Title stata.com

**testnl** — Test nonlinear hypotheses after estimation

Description Quick start Menu Syntax

Options Remarks and examples Stored results Methods and formulas

References Also see

# **Description**

testn1 tests (linear or nonlinear) hypotheses about the estimated parameters from the most recently fit model.

testnl produces Wald-type tests of smooth nonlinear (or linear) hypotheses about the estimated parameters from the most recently fit model. The *p*-values are based on the delta method, an approximation appropriate in large samples.

testnl can be used with svy estimation results; see [SVY] svy postestimation.

The format  $(exp_1=exp_2=exp_3...)$  for a simultaneous-equality hypothesis is just a convenient shorthand for a list  $(exp_1=exp_2)$   $(exp_1=exp_3)$ , etc.

testnl may also be used to test linear hypotheses. test is faster if you want to test only linear hypotheses; see [R] test. testnl is the only option for testing linear and nonlinear hypotheses simultaneously.

#### **Quick start**

After single-equation models

Test that the product of the coefficients for x1 and x2 is equal to 4

testnl 
$$b[x1]*b[x2] = 4$$

Test that the ratio of the indicators for the factor variable a=2 and a=3 is 1

testnl 
$$_{b}[2.a]/_{b}[3.a] = 1$$

Test that an expression involving continuous factor variable syntax is equal to 16

testnl 
$$-b[x1]/(2*b[c.x1#c.x1]) = 16$$

Test the equality of two expressions

testnl 
$$_b[x1]*_b[x2] = _b[x1]*_b[x3]$$

Joint test that two products are both equal to 2

testnl 
$$(_b[x1]*_b[x2] = 2)$$
  $(_b[x1]*_b[x3] = 2)$ 

Same as above

testnl 
$$_b[x1]*_b[x2] = _b[x1]*_b[x3] = 2$$

Same as above, but add separate tests for each expression

testnl 
$$_b[x1]*_b[x2] = _b[x1]*_b[x3] = 2$$
, mtest

Same as above, but adjust p-values for multiple comparisons using Holm's method

testnl 
$$_b[x1]*_b[x2] = _b[x1]*_b[x3] = 2$$
, mtest(holm)

Test a linear hypothesis and a nonlinear hypothesis together

testnl 
$$(_b[x1] =_b[x2])$$
  $(_b[x2] ^ 2 =_b[x3])$ 

After multiple-equation models

Test that the product of the coefficients for x1 and x2 in the equation for y1 is equal to 1 testnl  $_b[y1:x1]*_b[y1:x2] = 1$ 

Test that the product of the coefficients for x1 and x2 in the equation for y2 is equal to 1 testnl  $_b[y2:x1]*_b[y2:x2] = 1$ 

Test the equality of expressions involving coefficients from the equations for y1 and y4 testnl  $_b[y1:x1]*_b[y1:x2] = __b[y4:x1]*_b[y4:x2]$ 

### Menu

Statistics > Postestimation

### **Syntax**

```
testnl exp = exp \ [= exp \dots] \ [ , options \ ]
testnl (exp = exp \ [= exp \dots]) \ [ (exp = exp \ [= exp \dots]) \dots ] \ [ , options \ ]
```

options	Description
$\underline{\mathbf{m}} test [(opt)]$	test each condition separately
<u>iter</u> ate(#)	use maximum # of iterations to find the optimal step size
df(#)	use $F$ distribution with # denominator degrees of freedom for the reference distribution of the test statistic
$\frac{\text{nosvy}}{\text{adjust}}$	carry out the Wald test as $W/k \sim F(k,d)$ ; for use with svy estimation commands when the df() option is also specified

```
collect is allowed; see [U] 11.1.10 Prefix commands. df(#) and nosvyadjust 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.

```
exp is a possibly nonlinear expression containing
```

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

egno 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 varlists.

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

## **Options**

mtest[(opt)] specifies that tests be performed for each condition separately. opt specifies the method for adjusting p-values for multiple testing. Valid values for opt are

bonferroni Bonferroni's method
holm Holm's method
sidak Šidák's method
noadjust no adjustment is to be made

Specifying mtest without an argument is equivalent to specifying mtest(noadjust).

iterate(#) specifies the maximum number of iterations used to find the optimal step size in the calculation of numerical derivatives of the test expressions. 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.

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

df(#) specifies that the F distribution with # denominator degrees of freedom be used for the reference distribution of the test statistic. With survey data, # is the design degrees of freedom unless nosvyadjust is specified.

nosvyadjust is for use with svy estimation commands when the df() option is also specified; see [SVY] svy estimation. It specifies that the Wald test be carried out without the default adjustment for the design degrees of freedom. That is, the test is carried out as  $W/k \sim F(k,d)$  rather than as  $(d-k+1)W/(kd) \sim F(k,d-k+1)$ , where k= the dimension of the test and d= the design degrees of freedom specified in the df() option.

## Remarks and examples

stata.com

Remarks are presented under the following headings:

Introduction
Using testnl to perform linear tests
Specifying constraints
Dropped constraints
Multiple constraints
Manipulability

#### Introduction

#### Example 1

We have just estimated the parameters of an earnings model on cross-sectional time-series data using one of Stata's more sophisticated estimators:

```
. use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r18/earnings (NLS women 14-24 in 1968)
```

. xtgee ln\_w grade age c.age#c.age, corr(exchangeable) nolog

GEE population-averaged model Number of obs 1,326 Group variable: idcode Number of groups = 269 Family: Gaussian Obs per group: Identity min = 1 Correlation: exchangeable avg = 4.9 max = 9 Wald chi2(3) = 327.33Scale parameter = .0976738 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

ln_wage	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
grade age	.0749686 .1080806	.0066111	11.34 4.58	0.000	.062011 .0618526	.0879261 .1543086
c.age#c.age	0016253	.0004739	-3.43	0.001	0025541	0006966
_cons	8788933	. 2830899	-3.10	0.002	-1.433739	3240473

An implication of this model is that peak earnings occur at age -\_b[age]/(2\*\_b[c.age#c.age]), which here is equal to 33.2. Say that we have a theory that peak earnings should occur at age 16 + 1/\_b[grade].

```
. testnl -b[age]/(2*b[c.age#c.age]) = 16 + 1/b[grade]
 (1) -b[age]/(2*b[c.age#c.age]) = 16 + 1/b[grade]
              chi2(1) =
                               1.71
          Prob > chi2 =
                               0.1914
```

These data do not reject our theory.

4

### Using testnl to perform linear tests

testn1 may be used to test linear constraints, but test is faster; see [R] test. You could type

```
. testnl b[x4] = b[x1]
```

but it would take less computer time if you typed

```
. test _b[x4] = _b[x1]
```

### Specifying constraints

The constraints to be tested can be formulated in many different ways. You could type

```
. testnl _b[mpg]*_b[weight] = 1
```

or

```
. testnl _b[mpg] = 1/_b[weight]
```

or you could express the constraint any other way you wished. (To say that testnl allows constraints to be specified in different ways does not mean that the test itself does not depend on the formulation. This point is briefly discussed later.) In formulating the constraints, you must, however, exercise one caution: users of test often refer to the coefficient on a variable by specifying the variable name. For example,

```
. test mpg = 0
```

More formally, they should type

```
. test _b[mpg] = 0
```

but test allows the \_b[] surrounding the variable name to be omitted. testnl does not allow this shorthand. Typing

```
. testnl mpg=0
```

specifies the constraint that the value of variable mpg in the first observation is zero. If you make this mistake, sometimes testnl will catch it:

```
. testnl mpg=0
equation (1) contains reference to X rather than _b[X]
r(198):
```

In other cases, testnl may not catch the mistake; then, the constraint will be dropped because it does not make sense:

```
. testnl mpg=0
Constraint (1) dropped
```

(There are reasons other than this for constraints being dropped.) The worst case, however, is

```
. testnl _b[weight] *mpg = 1
```

when what you mean is not that \_b[weight] equals the reciprocal of the value of mpg in the first observation, but rather that

```
. testnl _b[weight]*_b[mpg] = 1
```

Sometimes, this mistake will be caught by the "contains reference to X rather than b[X]" error, and sometimes it will not. Be careful.

testn1, like test, can be used after any Stata estimation command, including the survey estimators. When you use it after a multiple-equation command, such as mlogit or heckman, you refer to coefficients by using Stata's standard syntax: [eqname]\_b[varname].

Stata's single-equation estimation output looks like this:

	Coef	• • •	
weight mpg	12.27 3.21		<pre>&lt;- coefficient is _b[weight]</pre>

Stata's multiple-equation output looks like this:

		Coef	• • •			
cat1	weight mpg	12.27 3.21		<-	coefficient is	[cat1]_b[weight]
8	weight mpg	5.83 7.43		<-	coefficient is	[8]_b[weight]

### **Dropped constraints**

testnl automatically drops constraints when

• They are nonbinding, for example, \_b[mpg] = \_b[mpg]. More subtle cases include

In this example, the third constraint is nonbinding because it is implied by the first two.

• They are contradictory, for example, \_b[mpg] = 2 and \_b[mpg] = 3. More subtle cases include

The third constraint contradicts the first two.

#### Multiple constraints

#### Example 2

We illustrate the simultaneous test of a series of constraints using simulated data on labor-market promotion in a given year. We fit a probit model with separate effects for education, experience, and experience-squared for men and women.

- . use https://www.stata-press.com/data/r18/promotion (Simulated data on promotions)
- . probit promo male male#c.(yedu yexp yexp2), nolog

Probit regression

Number of obs = LR chi2(7) = 424.42Prob > chi2 = 0.0000Pseudo R2 = 0.4637

Log likelihood = -245.42768

promo	Coefficient	Std. err.	z	P> z	[95% conf.	interval]
male	.6489974	. 203739	3.19	0.001	. 2496763	1.048318
male#c.yedu						
Female	.9730237	.1056136	9.21	0.000	.7660248	1.180023
Male	1.390517	.1527288	9.10	0.000	1.091174	1.68986
male#c.yexp						
Female	.4559544	.0901169	5.06	0.000	.2793285	.6325803
Male	1.422539	.1544255	9.21	0.000	1.11987	1.725207
male#c.yexp2 Female	1027149	.0573059	-1.79	0.073	2150325	.0096026
Male	3749457	.1160113	-3.23	0.001	6023236	1475677
_cons	.9872018	.1148215	8.60	0.000	.7621559	1.212248

Note: 1 failure and 2 successes completely determined.

The effects of human capital seem to differ between men and women. A formal test confirms this.

- . test (yedu#0.male = yedu#1.male) (yexp#0.male = yexp#1.male)
- > (yexp2#0.male = yexp2#1.male)
  - [promo]0b.male#c.yedu [promo]1.male#c.yedu = 0
  - (2) [promo]Ob.male#c.yexp - [promo]1.male#c.yexp = 0
  - (3) [promo]0b.male#c.yexp2 - [promo]1.male#c.yexp2 = 0

chi2(3) =35.43 Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

How do we interpret this gender difference? It has repeatedly been stressed (see, for example, Long [1997, 47-50]; Allison [1999]) that comparison of groups in binary response models, and similarly in other latent-variable models, is hampered by an identification problem: with  $\beta$  the regression coefficients for the latent variable and  $\sigma$  the standard deviation of the latent residual, only the  $\beta/\sigma$ are identified. In fact, in terms of the latent regression, the probit coefficients should be interpreted as  $\beta/\sigma$ , not as the  $\beta$ . If we cannot claim convincingly that the residual standard deviation  $\sigma$  does not vary between the sexes, equality of the regression coefficients  $\beta$  implies that the coefficients of the probit model for men and women are proportional but not necessarily equal. This is a nonlinear hypothesis in terms of the probit coefficients, not a linear one.

We conclude that we find fairly strong evidence against the proportionality of the coefficients, and hence we have to conclude that success in the labor market is produced in different ways by men and women. (But remember, these were simulated data.)

### ▶ Example 3

The syntax for specifying the equality of multiple expressions is just a convenient shorthand for specifying a series of constraints, namely, that the first expression equals the second expression, the first expression also equals the third expression, etc. The Wald test performed and the output of testnl are the same whether we use the shorthand or we specify the series of constraints.

Having established differences between men and women, we would like to do multiple testing between the ratios. Because we did not specify hypotheses in advance, we prefer to adjust the p-values of tests using, here, Bonferroni's method.

	chi2	df	p > chi2
(1) (2)	6.89 0.93	1	0.0173* 0.6713*
All	9.21	2	0.0100

st Bonferroni-adjusted  $p ext{-values}$ 

#### 1

### Manipulability

Although testnl allows you to specify constraints in different ways that are mathematically equivalent, as noted above, this does not mean that the tests are the same. This difference is known as the manipulability of the Wald test for nonlinear hypotheses; also see [R] boxcox. The test might even be significant for one formulation but not significant for another formulation that is mathematically

equivalent. Trying out different specifications to find a formulation with the desired p-value is totally inappropriate, though it may actually be fun to try. There is no variance under representation because the nonlinear Wald test is actually a standard Wald test for a linearization of the constraint, which depends on the particular specification. We note that the likelihood-ratio test is not manipulable in this sense.

From a statistical point of view, it is best to choose a specification of the constraints that is as linear is possible. Doing so usually improves the accuracy of the approximation of the null-distribution of the test by a  $\chi^2$  or an F distribution. The example above used the nonlinear Wald test to test whether the coefficients of human capital variables for men were proportional to those of women. A specification of proportionality of coefficients in terms of ratios of coefficients is fairly nonlinear if the coefficients in the denominator are close to 0. A more linear version of the test results from a bilinear formulation. Thus, instead of

```
. testnl _b[yedu#1.male]/_b[yedu#0.male] = _b[yexp#1.male]/_b[yexp#0.male]
 (1) _b[yedu#1.male]/_b[yedu#0.male] = _b[yexp#1.male]/_b[yexp#0.male]
              chi2(1) =
                               6.89
          Prob > chi2 =
                               0.0087
```

perhaps

```
. testnl _b[yedu#1.male] *_b[yexp#0.male] = _b[yedu#0.male] *_b[yexp#1.male]
      _b[yedu#1.male]*_b[yexp#0.male] = _b[yedu#0.male]*_b[yexp#1.male]
               chi2(1) =
                               13.95
           Prob > chi2 =
                                0.0002
```

is better, and in fact it has been suggested that the latter version of the test is more reliable. This assertion is confirmed by performing simulations and is in line with theoretical results of Phillips and Park (1988). There is strong evidence against the proportionality of human capital effects between men and women, implying for this example that differences in the residual variances between the sexes can be ruled out as the explanation of the sex differences in the analysis of labor market participation.

### Stored results

testnl stores the following in r():

```
Scalars
    r(df)
                     degrees of freedom
    r(df_r)
                     residual degrees of freedom
    r(chi2)
    r(p)
                     p-value for Wald test
    r(F)
                     F statistic
Macros
                     method specified in mtest()
    r(mtmethod)
Matrices
    r(G)
                     derivatives of R(\mathbf{b}) with respect to b; see Methods and formulas below
    r(R)
                     R(\mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{q}; see Methods and formulas below
    r(mtest)
                     multiple test results
```

### Methods and formulas

After fitting a model, define b as the resulting  $1 \times k$  parameter vector and V as the  $k \times k$ covariance matrix. The (linear or nonlinear) hypothesis is given by  $R(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{q}$ , where R is a function returning a  $j \times 1$  vector. The Wald test formula is (Greene 2018, 512–513)

$$W = \Big\{R(\mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{q}\Big\}' \Big(\mathbf{GVG'}\Big)^{-1} \Big\{R(\mathbf{b}) - \mathbf{q}\Big\}$$

where G is the derivative matrix of  $R(\mathbf{b})$  with respect to b. W is distributed as  $\chi^2$  if V is an asymptotic covariance matrix. F = W/j is distributed as F for linear regression.

The adjustment methods for multiple testing are described in [R] test. The adjustment for survey design effects is described in [SVY] svy postestimation.

#### References

Allison, P. D. 1999. Comparing logit and probit coefficients across groups. Sociological Methods and Research 28: 186-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124199028002003.

Greene, W. H. 2018. Econometric Analysis. 8th ed. New York: Pearson.

Long, J. S. 1997. Regression Models for Categorical and Limited Dependent Variables. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

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] **contrast** Contrasts and linear hypothesis tests after estimation
- [R] **lincom** Linear combinations of parameters
- [R] Irtest Likelihood-ratio test after estimation
- [R] **nlcom** Nonlinear combinations of parameters
- [R] test Test linear hypotheses after estimation
- [U] 13.5 Accessing coefficients and standard errors
- [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. Other brand and product names are registered trademarks or trademarks of their respective companies. Copyright (c) 1985-2023 StataCorp LLC, College Station, TX, USA. All rights reserved.

