arXiv:1911.09128v1 [econ.EM] 20 Nov 2019

A Scrambled Method of Moments

Jean-Jacques Forneron*

January 16, 2022

Abstract

Quasi-Monte Carlo (qMC) methods are a powerful alternative to classical Monte-Carlo (MC) integration. Under certain conditions, they can approximate the desired integral at a faster rate than the usual Central Limit Theorem, resulting in more accurate estimates. This paper explores these methods in a simulation-based estimation setting with an emphasis on the scramble of Owen (1995). For cross-sections and short-panels, the resulting Scrambled Method of Moments simply replaces the random number generator with the scramble (available in most softwares) to reduce simulation noise. Scrambled Indirect Inference estimation is also considered. For time series, qMC may not apply directly because of a curse of dimensionality on the time dimension. A simple algorithm and a class of moments which circumvent this issue are described. Asymptotic results are given for each algorithm. Monte-Carlo examples illustrate these results in finite samples, including an income process with "lots of heterogeneity."

JEL Classification: C11, C12, C13, C32, C36.
Keywords: Simulated Method of Moments, Indirect Inference, quasi-Monte Carlo, Scramble.

*Department of Economics, Boston University, 270 Bay State Road, Boston, MA 02215 USA.
Email: jjmf@bu.edu, Website: http://jjforneron.com.
I would like to thank Zhongjun Qu for his helpful comments and suggestions. All errors are my own.

1 Introduction

Simulation-based estimation is a popular approach to estimate complex economic models. The econometrician simply matches sample with simulated moments, drawn from a model of interest. The resulting Simulated Method of Moments (SMM) or Indirect Inference estimator makes estimation feasible even though the likelihood or the moments' expectation, required for MLE and GMM, may be impossible or impractical to compute. However, using simulations rather than analytical computations introduces simulation noise, which increases the variance of the estimates. Also, the resulting simulated objective function is typically non-smooth and hence more difficult to minimize numerically. In theory, simulating many samples reduces simulation noise and smoothes the objective function, making optimization easier. In practice, however, this may not be feasible because of the increased computational cost. Also, more informative moments used for Indirect Inference or the Efficient Method of Moments can to be more computationally demanding than simpler moments used in SMM, leading to a computational tradeoff between the informativeness of the moments and simulation noise. A practical solution is to use variance reduction techniques such as antithetic draws[1] which can reduce simulation noise with nearly no computational overhead.

This paper investigates quasi-Monte Carlo (qMC) integration, another variance reduction approach, in the context of simulation-based estimation, with an emphasis on the scramble of Owen (1995). Under certain conditions, qMC can approximate an expectation at a faster rate than the usual Monte-Carlo (MC) Central Limit Theorem (CLT). This suggests that a Scrambled Method of Moments could outperform conventional SMM estimates using as many simulated samples. This is shown to be the case for a large class of models in cross-sections and short-panels with potentially non-smooth moments as in McFadden (1989); Pakes and Pollard (1989) or auxiliary parameters as in Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993). For time series, qMC may not apply directly because of a curse of dimensionality over the time dimension. A class of models and moments which circumvent this issue are described.

Using the scramble in an estimation setting poses several practical and theoretical challenges. These sequences are designed to approximate a fixed integral of an *iid* sequence. Improper use of the scramble under dependence or with covariates may result in inconsistent estimators. Hence, the first and main contribution of the paper is methodological. The second contribution is theoretical. Uniform Laws of Large Numbers (ULLN) and CLTs are provided to handle smooth moments in cross-sections and short-panels. Scrambled draws

[1] See Section 2.1 for a brief overview of antithetic sampling.

are random and identically distributed *but not independent*. This makes it more challenging to handle time series and non-smooth moments. A stochastic equicontinuity result for cross-sections and short-panels is established by re-writing the scrambled empirical process as the sum of a non-identically distributed but independent array with a standard qMC sequence. This allows to invoke existing results for each term separately. In the time series setting, a similar strategy allows to invoke results for bounded dependent heterogeneous arrays.

The finite sample properties of the Scrambled Method of Moments are illustrated using several simple Monte-Carlo examples including an income process with "lots of heterogeneity" (Browning *et al.*, 2010). In this example, the scramble improves on SMM with random and antithetic draws in terms of variance. Furthermore, optimization over the 2,000 replications was on average 15% faster with the scramble than SMM using as many simulated samples - because scrambled moments are smoother than MC moments.

Structure of the Paper

After a review of the literature, Section 2 provides an overview of (quasi)-Monte Carlo integration which is lesser known in economics. Section 3 shows how to implement the Scrambled Method of Moments in various settings. Asymptotic results for each algorithm are given in Section 4 and the proofs are in Appendix A. Section 5 illustrates its finite sample properties using Monte-Carlo simulations. Section 6 concludes.

Related Literatures

There are two related literatures: simulation-based estimation and variance reduction techniques. In economics, simulation-based estimation includes the Simulated Method of Moments (McFadden, 1989; Pakes and Pollard, 1989; Duffie and Singleton, 1993), Indirect Inference (Gouriéroux *et al.*, 1993) and the Efficient Method of Moments (Gallant and Tauchen, 1996). See Smith (2006) for an overview of simulation-based estimation in economics and common empirical applications. In statistics, Bayesian methods such as Approximate Bayesian Computation (also known as ABC; Marin *et al.*, 2012) and Synthetic Likelihood (Wood, 2010) are more common. See Forneron and Ng (2018) for an overview and comparisons of these frequentist and Bayesian methods.

As discussed in the introduction, Monte-Carlo methods introduce simulation noise in the estimation which increases the variance of the estimator. There is a large number of variance reduction techniques, the following summary will only cover some of those that

are most relevant to simulation-based estimation. One approach is to use low-discrepancy sequences - this is more commonly known as quasi-Monte Carlo integration. These sequences were initially designed to compute integrals of *iid* sequences and can achieve faster than $\sqrt{n}$-rate convergence. More details are given in Section 2. qMC integration has been extended to non-linear state-space filtering (Gerber and Chopin, 2015, 2017), MCMC sampling (Owen and Tribble, 2005) and importance sampling for ABC estimation (Buchholz and Chopin, 2017). A key takeaway from these papers is that a lot of care is required in implementing qMC integration in non *iid* settings (MCMC or filtering) where 'naive' implementations may be inconsistent. This may explain why it is only rarely used in empirical economics, even though their appeal has been known for some time (Judd, 1998). In economics, antithetic draws are a popular variance reduction technique. However, they can lead to either efficiency gains or losses depending on the integrand as discussed in Section 2.1. Another variance reduction method, which is more popular in statistics, is the control variates approach (see e.g. Robert and Casella, 2013).[2] The main idea is to augment the estimating sample and simulated moments with analytically tractable moments for the shocks themselves. This additional information can help reduce the uncertainty attributable to simulation noise.[3] The control functional approach (Oates *et al.*, 2017), which uses all the information about the distribution of the shocks, can result in faster than $\sqrt{n}$-rate convergence. Important efficiency gains require the control variate moments to be sufficiently rich which could lead to a curse of dimensionality. For instance, the model of Section 5.2 has shocks with dimension $d = 30$ so that spanning polynomials of order up to 2 or 3 would require introducing 496 or $5,456$ additional moments respectively. The number of moments quickly becomes greater than the sample size itself.

2 (quasi)-Monte Carlo Integration and the Scramble

The following provides a brief overview of Monte-Carlo (MC) and quasi-Monte Carlo (qMC) integration.[4] Throughout, we are interested in evaluating the integral of a known measurable

[2]Note that despite the similarity in names, this is not related to control variable estimation used in structural econometric estimation.

[3]See Davis *et al.* (2019) for an application of control variates to Indirect Inference. Control variates were also considered for qMC integration in Hickernell *et al.* (2005).

[4]For further reading, Lemieux (2009) provides a non-technical introduction to MC and qMC integration; Dick and Pillichshammer (2010) provide the underlying theory.

function $f : [0,1]^d \to \mathbb{R}$:

$$I = \int_{[0,1]^d} f(u)du, \tag{1}$$

by using a fixed or random sequence of points $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ in $[0,1]^d$:

$$\hat{I}_n = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_i). \tag{2}$$

2.1 Monte-Carlo Integration and Antithetic Draws

A widely applicable approach is MC integration. Take *iid* uniform draws $u_i \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$ and compute the sample analog $\hat{I}_n^{MC} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_i)$. Assuming $f(u_i)$ has finite variance, $\hat{I}_n^{MC}$ is unbiased and the approximation error $|\hat{I}_n^{MC} - I|$ is of order $\sqrt{\text{var}[f(u_i)]/n}$. This implies that in order to reduce the approximation error tenfold, the number of draws must be a hundred times greater: the computational cost increases faster than the approximation error declines.

A popular variance reduction approach is to use antithetic draws. For n even, compute:

$$\hat{I}_n^{Anti} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n/2}[f(u_i) + f(1-u_i)], u_i \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}.$$

This approach is only valid if $f(u_i)$ and $f(1-u_i)$ have the same distribution; for instance, $e_i = \Phi^{-1}(u_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and $-e_i = \Phi^{-1}(1-u_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ as well. Without this property, when the distribution is asymmetric, $\hat{I}_n^{Anti}$ may not be consistent for I.

Assuming $f(u_i)$ and $f(1-u_i)$ have the same distribution, $\hat{I}_n^{Anti}$ is unbiased and $\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{Anti}) = (\text{var}[f(u_i)] + \text{cov}[f(u_i), f(1-u_i)])/n$. If $\text{corr}[f(u_i), f(1-u_i)] = -1$, then $\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{Anti}) = 0$; the estimator is exact as soon as $n = 2$. This improves significantly on MC integration. However, if $\text{corr}[f(u_i), f(1-u_i)] = +1$ then $\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{Anti}) = 2\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{MC})$. Now, $\hat{I}_n^{MC}$ outperforms $\hat{I}_n^{Anti}$.

The performance of antithetic draws relative to simple MC draws will typically depend on both the parameter of interest and the choice of estimating moments. To illustrate, consider the following two examples. First, suppose $I = \mathbb{E}(e_i)$ where $e_i = \Phi^{-1}(u_i) \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. Note that $-e_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ and $\hat{I}_n^{Anti}$ is consistent for I in this example. Since $\text{corr}(e_i, -e_i) = -1$, $\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{Anti}) = 0$. The estimator is exact as soon as $n = 2$. Second, suppose $I = \mathbb{E}(e_i^2)$ with e_i as above. Now, $\text{corr}(e_i^2, [-e_i]^2) = +1$ and $\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{Anti}) = 2\text{var}(\hat{I}_n^{MC})$. These examples suggest that the moments need to have some asymmetry properties in order to produce efficiency gains. This can be hard to check for intractable non-linear models.

2.2 quasi-Monte Carlo Integration

The discussion above shows that some sequences can outperform MC integration. For instance, for f smooth and $u_i \in [0,1]^d$ with $d = 1$ the lattice sequence $u_i = i/(n-1), i = 0, \ldots, n-1$, the estimator

$$\hat{I}_n^{Lattice} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_i), \quad u_i = i/(n-1),\ i \in \{0, \ldots, n-1\}$$

has an approximation error of order $O(\|\partial_u f\|_\infty / n)$. The approximation error declines linearly with the computational cost. However for $d \geq 2$, this sequence has approximation errors of order $n^{-1/d}$ which is worse than MC as soon as $d \geq 3$.

It is possible to break this curse of dimensionality. To achieve this, the qMC literature relies on two pivotal inequalities. The first one is the Koksma-Hlawka inequality:

$$\Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_i) - \int_{[0,1]^d} f(u)du\Big| \leq \|f\|_{TV} \times D_n^\star(u_1, \ldots, u_n), \tag{3}$$

where $\|f\|_{TV}$ is the total variance norm of f in the sense of Hardy and Krause:

$$\|f\|_{TV} = \sum_{\mathfrak{u} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_d} \int_{[0,1]^{|\mathfrak{u}|}} \Big|\frac{\partial^{|\mathfrak{u}|} f(\mathfrak{u})}{\partial \mathfrak{u}}\Big| d\mathfrak{u}, \tag{4}$$

$\partial^{|\mathfrak{u}|} f(\mathfrak{u})/\partial\mathfrak{u}$ consists of all univariate derivatives $\partial_{u_1} f(u), \ldots, \partial_{u_d} f(u)$ and partial cross-derivatives $\partial^2_{u_1,u_2} f(u), \partial^2_{u_1,u_3} f(u), \partial^2_{u_2,u_3} f(u), \ldots, \partial^2_{u_{d-1},u_d} f(u)$ up to order d with $\partial^d_{u_1,\ldots,u_d} f(u)$. It *does not include repeated derivatives* such as $\partial^2_{u_1,u_1} f(u)$. What matters here is the smoothness of f across the co-ordinates $u_1, \ldots, u_d$. As a result, integrating over larger dimensions d typically requires additional smoothness in f over these cross-derivatives.

The other term in the Koksma-Hlawka inequality is $D_n^\star(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ which corresponds to the star discrepancy of the sequence $(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$, defined as:

$$D_n^\star(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = \sup_{u \in [0,1)^d} \Big|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{u_i \in [0,u)} - \int_{[0,u)} 1du\Big|. \tag{5}$$

In statistics, this is known as the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) distance between the empirical CDF of $(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$ and the population CDF of a uniform $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$ distribution.

For a given function f, reducing the approximation error in (3) implies finding sequences with smaller $D_n^\star$. For *iid* random draws, $D_n^* = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Donsker theorems (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996). The lattice sequence above has $D_n^* = O(n^{-1/d})$ for $d \geq 1$.

For any sequence $(u_1, \ldots, u_n)$, the second pivotal inequality - initially due to Roth (1954) and generalized by Schmidt (1970) - provides a lower bound on its star discrepancy:

$$D_n^\star(u_1, \ldots, u_n) \geq C_d \times \frac{\log(n)^{d-1}}{n}, \tag{6}$$

where C_d is a universal constant which only depends on the dimension d. Note the striking difference with the Discrepancy of the set $D_n(u_1, \ldots, u_n) = \sup_{i=1,\ldots,n}(\inf_{j\neq i} \|u_i - u_j\|)$ which cannot decrease faster than $n^{-1/d}$. Under the sup-norm distance there is the well known curse of dimensionality which affects grid searches, non-parametric estimation, etc. Under the KS distance, this lower bound suggests that the impact of dimensionality is much less severe.

Constructing a qMC Sequence: the Sobol Point Set

The following material is adapted from Dick and Pillichshammer (2010), Chapter 8.1, and Lemieux (2009), Chapter 5.4. A popular approach to conduct qMC integration is to use sequences called *Digital Nets*. Many of these sequences can be represented as:

$$u_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} u_{i,j} b^{-j},$$

where $b \geq 2$ is a prime number so that $(u_{i,0}, u_{i,1}, \ldots)$ is the b-adic representation u_i, i.e. the digits of u_i in the basis b.[a] A well known digital net is the Sobol sequence for which $b = 2$ so that $(u_{i,0}, u_{i,1}, \ldots)$ is simply the digital expansion of u_i in base 2. The following considers the case $d = 1$ for simplicity. To construct the sequence two inputs are needed. First, we need *primitive polynomials* sorted by increasing degree $e_\ell, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$:[b]

$$p_\ell(x) = x^{e_\ell} + a_{\ell,1}x^{e_\ell - 1} + \cdots + a_{\ell,e_\ell - 1}x + a_{\ell,e_\ell}, \quad \ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\}.$$

Second, construct *direction numbers* $v_j^\ell, \ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, e_\ell\}$ as:

$$v_j^\ell = 2^{-\ell} m_j^\ell$$

for some user-chosen odd integers $m_j^\ell \in \{1, \ldots, 2^j - 1\}, j \in \{1, \ldots, e_\ell\}$. One way to think of these direction numbers is that $2^{-\ell}$ splits $[0, 1]$ into subintervals of length $2^{-\ell}$ and m_j^ℓ picks one of these subintervals (see the figure below for an illustration). Then the recursions described below ensure that the sequence covers $[0, 1]^d$ well using these subintervals (this is a defining feature of digital nets). From these initial direction numbers, the following recursion generates the rest of the sequence:

$$v_{j+1}^\ell = a_{\ell,1}v_j^\ell \oplus \cdots \oplus a_{\ell,e_\ell - 1}v_{j+2-e_\ell}^\ell \oplus v_{j+1-e_\ell}^\ell \oplus (2^{-e_\ell}v_{j+1-e_\ell}^\ell),$$

where $\oplus$ is the x-or operator on the binary representation.[c] The x-or operator allows to cycle over the splits described above and the requirement that the polynomial be primitive ensures that the cycle spans all the splits. Now to compute the i-th Sobol number, write down the base 2 representation $i = i_0 + 2i_1 + 2^2 i_2 + \cdots + 2^{r-1} i_r$ for some $r \geq 0$ and we have:

$$u_i^\ell = i_0 v_1^\ell \oplus i_1 v_2^\ell \oplus \cdots \oplus i_{r-1} v_r^\ell,$$

the Sobol point set is then $u_i = (u_i^1, \ldots, u_i^d), i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.
Note that since the initial direction numbers are user-chosen many Sobol sequences can be generated with varying finite sample properties. One issue in particular is that some direction numbers can lead to finite sample correlations between the dimensions of u_i which is undesirable. Several authors report direction numbers which perform well in practice; some scrambling algorithms can also improve the properties of the sequence (see e.g. Chi *et al.*, 2005). In practice, the Fortran implementation of ACM Algorithm 659(Bratley and Fox, 1988; Joe and Kuo, 2003) seems to be widely used [d] and provides direction numbers with good properties for dimensions up to $d = 1,111$.


To put this in practice, consider the case with $d = 1$, $p(x) = x^2 + x + 1$ so that $e = 2$, which means that two direction numbers are required. Pick $v_1 = 1/2, v_2 = 3/4$ or in binary representation $v_1 = (1, 0), v_2 = (1, 1)$. Using the recursion:

$$v_3 = (1, 1) \oplus (1, 0) \oplus (0, 0, 1) = (0, 1, 1),$$

since the polynomial coefficients are all equal to 1 and $2^{-1} v_1 = (0, 0, 1)$. Note that $v_3 = 2^{-2} + 2^{-3} = 1/4 + 1/8 = 3/8 = 0.375$. The next number in the sequence is:

$$v_4 = (0, 1, 1) \oplus (1, 1) \oplus (0, 0, 1, 1) = (1, 0, 0, 1)$$

since $2^{-2} v_2 = (0, 0, 1, 1)$, in base 10 we have $v_4 = 2^{-1} + 2^{-4} = 0.5625$. The Sobol sequence is then $u_0 = 0$, for $i = 1 = 1 \times 2^0$, we have $u_1 = v_1 = (0, 1)$ which implies $v_1 = 1/2$ in the decimal system. For $i = 2 = 0 \times 2^0 + 1 \times 2^1$, we have $u_2 = (0 \times v_1) \oplus (1 \times v_2) = v_2$ i.e. $u_2 = 3/4$, $u_3 = v_1 \otimes v_2 = (0, 1)$ which is $1/4$, then $u_4 = v_3$ i.e. $3/8$. The figure below illustrates the construction of the first 8 points of the Sobol sequence by the R package *randtoolbox*.


n = 1
n = 2
n = 3
n = 4
n = 5
n = 6
n = 7
n = 8
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00

[a] In base 10, the digits are simply the number's decimals.

[b] A primitive polynomial is a polynomial of degree $e \geq 1$ with coefficients in a Galois field $\mathbb{G}(m) = \mathbb{Z}$ modulo $m \times \mathbb{Z}$ (for instance $\mathbb{G}(2) = \mathbb{Z}$ modulo $2 \times \mathbb{Z} = \{-1, 0, 1\}$; a field is a finite set where addition, subtraction, multiplication and division are defined and verify certain axioms; in addition, a Galois field is finite) such that the powers x^j modulo $p(x), j = 1, \ldots, m^e - 1$ generate the set of nonzero polynomials of degree less of equal to e in $\mathbb{G}(m)$.

[c] The x-or or exclusive-or operator has the following property: $1 \oplus 1 = 0, 1 \oplus 0 = 1, 0 \oplus 0 = 0$. On the binary representation this implies for $v_1 = 1/2, v_2 = 3/4$ we have $v_1 = 1 \times 2^{-1}, v_2 = 1 \times 2^{-1} + 1 \times 2^{-2}$ so that $v_1 \oplus v_2 = (1, 0) \oplus (1, 1) = (0, 1)$ which is $1/4$ in the usual decimal representation.

[d] The *randtoolbox* package of Dutang and Savicky (2019) provides an R interface to the Fortran code.

For any $d \geq 1$ fixed, this lower bound suggests a faster than $\sqrt{n}$-rate is achievable. There are a number of deterministic sequences which are close in rate to the bound (6); these include the Sobol, Halton, van der Corput and Hammersley sequences. Most of these are readily available in statistical softwares.[5] There is, however, a caveat that when d becomes large C_d can also become large. For instance, $C_d = 2^d$ for the Sobol sequence which increases very rapidly with d. As a result, in finite samples MC integration may outperform qMC integration for d large relative to n. Under additional smoothness conditions, so-called higher-order sequences can achieve even faster rates of order $n^{-\alpha}$ (up to log-terms) for some $\alpha > 1$ which depends on the smoothness of f and higher-order properties of the sequence.

2.3 Randomized quasi-Monte Carlo and the Scramble

These results above are restrictive since they require the integrand f to be smooth, otherwise $\|f\|_{TV} = +\infty$ and the Koksma-Hlawka inequality (3) is uninformative. In economics, many problems involve non-smooth integrands such as simulation-based estimation of discrete choice models (Train, 2009). Also, $\hat{I}_n^{qMC}$ computed with a deterministic sequence is typically biased and its approximation error is hard to evaluate numerically. This would make it difficult to compute standard errors in an estimation setting.

One solution is to use randomized quasi-Monte Carlo (RqMC) methods. A simple randomizer is the digital shift. Take one random draw $u \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$, a qMC sequence $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ (e.g. Sobol, Halton) and compute $\tilde{u}_i = [u_i + u]$ modulo 1. The modulo operator is applied one dimension at a time. This shifts all the co-ordinates of $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ by the same random quantity u and preserves the order of magnitude of its star discrepancy $D_n^\star$. The randomized

[5] The R package *randtoolbox*, the *Sobol* module in Julia, the *quasirandomset* toolset in Matlab and the *SamplePack* library in C++ can generate the Sobol sequence, for instance.

$\tilde{u}_i$ are identically distributed $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$ but not independent. The estimator $\hat{I}_n^{RqMC}$ is unbiased. To approximate its variance, apply the digital shift with different draws u to compute the integral several times and then compute the variance across these estimates (Lemieux, 2009).

Another randomization approach, which will be the main focus of this paper, is the scramble introduced by Owen (1995). Similarly to the random shift above, it transforms a deterministic low-discrepancy sequence into random identically but not independently distributed uniform $\mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$ draws. Since the scrambled draws are uniform, the estimator $\hat{I}_n^{scramble}$ is unbiased. The procedure is described in the box below. The scramble does not deteriorate the discrepancy of the original sequence, in fact it was shown that it can further improve it (see Dick and Pillichshammer, 2010, Chapter 13.1 for bibliographical references).

The scramble approximates I under the same conditions as the classical CLT as shown in Theorem 1. The underlying theory is quite involved since it relies of Walsh expansions, an approach similar to Fourier expansions but in a digital basis b which requires an understanding of both number theory and functional approximation theory. See Dick and Pillichshammer (2010) for an introduction to the relevant material and proofs.

Theorem 1 (Owen, 1997)**.** *Let $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ be a scrambled sequence using the algorithm proposed by Owen (1995). If f is measurable and $f(u), u \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}$ has finite variance then:*

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f(u_i) - \int_{[0,1]^d} f(u)du = o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Under additional smoothness conditions $\hat{I}_n^{scramble}$ approximates I at a near $n^{-3/2}$-rate; which is faster than deterministic qMC sequences. A refinement of the orginal algorithm, higher-order scrambling, can achieve even faster rate for smooth integrands; for instance, in some cases the convergence can be of order $n^{-5/2}$ or $n^{-7/2}$. The scrambled estimator $\hat{I}_n^{Scramble}$ is unbiased. Its variance can be approximated the same way as for $\hat{I}_n^{RqMC}$. Note that these results assume $d \geq 1$ is fixed. In practice, MC may outperform the scramble for d large. Other scrambles have also been proposed by Hickernell (1996) and Matoušek (1998), among others. See Lemieux (2009) and Dick and Pillichshammer (2010) for additional references.

Owen's Scramble

The following material is adapted from Owen (1997). The scramble starts from a set of points $u_i = (u_i^1, \ldots, u_i^d) \in [0,1]^d$ with base b representation:

$$u_i^\ell = u_{i,1}^\ell b^{-1} + u_{i,2}^\ell b^{-2} + \ldots,$$

for each coordinate $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. The scrambled points $\tilde{u}_i$ are generated by applying random permutations to the b-adic representation $u_{i,j}^{\ell}$ of u_i. Let π^{ℓ} be random permutations from $\{0, \ldots, b-1\}$ to itself drawn uniformly over all permutations and independently across coordinates ℓ (there are $b! = b \times (b-1) \times (b-2) \times \cdots \times 1$ such permutations), then the scrambled sequence is generated recursively as:


$$\tilde{u}_{i,1}^{\ell} = \pi^{\ell}(u_{i,1}^{\ell}), \quad \tilde{u}_{i,2}^{\ell} = \pi_{u_{i,1}^{\ell}}^{\ell}(u_{i,2}^{\ell}), \quad \tilde{u}_{i,3}^{\ell} = \pi_{u_{i,1}^{\ell}, u_{i,2}^{\ell}}^{\ell}(u_{i,3}^{\ell}), \quad \ldots$$

the permutation for the j-th digit depends on the $j-1$ previous digits; this creates path dependence in the scrambling process which makes the algorithm computationally demanding. Owen's algorithm, described above, is also known as nested uniform or fully random scrambling. ACM Algorithm 823 implements a faster non-nested scrambling algorithm (which relies on matrix operations) that is also called Owen's scramble in statistical softwares (Hong and Hickernell, 2003; Dutang and Savicky, 2019).[a] Although the two implementations are different, the resulting sequences share important desirable theoretical properties.

To illustrate the nested scramble described above, consider a Sobol sequence written in base $b = 2$ with $d = 1$. There are two possible permutations: $\pi(0) = 1, \pi(1) = 0$ and $\pi(0) = 0, \pi(1) = 1$. First, the permutation is applied to $u_{i,1}$. The permutation $\pi(0) = 0$ preserves the first digit. In practice, this implies that $u_i \geq 0.5 \Rightarrow \tilde{u}_i \geq 0.5$. The other possible permutation $\pi(1) = 0$ splits the $[0, 1)$ segment into two parts $[0, 1/2)$ and $[1/2, 1)$ and permutes them: $u_i \geq 0.5 \Rightarrow \tilde{u}_i < 0.5$.

The second step permutes the second digit: split the unit interval into 4 subintervals $[0, 1/4), [1/4, 1/2), [1/2, 3/4), [3/4, 1)$ and apply a permutation as before but between the pairs $[0, 1/4), [1/4, 1/2)$ and $[1/2, 3/4), [3/4, 1)$. For instance, suppose that $\pi(0) = 0$ so that the first digit is unchanged. Consider the pair $[0, 1/4), [1/4, 1/2)$, and assume the permutation is $\pi_0(0) = 1$ then $u_i \in [0, 1/4) \Rightarrow \tilde{u}_i \in [1/4, 1/2)$. Separately, if $\pi_1(0) = 0$ then $u_i \in [1/2, 3/4) \Rightarrow \tilde{u}_i \in [1/2, 3/4)$.

The third step further splits $[0, 1)$ into 8 subintervals $[0, 1/8), [1/8, 1/4), [1/4, 3/8), [3/8, 1/2), \ldots$ and applies permutations over the 4 pairs following the same logic. For instance if $u_i \in [0, 1/8)$, then $\tilde{u}_{i,3} = \pi_{00}(0)$ while $\tilde{u}_{i,3} = \pi_{01}(0)$ when $u_i \in [1/4, 3/8)$. Note that π_{00} and π_{01} are different uniform permutations draws. The process continues until a desired level of precision is attained. The table below illustrates the first two iterations of the scramble when applied to a small sequence with $d = 1$ for some realization of the permutations.


Initial points: Sobol (n = 7)
Partition on the first digit
Permutation: π¹(0)=1,π²(0)=0
Partition on the second digit
Permutation: π¹₀(0)=1,π¹₁(0)=0,π²₀(0)=1,π²₁(0)=1
Partition on the third digit
0.00
0.25
0.50
0.75
1.00


	u_1	u_2	u_3	u_4
initial points	0.125	0.375	0.500	0.875
$\pi(0) = 1$	0.625	0.875	0.000	0.375
$\pi_0(0) = 0, \pi_1(0) = 1$	0.625	0.875	0.500	0.125

The figure above illustrates the first two iterations of the nested scramble applied the Sobol sequence with $n = 7$ and $d = 2$. The first iteration splits $[0, 1)^2$ into 4 squares and performs permutations over the two rectangles on the x-axis (π^1) and y-axis (π^2). The second iteration further splits each square into 4 sub-squares (so there is a total of 16 squares) and performs permutations between the 2 pairs of rectangles on the x-axis (π_0^1 and π_1^1) and the y-axis (π_0^2 and π_1^2). The next iteration further splits each square into 4 subsets and performs additional permutations. The procedure continues until a certain level of numerical precision is achieved.

Note that although the $\tilde{u}_i^\ell$ are not independent over i for a given ℓ, they are independent over ℓ for any i since the permutations are drawn independently over dimensions $\ell \in \{1, \ldots, d\}$. This feature is quite important for the finite sample properties of the scramble: while the Sobol sequence could display correlations across dimensions ℓ for some direction numbers, the nested scramble guarantees independence over ℓ. This is visible in Figure 1 where some Sobol points are aligned on the 45 degree line whereas the scrambled Sobol sequence does not display such patterns.

[a] As discussed in Hong and Hickernell (2003), this is "to recognize that it is done in the spirit of Owens original proposal."

Figure 1: Random, Sobol and Scrambled Sequences: $n = 500, d = 2$



Legend: top-left random uniform draws, top-right Sobol sequence, bottom-left one realization of the scrambled Sobol sequence, bottom-right another realization of the scrambled Sobol sequence.

Figure 1 illustrates the differences between random, deterministic and scrambled sequences. A particular realization of a random sample may have points clustered in some areas of $[0, 1]^2$, as visible in the figure. The Sobol sequence covers the square better in this case, though some points might appear to cluster here as well. The two realizations of the scrambled Sobol sequence cover the square well and cluster slightly less (better discrepancy) than the deterministic Sobol points.

3 A Scrambled Method of Moments

This section introduces the main algorithms to implement the Scrambled Method of Moments and Scrambled Indirect Inference. The data generating process (DGP) is the same as in Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993):

$$y_{i,t} = g_{obs}(y_{i,t-1}, x_{i,t}, z_{i,t}; \theta) \tag{7}$$

$$z_{i,t} = g_{latent}(z_{i,t-1}, u_{i,t}; \theta) \text{ where } u_{i,t} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}. \tag{8}$$

A simple transformation allows to replace $u_{i,t}$ with $e_{i,t} = \Phi^{-1}(u_{i,t}) \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ or other distributions by the Rosenblatt transform. $i = 1, \dots, n$ indexes individuals and $t = 1, \dots, T$ the time dimension. $y_{i,t}$ is the vector of observed outcome variables. $x_{i,t}$ is a vector of strictly exogenous covariates and $z_{i,t}$ a vector of unobserved latent variables. The functions g_{obs} and g_{latent} are assumed to be known up to a finite dimensional parameter θ to be estimated.

3.1 Static Models

For static models, which correspond to cross-sections and short-panels, the t index will be omitted to re-write (7)-(8) and the moments as:

$$y_i = g(x_i, u_i; \theta), \quad \hat{\psi}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(y_i, x_i), \tag{9}$$

where $y_i = (y_{i,1}, \dots, y_{i,T})$ and $u_i = (u_{i,1}, \dots, u_{i,T}) \in [0,1]^{T \times d_{u_{i,t}}}$. The dimension d of u_i is $T \times \dim(u_{i,t})$, using the notation in (7)-(8). Given a vector of moments $\hat{\psi}_n$ and a weighting matrix W_n, a simple SMM estimator is given in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Simulated Method of Moments for Static Models

Draw a random sequence $u_i^s \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}, i = 1, \dots, n$; and $s = 1, \dots, S$
Simulate: $y_i^s(\theta) = g_{obs}(x_i, u_i^s; \theta)$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{n \times S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \psi(y_i^s(\theta), x_i)$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_n^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)\|_{W_n}$

Without covariates x_i, the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)]$ has the same form as (1). The scramble can be applied if the moments have finite variance. The resulting Algorithm 2 is thus very similar to SMM. In practice, one samples an $(nS) \times d$ matrix of scrambled shocks rather than S different $n \times d$ matrices of random numbers. This is may be useful because using a large

Algorithm 2 Scrambled Method of Moments for Static Models without Covariates

Draw a scrambled sequence $\tilde{u}_i \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}, i = 1, \ldots, n \times S$
Simulate: $\tilde{y}_i(\theta) = g_{obs}(\tilde{u}_i; \theta)$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{n \times S} \sum_{i=1}^{n \times S} \psi(\tilde{y}_i(\theta))$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_n^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)\|_{W_n}$

simulated sample of $n \times S$ observations implies a reduction in variance greater than S, as a consequence of the faster rate in Theorem 1, compared to using S independent simulated samples. Asymptotic results for Algorithm 2 are provided in Proposition 1, assuming the moments are smooth in θ. These assumptions are comparable to those required for SMM.

When $\hat{\psi}_n$ is a vector of auxiliary moments as (Gouriéroux *et al.*, 1993), the results from Proposition 1 can be extended for the scramble as shown in Proposition 3. Again, the assumptions are comparable to those required for Indirect Inference. These Indirect Inference results could also be extended to non-smooth moments and time series given appropriate changes to the assumptions.

In the presence of covariates, $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)]$ does not have the same form as (1):

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)] = \int_{[0,1]^d \times \mathcal{X}} \psi\left(g(x, u; \theta), x\right) f_x(x) dx du,$$

where f_x is joint density of the covariates x.[6] Without further assumptions, it is typically not possible to sample from the population f_x directly so that qMC sequence with $n \times S$ elements for (x_i, u_i) cannot be constructed. Taking the covariates as given, Algorithm 3 relies on S independent scrambled sequences of size n rather than a large sequence of size $n \times S$ as in Algorithm 2.[7]

Algorithm 3 Scrambled Method of Moments for Static Models with Covariates

Draw S **independently scrambled sequences** $\tilde{u}_i^s \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}, i = 1, \ldots, n$
Simulate: $\tilde{y}_i^s(\theta) = g_{obs}(x_i, \tilde{u}_i^s; \theta)$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{n \times S} \sum_{i=1}^{n \times S} \psi(\tilde{y}_i^s(\theta), x_i)$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_n^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)\|_{W_n}$

For each $s \in \{1, \ldots, S\}$, the function $\mathbb{E}[\psi(y_i^s(\theta), x_i) | \tilde{u}_i^s = u]$ does not depend on x so that Theorem 1 can be applied to this conditional expectation, assuming it has finite variance.

[6] The results could be extended to allow some components of x to be discrete. However, the assumptions in the next Section imply that at least one of the covariates should have a continuous density.

[7] It is implicitly assumed that $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is a random sample. If the ordering is deterministic, then x_i and u_i) are not independent. Randomly shuffling the covariates without replacement solves this issue.

This insight was used to derive CLTs for moments based on hybrid sequences which combine MC draws with qMC sequences in Ökten *et al.* (2006) and Buchholz and Chopin (2017) for bounded ψ. The results in Proposition 2 extend these results to unbounded empirical processes over $\theta \in \Theta$, allowing $\hat{\psi}_n^s$ to be non-smooth in θ. The assumptions are more demanding than for SMM, although they could be weakened for smooth moments with covariates. The conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\cdot)|\tilde{u}_1, \tilde{u}_2, \dots]$ itself is required to be smooth in θ, *i.e.* integrating out the covariates smoothes out the sample and simulated moments. This implies that at least one of the covariates has a continuous density.

3.2 Dynamic Models

For dynamic models, which correspond to time series observations, the i index will be omitted to re-write (7)-(8) and the moments as:

$$y_t = g_{obs}(y_{t-1}, z_t; \theta), \quad z_t = g_{latent}(z_{t-1}, u_t; \theta), \quad u_t \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d} \tag{10}$$

$$\hat{\psi}_T = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=L+1}^{T} \psi(y_t, \dots, y_{t-L}). \tag{11}$$

Covariates are omitted to simplify the theoretical results. Only moments involving a fixed and finite number of lags L will be considered as explained below. Algorithm 4 details the SMM procedure to estimate (10)-(11).

Algorithm 4 Simulated Method of Moments for Dynamic Models

Draw a random sequence $u_t^s \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}, t = 1, \dots, T;\ s = 1, \dots, S$
Set $(y_0^s, z_0^s) = (y_0, z_0)$, a fixed initial value
Simulate: $z_t^s(\theta) = g_{latent}(z_{t-1}^s, u_t^s; \theta)$ and $y_t^s(\theta) = g_{obs}(y_{t-1}^s(\theta), z_t^s(\theta); \theta)$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{T \times S} \sum_{s=1}^{S} \sum_{t=L+1}^{n} \psi(y_t^s(\theta), \dots, y_{t-L}^s(\theta))$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_T^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_T - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)\|_{W_T}$

To understand the issues caused by the dynamics for the scramble and qMC integration, note that for any initial value (y_0, z_0), y_t can be re-written as:

$$y_t = g_t(u_t, \dots, u_1, y_0, z_0; \theta),$$

for some function g_t which can be expressed in terms of g_{obs} and g_{latent}. Using this notation, the expected value of $\hat{\psi}_T$ can be re-written as:

$$\mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_T) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=L+1}^{T} \int_{[0,1]^{t \times d}} \psi \circ (g_t, \dots, g_{t-L})(u_t, \dots, u_1, y_0, z_0) du_t \dots du_1.$$

The expectation above differs from the qMC setting in (1) in several ways. First, the function to be integrated involves g_t which varies with t unlike the function in (1). Second, the integral is computed over $u_1, \ldots, u_t$ which has a dimension t that increases with the sample size. This implies a curse of dimensionality for qMC which requires the dimension d to be fixed. Third, both randomized and non-randomized qMC sequences are identically but not independently distributed. A naive implementation of the scramble could introduce spurious dependence in the simulated data and the resulting estimator may not be consistent as a result.

Implementing qMC integration in a dynamic setting without additional structure comes at a cost. In finance, qMC sequences are used to simulate long time series and price financial derivatives (see e.g. Paskov and Traub, 1995; Lemieux, 2009). This is done by setting $d = T$ and sampling a very large number n of financial series. In the present setting, this amounts to picking S very large and $d = T$ which is not computationally attractive compared to standard SMM.[8] For state-space filtering, Gerber and Chopin (2015, 2017) propose a Hilbert sorting step to re-sample draws into a low-discrepancy sequence using the Hilbert fractal map from $[0, 1]$ to $[0, 1]^d$. This Hilbert map can be challenging to implement in practice and suffers from a curse of dimensionality.

3.2.1 qMC-only Approach

The class of moments described in (11) where the number of lags L is fixed and finite allows to circumvent these issues. To get some intuition, suppose that it is possible to draw $(y_t^1, z_t^1) = F_{y,z}^{(-1)}(v_t^1)$ from the stationary distribution directly using the Rosenblatt transform with $v_t^1 \sim \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^{\dim(v_t^1)}}$. Then, using additional shocks $u_t^2, \ldots, u_t^L$ one could simulate a short time series consisting of $L \geq 1$ observations for each $t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$:

$$
\begin{aligned}
(y_t^1, z_t^1) &= F_{y,z}^{(-1)}(v_t^1) \\
(y_t^2, z_t^2) &= \left(g_{obs}(y_t^1, z_t^2; \theta),\ g_{latent}(z_t^1, u_t^2; \theta)\right) \\
&\vdots \\
(y_t^L, z_t^L) &= \left(g_{obs}(y_t^{L-1}, z_t^L; \theta),\ g_{latent}(z_t^{L-1}, u_t^L; \theta)\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

The resulting draws $(y_t^1, \ldots, y_t^L)$ are *iid* over $t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$ from the stationary distribution by construction.[9] This is now within the setting of (1). Algorithm 5 describes

[8] Recall that for the Sobol sequence $C_d = 2^d$ so that the error would be of the order of $2^T/S$. Consistency of the qMC integral would require $S \gg 2^T$, *i.e.* S needs to grow exponentially fast with the sample size T.

[9] This idea was also used in Davis *et al.* (2019) but as a variance reduction method with MC draws.

a Scrambled Method of Moments for models where simulating as described above is feasible. The main idea is to simulate the $(y_t^1, \ldots, y_t^L)$ $T \times S$ times with scrambled shocks $(v_t^1, u_t^2, \ldots, u_t^L)_{t=1,\ldots,T\times S} \in [0,1]^d$ with dimension $d = \dim(v_t^1, u_t^2, \ldots, u_t^L)$. which depends on the dimension of the shocks and the numbers of lags L. Note that while Algorithm 4 requires $T \times S$ draws, Algorithm 5 effectively requires $n \times S \times L$ draws. However, the latter Algorithm is massively parallel over t so that for some models it may run faster than the former in a parallel environment. Proposition 4 provides the asymptotic results for Algorithm 5.[10]

Algorithm 5 Scrambled Method of Moments for Dynamic Models - qMC-only Approach

Draw a scrambled sequence $\tilde{u}_t = (\tilde{v}_t, \tilde{u}_t^2, \ldots, \tilde{u}_t^L) \in [0,1]^{d\times(L-1)+\tilde{d}}$, $t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$
Compute $(\tilde{y}_t^1(\theta), \tilde{z}_t^1(\theta)) = F^{-1}(\tilde{v}; \theta)$ for $t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$
Simulate: $\tilde{z}_t^\ell(\theta) = g_{latent}(\tilde{z}_t^{\ell-1}, \tilde{u}_t^\ell; \theta)$ and $\tilde{y}_t^\ell(\theta) = g_{obs}(\tilde{y}_t^{\ell-1}(\theta), \tilde{z}_t^\ell(\theta); \theta)$ for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{T\times S}\sum_{t=1}^{T\times S} \psi(\tilde{y}_t^L(\theta), \ldots, \tilde{y}_t^1(\theta))$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_T^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_T - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)\|_{W_T}$

Sampling from the stationary distribution directly is feasible for some DGPs such as the Gaussian ARMA model (see the Monte-Carlo example in Section 5.1.3) or the following stochastic volatility process:

$$\log(\sigma_t) = \mu_\sigma + \rho_\sigma \log(\sigma_{t-1}) + \kappa_\sigma e_{t,1}, \quad y_t = \sigma_t e_{t,2}, \quad (e_{t,1}, e_{t,2}) \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, I_2).$$

Since the log-volatility follows a Gaussian AR(1) process, one can simply draw $\log(\sigma_t^1) \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_\sigma/(1-\rho_\sigma, \kappa_\sigma^2/[1-\rho_\sigma^2])$ and $y_t^1 = \sigma_t^1 e_{t,2}^1$ where $e_{t,2}^1$ to simulate (y_t^1, σ_t^1) from their stationary distribution. For more complex DGPs this may not be feasible, however.

3.2.2 Hybrid MC-qMC Approach

When the direct approach in Algorithm 5 is not feasible, an alternative is to sample the initial draws (y_t^1, z_t^1) by MC methods and then simulate $(y_t^2, z_t^2), \ldots, (y_t^L, z_t^L)$ using the scramble. This hybrid MC-qMC approach allows to sample from intractable distributions while retaining some of the the features of qMC integration.

The resulting Algorithm 6 combines elements from Algorithms 4 and 5. It requires an additional loop compared to the latter, which is more computationally demanding. Because the estimation combines MC with qMC, the variance of the estimates will typically be greater

[10] When simulating the initial draw with the Rosenblatt transform is not possible, one may consider using a fixed starting value and a *burn-in* period assuming some decay conditions hold. This is only considered for the hybrid MC-qMC method, theoretical investigations for qMC-only draws is left to future research.

Algorithm 6 Scrambled Method of Moments for Dynamic Models - Hybrid MC-qMC Approach

Draw a random sequence $u_t^1 \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{U}_{[0,1]^d}, t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$
Set $(y_0^s, z_0^s) = (y_0, z_0)$, a fixed initial value
Simulate: $z_t^1(\theta) = g_{latent}(z_{t-1}^1, u_t^1; \theta)$ and $y_t^1(\theta) = g_{obs}(y_{t-1}^1(\theta), z_t^1(\theta); \theta)$
Draw a scrambled sequence $\tilde{u}_t = (\tilde{u}_t^2, \ldots, \tilde{u}_t^L) \in [0,1]^{d \times (L-1)}$, $t = 1, \ldots, T \times S$
Simulate: $\tilde{z}_t^\ell(\theta) = g_{latent}(\tilde{z}_t^{\ell-1}, \tilde{u}_t^\ell; \theta)$ and $\tilde{y}_t^\ell(\theta) = g_{obs}(\tilde{y}_t^{\ell-1}(\theta), \tilde{z}_t^\ell(\theta); \theta)$ for $\ell = 2, \ldots, L$
Compute: $\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{T \times S} \sum_{t=1}^{T \times S} \psi(\tilde{y}_t^L(\theta), \ldots, \tilde{y}_t^1(\theta))$
Find: $\hat{\theta}_T^S = \text{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_T - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)\|_{W_T}$

than a qMC only approach. Note that once the $(z_t^1(\theta), y_t^1(\theta))$ are drawn by MC simulations, $(z_t^\ell(\theta), y_t^\ell(\theta))_{\ell > 1}$ can be simulated in parallel which can be computationally attractive.

Proposition 5 provides asymptotic results for Algorithm 6 with conditions similar to Duffie and Singleton (1993) but assuming bounded moments. Relaxing this assumption would require to extend existing CLTs for dependent heterogeneous arrays (see e.g. White, 1984, Theorme 5.10) which goes beyond the scope of this paper. The simulations in Section 5.1.3 suggest that the estimator performs well with unbounded moments in practice.

3.3 Computing Standard Errors for the Simulated and Scrambled Method of Moments

Given that the scramble is different from standard Monte-Carlo methods, the following shows how to compute standard errors for $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ for SMM, antithetic draws and the scramble.

Under regularity conditions, the Simulated and Scrambled Method of Moments estimators satisfy the following asymptotic expansion:

$$\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta_0 = -\left(G' W_n G\right)^{-1} G' W_n \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}),$$

where $G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]$ is the usual Jacobian matrix. Under a CLT, the asymptotic variance is given by the usual sandwich formula. Given that W_n is chosen by the user, only two terms need to be approximated: the Jacobian G and the asymptotic variance of $[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$.

When the moments are smooth, the plug-in Jacobian estimator $\hat{G}_n = \partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)$ is consistent for G under a ULLN. For non-smooth moments, there are several possibilities. The more computationally demanding approach is to Bootstrap the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ directly. Alternatively, Bruins *et al.* (2018) propose to smooth the draws $y_{i,t}^s$ in dynamic discrete choice models using a kernel; this transforms non-smooth and unbiased into smooth but biased

simulated moments. Frazier *et al.* (2019) rely on a change of variable argument to compute analytical Jacobians in a class of discrete choice models. The quasi-Jacobian matrix in Forneron (2019) smoothes the moments themselves to approximate G. It is also possible to use MCMC methods to sample from a quasi-posterior distributions which approximates the frequentist distribution of $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ (see e.g. Chernozhukov and Hong, 2003; Wood, 2010).

For cross-sections and short panels, the asymptotic variance of $[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$ in SMM can be approximated with the cross-sectional variance of $[\psi(y_i, x_i) - \frac{1}{S}\sum_{s=1}^S \psi(y_i^s(\hat{\theta}_n^S), x_i)]$. Pooling all the simulated samples that way ensures that the estimator is consistent for both standard and antithetic draws.[11] For time series, under appropriate conditions, a HAC estimator is consistent for the long-run variance of $\hat{\psi}_T$ and the averaged $\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_n^S)$ respectively. Computing the long-run variance for the averaged $\sum_{s=1}^S \psi(y_t^s, \ldots, y_{t-L}^s)/S$ ensures that the estimate is consistent for both standard and antithetic draws. As before, an estimate for the non-averaged moment may not be consistent for antithetic draws because of the dependence between simulated moments.

For the Scrambled Method of Moments, the variance should not be computed as above because scrambled draws are not independent from one another. Theorem 1 implies that the asymptotic variance only involves $\hat{\psi}_n$ in most cases; because simulation noise is asymptotically negligible.[12] One approach is to only compute the variance of $\hat{\psi}_n$. However, as illustrated in Section 5, even though the simulation noise can be small in finite samples, it may not be completely negligible for some DGPs. In these cases, one would want to account for the variance attributable to $\hat{\psi}_n^S$. As discussed in Section 2.3, to consistently estimates the variance of $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ one can evaluate $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ several times with different seeds for the scramble and compute the variance across these estimates.

4 Asymptotic Theory

In the following $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ and $\hat{\theta}_T^S$ will denote the scrambled estimator for static and dynamic models respectively. Consistency and asymptotic normality results are provided for the algorithms described above. The first set of assumptions below is standard in the Monte-Carlo simulation-based estimation literature.

Assumption 1 (Identification, Regularity, Sample Moments)**.** *Suppose the following holds:*

[11] Another approach is to use use the variance of $\psi(y_i^s(\hat{\theta}_n^S), x_i)$ divided by S as an estimate for $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)$. Although commonly used, this may actually not be consistent in the presence of antithetic draws. Depending on the correlation described in Section 2.1 it may either under or over-estimate the variance.

[12] See e.g. Proposition 1.

i. (Identification) $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)] \Leftrightarrow \theta = \theta_0$.

ii. (Regularity) $\theta_0 \in$ *interior*(Θ) *where* Θ *is a compact and convex subset of* $\mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$, $1 \leq d_\theta < +\infty$ *fixed.* $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\cdot)]$ *is continuously differentiable around* θ_0 *and* $\partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$ *has full rank.*

iii. (Sample Moments) $\hat{\psi}_n$ *satisfies a Law of Large Numbers and a Central Limit Theorem:*

$$\sqrt{n}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n)\right] \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V).$$

iv. (Weighting Matrix) $W_n \xrightarrow{p} W$ *positive definite*

4.1 Static Models

To simplify notation, let:

$$\tilde{\psi}(x_i, \theta, u_i) \stackrel{def}{=} \psi(g(x_i, \theta, u_i), x_i)$$

4.1.1 Smooth moments with no covariates

Assumption 2 (Scrambled Smooth Moments without Covariates)**.** *Suppose that the following holds:*

i. For all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big\|\tilde{\psi}(\theta, u_i)\Big\|^2\Big) < +\infty$$

and

$$\|\tilde{\psi}(\theta_1, u_i) - \tilde{\psi}(\theta_2, u_i)\| \leq C_1(u_i) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|,$$

where $\mathbb{E}[C_1(u_i)^2] < +\infty$.

ii. For all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\tilde{\psi}$ *is continuously differentiable in* θ *around* θ_0 *and:*

$$\mathbb{E}\Big(\Big\|\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(\theta, u_i)\Big\|^2\Big) < +\infty,$$

and

$$\|\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(\theta_1, u_i) - \partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(\theta_2, u_i)\| \leq C_2(u_i) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|,$$

where $\mathbb{E}[C_2(u_i)^2] < +\infty$.

Assumption 2 provides sufficient conditions to prove a uniform law of large numbers (ULLN) for $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}$ using the scramble. The proof is similar to Jennrich (1969).

Proposition 1 (Consistency and Asymptotic Normality without Covariates)**.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold, then* $\hat{\theta}_n^S \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ *and*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta_0\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

where

$$\Sigma = \left(G'WG\right)^{-1} G'WVWG \left(G'WG\right)^{-1},$$

$G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$, $V = \lim_{n\to\infty} n \times var(\hat{\psi}_n)$.

Given the ULLN for the simulated moments and the fast convergence rate in Theorem 1, the estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal. The main difference with standard SMM is that here the simulations do not inflate the asymptotic variance, even for $S = 1$, whereas the simulation noise in SMM implies an additional $1/S$ factor.

4.1.2 Potentially non-smooth moments with covariates

As discussed in Section 3.1, moments with covariates do not quite fit the setting described in Section 2. Indeed, the scrambled draws are identically distributed but not independent. With the introduction of covariates, $\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta), i = 1, \ldots, n$ are neither identically distributed nor independent which makes deriving ULLNs and CLTs challenging. Furthermore, if the moments are non-smooth in θ then the approach of Jennrich (1969) cannot be applied and empirical process methods are required.

The main idea is to split the sample moments and the empirical process into two parts: one is non-identically distributed but independent and the other is identically distributed but not independent. The former can be handled using CTLs and empirical process results for heterogeneous arrays and assuming the later is smooth in θ, it can be handled using the steps in Jennrich (1969) as in Proposition 1. The main assumption there is that integrating over x_i, while conditioning on u_i, transforms non-smooth into smooth moments. This puts restrictions on the moments and covariates used in the estimation.

Assumption 3 (Scrambled Non-Smooth Moments with Covariates)**.** *Suppose that for some* $\delta > 0$ *the following holds:*

i. $\mathbb{E}\left[var\left(\psi(y_i, x_i) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_0)|u_i\right)\right]$ *is positive definite and finite, also* $\mathbb{E}\left[\|var\left(\psi(y_i, x_i) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_0)|u_i\right)\|^{2+\delta}\right] < +\infty$.

ii. There exists an envelope function $\bar{\psi}$ *such that for all* $\theta \in \Theta$, $\|\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta)\| \leq \bar{\psi}(x_i, u_i)$ *with* $\mathbb{E}\left[var\left(\bar{\psi}(x_i, u_i)|u_i\right)\right] > 0$ *and* $\mathbb{E}\left[var\left(\bar{\psi}(x_i, u_i)|u_i\right)^{2+\delta}\right) < +\infty$.

iii. There exists $\tilde{C}_1(\cdot)$ *such that* $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{E}(\|\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_2)\|^2 | u_i) \leq \tilde{C}(u_i)^2 \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2$ *with* $\mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{C}(u_i)^4\right) < +\infty$.

iv. $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \cdot)|u_i)$ *is continuously differentiable in* $\theta \in \Theta$, u_i *almost surely. There exists* $\tilde{C}_2(\cdot)$ *such that for all* $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, $\|\mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_2)|u_i\right) - \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_2)|u_i\right)(\theta_1 - \theta_2)\| \leq \tilde{C}_2(u_i) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|^2$. *There exists* $\tilde{C}_3(\cdot)$ *such that for all* $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{E}\left[\|\partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left(\tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta)|u_i\right)\|^2\right] < +\infty$, $\|\partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\psi}(\theta_1, u_i)|u_i\right] - \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\psi}(\theta_2, u_i)|u_i\right]\| \leq \tilde{C}_3(u_i) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$, *where* $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{C}_3(u_i)^2] < +\infty$.

Assumption 3 i.-ii. ensure the Lindeberg condition holds for the heterogeneous array which is required to apply a CLT and the Jain-Markus Theorem (van der Vaart and Wellner, 1996). Conditions iii-iv. ensures that Theorem 1 can be applied to the smoothed moments, i.e. after integrating out the covariates.

Proposition 2 (Consistency and Asymptotic Normality with Covariates)**.** *For* $S \geq 1$, *suppose that* $\|\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)\|_{W_n} \leq o_p(n^{-1/2})$ *and that Assumptions 1, 3 hold then* $\hat{\theta}_n^S \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ *and*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta_0\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

where

$$\Sigma = (G'WG)^{-1} G'W\tilde{V}WG\,(G'WG)^{-1},$$

$G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$, $\tilde{V} = \mathbb{E}\left[var\left(\psi(y_i, x_i) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta_0)|u_i\right)\right]$.

Proposition 2 is similar to Pakes and Pollard (1989) with scrambled instead of MC draws. The variance $\tilde{V}$ can be computed using the steps described in Section 3.3.

4.1.3 Scrambled Indirect Inference

The following extends the results from Proposition 1 to the Indirect Inference estimator of Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993). The moments $\hat{\psi}_n, \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)$ are now defined as sample and simulated M-estimators:

$$\hat{\psi}_n = \text{argmin}_{\psi \in \Psi} M_n(\psi), \qquad \text{where } M_n(\psi) \quad = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} m(y_i; \psi)$$

$$\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) = \text{argmin}_{\psi \in \Psi} M_n^S(\theta; \psi), \quad \text{where } M_n^S(\theta; \psi) = \frac{1}{nS}\sum_{i=1}^{nS} m(y_i^s(\theta); \psi).$$

Again, to simplify notation consider:

$$\tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi) \stackrel{def}{=} m(y_i^s(\theta); \psi).$$

As in Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993), the binding function $\psi_\infty(.\cdot)$ is defined as:

$$\psi_\infty(\theta) \stackrel{def}{=} \text{argmin}_{\psi \in \Psi} \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi)\right].$$

Rather than matching sample moments, the indirect inference estimator matches functions (minimizers) of sample moment functions. Assumption 4 below is more detailed than the high-level conditions in Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993). Using implicit function arguments, it allows to express the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ in terms of the sample moments $\partial_\theta M_n^S$ which fit the setting of Section 2 so that, eventually, Theorem 1 applies.

Assumption 4 (Scrambled Indirect Inference)**.** *Suppose that the following holds:*

i. The mapping $\theta \to \psi_\infty(\theta) \in \Psi$ is continuous differentiable and injective. Ψ is a compact and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d_\psi}$, finite-dimensional and $\psi_\infty(\theta_0) \in$ interior(Ψ).

ii. For all $(\theta, \psi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi)\|^2\right] < +\infty,$$

and there exists $C_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that for all $\theta \in \Theta$ and $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \Psi$:

$$\|\tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi_1) - \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi_2)\| \leq C_1(u_i, \theta) \times \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|,$$

with $\mathbb{E}[C_1(u_i, \theta)^2] < +\infty$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

iii. $\tilde{m}$ is twice continuously differentiable in (θ, ψ), u_i almost surely. For all $(\theta, \psi) \in \Theta \times \Psi$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|\partial_\psi \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi)\|^2\right] < +\infty, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\|\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi)\|^2\right] < +\infty, \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\|\partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta; \psi)\|^2\right] < +\infty,$$

and there exists $C_2(\cdot), C_3(\cdot), C_4(\cdot)$ such that for all $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$ and $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \Psi$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_\psi \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_1; \psi_1) - \partial_\psi \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_2; \psi_2)\| &\leq C_2(u_i) \times \left(\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| + \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|\right), \\
\|\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_1; \psi_1) - \partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_2; \psi_2)\| &\leq C_3(u_i) \times \left(\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| + \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|\right), \\
\|\partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_1; \psi_1) - \partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} \tilde{m}(u_i, \theta_2; \psi_2)\| &\leq C_4(u_i) \times \left(\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| + \|\psi_1 - \psi_2\|\right),
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mathbb{E}[C_2(u_i)^2]$, $\mathbb{E}[C_3(u_i)^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[C_4(u_i)^2] < +\infty$.

iv. The Hessian $\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{m}(u_i,\theta;\psi)]$ *is positive definite for all* $\theta \in \Theta$ *and all* $\psi \in \Psi$ *with*

$$0 < \inf_{(\theta,\psi)\in\Theta\times\Psi} \lambda_{\min}(\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{m}(u_i,\theta;\psi)]) \leq \sup_{(\theta,\psi)\in\Theta\times\Psi} \lambda_{\max}(\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{m}(u_i,\theta;\psi)]) < +\infty.$$

Also, $\sup_{(\theta,\psi)\in\Theta\times\Psi} \|\partial^2_{\psi,\theta'}\mathbb{E}[\tilde{m}(u_i,\theta;\psi)]\| < +\infty$.

Proposition 3 (Consistency and Asymptotic Normality with Auxiliary Parameters)**.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and 4 hold, then* $\hat{\theta}^S_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ *and*

$$\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}^S_n - \theta_0\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma),$$

where

$$\Sigma = (G'WG)^{-1} G'WVWG\,(G'WG)^{-1},$$

$G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}^S_n(\theta_0)]$, $V = \lim_{n\to\infty} n \times var(\hat{\psi}_n)$.

Proposition 3 is similar to the results found in Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993) but here the simulation noise has no effect on the asymptotic variance as in Proposition 1.

4.2 Dynamic Models

4.2.1 qMC-only Estimator

For simplicity, write:

$$\hat{\psi}^S_T(\theta) = \frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS} \tilde{\psi}(u_t;\theta),$$

where u_t has the appropriate dimension d given in Section 3.2.1. For the qMC-only estimator, $\hat{\psi}^S_T$ is simply a cross-sectional average over short-time series. This fits the framework of Section 2 directly and under the conditions in Assumption 2 the estimator is consistent and asymptotically normal as shown in the Proposition below. As for the static case, the asymptotic variance is not inflated by the simulation noise, even for $S = 1$.

Proposition 4 (Consistency and Asymptotic Normality - qMC only)**.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold and the draws are generate as in Algorithm 5 then* $\hat{\theta}^S_n \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ *and:*

$$\sqrt{T}\left(\hat{\theta}^S_T - \theta_0\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma),$$

where

$$\Sigma = (G'WG)^{-1} G'WVWG\,(G'WG)^{-1},$$

$G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}^S_T(\theta_0)\right]$, $V = \lim_{T\to\infty} T \times var(\hat{\psi}_T)$.

4.2.2 MC-qMC Hybrid Estimator

For simplicity, write:

$$\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) = \frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta),$$

where y_t^1, z_t^1 are simulated using MC methods as in Algorithm 6. The hybrid MC-qMC approach relies on MC simulations to approximately draw initial values from the ergodic distribution and is combined with the scramble to simulate a cross-section of paths.

Assumption 5 (Dynamic Models - MC-qMC)**.** *Suppose there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that:*

i. For all $\theta \in \Theta$, (y_t^1, z_t^1) is geometrically ergodic: $\|f_t(y_t^1, z_t^1; \theta) - f_\infty(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty; \theta)\|_{TV} \leq C_1 \times \rho^t$, for some $\rho \in [0, 1)$ and $0 \leq C_1 < +\infty$, where f_∞ is the ergodic distribution of y_t^1, z_t^1 and f_t its non-stationary distribution with fixed starting value.

ii. For all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$.

iii. For any $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$ small, $\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_2)\| \leq C_2(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$ with $\mathbb{E}[\|C_2(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|C_2(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta_1)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$.

iv. For all $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$.

v. For any $\|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$ small, $\|\partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1) - \partial_\theta \tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_2)\| \leq C_3(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1) \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|$ with $\mathbb{E}[\|C_3(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta_1)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|C_3(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta_1)\|^4 | u_t] \leq K < +\infty$.

vi. $\lim_{T\to\infty} T \times var(\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0) | u_1, \ldots, u_{TS})$ is positive definite and finite.

Assumption 5 i. is the usual geometric ergodicity condition (Duffie and Singleton, 1993). Conditions ii.-v. are more restrictive, they hold if the moments are bounded. To relax these conditions, one would need to extend the CLT in Theorem 5.20 of White (1984) to unbounded non-identically distributed dependent arrays which is outside the scope of this paper. Condition vi. requires the variance to be non-degenerate to apply a CLT. Otherwise, simulation noise is negligible in some directions which is not problematic in this setting.

Proposition 5 (Consistency and Asymptotic Normality - MC-qMC)**.** *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 5 hold, then* $\hat{\theta}_T^S \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ *and*

$$\sqrt{T}(\hat{\theta}_T^S - \theta_0) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),$$

where

$$\Sigma = (G'WG)^{-1} G'WVWG (G'WG)^{-1},$$

$G = \lim_{T\to\infty} \mathbb{E}[\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)]$, $V = \lim_{T\to\infty} T \times var(\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS})$.

Proposition 5 is similar to Duffie and Singleton (1993), the main idea to prove the result is to write the simulated moments as the sum of a mixing non-identically distributed heterogeneous array and an average of identically distributed non-independent terms. As in Proposition 2, the former is handled using a specific CLT while the former uses Theorem 1 with similar steps to Jennrich (1969).

5 Monte-Carlo Illustrations

The following illustrates the finite sample properties of the Scrambled Method of Moments and Scrambled Indirect Inference in several simple examples and one application drawn from the heterogeneous agents literature. All simulations were carried out in R and C++ using the *Rcpp* package. Scrambled sequences were generated using the *fOptions* package.

5.1 Simple Examples

5.1.1 Mean-Variance

The first example, drawn from Gouriéroux *et al.* (1993), considers the estimation of a sample mean and variance of for an *iid* Gaussian sample:

$$y_i = \mu + \sigma e_i, \quad e_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1).$$

This example illustrates Algorithms 1, 2 and Proposition 3. As in the original paper, the auxiliary parameters $\hat{\psi}_n$ are the sample mean and variance of $(y_1, \ldots, y_n)$:

$$\hat{\psi}_n = (\hat{\mu}_n, \hat{\sigma}_n^2)' = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i, [y_i - \hat{\mu}_n]^2)'.$$

In the $5,000$ Monte-Carlo replications, the sample size is $n = 100$ and $\theta_0 = (\mu_0, \sigma_0^2) = (0, 1)$. The number of simulated samples is $S = 1, 2, 4$ and 20. For SMM, e_i^s is drawn using the

random number generator *rnorm* in R and antithetic draws are generated for $S = 2, 4$ and 20 by taking $e_i^{s+S/2} = -e_i^s$ for each $s = 1, \ldots, S/2$. The *fOptions* package generates the scrambled Gaussian shocks directly. Table 1 summarizes the biases and standard deviations of the estimators.

Table 1: Mean and Variance Estimation

	MM	SMM				Antithetic				Scramble			
coef./S		1	2	4	20	1	2	4	20	1	2	4	20
$\sqrt{n} \times \text{std}(\hat{\mu})$	0.99	1.44	1.22	1.10	1.01	-	0.99	1.00	0.98	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
$\sqrt{n} \times \text{std}(\hat{\sigma}^2)$	1.41	2.07	1.76	1.60	1.47	-	2.03	1.75	1.50	1.44	1.44	1.41	1.41
$100 \times \text{bias}(\hat{\sigma}^2)$	-0.93	2.38	0.89	0.49	0.25	-	1.93	0.98	0.44	-0.43	-0.87	-1.07	-0.80

Because it has no simulation noise, the Method of Moments (MM) estimator has the smallest variance. SMM has a bias correction property for $\hat{\sigma}^2$ (Gouriéroux *et al.*, 1993). For $\hat{\mu}_n$, antithetic draws and the scramble perform equally well for $S = 2$ and $S = 1$, respectively. For $\hat{\sigma}_n^2$, antithetic draws perform worse than SMM and the scramble. This is in line with the discussion in Section 2.1. The scramble performs similarly to the MM while SMM requires $S = 20$ to perform similarly. SMM and antithetic draws reduce the bias while the scramble does not. This reflects the fact that the scrambled $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)$ approximates the asymptotic binding function $\psi_\infty(\theta_0) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n)$ while SMM and antithetic draws approximate the binding function $\psi(\theta_0) = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n)$ which provides some finite sample bias correction.

5.1.2 Probit Model

The second example illustrates Algorithm 3 with non-smooth moments and covariates. The DGP is a Probit model:

$$y_i = \mathbb{1}\left\{\theta_1 + \theta_2 x_i \theta + e_i \geq 0\right\}, \quad e_i \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1), \quad x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1).$$

The moments $\hat{\psi}_n$ consist of the intercept and the slope in an OLS regression of y_i on x_i. In the 5,000 Monte-Carlo replications, the sample size is $n = 1,000$ and $\theta_0 = (\theta_{1,0}, \theta_{2,0}) = (1, 1)$. The number of simulated samples is $S = 1, 2, 4$ and 20. The standard deviations of the estimators are reported in Table 2.

Table 2: Probit Models: $\sqrt{n} \times \text{std}(\hat{\theta}_n^S)$

	SMM				Antithetic				Scramble			
coef./S	1	2	4	10	1	2	4	10	1	2	4	10
$\hat{\theta}_{1,n}$	2.38	2.24	2.11	1.91	-	2.17	2.06	1.91	2.14	2.09	2.01	1.90
$\hat{\theta}_{2,n}$	2.76	2.57	2.42	2.22	-	2.47	2.35	2.21	2.68	2.52	2.39	2.19

The Scrambled Method of Moments outperforms SMM for $S = 1$ and above. For $S \geq 2$, the scramble performs similarly to antithetic draws for estimating θ_0 and θ_1. The gains are less substantial than in the previous example.

5.1.3 ARMA Model

To illustrate Algorithms 5 and 6 consider the following ARMA(1,1) model:[13]

$$y_t = \rho y_{t-1} + \sigma[e_t + \vartheta e_{t-1}], \quad e_t \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1),$$

In the $5,000$ Monte-Carlo replications, the sample size is $T = 200$ and $\theta_0 = (\vartheta_0, \rho_0, \sigma_0^2) = (0.5, 0.5, 1)$. The number of simulated samples is $S = 1, 2$. The moments are the OLS coefficients from regressing y_t on its first $L = 4$ lags and the variance of the OLS residuals. Using auto-covariances as moments instead yields similar results.

Algorithm 5 requires sampling (y_t^1, e_t^1) from its stationary distribution directly. The marginals are known since $e_t^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ by assumption and $y_t^1 \sim \mathcal{N}(0, [1 + \vartheta^2 + 2\rho\vartheta]/[1 - \rho^2]\sigma^2)$. Since they are jointly Gaussian, it is sufficient to compute their covariance, $\text{cov}(e_t^1, y_t^1) = \rho\vartheta\sigma$, to find their joint distribution:

$$\begin{pmatrix} y_t^1 \\ e_t^1 \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1+\vartheta^2+2\rho\vartheta}{1-\rho^2}\sigma^2 & \rho\vartheta\sigma \\ \rho\vartheta\sigma & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Transforming independent bivariate scrambled Gaussian shocks into draws from the joint distribution above is then straightforward. For Algorithm 6, the (y_t^1, e_t^1) need to be sampled using MC methods. First, the initial value $(y_0^1, e_0^1) = (0, 0)$ is set and a path (y_t^1, e_t^1) is simulated with random MC draws. Once these (y_t^1, e_t^1) are simulated, the remaining $(y_t^2, e_t^2, \ldots, y_t^5, e_t^5)$ are computed using scrambled Gaussian shocks.[14]

[13] In the notation of Section 4.2, the model can be written as: $y_t = \rho y_{t-1} + \sigma[z_{t,1} + \vartheta z_{t,2}]$, $(z_{t,1}, z_{t,2})' = (e_t, z_{t-1,1})'$, with $z_t = (z_{t,1}, z_{t,2})'$.

[14] Here the number of lags used to compute the moments is $L = 5$ because y_t^5 is regressed on its 4 lags $y_t^4, \ldots, y_t^1$.

Table 3 compares the Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE) with SMM and antithetic draws, the qMC-only scramble from Algorithm 5 (reported in the Scramble column) and the hybrid MC-qMC scrambled from Algorithm 6 (reported in the Scramble-MC column).

Table 3: ARMA(1,1): $\sqrt{n} \times \text{std}(\hat{\theta}_n^S)$

	MLE	SMM		Antithetic		Scramble		Scramble-MC	
coef./S		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
$\hat{\rho}_n$	1.10	1.64	1.44	-	1.66	1.20	1.17	1.39	1.28
$\hat{\theta}_n$	1.13	1.86	1.57	-	1.87	1.33	1.28	1.53	1.36
$\hat{\sigma}_n$	0.72	1.05	0.90	-	1.04	0.76	0.72	0.94	0.84

MLE corresponds to the lower bound for variance of the estimators. The qMC-only scramble from Algorithm 5 outperforms SMM and antithetic draws. Antithetic draws perform worse than SMM using the same S which further illustrates the discussion in Section 2.1. The hybrid MC-qMC Algorithm 6 performs better than SMM and antithetic draws and, as expected, worse than the qMC-only approach.

5.2 An Income Process with "Lots of Heterogeneity"

The last example is a more substantial model borrowed from Browning *et al.* (2010).[15] Simulation-based estimation is commonly used in this heterogeneous agents literature due to the complexity and intractability of the models.[16] The baseline data generating process is an ARMA(1,1) at the individual level:

$$y_{i,t} = \delta_i \times \left([1 - \omega_i^t] + \beta_i \times [1 - \omega_i^{t-1}]\right) + \alpha_i\beta_i + \beta_i y_{i,t-1} + \alpha_i \times [1 - \beta_i] \times t + \varepsilon_{i,t} + \theta_i\varepsilon_{i,t-1}$$

where the drift α_i, long-run mean δ_i, AR and MA coefficients β_i, θ_i as well as the persistence coefficient ω_i all vary at the individual level. The Gaussian shocks to log-income in the time dimension are denoted by ε_i while the Gaussian shocks to the ARMA coefficients $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \ldots$

[15]The data generating process considered here involves all the coefficients found in Browning *et al.* (2010), Table 2 minus the measurement errors and the time-trend in the ARCH component which are not considered in this Monte-Carlo exercise.

[16]See e.g. Guvenen (2011) for an overview of the computation and estimation of heterogeneous agents models.

will be denoted by η_i. The initial value for log-income $y_{i,0}$ is drawn as:

$$y_{i,0} = \exp(\tau) \times \eta_{i,0}.$$

The heterogenous ARMA coefficients are then drawn using:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nu_{i,0} &= \exp(\phi_{11} + \phi_{12} \times y_{i,0} + \psi_{11} \times \eta_{i,1}) \\
\theta_i &= \text{logit}\,(\phi_{21} + \phi_{22} \times y_{i,0} + \psi_{21} \times \eta_{i,1} + \psi_{22} \times \eta_{i,2}) - 1/2 \\
\alpha_i &= \phi_{31} + \phi_{32} \times y_{i,0} + \psi_{3,1} \times \eta_{i,1} \\
\beta_i &= \text{logit}\,(\phi_{41} + \phi_{42} \times y_{i,0} + \psi_{4,1} \times \eta_{i,1} + \psi_{4,2} \times \eta_{i,2}) \\
\delta_i &= \phi_{51} + \phi_{52} \times y_{i,0} + \psi_{5,1} \times \eta_{i,1} + \psi_{5,2} \times \eta_{i,2} \\
\omega_i &= \text{logit}(\phi_{61} + \psi_{62} \times \eta_{i,2})
\end{aligned}$$

where logit is the usual logistic transformation $\text{logit}(x) = 1/[1 + \exp(-x)]$. $\eta_{i,0}, \ldots, \eta_{i,2} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. For a discussion of the parameters and the role of the transformations, see Browning *et al.* (2010). $\nu_{i,0}$ is the initial value for the ARCH-type heteroskedasticity in the shocks $\varepsilon_{i,t}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma^2_{i,1} &= \nu_{i,0}, & \varepsilon_{i,1} &= \sigma_{i,1} \times e_{i,1} \\
\sigma^2_{i,t} &= \nu_{i,0} + \text{logit}(\varphi) \times \varepsilon^2_{i,t-1}, & \varepsilon_{i,t} &= \sigma_{i,t} \times e_{i,t}
\end{aligned}$$

where $e_{i,0}, \ldots, e_{i,T} \overset{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0,1)$. In the simulations, the number of households is $n = 1,000$; the number of time periods is $T = 30$. As in the original paper, a burn-in period of $T_{burn} = 3$ periods is used to reduce the effect of the initial conditions. The parameter values are taken from Table 2 in Browning *et al.* (2010) and the moments are those described in their Appendix A.2 except the ones involving year of birth which are not considered in these simulations. In a nutshell, the moments involve the aggregation of individual-level OLS coefficients, moments based on OLS residuals, autocorrelations and measures of social mobility.

The implementation of SMM is standard and described in Appendix A.4 of the original paper. For the scramble, a $(n \times S) \times (T + T_{burn} + 3) = (1,000 \times S) \times 36$ matrix of scrambled standard gaussian shocks is drawn. The integration dimension $d = 36$ is sufficiently large to illustrate the finite sample performance of the scrambled method of moments with a relatively large number of shocks. The first three dimensions (columns of the matrix) correspond to $\eta_{i,0}, \ldots, \eta_{i,2}$, the remaining dimensions correspond to time dimensions $e_{i,1}, \ldots, e_{i,T+T_{burn}}$. The rows correspond to the cross-sectional dimension of the shocks, *i.e.* the $i = 1, \ldots, n \times S$ index.

The results from the 2,000 Monte-Carlo replications are presented in Table 4 for $S = 1, 2, 4$. SMM and antithetic draws are used as a benchmark for the scramble with either a

Table 4: Income Process with Heterogeneity: $\sqrt{n} \times \text{std}(\hat{\theta}_n^S)$

	SMM			Antithetic			Scramble					
							S samples of size n			1 sample of size nS		
coef./S	1	2	4	1	2	4	1	2	4	1	2	4
τ	1.27	1.20	1.20	-	1.25	1.35	1.06	1.12	1.11	1.06	1.13	1.13
ϕ_{11}	1.29	1.22	1.18	-	1.06	1.23	1.00	0.99	1.00	1.00	1.03	1.04
ϕ_{12}	4.32	3.70	3.28	-	3.70	4.47	3.39	3.07	2.95	3.39	3.09	3.20
ϕ_{21}	1.62	1.44	1.39	-	1.53	1.73	1.30	1.31	1.26	1.30	1.20	1.28
ϕ_{31}	0.18	0.15	0.14	-	0.14	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.13	0.15	0.14	0.14
ϕ_{32}	0.17	0.16	0.14	-	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.15	0.14	0.15	0.14	0.14
ϕ_{41}	1.90	1.66	1.68	-	1.72	1.84	1.60	1.57	1.54	1.60	1.60	1.59
ϕ_{51}	2.98	2.84	2.70	-	2.68	2.79	2.94	2.78	2.59	2.94	2.76	2.61
ϕ_{52}	8.54	8.17	7.58	-	7.75	7.73	8.00	7.59	7.23	8.00	7.54	7.31
ϕ_{61}	4.18	4.20	3.29	-	3.36	3.32	3.27	3.16	2.87	3.27	3.01	3.04
ψ_{11}	1.25	1.29	1.20	-	1.29	1.28	0.89	0.88	0.96	0.98	0.97	1.01
ψ_{22}	2.55	2.42	2.39	-	2.47	2.89	2.13	2.08	2.15	2.13	2.09	2.21
ψ_{31}	0.08	0.07	0.07	-	0.07	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.06
ψ_{41}	2.68	2.36	2.30	-	2.40	2.61	2.27	2.22	2.10	2.27	2.22	2.19
ψ_{42}	1.90	1.76	1.74	-	1.75	1.87	1.56	1.53	1.55	1.56	1.63	1.58
ψ_{51}	3.30	3.13	2.83	-	2.90	3.28	2.64	2.89	2.56	2.64	2.64	2.70
ψ_{52}	2.14	2.03	2.20	-	2.14	2.45	1.78	1.95	1.83	1.78	1.84	1.96
ψ_{62}	3.53	3.53	3.65	-	3.55	4.01	3.34	3.28	3.36	3.34	3.44	3.56
φ	2.24	2.10	2.39	-	2.76	3.06	1.99	1.94	2.21	1.99	2.30	2.56

large sample of $n \times S$ individuals (as in Algorithm 2 or S samples of n individuals (as in Algorithm 2). The scramble generally outperform SMM and antithetic draws. Antithetic draws either under or over-performs SMM depending on the parameter of interest which is in line with previous discussions. Both implementations of the Scrambled Method of Moments perform similarly. For some coefficients, there is little to no improvement in increasing S from 1 to 2 or 4. For most coefficients, the scramble with $S = 2$ outperforms SMM with $S = 4$. Furthermore, using the same $S = 4$, the replications were computed about 15% faster for the scramble than SMM. Since the only difference between the two is the shocks used in the simulations, this reflects faster convergence of the optimizer. Possibly because the scramble are smoother (less noisy) than the MC moments which makes the objective function easier to minimize.

6 Conclusion

This paper proposes several algorithms implementing Owen's scramble for simulation-based estimation. Since the method is designed for computing integrals of *iid* sequences, some care is needed when simulating data with covariates or time series. Large sample results are provided to support the proposed algorithms. The results for dynamic models could be extended to non-smooth bounded moments through additional stochastic equicontinuity results using the inequality in Andrews and Pollard (1994) for instance. The simulations illustrate the finite performance of the Scrambled Methods of Moments and Scrambled Indirect Inference compared to other commonly used methods. The last example suggests the scramble could be useful in larger scale problems found in the heterogenous agents literature where SMM is commonly used.

References

Andrews, D. W. K. and Pollard, D. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Central Limit Theorems for Dependent Stochastic Processes. *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique*, **62** (1), 119.

Bratley, P. and Fox, B. L. (1988). ALGORITHM 659: implementing Sobol's quasirandom sequence generator. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, **14** (1), 88–100.

Browning, M., Ejrnaes, M. and Alvarez, J. (2010). Modelling Income Processes with Lots of Heterogeneity. *Review of Economic Studies*, **77** (4), 1353–1381.

Bruins, M., Duffy, J. A., Keane, M. P. and Smith, A. A. (2018). Generalized indirect inference for discrete choice models. *Journal of Econometrics*, **205** (1), 177–203.

Buchholz, A. and Chopin, N. (2017). Improving approximate Bayesian computation via quasi-Monte Carlo.

Chernozhukov, V. and Hong, H. (2003). An MCMC approach to classical estimation. *Journal of Econometrics*, **115** (2), 293–346.

Chi, H., Beerli, P., Evans, D. W. and Mascagni, M. (2005). On the scrambled Sobo sequence. In *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*.

Davis, R. A., Sousa, T. d. R. and Klüppelberg, C. (2019). Indirect Inference for Time Series Using the Empirical Characteristic Function and Control Variates.

Davydov, Y. A. (1968). Convergence of Distributions Generated by Stationary Stochastic Processes. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, **13** (4), 691–696.

Dick, J. and Pillichshammer, F. (2010). *Digital Nets and Sequences*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Duffie, D. and Singleton, K. (1993). Simulated Moments Estimation of Markov Models of Asset Prices. *Econometrica*, **61** (929-952).

Dutang, C. and Savicky, P. (2019). randtoolbox: Generating and Testing Random Numbers.

Forneron, J.-J. (2019). Detecting Identification Failure in Moment Condition Models.

— and Ng, S. (2018). The ABC of Simulation Estimation with Auxiliary Statistics. *Journal of Econometrics*.

Frazier, D. T., Oka, T. and Zhu, D. (2019). Indirect Inference with a Non-Smooth Criterion Function. *Forthcoming in the Journal of Econometrics*.

Gallant, a. R. and Tauchen, G. (1996). Which Moments to Match? *Econometric Theory*, **12** (04), 657.

Gerber, M. and Chopin, N. (2015). Sequential quasi Monte Carlo. *Journal of the Royal*

Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology), **77** (3), 509–579.

— and — (2017). Convergence of sequential quasi-Monte Carlo smoothing algorithms. *Bernoulli*, **23** (4B), 2951–2987.

Gouriéroux, C., Monfort, A. and Renault, E. (1993). Indirect inference. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, **8** (S1), S85—-S118.

Guvenen, F. (2011). Macroeconomics with Heterogeneity: A Practical Guide. *Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond Economic Quarterly*, **97** (3), 255–327.

Hickernell, F. J. (1996). The mean square discrepancy of randomized nets. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation*, **6** (4), 274–296.

—, Lemieux, C. and Owen, A. B. (2005). Control Variates for Quasi-Monte Carlo. *Statistical Science*, **20** (1), 1–31.

Hong, H. S. and Hickernell, F. J. (2003). Algorithm 823: Implementing scrambled digital sequences. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, **29** (2), 95–109.

Jennrich, R. I. (1969). Asymptotic properties of non-linear least squares estimators. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, **40** (2), 633–643.

Joe, S. and Kuo, F. Y. (2003). Remark on algorithm 659: Implementing Sobol's quasirandom sequence generator. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software*, **29** (1), 49–57.

Judd, K. L. (1998). *Numerical methods in economics*. MIT press.

Lemieux, C. (2009). *Monte Carlo and Quasi-Monte Carlo Sampling*. Springer Series in Statistics, New York, NY: Springer New York.

Marin, J. M., Pudlo, P., Robert, C. P. and Ryder, R. J. (2012). Approximate Bayesian computational methods. *Statistics and Computing*, **22** (6), 1167–1180.

Matoušek, J. (1998). On the L2-Discrepancy for Anchored Boxes. *Journal of Complexity*, **14** (4), 527–556.

McFadden, D. (1989). A Method of Simulated Moments for Estimation of Discrete Response Models Without Numerical Integration. *Econometrica*, **57** (5), 995.

Newey, W. K. and McFadden, D. (1994). Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. *Handbook of Econometrics*, **4**, 2111–2245.

Oates, C. J., Girolami, M. and Chopin, N. (2017). Control functionals for Monte Carlo integration. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, **79** (3), 695–718.

Ökten, G., Tuffin, B. and Burago, V. (2006). A central limit theorem and improved error bounds for a hybrid-Monte Carlo sequence with applications in computational finance. *Journal of Complexity*, **22** (4), 435–458.

Owen, A. B. (1995). Randomly permuted (t, m, s)-nets and (t, s)-sequences. In *Monte Carlo and quasi-Monte Carlo methods in scientific computing*, Springer, pp. 299–317.

— (1997). Scrambled net variance for integrals of smooth functions. *The Annals of Statistics*, **25** (4), 1541–1562.

— and Tribble, S. D. (2005). A quasi-Monte Carlo Metropolis algorithm. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **102** (25), 8844–8849.

Pakes, A. and Pollard, D. (1989). Simulation and the Asymptotics of Optimization Estimators. *Econometrica*, **57** (5), 1027.

Paskov, S. H. and Traub, J. F. (1995). Faster Valuation of Financial Derivatives. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, **22** (1), 113–123.

Robert, C. and Casella, G. (2013). *Monte Carlo statistical methods*. Springer Science & Business Media.

Roth, K. F. (1954). On irregularities of distribution. *Mathematika*, **1** (2), 73–79.

Schmidt, W. M. (1970). Irregularities of distribution. V. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, **25** (3), 608–608.

Smith, A. A. (2006). Indirect Inference Dictionary. *in S. Durlauf L. Blume (eds), The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*, **2**, 1–9.

Train, K. E. (2009). *Discrete choice methods with simulation*. Second edi edn.

van der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics, New York, NY: Springer New York.

White, H. (1984). *Asymptotic Theory for Econometricians*. Elsevier.

Wood, S. N. (2010). Statistical inference for noisy nonlinear ecological dynamic systems. *Nature*, **466** (7310), 1102–1104.

Appendix A Proofs

A.1 Static Models

A.1.1 Smooth Moments with No Covariates

Lemma A1 (ULLN and CLT for Smooth Moments without Covariates)**.** *Suppose the conditions in Assumption 2 hold, then:*

i. $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta))\| = o_p(1)$,

ii. $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\partial_\theta\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta) - \partial_\theta\mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta))\| = o_p(1)$,

iii. $\|\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta_0)]\| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Proof of Lemma A1.
Part i. ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)$
Assumption 2 implies $\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)]\| = o_p(1)$ pointwise. Using the same steps as in Jennrich (1969), the Lipschitz condition implies that for a finite cover $(\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_J)$ of Θ:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta))\| \\ &\quad\leq \max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}} \|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j))\| + \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\min_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}} \left\|[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j)] - [\mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j))]\right\|.\end{aligned}$$

Using the Lipschitz condition for $\tilde{\psi}$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\min_{j\in\{1,\ldots J\}}\left\|[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j)] - [\mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j))]\right\| \\ &\qquad\leq \Big[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n C_1(u_i) + \mathbb{E}(C_1(u_i))\Big] \times \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\min_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}} \|\theta - \theta_j\|\end{aligned}$$

Since C_1 is square integrable, Theorem 1 applies to $C_1(u_i)$ so that $\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n C_1(u_i) + \mathbb{E}(C_1(u_i))\right] = 2\times\mathbb{E}[C_1(u_i)] + o_p(1)$. For $J \geq 1$ large enough and an appropriate cover, $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\min_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}}\|\theta - \theta_j\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4\mathbb{E}[C_1(u_i)]}$. Similarly, for any given $J \geq 1$ fixed, $\max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}}\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_j))\| \leq \varepsilon/2$ with probability going to 1 as $n \to \infty$. Overall, this implies that:

$$\mathbb{P}(\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta))\| > \varepsilon) \to 0,$$

this provides a ULLN with scrambled draws.

Part ii. ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)$
The ULLN can be directly applied to $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^s(\theta)$ under the stated assumptions.

Part iii. Convergence rate for $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$
This is a direct application of Theorem 1 which concludes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 1. Combining Assumption 1 with the ULLN in Lemma A1 imply that the consitency Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994) applies; *i.e.* $\hat{\theta}_n^S \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$. Then, the ULLN for the Jacobian with a mean value expansion argument imply:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta_0\right) &= -\left(G'WG\right)^{-1} G'W\sqrt{n}\left[\underbrace{\hat{\psi}_n - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]}_{=O_p(n^{-1/2})} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)] - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)}_{=o_p(n^{-1/2})}\right] + o_p(1) \\
&= -\left(G'WG\right)^{-1} G'W\sqrt{n}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]\right] + o_p(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma),
\end{aligned}$$

where Σ is defined in the Proposition. This concludes the proof. □

A.1.2 Non-Smooth Moments with Covariates

Lemma A2 (Stochastic Equicontinuity and CLT with Covariates)**.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold and $S = 1$, then:*

i. $\sqrt{n}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{V})$ *where* $\tilde{V} = \mathbb{E}\left[var\left(\psi(y_i, x_i) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i, u_i; \theta)|u_i\right)\right]$

ii. $\sup_{\|\theta_1-\theta_2\|\leq\delta_n} \sqrt{n}\|[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_1) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_1) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]\| = o_p(1)$, $\forall \delta_n \searrow 0$

iii. $\sup_{\|\theta_1-\theta_2\|\leq\delta_n} \|\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_1) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)|u_1, \ldots, u_n] - \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)](\theta_1 - \theta_2)\| \leq O_p(\delta_n^2)$, $\forall \delta_n \searrow 0$

Proof of Lemma A2.
Part i. CLT for $\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)$
Similarly to Ökten *et al.* (2006), the main idea is to verify the conditions for an independent non-identically distributed CLT hold holding the qMC draws $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ fixed. Note that:

$$\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) = \underbrace{\hat{\psi}_n - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]}_{\text{independent non-identically distributed}} + \underbrace{\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]}_{\text{scrambled sequence}}.$$

For the second term, Theorem 1 can be applied given that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_i^S(\theta_0)|u_i]$ has finite variance. For the first term, Assumption 3 i. implies a Lyapunov condition holds. As a result, the

CLT for independent non-identically distributed arrays can be applied (White, 1984, Theorem 5.10). Note that similar arguments implies that for each $\theta \in \Theta$, $(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)]) = O_p(n^{-1/2})$, *i.e.* pointwise convergence holds.

Part ii. Stochastic Equicontinuity Result for $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]$
As in Part i., Assumption 3 i. implies a Lyapunov condition holds for the envelope $\bar{\psi}$. This implies a Lindeberg condition for the envelope holds. Further, Assumption 3 iii. implies that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sup_{\|\theta_1-\theta_2\|\leq\delta_n} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{E}\left[\|[\tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_2)] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_2)|u_i]\|^2|u_i\right] \\
\leq \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{C}_1(u_i)^2 + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{C}_1(u_i)^2]\right) \times \delta_n^2 \\
= \left(2\mathbb{E}[\tilde{C}_1(u_i)^2] + o_p(1)\right) \times \delta_n^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which goes to 0 for all sequences $\delta_n \to 0$. The last equality comes from applying Theorem 1 to $\tilde{C}(u_i)^2$ which has finite variance by assumption. Θ is a compact and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}^{d_\theta}$ which is finite dimensional. Given the Lindeberg condition, pointwise convergence in Part i. and the L^2-smoothness result above holds, the Jain-Markus Theorem can be applied[17] which implies the desired stochastic equicontinuity result.

Part iii. Taylor Expansion of $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]$
For all θ_1, θ_2, Assumption 3 iv. implies:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\{\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_1) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_2)|u_i] - \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}\left[\tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_2)|u_i\right](\theta_1-\theta_2)\}\| \\
\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{C}_3(u_i) \times \|\theta_1-\theta_2\|^2 \\
= (\mathbb{E}[\tilde{C}_3(u_i)] + o_p(1)) \times \|\theta_1-\theta_2\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies the desired result. The last equality follows from Theorem 1 applied to $\tilde{C}_3(u_i)$ which has finite variance. Also note, that the conditions imply that the ULLN of Lemma A1 applies to $\partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)|u_1, \ldots, u_n]$ so that $\partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)|u_1, \ldots, u_n] = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)] + o_p(1)$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$. This concludes the proof. □

[17] See Example 2.11.13 and Theorem 2.11.9 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996).

Proof of Proposition 2. By Lemma A2, $\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)$ is stochastically equicontinuous which, together with Assumption 1, implies that $\hat{\theta}_n^S \xrightarrow{p} \theta_0$ by Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994). Then, using Lemma A2 and standard arguments, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= G'W\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] \\
&= G'W\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] - \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] + \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]\right) \\
&= G'W\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] - \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)\right] + \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]\right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
&= G'W\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] + \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]\right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
&= G'W\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] + \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]\right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

The stochastic equicontinuity result can then be applied:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] - \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] - \left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\hat{\theta}_n^S)\right] + o_p(n^{-1/2}).
\end{aligned}$$

Then, by Theorem 1, $\|\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)|u_1,\ldots,u_n\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]\| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ which allows to substitute $\mathbb{E}\left[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)\right]$ with the desired quantity. Using the CLT and stochastic equicontinuity result in Lemma A2:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta\right) &= -\left(G'WG\right)^{-1}G'W\sqrt{n}[\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)] + o_p(1) \\
&\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0,\Sigma),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\Sigma = \left(G'WG\right)^{-1}G'W\tilde{V}WG\left(G'WG\right)^{-1},$$

$G = \partial_\theta \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)]$, $\tilde{V} = \mathbb{E}\left[\text{var}\left(\psi(y_i,x_i) - \tilde{\psi}(x_i,u_i;\theta_0)|u_i\right)\right]$.

The results above are given for $S = 1$. For $S > 1$ fixed and finite, the simulated moments $\hat{\psi}_n^s$ are *iid* over $s = 1,\ldots,S$. This implies that the CLT and stochastic equicontinuity results can be applied to each $s \in \{1,\ldots,S\}$ and also apply to their average $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ by independence with S fixed and finite. The remainder of the proof is identical which concludes the proof. □

A.1.3 Scrambled Indirect Inference

Proof of Proposition 3. Assumption 4 ii. implies a ULLN for $M_n^S(\theta;\psi)$ in ψ for all $\theta \in \Theta$, by Lemma A1. Then Assumption 4 i. implies that Theorem 2.1 in Newey and McFadden (1994) applies for each $\theta \in \Theta$ to $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ so that $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) - \psi_\infty(\theta) = o_p(1)$ pointwise in $\theta \in \Theta$.

Now, to prove that $\hat{\theta}_n^S$ itself is consistent, a ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ in θ is needed. Given the pointwise consistency above, it remains to show that $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ is Lispchitz-continuous with stochastically bounded Lipschitz constant. For all $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \Theta$, the mean-value theorem and the triangular inequality imply:

$$\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_1) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)\| \leq \|\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\tilde{\theta})\| \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|,$$

where $\tilde{\theta}$ is some intermediate value. The implicit function theorem provides a closed-form for $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S$ evaluated at any $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) = -\left[\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} M_n^S(\theta; \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta))\right]^{-1} \partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} M_n^S(\theta; \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta)).$$

Both $\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} M_n^S(\theta;\psi)$ and $\partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} M_n^S(\theta;\psi)$ satisfy a ULLN in (θ,ψ) by Assumption 4 and Lemma A1. The Continuous Mapping Theorem then implies that $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}(\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta))$ pointwise in $\theta \in \Theta$. Furthermore, Assumption 4 iv. implies that:

$$\left\| \left(\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} \mathbb{E}[M_n^S(\theta;\psi)]\right)^{-1} \partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} \mathbb{E}[M_n^S(\theta;\psi)] \right\| \leq \bar{M} < \infty,$$

uniformly in (θ,ψ) for some finite bound $\bar{M} \geq 0$. Putting everything together, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_1) - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_2)\| &\leq \|\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\tilde{\theta})\| \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| \\
&= \|\mathbb{E}[\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S(\tilde{\theta})] + o_p(1)\| \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| \\
&\leq [\bar{M} + o_p(1)] \times \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|
\end{aligned}$$

This implies, as in Jennrich (1969) and Proposition 1, a ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_n^S$ over $\theta \in \Theta$.

To establish the asymptotic normality for $\hat{\theta}_n^S$, first note that the ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_n^S$, $\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} M_n^S$ and $\partial^2_{\psi,\theta'} M_n^S$ together with the implicit function theorem and the Lipschitz conditions imply a ULLN for $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_n^S$ in θ.[18] By the usual mean-value expansion argument, this implies that:

$$\sqrt{n}[\hat{\theta}_n^S - \theta_0] = -\sqrt{n}\left[\partial_\theta \psi_\infty(\theta_0)' W \partial_\theta \psi_\infty(\theta_0) + o_p(1)\right]^{-1} \partial_\theta \psi_\infty(\theta_0)' W [\hat{\psi}_n - \hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)] + o_p(1).$$

To conclude the proof, we need to show that $\sqrt{n}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \psi_\infty(\theta_0)] = o_p(1)$. Since $\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0)$ is an M-estimator with the appropriate regularity conditions, the following holds:[19]

$$\sqrt{n}[\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \psi_\infty(\theta_0)] = -\left[\partial^2_{\psi,\psi'} \mathbb{E}[M_n^S(\theta_0; \psi_\infty(\theta_0))] + o_p(1)\right]^{-1} \partial_\psi M_n^S(\theta_0; \psi_\infty(\theta_0)).$$

Since $\psi_\infty(\theta_0)$ is the population minimizer of $\mathbb{E}[M_n^S(\theta_0;\cdot)]$, we have $\partial_\psi \mathbb{E}[M_n^S(\theta_0;\psi_\infty(\theta_0))] = 0$. Applying Theorem 1 with Assumption 4 iii. implies $\partial_\psi M_n^S(\theta_0;\psi_\infty(\theta_0)) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ which, in turn, implies the desired result and concludes the proof. □

[18] The proof is omitted for brevity but is similar to the previous ULLNs.

[19] The proof is very similar to Proposition 1.

A.2 Dynamic Models

A.2.1 qMC-only Estimator

Proof of Proposition 4. Given the construction in Algorithm 5 and the assumptions the results of Lemma A1 hold and the proof proceeds as in Proposition 1. This concludes the proof. □

A.2.2 Hybrid MC-qMC Estimator

Lemma A3 (Uniform Law of Large Numbers and CLT - MC-qMC)**.** *Suppose that the Assumptions 1, 5 hold then:*

i. $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]\| = o_p(1)$,

ii. $\sup_{\theta\in\Theta} \|\partial_\theta\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \partial_\theta\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]\| = o_p(1)$,

iii. $\sqrt{TS}\left(\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)]\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V)$ *where* $V = \lim_{T\to\infty} T\times var[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}]$.

Proof of Lemma A3.
Part i. ULLN for $\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)$
The main steps are similar to Lemma A1 using pointwise convergence and Lipschitz continuity arguments. The main difficulty is the presence of the Monte-Carlo terms y_t^1, z_t^1 which are dependent and non-stationary. To handle these, as in the proof of Lemma A2, separate $\hat{\psi}_T^S - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S]$ into two components $(\hat{\psi}_T^S - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}])$ and $(\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S])$ to study the two individually. For the first term, Davydov (1968)'s inequality implies pointwise convergence under mixing and moment conditions. For the second term, the non-stationarity implies that Theorem 1 does not apply directly. The geometric ergodicity conditions will allow to return to a setting where Theorem 1 applies.

As discussed above, for any $\theta \in \Theta$:

$$\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)] = \underbrace{\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}]}_{\text{heterogeneous dependent vector}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]}_{\text{non-stationary qMC sequence}}.$$

For the first term, Davydov's inequality implies, up to a universal constant:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS}]\|^2|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS}] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{[TS]^2}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^2|u_t] \\
&+ \frac{1}{[TS]^2}\sum_{t\neq t'}\alpha(|t-t'|)^{1/2} \times \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^4|u_t]^{1/4} \\
&\qquad\qquad \times \mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(\tilde{y}_{t'}, \tilde{z}_{t'}, u_{t'}; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_{t'}^1, z_{t'}^1, u_{t'}; \theta)|u_{t'}]\|^4|u_{t'}]^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^2|u_t]$ is not stationary, so that Theorem 1 does not apply directly. However, by geometric ergodicity we have for any function g with bounded fourth moment:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\mathbb{E}[g(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta) - g(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\| \\
&= \| \int g(y^1, z^1, u_t; \theta)[f_t(y^1, z^1) - f_\infty(y^1, z^1)]dy^1dz^1\| \\
&\leq \int \|g(y^1, z^1, u_t; \theta)\| \times |f_t(y^1, z^1) - f_\infty(y^1, z^1)|dy^1dz^1 \\
&\leq \left(\int \|g(y^1, z^1, u_t; \theta)\|^2 \times |f_t(y^1, z^1) - f_\infty(y^1, z^1)|dy^1dz^1\right)^{1/2}\left(\int |f_t(y^1, z^1) - f_\infty(y^1, z^1)|dy^1dz^1\right)^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2} \times \bar{K}_g \times \|f_t - f_\infty\|_{TV}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{2C_1} \times \bar{K}_g \times \rho^{t/2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{K}_g \geq 0$ is a bound for the moment conditional on u_t fixed. This bound is finite by Assumption 5 iii. and v. for $\tilde{\psi}$ and $\partial_\theta\tilde{\psi}$, respectively. Under the geometric ergodicity assumption, $\rho \in [0, 1)$ so that $\sum_{t\geq 0}\rho^{t/2} < +\infty$ and:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{[TS]^2}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^2|u_t] \\
&= \frac{1}{[TS]^2}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\left(\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^2|u_t]\right) + O(1/[TS]^2) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t; \theta)|u_t]\|^2]\right)/[TS] + o_p(1/[TS]) + O(1/[TS]^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is due to Theorem 1 using the bounded fourth moment assumption to find the finite variance condition needed in the Theorem.

The second term, which is a non-stationary qMC sequence, can be handled using the geometric ergodicity condition and the bounded fourth moment asusmption to get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\Big(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta)|u_t] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta)]\Big) \\
&= \frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS}\Big(\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t;\theta)|u_t] - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t;\theta)]\Big) + O(1/[TS]) \\
&= o_p(1/\sqrt{TS}) + O(1/[TS]).
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, the geometric ergodicity imply that $(y_t^1, z_t^1)_{t\geq 1}$ is α-mixing with exponential decay. This implies that $\frac{1}{[TS]^2}\sum_{t\neq t'}\alpha(|t-t'|) = O(1/[TS])$ where α are the α-mixing coefficients. Furthermore, by assumption $\mathbb{E}[\|\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta)|u_t]\|^4|u_t]^{1/4}$ is bounded for all $t \geq 1$. Altogether, these imply that:

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)] &= \underbrace{\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}]}_{=O_p(1/\sqrt{TS})} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)|u_1,\ldots,u_{TS}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]}_{=o_p(1/\sqrt{TS})} \\
&= O_p(1/\sqrt{TS}),
\end{aligned}$$

which implies pointwise convergence.

As in Proposition 1, take a cover $\{\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_J\}$ of Θ and:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]\| \\
&\quad\leq \max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}}\|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_j) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_j)]\| + \sup_{\theta\in\Theta}\min_{j\in\{1,\ldots,J\}}\Big\|[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_j)] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_j)]\Big\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The first term can be handled with the pointwise convergence result above. For the second term, note that:

$$\|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_j)\| \leq \frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS} C_2(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta_j)\times\|\theta - \theta_j\|.$$

It is sufficient to show that $\sum_{t=1}^{TS} C_2(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta_j)/[TS]$ is a $O_p(1)$ for each $j \in \{1,\ldots,J\}$. Since C_2 satisfies the conditions for the pointwise convergence derived above, using the same arguments as for $\hat{\psi}_T^S$ we have:

$$\frac{1}{TS}\sum_{t=1}^{TS} C_2(y_t^1, z_t^1, u_t;\theta_j) \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[C_2(y_t^\infty, z_t^\infty, u_t;\theta_j)].$$

As in the proof of Lemma A1, for J and T large enough we have:

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \|\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta)]\| \leq \varepsilon,$$

with probability going to 1, which implies the desired result.

Part ii. ULLN for $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_T^S$
Given the stated assumptions, the same results as above apply to $\partial_\theta \hat{\psi}_T^S$ uniformly in $\theta \in \Theta$.

Part iii. CLT for $\sqrt{TS}\left(\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)]\right)$
In part i., it was shown that $\mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS}] - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)] = o_p(1/\sqrt{TS})$. Then, the bounded fourth moment in Assumption 5 ii., the mixing condition i. and the variance condition vi. imply that the CLT for heterogeneous dependent arrays (White, 1984, Theorem 5.20) can be applied and:

$$\sqrt{TS}\left(\hat{\psi}_n^S(\theta_0) - \mathbb{E}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS}]\right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, V),$$

where $V = \lim_{T\to\infty} T \times \text{var}[\hat{\psi}_T^S(\theta_0)|u_1, \ldots, u_{TS}]$. This concludes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 5. Given the assumptions, Lemma A3 applies and the proof proceed as in Proposition 1. This concludes the proof. □