

Norkute, Milda

**Working Paper**

## A Monte Carlo Study of a Factor Analytical Method for Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models

Working Paper, No. 2014:7

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Department of Economics, School of Economics and Management, Lund University

*Suggested Citation:* Norkute, Milda (2014) : A Monte Carlo Study of a Factor Analytical Method for Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models, Working Paper, No. 2014:7, Lund University, School of Economics and Management, Department of Economics, Lund

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/260105>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

Working Paper 2014:7

Department of Economics  
School of Economics and Management

# A Monte Carlo Study of a Factor Analytical Method for Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models

Milda Norkute

February 2014



**LUND**  
UNIVERSITY

# A MONTE CARLO STUDY OF A FACTOR ANALYTICAL METHOD FOR FIXED-EFFECTS DYNAMIC PANEL MODELS\*

Milda Norkute<sup>†</sup>  
Lund University  
Sweden

February 17, 2014

## Abstract

In a recent article Bai (Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models, A Factor Analytical Method. *Econometrica* **81**, 285–314, 2013a) proposes a new factor analytical method (FAM) for the estimation of fixed-effects dynamic panel data models, which has the unique and very useful property that it is asymptotically bias free. In this paper we provide Monte Carlo evidence of the good small-sample performance of FAM, that complement Bai’s theoretical study.

**JEL Classification:** C13; C33.

**Keywords:** Dynamic panel data models; Heteroscedasticity; Monte Carlo simulations.

## 1 Introduction

It is well known that the within-groups (WG) estimator of the autoregressive coefficient in dynamic panel data models is subject to an incidental parameter bias, typically referred to as the “Nickell bias”. This bias, which occurs because the number of fixed-effects parameters grows without bound, is of order  $1/T$ , indicating that the WG estimator is inconsistent in panels where  $T$  is small even if  $N$  goes to infinity (see, for example, Baltagi, 2008). This problem has led to increased interest in generalized method of moments (GMM), see Baltagi, (2008) for an overview of this literature. However, although estimation methods based on

---

\*Corresponding address: Department of Economics, Lund University, P.O. Box 7082, S-220 07 Lund, Sweden. Tel.: +46 46 222 7919. E-mail address: `Milda.Norkute@nek.lu.se`.

<sup>†</sup>The author would like to thank Joakim Westerlund, David Edgerton and Fredrik N. G. Andersson for constructive comments and suggestions.

GMM will successfully remove the incidental parameter bias, they are instead biased of the order  $1/N$ . This means that they are inconsistent in panels where  $N$  is small even if  $T$  goes to infinity (see Alvarez and Arellano, 2003). GMM approaches are also known to suffer from problems of small-sample inefficiency (see, for example, Kiviet, 1995), and weak instrumentation (see Roodman, 2009). Another possibility is to use bias correction methods, which have the advantage of not being reliant on instrumental variables (see, for example, Kiviet, 1995; Hahn and Kuersteiner, 2002). These methods are, however, still biased in panels where  $T$  is small due to the approximation error in the asymptotic bias term. To the best of our knowledge, FAM is the only existing estimation method for dynamic panel data models that is bias free under a wide range of conditions (see, for example, Moon et al., 2013).

In a recent paper, Bai (2013a, b) proposes a factor analytical method (FAM) to estimate fixed-effects dynamic panel data models. One of the main features of this method is that there is no need for consistent estimation of the fixed-effects themselves but only their variance, which means that with this approach there is no “Nickell bias”. Indeed, as Bai (2013a, b) shows one can even allow for heteroscedasticity and still there is no bias. In contrast to other approaches, FAM therefore allows for asymptotically unbiased inference regardless of whether the incidental parameters are in the mean or in the variance. Of course, as is well known, asymptotic results need not provide accurate approximations in small samples. Thus, while certainly very promising, the usefulness of FAM from an applied point of view is yet to be proven since its small-sample properties are still unknown. The aim of the present paper is to fill this gap in the literature.

## 2 FAM

The data generating process (DGP) considered in the present paper is the same as in Bai (2013a), and is given by

$$y_{it} = \rho y_{it-1} + \mu_i + \delta_t + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (1)$$

where  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, T$ ,  $\mu_i$  and  $\delta_t$  are individual- and time-specific fixed-effects, respectively,  $y_{i0} = \dots = y_{N0} = 0$ ,  $|\rho| < 1$ , and  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is an error term that is assumed to be independently distributed with  $E(\varepsilon_{it}) = 0$ ,  $E(\varepsilon_{it}^2) = \sigma_t^2 > 0$  and  $E(\varepsilon_{it}^4) < \infty$ . It is further assumed that  $S_\mu = (N - 1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (\mu_i - \bar{\mu})^2 > 0$ , where  $\bar{\mu} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \mu_i$ . Equation (1) can

be written in a matrix form as

$$y_i = \Gamma 1_T \mu_i + \Gamma \delta + \Gamma \varepsilon_i, \quad (2)$$

where  $y_i = (y_{i1}, \dots, y_{iT})'$ ,  $\varepsilon_i = (\varepsilon_{i1}, \dots, \varepsilon_{iT})'$ ,  $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_T)'$  and  $1_T = (1, \dots, 1)'$  are all  $T \times 1$  vectors. The matrix  $\Gamma$  is  $T \times T$  and is given by

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \rho & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \rho^2 & \rho & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho^{T-1} & \dots & \rho^2 & \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The sample covariance matrix of  $y_i$  is given by  $S_y = (N-1)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N (y_i - \bar{y})(y_i - \bar{y})'$ , where  $\bar{y} = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N y_i$ . Under the above assumptions, it can be shown that

$$E(S_y) = \Sigma(\theta) = \Gamma(1_T 1_T' S_\mu + \Psi) \Gamma', \quad (3)$$

where  $\Psi = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2)$  and  $\theta = (S_\mu, \rho, \sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2)'$  is the vector containing the parameters of interest. The model in (2) can be seen as a common factor model with factor loading  $\Gamma 1_T$  and score  $\mu_i$ , suggesting that the estimation can be carried out using methods designed for such models (see, for example, Anderson and Amemiya, 1988). FAM is based on quasi-maximum likelihood whereby  $\theta$  is estimated by minimizing the following ‘‘discrepancy function’’

$$Q(\theta) = \log(|\Sigma(\theta)|) + \text{tr}(S_y \Sigma(\theta)^{-1}). \quad (4)$$

Denote by  $\hat{\rho}$  the resulting estimator of  $\rho$ . As Bai (2013a, Theorem 1) shows, as  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$  with  $NT^{-3} \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\rho} - \rho) \rightarrow_d N(0, \gamma^{-1}), \quad (5)$$

where  $\rightarrow_d$  signifies convergence in distribution and  $\gamma = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=2}^T \sigma_t^{-2} (\sigma_{t-1}^2 + \rho^2 \sigma_{t-2}^2 + \dots + \rho^{2(t-2)} \sigma_1^2)$ .<sup>1</sup> Hence, under the above conditions, there is no asymptotic bias and the estimator is asymptotically efficient. Moreover, the condition  $NT^{-3} \rightarrow 0$  is not necessary if we are only concerned with consistency (this condition is only imposed to ensure a simple form for the limiting distribution). In fact, consistency only requires  $N \rightarrow \infty$ .

<sup>1</sup>Under homoscedasticity,  $\gamma = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1}$  (see Bai 2013b, Theorem S.2).

**Remark 1.** Note that  $\theta$  only contains  $S_\mu$ , not  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N$ , and also how the time-specific fixed-effects are removed by subtracting  $\bar{y}$  in  $S_y$ . This means that the incidental parameter problem caused by the growing dimension of  $\theta$  does not arise. The way in which the incidental parameter problem is treated in FAM is therefore very different from the conventional approach of either performing the within transformation or by taking first differences. Of course, the dimension of  $\theta$  is still growing in  $T$ ; however, the estimation of  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  does not affect the consistency of  $\hat{\rho}$  (see Bai, 2013a, for an explanation).

**Remark 2.** While under the above assumptions  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is homoskedastic in  $i$ , this is not necessary. If  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is heteroskedastic in both  $i$  and  $t$ , then the estimation can proceed in exactly the same way as in the above, but then  $\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_T^2$  only capture the average variances over cross-sections (and not the variances themselves). This removes the incidental parameter problem, as the dimension of  $\theta$  does not depend on  $N$ .

### 3 Monte Carlo results

The DGP used in this section is given by (1) with  $\varepsilon_{it} \sim N(0, \sigma_{it}^2)$ ,  $\mu_i \sim U(1, 2)$  and  $\rho \in \{0, 0.5, 0.95\}$ . We run four distinct experiments<sup>2</sup>:

- A.  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 1, \delta_t = 0$ ;
- B.  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 1$  if  $i < \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$  and  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 2$  otherwise,  $\delta_t = 0$ ;
- C.  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 1$  if  $t < \lfloor T/2 \rfloor$  and  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 1/3$  otherwise,  $\delta_t = 0$ ;
- D.  $\sigma_{it}^2 = 1, \delta_t \sim U(1, 2)$ .

In experiment A  $\varepsilon_{it}$  is homoscedastic, whereas in experiments B and C heteroscedasticity is permitted by allowing for two distinct variance regimes. In experiments A–C the time-specific effects are absent, while in experiment D this is no longer the case. In each experiment the data are generated for 5,000 panels with  $T \in \{5, 10, 50\}$  and  $N \in \{10, 50, 100\}$ .

The small-sample performance of FAM is compared to the performance of four other estimators (of  $\rho$ ); WG, the bias-corrected ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator of Hahn and Kuersteiner (2002), the Anderson and Hsiao (1981) instrumental variables (IV) estimator using lagged levels as instruments<sup>3</sup>, and the GMM estimator of Arellano and Bond (1991),

<sup>2</sup>All computational work is performed in GAUSS 11 and the BFGS algorithm is used for constrained optimization with non-negativity constraints imposed on the variance parameters.

<sup>3</sup>We use level rather than first-differenced instruments, as the IV estimator based on the latter instruments has a singularity point and exhibits high variance over a wide range of parameter values (see Arellano, 1989).

where the last three are henceforth denoted bcOLS, AHL and abGMM, respectively. A large number of results were produced, but due to space constraints we focus here on the bias and root mean squared error (RMSE). Estimation using abGMM is computationally intensive, so for this estimator we only report results for the case when  $T = 5$ .

The results for experiment A are presented in Table 1. We see that the bias of FAM is close to zero for all the sample sizes considered. In fact, in terms of bias FAM outperforms the other estimators. We also see that the bias becomes smaller in absolute value as  $T$  and  $N$  increases, a finding that is in line with the  $\sqrt{NT}$ -consistency of FAM (irrespective of the relative rate of expansion of  $N$  and  $T$ ). As expected, with  $T$  fixed, WG is seriously biased and there is no improvement as  $N$  increases. abGMM is also noticeable biased when  $N$  is small; however, the performance improves as  $N$  increases. Similarly, although severely biased when  $N$  and  $T$  are small, the performance of bcOLS improves when  $T$  increases. We also see that the performance of bcOLS is much worse when  $\rho = 0.95$  than for  $\rho = 0.5$  or  $\rho = 0$ , which is in agreement with the findings in the previous literature. The performance of AHL is quite good and is only dominated by that of FAM.

FAM is superior, not only in terms of bias, but also in terms of RMSE. The RMSE of FAM is decreasing in both  $T$  and  $N$ . The fact that RMSE is also decreasing in  $\rho$  is in agreement with the theoretical result that the asymptotic variance of FAM is inversely related to the absolute value of  $\rho$ . One can also observe, that except for the case when  $\rho = 0.95$ , the RMSE of bcOLS and FAM are quite comparable, which is consistent with the fact that the both estimators are asymptotically efficient. The results provided in Table 1 further suggest that the least efficient estimator is AHL, which exhibits the highest RMSE.

Tables 2 and 3 contain the results for experiments B and C. We see that the bias and RMSE of FAM remain small, thus supporting the theoretical result that  $\hat{\rho}$  is asymptotically unbiased and consistent even in the presence of heteroscedasticity. Note in particular how the absolute bias is decreasing in  $T$ , suggesting that the estimation of time-specific variances does not result in incidental parameter bias. We also see that for FAM the results for experiments B and C are very similar to those for experiment A, and that the differences in results become less apparent as  $N$  and  $T$  increase. In fact, none of the estimators considered seem to much affected by the presence of heteroscedasticity, at least not for larger values of  $N$  and  $T$ . The relative performance of the estimators in experiments B and C is therefore the same as in experiment A.

The results for experiment D are not reported but we briefly describe them. First, FAM continues to perform well even in the presence of time-specific fixed-effects, which is again in line with our expectations. The only difference in comparison to experiments A–C is that the removal of time effects seem to result in increased RMSE. Second, the relative performance of the estimators is roughly the same as in experiments A–C with FAM leading to the best performance by far.

## References

- Alvarez, J., and M. Arellano (2003). The Time Series and Cross-Section Asymptotics of Dynamic Panel Data Estimators, *Econometrica* **71**, 1121–1159.
- Anderson, T. W., and Y. Amemiya (1988). The Asymptotic Normal Distribution of Estimators in Factor Analysis Under General Conditions. *The Annals of Statistics* **16**, 759–771.
- Anderson, T. W., and C. Hsiao (1981). Estimation of Dynamic Models with Error Components. *Journal of American Statistical Association* **76**, 598–606.
- Arellano, M., (1989). A Note On The Anderson-Hsiao Estimator For Panel Data. *Economics Letters* **31**, 337–341.
- Arellano, M., and S. Bond (1991). Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations. *Review of Economic Studies* **58**, 277–297.
- Bai, J. (2013a). Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models, A Factor Analytical Method. *Econometrica* **81**, 285–314.
- Bai, J. (2013b). Supplement to “Fixed-Effects Dynamic Panel Models, A Factor Analytical Method”. (*Econometrica* **81**, 285–314). Available on the Econometric Society website.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2008). *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*. Fourth edition, Wiley.
- Hahn, J., and G. Kuersteiner (2002). Asymptotically Unbiased Inference for a Dynamic Panel Model with Fixed Effects when Both  $n$  and  $T$  are Large. *Econometrica* **70**, 1639–1657.
- Kiviet, J. F. (1995). On bias, inconsistency, and efficiency of various estimators in dynamic panel data models. *Journal of Econometrics* **68**, 53–78.
- Moon, H. R., B. Perron and P. C. B. Phillips (2013). Incidental Parameters and Dynamic Panel Modeling. Forthcoming in Baltagi, B. (Ed.), *Oxford Handbook on Panel Data*, Oxford University Press.
- Roodman, D. (2009). A Note on the Theme of too Many Instruments. *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics* **71**, 135–158.

$T$	$N$	FAM		WG		bcOLS		AHI		abGMM	
		Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE
$\rho = 0$											
5	10	0	0.147	-0.251	0.294	-0.102	0.21	0.036	0.879	-0.132	0.343
	50	-0.001	0.061	-0.249	0.259	-0.099	0.13	0.009	0.19	-0.028	0.167
	100	-0.001	0.041	-0.25	0.255	-0.1	0.117	0.003	0.134	-0.016	0.116
10	10	0.001	0.101	-0.11	0.151	-0.021	0.116	0.014	0.189	-	-
	50	0	0.043	-0.11	0.119	-0.021	0.055	0.004	0.088	-	-
	100	0	0.03	-0.111	0.116	-0.022	0.043	0.001	0.064	-	-
50	10	0	0.045	-0.02	0.049	0	0.046	0.004	0.067	-	-
	50	0	0.02	-0.02	0.028	0	0.02	0.001	0.03	-	-
	100	-0.001	0.014	-0.02	0.025	-0.001	0.015	0	0.022	-	-
$\rho = 0.5$											
5	10	-0.004	0.119	-0.294	0.334	-0.053	0.197	0.278	64.44	-0.283	0.491
	50	-0.002	0.044	-0.245	0.254	0.006	0.079	0.012	0.261	-0.041	0.16
	100	-0.001	0.03	-0.242	0.246	0.01	0.057	0.005	0.172	-0.022	0.107
10	10	-0.004	0.082	-0.15	0.179	-0.015	0.108	-0.452	21.586	-	-
	50	-0.001	0.031	-0.129	0.135	0.008	0.045	0.244	37.221	-	-
	100	0	0.022	-0.128	0.131	0.009	0.033	0.066	25.761	-	-
50	10	-0.001	0.037	-0.031	0.051	-0.002	0.041	0.003	0.102	-	-
	50	0	0.016	-0.029	0.034	0	0.018	0.001	0.051	-	-
	100	0	0.011	-0.029	0.032	0	0.013	0.001	0.037	-	-
$\rho = 0.95$											
5	10	0.004	0.069	-0.097	0.126	0.274	0.29	0.016	0.14	-0.019	0.114
	50	0	0.024	-0.072	0.078	0.303	0.306	0.001	0.047	-0.003	0.04
	100	0	0.017	-0.071	0.074	0.305	0.306	0	0.033	-0.002	0.027
10	10	0.001	0.026	-0.028	0.04	0.164	0.167	0.004	0.059	-	-
	50	0	0.009	-0.02	0.023	0.173	0.173	0	0.021	-	-
	100	0	0.007	-0.02	0.021	0.173	0.174	0	0.015	-	-
50	10	0	0.005	-0.004	0.007	0.035	0.036	0	0.022	-	-
	50	0	0.002	-0.002	0.003	0.037	0.037	0	0.008	-	-
	100	0	0.001	-0.002	0.003	0.037	0.037	0	0.006	-	-

Table 1: Simulation results from experiment A.


$T$	$N$	FAM		WG		bcOLS		AHI		abGMM	
		Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE
$\rho = 0$											
5	10	0.003	0.175	-0.252	0.298	-0.102	0.218	0.043	0.704	-0.129	0.329
	50	-0.001	0.07	-0.249	0.26	-0.099	0.133	0.01	0.172	-0.029	0.165
	100	-0.001	0.048	-0.25	0.255	-0.1	0.118	0.004	0.122	-0.015	0.116
10	10	0.001	0.112	-0.11	0.155	-0.021	0.121	0.016	0.185	-	-
	50	0	0.048	-0.11	0.121	-0.021	0.058	0.004	0.086	-	-
	100	0	0.034	-0.111	0.116	-0.022	0.044	0.002	0.062	-	-
50	10	0	0.047	-0.02	0.051	0	0.048	0.004	0.069	-	-
	50	0	0.021	-0.02	0.029	0	0.022	0.001	0.031	-	-
	100	0	0.015	-0.02	0.026	-0.001	0.016	0.001	0.022	-	-
$\rho = 0.5$											
5	10	-0.001	0.16	-0.339	0.38	-0.107	0.231	-0.093	62.515	-0.432	0.634
	50	-0.002	0.055	-0.289	0.298	-0.047	0.099	-0.205	15.635	-0.092	0.252
	100	-0.001	0.037	-0.285	0.289	-0.042	0.075	0.035	1.046	-0.048	0.163
10	10	-0.006	0.096	-0.166	0.197	-0.033	0.12	-0.04	6.621	-	-
	50	-0.001	0.036	-0.145	0.151	-0.009	0.049	0.192	11.651	-	-
	100	0	0.026	-0.143	0.147	-0.008	0.036	-0.114	8.698	-	-
50	10	-0.002	0.041	-0.032	0.053	-0.003	0.043	0.003	0.096	-	-
	50	0	0.017	-0.03	0.035	0	0.019	0.001	0.047	-	-
	100	0	0.012	-0.03	0.033	-0.001	0.013	0.001	0.034	-	-
$\rho = 0.95$											
5	10	0.009	0.103	-0.144	0.175	0.218	0.248	0.03	0.203	-0.039	0.156
	50	0	0.031	-0.104	0.11	0.266	0.269	0.002	0.061	-0.006	0.051
	100	0	0.021	-0.101	0.105	0.268	0.27	0.001	0.042	-0.003	0.035
10	10	0.001	0.034	-0.044	0.056	0.147	0.152	0.007	0.081	-	-
	50	0	0.012	-0.03	0.032	0.162	0.163	0	0.027	-	-
	100	0	0.008	-0.029	0.03	0.163	0.164	0	0.019	-	-
50	10	0	0.007	-0.006	0.009	0.033	0.034	0	0.03	-	-
	50	0	0.002	-0.003	0.004	0.035	0.036	0	0.01	-	-
	100	0	0.002	-0.003	0.004	0.036	0.036	0	0.007	-	-

Table 2: Simulation results from experiment B.


$T$	$N$	FAM		WG		bcOLS		AHI		abGMM	
		Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE	Bias	RMSE
$\rho = 0$											
5	10	0.009	0.17	-0.173	0.221	-0.007	0.165	0.008	1.409	-0.128	0.33
	50	0	0.054	-0.167	0.178	0	0.075	0.007	0.187	-0.028	0.164
	100	0	0.037	-0.167	0.173	-0.001	0.054	0.002	0.128	-0.016	0.114
10	10	0.002	0.108	-0.101	0.146	-0.011	0.116	0.013	0.197	-	-
	50	0.001	0.041	-0.102	0.113	-0.012	0.054	0.004	0.095	-	-
	100	0	0.029	-0.102	0.108	-0.013	0.04	0.002	0.069	-	-
50	10	0.001	0.05	-0.019	0.053	0.001	0.051	0.005	0.074	-	-
	50	0	0.02	-0.02	0.03	-0.001	0.022	0.001	0.033	-	-
	100	0	0.014	-0.02	0.026	-0.001	0.016	0	0.024	-	-
$\rho = 0.5$											
5	10	0.003	0.136	-0.154	0.196	0.115	0.186	0.035	0.813	-0.125	0.3
	50	-0.002	0.037	-0.118	0.127	0.159	0.169	0.001	0.105	-0.015	0.089
	100	-0.001	0.025	-0.115	0.12	0.162	0.167	0	0.073	-0.008	0.06
10	10	-0.001	0.09	-0.13	0.162	0.007	0.106	-1.273	56.908	-	-
	50	0	0.029	-0.107	0.114	0.032	0.054	-0.007	0.298	-	-
	100	0	0.02	-0.106	0.11	0.034	0.046	-0.001	0.188	-	-
50	10	-0.001	0.041	-0.03	0.053	-0.001	0.044	0.005	0.119	-	-
	50	0	0.016	-0.028	0.034	0.001	0.019	0	0.061	-	-
	100	0	0.011	-0.028	0.031	0.002	0.014	0	0.045	-	-
$\rho = 0.95$											
5	10	0.004	0.057	-0.035	0.061	0.348	0.354	0.006	0.075	-0.005	0.064
	50	0	0.017	-0.026	0.032	0.359	0.359	0	0.026	-0.001	0.022
	100	0	0.012	-0.026	0.029	0.359	0.36	0	0.019	-0.001	0.015
10	10	0.001	0.023	-0.02	0.031	0.173	0.175	0.002	0.036	-	-
	50	0	0.008	-0.015	0.017	0.179	0.179	0	0.013	-	-
	100	0	0.005	-0.014	0.016	0.179	0.179	0	0.009	-	-
50	10	0	0.005	-0.003	0.005	0.036	0.037	0	0.013	-	-
	50	0	0.002	-0.002	0.002	0.037	0.037	0	0.005	-	-
	100	0	0.001	-0.002	0.002	0.037	0.037	0	0.003	-	-

Table 3: Simulation results from experiment C.


Figure 1: The bias and RMSE for all estimators and varying  $\rho$  from experiment A.




(a) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .




(b) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .




(c) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .




(d) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .




(e) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .



(f) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .




(g) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .




(h) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .

Note: The black, red, green and blue lines are for FAM, WG, bcOLS and abGMM, respectively. In order to keep the scales of axes comparable, the lines for AHI estimator are excluded.


Figure 2: The bias and RMSE for all estimators and varying  $\rho$  from experiment B.




(a) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .




(b) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .




(c) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .




(d) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .




(e) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .



(f) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .




(g) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .



(h) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .

Note: See Figure 1 for an explanation.

Figure 3: The bias and RMSE for all estimators and varying  $\rho$  from experiment C.




(a) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .

(b) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .

(c) Bias for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .

(d) Bias for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .



(e) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 5$ .

(f) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 5$ .

(g) RMSE for  $N = 10$  and  $T = 50$ .

(h) RMSE for  $N = 100$  and  $T = 50$ .

Note: See Figure 1 for an explanation.