

## RESEARCH IDEAS

RACHEL ANDERSON

- (1) What do we gain by using observations with multiple matches? Are there cases where we are better off excluding them in finite sample inference? (Bias/variance tradeoff)
- (2) Can we replicate the results from AER using a fully Bayesian framework?

Consider the case where the number of individuals with more than one match,  $N_L$  is small relative to the population, of size  $N$  (like the AER application where about 4% of observations have multiple linked outcomes.) It may then be feasible to solve:

$$\hat{\beta}^{\min/\max} = \min / \max_{\{w_{i\ell}\}} (x_i x'_i)^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \bar{y}_i \right)$$

$$\bar{y}_i = \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} w_{i\ell} y_{i\ell}$$

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} w_{i\ell} = 1, \quad w_{i\ell} \geq 0$$

Also, we can try alternating  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} w_{i\ell} = 1$  OR  $\sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} w_{i\ell} = 0$  for observations with  $L_i > 1$  only, to compare whether they should be included in analysis or not.

Compare this to our method, which uses the moment condtion:

$$m(y_{i\ell}, x_i; \theta) = x_i(y_{i\ell} - x'_i \beta)$$

so that the estimator uses

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} x_i(y_{i\ell} - x'_i \beta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (L_i - 1) \hat{g}(w_i, L_i, x_i; \beta)$$

$$g(w_i, L_i, x_i; \beta) = x_i E(y_{i\ell} | w_i, L_i) - x_i x'_i \beta$$

Rewriting,

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\beta} &= (X'X)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} x_i y_{i\ell} - (L_i - 1) x_i E[y|w_i] \right) \\
&= (X'X)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \sum_{L_i=1} x_i y_i + \sum_{L_i>1} x_i \left( E[y|w_i] + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} (y_{i\ell} - E[y|w_i]) \right) \right) \\
&= (X'X)^{-1} \frac{N - N_L}{N} \frac{1}{N - N_L} \sum_{L_i=1} x_i y_i + (X'X)^{-1} \frac{N_L}{N} \frac{1}{N_L} \sum_{L_i>1} x_i \left( E[y|w_i] + \sum_{\ell=1}^{L_i} (y_{i\ell} - E[y|w_i]) \right) \\
&\quad \xrightarrow{p} \beta
\end{aligned}$$

by the theorem

but what if we use the first term only? Or use a different kernel on the second term in order to change variance? We could get bias/variance tradeoff

Compare to unbalanced panel techniques/ random effects estimators