

Production Risk and the Estimation of Ex-ante Cost Functions

Giancarlo Moschini

March 1999

Staff Paper # 315

Giancarlo Moschini is Professor, Department of Economics, Iowa State University, Ames, IA 50011-1070. Telephone: (515) 294-5761. Fax: (515) 294-6644. Email: moschini@iastate.edu.

This is Journal Paper No. J-18316 of the Iowa Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station, Project No. 3539. The author thanks Yasuo Amemiya for helpful comments.

© 1999

Production Risk and the Estimation of Ex-ante Cost Functions

Abstract

Cost function estimation under production uncertainty is problematic because the relevant cost is conditional on unobservable expected output. If input demand functions are also stochastic, then one has a nonlinear errors-in-variables model and standard estimation procedures typically fail to achieve consistency. But by exploiting the full implications of the expected profit maximization hypothesis that gives rise to ex-ante cost functions, this paper shows that it is possible to effectively remove the errors-in-variables problem, such that consistent estimation of the parameters of the cost function of interest is possible. A Monte Carlo experiment illustrates the advantages of the proposed procedure as well as the pitfalls of other existing estimators.

Key words: Cost function, duality, expected profit maximization, nonlinear errors-in-variables, stochastic production.

1. Introduction

Following the pioneering work of Shephard (1953), Diewert (1971) and McFadden (1978), the cost function approach has proven very useful and popular in applied production studies. Insofar as the hypothesis of cost minimization is correct, estimating a cost function is usually deemed preferable to estimating a primal specification of the technology because, by using input prices instead of input quantities on the right-hand side of estimating equations, one removes a potential source of simultaneous equation bias. Specifically, in the cost function framework input choices are modeled as a function of input prices and the output level. But, as emphasized in the recent article by Pope and Just (1996), a problem then arises when the production technology is inherently stochastic. Such a case is very important in agricultural and environmental production models, where climatic and pest factors outside of the producer's control affect realized output in a nontrivial fashion. When producers make their input choices prior to the resolution of this production uncertainty, then the standard cost function specification (which is conditional on realized output level) is not relevant. In this setting one should instead

study input choices conditional on the expected output level, i.e., estimate the structure of the “ex-ante” cost function.

Estimating ex-ante cost functions turns out to be problematic because the expected output level that is relevant for the cost minimization problem is not observable. Pope and Just (1996) propose a solution that estimates the expected output level jointly with the cost function model, and they argue that their approach yields consistent estimation of the parameters of the cost function. In this paper we show that such a consistency property in fact does not hold for their ex-ante procedure. Essentially, the approach in question boils down to using input quantities as right-hand-side variables to estimate the expected output level. Hence, insofar as input choices do not hold deterministically (at least as far as the econometrician is concerned), measurement error problems and/or simultaneous equation problems will continue to affect the model, and the resulting estimates are typically inconsistent.

The crux of the matter is that, in the ex-ante cost model, there are really two distinct sources of errors: the primal error due to the stochastic production function, and input demand errors. The joint presence of these sources of errors is crucial. As shown in this paper, in general the presence of these two types of errors implies that the ex-ante cost model that one obtains belongs to the class of nonlinear errors-in-variables models (Y. Amemiya 1985; Hsiao 1989). Unlike in simultaneous equations models, where the relation of interest is specified to hold between observable variables, in an errors-in-variables model one has a relation between unobservable variables. If the errors-in-variables model were linear, then one could exploit a useful equivalence between linear errors-in-variables models and linear simultaneous equations models and obtain consistent estimation procedures. Fuller (1987) provides an extensive analysis of linear errors-in-variables models. But in fact the ex-ante cost function model is inherently nonlinear. As noted by Y. Amemiya (1985), a nonlinear errors-in-variables models is not

isomorphic to a simultaneous equations model, and for such nonlinear errors-in-variables models it is notoriously very difficult to obtain estimators that are consistent in the usual sense.

In this paper we provide a careful characterization of the ex-ante cost function problem and detail the conditions that give rise to a nonlinear errors-in-variables problem. In such a setting, the ex-ante procedure implemented by Pope and Just (1996) is bound to lead to inconsistent estimates. Appeals to procedures that work in a simultaneous equations setting, such as three-stage least squares using instrumental variables, are also unlikely to produce consistent estimates. But for the stochastic production setting of interest here, however, we are able to derive a procedure that in fact yields consistent estimators. The procedure exploits the economic context that makes it interesting to estimate the ex-ante cost function, namely, expected profit maximization. By appealing to behavioral implications of expected profit maximization, we are able to effectively remove the errors-in-variables problem from the model. Because of its simplicity, we believe that this approach is of considerable interest for a number of applications. Our claims about the inconsistency of existing estimators of the ex-ante cost function, and the consistency of our proposed procedure that exploits the implications of expected profit maximization, are illustrated by means of a Monte Carlo experiment. Related implications for modeling the dual structure of stochastic production are discussed.

2. The problem

The problem is that of estimating the parameters of the cost function corresponding to a stochastic production function. Of course, under production uncertainty it is not obvious that there exists a cost function that is “dual” to the production function. But following Pope and Just (1996), consider the ex-ante cost function that arises naturally in the context of expected profit maximization (a standard representation of the producer optimization problem under the assumption of risk neutrality). Specifically, let the stochastic production function be given by

$y = G(x, \varepsilon; \theta_0)$, where y is realized output, x is the vector of inputs, ε is a random term in production and θ_0 is the vector of all parameters appearing in the production function. The producer's expected profit maximization problem is written as:

$$\max_x \{E[pG(x, \varepsilon; \theta_0) - wx]\} \quad (1)$$

where p is output price, w denotes the input price vector and E is the mathematical expectation operator (which is here defined over the distribution of the random variable ε).

Now define the expected output function as $g(x; \theta) \equiv E[G(x, \varepsilon; \theta_0)]$, where θ is the vector of all relevant parameters. As made explicit by our notation, in general θ includes parameters of the distribution of the random variable ε . Then the expected profit maximization problem can be equivalently expressed in terms of two distinct problems. First, the producer chooses the optimal input vector to produce a given level of expected output, that is (s)he solves:

$$\min_x \{wx \mid \bar{y} \leq g(x; \theta)\} \quad (2)$$

where \bar{y} denotes a given expected output level. Let $x^* = h(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ denote the solution to problem (2). Then the ex-ante cost function is defined as $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta) \equiv w \cdot h(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$. Given the optimal input choices summarized by $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, the second step is for the producer to choose the optimal level of expected output that maximizes expected profit, that is to solve:¹

$$\max_{\bar{y}} \{p\bar{y} - C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)\}. \quad (3)$$

¹ Sufficient conditions for a unique solution to this maximization problem require the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ to be strictly convex in \bar{y} , which in turns requires the expected output function $g(x; \theta)$ to be strictly concave in x . These curvature properties are assumed here.

Because $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ here describes the relevant cost minimization behavior, it is often of considerable interest to estimate its parameters. Unfortunately, $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ is conditional on expected (or planned) output \bar{y} , which is not observable, and hence direct estimation of the ex-ante cost function is not feasible. As Pope and Just (1996) correctly note, previous applications with data that likely were generated by a stochastic process (such as agricultural production data) have simply ignored the problem. That is, researchers have routinely estimated $C(y, w; \theta)$, where y is the observed (ex-post or realized) output, when in fact they should have been estimating $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$. This approach, which is here labeled as the “standard” approach, essentially uses observed output y as the proxy for the unobserved expected output \bar{y} . But because y “measures” the true variable \bar{y} only with error, naïve (least-square) type estimators that ignore this problem lead to inconsistent estimates.

To overcome the inconsistency of the standard cost function approach when production is stochastic, Pope and Just (1996) propose an alternative and original estimation procedure which entails estimating \bar{y} simultaneously with the ex-ante cost function. First, recall that if \bar{y} were observable the parameters θ could be estimated efficiently by fitting the system of n input demand functions $h(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, which by Shephard’s lemma are related to the ex-ante cost function by $h(\bar{y}, w; \theta) \equiv \nabla_w C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$. But because \bar{y} is not observable, Pope and Just (1996, p. 238) propose to replace it by the output level which is part of the solution to the problem:

$$\max_{\bar{y}, \lambda, w} \left\{ \bar{y} - \lambda [C(\bar{y}, w; \theta) - wx] \right\}. \quad (4)$$

Denote such a solution by $\bar{y}^0 = \mu(x; \theta)$. But then, under standard regularity conditions, by duality theory it must be that $\mu(x; \theta) \equiv g(x; \theta)$ [see, for example, theorem 5.5 in Jehle and Reny

(1998)].² Hence, this method boils down to estimating the set of input demand equations with \bar{y} replaced by the expected output function $g(x; \theta)$. Although this point was perhaps not emphasized enough, it was certainly articulated explicitly by Pope and Just (1996) (e.g., in the first unnumbered equation at page 240). With such a substitution, and in our notation, the input demand equations are written as:

$$x = h(g(x; \theta), w; \theta) + e \quad (5)$$

where e is the error vector of input demands.

In estimating the ex-ante cost model, Pope and Just (1996) address two problems. First, as they emphasize, popular functional forms for the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ (such as the translog) do not admit a close-form solution for the underlying production function [i.e., an explicit solution for the problem in (4)]. In such a case, the method that they propose can be useful because it provides a procedure that constructs $g(x; \theta)$ numerically as part of the estimation algorithm. Of course, this observation should not obscure the basic point that, in their approach, $g(x; \theta)$ (whether analytically or numerically) is being used for the unobserved expected output level \bar{y} . A second problem is that not all parameters are estimable by using the input demand equations in (5). Intuitively, this is due to the fact that with (5) one is trying to estimate a cost function without observing output, which means that equations (5) define a simultaneous equation system that is not identified. To overcome this problem Pope and Just (1996, p. 240) suggest adding an equation to the estimating system. In our notation, one would

² Regularity conditions include that $g(x; \theta)$ be quasi-concave in x , which is guaranteed by the assumed curvature conditions for expected profit maximization [i.e., $g(x; \theta)$ is concave].

then estimate a system of $n + 1$ equations given by the n input demand equations in (5) plus the production function equation, that is:³

$$y = g(x; \theta) + u \quad (6)$$

where u is an error term induced by the random variable ε (i.e., $u \equiv y - E[G(x, \varepsilon; \theta)]$).

If the expected production function is such that the parameter vector θ is identified in equation (6), then the system of equations (5)-(6) can be used to estimate this parameter vector. But although joint estimation of equations (5)-(6) is in principle possible, it is now apparent that there is still a major unresolved issue in this setting. Specifically, the system of $n + 1$ equations in (5)-(6) entails that the (stochastic) vector of input quantities x appears on the right-hand side of all equations. This simultaneity feature was not accounted for in Pope and Just (1996).

Consequently their proposed estimation procedure, which from now onward we label the “naïve ex-ante” approach, is unlikely to yield consistent estimates. Recognizing that simultaneous equation bias might be a problem has led Pope and Just (1998) to implement, in a related setting, a three-stage least squares estimation procedure that uses instrumental variables (IV). But we will argue in the following section that such “IV ex-ante” approach is also unlikely to yield consistent estimates because, for reasonable specifications of the stochastic nature of input demands, the simultaneous equations representation of (5)-(6) is not the appropriate one. Rather, when both production and input demands are stochastic, the model that is obtained gives rise to an errors-in-variables problem. Because the model is also inherently nonlinear, estimation techniques that yield consistent estimators for simultaneous equation models do not typically work here (Amemiya 1985; Hsiao 1989).

³ Again, if the form of $g(\cdot)$ that is consistent with the parameterization of $C(\cdot)$ is not known, then $g(\cdot)$ can be retrieved numerically.

3. Stochastic input demands and the errors-in-variables problem

It is clear at this point that the stochastic nature of input demands plays a crucial role in the properties of the ex-ante estimators discussed in section 2. To gain more insights into this problem it is necessary to be precise about the source of these error terms. Here we analyze in detail what McElroy (1987) has called the “additive generalized error model” (AGEM), which provides an attractive and coherent explanation for stochastic input demands. Specifically, in the AGEM model producers are assumed to minimize cost conditional on a production function which, in our setting, can be written as $g(x - e; \theta)$, where the vector e is parametrically known to producers but unobservable to the econometrician. Hence, optimal input choices are written as:

$$x = h(\bar{y}, w; \theta) + e \quad (7)$$

with total production costs $C \equiv w \cdot x$ given by:

$$C = C(\bar{y}, w; \theta) + w \cdot e \quad (8)$$

Because the vector e is not observable, the determinist input demand setting at the producer level translates naturally into an internally consistent stochastic input demand setting for the purpose of estimation (McElroy 1987).

Although clearly appealing from an economic point of view, the AGEM rationalization for stochastic input demands, in conjunction with the assumed stochastic production structure, turns out to create a problem for the ex-ante cost function model. Specifically, although one can find the expected output function $g(\cdot; \theta)$ dual to the cost function being used [by solving (4), say], the argument of this function that is relevant for the purpose of computing expected output \bar{y} cannot be observed. In other words, if we define $\bar{x} \equiv x - e$, then the system of input demands and production function implied by the AGEM model is:

$$x = h(g(\bar{x}; \theta), w; \theta) + e \quad (9)$$

$$y = g(\bar{x}, \theta) + u \quad (10)$$

where $g(\bar{x}, \theta) \equiv \bar{y}$. Clearly, the system of equations (9) and (10) cannot be estimated directly because \bar{x} is not observed. Indeed, the problem here is completely analogous to the one that we have set out to solve [i.e., estimating $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ when \bar{y} is not observed]. Thus, with stochastic input demand and stochastic production, the estimating equations for the ex-ante cost model belong to the class of nonlinear errors-in-variables models. As mentioned earlier, such models are conceptually distinct from simultaneous equation models, and the estimators that apply to the latter do not typically work for the former [Y. Amemiya (1985)].

It should be emphasized that the joint presence of error terms in the input demand equations and in the production equation is crucial to giving rise to the errors-in-variables problem. Specifically, if production were not stochastic ($u \equiv 0$), then $y = \bar{y}$ and the errors-in-variables problem disappears. Similarly, if input demands were nonstochastic, then $x = \bar{x}$, and again the model could be rid of the errors-in-variables problem.⁴ Finally, we should note that the AGEM specification per se is not crucial in order to obtain an errors-in-variables model. Other internally consistent rationalizations for the stochastic terms of input demands, such as the assumption that agents make optimization errors, would yield an errors-in-variables problem as well when stochastic input demands are combined with a stochastic output.

4. A "full information" solution

Existing econometric results on the consistency of estimators for the nonlinear errors-in-variables problem are rather discouraging for the purpose of estimating the parameters of our ex-

⁴ Of course, if $e \equiv 0$ the system of n input demands would have to hold deterministically, whereas if $u \equiv 0$ then the output equation would need to hold deterministically. Because such cases are patently not interesting from an empirical point of view, they can safely be ignored here.

ante cost function. The standard instrumental variable approach that applies to nonlinear simultaneous equations models fails to achieve consistency in the usual sense. Y. Amemiya (1985) has investigated the use of an alternative notion of asymptotic convergence that applies when error variances (of the unobservable variable) are small and sample sizes are large. But such an asymptotic theory may not apply to typical econometric problems, where one cannot expect replicated experiments as the sample size increases. Hausman, Newey, Ichimura and Powell (1991) and Hausman, Newey and Powell (1996) also obtain a consistent estimator for a class of nonlinear errors-in-variables models when there is a single repeated observation on the unobserved regressor. But for the purpose of estimating ex-ante cost functions, such repeated observations on expected output are usually not available (especially when estimation relies on time series data).

Fortunately, an alternative procedure to estimate the ex-ante cost function suggests itself in the context of the economic problem where the ex-ante cost function is relevant. Specifically, recall that interest in the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ is motivated here by the assumption that producers solve the expected profit maximization problem in equation (1). Because this expected profit maximization problem can equivalently be written as (3), then from the optimality condition of problem (3) one finds the solution $\bar{y}^* = s(p, w; \theta)$, where the parametric structure of the ex-ante supply function $s(p, w; \theta)$ is implied by the structure of the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$. This optimal expected production level depends on the (exogenously given) output price p . If such an output price is observable (as it is usually the case) then p provides the obvious “instrument” for the unobserved expected output, and the function $s(p, w; \theta)$ provides the correct nonlinear mapping for this instrument. Thus, in this setting one can estimate the parameters of the cost function by fitting the system of n input demand equations:

$$x = h(s(p, w; \theta), w; \theta) + e \quad (11)$$

If so desired, the system of input demand functions in (11) can be supplemented by the expected output function equation, that is:

$$y = s(p, w; \theta) + u \quad (12)$$

Note, however, that here equation (12) is not necessary in order to identify all the parameters of the model. Unlike the ex-ante input demand system in (5), the system in (11) allows for the estimation of all parameters (again, this is made possible by the presence of the output price p).

The approach that we have suggested, based on the expected profit maximization problem actually solved by the producer, will yield consistent estimates of the parameters of the underlying technology because it effectively removes the errors-in-variables problem. It bears repeating that our proposed approach does not require additional assumptions relative to those inherent in the setting being analyzed. Specifically, the hypothesis of expected profit maximization is already made to motivate interest in the ex-ante cost function; and, given that, the shape of the ex-ante supply function $s(p, w; \theta)$ is fully determined by the cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ via the optimality conditions for problem (3). Although this alternative route to estimate the ex-ante cost function is reasonably straightforward, for many functional forms specifications of $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ one will not be able to solve explicitly for the ex-ante supply function $s(p, w; \theta)$. In such a case one could numerically retrieve $s(p, w; \theta)$, from a given specification for $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, as part of the estimation routine [in a manner similar to that implemented by Pope and Just (1996) for their procedure].

5. A Monte Carlo illustration: the generalized CES model

To illustrate the properties of the alternative estimators for the ex-ante cost function, we have constructed a Monte Carlo experiment that carefully represents all the features of the problem being analyzed. For this purpose, we work with a cost function that admits a close form

solution for the dual production function. Hence, we can avoid the complications of retrieving this function numerically as part of the estimation routine, a computational task that featured prominently in Pope and Just (1996) but which is really peripheral to the main issue analyzed here. Specifically, we consider a generalized constant elasticity of substitution (CES) cost function that allows for decreasing returns to scale (such that it can be consistent with the expected profit maximization problem that has been used to motivate the ex-ante cost function).

5.1 Experiment design

The AGEM specification of this CES cost function is written as:

$$C = \bar{y}^\beta \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i w_i^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} + \sum_{i=1}^n w_i e_i \quad (13)$$

where $\alpha_i > 0$ ($\forall i$), $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$, $\sigma > 0$, $\sigma \neq 1$ and $\beta > 1$. The restriction $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$ ensures that the cost function is homogeneous of degree one in input prices. The parameter σ is the constant Allen-Uzawa elasticity of substitution between inputs. Finally, β is a parameter that controls the curvature of the cost function in \bar{y} , and the condition $\beta > 1$ ensures that the cost function is (strictly) convex in \bar{y} . From Shephard's lemma, input demands consistent with this cost function are:

$$x_i = \alpha_i \bar{y}^\beta w_i^{-\sigma} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k w_k^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}} + e_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (14)$$

Consistent with the AGEM specification, the terms e_i are parametrically known to the producers but are treated as random variables by the econometrician. Hence, the parameters vector to be estimated is $\theta \equiv (\alpha, \beta, \sigma)$. For this particular cost function it is verified that the (expected) production function [i.e., the solution to problem (4)] can be derived explicitly as:

$$g(x - e; \theta) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \cdot (x_i - e_i)^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\beta(\sigma-1)}} \quad (15)$$

Hence, equation (15) here can be used to implement the ex-ante methods discussed earlier.

If producers maximize expected profit, then they will choose the level of expected output such that the ex-ante marginal cost equals output price, i.e., they will choose the level of expected output $s(p, w; \theta)$:

$$s(p, w; \theta) = \left(\frac{p}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i w_i^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{(\sigma-1)(\beta-1)}} \quad (16)$$

Hence, the supply function in (16) here can be used to implement our proposed method based on expected profit maximization.

Now the Monte Carlo experiment proceeds as follows.

- A. First, we choose the number of inputs to be four (i.e., $n = 4$), and we set the true values of the parameters as follows:

$$\alpha_1 = 0.1 \quad , \quad \alpha_2 = 0.2 \quad , \quad \alpha_3 = 0.3 \quad , \quad \alpha_4 = 0.4 \quad , \quad \beta = 1.2 \quad , \quad \sigma = 0.5 \quad .$$

- B. Next, we choose the design matrix of exogenous variables (the vectors of expected output \bar{y} and of input prices w), which is then held fixed throughout. Here we use an initial sample of 25 observations taken from a recent application using agricultural data (see the Appendix for more details). All variables are normalized to equal unity at their sample mean.

- C. For each replication $j = 1, \dots, N$, we construct a pseudo sample of optimal input quantities by using equations (14), with the vector e generated as $N(0, \Omega)$. Similarly, for each replication we construct a pseudo sample of stochastic output as $y = \bar{y} + u$, where the random term u is generated as $N(0, \phi^2)$. The standard deviation of each random variable

was set to 10 % of the corresponding mean.⁵ Thus, for the output stochastic term we set $\phi = 0.1$. For the covariance matrix of the terms e_i we consider three cases: one with independent input demand errors (Ω_0), one with such errors being negatively correlated (Ω_1) and one with these input errors being positively correlated (Ω_2). Specifically, the three covariance matrices for the vector e that we consider are:

$$\Omega_i = \begin{bmatrix} \omega_{11}^2 & \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{22} & \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{33} & \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{44} \\ \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{22} & \omega_{22}^2 & \rho_i \omega_{22} \omega_{33} & \rho_i \omega_{22} \omega_{44} \\ \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{33} & \rho_i \omega_{22} \omega_{33} & \omega_{33}^2 & \rho_i \omega_{33} \omega_{44} \\ \rho_i \omega_{11} \omega_{44} & \rho_i \omega_{22} \omega_{44} & \rho_i \omega_{33} \omega_{44} & \omega_{44}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad i = 0, 1, 2$$

For all cases we set $\omega_{11} = 0.01$, $\omega_{22} = 0.02$, $\omega_{33} = 0.03$ and $\omega_{44} = 0.04$. For Ω_0 we set $\rho_0 = 0$, for Ω_1 we set $\rho_1 = -0.3$ and for Ω_2 we set $\rho_2 = 0.3$.

D. For each covariance structure, we generate 2,000 pseudo-random samples of observations (i.e., $N = 2,000$) using 1,000 random draws and its 1,000 antithetic counterparts.⁶ For each sample, five models are estimated:

- (i) The true model consisting of four input equations in (14). The results from this model provide a useful benchmark for evaluating the feasible estimators.
- (ii) The standard model, which is the same as the true model but with y replacing \bar{y} .
- (iii) The naïve ex-ante procedure suggested by Pope and Just (1996), consisting of five equations [four input equations and the output equation with the structure of equations (5)-(6)], that is:

⁵ Given the normalizations chosen for the exogenous variables, the mean of x_i is approximately equal to α_i and the mean of y is equal to one.

⁶ For each draw we checked the regularity conditions $(x_i - e_i) > 0$, which turned out to be always satisfied.

$$x_i = \alpha_i w_i^{-\sigma} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} x_k^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k w_k^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}} + e_i \quad i = 1, \dots, n \quad (17)$$

$$y = \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \cdot x_k^{\frac{\sigma-1}{\sigma}} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{\beta(\sigma-1)}} + u \quad (18)$$

- (iv) The IV ex-ante procedure suggested by Pope and Just (1998), which estimates equations (17) and (18) by nonlinear three-stage least squares using a set of instrumental variables (which includes output price p).⁷
- (v) The new approach proposed in this paper, which uses the ex-ante supply function $s(p, w; \theta)$ in lieu of the unobserved expected output \bar{y} .⁸ Because this approach relies on the implications of expected profit maximization, it is labeled “max $E[\Pi]$.” Hence, here we fit the following system of four input demand equations plus the output equation:

$$x_i = \alpha_i w_i^{-\sigma} \left(\frac{p}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k w_k^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{\sigma}{(1-\sigma)} \left[\sigma + \frac{\beta}{(1-\beta)} \right]} + e_i \quad i = 1, \dots, 4 \quad (19)$$

$$y = \left(\frac{p}{\beta} \right)^{\frac{1}{\beta-1}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k w_k^{1-\sigma} \right)^{\frac{1}{(\sigma-1)(\beta-1)}} + u \quad (20)$$

⁷ We rely on four primitive instrumental variables: three input prices (deflated by the fourth input price) and the output price (deflated by the fourth input price). We use the four primitive variables plus their squares and cross-products, which together with the constant yields a total of 15 instruments that are used in the IV procedure.

⁸ Consistent with the assumption of expected profit maximization under stochastic production, the price series used in the Monte Carlo experiment was generated as $p = C_{\bar{y}}(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, where $C_{\bar{y}}(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ is readily obtained from the CES cost function specification in the text. Note that this output price series is used by both the IV ex-ante approach and by our proposed procedure.

5.2 Estimation

Each of the alternatives entails estimating a system of M equations using T observations.⁹ Thus, for each alternative the model can be written as $Y = f(Z, \theta) + v$, where Y is the $TM \times 1$ stacked vector of the left-hand-side variables, $f(\cdot)$ is a nonlinear (vector valued) function, Z is the (stacked) $TM \times K$ matrix of all right-hand-side variables, θ is the vector of all parameters to be estimated and v is the $TM \times 1$ stacked residual vector. The error terms are assumed to be contemporaneously correlated but serially independent, that is, $E[vv'] = \Psi \otimes I_T$, where Ψ is the $M \times M$ contemporaneous covariance matrix and I_T is the identity matrix of order T . For four of the models considered (true, standard, naïve ex-ante and our new procedure) the system of interest is treated as a standard nonlinear seemingly unrelated regression model. Iterated minimum distance estimation is used (which converges to the maximum likelihood estimator). Specifically, at each iteration stage the vector of parameters is found by minimizing:

$$(Y - f(Z, \theta))' (\Psi^{-1} \otimes I_T) (Y - f(Z, \theta))$$

where Ψ is the current estimate of the contemporaneous covariance matrix, which is updated at each iteration step until convergence. For the IV estimator, on the other hand, at each iteration the vector of parameters is found by minimizing:

$$(Y - f(Z, \theta))' (\Psi^{-1} \otimes (W(W'W)^{-1}W')) (Y - f(Z, \theta))$$

where W is the $T \times q$ matrix of all instrumental variables, and again the estimate of the contemporaneous covariance matrix Ψ is updated at each iteration step until convergence.¹⁰

⁹ Note that the first two methods entail $M = 4$, whereas for the last three methods $M = 5$.

¹⁰ Thus, this yields what is usually referred to as the nonlinear three-stage least squares estimator (e.g., T. Amemiya 1985). As mentioned earlier, here $q = 15$.

5.3 Results

The results are summarized in Tables 1 to 4. Table 1 reports the average percent bias for each parameter, for each estimation method and for all three covariance structures considered.¹¹

Average percent bias is computed as: $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}_i^j - \theta_i}{\theta_i} \right) \times 100$, where $\hat{\theta}_i^j$ is the estimated i^{th}

parameter in the j^{th} replication. All five methods do a reasonable good job at estimating the mean parameters α_i . Also, the new model that we are proposing, based on the expected profit maximization, is essentially unbiased and performs as well as the (unfeasible) true model. It is clear, on the other hand, that both the standard and the ex-ante procedures yield estimates that are affected by considerable bias. Specifically, the standard model gives very poor estimates of the scale parameter β (as expected, because this is the parameters attached to the unobserved output level). The naïve ex-ante model does a better job than the standard model at estimating this scale parameter, although the estimated β is affected by considerable bias in this case as well.

Furthermore, this ex-ante model provides a much more biased estimator for the elasticity of substitution σ (for example, for the case of uncorrelated e_i , the naïve ex-ante estimate of σ has an average bias of 31%, whereas the standard model's bias is less than 1%). The IV ex-ante procedure performs better than the naïve ex-ante approach, although estimates are still affected by considerable bias.¹² As expected, changing the correlation structure of the e_i does not affect the performance of the true model nor that of our proposed model. It does not affect the performance of the standard model either, which is intuitively sensible (because for the standard

¹¹ Because $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$, only three α_i parameters need to be estimated.

¹² The performance of the IV estimator could be improved by the bias adjustment method proposed by Y. Amemiya (1990). But such a computationally-intensive method still does not lead to consistency, and in our context is bound to be inferior to the procedure we are proposing.

model it is the random term u embodied in y , not the random vector e , that leads to inconsistency). But changing the correlation structure of the e_i does affect the performance of the naïve ex-ante model; with positively correlated e_i the bias in the scale parameter gets larger and the bias in the elasticity of substitution gets smaller, whereas the opposite holds true for negatively correlated e_i .

The conclusions based on the average percent bias of Table 1 are supported by the average percent root mean square errors (RMSE) reported in Table 2. The entries of this table

are computed as $\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}_i^j - \theta_i}{\theta_i} \times 100 \right)^2}$, and thus account for the sampling variance of each

estimator (in addition to the bias). From Table 2 it is clear that the performance of our proposed model is comparable to that of the true model, whereas both the standard model and the ex-ante procedure yield estimates that are far less precise.

Table 3 reports the average R^2 , over all replications, for each equation in each estimation method. Specifically, the R^2 for each equation is defined as the square of the correlation coefficient between observed and fitted left-hand-side variable. This table provides an ex-post check on the signal-to-noise ratio that we have implemented in our Monte Carlo experiment. Note that the “fit” of the various models is quite similar to that of many empirical applications. In particular, in some sense our experiment has been conservative in that the magnitude of the production error that we have used is relatively large compared with the magnitude of the input demand errors (thus, our set-up is somewhat slanted in favor of both ex-ante procedures relative to the standard procedure).

Finally, Table 4 illustrates the finite-sample properties of the five estimators considered as the sample size increases. Specifically, to get an idea of the asymptotic convergence of the various estimators we allow the sample size to increase from 25 to 400 (each time we double the

design matrix, such that the exogenous variables are multiple repeats of those reported in the Appendix). For the true model and our proposed model it is clear that the small-sample bias converges to zero as the sample size is increased. On the other hand, for the standard model and for both ex-ante procedures, the bias does not seem to be influenced by the increasing sample size. In particular, it is quite clear that the naïve ex-ante procedure proposed by Pope and Just (1996) leads to inconsistent parameter estimates. Indeed, the naïve ex-ante procedure arguably produces worse results than the standard approach. Of course, the ranking of these two inconsistent estimators likely depends on the magnitude of the randomness of the production function relative to the randomness of the input demand functions (recall that the errors-in-variables problem is due to u in the standard model, whereas it is due to e in the naïve ex-ante model).

6. Further discussion

The results of our Monte Carlo experiment provide a compelling example of the deleterious consequences of ignoring production risk when estimating a cost function. Indeed, these results are a bit more general, in that it is not even necessary to postulate production risk (in addition to input demand errors) in order to obtain an errors-in-variables cost function model. The above setting would in fact be unchanged if no production risk were present, but the error term u arose in a manner similar to the e_i : i.e., from an AGEM rationalization. In other words, one could postulate that the profit-maximizing agents have a production function written as $y = g(x - e; \theta) + u$, where the terms e and u are known to the producer but unobservable to the econometrician. Defining $\bar{y} = y - u$, the relevant cost function for this case is also written as $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, where \bar{y} is not observed by the econometrician. Hence, estimation of a “standard”

cost function, conditional on observed output, is a problematic task for a wider (and realistic) class of problems than that of production uncertainty.

But regardless of the source of the production error u , the approach that we have suggested, based on the expected profit maximization problem actually solved by producers, yields consistent estimates of the parameters of the underlying technology. As mentioned earlier, a practical problem may be posed by the fact that for many flexible specifications of $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ one cannot solve explicitly for the ex-ante supply function $s(p, w, \theta)$. In such a case one could numerically retrieve $s(p, w, \theta)$ as part of the estimation routine. Alternatively, and perhaps more to the point, one can recognize that, in this context, it is better to specify and estimate an expected profit function rather than an ex-ante cost function. Specifically, if the solution to problem (1) is written as $\Pi(p, w; \theta)$, then under standard assumptions this expected profit function exists and is continuous, linearly homogeneous and convex in (p, w) . This expected profit function is completely analogous to the standard profit function that obtains under conditions of certainty [as analyzed, for example, by Lau (1976)]. Hence, by Hotelling lemma we obtain $s(p, w; \theta) = \Pi_p(p, w; \theta)$ and $h(s(p, w; \theta), w; \theta) = -\nabla_w \Pi(p, w; \theta)$. Thus, instead of specifying an ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$, under production uncertainty the analysis can proceed by specifying the parametric structure of $\Pi(p, w; \theta)$, from which one can derive a coherent set of output supply and input demand equations that can be used in estimation.

To illustrate, one could adopt Lau's (1974) normalized quadratic specification for $\Pi(p, w; \theta)$. In such a case, assuming an AGEM structure for the stochastic terms of input demands and an additive production error (and possibly an AGEM specification for the error in expected supply functions, in addition to this production risk), the system of ex-ante input demands and output supply could be written as:

$$x_i = -\theta_i - \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{ij}(w_j/p) + e_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n$$

$$y = \theta_{00} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \theta_{ij}(w_i/p)(w_j/p) + u.$$

Thus, under production uncertainty, one can specify and estimate a coherent set of output supply and input demand equations if agents actually maximize expected profits. Because this route essentially removes the errors-in-variables problem, estimation of this set of equations produces consistent estimates of all the underlying parameters that are identified. Indeed, by duality theory, all the relevant information about the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ can be retrieved from the expected profit function (provided the latter exists).

The method that we have proposed to estimate the ex-ante cost function model crucially depends on the hypothesis that the expected profit maximization problem in (1) applies. But how should one estimate the parameters of the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ if such an expected profit maximization problem does not apply? It is important to emphasize, at this juncture, that the cost function $C(\bar{y}, w, \theta)$ is of interest precisely because of the expected profit maximization problem that producers are assumed to face. The framework that we have considered could be extended somewhat and still allow for the ex-ante cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ to play a meaningful role. For example, we could allow for both output price and production to be stochastic, under some suitable restrictions (e.g., multiplicative production risk). The method that we have proposed to estimate $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ could be adapted to this broader setting. But more generally, when price and production risk are unrestricted and decision makers may be risk averse, the relevant "cost function" may need to be defined otherwise (Chambers and Quiggin 1998), and the cost function $C(\bar{y}, w; \theta)$ may not be of much interest anyway.

7. Conclusion

The presence of production risk means that the likely object of interest in production studies is the ex-ante cost function, as noted by Pope and Just (1996). But when one recognizes that input demand equations (in addition to the production function) are also genuinely stochastic, the naïve ex-ante procedure is unlikely to improve over the standard estimation procedure because it does not solve the fundamental problem that arises in this context: i.e., that the ex-ante cost model inevitably leads to a nonlinear errors-in-variables problem. It is notoriously difficult to obtain consistent estimators for this class of models. For the particular case of an ex-ante cost function that naturally arises in the context of the expected profit maximization hypothesis, however, we have shown that it is possible to achieve consistent estimation for the parameters of the ex-ante cost function. Specifically, by exploiting the full implications of the expected profit maximization hypothesis one can effectively remove the errors-in-variables problem. The results of a carefully structured Monte Carlo experiment provide support for our claim about the properties of various estimation procedures. In particular, our proposed procedure to estimate the ex-ante cost function yields estimates of the underlying technological parameters that are equivalent to those of the (unfeasible) true model.

References

- Amemiya, T. (1985), Advanced Econometrics (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).
- Amemiya, Y. (1985), "Instrumental Variable Estimator for the Nonlinear Errors-in-Variables Model," Journal of Econometrics 28, 273–289.
- Amemiya, Y. (1990), "Two-State Instrumental Variable Estimators for the Nonlinear Errors-in-Variables Model," Journal of Econometrics 44, 311–332.
- Ball, V.E., J-C Bureau, R. Nerhing and A. Somwaru (1997), "Agricultural Productivity Revisited," American Journal of Agricultural Economics 79, 1045–1064.
- Berndt, E.R. and D.O. Wood (1975), "Technology, Prices, and the Derived Demand for Energy," Review of Economic and Statistics 57, 259–268.
- Chambers, R.G. and J. Quiggin (1998) "Cost Functions and Duality for Stochastic Technologies," American Journal of Agricultural Economics 80, 288–295.
- Diewert, W.E. (1971), "An Application of the Shephard's Duality Theorem: A Generalized Leontief Production Function," Journal of Political Economy 79, 481–507.
- Fuller, W.A. (1987), Measurement Error Models (Wiley, New York, NY).
- Hausman, J.A., W.K. Newey, H. Hichimura and J.L. Powell (1991), "Identification and Estimation of Polynomial Errors-in-Variables Models," Journal of Econometrics 50, 273–295.
- Hausman, J.A., W.K. Newey and J.L. Powell (1996), "Nonlinear Errors-in-Variables Estimation of Some Engel Curves," Journal of Econometrics 65, 205–233.
- Hsiao, C. (1989), "Consistent Estimation for Some Nonlinear Errors-in-Variables Models," Journal of Econometrics 41, 159–185.
- Jehle, G.A. and P.J. Reny (1998), Advanced Microeconomic Theory (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA).

- McElroy, M. (1987), "Additive General Error Models for Production, Cost, and Derived Demand or Share Systems," Journal of Political Economy 95, 737-757.
- McFadden, D. (1978), "Cost, Revenue, and Profit Functions," in Production Economics: A Dual Approach to Theory and Applications, M. Fuss and D. McFadden, eds., volume 1, pp. 3-109, (North-Holland, Amsterdam).
- Lau, L. (1974), "Applications of Duality Theory: A Comment," in Frontiers in Quantitative Economics, M.D. Intriligator and D.A. Kendrick, eds., volume II, pp. 176-199, (North-Holland, Amsterdam).
- Lau, L. (1976), "A Characterization of the Normalized Restricted Profit Function," Journal of Economic Theory 12, 131-163.
- Pope, R.D. and R.E. Just (1996), "Empirical Implementation of Ex-ante Cost Functions," Journal of Econometrics 72, 231-249.
- Pope, R.D. and R.E. Just (1998), "Cost Function Estimation under Risk Aversion," American Journal of Agricultural Economics 80, 296-302.
- Shephard, R.W. (1953), Cost and Production Functions (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ).

Table 1. Average percent bias in estimated parameters

		Covariance structure for the e_i 's		
		Zero correlation	Negative correlation	Positive correlation
True model				
	α_1	-0.0099	-0.0053	-0.0076
	α_2	-0.0059	-0.0022	-0.0038
	α_3	0.0026	0.0023	0.0014
	β	-0.0044	-0.0008	-0.0106
	σ	0.0217	0.0152	0.0133
Standard				
	α_1	-0.0707	-0.0333	-0.0967
	α_2	0.3036	0.3294	0.2829
	α_3	-0.0900	-0.0944	-0.0892
	β	-28.1709	-28.0437	-28.2886
	σ	-0.2483	-0.2961	-0.1942
Naïve ex-ante				
	α_1	-0.9651	-1.2241	-0.6876
	α_2	-0.3532	-0.4397	-0.2513
	α_3	0.9321	1.2031	0.6587
	β	10.0514	3.9848	15.8727
	σ	31.5560	39.5238	22.9752
IV ex-ante				
	α_1	-0.6934	-0.7120	-0.6318
	α_2	-0.1624	-0.2754	-0.0575
	α_3	0.2658	0.3369	0.1881
	β	6.3656	2.9518	9.7748
	σ	18.8045	23.6668	13.5399
max $E[\Pi]$				
	α_1	0.0001	0.0054	-0.0011
	α_2	0.0004	0.0019	-0.0004
	α_3	0.0039	-0.0003	0.0030
	β	0.0023	0.0005	0.0036
	σ	-0.0932	-0.0273	-0.0714

Table 2. Percent RMSE in estimated parameters

		Covariance structure for the e_i 's		
		Zero correlation	Negative correlation	Positive correlation
True model				
	α_1	1.9789	1.6518	1.7121
	α_2	1.8872	2.0389	1.5723
	α_3	1.6508	1.8927	1.3787
	β	5.7451	1.8892	7.8247
	σ	12.5260	8.8782	11.0176
Standard				
	α_1	2.0570	2.3233	1.7462
	α_2	1.9383	2.2543	1.6151
	α_3	1.6710	1.8842	1.4034
	β	29.9088	29.3855	30.4255
	σ	13.7342	15.3372	11.7556
Naïve ex-ante				
	α_1	2.5069	2.9191	2.0513
	α_2	2.2654	2.6728	1.8754
	α_3	2.2115	2.5664	1.7860
	β	21.3586	16.5466	26.4365
	σ	34.3807	42.1902	25.8993
IV ex-ante				
	α_1	2.5643	2.8354	2.2131
	α_2	2.1008	2.4242	1.7613
	α_3	1.8463	2.0761	1.5461
	β	18.2406	15.4823	21.0803
	σ	24.3597	28.9177	19.4645
max $E[\Pi]$				
	α_1	1.9967	1.9478	1.6973
	α_2	1.6915	1.2049	1.4824
	α_3	1.5558	1.2857	1.3435
	β	0.1681	0.0676	0.2095
	σ	11.7455	7.8556	10.8120

Table 3. Average R^2 of estimated equations

	Covariance structure for the e_i 's		
	Zero correlation	Negative correlation	Positive correlation
True model			
x_1 eqn	0.81	0.81	0.81
x_2 eqn	0.87	0.87	0.87
x_3 eqn	0.77	0.77	0.77
x_4 eqn	0.81	0.81	0.81
Standard			
x_1 eqn	0.61	0.61	0.61
x_2 eqn	0.74	0.74	0.74
x_3 eqn	0.53	0.53	0.53
x_4 eqn	0.60	0.60	0.60
Naïve ex-ante			
x_1 eqn	0.77	0.71	0.84
x_2 eqn	0.88	0.85	0.92
x_3 eqn	0.83	0.79	0.88
x_4 eqn	0.89	0.86	0.92
y eqn	0.68	0.71	0.64
IV ex-ante			
x_1 eqn	0.78	0.72	0.85
x_2 eqn	0.88	0.85	0.92
x_3 eqn	0.84	0.79	0.88
x_4 eqn	0.90	0.87	0.93
y eqn	0.68	0.71	0.65
max $E[II]$			
x_1 eqn	0.81	0.81	0.81
x_2 eqn	0.87	0.87	0.87
x_3 eqn	0.77	0.77	0.77
x_4 eqn	0.81	0.81	0.81
y eqn	0.73	0.73	0.73

Table 4. Average percent bias in estimated parameters and sample size

	$T=25$	$T=50$	$T=100$	$T=200$	$T=400$
True Model					
α_1	-0.0099	-0.0053	-0.0023	-0.0011	-0.0005
α_2	-0.0059	-0.0016	-0.0008	-0.0004	-0.0002
α_3	0.0026	0.0012	0.0006	0.0003	0.0001
β	-0.0044	-0.0022	-0.0008	0.0001	-0.0004
σ	0.0217	0.0111	0.0033	0.0030	0.0005
Standard					
α_1	-0.0707	-0.0703	-0.0707	-0.0660	-0.0705
α_2	0.3036	0.3069	0.3083	0.3093	0.3110
α_3	-0.0900	-0.0945	-0.0933	-0.0929	-0.0990
β	-28.1709	-28.9322	-29.1527	-29.3885	-29.3740
σ	-0.2483	-0.4271	-0.4931	-0.5191	-0.5075
Naïve ex-ante					
α_1	-0.9651	-0.9892	-0.9677	-0.9684	-0.9620
α_2	-0.3532	-0.3887	-0.4137	-0.4115	-0.4098
α_3	0.9321	0.9380	0.9489	0.9363	0.9295
β	10.0514	8.8001	8.2177	8.0898	7.9065
σ	31.5560	32.5978	33.0348	33.3495	33.3922
IV ex-ante					
α_1	-0.6934	-0.5602	-0.5107	-0.4869	-0.4622
α_2	-0.1624	-0.0887	-0.0673	-0.0515	-0.0400
α_3	0.2658	0.2351	0.2427	0.2314	0.2196
β	6.3656	3.3162	1.8069	1.0691	0.6704
σ	18.8045	18.5404	17.8961	17.5097	17.2222
max $E[\Pi]$					
α_1	0.0001	-0.0005	0.0001	0.0003	0.0000
α_2	0.0004	0.0008	0.0005	0.0005	0.0000
α_3	0.0039	0.0009	0.0003	0.0001	0.0001
β	0.0023	0.0012	0.0005	0.0003	0.0001
σ	-0.0932	-0.0276	-0.0172	-0.0088	-0.0041

Appendix

Ball et al. (1997) report a detailed data set pertaining to the U.S. agricultural sector for the period 1949–1994. To implement our Monte Carlo experiment we take four input price series from their data: labor (w_1), materials (w_2), energy (w_3) and capital (w_4). The aggregation of input prices in these four categories has been very common in the applied literature [leading to the so-called “KLEM” models; see Berndt and Wood (1975) for an early example]. Variables w_1 , w_3 and w_4 are reported directly by Ball et al. (1997), whereas w_2 had to be computed from the three non-energy intermediate input price series that they report. We did so by using Fisher’s ideal index formula (with mean values over the entire period as the base). The expected output series \bar{y} was generated as the fitted series of a linear regression of the quantity index for crop outputs, as reported by Ball et al. (1997), on the following variables: price of crops (lagged one period), price of livestock (lagged one period), price of the four inputs as described above (labor, materials, energy and capital) and a time trend. Whereas the computations just described were carried out for the entire period reported, for the purpose of our Monte Carlo experiment we utilize only the last 25 observations. Finally, the five data series that we utilize were scaled to equal one at the mean of the period that we use (i.e., for the period 1970–1994). The data so obtained, and used in the Monte Carlo experiment, are reported in Table A1.

Table A1. Data used in the Monte Carlo experiment

\bar{y}	w_1	w_2	w_3	w_4
0.7587	0.4076	0.4549	0.3260	0.4446
0.7656	0.4137	0.4769	0.3397	0.4093
0.7739	0.4291	0.4985	0.3410	0.4176
0.7450	0.4987	0.6769	0.3709	0.4384
0.8026	0.5475	0.8178	0.5463	0.4042
0.8779	0.5838	0.8364	0.5755	0.3460
0.8660	0.6495	0.8506	0.6225	0.5161
0.8997	0.7116	0.8493	0.6764	0.6261
0.9094	0.7715	0.8532	0.7145	0.6713
0.9349	0.8364	0.9401	0.9270	0.8419
0.9584	0.8820	1.0281	1.2636	1.1237
0.9854	0.8903	1.0919	1.4455	1.4533
1.0766	1.0416	1.0791	1.4508	1.6860
1.0014	0.9196	1.1315	1.4095	1.6439
1.0863	0.9969	1.1519	1.3832	1.8139
1.1295	1.1571	1.0834	1.3698	1.4502
1.1026	1.1394	1.0380	1.2592	1.2138
1.1055	1.0964	1.0693	1.1339	1.3617
1.0135	1.0547	1.2200	1.1423	1.2031
1.1447	1.3850	1.2874	1.1936	1.1098
1.1899	1.6175	1.2802	1.3550	1.1115
1.1932	1.6027	1.2831	1.3232	1.1237
1.1965	1.6334	1.2936	1.2816	1.2083
1.2147	1.8553	1.3301	1.2958	1.0642
1.2684	1.8786	1.3777	1.2534	1.3174