

# Spiked eigenvalues of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices: CLT and applications

Daning Bi  
Hunan University, China

Xiao Han\*  
University of Science and Technology of China, China

Adam Nie  
The Australian National University, Australia

Yanrong Yang<sup>†</sup>  
The Australian National University, Australia

May 14, 2024

## Abstract

We establish the central limit theorem (CLT) for spiked eigenvalues of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices under general conditions: (1) the spiked eigenvalues are allowed to go to infinity without restrictions in divergence order; (2) the number of spiked eigenvalues and the time lag of the autocovariance matrix could be either fixed or tending to infinity. As a further statistical application, a novel autocovariance test is proposed to detect the equivalence of spiked eigenvalues for two high-dimensional time series. Simulation studies are illustrated to justify the theoretical findings. Lastly, a hierarchical clustering approach is constructed to clustering mortality data from multiple countries.

*Keywords: high dimensional sample autocovariance matrices; spiked eigenvalues; central limit theorem; autocovariance test; hierarchical clustering*

---

\*Corresponding author: Professor Xiao Han, International Institute of Finance, School of Management, University of Science and Technology of China. Email Address: xhan011@ustc.edu.cn

<sup>†</sup>Four coauthors are co-first authors.

# 1 Introduction

Advances in modern technology have facilitated the collection and analysis of high-dimensional data. A major challenge of statistical inference on high-dimensional data is the well-known “curse of dimensionality” phenomenon (Donoho, 2000). Dimension reduction, which projects high-dimensional data into a low-dimensional subspace, is a natural idea to overcome the large-dimensional disaster. Principal component analysis (PCA) is a commonly-used dimension-reduction technique for high-dimensional independent and identically distributed (i.i.d) data, which pursues the low-dimensional subspace that keeps the most variation of the original data. A significant and intrinsic difference between i.i.d data and time series lies in the perception that time series have temporal dependence along the sample observations. As informed in earlier literature, Box and Tiao (1977); Pena and Box (1987); Tiao and Tsay (1989), identifying the low-dimensional representation or common factors that drive the temporal dependence of original time series is the major purpose of dimension reduction for high-dimensional time series. Lam and Yao (2012) conduct the eigen-decomposition of autocovariance matrices and justify that, the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest eigenvalues span a subspace where the projection of the original time series reserves the most temporal covariance. In view of such a close connection, there is a need to explore the spectral properties for high-dimensional autocovariance matrices.

The major contribution of this paper is to establish the asymptotic distribution of spiked eigenvalues for high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices. Similar to the spiked covariance model raised in Johnstone (2001), we consider a spiked autocovariance model in which the population autocovariance matrix has a few large eigenvalues, called spiked eigenvalues, that are detached from the bulk spectrum. The spiked autocovariance model could be expressed via a factor model, like Lam and Yao (2012), in which all temporal dependence is absorbed in low-dimensional common-factor time series. Intuitively speaking, spiked eigenvalues are equal to autocovariances of common-factor time series. In view of this point, spiked eigenvalues from high-dimensional autocovariance matrices could quantify the temporal dependence reserved in low-dimensional projected time series or common-factor time series. We will work under this factor model and investigate spiked eigenvalues from a symmetrized sample autocovariance matrix, which is the product of the autocovariance matrix and its transpose.

In the context of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrix analysis, fundamental asymptotic properties for spiked eigenvalues under moderately high-dimensional settings are available in the literature. Although Lam and Yao (2012) and Li et al. (2017) both focus on a ratio-based selection criterion for the number of factors, they essentially contribute to asymptotic properties of spiked and nonspiked eigenvalues of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices. In the case of strong spikiness, that is the spiked eigenvalues tending to infinity, Lam and Yao (2012) provide the rate of convergence for spiked and nonspiked eigenvalues. To be more sophisticated, Li et al. (2017) investigate the exact phase transition that distinguishes the factor part and the noise part. So their proposed ratio-based estimator is also applicable in weak spiked cases when the spiked eigenvalues are of constant order. More result for unspiked eigenvalues are derived in Li et al. (2015), Wang and Yao (2015) and Bose and Bhattacharjee (2018). Recently, Yao and Yuan (2021), Bose and Hachem (2021) develop asymptotic properties of the smallest eigenvalues for large dimensional autocovariance matrices and their variants.

As the first main contribution of this paper, under general conditions, we establish the asymptotic normality of  $\lambda_i$ , the  $i$ -th largest spiked eigenvalue of the matrix  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{\top}(\tau)$ , where  $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)$  is the lag  $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix of high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t, t =$

$1, 2, \dots, T\}$  under study. We assume that the spiked population eigenvalues  $\{\mu_i\}_{i \leq K}$  diverge as  $T \rightarrow \infty$  without restrictions on the diverging rates, which relaxes the specific rates used in [Lam et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#). Additionally, we also allow the number of factor  $K$  to be either fixed or diverging as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . This type of assumption has been made in the literature for large covariance matrices such as [Cai et al. \(2020\)](#), but has not yet been incorporated into the factor model for high-dimensional time series. Furthermore, the lag  $\tau$  in the autocovariance matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)$  is allowed to be either fixed or diverging. Our results show that the scalings for CLTs are not of the same order. In particular, if one is interested in the eigenvalues of  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)^\top$  for a moderately large  $\tau$ , the CLT in the regime where  $K \rightarrow \infty$  might provide a more accurate result than the case for a fixed  $\tau$ . Since we are working in a regime with less restricted assumptions on the number of factors, the lag of autocovariance, and the spikiness, as a natural trade-off, some difficulties arising in our work are worth to be noted.

A major source of difficulty in our setting comes from less restrictions on the rate of divergence of spiked population eigenvalues  $\{\mu_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K\}$ . We argue that the specification of the diverging speed of  $\mu_i$  such as ones used in [Lam et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#) entirely reduce the analysis of a high-dimensional factor model to the study of low-dimensional common-factor time series (see the remarks below [Theorem 1](#)). While this aligns with the goals of dimension reductions in [Lam et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#), it obfuscates some interesting features otherwise seen in high-dimensional models. Without such restriction, the idiosyncratic noise is no longer negligible and we obtain a clearer picture of how the high-dimensional noise part accumulates and affects the location of spiked eigenvalues. More specifically, even though  $\lambda_i$  is close to  $\mu_i$  asymptotically, the convergence rate of  $\lambda_i - \mu_i$  (after appropriate scaling) is in general slower than  $T^{-1/2}$ . In other words, we will not be able to obtain a CLT using  $\mu_i$  as the centering term. What happens here is that the bias of  $\lambda_i$  decays too slowly to obtain a CLT and a more accurate centering is needed. In our work, this centering term will be defined implicitly as the solution to an established equation. The phenomenon described above is common in large random matrix literature where, however, there is less emphasis on reducing high-dimensional models into low-dimensional ones (see, [Cai et al., 2020](#), for example).

Besides, instead of working with the autocovariance matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)$ , we are dealing with the symmetrized version  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)^\top$  in our analysis. From the technical aspect, the matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)^\top$  could not be decomposed into a matrix with independent entries like the covariance matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}$  does. Therefore, the common ideas and regular techniques of some existing works in large random matrix theory such as [Bai and Yao \(2008\)](#) and [Cai et al. \(2020\)](#) are not applicable directly in our work. Consequently, as the first work on CLT for large autocovariance matrices under less restricted assumptions, we need a new approach to establish the asymptotic normality for the empirical eigenvalues  $\{\lambda_i\}$ . Moreover, the approach we develop here could potentially be applied to other types of products of covariance-type matrices.

Another important contribution of this paper is a novel autocovariance test which is built on the developed CLT for  $\{\lambda_i\}$ . It is well known that when the data dimension  $p$  increases with sample size  $T$ , directly comparing and testing the equivalence of two autocovariance matrices is infeasible due to the ‘‘curse of dimensionality’’. The major idea of the proposed so-called autocovariance test is to compare the autocovariance of the low-dimensional common-factor time series. It is equivalent to testing whether spiked population eigenvalues of two high-dimensional autocovariance matrices are the same. It is worth mentioning that, as the CLT involves some unknown parameters, we propose an AR-sieve bootstrap to derive a feasible

test statistic. Furthermore, the proposed test statistic is powerful under some local alternative hypotheses, which are demonstrated via theoretical results and various simulation designs. This autocovariance test is not only in its own interest but also motivates other statistical inferences such as statistical clustering analysis on multi-population high-dimensional time series. In this paper, we construct a new hierarchical clustering approach based on the autocovariance test. It is applied to multi-country mortality data, for which we group those countries with similar low-dimensional autocovariances. The clustering results are consistent with findings in common literature on mortality studies.

The rest of this article is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the setting and assumptions of our work, sets up the relevant notations, and presents some preliminary results. The theoretical results of our work are given in Section 3. In Section 3.1 we investigate the asymptotic location of empirical eigenvalues and construct an accurate centering for these eigenvalues where technical results are collected in Appendix A of the Supplement Material. The CLT for empirical eigenvalues, which is the main result of our work, is given in Section 3.2. The proof of the CLT is quite involved and is thus divided into a series of intermediate results collected in Appendix B, and technical lemmas are collected in Appendixes C and D of the Supplement Material. We give a summary of the strategy of the proof in Section 3.2 and explain how the intermediate results are used to obtain the CLT. Lastly, a novel autocovariance test is illustrated in Section 4 as a statistical application of the proposed CLT where numerical results including simulation studies and real applications on mortality data are also provided in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Technical proofs, additional numerical results of this autocovariance test including its application on the multi-country mortality data are left to the Supplement Material.

## 2 Model Setting

We consider a high-dimensional time series with a factor model structure that appeared previously in Lam and Yao (2012); Lam et al. (2011); Li et al. (2017). Let  $(\mathbf{y}_t)_{t=1,\dots,T}$  be a  $K + p$  dimensional stationary time series containing  $K$  independent factors, observed over a period of length  $T$ . Formally we may write the time series as

$$\mathbf{y}_t = L\mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $(\mathbf{f}_t)_{t=1,\dots,T}$  is the  $K \times T$  matrix of factors, each assumed to be a stationary times series,  $L$  is the  $(p + K) \times K$  factor loading matrix and  $(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t)_t$  is a  $K + p$  dimensional idiosyncratic noise series to be specified below.

It is well-known (see for example Bai and Li (Bai and Li)) that the factor model (2.1) is not identifiable without additional constraints on  $L$  and  $\mathbf{f}_t$ , we refer to Table 1 of Bai and Li (Bai and Li) for a discussion of the different setups found in the existing literature. In our work we will assume, without any loss of generality, that  $L^\top L$  is equal to a diagonal matrix and all factors are standardized, i.e.  $\mathbb{E}[f_{it}] = 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}[f_{it}^2] = 1$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, K$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T$ .

We will work in the so-called high-dimensional setting where the dimension of the model  $p$  and the sample size  $T$  diverge at the same time while the ratio  $p/T$  tends to a constant  $c > 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . We allow the number of factors  $K$  to diverge as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , but impose conditions on the speed of its divergence so that the number of factors remains small in comparison to the dimension of the entire observation (see Assumption 2 and Assumption 3).

Each factor  $(f_{it})_t$  is assumed to be a stationary time series of the form

$$f_{it} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{il} z_{i,t-l}, \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad (2.2)$$

where the random variables  $(z_{it})$  are i.i.d. with zero mean, unit variance and finite  $(4 + \epsilon)$ -th moment for some small  $\epsilon > 0$ . Under this setup, the constraint  $\text{Var}(f_{it}) = 1$  mentioned above directly translates to the constraint  $\|\boldsymbol{\phi}_i\|_{\ell_2} = 1$  where  $\boldsymbol{\phi}_i := (\phi_{il})_l$  is the vector of coefficients for the  $i$ -th factor and  $\|\cdot\|_{\ell_2}$  is the usual  $\ell_2$  norm. Write  $\gamma_i(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[f_{i,1} f_{i,\tau+1}]$  for the lag- $\tau$  population auto-covariance of the  $i$ -th factor time series  $\mathbf{f}_i$ . In terms of the representation (2.2), clearly  $\gamma_i(\tau)$  can be written as

$$\gamma_i(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[f_{i,1} f_{i,\tau+1}] = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{i,l} \phi_{i,l+\tau}. \quad (2.3)$$

Although the loading matrix  $L$  appears in the (population) covariance and auto-covariance matrices of  $\mathbf{y}_t$ , it does not affect the eigenvalues of the covariance and auto-covariance matrix after normalization. Furthermore, as observed in Li et al. (2017), under additional Gaussian assumptions on the error time series  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ , the factor model can be reduced to a canonical form where  $L = (I_K \ \mathbf{0}_{K \times p})^\top$ . Under this assumption, Li et al. (2017) is able to obtain explicit results on the phase transition of the asymptotic locations of the spiked eigenvalues. As already mentioned, we will adopt a slightly different normalization for the matrix  $L$ , mainly for notational convenience. Nevertheless, we can invoke similar arguments as in Li et al. (2017) to obtain a canonical form of the factor model where  $L$  takes the form

$$L = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K)$  is a sequence of positive real numbers.

For the completeness of our exposition, we give a detailed explanation of the simplification (2.4). By assumption, the  $(p+K) \times K$  matrix  $\bar{L} := L \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{-1}, \dots, \sigma_K^{-1})$  satisfies  $\bar{L}^\top \bar{L} = I_K$  under our choice of normalization, thus there exists a  $(p+K) \times p$  matrix  $\underline{L}$  with orthonormal columns such that  $\tilde{L} := (\bar{L}, \underline{L})$  is orthonormal. Recall from (2.1) that  $\mathbf{y}_t = L\mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ . Define

$$\mathbf{z}_t := \tilde{L}^\top \mathbf{y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{L}^\top \\ \underline{L}^\top \end{pmatrix} L\mathbf{f}_t + \tilde{L}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{L}^\top \\ \underline{L}^\top \end{pmatrix} \bar{L} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \mathbf{f}_t + \tilde{L}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t.$$

By definition we have  $\bar{L}^\top \bar{L} = I_K$  and  $\underline{L}^\top \bar{L} = \mathbf{0}_p$ , therefore

$$\mathbf{z}_t = \tilde{L}^\top \mathbf{y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_t + \tilde{L}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t. \quad (2.5)$$

Note that  $\mathbf{z}_t$  is simply the original data  $\mathbf{y}_t$  subjected to an orthonormal transformation, so intuitively the sample auto-covariance matrix of  $(\mathbf{z}_t)$  contains the same temporal information as that of  $(\mathbf{y}_t)$ . More precisely, define the sample auto-covariance matrices

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \mathbf{y}_{t+\tau} \mathbf{y}_t^\top, \quad \Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}(\tau) := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \mathbf{z}_{t+\tau} \mathbf{z}_t^\top = \tilde{L}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau) \tilde{L}.$$

It is easy to see that the spectrum of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$  coincides with that of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^\top(\tau)$ . Indeed, we have

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^\top(\tau) = \tilde{L}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau) \tilde{L} \tilde{L}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)^\top \tilde{L} = \tilde{L}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau) \tilde{L},$$

where  $\tilde{L}$  is orthonormal so a conjugation by  $\tilde{L}$  does not affect the spectrum  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$ .

The main goal of our work is to establish the asymptotic distribution of the spiked eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$ . Since the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^\top(\tau)$  are the same as those of the matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$ , it suffices to consider  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{z}}^\top(\tau)$  instead of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$ . That is, we may without any loss of generality assume that

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_t + \tilde{L}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t.$$

Finally, under the assumptions  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$  is orthogonally invariant, the transformed error  $\tilde{L}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$  is equal in distribution to  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$ . Under this assumption, we have

$$\mathbf{y}_t \stackrel{\text{dist.}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \quad (2.6)$$

and we may take this as the canonical form of the factor model (2.1). Motivated by these observations, we will work under the canonical form (2.6).

## 2.1 Assumptions

The asymptotic properties of empirical spiked eigenvalues  $\lambda_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  mainly depend on the following five types of parameters:

- (1). **Factor strength**  $(\sigma_i^2)_{i=1}^K$ , which are the variances of factors (before normalization).
- (2). **Spikiness**  $(\mu_i^2)_{i=1}^K$ , which are spiked eigenvalues of the population matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top$ .
- (3). **Time lag**  $\tau$ , which is allowed to be fixed or tend to infinity.
- (4). **The number of factors**  $K$ , which could be fixed or tending to infinity.
- (5). **The dimension and sample size**:  $p$  and  $T$ , which tend to infinity simultaneously.

Depending on the choices made on these parameter, the model could exhibit a wide range of different behaviours. Below we will detail the assumptions we made relating to these five types of parameters, together with some discussion and justifications on these choices.

First, under the canonical representation (2.6),  $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K$  are in fact the standard deviations of the original factors. We will assume that the factors are “strong”, i.e.  $\sigma_i \rightarrow \infty, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ , which is a common assumption in the factor modelling literature. We note that Lam and Yao (2012) and many subsequent results explicitly specified the rate at which  $\sigma_i$  diverges, for instance Lam and Yao (2012) assumed  $\sigma_i^2 \sim p^{1-\delta}$  where  $\delta \in [0, 1]$  is a fixed constant. This type of assumption can be understood as essentially reducing the problem to a low dimensional setting, in the sense that the accumulated effects of the high dimensional noise  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  is still small in comparison to the signal strength  $\sigma_i$ . We will lift this restriction and consider a very general setting where  $\sigma_i$  can diverge at any rate instead of specific functions of  $T$ . This relaxation

brings numerous technical difficulties and required us to carry out detailed analysis of high dimensional random matrices.

Next, we note that the spiked eigenvalues  $\mu_{i,\tau}, i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  of the population matrix  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$  are closely related to the factor strength as well as the temporal dependence of the common factors. Recall  $\gamma_i(\tau) := \mathbb{E}[f_{i,1}f_{i,\tau+1}]$  from (2.3). Under the canonical form (2.6), the (population) lag- $\tau$  auto-covariance function for each time series  $(y_{it})_t$  can be written as

$$\mu_{i,\tau} := (\mathbb{E}[y_{i,t}y_{i,t+\tau}])^2 = \sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2, \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \quad \tau \geq 0. \quad (2.7)$$

To the extent of our knowledge, in the existing literature the parameter  $\tau$  is assumed to be a given constant. This classical setting is included in our work under Assumption 2. We will also study a novel setup where we allow  $\tau$  diverge as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . This new setup is motivated by the observation that the theoretical results under the classical fixed  $\tau$  settings can be inaccurate when  $\tau$  is large. As will be shown, the quantity  $\gamma_n(\tau)$  will appear in the characterisation of the asymptotic location of the eigenvalues as well as the variance term in the central limit theorem. For  $\tau$  large,  $\gamma_n(\tau)$  can be very small, in which case our second setting provides a more accurate description on the effect of large  $\tau$ .

In the case where  $\tau$  is fixed, we will assume without any loss of generality that the sequence  $(\mu_{i,\tau})_i$  is arranged in decreasing order, at least for large  $T$ . Furthermore, we assume impose a spectral gap condition that guarantees  $\{\mu_{i,\tau}\}$  is well separated, i.e. there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu_{i,\tau}/\mu_{i+1,\tau} > 1 + \epsilon$  for all  $i$  and  $\tau$ . This assumption is standard (see e.g. Cai et al. (2020)) and ensures that the empirical eigenvalues are separated asymptotically.

In the case where  $\tau$  is allowed to vary with  $T$ , it is too restrictive to assume that such an ordering on  $\mu_{i,\tau}$  exists for all  $\tau \geq 0$ . For example, suppose the  $(y_{1t})_t$  has a large variance  $\sigma_1^2$  but a very rapidly decaying auto-covariance function  $\gamma_1(\cdot)$ , while  $(y_{2t})_t$  has a smaller variance but a slow decaying auto-covariance function. Then we can easily have  $\mu_{1,1} > \mu_{2,1}$  as well as  $\mu_{1,\tau} < \mu_{2,\tau}$  for a larger  $\tau$  so the assumption  $\mu_{1,\tau} > \mu_{2,\tau}$  for all  $\tau$  is unrealistic. Instead, we will assume that the sequence  $(\mu_{i,\tau})_i$  is well separated only asymptotically, i.e. we assume there exists  $\tau_0$  large enough and  $\epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mu_{i,\tau}/\mu_{i+1,\tau} > 1 + \epsilon, \quad \forall \tau > \tau_0, \quad i = 1, \dots, K.$$

For simplicity and transparency of our results, we will assume that all  $\gamma_i(\tau), i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  decay at the same speed asymptotically, i.e.  $\gamma_i(\tau)/\gamma_j(\tau) < C_1$  for  $i, j = 1, \dots, K$  and some constant  $C_1$ . This implies that the  $\mu_{i,\tau}$ 's are of the same order as well and a comparison between them is more reasonable.

Finally, following Li et al. (2017) we will assume that the error time series  $(\epsilon_t)_t$  is standard Gaussian. This ensures a particularly transparent model (2.6) and theoretical results. We remark that the Gaussianity assumption can be significantly weakened. For instance, from the discussion leading up to (2.6), we see that we may still obtain (2.6) under the assumption that  $\epsilon_t$  is orthogonally invariant. However, as a trade-off, we would have to impose other less intuitive assumptions on  $\epsilon_t$  to ensure the concentration of certain quadratic forms to obtain a CLT. An alternative approach is to invoke a Linderberg type of argument and bound the difference between the Gaussian and non-Gaussian model as a sum of low rank perturbations, see for example Bao et al. (2015); Lee and Schnelli (2016). This type of argument, commonly used in studying the universality of random matrices, is more suitable for a standalone work and we will not pursue such an extension here.

For clarity and the convenience of the reader we summarize our settings into the following sets of conditions which will be referred to in later parts of the paper.

**Assumptions 1.** a)  $p, T \rightarrow \infty$  and  $p/T \rightarrow c \in (0, +\infty)$ .

b)  $\sigma_i \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\sigma_i = o(\sigma_j^2)$  for all  $i, j = 1, \dots, K$ .

c)  $(z_{it})_{1 \leq i \leq K, 1 \leq t \leq T+1}$  is independent, identically distributed with  $\mathbb{E}[z_{it}] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[z_{it}^2] = 1$  and uniformly bounded  $(4 + \epsilon)$ -th moment for some  $\epsilon > 0$ .

d)  $(\epsilon_{it})_{1 \leq i \leq p+K, 1 \leq t \leq T+1}$  is i.i.d. standard Gaussian.

e)  $\sup_i \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1} < \infty$ .

Part (a) and (b) of Assumption 1 capture our asymptotic regime where  $p$  diverges at the same rate as  $T$  and the strength of all factors diverges at some non-specific rates. In factor model analysis literature it is common to require all factors diverge at the same rate, see (Bai and Ng, 2002). We will not impose such a restriction, instead we opt for a mild assumption on the relative size of factors not being too different.

Moment conditions such as (c) of Assumption 1 are standard in the random matrix literature; see for instance Bao et al. (2018); Cai et al. (2020); Li et al. (2015); Wang and Yao (2016, 2017). The normality assumption in (d) is discussed above and finally condition (e) is very standard in the time series literature, see Brockwell et al. (1991). For instance, condition (e) is satisfied by an auto-regressive moving average process written in the form (2.2).

The following two sets of assumptions encapsulate the two asymptotic schemes discussed above relating to the parameter  $\tau$ . Our main results are formulated in such a way that they hold under either set of assumptions.

**Assumptions 2.** a)  $\tau$  is a fixed, positive integer.

b)  $K = o(T^{1/4})$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

c) the set of parameters  $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^K$  satisfy

$$\frac{K\sigma_i}{\sigma_j^{3/2}} = O(1), \quad \frac{K^2\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_j^2} = o(\sqrt{T}), \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, K,$$

d) the sequence  $(\mu_{1,\tau}, \dots, \mu_{K,\tau})$  is arranged in decreasing order and there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu_{i,\tau}/\mu_{i+1,\tau} > 1 + \epsilon$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, K - 1$ .

**Assumptions 3.** a)  $\tau$  is a positive integer and  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

b)  $K = o(T^{1/4})$  and  $\gamma_i(\tau)^{-1} = o(\sqrt{T})$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

c) the set of parameters  $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^K$  and  $(\gamma_i(\tau))_i$  satisfy

$$\frac{K\sigma_i}{\sigma_j^{3/2}\gamma_j(\tau)^{1/5}} = O(1), \quad \frac{K^2\sigma_i^2}{\sigma_j^2\gamma_j(\tau)^2} = o(\sqrt{T}), \quad \forall i, j = 1, \dots, K,$$

d) there exists  $\tau_0$  large enough and some  $\epsilon > 0$  such that  $\mu_{i,\tau}/\mu_{i+1,\tau} > 1 + \epsilon$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, K - 1$  and  $\tau > \tau_0$ .



As already mentioned, we do not impose specific restrictions on the speed of divergence of  $\sigma_i$ , nor do we assume all spikes are of the same size. Instead, it suffices to impose mild restrictions on the relative sizes of the spikes. As such, condition these assumptions are trivially satisfied when the spike sizes are comparable. The exponents appearing in the assumptions are chosen for convenient and are likely suboptimal. We will leave the optimization of these exponents to future work. Finally, we note that Assumption 3 is strictly stronger than Assumption 2, since  $\gamma_j(\tau)^{-1} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

## 2.2 Notations and Preliminaries

In our exposition and proofs, we will often encounter various resolvent matrices, which capture the spectral information of the random matrices we are studying. Since we are constantly dealing with many different matrices, assigning to each a different letter will easily exhaust the alphabet. Instead, we adopt some non-standard notations for matrices and sub-matrices. Write  $(a_{ij})$  for a matrix where the  $(i, j)$ -th entry is equal to  $a_{ij}$ . For such a matrix  $(a_{ij})$ , we will write

$$\mathbf{a}_{[i:j],[k:l]} := \begin{pmatrix} a_{ik} & \dots & a_{il} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ a_{jk} & \dots & a_{jl} \end{pmatrix}$$

for a specified sub-matrix. Similarly we will write  $\mathbf{a}_{i,[j:k]}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_{[i:j],k}$  for the column vectors  $(a_{ij}, \dots, a_{ik})^\top$  and  $(a_{ik}, \dots, a_{jk})^\top$  respectively.

First, we introduce notations for some of the more important random matrices in our study. We denote

$$x_{it} = \sigma_i f_{it} + \epsilon_{it}, i = 1, \dots, K, t = 1, \dots, T \quad (2.8)$$

and write  $\mathbf{x} = (x_{it})$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} X_0 &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_{[1:K],[1:T-\tau]}, & X_\tau &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_{[1:K],[\tau+1:T]}, \\ E_0 &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{[K+1:K+p],[1:T-\tau]}, & E_\tau &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{[K+1:K+p],[\tau+1:T]}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

for matrices used later that contain the factors and noises in our model. We will also write

$$Y_0 := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{y}_{[1:p+K],[1:T-\tau]}, \quad Y_\tau := \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{y}_{[1:p+K],[\tau+1:T]}, \quad (2.10)$$

i.e. we have  $Y_0 = (X_0^\top, E_0^\top)^\top$  and  $Y_\tau = (X_\tau^\top, E_\tau^\top)^\top$ . For an integer  $\tau > 0$ , the lag- $\tau$  sample auto-covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{y}_t$  can then be written as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \mathbf{y}_{t+\tau} \mathbf{y}_t^\top = \begin{pmatrix} X_\tau \\ E_\tau \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X_0 \\ E_0 \end{pmatrix}^\top = \begin{pmatrix} X_\tau X_0^\top & X_\tau E_0^\top \\ E_\tau X_0^\top & E_\tau E_0^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Next, we introduce resolvent matrices which are central to the study of spectral properties of random matrices. Most of our results rely on certain bilinear forms formed using the resolvents. For  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  outside of the spectrum of the matrix  $E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0$  write

$$R(a) := (I_{T-\tau} - a^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} = a(a - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} \quad (2.11)$$

for the (scaled) resolvent of  $E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0$  at  $a$ . The resolvent  $R(a)$  satisfies

$$R(a) = I_{T-\tau} + a^{-1}R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0, \quad (2.12)$$

which follows from rearranging  $R(a)(I_{T-\tau} - a^{-1}E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0) = I_{T-\tau}$ . Using the identity

$$A(\lambda I - BA)^{-1} = (\lambda I - AB)^{-1}A \quad (2.13)$$

we may also obtain the following identities

$$R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau = E_\tau^\top E_\tau R(a)^\top, \quad E_0^\top E_0 R(a) = R(a)^\top E_0^\top E_0. \quad (2.14)$$

In our analysis we will constantly be dealing with certain quadratic forms involving matrices  $X_0, X_\tau, E_0, E_\tau$  and the resolvent  $R(a)$ . To simplify notations we will write

$$A(a) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}}X_0R(a)X_\tau^\top, \quad B(a) := \frac{1}{a}X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R(a)X_\tau^\top, \quad (2.15)$$

$$\bar{Q}(a) := I_K - a^{-1}X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R(a)X_\tau^\top, \quad Q(a) := I_K - a^{-1}X_0R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top. \quad (2.16)$$

For any  $a$  outside the spectrum of the matrix  $X_0R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top$ , the matrix  $Q(a)$  defined above is invertible and similar to (2.12), we have

$$Q(a)^{-1} = I_K + \frac{1}{a}Q(a)^{-1}X_0R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top. \quad (2.17)$$

For two sequences of positive numbers  $(a_n)$  and  $(b_n)$ , we write  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  if there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that  $a_n \leq cb_n$ . We write  $a_n \asymp b_n$  if  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $b_n \lesssim a_n$  hold simultaneously. A sequence of events  $(F_n)$  is said to hold with high probability if there exists constants  $c, C > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{P}(F_n^c) \leq Cn^{-c}$ . The operator and Hilbert-Schmidt norms of a matrix  $M$  are denoted by  $\|M\|$  and  $\|M\|_F$  respectively, and we write  $\|(a_n)\|_{\ell^p}$  for the  $\ell^p$  norm of a sequence  $(a_n)$ . We will write  $(\mathbf{e}_i)_{i=1}^n$  for the standard orthonormal basis of Euclidean space  $\mathbb{R}^n$ , often without specifying the dimension  $n$ .

We will use the usual  $o_p$  and  $O_p$  notations for convergence in probability and stochastic compactness. For  $p \geq 1$ , we will write  $o_{L^p}$  and  $O_{L^p}$  for convergence to zero and boundedness in  $L^p$ , i.e. for a sequence of random variables  $(X_n)_n$  and real numbers  $(a_n)$ , we write  $X_n = O_{L^p}(a_n)$  if  $\mathbb{E}|X_n/a_n|^p = O(1)$  and  $X_n = o_{L^p}(a_n)$  if  $\mathbb{E}|X_n/a_n|^p = o(1)$ . For matrices  $(A_n)$  we will write  $A_n = O_{p, \|\cdot\|}(a_n)$  if  $\|A_n\| = O_p(a_n)$ .

Throughout the paper we will make use of certain events of high probability. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_0 &:= \left\{ \|E_0^\top E_0\| + \|E_\tau^\top E_\tau\| \leq 4 \left(1 + \frac{p}{T}\right) \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_1 &:= \left\{ \|X_0^\top X_0\| + \|X_\tau^\top X_\tau\| \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

and  $\mathcal{B}_2 := \mathcal{B}_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_1$ . We first state a preliminary result showing that these events happen with high probability as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . The proof will be given in Appendix A.

**Lemma 1.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

a)  $\mathcal{B}_0$  holds with probability  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_0) = 1 - o(T^{-l})$  for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}^+$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

b) For  $k = 1, 2$ ,  $\mathcal{B}_k$  holds with probability  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_k) = 1 - O(KT^{-1})$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

As an immediate consequence of this lemma and (b) of Assumption 1, we have

$$\|E_0^\top E_0\| + \|E_\tau^\top E_\tau\| = O_p(1), \quad \|X_0^\top X_0\| + \|X_\tau^\top X_\tau\| = O_p(K\sigma_1^2). \quad (2.19)$$

Furthermore, we observe that under the event  $\mathcal{B}_0$ , for any sequence  $(a_T)_T$  such that  $a_T \rightarrow \infty$ , the matrix  $I_{T-\tau} - a_T^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0$  is eventually invertible. Moreover, we note that under  $\mathcal{B}_0$  we have  $\|a_T^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| \leq 4a_T^{-1}(1+p/T) = O(a_T^{-1})$ , which is a non-random upper-bound. By the reverse triangle inequality we immediately have  $\|I_{T-\tau} - a_T^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| \geq 1 - O(a_T^{-1})$  and therefore

$$\|R(a_T) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| = 1 + o(1), \quad \|R(a_T)\| = 1 + o_p(1), \quad (2.20)$$

where the definition of  $R(\cdot)$  is in (2.11).

Similarly, under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$  the matrix  $Q(a_T)$  is eventually invertible as  $a_T \rightarrow \infty$  and

$$\|Q(a_T)^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}\| = 1 + o(1), \quad \|Q(a_T)^{-1}\| = 1 + o_p(1). \quad (2.21)$$

Finally, let  $\mathcal{F}_p$  be the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by the noise time series  $(\epsilon_t)$ , i.e.

$$\mathcal{F}_p := \sigma(\{\epsilon_{it}, i = K+1, \dots, K+p, t = 1, \dots, T\}). \quad (2.22)$$

We will often take expectations conditional on the noise series, in which case we shall write

$$\mathbb{E}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_p]. \quad (2.23)$$

### 3 Main results

Write  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  for the  $n$ -th largest spiked eigenvalue of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample auto-covariance matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top$ . The main goal of our work is to establish the asymptotic normality of  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  for  $n \leq K$  after appropriate centering and scaling. We will first in Section 3.1 establish the asymptotic location of the eigenvalue  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  as well as identify the correct centering for  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  in order to obtain a central limit theorem. The proof will be presented in Appendix A of the supplement. The central limit theorem itself, which is the main result of our work, is stated in Theorem 2 of Section 3.2.

Due to its length, the proof of Theorem 2 will be divided into a series of propositions and technical lemmas, which are collected in Appendixes B to D of the supplement. For the convenience of the reader, we will summarize the strategy of the proof of Theorem 2 and explain how the intermediate results are used in Section 3.2.

#### 3.1 Location of Spiked Eigenvalues

We first show that the spiked eigenvalue  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  is close to its population counterpart  $\mu_{n,\tau}$  asymptotically. This will in particular give the asymptotic order of  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

$$\frac{\lambda_{n,\tau}}{\mu_{n,\tau}} - 1 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_n(\tau)\sqrt{T}}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{K\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2}\right), \quad n = 1, \dots, K. \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\mu_{n,\tau}$  and  $\gamma_n(\tau)$  are defined in (2.7) and (2.3) respectively.

**Remark 1.** A closer inspection of the convergence rate in Theorem 1 shows that  $\mu_{n,\tau}$  is not the appropriate centering constant for  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  for the purpose of obtaining a CLT. The first term on the right-hand side of (3.1) can indeed be shown to be asymptotically normal at a scaling of  $\gamma_n(\tau)\sqrt{T}$ , which is the same scaling as our main result in Theorem 2. However, the second term in (3.1) is in general not negligible after scaling by  $\gamma_n(\tau)\sqrt{T}$  unless some restrictions on the rate of divergence of  $\mu_{n,\tau}$  are imposed.

If we were to impose stronger assumptions on the rate of  $\mu_{n,\tau}$ , for example assuming the rate  $\mu_{n,\tau} \asymp p^{1-\delta}$  required in Lam and Yao (2012), then the second term in (3.1) indeed becomes negligible. Under such assumptions the  $K$  spiked eigenvalues of the  $(p+K) \times (p+K)$  dimensional matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top$  are extremely close to the eigenvalues of the  $K \times K$  matrix  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$ , as can be deduced from the proof of Theorem 1. The analysis of the matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top$  reduces to the analysis of the much simpler matrix  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$ , which is essentially a low-dimensional problem. In this case, the derivation of a CLT is much easier.

As can be seen from the proof of Theorem 1, the second term in (3.1) represents the bias incurred when estimating  $\mu_{n,\tau}$  using  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$ . In order to obtain a CLT, we need a more accurate centering term for  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  to remove or reduce this bias. This centering term, which we write as  $\theta_{n,\tau}$ , will be defined implicitly as the unique solution to the equation

$$1 = \mathbb{E}[B(\theta_{n,\tau})_{nn} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A(\theta_{n,\tau})_{nn} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q(\theta_{n,\tau})_{nn}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}], \quad (3.2)$$

where the matrices  $B(a)$ ,  $A(a)$  and  $Q(a)$  are defined in (2.15) and (2.16) for  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .

To make this definition rigorous, we start with Proposition 1 which shows that (3.2) indeed has a unique solution for  $T$  large enough. Furthermore, this solution is shown to exist in some small interval containing  $\mu_{n,\tau} = \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2$ . This in particular establishes the asymptotic order of  $\theta_{n,\tau}$ .

**Proposition 1.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or Assumption 3 hold. Fix  $n \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$  be an arbitrary constant not related to  $p, T$ . Then there exists  $T_0$  large enough such that for  $T > T_0$ , the function*

$$a \mapsto g(a) = 1 - \mathbb{E}[B(a)_{nn} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{nn} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q(a)_{nn}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]$$

has a unique root in the interval

$$\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 [1 - \epsilon, 1 + \epsilon]. \quad (3.3)$$

## 3.2 Central Limit Theorem for Spiked Eigenvalues

The constant  $\theta_{n,\tau}$  defined in (3.2) turns out to be the appropriate centering constant for  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$ , in the sense that the second term in (3.1) becomes negligible after centering by  $\theta_{n,\tau}$ . We are ready to state the main result of our work. Define

$$\delta_{n,\tau} := \frac{\lambda_{n,\tau} - \theta_{n,\tau}}{\theta_{n,\tau}} = \frac{\lambda_{n,\tau}}{\theta_{n,\tau}} - 1.$$

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_n(\tau)}{2v_{n,\tau}} \delta_{n,\tau} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad n = 1, 2, \dots, K$$

where  $v_{n,\tau}$  is defined by

$$v_{n,\tau}^2 := \frac{1}{T} \text{Var}(\mathbf{f}_{n0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{n\tau}) = \sum_{|k| < T-\tau} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{T-\tau}\right) u_k, \quad (3.4)$$

and  $(u_k)_{|k| < T-\tau}$  is a sequence of constants given by

$$u_k := u_{nk} := \gamma_n(k)^2 + \gamma_n(k+\tau)\gamma_n(k-\tau) + (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{n,l} \phi_{n,l+\tau} \phi_{n,l+k} \phi_{n,l+k+\tau}.$$

**Remark 2.** We remark that for generality as well as the tidiness of presentation we choose to formulate Theorem 2 in a form that holds under either one of Assumption 2 and 3. A closer inspection shows that the two cases are quite different. In the case where  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , we observe that  $\gamma_n(\tau) \rightarrow 0$  while the term  $v_{n,\tau}^2$  defined by (3.4) can easily be shown to be bounded from zero. This implies that the scalings of CLT in the two cases are not of the same order. In the case where  $\tau$  is fixed, the variance of  $\sqrt{T}\delta_{n,\tau}$ , which is equal to  $4v_{n,\tau}\gamma_n(\tau)^{-2}$ , is bounded both from above and away from zero from below. On the other hand, when  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , the variance of  $\sqrt{T}\delta_{n,\tau}$  tends to infinity at a speed of  $\gamma_n(\tau)^{-1}$  while  $v_{n,\tau}$  remains bounded.

This result might seem surprising since  $\delta_{n,\tau} = (\lambda_{n,\tau} - \theta_{n,\tau})/\theta_{n,\tau}$  is already normalized in an obvious way so one might expect  $\delta_{n,\tau}$  to be of order  $T^{-1/2}$ . One might be tempted to draw the conclusion that  $\lambda_{n,\tau}$  is less accurate of an estimator of  $\theta_{n,\tau}$  for larger values of  $\tau$ , since the variance of  $\delta_{n,\tau}$  increases with  $\tau$ . However, the exact opposite is true here. Since  $\theta_{n,\tau} \asymp \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2$  by Proposition 1, this implies that in fact  $\lambda_{n,\tau} - \theta_{n,\tau} = O_p(\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau) T^{-1/2})$ , which is faster than the rate  $\lambda_{n,\tau} - \theta_{n,\tau} = O_p(\sigma_n^4 T^{-1/2})$  obtained in the case where  $\tau$  is fixed. In practical situations where we deal with the auto-covariance matrix with a larger  $\tau$ , the CLT under Assumption 3 provides a much more accurate convergence speed and asymptotic variance than using fixed  $\tau$  results.

## Strategy of the proof

The initial step is to derive an expression for the eigenvalue  $\lambda = \lambda_{n,\tau}$  and the related quantity  $\delta = \delta_{n,\tau}$ . In general, the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  of the matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top$ , in general, depends on its entries in complicated and non-linear ways. We take an approach commonly seen in the random matrix literature (e.g. Bai and Yao (2008); Cai et al. (2020); Li et al. (2017)) and express  $\delta$  as the solution to an equation involving the determinant of certain random matrices. This is established in Proposition 2:

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3 hold. Then the ratio  $\delta$  is the solution to the following equation*

$$\det \left( M + \frac{\delta}{\theta} X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \right) = 0. \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$M := I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R X_\tau^\top - \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1} X_0 R X_\tau^\top. \quad (3.6)$$

The main idea is then to apply Leibniz's formula to compute this determinant. In doing so we will express  $\delta$  as a polynomial function of the entries of the matrices  $M$  and  $\theta^{-1}X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$  plus many higher order terms. After estimating the terms in this polynomial, it can be shown that the asymptotic normality of the ratio  $\delta$  eventually follows from the asymptotic normality of the  $n$ -th diagonal entry  $M$ . This argument is carried out in the proof of Theorem 2. More specifically, we establish the CLT, it suffices to (a) show that

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{M_{nn}}{2\gamma_n(\tau)v_{n,\tau}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad M_{ii} \gtrsim 1, \quad \forall i \neq n, \quad (3.7)$$

then (b) establish a bound of sufficient sharpness on the off-diagonals of  $M$ , and (c) identify the limits in probability of the matrix  $\theta^{-1}X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$ . It is clear that the matrix  $M$  and the resolvents  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$  appearing in the definition of  $M$  are the central objects of our analysis. The following proposition provides an asymptotic approximation to  $M$  suited to our purpose.

**Proposition 3.** *Define the matrices*

$$A := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 R X_\tau^\top, \quad B := \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R X_\tau^\top,$$

so that  $M = I_K - B - A^\top Q^{-1} A$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , define

$$\overline{M}_{ii} := 1 - \mathbb{E}[B_{ii} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}].$$

Then under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have

$$M_{ii} - \overline{M}_{ii} = -2(A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}]) \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta \sqrt{T}} + KT^{-1} \right),$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  is defined in (2.23). Furthermore,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |M_{ij}| = O_p \left( \frac{K^4 \sigma_1^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j}{\theta^2 \sqrt{T}} \right).$$

A few remarks are in order to explain why the approximation in Proposition 3 is constructed in a seemingly unusual way. Since  $\theta$  diverges, the resolvents  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$  defined in (2.11) and (2.16), respectively, are very close to identity matrices for large  $T$ , a fact used frequently in our proofs. However one cannot simply replace them with identities to simplify (3.6). Indeed, it is easy to show that  $R - I_{T-\tau} = O_{p, \|\cdot\|}(\theta^{-1})$ , which converges to zero but not fast enough for obtaining a CLT after scaling by  $\sqrt{T}$ . This is a fundamental difficulty under our setting since we allow  $\theta$  to diverge at any rate and not as a specified function of  $T$ . In fact, if we were to impose for instance  $\theta \gg \sqrt{T}$ , our proofs will be greatly simplified.

It can be shown however that this approximation error of order  $\theta^{-1}$  appears only in the mean of the asymptotic distribution, see for instance (B.32). That is, we can safely use identity matrices to approximate  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$  in Proposition 3 as long as we include an appropriate centering term to adjust the expectation of  $M$  before multiplying by  $\sqrt{T}$ . In fact, identifying the correct centering for  $M$  results in the equation (3.2) that determines the asymptotic location  $\lambda$  of the eigenvalues  $\lambda$ .

Essentially, we construct approximations to  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$  that are more accurate than the identity, which in our case turn out to be their expectations under certain events of high

probability. To bound the approximation errors, we establish the concentration of  $R$  around its expectation in Lemma 7, the concentration of  $Q^{-1}$  around a certain conditional expectation in Lemma 8, and estimates on the differences between conditional and unconditional expectations in Lemma 9. After obtaining these technical results, we show in Proposition 3 that after centering by a certain conditional expectation (which is later replaced by an unconditional one using Lemma 9), the asymptotic distribution of  $M$  can be obtained from the asymptotic distribution of the bilinear form  $X_0 R X_\tau^\top$ , up to adjustments in the expectations.

Therefore it remains to establish the asymptotics of  $X_0 R X_\tau^\top$ . Using tools developed in Lemmas 3 to 6, we study the bilinear form  $X_0 R X_\tau^\top$  and establish its concentration around some conditional expectation. Using these results we show in the proof of Proposition 5 that the asymptotic normality for  $X_0 R X_\tau^\top$  follows from the asymptotic normality of the much simpler auto-covariance matrix  $X_0 X_\tau^\top$ , again up to adjustments in the expectations. The CLT for this matrix  $X_0 X_\tau^\top$  is established in Proposition 4. Finally, Proposition 5 gives the CLT for diagonals of the matrix  $M$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\theta}{2\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau) v_{i,\tau}} (M_{ii} - \bar{M}_{ii}) = Z_T + O_p \left( \frac{\|\sigma\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)} + \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 K}{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} \right)$$

where  $Z_T \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$ , the centering  $\bar{M}_{ii}$  is as defined in (B.11) and  $v_{i,\tau}$  is defined as in (3.4).

The proof of Theorem 2 can then be assembled from the above described ingredients, we present the proof at the end of Appendix B. To summarize, the quantity of interest  $\delta$  is first shown to satisfy equation (3.5). Through a series of approximations, we establish the asymptotic normality of the diagonals of the matrix  $M$ . The off-diagonals of  $M$  are bounded in probability and we establish the limit in probability of the matrix  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$  appearing. Leibniz's formula is then applied to compute the determinant in Proposition 2, and our main result Theorem 2 follows.

### 3.3 Outline of the proof

We finally include a brief outline of the proofs to help the readers navigate.

Firstly, in Proposition 2, the quantity of interest  $\delta$  is expressed as the solution to equation (3.7). As will be shown in the proof of Theorem 2, the asymptotic normality of  $\delta$  follows from the asymptotic normality of the matrix  $M$  appearing in Proposition 2.

The asymptotic normality of  $M$  is established in Propositions 3 to 5. We first identify an appropriate centering for the matrix  $M$  in (B.11). Using this centering, we show in Proposition 3 that the diagonal elements of  $M$  can be approximated by certain bilinear forms defined in (B.10), at the scale of  $o(T^{-1/2})$ . Proposition 5 obtains the asymptotic normality of  $M$  by further reducing this approximation into a much simpler bilinear form, the asymptotic distribution of which is established in Proposition 4.

The results described above all rely on a collection of technical lemmas. Throughout the proofs, we often encounter bilinear forms involving resolvent matrices  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$ . We routinely approximate these resolvent matrices and the bilinear forms by certain expectations. In Lemmas 7 to 9 we establish the concentration of  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$  around certain expectations, and in Lemmas 3 to 6 we establish the concentration of bilinear forms involving  $R$  and  $Q^{-1}$ .

## 4 Statistical application: autocovariance test

In this section, a novel test, called the autocovariance test, is proposed to detect the equivalence of spikiness for two high-dimensional time series. As analyzed in [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#), the eigenvectors corresponding to the  $K$  spiked eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^\top(\tau)$  span a  $K$ -dimensional linear subspace, where the projection of the original high-dimensional time series holds all the temporal dependence. For easy reference, we call this subspace as  $K$ -dimensional temporal subspace and denote it as  $\mathcal{M}_K$ . When two high-dimensional time series share the same  $K$ -dimensional temporal subspace, the proposed test is equivalent to checking whether the two projected time series have the same autocovariance. As a further application of the proposed autocovariance test, new hierarchical clustering analysis is constructed to cluster a large set of high-dimensional time series, where the dissimilarity between two populations is measured via the p-value of the proposed autocovariance test. The major aim of this clustering analysis is to group high-dimensional time series with similarly projected autocovariances.

To explain the idea of the autocovariance test and its application on the hierarchical clustering in detail, we will simply revisit the factor structures for high-dimensional time series and introduce the proposed test statistic with its asymptotic properties in [Section 4.1](#). [Section 4.2](#) describes how the hypothesis test can be implemented in practice where a flow chart is also provided to clarify the essential idea of the test procedure. We then use numerical simulations to investigate the empirical sizes and powers of the proposed test. Finally, the proposed test and the hierarchical clustering method with p-values acting as the measure of dissimilarities are applied to mortality data from multiple countries.

### 4.1 Hypotheses and test statistic

Consider for  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_1+p_1}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_2+p_2}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$ , which are two high-dimensional time series following the factor model in canonical form [\(2.4\)](#), that is we have

$$\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} = L^{(m)}\mathbf{f}_t^{(m)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}, \quad t = 1, \dots, T, \quad m = 1, 2, \quad (4.1)$$

where  $\{\mathbf{f}_t^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K_m}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$  are stationary factor time series with variances normalized to 1,  $K_m \ll p_m$ , and  $L^{(m)}$  is a  $(p_m + K_m) \times K_m$  factor loading matrix which takes the form

$$L^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1^{(m)}, \dots, \sigma_K^{(m)}) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K}^{(m)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.2)$$

To simplify the notations, we also let  $N_m := (p_m + K_m)$  be the dimension of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$ .

For high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$  following factor models such as [\(4.1\)](#),  $L^{(m)}$  is the time invariant factor loading matrix. As discussed in [Lam et al. \(2011\)](#) and [Lam and Yao \(2012\)](#), when  $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}\}$  are i.i.d, the temporal dependence of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$  is fully captured by  $\{\mathbf{f}_t^{(m)}\}$ . Denote by  $\mu_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  the eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$ . We then consider in this section the setting where there are  $K$  spiked eigenvalues in  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$  and  $\mu_{1,\tau}^{(m)} > \mu_{2,\tau}^{(m)} > \dots > \mu_{K_m,\tau}^{(m)}$  tend to infinity with  $T, p$ , while  $\mu_{K_m+1,\tau}^{(m)} = \mu_{K_m+2,\tau}^{(m)} = \dots = \mu_{N_m,\tau}^{(m)} = 0$  for any  $\tau \geq 1$ . With this definition of spiked eigenvalues, we can show that the columns of  $L^{(m)}$  are the eigenvectors of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$  corresponding to the spiked eigenvalues, as follow.



Write  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)}$  for a  $N_m \times p_m$  matrix where  $(L^{(m)}, \mathbf{W}^{(m)})$  forms a  $N_m \times N_m$  orthogonal matrix so that  $L^{(m)\top} \mathbf{W}^{(m)} = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)\top} \mathbf{W}^{(m)} = I_{p_m}$ . It then follows that  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top \mathbf{W}^{(m)} = \mathbf{0}$ , which means the columns of  $\mathbf{W}^{(m)}$  are precisely the eigenvectors associated with zero-eigenvalues. In other words, the columns of  $L^{(m)}$  are the  $K_m$  eigenvectors of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$  corresponding to those non-zero eigenvalues, and those non-zero eigenvalues of  $\Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \Sigma_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$  are precisely  $\sigma_1^{2(m)}, \dots, \sigma_K^{2(m)}$ .

Consequently,  $\mathcal{M}(L^{(m)})$  is the temporal subspace spanned by the columns of  $L^{(m)}$ , which are also the eigenvectors corresponding to the spiked eigenvalues of the symmetrized autocovariance matrix of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$ . Therefore, when  $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}) = \mathcal{M}(L^{(2)})$ , we can build a test statistic based on the difference between spiked eigenvalues of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrices of two high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$ . This test statistic is to detect the equivalence of autocovariances for two projected time series in the temporal subspace. In fact, the analysis of  $\mathcal{M}(L^{(m)})$  does not rely on the canonical form (4.2), and is valid for any identification conditions on  $L^{(m)}$ .

In this section, it is worth noting that we typically focus on testing the equivalence of spiked eigenvalues, but not the eigenspace of autocovariance matrices for two high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$ . Consequently, when  $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}) = \mathcal{M}(L^{(2)})$  and  $K_1 = K_2 = K$ , the null and alternative hypotheses of the autocovariance test for  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  with a finite time lag  $\tau$  can be summarized as

**Hypothesis Test.** *Autocovariance test for two high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$*

$$\begin{aligned} H_0: & \mu_{i,\tau}^{(1)} = \mu_{i,\tau}^{(2)} \text{ for all } i = 1, 2, \dots, K \\ H_1: & \mu_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \neq \mu_{i,\tau}^{(2)} \text{ for at least one } i, i = 1, 2, \dots, K \end{aligned}$$

Recall that for factor models in canonical form (4.2), we can write  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)} := \mathbb{E} \left( f_{i,1}^{(m)} f_{i,\tau+1}^{(m)} \right)$  and  $(v_{i,\tau}^{(m)})^2 := \frac{1}{T-\tau} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t}^{(m)} f_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)} \right)$  for a finite time lag  $\tau$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  and  $m = 1, 2$ . Denote by  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  the  $i$ -th largest spiked eigenvalue of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$ , where  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{T-\tau-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} (\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_T^{(m)}) (\mathbf{y}_{t+\tau}^{(m)} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}_T^{(m)})^\top$ , for  $m = 1, 2$ . Then, for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  and some finite  $\tau$ , the test statistic is given by

$$Z_{i,\tau} = \sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_{i,\tau}}{2\sqrt{2}v_{i,\tau}} \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, K, \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\theta_{i,\tau} = \frac{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} + \theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{2}, \quad v_{i,\tau} = \frac{v_{i,\tau}^{(1)} + v_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_{i,\tau} = \frac{\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(1)} + \gamma_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{2}, \quad (4.4)$$

and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  is the asymptotic centering of  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  defined in Proposition 1. It is then clearly that  $|Z_{i,\tau}|$  is generally large if  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  follow different factor models where the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalues of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix for two factor models are different. We name this test by autocovariance test since the idea behind is testing whether two independent high-dimensional time series observations share the same spiked eigenvalues of the autocovariance matrices.

For simplicity, we assume the idiosyncratic components  $\{\epsilon_t^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^{N_m}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T\}$  are independent of the factors  $\{\mathbf{f}_t^{(m)}\}$ , with  $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}) = 0$  for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, N_m$ , and  $\mathbb{E}(\epsilon_t^{(m)})^2 =: \Sigma_\epsilon^{(m)} = \text{diag}\left(\left(\sigma_{\epsilon,1}^{(m)}\right)^2, \left(\sigma_{\epsilon,2}^{(m)}\right)^2, \dots, \left(\sigma_{\epsilon,N_m}^{(m)}\right)^2\right)$ . Without loss of generality, we can again work on standardized factor models in canonical form, where the variance of  $\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}$  is normalized to one, i.e.  $\left(\sigma_{\epsilon,j}^{(m)}\right)^2 = 1$ . This standardization is just a transformation on  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  so that they can be transformed to the same canonical form if they share the same number of factors. For factor models with  $\left(\sigma_{\epsilon,j}^{(m)}\right)^2 \neq 1$ , we can simply standardize them by dividing  $\sigma_{\epsilon,j}^{(m)}$ . In this section, we only consider the case for a fixed time lag  $\tau$  and follow Assumptions 2 to simplify the factor models into canonical form (2.4).

In summary, we consider factor models (4.1) in canonical form with the loading matrix  $L^{(m)}$  defined by (4.2) and the variances of  $\{f_{i,t}^{(m)}\}$  and  $\{\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}\}$  normalized to one. In addition, we assume the data  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$  comes from strong factor models where  $\sigma_i^{(m)}$  is divergent as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$  and  $m = 1, 2$ . Besides, for a general strong factor model that is not in the canonical form (4.2), it can be normalized by standardizing the variance of  $\{\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}\}$  to one first and then rotating the original data such that the loading matrix  $L^{(m)}$  is in the canonical form (4.2). Moreover, recall that for a finite time lag  $\tau$ ,  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)} := \mathbb{E}\left(f_{i,1}^{(m)} f_{i,\tau+1}^{(m)}\right)$  is the population lag- $\tau$  autocovariance of the  $i$ -th factor time series  $\{f_{i,t}^{(m)}\}$ . Following (2.3), (2.7) and (3.4),  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  can be written as

$$\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)} = \mathbb{E}\left(f_{i,1}^{(m)} f_{i,\tau+1}^{(m)}\right) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{i,l}^{(m)} \phi_{i,l+\tau}^{(m)},$$

with the constraint  $\|\phi_i\|_{\ell_2} = 1$ , the population lag- $\tau$  autocovariance can be defined as

$$\mu_{i,\tau}^{(m)} := \mathbb{E}\left(y_{i,t}^{(m)} y_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)}\right) = \left(\sigma_i^{(m)}\right)^2 \gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)},$$

and  $\left(v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{T-\tau} \text{Var}\left(\sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t}^{(m)} f_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)}\right)$  for a finite positive time lag  $\tau$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, K$ , and  $m = 1, 2$ .

If  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  are assumed following the same canonical factor model under Assumptions 1 and 2, independently, it is clearly that  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$  share the same asymptotic distribution as shown in Theorem 2, independently. Therefore, to test whether  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  share the same spiked eigenvalues of the autocovariance matrices, it is natural to create the test statistic (4.3) based on the difference between  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ . When  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  follow the same factor model in the canonical form (4.2), we have the following CLT on the difference between  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, for two independent high-dimensional time series*

$\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  following the same factors in canonical form (4.2), we have

$$Z_{i,\tau} = \sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_{i,\tau}}{2\sqrt{2}v_{i,\tau}} \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad (4.5)$$

as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\theta_{i,\tau}$ ,  $v_{i,\tau}$  and  $\gamma_{i,\tau}$  are defined in (4.4).

Theorem 3 is a direct result of Theorem 2, since an asymptotic distribution of  $\frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}}$  can be derived using the independence between  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ . Consequently, under the null hypothesis of the autocovariance test, the test statistic  $Z_{i,\tau}$  converges weakly to a standard normal random variable when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ . Nonetheless, under certain alternative hypotheses such as  $K_1 = K_2 = K$ , but  $\mu_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \neq \mu_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \neq \theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ , it can be shown in the next theorem that, under a local alternative hypothesis, the power of the autocovariance test converges to 1 as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, if we additionally assume two independent high-dimensional time series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  follow two different canonical factor models (4.2) such that  $K_1 = K_2 = K$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} = (1 + c)\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ . Then, for any  $c$  such that  $\sqrt{T} \frac{2c}{2+c} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \neq \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ , it holds that*

$$Pr(|Z_{i,\tau}| > z_\alpha | H_1) \rightarrow 1, \quad (4.6)$$

for  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $z_\alpha$  is the  $\alpha$ -th quantile of the standard normal distribution.

**Remark 3.** The condition  $\sqrt{T} \frac{2c}{2+c} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$  in Theorem 4 indicates a local alternative hypothesis. It implies that for  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , the power of the test converges to 1 not only for a constant  $c$ , but also for some  $c \rightarrow 0$  as long as  $\sqrt{T}c \rightarrow \infty$ . In other words, this test even works asymptotically for a local alternative hypothesis where the difference between  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$  tends to 0, but slower than  $1/\sqrt{T}$ .

## 4.2 Implementation of testing procedure

The test statistic  $Z_{i,\tau}$  is an infeasible statistic in practice as it involves some unknown parameters  $\gamma_{i,\tau}$ ,  $v_{i,\tau}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}$ . In this part, we will propose a practical procedure for the autocovariance test.

For two high-dimensional time series, the test procedure can be summarized into four steps. Firstly, estimates of the factor models for both populations should be conducted, where the number of factors needs to be determined. Secondly, the original high-dimensional observations and the factor models' estimates need to be standardized to fulfill the canonical factor model (4.2). Thirdly, the quantities required to compute the feasible test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  should be estimated from both populations. Furthermore, we can compute the feasible test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  and its corresponding  $p$ -values for testing the equivalence of eigenvalues. The details of the estimation and testing procedures are illustrated and discussed as follows.

**Step 1:** Estimation of factor models.

For de-means high-dimensional time series observations  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$  with  $m = 1, 2$ , we first compute the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$ , where

$\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{T-\tau-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} \mathbf{y}_{t+\tau}^{(m)\top}$  is the lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$ . By applying spectral (eigenvalue) decomposition on  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$ , we can obtain an estimate of the factor loading matrix as  $\hat{L}_\tau^{(m)} = \left( \hat{L}_{1,\tau}^{(m)}, \hat{L}_{2,\tau}^{(m)}, \dots, \hat{L}_{p,\tau}^{(m)} \right)$  with  $\hat{L}_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  the eigenvector of  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau) \tilde{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{y}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$  corresponding to the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue  $\hat{\lambda}_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ . We then use a ratio-based estimator, which has been considered by [Lam et al. \(2011\)](#), to determine the number of factors. The number of factors is determined as  $\hat{K}_m = \operatorname{argmin}_{1 \leq j \leq R} \hat{\lambda}_{j+1,\tau}^{(m)} / \hat{\lambda}_{j,\tau}^{(m)}$  where  $\hat{\lambda}_{1,\tau}^{(m)} \geq \hat{\lambda}_{2,\tau}^{(m)} \geq \dots \geq \hat{\lambda}_{N_m,\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $R$  is an integer satisfying  $K_m \leq R < N_m$ .

With  $\hat{L}_\tau^{(m)}$ , the factors can then be estimated by  $\hat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)} = \hat{L}_\tau^{(m)\top} \mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}$  and the high-dimensional time series can be recovered by  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)} = \hat{L}_\tau^{(m)} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)}$ . Hence we have estimates of the factor model that is not in the canonical form (4.2) and the residuals can be estimated by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t^{(m)} = \mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} - \hat{L}_\tau^{(m)} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)}. \quad (4.7)$$

Moreover, to standardize the estimated factor model into canonical form (4.2), we need to find an estimate of  $\Sigma_\epsilon^{(m)}$ , the covariance of  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}$ . To achieve that, we can obtain an estimate of the variance of  $\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}$  as

$$\left( \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon,j}^{(m)} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \hat{\epsilon}_{j,t}^{(m)} - \bar{\hat{\epsilon}}_{j,t}^{(m)} \right)^2.$$

And  $\Sigma_\epsilon^{(m)}$  can then be estimated by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} = \operatorname{diag} \left( \left( \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon,1}^{(m)} \right)^2, \left( \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon,2}^{(m)} \right)^2, \dots, \left( \hat{\sigma}_{\epsilon,N_m}^{(m)} \right)^2 \right).$$

**Remark 4.** It is clear that for two high-dimensional time series where the estimated numbers of factors are different, i.e.,  $\hat{K}_1 \neq \hat{K}_2$ , one can conclude that the two high-dimensional data follow different factor models where  $\mathcal{M}(L^{(1)}) \neq \mathcal{M}(L^{(2)})$  and the numbers of spiked eigenvalues for their autocovariance matrices are different. However, if we are interested in testing the equivalence for the particular spiked eigenvalue of the autocovariance matrices for two high-dimensional data, it is still possible to perform the autocovariance test even if  $\hat{K}_1 \neq \hat{K}_2$ . For example, in analyzing mortality data, the first factor represents human characteristics that lead the trend of mortality improvement across ages (see [Lee and Carter, 1992](#); [Li and Lee, 2005](#), for example). Testing the equivalence of the first eigenvalue of autocovariance matrices across countries or regions may tell whether human characteristics are of the same importance in affecting mortality rates across countries. In meteorology, [Zhang et al. \(2022\)](#) study the joint prediction of temperature from multi-stations, where the autocovariance test can be applied since the spiked eigenvalues measure the extent of co-movements of temperature from multi-stations. When predicting human trajectory in crowded spaces (see, [Alahi et al., 2016](#), for example), the spiked eigenvalues can be considered for testing the equivalence of the importance of common sense rules and social conventions in different scenarios. Therefore, The autocovariance test performed based on the first several factors is in its own interest, even if  $\hat{K}_1 \neq \hat{K}_2$ .

**Step 2:** Standardizing factor models to the canonical form.

With  $\widehat{L}_\tau^{(m)}$  and  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)}$ , we can now standardize the estimated factor models (4.7) to fulfill the canonical form. Firstly, we define a  $N_m \times N_m$  matrix  $\mathbf{M}_\tau^{(m)} = \left( \widehat{L}_\tau^{(m)}, \mathbf{0}_{p_m + K_m - \widehat{K}_m} \right)$ . Then we can define  $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)} := \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}_\tau^{(m)\top} \mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}$  for the normalized data and  $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t^{(m)} := \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}$  for the normalized residuals. By left multiplying  $\left( \widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}_\tau^{(m)\top}$ , the estimated factor model is reduced to

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)} = \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2} \mathbf{M}_\tau^{(m)\top} \widehat{L}_\tau^{(m)} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t^{(m)},$$

where note that

$$\mathbf{M}_\tau^{(m)\top} \widehat{L}_\tau^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} I_{\widehat{K}_m} \\ \mathbf{0}_{(p_m + K_m - \widehat{K}_m) \times \widehat{K}_m} \end{pmatrix}.$$

To normalize  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)}$ , we estimate the variance of  $\widehat{f}_{i,t}^{(m)}$  by  $\left( \widehat{\sigma}_i^{(m)} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{T-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \left( \widehat{f}_{i,t}^{(m)} - \overline{\widehat{f}}_{i,t}^{(m)} \right)^2$ , for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, \widehat{K}_m$ . Hence the covariance of  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)}$  can be obtained as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}}^{(m)} = \text{diag} \left( \left( \widehat{\sigma}_1^{(m)} \right)^2, \left( \widehat{\sigma}_2^{(m)} \right)^2, \dots, \left( \widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{K}_m}^{(m)} \right)^2 \right).$$

Write  $\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)} = \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)} \left( \widehat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{f}}^{(m)} \right)^{-1/2}$  for the normalized estimates of factors, and  $\widetilde{L}_\tau^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\widehat{\sigma}_1^{(m)}, \dots, \widehat{\sigma}_{\widehat{K}_m}^{(m)}) \\ \mathbf{0}_{(p_m + K_m - \widehat{K}_m) \times \widehat{K}_m} \end{pmatrix}$  for the estimates of loading matrices. Then we have standardized the estimated factor models to

$$\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)} = \widetilde{L}_\tau^{(m)} \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_t^{(m)}, \quad (4.8)$$

which follows the canonical form defined by (4.2).

**Step 3:** Estimation of unknown parameters in the test statistic.

For standardized data  $\{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)}\}$  following the estimated factor model (4.8),  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  can be computed as the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrix  $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}}^{(m)}(\tau) \widetilde{\Sigma}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}}^{(m)}(\tau)^\top$ , where  $\widetilde{\Sigma}_{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}}^{(m)}(\tau) = \frac{1}{T-\tau-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)} \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_{t+\tau}^{(m)\top}$  and  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  can be estimated from the sample lag- $\tau$  autocovariance of the  $i$ -th estimated factor  $\{\widetilde{f}_{i,t}^{(m)}\}$ . Besides, we also need to estimate the quantities  $v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ , as defined in the autocovariance test, for each sample to compute the test statistic. However, since  $\left( v_{i,\tau}^{(m)} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{T-\tau} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \widetilde{f}_{i,t}^{(m)} \widetilde{f}_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)} \right)$  depends on the variance of  $\sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \widetilde{f}_{i,t}^{(m)} \widetilde{f}_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  is the asymptotic centering of  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ , they cannot be directly estimated from original sample observations. Instead, we can use bootstrap to estimate both quantities. It is worth noting that since the bootstrap is conducted on the estimated low-dimensional factor time series  $\{\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_t^{(m)}\}$ , the bootstrap estimators are not affected by the increasing dimensions.

Therefore, bootstrap methods for time series such as the sieve bootstrap can be conducted on the estimated factors for estimating  $v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ . Next, we will apply the AR-sieve bootstrap method in [Bi et al. \(2021\)](#) to get a bootstrap estimation for the unknown parameters. In specific, an AR( $p$ ) model can be fitted for each estimated factor  $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_i^{(m)}$  and the residuals can be taken as

$$\tilde{u}_{i,t}^{(m)} = \tilde{f}_{i,t}^{(m)} - \sum_{l=1}^p \tilde{\phi}_{i,l}^{(m)} \tilde{f}_{i,t-l}^{(m)},$$

where  $\{\tilde{\phi}_{i,l}^{(m)}, l = 1, 2, \dots, \widehat{K}_m\}$  are the AR coefficients. Then by resampling from the empirical distribution of the centralized residual  $(\tilde{u}_{i,t}^{(m)} - \bar{\tilde{u}}_i^{(m)})$ , the bootstrap factors can be generated as

$$f_{i,t}^{(m)b} = \sum_{l=1}^p \tilde{\phi}_{i,l}^{(m)} f_{i,t-l}^{(m)b} + u_{i,t}^{(m)b},$$

where  $b = 1, 2, \dots, B$  for  $B$  bootstrap samples of  $\{f_{i,t}^{(m)b}\}$  and  $u_{i,t}^{(m)b}$  is the bootstrap residual. Hence, we can estimate  $v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  by

$$\tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T-\tau} \left( \frac{1}{B-1} \sum_{b=1}^B \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t}^{(m)b} f_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)b} - \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t}^{(m)b} f_{i,t+\tau}^{(m)b} \right) \right)^2 \right)}.$$

In addition, since  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  is an estimate of the asymptotic centering of  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ , we can also bootstrap  $\{\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(m)}\}$  by  $\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)b} = \tilde{L}_\tau^{(m)} \mathbf{f}_t^{(m)b}$  for  $B$  times and estimate  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  by  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)b}$ , where  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)b}$  is the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrices of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)b}\}$ . Meanwhile, since the sieve bootstrap is conducted to estimate  $v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ , an alternative estimate of  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  can also be computed based on  $B$  bootstrap samples, as

$$\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \left( \frac{1}{T-\tau-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \left( f_{i,1}^{(m)b} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{i,t}^{(m)b} \right) \left( f_{i,\tau+1}^{(m)b} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T f_{i,t}^{(m)b} \right) \right).$$

**Step 4:** Computing the test statistic and  $p$ -value.

When the first three steps have been conducted on both high-dimensional times series  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$ , we can estimate the unknown parameters in (4.3) by

$$\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^* := \frac{T_1 \tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(1)*} + T_2 \tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(2)*}}{T_1 + T_2}, \quad \tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^* := \frac{T_1 \tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(1)*} + T_2 \tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(2)*}}{T_1 + T_2}, \quad \tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^* := \frac{T_1 \tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(1)*} + T_2 \tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(2)*}}{T_1 + T_2},$$

where  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  are computed from two high-dimensional time series following the procedure in Step 3. Then, the test statistic can be computed as

$$\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau} := \left( \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)} \right) \sqrt{\frac{T_1 T_2}{T_1 + T_2} \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^*}{2 \tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^* \tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^*}}, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$  are the  $i$ -th ( $1 \leq i \leq \widehat{K}$ ) largest eigenvalues of the symmetrized lag- $\tau$  sample autocovariance matrices for the standardized data  $\{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_t^{(2)}\}$ , respectively. At last, the  $p$ -values of the test statistic  $\widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  are computed as  $\Pr(z > |\widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau}|) = 2(1 - \Phi(|\widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau}|))$  for a two-sided test, and  $\Pr(z > \widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau}) = 1 - \Phi(\widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau})$  or  $\Pr(z < \widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau}) = \Phi(\widetilde{Z}_{i,\tau})$  for one-sided tests, where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  denotes the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of a standard normal random variable.

To clarify the four steps mentioned above, a flow chart is provided in Figure 1, which summarizes the basic logic and procedure for the autocovariance test.




Figure 1: Flow chart for the autocovariance test

## 5 Simulation studies

This section uses numerical simulations to investigate the empirical sizes and powers of the proposed autocovariance test.

To start, we first of all explore the empirical sizes of the autocovariance test under various scenarios, including various orders of factor strength and ratios between the sample size and the data dimension. In this section of simulation studies, we again write  $N_m := K_m + p_m$  as the data dimension of  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)}\}$  and consider only the case that  $N_1 = N_2 =: N$  for simplicity. We assume the high-dimensional observations  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{\mathbf{y}_t^{(2)}\}$  are generated from the one-factor model  $\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} = L^{(m)}\mathbf{f}_t^{(m)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}$  in the canonical form (4.2). Moreover, we assume that the factors  $\{f_{1,t}^{(m)}\}$  for both time series follow AR(1) models with zero means, AR coefficients  $\phi_1^{(m)} = 0.5$  and variances equal to 1. In other words, the factors for both time series are generated by

$$f_{1,t}^{(m)} = \phi_1^{(m)} f_{1,t-1}^{(m)} + z_{1,t}^{(m)}, \quad m = 1, 2, \quad (5.1)$$

where  $\phi_1^{(m)} = 0.5$  and  $\{z_{1,t}^{(m)}\}$  are i.i.d  $\mathcal{N}\left(0, \left(\sigma_z^{(m)}\right)^2\right)$  with  $\left(\sigma_z^{(m)}\right)^2 = 1/\left(1 - \left(\phi_1^{(m)}\right)^2\right) = 3/4$ , so that  $Var\left(f_{1,t}^{(m)}\right) = 1$ . As discussed for the canonical form of factor models, the variance  $\left(\sigma_i^{(m)}\right)^2$  of unnormalized factors are contained in the loading matrix  $L^{(m)}$ . To study the empirical sizes of the autocovariance test under various factor strengths, we consider the case  $\left(\sigma_1^{(m)}\right)^2 \asymp N^{1-\delta}$  for  $\delta \in [0, 1)$  utilized in Lam et al. (2011). Using this definition,  $\delta = 0$  refers to

the strongest factors with the pervasiveness, and factor strengths drop when  $\delta$  increases from 0 to 1. In this section, we consider four different cases for factor strengths, where  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3,$  and  $0.5$ . Specifically,  $\left(\sigma_1^{(m)}\right)^2$  in the loading matrix  $L^{(m)}$  that follows canonical form (4.2) is assumed to be  $N, N^{0.9}, N^{0.7},$  and  $N^{0.5}$ , respectively, and  $\left\{\epsilon_{j,t}^{(m)}\right\}$  are assumed to be i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ .

In summary, both  $N$ -dimensional time series observations are generated by

$$\mathbf{y}_t^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_1^{(m)} \\ \mathbf{0}_{N-1} \end{pmatrix} f_{1,t}^{(m)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t^{(m)}, \quad m = 1, 2, \quad (5.2)$$

where  $\sigma_1^{(m)} = N^{1-\delta}$ ,  $\{\epsilon_{j,t}\}$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , and  $\{f_{1,t}^{(m)}\}$  are generated by (5.1).

To explore the impact of ratios between sample size  $T$  and data dimension  $N$ , we generate data with  $T = 400, 800$  and  $N = 100, 200, 400, 800, 1600$ . To compute the empirical sizes, for each combination of  $T, N$  and  $\delta$ , the observations of two high-dimensional time series are first of all generated. Then, by utilizing the estimation and testing procedures in Section 4.2, the test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  can be computed by (4.9), where  $B = 500$  bootstrap samples are generated to compute  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}, \tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ , and the numbers of factors are assumed to be known (i.e.,  $\tilde{K}_m = 1$ ) for both samples. The empirical sizes of a one-sided autocovariance test for  $i = 1,$   $\tau = 1,$  and significant level  $\alpha = 0.1$  are computed as the empirical probabilities that  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$  is less than  $z_\alpha$  or greater than  $z_{1-\alpha}$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{Z}_{1,1}(m) < z_\alpha\}, \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{1}\{\tilde{Z}_{1,1}(m) > z_{1-\alpha}\},$$

for  $M = 500$  Monte Carlo simulations, where  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}(m)$  is the test statistic computed from the  $m$ -th simulation.




Figure 2: Empirical sizes of the autocovariance test in the first scenario with  $T = 400, 800,$   $N = 100, 200, 400, 800, 1600,$  and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ .

As presented in Figure 2, despite some minor fluctuations, the empirical sizes of the autocovariance test are close to the nominal significant level  $\alpha = 0.1$  for all choices of  $N, T$  and  $\delta$ . That is, when the numbers of factors are known or can be correctly estimated, the nominal type-I errors of the autocovariance test can be verified via empirical simulation studies for  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5,$   $T = 400, 800,$  and  $N = 100, 200, 400, 800, 1600$ . The choice of  $\tau = 1$  for the



autocovariance test is to acquire the most information on temporal dependence of the observations and to achieve the best accuracy on corresponding estimators  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ , while other choices of finite  $\tau$  may be considered with cautions as the temporal correlation  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  tends to 0 when  $\tau$  increases.

To study the empirical powers of the autocovariance test, we notice that for two high-dimensional time series following factor models that are normalized to the canonical form (4.8), the difference between spiked eigenvalues  $\mu_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ ,  $m = 1, 2$  may arise from either the difference between factor strength  $(\sigma_i^{(m)})^2$ ,  $m = 1, 2$  or the difference between temporal autocorrelation  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ ,  $m = 1, 2$ . Therefore, to empirically investigate the autocovariance test's power, we study two typical scenarios where either variances or autocorrelations of factors are different between two factor models. We are particularly interested in whether the autocovariance test's empirical power grows with the difference between variances or autocorrelations for two high-dimensional time series.

Specifically, to explore the impacts of  $\delta$ ,  $N$  and  $T$  on empirical powers, we again generate observations from two populations with  $T = 400, 800$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ . The data in the first population is generated by (5.2), which is precisely the same as we study the empirical sizes, while the data in the second population is generated with a different  $\sigma_1^{(2)}$  or  $\phi_1^{(2)}$  in the factor model. In the current work, we study the impact of variance numerically while left the investigation on the autocorrelations to the supplement. We keep the temporal autocorrelation unchanged, i.e. AR coefficient  $\phi_1^{(2)}$  is the same as  $\phi_1^{(1)}$  (i.e.  $\phi_1^{(2)} = \phi_1^{(1)} = 0.5$ ), and set  $(\sigma_1^{(2)})^2 = 1.1 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2, 1.3 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2, 1.5 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2, 1.7 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2, 1.9 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2$ , respectively. By doing that, we can investigate how the empirical powers of the autocovariance test are affected by the difference between variances of factors in two factor models. Moreover, it is worth to mention that when generating  $\{f_{i,t}^{(1)}\}$  and  $\{f_{i,t}^{(2)}\}$ ,  $\{z_{1,t}^{(1)}\}$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}\left(0, (\sigma_z^{(1)})^2\right)$  with  $(\sigma_z^{(1)})^2 = 1/\left(1 - (\phi_1^{(1)})^2\right)$ , whereas  $\{z_{1,t}^{(2)}\}$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}\left(0, (\sigma_z^{(2)})^2\right)$  with  $(\sigma_z^{(2)})^2 = 1/\left(1 - (\phi_1^{(2)})^2\right)$ .

To compute the empirical powers, for each combination of  $T$ ,  $N$  and  $\delta$ , two high-dimensional time series observations are generated first. Then, we can follow the estimation and testing procedures in Section 4.2 and compute the test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  by (4.9), where again  $B = 500$  bootstrap samples are generated to find  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  for both samples with the number of factors assumed to be known (i.e.,  $\tilde{K}_m = 1$ ). Lastly, based on  $M = 500$  Monte Carlo simulations, the empirical powers of a one-sided autocovariance test for  $i = 1$ ,  $\tau = 1$ , and  $\alpha = 0.1$  can be estimated by the empirical probability that  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$  is less than  $z_\alpha$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{Z}_{1,1}^{(m)} < z_\alpha\}},$$

where we have assumed  $\mu_{1,1}^{(1)} < \mu_{1,1}^{(2)}$  for various choices of  $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ .

Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with various choices of  $N$ ,  $T$ , and  $\delta$  are presented in Figures 3 to 4. It is clear that for all combinations of  $N$  and  $T$ , empirical powers increase towards 1 when  $(\sigma_1^{(2)})^2$  increases from  $1.1 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2$  to  $1.9 (\sigma_1^{(1)})^2$ . Therefore, numerical results in Figure 3 and 4 suggest that the autocovariance test can correctly reject the null hypothesis when two high-dimensional time series follow factor models with different variances of factors.

Besides, despite the common temporal autocorrelation, for the same amount of increase in  $\sigma_1^{(2)}/\sigma_1^{(1)}$ , the empirical powers of one-sided autocovariance tests for  $T = 800$  are generally higher than those associated with  $T = 400$ , which can be justified by the order  $\sqrt{T}$  in (4.3). In detail, a larger value of  $T$  could incur a larger power. Also, the powers of stronger factor models with smaller  $\delta$  are slightly higher than those of weaker factor models with larger  $\delta$ , especially for  $T = 400$ .




Figure 3: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ .




Figure 4: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 800$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ .

## 6 Hierarchical Clustering for Multi-country Mortality Data

To incorporate the proposed autocovariance test into hierarchical clustering analysis on real-world data, we study age-specific mortality rates from countries worldwide. In the past century, age-specific mortality rates have received massive attention, especially by insurance companies and governments, as accurate forecasting of mortality rates is crucial for the pricing of life insurance products and is highly related to social and economic policies. Among many works on forecasting age-specific mortality rates, the Lee-Carter model (Lee and Carter, 1992) is

prevalent and has been used globally. Despite some extensions on the original model (see, e.g., [Hyndman and Shahid Ullah, 2007](#); [Li et al., 2013](#)), one drawback of the Lee-Carter model is that it only focuses on the death rates of a single country, therefore may produce quite different long-run forecasts of mortality rates from different countries.

This section uses the proposed autocovariance test to explore multiple countries' mortality data, especially the spiked eigenvalues of the autocovariance matrices, and proposes a novel hierarchical clustering method for mortality data from different countries. To achieve this, we collect the total death rates for various countries from the Human Mortality Database ([University of California, Berkeley \(USA\) and Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research \(Germany\), 2018](#)). The plots of log mortality rates for Australia and Belgium are shown in Figure 5 as an example, where similar patterns are observed for mortality rates in both countries. For the best quality of data, we choose the death rates from age 0 to 90 and require each country's sample size to be relatively large. As a consequence, we study countries with total death rates available from 1957 to 2017. Besides, for countries with small populations, zero death rates are replaced by the averages of death rates in adjacent years. In summary, the data we study has dimension  $N = 91$  and sample size  $T = 60$  for each country.




Figure 5: Observed time series of log death rates in Australia

According to the estimation and testing procedure in Section 4.2, factor models in canonical form (4.2) are firstly estimated and normalized from the differenced log death rates for each country. In the meantime, the number of factors in the factor model for each country is estimated and compared. As shown in Table 1, for most countries, there is only one factor estimated from the differenced log death rates, while there are some exceptions where two, three, and five factors are estimated. For countries with the same number of factors, we can compute the test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  to test the equivalence of the temporal covariance in the temporal subspace. For the best accuracy in estimating the number of factors and temporal dependence among death rates, the autocovariance test is performed based on  $\tau = 1$  throughout this section.

For countries with one factor, the test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$  for each pair of countries can be computed by following the procedure in Section 4.2. For all other countries with one factor, the  $p$ -values associated with all test statistics are computed. As illustrated in Figure 6, the spiked eigenvalues of the autocovariance matrices in the majority of European countries are similar as most  $p$ -values of test statistics between two European countries are greater than 0.1. However, the  $p$ -values between Finland and Bulgaria, the U.K., and Finland are relatively small. Following the results of the autocovariance test between each pair of countries with the same number of factors, a hierarchical clustering method can be proposed where the dissimilarity can be measured using the  $p$ -value, such as  $(1-p)$ -value or  $(1/p)$ -value. For the analysis of mortality

Table 1: Estimated number of factors in the factor model for each country

Estimated number of factors	Countries
1	Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czechia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Netherlands, Sweden, Switzerland, U.K.
2	Denmark
3	Canada, France, Italy, Portugal
5	Poland

data, we define the dissimilarity for all countries with one factor as  $(1-p)$ -value, and the result of hierarchical clustering using average linkage for all countries with one factor is presented in Figure 6.




Figure 6:  $p$ -values of the autocovariance test and the cluster dendrogram for countries that have one factor in the estimated factor model

For countries with more than one factor, a more sophisticated testing and clustering procedure can be developed to incorporate multiple test statistics for different factors. This procedure and the corresponding empirical results are, to some extent, beyond the scope of the current work hence is discussed in the supplement.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 72201093, 12001518).

## DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in the Human Mortality Database (HMD) at <https://mortality.org/>.

# CONFLICTS OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors declared that they have no conflicts of interest to this work.

## References

- Alahi, A., K. Goel, V. Ramanathan, A. Robicquet, L. Fei-Fei, and S. Savarese (2016). Social lstm: Human trajectory prediction in crowded spaces. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pp. 961–971.
- Bai, J. and K. Li. Statistical analysis of factor models of high dimension. *Ann. Statist.* *40*(1), 436–465.
- Bai, J. and S. Ng (2002). Determining the Number of Factors in Approximate Factor Models. *Econometrica* *70*(1), 191–221.
- Bai, Z. and J.-f. Yao (2008). Central limit theorems for eigenvalues in a spiked population model. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* *44*(3), 447–474.
- Bai, Z. D. and J. W. Silverstein (1998). No eigenvalues outside the support of the limiting spectral distribution of large-dimensional sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Probability* *26*(1), 316–345.
- Bao, Z., X. Ding, and K. Wang (2018). Singular vector and singular subspace distribution for the matrix denoising model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.10476*.
- Bao, Z., G. Pan, and W. Zhou (2015). Universality for the largest eigenvalue of sample covariance matrices with general population.
- Berk, K. N. (1973). A Central Limit Theorem for  $m$ -Dependent Random Variables with Unbounded  $m$ . *The Annals of Probability* *1*(2), 352 – 354.
- Bi, D., H. L. Shang, Y. Yang, and H. Zhu (2021). Ar-sieve bootstrap for high-dimensional time series. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.00414*.
- Bose, A. and M. Bhattacharjee (2018). *Large Covariance and Autocovariance Matrices*. CRC Press.
- Bose, A. and W. Hachem (2021). Spectral measures of empirical autocovariance matrices of high dimensional gaussian stationary processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08523*.
- Böttcher, A. and B. Silbermann (1999). *Introduction to Large Truncated Toeplitz Matrices*. Universitext. New York: Springer .
- Box, G. E. P. and G. C. Tiao (1977). A canonical analysis of multiple time series. *Biometrika* *64*(2), 355–365.
- Brockwell, P. J., R. A. Davis, and S. E. Fienberg (1991). *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. New York: Springer.

- Cai, T., X. Han, and G. Pan (2020). Limiting laws for divergent spiked eigenvalues and largest nonspiked eigenvalue of sample covariance matrices. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(3), 1255 – 1280.
- Donoho, D. L. (2000). High-dimensional data analysis: the curses and blessings of dimensionality. *AMS Math Challenges Lecture*, 1–32.
- Fan, J., Y. Fan, X. Han, and J. Lv (2022). Asymptotic theory of eigenvectors for random matrices with diverging spikes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association: Theory and Methods* 117(538), 996–1009.
- Fan, J., Y. Liao, and M. Mincheva (2013). Large Covariance Estimation by Thresholding Principal Orthogonal Complements. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* 75(4).
- Hyndman, R. J. and M. Shahid Ullah (2007). Robust forecasting of mortality and fertility rates: A functional data approach. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 51(10), 4942–4956.
- Johnstone, I. M. (2001). On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of statistics* 29, 295–327.
- Lam, C. and Q. Yao (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: Inference for the number of factors. *The Annals of Statistics* 40(2), 694–726.
- Lam, C., Q. Yao, and N. Bathia (2011). Estimation of latent factors for high-dimensional time series. *Biometrika* 98(4), 901–918.
- Lee, J. O. and K. Schnelli (2016). Tracy–widom distribution for the largest eigenvalue of real sample covariance matrices with general population.
- Lee, R. D. and L. R. Carter (1992). Modeling and Forecasting U. S. Mortality. *Journal of the American Statistical Association: Applications and Case Studies* 87(419), 659–671.
- Li, N. and R. Lee (2005). Coherent mortality forecasts for a group of populations: An extension of the lee-carter method. *Demography* 42(3), 575–594.
- Li, N., R. Lee, and P. Gerland (2013). Extending the Lee-Carter method to model the rotation of age patterns of mortality-decline for long-term projection. *Demography* 50(6), 2037–2051.
- Li, Z., G. Pan, and J. Yao (2015). On singular value distribution of large-dimensional autocovariance matrices. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 137, 119–140.
- Li, Z., Q. Wang, and J. Yao (2017). Identifying the number of factors from singular values of a large sample auto-covariance matrix. *The Annals of Statistics* 45(1), 257–288.
- Pena, D. and G. E. P. Box (1987). Identifying a simplifying structure in time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association: Theory and Methods* 82(399), 836–843.
- Riordan, J. (2012). *Introduction to Combinatorial Analysis*. New York: Courier Corporation.
- Silin, I. and J. Fan (2020). Hypothesis testing for eigenspaces of covariance matrix. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.09810*.

- Tang, C., H. L. Shang, and Y. Yang (2022). Clustering and forecasting multiple functional time series. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 16(4), 2523 – 2553.
- Tiao, G. C. and R. S. Tsay (1989). Model specification in multivariate time series. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)* 51(2), 157–213.
- University of California, Berkeley (USA) and Max Planck Institute for Demographic Research (Germany) (2018). *Human Mortality Database*. [www.mortality.org](http://www.mortality.org) [Accessed: 2018.07.10].
- Wang, Q. and J. Yao (2015). On singular values distribution of a large auto-covariance matrix in the ultra-dimensional regime. *Random Matrices: Theory Appl.* 04(04), 1550015.
- Wang, Q. and J. Yao (2016). Moment approach for singular values distribution of a large auto-covariance matrix. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Probab. Statist.* 52(4), 1641–1666.
- Wang, Q. and J. Yao (2017). Extreme eigenvalues of large-dimensional spiked Fisher matrices with application. *The Annals of Statistics* 45(1), 415–460.
- Yao, J. and W. Yuan (2021). On eigenvalue distributions of large auto-covariance matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.09165*.
- Zhang, J., P. Wu, X. Xu, M. Han, and B. Pan (2022). Pcs-lstm: A hybrid deep learning model for multi-stations joint temperature prediction based on periodicity and closeness. *Neurocomputing* 501, 151–161.

# Supplement to “Spiked eigenvalues of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices: CLT and applications”

Danqing Bi, Xiao Han, Adam Nie, Yanrong Yang

This supplementary material contains technical proofs of results in the original paper ‘Spiked eigenvalues of high-dimensional sample autocovariance matrices: CLT and applications’. In Appendix A, proofs of Lemma 1, Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 are presented. The proof of Theorem 2 is located in Appendix B and technical lemmas are collected in Appendixes C and D. Lastly, Appendix E to G collects technical proof and additional numerical results for the autocovariance test and its application on the multi-country mortality data.

## Appendix A Proofs of Lemma 1, Theorem 1 and Proposition 1

*Proof of Lemma 1.* (a) of the lemma can be found in Cai et al. (2020), here we give a proof for (b). Since  $X_0^\top X_0$  is symmetric and positive definite, we have

$$\|X_0^\top X_0\| \leq \text{tr}(X_0^\top X_0) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{i=1}^K \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} x_{it}^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2.$$

By (a) of Lemma 5 (whose proof does not depend the current lemma) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2 \right] = \sigma_i^2 + 1, \quad \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2 \right) = O \left( \frac{\sigma_i^4}{T} \right). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Taking a union bound we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left( \|X_0^\top X_0\| > 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2 > 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2 > 2\sigma_i^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbb{P} \left( \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2 - (\sigma_i^2 + 1) > \sigma_i^2 - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally by Chebyshev’s inequality and (A.1) we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left( \|X_0^\top X_0\| > 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right) = O \left( \frac{K \sigma_i^4}{(\sigma_i^2 - 1)^2 T} \right) = O \left( \frac{K}{T} \right).$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We shall write  $\Lambda_n(A)$  for the  $n$ -th largest eigenvalue of a matrix  $A$ . Note that the non-zero eigenvalues of  $\hat{\Sigma}_\tau \hat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top = Y_\tau Y_0^\top Y_0 Y_\tau^\top$  coincide with those of the matrix  $Y_0^\top Y_0 Y_\tau^\top Y_\tau = (X_0^\top X_0 + E_0^\top E_0)(X_\tau^\top X_\tau + E_\tau^\top E_\tau)$ . We first show that the eigenvalue  $\Lambda_n(\hat{\Sigma}_\tau \hat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top)$  is close to  $\Lambda_n(X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top X_\tau)$ . By Weyl’s inequality (Lemma B.1 of Fan et al. (2013)) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Lambda_n(\hat{\Sigma}_\tau \hat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top) - \Lambda_n(X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top X_\tau) \right| &= \left| \Lambda_n(Y_0^\top Y_0 Y_\tau^\top Y_\tau) - \Lambda_n(X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top X_\tau) \right| \\ &\leq \|X_0^\top X_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau + E_0^\top E_0 X_\tau^\top X_\tau + E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau\| = O_p(K \sigma_1^2), \end{aligned}$$



where the last equality follows from (2.19). Dividing by  $\mu_{n,\tau} = \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2$  we have

$$\frac{\Lambda_n(\hat{\Sigma}_\tau \hat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top) - \Lambda_n(X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)}{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2} = O_p \left( \frac{K \sigma_1^2}{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2} \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Next we compute  $\Lambda_n(X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)$  in more details. It is shown in Lemma 5 that

$$(X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} = \mathbb{E}[(X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij}] + O_{L^2}(\sigma_i \sigma_j T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where from equation (C.6) we know  $\mathbb{E}[(X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij}] = 1_{i=j} \sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)$ . Therefore for any  $i \neq j$ , the off-diagonal elements of  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$  can be written into

$$\begin{aligned} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} &= \sum_{k=1}^K (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ki} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{kj} \\ &= (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} + (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ji} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{jj} + \sum_{k \neq i, j} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ki} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{kj} \\ &= O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^3 \sigma_j \gamma_i(\tau) + \sigma_i \sigma_j^3 \gamma_j(\tau)}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sigma_i^3 \sigma_j + \sigma_i \sigma_j^3 + \sigma_i \sigma_j \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{T} \right) \\ &= O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i \sigma_j (\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau) + \sigma_j^2 \gamma_j(\tau))}{\sqrt{T}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where the last line follows from Assumptions 2 and 3. This gives

$$\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1/2} \mu_{j,\tau}^{-1/2} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} = O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i}{\sigma_j \gamma_j(\tau) \sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma_i \gamma_i(\tau) \sqrt{T}} \right)$$

Similarly, the diagonal elements of  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} &= (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii}^2 + \sum_{k \neq i} (X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ki}^2 \\ &= (\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau) + O_{L^2}(\sigma_i^2 T^{-1/2}))^2 + O_{L^1}(\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2 T^{-1}) \\ &= \mu_{i,\tau} + O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sigma_i^4 + \sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{T} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Using Assumptions 2 and 3 again we have

$$\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} = 1 + O_{L^1} \left( \frac{1}{\gamma_i(\tau) \sqrt{T}} \right).$$

Using (A.4), (A.5) and taking a union bound over  $i, j$  we obtain

$$\text{diag}(\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1/2}) X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top \text{diag}(\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1/2}) = I_K + O_{p,\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\alpha_T), \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where

$$\alpha_T := \frac{K^2}{\sqrt{T}} \sup_{ij} \frac{\sigma_j}{\sigma_i \gamma_i(\tau)}.$$

Let  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_K$  be the eigenvalues of  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$  arranged in decreasing order. Let  $\omega$  be one of these eigenvalues. Define the function

$$G(\omega) := \text{diag}(\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1/2}) (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top - \omega I_K) \text{diag}(\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1/2}),$$

then clearly we have  $0 = |X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top - \omega I_K| = |G(\omega)|$ . From (A.6) we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = |G(\omega)| &= |I_K + O_{p,\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\alpha_T) - \omega \text{diag}(\mu_{i,\tau}^{-1})| \\ &= |I_K - \text{diag}(\omega \mu_i^{-1}) + O_{p,\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\alpha_T)|, \end{aligned}$$

and using Leibniz's formula analogous to the derivation of (B.41) we obtain

$$0 = |G(\omega)| = \prod_{i=1}^K G(\omega)_{ii} + O_p(\alpha_T^2). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Since  $\prod_i G(\omega)_{ii} = o_p(1)$ , there is at least one  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that  $G(\omega)_{ii} = o_p(1)$ . Now we claim that in fact there can be only one such  $i$ . Indeed, suppose for a contradiction that for some  $i < j$  we have  $G(\omega)_{ii} = o_p(1)$  and  $G(\omega)_{jj} = o_p(1)$ . By Assumption 2 or 3 we know that

$$G(\omega)_{ii} - G(\omega)_{jj} = \omega(\mu_i^{-1} - \mu_j^{-1}) \geq \omega \mu_i^{-1} \epsilon \quad (\text{A.8})$$

for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , which implies  $\omega \mu_i^{-1} = o_p(1)$ . However, this is clearly impossible since  $G(\omega)_{ii}$  is assumed to be  $o_p(1)$ .

Therefore, for (A.7) to hold, there must exist some  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  such that

$$0 = G(\omega)_{ii} + O_p(\alpha_T^2),$$

which gives one solution to  $|G(\omega)| = 0$ . On the other hand, note that  $|G(\omega)| = 0$  has  $K$  solutions in total. By the above arguments, it should be clear that each solution then corresponds to a particular  $i \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ , i.e. the  $K$  solutions to  $|G(\omega)| = 0$  satisfy the system of equations

$$0 = G(\omega)_{ii} + O_p(\alpha_T^2), \quad i = 1, \dots, K.$$

Using (A.5), we see that each  $G(\omega)_{ii}$  satisfies

$$G(\omega)_{ii} = \frac{(X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} - \omega}{\mu_{i,\tau}} = 1 - \frac{\omega}{\mu_{i,\tau}} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i(\tau)\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

which implies that the  $K$  solutions to  $|G(\omega)| = 0$  satisfy the system of equations

$$\frac{\omega}{\mu_{i,\tau}} - 1 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i(\tau)\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad i = 1, \dots, K. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Note that by definition there are  $K$  possible choices of  $\omega$ , which are the order eigenvalues of  $X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top$ . Since  $\{\mu_{i,\tau}\}$  are ordered under Assumption 2 or asymptotically ordered under Assumption 3, we can easily conclude that

$$\frac{\Lambda_i(X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)}{\mu_{i,\tau}} - 1 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i(\tau)\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

Combining this result with (A.2) we get

$$\frac{\Lambda_i(\hat{\Sigma}_\tau \hat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top)}{\mu_{i,\tau}} - 1 = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\gamma_i(\tau)\sqrt{T}} + \frac{K\sigma_1^2}{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2}\right)$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

*proof of Proposition 1.* We first consider the invertibility of the matrix  $Q(a)$  defined in (2.16). Recall the matrix  $R(a)$  from (2.11) and the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$  from (2.18). Since  $a \asymp \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\|E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}\|$  is bounded by definition of  $\mathcal{B}_2$ , the matrix  $I - a^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0$  is invertible under  $\mathcal{B}_2$  and we have  $\|R(a)\|_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O(1)$ . Therefore we have  $\|a^{-1} X_0 R_a E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top\|_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O(\sigma_n^{-2} \gamma_n(\tau)^{-2}) = o(1)$  and thus  $Q(a)$  is invertible under  $\mathcal{B}_2$  for  $T$  large enough.

It will be shown in Lemma 6 that

$$\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{nn} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \frac{\sigma_n^2 \gamma_n(\tau)}{\sqrt{a}} + o(1), \quad \mathbb{E}[B(a)_{nn} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = o(1), \quad \mathbb{E}[Q(a)_{nn}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}] = 1 + o(1).$$

From (3.3) we have  $a^{-1/2} \sigma_n^2 \gamma_n(\tau) \asymp O(1)$ , using which we can obtain

$$g(a) = 1 - \mathbb{E}[A(a) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}]_{nn}^2 \mathbb{E}[Q(a)_{nn}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + o(1) = 1 - \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2}{a} + o(1).$$

Substituting the endpoints of the interval (3.3) into the function  $g$ , we have

$$g((1 \pm \epsilon) \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 \pm \epsilon} + o(1) = \frac{\mp \epsilon}{1 \pm \epsilon} + o(1).$$

For  $T$  large enough, the signs of  $g$  differ at the two endpoints of the interval (3.3) and therefore  $g$  has a root inside the interval. It is not difficult to observe that  $g$  is a monotone function in  $a$  for  $T$  large enough which implies the root is unique.  $\square$

## Appendix B Proof of Theorem 2

We begin with the statements and proofs of the four propositions described in Section 3 of the paper. The proof of our main result Theorem 2 is given at the end of this appendix.

We first give an expression for  $\delta := \delta_{n,\tau}$ . Recall the matrix  $M$  from (3.6)

$$M := I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R X_\tau^\top - \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1} X_0 R X_\tau^\top.$$

**Proposition 2.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3 hold. Then the ratio  $\delta$  is the solution to the following equation*

$$\det \left( M + \frac{\delta}{\theta} X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \right) = 0. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

*Proof.* Suppose  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top$ , then  $\sqrt{\lambda}$  is a singular value of the matrix  $\widehat{\Sigma}_\tau$ , or equivalently an eigenvalue of the  $(2p + 2K) \times (2p + 2K)$  matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & X_\tau X_0^\top & X_\tau E_0^\top \\ 0 & 0 & E_\tau X_0^\top & E_\tau E_0^\top \\ X_0 X_\tau^\top & X_0 E_\tau^\top & 0 & 0 \\ E_0 X_\tau^\top & E_0 E_\tau^\top & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By definition the eigenvalue  $\lambda$  satisfies

$$0 = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda} I_{K+p} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \sqrt{\lambda} I_{K+p}^\top \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_\tau^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda} I_K & 0 & -X_\tau X_0^\top & -X_\tau E_0^\top \\ 0 & \sqrt{\lambda} I_p & -E_\tau X_0^\top & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -X_0 X_\tau^\top & -X_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda} I_K & 0 \\ -E_0 X_\tau^\top & -E_0 E_\tau^\top & 0 & \sqrt{\lambda} I_p \end{pmatrix} \right|,$$

which, after interchanging the columns and rows, becomes

$$0 = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_K & -X_\tau X_0^\top & 0 & -X_\tau E_0^\top \\ -X_0 X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_K & -X_0 E_\tau^\top & 0 \\ 0 & -E_\tau X_0^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -E_0 X_\tau^\top & 0 & -E_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p \end{pmatrix} \right|. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

From Theorem 1 we know that the spiked eigenvalue  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . From Lemma 1 we recall that the spectral norm of  $E_\tau E_0^\top$  is bounded with probability tending to 1 as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore the bottom right sub-matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_p & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -E_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p \end{pmatrix}$  is invertible with probability tending to 1. Using the matrix identity

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} (A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} & -A^{-1}B(D - CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \\ -D^{-1}C(A - BD^{-1}C)^{-1} & (D - CA^{-1}B)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

we can compute the inverse of the submatrix  $\begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_p & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -E_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p \end{pmatrix}$  and get

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_p & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -E_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \left(\sqrt{\lambda}I_p - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top\right)^{-1} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_\tau E_0^\top \left(\sqrt{\lambda}I_p - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top\right)^{-1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_0 E_\tau^\top \left(\sqrt{\lambda}I_p - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top\right)^{-1} & \left(\sqrt{\lambda}I_p - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda}}E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top\right)^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}(\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} & E_\tau E_0^\top (\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} \\ E_0 E_\tau^\top (\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} & \sqrt{\lambda}(\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \alpha \\ \beta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \beta^\top \\ \alpha^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha D \alpha^\top & \alpha C \beta^\top \\ \beta B \alpha^\top & \beta A \beta^\top \end{pmatrix}.$$

Substituting the above computations back into (B.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_K & -X_\tau X_0^\top \\ -X_0 X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_K \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -X_\tau E_0^\top \\ -X_0 E_\tau^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_p & -E_\tau E_0^\top \\ -E_0 E_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_p \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -E_\tau X_0^\top \\ -E_0 X_\tau^\top & 0 \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}I_K & -X_\tau X_0^\top \\ -X_0 X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}I_K \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} X_\tau E_0^\top \sqrt{\lambda}(\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} E_0 X_\tau^\top & X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top (\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} E_\tau X_0^\top \\ X_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top (\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} E_0 X_\tau^\top & X_0 E_\tau^\top \sqrt{\lambda}(\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} E_\tau X_0^\top \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ &= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}(I_K - X_\tau E_0^\top (\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} E_0 X_\tau^\top) & -X_\tau (I_{T-\tau} + E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top (\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} E_\tau) X_0^\top \\ -X_0 (I_{T-\tau} + E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top (\lambda I_p - E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top)^{-1} E_0) X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}(I_K - X_0 E_\tau^\top (\lambda I_p - E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top)^{-1} E_\tau) X_0^\top \end{pmatrix} \right|, \\ &= \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda}(I_K - X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 (\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} X_\tau^\top) & -X_\tau (I_{T-\tau} + E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau (\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_0^\top E_0 E_\tau^\top E_\tau)^{-1}) X_0^\top \\ -X_0 (I_{T-\tau} + (\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0) X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda}(I_K - X_0 (\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau) X_0^\top \end{pmatrix} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by (2.13). Recalling the notations we introduced in Section 2 and identity (2.12), we obtain

$$0 = \left| \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\lambda} \bar{Q}_\lambda & -X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top \\ -X_0 R_\lambda X_\tau^\top & \sqrt{\lambda} Q_\lambda \end{pmatrix} \right| = |\bar{Q}_\lambda - \lambda^{-1} X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1} X_0 R_\lambda X_\tau^\top|. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Next, we center  $\lambda$  around the quantity  $\theta$  defined in (3.2). Since  $\lambda$  and  $\theta$  diverge, they are outside of the spectrum of  $E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0$  with probability tending to 1. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda}R_\lambda - \frac{1}{\theta}R &= (\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} - (\theta I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} \\ &= (\theta - \lambda)(\lambda I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1}(\theta I_{T-\tau} - E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0)^{-1} = -\frac{\delta}{\lambda}R_\lambda R. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back into itself, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}R_\lambda = \frac{1}{\theta}R - \delta \left[ \frac{1}{\theta}R - \frac{\delta}{\lambda}R_\lambda R \right] R = \frac{1}{\theta}R - \frac{\delta}{\theta}R^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{\lambda}R_\lambda R^2. \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Using the bounds in (2.19) and (2.20) we have

$$R - I_{T-\tau} = \frac{1}{\theta}E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R = O_{p,\|\cdot\|}(\theta^{-1}), \quad R^2 = I_{T-\tau} + O_{p,\|\cdot\|}(\theta^{-1}), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

where the second equation follows from expanding  $(R - I)^2$ . By Theorem 1 we have  $\delta = o_p(1)$ . Substituting back into (B.4) we get

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}R_\lambda = \frac{1}{\theta}R - \frac{\delta}{\theta}R^2 + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(\lambda^{-1}) = \frac{1}{\theta}R - \frac{\delta}{\theta}I_{T-\tau} + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(\lambda^{-1}). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Using this we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{Q}_\lambda - \overline{Q} &= (I_K - X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \lambda^{-1} R_\lambda X_\tau^\top) - (I_K - X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \theta^{-1} R X_\tau^\top) \\ &= X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 (\theta^{-1} R - \lambda^{-1} R_\lambda) X_\tau^\top = X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 \left[ \frac{\delta}{\theta} I_{T-\tau} + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(\lambda^{-1}) \right] X_\tau^\top. \end{aligned}$$

From (2.19) we recall that  $\|X_\tau\|^2 = O_p(K\sigma_1^2)$ . Using  $\delta = o_p(1)$  again we get

$$\overline{Q}_\lambda = \overline{Q} + \frac{\delta}{\theta} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(K\sigma_1^2 \lambda^{-1}) = \overline{Q} + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1),$$

and similarly  $Q_\lambda = Q + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1)$ . Finally, since  $\|Q_\lambda^{-1}\| = O_p(1)$ , we have

$$Q_\lambda^{-1} - Q^{-1} = Q_\lambda^{-1}(Q - Q_\lambda)Q^{-1} = o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1). \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Next we consider the matrix  $X_0 R_\lambda X_\tau^\top$  appearing in (B.3). From (B.4) we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\lambda} X_0 R_\lambda X_\tau^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 R X_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 R^2 X_\tau^\top + \frac{\delta^2 \sqrt{\theta}}{\lambda} X_0 R_\lambda R^2 X_\tau^\top. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

For the second term on the right hand side of (B.8), using (B.5) and (2.19) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 R^2 X_\tau^\top &= \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 X_\tau^\top + \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 (R^2 - I) X_\tau^\top \\ &= \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta O_{p,\|\cdot\|} \left( \frac{K\sigma_1^2}{\theta^{3/2}} \right) = \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}} X_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly the last term in (B.8) satisfies  $\frac{\delta^2\sqrt{\theta}}{\lambda}X_0R_\lambda R^2X_\tau^\top = \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1)$ . Therefore

$$\frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\lambda}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1). \quad (\text{B.9})$$

To deal with the second term appearing in the determinant in (B.3), we first make the following computations. Using (B.8)-(B.9) as well as (B.7) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta}{\lambda^2}X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_\tau X_0^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \right) \\ &\quad \times \left( Q^{-1} + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \right) \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \right) \\ &= \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_\tau X_0^\top \right) Q^{-1} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0X_\tau^\top \right) + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1). \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the expression above and using (B.8)-(B.9) again we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta}{\lambda^2}X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top &= \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top \\ &\quad - \frac{\delta}{\theta} \left( X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0X_\tau^\top + X_\tau X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top \right) + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{2\delta}{\theta}X_\tau X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, recalling  $\lambda/\theta = 1 + \delta$ , we can conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\lambda}X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top &= (1 + \delta) \frac{\theta}{\lambda^2}X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{2\delta}{\theta}X_\tau X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0X_\tau^\top \\ &\quad + \delta \left( \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{2\delta}{\theta}X_\tau X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0X_\tau^\top \right) + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\theta}X_\tau X_0^\top X_0X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we have used (B.5)-(B.9) again. To conclude, we have shown

$$\bar{Q}_\lambda = I_K - \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau E_0^\top E_0RX_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1),$$

for the first term in the right hand side of (B.3) and

$$\frac{1}{\lambda}X_\tau R_\lambda^\top X_0^\top Q_\lambda^{-1}X_0R_\lambda X_\tau^\top = \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau R^\top X_0^\top Q^{-1}X_0RX_\tau^\top - \frac{\delta}{\theta}X_\tau X_0^\top X_0X_\tau^\top + \delta o_{p,\|\cdot\|}(1)$$

for the second term. The claim then follows.  $\square$

We now work towards establishing the asymptotic distribution of the matrix  $M$  from (3.6) with the help of Lemma 5.9. For notational convenience we define

$$A := \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}}X_0RX_\tau^\top, \quad B := \frac{1}{\theta}X_\tau E_0^\top E_0RX_\tau^\top, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

so that  $M = I_K - B - A^\top Q^{-1}A$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , define

$$\bar{M}_{ii} := 1 - \mathbb{E}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] \quad (\text{B.11})$$

which serves as a deterministic centering for the  $i$ -th diagonal entry of  $M$ . We first give an approximation for  $M_{ii} - \bar{M}_{ii}$  up to the scaling of  $T^{-1/2}$ .

**Proposition 3.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

$$M_{ii} - \bar{M}_{ii} = -2(A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}])\mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]\mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_p\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}} + KT^{-1}\right), \quad (\text{B.12})$$

for all  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  is defined in (2.23). Furthermore,

$$\max_{i \neq j} |M_{ij}| = O_p\left(\frac{K^4 \sigma_1^4 \sigma_i \sigma_j}{\theta^2 \sqrt{T}}\right).$$

*Proof.* We first recall from Lemma 6 and Assumption 1 that

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = 1_{i=j} \left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\theta^{1/2}} + o(1)\right), \quad \text{Var}(A_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}{\theta T}\right). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

We also recall from Lemma 8 that

$$Q_{kk}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = \mathbb{E}[Q_{kk}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_{L^1}\left(\frac{\sigma_k^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad Q_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{\sigma_i \sigma_j}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Recall that  $M = I_K - B - A^\top Q^{-1}A$ . We first consider the  $i$ -th diagonal of  $A^\top Q^{-1}A$  and show that it is close to  $A_{ii}^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]$  under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ . Note that we can write

$$\begin{aligned} (A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ii} &= \sum_{m,n} A_{mi} A_{ni} Q_{mn}^{-1} \\ &= A_{ii}^2 Q_{ii}^{-1} + \sum_{m,n \neq i} A_{mi} A_{ni} Q_{mn}^{-1} + A_{ii} \left( \sum_{n \neq i} A_{ni} Q_{in}^{-1} + \sum_{m \neq i} A_{mi} Q_{mi}^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

We will consider each term in (B.15) separately. Recall from (2.21) that  $\|Q^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}\| = 1 + o(1)$  which implies  $Q_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1 + o(1)$  for all  $i, j \leq K$ . Using the triangle inequality followed by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{m,n \neq i} A_{mi} A_{ni} Q_{mn}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right| \lesssim \sum_{m,n \neq i} \mathbb{E}[A_{mi}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[A_{ni}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^{\frac{1}{2}} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta T} \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2,$$

where the first inequality follows since  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \leq 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}$  and the last equality follows from (B.13).

For the last term in (B.15), we note that  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}$  by definition. Using  $\|Q^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}\| = 1 + o(1)$  and the triangle inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{n \neq i} A_{ii} A_{ni} Q_{in}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right| \lesssim \sum_{n \neq i} \mathbb{E} |(A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]) A_{ni} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}| + |\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]| \sum_{n \neq i} \mathbb{E} |A_{ni} Q_{in}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|.$$

By the Cauchy Schwarz inequality and (B.13) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| A_{ii} \sum_{n \neq i} A_{ni} Q_{in}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right| &\lesssim \sum_{n \neq i} \text{Var}(A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0})^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[A_{ni}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}|A_{ii}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}|^{1/2} \left( \sum_{n \neq i} \mathbb{E}[A_{ni}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[(Q^{-1})_{in}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]^{1/2} \right) \\ &\lesssim \sum_{n \neq i} \frac{\sigma_i^3 \sigma_n}{\theta T} + \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{1/2}} + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{1/2} \sqrt{T}} \right) \sum_{n \neq i} \frac{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_n^2}{\theta T} \lesssim \frac{\sigma_i^3 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}}{\theta T} + \frac{\sigma_i^4 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{\theta^{3/2} T}. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back into (B.15) we obtain

$$(A^\top Q^{-1} A)_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = A_{ii}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} \right).$$

From Lemma 1 we know that  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1 + o_p(1)$ , therefore

$$(A^\top Q^{-1} A)_{ii} = A_{ii}^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + KT^{-1} \right). \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Next, we expand  $A_{ii}^2$  around the conditional mean  $\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2$ . Write

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ii}^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} &= \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}](A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]) \\ &\quad + (A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.17})$$

Recall from (c) of Lemma 5 that the last term satisfies

$$(A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2 = O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^4}{\theta T} \right).$$

Next, we note that by definition of  $\mathbb{E}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_0$ , we have

$$A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = (A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}]) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} = A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}] + O_p(KT^{-1}),$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 1. Therefore from (B.17) we may obtain

$$A_{ii}^2 = \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 + 2\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}](A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}]) + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^4}{\theta T} + KT^{-1} \right).$$

Substituting back into (B.16) we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A^\top Q^{-1} A)_{ii} &= \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + 2\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}](A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}]) + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + KT^{-1} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]^2 \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + 2\mathbb{E}[A_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}](A_{ii} - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}]) + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + KT^{-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, Lemma 9 is used to replace the conditional expectations with the unconditional ones (except for the centering of  $A_{ii}$  where the conditional expectation is intentionally kept).

Finally, we recall  $M_{ii} = 1 - B_{ii} - (A^\top Q^{-1} A)_{ii}$ , so it remains to consider the matrix  $B = \frac{1}{\theta} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R X_\tau^\top$  in the same manner as above. By Lemma 5, we have

$$\mathbb{E} |B_{ij} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - 1_{i=j} \mathbb{E}[B_{ii} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} O(\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2 T) = \frac{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}{\theta^2 T}. \quad (\text{B.18})$$



Using Lemma 9 to replace  $\underline{\mathbb{E}}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]$  with  $\mathbb{E}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]$  and  $1_{\mathcal{B}_0} = 1 - o_p(1)$ , we get

$$B_{ij} = 1_{i=j}\mathbb{E}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] + O_p\left(\frac{\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

Combining the above computations, we get

$$M_{ii} = \bar{M}_{ii} - 2\mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]\mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}](A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]) + O_p\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}} + KT^{-1}\right)$$

and the first claim follows.

For the off-diagonal elements, write

$$\begin{aligned} (A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij} &= \sum_{m,n} A_{mi}A_{nj}Q_{mn}^{-1} = A_{ii}A_{jj}Q_{ij}^{-1} + A_{ii}A_{ij}Q_{ii}^{-1} + A_{ji}A_{jj}Q_{jj}^{-1} \\ &+ \sum_{m \neq i, n \neq j, m \neq n} A_{mi}A_{nj}Q_{mn}^{-1} + A_{ii} \sum_{n \neq i, j} A_{nj}Q_{in}^{-1} + A_{jj} \sum_{m \neq i, j} A_{mi}Q_{mj}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.19})$$

Observe that by definition of  $A_{ii}$ ,  $Q_{ii}$  and the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$  we have

$$A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O\left(\frac{K\sigma_1^2}{\sqrt{\theta}}\right), \quad Q_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O(1). \quad (\text{B.20})$$

Recall from (B.13), Lemma 8 and Lemma 6 that

$$A_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta^{1/2}\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad Q_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad \forall i \neq j. \quad (\text{B.21})$$

Substituting (B.20) and (B.21) back into the terms in (B.19) we have

$$A_{ii}A_{jj}Q_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{K^2\sigma_1^4\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta^2\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad A_{ii}A_{ij}Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^1}\left(\frac{K\sigma_1^2\sigma_i^2\sigma_j^2}{\theta^2T}\right).$$

With similar computation, the rest of (B.19) are all of smaller order than the above. Substituting the above four estimates back into (B.19) we get

$$(A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij} = O_{L^1}\left(\frac{K^2\sigma_1^4\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta^2\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

which is uniform in  $i, j$ . Taking a union bound we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \neq j} (A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij} > \epsilon\right) \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E}|(A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij}| = \frac{1}{\epsilon} O\left(\frac{K^4\sigma_1^4\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta^2\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

or in other words we have the bound

$$\max_{i \neq j} |(A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij}| = O_p\left(\frac{K^4\sigma_1^4\sigma_i\sigma_j}{\theta^2\sqrt{T}}\right)$$

Lastly, since  $M = I_K - B - A^\top Q^{-1}A$ , it remains to bound the off-diagonals of  $B$ . Routine computations similar to (B.13) and the union bound above show that  $B_{ij}$  is of high order compared to  $(A^\top Q^{-1}A)_{ij}$  and is thus negligible. This completes the proof.  $\square$

From Proposition 3 we can conclude that the CLT of  $M_{ii}$  is given by the CLT of  $A_{ii}$ , up to centering and scaling. This is what we compute next.

**Proposition 4.** *Suppose Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3 hold. For any  $i = 1, \dots, K$  and  $\tau \geq 0$ , define*

$$v_{i,\tau}^2 := \frac{1}{T-\tau} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t} f_{i,t+\tau} \right).$$

a) *For any  $i$  and  $\tau$ , the quantity  $v_{i,\tau}^2$  satisfies*

$$v_{i,\tau}^2 = \sum_{|k| < T-\tau} \left( 1 - \frac{|k|}{T-\tau} \right) u_{i,k}(\tau), \quad (\text{B.22})$$

where  $(u_{i,k}(\tau))_k$  is given by

$$u_{i,k}(\tau) := \gamma_i(k)^2 + \gamma_i(k+\tau)\gamma_i(k-\tau) + (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{i,l} \phi_{i,l+\tau} \phi_{i,l+k} \phi_{i,l+k+\tau}.$$

b) *As  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , the sequence  $(v_{i,\tau}^2)$  tends to a limit*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_{i,\tau}^2 = (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3) \gamma_i(\tau)^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\gamma_i(k)^2 + \gamma_i(k+\tau)\gamma_i(k-\tau))$$

in the case where  $\tau$  is a fixed constant, and

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_{i,\tau}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \gamma_i(k)^2$$

in the case where  $\tau = \tau_T \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ .

c) *In both cases where  $\tau$  is fixed and where  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ , we have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T} v_{i,\tau}} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t} f_{i,t+\tau} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_{i,t} f_{i,t+\tau} \right] \right) \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad T \rightarrow \infty.$$

*Proof.* In the case where  $\tau$  is fixed, the proof can be adapted from the arguments in section 7.3 of Brockwell et al. (1991) so it remains to consider the case where  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ . For concreteness, the following proof covers both the case where  $\tau$  is finite and fixed and where  $\tau$  is diverging as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . For brevity of notation we will drop the subscript  $i$  (denoting the  $i$ -th factor) within the proof and write for instance  $f_t := f_{it}$  and  $\phi_l := \phi_{il}$ .

With some adaptations to the computations in page 226-227 of Brockwell et al. (1991), we may obtain

$$\begin{aligned} v_T^2 &:= \frac{1}{T-\tau} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t f_{t+\tau} \right) = \frac{1}{T-\tau} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \sum_{s=1}^{T-\tau} f_t f_{t+\tau} f_s f_{s+\tau} \right] - (T-\tau) \gamma(\tau)^2 \\ &= \sum_{|k| < T-\tau} \left( 1 - \frac{|k|}{T-\tau} \right) u_k(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.23})$$

where  $(u_k(\tau))_k$  is given by

$$u_k(\tau) := \gamma(k)^2 + \gamma(k + \tau)\gamma(k - \tau) + (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_l \phi_{l+\tau} \phi_{l+k} \phi_{l+k+\tau}.$$

Note that the sequence  $(\phi_l)_l$  is summable and so is the sequence  $(u_k(\tau))_k$ . Taking the limit of (B.23) and invoking the dominated convergence theorem we conclude

$$v^2 := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_T^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(1 - \frac{|k|}{T - \tau}\right) u_k(\tau).$$

In the case where  $\tau$  is a fixed constant, we have, as in Proposition 7.3.1 of Brockwell et al. (1991),

$$v^2 = (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3)\gamma(\tau)^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\gamma(k)^2 + \gamma(k + \tau)\gamma(k - \tau)), \quad (\text{B.24})$$

and in the case where  $\tau$  is diverging, i.e.  $\gamma(\tau) \rightarrow 0$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , we easily see that

$$v^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_T^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \gamma(k)^2. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

This settles the first two claims of the proposition.

We first prove a version of the CLT for a truncated version of the factor  $(f_t)_{t \geq 0}$ . The truncation will be justified further below. Fix  $L > 0$  and define  $(f_t^{(L)})_{t=1, \dots, T}$  by

$$f_t^{(L)} := \sum_{l=0}^L \phi_l z_{t-l},$$

Consider the stochastic process  $(f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)})_{t=1, \dots, T-\tau}$ . Clearly  $(f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)})_t$  is an  $(L + \tau)$ -dependent process, i.e.  $f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)}$  is independent from  $f_s^{(L)} f_{s+\tau}^{(L)}$  whenever  $|s - t| > L + \tau$ . The mean is given by  $\mathbb{E}[f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)}] = \gamma_L(\tau)$ , where  $\gamma_L(\cdot)$  is the auto-covariance function of the truncated process  $(f_t^{(L)})$ . Similar to (B.23)-(B.25) we may compute

$$v_{T,(L)}^2 := \frac{1}{T - \tau} \text{Var} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)} \right),$$

which has limits, in the case where  $\tau$  is fixed:

$$v_{(L)}^2 := \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_{T,(L)}^2 = (\mathbb{E}[z_{11}^4] - 3)\gamma_L(\tau)^2 + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} (\gamma_L(k)^2 + \gamma_L(k + \tau)\gamma_L(k - \tau))$$

and in the case where  $\tau \rightarrow \infty$ :

$$v_{(L)}^2 = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} v_{T,(L)}^2 = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \gamma_L(k)^2.$$

Note that in either case  $V^{(L)}$  is a non-zero constant. It can easily be checked that, under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, the process  $(f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)})_{t=1, \dots, T-\tau}$  (after centering) satisfies the conditions in Berk (1973), whose main theorem can be applied here to obtain

$$\sqrt{T-\tau} \left( \frac{1}{T-\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)} - \gamma_L(\tau) \right) \Rightarrow N(0, v_{(L)}^2), \quad T \rightarrow \infty.$$

We now justify the truncation. Since  $(\phi_l)_l \in \ell_1$  and  $(z_t)_t$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^4$ , it is easy to conclude that, for each fixed  $T$ , we have

$$\left\| \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t^{(L)} f_{t+\tau}^{(L)} - \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t f_{t+\tau} \right\|_{L^2} \rightarrow 0, \quad L \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.26})$$

Consequently, we may conclude that  $\gamma_L(\tau) \rightarrow \gamma(\tau)$  and  $v_{(L)}^2 \rightarrow v^2$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , since they are the first and second moments of the sums in (B.26). We may then follow the arguments on page 229 of Brockwell et al. (1991) and apply Proposition 6.3.9 of Brockwell et al. (1991) to obtain

$$\sqrt{T-\tau} \left( \frac{1}{T-\tau} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t f_{t+\tau} - \gamma(\tau) \right) \Rightarrow N(0, v^2), \quad T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{B.27})$$

Finally, using (B.24), (B.25) and  $\frac{T-\tau}{T} \rightarrow 1$ , by Slutsky's theorem we may conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}v_T} \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} f_t f_{t+\tau} - (T-\tau)\gamma_L(\tau) \right) \Rightarrow N(0, 1).$$

It remains to observe that  $(T-\tau)\gamma_L(\tau)$  is exactly the expectation of  $\sum f_t f_{t+\tau}$  and the last claim of the proposition follows.  $\square$

**Proposition 5.** *Under Assumption 1 and either Assumption 2 or 3, we have*

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\theta}{2\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau) v_{i,\tau}} (M_{ii} - \bar{M}_{ii}) = Z_T + O_p \left( \frac{\|\sigma\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)} + \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 K}{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} \right) \quad (\text{B.28})$$

where  $Z_T \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$ , the centering  $\bar{M}_{ii}$  is as defined in (B.11) and  $v_{i,\tau}$  is defined as in (3.4).

*Proof.* For simplicity, within the current proof we will denote  $\mathbf{x}_{i0} := \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{i\tau} := \mathbf{x}_{i,[\tau+1:T]}$  and similarly  $\mathbf{f}_{i0} := \mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_{i\tau} := \mathbf{f}_{i,[\tau+1:T]}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i0} := \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\tau} := \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i,[\tau+1:T]}$ .

Observe from (B.12) that the asymptotic distribution of  $M$  depends crucially on that of  $A$ . We first give the asymptotic distribution of  $A_{ii}$ . Recall from (2.12) that  $R - I_{T-\tau} = \theta^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R$ , using which we can write

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ii} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top (R - I_{T-\tau}) \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} + \frac{1}{\theta^{3/2} T} \mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R \mathbf{x}_{i\tau}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.29})$$

Applying Lemma 5 to the last term in (B.29) we have

$$\frac{1}{\theta^{3/2} T} \mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \frac{1}{\theta^{3/2} T} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top E_\tau^\top E_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{3/2} \sqrt{T}} \right).$$

which gives

$$A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} (\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau}]) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} + O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{3/2} \sqrt{T}} \right). \quad (\text{B.30})$$

Next, we recall that  $\mathbf{x}_{i0} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}}(\sigma_i \mathbf{f}_{i0} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i0})$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{i\tau} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}}(\sigma_i \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\tau})$  so that

$$\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} + (\sigma_i \mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\tau} + \sigma_i \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i0}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\tau}).$$

Applying Lemma 4 to the three terms in parenthesis on the right hand we get

$$\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{x}_{i\tau}] = \sigma_i^2 \mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} - \sigma_i^2 \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau}] + O_{L^2}(\sigma_i \sqrt{T}). \quad (\text{B.31})$$

Substituting back into (B.30) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sqrt{\theta T}} (\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau}]) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} + O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i}{\theta^{1/2} \sqrt{T}} \right) + O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{3/2} \sqrt{T}} \right) \\ &= \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sqrt{\theta T}} (\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau}]) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} + O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i}{\theta^{1/2} \sqrt{T}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.32})$$

Rescaling and recalling that  $1_{\mathcal{B}_0} = 1 - o_p(T^{-l})$  for any  $l \geq 1$ , we have

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\sigma_i^2} (A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} (\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_{i0}^\top \mathbf{f}_{i\tau}]) + O_p(\sigma_i^{-1}).$$

From this we observe that we can obtain a CLT for  $A_{ii}$  from a CLT for the auto-covariance function of  $\mathbf{f}_i$ . Indeed, by Proposition 4 we have

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\sigma_i^2 v_{i,\tau}} (A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]) \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad p, T \rightarrow \infty, \quad (\text{B.33})$$

where  $v_{i,\tau}$  is specified in the statement of Proposition 4.

Finally, we recall from Proposition 3 that

$$M_{ii} - \overline{M}_{ii} = -2(A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]) \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] + O_p \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\theta T} + \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta \sqrt{T}} + KT^{-1} \right). \quad (\text{B.34})$$

To apply the CLT in (B.33) to (B.34), we need to divide (B.34) by the coefficient of  $A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]$ . We recall from (2.21) that  $Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1 + o(1)$ . Furthermore, from Lemma 6 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{\theta}} + o(1). \quad (\text{B.35})$$

Therefore from (B.34) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \frac{\theta}{-2\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau) v_{i,\tau}} (M_{ii} - \overline{M}_{ii}) &= \sqrt{T} \frac{\sqrt{\theta}}{\sigma_i^2 v_{i,\tau}} (A_{ii} - \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}]) (1 + o(1)) \\ &\quad + O_p \left( \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)} + \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 K}{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows then from the CLT in (B.33).  $\square$

The asymptotic distribution of  $M_{ii}$  proved in Proposition 5 is the last piece of ingredient we need to prove the main result of the paper, which we present below.

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Recall from Section 3 that up to now we have dealt with, without loss of generality, the  $n$ -th largest eigenvalue  $\lambda := \lambda_n$  and the corresponding  $\theta := \theta_n$  and  $\delta := \delta_n := \lambda_n/\theta_n - 1$ . Recall from Proposition 2 that  $\delta_n$  satisfies

$$\det \left( M + \frac{\delta_n}{\theta_n} X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top + \delta_{o_p, \|\cdot\|}(1) \right) = 0 \quad (\text{B.36})$$

We first consider the asymptotic properties of the elements of the matrix  $M$ . From Proposition 1 and the definition of  $\overline{M}_{ii}$  in (B.11), clearly we see  $\overline{M}_{nn} = 0$ . From Theorem 1 and Proposition 1 we also recall that  $\theta_n/(\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2) = \theta_n/\mu_{n,\tau}^2 = 1 + o(1)$ . By Proposition 5 we have

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_n(\tau)}{2v_{n,\tau}} M_{nn} = N(0, 1) + O_p \left( \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\sigma_n^2 \gamma_n(\tau)^2 \sqrt{T}} + \frac{1}{\sigma_n^2 \gamma_n(\tau)} + \frac{K}{\sqrt{T}} \right),$$

where the last term is  $o_p(1)$  by the Assumptions.

For  $i \neq n$ , we recall from (B.11) and Lemma 6 that

$$\overline{M}_{ii} = 1 - \frac{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2}{\theta_n} + o(1) = 1 - \frac{\mu_{i,\tau}^2}{\mu_{n,\tau}^2} + o(1) \gtrsim 1,$$

where the last inequality is due to Assumption 1. Using Proposition 3 we have

$$M_{ii} \gtrsim 1 + o_p(1), \quad \forall i \neq n, \quad \max_{i \neq j} |M_{ij}| = O_p \left( \frac{K^4 \sigma_1^6}{\theta_n^2 \sqrt{T}} \right).$$

Next, recall  $\delta = o_p(1)$  from Theorem 1. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} &= O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i \sigma_j (\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau) + \sigma_j^2 \gamma_j(\tau))}{\sqrt{T}} \right), \\ (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} &= \mu_{i,\tau} + O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{T}} + \frac{\sigma_i^4 + \sigma_i^2 \|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{T} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This in particular implies

$$\frac{\delta_n}{\theta_n} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ii} = \delta_n \frac{\sigma_i^4 \gamma_i(\tau)^2}{\theta_n} + o_p(\delta_n), \quad \frac{\delta_n}{\theta_n} (X_\tau X_0^\top X_0 X_\tau^\top)_{ij} = o_p(\delta), \quad \forall i \neq j.$$

Combining the above, equation (B.36) becomes  $\det(Q) = 0$ , where  $Q$  is a matrix satisfying

$$Q_{nn} = M_{nn} + \delta_n \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2}{\theta_n} + \delta_n o_p(1),$$

for its  $n$ -th diagonal element,  $Q_{ii} \gtrsim 1$ ,  $\forall i \neq n$  and

$$\sup_{ij} Q_{ij} = O_p \left( \frac{K^4 \sigma_1^6}{\theta_n^2 \sqrt{T}} \right) + \delta o_p(1). \quad (\text{B.37})$$

Using Leibniz's formula to compute  $\det(Q)$ , we have

$$0 = \det(Q) = \sum_{\pi \in S_K} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^K Q_{i,\pi(i)}, \quad (\text{B.38})$$

where  $\operatorname{sgn}(\pi)$  is the sign of a permutation  $\pi$  in the symmetry group  $S_K$ . Next we show that  $\prod_i Q_{ii}$  is the leading term in the sum in (B.38). Write  $S_{K,k}$  for the subgroup of permutations that has exactly  $K - k$  fixed points, i.e.

$$S_{K,k} = \{\pi \in S_K, i = \pi(i) \text{ for exactly } K - k \text{ such } i\text{'s}\}.$$

Using this notation we can rewrite (B.38) into

$$0 = \det(Q) = \sum_{k=0}^K \sum_{\pi \in S_{K,k}} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^K Q_{i,\pi(i)}. \quad (\text{B.39})$$

We recall that the order of  $S_{K,k}$  is given by the rencontres numbers (see [Riordan \(2012\)](#))

$$|S_{K,k}| = D_{K,K-k} := \frac{K!}{(K-k)!} \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{(-1)^i}{i!}.$$

Observe that  $|S_{K,0}| = 1$  since  $S_{K,0}$  contains only the identity permutation and  $|S_{K,1}| = 0$  since for any non-identity permutation  $\pi$ , there exists at least two indices  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ ,  $i \neq j$  such that  $i \neq \pi(i)$  and  $j \neq \pi(j)$ . Therefore (B.39) becomes

$$0 = \det(Q) = \prod_{i=1}^K Q_{ii} + \sum_{k=2}^K \sum_{\pi \in S_{K,k}} \operatorname{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^K Q_{i,\pi(i)}. \quad (\text{B.40})$$

Note that for any  $k \geq 2$  and any permutation  $\pi \in S_{K,k}$ , the product  $\prod_{i=1}^K Q_{i,\pi(i)}$  contains exactly  $k$  off-diagonal elements of  $Q$ . By (B.37) we have the estimate

$$\prod_{i=1}^K Q_{i,\pi(i)} = \left( O_p \left( \frac{K^4 \sigma_1^6}{\theta_n^2 \sqrt{T}} \right) + \delta o_p(1) \right)^k.$$

Finally, after substituting back into (B.40) and a rather tedious computation we have

$$0 = \det(Q) = \prod_{i=1}^K Q_{ii} + \delta o_p(1) + o_p(T^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{B.41})$$

which shows that the product  $\prod_{i=1}^K Q_{ii}$  is the leading term of  $\det(Q)$ .

Next, using (B.37) again we see that  $\prod_{i=1}^K Q_{ii}$  can be written into

$$\prod_{i=1}^K Q_{ii} = \left( M_{nn} + \delta_n \frac{\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2}{\theta_n} + \delta_n o_p(1) \right) (1 + o_p(1)) = (M_{nn} + \delta_n) (1 + o_p(1)),$$

which can be substituted back into (B.41) to obtain

$$0 = M_{nn}(1 + o_p(1)) + \delta_n(1 + o_p(1)) + \delta_n o_p(1) + o_p(T^{-1/2}).$$

Rearranging (and recalling  $\theta_n \asymp \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2$  by Proposition 1), we finally get

$$-\sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_n(\tau)}{2v_{n,\tau}} \delta_n (1 + o_p(1)) = \sqrt{T} \frac{\theta_n}{2\sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau) v_{n,\tau}} M_{nn} (1 + o_p(1)) + o_p(1).$$

Applying Proposition 5 we immediately have

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_n(\tau)}{2v_{n,\tau}} \delta_n \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad T \rightarrow \infty$$

and the proof is complete.  $\square$

## Appendix C Estimates on bilinear forms

The following linear algebraic result will be useful throughout.

**Lemma 2** (Sherman-Morrison formula). *Suppose  $A$  and  $B$  are invertible matrices of the same dimension, such that  $A - B$  is of rank one. Then*

$$A^{-1} - B^{-1} = -\frac{B^{-1}(A - B)B^{-1}}{1 + \text{tr}(B^{-1}(A - B))}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Further more, if  $A - B = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top$ , then

$$A^{-1}\mathbf{u} = \frac{B^{-1}\mathbf{u}}{1 + \mathbf{v}^\top B^{-1}\mathbf{u}}, \quad \mathbf{v}^\top A^{-1} = \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top B^{-1}}{1 + \mathbf{v}^\top B^{-1}\mathbf{u}}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

We first establish some concentration inequalities for quadratic forms of the random vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . To do so we will need to introduce some notations. We recall from (2.2) and (2.8) that

$$x_{it} = \sigma_i f_{it} + \epsilon_{it} = \sigma_i \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \phi_{il} z_{i,t-l} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad i = 1, \dots, K, \quad t = 1, \dots, T.$$

We truncate the series and define an approximation

$$x_{it}^{(L)} := \sigma_i f_{it}^{(L)} + \epsilon_{it} := \sigma_i \sum_{l=0}^L \phi_{il} z_{i,t-l} + \epsilon_{it}, \quad L \geq 1, \quad (\text{C.3a})$$

and write  $\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)}$  for  $(x_{it}^{(L)})_{t=1,\dots,T}$  and  $(f_{it}^{(L)})_{t=1,\dots,T}$ . For each  $L$ , We write

$$\underline{\phi}_i^\top := \left( \phi_{iL}, \dots, \phi_{i0}, \mathbf{0}_{T-1}^\top \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{T+L}. \quad (\text{C.3b})$$

Let  $S$  be the right-shift operator on  $\mathbb{R}^{T+L}$ , i.e.  $S\mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{e}_{i+1}$ . Define

$$\Phi_i := \left( \underline{\phi}_i, S\underline{\phi}_i, \dots, S^{T-1}\underline{\phi}_i \right) \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+L) \times T}, \quad (\text{C.3c})$$



then clearly we can write the approximation  $\mathbf{f}_i^{(L)}$  as

$$\mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)} = \mathbf{z}_{i,[1-L,T]}^\top \Phi_i. \quad (\text{C.3d})$$

We note that the spaces of  $n \times n$  matrices equipped with the Frobenius norm is isometrically isomorphic to  $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  with the Euclidean norm. For each  $1 \leq i, j \leq K$ , we define linear operators  $\Psi_n^{ij}$ ,  $n = 0, 1, 2$ ,

$$\Psi_n^{ij} : \mathbb{R}^{(T-\tau) \times (T-\tau)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{(2T+L) \times (2T+L)}$$

by sending a  $(T - \tau) \times (T - \tau)$  matrix  $B$  to the  $(2T + L) \times (2T + L)$  matrices

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_0^{ij} B &:= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_i \Phi_i \\ I_T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{T-\tau} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \end{pmatrix} B \begin{pmatrix} I_{T-\tau} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_j \Phi_j \\ I_T \end{pmatrix}^\top, \\ \Psi_1^{ij} B &:= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_i \Phi_i \\ I_T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{T-\tau} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \end{pmatrix} B \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \\ I_{T-\tau} \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_j \Phi_j \\ I_T \end{pmatrix}^\top, \\ \Psi_2^{ij} B &:= \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_i \Phi_i \\ I_T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \\ I_{T-\tau} \end{pmatrix} B \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \\ I_{T-\tau} \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_j \Phi_j \\ I_T \end{pmatrix}^\top, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.4})$$

where  $\Phi_i := (\underline{\phi}_i, S\underline{\phi}_i, \dots, S^{T-1}\underline{\phi}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{(T+L) \times T}$  is as defined in (C.3c). We first give some estimates on the operators  $\Psi_n^{ij}$ .

**Lemma 3.** *The following estimates hold uniformly in  $L \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

a) *The matrix  $\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i$  is symmetric and (banded) Toeplitz with*

$$\sup_i \|\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i\| \leq 1 + \sup_i \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2 = O(1).$$

b) *For  $n = 0, 1, 2$ , the operator norms of  $\Psi_n^{ij}$  be bounded by*

$$\|\Psi_n^{ij}\|^2 \leq \left(1 + \sigma_i^2 \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2\right) \left(1 + \sigma_j^2 \|\phi_j\|_{\ell_1}^2\right) = O(\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2).$$

c) *For any  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times T}$ , the trace of  $\Psi_n^{ii} B$  can be bounded by*

$$|\text{tr}(\Psi_n^{ii} B)| \leq (T - \tau)(1 + \sigma_i^2 \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2) \|B\| = O(\sigma_i^2 (T - \tau) \|B\|).$$

*Proof.* a) From the definitions (C.3b) and (C.3c) we immediately have

$$(\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i)_{s,t} = \mathbf{1}_{|s-t| \leq L} \underline{\phi}_i^\top S^{|s-t|} \underline{\phi}_i = \mathbf{1}_{|s-t|=k \leq L} \sum_{l=0}^{L-k} \phi_{i,l+k} \phi_{i,l}.$$

It is clear that  $\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i$  is a banded, symmetric Toeplitz matrix. The operator norm of  $\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i$  is controlled by the supremum of its symbol over  $\mathbb{C}$  (see Böttcher and Silbermann (1999)) and we have

$$\|\Phi_i^\top \Phi_i\| \leq \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{C}} \left| \sum_{|k|=0}^L \underline{\phi}_i^\top S^{|k|} \underline{\phi}_i e^{\sqrt{-1}k\lambda} \right| \leq \|\underline{\phi}_i\|_{\ell_2}^2 + \sum_{k=1}^L \sum_{l=0}^{L-k} |\phi_{i,l+k} \phi_{i,l}| \leq 1 + \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2,$$

which is bounded uniformly in  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , due to Assumption (1).

b) By the cyclic property of the trace and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Psi_1^{ij} B\|_F^2 &= \text{tr} \left( (\Psi_1^{ij} B)(\Psi_1^{ij} B)^\top \right) \\ &= \text{tr} \left( (I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i)(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0})^\top B(\mathbf{0}, I_{T-\tau})(I_T + \sigma_j^2 \Phi_j^\top \Phi_j)(\mathbf{0}, I_{T-\tau})^\top B^\top(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0}) \right). \\ &\leq \left\| (I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i)(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0})^\top B(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0}) \right\|_F \left\| (I_T + \sigma_j^2 \Phi_j^\top \Phi_j)(\mathbf{0}, I_{T-\tau})^\top B^\top(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0}) \right\|_F. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|AB\|_F \leq \|A\| \|B\|_F$ , we have

$$\|\Psi_1^{ij} B\|_F^2 \leq \|I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i\| \|I_T + \sigma_j^2 \Phi_j^\top \Phi_j\| \|B\|_F^2,$$

where  $\|I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i\| \leq 1 + \sigma_i^2 \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2$  by the first claim of the Lemma. By identifying  $\Psi_1^{ij}$  as an operator between spaces of matrices equipped with the Frobenius norm, this translates to a bound on its spectral norm. The case of  $\Psi_0$  and  $\Psi_2$  hold analogously.

c) For the last bound, similar computations give

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{tr}(\Psi_0^{ii} B)| &= \left| \text{tr} \left( (I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i)(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0})^\top B(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \|I_T + \sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i\| \|B\|_F \leq (T - \tau)(1 + \sigma_i^2 \|\phi_i\|_{\ell_1}^2) \|B\| \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the claims hold similarly.  $\square$

Next, we state an easy extension to Lemma 2.7 of [Bai and Silverstein \(1998\)](#) suited to our needs.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_1^\top, \mathbf{z}_2^\top)^\top$ , where  $\mathbf{z}_1 = (z_1, \dots, z_m)$  and  $\mathbf{z}_2 = (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n)$  are independent random vectors each with i.i.d. entries satisfying  $\mathbb{E}[z_1] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{z}_1] = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{E}[z_1^2] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{z}_1^2] = 1$ ,  $\nu_q := \mathbb{E}|z_1|^q < \infty$  and  $\tilde{\nu}_q := \mathbb{E}|\tilde{z}_1|^q < \infty$  for some  $q \in [1, \infty)$ .*

a) *Let  $C$  be a deterministic  $m \times n$  matrix, then*

$$\mathbf{z}_1^\top C \mathbf{z}_2 = O_{L^q}(\|C\|_F),$$

*where the constant in the estimate depends only on  $q$  and  $\nu_q, \tilde{\nu}_q$ .*

b) *Let  $M$  be a deterministic  $(m+n) \times (m+n)$  matrix, then*

$$\mathbf{z}^\top M \mathbf{z} - \text{tr} M = O_{L^q}(\|M\|_F),$$

*where the constant in the estimate depends only on  $q$  and  $\nu_k, \tilde{\nu}_k$  for  $k \leq 2q$ .*

*Proof.* a) By Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 of [Bai and Silverstein \(1998\)](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top C \mathbf{z}_2|^q &= \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i,j} z_i \tilde{z}_j C_{ij} \right|^q \lesssim \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{i,j} z_i^2 \tilde{z}_j^2 C_{ij}^2 \right|^{q/2} \\ &\lesssim \left( \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[z_i^2 \tilde{z}_j^2 C_{ij}^2] \right)^{q/2} + \sum_{i,j} \mathbb{E}[|z_i|^q |\tilde{z}_j|^q |C_{ij}|^q] \\ &= \left( \sum_{i,j} M_{ij}^2 \right)^{q/2} + \nu_q \tilde{\nu}_q \sum_{i,j} |C_{ij}|^q \leq (1 + \nu_q \tilde{\nu}_q) \|C\|_F^q, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since  $\sum |C_{ij}|^q \leq (\sum |C_{ij}|^2)^{q/2}$  for  $q \geq 2$ .

b) Write  $M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$  where  $A, B, C, D$  are of dimensions such that

$$\mathbf{z}^\top M \mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_1^\top A \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{z}_1^\top B \mathbf{z}_2 + \mathbf{z}_2^\top C \mathbf{z}_1 + \mathbf{z}_2^\top D \mathbf{z}_2.$$

By Lemma 2.7 of [Bai and Silverstein \(1998\)](#) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top A \mathbf{z}_1 - \text{tr}A|^q &\lesssim (\nu_4^{q/2} + \nu_{2q}) \text{tr}(AA^\top)^{q/2} \leq (\nu_4^{q/2} + \nu_{2q}) \|M\|_F^q, \\ \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_2^\top D \mathbf{z}_2 - \text{tr}D|^q &\lesssim (\tilde{\nu}_4^{q/2} + \tilde{\nu}_{2q}) \text{tr}(DD^\top)^{q/2} \leq (\nu_4^{q/2} + \nu_{2q}) \|M\|_F^q. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}^\top M \mathbf{z} - \text{tr}M|^q &\lesssim \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top A \mathbf{z}_1 - \text{tr}A|^q + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_2^\top B \mathbf{z}_2 - \text{tr}B|^q \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_1^\top C \mathbf{z}_2|^q + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_2^\top D \mathbf{z}_1|^q. \end{aligned}$$

and the claim follows from (a) of the lemma.  $\square$

Using Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 we can derive the following concentration inequalities for quadratic forms involving certain high probability events.

**Lemma 5.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  be defined as in (2.9) and  $q \leq 2$ . Under Assumptions 1 and either Assumptions 2 or 3 we have*

a) *For any (deterministic) square matrix  $B$  of size  $T - \tau$ , we have*

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] = O_{L^q} \left( \sigma_i \sigma_j \sqrt{T} \|B\| \right),$$

where the expectation is satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] = 1_{i=j} \text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(B)) = 1_{i=j} O(\sigma_i^2 T \|B\|).$$

b) *For all  $i, j$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top B \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] = 0$  and*

$$\mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top B \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} = O_{L^{2q}}(\sigma_i \sqrt{T} \|B\|).$$

c) *Suppose  $n \in \{1, \dots, K\}$  and  $c_1, c_2$  are positive constants with  $c_1 < c_2$ . Pick any*

$$a \in [c_1, c_2] \mu_{n,\tau}^2.$$

Recall from (2.11) the resolvent  $R(a) := (I_{T-\tau} - a^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E^\top E)^{-1}$ , then

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = O_{L^q}(\sigma_i \sigma_j \sqrt{T}),$$

for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_p]$  is defined in (2.23). In particular,

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = O_p(\sigma_i \sigma_j \sqrt{T}).$$

d) *Parts (a)-(c) of the lemma remain true if the vector  $\mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}$  is replaced by  $\mathbf{x}_{j,[1:T-\tau]}$  and the operator  $\Psi_1^{ii}$  is replaced by  $\Psi_0^{ii}$ .*

*Proof.* **a)** We apply the truncation procedure as described in (C.3a). Recalling (C.3a), (C.3d) and (C.4) we may write

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^{(L)\top} B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}^{(L)} &= (\sigma_i \mathbf{f}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i,[1:T]})^\top \begin{pmatrix} I_{T-\tau} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} B \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{0} \\ I_{T-\tau} \end{pmatrix}^\top (\sigma_j \mathbf{f}_{j,[1:T]}^{(L)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{j,[1:T]}) \\ &= (\mathbf{z}_{i,[1-L:T]}^\top, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i,[1:T]}^\top) (\Psi_1^{ij}(B)) (\mathbf{z}_{i,[1-L:T]}^\top, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i,[1:T]}^\top)^\top.\end{aligned}$$

Applying (b) of Lemma 4 to the above quadratic form gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^{(L)\top} B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}^{(L)} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^{(L)\top} B \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}^{(L)} \right] \right|^q \lesssim \|\Psi_1^{ij}(B)\|_F^q, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

where  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)\top} B \mathbf{x}_{j,[1:T]}^{(L)}] = 1_{i=j} \text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(B))$ . Using Lemma 3 we see that

$$\|\Psi_0^{ij}(B)\|_F^q = O(\sigma_i^q \sigma_j^q) \|B\|_F^q = (T-\tau)^{q/2} O(\sigma_i^q \sigma_j^q) \|B\|^q = T^{q/2} O(\sigma_i^q \sigma_j^q) \|B\|^q,$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T]}^{(L)\top} B \mathbf{x}_{j,[1:T]}^{(L)}] = 1_{i=j} O(\sigma_i^2 (T-\tau)) \|B\| = 1_{i=j} O(\sigma_i^2 T) \|B\|,$$

both of which are uniform in  $L$ .

Since  $(\phi_{il})_l$  is summable and  $(z_{it})$  have uniformly bounded 4-th moments, it is clear that  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(L)}/\sigma_i$  converges to  $\mathbf{x}_i/\sigma_i$  in  $L^4$  as  $L \rightarrow \infty$ , for each fixed  $T$ . By the dominated convergence theorem with (C.5) as an upper-bound, we can take the limit as  $L \rightarrow \infty$  inside the expectation in (C.5) and the claim follows.

**b)** follows from similar computations as in (a) and is omitted.

**c)** Note that  $E_\tau^\top E_\tau E^\top E$  has bounded operator norm under the event  $\mathcal{B}_0$  defined in (2.18). Since  $a \asymp \sigma_n^4 \gamma_n(\tau)^2$  diverges as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ , the resolvent  $R(a)$  is well-defined under  $\mathcal{B}_0$  and  $\|R(a)^k \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| = O(1)$ . After conditioning on the  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathcal{F}$  defined in (2.22), we can then apply (a) of the Lemma and get

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} \right] \right|^q \lesssim T^{q/2} O(\sigma_i^q \sigma_j^q).$$

Taking expectations again to remove the conditioning, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} \right] \right|^q \lesssim T^{q/2} O(\sigma_i^q \sigma_j^q).$$

Note that  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = 0$  for all  $i \neq j$  by (a) of the Lemma. So

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} = 1_{i=j} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R(a)^k \mathbf{x}_{i,[\tau+1:T]} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0}] + O_{L^q}(\sigma_i \sigma_j \sqrt{T}).$$

By Lemma 1 we have  $\mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0} = 1 - o_p(1)$ , from which the last claim follows.

**d)** follows from similar computations to the above and is omitted.  $\square$

Note that the expectations appearing in the previous lemma are conditional on the noise series  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ . The following lemma gives a preliminary computation on the unconditional moments of certain quadratic forms. Recall matrices  $B(a)$ ,  $A(a)$  and  $Q(a)$ :

$$\begin{aligned}A(a) &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} X_0 R(a) X_\tau^\top, & B(a) &:= \frac{1}{a} X_\tau E_0^\top E_0 R(a) X_\tau^\top, \\ Q(a) &:= I_K - a^{-1} X_0 R_a E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top.\end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 6.** *Under the same setting as (c) of Lemma 5, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= 1_{i=j} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{a^{1/2}} + o(1) \right) \\ \text{Var}(A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) &= O \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}{aT} \right), \\ \mathbb{E}[B(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= 1_{i=j} o(1), \quad \mathbb{E}[Q(a)_{ij}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] = 1_{i=j} + o(1).\end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* Since  $\mathbf{x}_i = \sigma_i \mathbf{f}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ , we first observe that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 \mathbf{f}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top \mathbf{f}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] = 1_{i=j} \frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{a}}. \quad (\text{C.6})$$

By definition, the event  $\mathcal{B}_0$  is independent from the vector  $\mathbf{x}$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] + \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top (R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] \\ &= 1_{i=j} \frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{a}} \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_0) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top (R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] \\ &= 1_{i=j} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2 \gamma_i(\tau)}{\sqrt{a}} + o(1) \right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top (R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}],\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows since  $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_0) = 1 + o(1)$  by Lemma 1. It remains to compute the last expectation above. Recall from (2.12) that the resolvent  $R(a)$  satisfies  $R(a) - I = a^{-1} E_\tau^\top E_\tau E^\top E R(a)$ . By definition of  $\mathcal{B}_0$  we have  $\|E_\tau^\top E_\tau E^\top E 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| = O(1)$  and  $\|R(a) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}\| = O(1)$ . Therefore

$$(R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} = O_{\|\cdot\|}(a^{-1}). \quad (\text{C.7})$$

Using (C.7) and (a) of Lemma 5 and taking iterated expectations we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top (R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1,T-\tau]}^\top (R(a) - I) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{j,[\tau+1:T]}]] \\ &= 1_{i=j} \frac{1}{\sqrt{aT}} O(\sigma_i^2 T) \mathbb{E}[\|R(a) - I\| 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = 1_{i=j} o(1).\end{aligned}$$

For the second moment, using  $(a - b)^2 = (a - c)^2 + (c - b)^2 + 2(a - c)(c - b)$ , we write

$$\begin{aligned}(A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2 & \\ &= (A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2 + (\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2 \\ &\quad + 2(A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])(\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]).\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

where by (c) of Lemma 5 we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2] = \frac{1}{aT^2} O(\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2 T) = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2}{aT}\right),$$

and from Lemma 9 (whose proof does not depend on the current lemma) we recall

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{aT}\right).$$

Taking expectation of (C.8) and using the Cauchy Schwarz inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[A(a)_{ij}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])^2] = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2\sigma_j^2}{aT}\right).$$

The expectation of  $B(a)$  can be computed based on the same ideas and is omitted.

Lastly, under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ , the matrix  $Q(a)$  is invertible with  $\|Q(a)1_{\mathcal{B}_2}\| = O(1)$ . We recall from (2.17) that the inverse of  $Q(a)$  satisfies

$$Q(a)^{-1} = I_K + \frac{1}{a}Q(a)^{-1}X_0R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top.$$

By definition of  $\mathcal{B}_2$  we know  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2}Q(a)^{-1}X_0R(a)E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top = O_{\|\cdot\|}(\sigma_1^2)$  and therefore

$$Q(a)^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}I_K + o_{\|\cdot\|}(1)$$

and the last claim follows after taking expectations.  $\square$

## Appendix D Estimates on resolvents

Define the following families of  $\sigma$ -algebras  $(\mathcal{F}_i)_{i=1}^p$  and  $(\underline{\mathcal{F}}_i)_{i=1}^K$  by

$$\mathcal{F}_i := \sigma(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{[K+1, K+i], [1:T]}), \quad \underline{\mathcal{F}}_i := \sigma(\mathbf{x}_{[1:i], [1:T]}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{[K+1, K+p], [1:T]}),$$

i.e.  $\mathcal{F}_i$  is the  $\sigma$ -algebra generated by first  $i$  coordinates of the noise series  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  and  $\underline{\mathcal{F}}_i$  is generated by all  $p$  coordinates of  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$  plus the first  $i$  coordinates of the series  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Throughout the appendix we will write

$$\mathbb{E}_i[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}_i[\cdot | \mathcal{F}_i], \quad \underline{\mathbb{E}}_i[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}_i[\cdot | \underline{\mathcal{F}}_i]. \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Note that by definition  $\mathbb{E}_0[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  and  $\underline{\mathbb{E}}_p[\cdot] = \underline{\mathbb{E}}_0[\cdot] = \underline{\mathbb{E}}[\cdot]$ .

We first develop a concentration inequality for normalized traces of the resolvent  $R$ .

**Lemma 7.** *For any matrix  $B$  with  $T - \tau$  columns, we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(R1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[R1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])) = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{\|B\|}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right), \quad (\text{a})$$

$$\frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(E_0^\top E_0 R1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[E_0^\top E_0 R1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])) = O_{L^2}\left(\frac{\|B\|}{\sqrt{T}}\right). \quad (\text{b})$$

*Proof.* a) Similar to Lemma 8 the proof is based on a martingale difference decomposition of  $R1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[R1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]$ . We first setup the necessary notations and carry out some preliminary computations.

Recall that the  $k$ -th row of  $E_0$  is equal to  $T^{-1/2}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{K+k, [1:T-\tau]}^\top$ . For brevity of notation we will adopt the following notation

$$\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0} := \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{K+k, [1:T-\tau]}, \quad \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k\tau} := \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{K+k, [\tau+1:T]}. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

Let  $E_{k_0}$  and  $E_{k_\tau}$  be the matrices  $E_0$  and  $E_\tau$  with the  $k$ -th row replaced by zeros, i.e.  $E_{k_0} := E_0 - T^{-1/2} \mathbf{e}_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}$  and  $E_{k_\tau} := E_\tau - T^{-1/2} \mathbf{e}_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}$ . Define

$$\underline{R}_k := \left( I_T - \frac{1}{\theta} E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} E_0^\top E_0 \right)^{-1}, \quad R_k := \left( I_T - \frac{1}{\theta} E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} E_{k_0}^\top E_{k_0} \right)^{-1},$$

where  $R_k$  is not to be confused with  $R_\theta$  and  $R_\lambda$  defined previously. Then

$$E_0^\top E_0 - E_{k_0}^\top E_{k_0} = \frac{1}{T} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top, \quad E_\tau^\top E_\tau - E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} = \frac{1}{T} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top,$$

from which we can compute

$$\begin{aligned} R^{-1} - \underline{R}_k^{-1} &= -\frac{1}{\theta} (E_\tau^\top E_\tau - E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau}) E_0^\top E_0 = -\frac{1}{\theta T} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 \\ \underline{R}_k^{-1} - R_k^{-1} &= -\frac{1}{\theta} E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} (E_0^\top E_0 - E_{k_0}^\top E_{k_0}) = -\frac{1}{\theta T} E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top. \end{aligned}$$

We furthermore define scalars

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\beta}_k &= \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(\underline{R}_k (R^{-1} - \underline{R}_k^{-1}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta T} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 \underline{R}_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}}, \\ \beta_k &= \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(R_k (\underline{R}_k^{-1} - R_k^{-1}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta T} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}}, \end{aligned}$$

both of which are clearly of order  $1 + o(1)$  under the event  $\mathcal{B}_0$ . Using (C.1) we get

$$R - \underline{R}_k = -\underline{\beta}_k \underline{R}_k (R^{-1} - \underline{R}_k^{-1}) \underline{R}_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} \underline{R}_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 \underline{R}_k, \quad (\text{D.3a})$$

$$\underline{R}_k - R_k = -\beta_k R_k (\underline{R}_k^{-1} - R_k^{-1}) R_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k. \quad (\text{D.3b})$$

Substituting (D.3b) back into (D.3a) we get

$$R - \underline{R}_k = \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} \left( R_k + \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k \right) \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 \left( R_k + \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k \right),$$

and so we have

$$R - R_k = (\underline{R}_k - R_k) + (R - \underline{R}_k) =: U_1 + U_2 + U_3 + U_4 + U_5, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

where we have defined

$$\begin{aligned} U_1 &:= \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k, & U_2 &:= \frac{\beta_k}{\theta T} R_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k, \\ U_3 &:= \frac{\beta_k \beta_k}{\theta^2 T^2} R_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k, \\ U_4 &:= \frac{\beta_k \beta_k}{\theta^2 T^2} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k, \\ U_5 &:= \frac{\beta_k \beta_k^2}{\theta^3 T^3} R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k_\tau}^\top E_{k_\tau} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0} \underline{\mathbf{e}}_{k_0}^\top R_k. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.5})$$

Recall the event  $\mathcal{B}_0$  from (1). Define

$$\mathcal{B}_0^k := \left\{ \|E_{k0}^\top E_{k0}\| + \|E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau}\| \leq 4 \left(1 + \frac{p}{T}\right) \right\}, \quad k = 1, \dots, p. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Clearly  $\|E_{k0}^\top E_{k0}\| \leq \|E_0^\top E_0\|$  which implies  $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0^k$  and so  $1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \leq 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}$ . Recall the family of conditional expectations  $\mathbb{E}_i[\cdot]$  defined in (D.1). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(R1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[R1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])) &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \text{tr}(BR1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \left( \text{tr}(BR1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) - \text{tr}(BR_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \text{tr}(B(R - R_k)1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \text{tr}(BR_k(1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_0})) \\ &=: I_1 + I_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

where the second equality holds since  $\mathbb{E}_k[\text{tr}(BR_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k})] = \mathbb{E}_{k-1}[\text{tr}(BR_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k})]$  and the third equality is purely algebraic computations. We first deal with the second term in (D.7). Using  $\text{tr}(BR_k) \leq p\|BR_k\|$  and  $\|BR_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}\| = O(\|B\|)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_2|^2 &= \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \text{tr}(BR_k(1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_0})) \right|^2 \leq \frac{4p^2}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| \|BR_k\| (1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}) \right|^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{p^2}{T^2} \|B\|^2\right) \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \right|^2 = O\left(\frac{p^2}{T^2} \|B\|^2\right) \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{B}_0^c) = o(T^{-l} \|B\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  by Lemma 1. For the first term in (D.7), since  $I_1$  is a sum of a martingale difference sequence, using (D.4) and  $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0^k$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|I_1|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \text{tr}(B(R - R_k)1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{4}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr}(B(R - R_k)1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}) \right|^2 \leq \frac{20}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{n=1}^5 \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr}(BU_n 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}) \right|^2, \end{aligned}$$

and it remains to bound the second moment of each  $\text{tr}(BU_n 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k})$ . Since  $\{\epsilon_{it}\}$  are assumed to be i.i.d. standard Gaussian, we have the following moment estimate

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\epsilon_{k0}\|^n \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \epsilon_{kt}^2 \right)^{n/2} \right] \lesssim (T-\tau)^{n/2-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-\tau} \mathbb{E} |\epsilon_{kt}|^n = O(T^{n/2}). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Using  $\beta_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} = 1 + o(1)$  and the trivial inequality  $x^\top Ax \leq \|x\|^2 \|A\|$  we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \text{tr}(BU_1 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}) \right|^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\epsilon_{k0}^\top R_k B R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \epsilon_{k0})^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\epsilon_{k0}\|^4 \|R_k\|^4 \|E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau}\|^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right] \|B\|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2} \|B\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9a})$$



The second term  $U_2$  can be dealt in exactly the same way to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(BU_2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k})|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2} \|B\|^2, \quad (\text{D.9b})$$

and we omit the details. For  $U_3$ , similar computations gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(BU_3 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k})|^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^4 T^4} \mathbb{E} \left[ (\underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k B R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0})^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\theta^4 T^4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\underline{\epsilon}_{k0}\|^4 \|\underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}\|^4 \|R_k\|^4 \|E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau}\|^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right] \|B\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

since  $x^\top A y \leq \|x\| \|y\| \|A\|$ . Therefore

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(BU_3)|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^4 T^4} \mathbb{E} [\|\underline{\epsilon}_{k0}\|^8]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [\|\underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}\|^8]^{1/2} \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^4} \|B\|^2. \quad (\text{D.9c})$$

Once again  $U_4$  can be bounded in the same way to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(BU_4) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\theta^4} \|B\|^2. \quad (\text{D.9d})$$

With the same approach but more laborious computations we can obtain

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{tr}(BU_5) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^6} \|B\|^2. \quad (\text{D.9e})$$

Note that the estimates (D.9a)-(D.9e) are uniform in  $k = 1, \dots, p$ . We then conclude

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - \mathbb{E}[R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}])) \right|^2 = O\left(\frac{p}{T^2 \theta^2}\right) \|B\|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{T \theta^2}\right) \|B\|^2,$$

and the conclusion follows.

**b)** Similar to (a), via a martingale difference decomposition we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(E_0^\top E_0 R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} - \mathbb{E}[E_0^\top E_0 R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}])) \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} |\text{tr}(B(E_0^\top E_0 R - E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} R_k)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}|^2,$$

where, recalling the  $U_n$ 's defined in the proof of (a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E_0^\top E_0 R - E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} R_k &= \frac{1}{T} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k + \frac{1}{T} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top (R - R_k) + E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} (R - R_k) \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=1}^5 \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top U_n + \sum_{n=1}^5 E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} U_n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.10})$$

We deal with the first two term in (D.10) to illustrate the ideas of the proof, the other terms can be dealt with similarly. Using (D.8) and  $p \asymp T$ , clearly we have

$$\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{T^4} \sum_{k=1}^p T^2 \mathbb{E} [\|B R_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}\|^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) \|B\|^2. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Similar to the computations in (D.9a), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top U_1)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right|^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} \frac{1}{T^2} \mathbb{E} [(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k B \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0})^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^4} \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0}\|^8 \|R_k\|^4 \|E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau}\|^2 \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right] \|B\|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2} \|B\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

which immediately gives

$$\frac{1}{T^2} \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{T} \text{tr}(B(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top U_1)) \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right|^2 = O\left(\frac{p}{\theta^2 T^2}\right) \|B\|^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{\theta^2 T}\right) \|B\|^2.$$

Note that this term is negligible in comparison to (D.11). Using the same ideas, it is routine to check that the other 9 terms in (D.10) are negligible as well, and we omit the details. The bound therefore follows from (D.11).  $\square$

Next recall that  $Q = I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top$ . We now state a concentration inequality for entries of the matrix  $Q^{-1}$ , under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ .

**Lemma 8.** *Write  $Q_{ij}^{-1} := (Q^{-1})_{ij}$ . Then*

a) *For all  $k = 1, \dots, K$ , we have*

$$Q_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2} - \mathbb{E}[Q_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}] = O_{L^1} \left( \frac{\sigma_k^2}{\theta \sqrt{T}} \right).$$

b) *The off-diagonal elements of  $Q^{-1}$  satisfies*

$$Q_{ij}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2} = O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i \sigma_j}{\theta \sqrt{T}} \right)$$

*uniformly in  $i, j = 1, \dots, K$ ,  $i \neq j$ .*

*Proof.* a) Recalling the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ , we note that the matrix  $Q$  is invertible with probability tending to 1. The proof relies on expressing  $Q_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2} - \mathbb{E}[Q_{kk}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}]$  as a sum of martingale differences. We first setup the notations necessary.

Let  $T^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_i := T^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{i, [1:T-\tau]}$  be the (column vector) of the  $i$ -th row of  $X_0$ , i.e. we can write  $X_0 = T^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top$ . Define  $X_{i0} := X_0 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top$ , and

$$Q_{(i)} := I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top, \quad Q_{(ii)} := I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top,$$

from which we can immediately compute

$$Q - Q_{(i)} = -\frac{1}{\theta \sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top, \quad Q_{(i)} - Q_{(ii)} = -\frac{1}{\theta \sqrt{T}} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top.$$

Note that all elements on the  $i$ -th row of  $Q_{(i)}$  are equal to zero except for the diagonal which is equal to 1, i.e.  $Q_{(i)}$  is equal to the identity when restricted to the  $i$ -th coordinate. Then the inverse  $Q_{(i)}^{-1}$ , whenever it exists, must also equal to the identity when restricted to the  $i$ -th

coordinate. A similar observation can be made for the matrix  $Q_{(ii)}$  and it is not hard to observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q_{(ii)})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i &= 1, & \mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q_{(i)})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j &= 0, & \forall j \neq i, \\ \mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q_{(ii)})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j &= \mathbf{e}_j^\top (Q_{(ii)})^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i &= 0, & \forall j \neq i. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.12})$$

To compute the difference  $Q^{-1} - Q_{(i)}^{-1}$ , which will turn out to be the central focus of the proof, we first define the following scalars

$$\begin{aligned} b_i &:= \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(Q_{(i)}^{-1}(Q - Q_{(i)}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i} \\ b_{ii} &:= \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(Q_{(ii)}^{-1}(Q_{(i)} - Q_{(ii)}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i} = 1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.13})$$

where the last equality holds by (D.12). Then using the identity (C.1) we have

$$Q^{-1} - Q_{(i)}^{-1} = \frac{b_i}{\theta\sqrt{T}} Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1}, \quad (\text{D.14a})$$

$$Q_{(i)}^{-1} - Q_{(ii)}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1}. \quad (\text{D.14b})$$

We observe that the matrices  $Q_{(i)}^{-1}$  and  $Q_{(ii)}^{-1}$  differ only on off-diagonal elements on the  $i$ -th column. Indeed, from (D.12) and (D.14b), if  $n \neq i$  or if  $n = m = i$  then

$$\mathbf{e}_m^\top (Q_{(i)}^{-1} - Q_{(ii)}^{-1}) \mathbf{e}_n = \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_m^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_n = 0. \quad (\text{D.15})$$

Then, substituting (D.14b) back into (D.14a) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_k^\top (Q^{-1} - Q_{(i)}^{-1}) \mathbf{e}_k &= \frac{b_i}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \frac{b_i}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &\quad + \frac{b_i}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &= \frac{b_i}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &\quad + \frac{b_i}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &\quad + \frac{b_i}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \\ &=: I_1 + I_2 + I_3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.16})$$

To simplify this expression further, define the following quadratic forms

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_i &:= \frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i, & \eta_i &:= \frac{1}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i, \\ \zeta_{ik} &:= \frac{1}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.17})$$

then using (D.12), we can easily write  $I_1, I_2$  and  $I_3$  into

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= 1_{i=k} \frac{b_k}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_k^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k = 1_{i=k} b_k \xi_k, \\ I_2 &= 1_{i=k} \frac{b_k}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{x}_k^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(kk)}^{-1} X_{k0} RE_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_k = 1_{i=k} b_k \eta_k, \\ I_3 &= 1_{i \neq k} \frac{b_i}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} RE_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_k = 1_{i \neq k} b_i \zeta_{ik}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.18})$$

We first state some estimates on  $\xi$  and  $\eta$  under the appropriate events. Recall from (2.18) the event  $\mathcal{B}_1 := \left\{ \|X_0^\top X_0\| \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right\}$ . Define the event

$$\mathcal{B}_1^i := \left\{ \|X_{i0}^\top X_{i0}\| \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^K \sigma_i^2 \right\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, K \quad (\text{D.19})$$

and write  $\mathcal{B}_2^i := \mathcal{B}_0 \cap \mathcal{B}_1^i$ . Then clearly  $\mathcal{B}_2^i \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2$ . Define

$$\bar{\xi}_i := \frac{1}{\theta T} \text{tr}(\Psi_0^{ii}(RE_\tau^\top E_\tau)), \quad \bar{\eta}_i := \frac{1}{\theta^2 T} \text{tr}(\Psi_0^{ii}(RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} RE_\tau^\top E_\tau)),$$

where  $\Psi_0^{ii}$  is defined in (C.4). Write

$$\underline{\xi}_i := \xi_i - \bar{\xi}_i, \quad \underline{\eta}_i := \eta_i - \bar{\eta}_i. \quad (\text{D.20})$$

Using Lemma 5 and taking iterated expectations we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\underline{\xi}_i^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i}] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\underline{\xi}_i^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i}]] = \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} O(\sigma_i^4 T) \mathbb{E} \|RE_\tau^\top E 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i}\|^2 = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^4}{\theta^2 T}\right), \\ \mathbb{E}[\underline{\eta}_i^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i}] &= \frac{1}{\theta^4 T^2} O(\sigma_i^4 T) \mathbb{E} \|RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_{i0}^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} RE_\tau^\top E_\tau 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i}\|^2 = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^4 \sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_j^4}{\theta^4 T}\right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3 we also have

$$\bar{\xi}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} = O(\sigma_i^2 \theta^{-1}), \quad \bar{\eta}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} = O\left(\frac{\sigma_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^K \sigma_j^2}{\theta^2}\right). \quad (\text{D.21})$$

We then consider the scalar  $b_i$  defined in (D.13). From (D.12) and (D.14b) we observe

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_i^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i &= \frac{1}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \mathbf{x}_i^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &+ \frac{1}{\theta^2 T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top RE_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} X_{i0} RE_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i = \xi_i + \eta_i. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting back into (D.13) we can simplify to obtain

$$b_i = (1 - \xi_i - \eta_i)^{-1}. \quad (\text{D.22})$$

Define  $\bar{b}_i = (1 - \bar{\xi}_i - \bar{\eta}_i)^{-1}$  so that subtracting the two we get

$$b_i = (1 - \xi_i - \eta_i)^{-1} = \bar{b}_i - b_i \bar{b}_i (\underline{\xi}_i + \underline{\eta}_i). \quad (\text{D.23})$$

Finally, from the expression (D.22) and the bounds (D.21) we clearly have

$$b_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 1 + o(1), \quad \bar{b}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} = 1 + o(1). \quad (\text{D.24})$$

We can now carry out the main idea of the proof. Recall notations  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  and  $\mathbb{E}_i[\cdot]$  from (D.1). By definition of  $Q_{(ii)}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2^i$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_k^\top (Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} - \mathbb{E}[Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]) \mathbf{e}_k &= \sum_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) \left( \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(ii)}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} \mathbf{e}_k \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) \left( \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \mathbf{e}_k - \mathbf{e}_k^\top Q_{(i)}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} \mathbf{e}_k \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from (D.15). Similar to how we dealt with the second term in (D.7) in the proof of Lemma 7, using Lemma 1 we may obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{e}_k^\top (Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} - \mathbb{E}[Q^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]) \mathbf{e}_k &= \sum_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) \mathbf{e}_k \left( Q^{-1} - Q_{(ii)}^{-1} \right) 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \mathbf{e}_k + O_{L^2}(KT^{-1}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) (I_1 + I_2 + I_3) 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} + O_{L^2}(KT^{-1}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.25})$$

where the second equality holds by (D.15).

As will be shown, the term involving  $I_1$  is the leading term of (D.25), this is what we consider now. Using the identity (D.18) we simply have

$$\sum_{i=1}^K (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) I_1 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^i} = (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) b_k \xi_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2},$$

which, recalling (D.20) and using (D.23), can be written into

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) b_k \xi_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} &= (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \left( \bar{b}_k - b_k \bar{b}_k (\underline{\xi}_k + \underline{\eta}_k) \right) \left( \bar{\xi}_k + \underline{\xi}_k \right) 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \left[ \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k + \bar{b}_k \underline{\xi}_k - b_k \bar{b}_k (\underline{\xi}_k + \underline{\eta}_k) (\bar{\xi}_k + \underline{\xi}_k) \right] 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.26})$$

We consider the three terms in the square bracket in (D.26) separately. For the first term, we note that  $(\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} = 0$  by definition of  $\bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2^k$ . Using this, we have

$$(\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = 0 - (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k (1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}).$$

Recalling (D.21) and (D.24) and using Assumptions 1 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right| \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left| \bar{b}_k \bar{\xi}_k (1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}) \right| = O(\sigma_k^2 \theta^{-1}) \mathbb{E} |1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}| = O(\sigma_k^2 \theta^{-1} KT^{-1}),$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that  $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2^k$  and Lemma 1. For the second term in (D.26), using  $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2^k$ , (D.24) and (D.21) we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left| (\mathbb{E}_k - \mathbb{E}_{k-1}) \bar{b}_k \underline{\xi}_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right|^2 \lesssim 4 \mathbb{E} \left| \bar{b}_k \underline{\xi}_k 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} \right|^2 = O \left( \frac{\sigma_k^4}{\theta^2 T} \right).$$

Similarly the third term of (D.26) is bounded by

$$\mathbb{E}|(\underline{\mathbb{E}}_k - \underline{\mathbb{E}}_{k-1})[b_k \bar{b}_k (\underline{\xi}_k + \underline{\eta}_k)(\bar{\xi}_k + \underline{\xi}_k) 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]| \lesssim 2\mathbb{E}|(\underline{\xi}_k + \underline{\eta}_k)(\bar{\xi}_k + \underline{\xi}_k) 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k}|.$$

Expanding, applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and using (D.24) and (D.21), we may obtain a bound of order  $o_{L^1}(T^{-1/2})$ ; we omit the repetitive details. Substituting the above bounds back into equation (D.26) we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{i=1}^K (\underline{\mathbb{E}}_i - \underline{\mathbb{E}}_{i-1}) I_1\right| = \mathbb{E}\left|(\underline{\mathbb{E}}_K - \underline{\mathbb{E}}_{K-1}) b_K \xi_K\right| = O\left(\frac{\sigma_k^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}}\right).$$

The cases of  $I_2$  and  $I_3$  can be dealt with with similar approaches and we omit the details. In fact, from the definitions in (D.18) it is not difficult to see that  $\eta$  and  $\zeta$  are higher order terms relative to  $\xi$  under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ . It can therefore be shown that the term involving  $I_1$  is the leading term in (D.25) and the claim follows.

b) Define  $\bar{Q} := I_T - \theta^{-1} X_0^\top X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau$  so that similar to (2.17) we have

$$Q^{-1} - I_K = \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top (I_K - \theta^{-1} X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top)^{-1} = \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}^{-1} X_0^\top.$$

Recall that we have  $X_0^\top X_0 = T^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top$ , define the matrices

$$\bar{Q}_{(j)} := I_T - \frac{1}{\theta T} \sum_{k \neq j} \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \quad \bar{Q}_{(ij)} := I_T - \frac{1}{\theta T} \sum_{k \neq i, j} \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau,$$

so that  $\bar{Q} - \bar{Q}_{(j)} = -\frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_j \mathbf{x}_j^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau$  and  $\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \bar{Q}_{(ij)} = -\frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau$ . Let

$$a_j := \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{(j)}^{-1}(\bar{Q} - \bar{Q}_{(j)}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_j^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(j)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j},$$

$$a_{ij} := \frac{1}{1 + \text{tr}(\bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1}(\bar{Q}_{(j)} - \bar{Q}_{(ij)}))} = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i},$$

then by (C.2) we have

$$\bar{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j = a_j \bar{Q}_{(j)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j, \quad \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(i)}^{-1} = a_{ij} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1}.$$

We can therefore write

$$Q_{ij}^{-1} = \frac{1}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j = \frac{a_j a_{ij}}{\theta T} \mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j.$$

Now define  $X_{ij0} := X_0 - T^{-1/2}(\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top + \mathbf{e}_j \mathbf{x}_j)$  and events  $\mathcal{B}_1^{ij}$  and  $\mathcal{B}_2^{ij}$  analogous to (D.19) with  $X_{i0}$  replaced by  $X_{ij0}$ . Similar to (a) of the Lemma we have  $a_j = 1 + o(1)$  and  $a_{ij} = 1 + o(1)$  under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ . Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^2 \leq \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}_i^\top R E_\tau^\top E_\tau \bar{Q}_{(ij)}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_j 1_{\mathcal{B}_2^{ij}}|^2.$$

By Lemma 5 we have

$$\mathbb{E}|Q_{ij}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^2 = \frac{1}{\theta^2 T^2} O(\sigma_i^2 \sigma_j^2 T),$$

which completes the whole proof.  $\square$

We finally show that the conditional expectations of diagonal elements of  $A$ ,  $B$  and  $Q^{-1}$ , defined in (2.15), are sufficiently close to the unconditional expectation.

**Lemma 9.** *For each  $i = 1, \dots, K$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{3/2}\sqrt{T}} \right), \quad \underline{\mathbb{E}}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \right), \\ \underline{\mathbb{E}}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] - \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] &= O_{L^2} \left( \frac{K\|\boldsymbol{\sigma}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* From (a) of Lemma 5 we recall that

$$\underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \underline{\mathbb{E}}[\mathbf{x}_{i,[1:T-\tau]}^\top R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \mathbf{x}_{i,[\tau+1:T]}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} \quad (\text{D.27})$$

where, using (C.4) and the cyclic property of the trace, we have

$$\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(R)) = \text{tr}((\mathbf{0}, I_{T-\tau})(\sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i + I_T)(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0})^\top R) =: \text{tr}(GR). \quad (\text{D.28})$$

Furthermore, using (a) of Lemma 3, we see that

$$G := (\mathbf{0}, I_{T-\tau})(\sigma_i^2 \Phi_i^\top \Phi_i + I_T)(I_{T-\tau}, \mathbf{0})^\top = O_{\|\cdot\|}(\sigma_i^2). \quad (\text{D.29})$$

From (D.27) we have  $\underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \mathbb{E}[\underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} (\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} (\text{tr}(GR) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(GR) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta T}} \text{tr}(G(R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])), \end{aligned}$$

by linearity of the expectation and the trace. By (a) of Lemma 7 we have

$$\underline{\mathbb{E}}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[A_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\theta}} O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\|G\|}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \right) = O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta^{3/2}\sqrt{T}} \right),$$

where the last equality follows from (D.29). For the case of  $B$ , similar computations and (b) of Lemma 7 give

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{\mathbb{E}}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] - \mathbb{E}[B_{ii}1_{\mathcal{B}_0}] &= \frac{1}{\theta T} (\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(E_0^\top E_0 R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\Psi_1^{ii}(E_0^\top E_0 R)) 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}]) \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta T} \text{tr}(G(E_0^\top E_0 R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0} - \mathbb{E}[E_0^\top E_0 R 1_{\mathcal{B}_0}])) = \frac{1}{\theta} O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\|G\|}{\sqrt{T}} \right) = O_{L^2} \left( \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\theta\sqrt{T}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally we consider  $\underline{\mathbb{E}}[Q_{ii}^{-1}]$ . We recall from (2.17) that

$$Q := I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 R E_\tau^\top E_\tau X_0^\top. \quad (\text{D.30})$$

The strategy of the proof, similar to that of Lemma 7 and Lemma 8, is express  $\underline{\mathbb{E}}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] - \mathbb{E}[Q_{ii}^{-1}1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]$  into a sum of martingale difference sequence. We first introduce the necessary notations and carry out some algebraic computations.

Similar to (D.2), we will define  $\underline{\epsilon}_{k0} := \epsilon_{K+k, [1:T-\tau]}$  and  $\underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} := \epsilon_{K+k, [\tau+1:T]}$ . Recall from (D.4) that  $R - R_k = \sum_{n=1}^5 U_n$ , where the  $U_n$ 's are defined in (D.5). Similar to the computations in (D.10), we may obtain

$$RE_\tau^\top E_\tau - R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} = \frac{1}{T} R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top + \sum_{n=1}^5 U_n E_\tau^\top E_\tau =: V + W,$$

where we defined

$$\begin{aligned} V &:= \frac{1}{T} R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top + (U_2 + U_3) E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \\ W &:= (U_1 + U_4 + U_5) E_\tau^\top E_\tau. \end{aligned}$$

Define matrices  $V_1, V_2, V_3, W_1, W_2, W_3$  by,

$$\begin{aligned} V_1 &:= I_T, \quad V_2 := \frac{\beta_k}{\theta} E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \quad V_3 := \frac{\beta_k \beta_k}{\theta^2 T} E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau \\ W_1 &:= \beta_k R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \quad W_2 := \frac{\beta_k \beta_k}{\theta T} R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \\ W_3 &:= \frac{\beta_k \beta_k^2}{\theta^2 T^2} R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau, \end{aligned}$$

so that using (D.5) we can decompose  $V$  and  $W$  into

$$V = \frac{1}{T} R_k \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k\tau}^\top (V_1 + V_2 + V_3) \tag{D.31a}$$

$$W = \frac{1}{\theta T} R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0} \underline{\epsilon}_{k0}^\top (W_1 + W_2 + W_3). \tag{D.31b}$$

It is clear that  $V$  and  $W$  are matrices of rank one. We define

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{Q}_{(k)} &:= I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 (R E_\tau^\top E_\tau - V) X_0^\top, \\ \underline{Q}_{(kk)} &:= I_K - \frac{1}{\theta} X_0 (R E_\tau^\top E_\tau - V - W) X_0^\top, \end{aligned}$$

then from (D.30) we can write  $Q - \underline{Q}_{(k)} = -\theta^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top$  and  $Q_{(k)} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)} = -\theta^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top$ . Define the following scalars quantities

$$\alpha_k := \frac{1}{1 - \theta^{-1} \text{tr}(Q_{(k)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top)}, \quad \alpha_{kk} := \frac{1}{1 - \theta^{-1} \text{tr}(Q_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top)},$$

then using (C.1) we obtain

$$Q^{-1} = \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1}, \quad \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1} = \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1}.$$

Substituting the second identity into the first gives

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{-1} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} &= \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\theta} \left( \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \right) X_0 V X_0^\top \left( \underline{Q}_{(k)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \right), \end{aligned}$$



which after simplifying becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{-1} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} &= \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{\theta^2} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\theta^2} \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 W X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.32})$$

Before we proceed with the proof we first prove some moment estimates for the terms in (D.32). We start with some informal observations. By comparing (D.31a) and (D.31a), we see that the matrix  $W$  is smaller in magnitude in comparison to  $V$  by a factor of  $\theta^{-1}$ . This suggests that the first term in (D.32) is the leading term while the rest are high order terms in comparison and we will therefore only deal with first term in detail below. The same arguments can be applied to the rest of (D.32) to make the above argument rigorous, but we omit the repetitive details.

Recall the family of event  $\{\mathcal{B}_0^k, k = 1, \dots, p\}$  from (D.6) and define  $\mathcal{B}_2^k := \mathcal{B}_0^k \cap \mathcal{B}_1$ . From definition we note that  $\mathcal{B}_2 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_2^k$ . Furthermore, from Lemma 1 we have

$$1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k} - 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \leq 1 - 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} = o_p(T^{-l}), \quad \forall l \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (\text{D.33})$$

In the computations below, we will often substitute  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k}$  with  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2}$  and vice versa in expectations. Whenever we do so, we may use (D.33) and a similar argument to how we dealt with (D.7) to show that the error term of such a substitution is negligible for the purpose of the proof. Hence from now on we will use the two indicators  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2^k}$  and  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2}$  interchangeably below without further justifications.

Since we can write  $X_0^\top = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{l=1}^K \mathbf{x}_l \mathbf{e}_l^\top$ , the first term in (D.32) can be expressed as

$$\frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i = \frac{1}{\theta T} \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^K \mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_l (\mathbf{x}_l^\top V \mathbf{x}_m) \mathbf{e}_m^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i, \quad (\text{D.34})$$

where, recalling (D.31a), we have

$$\mathbf{x}_l^\top V \mathbf{x}_m = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{n=1}^3 \mathbf{x}_l^\top R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top V_n \mathbf{x}_m. \quad (\text{D.35})$$

Using (D.34)-(D.35) and the inequality  $(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i)^p \lesssim n^{p-1} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^p$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right|^2 &\lesssim \frac{K^2}{\theta^2 T^2} \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_l (\mathbf{x}_l^\top V \mathbf{x}_m) \mathbf{e}_m^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right|^2 \\ &\lesssim \frac{3K^2}{\theta^2 T^4} \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^3 \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbf{x}_l^\top R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top V_n \mathbf{x}_m \|\underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1}\|^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.36})$$

Note that under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ , we can easily see that  $\|\underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}\| = O(1)$ . Therefore by the Cauchy Schwarz inequality we can obtain

$$(\text{D.36}) \lesssim \frac{K^2}{\theta^2 T^4} \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^K \sum_{n=1}^3 \mathbb{E} [(\mathbf{x}_l^\top R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau})^4 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]^{1/2} \mathbb{E} [(\underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top V_n \mathbf{x}_m)^4 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]^{1/2}. \quad (\text{D.37})$$

Note that  $\mathcal{B}_2 = \mathcal{B}_1 \cap \mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0^k$  so that  $1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \leq 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}$ . We can then condition on  $R_k$  and apply (a) of Lemma 4 to the first quadratic form in (D.36) to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{x}_l^\top R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left| \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{z}_{l,[1:T]} \\ \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{l,[1:T]} \end{pmatrix}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_l \Phi_l \\ I_T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I_{T-\tau} \\ \mathbf{0}_{\tau \times (T-\tau)} \end{pmatrix} R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k} \right|^4 \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(R_k^2 (\sigma_l^2 \Phi_l^\top \Phi_l + I_T))^2 1_{\mathcal{B}_0^k}] = O(\sigma_l^4 T^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from using  $\text{tr}(R) \leq T\|R\|$  and applying Lemma 3. Similarly, for the quadratic involving  $V_1$  in (D.37), we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top V_1 \mathbf{x}_m|^4 = \mathbb{E}|\underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top \mathbf{x}_m|^4 \lesssim \text{tr}(\sigma_m^2 \Phi_m^\top \Phi_m + I_T)^2 = O(\sigma_m^4 T^2).$$

We observe here that that the matrices  $V_2$  and  $V_3$  are smaller in magnitude in comparison to  $V_1$  by a factor of  $\theta^{-1}$  under the event  $\mathcal{B}_2$ . Hence it is to be expected that the quadratic forms involving  $V_2$  and  $V_3$  in (D.37) should be negligible in comparison to the one involving  $V_1$ . To be more concrete, we sketch here how bound the quadratic form involving  $V_2$ ; the case of  $V_3$  can be dealt with in a similar manner. Recall that the matrix  $E_0^\top E_0$  can be written as  $E_0^\top E_0 = E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} + \frac{1}{T} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0}^\top$ . Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top V_2 \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 &= \frac{1}{\theta^4} \mathbb{E}|\underline{\beta}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top E_0^\top E_0 R_k E_\tau^\top E_\tau \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 \\ &\lesssim \frac{1}{\theta^4} \mathbb{E}|\underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} R_k E_{k\tau}^\top E_{k\tau} \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 + \frac{1}{\theta^4} \mathbb{E}|\frac{1}{T} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0} \frac{1}{T} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0}^\top R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0}^\top \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta^4} \mathbb{E}|\frac{1}{T} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} R_k \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau}^\top \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4 + \frac{1}{\theta^4} \mathbb{E}|\frac{1}{T} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k\tau} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0} \underline{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}_{k0}^\top R_k E_{k0}^\top E_{k0} \mathbf{x}_m 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^4. \end{aligned}$$

At this point we recognize that the four terms above has a similar structure as the case of  $V_1$ . Namely they all involve quadratic forms where the matrix in the middle is independent from the vectors on each side. Using the same approach as we did in the case of  $V_1$  we can indeed show that this is a negligible term in comparison. The case of  $V_3$  is similar albeit more tedious, and we omit the details. We may then conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}|\frac{1}{\theta} \mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} X_0 V X_0^\top \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^2 \lesssim \frac{K^2}{\theta^2 T^4} \sum_{l=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^K \sigma_l^2 \sigma_m^2 T^2. \quad (\text{D.38})$$

The same strategy described above can then be repeated for each of the remaining three terms in (D.32) to show that they are higher order terms compared to the term in (D.38) (see the remark below (D.32)). We may therefore conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q^{-1} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1}) \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}|^2 \lesssim \frac{K^2}{\theta^2 T^2} \left( \sum_{m=1}^K \sigma_m^2 \right)^2. \quad (\text{D.39})$$

Finally, we can decompose  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top Q^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}]$  into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top Q^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top \underline{Q}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}] &= \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) \mathbf{e}_i^\top Q^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2} \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^p (\mathbb{E}_i - \mathbb{E}_{i-1}) \mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q^{-1} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1}) \mathbf{e}_i 1_{\mathcal{B}_2}, \end{aligned}$$

where for the last equality we refer to (D.33) and the remark immediately below it. Using the bound (D.39) we immediately have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top Q^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{e}_i^\top Q^{-1} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}]|^2 \\ & \leq 4 \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{e}_i^\top (Q^{-1} - \underline{Q}_{(kk)}^{-1} \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{B}_2}) \mathbf{e}_i|^2 \lesssim \frac{K^2}{\theta^2 T} \left( \sum_{m=1}^K \sigma_m^2 \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which the claim follows.  $\square$

## Appendix E Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Without loss of generality, we only consider the case for  $Z_{i,\tau} > 0$  since the case for  $Z_{i,\tau} < 0$  can be considered in precisely the same way. For a constant significant level  $\alpha$ , to see  $\Pr(Z_{i,\tau} > z_\alpha | H_1) \rightarrow 1$  as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , it is sufficient to show that  $Z_{i,\tau} \rightarrow \infty$  as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ .

To start, we firstly notice that for any  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, K\}$  and a finite time lag  $\tau$ ,  $\frac{\gamma_{i,\tau}}{2\sqrt{2}v_{i,\tau}}$  does not divergent with  $T$  and  $p$ , since both  $\gamma_{i,\tau}$  and  $v_{i,\tau}$  are some constants when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ . It then suffices to show  $\sqrt{T} \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}} \rightarrow \infty$  when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ . Note that by the definition of  $\theta_{i,\tau}$  in (4.4), we can show that

$$\frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}} = \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \theta_{i,\tau}} - \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)} \theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)} \theta_{i,\tau}} = \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)}} \frac{2 + 2c}{2 + c} - \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}} \frac{2}{2 + c}, \quad (\text{E.1})$$

where the second equation follows from the fact that  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} = (1 + c)\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$  and  $\theta_{i,\tau} = \frac{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(1)} + \theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{2} = \frac{2+c}{2}\theta_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ . Moreover, under Assumptions 1 and 2, we know from Theorem 2 that for  $m = 1$  and 2,

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}}{2v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}} \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)} - \theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1),$$

as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$  where  $\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  is the asymptotic centering of  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$ . As a result,

$$\frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(m)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}^{(m)}} = 1 + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right),$$

as  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , where we stress the fact that  $\gamma_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  and  $v_{i,\tau}^{(m)}$  are constant when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore, (E.1) reduces to

$$\frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}} = \frac{2 + 2c}{2 + c} \left( 1 + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \right) - \frac{2}{2 + c} \left( 1 + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}\right) \right) = \frac{2c}{2 + c} + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{2c}{2 + c}\right),$$

for  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ , and we conclude that

$$\sqrt{T} \frac{\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} - \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}}{\theta_{i,\tau}} = \sqrt{T} \frac{2c}{2 + c} + o_P\left(\frac{2c}{2 + c}\right),$$

when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ .

Consequently, when  $T, p \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $Z_{i,\tau} \rightarrow \infty$  as long as  $\sqrt{T} \frac{2c}{2+c} \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\lambda_{i,\tau}^{(1)} \neq \lambda_{i,\tau}^{(2)}$ . And it is sufficient to show the assertion in this theorem.  $\square$

# Appendix F Additional Simulations on the Power of Autocovariance Test

## F.1 The Impact of Autocorrelation on the Power of Autocovariance Test

In this section, we study the impact of the autocorrelations on the power of autocovariance test. To be specific, we consider exactly the same setup as in Section 5 of the main paper, except that we keep the variance of factors the same across two different factor models but set the AR coefficients for the second population to be  $\phi_1^{(2)} = 0.9\phi_1^{(1)}, 0.8\phi_1^{(1)}, 0.7\phi_1^{(1)}, 0.6\phi_1^{(1)}, 0.5\phi_1^{(1)}$ , respectively. By doing that, we can investigate how the empirical powers of the autocovariance test are affected by the difference between autocorrelations of factors in two factor models.

Similar to Section 5, for each combination of  $T, N$  and  $\delta$ , two high-dimensional time series observations are generated first. We then follow the same estimation and testing procedures in Section 4.2 and compute the test statistic  $\tilde{Z}_{i,\tau}$  by (4.9), where again  $B = 500$  bootstrap samples are generated to find  $\tilde{\theta}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ ,  $\tilde{v}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$ , and  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i,\tau}^{(m)*}$  for both samples with the number of factors assumed to be known (i.e.,  $\tilde{K}_m = 1$ ). Lastly, based on  $M = 500$  Monte Carlo simulations, the empirical powers of a one-sided autocovariance test for  $i = 1$ ,  $\tau = 1$ , and  $\alpha = 0.1$  can be estimated by the empirical probability that  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$  is greater than  $z_{1-\alpha}$ , i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbf{1}_{\{\tilde{Z}_{1,1}^{(m)} > z_{1-\alpha}\}},$$

where we have assumed  $\mu_{1,1}^{(1)} > \mu_{1,1}^{(2)}$  for various choices of  $\phi_1^{(2)}$ .




Figure 7: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ .

As presented in Figure 7 and 8, for all ratios of  $N$  and  $T$ , empirical powers increase towards 1, while  $\phi_1^{(2)}$  drops from  $0.9\phi_1^{(1)}$  to  $0.5\phi_1^{(1)}$ . As a consequence, Figure 7 and 8 suggest that the autocovariance test can correctly reject the null hypothesis when two high-dimensional time series have different temporal autocorrelations  $\phi_1^{(2)} \neq \phi_1^{(1)}$ . However, unlike the case for the impact of variance, empirical powers of the one-sided autocovariance test for relatively weak factor models with large  $\delta$ , especially  $\delta = 0.5$ , are slightly lower than those of relatively strong factor models with small  $\delta$ . In other words, compared with strong factor models (i.e. high factor




Figure 8: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 800$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\delta = 0, 0.1, 0.3, 0.5$ .

strength), the autocovariance test for weak factor models is slightly less potent in detecting the same proportional changes in autocorrelations of factors for two different factor models.

## F.2 The Impact of Temporal-dependent Noises on the Power of Autocovariance Test

In this section, we study the impact of temporal-dependent noises on the power of autocovariance test. To be specific, we consider exactly the same setup as in Section 5 of the main paper, except that we change the DGP of  $\{\epsilon_{j,t}\}$  from i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  to the same AR(1) processes as  $\{f_{1,t}^{(m)}\}$  but with various variances. In that sense, the error components are temporal-dependent and we are studying the case of “1 large spikes +  $(N - 1)$  small/medium eigenvalues” in the symmetrized autocovariance matrix. To explore the impact of temporal-dependent noise, we set the standard deviation of  $\{\epsilon_{j,t}\}$  to be 1, 2 and 5, respectively.




Figure 9: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\sigma_\epsilon = 0, 1, 2, 5$ .

Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$  and various choices of  $N$  are presented in Figure 9. When the autocovariances of noise components are relatively small ( $\sigma_\epsilon = 1, 2$ ), i.e. in the case of “1 large spikes +  $(N - 1)$  small eigenvalues” in the symmetrized autocovariance matrix, the power of autocovariance test is not much different from the case

with i.i.d. errors. However, when the autocovariance of noise increases ( $\sigma_\epsilon = 5$ ), i.e. in the case of “1 large spikes +  $(N - 1)$  medium eigenvalues”, the power drops since the estimation of sample autocovariance matrices starts to suffer from the “curse of dimensionality”.

### F.3 The Impact of Time Lags on the Power of Autocovariance Test

In this section, we study the impact of the choice of time lags on the power of autocovariance test. To be specific, we consider exactly the same setup as in Section 5 of the main paper, except that we perform our test on various choices of time lag  $\tau$ . To explore the impact of time lag  $\tau$ , we perform the test for  $\tau = 1, 2, 3$  and 5, respectively.




Figure 10: Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$ ,  $N = 200, 400, 800$ , and  $\tau = 1, 2, 3, 5$ .

Empirical powers of the autocovariance test with  $T = 400$  and various choices of  $N$  are presented in Figure 10. When the time lag  $\tau$  increases, the power of the autocovariance test drops. This is mainly because when  $\tau$  is relatively large, the autocorrelation of the factors, which are generated with AR(1) and  $\phi_1 = 0.5$ , becomes weak so that the spikiness of the first eigenvalue drops accordingly.

## Appendix G Additional Study on Hierarchical Clustering for Multi-country Mortality Data

### G.1 Comparing Projection Matrices for Multi-country Mortality Data with One Factor

As discussed in Remark 4, the test of eigenvectors and eigenspace is of interest to many applications as discussed by a few works such as Fan et al. (2022) and Silin and Fan (2020), and we notice that Tang et al. (2022) proposed a clustering method for multi-country mortality data using eigen functions under a functional time series setup.

Therefore, in this section, we include a comparison of the mortality rate projection matrices for countries with one spiked factor to study the similarity of the mortality data.

For each country, the projection matrix is computed as the sum of eigenvectors corresponding to spiked eigenvalues multiplied by their transpose, i.e.  $\sum_i^K v_i v_i^\top$ , where  $v_i$  is the eigenvector corresponding to the  $i$ -th largest eigenvalue of the symmetrized autocovariance matrix. We

measure the dissimilarity between each pair of countries by the  $\ell_2$  norm of the difference between two projection matrices. The  $\ell_2$  norm takes values between 0 (for exactly the same projection matrix) and 1 (for projections corresponding to orthonormal eigenvectors). The results are presented in Figure 11.




Figure 11:  $\ell_2$  norm of the difference between the projection matrices for countries with one factor

Indeed, for most countries (except for Bulgaria) with one factor, the dissimilarity is relatively small. The similarity in projection matrices reveals that common human characteristics can be extracted from different countries. Meanwhile, this similarity does not guarantee that common human characteristics are of the same importance in leading the trend of human mortality rates in different countries. This motivates our proposed test on the equivalence of the largest eigenvalues since it can tell whether common human characteristics (compared to the country-specific features such as socioeconomic conditions) are of the same strength in affecting the mortality rates in different countries. Similar discussions on the roles of both human characteristics and country-specific features in mortality forecasting are also seen in [Li and Lee \(2005\)](#).

## G.2 Hierarchical Clustering for Multi-country Mortality Data with More than One Factors

For countries with more than one factor, to test on the equivalence of autocovariances through factor models, test statistics between each pair of countries are computed for all three factors as  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$ ,  $\tilde{Z}_{2,1}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{3,1}$ . As depicted in Figure 12, the  $p$ -values for  $\tilde{Z}_{1,1}$  and  $\tilde{Z}_{2,1}$  between all

pairs of countries are relatively large, which suggests that the differences of the first two factors between each pair of countries are not significant (at  $\alpha = 0.1$ ). Nonetheless,  $p$ -values for  $\tilde{Z}_{1,3}$  are relatively small between Canada and France, Canada and Italy, and Italy and Portugal. As a result, despite that  $p$ -value is 0.09 for  $\tilde{Z}_{1,3}$  between Italy and Portugal, one may suggest considering France, Italy, and Portugal have similar spiked eigenvalues of their autocovariance matrices in a three-factor model and include them in a combined statistical analysis while leaving Canada for an independent analysis. To measure the dissimilarity of mortality data between two countries with more than one factors, the overall distance between two countries can be defined as a weighted average of the distances for all factors. In specific, for each pair of countries, we can define the distance for the  $i$ -th factor as  $dist_i = 1 - p_i$ , where  $p_i$  is the  $p$ -value of the autocovariance test computed using the  $i$ -th factor of both countries. It is then straightforward to compute the overall distance between this pair of countries as

$$dist = \sum_{i=1}^K w_i \cdot dist_i,$$

where  $w_i$  is a weight on  $dist_i$ . Practically, we suggest that the weight  $w_i$  is related to the magnitude of each singular value of the autocovariance matrix (or equivalently the squared root of the eigenvalues of symmetrized autocovariance matrix), since the singular values are related to the autocovariance explained by each factor. Based on this idea, we compute  $w_i$  as

$$w_i = (w_i^{(1)} + w_i^{(2)})/2,$$

where  $w_i^{(1)} = \sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_{i,\tau}^{(1)}} / \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_{i,\tau}^{(1)}} \right)$  and  $w_i^{(2)} = \sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_{i,\tau}^{(2)}} / \left( \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{\tilde{\lambda}_{i,\tau}^{(2)}} \right)$ . The result of hierarchical clustering using average linkage for all countries with three factors is presented in Figure 13.




Figure 12:  $p$ -values of the autocovariance test for each pair of countries that have three factors in the estimated factor model

However, as discussed in Remark 4, even the number of factors across some countries are different, it may still be of interest to perform the test for the first factor only. The idea behind is also very straightforward, that is we can study whether the mortality rates across all countries have the same low-dimensional representations in the eigenspace spanned by the first eigenvector shared by all countries. In this sense, we perform autocovariance tests and the hierarchical clustering analysis on the first factor for all countries regardless of the estimated total number of factors. The result of  $p$ -values computed for the first factors are illustrated in






Figure 13: Cluster dendrogram for countries that have three factors in the estimated factor model

Figure 14 and the result of hierarchical clustering using average linkage for the first factor is presented in Figure 15. As seen in Figure 14, in addition to what has been discussed for those countries with only one factor in their factor models, the first factor of Portugal and France are also different from the first factor of Bulgaria and Finland, respectively. Consequently, despite the differences between the estimated numbers of factors for Canada, Denmark, Italy, Poland, and all other countries, the total death rates projected in the eigenspace spanned by the first common eigenvector are not significantly different across these countries.



Figure 14:  $p$ -values of the autocovariance test of the first factor for all countries




Figure 15: Cluster dendrogram for all countries using the first factor

## Appendix H Simulation Studies on Gaussian Assumption in Theorem 2

In this section, we conduct simulations to show that the results of Theorem 2 can still be obtained when we replace the Gaussian error  $\epsilon_{it}$  by Gamma or Student's t distributed errors. The simulations considered in this section are based on the following factor models

$$\mathbf{y}_t = \begin{pmatrix} \text{diag}(\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_K) \\ \mathbf{0}_{p \times K} \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{f}_t + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \quad (\text{H.1})$$

where we choose  $T = 4000$ ,  $p = 400$ ,  $K = 2$ ,  $\sigma_1 = 50$ ,  $\sigma_2 = 10$ , and the factors  $\mathbf{f}_t$  are generated by MA(2) processes

$$f_{it} = \sum_{l=0}^2 \phi_{il} z_{i,t-l}, \quad i = 1, 2, \quad t = 1, \dots, T,$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\phi}_1 = (5, 3, 1)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\phi}_2 = (1, -2, 1)$  with variances of factors normalized to 1. The errors  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$  are generated i.i.d. from three different distributions: (1) Gaussian i.e.  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ; (2) Gamma(2, 2) with mean and variance normalized to 0 and 1, respectively; (3) Student's t with d.f. = 4 with mean and variance normalized to 0 and 1, respectively. By generating  $M = 5000$  Monte Carlo simulations, we draw the histograms and density plots of  $\lambda_{1,1}$  and  $\lambda_{2,1}$  for the above three cases (subject to the same scaling) as shown in Figure 16 to 17, where the differences among the histograms and density plots are rather small.




Figure 16: Histograms of  $\lambda_{1,1}$  and  $\lambda_{2,1}$  (subject to a rescaling) under three different assumptions of  $\epsilon_t$




Figure 17: Density plots of  $\lambda_{1,1}$  and  $\lambda_{2,1}$  (subject to a rescaling) under three different assumptions of  $\epsilon_t$