This problem is meant to help draw connections between GMM estimators and maximum likelihood estimators, with a particular focus on the 'logit' model.

The development of a maximum likelihood estimator typically begins with an assumption that some random variable has a (conditional) distribution which is known up a k-vector of parameters β . Consider the case in which we observe N independent realizations of a Bernoulli random variable Y, with $\Pr(Y = 1|X) = \sigma(\beta^{\top}X)$, and $\Pr(Y = 0|X) = 1 - \sigma(\beta^{\top}X)$.

(1) Show that under this model $\mathbb{E}(Y_i - \sigma(X\beta)|X) = 0$. Assume that σ is a known function, and use this fact to develop a GMM estimator of β . Is your estimator just- or over-identified?

Yi N Bernoulli (T).

$$E[Y_i|X_i] = I. \Pr(Y_i=1|X_i) + o. \Pr(Y_i=0|X_i) = \sigma(\beta^T X_i).$$

$$E[\sigma(\beta^T X_i)|X_i] = \sigma(\beta^T X_i)$$

Thus,
$$E[Y_i - \nabla(X\beta) | X] = \nabla(X\beta) - \nabla(X\beta) = 0$$

Suppose T is a known function.

The moment condition is: $E[Y_i - T(\beta^T X_i) | X_i) = 0$.

By taking the law of iterated expectations,

$$E[E[Y_i - \nabla(\beta^T X_i) | X_i]] = E[Y_i - \nabla(\beta^T X_i)] = 0.$$

This implies: $E[X_i[Y_i-T(\beta^TX_i)]] = 0$.

By taking the sample analog of the moment condition,

$$g_N(\beta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i (Y_i - \nabla (\beta^T X_i))$$

To estimate p, GMM chooses the parameter that minimizes the squared weighted sum of these moment conditions:

$$\hat{\beta} = \underset{\beta}{\operatorname{arg min}} \left(g_{N}(\beta)^{T} W g_{N}(\beta) \right)$$

where W is a positive definite weighting matrix.

[W is often chosen to be the inverse of the ovariance matrix of the moment conditions, which provides the most efficient estimator in the class of GMM estimators].

 β has k parameters. We need to estimate these k parameter. Each component of Xi provides a moment condition derived from $X_i(Y_i - \Gamma(\beta^T X_i))$.

If Xi is k-dimensional, which is equal to the number of parameters in B, then the system is just-identified.

If there are more moment conditions than parameters, it is over-identified.

(2) Show that the likelihood can be written as

$$L(\beta|y,X) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \sigma(\beta^{\top} X_i)^{y_i} \left(1 - \sigma(\beta^{\top} X_i)\right)^{1-y_i}.$$

$$\Pr\left(Y_{i} = y_{i} \mid X_{i}\right) = \nabla(\beta^{T} X_{i})^{Y_{i}} \left(1 - \nabla(\beta^{T} X_{i})\right)^{1 - Y_{i}}$$

If
$$y_i = 1$$
, $P_{\mathbf{r}}(y_i = 1 \mid X_i) = \sigma(\beta^T X_i)$
If $y_i = 0$, $P_{\mathbf{r}}(y_i = 0 \mid X_i) = 1 - \sigma(\beta^T X_i)$.

The likelihood function is:

$$\lambda(\beta|y,X) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \Pr(y_i = y_i \mid X_i).$$

$$\Rightarrow \lambda(\beta|y,X) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \sigma(\beta^T X_i)^{y_i} (1-\sigma(\beta^T X_i))^{1-y_i}$$

(3) To obtain the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) one can chose b to maximize $\log L(b|y,X)$. When the likelihood is well-behaved, the MLE estimator satisfies the first order conditions (also called the "scores") from this maximization problem, in which case this is called a "type I" MLE. Let $\sigma(z) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}}$ (this is sometimes called the logistic function, or the sigmoid function), and obtain the scores $S_N(b)$ for this estimation problem. Show that $\mathbb{E}S_N(\beta) = 0$. Demonstrate that these moment conditions can serve as the basis for a GMM estimator of β , and compare this estimator to the GMM estimator you developed above. Which is more efficient, and why?

lef
$$\tau(z) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}}$$
.

Note that $1 - \sigma(z) = 1 - \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}} = \frac{1+e^{-z}-1}{1+e^{-z}} = \frac{e^{-z}}{1+e^{-z}}$

Thus,

$$\tau'(z) = \frac{-1}{(1+e^{-z})^2} (-e^{-z}) = \frac{e^{-z}}{(1+e^{-z})^2} = \tau(z) (1 - \tau(z)).$$

$$J(\beta|y,X) = \prod_{i=1}^{N} \sigma(\beta^T X_i)^{Y_i} (1 - \sigma(\beta^T X_i))^{1-Y_i}$$

$$\log J(\beta|y,X) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[y_i \log(\sigma(\beta^T X_i)) + (1-y_i) \log(1 - \sigma(\beta^T X_i)) \right]$$

The score function is obtained by $\frac{\partial \log J}{\partial B} = S_N(\beta)$

 $\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log J(\beta|y,X) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} [y_i - \tau(\beta^T X_i)] X_i = S_N(\beta).$

[Work shown below].

Differentiate (1):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \left(\sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i}) \right) = \frac{1}{\sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i})} \sigma'(\beta^{T} X_{i}) \cdot X_{i}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i})} \sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i}) \left(1 - \sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i}) \right) \cdot X_{i}$$

$$= \left(1 - \sigma(\beta^{T} X_{i}) \right) X_{i}$$

Similarly, differentiate (2):

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log (1 - \nabla (\beta^T X_i)) = - \nabla (\beta^T X_i) X_i$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} \log \Delta(\beta|y_1X) = \sum_{i=1}^{N} [y_i(1-\nabla(\beta^T X_i)) X_i + (1-y_i)(-\nabla(\beta^T X_i)) X_i]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} [y_i X_i - y_i X_i \nabla(\beta^T X_i) - X_i \nabla(\beta^T X_i) + y_i X_i \nabla(\beta^T X_i)]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{N} [y_i - \nabla(\beta^T X_i)] X_i$$

Proof that $E[S_N(\beta)] = 0$:

The scores $S_N(\beta)$ can be directly used as moment conditions for GMM estimator:

$$\mathcal{G}_{N}(\beta) = \frac{1}{N} S_{N}(\beta) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} [y_{i} - \nabla [\beta^{T} X_{i})] X_{i}.$$

$$\Rightarrow \hat{\beta}_{\alpha m m} = \alpha q \min_{\beta} (g_{N}(\beta)^{T} W g_{N}(\beta))$$

where W is a weighting matrix.

(Gmm1) (Gmm3) Comparing Gmm estimator From part (1) Vs this Gmm estimator:

- . The functional forms of both GMM estimators are the same.

 However, the sources of moment conditions differ.
- . In GMMI, moment conditions are derived assuming that the model residuals should average to 0, which is the direct application of the logistic regression model's fit to the data.
- . In GMM3, moment conditions come from the score function of the MLE, which also implies that the model's residuals should average to 0.
- . The choice of W can affect the efficiency of both estimators.

 If W is chosen as the inverse of the covariance matrix of moment conditions, both estimators can be asymptotically equivalent and efficient.
- and aligns with the Fisher information achieving the Cramer-Rao lower bound.