-
$$y_i \sim Pois(n_i)$$
, $n_i = x_i\beta$

$$P(y_i = y) = \frac{y}{x^i} \exp(-n)$$
, $y \ge 0$.

$$\Rightarrow E[y] = Var(y) = n$$

Just the OLS estimator

which we know is consistent if E[x:x:] has full rank and

- B unbiased by property of OLS (since E[EilXi]=10).
- B linear estimator as reg. by Flauss-Markov.
- Not BLUE because our problem has E[y|x] = Var[y|x] = 71

- 1) Bunbiased

 - $5E[\hat{\beta}|X] = \beta$ $2) var(\hat{\beta}|X) = \delta^{2}(X|X)^{-1}$

Assumy

$$Ni = \exp(xi\beta)$$
 thre

 $V = \log yi = xi'\beta + \xi_i$ can we do this?

Before!

If $Ni = \exp(xi'\beta)$, then

 $E[yi|xi] = Ni = \exp(xi'\beta)$ thre

After.

 $E[\log y_i|x_i] \in \log(E(y_i|x_i))$
 $= \log(\exp(xi'\beta))$
 $= \chi_i'\beta$

Not thre by Jensen's

Inequality

1.4) Estimate

yi = xi/s+&, when yi ~ Pois(ni)

Froal: B)

ni = exp(xi/B)

Pecall, E[yi] = Var(yi) = ni = exp(xi/B).

We can perform a nonlinear GMM estimation with moment condition.

 $E[y_i - exp(x_i \beta)] = 0$ $E[y_i] = \lambda_i$

Requires:

$$\hat{X} = \hat{\delta} Z$$

2)
$$Y = \beta_2(\hat{\eta}) + \epsilon, \quad \hat{\eta} = X - \hat{\chi}.$$

 $\hat{\eta}$ = amount of variation $\hat{\chi}$ cannot explain in $\hat{\chi}$. Stage.(2) is equivalent to $\hat{\chi} = \beta_0 + \hat{\phi}_1 \hat{\chi} + \beta_2 \hat{\chi} + \hat{e}$.

Henry, this is just a typical multivariate OLS model where we require

- l=k - E[XE] = E[ZE] =0.

Note: This is a Ful depiction of ous

2.3) Obviously, if the assumptions hold for both models, either estimator works.

If we have that E[ZE]=0, but E[XE] +0

Honever, if our goal is to simply find the cansal effect of X on Y (assuming all assumptions hold), we could perform simple ors.

Side Note: Could perform SUR if E[ZE] = 0 and lzk.

$$\frac{2014 \text{ Q3}}{\hat{\theta}(\hat{w})} = (S'\hat{w}S)'S'\hat{w}S.$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\beta}(\hat{w}) = (X'Z\hat{w}Z'X)'(X'Z\hat{w}Z'Y)$$

$$S = Z'X \qquad \text{Note: There doesn't seem }$$

$$S = Z'Y \qquad \text{to be instruments}$$

$$\text{here, so } Z = X$$

$$\theta = \begin{bmatrix} x \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} \qquad S = \text{En}[X'X].$$
[Xi8]

For WPW, where Wis the efficient weighting mothix (iet the inverse it varcor) then my in must at least be symmetric and positive definite.

Here, we have a just-identified model (l=k), so the choice of w does not matter because things will careel out.

Hence, estimating this model eq-by-eq VS. jointly are identical (assumy w is-full rank).

3.3) Who, if x=0, then we have an overidentified model in which l=3 > k=2.

Hener, are should estimate jointly to attain better officiency.

Honever, the chamberek of estimating jointly is that misspecification will permeate throughout the model, so other estimators will be affected as well.