

KoulMde: An R Package for Koul's Minimum Distance Estimation

Jiwoong Kim
Michigan State University

January 27, 2022

Abstract

This article provides a full description of the R package `KoulMde` which is designed for Koul's minimum distance estimation method. When we encounter estimation problems in the linear regression and autoregressive models, this package provides more efficient estimators than other R packages.

Keywords: minimum distance estimation; linear regression; autoregressive error

1 Introduction

Minimum distance (MD) estimation method refers to the technique that obtains estimators by minimizing a difference between a function obtained from the sample of observations and the one from the assumed model. The most common and popular distance used in the literature of the MD estimation methodology is Cramér-von Mises (CM) type distance. Wolfowitz (1957) used CM type distance which measures difference between empirical distribution function and assumed model distribution function. Parr and Schucany (1980) empirically showed the robustness of these MD estimators of location parameters in the one and two sample location models. Departing from the one sample model, Koul and De Wet (1986) extended domain of applications of these MD estimators to the linear regression model, where the regression parameters of interest are estimated by minimizing a CM type distance between weighted empirical residual process and its expectation. All of these works assume that error distribution in these models is known, which is not a practical assumption. Koul (1985) weakened this assumption by assuming that the error distribution in the multiple linear regression model is symmetric around the origin. He defined a class of L_2 distances between weighted empiricals of residuals and negative residuals and a class of estimators that minimize these distances. Koul (1986) broadened the domain of applications of this MD estimation methodology to the linear autoregression models. R package `KoulMde` is based on his work (Koul (1985) and Koul (1986)). The package is available from Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) at <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/KoulMde/index.htm>.

This article is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide the detailed description of the package. We also provide a comparison between `KoulMde` and other existing estimation methods or R packages; ordinary least squares (OLS) vs. `KoulMde` in Section 2.1; `arima` (R package) vs. `KoulMde` in Section 2.2; and `orcutt` (R package) vs. `KoulMde` in Section 2.3. We conclude this article with a brief summary of the package in Section 3.

2 KoulMde package

The `KoulMde` package contains three functions: `KoulLrMde`, `KoulArMde`, and `Koul2StageMde`. The function `KoulLrMde` estimates the regression parameter vector in the multiple linear regression model; `KoulArMde` deals with the estimation of the parameter vector in linear autoregressive model of order q , a known positive integer. Wrapping up these two functions, `Koul2StageMde` provides consistent estimators of both regression and autoregressive parameters when we consider the linear regression model with autoregressive errors.

2.1 KouLLrMde

Consider the linear regression model for

$$Y_i = \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the parameter vector of interest. Let ε_i 's be independently and identically distributed random variables. In addition, ε_1 is assumed to be symmetric around zero. As in Koul (1985), we introduce the distance function for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$T(\mathbf{b}) := \sum_{k=1}^p \int \left[\sum_{i=1}^n d_{ik} \left\{ I(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{b} \leq y) - I(-Y_i + \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{b} < y) \right\} \right]^2 dH(y),$$

where H is a σ -finite measure on \mathbb{R} and symmetric around 0, i.e., $dH(-x) = -dH(x)$, for $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $d_{ik}, 1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq k \leq p$, are some real numbers. Define the class of MD estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, one for each H , as

$$T(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) := \inf_{\mathbf{b}} T(\mathbf{b}).$$

If H is continuous, then from Koul (2002, p. 149),

$$T(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n d_{ik} d_{jk} \left[|H(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{b}) - H(-Y_j + \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{b})| - |H(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{b}) - H(Y_j - \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{b})| \right].$$

Note that for degenerate H ,

$$T(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{k=1}^p \left[\sum_{i=1}^n d_{ik} \text{sgn}(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{b}) \right]^2,$$

where

$$\text{sgn}(x) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } x > 0; \\ 0, & \text{if } x = 0; \\ -1, & \text{if } x < 0. \end{cases}$$

Choosing optimal measure combined with optimal d_{ik} 's will give a rise to well-celebrated estimators. For example, minimizing T with degenerate measure combined with $d_{ik} = x_{ik}$ will yield least absolute deviation (LAD) estimators; see, e.g., Chapter 5.3 in Koul (2002) for the detail. The function `KouLLrMde` estimates $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the regression model (1) by minimizing distance function T after selecting d_{ik} and H . Table 1 summarizes its arguments and return values. \mathbf{D} is a n -by- p matrix whose (i, k) th entry is d_{ik} . Koul (2002) showed that

Usage	<code>KouLLrMde(Y, X, D, IntMeasure)</code> .
Arguments	
<code>Y</code>	Vector of response variable in linear regression model.
<code>X</code>	Design matrix of explanatory variable in linear regression model.
<code>D</code>	Weight matrix. Dimension of <code>D</code> should match that of <code>X</code> . "default" uses $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}$ where $\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1/2}$.
<code>IntMeasure</code>	Symmetric and σ -finite measure.
Return Values	
<code>betahat</code>	Minimum distance estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.
<code>residual</code>	Residuals after minimum distance estimation.

Table 1: Summary of `KouLLrMde`

$\mathbf{D} := \mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}$ gives the most efficient estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$; see Chapter 5.6 therein.

The following example shows the usage of `KouLLrMde`. First, generate model (1) with normal error where $n = 50$, $p = 3$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (-2, 0.3, 1.5)'$.

```

> n <- 50
> p <- 3
> X <- matrix(runif(n*p, 0,50), nrow=n, ncol=p)
> beta <- c(-2, 0.3, 1.5)
> eps <- rnorm(n, 0, 5)
> Y <- X %*% beta + eps

```

Next, determine `D` and `IntMeasure`. We use default value and Lebesgue measure, respectively.

```

> D <- "default"
> Lx <- function(x){return(x)}

```

Finally, use `KouLLrMde` to obtain m.d. estimator of β and residuals.

```

> MDEResult <- KouLLrMde(Y,X,D,Lx)
> betahat <- MDEResult$betahat
> resid <- MDEResult$residual
> betahat

```

```

      [,1]
[1,] -2.0609373
[2,]  0.2792313
[3,]  1.5676715

```

We finish this section by comparing the performance of OLS and `KouLLrMde`. Let f_N , f_{La} , f_{Lo} denote density functions of normal, Laplace, and logistic random variables, respectively. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
f_N(x) &:= (2\sigma_1)^{-1/2} \exp(-(x - \mu_1)^2/(2\sigma_1^2)), \\
f_{La}(x) &:= (2\sigma_2)^{-1} \exp(-|x - \mu_2|/\sigma_2), \\
f_{Lo}(x) &:= \sigma_3^{-1} \exp(-(x - \mu_3)/\sigma_3)/(1 + \exp(-(x - \mu_2)/\sigma_3))^2.
\end{aligned}$$

When we generate errors or innovations in the subsequent sections, we set $\mu_i = 0$, $i = 1, 2, 3$; we use 5 for σ_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$. We repeat above example 1000 times and obtain OLS and MD estimators each time. Table 2 reports bias, standard error (SE), and mean squared error (MSE) of OLS and MD estimators corresponding to normal, Laplace, and logistic errors. To obtain MD estimator from `KouLLrMde`, we chose $H(x) \equiv x$. As shown in Table 2, the corresponding MD method is superior to OLS in terms of MSE when the regression error distribution is Laplace or logistic, while the opposite is true for normal errors. If we judge superiority in terms of bias and SE separately, a similar conclusion is made; MD estimators for all β_i 's display smaller SE's when error is Laplace or Logistic; the opposite is again true when error is normal. In terms of the bias, it is hard to judge the superiority when error is Laplace or logistic. However, not surprisingly, it is easily seen that OLS displays smaller bias for all β_i 's for the case of normal error.

2.2 KouLLrMde

Consider the following autoregressive model of known order q

$$X_i = \mathbf{Z}_i' \boldsymbol{\rho} + \xi_i, \quad (2)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \dots, \rho_q)' \in \mathbb{R}^q$, and the innovations ξ_i 's are identically and independently distributed random variables. Assume that ξ_i is independent of $\mathbf{Z}_i = (X_{i-1}, \dots, X_{i-q})' \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Furthermore, assume that ξ_0 is symmetric around 0. The OLS estimation method gives an estimator $(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i' \mathbf{Z}_i)^{-1} (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{Z}_i X_i)$, which is consistent for $\boldsymbol{\rho}$. However, this estimator displays poor efficiency for contaminated Gaussian innovations: see, e.g., Fox (1972) and Denby and Martin (1979). Seeking alternative estimation methods, we propose `KouLLrMde`, an analogue of `KouLLrMde`, which provides MD estimators of autoregressive parameters in the model (2.2). We compare `KouLLrMde` with R package `arima`-which gives another alternative method of estimation- at the end of this section; we empirically verify that `KouLLrMde` is superior to `arima`.

Innovation	Parameter	OLS			KoulLrMde		
		bias	SE	MSE	bias	SE	MSE
Normal	β_1	0.0389	1.9404	3.7666	0.0629	2.0054	4.0257
	β_2	0.0015	0.0513	0.0026	0.0011	0.0532	0.0028
	β_3	-0.0007	0.0505	0.0025	-0.0013	0.0519	0.0027
Laplace	β_1	0.0034	2.7448	7.5338	-0.0064	2.3735	5.6334
	β_2	-0.0017	0.0684	0.0047	-0.0011	0.0595	0.0035
	β_3	0.0010	0.0710	0.0050	0.0010	0.0617	0.0038
Logistic	β_1	0.0147	3.4372	11.8147	0.0377	3.3857	11.4643
	β_2	-0.0041	0.0917	0.0084	-0.0043	0.0901	0.0081
	β_3	0.0009	0.0918	0.0084	0.0005	0.0897	0.0080

Table 2: OLS vs KoulLrMde: Bias, SE, and MSE

Let $g \in \mathcal{R}$ be a measurable function. Define the class of distances and the corresponding MD estimators, respectively, to be

$$M_g(\mathbf{r}) := \sum_{k=1}^q \int \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g(X_{i-k}) \left\{ I(X_i - \mathbf{Z}_i' \mathbf{r} \leq y) - I(-X_i + \mathbf{Z}_i' \mathbf{r} < y) \right\} \right]^2 dH(y),$$

$$M_g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_g) := \inf_{\mathbf{r}} M_g(\mathbf{r}), \quad \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^q$$

Among a class of estimators $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_g : g \in \mathcal{R}\}$, Koul (1986) showed MD estimator obtained by taking $g(x) \propto x$ has the smallest asymptotic variance, for every given H satisfying the assumed conditions. Hence, we preset $g(x) := x$ in KoulArMde for estimating $\boldsymbol{\rho}$. Similar to T , choosing optimal σ -finite and symmetric measure H results in well-celebrated estimators. The estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_g$'s corresponding to the H equivalent to Lebesgue measure and the degenerate measure at 0 are analogues of the Hodges-Lehmann and LAD estimators, respectively. See, e.g., Chapter 7 of Koul (2002) for the detail. Table 3 shows the summary of KoulArMde: its arguments and return values.

Usage	KoulArMde(X, AR_Order, IntMeasure).
Arguments	
X	Vector of n observed values.
AR_Order	Order of the autoregression model.
IntMeasure	Symmetric and σ -finite measure.
Return Values	
rhohat	Minimum distance estimators of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$.
residual	Residuals after minimum distance estimation.

Table 3: Summary of KoulArMde

The following example describes the usage of KoulArMde with degenerate measure at 0. Define degenerate measure `degenx` and pass it to the function.

```
> degenx = function(x){
>   if(x==0){return(1)}
>   else{return(0)}
> }
```

Generate model (2) with $n = 100$, $q = 4$, and logistic innovation.

```
> n <- 100
> q <- 4
```

```

> rho <- c(-0.2, 0.8, 0.4, -0.7)
> eps <- rlogis(n, 0,5)
>
> X <- rep(0, times=n)
> for (i in 1:n){
>   tempCol <- rep(0, times=q)
>   for (j in 1:q){
>     if(i-j<=0){
>       tempCol[j] <- 0
>     }else{
>       tempCol[j] <- X[i-j]
>     }
>   }
>   X[i] <- t(tempCol) %*% rho + eps[i]
> }
>
> MDEResult <- KouArMde(X, q, degenx)
> rhohat <- MDEResult$rhohat
> rhohat

[1] -0.2617441  0.8548842  0.3999877 -0.5820040

```

Corresponding to normal, Laplace, and logistic innovations, we repeat the above example 1000 times and obtain estimators of $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \rho_4)'$ from **arima** and **KouArMde** with $H(x) \equiv x$ and with H =degenerate measure at 0. Table 4 compares **arima** and **KouArMde** in terms of bias, SE, and MSE. As shown in the

Innovation	Parameter	arima			KouArMde(Lebesgue)			KouArMde(degenerate)		
		bias	SE	MSE	bias	SE	MSE	bias	SE	MSE
Normal	ρ_1	0.0420	0.1334	0.0196	-0.0012	0.1330	0.0177	-0.0005	0.1187	0.0141
	ρ_2	-0.0910	0.1298	0.0251	-0.0309	0.1242	0.0164	-0.0303	0.1109	0.0132
	ρ_3	-0.1235	0.1065	0.0266	-0.0256	0.1273	0.0169	-0.0255	0.1141	0.0137
	ρ_4	0.1087	0.1096	0.0238	0.0296	0.1426	0.0212	0.0283	0.1267	0.0169
Laplace	ρ_1	0.0347	0.120	0.0156	-0.0058	0.1277	0.0163	-0.0070	0.1217	0.0149
	ρ_2	-0.1000	0.117	0.0237	-0.0348	0.1212	0.0159	-0.0382	0.1174	0.0152
	ρ_3	-0.1052	0.108	0.0227	-0.0196	0.1182	0.0144	-0.0203	0.1146	0.0135
	ρ_4	0.1209	0.116	0.0281	0.0324	0.1358	0.0195	0.0376	0.1289	0.0180
Logistic	ρ_1	0.0410	0.1449	0.0227	-0.0033	0.1357	0.0184	-0.0013	0.1287	0.0166
	ρ_2	-0.1006	0.1283	0.0266	-0.0355	0.1221	0.0162	-0.0355	0.1171	0.0150
	ρ_3	-0.1144	0.1002	0.0231	-0.0242	0.1188	0.0147	-0.0266	0.1067	0.0121
	ρ_4	0.1147	0.1137	0.0261	0.0308	0.1361	0.0195	0.0294	0.1233	0.0161

Table 4: **arima** vs **KouArMde**: Bias, SE, and MSE

table, **KouArMde** outperforms **arima** at all innovations. Regardless of innovations, **KouArMde** corresponding to the degenerate H is superior to all of the other estimators considered here in terms of SE and MSE. Putting it aside, **KouArMde** corresponding to $H(x) \equiv x$ is still superior to **arima** for all innovations. In terms of bias, **KouArMde** corresponding to $H(x) \equiv x$ shows smaller bias for all ρ_i 's than one corresponding to H =degenerate measure when innovations is Laplace; the opposite is true for the case of normal and logistic innovations. **arima** displays lack of competition due to both poor bias and SE. Therefore, we finish this section by concluding there is no doubt about the superiority of **KouArMde** to **arima**.

2.3 Kou2StageMde

Consider the linear regression model (1) where ε_i 's obey the autoregressive model (2) with known order q . The OLS method gives unbiased and consistent estimators of regression parameters for a large class of error distributions, but at non-Gaussian errors, they are inefficient and hence can lead to inaccurate inference procedures. When the presence of autoregressive errors is suspected, alternative methods such as generalized

least squares (GLS) are recommended to use. If ρ is known, i.e., if there is no need to estimate variance-covariance matrix of error, direct application of GLS yields an efficient estimator. In practice, ρ is rarely known, and hence, it needs to be estimated along with β . In econometrics literature, Cochrane-Orcutt (CO) iterative estimation procedure has been the most popular method; it provides estimators of both ρ and β . In this section, we propose **Koul2StageMde** as a competing method and show that it still remains competitive under various autoregressive errors. **Koul2StageMde** is an analogue of the CO procedure but gives more efficient estimators of ρ and β at some error distributions.

To describe these MD estimators, rewrite the given regression-autoregressive model as

$$Y_i - \rho_1 Y_{i-1} - \cdots - \rho_q Y_{i-q} = (\mathbf{x}_i - \rho_1 \mathbf{x}_{i-1} - \cdots - \rho_q \mathbf{x}_{i-q})' \beta + \xi_i. \quad (3)$$

Koul2StageMde replaces ρ in (3) with a consistent estimator and applies MD estimation method to (3) while CO procedure is an application of OLS method to (3). Since MD estimation method provides more efficient estimator than OLS in linear regression model with logistic or Laplace innovations as shown in Section 2.1, **Koul2StageMde** is expected to yield more efficient estimators than CO procedure at these error distributions. The following describes two stage algorithm of the function **Koul2StageMde**.

Stage 1:

- (i) Obtain $\hat{\beta}^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ by **KoulLrMde**.
- (ii) Obtain residuals $\hat{\epsilon}^{(1)} = (\hat{\epsilon}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_n^{(1)})' \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (iii) Pass $\hat{\epsilon}^{(1)}$ to **KoulArMde** and obtain $\hat{\rho}^{(1)} = (\hat{\rho}_1^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\rho}_q^{(1)})' \in \mathbb{R}^q$.

Stage 2:

- (i) Define $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} := (\tilde{Y}_1, \dots, \tilde{Y}_{n-q})' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-q}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} := [\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1 \ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2 \ \cdots \ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{n-q}]' \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-q) \times p}$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_i &:= Y_{i+q} - (\hat{\rho}_1^{(1)} Y_{i+q-1} + \hat{\rho}_2^{(1)} Y_{i+q-2} + \cdots + \hat{\rho}_q^{(1)} Y_i), \\ \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i &:= \mathbf{x}_{i+q} - (\hat{\rho}_1^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_{i+q-1} + \hat{\rho}_2^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_{i+q-2} + \cdots + \hat{\rho}_q^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_i), \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i \leq (n - q)$.

- (ii) Pass $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ to **KoulLrMde** and obtain $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}$.
- (iv) Obtain residuals $\hat{\epsilon}^{(2)} := (\hat{\epsilon}_1^{(2)}, \dots, \hat{\epsilon}_n^{(2)})' \in \mathbb{R}^n$.
- (v) Pass $\hat{\epsilon}^{(2)}$ to **KoulArMde** and obtain $\hat{\rho}^{(2)}$.

Koul2StageMde combines **KoulLrMde** and **KoulArMde** together, and hence, estimates both regression and autoregression parameters through two stages. Table 5 summarizes **Koul2StageMde**.

The following example shows the usage of **Koul2StageMde**.

```
> Lx = function(x){ return(x)}
> n <- 50
> p <- 4
> X <- matrix(runif(n*p, 0,50), nrow=n, ncol=p) ##### Generate n-by-p design matrix X
> beta <- c(-2, 0.3, 1.5, -4.3) ##### true beta = (-2, 0.3, 1.5, -4.3)'
> q <- 1
> rho <- 0.4 ##### true rho = 0.4
> Xi <- rnorm(n, 0,5) ##### Generate innovations from N(0,5)
> eps <- rep(0, times=n)
> for (i in 1:n){
>   tempCol <- rep(0, times=q)
>   for (j in 1:q){
```

Usage	<code>Koul2StageMde(Y, X, D, RegIntMeasure, AR_Order, ArIntMeasure).</code>
Arguments	
<code>Y</code>	Vector of response variables in linear regression model.
<code>X</code>	Design matrix of explanatory variables in linear regression model.
<code>D</code>	Weight matrix. Dimension of <code>D</code> should match that of <code>X</code> . “default” uses $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{A}$ where $\mathbf{A}=(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{X})^{-1/2}$.
<code>RegIntMeasure</code>	Symmetric and σ -finite measure used for estimating β .
<code>AR_Order</code>	Order of the autoregressive error.
<code>ArIntMeasure</code>	Symmetric and σ -finite measure used for estimating autoregressive coefficients.
Return Values	
<code>MDE1stage</code>	The list of <code>betahat1stage</code> , <code>residual1stage</code> , and <code>rhohat1stage</code> .
<code>betahat1stage</code>	The first stage minimum distance estimators of regression coefficients.
<code>residual1stage</code>	Residuals after the first stage minimum distance estimation.
<code>rhohat1stage</code>	The first stage minimum distance estimators of autoregressive coefficients.
<code>MDE2stage</code>	The list of <code>betahat2stage</code> , <code>residual2stage</code> , and <code>rhohat2stage</code> .
<code>betahat2stage</code>	The second stage minimum distance estimators of regression coefficients.
<code>residual2stage</code>	Residuals after the second stage minimum distance estimation.
<code>rhohat2stage</code>	The second stage minimum distance estimators of autoregressive coefficients.

Table 5: Summary of `Koul2StageMde`

```

>   if(i-j<=0){
>     tempCol[j] <- 0
>   }else{
>     tempCol[j] <- eps[i-j]
>   }
> }
> eps[i] <- t(tempCol) %*% rho + Xi[i]
> }
> Y <- X %*% beta + eps
> D <- "default" ##### Use the default weight matrix
> Lx <- function(x){return(x)} ##### Define Lebesgue measure
> MDEResult <- Koul2StageMde(Y,X, "default", Lx, q, Lx)
> MDE1stageResult <- MDEResult$MDE1stage
> MDE2stageResult <- MDEResult$MDE2stage

> beta1 <- MDE1stageResult$betahat1stage
> residual1 <- MDE1stageResult$residual1stage
> rho1 <- MDE1stageResult$rhohat1stage

> beta2 <- MDE2stageResult$betahat2stage
> residual2 <- MDE2stageResult$residual2stage
> rho2 <- MDE2stageResult$rhohat2stage

```

We finish this section with reporting our findings in the simulation. We use R package `orcutt` for CO procedure. Similar to previous sections, we repeat the above example 1000 times and obtain estimators from `Koul2StageMde` and `orcutt`. Table 6 shows a comparison between `Koul2StageMde` and `orcutt` in terms of bias, SE and MSE. Of procedure where result is consistent with previous Section while the MDE estimation method case of normal innovation.

Innovation	Parameter	orcutt			Koul2StageMde		
		bias	SE	MSE	bias	SE	MSE
Normal	β_1	-0.1008	2.4235	5.8837	-0.0404	2.5159	6.3312
	β_2	0.0011	0.0498	0.0025	0.0007	0.0521	0.0027
	β_3	0.0010	0.0494	0.0024	0.0005	0.0521	0.0027
	β_4	0.0015	0.0475	0.0023	0.0009	0.0497	0.0025
	ρ	-0.0334	0.1521	0.0242	-0.0390	0.1568	0.0261
Laplace	β_1	-0.0619	3.3641	11.3208	-0.0512	2.9165	8.5087
	β_2	0.0051	0.0691	0.0048	0.0036	0.0599	0.0036
	β_3	-0.0032	0.0669	0.0045	-0.0030	0.0601	0.0036
	β_4	0.0006	0.0679	0.0046	0.0011	0.0597	0.0036
	ρ	-0.0284	0.1332	0.0185	-0.0314	0.1227	0.0160
Logistic	β_1	0.1422	4.2534	18.1119	0.1358	4.1827	17.5131
	β_2	-0.0028	0.0896	0.0080	-0.0032	0.0895	0.0080
	β_3	-0.0024	0.0847	0.0072	-0.0020	0.0838	0.0070
	β_4	0.0005	0.0866	0.0075	0.0011	0.0865	0.0075
	ρ	-0.0299	0.1416	0.0209	-0.0349	0.1392	0.0206

Table 6: orcutt vs Koul2StageMde: Bias, SE, and MSE

3 Conclusion

This article discussed R package **KoulMde** which performs the MD estimation for linear regression and autoregressive models. This package contains three functions: **KoulLrMde**, **KoulArMde**, and **Koul2StageMde**. The former two provide MD estimators of parameters in linear regression and autoregressive models, respectively. **Koul2StageMde** deals with linear regression model with autoregressive errors and estimates both regression and autoregressive parameters. Compared to other estimation methods and R packages, this package remains competitive in that it outperforms them; our findings in simulation studies show all **KoulLrMde**, **KoulArMde**, and **Koul2StageMde** display better MSE than competing methods or R packages.

References

- [1] Denby, L. and Martin, R. (1979). Robust estimation of the first-order autoregressive parameter. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **74**, 140-146.
- [2] Fox, A. J. (1972). Outliers in time series. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc. Ser. B.*, **34** 350-363.
- [3] Koul, H. L. (1985). Minimum distance estimation in linear regression with unknown error distributions. *Statist. Probab. Lett.*, **3** 1-8.
- [4] Koul, H. L. (1986). Minimum distance estimation and goodness-of-fit tests in first-order autoregression. *Ann. Statist.*, **14** 1194-1213.
- [5] Koul, H. L. (2002). *Weighted empirical process in nonlinear dynamic models*. Springer, Berlin, Vol. 166.
- [6] Koul, H. L. and De Wet (1983). Minimum distance estimation in a linear regression model. *Ann. Statist.*, **11** 921-932.
- [7] Parr, W. C. and Schucany, W. R. (1979). Minimum distance and robust estimation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **75** 616-624.
- [8] Wolfowitz, J. (1957). Minimum distance method. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, **28** 75-88.