

Computational Statistics. Chapter 1: Continuous optimization. Solution of exercises

Thierry Denoeux


2024-02-07

Exercise 1


Question a

```
x<-c(1.77,-0.23,2.76,3.80,3.47,56.75,-1.34,4.24,-2.44,  
      3.29,3.71,-2.40,4.53,-0.07,-1.05,-13.87,-2.53,  
      -1.75,0.27,43.21)  
n<- length(x)
```

```
boxplot(x)
```



```
dotchart(x)
```



Question b

We first write a function to compute the log-likelihood:

```
loglik <- function(theta,x) return(sum(log(dcauchy(x,location=theta))))
```

We compute the log-likelihood for different values of θ :


```
theta<- seq(-10,10,0.1)
N<-length(theta)
logL<-rep(0,N)
for(i in 1:N) logL[i]<- loglik(theta[i],x)
```

We can get the same result much faster without a loop, thanks to function `sapply`:

```
logL<-sapply(theta,loglik,x)
```

Finally, we plot the result:

```
plot(theta,logL,type="l")
```



We observe that the likelihood has 2 modes.

Question c

We first need to compute the score function (first derivative of the log-likelihood). We have

$$L(\theta) = \frac{1}{\pi^n} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(x_i - \theta)^2 + 1}$$

$$\ell(\theta) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \log[(x_i - \theta)^2 + 1] - n \log \pi$$

$$\ell'(\theta) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i - \theta}{(x_i - \theta)^2 + 1}$$

We can then write the R function:

```
dloglik <- function(theta,x) return(2*sum((x-theta)/((x-theta)^2+1)))
```

This is a function that encodes the bisection method:


```
bisection <-function(fun,dfun,a,b,epsi,...){
  theta<-(a+b)/2
  delta<-1
  while(delta>epsi){
    theta0<-theta
    if(dfun(a,x)*dfun(theta0,...)<=0) b<-theta0 else a<-theta0
    theta<-(a+b)/2
    delta<-abs(theta-theta0)/(abs(theta0)+epsi)
    print(c(a,b,delta))
  }
  return(list(objective=fun(theta,...),optimum=theta))
}
```

We run it on the data and plot the result:

```
opt<-bisection(loglik,dloglik,-1,3,1e-6,x)
```

```
## [1] -1.000000  1.000000  0.999999
## [1]    -1      0 500000
## [1] -0.500000  0.000000  0.499999
## [1] -0.250000  0.000000  0.499998
## [1] -0.250000 -0.125000  0.499996
## [1] -0.250000 -0.1875000  0.1666658
## [1] -0.21875000 -0.18750000  0.07142824
## [1] -0.20312500 -0.18750000  0.03846135
## [1] -0.1953125 -0.1875000  0.0199999
## [1] -0.19531250 -0.19140625  0.01020403
## [1] -0.193359375 -0.191406250  0.005050479
## [1] -0.192382812 -0.191406250  0.002538058
## [1] -0.192382812 -0.191894531  0.001272258
## [1] -0.1923828125 -0.1921386719  0.0006353207
## [1] -0.1923828125 -0.1922607422  0.0003174587
## [1] -0.192321777 -0.192260742  0.000158679
## [1] -1.922913e-01 -1.922607e-01  7.935207e-05
## [1] -1.922913e-01 -1.922760e-01  3.967918e-05
## [1] -0.1922912598 -0.1922836304  0.0000198388
## [1] -1.922874e-01 -1.922836e-01  9.919206e-06
## [1] -1.922874e-01 -1.922855e-01  4.959652e-06
## [1] -1.922874e-01 -1.922865e-01  2.479814e-06
## [1] -1.922870e-01 -1.922865e-01  1.239904e-06
## [1] -1.922867e-01 -1.922865e-01  6.199527e-07
```

```
plot(theta,logL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,opt$objective)
```



Question d

Let us program Newton's method. For that, we need the second derivative of the log-likelihood:

$$\ell''(\theta) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(x_i - \theta)^2 - 1}{[(x_i - \theta)^2 + 1]^2}$$

We write the corresponding R function:

```
d2loglik <- function(theta,x) return(2*sum(((x-theta)^2-1)/((x-theta)^2+1)^2))
```

This is an implementation of Newton's method:


```
newton <-function(fun,dfun,d2fun,theta0,epsi,tmax,...){
  delta=1
  t<-0
  while((delta>epsi)&(t<=tmax)){
    t<-t+1
    theta<-theta0-dfun(theta0,...)/d2fun(theta0,...)
    delta<-abs(theta-theta0)/(abs(theta0)+epsi)
    obj<-fun(theta,...)
    print(c(t,theta,obj,delta))
    theta0<-theta
  }
  return(list(objective=obj,optimum=theta,
             derivative=dfun(theta,...),
             derivative2=d2fun(theta,...)))
}
```

We run it on our data and plot the results:

```
theta0 <- 0
opt <- newton(loglik,dloglik,d2loglik,theta0,1e-6,1000,x)

## [1] 1.000000e+00 -1.963366e-01 -7.291584e+01 1.963366e+05
## [1] 2.000000000 -0.19228252 -72.91581962 0.02064847
## [1] 3.000000e+00 -1.922866e-01 -7.291582e+01 2.126305e-05
## [1] 4.000000e+00 -1.922866e-01 -7.291582e+01 2.109083e-11


plot(theta,logL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,opt$objective,pch=22)
```



Question e

Finally, we can get the same result with the R built-in function `optimize`:

```
opt <- optimize(f=loglik,lower=-2,upper=2,maximum=TRUE,x=x)
plot(theta,logL,type="l")
points(opt$maximum,opt$objective,pch=23)
```



Exercise 2

Newton's method

For Newton's method, we need to compute the log-likelihood as well as its first and second derivatives. We have

$$L(\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{\theta^{x_i}}{x_i[-\log(1-\theta)]}$$
$$\ell(\theta) = \log \theta \sum_{i=1}^n x_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(x_i) - n \log[-\log(1-\theta)]$$
$$\ell'(\theta) = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{\theta} + \frac{n}{(1-\theta)\log(1-\theta)}$$
$$\ell''(\theta) = -\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n x_i}{\theta^2} + n \frac{\log(1-\theta) + 1}{(1-\theta)^2 [\log(1-\theta)]^2}$$

These functions can be encoded as follows:

```
loglik1<-function(theta,x){ # loglikelihood
  n<-length(x)
  return(sum(x)*log(theta)-n*log(-log(1-theta)) -sum(log(x)))
}
dloglik1<-function(theta,x){ # first derivative
  n<-length(x)
  return(sum(x)/theta + n/((1-theta)* log(1-theta)))
}
d2loglik1<-function(theta,x){ # second derivative
  n<-length(x)
  return(-sum(x)/theta^2 + n*(1+log(1-theta))/((1-theta)^2* log(1-theta)^2))
}
```


We use function `newton` from Exercise 1:

```
theta0<- 0.8
x<-c(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2, 3)
opt <- newton(loglik1,dloglik1,d2loglik1,theta0,1e-6,1000,x)

## [1] 1.0000000 0.6502650 -10.1271031 0.1871685
## [1] 2.0000000 0.5444798 -9.8929451 0.1626798
## [1] 3.0000000 0.53359344 -9.89093316 0.01999409
## [1] 4.000000e+00 5.335892e-01 -9.890933e+00 7.890570e-06
## [1] 5.000000e+00 5.335892e-01 -9.890933e+00 1.474360e-12
```

We plot the result:

```
theta<- seq(0,1,0.01)
logL<-sapply(theta,loglik1,x)
dlogL<-sapply(theta,dloglik1,x)
par(mfrow=c(1,2))
plot(theta,logL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,opt$objective)
plot(theta,dlogL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,0)
abline(0,1)
```



```
par(mfrow=c(1,1))
```

Fisher scoring

To implement the Fisher scoring method, we need to compute the Fisher information. We have

$$I_n(\theta) = -\mathbb{E}_\theta[\ell''(\theta)] = \frac{n\mathbb{E}_\theta[X]}{\theta^2} - n \frac{\log(1-\theta) + 1}{(1-\theta)^2 [\log(1-\theta)]^2},$$

with


$$\mathbb{E}_\theta[X] = \frac{-\theta}{(1-\theta)\log(1-\theta)}.$$

The following function computes $-I_n(\theta)$:

```
fisher.info <-function(theta,x){ # Fisher information with minus sign
  n<-length(x)
  EX<- -1/log(1-theta) * theta/(1-theta)
  return(-n*EX/theta^2 + n*(1+log(1-theta))/((1-theta)^2* log(1-theta)^2))
}
```

We can check that $I_n(\theta) \approx -\ell''(\theta)$, especially around $\hat{\theta}$:

```
d2logL<-sapply(theta,d2loglik1,x)
fish<-sapply(theta,fisher.info,x)
plot(theta,d2logL,type='l')
lines(theta,fish,col="red")
```



To use the Fisher scoring method, we can use function `newton` and pass minus the Fisher information instead of the second derivative as argument:

```
theta0<- 0.8
opt=newton(loglik1,dloglik1,fisher.info,theta0,1e-6,1000,x)
```

```
## [1] 1.0000000 0.6738722 -10.2362220 0.1576596
## [1] 2.0000000 0.5709805 -9.9146869 0.1526870
## [1] 3.0000000 0.53617188 -9.89104631 0.06096278
## [1] 4.000000000 0.533601446 -9.890933165 0.004794031
## [1] 5.000000e+00 5.335892e-01 -9.890933e+00 2.288544e-05
## [1] 6.000000e+00 5.335892e-01 -9.890933e+00 5.113807e-10
```

Plotting the results:

```
par(mfrow=c(1,2))
plot(theta,logL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,opt$objective)
plot(theta,dlogL,type="l")
points(opt$optimum,0)
abline(h=0)
```



```
par(mfrow=c(1,1))
```

Exercise 3


Question a

We start by reading the file:

```
data <- read.table("/Users/Thierry/Documents/R/Data/Compstat/F5_2.txt",header=TRUE)
```

Consumption and income correspond, respectively, to variables `realdpi` and `realcons`. We plot these two variables:

```
plot(data$realdpi,data$realcons,xlab="income",ylab="consumption")
```




The relationship between consumption and income seems approximately linear. We then estimate α and β using linear regression and display a summary of the result:

```
reg<-lm(realcons ~ realdpi, data=data)
summary(reg)
```

```
##
## Call:
## lm(formula = realcons ~ realdpi, data = data)
##
## Residuals:
##      Min       1Q   Median       3Q      Max
## -191.42  -56.08    1.38   49.53  324.14
##
## Coefficients:
##              Estimate Std. Error t value Pr(>|t|)
## (Intercept) -80.354749  14.305852  -5.617 6.38e-08 ***
## realdpi      0.921686   0.003872 238.054 < 2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
##
## Residual standard error: 87.21 on 202 degrees of freedom
## Multiple R-squared:  0.9964, Adjusted R-squared:  0.9964
## F-statistic: 5.667e+04 on 1 and 202 DF,  p-value: < 2.2e-16
```


A plot of the least-squares line together with the data seems to indicate a good fit:

```
plot(data$realdpi,data$realcons,xlab="income",ylab="consumption")
lines(data$realdpi,reg$fitted.values,col='red',lwd=2)
```



However, a plot of the residuals vs. income shows that the linear model is misspecified. (The residuals do not appear as purely random, they depend on the income):

```
plot(data$realdpi,reg$residuals,xlab="income",ylab="residuals")  
abline(h=0)
```



This analysis justifies the use of nonlinear regression.

Question b

To apply the BFGS algorithm implemented in function `optim`, we first write a function that compute the residual sum-of-squares criterion:

```
RSS<-function(theta,y,z){
  yhat <- theta[1]+theta[2]*z^theta[3]
  return(sum((y-yhat)^2))
}
```


We can then run function `optim`, using the linear regression estimates of coefficients α and β with $\gamma = 1$ as initial estimates:

```
theta0 <- c(reg$coefficients,1)
opt <- optim(theta0,RSS,y=data$realcons,z=data$realdpi,method="BFGS",
            control=list(trace=3,maxit=1000))
```

```
## initial value 1536321.880788
## iter 10 value 1393750.823599
## iter 20 value 1131753.022894
## iter 30 value 942822.914783
## iter 40 value 824997.561004
## iter 50 value 731509.516342
## iter 60 value 664774.066417
## iter 70 value 600208.014377
## iter 80 value 567557.604705
## iter 90 value 541915.432076
## iter 100 value 530739.243338
## iter 110 value 521066.188498
## final value 520866.618992
## converged
```

Plotting the results:

```
theta <- opt$par
yhat<-theta[1]+ theta[2]*data$realdpi^theta[3]
plot(data$realdpi,data$realcons,xlab="income",ylab="consumption")
lines(data$realdpi,yhat,col="blue",lwd=2)
lines(data$realdpi,reg$fitted.values,col="red")
```



We can check that the nonlinear solution is better than the linear one by comparing the RSS. For linear regression, it was:

```
print(sum(reg$residuals^2))
```

```
## [1] 1536322
```

With nonlinear regression, we now have:

```
print(sum((data$realcons-yhat)^2))
```

```
## [1] 520866.6
```

The RSS has been divided by 3.

Question c

We start by writing a function that computes the LS error as a function of γ , for fixed α and β :

```
g_gamma<-function(gam,alpha,beta,y,z) return(sum((y-alpha-beta*z^gam)^2))
```

The following code implements the cyclic coordinate descent algorithm: we start with an initial value of γ (e.g., $\gamma = 1.1$), and compute the OLS estimates of α and β for this value of γ . We then optimize γ , for fixed α and β , using the R function `optimize`.

```
z<-data$realdpi # income
y<-data$realcons # consumption
delta<-1
epsi<-1e-9
theta0<-c(0,0,1.1)
tmax<-10000
t<-0
g<-rep(0,tmax)
while((delta > epsi)&(t<=tmax)){
  t<-t+1
```


```

z1<-z^theta0[3]
reg<-lm(y~z1)
theta<-c(reg$coefficients,theta0[3])
opt<-optimize(g_gamma,alpha=theta[1],beta=theta[2],y=y,z=z,lower=0.5,upper=2)
theta[3]<-opt$minimum
delta<-sum(abs(theta-theta0))/sum(abs(theta0))
g[t]<-RSS(theta,y,z)
theta0<-theta
}

```

This is a plot of the error vs. the number of iterations:

```
plot(g[2:t],type="l",xlab="iterations",ylab="error")
```



We can see that the cyclic coordinate descent algorithm achieves an error of approximately $8.6e5$ after 1500 iterations: it does not perform well on this problem.

Question d

We will now implement an optimization strategy that exploits the particular form of the problem: the Gauss-Newton algorithm.

As in the slides, let us denote the response variable (consumption) by Y and the covariate (income) by z . The model can then be written as

$$Y = f(z, \theta) + \epsilon$$

with $f(z, \theta) = \alpha + \beta z^\gamma$ and $\theta = (\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$.

To linearize f around $\theta = \theta^{(t)}$, let us first compute the gradient of f with respect to θ . We have

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \alpha} = 1, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial \beta} = z^\gamma,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \gamma} = \frac{\partial(\alpha + \beta \exp(\gamma \log z))}{\partial \gamma} = \beta(\log z) \exp(\gamma \log(z)) = \beta z^\gamma \log z.$$

The linear Taylor series expansion of f around $\theta = \theta^{(t)}$ can be written as

$$f(z, \theta) \approx f(z, \theta^{(t)}) + (\theta - \theta^{(t)})^T \mathbf{f}'(\theta^{(t)}).$$

Here we have

$$f(z, \theta) \approx \alpha^{(t)} + \beta^{(t)} z^{\gamma^{(t)}} + (\alpha - \alpha^{(t)}) + (\beta - \beta^{(t)}) z^{\gamma^{(t)}} + (\gamma - \gamma^{(t)}) \beta^{(t)} (\log(z)) z^{\gamma^{(t)}}.$$

We can thus write

$$y_i - f(z_i, \theta) \approx \underbrace{y_i - f(z_i, \theta^{(t)})}_{x_i^{(t)}} - (\theta - \theta^{(t)})^T \underbrace{(1, z_i^{\gamma^{(t)}}, \beta^{(t)} (\log z_i) z_i^{\gamma^{(t)}})}_{\mathbf{a}_i^{(t)}}$$

Denoting by $\mathbf{x}^{(t)}$ the vector of length n with components $x_i^{(t)}$ and by $\mathbf{A}^{(t)}$ the $n \times 3$ matrix with i th row $\mathbf{a}_i^{(t)}$, we can write the following regression model:

$$\mathbf{x}^{(t)} = \mathbf{A}^{(t)}(\theta - \theta^{(t)}) + \epsilon.$$

The expression of the ordinary least-squares (OLS) estimate gives us the update equation:

$$\theta^{(t+1)} = \theta^{(t)} + \left((\mathbf{A}^{(t)})^T \mathbf{A}^{(t)} \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{A}^{(t)})^T \mathbf{x}^{(t)}.$$

We will now write a generic implementation of the Gauss-Newton algorithm. The inputs are the vector of responses \mathbf{y} , the vector or matrix of covariates \mathbf{z} , the initial parameter value `theta0`, and functions `fun` and `grad` for, respectively, function f and its gradient. Here, we have

```
fun<-function(theta,z) return(theta[1]+theta[2]*z^theta[3])
```

and

```
grad<-function(theta,z) return(cbind(rep(1,length(z)),z^theta[3],theta[2]*log(z)*z^theta[3]))
```

We note that function `grad` returns matrix \mathbf{A} . We can now write a generic function for the Gauss-Newton algorithm:

```
gauss.newton<-function(y,z,theta0,fun,grad,epsi=1e-6){
  delta<-1
  LS<-function(theta,y,z) return(sum((y-fun(theta,z))^2)) # Computes the sum of squared errors
  g<-LS(theta0,y,z)
  t<-0
  print(c(t,g,delta))
  while(delta>epsi){ # Main loop
    t<-t+1
    x <- y-fun(theta0,z)
    A<-grad(theta0,z)
    theta1<-theta0+solve(t(A)%*%A)%*%t(A)%*%x
    delta<-sqrt(sum((theta1-theta0)^2))/sqrt(sum((theta0)^2))
    g<-LS(theta1,y,z)
    print(c(t,g,delta))
    theta0<-theta1
  }
  return(list(theta=theta1,g=g))
}
```

Let us now run this algorithm with our data. We initialize the parameter with the OLS estimate:


```
theta0<-c(reg$coefficients,1)
```


We then run the algorithm:

```
opt<-gauss.newton(y=data$realcons,z=data$realdpi,theta0,fun,grad)
```

```
## [1] 0 671980082 1
## [1] 1.000000e+00 5.414692e+13 2.335247e+00
## [1] 2.000000e+00 1.077596e+10 5.710656e-03
## [1] 3.000000e+00 8.920104e+08 1.377816e-03
## [1] 4.000000e+00 5.230492e+06 6.673758e-02
## [1] 5.000000e+00 1.430607e+08 9.210359e-02
## [1] 6.000000e+00 5.799672e+05 4.720853e-02
## [1] 7.000000e+00 5.044040e+05 3.580747e-04
## [1] 8.000000e+00 5.044032e+05 8.905798e-05
## [1] 9.000000e+00 5.044032e+05 2.491232e-06
## [1] 1.000000e+01 5.044032e+05 8.601250e-08
```

We plot the data together with the fitted values and the least-squares line:

```
yh<-fun(theta=opt$theta,z=data$realdpi)
plot(data$realdpi,data$realcons,xlab="income",ylab="consumption",pch=3)
lines(data$realdpi,yh,col="red",lwd=2)
lines(data$realdpi,reg$fitted.values,col='green',lwd=2,lt=2)
```



The RSS is

```
print(sum((data$realcons-yh)^2))
```

```
## [1] 504403.2
```

It is slightly smaller than the RSS obtained using the BFGS algorithm.

Question e

Nelder-Mead algorithm:

```
theta0<-c(lm(y~z)$coefficients,1)
opt<-optim(theta0,RSS,y=data$realcons,z=data$realdpi,method="Nelder-Mead",
           control=list(trace=0))
print(opt$value)
```

```
## [1] 651339.3
```

The Nelder-Mead algorithm does not perform as well as BFGS and Gauss-Newton on this problem.


Exercise 4

Question a

```
transport <- read.table("/Users/Thierry/Documents/R/Data/Compstat/transportation.txt",
                       header=TRUE)
```

Question b

```
pairs(log(transport))
```



Question c

```
reg <- lm(log(ValueAdd)~log(Capital)+log(Labor),data=transport)
```

Question d

We first need to write a function that computes the log-likelihood:

```
loglik<- function(theta,x,y){
  n<-nrow(x)
  p<-ncol(x)
  beta<-theta[1:(p+1)]
  sigma<-theta[p+2]
  lambda<-theta[p+3]
  epsi<- y-beta[1] - x %*% beta[2:(p+1)]
  loglik<- -n*log(abs(sigma)) + (n/2)*log(2/pi) - 0.5*sum((epsi/sigma)^2) +
    sum(log(pnorm(-epsi*abs(lambda/sigma))))
  return(loglik)
}
```

We then initialize the parameters:

```
beta0 <- coef(reg)
sigma0 <- sqrt(mean(reg$res^2))
lambda0 <- 1
theta0 <- c(beta0,sigma0,lambda0)
print(theta0)
```

```
## (Intercept) log(Capital) log(Labor)
## 1.8444157 0.2454281 0.8051830 0.2211117 1.0000000
```

and run the BFGS algorithm with function optim:

```
opt<-optim(theta0, loglik, method = "BFGS",control=list(fnscale=-1,trace=2),
  x=cbind(log(transport$Capital),log(transport$Labor)),
  y=log(transport$ValueAdd))
```

```
## initial value 5.018060
## iter 10 value -2.469491
## final value -2.469521
## converged
```

The maximum of the log-likelihood found is

```
print(opt$value)
```

```
## [1] 2.469521
```

and the corresponding parameter estimates are:


```
print(opt$par)
```

```
## (Intercept) log(Capital) log(Labor)
## 2.0812043 0.2585327 0.7802561 0.2824470 1.2653270
```

Question e

For example, let us fix all parameters, except β_0 and σ .

```
thetah<-opt$par
xx<-seq(1,3,0.005)
yy<-seq(0.1,0.5,0.0005)
nx=length(xx)
ny=length(yy)
z <- matrix(0,nrow=nx,ncol=ny)
for(i in 1:nx){
  for(j in 1:ny){
    z[i,j] <- loglik(c(xx[i],thetah[2:3],yy[j],thetah[5]),
                    x=cbind(log(transport$Capital),log(transport$Labor)),
                    y=log(transport$ValueAdd))
  }
}
contour(x=xx,y=yy,z,levels=c(2,0,-2,-10,-50,-100,-200,-300,-500,-1000,-1500))
points(thetah[1],thetah[4],pch=3)
title(xlab=expression(beta[0]),ylab=expression(sigma))
```



We can see that the solution found using `optim` is a local maximum.

Question f

```
theta0=c(3,beta0[2:3],0.5,10)
opt1<-optim(theta0, loglik, method = "BFGS", control=list(fnscale=-1,trace=2),
            x=cbind(log(transport$Capital),log(transport$Labor)),y=log(transport$ValueAdd))
```

```
## initial value 57.529376
## iter 10 value -0.714958
## iter 20 value -1.029694
```

```
## iter 30 value -1.310878
## iter 40 value -1.855346
## final value -1.872617
## converged
```

The solution is very different from the previous one:

```
print(opt1$par)
```

```
##          log(Capital)  log(Labor)
## 2.8500100  0.3035175  0.5978896  0.4391104  42.2383802
```


The corresponding value of the likelihood is lower:

```
print(opt1$value)
```

```
## [1] 1.872617
```

Let us check that it is a local maximum:

```
thetah<-opt1$par
xx<-seq(2.5,3.2,0.005)
yy<-seq(0.2,0.8,0.0005)
nx=length(xx)
ny=length(yy)
z <- matrix(0,nrow=nx,ncol=ny)
for(i in 1:nx){
  for(j in 1:ny){
    z[i,j] <- loglik(c(xx[i],thetah[2:3],yy[j],thetah[5]),
                    x=cbind(log(transport$Capital),log(transport$Labor)),
                    y=log(transport$ValueAdd))
  }
}
contour(x=xx,y=yy,z,levels=c(1,0,-2,-10,-20,-50,-100,-500,-1000,-2000,-3000,-5000,-7000))
points(thetah[1],thetah[4],pch=20)
title(xlab=expression(beta[0]),ylab=expression(sigma))
```



Question g

Starting with completely random values often produces an error because the likelihood is so close to 0 that the computed log-likelihood becomes equal to minus infinity. To search for alternative local maxima, we can start with initial coefficients β_0 close to the OLS estimates, and randomly initialize σ and λ in some intervals, e.g., $\sigma \in [0.1, 0.5]$ and $\lambda \in [0.5, 5]$. Let us do it $N = 100$ times:

```
set.seed(20240207)
N <- 100
thetah <- opt$par
best.loglik <- opt$value
for(i in 1:N){
  theta0 <- c(beta0+0.1*rnorm(3),runif(1,0.1,0.5),runif(1,0.5,5))
  opt2 <- optim(theta0, loglik, method = "BFGS", control=list(trace=0,fnscale=-1),
               x=cbind(log(transport$Capital),log(transport$Labor)),
               y=log(transport$ValueAdd))
  print(c(i,opt2$value))
  if(opt2$value>best.loglik){
    thetah <- opt2$par
    best.loglik <- opt2$value
  }
}
```

```
## [1] 1.000000 2.469521
## [1] 2.000000 2.469521
## [1] 3.000000 2.469521
## [1] 4.000000 2.469521
## [1] 5.000000 2.469521
## [1] 6.000000 2.469521
## [1] 7.000000 0.9535894
## [1] 8.000000 2.469521
## [1] 9.000000 1.969237
## [1] 10.000000 2.469521
## [1] 11.000000 2.469521
## [1] 12.000000 2.169638
## [1] 13.000000 2.469521
## [1] 14.000000 2.469521
## [1] 15.000000 2.469521
## [1] 16.000000 2.469521
## [1] 17.0000 -103.8484
## [1] 18.000000 2.469521
## [1] 19.000000 2.469521
## [1] 20.000000 2.469521
## [1] 21.0000 -140.9483
## [1] 22.000000 2.469521
## [1] 23.000000 2.469521
## [1] 24.000000 2.469521
## [1] 25.000000 1.92534
## [1] 26.000000 2.469521
## [1] 27.000000 2.469521
## [1] 28.000000 2.469521
## [1] 29.000000 2.469521
## [1] 30.000000 1.915976
## [1] 31.000000 2.469521
## [1] 32.000000 2.469521
```

```
## [1] 33.000000 2.469521
## [1] 34.000000 2.469521
## [1] 35.000000 2.469521
## [1] 36.000000 2.469521
## [1] 37.000000 2.469521
## [1] 38.000000 2.469521
## [1] 39.000000 2.469521
## [1] 40.000000 2.469521
## [1] 41.000000 2.469521
## [1] 42.000000 2.469521
## [1] 43.000000 2.469521
## [1] 44.000000 2.469521
## [1] 45.000000 2.176872
## [1] 46.000000 2.469521
## [1] 47.000000 2.469521
## [1] 48.000000 -51.89819
## [1] 49.000000 2.065885
## [1] 50.000000 1.840792
## [1] 51.000000 2.469521
## [1] 52.000000 1.839395
## [1] 53.000000 2.469521
## [1] 54.000000 2.469521
## [1] 55.000000 2.469521
## [1] 56.000000 2.469521
## [1] 57.000000 2.469521
## [1] 58.000000 2.469521
## [1] 59.000000 2.469521
## [1] 60.000000 2.469521
## [1] 61.000000 2.469521
## [1] 62.000000 2.469521
## [1] 63.000000 2.469521
## [1] 64.000000 1.459819
## [1] 65.000000 1.682908
## [1] 66.000000 2.469521
## [1] 67.000000 2.469521
## [1] 68.000000 2.469521
## [1] 69.000000 2.469521
## [1] 70.000000 2.469521
## [1] 71.000000 2.469521
## [1] 72.000000 -153.1449
## [1] 73.000000 2.469521
## [1] 74.000000 2.469521
## [1] 75.000000 2.469521
## [1] 76.000000 2.469521
## [1] 77.000000 2.469521
## [1] 78.000000 2.469521
## [1] 79.000000 2.142531
## [1] 80.000000 2.469521
## [1] 81.000000 2.469521
## [1] 82.000000 2.469521
## [1] 83.000000 2.469521
## [1] 84.000000 2.253715
## [1] 85.000000 2.469521
## [1] 86.000000 -11.65473
```

```
## [1] 87.000000 2.469521
## [1] 88.000000 2.469521
## [1] 89.000000 2.469521
## [1] 90.000000 2.469521
## [1] 91.000000 2.469521
## [1] 92.000000 2.469521
## [1] 93.000000 2.469521
## [1] 94.000000 2.469521
## [1] 95.000000 2.469521
## [1] 96.000000 2.469521
## [1] 97.000000 2.469521
## [1] 98.000000 2.469521
## [1] 99.000000 2.084821
## [1] 100.000000 1.916674
```

The algorithm converges to several local maxima, none of which is higher than that found in Question d: this solution is very stable and may correspond to a global maximum (although this is difficult to establish with certainty).