



Université de Montréal
Faculté des arts et des sciences
Département de sciences économiques

CAHIER 9333

**PITFALLS OF RESCALING REGRESSION MODELS
WITH BOX-COX TRANSFORMATIONS**

Marcel G. Dagenais¹ and Jean-Marie Dufour¹

¹ Département de sciences économiques and Centre de recherche et développement en économique (C.R.D.E.), Université de Montréal.

November 1993

This work was supported by the Fonds FCAR (Government of Québec), the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada. The authors thank two anonymous referees for several useful comments.

C.P. 6128, succursale A
Montréal (Québec)
H3C 3J7

Télécopieur (FAX): (514) 343-5831
Courrier électronique (E-Mail): econo@tornade.ERE.Umontreal.CA

Ce cahier a également été publié au Centre de recherche et développement en économique
(C.R.D.E.) (publication no 2693).

Dépôt légal - 1993
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

ISSN 0709-9231

RÉSUMÉ

Pour estimer les modèles de régression contenant des transformations de Box-Cox sur la variable dépendante, plusieurs auteurs, de Box et Cox (1964) à Spitzer (1984), ont suggéré d'exprimer la variable dépendante en termes du ratio de la variable originale divisée par sa moyenne géométrique, telle que calculée à partir de l'échantillon. Ce changement d'échelle, qui entraîne implicitement la division des paramètres du modèle original par une variable aléatoire, a l'avantage de faciliter le calcul des estimateurs du maximum de vraisemblance. Cependant, cette procédure a plusieurs inconvénients qui, semble-t-il, n'ont jamais été relevés dans la littérature. Un premier problème vient du fait qu'après ce changement d'échelle, la fonction de vraisemblance du modèle ne correspond plus à la formule habituelle, si bien que la division de la variable dépendante par sa moyenne géométrique échantillonnale (à moins d'en tenir compte de façon adéquate) peut modifier le contenu du modèle. Cela a donc des implications beaucoup plus sérieuses qu'un simple changement d'unités de mesure des variables. Un deuxième problème concerne l'absence d'une interprétation paramétrique claire des coefficients du modèle ainsi modifié. Nous suggérons une façon d'interpréter ces coefficients, mais alors il s'avère que les formules usuelles des écarts-types asymptotiques des estimateurs des coefficients des modèles de régression avec transformations de Box-Cox ne sont plus valides. Par conséquent, les intervalles de confiance correspondants ne sont pas valides non plus, même asymptotiquement. Par ailleurs, les tests d'hypothèses de nullité des coefficients demeurent asymptotiquement corrects. Une dernière remarque porte sur la façon appropriée de mesurer les élasticités dans les modèles de Box-Cox.

Mots clés : transformation de Box-Cox, régression non linéaire, changement d'échelle, test d'hypothèse, élasticité.

ABSTRACT

For the purpose of estimating regression models with the Box-Cox transformation on the dependent variable, several authors, from Box and Cox (1964) to Spitzer (1984), have suggested to express the dependent variable as a ratio of the original variable divided by its sample geometric mean. Such rescaling, which involves dividing the original parameters by a random variable, has the advantage of facilitating the computation of the maximum likelihood estimators. However, this procedure has a number of drawbacks which, as far as we know, have not been pointed out in the literature. The first problem comes from the fact that the likelihood function of the rescaled model no longer corresponds to the usual expression, so that dividing the dependent variable by the sample geometric mean (if not dealt with properly) can modify the content of the model and thus involves much more than a mere unit change. A second problem concerns the absence of a clear parametric interpretation of the parameters after such rescaling has been performed. We suggest such an interpretation but find that the usual formulas for the asymptotic standard errors of the coefficients of the "rescaled model" are not valid, so that the corresponding confidence intervals are not valid either, even asymptotically. On the other hand, tests for zero regression coefficients are asymptotically valid. A final point concerns the appropriate way of measuring elasticities in Box-Cox models.

Key words : Box-Cox transformation, nonlinear regression, rescaling, hypothesis testing, elasticity.

I. INTRODUCTION

In a paper published some time ago, Spitzer (1984) demonstrated the lack of invariance of asymptotic t-ratios for the linear coefficients of regression models with the Box-Cox transformation on the dependent variable. Further, he discussed the merits of using a scaled version of the model, in which the observations on the dependent variable are divided by their geometric mean. This "rescaling" technique was in fact originally suggested by Box and Cox (1964) and has since been recommended or used in numerous textbooks [see, for example, Abraham and Ledolter (1983, pp. 56-60), Atkinson (1987, sections 6.2 and 6.4), Box, Hunter and Hunter (1978, p. 239), Cook and Weisberg (1982, p. 62), Davidson and MacKinnon (1993, pp. 486-488), Draper and Smith (1981, section 5.3), Judge et al. (1985, section 20.5) and Maddala (1977, section 13-11)] and articles [e.g., Blackley, Follain and Ondrich (1984), Collins (1991), John and Draper (1980), Lindsey (1972), Logothetis (1990), Rasmussen and Zuehlke (1990), Seaks and Vine (1990), Spitzer (1982), Zarembka (1974)].

This approach, however, raises a number of important questions that deserve further discussion. Even though some authors have issued warnings on the importance of taking into account the uncertainty of the Box-Cox transformation parameter (which is typically estimated) when making inferences in such models,¹ none of the above-cited authors has apparently pointed out the fact that "rescaling" of the observations by their geometric mean involves a very similar problem *even if the uncertainty of the estimation of the transformation exponent is taken into account* [using, for example, the corrections suggested by Spitzer (1982, 1984)]. In particular, applications of Box-Cox models, with the dependent variable scaled by its geometric mean, have appeared in the literature, where the implications of such random "scaling" on statistical inference have been totally ignored; see, for example, Blackley, Follain and Ondrich (1990), Collins (1991), Logothetis (1990), and Rasmussen and Zuehlke (1984).

In this paper, we discuss some of the intricate implications of rescaling by the geometric mean for statistical inference in Box-Cox models. After describing the model in section II, we show in section III that rescaling the dependent variable with its sample geometric mean (without taking into account the random nature of the scaling factor) leads one to use the wrong likelihood function: the estimated model is not the same as in the original

¹ See Bickel and Doksum (1981), Davidson and MacKinnon (1993, p. 487), Judge et al. (1985, p. 842), Maddala (1977, p. 316) and Spitzer (1982, 1984). Here, we shall take for granted this point of view. For further discussion, see Box and Cox (1982), and Hinkley and Runger (1984, with comments).

specification, and dividing the dependent variable by the sample geometric mean modifies the model in a basic way and thus involves much more than a mere unit change. Then, in sections IV and V, under an (additional) convergence assumption, we interpret the sample geometric mean as an estimator of a supplementary parameter and use this extended parametrization to interpret hypothesis tests in the "rescaled" model. In particular, regression coefficient standard errors obtained from the rescaled model are not generally valid, so that these standard errors cannot be used to build confidence sets (for either the original or the rescaled model). These standard errors are, however, valid for testing whether individual regression coefficients (other than the intercept) are zero. In section VI, we discuss the evaluation of elasticities in Box-Cox models. We conclude in section VII.

II. THE SCALED MODEL

The simple model considered by Spitzer (1984) to illustrate his approach is the following :

$$Y^{(\lambda)} = X\beta + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where $Y^{(\lambda)}$ is a $T \times 1$ vector with typical element $y_t^{(\lambda)}$, $t = 1, \dots, T$:

$$\begin{aligned} y_t^{(\lambda)} &= (y_t^\lambda - 1)/\lambda, & \text{if } \lambda \neq 0, \\ &= \ln(y_t), & \text{if } \lambda = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where y_t is a positive random variable, X is a $T \times K$ matrix of (fixed or strictly exogenous) explanatory variables with a unit vector as its first column, β is a $K \times 1$ vector of parameters (with β_1 the constant term), ε is a $T \times 1$ vector of disturbances which is assumed to follow an (approximately) $N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 I_T)$ distribution. Given that y_t must be positive, a necessary condition to assume that ε is approximately normal, when $\lambda > 0$, is that for each possible observation in the admissible range of X_t (the t -th row of X), we have $(1/\lambda + X_t\beta)/\sigma_\varepsilon \gg 1$, for all t [see Draper and Cox (1969)]. For $\lambda < 0$, the condition becomes $(1/\lambda + X_t\beta)/\sigma_\varepsilon \ll -1$.

Box and Cox (1964) and Spitzer (1984) have noted that a scaling trick that simplifies the computations for estimating the parameters of the model consists in defining

$$w_t = y_t/g, \quad t = 1, \dots, T \quad (3)$$

where $g = \left[\prod_{t=1}^T y_t \right]^{1/T}$ is the sample geometric mean of the y_t 's. From (1), we have :

$$W(\lambda) = X\gamma + v \quad (4)$$

where $W(\lambda) = (w_1^{(\lambda)}, \dots, w_T^{(\lambda)})'$, $v = \varepsilon/g^\lambda$, and

$$\gamma_1 = (\beta_1 + 1/\lambda)/g^\lambda - 1/\lambda, \quad \gamma_k = \beta_k/g^\lambda, \quad k = 2, \dots, K. \quad (5)$$

Then, writing the log-likelihood function of the transformed model as if the elements of v were independent $N(0, \sigma_v^2)$, where $\sigma_v^2 = \sigma^2/g^{2\lambda}$ and g is taken as fixed, the values of λ and γ that maximize this function are readily found, since the logarithm of the Jacobian vanishes. Further, the maximum likelihood estimates of the elements of β are easily obtained from equation (5).

It must be noted, however, that the above procedure is only a trick to facilitate computations. Clearly, the *sample* geometric mean g is a *random* variable and, since $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 I_T)$, it is easy to see that $v = \varepsilon/g^\lambda$ does not follow a normal distribution. Hence, equation (6), appearing in Spitzer (1984),

$$L(\gamma; \lambda; X, W) = -(T/2) \ln(\hat{\sigma}_v^2) \quad (6)$$

with $\hat{\sigma}_v^2 = v'v/T$, is not the concentrated log-likelihood of W , where W is a $T \times 1$ vector with typical element w_t .² Since $\prod_{t=1}^T w_t = 1$, the true density of the elements of W is necessarily degenerate. In addition, the elements of γ are *random* coefficients since they are all functions of the *stochastic* variable g . It will be of interest here to derive the correct likelihood function.

² For a similar remark about a somewhat different data transformation in the Box-Cox model, see Doksum (1984) and Bickel (1984). Note that a constant term is missing in equation (6), but this has no consequence on our discussion.

III. THE LIKELIHOOD FUNCTION

The likelihood associated with the model where the dependent variable has been scaled by its sample geometric mean can be expressed in terms of the joint density of, say, w_1, w_2, \dots, w_{T-1} and g . This likelihood could be denoted by $l(\beta, \lambda, \sigma_e; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}, g)$, thus indicating that the *fixed parameters* are λ, σ_e and the elements of β (not γ, λ and σ_e) and that the stochastic variables considered in the scaled model are w_1, \dots, w_{T-1} , and g . The joint density of w_1, \dots, w_{T-1} may then be obtained by integrating out g . As for the joint density of w_1, \dots, w_T , it is identical to that of w_1, \dots, w_{T-1} , since $\prod_{t=1}^T w_t = 1$ with probability 1.

Specifically, the log-likelihood function associated with the y_t 's can be written as

$$L(\beta, \sigma_e, \lambda; y_1, \dots, y_T) = -(T/2) \ln(2\pi) - T \ln(\sigma_e^2) \\ - (Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)'(Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)/(2\sigma_e^2) + \ln(J_1) \quad (7)$$

where J_1 is the Jacobian of the change of variables from $Y^{(\lambda)}$ to Y :

$$\ln(J_1) = (\lambda - 1) \sum_{t=1}^T \ln(y_t) = T(\lambda - 1) \ln(g) \quad (8)$$

Then the log-likelihood associated with the model expressed in terms of the scaled variables w_1, \dots, w_{T-1} and the sample geometric mean g is

$$L(\beta, \sigma_e, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}, g) = L(\beta, \sigma_e, \lambda; y_1, \dots, y_T) + \ln(J_2) \quad (9)$$

where J_2 is the Jacobian associated with the change of variables from (Y_1, \dots, Y_T) to (w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}, g) :

$$\ln(J_2) = \ln(T) + (T-1) \ln(g) - \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \ln(w_t) \quad (10)$$

We can therefore write

$$L(\beta, \sigma_\epsilon, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}, g) = -(T/2) \ln(2\pi) - T \ln(\sigma_\epsilon^2) \\ - (Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)'(Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)/(2\sigma_\epsilon^2) + \ln(T) + (T\lambda - 1) \ln(g) - \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \ln(w_t), \quad (11)$$

where the y_t 's contained in $Y^{(\lambda)}$ may be expressed in terms of w_1, \dots, w_{T-1} and g as

$$y_t = gw_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T-1, \quad y_T = g \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} w_t^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Finally, the probability density of (w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}) can be obtained from $\ell(\beta, \sigma, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}, g)$ by integrating out g :

$$\ell(\beta, \sigma, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}) = T(2\pi)^{-T/2} \sigma_\epsilon^{-T} \\ \prod_{t=1}^{T-1} w_t^{-1} \int_0^\infty [g^{(T\lambda-1)} \exp\{- (Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)'(Y^{(\lambda)} - X\beta)/(2\sigma_\epsilon^2)\}] dg. \quad (13)$$

Clearly, this likelihood function is quite different from the usual Box-Cox likelihood function (where g would be taken as nonrandom). As mentioned above, on the hypersurface defined by $\prod_{t=1}^T w_t = 1$, we have:

$$\ell(\beta, \sigma, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_T) = \ell(\beta, \sigma, \lambda; w_1, \dots, w_{T-1}). \quad (14)$$

IV. A LARGE-SAMPLE INTERPRETATION OF GEOMETRIC MEAN RESCALING

It appears that an alternative way of interpreting the Box-Cox-Spitzer approach of rescaling by the sample geometric mean might avoid the above complications. It would consist in considering that the original model has been scaled not by the stochastic geometric mean g but by a *constant term* that takes on the specific value $\Xi = \text{plim } g$, where *plim* refers to the probability limit as $T \rightarrow \infty$.³ One would then obtain:

³ Clearly, we assume here that $\text{plim}(g)$ exists. Whether Ξ coincides with the actual geometric mean of the population or not is not relevant for our purpose.

$$z_t^{(\lambda)} = X_t \psi + \zeta_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (15)$$

where $z_t = y_t/\Xi$, $\psi_k = \beta_k/\Xi^\lambda$ for $k = 2, \dots, K$, $\psi_1 = (\beta_1 + 1/\lambda)/\Xi^\lambda - (1/\lambda)$ and $\zeta_t = \varepsilon_t/\Xi^\lambda$.

If Ξ were known, a consistent estimator of ψ could be obtained by maximizing the likelihood function associated with the z_t 's. Given the properties of ML estimators, the ML estimates of the ψ_k 's would satisfy the following equations :

$$\hat{\psi}_1 = (\hat{\beta}_1 + 1/\hat{\lambda})/\Xi^{\hat{\lambda}} - (1/\hat{\lambda}), \quad \hat{\psi}_k = \hat{\beta}_k/\Xi^{\hat{\lambda}}, \quad k = 2, \dots, K. \quad (16)$$

Note that the ML estimate of λ would be the same for the original model and the model scaled by Ξ . Now, the $\hat{\gamma}$ estimators proposed by Spitzer (1984) could be seen as alternative computable consistent estimators of the ψ_k 's, since

$$\text{plim } \hat{\gamma}_1 = \text{plim}[(\hat{\beta}_1 + 1/\hat{\lambda})/g^{\hat{\lambda}} - (1/\hat{\lambda})] = \psi_1, \quad (17)$$

$$\text{plim } \hat{\gamma}_k = \text{plim}(\hat{\beta}_k/g^{\hat{\lambda}}) = \psi_k, \quad k = 2, \dots, K. \quad (18)$$

This interpretation of $\hat{\gamma}_k$ as a computable estimator of β_k/Ξ^λ avoids the difficulties encountered in Section II and preserves the meaning of the tests discussed by Spitzer, since each null hypothesis $\beta_k = 0$ is equivalent to $\psi_k = 0$, for $2 \leq k \leq K$.⁴ However, adopting this alternative viewpoint also has its drawbacks, as pointed out in the next section.

V. THE ASYMPTOTIC COVARIANCE MATRIX ESTIMATOR

If one adopts the interpretation discussed in the previous section, the expression shown in equation (12) of Spitzer's (1984) paper may be considered as an estimator of the asymptotic

⁴ A somewhat different interpretation suggested by Berndt, Showalter and Wooldridge (1993) would be to assume that the data is generated not by the original equation (1) as is usually done, but directly by equation (15) and that the observed Y 's are then obtained by multiplying the z_t 's by an *extra parameter* v , which corresponds to the population geometric mean. The likelihood function used by Spitzer would clearly not be applicable to this extended model either, since it does not incorporate the extra parameter v .

covariance matrix of the elements of $\hat{\psi}$. However, given that g is a random variable, is this estimator appropriate as an estimator of the asymptotic covariance of $\hat{\gamma}$?

There is no evidence that the elements of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma} - \psi)$ will, in general, have the same asymptotic variances as the corresponding elements of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi} - \psi)$. This would be the case [Theil (1971, p. 370)] if we had

$$\text{plim}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma} - \psi) - \sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi} - \psi)] = 0. \quad (19)$$

This does not appear to be the case, in general, except when $\beta_k = 0$ for $2 \leq k \leq K$. Indeed, for $2 \leq k \leq K$, we have :

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_k - \psi_k) - \sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k) &= \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_k - \hat{\psi}_k) \\ &= \sqrt{T} \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\beta}_k \\ \hat{\lambda} \\ \hat{\beta}_k \\ \Xi \hat{\lambda} \end{bmatrix} = \hat{\beta}_k \sqrt{T} \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ \hat{\lambda} \\ 1 \\ \Xi \hat{\lambda} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Since $\hat{\beta}_k \sqrt{T(1/g^{\hat{\lambda}} - 1/\Xi^{\hat{\lambda}})}$ converges in distribution, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, to a nondegenerate *random variable*, $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_k - \psi_k)$ will not *in general* have the same asymptotic distribution as $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k)$. This would be the case, however, under the null hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_k = \psi_k = 0$, since the probability limit of $\hat{\beta}_k \sqrt{T(1/g^{\hat{\lambda}} - 1/\Xi^{\hat{\lambda}})}$ then vanishes.

Thus, the t-test proposed by Spitzer for $H_0 : \gamma_k = 0$, as well as the corresponding test for the original model, are both *asymptotically* valid. In fact, it can be shown that *under* H_0 , as $T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\psi_k, \gamma_k \rightarrow 0$, the value of the *asymptotic* t-statistic for $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k)$ does not change with the scaling factor; the proof of this result can be found in the Appendix. However, it must be noted that asymptotically valid confidence intervals could not be established for γ_k , using the variance estimator employed by Spitzer (1984) in the denominator of the right-hand side of his equation (15).

Even if the proposed t-test is *asymptotically* valid for testing $\gamma_k = \psi_k = 0$, it does remain, however, as demonstrated by Spitzer, that *in finite samples* the value of the t-statistic can be altered arbitrarily by changing the scaling factor and that invariant tests should therefore be preferred [for some proposals, see Dagenais and Dufour (1991)].

VI. ELASTICITIES

It is often of interest to evaluate elasticities from an econometric model. To be meaningful, such quantities must correspond to a well-defined population parameter (i.e., a nonstochastic characteristic of the model). In nonlinear models of the form

$$f(y_t, X_t, \varepsilon_t) = 0, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (21)$$

where X_t is fixed and ε_t is a random disturbance, it is natural to define the elasticity of y_t with respect to x_{kt} , given X_t , as :

$$\theta_k = \frac{\partial E(y_t | X_t)}{\partial x_{kt}} \cdot \frac{x_{kt}}{E(y_t | X_t)}. \quad (22)$$

When evaluated at the sample geometric mean of the elements of X (say \dot{X}), this yields :

$$\dot{\theta}_k = \frac{\partial E(y | X)}{\partial x_k} \cdot \frac{x_k}{E(y | X)} \Big|_{X = \dot{X}}. \quad (23)$$

Spitzer (1984) suggests computing elasticities in a Box-Cox regression as :

$$\theta_k^* = \left[\frac{\partial y(\lambda)}{\partial x_k} \cdot \frac{x_k}{g^\lambda} \right]_{X = \dot{X}} \quad (24)$$

or, for the scaled model,

$$\Gamma_k = \left[\frac{\partial w(\lambda)}{\partial x_k} \cdot x_k \right]_{X = \dot{X}} = \gamma_k \dot{x}_k. \quad (25)$$

However, it appears more meaningful, for most applications, to define the elasticity in terms of proportional changes of the variable of interest (namely y_t in the case at hand) rather than in terms of proportional changes of a power function of this variable (such as $y_t^{(\lambda)}$). A more important drawback of defining the elasticity as in equations (24) or (25) is that this is a *random variable* which conveys little information unless a confidence interval is also supplied.⁵

Clearly, the true elasticity defined by equation (23) is a fixed number, given \dot{X} . It will, in general, only depend on the unknown coefficients of the model. But to evaluate the elasticity, the unknown coefficients must be replaced by estimates.⁶

VII. CONCLUSION

We have tried, in this paper, to clarify a number of questions raised by Spitzer's (1984) paper. In particular, we have pointed out that the coefficients of Spitzer's scaled model are random coefficients and we have derived explicitly the likelihood function of the scaled model. We have also suggested a reinterpretation of Spitzer's approach, in which the coefficients of the scaled model would correspond to fixed parameters. We have then established that the variance estimators suggested by Spitzer for the parameter estimates of the scaled model are inconsistent, except under the null hypothesis of a zero coefficient. We have also pointed out that elasticities should be defined in terms of expected values.

Because of the pitfalls involved in the interpretation of the scaled model, we conclude that there is definitely no advantage from a statistical viewpoint, in using this type of approach. Nor do we believe that scaling each variable by its sample geometric mean would produce scale invariant t-statistics in regression models with Box-Cox transformations. Clearly, if all practitioners agree, when using regression models with Box-Cox transformations, to adopt a uniform scaling factor (such as the geometric or the arithmetic mean), the results of all experimenters using the same sample will be exactly similar, including the t-ratios of the linear coefficients. However, this uniformity of results, which would arise from the adoption

⁵ Furthermore, if the elasticity is defined as in equation (25), testing hypotheses such as $H_0 : \Gamma_k = 1$, where $\Gamma_k = \gamma_k \dot{x}_k$, would involve a contradiction, since γ_k is *stochastic*. A more meaningful null hypothesis would be $\psi_k \dot{x}_k = 1$.

⁶ For examples of the estimation of such elasticities in regression models with Box-Cox transformations, see Dagenais, Gaudry and Liem (1987).

of a *similar* scaling factor, does not render the statistics invariant to *changes* in measurement units.⁷ Note that, as pointed out by a referee, researchers may be only interested in testing the linear model ($\lambda = 1$) against the loglinear model ($\lambda = 0$), rather than in performing a full nonlinear estimation of the model with continuous possible values of λ . Within such a framework, scaling by the geometric mean is not an issue since the asymptotic t-tests for λ are scale invariant. Such a procedure, however, would be affected by the biases associated with pretest estimators [Judge et al. (1985)].

⁷ As pointed out earlier, scaling the dependent variable by its geometric mean may still be resorted to as an intermediate computational technique to obtain the maximum likelihood estimates of the (β, λ) vector of parameters. However, given the efficiency of the presently available hardware and software, the usefulness of this algorithmic device is no longer very significant.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, B. and J. Ledolter (1983), *Statistical Methods for Forecasting*, Wiley, New York.
- Atkinson, A.C. (1985), *Plots, Transformations and Regression : An Introduction to Graphical Methods of Diagnostic Regression Analysis*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Berndt, E.R., M.H. Showalter and J.M. Wooldridge (1993), "A Theoretical and Empirical Investigation of the Box-Cox Model and a Nonlinear Least Squares Alternative", *Econometric Reviews* 12(1), 65-102.
- Bickel, P.J. (1984), "Comment on 'The Analysis of Transformed Data'", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 315.
- Bickel, P.J. and K.A. Doksum (1981), "An Analysis of Transformation Revisited", *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 76, 296-311.
- Blackley, P., J.R. Follain and J. Ondrich (1984), "Box-Cox Estimation of Hedonic Models : How Serious Is the Iterative OLS Variance Bias?", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 66, 348-353.
- Box, G.E.P. and D.R. Cox (1964), "An Analysis of Transformations", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 26, 211-243.
- Box, G.E.P. and D.R. Cox (1982), "An Analysis of Transformation Revisited, Rebutted", *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 77, 209-216.
- Box, G.E.P., W.G. Hunter and J.S. Hunter (1978), *Statistics for Experimenters : An Introduction. Design, Data Analysis and Model Building*, Wiley, New York.
- Collins, S. (1991), "Prediction Techniques for Box-Cox Regression Models", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics* 3(35), 267-277.
- Cook, R.D. and S. Weisberg (1982), *Residuals and Influence in Regression*, Chapman and Hall, New York.
- Dagenais, M.G. and J.-M. Dufour (1991), "Invariance, Nonlinear Models and Asymptotic Tests", *Econometrica*, 1601-1615.
- Dagenais, M.G., M.J.I. Gaudry and T.C. Liem (1987), "Urban Travel Demand : The Impact of Box-Cox Transformations with Non-Spherical Residual Errors", *Transportation Research, Series B*, 443-477.
- Davidson, R. and J.G. MacKinnon (1993), *Estimation and Inference in Econometrics*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Doksum, K.A. (1984), "Comment on the Analysis of Transformed Data", *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 316.
- Draper, N.R. and D.R. Cox (1969), "On Distributions and Their Transformation to Normality", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B*, 472-476.

- Draper, N.R. and H. Smith (1981), *Applied Regression Analysis*, 2nd Edition, Wiley, New York.
- Hinkley, D.V. and G. Runger (1984), "The Analysis of Transformed Data", *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 79, 302-324 (with comments).
- John, J.A. and N.R. Draper (1980), "An Alternative Family of Transformations", *Applied Statistics* 29, 190-197.
- Judge, G.G., W.E. Griffiths, R.C. Hill, H. Lütkepohl and T.-C. Lee (1985), *The Theory and Practice of Econometrics*, 2nd Edition, John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Lindsey, J.K. (1972), "Fitting Response Surfaces with Power Transformations", *Applied Statistics* 21, 234-247.
- Logothetis, N. (1990), "Box-Cox Transformations and the Taguchi Method", *Applied Statistics* 39(1), 31-48.
- Maddala, G.S. (1977), *Econometrics*, McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Rasmussen, D.W. and T.W. Zuehlke (1990), "On the Choice of Functional Form for Hedonic Price Functions", *Applied Economics* 22, 431-438.
- Seaks, T.G. and D.P. Vines (1990), "A Monte Carlo Evaluation of the Box-Cox Difference Transformation", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 72, 506-510.
- Spitzer, J.J. (1982), "A Primer on Box-Cox Estimation", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 64, 307-313.
- Spitzer, J.J. (1984), "Variance Estimates in Models with the Box-Cox Transformation: Implications for Estimation and Hypothesis Testing", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 66, 645-652.
- Theil, H. (1971), *Principles of Econometrics*, Wiley, New York.
- Zarembka, P. (1968), "Functional Forms in the Demand for Money", *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 77, 502-511.
- Zarembka, P. (1974), "Transformation of Variables in Econometrics", in P. Zarembka (ed.), *Frontiers of Econometrics*, Academic Press, New York, 81-104.

APPENDIX

The matrix of second derivatives of the likelihood function of the original model [equation (10)], evaluated at the ML parameter values, may be expressed as follows :

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda^2} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \beta'} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda \partial \sigma_\epsilon^2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \lambda} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \beta'} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \beta \partial \sigma_\epsilon^2} \\ \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \sigma_\epsilon^2 \partial \lambda} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \sigma_\epsilon^2 \partial \beta} & \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \sigma_\epsilon^2 \partial \sigma_\epsilon^2} \end{bmatrix} (\lambda, \beta, \sigma_\epsilon^2) = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$= \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\partial^2 L}{\partial \lambda^2} & \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}^2} Y_\lambda' X & \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_t \\ \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}^2} X' Y_\lambda & -\frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}^2} X' X & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\hat{\lambda}^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_t & 0 & -\frac{T}{2(\hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2)^2} \end{bmatrix} (\lambda, \beta, \sigma_\epsilon^2) = (\hat{\lambda}, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\sigma}_\epsilon^2) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where Y_λ is a $N \times 1$ vector with typical element $y_{\lambda t}$ and $y_{\lambda t} = [y_t^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln y_t - y_t^{(\hat{\lambda})}] / \hat{\lambda}$.

Partitioning M so as to isolate the element of the first row and first column, the negative inverse of M may, in turn, be expressed as :

$$-M^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}), & \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \hat{\xi}' \\ \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \hat{\xi}, & \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2 (X'X)^{-1} + \hat{\xi}' \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \hat{\xi}' \\ 2\hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_t (\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2/T), & 2(\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2/T) \sum_{t=1}^T (\ln y_t) \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \hat{\xi}' \\ 2\hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_t (\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2/T) & \\ 2(\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2/T) \sum_{t=1}^T (\ln y_t) \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) \hat{\xi}' & \\ [4(\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2)^4/T^2] \hat{V}(\hat{\lambda}) (\sum_{t=1}^T \ln y_t)^2 + 2(\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2)^2/T & \end{bmatrix} \quad (A.3)$$

where $\hat{V}(\hat{\lambda})$ is a scalar, $\hat{\xi} = (X'X)^{-1}XY\hat{\lambda} = \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\omega}$

with $\hat{\alpha} = (X'X)^{-1}X'(Y^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln Y)/\hat{\lambda}$, $\hat{\omega} = \hat{\beta}/\hat{\lambda}$,

$(Y^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln Y)$ is a $T \times 1$ column vector with typical element $y_t^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln y_t$, and $Y^{\hat{\lambda}}$ is a $T \times 1$ column vector with typical element $y_t^{\hat{\lambda}}$.

The asymptotic covariance estimator of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)$ may therefore be expressed as :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)] &= \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2 [(X'X)/T]_{kk}^{-1} + \hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)] \hat{\xi}_k^2 \\ &= \hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2 [(X'X)/T]_{kk}^{-1} + \hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)] (\hat{\alpha}_k^2 + \hat{\omega}_k^2 - 2\hat{\alpha}_k \hat{\omega}_k) \end{aligned}$$

where $[(X'X)/T]_{kk}^{-1}$ is the k 'th diagonal element of $[(X'X)/T]^{-1}$, $\hat{\xi}_k$, $\hat{\alpha}_k$ and $\hat{\omega}_k$ are the k 'th elements of $\hat{\xi}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$, and $\hat{\omega}$ respectively.

The probability limit of the above variance estimator is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)]\} &= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 [\text{lim}(X'X/T)]_{kk}^{-1} \\ &+ \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)]\}(\alpha_k^2 + \omega_k^2 - 2\alpha_k\omega_k) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\alpha_k = \text{Plim } \hat{\alpha}_k$ and $\omega_k = \text{Plim } \hat{\omega}_k$.

If one now considers a scaled model such as that defined by equation (20) with scaling factor C, where C is an arbitrary constant term that may, among other values, take the value Ξ , one obtains :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k)]\} &= C^{-2\lambda} \sigma_\varepsilon^2 [\text{lim}(X'X)/T]_{kk}^{-1} \\ &+ \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)]\} \eta_k^2 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where η_k is the k'th element of η ,

$$\eta = \text{Plim } \hat{\eta}$$

$$\text{and } \hat{\eta} = (X'X)^{-1}X'[(Y/C)^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln(Y/C)] - (Y/C)^{\hat{\lambda}} / \hat{\lambda}.$$

The above expression may also be written, for $k = 2, \dots, K$, as :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k)]\} &= \sigma_\varepsilon^2 C^{-2\lambda} [\text{lim}(X'X)/T]_{kk}^{-1} \\ &+ C^{-2\lambda} \text{Plim}\{\hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\lambda} - \lambda)]\} \{\alpha_k^2 \\ &+ (1 + \lambda \ln C)^2 \omega_k^2 - 2\alpha_k\omega_k(1 + \lambda \ln C)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This last expression is derived from the fact that

$$(X'X)^{-1}X' \{[(Y/C)^{\hat{\lambda}} \ln(Y/C)] - (Y/C)^{(\hat{\lambda})}\} \hat{\lambda} = C^{-\hat{\lambda}} \hat{\alpha} - C^{-\hat{\lambda}} [1 + \hat{\lambda} \ln C] \hat{\omega} - \hat{\theta} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

where $\hat{\theta} = (X'X)^{-1}X'i[(C^{-\hat{\lambda}} - 1)/\lambda + C^{-\hat{\lambda}} \ln C]/\hat{\lambda}$

and i is a $(T \times 1)$ unit vector. Note that $\hat{\theta}$ is the OLS estimator obtained by regressing the constant vector $i[(C^{-\hat{\lambda}} + 1)/\lambda - C^{-\hat{\lambda}} \ln C]$ on the variables contained in the X matrix. Since the first column of X is a unit vector, the elements of the $\hat{\theta}$ -vector will all be equal to zero, except for the first element.

Comparing (A.6) with (A.4), one sees that if $\beta_k = \psi_k = 0$, $\omega_k = 0$, $\text{Plim} \{ \hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\psi}_k - \psi_k)] \} = C^{-2\lambda} \text{Plim} \{ \hat{V}[\sqrt{T}(\hat{\beta}_k - \beta_k)] \}$.

**Université de Montréal
Département de sciences économiques**

**Cahiers de recherche (Discussion Papers)
1992 à aujourd'hui (1992 to date)**

- 9201 : Dionne, Georges and Robert Gagné, "Measuring Technical Change and Productivity Growth with Varying Output Qualities and Incomplete Panel Data", 32 pages.
- 9202 : Beaudry, Paul and Michel Poitevin, "The Commitment Value of Contracts Under Dynamic Renegotiation", 30 pages.
- 9203 : Dionne, Georges et Christian Gollier, "Simple Increases in Risk and their Comparative Statics for Portfolio Management", 22 pages.
- 9204 : Fortin, Nicole M., "Allocation Inflexibilities, Female Labor Supply and Housing Assets Accumulation : Are Women Working to Pay the Mortgage?", 42 pages.
- 9205 : Beaudry, Paul, Marcel Boyer et Michel Poitevin, "Le rôle du collatéral dans le report des investissements en présence d'asymétries d'information", 20 pages.
- 9206 : Brenner, Reuven, Marcel G. Dagenais et Claude Montmarquette, "The Declining Saving Rate : An Overlooked Explanation", 34 pages.
- 9207 : Tremblay, Rodrigue, "L'impact fiscal statique et dynamique de l'accession du Québec au statut de pays souverain", 33 pages.
- 9208 : Mercenier, Jean, "Completing the European Internal Market : A General Equilibrium Evaluation Under Alternative Market Structure Assumptions", 38 pages.
- 9209 : Martin, Fernand and Sonia Granzer, "Notes of Methods of Assessing the Value of the Damages to Forests Caused by Air Pollution", 21 pages.
- 9210 : Dionne, Georges et Robert Gagné, "Rendements d'échelle, progrès technique et croissance de la productivité dans les industries québécoise et ontarienne de transport par camion, 1981-1988", 28 pages.
- 9211 : Sprumont, Yves, "Continuous Strategyproof Mechanisms for Sharing Private Goods", 30 pages.
- 9212 : Tremblay, Rodrigue, "L'émergence d'un bloc économique et commercial nord-américain : la compétitivité de l'économie canadienne et la politique du taux de change", 37 pages.
- 9213 : Hollander, Abraham, "Restricting Intra-industry Quota Transfers in Agriculture: Who Gains, Who Loses?", 10 pages.
- 9214 : Mandel, Benedikt, Marc Gaudry and Werner Rothengatter, "Linear or Nonlinear Utility Functions in Logit Models? The Impact of German High Speed Rail Demand Forecasts", 17 pages.
- 9215 : Ghysels, Éric, "Christmas, Spring and the Dawning of Economic Recovery", 26 pages.
- 9216 : Canova, Fabio et Éric Ghysels, "Changes in Seasonal Patterns : Are They Cyclical", 38 pages.

- 9217 : Campbell, Bryan et Éric Ghysels, "Is the Outcome of the Federal Budget Process Unbiased and Efficient? A Nonparametric Assessment", 34 pages.
- 9218 : Boismenu, Gérard, Nicolas Gravel et Jean-Guy Loranger, "Régime d'accumulation et approche de la régulation : un modèle à équations simultanées", 27 pages.
- 9219 : Dionne, Georges and Pascale Viala, "Optimal Design of Financial Contracts and Moral Hazard", 60 pages.
- 9220 : Desruelle, Dominique, Gérard Gaudet et Yves Richelle, "Complementarity, Coordination and Compatibility : An Analysis of the Economics of Systems", 52 pages.
- 9221 : Desruelle, Dominique et Yves Richelle, "The Investment Dynamics of a Duopoly: The Relative Importance of a Head Start", 34 pages.
- 9222 : Mercenier, Jean, "Can '1992' Reduce Unemployment in Europe? On Welfare and Employment Effects of Europe's Move to a Single Market", 36 pages.
- 9223 : Dufour, Jean-Marie, Éric Ghysels et Alastair Hall, "Generalized Predictive Tests and Structural Change Analysis in Econometrics", 46 pages.
- 9224 : Dufour, Jean-Marie et Marc Hallin, "Improved Eaton Bounds for Linear Combinations of Bounded Random Variables, with Statistical Applications", 25 pages.
- 9225 : Crampes, Claude et Abraham Hollander, "How Many Karats is Gold : Welfare Effects of Easing a Denomination Standard, 20 pages.
- 9226 : Bonomo, Marco et René Garcia, "Indexation, Staggering and Disinflation", 32 pages.
- 9227 : Dudley, Leonard et Jacques Robert, "A Non-Cooperative Model of Alliances and Warfare", 26 pages.
- 9228 : Arcand, Jean-Louis, "Structural Adjustment and the Organization of Agricultural Credit in Egypt", 29 pages.
- 9229 : Arcand, Jean-Louis, "Supply Response and Marketing Board Policy : The Case of Egyptian Cotton", 38 pages.
- 9230 : Cadot, Olivier et Dominique Desruelle, "R & D : Who Does the R, Who Does the D?", 18 pages.
- 9231 : Kollmann, Robert, "Incomplete Asset Markets and International Business Cycles", 36 pages.
- 9232 : Kollmann, Robert, "Consumptions, Real Exchange Rates and the Structure of International Asset Markets", 33 pages.
- 9233 : Arcand, Jean-Louis, "Growth and Social Custom", 37 pages.
- 9234 : Desruelle, Dominique, "Infant Industries and Imperfect Capital Markets : The Case Against Tariff Protection", 30 pages.
- 9235 : Mercenier, Jean et Nicolas Schmitt, "Sunk Costs, Free-Entry Equilibrium and Trade Liberalization in Applied General Equilibrium : Implications for 'Europe 1992'", 42 pages.
- 9236 : Boudjellaba, Hafida, Jean-Marie Dufour et Roch Roy, "Simplified Conditions for Non-Causality between Vectors in Multivariate Arma Models", 24 pages.

- 9237 : Ghysels, Eric, Hahn S. Lee et Pierre L. Siklos, "On the (Mis)specification of Seasonality and its Consequences : An Empirical Investigation with U.S. Data", 45 pages.
- 9301 : Mercenier, Jean, "Nonuniqueness of Solutions in Applied General-Equilibrium Models with Scale Economies and Imperfect Competition : A Theoretical *Curiosum*?", 26 pages.
- 9302 : Lemieux, Thomas, "Unions and Wage Inequality in Canada and in the United States", 66 pages.
- 9303 : Lemieux, Thomas, "Estimating the Effects of Unions on Wage Inequality in a Two-Sector Model with Comparative Advantage and Non-Random Selection", 54 pages.
- 9304 : Harchaoui, Tarek H., "Time-Varying Risks and Returns : Evidence from Mining Industries Data", 20 pages.
- 9305 : Lévy-Garboua, Louis et Claude Montmarquette, "Une étude économétrique de la demande de théâtre sur données individuelles", 40 pages.
- 9306 : Montmarquette, Claude, Rachel Houle et Sophie Mahseredjian, "The Determinants of University Dropouts : A Longitudinal Analysis", 17 pages.
- 9307 : Gaudry, Marc, Benedikt Mandel et Werner Rothengatter, "A Disaggregate Box-Cox Logit Mode Choice Model of Intercity Passenger Travel in Germany", 17 pages.
- 9308 : Fortin, Nicole M., "Borrowing Constraints and Female Labor Supply : Nonparametric and Parametric Evidence of the Impact of Mortgage Lending Rules", 38 pages.
- 9309 : Dionne, Georges, Robert Gagné, François Gagnon et Charles Vanasse, "Debt, Moral Hazard and Airline Safety : an Empirical Evidence", 34 pages.
- 9310 : Dionne, Georges, Anne Gibbens et Pierre St-Michel, "An Economic Analysis of Insurance Fraud", 40 pages.
- 9311 : Gaudry, Marc, "Asymmetric Shape and Variable Tail Thickness in Multinomial Probabilistic Responses to Significant Transport Service Level Changes", 26 pages.
- 9312 : Laferrière, Richard et Marc Gaudry, "Testing the Linear Inverse Power Transformation Logit Mode Choice Model", 29 pages.
- 9313 : Kollmann, Robert, "Fiscal Policy, Technology Shocks and the US Trade Balance Deficit", 38 pages.
- 9314 : Ghysels, Eric, "A Time Series Model With Periodic Stochastic Regime Switching", 54 pages.
- 9315 : Allard, Marie, Camille Bronsard et Lise Salvas-Bronsard, "C⁺-Conjugate Expectations and Duality", 22 pages.
- 9316 : Dudley, Leonard et Claude Montmarquette, "Government Size and Economic Convergence", 28 pages.
- 9317 : Bronsard, Camille, "L'histoire de l'économie mathématique racontée à Juliette", 17 pages.
- 9318 : Tremblay, Rodrigue, "The Quest for Competitiveness and Export-Led Growth", 16 pages.
- 9319 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "L'ALÉNA", 12 pages.

- 9320 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "Le Québec dans l'ALÉNA", 28 pages.
- 9321 : Dionne, Georges, Denise Desjardins, Claire Laberge-Nadeau et Urs Magg, "Medical Conditions, Risk Exposure and Truck Drivers' Accidents : an Analysis with Count Data Regression Models", 20 pages.
- 9322 : Ghysels, Eric, "Seasonal Adjustment and Other Data Transformations", 28 pages.
- 9323 : Dufour, Jean-Marie et David Tessier, "On the Relationship Between Impulse Response Analysis, Innovation Accounting and Granger Causality", 12 pages.
- 9324 : Dufour, Jean-Marie et Eric Renault, "Causalités à court et à long terme dans les modèles VAR et ARIMA multivariés", 68 pages.
- 9325 : Ghysels, Eric et Alastair Hall, "On Periodic Time Series and Testing the Unit Root Hypothesis", 36 pages.
- 9326 : Campbell, Bryan et Jean-Marie Dufour, "Exact Nonparametric Orthogonality and Random Walk Tests", 28 pages.
- 9327 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "Quebec in North America : from a Borderlands to a Borderless Economy : an Examination of its Trade Flows with the U.S.A. at the National and Regional Levels", 24 pages.
- 9328 : Proulx, Pierre-Paul, "L'ALÉNA, le Québec et la mutation de son espace économique", 36 pages.
- 9329 : Sprumont, Yves, "Strategyproof Collective Choice in Economic and Political Environments", 48 pages.
- 9330 : Cardia, Emanuela et Steve Ambler, "The Cyclical Behaviour of Wages and Profits Under Imperfect Competition", 24 pages.
- 9331 : Arcand, Jean-Louis L. et Elise S. Brezis, "Disequilibrium Dynamics During the Great Depression", 64 pages.
- 9332 : Beaudry, Paul et Michel Poitevin, "Contract Renegotiation : a Simple Framework and Implications for Organization Theory", 48 pages.
- 9333 : Ghysels, Eric et Alastair Hall, "On Periodic Time Series and Testing the Unit Root Hypothesis", 36 pages. (Ce cahier portait déjà le no 9325.)
- 9333 : Dagenais, Marcel G. et Jean-Marie Dufour, "Pitfalls of Rescaling Regression Models with Box-Cox Transformations", 16 pages.
- 9334 : Bonomo, Marco et René Garcia, "Disappointment Aversion as a Solution to the Equity Premium and the Risk-Free Rate Puzzles", 40 pages.
- 9335 : Ghysels, Eric et Offer Lieberman, "Dynamic Regression and Filtered Data Series : A Laplace Approximation to the Effects of Filtering in Small Samples", 24 pages.