

## EDITOR

Stephen Morris  
Department of Economics  
Princeton University, USA  
morris@econometricsociety.org

## CO-EDITORS

Daron Acemoglu  
Department of Economics  
MIT, USA  
daron@econometricsociety.org

Steven Berry  
Department of Economics  
Yale University, USA  
berry@econometricsociety.org

Whitney K. Newey  
Department of Economics  
MIT, USA  
wnewey@mit.edu

Wolfgang Pesendorfer  
Department of Economics  
Princeton University, USA  
wpesendorfer@econometricsociety.org

Larry Samuelson  
Department of Economics  
Yale University, USA  
samuelson@econometricsociety.org

Harald Uhlig  
Department of Economics  
University of Chicago, USA  
uhlig@econometricsociety.org

## MANAGING EDITOR

Geri Mattson  
Mattson Publishing Services  
Baltimore, MD 21221 USA  
mattsonpublishingservices@comcast.net

# ECONOMETRICA

PUBLISHED BY THE ECONOMETRIC SOCIETY

*An International Society for the Advancement of Economic  
Theory in Its Relation to Statistics and Mathematics*

[www.econometricsociety.org/thejournal.html](http://www.econometricsociety.org/thejournal.html)

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Yacine Ait-Sahalia  
Princeton University, USA  
Joseph G. Altonji  
Yale University, USA  
James Andreoni  
University of California, San Diego, USA  
Donald W. K. Andrews  
Yale University, USA  
Jushan Bai  
New York University, USA  
Marco Battaglini  
Princeton University, USA  
Pierpaolo Battigalli  
Università Bocconi, Italy  
Dirk Bergemann  
Yale University, USA  
Michele Boldrin  
Washington University in St. Louis, USA  
Victor Chernozhukov  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA  
J. Darrell Duffie  
Stanford University, USA  
Jeffrey Ely  
Northwestern University, USA  
Larry G. Epstein  
Boston University, USA  
Haluk Ergin  
Washington University in St. Louis, USA  
Faruq Gul  
Princeton University, USA  
Jinyong Hahn  
University of California, Los Angeles, USA  
Philip Haile  
Yale University, USA  
Guido Imbens  
Harvard University, USA  
Philippe Jehiel  
Paris School of Economics, France  
University College London, UK  
Yuichi Kitamura  
Yale University, USA  
Per Krusell  
Princeton University, USA  
Stockholm University, Sweden  
Oliver Linton  
London School of Economics, UK  
Bart Lipman  
Boston University, USA  
Thierry Magnac  
GREMAQ & IDEI, Toulouse, France  
Université des Sciences Sociales, France  
George J. Mailath  
University of Pennsylvania, USA  
David Martimort  
GREMAQ & IDEI, Toulouse, France  
Université des Sciences Sociales, France  
Steven A. Matthews  
University of Pennsylvania, USA  
Rosa L. Matzkin  
University of California, Los Angeles, USA  
Lee Ohanian  
University of California, Los Angeles, USA  
Wojciech Olszewski  
Northwestern University, USA  
Eric Renault  
University of North Carolina, USA  
Philip J. Reny  
University of Chicago, USA  
Jean-Marc Robin  
Université de Paris 1, France  
University College London, UK  
Susanne M. Schennach  
University of Chicago, USA  
Uzi Segal  
Boston College, USA  
Chris Shannon  
University of California, Berkeley, USA  
Neil Shephard  
Nuffield College, Oxford University, UK  
Marciano Siniscalchi  
Northwestern University, USA  
Jeroen M. Swinkels  
Washington University in St. Louis, USA  
Elie Tamer  
Northwestern University, USA  
Iván Werning  
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA  
Asher Wolinsky  
Northwestern University, USA

November 14, 2008

Professor Che-Lin Su  
Graduate School of Business  
University of Chicago  
5807 South Woodlawn Avenue  
Chicago, IL 60637

Dear Professor Su:

I am writing to you concerning your paper, "Constrained Optimization Approaches to Estimation of Structural Models," Manuscript 7925, that was submitted to *Econometrica*. I have enclosed copies of four referee reports. **I have also consulted with other members of the *Econometrica* editorial board in writing this letter.**

All of the referees thought that the idea of this paper was interesting. They all thought it would be great to improve the computation of structural estimators and that using Mathematical Programming with Equilibrium Constraints (MPEC) to do this is an innovative idea for econometrics. On this basis, three of the referees recommended that a revision of the paper be invited. I share these views, and so hope you will prepare a revised version for possible publication in *Econometrica*. I think that estimation of structural models is very important and that the approach you describe is exciting.

The referees raised a number of concerns that we invite you to address in the revised version. We would all like different information about how MPEC compares with the existing approaches. Referee 4 makes some excellent and extensive suggestions along these lines. I endorse the suggestion to run a head-to-head comparison with a modern Nested Fixed Point (NFXP) implementation. **Also, please provide at least one additional comparison with existing approaches, in the context of estimation of a game. Referee 4 provides one suggestion.** Another suggestion is to make a comparison in the Monte Carlo design of Aguirregabiria and Mira (2007). In any case, we ask that you include a head-to-head comparison in computational methods for a game, in addition to the Zurcher one.

We realize that this involves substantial additional work. However, the referees were very clear that more comparisons were needed in order for them to be convinced of the advantages of MPEC. I also have a similar view. I am optimistic about MPEC given what is written but think that more information would be helpful for all.

It would also be good to help the reader understand when MPEC works particularly well relative to NFXP. For example, Dube, Fox, and Su (2008, "Improving the Numerical Performance of BLP Static and Dynamic Discrete Choice Random Coefficients Demand Estimators") do a nice job at this in another example. Also, it would be good to know what problems might come up with MPEC. For instance, could having enough computer memory be a problem with all those constraints? One of the referees suggested that more information about how to actually use the software be provided. I think that would be great for the supplementary material website. In any case, as is *Econometrica* policy, the software instructions used for the computations in the paper will need to be included in a form suitable for replication, to be placed on the supplementary material website.

It would also be nice to have some theoretical results on comparative performance of the algorithms estimators, though this is not a requirement for publication.

Another important issue is multiple equilibria. Most of the recent literature has relied on the assumption that the data are generated by only one equilibrium (even if there are multiple equilibria at the true parameters). If the data were generated by more than one, then the selection mechanism would need to be incorporated in the likelihood in order for maximum likelihood to be consistent. Ignoring that selection mechanism would result in a misspecified likelihood. This problem cannot be sidestepped by changing the algorithm for computing the maximum likelihood estimator. It is inherent in the specification of the likelihood. The referees are clear about this. Indeed, the paper assumes something very much like this on p. 26, where it is assumed that the "same equilibrium is played in each city of a particular type."

Given this concern, and given that the primary focus of this paper is on computation, it seems best to drop the attempt to do something more about multiple equilibria, and just focus on computational methods for models from the established literature, where the assumption that the data corresponds to one equilibrium is maintained.

It would also be good to discuss efficiency issues somewhat and to be more precise about the bootstrap. One question raised by the referees is

Professor Che-Lin Su  
November 14, 2008  
Page 3 of 3

whether MPEC is simply a different way to compute the MLE or whether it changes the estimator. It would be good to clarify this, e.g. in the context of the Zurcher model where a referee asks if the estimators are different.

The referees have a number of expositional suggestions that seem quite reasonable. In particular, all the referees think that the paper could be written as a more positive contribution. For example, Referee 3 suggests deleting most of the material in Section 2 and 5.4, which seems good. The other expositional suggestions of the referees seem good also.

We look forward to receiving a revised version of the paper. Please include with the revision separate responses to the coeditor and each of the referees.

We thank you for submitting your work to *Econometrica*.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Whitney Newey". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Whitney Newey  
Co-Editor

Attachments