



Consistent estimation of linear regression models using matched data[☆]

Masayuki Hirukawa^a, Artem Prokhorov^{b,c,d,*}

^a Faculty of Economics, Setsunan University, 17-8 Ikeda Nakamachi, Neyagawa, Osaka 572-8508, Japan

^b Discipline of Business Analytics, Business School, University of Sydney, H04-499 Merewether Building, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia

^c St. Petersburg State University, St. Petersburg, Russian Federation

^d Innopolis University, Kazan, Russian Federation

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 6 June 2015

Received in revised form 16 April 2017

Accepted 4 July 2017

Available online 6 January 2018

JEL classification:

C13

C14

C31

Keywords:

Bias correction

Indirect inference

Linear regression

Matching estimation

Measurement error bias

ABSTRACT

Economists often use matched samples, especially when dealing with earnings data where a number of missing observations need to be imputed. In this paper, we demonstrate that the ordinary least squares estimator of the linear regression model using matched samples is inconsistent and has a non-standard convergence rate to its probability limit. If only a few variables are used to impute the missing data, then it is possible to correct for the bias. We propose two semiparametric bias-corrected estimators and explore their asymptotic properties. The estimators have an indirect-inference interpretation, and they attain the parametric convergence rate when the number of matching variables is no greater than four. Monte Carlo simulations confirm that the bias correction works very well in such cases.

© 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Suppose that we are interested in estimating a linear regression model

$$Y = \beta_0 + X_1' \beta_1 + X_2' \beta_2 + Z' \gamma + u := W' \theta + u, \quad E(u|W) = 0, \quad (1)$$

using a random sample, where $X_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1}$, $X_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d_2}$ and $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3}$. The reason for distinguishing between the regressors X_1 , X_2 and Z will become clear shortly. In addition, while $d_1 = 0$ is allowed, $d_2, d_3 > 0$ must be the case in our setup. When $W =$

[☆] The authors would like to thank the editor Oliver Linton, an associate editor, three anonymous referees, Alberto Abadie, Bruce Hansen, Hidehiko Ichimura, Seojeong Lee, Arthur Lewbel, Adrian Pagan, and the participants of NZESG2014, AMES2014, ESAM2014, ESEM2014, CORE@50, CFE2016, IAAE2017, and seminars at the University of New South Wales, the University of Sydney, the University of Tokyo, and the Development Bank of Japan for their constructive comments and suggestions. Financial support through grants from Japan Society of the Promotion of Science (M. Hirukawa, grant numbers 23530259 and 15K03405) and the Russian Science Foundation (A. Prokhorov, Project No. 16-18-10432) for various and non-overlapping parts of this research is gratefully acknowledged.

* Corresponding author at: Discipline of Business Analytics, Business School, University of Sydney, H04-499 Merewether Building, Sydney, NSW 2006, Australia.

E-mail addresses: hirukawa@econ.setsunan.ac.jp (M. Hirukawa), artem.prokhorov@sydney.edu.au (A. Prokhorov).

$(1, X_1', X_2', Z) \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$, where $d := d_1 + d_2 + d_3$, is exogenous and a single random sample of (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) can be obtained, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator of $\theta = (\beta_0, \beta_1', \beta_2', \gamma)'$ is consistent.

In reality, however, we often face the problem that (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) cannot be taken from a single data source. It is not uncommon that economists who use survey data for empirical analysis must collect all necessary variables from more than one source. Examples include Lusardi (1996), Björklund and Jäntti (1997), Currie and Yelowitz (2000), Dee and Evans (2003), Borjas (2004), Bover (2005), Fujii (2008), Bostic et al. (2009), and Murtazashvili et al. (2015), to name a few. Ridder and Moffitt (2007) provide an excellent survey. This is the setting in which we are interested. Specifically, suppose that instead of observing a complete data set (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) , we have the following two overlapping subsets of data, (Y, X_1, Z) and (X_2, Z) , i.e., some of the regressors are not available in the initial data set, where the initial data set is the one containing observations on the dependent variable along with a few other regressors. In such a setting, it is natural to construct a matched data set via exploiting the proximity of the common regressor(s) Z across the two samples. This is often called “probabilistic record linkage”. Here are two examples of the setting.

Example 1 (Earnings Data). Matching is currently used for imputing missing records of earnings in important economic data sets. For example, the U.S. Current Population Survey (CPS) files use the so-called “hot deck imputation” procedure of the Census (see, e.g., Little and Rubin, 2002; Hirsch and Schumacher, 2004; Bollinger and Hirsch, 2006), which allocates to nonrespondents the reported earnings of a matched respondent who has similar recorded attributes.¹ The share of imputed values is as high as 30%. The resulting earnings data have been used to uncover much of what is known about the labor market dynamics and outcomes.

Example 2 (Returns to Schooling). Let Y denote (the logarithm of) earnings, X_1 individual characteristics, X_2 ability measured by test scores, and Z education. Although (Y, X_1, Z) is available in the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID), for instance, it is often the case that (X_2, Z) can be found only in a different, psychometric data set. Utilizing the proximity of the common variable Z , we must construct a matched data set of (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) .

There are many algorithms that can be used to construct matched data sets (see, e.g., Smith and Todd, 2005; Ridder and Moffitt, 2007). We focus on the nearest neighbor matching (NNM) because of its simplicity and wide use. Abadie and Imbens (2006, 2012) use it in the context of the average treatment effect (ATE) estimation. Chen and Shao (2001) and Shao and Wang (2008) study the problem of variance estimation after a nearest neighbor-based imputation. The NNM can be used as a building block in construction of more complicated matching algorithms, most notably the single index or propensity score matching, but we do not pursue these extensions here.

We demonstrate that the OLS estimator from the regression (1) using NNM-based matched samples is inconsistent. The source of the inconsistency is a non-vanishing bias term, which can be viewed as a measurement error bias stemming from replacing unobservable X_2 with a proxy in the matched data. In this sense, the paper is related to the literature on the classical problem of generated regressors and missing data (see, e.g., Pagan, 1984; Prokhorov and Schmidt, 2009). Moreover, we show that the rate of convergence to the probability limit of OLS depends on the number of common, matching variables and the divergence patterns of two sample sizes.

In line with these findings, we propose two semiparametric bias-corrected estimators. The first, one-step estimator is shown to attain the parametric convergence rate for the cases with at most two matching variables. The second estimator attempts to remedy the curse of dimensionality with respect to the number of matching variables. It is a two-step estimator, and in the second step it eliminates the second-order bias due to the so-called *matching discrepancy* (Abadie and Imbens, 2006) asymptotically in a similar manner to the one studied by Abadie and Imbens (2011). It is demonstrated that the estimator can achieve parametric convergence when the number of matching variables is four or less. Both estimators can be also interpreted as indirect inference estimators (Gouriéroux et al., 1993; Smith, 1993) in the sense that they can be obtained by taking the probability limit of the OLS estimator from the regression (1) as the “binding” function.

The paper contributes to three important areas. First, we provide new asymptotic results for regression analysis using matched data. In particular, we explicitly handle the issue of biases due to matching errors, which has been often ignored in the literature as if

there were no mismatches; see Ridder and Moffitt (2007, p. 5480) for a discussion and Bover (2005) and Bostic et al. (2009) for regression analysis using matched data. Available results are limited to the case of matching in the ATE estimation. For example, Abadie and Imbens (2006) show that when there is only one matching covariate, the bias in NNM-based matching estimators of the ATE may be asymptotically ignored; they attain the parametric convergence rate in that case. To the best of our knowledge, bias-corrected estimation using matched data and the convergence properties of estimators within the framework of regression analysis have not been explored in the literature before.

Second, the estimation theory we develop provides guidance on repeated survey sampling when some covariates are found to be completely or partially missing after the initial survey. Our theory suggests (approximately) how many observations should be collected in a follow-up survey and how to estimate the linear regression model of interest consistently using the matched data from two surveys.

Finally, the paper offers an alternative to some well-known estimation methods based on two samples. A number of such methods have been designed within the framework of instrumental variables (IV) or generalized method of moments (GMM) estimation, where we can construct required moments from the two samples individually so that no matching is required (e.g., Angrist and Krueger, 1992, 1995; Arellano and Meghir, 1992; Inoue and Solon, 2010; Murtazashvili et al., 2015). These approaches are not applicable to the setting of a linear regression where some regressors are missing and two-sample moment based estimation is infeasible.

Throughout we assume that the two samples *jointly* identify the regression models. There are other two-sample estimators that cover the cases where the first sample *alone* identifies the models and the second sample is used for efficiency gains (see, e.g., Imbens and Lancaster, 1994; Hellerstein and Imbens, 1999). These are not the settings we consider.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 shows inconsistency of the OLS estimation from the regression (1) using matched samples. Section 3 proposes two bias-corrected estimators and explores their convergence properties. We also discuss consistent estimation of their asymptotic covariance matrices. Section 4 contains selected Monte Carlo simulations, examining how the bias correction works in finite samples. As an empirical example, in Section 5, we apply the bias-corrected two-sample estimation to a version of Mincer’s (1974) wage regression. Section 6 concludes with a few questions for future research. All proofs are given in Appendix A.²

The paper adopts the following notational conventions: $\|A\| = \{\text{tr}(A'A)\}^{1/2}$ is the Euclidean norm of matrix A ; $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$ denotes an indicator function; $0_{p \times q}$ signifies the $p \times q$ zero matrix, where the subscript may be suppressed if $q = 1$; and the symbol $>$ applied to matrices means positive definiteness.

2. Inconsistency of OLS estimation using matched samples

2.1. Setup

In order to explain how a matched sample is constructed, we need more notations. Denote the two random samples by S_1 and S_2 . Also let n and m be sample sizes of S_1 and S_2 , respectively. Then, the two samples can be expressed as $S_1 = S_{1n} = \{(Y_i, X_{1i}, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $S_2 = S_{2m} = \{(X_{2j}, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^m$. A natural way of matching based on Z is to use the NNM based on some metric. For a vector x

¹ The distinction between hot and cold deck imputation seems to primarily refer to which sample (of punch cards) to use for matching, a current sample (hot) or an earlier sample (cold). Hence, hot deck imputation often means imputation of missing values of an existing variable, whereas cold deck imputation means imputation of entire missing variables. In this respect, this paper may be closer to cold rather than hot deck imputation.

² An online Supplement contains some lengthy derivations and comprehensive simulation results. GAUSS codes implementing the estimators are also available from the authors upon request.

and some symmetric matrix $A > 0$, a vector norm is denoted by $\|x\|_A = (x'Ax)^{1/2}$. While there may be numerous choices of A , following [Abadie and Imbens \(2011\)](#), we adopt the Mahalanobis metric $A_M = \left\{ (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N (Z_i - \bar{Z})(Z_i - \bar{Z})' \right\}^{-1}$ and the normalized Euclidean metric $A_{NE} = \text{diag}(A_M^{-1})^{-1}$, where $N := n + m$ and $\bar{Z} = (1/N) \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i$.

Furthermore, let $j_k(i)$ be the index of the k th match in S_2 to the unit i in S_1 , i.e., for each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $j_k(i)$ satisfies

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{1} \{ \|Z_j - Z_i\|_A \leq \|Z_{j_k(i)} - Z_i\|_A \} = k.$$

Also let $\mathcal{J}_K(i) = \{j_1(i), \dots, j_K(i)\}$ denote the set of indices for the first K matches for the unit i . The NNM constructs the matched data set

$$\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_n = \left\{ (Y_i, X_{1i}, X_{2j_1(i)}, \dots, X_{2j_K(i)}, Z_i, Z_{j_1(i)}, \dots, Z_{j_K(i)}) \right\}_{i=1}^n.$$

We also define

$$X_{2j(i)} := \left(\frac{1}{K} \right) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} X_{2j} \text{ and } Z_{j(i)} := \left(\frac{1}{K} \right) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} Z_j.$$

It is worth noting that X_2 is missing entirely but only from the first sample. When the problem is considered in the context of the imputed sample, only the values corresponding to the first sample are missing. Thus formally, the problem can be viewed as both value imputation and variable imputation. However, in what follows we view the problem as missing variable (rather than missing values) imputation.

In our NNM, the number of matches K remains fixed, as in [Abadie and Imbens \(2006\)](#). While it is possible to achieve consistency as in the K -nearest neighbor (K -NN) method by letting K diverge at a slower rate than n and m , there are two reasons why we keep K fixed. First, this is what is done in practice. In many applications, the NNM is implemented with small values of K , and $K = 1$ (i.e., NNM with a single match) is often chosen even for large n and m . Second, it can be argued that the analysis with fixed K provides a better approximation to the finite sample behavior of the estimator than under $K \rightarrow \infty$.

A few additional remarks on NNM are in order. First, matching is made with replacement, and each element of the matching vector Z is assumed to be continuous. Hence, our setting can be viewed as a foundation for more complicated methods of kernel-based matching (see, e.g., [Busso et al., 2014](#)). Second, matching with replacement, allowing each unit to be used as a match more than once, seems to be standard in the econometric literature. Third, inclusion of discrete matching variables with a finite number of support points does not affect the subsequent asymptotic results but raises the question of how to treat ties. For simplicity, we ignore ties in the NNM, which happen with probability zero as long as Z is continuous.

Throughout it is assumed that we estimate θ by regressing Y_i on $W_{i,j(i)} := (1, X'_{1i}, X'_{2j(i)}, Z'_i)'$. It is possible to use $Z_{j(i)}$ in place of Z_i and run the regression of Y_i on $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger := (1, X'_{1i}, X'_{2j(i)}, Z'_{j(i)})'$. However, we focus exclusively on the former scenario because of the following two reasons. First, the two scenarios yield first-order asymptotically equivalent results. To see this, observe that $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger = W_{i,j(i)} + [0_{1 \times (d_1+d_2+1)} (Z_{j(i)} - Z_i)']' = W_{i,j(i)} + O_p(m^{-1/d_3})$ by [Lemma A.1](#), i.e., the second term serves merely as an extra second-order bias term. It is noteworthy that the identification condition is derived from the latter scenario. Second, as illustrated in [Section 4](#), bias-corrected estimators based on $W_{i,j(i)}$ exhibits better finite-sample properties.

We start our analysis from running OLS for the regression of Y_i on $W_{i,j(i)}$. The OLS estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{OLS} := \hat{Q}_W^{-1} \hat{R}_W := \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} W'_{i,j(i)} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} Y_i$$

is referred to as the *matched-sample OLS* (MSOLS) estimator hereinafter.

2.2. Regularity conditions

In what follows, we develop the asymptotic theory of estimation of θ in the regression (1) as n and m diverge while K is fixed. All of the estimation theory, including the bias-corrected estimation methods and their convergence properties, is new to the literature.

All of the results in the paper, including the inconsistency proof of the MSOLS estimator and the consistency proof of the new bias-corrected estimators of θ , require the following conditions.

Assumption 1. Two random samples $(S_1, S_2) = (S_{1n}, S_{2m})$ are drawn independently from the joint distribution of (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) with finite fourth-order moments.

Assumption 2. The matching variable Z is continuously distributed with a convex and compact support \mathbb{Z} , and its density is bounded and bounded away from zero on \mathbb{Z} .

Assumption 3.

- (i) The regression error u satisfies $E(u|W) = 0$ and $\sigma_u^2(W) := E(u^2|W) \in (0, \infty)$.
- (ii) Let $g(Z) := [g_1(Z)' g_2(Z)']' := [E(X_1|Z)' E(X_2|Z)']'$ and let $\eta := [\eta_1' \eta_2']' := [X_1' - g_1(Z)' X_2' - g_2(Z)']'$. Then, $\Sigma_1 := E(\eta_1 \eta_1') > 0$, $\Sigma_2 := E(\eta_2 \eta_2') > 0$, $E(\eta_1 \eta_2') = 0_{d_1 \times d_2}$, and $g_2(\cdot)$ is a first-order Lipschitz continuous, strictly nonlinear function on \mathbb{Z} .

These regularity conditions are largely inspired by those in the literature on semiparametric, partial linear regression models (e.g., [Robinson, 1988](#); [Yatchew, 1997](#)), matching estimators for the ATE (e.g., [Abadie and Imbens, 2006](#)), and regression estimation based on two samples (e.g., [Angrist and Krueger, 1992](#); [Inoue and Solon, 2010](#)). In particular, equivalents to [Assumption 1](#) (the common distribution assumption) are often imposed in the literature (e.g., [Assumption 3 of Abadie and Imbens, 2006](#); [Assumption 3 of Inoue and Solon, 2010](#)). This is a strong assumption which simplifies the subsequent derivations considerably. It implies that the matched sample S behaves as a pseudo-population, from which the two samples are drawn. [Assumption 2](#) plays a key role in controlling the order of magnitude in the matching discrepancy. Nonlinearity of $g_2(\cdot)$ in [Assumption 3\(ii\)](#) will be discussed in [Remark 1](#) in relation to identification. Zero correlation between η_1 and η_2 in [Assumption 3\(ii\)](#) is also a key assumption. Because we observe X_1 and X_2 in two independent samples, there seems to be no way to estimate $E(\eta_1 \eta_2')$ consistently. Therefore we assume uncorrelatedness between η_1 and η_2 .

2.3. Inconsistency of MSOLS

Our asymptotic analysis is built on reformulating the regression (1) in a 'partial linear'-like format. A straightforward calculation yields

$$Y_i := W'_{i,j(i)} \theta + \lambda_{i,j(i)} + \epsilon_{i,j(i)}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{2}$$

where

$$\lambda_{i,j(i)} = \lambda(Z_i, Z_{j(i)}) = \left\{ g_2(Z_i) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} g_2(Z_j) \right\}' \beta_2, \text{ and}$$

$$\epsilon_{i,j(i)} = u_i + \left(\eta_{2i} - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} \eta_{2j} \right)' \beta_2 := u_i + (\eta_{2i} - \eta_{2j(i)})' \beta_2.$$

The reason why this is not exactly a partial linear model is that there is a common regressor $Z_{j(i)}$ included in $W_{i,j(i)}$ and $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$. In this formulation, $W_{i,j(i)}$ is employed as the regressor of the fully parametric part $W'_{i,j(i)}\theta$. On the other hand, the semiparametric part $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$ generates the second-order bias that will be discussed shortly, and thus it could be viewed as an analogue to the conditional bias discussed in [Abadie and Imbens \(2006\)](#). A key difference from the partial linear regression models studied in [Robinson \(1988\)](#) and [Yatchew \(1997\)](#) is that the matched regressor $X_{2j(i)}$ is endogenous, i.e., $X_{2j(i)}$ and the composite error $\epsilon_{i,j(i)}$ are correlated. The theorem below is established for the model in [\(2\)](#); it provides the probability limit of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ and its associated rate of convergence.

Theorem 1. *If Assumptions 1–3 hold, then*

$$\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta + O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2})$$

as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, where $Q_W := E(W_{i,j(i)} W'_{i,j(i)})$, $P_W := Q_W - (1/K) \Sigma$, and Σ is a $(d+1) \times (d+1)$ block-diagonal matrix of the form $\Sigma := \text{diag}\{0_{(d+1) \times (d+1)}, \Sigma_2, 0_{d_3 \times d_3}\}$.

Remark 1. Basic identification assumptions for MSOLS follow from those of the standard OLS. Fundamentally, they require that η_1 and η_2 are not in the linear span of each other and that X_1 and X_2 are not in the linear span of Z . As in the standard OLS, we need $E(WW')$ to be of full rank. In our setting, the additional issue is whether \hat{Q}_W and Q_W are invertible. While we implicitly assume non-singularity of the former, the invertibility of the latter can be examined explicitly.

The invertibility of Q_W can be analyzed from the regression of Y_i on $W'_{i,j(i)} = (1, X_{1i}, X_{2j(i)}, Z_{j(i)})'$. The result below turns out to be valid for the regression of Y_i on $W_{i,j(i)} = (1, X_{1i}, X_{2j(i)}, Z_i)'$, because $\hat{Q}_{W^\dagger} := (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n W'_{i,j(i)} W_{i,j(i)}$ and \hat{Q}_W are first-order asymptotically equivalent in that $\hat{Q}_W = \hat{Q}_{W^\dagger} + O_p(m^{-1/d_3})$ by [Lemma A.1](#). Let $Q_{W^\dagger} := E(W'_{i,j(i)} W_{i,j(i)})$. Then, a straightforward calculation yields its determinant as $|Q_{W^\dagger}| = K^{-(d_2+d_3)} |\Omega_{X_1, X_1}| |\Omega_{X_2, X_2}| \times |\Omega_{Z, Z} - \Omega_{Z, X_2} \Omega_{X_2, X_2}^{-1} \Omega_{X_2, Z}|$, where $\Omega_{a, b} := E(ab') - E(a)E(b)'$ is the covariance between two random vectors a and b . Since $|\Omega_{X_2, X_2}| |\Omega_{Z, Z} - \Omega_{Z, X_2} \Omega_{X_2, X_2}^{-1} \Omega_{X_2, Z}|$ is the determinant of the covariance matrix of $(X'_2, Z)'$, $|Q_{W^\dagger}| > 0$ holds with no additional restrictions. Hence, Q_{W^\dagger} is invertible. Furthermore, the identification of bias-corrected estimators that will be proposed in the next section requires us to ensure non-singularity of $P_{W^\dagger} := Q_{W^\dagger} - (1/K) \Sigma$, where $|P_{W^\dagger}|$, the determinant of P_{W^\dagger} , can be obtained by replacing X_2 in $|Q_{W^\dagger}|$ with $g_2(Z)$. Considering the covariance matrix of $(g_2(Z)', Z)'$, we find that $|P_{W^\dagger}| > 0$ if and only if $g_2(\cdot)$ is strictly nonlinear, as assumed in [Assumption 3\(ii\)](#).

So far we have maintained the assumption that the vector of common variables Z is employed for both matching and estimation. It is possible that at least one common variable is used exclusively for matching (and thus not included in the regression [\(1\)](#)).³ In this case the variable can be used to form yet another identification condition, which would allow us to relax our identification

restrictions somewhat and/or improve efficiency. For example, in the presence of an outside matching variable, $g_2(\cdot)$ can be allowed to be linear. But we do not pursue this point here.

Remark 2. [Theorem 1](#) implies that MSOLS is inconsistent in general. The term $(1/K) \Sigma$ in P_W , which is the source of inconsistency, is generated by misspecifying the regression of Y_i on W_i as the one of Y_i on $W_{i,j(i)}$, or equivalently, employing $X_{2j(i)}$ as a proxy of the latent variable X_{2i} . Therefore, the non-vanishing bias in MSOLS can be thought of as a measurement error bias. The measurement error interpretation is revisited in [Section 2.4](#).

A straightforward calculation shows that the MSOLS estimator of β_2 is biased toward zero (an attenuation bias) in the limit and that all other parameter estimates are also biased. Perhaps surprisingly, the entire set of MSOLS estimates is inconsistent. This is contrary to the textbook regression with proxy variables where only a part of the OLS estimates is biased (see, e.g., [Wooldridge, 2013](#), Ch. 9). It is also easy to demonstrate that the bias in $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is a function of β_2 , Σ_2 and K . Therefore, the estimator would be consistent if either (i) $\beta_2 = 0$, i.e., X_2 were irrelevant in the correctly specified model; or (ii) $\Sigma_2 = 0$, i.e., X_2 were a deterministic function of Z .

Remark 3. The convergence rate of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is affected by the $O_p(m^{-1/d_3})$ term, which corresponds to the second-order bias term $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$ due to the matching discrepancy. The rate can be determined by three different divergence patterns of (n, m) , namely, $n/m \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, \infty)$, $n/m \rightarrow 0$, and $n/m \rightarrow \infty$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$, and there exists a *curse of dimensionality* with respect to the matching variable Z for each divergence pattern.

When $n/m \rightarrow \kappa$, $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta + O_p(n^{-\min\{1/2, 1/d_3\}})$. For $d_3 = 1$, a central limit theorem (CLT) implies that $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta)$ has a normal limit. For $d_3 = 2$, $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is still \sqrt{n} -convergent, but we can only demonstrate asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ after subtracting the second-order bias term, i.e., the best we can do in this case is to apply the CLT to $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta - B_{OLS2})$, where

$$B_{OLS2} := \hat{Q}_W^{-1} B_{RW2} := \hat{Q}_W^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} \lambda_{i,j(i)}.$$

These limiting distributions would reduce to the usual one of OLS if a complete data set of (Y, X_1, X_2, Z) were available. For $d_3 \geq 3$, the convergence rate of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is slower than the parametric one, and it becomes slower as d_3 increases.

When $n/m \rightarrow 0$, $m^{-1/d_3} = o(n^{-1/2})$ for $d_3 \leq 2$. Hence, $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta + O_p(n^{-1/2})$, and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta)$ has a normal limit in this case. However, for $d_3 \geq 3$, the convergence rate of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ can be determined only if an extra divergence pattern of (n, m) is imposed. For instance, when $d_3 = 3$, $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is \sqrt{n} -convergent if $n^3 = O(m^2)$ and its convergence rate is a nonparametric one if $n^3/m^2 \rightarrow \infty$.

When $n/m \rightarrow \infty$, a \sqrt{n} -convergent of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ can be attained only if $d_3 = 1$ and $n = O(m^2)$. Moreover, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta)$ has a normal limit when $d_3 = 1$ and $n/m^2 \rightarrow 0$. On the other hand, if $d_3 = 1$ and $n/m^2 \rightarrow \infty$ or if $d_3 \geq 2$, then $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta + O_p(m^{-1/d_3})$, and the convergence bound m^{1/d_3} is slower than \sqrt{n} , regardless of whether or not the bound is sharp.

³ We thank an anonymous referee for pointing out this possibility to us.

2.4. A measurement error interpretation

Before moving to our proposal for bias-corrected estimation, it is helpful to consider the problem of imputation as a measurement error problem arising from using a proxy.⁴ Write the model in (1) as

$$Y = \beta_0 + X_1' \beta_1 + g_2(Z)' \beta_2 + Z' \gamma + e,$$

where $e := \{X_2 - g_2(Z)\}' \beta_2 + u$. Then, $g_2(Z)$ can be viewed as a proxy for X_2 and if we could observe $g_2(Z)$ then the model could be estimated by OLS as long as X_1 is uncorrelated with $\{X_2 - g_2(Z)\}$ and $g_2(Z)$ is not in the linear span of Z .

However, $g_2(Z)$ is not observed and needs to be estimated. There are two complications here. One is that we need to use an estimator $\hat{g}_2(Z)$ based on another sample. The other is that the estimator uses matched values of X_2 obtained using nearest-neighbors of Z from the other sample, not the Z itself. Suppose that $\hat{g}_2(Z)$ is the estimate via the K -NN method for the moment.⁵ Rewriting the model as

$$Y = \beta_0 + X_1' \beta_1 + \hat{g}_2(Z)' \beta_2 + Z' \gamma + v,$$

where $v := \{X_2 - \hat{g}_2(Z)\}' \beta_2 + u$, we attempt to estimate this regression by OLS. If $\hat{g}_2(Z)$ were estimated from the same sample, then the correlation between $\hat{g}_2(Z)$ and $\{X_2 - \hat{g}_2(Z)\}$ would be near zero because of orthogonality of $g_2(Z)$ and $\{X_2 - g_2(Z)\}$. We actually employ a different sample to estimate (or impute) $g_2(Z)$, and thus the correlation does not equal zero, which causes a non-negligible bias in the OLS estimator. This can be interpreted as a classical measurement error problem.

As is well known in the literature on measurement error problems, the bias of OLS can be corrected if the variance of the measurement error can be obtained analytically, given that the matching discrepancy from K -NN is bounded. Our bias correction methods in the next section basically follow this idea, although the nearest-neighbor algorithm that we use is intended only to find K closest matches to Z and not to estimate $g_2(Z)$.

3. Bias-corrected estimation

3.1. One-step bias-corrected estimator

This section develops bias-corrected estimation of θ . As suggested by the proof of Theorem 1, inconsistency of MSOLS comes from the fact that $\hat{Q}_W \xrightarrow{P} Q_W$ whereas $\hat{R}_W \xrightarrow{P} P_W \theta = \{Q_W - (1/K) \Sigma\} \theta$. Therefore, the non-vanishing bias in MSOLS can be eliminated if either

- (1a) the denominator \hat{Q}_W is replaced by a consistent estimator of P_W with the numerator \hat{R}_W left unchanged; or
- (1b) an extra term consistent for $(1/K) \Sigma \theta$ is added to \hat{R}_W with \hat{Q}_W held as it is.

Bias correction in each strategy is semiparametric in that a consistent estimate of Σ_2 (covariance matrix of the nonparametric regression error η_2) is required. Moreover, implementing (1b) inevitably leads to a two-step estimation with an initial consistent estimate of θ plugged in. However, if the plug-in estimator is the one using strategy (1a), then the two-step estimation will produce a numerically identical result. To see why, let an initial estimator

of θ using strategy (1a) be $\hat{\theta}_{(1a)} = \hat{P}_W^{-1} \hat{R}_W$, where $\hat{P}_W \xrightarrow{P} P_W$. Given $\hat{\theta}_{(1a)}$, we obtain the second-step estimator as

$$\hat{\theta}_{(1b)} := \hat{Q}_W^{-1} \left(\hat{R}_W + \frac{1}{K} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{\theta}_{(1a)} \right) = \hat{Q}_W^{-1} \left(I_{d+1} + \frac{1}{K} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{P}_W^{-1} \right) \hat{R}_W, \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}$ is a consistent estimate of Σ . Post-multiplying both sides of $\hat{P}_W + (1/K) \hat{\Sigma} = \hat{Q}_W$ by \hat{P}_W^{-1} yields $I_{d+1} + (1/K) \hat{\Sigma} \hat{P}_W^{-1} = \hat{Q}_W \hat{P}_W^{-1}$. Substituting this into the right-hand side of (3) immediately establishes that $\hat{\theta}_{(1b)} = \hat{\theta}_{(1a)}$. Therefore, there is no point in pursuing strategy (1b) separately; strategy (1b) is interesting only if an alternative consistent estimator of θ (other than $\hat{\theta}_{(1a)}$) is chosen.

Now we turn to the bias correction based on strategy (1a). The idea behind the strategy comes from indirect inference (II) estimation by Gouriéroux et al. (1993) and Smith (1993). Take the probability limit of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ as the binding function $b(\theta)$, i.e., $b(\theta) = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta$.⁶ Because P_W^{-1} exists as discussed in Remark 1, the II estimator can be built on the inverse mapping of $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = b(\theta)$, i.e., $\theta = P_W^{-1} Q_W \hat{\theta}_{OLS}$. The interpretation then follows from replacing P_W with its \sqrt{n} -consistent estimator \hat{P}_W and regarding \hat{R}_W as a ‘sample analog’ of $Q_W \hat{\theta}_{OLS}$. Accordingly, we call this estimation method the *matched-sample indirect inference* (MSII) estimation. We formally define the MSII estimator as

$$\hat{\theta}_{II} := \hat{P}_W^{-1} \hat{R}_W,$$

which has been called $\hat{\theta}_{(1a)}$ before.⁷

Our remaining task is to deliver a consistent estimator of P_W . Obviously, \hat{Q}_W is a natural estimator of Q_W . Furthermore, it turns out that when estimating $\Sigma = \text{diag} \{0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \Sigma_2, 0_{d_3 \times d_3}\}$, we can do without a nonparametric estimation of $g_2(\cdot)$. To do so, we first reorder S_2 with respect to Z by the following recursion:

1. Define $Z_{(1)}$ as the observation that has the smallest first element, i.e., $(1) = \arg \min_{1 \leq j \leq m} Z_{j1}$.
2. For $j = 2, \dots, m$, choose $(j) = \arg \min_{j \neq (1), \dots, (j-1)} \|Z_j - Z_{(j-1)}\|$.⁸

Given the reordered sample $S_2 = \{X_{2(j)}, Z_{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$, Σ_2 can be consistently estimated by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_2 = \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta X_{2(j)} \Delta X_{2(j)}', \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta X_{2(j)} := X_{2(j)} - X_{2(j-1)}$. This is known as the difference-based variance estimator; see von Neumann (1941) and Rice (1984) for univariate and Yatchew (1997) and Horowitz and Spokoiny (2001) for multivariate cases. In the end, the estimator of P_W is given by

$$\hat{P}_W := \hat{Q}_W - \frac{1}{K} \hat{\Sigma} = \hat{Q}_W - \frac{1}{K} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \hat{\Sigma}_2, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\}.$$

⁶ Typically the binding function is unknown, and it must be approximated via simulations. However, when the function has a closed form, there is no need for simulations; see Carrasco and Florens (2002) for another example. As suggested by a referee, this also gives the estimator the interpretation of a classical minimum distance estimation based on the distance $b(\theta) - \hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ but we do not pursue this point further.

⁷ The estimator $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ also has a method-of-moment interpretation, where the moment is

$$E(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)}) = -\frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta.$$

From the viewpoint of likelihood-based methods MSII may leave some information (or moment restrictions) unused, and thus there may be room for efficiency improvement. But pursuing this point is beyond the scope of this paper.

⁸ If Z is a scalar, then the recursion reduces to rearranging $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^m$ in an ascending order $Z_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq Z_{(m)}$.

⁴ We thank an anonymous referee for suggesting this interpretation to us.
⁵ We adopt a power-series approximation to estimate $g_2(Z)$; see Section 3.3 for details.

3.2. Convergence properties of the MSII estimator

We first provide a consistency result for the MSII estimator $\hat{\theta}_{II}$. The result holds regardless of the number of matching variables d_3 and of the divergence patterns of (n, m) .

Theorem 2. *If Assumptions 1–3 hold, then $\hat{\theta}_{II} \xrightarrow{p} \theta$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$.*

Next we establish asymptotic normality of $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ after correcting for the two bias terms, namely, B_{MD} (second-order bias term due to the matching discrepancy) and B_{Σ} (third-order bias term due to the nonparametric estimation of Σ). Before proceeding, we make an additional assumption. Like Assumption c of Inoue and Solon (2010), Assumption 4 makes derivations of asymptotic variances in the limiting distributions of $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ easier.

Assumption 4. In the nonparametric regression $X_2 = g_2(Z) + \eta_2$, $g_2(Z)$ and η_2 are independent, and third-order moments of η_2 are zeros.

The next theorem establishes the limiting distributions of $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ under a variety of divergence patterns of (n, m) . Again, these results hold regardless of the number of matching variables d_3 .

Theorem 3. *If Assumptions 1–4 hold, then, as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_I) \\ \quad := N(0, P_W^{-1} \Omega P_W^{-1}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, \infty) \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{II}) \\ \quad := N(0, P_W^{-1} \Omega_{11A} P_W^{-1}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \\ \sqrt{m}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{III}) \\ \quad := N(0, P_W^{-1} \Omega_{22} P_W^{-1}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \end{cases},$$

where $B_{MD} = 1/n \hat{P}_W^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} \lambda_{i,j(i)}$ and

$$B_{\Sigma} = \hat{P}_W^{-1} \frac{1}{K} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta g_2(Z_{(j)}) \Delta g_2(Z_{(j)})', 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \theta$$

are the two bias terms,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega &:= \Omega_{11} + \sqrt{\kappa} (\Omega_{12} + \Omega'_{12}) + \kappa \Omega_{22} \\ &:= (\Omega_{11A} + \Omega_{11B}) + \sqrt{\kappa} (\Omega_{12} + \Omega'_{12}) + \kappa \Omega_{22}, \\ \Omega_{11A} &:= E \left\{ \left(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta \right) \left(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta \right)' \right\}, \\ \Omega_{11B} &:= \kappa \left[(\beta_2' \Sigma_2 \beta_2) E(W) E(W)' \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, (\beta_2' \Sigma_2 \beta_2) V_{g_2} + \Xi, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \} \right], \\ \Omega_{12} &:= -\frac{\sqrt{\kappa}}{K^2} \text{diag} \{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \Xi, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \}, \\ \Omega_{22} &:= \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \Psi, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\}, \\ V_{g_2} &:= \text{Var} \{ g_2(Z) \}, \\ \Xi &:= E \{ (\eta_2 \eta_2' - \Sigma_2) \beta_2 \beta_2' (\eta_2 \eta_2' - \Sigma_2) \}, \text{ and} \\ \Psi &:= (\beta_2' \Sigma_2 \beta_2) \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_2 \beta_2 \beta_2' \Sigma_2. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that Ω in V_I can be simplified as

$$\Omega = E \left\{ \left(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta \right) \left(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta \right)' \right\}$$

$$+ \kappa \left[(\beta_2' \Sigma_2 \beta_2) E(W) E(W)' + \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, (\beta_2' \Sigma_2 \beta_2) V_{g_2} + \frac{1}{2} \Psi, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \right].$$

This suggests that V_I is greater than V_{II} in the positive definite sense, i.e., amassing more information in the form of a quicker growing m provides asymptotic efficiency gains.

Another relative efficiency implication is that when we include an extra matching variable, i.e., d_3 increases, the additional variability captured by P_W leads to a smaller V_{III} (in the positive definite sense) since the non-zero elements of Ω_{22} remain unchanged. This is similar to the effect of adding a regressor to a regression. The effect of a larger d_3 on V_I and V_{II} is unclear as Ω_{11A} and Ω will be also inflated by the inclusion.

More importantly, the limiting distributions of $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ vary across divergence patterns of (n, m) . The convergence rate of $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ is determined by the sample size of the smaller sample. The rate is \sqrt{n} when $n/m \rightarrow \kappa$, where $\kappa \in [0, \infty)$, i.e., S_2 is no smaller than S_1 in order of magnitude. In contrast, when $n/m \rightarrow \infty$ or S_1 is much larger than S_2 , the best possible rate slows down to $\sqrt{m} = o(\sqrt{n})$. The slow rate can be thought of as the price paid for estimating θ using a considerably smaller sample S_2 via the NNM. As a result of the bias correction, the order of magnitude in the estimation error of Σ_2 dominates.

While the MSII estimator is consistent, its convergence is affected by the asymptotic bias terms. For a large d_3 the second-order bias term B_{MD} dominates and the convergence rate becomes inferior. This is the curse of dimensionality of NNM that is commonly observed in other applications. With regards to the ATE estimation, Abadie and Imbens (2006, Corollary 1), for instance, show that the matching discrepancy bias can be safely ignored only when matching is made on a single variable.

A similar result applies in our setting for small values of d_3 . The next corollary illustrates such cases.

Corollary 1. *If Assumptions 1–4 hold, then, as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_I) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, \infty) \text{ and } d_3 = 1 \\ \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{II}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 1, 2 \\ \sqrt{m}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{III}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 1 \end{cases},$$

where V_I, V_{II} and V_{III} are defined in Theorem 3.

In the cases covered by Corollary 1, the bias terms B_{MD} as B_{Σ} are already of smaller order than $n^{-1/2}$ or $m^{-1/2}$, and thus we obtain parametric convergence rates without bias correction.

3.3. Two-step bias-corrected estimator

If a parametric rate of convergence cannot be obtained without bias correction as in Corollary 1, then we need to find a way of eliminating the second-order bias B_{MD} , or equivalently, the effect of $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$ asymptotically from (2). There are two possible strategies, namely:

- Strategy 1: taking the first-order difference of (2); and
- Strategy 2: subtracting a consistent estimate of $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$ from the dependent variable Y_i .

Yatchew (1997) advocates Strategy 1 in semiparametric regression estimation, whereas Robinson (1988) and Abadie and Imbens (2011) adopt a similar strategy to Strategy 2 in semiparametric regression and ATE estimations, respectively. In our settings, we have found that Strategy 1 has a few disadvantages. First, differencing (2) leaves β_0 and γ unidentified. Second, our preliminary Monte

Carlo study suggests that MSII estimates from the differenced regression are numerically quite unstable. For these reasons we focus on Strategy 2.

Estimating $\lambda_{i,j(i)}$ requires consistent estimates of θ and $g_2(\cdot)$. For the former, it suffices to employ the MSII estimate $\hat{\theta}_{II}$. For the latter, as in [Abadie and Imbens \(2011\)](#), we adopt a nonparametric power-series estimation. Let $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_{d_3})$ be a multi-index of dimension d_3 , which is a d_3 -dimensional vector of nonnegative integers with $|\nu| = \sum_{l=1}^{d_3} \nu_l$. Also denote $z^\nu = \prod_{l=1}^{d_3} z_l^{\nu_l}$, where z_l is the l th element of z . Consider a series $\{v(K)\}_{K=1}^\infty$ containing distinct vectors such that $|v(K)|$ is non-decreasing. Let $p_K(z) = z^{v(K)}$ and $p^K(z) = (p_1(z), \dots, p_K(z))'$. Then, a nonparametric series estimator of the regression function $g_{2r}(z)$, $r = 1, \dots, d_2$, is given by

$$\hat{g}_{2r}(z) := p^{K(m)}(z)' \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^m p^{K(m)}(Z_j) p^{K(m)}(Z_j)' \right\}^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^m p^{K(m)}(Z_j) X_{2r,j},$$

where $X_{2r,j}$ is the r th element of X_{2j} in S_2 , $(\cdot)^{-1}$ denotes the general-ized inverse, and $K = K(m)$ signifies the dependence of K on the sample size of S_2 .

The entire estimation procedure based on Strategy 2 can be summarized in the following two steps:

1. Run MSII using the original matched sample S to obtain the initial estimate $\hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)} = (\hat{\beta}_{II,0}^{(1)}, \hat{\beta}_{II,1}^{(1)'}, \hat{\beta}_{II,2}^{(1)'}, \hat{\gamma}_{II}^{(1)'})'$.
2. Construct adjusted dependent variables

$$\{Y_i^+\}_{i=1}^n := \{Y_i - \hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)}\}_{i=1}^n,$$

where

$$\hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)} = \left\{ \hat{g}_2(Z_i) - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} \hat{g}_2(Z_j) \right\}' \hat{\beta}_{II,2}^{(1)}$$

and $\hat{g}_2(z) = (\hat{g}_{21}(z), \dots, \hat{g}_{2d_2}(z))'$, and rerun MSII using the modified matched sample $S^+ = S_n^+ := \{(Y_i^+, X_{1i}, X_{2j_1(i)}, \dots, X_{2j_K(i)}, Z_i, Z_{j_1(i)}, \dots, Z_{j_K(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$ to obtain the final estimator

$$\hat{\theta}_{II-FM} := \hat{P}_W^{-1} \hat{R}_W^+ := \hat{P}_W^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} Y_i^+.$$

The idea behind the above procedure is as follows. The initial MSII estimate $\hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)}$ is consistent but inefficient, because the slow convergence rate m^{1/d_3} of the second-order bias term B_{MD} dominates. Then, in the second step, we (asymptotically) eliminate the source of the inferior rate by subtracting $\hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)}$ from the dependent variable and reestimate θ by MSII using the bias-adjusted data to ensure \sqrt{n} - or \sqrt{m} -consistency. The entire procedure is reminiscent of the fully-modified least squares estimation for cointegrating regressions by [Phillips and Hansen \(1990\)](#). In this sense, we call the estimator the *fully-modified MSII* (MSII-FM) estimator hereinafter.

In order to deliver convergence results for $\hat{\theta}_{II-FM}$, we must additionally impose the following regularity conditions. These are analogous to conditions (i)-(iii) in Theorem 2 of [Abadie and Imbens \(2011\)](#).

Assumption 5. \mathbb{Z} is a Cartesian product of compact intervals.

Assumption 6. $K(m) \asymp m^\nu$ for some constant

$$\nu \in \left(0, \min \left\{ \frac{2}{4d_3 + 3}, \frac{2}{4d_3^2 - d_3} \right\} \right).$$

Assumption 7. There is a constant C such that for each multi-index ν , the ν th partial derivative of $g_2(z)$ exists and its norm is bounded by $C^{|\nu|}$.

The theorem below refers to the limiting distributions of $\hat{\theta}_{II-FM}$ under a variety of divergence patterns of (n, m) . It is worth emphasizing that asymptotic variances of the MSII-FM estimator take the same forms as in [Theorem 3](#) and [Corollary 1](#), i.e., the FM procedure asymptotically removes the second- and third-order bias terms without inflating the variance.

Theorem 4. If [Assumptions 1–7](#) hold, then, as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{cases} \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_{II-FM} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_I) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, \infty) \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \\ \sqrt{n} (\hat{\theta}_{II-FM} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{II}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 3, 4 \\ \sqrt{m} (\hat{\theta}_{II-FM} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{III}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \end{cases},$$

where V_I, V_{II} and V_{III} are defined in [Theorem 3](#).

An important practical question when implementing MSII-FM is how to choose $K(m)$, the number of terms in the series approximation. We will address this issue in [Section 4](#) and in [Section C](#) of the Supplement.

3.4. Covariance estimation

We conclude this section by discussing covariance estimation, which is essential for inference. Our focus is on the MSII estimator of [Corollary 1](#) and the MSII-FM estimator of [Theorem 4](#), which are first-order asymptotically equivalent. Because \hat{P}_W is consistent for P_W , the problem of estimating V_I, V_{II} and V_{III} consistently is boiled down to proposing consistent estimators of Ω, Ω_{11A} and Ω_{22} .

The consistent estimators are presented in the proposition below. Notice that the proposition is built on the assumption that $\hat{\theta}_{II}$ is employed as a consistent estimator for θ ; it is easy to see that the result equally holds after it is replaced by $\hat{\theta}_{II-FM}$.

Proposition 1. Let the estimators of $\Omega_{11A}, \Omega_{22}$ and Ω be

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Omega}_{11A} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(W_{i,j(i)} \hat{\epsilon}_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{\theta}_{II} \right) \left(W_{i,j(i)} \hat{\epsilon}_{i,j(i)} + \frac{1}{K} \hat{\Sigma} \hat{\theta}_{II} \right)', \\ \hat{\Omega}_{22} &= \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \hat{\Gamma}(-1) + \hat{\Gamma}(0) + \hat{\Gamma}(1), 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\}, \text{ and} \\ \hat{\Omega} &= \hat{\Omega}_{11A} + \frac{n}{m} \left[\left(\hat{\beta}'_{2,II} \hat{\Sigma}_2 \hat{\beta}_{2,II} \right) \bar{W} \bar{W}' \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. \left(\hat{\beta}'_{2,II} \hat{\Sigma}_2 \hat{\beta}_{2,II} \right) \hat{V}_{g_2} + \hat{\Gamma}(0) - \left\{ \hat{\Gamma}(-1) + \hat{\Gamma}(1) \right\}, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\epsilon}_{i,j(i)} = Y_i - W'_{i,j(i)} \hat{\theta}_{II}$ is the MSII residual, $\hat{\beta}_{2,II}$ is the MSII estimator of β_2 , $\hat{\Gamma}(\ell)$ is the ℓ th sample autocovariance of $\left\{ (\Delta X_{2j} \Delta X'_{2j} / 2) - \hat{\Sigma}_2 \right\} \hat{\beta}_{2,II}$, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Gamma}(\ell) &= \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j=\max\{2, 2+\ell\}}^{\min\{m, m+\ell\}} \left(\frac{\Delta X_{2j} \Delta X'_{2j}}{2} - \hat{\Sigma}_2 \right) \\ &\quad \times \hat{\beta}_{2,II} \hat{\beta}'_{2,II} \left(\frac{\Delta X_{2j-\ell} \Delta X'_{2j-\ell}}{2} - \hat{\Sigma}_2 \right), \end{aligned}$$

$$\bar{W} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \bar{X}_1 \\ \bar{X}_2 \\ \bar{Z} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{1i} \\ \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m X_{2j} \\ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Z_i \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{V}_{g_2} = \frac{1}{m-1} \sum_{j=1}^m (X_{2j} - \bar{X}_2) (X_{2j} - \bar{X}_2)' - \hat{\Sigma}_2.$$

Then, under Assumptions 1–4, $\hat{\Omega}_{11A} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega_{11A}$, $\hat{\Omega}_{22} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega_{22}$ and $\hat{\Omega} \xrightarrow{p} \Omega$ as $n, m \rightarrow \infty$.

4. Finite-sample performance

4.1. Monte Carlo setup

In this section we conduct Monte Carlo simulations to examine finite-sample properties of proposed bias-corrected estimators. The simulation study takes a unified approach in the sense that the same regression model is employed regardless of the number of matching variables d_3 . The model considered throughout is

$$Y = \beta_0 + X_1' \beta_1 + X_2' \beta_2 + Z' \gamma + u, \tag{5}$$

where $X_1 = (X_{11}, X_{12})', \beta_1 = (\beta_{11}, \beta_{12})' \in \mathbb{R}^2, X_2 = (X_{21}, X_{22})', \beta_2 = (\beta_{21}, \beta_{22})' \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{d_3})', \gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d_3})' \in \mathbb{R}^{d_3}$ for $d_3 = 1, 2, 3$. It is assumed that two samples, namely, $S_1 = \{(Y_i, X_{1i}, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $S_2 = \{(X_{2j}, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^m$, are only observable. The complete sample $S^* = \{(Y_i, X_{1i}, X_{2i}, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ is the sample that would not be observed in practice.

The data are generated in the following manner. First, $Z^* = (Z_1^*, Z_2^*, Z_3^*)'$ is generated by

$$Z^* \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N \left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1/\sqrt{2} & 1/\sqrt{3} \\ 1/\sqrt{2} & 1 & \sqrt{2}/\sqrt{3} \\ 1/\sqrt{3} & \sqrt{2}/\sqrt{3} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right).$$

Each Z_p^* ($p = 1, 2, 3$) is transformed to $Z_p = 4\Phi(Z_p^*) - 2$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cdf of $N(0, 1)$. Observe that the Z_p are mutually correlated $U[-2, 2]$ random variables. Then, for a given d_3 , the Z_p ($p \leq d_3$) are used as matching variables.

Second, $X_1 = (X_{11}, X_{12})'$ is generated by $X_{1q} = \sum_{p=1}^{d_3} Z_p + \eta_{1q}$ ($q = 1, 2$), where $\eta_1 = (\eta_{11}, \eta_{12})' \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0_{2 \times 1}, I_2)$. Third, $X_2 = (X_{21}, X_{22})'$ is generated by $X_{2r} = \sum_{p=1}^{d_3} g_{2r}(Z_p) + \eta_{2r}$ ($r = 1, 2$) for some nonlinear function $g_{2r}(\cdot)$, where $\eta_2 = (\eta_{21}, \eta_{22})' \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0_{2 \times 1}, I_2)$. While $g_{21}(z) = z + (5/\tau)\phi(z/\tau)$, $\tau = 0.25$ is employed throughout, where $\phi(\cdot)$ is the pdf of $N(0, 1)$, one of the following three functional forms is chosen as $g_{22}(z)$:

$$g_{22}(z) = \begin{cases} z + (5/\tau)\phi(z/\tau), \tau = 0.75 & \text{[Model A]} \\ 2|z| & \text{[Model B]} \\ 4\sqrt{|z/2|(1-|z/2|)} \sin\{2\pi(1+\epsilon)/(|z/2|+\epsilon)\}, \\ \epsilon = 0.05 & \text{[Model C].} \end{cases}$$

Both $g_{21}(\cdot)$ and Model A, which are inspired by the Monte Carlo design of Horowitz and Spokoiny (2001), can be viewed as a linear function with a bump. Model A is a smooth function, whereas Models B and C have a kink at the origin. Strictly speaking, these models violate the smoothness condition given in Assumption 7.

Nonetheless we investigate them to see how the violation affects finite-sample properties of MSII-FM. In addition, Model C is (a mirror image of) the Doppler function, which is a rapidly oscillating, spatially inhomogeneous function, as illustrated in Fig. 1 of Donoho and Johnstone (1994). Therefore, the model may be thought of as the most difficult case among the three. This is the model for which we report the results here.⁹

Finally, Y is generated by setting all coefficients in (5) equal to 1 with $u \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$.

The above procedure provides us with two observable samples $S_1 = \{(Y_i, X_{1i}, Z_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and $S_2 = \{(X_{2j}, Z_j)\}_{j=1}^m$, and one complete sample S^* . Finally, the matched sample $S = \{(Y_i, X_{1i}, X_{2j_1(i)}, \dots, X_{2j_K(i)}, Z_i, Z_{j_1(i)}, \dots, Z_{j_K(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$ is constructed via the NNM with respect to Z , where the NNM is based on the Mahalanobis metric. We focus only on small numbers of matches and examine $K \in \{1, 2, 4, 8\}$.¹⁰

With regards to sample sizes, for each of $n \in \{1000, 2000\}$, m is chosen as one of $m \in \{n/2, n, 2n\}$ so that the values of κ are $\kappa = 2, 1$ and $1/2$, respectively. For each combination of sample sizes (n, m) and the functional form of $g_{22}(z)$, we generate 1000 Monte Carlo samples. The following five estimators are examined: (i) the infeasible OLS estimator using the complete sample S^* [OLS*]; (ii) the MSOLS estimator using the matched sample S and $W_{i,j(i)}$ [MSOLS-A]; (iii) the MSOLS estimator using the matched sample S and $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ [MSOLS-B]; (iv) the MSII(-FM) estimator using the matched sample S and $W_{i,j(i)}$ [MSII(-FM)-A]; and (v) the MSII(-FM) estimator using the matched sample S and $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ [MSII(-FM)-B]. Second-, third- and fourth-order polynomials are investigated in the power-series approximation for MSII-FM, and these specifications are denoted as “2nd”, “3rd” and “4th” in the row “Poly.”, respectively. Results on the initial MSII are also available as “initial” for reference. Moreover, the consistent estimator of the second-order bias term for MSII-FM-B is $\hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)}^\dagger = \hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)} + \left\{ Z_i - (1/K) \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} Z_j \right\}' \hat{\gamma}_H^{(1)'}$.

We focus on finite-sample properties of estimators of β_{22} and γ_1 . For each estimator, the following performance measures are computed: (i) Mean (simulation average of the parameter estimate); (ii) SD (simulation standard deviation of the parameter estimate); (iii) RMSE (root mean-squared error of the parameter estimate); (iv) SE (simulation average of the standard error); and (v) CR (coverage rate for the nominal 95% confidence interval). Since MSOLS is inconsistent and limiting distributions of the initial MSII for $d_3 = 2, 3$ are not available, their standard errors are not well defined. Accordingly, SE and CR are not computed for these estimators.

4.2. Results

Simulation results are summarized in Table 1. To save space, we present only the results from the most difficult case (Model C) for $(n, m) = (1000, 1000)$ and $(2000, 2000)$.

(a) For $d_3 = 1$: Panel (a) reports the results for a single matching variable. Because of conditional homoskedasticity of the error term u , OLS* is the best linear unbiased estimator. The results indicate that it is unbiased and yields small standard deviations. However, OLS* is an infeasible, oracle estimator. Instead, we should make a realistic comparison between MSOLS and MSII and use OLS* as the benchmark to measure the efficiency loss when all variables cannot be taken from a single data source.

⁹ Comprehensive simulation results, available in Section B of the Supplement, are even more favorable for Models A and B.

¹⁰ In our preliminary Monte Carlo study larger values of matches (e.g., $K = 16, 32, 64, 128$) have been also investigated. However, the results are quite poor.

Table 1
Monte Carlo results for Model C.

Panel (a): $d_3 = 1$										
(n, m)	Estimator		β_{22}				γ_1			
(1000, 1000)	OLS*	Mean	1.0003				0.9970			
		SD	0.0202				0.0529			
		RMSE	0.0202				0.0529			
		SE	0.0207				0.0527			
		CR	96%				95%			
	MSOLS-A	K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8
		Mean	0.5556	0.7148	0.8355	0.9203	1.0513	1.0272	1.0145	1.0091
		SD	0.0512	0.0546	0.0582	0.0611	0.1134	0.1052	0.1019	0.1008
		RMSE	0.4474	0.2903	0.1745	0.1004	0.1245	0.1087	0.1029	0.1012
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.5556	0.7148	0.8355	0.9203	1.0513	1.0271	1.0145	1.0092
		SD	0.0512	0.0546	0.0582	0.0611	0.1135	0.1052	0.1020	0.1008
		RMSE	0.4474	0.2903	0.1745	0.1005	0.1245	0.1087	0.1030	0.1012
		K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8
	MSII-A	Mean	1.0251	1.0142	1.0126	1.0221	0.9970	0.9980	0.9993	1.0013
		SD	0.1141	0.0906	0.0774	0.0711	0.1231	0.1098	0.1040	0.1019
RMSE		0.1168	0.0917	0.0784	0.0744	0.1231	0.1098	0.1040	0.1019	
SE		0.1040	0.0740	0.0633	0.0609	0.1199	0.1064	0.0994	0.0961	
MSII-B	CR	94%	89%	88%	90%	95%	94%	93%	93%	
	Mean	1.0251	1.0142	1.0126	1.0221	0.9970	0.9979	0.9993	1.0013	
	SD	0.1141	0.0906	0.0774	0.0711	0.1231	0.1098	0.1040	0.1019	
	RMSE	0.1168	0.0917	0.0784	0.0744	0.1231	0.1099	0.1040	0.1019	
(2000, 2000)	OLS*	Mean	0.9995				0.9988			
		SD	0.0145				0.0372			
		RMSE	0.0145				0.0372			
		SE	0.0147				0.0374			
		CR	96%				94%			
	MSOLS-A	K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8
		Mean	0.5602	0.7204	0.8406	0.9191	1.0502	1.0263	1.0137	1.0063
		SD	0.0359	0.0380	0.0399	0.0416	0.0814	0.0758	0.0729	0.0716
		RMSE	0.4413	0.2821	0.1643	0.0909	0.0956	0.0803	0.0742	0.0719
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.5602	0.7204	0.8406	0.9191	1.0502	1.0263	1.0137	1.0063
		SD	0.0359	0.0380	0.0399	0.0416	0.0814	0.0758	0.0729	0.0716
		RMSE	0.4413	0.2821	0.1643	0.0909	0.0956	0.0803	0.0742	0.0719
		K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8
	MSII-A	Mean	1.0144	1.0100	1.0099	1.0135	0.9961	0.9975	0.9986	0.9985
		SD	0.0745	0.0614	0.0519	0.0478	0.0879	0.0790	0.0744	0.0724
RMSE		0.0758	0.0622	0.0528	0.0496	0.0880	0.0790	0.0745	0.0724	
SE		0.0712	0.0512	0.0436	0.0413	0.0843	0.0750	0.0700	0.0676	
MSII-B	CR	94%	90%	90%	91%	94%	94%	94%	93%	
	Mean	1.0144	1.0100	1.0099	1.0135	0.9961	0.9975	0.9987	0.9985	
	SD	0.0745	0.0614	0.0519	0.0478	0.0879	0.0790	0.0744	0.0724	
	RMSE	0.0758	0.0622	0.0528	0.0496	0.0880	0.0790	0.0745	0.0724	
MSII-B	SE	0.0712	0.0512	0.0436	0.0413	0.0843	0.0750	0.0700	0.0676	
	CR	94%	90%	90%	91%	95%	94%	94%	93%	

(continued on next page)

For MSOLS, whether $W_{i,j(i)}$ or $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ is used as the regressor has almost no difference; this reflects the fact that the extra second-order bias induced by replacing Z_i with $Z_{j(i)}$ is $O_p(n^{-1}) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. As predicted in Theorem 1, the bias of the MSOLS estimate decreases with the number of matches K . However, it is inconsistent in that its bias does not vanish with the sample size n . Also observe that the standard deviation of each MSOLS estimate shrinks with n , as Theorem 1 suggests.

Now we turn to MSII. At a glance, we can find that the proposed bias-correction method works remarkably well, and that the choice of the regressor again does not change the results. However, unlike MSOLS, increasing K has little effect at best, which suggests that MSII works well across small values of K . The results also confirm consistency of MSII; as n increases, the simulation average of each MSII estimate gets closer to the truth and its standard deviation shrinks. In addition, \overline{SE} is reasonably close to SD , which indicates that the (properly-scaled) covariance estimator $\hat{\Omega}$ yields good estimates of standard deviations of MSII. Coverage rates are

also close to the nominal level of confidence, and the single match case appears to have advantage from the viewpoint of coverage accuracy.

Comparing MSII with OLS*, we have the following two findings. First, unlike OLS*, MSII is not unbiased. However, it is nearly unbiased for large sample sizes. Second, standard deviations of the latter are always greater than those of the former. The relative efficiency loss can be thought of as the price to pay for identifying and estimating the regression using two samples jointly. It is worth noting that while standard deviations of MSOLS are greater than those of OLS*, they are smaller than those of MSII. This can be explained by the fact that the asymptotic variance of $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{OLS} - Q_W^{-1}P_W\theta - B_{OLS2})$ is $Q_W^{-1}\Omega_{11}Q_W^{-1}$, which tends to be smaller (in the matrix sense) than $P_W^{-1}\Omega P_W^{-1}$.

(b) For $d_3 = 2$:. Next, we look into Panel (b), which presents the results from two matching variables. Only results of MSII-FM for $K = 1$ are provided, because those for $K \geq 2$ are quite poor.

Table 1 (continued)

Panel (b): $d_3 = 2$										
(n, m)	Estimator		β_{22}				γ_1			
(1000, 1000)	OLS*	Mean	0.9986				0.9977			
		SD	0.0165				0.0571			
		RMSE	0.0166				0.0572			
		SE	0.0164				0.0588			
		CR	95%				95%			
			K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4
	MSOLS-A	Mean	0.4733	0.6337	0.7856	0.9459	1.0597	1.0291	1.0100	0.9780
		SD	0.0528	0.0571	0.0662	0.0847	0.1767	0.1725	0.1766	0.1967
		RMSE	0.5294	0.3707	0.2243	0.1005	0.1865	0.1749	0.1769	0.1979
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.4735	0.6340	0.7858	0.9461	1.0123	0.9931	0.9795	0.9457
		SD	0.0529	0.0573	0.0664	0.0850	0.1782	0.1731	0.1786	0.1991
		RMSE	0.5292	0.3705	0.2242	0.1006	0.1786	0.1732	0.1798	0.2064
	MSII-FM-A	Poly.	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th
		Mean	1.1785	1.1803	1.1805	1.1588	0.9740	0.9723	0.9725	0.9667
		SD	0.1768	0.1772	0.1773	0.1750	0.2100	0.2123	0.2133	0.2165
RMSE		0.2512	0.2528	0.2530	0.2363	0.2116	0.2141	0.2150	0.2191	
SE		–	0.1688	0.1689	0.1679	–	0.1869	0.1871	0.1891	
CR		–	87%	87%	90%	–	92%	92%	92%	
MSII-FM-B	Mean	1.1791	1.1803	1.1805	1.1587	0.9272	0.9710	0.9714	0.9654	
	SD	0.1770	0.1772	0.1773	0.1750	0.2114	0.2153	0.2160	0.2185	
	RMSE	0.2518	0.2528	0.2530	0.2363	0.2236	0.2173	0.2179	0.2212	
	SE	–	0.1688	0.1689	0.1679	–	0.1866	0.1868	0.1887	
	CR	–	87%	87%	90%	–	90%	90%	91%	
		K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8
(2000, 2000)	OLS*	Mean	0.9997				1.0009			
		SD	0.0116				0.0405			
		RMSE	0.0116				0.0406			
		SE	0.0116				0.0415			
		CR	95%				95%			
			K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4
	MSOLS-A	Mean	0.5365	0.6953	0.8374	0.9698	1.0429	1.0200	1.0000	0.9811
		SD	0.0350	0.0372	0.0421	0.0502	0.1095	0.1049	0.1071	0.1160
		RMSE	0.4648	0.3070	0.1680	0.0586	0.1176	0.1068	0.1071	0.1175
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.5365	0.6953	0.8374	0.9699	1.0192	1.0020	0.9844	0.9656
		SD	0.0351	0.0372	0.0421	0.0503	0.1105	0.1055	0.1077	0.1171
		RMSE	0.4648	0.3069	0.1679	0.0587	0.1121	0.1055	0.1089	0.1220
	MSII-FM-A	Poly.	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th
		Mean	1.1229	1.1242	1.1243	1.1132	0.9787	0.9778	0.9776	0.9752
		SD	0.0932	0.0933	0.0933	0.0924	0.1250	0.1254	0.1256	0.1274
RMSE		0.1543	0.1553	0.1554	0.1461	0.1268	0.1274	0.1276	0.1298	
SE		–	0.0894	0.0894	0.0892	–	0.1183	0.1183	0.1198	
CR		–	63%	63%	69%	–	87%	87%	88%	
MSII-FM-B	Mean	1.1230	1.1242	1.1243	1.1131	0.9548	0.9774	0.9772	0.9753	
	SD	0.0933	0.0933	0.0933	0.0924	0.1258	0.1267	0.1269	0.1288	
	RMSE	0.1544	0.1553	0.1554	0.1461	0.1337	0.1287	0.1289	0.1312	
	SE	–	0.0894	0.0894	0.0892	–	0.1182	0.1182	0.1196	
	CR	–	63%	63%	69%	–	86%	86%	87%	
		K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4	8

(continued on next page)

As in the case for $d_3 = 1$, employing $W_{i,j(i)}$ or $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ has little effect on MSOLS or MSII-FM; although the extra second-order bias generated by switching Z_i to $Z_{j(i)}$ is $O_p(n^{-1/2})$, its effect appears to be minor at best.

Even after the number of matching variables increases, the general tendency remains unchanged. Performance of MSOLS varies with K . MSII-FM successfully corrects the bias generated by MSOLS, at the expense of precision in estimation. Standard deviations of MSII-FM are close to that of the initial MSII, which reflects that the FM procedure corrects the second-order bias of MSII without inflating the variance. However, FM works only for $K = 1$. The rationale could be that FM requires both the initial MSII and second-order bias estimates to be of good quality. This requirement is unlikely to be satisfied with many matches, which include poor ones and thus inevitably affect the performance of MSII-FM. In terms of the power-series approximation, results from the second- and third-order polynomials look similar, and those from the fourth-order polynomial differ slightly. Coverage accuracy in estimates of β_{22} may be a concern. However, based on the results

for larger samples (reported in the Supplement), it seems that the under-coverage is due to finite-sample bias of MSII-FM.

(c) For $d_3 = 3$:. In Panel (c), only results of MSII-FM for $K = 1$ are provided again in view of quality. An apparent difference is that once the number of matching variables increases to three, results from using $W_{i,j(i)}$ or $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ differ substantially for each of MSOLS and MSII-FM. Observe that MSII-FM using $W_{i,j(i)}$ exhibits much better finite-sample properties. In contrast, MSII-FM based on $W_{i,j(i)}^\dagger$ generates considerable biases in estimates of γ . The extra second-order bias when $Z_{j(i)}$ is used in place of Z_i becomes as slow as $O_p(n^{-1/3})$, and its adverse effect is no longer negligible in finite samples. Coverage rates of MSII-FM are improved from those for $d_3 = 2$. In terms of the series approximation, results from the second- and third-order polynomials are again similar. However, those from the fourth-order polynomial look inferior in the presence of non-smoothness in $g_{22}(\cdot)$, in particular, for Model B.

Table 1 (continued)

Panel (c): $d_3 = 3$										
(n, m)	Estimator		β_{22}				γ_1			
(1000, 1000)	OLS*	Mean	0.9994				0.9997			
		SD	0.0135				0.0580			
		RMSE	0.0135				0.0580			
		\overline{SE}	0.0139				0.0585			
		CR	96%				96%			
			K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4
	MSOLS-A	Mean	0.2193	0.3687	0.5758	0.8942	1.1498	1.0658	0.9978	0.9333
		SD	0.0748	0.0887	0.1163	0.1528	0.3103	0.3050	0.3246	0.3601
		RMSE	0.7843	0.6375	0.4398	0.1859	0.3445	0.3121	0.3246	0.3663
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.2205	0.3703	0.5788	0.8994	0.6439	0.6835	0.6775	0.6299
		SD	0.0755	0.0895	0.1168	0.1542	0.3176	0.3146	0.3406	0.3837
		RMSE	0.7832	0.6360	0.4371	0.1842	0.4772	0.4463	0.4691	0.5332
	MSII-FM-A	Poly.	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th
		Mean	1.1151	1.0889	1.0901	1.0651	0.9763	0.9550	0.9534	0.9404
		SD	0.4064	0.4009	0.4005	0.3953	0.3698	0.3751	0.3770	0.3712
RMSE		0.4224	0.4106	0.4105	0.4007	0.3705	0.3778	0.3799	0.3760	
\overline{SE}		–	0.3718	0.3726	0.3669	–	0.3288	0.3304	0.3245	
CR		–	92%	92%	91%	–	85%	85%	86%	
MSII-FM-B	Mean	1.1217	1.0890	1.0903	1.0649	0.4709	0.8358	0.8318	0.8200	
	SD	0.4099	0.4012	0.4009	0.3954	0.3777	0.4210	0.4249	0.4136	
	RMSE	0.4275	0.4110	0.4110	0.4007	0.6501	0.4519	0.4570	0.4511	
	\overline{SE}	–	0.3722	0.3730	0.3673	–	0.3273	0.3290	0.3200	
	CR	–	92%	92%	91%	–	77%	77%	76%	
(2000, 2000)	OLS*	Mean	1.0002				0.9991			
		SD	0.0096				0.0419			
		RMSE	0.0096				0.0419			
		\overline{SE}	0.0099				0.0415			
		CR	96%				94%			
			K	1	2	4	8	1	2	4
	MSOLS-A	Mean	0.2994	0.4653	0.6632	0.9149	1.1037	1.0492	0.9910	0.9347
		SD	0.0454	0.0541	0.0657	0.0877	0.2007	0.1904	0.1946	0.2169
		RMSE	0.7021	0.5374	0.3432	0.1222	0.2259	0.1967	0.1948	0.2265
	MSOLS-B	Mean	0.3003	0.4664	0.6648	0.9175	0.7534	0.7911	0.7804	0.7366
		SD	0.0459	0.0546	0.0664	0.0886	0.2033	0.1931	0.1977	0.2235
		RMSE	0.7012	0.5364	0.3417	0.1211	0.3195	0.2845	0.2955	0.3454
	MSII-FM-A	Poly.	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th	(initial)	2nd	3rd	4th
		Mean	1.0576	1.0477	1.0481	1.0191	0.9800	0.9667	0.9663	0.9617
		SD	0.1826	0.1816	0.1818	0.1787	0.2277	0.2305	0.2307	0.2239
RMSE		0.1915	0.1877	0.1881	0.1797	0.2286	0.2328	0.2332	0.2271	
\overline{SE}		–	0.1800	0.1802	0.1771	–	0.1985	0.1989	0.1961	
CR		–	97%	97%	96%	–	90%	90%	91%	
MSII-FM-B	Mean	1.0608	1.0477	1.0481	1.0189	0.6300	0.9094	0.9094	0.9032	
	SD	0.1840	0.1817	0.1819	0.1788	0.2328	0.2526	0.2530	0.2438	
	RMSE	0.1938	0.1879	0.1882	0.1798	0.4371	0.2683	0.2687	0.2623	
	\overline{SE}	–	0.1801	0.1802	0.1772	–	0.1996	0.2000	0.1955	
	CR	–	96%	96%	96%	–	84%	85%	85%	

Note: Mean = simulation average of the parameter estimate; SD = simulation standard deviation of the parameter estimate; RMSE = root mean-squared error of the parameter estimate; \overline{SE} = simulation average of the standard error; and CR = coverage rate for the nominal 95% confidence interval.

(d) Summary: Simulation results confirm that the bias-corrected estimation proposed in this paper works reasonably well. Simulation averages of MSII(-FM) for $d_3 = 1$ ($d_3 = 2, 3$) tend to be closer to the truths as n increases, even in the most difficult case. Judging from the Monte Carlo evidence, we recommend setting $K = 1$, employing $W_{i,j(i)}$ as the regressor, and applying the second- or third-order polynomials for the series approximation in MSII-FM. It follows that making MSOLS consistent by use of K -NN method (i.e., by letting K diverge at a slower rate than n and m) does not appear to be a solution in the setting of matched sample estimation. Rather, it looks promising to pursue the strategy of constructing a matched sample based on a single match and then correcting the non-negligible bias of the estimate analytically.

5. An empirical application: Returns to schooling

We now apply our proposed estimation methods to a version of Mincer’s (1974) wage regression. As argued in Card (1995),

the estimation result may suffer from the “ability bias” unless it includes a variable representing ability as a regressor. Therefore, we consider the following wage regression

$$\log(wage) = \beta_0 + \beta_1educ + \beta_2exper + \beta_3exper^2 + \beta_4abil + \beta_5feduc + \beta_6meduc + \beta_7black + \beta_8smsa + \beta_9south + u, \tag{6}$$

where $educ$ is years of education, $exper$ is work experience, $abil$ is an ability measure, $feduc$ and $meduc$ are years of father’s and mother’s education, and $black$, $smsa$ and $south$ are indicator variables that take one if the individual is black, lives in the urban area and south, respectively.

We estimate regression (6) using three data sets, namely, those used in Card (1995), Blackburn and Neumark (1992), and Heckman et al. (2000). The data sets are available under the names “card”, “wage2” and “htv”, respectively, as supplemental materials for Wooldridge (2013). Each of the three data sets is drawn from the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) and contains some ability

Table 2
Estimation results of wage regressions with ability measures.

Dependent variable: log (wage)					
Regressors	(1) OLS*	(2) MSOLS	(3) MSII-FM	(4) MSOLS	(5) MSII-FM
<i>educ</i>	0.0612 (0.0054)	0.0736 (0.0050)	0.0690 (0.0074)	0.0724 (0.0050)	0.0693 (0.0165)
<i>exper</i>	0.0787 (0.0084)	0.0875 (0.0082)	0.0847 (0.0083)	0.0876 (0.0081)	0.0876 (0.0082)
<i>exper</i> ²	−0.0022 (0.0004)	−0.0023 (0.0004)	−0.0022 (0.0004)	−0.0023 (0.0004)	−0.0023 (0.0004)
<i>abil</i>	0.0056 (0.0013)	−0.0007 (0.0014)	0.0016 (0.0046)	0.0006 (0.0049)	0.0070 (0.0356)
<i>feduc</i>	−0.0018 (0.0031)	−0.0006 (0.0031)	−0.0007 (0.0031)	−0.0007 (0.0032)	−0.0010 (0.0038)
<i>meduc</i>	0.0071 (0.0037)	0.0080 (0.0037)	0.0073 (0.0039)	0.0079 (0.0037)	0.0072 (0.0041)
<i>black</i>	−0.1321 (0.0258)	−0.1664 (0.0259)	−0.1559 (0.0331)	−0.1630 (0.0249)	−0.1607 (0.0283)
<i>smsa</i>	0.1517 (0.0179)	0.1602 (0.0183)	0.1576 (0.0186)	0.1595 (0.0181)	0.1612 (0.0198)
<i>south</i>	−0.1111 (0.0178)	−0.1126 (0.0179)	−0.1125 (0.0178)	−0.1125 (0.0180)	−0.1104 (0.0216)
<i>intercept</i>	4.6861 (0.0841)	4.6491 (0.0861)	4.6540 (0.1107)	4.6425 (0.0849)	4.6818 (0.1945)
<i>abil?</i>	<i>kww</i>	<i>kww</i>	<i>kww</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>
Matching?	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
(<i>n</i> , <i>m</i>)	(2191, −)	(2191, 466)	(2191, 466)	(2191, 589)	(2191, 589)

Note: Numbers in parentheses are standard errors. White's (1980) heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors are calculated for OLS*, whereas 'standard errors' for MSOLS are square-roots of diagonal elements of $\hat{Q}_W^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{11} \hat{Q}_W^{-1} / n$.

measure; to be precise, while both *card* and *wage2* include scores of IQ and Knowledge of the World of Work (*kww*) tests, *htv* has the "g" measure constructed from 10 component tests of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery.

We conduct two exercises that address the following questions:

- (Q1) How would the estimation result change if *kww* in *card* were missing and instead taken from *wage2*?
- (Q2) What would happen if *kww* in *card* were replaced by *g* from *htv*?

For these exercises, the OLS result using 2191 male observations in *card* with *kww* chosen as *abil* can be viewed as the benchmark result from the infeasible OLS*. Because each of Q1 and Q2 requires a matched sample, we regard *card* as S_1 and *wage2* or *htv* as S_2 . The NNM is made in the following manner. When *wage2* is employed as S_2 , (*educ*, *feduc*, *meduc*, *black*, *smsa*, *south*) are chosen as matching variables, where the first three variables are treated as continuous. On the other hand, *htv* contains only white-male observations. Accordingly, when using it as S_2 , we choose five matching variables excluding *black*. Not surprisingly, there are several ties of the matching variables in S_2 . Then, we take an average of *kww* or *g* within ties and assign the average as the unique value of the ability measure to each combination of matching variables. As a consequence, 466 and 589 distinct combinations of matching variables remain in male samples of *wage2* and *htv*, respectively. In both cases, the NNM is based on the Mahalanobis metric, and we set the number of matches $K = 1$ (single match) based on the simulation results.

Given the matched sample, we estimate (6) by MSOLS and MSII-FM. Specifically, MSOLS-A and MSII-FM-A (i.e., estimators with $W_{i,j(i)}$ used as the regressor) are chosen, and the third-order polynomial is applied for the power-series approximation of MSII-FM, again based on the simulation results; estimation results from second- and fourth-order polynomials are qualitatively similar.

Table 2 presents estimation results and standard errors (in parentheses). White's (1980) heteroskedasticity-robust standard

errors are computed for OLS*, whereas 'standard errors' for MSOLS are square-roots of diagonal elements of $\hat{Q}_W^{-1} \hat{\Sigma}_{11} \hat{Q}_W^{-1} / n := \hat{Q}_W^{-1} (\hat{\Sigma}_{11A} + \hat{\Sigma}_{11B}) \hat{Q}_W^{-1} / n$, where

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{11B} = \frac{n}{m} \left[\left(\hat{\beta}'_{2,II} \hat{\Sigma}_2 \hat{\beta}_{2,II} \right) \bar{W} \bar{W}' + \frac{1}{K^2} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \left(\hat{\beta}'_{2,II} \hat{\Sigma}_2 \hat{\beta}_{2,II} \right) \hat{V}_{g_2} + 2 \left\{ \hat{\Gamma}(-1) + \hat{\Gamma}(1) \right\}, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \right]$$

for (*n*, *m*) given in the corresponding column of Table 2. The latter should be interpreted with caution; because $\hat{\theta}_{OLS}$ is inconsistent (and even its convergence rate is slower than the parametric one), the numbers merely indicate measures of dispersion at the same scale as other estimates and are not intended for inference.

The benchmark OLS* result using *card* is provided in the first column. Signs of the coefficient estimates on *educ*, *exper*, *exper*², and *abil* (= *kww*) are as expected, and they are significant at the 5% level. To answer Q1, we run MSOLS and MSII-FM using the matched sample with *wage2*. The results are reported in columns 2 and 3. Signs of the coefficient estimates by MSII-FM are the same as those by OLS*. On the other hand, MSOLS overestimates returns to schooling due to failure to correct for matching results. It also yields a negative estimate of the ability effect, whereas the one from MSII-FM is positive (but insignificant due to the large standard error).

Furthermore, to answer Q2, we replace the ability measure with *g* by constructing the matched sample with *htv*. Results from MSOLS and MSII-FM using this sample are presented in columns 4 and 5. There is still the tendency that MSII-FM estimates are closer to those of OLS*. MSOLS again tends to inflate returns to schooling. The estimated ability effect turns positive, but its magnitude is much smaller than the one from MSII-FM.

6. Conclusion

Regression estimation using samples constructed via the NNM from two sources is not uncommon in applied economics. This

paper has demonstrated that such OLS estimators are generally inconsistent, and thus an appropriate bias correction is required. It has also been shown that the convergence rate to the probability limit of the OLS depends on the number of matching variables and the divergence pattern of two sample sizes.

Two versions of bias-corrected estimators have been proposed, and each can be interpreted as a variant of indirect inference estimators. The MSII estimator attains the parametric convergence rate for the cases with at most two matching variables, whereas the MSII-FM estimator achieves the parametric convergence rate when the number of matching variables does not exceed four. Monte Carlo results suggest that a small number of matches work well in practice, and in particular, we should consider the single match when the number of matching variables is two or three.

The paper aims at providing corrections for an established practice, which is to run (parametric) OLS ignoring imputation. In particular, our proposal for MSII-FM is based on a nonparametric series estimation of $g_2(Z) = E(X_2|Z)$. The nonparametric estimator is employed only when the curse of dimensionality in matching variables prevents MSII from attaining parametric convergence. Alternatively, it is possible to use a nonparametric estimate of $g_2(Z)$ as a (generated) regressor in place of X_2 in regression (1) from the beginning. As illustrated in Section 2.4, this would result in a partially linear semiparametric model with a measurement error problem. There could be several different (nonparametric) estimators available for the model of this class. However, such estimators are not as widely used in practice as the OLS, and hence we leave the development of the estimators for future work.

Several other extensions would be fruitful. First, we may adopt propensity score matching as a means of dimension reduction using multiple matching variables. This would involve using the observable variables to estimate a selection model for observations that are imputed, and obtaining the (imputation) propensity score. In a closely related paper, Abadie and Imbens (2016) deliver asymptotic properties of the matching estimators of ATE using an estimated propensity score as a plug-in. It may be worth pursuing a similar idea for matched-sample regression estimation.

Second, combining our matched-sample estimation theory with IV/GMM estimation would be also of interest in the presence of endogeneity in regressors. This is particularly relevant to empirical studies using earnings data, which are thought to include measurement errors and imputation biases.

Finally, the estimation theory may be extended to kernel estimation of varying coefficient models using matched samples. It is not difficult to see that kernel estimators of the varying coefficients are also inconsistent, and appropriate bias-correction methods similar to those proposed in this paper are worth investigating.

Appendix A. Technical proofs

A.1. A useful lemma

Before proceeding, we present a lemma about the error bounds from NNM, which is repeatedly applied in the technical proofs below. To do so, we provide the formal definition of the matching discrepancy from Abadie and Imbens (2006).

Let $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a fixed value of the matching variable Z , where, in practice, z is one of $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ in S_1 . Then, the k th closest matching discrepancy $U_k = U_k(z)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$ is defined as $U_k := Z_{j_k(z)} - z$ if $Z_{j_k(z)}$ is the k th closest match to z among all $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^m$ in S_2 . The following lemma states uniform moment bounds of the matching discrepancy.

Lemma A.1 (Abadie and Imbens, 2006, Lemma 2). *If Assumptions 1–2 hold, then all the moments of $m^{1/d_3} \|U_k\|$ are uniformly bounded in m and $z \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

A.2. Proof of Theorem 1

The proof requires the following lemma.

Lemma A.2. *If Assumptions 1–3 hold, then $B_{R_{W2}} = O(m^{-1/d_3}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$.*

A.2.1. Proof of Lemma A.2

Consider the identity $B_{R_{W2}} \equiv E(B_{R_{W2}}) + \{B_{R_{W2}} - E(B_{R_{W2}})\}$. It follows from Assumption 1, Lipschitz continuity of g_2 , the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and Lemma A.1 that $\|E(m^{1/d_3} B_{R_{W2}})\| < \infty$, and thus $E(B_{R_{W2}}) = O(m^{-1/d_3})$. Similarly, we have $\text{Var}(n^{1/2} m^{1/d_3} \|B_{R_{W2}}\|) < \infty$ so that

$$B_{R_{W2}} = O(m^{-1/d_3}) + o_p(n^{-1/2} m^{-1/d_3}) = O(m^{-1/d_3}) + o_p(n^{-1/2}). \quad \blacksquare$$

A.2.2. Proof of Theorem 1

It is easy to see from (2) that $\hat{R}_W := \hat{Q}_W \theta + B_{R_{W1}} + B_{R_{W2}} + E_{R_W}$, where

$$B_{R_{W1}} = E(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)}),$$

$$B_{R_{W2}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} \lambda_{i,j(i)}, \text{ and}$$

$$E_{R_W} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)} - E(W_{i,j(i)} \epsilon_{i,j(i)})\}.$$

It follows that $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} := \theta + B_{OLS1} + B_{OLS2} + E_{OLS}$, where $B_{OLS1} = \hat{Q}_W^{-1} B_{R_{W1}}$, $B_{OLS2} = \hat{Q}_W^{-1} B_{R_{W2}}$ and $E_{OLS} = \hat{Q}_W^{-1} E_{R_W}$ correspond to the first-order (or leading) bias, the second-order bias due to the matching discrepancy and the weighted average of errors, respectively.

We begin with evaluating B_{OLS1} . First note that $E(X_{1i} \eta'_{2i}) = E\{g_1(Z) \eta'_2\} + E(\eta_1 \eta'_2) = 0_{d_1 \times d_2}$, $E(X_{2j(i)} \eta'_{2j(i)}) = (1/K) \Sigma_2$, and that the i th and $j_k(i)$ th observations are independent. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} B_{R_{W1}} &= \begin{bmatrix} 0_{(d_1+1) \times 1} \\ -(1/K) \Sigma_2 \beta_2 \\ 0_{d_3 \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= -\frac{1}{K} \text{diag}\{0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, \Sigma_2, 0_{d_3 \times d_3}\} \theta \\ &:= -\frac{1}{K} \Sigma \theta. \end{aligned}$$

Because $\hat{Q}_W = Q_W + O_p(n^{-1/2})$, we obtain

$B_{OLS1} = -(1/K) Q_W^{-1} \Sigma \theta + O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Next, Lemma A.2 implies that $B_{OLS2} = O(m^{-1/d_3}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Finally, $E_{R_W} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ by CLT, and thus $E_{OLS} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Therefore, $\hat{\theta}_{OLS} = Q_W^{-1} P_W \theta + O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2})$ by denoting $P_W := Q_W - (1/K) \Sigma$. \blacksquare

A.3. Proof of Theorem 2

The proof requires the following lemma.

Lemma A.3. *If Assumptions 1–3 hold, then $\hat{\Sigma}_2$ and B_{Σ_2} admit the expansions $\hat{\Sigma}_2 - B_{\Sigma_2} = \Sigma_2 + O_p(m^{-1/2})$ and $B_{\Sigma_2} = O(m^{-2/d_3}) + o_p(m^{-1/2})$.*

A.3.1. Proof of Lemma A.3

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_2 &= \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta X_{2(j)} \Delta X'_{2(j)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta \eta_{2(j)} \Delta \eta'_{2(j)} + \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta \eta_{2(j)} \Delta g'_{2(j)} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta g_{2(j)} \Delta \eta'_{2(j)} + \frac{1}{2(m-1)} \sum_{j=2}^m \Delta g_{2(j)} \Delta g'_{2(j)} \\ &= S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_4 \text{ (say).} \end{aligned}$$

As in the proof of Lemma A.2, consider the identity $S_i \equiv E(S_i) + \{S_i - E(S_i)\}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$. First, $S_1 = E(S_1) + \{S_1 - E(S_1)\} = \Sigma_2 + O_p(m^{-1/2})$. Second, for S_4 , it follows from Lipschitz continuity of $g_2(\cdot)$ in Assumption 3(ii) that the order of magnitude in $\|E(S_4)\|$ is determined by $E\left\{\sum_{j=2}^m \|\Delta Z_{(j)}\|^2\right\}/\{2(m-1)\}$. Because the re-ordered sample $\{Z_{(j)}\}_{j=1}^m$ is constructed by the nearest-neighbor algorithm in accordance with Yatchew (1997), we may apply the moment approximation in Theorem 5.4 of Evans et al. (2002) to obtain $E\left\{\sum_{j=2}^m \|\Delta Z_{(j)}\|^2\right\}/\{2(m-1)\} = O(m^{-2/d_3})$ so that $E(S_4) = O(m^{-2/d_3})$. Also $\text{Var}(m^{1/2+2/d_3} \|S_4\|) < \infty$ by the theorem, and thus $S_4 = O(m^{-2/d_3}) + O_p(m^{-(1/2+2/d_3)}) = O(m^{-2/d_3}) + o_p(m^{-1/2})$. Third, for S_2 and S_3 , we have $E(S_2) = E(S_3) = 0_{d_2 \times d_2}$. Because, by a similar argument to above, $\text{Var}(m^{1/2+1/d_3} \|S_3\|)$, $\text{Var}(m^{1/2+1/d_3} \|S_3\|) < \infty$, each of S_2 and S_3 is $O_p(m^{-(1/2+1/d_3)}) = o_p(m^{-1/2})$. Finally, rewriting S_4 as B_{Σ_2} yields the stated result. ■

A.3.2. Proof of Theorem 2

By the proof of Theorem 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_W &= \left(\hat{Q}_W - \frac{1}{K} \Sigma\right) \theta + B_{R_W2} + E_{R_W} \\ &= \hat{P}_W \theta + B_{R_W2} + \frac{1}{K} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \theta + E_{R_W}. \end{aligned}$$

It also follows from Lemma A.3 that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{K} (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \theta \\ &= \frac{1}{K} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, (\hat{\Sigma}_2 - B_{\Sigma_2}) - \Sigma_2, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \theta \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{K} \text{diag} \left\{ 0_{(d_1+1) \times (d_1+1)}, B_{\Sigma_2}, 0_{d_3 \times d_3} \right\} \theta \\ &= O_p(m^{-1/2}) + \{O(m^{-2/d_3}) + o_p(m^{-1/2})\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term on the right-hand side is denoted as E_{Σ_2} hereinafter. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\theta}_{II} &= \hat{P}_W^{-1} \hat{R}_W \\ &= \theta + B_{MD} + B_{\Sigma} + \hat{P}_W^{-1} E_{R_W} + \hat{P}_W^{-1} E_{\Sigma_2} \\ &= \theta + \{O(m^{-1/d_3}) + o_p(n^{-1/2})\} + \{O(m^{-2/d_3}) + o_p(m^{-1/2})\} \\ &\quad + O_p(n^{-1/2}) + O_p(m^{-1/2}) \xrightarrow{p} \theta. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

A.4. Proof of Theorem 3

To save space, we only demonstrate asymptotic normality results depending on the divergence pattern of (n, m) ; see Section A of the Supplement for detailed derivation of asymptotic variances V_I, V_{II} and V_{III} . It follows from (A.1) that if $n/m \rightarrow \kappa$, then

$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_I)$, where

$$V_I := P_W^{-1} \lim_{\substack{n, m \rightarrow \infty \\ n/m \rightarrow \kappa}} \text{Var} \left\{ \sqrt{n} (E_{R_W} + E_{\Sigma_2}) \right\} P_W^{-1}.$$

Alternatively, if $n/m \rightarrow 0$, then $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{II})$, where

$$V_{II} := P_W^{-1} \lim_{\substack{n, m \rightarrow \infty \\ n/m \rightarrow 0}} \text{Var} (\sqrt{n} E_{R_W}) P_W^{-1}.$$

Finally, if $n/m \rightarrow \infty$, then $\sqrt{m}(\hat{\theta}_{II} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_{III})$, where

$$V_{III} := P_W^{-1} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} (\sqrt{m} E_{\Sigma_2}) P_W^{-1}. \quad \blacksquare$$

A.5. Proof of Corollary 1

Because the corollary is a straightforward outcome of Theorem 3, its proof is omitted. ■

A.6. Proof of Theorem 4

The proof requires the following lemma.

Lemma A.4. If Assumptions 1–7 hold, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left| \hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)} - \lambda_{i,j(i)} \right| \\ &= \begin{cases} o_p(n^{-1/2}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 3, 4 \\ o_p(m^{-1/2}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

A.6.1. Proof of Lemma A.4

It is easy to see that $\hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)} := R_{1i} + R_{2i} + R_{3i} + \lambda_{i,j(i)}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} R_{1i} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} [\{\hat{g}_2(Z_i) - g_2(Z_i)\} - \{\hat{g}_2(Z_j) - g_2(Z_j)\}]' (\hat{\beta}_{II,2}^{(1)} - \beta_2), \\ R_{2i} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} [\{\hat{g}_2(Z_i) - g_2(Z_i)\} - \{\hat{g}_2(Z_j) - g_2(Z_j)\}]' \beta_2, \text{ and} \\ R_{3i} &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}_K(i)} \{g_2(Z_i) - g_2(Z_j)\}' (\hat{\beta}_{II,2}^{(1)} - \beta_2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the proof is boiled down to demonstrating that each of $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |R_{\ell i}|$, $\ell = 1, 2, 3$ is bounded by either $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ or $o_p(m^{-1/2})$, depending on the divergence pattern of (n, m) and d_3 .

We first work on R_{3i} . To derive the bounds for R_{1i} and R_{3i} , we may apply (A.1) to obtain

$$\hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)} = \theta + \begin{cases} O(n^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \\ O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2}) \\ \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 3, 4 \\ O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(m^{-1/2}) \\ \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \end{cases}$$

It follows from Lemma A.1 and Lipschitz continuity of $g_2(\cdot)$ that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |R_{3i}|$ is bounded by

$$\begin{cases} O_p(m^{-1/d_3}) \{O(n^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2})\} \\ \quad = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \\ O_p(m^{-1/d_3}) \{O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(n^{-1/2})\} \\ \quad = o_p(n^{-1/2}) \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 3, 4 \\ O_p(m^{-1/d_3}) \{O(m^{-1/d_3}) + O_p(m^{-1/2})\} \\ \quad = o_p(m^{-1/2}) \quad \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \end{cases}$$

The remaining task is to demonstrate that for $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| \left\{ \hat{g}_2(Z_i) - g_2(Z_i) \right\} - \left\{ \hat{g}_2(Z_{j_k(i)}) - g_2(Z_{j_k(i)}) \right\} \right\| \\ &= \begin{cases} o_p(n^{-1/2}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \kappa \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \text{ or} \\ & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow 0 \text{ and } d_3 = 3, 4 \\ o_p(m^{-1/2}) & \text{if } n/m \rightarrow \infty \text{ and } d_3 = 2, 3 \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.2}) \end{aligned}$$

However, Lemma A.2 of Abadie and Imbens (2011) holds under Assumptions 1–7. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \left\| \left\{ \hat{g}_{2r}(Z_i) - \hat{g}_{2r}(Z_{j_k(i)}) \right\} - \left\{ g_{2r}(Z_i) - g_{2r}(Z_{j_k(i)}) \right\} \right\| \\ &= o_p(m^{-1/2}), \quad r = 1, \dots, d_2, \end{aligned}$$

and thus (A.2) immediately follows. Then, each of $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |R_{1i}|$ and $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |R_{2i}|$ is also bounded by either $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ or $o_p(m^{-1/2})$. This completes the proof. ■

A.6.2. Proof of Theorem 4

To save space, we focus on the case in which $n/m \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, \infty)$ and $d_3 = 2, 3$. Observe that $\hat{\theta}_{II-FM} := \hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)} - \hat{B}_{MD} := \hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)} - (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n W_{i,j(i)} \hat{\lambda}_{i,j(i)}$. By Theorem 3, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_{II}^{(1)} - \theta - B_{MD} - B_{\Sigma}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_I)$. Lemma A.4 implies that $\|B_{MD} - \hat{B}_{MD}\| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Then, $\sqrt{n} \left\{ (B_{MD} - \hat{B}_{MD}) + B_{\Sigma} \right\} = o_p(1)$, and thus the result immediately follows. ■

A.7. Proof of Proposition 1

The proof is obvious in light of Section A of the Supplement and thus omitted. ■

Appendix B. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2017.07.006>.

References

- Abadie, A., Imbens, G.W., 2006. Large sample properties of matching estimators for average treatment effects. *Econometrica* 74, 235–267.
- Abadie, A., Imbens, G.W., 2011. Bias-corrected matching estimators for average treatment effects. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* 29, 1–11.
- Abadie, A., Imbens, G.W., 2012. A martingale representation for matching estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 107, 833–843.
- Abadie, A., Imbens, G.W., 2016. Matching on the estimated propensity score. *Econometrica* 84, 781–807.
- Angrist, J.D., Krueger, A.B., 1992. The effect of age at school entry on educational attainment: An application of instrumental variables with moments from two samples. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 87, 328–336.
- Angrist, J.D., Krueger, A.B., 1995. Split-sample instrumental variables estimates of the return to schooling. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* 13, 225–235.
- Arellano, M., Meghir, C., 1992. Female labour supply and on the job search: An Empirical model estimated using complementary data sets. *Rev. Econom. Stud.* 59, 537–559.
- Björklund, J., Jäntti, M., 1997. Intergenerational income mobility in Sweden compared to the United States. *Am. Econ. Rev.* 87, 1009–1018.
- Blackburn, M., Neumark, D., 1992. Unobserved ability, efficiency wages, and inter-industry wage differentials. *Quart. J. Econ.* 107, 1421–1436.
- Bollinger, C.R., Hirsch, B.T., 2006. Match bias from earnings imputation in the current population survey: The case of imperfect matching. *J. Labor Econ.* 24, 483–519.
- Borjas, G.J., 2004. Food insecurity and public assistance. *J. Publ. Econ.* 88, 1421–1443.
- Bostic, R., Gabriel, S., Painter, G., 2009. Housing wealth, financial wealth, and consumption: New evidence from micro data. *Reg. Sci. Urban Econ.* 39, 79–89.
- Bover, O., 2005. Wealth Effects on Consumption: Microeconomic Estimates from the Spanish Survey of Household Finances. *Documentos de Trabajo No.0522*, Banco de España.

- Busso, M., DiNardo, J., McCrary, J., 2014. New evidence on the finite sample properties of propensity score reweighting and matching estimators. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 96, 885–897.
- Card, D., 1995. Using geographic variation in college proximity to estimate the return to schooling. In: Christophides, L.N., Grant, E.K., Swidinsky, R. (Eds.), *Aspects of Labour Market Behavior: Essays in Honour of John Vanderkamp*. University of Toronto Press, Toronto, pp. 201–222.
- Carrasco, M., Florens, J.-P., 2002. Simulation-based method of moments and efficiency. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* 20, 482–492.
- Chen, J., Shao, H., 2001. Jackknife variance estimation for nearest-neighbor imputation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* 96, 260–269.
- Currie, J., Yelowitz, A., 2000. Are public housing projects good for kids? *J. Publ. Econ.* 75, 99–124.
- Dee, T.S., Evans, W.N., 2003. Teen drinking and educational attainment: Evidence from two-sample instrumental variables estimates. *J. Labor Econ.* 21, 178–209.
- Donoho, D.L., Johnstone, I.M., 1994. Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *Biometrika* 81, 425–455.
- Evans, D., Jones, A.J., Schmidt, W.M., 2002. Asymptotic moments of near-neighbour distance distributions. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* 458, 2839–2849.
- Fujii, T., 2008. Two-Sample Estimation of Poverty Rates for Disabled People: An Application to Tanzania. Singapore Management University Economics & Statistics Working Paper No.02-2008.
- Gouriéroux, C., Monfort, A., Renault, E., 1993. Indirect inference. *J. Appl. Econometrics* 8, S85–S118.
- Heckman, J., Tobias, J.L., Vytlacil, E., 2000. Simple Estimators for Treatment Parameters in a Latent Variable Framework with an Application to Estimating the Return to Schooling. NBER Working Paper No.7950.
- Hellerstein, J.K., Imbens, G.W., 1999. Imposing moment restrictions from auxiliary data by weighting. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 81, 1–14.
- Hirsch, B.T., Schumacher, E.J., 2004. Match bias in wage gap estimates due to earnings imputation. *J. Labor Econ.* 22, 689–722.
- Horowitz, J.L., Spokoiny, V.G., 2001. An adaptive, rate-optimal test of a parametric mean-regression model against a nonparametric alternative. *Econometrica* 69, 599–631.
- Imbens, G.W., Lancaster, T., 1994. Combining micro and macro data in microeconomic models. *Rev. Econom. Stud.* 61, 655–680.
- Inoue, A., Solon, G., 2010. Two-sample instrumental variables estimators. *Rev. Econ. Stat.* 92, 557–561.
- Little, R.J.A., Rubin, D.B., 2002. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*, second ed. John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Lusardi, A., 1996. Permanent income, current income, and consumption: Evidence from two panel data sets. *J. Bus. Econom. Statist.* 14, 81–90.
- Mincer, J.A., 1974. Schooling, Experience and Earnings. National Bureau of Economic Research, New York.
- Murtazashvili, I., Liu, D., Prokhorov, A., 2015. Two-sample nonparametric estimation of intergenerational income mobility in the United States and Sweden. *Can. J. Econ.* 48, 1733–1761.
- Pagan, A., 1984. Econometric issues in the analysis of regressions with generated regressors. *Internat. Econom. Rev.* 25, 221–247.
- Phillips, P.C.B., Hansen, B.E., 1990. Statistical inference in instrumental variables regression with I(1) processes. *Rev. Econom. Stud.* 57, 99–125.
- Prokhorov, A., Schmidt, P., 2009. GMM redundancy results for general missing data problems. *J. Econometrics* 151, 47–55.
- Rice, J., 1984. Bandwidth choice for nonparametric regression. *Ann. Statist.* 12, 1215–1230.
- Ridder, G., Moffitt, R., 2007. The econometrics of data combination. In: Heckman, J.J., Leamer, E.E. (Eds.), *Handbook of Econometrics*, Vol. 6, Part B. Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp. 5469–5547 (Chapter 75).
- Robinson, P.M., 1988. Root-N-consistent semiparametric regression. *Econometrica* 56, 931–954.
- Shao, J., Wang, H., 2008. Confidence intervals based on survey data with nearest neighbor imputation. *Statist. Sinica* 18, 281–297.
- Smith, J.A., Todd, P.E., 2005. Does matching overcome LaLonde's critique of nonexperimental estimators. *J. Econometrics* 125, 305–353.
- Smith Jr., A.A., 1993. Estimating nonlinear time-series models using simulated vector autoregressions. *J. Appl. Econometrics* 8, S63–S84.
- von Neumann, J., 1941. Distribution of the ratio of the mean square successive difference to the variance. *Ann. Math. Stat.* 12, 367–395.
- White, H., 1980. A heteroskedasticity-consistent covariance matrix estimator and a direct test for heteroskedasticity. *Econometrica* 48, 817–838.
- Wooldridge, J.M., 2013. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach*, fifth ed. South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, OH.
- Yatchew, A., 1997. An elementary estimator of the partial linear model. *Econom. Lett.* 57, 135–143.