

IV Regression with Possibly Uncorrelated Instruments

Emmanuel Selorm Tsyawo*

March 2021

Abstract

This paper proposes a closed-form linear IV estimator which allows endogenous covariates to be weakly correlated or un-correlated but mean-dependent on instruments. Identification rests on (1) a weak uncorrelatedness exclusion restriction and (2) a weak relevance condition where covariates are mean-dependent on instruments. The significant weakening of the relevance condition does not come at the cost of a stronger exclusion restriction. The estimator is root- n -consistent and asymptotically normal. Monte Carlo simulations show the estimator exploits unknown forms of both monotone and non-monotone identifying variation equally well, and it incurs less bias and size distortion relative to conventional IV methods when instruments are weak. An empirical example illustrates the practical usefulness of the estimator.

Keywords: martingale difference divergence, mean dependence, weak instrument, endogeneity, U -statistics

JEL classification: C13, C14, C26

*Email: emmanuel.tsyawo@um6p.ma, FGSES, Mohammed VI Polytechnic University, Lot 660, Hay Moulay Rachid, Benguerir. 43150. Morocco.

1 Introduction

The problem of weak instruments adversely impacts identification and inference about structural parameters of interest. For example, weak instruments lead to biased estimates and large size distortions in hypothesis tests. While the literature on the detection and weak-instrument-robust inference is advanced, comparable progress on estimation is not realised (see Andrews, Stock, and Sun (2019) for a survey of the literature). This paper contributes a simple closed-form IV estimator to the literature. The proposed framework weakens the standard IV relevance condition of correlatedness and allows endogenous covariates to be weakly correlated or completely uncorrelated but mean-dependent on instruments. The weakened relevance condition is not achieved at the cost of an exclusion restriction stronger than the standard IV uncorrelatedness condition.

The Minimum Mean Dependence estimator (MMD hereafter) proposed in this paper minimises the dependence of the mean of a vector of errors on a set of instruments. The objective function is based on Shao and Zhang’s (2014) Martingale Difference Divergence measure (MDD hereafter). Thanks to this general notion of dependence, the MMD weakens the IV-relevance condition from correlatedness to mean dependence and thus expands the set of relevant IVs. This is useful in empirical practice because weakly correlated IVs may have strong but non-linear and non-monotone identifying variation. In addition to the weaker relevance condition of the MMD, a stronger exclusion restriction is not required. The MMD is a parsimonious estimator that does not, for example, need to explore several transformations (e.g., polynomials or splines) of a small set of elementary instruments in the hope of improving instrument strength.¹

The MMD is a linear IV estimator and thus shares its advantages; it has a closed-form expression, is computationally fast, and is amenable to estimation using available routines. In contrast to conventional IV methods, the MMD does not require modelling the first-stage

¹A simulation exercise in Appendix B demonstrates the MMD’s ability to, without any transformations, exploit identifying variation that stems uniquely from pairwise interactions of a set of elementary instruments.

relationship. The mean of endogenous covariates can be dependent on instruments in an arbitrary way that neither needs to be known nor specified. This feature renders the MMD robust to the sensitivity of second-stage estimates to possible (mis)-specification in the first-stage.² Moreover, the MDD is a scalar-valued measure of conditional mean dependence. The MMD estimator is thus an IV conditional moment estimator which is more suitable when economic theory, for example, prescribes conditional moment restrictions. The MMD, however, does not involve simplifications such as basing estimation on implied unconditional moments, (non-parametrically) estimating optimal moments (see, e.g., Chamberlain (1987), Chen, Chen, and Lewis (2020), Hansen and Kozbur (2014), and Carrasco (2012)), or deriving a scalar-valued minimand from (un)-conditional moment conditions (see, e.g., Honoré and Powell (1994) and Alan, Honoré, Hu, and Leth-Petersen (2014)). Identification holds under standard IV-type conditions, and the estimator is \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically normal. Simulations conducted in the paper suggest the MMD exploits both linear and non-monotone variation of unknown form in the instrument equally well and generally attenuates bias and size distortions that are characteristic of conventional IV methods with weak IVs.

The MMD complements estimators that seek to alleviate the weak IV problem. Andrews and Armstrong (2017) exploits knowledge of at least one first-stage coefficient’s sign in order to derive a mean-unbiased estimator in IV models with a single endogenous covariate. Tsyawo and Soale (2021) introduces an estimator based on the Distance Covariance measure of Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007). The estimator allows endogenous covariates to be mean- but not quantile-independent of instruments at all points on the distribution. Although the MMD cannot exploit the quantile dependence of endogenous covariates on instruments, it nonetheless exploits a non-trivial subset of identifying variation. In addition, the linear MMD has the tractability and computational ease of a linear IV estimator. Hansen and Kozbur (2014) uses ridge-regularisation and the Jackknife to alleviate the bias from first-stage regularisation when there are several weak instruments or when the researcher takes

²Dieterle and Snell, 2016 documents statistically different second-stage estimates resulting from linear versus quadratic specifications of the first-stage.

transformations of a small set of elementary instruments. Similar regularisation schemes are proposed by Belloni, Chen, Chernozhukov, and Hansen (2012) and Carrasco (2012). Chen, Chen, and Lewis (2020) combines machine learning techniques such as neural networks and random forests with sample splitting to extract additional identifying variation in instruments for improved precision of second-stage estimates.

This paper contributes to the growing literature on applications of the distance covariance (see Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007)) and martingale divergence difference (see Shao and Zhang (2014) and Lee and Shao (2018)) measures of (distributional) dependence and mean dependence respectively. Using a special weight function proposed by Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007), Shao and Zhang (2014) derives the Martingale Difference Divergence (MDD) measure which can be used to test conditional mean or quantile independence. Park, Shao, Yao, et al. (2015) extends the test of Shao and Zhang (2014) to the partial conditional mean independence setting. The matrix version of the MDD measure proposed by Lee and Shao (2018) provides an interesting generalisation; it can test and detect the presence of linearly independent linear combinations of a multivariate random variable that are mean-independent of another set of variables. The specification test of Su and Zheng (2017) extends the test of Shao and Zhang (2014) to assess the conditional mean independence exclusion restriction in a regression setting. The literature on applications of tests and applications based on the seminal work of Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007) is growing. See Edelman, Fokianos, and Pitsillou (2019) for a survey.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 presents the MMD estimator, and Section 3 collects theoretical results including identification, consistency, and asymptotic normality. Section 4 examines the small sample performance of the estimator and its covariance matrix estimator using simulations. An empirical example in Section 5 illustrates the proposed estimator's practical usefulness, and Section 6 concludes. All proofs and additional simulation results are relegated to Appendices A and B.

2 The MMD Estimator

2.1 The MDD measure

Martingale difference divergence (MDD) measures the conditional mean dependence of a random variable $U \in \mathbb{R}$ on another random variable $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{p_z}$. It is a generalisation of the distance covariance measure of Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007) to a single point on the distribution of a random variable. The MDD measure is defined as the square root of the scalar-valued function

$$\text{MDD}^2(U|Z) = \frac{1}{c_{p_z}} \int \frac{|\mathbb{E}[U \exp(\iota s'Z)] - \mathbb{E}[U]\mathbb{E}[\exp(\iota s'Z)]|^2}{\|s\|^{1+p_z}} ds$$

where the weight function $c_{p_z} = \frac{\pi^{(1+p_z)/2}}{\Gamma((1+p_z)/2)}$ is proposed by Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al. (2007), $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the complete gamma function, $\iota = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary unit, and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. From the definition above, it is obvious that $\text{MDD}^2(U|Z) = 0$ if and only if U is mean-independent of Z . Let the $n \times (1 + p_x + p_z)$ matrix $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Z}]$ denote a sample from the joint distribution of $[U, X, Z]$. For a random variable indexed by i or (i, j) , define $\mathbb{E}_n[\xi_i] \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$ and $\mathbb{E}_n[\xi_{ij}] \equiv \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_{ij}$. Without loss of generality and for ease of exposition, the sample mean of \mathbf{U} and the expected value of u_i are assumed to be zero throughout the rest of the paper. Shao and Zhang (2014, Theorem 2) shows that the square of the sample MDD based on the empirical characteristic function $\frac{1}{c_{p_z}} \int \frac{|\mathbb{E}_n[u_i \exp(\iota s' \mathbf{z}_i)] - \mathbb{E}_n[u_i] \mathbb{E}_n[\exp(\iota s' \mathbf{z}_i)]|^2}{\|s\|^{1+p_z}} ds$ simplifies to

$$(2.1) \quad \text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}) = -\mathbb{E}_n[u_i u_j \bar{z}_{ij}]$$

where $\bar{z}_{ij} \equiv \|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\|$.

For ease of reference, the following collects some properties of the MDD measure.

Properties of MDD.

(a) $\text{MDD}(U|Z) = 0$ if and only if the mean of U is independent of Z .

(b) $\text{MDD}(U|Z) \geq 0$.

(c) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{MDD}_n(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}) = \text{MDD}(U|Z)$ almost surely (a.s.).

Property (a) says the mean of U is independent of Z if and only if $\text{MDD}(U|Z) = 0$. This property of the MDD coupled with the non-negativity property (b) follow from the definition of the MDD measure. Property (c) is proven in Shao and Zhang (2014, Theorem 3). It says the sample-based measure $\text{MDD}_n(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z})$ is strongly consistent. Combining all three properties says $\text{MDD}_n(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}) = 0$ if and only if U is mean-independent of Z and $\text{MDD}_n(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z}) > 0$ otherwise with probability approaching one (w.p.a.1).

The MDD measure (2.1) is a convenient choice of measure of conditional mean dependence which inherits many desirable features of Székely, Rizzo, Bakirov, et al.'s (2007) distance covariance measure. The MDD measure does not require smoothing parameters (e.g., the bandwidth in kernel-based measures), and it does not suffer the curse of dimensionality for high p_z . The asymptotic theory in this paper, however, requires that p_z be finite.

2.2 Computation

For simplicity and without loss of generality, it is assumed throughout the paper that the outcome and covariates are measured in departures from means, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbb{E}_n[y_i] = 0$. The intercept can therefore be omitted. The objective function based on the MDD measure (2.1) is

$$(2.2) \quad Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_n[(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\theta})(y_j - \mathbf{x}_j\boldsymbol{\theta})\bar{z}_{ij}]$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x}$ denotes the slope parameter. The following result shows that the MMD is a linear IV estimator.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ be the minimiser of $Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ in (2.2), then $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ is a linear IV estimator given by the closed-form expression*

$$(2.3) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n = (\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_i])^{-1}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}y_i]$$

where $\mathbf{z}_{n,i} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j$ is a $1 \times p_x$ row-vector of instruments.

The estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ in (2.3) is a linear IV-estimator (see, e.g., Wooldridge (2010, p. 92)) with the special instrument matrix whose rows comprise $\{\mathbf{z}_{n,i}, 1 \leq i \leq n\}$. It remains an IV estimator irrespective of the dimension of \mathbf{z}_i .³ Estimation thus proceeds by constructing the instrument matrix and running a standard IV regression.

From Property (a), (2.2), and Proposition 2.1, one observes that the MMD is a conditional moment estimator. When the researcher imposes conditional mean independence exclusion restrictions in a linear model with a small set of elementary instruments, the MMD is theoretically more suitable because the MMD, thanks to the MDD measure, coincides with the solution of the conditional moment “equations”. This feature of the MMD is without simplifications such as estimation based on implied unconditional moments, a first-step estimation of optimal moments (see, e.g., Chamberlain (1987), Chen, Chen, and Lewis (2020), Hansen and Kozbur (2014), and Carrasco (2012)), or the derivation a scalar-valued minimand from unconditional moment conditions (see, e.g., Honoré and Powell (1994) and Alan, Honoré, Hu, and Leth-Petersen (2014)).

The summands of (2.2) involve pairs of observations, and they can be expressed in terms of U-statistics. The MMD thus relates to estimators based on U-statistics (see, e.g., Honoré and Powell (1994), Alan, Honoré, Hu, and Leth-Petersen (2014), Honoré and Hu (2018), and Tsyawo and Soale (2021)).

³The representation (2.3) does not change even in the over-identified case where there are more instruments than covariates, i.e., $p_z > p_x$, since $\bar{z}_{ij} \equiv \|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\|$ is always a scalar.

3 Asymptotic Theory

Regularity conditions for the MMD are grouped into two categories. The first category (Assumption 1) comprises sampling and dominance conditions.

Assumption 1.

- (a) *Observed data $\{[y_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i], 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ are independently distributed and the outcome is generated as $y_i = \mathbf{x}_i \boldsymbol{\theta}_o + u_i$.*
- (b) *There exists a constant $C > 0$ such that $\mathbb{E}[|u_j \bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}_i|^4] \leq C$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j|^4] \leq C$ for any $1 \leq i, i', j \leq n$.*

Assumption 1(a) allows for heteroskedastic errors. The boundedness assumptions are useful for the existence of the MDD measure and the consistency of the covariance matrix estimator.

3.1 Identification

The second set of regularity conditions are needed for identification. These IV-type conditions ensure that in sufficiently large samples, the expected value of the objective function (2.2) is uniquely minimised by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o$.

Assumption 2 (Identification).

- (a) $\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} | \mathbf{x}_j] = 0$ for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.
- (b) *The expected value of $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} \mathbf{x}_j]$ exists and is non-singular for n sufficiently large.*

Assumption 2(a) says the covariance of u_i and \bar{z}_{ij} given \mathbf{x}_j is zero for any $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. It is a weak exclusion restriction like in the case of IV methods (e.g., Wooldridge (2010, eqn. 5.8)). Since $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} | \mathbf{x}_j] \mathbf{x}'_j] = \mathbf{0}$ by Assumption 2(a) and the law of iterated expectations (LIE), Assumption 2(a) implies a “standard IV exclusion restriction” of uncorrelatedness with respect to the constructed instrument $\mathbf{z}_{n,i}$,

i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i] = \mathbf{0}$. It is interesting to note how the MMD exclusion restriction relates to the standard IV exclusion restriction $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}'_i u_i] = \mathbf{0}$ and the stronger conditional mean independence exclusion restriction $\mathbb{E}[u_i | \mathbf{z}_i] = 0$ a.s. The following result examines the relationship.

Proposition 3.1. *Under Assumption 1(a),*

(i) *Assumption 2(a) and the standard IV uncorrelatedness exclusion restriction are equivalent for $p_z = p_x = 1$.*

(ii) *Assumption 2(a) is implied by the conditional mean independence exclusion restriction.*

In the simple but non-trivial case of a single endogenous covariate and a single instrument, Proposition 3.1(i) shows that both the standard uncorrelatedness exclusion restriction and the MMD exclusion restriction are equivalent under independent sampling (Assumption 1(a)). In the more general case with multiple instruments and covariates, Proposition 3.1(ii) says the MMD exclusion restriction (Assumption 2(a)), like the standard IV exclusion restriction, is weaker than the conditional mean independence exclusion restriction. This suggests that the specification test of Su and Zheng (2017) can be used to verify Assumption 2(a).⁴ Proposition 3.1 thus shows that both the MMD exclusion restriction (Assumption 2(a)) and the standard IV exclusion restriction of uncorrelatedness are weak.

$\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j] = \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i\mathbf{x}_j]$ in Assumption 2(b) is the Martingale Difference Divergence Matrix measure of Lee and Shao (2018). Under Assumption 1(b), it is finite. Also, it is symmetric and positive semi-definite by construction. The full rank condition imposed in Assumption 2(b) is a standard IV relevance identification condition (see, e.g., Wooldridge (2010, eqn. 5.10)). How does the relevance condition (Assumption 2(b)) relate to the standard IV-relevance condition of a finite non-singular $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}'_i\mathbf{x}_i]]$ for n sufficiently large? This question is answered in Proposition 3.2. In addition, Proposition 3.2 draws a parallel between identification in the IV framework and identification purely based on the properties

⁴The specification test of Su and Zheng (2017) is a test of conditional mean independence. This condition is sufficient but not necessary for Assumption 2(a).

of the MDD measure (2.1) using the same set of identification conditions (Assumptions 2(a) and 2(b)).

Proposition 3.2. *The following hold for a constant $\delta > 0$.*

(i) *The condition $\inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x}: \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}|\mathbf{Z})] > \delta$ and Assumption 2(b) are equivalent for n sufficiently large.*

(ii) *Under Assumption 1(b), $p_x \geq \text{rank}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]) \geq \text{rank}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_i\mathbf{x}_j])$ w.p.a.1.*

(iii) *Under Assumptions 2(a) and 2(b), $\mathbb{E}[Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)] > \delta\|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|^2$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \neq \boldsymbol{\theta}_o$ and n sufficiently large.*

For n sufficiently large, Proposition 3.2(i) shows a probably more interesting interpretation of the MMD relevance condition (Assumption 2(b)). It implies there is no non-zero linear combination of covariates which is mean-independent of instruments. This interpretation suggests that in the case of a single endogenous covariate in the set of covariates, Assumption 2(b) can be assessed using the partial conditional mean independence test of Park, Shao, Yao, et al. (2015).⁵ Generally, Assumption 2(b) should be verifiable via tests like the matrix rank test of Kleibergen and Paap (2006). Such a pursuit is, however, beyond the scope of the current paper. A similar interpretation of the standard IV relevance condition is that there is no non-zero linear combination of covariates which is uncorrelated with instruments. Since mean independence implies uncorrelatedness, one intuitively sees why Proposition 3.2(ii) follows from Proposition 3.2(i). Proposition 3.2(ii) shows that the MMD relevance condition Assumption 2(b) is weaker than the standard IV relevance condition. Proposition 3.2(iii) establishes identification in the MMD framework under Assumption 2 using the properties of the MMD measure. It says the objective function is uniquely minimised by $\boldsymbol{\theta}_o$ for n sufficiently large.

⁵This can be used to test the conditional mean dependence of a single endogenous covariate on its excluded instruments after netting out dependence on other covariates.

Proposition 3.2 shows that the MMD relevance condition is weaker than that of the standard IV. In addition to Proposition 3.1, one observes that the weakening of the relevance condition in the MMD framework does not come at the added cost of a stronger exclusion restriction. Propositions 3.1 and 3.2 jointly highlight the merit of the MMD estimator.

Assumption 2(b) is violated if \mathbf{X} does not have full column rank or there are fewer instruments than covariates. First, note that if \mathbf{X} is rank deficient, there exists a linear combination $\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}$ such that $\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau} = \mathbf{0}$ almost surely. This implies $\inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}|\mathbf{Z})] = 0$ for n sufficiently large, and by Proposition 3.2(i), Assumption 2(b) is violated. Second, it is not difficult to construct an example where there are fewer instruments than covariates, each covariate is mean-dependent on the set of instruments, but Assumption 2(b) is violated. To fix ideas, suppose the $n \times 2$ covariate matrix \mathbf{X} equals $[\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2 - \boldsymbol{\xi}_1]$ where $[\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \boldsymbol{\xi}_2]$ are samples of the random variables $[\xi_1, \xi_2]$, ξ_2 is mean-independent of ξ_1 , $\mathbf{Z} = \boldsymbol{\xi}_1$, and $\boldsymbol{\tau} = [1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}]$. One observes that each element of X is not mean-independent of Z . For n sufficiently large, $\mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}|\mathbf{Z})] = \mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\boldsymbol{\xi}_2|\boldsymbol{\xi}_1)]/2 = 0$, and by Proposition 3.2(i), Assumption 2(b) is violated.

3.2 Consistency

Define $\mathbf{B}_n \equiv \text{var}(\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i])$ where

$$(3.1) \quad \text{var}(\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i]) = \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \mathbb{E}[u_i u_{i'} \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_j] + \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j' \neq j}^n \mathbb{E}[u_i^2 \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{ij'} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_{j'}].$$

The following lemma is useful in determining the rate of convergence of the MMD estimator. It derives the variance of $\text{var}(\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i])$ under Assumption 1(a) and proves its boundedness under Assumption 1(b).

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumption 1,*

(i) \mathbf{B}_n is given by the expression (3.1);

(ii) $\|\mathbf{B}_n\| \leq 2C$ for all n .

In the standard IV framework, it is known that consistency holds if $\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i] = \mathbf{0}$. This is what Lemma 3.1(ii) shows in the context of the MMD. More precisely, with Lemma 3.1 in hand, a statement on the rate of convergence of the MMD estimator can be made.

Theorem 1 (Consistency). *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$.*

3.3 Asymptotic Normality

The summands in $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i]$ are not independent because $\mathbf{z}_{n,i} \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j$ depends on all observations. This implies that the Lyapunov central limit theorem (CLT) is not directly applicable. Denote a symmetrised kernel by $\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) \equiv (\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j u_i + \bar{z}_{ji} \mathbf{x}'_i u_j)/2 = \psi(\mathbf{w}_j, \mathbf{w}_i)$ where $\mathbf{w}_i \equiv [u_i, \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{z}_i]$. For any sequence $\boldsymbol{\tau}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n\| = 1$, $\mathbb{E}_n[\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) = (1 - \frac{1}{n}) \mathbf{U}_n$ where $\mathbf{U}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j)$ is a U-statistic (see, e.g., Hoeffding (1948) and Honoré and Powell (1994)). The Hajék projection of \mathbf{U}_n on \mathbf{w}_i is $\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$ where $\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) | \mathbf{w}_i]$. Thanks to the Hajék projection and independent sampling in Assumption 1(a), the summands $\{\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i), 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ are independently distributed, and the Lyapunov CLT is applicable. The proof of Theorem 2(i) essentially involves verifying the conditions of Hoeffding (1948, Theorem 8.1). Define $\mathbf{B}_o \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{B}_n$ and $\mathbf{A}_o \equiv \text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} \mathbf{x}_j]$. The following assumption is needed for the CLT result.

Assumption 3. *There exists a constant $D > 0$ such that the smallest eigen-value of $\text{var}(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))$ is greater than $D^{1/2}$ for n sufficiently large.*

Theorem 2 (Asymptotic Normality). *Suppose Assumptions 1 to 3 hold, then*

(i) $\sqrt{n} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ for any sequence $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x}$ with $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n\| = 1$;

(ii) $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{A}_o^{-1} \mathbf{B}_o \mathbf{A}_o^{-1})$.

3.4 Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimation

The covariance matrix estimator comprises the sample analogues of \mathbf{A}_o and \mathbf{B}_o . Denote $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n \equiv \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]$ and

$$\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_{i'} \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_j + \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j' \neq j}^n \hat{u}_i^2 \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{ij'} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_{j'}$$

where $\hat{u}_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$. The estimator of the asymptotic covariance matrix is $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}$. The following result shows the consistency of the covariance matrix estimator $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}$.

Proposition 3.3. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} = \mathbf{A}_o^{-1} \mathbf{B}_o \mathbf{A}_o^{-1}$.*

The computation of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n$ in the covariance matrix estimator involves $O(n^3)$ steps. This is computationally expensive in moderately large data sets. An important result that holds under the conditions of Theorem 2(i) is that the standardised \mathbf{U}_n and its standardised Hajék projection converge in quadratic mean (see Hoeffding (1948, eqn. 8.5)) and their variances have the same probability limit, i.e., $\text{var}(\mathbf{U}_n) = \text{var}(\hat{\mathbf{U}}_n) + O(n^{-2})$ (see Hoeffding (1948, equations 8.9 and 8.10)). This idea is exploited in, e.g., Honoré and Powell (1994), to obtain a covariance matrix that is computationally less expensive. Define $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$, $\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^n (\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j \hat{u}_i + \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_i \hat{u}_j) / 2 = (\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} \hat{u}_i + \mathbf{x}'_i \hat{u}_{n,i}) / 2$, $\hat{u}_{n,i} \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \bar{z}_{ij} \hat{u}_j$, and $\mathcal{B}_o \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)']$ (see, e.g., Honoré and Hu (2018, eqn. 2.3) and Honoré and Powell (1994, Theorem 3)). The following shows the consistency of the covariance matrix estimator based on $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n$.

Proposition 3.4. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, $\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathcal{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} = \mathbf{A}_o^{-1} \mathcal{B}_o \mathbf{A}_o^{-1}$.*

The presence of the term $\mathbf{x}'_i \hat{u}_{n,i}$ in $\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)$ means the covariance estimator $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1} \hat{\mathcal{B}}_n \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n^{-1}$ does not coincide with the standard IV heteroskedasticity-robust covariance matrix estimator with $\mathbf{z}_{n,i}$ as instrument. One, however, only needs a simple adjustment for the extra term in $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n$. This paper also considers the non-parametric bootstrap as an alternative to the asymptotic covariance matrix estimators. Although potentially faster inference procedures for estimators

based on U-statistics such as the simpler bootstrap procedure of Honoré and Hu (2018) can also be applied to the MMD, these procedures are not considered in the present paper due to concerns of space and scope.

4 Monte Carlo Simulations

This section examines the empirical performance of the MMD estimator vis-à-vis OLS/IV using simulations. To keep the exposition simple, only a single covariate with a single instrument is considered. Four different specifications and four sample sizes $n \in \{100, 250, 1000, 2500\}$ are considered. The median absolute deviation (MAD), root mean squared error (RMSE), and rejection probabilities at the 5% level are reported for each specification. The rejection probabilities are computed based on standard errors from the asymptotic covariance matrix (5% RP-A.) and the non-parametric bootstrap (5% RP-B.). For comparability, the same set of bootstrap samples are used across estimators and specifications. The variables x_i^* and u_i are sampled as $x_i^* \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $u_i \sim (\chi^2(1) - 1)/\sqrt{2}$. The true parameter on the covariate is set to $\theta_o = 1$. Let $\Phi^{-1}(\tau)$ denote the τ 'th quantile of the standard normal distribution, and $\sigma_{\dot{x}}$ denote the standard deviation of \dot{x}_i . The following specifications are considered.

- (i) $y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i$, and $z_i = x_i = x_i^*$.
- (ii) $y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i$, $x_i = \dot{x}_i/\sigma_{\dot{x}}$, $\dot{x}_i = x_i^* + u_i/2$, $z_i = \dot{z}_i/\sigma_{\dot{z}}$, $\dot{z}_i = x_i^* + w_i/2$, and $w_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.
- (iii) $y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i$, $x_i = \dot{x}_i/\sigma_{\dot{x}}$, $\dot{x}_i = 3x_i^*/\sqrt{n} + |x_i^*|/\sqrt{1 - 2/\pi} + u_i/2$, and $z_i = x_i^*$.
- (iv) $y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i$, $x_i = \dot{x}_i/\sigma_{\dot{x}}$, $\dot{x}_i = 2\mathbf{I}(|x_i^*| < -\Phi^{-1}(0.25)) + u_i/2$, and $z_i = x_i^*$.

Specifications (i) and (ii) consider standard cases of either exogenous covariates or endogenous covariates with IV-strong instruments. These serve as a benchmark to compare the MMD to the OLS/IV. Weak instruments are introduced in Specification (iii) where the weight $3/\sqrt{n}$ ensures a median non-homoskedasticity-robust F-statistic (see Andrews, Stock,

and Sun (2019, eqn. 7.)) below 5. Note, however, that the covariate has a non-monotone mean dependence on the instrument. The IV cannot exploit this variation since the endogenous covariate is uncorrelated with the non-monotone part.⁶ This specification serves to illustrate the performance of the MMD when the endogenous covariate is weakly correlated but mean-dependent on the instrument in an unknown way. Unlike Specification (iii), Specification (iv) is a case where the endogenous covariate, which is completely uncorrelated with the instrument, has non-monotone and discrete mean-dependence of unknown form. This specification helps to illustrate how the MDD complements conventional IV methods by expanding the set of relevant instruments.

Table 4.1 reports simulation results for MMD and OLS/IV. Panel A compares the numerical minimiser of (2.2) to the OLS/IV for small samples. The computationally less efficient covariance matrix in Proposition 3.3 is used alongside the bootstrap for the rejection probabilities reported in Panel A. Panel B uses the analytical form of the estimator (2.3) with the computationally more efficient covariance matrix in Proposition 3.4 in larger samples.⁷ Given that the asymptotic covariance matrix, unlike the bootstrap covariance matrix, suffers size distortions when the linear relationship between the endogenous covariate and the instrument is very weak (see Specifications (iii) and (iv) in Panel A), only Specifications (i) and (ii) are considered in Panel B alongside the covariance matrix estimator of Proposition 3.4.⁸

In Specifications (i) and (ii) where the covariate is either exogenous or the instrument is IV-strong, the MMD and OLS/IV perform comparably well. When the instrument is MMD-strong but IV-weak (Specification (iii)) or completely uncorrelated with the endogenous covariate (Specification (iv)), the performance of the MMD relative to its performance in Specifications (i) and (ii) is comparable both in terms of MAD and RMSE. The IV in this

⁶For a symmetrically distributed x^* from, e.g., the standard normal, x^* and its absolute value $|x^*|$ are uncorrelated.

⁷Prior simulations indicate that the numerical minimiser of (2.2), relative to the analytical form (2.3), incurs less bias in very small samples. Table B.1 in Appendix B considers other specifications and compares the analytical form (2.3) to the OLS/IV for sample sizes $n \in \{1000, 2500\}$.

⁸Prior simulations indicate that both covariance matrix estimators, unlike the non-parametric bootstrap lead to size distortions when instruments are very IV-weak but MMD-strong.

Table 4.1: Simulations Results - MMD and OLS/IV

Panel A	$n = 100$				$n = 250$			
	MAD	RMSE	5% RP-A.	5% RP-B.	MAD	RMSE	5% RP-A.	5% RP-B.
					<u>Specification (i)</u>			
MMD	0.070	0.105	0.050	0.049	0.048	0.067	0.045	0.045
OLS	0.068	0.103	0.048	0.058	0.046	0.066	0.050	0.052
					<u>Specification (ii)</u>			
MMD	0.086	0.132	0.061	0.059	0.058	0.085	0.062	0.064
IV	0.086	0.130	0.062	0.067	0.057	0.084	0.061	0.060
					<u>Specification (iii)</u>			
MMD	0.089	0.138	0.023	0.041	0.057	0.084	0.010	0.045
IV	0.261	5.220	0.019	0.006	0.289	34.40	0.017	0.006
					<u>Specification (iv)</u>			
MMD	0.082	0.129	0.002	0.039	0.053	0.079	0.001	0.043
IV	0.985	25.09	0.005	0.006	1.059	254.36	0.006	0.007
Panel B	$n = 1000$				$n = 2500$			
	MAD	RMSE	5% RP-A.	5% RP-B.	MAD	RMSE	5% RP-A.	5% RP-B.
					<u>Specification (i)</u>			
MMD	0.021	0.033	0.064		0.014	0.021	0.050	
OLS	0.021	0.032	0.062		0.014	0.020	0.045	
					<u>Specification (ii)</u>			
MMD	0.025	0.040	0.058		0.017	0.026	0.050	
IV	0.025	0.039	0.052		0.017	0.025	0.051	

Notes: Results in the table are based on 1000 random repetitions. The median p-values of the Park, Shao, Yao, et al.'s (2015) test of partial conditional mean independence are zero in Specifications (ii) to (iv).

case, i.e., in Specifications (iii) and (iv), suffers identification failure as expected. Both MMD and OLS rejection probabilities in Specifications (i) and (ii) of both Panels A and B are reasonably close to the nominal 5% level. In Specifications (iii) and (iv), inference in the IV context is no longer reliable as expected. In the presence of IV-weak but MMD-strong instruments, the MMD rejection probabilities based on the asymptotic covariance matrix estimators are quite low, whereas those based on the non-parametric bootstrap are reasonable.

A few points in this simulation exercise are worth highlighting. The performance of the MMD appears to be robust to the form of “first-stage” conditional mean dependence. As expected, the performance of the IV is quite sensitive to the nature of this dependence. The asymptotic covariance matrix estimators and the non-parametric bootstrap are both reliable in the presence of a strong correlation between the endogenous covariate and the instrument. When instruments are IV-weak but MMD-strong, the non-parametric bootstrap appears to be more reliable. On the whole, the MDD alleviates the problems of bias and size distortions when instruments are IV-weak but MDD-strong.

5 Empirical Example

This section considers a simple empirical example that illustrates the practical usefulness of the MMD estimator. Quite importantly, this example has weak instruments with non-trivial non-linear dependence and a small sample size. The data are sourced from Hornung (2014). Andrews and Armstrong (2017) and Tsyawo and Soale (2021) also consider empirical examples based on this dataset.

Huguenots fled religious persecution in France, settled in Brandenburg-Prussia in 1685, and compensated for population losses caused by plagues during the Thirty Years’ War. Hornung (2014) exploits the settlement pattern in order to identify the long-term impact of skilled-worker migration on the productivity of textile manufactories in Prussia. This

empirical example compares OLS/IV and MMD estimates. The outcome is the value of a firm’s output in a given town, and the covariate of interest is the population share of Huguenots in a town. Other covariates include the number of workers, the number of looms, the value of material input, and regional and town-specific characteristics that can impact productivity. Excluded instruments proposed by Hornung (2014) for the covariate of interest include population losses during the Thirty Years’ War and its interpolated version (see Hornung (2014) for details).

Table 5.1: Estimates - Huguenot Productivity - Hornung (2014)

	MMD (1)	OLS (1)	MMD (2)	IV (2)	MMD (3)	IV (3)
Percent Huguenots 1700	1.822 (0.753)	1.741 (0.467)	1.904 (0.731)	3.475 (0.975)	1.899 (0.733)	3.380 (0.994)
ln workers	0.126 (0.038)	0.123 (0.033)	0.125 (0.038)	0.135 (0.033)	0.126 (0.038)	0.134 (0.033)
ln looms	0.086 (0.041)	0.102 (0.035)	0.086 (0.041)	0.082 (0.035)	0.086 (0.041)	0.083 (0.035)
ln materials (imputed)	0.804 (0.033)	0.800 (0.030)	0.805 (0.033)	0.811 (0.031)	0.805 (0.033)	0.811 (0.031)
Excluded Instr.			✓	✓	✓	✓
<u>Relevance</u>						
$pMDD_n^{nl}$ p-value			0.000		0.000	
$pMDD_n$ p-value			0.000		0.000	
KB F -Stat.				14.331		22.531
<u>Specification</u>						
T_n p-value	0.333	0.490	0.340	0.296	0.339	0.340

Notes: The number of observations in each specification is 150 firms. For each specification, standard errors (in parentheses) are computed using the same 999 non-parametric bootstrap samples. 999 wild-bootstrap samples are used to conduct the $pMDD_n^{nl}$, $pMDD_n$, and T_n tests. *Percent population losses in 30 Years’ War* is the excluded instrument in Specification (2), and *Percent population losses in 30 Years’ War, interpolated* is the excluded instrument in Specification (3). Excluded Instr. denotes whether an excluded instrument is used, and the KB F -Stat. denotes Kleibergen and Paap’s (2006) rk Wald F -statistic.

Table 5.1 presents the empirical results. The upper panel presents coefficient estimates with standard errors, the second presents p-values of Park, Shao, Yao, et al.’s (2015) test of partial conditional mean independence $pMDD_n$, its non-linear version $pMDD_n^{nl}$, the F -

statistic of Kleibergen and Paap (2006), and the specification test of Su and Zheng (2017).⁹ Three specifications are used. The first compares the MMD to the OLS, the second uses population losses during the Thirty Years' War as the excluded instrument, and the third uses its interpolated version. For comparability, the same set of non-parametric bootstrap samples are used across estimators and specifications to obtain standard errors.

One observes that the MMD estimates of interest and standard errors are stable across all specifications while OLS/IV estimates show substantial variation. In the presence of excluded instruments, MMD estimates are more precise. Park, Shao, Yao, et al.'s test of non-linear conditional mean independence suggests the presence of non-trivial non-linear/non-monotone variation that the MMD, unlike the IV, is able to exploit.

6 Conclusion

This paper introduces an IV estimator that minimises the conditional mean dependence of a vector of errors on a finite set of instruments. Besides requiring an exclusion restriction not stronger than the OLS/IV uncorrelatedness condition, this estimator weakens the relevance condition and allows endogenous covariates to be uncorrelated but not mean-independent of instruments. The estimator's closed-form expression makes it computationally fast to implement in large datasets using available linear IV routines. The covariance matrix estimator, however, requires a small adjustment. While the contribution of this paper crucially lies in weakening the relevance condition, it proffers a few additional gains, among which is the need not to model the first-stage relationship.

This paper contributes to the small literature on estimation in the presence of weak instruments by proposing a parsimonious estimator that exploits beyond linear and monotone forms of identifying variation. Although this approach is not a panacea for all forms of the weak IV problem, it enables the researcher to exploit unknown forms of identifying variation

⁹The non-linear version of the test first eliminates the linear dependence of the endogenous covariate on its excluded instrument before conducting the test.

that are hitherto unexplored using parsimonious methods. The empirical example in this paper mostly demonstrates the robustness and reliability of inference that the MMD offers. The simulation exercise, in addition, offers insights into how the MMD can rescue a project from an otherwise very weak set of excluded instruments.

A number of interesting extensions of the current paper are left for future work. Examples include extending the single-equation linear framework of the current paper to non-linear models, models with non-smooth moments such as quantile regression, and multivariate outcomes. Owing to the frequency of autocorrelation and clustering in empirical practice, it is also interesting to extend the current framework to allow for autocorrelation- and cluster-robust inference.

References

- [1] Alan, Sule, Bo E Honoré, Luojia Hu, and Søren Leth-Petersen. “Estimation of panel data regression models with two-sided censoring or truncation”. *Journal of Econometric Methods* 3.1 (2014).
- [2] Andrews, Isaiah and Timothy B Armstrong. “Unbiased instrumental variables estimation under known first-stage sign”. *Quantitative Economics* 8.2 (2017), pp. 479–503.
- [3] Andrews, Isaiah, James H Stock, and Liyang Sun. “Weak instruments in instrumental variables regression: Theory and practice”. *Annual Review of Economics* 11 (2019), pp. 727–753.
- [4] Belloni, Alexandre, Daniel Chen, Victor Chernozhukov, and Christian Hansen. “Sparse models and methods for optimal instruments with an application to eminent domain”. *Econometrica* 80.6 (2012), pp. 2369–2429.
- [5] Carrasco, Marine. “A regularization approach to the many instruments problem”. *Journal of Econometrics* 170.2 (2012), pp. 383–398.

- [6] Chamberlain, Gary. “Asymptotic efficiency in estimation with conditional moment restrictions”. *Journal of Econometrics* 34.3 (1987), pp. 305–334.
- [7] Chen, Jiafeng, Daniel L Chen, and Greg Lewis. “Mostly Harmless Machine Learning: Learning Optimal Instruments in Linear IV Models”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06158* (2020).
- [8] Dieterle, Steven G and Andy Snell. “A simple diagnostic to investigate instrument validity and heterogeneous effects when using a single instrument”. *Labour Economics* 42 (2016), pp. 76–86.
- [9] Edelmann, Dominic, Konstantinos Fokianos, and Maria Pitsillou. “An updated literature review of distance correlation and its applications to time series”. *International Statistical Review* 87.2 (2019), pp. 237–262.
- [10] Hansen, Christian and Damian Kozbur. “Instrumental variables estimation with many weak instruments using regularized JIVE”. *Journal of Econometrics* 182.2 (2014), pp. 290–308.
- [11] Hoeffding, Wassily. “A Class of Statistics with Asymptotically Normal Distribution”. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 19.3 (1948), pp. 293–325.
- [12] Honoré, Bo E and LuoJia Hu. “Simpler bootstrap estimation of the asymptotic variance of U-statistic-based estimators”. *The Econometrics Journal* 21.1 (2018), pp. 1–10.
- [13] Honoré, Bo E and James L Powell. “Pairwise difference estimators of censored and truncated regression models”. *Journal of Econometrics* 64.1-2 (1994), pp. 241–278.
- [14] Hornung, Erik. “Immigration and the diffusion of technology: The Huguenot diaspora in Prussia”. *American Economic Review* 104.1 (2014), pp. 84–122.
- [15] Kleibergen, Frank and Richard Paap. “Generalized reduced rank tests using the singular value decomposition”. *Journal of Econometrics* 133.1 (2006), pp. 97–126.

- [16] Lee, Chung Eun and Xiaofeng Shao. “Martingale difference divergence matrix and its application to dimension reduction for stationary multivariate time series”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 113.521 (2018), pp. 216–229.
- [17] Park, Trevor, Xiaofeng Shao, Shun Yao, et al. “Partial martingale difference correlation”. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 9.1 (2015), pp. 1492–1517.
- [18] Shao, Xiaofeng and Jingsi Zhang. “Martingale difference correlation and its use in high-dimensional variable screening”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 109.507 (2014), pp. 1302–1318.
- [19] Su, Liangjun and Xin Zheng. “A martingale-difference-divergence-based test for specification”. *Economics Letters* 156 (2017), pp. 162–167.
- [20] Székely, Gábor J, Maria L Rizzo, Nail K Bakirov, et al. “Measuring and testing dependence by correlation of distances”. *The Annals of Statistics* 35.6 (2007), pp. 2769–2794.
- [21] Tsyawo, Emmanuel Selorm and Abdul-Nasah Soale. “A Distance Covariance-based Estimator”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.07008* (2021).
- [22] Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. *Econometric analysis of cross section and panel data*. MIT Press, 2010.

Appendix

A Theoretical Results

A.1 Proofs of Theorems

Proof of Lemma 3.1.

Part (i):

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B}_n &\equiv \text{var}(\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i]) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_ju_i\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_ju_i\right)\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{i'=1}^n\sum_{j'=1}^n\text{cov}(\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_ju_i,\bar{z}_{i'j'}\mathbf{x}'_{j'}u_{i'}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{i'=1}^n\mathbb{E}[u_iu_{i'}\bar{z}_{ij}\bar{z}_{i'j'}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_j] + \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{j'\neq j}^n\mathbb{E}[u_i^2\bar{z}_{ij}\bar{z}_{ij'}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_{j'}].
\end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from Assumption 1(a).

Part (ii): By the triangle, Cauchy-Schwartz, and Jensen's inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{B}_n\| &\leq \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{i'=1}^n\|\mathbb{E}[u_iu_{i'}\bar{z}_{ij}\bar{z}_{i'j'}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_j]\| + \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{j'\neq j}^n\|\mathbb{E}[u_i^2\bar{z}_{ij}\bar{z}_{ij'}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_{j'}]\| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{i'=1}^n(\mathbb{E}[\|u_i\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j\|^4]\mathbb{E}[\|u_{i'}\bar{z}_{i'j'}\mathbf{x}_{j'}\|^4])^{1/4} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n^3}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n\sum_{i'=1}^n(\mathbb{E}[\|u_i\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j\|^4]\mathbb{E}[\|u_i\bar{z}_{ij'}\mathbf{x}_{j'}\|^4])^{1/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from Assumption 1(b) that $\|\mathbf{B}_n\| \leq 2C^{1/2}$.

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Substituting y_i from Assumption 1(a) in (2.3),

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o = (\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j])^{-1}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i].$$

Under Assumption 2(b) and by continuity of the inverse at a non-singular matrix, $\|(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j])^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$. $\|\text{var}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i])\| = \|\text{var}(\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i])\|/n = \|\mathbf{B}_n\|/n \leq 2C^{1/2}/n$ under the assumption of Lemma 3.1 implies $\|\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i]\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Combining both preceding arguments and Slutsky's theorem implies $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. The proof of Theorem 2 is decomposed into two parts.

Part (i):

The proof of part (i) involves verifying the three conditions of Hoeffding (1948, Theorem 8.1). The conditions are verified in the following lemma.

Lemma A.1. Under Assumption 1(b) and Assumption 3,

- (a) $\mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j))^2] \leq C^{1/2}/2$;
- (b) $\mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^3|] \leq C^{3/4}$;
- (c) $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^3|]}{(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^2])^{3/2}} \leq (C/D)^{3/4}n^{-1/2}$.

Proof.

Condition (a): By the c_r -inequality, Jensen's inequality, and Assumption 1(b),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j))^2] &= \mathbb{E}[|\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j)|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j)|^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|u_i\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j|^2]/2 + \mathbb{E}[|u_j\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i|^2]/2 \\ &\leq (\mathbb{E}[|u_i\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j|^4])^{1/2}/2 + (\mathbb{E}[|u_j\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i|^4])^{1/2}/2 \\ &\leq C^{1/2}/2. \end{aligned}$$

Condition (b): For any $1 \leq i \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^3|] &= \frac{1}{(n-1)^3} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{j' \neq i}^n \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_{j'}) | \mathbf{w}_i]\right|^3\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{(n-1)^3} \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\sum_{j \neq i}^n \sum_{k \neq i}^n \sum_{l \neq i}^n (\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) | \mathbf{w}_i]) (\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_k) | \mathbf{w}_i]) (\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_l) | \mathbf{w}_i])\right|\right] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)^3} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \sum_{k \neq i}^n \sum_{l \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}\left[|(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) | \mathbf{w}_i]) (\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_k) | \mathbf{w}_i]) (\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_l) | \mathbf{w}_i])|\right] \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E}\left[|\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbb{E}[\psi(\mathbf{w}_i, \mathbf{w}_j) | \mathbf{w}_i]|^3\right] = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E}\left[|\bar{z}_{ij} u_i \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{x}'_j / 2 + \bar{z}_{ij} u_j \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{x}'_i / 2|^3\right] \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E}\left[|u_i \bar{z}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{x}'_j|^3\right] / 2 + \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \mathbb{E}\left[|u_j \bar{z}_{ij} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{x}'_i|^3\right] / 2 \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} (\mathbb{E}\left[|u_i \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j|^4\right])^{3/4} / 2 + \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} (\mathbb{E}\left[|u_j \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_i|^4\right])^{3/4} / 2 \\
&\leq C^{3/4}.
\end{aligned}$$

The third inequality follows from the c_r -inequality, the fourth by Jensen's inequality, and the last by Assumption 1(b).

Condition (c): Define $\rho_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Psi})$ as the smallest eigenvalue of matrix $\boldsymbol{\Psi}$, then for n sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^2] &= \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)'] \right) \boldsymbol{\tau}_n \\
&= n \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \text{var}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\right) \boldsymbol{\tau}_n \geq n \min_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \boldsymbol{\tau}' \text{var}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\right) \boldsymbol{\tau} \\
&= n \rho_{\min} \left(\text{var}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\right) \right) > n D^{1/2}
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 3. From **Condition (b)** above and the foregoing,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[|(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^3|]}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))^2]\right)^{3/2}} \leq (C/D)^{3/4} n^{-1/2}.$$

□

The three conditions of Hoeffding (1948) are implied by the three conditions verified above. Therefore, it follows that $\mathbf{U}_n/\text{var}(\mathbf{U}_n)^{1/2} \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Noting that $\mathbb{E}_n[\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] = (1 - \frac{1}{n})\mathbf{U}_n$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{U}_n/\text{var}(\mathbf{U}_n)^{1/2} &= \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i]/(\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{B}_n \boldsymbol{\tau}_n)^{1/2} \\ &= \sqrt{n}\|\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{1/2}\|^{-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{1/2} \mathbf{B}_n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] \\ &= \sqrt{n}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n \equiv \|\boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{1/2}\|^{-1} \boldsymbol{\tau}'_n \mathbf{B}_n^{1/2}$ satisfies $\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_n\| = 1$ for any sequence $\boldsymbol{\tau}_n$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_n\| = 1$.

Part (ii): Part (i) above and the Cramér-Wold device imply $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i] \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{B}_o)$. Using the expression $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o = (\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} \mathbf{x}_j])^{-1} \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i]$ from the proof of Theorem 1, one obtains $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) = (\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} \mathbf{x}_j])^{-1} \sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i]$. $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$ is linear in $\sqrt{n}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i} u_i]$. The conclusion to part (ii) follows from Assumption 2(b). □

A.2 Proofs of Propositions

Proof of Proposition 2.1. By the commutativity of sums, eq. (2.2) can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) &= -\mathbb{E}_n[y_i y_j] + \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} y_i \mathbf{x}_j] \boldsymbol{\theta} + \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} y_j \mathbf{x}_i] \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j] \boldsymbol{\theta} \\ &= -\mathbb{E}_n[y_i y_j] + 2\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} y_i \mathbf{x}_j] \boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}' \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j] \boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$ is the minimiser of (2.2), it satisfies the first-order condition $\frac{\partial Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{0}$. Taking the first derivative and equating it to zero gives

$$2\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j y_i] - \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{x}_j] \boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_i] \boldsymbol{\theta} = 2\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j y_i] - 2\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_i] \boldsymbol{\theta} = \mathbf{0}$$

by the equality of $\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i\mathbf{x}_j]$ and $\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_i]$ due to symmetry. The analytical expression of the estimator is thus

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n &= (\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j\mathbf{x}_i])^{-1}\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j y_i] \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j\right)'\mathbf{x}_i\right]^{-1}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j\right)'y_i \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_i])^{-1}\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}y_i].\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Proposition 3.1.

Part (i): $\text{sgn}(z_i - z_j) \equiv 1 - 2\mathbb{I}(z_i - z_j < 0)$ is the sign of $z_i - z_j$, and let $w_{ij} \equiv \mathbb{I}(z_i - z_j < 0)$ for $i \neq j$. Then using the definition $|u| = u\text{sgn}(u)$ of the absolute value function,

$$(A.1) \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[(u_i |z_i - z_j|) | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | x_j] - 2\mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j)w_{ij} | x_j].$$

By the law of iterated expectations (LIE),

$$\begin{aligned}(A.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j)w_{ij} | x_j] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | w_{ij}, x_j] w_{ij} | x_j] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | x_j] \mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1 | x_j) | x_j] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | x_j] \mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1 | x_j).\end{aligned}$$

Under independent sampling Assumption 1(a) and the LIE,

$$(A.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i z_i | x_j] - \mathbb{E}[u_i z_j | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i z_i | x_j] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i | x_j, z_j] z_j | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i z_i]$$

by the LIE since $\mathbb{E}[u_i z_i | x_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i z_i]$ and $\mathbb{E}[u_i | x_j, z_j] = \mathbb{E}[u_i] = 0$ because independence implies conditional mean independence.

Substituting (A.2) into (A.1) gives the expression $\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} | x_j] = (1 - 2\mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1 | x_j))\mathbb{E}[u_i(z_i - z_j) | x_j]$. Substituting in (A.3) gives the expression $\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij} | x_j] = (1 - 2\mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1 | x_j))\mathbb{E}[u_i z_i]$.

By the LIE and Assumption 1(a), $\mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1|x_j) = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(z_i < z_j)|x_j] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}(z_i < z_j)|z_j]|x_j] = \mathbb{E}[F_{z_i|z_j}(z_j)|x_j] = \mathbb{E}[F_{z_i}(z_j)|x_j]$ where $F_{z_i}(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of z_i . $F_{z_i}(\cdot)$ is non-constant in z_j , and $\mathbb{E}[F_{z_i}(z_j)|x_j]$ thus varies in x_j for all $i \neq j$. From the foregoing, the probability that $\mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1|x_j) = 1/2$ for all pairs $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ is zero. $\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij}|x_j] = (1 - 2\mathbb{P}(w_{ij} = 1|x_j))\mathbb{E}[u_i z_i] = (1 - 2\mathbb{E}[F_{z_i}(z_j)|x_j])\mathbb{E}[u_i z_i]$ equals zero a.s. if and only if $\mathbb{E}[u_i z_i] = 0$ for all pairs $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.

Part (ii): Under the conditional mean independence exclusion restriction, $\mathbb{E}[u_i|\mathbf{z}_i] = 0$ a.s. By the LIE, $\mathbb{E}[u_i \bar{z}_{ij}|x_j] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i|\bar{z}_{ij}]\bar{z}_{ij}|x_j] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u_i|x_j, \bar{z}_{ij}]\bar{z}_{ij}|x_j]$. Under the conditional mean independence exclusion restriction, the mean of u_i is independent of \mathbf{z}_i . Under the assumption of independent sampling (Assumption 1(a)), the mean of u_i is also independent of $[\mathbf{x}_j, \mathbf{z}_j]$. Since $\bar{z}_{ij} \equiv \|\mathbf{z}_i - \mathbf{z}_j\|$ is a function of $[\mathbf{z}_i, \mathbf{z}_j]$, combining the assumption of independent sampling and conditional mean independence implies $\mathbb{E}[u_i|x_j, \bar{z}_{ij}] = 0$, and the assertion is proved. □

Proof of Proposition 3.2.

Part (i): By Assumption 2(b) and for n sufficiently large, $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]]$ is positive definite thus for some constant $\delta > 0$ such that $2\delta \leq \rho_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]])$,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta < \rho_{\min}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]]) &= \inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \boldsymbol{\tau}' \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i\mathbf{x}_j]] \boldsymbol{\tau} \\ &= \inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_i\mathbf{x}_j\boldsymbol{\tau}]] \\ &= \inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\tau})'(\mathbf{x}_j\boldsymbol{\tau})]] \\ &= \inf_{\{\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x} : \|\boldsymbol{\tau}\|=1\}} \mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}|\mathbf{Z})]. \end{aligned}$$

The last line uses the equality $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{0}$.

Part (ii): Note that $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{0}$, $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j] = \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i\mathbf{x}_j] = \text{MDDM}_n(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})$ where

$\text{MDDM}_n(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})$ denotes the Martingale Difference Divergence Matrix of Lee and Shao (2018). The boundedness condition of Lee and Shao (2018, Theorem 1) is implied by Assumption 1(b).

$\text{MDDM}_n(\mathbf{X}\mathcal{T}|\mathbf{Z}) = \mathcal{T}'\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]\mathcal{T}$ for any $p_x \times r$ matrix \mathcal{T} whose columns comprise $[\boldsymbol{\tau}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\tau}_r]$, and let $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}_t\| = 1$ for each $t \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ without loss of generality. This implies $\text{rank}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]) = p_x - r^*$ w.p.a.1 if and only if there exists r^* linearly independent combinations of \mathbf{X} such that $\boldsymbol{\tau}_t'\text{MDDM}_n(\mathbf{X}|\mathbf{Z})\boldsymbol{\tau}_t = \boldsymbol{\tau}_t'\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]\boldsymbol{\tau}_t = \text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}_t|\mathbf{Z}) = 0$ w.p.a.1 for each $t \in \{1, \dots, r^*\}$.

Consider a covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_i\mathbf{x}_i]$ where there are r^\dagger linearly independent combinations of \mathbf{X} such that $\mathbf{Z}'(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\alpha}_t)/n = \mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_i\mathbf{x}_i]\boldsymbol{\alpha}_t = \mathbf{0}$ w.p.a.1, and $\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_t\| = 1$ for each $t \in \{1, \dots, r^\dagger\}$. Since conditional mean independence implies zero correlation, it follows that $r^* \leq r^\dagger$, and $p_x \geq p_x - r^* = \text{rank}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}\mathbf{x}_j]) \geq \text{rank}(\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_i\mathbf{x}_i]) = p_x - r^\dagger$ w.p.a.1. This completes the proof part (ii).

Part (iii): By the data generating process (DGP) in Assumption 1(a) and (2.2), write $Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -\mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}(u_i - \mathbf{x}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o))(u_j - \mathbf{x}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o))]$, then $Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o) = 2\mathbb{E}_n[u_i\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}_j](\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) - \mathbb{E}_n[\bar{z}_{ij}(\mathbf{x}_i(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o))(\mathbf{x}_j(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o))] = 2(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)'\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i] + \text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)|\mathbf{Z})$ since $\mathbb{E}_n[\mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{0}$. Assumption 2(a) implies $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{z}'_{n,i}u_i] = \mathbf{0}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$, and thus $\mathbb{E}[Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - Q_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}_o)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)|\mathbf{Z})] = \epsilon^2\mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)\epsilon^{-2}|\mathbf{Z})] = \epsilon^2\mathbb{E}[\text{MDD}_n^2(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\tau}|\mathbf{Z})] > \epsilon^2\delta$ by the equivalence of part (ii) above and Assumption 2(b) where $0 < \epsilon \equiv \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|$ and $\boldsymbol{\tau} \equiv (\boldsymbol{\theta} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)\epsilon^{-1}$. This completes the proof of part (iii). □

Proof of Proposition 3.3. Define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n u_i u_{i'} \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_j + \frac{1}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j' \neq j}^n u_i^2 \bar{z}_{ij} \bar{z}_{ij'} \mathbf{x}'_j \mathbf{x}_{j'}.$$

Since $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_n$ does not depend on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n$, $\text{plim} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_n = \mathbf{A}_o$ under Assumption 2(b), and $\mathbf{B}_o \equiv \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{B}_n =$

$\text{plim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{\mathbf{B}}_n$, it suffices to show that $\|\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n\| = o_p(1)$. Noting that $\hat{u}_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n = u_i - \mathbf{x}_i'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{u}_i \hat{u}_{i'} - u_i u_{i'} &= (\hat{u}_i - u_i) u_{i'} + (\hat{u}_{i'} - u_{i'}) u_i + (\hat{u}_i - u_i)(\hat{u}_{i'} - u_{i'}) \\ &= u_{i'} \mathbf{x}_i'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) + u_i \mathbf{x}_{i'}'(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) + (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)' \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_{i'}' (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o) \end{aligned}$$

for any $1 \leq i, i' \leq n$. From the foregoing and the commutativity of sums,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n\| &\leq 2 \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \|u_{i'} \bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}_i\| \times \|\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{x}_j\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|^2}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{i'=1}^n \|\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{x}_j\| \times \|\bar{z}_{i'j} \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_{i'}\| \\ &\quad + 2 \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j'=1}^n \|u_i \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j\| \times \|\bar{z}_{ij'} \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_{j'}\| \\ &\quad + \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o\|^2}{n^3} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{j'=1}^n \|\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_i\| \times \|\bar{z}_{ij'} \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{x}_{j'}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 1(b) and the assumptions of Theorem 1, $\|\hat{\mathbf{B}}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_n\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.4. Define $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)'$ where $\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \equiv \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i}^n (\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j' u_i + \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_i' u_j)/2$, and $\mathcal{B}_n \equiv \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)']$. By the triangle inequality, $\|\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n - \mathcal{B}_n\| \leq \|\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n\| + \|\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n - \mathcal{B}_n\|$.

First, $\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) = -\frac{1}{2(n-1)} \sum_{j \neq i}^n (\bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_j' \mathbf{x}_i + \bar{z}_{ij} \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{x}_j) (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$ using the expression $\hat{u}_i - u_i = -\mathbf{x}_i' (\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_o)$. Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 and Assumption 1(b), $\|\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Then by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' &= \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i))' + (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)) \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' \\ &= \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i))' + (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)) \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' + (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)) (\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i))', \end{aligned}$$

$$\|\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)'\| \leq 2 \|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\| \times \|\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\| + \|\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\|^2 =$$

$O_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Theorem 1, Assumption 1(b), and the triangle inequality. This implies $\|\hat{\mathcal{B}}_n - \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_n\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Second, following the preceding paragraph,

$$\|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)' - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)'\| \leq 2\|\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\| \times \|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\| + \|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\|^2$$

by the triangle inequality. By Assumption 1(b), it suffices to show that $\|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\|$ converges to zero in quadratic mean. $\|\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)]\| = \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)|\mathbf{w}_i] - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)]\| = \|\mathbb{E}[\psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)]\| = 0$ by the LIE. For any $\boldsymbol{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_x}$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\tau}\| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{var}(\boldsymbol{\tau}'(\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i))) &= \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\boldsymbol{\tau}'\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i)|\mathbf{w}_i)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \sum_{j' \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_j u_i, \bar{z}_{ij'}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_{j'} u_i | \mathbf{w}_i)]/2 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \sum_{j' \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{cov}(\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_i u_j, \bar{z}_{ij'}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_{i'} u_{j'} | \mathbf{w}_i)]/2 \\ &= \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_j u_i | \mathbf{w}_i)]/2 + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\text{var}(\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_i u_j | \mathbf{w}_i)]/2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j u_i\|^2]/2 + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i u_j\|^2]/2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n (\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_j u_i\|^4])^{1/2}/2 + \frac{1}{(n-1)^2} \sum_{j \neq i}^n (\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{z}_{ij}\mathbf{x}'_i u_j\|^4])^{1/2}/2 \\ &\leq \frac{C^{1/2}}{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the c_r -inequality. The equality follows from independent sampling since for $j \neq j'$, $\text{cov}(\bar{z}_{ij}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_j u_i, \bar{z}_{ij'}\boldsymbol{\tau}'\mathbf{x}'_{j'} u_i | \mathbf{w}_i) = 0$ a.s. The third inequality follows from Jensen's inequality and the last inequality uses Assumption 1(b). $\|\tilde{\psi}_i(\mathbf{w}_i) - \psi_i(\mathbf{w}_i)\|$ thus converges to zero in quadratic mean. \square

B More Simulation Results

This section examines the performance of the MMD and OLS/2SLS estimators in larger samples with multiple instrumental variables. This section also compares the analytical form of the MMD estimator (2.3) with OLS/2SLS under other specifications. The instrument in Specification (i) is generated as in Section 4, Specification (i). Three instrumental variables $[z_{1i}, z_{2i}, z_{3i}]$ are used in Specifications (ii) to (iv) below. They are drawn from the multivariate normal distribution with $\text{cov}(z_{ki}, z_{li}) = 0.5^{|k-l|}$ for $1 \leq k, l \leq 3$.

$$(i) \quad y_i = \theta_o x_i + \nu_i, \nu_i = (u_i + \xi_i)/\sqrt{2}, \xi_i = (\dot{\xi}_i - \mathbb{E}_n[\dot{\xi}_i])/\sigma_{\dot{\xi}}, \dot{\xi}_i = \phi(x_i^*), \text{ and } z_i = x_i = x_i^*.$$

$$(ii) \quad y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i, x_i = (\dot{x}_i - \mathbb{E}_n[\dot{x}_i])/\sigma_{\dot{x}}, \text{ and } \dot{x}_i = z_{1i}z_{2i} + z_{2i}z_{3i} + z_{1i}z_{3i} + u_i.$$

$$(iii) \quad y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i, x_i = \mathbb{I}(\dot{x}_i - \mathbb{E}_n[\dot{x}_i] \geq 0), \text{ and } \dot{x}_i = (1 + z_{1i} + z_{2i} + z_{3i} + u_i)^3.$$

$$(iv) \quad y_i = \theta_o x_i + u_i, x_i = (\dot{x}_i - \mathbb{E}_n[\dot{x}_i])/\sigma_{\dot{x}}, \dot{x}_i = |z_{1i}|/\sqrt{1 - 2/\pi} + 2\mathbb{I}(|z_{2i}| < -\Phi^{-1}(0.25)) + \dot{\zeta}_{3i}/\sigma_{\dot{\zeta}_3} + u_i, \text{ and } \dot{\zeta}_{3i} = \sqrt{|z_{3i}^2 - 1|}.$$

Specification (i) examines the performance of the MMD and OLS when the weak uncorrelatedness exclusion restriction holds, but the stronger conditional mean independence exclusion restriction does not hold. Specifications (ii) to (iv) generally serve to examine the performance of both MMD and IV in the presence of multiple instruments. Identification for the IV only holds under Specification (iii). Specification (ii) is meant to examine the MMD's ability to exploit identifying variation from a small set of elementary instruments without taking transformations. Specification (iii) considers a binary endogenous covariate with strong IVs, and Specification (iv) extends Specification (iv) in Section 4 to the multiple IV setting.

The results are reported in Table B.1. One observes that in the case of exogenous covariates or IV-strong instruments (Specifications (i) and (iii)), both the MMD and OLS/2SLS perform comparably well, just as in Table 4.1 of Section 4. Specifications (ii) and (iv) in the

Table B.1: More Simulations Results

n	1000			2500		
	Specification (i)					
	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE
MMD	0.003	0.025	0.037	0.000	0.016	0.023
OLS	0.003	0.028	0.042	0.000	0.018	0.025
	Specification (ii)					
	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE
MMD	0.013	0.027	0.042	0.004	0.018	0.026
2SLS	0.190	0.372	0.693	0.235	0.359	0.734
	Specification (iii)					
	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE
MMD	-0.010	0.111	0.178	-0.001	0.074	0.112
2SLS	-0.009	0.075	0.119	-0.001	0.051	0.074
	Specification (iv)					
	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE	Med. Bias	MAD	RMSE
MMD	0.040	0.047	0.074	0.021	0.027	0.041
2SLS	0.366	0.445	0.844	0.403	0.483	0.843

Notes: This table provides results for the MMD and OLS/IV estimators of the linear model. Results are based on 1000 random repetitions. The median bias (Med. Bias), median absolute deviation (MAD), and root mean squared errors (RMSE) are reported.

table confirm the MMD's good performance even in the case of extremely weak but MMD-relevant instruments. The 2SLS in Specifications (ii) and (iv), as expected, is not consistent because of identification failure.