

APPENDIX

A Careful Consideration of CLARIFY

Simulation-Induced Bias in Point Estimates of Quantities of Interest

Carlisle Rainey[†]

December 13, 2022

A Proofs

A.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof By definition,

$$\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} = \text{E} \left[\tau \left(\tilde{\beta} \right) \right].$$

Using Jensen's inequality (Casella and Berger 2002, p. 190, Thm. 4.7.7), $\text{E} \left[\tau \left(\tilde{\beta} \right) \right] > \tau \left[\text{E} \left(\tilde{\beta} \right) \right]$, so that

$$\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} > \tau \left[\text{E} \left(\tilde{\beta} \right) \right].$$

However, because $\tilde{\beta} \sim \text{MVN} \left[\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}}, \hat{V} \left(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}} \right) \right]$, $\text{E} \left(\tilde{\beta} \right) = \hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}}$, so that

$$\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} > \tau \left(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}} \right).$$

Of course, $\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}} = \tau \left(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}} \right)$ by definition, so that

$$\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} > \hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}.$$

The proof for concave τ follows similarly. ■

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof According to Theorem 1 of Rainey (2017, p. 405), $\text{E} \left(\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}} \right) - \tau \left[\text{E} \left(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}} \right) \right] > 0$. Lemma 1 shows that for any convex τ , $\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} > \hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}$. It follows that $\underbrace{\text{E} \left(\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} \right) - \tau \left[\text{E} \left(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}} \right) \right]}_{\text{s.i. and t.i. } \tau\text{-bias in } \hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}} >$

[†]Carlisle Rainey is Associate Professor of Political Science, Florida State University, 540 Bellamy, Tallahassee, FL, 32306. (crainey@fsu.edu).

$$\underbrace{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}) - \tau \left[\mathbb{E}(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}}) \right]}_{\text{t.i. } \tau\text{-bias in } \hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}} > 0.$$

For the concave case, it follows similarly that $\underbrace{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}) - \tau \left[\mathbb{E}(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}}) \right]}_{\text{s.i. and t.i. } \tau\text{-bias in } \hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}} < \underbrace{\mathbb{E}(\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}) - \tau \left[\mathbb{E}(\hat{\beta}^{\text{mle}}) \right]}_{\text{t.i. } \tau\text{-bias in } \hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}}} <$

0. ■

B Additional Analysis of the Drastic, Convex Transformation

In the main text, I develop an intuition for the simulation-induced τ -bias in $\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}$ using the simple (unrealistic, but heuristically useful) scenario in which $y_i \sim \text{N}(0, 1)$, for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n = 100\}$, and the researcher wishes to estimate μ^2 . Suppose that the researcher knows that the variance equals one but does not know that the mean μ equals zero. The researcher uses the unbiased ML estimator $\hat{\mu}^{\text{mle}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{n}$ of μ , but ultimately cares about the quantity of interest $\tau(\mu) = \mu^2$. The researcher can use the plug-in estimator $\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}} = (\hat{\mu}^{\text{mle}})^2$ of $\tau(\mu)$. Alternatively, the researcher can use the average-of-simulations estimator, estimating $\tau(\mu)$ as $\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \tau(\tilde{\mu}^{(i)})$, where $\tilde{\mu}^{(i)} \sim \text{N}\left(\hat{\mu}^{\text{mle}}, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, M\}$.

Below, I calculate the bias of each estimator.¹

B.1 The Bias in the ML Estimator

To simplify the notation below, I use $\hat{\mu}$ in place of $\hat{\mu}^{\text{mle}}$.

First, note that $\hat{\mu} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{n}$ is an *unbiased* estimator so that $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}) = \mu = 0$. We then have the common identity for mean-squared error: $\mathbb{E}((\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2) = \text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu} - \mu)^2$. Substituting $\mu = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = \text{Var}(\hat{\mu}) - \mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu})^2$. Substituting $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}) = \mu = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = \text{Var}(\hat{\mu})$. Then $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = \text{Var}\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n y_i}{n}\right) = \frac{1}{n^2} \text{Var}(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i)$. Then, using the identity that the variance of the sum of independent random variables is the sum of their variances, we have $\mathbb{E}(\hat{\mu}^2) = \frac{1}{n^2}(n \times 1) = \frac{1}{n}$.

Since $\tau = \mu^2 = 0$, the bias in $\hat{\tau} = [\hat{\mu}^{\text{mle}}]^2$ is $\frac{1}{n} - 0 = \frac{1}{n}$. Because there is no coefficient-induced bias, this is also the transformation-induced bias.

B.2 The Bias in the Average-of-Simulations Estimator

To simplify the notation below, I use $\bar{\tau}$ in place of $\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}$.

¹I thank a reviewer for pointing out these results.

First, compute $E(\bar{\tau} \mid \hat{\mu}) = E\left[\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M (\tilde{\mu}^{(i)})^2\right] = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M E\left[(\tilde{\mu}^{(i)})^2\right]$. Then we have $E(\bar{\tau} \mid \hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\text{Var}(\tilde{\mu}^{(i)}) + E(\tilde{\mu}^{(i)})^2\right]$. Substituting known values, we have $E(\bar{\tau} \mid \hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \left[\frac{1}{n} + \hat{\mu}^2\right]$. Simplifying, we have $E(\bar{\tau} \mid \hat{\mu}) = \frac{1}{M} \left[\frac{M}{n} + M\hat{\mu}^2\right] = \frac{1}{n} + \hat{\mu}^2$.

Next, apply the law of iterated expectations to find $E(\bar{\tau}) = E(\bar{\tau} \mid \hat{\mu})$. Substituting, we have $E(\bar{\tau}) = E\left(\frac{1}{n} + \hat{\mu}^2\right)$. Then, simplifying, we have $E(\bar{\tau}) = \frac{1}{n} + E(\hat{\mu}^2) = \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} = \frac{2}{n}$.

The bias in $\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}$ is therefore $\frac{2}{n}$. Because simulation-induced bias is defined as $E(\hat{\tau}^{\text{avg}}) - E(\hat{\tau}^{\text{mle}})$, the simulation-induced bias in this example is $\frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n} = \frac{1}{n}$. Thus, the simulation-induced and transformation-induced bias are exactly equal and the average-of-simulations estimator exactly doubles the bias in the ML estimator.

References

- Casella, George, and Roger L. Berger. 2002. *Statistical Inference*. 2nd ed. Pacific Grove, CA: Duxbury.
- Rainey, Carlisle. 2017. “Transformation-Induced Bias: Unbiased Coefficients Do Not Imply Unbiased Quantities of Interest.” *Political Analysis* 25:402–409.