Estimating Equations in R: geex

B. Saul

2017-05-15

M-estimation theory provides a framework for asymptotic properties of estimators that are solutions to estimating equations. Regression methods such as Generalized Linear Models (GLM) and Generalized Estimating Equations (GEE) fit in this framework. Countless R packages implement specific applications of estimating equations. A common reason to use M-estimation is to compute the empirical sandwich variance estimator - an asymptotically Normal and "robust" covariance. Many packages compute this variance estimator automatically, and packages such as sandwich take the output of other modeling methods to compute this variance estimate.

geex aims to be provide a more general framework that any modelling method can use to compute point and variance estimates for parameters that are solutions to estimating equations. The basic idea:

- Analyst provides three things: (1) data, (2) instructions on how to split the data into independent units and (3) a function that takes unit-level data and returns a function in terms of parameters.
- geex computes point estimates and variance estimates for the parameters.

Basic Setup

I mostly follow the notation of Stefanski and Boos. I tried to keep notation in the code similar to mathematical notation.

Suppose we have m independent or nearly independent units of observations.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \psi(O_i, \theta) = 0$$

Where ψ is vector of length p corresponding to the number of parameters in θ .

For notational ease, let $\psi(O_i, \theta) = \psi_i$ Let:

$$A_i = -\frac{\partial \psi(O_i, \theta)}{\partial \theta}$$

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} A_i$$

$$B_i = \psi_i \psi_i^T$$

$$B = \sum_{i=1}^{m} B_i$$

$$\Sigma = A^{-1}B\{A^{-1}\}^T$$

Example 1 illustrates calculation of sample mean and variance using estimating equations. I generate a data set with 100 observations drawn from a Normal(5, 2) distribution. Table translates the estimating equations into the R function needed for geex:

With the eeFUN function prepared, it is passed to estimate_equations along with the data, a character string naming the variable that identifies groups within the dataset, and starting values for the root finder.

Table 2: " Comparing estimates from closed form versus geex "

Stefanski & Boos example 2

Example 2 illustrates calculation of a ratio estimator. I generate a data set with 100 observations where $Y \sim N(5, 2)$ and $X \sim N(2, 0.2)$. Table translates the estimating equations into the R function needed for geex:

Table 4: " test "
$$\hat{\theta}$$
 $\hat{\Sigma}$ Closed form (5.3394 1.9933 2.6787)
$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.0378 & 0.0003 & 0.0186 \\ 0.0003 & 0.0004 & -0.0003 \\ 0.0186 & -0.0003 & 0.0098 \\ 0.0375 & 0.0003 & 0.0184 \\ 0.0003 & 0.0004 & -0.0003 \\ 0.0184 & -0.0003 & 0.0097 \end{pmatrix}$$
 Decimal of difference (Inf Inf 16)
$$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 6 & 4 \\ 6 & 6 & 6 \\ 4 & 6 & 5 \end{pmatrix}$$

Example 3 illustrates calculation of a ratio estimator. I generate a data set with 100 observations where $Y \sim N(5, 4)$. Table translates the estimating equations into the R function needed for geex:

```
Table 5: Translating math to code \\ SB3\_eefun <- function(data) \{ \\ function(theta) \{ \\ with(data, \\ c(Y - theta[1], \\ (Y - theta[1])^2 - theta[2], \\ sqrt(theta[2]) - theta[3], \\ log(theta[2]) - theta[4]) \\ \} \\ \}
```

```
Table 6: "Example 3"
                                                                                               \hat{\Sigma}
                                                                             (0.1650 \quad 0.1116 \quad 0.0137 \quad 0.0068)
                                                                                      5.3752 0.6616 0.3257
                                                                             0.1116
Closed form
                            (5.0117 \quad 16.5029 \quad 4.0624 \quad 2.8035)
                                                                             0.0137
                                                                                       0.6616 \quad 0.0814 \quad 0.0401
                                                                             0.0068
                                                                                       0.3257 \quad 0.0401 \quad 0.0197
                                                                             0.1650
                                                                                       0.1116 \quad 0.0137 \quad 0.0068
                                                                             0.1116
                                                                                       5.3752 \quad 0.6616 \quad 0.3257
                            (5.0117 \quad 16.5029 \quad 4.0624 \quad 2.8035)
geex
                                                                             0.0137
                                                                                       0.6616 \quad 0.0814 \quad 0.0401
                                                                            0.0068
                                                                                       0.3257 \quad 0.0401 \quad 0.0197
                                                                                       13 	12 	13 	13
                                                                                       12\quad 10\quad 12\quad 12
                                    (Inf Inf Inf 16)
Decimal of difference
                                                                                          12 \quad 12
```

Example 4 illustrates calculation of an instumental variable estimator. I generate a data set with 100 observations where INPUT data generation. Table translates the estimating equations into the R function needed for geex:

```
 \text{Table 7: Translating math to code} \\ \text{SB\_eefun} <- \text{ function(data)} \{ \\ \text{function(theta)} \{ \\ \text{with(data,} \\ \text{c(theta[1] - T\_,} \\ \text{theta[2] - W,} \\ (Y_i - \theta_3 W_i)(\theta_2 - W_i) \\ (Y_i - \theta_4 W_i)(\theta_1 - T_i) \end{pmatrix} \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{c(theta[3] * W)) * (theta[2] - W),} \\ \text{(Y - (theta[4] * W)) * (theta[1] - T\_))} \\ \text{)} \\ \text{)} \\ \text{\}} \\ \end{array}
```

```
# sigma2_W <- var(dt$W)
# sigma2_U <- var(residuals(YT_model))

# ((sigma_e^2 * (1 + sigma_U^2 * sigma_e^2) + beta^2 * (sigma_U^2 * 1))/(1 + sigma_U^2 * sigma_e^2)^2)
# ((sigma_e^2 * (1 + sigma_U^2 * sigma_e^2) + beta^2 * (sigma_U^2 * 1))/(1 + sigma_U^2 * sigma_e^2)^2)
Sigma_cls <- matrix(NA, nrow = 2, ncol = 2)
```

```
Table 8: " Example 4 " \hat{\theta} \hat{\Sigma} Closed form (9.4961 4.9928 3.0057 3.0210) ( ) geex (9.4961 4.9928 3.0057 3.0210) (0.0001 0.0001) Decimal of difference (Inf Inf 16 15) ( )
```

```
## Loading required package: mvtnorm
## Warning: package 'mvtnorm' was built under R version 3.3.2
## Loading required package: ICS
## Warning: package 'ICS' was built under R version 3.3.2
```

Example 5 illustrates calculation of an instumental variable estimator. I generate a data set with 100 observations where $X \sim N(2, 1)$. Let $\theta_0 = 0$. Table translates the estimating equations for the Hodges-Lehmann location estimation and the sample mean into the R function needed for geex:

```
 \text{Table 9: Translating math to code} \\ \text{SB5\_eefun} \leftarrow \text{function(data, theta0 = 0)} \{ \\ \text{Xi} \leftarrow \text{data$X} \\ \text{IC\_HL} \leftarrow (1/\text{IC\_denom}) * (\text{FO(Xi, theta0)} - 0.5) \\ \psi(Y_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} IC_{\hat{\theta}_{HL}}(X; \theta_0) - (\theta_1 - \theta_0) \\ X_i - \theta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \text{function(theta)} \{ \\ \text{c(IC\_HL} - (\text{theta[1]} - \text{theta0}), \\ \text{Xi} - \text{theta[2]}) \\ \} \\ \}
```

```
F0 <- function(y, theta0, distrFUN = pnorm){
   distrFUN(y - theta0, mean = 0)
}

f0 <- function(y, densFUN){
   densFUN(y, mean = 0)
}

integrand <- function(y, densFUN = dnorm){
   f0(y, densFUN = densFUN)^2
}</pre>
```

```
IC_denom <- integrate(integrand, lower = -Inf, upper = Inf)$value</pre>
SB5_eefun <- function(data){</pre>
  Xi <- data$X
  function(theta){
     IC_{HL} \leftarrow (1/IC_{denom}) * (FO(Xi, theta[1]) - 0.5)
     c(IC_HL,
       Xi - theta[2])
  }
}
estimates <- estimate_equations(eeFUN = SB5_eefun,
                                  data = dt, units = 'id',
                                  roots = c(2, 1)
theta_cls <- c(hl.loc(dt$X), mean(dt$X))</pre>
## closed form covariance
# Not sure how compute SB's closed form since it depends on X, which is
# supposed to be unobserved.
Sigma_cls \leftarrow matrix(c(1/(12 * IC_denom^2) / n, NA, NA, var(dt$X)/100),
                     nrow = 2, ncol = 2, byrow = TRUE)
```

```
Table 10: " Example 5 " \hat{\theta} \hat{\Sigma} Closed form (1.9729 \ 1.9422) \begin{pmatrix} 0.0105 \\ 0.0118 \end{pmatrix} geex (1.9729 \ 1.9422) \begin{pmatrix} 0.0124 \ 0.0117 \\ 0.0117 \ 0.0117 \end{pmatrix} Decimal of difference \begin{pmatrix} 6 \ Inf \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 3 \\ 4 \end{pmatrix}
```

Example 6 illustrates calculation of the Huber estimator of the center of symmetric distributions. I generate a data set with 100 observations where $Y \sim N(2, 1)$. Table translates the estimating equations for the Huber estimator for the center of symmetric distributions into the R function needed for geex:

```
theta_cls <- MASS::huber(dt$Y, tol = 1e-10)$mu

psi_k <- function(x, k = 1.5){
    if(abs(x) <= k) x else sign(x) * k
}

A <- lapply(dt$Y, function(y){
    x <- y - theta_cls
    -numDeriv::grad(psi_k, x = x)
}) %>% unlist() %>% mean()

B <- lapply(dt$Y, function(y){
    x <- y - theta_cls
    psi_k(x = x)^2
}) %>% unlist() %>% mean()

## closed form covariance
Sigma_cls <- matrix(1/A * B * 1/A / n)</pre>
```

```
Table 12: " Example 6 " \hat{\theta} \hat{\Sigma} Closed form (1.9368) (0.0130) geex (1.9301) (0.0130) Decimal of difference (3) (5)
```

Example 7 illustrates calculation of sample quantiles using M-estimation. I generate a data set with 100 observations where $Y \sim N(2, 1)$. Table translates the estimating equations for two sample quantiles (median and 65th percentile) into the R function needed for geex:

```
 \text{Table 13: Translating math to code } \\ \text{SB7\_eefun} \leftarrow \text{function(data)} \{ \\ \text{function(theta)} \{ \\ \text{with(data,} \\ \\ \psi_k(Y_i,\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 - I(Y_i \leq \theta_1) \\ 0.65 - I(Y_i \leq \theta_2) \end{pmatrix} \\ & \text{c(0.5 - (Y <= theta[1]),} \\ 0.65 - (Y <= theta[2])) \\ \\ ) \\ \} \\ \}
```

This example is under development. The core functions need to be modified in order approximate the ψ and ψ_i functions. I propose to add an additional API that allows users to manipulate these functions. The example below illustrate.

I begin with a nondifferentiable ψ function of a single dimension.

```
SB7_eefun <- function(data){
  function(theta){
    0.5 - (data$Y <= theta[1])
  }
}</pre>
```

Here, I modify the eeroot function in order to approximate the $\psi = \sum_i \psi_i$ function.

```
eeroot_mod <- function(geex_list,</pre>
                                 = NULL,
                    start
                    rootsolver = rootSolve::multiroot,
                   root_options = NULL,
                               = NULL,
                   apprx_fun
                    apprx_options = NULL,
                    ...){
  # Create estimating equation functions per group
  psi_i <- lapply(geex_list$splitdt, function(data_i){</pre>
    geex_list$eeFUN(data = data_i, ...)
  })
  # Create psi function that sums over all ee funs
  psi <- function(theta){</pre>
    psii <- lapply(psi_i, function(f) {</pre>
      do.call(f, args = append(list(theta = theta), geex_list$ee_args))
    apply(check_array(simplify2array(psii)), 1, sum)
  }
  # apprx_fun is a function that manipulates the psi function and returns a new psi function
  if(!is.null(apprx_fun)){
    psi <- do.call(apprx_fun, args = append(list(psi = psi), apprx_options))</pre>
  }
  # Find roots of psi
  rargs <- append(root_options, list(f = psi, start = start))</pre>
  do.call(rootsolver, args = rargs)
}
```

Here's an example of how it would work using splinefun.

```
spline_approx <- function(psi, eval_theta){
    ### Use splinefun ####
    psi2 <- Vectorize(psi)
    psi <- function(theta) splinefun(x = eval_theta, psi2(eval_theta))(theta)
    psi
}

myList <- list(eeFUN = SB7_eefun, splitdt = split(dt, f = dt$id))

root_spline1 <- eeroot_mod(
    geex_list = myList,
    start = 2,
    apprx_fun = spline_approx,
    apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(1, 5, by = .5))
)

# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_spline1$root</pre>
```

[1] -0.08006065

```
# But notice that the basis of the spline matters too
root_spline2 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
  start
           = 2,
  apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(1, 5, by = .1))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_spline2$root
## [1] 0.02921017
# But notice that the basis of the spline matters too
root_spline3 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
  start
         = 2,
  apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx options = list(eval theta = seq(-5, 5, by = 1))
)
# Compare to the truth
```

[1] -0.08048269

median(dt\$Y) - root_spline3\$root

The above method works, but (a) it's not clear how to choose eval_theta and (b) it would not work with a ψ function of greater than 1 dimension since splinefun only takes univariate arguments.

Here's an example of how it would work using mgcv::gam.

```
library(mgcv)
```

```
## Loading required package: nlme
##
## Attaching package: 'nlme'
## The following object is masked from 'package:dplyr':
##
##
       collapse
## This is mgcv 1.8-13. For overview type 'help("mgcv-package")'.
##
## Attaching package: 'mgcv'
## The following object is masked from 'package:inferference':
##
##
gam_approx <- function(psi, eval_theta){</pre>
  ### Use splinefun ####
  psi2 <- Vectorize(psi)</pre>
       <- psi2(eval_theta)</pre>
  gam_basis <- gam(Y ~ s(eval_theta))</pre>
  psi <- function(theta) predict(gam_basis, newdata = data.frame(eval_theta = theta))</pre>
  psi
}
```

```
root_gam1 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
 start = 2,
 apprx_fun = gam_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(1, 5, by = .3))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_gam1$root
## [1] -0.02318684
# Still, the basis of the spline influences the result
root_gam2 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
          = 2,
 start
 apprx_fun = gam_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(1.5, 3.5, length.out = 20))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_gam2$root
## [1] -0.05344775
What happens when the n increases from 100 to 10000?
dt2 <- data.frame(Y = rnorm(n, mean = theta_tru, sd = sigma), id = 1:10000)
myList2 <- list(eeFUN = SB7_eefun, splitdt = split(dt2, f = dt2$id))</pre>
root_spline4 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList2,
  start
          = 2,
  apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 5, by = .1))
median(dt2$Y) - root_spline4$root
## [1] -0.01297451
root_gam3 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
 geex_list = myList2,
           = 2,
 start
 apprx_fun = gam_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 5, by = .1))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_gam3$root
## [1] -0.1546932
In order to compute A_i, we need to approximate \psi_i, so I'll make a similar modification to compute_matrices.
compute_matrices_mod <- function(geex_list,</pre>
                              theta,
```

```
numDeriv_options = list(method = 'Richardson'),
                              silent = TRUE,
                              apprx_fun
                                            = NULL.
                              apprx_options = NULL,
                              ...){
  if(is.null(geex_list$ee_args)){
    ee_args <- NULL
  with(geex_list, {
    # Create list of estimating eqn functions per unit
    psi_i <- lapply(splitdt, function(data_i){</pre>
      f <- eeFUN(data = data_i, ...)</pre>
      if(!is.null(apprx_fun)){
        f <- do.call(apprx_fun, args = append(list(psi = f), apprx_options))</pre>
      }
      f
    })
    # Compute the negative of the derivative matrix of estimating eqn functions
    # (the information matrix)
    A_i <- lapply(psi_i, function(ee){
      args <- append(list(fun = ee, x = theta), numDeriv_options)</pre>
      val <- do.call(numDeriv::jacobian, args = append(args, ee_args))</pre>
      -val
    })
    A_i_array <- check_array(simplify2array(A_i))
    A <- apply(A_i_array, 1:2, sum)
    # Compute outer product of observed estimating eqns
    B_i <- lapply(psi_i, function(ee) {</pre>
      ee_val <- do.call(ee, args = append(list(theta = theta), ee_args))</pre>
      ee_val %*% t(ee_val)
    })
       <- apply(check_array(simplify2array(B_i)), 1:2, sum)</pre>
    list(A = A, A_i = A_i, B = B, B_i = B_i)
 })
}
spline_matrices1 <- compute_matrices_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
         = median(dt$Y),
 theta
 apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 4, by = .5))
compute_sigma(A = spline_matrices1$A, B = spline_matrices1$B)
              [,1]
## [1,] 0.01925883
```

```
gam_matrices1 <- compute_matrices_mod(
  geex_list = myList,
  theta = median(dt$Y),
  apprx_fun = gam_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 4, by = .3))
)

compute_sigma(A = gam_matrices1$A, B = gam_matrices1$B)

## [1,]
## [1,] 0.01164746

# V(theta) from Stefanski and Boos
((0.5 * (1 -0.5))/((dnorm(median(dt2$Y), mean = mean(dt2$Y), sd = sd(dt2$Y)))^2) )

## [1] 1 550000</pre>
```

[1] 1.552629

For the the quantiles in particular, Stefanski and Boos suggest directly approximating f(theta) by a kernel density. Let's try that.

```
dens <- density(dt$Y)
ff <- splinefun(x = dens$x, y = dens$y)
density_apprx <- function(psi){
  function(theta) ff(theta)
}

density_matrices1 <- compute_matrices_mod(
  geex_list = myList,
  theta = median(dt$Y),
  apprx_fun = density_apprx
)

compute_sigma(A = density_matrices1$A, B = density_matrices1$B)</pre>
```

```
## [,1]
## [1,] 6.785466
```

What would happen if instead of approximating ψ for finding roots, we approximated ψ_i ? I'm sure it would be slower, but if making same approximations for both situations (finding roots and derivatives of A_i) seems more principled plus the code would be modified in the same location in both eeroot and compute_matrices.

```
})
  # Create psi function that sums over all ee funs
  psi <- function(theta){</pre>
    psii <- lapply(psi_i, function(f) {</pre>
      do.call(f, args = append(list(theta = theta), geex_list$ee_args))
    apply(check_array(simplify2array(psii)), 1, sum)
  }
  # Find roots of psi
  rargs <- append(root_options, list(f = psi, start = start))</pre>
  do.call(rootsolver, args = rargs)
# But notice that the basis of the spline matters too
root_spline5 <- eeroot_mod2(</pre>
  geex_list = myList,
 start = 2,
 apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(-5, 5, by = 1))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_spline5$root
## [1] -0.08048269
root_gam5 <- eeroot_mod2(</pre>
  geex list = myList,
          = 2,
 start
 apprx_fun = gam_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 5, by = .1))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_gam5$root
## [1] -0.03741613
# But notice that the basis of the spline matters too
root_spline6 <- eeroot_mod2(</pre>
  geex_list = myList2,
  start
          = 2,
  apprx_fun = spline_approx,
  apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(-5, 5, by = 1))
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_spline6$root
## [1] -0.197103
root_gam6 <- eeroot_mod(</pre>
  geex_list = myList2,
  start
           = 2,
 apprx_fun = gam_approx,
```

```
apprx_options = list(eval_theta = seq(0, 5, by = .1))
)
# Compare to the truth
median(dt$Y) - root_gam6$root
## [1] -0.1546932
Not really.
Now try to approximate a multidimensional \psi function.
SB7 eefun2 <- function(data){
  function(theta){
    with(data,
    c(0.25 - (Y \le theta[1]),
           - (Y <= theta[2]),</pre>
      0.5
      0.75 - (Y \le theta[3])
    )
  }
}
```

The code next is work in progress. No good, so far.

```
gam_approx_multi <- function(psi, eval_theta1, eval_theta2, eval_theta3){</pre>
  ### Use splinefun ####
  # psi2 <- Vectorize(psi)</pre>
  Y <- matrix(NA, nrow = length(eval_theta1), ncol = 3)
  for(i in 1:length(eval_theta1)){
      Y[i, ] <- psi(c(eval_theta1[i], eval_theta2[i], eval_theta3[i]))
  }
  gam_data <- data.frame(</pre>
    Y1 = Y[, 1],
    Y2 = Y[, 2],
   Y3 = Y[, 3],
    x1 = eval_theta1,
    x2 = eval\_theta2,
    x3 = eval\_theta3
  gam_basis <- gam(list(Y1 ~ s(x1),</pre>
                         Y2 \sim s(x2),
                         Y3 \sim s(x3)),
                    family = mvn(d = 3),
                    data = gam_data)
  print(gam_basis)
  psi <- function(theta) {</pre>
    predict(gam_basis, newdata = data.frame(eval_theta1 = theta[1],
                                               eval_theta2 = theta[2],
                                               eval_theta3 = theta[3]))
  }
 psi
}
SB7_eefun2(dt[1, ])(c(1, 2, 3))
```

Example 8 illustrates robust regression. I generate a data set with 50 observations where half of the observation have $X_i = 1$ and the others have $X_i = 0$. Y = 0.5 + 2 and $X_i = 0.5 + 2$ and $X_i =$

Table 15: "Example 8 "
$$\hat{\theta}$$
 $\hat{\Sigma}$ Closed form $\begin{pmatrix} 0.5681 & 1.6957 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0.0438 & -0.0438 \\ -0.0438 & 0.0876 \end{pmatrix}$ geex $\begin{pmatrix} 0.5705 & 1.6913 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0.0381 & -0.0381 \\ -0.0381 & 0.0814 \end{pmatrix}$ Decimal of difference $\begin{pmatrix} 3 & 3 \\ 3 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$

Example 9 illustrates estimation of a generalized linear model. I generate a data set with 100 observations where half of the observation have $X_{1i} = 1$ and the others have $X_{1i} = 0$. $Y_i \sim Bern[logit^{-1}(0.5 + 2 X_{1i} + 0.1 X_{2i})]$. Table translates the estimating equations for logistic regression into the R function needed for geex:

```
 \begin{tabular}{lll} Table 16: Translating math to code \\ SB9\_eefun <- function(data) \{ \\ Yi <- data\$Y \\ xi <- model.matrix(Y ~ X1 + X2, data = data, drop = FALSE) \\ function(theta) \{ \\ lp <- xi  %*% theta \\ mu <- plogis(lp) \\ D <- t(xi)  %*% dlogis(lp) \\ V <- mu * (1 - mu) \\ D  %*% solve(V)  %*% (Yi - mu) \\ \} \\ \} \\ \end{tabular}
```

Table 17: " Example 9 "
$$\hat{\beta}$$
 $\hat{\Sigma}$ Closed form $\begin{pmatrix} 0.3545 & 2.2680 & 0.2747 \end{pmatrix}$ $\begin{pmatrix} 0.1421 & -0.0336 & -0.1225 \\ -0.0336 & 0.4264 & -0.1087 \\ -0.1225 & -0.1087 & 0.2687 \end{pmatrix}$ geex $\begin{pmatrix} 0.3545 & 2.2680 & 0.2747 \end{pmatrix}$ $\begin{pmatrix} 0.1421 & -0.0336 & -0.1225 \\ -0.0336 & 0.4264 & -0.1087 \\ -0.0336 & 0.4264 & -0.1087 \\ -0.1225 & -0.1087 & 0.2687 \end{pmatrix}$ Decimal of difference $\begin{pmatrix} 12 & 10 & 12 \end{pmatrix}$ $\begin{pmatrix} 8 & 7 & 7 \\ 7 & 7 & 6 \\ 7 & 6 & 7 \end{pmatrix}$

[1] 0.1078138

Example 10 illustrates testing equality of success probablities. Table translates the estimating equations into the R function needed for geex:

Table 18: Translating math to code

SB10_eefun <- function(data){</pre>

Y <- data\$ft_made

```
n <- data$ft_attp
                                                function(theta){
          \psi_k(Y_i, n_i, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{(Y_i - n_i \theta_2)^2}{n_i \theta_2 (1 - \theta_2)} - \theta_1 \\ Y_i - n_i \theta_2 \end{pmatrix}
                                                  p <- theta[2]
                                                  c(((Y - (n * p))^2)/(n * p * (1 - p)) - theta[1],
                                                     Y - n * p
                                                }
                                              }
estimates <- estimate_equations(eeFUN = SB10_eefun,
                                     data = shaq,
                                     units = 'game',
                                     numDeriv_options = list(method.args = list(eps = 1e-7, r = 10, zero.tol
                                     roots = c(.5, .5))
V11 <- function(p) {
        <- nrow(shaq)
  sumn <- sum(shaq$ft_attp)</pre>
  sumn_inv <- sum(1/shaq$ft_attp)</pre>
  term2_n <-1 - (6 * p) + (6 * p^2)
  term2_d \leftarrow p * (1 - p)
  term2 <- term2_n/term2_d</pre>
  term3 <-((1 - (2 * p))^2) / ((sumn/k) * p * (1 - p))
  2 + (term2 * (1/k) * sumn_inv) - term3
p_tilde <- sum(shaq$ft_made)/sum(shaq$ft_attp)</pre>
V11_hat <- V11(p_tilde)/23
# Compare variance estimates
V11_hat
## [1] 0.0783097
estimates$vcov[1, 1]
## [1] 0.1929791
# Compare p-values
pnorm(35.51/23, mean = 1, sd = sqrt(V11_hat), lower.tail = FALSE)
## [1] 0.02596785
pnorm(estimates$parameters[1],
       mean = 1,
       sd = sqrt(estimates$vcov[1, 1]),
       lower.tail = FALSE)
```

Small Sample Corrections of Fay (2001)

Bias correction

$$H_i = \{1 - min(b, \{A_iA\}_{jj})\}^{-1/2}$$

Where b is a constant chosen by the analyst. Fay lets b = 0.75. Note that H_i is a diagonal matrix.

$$B_i^{bc} = H_i \psi_i \psi_i^T H_i$$

$$B^{bc} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} B_i^{bc}$$

$$\Sigma^{bc} = A^{-1}B^{bc}\{A^{-1}\}^T$$

Degrees of Freedom corrections

Let L be the contrast of interest (e.g.) $(0, \ldots, 0, 1, -1)$ for a causal difference when the last two elements of the estimating equations are the counterfactual means.

$$\mathcal{I} = [I_p \cdots I_p]$$

where I_p is a $p \times p$ identity matrix.

$$G = I_{pm} - \begin{bmatrix} A_1^{bc} \\ \vdots \\ A_m \end{bmatrix} A^{-1} \mathcal{I}$$

$$M = diag\{H_i A^{-1} L L^T (A^{-1})^T H_i\}$$

$$C = G^T M G$$

$$w_i = L^T \left[\left\{ \sum_{j \neq i} A_i \right\}^{-1} - A^{-1} \right] L$$

$$\bar{w} = \sum_{i=1}^{m} w_i$$

$$A_i^{bc} = \frac{w_i}{\bar{w}} B^{bc}$$

$$\hat{df}_1 = \frac{\left\{Tr(diag(A_i)C)\right\}^2}{Tr(diag(A_i)Cdiag(A_i)C)}$$

$$\hat{d\!f}_2 = \frac{\left\{Tr(diag(A_i^{bc})C)\right\}^2}{Tr(diag(A_i^{bc})Cdiag(A_i^{bc})C)}$$