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#### Abstract

This paper gives a generalization of results presented by ten Berge, Krijnen, Wansbeek \& Shapiro. They examined procedures and results as proposed by Anderson \& Rubin, McDonald, Green and Krijnen, Wansbeek \& ten Berge. We shall consider the same matter, under weaker rank assumptions. We allow some moments, namely the variance $\Omega$ of the observable scores vector and that of the unique factors, $\Psi$, to be singular. We require $T^{\prime} \Psi T>0$, where $T \Lambda T^{\prime}$ is a Schur decomposition of $\Omega$. As usual the variance of the common factors, $\Phi$, and the loadings matrix $A$ will have full column rank.
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## 1 Introduction

We consider the factor model $y=\mu_{y}+A f+\varepsilon$, where $y$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of observable random variables called «scores», $f$ is an $m \times 1$ vector of non-observable random variables called «common factors», $A$ is a $p \times m$ matrix of full column rank whose elements are called «factor loadings» and $\varepsilon$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of non-observable random variables called «unique factors». The usual moment definitions and assumptions are

$$
E(\varepsilon)=0, \quad E(f)=0, \quad E(y)=\mu_{y}, \quad D(\varepsilon)=\Psi, \quad D(f)=\Phi, \quad C(f, \varepsilon)=0 .
$$

[^0]This yields the moment structure

$$
\Omega=A \Phi A^{\prime}+\Psi,
$$

where $\Omega=D(y)$ and $\Psi$ can be singular, $\Phi$ and $A$ have full column rank.
Notice that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{M}(A) \subset \mathcal{M}(\Omega) . \tag{1.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

The following additional assumption is made:

$$
T^{\prime} \Psi T>0 .
$$

It is inspired by the Schur decomposition $\Omega=T \Lambda T^{\prime}$, with $T^{\prime} T=I_{r}$ and diagonal $\Lambda>0$. Obviously $p \geqslant r>m$.

In two recent publications Krijnen, Wansbeek \& ten Berge (1996) and ten Berge, Krijnen, Wansbeek \& Shapiro (1999) studied the problem of best linear prediction of $f$ given $y$, subject to the constraint $E \hat{f} \hat{f}^{\prime}=E f f^{\prime}$, where $\hat{f}=B^{\prime} y$ is their predictor function. Vectors $f$ and $y$ have a simultaneous distribution. The two expectations are taken with respect to this distribution.

The constraint $E \hat{f} \hat{f}^{\prime}=E f f^{\prime}$ is mistakenly referred to as «correlation-preserving». We shall call it «covariance-preserving», although at face value only the RHS expression is a variance matrix. We shall use an affine predictor function $\hat{f}=a+B^{\prime} y$. It will be shown that $a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}=0$. Hence the predictor function will become $\hat{f}=B^{\prime}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)$ which is linear and unbiased. Consequently the LHS expression will become a variance matrix.

In their article ten Berge et al. (1999) examine three prediction procedures, due to McDonald (1981) -who generalized a procedure proposed by Anderson \& Rubin (1956) - Green (1969) and Krijnen et al. (1996), respectively.

We shall consider the same three procedures. The second and third are based on the mean-squared-error matrix $M=E(\hat{f}-f)(\hat{f}-f)^{\prime}$. Where Green minimizes its trace, tr $M$, Krijnen et al. minimize its determinant, $|M|$. McDonald uses a different though related criterion $\operatorname{tr} \Psi^{-1} E\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)^{\prime}$ which he minimizes. Note that these authors assume $\Psi>0$, hence $\Omega>0$. ten Berge et al. conclude that McDonald's and Krijnen et al.'s solutions for $B$ coincide.

In the present paper we shall again consider the above-mentioned procedures, under weaker rank assumptions. We shall show that the MSE matrix $M$ is positive definite. Minimization of the trace and the determinant of $M$ yields immediately $a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}=0$. Minimization of McDonald's criterion function yields the same result. As mathematical methods we use a Kristof-type theorem and a matrix inequality developed by Zhang (1999). Finally we show that 1) $\hat{f}_{G}$, the Green predictor and $\hat{f}_{K}$, the Krijnen et al. predictor coincide when $\Phi$ and $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A$ commute, 2) $\hat{f}_{M}$, the McDonald predictor and $\hat{f}_{K}$ coincide when $\Psi$ and $A \Phi A^{\prime}$ commute.

## 2 A Kristof-type theorem

Two of the three criterion functions can be seen to belong to the class $\operatorname{tr} P^{\prime} X$, where $P$ and $X$ have dimension $p \times m$. The constant matrix $P$ has rank $q$. The variable matrix $X$ satisfies the constraint $X^{\prime} X=I_{m}$. The aim is to maximize $\operatorname{tr} P^{\prime} X$ subject to $X^{\prime} X=I_{m}$. Define then the Lagrangean function

$$
\varphi(X)=\operatorname{tr} P^{\prime} X-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{tr} L\left(X^{\prime} X-I_{m}\right)
$$

where $L$ is a symmetric matrix of multipliers. Symmetry of $L$ is vital. It is justified, of course, by the symmetry of the constraint.

The differential of the function, namely

$$
d \varphi=\operatorname{tr} P^{\prime} d X-\operatorname{tr} L X^{\prime} d X=\operatorname{tr}(P-X L)^{\prime} d X
$$

has to be zero. This yields the equations

$$
\begin{gather*}
P=X L  \tag{2.1}\\
X^{\prime} X=I_{m} \tag{2.2}
\end{gather*}
$$

From these we obtain

$$
\begin{gather*}
P^{\prime} P=L^{2}  \tag{2.3}\\
P=X\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.4}
\end{gather*}
$$

Which square root will be selected is still undecided. Consider equation (2.4). As

$$
P\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{+\frac{1}{2}}\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}=P
$$

it is consistent. The symbol «+» denotes the Moore-Penrose inverse. The symbols «+» and « $\frac{1}{2}$ » are interchangeable in $\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{+\frac{1}{2}}$. The general solution of (2.4) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{\circ}=P\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{+\frac{1}{2}}+Q-Q\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{+\frac{1}{2}}, \quad Q \text { arbitrary } \tag{2.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

When we use the singular-value decomposition $P=F_{1} \Gamma_{1}^{\frac{1}{2}} G_{1}^{\prime}$, with $F_{1}^{\prime} F_{1}=G_{1}^{\prime} G_{1}=I_{q}$ and (diagonal) $\Gamma_{1}^{\frac{1}{2}}>0$, we can write the solution as

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{\circ}=F_{1} G_{1}^{\prime}+Q\left(I_{m}-G_{1} G_{1}^{\prime}\right) \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from (2.5) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{tr} P^{\prime} X_{\circ}=\operatorname{tr}\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \tag{2.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

As we look for a maximum, we have to take the positive definite square $\operatorname{root}\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The solution $X_{\circ}$ is not unique, unless $q=m$. In that case it can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{\circ}=P\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}=F_{1} G_{1}^{\prime} \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the connaisseurs we shall examine the second differential

$$
\begin{equation*}
d^{2} \varphi=-\operatorname{tr}(d X) L(d X)^{\prime} \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

When this expression is negative for all $d X \neq 0$ satisfying $(d X)^{\prime} X \circ+X_{\circ}^{\prime} d X=0$, a maximum has been found. The choice $L=\left(P^{\prime} P\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}>0$ guarantees this.

## 3 The Green procedure

As stated we use the MSE matrix $M=E(\hat{f}-f)(\hat{f}-f)^{\prime}=\left(a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}\right)\left(a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}\right)^{\prime}+$ $B^{\prime} \Omega B+\Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B$. Obviously $a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}=0$, as we have to minimize $\operatorname{tr} M$. As a consequence $E \hat{f} \hat{f}^{\prime}=B^{\prime} \Omega B$. Imposition of the constraint $E \hat{f} \hat{f}^{\prime}=E f f^{\prime}$ yields then $M=2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B$. Green (1969) defines the problem:

$$
\min _{B} \operatorname{tr}\left(2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B\right) \quad \text { subject to } B^{\prime} \Omega B=\Phi .
$$

We introduce $C^{\prime}=\Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\prime} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Clearly $C^{\prime} C=I_{m}$. This yields the equivalent problem

$$
\max _{C} \operatorname{tr} \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} C \quad \text { subject to } C^{\prime} C=I_{m}
$$

We used: $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} C \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=R^{\prime} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} B=R^{\prime} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} B=A^{\prime} B$, with $A=\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} R$ due to (1.1).
Application of the Kristof-type theorem gives the solution

$$
C_{G}=\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}},
$$

from which follows the solution

$$
B_{G}=\Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left(I_{p}-\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) Q, \quad Q \text { arbitrary } .
$$

The arbitrary component disappears in the predictor expression $B_{G}^{\prime}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)$, because $\left(I_{p}-\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)=0$ with probability one (w. p. 1).

Hence we get as predictor

$$
\hat{f}_{G}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right) .
$$

The reader can verify that $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A>0$.
An alternative expression is

$$
C_{G}=F_{2} G_{2}^{\prime},
$$

where we have used the singular-value decomposition

$$
\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}=F_{2} \Gamma_{2}^{\frac{1}{2}} G_{2}^{\prime},
$$

with $F_{2}^{\prime} F_{2}=G_{2}^{\prime} G_{2}=G_{2} G_{2}^{\prime}=I_{m}$. Use was made of the fact that $\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} A$ has full column rank ( $m$ ).

For nonsingular $\Omega$ the solution becomes that given by ten Berge et al. (1999) in their presentation, namely between (6) and (7).

## 4 The McDonald procedure

This approach is based on the weighted-least-squares function

$$
\operatorname{tr} \Psi^{+} E\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)^{\prime}
$$

Clearly

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)^{\prime}=\left(I_{p}-A B^{\prime}\right) \Omega\left(I_{p}-B A^{\prime}\right)+ \\
& \quad+A\left(a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}\right)\left(a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}\right)^{\prime} A^{\prime} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Again we find that $a+B^{\prime} \mu_{y}=0$, now having to minimize

$$
\operatorname{tr} \Psi^{+} E\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}-A \hat{f}\right)^{\prime}
$$

Notice that $A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A>0$.
Imposition of the constraint $E \hat{f} \hat{f}^{\prime}=E f f^{\prime}$ leads to the problem of minimizing

$$
\operatorname{tr} \Psi^{+}\left(I_{p}-A B^{\prime}\right) \Omega\left(I_{p}-B A^{\prime}\right) \quad \text { subject to } B^{\prime} \Omega B=\Phi
$$

Using $C^{\prime}=\Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\prime} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}$ we define the problem:

$$
\max _{C} \operatorname{tr} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} C \quad \text { subject to } C^{\prime} C=I_{m}
$$

Application of the Kristof-type theorem yields the solution

$$
C_{M}=\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
$$

from which follows the solution

$$
B_{M}=\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left(I_{p}-\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) Q, \quad Q \text { arbitrary. }
$$

Finally the predictor turns out to be

$$
\hat{f}_{M}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)
$$

Again we used

$$
\left(I_{p}-\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}}\right)\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)=0 \quad \text { w.p.1. }
$$

The reader can verify that $A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A>0$, using

$$
A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A=A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}\left(A \Phi A^{\prime}+\Psi\right) \Psi^{+} A=A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A+A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A
$$

An alternative expression is

$$
C_{M}=F_{3} G_{3}^{\prime},
$$

where

$$
\Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=F_{3} \Gamma_{3}^{\frac{1}{2}} G_{3}^{\prime},
$$

with $F_{3}^{\prime} F_{3}=G_{3}^{\prime} G_{3}=G_{3} G_{3}^{\prime}=I_{m}$.
For nonsingular $\Omega$ the solution becomes that given by ten Berge et al. (1999) in their presentation, namely between (4) and (5).

## 5 The Krijnen et al. procedure

Like Green's this approach uses the MSE matrix $M$ of $\hat{f}$. Instead of $\operatorname{tr}\left(2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\right.$ $\left.\Phi A^{\prime} B\right)$, Krijnen et al. use $\left|2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B\right|$ which has to be minimized. The first thing to do is to prove that $2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B>0$.

We have

$$
\begin{aligned}
2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B & =\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(2 I_{m}-\Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\prime} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}-\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} B \Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \Phi \\
& =\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(2 I_{m}-\Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}} B^{\prime} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}-\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}} B \Phi^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right) \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& =\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(2 I_{m}-C^{\prime} V-V^{\prime} C\right) \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& =\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[(C-V)^{\prime}(C-V)+\left(I_{m}-V^{\prime} V\right)\right] \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
V=\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text { and hence } \quad V^{\prime} V=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} .
$$

We shall show that all eigenvalues of $V^{\prime} V$ are positive and less than unity. Pre-(post-) multiply the moment structure $\Omega=A \Phi A^{\prime}+\Psi$ by $\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}\left(\Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)$. This leads to $\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} \Psi \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}$, hence

$$
\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}>\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2},
$$

as $\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} \Psi \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}>0$, and $\lambda_{i}>\lambda_{i}^{2}$ where $\lambda_{i}$ is any eigenvalue of $\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}$. This proves the property. Hence $I_{m}-V^{\prime} V>0$. As $(C-V)^{\prime}(C-V) \geqslant 0$ we have shown that $2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B>0$.

Hence $\left|2 \Phi-B^{\prime} A \Phi-\Phi A^{\prime} B\right|>0$. Consider then the positive definite matrix $2 I_{m}-$ $C^{\prime} V-V^{\prime} C$. We use (7.18) in Zhang (1999) which yields

$$
C^{\prime} V+V^{\prime} C \leqslant 2 U^{\prime}\left(V^{\prime} C C^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U
$$

where $U$ is an orthogonal matrix.
As $C^{\prime} C=I_{m}$ we have $C C^{\prime} \leqslant I_{p}$. This in its turn leads to $V^{\prime} C C^{\prime} V \leqslant V^{\prime} V$. The latter inequality gives $\left(V^{\prime} C C^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leqslant\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. See Theorem 2.5.5 in Wang \& Chow (1994).

Finally, we have

$$
C^{\prime} V+V^{\prime} C \leqslant 2 U^{\prime}\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U
$$

or equivalently

$$
2 I_{m}-C^{\prime} V-V^{\prime} C \geqslant 2\left[I_{m}-U^{\prime}\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U\right]
$$

From this we derive

$$
\left|2 I_{m}-C^{\prime} V-V^{\prime} C\right| \geqslant\left|2\left[I_{m}-U^{\prime}\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U\right]\right|=\left|2\left[I_{m}-\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]\right|
$$

It is easy to see that $C_{K}=V\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ leads to the equality

$$
\left|2 I_{m}-C_{K}^{\prime} V-V^{\prime} C_{K}\right|=\left|2\left[I_{m}-\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right]\right|
$$

Hence $C_{K}$ solves the problem. It is not clear whether the solution is unique.
In fact, $C_{K}$ also solves the related problem

$$
\max _{C} \operatorname{tr} V^{\prime} C \quad \text { subject to } C^{\prime} C=I_{m}
$$

The (unique) solution is $C_{K}$ by the Kristof-type theorem.
Application of Zhang's (7.18) yields

$$
2 \operatorname{tr} V^{\prime} C=\operatorname{tr}\left(C^{\prime} V+V^{\prime} C\right) \leqslant 2 \operatorname{tr} U^{\prime}\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} U=2 \operatorname{tr}\left(V^{\prime} V\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

which again has solution $C_{K}$. We then get the solution

$$
B_{K}=\Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left(I_{p}-\Omega^{+\frac{1}{2}} \Omega^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) Q, \quad Q \text { arbitrary }
$$

From this follows the unique predictor

$$
\hat{f}_{K}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)
$$

For nonsingular $\Omega$ the solution $C_{K}$ coincides with that given by ten Berge et al. (1999), namely in (9).

## 6 Equality of $\hat{f}_{G}$ and $\hat{f}_{K}$ when $\Phi$ and $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A$ commute

ten Berge et al. (1999) showed that $C_{G}=C_{K}$ under their assumptions when $\Phi$ and $A^{\prime} \Omega^{-1} A$ commute. We shall prove that $\hat{f}_{G}=\hat{f}_{K}$ under our milder conditions.

When $\Phi$ and $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A$ commute we have $\Phi=S M S^{\prime}$ and $A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A=S N S^{\prime}$, where $M$ and $N$ are positive definite diagonal matrices and $S$ is orthogonal. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{3}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{3}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} & =S M^{\frac{3}{2}} S^{\prime}\left(S M^{\frac{3}{2}} S^{\prime} S N S^{\prime} S M^{\frac{3}{2}} S^{\prime}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
& =S M^{\frac{3}{2}} S^{\prime}\left(S M^{3} N S^{\prime}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}=S M^{\frac{3}{2}} S^{\prime} S\left(M^{3} N\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime} \\
& =S N^{-\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime}=\left(A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Further This yields

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}}=\left(A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \\
& \hat{f}_{G}=\hat{f}_{K}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## 7 Equality of $\hat{f}_{M}$ and $\hat{f}_{K}$ when $\Psi$ and $A \Phi A^{\prime}$ commute

ten Berge et al. (1999) showed that $C_{M}=C_{K}$ under their assumptions when $\Psi$ is nonsingular. Essential is the expression

$$
\Omega^{-1}=\Psi^{-1}-\Psi^{-1} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{-1} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{-1}
$$

Under our assumptions $I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is nonsingular because $A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A>0$ which follows from $T^{\prime} \Psi T>0$ and (1.1). When we additionally assume that $\Psi$ and $A \Phi A^{\prime}$ commute we can establish the equality

$$
\Omega^{+}=\Psi^{+}-\Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}
$$

Proof. When $\Psi$ and $A \Phi A^{\prime}$ commute we have $\Psi=S M S^{\prime}$ and $A \Phi A^{\prime}=S N S^{\prime}$ where $M$ and $N$ are positive definite diagonal matrices and $S^{\prime} S=I_{m}$. Further $A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=S N^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{\prime}$, with orthogonal $T$, a singular-value decomposition. Hence

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Psi^{+} & -\Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \\
& =S M^{-1} S^{\prime}-S M^{-1} S^{\prime} S N^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{\prime}\left(I_{m}+T N^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime} S M^{-1} S^{\prime} S N^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{\prime}\right)^{-1} T N^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime} S M^{-1} S^{\prime} \\
& =S M^{-1} S^{\prime}-S M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{\prime}\left(I_{m}+T M^{-1} N T^{\prime}\right)^{-1} T M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime} \\
& =S M^{-1} S^{\prime}-S M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}} T^{\prime} T\left(I_{m}+M^{-1} N\right)^{-1} T^{\prime} T M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime} \\
& =S M^{-1} S^{\prime}-S M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+M^{-1} N\right)^{-1} M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}} S^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

Further $\Omega=A \Phi A^{\prime}+\Psi=S(M+N) S^{\prime}$, and $\Omega^{+}=S(M+N)^{-1} S^{\prime}$. It is easy to see that

$$
(M+N)^{-1}=M^{-1}-M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+M^{-1} N\right)^{-1} M^{-1} N^{\frac{1}{2}}
$$

This yields the result.

Recall that

$$
\hat{f}_{M}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)
$$

and

$$
\hat{f}_{K}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right)
$$

Consider

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}-\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \\
& \times \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&=\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&=\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1} E, \\
& \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \Omega \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
&=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}+\left(\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{2} \\
&=E+E^{2}, \\
& \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Omega^{+}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}-\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \\
&=\left(I_{m}+\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} \\
&=\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}, \\
& \hat{f}_{K}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left[\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1} E\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right), \\
& \hat{f}_{M}=\Phi^{\frac{1}{2}}\left(E+E^{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \Phi^{\frac{1}{2}} A^{\prime} \Psi^{+}\left(y-\mu_{y}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Clearly

$$
\left[\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1} E\right]^{-\frac{1}{2}}\left(I_{m}+E\right)^{-1}=\left(E+E^{2}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \quad \text { as } E>0
$$

This establishes the equality of $\hat{f}_{K}$ and $\hat{f}_{M}$.

## 8 Comments

1. ten Berge et al. (1999) claim that the McDonald method is undefined when $\Psi$ is singular. This is unjustified. What matters is the nonsingularity of $T^{\prime} \Psi T$. We make that assumption. It implies that $A^{\prime} \Psi^{+} A>0$ which we use several times.
2. Application of Zhang's result shows immediately that $C_{G}$ and $C_{M}$ yield the maximum. The Kristof-type theorem shows the unicity of the solutions.
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## Resum

Es dóna una generalització dels resultats presentats per ten Berge, Krijnen, Wansbeek and Shapiro . Aquests autors examinen mètodes i resultats basats en Anderson i Rubin. Mc Donald, Green i Krijnen, Wansbeek i ten Berge. Considerarem el mateix plantejament però sota condicions de rang més dèbils. Així suposarem que alguns moments, com les matrius de covariàncies $\Omega$ del vector de mesures observades dels factors comuns $\mathrm{i} \psi$ dels factors únics, siguin singulars. Imposem la condició $\mathrm{T}^{\prime} \psi \mathrm{T}>0$, essent $T \Lambda T^{\prime}$ la descomposició de Schur de $\Omega$. Com és usual, suposem que tenen rang màxim per columnes les matrius de covariàncies $\Phi$ dels factors comuns i la matriu A del model factorial.
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