

# Fundamentals of Statistical Modeling (VT21)

Andrea Discacciati  
Karolinska Institutet  
Stockholm, Sweden

## Lab 2 (Extra material on convenient parametrizations)

Load the dataset and the mlci command

```
. version 14
. use https://raw.githubusercontent.com/anddis/fsm/master/data/lab2.dta, clear
. run https://raw.githubusercontent.com/anddis/fsm/master/do/mlci.do
```

### Exercise 1

So far, we've used the gamma distribution parametrized by parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . They are not interpretable.

```
. local alpha = "exp({theta1})"
. local beta = "exp({theta2})"
. local f = "gammaden(`alpha`, `beta`, 0, y)"
. mlexp (ln(`f`))
initial:      log likelihood =      -<inf>   (could not be evaluated)
feasible:      log likelihood = -96414.257
rescale:      log likelihood = -13891.173
rescale eq:    log likelihood = -13891.173
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -13891.173
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -8165.6417
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -8160.8897
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -8160.8781
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -8160.8781
Maximum likelihood estimation
Log likelihood = -8160.8781                Number of obs   =       1,432
```

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]
/theta1	.3906123	.033984	11.49	0.000	.3240049 .4572196
/theta2	4.349872	.0403414	107.83	0.000	4.270804 4.42894

```
. mlci exp /theta1
1.477885   95% CI: 1.382654, 1.579676
. mlci exp /theta2
77.46854   95% CI: 71.57918, 83.84246
```

The mean of a gamma distribution is equal to  $\alpha\beta$  (see Wikipedia).

```
. di exp(_b[/theta1])*exp(_b[/theta2])
114.48962
```

Sometimes it can be useful to parametrize the gamma distribution in such a way that one of its 2 parameters is equal to (a transform of) the mean.

We define a parameter for the mean:  $E[Y] \equiv \eta = \alpha\beta$ . Then,  $\alpha = \eta/\beta$  (see the slide “Convenient Parametrizations” for an analogous example with the log-normal distribution).

Note that the log-likelihood of this model is identical to the one of the previous one. No surprise: the model is exactly the same, it's just its parametrization that changed.

```

. local eta = "exp({theta1})" // We constrain the mean to be strictly positive
. local beta = "exp({theta2})"
. local alpha = "`eta' / `beta'"
. local f = "gammaden(`alpha', `beta', 0, y)"
. mlexp (ln(`f'))
initial:      log likelihood =      -<inf>  (could not be evaluated)
feasible:      log likelihood = -100156.17
rescale:      log likelihood = -8730.8329
rescale eq:    log likelihood = -8730.8329
Iteration 0:   log likelihood = -8730.8329
Iteration 1:   log likelihood = -8309.9438
Iteration 2:   log likelihood = -8161.7729
Iteration 3:   log likelihood = -8160.8785
Iteration 4:   log likelihood = -8160.8781
Maximum likelihood estimation
Log likelihood = -8160.8781                Number of obs      =      1,432

```

	Coef.	Std. Err.	z	P> z	[95% Conf. Interval]	
/theta1	4.740484	.0217374	218.08	0.000	4.697879	4.783088
/theta2	4.349871	.0403413	107.83	0.000	4.270803	4.428938

```

. mlci exp /theta1 // This gives me the MLE of eta (the mean) with 95% CI
114.4896  95% CI: 109.7142, 119.4728
. mlci exp /theta2
77.46844  95% CI: 71.5791, 83.84235

```