



On testability of complementarity in models with multiple equilibria



Yoshiyasu Rai^a, Taisuke Otsu^{b,*}

^a Department of Economics, Keio University, 2-15-45 Mita, Minato-ku, Tokyo 108-8345, Japan

^b Department of Economics, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, UK

HIGHLIGHTS

- Echenique and Komunjer's (2009) testability of complementarity is reconsidered.
- Their testable condition is implied by a tail condition without complementarity.
- A stronger version of complementarity implies their testable condition.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 17 December 2012

Received in revised form

22 March 2013

Accepted 23 March 2013

Available online 6 April 2013

JEL classification:

C10

Keywords:

Complementarity

Testability

Quantile

ABSTRACT

This paper revisits testability of complementarity in economic models with multiple equilibria studied by Echenique and Komunjer (2009). We find that Echenique and Komunjer's (2009) testable implications on extreme quantiles can be implied by a weaker version of their tail condition without complementarity, and on the other hand, a slightly stronger version of complementarity implies their testable implications without the tail condition.

© 2013 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Main result

We first introduce the setup and main result of Echenique and Komunjer (2009) (hereafter, EK). Our notation closely follows EK's. Consider a structural equation:

$$r(Y, X) = U,$$

where $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ is a dependent variable, $X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ is an explanatory variable, $U \in \mathbb{R}$ is a disturbance term, and $r: \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function implied by economic theory. We observe X and Y but do not observe U . EK studied testability of this model when there are complementarities between X and Y without assuming a parametric functional form of r , dependence structure between X and U , and specific equilibrium selection rule. Let $\mathcal{E}_{xu} = \{y \in \mathbb{R} | r(y, x) = u\}$ be the equilibrium set for given x and u , $F_{U|X=x}$ be the conditional distribution of U given $X = x$ (which is assumed to have a strictly positive density), and $\bar{F}_{Y|X=x}(y) = 1 - F_{Y|X=x}(y)$, where $F_{Y|X=x}$ is the conditional distribution of Y given $X = x$.

By an innovative argument to focus on the largest or smallest equilibrium and to apply a change of variable technique, EK

obtained the following result (the comments in the parentheses are added by the authors).

Assumption S1. (i) The function $r: \mathbb{R} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is continuous (on $y \in \mathbb{R}$ for each given $X \in \mathcal{X}$); (ii) for any $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\lim_{y \rightarrow -\infty} r(y, x) = +\infty$ and $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} r(y, x) = -\infty$; (iii) for any $(x, u) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}$, \mathcal{E}_{xu} is a finite set. We write $\mathcal{E}_{xu} = \{\xi_{1xu}, \dots, \xi_{n_x xu}\}$ ($\xi_{1xu} \leq \dots \leq \xi_{n_x xu}$) with $n_x = \text{Card}(\mathcal{E}_{xu})$ (which is finite and does not depend on u). (Also, the selection rule \mathcal{P}_{xu} , a probability distribution over \mathcal{E}_{xu} , assigns probabilities $\{\pi_{1x}, \dots, \pi_{n_x x}\}$ to $\{\xi_{1xu}, \dots, \xi_{n_x xu}\}$ for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\pi_{1x} > 0$ and $\pi_{n_x x} > 0$.)

Assumption S2. $r(y, x)$ is monotone increasing in x on \mathbb{R} .

Assumption S3 (For any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$). (i) $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} [r(y, x_1) / r(y, x_2)] = \lambda$ with $\lambda > 1$; (ii) for any $\lambda > 1$,

$\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} F_{U|X=x_1}(\lambda u) / F_{U|X=x_1}(u) = 0$; (iii) $F_{U|X=x_1}(u) / F_{U|X=x_2}(u)$ is bounded as $u \rightarrow -\infty$.

Theorem 1 (Echenique–Komunjer). Assume that S1, S2, and S3 hold. Fix a selection rule \mathcal{P}_{xu} . For any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 \leq x_2$, there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for all $y \geq \bar{y}$, $\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y) \leq \bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)$.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +44 2079557509.

E-mail addresses: yasur88@a2.keio.jp (Y. Rai), t.otsu@lse.ac.uk (T. Otsu).




Fig. 1. Plots of $y \mapsto r(y, x_1)$ (solid line) and $y \mapsto r(y, x_2)$ (dashed line) with $x_1 < x_2$.

EK argued that the above monotonicity in x on the tail of $\bar{F}_{Y|X=x}$ is a testable implication of Assumption S2, complementarities between y and x . By a close inspection of the proof of EK, we find that the conclusion of Theorem 1 can be derived without S2 and indeed S3(i), which guarantees complementarities in the tail, is sufficient. We introduce the following weaker version of S3(i).

Assumption S3. (i') $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1) / r(y', x_2)] = \lambda$ with $\lambda > 1$.

Assumption S2 requires that the structural function $r(y, x)$ is monotone increasing in x for all y (i.e., for each y , it holds $r(y, x_1) < r(y, x_2)$ for all $x_1 < x_2$), which in turn implies the monotonicity of the largest equilibrium (i.e., $\xi_{n_{x_1}, x_1 u} < \xi_{n_{x_2}, x_2 u}$) for all $u \in \mathbb{R}$. EK used this monotone comparative statics prediction as a key to obtain the testable implication. On the other hand, S3(i') (and thus S3(ii)) only requires that the structural function $r(y, x)$ is monotone increasing in x for large enough y , i.e., there exists \bar{y} such that for each $y > \bar{y}$, it holds $r(y, x_1) < r(y, x_2)$ for all $x_1 < x_2$ (see, Fig. 1). Therefore, the monotone comparative statics prediction may not hold true for some values of u . However, roughly speaking, because the structural function $r(y, x)$ eventually has a downward slope in y by S1, we can still argue that there is a cutoff value \bar{u} below which the largest equilibrium is large enough so that the monotone comparative statics prediction holds true. Indeed, this prediction on the largest equilibrium for sufficiently small values of u is enough to derive the testable implication for conditional quantiles in the tail. This intuition is formalized in Proposition (i) below (see also Remark 2).¹

Proposition. Fix a selection rule $\mathcal{P}_{X|U}$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$.

- (i) Under S1 and S3 (i') and (ii)–(iii), the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds true.
- (ii) Under S1 and S3, the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds true.
- (iii) Under S1–S3(iii), $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y) / \bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)$ is bounded.
- (iv) Under S1, S3 (i') is neither necessary nor sufficient for S2.
- (v) Under S1, S3 (i') is sufficient but not necessary for complementarity at extremes (i.e., there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r(y, x_1) < r(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$).
- (vi) The conclusion of Theorem 1, S1, and S3(ii)–(iii) are not sufficient for complementarity at extremes.

Proof of (i). Let $r^e(y, x)$ be a nonincreasing upper envelope of $r(y, x)$ on $[y_0, +\infty)$ for a given $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, i.e., $r^e(y, x) = \inf\{q(y) : q \text{ is nonincreasing on } [y_0, +\infty) \text{ and } q(y) \geq r(y, x) \text{ for all } [y_0, +\infty)\}$. We proceed in three steps.

Step 1: Show that for any $\lambda_1 \in (1, \lambda)$, there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. Pick any $\lambda_1 \in (1, \lambda)$. By S3(i'), there exists $y^* \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\inf_{y \geq y^*} [r(y, x_1) / r(y, x_2)] \geq \lambda_1, \quad (1.1)$$

for all $y \geq y^*$. Moreover, by S1(ii), there exists $y' \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r(y, x_2) \leq -1$ for all $y \geq y'$. Thus, by taking $\bar{y} = \max\{y^*, y'\}$, we have $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion of this step.

Step 2: Show that there exists $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r^e(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. From Step 1, take $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. By taking $\tilde{y} = \bar{y}$ and letting $r^e(y, x_2)$ be a nonincreasing upper envelope for \tilde{y} , we have $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2) \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. Now from the definition of $r^e(y, x)$,

$$r^e(y, x_1) = \inf\{q(y) : q \text{ is nonincreasing on } [\tilde{y}, +\infty) \text{ and } q(y) \geq r(y, x_1) \text{ for all } [\tilde{y}, +\infty)\} \\ \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2),$$

for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. Thus, we obtain the conclusion of this step.

Step 3: Show $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y)}{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)} = 0$. By Proposition 1 of EK, we have

$$\frac{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y)}{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)} \leq \frac{1}{\pi_{n_{x_2}, x_2}} \frac{\bar{F}_{n_1 Y|X=x_1}(y)}{\bar{F}_{n_2 Y|X=x_2}(y)},$$

where $\bar{F}_{n_i Y|X=x_i}(y) = \int_{+\infty}^{-\infty} \mathbb{I}(\xi_{n_i x_i u} \geq y) f_{U|X=x_i} du$ is the conditional tail probability of the largest equilibrium at x_i . Also, by Lemma 1 of EK, we have $\mathbb{I}(\xi_{n_i x_i u} \geq y) = \mathbb{I}(u \leq r^e(y, x_i))$.² Thus, we have

$$\frac{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y)}{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)} \leq \frac{1}{\pi_{n_{x_2}, x_2}} \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_1))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))}. \quad (1.2)$$

By Step 2, there exists $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r^e(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. Therefore, for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$,

$$\frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_1))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))} \leq \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(\lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))} \\ = \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(\lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2))}{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_2))} \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_2))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))}. \quad (1.3)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (1.3) converges to 0 as $y \rightarrow +\infty$ by S3(ii), and the second term on the right hand side of (1.3) is bounded by S3(iii). Combining this result with (1.2), we obtain the conclusion. \square

Proof of (ii). From Part (i), it is sufficient to show that S3(i) implies S3(i'). Pick any $\epsilon > 0$. By S3(i), there exists $\bar{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $[r(y, x_1) / r(y, x_2)] \in (\lambda - \epsilon/2, \lambda + \epsilon/2)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. This implies $\inf_{y \geq \bar{y}} [r(y, x_1) / r(y, x_2)] \in (\lambda - \epsilon, \lambda + \epsilon)$ for all $y \geq \bar{y}$. Therefore, S3(i') is guaranteed. \square

Proof of (iii). By Proposition 1 and Lemma 1 of EK,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y)}{\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)} \leq \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\pi_{n_{x_2}, x_2}} \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_1))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))} \\ \leq \lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\pi_{n_{x_2}, x_2}} \frac{F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y, x_2))}{F_{U|X=x_2}(r^e(y, x_2))}$$

where the last inequality follows from S2, which implies $r^e(y, x_1) \leq r^e(y, x_2)$. Therefore, S1(ii) and S3(iii) imply the conclusion. \square

Proof of (iv). We first argue that S1 and S3(i') are not sufficient for S2. Let $x_1 = 1, x_2 = 3$, and

$$r(y, x) = \begin{cases} -y^x - x & \text{for } y \in (-\infty, 0) \\ -y^{\frac{1}{x}} - x & \text{for } y \in [0, +\infty). \end{cases}$$

¹ We are grateful to Ivana Komunjer to clarify this point.

² Note that S1 is sufficient for Proposition 1 and Lemma 1 of EK.

Then $r(y, x)$ satisfies S1. Also, since $\inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1)/r(y', x_2)] = r(y, x_1)/r(y, x_2)$ in this case, L'Hôpital's rule implies that S3(i') is satisfied with $\lambda = +\infty$. On the other hand, from $r(0, 1) > r(0, 3)$, S2 is not satisfied.

We next argue that S1 and S3(i') are not necessary for S2. Let $x_1 = 0, x_2 = 1$, and

$$r(y, x) = -y + \left(\frac{x}{1+y^2} \right).$$

Then $r(y, x)$ satisfies S1 and S2. Also, since $\inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1)/r(y', x_2)] = r(y, x_1)/r(y, x_2)$ in this case, L'Hôpital's rule implies $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1)/r(y', x_2)] = 1$. Thus, S3(i') is not satisfied. \square

Proof of (v). We first show sufficiency. In the proof of Part (i), we have shown that under S1 and S3(i'), for any $\lambda_1 \in (1, \lambda)$, there exists $\tilde{y} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r(y, x_2)$ and $r(y, x_2) \leq -1$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. Therefore, $r(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r(y, x_2) < r(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$ and the sufficiency is obtained.

We next argue that S1 and complementarity at extremes do not necessarily imply S3(i). Note that S2 implies complementarity at extremes. Therefore, the second example of the proof of Part (iv) guarantees the conclusion. \square

Proof of (vi). In the proof of proposition (i), we use S3(i') only to derive the fact that there are $\lambda_1 > 1$ and \tilde{y} such that $\lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2) > r^e(y, x_1)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$. Thus, it is enough to find functions $r(y, x_1)$ and $r(y, x_2)$ of y that satisfy S1 and $\lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2) > r^e(y, x_1)$ for large enough y but do not satisfy S3(i'). Let

$$r(y, x_1) = -\frac{3}{2}y.$$

For $r(y, x_2)$, we take some constant $c > 0$ and define sequences $\{a_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\{b_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$, and $\{d_j\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ as

$$a_j = \begin{cases} -3 & \text{if } j \text{ is odd} \\ 1 & \text{if } j \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

$$b_1 = c, \quad b_2 = 3c, \quad b_j = 7b_{j-2} \quad \text{for } j \geq 3,$$

$$d_0 = -\infty, \quad d_1 = c, \quad d_2 = 2.5c,$$

$$d_j = 7d_{j-2} \quad \text{for } j \geq 3.$$

Then we define

$$r(y, x_2) = a_j y + b_j,$$

for $y \in (d_{j-1}, d_j]$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that $r(y, x_1)$ and $r(y, x_2)$ satisfy S1. Moreover, $\inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1)/r(y', x_2)] = 3/4$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$ but $\inf_{y' \geq y} [r^e(y', x_1)/r^e(y', x_2)] = 3/2$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}$. \square

Remarks. 1. Proposition (i) derives the conclusion of Theorem 1 of EK without using S2. Indeed S3(i') plays a role of complementarity in the tails, which guarantees the inequality in (1.1). Since S3(i') implies S3(i), we can argue that the conclusion of Theorem 1 can be derived by only S1 and S3. This point is presented in Proposition (ii). Therefore, monotonicity of the conditional distribution $F_{Y|X=x}$ in x in the tails may not be a testable implication of S2. On the other hand, if we impose S2 instead of S3(i), the inequality in (1.1) can be guaranteed only for $\lambda = 1$. Therefore, under S2 without S3(i), we can only say that the ratio $\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_1}(y)/\bar{F}_{Y|X=x_2}(y)$ does not diverge as $y \rightarrow +\infty$. This point is presented in Proposition (iii).

2. An intuition for Proposition (i) can be explained as follows. In Fig. 2, we add $r^e(y, x_1)$ (thick solid line) and $r^e(y, x_2)$ (thick dashed line) to Fig. 1. Let us assume that X and U are independent




Fig. 2. Plots of $y \mapsto r^e(y, x_1)$ (thick solid line) and $y \mapsto r^e(y, x_2)$ (thick dashed line) with $x_1 < x_2$.

just for explanation. As in Step 2 of the proof, take \tilde{y} to satisfy $r^e(y, x_1) \leq \lambda_1 r^e(y, x_2)$ for all $y \geq \tilde{y}$ and some $\lambda_1 \in (1, \lambda)$. First of all, at $y' < \tilde{y}$, we have $r^e(y', x_1) = u'_1 > u'_2 = r^e(y', x_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_{n_1 Y|X=x_1}(y') &= F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y', x_1)) \\ &= F_U(u'_1) > F_U(u'_2) = \bar{F}_{n_2 Y|X=x_2}(y'). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\bar{F}_{n_1 Y|X=x_1}(y)$ is not monotone increasing in x at $y' < \tilde{y}$. But this is not a problem because at $y'' \geq \tilde{y}$, we get $r^e(y'', x_1) = u''_1 > u''_2 = r^e(y'', x_2)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{F}_{n_1 Y|X=x_1}(y'') &= F_{U|X=x_1}(r^e(y'', x_1)) \\ &= F_U(u''_1) < F_U(u''_2) = \bar{F}_{n_2 Y|X=x_2}(y''). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\bar{F}_{n_1 Y|X=x_1}(y)$ is monotone increasing in x at $y'' \geq \tilde{y}$. The key is: whenever we consider the events $\xi_{n_{x_1} x_1 u} \geq \tilde{y}$, we only need to work on the events associated with $u \leq \bar{u}$, where the monotone comparative statics prediction on the largest equilibrium holds.

3. Proposition (iv) clarifies that there is no logical relationship for the two complementary conditions, S2 and S3(i'). Therefore, under S1, the rejection of the testable implication of Theorem 1 implies the rejection of S3(i') but does not necessarily imply the rejection of S2. Proposition (v) compares S3(i') and a weaker notion on S2, complementarity at extremes. This notion is weak enough so that S3(i') implies complementarity at extremes, but not vice versa. Therefore, the rejection of the testable implication of Theorem 1 does not necessarily imply the rejection of complementarity at extremes. Since S3(i) implies S3(i'), the above arguments remain true when we replace S3(i') with S3(i).

4. A key insight from the above argument is that we need a stronger notion of complementarity so that the ratio $r(y, x_1)/r(y, x_2)$ is bounded away from 1 at least in the tails. For example, we can strengthen S2 by the following one.

Assumption S2'. $r(y, x)$ is monotone increasing in x on \mathbb{R} . Furthermore, as $y \rightarrow +\infty$, $r(y, x_1)/r(y, x_2)$ neither converges to 1 nor contacts to 1 infinitely many times.

Then since S2' implies S3(i'), Proposition (i) guarantees that under S1, S2', and S3(ii)–(iii), the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds true. We summarize this point in the following corollary.

Corollary. Under S1, S2', and S3(ii)–(iii), the conclusion of Theorem 1 holds true.

5. Proposition (vi) considers the meaning of acceptance of the testable implication. This result implies that the acceptance of the testable implication in Theorem 1 does not necessarily imply the acceptance of complementarity at extreme (and S2 as well).

6. EK considered an alternative set of assumptions for S3.

Assumption S3' (For any $x_1, x_2 \in \mathcal{X}$ with $x_1 < x_2$). (i) $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} [r(y, x_1) - r(y, x_2)] = \delta$ with $\delta < 0$; (ii) for any $\delta < 0$, $\lim_{u \rightarrow -\infty} F_{U|X=x_1}(u + \delta) / F_{U|X=x_1}(u) = 0$; (iii) $F_{U|X=x_1}(u) / F_{U|X=x_2}(u)$ is bounded as $u \rightarrow -\infty$.

We can derive an analogous proposition and remarks if we replace S3'(i) with the following assumption.

Assumption S3'. (i') $\lim_{y \rightarrow +\infty} \inf_{y' \geq y} [r(y', x_1) - r(y', x_2)] = \delta$ with $\delta < 0$.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank Ivana Komunjer for helpful comments.

References

Echenique, F., Komunjer, I., 2009. Testing models with multiple equilibria by quantile methods. *Econometrica* 77, 1281–1297.