

Testing the Root-N Asymptotic Normality for the GMM and M Estimators

Yuya Sasaki* and Yulong Wang†

Abstract

Common approaches to statistical inference for structural and reduced-form parameters in empirical economic analysis are based on the root-n asymptotic normality of the GMM and M estimators. The canonical root-n asymptotic normality for these classes of the estimators requires at least the second moment of the score to be bounded. In this article, we present a method of testing this condition for the asymptotic normality of the GMM and M estimators. Our test has a uniform size control over the set of data generating processes compatible with the root-n asymptotic normality. Simulation studies support this theoretical result. Applying the proposed test to the market share data from the Dominick's Finer Foods retail chain, we find that a common *ad hoc* procedure to deal with zero market shares results in a failure of the root-n asymptotic normality.

Keywords: extreme value theory, GMM and M estimators, likelihood ratio test, root-n asymptotic normality

JEL-Code: C12

1 Introduction

Many estimators of interest in economic analysis are GMM or M estimators. They include, but are not limited to, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimators, the generalized least squares

*Associate professor of economics, Vanderbilt University. Email: yuya.sasaki@vanderbilt.edu

†Assistant professor of economics, Syracuse University. Email: ywang402@maxwell.syr.edu.

(GLS) estimators, the quasi maximum likelihood estimators (QMLE), and the two stage least squares (TSLS) estimators. Under random sampling, the root-n asymptotic normality of these estimators is usually established via Lindeberg-Lévy Central Limit Theorem (CLT), which requires a bounded second moment of the score. Under non-identical distributions, versions of the relevant CLTs require even stronger conditions, such as Lindeberg's condition and Lyapunov's condition, e.g., a norm of the score has a bounded $(2 + \delta)$ -th moment for some $\delta > 0$. These conditions are usually taken for granted by the authors of empirical economics papers that report standard errors, report confidence interval, and/or conduct hypothesis testing based on the limit normal distribution.

However, this assumption is not necessarily plausibly satisfied in applications. There are two possible scenarios in which the score may not have a bounded second moment. First, some dependent variables (e.g., infant birth weight¹ and murder rate² as well as wealth and stock returns) are reported to exhibit heavy tailed distributions. Second, suppose that a dependent variable is the logarithm of a variable, as is the case with market share data for example. Rich data sets contain information about many products, and the large number of products makes it more likely to contain some products with infinitesimal market shares. These infinitesimal market shares translate into absolutely large values in the logarithm, thus enlarging tails of the distribution of the residuals. The lack of the second moment in either of these raw or transformed dependent variables usually entails unbounded second moments of the score.

In doubt about the assumption of the bounded second moment of the score in certain applications, we naturally desire to acquire a method of testing this assumption for the root-n asymptotic normality. This article is motivated by this objective, and we therefore propose a method of testing this assumption. With our proposed test, researchers can assess whether the condition for the root-n asymptotic normality is satisfied for past and future empirical studies. In the event that the test supports the root-n asymptotic normality for a selected study, the test result will reinforce the credibility of the inference results reported by that study. On the other hand, in the event that the test fails to support the root-n asymptotic normality for a

¹See Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2011, Section 6.2) for example.

²See Gandhi, Lu, and Shi (2017, Appendix A) for example.

selected study, researchers would like to substitute robust inference methods that do not rely on the root-n asymptotic normality – see the related literature ahead. In this way, our proposed method of testing the root-n asymptotic normality is expected to contribute to enhancing the credibility of empirical economic studies.

Our proposed method is based on the Extreme Value (EV) Theory, and works in the following simple manner. First, sort the square norm of the estimated score in descending order. Second, pick the largest k of these order statistics and self-normalize them. We show that these self-normalized statistics asymptotically follow a known joint distribution up to the unknown tail index. A sub-unit (respectively, super-unit) value of this tail index indicates a bounded (respectively, unbounded) square norm of the score. Lastly, using these dichotomous characteristics, we construct a likelihood ratio test based on the limit joint distribution of the self-normalized statistics. We establish a uniform size control of the proposed test over the set of data generating processes with bounded squared moments of the scores. This uniformity property of the test is attractive since researchers do not *ex ante* know the true distribution of the norm of the score.

Simulation studies support the theoretical result of the uniform size control property. Applying the proposed method of testing to the widely used market share data from Dominick’s Finer Foods retail chain, we find that the common *ad hoc* treatment of zero market shares by adding an infinitesimal positive value results in a failure of the root-n asymptotic normality.

Relation to the Literature: We are not aware of any existing paper that develops a test of the bounded moment condition for the root-n asymptotic normality for GMM and M estimators, as we do in this paper. A different but related topic is a set of tools to test non- and weak-identification (e.g., Wright, 2003; Stock and Yogo, 2005; Inoue and Rossi, 2011; Sanderson and Windmeijer, 2016). These are related to our framework on one hand because non- and weak-identification also results in a failure of the canonical root-n asymptotic normality, and therefore these testing methods serve for a related objective. On the other hand, these are different from our framework because the non- and weak-identification concerns about non- and weak-invertibility of the expected gradient of the score,³ whereas the issue of our concern

³For general matrix rank tests, see e.g., Gill and Lewbel (1992); Cragg and Donald (1996, 1997); Robin and

is instead about the boundedness of moments of the score as the condition for the CLTs. In this sense, the purposes of our method of test are different from those of the preceding methods of tests of non- and weak-identification, while they indeed play complementary roles.

Also related is the paper by Shao, Yu, and Yu (2001) that proposes a test of bounded variance. On one hand, our test is also based on the test of bounded second moments, similarly to Shao, Yu, and Yu (2001). On the other hand, our objective of testing the asymptotic normality for the GMM and M estimators requires to take into account that the score is not directly observed in data, but has to be estimated via the GMM or M estimation. With these similarities and differences, our proposed method also contributes to this existing literature on testing bounded moments by allowing for generated data.

For scalar locations and single equation models, an unbounded second moment of the score of the OLS is often imputed to outliers. Recognizing this issue, Edgeworth (1887) proposes to use the absolute loss instead of the square loss for robust estimation of the equation parameters. This idea later extends and generalizes to other robust methods based on the check losses (Koenker and Bassett Jr, 1978) and the Huber loss (Huber, 1992). While we propose a test of bounded second moment of a norm of the score for the root-n asymptotic normality of GMM and M estimators in general, there are existing papers that establish limit distribution theories (which are not necessarily root-n or normal) without requiring the bounded second moment condition in these frameworks (e.g., Davis and Resnick, 1985, 1986; Davis, Knight, and Liu, 1992; Hill and Prokhorov, 2016). In the event where our test fails to support the bounded second moment condition, a researcher can resort to one of these alternative robust methods instead of relying on the standard methods of inference based on the root-n asymptotic normality.

We in particular highlight the cases of market share data and trade data as motivating examples, where the dependent variable in linear models is often defined as the logarithm of a variable that may occasionally take infinitesimal values. Our concern is about these infinitesimal values making their logarithms absolutely large, and therefore failing a bounded second moment of the score as the condition for the root-n asymptotic normality. Very closely related to this idea are topics on the logarithms of exact zeros. There exist robust procedures to deal with

Smith (2000); Kleibergen and Paap (2006).

the logarithms of exact zeros, such as Santos Silva and Tenreyro (2006) for analysis of trade data and Gandhi, Lu, and Shi (2017) for analysis of market share data. Researchers sometimes trim observations with exact zeros, but the root- n asymptotic normality may still fail even after the trimming if the score has an unbounded second moment with respect to the trimmed distribution. Researchers also sometimes add infinitesimal positive values to zeros in order to avoid the logarithm of zero, but this practice may also entail unbounded second moments of the score – see our empirical application in Section 6. In the event where our test fails to support the bounded second moment condition with respect to these artificially modified distributions, a researcher can resort to the robust methods cited above.

Our method is based on recent developments in the extreme value theory. We refer readers to De Haan and Ferreira (2006) for a very comprehensive review of this subject. In particular, our inference approach is based on fixed- k asymptotics, and takes advantage of and extends the technique developed by Müller and Wang (2017). The fixed- k approach is useful in practice, because the asymptotic size control is valid for any predetermined fixed number k , unlike traditional increasing- k approaches that require a sequence of changing tuning parameters as the sample size grows for which a sensible choice rule is difficult to obtain in finite sample.

2 Econometric Frameworks and Objective

In this section, we introduce the general frameworks of the GMM and M estimators for which we propose the test of the root- n asymptotic normality. A couple of concrete empirical examples will follow the presentation of the general frameworks. After introducing a unifying notation for the key object across multiple econometric frameworks, we then state our objective based on the unifying notation.

2.1 GMM and M Estimators

M-Estimation: Consider the class of estimators defined by

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{Q}_n(\theta),$$

where the criterion function Q_n takes the form of $\hat{Q}_n(\theta) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta)$. Under regularity conditions for this class, the influence function representation takes the form of

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta \right) = -\hat{H}_n(\theta)^{-1} \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g'_i(\theta) + o_p(1)$$

where $\hat{H}_n(\theta) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n D_\theta^2 g_i(\theta)$ and $g'_i(\theta) = \nabla_\theta g_i(\theta)$. The asymptotic normality (via multivariate Lindeberg-Lévy CLT) requires $E \left[\|g'_i(\theta)\|^2 \right] < \infty$. Common examples include the following two classes of estimators:

1. (OLS) $g'_i(\theta) = X_i(Y_i - X_i^\top \theta) \Rightarrow A_i(\theta) = \|g'_i(\theta)\|^2 = (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)^\top X_i^\top X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)$
2. (QMLE) $g'_i(\theta) = \nabla_\theta \ell(Y_i, X_i; \theta) \Rightarrow A_i(\theta) = \|g'_i(\theta)\|^2 = \nabla_\theta \ell(Y_i, X_i; \theta)^\top \nabla_\theta \ell(Y_i, X_i; \theta)$

In this paper, we propose a test of the null hypothesis that $E[A_i(\theta)] < \infty$, the condition that is required for establishing the asymptotic normality of $\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta \right)$ via multivariate Lindeberg-Lévy CLT.

GMM: Next, consider the class of estimators defined by

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{Q}_n(\theta),$$

where the criterion function \hat{Q}_n takes the form of $\hat{Q}_n(\theta) = [n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta)]^\top \hat{W} [n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta)]$. Under regularity conditions for this class, the influence function representation takes the form of

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta \right) = - \left(\hat{G}_n(\hat{\theta})^\top \hat{W} \hat{G}_n(\hat{\theta}) \right)^{-1} \hat{G}_n(\hat{\theta})^\top \hat{W} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n g_i(\theta) + o_p(1)$$

where $\hat{G}_n(\theta) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \nabla_\theta g_i(\theta)$ and $\hat{W} \xrightarrow{p} W$. The asymptotic normality (via multivariate Lindeberg-Lévy CLT) requires $E \left[\|g_i(\theta)\|^2 \right] < \infty$. A common example is:

$$3 \text{ (2SLS) } g_i(\theta) = Z_i(Y_i - X_i^\top \theta) \Rightarrow A_i(\theta) = \|g_i(\theta)\|^2 = (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)^\top Z_i^\top Z_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)$$

Similar as the previous case, we propose a test of the null hypothesis that $E[A_i(\theta)] < \infty$, which is required for establishing the asymptotic normality of $\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta \right)$ via CLT.

2.2 Examples

In applications, $A_i(\theta)$ may not have a bounded moment in the presence of outliers in the dependent variable. This may occur, for example, when the dependent variable is the logarithm of a variable that occasionally takes infinitesimal values. Here are two concrete examples drawn from popular empirical frameworks.

Example 1 (Demand Analysis). *Demand estimation with market share data⁴ in the logit case is based on GMM with the moment function defined by*

$$g_{jt}(\theta) = Z_{jt} (\ln(S_{jt}) - \ln(S_{0t}) - P_{jt}\theta_1 - X_{it}^\top \theta_{-1}),$$

where j indexes products, t indexes markets, S_{jt} denotes the share of product j in market t , P_{jt} denotes the price, X_{jt} denotes product characteristics, and Z_{jt} denotes instruments. In this case,

$$A_{jt}(\theta) = (\ln(S_{jt}) - \ln(S_{0t}) - P_{jt}\theta_1 - X_{it}^\top \theta_{-1})^\top Z_{jt}^\top Z_{jt} (\ln(S_{jt}) - \ln(S_{0t}) - P_{jt}\theta_1 - X_{it}^\top \theta_{-1})$$

may not have a bounded moment because there are in general many products with infinitesimal market shares S_{jt} , making $\ln(S_{jt})$ absolutely large. Furthermore, in the presence of zero market shares, there is a common ad hoc practice of replacing zero shares by infinitesimal shares in order to avoid the log of zeros, but only to artificially produce absolutely large dependent variables. Such a practice can also result in a failure of the root- n asymptotic normality – see our empirical applications in Section 6. In the event where one rejects the root- n asymptotic normality, a researcher can still resort to robust inference procedures (e.g., Gandhi, Lu, and Shi, 2017) specialized in this empirical framework. \triangle

Example 2 (Gravity Analysis). *Estimation of a log-linearized gravity model⁵ is based on panel*

⁴This framework is drawn from the literature on the estimation of demand for differentiated products (Berry, 1994; Berry, Levinsohn, and Pakes, 1995). See Ackerman, Benkard, Berry, and Pakes (2007) for a survey.

⁵This framework is drawn from the literature on gravity analysis. See Head and Mayer (2014) for a survey of this extensive subject. Among many other frameworks in this literature, we focus on the log-linearized gravity model to highlight a part of its problem concerning zero trade flows.

GMM with the moment function defined by

$$g_{ijt}(\theta) = Z_{ijt} (\ln(Y_{ijt}) - X_{ijt}^\top \theta)$$

where i indexes origins, j indexes destinations, t indexes time, Y_{ijt} denotes bilateral trade volumes, X_{ijt} denotes bilateral observed characteristics, and Z_{ijt} denotes instruments. In this case,

$$A_{ijt}(\theta) = (\ln(Y_{ijt}) - X_{ijt}^\top \theta)^\top Z_{ijt}^\top Z_{ijt} (\ln(Y_{ijt}) - X_{ijt}^\top \theta)$$

may not have a bounded moment because there are in general many trade pairs with infinitesimal bilateral trade volumes Y_{ijt} , making $\ln(Y_{ijt})$ absolutely large. Furthermore, in the presence of zero trade volumes, there is a common ad hoc practice of replacing zero shares by infinitesimal numbers in order to avoid the log of zeros, but only to artificially produce absolutely large dependent variables. In the event where one rejects the root- n asymptotic normality, a researcher can still resort to robust approaches (e.g., Santos Silva and Tenreyro, 2006) specialized in this empirical framework. \triangle

2.3 Objective

We thus far introduced general econometric frameworks with a unifying notation for the key object, namely the square norm of the score denoted by $A(\theta)$. Uniformly across the multiple frameworks, our objective is thus to test the null hypothesis that $A(\theta)$ has a bounded moment, as the condition for the root- n asymptotic normality of the relevant estimator. The next section presents our proposed method to this end.

3 The Test

We first provide an informal overview of the procedure of our proposed test. Formal theoretical justifications for why this method works will be presented in Section 4.

Our test is a likelihood ratio test with a likelihood function that describes the tail behavior of the distribution of $A(\theta)$. Since θ is unknown in general, we use its consistent estimator of

θ , denoted by $\hat{\theta}$. Let $A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}) \geq A_{(2)}(\hat{\theta}) \geq \dots \geq A_{(n)}(\hat{\theta})$ denote the order statistics by sorting $\{A_i(\hat{\theta})\}_{i=1}^n$ in the descending order. For a pre-determined integer $k \geq 3$, collect the k -order statistics as

$$\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta}) = [A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}), A_{(2)}(\hat{\theta}), \dots, A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta})]^\top.$$

Then, construct the self-normalized statistics

$$\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}) = \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta})}{A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta})} \right)^\top.$$

Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be a small positive constant. We require $\varepsilon > 0$ in theory, but one can let $\varepsilon = 0$ practically. (In our simulations and empirical application, we use $\varepsilon = 0.01$.) Our proposed test rejects the null hypothesis that $A_i(\theta)$ has a bounded moment if

$$\frac{\int_{1-\varepsilon}^2 f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}); \xi) dW(\xi)}{\int_0^{1-\varepsilon} f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}); \xi) d\Lambda(\xi)} > 1,$$

where

$$f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{v}^*; \xi) = \Gamma(k) \int_0^\infty s^{k-2} \exp\left((-1 - 1/\xi) \sum_{i=1}^k \log(1 + \xi v_i^* s)\right) ds, \quad (3.1)$$

$W(\cdot)$ denotes a weight chosen to reflect the importance of rejecting different alternatives, and $\Lambda(\cdot)$ is some pre-determined weight that is computed using the algorithm by Elliott, Müller, and Watson (2015) – see Appendix B.

Figure 1 plots oracle rejection probabilities of the test with \mathbf{V}^* generated from the joint extreme value distribution (3.1) and the nominal size of 0.05. The plots are based on simulations with 10000 iterations. (Full-blown Monte Carlo simulation studies with concrete econometric models will be conducted and presented in Section 5.) Observe that the rejection probabilities for $\xi \in [0, 1)$ are uniformly dominated by the nominal size, 0.05. In other words, the test has the uniform size control property. This uniformity property is useful in practice, because researchers do not *ex ante* know the true value of ξ in models of their interest. The following section formally presents the formal asymptotic theory to guarantee this important property of the test.




Figure 1: Rejection probabilities of the test with \mathbf{V}^* generated from the joint extreme value distribution (3.1) and the nominal size of 0.05. The plots are based on numerical simulations with 10000 iterations.

4 Asymptotic Theory

In this section, we present a formal theory to guarantee that our proposed test works in large samples. To this end, we introduce some notations and definitions.

Denote by D_i the i -th observation so that we can write $A_i(\theta) = A(\theta; D_i)$. For example, $D_i = (X_i^\top, Y_i)^\top$ in the context of the OLS, and $D_i = (X_i^\top, Z_i^\top, Y_i)^\top$ in the context of the 2SLS. Let $F_{A(\theta)}$ denote the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of $A_i(\theta)$ and θ_0 denote the (pseudo-) true value of θ . Let $B_{\eta_n}(\theta_0)$ denote an open ball centered at θ_0 with radius $\eta_n \rightarrow 0$. Let $f_{A(\theta_0)}$ and $Q_{A(\theta_0)}$ be the probability density function (PDF) and quantile function of $A_i(\theta_0)$, respectively.

We say that a distribution F is within the domain of attraction of the extreme value distribution, denoted by $F \in \mathcal{D}(\xi)$, if there exist sequences of constants a_n and b_n such that for every v ,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} F(a_n v + b_n) = G_\xi(v),$$

where

$$G_\xi(v) = \begin{cases} \exp(-(1 + \xi v)^{-1/\xi}) & 1 + \xi v > 0, \xi \neq 0 \\ \exp(-e^{-v}) & v \in \mathbb{R}, \xi = 0. \end{cases}$$

This condition characterizes the tail shape of the underlying distribution, which is mild and satisfied by many commonly used distributions. In particular, the case with a positive ξ covers the distributions with a regularly varying tail, including Pareto, Student-t, and F distributions. The case with $\xi = 0$ covers the thin tailed distributions, such as the Gaussian family. The case with a negative ξ covers the distribution with a bounded right end-point, such as the uniform distribution. See De Haan and Ferreira (2006, Ch. 1) for a review. With these notations and definitions, we impose the following regularity conditions.

Condition 1. *The following conditions are satisfied.*

(i) D_i is i.i.d.

(ii) $F_{A(\theta_0)} \in \mathcal{D}(\xi)$ with $\xi \geq 0$ and $Q_{A(\theta_0)}(1) = \infty$.

(iii) $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = o_p(1)$. If $\xi > 0$, then $\sup_i \sup_{\theta \in B_{\eta_n}(\theta_0)} \left\| \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\| = O_p(n^\xi)$. If $\xi = 0$, then $\sup_i \sup_{\theta \in B_{\eta_n}(\theta_0)} \left\| \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\| = O_p(n f_{A(\theta_0)}(Q_{A(\theta_0)}(1 - 1/n)))$.

Condition 1 (i) requires random sampling. Condition 1 (ii) requires that the distribution of $A(\theta_0)$ falls in the domain of attraction of the extreme value distribution, and that it has an unbounded support.⁶ The first part of Condition 1 (iii) requires that $\hat{\theta}$ is consistent for θ_0 . Note that this in general only requires the identification and bounded first moments of the score. The second part of Condition 1 (iii) requires that the gradient of $A_i(\theta)$ grows not too fast. Since the last piece of the condition is a high-level statement, it will be useful to consider stronger lower level conditions in a specific example. Since we focus on the case of the GMM in our application, we do so in the context of the GMM.

Discussion of Condition 1 (iii) – Case of GMM: Recall that we defined $A_i(\theta) = (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)^\top Z_i^\top Z_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} &= -2X_i Z_i^\top Z_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \theta) \\ &= -2X_i Z_i^\top Z_i u_i + 2X_i Z_i^\top Z_i X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta). \end{aligned}$$

The triangle inequality and Cauchy-Schwartz inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_i \sup_{\theta \in B_{\eta}(\theta_0)} \left\| \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\| &\leq 2 \sup_i \|X_i Z_i^\top Z_i u_i\| + 2 \sup_i \|X_i Z_i^\top Z_i X_i^\top\| \cdot \sup_{\theta \in B_{\eta_n}(\theta_0)} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_i \|X_i Z_i^\top\| \left(\sup_i \|A_i(\theta_0)\| \right)^{1/2} + 2 \left(\sup_i \|X_i Z_i^\top\| \right)^2 \cdot \sup_{\theta \in B_{\eta_n}(\theta_0)} \|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|. \quad (4.1) \end{aligned}$$

Condition 1 (ii) implies that $\sup_i \|A_i(\theta_0)\| \rightarrow \infty$ so that $(\sup_i \|A_i(\theta_0)\|)^{1/2}$ is of a smaller order than $\sup_i \|A_i(\theta_0)\|$. Therefore, a sufficient condition for Condition 1 (iii) is that $\sup_i \|X_i Z_i^\top\|$ is of a smaller order than $(\sup_i \|A_i(\theta_0)\|)^{1/2}$. An even stronger sufficient condition for this sufficient condition is that X_i and Z_i have bounded supports, which is satisfied by the typical applications in the demand analysis, in particular the one that we consider in our empirical application in Section 6. \square

⁶The boundedness of $E[A_i(\theta_0)]$ is trivially satisfied if ξ is negative.

Since A_i is non-negative, whether its moment is bounded is fully determined by its right tail behavior. Given Condition 1 (ii), the boundedness of the r -th moment of A_i is equivalent to the condition that ξ is less than $1/r$ (cf. De Haan and Ferreira, 2006, Ch. 5.3.1). Therefore, the two competing hypotheses for which we propose a test can be written as

$$H_0 : \xi_{\theta_0} \in [0, 1 - \varepsilon] \text{ against } H_1 : \xi_{\theta_0} \in (1 - \varepsilon, 2) \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0. \quad (4.2)$$

Now, recall the following notations from Section 3. Let $A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}) \geq A_{(2)}(\hat{\theta}) \geq \dots \geq A_{(n)}(\hat{\theta})$ denote the order statistics by sorting $\{A_i(\hat{\theta})\}_{i=1}^n$ in the descending order, and

$$\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta}) = \left[A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}), A_{(2)}(\hat{\theta}), \dots, A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta}) \right]^\top.$$

The following lemma shows that these order statistics asymptotically follows the joint extreme value distribution.

Lemma 1. *Under Condition 1, there exist sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ of constants depending on $F_{A(\theta_0)}$ such that, for any fixed k ,*

$$\frac{\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta}) - b_n}{a_n} \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{V} \equiv (V_1, \dots, V_k)^\top,$$

where \mathbf{V} is jointly distributed with the density given by $f_{\mathbf{V}|\xi}(v_1, \dots, v_k) = G_\xi(v_k) \prod_{i=1}^k g_\xi(v_i)/G_\xi(v_i)$ on $v_k \leq v_{k-1} \leq \dots \leq v_1$, and $g_\xi(v) = dG_\xi(v)/dv$.

A proof is provided in Appendix A.1.

Since a_n and b_n are unknown, we would like to eliminate them in constructing feasible test statistics. We do so by the self-normalized statistic

$$\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}) = \left(\frac{\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta})}{A_{(1)}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{(k)}(\hat{\theta})} \right)^\top.$$

By the continuous mapping theorem, change of variables, and Lemma 1, we have

$$\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{V}^* \equiv \left(\frac{\mathbf{V} - V_k}{V_1 - V_k} \right)^\top,$$

where the density function $f_{\mathbf{V}^*}$ of the limit \mathbf{V}^* is given by

$$f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{v}^*; \xi) = \Gamma(k) \int_0^\infty s^{k-2} \exp\left((-1 - 1/\xi) \sum_{i=1}^k \log(1 + \xi v_i^* s)\right) ds. \quad (4.3)$$

With this density function, we construct the likelihood ratio test

$$\varphi(\mathbf{V}^*) = \mathbf{1} \left[\frac{\int_{1-\varepsilon}^2 f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{V}^*; \xi) dW(\xi)}{\int_0^{1-\varepsilon} f_{\mathbf{V}^*}(\mathbf{V}^*; \xi) d\Lambda(\xi)} > 1 \right], \quad (4.4)$$

where $W(\cdot)$ denotes a weight chosen to reflect the importance of rejecting different alternatives and $\Lambda(\cdot)$ is some pre-determined weight that is computed using the algorithm by Elliott, Müller, and Watson (2015) – see Appendix B for details. The following theorem establishes the asymptotic uniform size control of our test (4.4), which is the main theoretical result of this article.

Theorem 1. *Suppose Condition 1 holds. For any fixed k ,*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\xi \in [0, 1-\varepsilon]} \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[\varphi \left(\mathbf{A}^* \left(\hat{\theta} \right) \right) \right] \leq \alpha.$$

A proof is provided in Appendix A.2.

5 Simulation Studies

Using Monte Carlo simulations, we demonstrate that the proposed test has the claimed uniform size control property. We consider two of the most popular econometric models, namely the linear regression model and the linear IV model, for data generating designs.

First, consider the linear regression model:

$$Y_i = \theta_0 + \theta_1 X_i + U_i$$

where $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1)^\top = (1, 1)^\top$. The independent variable is generated according to $X_i \sim N(0, 1)$. The error U_i is generated according to the zero symmetric Pareto distribution with tail index $\xi/2$, independently from X_i^\top . We vary ξ across sets of simulations. The test is based on

the score in squared norm: $A_i(\theta) = (1 + X_i^2) \cdot (Y_i - \theta_0 - \theta_1 X_i)^2$. Since we do not know θ , we replace θ by the OLS $\hat{\theta}$. We thus use k order statistics of

$$A_i(\hat{\theta}) = (1 + X_i^2) \cdot (Y_i - \hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\theta}_1 X_i)^2$$

to construct our test, following the procedure outlined in Section 3.

Second, consider the linear IV model:

$$Y_i = \theta_0 + \theta_1 X_i + U_i + V_i$$

$$X_i = \pi_0 + \pi_1 Z_i + W_i$$

where $\theta = (\theta_0, \theta_1)^\top = (1, 1)^\top$ and $\pi = (\pi_0, \pi_1)^\top = (1, 1)^\top$. The instrument is generated according to $Z_i \sim N(0, 1)$ independently of the tri-variate error components $(U_i, V_i, W_i)^\top$. The heavy-tailed part of the error U_i is generated according to the zero symmetric Pareto distribution with tail index $\xi/2$, independently from $(V_i, W_i)^\top$. We vary ξ across sets of simulations. The endogenous part of the error components $(V_i, W_i)^\top$ is generated according to $(V_i, W_i)^\top \sim N(\vec{0}, \Sigma)$ where $\Sigma = (1, 0.5; 0.5, 1)$. The test is based on the score in squared norm: $A_i(\theta) = (1 + Z_i^2) \cdot (Y_i - \theta_0 - \theta_1 X_i)^2$. Since we do not know θ , we replace θ by the IV estimator $\hat{\theta}$. We thus use k order statistics of

$$A_i(\hat{\theta}) = (1 + Z_i^2) \cdot (Y_i - \hat{\theta}_0 - \hat{\theta}_1 X_i)^2$$

to construct our test, following the procedure outlined in Section 3.

For both of the linear regression model and the linear IV model introduced above, we experiment with sample sizes of $n = 10^4$, 10^5 and 10^6 , which are similar to the sample size that we actually encounter in our empirical application in Section 6. We also experiment with the tail index values of $\xi/2 = 0.09, 0.19, 0.29, 0.39, 0.49, 0.59, 0.69, 0.79, 0.89$ and 0.99 . Note that $\xi/2 \in \{0.09, 0.19, 0.29, 0.39, 0.49\}$ satisfy the condition for the asymptotic normality, but $\xi/2 \in \{0.59, 0.69, 0.79, 0.89, 0.99\}$ fail to satisfy it. We also experiment with various numbers $k = 50, 100$, and 200 of order statistics for construction of the test. Each set of simulations consists of 5000 Monte Carlo iterations.

Tables 1 and 2 show Monte Carlo simulation results for the linear regression model and the linear IV model, respectively. In both of the two tables, we can see that the simulated rejection

probabilities are dominated by the nominal size 0.05 for all of $\xi/2 \in \{0.09, 0.19, 0.29, 0.39\}$ in the null region, and those are approximately the same as the nominal size 0.05 near the boundary, i.e., $\xi/2 = 0.49$, of the null region. These results support the uniform size control property of the test that is established in Theorem 1 as the main result of this paper. The asymptotic normality holds for any of $\xi/2 < 0.5$, but a researcher does not know which exact value $\xi/2$ takes for a specific application even under the consideration of the null hypothesis. For this reason, this uniform size control property is important.

6 Application to Demand Estimation

In this section, we present an empirical application of our proposed test procedure. Recall the demand estimation framework introduced in Example 1. The dependent variable is defined by the logarithm of the market share of a product relative to that of an outside product. In rich data sets, we often encounter zero empirical market shares. Since the logarithm of zero is undefined, empirical practitioners often use *ad hoc* procedures to deal with observations with zero market share. One common way is to simply remove observations with zero empirical market shares. Another common way is to replace zeros with a small positive value. Both of these two *ad hoc* treatments result in biased estimates in general, as demonstrated through Monte Carlo simulation studies by Gandhi, Lu, and Shi (2017). In implementing the second approach, empirical researchers often substitute infinitesimal positive values Δ for zeros, perhaps in efforts to mitigate such biases. In this paper, we show that substitution of infinitesimal positive values Δ may in fact result in a failure of the root-n asymptotic normality, in addition to biased estimates.

Following preceding papers on market analysis, we use scanner data from the Dominick's Finer Foods (DFF) retail chain.⁷ The unit of observation is defined by the product of UPC (universal product code), store, and week. Our analysis, as described below, follows that of Gandhi, Lu, and Shi (2017). We focus on the product category of canned tuna. Empirical

⁷We thank James M. Kilts Center, University of Chicago Booth School of Business for allowing us to use this data set. It is available at <https://www.chicagobooth.edu/research/kilts/datasets/dominicks>.

| $\xi/2$ | $n = 10^4$ | | | $n = 10^5$ | | | $n = 10^6$ | | |
|---------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|
| | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ |
| 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.49 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| 0.59 | 0.19 | 0.27 | 0.47 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.41 | 0.17 | 0.24 | 0.39 |
| 0.69 | 0.44 | 0.59 | 0.81 | 0.43 | 0.59 | 0.78 | 0.43 | 0.58 | 0.77 |
| 0.79 | 0.60 | 0.85 | 0.98 | 0.60 | 0.84 | 0.98 | 0.60 | 0.83 | 0.98 |
| 0.89 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.99 | 1.00 |

Table 1: Rejection probabilities of the test (4.4) for the linear regression model. The results are based on 5000 simulation draws. The significance level is 0.05.

| $\xi/2$ | $n = 10^4$ | | | $n = 10^5$ | | | $n = 10^6$ | | |
|---------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|------------|---------|---------|
| | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ | $k=50$ | $k=100$ | $k=200$ |
| 0.09 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.29 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 0.49 | 0.07 | 0.06 | 0.06 | 0.07 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.03 |
| 0.59 | 0.18 | 0.29 | 0.48 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.41 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.39 |
| 0.69 | 0.44 | 0.61 | 0.81 | 0.43 | 0.60 | 0.79 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 0.77 |
| 0.79 | 0.61 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.59 | 0.83 | 0.98 | 0.60 | 0.82 | 0.98 |
| 0.89 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.81 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.80 | 0.95 | 1.00 |
| 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.88 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.99 | 1.00 |

Table 2: Rejection probabilities of the test (4.4) for the linear IV model. The results are based on 5000 simulation draws. The significance level is 0.05.

market shares are constructed by using quantity sales and the number of customers who visited the store in the week. Control variables include the price, UPC fixed effects and a time trend. We instrument the possibly endogenous prices by the whole sale costs by inverting the gross margin.

The number of observations is approximately 10^6 . This feature of the data allows us to use a reasonably large number k of order statistics to enhance the power of our proposed test. Among this large number of observations, approximately 44% of the observations are recorded to have the zero empirical market share. The smallest non-zero empirical market share is approximately 10^{-5} . Therefore, it is sensible to replace the zero empirical market share by an infinitesimal positive number Δ that is no larger than 10^{-5} . In our analysis, therefore, we consider the following numbers to replace zero: $\Delta = 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}, \dots, 10^{-19}, 10^{-20}$.

Table 3 summarizes p-values of the test. For the sake of transparency, we show results for various numbers of k that are as small as 50. Before discussing these results, first note that small numbers k of order statistics in general entail short power. Note also that the number $k = 100$ corresponds to only 0.01 percent of the whole sample. However, observe in the simulation results reported in Table 3 that, even for a small k as $k \gtrapprox 65$, we can start to reject the null hypothesis. In other words, we reject the root-n asymptotic normality of the demand estimator that is based on the *ad hoc* practice of replacing the zero empirical market share by any of the infinitesimal positive values $\Delta = 10^{-5}, 10^{-6}, \dots, 10^{-19}, 10^{-20}$.

We conclude this section by discussing the implications of our test results and practical suggestions in light of them. Rich market share data often include zero empirical market shares. Since the logarithm of zero is undefined, empirical researchers often employ the *ad hoc* practice of replacing the zero by an infinitesimal positive value Δ . This practice has been already known to incur biased estimates (see Gandhi, Lu, and Shi, 2017), but can also result in a failure of the root-n asymptotic normality in addition. As such, both the point estimates and their standard errors may be incredible. Empirical researchers may, therefore, want to resort to alternative methods that are robust against zero market shares, such as the method proposed by Gandhi, Lu, and Shi (2017).

| Δ | $k=50$ | $k=55$ | $k=60$ | $k=65$ | $k=70$ | $k=100$ |
|------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| 10^{-5} | 0.96 | 0.79 | 0.46 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-6} | 0.98 | 0.83 | 0.30 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-7} | 0.98 | 0.81 | 0.24 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-8} | 0.98 | 0.79 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-9} | 0.98 | 0.77 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-10} | 0.98 | 0.76 | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-11} | 0.98 | 0.76 | 0.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-12} | 0.98 | 0.76 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-13} | 0.98 | 0.76 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-14} | 0.98 | 0.76 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-15} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-16} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-17} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-18} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-19} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.12 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 10^{-20} | 0.98 | 0.75 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

Table 3: P-values of the test (4.4) with the market share data from DFF for the product category of canned tuna data, where zero empirical market shares are replaced by $\Delta = 10^{-5}$, 10^{-6} , ..., 10^{-19} , 10^{-20} .

7 Summary and Discussions

Many empirical studies in economics rely on the GMM and M estimators including, but not limited to, the OLS, GLS, QMLE, and TSLS. Furthermore, they usually rely on the root-n asymptotic normality of these estimators when drawing scientific conclusions via statistical inference. Although the condition for the root-n asymptotic normality is usually taken for granted as such, it may not be always plausibly satisfied. In this light, this paper proposes a method of testing the hypothesis of a bounded second moment of scores, which serves as the main condition of the root-n asymptotic normality.

There are two desired properties of our proposed test in practice. First, unlike other approaches in the extreme value theory that require a sequence of tuning parameter values that change as the sample size grows, our test is valid for any predetermined fixed number k of order statistics to be used to construct the test. This is a useful property in practice because it relieves researchers from worrying about a ‘valid’ data driven choice of tuning parameters for the purpose of size control. Second, our test has the uniform size control property over the set of data generating processes for which the asymptotic normality holds. This uniform size control property is useful in practice, because researchers usually do not *ex ante* know the true tail index ξ . Monte Carlo simulation studies indeed support this theoretical property for two of the most commonly used econometric frameworks, namely the linear regression model and the linear IV model.

A failure of the root-n asymptotic normality may be caused by the following two cases among others. First, some dependent variables (e.g., wealth, infant birth weight, murder rate) are reported to exhibit heavy tailed distributions, and they can induce unbounded second moments of the score of an estimator. Second, when a dependent variable is the logarithm of a variable, infinitesimal values of this variable translate into absolutely large logarithmic values, and they can induce unbounded second moments of the score of an estimator. In our empirical application, we highlighted the second case, where infinitesimal values are artificially introduced through a commonly employed *ad hoc* procedure to circumvent the issue of zero empirical market shares in demand analysis. Using scanner data from the Dominick’s Finer

Foods (DFF) retail chain, we reject the root-n asymptotic normality for demand estimators with such an *ad hoc* practice.

Finally, we conclude this paper by remarking that the test can be used to enhance the quality and credibility of past and future empirical studies. On one hand, if our test supports the root-n asymptotic normality for a selected empirical work, then the test result reinforces the credibility of scientific conclusions reported by that work. On the other hand, if our test fails to support the root-n asymptotic normality for a selected empirical work, a researcher may want to consider one of the alternative robust approaches for more credible empirical research.

Appendix

The appendix consists of two sections. Appendix A contains proofs of the main results, namely Lemma 1 and Theorem 1. Appendix B contains additional computational details to implement the test.

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof of Lemma 1 First, By the EV theory, Condition 1.1 (D_i is i.i.d.) and Condition 1.2 ($F_{A(\theta_0)} \in \mathcal{D}(\xi)$) imply

$$\left(\frac{\mathbf{A}(\theta_0) - b_n}{a_n} \right)^\top \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{V}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where \mathbf{V} is jointly EV distributed with tail index ξ . By Corollary 1.2.4 and Remark 1.2.7 in de Haan and Ferreira (2007), the constants a_n and b_n can be chosen as follows. If $\xi > 0$, we choose $a_n = Q_{A(\theta_0)}(1 - 1/n)$ and $b_n = 0$. If $\xi = 0$, we choose $a_n = 1/(nf_{A(\theta_0)}(b_n))$ and $b_n = Q_{A(\theta_0)}(1 - 1/n)$. By construction, these constants satisfy that $1 - F_{A(\theta_0)}(a_n y + b_n) = O(n^{-1})$ for every $y > 0$ in both of the cases.

Now, let $I = (I_1, \dots, I_k) \in \{1, \dots, T\}^k$ be the k random indices such that $A_{(j)}(\theta_0) = A_{I_j}(\theta_0)$, $j = 1, \dots, k$, and let \hat{I} be the corresponding indices such that $A_{(j)}(\hat{\theta}) = A_{\hat{I}_j}(\hat{\theta})$.

Then, the convergence of $\mathbf{A}(\hat{\theta})$ follows from (A.1) once we establish $|A_{\hat{I}_j}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{I_j}(\theta_0)| = o_p(a_n)$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$. We present the case of $k = 1$, but the argument for a general k is similar. Denote $\varepsilon_i \equiv A_i(\hat{\theta}) - A_i(\theta_0)$.

First, consider the case with $\xi > 0$. The part of Condition 2.3 for the case of $\xi > 0$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_i |\varepsilon_i| &= \sup_i |A_i(\hat{\theta}) - A_i(\theta_0)| \\ &\leq \sup_i \sup_{\theta \in B_\eta(\theta_0)} \left\| \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\| \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\| \\ &= o_p(a_n). \end{aligned}$$

Given this result, we have that, on one hand, $A_{\hat{I}}(\hat{\theta}) = \max_i \{A_i(\theta_0) + \varepsilon_i\} \leq A_I(\theta_0) + \sup_i |\varepsilon_i| = A_I(\theta_0) + o_p(a_n)$; and, on the other hand, $A_{\hat{I}}(\hat{\theta}) = \max_i \{A_i(\theta_0) + \varepsilon_i\} \geq \max_i \{A_i(\theta_0) + \min_i \{\varepsilon_i\}\} \geq A_I(\theta_0) + \min_i \{\varepsilon_i\} \geq \alpha_I - \sup_i |\varepsilon_i| = \alpha_I - o_p(a_n)$. Therefore, $|A_{\hat{I}_j}(\hat{\theta}) - A_{I_j}(\theta_0)| \leq o_p(a_n)$ holds.

Next, consider the case with $\xi = 0$. The part of Condition 2.3 for the case of $\xi_{\theta_0} = 0$ implies that $\sup_i \sup_{\theta \in B_\eta(\theta_0)} \left\| \frac{\partial A_i(\theta)}{\partial \theta} \right\| = O_p(a_n)$. The rest of the proof is identical to the case with $\xi > 0$. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1 By Lemma 1 and the continuous mapping theorem, we have $\mathbf{A}^*(\hat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{V}^*$. Write $\Lambda(\xi) = c\tilde{\Lambda}(\xi)$ for some constant $c > 0$ and $\tilde{\Lambda}(\xi)$ a positive measure on $[0, 1 - \varepsilon]$. Since the density $f_{\mathbf{V}^*}$ is continuous, $\mathbb{E}_\xi[\varphi(\mathbf{V}^*)]$ as a function of ξ and c is also continuous in both arguments for any given $\tilde{\Lambda}(\cdot)$. Therefore, we can choose a large enough c so that $\sup_{\xi \in [0, 1 - \varepsilon]} \mathbb{E}_\xi[\varphi(\mathbf{V}^*)] \leq \alpha$. \square

Remark 1. Since $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in the last part of the above proof can be arbitrary in theory, we provide an empirical guide for determining a nearly optimal $\tilde{\Lambda}$ in the following section.

B Additional Computational Details

This section provides computational details about constructing the test (4.4), which is based on the limiting observation \mathbf{V}^* . The density of \mathbf{V}^* is given by (3.1), which is computed by Gaussian Quadrature. To construct the test (4.4), we specify the weight W to be the uniform distribution for expositional simplicity. The weight W reflects the importance attached by the econometrician to different alternatives, which can be easily changed. Then, it remains to determine a suitable candidate for the weight Λ . We do this by the generic algorithm provided by Elliott, Müller, and Watson (2015).

To be specific, we use the same notation as in the proof of Theorem 1 and consider $\Lambda = c\tilde{\Lambda}$, where $\tilde{\Lambda}$ is some probability distribution function with support on $\Xi = [0, 0.99]$. Suppose that ξ is randomly drawn from $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and c satisfies that $\int P_\xi(\varphi(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)d\tilde{\Lambda}(\xi) = \alpha$, where we slightly abuse the notation so that the subscripts ξ and Λ emphasize that they determine the test. Denote the W -weighted average power as $P_\Lambda = \int_{(1-\varepsilon, 2)} P_\xi(\varphi_\Lambda(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)dW(\xi)$. Since the uniform size constraint for all $\xi \in \Xi$ implies the $\tilde{\Lambda}$ -weighted average size control for any probability distribution $\tilde{\Lambda}$ and $\varphi_{c\tilde{\Lambda}}$ maximizes the W -weighted average power by the Neyman-Pearson lemma, $V_{\tilde{\Lambda}}$ essentially provides an upper bound for the W -weighted average power among all tests φ that satisfy the uniform size constraint.

Now, suppose that we obtain some $\tilde{\Lambda}^*$ on Ξ and the constant c^* such that

$$P_\xi(\varphi_{c^*\tilde{\Lambda}^*}(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1) \leq \alpha \text{ for all } \xi \in \Xi, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and

$$\int_{(1-\varepsilon, 2)} P_\xi(\varphi_{c^*\tilde{\Lambda}^*}(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)dW(\xi) \geq (1 - \varepsilon)V_{\tilde{\Lambda}^*}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Then, the test $\varphi_{c^*\tilde{\Lambda}^*}$ will have a W -weighted average power no less than $100\varepsilon\%$ lower than any other test of the same level. We set $\varepsilon = 0.01$ for our test (4.4).

The idea of identifying a suitable choice of $\tilde{\Lambda}^*$ and c^* is as follows. First, we can discretize Ξ into a grid Ξ_a and determine $\tilde{\Lambda}$ accordingly as the point masses. Then we can simulate N random draws of \mathbf{V}^* from $\xi \in \Xi_a$ and estimate $P_\xi(\varphi_\Lambda(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)$ by sample fractions. By iteratively increasing or decreasing the point masses as a function of whether the estimated

$P_\xi(\varphi_\Lambda(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)$ is larger or smaller than the nominal level, we can always find a candidate $\tilde{\Lambda}^*$. Note that such $\tilde{\Lambda}^*$ always exists since we allow $P_\xi(\varphi_\Lambda(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1) < \alpha$ for some ξ . We determine c^* so that (B.2) is satisfied. The continuity of $f_{\mathbf{V}^*}$ entails that $P_\xi(\varphi_\Lambda(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)$ as a function of ξ is also continuous. Therefore, (B.1) is guaranteed as we consider $|\Xi_a| \rightarrow \infty$ and $N/|\Xi_a| \rightarrow \infty$, where $|\Xi_a|$ denotes the cardinality of Ξ_a .

In practice, we can determine the point masses by the following concrete steps.

Algorithm:

1. Simulate $N = 10,000$ i.i.d. random draws from some proposal density with ξ drawn uniformly from Ξ_a , which is an equally spaced grid on $[0, 0.99]$ with 50 points.
2. Start with $\tilde{\Lambda}_{(0)} = \{1/50, 1/50, \dots, 1/50\}$ and $c^* = 1$. Calculate the (estimated) coverage probabilities $P_{\xi_j}(\varphi_{c^* \tilde{\Lambda}_{(0)}}(\mathbf{V}^*) = 1)$ for every $\xi_j \in \Xi_a$ using importance sampling. Denote them by $P = (P_1, \dots, P_{50})'$.
3. Update Λ by setting $\Lambda_{(s+1)} = \Lambda_{(s)} + \eta_\Lambda(P - 0.05)$ with some step-length constant $\eta_\Lambda > 0$, so that the j -th point mass in Λ is increased/decreased if the coverage probability for ξ_j is larger/smaller than the nominal level.
4. Keep the integration for 500 times. Then, the resulting $\Lambda_{(500)}$ is a valid candidate.
5. Numerically check if $\varphi_{\Lambda_{(500)}}$ indeed controls the size uniformly by simulating the rejection probabilities over a much finer grid on Ξ . If not, go back to step 2 with a finer Ξ_a .

References

- ACKERBERG, D., C. L. BENKARD, S. BERRY, AND A. PAKES (2007): “Econometric tools for analyzing market outcomes,” *Handbook of Econometrics*, 6, 4171–4276.
- BERRY, S., J. LEVINSOHN, AND A. PAKES (1995): “Automobile prices in market equilibrium,” *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 841–890.

- BERRY, S. T. (1994): “Estimating discrete-choice models of product differentiation,” *The RAND Journal of Economics*, 242–262.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V. AND I. FERNÁNDEZ-VAL (2011): “Inference for extremal conditional quantile models, with an application to market and birthweight risks,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 78, 559–589.
- CRAGG, J. G. AND S. G. DONALD (1996): “On the asymptotic properties of LDU-based tests of the rank of a matrix,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91, 1301–1309.
- (1997): “Inferring the rank of a matrix,” *Journal of econometrics*, 76, 223–250.
- DAVIS, R. AND S. RESNICK (1985): “More limit theory for the sample correlation function of moving averages,” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 20, 257–279.
- (1986): “Limit theory for the sample covariance and correlation functions of moving averages,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 533–558.
- DAVIS, R. A., K. KNIGHT, AND J. LIU (1992): “M-estimation for autoregressions with infinite variance,” *Stochastic Processes and Their Applications*, 40, 145–180.
- DE HAAN, L. AND A. FERREIRA (2006): *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*, New York: Springer Science and Business Media.
- EDGEWORTH, F. Y. (1887): “On observations relating to several quantities,” *Hermathena*, 6, 279–285.
- ELLIOTT, G., U. K. MÜLLER, AND M. W. WATSON (2015): “Nearly optimal tests when a nuisance parameter is present under the null hypothesis,” *Econometrica*, 83, 771–811.
- GANDHI, A., Z. LU, AND X. SHI (2017): “Estimating demand for differentiated products with zeroes in market share data,” *Microsoft Research, SUFE, and UW-Madison*.
- GILL, L. AND A. LEWBEL (1992): “Testing the rank and definiteness of estimated matrices with applications to factor, state-space and ARMA models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87, 766–776.

- HEAD, K. AND T. MAYER (2014): “Gravity equations: Workhorse, toolkit, and cookbook,” in *Handbook of International Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 4, 131–195.
- HILL, J. B. AND A. PROKHOROV (2016): “GEL estimation for heavy-tailed GARCH models with robust empirical likelihood inference,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 190, 18–45.
- HUBER, P. J. (1992): “Robust estimation of a location parameter,” in *Breakthroughs in statistics*, Springer, 492–518.
- INOUE, A. AND B. ROSSI (2011): “Testing for weak identification in possibly nonlinear models,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 161, 246–261.
- KLEIBERGEN, F. AND R. PAAP (2006): “Generalized reduced rank tests using the singular value decomposition,” *Journal of econometrics*, 133, 97–126.
- KOENKER, R. AND G. BASSETT JR (1978): “Regression quantiles,” *Econometrica: journal of the Econometric Society*, 33–50.
- MÜLLER, U. K. AND Y. WANG (2017): “Fixed-k asymptotic inference about tail properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112, 1334–1343.
- ROBIN, J.-M. AND R. J. SMITH (2000): “Tests of rank,” *Econometric Theory*, 16, 151–175.
- SANDERSON, E. AND F. WINDMEIJER (2016): “A weak instrument F-test in linear IV models with multiple endogenous variables,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 190, 212–221.
- SANTOS SILVA, J. AND S. TENREYRO (2006): “The log of gravity,” *The Review of Economics and statistics*, 88, 641–658.
- SHAO, Q.-M., H. YU, AND J. YU (2001): “Do stock returns follow a finite variance distribution?” *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 2, 467.
- STOCK, J. H. AND M. YOGO (2005): “Testing for weak instruments in Linear Iv regression,” in *Identification and Inference for Econometric Models: Essays in Honor of Thomas Rothenberg*, Cambridge University Press, 80–108.

WRIGHT, J. H. (2003): “Detecting lack of identification in GMM,” *Econometric Theory*, 19, 322–330.