Title

nlcom — Nonlinear combinations of parameters

Description Options References Quick start Remarks and examples Also see Menu Stored results Syntax Methods and formulas

# Description

nlcom computes point estimates, standard errors, test statistics, significance levels, and confidence intervals for (possibly) nonlinear combinations of parameter estimates after any Stata estimation command, including survey estimation. Results are displayed in the usual table format used for displaying estimation results. Standard error calculations are based on the "delta method", an approximation appropriate in large samples.

# Quick start

```
Estimate the ratio of the coefficient of x2 to the coefficient of x1 nlcom _b[x2]/_b[x1]
```

```
Also estimate the ratio of the coefficient of x3 to coefficient of x1
nlcom (_b[x2]/_b[x1]) (_b[x3]/_b[x1])
```

Add labels to the ratios

```
nlcom (r21:_b[x2]/_b[x1]) (r31:_b[x3]/_b[x1])
```

Same as above, but post estimates and use the test command to test that both ratios are equal to 1
nlcom (r21:\_b[x2]/\_b[x1]) (r31:\_b[x3]/\_b[x1]), post
test (r21 = 1) (r31 = 1)

Estimate the ratio of the coefficients of factor indicators 2.a and 3.a nlcom \_b[2.a]/\_b[3.a]

Estimate the ratio of the coefficients of x1 in the equations for y1 and y2 in a multiequation model nlcom \_b[y1:x1]/\_b[y2:x1]

### Menu

Statistics > Postestimation

## Syntax

Nonlinear combination of parameters—one expression

nlcom [name:]exp [, options]

Nonlinear combinations of parameters-more than one expression

```
nlcom ([name:]exp) [([name:]exp)...] [, options]
```

options	Description
<u>l</u> evel(#)	set confidence level; default is level(95)
<u>iter</u> ate(#)	maximum number of iterations
display_options	control column formats and line width
post	post estimation results
eform	report exponentiated estimates; column title is "exp(b)"
eform( <i>string</i> )	report exponentiated estimates; column title is "string"
noheader	suppress output header
df(#)	use $t$ distribution with $\#$ degrees of freedom for computing $p$ -values and confidence intervals

collect is allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands.

Only one of eform or eform() is allowed.

noheader and df(#) do not appear in the dialog box.

The second syntax means that if more than one expression is specified, each must be surrounded by parentheses. The optional *name* is any valid Stata name and labels the transformations.

exp is a possibly nonlinear expression containing

\_b[coef] \_b[eqno:coef] [eqno]coef [eqno]\_b[coef]

eqno is

## name

*coef* identifies a coefficient in the model. *coef* is typically a variable name, a level indicator, an interaction indicator, or an interaction involving continuous variables. Level indicators identify one level of a factor variable and interaction indicators identify one combination of levels of an interaction; see [U] **11.4.3 Factor variables**. *coef* may contain time-series operators; see [U] **11.4.4 Time-series variables**.

Distinguish between [], which are to be typed, and [], which indicate optional arguments.

## Options

- level(#) specifies the confidence level, as a percentage, for confidence intervals. The default is level(95) or as set by set level; see [U] 20.8 Specifying the width of confidence intervals.
- iterate(#) specifies the maximum number of iterations used to find the optimal step size in calculating numerical derivatives of the transformation(s) with respect to the original parameters. By default, the maximum number of iterations is 100, but convergence is usually achieved after only a few iterations. You should rarely have to use this option.
- display\_options: cformat(% fmt), pformat(% fmt), sformat(% fmt), and nolstretch; see [R] Estimation options.
- post causes nlcom to behave like a Stata estimation (eclass) command. When post is specified, nlcom will post the vector of transformed parameters and its estimated variance-covariance matrix to e(). This option, in essence, makes the transformation permanent. Thus you could, after posting, treat the transformed estimation results in the same way as you would treat results from other Stata estimation commands. For example, after posting, you could redisplay the results by typing nlcom without any arguments, or use test to perform simultaneous tests of hypotheses on linear combinations of the transformed parameters; see [R] test.

Specifying post clears out the previous estimation results, which can be recovered only by refitting the original model or by storing the estimation results before running nlcom and then restoring them; see [R] estimates store.

eform and eform(*string*) specify that the table of estimates be displayed in exponentiated form: for each estimate,  $e^b$  rather than b is displayed, where b is the nonlinear combination of parameters. eform labels the exponentiated results exp(b), whereas eform(*string*) uses *string* to label them. Standard errors and confidence intervals are also transformed; see [R] *eform\_option*.

The following options are available with nlcom but are not shown in the dialog box:

noheader suppresses the output header.

df (#) specifies that the t distribution with # degrees of freedom be used for computing p-values and confidence intervals.

## **Remarks and examples**

#### stata.com

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

Introduction Basics Using the post option Reparameterizing ML estimates for univariate data nlcom versus eform

### Introduction

nlcom and predictnl both use the delta method. They take nonlinear transformations of the estimated parameter vector from some fitted model and apply the delta method to calculate the variance, standard error, Wald test statistic, etc., of the transformations. nlcom is designed for functions of the parameters, and predictnl is designed for functions of the parameters and of the data, that is, for predictions.

nlcom generalizes lincom (see [R] lincom) in two ways. First, nlcom allows the transformations to be nonlinear. Second, nlcom can be used to simultaneously estimate many transformations (whether linear or nonlinear) and to obtain the estimated variance–covariance matrix of these transformations.

#### **Basics**

In [R] lincom, the following regression was performed:

. use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r18/regress

. regress y x1	x2 x3						
Source	SS	df	MS		er of obs	=	148
				- F(3,	144)	=	96.12
Model	3259.3561	3	1086.45203	Prob	> F	=	0.0000
Residual	1627.56282	144	11.3025196	R-sq	uared	=	0.6670
				- Adj	R-squared	=	0.6600
Total	4886.91892	147	33.2443464	Root	MSE	=	3.3619
У	Coefficient	Std. err.	t	P> t	[95% co:	nf.	interval]
x1	1.457113	1.07461	1.36	0.177	66693	4	3.581161
x2	2.221682	.8610358	2.58	0.011	.519779	7	3.923583
x3	006139	.0005543	-11.08	0.000	007234	5	0050435
_cons	36.10135	4.382693	8.24	0.000	27.4386	3	44.76407

Then, lincom was used to estimate the difference between the coefficients of x1 and x2:

```
. lincom _b[x2] - _b[x1]
( 1) - x1 + x2 = 0
```

У	Coefficient	Std. err.	t	P> t	[95% conf.	interval]
(1)	.7645682	.9950282	0.77	0.444	-1.20218	2.731316

It was noted, however, that nonlinear expressions are not allowed with lincom:

```
. lincom _b[x2]/_b[x1]
not possible with test
r(131);
```

Nonlinear transformations are instead estimated using nlcom:

. nlc	om _b[x2] _nl_1:	]/_b[x1] _b[x2]/_b[x1]					
	У	Coefficient	Std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
	_nl_1	1.524714	.9812848	1.55	0.120	3985686	3.447997

### □ Technical note

The notation  $\_b[name]$  is the standard way in Stata to refer to regression coefficients; see [U] **13.5 Accessing coefficients and standard errors**. Some commands, such as lincom and test, allow you to drop the  $\_b[]$  and just refer to the coefficients by *name*. nlcom, however, requires the full specification  $\_b[name]$ .

Returning to our linear regression example, nlcom also allows simultaneous estimation of more than one combination:

_nl_1: _nl_2:	2]/_b[x1]) (_b _b[x2]/_b[x1] _b[x3]/_b[x1] _b[x3]/_b[x2]		) (_b[x3]	/_b[x2])		
у	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
_nl_1 _nl_2 _nl_3	1.524714 0042131 0027632	.9812848 .0033483 .0010695	1.55 -1.26 -2.58	0.120 0.208 0.010	3985686 0107756 0048594	3.447997 .0023494 000667

We can also label the transformations to produce more informative names in the estimation table:

```
. nlcom (ratio21:_b[x2]/_b[x1]) (ratio31:_b[x3]/_b[x1]) (ratio32:_b[x3]/_b[x2])
```

```
ratio21: _b[x2]/_b[x1]
ratio31: _b[x3]/_b[x1]
ratio32: _b[x3]/_b[x2]
```

-

-

у	Coefficient	Std. err.	Z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
ratio21	1.524714	.9812848	1.55	0.120	3985686	3.447997
ratio31	0042131	.0033483	-1.26	0.208	0107756	.0023494
ratio32	0027632	.0010695	-2.58	0.010	0048594	000667

nlcom stores the vector of estimated combinations and its estimated variance-covariance matrix in r().

```
. matrix list r(b)
r(b)[1,3]
       ratio21
                   ratio31
                               ratio32
c1
     1.5247143 -.00421315 -.00276324
. matrix list r(V)
symmetric r(V)[3,3]
            ratio21
                        ratio31
                                    ratio32
ratio21
          .96291982
ratio31
        -.00287781
                      .00001121
ratio32 -.00014234
                      2.137e-06
                                  1.144e-06
```

#### Using the post option

When used with the post option, nlcom stores the estimation vector and variance-covariance matrix in e(), making the transformation permanent:

```
. quietly nlcom (ratio21:_b[x2]/_b[x1]) (ratio31:_b[x3]/_b[x1])
> (ratio32:_b[x3]/_b[x2]), post
. matrix list e(b)
e(b)[1,3]
       ratio21
                  ratio31
                               ratio32
     1.5247143 -.00421315 -.00276324
y1
. matrix list e(V)
symmetric e(V)[3,3]
            ratio21
                        ratio31
                                    ratio32
ratio21
        .96291982
ratio31 -.00287781
                      .00001121
ratio32 -.00014234
                      2.137e-06
                                  1.144e-06
```

After posting, we can proceed as if we had just run a Stata estimation (eclass) command. For instance, we can replay the results,

. nlcom

У	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
ratio21	1.524714	.9812848	1.55	0.120	3985686	3.447997
ratio31	0042131	.0033483	-1.26	0.208	0107756	.0023494
ratio32	0027632	.0010695	-2.58	0.010	0048594	000667

or perform other postestimation tasks in the transformed metric, this time making reference to the new "coefficients":

```
. display _b[ratio31]
-.00421315
. estat vce. correlation
Correlation matrix of coefficients of nlcom model
        e(V)
                ratio21
                          ratio31
                                    ratio32
     ratio21
                 1.0000
                -0.8759
                          1.0000
     ratio31
                -0.1356
                           0.5969
     ratio32
                                     1.0000
. test _b[ratio21] = 1
 (1) ratio21 = 1
           chi2( 1) =
                          0.29
         Prob > chi2 =
                          0.5928
```

We see that testing  $_b[ratio21]=1$  in the transformed metric is equivalent to testing using testnl  $_b[x2]/_b[x1]=1$  in the original metric:

We needed to refit the regression model to recover the original parameter estimates.

### Technical note

In a previous technical note, we mentioned that commands such as lincom and test permit reference to *name* instead of \_b[*name*]. This is not the case when lincom and test are used after nlcom, post. In the above, we used

. test  $_b[ratio21] = 1$ 

rather than

. test ratio21 = 1

which would have returned an error. Consider this a limitation of Stata. For the shorthand notation to work, you need a variable named *name* in the data. In nlcom, however, *name* is just a coefficient label that does not necessarily correspond to any variable in the data.

### Reparameterizing ML estimates for univariate data

When run using only a response and no covariates, Stata's maximum likelihood (ML) estimation commands will produce ML estimates of the parameters of some assumed univariate distribution for the response. The parameterization, however, is usually not one we are used to dealing with in a nonregression setting. In such cases, nlcom can be used to transform the estimation results from a regression model to those from a maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of a univariate probability distribution in a more familiar metric.

#### Example 1

Consider the following univariate data on Y = # of traffic accidents at a certain intersection in a given year:

. use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r18/trafint

. summarize ad	ccidents				
Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. dev.	Min	Max
accidents	12	13.83333	14.47778	0	41

A quick glance of the output from summarize leads us to quickly reject the assumption that Y is distributed as Poisson because the estimated variance of Y is much greater than the estimated mean of Y.

Instead, we choose to model the data as univariate negative binomial, of which a common parameterization is

$$\Pr(Y=y) = \frac{\Gamma(r+y)}{\Gamma(r)\Gamma(y+1)} p^r (1-p)^y \qquad 0 \le p \le 1, \quad r > 0, \quad y = 0, 1, \dots$$

with

$$E(Y) = \frac{r(1-p)}{p}$$
  $Var(Y) = \frac{r(1-p)}{p^2}$ 

There exist no closed-form solutions for the maximum likelihood estimates of p and r, yet they may be estimated by the iterative method of Newton–Raphson. One way to get these estimates would be to write our own Newton–Raphson program for the negative binomial. Another way would be to write our own ML evaluator; see [R] ml.

The easiest solution, however, would be to use Stata's existing negative binomial ML regression command, nbreg. The only problem with this solution is that nbreg estimates a different parameterization of the negative binomial, but we can worry about that later.

```
. nbreg accidents
Fitting Poisson model:
Iteration 0: Log likelihood = -105.05361
Iteration 1: Log likelihood = -105.05361
Fitting constant-only model:
Iteration 0: Log likelihood = -43.948619
Iteration 1: Log likelihood = -43.891483
Iteration 2: Log likelihood = -43.89144
Iteration 3: Log likelihood = -43.89144
Fitting full model:
Iteration 0: Log likelihood =
                                -43.89144
Iteration 1: Log likelihood = -43.89144
Negative binomial regression
                                                         Number of obs =
                                                                             12
                                                         LR chi2(0)
                                                                           0.00
                                                         Prob > chi2
Dispersion: mean
                                                                       =
                                                         Pseudo R2
                                                                       = 0.0000
Log likelihood = -43.89144
   accidents
               Coefficient Std. err.
                                                           [95% conf. interval]
                                            z
                                                 P>|z|
       _cons
                 2.627081
                            .3192233
                                          8.23
                                                 0.000
                                                           2.001415
                                                                       3.252747
    /lnalpha
                 .1402425
                            .4187147
                                                          -.6804233
                                                                       .9609083
       alpha
                 1.150553
                            .4817534
                                                           .5064026
                                                                        2.61407
LR test of alpha=0: chibar2(01) = 122.32
                                                        Prob >= chibar2 = 0.000
. nbreg, coeflegend
Negative binomial regression
                                                         Number of obs =
                                                                             12
                                                                           0.00
                                                         LR chi2(0)
                                                                       =
Dispersion: mean
                                                         Prob > chi2
                                                                       =
Log likelihood = -43.89144
                                                         Pseudo R2
                                                                       = 0.0000
   accidents
               Coefficient
                            Legend
       _cons
                 2.627081
                           _b[_cons]
    /lnalpha
                 .1402425
                           _b[/lnalpha]
       alpha
                 1.150553
LR test of alpha=0: chibar2(01) = 122.32
                                                        Prob >= chibar2 = 0.000
```

From this output, we see that, when used with univariate data, nbreg estimates a regression intercept,  $\beta_0$ , and the logarithm of some parameter  $\alpha$ . This parameterization is useful in regression models:  $\beta_0$  is the intercept meant to be augmented with other terms of the linear predictor, and  $\alpha$  is an overdispersion parameter used for comparison with the Poisson regression model.

However, we need to transform  $(\beta_0, \ln \alpha)$  to (p, r). Examining *Methods and formulas* of [R] **nbreg** reveals the transformation as

$$p = \{1 + \alpha \exp(\beta_0)\}^{-1}$$
  $r = \alpha^{-1}$ 

which we apply using nlcom:

> (r:exp(b[	(1 + exp(_b[/l /lnalpha])) 1/(1 + exp(_b	-				
-	exp(b[/lnal	-	_01_001	15]//		
accidents	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
p r	.0591157 .8691474	.0292857 .3639248	2.02 2.39	0.044 0.017	.0017168 .1558679	.1165146 1.582427

Given the invariance of maximum likelihood estimators and the properties of the delta method, the above parameter estimates, standard errors, etc., are precisely those we would have obtained had we instead performed the Newton–Raphson optimization in the (p, r) metric. 4

Technical note

Note how we referred to the estimate of  $\ln \alpha$  above as \_b[/lnalpha]. This is not entirely evident from the output of nbreg, which is why we redisplayed the results using the coeflegend option so that we would know how to refer to the coefficients; [U] 13.5 Accessing coefficients and standard errors.

#### nlcom versus eform

Many Stata estimation commands allow you to display exponentiated regression coefficients, some by default, some optionally. Known as "eform" in Stata terminology, this reparameterization serves many uses: it gives odds ratios for logistic models, hazard ratios in survival models, incidence-rate ratios in Poisson models, and relative-risk ratios in multinomial logit models, to name a few.

For example, consider the following estimation taken directly from the technical note in [R] **poisson**:

```
. use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r18/airline
. generate lnN = ln(n)
. poisson injuries XYZowned lnN
Iteration 0: Log likelihood = -22.333875
Iteration 1:
              Log likelihood = -22.332276
             Log likelihood = -22.332276
Iteration 2:
                                                          Number of obs =
Poisson regression
                                                                                9
                                                          LR chi2(2)
                                                                        = 19.15
                                                          Prob > chi2
                                                                        = 0.0001
                                                                        = 0.3001
                                                          Pseudo R2
Log likelihood = -22.332276
               Coefficient
                            Std. err.
                                                  P>|z|
                                                            [95% conf. interval]
    injuries
                                            7
    XYZowned
                  .6840667
                             .3895877
                                          1.76
                                                  0.079
                                                           -.0795111
                                                                         1.447645
         lnN
                 1.424169
                             .3725155
                                          3.82
                                                  0.000
                                                            .6940517
                                                                        2.154285
                 4.863891
                             .7090501
                                          6.86
                                                  0.000
                                                            3.474178
                                                                        6.253603
       _cons
```

When we replay results and specify the irr (incidence-rate ratios) option,

. poisson, irm	c .					
Poisson regression					Number of ob LR chi2(2) Prob > chi2	= 19.15 = 0.0001
Log likelihood	1 = -22.332276	5			Pseudo R2	= 0.3001
injuries	IRR	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
XYZowned lnN _cons	1.981921 4.154402 129.5272	.7721322 1.547579 91.84126	1.76 3.82 6.86	0.079 0.000 0.000	.9235678 2.00181 32.2713	4.253085 8.621728 519.8828

Note: \_cons estimates baseline incidence rate.

we obtain the exponentiated regression coefficients and their estimated standard errors.

Contrast this with what we obtain if we exponentiate the coefficients manually by using nlcom:

```
. nlcom (E_XYZowned:exp(_b[XYZowned])) (E_lnN:exp(_b[lnN]))
```

```
E_XYZowned: exp(_b[XYZowned])
        E_lnN: exp(_b[lnN])
```

injuries	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
E_XYZowned	1.981921	.7721322	2.57	0.010	.4685701	3.495273
E_lnN	4.154402	1.547579	2.68	0.007	1.121203	7.187602

There are three things to note when comparing an estimation command specified with an *eform\_option* with the nlcom command specified with coefficients that are exponentiated manually:

- 1. The exponentiated coefficients and standard errors are identical. This is certainly good news.
- 2. The Wald test statistic (z) and level of significance are different. When using eform or any *eform\_option* with an estimation command, the Wald test does not change from what you would have obtained without the eform option. You can see this by comparing both versions of the poisson output given previously.

When you use eform, Stata knows that what is usually desired is a test of

$$H_0$$
:  $\exp(\beta) = 1$ 

and not the uninformative-by-comparison

$$H_0$$
:  $\exp(\beta) = 0$ 

The test of  $H_0: \exp(\beta) = 1$  is asymptotically equivalent to a test of  $H_0: \beta = 0$ , the Wald test in the original metric, but the latter has better small-sample properties. Thus if you specify eform, you get a test of  $H_0: \beta = 0$ .

nlcom, however, is general. It does not attempt to infer the test of greatest interest for a given transformation, and so a test of

$$H_0$$
: transformed coefficient = 0

is always given, regardless of the transformation.

4.253085

8.621728

3. You may be surprised to see that, even though the coefficients and standard errors are identical, the confidence intervals (both 95%) are different.

eform confidence intervals reported by an estimation command are standard confidence intervals with the endpoints transformed. For example, the confidence interval for the coefficient on lnN is [0.694, 2.154], whereas the confidence interval for the incidence-rate ratio due to lnN is  $[\exp(0.694), \exp(2.154)] = [2.002, 8.619]$ , which, except for some roundoff error, is what we see from the output of poisson, irr. For exponentiated coefficients, confidence intervals based on transform-the-endpoints methodology generally have better small-sample properties than their asymptotically equivalent counterparts.

The transform-the-endpoints method, however, gives valid coverage only when the transformation is monotonic. nlcom uses a more general and asymptotically equivalent method for calculating confidence intervals, as described in Methods and formulas.

Notice that nlcom has an eform option that behaves the same way as the eform option of any estimation command. Thus, we could have obtained the exponentiated coefficients and confidence intervals after poisson by specifying the eform option with nlcom; that is, we would type

```
. nlcom (E_XYZowned:_b[XYZowned]) (E_lnN:_b[lnN]), eform
 E_XYZowned: _b[XYZowned]
       E_lnN: _b[lnN]
    injuries
                    exp(b)
                             Std. err.
                                             z
                                                  P>|z|
                                                             [95% conf. interval]
 E_XYZowned
                  1.981921
                             .7721322
                                           1.76
                                                   0.079
                                                             .9235678
       E_lnN
                 4.154402
                                                   0.000
                             1.547579
                                           3.82
                                                              2.00181
```

We obtain the same results as we did using poisson with the irr option. The interpretation of the coefficients and confidence intervals follows the discussion above.

# Stored results

nlcom stores the following in r():

Scalars r(N) r(df_r)	number of observations residual degrees of freedom
Matrices	vector of transformed coefficients
r(b)	estimated variance-covariance matrix of the transformed coefficients
r(V)	matrix containing the estimates with their standard errors, test statistics, <i>p</i> -values, and
r(table)	confidence intervals

If post is specified, nlcom also stores the following in e():

Scalars	
e(N)	number of observations
e(df_r)	residual degrees of freedom
e(N_strata)	number of strata $L$ , if used after svy
e(N_psu)	number of sampled PSUs $n$ , if used after svy
e(rank)	rank of e(V)
Macros	
e(cmd)	nlcom
e(predict)	program used to implement predict
e(properties)	b V

0
2

# Methods and formulas

Given a  $1 \times k$  vector of parameter estimates,  $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_k)$ , consider the estimated *p*-dimensional transformation

$$g(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = [g_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}), g_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}), \dots, g_p(\boldsymbol{\theta})]$$

The estimated variance–covariance of  $g(\widehat{\theta})$  is given by

$$\widehat{\operatorname{Var}}\left\{g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right\} = \mathbf{GVG}'$$

where **G** is the  $p \times k$  matrix of derivatives for which

$$\mathbf{G}_{ij} = \frac{\partial g_i(\boldsymbol{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \bigg|_{\boldsymbol{\theta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}} \qquad i = 1, \dots, p \qquad j = 1, \dots, k$$

and V is the estimated variance–covariance matrix of  $\hat{\theta}$ . Standard errors are obtained as the square roots of the variances.

The Wald test statistic for testing

$$H_0: g_i(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$$

versus the two-sided alternative is given by

$$Z_{i} = \frac{g_{i}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})}{\left[\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}_{ii}\left\{g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\right\}\right]^{1/2}}$$

When the variance–covariance matrix of  $\hat{\theta}$  is an asymptotic covariance matrix,  $Z_i$  is approximately distributed as Gaussian. For linear regression,  $Z_i$  is taken to be approximately distributed as  $t_{1,r}$  where r is the residual degrees of freedom from the original fitted model.

A  $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$  confidence interval for  $g_i(\theta)$  is given by

$$g_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \pm z_{\alpha/2} \Big[ \widehat{\operatorname{Var}}_{ii} \left\{ g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \right\} \Big]^{1/2}$$

for those cases where  $Z_i$  is Gaussian and

$$g_i(\widehat{\boldsymbol{ heta}}) \pm t_{\alpha/2,r} \Big[ \widehat{\operatorname{Var}}_{ii} \left\{ g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{ heta}}) \right\} \Big]^{1/2}$$

for those cases where  $Z_i$  is t distributed.  $z_p$  is the 1 - p quantile of the standard normal distribution, and  $t_{p,r}$  is the 1 - p quantile of the t distribution with r degrees of freedom.

### References

Feiveson, A. H. 1999. FAQ: What is the delta method and how is it used to estimate the standard error of a transformed parameter? https://www.stata.com/support/faqs/stat/deltam.html.

Oehlert, G. W. 1992. A note on the delta method. American Statistician 46: 27-29. https://doi.org/10.2307/2684406.

Phillips, P. C. B., and J. Y. Park. 1988. On the formulation of Wald tests of nonlinear restrictions. Econometrica 56: 1065–1083. https://doi.org/10.2307/1911359.

### Also see

- [R] lincom Linear combinations of parameters
- [R] predictnl Obtain nonlinear predictions, standard errors, etc., after estimation
- [R] test Test linear hypotheses after estimation
- [R] testnl Test nonlinear hypotheses after estimation
- [SVY] svy postestimation Postestimation tools for svy
- [U] 20 Estimation and postestimation commands

Stata, Stata Press, and Mata are registered trademarks of StataCorp LLC. Stata and Stata Press are registered trademarks with the World Intellectual Property Organization of the United Nations. StataNow and NetCourseNow are trademarks of StataCorp LLC. Other brand and product names are registered trademarks or trademarks of their respective companies. Copyright ⓒ 1985–2023 StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA. All rights reserved.



For suggested citations, see the FAQ on citing Stata documentation.