Frontier Topics in Empirical Economics: Week 2 Non-parametric Method

Zibin Huang 1

¹College of Business, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics

November 30, 2023

<ロト < 部ト < 言ト < 言ト 三日日 のへで 1/47

- Common Parametric Models
 Linear Model: y = X^Iβ + e, e ~ N(0, σ²);
 Probit/Logit Model: P(y|X) = G(Xβ) where G is a nonlinear function
- Explicit Parametric Structure for Distribution
- Common Estimator
 - OLS, MLE, Nonlinear LS, Efficient GMM etc.
- Key Properties of the Estimator Consistency, BLUE, Asymptotic Efficiency etc.

- Common Parametric Models Linear Model: $y = X'\beta + e$, $e \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$; Probit/Logit Model: $P(y|X) = G(X\beta)$ where G is a nonlinear function
- Explicit Parametric Structure for Distribution
- Common Estimator
 OLS, MLE, Nonlinear LS, Efficient GMM etc.
- Key Properties of the Estimator Consistency, BLUE, Asymptotic Efficiency etc.

- Common Parametric Models Linear Model: $y = X'\beta + e$, $e \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$; Probit/Logit Model: $P(y|X) = G(X\beta)$ where G is a nonlinear function
- Explicit Parametric Structure for Distribution
- Common Estimator OLS, MLE, Nonlinear LS, Efficient GMM etc
- Key Properties of the Estimator Consistency, BLUE, Asymptotic Efficiency etc.

- Common Parametric Models Linear Model: $y = X'\beta + e$, $e \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$; Probit/Logit Model: $P(y|X) = G(X\beta)$ where G is a nonlinear function
- Explicit Parametric Structure for Distribution
- Common Estimator OLS, MLE, Nonlinear LS, Efficient GMM etc.
- Key Properties of the Estimator Consistency, BLUE, Asymptotic Efficiency etc.

- Common Parametric Models Linear Model: $y = X'\beta + e$, $e \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$; Probit/Logit Model: $P(y|X) = G(X\beta)$ where G is a nonlinear function
- Explicit Parametric Structure for Distribution
- Common Estimator OLS, MLE, Nonlinear LS, Efficient GMM etc.
- Key Properties of the Estimator Consistency, BLUE, Asymptotic Efficiency etc.

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot \ln x + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear

- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

- In linear regression, we have to assume that CEF is linear
- Why linear? Simple? Why not $y = x^3 \cdot lnx + e$?
- What if linear specification is wrong?
- Everything collapses. No data can save.
- It becomes only a linear approximation
- For example, if true model is Logit, but not linear regression

Potential Outcome Model is intrinsically NON-parametric!!

- There are many other statistical modeling methods
- Non-parametric, semi-parametric
- To understand tools beyond linear regression!

Potential Outcome Model is intrinsically NON-parametric!!!

- There are many other statistical modeling methods
- Non-parametric, semi-parametric
- To understand tools beyond linear regression!

- Potential Outcome Model is intrinsically NON-parametric!!!
- There are many other statistical modeling methods
- Non-parametric, semi-parametric
- To understand tools beyond linear regression!

- Potential Outcome Model is intrinsically NON-parametric!!!
- There are many other statistical modeling methods
- Non-parametric, semi-parametric
- To understand tools beyond linear regression!

- Potential Outcome Model is intrinsically NON-parametric!!!
- There are many other statistical modeling methods
- Non-parametric, semi-parametric
- To understand tools beyond linear regression!

- Let's forget about the model functional form
- Give up the "parametric" model like linear regression
- Do not assume that CEF is linear
- Go back to the original question to estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ without imposing any functional form assumption

Let's forget about the model functional form

- Give up the "parametric" model like linear regression
- Do not assume that CEF is linear
- Go back to the original question to estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ without imposing any functional form assumption

- Let's forget about the model functional form
- Give up the "parametric" model like linear regression
- Do not assume that CEF is linear
- Go back to the original question to estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ without imposing any functional form assumption

- Let's forget about the model functional form
- Give up the "parametric" model like linear regression
- Do not assume that CEF is linear
- Go back to the original question to estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ without imposing any functional form assumption

- Let's forget about the model functional form
- Give up the "parametric" model like linear regression
- Do not assume that CEF is linear
- Go back to the original question to estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ without imposing any functional form assumption

- Notation: x_i, y_i denotes random variable; X_i, Y_i denotes realizations; x, y denotes random variables or some value of the random variables
- Realizations are given (sample), they are NOT random in our context ∫ x ∑_iⁿ X_idx = ∑_iⁿ X_i ∫ xdx

- Notation: x_i, y_i denotes random variable; X_i, Y_i denotes realizations; x, y denotes random variables or some value of the random variables
- Realizations are given (sample), they are NOT random in our context $\int x \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i dx = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \int x dx$

- Notation: x_i, y_i denotes random variable; X_i, Y_i denotes realizations; x, y denotes random variables or some value of the random variables
- Realizations are given (sample), they are NOT random in our context $\int x \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i dx = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i \int x dx$

- Let's consider the first non-parametric method: Kernel regression
- It is super intuitive and interesting
- Instead of assuming $E(y_i|x_i) = x_i^{\prime}\beta$, we consider this CEF point by point
- That is, estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ for each possible point of $x_i = x_i$

Let's consider the first non-parametric method: Kernel regression

- It is super intuitive and interesting
- Instead of assuming $E(y_i|x_i) = x_i'\beta$, we consider this CEF point by point
- That is, estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ for each possible point of $x_i = x$

- Let's consider the first non-parametric method: Kernel regression
- It is super intuitive and interesting
- Instead of assuming $E(y_i|x_i) = x_i'\beta$, we consider this CEF point by point
- That is, estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ for each possible point of $x_i = x$

- Let's consider the first non-parametric method: Kernel regression
- It is super intuitive and interesting
- Instead of assuming $E(y_i|x_i) = x'_i\beta$, we consider this CEF point by point
- That is, estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ for each possible point of $x_i = x$

- Let's consider the first non-parametric method: Kernel regression
- It is super intuitive and interesting
- Instead of assuming $E(y_i|x_i) = x'_i\beta$, we consider this CEF point by point
- That is, estimate $E(y_i|x_i)$ for each possible point of $x_i = x$

Step 1: Estimating a cumulative density

Consider estimating a cumulative density function (CDF)



• What is the CDF at x = 3? $\hat{F}(x = 3) =$?

Step 1: Estimating a cumulative density

Consider estimating a cumulative density function (CDF)



• What is the CDF at x = 3? $\hat{F}(x = 3) =$?

Step 1: Estimating a cumulative density

• Consider estimating a cumulative density function (CDF)



• What is the CDF at x = 3? $\hat{F}(x = 3) =$?

Step 1: Estimating a cumulative density

• Consider estimating a cumulative density function (CDF)



• What is the CDF at x = 3? $\hat{F}(x = 3) =$?

Step 1: Estimating a cumulative density

• Consider estimating a cumulative density function (CDF)



• What is the CDF at x = 3? $\hat{F}(x = 3) =$?
Just count how many points lie on the left to the red line:

$$\hat{F}(x=3)=\frac{1}{n}\sum \mathbf{1}(X_i\leq 3)$$

In general, we have an estimation of F(x) as:

$$F(x) = P(X \le x) \Rightarrow \hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}(X_i \le x)$$

Just count how many points lie on the left to the red line:

$$\hat{F}(x=3)=\frac{1}{n}\sum \mathbf{1}(X_i\leq 3)$$

In general, we have an estimation of F(x) as:

$$F(x) = P(X \le x) \Longrightarrow \hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}(X_i \le x)$$

Just count how many points lie on the left to the red line:

$$\hat{F}(x=3) = \frac{1}{n} \sum \mathbf{1}(X_i \leq 3)$$

In general, we have an estimation of F(x) as:

$$F(x) = P(X \le x) \Longrightarrow \hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}(X_i \le x)$$

Just count how many points lie on the left to the red line:

$$\hat{F}(x=3) = \frac{1}{n} \sum \mathbf{1}(X_i \leq 3)$$

In general, we have an estimation of F(x) as:

$$F(x) = P(X \le x) \Rightarrow \hat{F}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1}(X_i \le x)$$

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)

PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

- Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)
- PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

- Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)
- PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)

PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

• Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)

h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

- Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)
- PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

- Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
- h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

- Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)
- PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

- Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
- h is called "bandwidth"

Step 2: Estimating a probability density

- Consider estimating a probability density function (PDF)
- PDF represents a marginal increase in CDF at some point (derivative)

$$f(x) = \frac{dF(x)}{dx} = \lim_{h \to 0} \frac{F(x+h) - F(x-h)}{2h}$$
$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{\hat{F}(x+h) - \hat{F}(x-h)}{2h}$$

- Changes of F(x) in a very small interval (with length 2h)
- h is called "bandwidth"

Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} \{ X_i \le x + h \} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} \{ X_i \le x - h \} \Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} \{ x - h \le X_i \le x + h \}$$

- How to interpret this?
- We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs
- $\prod_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x h \le X_i \le x + h)$ is the number of obs per unit length
- When n is large, we can choose very small h

Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x + h) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x - h) \Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} (x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$

- How to interpret this?
- We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x h \le X_i \le x + h)$ is the number of obs per unit length
- When *n* is large, we can choose very small *h*

• Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x + h) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x - h) \right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} (x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$

How to interpret this?

We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$
 is the number of obs per unit length

When *n* is large, we can choose very small *h*

Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x + h) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x - h) \Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} (x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$

- How to interpret this?
- We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs
- $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x h \le X_i \le x + h)$ is the number of obs per unit length
- When *n* is large, we can choose very small *h*

• Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \Big[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x + h) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x - h) \Big]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} (x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$

- How to interpret this?
- We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x h \le X_i \le x + h)$ is the number of obs per unit length

When *n* is large, we can choose very small *h*

• Then we can write the probability density f(x) at some value x as:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{2h} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x + h) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mathbf{1} (X_i \le x - h) \right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1} (x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$

- How to interpret this?
- We count the number of obs within a small interval around x, dividing by the length and the total number of obs

•
$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2h} \mathbf{1}(x - h \le X_i \le x + h)$$
 is the number of obs per unit length

When *n* is large, we can choose very small *h*



▲□ > ▲□ > ▲目 > ▲目 > ▲目 のへで

12 / 47



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへで



14 / 47



15 / 47

Define $k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

• Define
$$k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$$
. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

• Define
$$k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$$
. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

• Define
$$k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$$
. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

• Define
$$k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$$
. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

• Define
$$k(v) = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$$
. Then we have:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{h} k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- We call k(v) a uniform kernel function
- This $\hat{f}(x)$ is a kernel estimator of the PDF (uniform kernel)
- Kernel is weight!
- There can be other kinds of kernel functions, when we assign different weights to different observations

- = k(v) is integrated to 1
- $= k(\nu)$ is symmetric with $k(\nu) = k(-\nu)$.
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- k(v) is integrated to 1
- k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- k(v) is integrated to 1
- k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- k(v) is integrated to 1
- k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- A function can be used as a kernel if
 - k(v) is integrated to 1
 - k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- A function can be used as a kernel if
 - k(v) is integrated to 1
 - k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- A function can be used as a kernel if
 - k(v) is integrated to 1
 - k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$

Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$

Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- A function can be used as a kernel if
 - k(v) is integrated to 1
 - k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred

- A function can be used as a kernel if
 - k(v) is integrated to 1
 - k(v) is symmetric with k(v) = k(-v)
- The weights sum to one; The weights are symmetric to the left and to the right
- Triangular Kernel: $k(v) = (1 |v|)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Epanechnikov Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{3}{4}(1 v^2)\mathbf{1}(|v| \le 1)$
- Gaussian Kernel: $k(v) = \frac{1}{2\pi}e^{\frac{-v^2}{2}}$
- Usually, Epanechnikov Kernel and Triangular Kernel are preferred


Figure 1: Various Kernels

- For multivariate case, let $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q)$.
- Define product kernel: $K(v) = k(v_1)k(v_2)\cdots, k(v_q)$.
- The estimator becomes:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh_1h_2\cdots,h_q}\sum_i K(\frac{X_i-x}{h})$$

- For multivariate case, let $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q)$.
- Define product kernel: $K(v) = k(v_1)k(v_2)\cdots, k(v_q)$.
- The estimator becomes:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh_1h_2\cdots, h_q} \sum_i K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- For multivariate case, let $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q)$.
- Define product kernel: $K(v) = k(v_1)k(v_2)\cdots, k(v_q)$.
- The estimator becomes:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh_1h_2\cdots, h_q} \sum_i K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})$$

- For multivariate case, let $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q)$.
- Define product kernel: $K(v) = k(v_1)k(v_2)\cdots, k(v_q)$.
- The estimator becomes:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh_1h_2\cdots,h_q}\sum_i K(\frac{X_i-x}{h})$$

- For multivariate case, let $v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_q)$.
- Define product kernel: $K(v) = k(v_1)k(v_2)\cdots, k(v_q)$.
- The estimator becomes:

$$\hat{f}(x) = \frac{1}{nh_1h_2\cdots,h_q}\sum_i K(\frac{X_i-x}{h})$$



Step 3: Estimating a CEF

- Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method
- Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point

Assume that we have CEF:

Y = g(X) + u[Y|X] = g(X)

• u has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method

Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point

Assume that we have CEF:

Y = g(X) + u[Y|X] = g(X)

u has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method

Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point

Assume that we have CEF:

Y = g(X) + u[Y|X] = g(X)

u has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

- Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method
- Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point

Assume that we have CEF:

$$Y = g(X) + u$$
$$[Y|X] = g(X)$$

• u has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

- Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method
- Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point

Assume that we have CEF:

$$Y = g(X) + u$$
$$F[Y|X] = g(X)$$

• u has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

21 / 47

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

- Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method
- Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point
- Assume that we have CEF:

Y = g(X) + uE[Y|X] = g(X)

• *u* has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

- Finally, let's see how to estimate a CEF using kernel method
- Not like linear regression, we estimate the CEF point by point
- Assume that we have CEF:

Y = g(X) + uE[Y|X] = g(X)

• *u* has a conditional variance $Var(u|X) = \sigma^2$

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

 Based on the CDF and PDF we've got, we have Nadaraya-Watson Estimator (N-W) for CEF as follows:

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x)$$
 where $K_h(X_i - x) = rac{K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}$

 Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).

Weights are determined by the kernel function

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x)$$
 where $K_h(X_i - x) = rac{K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}$

- Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).
- Weights are determined by the kernel function

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x)$$
 where $K_h(X_i - x) = rac{K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(rac{X_i - x}{h})}$

- Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).
- Weights are determined by the kernel function

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x) \quad \text{where} \quad K_h(X_i - x) = \frac{K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}$$

- Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).
- Weights are determined by the kernel function

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

 Based on the CDF and PDF we've got, we have Nadaraya-Watson Estimator (N-W) for CEF as follows:

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x) \quad \text{where} \quad K_h(X_i - x) = \frac{K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}$$

Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).

Weights are determined by the kernel function

Step 3: Estimating a CEF

$$\hat{g}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i K_h(X_i - x) \quad \text{where} \quad K_h(X_i - x) = \frac{K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}{\sum_{i=1}^{n} K(\frac{X_i - x}{h})}$$

- Intuition: The conditional Expectation of Y given X=x is estimated as a weighted average of observed Y_i closely around x (within the range of bandwidth h).
- Weights are determined by the kernel function

- I. Derive NW Estimator from the kernel estimator of CDF and PDF. This can be a little bit hard. You can refer to Notes from Carol (or Hansen's book) for help.
- 2. What is NW Estimator, if we use the uniform kernel?

- I. Derive NW Estimator from the kernel estimator of CDF and PDF. This can be a little bit hard. You can refer to Notes from Carol (or Hansen's book) for help.
- 2. What is NW Estimator, if we use the uniform kernel?

- 1. Derive NW Estimator from the kernel estimator of CDF and PDF. This can be a little bit hard. You can refer to Notes from Carol (or Hansen's book) for help.
- 2. What is NW Estimator, if we use the uniform kernel?

- 1. Derive NW Estimator from the kernel estimator of CDF and PDF. This can be a little bit hard. You can refer to Notes from Carol (or Hansen's book) for help.
- 2. What is NW Estimator, if we use the uniform kernel?

• We have g(x) = E(Y|X) as CEF and f(x) as density for x

Theorem (Asymptotics for N-W Estimator)

Under some regularity conditions, as $n \to \infty$, $h_s \to 0$ (s = 1, ..., q), $nh_1 ... h_q \to \infty$ and $nh_1 ... h_q \sum_{s=1}^q h_s^6 \to 0$, we have:

$$\sqrt{nh_1...h_q}(\hat{g}(x) - g(x) - \sum_{s=1}^q h_s^2 B_s(x)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} (\int k(v)^2 dv)^q)$$

where
$$B_s(x) = \frac{\int v^2 k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s} + f(x) \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2} \right]$$

(日) (四) (三) (三) (三) (三) (○) (○)

• We have g(x) = E(Y|X) as CEF and f(x) as density for x

Theorem (Asymptotics for N-W Estimator)

Under some regularity conditions, as $n \to \infty, h_s \to 0$ (s = 1, ..., q), $nh_1 ... h_q \to \infty$ and $nh_1 ... h_q \sum_{s=1}^q h_s^6 \to 0$, we have:

$$\sqrt{nh_1\dots h_q}(\hat{g}(x) - g(x) - \sum_{s=1}^q h_s^2 B_s(x)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} (\int k(v)^2 dv)^q)$$

where
$$B_s(x) = \frac{\int v^2 k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s} + f(x) \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2} \right]$$

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_s^2 \frac{\int v^2 k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s} + f(x) \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_1 \dots h_q} \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^2 dv \right)^q$$

- $\blacksquare (1) h_s \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \uparrow, Variance \downarrow$
 - \therefore we have trade-off in choosing kernel bandwidth.
- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv), Variance \uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv))$
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_i} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_i}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_i^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2} k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x) \frac{\partial^{2} g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (1) h_s ↑ ⇒ Bias ↑, Variance ↓
 - ... we have trade-off in choosing kernel bandwidth.
- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv), Variance \uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv))$
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_a} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_a}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_a^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow, Variance \downarrow (more observations)$

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2} k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x) \frac{\partial^{2} g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv), Variance \uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv))$
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2} k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x) \frac{\partial^{2} g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (1) h_s ↑⇒ Bias ↑, Variance ↓
 ∴ we have trade-off in choosing kernel bandwidth.
- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv), Variance \uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv))$
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2}k(v)dv}{2f(x)} \left[2\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x)\frac{\partial^{2}g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv)$, Variance $\uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv)$)
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2} k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x) \frac{\partial^{2} g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv)$, Variance $\uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv)$)
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2}$

• (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Asymptotic Bias=
$$\sum_{s=1}^{q} h_{s}^{2} \frac{\int v^{2} k(v) dv}{2f(x)} \left[2 \frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_{s}} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_{s}} + f(x) \frac{\partial^{2} g(x)}{\partial x_{s}^{2}} \right]$$

Asymptotic Variance=
$$\frac{1}{nh_{1}...h_{q}} \frac{\sigma^{2}(x)}{f(x)} \left(\int k(v)^{2} dv \right)^{q}$$

- (2) q ↑⇒ Variance ↑ exponentially We call this "Curse of Dimensionality".
- (3) Kernel more concentrated \Rightarrow Bias $\downarrow (\int v^2 k(v) dv)$, Variance $\uparrow (\int k(v)^2 dv)$)
- (4) Slope Effect and Curvature Effect on bias: $\frac{\partial f(x)}{\partial x_s} \frac{\partial g(x)}{\partial x_s}, \frac{\partial^2 g(x)}{\partial x_s^2}$
- (5) $f(x) \uparrow \Rightarrow Bias \downarrow$, Variance \downarrow (more observations)

Non-parametric Method: Local Polynomial

- Another widely used kernel-based method is local polynomial
- In linear regression, we use a global linear function to fit data
- In local polynomial, we use piece-wise polynomial (linear) function to fit data interval by interval

Non-parametric Method: Local Polynomial

Another widely used kernel-based method is local polynomial

- In linear regression, we use a global linear function to fit data
- In local polynomial, we use piece-wise polynomial (linear) function to fit data interval by interval

Non-parametric Method: Local Polynomial

- Another widely used kernel-based method is local polynomial
- In linear regression, we use a global linear function to fit data
- In local polynomial, we use piece-wise polynomial (linear) function to fit data interval by interval
- Another widely used kernel-based method is local polynomial
- In linear regression, we use a global linear function to fit data
- In local polynomial, we use piece-wise polynomial (linear) function to fit data interval by interval



For some X = x, we fit g(x) by choosing samples very close to x. Then we fit a polynomial for these observations. (Here, linear)

■ For g(x), we solve the following optimization problem at each point x:

$$\min_{b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_p} \sum_{i=1}^n k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})(Y_i - b_0 - b_1(X_i - x) - b_2(X_i - x)^2 - \cdots - b_p(X_i - x)^p)^2$$

When p = 1, we call it local linear regression
When p = 2, we call it local quadratic regressio

For g(x), we solve the following optimization problem at each point x:

$$\min_{b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_p} \sum_{i=1}^n k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})(Y_i - b_0 - b_1(X_i - x)) - b_2(X_i - x)^2 - \cdots - b_p(X_i - x)^p)^2$$

• When p = 1, we call it local linear regression

• When p = 2, we call it local quadratic regression

For g(x), we solve the following optimization problem at each point x:

$$\min_{b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_p} \sum_{i=1}^n k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})(Y_i - b_0 - b_1(X_i - x)) - b_2(X_i - x)^2 - \cdots - b_p(X_i - x)^p)^2$$

- When p = 1, we call it local linear regression
- When p = 2, we call it local quadratic regression

For g(x), we solve the following optimization problem at each point x:

$$\min_{b_0, b_1, \cdots, b_p} \sum_{i=1}^n k(\frac{X_i - x}{h})(Y_i - b_0 - b_1(X_i - x)) - b_2(X_i - x)^2 - \cdots - b_p(X_i - x)^p)^2$$

- When p = 1, we call it local linear regression
- When p = 2, we call it local quadratic regression

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form.
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods

There are three disadvantages of this method:

- Computational burden is large
- Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
- Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

- Both kernel and local polynomial regressions are Kernel-based methods
- There are three disadvantages of this method:
 - Computational burden is large
 - Hard to include information or restriction over functional form
 - Requirement of large sample
- Series-based methods alleviate these problems

As usual, we have a CEF model:

Y = g(X) + ug(X) = E(Y|X)

We expand the CEF by Taylor Series at zero:

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{g^{(k)}(0)}{k!} X^{k}$$

<ロ> <回> <回> < 回> < 回> < 回> < 回> < 回</p>

As usual, we have a CEF model:

Y = g(X) + ug(X) = E(Y|X)

• We expand the CEF by Taylor Series at zero:

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{g^{(k)}(0)}{k!} X^{k}$$

As usual, we have a CEF model:

Y = g(X) + ug(X) = E(Y|X)

• We expand the CEF by Taylor Series at zero:

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{g^{(k)}(0)}{k!} X^{k}$$

ショック 正則 スポットポット 白マ

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k p_k(X)$$
$$p_0(x) = 1, p_1(x) = x, p_2(x) = x^2, \dots, p_K(x) = x^K$$

We can use OLS to estimate this polynomial

- The vector of $\{p_0, p_1, p_2, ..., p_K\}$ is called "basis"
- This is "global" polynomial, in contrast to "local" polynomial

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k p_k(X)$$
$$p_0(x) = 1, p_1(x) = x, p_2(x) = x^2, \dots, p_K(x) = x^K$$

- We can use OLS to estimate this polynomial
- The vector of $\{p_0, p_1, p_2, ..., p_K\}$ is called "basis"
- This is "global" polynomial, in contrast to "local" polynomial

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k p_k(X)$$
$$p_0(x) = 1, p_1(x) = x, p_2(x) = x^2, \dots, p_K(x) = x^K$$

- We can use OLS to estimate this polynomial
- The vector of $\{p_0, p_1, p_2, ..., p_K\}$ is called "basis"
- This is "global" polynomial, in contrast to "local" polynomial

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k p_k(X)$$
$$p_0(x) = 1, p_1(x) = x, p_2(x) = x^2, \dots, p_K(x) = x^K$$

- We can use OLS to estimate this polynomial
- The vector of $\{p_0, p_1, p_2, ..., p_K\}$ is called "basis"
- This is "global" polynomial, in contrast to "local" polynomial

$$g(X) = \sum_{k=0}^{K} \beta_k p_k(X)$$
$$p_0(x) = 1, p_1(x) = x, p_2(x) = x^2, \dots, p_K(x) = x^K$$

- We can use OLS to estimate this polynomial
- The vector of $\{p_0, p_1, p_2, ..., p_K\}$ is called "basis"
- This is "global" polynomial, in contrast to "local" polynomial

- Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis
- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: {1, x₁, x₂, x₁x₂, x₁², x₂², x₁x₂², x₁²x₂, x₁²x₂²...}
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis

- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: $\{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2...\}$
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

- Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis
- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: $\{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2...\}$
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

- Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis
- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: $\{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2...\}$
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

- Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis
- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: $\{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2...\}$
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

- Polynomial is the simplest choice of basis
- In multivariate case (2 variables), it becomes: $\{1, x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2, x_1x_2^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2...\}$
- Polynomial series has several problems
- It is very sensitive to outliers
- The biggest problem for polynomial series is Runge's phenomenon

Runge's phenomenon

Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



- Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere
- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

Runge's phenomenon

Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



- Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere
- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

(日) (周) (王) (王) (王)

- Runge's phenomenon
- Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



- Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere
- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

- Runge's phenomenon
- Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere

- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

- Runge's phenomenon
- Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



- Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere
- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

- Runge's phenomenon
- Red: original function; Blue: fifth-order poly; Green: ninth-order poly



- Since the power polynomials are forced to vary somewhere
- It may be pushed to the boundary
- The boundary part is approximated very poorly

- How to choose the optimal order?
- We will discuss this problem in details in the next lecture
- But in general, high order polynomial behaves very bad
- Some other basis are better

How to choose the optimal order?

- We will discuss this problem in details in the next lecture
- But in general, high order polynomial behaves very bad
- Some other basis are better

- How to choose the optimal order?
- We will discuss this problem in details in the next lecture
- But in general, high order polynomial behaves very bad
- Some other basis are better
- How to choose the optimal order?
- We will discuss this problem in details in the next lecture
- But in general, high order polynomial behaves very bad
- Some other basis are better

- How to choose the optimal order?
- We will discuss this problem in details in the next lecture
- But in general, high order polynomial behaves very bad
- Some other basis are better



- Excellent for approximating periodic functions
- Better than poly, but still not good at boundary (Gibbs' phenomenon)



- Excellent for approximating periodic functions
- Better than poly, but still not good at boundary (Gibbs' phenomenon)



- Excellent for approximating periodic functions
- Better than poly, but still not good at boundary (Gibbs' phenomenon)



- Excellent for approximating periodic functions
- Better than poly, but still not good at boundary (Gibbs' phenomenon)

- There are more basis
- Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis
- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

There are more basis

- Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis
- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

There are more basis

Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis

- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

- There are more basis
- Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis
- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

- There are more basis
- Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis
- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

- There are more basis
- Such as Spline basis and Wavelet basis
- They are complicated, rarely seen in Applied works
- But Carol claims that Spline basis is in general a better choice
- If interested, you can read her notes

- Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure
- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure

- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

- Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure
- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

- Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure
- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

- Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure
- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

- Non-parametric model is so general that we do not impose any structure
- Totally data driven, no prior information
- Convergence rate is low, variance is high, requirement for data is high
- What if we want to impose some structure, but not the full structure?
- Semi-parametric model

Partially linear model
 One of the most popular semi-parametric

$$Y = X'\beta + g(Z) + u, \quad E(u|X,Z) = 0, Var(u|X,Z) = \sigma^{2}$$

X enters in the model linearly, Z non-parametrically

Partially linear model

One of the most popular semi-parametric models

$$Y = X'\beta + g(Z) + u, \quad E(u|X,Z) = 0, Var(u|X,Z) = \sigma^2$$

• X enters in the model linearly, Z non-parametrically

- Partially linear model
- One of the most popular semi-parametric models

$$Y = X'\beta + g(Z) + u, \quad E(u|X,Z) = 0, Var(u|X,Z) = \sigma^2$$

• X enters in the model linearly, Z non-parametrically

- Partially linear model
- One of the most popular semi-parametric models

$$Y = X'\beta + g(Z) + u, \quad E(u|X,Z) = 0, Var(u|X,Z) = \sigma^2$$

• X enters in the model linearly, Z non-parametrically

Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
 In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtractional statement of the subtractional stateme

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- Then we can estimate β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

• Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)

In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- **Then we can estimate** β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

- Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
- In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- **Then we can estimate** β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

- Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
- In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- **Then we can estimate** β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

- Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
- In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
 Then we have estimators for Y − E(Y|Z) and X − E(X|Z)
- Then we can estimate β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

- Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
- In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- \blacksquare Then we can estimate β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

- Estimation of β is simple, we follow Robinson (1988)
- In the first step, conditional on Z and then take the subtract:

$$E(Y|Z) = E(X'|Z)\beta + g(Z)$$
$$Y - E(Y|Z) = [X - E(X|Z)]'\beta + u$$

- E(Y|Z) and E(X|Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously
- Then we have estimators for Y E(Y|Z) and X E(X|Z)
- \blacksquare Then we can estimate β using OLS
- Asymptotics of this estimator is complicated

In the second step, we subtract $X'\beta$ from Y:

$$Y - X'\beta = g(Z) + u$$

g(Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously

In the second step, we subtract $X'\beta$ from Y:

$$Y - X'\beta = g(Z) + u$$

g(Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously

• In the second step, we subtract $X'\beta$ from Y:

$$Y - X'\beta = g(Z) + u$$

■ g(Z) can be estimated using methods introduced previously

- **Question:** How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?
- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X' \beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap

• Question: How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?

- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X'\beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap

- Question: How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?
- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X'\beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap

- Question: How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?
- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X'\beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap
Non-parametric Method: Semi-parametric Model

- Question: How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?
- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X'\beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap

Non-parametric Method: Semi-parametric Model

- Question: How to estimate the variance of $\hat{g}(Z)$?
- Can we use the variance from the non-parametric regression directly?
- No! Because $Y X'\beta$ is also estimated
- It contains more uncertainty from the first step
- We need bootstrap

- Bootstrap is a non-parametric method for inference
- Instead of deriving the closed-form equation of variance
- We use simulation to estimate it
- Random sampling with replacement

Bootstrap is a non-parametric method for inference

- Instead of deriving the closed-form equation of variance
- We use simulation to estimate it
- Random sampling with replacement

- Bootstrap is a non-parametric method for inference
- Instead of deriving the closed-form equation of variance
- We use simulation to estimate it
- Random sampling with replacement

- Bootstrap is a non-parametric method for inference
- Instead of deriving the closed-form equation of variance
- We use simulation to estimate it
- Random sampling with replacement

- Bootstrap is a non-parametric method for inference
- Instead of deriving the closed-form equation of variance
- We use simulation to estimate it
- Random sampling with replacement

- Step 1: Given full sample with size n, draw R new samples of size n, with replacement. Index each new sample by r
- Step 2: Calculate the simulated variance of $\hat{g}(x)$ by: $\hat{V}(x) = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{r=1}^{R} [\hat{g}_r(x) - \hat{g}(x)]^2$
- Step 3: Use V(x) to calculate confidence intervals and implement statistical tests
 We call this bootstrapped variance

- Step 1: Given full sample with size n, draw R new samples of size n, with replacement. Index each new sample by r
- Step 2: Calculate the simulated variance of $\hat{g}(x)$ by: $\hat{V}(x) = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{r=1}^{R} [\hat{g}_r(x) - \hat{g}(x)]^2$
- Step 3: Use $\hat{V}(x)$ to calculate confidence intervals and implement statistical tests
- We call this bootstrapped variance

- Step 1: Given full sample with size n, draw R new samples of size n, with replacement. Index each new sample by r
- Step 2: Calculate the simulated variance of $\hat{g}(x)$ by: $\hat{V}(x) = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{r=1}^{R} [\hat{g}_r(x) - \hat{g}(x)]^2$
- Step 3: Use V(x) to calculate confidence intervals and implement statistical tests
 We call this bootstrapped variance

- Step 1: Given full sample with size n, draw R new samples of size n, with replacement. Index each new sample by r
- Step 2: Calculate the simulated variance of $\hat{g}(x)$ by: $\hat{V}(x) = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{r=1}^{R} [\hat{g}_r(x) - \hat{g}(x)]^2$
- Step 3: Use V(x) to calculate confidence intervals and implement statistical tests
 We call this bootstrapped variance

- Step 1: Given full sample with size n, draw R new samples of size n, with replacement. Index each new sample by r
- Step 2: Calculate the simulated variance of $\hat{g}(x)$ by: $\hat{V}(x) = \frac{1}{R-1} \sum_{r=1}^{R} [\hat{g}_r(x) - \hat{g}(x)]^2$
- Step 3: Use $\hat{V}(x)$ to calculate confidence intervals and implement statistical tests
- We call this bootstrapped variance

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- \blacksquare We have an empirical distribution of \hat{eta}'
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q^*_{\alpha/2}, q^*_{1-\alpha/2}]$
- \blacksquare q^* is the quantile of this empirical distribution

But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice

- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^* is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^* is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^* is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^{*} is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1-\alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^{*} is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1 \alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^* is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- But using bootstrapped variance to construct confidence interval is a poor choice
- It relies on asymptotic normality, which is not accurate in finite sample
- A better chioce is "percentile interval"
- First, we stack the sample of bootstrap estimates $\{\hat{\beta}^1, \hat{\beta}^2, ..., \hat{\beta}^R\}$
- We have an empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}^r$
- The bootstrap $100(1 \alpha)$ % confidence interval is then: $[q_{\alpha/2}^*, q_{1-\alpha/2}^*]$
- q^{*} is the quantile of this empirical distribution

- Anything related to estimation of CEF
- Potential outcome framework is non-parametric
- Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques
- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

Anything related to estimation of CEF

Potential outcome framework is non-parametric

Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques

- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

- Anything related to estimation of CEF
- Potential outcome framework is non-parametric
 Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques
- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

- Anything related to estimation of CEF
- Potential outcome framework is non-parametric
 Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques
- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

- Anything related to estimation of CEF
- Potential outcome framework is non-parametric
 Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques
- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

- Anything related to estimation of CEF
- Potential outcome framework is non-parametric
 Causal inference highly depends on non-parametric techniques
- Non-parametric inference in complicated models (Bootstrap)
- If you focus on prediction and fit, but not the structure behind it Predict stock price, machine learning, RDD fitting
- We will show these in the following lectures

Paper report
 Dube et al. (2020) Monopsony in Online Labor Markets

Paper report
 Dube et al. (2020) Monopsony in Online Labor Markets

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - # Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet.
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions.
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression

- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric
Final Conclusion

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

Final Conclusion

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric

Final Conclusion

- There are statistical modeling methods other than Linear regression
- Non-parametric methods impose no prior structure, totally data-driven
 - Kernel-based methods: N-W estimator, Local polynomial
 - Series-based methods: Polynomial, Fourier, Spline, Wavelet
- They are very useful when you want to do prediction, or when you want to implement causal inference in a complicated context
- However, they have weaknesses: Not always better to make model more flexible
 - Hard to incorporate restrictions
 - Require large sample size to have accurate estimation
- We will discuss more about it next week
- A semi-parametric model is between non-parametric and parametric



Dube, Arindrajit, Jeff Jacobs, Suresh Naidu, and Siddharth Suri. 2020. "Monopsony in Online Labor Markets." *American Economic Review: Insights* 2 (1):33–46.

Robinson, Peter M. 1988. "Root-N-consistent Semiparametric Regression." Econometrica :931-954.