-1} \\
& \bar{\epsilon}^{*}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=2}^{n_{i}-1} \epsilon_{i t_{i j}}^{*}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} n_{i}-1}
\end{aligned}
$$

The within estimator of the fixed-effects model is then obtained by running OLS on

$$
\breve{y}_{i t_{i j}}=\alpha+\breve{\mathbf{x}}_{i t_{i j}} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\breve{\epsilon}_{i t_{i j}}
$$

Reported as $R^{2}$ within is the $R^{2}$ from the above regression.
Reported as $R^{2}$ between is $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ overall is $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.

## The Baltagi-Wu GLS estimator

The residuals $\mu^{*}$ can be used to estimate the variance components. Translating the matrix formulas given in Baltagi and Wu (1999) into summations yields the following variance-components estimators:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \widehat{\sigma}_{\omega}^{2}=\sum_{i=1}^{N} \frac{\left(\mu_{i}^{* \prime} g_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(g_{i}^{\prime} g_{i}\right)} \\
& \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}=\frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_{i}^{* \prime} \mu_{i}^{*}\right)-\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\{\frac{\left(\mu_{i}^{* \prime} g_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(g_{i}^{\prime} g_{i}\right)}\right\}\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(n_{i}-1\right)} \\
& \widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}=\frac{\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\{\frac{\left(\mu_{i}^{* \prime} g_{i}\right)^{2}}{\left(g_{i}^{\prime} g_{i}\right)}\right\}-N \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}\right]}{\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(g_{i}^{\prime} g_{i}\right)}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
g_{i}=\left[1, \frac{\left\{1-\rho^{\left(t_{i, 2}-t_{i, 1}\right)}\right\}}{\left\{1-\rho^{2\left(t_{i, 2}-t_{i, 1}\right)}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}, \ldots, \frac{\left\{1-\rho^{\left(t_{i, n_{i}}-t_{i, n_{i}-1}\right)}\right\}}{\left\{1-\rho^{2\left(t_{i, n_{i}}-t_{i, n_{i}-1}\right)}\right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right]^{\prime}
$$

and $\mu_{i}^{*}$ is the $n_{i} \times 1$ vector of residuals from $\mu^{*}$ that correspond to person $i$.
Then

$$
\widehat{\theta}_{i}=1-\left(\frac{\widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}}{\widehat{\omega}_{i}}\right)
$$

where

$$
\widehat{\omega}_{i}^{2}=g_{i}^{\prime} g_{i} \widehat{\sigma}_{\mu}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}
$$

With these estimates in hand, we can transform the data via

$$
z_{i t_{i j}}^{* *}=z_{i t_{i j}}^{*}-\widehat{\theta}_{i} g_{i j} \frac{\sum_{s=1}^{n_{i}} g_{i s} z_{i t_{i s}}^{*}}{\sum_{s=1}^{n_{i}} g_{i s}^{2}}
$$

for $z \in\{y, \mathbf{x}\}$.
Running OLS on the transformed data $y^{* *}, \mathbf{x}^{* *}$ yields the feasible GLS estimator of $\alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ between is $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \bar{y}_{i}\right)\right\}^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ within is $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left\{\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t}-\overline{\mathbf{x}}_{i}\right) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}-\bar{y}_{i}\right\}\right\}^{2}$.
Reported as $R^{2}$ overall is $\left\{\operatorname{corr}\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_{i t}\right)\right\}^{2}$.

## The test statistics

The Baltagi-Wu LBI is the sum of terms

$$
d_{*}=d_{1}+d_{2}+d_{3}+d_{4}
$$

where

$$
\begin{gathered}
d_{1}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}}\left\{\widetilde{z}_{i t_{i, j-1}}-\widetilde{z}_{i t_{i j}} I\left(t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}=1\right)\right\}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i j}}^{2}} \\
d_{2}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}-1} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i, j-1}}^{2}\left\{1-I\left(t_{i j}-t_{i, j-1}=1\right)\right\}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i j}}^{2}} \\
d_{3}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i 1}}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i j}}^{2}} \\
d_{4}=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i i_{i}}}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i}} \widetilde{z}_{i t_{i j}}^{2}}
\end{gathered}
$$

$I()$ is the indicator function that takes the value of 1 if the condition is true and 0 otherwise. The $\widetilde{z}_{i t_{i, j-1}}$ are residuals from the within estimator.

Baltagi and Wu (1999) also show that $d_{1}$ is the Bhargava et al. Durbin-Watson statistic modified to handle cases of unbalanced panels and unequally spaced data.
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## Also see

[XT] xtregar postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtregar
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[XT] xtgee - Fit population-averaged panel-data models by using GEE
[XT] xtgls - Fit panel-data models by using GLS
[XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
[TS] newey - Regression with Newey-West standard errors
[TS] prais - Prais-Winsten and Cochrane-Orcutt regression
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtregar postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtregar

Postestimation commands predict margins Also see

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xtregar:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| * estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample |
| estat vce | variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal |
| marginsplot | effects |
| graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |  |
| nlcom | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations |
| of coefficients |  |

[^16]
## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions and predictions.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic]
statistic Description
Main
$\mathrm{xb} \quad \mathbf{x}_{i t} \mathbf{b}$, linear prediction; the default
ue $\quad u_{i}+e_{i t}$, the combined residual
*u $\quad u_{i}$, the fixed- or random-error component
*e $\quad e_{i t}$, the overall error component
Unstarred statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample. Starred statistics are calculated only for the estimation sample, even when if $e$ (sample) is not specified.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction, $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$.
ue calculates the prediction of $u_{i}+e_{i t}$.
u calculates the prediction of $u_{i}$, the estimated fixed or random effect.
e calculates the prediction of $e_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [options]
```

statistic
Description
$\mathrm{xb} \quad \mathbf{x}_{i t} \mathbf{b}$, linear prediction; the default
ue not allowed with margins
u not allowed with margins
e not allowed with margins

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Also see

[XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtset - Declare data to be panel data

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Also see |

## Description

xtset manages the panel settings of a dataset. You must xtset your data before you can use the other xt commands. xtset panelvar declares the data in memory to be a panel in which the order of observations is irrelevant. xtset panelvar timevar declares the data to be a panel in which the order of observations is relevant. When you specify timevar, you can then use Stata's time-series operators and analyze your data with the ts commands without having to tsset your data.
xtset without arguments displays how the data are currently xtset. If the data are set with a panelvar and a timevar, xtset also sorts the data by panelvar timevar if a timevar was specified. If the data are set with a panelvar only, the sort order is not changed.
xtset, clear is a rarely used programmer's command to declare that the data are no longer to be considered a panel.

## Quick start

Declare dataset to be panel data with panel identifier pvar

```
xtset pvar
```

Indicate that observations are ordered by year, stored in tvar1 xtset pvar tvar1

As above, but indicate that observations are instead made every 2 years
xtset pvar tvar1, delta(2)
Indicate that observations are made monthly; tvar2 is not formatted
xtset pvar tvar2, monthly
As above, and apply \%tm format to tvar2
xtset pvar tvar2, format (\%tm)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Declare dataset to be panel data

## Syntax

Declare data to be panel
xtset panelvar
xtset panelvar timevar [, tsoptions]

Display how data are currently xtset

```
xtset
```

Clear xt settings

```
xtset, clear
```

In the declare syntax, panelvar identifies the panels and the optional timevar identifies the times within panels. tsoptions concern timevar.
tsoptions Description

| unitoptions <br> deltaoption | specify units of timevar <br> specify periodicity of timevar |
| :--- | :--- |
| noquery | suppress summary calculations and output |

noquery is not shown in the dialog box.
unitoptions
Description

| (default) | timevar's units to be obtained from timevar's display format |
| :---: | :---: |
| clocktime | timevar is \%tc: $0=1 \mathrm{jan} 1960$ 00:00:00.000, $1=1 \mathrm{jan1960} 00: 00: 00.001$, |
| daily | timevar is \%td: $0=1 \mathrm{jan} 1960,1=2 \mathrm{jan} 1960$, |
| weekly | timevar is \%tw: $0=1960 \mathrm{w} 1,1=1960 \mathrm{w} 2$, |
| monthly | timevar is \%tm: $0=1960 \mathrm{ml} 1,1=1960 \mathrm{~m} 2$, |
| quarterly | timevar is \%tq: $0=1960 \mathrm{q} 1,1=1960 \mathrm{q} 2,$. |
| halfyearly | timevar is \%th: $0=1960 \mathrm{~h} 1,1=1960 \mathrm{~h} 2, .$. |
| yearly | timevar is \%ty: $1960=1960,1961=1961$, |
| generic | timevar is \%tg: $0=?, 1=?, \ldots$ |
| format (\% fint) | specify timevar's format and then apply default rule |

In all cases, negative timevar values are allowed.
deltaoption specifies the period between observations in timevar units and may be specified as

| deltaoption | Example |
| :--- | :--- |
| delta(\#) | delta(1) or delta(2) |
| delta((exp)) | delta( $7 * 24))$ |
| delta(\# units) | delta(7 days) or delta(15 minutes) or delta(7 days 15 minutes) |
| delta((exp) units) | delta( $2+3)$ weeks) |

Allowed units for $\% \mathrm{tc}$ and $\% \mathrm{tc}$ timevars are

| seconds | secs | sec |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| minutes | mins | min |
| hours | hour |  |
| days | day |  |
| weeks | week |  |

and for all other \%t timevars are

| days | day |
| :--- | :--- |
| weeks | week |

## Options

unitoptions clocktime, daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, halfyearly, yearly, generic, and format (\%fmt) specify the units in which timevar is recorded, if timevar is specified.
timevar will often simply be a variable that counts $1,2, \ldots$, and is to be interpreted as first year of survey, second year, ... , or first month of treatment, second month, .... In these cases, you do not need to specify a unitoption.

In other cases, timevar will be a year variable or the like such as 2001, 2002, ..., and is to be interpreted as year of survey or the like. In those cases, you do not need to specify a unitoption. In still other, more complicated cases, timevar will be a full-blown \%t variable; see [D] datetime. If timevar already has a $\% \mathrm{t}$ display format assigned to it, you do not need to specify a unitoption; xtset will obtain the units from the format. If you have not yet bothered to assign the appropriate $\% \mathrm{t}$ format to the $\% \mathrm{t}$ variable, however, you can use the unitoptions to tell xtset the units. Then xtset will set timevar's display format for you. Thus, the unitoptions are convenience options; they allow you to skip formatting the time variable. The following all have the same net result:

| Alternative 1 | Alternative 2 | Alternative 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| format $\mathrm{t} \% \mathrm{td}$ | $(t$ not formatted $)$ | $(t$ not formatted $)$ |
| xtset pid t | xtset pid t, daily | xtset pid t, format $(\% \mathrm{td})$ |

Understand that timevar is not required to be a \%t variable; it can be any variable of your own concocting so long as it takes on integer values. When you xtset a time variable that is not $\%$, the display format does not change unless you specify the unitoption generic or use the format() option.
delta() specifies the periodicity of timevar and is commonly used when timevar is \%tc. delta() is only sometimes used with the other $\% \mathrm{t}$ formats or with generic time variables.

If delta() is not specified, delta(1) is assumed. This means that at timevar $=5$, the previous time is timevar $=5-1=4$ and the next time would be timevar $=5+1=6$. Lag and lead operators, for instance, would work this way. This would be assumed regardless of the units of timevar.

If you specified delta(2), then at timevar $=5$, the previous time would be timevar $=5-2=3$ and the next time would be timevar $=5+2=7$. Lag and lead operators would work this way. In the observation with timevar $=5$, L.income would be the value of income in the observation for which timevar $=3$ and F .income would be the value of income in the observation for which timevar $=7$. If you then add an observation with timevar $=4$, the operators will still work appropriately; that is, at timevar $=5$, L. income will still have the value of income at timevar $=3$.
There are two aspects of timevar: its units and its periodicity. The unitoptions set the units. delta() sets the periodicity. You are not required to specify one to specify the other. You might have a generic timevar but it counts in 12: $0,12,24, \ldots$ You would skip specifying unitoptions but would specify delta(12).

We mentioned that delta() is commonly used with \%tc timevars because Stata's \%tc variables have units of milliseconds. If delta() is not specified and in some model you refer to L.bp, you will be referring to the value of bp 1 ms ago. Few people have data with periodicity of a millisecond. Perhaps your data are hourly. You could specify delta (3600000). Or you could specify delta ( $(60 * 60 * 1000))$, because delta() will allow expressions if you include an extra pair of parentheses. Or you could specify delta(1 hour). They all mean the same thing: timevar has periodicity of $3,600,000 \mathrm{~ms}$. In an observation for which timevar $=1,489,572,000,000$ (corresponding to 15 mar 2007 10:00:00), L. bp would be the observation for which timevar $=$ $1,489,572,000,000-3,600,000=1,489,568,400,000$ (corresponding to 15 mar 2007 9:00:00).
When you xtset the data and specify delta(), xtset verifies that all the observations follow the specified periodicity. For instance, if you specified delta(2), then timevar could contain any subset of $\{\ldots,-4,-2,0,2,4, \ldots\}$ or it could contain any subset of $\{\ldots,-3,-1,1,3, \ldots\}$. If timevar contained a mix of values, xtset would issue an error message. The check is made on each panel independently, so one panel might contain timevar values from one set and the next, another, and that would be fine.
clear—used in xtset, clear—makes Stata forget that the data ever were xtset. This is a rarely used programmer's option.

The following option is available with xtset but is not shown in the dialog box:
noquery prevents xtset from performing most of its summary calculations and suppresses output. With this option, only the following results are posted:

```
r(tdelta) r(tsfmt)
r(panelvar) r(unit)
r(timevar) r(unit1)
```


## Remarks and examples

xtset declares the dataset in memory to be panel data. You need to do this before you can use the other xt commands. The storage types of both panelvar and timevar must be numeric, and both variables must contain integers only.

There are two syntaxes for setting the data:

In the first syntax-xtset panelvar-the data are set to be a panel and the order of the observations within panel is considered to be irrelevant. For instance, panelvar might be country and the observations within might be city.

In the second syntax-xtset panelvar timevar-the data are to be a panel and the order of observations within panel are considered ordered by timevar. For instance, in data collected from repeated surveying of the same people over various years, panelvar might be person and timevar, year. When you specify timevar, you may then use Stata's time-series operators such as L. and F. (lag and lead) in other commands. The operators will be interpreted as lagged and lead values within panel.

The storage types of both panelvar and timevar must be numeric, and both variables must contain integers only.

## - Technical note

In previous versions of Stata there was no xtset command. The other xt commands instead had the i(panelvar) and $t$ (timevar) options. Older commands still have those options, but they are no longer documented and, if you specify them, they just perform the xtset for you. Thus, do-files that you previously wrote will continue to work. Modern usage, however, is to xtset the data first.

## - Technical note

xtset is related to the tsset command, which declares data to be time series. One of the syntaxes of tsset is tsset panelvar timevar, which is identical to one of xtset's syntaxes, namely, xtset panelvar timevar. Here they are in fact the same command, meaning that xtsetting your data is sufficient to allow you to use the ts commands and tssetting your data is sufficient to allow you to use the xt commands. You do not need to set both, but it will not matter if you do.
xtset and tsset are different, however, when you set just a panelvar-you type xtset panelvaror when you set just a timevar-you type tsset timevar.

If you save your data after xtset, the data will be remembered to be a panel and you will not have to xtset again.

## > Example 1: Panel data without a time variable

Many panel datasets contain a variable identifying panels but do not contain a time variable. For example, you may have a dataset where each panel is a family, and the observations within panel are family members, or you may have a dataset in which each person made a decision multiple times but the ordering of those decisions is unimportant and perhaps unknown. In this latter case, if the time of the decision were known, we would advise you to xtset it. The other xt statistical commands do not do something different because timevar has been set-they will ignore timevar if timevar is irrelevant to the statistical method that you are using. You should always set everything that is true about the data.

In any case, let's consider the case where there is no timevar. We have data on U.S. states and cities within states:

```
. list state city in 1/10, sepby(state)
```

|  | state | city |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | Alabama | Birmingham |
| 2. | Alabama | Mobile |
| 3. | Alabama | Montgomery |
| 4. | Alabama | Huntsville |
| 5. | Alaska | Anchorage |
| 6. | Alaska | Fairbanks |
| 7. | Arizona | Phoenix |
| 8. | Arizona | Tucson |
| 9. | Arkansas | Fayetteville  <br> 10. Arkansas |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Here we do not type xtset state city because city is not a time variable. Instead, we type xtset state:

```
. xtset state
string variables not allowed in varlist;
state is a string variable
r(109);
```

You cannot xtset a string variable. We must make a numeric variable from our string variable and xtset that. One alternative is

```
. egen statenum = group(state)
. list state statenum in 1/10, sepby(state)
```

|  | state | statenum |
| :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1. | Alabama | 1 |
| 2. | Alabama | 1 |
| 3. | Alabama | 1 |
| 4. | Alabama | 1 |
| 5. | Alaska | 2 |
| 6. | Alaska | 2 |
| 7. | Arizona | 3 |
| 8. | Arizona | 3 |
| 9. | Arkansas | 4 |
| 10. | Arkansas | 4 |
|  |  |  |

. xtset statenum

```
    panel variable: statenum (unbalanced)
```

Perhaps a better alternative is

```
. encode state, gen(st)
. list state st in 1/10, sepby(state)
```

|  | state | st |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Alabama | Alabama |
| 2. | Alabama | Alabama |
| 3. | Alabama | Alabama |
| 4. | Alabama | Alabama |
| 5. | Alaska | Alaska |
| 6. | Alaska | Alaska |
| 7. | Arizona | Arizona |
| 8. | Arizona | Arizona |
| 9. | Arkansas | Arkansas |
| 10. | Arkansas | Arkansas |

encode (see [D] encode) produces a numeric variable with a value label, so when we list the result, new variable st looks just like our original. It is, however, numeric:
. list state st in $1 / 10$, nolabel sepby (state)

|  | state | st |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Alabama | 1 |
| 2. | Alabama | 1 |
| 3. | Alabama | 1 |
| 4. | Alabama | 1 |
| 5. | Alaska | 2 |
| 6. | Alaska | 2 |
| 7. | Arizona | 3 |
| 8. | Arizona | 3 |
| 9. | Arkansas | 4 |
| 10. | Arkansas | 4 |

We can xtset new variable st:
. xtset st
panel variable: st (unbalanced)

## > Example 2: Panel data with a time variable

Some panel datasets do contain a time variable. Dataset abdata.dta contains labor demand data from a panel of firms in the United Kingdom. Here are wage data for the first two firms in the dataset:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/abdata, clear
. list id year wage if id==1 | id==2, sepby(id)
```

|  | id | year | wage |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | 1 | 1977 | 13.1516 |
| 2. | 1 | 1978 | 12.3018 |
| 3. | 1 | 1979 | 12.8395 |
| 4. | 1 | 1980 | 13.8039 |
| 5. | 1 | 1981 | 14.2897 |
| 6. | 1 | 1982 | 14.8681 |
| 7. | 1 | 1983 | 13.7784 |
| 8. | 2 | 1977 | 14.7909 |
| 9. | 2 | 1978 | 14.1036 |
| 10. | 2 | 1979 | 14.9534 |
| 11. | 2 | 1980 | 15.491 |
| 12. | 2 | 1981 | 16.1969 |
| 13. | 2 | 1982 | 16.1314 |
| 14. | 2 | 1983 | 16.3051 |

To declare this dataset as a panel dataset, you type

```
. xtset id year, yearly
    panel variable: id (unbalanced)
        time variable: year, 1976 to 1984
            delta: 1 year
```

The output from list shows that the last observations for these two firms are for 1983, but xtset shows that for some firms data are available for 1984 as well. If one or more panels contain data for nonconsecutive periods, xtset will report that gaps exist in the time variable. For example, if we did not have data for firm 1 for 1980 but did have data for 1979 and 1981, xtset would indicate that our data have a gap.

For yearly data, we could omit the yearly option and just type xtset id year because years are stored and listed just like regular integers.

Having declared our data to be a panel dataset, we can use time-series operators to obtain lags:

```
. list id year wage L.wage if id==1 | id==2, sepby(id)
```

| id | year | wage | L. <br> wage |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1977 | 13.1516 | . |
| 1 | 1978 | 12.3018 | 13.1516 |
| 1 | 1979 | 12.8395 | 12.3018 |
| 1 | 1980 | 13.8039 | 12.8395 |
| 1 | 1981 | 14.2897 | 13.8039 |
| 1 | 1982 | 14.8681 | 14.2897 |
| 1 | 1983 | 13.7784 | 14.8681 |
| 2 | 1977 | 14.7909 |  |
| 2 | 1978 | 14.1036 | 14.7909 |
| 2 | 1979 | 14.9534 | 14.1036 |
| 2 | 1980 | 15.491 | 14.9534 |
| 2 | 1981 | 16.1969 | 15.491 |
| 2 | 1982 | 16.1314 | 16.1969 |
| 2 | 1983 | 16.3051 | 16.1314 |

L.wage is missing for 1977 in both panels because we have no wage data for 1976. In observation 8, the lag operator did not incorrectly reach back into the previous panel.

## - Technical note

The terms balanced and unbalanced are often used to describe whether a panel dataset is missing some observations. If a dataset does not contain a time variable, then panels are considered balanced if each panel contains the same number of observations; otherwise, the panels are unbalanced.

When the dataset contains a time variable, panels are said to be strongly balanced if each panel contains the same time points, weakly balanced if each panel contains the same number of observations but not the same time points, and unbalanced otherwise.
> Example 3: Applying time-series formats to the time variable
If our data are observed more than once per year, applying time-series formats to the time variable can improve readability.

We have a dataset consisting of individuals who joined a gym's weight-loss program that began in January 2005 and ended in December 2005. Each participant's weight was recorded once per month. Some participants did not show up for all the monthly weigh-ins, so we do not have all 12 months' records for each person. The first two people's data are

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/gymdata
. list id month wt if id==1 | id==2, sepby(id)
```

|  | th | wt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | 145 |
| 1 | 2 | 144 |
| (output omitted) |  |  |
| 1 | 11 | 124 |
| 1 | 12 | 120 |
| 2 | 1 | 144 |
| 2 | 2 | 143 |
| (output omitted) |  |  |
| 2 | 11 | 122 |
| 2 | 12 | 118 |

To set these data, we can type

```
. xtset id month
    panel variable: id (unbalanced)
    time variable: month, 1 to 12, but with gaps
    delta: 1 unit
```

The note "but with gaps" above is no cause for concern. It merely warns us that, within some panels, some time values are missing. We already knew that about our data-some participants did not show up for the monthly weigh-ins.

The rest of this example concerns making output more readable. Month numbers such as 1,2 , $\ldots, 12$ are perfectly readable here. In another dataset, where month numbers went to, say 127 , they would not be so readable. In such cases, we can make a more readable date-2005m1, 2005m2, ...-by using Stata's \%t variables. For a discussion, see [D] datetime. We will go quickly here. One of the \%t formats is \%tm-monthly—and it says that 1 means 1960 ml . Thus, we need to recode our month variable so that, rather than taking on values from 1 to 12, it takes on values from 540 to 551. Then we can put a \%tm format on that variable. Working out $540-551$ is subject to mistakes. Stata function $\mathrm{tm}(2005 \mathrm{~m} 1)$ tells us the $\% \mathrm{tm}$ month corresponding to January of 2005, so we can type

```
. generate month2 = month + m(2005m1) - 1
. format month2 %tm
```

New variable month2 will work just as well as the original month in an xtset, and even a little better, because output will be a little more readable:

```
. xtset id month2
    panel variable: id (unbalanced)
        time variable: month2, 2005m1 to 2005m12, but with gaps
        delta: 1 month
```

By the way, we could have omitted typing format month2 \%tm and then, rather than typing xtset id month2, we would have typed xtset id month2, monthly. The monthly option specifies that the time variable is $\% \mathrm{tm}$. When we did not specify the option, xtset determined that it was monthly from the display format we had set.

## > Example 4: Clock times

We have data from a large hotel in Las Vegas that changes the reservation prices for its room reservations hourly. A piece of the data looks like

```
. list in 1/5
```

|  | roomtype |  | time | price |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 |
| 2. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 |
| 3. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 |
| 4. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 |
| 5. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 |

The panel variable is roomtype and, although you cannot see it from the output above, it takes on 1, $2, \ldots, 20$. Variable time is a string variable. The first step in making this dataset xt is to translate the string to a numeric variable:

```
. generate double t = clock(time, "MDY hm")
. list in 1/5
```

| roomtype |  | time | price | t |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 | $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 | $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 | $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 | $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 | $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ |

See [D] datetime translation for an explanation of what is going on here. clock() is the function that converts strings to datetime (\%tc) values. We typed clock(time, "MDY hm") to convert string variable time, and we told clock() that the values in time were in the order month, day, year, hour, and minute. We stored new variable $t$ as a double because time values are large and that is required to prevent rounding. Even so, the resulting values $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ look rounded, but that is only because of the default display format for new variables. We can see the values better if we change the format:

```
. format t %20.0gc
. list in 1/5
```

| roomtype |  | time | price |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | $02.13 .200708: 00$ | 140 | $1,486,972,800,000$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 |
| 1 | $1,486,976,400,000$ |  |  |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 |
| $1,486,983,600,000$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Even better, however, would be to change the format to \%tc-Stata's clock-time format:

```
. format t %tc
```

. list in $1 / 5$

| roomtype |  | time | price | $t$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| $09: 09: 00: 00$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| $11: 00: 00$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| $12: 00: 00$ |  |  |  |  |

We could now drop variable time. New variable $t$ contains the same information as time and $t$ is better because it is a Stata time variable, the most important property of which being that it is numeric rather than string. We can xtset it. Here, however, we also need to specify the periodicity with xtset's delta() option. Stata's time variables are numeric, but they record milliseconds since 01jan1960 00:00:00. By default, xtset uses delta(1), and that means the time-series operators would not work as we want them to work. For instance, L.price would look back only 1 ms (and find nothing). We want L.price to look back 1 hour ( $3,600,000 \mathrm{~ms}$ ):

```
. xtset roomtype t, delta(1 hour)
        panel variable: roomtype (strongly balanced)
        time variable: t, 13feb2007 08:00:00 to 31mar2007 18:00:00
                        but with gaps
        delta: 1 hour
. list t price l.price in 1/5
```

|  | t | price | ${ }_{\text {price }}^{\text {L. }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13 feb 2007 | 08:00:00 | 140 |  |
| 13 feb 2007 | 09:00:00 | 155 | 140 |
| 13 feb 2007 | 10:00:00 | 160 | 155 |
| 13 feb 2007 | 11:00:00 | 155 | 160 |
| 13feb2007 | 12:00:00 | 160 | 155 |

## > Example 5: Clock times must be double

In the previous example, it was of vital importance that when we generated the $\% \mathrm{tc}$ variable t ,

```
. generate double t = clock(time, "MDY hm")
```

we generated it as a double. Let's see what would have happened had we forgotten and just typed generate $\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{clock}$ (time, "MDY hm"). Let's go back and start with the same original data:
. list in $1 / 5$

| roomtype |  | time | price |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 |

Remember, variable time is a string variable, and we need to translate it to numeric. So we translate, but this time we forget to make the new variable a double:

```
. generate t = clock(time, "MDY hm")
. list in 1/5
```

| roomtype |  | time | price | t |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 | $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 | $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 | $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 | $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ |
| 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 | $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ |

We see the first difference- t now lists as $1.49 \mathrm{e}+12$ rather than $1.487 \mathrm{e}+12$ as it did previously-but this is nothing that would catch our attention. We would not even know that the value is different. Let's continue.

We next put a $\% 20.0 \mathrm{gc}$ format on t to better see the numerical values. In fact, that is not something we would usually do in an analysis. We did that in the example to emphasize to you that the $t$ values were really big numbers. We will repeat the exercise just to be complete, but in real analysis, we would not bother.

```
. format t % 20.0gc
. list in 1/5
```

|  | roomtype |  | time | price |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | $t$ |
| 2. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 |

Okay, we see big numbers in t. Let's continue.

Next we put a \%tc format on $t$, and that is something we would usually do, and you should always do. You should also list a bit of the data, as we did:

```
. format t %tc
. list in 1/5
```

|  | roomtype |  | time | price | $t$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $08: 00$ | 140 | $13 f e b 2007$ |
| 1. | $07: 59: 40$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $09: 00$ | 155 | $13 f e b 2007$ | $09: 00: 50$ |
| 3. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $10: 00$ | 160 | $13 f e b 2007$ | $09: 59: 49$ |
| 4. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $11: 00$ | 155 | $13 f e b 2007$ | $11: 00: 59$ |
| 5. | 1 | 02.13 .2007 | $12: 00$ | 160 | $13 f e b 2007$ | $11: 59: 58$ |

By now, you should see a problem: the translated datetime values are off by a second or two. That was caused by rounding. Dates and times should be the same, not approximately the same, and when you see a difference like this, you should say to yourself, "The translation is off a little. Why is that?" and then you should think, "Of course, rounding. I bet that I did not create $t$ as a double."

Let's assume, however, that you do not do this. You instead plow ahead:

```
. xtset roomtype t, delta(1 hour)
time values with period less than delta() found
r(451);
```

And that is what will happen when you forget to create $t$ as a double. The rounding will cause uneven periodicity, and xtset will complain.

By the way, it is important only that clock times (\%tc and \%tC variables) be stored as doubles. The other date values $\% \mathrm{td}, \% \mathrm{tw}, \% \mathrm{tm}, \% \mathrm{tq}, \% \mathrm{th}$, and $\% \mathrm{ty}$ are small enough that they can safely be stored as floats, although forgetting and storing them as doubles does no harm.

## Technical note

Stata provides two clock-time formats, \%tc and \%tC. \%tC provides a clock with leap seconds. Leap seconds are occasionally inserted to account for randomness of the earth's rotation, which gradually slows. Unlike the extra day inserted in leap years, the timing of when leap seconds will be inserted cannot be foretold. The authorities in charge of such matters announce a leap second approximately 6 months before insertion. Leap seconds are inserted at the end of the day, and the leap second is called 23:59:60 (that is, 11:59:60 pm), which is then followed by the usual 00:00:00 (12:00:00 am). Most nonastronomers find these leap seconds vexing. The added seconds cause problems because of their lack of predictability-knowing how many seconds there will be between 01jan2012 and 01 jan2013 is not possible-and because there are not necessarily 24 hours in a day. If you use a leap second-adjusted clock, most days have 24 hours, but a few have 24 hours and 1 second. You must look at a table to find out.

From a time-series analysis point of view, the nonconstant day causes the most problems. Let's say that you have data on blood pressure for a set of patients, taken hourly at 1:00, 2:00, $\ldots$, and that you have xtset your data with delta(1 hour). On most days, L24.bp would be blood pressure at the same time yesterday. If the previous day had a leap second, however, and your data were recorded using a leap second-adjusted clock, there would be no observation L24.bp because 86,400 seconds before the current reading does not correspond to an on-the-hour time; 86,401 seconds before the current reading corresponds to yesterday's time. Thus, whenever possible, using Stata's \%tc encoding rather than $\% \mathrm{tC}$ is better.

When times are recorded by computers using leap second-adjusted clocks, however, avoiding \%tC is not possible. For performing most time-series analysis, the recommended procedure is to map the $\% t \mathrm{C}$ values to \%tc and then xtset those. You must ask yourself whether the process you are studying is based on the clock-the nurse does something at 2 o'clock every day-or the true passage of time-the emitter spits out an electron every $86,400,000 \mathrm{~ms}$.

When dealing with computer-recorded times, first find out whether the computer (and its timerecording software) use a leap second-adjusted clock. If it does, translate that to a $\% \mathrm{tC}$ value. Then use function $\operatorname{cofC}()$ to convert to a $\% \mathrm{tc}$ value and xtset that. If variable T contains the $\% \mathrm{tC}$ value,
. generate double $t=\operatorname{cofC}(T)$
. format t \%tc
. xtset panelvar t, delta(...)
Function $\operatorname{cofC}()$ moves leap seconds forward: 23:59:60 becomes 00:00:00 of the next day.

## Stored results

xtset stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars
$r$ (imin) minimum panel ID
$r$ (imax) maximum panel ID
$r$ (tmin) minimum time
$r$ (tmax) maximum time
$r$ (tdelta) delta
Macros
$r$ (panelvar) name of panel variable
$r$ (timevar) name of time variable
$r$ (tdeltas) formatted delta
$r$ (tmins) formatted minimum time
$r$ (tmaxs) formatted maximum time
$r$ (tsfmt) $\quad \% f m t$ of time variable
$r$ (unit) units of time variable: Clock, clock, daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly, halfyearly, yearly, or generic
$r$ (unit1) units of time variable: $C, c, d, w, m, q, h, y$, or ""
$r$ (balanced) unbalanced, weakly balanced, or strongly balanced; a set of panels are strongly balanced if they all have the same time values, otherwise balanced if same number of time values, otherwise unbalanced

## Also see

[XT] xtdescribe - Describe pattern of xt data
[XT] xtsum - Summarize xt data
[TS] tsset - Declare data to be time-series data
[TS] tsfill - Fill in gaps in time variable

## Title

xtstreg — Random-effects parametric survival models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xtstreg fits random-effects parametric survival-time models. The conditional distribution of the response given the random effects is assumed to be an exponential, a Weibull, a lognormal, a loglogistic, or a gamma distribution. xtstreg can be used with single- or multiple-record st data.

## Quick start

Declare pvar as the panel variable using xtset, and declare data to be survival-time data using stset
xtset pvar
stset tvar, failure(fail)
Random-effects Weibull survival model with covariates x1 and x2
xtstreg x1 x2, distribution(weibull)
Use accelerated failure-time metric instead of proportional-hazards metric
xtstreg x 1 x 2 , distribution(weibull) time
As above, but with panel-level probability weights wvar
xtstreg x1 x2 [pw=wvar], distribution(weibull) time
Random-effects model with cluster-robust standard errors for panels nested within cvar
xtstreg $x 1$ x2, distribution(weibull) vce(cluster cvar)

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Parametric survival regression

## Syntax

```
xtstreg [varlist] [if] [in] [weight], distribution(distname) [options]
```

options
Description

Model
noconstant
*distribution(distname)
time
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE/Robust
vce (vcetype)

Reporting
level(\#)
nohr
noshow
noskip
nocnsreport
tratio
display_options
suppress constant term
specify survival distribution
use accelerated failure-time metric
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, robust, cluster clustvar, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
do not report hazard ratios
do not show st setting information
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
report time ratios
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
Integration
intmethod(intmethod)
intpoints (\#)
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints (12)
Maximization
maximize_options
startgrid(numlist)
nodisplay
coeflegend
control the maximization process; seldom used
improve starting value of the random-intercept parameter by performing a grid search
suppress display of header and coefficients
display legend instead of statistics
*distribution (distname) is required.

## distname Description

exponential
loglogistic
llogistic
weibull
lognormal
lnormal
gamma
exponential survival distribution
loglogistic survival distribution
synonym for loglogistic
Weibull survival distribution
lognormal survival distribution
synonym for lognormal
gamma survival distribution

You must stset your data before using xtstreg; see [ST] stset.
A panel variable must be specified. Use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
varlist may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, fp, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
fweights, iweights, and pweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
startgrid, nodisplay, and coeflegend do not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options


distribution(distname) specifies the survival model to be fit. distname is one of the following: exponential, loglogistic, llogistic, weibull, lognormal, lnormal, or gamma. This option is required.
time specifies that the model be fit in the accelerated failure-time metric rather than in the $\log$ relative-hazard metric. This option is valid only for the exponential and Weibull models because these are the only models that have both a proportional-hazards and an accelerated failure-time parameterization. Regardless of metric, the likelihood function is the same, and models are equally appropriate in either metric; it is just a matter of changing interpretation.
time must be specified at estimation.
offset (varname) specifies that varname be included in the fixed-effects portion of the model with the coefficient constrained to be 1 .
constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.

SE/Robust
vce(vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim), that are robust to some kinds of misspecification (robust), that allow for intragroup correlation (cluster clustvar), and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

Specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce(cluster panelvar); see xtstreg and the robust VCE estimator in Methods and formulas.
level(\#); see [R] estimation options.
nohr, which may be specified at estimation or upon redisplaying results, specifies that coefficients rather than exponentiated coefficients be displayed, that is, that coefficients rather than hazard ratios be displayed. This option affects only how coefficients are displayed, not how they are estimated.
This option is valid only for the exponential and Weibull models because they have a natural proportional-hazards parameterization. These two models, by default, report hazards ratios (exponentiated coefficients).
noshow prevents xtstreg from showing the key st variables. This option is rarely used because most users type stset, show or stset, noshow to set once and for all whether they want to see these variables mentioned at the top of the output of every st command; see [ST] stset.
noskip, nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
tratio specifies that exponentiated coefficients, which are interpreted as time ratios, be displayed. tratio is appropriate only for the loglogistic, lognormal, and gamma models or for the exponential and Weibull models when fit in the accelerated failure-time metric.
tratio may be specified at estimation or upon replay.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\% fmt), sformat (\% fint), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\sqrt{\text { Integration }}$
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.

Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate (\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance(\#), nonrtolerance, and from (init_specs); see [R] maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following options are available with xtstreg but are not shown in the dialog box:
startgrid(numlist) performs a grid search to improve the starting value of the random-intercept parameter. No grid search is performed by default unless the starting value is found to be not feasible, in which case xtstreg runs startgrid ( 0.1110 ) and chooses the value that works best. You may already be using a default form of startgrid() without knowing it. If you see xtstreg displaying Grid node 1, Grid node $2, \ldots$ following Grid node 0 in the iteration log, that is xtstreg doing a default search because the original starting value was not feasible.
nodisplay is for programmers. It suppresses the display of the header and the coefficients. coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xtstreg fits random-effects parametric survival-time models. The following discussion relies on the jargon of survival analysis; if you are not familiar with survival-time data or time-to-event data, see Introduction to survival analysis in [ST] survival analysis for an overview of survival analysis in Stata and [ST] Glossary for a glossary of technical terms.
xtstreg is suitable only for data that have been stset as well as xtset. stset weights are not used; instead, weights must be specified at estimation. xtstreg requires "subjects", as defined by option id() in stset, to be nested within panels identified by the panelvar specified in xtset. xtstreg can be used with multiple-record data, but it does not allow delayed entry or gaps.

For a Stata-specific introduction to survival analysis, see Cleves, Gould, and Marchenko (2016). Rabe-Hesketh and Skrondal (2012, chap. 14-15) is a good introductory read on applied longitudinal modeling of survival data.

## Example 1

In example 11 of [ST] streg, we fit a Weibull model with an inverse-Gaussian shared frailty to the recurrence times for catheter-insertion point infection for 38 kidney dialysis patients. In this example, the subjects are the catheter insertions, not the patients themselves. This is a function of how the data were recorded - the onset of risk occurs at the time the catheter is inserted and not, say, at the time of admission of the patient into the study. Thus we have two subjects (insertions) within each panel (patient). Each catheter insertion results in either infection (infect==1) or right-censoring (infect==0). Here we stset the data:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/catheter
(Kidney data, McGilchrist and Aisbett, Biometrics, 1991)
. stset
-> stset time, failure(infect)
    failure event: infect != 0 & infect < .
obs. time interval: (0, time]
    exit on or before: failure
```

| $\begin{array}{r} 76 \\ 0 \end{array}$ | total observations exclusions |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 76 | observations remaining, representing |  |
| 58 | failures in single-record/single-failure data |  |
| 7424 | total analysis time at risk and under observation |  |
|  | at risk from $\mathrm{t}=$ | 0 |
|  | earliest observed entry $\mathrm{t}=$ | 0 |
|  | last observed exit $\mathrm{t}=$ | 562 |

While it is reasonable to assume independence of patients, we would not want to assume that recurrence times within each patient are independent. The model used in [ST] streg allowed us to model the correlation by assuming that it was the result of a latent patient-level effect, or frailty.

Here we use xtstreg to fit a random-effects Weibull model with normally distributed random effects at the patient level. This is done by defining our panels as patients in the dataset.

```
. xtset patient
            panel variable: patient (balanced)
. xtstreg age female, distribution(weibull)
            failure _d: infect
    analysis time _t: time
Fitting comparison model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -1700758.8
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -209.06397
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -105.48579
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -103.51354
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -103.44376
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -103.44362
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -103.44362
Refining starting values:
Grid node 0: log likelihood = -104.9032
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: log likelihood = -104.9032 (not concave)
Iteration 1: log likelihood = -101.98184
Iteration 2: log likelihood = -100.43558
Iteration 3: log likelihood = -98.849674
Iteration 4: log likelihood = -98.743848
Iteration 5: log likelihood = -98.74355
Iteration 6: log likelihood = -98.74355
Random-effects Weibull regression Number of obs = 76
Group variable: patient Number of groups = 38
Obs per group:
```



```
\begin{tabular}{r|rrrrrr}
\hline _t & Haz. Ratio & Std. Err. & z & P>|z| & [95\% Conf. Interval] \\
\hline age & 1.007329 & .0137828 & 0.53 & 0.594 & .9806742 & 1.034708 \\
female & .1910581 & .0999004 & -3.17 & 0.002 & .0685629 & .5324042 \\
_cons & .0073346 & .0072307 & -4.99 & 0.000 & .0010623 & .0506427 \\
\hline /ln_p & .222825 & .1386296 & 1.61 & 0.108 & -.0488841 & .494534 \\
\hline /sigma2_u & .8234584 & .4812598 & & & .2619194 & 2.588902 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
LR test vs. Weibull model: chibar2(01) = 9.40 Prob >= chibar2 = 0.0011
```

The results are similar to those in [ST] streg. The likelihood-ratio test compares the random-effects model with a survival model with fixed effects only. The results support the random-effects model.

For this model, xtstreg displays exponentiated coefficients, labeled as hazard ratios. These hazard ratios should be interpreted as "conditional hazard ratios", that is, conditional on the random effects.

For example, the hazard ratio for age is 1.01 . This means that according to the model, for a given patient, the hazard would increase $1 \%$ with each year of age. However, at the population level, marginal hazards corresponding to different levels of the covariates are not necessarily proportional; see example 5 in [ME] mestreg postestimation for further discussion.

The exponentiated coefficients of covariates that usually remain constant within a panel do not have a natural interpretation as conditional hazard ratios. However, the magnitude of the exponentiated coefficients always gives an idea of the effect of the covariates. In this example, female is constant within the panel. The estimated hazard ratio for female is 0.19 , which indicates that hazard functions for females tend to be smaller than hazard functions for males.

## Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see whether changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints () option, and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xtstreg likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the computations on large problems can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xtstreg stores the following in e():
Scalars
e(N)
e(N_g)
e(k)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(N_clust)
e(chi2)
e(p)
e(ll_c)
e(chi2_c)
e(sigma_u)
e(n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(rank)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
Macros
e(cmd)
e(cmd2)
e(cmdline)
e(depvar)
e(wtype)

```
number of observations
number of groups
number of parameters
number of equations in e(b)
number of equations in overall model test
number of dependent variables
model degrees of freedom
log likelihood
number of clusters
\chi
significance
log likelihood, comparison model
\chi ^ { 2 } \text { , comparison model}
panel-level standard deviation
number of quadrature points
smallest group size
average group size
largest group size
rank of e(V)
number of iterations
return code
1 if converged, 0 otherwise
gsem
xtstreg
command as typed
_t
weight type
```

```
e(wexp)
e(covariates)
e(ivar)
e(model)
e(title)
e(distribution)
e(clustvar)
e(offset)
e(intmethod)
e(n_quad)
e(chi2type)
e(vce)
e(vcetype)
e(frm2)
e(opt)
e(which)
e(ml_method)
e(user)
e(technique)
e(properties)
e(estat_cmd)
e(predict)
e(marginsok)
e(marginswexp)
e(asbalanced)
e(asobserved)
Matrices
    e(b)
    e(Cns)
    e(ilog)
    e(gradient)
    e(V)
    e(V_modelbased)
Functions
    e(sample) marks estimation sample
```


## Methods and formulas

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:
Survival models
xtstreg and the robust VCE estimator

## Survival models

Survival models have a trivariate response $\left(t_{0}, t, d\right)$ :
$t_{0}$ is the starting time under observation $t_{0} \geq 0 ;$
$t$ is the ending time under observation $t \geq t_{0}$; and
$d$ is an indicator for failure $d \in\{0,1\}$.
You must stset your data before using xtstreg; see [ST] stset. By stsetting your data, you define the variables $\_\mathrm{t} 0$, $\_\mathrm{t}$, and $\_\mathrm{d}$, which serve as the trivariate response variable.

Let $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, $j=1, \ldots, n_{i}$, and $\nu_{i}$ s be unobservable panel-level random effects that are independent and identically distributed $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$.

Two often-used models for adjusting survivor functions for the effects of covariates are the accelerated failure-time (AFT) model and the multiplicative or proportional hazards (PH) model.

In the AFT model, the natural logarithm of the survival time, $\log t$, is expressed as a linear function of the covariates; when we incorporate the random effects, this yields the model

$$
\log t_{i j}=\mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i j}
$$

The $1 \times p$ row vector $\mathbf{x}_{i j}$ contains the covariates for the fixed effects, with regression coefficients (fixed effects) $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

The $\epsilon_{i j}$ are the observation-level errors with density $\varphi(\cdot)$. The distributional form of the error term determines the regression model. Five regression models are implemented in xtstreg using the AFT parameterization: exponential, gamma, loglogistic, lognormal, and Weibull. The lognormal regression model is obtained by letting $\varphi(\cdot)$ be the normal density. Similarly, by letting $\varphi(\cdot)$ be the logistic density, one obtains the loglogistic regression. Setting $\varphi(\cdot)$ equal to the extreme-value density yields the exponential and the Weibull regression models.

In the PH models fit by xtstreg, the covariates have a multiplicative effect on the hazard function

$$
h\left(t_{i j}\right)=h_{0}\left(t_{i j}\right) \exp \left(\mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

for some baseline hazard function $h_{0}(t)$. For the xtstreg command, $h_{0}(t)$ is assumed to be parametric. The exponential and Weibull models are implemented in xtstreg for the PH parameterization. These two models are implemented using both the AFT and PH parameterizations.

The survivor function for a given family is the complement of the cumulative distribution function, $S(t)=1-F(t)$. The density for a failure at time $t$ is given by

$$
g(t)=\frac{\partial F(t)}{\partial t}=-\frac{\partial S(t)}{\partial t}
$$

Some distributions contain ancillary parameters that are not denoted here.
The conditional density for a failure at time $t$ is

$$
g\left(t \mid t \geq t_{0}, d=1\right)=g(t) / S\left(t_{0}\right)
$$

and the conditional probability of survival without failure up to time $t$ is

$$
P\left(T \geq t \mid t \geq t_{0}, d=0\right)=S(t) / S\left(t_{0}\right)
$$

The conditional likelihood is given by

$$
L\left(t_{0}, t, d\right)=\left\{\frac{g(t)}{S\left(t_{0}\right)}\right\}^{d}\left\{\frac{S(t)}{S\left(t_{0}\right)}\right\}^{1-d}
$$

See Survival distributions in [SEM] methods and formulas for gsem for the specific density function corresponding to each distribution.

Given the panel-level random effect $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{i}$, the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{t}_{i}=\left(t_{i 1}, \ldots, t_{i n_{i}}\right)^{\prime}$ given $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}=\left(\mathbf{x}_{i 1} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)$ for panel $i$ is

$$
f\left(\mathbf{t}_{i} \mid \boldsymbol{\eta}_{i}\right)=\prod_{j=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(t_{i j} \mid \eta_{i j}\right)
$$

where $f\left(t_{i j} \mid \eta_{i j}\right)$ is the contribution to the likelihood from observation $i j$; that is,

$$
f\left(t_{i j} \mid \eta_{i j}\right)=\left\{\frac{g\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}{S\left(t_{0 i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}\right\}^{d_{i j}}\left\{\frac{S\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}{S\left(t_{0 i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)}\right\}^{1-d_{i j}}
$$

where $g(t \mid \eta)$ and $S(t \mid \eta)$ are, respectively, the density and the survivor function conditional on the linear prediction $\eta$.

As mentioned above, xtstreg does not allow delayed entry or gaps. Therefore, the first observation for a given subject will have a value of $t_{0}=0$, and subsequent spells for the subject must start at the end of the previous spell. That is, if observations $i j$ and $i, j+1$ belong to the same subject, then $t_{0 i, j+1}=t_{i j}$.

Given a normal distribution $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$ for the random effect $\nu_{i}$, the panel-level likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{L}_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_{\nu}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{j=1}^{n_{i}} f\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The integration in (1) has no closed form and thus must be approximated. xtstreg offers two approximation methods: mean-variance adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature (default) and nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature. For details on these integration methods, see [SEM] methods and formulas for gsem. To see how panel-level weights are incorporated into the likelihood function, see Survey data in [SEM] methods and formulas for gsem.

The log likelihood for the entire dataset is simply the sum of the contributions of the $n$ individual panels; namely, $\mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_{\nu}\right)=\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{L}_{i}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_{\nu}\right)$.

Maximization of $\mathcal{L}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_{\nu}\right)$ is performed with respect to ( $\boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma_{\nu}{ }^{2}$ ). Parameter estimates are stored in e(b) as $\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, with the corresponding variance-covariance matrix stored in e(V).

## xtstreg and the robust VCE estimator

Specifying vce (robust) or vce(cluster clustvar) causes the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator to be calculated for the coefficients estimated in this regression. See [P] _robust, particularly Introduction and Methods and formulas. Wooldridge (2016) and Arellano (2003) discuss this application of the Huber/White/sandwich VCE estimator. As discussed by Wooldridge (2016), Stock and Watson (2008), and Arellano (2003), specifying vce(robust) is equivalent to specifying vce (cluster panelvar), where panelvar is the variable that identifies the panels.

Clustering on the panel variable produces a consistent VCE estimator when the disturbances are not identically distributed over the panels or there is serial correlation in $\epsilon_{i t}$.

The cluster-robust VCE estimator requires that there be many clusters and that the disturbances be uncorrelated across the clusters. The panel variable must be nested within the cluster variable because of the within-panel correlation that is generally induced by the random-effects transform when there is heteroskedasticity or within-panel serial correlation in the idiosyncratic errors.
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## Also see

[XT] xtstreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtstreg
[XT] quadchk - Check sensitivity of quadrature approximation
[XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
[ME] mestreg - Multilevel mixed-effects parametric survival models
[ST] streg - Parametric survival models
[ST] stset - Declare data to be survival-time data
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtstreg postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtstreg

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation command is of special interest after xtstreg:
Command Description
stcurve plot the survivor, hazard, and cumulative hazard functions

The following standard postestimation commands are also available:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lincom | likelihood-ratio test |
| margins | marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| marginsplot | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| nlcom | predictions, residuals, influence statistics, and other diagnostic measures <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for generalized predictions |
| predict | pairwise comparisons of estimates <br> predictnl <br> pwcompare <br> test |
| testnl | Wald tests of simple and composite linear hypotheses nonlinear hypotheses |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, mean and median survival times, hazard functions, and standard errors.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```

statistic Description

Main
xb
mean
mean0
median0
hazard
hazard0
surv
surv0
stdp
linear prediction; the default
marginal mean survival time
mean survival time assuming that the random effects are zero
median survival time assuming that the random effects are zero
marginal hazard
hazard assuming that the random effects are zero
marginal predicted survivor function
predicted survivor function assuming that the random effects are zero
standard error of the linear prediction

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e(sample)... if wanted only for the estimation sample.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction.
mean calculates the mean survival time that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the statistic is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
mean0 calculates the mean survival time assuming that all random effects are zero.
median0 calculates the median survival time assuming that all random effects are zero.
hazard calculates the hazard function at _to that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the statistic is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
hazard0 calculates the hazard function at _t0, assuming that all random effects are zero.
surv calculates the predicted survivor function at _t0 that is marginal with respect to the random effect, which means that the statistic is calculated by integrating the prediction function with respect to the random effect over its entire support.
surv0 calculates the predicted survivor function at _t0, assuming that all random effects are zero. stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction.
nooffset is relevant only if you specified offset (varname) with xtstreg. This option modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than as $\mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i j}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions and mean and median survival times.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins


margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [predict(statistic ...)...] [options]
statistic

| mean | marginal mean survival time; the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| mean0 | mean survival time conditional on zero random effects |
| median0 | median survival time conditional on zero random effects |
| hazard | marginal hazard |
| surv | marginal predicted survivor function |
| xb | linear predictor for the fixed portion of the model only |
| hazard0 | not allowed with margins |
| surv0 | not allowed with margins |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |

## Remarks and examples

## > Example 1

In example 1 of [XT] xtstreg, we analyzed the time to infection of the catheter-insertion point for 38 kidney dialysis patients. We fit the following model:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/catheter
(Kidney data, McGilchrist and Aisbett, Biometrics, 1991)
. xtset patient
    (output omitted)
. xtstreg age female, distribution(weibull)
    (output omitted)
```

The predict command allows us to compute the marginal mean and the mean and median survival time assuming that all random effects are zero:

```
. predict mean, mean
. predict mean0, mean0
. predict median0, median0
```

Here we list the predicted mean and median survival times for the first five patients:
. list patient mean mean0 median0 in $1 / 10$, sepby (patient)

|  | patient | mean | mean0 | median0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1 | 60.97527 | 40.39634 | 32.34459 |
| 2. | 1 | 60.97527 | 40.39634 | 32.34459 |
| 3. | 2 | 204.0082 | 135.1562 | 108.217 |
| 4. | 2 | 204.0082 | 135.1562 | 108.217 |
| 5. | 3 | 59.56654 | 39.46305 | 31.59731 |
| 6. | 3 | 59.56654 | 39.46305 | 31.59731 |
| 7. | 4 | 224.6581 | 148.8368 | 119.1708 |
| 8. | 4 | 224.6581 | 148.8368 | 119.1708 |
| 9. | 5 | 67.7384 | 44.87694 | 35.93212 |
| 10. | 5 | 67.7384 | 44.87694 | 35.93212 |

This example illustrates that for nonlinear models, the mean computed with the random effects equal to zero is usually not representative of the marginal mean.
predict can also compute the predicted survivor function and the predicted hazard function. All of these predictions can be marginal or conditional on the random effects being zero.

Predicted survivor, hazard, or cumulative hazard functions can be visualized with stcurve. For example, below we compute marginal predictions for the survivor function for men and women at age 50 .

```
. stcurve, survival at1(age=50 female=0) at2(age=50 female=1)
(option marginal assumed)
```



The graph above shows that women who are 50 years old have larger survival probabilities than men of the same age.

## Methods and formulas

predict newvar computes the following predictions:
mean0:

$$
\text { newvar }_{i j}=\int_{0}^{\infty} \widehat{S}\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right) d t
$$

median0:

$$
\text { newvar }_{i j}=\left\{t: \widehat{S}\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right)=1 / 2\right\}
$$

surv0:

$$
\text { newvar }_{i j}=\widehat{S}\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right)
$$

hazard0:

$$
\text { newvar }_{i j}=\widehat{g}\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right) / \widehat{S}\left(t_{i j} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right)
$$

Here $\widehat{S}\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right)$ is the survivor function $S\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+u_{i j}\right)$, and $\widehat{g}\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j}, u_{i j}\right)$ is the density $g\left(t \mid \mathbf{x}_{i j} \boldsymbol{\beta}+u_{i j}\right)$ with the parameter estimates substituted in for $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and zero substituted for $u_{i j}$.

## Also see

[XT] xtstreg - Random-effects parametric survival models
[ST] stcurve - Plot survivor, hazard, cumulative hazard, or cumulative incidence function
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtsum - Summarize xt data

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Remarks and examples | Stored results | Also see |  |

## Description

xtsum, a generalization of summarize (see [R] summarize), reports means and standard deviations for panel data; it differs from summarize in that it decomposes the standard deviation into between and within components.

## Quick start

Report means and overall, between, and within standard deviations for all numeric variables in xtset data xtsum

As above, but restrict to v1, v2, and v3
xtsum v1 v2 v3
As above, but calculate statistics separately for each level of catvar
bysort catvar: xtsum v1 v2 v3

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Summarize xt data

## Syntax

xtsum [varlist] [if]
A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
varlist may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by is allowed; see [D] by.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
xtsum provides an alternative to summarize. For instance, in the nlswork dataset described in [XT] xt, hours contains the usual hours worked:

xtsum provides the same information as summarize and more. It decomposes the variable $x_{i t}$ into a between ( $\bar{x}_{i}$ ) and within ( $x_{i t}-\bar{x}_{i}+\overline{\bar{x}}$, the global mean $\overline{\bar{x}}$ being added back in make results comparable). The overall and within are calculated over 28,467 person-years of data. The between is calculated over 4,710 persons, and the average number of years a person was observed in the hours data is 6 .
xtsum also reports minimums and maximums. Hours worked last week varied between 1 and (unbelievably) 168. Average hours worked last week for each woman varied between 1 and 83.5. "Hours worked within" varied between -2.15 and 130.1 , which is not to say that any woman actually worked negative hours. The within number refers to the deviation from each individual's average, and naturally, some of those deviations must be negative. Then the negative value is not disturbing but the positive value is. Did some woman really deviate from her average by +130.1 hours? No. In our definition of within, we add back in the global average of 36.6 hours. Some woman did deviate from her average by $130.1-36.6=93.5$ hours, which is still large.

The reported standard deviations tell us something that may surprise you. They say that the variation in hours worked last week across women is nearly equal to that observed within a woman over time. That is, if you were to draw two women randomly from our data, the difference in hours worked is expected to be nearly equal to the difference for the same woman in two randomly selected years.

If a variable does not vary over time, its within standard deviation will be zero:
. xtsum birth_yr

| Variable | Mean | Std. Dev. | Min | Max | Observations |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| birth_yr overall | 48.08509 | 3.012837 | 41 | 54 | $\mathrm{~N}=$ |
| between |  | 3.051795 | 41 | 54 | $\mathrm{n}=$ |
| within | 0 | 48.08509 | 48.08509 | T-bar $=6.05689$ |  |

## Stored results

xtsum stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars

| $r(N)$ | number of observations |
| :--- | :--- |
| $r(n)$ | number of panels |
| $r(\operatorname{Tbar})$ | average number of years under observation |
| $r(\operatorname{mean})$ | mean |
| $r(\operatorname{sd})$ | overall standard deviation |
| $r(\min )$ | overall minimum |
| $r(\max )$ | overall maximum |
| $r\left(\operatorname{sd\_ b}\right)$ | between standard deviation |
| $r\left(\min \_b\right)$ | between minimum |
| $r\left(\max \_b\right)$ | between maximum |
| $r\left(\operatorname{sd\_ w}\right)$ | within standard deviation |
| $r(\min -w)$ | within minimum |
| $r(\max -w)$ | within maximum |

## Also see

[XT] xtdescribe - Describe pattern of xt data
[XT] xttab - Tabulate xt data

## Title

xttab - Tabulate xt data

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Option | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Also see |

## Description

xttab, a generalization of tabulate (see [R] tabulate oneway), performs one-way tabulations and decomposes counts into between and within components in panel data.
xttrans, another generalization of tabulate (see [R] tabulate oneway), reports transition probabilities (the change in one categorical variable over time).

## Quick start

Overall, between, and within one-way tabulation of v1 using xtset data xttab v1

Report transition probabilities for v 2
xttrans v2
Add frequency of transitions
xttrans v2, freq
As above, but for each level of catvar
bysort catvar: xttrans v2, freq

## Menu

xttab
Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Tabulate xt data

## xttrans

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Setup and utilities $>$ Report transition probabilities

## Syntax

xttab varname [if]
xttrans varname [if] [, freq]
A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
by is allowed with xttab and xttrans; see [D] by.

## Option

$\xrightarrow{\text { Main }}$
freq, allowed with xttrans only, specifies that frequencies as well as transition probabilities be displayed.

## Remarks and examples

If you have not read [XT] xt, please do so.
> Example 1: xttab
Using the nlswork dataset described in [XT] xt, variable msp is 1 if a woman is married and her spouse resides with her, and 0 otherwise:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xttab msp
```

|  | Overall |  | Between |  | Within |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| msp | Freq. | Percent | Freq. | Percent | Percent |
| 0 | 11324 | 39.71 | 3113 | 66.08 | 62.69 |
| 1 | 17194 | 60.29 | 3643 | 77.33 | 75.75 |
| Total | 28518 | 100.00 | (n $=4756$ | 143.41 | 69.73 |

The overall part of the table summarizes results in terms of person-years. We have 11,324 person-years of data in which msp is 0 and 17,194 in which it is 1 -in $60.3 \%$ of our data, the woman is married with her spouse present. Between repeats the breakdown, but this time in terms of women rather than person-years; 3,113 of our women ever had msp 0 and 3,643 ever had msp 1, for a grand total of 6,756 ever having either. We have in our data, however, only 4,711 women. This means that there are women who sometimes have msp 0 and at other times have msp 1 .

The within percent tells us the fraction of the time a woman has the specified value of msp. If we take the first line, conditional on a woman ever having msp $0,62.7 \%$ of her observations have msp 0 . Similarly, conditional on a woman ever having msp 1, $75.8 \%$ of her observations have msp 1 . These two numbers are a measure of the stability of the msp values, and, in fact, msp 1 is more stable among these younger women than msp 0 , meaning that they tend to marry more than they divorce. The total within of $69.75 \%$ is the normalized between weighted average of the within percents, that is, $(3113 \times 62.69+3643 \times 75.75) / 6756$. It is a measure of the overall stability of the msp variable.

A time-invariant variable will have a tabulation with within percents of 100 :
. xttab race

|  | Overall |  | Between |  | Within |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| race | Freq. | Percent | Freq. | Percent | Percent |
| white | 20180 | 70.72 | 3329 | 70.66 | 100.00 |
| black | 8051 | 28.22 | 1325 | 28.13 | 100.00 |
| other | 303 | 1.06 | 57 | 1.21 | 100.00 |
| Total | 28534 | 100.00 | 4711 | 100.00 | 100.00 |

## > Example 2: xttrans

xttrans shows the transition probabilities. In cross-sectional time-series data, we can estimate the probability that $x_{i, t+1}=v_{2}$ given that $x_{i t}=v_{1}$ by counting transitions. For instance

| . xttrans msp |  |  |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 if <br> married, <br> spouse <br> present | if married, spouse <br> present <br> 0 | 1 |  |
| 0 | 80.49 | 19.51 | 100.00 |
| 1 | 7.96 | 92.04 | 100.00 |
| Total | 37.11 | 62.89 | 100.00 |

The rows reflect the initial values, and the columns reflect the final values. Each year, some $80 \%$ of the msp 0 persons in the data remained msp 0 in the next year; the remaining $20 \%$ became msp 1 . Although msp 0 had a $20 \%$ chance of becoming msp 1 in each year, the msp 1 had only an $8 \%$ chance of becoming (or returning to) msp 0 . The freq option displays the frequencies that go into the calculation:

| $\begin{array}{r} 1 \text { if } \\ \text { married, } \\ \text { spouse } \\ \text { present } \end{array}$ | 1 if married, spouse present 0 |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 7,697 | 1,866 | 9,563 |
|  | 80.49 | 19.51 | 100.00 |
| 1 | 1,133 | 13,100 | 14,233 |
|  | 7.96 | 92.04 | 100.00 |
| Total | 8,830 | 14,966 | 23,796 |
|  | 37.11 | 62.89 | 100.00 |

## - Technical note

The transition probabilities reported by xttrans are not necessarily the transition probabilities in a Markov sense. xttrans counts transitions from each observation to the next once the observations have been put in $t$ order within $i$. It does not normalize for missing periods. xttrans does pay attention to missing values of the variable being tabulated, however, and does not count transitions from nonmissing to missing or from missing to nonmissing. Thus if the data are fully rectangularized, xttrans produces (inefficient) estimates of the Markov transition matrix. fillin will rectangularize datasets; see [D] fillin. Thus the Markov transition matrix could be estimated by typing

```
. fillin idcode year
. xttrans msp
(output omitted)
```


## Stored results

xttab stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars
$r(n) \quad$ number of panels
Matrices
$r$ (results) results matrix

## Also see

[XT] xtdescribe - Describe pattern of xt data
[XT] xtsum - Summarize xt data

## Title

xttobit — Random-effects tobit models

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| References | Also see |  |  |

## Description

xttobit fits random-effects tobit models for panel data where the outcome variable is censored. Censoring limits may be fixed for all observations or vary across observations. The user can request that a likelihood-ratio test comparing the panel tobit model with the pooled tobit model be conducted at estimation time.

## Quick start

Tobit model of $y$ on $x$ where $y$ is censored at a lower limit of 5 using xtset data xttobit $\mathrm{y} x, \mathrm{ll}(5)$

Add indicators for levels of categorical variable a
xttobit y x i.a, ll(5)
As above, but specify that censoring occurs at 5 and 25
xttobit y x i.a, ll(5) ul(25)
As above, but where lower and upper are variables containing the censoring limits xttobit y x i.a, ll(lower) ul(upper)

Add likelihood-ratio test comparing the random-effects model with the pooled model xttobit y x i.a, ll(lower) ul(upper) tobit

## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Censored outcomes $>$ Tobit regression (RE)

## Syntax

> xttobit depvar [indepvars][if][in][weight][,options]
options

## Model

noconstant
ll(varname|\#)
ul (varname|\#)
offset (varname)
constraints (constraints)
collinear
SE
vce (vcetype)
Reporting
level(\#)
tobit
noskip
nocnsreport
display_options

Description
suppress constant term
left-censoring variable/limit
right-censoring variable/limit
include varname in model with coefficient constrained to 1
apply specified linear constraints
keep collinear variables
vcetype may be oim, bootstrap, or jackknife
set confidence level; default is level (95)
perform likelihood-ratio test comparing against pooled tobit model
perform overall model test as a likelihood-ratio test
do not display constraints
control columns and column formats, row spacing, line width, display of omitted variables and base and empty cells, and factor-variable labeling
integration method; intmethod may be mvaghermite (the default) or ghermite
use \# quadrature points; default is intpoints(12)
control the maximization process; seldom used
display legend instead of statistics

A panel variable must be specified; use xtset; see [XT] xtset.
indepvars may contain factor variables; see [U] 11.4.3 Factor variables.
depvar and indepvars may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.
by, $f p$, and statsby are allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.
iweights are allowed; see [U] 11.1.6 weight. Weights must be constant within panel.
coeflegend does not appear in the dialog box.
See [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands for more capabilities of estimation commands.

## Options

Model
noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
11 (varname|\#) and ul (varname|\#) indicate the censoring points. You may specify one or both. 11() indicates the lower limit for left-censoring. Observations with depvar $\leq 11$ () are left-censored, observations with depvar $\geq \mathrm{ul}$ () are right-censored, and remaining observations are not censored. offset (varname), constraints (constraints), collinear; see [R] estimation options.
vce (vcetype) specifies the type of standard error reported, which includes types that are derived from asymptotic theory (oim) and that use bootstrap or jackknife methods (bootstrap, jackknife); see [XT] vce_options.

## Reporting

level (\#); see [R] estimation options.
tobit specifies that a likelihood-ratio test comparing the random-effects model with the pooled (tobit) model be included in the output.
noskip; see [R] estimation options.
nocnsreport; see [R] estimation options.
display_options: noci, nopvalues, noomitted, vsquish, noemptycells, baselevels, allbaselevels, nofvlabel, fvwrap(\#), fvwrapon(style), cformat (\%fmt), pformat (\%fmt), sformat (\% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Integration
intmethod(intmethod), intpoints(\#); see [R] estimation options.
$\qquad$ Maximization
maximize_options: difficult, technique (algorithm_spec), iterate(\#), [no] log, trace, gradient, showstep, hessian, showtolerance, tolerance(\#), ltolerance(\#), nrtolerance (\#), nonrtolerance, and from(init_specs); see [ R$]$ maximize. These options are seldom used.

The following option is available with xttobit but is not shown in the dialog box: coeflegend; see $[R]$ estimation options.

## Remarks and examples

xttobit fits random-effects tobit models. There is no command for a fixed-effects model, because there does not exist a sufficient statistic allowing the fixed effects to be conditioned out of the likelihood.

Consider the linear regression model with panel-level random effects

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

for $i=1, \ldots, n$ panels, where $t=1, \ldots, n_{i}$. The random effects, $\nu_{i}$, are i.i.d., $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, and $\epsilon_{i t}$ are i.i.d. $N\left(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}\right)$ independently of $\nu_{i}$.

The observed data, $y_{i t}^{o}$, represent possibly censored versions of $y_{i t}$. If they are left-censored, all that is known is that $y_{i t} \leq y_{i t}^{o}$. If they are right-censored, all that is known is that $y_{i t} \geq y_{i t}^{o}$. If they are uncensored, $y_{i t}=y_{i t}^{o}$. If they are left-censored, $y_{i t}^{o}$ is determined by ll(). If they are right-censored, $y_{i t}^{o}$ is determined by ul(). If they are uncensored, $y_{i t}^{o}$ is determined by depvar.

## > Example 1: Random-effects tobit regression

Using the nlswork data described in [XT] xt, we fit a random-effects tobit model of adjusted (log) wages. We use the ul () option to impose an upper limit on the recorded $\log$ of wages.

| Random-effects tobit regression | Number of obs |  | 19,224 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Group variable: idcode | Number of groups |  | 4,148 |
| Random effects u_i ~ Gaussian | Obs per group: |  | 1 |
|  | avg |  | 4.6 |
|  | ma |  | 12 |
| Integration method: mvaghermite | Integration pts. |  | 12 |
|  | Wald chi2(7) |  | 2925.68 |
| Log likelihood = -6814.4606 | Prob > chi2 |  | 0.0000 |


| ln_wage | Coef. | Std. Err. | $z$ | $\mathrm{P}>\|\mathrm{z}\|$ | [95\% Conf. Interval] |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1.union | .1430527 | .0069718 | 20.52 | 0.000 | .1293883 | .1567171 |
| age | .0099132 | .0017516 | 5.66 | 0.000 | .0064801 | .0133464 |
| grade | .0784855 | .0022764 | 34.48 | 0.000 | .0740239 | .0829472 |
| not_smsa | -.1339978 | .009206 | -14.56 | 0.000 | -.1520413 | -.1159544 |
| 1.south | -.3507188 | .0695554 | -5.04 | 0.000 | -.4870449 | -.2143928 |
| year | -.0008285 | .0018371 | -0.45 | 0.652 | -.0044292 | .0027721 |
| south\#c.year |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | .0031938 | .0008606 | 3.71 | 0.000 | .0015071 | .0048805 |
| _cons | .5101956 | .1006646 | 5.07 | 0.000 | .3128966 | .7074946 |
| /sigma_u | .3045992 | .0048344 | 63.01 | 0.000 | .2951239 | .3140745 |
| /sigma_e | .2488678 | .0018254 | 136.34 | 0.000 | .24529 | .2524455 |
| rho | .5996844 | .0084095 |  |  | .583118 | .6160734 |

LR test of sigma_u=0: chibar2 $(01)=6650.63 \quad$ Prob $>=$ chibar2 $=0.000$

| 0 | left-censored observations |
| ---: | ---: |
| 12,334 | uncensored observations |
| 6,890 | right-censored observations |

The results from a tobit regression can be interpreted as we would those from a linear regression. Because the dependent variable is log transformed, the coefficients can be interpreted in terms of a percentage change. We see, for example, that on average, union members make $14.3 \%$ more than nonunion members.

The output also includes the overall and panel-level variance components (labeled sigma_e and sigma_u, respectively) together with $\rho$ (labeled rho)

$$
\rho=\frac{\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}+\sigma_{\nu}^{2}}
$$

which is the percent contribution to the total variance of the panel-level variance component.
When rho is zero, the panel-level variance component is unimportant, and the panel estimator is not different from the pooled estimator. A likelihood-ratio test of this is included at the bottom of the output. This test formally compares the pooled estimator (tobit) with the panel estimator. In this case, we reject the null hypothesis that there are no panel-level effects.

- Technical note

The random-effects model is calculated using quadrature, which is an approximation whose accuracy depends partially on the number of integration points used. We can use the quadchk command to see if changing the number of integration points affects the results. If the results change, the quadrature approximation is not accurate given the number of integration points. Try increasing the number of integration points using the intpoints() option and run quadchk again. Do not attempt to interpret the results of estimates when the coefficients reported by quadchk differ substantially. See [XT] quadchk for details and [XT] xtprobit for an example.

Because the xttobit likelihood function is calculated by Gauss-Hermite quadrature, on large problems the computations can be slow. Computation time is roughly proportional to the number of points used for the quadrature.

## Stored results

xttobit stores the following in e():

## Scalars

e(N)
e(N_g)
e(N_unc)
e(N_lc)
e(N_rc)
e(N_cd)
e(k)
e(k_eq)
e(k_eq_model)
e(k_dv)
e(df_m)
e(11)
e(11_0)
e(chi2)
e(chi2_c)
e(rho)
e(sigma_u)
e(sigma_e)
$e$ (n_quad)
e(g_min)
e(g_avg)
e(g_max)
e(p)
e(rank)
e(rankO)
e(ic)
e(rc)
e(converged)
> number of observations
> number of groups
> number of uncensored observations
> number of left-censored observations
> number of right-censored observations
> number of completely determined observations
> number of parameters
> number of equations in $e(b)$
> number of equations in overall model test
> number of dependent variables
> model degrees of freedom
> log likelihood
> log likelihood, constant-only model
> $\chi_{2}^{2}$
> $\chi^{2}$ for comparison test
> $\rho$
> panel-level standard deviation
> standard deviation of $\epsilon_{i t}$
> number of quadrature points
> smallest group size
> average group size
> largest group size
> significance
> rank of $e(V)$
> rank of $e(V)$ for constant-only model
> number of iterations
> return code
> 1 if converged, 0 otherwise

Macros

```
e(cmd)
    e(cmdline)
    e(depvar)
    e(ivar)
    e(llopt)
    e(ulopt)
    e(k_aux)
    e(wtype)
    e(wexp)
    e(title)
    e(offset1)
```

    e(chi2type)
    e(chi2_ct)
    e(vce)
    e(vcetype)
    e(intmethod)
    e(distrib)
    e(opt)
    e(which)
    e(ml_method)
    e(user)
    e(technique)
    e(properties)
    e(predict)
    e(marginsok)
    e(asbalanced)
    e(asobserved)
    Matrices
e(b)
e(Cns)
e(ilog)
e(gradient)
e(V)
xttobit
command as typed
names of dependent variables
variable denoting groups
contents of 11() , if specified contents of ul(), if specified number of auxiliary parameters weight type weight expression title in estimation output
offset
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test
Wald or LR; type of model $\chi^{2}$ test corresponding to e(chi2_c)
vcetype specified in vce()
title used to label Std. Err.
integration method
Gaussian; the distribution of the random effect
type of optimization
max or min; whether optimizer is to perform maximization or minimization type of ml method
name of likelihood-evaluator program
maximization technique

## b V

program used to implement predict
predictions allowed by margins
factor variables fvset as asbalanced
factor variables fvset as asobserved
coefficient vector
constraints matrix
iteration $\log$
gradient vector
variance-covariance matrix of the estimator
Functions
e(sample) marks estimation sample

## Methods and formulas

Assuming a normal distribution, $N\left(0, \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right)$, for the random effects $\nu_{i}$, we have the joint (unconditional of $\nu_{i}$ ) density of the observed data from the $i$ th panel

$$
f\left(y_{i 1}^{o}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}}^{o} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}^{o}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i}
$$

where

$$
F\left(y_{i t}^{o}, \Delta_{i t}\right)= \begin{cases}\left(\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\epsilon}\right)^{-1} e^{-\left(y_{i t}^{o}-\Delta_{i t}\right)^{2} /\left(2 \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}\right)} & \text { if } y_{i t}^{o} \in C \\ \Phi\left(\frac{y_{i t}^{o}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right) & \text { if } y_{i t}^{o} \in L \\ 1-\Phi\left(\frac{y_{i t}^{o}-\Delta_{i t}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}}\right) & \text { if } y_{i t}^{o} \in R\end{cases}
$$

where $C$ is the set of noncensored observations, $L$ is the set of left-censored observations, $R$ is the set of right-censored observations, and $\Phi()$ is the cumulative normal distribution.

The panel level likelihood $l_{i}$ is given by

$$
\begin{gathered}
l_{i}=\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu_{i}^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\left\{\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}^{o}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)\right\} d \nu_{i} \\
\equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right) d \nu_{i}
\end{gathered}
$$

This integral can be approximated with $M$-point Gauss-Hermite quadrature

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-x^{2}} h(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} h\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

This is equivalent to

$$
\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x) d x \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} f\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)
$$

where the $w_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature weights and the $a_{m}^{*}$ denote the quadrature abscissas. The log likelihood, $L$, is the sum of the logs of the panel level likelihoods $l_{i}$.

The default approximation of the log likelihood is by adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, which approximates the panel level likelihood with

$$
l_{i} \approx \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ are the adaptive parameters for panel $i$. Therefore, with the definition of $g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \nu_{i}\right)$, the total $\log$ likelihood is approximated by

$$
\begin{align*}
& L \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} \frac{\exp \left\{-\left(\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)^{2} / 2 \sigma_{\nu}^{2}\right\}}{\sqrt{2 \pi} \sigma_{\nu}}\right. \\
&\left.\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i}\right)\right] \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $w_{i}$ is the user-specified weight for panel $i$; if no weights are specified, $w_{i}=1$.
The default method of adaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature is to calculate the posterior mean and variance and use those parameters for $\widehat{\mu}_{i}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i}$ by following the method of Naylor and Smith (1982), further discussed in Skrondal and Rabe-Hesketh (2004). We start with $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, 0}=1$ and $\widehat{\mu}_{i, 0}=0$, and the posterior means and variances are updated in the $k$ th iteration. That is, at the $k$ th iteration of the optimization for $l_{i}$ we use

$$
\left.l_{i, k} \approx \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1}\right)
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{gathered}
\tau_{i, m, k-1}=\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} a_{m}^{*}+\widehat{\mu}_{i, k-1} \\
\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right) \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}
\end{gathered}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}=\sum_{m=1}^{M}\left(\tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)^{2} \frac{\sqrt{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{i, k-1} w_{m}^{*} \exp \left\{\left(a_{m}^{*}\right)^{2}\right\} g\left(y_{i t}^{o}, x_{i t}, \tau_{i, m, k-1}\right)}{l_{i, k}}-\left(\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}\right)^{2}
$$

and this is repeated until $\widehat{\mu}_{i, k}$ and $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, k}$ have converged for this iteration of the maximization algorithm. This adaptation is applied on every iteration until the log-likelihood change from the preceding iteration is less than a relative difference of $1 \mathrm{e}-6$; after this, the quadrature parameters are fixed.

The log likelihood can also be calculated by nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature if the intmethod (ghermite) option is specified. For nonadaptive Gauss-Hermite quadrature, the following formula for the log likelihood is used in place of (1).

$$
\begin{aligned}
L & =\sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left\{\operatorname{Pr}\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i n_{i}} \mid \mathbf{x}_{i 1}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{i n_{i}}\right)\right\} \\
& \approx \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_{i} \log \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \sum_{m=1}^{M} w_{m}^{*} \prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left\{y_{i t}^{o}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\sqrt{2} \sigma_{\nu} a_{m}^{*}\right\}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

Both quadrature formulas require that the integrated function be well approximated by a polynomial of degree equal to the number of quadrature points. Panel size can affect whether

$$
\prod_{t=1}^{n_{i}} F\left(y_{i t}^{o}, \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}\right)
$$

is well approximated by a polynomial. As panel size and $\rho$ increase, the quadrature approximation can become less accurate. For large $\rho$, the random-effects model can also become unidentified. Adaptive quadrature gives better results for correlated data and large panels than nonadaptive quadrature; however, we recommend that you use the quadchk command (see [XT] quadchk) to verify the quadrature approximation used in this command, whichever approximation you choose.
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## Title

xttobit postestimation - Postestimation tools for xttobit

| Postestimation commands | predict | margins |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | Remarks and examples

## Postestimation commands

The following postestimation commands are available after xttobit:

| Command | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| contrast | contrasts and ANOVA-style joint tests of estimates |
| estat ic | Akaike's and Schwarz's Bayesian information criteria (AIC and BIC) |
| estat summarize | summary statistics for the estimation sample <br> estat vce |
| variance-covariance matrix of the estimators (VCE) |  |
| estimates | cataloging estimation results |
| forecast | dynamic forecasts and simulations |
| hausman | Hausman's specification test <br> point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for linear combinations <br> of coefficients |
| lrtest | likelihood-ratio test <br> marginal means, predictive margins, marginal effects, and average marginal <br> effects |
| margins | graph the results from margins (profile plots, interaction plots, etc.) |
| marginsplot | point estimates, standard errors, testing, and inference for nonlinear combinations |
| of coefficients |  |

## predict

## Description for predict

predict creates a new variable containing predictions such as linear predictions, standard errors, probabilities, and expected values.

## Menu for predict

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for predict

```
predict [type] newvar [if] [in] [, statistic nooffset]
```


## statistic Description

| Main |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| xb | linear prediction; the default |
| stdp | standard error of the linear prediction |
| stdf | standard error of the linear forecast |
| $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| $\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ | $E(y \mid a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| ystar $(a, b)$ | $E\left(y^{*}\right), y^{*}=\max \{a, \min (y, b)\}$, marginal with respect to the random effect |

These statistics are available both in and out of sample; type predict ... if e (sample) ... if wanted only for the estimation sample.
where $a$ and $b$ may be numbers or variables; $a$ missing ( $a \geq$.) means $-\infty$, and $b$ missing ( $b \geq$.) means $+\infty$; see [U] 12.2.1 Missing values.

## Options for predict

$\qquad$ Main
xb , the default, calculates the linear prediction $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ using the estimated fixed effects (coefficients) in the model. This is equivalent to fixing all random effects in the model to their theoretical (prior) mean value of zero.
stdp calculates the standard error of the linear prediction. It can be thought of as the standard error of the predicted expected value or mean for the observation's covariate pattern. The standard error of the prediction is also referred to as the standard error of the fitted value.
stdf calculates the standard error of the linear forecast. This is the standard error of the point prediction for 1 observation. It is commonly referred to as the standard error of the future or forecast value. By construction, the standard errors produced by stdf are always larger than those produced by stdp; see Methods and formulas in [R] regress.
$\operatorname{pr}(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $\operatorname{Pr}\left(a<y<b \mid \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, which is the probability that $y$ would be observed in the interval $(a, b)$, given the current values of the predictors, $\mathbf{x}_{i t}$. The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function. In the discussion that follows, these two conditions are implied.
$a$ and $b$ may be specified as numbers or variable names; $l b$ and $u b$ are variable names;
$\operatorname{pr}(20,30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<30)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(l b, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(l b<y<u b)$; and
$\operatorname{pr}(20, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<u b)$.
$a$ missing $(a \geq$.$) means -\infty ; \operatorname{pr}(., 30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(-\infty<y<30)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(l b, 30)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(-\infty<y<30)$ in observations for which $l b \geq$.
(and calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(l b<y<30)$ elsewhere).
$b$ missing $(b \geq$.$) means +\infty$; $\operatorname{pr}(20,$.$) calculates \operatorname{Pr}(+\infty>y>20)$;
$\operatorname{pr}(20, u b)$ calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(+\infty>y>20)$ in observations for which $u b \geq$.
(and calculates $\operatorname{Pr}(20<y<u b)$ elsewhere).
$\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $E\left(y \mid a<y<b, \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, which is the expected value of $y$ conditional on $y$ being in the interval $(a, b)$, meaning that $y$ is truncated. $a$ and $b$ are specified as they are for pr() . The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function.
ystar $(a, b)$ calculates estimates of $E\left(y^{*} \mid \mathbf{x}=\mathbf{x}_{i t}\right)$, where $y^{*}=a$ if $y \leq a, y^{*}=b$ if $y \geq b$, and $y^{*}=y$ otherwise, meaning that $y^{*}$ is the censored version of $y . a$ and $b$ are specified as they are for pr() . The predictions are calculated marginally with respect to the random effect. That is, the random effect is integrated out of the prediction function.
nooffset is relevant only if you specify offset (varname) for xttobit. It modifies the calculations made by predict so that they ignore the offset variable; the linear prediction is treated as $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ rather than $\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+$ offset $_{i t}$.

## margins

## Description for margins

margins estimates margins of response for linear predictions, probabilities, and expected values.

## Menu for margins

Statistics $>$ Postestimation

## Syntax for margins

```
margins [marginlist] [, options]
margins [marginlist] , predict(statistic ...) [\underline{predict(statistic ...) ...] [options]}]
```

statistic Description

| xb | linear prediction, the default |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$ | $\operatorname{Pr}(a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| $\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ | $E(y \mid a<y<b)$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| ystar $(a, b)$ | $E\left(y^{*}\right), y^{*}=\max \{a, \min (y, b)\}$, marginal with respect to the random effect |
| stdp | not allowed with margins |
| stdf | not allowed with margins |

Statistics not allowed with margins are functions of stochastic quantities other than e(b). For the full syntax, see [R] margins.

## Remarks and examples

> Example 1: Average marginal probabilities at specified covariate values
In example 1 of [XT] xttobit, we fit a random-effects model of wages. Say that we want to know how union membership status affects the probability that a worker's wage will be "low", where low means a $\log$ wage that is less than the 20th percentile of all observations in our dataset. First, we use centile to find the 20th percentile of $\ln$ _wage:

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/nlswork3
(National Longitudinal Survey. Young Women 14-26 years of age in 1968)
. xttobit ln_wage i.union age grade not_smsa south##c.year, ul(1.9)
(output omitted)
. centile ln_wage, centile(20)
\begin{tabular}{c|rcccc} 
Variable & Obs & Percentile & Centile & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ [95\% Bom. Interp. - Conf. Interval] } \\
\hline [9n_wage & 28,534 & 20 & 1.301507 & 1.297063 & 1.308635
\end{tabular}
```

Now, we use margins to obtain the effect of union status on the probability that the log of wages is in the bottom $20 \%$ of women. Given the results from centile, that corresponds to the log of wages being below 1.30. We evaluate the effect for two groups: 1) women age 30 living in the south in 1988 who graduated from high school but had no more schooling and 2) the same group of women who instead graduated from college (grade=16).


Note: dy/dx for factor levels is the discrete change from the base level.
For the first group of women, according to our fitted model, being in a union lowers the probability of being classified as a low-wage worker by almost 10 percentage points. Being a college graduate attenuates this effect to just above 3.7 percentage points.

## Methods and formulas

The following uses the notation introduced in Remarks and examples of [XT] xttobit.
The marginal probability that $y_{i t}$ is observed in the interval $\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right)$, obtained by specifying the option $\mathrm{pr}(a, b)$, is calculated as

$$
\begin{align*}
\operatorname{pr}\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right) & =\operatorname{Pr}\left(\ell \ell_{i t}<\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}<u \ell_{i t}\right) \\
& =\Phi\left(\frac{u \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{\ell \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right) \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}$ is the square root of the estimated marginal variance of the linear predictor, $\sqrt{\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}+\widehat{\sigma}_{\nu}^{2}}$.
The $\mathrm{e}(a, b)$ option computes the expected value of $y_{i t}$ conditional on $y_{i t}$ being in the interval $\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right)$, that is, when $y_{i t}$ is truncated. The expected value is calculated as

$$
\begin{align*}
e\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right) & =E\left(\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \mid \ell \ell_{i t}<\mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\nu_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}<u \ell_{i t}\right) \\
& =\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}-\widehat{\sigma} \frac{\phi\left(\frac{u \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)-\phi\left(\frac{\ell \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)}{\Phi\left(\frac{u \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)-\Phi\left(\frac{\ell \ell_{i t}-\mathbf{x}_{i t} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\widehat{\sigma}}\right)} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\phi$ is the normal density and $\Phi$ is the cumulative normal distribution.
You can also compute the expected value of $y_{i t}$, where $y_{i t}$ is assumed censored at $\ell \ell_{i t}$ and $u \ell_{i t}$ by specifying the option ystar $(a, b)$. This expected value is

$$
y_{i t}^{*}= \begin{cases}\ell \ell_{i t} & \text { if } y_{i t} \leq \ell \ell_{i t} \\ \mathbf{x}_{i t} \boldsymbol{\beta}+\epsilon_{i t} & \text { if } \ell \ell_{i t}<y_{i t}<u \ell_{i t} \\ u \ell_{i t} & \text { if } y_{i t} \geq u \ell_{i t}\end{cases}
$$

This computation can be expressed in several ways, but the most intuitive formulation involves a combination of (1) and (2):

$$
E\left(y_{i t}^{*}\right)=\operatorname{pr}\left(-\infty, \ell \ell_{i t}\right) \ell \ell_{i t}+\operatorname{pr}\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right) e\left(\ell \ell_{i t}, u \ell_{i t}\right)+\operatorname{pr}\left(u \ell_{i t},+\infty\right) u \ell_{i t}
$$

## Also see

[XT] xttobit - Random-effects tobit models
[U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

## Title

xtunitroot - Panel-data unit-root tests

| Description | Quick start | Menu | Syntax |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Options | Remarks and examples | Stored results | Methods and formulas |
| Acknowledgments | References | Also see |  |

## Description

xtunitroot performs a variety of tests for unit roots (or stationarity) in panel datasets. The Levin-Lin-Chu (2002), Harris-Tzavalis (1999), Breitung (2000; Breitung and Das 2005), Im-Pesaran-Shin (2003), and Fisher-type (Choi 2001) tests have as the null hypothesis that all the panels contain a unit root. The Hadri (2000) Lagrange multiplier (LM) test has as the null hypothesis that all the panels are (trend) stationary. The top of the output for each test makes explicit the null and alternative hypotheses. Options allow you to include panel-specific means (fixed effects) and time trends in the model of the data-generating process.

## Quick start

Levin-Lin-Chu test that each series y within panels contains a unit root using xtset data xtunitroot llc y

As above, but specify 4 lags for the augmented Dickey-Fuller regressions xtunitroot llc y, lags(4)

Harris-Tzavalis unit-root test including a time trend xtunitroot ht y, trend

Breitung unit-root test with 4 lags to prewhiten the series
xtunitroot breitung y, lags(4)
Im-Pesaran-Shin unit-root test for the demeaned series y
xtunitroot ips y, demean
Philips-Perron unit-root test of y with 1 lag for prewhitening
xtunitroot fisher y, pperron lags(1)
Hadri Lagrange multiplier stationarity test using Bartlett's kernel with 1 lag to estimate long-run variance

```
xtunitroot hadri y, kernel(bartlett)
```


## Menu

Statistics $>$ Longitudinal/panel data $>$ Unit-root tests

## Syntax

Levin-Lin-Chu test
xtunitroot llc varname [if] [in] [, LLC_options]
Harris-Tzavalis test
xtunitroot ht varname [if] [in] [, HT_options]
Breitung test
xtunitroot breitung varname [if] [in] [, Breitung_options]
Im-Pesaran-Shin test
xtunitroot ips varname [if] [in] [, IPS_options]
Fisher-type tests (combining p-values)

```
xtunitroot fisher varname [if] [in], {酎uller|pperron} lags(#)
```

[Fisher_options]
Hadri Lagrange multiplier stationarity test
xtunitroot hadri varname [if] [in] [, Hadri_options]

| LLC_options | Description |
| :--- | :--- |
| trend | include a time trend |
| noconstant | suppress panel-specific means |
| demean | subtract cross-sectional means |
| lags (lag_spec) | specify lag structure for augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) regressions |
| kernel (kernel_spec) | specify method to estimate long-run variance |

lag_spec is either a nonnegative integer or one of aic, bic, or hqic followed by a positive integer.
kernel_spec takes the form kernel maxlags, where kernel is one of bartlett, parzen, or quadraticspectral and maxlags is either a positive number or one of nwest or llc.

HT_options Description

| trend | include a time trend |
| :--- | :--- |
| noconstant | suppress panel-specific means |
| demean | subtract cross-sectional means |
| altt | make small-sample adjustment to $T$ |

Breitung_options Description
trend include a time trend
noconstant suppress panel-specific means
demean subtract cross-sectional means
robust allow for cross-sectional dependence
lags (\#) specify lag structure for prewhitening

## IPS_options Description

| trend | include a time trend |
| :--- | :--- |
| demean | subtract cross-sectional means |
| lags (lag_spec) | specify lag structure for ADF regressions |

lag_spec is either a nonnegative integer or one of aic, bic, or hqic followed by a positive integer.
Fisher_options Description

* dfuller
* pperron
* lags(\#)
demean
dfuller_opts
pperron_opts
use ADF unit-root tests
use Phillips-Perron unit-root tests
specify lag structure for prewhitening
subtract cross-sectional means
any options allowed by the dfuller command
any options allowed by the pperron command

[^17]Hadri_options Description
trend include a time trend
demean subtract cross-sectional means
robust allow for cross-sectional dependence
kernel(kernel_spec) specify method to estimate long-run variance
kernel_spec takes the form kernel [\#], where kernel is one of bartlett, parzen, or quadraticspectral and \# is a positive number.
varname may contain time-series operators; see [U] 11.4.4 Time-series varlists.

## Options

## LLC_options

trend includes a linear time trend in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated.
noconstant suppresses the panel-specific mean term in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated. Specifying noconstant imposes the assumption that the series has a mean of zero for all panels.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
lags (lag_spec) specifies the lag structure to use for the ADF regressions performed in computing the test statistic.

Specifying lags(\#) requests that \# lags of the series be used in the ADF regressions. The default is lags(1).

Specifying lags (aic \#) requests that the number of lags of the series be chosen such that the Akaike information criterion (AIC) for the regression is minimized. xtunitroot llc will fit ADF regressions with 1 to \# lags and choose the regression for which the AIC is minimized. This process is done for each panel so that different panels may use ADF regressions with different numbers of lags.

Specifying lags (bic \#) is just like specifying lags (aic \#), except that the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) is used instead of the AIC.
Specifying lags (hqic \#) is just like specifying lags (aic \#), except that the Hannan-Quinn information criterion is used instead of the AIC.
kernel(kernel_spec) specifies the method used to estimate the long-run variance of each panel's series. kernel_spec takes the form kernel maxlags. kernel is one of bartlett, parzen, or quadraticspectral. maxlags is a number, nwest to request the Newey and West (1994) bandwidth selection algorithm, or llc to request the lag truncation algorithm in Levin, Lin, and Chu (2002).
Specifying, for example, kernel (bartlett 3) requests the Bartlett kernel with 3 lags.
Specifying kernel (bartlett nwest) requests the Bartlett kernel with the maximum number of lags determined by the Newey and West bandwidth selection algorithm.
Specifying kernel (bartlett llc) requests the Bartlett kernel with a maximum lag determined by the method proposed in Levin, Lin, and Chu's (2002) article:

$$
\operatorname{maxlags}=\operatorname{int}\left(3.21 T^{1 / 3}\right)
$$

where $T$ is the number of observations per panel. This is the default.

## HT_options

trend includes a linear time trend in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated.
noconstant suppresses the panel-specific mean term in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated. Specifying noconstant imposes the assumption that the series has a mean of zero for all panels.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
altt requests that xtunitroot use $T-1$ instead of $T$ in the formulas for the mean and variance of the test statistic under the null hypothesis. When the number of time periods, $T$, is small (less than 10 or 15 ), the test suffers from severe size distortions when fixed effects or time trends are included; in these cases, using altt results in much improved size properties at the expense of significantly less power.

## Breitung_options

trend includes a linear time trend in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated.
noconstant suppresses the panel-specific mean term in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated. Specifying noconstant imposes the assumption that the series has a mean of zero for all panels.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
robust requests a variant of the test that is robust to cross-sectional dependence.
lags (\#) specifies the number of lags used to remove higher-order autoregressive components of the series. The Breitung test assumes the data are generated by an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process; for higher-order processes, the first-differenced and lagged-level data are replaced by the residuals from regressions of those two series on the first \# lags of the first-differenced data. The default is to not perform this prewhitening step.

## IPS_options

trend includes a linear time trend in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
lags (lag_spec) specifies the lag structure to use for the ADF regressions performed in computing the test statistic. With this option, xtunitroot reports Im, Pesaran, and Shin's (2003) $W_{t-b a r}$ statistic that is predicated on $T$ going to infinity first, followed by $N$ going to infinity. By default, no lags are included, and xtunitroot instead reports Im, Pesaran, and Shin's $\widetilde{t}$-bar and $Z_{\tilde{t} \text {-bar }}$ statistics that assume $T$ is fixed while $N$ goes to infinity, as well as the $t$-bar statistic and exact critical values that assume both $N$ and $T$ are fixed.

Specifying lags (\#) requests that \# lags of the series be used in the ADF regressions. By default, no lags are included.
Specifying lags (aic \#) requests that the number of lags of the series be chosen such that the AIC for the regression is minimized. xtunitroot llc will fit ADF regressions with 1 to \# lags and choose the regression for which the AIC is minimized. This process is done for each panel so that different panels may use ADF regressions with different numbers of lags.
Specifying lags (bic \#) is just like specifying lags (aic \#), except that the BIC is used instead of the AIC.

Specifying lags(hqic \#) is just like specifying lags(aic \#), except that the Hannan-Quinn information criterion is used instead of the AIC.
If you specify lags (0), then xtunitroot reports the $W_{t-b a r}$ statistic instead of the $Z_{t \text {-bar }}$, $Z_{\widetilde{t}-b a r}$, and $t$-bar statistics.

## Fisher_options

dfuller requests that xtunitroot conduct ADF unit-root tests on each panel by using the dfuller command. You must specify either the dfuller or the pperron option.
pperron requests that xtunitroot conduct Phillips-Perron unit-root tests on each panel by using the pperron command. You must specify either the pperron or the dfuller option.
lags(\#) specifies the number of lags used to remove higher-order autoregressive components of the series. The Fisher test assumes the data are generated by an AR(1) process; for higher-order processes, the first-differenced and lagged-level data are replaced by the residuals from regressions of those two series on the first \# lags of the first-differenced data. lags(\#) is required.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
dfuller_opts are any options accepted by the dfuller command, including noconstant, trend, drift, and lags(). Because xtunitroot calls dfuller quietly, the dfuller option regress has no effect. See [TS] dfuller.
pperron_opts are any options accepted by the pperron command, including noconstant, trend, and lags(). Because xtunitroot calls pperron quietly, the pperron option regress has no effect. See [TS] pperron.

## Hadri_options

trend includes a linear time trend in the model that describes the process by which the series is generated.
demean requests that xtunitroot first subtract the cross-sectional averages from the series. When specified, for each time period xtunitroot computes the mean of the series across panels and subtracts this mean from the series. Levin, Lin, and Chu suggest this procedure to mitigate the impact of cross-sectional dependence.
robust requests a variant of the test statistic that is robust to heteroskedasticity across panels.
kernel (kernel_spec) requests a variant of the test statistic that is robust to serially correlated errors. kernel_spec specifies the method used to estimate the long-run variance of each panel's series. kernel_spec takes the form kernel [\#]. Three kernels are supported: bartlett, parzen, and quadraticspectral.
Specifying, for example, kernel (bartlett 3) requests the Bartlett kernel with 3 lags.
If \# is not specified, then 1 lag is used.

## Remarks and examples

Remarks are presented under the following headings:
Overview
Levin-Lin-Chu test
Harris-Tsavalis test
Breitung test
Im-Pesaran-Shin test
Fisher-type tests
Hadri LM test

## Overview

We consider a simple panel-data model with a first-order autoregressive component:

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\rho_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, N$ indexes panels; $t=1, \ldots, T_{i}$ indexes time; $y_{i t}$ is the variable being tested; and $\epsilon_{i t}$ is a stationary error term. The $\mathbf{z}_{i t}$ term can represent panel-specific means, panel-specific means and a time trend, or nothing, depending on the options specified to xtunitroot. By default, $\mathbf{z}_{i t}=1$, so that the term $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ represents panel-specific means (fixed effects). If trend is specified,
$\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime}=(1, t)$ so that $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ represents panel-specific means and linear time trends. For tests that allow it, specifying noconstant omits the $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ term. The Im-Pesaran-Shin (xtunitroot ips), Fisher-type (xtunitroot fisher), and Hadri LM (xtunitroot hadri) tests allow unbalanced panels, while the remaining tests require balanced panels so that $T_{i}=T$ for all $i$.

Panel unit-root tests are used to test the null hypothesis $H_{0}: \rho_{i}=1$ for all $i$ versus the alternative $H_{a}: \rho_{i}<1$. Depending on the test, $H_{a}$ may hold, for one $i$, a fraction of all $i$ or all $i$; the output of the respective test precisely states the alternative hypothesis. Equation (1) is often written as

$$
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

so that the null hypothesis is then $H_{0}: \phi_{i}=0$ for all $i$ versus the alternative $H_{a}: \phi_{i}<0$.
The Hadri LM test for panel stationarity instead assumes the null hypothesis that all panels are stationary versus the alternative that at least some of the panels contain unit roots. We discuss the Hadri LM test in detail later, though for now our remarks focus on tests whose null hypothesis is that the panels contain unit roots.

The various panel unit-root tests implemented by xtunitroot differ in several key aspects. First, the Levin-Lin-Chu (xtunitroot llc), Harris-Tsavalis (xtunitroot ht), and Breitung (xtunitroot breitung) tests make the simplifying assumption that all panels share the same autoregressive parameter so that $\rho_{i}=\rho$ for all $i$. The other tests implemented by xtunitroot, however, allow the autoregressive parameter to be panel specific. Maddala and Wu (1999) provide an example of testing whether countries' economic growth rates converge to a long-run value. Imposing the restriction that $\rho_{i}=\rho$ for all $i$ implies that the rate of convergence would be the same for all countries, an implication that is too restrictive in practice.

Second, the various tests make differing assumptions about the rates at which the number of panels, $N$, and the number of time periods, $T$, tend to infinity or whether $N$ or $T$ is fixed. For microeconomic panels of firms, for example, increasing the sample size would involve gathering data on more firms while holding the number of time periods fixed; here $N$ tends to infinity whereas $T$ is fixed. In a macroeconomic analysis of OECD countries, one would typically assume that $N$ is fixed whereas $T$ tends to infinity.

Related to the previous point, the size of one's sample will in large part determine which test is most appropriate in a given situation. If a dataset has a small number of panels and a large number of time periods, then a panel unit-root test that assumes that $N$ is fixed or that $N$ tends to infinity at a slower rate than $T$ will likely perform better than one that is designed for cases where $N$ is large.

Hlouskova and Wagner (2006) provide a good overview of the types of panel unit-root tests available with xtunitroot, and they present exhaustive Monte Carlo simulations examining the tests' performance. Baltagi (2013, chap. 12) also concisely discusses the tests implemented by xtunitroot.

The following table summarizes some of the key differences among the various tests:

| Test | Options | Asymptotics | $\rho$ under $H_{a}$ | Panels |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LLC | noconstant | $\sqrt{N} / T \rightarrow 0$ | common | balanced |
| LLC |  | $N / T \rightarrow 0$ | common | balanced |
| LLC | trend | $N / T \rightarrow 0$ | common | balanced |
| HT | noconstant | $N \rightarrow \infty, T$ fixed | common | balanced |
| HT |  | $N \rightarrow \infty, T$ fixed | common | balanced |
| HT | trend | $N \rightarrow \infty, T$ fixed | common | balanced |
| Breitung | noconstant | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | common | balanced |
| Breitung |  | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | common | balanced |
| Breitung | trend | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | common | balanced |
| IPS |  | $N \rightarrow \infty, T$ fixed | panel-specific | unbalanced |
|  |  | or $N$ and $T$ fixed |  |  |
| IPS |  | $N \rightarrow \infty, T$ fixed | panel-specific | unbalanced |
| IPS | lags () | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | panel-specific | unbalanced |
| IPS | or $N$ and $T$ fixed | unbalanced |  |  |
| Fisher-type |  | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | panel-specific | uns |
|  |  | $T \rightarrow \infty, N$ finite | panel-specific | unbalanced |
| Hadri LM |  | or infinite |  | balanced |
| Hadri LM | trend | $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$ | (not applicable) | balanced |

The first column identifies the test procedure, where we use LLC to denote the Levin-Lin-Chu test, HT to denote the Harris-Tsavalis test, and IPS to denote the Im-Pesaran-Shin test. The second column indicates the deterministic components included in (1) or ( $1^{\prime}$ ). The column labeled "Asymptotics" indicates the behavior of the number of panels, $N$, and time periods, $T$, required for the test statistic to have a well-defined asymptotic distribution. For example, the LLC test without the noconstant option requires that $T$ grow at a faster rate than $N$ so that $N / T$ approaches zero; with the noconstant option, we need only for $T$ to grow faster than the square root of $N$ (so $T$ could grow more slowly than $N$ ).

The HT tests and the IPS tests without accommodations for serial correlation assume that the number of time periods, $T$, is fixed, whereas $N$ tends to infinity; xtunitroot also reports critical values for the IPS tests that are valid in finite samples (where $N$ and $T$ are fixed).

Many of the tests are justified using sequential limit theory, which we denote as $(T, N) \rightarrow_{\text {seq }} \infty$. First, the time dimension goes to infinity, and then the number of panels goes to infinity. As a practical matter, these tests work best with "large" $T$ and at least "moderate" $N$. See Phillips and Moon (2000) for an introduction to asymptotics that depend on both $N$ and $T$ and their relation to nonstationary panels. Phillips and Moon (1999) contains a more technical discussion of "multi-indexed" asymptotics.

The fourth column refers to the parameter $\rho_{i}$ in (1) and $\phi_{i}$ in ( $1^{\prime}$ ). As we mentioned previously, some tests assume that all panels have the same autoregressive parameter under the alternative hypothesis of stationarity (denoted "common" in the table), while others allow for panel-specific autoregressive
parameters (denoted "panel-specific" in the table). The Hadri LM tests are not framed in terms of an equation like (1) or ( $1^{\prime}$ ), so the distinction based on $\rho$ is not applicable.

The final column indicates whether the panel dataset must be strongly balanced, meaning each panel has the same number of observations covering the same time span. Except for the Fisher tests, all the tests require that there be no gaps in any panel's series.

We now discuss each test in turn.

## Levin-Lin-Chu test

The starting point for the Levin-Lin-Chu (LLC) test is ( $1^{\prime}$ ) with the restriction that all panels share a common autoregressive parameter. In a regression model like (1), $\epsilon_{i t}$ is likely to be plagued by serial correlation, so to mitigate this problem, LLC augment the model with additional lags of the dependent variable:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{p} \theta_{i j} \Delta y_{i, t-j}+u_{i t} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The number of lags, $p$, can be specified using the lags () option, or you can have xtunitroot llc select the number of lags that minimizes one of several information criteria. The LLC test assumes that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is independently distributed across panels and follows a stationary invertible autoregressive moving-average process for each panel. By including sufficient lags of $\Delta y_{i, t}$ in (2), $u_{i t}$ will be white noise; the test does not require $u_{i t}$ to have the same variance across panels.

Under the null hypothesis of a unit root, $y_{i t}$ is nonstationary, so a standard ols regression $t$ statistic for $\phi$ will have a nonstandard distribution that depends in part on the specification of the $\mathbf{z}_{i t}$ term. Moreover, the inclusion of a fixed-effect term in a dynamic model like (2) causes the OLS estimate of $\phi$ to be biased toward zero; see Nickell (1981). The LLC method produces a bias-adjusted $t$ statistic, which the authors denote as $t_{\delta}^{*}$, that has an asymptotically normal distribution.

The LLC test without panel-specific intercepts or time trends, requested by specifying the noconstant option with xtunitroot llc, is justified asymptotically if $\sqrt{N} / T \rightarrow 0$, allowing the time dimension $T$ to grow more slowly than the cross-sectional dimension $N$; LLC (2002) mention that this assumption is particularly relevant for panel datasets typically encountered in microeconomic applications.

If model (2) includes panel-specific means (the default for xtunitroot llc) or time trends (requested with the trend option), then you must assume that $N / T \rightarrow 0$ for the $t_{\delta}^{*}$ statistic to have an asymptotically standard normal distribution. This implies that the time dimension, $T$, must grow faster than the cross-sectional dimension, $N$, a situation more plausible with macroeconomic datasets.

LLC (2002) recommend using their test with panels of "moderate" size, which they describe as having between 10 and 250 panels and 25 to 250 observations per panel. Baltagi (2013, sec. 12.2.3) mentions that the requirement $N / T \rightarrow 0$ implies that $N$ should be small relative to $T$.

## Technical note

Panel unit-root tests have frequently been used to test the purchasing power parity (PPP) hypothesis. We use a PPP dataset to illustrate the xtunitroot command, but understanding PPP is not required to understand how these tests are applied. Here we outline PPP and explain how to test it using panel unit-root tests; uninterested readers can skip the remainder of this technical note. Our discussion and examples are motivated by those in Oh (1996) and Patterson (2000, chap. 13). Also see Rogoff (1996) for a broader introduction to PPP.

The PPP hypothesis is based on the Law of One Price, which stipulates that the price of a tradeable good will be the same everywhere. Absolute PPP stipulates that the nominal exchange rate, $E$, is

$$
E=\frac{P}{P^{*}}
$$

where $P$ is the price of a basket of goods in the home country and $P^{*}$ is the price of the same basket in the foreign country. The exchange rate, $E$, indicates the price of a foreign currency in terms of our "home" currency or, equivalently, how many units of the home currency are needed to buy one unit of the foreign currency.

Now consider the real exchange rate, $\lambda$, which tells us the prices of goods and services-things we actually consume-in a foreign country relative to their prices at home. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda=\frac{E P^{*}}{P} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\lambda$ in general does not equal unity for many reasons, including the fact that not all goods are tradeable across countries (haircuts being the textbook example), trade barriers such as tariffs and quotas, differences among countries in how price indices are constructed, and the Harrod-Balassa-Samuelson effect, which links productivity and price levels; see Obstfeld and Rogoff (1996, 210-216).

Taking logs of both sides of (3), we have

$$
y \equiv \ln \lambda=\ln E+\ln P^{*}-\ln P
$$

PPP holds only if the real exchange rate reverts to its equilibrium value over time. Thus, to test for PPP, we test whether $y$ contains a unit root. If $y$ does contain a unit root, we reject PPP.

The dataset pennxrate.dta contains real exchange-rate data based on the Penn World Table version 6.2 (Heston, Summers, and Aten 2006). The data are a balanced panel consisting of 151 countries observed over 34 years, from 1970 through 2003. The United States was treated as the domestic country and is therefore not included. The variable $\operatorname{lnrxrate}$ contains the log of the real exchange rate and is the variable on which we conduct panel unit-root tests in the examples.

Two indicator variables are included in the dataset as well. The variable oecd flags 27 countries aside from the United States that are members of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (The Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic are excluded because they did not become independent countries until 1993.) The variable g7 flags the six countries aside from the United States that are members of the Group of Seven (G7) nations.
> Example 1
The dataset pennxrate.dta contains real exchange-rate data for a panel of countries observed over 34 years. Here we use the LLC test to determine whether the series lnrxrate, the log of real exchange rates, contains a unit root for six nations that are currently in the G7 group of advanced economies. We do not have any reason to believe lnrxrate should exhibit a global trend, so we do not include the trend option.

Looking at (2), we have no a priori knowledge of the number of lags, $p$, needed to ensure that $u_{i t}$ is white noise, so we let xtunitroot choose the number of lags for each panel by minimizing the AIC, subject to a maximum of 10 lags.

We type

```
. use http://www.stata-press.com/data/r14/pennxrate
. xtunitroot llc lnrxrate if g7, lags(aic 10)
Levin-Lin-Chu unit-root test for lnrxrate
```

```
Ho: Panels contain unit roots Number of panels = 6
Ha: Panels are stationary Number of periods = 34
AR parameter: Common Asymptotics: N/T -> 0
Panel means: Included
Time trend: Not included
ADF regressions: 1.00 lags average (chosen by AIC)
LR variance: Bartlett kernel, 10.00 lags average (chosen by LLC)
```

|  | Statistic | $p$-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unadjusted t | -6.7538 |  |
| Adjusted t* | -4.0277 | 0.0000 |

The header of the output summarizes the exact specification of the test and dataset. Because we did not specify the noconstant option, the test allowed for panel-specific means. On average, $p=1$ lag of the dependent variable of (2) were included as regressors in the ADF regressions. By default, xtunitroot estimated the long-run variance of $\Delta \operatorname{lnrxrate}_{i t}$ by using a Bartlett kernel with an average of 10 lags.

The LLC bias-adjusted test statistic $t_{\delta}^{*}=-4.0277$ is significantly less than zero ( $p<0.00005$ ), so we reject the null hypothesis of a unit-root [that is, that $\phi=0$ in (2)] in favor of the alternative that Inrxrate is stationary (that is, that $\phi<0$ ). This conclusion supports the PPP hypothesis.

Labeled "Unadjusted t " in the output is a conventional $t$ statistic for testing $H_{0}: \phi=0$. When the model does not include panel-specific means or trends, this test statistic has a standard normal limiting distribution and its $p$-value is shown in the output; the unadjusted statistic, $t_{\delta}$, diverges to negative infinity if trends or panel-specific constants are included, so a $p$-value is not displayed in those cases.

Because the G7 economies have many similarities, our results could be affected by cross-sectional correlation in real exchange rates; O'Connell's (1998) results showed that the LLC test exhibits severe size distortions in the presence of cross-sectional correlation. LLC (2002) suggested removing cross-sectional averages from the data to help control for this correlation. We can do this by specifying the demean option to xtunitroot:

```
. xtunitroot llc lnrxrate if g7, lags(aic 10) demean
```

Levin-Lin-Chu unit-root test for lnrxrate

```
Ho: Panels contain unit roots
Ha: Panels are stationary
    Number of panels = 6
Number of periods = 34
AR parameter: Common Asymptotics: N/T -> 0
Panel means: Included
Time trend: Not included Cross-sectional means removed
ADF regressions: 1.50 lags average (chosen by AIC)
LR variance: Bartlett kernel, 10.00 lags average (chosen by LLC)
```

|  | Statistic | p-value |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Unadjusted $t$ | -5.5473 |  |
| Adjusted t* | -2.0813 | 0.0187 |

Once we control for cross-sectional correlation by removing cross-sectional means, we can no longer reject the null hypothesis of a unit root at the $1 \%$ significance level, though we can reject at the 5\% level.

Here we chose the number of lags based on the AIC criterion in an admission that we do not know the true number of lags to include in (2). However, the test statistics are derived under the assumption that the lag order, $p$, is known. If we happen to choose the wrong number of lags, then the distribution of the test statistic will depart from its expected distribution that assumes $p$ is known.

## Harris-Tsavalis test

In many datasets, particularly in microeconomics, the time dimension, $T$, is small, so tests whose asymptotic properties are established by assuming that $T$ tends to infinity can lead to incorrect inference. HT (1999) derived a unit-root test that assumes that the time dimension, $T$, is fixed. Their simulation results suggest that the test has favorable size and power properties for $N$ greater than 25 , and they report (p. 213) that power improves faster as $T$ increases for a given $N$ than when $N$ increases for a given $T$.

The HT test statistic is based on the OLS estimator, $\rho$, in the regression model

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{i t}=\rho y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the term $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ allows for panel-specific means and trends and was discussed in Overview. Harris and Tsavalis assume that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) normal with constant variance across panels. Because of the bias induced by the inclusion of the panel means and time trends in this model, the expected value of the OLS estimator is not equal to unity under the null hypothesis. Harris and Tsavalis derived the mean and standard error of $\widehat{\rho}$ for (4) under the null hypothesis $H_{0}: \rho=1$ when neither panel-specific means nor time trends are included (requested with the noconstant option), when only panel-specific means are included (the default), and when both panel-specific means and time trends are included (requested with the trend option). The asymptotic distribution of the test statistic is justified as $N \rightarrow \infty$, so you should have a relatively large number of panels when using this test. Notice that, like the LLC test, the HT test assumes that all panels share the same autoregressive parameter.

## > Example 2

Because the HT test is designed for cases where $N$ is relatively large, here we test whether the series lnrxrate contains a unit root using all 151 countries in our dataset. We will again remove cross-sectional means to help control for contemporaneous correlation. We type

| Harris-Tzavalis unit-root test for lnrxrate |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ho: Panels contain unit roots |  | Number of panels $=151$ |
| Ha: Panels are stationary |  | Number of periods $=34$ |
| AR parameter: Common |  | Asymptotics: N -> Infinity |
| Panel means: Included |  | T Fixed |
| Time trend: Not included |  | Cross-sectional means removed |
| Statistic | z | p-value |
| rho 0.8184 | -13.1239 | 0.0000 |

Here we strongly reject the null hypothesis of a unit root, again finding support for PPP. The point estimate of $\rho$ in (4) is 0.8184 , and the $z$ statistic is -13.12 .

Can we directly compare the results from the LLC and HT tests? We used a subset of the data for the LLC test but used all the data for the HT test. That leads to the obvious answer that no, our results are not entirely comparable. However, a more subtle issue regarding the asymptotic properties of the tests also warrants caution when comparing results.

The LLC test assumes that $N / T \rightarrow 0$, so $N$ should be small relative to $T$. Moreover, with our exchange-rate dataset, we are much more likely to be able to add more years of data rather than add more countries, because the number of countries in the world is for the most part fixed. Hence, assuming $T$ grows faster than $N$ is certainly plausible.

On the other hand, the HT test assumes that $T$ is fixed whereas $N$ goes to infinity. Is that assumption plausible for our dataset? As we just mentioned, $T$ likely grows faster than $N$ here, so using a test that assumes $T$ is fixed whereas $N$ grows is hard to justify with our dataset.

In short, when selecting a panel unit-root test, you must consider the relative sizes of $N$ and $T$ and the relative speeds at which they tend to infinity or whether either $N$ or $T$ is fixed.

## Breitung test

Both the LLC and HT tests take the approach of first fitting a regression model and subsequently adjusting the autoregressive parameter or its $t$ statistic to compensate for the bias induced by having a dynamic regressor and fixed effects in the model. The Breitung (2000; Breitung and Das 2005) test takes a different tact, adjusting the data before fitting a regression model so that bias adjustments are not needed.

In the LLC test, additional lags of the dependent variable could be included in (2) to control for serial correlation. The Breitung procedure instead allows for a prewhitening of the series before computing the test. If the trend option is not specified, we regress $\Delta y_{i t}$ and $y_{i, t-1}$ on $\Delta y_{i, t-1}, \ldots, \Delta y_{i, t-p}$ and use the residuals from those regressions in place of $\Delta y_{i, t}$ and $y_{i, t-1}$ in computing the test. You specify the number of lags, $p$, to use by specifying lags(\#). If the trend option is specified, then the Breitung method uses a different prewhitening procedure that involves fitting only one (instead of two) preliminary regressions; see Methods and formulas for details.

Monte Carlo simulations by Breitung (2000) show that bias-corrected statistics such as LLC's $t_{\delta}^{*}$ suffer from low power, particularly against alternative hypotheses with autoregressive parameters near one and when panel-specific effects are included. In contrast, the Breitung (2000) test statistic exhibits much higher power in these cases. Moreover, the Breitung test has good power even with small datasets ( $N=25, T=25$ ), though the power of the test appears to deteriorate when $T$ is fixed and $N$ is increased.

The Breitung test assumes that the error term $\epsilon_{i t}$ is uncorrelated across both $i$ and $t$. xtunitroot breitung optionally also reports a version of the statistic based on Breitung and Das (2005) that is robust to cross-sectional correlation.

## > Example 3

Here we test whether lnrxrate contains a unit root for the subset of 27 OECD countries in our dataset. We will use the robust option to obtain a test statistic that is robust to cross-sectional correlation, so we will not subtract the cross-sectional means via the demean option. We type

```
. xtunitroot breitung lnrxrate if oecd, robust
Breitung unit-root test for lnrxrate
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Ho: Panels contain unit roots & Number of panels \(=27\) \\
\hline Ha: Panels are stationary & Number of periods = 34 \\
\hline AR parameter: Common & Asymptotics: T,N -> Infinity \\
\hline Panel means: Included & sequentially \\
\hline Time trend: Not included & Prewhitening: Not performed \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

|  | Statistic | p-value |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| lambda* | -1.6794 | 0.0465 |

* Lambda robust to cross-sectional correlation

We can reject the null of a unit root at the $5 \%$ level but not at the $1 \%$ level.

## Im-Pesaran-Shin test

All the tests we have discussed thus far assume that all panels share a common autoregressive parameter, $\rho$. Cultural, institutional, and other factors make such an assumption tenuous for both macro- and microeconometric panel datasets. IPS (2003) developed a set of tests that relax the assumption of a common autoregressive parameter. Moreover, the IPS test does not require balanced datasets, though there cannot be gaps within a panel. The starting point for the IPS test is a set of Dickey-Fuller regressions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that here $\phi$ is panel-specific, indexed by $i$, whereas in (2), $\phi$ is constant. Im, Pesaran, and Shin assume that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is independently distributed normal for all $i$ and $t$, and they allow $\epsilon_{i t}$ to have heterogeneous variances $\sigma_{i}^{2}$ across panels.

As described by Maddala and Wu (1999), one way to view the key difference between the IPS and LLC tests is that here we fit (5) to each panel separately and average the resulting $t$ statistics, whereas in the LLC test we pool the data before fitting an equation such as (2) (thus we impose a common autoregressive parameter) and compute a test statistic based on the pooled regression results.

Under the null hypothesis that all panels contain a unit root, we have $\phi_{i}=0$ for all $i$. The alternative is that the fraction of panels that follow stationary processes is nonzero; that is, as $N$ tends to infinity, the fraction $N_{1} / N$ converges to a nonzero value, where $N_{1}$ is the number of panels that are stationary.

Whether you allow for serially correlated errors determines the test statistics produced, and because there are substantive differences in the output, we consider the serially uncorrelated and serially correlated cases separately. First, we consider the serially uncorrelated case, which xtunitroot assumes when you do not specify the lags() option.

The IPS test allowing for heterogeneous panels with serially uncorrelated errors assumes that the number of time periods, $T$, is fixed; xtunitroot ips produces statistics both for the case where $N$ is fixed and for the case where $N \rightarrow \infty$. Under the null hypothesis of a unit root, the usual $t$ statistic, $t_{i}$, for testing $H_{0}: \phi_{i}=0$ in (5) does not have a mean of zero. For the case where $N$ is fixed, IPS used simulation to tabulate "exact" critical values for the average of the $t_{i}$ statistics when the dataset is balanced; these critical values are not available with unbalanced datasets. The critical values are "exact" only when the error term is normally distributed and when $T$ corresponds to one of the sample sizes used in their simulation studies. For other values of $T$, xtunitroot ips linearly interpolates the values in IPS (2003, table 2).

For the case where $N \rightarrow \infty$, they used simulation to tabulate the mean and variance of $t_{i}$ for various values of $T$ under the null hypothesis and showed that a bias-adjusted average of the $t_{i}$ 's has a standard normal limiting distribution. We illustrate the test with an example.

## > Example 4

Here we test whether lnrxrate contains a unit root for the subset of OECD countries. We type

| Im-Pesaran-Shin unit-root test for lnrxrate |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Ho: All panels contain unit roots | Number of panels $=27$ |
| Ha: Some panels are stationary | Number of periods $=34$ |
| AR parameter: Panel-specific | Asymptotics: T,N -> Infinity |
| Panel means: Included | sequentially |
| Time trend: Not included | Cross-sectional means removed |
| ADF regressions: No lags included |  |


|  |  |  | Fixed-N exact critical values |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Statistic | p-value | $1 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| t-bar | -3.1327 |  |  | -1.810 | -1.730 |
| t-tilde-bar | -2.5771 |  |  |  |  |
| Z-t-tilde-bar | -7.3911 | 0.0000 |  |  |  |

As with the other unit-root tests available with xtunitroot, the header of the output contains a summary of the dataset's dimensions and the null and alternative hypotheses. First, consider the statistic labeled t -bar, which IPS denote as $t$-bar ${ }_{N T}$. This statistic is appropriate when you assume that both $N$ and $T$ fixed; exact critical values reported in IPS (2003) are reported immediately to its right. Here, because $t-b a r_{N T}$ is less than even its $1 \%$ critical value, we strongly reject the null hypothesis that all series contain a unit root in favor of the alternative that a nonzero fraction of the panels represent stationary processes.

The statistic labeled t-tilde-bar is IPS's $\tilde{t}$ - $b a r_{N T}$ statistic and is similar to the $t-b a r_{N T}$ statistic, except that a different estimator of the Dickey-Fuller regression error variance is used. A standardized version of this statistic, $Z_{\tilde{t}-b a r}$, is labeled $\mathrm{Z}-\mathrm{t}-\mathrm{til}$ de-bar in the output and has an asymptotic standard
normal distribution. Here the $p$-value corresponding to Z-t-tilde-bar is essentially zero, so we strongly reject the null that all series contain a unit root.

## Technical note

Just as the $Z_{\tilde{t} \text {-bar }}$ statistic corresponds to $\tilde{t}$-bar $r_{N T}$, IPS present a $Z_{t-b a r}$ statistic corresponding to $t$-bar ${ }_{N T}$. However, the $Z_{t \text {-bar }}$ statistic does not have an asymptotic normal distribution, and so it is not presented in the output. $Z_{t \text {-bar }}$ is available in the stored results as $r(z t)$.

When serial correlation is present, we augment the Dickey-Fuller regression with further lags of the dependent variable:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{p} \Delta y_{i, t-j}+\epsilon_{i t} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the number of lags, $p$, is specified using the lags() option, and if the trend option is specified, we also include a time trend with panel-specific slope. You can either specify a number or have xtunitroot choose the number of lags for each panel by minimizing an information criterion. Here xtunitroot produces the IPS $W_{t-b a r}$ statistic, which has an asymptotically standard normal distribution as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$. As a practical matter, this means you should have a reasonably large number of both time periods and panels to use this test.

Part of the computation of the $W_{t-b a r}$ statistic involves retrieving expected values and variances of the $t$ statistic for $\beta_{i}$ in (6) in table 3 of IPS (2003). Because expected values have not been computed beyond $p=8$ lags in (6), you cannot request more than 8 lags in the lags () option.
$>$ Example 5
We again test whether lnrxrate contains a unit root for the subset of OECD countries, except we allow for serially correlated errors. We will choose the number of lags for the ADF regressions by minimizing the AIC criterion, subject to a maximum of 8 lags. We type


## Fisher-type tests

In our discussion of the IPS test, we intimated that the test statistics could be viewed as averages of bias-adjusted $t$ statistics for each panel. As Maddala and $\mathrm{Wu}(1999,635)$ describe the IPS test, ". . . the IPS test is a way of combining the evidence on the unit-root hypothesis from the $N$ unit-root tests performed on the $N$ cross-section units." Fisher-type panel unit-root tests make this approach explicit.

Meta-analysis, frequently used in biostatistics and medical sciences, is the combination of results from multiple studies designed to test a similar hypothesis in order to yield a more decisive conclusion. One type of meta-analysis, first proposed by R. A. Fisher, combines the $p$-values from independent tests to obtain an overall test statistic and is frequently called a Fisher-type test. See Whitehead (2002, sec. 9.8) for an introduction. In the context of panel data unit-root tests, we perform a unit-root test on each panel's series separately, then combine the $p$-values to obtain an overall test of whether the panel series contains a unit root.
xtunitroot fisher performs either ADF or Phillips-Perron unit-root tests on each panel depending on whether you specify the dfuller or pperron option. The actual tests are conducted by the dfuller and pperron commands, and you can specify to xtunitroot fisher any options those commands take; see [TS] dfuller and [TS] pperron.
xtunitroot fisher combines the $p$-values from the panel-specific unit-root tests using the four methods proposed by Choi (2001). Three of the methods differ in whether they use the inverse $\chi^{2}$, inverse-normal, or inverse-logit transformation of $p$-values, and the fourth is a modification of the inverse $\chi^{2}$ transformation that is suitable for when $N$ tends to infinity. The inverse-normal and inverse-logit transformations can be used whether $N$ is finite or infinite.

The null hypothesis being tested by xtunitroot fisher is that all panels contain a unit root. For a finite number of panels, the alternative is that at least one panel is stationary. As $N$ tends to infinity, the number of panels that do not have a unit root should grow at the same rate as $N$ under the alternative hypothesis.

## $>$ Example 6

Here we test for a unit root in Inrxrate using all 151 countries in our sample. We will use the ADF test. As before, we do not include a trend in real exchange rates and will therefore not specify the trend option. However, because the mean real exchange rate for any country is nonzero, we will specify the drift option. We will use two lags in the ADF regressions, and we will remove cross-sectional means by using demean. We type


|  |  | Statistic | p-value |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Inverse chi-squared(302) | P | 975.9130 | 0.0000 |
| Inverse normal | Z | -19.6183 | 0.0000 |
| Inverse logit t(759) | $\mathrm{L} *$ | -20.9768 | 0.0000 |
| Modified inv. chi-squared Pm | 27.4211 | 0.0000 |  |

P statistic requires number of panels to be finite.
Other statistics are suitable for finite or infinite number of panels.

All four of the tests strongly reject the null hypothesis that all the panels contain unit roots. Choi's (2001) simulation results suggest that the inverse normal $Z$ statistic offers the best trade-off between size and power, and he recommends using it in applications. We have observed that the inverse logit $L^{*}$ test typically agrees with the $Z$ test. Under the null hypothesis, $Z$ has a standard normal distribution and $L^{*}$ has a $t$ distribution with $5 N+4$ degrees of freedom. Low values of $Z$ and $L^{*}$ cast doubt on the null hypothesis.

When the number of panels is finite, the inverse $\chi^{2} P$ test is applicable; this statistic has a $\chi^{2}$ distribution with $2 N$ degrees of freedom, and large values are cause to reject the null hypothesis. Under the null hypothesis, as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty, P$ tends to infinity so that $P$ has a degenerate limiting distribution. For large panels, Choi (2001) therefore proposes the modified inverse $\chi^{2} P_{m}$ test which converges to a standard normal distribution; a large value of $P_{m}$ casts doubt on the null hypothesis. Choi's simulation results do not reveal a specific value of $N$ over which $P_{m}$ should be preferred to $P$, though he mentions that $N=100$ is still too small for $P_{m}$ to have an approximately normal distribution.

## Hadri LM test

All the tests we have discussed so far take as the null hypothesis that the series contains a unit root. Classical statistical methods are designed to reject the null hypothesis only when the evidence against the null is sufficiently overwhelming. However, because unit-root tests typically are not very powerful against alternative hypotheses of somewhat persistent but stationary processes, reversing roles and testing the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative of a unit root is appealing. For pure time series, the KPSS test of Kwiatkowski et al. (1992) is one such test.

The Hadri (2000) LM test uses panel data to test the null hypothesis that the data are stationary versus the alternative that at least one panel contains a unit root. The test is designed for cases with large $T$ and moderate $N$. The motivation for the test is straightforward. Suppose we include a panel-specific time trend (using the trend option with xtunitroot hadri) and write our series, $y_{i t}$, as

$$
y_{i t}=r_{i t}+\beta_{i} t+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $r_{i t}$ is a random walk,

$$
r_{i t}=r_{i, t-1}+u_{i t}
$$

and $\epsilon_{i t}$ and $u_{i t}$ are zero-mean i.i.d. normal errors. If the variance of $u_{i t}$ were zero, then $r_{i t}$ would collapse to a constant; $y_{i t}$ would therefore be trend stationary. Using this logic, the Hadri LM test tests the hypothesis

$$
H_{0}: \lambda=\frac{\sigma_{u}^{2}}{\sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}}=0 \quad \text { versus } \quad H_{a}: \lambda>0
$$

Two options to xtunitroot hadri allow you to relax the assumption that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is i.i.d., though normality is still required. You can specify the robust option to obtain a variant of the test that is robust to heteroskedasticity across panels, or you can specify kernel () to obtain a variant that is robust to serial correlation and heteroskedasticity. Asymptotically, the Hadri LM test is justified as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$. As a practical matter, Hadri (2000) recommends this test for "large" $T$ and "moderate" $N$.

## $>$ Example 7

We now test the null hypothesis that lnrxrate is stationary for the subset of OECD countries. To control for serial correlation, we will use a Bartlett kernel with 5 lags. We type

```
. xtunitroot hadri lnrxrate if oecd, kernel(bartlett 5) demean
Hadri LM test for lnrxrate
```



```
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\hline & Statistic & p-value \\
\hline\(z\) & 9.6473 & 0.0000 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

We strongly reject the null hypothesis that all panels' series are stationary in favor of the alternative that at least one of them contains a unit root. In contrast, the previous examples generally rejected the null hypothesis that all series contain unit roots in favor of the alternative that at least some are stationary. For cautionary remarks on the use of panel unit-root tests in the examination of PPP, see, for example, Banerjee, Marcellino, and Osbat (2005). In short, our results are qualitatively quite similar to those reported in the literature, though Banerjee, Marcellino, and Osbat argue that because of cross-unit cointegration and long-run relationships among countries, panel unit-root tests quite often reject the null hypothesis even when true.

## Stored results

xtunitroot llc stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars

```
r(N) number of observations
    r(N_g) number of groups
    r(N_t) number of time periods
    r(sig_adj) standard deviation adjustment
    r(mu_adj) mean adjustment
    r(delta) pooled estimate of }
    r(se_delta) pooled standard error of \widehat{\delta}
    r(Var_ep) variance of whitened differenced series
    r(sbar)
    r(ttilde)
    r(td)
    r(p_td)
    r(tds)
    r(p_tds)
    r(hac_lags)
    r(hac_lagm)
    r(adf_lags)
    r(adf_lagm)
        r(test)
        r(hac_kernel)
        r(hac_method)
    r(adf_method)
    r(demean)
    r(deterministics)
    mean of ratio of long-run to innovation standard deviations
    observations per panel after lagging and differencing
    unadjusted }\mp@subsup{t}{\delta}{}\mathrm{ statistic
    p-value for t}\mp@subsup{t}{\delta}{
    adjusted t* statistic
    p-value for }\mp@subsup{t}{\delta}{*
    lags used in HAC variance estimator
    average lags used in HAC variance estimator
    lags used in ADF regressions
    average lags used in ADF regressions
    llc
    kernel used in HAC variance estimator
    HAC lag-selection algorithm
    ADF regression lag-selection criterion
    demean, if the data were demeaned
    noconstant, constant, or trend
```

Macros
xtunitroot ht stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars

```
        r(N)
        r(N_g)
        r(N_t)
        r(rho)
        r(Var_rho)
        r(mean_rho)
        r(z)
        r(p)
```

```
number of observations
```

number of observations
number of groups
number of groups
number of time periods
number of time periods
estimated \rho
estimated \rho
variance of \rho under }\mp@subsup{H}{0}{
variance of \rho under }\mp@subsup{H}{0}{
mean of \rho}\mathrm{ under }\mp@subsup{H}{0}{
mean of \rho}\mathrm{ under }\mp@subsup{H}{0}{
z statistic
z statistic
p-value

```
p-value
```

Macros

```
r(test)
    r(demean)
    r(deterministics)
    r(altt)
```


## ht

demean, if the data were demeaned noconstant, constant, or trend altt, if altt was specified
xtunitroot breitung stores the following in r() :
Scalars

```
r(N) number of observations
r(N_g) number of groups
r(N_t)
r(lambda)
r(lrobust)
r(p)
r(p_lrobust)
r(lags)
number of time periods
test statistic }
robust test statistic }\mp@subsup{\lambda}{R}{
p-value for }
p-value for }\mp@subsup{\lambda}{R}{
lags used for prewhitening
```

Macros

```
r(test)
r(demean)
r(robust)
r(deterministics)
```

```
breitung
demean, if the data were demeaned
robust, if specified
noconstant, constant, or trend
```

xtunitroot ips stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars

```
        r(N)
    r(N_g)
    r(N_t)
    r(tbar)
    r(cv_10)
    r(cv_5)
    r(cv_1)
    r(zt)
    r(ttildebar)
    r(zttildebar)
    r(p_zttildebar)
    r(wtbar)
    r(p_wtbar)
    r(lags)
    r(lagm)
```

number of observations
number of groups
number of time periods
test statistic $t-b a r_{N T}$
exact $10 \%$ critical value for $t-b a r_{N T}$
exact $5 \%$ critical value for $t-b a r_{N T}$
exact $1 \%$ critical value for $t-b a r_{N T}$
test statistic $\underset{\sim}{\underset{\sim}{Z}}{ }_{t-b a r}$
test statistic $\widetilde{t}-$ bar $_{N T}$
test statistic $Z_{\sim}^{\sim}$
$p$-value for $Z \sim^{t-b a r}$
$p$-value for $Z \underset{t-b}{\sim}$
test statistic $W_{t-b a r}$
$p$-value for $W_{t-b a r}$
lags used in ADF regressions
average lags used in ADF regressions
Macros
$r$ (test) ips
$r$ (demean)
r(adf_method)
demean, if the data were demeaned
ADF regression lag-selection criterion
r(deterministics)
constant or trend
xtunitroot fisher stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars

```
r(N)
    r(N_g)
    r(N_t)
    r(P)
    r(df_P)
    r(p_P)
    r(L)
    r(df_L)
    r(p_L)
    r(Z)
    r(p_Z)
    r(Pm)
    r(p_Pm)
```

```
number of observations
```

number of observations
number of groups
number of groups
number of time periods
number of time periods
inverse }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2}P\mathrm{ statistic
inverse }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2}P\mathrm{ statistic
P statistic degrees of freedom
P statistic degrees of freedom
p-value for P statistic
p-value for P statistic
inverse logit L statistic
inverse logit L statistic
L statistic degrees of freedom
L statistic degrees of freedom
p-value for L statistic
p-value for L statistic
inverse normal }Z\mathrm{ statistic
inverse normal }Z\mathrm{ statistic
p-value for Z statistic
p-value for Z statistic
modified inverse }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2}\mp@subsup{P}{m}{}\mathrm{ statistic
modified inverse }\mp@subsup{\chi}{}{2}\mp@subsup{P}{m}{}\mathrm{ statistic
p-value for }\mp@subsup{P}{m}{}\mathrm{ statistic

```
p-value for }\mp@subsup{P}{m}{}\mathrm{ statistic
```

Macros
Macros

```
        r(test)
        r(urtest)
r(options)
        r(demean)
r(test)
```

```
fisher
dfuller or pperron
options passed to dfuller or pperron
demean, if the data were demeaned
```

xtunitroot hadri stores the following in $r()$ :
Scalars
number of observations number of groups $r\left(N_{-} t\right) \quad$ number of time periods $r$ (var) variance of $z$ under $H_{0}$ $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{mu}) \quad$ mean of $z$ under $H_{0}$
r(z)
$r(p)$ r(lags)
test statistic $z$
$p$-value for $z$
lags used for HAC variance
Macros

```
r(test) hadri
    r(demean)
    r(robust)
    r(kernel) kernel used for HAC variance
    r(deterministics) constant or trend
```


## Methods and formulas

Methods and formulas are presented under the following headings:
Levin-Lin-Chu test
Harris-Tsavalis test
Breitung test
Breitung test without trend
Breitung test with trend
Im-Pesaran-Shin test
Fisher-type tests
Hadri LM test
We consider a simple panel-data model with a first-order autoregressive component:

$$
y_{i t}=\rho_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $i=1, \ldots, N$ indexes panels and $t=1, \ldots, T$ indexes time. For the IPS, Fisher-type, and Hadri LM tests, we instead have $t=1, \ldots, T_{i}$, because they do not require balanced panels. $\epsilon_{i t}$ is a zero-mean error term; we discuss the assumptions about $\epsilon_{i t}$ for each test below. Here we use $N$ to denote the number of panels, not the total number of observations. By default, $\mathbf{z}_{i t}=1$, so that the term $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ represents panel-specific means (fixed effects). If noconstant is specified, $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ vanishes. If trend is specified, $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime}=(1, t)$ so that $\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}$ represents panel-specific means and linear time trends.

## Levin-Lin-Chu test

The starting point for the LLC test is the regression model

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{p_{i}} \theta_{i j} \Delta y_{i, t-j}+u_{i t} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

In $\left(1^{\prime}\right)$, LLC assume $\epsilon_{i t}$ is independently distributed across panels and follows a stationary invertible process so that with sufficient lags of $\Delta y_{i t}$ included in (7), $u_{i t}$ will be white noise with potentially heterogeneous variance across panels. If lags(\#) is specified with xtunitroot llc, then we set $p_{i}=\#$ for all panels $i=1, \ldots, N$. Otherwise, we fit (7) for each panel individually for lags $1 \ldots p^{\max }$ and choose the lag length, $p_{i}$, that minimizes the information criterion requested by the user. During this step, we restrict estimation to the subset of observations that are valid when $p^{\max }$ lags are included. Information criteria are defined as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{AIC} & =(-2 \ln L+2 k) / M \\
\mathrm{BIC} & =(-2 \ln L+k \ln M) / M \\
\mathrm{HQIC} & =(-2 \ln L+2 k \ln \ln M) / M
\end{aligned}
$$

where $\ln L$ is the $\log$ likelihood assuming Gaussian errors, $M=T-p^{\max }-2$, and $k$ is the number of parameters in (7).

With the lag orders, $p_{i}$, in hand, the test proceeds in three main steps, the first of which is to use panel-by-panel OLS regressions to obtain the orthogonalized residuals

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{e}_{i t}=\Delta y_{i t}-\sum_{j=1}^{p_{i}} \widehat{\theta}_{i j} \Delta y_{i j}-\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \widehat{\gamma}_{i} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{v}_{i, t-1}=y_{i, t-1}-\sum_{j=1}^{p_{i}} \widetilde{\theta}_{i j} \Delta y_{i j}-\mathbf{z}_{i t} \widetilde{\gamma}_{i} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

To control for panel-level heterogeneity, compute

$$
\widetilde{e}_{i t}=\widehat{e}_{i t} / \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon i} \quad \text { and } \quad \widetilde{v}_{i, t-1}=\widehat{v}_{i, t-1} / \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon i}
$$

where

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon i}^{2}=\frac{1}{T-p_{i}-1} \sum_{t=p_{i}}^{T}\left(\widehat{e}_{i t}-\widehat{\delta}_{i} \widehat{v}_{i, t-1}\right)^{2}
$$

and $\widehat{\delta}_{i}$ is the OLS coefficient from a regression of $\widehat{e}_{i t}$ on $\widehat{v}_{i, t-1}$. If time trends are included (by specifying the trend option), then a linear time trend is included in regressions (7), (8), and (9).

In the second step, we estimate the ratio of long-run to short-run variances. Under the null hypothesis of a unit root, the long-run variance of the model without panel-specific intercepts or time trends $\left(z_{i t}=\{\emptyset\}\right)$ can be estimated as

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{y i}^{2}=\frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=2}^{T} \Delta y_{i t}^{2}+\frac{2}{T-1} \sum_{j=1}^{m} K(j, m)\left(\sum_{t=j+2}^{T} \Delta y_{i t} \Delta y_{i, t-j}\right)
$$

where $m$ is the maximum number of lags and $K(j, m)$ is the kernel weight function. Define $z=j /(m+1)$. If kernel is bartlett, then

$$
K(j, m)= \begin{cases}1-z & 0 \leq z \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

If kernel is parzen, then

$$
K(j, m)= \begin{cases}1-6 z^{2}+6 z^{3} & 0 \leq z \leq 0.5 \\ 2(1-z)^{3} & 0.5<z \leq 1 \\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

If kernel is quadraticspectral, then

$$
K(j, m)= \begin{cases}1 & z=0 \\ 3\{\sin (\theta) / \theta-\cos (\theta)\} / \theta^{2} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

where $\theta=6 \pi z / 5$. If the user requests automatic bandwidth (lag) selection using the Newey-West algorithm, then we use the method documented in Methods and formulas of [R] ivregress with $\mathbf{z}_{i}=\mathbf{h}=1$. If automatic lag selection with the LLC algorithm is chosen, then $m=\operatorname{int}\left(3.21 T^{1 / 3}\right)$.

If panel-specific intercepts are included (by not specifying noconstant), then in the formula for $\widehat{\sigma}_{y i}^{2}$ we replace $\Delta y_{i t}$ with $\Delta y_{i t}-\overline{\Delta y_{i t}}$, where $\overline{\Delta y_{i t}}$ is the panel-level mean of $\Delta y_{i t}$ for panel $i$. Let $\widehat{s}_{i}=\widehat{\sigma}_{y i} / \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon i}$, and denote $\widehat{S}_{N}=N^{-1} \sum_{i} \widehat{s}_{i}$.

In the third step, we run the OLS regression

$$
\widetilde{e}_{i t}=\delta \widetilde{v}_{i, t-1}+\widetilde{\epsilon}_{i t}
$$

Called the "Basic test statistic" in the output of xtunitroot llc is the standard $t$ statistic for $\delta$ computed as

$$
t_{\delta}=\widehat{\delta} / \mathrm{se}_{(\widehat{\delta})}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{se}_{(\widehat{\delta})}=\widehat{\sigma}_{\widetilde{\epsilon}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p_{i}+2}^{T} \widetilde{v}_{i, t-1}^{2}\right)^{-1 / 2} \\
& \widehat{\sigma}_{\widetilde{\epsilon}}^{2}=\frac{1}{N \widetilde{T}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p_{i}+2}\left(\widetilde{e}_{i t}-\delta \widetilde{v}_{i, t-1}\right)^{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

and $\widetilde{T}=T-\bar{p}-1$ with $\bar{p}$ the average of $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{N}$.
The adjusted test statistic is then computed as

$$
t_{\delta}^{*}=\frac{t_{\delta}-N \widetilde{T} \widehat{S}_{N} \operatorname{se}_{(\widehat{\delta})} \mu_{\widetilde{T}}^{*}}{\sigma_{\widetilde{T}}^{*}}
$$

where $\mu_{\widetilde{T}}^{*}$ and $\sigma_{\widetilde{T}}^{*}$ are obtained by linearly interpolating the values in LLC (2002, table 2). $t_{\delta}^{*}$ is asymptotically $N(0,1)$, with very negative values casting doubt on $H_{0}$. If noconstant is specified, then the asymptotic properties hold as $\sqrt{N} / T \rightarrow \infty$. Otherwise, $T$ must grow at a faster rate so that $N / T \rightarrow \infty$.

## Harris-Tsavalis test

The starting point for the HT test is (4), where $\epsilon_{i t}$ is assumed to be i.i.d. normal with constant variance across panels. Denote by $\widehat{\rho}$ the least-squares estimate of $\rho$.

HT show that $\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\rho}-\mu) \xrightarrow{D} N\left(0, \sigma^{2}\right)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ with $T$ fixed, where $\mu$ and $\sigma^{2}$ depend on the specification of the deterministic component:

| Option | $\mu$ | $\sigma^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| noconstant | 1 | $\frac{2}{T(T-1)}$ |
| none | $1-\frac{3}{T+1}$ | $\frac{3\left(17 T^{2}-20 T+17\right)}{5(T-1)(T+1)^{3}}$ |
| trend | $1-\frac{15}{2(T+2)}$ | $\frac{15\left(193 T^{2}-728 T+1147\right)}{112(T+2)^{3}(T-2)}$ |

## Breitung test

Suppose the data are generated by an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process so that we can express $y_{i t}$ as

$$
y_{i t}=\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+x_{i t}
$$

where

$$
x_{i t}=\alpha_{1} x_{i, t-1}+\alpha_{2} x_{i, t-2}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $\epsilon_{i t}$ is an error term. A prewhitening step is available to correct for serial correlation. The nonrobust version assumes that $\epsilon_{i t}$ is uncorrelated across panels, whereas the robust version allows for the panels to be contemporaneously correlated with covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$.

Under the null hypothesis that $y_{i t}$ contains a unit root, that is, that $y_{i t}$ is difference stationary, $\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}=1$. Under the alternative that $y_{i t}$ is stationary, $\alpha_{1}+\alpha_{2}<1$. Some of the time indices and summation limits of the formulas below appear more complex than those in Breitung (2000) and Breitung and Das (2005) because our formulas make explicit the loss of observations because of the prewhitening step.

## Breitung test without trend

Let $y_{i, t}^{\ell}=y_{i, t-1}-y_{i, p+1}$ unless noconstant is specified, in which case let $y_{i, t}^{\ell}=y_{i, t-1}$. If the lags () option is specified with xtunitroot breitung, then we replace $\Delta y_{i t}$ and $y_{i, t}^{\ell}$ in the following description with the residuals from running regressions of $\Delta y_{i t}$ and $y_{i, t}^{\ell}$ on $\Delta y_{i, t-1}, \ldots, \Delta y_{i, t-p}$, where $p$ is the lag order specified in lags().

Define

$$
\sigma_{i}^{2}=\frac{1}{T-p-2} \sum_{t=p+2}^{T}\left(\Delta y_{i t}\right)^{2}
$$

Then

$$
\lambda=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p+2}^{T} y_{i t}^{\ell} \cdot \Delta y_{i t} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p+2}^{T}\left(y_{i t}^{\ell}\right)^{2} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}}
$$

$\lambda$ is asymptotically distributed $N(0,1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$; small values of $\lambda$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

For the robust version of the test statistic, let

$$
\phi=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p+2}^{T} y_{i t}^{\ell} \cdot \Delta y_{i t} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=p+2}^{T}\left(y_{i t}^{\ell}\right)^{2} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}
$$

and define $u_{i t}=\Delta y_{i t}-\phi y_{i t}^{\ell}$. Let $\mathbf{u}_{i}=\left(u_{i, p+2}, \ldots, u_{i T}\right)^{\prime}$ and let the $N \times N$ matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ have typical element $\mathbf{u}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{u}_{j} /(T-p-2)$. Let $\Delta \mathbf{y}_{t}=\left(\Delta y_{1 t}, \ldots, \Delta y_{N t}\right)^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{t}^{\ell}=\left(y_{1, t-1}, \ldots, y_{N, t-1}\right)^{\prime}$. Then

$$
\lambda_{\text {robust }}=\frac{\sum_{t=p+2}^{T}\left(\Delta \mathbf{y}_{t}\right)^{\prime} \mathbf{y}_{t}^{\ell}}{\sum_{t=p+2}^{T}\left(\mathbf{y}_{t}^{\ell}\right)^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \mathbf{y}_{t}^{\ell}}
$$

For $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ to be positive definite, we must have $T-p-1 \geq N$. As a practical matter, for $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ to have good finite-sample properties, we need $T \gg N$. $\lambda_{\text {robust }}$ is asymptotically distributed $N(0,1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$; very negative values of $\lambda_{\text {robust }}$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

## Breitung test with trend

Let $p$ denote the number of lags requested in the lags() option. We fit the regression

$$
\Delta y_{i t}=\alpha_{i 0}+\sum_{j=1}^{p} \alpha_{i j} \Delta y_{i, t-j}+\nu_{i t}
$$

and compute the $1 \times(T-p-1)$ vectors $\Delta \mathbf{u}_{i}$ and $\mathbf{u}_{i}^{\ell}$ with typical elements

$$
\Delta u_{i s}=\Delta y_{i s}-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \widehat{\alpha}_{i j} \Delta y_{i, s-j}
$$

and

$$
u_{i s}^{\ell}=y_{i, s-1}-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \widehat{\alpha}_{i j} y_{i, s-j-1}
$$

for $s=1, \ldots, T-p-1$. Let

$$
\sigma_{i}^{2}=\frac{1}{T-p-2} \sum_{s=1}^{T-p-1}\left(\Delta u_{i s}-\overline{\Delta u}_{i}\right) \Delta u_{i s}
$$

where $\overline{\Delta u}_{i}$ is the mean of $\Delta u_{i s}$ over $s$. Let $\Delta \mathbf{v}_{i}$ and $\mathbf{v}_{i}^{\ell}$ denote $1 \times(T-p-1)$ vectors with typical elements

$$
\Delta v_{i s}=\sqrt{\frac{T-p-s-1}{T-p-s}}\left(\Delta u_{i s}-\frac{1}{T-p-s-1} \sum_{j=s+1}^{T-p-1} \Delta u_{i j}\right)
$$

and

$$
v_{i s}^{\ell}=u_{i s}^{\ell}-u_{i 1}^{\ell}-(T-p-1) \overline{\Delta u}_{i}
$$

Now

$$
\lambda=\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{s=1}^{T-p-1} v_{i s}^{\ell} \Delta v_{i s} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{s=1}^{T-p-1}\left(v_{i s}^{\ell}\right)^{2} / \sigma_{i}^{2}}}
$$

$\lambda$ is asymptotically distributed $N(0,1)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$; very negative values of $\lambda$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$. The computation of the robust form of the statistic proceeds in a fashion entirely analogous to the case without trend.

## Im-Pesaran-Shin test

Write the model as

$$
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \gamma_{i}+\epsilon_{i t}
$$

where $\epsilon_{i t}$ is independently distributed normal for all $i$ and $t$ with panel-specific variance $\sigma_{i}^{2}$. Denote $\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}=\left(\Delta y_{i 2}, \ldots, \Delta y_{i T}\right)^{\prime}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}=\left(y_{i 1}, \ldots, y_{i, T-1}\right)^{\prime}$. Note that to be consistent with the notation used in the rest of this documentation, we start the time index at $t=1$ instead of $t=0$ as in IPS (2003). Also let $\tau_{T}$ be a conformable vector of ones, $\mathbf{M}_{\tau}=\mathbf{I}-\tau_{T}\left(\tau_{T}^{\prime} \tau_{T}\right)^{-1} \tau_{T}^{\prime}, \mathbf{X}_{i}=\left(\tau_{T}, \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}\right)$, and $\mathbf{M}_{X_{i}}=\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{X}_{i}\left(\mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}$.

First, we consider the case of no serial correlation, where the user does not specify the lags() option. Then

$$
\tilde{t}-\operatorname{bar}_{N T}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \tilde{t}_{i T}
$$

where

$$
\tilde{t}_{i T}=\frac{\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{\tau} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}}{\widetilde{\sigma}_{i T}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{\tau} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}\right)^{1 / 2}}
$$

and

$$
\widetilde{\sigma}_{i T}^{2}=\frac{\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{\tau} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{y}_{i}}{T-1}
$$

Also

$$
t-b a r_{N T}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{i T}
$$

where

$$
t_{i T}=\frac{\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{\tau} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{i T}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{\tau} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}\right)^{1 / 2}}
$$

and

$$
\widetilde{\sigma}_{i T}^{2}=\frac{\boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{y}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{X_{i}} \boldsymbol{\Delta} \mathbf{y}_{i}}{T-1}
$$

Now

$$
Z_{\widetilde{t}-b a r}=\frac{\sqrt{N}\left\{\widetilde{t}-b a r_{N T}-N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E\left(\widetilde{t}_{T_{i}}\right)\right\}}{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i} \operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{t}_{T_{i}}\right)}}
$$

where $E\left(\widetilde{t}_{T_{i}}\right)$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left(\widetilde{t}_{T_{i}}\right)$ are obtained by linearly interpolating the values shown in IPS (2003, table 1). $Z_{\overparen{t} \text {-bar }}$ has a standard normal limiting distribution for fixed $T$ and $N \rightarrow \infty$; very negative values cast doubt on $H_{0}$. Similarly,

$$
Z_{t-b a r}=\frac{\sqrt{N}\left\{t-b a r_{N T}-N^{-1} \sum_{i} E\left(t_{T_{i}}\right)\right\}}{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i} \operatorname{Var}\left(t_{T_{i}}\right)}}
$$

If the lags() option is specified, then we fit the ADF regressions

$$
\Delta y_{i t}=\phi_{i} y_{i, t-1}+\mathbf{z}_{i t}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{i}+\sum_{j=1}^{p_{i}} \rho_{i j} \Delta y_{i, t-j}+\epsilon_{i} t
$$

In matrix form, we can write this more compactly as

$$
\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}=\phi_{i} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}+\mathbf{Q}_{i} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}+\epsilon_{i}
$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_{i}=\left(\tau_{t}, \Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \ldots, \Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-p_{i}}\right)$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{i}=\left(\alpha_{i}, \rho_{i 1}, \ldots, \rho_{i p_{i}}\right)^{\prime}$. Then

$$
t-b a r_{N T}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)
$$

where

$$
t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)=\frac{\sqrt{T-p_{i}-2}\left(\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{Q_{i}} \Delta \mathbf{y}_{i}\right)}{\left(\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{Q_{i}} \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}\right)^{1 / 2}\left(\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}_{Q_{i}} \Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}\right)^{1 / 2}}
$$

where $\mathbf{M}_{Q_{i}}=\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{Q}_{i}\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{Q}_{i}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}_{i}^{\prime}, \mathbf{M}_{X_{i}}=\mathbf{I}-\mathbf{X}_{i}\left(\mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime} \mathbf{X}_{i}\right)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{i}^{\prime}$, and $\mathbf{X}_{i}=\left(\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \mathbf{Q}_{i}\right)$. Finally,

$$
\mathbf{W}_{t-b a r}(p)=\frac{\sqrt{N}\left[t-b a r_{N T}-N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} E\left\{t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)\right\}\right]}{\sqrt{N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \operatorname{Var}\left\{t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)\right\}}}
$$

where $E\left\{t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)\right\}$ and $\operatorname{Var}\left\{t_{i T}\left(p_{i}\right)\right\}$ are obtained by linearly interpolating the values shown in IPS (2003, table 3). $\mathbf{W}_{t-b a r}(p)$ has a standard normal limiting distribution as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$; very negative values cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

## Fisher-type tests

We use dfuller or pperron to perform unit-root tests on each panel; denote the $p$-value for the respective test on the $i$ th panel as $p_{i}$. All of these tests are predicated on $T \rightarrow \infty$ so that the unit-root test for each panel is consistent. The $P$ test is for finite $N$; the other tests are valid whether $N$ is finite or infinite. Then

$$
P=-2 \sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \left(p_{i}\right)
$$

$P \sim \chi^{2}(2 N)$ and large values cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

$$
Z=\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Phi^{-1}\left(p_{i}\right)
$$

where $\Phi^{-1}()$ is the inverse of the standard normal cumulative distribution function. $Z \sim N(0,1)$; very negative values of $Z$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

$$
L=\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ln \left(\frac{p_{i}}{1-p_{i}}\right)
$$

$L^{*}=\sqrt{k} L \sim t(5 N+4)$ where

$$
k=\frac{3(5 N+4)}{\pi^{2} N(5 N+2)}
$$

Very negative values of $L^{*}$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$. Finally,

$$
P_{m}=-\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\{\ln \left(p_{i}\right)+1\right\}
$$

$P_{m} \sim N(0,1) ;$ very positive values of $P_{m}$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$.

## Hadri LM test

As discussed in the main text, the Hadri LM test can be viewed as a test of $H_{0}: \sigma_{u}^{2} / \sigma_{\epsilon}^{2}=0$, where both $u_{i t}$ and $\epsilon_{i t}$ are normally distributed random errors.

Let $\widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}$ denote the residuals from a regression of $y_{i t}$ on a panel-specific intercept or a panel-specific intercept and time trend if trend is specified. Then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\widehat{\mathrm{LM}}=\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i} \frac{1}{T^{2}} \sum_{t} S_{i t}^{2}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
S_{i t}=\sum_{j=1}^{t} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i j}
$$

and

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}=\frac{1}{N T^{\prime}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}^{2}
$$

where $T^{\prime}=T-2$ if trend is specified and $T^{\prime}=T-1$ otherwise. Then

$$
Z=\frac{\sqrt{N}(\widehat{\mathrm{LM}}-\mu)}{\sigma}
$$

where $\mu=1 / 15$ and $\sigma=11 / 6300$ if trend is specified and $\mu=1 / 6$ and $\sigma=1 / 45$ otherwise. $Z \sim N(0,1)$ asymptotically as $T \rightarrow \infty$ followed by $N \rightarrow \infty$. Very positive values of $Z$ cast doubt on $H_{0}$. If robust is specified, then we instead use

$$
\widehat{\mathrm{LM}}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\frac{\sum_{t=1}^{T} S_{i t}^{2}}{T^{2} \widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon, i}^{2}}\right)
$$

where we calculate $\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon, i}^{2}$ individually for each panel:

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon, i}^{2}=\sum_{t=1}^{T} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}^{2}
$$

If kernel () is specified, then we use (10) with

$$
\widehat{\sigma}_{\epsilon}^{2}=\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=p+1}^{T} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i t}^{2}+\frac{2}{T} \sum_{j=1}^{m} K(j, m) \sum_{t=j+1}^{T} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i t} \widehat{\epsilon}_{i, t-j}\right\}
$$

where $m$ is the maximum number of lags and $K(.,$.$) is the kernel function defined previously.$
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## Also see

[TS] dfgls - DF-GLS unit-root test
[TS] dfuller - Augmented Dickey-Fuller unit-root test
[TS] pperron - Phillips-Perron unit-root test

## Glossary

Arellano-Bond estimator. The Arellano-Bond estimator is a generalized method of moments (GMM) estimator for linear dynamic panel-data models that uses lagged levels of the endogenous variables as well as first differences of the exogenous variables as instruments. The Arellano-Bond estimator removes the panel-specific heterogeneity by first-differencing the regression equation.
autoregressive process. In autoregressive processes, the current value of a variable is a linear function of its own past values and a white-noise error term. For panel data, a first-order autoregressive process, denoted as an $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process, is $y_{i t}=\rho y_{i, t-1}+\epsilon_{i t}$, where $i$ denotes panels, $t$ denotes time, and $\epsilon_{i t}$ is white noise.
balanced data. A longitudinal or panel dataset is said to be balanced if each panel has the same number of observations. See also weakly balanced and strongly balanced.
between estimator. The between estimator is a panel-data estimator that obtains its estimates by running OLS on the panel-level means of the variables. This estimator uses only the between-panel variation in the data to identify the parameters, ignoring any within-panel variation. For it to be consistent, the between estimator requires that the panel-level means of the regressors be uncorrelated with the panel-specific heterogeneity terms.
canonical link. Corresponding to each family of distributions in a generalized linear model is a canonical link function for which there is a sufficient statistic with the same dimension as the number of parameters in the linear predictor. The use of canonical link functions provides the GLM with desirable statistical properties, especially when the sample size is small.
conditional fixed-effects model. In general, including panel-specific dummies to control for fixed effects in nonlinear models results in inconsistent estimates. For some nonlinear models, the fixedeffect term can be removed from the likelihood function by conditioning on a sufficient statistic. For example, the conditional fixed-effect logit model conditions on the number of positive outcomes within each panel.
conditional hazard function. In the context of random-effects survival models, the conditional hazard function is the hazard function computed conditionally on the random effects. Even within the same covariate pattern, the conditional hazard function varies among individuals who belong to different random-effects clusters.
conditional hazard ratio. In the context of random-effects survival models, the conditional hazard ratio is the ratio of two conditional hazard functions evaluated at different values of the covariates. Unless stated differently, the denominator corresponds to the conditional hazard function at baseline, that is, with all the covariates set to zero.
correlation structure. A correlation structure is a set of assumptions imposed on the within-panel variance-covariance matrix of the errors in a panel-data model. See [XT] xtgee for examples of different correlation structures.
cross-sectional data. Cross-sectional data refers to data collected over a set of individuals, such as households, firms, or countries sampled from a population at a given point in time.
cross-sectional time-series data. Cross-sectional time-series data is another name for panel data. The term cross-sectional time-series data is sometimes reserved for datasets in which a relatively small number of panels were observed over many periods. See also panel data.
disturbance term. The disturbance term encompasses any shocks that occur to the dependent variable that cannot be explained by the conditional (or deterministic) portion of the model.
dynamic model. A dynamic model is one in which prior values of the dependent variable or disturbance term affect the current value of the dependent variable.
endogenous variable. An endogenous variable is a regressor that is correlated with the unobservable error term. Equivalently, an endogenous variable is one whose values are determined by the equilibrium or outcome of a structural model.
error-components model. The error-components model is another name for the random-effects model. See also random-effects model.
exogenous variable. An exogenous variable is a regressor that is not correlated with any of the unobservable error terms in the model. Equivalently, an exogenous variable is one whose values change independently of the other variables in a structural model.
fixed-effects model. The fixed-effects model is a model for panel data in which the panel-specific errors are treated as fixed parameters. These parameters are panel-specific intercepts and therefore allow the conditional mean of the dependent variable to vary across panels. The linear fixedeffects estimator is consistent, even if the regressors are correlated with the fixed effects. See also random-effects model.
generalized estimating equations (GEE). The method of generalized estimating equations is used to fit population-averaged panel-data models. GEE extends the GLM method by allowing the user to specify a variety of different within-panel correlation structures.
generalized linear model. The generalized linear model is an estimation framework in which the user specifies a distributional family for the dependent variable and a link function that relates the dependent variable to a linear combination of the regressors. The distribution must be a member of the exponential family of distributions. The generalized linear model encompasses many common models, including linear, probit, and Poisson regression.
idiosyncratic error term. In longitudinal or panel-data models, the idiosyncratic error term refers to the observation-specific zero-mean random-error term. It is analogous to the random-error term of cross-sectional regression analysis.
instrumental variables. Instrumental variables are exogenous variables that are correlated with one or more of the endogenous variables in a structural model. The term instrumental variable is often reserved for those exogenous variables that are not included as regressors in the model.
instrumental-variables (IV) estimator. An instrumental variables estimator uses instrumental variables to produce consistent parameter estimates in models that contain endogenous variables. IV estimators can also be used to control for measurement error.
interval data. Interval data are data in which the true value of the dependent variable is not observed. Instead, all that is known is that the value lies within a given interval.
link function. In a generalized linear model, the link function relates a linear combination of predictors to the expected value of the dependent variable. In a linear regression model, the link function is simply the identity function.
longitudinal data. Longitudinal data is another term for panel data. See also panel data.
negative binomial regression model. The negative binomial regression model is for applications in which the dependent variable represents the number of times an event occurs. The negative binomial regression model is an alternative to the Poisson model for use when the dependent variable is overdispersed, meaning that the variance of the dependent variable is greater than its mean.
overidentifying restrictions. The order condition for model identification requires that the number of exogenous variables excluded from the model be at least as great as the number of endogenous regressors. When the number of excluded exogenous variables exceeds the number of endogenous regressors, the model is overidentified, and the validity of the instruments can then be checked via a test of overidentifying restrictions.
panel data. Panel data are data in which the same units were observed over multiple periods. The units, called panels, are often firms, households, or patients who were observed at several points in time. In a typical panel dataset, the number of panels is large, and the number of observations per panel is relatively small.
panel-corrected standard errors (PCSEs). The term panel-corrected standard errors refers to a class of estimators for the variance-covariance matrix of the OLS estimator when there are relatively few panels with many observations per panel. PCSEs account for heteroskedasticity, autocorrelation, or cross-sectional correlation.

Poisson regression model. The Poisson regression model is used when the dependent variable represents the number of times an event occurs. In the Poisson model, the variance of the dependent variable is equal to the conditional mean.
pooled estimator. A pooled estimator ignores the longitudinal or panel aspect of a dataset and treats the observations as if they were cross-sectional.
population-averaged model. A population-averaged model is used for panel data in which the parameters measure the effects of the regressors on the outcome for the average individual in the population. The panel-specific errors are treated as uncorrelated random variables drawn from a population with zero mean and constant variance, and the parameters measure the effects of the regressors on the dependent variable after integrating over the distribution of the random effects.
predetermined variable. A predetermined variable is a regressor in which its contemporaneous and future values are not correlated with the unobservable error term but past values are correlated with the error term.
prewhiten. To prewhiten is to apply a transformation to a time series so that it becomes white noise.
production function. A production function describes the maximum amount of a good that can be produced, given specified levels of the inputs.
quadrature. Quadrature is a set of numerical methods to evaluate a definite integral.
random-coefficients model. A random-coefficients model is a panel-data model in which groupspecific heterogeneity is introduced by assuming that each group has its own parameter vector, which is drawn from a population common to all panels.
random-effects model. A random-effects model for panel data treats the panel-specific errors as uncorrelated random variables drawn from a population with zero mean and constant variance. The regressors must be uncorrelated with the random effects for the estimates to be consistent. See also fixed-effects model.
robust standard errors. Robust standard errors, also known as Huber/White or Taylor linearization standard errors, are based on the sandwich estimator of variance. Robust standard errors can be interpreted as representing the sample-to-sample variability of the parameter estimates, even when the model is misspecified. See also semirobust standard errors.
semirobust standard errors. Semirobust standard errors are closely related to robust standard errors and can be interpreted as representing the sample-to-sample variability of the parameter estimates, even when the model is misspecified, as long as the mean structure of the model is specified correctly. See also robust standard errors.
sequential limit theory. The sequential limit theory is a method of determining asymptotic properties of a panel-data statistic in which one index, say, $N$, the number of panels, is held fixed, while $T$, the number of time periods, goes to infinity, providing an intermediate limit. Then one obtains a final limit by studying the behavior of this intermediate limit as the other index ( $N$ here) goes to infinity.
strongly balanced. A longitudinal or panel dataset is said to be strongly balanced if each panel has the same number of observations and the observations for different panels were all made at the same times.
unbalanced data. A longitudinal or panel dataset is said to be unbalanced if each panel does not have the same number of observations. See also weakly balanced and strongly balanced.
weakly balanced. A longitudinal or panel dataset is said to be weakly balanced if each panel has the same number of observations but the observations for different panels were not all made at the same times.
white noise. A variable $u_{t}$ represents a white-noise process if the mean of $u_{t}$ is zero, the variance of $u_{t}$ is $\sigma^{2}$, and the covariance between $u_{t}$ and $u_{s}$ is zero for all $s \neq t$.
within estimator. The within estimator is a panel-data estimator that removes the panel-specific heterogeneity by subtracting the panel-level means from each variable and then performing ordinary least squares on the demeaned data. The within estimator is used in fitting the linear fixed-effects model.

## Subject and author index

See the combined subject index and the combined author index in the Glossary and Index.


[^0]:    Instruments for differenced equation
    GMM-type: L(2/.).n
    Standard: D.w LD.w D.k LD.k L2D.k D.ys LD.ys L2D.ys D.yr1980
    D.yr1981 D.yr1982 D.yr1983 D.yr1984 D.year

    Instruments for level equation
    Standard: _cons

[^1]:    * estat ic is not appropriate after xtcloglog, pa.
    $\dagger$ forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^2]:    * forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^3]:    Model
    noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
    panels(pdist) specifies the error structure across panels.
    panels(iid) specifies a homoskedastic error structure with no cross-sectional correlation. This is the default.

[^4]:    Also see
    [XT] xtgls postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtgls
    [XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
    [XT] xtpcse - Linear regression with panel-corrected standard errors
    [XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
    [XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
    [R] regress - Linear regression
    [TS] newey - Regression with Newey-West standard errors
    [TS] prais - Prais-Winsten and Cochrane-Orcutt regression
    [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

[^5]:    * estat ic and lrtest are available only if igls and corr (independent) were specified at estimation.

[^6]:    Model
    noconstant; see $[R]$ estimation options.
    fd requests the first-differenced regression estimator.
    regress specifies that all the covariates be treated as exogenous and that the instrument list be ignored. Specifying regress causes xtivreg to fit the requested panel-data regression model of depvar on varlist ${ }_{1}$ and varlist ${ }_{2}$, ignoring varlist $_{\mathrm{iv}}$.

[^7]:    * contrast and pwcompare are not appropriate after xtivreg, fd.

[^8]:    * estat ic and lrtest are not appropriate after xtlogit, pa.
    $\dagger$ forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results or after xtlogit, fe.

[^9]:    * estat ic and lrtest are not appropriate after xtnbreg, pa.
    $\dagger$ forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^10]:    Model
    noconstant; see [R] estimation options.
    correlation (corr) specifies the form of assumed autocorrelation within panels.
    correlation(independent), the default, specifies that there is no autocorrelation.
    correlation(ar1) specifies that, within panels, there is first-order autocorrelation $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ and that the coefficient of the $\operatorname{AR}(1)$ process is common to all the panels.

[^11]:    Also see
    [XT] xtpese postestimation - Postestimation tools for xtpcse
    [XT] xtset - Declare data to be panel data
    [XT] xtgls - Fit panel-data models by using GLS
    [XT] xtreg - Fixed-, between-, and random-effects and population-averaged linear models
    [XT] xtregar - Fixed- and random-effects linear models with an AR(1) disturbance
    [ R$]$ regress - Linear regression
    [TS] newey - Regression with Newey-West standard errors
    [TS] prais - Prais-Winsten and Cochrane-Orcutt regression
    [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

[^12]:    * estat ic and lrtest are not appropriate after xtpoisson, pa.
    $\dagger$
    forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^13]:    * estat ic and lrtest are not appropriate after xtprobit, pa.
    $\dagger$ forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^14]:    * forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^15]:    * estat ic and lrtest are not appropriate after xtreg with the pa or re option.
    $\dagger$ forecast is not appropriate with mi estimation results.

[^16]:    * estat ic is not appropriate after xtregar, re.

[^17]:    *Either dfuller or pperron is required.
    ${ }^{*}$ lags(\#) is required.

