

# Quasi Maximum-Likelihood Estimation of Dynamic Panel Data Models

Robert F. Phillips

Department of Economics  
George Washington University  
Washington, D.C. 20052

E-mail: rphil@gwu.edu

January 2017

## Abstract

This paper establishes the almost sure convergence and asymptotic normality of levels and differenced quasi maximum-likelihood (QML) estimators of dynamic panel data models. The QML estimators are robust with respect to initial conditions, conditional and time-series heteroskedasticity, and misspecification of the log-likelihood. The paper also provides an ECME algorithm for calculating levels QML estimates. Finally, it uses Monte Carlo experiments to compare the finite sample performance of levels and differenced QML estimators, the differenced GMM estimator, and the system GMM estimator. In these experiments the QML estimators usually have smaller — typically substantially smaller — bias and root mean squared errors than the panel data GMM estimators.

## 1 Introduction

Two prominent approaches to estimating a dynamic panel data model are generalized method of moments (GMM) and maximum likelihood (ML). Several authors have studied ML estimation of dynamic panel data models; see, for example, Alvarez and Arellano (2004), Anderson and Hsiao (1981), Hsiao et al. (2002), and Moral-Benito (2013), among others. As is well-known, the consistency and asymptotic normality of a ML estimator follows from ML theory assuming the likelihood is correctly specified and standard regularity conditions are met. On the other hand, strong distributional assumptions are not required to establish the sampling behavior of a GMM estimator. This fact would appear to make GMM more attractive than ML, but GMM has its drawbacks as well — for example, GMM estimators are known to often have severe finite sample bias. Furthermore, some papers have shown that the maximizer of a log-likelihood for a panel data model can be consistent and asymptotically normal under assumptions that do not require normality. Binder et al. (2005), for example, considered quasi-ML (QML) estimation of vector panel autoregressions. Kruiniger (2013), on the other hand, studied QML estimation of a first-order autoregressive (AR(1)) panel data model. And Phillips (2010, 2015) examined QML estimation of

a  $p$ th-order dynamic panel data model. These papers provide conditions under which the log-likelihood for a dynamic panel data model can be misspecified, and the maximizer of the quasi log-likelihood is nevertheless consistent and asymptotically normal.

This paper makes several contributions to the literature on QML estimation. Like Phillips (2010, 2015), the model studied in this paper includes  $p$  lags of the dependent variable as well as other explanatory variables. Phillips (2010, 2015), however, focused on QML estimation without differencing the observations — i.e., levels QML — while assuming the errors are unconditionally homoskedastic. The assumption of unconditional homoskedasticity is more general than it might first appear, for it allows for conditional heteroskedasticity. But it does not allow for time-series heteroskedasticity. Allowing for more general forms of heteroskedasticity is important, for QML estimation, although robust with respect to initial conditions and misspecification of the log-likelihood, is not robust to misspecification of the unconditional error variance-covariance matrix; see also Alvarez and Arellano (2004). This paper, therefore, provides large  $N$ , fixed  $T$  asymptotics under more general conditions than those considered in Phillips (2010, 2015) — conditions that allow for time-series heteroskedasticity. Indeed, the error variance-covariance matrix can be of a general form.

Phillips (2010) provided a straightforward iterative feasible generalized least squares algorithm for calculating QML estimates when the errors in the dynamic regression model have an error-components structure. However, that procedure is not easily extended to the case where the idiosyncratic errors are time-series heteroskedastic. Furthermore, derivative-based algorithms can produce negative fitted variance components when applied to error-components models if they are not substantially modified to avoid that outcome (see also Meng and van Dyk 1998). This paper improves on these algorithms by providing an expectation conditional maximization either (ECME) algorithm for calculating levels QML estimates that allows for conditional and time-series heteroskedasticity. The ECME algorithm is straightforward and guarantees non-negative estimated variance components.

The paper also examines QML estimation after differencing the observations (differenced QML). It shows that the ML estimator examined by Hsiao et al. (2002) is consistent and asymptotically normal under more general conditions than the conditions considered by Hsiao et al. (2002). For example, Hsiao et al. (2002) assumed normality. This paper shows the estimator can be consistent and asymptotically normal even if the log-likelihood is misspecified. Moreover, restrictive initial conditions are not required, and the errors can be conditionally heteroskedastic.

Finally, using simulated data, the finite sample behavior of levels and differenced QML estimators are compared, and their finite sample behavior is compared to the differenced GMM (Arellano and Bond 1991) and the system GMM estimators (Blundell and Bond 1998). The Monte Carlo results show that, compared to GMM estimators, the QML estimators have negligible finite sample bias, and consequently they have smaller — sometimes much smaller — root mean squared errors.

## 2 QML via Regression Augmentation

Since Anderson and Hsiao (1981) it has been known that whether or not application of ML estimation to a dynamic panel data model will yield a consistent estimator as  $N \rightarrow$

$\infty$ , with  $T$  fixed, depends on initial conditions. However, Phillips (2010) showed that, when QML estimation is based on observations in levels (henceforth levels QML), it does not depend on initial condition restrictions if the regression is augmented with a suitable control function. This section extends the results in Phillips (2010) by establishing the almost sure convergence and asymptotic normality of levels QML estimation under weaker conditions than those used in Phillips (2010). For example, the results provided here allow for more general specifications of the error variance-covariance matrix. This generalization is important because QML estimation is inconsistent if the error variance-covariance matrix is misspecified.

The model examined in this paper is the  $p$ th-order dynamic panel data model

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{Y}_i \delta_0 + \mathbf{X}_i \beta_0 + \mathbf{e}_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, N). \quad (1)$$

In this expression  $\mathbf{y}_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iT})'$ ,  $\mathbf{Y}_i = (\mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{i,-p})$ ,  $\mathbf{y}_{i,-j} = (y_{i,1-j}, \dots, y_{i,T-j})'$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ), and  $\mathbf{X}_i = (\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{iT})'$ , with  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  a  $K \times 1$  vector of explanatory variables that vary with  $t$  (for at least some  $i$ ). Moreover,  $\mathbf{e}_i = (e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iT})'$  is a vector of regression errors. For notational convenience, the numbering of observed variables begins with  $t = -p + 1$ .

Straightforward ML estimation of the model in (1) will not generally yield a consistent estimator. To see why, let  $\mathbf{y}_i^o = (y_{i0}, \dots, y_{i,-p+1})'$ ; let  $\mathbf{x}_i$  be a column vector consisting of all of the distinct elements of  $\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{iT}$ ; and set  $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i', \mathbf{y}_i^{o'})'$ . Then, assuming  $\mathbf{e}_i | \mathbf{z}_i \sim IIN(\mathbf{0}, \Omega_0^*)$ , the log-likelihood is given by

$$-\frac{NT}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{N}{2} \ln |\Omega^*| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{e}_i(\boldsymbol{\varphi})' \Omega^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i(\boldsymbol{\varphi}), \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbf{e}_i(\boldsymbol{\varphi}) = \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{Y}_i \delta - \mathbf{X}_i \beta$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\varphi} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}', \boldsymbol{\beta}')'$ . If  $\Omega_0^*$  were known, then maximizing the log-likelihood in (2) yields the generalized least squares (GLS) estimator based on  $\Omega_0^*$ , and the consistency of that estimator requires  $E(\mathbf{X}_i' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $E(\mathbf{y}_{i,-j}' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ).

We have  $E(\mathbf{X}_i' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  if the regressors in  $\mathbf{X}_i$  are strictly exogenous with respect to the errors in  $\mathbf{e}_i$ . But the moment restrictions  $E(\mathbf{y}_{i,-j}' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ) depends on an even stronger assumption, which is summarized in Lemma 1.

**Lemma 1.** If  $E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{y}_i^{o'}) = \mathbf{0}$ ,  $E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i') = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i') = \Omega_0^*$ , then  $E(\mathbf{y}_{i,-j}' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ).

**Proof.** See Appendix A.

According to Lemma 1, if the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  and the initial values of the dependent variable  $y_{i0}, \dots, y_{i,-p+1}$  are uncorrelated with the errors  $e_{i1}, \dots, e_{iT}$ , then  $E(\mathbf{y}_{i,-j}' \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). However, assuming the initial values of the dependent variable are uncorrelated with subsequent errors is quite restrictive. For example, a commonly used model for the errors is the error-components model

$$e_{it} = c_i + v_{it}. \quad (3)$$

If the  $v_{it}$ s are uncorrelated, we can take  $v_{it}$  to be uncorrelated with the elements of  $\mathbf{y}_i^o$ , for  $t \geq 1$ , but assuming the elements of  $\mathbf{y}_i^o$  are also uncorrelated with  $c_i$  is a strong initial condition restriction.

Fortunately, we need make no such initial condition assumption if the model in (1) is augmented with a suitable control function. Nor need we assume the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are strictly exogenous with respect to the  $e_{it}$ s. The possible correlation between the elements in  $\mathbf{e}_i$  and the elements in  $\mathbf{z}_i$  can be controlled for by the linear projection of  $e_{it}$  on 1 and  $\mathbf{z}_i$ :

$$e_{it} = \mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + u_{it}, \quad (t = 1, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, \dots, N) \quad (4)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \text{Var}(\mathbf{z}_i)^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{z}_i, e_{it})$  and  $\mu_0 = E(e_{it}) - E(\mathbf{z}_i)' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ .

The linear projection parameters  $\mu_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  exist and depend on neither  $i$  nor  $t$  if  $E(e_{it})$  and the moments in  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{z}_i, e_{it})$  depend on neither  $i$  nor  $t$  and the moments in  $\text{Var}(\mathbf{z}_i)$  and  $E(\mathbf{z}_i)$  do not depend on  $i$ . The restriction that the linear projection parameters are independent of  $t$  is met if the errors have a one-way error-components structure given by (3) and  $v_{it}$  is a mean zero random variable that is uncorrelated with the elements of  $\mathbf{z}_i$  for  $t \geq 1$ . Then  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{z}_i, e_{it}) = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{z}_i, c_i)$  and  $E(e_{it}) = E(c_i)$  for  $t \geq 1$ . For this case, the linear projection reduces to that considered in Phillips (2010, 2015). Specifically, we have

$$c_i = \mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + a_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, N) \quad (5)$$

(cf Phillips 2010, p. 411, Eq. (2)).<sup>1</sup> If the errors can be decomposed as in Eq. (3), then  $\mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  controls for possible correlation between time-invariant unobservables, captured by  $c_i$ , and the elements of  $\mathbf{z}_i$ .

Another, albeit trivial, case in which the linear projection parameters depend on neither  $i$  nor  $t$  is when there are no individual specific effects and the  $e_{it}$ s are uncorrelated among themselves and with the elements of  $\mathbf{z}_i$ , for  $t \geq 1$ . In this case,  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ , and the linear projection in (4) simplifies to  $e_{it} = \mu_e + u_{it}$ , where  $E(e_{it}) = \mu_e$ . This example illustrates that the necessity of adding the control function  $\mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  follows from the presence of unobservable time-invariant omitted variables, which are captured by  $c_i$ .

Moreover, although it is obvious we must include  $\mathbf{x}_i$  in the control function when the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are correlated with  $c_i$ , it is also true that we typically must do so even when all of the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are uncorrelated with  $c_i$ , as in the random effects model. To see this, consider the linear projection of  $c_i$  on just 1 and  $\mathbf{y}_i^o$ :

$$c_i = \mu_{y0} + \mathbf{y}_i^{o'} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0} + a_{yi} \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad (6)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0} = \text{Var}(\mathbf{y}_i^o)^{-1} \text{Cov}(\mathbf{y}_i^o, c_i)$  and  $\mu_{y0} = E(c_i) - E(\mathbf{y}_i^{o'}) \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0}$ . If we augment the model in (1) with the control function  $\mu_{y0} + \mathbf{y}_i^{o'} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0}$  rather than the control function  $\mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ , then the error term in the augmented model is  $a_{yi} + v_{it}$  rather than  $a_i + v_{it}$ , and, in order for QML estimation of the augmented model to be consistent, we must have not just  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{y}_i^o, a_{yi}) = \mathbf{0}$ , which the linear projection in (6) ensures, but also  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}_i, a_{yi}) = \mathbf{0}$ , which the linear projection in (6) does not guarantee. Indeed, given  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}_i, c_i) = \mathbf{0}$ , the

---

<sup>1</sup>See also Chamberlain (1982, 1984) and Kruiniger (2013), who uses a linear projection of an individual effect on  $y_{i0}$ . The linear projection parameters used in Kruiniger (2013) are implicitly assumed to be independent of  $i$ .

result  $Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, a_{yi}) = \mathbf{0}$  is not guaranteed unless  $Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0}) = \mathbf{0}$ ,<sup>2</sup> which will not be satisfied in general assuming  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0} \neq \mathbf{0}$ .

This last example illustrates that results obtained for the AR(1) panel data model (see Kruiniger 2013) or the AR(p) panel data model (see Alvarez and Arellano 2004) do not extend in a straightforward manner to models with additional regressors even under the random effects assumption that the elements of  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are uncorrelated with  $c_i$ . For example, in his treatment of the “random effects” case of the AR(1) panel data model, Kruiniger includes a linear projection of  $c_i$  on the initial value  $y_{i0}$  in a control function. However, such a control function will not suffice if there are additional regressors even when these additional regressors are uncorrelated with  $c_i$ .

Equations (1) and (4) imply the augmented dynamic panel data model

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{W}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 + \mathbf{u}_i, \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad (7)$$

where  $\mathbf{W}_i = (\mathbf{Y}_i, \mathbf{Z}_i)$ ,  $\mathbf{Z}_i = (\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\iota}, \boldsymbol{\iota} \mathbf{z}'_i)$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\iota}$  is a  $T \times 1$  vector of ones, and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\delta}'_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_0, \mu_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_0)'$ . The errors in this augmented model —  $\mathbf{u}_i = (u_{i1}, \dots, u_{iT})'$  — are now uncorrelated with the elements of  $\mathbf{Z}_i$  by construction. Thus, upon letting  $\Omega_0 = E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}'_i)$ , we have  $E(\mathbf{Z}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ . Moreover, because  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{y}_i') = \mathbf{0}$  and  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{x}'_i) = \mathbf{0}$ , it follows from Lemma 1 that  $E(\mathbf{y}'_{i,-j} \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). The preceding shows  $E(\mathbf{W}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ .

Now consider the quasi log-likelihood for the augmented model in (7):  $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ , where

$$l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = -\frac{T}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\Omega| - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}),$$

$\mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = \mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{W}_i \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}', \boldsymbol{\beta}', \mu, \boldsymbol{\theta}')'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}', \boldsymbol{\omega}')'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \text{vech}(\Omega)$ , and  $\Omega$  is a positive definite matrix. For known  $\boldsymbol{\omega}_0 = \text{vech}(\Omega_0)$ , the maximizer of this log-likelihood is the GLS estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{GLS} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{W}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i$ , and this estimator is consistent because  $E(\mathbf{W}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ . Moreover, if  $\hat{\Omega}$  is a consistent estimator of  $\Omega_0$ , the feasible GLS (FGLS) estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{FGLS} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}'_i \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{W}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}'_i \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i$  is also consistent.

However, the large  $N$  (fixed  $T$ ) distribution of such a FGLS estimator depends on the first-round estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$  used to estimate  $\Omega_0$  (see Phillips 2010). An alternative that does not depend on a first-round estimator is to estimate  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}'_0, \boldsymbol{\omega}'_0)'$  by maximizing the quasi log-likelihood  $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ .

Theorems 1 and 2 provide sufficient conditions for the almost sure convergence of the QML estimator and its asymptotic normality (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $T$  fixed). In order to state the theorems, set  $L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  and  $\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi} \partial \boldsymbol{\psi}'$ ; let  $x_{itk}$  denote the  $k$ th element of  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$ ; and set  $\Psi = \{\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\boldsymbol{\gamma}', \boldsymbol{\omega}')' \in \mathbb{R}^m : \Omega \text{ is positive definite}\}$ .

**Theorem 1.** Assume the following conditions are satisfied:

**C1:**  $E|y_{it}|^{2+\epsilon} < M$  and  $E|x_{itk}|^{2+\epsilon} < M$  for all  $i, t$ , and  $k$  and some  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M < \infty$ ;

---

<sup>2</sup>This conclusion follows from  $Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, a_{yi}) = Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, c_i - \mu_{y0} - \mathbf{y}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0}) = -Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_{y0})$  if  $Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, c_i) = \mathbf{0}$ .

**C2:**  $Var(\mathbf{z}_i) = \Xi_{zz}$  for all  $i$ , with  $\Xi_{zz}$  a positive definite matrix,  $E(\mathbf{z}_i) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$  for all  $i$ , and  $E(e_{it}) = \mu_e$  and  $E(\mathbf{z}_i e_{it}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}_{ze}$  for all  $i$  and  $t \geq 1$ ;

**C3:**  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i') = \Omega_0$  for all  $i$ , with  $\Omega_0$  a positive definite matrix;

**C4:** the limits  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E(y_{is} y_{it})$ ,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E(y_{is} x_{itk})$ , and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E(x_{isj} x_{itk})$  exist for all  $s, t, j$ , and  $k$ ; and

**C5:** the vectors  $(\mathbf{z}'_1, \mathbf{y}'_1)', \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_N, \mathbf{y}'_N)'$  are independent for all  $N$ .

Then  $E[\partial L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi}] = \mathbf{0}$  and the limit  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  exists. Moreover, if  $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)$  is negative definite, then there is a compact subset, say  $\bar{\Psi}$ , of  $\Psi$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  in its interior, and there is a measurable maximizer,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ , of  $L_N(\cdot)$  in  $\bar{\Psi}$  such that  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  ( $N \rightarrow \infty, T$  fixed).

**Proof.** See Appendix B.

**Theorem 2.** Assume Conditions C2–C5 are satisfied,  $\mathbf{H}_0$  is negative definite, and the following conditions are satisfied:

**C1':**  $E|y_{it}|^{4+\epsilon} < M$  and  $E|x_{itk}|^{4+\epsilon} < M$  for all  $i, t$ , and  $k$  and some  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $M < \infty$ ; and

**C6:** the limit  $\mathcal{I}_0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E[(\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi})(\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi})']$  exists and is positive definite.

Then  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}_0^{-1} \mathcal{I}_0 \mathbf{H}_0^{-1})$  ( $N \rightarrow \infty, T$  fixed).

**Proof.** See Appendix C.

In order for the QML estimator to be consistent and asymptotically normal, it must be the case that the true parameter vector,  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$ , uniquely maximizes the expected log-likelihood, at least within a neighborhood of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$ . Conditions C1 through C3 are mild, and they suffice to guarantee that  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  is indeed a stationary value of the expected log-likelihood. But the fact that  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  is a stationary value is necessary but not sufficient to ensure it is a unique maximizer of the expected log-likelihood. The matrix  $\mathbf{H}_0$  must also be negative definite. If the log-likelihood  $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  is correctly specified, that is, if  $\mathbf{u}_i$  is normally distributed with mean vector  $\mathbf{0}$  and variance-covariance matrix  $\Omega_0$ , conditionally on  $\mathbf{z}_i$ , then by well-known ML theory, we have  $\mathbf{H}_0 = -\mathcal{I}_0$ , and  $\mathbf{H}_0$  exists and is negative definite by virtue of Condition C6. However, even when  $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  is misspecified,  $\mathbf{H}_0$  can be shown to be negative definite in particular cases. Phillips (2015), for example, provides an example in which  $\mathbf{H}_0$  is negative definite under conditions that do not include normality.

Moreover,  $\Omega_0$  is the unconditional variance-covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{u}_i$ , and, although it does not depend on  $i$ , the variance-covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{u}_i$  conditionally on  $\mathbf{z}_i$  may depend on  $i$  — for example, the errors may be conditionally heteroskedastic (see also Phillips 2010, 2015). The errors can also be unconditionally time-series heteroskedastic, for the diagonal elements of  $\Omega_0$  can differ.

Furthermore, the conditions in Theorems 1 and 2 do not require the random vectors  $(\mathbf{z}'_1, \mathbf{y}'_1)', \dots, (\mathbf{z}'_N, \mathbf{y}'_N)'$  be drawn from a common distribution. On the other hand, Conditions C2 and C3 imply some homogeneity is required.

Estimators previously considered in the literature are covered by Theorems 1 and 2. Blundell and Bond (1998) considered a conditional GLS estimator of an AR(1) panel data model that relied on augmenting the regression model with the initial observation on the dependent variable. They argued that if the error components are homoskedastic across individuals and time, then restrictions on the initial conditions can be used to derive the GLS estimator. Theorems 1 and 2, however, show that these conditions are unnecessarily restrictive. The errors can be conditionally and time-series heteroskedastic. Moreover, initial condition restrictions are not needed. All that is required is that the moments defining the control function parameters exist and depend on neither  $i$  nor  $t$ . Furthermore, the structured error variance-covariance matrices, such as those considered by Phillips (2010, 2015) and Kruiniger (2013), are special cases of  $\Omega_0$ , and, therefore, Theorems 1 and 2 cover those cases.

### 3 Fixed-Effects QML

An alternative to first augmenting the regression model with a control function and then applying QML estimation to the model in levels is to instead first difference the observations and then apply QML estimation. In the literature, ML or QML estimation based on first differencing the observations has been referred to as fixed-effects ML estimation (e.g., Hsiao et al. 2002) or fixed-effects QML estimation (e.g., Kruiniger 2013). This description, however, should not lead one to interpret levels QML estimation as random-effects QML, for the results in Section 2 make clear that levels QML estimation is not restricted to random-effects models with regressors that are exogenous with respect to  $c_i$ .

Kruiniger (2013) studied differenced QML for an AR(1) panel data model. Hsiao et al. (2002), on the other hand, studied ML estimation, after differencing, and, like this paper, considered a model with additional explanatory variables beyond a lagged dependent variable. This section shows that likelihood-based methods using differences are consistent and asymptotically normal under much weaker conditions than those assumed in Hsiao et al. (2002).

Instead of augmenting the regression with a control function that involves  $\mathbf{y}_i^o$ , differenced QML requires estimation of a system of equations that includes a separate linear projection for each initial difference  $\Delta y_{i,-p+2}, \dots, \Delta y_{i1}$ , where  $\Delta y_{it} = y_{it} - y_{i,t-1}$ . Specifically, suppose  $Var(\mathbf{x}_i)$  is positive definite, and set  $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,p+1-j} = Var(\mathbf{x}_i)^{-1} Cov(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta y_{i,-j+2})$  and  $\mu_{0,p+1-j} = E(\Delta y_{i,-j+2}) - E(\mathbf{x}'_i) \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,p+1-j}$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). Then, system differenced QML relies on estimating the linear projections

$$\Delta y_{i,-j+2} = \mu_{0,p+1-j} + \mathbf{x}'_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_{0,p+1-j} + r_{i,p+1-j} \quad (j = 1, \dots, p). \quad (8)$$

Here  $r_{i,p+1-j}$  is a linear projection residual, which is, by construction, uncorrelated with all of the elements of  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Note that because the linear projection in (8) does not specify how  $\Delta y_{i,-j+2}$  was generated it does not depend on initial condition restrictions. In addition to

the linear projection equations in (8) we also estimate the differenced equation:

$$\Delta \mathbf{y}_i = \Delta \mathbf{Y}_i \boldsymbol{\delta}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{e}_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad (9)$$

where  $\Delta \mathbf{y}_i = (\Delta y_{i2}, \dots, \Delta y_{iT})'$ ,  $\Delta \mathbf{Y}_i = (\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-1}, \dots, \Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-p})$ , and  $\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-j} = (\Delta y_{i,-j+2}, \dots, \Delta y_{i,T-j})'$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). Moreover,  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_i = (\Delta \mathbf{x}_{i2}, \dots, \Delta \mathbf{x}_{iT})'$ ,  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_{it} = \mathbf{x}_{it} - \mathbf{x}_{i,t-1}$ , and  $\Delta \mathbf{e}_i = (\Delta e_{i2}, \dots, \Delta e_{iT})'$ , with  $\Delta e_{it} = e_{it} - e_{i,t-1}$ . For differenced QML, the equations in (8) and (9) are estimated as a system given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i = \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_0 + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \quad (i = 1, \dots, N), \quad (10)$$

with  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i = (\Delta y_{i,-p+2}, \dots, \Delta y_{i1}, \Delta \mathbf{y}_i')$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i = (r_{i1}, \dots, r_{ip}, \Delta \mathbf{e}_i')$ ,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_p \otimes (1, \mathbf{x}_i') \\ \Delta \mathbf{Y}_i & \Delta \mathbf{X}_i & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix},$$

and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\delta}'_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_0, \mu_{01}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{01}, \mu_{02}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{02}, \dots, \mu_{0p}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{0p})'$ .

If  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$  is multivariate normal with mean vector  $\mathbf{0}$  and variance-covariance matrix  $\Upsilon_0$  conditional on  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , then the log-likelihood for the system in (10) is  $\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{l}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ , where

$$\tilde{l}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = -\frac{(T+p-1)}{2} \ln(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \ln |\Upsilon| - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta})' \Upsilon^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}),$$

$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\boldsymbol{\delta}', \boldsymbol{\beta}', \mu_1, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_1, \mu_2, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_2, \dots, \mu_p, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_p)'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}', \mathbf{v}')'$ , and  $\mathbf{v} = \text{vech}(\Upsilon)$ . Also, set  $\tilde{L}_N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{l}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \partial^2 \tilde{L}_N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda} \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}'$ , and  $\Lambda = \{\boldsymbol{\lambda} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}', \mathbf{v}')' \in \mathbb{R}^n : \Upsilon \text{ is positive definite}\}$ .

The maximizer of  $\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{l}_i(\cdot)$  is a ML estimator given normality, but even if the log-likelihood is misspecified — that is, the errors are not normally distributed given  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , nor are they necessarily conditionally homoskedastic — maximizing  $\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{l}_i(\cdot)$  will still yield a consistent and asymptotically normal estimator under suitable conditions. Sufficient conditions are provided in Theorems 3 and 4.

**Theorem 3.** Suppose C1, C4, and C5 are satisfied. Further assume:

**C2':**  $\text{Var}(\mathbf{x}_i) = \Xi_{xx}$  for all  $i$ , with  $\Xi_{xx}$  positive definite,  $E(\mathbf{x}_i) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_x$  for all  $i$ ,  $E(\Delta y_{i,-j+2}) = \mu_{\Delta y_j}$  and  $E(\mathbf{x}_i \Delta y_{i,-j+2}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}_{x \Delta y_j}$  for all  $i$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ), and  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}_i, \Delta \mathbf{e}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ ; also,

**C3':**  $E(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i') = \Upsilon_0$  for all  $i$ , with  $\Upsilon_0$  a positive definite matrix.

Then  $E[\partial \tilde{L}_N(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda}] = \mathbf{0}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\eta}'_0, \mathbf{v}'_0)'$  and  $\mathbf{v}_0 = \text{vech}(\Upsilon_0)$ . Furthermore, the limit  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_N(\boldsymbol{\lambda})$  exists. Moreover, if  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{H}}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0)$  is negative definite, there is a compact subset, say  $\bar{\Lambda}$ , of  $\Lambda$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  in its interior, and there is a measurable maximizer,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}}$ , of  $\tilde{L}_N(\cdot)$  in  $\bar{\Lambda}$  such that  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T$  fixed).

**Theorem 4.** Suppose C1'–C3', C4, and C5 are satisfied and  $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}_0$  is negative definite. Further assume the following condition is met:



**C6'**: the limit  $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E \left[ \left( \partial \tilde{l}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right) \left( \partial \tilde{l}_i(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\lambda} \right)' \right]$  exists and is positive definite.

Then  $\sqrt{N} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\lambda}_0 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left( \mathbf{0}, \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_0 \tilde{\mathbf{H}}_0^{-1} \right)$  ( $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T$  fixed).

**Proof.** For proofs of Theorems 3 and 4, see Appendix D.

The linear projection of  $\Delta y_{i,-j+2}$  on 1 and  $\mathbf{x}_i$  guarantees the residual in this linear projection is uncorrelated with the elements of  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_i$ . This is a critical condition for consistent differenced QML estimation. But this condition is also met if we instead used the linear projection of  $\Delta y_{i,-j+2}$  on 1 and  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i$ , where  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i$  is a vector consisting of the distinct elements of  $\Delta \mathbf{X}_i$ . The latter approach generalizes an estimator studied by Hsiao et al. (2002). Hsiao et al. (2002) studied differenced ML estimation of a dynamic panel data model while assuming  $p = 1$ , individual specific effects, and uncorrelated and conditionally homoskedastic  $v_{it}$ s. Moreover, Hsiao et al. (2002) also imposed restrictions on how the regressors are generated. Furthermore, Hsiao et al. (2002) noted that the likelihood satisfies standard regularity conditions, and therefore the ML estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal. However, that conclusion follows from ML theory assuming the log-likelihood is correctly specified. The analysis in this section provides weaker conditions that imply the differenced ML estimator proposed by Hsiao et al. (2002) is consistent and asymptotically normal (for  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $T$  fixed). Specifically, the log-likelihood can be misspecified and the  $v_{it}$ s can be conditionally heteroskedastic. Moreover, all that is required of the elements of  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  is that they be uncorrelated with the  $v_{it}$ s and that the linear projection of  $\Delta y_{i1}$  on 1 and  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i$  does not depend on  $i$ .

## 4 Computation

If the error variance-covariance matrix is unrestricted, QML estimates can be easily computed using iterated feasible generalized least squares. Consider, for example, calculating QML estimates of the elements of  $\Omega_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ . These estimates can be calculated by iterating back and forth between fitting  $\Omega_0$  and fitting  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ . Specifically,  $L_N(\cdot)$  is maximized with respect to the elements of  $\Omega$ , conditional on the current fit of the regression parameters, say  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c$ , by the fit  $\Omega^+ = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c)' / N$ . And, after  $\Omega^+$  is obtained,  $L_N(\cdot)$  is then maximized with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ , conditional on  $\Omega = \Omega^+$ , which gives the feasible generalized least squares (FGLS) fit:

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}^+ = \left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{w}'_i(\Omega^+) \mathbf{w}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{w}'_i(\Omega^+) \mathbf{y}_i. \quad (11)$$

This fit is then made the current fit,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c$ , and new fits  $\Omega^+$  and  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^+$  are calculated again, and so on, until the sequence of fitted values converges. Calculating QML estimates of  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  and  $\Upsilon_0$ , based on differenced observations, is similar when  $\Upsilon_0$  is unrestricted.

Although it is easy to calculate estimates by iterating back and forth between fitting  $\Omega_0$  and fitting  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ , or between fitting  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0$  and  $\Upsilon_0$ , this approach implies that the number of free parameters being fitted in either  $\Omega_0$  or  $\Upsilon_0$  increases with  $T$  at the rate  $T^2$  increases. This

fact, in turn, suggests that, if  $T$  is not quite small, the sampling performance of a QML estimator that does not impose valid restrictions on  $\Omega_0$  or  $\Upsilon_0$  will be poor compared to that of a QML estimator that does rely on valid restrictions.

Unfortunately, maximizing the likelihood for differenced observations when restrictions on  $\Upsilon_0$  are imposed is tractable only for a highly specialized case. Specifically, we must assume  $p = 1$ ,  $e_{it}$  is given by the error-components model in (3), the  $v_{it}$ s are uncorrelated and unconditionally homoskedastic, and the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_{it}$  are strictly exogenous with respect to the  $v_{it}$ s. Further assume  $\Delta y_{i1}$  is generated by the same process generating  $\Delta y_{it}$  for  $t \geq 2$ . Then it is easy to show that the error variance-covariance matrix is  $\Upsilon_0 = \sigma_0^2 \Phi_0$ ,

$$\Phi_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_0 & -1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ -1 & 2 & -1 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

(cf Hsiao et al. 2002, p. 110, Eq. (3.2)). Moreover, the determinant  $|\sigma_0^2 \Phi_0|$  equals  $\sigma_0^{2T} [1 + T(\phi_0 - 1)]$  (see, e.g., Hsiao et al 2002, p. 111, Eq. (3.7)). From this determinant we see that, in order to ensure a positive definite fitted value for  $\sigma_0^2 \Phi_0$ , we must search over values of  $\phi$  satisfying  $\phi > 1 - 1/T$ . This restriction is guaranteed if we set  $\varpi = \ln(\phi - 1 + 1/T)$  and maximize the log-likelihood

$$\text{const} - \frac{NT}{2} \ln(\sigma^2) - \frac{N\varpi}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta})' \Phi^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta})$$

with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ,  $\sigma^2$ , and  $\varpi$ . Here  $\Phi$  has  $\exp(\varpi) + 1 - 1/T$  in its first row, first column and everywhere else is the same as  $\Phi_0$  in (12).

Maximizing the log-likelihood for differenced QML estimation becomes much more complicated if the  $v_{it}$ s are time-series heteroskedastic or  $p > 1$ . On the other hand, the ease with which levels QML estimates can be calculated is not affected by the size of  $p$  nor by whether or not the  $v_{it}$ s are time-series heteroskedastic. The remainder of this section is devoted to describing an ECME algorithm that can be applied to calculate levels QML estimates for arbitrary  $p$  and for an error variance-covariance matrix given by  $\Omega_0 = \sigma_{a0}^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}\boldsymbol{\mu}' + \Sigma_0$ , with  $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_{01}^2, \dots, \sigma_{0T}^2)$ .

The ECME algorithm relies on conditional or constrained maximization (CM) of either an imputed log-likelihood, based on augmented data, or the log-likelihood based on the observed data. In the present application, the observed data are  $\mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{y}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}'_N)'$ , while the augmented data consists of  $\mathbf{y}$  and  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N)'$ .<sup>3</sup> The imputed log-likelihood is built during the expectation (E) step by taking the conditional expectation of the log-likelihood for the augmented data given the observed data, while treating the current fit of the parameters  $\boldsymbol{\psi}^c$  as the parameters of the conditional distribution.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>3</sup>For the purposes of deriving the imputed log-likelihood and the actual log-likelihood, the variables in  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}'_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}'_N)'$  are treated as fixed.

<sup>4</sup>Liu and Rubin (1994) describe the properties of the ECME algorithm. For applications of it to panel data see Phillips (2004, 2012).

Applying the ECME algorithm to an error-components model for which  $\Omega_0 = \sigma_{a0}^2 \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota}' + \Sigma_0$ , with  $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_{01}^2, \dots, \sigma_{0T}^2)$ , leads to the following E and CM steps:

*E-step:* Let  $(\sigma_a^2)^c$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c$ , and  $\Omega^c = (\sigma_a^2)^c \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota}' + \Sigma^c$ , with  $\Sigma^c = \text{diag}((\sigma_1^2)^c, \dots, (\sigma_T^2)^c)$ , denote the current fits of  $\sigma_{a0}^2$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_0$ , and  $\Omega_0$ . Compute the conditional mean and variance of  $a_i$  given  $\mathbf{y}_i$  evaluated at the current fit of the parameters. These are  $a_i^c = (\sigma_a^2)^c \boldsymbol{\iota}' (\Omega^c)^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c)$  and  $v_a^c = (\sigma_a^2)^c \left[ 1 - (\sigma_a^2)^c \boldsymbol{\iota}' (\Omega^c)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\iota} \right]$ , respectively (see, e.g., Greene 2012, Theorem B.7, pp. 1041-1042). Then the imputed log-likelihood is

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\boldsymbol{\psi}; \boldsymbol{\psi}^c) &= \text{const} - \frac{N}{2} \left( \ln \sigma_a^2 + \sum_{t=1}^T \ln \sigma_t^2 \right) - \frac{1}{2\sigma_a^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (a_i^c)^2 - \frac{N}{2\sigma_a^2} v_a^c \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^N [\mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \boldsymbol{\iota} a_i^c]' \Sigma^{-1} [\mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \boldsymbol{\iota} a_i^c] - \frac{N}{2} \boldsymbol{\iota}' \Sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\iota} v_a^c. \end{aligned}$$

*CM-step 1:* Maximize  $Q(\cdot; \boldsymbol{\psi}^c)$  with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = (\sigma_a^2, \sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2)'$  subject to the constraint  $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^c$ . This step yields  $(\sigma_a^2)^+ = v_a^c + \sum_{i=1}^N (a_i^c)^2 / N$  and

$$(\sigma_t^2)^+ = v_a^c + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N [u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}^c) - a_i^c]^2 \quad t = 1, \dots, T. \quad (13)$$

*CM-step 2:* Maximize the actual log-likelihood  $\sum_{i=1}^N l_i(\cdot)$  with respect to  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  subject to the constraint  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \boldsymbol{\omega}^+$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\omega}^+ = ((\sigma_a^2)^+, (\sigma_1^2)^+, \dots, (\sigma_T^2)^+)'$ . This step gives the FGLS fit in Eq. (11) with  $\Omega^+ = (\sigma_a^2)^+ \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota}' + \Sigma^+$  and  $\Sigma^+ = \text{diag}((\sigma_1^2)^+, \dots, (\sigma_T^2)^+)$ .

After the new fits of the parameters are obtained, they become the current fits, and the preceding steps are repeated, until convergence.

Unlike some other algorithms, the ECME fitted values for the error variance components are guaranteed to be non-negative. But this advantage can lead to another complication. Specifically, EM-like algorithms — including the ECME algorithm — can be excruciatingly slow to converge, and, when calculating estimates of error-components models, the rate of convergence can slow when the sequence of the fitted variance of the individual-specific effect gets close to zero (see Meng and van Dyk 1998). Moreover, there is always the possibility that the error-components model in (3) is inappropriate; specifically, there may be no individual-specific effects. In this case, we have  $\sigma_{c0}^2 = 0$ , where  $\sigma_{c0}^2 = \text{var}(c_i)$ , and  $\sigma_{a0}^2 = 0$ , and consequently the sequence of fitted values for  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  can approach zero. Furthermore, even if  $\sigma_{c0}^2$  is positive and large,  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  can be small, for the control function  $\mu_0 + \mathbf{z}_i' \boldsymbol{\theta}_0$  is the best linear predictor of  $c_i$  based on  $\mathbf{z}_i$ , and if that predictor is accurate, then  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  can be near zero. If so, the sequence of fitted values for  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  can get close to zero.

As a practical matter, however, given  $\Omega_0 = \sigma_{a0}^2 \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota}' + \Sigma_0$ , with  $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_{01}^2, \dots, \sigma_{0T}^2)$ , then, when the fitted value for  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  is near zero, the fitted value  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^+$  in (11) differs little from the weighted least squares fit  $\left( \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' (\Sigma^+)^{-1} \mathbf{W}_i \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{W}_i' (\Sigma^+)^{-1} \mathbf{y}_i$ , which is obtained by setting  $(\sigma_a^2)^+ = 0$ . Furthermore, once  $(\sigma_a^2)^+$  is set to zero, all subsequent fitted values for  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  will be zero. Also, when  $(\sigma_a^2)^c = 0$ , Eq. (13) simplifies to  $(\sigma_t^2)^+ =$

$\sum_{i=1}^N u_{it} (\gamma^c)^2 / N$ . Thus, if  $(\sigma_a^2)^+$  is set to zero, convergence is rapid. Consequently, the ECME algorithm for computing level QML estimates will generally converge at a robust rate if, as part of the convergence criterion, the size of the fitted value for  $\sigma_{a0}^2$  is evaluated and  $(\sigma_a^2)^+$  is set to zero should it become sufficiently small.<sup>5</sup>

## 5 Monte Carlo Experiments

### 5.1 Design

In order to assess the finite sampling properties of QML estimators described in Section 4, Monte Carlo experiments were conducted. For all of the experiments, observations on the dependent variable  $y_{it}$  were generated according to the model

$$y_{it} = \delta_0 y_{i,t-1} + 0.5x_{it} + c_i + v_{it} \quad (t = -t_0 + 1, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, \dots, N),$$

with  $y_{i,-t_0} = 0$ . The values for  $\delta_0$  considered were 0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, and 0.9. Moreover, the  $x_{it}$ s were generated according to the autoregressive process

$$x_{it} = 0.5 + 0.5x_{i,t-1} + \xi_{it} \quad (t = -t_0 + 1, \dots, T, \quad i = 1, \dots, N).$$

The starting value  $x_{i,-t_0}$  was set equal to  $5 + 10\xi_{i,-t_0}$  and the  $\xi_{it}$ s were generated as independent uniform random variates with mean zero and variance one. Furthermore, two values for  $t_0$  were considered:  $t_0 = 1$  and  $t_0 = 50$ . For  $t_0 = 50$ , the time series for  $x_{it}$  and  $y_{it}$  were essentially stationary, whereas for  $t_0 = 1$  they were nonstationary.

As for the  $v_{it}$ s, they were generated as  $v_{it} = x_{it}(\epsilon_{it} - 5)/\sqrt{10}$ , with  $\epsilon_{it}$  a chi-square random variate with five degrees of freedom. The variate  $(\epsilon_{it} - 5)/\sqrt{10}$  has an asymmetric distribution about zero with a variance of one. Moreover, because the  $\epsilon_{it}$ s were generated independently of one another and of the  $x_{it}$ s, the  $v_{it}$ s were uncorrelated but conditionally heteroskedastic. However, the  $v_{it}$ s were unconditionally homoskedastic for  $t \geq 1$  when  $t_0$  was set to 50, for in this case the  $x_{it}$ s were essentially stationary by the time  $t = 1$ . On the other hand, for  $t_0 = 1$ , the  $x_{it}$ s had insufficient time to become approximately stationary by the time  $t = 1$ . Hence, in this case, the  $v_{it}$ s were not only conditionally heteroskedastic, they were also unconditionally time-series heteroskedastic for  $t \geq 1$ .

The heterogeneity component,  $c_i$ , was generated as  $c_i = \sum_{t=0}^T \ln|x_{it}| / (T+1) + \sigma_\zeta(\zeta_i - 5)/\sqrt{10}$ , with  $\zeta_i$  a chi-square random variate with five degrees of freedom. Furthermore, the parameter  $\sigma_\zeta$  was set to either one or four. This specification for  $c_i$  induced correlation between  $c_i$  and the  $x_{it}$ s. Moreover, both  $c_i$  and  $v_{it}$ , conditional on the  $x_{it}$ s, had non-normal asymmetric distributions, implying that, conditional on the  $x_{it}$ s, the error  $e_{it} = c_i + v_{it}$  came from a non-normal asymmetric distribution.

After a sample was generated, the start up observations were discarded so that QML estimation was based on  $(x_{i1}, y_{i1}), \dots, (x_{iT}, y_{iT})$  and  $y_{i0}$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ), while GMM estimation was based on  $(x_{i0}, y_{i0}), \dots, (x_{iT}, y_{iT})$ . Furthermore,  $T$  was set to ten, and  $N$  was

---

<sup>5</sup>For example, the fitted value of  $\sigma_a^2$  might be set to zero when the fitted value for the average correlation coefficient, say  $\bar{\rho}$ , is small, where  $\bar{\rho} = 2 \sum_{s=1}^{T-1} \sum_{t>s}^T \rho_{st} / [T(T-1)]$ , with  $\rho_{st} = \sigma_{a0}^2 / [(\sigma_{a0}^2 + \sigma_{0s}^2)(\sigma_{a0}^2 + \sigma_{0t}^2)]^{1/2}$ . This criterion was used to obtain the results for the levels QML estimator provided in Section 5.3. In particular, the fitted value of  $\sigma_a^2$  was set to zero when the fitted value of  $\rho$  fell below 0.01.

set to 200. Finally, for each combination of parameters, 5,000 independent samples were generated.

## 5.2 Estimators

The finite sample properties of levels and differenced QML estimators were compared to each other and to two well-known GMM estimators. The GMM estimators considered were the differenced GMM estimator proposed by Arellano and Bond (1991) (denoted DGMM) and the system GMM estimator suggested by Blundell and Bond (1998) (SGMM).

Three QML estimators were considered. Results are provided for levels QML (LQML) while relying on the structured variance-covariance matrix  $\Omega_0 = \sigma_{a0}^2 \boldsymbol{\iota} \boldsymbol{\iota}' + \Sigma_0$  with  $\Sigma_0 = \text{diag}(\sigma_{01}^2, \dots, \sigma_{0T}^2)$ . For this case, estimates were calculated with the ECME algorithm. Differenced QML estimates were also calculated. As noted in Section 4, computing differenced QML estimates via gradient methods is complicated if we model the  $v_{it}$ s as time-series heteroskedastic. For this reason, results are only provided for differenced QML estimates that restrict the  $v_{it}$ s to be uncorrelated and unconditionally homoskedastic. Because we can use either a linear projection of  $\Delta y_{i1}$  on 1 and  $\Delta \mathbf{x}_i$  or a linear projection of  $\Delta y_{i1}$  on 1 and  $\mathbf{x}_i$ , results for both choices are reported and are denoted by  $\text{DQML}_{\Delta \mathbf{x}}$  and  $\text{DQML}_{\mathbf{x}}$ .

## 5.3 Results

### 5.3.1 Stationary Designs

This section provides results for designs for which the generated variables were approximately stationary ( $t_0 = 50$ ). Table 1 provides estimates of finite sample bias and root mean squared error for the panel data GMM and QML estimators for stationary designs with  $\sigma_\zeta = 1$  and  $\sigma_\zeta = 4$ .

The evidence in Table 1 shows that the QML estimators — LQML,  $\text{DQML}_{\mathbf{x}}$ , and  $\text{DQML}_{\Delta \mathbf{x}}$  — generally have negligible finite sample bias, and, consequently, their root mean squared errors are significantly smaller than that of the GMM estimators, which have non-negligible finite sample bias. Moreover, for most designs, whether one uses  $\text{DQML}_{\mathbf{x}}$  or  $\text{DQML}_{\Delta \mathbf{x}}$  does not matter much; they have similar finite sample bias and root mean squared error. The exception is when  $\delta_0 = 0.9$ . For highly persistent designs,  $\text{DQML}_{\mathbf{x}}$  outperforms  $\text{DQML}_{\Delta \mathbf{x}}$ . But among the QML estimators, the levels QML estimator (LQML) is — in terms of root mean squared error — best.

The system GMM estimator was introduced as a response to the poor sampling performance of the differenced GMM estimator when  $\delta_0$  is near one. Blundell and Bond (1998) showed that the system GMM estimator will perform better than the differenced GMM estimator in this case, and it does indeed have smaller bias and root mean squared error than the differenced GMM estimator for  $\delta_0$  near one and  $\sigma_\zeta = 1$ . However, surprisingly, its sampling performance is worse — often much worse — than that of the differenced GMM estimator for  $\delta_0$  not near one. Furthermore, when  $\sigma_\zeta = 4$ , the system GMM estimator has substantial bias even when  $\delta_0$  is near one. Bun and Windmeijer (2010) provide an explanation for this result. They note the system GMM estimator may suffer from a weak instrument problem when the variance of the individual-specific effect is large relative to the variance of the idiosyncratic error. The sampling performance of the QML estimators, on

the other hand, are unaffected by the relative size of the individual-specific effect variance versus the idiosyncratic error variance.

**Table 1:** Finite sample characteristics of estimators of  $\delta_0$  for  $t = 50$ .

		$\delta_0$					
		0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
<hr/>							
$\sigma_\zeta = 1$							
DGMM	bias	-0.0112	-0.0147	-0.0223	-0.0318	-0.0533	-0.0784
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0322</i>	<i>0.0345</i>	<i>0.0391</i>	<i>0.0455</i>	<i>0.0637</i>	<i>0.0875</i>
SGMM	bias	-0.0419	-0.0547	-0.0679	-0.0741	-0.0498	-0.0106
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0539</i>	<i>0.0662</i>	<i>0.0785</i>	<i>0.0850</i>	<i>0.0641</i>	<i>0.0332</i>
LQML	bias	0.0003	0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0004	-0.0001	-0.0049
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0275</i>	<i>0.0282</i>	<i>0.0273</i>	<i>0.0265</i>	<i>0.0271</i>	<i>0.0269</i>
DQML $_{\mathbf{x}}$	bias	0.0002	0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0002	0.0011	-0.0001
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0281</i>	<i>0.0287</i>	<i>0.0281</i>	<i>0.0276</i>	<i>0.0309</i>	<i>0.0369</i>
DQML $_{\Delta\mathbf{x}}$	bias	0.0002	0.0005	-0.0005	-0.0002	0.0012	0.0008
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0281</i>	<i>0.0287</i>	<i>0.0280</i>	<i>0.0276</i>	<i>0.0310</i>	<i>0.0389</i>
<hr/>							
$\sigma_\zeta = 4$							
DGMM	bias	-0.0139	-0.0183	-0.0248	-0.0366	-0.0616	-0.0809
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0346</i>	<i>0.0383</i>	<i>0.0425</i>	<i>0.0508</i>	<i>0.0721</i>	<i>0.0899</i>
SGMM	bias	-0.0058	0.0057	0.0313	0.0736	0.1032	0.0769
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0416</i>	<i>0.0482</i>	<i>0.0630</i>	<i>0.0896</i>	<i>0.1086</i>	<i>0.0780</i>
LQML	bias	-0.0006	-0.0001	-0.0002	0.0003	-0.0011	-0.0038
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0278</i>	<i>0.0283</i>	<i>0.0278</i>	<i>0.0271</i>	<i>0.0277</i>	<i>0.0276</i>
DQML $_{\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0007	-0.0001	-0.0001	0.0006	-0.0006	0.0003
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0281</i>	<i>0.0288</i>	<i>0.0285</i>	<i>0.0279</i>	<i>0.0303</i>	<i>0.0366</i>
DQML $_{\Delta\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0007	-0.0001	-0.0001	0.0006	-0.0006	0.0010
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0281</i>	<i>0.0288</i>	<i>0.0284</i>	<i>0.0278</i>	<i>0.0302</i>	<i>0.0386</i>

### 5.3.2 Nonstationary Designs

Table 2 provides finite sample bias and root mean squared error estimates for nonstationary designs. For these designs  $t_0 = 1$ , and, therefore, for each cross section, the time series began in the immediate past.

**Table 2:** Finite sample characteristics of estimators of  $\delta_0$  for  $t = 1$ .

		$\delta_0$					
		0.0	0.2	0.4	0.6	0.8	0.9
<hr/>							
$\sigma_\zeta = 1$							
DGMM	bias	-0.0042	-0.0050	-0.0086	-0.0129	-0.0257	-0.0349
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0329</i>	<i>0.0340</i>	<i>0.0333</i>	<i>0.0332</i>	<i>0.0408</i>	<i>0.0463</i>
SGMM	bias	-0.0179	-0.0226	-0.0262	-0.0208	0.0097	0.0581
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0382</i>	<i>0.0422</i>	<i>0.0439</i>	<i>0.0390</i>	<i>0.0317</i>	<i>0.0630</i>
LQML	bias	-0.0005	0.0001	-0.0012	-0.0010	-0.0010	0.0001
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0248</i>	<i>0.0250</i>	<i>0.0233</i>	<i>0.0218</i>	<i>0.0221</i>	<i>0.0226</i>
DQML $_{\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0021	-0.0029	-0.0068	-0.0127	-0.0291	-0.0400
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0328</i>	<i>0.0332</i>	<i>0.0320</i>	<i>0.0315</i>	<i>0.0409</i>	<i>0.0493</i>
DQML $_{\Delta\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0021	-0.0029	-0.0068	-0.0128	-0.0295	-0.0417
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0328</i>	<i>0.0332</i>	<i>0.0320</i>	<i>0.0315</i>	<i>0.0411</i>	<i>0.0504</i>
<hr/>							
$\sigma_\zeta = 4$							
DGMM	bias	-0.0070	-0.0118	-0.0193	-0.0317	-0.0110	-0.0043
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0357</i>	<i>0.0390</i>	<i>0.0455</i>	<i>0.0480</i>	<i>0.0193</i>	<i>0.0100</i>
SGMM	bias	-0.0055	-0.0163	0.0942	0.2512	0.2636	0.1914
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0385</i>	<i>0.0489</i>	<i>0.1110</i>	<i>0.2568</i>	<i>0.2638</i>	<i>0.1915</i>
LQML	bias	-0.0004	-0.0008	-0.0004	-0.0006	-0.0003	-0.0001
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0248</i>	<i>0.0244</i>	<i>0.0229</i>	<i>0.0184</i>	<i>0.0102</i>	<i>0.0066</i>
DQML $_{\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0030	-0.0048	-0.0060	-0.0088	-0.0083	-0.0063
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0328</i>	<i>0.0320</i>	<i>0.0299</i>	<i>0.0244</i>	<i>0.0152</i>	<i>0.0103</i>
DQML $_{\Delta\mathbf{x}}$	bias	-0.0030	-0.0048	-0.0060	-0.0088	-0.0083	-0.0063
	<i>rmse</i>	<i>0.0328</i>	<i>0.0320</i>	<i>0.0299</i>	<i>0.0244</i>	<i>0.0152</i>	<i>0.0103</i>

In order for the system GMM estimator to be consistent (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) the stochastic process for each individual has to have had sufficient time to converge to its steady state by time  $t = 1$  (see, e.g., Roodman 2009). However, given  $t_0 = 1$ , convergence to a steady state at time  $t = 1$  has clearly not occurred. The effect of the failure of this initial condition restriction is most striking when  $\sigma_\zeta = 4$ . In this case, for many designs, the absolute bias and root mean squared error of the system GMM estimator is much larger than that of the other estimators.

Except for the condition that  $y_{i0}$  must be uncorrelated with  $v_{it}$  for  $t \geq 1$ , the QML estimators are unaffected by initial conditions. However, the consistency (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ) of the differenced QML estimators —  $\text{DQML}_x$  and  $\text{DQML}_{\Delta x}$  — depends on the  $v_{it}$ s being unconditionally homoskedastic, and, when  $t_0 = 1$ , the  $v_{it}$ s are time-series heteroskedastic. Consequently, in Table 2, the differenced QML estimators no longer dominate the differenced GMM estimator in terms of finite sample bias. On the other hand, the levels QML estimator is robust with respect to time-series heteroskedasticity, and therefore its finite sample bias is still negligible for  $t_0 = 1$ .

## 6 Conclusions

This paper established the almost sure convergence and asymptotic normality of levels and differenced QML estimators of the parameters of a  $p$ th-order dynamic panel data model. The almost sure convergence and asymptotic normality of the estimators do not depend on initial conditions, like those required by the system GMM estimator. Moreover, the log-likelihood can be misspecified, and the errors can be conditionally and time-series heteroskedastic. However, only levels QML estimates can be easily calculated when the errors are time-series heteroskedastic. The paper provided an ECME algorithm for this case. Furthermore, the levels QML estimator dominated all of the other estimators in terms of having the smallest root mean squared errors.



## Appendix A: Lemma 1 Proof

In order to establish  $E\left(\mathbf{y}'_{i,-j}\Omega_0^{*-1}\mathbf{e}_i\right) = 0$ , I first use an analysis similar to that in Hamilton (1994, pp. 7-9). Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} = (y_{it}, y_{i,t-1}, \dots, y_{i,t-p+1})'$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{it} = (\mathbf{x}'_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{it}, 0, \dots, 0)'$ , and

$$\mathbf{F} = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_{01} & \delta_{02} & \cdots & \delta_{0,p-1} & \delta_{0p} \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\delta}_0 = (\delta_{01}, \dots, \delta_{0p})'$ . Then  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} = \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{it}$ . Hence,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1} = \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i0} + \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i1}$ , and, for  $t > 1$ , by repeated substitutions we get  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} = \mathbf{F}^t\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i0} + \mathbf{F}^{t-1}\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i1} + \mathbf{F}^{t-2}\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i2} + \dots + \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i,t-1} + \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{it}$ . Writing this last expression out in full, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_{it} \\ y_{i,t-1} \\ \vdots \\ y_{i,t-p+1} \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{F}^t \begin{pmatrix} y_{i0} \\ y_{i,-1} \\ \vdots \\ y_{i,-p+1} \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{F}^{t-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}'_{i1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i1} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \mathbf{F}^{t-2} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}'_{i2}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i2} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ + \dots + \mathbf{F} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}'_{i,t-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i,t-1} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{x}'_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{it} \\ 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

Next let  $f_{rs}^{(t)}$  denote the  $(r, s)$ th element of  $\mathbf{F}^t$ . Then  $y_{i1} = f_{11}^{(1)}y_{i0} + f_{12}^{(1)}y_{i,-1} + \dots + f_{1p}^{(1)}y_{i,-p+1} + \mathbf{x}'_{i1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i1}$ , and, for  $t > 1$ , from the first equation in (15) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= f_{11}^{(t)}y_{i0} + f_{12}^{(t)}y_{i,-1} + \dots + f_{1p}^{(t)}y_{i,-p+1} + f_{11}^{(t-1)}(\mathbf{x}'_{i1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i1}) \\ &\quad + f_{11}^{(t-2)}(\mathbf{x}'_{i2}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i2}) + \dots + f_{11}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}'_{i,t-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{i,t-1}) + \mathbf{x}'_{it}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + e_{it}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Using the expression for  $y_{it}$  in Eq. (16), we can write  $\mathbf{y}_{i,-j}$  in terms of  $\mathbf{y}_i^o$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i$ , and  $\mathbf{e}_i$ . To that end, let  $\mathbf{A}_j$  and  $\mathbf{B}_j$  be  $T \times p$  and  $T \times T$  matrices given by

$$\mathbf{A}_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ f_{11}^{(1)} & f_{12}^{(1)} & \cdots & f_{1,j-1}^{(1)} & f_{1j}^{(1)} & f_{1,j+1}^{(1)} & \cdots & f_{1p}^{(1)} \\ f_{11}^{(2)} & f_{12}^{(2)} & \cdots & f_{1,j-1}^{(2)} & f_{1j}^{(2)} & f_{1,j+1}^{(2)} & \cdots & f_{1p}^{(2)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ f_{11}^{(T-j)} & f_{12}^{(T-j)} & \cdots & f_{1,j-1}^{(T-j)} & f_{1j}^{(T-j)} & f_{1,j+1}^{(T-j)} & \cdots & f_{1p}^{(T-j)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (17)$$

$$\mathbf{B}_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ f_{11}^{(1)} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ f_{11}^{(2)} & f_{11}^{(1)} & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ f_{11}^{(T-j-1)} & f_{11}^{(T-j-2)} & f_{11}^{(T-j-3)} & \cdots & f_{11}^{(1)} & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Given these definitions, we have  $\mathbf{y}_{i,-j} = \mathbf{A}_j \mathbf{y}_i^o + \mathbf{B}_j (\mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{e}_i)$ .

Therefore,  $E(\mathbf{y}'_{i,-j} \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = E(\mathbf{y}'_i \mathbf{A}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) + E(\boldsymbol{\beta}'_0 \mathbf{X}'_i \mathbf{B}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) + E(\mathbf{e}'_i \mathbf{B}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i)$ . Note that  $E(\mathbf{e}'_i \mathbf{B}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = E[\text{tr}(\Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}'_i \mathbf{B}'_j)] = \text{tr}[\Omega_0^{*-1} E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}'_i) \mathbf{B}'_j] = \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}'_j) = 0$ , where the last equality follows from the fact that  $\mathbf{B}_j$  is a square matrix with zeros down the main diagonal. Moreover, if  $E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}'_i) = \mathbf{0}$ , then  $E(\boldsymbol{\beta}'_0 \mathbf{X}'_i \mathbf{B}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = 0$ . And  $E(\mathbf{y}'_i \mathbf{A}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = \text{tr}[E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{y}'_i) \mathbf{A}'_j \Omega_0^{*-1}] = 0$  given  $E(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{y}'_i) = \mathbf{0}$ . The preceding proves  $E(\mathbf{y}'_{i,-j} \Omega_0^{*-1} \mathbf{e}_i) = 0$ .

## Appendix B: Theorem 1 Proof

The proof of Theorem 1 relies on verifying several preliminary results, which are provided as Lemmas B.1 through B.3. Throughout convergence is with respect to  $N \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $T$  fixed. Moreover, in the sequel,  $M$  denotes a sufficiently large finite number.

**Lemma B.1.** Suppose  $E(x_{itk}^2) < \infty$  and  $E(y_{it}^2) < \infty$ , for each  $i, t$ , and  $k$ , and Conditions C2 and C4 are satisfied. Then the linear projection in (4) exists. Furthermore, the limits  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  exist, and  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  and the elements of  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  are continuous functions of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ .

**Proof.** The conditions  $E(x_{itk}^2) < \infty$  and  $E(y_{it}^2) < \infty$ , for each  $i, t$ , and  $k$ , and C2 imply the existence of the linear projection in (4) (see, e.g., Wooldridge, 2010, pp. 25-26).

Also,  $E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  is finite if  $E[\mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})]$  is finite, and the latter is finite if  $x_{itk}$  and  $y_{it}$  have finite second-order moments, for all  $i, t$ , and  $k$ .

The matrix  $E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  has finite elements as well. To see this, first let  $\mathbf{W}_{i,j}$  denote the  $j$ th column of  $\mathbf{W}_i$ , and let  $\mathbf{S}_{\cdot j}$  denote the  $j$ th column of  $\partial \text{vec}(\Omega) / \partial \boldsymbol{\omega}'$ , where recall that  $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \text{vech}(\Omega)$ . Then,  $\partial^2 l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial \gamma_j \partial \gamma_k = -\mathbf{W}'_{i,j} \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{i,k}$ ,  $\partial^2 l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial \gamma_j \partial \omega_k = -\mathbf{W}'_{i,j} \Omega^{-1} (\partial \Omega / \partial \omega_k) \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$ , and

$$\frac{\partial^2 l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})}{\partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k} = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{S}'_{\cdot j} (\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\cdot k} - \frac{1}{2} s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - \frac{1}{2} s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}), \quad (19)$$

where  $s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \mathbf{S}'_{\cdot j} (\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' \Omega^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\cdot k}$  and  $s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \mathbf{S}'_{\cdot j} (\Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' \Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\cdot k}$  (see Ruud 2000, p. 930). From the preceding second-order partial derivatives we see that the condition  $E(x_{itk}^2) < \infty$  and  $E(y_{it}^2) < \infty$ , for each  $i, t$ , and  $k$ , implies  $E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  has finite elements.

Inspection of  $E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  and the elements of  $E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  reveals  $E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  and the elements of  $E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  are functions of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  and terms of the form  $N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}y_{it})$ ,  $N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}x_{itk})$ , and  $N^{-1}\sum_i E(x_{isj}x_{itk})$ . Therefore, if the limits of these averages exist (as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ ), then the limits  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  and  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]$  exist, where  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  and the elements of  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  are functions of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  and terms involving limits of the form  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}y_{it})$ ,  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}x_{itk})$ , and  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(x_{isj}x_{itk})$ . And, inspection of  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  and the elements of  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  reveals  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  and the elements of  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  are continuous functions of  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ .

**Lemma B.2.** Let  $\overline{\Psi}$  denote a compact subset of  $\Psi$ . Suppose C1, C4, and C5 are satisfied. Then  $L_N(\cdot) \xrightarrow{a.s.} L(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\omega^{st}$  denote the  $(s,t)$ th element of  $\Omega^{-1}$ ; let  $\gamma_k$  denote the  $k$ th element of  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ; recall that  $\mathbf{W}_{i \cdot j}$  is the  $j$ th column of  $\mathbf{W}_i$ ; and let  $W_{itj}$  denote the  $t$ th element of  $\mathbf{W}_{i \cdot j}$ . Also, let  $S_{y_s y_t, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i [y_{is}y_{it} - E(y_{is}y_{it})]$ ,  $S_{y_s W_{tj}, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i [y_{is}W_{itj} - E(y_{is}W_{itj})]$ , and  $S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i [W_{isj}W_{itk} - E(W_{isj}W_{itk})]$ . Then  $L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})] = -\sum_s \sum_t \omega^{st} S_{y_s y_t, N}/2 + \sum_s \sum_t \omega^{st} \sum_j \gamma_j S_{y_s W_{tj}, N} - \sum_s \sum_t \omega^{st} \sum_j \sum_k \gamma_j \gamma_k S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N}/2$ . Therefore, by an obvious inequality, we have  $|L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]| \leq \sum_s \sum_t |\omega^{st}| |S_{y_s y_t, N}|/2 + \sum_s \sum_t |\omega^{st}| \sum_k |\gamma_k| |S_{y_s W_{tk}, N}| + \sum_s \sum_t |\omega^{st}| \sum_j \sum_k |\gamma_j \gamma_k| |S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N}|/2$ . Given  $\omega^{st}$  and  $\gamma_k$  are bounded for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ , it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}} |L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})]| &\leq M \sum_s \sum_t |S_{y_s y_t, N}| + M \sum_s \sum_t \sum_k |S_{y_s W_{tk}, N}| \\ &\quad + M \sum_s \sum_t \sum_j \sum_k |S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N}|. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Hence,  $L_N(\cdot) - E[L_N(\cdot)] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$  if  $S_{y_s y_t, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ ,  $S_{y_s W_{tk}, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ , and  $S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  for each  $s, t, j$ , and  $k$ .

To see that  $S_{y_s y_t, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ , note that, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and C1, we get  $E|y_{is}y_{it}|^{1+\epsilon/2} \leq \left(E|y_{is}|^{2+\epsilon} E|y_{it}|^{2+\epsilon}\right)^{1/2} < M$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$  and all  $i, s$ , and  $t$ . This conclusion and C5 imply  $S_{y_s y_t, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  (see White 2001, p. 35, Corollary 3.9). By similar arguments, we also have  $S_{y_s W_{tk}, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  and  $S_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ . Hence,  $L_N(\cdot) - E[L_N(\cdot)] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

Given C4, the following expressions are defined:  $A_{y_s y_t, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}y_{it}) - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}y_{it})$ ,  $A_{y_s W_{tj}, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}W_{itj}) - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(y_{is}W_{itj})$ , and  $A_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N} = N^{-1}\sum_i E(W_{isj}W_{itk}) - \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1}\sum_i E(W_{isj}W_{itk})$ . And, by arguments analogous to those leading to the inequality in (20), one can show  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}} |E[L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi})] - L(\boldsymbol{\psi})| \leq M \sum_s \sum_t |A_{y_s y_t, N}| + M \sum_s \sum_t \sum_j |A_{y_s W_{tj}, N}| + M \sum_s \sum_t \sum_j \sum_k |A_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N}|$ . Because  $A_{y_s y_t, N}$ ,  $A_{y_s W_{tj}, N}$ , and  $A_{W_{sj} W_{tk}, N}$  all  $\rightarrow 0$ , we have  $E[L_N(\cdot)] \rightarrow L(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

The conclusions of the last two paragraphs imply  $L_N(\cdot) \xrightarrow{a.s.} L(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

**Lemma B.3.** If C1–C3 are satisfied, then  $E[\partial L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}] = \mathbf{0}$ . If, in addition, C4 and

C5 are satisfied and  $\mathbf{H}_0$  is negative definite, then there is a compact subset  $\overline{\Psi}$  of  $\Psi$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  in its interior, such that  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}) < L(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)$  if  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \neq \boldsymbol{\psi}_0$ .

**Proof.** First

$$E[\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}] = \mathbf{0} \quad (21)$$

is established. By well known results,  $\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})/\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{W}'_i \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})$  and

$$\frac{\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\omega}} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{vech}(\Omega^{-1} - \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' \Omega^{-1}) \quad (22)$$

(see, e.g., Ruud, 2000, pp. 928-930). To see that  $E[\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}] = \mathbf{0}$ , first note that  $E(\mathbf{Z}'_i \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  because all of the elements of  $\mathbf{u}_i$  are uncorrelated with all of the elements of  $\mathbf{Z}_i$  by construction. Moreover, C1–C3 imply  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{y}_i^{o'}) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{x}_i') = \mathbf{0}$ , and  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i') = \Omega_0$ . Thus, the conditions of Lemma 1 hold for the augmented regression in (7). Hence, by Lemma 1, we have  $E(\mathbf{y}'_{i,-j} \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i) = 0$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). This proves  $E[\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi})/\partial \boldsymbol{\gamma}] = \mathbf{0}$ . Furthermore, from Eq. (22), it is clear that, because  $E(\mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i') = \Omega_0$ , we have  $E[\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\omega}] = \mathbf{0}$ . Hence,  $E[\partial L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}] = \mathbf{0}$ .

Next, a Taylor series expansion gives

$$L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0)' \mathbf{g}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0)' \mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*) (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / 2, \quad (23)$$

where  $\mathbf{g}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) = \partial L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)/\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\psi}^*$  satisfies  $\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}^*\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0\|$ . Given Eq. (21) and Lemma B.1, taking the expectation of the left and right-hand sides of (23) and then letting  $N \rightarrow \infty$  gives  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = L(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) + (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0)' \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*) (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / 2$ .

Let  $h_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  denote the  $(j, k)$ th element of  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$ , and define determinants

$$d_j(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \begin{vmatrix} h_{11}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) & \cdots & h_{1j}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_{j1}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) & \cdots & h_{jj}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) \end{vmatrix} \quad (j = 1, \dots, m).$$

By assumption,  $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)$  is negative definite, and thus  $d_1(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) < 0$ ,  $d_2(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) > 0$ ,  $d_3(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) < 0, \dots$  (see Rao 1973, p. 37). Moreover, the determinant  $d_j(\cdot)$  is continuous in  $h_{11}(\cdot), h_{12}(\cdot), \dots$ , which are, in turn, continuous in  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  (see Lemma B.1). Hence,  $d_j(\cdot)$  is continuous in  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ . It follows that there is a  $r > 0$  such that for the closed ball in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , centered at  $\boldsymbol{\psi}_0$ , with radius  $r$ , we have  $d_1(\boldsymbol{\psi}) < 0$ ,  $d_2(\boldsymbol{\psi}) > 0$ ,  $d_3(\boldsymbol{\psi}) < 0, \dots$  for  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$  in the ball. Let  $\overline{\Psi}$  denote the ball (a compact subset of  $\mathbb{R}^m$ ). Then  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi})$  is negative definite for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ . Therefore, for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \neq \boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  and  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ , we must have  $(\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0)' \mathbf{H}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*) (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \boldsymbol{\psi}_0) < 0$ , because  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$  implies  $\boldsymbol{\psi}^* \in \overline{\Psi}$  and, therefore,  $\mathbf{H}(\boldsymbol{\psi}^*)$  is negative definite. Hence,  $L(\boldsymbol{\psi}) < L(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0)$  if  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \neq \boldsymbol{\psi}_0$ .

**Proof of Theorem 1:** The conclusions of Lemmas B.2 and B.3 imply there is a measurable maximizer,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ , in  $\overline{\Psi}$  and  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} \boldsymbol{\psi}_0$  (see, e.g., Amemiya, 1985, Theorem 4.1.1, and his footnote 1 on p. 107).

## Appendix C: Theorem 2 Proof

Theorem 2 is proven by establishing several lemmas. The first result is an elementary inequality, which is applied repeatedly in the sequel.

**Lemma C.1.** For  $r > 0$ ,  $\left| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \right|^r \leq b_r \sum_{j=1}^m |a_j|^r$  where  $b_r = 1$  or  $2^{(r-1)(m-1)}$  according as  $r \leq 1$  or  $r \geq 1$ .

**Proof.** By repeated application of the inequality  $|a + b|^r \leq c_r |a|^r + c_r |b|^r$ ,  $r > 0$ , where  $c_r = 1$  or  $2^{r-1}$  according as  $r \leq 1$  or  $r \geq 1$  (see Loève 1977, p. 157), we have  $\left| \sum_{j=1}^m a_j \right|^r \leq c_r |a_1|^r + c_r \left| \sum_{j=2}^m a_j \right|^r \leq c_r |a_1|^r + c_r^2 |a_2|^r + c_r^2 \left| \sum_{j=3}^m a_j \right|^r \leq \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} c_r^j |a_j|^r + c_r^{m-1} |a_m|^r$ . Also,  $\sum_{j=1}^{m-1} c_r^j |a_j|^r + c_r^{m-1} |a_m|^r \leq b_r \sum_{j=1}^m |a_j|^r$  for  $b_r = c_r^{m-1}$ .

**Lemma C.2.** Suppose C1', C2, C3, C5, and C6 are satisfied. Then  $\sqrt{N} \mathbf{g}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{I}_0)$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  be a  $m \times 1$  vector of constants such that  $\boldsymbol{\mu} \neq \mathbf{0}$ . We have  $\boldsymbol{\mu}' \sqrt{N} \mathbf{g}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) = N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i$  for  $\mathcal{Z}_i = \boldsymbol{\mu}' (\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi})$ . And  $\sqrt{N} \mathbf{g}_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathcal{I}_0)$  if  $N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\mu}' \mathcal{I}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu})$  (see Amemiya 1985, Theorem 3.3.8).

To verify  $N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\mu}' \mathcal{I}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu})$ , let  $\nu_i^2 = \text{var}(\mathcal{Z}_i) = \boldsymbol{\mu}' E[(\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi})(\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\psi})'] \boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and  $\bar{\nu}_N^2 = N^{-1} \sum_i \nu_i^2$ . Because  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_N^2 = \boldsymbol{\mu}' \mathcal{I}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu}$  (by C6), we have  $N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\mu}' \mathcal{I}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu})$  if  $N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i / \bar{\nu}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Moreover,  $N^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathcal{Z}_i / \bar{\nu}_N \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  if  $E(\mathcal{Z}_i) = 0$ ,  $\bar{\nu}_N^2 > \epsilon' > 0$  for all  $N$  sufficiently large, and  $E|\mathcal{Z}_i|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and some  $\epsilon/2 > 0$  (see White 2001, Theorem 5.10). Therefore, Lemma C.2 is proven upon proving  $E(\mathcal{Z}_i) = 0$ ,  $\bar{\nu}_N^2 > \epsilon' > 0$  for all  $N$  sufficiently large, and  $E|\mathcal{Z}_i|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and some  $\epsilon/2 > 0$ .

We can verify  $E(\mathcal{Z}_i) = 0$  and  $\bar{\nu}_N^2 > \epsilon' > 0$  for all  $N$  sufficiently large easily. In particular, Eq. (21) implies  $E(\mathcal{Z}_i) = 0$ . Moreover, given C6, we have  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\nu}_N^2 = \boldsymbol{\mu}' \mathcal{I}_0 \boldsymbol{\mu}$ , and, because  $\mathcal{I}_0$  is positive definite, we can find an  $\epsilon' > 0$  such that  $\bar{\nu}_N^2 > \epsilon'$  for all  $N$  sufficiently large.

To verify  $E|\mathcal{Z}_i|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and some  $\epsilon/2 > 0$ , first let  $\mu_j$  and  $\psi_j$  denote the  $j$ th elements of  $\boldsymbol{\mu}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ . Then  $\mathcal{Z}_i = \sum_j \mu_j \partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \psi_j$ . Hence, by Lemma C.1, we have  $E|\mathcal{Z}_i|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  if  $E|\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \psi_j|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and  $j$ . Next, recall  $\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\gamma} = \mathbf{W}_i' \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i$  while  $\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \boldsymbol{\omega} = -\text{vech}(\Omega_0^{-1} - \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i' \Omega_0^{-1}) / 2$ . Moreover, upon letting  $\omega_0^{st}$  denote the  $(s, t)$ th element of  $\Omega_0^{-1}$  and recalling  $W_{isj}$  denotes the  $(s, j)$ th element of  $\mathbf{W}_i$ , the elements of  $\mathbf{W}_i' \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i$  are of the form  $\sum_s \sum_t \omega_0^{st} W_{isj} u_{it}$  while the elements of  $\text{vech}(\Omega_0^{-1} - \Omega_0^{-1} \mathbf{u}_i \mathbf{u}_i' \Omega_0^{-1})$  are of the form  $\omega_0^{jk} - \sum_s \sum_t \omega_0^{js} \omega_0^{kt} u_{is} u_{it}$ . These observations and another application of Lemma C.1 implies  $E|\partial l_i(\boldsymbol{\psi}_0) / \partial \psi_j|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and  $j$  if  $E|W_{isj} u_{it}|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  and  $E|u_{is} u_{it}|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i, j, s$ , and  $t$ . But  $E|W_{isj} u_{it}|^{2+\epsilon/2} \leq \left( E|W_{isj}|^{4+\epsilon} E|u_{it}|^{4+\epsilon} \right)^{1/2}$  by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Moreover, for a suitable choice of  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have  $E|W_{isj}|^{4+\epsilon} < M$  for all  $i, s$ , and  $j$  by C1'. Condition

C1' also implies  $E|u_{it}|^{4+\epsilon} < M$  for all  $i$  and  $t$ . Hence,  $E|W_{isj}u_{it}|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i, j, s$ , and  $t$ . Similar arguments give  $E|u_{is}u_{it}|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i, s$ , and  $t$ . It follows that  $E|\mathcal{Z}_i|^{2+\epsilon/2} < M$  for all  $i$  and some  $\epsilon/2 > 0$ .

**Lemma C.3.** Let  $\overline{\Psi}$  be a compact subset of  $\Psi$ . Suppose C1, C4, and C5 are satisfied. Then  $\mathbf{H}_N(\cdot) \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{H}(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

**Proof.** Let  $h_{\gamma_j\gamma_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\gamma_k]$ . Then  $|\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\gamma_k - h_{\gamma_j\gamma_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi})| = |\sum_s \sum_t \omega^{st} (S_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N} + A_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N})| \leq \sum_s \sum_t |\omega^{st}| (|S_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}| + |A_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}|)$ . (For the definitions of  $S_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}$  and  $A_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}$ , see the proof of Lemma B.2.) Given  $\omega^{st}$  is bounded for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ , we have  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}} |\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\gamma_k - h_{\gamma_j\gamma_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi})| \leq M \sum_s \sum_t (|S_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}| + |A_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N}|)$ . Recall that  $S_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  (see the proof of Lemma B.2), and  $A_{W_{sj}W_{tk},N} \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore,  $\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\gamma_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} h_{\gamma_j\gamma_k}(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

Let  $h_{\gamma_j\omega_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\omega_k]$ . Also, let  $\vartheta_{k,st}$  denote the  $(s, t)$ th element of  $\Omega^{-1}(\partial\Omega/\partial\omega_k)\Omega^{-1}$ . Then  $\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\omega_k - h_{\gamma_j\omega_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) = -\sum_s \sum_t \vartheta_{k,st} [S_{y_s W_{tj},N} + A_{y_s W_{tj},N}] + \sum_s \sum_t \sum_l \vartheta_{k,st} \gamma_l [S_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N} + A_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N}]$ . (For the definitions of  $S_{y_s W_{tj},N}$  and  $A_{y_s W_{tj},N}$ , see the proof of Lemma B.2.) Because  $\vartheta_{k,st}$  is a continuous function on  $\overline{\Psi}$ , and, therefore, bounded on  $\overline{\Psi}$ , and  $\gamma_l$  is bounded for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ , we have  $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}} |\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\omega_k - h_{\gamma_j\omega_k}(\boldsymbol{\psi})| \leq M \sum_s \sum_t (|S_{y_s W_{tj},N}| + |A_{y_s W_{tj},N}|) + M \sum_s \sum_t \sum_l (|S_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N}| + |A_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N}|)$ . Given  $S_{y_s W_{tj},N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ ,  $S_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ ,  $A_{y_s W_{tj},N} \rightarrow 0$ , and  $A_{W_{sj}W_{tl},N} \rightarrow 0$ , we have  $\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial\gamma_j \partial\omega_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} h_{\gamma_j\omega_k}(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

Finally, from (19), we see that  $\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\omega_j \partial\omega_k - E(\partial^2 L_N(\boldsymbol{\psi}) / \partial\omega_j \partial\omega_k) = -(2N)^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi})] \right\} - (2N)^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\boldsymbol{\psi})] \right\}$ . Note that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_i \left\{ s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi}) - E[s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{\psi})] \right\} = \mathbf{S}'_{\cdot j} (\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}) \mathbf{S}_{\cdot k} \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = N^{-1} \sum_i \{ \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})' - E[\mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \mathbf{u}_i(\boldsymbol{\gamma})'] \}$ . Because  $\mathbf{S}_{\cdot j}$  is a vector of zeros and ones, we see that the right-hand side of (24) is a sum of the elements of  $\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}$ . Therefore, if each element of this matrix converges almost surely to zero uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ , then  $N^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\cdot) - E[s_{ijk}^{(1)}(\cdot)] \right\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ . Similar arguments can be used to show  $N^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\cdot) - E[s_{ijk}^{(2)}(\cdot)] \right\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\overline{\Psi}$ .

To see that each element of  $\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}$  converges almost surely to zero uniformly, note that the matrix  $\Omega^{-1} \otimes \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}$  can be partitioned into  $T \times T$  sub-matrices of the form  $\omega^{lm} \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}$  ( $l = 1, \dots, T$ ,  $m = 1, \dots, T$ ). Furthermore, the  $(j, k)$ th element of  $\omega^{lm} \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{U}_N(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) \Omega^{-1}$  is  $\omega^{lm} \sum_s \sum_t \omega^{js} \omega^{kt} N^{-1} \sum_i \{ u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - E[u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})] \}$ . And, by familiar arguments, we can show that the absolute value of this element is no greater than  $M \sum_s \sum_t |N^{-1} \sum_i \{ u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - E[u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})] \}|$  for  $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \overline{\Psi}$ . Moreover,  $N^{-1} \sum_i \{ u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - E[u_{is}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) u_{it}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})] \} = S_{y_s y_t, N} - \sum_q \gamma_q (S_{y_s W_{tq}, N} + S_{y_t W_{sq}, N}) +$

$\sum_q \sum_r \gamma_q \gamma_r S_{W_{sq} W_{tr} N}$ , and, given  $\gamma$  is bounded for  $\psi \in \bar{\Psi}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\psi \in \bar{\Psi}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \{u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma) - E[u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma)]\} \right| \\ & \leq |S_{y_s y_t, N}| + M \sum_q \left( |S_{y_s W_{tq}, N}| + |S_{y_t W_{sq}, N}| + \sum_r |S_{W_{sq} W_{tr} N}| \right). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Because the right-hand side (25)  $\xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  (see the proof of Lemma B.2), we have  $N^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{i,jk}^{(1)}(\cdot) - E \left[ s_{i,jk}^{(1)}(\cdot) \right] \right\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\bar{\Psi}$ . Simliar arguments establish  $N^{-1} \sum_i \left\{ s_{i,jk}^{(2)}(\cdot) - E \left[ s_{i,jk}^{(2)}(\cdot) \right] \right\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\bar{\Psi}$ . It follows that  $\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k - E[\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  uniformly on  $\bar{\Psi}$ .

Let  $h_{\omega_j \omega_k}(\psi) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} E[\partial^2 L_N(\psi) / \partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k]$ . We can establish  $E[\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k] \rightarrow h_{\omega_j \omega_k}(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\bar{\Psi}$  by arguments paralleling those in the last two paragraphs. (For example, in the foregoing derivations, replace  $N^{-1} \sum_i E[u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma)]$  with  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} N^{-1} \sum_i E[u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma)]$  and  $N^{-1} \sum_i u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma)$  with  $N^{-1} \sum_i E[u_{is}(\gamma) u_{it}(\gamma)]$ . Also, replace  $S_{y_s y_t, N}$ ,  $S_{y_s W_{tq}, N}$ ,  $S_{y_t W_{sq}, N}$ , and  $S_{W_{sq} W_{tr} N}$  with  $A_{y_s y_t, N}$ ,  $A_{y_s W_{tq}, N}$ ,  $A_{y_t W_{sq}, N}$ , and  $A_{W_{sq} W_{tr} N}$ .)

From the foregoing, we have  $\partial^2 L_N(\cdot) / \partial \omega_j \partial \omega_k \xrightarrow{a.s.} h_{\omega_j \omega_k}(\cdot)$  uniformly on  $\bar{\Psi}$ .

**Proof of Theorem 2:** The conclusions of Lemmas C.2 and C.3, the consistency of  $\hat{\psi}$ , the continuity of  $\mathbf{H}(\cdot)$  at  $\psi_0$ , and the nonsingularity of  $\mathbf{H}_0 = \mathbf{H}(\psi_0)$  imply  $\sqrt{N}(\hat{\psi} - \psi_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{H}_0^{-1} \mathcal{I}_0 \mathbf{H}_0^{-1})$  (see Newey and McFadden 1994, Theorem 3.1).

## Appendix D: Proof of Theorems 3 and 4

The proofs of Theorems 3 and 4 are similar to the proofs of Theorems 1 and 2. For example, Conditions C1 and C2' ensure the linear projection parameters in (8) exist and do not depend on  $i$  and the errors in  $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$  are uncorrelated with the regressors in  $\mathbf{x}_i$ . Furthermore, the quasi log-likelihood  $\sum_{i=1}^N \tilde{l}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_0)$  is similar to the quasi log-likelihood  $\sum_{i=1}^N l(\psi_0)$ , and, therefore, most of the technical details are the same as in Appendices B and C and need not be repeated.

However, the conclusions of Theorems 3 and 4 depend on  $E(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  being true, and the proof of this result, though similar to the proof of Lemma 1, differs in some details. Therefore, the proof of  $E(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i) = \mathbf{0}$  is provided in this appendix.

**Lemma D.1.** Suppose  $E(x_{itk}^2) < \infty$  and  $E(y_{it}^2) < \infty$ , for each  $i$ ,  $t$ , and  $k$ , and Conditions C2' and C3' are satisfied. Then  $E(\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_i) = \mathbf{0}$ .

**Proof.** Let

$$\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_p \otimes (1, \mathbf{x}_i') \\ \Delta \mathbf{X}_i & \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Given this definition, showing  $E\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right) = \mathbf{0}$  consists of showing  $E\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right) = \mathbf{0}$  and  $E\left[\left(\mathbf{0}, \Delta \mathbf{y}'_{i,-j}\right) \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right] = 0$  ( $j = 1, \dots, p$ ). Under the conditions of the lemma, the elements of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i$  are uncorrelated with the elements of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$ ; hence,  $E\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i' \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right) = \mathbf{0}$ . It remains to show  $E\left[\left(\mathbf{0}, \Delta \mathbf{y}'_{i,-j}\right) \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right] = 0$ .

This result can be established by arguments similar to those used in the proof of Lemma 1. Specifically, let  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} = (\Delta y_{it}, \Delta y_{i,t-1}, \dots, \Delta y_{i,t-p+1})'$ ,  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{it} = (\Delta \mathbf{x}'_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta e_{it}, 0, \dots, 0)'$  and let  $\mathbf{F}$  be defined as in (14). Then we get  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i2} = \mathbf{F} \Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1} + \Delta \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i2}$ ; and, for  $t > 2$ , we have  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{it} = \mathbf{F}^{t-1} \Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1} + \mathbf{F}^{t-2} \Delta \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i2} + \dots + \mathbf{F} \Delta \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{i,t-1} + \Delta \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_{it}$ . Let  $f_{rs}^{(t)}$  denote the  $(r, s)$ th element of  $\mathbf{F}^t$ . Then, the preceding implies  $\Delta y_{i2} = f_{11}^{(1)} \Delta y_{i1} + f_{12}^{(1)} \Delta y_{i0} + \dots + f_{1p}^{(1)} \Delta y_{i,-p+2} + \Delta \mathbf{x}'_{i2} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta e_{i2}$ ; and, for  $t > 2$ , we have  $\Delta y_{it} = f_{11}^{(t-1)} \Delta y_{i1} + f_{12}^{(t-1)} \Delta y_{i0} + \dots + f_{1p}^{(t-1)} \Delta y_{i,-p+2} + f_{11}^{(t-2)} (\Delta \mathbf{x}'_{i2} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta e_{i2}) + \dots + f_{11}^{(1)} (\Delta \mathbf{x}'_{i,t-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta e_{i,t-1}) + \Delta \mathbf{x}'_{it} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta e_{it}$  (see the proof of Lemma 1).

Using these equations we can write  $\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-j}$  as  $\Delta \mathbf{y}_{i,-j} = \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_j \Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1} + \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j (\Delta \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \Delta \mathbf{e}_i)$ , where  $\widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_j$  is a  $(T-1) \times p$  matrix consisting of the first  $T-1$  rows of  $\mathbf{A}_j$  (see Eq. (17)) and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j$  is a  $(T-1) \times (T-1)$  matrix consisting of the first  $T-1$  rows and first  $T-1$  columns of  $\mathbf{B}_j$  (see Eq. (18)). Recall  $(\Delta y_{i,-p+2}, \dots, \Delta y_{i1})' = [\mathbf{I}_p \otimes (1, \mathbf{x}'_i)] \boldsymbol{\pi}_0 + \mathbf{r}_i$  for  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_0 = (\mu_{01}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{01}, \mu_{02}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{02}, \dots, \mu_{0,p}, \boldsymbol{\theta}'_{0,p})'$  and  $\mathbf{r}_i = (r_{i1}, \dots, r_{ip})'$  (see Eq. (10)). Moreover, note that  $\Delta \boldsymbol{\xi}_{i1} = \mathbf{I}^* (\Delta y_{i,-p+2}, \dots, \Delta y_{i1})'$  for  $p \times p$  matrix

$$\mathbf{I}^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let

$$\mathbf{D}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} \\ \widetilde{\mathbf{A}}_j \mathbf{I}^* & \widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then some straightforward calculations give

$$\left( \mathbf{0}, \Delta \mathbf{y}'_{i,-j} \right) \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i = (\boldsymbol{\beta}'_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}'_0) \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i' \mathbf{D}'_j \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i + \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i' \mathbf{D}'_j \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i. \quad (26)$$

Because the elements of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i$  are uncorrelated with the elements of  $\widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i$ , we have  $E\left[(\boldsymbol{\beta}'_0, \boldsymbol{\pi}'_0) \widetilde{\mathbf{Z}}_i' \mathbf{D}'_j \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right] = 0$ . Also,  $E\left(\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i' \mathbf{D}'_j \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right) = \text{tr}[\Upsilon_0^{-1} E(\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i') \mathbf{D}'_j] = \text{tr}(\mathbf{D}'_j)$ . But  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{D}'_j) = 0$ , because the upper left-hand submatrix  $\mathbf{0}$  in  $\mathbf{D}_j$  is square with zeros down its main diagonal and  $\widetilde{\mathbf{B}}_j$  is a square matrix with zeros down its main diagonal, and, therefore,  $\mathbf{D}_j$  has zeros down its main diagonal. These observations and Eq. (26) prove  $E\left[\left(\mathbf{0}, \Delta \mathbf{y}'_{i,-j}\right) \Upsilon_0^{-1} \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_i\right] = 0$ .



## References:

- Alvarez, J., Arellano, M. (2004). Robust likelihood estimation of dynamic panel data models. CEMFI Working Paper 0421.
- Amemiya, T. (1985). *Advanced Econometrics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Anderson, T. W., Hsiao, C. (1981). Estimation of dynamic models with error components. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 76, 598-606.
- Arellano, M., Bond, S. (1991). Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations. *The Review of Economic Studies* 58, 277-297.
- Binder, M., Hsiao, C., Pesaran, M. H. (2005). Estimation and inference in short panel vector autoregressions with unit roots and cointegration. *Econometric Theory* 21, 795-837.
- Blundell, R., Bond, S. (1998). Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of Econometrics* 87, 115-143.
- Bun, M. J. G., Windmeijer, F. (2010). The weak instrument problem of the system GMM estimator in dynamic panel data models. *The Econometrics Journal* 13, 95-126.
- Chamberlain, G. (1982). Multivariate regression models for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics* 18, 5-46.
- Chamberlain, G. (1984). Panel data. In: Griliches, Z., Intriligator, M. D. (eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 2. Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 1247-1318.
- Hamilton, J. D. (1994). *Time Series Analysis*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hsiao, C., Pesaran, H. M., Tahmiscioglu, A. K. (2002). Maximum likelihood estimation of fixed effects dynamic panel data models covering short time periods. *Journal of Econometrics* 109, 107-150.
- Kruiniger, H. (2013). Quasi ML estimation of the panel AR(1) model with arbitrary initial conditions. *Journal of Econometrics* 173, 175-188.
- Loève, M. (1977). *Probability Theory I*, 4th ed. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Meng, X.-L., van Dyk, D. (1998). Fast EM-Type Implementations for Mixed Effects Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 60, 559-578.
- Moral-Benito, E. (2013). Likelihood-based estimation of dynamic panels with predetermined regressors. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 31, 451-472.
- Newey, W. K., McFadden, D. (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. In: Engle, R. F., McFadden, D. L. (eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 4. Amsterdam: North Holland, pp. 2111-2245.

- Phillips, R. F. (2004). Estimation of a generalized random-effects model: Some ECME algorithms and Monte Carlo evidence. *Journal of Economic Dynamics & Control* 28, 1801-1824.
- Phillips, R. F. (2010). Iterated feasible generalized least-squares estimation of augmented dynamic panel data models. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 28, 410-422.
- Phillips, R. F. (2012). On computing maximum-likelihood estimates of the unbalanced two-way random-effects model. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 41, 1921-1927.
- Phillips, R. F. (2015). On quasi maximum-likelihood estimation of dynamic panel data models. *Economics Letters* 137, 91-94.
- Rao, C. R. (1973). *Linear Statistical Inference and its Applications*. New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- Roodman, D. (2009). A note on the theme of too many instruments. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* 71, 135-158.
- Ruud, P. A. (2000). *An Introduction to Classical Econometric Theory*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- White, H. (2001). *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, 2nd ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.