

Model Averaging based Semiparametric Modelling for Conditional Quantile Prediction

Chaohui Guo

School of Mathematical Sciences
Chongqing Normal University, China

Wenyang Zhang *

Department of Mathematics
The University of York, UK

March 21, 2022

Abstract

In real data analysis, the underlying model is usually unknown, modelling strategy plays a key role in the success of data analysis. Stimulated by the idea of model averaging, we propose a novel semiparametric modelling strategy for conditional quantile prediction, without assuming the underlying model is any specific parametric or semiparametric model. Thanks the optimality of the selected weights by cross-validation, the proposed modelling strategy results in a more accurate prediction than that based on some commonly used semiparametric models, such as the varying coefficient models and additive models. Asymptotic properties are established of the proposed modelling strategy together with its estimation procedure. Intensive simulation studies are conducted to demonstrate how well the proposed method works, compared with its alternatives under various circumstances. The results show the proposed method indeed leads to more accurate predictions than its alternatives. Finally, the proposed modelling strategy together with its prediction procedure are applied to the Boston housing data, which result in more accurate predictions of the quantiles of the house prices than that based on some commonly used alternative methods, therefore, present us a more accurate picture of the housing market in Boston.

Keywords: Asymptotic optimality, conditional quantile prediction, Kernel smoothing, leave-one-out cross-validation, model averaging, varying coefficient models.

*Corresponding author, email: wenyang.zhang@york.ac.uk, address: Department of Mathematics, University of York, York YO10 5DD, UK.

1 Introduction

1.1 Preamble

Quantile prediction is an important topic in data analysis, it is widely used in many scientific disciplines, which includes economics, finance, sociology, engineering, medical science, to name but a few. Modelling strategy plays a key role in the success of quantile prediction. Traditional approach is mainly based on linear models, see [Belloni and Chernozhukov \(2011\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2012\)](#); [Daye et al. \(2012\)](#); [Lee et al. \(2014\)](#); [Fan et al. \(2014a\)](#); [Tong et al. \(2020\)](#); [Frumento et al. \(2021\)](#). It is well know the linearity assumption may not hold in reality, some nonlinear models are proposed in literature, see [Muller et al. \(2006\)](#); [Jiang et al. \(2012\)](#); [Zheng et al. \(2018\)](#); [Uematsu \(2019\)](#); [Zhu et al. \(2021\)](#), and the reference therein. Like linear models, any parametric models have their limitation, therefore, may suffer from misspecification and lead to biased predictions. Nonparametric modelling is flexible, however, it is not applicable for multiple explanatory variables due to “curse of dimensionality”. Semiparametric modelling appears as a more promising modelling strategy in quantile regression analysis, it makes use of model information, yet incorporates the ingredients of nonparametric modelling into the model building process, see [Fan and Zhang \(1999\)](#); [Wang et al. \(2009\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2009\)](#); [Kai et al. \(2010\)](#); [Kim and Yang \(2011\)](#); [Sun et al. \(2014\)](#); [Cheng et al. \(2014\)](#); [Fan et al. \(2015\)](#); [Sherwood and Wang \(2016\)](#); [Cheng et al. \(2016\)](#); [Dong et al. \(2019\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#), and the reference therein. However, to find a suitable semiparametric model for a dataset of interest can be difficult. Model averaging, as a modelling technique, takes all potential models into account and assigns a weight to each model, which reduces model uncertainty and may result in more accurate predictions, see [Hansen and Racine \(2012\)](#); [Lu and Su \(2015\)](#); [Gao et al. \(2016\)](#); [Ando and Li \(2017\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2020\)](#); [Li et al. \(2020\)](#); [Feng et al. \(2020, 2021\)](#), and the reference therein. Although plenty of models appear in literature, which model should be used in reality depends on what the data is like and which aspects are of interest.

1.2 A motivating example

The data which stimulates this work is the famous Boston housing data, see detailed description of the data in [Section 5](#). What we are interested in is how some factors, which are commonly associated with house price, affect the house prices in different parts of the market, such as upper end of the market and lower end of the market, thereby predict the market. The factors of interest are:

- (1) CRIM: per capita crime rate by town

- (2) ZN: proportion of residential land zoned for lots over 25,000 sq.ft.
- (3) INDUS: proportion of non-retail business acres per town
- (4) CHAS: Charles River dummy variable (= 1 if tract bounds river; 0 otherwise)
- (5) NOX: nitric oxides concentration (parts per 10 million)
- (6) RM: average number of rooms per dwelling
- (7) AGE: proportion of owner-occupied units built prior to 1940
- (8) DIS: weighted distances to five Boston employment centres
- (9) RAD: index of accessibility to radial highways
- (10) TAX: full-value property-tax rate per \$10,000
- (11) PTRATIO: pupil-teacher ratio by town
- (12) B: $1000(Bk - 0.63)^2$ where Bk is the proportion of blacks by town
- (13) LSTAT: % lower status of the population.

In the context of statistical modelling, what we are interested in can be formulated as how the above listed factors affect the quantiles of the house prices in Boston, and how to predict the conditional quantiles given these factors. This is basically a problem of conditional quantile prediction.

The analysis of this dataset has appeared in much literature. One frequently used approach is based on the varying coefficient models (VCMs), see [Fan and Huang \(2005\)](#); [Wang and Xia \(2009\)](#); [Hu and Xia \(2012\)](#); [Fan et al. \(2014b\)](#). However, for this dataset, the selection of the index in the varying coefficient models is not as obvious as the cases where nonlinear dynamic is of interest. Among the 13 factors, which are the explanatory variables, 10 are continuous variables, therefore, any of them can serve as the index. Quite a few literature assumes LSTAT as the index, for example [Fan and Huang \(2005\)](#); [Wang and Xia \(2009\)](#); [Hu and Xia \(2012\)](#). Whilst, their analysis has led to some interesting findings, it is reasonable to question the rationale of assuming LSTAT as the index. In fact, regardless which variable is assumed as the index, the same question can be asked. To solve this problem, it would be better to take a more data driven approach. One promising data-driven-approach is that we assume any of the 10 continuous variables can be the index, and let data assign a weight to the prediction obtained based on each varying coefficient model resulted

from assuming each of the 10 continuous variables to be the index, then take a model averaging approach to construct the final prediction. Indeed, we will see that this approach leads to a more accurate and stable prediction for the conditional quantiles, and it stimulates us to propose the semiparametric modelling strategy for conditional quantile prediction in this paper.

Although the proposed modelling strategy and the resulting predictions are stimulated by a particular dataset, apparently, they are widely applicable for other datasets from many other disciplines.

This paper is organised as follows: in Section 2, we will give a detailed description about the proposed modelling strategy and the resulting prediction. Theoretical properties of the proposed prediction and estimation involved are presented in Section 3. In Section 4, we conduct intensive simulation studies to demonstrate how well the proposed prediction works. In Section 5, we apply the proposed prediction method to the Boston house price data, and show the proposed method provides a more accurate prediction to the market than its alternatives. All theoretical proofs are left in Section 6.

2 A modelling strategy in quantile prediction

Although the proposed modelling strategy is motivated by the Boston house price data, in this Section, rather than focusing on this specific data, we introduce the methodology in a generic term.

Let Y be the response variable, \mathbf{X} the covariate. $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_C^\top, \mathbf{X}_D^\top)^\top$, \mathbf{X}_C is a p -dimensional continuous vector, \mathbf{X}_D a q dimensional discrete vector. We use $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X})$ to denote the τ th quantile of Y given \mathbf{X} , which is what we would like to predict.

Let $\{(\mathbf{X}_i^\top, Y_i), 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ be a sample from (\mathbf{X}^\top, Y) , we are going to construct a prediction of $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X})$ based on this sample.

2.1 Individual varying coefficient model based quantile prediction

In this Sub-section, we are going to brief the quantile prediction based on a varying coefficient model.

For each given s , $1 \leq s \leq p$, taking the s th component of \mathbf{X}_i , X_{is} , as the index, we apply the following varying coefficient model to fit the condition quantile $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X}_i)$

$$\mathbb{M}_s : \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \alpha_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) + \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}), \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad s = 1, \dots, p, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}$ is \mathbf{X}_i with the s th component being removed.

For any given x_s , let $\dot{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$ and $\dot{\beta}_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$ be the first derivative of $\alpha_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$ and $\beta_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$, respectively, by the Taylor's expansion, we have

$$\alpha_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \approx \alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s) + \dot{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s)(X_{is} - x_s), \quad \beta_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \approx \beta_{\tau,s}(x_s) + \dot{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)(X_{is} - x_s)$$

when X_{is} is in a small neighbourhood of x_s . This together with the ρ -loss function for quantile regression lead to the following objective function for estimating $\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\beta_{\tau,s}(x_s)$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{\tau} \left\{ Y_i - a - b(X_{is} - x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^{\top} (\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}(X_{is} - x_s)) \right\} K_{h_s}(X_{is} - x_s), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\rho_{\tau}(u) = \tau u - uI(u \leq 0)$, $K_{h_s}(\cdot) = K(\cdot/h_s)/h_s$, $K(\cdot)$ is a kernel function, usually taken to be either the Gauss kernel or the Epanechnikov kernel, i.e. $K(\cdot) = 0.75(1 - u^2)_+$, h_s is a bandwidth. In the numerical analysis in this paper, we use the Gauss kernel.

Minimise (2.2) with respect to a , b , \mathbf{c} and \mathbf{d} , and denote the resulting minimiser by $(\hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^{\top}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\top})$. We use \hat{a} and $\hat{\mathbf{c}}$ to estimate $\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\beta_{\tau,s}(x_s)$, and denote them by $\hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\hat{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$.

For a given \mathbf{X} , let X_s be the s th component of \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}$ be \mathbf{X} with its s th component being removed. Based on model (2.1), we use

$$\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) = \hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(X_s) + \mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}^{\top} \hat{\beta}_{\tau,s}(X_s), \quad (2.3)$$

to predict $Q_{\tau}(Y|\mathbf{X})$.

2.2 Cross-validation based model averaging

As mentioned in Section 1.2, the selection of index in the varying coefficient models can be difficult in some cases, and wrongly selected index may lead to biased prediction due to misspecification, therefore, the prediction (2.3) may not be a good one in practice when the index variable is not obvious. Rather than setting one particular continuous explanatory variable as the index variable to construct a prediction, a sensible approach would be applying the model averaging idea to construct the prediction. Specifically, for each continuous explanatory variable, we treat it as the index variable to form a varying coefficient model and construct a prediction based on this model, then use a weighted average of the obtained predictions as the final prediction. Namely, we use

$$\hat{\mu}_{\tau}^{[w]}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}), \quad (2.4)$$

as the prediction of $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X})$, where

$$w_s \geq 0, \quad \sum_{s=1}^p w_s = 1.$$

The weights $w_{s,s}$ in (2.4) play a key role in the success of the prediction. We apply the cross-validation to select the weights.

Let $\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{X}_i)$ be the prediction of $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X}_i)$ constructed by (2.3) without using the i th observation (\mathbf{X}_i^\top, Y_i) , $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_p)^\top$. Our cross-validation sum is defined as

$$\text{CV}_n(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau \left\{ Y_i - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(\mathbf{X}_i) \right\}. \quad (2.5)$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_p)^\top$, minimise (2.5). Our proposed model averaging prediction of $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X})$ is

$$\hat{\mu}_\tau^{[\hat{\mathbf{w}}]}(\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{s=1}^p \hat{w}_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}), \quad (2.6)$$

and termed jackknife varying coefficient quantile model averaging prediction, denoted by JVC-QMA. Although the idea used here is leave-one-out cross-validation, there are no much ingredients of jackknife, to conform with the conventional names used in this regard, such as that in Hansen and Racine (2012), we still name the proposed method jackknife varying coefficient quantile model averaging prediction.

2.3 Measurement of accuracy and computational issues

Let $\mathcal{D}_n = \{(\mathbf{X}_i^\top, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, and (\mathbf{X}^\top, Y) be independent of \mathcal{D}_n , and shares the same distribution with (\mathbf{X}_i^\top, Y_i) . A natural measurement of the accuracy of a model averaging prediction defined by (2.4) is

$$\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) = E \left\{ \rho_\tau \left(Y - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) \right) \mid \mathcal{D}_n \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

We will show, in Section 3, that the proposed JVCQMA prediction is the optimal one among all model averaging predictions defined by (2.4), in terms of $\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})$.

There are two optimization problems involved in the implementation of the proposed prediction, i.e. minimization of (2.2) and of (2.5). However, they are not difficult to solve numerically. In fact, the minimization of (2.2) can be easily solved by the R package `quantreg`, and the minimization of (2.5) can be done by the R package `Rsolnp`. Indeed, our numerical analysis conducted in Sections 4 and 5 shows these two packages work very well in the implementation of the proposed prediction.

3 Asymptotic properties

In this Section, we are going to show the proposed prediction, JVCQMA, is the optimal one among the varying coefficient models based model averaging prediction.

In the asymptotic properties of the proposed method, because we do not assume the underlying model is any specific model, there are no true functions or true parameters for the estimators, involved in the proposed prediction, to converge to.

For the response variable Y and covariate \mathbf{X} , let X_s be the s th component of \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}$ be \mathbf{X} with its s th component being removed. We define

$$\left(\alpha_{\tau,s}(\cdot), \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(\cdot)^\top \right)^\top = \arg \min_{a(\cdot), \mathbf{c}(\cdot) \in \mathcal{F}} E \left\{ \rho_\tau \left(Y - a(x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}^\top \mathbf{c}(x_s) \right) \right\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the set of all functions with bounded second derivatives. We will show the estimators $\hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ in Section 2.1 converge to $\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ uniformly.

3.1 Technical conditions

Before presenting our theoretical results, we first state the technical conditions needed. We start with the introduction of some notations. Let $\varepsilon_i = Y_i - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)$, and $f(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ and $F(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ be the conditional probability density function (PDF) and cumulative distribution function (CDF) of ε_i given \mathbf{X}_i , respectively. For each s , $s = 1, \dots, p$, we use $f_{X_s}(\cdot)$ to denote the marginal density function of X_s , the s th component of \mathbf{X} , and define $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s = E \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}^\top \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}^\top \end{pmatrix} \right]$. For any matrix \mathbf{A} , we use $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$ to denote its smallest and largest eigenvalue, respectively, and for any vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_s)^\top$, we define $\|\mathbf{a}\| = (a_1^2 + \dots + a_s^2)^{1/2}$.

The technical conditions needed in order to derive the asymptotic properties of the proposed methods are as follows:

- (C1) $f_{X_s}(\cdot)$ has a compact support and continuous derivatives up to the second order, and $0 < c_1 \leq f_{X_s}(x) \leq c_2 < \infty$.
- (C2) $\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ have continuous second derivatives.
- (C3) $K(\cdot)$ is a symmetric density function with bounded support and satisfies a Lipschitz condition.
- (C4) $f(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ is differentiable, and both $f(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ and its derivative are bounded by a constant c_f .
- (C5) There exist two constants C_1 and C_2 such that $0 < C_1 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \leq C_2 < \infty$.

Conditions (C1) and (C2) impose some smoothness restrictions on the marginal density functions and marginal regression functions, which are similar to the conditions (A2) and (A4) in [Chen et al. \(2018\)](#). Condition (C1) could be relaxed by slightly modifying our methodology. For example, if the marginal density function of X_{is} is the standard normal density which does not have a compact support, we can truncate the tail of X_{is} by replacing X_{is} with $X_{is}I(|X_{is}| \leq \varsigma_n)$ and ς_n divergent to infinity at a slow rate. Condition (C2) is necessary for local linear estimation. Condition (C3) is a commonly-used condition for a kernel function. Condition (C4) specifies the quantile restriction, which is similar to the condition (A.2) (i) in [Lu and Su \(2015\)](#) and (C5)(i) in [Kai et al. \(2011\)](#). Condition (C5) imposes some regularity conditions on the eigenvalues of the positive definite matrix involved in the asymptotic theory.

3.2 Main theoretical results

Let

$$\underline{h} = \min_{1 \leq s \leq p} h_s, \quad \bar{h} = \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} h_s, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) = \left(\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s), \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}^\top(x_s) \right)^\top,$$

and

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) = \left(\hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s), \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}^\top(x_s) \right)^\top, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s) = \left(\hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s), \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s) \right)^\top \right)^\top,$$

where $\hat{\alpha}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s)$ are the estimators of $\alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ without using the i th observation (\mathbf{X}_i^\top, Y_i) .

Theorem 1. *For any compact sets \mathcal{C}_s , $s = 1, \dots, p$, under conditions (C1)–(C5), if $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$ and $n\underline{h} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| = O_p \left(\log^{1/2}(1/\underline{h}) / \sqrt{n\underline{h} + \bar{h}^2} \right),$$

and for each i , $i = 1, \dots, n$,

$$\max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| = O_p \left(\log^{1/2}(1/\underline{h}) / \sqrt{n\underline{h} + \bar{h}^2} \right).$$

Theorem 1 gives the uniform convergence rates of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^{\setminus i}(x_s)$ to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s)$. These results are building blocks for the asymptotic optimality of our proposed model averaging estimator, which is presented in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Under the same conditions as Theorem 1. If $\log(1/\underline{h})/n\underline{h} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{\text{FPE}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{w}})}{\inf_{\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \text{FPE}_n(\boldsymbol{w})} = 1 + o_p(1). \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 2 shows the proposed prediction JVCQMA is asymptotically optimal among all varying coefficient models based model averaging predictions. As a consequence, the proposed prediction JVCQMA is more accurate than the prediction based on either the varying coefficient models or additive models.

4 Simulation Studies

In this section, we are going to use simulated examples to demonstrate the superiority of the proposed JVCQMA over its alternatives.

In all numerical analysis in this paper, the kernel function involved in the proposed JVCQMA is taken to be the Gauss kernel, and the bandwidth involved is selected in the same way as that in Kai et al. (2011), namely,

$$h_s = \tilde{h}_s \times \{\tau(1 - \tau)/\phi^2(\Phi^{-1}(\tau))\}^{1/5}, \quad s = 1, \dots, p,$$

where $\phi(\cdot)$ and $\Phi(\cdot)$ are the density function and distribution function of standard normal distribution, respectively, and \tilde{h}_s is selected by the cross-validation criterion based on the local least squares estimation for $\alpha_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$ and $\beta_{\tau,s}(\cdot)$, pretending (2.1) is the regression function of Y_i on \boldsymbol{X}_i .

The methods we are going to compare with are as follows:

- (1) The linear quantile regression model, denoted by LQR. It is implemented by the R function `rq` in the R package `quantreg`.
- (2) The penalized linear quantile regression model with SCAD proposed by Wu and Liu (2009), denoted by PLQR. It is implemented by the R function `cv.rq.pen` in the R package `rqPen`.
- (3) The linear quantile model averaging proposed by Lu and Su (2015), denoted by LQMA.
- (4) The varying coefficient quantile regression model, denoted by VCQR.
- (5) The partial linear additive quantile regression model proposed by Lian (2012), denoted by AQR.

(6) The varying coefficient quantile model averaging prediction with equal weights, denoted by VCQMA1.

(7) The varying coefficient quantile model averaging prediction with weights being selected by the smoothed BIC criterion (Buckland et al., 1997), namely,

$$\hat{w}_s = \exp(-0.5\text{BIC}_{(s)}) / \sum_{j=1}^p \exp(-0.5\text{BIC}_{(j)}), \quad s = 1, \dots, p$$

with

$$\text{BIC}_{(s)} = 2n \ln \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_{\tau}(Y_i - \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i)) \right] + (p + q - 1) \ln(n).$$

This method is denoted by VCQMA2.

(8) The proposed JVCQMA.

We are going to examine the performances of the above eight methods by four simulated examples, which are detailed as follows:

Example 1. In this example, we consider an unconventional varying coefficient model and generate the random samples from the following model

$$Y_i = \alpha(X_{i1}) + \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus 1}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}(X_{i1}) + \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus 2}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}(X_{i2}) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (4.1)$$

where, we set $\alpha(u) = u$,

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}(u) = (u(1 - 0.5u), \exp(u/2 - 0.5), \sin(2\pi u) - u, 2\exp(-0.5u^2)/(\exp(-0.5u^2) + 1), \mathbf{0}_{p-5})^{\top},$$

where $\mathbf{0}_k$ is a k -dimensional row vector with each component being 0.

The covariate $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^{\top}$ s are generated from a normal distributions with mean zero and $Cov(X_{ij}, X_{il}) = 0.5^{|j-l|}$ for $1 \leq j, l \leq p$.

We note that this true model involves two types of varying coefficients induced by two index variables. In order to examine the robustness of the proposed procedure, we consider the following three different error distributions for ε_i : standard normal distribution (*case1*), t -distribution with three degrees of freedom (*case2*) and a mixture of two normal distributions (*case3*), which is a mixture of $N(0, 1)$ and $N(0, 25)$ with the weights 95% and 5%, respectively.

Example 2. In this example, we generate the random samples from the following heteroscedastic

model

$$Y_i = \alpha(X_{i1}) + \mathbf{X}_{i\setminus 3}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_1(X_{i3}) + \mathbf{X}_{i\setminus 4}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_2(X_{i4}) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where, we set $\alpha(u) = u(1 - u)$,

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_1(u) = ((2 + u^2)/(1 + u^2), u, \mathbf{0}_{p-3})^\top,$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_2(u) = (2\sin(2\pi u)/(2 - \cos(2\pi u)), \exp(-0.5u^2), 1, -1, \mathbf{0}_{p-5})^\top.$$

$\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})^\top$ s are independently generated from $U(-2, 2)$, ε_i s are generated through

$$\varepsilon_i = 0.5(\sin^2(X_{i1}) + \cos^2(X_{i2}) + 0.5)e_i.$$

To examine the performance of the proposed method when the error distribution is asymmetric, we generate e_i s from one of the following three asymmetric distributions: chi-square distribution with one degree of freedom (*case4*), gamma-distribution $G(1, 1)$ (*case5*), and log normal distribution (*case6*) with mean and standard deviation being 0.5 and 0.5, respectively, on the log scale. \mathbf{X}_i and e_i are generated independently.

Example 3. To demonstrate the flexibility of the proposed method, similar to [Chen et al. \(2018\)](#), we generate the random samples from the following partially linear additive model

$$Y_i = \sum_{j=1}^6 f_j(X_{ij}) + \beta_1 X_{i7} + \beta_2 X_{i8} + \beta_3 X_{i9} + \beta_4 X_{i10} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where, we set

$$f_1(u) = -\sin(2u), \quad f_2(u) = 0.5(u^2 - 25/12), \quad f_3(u) = u,$$

$$f_4(u) = \exp(-u) - \frac{2}{5}\sinh(5/2), \quad f_5(u) = u, \quad f_6(u) = -2u,$$

$$\beta_1 = \beta_3 = 1, \quad \beta_2 = \beta_4 = -2.$$

The covariate $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i6})^\top$ is generated from a normal distribution with mean zero and $Cov(X_{ij}, X_{il}) = 0.5^{|j-l|}$ for $1 \leq j, l \leq 6$, X_{i7} from *Binomial*(2, 0.5), X_{i8} from *Binomial*(2, 0.5), X_{i9} from *Binomial*(3, 0.5), and X_{i10} from *Binomial*(3, 0.5). ε_i is generated through

$$\varepsilon_i = (|0.5X_{i1} - 0.5X_{i2}| + 0.5)e_i,$$

and e_i is generated from one of the six error distributions, marked as *case1*, \dots , *case6*, in Examples

1 and 2. We generate $\mathbf{X}_i, X_{i7}, X_{i8}, X_{i9}, X_{i10}$, and e_i independently.

Example 4. In examples 1–3, we generate data from the models with varying coefficient and additive structure. To demonstrate the flexibility of the proposed method in model specification and the advantage over commonly used methods, we consider the following multivariate regression model, where the commonly assumed structures do not hold,

$$Y_i = \alpha(X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i10}) + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where, we set

$$\alpha(X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i10}) = 4\cos(X_{i1}X_{i2}X_{i3}X_{i4}) - X_{i5}X_{i6} + X_{i7}X_{i8}X_{i9}X_{i10}.$$

The covariate $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_{i1}, \dots, X_{i6})^\top$ is generated from a normal distribution with mean zero and $Cov(X_{ij}, X_{il}) = 0.5^{|j-l|}$ for $1 \leq j, l \leq 6$, X_{i7} from *Binomial*(1, 0.5), X_{i8} from *Binomial*(1, 0.5), X_{i9} from *Binomial*(2, 0.5), and X_{i10} from *Binomial*(2, 0.5). ε_i is generated through

$$\varepsilon_i = (|0.5X_{i1} - 0.5X_{i2}| + 0.5) e_i$$

and e_i is generated from one of the six error distributions, marked as *case1*, \dots , *case6*, in Examples 1 and 2. We generate $\mathbf{X}_i, X_{i7}, X_{i8}, X_{i9}, X_{i10}$, and e_i independently.

For Examples 1 and 2, we set sample size n to be either 200 or 400, and consider $p = 5$ or 10 to reflect different sparsity levels. For Examples 3 and 4, we only consider the cases when $n = 400$ to save space.

For each simulation in each simulated example, we generate a training data set of sample size n to estimate unknown parameters, functions and model weights, then generate another 100 observations (a testing set) to calculate the FPE, defined in (2.7), for each of the eight methods under comparison. The FPE is used to measure the accuracy of the out-of-sample quantile prediction, and is calculated through

$$\text{FPE} = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{I}|} \sum_{(Y_i, \mathbf{X}_i) \in \mathcal{I}} \rho_\tau(Y_i - \bar{\mu}_\tau(\mathbf{X}_i))$$

where $\bar{\mu}_\tau(\mathbf{X}_i)$ is a prediction of the conditional quantile $Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X}_i)$, \mathcal{I} stands for the testing set, and $|\mathcal{I}|$ is the size of \mathcal{I} .

For each setting in the 4 simulated examples, we repeat the simulation 200 times and report, in Figures 1 to 4, the mean of the obtained 200 FPEs for each method under comparison for different

quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 with increment 0.1. Obviously, the smaller the mean of the FPE, the better the method in terms of the out-of-sample quantile prediction error.

We also report, in Tables 1 to 4, the means and standard deviations of the estimated model weights, obtained by the proposed method, over the 200 simulations for different settings and different quantiles.

[Tables 1 to 4 about here.]

We first examine the performance of the estimators of the weights in the proposed JVCQMA. For Example 1, Table 1 shows the first two sub-models carry almost all the weights, and the combination of the two models is indeed the true model, which indicates the proposed cross-validation based method works very well for selection of the weights in the model averaging prediction. This implies the proposed JVCQMA has the best prediction ability by optimally combining the most suitable candidate models. Furthermore, we can also see from Tables 1-2 that different quantiles may lead to different estimators of model weights, and they are becoming more stable when sample size is increasing.

[Figures 1 to 4 about here.]

After having examined the performance of the estimated model weights, we now evaluate the prediction accuracy. The results about the mean FPEs for each method under consideration for different sample sizes, sparsity levels and error distributions are presented in Figures 1-4, which clearly show the proposed JVCQMA has the best out-of-sample prediction performance in the sense that it has the smallest mean FPE, except for the lower quartile in example 4, compared to its alternatives. LQR, PLQR and LQMA apply linear models for the prediction, which completely ignores the nonlinear functional relationship between the response and covariates, therefore, results in very poor predictions. AQR and VCQR employ misspecified model structures for predictions, hence, also perform poorly.

Although JVCQMA may also use misspecified candidate models, it combines useful information from different candidate models in a sensible way, thus leads to more accurate predictions. It is clear the proposed model averaging prediction is more flexible in terms of model specification and has clear advantages over the other methods considered in the simulations. Furthermore, it is also worth mentioning that JVCQMA clearly outperforms VCQMA1 and VCQMA2, suggesting the weights in model averaging play a key role and the proposed cross-validation based selection of weights works very well, which is in line with Theorem 2 in Section 3.

Remark: *When applying VCQR to the 4 simulated examples, we only report the results for the cases*

where the index variable is set to be X_{i1} . When the index variable is set to be any other continuous variable, the performance of VCQR is also poor. To save space, we don't report those results. When applying AQR, the variables for nonparametric additive part are set to be all continuous variables, and the variables for linear part are set to be all discrete variables.

5 Real data analysis

In this Section, we are going to analyse the Boston housing data by using each method mentioned in simulation study and the commonly used varying coefficient model based method. Specifically, we are going to examine the prediction power of each method for different parts of the housing market in Boston, that is to predict different quantiles of the house price there by each method and assess the accuracy of the resulting prediction.

The Boston housing data is freely available in the R package `mlbench`, (<http://cran.r-project.org/>). It has been analysed in much literature, see [Fan and Huang \(2005\)](#), [Hu and Xia \(2012\)](#) and [Sun et al. \(2014\)](#). The dataset consists of the median value of owner price in 1970 of owner-occupied houses in 506 census tracts within the Boston metropolitan area, together with several variables which are commonly believed to be associated with housing values, detailed in Section 1.2. Like [Fan and Huang \(2005\)](#) and [Hu and Xia \(2012\)](#), we take MEDV (median value of owner-occupied homes in 1,000 United States dollar (USD)) as the response, denoted by Y , and the variables CRIM, ZN, INDUS, CHAS, NOX, RM, AGE, DIS, RAD, TAX, PTRATIO, B and LSTAT as covariates. Among the covariates, CRIM, INDUS, NOX, RM, AGE, DIS, TAX, PTRATIO, B and LSTAT are continuous variables, we denote them by X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{10} , respectively. ZN, CHAS and RAD are discrete variables, we denote them by X_{11}, X_{12} , and X_{13} , respectively. Each continuous covariate is standardized such that it has mean zero and variance 1, before any analysis is carried out.

This dataset has 10 continuous covariates, i.e. $X_i, i = 1, \dots, 10$, if a varying coefficient model based approach is employed for the quantile prediction, any of the 10 continuous covariates could be the index variable in the varying coefficient model used. We denote the varying coefficient model based approach with X_i being the index variable by VCQR_i .

When applying AQR to this dataset, the variables for nonparametric additive part are set to be all continuous variables, i.e. $X_i, i = 1, \dots, 10$, and the variables for linear part are set to be all discrete variables, i.e. $X_i, i = 11, 12, 13$.

[Figure 5 about here.]

To have a visible idea about how the weights are assigned, by the proposed cross-validation, to the 10 varying coefficient models, formed by setting each X_i , $i = 1, \dots, 10$, to be the index variable, involved in the proposed JVCQMA, we apply bootstrap to compute the standard errors of the estimated weights, and present in Figure 5 the 95% confidence intervals of the weights for different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 with increment 0.1. Figure 5 shows the allocation of the weights is different for different quantiles.

To examine the prediction power of each method and make a comparison between different methods, we randomly split the dataset to training set of size n_{train} and testing set of size n_{test} . We apply each method under comparison to the training set to form quantile predictions, and use the testing set to compute the out-of-sample quantile prediction error of this method. We repeat the random splitting procedure 200 times, and compute the mean of the obtained 200 FPEs for each method.

[Table 5 about here.]

We set the size n_{test} of the test set to be either 50, 100 or 200, and compute the mean FPE for each method for different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 with increment 0.1, and present the results in Table 5. Table 5 shows the proposed JVCQMA gives the most accurate prediction under any circumstance.

6 Theoretical proofs

Lemma 1 below, which is a direct result of Mack and Silverman (1982), will be used repeatedly.

Lemma 1. *Let $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ be i.i.d. random vectors, where Y_i s are scalar random variables. Assume further that $E|Y|^r < \infty$ and that $\sup_x \int |y|^r f(x, y) dy < \infty$, where f denotes the joint density of (X, Y) . Let K be a bounded positive function with bounded support, satisfying a Lipschitz condition. Then,*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{D}} \left| n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \{K_h(X_i - x) Y_i - E[K_h(X_i - x) Y_i]\} \right| = O_p \left(\log^{1/2}(1/h) / \sqrt{nh} \right),$$

provided that $0 < h \rightarrow 0$ and $n^{2\epsilon-1}h \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\epsilon < 1 - r^{-1}$, where h is a bandwidth and \mathcal{D} is some closed set.

Let $\varepsilon_{i,s} = Y_i - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i)$, and $f_s(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ and $F_s(\cdot | \mathbf{X}_i)$ be the conditional probability density function and cumulative distribution function of $\varepsilon_{i,s}$ given \mathbf{X}_i , respectively. Furthermore, denote $u_{i,s}(x_s) = \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - \alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \dot{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s)(X_{is} - x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s)(X_{is} - x_s)$,

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,s}(x_s) = \left\{ 1, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top, (X_{is} - x_s)/h_s, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top (X_{is} - x_s)/h_s \right\}^\top, \eta_{i,s}(x_s) = I(\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s)) - \tau \text{ and}$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}} = \sqrt{nh_s} \left\{ \hat{a} - \alpha_{\tau,s}(x_s), (\hat{\mathbf{c}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau,s}(x_s))^\top, h_s (\hat{b} - \dot{\alpha}_{\tau,s}(x_s)), h_s (\hat{\mathbf{d}} - \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s))^\top \right\}^\top.$$

Lemma 2. For $s = 1, \dots, p$, under conditions (C1)–(C4), if $h_s \rightarrow 0$ and $nh_s \rightarrow \infty$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{nh_s} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right) \\ &= -f_{X_s}^{-1}(x_s) (\mathbf{D}_s(x_s))^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{n,s}^{(1)}(x_s) + O_p \left(h_s^2 + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s) / \sqrt{nh_s} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{D}_s(x_s) = E \left\{ f_s(-u_{i,s} | \mathbf{X}_i) \left(1, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \right)^\top \left(1, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \right) | X_{is} = x_s \right\},$$

and

$$\mathbf{W}_{n,s}^{(1)}(x_s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_s}} \sum_{i=1}^n K \left\{ (X_{is} - x_s)/h_s \right\} \eta_{i,s}(x_s) \left(1, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \right)^\top.$$

Proof of Lemma 2. Recall that $\{\hat{a}, \hat{\mathbf{c}}^\top, \hat{b}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}^\top\}^\top$ minimizes

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_\tau \left\{ Y_i - a - b(X_{is} - x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top (\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}(X_{is} - x_s)) \right\} K_{h_s}(X_{is} - x_s).$$

We write $Y_i - a - b(X_{is} - x_s) - \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top (\mathbf{c} + \mathbf{d}(X_{is} - x_s)) = \varepsilon_{i,s} + u_{i,s}(x_s) - \Delta_{i,s}$, where $\Delta_{i,s} = \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top(x_s) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} / \sqrt{nh_s}$. Then, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}}$ is also the minimizer of

$$L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n [\rho_\tau \{\varepsilon_{i,s} + u_{i,s}(x_s) - \Delta_{i,s}\} - \rho_\tau \{\varepsilon_{i,s} + u_{i,s}(x_s)\}] K_i(x_s),$$

where $K_i(x_s) = K \{(X_{is} - x_s)/h_s\}$. By applying the identity in [Knight \(1998\)](#)

$$\rho_\tau(u - v) - \rho_\tau(u) = v \{I(u \leq 0) - \tau\} + \int_0^v \{I(u \leq t) - I(u \leq 0)\} dt, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) \Delta_{i,s} [I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s)\} - \tau] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) \int_0^{\Delta_{i,s}} [I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s) + t\} - I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s)\}] dt \\ &\triangleq [\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s)]^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{nh_s}} \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) [I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s)\} - \tau] \mathbf{X}_{i,s}(x_s),$$

and

$$B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) \int_0^{\Delta_{i,s}} [I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s) + t\} - I\{\varepsilon_{i,s} \leq -u_{i,s}(x_s)\}] dt.$$

Since $B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})$ is a summation of i.i.d. random variables of the kernel form, it follows, by Lemma 1, that

$$B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = E[B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})] + O_p\left(\log^{1/2}(1/h_s)/\sqrt{nh_s}\right).$$

Denote by \mathcal{X} the observed covariates vector, namely $\mathcal{X} = (X_{11}, \dots, X_{1(p+q)}, \dots, X_{n1}, \dots, X_{n(p+q)})^\top$.

The conditional expectation of $B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})$ can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} & E[B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) | \mathcal{X}] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) \int_0^{\Delta_{i,s}} [F_s\{-u_{i,s}(x_s) + t | \mathbf{X}_i\} - F_s\{-u_{i,s}(x_s) | \mathbf{X}_i\}] dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \left[\frac{1}{nh_s} \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(x_s) f_s\{-u_{i,s}(x_s) | \mathbf{X}_i\} \mathbf{X}_{i,s}(x_s) \mathbf{X}_{i,s}^\top(x_s) \right] \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\ &\triangleq \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{D}_{n,s}(x_s) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} \{1 + o_p(1)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) &= [\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s)]^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + E[B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})] + O_p\left(\log^{1/2}(1/h_s)/\sqrt{nh_s}\right) \\ &= [\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s)]^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + E\{E[B_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) | \mathcal{X}]\} + O_p\left(\log^{1/2}(1/h_s)/\sqrt{nh_s}\right) \\ &= [\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s)]^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top E[\mathbf{D}_{n,s}(x_s)] \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + O_p\left(\log^{1/2}(1/h_s)/\sqrt{nh_s}\right). \end{aligned}$$

It can be shown that

$$E[\mathbf{D}_{n,s}(x_s)] = f_{X_s}(x_s) \mathbf{D}_s^*(x_s) + O_p(h_s^2),$$

where $\mathbf{D}_s^*(x_s) = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{D}_s(x_s), \mu_2 \mathbf{D}_s(x_s)\}$.

Therefore, we can write $L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})$ as

$$L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta}) = [\mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s)]^\top \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + \frac{f_{X_s}(x_s)}{2} \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^\top \mathbf{D}_s^*(x_s) \boldsymbol{\vartheta} + O_p\left(h_s^2 + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s)/\sqrt{nh_s}\right).$$

By applying the convexity lemma of Pollard (1991) and the quadratic approximation lemma of

Fan and Gijbels (1996), the minimizer of $L_{n,s}(\boldsymbol{\vartheta})$ can be expressed as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\vartheta}} = -f_{X_s}^{-1}(x_s) (\mathbf{D}_s^*(x_s))^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{n,s}(x_s) + O_p\left(h_s^2 + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s) / \sqrt{nh_s}\right),$$

which holds uniformly for $x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s$. Note that $\mathbf{D}_s^*(x_s) = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{D}_s(x_s), \mu_2 \mathbf{D}_s(x_s)\}$ is a quasi-diagonal matrix. So,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{nh_s} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right) \\ &= -f_{X_s}^{-1}(x_s) (\mathbf{D}_s(x_s))^{-1} \mathbf{W}_{n,s}^{(1)}(x_s) + O_p\left(h_s^2 + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s) / \sqrt{nh_s}\right), \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s$. We complete the proof of Lemma 2. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We only prove (i) as the proof of (ii) is analogous. By Lemma 2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \\ &= -f_{X_s}^{-1}(x_s) (\mathbf{D}_s(x_s))^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{h_s}(X_{is} - x_s) \eta_{i,s}(x_s) \left(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \right)^\top \\ & \quad + O_p\left(n^{-1/2} h_s^{3/2} + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s) / nh_s\right), \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

uniformly for $x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s$. By lemma 1, it can be shown that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n K_{h_s}(X_{is} - x_s) \eta_{i,s}(x_s) \left(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top \right)^\top = O_p\left(h_s^2 + \log^{1/2}(1/h_s) / \sqrt{nh_s}\right), \tag{A.3}$$

uniformly for $x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s$. By (A.2) and (A.3), we have

$$\max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| = O_p\left(\log^{1/2}(1/h) / \sqrt{nh} + \bar{h}^2\right).$$

We complete the proof of Theorem 1 (i). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Following the proof of Theorem 3.3 in Lu and Su (2015), if we can show that the difference $\text{CV}_n(\mathbf{w}) - \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})$ is negligible compared with $\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})$ uniformly for any $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}$, then the optimality property is established for $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$. More precisely, it suffices to show that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \left| \frac{\text{CV}_n(\mathbf{w}) - \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})}{\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| = o_p(1). \tag{A.4}$$

By Knight's identity (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{CV}_n(\mathbf{w}) - \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) \\
&= \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\rho_\tau \left\{ Y_i - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) \right\} - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad - \{ \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon)] \} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon)] \} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) \right] \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} [I(\varepsilon_i \leq t) - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)] dt \\
&\quad - E \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) - Q_\tau(Y | \mathbf{X})} [I(\varepsilon \leq t) - I(\varepsilon \leq 0)] dt | \mathcal{D}_n \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{ \rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i)] \} \\
&\triangleq \Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n5},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i) = \tau - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)$,

$$\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) \right] \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i),$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} \{ [I(\varepsilon_i \leq t) - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)] \\
&\quad - [F(t | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(0 | \mathbf{X}_i)] \} dt
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(0 | \mathbf{X}_i)] dt, \right. \\
&\quad \left. - E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(0 | \mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \right. \\ \left. - E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \right\},$$

$$\Lambda_{n5} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon_i)]\}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \left| \frac{\text{CV}_n(\mathbf{w}) - \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})}{\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \left| \frac{\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n5}}{\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n5}|}{\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})|} \\ &\leq \frac{\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w})| + \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w})| + \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w})| + \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w})| + |\Lambda_{n5}|}{\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w})|}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, to prove (A.4), we will prove (i) $\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) \geq E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon)] - o_p(1)$; (ii) $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$; (iii) $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$; (iv) $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$; (v) $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$ and (vi) $|\Lambda_{n5}| = o_p(1)$. (vi) follows by the weak law of large numbers so we only show (i)–(v) below.

We first show (i). Let $u(\mathbf{w}) = Q_\tau(Y|\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X})$, $u_i(\mathbf{w}) = Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i)$, $\mathbf{\Pi}_s = (1, \mathbf{X}_{\setminus s}^\top)^\top$ and $\mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s} = (1, \mathbf{X}_{i \setminus s}^\top)^\top$. Then by Knight's identity (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}))] \\ &= E \left[\left\{ \rho_\tau \left(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X})) \right) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w})) \right\} | \mathcal{D}_n \right] \\ &= E \left\{ \sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X})) [I(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}) \leq 0) - \tau] | \mathcal{D}_n \right\} \\ & \quad + E \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}))} [I(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}) \leq t) - I(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}) \leq 0)] dt | \mathcal{D}_n \right] \\ &\triangleq I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned} \tag{A.5}$$

By Taylor expansion, Jensen inequality, conditions (C4)–(C5) and Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& I_2 \\
&= E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i))} [F(t - u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(-u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \\
&= E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i))} f(-u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i) t dt \right] \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left\{ f(-u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i) \left[\sum_{s=1}^p w_s (\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i)) \right]^2 \right\} \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left\{ f(-u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i) \sum_{s=1}^p w_s [\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i)]^2 \right\} \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left\{ f(-u_i(\mathbf{w}) | \mathbf{X}_i) \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \left[\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right]^\top \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i,s} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left[\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad \times \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} c_f \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\|^2 \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&= O_p(\log(1/\underline{h})/(n\underline{h}) + \bar{h}^4) \{1 + o_p(1)\} \\
&= o_p(1), \tag{A.6}
\end{aligned}$$

under the conditions $\bar{h} \rightarrow 0$ and $\log(1/\underline{h})/(n\underline{h}) \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

By the triangle inequality, the fact $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ for any real symmetric matrix \mathbf{B} , condition (C5), Theorem 1 and $|I(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}) \leq 0) - \tau| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_1| &\leq \sum_{s=1}^p w_s E |(\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}))| \\
&= \sum_{s=1}^p w_s E \left\{ \left[\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(X_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_s) \right]^\top \left(\boldsymbol{\Pi}_s \boldsymbol{\Pi}_s^\top \right) \left[\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(X_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_s) \right] \right\}^{1/2} \\
&\leq \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \{ \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \}^{1/2} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| \\
&= O_p \left(\sqrt{\log(1/\underline{h})/(n\underline{h})} + \bar{h}^2 \right) \\
&= o_p(1). \tag{A.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, combine with (A.5)–(A.7), we have $\text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) - E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}))] = o_p(1)$.

Let $U(t) = \rho_\tau(\varepsilon + t) - \rho_\tau(\varepsilon)$, where $t \in \mathbb{R}$. It is well known that $U(t)$ has a global min-

imum at $t = 0$. This implies that $\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}))] \geq E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon)]$. Consequently, we have $\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \text{FPE}_n(\mathbf{w}) = \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon + u(\mathbf{w}))] - o_p(1) \geq E[\rho_\tau(\varepsilon)] - o_p(1)$.

(ii) We decompose $\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i) - \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) \right] \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \left[\hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) \right] \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \\ &\triangleq \Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n1,2}(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the fact that $E(\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w})) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\text{Var}[\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w})] = O(1/n)$, we have $\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1)$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}$. Since p and q are finite, one can apply the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem (e.g., Theorem 2.4.1 in [Van der Vaart and Wellner \(1996\)](#)) to conclude $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$.

By the triangle inequality and $|\psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i)| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1,2}(\mathbf{w})| &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \left| \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \psi_\tau(\varepsilon_i) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}\| \\ &= O_p \left(\sqrt{\log(1/\underline{h}) / (n\underline{h})} + \bar{h}^2 \right) O_p(1) \\ &= o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1,2}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$ and $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$.

(iii) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} \{ [I(\varepsilon_i \leq t) - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)] \\ &\quad - [F(t | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(0 | \mathbf{X}_i)] \} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i | \mathbf{X}_i)} \{ [I(\varepsilon_i \leq t) - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)] \\ &\quad - [F(t | \mathbf{X}_i) - F(0 | \mathbf{X}_i)] \} dt \\ &\triangleq \Lambda_{n2,1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n2,2}(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

In view of the fact that $||I(\varepsilon_i \leq t) - I(\varepsilon_i \leq 0)|| - [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] \leq 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Lambda_{n2,2}(\mathbf{w})| &\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \left| \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}\| \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right\| \\
&\leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| \|\mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}\| \\
&= O_p \left(\sqrt{\log(1/\underline{h})/(n\underline{h})} + \bar{h}^2 \right) O_p(1) \\
&= o_p(1). \tag{A.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Observing that $E[\Lambda_{n2,1}(\mathbf{w})] = \mathbf{0}$ and $Var[\Lambda_{n2,1}(\mathbf{w})] = O(1/n)$, we have $\Lambda_{n2,1}(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1)$ for each $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}$. Analogous to the proof of $\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w})$, we can show that $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n2,1}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$. Therefore, we have $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n2}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$.

(iv) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_{n3}(\mathbf{w}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. - E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_0^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \right\} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \int_{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)}^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right. \\
&\quad \left. - E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left[\int_{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \hat{\mu}_{\tau,s}^i(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)}^{\sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mu_{\tau,s}(\mathbf{X}_i) - Q_\tau(Y_i|\mathbf{X}_i)} [F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)] dt \right] \right\} \\
&\triangleq \Lambda_{n3,1}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n3,2}(\mathbf{w}).
\end{aligned}$$

In view of the fact that $|F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)| \leq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Lambda_{n3,2}(\mathbf{w})| &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left| \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| \\ &\triangleq \Lambda_{n3,21}(\mathbf{w}) + \Lambda_{n3,22}(\mathbf{w}). \end{aligned}$$

According to (A.8), we have $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n3,21}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$. For $\Lambda_{n3,22}(\mathbf{w})$, by the triangle and Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, the fact $\mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{A} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}) \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{A}$ for any real symmetric matrix \mathbf{B} , and Theorem 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n3,22}(\mathbf{w})| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left| \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{s=1}^p w_s E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left\{ \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right)^\top \left(\mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s} \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \right) \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \max_{1 \leq s \leq p} \sup_{x_s \in \mathcal{C}_s} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(x_s) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\tau,s}(x_s) \right\| \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_s) \\ &\leq O_p \left(\sqrt{\log(1/\underline{h}) / (n\underline{h})} + \bar{h}^2 \right) O_p(1) \\ &= o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n3,2}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$. The proof that $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \Lambda_{n3,1}(\mathbf{w}) = o_p(1)$ is analogous to that of $\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n1,1}(\mathbf{w})| = o_p(1)$ and thus omitted.

(v) For $\Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w})$, noting that $|F(t|\mathbf{X}_i) - F(0|\mathbf{X}_i)| \leq 1$ and by the study of $\Lambda_{n3,22}(\mathbf{w})$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} |\Lambda_{n4}(\mathbf{w})| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{W}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n E_{\mathbf{X}_i} \left| \sum_{s=1}^p w_s \mathbf{\Pi}_{i,s}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}^i(X_{is}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\tau,s}(X_{is}) \right) \right| = o_p(1).$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Acknowledgements

This research is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Numbers 11931014). Chaohui Guo's research is supported by the Science and Technology Research Program of Chongqing Municipal Education Commission (Grant No. KJQN202100526, KJQN201900511) and Chongqing University Innovation Research Group Project: Nonlinear Optimization Method and Its Application(Grant No. CXQT20014).

References

- Ando, T. and Li, K. (2017). A weight-relaxed model averaging approach for high-dimensional generalized linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45:2654–2679.
- Belloni, A. and Chernozhukov, V. (2011). L1 penalized quantile regression in high-dimensional sparse models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39:82–130.
- Buckland, S., Burnham, K., and Augustin, N. (1997). Model selection: an integral part of inference. *Biometrics*, 53:603–618.
- Chen, J., Li, D., Linton, O., and Lu, Z. (2018). Semiparametric ultra-high dimensional model averaging of nonlinear dynamic time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113:919–932.
- Cheng, M.-Y., Honda, T., and Li, J. (2016). Efficient estimation in semivarying coefficient models for longitudinal/clustered data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44:1988–2017.
- Cheng, M.-Y., Honda, T., Li, J., and Peng, H. (2014). Nonparametric independence screening and structure identification for ultra-high dimensional longitudinal data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42:1819–1849.
- Daye, Z. J., Chen, J., and Li, H. (2012). High-dimensional heteroscedastic regression with an application to eqtl data analysis. *Biometrics*, 68:316–326.
- Dong, C., Li, G., and Feng, X. (2019). Lack-of-fit tests for quantile regression models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 81:629–648.
- Fan, J., Fan, Y., and Barut, E. (2014a). Adaptive robust variable selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42:324–351.

- Fan, J. and Gijbels, I. (1996). *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Fan, J. and Huang, T. (2005). Profile likelihood inferences on semiparametric varying-coefficient partially linear models. *Bernoulli*, 11:1031–1057.
- Fan, J., Ma, Y., and Dai, W. (2014b). Nonparametric independence screening in sparse ultra-high-dimensional varying coefficient models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109:1270–1284.
- Fan, J. and Zhang, W. (1999). Statistical estimation in varying coefficient models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27:1491–1518.
- Fan, Y., James, G., and Radchenko, P. (2015). Functional additive regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43:2296–2325.
- Feng, Y., Liu, Q., and Okui, R. (2020). On the sparsity of mallows model averaging estimator. *Economics Letters*, 187:108916.
- Feng, Y., Liu, Q., Yao, Q., and Zhao, G. (2021). Model averaging for nonlinear regression models. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/07350015.2020.1870477>.
- Frumento, P., Bottai, M., and Fernandez-Val, I. (2021). Parametric modeling of quantile regression coefficient functions with longitudinal data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116:783–797.
- Gao, Y., Zhang, X., Wang, S., and Zou, G. (2016). Model averaging based on leave-subject-out cross-validation. *Journal of Econometrics*, 192:139–151.
- Hansen, B. E. and Racine, J. S. (2012). Jackknife model averaging. *Journal of Econometrics*, 167:38–46.
- Hu, T. and Xia, Y. (2012). Adaptive semi-varying coefficient model selection. *Statistica Sinica*, 22:575–599.
- Jiang, X., Jiang, J., and Song, X. (2012). Oracle model selection for nonlinear models based on weighted composite quantile regression. *Statistica Sinica*, 22:1479–1506.

- Kai, B., Li, R., and Zou, H. (2010). Local composite quantile regression smoothing: an efficient and safe alternative to local polynomial regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 72:49–69.
- Kai, B., Li, R., and Zou, H. (2011). New efficient estimation and variable selection methods for semiparametric varying-coefficient partially linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39:305–332.
- Kim, M. O. and Yang, Y. (2011). Semiparametric approach to a random effects quantile regression model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106:1405–1417.
- Knight, K. (1998). Limiting distribution for ll regression estimators under general conditions. *Annals of Statistics*, 26:755–770.
- Lee, E., Noh, H., and Park, B. (2014). Model selection via bayesian information criterion for quantile regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109:216–229.
- Li, J., Lv, J., Wan, A., and Liao, J. (2020). Adaboost semiparametric model averaging prediction for multiple categories. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2020.1790375>.
- Lian, H. (2012). Semiparametric estimation of additive quantile regression models by two-fold penalty. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 30:337–350.
- Lu, X. and Su, L. (2015). Jackknife model averaging for quantile regressions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 188:40–58.
- Mack, Y. P. and Silverman, B. W. (1982). Weak and strong uniform consistency of kernel regression estimates. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, 61:405–415.
- Muller, U. U., Schick, A., and Wefelmeyer, W. (2006). Efficient prediction for linear and nonlinear autoregressive models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34:2496–2533.
- Pollard, D. (1991). Asymptotics for least absolute deviation regression estimators. *Econometric Theory*, 7:186–199.
- Sherwood, B. and Wang, L. (2016). Partially linear additive quantile regression in ultra-high dimension. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44:288–317.
- Sun, Y., Yan, H., Zhang, W., and Lu, Z. (2014). A semiparametric spatial dynamic model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42:700–727.

- Tong, X., Xia, L., Wang, J., and Feng, Y. (2020). Neyman-pearson classification: parametrics and power enhancement. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21:1–48.
- Uematsu, Y. (2019). Nonstationary nonlinear quantile regression. *Econometric Reviews*, 38:386–416.
- Van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1996). *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer, New York.
- Wang, H. and Xia, Y. (2009). Shrinkage estimation of the varying coefficient model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104:747–757.
- Wang, H., Zhu, Z., and Zhou, J. (2009). Quantile regression in partially linear varying coefficient models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37:3841–3866.
- Wang, L., Wu, Y., and Li, R. (2012). Quantile regression for analyzing heterogeneity in ultra-high dimension. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107:214–222.
- Wu, Y. and Liu, Y. (2009). Variable selection in quantile regression. *Statistica Sinica*, 19:801–817.
- Zhang, W., Fan, J., and Sun, Y. (2009). A semiparametric model for cluster data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37:2377–2408.
- Zhang, X., Zou, G., Liang, H., and Carroll, R. J. (2020). Parsimonious model averaging with a diverging number of parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115:972–984.
- Zhang, Y., Wang, H., and Zhu, Z. (2021). Single-index thresholding in quantile regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2021.1915319>.
- Zheng, Y., Zhu, Q., Li, G., and Xiao, Z. (2018). Hybrid quantile regression estimation for time series models with conditional heteroscedasticity. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 80:975–993.
- Zhu, Q., Li, G., and Xiao, Z. (2021). Quantile estimation of regression models with garch-x errors. *Statistica Sinica*, 31:1261–1284.

Table 1: The means and standard deviations (sd) of the estimated model weights for example 1.

case 1		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.390	0.462	0.020	0.107	0.020	0.419	0.458	0.008	0.104	0.004	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.002
	sd	0.165	0.163	0.060	0.105	0.071	0.110	0.114	0.028	0.079	0.018	0.014	0.011	0.014	0.004	0.013
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.451	0.486	0.060	0.053	0.004	0.459	0.491	0.001	0.047	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
	sd	0.143	0.142	0.020	0.058	0.016	0.100	0.094	0.010	0.045	0.004	0.001	0.000	0.004	0.001	0.006
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.476	0.494	0.003	0.025	0.003	0.488	0.488	0.001	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.125	0.124	0.012	0.038	0.017	0.092	0.092	0.008	0.032	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.001
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.484	0.496	0.001	0.017	0.002	0.500	0.491	0.001	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.118	0.119	0.011	0.034	0.012	0.088	0.089	0.008	0.015	0.002	0.005	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.498	0.488	0.001	0.012	0.001	0.505	0.491	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.124	0.123	0.010	0.027	0.005	0.094	0.093	0.002	0.010	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.498	0.491	0.002	0.008	0.001	0.514	0.483	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.124	0.123	0.009	0.022	0.008	0.097	0.096	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.518	0.473	0.001	0.006	0.000	0.525	0.474	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.141	0.140	0.008	0.019	0.003	0.100	0.099	0.001	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.532	0.458	0.001	0.007	0.001	0.534	0.462	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.142	0.141	0.012	0.018	0.008	0.102	0.100	0.000	0.012	0.003	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.546	0.437	0.003	0.010	0.005	0.535	0.457	0.000	0.004	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.154	0.152	0.012	0.025	0.018	0.119	0.117	0.004	0.013	0.005	0.004	0.003	0.000	0.003	0.004

case 2		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.386	0.423	0.050	0.113	0.028	0.383	0.438	0.028	0.116	0.013	0.006	0.004	0.007	0.004	0.002
	sd	0.189	0.205	0.101	0.136	0.065	0.134	0.146	0.063	0.099	0.037	0.024	0.023	0.026	0.019	0.011
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.447	0.475	0.016	0.055	0.006	0.448	0.488	0.009	0.049	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.001
	sd	0.172	0.171	0.047	0.073	0.022	0.115	0.123	0.038	0.054	0.010	0.014	0.002	0.006	0.003	0.009
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.484	0.477	0.008	0.028	0.002	0.470	0.499	0.003	0.025	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.145	0.148	0.026	0.052	0.012	0.113	0.114	0.013	0.035	0.007	0.003	0.003	0.009	0.004	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.490	0.485	0.004	0.019	0.002	0.499	0.486	0.002	0.011	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.152	0.157	0.016	0.039	0.007	0.101	0.107	0.010	0.026	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.003	0.001
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.501	0.479	0.003	0.014	0.003	0.507	0.486	0.001	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.148	0.151	0.015	0.033	0.015	0.108	0.107	0.004	0.017	0.002	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.514	0.472	0.003	0.009	0.002	0.512	0.483	0.001	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.144	0.145	0.011	0.023	0.009	0.103	0.104	0.005	0.016	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.517	0.468	0.002	0.011	0.002	0.513	0.482	0.001	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.158	0.158	0.010	0.026	0.008	0.112	0.112	0.006	0.013	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.003	0.006	0.000
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.528	0.455	0.004	0.008	0.005	0.526	0.466	0.000	0.005	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.176	0.175	0.017	0.021	0.018	0.123	0.124	0.002	0.019	0.005	0.003	0.003	0.005	0.000	0.004
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.516	0.444	0.008	0.020	0.012	0.523	0.453	0.003	0.009	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002
	sd	0.198	0.203	0.027	0.041	0.033	0.146	0.147	0.014	0.024	0.011	0.008	0.014	0.010	0.009	0.010

case 3		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.393	0.430	0.030	0.121	0.026	0.394	0.445	0.014	0.125	0.010	0.003	0.001	0.003	0.003	0.002
	sd	0.189	0.196	0.069	0.141	0.063	0.119	0.137	0.043	0.094	0.033	0.016	0.007	0.016	0.018	0.013
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.450	0.481	0.014	0.048	0.007	0.450	0.490	0.003	0.054	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.150	0.150	0.042	0.068	0.030	0.102	0.114	0.014	0.058	0.008	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.005	0.005
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.472	0.495	0.006	0.024	0.003	0.480	0.496	0.001	0.021	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.144	0.137	0.020	0.042	0.015	0.098	0.104	0.004	0.034	0.007	0.003	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.491	0.490	0.003	0.014	0.002	0.494	0.492	0.000	0.012	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.136	0.135	0.013	0.031	0.011	0.093	0.099	0.003	0.025	0.006	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.493	0.493	0.002	0.010	0.002	0.496	0.495	0.001	0.007	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.143	0.137	0.011	0.024	0.011	0.094	0.098	0.005	0.018	0.004	0.000	0.003	0.003	0.000	0.003
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.512	0.478	0.002	0.007	0.002	0.510	0.485	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.141	0.139	0.011	0.018	0.010	0.096	0.098	0.003	0.013	0.001	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.516	0.475	0.001	0.007	0.001	0.512	0.485	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.163	0.161	0.007	0.019	0.006	0.102	0.104	0.000	0.011	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.522	0.465	0.002	0.008	0.003	0.524	0.472	0.000	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.171	0.172	0.008	0.019	0.011	0.117	0.119	0.003	0.010	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.000
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.526	0.449	0.007	0.013	0.005	0.520	0.466	0.001	0.006	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
	sd	0.206	0.206	0.024	0.032	0.018	0.140	0.144	0.003	0.014	0.010	0.007	0.008	0.007	0.007	0.006

Table 2: The means and standard deviations (sd) of the estimated model weights for example 2.

case 4		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.474	0.240	0.278	0.005	0.004	0.482	0.236	0.280	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.183	0.238	0.235	0.030	0.029	0.110	0.179	0.172	0.006	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.000
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.451	0.253	0.293	0.003	0.000	0.463	0.245	0.291	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.130	0.222	0.217	0.028	0.000	0.084	0.170	0.167	0.003	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.397	0.267	0.335	0.001	0.000	0.407	0.274	0.318	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.106	0.238	0.244	0.007	0.000	0.075	0.203	0.196	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.347	0.295	0.357	0.001	0.000	0.350	0.295	0.355	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.091	0.242	0.237	0.017	0.000	0.068	0.222	0.219	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.282	0.319	0.398	0.001	0.000	0.288	0.351	0.361	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.084	0.265	0.263	0.012	0.000	0.062	0.215	0.209	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.210	0.355	0.433	0.002	0.001	0.229	0.326	0.445	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.080	0.286	0.282	0.012	0.010	0.060	0.247	0.243	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.159	0.369	0.465	0.006	0.000	0.174	0.368	0.456	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.082	0.304	0.308	0.025	0.005	0.059	0.278	0.268	0.010	0.003	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.117	0.404	0.462	0.012	0.005	0.126	0.412	0.449	0.005	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
	sd	0.086	0.309	0.317	0.038	0.022	0.071	0.266	0.265	0.019	0.013	0.005	0.007	0.008	0.010	0.006
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.100	0.421	0.408	0.041	0.030	0.101	0.419	0.401	0.017	0.015	0.013	0.011	0.008	0.007	0.007
	sd	0.111	0.293	0.292	0.078	0.065	0.097	0.256	0.259	0.042	0.044	0.037	0.041	0.029	0.028	0.019
case 5		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.452	0.248	0.292	0.005	0.004	0.455	0.243	0.298	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.000
	sd	0.151	0.227	0.238	0.026	0.026	0.122	0.193	0.195	0.019	0.010	0.002	0.006	0.000	0.006	0.000
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.431	0.274	0.293	0.002	0.000	0.439	0.245	0.315	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.116	0.228	0.235	0.015	0.002	0.080	0.177	0.179	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.392	0.308	0.299	0.001	0.000	0.398	0.250	0.352	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.093	0.228	0.227	0.011	0.000	0.068	0.192	0.199	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.337	0.301	0.360	0.002	0.000	0.341	0.303	0.355	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.098	0.263	0.256	0.014	0.000	0.064	0.208	0.206	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.279	0.310	0.409	0.001	0.000	0.289	0.336	0.374	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.086	0.268	0.270	0.009	0.000	0.058	0.224	0.222	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.228	0.337	0.433	0.001	0.000	0.228	0.332	0.440	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.077	0.275	0.274	0.011	0.000	0.057	0.234	0.238	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.173	0.368	0.457	0.002	0.001	0.179	0.358	0.461	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.078	0.298	0.289	0.013	0.006	0.052	0.254	0.254	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.134	0.369	0.489	0.007	0.001	0.137	0.424	0.436	0.002	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.077	0.290	0.298	0.022	0.007	0.052	0.263	0.266	0.012	0.009	0.001	0.001	0.004	0.002	0.003
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.119	0.422	0.424	0.024	0.010	0.106	0.430	0.432	0.008	0.006	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.004	0.003
	sd	0.100	0.290	0.300	0.057	0.035	0.068	0.250	0.253	0.026	0.028	0.019	0.013	0.023	0.018	0.015
case 6		$n = 200, p = 5$					$n = 400, p = 10$									
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_7	\hat{w}_8	\hat{w}_9	\hat{w}_{10}
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.372	0.282	0.331	0.011	0.004	0.395	0.276	0.317	0.007	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.000	0.001
	sd	0.160	0.249	0.251	0.049	0.035	0.116	0.199	0.192	0.037	0.007	0.009	0.008	0.018	0.000	0.006
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.359	0.315	0.321	0.005	0.000	0.369	0.299	0.328	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.122	0.240	0.257	0.032	0.000	0.079	0.190	0.192	0.018	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.326	0.342	0.327	0.005	0.000	0.313	0.328	0.357	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.107	0.249	0.243	0.033	0.000	0.070	0.215	0.212	0.014	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.272	0.397	0.325	0.006	0.000	0.262	0.380	0.355	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.098	0.277	0.280	0.035	0.000	0.064	0.226	0.228	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.214	0.455	0.325	0.005	0.000	0.220	0.430	0.348	0.002	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.089	0.271	0.272	0.031	0.000	0.057	0.220	0.217	0.015	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.168	0.467	0.356	0.008	0.001	0.179	0.433	0.386	0.003	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.082	0.278	0.272	0.033	0.008	0.056	0.226	0.230	0.015	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.127	0.478	0.386	0.008	0.001	0.139	0.453	0.402	0.005	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	sd	0.080	0.277	0.280	0.032	0.008	0.055	0.233	0.238	0.022	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.002
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.099	0.479	0.403	0.015	0.004	0.106	0.493	0.389	0.009	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001
	sd	0.079	0.281	0.283	0.041	0.019	0.060	0.217	0.219	0.028	0.001	0.002	0.008	0.006	0.000	0.005
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.088	0.469	0.390	0.038	0.014	0.085	0.469	0.393	0.018	0.005	0.005	0.006	0.010	0.004	0.006
	sd	0.095	0.285	0.282	0.066	0.035	0.078	0.215	0.222	0.042	0.024	0.020	0.022	0.033	0.018	0.022

Table 3: The means and standard deviations (sd) of the estimated model weights for example 3.

		case 1						case 2					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.396	0.113	0.066	0.365	0.042	0.018	0.312	0.150	0.103	0.286	0.089	0.059
	sd	0.180	0.151	0.106	0.155	0.092	0.054	0.197	0.171	0.146	0.179	0.132	0.112
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.429	0.081	0.033	0.444	0.011	0.002	0.373	0.116	0.071	0.380	0.046	0.014
	sd	0.172	0.119	0.075	0.137	0.035	0.011	0.192	0.146	0.125	0.169	0.094	0.051
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.402	0.084	0.024	0.482	0.006	0.001	0.369	0.109	0.057	0.440	0.022	0.004
	sd	0.154	0.126	0.050	0.126	0.024	0.008	0.170	0.135	0.101	0.157	0.058	0.018
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.352	0.106	0.022	0.514	0.006	0.001	0.325	0.135	0.049	0.473	0.016	0.002
	sd	0.148	0.134	0.049	0.131	0.028	0.009	0.165	0.153	0.092	0.153	0.052	0.014
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.307	0.145	0.026	0.515	0.007	0.001	0.279	0.160	0.057	0.490	0.013	0.001
	sd	0.145	0.152	0.058	0.130	0.029	0.005	0.151	0.155	0.102	0.150	0.046	0.004
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.248	0.172	0.039	0.531	0.009	0.001	0.220	0.184	0.065	0.518	0.013	0.000
	sd	0.145	0.143	0.075	0.141	0.034	0.012	0.145	0.170	0.104	0.164	0.039	0.001
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.198	0.183	0.063	0.540	0.014	0.002	0.171	0.196	0.087	0.520	0.025	0.001
	sd	0.133	0.146	0.097	0.164	0.048	0.016	0.131	0.160	0.125	0.176	0.066	0.008
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.141	0.193	0.106	0.529	0.029	0.003	0.123	0.196	0.131	0.485	0.055	0.010
	sd	0.116	0.145	0.126	0.180	0.074	0.019	0.121	0.172	0.152	0.202	0.099	0.049
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.078	0.164	0.184	0.477	0.086	0.011	0.089	0.146	0.201	0.415	0.121	0.028
	sd	0.097	0.145	0.158	0.210	0.123	0.036	0.101	0.159	0.185	0.212	0.137	0.074

		case 3						case 4					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.355	0.117	0.096	0.324	0.079	0.028	0.373	0.163	0.038	0.415	0.009	0.002
	sd	0.202	0.155	0.136	0.187	0.131	0.069	0.194	0.166	0.080	0.143	0.029	0.013
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.380	0.113	0.044	0.422	0.034	0.006	0.374	0.149	0.018	0.457	0.002	0.000
	sd	0.190	0.142	0.083	0.163	0.069	0.027	0.176	0.155	0.048	0.133	0.014	0.004
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.365	0.108	0.042	0.467	0.016	0.002	0.318	0.175	0.021	0.480	0.005	0.001
	sd	0.173	0.135	0.077	0.149	0.046	0.010	0.164	0.151	0.052	0.138	0.029	0.013
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.311	0.146	0.037	0.495	0.010	0.002	0.265	0.206	0.029	0.497	0.003	0.000
	sd	0.165	0.152	0.072	0.147	0.046	0.012	0.150	0.150	0.064	0.136	0.022	0.000
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.270	0.178	0.038	0.504	0.010	0.000	0.200	0.231	0.049	0.513	0.008	0.000
	sd	0.162	0.153	0.080	0.148	0.039	0.000	0.125	0.137	0.085	0.140	0.034	0.004
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.226	0.197	0.045	0.522	0.009	0.000	0.160	0.251	0.065	0.514	0.011	0.000
	sd	0.158	0.146	0.086	0.151	0.031	0.007	0.120	0.147	0.106	0.153	0.036	0.002
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.173	0.212	0.073	0.517	0.023	0.002	0.111	0.243	0.100	0.518	0.026	0.001
	sd	0.143	0.155	0.112	0.171	0.059	0.014	0.108	0.156	0.128	0.175	0.072	0.012
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.126	0.204	0.104	0.520	0.042	0.003	0.089	0.216	0.151	0.468	0.068	0.007
	sd	0.122	0.172	0.142	0.198	0.093	0.022	0.098	0.165	0.164	0.197	0.098	0.028
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.091	0.160	0.198	0.420	0.113	0.019	0.074	0.166	0.228	0.340	0.147	0.044
	sd	0.110	0.162	0.176	0.231	0.125	0.055	0.104	0.169	0.196	0.221	0.162	0.094

		case 5						case 6					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.337	0.198	0.047	0.405	0.012	0.002	0.285	0.280	0.044	0.368	0.018	0.005
	sd	0.187	0.176	0.078	0.139	0.035	0.010	0.157	0.185	0.086	0.148	0.051	0.023
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.333	0.197	0.019	0.449	0.003	0.000	0.258	0.300	0.019	0.417	0.007	0.000
	sd	0.183	0.163	0.048	0.130	0.016	0.000	0.156	0.174	0.054	0.143	0.031	0.001
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.282	0.215	0.019	0.481	0.003	0.001	0.219	0.329	0.017	0.429	0.005	0.000
	sd	0.167	0.160	0.047	0.131	0.014	0.008	0.141	0.149	0.053	0.146	0.028	0.000
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.223	0.239	0.022	0.513	0.001	0.000	0.176	0.349	0.026	0.444	0.004	0.001
	sd	0.152	0.157	0.055	0.124	0.012	0.000	0.130	0.160	0.068	0.158	0.021	0.010
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.177	0.268	0.028	0.524	0.003	0.000	0.151	0.346	0.034	0.464	0.005	0.000
	sd	0.139	0.154	0.059	0.140	0.016	0.003	0.126	0.161	0.075	0.152	0.028	0.000
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.134	0.287	0.044	0.528	0.006	0.000	0.122	0.341	0.055	0.474	0.008	0.000
	sd	0.128	0.150	0.074	0.146	0.022	0.005	0.120	0.162	0.098	0.150	0.034	0.003
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.111	0.269	0.078	0.532	0.009	0.000	0.097	0.330	0.085	0.475	0.013	0.000
	sd	0.112	0.157	0.102	0.153	0.034	0.004	0.110	0.170	0.120	0.160	0.037	0.002
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.081	0.229	0.129	0.516	0.041	0.005	0.072	0.280	0.149	0.456	0.041	0.001
	sd	0.092	0.153	0.134	0.181	0.076	0.032	0.109	0.173	0.158	0.191	0.073	0.007
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.065	0.164	0.227	0.426	0.096	0.022	0.057	0.218	0.213	0.379	0.104	0.029
	sd	0.102	0.157	0.183	0.219	0.126	0.064	0.091	0.171	0.161	0.209	0.130	0.072

Table 4: The means and standard deviations (sd) of the estimated model weights for example 4.

		case 1						case 2					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.106	0.220	0.234	0.135	0.170	0.135	0.094	0.212	0.224	0.179	0.182	0.108
	sd	0.127	0.173	0.166	0.143	0.143	0.128	0.124	0.186	0.185	0.172	0.148	0.120
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.054	0.184	0.198	0.084	0.272	0.207	0.068	0.186	0.195	0.108	0.270	0.173
	sd	0.084	0.136	0.156	0.109	0.181	0.175	0.102	0.149	0.167	0.127	0.168	0.154
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.042	0.157	0.153	0.051	0.328	0.270	0.036	0.160	0.158	0.080	0.325	0.241
	sd	0.071	0.109	0.132	0.077	0.202	0.200	0.065	0.130	0.143	0.099	0.195	0.190
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.038	0.119	0.121	0.044	0.356	0.322	0.037	0.117	0.134	0.063	0.366	0.284
	sd	0.062	0.103	0.106	0.060	0.222	0.218	0.063	0.103	0.129	0.090	0.199	0.198
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.036	0.102	0.094	0.036	0.357	0.376	0.046	0.108	0.095	0.053	0.387	0.311
	sd	0.062	0.098	0.096	0.055	0.233	0.228	0.071	0.099	0.113	0.079	0.216	0.208
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.039	0.088	0.073	0.041	0.384	0.374	0.044	0.094	0.083	0.043	0.390	0.346
	sd	0.068	0.090	0.083	0.064	0.232	0.217	0.074	0.096	0.105	0.076	0.219	0.215
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.044	0.087	0.054	0.036	0.381	0.398	0.049	0.089	0.074	0.046	0.392	0.351
	sd	0.070	0.089	0.070	0.063	0.230	0.231	0.078	0.097	0.096	0.080	0.234	0.226
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.051	0.075	0.053	0.044	0.364	0.413	0.066	0.088	0.056	0.064	0.358	0.369
	sd	0.077	0.082	0.075	0.066	0.241	0.244	0.099	0.096	0.088	0.087	0.233	0.238
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.078	0.083	0.056	0.050	0.352	0.382	0.083	0.101	0.077	0.085	0.349	0.306
	sd	0.096	0.105	0.081	0.075	0.198	0.204	0.125	0.109	0.106	0.106	0.212	0.210
		case 3						case 4					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.094	0.200	0.235	0.172	0.172	0.127	0.097	0.245	0.197	0.134	0.212	0.115
	sd	0.121	0.173	0.185	0.168	0.155	0.126	0.125	0.168	0.174	0.157	0.157	0.134
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.061	0.172	0.194	0.114	0.269	0.190	0.049	0.204	0.143	0.060	0.347	0.198
	sd	0.086	0.146	0.155	0.134	0.167	0.148	0.090	0.143	0.127	0.092	0.174	0.168
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.037	0.152	0.148	0.066	0.330	0.267	0.035	0.135	0.099	0.036	0.386	0.309
	sd	0.064	0.122	0.130	0.093	0.192	0.183	0.061	0.110	0.092	0.063	0.215	0.206
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.034	0.120	0.113	0.047	0.360	0.325	0.032	0.109	0.077	0.028	0.423	0.331
	sd	0.063	0.106	0.106	0.075	0.199	0.192	0.054	0.092	0.075	0.050	0.230	0.220
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.030	0.102	0.084	0.044	0.394	0.345	0.041	0.096	0.063	0.024	0.424	0.352
	sd	0.056	0.094	0.091	0.069	0.224	0.217	0.062	0.090	0.071	0.045	0.236	0.228
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.032	0.082	0.074	0.040	0.407	0.364	0.049	0.090	0.054	0.032	0.394	0.381
	sd	0.059	0.087	0.087	0.067	0.224	0.212	0.065	0.089	0.074	0.054	0.235	0.223
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.038	0.082	0.068	0.037	0.409	0.366	0.064	0.088	0.056	0.044	0.385	0.363
	sd	0.064	0.092	0.084	0.058	0.220	0.214	0.085	0.103	0.080	0.069	0.245	0.229
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.050	0.083	0.056	0.047	0.410	0.352	0.080	0.102	0.075	0.059	0.338	0.345
	sd	0.074	0.095	0.083	0.078	0.220	0.216	0.113	0.112	0.118	0.095	0.227	0.228
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.076	0.098	0.064	0.072	0.359	0.331	0.135	0.136	0.081	0.101	0.273	0.273
	sd	0.103	0.112	0.102	0.092	0.210	0.206	0.152	0.153	0.123	0.136	0.210	0.214
		case 5						case 6					
		\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6	\hat{w}_1	\hat{w}_2	\hat{w}_3	\hat{w}_4	\hat{w}_5	\hat{w}_6
$\tau = 0.1$	mean	0.094	0.266	0.196	0.137	0.211	0.096	0.099	0.261	0.183	0.140	0.225	0.092
	sd	0.124	0.174	0.158	0.149	0.152	0.121	0.132	0.184	0.166	0.157	0.151	0.117
$\tau = 0.2$	mean	0.052	0.225	0.144	0.062	0.338	0.180	0.071	0.221	0.132	0.061	0.330	0.185
	sd	0.083	0.134	0.125	0.090	0.180	0.159	0.104	0.135	0.139	0.088	0.169	0.163
$\tau = 0.3$	mean	0.044	0.162	0.094	0.034	0.385	0.282	0.061	0.179	0.086	0.038	0.356	0.280
	sd	0.068	0.108	0.096	0.058	0.210	0.205	0.083	0.115	0.096	0.064	0.194	0.191
$\tau = 0.4$	mean	0.039	0.130	0.072	0.026	0.395	0.338	0.056	0.160	0.055	0.030	0.396	0.302
	sd	0.065	0.093	0.084	0.045	0.224	0.220	0.074	0.106	0.075	0.055	0.212	0.201
$\tau = 0.5$	mean	0.041	0.110	0.058	0.021	0.420	0.350	0.072	0.132	0.041	0.025	0.374	0.356
	sd	0.064	0.089	0.070	0.038	0.224	0.226	0.095	0.107	0.064	0.048	0.212	0.212
$\tau = 0.6$	mean	0.052	0.097	0.048	0.028	0.409	0.367	0.086	0.114	0.037	0.024	0.348	0.392
	sd	0.072	0.094	0.069	0.050	0.220	0.219	0.092	0.102	0.057	0.049	0.220	0.220
$\tau = 0.7$	mean	0.058	0.099	0.050	0.025	0.406	0.362	0.095	0.109	0.036	0.030	0.363	0.367
	sd	0.081	0.098	0.078	0.047	0.230	0.225	0.107	0.109	0.065	0.057	0.215	0.214
$\tau = 0.8$	mean	0.083	0.098	0.056	0.039	0.353	0.371	0.118	0.114	0.038	0.043	0.362	0.326
	sd	0.097	0.107	0.087	0.070	0.216	0.221	0.129	0.115	0.068	0.072	0.209	0.213
$\tau = 0.9$	mean	0.116	0.109	0.065	0.067	0.310	0.333	0.142	0.126	0.063	0.066	0.300	0.303
	sd	0.119	0.127	0.106	0.102	0.223	0.212	0.142	0.140	0.093	0.101	0.201	0.195

Table 5: Mean-FPEs at different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for the Boston housing data.

	Method	$\tau = 0.1$	$\tau = 0.2$	$\tau = 0.3$	$\tau = 0.4$	$\tau = 0.5$	$\tau = 0.6$	$\tau = 0.7$	$\tau = 0.8$	$\tau = 0.9$
$n_{test} = 50$	LQR	0.590	0.967	1.251	1.466	1.587	1.657	1.619	1.423	1.067
	PLQR	0.651	1.034	1.359	1.557	1.681	1.708	1.702	1.521	1.159
	LQMA	0.595	0.973	1.254	1.470	1.591	1.655	1.640	1.445	1.090
	VCQR ₁	0.579	0.925	1.174	1.378	1.522	1.616	1.548	1.353	0.937
	VCQR ₂	0.555	0.820	1.047	1.244	1.315	1.398	1.336	1.134	0.819
	VCQR ₃	0.574	0.827	1.023	1.147	1.241	1.245	1.249	1.065	0.727
	VCQR ₄	0.556	0.855	1.080	1.222	1.293	1.316	1.256	1.072	0.869
	VCQR ₅	0.572	0.883	1.130	1.315	1.459	1.528	1.457	1.289	0.877
	VCQR ₆	0.562	0.884	1.143	1.331	1.425	1.429	1.366	1.136	0.812
	VCQR ₇	0.498	0.806	1.058	1.224	1.304	1.333	1.307	1.125	0.828
	VCQR ₈	0.532	0.836	1.055	1.207	1.265	1.318	1.262	1.087	0.803
	VCQR ₉	0.665	1.049	1.313	1.477	1.586	1.626	1.595	1.474	1.059
	VCQR ₁₀	0.658	0.926	1.117	1.195	1.271	1.282	1.235	1.091	0.755
	AQR	2.387	3.347	3.823	4.136	4.260	4.306	4.033	3.377	2.174
	VCQMA1	0.472	0.751	0.952	1.096	1.185	1.216	1.165	0.986	0.666
	VCQMA2	0.513	0.846	1.052	1.203	1.287	1.303	1.291	1.139	0.752
JVCQMA	0.469	0.749	0.938	1.065	1.134	1.157	1.090	0.908	0.626	
$n_{test} = 100$	LQR	0.595	0.971	1.256	1.476	1.603	1.675	1.639	1.435	1.079
	PLQR	0.649	1.050	1.364	1.571	1.685	1.730	1.714	1.528	1.154
	LQMA	0.599	0.975	1.259	1.480	1.610	1.675	1.654	1.453	1.093
	VCQR ₁	0.585	0.919	1.170	1.378	1.520	1.591	1.541	1.334	0.930
	VCQR ₂	0.569	0.840	1.066	1.256	1.358	1.418	1.359	1.176	0.881
	VCQR ₃	0.594	0.845	1.034	1.172	1.254	1.286	1.273	1.107	0.773
	VCQR ₄	0.560	0.858	1.082	1.229	1.312	1.333	1.270	1.104	0.887
	VCQR ₅	0.570	0.883	1.126	1.319	1.459	1.534	1.469	1.293	0.902
	VCQR ₆	0.570	0.893	1.154	1.337	1.443	1.468	1.401	1.175	0.851
	VCQR ₇	0.505	0.809	1.057	1.220	1.309	1.346	1.296	1.120	0.822
	VCQR ₈	0.552	0.845	1.082	1.233	1.304	1.351	1.302	1.136	0.893
	VCQR ₉	0.670	1.048	1.317	1.488	1.597	1.633	1.605	1.493	1.093
	VCQR ₁₀	0.664	0.938	1.120	1.204	1.267	1.271	1.215	1.079	0.768
	AQR	2.288	3.268	3.684	3.989	4.124	4.166	3.906	3.282	2.174
	VCQMA1	0.468	0.746	0.955	1.108	1.200	1.232	1.180	1.007	0.679
	VCQMA2	0.527	0.844	1.066	1.218	1.311	1.342	1.281	1.152	0.825
JVCQMA	0.467	0.742	0.939	1.073	1.143	1.169	1.098	0.942	0.671	
$n_{test} = 200$	LQR	0.609	0.991	1.280	1.494	1.624	1.699	1.668	1.466	1.105
	PLQR	0.663	1.065	1.370	1.574	1.693	1.748	1.731	1.542	1.163
	LQMA	0.613	0.995	1.284	1.502	1.635	1.710	1.682	1.490	1.110
	VCQR ₁	0.605	0.947	1.218	1.441	1.587	1.643	1.583	1.375	1.010
	VCQR ₂	0.649	0.931	1.174	1.365	1.477	1.539	1.530	1.477	1.084
	VCQR ₃	0.669	0.919	1.103	1.244	1.329	1.369	1.342	1.191	0.888
	VCQR ₄	0.594	0.896	1.116	1.269	1.355	1.373	1.305	1.153	0.951
	VCQR ₅	0.593	0.911	1.159	1.355	1.487	1.554	1.508	1.323	0.945
	VCQR ₆	0.599	0.937	1.194	1.386	1.511	1.552	1.488	1.285	0.939
	VCQR ₇	0.540	0.845	1.089	1.261	1.353	1.392	1.336	1.156	0.862
	VCQR ₈	0.646	0.926	1.173	1.323	1.401	1.429	1.369	1.211	1.012
	VCQR ₉	0.737	1.109	1.375	1.547	1.659	1.706	1.699	1.576	1.226
	VCQR ₁₀	0.715	0.982	1.157	1.259	1.311	1.317	1.255	1.119	0.828
	AQR	2.247	3.243	3.691	3.950	4.085	4.140	3.869	3.254	2.238
	VCQMA1	0.488	0.773	0.984	1.138	1.240	1.278	1.234	1.081	0.788
	VCQMA2	0.575	0.888	1.123	1.251	1.347	1.365	1.298	1.154	0.883
JVCQMA	0.496	0.772	0.974	1.108	1.185	1.200	1.139	0.993	0.748	




Figure 1: Mean-FPEs at different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for example 1.




Figure 2: Mean-FPEs at different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for example 2.




Figure 3: Mean-FPEs at different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for example 3.




Figure 4: Mean-FPEs at different quantiles with τ ranging from 0.1 to 0.9 for example 4.




Figure 5: Plots of the estimated model weights $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_{10})$ and their 95% confidence limits, where the standard errors are computed based on 500 bootstrap samples.