

Quantile Regression for General Spatial Panel Data Models with Fixed Effects

Xiaowen Dai¹, Zhen Yan¹, Maozai Tian^{1,2}, ManLai Tang³

1. Center for Applied Statistics, School of Statistics, Renmin University of China, Beijing 100872, China
2. School of Statistics, Lanzhou University of Finance and Economics Lanzhou, 730101, Gansu, China
3. Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Hang Seng Management College, Shatin, Hong Kong, China

August 8, 2016

Abstract

This paper considers the quantile regression model with both individual fixed effect and time period effect for general spatial panel data. Instrumental variable quantile regression estimators will be proposed. Asymptotic properties of the proposed estimators will be developed. Simulations are conducted to study the performance of the proposed method. We will illustrate our methodologies using a cigarettes demand data set.

Keywords: Fixed effects, Instrumental variables, Quantile regression, Space-time panel models, Spatial autoregressive.

1 Introduction

Spatial econometric models have been widely used in many areas (e.g., economics, political science and public health) to deal with spatial interaction effects among geographical units (e.g., jurisdictions, regions, and states). Recently, the spatial econometrics literature has exhibited a growing interest in the specification and estimation of econometric relationships based on spatial panels, which typically refer to data containing time series observations of a number of spatial units. For instance, Kapoor *et al.* (2007) developed a generalized moments (GM) estimator for a space-time model with error components that are both spatially and time-wise

correlated. Lee and Yu (2010) proposed the maximum likelihood (ML) estimator for the spatial autoregressive (SAR) panel model with both spatial lag and spatial disturbances. All these works were developed based on (conditional) mean regression methods. Compared with mean regression methods, the quantile regression (QR) method is more robust and can be adopted to deal with data characterized by different error distributions.

Recently, there has been a growing literature on estimating and testing of QR panel data models. Koenker (2004) introduced a novel approach for the estimation of a QR model for longitudinal data. Galvao *et al.* (2011) studied the quantile regression dynamic panel model with fixed effects. Galvao *et al.* (2013) investigated the estimation of censored QR models with fixed effects. Galvao *et al.* (2015) developed a new minimum distance quantile regression (MD-QR) estimator for panel data models with fixed effects. However, quantile regression estimation for spatial econometric panel models has not been studied in existing literature.

This paper focuses on the QR estimations in the general SAR panel data model with both individual fixed effects and time period specific effects (see, e.g., Lee and Yu, 2010). We employ the instrumental variable quantile regression (IVQR) method to estimate the parameters. The asymptotic properties of the IVQR estimator are also developed. The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the SAC panel data model with both individual fixed effects and time period fixed effects, and proposes the instrumental variable quantile regression (IVQR) estimation procedure. The asymptotic properties of the IVQR estimators are also discussed. Proofs of the theorems in Sections 2 are given in the Appendix. Section 3 reports a simulation study for assessing the finite sample performance of the proposed estimators. An empirical illustration is considered in Section 4. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2 General spatial autoregressive panel data quantile regression model with both individual and time effects

Lee and Yu (2010, Eq. (19)) considered the following general spatial autoregressive panel data model with both individual and time effects

$$\begin{aligned} y_{it} &= \rho \sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_{jt} + X_{it} \beta + \nu_i + \psi_t + u_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, t = 1, \dots, T, \\ u_{it} &= \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} u_{jt} + \varepsilon_{it}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where y_{it} is the dependent variable for subject i at time t , X_{it} is a $1 \times p$ vector of nonstochastic time varying explanatory variables, w_{ij} is the (i, j) th element of the spatial weight matrix W reflecting spatial dependence on y_{it} among cross sectional units, and ε_{it} is independent and identically distributed across i and t . Similarly, m_{ij} is the (i, j) th element of the spatial weight matrix M for the disturbances. The parameters $\nu_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ are fixed effects for the regions while the parameters $\psi_t, t = 1, \dots, T$ are fixed time effects. Interaction effects are reflected in the spatial-temporal lag variable $\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_{jt}$ (and associated scalar parameter ρ). In practice, M may or may not be W .

The model (2.1) can also be written in an alternative form as

$$y_{it} = \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} y_{jt} + Z_{it}^* \alpha^* + Z_{1i}^* \nu^* + Z_{2t}^* \psi^* + \varepsilon_{it}, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\alpha = (\rho, \beta^T)^T$, $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_N)^T$, $\psi = (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_T)$, $\alpha^* = (\alpha^T, \lambda \alpha^T)^T$, $\nu^* = (\nu^T, \lambda \nu^T)^T$, $\psi^* = (\psi^T, \lambda \psi^T)^T$, $Z_1 = \mathbf{1}_T \otimes I_N$ is an $NT \times N$ matrix, $Z_2 = I_T \otimes \mathbf{1}_N$ is an $NT \times T$ matrix, $\mathbf{1}_J$ is the $J \times 1$ vector with all the elements being 1, $Z_{it}^* = [Z_{it}, -\sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} Z_{jt}]$, $Z_{it} = [\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} y_{jt}, X_{it}]$, $Z_{1i}^* = [Z_{1i}, -\sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} Z_{1j}]$, $Z_{2t}^* = [Z_{2t}, -\sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} Z_{2t}]$, $Z_{1i} = h'_{1i} Z_1$ is an indicator variable for the individual effect ν_i , h_{1i} is an $NT \times 1$ vector with the i th element equal to 1 and the rest equal to 0, $i = 1, \dots, N$, $Z_{2t} = h'_{2t} Z_2$ is an indicator variable for the time effect ψ_t , and h_{2t} is an $NT \times 1$ vector with the $(t-1)N + 1$ th element equal to 1 and the rest equal to 0, $t = 1, \dots, T$.

Matrix form of model (2.2) is

$$y = \lambda M^* y + Z^* \alpha^* + Z_1^* \nu^* + Z_2^* \psi^* + \varepsilon, \quad (2.3)$$

where $y = (y_1, \dots, y_T)^T$ is an $NT \times 1$ vector with $y_i = (y_{1i}, \dots, y_{Ni})^T$, $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_T)^T$ is an $NT \times 1$ vector with $\varepsilon_i = (\varepsilon_{1i}, \dots, \varepsilon_{Ni})^T$, $X = (X_1, \dots, X_T)^T$ is an $NT \times p$ matrix, $X_i = (X_{1i}, \dots, X_{Ni})^T$, $W^* = I_T \otimes W$, $M^* = I_T \otimes M$, W and M are both $N \times N$ spatial weight matrices, $Z = [W^*y, X]$, $Z^* = [Z, -M^*Z]$, $Z_1^* = [Z_1, -M^*Z_1]$, and $Z_2^* = [Z_2, -M^*Z_2]$. Here we denote $\theta^* = (\lambda, \alpha^{*T}, \nu^{*T}, \psi^{*T})^T = \theta^* = (\lambda, \rho, \beta^{*T}, \nu^{*T}, \psi^{*T})^T$.

We consider the following conditional τ -quantile of response variable:

$$Q_\tau(y_{it} | \mathcal{F}_{-it}, Z_{it}^*, Z_{1i}^*, Z_{2i}^*) = \lambda(\tau) \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} y_{jt} + Z_{it}^* \alpha^*(\tau) + Z_{1i}^* \nu^*(\tau) + Z_{2i}^* \psi^*(\tau), \quad (2.4)$$

where τ is a quantile in the interval $(0, 1)$. We define the objection function by

$$R(\tau, \theta^*) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - \lambda \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} y_{jt} - Z_{it}^* \alpha^* - Z_{1i}^* \nu^* - Z_{2i}^* \psi^*), \quad (2.5)$$

where $\rho_\tau(u) = u(\tau - I(u \leq 0))$ is the check function and $I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function (see, e.g., Koenker, 2005). The estimator $\hat{\theta}^*(\tau)$ can then be obtained by

$$\hat{\theta}^*(\tau) = \arg \min_{\theta^*} R(\tau, \theta^*). \quad (2.6)$$

2.1 Instrumental Variable Quantile Regression Estimator (IVQR)

In this section, we employ the instrumental variable quantile regression (IVQR) method for estimation. Let $d_{it} = \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} y_{jt}$ denote a scalar endogenous variable, which is related to a vector of instruments ω_{it} . The instruments ω_{it} are independent of ε_{it} . Consider the objection function for the conditional instrumental quantile relationship:

$$R_{IV}(\tau, \theta^*, \gamma) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \rho_\tau(y_{it} - \lambda d_{it} - Z_{it}^* \alpha^* - Z_{1i}^* \nu^* - Z_{2i}^* \psi^* - \omega_{it} \gamma). \quad (2.7)$$

Following Chernozhukov and Hansen (2006, 2008) and Galvao (2011), and assuming the availability of instrumental variables ω_{it} , we can derive the IVQR estimator via the following three steps:

Step 1: For a given quantile τ , define a suitable set of values $\{\lambda_j, j = 1, \dots, J; |\lambda| < 1\}$. One then minimizes the objective function for θ^*, γ to obtain the ordinary QR estimators of $\alpha^*, \nu^*, \psi^*, \gamma$:

$$(\hat{\alpha}^*(\lambda, \tau), \hat{\nu}^*(\lambda, \tau), \hat{\psi}^*(\lambda, \tau), \hat{\gamma}(\lambda, \tau)) = \arg \min_{\alpha^*, \nu^*, \psi^*, \gamma} R_{IV}(\tau, \theta^*, \gamma). \quad (2.8)$$

Step 2: Choose $\hat{\lambda}(\tau)$ among $\{\lambda_j, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ which makes a weighted distance function defined on γ closest to zero:

$$\hat{\lambda}(\tau) = \arg \min_{\lambda \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ \hat{\gamma}(\lambda, \tau)^T \hat{A}(\tau) \hat{\gamma}(\lambda, \tau) \right\}, \quad (2.9)$$

where A is a positive definite matrix.

Step 3: The estimation of α^*, ν^*, ψ^* can be obtained, which is respectively $\hat{\alpha}^{*IV}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau)$, $\hat{\nu}^{*IV}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau)$, $\hat{\psi}^{*IV}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau)$.

2.2 Asymptotic theory

In this section, we investigate the asymptotic properties of the IVQR estimator in Model (2.1). We impose the following regularity conditions:

A1 $\{(y_{it}, X_{it})\}$ is independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) for each fixed i with conditional distribution function F_{it} and differentiable conditional densities, $0 < f_{it} < \infty$, with bounded derivatives f'_{it} for $i = 1, \dots, N$ and $t = 1, \dots, T$.

A2 For all $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $(\lambda(\tau), \alpha^*(\tau))$ is in the interior of the set $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A}$, and $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A}$ is compact and convex.

A3 Let $\vartheta = (\theta^{*T}, \gamma^T)^T$,

$$\Pi(\vartheta, \tau) = \mathbb{E}[(\tau - I(y < B^{-1}(Z^* \alpha^* + Z_1^* \nu^* + Z_2^* \psi^* + E\gamma))) \Delta(\tau)], \quad (2.10)$$

and

$$\Pi(\theta^*, \tau) = \mathbb{E}[(\tau - I(y < B^{-1}(Z^* \alpha^* + Z_1^* \nu^* + Z_2^* \psi^*))) \Delta(\tau)], \quad (2.11)$$

where $B = I_{NT} - \lambda M^*$ and $\Delta(\tau) = [Z^*, Z_1^*, Z_2^*, E]$. The Jacobian matrices $\frac{\partial \Pi(\theta^*, \tau)}{\partial (\lambda, \alpha^*, \nu^*, \psi^*)}$ and $\frac{\partial \Pi(\vartheta, \tau)}{\partial (\alpha^*, \nu^*, \psi^*, \gamma)}$ are continuous and have full rank uniformly over $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{T}$. The parameter space $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P}$ is a connected set and the image of $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P}$ under the map $\theta^* \mapsto \Pi(\theta^*, \tau)$ is simply connected.

A4 Denote $\Omega = \text{diag}(f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)))$, where $\xi_{it}(\tau) = \lambda(\tau) d_{it} + Z_{it}^* \alpha^*(\tau) + Z_{1i}^* \nu^*(\tau) + Z_{2i}^* \psi^*(\tau) + \omega_{it} \gamma(\tau)$. Let $\tilde{X} = [Z^*, E]$. Then, the following matrices are positive definite:

$$\mathbf{J}_\zeta = \lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\mathbf{J}_\lambda = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} D, \quad (2.13)$$

$$S = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}. \quad (2.14)$$

where $M_{\tilde{Z}} = I - P_{\tilde{Z}}$ and $P_{\tilde{Z}} = \tilde{Z}(\tilde{Z}^T \Omega \tilde{Z})^{-1} \tilde{Z}^T \Omega$, $\tilde{Z} = [Z_1^*, Z_2^*]$. Let $[\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T, \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T]$ be a conformable partition of \mathbf{J}_ζ^{-1} and $H = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T A \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma$. Hence, \mathbf{J}_ζ is invertible and $\mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H \mathbf{J}_\lambda$ is also invertible.

A5 $\max \|y_{it}\| = O(\sqrt{NT})$, $\max \|X_{it}\| = O(\sqrt{NT})$ and $\max \|\omega_{it}\| = O(\sqrt{NT})$.

Lemma 2.1 Denote $\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) = y_{it} - \xi_{it}(\tau)$, and let $\vartheta = (\lambda, \alpha^{*T}, \nu^{*T}, \psi^{*T}, \gamma^T)^T$ be a parameter vector in $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P} \times \mathcal{G}$. Let

$$\delta = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\lambda \\ \delta_{\alpha^*} \\ \delta_{\nu^*} \\ \delta_{\psi^*} \\ \delta_\gamma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau) - \lambda(\tau)) \\ \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\alpha}^*(\tau) - \alpha^*(\tau)) \\ \sqrt{T}(\hat{\nu}^* - \nu^*) \\ \sqrt{N}(\hat{\psi}^* - \psi^*) \\ \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\gamma}(\tau) - \gamma(\tau)) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.15)$$

Under conditions A1-A5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\vartheta \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{1}{NT} \left| \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\rho_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it} \delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^* \delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2i}^* \delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it} \delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. - E \left[\rho_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it} \delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^* \delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2i}^* \delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it} \delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right] \right] \right| = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Theorem 2.1 (Consistency) Under conditions A1-A5, $(\lambda(\tau), \alpha^*(\tau), \nu^*, \psi^*)$ uniquely solves the equation $\mathbb{E}[(\tau - I(y < B^{-1}(Z^* \alpha^* + Z_1^* \nu^* + Z_2^* \psi^*))) \Delta(\tau)] = 0$ over $\mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{N} \times \mathcal{P}$ and $(\lambda(\tau), \alpha^*(\tau), \nu^*, \psi^*)$ is consistently estimable. Therefore, the parameters ρ, β, ν, ψ are also consistently estimable.

Theorem 2.2 (Asymptotic distribution) Under conditions A1-A5 and Lemma 2.1, for a given $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\alpha}^*) = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\rho}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\lambda}\hat{\rho}, \hat{\lambda}\hat{\beta})$ converges to a Gaussian distribution:

$$\sqrt{NT}(\hat{\theta}(\tau) - \theta(\tau)) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Lambda), \quad (2.16)$$

where $\Lambda = J^T S J$, $S = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}$, $\tilde{X} = [Z^*, E]$, $J = (K^T, L^T)$, $M_{\tilde{Z}} = I - P_{\tilde{Z}}$, $P_{\tilde{Z}} = \tilde{Z}(\tilde{Z}^T \Omega \tilde{Z})^{-1} \tilde{Z}^T \Omega$, $\tilde{Z} = [Z_1^*, Z_2^*]$, $\Omega = \text{diag}(f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)))$, $\mathbf{J}_\lambda = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} D$, $L = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T M$, $M = I - \mathbf{J}_\lambda K$, $\mathbf{J}_\zeta = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{NT} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}$, $K = (\mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H \mathbf{J}_\lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H$, $H = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T A \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma$ and $[\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T, \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T]$ is a conformable partition of \mathbf{J}_ζ^{-1} .

3 Monte Carlo simulations

In this section, we report the results of a Monte Carlo study in which we assess the finite sample performance of the IVQR estimators proposed in Section 2. For comparison purpose, we generate the samples being considered in the design of Lee and Yu (2010):

$$y = \rho W^* y + X\beta + Z_1\nu + Z_2\psi + u,$$

$$u = \lambda M^* u + \varepsilon,$$

where $\theta_0 = (\rho_0, \lambda_0, \beta_0)^T$, $\theta_0^a = (0.2, 0.5, 1)^T$ and $\theta_0^b = (0.5, 0.2, 1)^T$. Here, X , ν , ψ are drawn independently from $N(0, 1)$ and both the spatial weights matrices W and M are the same rook matrices. We use some combinations of $T = 5, 10$, and $n = 49$. For the disturbance errors, we consider the standard normal (i.e., $N(0, 1)$) and Cauchy (i.e., t_1) distributions.

For each set of generated sample observations, we calculate the IVQR estimators. This step is repeated for 2000 times. We consider the bias and root mean squared error (RMSE) for the MLE, QMLE, OLS and IVQR. The quantile regression based estimators are calculated for quantiles $\tau = (0.25, 0.5, 0.75)$. For the IVQR estimator, we employed y_{it-1} as instrument. The results are summarized in Table 1-4.

Table 1-4 show that the IVQR estimator performs better than the other estimators in t_1 settings. In general, we find that the biases and RMSEs associated with $\tau = 0.5$ are slightly smaller for the IVQR estimator. Under normal disturbance errors, the IVQR estimators for λ performs better than the other estimators while those for ρ and β have similar biases and RMSEs as the OLS estimators, but a bit larger than the MLE and QMLE estimators. For Cauchy disturbance errors, our proposed IVQR estimators outperform the other estimators as we do not impose any finite moment assumption on the disturbance errors. Therefore, we conclude that the proposed IVQR is more robust in practice.

Table 1: Bias and RMSE of various estimators (with both individual and time effects) with $N = 49$ and $T = 5$.

Distribution		IVQR			MLE	QMLE	OLS	
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$				
$N(0, 1)$	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.1278	0.1256	0.1278	0.0271	0.0121	0.1164
		RMSE	0.2293	0.2176	0.2286	0.1243	0.1408	0.1935
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0085	0.0056	0.0075	-0.0904	-0.0300	0.1877
		RMSE	0.0408	0.0406	0.0410	0.1618	0.1558	0.2382
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0096	0.0037	0.0049	0.0021	-0.0020	-0.0276
		RMSE	0.0975	0.0872	0.0976	0.0749	0.0764	0.0786
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.2382	0.2381	0.2472	-0.0382	-0.0167	0.2264
		RMSE	0.2844	0.2749	0.2887	0.1129	0.1238	0.2599
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	-0.0001	0.0001	0.0001	0.0183	0.0017	-0.0237
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0040	0.0041	0.1455	0.1658	0.2440
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0117	-0.0057	-0.0105	-0.0017	-0.0042	-0.0299
		RMSE	0.1063	0.0926	0.1065	0.0733	0.0738	0.0817
t_1	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0199	0.0136	0.0183	0.0512	0.0528	0.2183
		RMSE	0.0579	0.0402	0.0598	0.1815	0.1775	0.2760
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0029	0.0022	0.0043	-0.1057	-0.1095	0.2114
		RMSE	0.0410	0.0404	0.0412	0.1937	0.1917	0.2608
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0081	0.0033	-0.0007	-1.3403	-5.6184	-0.5514
		RMSE	0.2253	0.1513	0.2243	57.2094	153.2562	47.4065
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.0454	0.0311	0.0484	-0.1077	-0.1031	0.4463
		RMSE	0.0728	0.0502	0.0759	0.1841	0.1823	0.4645
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0031	0.0021	0.0030	0.0546	0.0551	-0.0416
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0041	0.0041	0.1763	0.1740	0.1947
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0098	0.0023	0.0183	-0.2703	0.8199	-0.2556
		RMSE	0.2127	0.1521	0.2087	21.7709	17.4982	14.4871

Table 2: Bias and RMSE of various estimators (with both individual and time effects) with $N = 49$ and $T = 10$.

Distribution		IVQR			MLE	QMLE	OLS	
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$				
$N(0, 1)$	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.1267	0.1248	0.1274	0.0241	0.0056	0.1070
		RMSE	0.1800	0.1753	0.1789	0.0889	0.0988	0.1462
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0007	0.0009	0.0010	-0.0779	-0.0137	0.2109
		RMSE	0.0406	0.0410	0.0403	0.1198	0.1040	0.2312
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0012	0.0001	0.0013	0.0038	-0.0001	-0.0323
		RMSE	0.0660	0.0616	0.0666	0.0489	0.0500	0.0598
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.2326	0.2246	0.2300	-0.0305	-0.0064	0.2328
		RMSE	0.2576	0.2489	0.2549	0.0794	0.0839	0.2491
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0002	0.0000	0.0001	-0.0178	-0.0005	0.0116
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0040	0.0041	0.0996	0.1126	0.1471
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0301	-0.0268	-0.0295	0.0001	-0.0013	-0.0293
		RMSE	0.0717	0.0689	0.0736	0.0471	0.0471	0.0577
t_1	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0131	0.0064	0.0105	0.0571	0.0613	0.2211
		RMSE	0.0397	0.0180	0.0344	0.1639	0.1615	0.2533
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0016	0.0003	0.0030	-0.1065	-0.1093	0.2330
		RMSE	0.0406	0.0408	0.0409	0.1781	0.1775	0.2565
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0034	0.0001	-0.0008	4.5772	2.9534	-2.0496
		RMSE	0.1365	0.0942	0.1316	151.1233	132.0682	48.2493
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.0205	0.0132	0.0211	-0.1010	-0.1017	0.4500
		RMSE	0.0373	0.0242	0.0398	0.1696	0.1723	0.4606
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0533	0.0527	-0.0145
		RMSE	0.0040	0.0040	0.0041	0.1617	0.1609	0.1331
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0053	-0.0048	-0.0066	-0.4902	-2.9283	0.4147
		RMSE	0.1322	0.0947	0.1308	15.7727	82.8778	15.9012

Table 3: Bias and RMSE of various estimators (with individual effect only) with $N = 49$ and $T = 5$.

Distribution		IVQR			MLE(QMLE)	OLS	
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$			
$N(0, 1)$	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0969	0.0935	0.0961	0.0096	0.0932
		RMSE	0.2088	0.1989	0.2127	0.1380	0.1756
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	-0.0028	-0.0010	0.0010	-0.0279	0.2372
		RMSE	0.0412	0.0409	0.0409	0.1485	0.2629
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0092	-0.0076	-0.0104	-0.0027	-0.0372
		RMSE	0.1004	0.0878	0.0973	0.0766	0.0804
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.2121	0.2063	0.2176	-0.0173	0.2125
		RMSE	0.2694	0.2552	0.2737	0.1163	0.2480
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0001	0.0000	0.0000	0.0021	0.0510
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0041	0.0041	0.1590	0.2172
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0366	-0.0306	-0.0370	-0.0039	-0.0340
		RMSE	0.1078	0.0942	0.1077	0.0737	0.0820
t_1	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0164	0.0088	0.0146	-0.4973	0.1838
		RMSE	0.0555	0.0362	0.0523	0.5068	0.2449
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0018	-0.0005	-0.0002	0.4453	0.2798
		RMSE	0.0410	0.0408	0.0410	0.4489	0.3053
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0005	0.0019	-0.0090	-0.2086	0.2149
		RMSE	0.2122	0.1555	0.2172	6.7370	20.5035
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.0349	0.0231	0.0367	-0.7019	0.4122
		RMSE	0.0654	0.0450	0.0777	0.7774	0.4327
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	0.6524	-0.0024
		RMSE	0.0042	0.0041	0.0041	0.7311	0.1918
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0050	-0.0056	-0.0021	-0.8846	-0.1423
		RMSE	0.2011	0.1484	0.2052	17.5186	11.0912

Table 4: Bias and RMSE of various estimators (with individual effects only) with $N = 49$ and $T = 10$.

Distribution		IVQR			MLE(QMLE)	OLS	
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$			
$N(0, 1)$	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0955	0.0920	0.0960	0.0040	0.0946
		RMSE	0.1570	0.1523	0.1586	0.0949	0.1358
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	-0.0014	0.0002	0.0004	-0.0110	0.2602
		RMSE	0.0409	0.0407	0.0414	0.0945	0.2698
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0047	-0.0055	-0.0022	-0.0005	-0.0364
		RMSE	0.0647	0.0588	0.0630	0.0492	0.0602
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.2123	0.2130	0.2115	-0.0066	0.2118
		RMSE	0.2379	0.2370	0.2361	0.0762	0.2283
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	0.0000	0.0001	0.0000	0.0007	0.0755
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0041	0.0041	0.1053	0.1636
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0335	-0.0316	-0.0338	-0.0011	-0.0362
		RMSE	0.0713	0.0718	0.0716	0.0466	0.0621
t_1	$\rho = 0.2$	Bias	0.0078	0.0050	0.0082	-0.3896	0.1907
		RMSE	0.0253	0.0164	0.0249	0.4027	0.2215
	$\lambda = 0.5$	Bias	0.0005	0.0015	-0.0001	0.3629	0.2919
		RMSE	0.0411	0.0410	0.0405	0.3696	0.3064
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	0.0008	0.0003	-0.0007	-1.4438	-2.3930
		RMSE	0.1358	0.0952	0.1349	22.4584	34.5131
	$\rho = 0.5$	Bias	0.0202	0.0105	0.0194	-0.0082	0.4118
		RMSE	0.0363	0.0204	0.0351	0.4977	0.4207
	$\lambda = 0.2$	Bias	-0.0001	0.0001	-0.0001	-0.0192	0.0218
		RMSE	0.0041	0.0040	0.0041	0.5188	0.1456
	$\beta = 1$	Bias	-0.0066	-0.0030	-0.0067	0.5884	-1.0812
		RMSE	0.1263	0.0904	0.1274	25.4738	47.3648

Remark: Lee and Yu (2010) demonstrated the transformation approach (QMLE) and the direct approach (MLE) yield the same estimate of (ρ, λ, β) when considering the individual effects only.

4 Illustration

In this section, we use the cigarette demand data set to illustrate our methodologies. The data set is based on a panel of 46 states over 30 time periods (1963-1992), which has been analyzed by many authors (see, Baltagi and Levin, 1992; Baltagi, 2001; Baltagi, Griffin, and Xiong, 2000; Yang, 2006; Elhorst, 2005; Kelejian and Piras, 2013). The QR model with both individual and time-period effects is given by:

$$Q_\tau(\log C_{it} | \mathcal{F}_{-it}, Z_{it}^*, Z_{1i}^*, Z_{2t}^*) = \lambda(\tau) \sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} \log C_{jt} + Z_{it}^* \alpha^*(\tau) + Z_{1i}^* \nu^*(\tau) + Z_{2t}^* \psi^*(\tau), \quad (4.1)$$

$$i = 1, \dots, 46, t = 1, \dots, 30,$$

where C_{it} is real per capita sales of cigarettes by persons of smoking age (14 years and older), $Z_{it}^* = [Z_{it}, -\sum_{j \neq i} m_{ij} Z_{jt}]$, $Z_{it} = [\sum_{j \neq i} w_{ij} \log C_{jt}, X_{it}]$, $X_{it} = [\log P_{it}, \log Y_{it}]$, P_{it} is the average retail price of a pack of cigarettes measured in real terms, and Y_{it} is real per capita disposable income. Here, we choose $\log C_{it-1}$ as instruments.

We estimate the parameters using the IVQR, MLE, and OLS methods. The results are presented in Table 5. The first three columns are the IVQR estimates for $\tau = 0.25, 0.50, 0.75$, and the last two columns correspond to the MLE and OLS estimates respectively. The top half of table presents the estimations with both the individual and time-period effects while the bottom half of table shows the estimations with individual effects only. We can see that the IVQR estimates at different quantiles (i.e., $\tau = 0.25, 0.50, 0.75$) are quite different from the MLE and OLS estimates. In particular, the signs of the estimates for ρ and λ are different among IVQR, MLE and OLS methods. Besides, the sign of the MLE estimates for ρ and λ change when the individual effect is omitted from the analysis.

Table 5: Estimation Results of Cigarette Demand Using general spatial panel data models.

Parameter	IVQR			MLE	OLS
	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$		
With both individual and time-period effects					
ρ	-0.5249	-0.7183	-0.3087	0.3547	-0.1747
λ	0.1900	0.4800	0.0400	-0.3289	-0.1747
log average cigarettes retail price	-0.4108	-0.4284	-0.4552	-1.0886	-0.6115
log disposable income	0.2652	0.3308	0.3320	0.4706	0.3955
With individual effects only					
ρ	-0.4617	-0.9111	-1.1878	0.3938	-0.1191
λ	0.1800	0.7200	0.9900	0.6168	-0.1191
log average cigarettes retail price	-0.3699	-0.3699	-0.4173	-3.2356	-0.5464
log disposable income	0.3073	0.3446	0.3713	0.5310	0.4370

Figure 1 presents a complete analysis, which considers other quantiles of the conditional cigarettes demand distribution. Similarly, the top panel presents the estimations which are with both individual and time-period effects and the bottom panel shows the estimations which are with individual effects only. The x -axis presents the quantiles and y -axis presents the estimations of parameters (red lines) and their corresponding confidence intervals (blue lines). We find that the cigarettes retail price has negative effect to the capita sales of cigarettes and disposable income has positive effect to the capita sales of cigarettes. In the presence of both individual and time-period effects, the estimates of capita sales of cigarettes are larger at extreme quantiles than those at other quantiles. The estimates of disposable income become larger along with the higher quantiles. However, in the presence of individual effect only, the estimates of parameters are larger at the middle quantiles.




Figure 1: (a)-(b) Quantile effects of the log average retail price of a pack of cigarettes and the log disposable income with both individual and time-period effects. (c)-(d) Quantile effects of the log average retail price of a pack of cigarettes and the log disposable income with individual effects only. The areas represent 90% point-wise confidence intervals.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the instrumental variable quantile (IVQR) estimation of general spatial autoregressive panel data model with fixed effects. The model with both individual and time-period effects is considered. The asymptotic properties are studied. Monte Carlo results are provided to show that the proposed methodology is robust to error distributions with un-defined moments.

6 Acknowledgements

The work was partially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.11271368), Project supported by the Major Program of Beijing Philosophy and Social Science Foundation of China (No. 15ZDA17), Project of Ministry of Education supported by the Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No. 20130004110007), The Key Program of National Philosophy and Social Science Foundation Grant (No. 13AZD064), The Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, and the Research Funds of Renmin University of China (No. 15XNL008), and The Project of Flying Apsaras Scholar of Lanzhou University of Finance & Economics.

Appendix: Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2.1 is similar to that of Lemma 2 in Galvao (2011) and is hence omitted here.

1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. Firstly, following Chernozhukov and Hansen (2006), $(\lambda(\tau), \alpha^*(\tau), \nu^*, \psi^*)$ uniquely solves the problem for each τ .

To prove the consistency of the parameter, we need to show that under conditions A1-A5, $\hat{\theta}^*(\tau) = \theta^*(\tau) + o_p(1)$. Let

$$\mathcal{P} : \vartheta \mapsto \rho_\tau(y - \lambda D - Z^* \alpha^* - Z_1^* \nu^* - Z_2^* \psi^*),$$

and \mathcal{P} is continuous. Under condition Lemma 2.1, we have that $\|\hat{\vartheta}^*(\lambda, \tau) - \vartheta^*(\lambda, \tau)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ for $\vartheta^* = (\lambda, \alpha^*, \nu^*, \psi^*, \gamma)$, which implies that $\|\|\hat{\gamma}(\lambda, \tau)\| - \|\gamma(\lambda, \tau)\|\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. By Corollary 3.2.3 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996), we have $\|\hat{\lambda}(\tau) - \lambda(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Therefore, $\|\hat{\alpha}^*(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau) - \alpha^*(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $\|\hat{\nu}^*(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau) - \nu^*\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, $\|\hat{\psi}^*(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau) - \psi^*\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$, and $\|\hat{\gamma}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau), \tau) - 0\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Hence, $\|\hat{\theta}^*(\tau) - \theta^*(\tau)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ and the theorem follows. \square

2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

For any $\hat{\lambda}(\tau) \xrightarrow{P} \lambda(\tau)$ ($\delta_\lambda \xrightarrow{P} 0$), we can write the objective function defined in equation (2.7) as

$$V_{IV}(\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\rho_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right]$$

where $\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) = y_{it} - \xi_{it}(\tau)$, $\xi_{it}(\tau) = \lambda(\tau)d_{it} + Z_{it}^*\alpha^*(\tau) + Z_{1i}^*\nu^*(\tau) + Z_{2t}^*\psi^*(\tau) + \omega_{it}\gamma(\tau)$, and

$$\delta = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_\lambda \\ \delta_{\alpha^*} \\ \delta_{\nu^*} \\ \delta_{\psi^*} \\ \delta_\gamma \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\lambda}(\tau) - \lambda(\tau)) \\ \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\alpha}^*(\tau) - \alpha^*(\tau)) \\ \sqrt{T}(\hat{\nu}^* - \nu^*) \\ \sqrt{N}(\hat{\psi}^* - \psi^*) \\ \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\gamma}(\tau) - \gamma(\tau)) \end{pmatrix}.$$

For fixed $(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_\gamma)$, we can consider the behavior of δ_{ν^*} . Let $\varphi_\tau(u) = \tau - I(u < 0)$ and

$$g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right).$$

Let

$$\sup \|g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_{it}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)\|$$

and

$$-\mathbb{E}[g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_{it}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)] = o_p(1).$$

Expanding g_{it} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_{it}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)] \\ &= \frac{-1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left(\varphi_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) - \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right) \\ &= \frac{-1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \left[\tau - F \left(\xi_{it}(\tau) + \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right] + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $F(\cdot)$ is the conditional distribution of y_{it} . Obviously, $g_{it}(\hat{\delta}_\lambda, \hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*}, \hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}, \hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}, \hat{\delta}_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$, and thus $\mathbb{E}[g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_{it}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)] = -g_{it}(0, 0, 0, 0, 0)$, i.e., the last equation has the following equivalent expression:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{1i}^*\delta_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)).$$

Optimality of $\hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}$ implies that $g_{it}(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\nu^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) = o(T^{-1})$, and thus

$$\hat{\delta}_{\nu^*} = \bar{f}_i^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \right) + o_p(1),$$

where $\bar{f}_i = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau))$. Substituting $Z_{1i}^*\hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}$'s, we denote

$$g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^*\hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right).$$

Let

$$\sup \|g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_t(0, 0, 0, 0) - \mathbb{E}[g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_t(0, 0, 0, 0)]\| = o_p(1).$$

Expanding g_t , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_t(0, 0, 0, 0)] \\ &= \frac{-1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left(\varphi_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^*\hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) - \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right] + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $g_t(\hat{\delta}_\lambda, \hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*}, \hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}, \hat{\delta}_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$, thus $\mathbb{E}[g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) - g_t(0, 0, 0, 0)] = -g_t(0, 0, 0, 0)$, i.e., the last equation has the following equivalent expression:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^*\delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^*\delta_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Optimality of $\hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}$ implies that $g_t(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_{\psi^*}, \delta_\gamma) = o(N^{-1})$, and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\delta}_{\psi_t^*} &= \bar{f}_t^{-1} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) - \sqrt{NT} T^{-1} \bar{f}_t \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) \right) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{f}_t = N^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau))$. Substituting $Z_{2t}^* \hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}$'s, we denote

$$G(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_\gamma) = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T \varphi_\tau \left(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau) - \frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} - \frac{Z_{1i}^* \hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} - \frac{Z_{2t}^* \hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right)$$

where $\tilde{X}_{it} = [Z_{it}^*, \omega_{it}]$. Let

$$\sup \|G(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_\gamma) - G(0, 0, 0) - \mathbb{E}[G(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_\gamma) - G(0, 0, 0)]\| = o_p(1).$$

Expanding G , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[G(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_\gamma) - G(0, 0, 0)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{1i}^* \hat{\delta}_{\nu^*}}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{Z_{2t}^* \hat{\delta}_{\psi^*}}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right] + o_p(1), \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\left(1 - N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) + N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) + T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right] + o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Obviously, $G(\hat{\delta}_\lambda, \hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*}, \hat{\delta}_\gamma) \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbb{E}[G(\delta_\lambda, \delta_{\alpha^*}, \delta_\gamma) - G(0, 0, 0)] = -G(0, 0, 0)$, i.e., the last equation has the following equivalent expression:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\left(1 - N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \left(\frac{d_{it}\delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{Z_{it}^* \delta_{\alpha^*}}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{\omega_{it}\delta_\gamma}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) + N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \\ &\quad \left. + T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\delta_\zeta = (\alpha_{\alpha^*}^T, \alpha_\gamma^T)^T$, we write the equation above as:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \left[\left(1 - N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)) \right) \left(\frac{\tilde{X}_{it} \delta_\zeta}{\sqrt{NT}} + \frac{d_{it} \delta_\lambda}{\sqrt{NT}} \right) + N^{-1} \bar{f}_t^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \\ & + T^{-1} \bar{f}_i^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)) \Big] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NT}} \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T \tilde{X}_{it}^T \varphi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)). \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, using more convenient notation, we write the last expression as:

$$\mathbf{J}_\zeta \delta_\zeta + \mathbf{J}_\lambda \delta_\lambda = \mathbb{J}_\phi,$$

where $\mathbf{J}_\zeta = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}$, $\mathbf{J}_\lambda = \lim_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T \Omega M_{\tilde{Z}} D$, \mathbb{J}_ϕ is a mean zero r.v. with covariance $\tau(1-\tau) \tilde{X}^T M_{\tilde{Z}}^T M_{\tilde{Z}} \tilde{X}$, $\Omega = \text{diag}(f_{it}(\xi_{it}(\tau)))$ and Φ_τ is a NT -vector $(\phi_\tau(\varepsilon_{it}(\tau)))$, $\tilde{Z} = [Z_1^*, Z_2^*]$, $M_{\tilde{Z}} = I - P_{\tilde{Z}}$, $P_{\tilde{Z}} = \tilde{Z}(\tilde{Z}^T \Omega \tilde{Z})^{-1} \tilde{Z}^T \Omega$.

Letting $[\bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T, \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T]$ be a conformable partition of \mathbf{J}_ζ^{-1} as in Galvao (2011) and Chernozhukov and Hansen (2006) yields $\hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*} = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T (\mathbb{J}_\phi - \mathbf{J}_\lambda \delta_\lambda)$, and $\hat{\delta}_\gamma = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T (\mathbb{J}_\phi - \mathbf{J}_\lambda \delta_\lambda)$. Letting $H = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T A \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma$ as in Chernozhukov and Hansen (2006) gives $\hat{\delta}_\lambda = K \mathbb{J}_\phi$, where $K = (\mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H \mathbf{J}_\lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H$. Replacing it in the previous expression, $\hat{\delta}_\gamma = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T (\mathbb{J}_\phi - \mathbf{J}_\lambda \delta_\lambda) = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T (I - \mathbf{J}_\lambda (\mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H \mathbf{J}_\lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H) \mathbb{J}_\phi = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma^T M \mathbb{J}_\phi$, where $M = I - \mathbf{J}_\lambda (\mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H \mathbf{J}_\lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{J}_\lambda^T H$. Due to the invertibility of $\mathbf{J}_\lambda \bar{\mathbf{J}}_\gamma$, $\hat{\delta}_\gamma = \mathbf{0} \times O_p(1) + o_p(1)$. Similarly, substituting back δ_λ , we obtain that $\hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*} = \bar{\mathbf{J}}_{\alpha^*}^T M \mathbb{J}_\phi$. By the regularity conditions, we have that

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{\delta}_\lambda(\lambda_n, \tau) \\ \hat{\delta}_{\alpha^*}(\lambda_n, \tau) \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\lambda}(\lambda_n, \tau) - \lambda(\tau)) \\ \sqrt{NT}(\hat{\alpha}^*(\lambda_n, \tau) - \alpha^*(\tau)) \end{pmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, J^T S J).$$

References

- [1] Abrevaya, J., Dahl, C.M. (2008) The effects of birth inputs on birthweight: Evidence from quantile estimation on panel data. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* 26, 379-397.
- [2] Ahn, S.C., Schmidt, P. (1995) Efficient estimation of models for dynamic panel data. *Journal of Econometrics* 68, 5-27.
- [3] Baltagi, B.H. (2001) *Econometric analysis of panel data*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [4] Baltagi, B.H., Griffin, J.M. and Xiong, W. (2000) To Pool or Not to Pool: Homogeneous Versus Heterogeneous Estimators Applied to Cigarette Demand. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 82, 117-126.

- [5] Baltagi, B.H., and Levin, D. (1992) Cigarette Taxation: Raising Revenues and Reducing Consumption. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 3, 321-335.
- [6] Canay, I. (2011) A simple approach to quantile regression for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics* 14, 368-386.
- [7] Chernozhukov, V., Hong, H. (2001) Three-step censored quantile regression and extramarital affairs. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 97, 872-882.
- [8] Chernozhukov, V., Hansen, C. (2006) Instrumental quantile regression inference for structural and treatment effect models . *Journal of Econometrics* 132, 491-525.
- [9] Chernozhukov, V., Hansen, C. (2008) Instrumental variable quantile regression: A robust inference approach. *Journal of Econometrics* 142, 379-398.
- [10] Galvao, A.F. Montes-Rojas, G.V. (2010) Penalized quantile regression for dynamic panel data. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 140, 3476-3497.
- [11] Galvao, A.F. (2011) Quantile regression for dynamic panel data with fixed effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 164, 142-157.
- [12] Elhorst, J.P. (2005) Unconditional maximum likelihood estimation of linear and log-linear dynamic models for spatial panels. *Geographical Analysis* 37, 85-106.
- [13] Galvao, A.F., Lamarche, C., Lima, L. (2013) Estimation of censored quantile regression for panel data with fixed effects. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 108, 1075-1089.
- [14] Galvao, A.F., Wang, L. (2015) Efficient minimum distance estimator for quantile regression fixed effects panel data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 133, 1-26.
- [15] Harding, M., Lamarche, C. (2009) A quantile regression approach for estimating panel data models using instrumental variables. *Economics Letters* 104, 133-135.
- [16] Harding, M., Lamarche, C. (2014) Estimating and testing a quantile regression model with interactive effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 178, 101-113.

- [17] Hsiao, C., Pesaran, M.H., Tahmiscioglu, A.K. (2002) Maximum Likelihood estimation of fixed effects dynamic panel data models covering short time periods. *Journal of Econometrics* 109, 107-150.
- [18] Kapoor, M., Kelejian, H.H., Prucha, I.R. (2007) Panel data models with spatially correlated error components. *Journal of Econometrics* 140, 97-130.
- [19] Kato, K., Galvao, A. (2010) *Smoothed Quantile Regression for Panel Data*. mimeo.
- [20] Kato, K., Galvao, A., Montes-Rojas, G. (2012) Asymptotics for panel quantile regression models with individual effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 170, 76-91.
- [21] Kelejian, H.H., & Piras, G. (2013) A j-test for panel models with fixed effects, spatial and time. Working Papers.
- [22] Koenker, R., Bassett, G.W. (1978) Regression quantiles. *Econometrica* 46, 33-49.
- [23] Koenker, R., Machado, J.A.F., Skeels, C.L., Welsh, A.H. (1994) Momentary lapses: Moment expansions and the robustness of minimum distance estimation. *Econometric Theory* 10, 172-197.
- [24] Koenker, R. (2004) Quantile regression for longitudinal data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 91, 74-89.
- [25] Koenker, R. (2005) *Quantile Regression*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- [26] Lamarche, C. (2010) Robust penalized quantile regression estimation for panel data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 157, 396-408.
- [27] Lee, L.F., Yu, J.H. (2010) Estimation of spatial autoregressive panel data models with fixed effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 154, 165-185.
- [28] Lee, N., Moon, H.R., Weidner, M. (2012) Analysis of interactive fixed effects dynamic linear panel regression with measurement error. *Economics Letters* 117, 239-242.
- [29] Lee, L.F., Yu, J.H. (2014) Efficient GMM estimation of spatial dynamic panel data models with fixed effects. *Journal of Econometrics* 180, 174-197.

- [30] LeSage, J.P. (2014) Spatial econometric panel data model specification: A Bayesian approach. *Spatial Statistics* 9, 122-145.
- [31] Wang, W., Lee, L. (2013) Estimation of spatial panel data models with randomly missing data in the dependent variable. *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 43, 521-538.
- [32] Xiong, W., Tian, M.Z. (2014) A new model selection procedure based on dynamic quantile regression. *Journal of Applied Statistics* 41, 2240-2256.
- [33] Yang, Z. (2006) Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation for spatial panel data regressions. Research Collection School of Economics.
- [34] Zou, H., Yuan, M. (2008) Composite quantile regression and the oracle model selection theory. *Ann. Statist.* 36, 1108-1126.