Econometric Theory, **25**, 2009, 806–818. Printed in the United States of America.
doi:10.1017/S0266466608090312

ADMISSIBLE INVARIANT SIMILAR TESTS FOR INSTRUMENTAL VARIABLES REGRESSION

VICTOR CHERNOZHUKOV
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

CHRISTIAN HANSEN
University of Chicago

MICHAEL JANSSON
University of California, Berkeley

This paper studies a model widely used in the weak instruments literature and establishes admissibility of the weighted average power likelihood ratio tests recently derived by Andrews, Moreira, and Stock (2004, NBER Technical Working Paper 199). The class of tests covered by this admissibility result contains the Anderson and Rubin (1949, *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 20, 46–63) test. Thus, there is no conventional statistical sense in which the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test "wastes degrees of freedom." In addition, it is shown that the test proposed by Moreira (2003, *Econometrica* 71, 1027–1048) belongs to the closure of (i.e., can be interpreted as a limiting case of) the class of tests covered by our admissibility result.

1. INTRODUCTION

Conducting valid (and preferably "optimal") inference on structural coefficients in instrumental variables (IVs) regression models is known to be nontrivial when the IVs are weak.[1] Influential papers on this subject include Dufour (1997) and Staiger and Stock (1997), both of which highlight the inadequacy of conventional asymptotic approximations to the behavior of two-stage least squares and point out that valid inference can be based on the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test. Several methods intended to enjoy improved power properties relative to the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test have been proposed, prominent examples being the conditional likelihood ratio (CLR) and Lagrange multiplier (LM) tests of Moreira (2003) and Kleibergen (2002), respectively.

All of the previously mentioned methods and results have been or can be deduced within an IV regression model with a single endogenous regressor, fixed (i.e., nonstochastic) IVs, and independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) homoskedastic Gaussian errors. Studying that model, Andrews, Moreira, and Stock

The authors thank Jim Powell, Paul Ruud, a co-editor, and (in particular) two referees for very valuable comments. Address correspondence to Michael Jansson, Department of Economics, University of California Berkeley, 508-1 Evans Hall #3880, Berkeley, CA 94720-3880, USA; e-mail: mjansson@econ.berkeley.edu.

 © 2009 Cambridge University Press 0266-4666/09 $15.00

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(2004) obtain a family of tests, the so-called weighted average power likelihood ratio (WAP-LR) tests, each member of which enjoys demonstrable optimality properties within the class of tests satisfying a certain invariance restriction. The invariance restriction in question, namely, that inference is invariant to transformations of the minimal sufficient statistic (S, T) (defined in (2) in Section 2) corresponding to a rotation of the instruments, is satisfied by the Anderson and Rubin (1949), CLR, and LM tests. Furthermore, testing problems involving the structural coefficient are rotation invariant under the distributional assumptions employed by Andrews et al. (2004). For these reasons (and others), the rotation invariance restriction seems "natural," in which case the numerical finding of Andrews et al. (2004) that the CLR test is "nearly" efficient relative to the class of rotation invariant tests provides strong evidence in favor of the CLR test.

Nevertheless, because best invariant procedures can fail to be admissible even if they exist, it is not entirely obvious whether it is "natural" to confine attention to rotation invariant tests when developing optimality theory for hypothesis tests in the model of Andrews et al. (2004). In particular, it would appear to be an open question whether the members of the WAP-LR family, upon which the construction of the two-sided power envelope of Andrews et al. (2004) is based, are even admissible (in the Gaussian model with fixed IVs). We show that all members of the WAP-LR family are indeed admissible, essentially because the defining optimality property of these tests can be reformulated in such a way that rotation invariance becomes a conclusion rather than an assumption. The Anderson and Rubin (1949) test belongs to the WAP-LR family and is therefore admissible. In contrast, the CLR and LM tests do not seem to admit WAP-LR representations, though we demonstrate here that these test statistics "nearly" admit WAP-LR interpretations in the sense that they belong to the closure (appropriately defined) of the class of WAP-LR tests.

Section 2 introduces the model and defines some terminology needed for the development of the formal results of the paper, all of which are stated in Section 3 and proved in Section 4.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Consider the model

$$y_1 = y_2\beta + u,$$

$$y_2 = Z\pi + v_2, \tag{1}$$

where $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times k}$ are observed variables (for some $k \geq 2$), $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^k$ are unknown parameters, and $u, v_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are unobserved errors.[2]

Suppose β is the parameter of interest. Specifically, suppose we are interested in a testing problem of the form

$$H_0 : \beta = \beta_0 \quad \text{vs. } H_1 : \beta \neq \beta_0.$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Writing the model in reduced form, we have

$$y_1 = Z\pi\beta + v_1,$$

$$y_2 = Z\pi + v_2,$$

where $v_1 = u + v_2\beta$. Following Andrews et al. (2004) (and many others), we treat Z as a fixed $n \times k$ matrix with full column rank, and we assume that $(v_1', v_2')' \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \Omega \otimes I_n)$, where Ω is a known, positive definite 2×2 matrix. Without loss of generality we normalize a variety of unimportant constants by assuming that $\beta_0 = 0$, $Z'Z = I_k$, and Ω is of the form

$$\Omega = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \delta \\ \delta & 1+\delta^2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ is known.[3]

Under the stated assumptions, the model is fully parametric, the (multivariate normal) distribution of (y_1, y_2) being completely specified up to the parameters β and π. A minimal sufficient statistic for β and π is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} S \\ T \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} Z'y_1 \\ Z'(y_2 - \delta y_1) \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}(\eta_\beta \otimes \pi, I_{2k}), \tag{2}$$

where

$$\eta_\beta = \begin{pmatrix} \beta \\ 1 - \delta\beta \end{pmatrix}.$$

Because (S, T) is sufficient, the totality of attainable power functions is spanned by the set of power functions associated with (possibly randomized) tests based on (S, T). Any such test can be represented by means of a $[0, 1]$-valued function $\phi(\cdot)$ such that H_0 is rejected with probability $\phi(s, t)$ if $(S, T) = (s, t)$. The power function of this test is the function (with arguments β and π) $\mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S, T)$, where the subscript on E indicates the distribution with respect to which the expectation is taken.

For any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, a test with test function ϕ is of level α if

$$\sup_\pi \mathrm{E}_{0,\pi}\phi(S, T) \leq \alpha.$$

A level α test with test function ϕ is said to be α-admissible if

$$\mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S, T) \leq \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\varphi(S, T) \qquad \forall(\beta, \pi) \tag{3}$$

implies

$$\mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S, T) = \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\varphi(S, T) \qquad \forall(\beta, \pi) \tag{4}$$

whenever the test associated with φ is of level α.[4]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The main purpose of the present paper is to investigate the α-admissibility properties of certain recently developed rotation invariant α-similar tests. By definition, a rotation invariant test is one whose test function ϕ satisfies $\phi(OS, OT) = \phi(S, T)$ for every orthogonal $k \times k$ matrix O, and an α-similar test is one for which

$$\mathrm{E}_{0,\pi}\phi(S,T) = \alpha \qquad \forall \pi. \tag{5}$$

The rotation invariant α-similar tests under consideration here are the WAP-LR tests of Andrews et al. (2004). By construction, a size α WAP-LR test maximizes a weighted average power (WAP) criterion of the form

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S,T)\, dW(\beta,\pi) \tag{6}$$

among rotation invariant α-similar tests, where the weight function W is some cumulative distribution function (c.d.f.) on $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$.

In spite of the fact that the defining property of a WAP-LR test is an optimality property, it is not obvious whether a WAP-LR is α-admissible, the reason being that admissibility of optimum invariant tests cannot be taken for granted (e.g., Lehmann and Romano, 2005, Sect. 6.7). We show in Section 3 that any WAP-LR test maximizes a WAP criterion among the class of α-similar tests. In the present context, that optimality property is sufficiently strong to imply that any WAP-LR test is α-admissible.

Remark. The fact that the alternative hypothesis is dense in the maintained hypothesis implies that any α-admissible test is d-admissible in the sense of Lehmann and Romano (2005). The (rotation invariant) posterior odds ratio tests of Chamberlain (2007) are d-admissible almost by construction (e.g., Lehmann and Romano, 2005, Thm. 6.7.2(i)), but because these tests are not necessarily similar it is unclear whether these tests are also α-admissible (for some α).

3. RESULTS

3.1. Admissible α-Similar Tests

Two basic facts about exponential families greatly simplify the construction of α-admissible α-similar tests. First, because the power function of the test with test function ϕ can be represented as

$$\mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S,T) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k}\int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \phi(s,t)\, f_S(s|\beta,\pi)\, f_T(t|\beta,\pi)\, ds\, dt,$$

where $f_S(\cdot|\beta,\pi)$ and $f_T(\cdot|\beta,\pi)$ denote the densities (indexed by β and π) of S and T, it follows from Lehmann and Romano (2005, Thm. 2.7.1) that $\mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S,T)$ is a continuous function of (β,π). Therefore, an α-similar test cannot be dominated by a level α test that is not α-similar. By implication, an α-similar test with

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

test function ϕ is α-admissible if (3) implies (4) whenever the test associated with φ is α-similar.

Second, because π is unrestricted, T is a complete, sufficient statistic for π under H_0 (e.g., Moreira, 2001). As a consequence, a test with test function ϕ is α-similar if and only if it is conditionally α-similar in the sense that, almost surely,

$$\mathrm{E}_{0,\pi}\left[\phi\left(S,T\right)|T\right]=\alpha \qquad \forall\pi.$$

It follows from the preceding considerations and the Neyman–Pearson lemma that if W is a c.d.f. on $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$, then the WAP criterion (6) is maximized among α-similar tests by the test with test function given by

$$\phi_{LR}^{W}\left(s,t;\alpha\right)=1\left[LR^{W}\left(s,t\right)>\kappa_{LR}^{W}\left(t;\alpha\right)\right],$$

where $1\left[\cdot\right]$ is the indicator function,

$$LR^{W}\left(s,t\right)=\frac{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}}f_{S}\left(s|\beta,\pi\right)f_{T}\left(t|\beta,\pi\right)dW\left(\beta,\pi\right)}{f_{S}\left(s|0,0\right)f_{T}\left(t|0,0\right)},$$

and $\kappa_{LR}^{W}\left(t;\alpha\right)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the distribution of $LR^{W}\left(\mathcal{Z}_k,t\right)$, where $\mathcal{Z}_k$ is distributed $\mathcal{N}\left(0,I_k\right)$.[5] Because the maximizer ϕ_{LR}^{W} is essentially unique (in the measure theoretic sense), the test with test function $\phi_{LR}^{W}\left(\cdot;\alpha\right)$ is α-admissible.[6] To demonstrate α-admissibility of a test, it therefore suffices to show that its test function can be represented as $\phi_{LR}^{W}\left(\cdot;\alpha\right)$ for some W. Section 3.2 uses that approach to show that the WAP-LR tests of Andrews et al. (2004) are all α-admissible.

3.2. Admissibility of WAP-LR Tests

The WAP-LR tests are indexed by c.d.f.s on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_{+}$.[7] Accordingly, let w be a c.d.f. on $\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_{+}$ and define

$$\mathcal{L}^{w}\left(s,t\right)=\int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_{+}}\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda\eta_{\beta}'\eta_{\beta}}{2}\right){}_{0}\tilde{F}_{1}\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{\lambda}{4}\eta_{\beta}'Q\left(s,t\right)\eta_{\beta}\right]dw\left(\beta,\lambda\right), \tag{7}$$

where ${}_{0}\tilde{F}_{1}$ is the regularized confluent hypergeometric function,

$$Q\left(s,t\right)=\begin{pmatrix}s's & s't\\ t's & t't\end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

and η_β is defined as in Section 2. By Corollary 1 of Andrews et al. (2004) (these authors are denoted by *AMS* in the mathematical expressions that follow), the test function of the size α WAP-LR test associated with w is

$$\phi_{AMS}^{w}\left(s,t;\alpha\right)=1\left[\mathcal{L}^{w}\left(s,t\right)>\kappa_{AMS}^{w}\left(t;\alpha\right)\right],$$

where $\kappa_{AMS}^{w}\left(t;\alpha\right)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the distribution of $\mathcal{L}^{w}\left(\mathcal{Z}_k,t\right)$.[8]

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

For our purposes, it is convenient to characterize the defining optimality property of ϕ^{w}_{AMS} as follows. Let W^{w}_{AMS} denote the c.d.f. (on $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$) of $\left(\mathcal{B}, \sqrt{\Lambda}\mathcal{U}_k'\right)'$, where $(\mathcal{B}, \Lambda)'$ has c.d.f. w and $\mathcal{U}_k$ is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^k$ (independently of $\mathcal{B}$ and Λ). In terms of W^{w}_{AMS}, Theorem 3 of Andrews et al. (2004) asserts that the test with test function $\phi^{w}_{AMS}(\cdot;\alpha)$ maximizes

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S,T)\, dW^{w}_{AMS}(\beta,\pi)$$

among rotation invariant α-similar tests. In this optimality result, the assumption of rotation invariance is unnecessary because it turns out that

$$\phi^{w}_{AMS}(s,t;\alpha) = \phi^{W^{w}_{AMS}}_{LR}(s,t;\alpha). \tag{9}$$

Equation (9) follows from a calculation performed in the proof of the following strengthening of Theorem 3 of Andrews et al. (2004).

THEOREM 1. *Let w be a c.d.f. on $R \times R_+$. If ϕ satisfies (5), then*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi(S,T)\, dW^{w}_{AMS}(\beta,\pi) \le \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\phi^{w}_{AMS}(S,T;\alpha)\, dW^{w}_{AMS}(\beta,\pi),$$

where the inequality is strict unless $\Pr_{\beta,\pi}\left[\phi(S,T) = \phi^{w}_{AMS}(S,T;\alpha)\right] = 1$ for some (and hence for all) (β,π). In particular, the size α WAP-LR test associated with w is α-admissible.

The testing function of the size α Anderson and Rubin (1949) (denoted by *AR* in the mathematical expressions that follow) test (for known $\mathbf{\Omega}$) is given by

$$\phi_{AR}(s,t;\alpha) = 1\left[s's > \chi^2_\alpha(k)\right],$$

where $\chi^2_\alpha(k)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the χ^2 distribution with k degrees of freedom. As remarked by Andrews et al. (2004), $\mathcal{L}^{w}(s,t)$ is an increasing function of $s's$ whenever the weight function w assigns unit mass to the set $\left\{(\beta,\lambda) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+ : \beta = \delta^{-1}\right\}$. As a consequence, the following result is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.

COROLLARY 2. *The size α Anderson and Rubin (1949) test is α -admissible.*

In spite of the fact that the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test is a k degrees of freedom test applied to a testing problem with a single restriction, a fact that suggests that its power properties should be poor (e.g., Kleibergen, 2002, p. 1781; Moreira, 2003, p. 1031), Corollary 2 implies that there is no conventional statistical sense in which the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test "wastes degrees of freedom."

In addition to the Anderson and Rubin (1949) test, Theorem 1 also covers the two-point optimal invariant similar tests of Andrews et al. (2004), the power functions of which trace out a two-sided power envelope for rotation invariant

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

α-similar tests. On the other hand, the CLR and LM tests do not seem to belong to the class of WAP-LR tests. Indeed, it would appear to be an open question whether one or both of these tests even belong to the closure (appropriately defined) of the class of WAP-LR tests. Section 3.3 provides an affirmative answer to that question.

Remark. As pointed out by a referee, two distinct generalizations of the results of this section seem feasible. First, the conclusion that a Bayes rule corresponding to a distribution w on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ can be "lifted" to a Bayes rule corresponding to a distribution on $\mathbb{R}^{k+1}$ (by introducing a $\mathcal{U}_k$ that is uniformly distributed on the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^k$ and independent of (β, λ)) applies to more general decision problems than the one considered. Second, using Muirhead (1982, Thms. 2.1.14 and 7.4.1) it should be possible to generalize the results to a model with multiple endogenous regressors. To conserve space, we do not pursue these extensions here.

3.3. The CLR Test

The test function of the size α CLR test is

$$\phi_{CLR}(s,t;\alpha) = 1\left[LR(s,t) > \kappa_{CLR}(t;\alpha)\right],$$

where

$$LR(s,t) = \frac{1}{2}\left(s's - t't + \sqrt{(s's + t't)^2 - 4\left[(s's)(t't) - (s't)^2\right]}\right)$$

and $\kappa_{CLR}(t;\alpha)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the distribution of $LR(\mathcal{Z}_k, t)$.

In numerical investigations, the CLR test has been found to perform remarkably well in terms of power. For instance, Andrews et al. (2004) find that the power of the size α CLR test is "essentially the same" as the two-sided power envelope for rotation invariant α-similar tests. In light of this numerical finding, it would appear to be of interest to analytically characterize the relation (if any) between the CLR test and the class of WAP-LR tests.

Theorem 3, which follows, shows that $CLR(s,t)$ can be represented as the limit as $N \to \infty$ of a suitably normalized version of $\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)$, where $\{w_{CLR,N} : N \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is a carefully chosen collection of c.d.f.s on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$.

To motivate this representation and the functional form of $w_{CLR,N}$, it is convenient to express the test function of the CLR test as

$$\phi_{CLR}(s,t;\alpha) = 1\left[CLR^*(s,t) > \kappa_{CLR^*}(t;\alpha)\right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} CLR^*(s,t) &= \sqrt{s's + t't + \sqrt{(s's + t't)^2 - 4\left[(s's)(t't) - (s't)^2\right]}} \\ &= \sqrt{2\left[LR(s,t) + t't\right]} \end{aligned}$$

and $\kappa_{CLR^*}(t;\alpha) = \sqrt{2\left[\kappa_{CLR}(t;\alpha) + t't\right]}$.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

The statistic $CLR^*(s,t)$ is the square root of the largest eigenvalue of $Q(s,t)$ (defined in (8)) and therefore admits the following characterization:

$$CLR^*(s,t) = \sqrt{\max_{\eta\in\mathbb{R}^2:\eta'\eta=1} \eta' Q(s,t)\,\eta}. \tag{10}$$

Moreover, the integrand in (7) can be written as

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\lambda\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta}{2}\right)\ {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{\lambda\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta}{4}\tilde{\eta}_\beta' Q(s,t)\,\tilde{\eta}_\beta\right],$$

where $\tilde{\eta}_\beta = \eta_\beta/\sqrt{\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta}$ is a vector of unit length proportional to η_β. If $w_{CLR,N}$ is such that its support is the set of all pairs (β,λ) for which $\lambda\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta = N$, then the integrand is maximized (over the support of $w_{CLR,N}$) by setting $\tilde{\eta}_\beta$ equal to the eigenvector associated with the largest eigenvalue of $Q(s,t)$. This observation, and the fact that the tail behavior of ${}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;\cdot/4]$ is similar to that of $\exp\left(\sqrt{\cdot}\right)$, suggests that the large N behavior of $\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)$ "should" depend on $Q(s,t)$ only through $CLR^*(s,t)$.

For any $N > 0$, let $w_{CLR,N}$ denote the c.d.f. of $\left(\mathcal{B}, N/\sqrt{\eta_{\mathcal{B}}'\eta_{\mathcal{B}}}\right)'$, where $\mathcal{B}\sim\mathcal{N}(0,1)$.[9] By construction, $w_{CLR,N}$ is such that its support is the set of all pairs (β,λ) for which $\lambda\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta = N$. Using that property, the relation (10), and basic facts about ${}_0\tilde{F}_1(;k/2;\cdot)$, we obtain the following result.

THEOREM 3. *For any* $\left(s',t'\right)' \in R^{2k}$,

$$CLR^*(s,t) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t) + \frac{N}{2}\right]. \tag{11}$$

In particular,

$$CLR(s,t) = \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{2N}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t) + \frac{N}{2}\right]^2 - t't.$$

Define $\mathcal{L}^*_{CLR,N}(s,t) = \left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t) + N/2\right]/\sqrt{N}$. The proof of Theorem 3 shows that as $N\to\infty$, $\mathcal{L}^*_{CLR,N}(\cdot)$ converges to $CLR^*(\cdot)$ in the topology of uniform convergence on compacta. Using this result, it follows that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \mathrm{E}_{\beta,\pi}\left|\phi_{AMS}^{w_{CLR,N}}(S,T;\alpha) - \phi_{CLR}(S,T;\alpha)\right| = 0 \qquad \forall(\beta,\pi).$$

In particular, the power function of the WAP-LR test associated with $w_{CLR,N}$ converges (pointwise) to the power function of the CLR test (as $N\to\infty$).

In light of the previous paragraph, it seems plausible that the CLR test enjoys an "admissibility at ∞" property reminiscent of Andrews (1996, Thm. 1(c)). Verifying this conjecture is not entirely trivial, however, because the unboundedness

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(in t) of $\kappa_{CLR^*}(t;\alpha)$ makes it difficult (if not impossible) to adapt the proofs of Andrews and Ploberger (1995) and Andrews (1996) to the present situation.

Theorem 3 also suggests a method of constructing tests that share the nice numerical properties of the CLR test and furthermore enjoy demonstrable optimality properties, namely, tests based on $\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)$ for some "large" (possibly sample-dependent) value of N. Because the power improvements (if any) attainable in this way are likely to be slight, the properties of tests constructed in this way are not investigated in this paper.

Remark. The test function of the size α LM test is

$$\phi_{LM}(s,t;\alpha) = 1\left[\frac{(s't)^2}{t't} > \chi^2_\alpha(1)\right],$$

where $\chi^2_\alpha(1)$ is the $1-\alpha$ quantile of the χ^2 distribution with 1 degree of freedom. Andrews et al. (2004) show that a one-sided version of the LM test can be interpreted as a limit of WAP-LR tests (and is locally most powerful invariant). On the other hand, we are not aware of any such results that cover the (two-sided) LM test.

A slight variation on the argument used in Section 3.2 can be used to obtain a WAP-LR interpretation of the LM test. Indeed, letting $w_{LM,N}$ denote the c.d.f. of $\left[\mathcal{B}_N, N/\sqrt{\eta'_{\mathcal{B}_N}\eta_{\mathcal{B}_N}}\right]'$, where the distribution of $N^{1/3}\mathcal{B}_N$ is uniform on $[-1,1]$, it can be shown that[10]

$$\left|s't\right|/\sqrt{t't} = \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N^{1/6}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{LM,N}}(s,t) + \frac{N}{2} - \sqrt{N}\sqrt{t't}\right],$$

implying in particular that

$$\frac{(s't)^2}{t't} = \lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N^{1/3}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{LM,N}}(s,t) + \frac{N}{2} - \sqrt{N}\sqrt{t't}\right]^2.$$

4. PROOFS

Proof of Theorem 1. It suffices to establish (9). To do so, it suffices to show that $LR^{W^w_{AMS}}(s,t)$ is proportional to $\mathcal{L}^w(s,t)$. Now,

$$\frac{f_S(s|\beta,\pi)\,f_T(t|\beta,\pi)}{f_S(s|0,0)\,f_T(t|0,0)} = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\left[\|s-\beta\pi\|^2 - \|s\|^2 + \|t-(1-\delta\beta)\pi\|^2 - \|t\|^2\right]\right)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda_\pi\eta'_\beta\eta_\beta}{2}\right)\exp\left(\sqrt{\lambda_\pi}\left[\beta s + (1-\delta\beta)t\right]'\tilde{\pi}\right),$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where $\|\cdot\|$ signifies the euclidean norm, $\lambda_\pi = \pi'\pi$, and $\tilde{\pi} = \lambda_\pi^{-1/2}\pi$.

Because $\tilde{\pi}$ has unit length, it follows from Muirhead (1982, Thm. 7.4.1) that

$$LR^{W^w_{AMS}}(s,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k+1}} \frac{f_S(s|\beta,\pi)\, f_T(t|\beta,\pi)}{f_S(s|0,0)\, f_T(t|0,0)}\, dW^w_{AMS}(\beta,\pi)$$

$$\propto \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda\eta'_\beta\eta_\beta}{2}\right) {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{\lambda}{4}\eta'_\beta Q(s,t)\,\eta_\beta\right] dw(\beta,\lambda),$$

as was to be shown. (We are grateful to a referee for suggesting the use of Muirhead, 1982, Thm. 7.4.1.) ■

Proof of Theorem 3. The result is obvious if $Q(s,t) = 0$, and so suppose that $Q(s,t) \neq 0$.

The proof will make use of the fact (e.g., Andrews and Ploberger, 1995, Lem. 2) that $0 < \underline{C} \leq \overline{C} < \infty$, where

$$\underline{C} = \inf_{z\geq 0} \frac{{}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;z/4]}{\exp\left(\sqrt{z}\right)\max(z,1)^{-(k-1)/4}}, \qquad \overline{C} = \sup_{z\geq 0} \frac{{}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;z/4]}{\exp\left(\sqrt{z}\right)}.$$

By construction,

$$\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}\times\mathbb{R}_+} \exp\left(-\frac{\lambda\eta'_\beta\eta_\beta}{2}\right) {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{\lambda}{4}\eta'_\beta Q(s,t)\,\eta_\beta\right] dw_{CLR,N}(\beta,\lambda)$$

$$= \exp\left(-\frac{N}{2}\right) \int_{\mathbb{R}} {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{N}{4}\tilde{\eta}'_\beta Q(s,t)\,\tilde{\eta}_\beta\right] d\Phi(\beta),$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal c.d.f. Using this representation, the relation (10), and monotonicity of ${}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;\cdot]$,

$$\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)\exp\left(\frac{N}{2}\right) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{N}{4}\tilde{\eta}'_\beta Q(s,t)\,\tilde{\eta}_\beta\right] d\Phi(\beta)$$

$$\leq {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{N}{4}CLR^*(s,t)^2\right]$$

$$\leq \overline{C}\exp\left[\sqrt{N}CLR^*(s,t)\right],$$

from which it follows immediately that

$$\overline{\lim}_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t) + \frac{N}{2}\right] \leq CLR^*(s,t). \tag{12}$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

On the other hand, for any $0 < \varepsilon < CLR^*(s,t)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)\exp\left(\frac{N}{2}\right) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{N}{4}\tilde{\eta}_\beta' Q(s,t)\tilde{\eta}_\beta\right] d\Phi(\beta)\\ &\geq \int_{\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(s,t)} {}_0\tilde{F}_1\left[;\frac{k}{2};\frac{N}{4}\tilde{\eta}_\beta' Q(s,t)\tilde{\eta}_\beta\right] d\Phi(\beta)\\ &\geq \exp\left[\sqrt{N}\left(CLR^*(s,t)-\varepsilon\right)\right]\\ &\quad\times \underline{C}\max\left[N\cdot CLR^*(s,t)^2,1\right]^{-(k-1)/4}\int_{\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(s,t)} d\Phi(\beta),\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(s,t) = \left\{\beta : \sqrt{\tilde{\eta}_\beta' Q(s,t)\tilde{\eta}_\beta} \geq CLR^*(s,t)-\varepsilon\right\},$$

the first inequality uses positivity of ${}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;\cdot]$, and the second inequality uses (10) and monotonicity of ${}_0\tilde{F}_1[;k/2;\cdot]$. The integral $\int_{\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(s,t)} d\Phi(\beta)$ is strictly positive because $\Phi(\cdot)$ has full support, and so

$$\underline{\lim}_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)+\frac{N}{2}\right] \geq CLR^*(s,t)-\varepsilon.$$

Letting ε tend to zero in the displayed inequality, we obtain an inequality that can be combined with (12) to yield (11).

Indeed, because

$$\sup_{(s',t')'\in K} CLR^*(s,t) < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \inf_{(s',t')'\in K}\int_{\mathbb{B}_\varepsilon(s,t)} d\Phi(\beta) > 0$$

for any compact set $K \subset \mathbb{R}^{2k}$, the result (11) can be strengthened as follows:

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\sup_{(s',t')'\in K}\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\left[\log\mathcal{L}^{w_{CLR,N}}(s,t)+\frac{N}{2}\right]-CLR^*(s,t)\right| = 0. \qquad \blacksquare$$

NOTES

1. Recent reviews include Stock, Wright, and Yogo (2002), Dufour (2003), Hahn and Hausman (2003), and Andrews and Stock (2007).

2. It is straightforward to accommodate exogenous regressors in (1). We tacitly assume that any such regressors have been "partialed out." This assumption is made for simplicity and entails no loss of generality (for details, see Andrews et al., 2004, Sect. 2).

3. These assumptions correspond to the model in which (Z, y_1, y_2) has been replaced by

$$\left(\tilde{Z},\tilde{y}_1,\tilde{y}_2\right) = (Z'Z)^{-1/2}\left[Z,\omega_{11}^{-1/2}(y_1-y_2\beta_0),\omega_{22.1}^{-1/2}y_2\right],$$

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

where ω_{ij} is the (i,j) element of Ω and $\omega_{22.1} = \omega_{22} - \omega_{11}^{-1}\omega_{12}^2$. In the chosen parameterization, the parameter δ is related to the correlation coefficient ρ computed from Ω through the formula $\delta = \rho/\sqrt{1-\rho^2}$.

4. In the model under study here, the present notion of α-admissibility agrees with that of Lehmann and Romano (2005, Sect. 6.7) (in which (3) and (4) are required to hold for all $\beta \neq 0$ and all π) because (a) all power functions are continuous and (b) the set $\{\beta : \beta \neq 0\}$ is a dense subset of $\mathbb{R}$.

5. Details are provided in an Appendix, available from the authors upon request.

6. As pointed out by a referee, this fact is a special case of the more general decision theoretic result that (essentially) unique Bayes rules are admissible (e.g., Ferguson, 1967, Thm. 2.3.1).

7. Because the power of an invariant test depends on π only through the scalar $\pi'\pi$, the corresponding WAP criterion (6) depends on W only through the c.d.f. on $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_+$ given by

$$w(\beta, \lambda) = \int_{b \leq \beta, \pi'\pi \leq \lambda} dW(b, \pi).$$

8. The function $\mathcal{L}^w(s,t)$ is proportional to $\psi_w(q_1, q_T)$ in Lemma 1 of Andrews et al. (2004) because ${}_0\tilde{F}_1(;k/2;z/4)$ is proportional to $z^{-(k-2)/4} I_{(k-2)/2}\left(\sqrt{z}\right)$, where $I_\nu(\cdot)$ denotes the modified Bessel function of the first kind of order ν. The size α WAP-LR test is α-similar by construction and is rotation invariant because $\kappa_{AMS}^w(t;\alpha)$ depends on t only through $t't$.

9. The distributional assumption $\mathcal{B} \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ is made for concreteness. An inspection of the proof of Theorem 3 shows that (11) is valid for any distribution (of $\mathcal{B}$) whose support is $\mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, as pointed out by a referee it is possible to obtain analogous results without making the distribution of $\lambda\eta_\beta'\eta_\beta$ degenerate.

10. Details are provided in an Appendix, available from the authors upon request. An inspection of the proof given there shows that the distributional assumption on $N^{1/3}\mathcal{B}_N$ is made for concreteness insofar as the preceding representations are valid whenever $N^{1/3}\mathcal{B}_N$ has a (fixed) distribution whose support is $[-1,1]$.

REFERENCES

Anderson, T.W. & H. Rubin (1949) Estimation of the parameters of a single equation in a complete set of stochastic equations. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 20, 46–63.

Andrews, D.W.K. (1996) Admissibility of the likelihood ratio test when the parameter space is restricted under the alternative. *Econometrica* 64, 705–718.

Andrews, D.W.K., M.J. Moreira, & J.H. Stock (2004) Optimal Invariant Similar Tests for Instrumental Variables Regression. NBER Technical Working Paper 299.

Andrews, D.W.K. & W. Ploberger (1995) Admissibility of the likelihood ratio test when a nuisance parameter is present only under the alternative. *Annals of Statistics* 23, 1609–1629.

Andrews, D.W.K. & J.H. Stock (2007) Inference with weak instruments. In R. Blundell, W.K. Newey, & T. Persson (eds.), *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Ninth World Congress,* vol. III, pp. 122–173. Cambridge University Press.

Chamberlain, G. (2007) Decision theory applied to an instrumental variables model. *Econometrica* 75, 609–652.

Dufour, J.-M. (1997) Some impossibility theorems in econometrics with applications to structural and dynamic models. *Econometrica* 65, 1365–1387.

Dufour, J.-M. (2003) Identification, weak instruments, and statistical inference in econometrics. *Canadian Journal of Economics* 36, 767–808.

Ferguson, T.S. (1967) *Mathematical Statistics: A Decision Theoretic Approach.* Academic Press.

Hahn, J. & J. Hausman (2003) Weak instruments: Diagnosis and cures in empirical econometrics. *American Economic Review* 93, 118–125.

Kleibergen, F. (2002) Pivotal statistics for testing structural parameters in instrumental variables regression. *Econometrica* 70, 1781–1803.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lehmann, E.L. & J.P. Romano (2005) *Testing Statistical Hypotheses*, 3rd ed. Springer-Verlag.
Moreira, M.J. (2001) Tests with Correct Size When Instruments Can Be Arbitrarily Weak. CLE Working paper 37, University of California Berkeley.
Moreira, M.J. (2003) A conditional likelihood ratio test for structural models. *Econometrica* 71, 1027–1048.
Muirhead, R.J. (1982) *Aspects of Multivariate Statistical Theory*. Wiley.
Staiger, D. & J.H. Stock (1997) Instrumental variables estimation with weak instruments. *Econometrica* 65, 557–586.
Stock, J.H., J.H. Wright, & M. Yogo (2002) A survey of weak instruments and weak identification in generalized method of moments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 20, 518–529.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266466608090312 Published online by Cambridge University Press