full-simulation-binary

Objective

Understand maximum **simulated** likelihood with help of a simple example (binary logit model).

Introduction

The probability that the agent chooses outcome y can be expressed as an expectation (integral over the random part) (Train 2009):

$$P(y|x) = Prob(I[h(x,\varepsilon) = y] = 1)$$
(1)

$$= \int I[h(x,\varepsilon) = y]f(\varepsilon)d\varepsilon \tag{2}$$

In random utility theory we usually assume that the observed part of utility is $\beta'x$ (a linear combination of observable factors) and that the outcome is chosen if the utility is positive (in the binary case). Therefore we can rewrite:

$$P(y|x) = \int I[\beta' x + \varepsilon > 0] f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon$$

If we assume that ε is distributed logistically, such that the density is $f(\varepsilon) = e^{-\varepsilon}/(1 + e^{-\varepsilon})^2$ then we can derive a closed-form solution for the integral:

$$P(y|x) = \int I[\beta' x + \varepsilon > 0] f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \tag{3}$$

$$= \int I[\varepsilon > -\beta' x] f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \tag{4}$$

$$= \int_{\varepsilon = -\beta' x}^{\infty} f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon \tag{5}$$

$$=1 - F(-\beta'x) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + e^{\beta'x}}$$
 (6)

$$=\frac{e^{\beta'x}}{1+e^{\beta'x}}\tag{7}$$

Estimation

The goal is to learn about maximum **simulated** likelihood. This is useful for models which do not have a closed-form solution of the integral and therefore require simulation techniques to approximate it.

In our case we want to simulate $P(y|x) = \int I[\beta' x + \varepsilon > 0] f(\varepsilon) d\varepsilon$. The general strategy to achieve this is:

- 1. Draw from $f(\varepsilon)$ and label the rth draw ε^r
- 2. Compute $\beta' x + \varepsilon^r$ and evaluate the indicator function (i.e. 1 if $\beta' x + \varepsilon^r > 0$ and 0 otherwise).
- 3. Repeat step 1. and 2. R times.
- 4. The integral (and thus our probability) is simply the average $1/R\sum_{r=1}^{R} t(x, \varepsilon^r)$.

Let's implement this in R.

Implementation in R

We first simulate some data for illustration

```
simulate_binary <- function(beta = c(ASC = 0, beta1 = 1, beta2 = 2), n = 1000, seed = 0) {
  set.seed(seed)
  simulated_data <- list()</pre>
  simulated_data$beta <- beta</pre>
  x1 <- rnorm(n) # does not need to be normal!
  x2 \leftarrow rnorm(n)
  latent <- beta["ASC"] + beta["beta1"] * x1 + beta["beta2"] * x2</pre>
  choice <- as.numeric(latent + rlogis(n) > 0)
  simulated_data$data <- data.frame(x1, x2, choice)</pre>
  return(simulated_data)
sim_dat <- simulate_binary(n = 10e3)</pre>
beta <- sim_dat$beta</pre>
dat <- sim_dat$data</pre>
beta
#> ASC beta1 beta2
#>
       0
            1
head(dat)
#>
                          x2 choice
             x1
#> 1 1.2629543 -1.21955126
#> 2 -0.3262334 -1.20146018
#> 3 1.3297993 -0.49604255
#> 4 1.2724293 0.06693112
                                   1
#> 5 0.4146414 -0.05694914
                                   0
#> 6 -1.5399500 0.25558017
```

Using stats to illustrate

Let's use R's stats::glm function to test

```
fit <- glm(choice ~ x1 + x2, data = dat, family = binomial(link = "logit"))
summary(fit)
#>
#> Call:
```

```
#> glm(formula = choice ~ x1 + x2, family = binomial(link = "logit"),
     data = dat
#>
#> Coefficients:
#>
             Estimate Std. Error z value Pr(>|z|)
#> (Intercept) 0.04847 0.02677 1.811
                                          0.0702 .
                       0.03133 31.741
#> x1
             0.99444
                                          <2e-16 ***
             2.05691
                       0.04280 48.063 <2e-16 ***
#> x2
#> ---
#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
#> (Dispersion parameter for binomial family taken to be 1)
#>
      Null deviance: 13859.8 on 9999 degrees of freedom
#>
#> Residual deviance: 8601.2 on 9997 degrees of freedom
#> AIC: 8607.2
#> Number of Fisher Scoring iterations: 5
```

Compare the estimated coefficients with our assumed beta vector. Surprise!

Closed-form own implementation

We use the maxLik package to impelement the closed-form solution. Compare the loglik function to the formulas above (REF). It translates almost verbatim to R code

```
loglik <- function(param) {</pre>
  latent <- param["ASC"] + param["beta1"] * dat$x1 + param["beta2"] * dat$x2</pre>
  exp <- exp(latent)</pre>
  P_1n \leftarrow exp / (1 + exp)
  P_On <- 1 - P_1n
  y_1n <- dat$choice
  y_0n \leftarrow 1 - y_1n
  11 \leftarrow sum(y_1n * log(P_1n) + y_0n * log(P_0n))
  cat(ll, "\n")
  11
}
p <- function(v) {</pre>
  v <- setNames(v, c("ASC", "beta1", "beta2"))</pre>
}
param \leftarrow p(c(1, 1, 1))
m <- maxLik::maxLik(loglik, start = param, method = "BFGS")</pre>
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
```

```
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.844
#> -5603.843
#> NaN
#> NaN
#> NaN
#> -40908.44
#> -6436.235
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.661
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.662
#> -4602.661
#> NaN
#> NaN
#> -9425.934
#> -4864.053
#> -4603.321
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.47
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.471
#> -4600.471
#> NaN
#> -8768.972
#> -4908.343
#> -4608.777
#> -4599.384
#> -4599.384
#> -4599.384
#> -4599.385
#> -4599.384
#> -4599.384
#> -4599.385
#> -4599.384
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
```

```
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
#> -4360.476
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4301.923
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.645
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -5976.509
#> -4357.721
#> -4302.736
#> -4300.68
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.611
#> -4408.507
#> -4304.331
#> -4300.746
#> -4300.614
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.645
```

```
#> -4300.612
#> -4300.61
#> -5502.769
#> -4352.889
#> -4302.671
#> -4300.681
#> -4300.611
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4864.041
#> -4324.792
#> -4301.567
#> -4300.644
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4304.17
#> -4300.754
#> -4300.615
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4466.75
#> -4307.509
#> -4300.88
#> -4300.619
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4306.476
#> -4300.837
#> -4300.618
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4361.809
#> -4303.084
```

```
#> -4300.707
#> -4300.613
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
#> -4300.61
summary(m)
#> -----
#> Maximum Likelihood estimation
#> BFGS maximization, 69 iterations
#> Return code 0: successful convergence
#> Log-Likelihood: -4300.61
#> 3 free parameters
#> Estimates:
\#> Estimate Std. error t value Pr(>t)
#> ASC 0.04843 0.02677 1.81 0.0704 .
#> beta1 0.99435 0.03132 31.74 <2e-16 ***
#> beta2 2.05668 0.04274 48.12 <2e-16 ***
```

```
#> ---

#> Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

#> ------
```

Maximum simulated likelihood

Now to our main objective: To explore maximum simulated likelihood. Using some matrix algebra and passing a draws matrix to the loglik function (instead of generating the draws inside the function and/or loop over the observations)...

```
n draws <- 1000
n_rows <- nrow(dat)</pre>
draws_matrix <- matrix(rlogis(n_draws * n_rows), nrow = n_rows, ncol = n_draws)</pre>
loglik <- function(param, epsilon = 1e-10) {</pre>
  # 10000 x 1
  latent <- param["ASC"] + param["beta1"] * dat$x1 + param["beta2"] * dat$x2
  # 10000 x n_draws
  indicator_ <- latent + draws_matrix</pre>
  indicator <- (indicator_ > 0)
  P 1n <- apply(indicator, 1, mean)
  P_1n <- pmax(pmin(P_1n, 1 - epsilon), epsilon)
  P_On <- 1 - P_1n
  y_1n <- dat$choice
  y_0n < 1 - y_1n
  11 \leftarrow sum(y_1n * log(P_1n) + y_0n * log(P_0n))
  cat(11, "\n")
  11
}
```

Clearly, our loglik function makes sense: Evaluated at the true parameters, we get the highest likelihood (which almost matches the non-simulated likelihood from the chapter before):

```
loglik(p(c(0, 0, 0)))
#> -6942.008
#> [1] -6942.008
loglik(p(c(1, 1, 1)))
#> -5610.319
#> [1] -5610.319
loglik(p(c(0, 1, 2)))
#> -4310.408
#> [1] -4310.408
```

Remark: The line P_1n <- pmax(pmin(P_1n, 1 - epsilon), epsilon) is needed because the simulated integral (depending on the parameter values passed to it) can yield $P_1n = 0$ which results in -Inf when taking the log. Similarly, $P_1n = 1$ would yield $P_0n = 0$ and thus the same problem. Therefore we add (or subtract) a very small value epsilon to 0 (from 1).

Trying to estimate (again using maxLik) does not seem to converge. Why?

```
m <- maxLik::maxLik(loglik, start = param, method = "BFGS")
summary(m)</pre>
```

References

Train, Kenneth E. 2009. Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation. Cambridge university press.