

Testing for Vector White Noise Using Maximum Cross Correlations

Jinyuan Chang[†] Qiwei Yao[‡] Wen Zhou[§]

October 11, 2024

Abstract

We propose a new omnibus test for vector white noise using the maximum absolute auto-correlations and cross-correlations of the component series. Based on the newly established approximation by the L_∞ -norm of a normal random vector, the critical value of the test can be evaluated by bootstrapping from a multivariate normal distribution. In contrast to the conventional white noise test, the new method is proved to be valid for testing the departure from non-IID white noise. We illustrate the accuracy and the power of the proposed test by simulation, which also shows that the new test outperforms several commonly used methods including, for example, the Lagrange multiplier test and the multivariate Box-Pierce portmanteau tests especially when the dimension of time series is high in relation to the sample size. The numerical results also indicate that the performance of the new test can be further enhanced when it is applied to the pre-transformed data obtained via the time series principal component analysis proposed by [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#). The proposed procedures have been implemented in an R-package `HDtest` and is available online at [CRAN](#).

Keywords: Cross correlations; Normal approximation; Parametric bootstrap; PCA for time series; Portmanteau test; Vector white noise.

[†]School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia. E-mail: jinyuan.chang@unimelb.edu.au.

[‡]Department of Statistics, London School of Economics, London, WC2A 2AE, UK. E-mail: q.yao@lse.ac.uk.

[§]Department of Statistics, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA. E-mail: riczw@stat.colostate.edu.

1 Introduction

Testing for white noise or serial correlation is a fundamental problem in statistical inference, as many testing problems in linear modelling may be transformed into a white noise test. It continues to play an important role in modern data analysis as, for example, investigating residual-whiteness remains as one of the most effective means to assess the adequacy of a fitted model. The testing for white noise can be pursued in two different manners: (i) the departure from white noise is specified as an alternative hypothesis in the form of an explicit parametric family (such as ARMA models), and (ii) the alternative hypothesis is unspecified. With an explicitly specified alternative, a likelihood ratio test can be applied. The likelihood based tests typically have more power to detect a specific form of the departure from the null hypothesis than the omnibus tests which try to detect arbitrary departure from white noise. The likelihood approach has been taken further in the non-parametric context using the generalized likelihood ratio test initiated by [Fan, Zhang and Zhang \(2001\)](#); see Section 7.4.2 of [Fan and Yao \(2003\)](#) and also [Fan and Zhang \(2004\)](#). Nevertheless many applications including model diagnosis do not lead to a natural alternative model. Therefore various omnibus tests, especially the celebrated Box-Pierce portmanteau test and its variations, remain popular. Those portmanteau tests are proved to be asymptotically χ^2 -distributed under the null hypothesis of white noise, which is free from the underlying distribution. This makes the application of those tests extremely easy. We refer to Section 3.1 of [Li \(2004\)](#) and Section 4.4 of [Lütkepohl \(2005\)](#) for further information on those portmanteau tests.

While the Box-Pierce type of portmanteau tests are designed for testing white noise, their asymptotic χ^2 -distributions are established under the independent and identical distribution (IID) assumption. However, empirical evidences, including those in Section 4 below, suggest that this may represent another case in which the theory is more restrictive than the method itself. The effort to establish the asymptotic theory of the portmanteau tests for non-IID white noise has attracted a lot of attention. One of the most popular approaches is to establish the asymptotic normality of a normalized portmanteau test statistic. An incomplete list in this endeavour includes [Durlauf \(1991\)](#), [Romano and Thombs \(1996\)](#), [Deo \(2000\)](#), [Hong and Lee \(2003\)](#), [Escanciano and Lobato \(2009\)](#), [Shao \(2011\)](#) and [Xiao and Wu \(2011\)](#). However, those convergences are typically slow or very slow, resulting in the size distortion of the tests. [Horowitz et al. \(2006\)](#) proposed a double blockwise bootstrap method to test for non-IID white noise.

In this paper we propose a new omnibus test for vector white noise. Instead of using a portmanteau type statistic, the new test is based on the maximum absolute auto- and cross-correlation of all component time series. Intuitively this avoids the impact of small correlations, and the new test will perform well when there are one or two big sparks among

absolute auto- and cross-correlations. Therefore the test should be more powerful than the portmanteau tests. Of course our test statistic is no longer asymptotically normal. We have established that the distribution the maximum correlation test statistic under null hypothesis can be approximated asymptotically by that of $|G|_\infty$, where G is a certain Gaussian random vector, and $|u|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq s} |u_i|$ denotes the L_∞ -norm of a vector $u = (u_1, \dots, u_s)^T$. See Proposition 1 in Section 2.1 below. Hence the critical values of the proposed test can be evaluated by bootstrapping from a multivariate normal distribution.

The new test works well when auto- and cross-correlations have some big (either positive or negative) sparks. Note that when most auto- and cross-correlations are small except a few big sparks, the Box-Pierce type of portmanteau tests suffer from having too many degrees of freedom in their asymptotic distribution. On the other hand, the new test lacks power when all auto- and cross-correlations are small. But most (if not all) tests will struggle in latter case.

An added advantage of the new test is its ability to handle high-dimensional time series in the sense that the dimension of time series is as large as, or even larger than, the sample size. In this information age, it is common place to model and forecast a large number of time series together, which has direct applications in, among others, finance, economics, business analytics, environmental and medical studies. The current literature on high-dimensional time series focuses on the estimation, and dimension-reduction aspects of the modelling. See, for example, Basu and Michailidis (2015), and Guo, Wang and Yao (2016) and the references within for high-dimensional VAR models, and Bai and Ng (2002), Forni et al. (2005), Lam and Yao (2012) and Chang, Guo and Yao (2015) for various factor models for high-dimensional time series. The model diagnostics has largely been untouched as far as we are aware. The proposed test in this paper represents an effort to fill in this gap.

We compare the performance of the new test with those of the three Box-Pierce types of portmanteau tests, the Lagrange multiplier test and a likelihood ratio test in simulation, which shows that the new test attains the nominal significance levels more accurately and is also more powerful when the dimension of time series is large or moderately large. The performance of the new test can be further enhanced by first applying the time series principal component analysis (TS-PCA) of Chang, Guo and Yao (2014) to the data, and then applying the new test to the transformed data.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. The new test is presented in Section 2. The theoretical justification is provided in Section 3. Section 4 reports the simulation results. Throughout the paper, we denote by $\lceil x \rceil$ and $\lfloor x \rfloor$, respectively, the smallest integer not less than x and the largest integer not greater than x . For matrix $M = (m_{i,j})_{s_1 \times s_2}$, let $|M|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq s_1, 1 \leq j \leq s_2} |m_{ij}|$, and $\text{vec}(M)$ be the long vector obtained by stacking the columns of M together. We denote by \otimes the Kronecker product for matrices, and by I_s

the $s \times s$ identity matrix.

2 Methodology

2.1 Tests

Let $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ be a p -dimensional weakly stationary time series with mean zero. Denote by

$$\Sigma(k) = \text{Cov}(\varepsilon_{t+k}, \varepsilon_t), \quad \Gamma(k) = [\text{diag}\{\Sigma(0)\}]^{-1/2} \Sigma(k) [\text{diag}\{\Sigma(0)\}]^{-1/2}$$

the autocovariance and the autocorrelation of ε_t at lag k , respectively, where $\text{diag}(\Sigma)$ denotes the diagonal matrix consisting of the diagonal elements of Σ only. With the available observations $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n$, let

$$\widehat{\Gamma}(k) \equiv (\widehat{\rho}_{ij}(k))_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} = [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2} \widehat{\Sigma}(k) [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2} \quad (1)$$

be the sample autocorrelation matrix at lag k , where

$$\widehat{\Sigma}(k) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^{n-k} \varepsilon_{t+k} \varepsilon_t^T \quad (2)$$

is the sample autocovariance matrix.

Consider the hypothesis testing problem

$$H_0 : \{\varepsilon_t\} \text{ is white noise} \quad \text{v.s.} \quad H_1 : \{\varepsilon_t\} \text{ is not white noise.} \quad (3)$$

Since $\Gamma(k) \equiv 0$ for any $k \geq 1$ under H_0 , our test statistic T_n is defined as

$$T_n = \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} T_{n,k}, \quad (4)$$

where $T_{n,k} = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} n^{1/2} |\widehat{\rho}_{ij}(k)|$ and $K \geq 1$ is a prescribed integer. We reject H_0 if $T_n > cv_\alpha$, where $cv_\alpha > 0$ is the critical value determined by

$$\text{pr}(T_n > cv_\alpha | H_0) = \alpha, \quad (5)$$

and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is the significance level of the test.

To determine cv_α in (5), we need to derive the distribution of T_n under H_0 . Proposition 1 below shows that the Kolmogorov distance between this distribution and that of the L_∞ -norm of a Gaussian random vector G with mean 0 and covariance matrix Ξ_n converges to zero, even when p diverges at the exponential rate of n , where

$$\Xi_n = (I_K \otimes W) E(\xi_n \xi_n^T) (I_K \otimes W). \quad (6)$$

In the above expression, $\xi_n = (n^{1/2} [\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(1)\}]^T, \dots, n^{1/2} [\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(K)\}]^T)^T$ and $W = [\text{diag}\{\Sigma(0)\}]^{-1/2} \otimes [\text{diag}\{\Sigma(0)\}]^{-1/2}$. This paves the way to evaluate cv_α simply by drawing a bootstrap sample from $N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$, where $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ is an appropriate estimator for Ξ_n .

Proposition 1. *Let Conditions 1–4 in Section 3 below hold and $G \sim N(0, \Xi_n)$. There exists a positive constant δ_1 depending only on the constants appeared in Conditions 1–4 for which $\log(p) \leq Cn^{\delta_1}$ for some constant $C > 0$. Then it holds that*

$$\sup_{s \geq 0} |\text{pr}(T_n > s | H_0) - \text{pr}(|G|_\infty > s)| \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By replacing Ξ_n in (6) by $\widehat{\Xi}_n$, where $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ is defined in Section 2.2 below, the critical value cv_α in (5) can be replaced by $\widehat{\text{cv}}_\alpha$ which is determined by

$$\text{pr}(|G|_\infty > \widehat{\text{cv}}_\alpha | \mathcal{X}_n) = \alpha, \quad (7)$$

where $G \sim N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$ and $\mathcal{X}_n = \{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n\}$. In practice, we can draw G_1, \dots, G_B independently from $N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$ for a large integer B . The $\lfloor B\alpha \rfloor$ -th largest value among $|G_1|_\infty, \dots, |G_B|_\infty$ is taken (approximately) as the critical value $\widehat{\text{cv}}_\alpha$. We then reject H_0 whenever $T_n > \widehat{\text{cv}}_\alpha$.

Remark 1. *When p is large or moderately large, it is advantageous to apply TS-PCA transformation of [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#) to the data first, and then apply the test T_n to the transformed data. We denote such a test as T_n^* . More precisely let $\varepsilon_t^* = Q\varepsilon_t$ ($t = 1, \dots, n$) denote the transformed data. Since the transformation matrix Q does not depend on t , $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is white noise if and only if $\{\varepsilon_t^*\}$ is white noise. We can calculate Q using the R-function `segmentTS` in the package `PCA4TS` available at CRAN. Then T_n^* is defined in the same manner as T_n in (4) with $\{\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n\}$ replaced by $\{\varepsilon_1^*, \dots, \varepsilon_n^*\}$. The TS-PCA pushes most the auto-correlations and cross-correlations of ε_t into the component directions of the transformed series ε_t^* , making the components of ε_t^* as uncorrelated as possible across all time lags; see Section 6 of [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#). Intuitively the transformation would make the maximum correlation greater, and therefore the test will be more powerful. This is reinforced by the simulation results reported Section 4 below.*

2.2 Estimation of Ξ_n

By Lemma 3.1 of [Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato \(2013\)](#), the proposed test in Section 2.1 is valid if the estimator $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ satisfies $|\widehat{\Xi}_n - \Xi_n|_\infty = o_p(1)$. We construct such an estimator now even when the dimension of time series is ultra-high, i.e. $p \gg n$. Let $\tilde{n} = n - K$ and

$$f_t = \{\text{vec}(\varepsilon_{t+1}\varepsilon_t^\text{T}), \dots, \text{vec}(\varepsilon_{t+K}\varepsilon_t^\text{T})\}^\text{T} \quad (8)$$

for $t = 1, \dots, \tilde{n}$. Note that the second factor $E(\xi_n \xi_n^\text{T})$ on the right-hand side of (6) is closely related to $\text{Var}(\tilde{n}^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}} f_t)$, the long-run covariance of $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}}$. The long-run covariance plays an important role in the inference with dependent data. There exist various estimation methods for long-run covariances, including the kernel-type estimators

(Andrews, 1991), and the estimators utilizing the moving block bootstraps (Lahiri, 2003). See also Den Haan and Levin (1997) and Kiefer, Vogelsang and Bunzel (2000). We adopt the kernel-type estimator for the long-run covariance of $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}}$ (centered if necessary):

$$\widehat{J}_n = \sum_{j=-\tilde{n}+1}^{\tilde{n}-1} \mathcal{K}\left(\frac{j}{b_n}\right) \widehat{H}(j), \quad (9)$$

where $\widehat{H}(j) = \tilde{n}^{-1} \sum_{t=j+1}^{\tilde{n}} f_t f_{t-j}^T$ if $j \geq 0$ and $\widehat{H}(j) = \tilde{n}^{-1} \sum_{t=-j+1}^{\tilde{n}} f_{t+j} f_t^T$ otherwise, $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ is a symmetric kernel function that is continuous at 0 with $\mathcal{K}(0) = 1$, and b_n is the bandwidth diverging with n . Among a variety of kernel functions that guarantee the positive definiteness of the long-run covariance estimators, Andrews (1991) derived an optimal kernel, i.e. the quadratic spectral kernel

$$\mathcal{K}_{QS}(x) = \frac{25}{12\pi^2 x^2} \left\{ \frac{\sin(6\pi x/5)}{6\pi x/5} - \cos(6\pi x/5) \right\} \quad (10)$$

by minimizing the asymptotic truncated mean square error of the estimator. For the numerical study in Section 4, we always use this kernel function with an explicitly specified bandwidth selection procedure there. The theoretical results in Section 3 apply to general kernel functions. As now \widehat{J}_n in (9) provides an estimator for $E(\xi_n \xi_n^T)$, Ξ_n in (6) can be estimated by

$$\widehat{\Xi}_n = (I_K \otimes \widehat{W}) \widehat{J}_n (I_K \otimes \widehat{W}),$$

where $\widehat{W} = [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2} \otimes [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2}$ for $\widehat{\Sigma}(0)$ defined in (2). Simulation results show that the proposed test with this estimator performs very well.

2.3 Computational issues

To draw a random vector $G \sim N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$, the standard approach consists of three steps: (i) perform the Cholesky decomposition on the $p^2 K \times p^2 K$ matrix $\widehat{\Xi}_n = L^T L$, (ii) generate $p^2 K$ independent standard normal random variables $z = (z_1, \dots, z_{p^2 K})^T$, (iii) perform transformation $G = L^T z$. Thus, it requires to store matrix $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ and $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}}$, which amounts to the storage costs $O(p^4 K^2)$ and $O(np^2 K)$, respectively. The computational complexity is $O(np^4 K^2 + p^6 K^3)$, mainly due to computing $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ and the Cholesky decomposition. To circumvent the high computing and storage costs and make the proposed test practically feasible even when p and/or K are large, we propose a method below which generates random variables from an \tilde{n} -variate normal distribution instead.

Let Θ be an $\tilde{n} \times \tilde{n}$ matrix with the (i, j) -th element $\mathcal{K}((i-j)/b_n)$. Let $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_{\tilde{n}})^T \sim N(0, \Theta)$ be a random vector independent of \mathcal{X}_n . Then it is easy to see that conditionally on \mathcal{X}_n ,

$$G = (I_K \otimes \widehat{W}) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{n}}} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}} \eta_t f_t \right) \sim N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n). \quad (11)$$

That is, we only need to draw B samples independently from $N(0, \Theta)$. Then, random samples from $N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$ can be obtained through (11). This new approach only requires to store vectors $\{f_t\}_{t=1}^{\bar{n}}$ and matrix Θ , which amounts to the total storage cost $O(np^2K + n^2)$. More significantly, the computational complexity of the new method is only $O(n^3)$ which is independent of p and K . The main computational cost is to generate B random vectors from $N(0, \Theta)$, which is much less demanding. For example, for $p = 1000$ and $B = 100,000$ such a task only takes 3.134 seconds on a PC with Intel(R) Core(MT) i7-4770 CPU @ 3.40GHz. On the other hand, it takes only 0.235 seconds to compute Θ on the same machine for $n = 1000$.

3 Theoretical properties

Write $\varepsilon_t = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{p,t})^T$ for each $t = 1, \dots, n$. To investigate the theoretical properties of the proposed testing procedure, we need the following regularity conditions.

Condition 1. There exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ independent of p such that $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_{i,t}) \geq C_1$ uniformly holds for any $i = 1, \dots, p$.

Condition 2. There exist three constants $C_2, C_3 > 0$ and $r_1 \in (0, 2]$ independent of p such that

$$\sup_t \sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} \text{pr}(|\varepsilon_{i,t}| > x) \leq C_2 \exp(-C_3 x^{r_1})$$

for any $x > 0$.

Condition 3. Assume that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is β -mixing in the sense that

$$\beta_k := \sup_t E \left\{ \sup_{B \in \mathcal{F}_{t+k}^\infty} |\text{pr}(B | \mathcal{F}_{-t}^u) - \text{pr}(B)| \right\} \rightarrow 0$$

as $k \rightarrow \infty$, where \mathcal{F}_{-t}^u and \mathcal{F}_{t+k}^∞ are the σ -fields generated respectively by $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \leq u}$ and $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \geq u+k}$. Furthermore there exist two constants $C_4 > 0$ and $r_2 \in (0, 1]$ independent of p such that $\beta_k \leq \exp(-C_4 k^{r_2})$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Condition 4. There exists a constant $C_5 > 0$ and $\iota > 0$ independent of p such that

$$\begin{aligned} C_5^{-1} &< \liminf_{q \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{m \geq 0} E \left(\left| \frac{1}{q^{1/2}} \sum_{t=m+1}^{m+q} \varepsilon_{i,t+k} \varepsilon_{j,t} \right|^{2+\iota} \right) \\ &\leq \limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{m \geq 0} E \left(\left| \frac{1}{q^{1/2}} \sum_{t=m+1}^{m+q} \varepsilon_{i,t+k} \varepsilon_{j,t} \right|^{2+\iota} \right) < C_5 \end{aligned}$$

uniformly holds for any $1 \leq i, j \leq p$ and $1 \leq k \leq K$.

Condition 1 ensures that all component series are not degenerate. Condition 2 is a common assumption in the literature of ultra high-dimensional data analysis. It ensures the exponential-type upper bounds for the tail probabilities of the statistics concerned. The β -mixing assumption in Condition 3 is mild. Causal ARMA processes with continuous innovation distributions are β -mixing with exponentially decaying β_k . So are the stationary Markov chains satisfying certain conditions. See Section 2.6.1 of Fan and Yao (2003) and the references within. In fact stationary GARCH models with finite second moments and continuous innovation distributions are also β -mixing with exponentially decaying β_k ; see Proposition 12 of Carrasco and Chen (2002). If we only require $\sup_t \sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} \Pr(|\varepsilon_{i,t}| > x) = O\{x^{-2(\nu+\epsilon)}\}$ for any $x > 0$ in Condition 2 and $\beta_k = O\{k^{-\nu(\nu+\epsilon)/(2\epsilon)}\}$ in Condition 3 for some $\nu > 2$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we can apply the Fuk-Nagaev-type inequalities to construct the upper bounds for the tail probabilities of the statistics for which our testing procedure still works for p diverging at some polynomial rate of n . We refer to Section 3.2 of Chang, Guo and Yao (2014) for the implementation of the Fuk-Nagaev-type inequalities in such a scenario. The β -mixing condition can be replaced by the α -mixing condition under which we can justify the proposed method for p diverging at some polynomial rate of n by using the Fuk-Nagaev-type inequalities. However, it remains open to establish the relevant properties under α -mixing for p diverging at some exponential rate of n . Condition 4 is a technical assumption for the validity of the Gaussian approximation for dependent data.

We are ready to state the main asymptotic results now, which indicate that the critical value $\widehat{c}v_\alpha$ defined in (7) by the normal approximation is asymptotically valid, and, furthermore, the proposed test is a power-one test asymptotically.

Theorem 1. *Assume that Conditions 1–4 hold, the kernel function $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ satisfying $|\mathcal{K}(x)| \asymp |x|^{-\tau}$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\tau > 1$, and the bandwidth $b_n \asymp n^\rho$ for some $0 < \rho < \min\{\frac{\tau-1}{3\tau}, \frac{r_2}{2r_2+1}\}$. There exists a positive constant δ_2 depending only on the constants appeared in Conditions 1–4 for which $\log(p) \leq Cn^{\delta_2}$ for some constant $C > 0$. Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\Pr(T_n > \widehat{c}v_\alpha | H_0) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

Theorem 2. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 1 hold. Let ϱ be the largest element in the main diagonal of Ξ_n , and $\lambda(p, \alpha) = \{2 \log(p^2 K)\}^{1/2} + \{2 \log(1/\alpha)\}^{1/2}$. Suppose that*

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\rho_{i,j}(k)| \geq \varrho^{1/2} (1 + \epsilon_n) n^{-1/2} \lambda(p, \alpha)$$

for some positive ϵ_n satisfying $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\epsilon_n^2 \log(p) \rightarrow \infty$. Then as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\Pr(T_n > \widehat{c}v_\alpha | H_1) \rightarrow 1.$$

4 Numerical properties

In this section, we illustrate the finite sample properties of the proposed test T_n by simulation studies. Also included is the test T_n^* based on the pre-transformed data by TS-PCA of [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#); see Remark 1 in Section 2.1 above. We always use the quadratic spectral kernel $\mathcal{K}_{QS}(x)$ specified in (10). In addition, we always use the data-driven bandwidth $b_n = 1.3221\{\hat{a}(2) \cdot \tilde{n}\}^{1/5}$ suggested in Section 6 of [Andrews \(1991\)](#), where

$$\hat{a}(2) = \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^{p^2 K} \frac{4\hat{\rho}_\ell^2 \hat{\sigma}_\ell^4}{(1 - \hat{\rho}_\ell)^8} \right\} \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^{p^2 K} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_\ell^4}{(1 - \hat{\rho}_\ell)^4} \right\}^{-1}.$$

In the above expression, $\hat{\rho}_\ell$ and $\hat{\sigma}_\ell^2$ are, respectively, the estimated autoregressive coefficient and innovation variance from fitting an AR(1) model to time series $\{f_{\ell,t}\}_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}}$, where $f_{\ell,t}$ is the ℓ -th component of f_t defined in (8). With this b_n , we draw G_1, \dots, G_B independently from $N(0, \hat{\Xi}_n)$ with $B = 2000$ based on (11) and take the $\lfloor B\alpha \rfloor$ -th largest value among $|G_1|_\infty, \dots, |G_B|_\infty$ as the critical value \hat{c}_{v_α} . We always set the nominal significance level at $\alpha = 0.05$, and let $n = 300$, $p = 3, 15, 50, 150$, and $K = 2, 4, 6, 8, 10$. For each setting, we replicate the simulation 500 times.

We compare the new tests T_n and T_n^* with the three multivariate portmanteau tests, i.e. the multivariate version of Box-Pierce test using statistic $Q_1 = n \sum_{k=1}^K \text{tr}\{\hat{\Gamma}(k)^T \hat{\Gamma}(k)\}$ ([Box and Pierce, 1970](#)), the test using statistic $Q_2 = n^2 \sum_{k=1}^K \text{tr}\{\hat{\Gamma}(k)^T \hat{\Gamma}(k)\} / (n - k)$ of [Hosking \(1980\)](#), the test using statistic $Q_3 = n \sum_{k=1}^K \text{tr}\{\hat{\Gamma}(k)^T \hat{\Gamma}(k)\} + p^2 K(K + 1) / (2n)$ of [Li and McLeod \(1981\)](#), where $\hat{\Gamma}(k)$ is the sample correlation matrix given in (1). It has been shown that under the condition that ε_t are IID (hence null hypothesis H_0 in (3) holds), all Q_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are asymptotically $\chi_{p^2 K}^2$. Thus H_0 is rejected if the corresponding testing statistic exceeds the upper α quantile of $\chi_{p^2 K}^2$. Also, we compare T_n and T_n^* with the Lagrange multiplier test ([Lütkepohl, 2005](#)) (denoted by LM hereafter), as well as a likelihood ratio test proposed by [Tiao and Box \(1981\)](#) (denoted by TB hereafter). The TB test is designed for testing for a VAR(r) model against a VAR($r + 1$) model and is therefore applicable for testing (3) with $r = 0$. In particular, different from all the other tests included in the comparison, the TB test does not involve the lag parameter K . For those tests relying on the asymptotic χ^2 -approximation, it is known that the χ^2 -approximation is poor when the degree of freedom is large. In our simulation, we perform the tests based on the normal approximation instead when $p > 10$, i.e. we reject H_0 if the standardized testing statistic exceeds the the upper α quantile of $N(0, 1)$. We refer to the further discussions on those tests in Section 3.1 of [Li \(2004\)](#) and Section 4.4 of [Lütkepohl \(2005\)](#).

The newly proposed tests T_n and T_n^* , together with the existing methods mentioned above, have been implemented in an R-package `HDtest` and is currently available online at CRAN (<http://cran.r-project.org>).

4.1 Study on empirical sizes

To examine the sizes of the aforementioned tests under H_0 , we generated data from the model $\varepsilon_t = Az_t$ ($t = 1, \dots, n$), where $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^n$ is a p -dimensional time series. We considered three different $p \times p$ loading matrices A and four different models for $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^n$. For the loading matrices A , we considered the following settings.

- M1: Let $S = (s_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ for $s_{k\ell} = 0.995^{|k-\ell|}$, then let $A = S^{1/2}$.
- M2: Let $r = \lceil p/2.5 \rceil$, $S = (s_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ where $s_{kk} = 1$, $s_{k\ell} = 0.8$ for $r(q-1) + 1 \leq k \neq \ell \leq rq$ for $q = 1, \dots, \lfloor p/r \rfloor$, and $s_{k\ell} = 0$ otherwise. Let $A = S^{1/2}$ which is a block diagonal matrix.
- M3: Let $A = (a_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ for $a_{k\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$.

For time series $\{z_t\}_{t=1}^n$, we considered the following models. Note that under Models D3 and D4, the white noise null hypothesis H_0 still holds although $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ are no longer independent and identically distributed.

- D1: Let $z_t \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} N(0, I_p)$.
- D2: Let (z_1, \dots, z_n) be a $p \times n$ matrix with all the elements being independent t_8 random variables.
- D3: Let the components of z_t be p independent ARCH(1) processes. More precisely, write $z_t = (z_{1,t}, \dots, z_{p,t})^\top$, for each $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, $z_{\ell,t} | z_{\ell,t-1} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\ell,t}^2)$ with $\sigma_{\ell,t}^2 = \gamma_{0,\ell} + \gamma_{1,\ell} z_{\ell,t-1}^2$, where $\gamma_{0,\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(0.25, 0.5)$, and $\gamma_{1,\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(0, 0.5 - \gamma_{0,\ell})$.
- D4: Let the components of z_t be p independent GARCH(1) processes. More precisely, write $z_t = (z_{1,t}, \dots, z_{p,t})^\top$, for each $\ell = 1, \dots, p$, $z_{\ell,t} | z_{\ell,t-1} \sim N(0, \sigma_{\ell,t}^2)$ with $\sigma_{\ell,t}^2 = \gamma_{0,\ell} + \gamma_{1,\ell} z_{\ell,t-1}^2 + \beta_{1,\ell} \sigma_{\ell,t-1}^2$, where $\gamma_{0,\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(0.25, 0.5)$, $\gamma_{1,\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(0, 0.5 - \gamma_{0,\ell})$, and $\beta_{1,\ell} \stackrel{\text{IID}}{\sim} U(0, 0.5 - \gamma_{0,\ell} - \gamma_{1,\ell})$.

Tables 1–2 report the empirical sizes (i.e. the relative frequencies of the occurrence of the event that the test statistic concerned exceeds the corresponding critical value) of the proposed tests T_n and T_n^* for data models D1 and D3, along with those of the three portmanteau tests Q_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$), the LM and the TB tests. Similar results for data models D2 and D4 are included in the supplementary materials. The TB test, as mentioned earlier, does not involve the lag parameter K . Hence we only report its empirical size once for each p in the tables. Also, the LM test requires $pK < n$ in practice in order to compute the testing statistic based on multivariate regression. Thus, for the LM test we only report results for

$p = 3, 15$ and $p = 50$ while $K = 2, 4, 6$, and mark by NA for the entries corresponding to $pK \geq n$. Recall $n = 300$ in our simulation.

Tables 1–2 indicate that the proposed methods T_n and T_n^* perform about the same to the other tests when the dimension p is small, such as $p = 3$. The portmanteau, LM and TB tests, however, fail badly to attain the nominal significance level as the dimension p increases, as then the empirical sizes severely underestimate the nominal level. In fact the empirical sizes for the portmanteau tests and TB test are almost 0 under all the settings with $p = 150$. Also the empirical sizes for the portmanteau tests and LM test are almost 0 for some settings with $p = 50$. In particular, the empirical sizes for the LM test quickly deviate from the nominal level as pK approaching to n . In contrast, the newly proposed test T_n performs much better, although may still underestimate the nominal level when p is relatively large, particularly for model M3. Noticeably T_n^* , i.e. the procedure combining the new test with TS-PCA by [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#), produces the empirical sizes much closer to the nominal level 0.05 than all other tests across almost all the settings with $p = 50$ and 150.

We also observe that the portmanteau tests Q_2 and Q_3 perform about the same in general and both outperform Q_1 when p is large. This is in line with the known fact that the asymptotic approximations for Q_2 and Q_3 are more accurate than that for Q_1 . In addition, Tables 1–2, as well as the results in the supplementary materials, indicate that the proposed tests are more robust with respect to the choice of the prescribed lag parameter K . It is also interesting to note that the proposed method T_n , along with portmanteau tests, performs better for the loading matrices in models M1 and M2 than for that in model M3 when p is large. As the coefficients in the loading matrix A under model M3 can be both positive and negative, the signals in ε_t may be relatively weak due to possible cancellations. Nevertheless, with the aid of TS-PCA, T_n^* perform reasonably well for all models M1–M3.

In summary, the proposed tests, especially T_n^* , attain the nominal level much better than the existing tests when p is large. On the other hand, for small p all the tests perform about the same as far as the attaining the significance level is concerned.

4.2 Study on empirical powers

To compare the powers of the tests, we considered the following five different non-white noise models.

- A1: Let $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ be a VAR(1) process defined by $\varepsilon_t = A\varepsilon_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$, where ϵ_t is a sequence of independent random vectors and all the components of ϵ_t are independent t_8 random variables. In the coefficient matrix $A = (a_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$, $a_{k\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(-0.25, 0.25)$ for $1 \leq k, \ell \leq \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$, and $a_{k\ell} = 0$ for $\max(k, \ell) > \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$. Thus only the first

$\min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$ components of ε_t are not white noise.

- A2: Same as A1 above except changing the definition of $a_{k\ell}$ for $1 \leq k, \ell \leq \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$ to $a_{kk} = 0.8$, $a_{k\ell} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(-0.25, 0.25)$ with probability $1/3$ and $a_{k\ell} = 0$ with probability $2/3$ for $k \neq \ell$.
- A3: Let $\varepsilon_t = Az_t$, where $z_t = (z_{1,t}, \dots, z_{p,t})^\top$. For $1 \leq k \leq \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$, we assume $(z_{k,1}, \dots, z_{k,n})^\top \sim N(0, \Sigma)$, where the (i, j) -th element of Σ is $0.2^{|j-i|^2}$. For $k > \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$, $(z_{k,1}, \dots, z_{k,n})^\top \sim N(0, I_n)$. For the loading matrix $A = (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$, $a_{ii} = 0.8$, $a_{ij} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$ with probability $1/3$ and $a_{ij} = 0$ with probability $2/3$ for $i \neq j$.
- A4: Similar to model A3 except we set the (i, j) -th element of Σ as $\sigma_{ij} = 0.5|i-j|^{-0.6}$ for $2 \leq |i-j| \leq 7$ and $\sigma_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. The components in $(z_{k,1}, \dots, z_{k,n})^\top$ for $k > \min(\lceil p/5 \rceil, 12)$ are independent and identically distributed t_8 random variables.
- A5: Similar to model A4 except that the loading matrix $A = (a_{k\ell})_{1 \leq k, \ell \leq p}$ is set as a diagonal block matrix with block size $r = \lceil p/5 \rceil$. That is, we set $a_{kk} = 1$, $a_{k\ell} = 0.8$ for $r(m-1) + 1 \leq k \neq \ell \leq rm$ for $m = 1, \dots, \lfloor p/r \rfloor$, and $a_{k\ell} = 0$ otherwise.

Both models A1 and A2 are VAR processes with only a fraction of the p components not being white noise. In addition, model A1 has a denser loading matrix A than that in model A2. In models A3–A5, more general autocorrelation structures are considered for processes z_t , and ε_t are contributed by all p components of z_t .

Figs. 1–2 plot the empirical powers, defined as the same as the empirical sizes in Section 4.1 above, of the seven tests concerned against the lag parameter K for models A1 and A4. Similar results for models A2, A3 and A5 are included in the supplementary materials. As the TB test involves no lag parameter K , its empirical power does not change with respect to K . Also note that LM test are only available for $p = 3, 15$ and $p = 50$ while $K = 2, 4, 6$. Overall, it is clear that the proposed tests T_n and T_n^* outperform the portmanteau tests, the LM and the TB tests when the dimension p is large, say $p = 150$, as well as for some settings with $p = 50$ under all the five models. When $p = 150$, the proposed tests, especially T_n^* , are able to maintain substantial power while all the other tests become powerless. Under models A1–A3, where the autocorrelation decays relatively fast, the proposed tests T_n and T_n^* is substantially more powerful than the portmanteau tests and the LM test even when p is small. In addition, Fig. 1 and the results in the supplementary materials also indicate that the existing tests compromise more in their power than the newly proposed tests when the loading matrix A is relatively sparse. For models A4 and A5 where the autocorrelations for processes z_t is strong, Fig. 2 and the results in the supplementary materials show that the portmanteau and the LM test perform well or even better when p is very small such as $p = 3$. Finally, as expected, T_n^* is more powerful than T_n when p is large, and the




Figure 1: Plots of empirical powers against lag K for the newly proposedly tests T_n (solid and \blacksquare lines) and T_n^* (solid and \bullet lines), the portmanteau tests Q_1 (dashed and \triangle lines), Q_2 (dashed and $+$ lines) and Q_3 (dashed and \square lines), the LM test (dashed and \circ lines), and the TB test (dashed and \times). The data are generated from model A1 with sample size $n = 300$. The nominal level is $\alpha = 0.05$.

improvement is substantial when, for example, $p = 150$. Overall, our proposed tests T_n and T_n^* are more powerful than the traditional tests when the dimension p is large or moderately large.




Figure 2: Plots of empirical powers against lag K for the newly proposedly tests T_n (solid and \blacksquare lines) and T_n^* (solid and \bullet lines), the portmanteau tests Q_1 (dashed and \triangle lines), Q_2 (dashed and $+$ lines) and Q_3 (dashed and \square lines), the LM test (dashed and \circ lines), and the TB test (dashed and \times). The data are generated from model A4 with sample size $n = 300$. The nominal level is $\alpha = 0.05$.

5 Applications in model diagnosis

Let $\{y_t\}$ and $\{u_t\}$ be observable $p \times 1$ and $q \times 1$ time series, respectively. We assume they follow the equation

$$y_t = g(u_t; \theta) + \varepsilon_t, \quad (12)$$

where a known link function $g(\cdot; \cdot)$ and an unknown $s \times 1$ parameter $\theta \in \Theta$. In time series analysis, we are interested in testing whether the error process $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is white noise or not,

as one of the most frequently used procedures in model diagnosis.

Model (12) encompasses a large number of frequently used models, including VARMA. Denote L the backshift operator. A VARMA(m_1, m_2) model has the form $a(L)y_t = b(L)\varepsilon_t$ where $a(L) = I_p + A_1L + \dots + A_{m_1}L^{m_1}$ and $b(L) = I_p + B_1L + \dots + B_{m_2}L^{m_2}$. Whenever the inverse of the polynomial $b(x)$ exists, this VARMA(m_1, m_2) model is equivalent to $\beta(L)y_t = \varepsilon_t$ with $\beta(L) = \{b(L)\}^{-1}a(L)$. Write $\beta(L) = I_p + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \Pi_m L^m$, where $\Pi_m = (\zeta_{m,1}^0, \dots, \zeta_{m,p}^0)^\top$ with $\zeta_{m,j}^0$ s being p -dimensional vectors. Therefore a VARMA(m_1, m_2) model is a special case of (12) with $u_t = (y_{t-1}^\top, y_{t-2}^\top, \dots)^\top$ and $\theta_0 = [\{\text{vec}(\Pi_1^\top)\}^\top, \{\text{vec}(\Pi_2^\top)\}^\top, \dots]^\top$.

Write $g(\cdot; \cdot) = \{g_1(\cdot; \cdot), \dots, g_p(\cdot; \cdot)\}^\top$ and let \mathcal{U} be the domain of u_t . We assume the link function $g(\cdot; \cdot)$ satisfy the following condition.

Condition 5. Denote by Θ_0 a small neighborhood of θ_0 . For some given metric $|\cdot|_*$ defined on Θ , $|g_i(u; \theta^*) - g_i(u; \theta^{**})| \leq M_i(u)|\theta^* - \theta^{**}|_* + R_i(u; \theta^*, \theta^{**})$ for any $\theta^*, \theta^{**} \in \Theta_0$, $u \in \mathcal{U}$ and $i = 1, \dots, p$, where $\{M_i(\cdot)\}_{i=1}^p$ and $\{R_i(\cdot; \cdot, \cdot)\}_{i=1}^p$ are some positive functions satisfying the condition that $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n M_i^2(u_t) = O_p(\varphi_{1,n})$ and

$$\sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sup_{\theta^*, \theta^{**} \in \Theta_0} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n R_i^2(u_t; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) = O_p(\varphi_{2,n})$$

for some $\varphi_{1,n} > 0$ which may diverge and $\varphi_{2,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In fact, the first part of Condition 5 can be replaced by the Lipschitz continuity $|g_i(u; \theta^*) - g_i(u; \theta^{**})| \leq M_i(u)|\theta^* - \theta^{**}|_*^\phi + R_i(u; \theta^*, \theta^{**})$ for some $\phi \in (0, 1]$. Since the technical details for Theorem 3 are identical under these two types of continuity, we only state $\phi = 1$ in our presentation. The remainder term $R_i(\cdot)$ is employed to accommodate the models with infinite-dimensional parameter θ_0 (such as VARMA models). When θ_0 has finite number of components, we can let $|\cdot|_*$ be the standard L_2 -norm. If the link function $g_i(u; \theta)$ is continuously differentiable with respect to θ , Taylor expansion leads to $|g_i(u; \theta^*) - g_i(u; \theta^{**})| \leq |\nabla_\theta g_i(u; \bar{\theta})|_2 |\theta^* - \theta^{**}|_2$ for some $\bar{\theta}$ lies between θ^* and θ^{**} . If there exists an envelop function $M_i(\cdot)$ satisfying $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\nabla_\theta g_i(u; \bar{\theta})|_2 \leq M_i(u)$ for any $u \in \mathcal{U}$, then the first part of Condition 5 holds with $R_i(u) = 0$. When θ_0 is an infinite dimensional parameter, we can select $|\cdot|_*$ as the vector L_1 -norm. Write $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots)^\top$. If $\partial g_i(u; \theta) / \partial \theta_j$ exists for any $j = 1, 2, \dots$, Taylor expansion implies $g_i(u; \theta^*) - g_i(u; \theta^{**}) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} (\theta_j^* - \theta_j^{**}) \partial g_i(u; \bar{\theta}) / \partial \theta_j$ for some $\bar{\theta}$ lies between θ^* and θ^{**} . For some given diverging d , letting $M_i(u) = \sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |\partial g_i(u; \theta) / \partial \theta_j|$ and $R_i(u; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) = |\sum_{j=d+1}^{\infty} (\theta_j^* - \theta_j^{**}) \partial g_i(u; \bar{\theta}) / \partial \theta_j|$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |g_i(u; \theta^*) - g_i(u; \theta^{**})| &\leq \sup_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left| \frac{\partial g_i(u; \bar{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \right| \left| \sum_{j=1}^d |\theta_j^* - \theta_j^{**}| \right| + \left| \sum_{j=d+1}^{\infty} (\theta_j^* - \theta_j^{**}) \frac{\partial g_i(u; \bar{\theta})}{\partial \theta_j} \right| \\ &\leq M_i(u) |\theta^* - \theta^{**}|_1 + R_i(u; \theta^*, \theta^{**}). \end{aligned}$$

Write $\theta^* = [\{\text{vec}(\Pi_1^{*\text{T}})\}^{\text{T}}, \{\text{vec}(\Pi_2^{*\text{T}})\}^{\text{T}}, \dots]^{\text{T}}$ and $\theta^{**} = [\{\text{vec}(\Pi_1^{**\text{T}})\}^{\text{T}}, \{\text{vec}(\Pi_2^{**\text{T}})\}^{\text{T}}, \dots]^{\text{T}}$ in the VARMA model with $\Pi_m^* = (\varsigma_{m,1}^*, \dots, \varsigma_{m,p}^*)^{\text{T}}$ and $\Pi_m^{**} = (\varsigma_{m,1}^{**}, \dots, \varsigma_{m,p}^{**})^{\text{T}}$ for any $m \geq 1$, where $\varsigma_{m,j}$ s are p -dimensional vectors. For the VARMA model, if $d = p^2\ell$, we have $M_i(u_t) = \max_{1 \leq m \leq \ell} |y_{t-m}|_{\infty}$ and $R_i(u_t; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) = |\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} (\varsigma_{m,i}^* - \varsigma_{m,i}^{**})^{\text{T}} y_{t-m}|$. If the process $\{y_t\}$ satisfy Condition 2, it can be shown that $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n M_i^2(u_t) = O_p\{(\ell p)^{1/\chi}\}$ for some sufficiently large χ , which implies that $\varphi_{1,n} = (\ell p)^{1/\chi}$ in the VARMA model. Notice that $R_i(u; \theta^*, \theta^{**})$ defined above for the VARMA model satisfies $R_i(u_t; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) \leq \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} |\varsigma_{m,i}^* - \varsigma_{m,i}^{**}|_2 |y_{t-m}|_2$, using Jensen's inequality, it holds that $R_i^2(u_t; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) \leq (\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} |\varsigma_{m,i}^* - \varsigma_{m,i}^{**}|_2) (\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} |\varsigma_{m,i}^* - \varsigma_{m,i}^{**}|_2 |y_{t-m}|_2^2)$. In addition, if we select $\Theta_0 = \{\theta = (\varsigma_{1,1}^{\text{T}}, \dots, \varsigma_{1,p}^{\text{T}}, \varsigma_{2,1}^{\text{T}}, \dots, \varsigma_{2,p}^{\text{T}}, \dots)^{\text{T}} : \sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\varsigma_{m,i} - \varsigma_{m,i}^0|_2 \leq C\lambda_m \text{ for any } m \geq 1\}$ for some $\{\lambda_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ such that $\sum_{m=j}^{\infty} \lambda_m \rightarrow 0$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, where $C > 0$ is a uniform constant. Let $b_j = \sum_{m=j+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m$ for any $j \geq 0$, then we have $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sup_{\theta^*, \theta^{**} \in \Theta_0} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n R_i^2(u_t; \theta^*, \theta^{**}) \leq 4C^2 b_{\ell} \sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m |y_{t-m}|_2^2$. Since $\sum_{m=\ell+1}^{\infty} \lambda_m |y_{t-m}|_2^2 = O_p(pb_{\ell})$, then $\varphi_{2,n} = pb_{\ell}^2$ in the VARMA model.

Given an estimate $\hat{\theta}$ for θ_0 , we define $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = y_t - g(u_t; \hat{\theta})$ for $t = 1, \dots, n$. Replacing ε_t in the proposed testing procedure by $\hat{\varepsilon}_t$, we can obtain a testing procedure for the model diagnosis of (12). The following theorem states validity of such procedure.

Theorem 3. *Assume that Condition 5 and the conditions in Theorems 1 and 2 hold. Let $|\hat{\theta} - \theta|_* = O_p(\zeta_n)$ for some $\zeta_n \rightarrow 0$. If $\zeta_n^2 \varphi_{1,n} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then the results of Theorems 1 and 2 hold for above defined testing procedure for the model diagnosis of (12).*

6 Appendix

Let $\hat{\mu} = ([\text{vec}\{\hat{\Gamma}(1)\}]^{\text{T}}, \dots, [\text{vec}\{\hat{\Gamma}(K)\}]^{\text{T}})^{\text{T}}$ and $\hat{W} = [\text{diag}\{\hat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2} \otimes [\text{diag}\{\hat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2}$. Then the testing statistic $T_n = n^{1/2} |\hat{\mu}|_{\infty}$. From (1), it holds that

$$\hat{\mu} = (I_K \otimes \hat{W})([\text{vec}\{\hat{\Sigma}(1)\}]^{\text{T}}, \dots, [\text{vec}\{\hat{\Sigma}(K)\}]^{\text{T}})^{\text{T}}.$$

Write $\hat{\mu} = (\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{p^2K})^{\text{T}}$. We also define $\mu = (I_K \otimes W)([\text{vec}\{\hat{\Sigma}(1)\}]^{\text{T}}, \dots, [\text{vec}\{\hat{\Sigma}(K)\}]^{\text{T}})^{\text{T}} =: (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_{p^2K})^{\text{T}}$. Let $\hat{Z} = n^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \hat{\mu}_{\ell}$, $Z = n^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \mu_{\ell}$ and $V = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} G_{\ell}$ where $G = (G_1, \dots, G_{p^2K})^{\text{T}} \sim N(0, \Xi_n)$ for Ξ_n specified in (6). Throughout the Appendix, C denotes a generic positive finite constant that does not depend on p and n , and may be different in different uses. To construct the theoretical results, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Assume that Conditions 1–3 hold. Let γ satisfy $\gamma^{-1} = 2r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1}$. If $\log(p) = o\{n^{\gamma/(2-\gamma)}\}$, then with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$, $|\hat{W} - W|_{\infty} \leq Cn^{-1/2} \{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$.*

Proof: Write $\text{diag}\{\hat{\Sigma}(0)\} = \text{diag}(\hat{\sigma}_1^2, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_p^2)$ and $\text{diag}\{\Sigma(0)\} = \text{diag}(\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)$. Together

with Condition 1, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{W} - W|_\infty &= \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1} \widehat{\sigma}_j^{-1} - \sigma_i^{-1} \sigma_j^{-1}| \\ &\leq \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - \sigma_i^{-1}| \right)^2 + C \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - \sigma_i^{-1}|. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

To bound the term on the right-hand side of above inequality, we first consider the tail probability of $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i|$. Following the same arguments of Lemma 9 in [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2| > \varepsilon \right) &\leq Cp n \exp(-C\varepsilon^\gamma n^\gamma) + Cp n \exp(-C\varepsilon^{\tilde{\gamma}/2} n^{\tilde{\gamma}}) \\ &\quad + Cp \exp(-C\varepsilon^2 n) + Cp \exp(-C\varepsilon n) \end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $n\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty$, where $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} = r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1}$. Therefore, if $\log(p) = o\{n^{\gamma/(2-\gamma)}\}$, with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$, $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2| \leq Cn^{-1/2} \{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$. Notice that $\widehat{\sigma}_i^2 - \sigma_i^2 = (\widehat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i)^2 + 2\sigma_i(\widehat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i)$, we have, with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$, $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i| \leq Cn^{-1/2} \{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$. Finally, by the identity $\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - \sigma_i^{-1} = -(\widehat{\sigma}_i - \sigma_i)\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1}\sigma_i^{-1}$, we know $\max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_i^{-1} - \sigma_i^{-1}| \leq Cn^{-1/2} \{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$ holds with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$. Hence, together with (13), we complete the proof.

Lemma 2. *Assume that Conditions 1–3 hold. Let γ and $\tilde{\gamma}$ satisfy $\gamma^{-1} = 2r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1}$ and $\tilde{\gamma}^{-1} = r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1}$, respectively. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} \left[\max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\} - \text{vec}\{\Sigma(k)\}|_\infty > s \right] &\leq Cp^2 n \exp(-Cs^\gamma n^\gamma) + Cp^2 n \exp(-Cs^{\tilde{\gamma}/2} n^{\tilde{\gamma}}) \\ &\quad + Cp^2 \exp(-Cs^2 n) + Cp^2 \exp(-Csn) \end{aligned}$$

for any $s > 0$ such that $ns \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof: Notice that $|\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\} - \text{vec}\{\Sigma(k)\}|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i,j}(k) - \sigma_{i,j}(k)|$. For given $k = 1, \dots, K$, Lemma 9 in [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr} [|\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\} - \text{vec}\{\Sigma(k)\}|_\infty > s] &\leq Cp^2 n \exp(-Cs^\gamma n^\gamma) + Cp^2 n \exp(-Cs^{\tilde{\gamma}/2} n^{\tilde{\gamma}}) \\ &\quad + Cp^2 \exp(-Cs^2 n) + Cp^2 \exp(-Csn) \end{aligned}$$

for any $s > 0$ such that $ns \rightarrow \infty$. For fixed K , by Bonferroni inequality, we complete the proof.

Lemma 3. *Assume that Conditions 1–3 hold. Let γ satisfy $\gamma^{-1} = 2r_1^{-1} + r_2^{-1}$. Under null hypothesis H_0 with $\log(p) = o(n^{\gamma/(2-\gamma)})$, then with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$, $|\widehat{Z} - Z| \leq Cn^{-1/2} \log(p)$.*

Proof: Observe that $|\widehat{Z} - Z| \leq |\widehat{W} - W|_\infty \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} n^{1/2} |\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\}|_\infty$. Lemma 2 implies that, under H_0 , with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$ we have $\max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\}|_\infty \leq Cn^{-1/2} \{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$. Together with Lemma 1, we have that with probability at least $1 - Cp^{-1}$ it holds that $|\widehat{Z} - Z| \leq Cn^{-1/2} \log(p)$. Therefore, we complete the proof.

Lemma 4. *Assume that Conditions 1–4 hold. Under null hypothesis H_0 , if $\log(p) \leq Cn^\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, it holds that $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(Z \leq s) - \text{pr}(V \leq s)| = o(1)$.*

Proof: By the definition of $\widehat{\Sigma}(k)$ given in (2), we can write μ as follows $\mu = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}} u_t + R_n$ where $\tilde{n} = n - K$, each element of u_t has the form $x_{i,t+k}x_{j,t}/(\sigma_i\sigma_j)$, and R_n is the remainder term. Let $\tilde{\beta}_k$ ($k \geq 1$) be the β -mixing coefficients generated by the process $\{u_t\}$. Obviously, it holds that $\tilde{\beta}_k \leq \beta_{(k-K)^+}$. Define $\bar{u} = \tilde{n}^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{\tilde{n}} u_t =: (\bar{u}_1, \dots, \bar{u}_{p^2K})^\top$ and $\tilde{Z} = \tilde{n}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \bar{u}_\ell$. In addition, let $d_n = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(Z \leq s) - \text{pr}(V \leq s)|$ and $\tilde{d}_n = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(\tilde{Z} \leq s) - \text{pr}(V \leq s)|$. Our proof to show $d_n = o(1)$ includes two steps: (i) to show $d_n \leq \tilde{d}_n + o(1)$, and (ii) to prove $\tilde{d}_n = o(1)$.

We first prove (i). For any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\varepsilon > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{pr}(Z \leq s) - \text{pr}(V \leq s) \\ & \leq \text{pr}(\tilde{Z} \leq s + \varepsilon) - \text{pr}(V \leq s + \varepsilon) + \text{pr}(|Z - \tilde{Z}| > \varepsilon) + \text{pr}(s < V \leq s + \varepsilon) \\ & \leq \tilde{d}_n + \text{pr}(|Z - \tilde{Z}| > \varepsilon) + \text{pr}(s < V \leq s + \varepsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the reverse inequality. Therefore,

$$d_n \leq \tilde{d}_n + \text{pr}(|Z - \tilde{Z}| > \varepsilon) + \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \text{pr}(|V - s| \leq \varepsilon). \quad (14)$$

By the Anti-Concentration inequality of Gaussian random variables, it holds that $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} \text{pr}(|V - s| \leq \varepsilon) \leq C\varepsilon \{\log(p/\varepsilon)\}^{1/2}$. Meanwhile, by Triangle inequality and Condition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z - \tilde{Z}| & \leq (n^{1/2} - \tilde{n}^{1/2}) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} |\mu_\ell| + \tilde{n}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} |\mu_\ell - \bar{u}_\ell| \\ & \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |\text{vec}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(k)\}|_\infty + \frac{C}{n^{1/2}} |\bar{u}|_\infty + n^{1/2} |R_n|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Following the same arguments of Lemma 9 of [Chang, Guo and Yao \(2014\)](#), under H_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}\left(\frac{C}{n^{1/2}} |\bar{u}|_\infty > \frac{\varepsilon}{3}\right) & \leq Cp^2n \exp(-C\varepsilon^\gamma n^{3\gamma/2}) + Cp^2n \exp(-C\varepsilon^{\tilde{\gamma}/2} n^{5\tilde{\gamma}/4}) \\ & \quad + Cp^2 \exp(-C\varepsilon^2 n^2) + Cp^2 \exp(-C\varepsilon n^{3/2}) \end{aligned}$$

if $n^3\varepsilon^2 \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, under H_0 , $\text{pr}(n^{1/2}|R_n|_\infty > \varepsilon/3)$ can be also controlled by the same upper bound specified above. Together with Lemma 2, under H_0 ,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pr}(|Z - \tilde{Z}| > \varepsilon) & \leq Cp^2n \exp(-C\varepsilon^\gamma n^{3\gamma/2}) + Cp^2n \exp(-C\varepsilon^{\tilde{\gamma}/2} n^{5\tilde{\gamma}/4}) \\ & \quad + Cp^2 \exp(-C\varepsilon^2 n^2) + Cp^2 \exp(-C\varepsilon n^{3/2}). \end{aligned}$$

Selecting $\varepsilon = Cn^{-1}\{\log(p)\}^{1/2}$, if $\log(p) = o(n^{\gamma/(2-\gamma)})$, then (14) implies that $d_n \leq \tilde{d}_n + o(1)$.

The proof of (ii) that $\tilde{d}_n = o(1)$ is the same as that to show $d_1 = o(1)$ in the proof of Theorem 1 of [Chang, Qiu and Yao \(2016\)](#). Therefore, if $\log(p) \leq Cn^\delta$ for some $\delta > 0$, we have $\tilde{d}_n = o(1)$. Then we complete the proof of Lemma 4.

6.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Following the arguments stated in the proof of Proposition 1 in the supplementary file of [Chang, Zhou and Zhou \(2014\)](#), it suffices to show $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(\widehat{Z} > s) - \text{pr}(V > s)| = o(1)$, where \widehat{Z} and V are defined in the first paragraph of Appendix. Recall $d_n = \sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(Z \leq s) - \text{pr}(V \leq s)|$. Similar to the arguments of (14), it yields that $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(\widehat{Z} > s) - \text{pr}(V > s)| \leq d_n + \text{pr}(|\widehat{Z} - Z| > \varepsilon) + C\varepsilon\{\log(p/\varepsilon)\}^{1/2}$. Select $\varepsilon = Cn^{-1/2}\log(p)$, Lemmas 3 and 4 yield that $\sup_{s \in \mathbb{R}} |\text{pr}(\widehat{Z} > s) - \text{pr}(V > s)| = o(1)$. We complete the proof of Theorem 1.

6.2 Proof of Theorem 1

Based on Lemma 4 of [Chang, Qiu and Yao \(2016\)](#) and Proposition 1, we can construct the proof by the same arguments of the proof for Theorem 2 of [Chang, Qiu and Yao \(2016\)](#).

6.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Notice that $G|\mathcal{X}_n \sim N(0, \widehat{\Xi}_n)$, it holds that

$$E(|G|_\infty|\mathcal{X}_n) \leq [1 + \{2\log(p^2K)\}^{-1}]\{2\log(p^2K)\}^{1/2} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \widehat{\Xi}_\ell^{1/2}$$

where $\widehat{\Xi}_1, \dots, \widehat{\Xi}_{p^2K}$ are the elements in the diagonal of $\widehat{\Xi}_n$. Meanwhile, it holds $\text{pr}\{|G|_\infty \geq E(|G|_\infty|\mathcal{X}_n) + u|\mathcal{X}_n\} \leq \exp\{-u^2/(2\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \widehat{\Xi}_\ell)\}$ for any $u > 0$. Let Ξ_1, \dots, Ξ_{p^2K} be the elements in the main diagonal of Ξ_n . In addition, for any $v > 0$, we define the event $\mathcal{E}_0(v) = \{\max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} |\widehat{\Xi}_\ell^{1/2}/\Xi_\ell^{1/2} - 1| \leq v\}$. Restricted on $\mathcal{E}_0(v)$, we have that $\widehat{c}v_\alpha \leq (1+v)([1 + \{2\log(p^2K)\}^{-1}]\{2\log(p^2K)\}^{1/2} + \{2\log(1/\alpha)\}^{1/2}) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2}$. Let $(i_0, j_0, k_0) = \arg \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\rho_{i,j}(k)|$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\rho_{i_0, j_0}(k_0) > 0$. Then, restricted on $\mathcal{E}_0(v)$, it holds that $T_n \geq n^{1/2}\widehat{\rho}_{i_0, j_0}(k_0) \geq n^{1/2}\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0}^{-1}\widehat{\sigma}_{j_0}^{-1}\{\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0, j_0}(k_0) - \sigma_{i_0, j_0}(k_0)\} + n^{1/2}\rho_{i_0, j_0}(k_0)(1+v)^{-2}$. Choose u in such a way that $(1+v)^2[1 + \{\log(p^2K)\}^{-1} + u] = 1 + \varepsilon_n$, for $\varepsilon_n > 0$ satisfying that $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\varepsilon_n\{\log(p)\}^{1/2} \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, $n^{1/2}\rho_{i_0, j_0}(k_0) \geq (1+v)^2[1 + \{\log(p^2K)\}^{-1} + u]\lambda(p, \alpha) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2}$. Following the same

arguments of Lemma 2, we can choose suitable $v \rightarrow 0$ such that $\text{pr}\{\mathcal{E}_0(v)^c\} \rightarrow 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{pr}(T_n > \widehat{c}v_\alpha) \\
& \geq \text{pr}\left(n^{1/2}\widehat{\rho}_{i_0,j_0}(k_0) > [1 + \{\log(p^2K)\}^{-1}]\lambda(p, \alpha) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2}\right) \\
& \geq \text{pr}\left[\frac{n^{1/2}\{\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0,j_0}(k_0) - \sigma_{i_0,j_0}(k_0)\}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0}\widehat{\sigma}_{j_0}} > -u\lambda(p, \alpha) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2}, \mathcal{E}_0(v) \text{ holds}\right] \\
& \geq 1 - \text{pr}\left[\frac{n^{1/2}\{\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0,j_0}(k_0) - \sigma_{i_0,j_0}(k_0)\}}{\widehat{\sigma}_{i_0}\widehat{\sigma}_{j_0}} \leq -u\lambda(p, \alpha) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2}\right] - \text{pr}\{\mathcal{E}_0(v)^c\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that $u \sim \varepsilon_n$, then $u\lambda(p, \alpha) \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq p^2K} \Xi_\ell^{1/2} \rightarrow \infty$ which implies that $\text{pr}(T_n > \widehat{c}v_\alpha) \rightarrow 1$. We complete the proof.

6.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Let \widehat{W}^* , $\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0)$, \widehat{J}_n^* and $\widehat{\Xi}_n^*$ be, respectively, the analogues of \widehat{W} , $\widehat{\Sigma}(0)$, \widehat{J}_n and $\widehat{\Xi}_n$ with replacing ε_t by $\widehat{\varepsilon}_t$. By Lemma 3.1 of [Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Kato \(2013\)](#), to prove Theorem 3, we need to show $|\widehat{\Xi}_n^* - \widehat{\Xi}_n|_\infty = o_p(1)$. Recall $\widehat{\Xi}_n = (I_K \otimes \widehat{W})\widehat{J}_n(I_K \otimes \widehat{W})$ and $\widehat{\Xi}_n^* = (I_K \otimes \widehat{W}^*)\widehat{J}_n^*(I_K \otimes \widehat{W}^*)$, it suffices to prove $|\widehat{W}^* - \widehat{W}|_\infty = o_p(1)$ and $|\widehat{J}_n^* - \widehat{J}_n|_\infty = o_p(1)$. Same technique will be used to show these two results. To simplify our presentation, we only state the proof for $|\widehat{W}^* - \widehat{W}|_\infty = o_p(1)$. Since $\widehat{W} = [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2} \otimes [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}(0)\}]^{-1/2}$ and $\widehat{W}^* = [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0)\}]^{-1/2} \otimes [\text{diag}\{\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0)\}]^{-1/2}$, it suffices to show $|\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0) - \widehat{\Sigma}(0)|_\infty = o_p(1)$. Write $\widehat{\varepsilon}_t = (\widehat{\varepsilon}_{1,t}, \dots, \widehat{\varepsilon}_{p,t})^\top$ and $\varepsilon_t = (\varepsilon_{1,t}, \dots, \varepsilon_{p,t})^\top$ for any t . Then, for any i, j , the (i, j) th element of $\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0) - \widehat{\Sigma}(0)$ is given by $\Delta_{i,j} = n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n (\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,t}\widehat{\varepsilon}_{j,t} - \varepsilon_{i,t}\varepsilon_{j,t})$. Notice that $\widehat{\varepsilon}_{i,t} = y_{i,t} - g(u_t; \widehat{\theta})$ and $\varepsilon_{i,t} = y_{i,t} - g(u_t; \theta)$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{i,j} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_i(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_i(u_t; \theta)\} \{g_j(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_j(u_t; \theta)\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_i(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_i(u_t; \theta)\} \varepsilon_{j,t} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \varepsilon_{i,t} \{g_j(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_j(u_t; \theta)\}.
\end{aligned}$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{i,j}^2 &\leq 3 \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_i(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_i(u_t; \theta)\}^2 \right] \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_j(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_j(u_t; \theta)\}^2 \right] \\
&\quad + 3 \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_i(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_i(u_t; \theta)\}^2 \right] \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \varepsilon_{j,t}^2 \right) \\
&\quad + 3 \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_j(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_j(u_t; \theta)\}^2 \right] \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

By Condition 5, it holds that $n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \{g_i(u_t; \widehat{\theta}) - g_i(u_t; \theta)\}^2 \leq 2|\widehat{\theta} - \theta|_*^2 n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n M_i^2(u_t) + 2n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n R_i^2(u_t) = O_p(\zeta_n^2 \varphi_{1,n} + \varphi_{2,n})$ uniformly for any $i = 1, \dots, p$. Meanwhile, Lemma

A2 implies that $\sup_{1 \leq i \leq p} n^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^n \varepsilon_{i,t}^2 = O_p(1)$. Together with (15), we know $\Delta_{ij}^2 = O_p(\zeta_n^2 \varphi_{1,n} + \varphi_{2,n})$ holds uniformly for any $i, j = 1, \dots, p$. Thus $|\widehat{\Sigma}^*(0) - \widehat{\Sigma}(0)|_\infty = O_p(\zeta_n \varphi_{1,n}^{1/2} + \varphi_{2,n}^{1/2}) = o_p(1)$. We complete the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to the Editor, an Associate Editor and two referees for their helpful suggestions.

Supplementary material

Supplementary material are available for additional numerical results discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2.

References

- Andrews, D. W. K. (1991). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica*, **59**, 817–858.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, **70**, 191–221.
- Basu, S. and Michailidis, G. (2015). Regularized estimation in sparse high-dimensional time series models. *The Annals of Statistics*, in press.
- Box, G. E. P. and Pierce, D. A. (1970). Distribution of residual autocorrelations in autoregressive-integrated moving average time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **65**, 1509–1526.
- Carrasco, M. and Chen, X. (2002). Mixing and moment properties of various GARCH and stochastic volatility models. *Econometric Theory*, **18**, 17–39.
- Chang, J., Guo, B. and Yao, Q. (2014). Principal component analysis for second-order stationary vector time series. Available at [arXiv:1410.2323](https://arxiv.org/abs/1410.2323).
- Chang, J., Guo, B. and Yao, Q. (2015). High dimensional stochastic regression with latent factors, endogeneity and nonlinearity. *Journal of Econometrics*, **189**, 297–312.
- Chang, J., Qiu, Y. and Yao, Q. (2016). On the statistical inference for large precision matrices with dependent data. Available at [arXiv:1603.06663](https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.06663).

- Chang, J., Zhou, W. and Zhou, W.-X. (2014). Simulation-based hypothesis testing of high dimensional means under covariance heterogeneity. Available at *arXiv:1406.1939*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D. and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2786–2819.
- Den Haan, W. J. and Levin, A. (1997). A Practitioner’s Guide to Robust Covariance Matrix Estimation, *Handbook of Statistics 15*, Chapter 12, 291–341.
- Deo, R. S. (2000). Spectral tests of the martingale hypothesis under conditional heteroscedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics*, **99**, 291–315.
- Durlauf, S. N. (1991). Spectral based testing of the martingale hypothesis. *Journal of Econometrics*, **50**, 355–376.
- Escanciano, J. C. and Lobato, I. N. (2009). An automatic Portmanteau test for serial correlation. *Journal of Econometrics*, **151**, 140–149.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). *Nonlinear Time Series: Nonparametric and Parametric Methods*. Springer, New York.
- Fan, J., Zhang, C. and Zhang, J. (2001). Generalized likelihood test statistic and Wilks phenomenon. *The Annals of Statistics*, **29**, 153–193.
- Fan, J. and Zhang, W. (2004). Generalised likelihood ratio tests for spectral density. *Biometrika*, **91**, 195–209.
- Forni, M., Hallin, M., Lippi, M. and Reichlin, L. (2005). The generalized dynamic factor model: One-sided estimation and forecasting, *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **100**, 830–840.
- Guo, S., Wang, Y. and Yao, Q. (2016). High-dimensional and banded autoregressions. A *preprint*.
- Hong, Y. and Lee, Y. J. (2003). Consistent testing for serial correlation of unknown form under general conditional heteroscedasticity. *Preprint*, Cornell University, Department of Economics.
- Horowitz, J. L., Lobato, I. N., Nankervis, J. C. and Savin, N. E. (2006). Bootstrapping the Box-Pierce Q test: A robust test of uncorrelatedness. *Journal of Econometrics*, **133**, 841–862.
- Hosking, J. R. M. (1980). The multivariate portmanteau statistic. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **75**, 602–607.

- Kiefer, N. M., Vogelsang, T. J. and Bunzel, H. (2000). Simple robust testing of regression hypotheses. *Econometrica*, **68**, 695–714.
- Lahiri, S. N. (2003). *Resampling Methods for Dependent Data*. Springer, Berlin.
- Lam, C. and Yao, Q. (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: inference for the number of factors. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 694–726.
- Li, W. K. (2004). *Diagnostic Checks in Time Series*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Li, W. K. and McLeod, A. I. (1981). Distribution of the residual autocorrelations in multivariate time series models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, **B**, **43**, 231–239.
- Lütkepohl, H. (2005). *New Introduction to Multiple Time Series Analysis*. Springer, Berlin.
- Romano, J. P. and Thombs, L. A. (1996). Inference for autocorrelations under weak assumptions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **91**, 590–600.
- Shao, X. (2011). Testing for white noise under unknown dependence and its applications to diagnostic checking for time series models. *Econometric Theory*, **27**, 312–343.
- Tiao, G. C. and Box, G. E. P. (1981). Modeling multiple time series with applications. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **76**, 802–816.
- Xiao, H. and Wu, W. B. (2011). Asymptotic inference of autocovariances of stationary processes. Available at [arXiv:1105.3423](https://arxiv.org/abs/1105.3423).

Table 1: The empirical sizes in percentages of the tests $T_n, T_n^*, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, LM$ and TB at the 5% nominal significance level and with sample size $n = 300$. z_t consists of independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables (Model D1).

p	K	M1					M2					M3											
		T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	
3	2	5.2	5.8	5.2	5.6	5.6	5.2	5.2	3.2	6.6	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.8	4.8	4.0	6.4	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	5.2	3.8
	4	4.6	7.4	3.6	4.4	4.2	4.4	4.0	4.0	7.4	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.8	5.4	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.4	3.8
	6	5.6	8.6	4.4	5.2	5.0	5.4	2.8	2.8	7.2	3.2	3.6	3.4	3.0	3.0	4.0	5.4	6.0	6.4	6.2	6.2	5.2	4.0
15	8	4.4	8.4	3.6	5.0	4.4	3.0	3.8	6.2	2.6	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.8	6.4	6.4	5.0	6.8	6.2	4.6	3.8	3.8
	10	4.2	7.8	3.6	4.4	4.2	4.0	3.0	6.0	1.4	3.0	2.4	2.4	2.4	3.6	5.6	5.4	5.4	7.4	7.2	4.6	3.6	3.6
	2	3.8	5.2	4.2	4.8	4.8	5.0	4.8	2.8	4.4	4.2	5.0	5.0	5.4	7.6	3.0	3.8	3.4	4.0	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.0
50	4	4.0	5.4	2.8	5.0	5.0	3.8	2.6	4.2	2.8	4.6	4.6	3.6	3.6	2.4	4.8	4.8	2.2	3.0	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.4
	6	3.6	6.2	3.2	5.2	5.2	3.8	2.2	5.2	3.4	5.2	5.0	3.4	3.4	2.0	5.8	1.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	2.4	2.0	2.0
	8	3.6	6.6	2.0	5.2	5.0	1.0	2.4	6.0	0.8	5.0	4.6	2.0	2.0	2.2	7.2	0.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	1.4	2.2	2.2
150	10	3.0	7.0	1.4	5.6	5.2	0.4	2.2	6.2	1.0	5.0	4.8	1.6	1.6	2.6	6.6	1.0	4.0	3.8	0.8	2.6	2.6	2.6
	2	2.4	4.0	1.6	2.4	2.4	1.2	3.0	4.2	1.4	2.4	2.4	1.4	1.4	7.8	1.8	4.8	1.6	2.8	2.8	1.2	1.8	1.8
	4	4.0	4.4	0.6	3.0	2.8	0.0	2.6	4.6	0.6	2.2	2.2	0.0	0.0	2.2	2.2	5.2	0.8	2.6	2.6	0.0	2.2	2.2
150	6	3.6	4.8	0.0	3.8	3.6	0.0	1.8	5.2	0.2	2.8	2.6	0.0	0.0	2.0	6.4	0.2	2.2	2.2	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	8	3.8	4.4	0.0	3.8	3.6	NA	2.0	5.4	0.0	2.2	2.2	NA	NA	1.6	7.2	0.0	2.8	2.4	NA	1.6	1.6	
	10	4.6	4.8	0.0	3.0	3.0	NA	1.4	5.4	0.0	2.8	2.2	NA	NA	1.4	6.2	0.0	2.0	1.8	NA	1.4	1.4	
150	2	3.0	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	3.0	3.8	0.0	0.2	0.0	NA	0.0	1.4	3.6	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	1.4	1.4	
	4	1.4	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	2.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	1.4	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	1.4	1.4	
	6	1.8	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	2.4	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	1.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	1.2	1.2	
150	8	2.2	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	1.8	3.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	0.0	0.6	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.6	0.6	
	10	3.2	4.6	0.0	0.2	0.0	NA	1.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0	0.4	5.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.4	0.4	

Table 2: The empirical sizes in percentages of the tests $T_n, T_n^*, Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, LM$ and TB at the 5% nominal significance level and with sample size $n = 300$. z_t consists of p independent $ARCH(1)$ processes (Model D3).

p	K	M1						M2						M3									
		T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	
3	2	4.2	6.6	5.8	6.2	6.0	5.8	7.6	4.2	7.0	6.2	6.4	6.2	5.8	7.0	4.2	6.0	6.0	4.0	4.2	4.8	4.8	6.2
	4	5.2	6.2	5.8	6.0	5.8	5.4		4.0	6.8	4.8	5.8	5.2	3.6		4.0	7.2	7.4	3.8	4.8	3.6		
	6	5.0	5.0	5.2	6.0	5.6	5.2		4.0	7.8	3.4	4.2	3.8	3.6		3.4	5.2	5.2	4.0	4.8	5.0		
15	8	5.0	4.6	4.0	5.6	5.4	4.0		3.6	7.0	4.4	5.2	5.2	4.0		4.0	5.4	5.4	3.6	3.6	4.2		
	10	5.0	4.2	4.4	6.2	6.0	4.0		2.6	5.4	6.0	7.0	6.8	4.6		4.6	4.6	4.4	2.2	3.2	2.4		
	2	5.6	4.2	4.8	5.0	5.0	4.8	6.6	3.0	4.2	3.8	4.8	4.8	5.8	7.0	3.2	4.2	4.8	5.6	5.6	5.4	6.8	
50	4	4.2	5.0	3.2	5.0	4.8	4.4		3.8	5.2	3.2	3.8	3.8	3.6		2.6	4.8	2.4	4.0	3.8	2.8		
	6	4.0	6.2	2.4	5.2	5.2	2.0		2.8	5.8	1.6	4.0	4.0	2.8		1.8	5.6	1.4	4.8	4.8	2.8		
	8	3.8	5.8	2.6	4.8	4.8	1.8		2.6	5.6	1.2	2.8	2.6	0.4		2.8	5.6	1.4	4.2	4.0	1.4		
150	10	3.8	6.4	1.0	5.8	5.0	0.8		2.6	5.4	0.4	4.6	4.6	0.8		2.4	6.0	0.8	5.2	5.0	1.4		
	2	4.6	3.6	1.6	2.6	2.6	0.8	8.8	2.0	3.6	1.8	4.0	4.0	1.0	9.8	2.4	4.0	1.0	2.2	2.0	0.4	6.8	
	4	3.6	4.6	0.6	2.0	2.0	0.0		2.6	4.4	0.0	2.4	2.4	0.0		2.0	5.6	0.6	2.6	2.4	0.0		
500	6	5.0	6.0	0.0	2.6	2.6	0.0		2.0	5.6	0.0	1.8	1.8	0.0		2.0	5.0	0.2	3.4	3.2	0.0		
	8	4.8	5.8	0.0	1.8	1.6	NA		1.8	5.0	0.0	2.4	2.4	NA		2.0	6.2	0.0	3.8	3.6	NA		
	10	3.8	6.0	0.0	2.6	2.4	NA		2.0	4.4	0.0	2.8	2.8	NA		2.6	5.2	0.0	2.8	2.8	NA		
1500	2	3.2	4.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	0.0	2.2	3.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	0.0	1.8	2.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	0.0	
	4	3.0	3.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.6	3.0	0.0	0.4	0.2	NA		1.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		
	6	4.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.6	4.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		
3000	8	2.6	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		2.6	3.8	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		0.8	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		
	10	2.4	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.6	3.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.0	5.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		

Supplementary Materials for “Testing for vector white noise using maximum cross correlations” by Jinyuan Chang, Qiwei Yao, and Wen Zhou

In this online supplementary material, we include more simulation results from the study on the empirical sizes and powers of the proposed procedures discussed in Sections 4.1 and 4.2 in the main paper. Tables [S1](#) and [S2](#) report the comparisons of the empirical sizes of the proposed tests to different existing methods for data models D2 (z_t consists of independent t_8 random variables) and D4 (z_t consists of p independent GARCH(1,1) processes), where the definition of z_t is referred to the main paper. In Figures [S1](#) to [S3](#), the comparison of the empirical powers are displayed for data models A2, A3 and A5, whose settings are detailed in Section 4.2 in the main paper.

Table S1: The empirical sizes in percents of the tests T_n , T_n^* , Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 , LM and TB at the 5% nominal significance level; z_t consists of independent t_8 random variables (Model D2 in the main paper). NA indicates that the corresponding test is not applicable to the setting.

p	K	M1						M2						M3								
		T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB
3	2	4.6	7.8	5.0	5.6	5.4	5.8	4.2	3.6	6.4	4.6	4.8	4.8	4.2	2.6	3.6	6.6	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.4
	4	4.2	6.6	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.6		4.0	6.2	4.2	4.6	4.6	5.2		3.8	6.4	4.0	4.6	4.4	5.4	
6	6	5.0	7.6	4.6	5.2	5.0	6.0		2.8	5.4	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.6		3.8	5.6	2.4	3.6	3.0	3.2	
	8	4.6	6.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.4		3.2	4.8	3.4	4.2	4.0	3.6		3.6	6.6	3.8	5.2	4.8	5.0	
10	10	4.2	5.8	3.0	3.6	3.4	3.4		2.8	5.0	3.2	3.8	3.6	4.0		2.8	5.2	2.4	4.2	3.8	4.0	
	15	4.6	6.2	3.2	4.2	4.2	3.2	4.4	3.4	7.4	3.4	4.0	3.8	4.6	5.0	3.4	4.4	3.2	4.2	4.0	3.2	4.6
4	4	3.6	8.4	2.6	4.2	4.0	2.6		2.4	7.8	3.4	3.8	3.8	3.8		3.6	5.6	2.4	3.4	3.4	3.2	
	6	4.0	6.8	2.6	4.6	4.4	2.2		2.0	7.4	2.0	4.2	3.8	2.4		2.6	5.6	3.0	4.8	4.8	2.8	
8	8	4.4	5.8	1.2	5.6	4.4	2.4		1.6	6.2	1.4	4.6	4.0	1.8		2.2	6.0	1.8	4.6	4.6	1.8	
	10	4.4	5.6	0.8	4.8	4.8	1.0		2.8	5.6	1.4	4.2	4.0	1.0		2.8	5.8	1.4	5.0	4.8	1.4	
50	2	3.0	4.8	1.0	1.8	1.8	1.2	5.8	2.4	5.0	1.2	2.2	2.2	1.4	6.4	2.2	3.8	1.6	3.2	3.2	1.2	7.4
	4	3.6	4.4	0.6	2.8	2.6	0.0		2.4	5.0	0.2	1.6	1.6	0.2		2.6	4.8	0.2	1.6	1.6	0.0	
6	6	3.0	4.2	0.2	3.4	3.0	0.0		2.6	5.0	0.2	1.6	1.6	0.0		2.2	5.8	0.0	3.4	3.2	0.0	
	8	2.6	3.8	0.0	2.0	2.0	NA		2.0	4.2	0.0	2.6	2.4	NA		1.6	5.2	0.0	2.8	2.8	NA	
10	10	3.6	5.4	0.0	2.2	2.2	NA		2.0	3.6	0.0	2.2	1.8	NA		2.6	5.2	0.0	1.4	1.2	NA	
	150	3.8	7.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	7.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.2	2.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0
4	4	4.4	6.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.6	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.2	4.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	
	6	4.2	5.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.8	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.8	4.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	
8	8	3.8	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.2	4.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.2	4.6	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	
	10	3.4	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.0	4.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.4	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA	

Table S2: The empirical sizes in percents of the tests T_n , T_n^* , Q_1 , Q_2 , Q_3 , LM and TB at the 5% nominal significance level; z_t consists of p independent GARCH(1,1) processes (Model D4 in the main paper). NA indicates that the corresponding test is not applicable to the setting.

p	K	M1						M2						M3								
		T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB	T_n	T_n^*	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	LM	TB
3	2	5.2	5.6	5.8	6.0	6.0	6.8	8.0	6.2	7.8	5.2	5.4	5.2	5.0	5.4	4.4	7.2	6.4	6.6	6.4	5.0	6.0
	4	4.8	6.2	5.8	6.2	6.2	5.8		5.0	7.8	5.4	6.6	6.0	6.4		4.0	7.0	5.8	6.4	6.0	4.2	
6	6	3.2	5.8	4.2	5.2	4.8	6.0		4.0	6.0	4.6	5.4	5.0	6.2		3.4	6.0	5.2	6.2	5.8	3.2	
	8	3.6	5.0	5.4	5.8	5.6	5.2		4.0	5.6	3.2	4.8	4.6	4.6		3.2	5.8	6.0	7.0	7.0	5.0	
10	10	3.6	4.6	4.0	5.4	5.4	3.8		4.0	5.0	3.4	5.4	5.0	4.4		3.4	4.6	5.0	6.2	5.8	3.8	
	15	5.0	5.2	3.8	5.0	4.8	3.8	6.0	3.2	5.2	3.2	4.0	4.0	4.4	5.6	2.8	4.8	4.2	5.6	5.4	4.4	4.2
4	4	4.4	6.0	2.0	3.4	3.0	2.0		3.6	4.4	2.4	3.4	3.2	2.8		3.2	5.4	4.4	6.2	6.2	4.6	
	6	4.6	6.4	2.8	4.6	4.6	1.6		3.4	4.4	1.2	2.2	2.0	1.8		2.4	5.8	2.8	5.4	5.4	3.2	
8	8	3.4	6.6	2.0	4.4	4.2	2.0		3.4	5.0	1.0	4.0	3.8	1.4		2.2	5.2	1.4	4.6	4.6	1.4	
	10	3.4	7.4	0.8	5.0	4.8	1.0		3.8	5.0	0.6	4.4	4.2	1.0		1.8	4.6	1.4	5.8	5.6	1.2	
50	2	4.0	7.2	1.4	2.4	2.4	1.8	7.6	1.8	3.8	1.4	3.2	3.2	1.2	8.0	2.2	3.4	1.0	2.2	2.2	0.8	7.0
	4	4.2	5.6	1.2	3.4	3.2	0.2		2.2	5.2	0.4	1.8	1.8	0.0		2.4	5.0	0.0	2.0	1.8	0.0	
6	6	3.8	5.0	0.2	3.2	3.2	0.0		1.8	6.6	0.2	1.8	1.8	0.0		3.2	7.4	0.2	2.8	2.6	0.0	
	8	3.6	5.4	0.0	2.8	2.8	NA		2.4	5.8	0.0	2.2	2.0	NA		2.2	6.6	0.0	2.2	1.6	NA	
10	10	4.6	5.4	0.0	3.6	3.4	NA		2.4	6.6	0.0	3.2	3.2	NA		1.2	5.6	0.0	1.8	1.6	NA	
	150	3.8	3.4	0.0	0.2	0.2		0.0	2.6	2.2	0.0	0.0	0.0		0.0	1.6	3.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	0.0
4	4	3.4	4.4	0.0	0.2	0.2	NA		1.8	3.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.4	2.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	
	6	3.8	5.6	0.0	0.4	0.4	NA		2.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.2	3.4	0.0	0.4	0.2	NA	
8	8	3.2	4.6	0.0	0.6	0.4	NA		2.0	4.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA		1.0	4.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	NA	
	10	3.2	4.4	0.0	0.6	0.6	NA		1.8	5.2	0.0	0.2	0.0	NA		1.0	5.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	NA	




Figure S1: Comparison of the empirical powers against alternatives from model A2 in the main paper. In each panel, horizontal and vertical axes depict the lag K and empirical powers, respectively; the unbroken lines represent the results for the proposed method with and without the linear contemporaneous transformation, T_n and T_n^* (\blacksquare and \bullet , respectively), and the dashed lines represent the portmanteau tests $Q_1(\Delta)$, $Q_2(+)$ and $Q_3(\square)$, the LM test (\circ) and the TB test (\times), respectively. Results are based on 500 replications with $\alpha = 0.05$. For the LM test, only the results for $p = 3, 15$ and $p = 50$ (with $K = 2, 4, 6$ only) were reported.




Figure S2: Comparison of the empirical powers against alternatives from model A3 in the main paper. In each panel, horizontal and vertical axes depict the lag K and empirical powers, respectively; the unbroken lines represent the results for the proposed method with and without the linear contemporaneous transformation, T_n and T_n^* (\blacksquare and \bullet , respectively), and the dashed lines represent the portmanteau tests $Q_1(\Delta)$, $Q_2(+)$ and $Q_3(\square)$, the LM test (\circ) and the TB test (\times), respectively. Results are based on 500 replications with $\alpha = 0.05$. For the LM test, only the results for $p = 3, 15$ and $p = 50$ (with $K = 2, 4, 6$ only) were reported.




Figure S3: Comparison of the empirical powers against alternatives from model A5 in the main paper. In each panel, horizontal and vertical axes depict the lag K and empirical powers, respectively; the unbroken lines represent the results for the proposed method with and without the linear contemporaneous transformation, T_n and T_n^* (■ and ●, respectively), and the dashed lines represent the portmanteau tests $Q_1(\Delta)$, $Q_2(+)$ and $Q_3(\square)$, the LM test (○) and the TB test (×), respectively. Results are based on 500 replications with $\alpha = 0.05$. For the LM test, only the results for $p = 3, 15$ and $p = 50$ (with $K = 2, 4, 6$ only) were reported.