

Inference on Extreme Quantiles of Unobserved Individual Heterogeneity

Vladislav Morozov*

June 16, 2023

Abstract

We develop a methodology for conducting inference on extreme quantiles of unobserved individual heterogeneity (heterogeneous coefficients, heterogeneous treatment effects, etc.) in a panel data or meta-analysis setting. Inference in such settings is challenging: only noisy estimates of unobserved heterogeneity are available, and approximations based on the central limit theorem work poorly for extreme quantiles. For this situation, under weak assumptions we derive an extreme value theorem and intermediate order theorem for noisy estimates and appropriate rate and moment conditions. Both theorems are then used to construct confidence intervals for extremal quantiles. The intervals are simple to construct and require no optimization. Inference based on the intermediate order theorem involves a novel self-normalized intermediate order theorem. In simulations, our extremal confidence intervals have favorable coverage properties in the tail. Our methodology is illustrated with an application to firm productivity in denser and less dense areas.

KEYWORDS: unobserved heterogeneity, panel data, heterogeneous coefficients, estimation noise, extreme value theory, feasible inference

JEL CLASSIFICATION: C21, C23

*vladislav.morozov@upf.edu; Universitat Pompeu Fabra and Barcelona School of Economics

†Acknowledgments: I am indebted to Christian Brownlees and Kirill Evdokimov for their support and guidance. I am also grateful to Iván Fernández-Val, Adam Lee, Zoel Martin, Geert Mesters, Katerina Petrova, Barbara Rossi, Alina Shirshikova, André Souza, Andrea Sy, Piotr Zwiernik, and the participants at the 2021 European Winter Meeting of the Econometric Society, the 2021 Spanish Economic Association Symposium, the 2022 Royal Economic Society Annual Conference, the 2022 BSE Summer Forum, the 27th International Panel Data Conference, the 10th ICEEE, and the 3rd CESC for comments and discussions.

1 Introduction

Extreme quantiles of unobserved individual heterogeneity (UIH) are often of interest in analysis of economic panel data and in meta-analysis; UIH includes heterogeneous coefficients, treatment effects, etc. For example, in the setting of [Combes, Duranton, Gobillon, Puga, and Roux \(2012\)](#) we might be interested in estimating the lowest level of firm-specific productivity that is compatible with firm survival in a given area. This corresponds to finding the zeroth quantile of the distribution of productivity of surviving firms.¹

The key challenge to estimation and inference is that only noisy estimates of UIH are available, and it is not a priori clear when such estimates yield useful information about the quantiles of interest. These individual estimates are constructed from individual time series, studies, or cluster-level data, and thus are subject to estimation noise. This estimation noise and the true UIH are often related in a complex and unobservable manner due to the dependence between UIH and covariates used in estimation (e.g. [Heckman \(2001\)](#); [Browning and Carro \(2007, 2010\)](#)). Importantly, estimation noise does not “average out” when dealing with extreme quantiles, in contrast to estimation of means.

In this paper we develop a methodology for conducting inference on extreme quantiles of UIH on the basis of noisy estimates, and we establish sharp conditions under which noisy estimates of UIH are informative about the quantiles of interest. The noisy estimates can be used for estimation and inference if the tails of their distribution converge to the tails of the distribution of interest in a certain weak pointwise sense. We construct confidence intervals for extreme quantiles of UIH using self-normalizing ratios of extreme or intermediate order statistics of the estimates. We also provide hypothesis tests about the support of UIH. To obtain the relevant asymptotic distributions, we prove appropriate extreme and intermediate value theorems (EVT and IVT) for noisy estimates.

The asymptotic distributions of the statistics we propose are based on extreme and intermediate asymptotic approximations. Such approximations are suited to inference on extreme quantiles, and complement the central approximations constructed by [Jochmans and Weidner \(2022\)](#) for conducting inference on central quantiles of UIH. The three asymptotic approximations differ in how the quantile of interest is modeled as a function of the cross-sectional size. Extreme order approximations model the quantile of interest as drifting to 0 or 1 at a rate proportional to the cross-sectional dimension. The resulting confidence intervals and tests for extreme quantiles of UIH are based on a ratio of extreme order statistics of the estimated UIH. The distribution of such ratios depends on the extreme value (EV) index of the distribution of latent true UIH, and thus is non-pivotal. The corresponding critical values can be consistently estimated by subsampling. In intermediate order approximations, the quantile of interest drifts to 0 or 1 at a rate slower than the cross-sectional sample size. In this case we base confidence intervals on a ratio statistic of intermediate order statistics. This ratio exploits a deterministic difference between two perfectly

¹Here and in the empirical application, “productivity” is understood in the sense of firm-specific total factor productivity in a Cobb-Douglas production function. This view follows the literature on production function estimation (e.g. [Akerberg, Benkard, Berry, and Pakes \(2007\)](#)), rather than the literature on estimation of production frontiers (e.g. [Kumbhakar, Parmeter, and Zelenyuk \(2020a,b\)](#)). In particular, each firm may be viewed as always being on its firm-specific production frontier, and interest centers on the heterogeneous parameters controlling the frontiers.

dependent random variables in order to normalize the statistic. This result may also be of interest in the noiseless case. In contrast, central order approximations are based on the central limit theorem for quantiles; the quantile of interest is modeled as fixed.

We show that the noisy estimates of UIH can be used for estimation and valid inference on the quantiles of interest under mild conditions. There are two key restrictions. First, we impose weak assumptions on the marginal distributions of UIH and of the estimation noise. We do not restrict the dependence structure between the true UIH and the estimation noise. This allows estimation noise and the true UIH to be related in a complex manner, as they typically are outside of experimental settings (Heckman, 2001; Browning and Carro, 2007, 2010). Second, the tail of the noisy distribution of estimates has to converge to the tail of the latent distribution of interest in a certain pointwise sense; a condition that we label pointwise asymptotic tail equivalence.

When tail equivalence holds, noisy estimates inherit extreme value properties of the UIH. This allows us to establish an EVT and supporting distributional results for noisy estimates. These results in turn serve as a foundation for inference.

For a broad class of distributions, we obtain sufficient conditions for the tail equivalence conditions in terms of rate restrictions on the cross-sectional dimensional and individual sample sizes. The sufficient conditions only require typical moment or normality assumptions on the estimation noise and a lower bound for the extreme value index. The rate restrictions are mild if the distribution has an infinite right endpoint. For example, in this case tail equivalence holds if $N/T^4 \rightarrow 0$ if the estimation noise has more than 8 moments, where N is the cross-section size and T is the size of unit-specific datasets. This restriction matches the condition for validity of inference on central quantiles obtained by Jochmans and Weidner (2022). Moreover, if the estimation noise is normal, N may be almost exponentially large relative to T . In contrast, for distributions with finite endpoints the rate conditions may be more stringent. There are two main components which make restrictions milder: how light the tails of the noise distribution are, and how heavy the tails of the true distribution of the effects are. Intuitively, lighter-tailed noise and heavier-tailed UIH both increase signal strength.

In simulations we find that if rate conditions hold, extreme-order approximations offer favorable coverage properties in the tails, including when compared with other approximations. The rate conditions are important, and their failure may lead to distorted inference.

Our methodology is illustrated with an application to firm productivity in denser and less dense areas in the setting of Combes et al. (2012). We address two key aspects of their analysis. First, we consider the issue of firm selection. Firm selection is conjectured to left-truncate the productivity distribution by creating a minimal productivity threshold required for firm survival. We find no evidence of truncation in the productivity distributions in both denser and less areas. This strengthens the previous finding of Combes et al. (2012) that truncation must be the same in both kinds of areas, though at an unknown level. Second, Combes et al. (2012) make the key assumption that the productivity distributions in denser and less dense areas are the same up to mean, variance, and truncation. We nonparametrically show that the tails of the productivity distribution in denser

and less dense areas are similar up to mean and variance of the distribution, lending credence to that assumption.

This paper is related to several strands of literature. First, several recent papers have proposed methods for studying distributional properties of UIH (Evdokimov, 2010; Arellano and Bonhomme, 2012; Okui and Yanagi, 2019; Barras, Gagliardini, and Scaillet, 2021; Jochmans and Weidner, 2022; Sasaki and Wang, 2022). There are two key contributions related to our paper. Jochmans and Weidner (2022) study the issue of estimating the distribution function and central quantiles of UIH from noisy estimates. They develop rate conditions and asymptotic normality results in a similar setting to ours. However, their methodology is based on a central limit theorem for quantiles, which is not well-suited for inference on extreme quantiles. Sasaki and Wang (2022) apply an extreme order approximation they develop for noiseless data to extreme quantiles of coefficients in a linear random coefficient model under a high level condition on the data. We focus on the general problem of inference using noisy estimates that covers linear, nonlinear, and nonparametric estimators and obtain sharp conditions under which these estimates are informative. Second, extreme order approximations are related to the fixed- k tail inference methods of Müller and Wang (2017) and Sasaki and Wang (2022), developed in a noiseless setting. In contrast to Müller and Wang (2017), we propose optimization-free confidence intervals that require no bounds on the EV index. Third, while our approach to inference using intermediate order approximation is novel, methods using intermediate order statistics are standard in the EV literature, and we refer to ch. 4 of de Haan and Ferreira (2006) for textbook treatment. Last, our setting and results should be contrasted with the literature on estimating extreme conditional quantiles or treatment effects in cross-sectional settings (Chernozhukov, 2005; Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val, 2011; Zhang, 2018). The focus of those papers is on modeling extreme conditional quantiles of observable quantities, whereas our focus lies squarely on unobserved quantities and the issue of estimation noise.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formalizes our setup and assumptions. In section 3 we lay down the probabilistic foundations of our inference theory by proving extreme and intermediate extreme value theorems for noisy estimates. Building on these results, in section 4 we discuss three approaches to inferences: extreme, intermediate, and central order asymptotic approximations. Using those approximations we construct confidence intervals and tests about the support of the distribution of unobserved UIH. In section 5 we explore performance of those CIs in a Monte Carlo setting. Section 6 contains the empirical application. All proofs are collected in the appendix. We provide additional results in the online appendix, available from the author’s website.

2 Setting and Assumptions

2.1 Problem statement

Suppose that unobserved individual heterogeneity θ_i is sampled in an iid fashion from some distribution F . θ_i may be a treatment effect, effect size, a coordinate of a vector of individual-specific coefficients, value of a function at a point, etc. i indexes cross-sectional units or individual

studies; in what follows we will refer to them as “units”.

Our goal is to estimate quantiles $F^{-1}(q)$ where q is close to 0 or 1, and to conduct inference on them. In particular, we are interested in constructing confidence intervals and hypothesis tests for hypotheses like $H_0 : \theta_i \geq 0$, which is equivalent to $H_0 : F^{-1}(0) \geq 0$. Without loss of generality we focus on the right tail of F .

2.2 Data generating process

We do not observe θ_i directly; instead we only see noisy observations $\vartheta_{i,T}$:

$$\vartheta_{i,T} = \theta_i + \frac{1}{T_i^p} \varepsilon_{i,T_i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, N, \quad (1)$$

where T_i is the sample size available for unit i , ε_{i,T_i} is the scaled estimation error, $\varepsilon_{i,T} = O_p(1)$ for all T , and $p > 0$ is the rate of convergence of the estimator. For clarity of exposition, in what follows we assume that for all units $T_i = T$ for some common T ; in the online appendix we show that our results naturally extend to the case where sample sizes are unequal between units (or clusters). p is determined by the estimation method used in a given case. For estimators convergent at the parametric rate $T^{-1/2}$, p is equal to $1/2$, but we allow other rates. $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_{i,T}]$ may be nonzero and need not converge to 0 as $T \rightarrow \infty$; however, this bias may not diverge as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Representation (1) is general. It is compatible with any estimation method for which a suitable rate of convergence is known; $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ can always be defined via the identity $\varepsilon_{i,T} = T^p(\vartheta_{i,T} - \theta_i)$. Intuitively, $\vartheta_{i,T}$ are estimators of θ_i that have growing precision. $\vartheta_{i,T}$ can potentially be biased. Our setting nests the setup considered by [Jochmans and Weidner \(2022\)](#) and the typical setup of meta-analysis (see e.g. [Higgins, Thompson, and Spiegelhalter \(2009\)](#)).

We provide several examples of how $\vartheta_{i,T}$ may be constructed.

Example 1 (Unit-wise OLS and IV). Let $y_{it} = \theta_i x_{it} + u_{it}$. First suppose that $\mathbb{E}[u_{it}x_{it}] = 0$. We estimate heterogeneous coefficients θ_i by unit-wise OLS: $\vartheta_{i,T} = (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2)^{-1} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it} y_{it}$. Define $\varepsilon_{i,T} = (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it}^2)^{-1} T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T x_{it} u_{it}$ to write $\vartheta_{i,T}$ as in eq. (1) for $p = 1/2$. Now let x_{it} be endogenous in the sense that $\mathbb{E}[u_{it}x_{it}] \neq 0$. Suppose a valid instrument z_{it} is available: $\mathbb{E}[z_{it}u_{it}] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[z_{it}x_{it}] \neq 0$. The unit-wise IV estimators are given by $\vartheta_{i,T} = (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}x_{it})^{-1} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}y_{it}$. In this case $\varepsilon_{i,T} = (T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}x_{it})^{-1} T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^T z_{it}u_{it}$. Note that the distribution of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ may be dissimilar to the normal distribution even for large T if z_{it} is not a strong instrument. Even if u_{it} is normally distributed, the distribution of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ can be skewed, bimodal, and possess an infinite expected value ([Nelson and Startz, 1990](#)).

Example 2 (Nonparametric regression). Let $\theta_i := \mathbb{E}[y_{it}|x_{it} = x_0]$ for some fixed value x_0 . Let $\vartheta_{i,T} = (\sum_{t=1}^T K((x_{it} - x_0)/h))^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T y_{it} K((x_{it} - x_0)/h)$ by the Nadaraya-Watson estimator of θ_i where K is a kernel function and h is a bandwidth parameter. Let $u_{it} = y_{it} - \theta_i$, and set $\varepsilon_{i,T} = (\sum_{t=1}^T K((x_{it} - x_0)/h))^{-1} \sqrt{T} h \sum_{t=1}^T u_{it} K((x_{it} - x_0)/h)$. Let $h = T^{-s}$, $s \in (0, 1)$. It holds that $\varepsilon_{i,T} = O_p(1)$ and $\vartheta_{i,T} = \theta_i + T^{-(1-s)/2} \varepsilon_{i,T}$ under suitable conditions on h . If h is picked to optimize the convergence rate, $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ has a non-zero mean even in the limit.

Notation Let $\vartheta_{1,N,T} \leq \dots \leq \vartheta_{N,N,T}$ be the order statistics of $\{\vartheta_{1,T}, \dots, \vartheta_{N,T}\}$, and similarly let $\theta_{1,N} \leq \dots \leq \theta_{N,N}$ be the order statistics of the latent noiseless $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N\}$. “Noiseless maximum” always stands for $\theta_{N,N}$; “noisy maximum” stands for $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$; same applies to all other order statistics. \Rightarrow denotes weak convergence, both of random variables and functions.

2.3 Assumptions

Assumption 1. For each T , $\{(\theta_i, \varepsilon_{i,T})\}_{i=1,\dots,N}$ are independent and identically distributed random vectors indexed by i .

Observations $\vartheta_{i,T}$ are sampled in an iid fashion. Note that $\vartheta_{i,T}$ can be conditionally heteroskedastic: $\text{Var}(\vartheta_{i,T}|\theta_i) = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_{i,T}|\theta_i)$ can depend on θ_i , provided this variance exists.

Assumption 2. The distribution F of θ is in the weak domain of attraction of an extreme value distribution with extreme value index $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$.

Under assumption 2, the classical extreme value theorem of [Gnedenko \(1943\)](#) applies to the latent noiseless distribution F . This will serve as the basis for extending this extreme value convergence to the observed noisy data. Without assumption 2, we would not be able to conduct inference using the asymptotic behavior of the sample maximum even if we had access to the true θ_i . Assumption 2 is a mild assumption, satisfied by almost all textbook continuous distributions and many discrete ones. Assumption 2 is equivalent to certain regular variation conditions on F (see theorem 1.2.1 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) for precise conditions)

Two key features of our analysis are that we place no restrictions on the dependence structure between θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ and that we impose no distributional assumptions on $\varepsilon_{i,T}$. This approach can be motivated as follows. First, θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ will typically be related in a complex and unobservable manner outside of tightly controlled experimental settings. Such dependence may arise if the agent chooses some covariates with knowledge of θ_i , and these covariates are in turn used in estimation of θ_i . Second, the distribution of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ might not be well-approximated by a normal distribution, as in the IV case of example 1 (however, we show how to exploit normality of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ in establishing our rate conditions). In light of these challenges, we only impose a weak assumption on the marginal distribution G_T of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$.

Assumption 3. $\{G_T\}$ form a tight family of distributions indexed by T .

Intuitively, assumption 3 requires that $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ be defined in such a way that, as $T \rightarrow \infty$, the distributions G_T of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ do not escape to infinity. Assumption 3 holds automatically if $T^p(\vartheta_{i,T} - \theta_i)$ has a non-degenerate asymptotic distribution. Together with definition (1), assumption 3 implies that each $\vartheta_{i,T}$ is consistent for θ_i , but we allow $\vartheta_{i,T}$ to be biased in finite samples. In addition, assumption 3 allows the mean of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ to be nonzero in the limit, as may occur in nonparametric regression with MSE-minimizing choice of bandwidth (example 2).

3 Extreme Value Theory For Noisy Estimates

3.1 Extreme Value Theorem For Noisy Estimates

The key first step towards conducting inference on extreme quantiles is to establish distributional results for the sample maximum $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$. The following theorem provides conditions under which $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ and the latent maximum $\theta_{N,N} = \max\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N\}$ have the same asymptotic distribution. It introduces the notion of tail equivalence and serves as a stepping stone towards our inference results.

Theorem 3.1. *Let assumption 1 hold. Let constants a_N, b_N and a random variable X be such that $(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow X$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Let F be the cdf of θ_i and G_T be the cdf of $\varepsilon_{i,T}$.*

(1) (Transferral of convergence) *Let the following tail equivalence (TE) conditions hold: for each $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ there exists some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{TE-Sup})$$

$$\inf_{u \in [0, \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} + u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1-u) \right) \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{TE-Inf})$$

Then $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow X$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$.

(2) (Sharpness) *Consider the following TE condition: for each $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{TE-Sup}')$$

Then (i) (TE-Sup) and (TE-Inf) together imply (TE-Sup'); (ii) (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup') are sharp in the following sense: if at least one of the conditions fails, there exists a sequence of joint distributions of $(\theta_i, \varepsilon_{i,T})$ with given marginal distributions F, G_T such that $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N$ weakly converges to a limit different from X or does not converge at all.

(TE-Sup) and (TE-Inf) are pointwise asymptotic tail equivalence conditions between the distributions of $\vartheta_{i,T}$ and θ_i . The $F^{-1} + T^{-p}G^{-1}$ term approximately corresponds to the quantiles of the noisy estimates, where the infimum and supremum adjust for the unknown joint distribution of θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$. The $(-F^{-1})$ term corresponds to the target noiseless quantiles. If (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup) hold, the distance between the tails of F and the distribution of $\vartheta_{i,T}$ is shrinking, pointwise in τ . Observe that (TE-Sup) and (TE-Inf) are trivially satisfied in a noiseless setting (that is, if $G_T^{-1} = 0$), as both the supremum and the infimum are attained at $u = 0$ and are equal to zero.

Theorem 3.1 may be interpreted as a necessary and sufficient condition for $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ and $\theta_{N,N}$ to have the same asymptotic distribution regardless of the dependence structure between θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$. In particular, if conditions (TE-Sup') and (TE-Inf) do not hold, it is generally uncertain to what extent $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ inherits the limit properties of $\theta_{N,N}$ (however, see remark 2 below for a special case). For some joint distributions of $(\theta_i, \varepsilon_{i,T})$, $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ might still have the same asymptotic distribution as $\theta_{N,N}$. However, as the proof of theorem 3.1 shows, there exists at least one possible asymptotic

distribution for $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ that is different from the distribution of $\theta_{N,N}$. Moreover, $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ may only converge to it along a subsequence and not overall.

We stress three important but subtle features of conditions **(TE-Sup)** and **(TE-Inf)**. First, the value of the infimum of **(TE-Inf)** is greater or equal to the value of the supremum in **(TE-Sup)** (and **(TE-Sup')**), as the proof shows. Second, suppose that there is no estimation noise. Then the expression under the supremum in **(TE-Sup)** is non-positive for all values of u allowed and equal to 0 at $u = 0$. Similarly, the expression under the infimum in **(TE-Inf)** is non-negative and also equal to zero at $u = 0$. Similar logic persists in the presence of estimation noise, though it affects the two conditions somewhat asymmetrically. Suppose that $G_T(0) \in (0, 1)$. Then the expression under the infimum is eventually always non-negative due to the shrinking choice set for u . **(TE-Inf)** requires the minimal value of that non-negative function to converge to zero. Similarly, the expression under the supremum in **(TE-Sup)** is negative for some interval of values of u , though it may change sign for some larger values of u . Condition **(TE-Sup)** then requires that the supremum of this function converges to 0, whether from above or below. We remark that this is not a requirement of uniform convergence to 0 of the function under the supremum. Last, to obtain sharpness it is necessary to consider **(TE-Sup')**, which is weaker than **(TE-Sup)** in the presence of **(TE-Inf)**, as we show in the proof. However, for practical purposes **(TE-Sup)** is sufficient and easier to interpret as controlling the contribution of the left tail of G_T .

Remark 1. It is natural to use the same normalization constants a_N, b_N for both $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ and $\theta_{N,N}$. The distribution of $\vartheta_{i,T}$ is composed of two components: the G_T component that decays as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and the F component. As the F component does not decay, it is appropriate to use the same a_N . For inference, the centering constants b_N will be quantiles of F (see lemma 4.1 below). Since they are the primary object of interest, it is natural to center at them.

Remark 2 (Knife-edge failure of **(TE-Inf)** and **(TE-Sup)**). A special knife-edge case arises if for each $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ the expressions in **(TE-Inf)** and **(TE-Sup)** (or **(TE-Sup')**) converge to the same δ_τ . In this case $a_N^{-1}(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)$ does converge. However, if δ_τ is not a constant function of $\tau \in (0, \infty)$, this limit distribution has a shape different from the limit of $a_N^{-1}(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)$. Correspondingly, it is not necessarily a generalized extreme value distribution. We conjecture that inference is still possible in this case using a suitable modification of theorems 4.3-4.4 below.

When do conditions **(TE-Inf)** and **(TE-Sup)** hold? Sufficient conditions for **(TE-Inf)** and **(TE-Sup)** take the form of restrictions on the magnitude of N relative to T , given assumptions on the tails of G_T . Such conditions depend on γ , the extreme value index of F , which is unknown. However, a sufficient condition is possible if a lower bound γ' for γ is available. This is intuitive. Distributions with larger values of γ have heavier and longer tails. This heavier tail of F will be more pronounced in the data relative to the contribution of the noise, and so a larger value of N will be allowable. We state these conditions formally:

Proposition 3.2. *Let assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Let one of the following conditions hold:*
(1) *Let $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$ for some $\beta > 0$, and let $N^{1/\beta-\gamma'}(\log(T))^{1/\beta}/T^p \rightarrow 0$ for some γ' .*

(2) For all T , let $\varepsilon_{i,T} \sim N(\mu_T, \sigma_T^2)$, and let $N^{-\gamma'} \sqrt{\log(N)}/T^p \rightarrow 0$ for some γ' .

In addition, let F satisfy assumption 2 with EV index $\gamma > \gamma'$. Then (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup) hold for F and G_T for any sequence $\{(a_N, b_N)\}_{N=1}^\infty$ such that $(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)/a_N$ converges to a non-degenerate random variable.

As proposition 3.2 shows, two key factors determine how stringent the rate restrictions are. First, as noted above, a heavier right tail of F (larger γ') allows a larger value of N relative to T . Second, lighter tails of G_T lead to milder restrictions on N . The conditions on tail of G_T are captured by (1) and (2). Condition (1) only requires G_T to have uniformly bounded β th moments; (2) is a stronger assumption of exact normality, it may be seen as a limiting version of (1) as $\beta \rightarrow \infty$. In practice, we expect G_T to lie between the two extremes.

It is useful to compare the rate conditions of proposition 3.2 to the conditions obtained by Jochmans and Weidner (2022) for inference on central quantiles. Jochmans and Weidner (2022) show that $N/T^4 \rightarrow 0$ is sufficient for valid inference for a broad class of distributions F if $p = 1/2$ (see theorem 4.6 below). The same rate condition arises in our extreme setting if F has an infinite tail ($\gamma \geq 0$) and G_T has more than 8 moments (see remark 3 below for importance of $\gamma \geq 0$).² Further, proposition 3.2 allows N to be almost exponentially large compared to T if $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ is normally distributed. In such settings tail equivalence may hold even if the conditions for validity of inference on central quantiles do not. If $\gamma < 0$, the opposite may happen, and the conditions of proposition 3.2 may be more restrictive. We further highlight that our tail equivalence conditions and the conditions of Jochmans and Weidner (2022) reflect two fundamentally different aspects of the estimation problem. The conditions of Jochmans and Weidner (2022) are driven by the order of the bias incurred by estimation. In contrast, the tail equivalence conditions control the balance between the right tail of the distribution of interest F and (both) tails of the distribution G_T of estimation noise. Correspondingly, these conditions benefit if the tails of G_T are lighter; in particular, the conditions hold trivially in a noiseless setting, as we note after theorem 3.1.

Remark 3. An appropriate value of γ' might often be apparent in a given application. For example, Gabaix (2009, 2016) documents that many economic relations follow a power law and outlines some general theoretical mechanisms under which a power law arises. If such a mechanism is likely to hold in a given situation, it is reasonable to assume that the distribution of the data is well approximated by a power law. Since a power law distribution has to have $\gamma > 0$, it is sufficient to check the hypothesis of proposition 3.2 with $\gamma' = 0$. Further, to allow the distribution of θ to potentially have a light infinite tail, it is sufficient to check conditions for any $\gamma' < 0$, potentially arbitrarily close to 0.

²It is fairly straightforward to impose conditions under which G_T has a given number of moments for linear estimators, such as those of examples 1 and 2. Further, Brownlees and Morozov (2022) provide some conditions on existence of moments of estimation error for nonlinear estimators.

3.2 Intermediate Order Statistics

To conduct inference on extreme quantiles, we also need to develop an asymptotic theory for intermediate order statistics. Formally, $\theta_{N-k(N),N}$ is called an intermediate order statistic if $k(N) \rightarrow \infty$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $k(N) = o(N)$. Intuitively, such statistics asymptotically stay in the tail, but are not the top statistics. We generally suppress dependence of k on N .

To derive asymptotic properties of intermediate order statistics, we impose an additional assumption on F that refines assumption 2.

Assumption 4 (F satisfies a first order von Mises condition). F is twice differentiable with density f , f positive in some left neighborhood of $F^{-1}(1)$ ($F^{-1}(1)$ might be finite or infinite), and for some $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds that $\lim_{t \uparrow F^{-1}(1)} ([1 - F]/f)'(t) = \gamma$.

Assumption 4 is a slight strengthening of assumption 2. See Dekkers and de Haan (1989) and de Haan and Ferreira (2006) for a discussion of the condition and its plausibility.

We now state a theorem describing the asymptotic behavior of intermediate order statistics:

Theorem 3.3 (Intermediate value theorem (IVT)). *Let assumptions 1 and 4 hold and let $k = k(N) \rightarrow \infty, k = o(N)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Define c_N as the derivative of the inverse of $1/(1 - F)$ evaluated at N/k and multiplied by N/k , that is, $c_N = (N/k) \times \left[\left((1/(1 - F))^{-1} \right)'(N/k) \right]$. Let U_1, \dots, U_N be iid Uniform $[0, 1]$ random variables.*

(1) (Transferral of convergence) *Let the following tail equivalence conditions hold as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ for some $\epsilon > 0$:*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N} - u) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (2)$$

$$\inf_{u \in [0, U_{k,N}]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N} + u) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1 - u) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (3)$$

Then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\frac{\sqrt{k} \vartheta_{N-k, N, T} - F^{-1}(1 - k/N)}{c_N} \Rightarrow N(0, 1). \quad (4)$$

(2) (Sharpness) *Consider the following condition:*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1 - U_{k,N}]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N} - u) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (5)$$

Conditions (3) and (5) are sharp in the sense of theorem 3.1.

Theorem 3.3 is the intermediate order counterpart of theorem 3.1; conditions (2), (3), and (5) are analogs of conditions (TE-Sup), (TE-Inf), and (TE-Sup'), respectively. The key difference between the two sets of conditions is the region where tail equivalence is imposed. Theorem 3.1 concerns quantiles of the form $1 - 1/(N\tau)$, $\tau > 0$ fixed, whereas theorem 3.3 looks at quantiles of the order $1 - k/N$ (as we show in the proofs, $U_{k,N} = O_p(k/N)$). Since $k \rightarrow \infty$, the two regions are

asymptotically distinct. A second (minor) point of difference between the two pairs of conditions is that conditions of theorem 3.3 take a randomized form. As we show in proposition 3.4 below, this randomness is easy to control, giving deterministic sufficient rate conditions.

As for (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup), sufficient conditions for (2) and (3) take form of rate restrictions on N and T that depend on the EV index γ . A sufficient condition is possible if a lower bound for γ is available. The following proposition is an analog of proposition 3.2.

Proposition 3.4. *Let assumptions 1 and 3 hold. Let $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Let one of the following conditions hold*

- (1) $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$ and for some $\nu > 0, \gamma'$ it holds that $N^{\delta/2(1+1/\beta)+(1-\delta)(-\gamma'+1/\beta)+\nu/\beta}/T^\nu \rightarrow 0$
 - (2) For all T let $\varepsilon_{i,T} \sim N(\mu_T, \sigma_T^2)$, and for some γ' it holds that $N^{\delta/2+(1-\delta)(-\gamma')}\sqrt{\log(N)}/T^\nu \rightarrow 0$.
- In addition, let F satisfy assumption 4 with EV index $\gamma > \gamma'$. Then conditions (2) and (3) hold for F and G_T for $k = N^\delta$.

Remark 4 (Comparison of sufficient conditions for the EVT and the IVT). Depending on γ , the rate conditions for the EVT may be more or less restrictive than the conditions for the IVT. For example, suppose that $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ is normally distributed. In this case for the EVT to hold it is sufficient that $N^{-\gamma}\sqrt{\log(N)}/T^\nu \rightarrow 0$; for the IVT to hold it is sufficient that $N^{\delta/2+(1-\delta)(-\gamma')}\sqrt{\log(N)}/T^\nu \rightarrow 0$. If $\gamma \leq -1/2$, then the EVT condition implies the IVT condition; the opposite holds if $\gamma > -1/2$, regardless of the value of δ . In particular, if $\gamma > 0$, for the EVT there are no restrictions on relative sizes of N and T , but there are restrictions for the IVT. ³

Remark 5 (Dependence on δ). Conditions of proposition 3.4 depend on δ , the parameter that determines the magnitude of $k = N^\delta$. If δ is close to zero, conditions for the IVT are close to those for the EVT. Intuitively, in this case conditions (2) and (3) require asymptotic tail equivalence in approximately the same section of the tail as conditions (TE-Sup) and (TE-Inf), and so the resulting sufficient conditions are similar. As δ grows, the region controlled by conditions (2) and (3) becomes distinct from the right endpoint of the distribution (while still staying in the tails by requirement that $k = o(N)$).

4 Inference Using Noisy Estimates

We now turn to inference. In this section, we introduce confidence intervals, estimators, and tests based on extreme and intermediate order asymptotic approximations. We also briefly discuss the central order approximations of Jochmans and Weidner (2022).

The extreme, intermediate, and central order approximations differ in their appropriate use case. First, extreme and intermediate order approximations should be employed when there are relatively

³A somewhat related condition is obtained by Girard, Stupfler, and Usseglio-Carleve (2021) in the context of estimating expectiles in a regression model with heavy-tailed noise in a cross-sectional setting. The key condition of their paper is that the estimation noise is uniformly small (see their condition (2)). This condition is naturally sufficient for theorem 3.3 (modulo the different normalizing factors involved). In contrast, the conditions of theorem 3.3 only target the differences between intermediate order statistics, and do not restrict the difference between central or top order statistics.

few data points to the right of the corresponding sample quantile. In this case the central limit theorem for quantiles is unlikely to provide a good approximation, and central order approximations should not be used. Second, the choice between extreme and intermediate order approximations is further determined by the magnitude of N . Extreme order approximations are applicable even for N fairly small, in addition to having certain desirable robustness properties, as shown by Müller and Wang (2017). In contrast, intermediate order approximations require a fairly large value of N . Such approximations are controlled by the parameter k which is required to satisfy two conditions: k must be large, while k/N must be small. These conditions may be incompatible in smaller datasets.

In addition, the three approximations differ in how the quantile of interest is modeled. This choice determines the resulting limit distributions, whose critical values are used to form the confidence intervals of interest or to provide corrected estimators for quantiles.

4.1 Inference Using Extreme Order Approximations

Extreme order approximations use theorem 3.1 as the basis for inference. The quantile of interest is modeled as drifting to 1 at a rate proportional to N^{-1} . Formally, we select $b_N = F^{-1}(1 - l/N)$ in theorem 3.1 for some fixed $l > 0$. Further, we make an explicit choice of scaling constants a_N . Then the following version of theorem 3.1 holds:

Lemma 4.1. *Let assumptions of theorem 3.1 hold. Let $l > 0$ be fixed. Let E_1^* be a standard exponential random variable.*

(1) *If F satisfies assumption 2 with EV index $\gamma > 0$, then*

$$\frac{1}{F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)} \left[\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right] \Rightarrow (E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - l^{-\gamma} \text{ as } N, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

(2) *If F satisfies assumption 2 with EV index $\gamma = 0$, there for some positive function \hat{f}*

$$\frac{1}{\hat{f}\left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right)} \left(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right) \Rightarrow -\log(E_1^*) - \log(l) \text{ as } N, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

(3) *If F satisfies assumption 2 with EV index $\gamma < 0$, then $F^{-1}(1) < \infty$ and*

$$\frac{1}{F^{-1}(1) - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)} \left(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right) \Rightarrow -(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} + l^{-\gamma} \text{ as } N, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Lemma 4.1 cannot be used for inference directly, as the scaling constants involved are unknown. These constants involve the $(1 - 1/N)$ th quantile of F , and so are not covered by sample information.

To address this challenge, we first establish an intermediate result. The following lemma extends theorem 3.1 to cover a vector of q top order statistics for q fixed.

Lemma 4.2 (Joint EVT). *Let assumptions of theorem 3.1 hold. Let q be a fixed natural number and E_1^*, \dots, E_{q+1}^* be iid standard exponential random variables.*

(1) If F satisfies assumption 2 with $\gamma > 0$, then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T}}{F^{-1}(1-1/N)}, \frac{\vartheta_{N-1,N,T}}{F^{-1}(1-1/N)}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T}}{F^{-1}(1-1/N)} \right) \\ & \Rightarrow \left((E_1^*)^{-\gamma}, (E_1^* + E_2^*)^{-\gamma}, \dots, (E_1^* + E_2^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(2) If F satisfies assumption 2 with $\gamma = 0$, then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ for \hat{f} as in lemma 4.1.

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)}{\hat{f}\left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right)}, \frac{\vartheta_{N-1,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)}{\hat{f}\left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right)}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)}{\hat{f}\left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right)} \right) \\ & \Rightarrow \left(-\log(E_1^*), -\log(E_1^* + E_2^*), \dots, -\log(E_1^* + E_2^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*) \right). \end{aligned}$$

(3) If F satisfies assumption 2 with EV index $\gamma < 0$, then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}(1)}{F^{-1}(1) - F^{-1}(1-1/N)}, \frac{\vartheta_{N-1,N,T} - F^{-1}(1)}{F^{-1}(1) - F^{-1}(1-1/N)}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - F^{-1}(1)}{F^{-1}(1) - F^{-1}(1-1/N)} \right) \\ & \Rightarrow \left(-(E_1^*)^{-\gamma}, -(E_1^* + E_2^*)^{-\gamma}, \dots, -(E_1^* + E_2^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.2 allows us to solve the issue of unknown scaling rates by using an observation due to Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2011). By taking the ratio of two elements in the joint EVT 4.2, we eliminate scaling factors completely, while the form of the limit is explicitly known up to the EV index γ .

Combining lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we obtain the following version of the EVT that can be used to conduct inference on extreme quantiles under tail equivalence conditions:

Theorem 4.3 (Feasible EVT). *Let assumptions of theorem 3.1 hold, in particular, let F have EV index $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $q \geq 1, r \geq 0$ be fixed integers and $l > 0$ be a fixed real number; let E_1^*, E_2^*, \dots be iid standard exponential RVs. Then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$*

$$\frac{\vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right)}{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}} \Rightarrow \frac{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{r+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - l^{-\gamma}}{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}}, \quad (6)$$

where for $\gamma = 0$ the right hand side means $[\log(E_1^*) - \log(l)]/[\log(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*) - \log(E_1^*)]$. In addition, if F satisfies assumption 2 with $\gamma < 0$, then $F^{-1}(1) < \infty$ and we may set $l = 0$ in eq. (6).

Theorem 4.3 allows us to conduct inference on extreme quantiles with no knowledge of the value of γ . The left hand side of eq. (6) does not depend on γ ; this statistic is the basis of our inference procedures. While the right hand side limit distribution of eq. (6) is non-pivotal and does depend on γ , we show below how the critical values can be consistently estimated by subsampling without estimating γ (while γ may be estimated consistently in our setting, we recommend against it unless N is fairly large, see remark 9 below).

We show how to construct confidence intervals, estimators and hypothesis tests for extreme quantiles based on theorem 4.3 with a series of examples.

Example 3 (Location-scale equivariant confidence interval for 95th percentile). Let $l = 10$ and $N = 200$, in which case $F^{-1}(1 - l/N) = F^{-1}(0.95)$. There are only 10 observations to the right of the sample quantile, and it is appropriate to use extreme order approximation described by theorem 4.3. Let $q \geq 1$, $r \geq 0$ be fixed integers, see remark 6 below on choice of r and q . Let \hat{c}_α be a consistent estimator of the α th quantile of $[(E_1^* + \dots + E_{r+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - 10^{-\gamma}] / [(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}]$. Then let the confidence interval for $F^{-1}(0.95)$ based on sample size $N = 200$ be given by:

$$CI_\alpha = \left[\vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - \hat{c}_{\alpha/2} (\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}), \vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - \hat{c}_{1-\alpha/2} (\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}) \right].$$

CI_α is location-scale equivariant, as the statistic of eq. (6) is location-scale invariant.

Care must be exercised in interpreting the asymptotic properties of CI_α : it is a $(1 - \alpha) \times 100\%$ asymptotic confidence intervals for $F^{-1}(1 - l/N)$. The target quantity shifts with N , and the value of l determines which quantile is targeted for a given sample size.

Example 4 (Median-unbiased estimator for 95th percentile). Let q, r , and \hat{c}_α be as in example (3). By theorem 4.3 $P\left((\vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - F^{-1}(1 - l/N)) / (\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}) \leq \hat{c}_{1/2}\right) \rightarrow 1/2$. Rearranging, we obtain that the estimator

$$\mathcal{M}_{N,T} = \vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - \hat{c}_{1/2} (\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}) \quad (7)$$

is asymptotically median-unbiased for $F^{-1}(1 - l/N)$ (see Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2011) for a similar construction in a quantile regression setting). Note that $\mathcal{M}_{N,T}$ is always contained in CI_α (unlike $\vartheta_{N-r,N,T}$ which lies in CI_α if $\hat{c}_{\alpha/2}$ and $\hat{c}_{1-\alpha/2}$ have different signs).

Example 5 (Hypothesis tests about support). We can also use theorem 4.3 to test hypotheses about the support of F . Let $\gamma < 0$ and suppose we wish to test $H_0 : F^{-1}(1) \leq C$ vs. $H_1 : F^{-1}(1) > C$. Define the test statistic $W_C = (\vartheta_{N,N,T} - C) / (\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T})$. The test rejects H_0 if $W_C < \hat{c}_\alpha$ where \hat{c}_α is a consistent estimator of the α th quantile of $(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} / [(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}]$. The test is asymptotically size α and consistent against point alternatives, since $P(W_C < \hat{c}_\alpha | F^{-1}(1) = C) \rightarrow \alpha$, and for any $\delta > 0$, $P(W_C < \hat{c}_\alpha | F^{-1}(1) = C - \delta) \rightarrow 0$, $P(W_C < \hat{c}_\alpha | F^{-1}(1) = C + \delta) \rightarrow 1$.

Remark 6 (Choice of r and q). Constructing CIs, median-unbiased estimators, and tests based on eq. (6) requires choosing the tuning parameters r and q . There are two leading choices for r : $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ and $r = 0$, all other values are dominated by these two in simulations. Confidence intervals based on $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ are centered at the sample $(1 - l/N)$ th quantile; those based on $r = 0$ are centered at the sample maximum. Similarly, the median-unbiased estimator $\mathcal{M}_{N,T}$ of eq. (7) is based on adjusting either the corresponding sample quantile or the sample maximum depending on whether $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ or $r = 0$. In simulations of section 5 and the online appendix we show that both options perform favorably when constructing CIs. The intervals with $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ display better length properties, while the intervals with $r = 0$ have slightly better coverage properties for less extreme quantiles. In contrast, only $\mathcal{M}_{N,T}$ with $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ offers an improvement over the raw sample quantile in terms of mean absolute error. The parameter q can be any positive integer. We recommend picking q in the

range 2-10 based on unreported simulation evidence. Picking q in this range appears to not affect performance of the CIs and the estimators.

We now describe a subsampling estimator for the limit distribution of theorem 4.3 (Politis and Romano, 1994; Politis, Romano, and Wolf, 1999). Let $q > 1$, $r \geq 0$, and $l \geq 0$. Define $J(x)$ to be the limit distribution in eq. (6). Split the set of units $\{1, \dots, N\}$ into all subsamples of size b and index the subsamples by s , $s = 1, \dots, \binom{N}{b}$. Let $\vartheta_{b-k,b,T}^{(s)}$ be the $(b-k)$ th order statistic in subsample s . Define the subsampling estimator $L_{b,N,T}$ for J as

$$L_{b,N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{b}} \sum_{s=1}^{\binom{N}{b}} \mathbb{I}\{W_{s,b,N,T} \leq x\}, \quad W_{s,b,N,T} = \frac{\vartheta_{b-r,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{N-Nl/b,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}}, \quad \frac{Nl}{b} \leq N.$$

Observe that the subsample statistic $W_{s,b,N,T}$ is centered at $\vartheta_{N-Nl/b,N,T}$. Intuitively, this corresponds to the $(1-l/b)$ th quantile, giving the correct centering to the subsampled statistics. If we are interested in $F^{-1}(1)$, then $l = 0$, and the statistic is centered at $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$.

Define the estimated critical value \hat{c}_α as the α th quantile of $L_{b,N,T}$. The following result shows that \hat{c}_α is consistent for the true critical values of interest for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $b = N^m$, $m \in (0, 1)$. If $l > 0$, let conditions of propositions 3.2 and 3.4 hold with $\delta = 1 - m$. If $\gamma < 0$ and $l = 0$, then let conditions of proposition 3.2 hold. Then the subsampling estimator $L_{b,N,T}(x) \xrightarrow{P} J(x)$ at all x and $\hat{c}_\alpha \xrightarrow{P} c_\alpha = J^{-1}(\alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.*

Remark 7. The assumptions and the proof of theorem 4.4 crucially depend on whether we are interested in $F^{-1}(1)$ or in $F^{-1}(q)$ for $q < 1$. If interest lies in $F^{-1}(1)$, consistency of subsampling only requires checking whether the extreme value theorem applies. If we are instead interested in $F^{-1}(q)$ for $q < 1$, the subsample statistics are centered at $\vartheta_{N-Nl/b,N,T}$, an intermediate order statistic, in which case both the EVT and the IVT must hold.

Remark 8. Chernozhukov and Fernández-Val (2011) originally proposed and showed validity of using subsampling for inference in the context of extreme quantile regression. Theorem 4.4 shows that a similar approach can be applied in the case of noisy observations. Further, it shows that subsampling is also possible with $l = 0$ in case of $\gamma < 0$. The key challenge in establishing the validity of subsampling is to control the estimation noise in the subsamples and to leverage tail equivalence in the full sample.

Remark 9 (Estimation of the EV index). Inference based on theorem 4.3 does not require an estimate of γ . However, γ may be consistently estimated. Let $k = k(N)$ satisfy $k \rightarrow \infty, k = o(N)$. Let $A_{N,T} = k^{-1} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \vartheta_{N-i,N,T} - \vartheta_{N-k,N,T}$ and $B_{N,T} = k^{-2} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} i (\vartheta_{N-i,N,T} - \vartheta_{N-k,N,T})$. The Hill (1975) estimator $\hat{\gamma}_H$ and probability weighted moment (PWM) estimator $\hat{\gamma}_{PWM}$ of Hosking and Wallis (1987) are defined as

$$\hat{\gamma}_H = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \log(\vartheta_{N-i,N,T}) - \log(\vartheta_{N-k,N,T}), \quad \hat{\gamma}_{PWM} = \frac{A_{N,T} - 4B_{N,T}}{A_{N,T} - 2B_{N,T}},$$

If conditions of theorem 4.3 hold, then $\hat{\gamma}_H \xrightarrow{p} \gamma$ if $\gamma \geq 0$ and $\hat{\gamma}_H \xrightarrow{p} 0$ if $\gamma < 0$; $\hat{\gamma}_{PWM} \xrightarrow{p} \gamma$ if $\gamma < 1$ (approximately if F has a finite first moment). The proof of consistency is given in proof appendix.

$\hat{\gamma}_H$ and $\hat{\gamma}_{PWM}$ are likely to be imprecise if N is not large. For the estimators to be close to γ , two conditions must hold: k must be sufficiently large and k/N must be small. If N is not large, these requirements may be incompatible, as noted by Müller and Wang (2017).⁴

Remark 10. An alternative approach for constructing CIs for extreme quantiles using an extreme order approximation is proposed by Müller and Wang (2017). They use lemma 4.2 as the foundation of inference by treating the vector of top q order statistics as a single draw from the corresponding limit distribution. Based on such a joint EVT, Müller and Wang (2017) propose two methods: inverting the likelihood ratio and minimizing the average expected length where the average is taken over a pre-specified range of values for γ . Both methods lead to valid CIs for extreme quantiles in our setting, as long as lemma 4.2 holds; though we recommend using CIs based on theorem 4.3 that require no optimization and no bounds on the parameter γ .

4.2 Inference Using Intermediate Order Approximations

The intermediate order approximation of theorem 3.3 provides an alternative approach to inference that is based on convergence of intermediate order statistics (eq. (4)). In this case, the quantile of interest is modeled as drifting to 1 at a rate k/N where $k \rightarrow \infty, k = o(N)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$; this rate is slower than the rate N^{-1} of extreme order approximations. The resulting statistic is asymptotically standard normal. Intermediate order approximations should not be applied to $F^{-1}(\tau)$ for τ very close to 1 (see remark 11 below).

As the scaling rate c_N of statistic (4) is unknown, we follow an approach similar to the feasible EVT 4.3 and use a second intermediate order statistics to eliminate c_N .⁵ Unlike the case of theorem 4.3, the statistics in the denominator of the self-normalized statistic are asymptotically perfectly dependent and only differ by a non-zero deterministic factor. The following theorem first establishes that such a technique works in the noiseless case, which may be of independent interest; the result is then transferred to noisy observables.

Theorem 4.5. *Let assumptions 1 and 4 hold. Let $k = o(N), k \rightarrow \infty$. Let $f = F'$ be non-increasing or non-decreasing in some left neighborhood of $F^{-1}(1)$ ($F^{-1}(1) \leq \infty$).*

(1) *Then*

$$\frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{k}{N}\right)}{\theta_{N-k,N} - \theta_{N-k - \lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor, N}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad N \rightarrow \infty.$$

⁴We also note that estimating γ provides an alternative way of estimating the critical values necessary for application of theorem 4.3. Simulation-based critical values can be obtained by drawing samples from the right hand side distribution of eq. (6) after plugging in $\hat{\gamma}_H$ or $\hat{\gamma}_{PWM}$ in place of γ . However, subsampling-based critical values of theorem 4.4 should be used unless N is large.

⁵There are alternative approaches to inference using intermediate order statistics. For example, the subsampling approach of Bertail, Politis, and Romano (1999); Bertail, Haefke, Politis, and White (2004) can be used to account for unknown scaling rate c_N . However, the presence of a slowly varying component in c_N requires using multiple subsampling sizes, which may be problematic if N is not extremely large. Alternatively, for example, see ch. 4 of de Haan and Ferreira (2006) for inference under a second-order condition in a setting without estimation noise.

(2) In addition, let conditions of theorem 3.3 hold when evaluated at k and $k + \sqrt{k}$. Then

$$\frac{\vartheta_{N-k,N,T} - F^{-1}(1 - k/N)}{\vartheta_{N-k,N,T} - \vartheta_{N-k-\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor,N,T}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1), \quad N, T \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

The choice of k determines the centering quantile of interest. When k is chosen, the denominator is uniquely determined by k . This is in contrast to the free choice of the parameters r, q in the statistics of theorem 4.3.

Example 6. Let $N = 200$ and suppose that $k = k(N)$ is such that $k(200) = 16$ and $k \rightarrow \infty, k = o(N)$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Then by theorem 4.5 a confidence interval for $F^{-1}(0.92)$ based on sample of size $N = 200$

$$\left[\vartheta_{N-k,N} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left(\vartheta_{N-k,N} - \vartheta_{N-k-\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor,N} \right), \vartheta_{N-k,N} - z_{\alpha/2} \left(\vartheta_{N-k,N} - \vartheta_{N-k-\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor,N} \right) \right],$$

where z_α the α th quantile of the standard normal distribution. As with extreme approximations (example 3), the target quantity of the interval $F^{-1}(1 - k/N)$, though the quantile is drifting to 1 at a rate k/N , which is slower than $1/N$.

Remark 11. The approximation of theorem 4.5 should not be used if k is small. If $\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor$ is small but positive, $\vartheta_{N-k,N}$ and $\vartheta_{N-k-\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor,N}$ will be close, and the statistic will be unstable. If $\lfloor\sqrt{k}\rfloor = 0$, the statistic cannot be used at all.

4.3 Inference Using Central Order Approximations

The third method of inference is based on the central limit theorem for quantiles. The quantile of interest $F^{-1}(\tau)$ is modeled as fixed and independent from sample size (N, T) , in contrast to the extreme and intermediate approximations given above. Such ‘‘central’’ order approximations require that a sufficient number of observations be available on both sides of the corresponding sample order statistic $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N, T}$.

Jochmans and Weidner (2022) derive such approximations in the context of our problem, and we briefly state their results. They study a version of (1) given by $\vartheta_{i,T} = \theta_i + T^{-1/2}\varepsilon_i$ (that is, $p = 1/2$ and $G_T = G$ for all T). We introduce some additional notation: let K be a kernel function, h a bandwidth parameter, and define

$$b_F(x) = \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}[\sigma_i^2 | \theta_i = x] f(t)}{2} \right]', \quad \sigma_i^2 = \text{Var}(\varepsilon_i | \theta_i),$$

$$\hat{b}_F = -\frac{(nh^2)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 K'((\vartheta_{i,T} - \theta)/h)}{2}, \quad \hat{\tau}^* = \tau + \frac{\hat{b}_F(\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N, T})}{T}.$$

σ_i^2 is assumed known and invariant over time.

Theorem 4.6 (Propositions 2 and 4 of Jochmans and Weidner (2022)). *Let conditions of proposition 3 in Jochmans and Weidner (2022) hold, and in particular let for all T $\varepsilon_{i,T} = \varepsilon_i$, $\mathbb{E}[\varepsilon_i | \theta_i] = 0$, and ε_i be independent from θ_i given σ_i^2 . Let $\tau \in (0, 1)$.*

(1) If $N/T^2 \rightarrow c < \infty$, then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N, T} - F^{-1}(\tau) + \frac{1}{T} \frac{b_F(F^{-1}(\tau))}{f(F^{-1}(\tau))} \right) \Rightarrow N \left(0, \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{f(F^{-1}(\tau))^2} \right).$$

(2) If $N/T^4 \rightarrow 0$, then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sqrt{N} \left(\vartheta_{\lfloor N\hat{\tau}^* \rfloor, N, T} - F^{-1}(\tau) \right) \Rightarrow N \left(0, \frac{\tau(1-\tau)}{f(F^{-1}(\tau))^2} \right).$$

Theorem 4.6 is a restatement of proposition 2 and 4 of [Jochmans and Weidner \(2022\)](#). It shows that the sample τ th quantile $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N, T}$ is a consistent and asymptotically normal estimator for $F^{-1}(\tau)$ with standard asymptotic variance. However, $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N}$ is subject to bias of leading order $1/T$. [Jochmans and Weidner \(2022\)](#) show that this bias can be reduced by instead considering the sample $\hat{\tau}^*$ th quantile: $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\hat{\tau}^* \rfloor, N, T}$ is consistent and asymptotically normal with the same variance, but the leading order of the bias is instead given by $1/T^2$. This bias is eliminated if $\sqrt{N}/T^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Remark 12. For central order approximations, the order of the bias incurred by using $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N, T}$ in place of $\theta_{\lfloor N\tau \rfloor, N}$ is the same for a broad class of distributions, and equal to $1/T$. This invariance of bias order enables construction of the debiased estimator $\vartheta_{\lfloor N\hat{\tau}^* \rfloor, N, T}$. The situation is more complex for extreme and intermediate order approximations. The magnitude of the impact of estimation noise is determined by the interaction of a_N and T in theorem 3.1; a_N itself may behave like N^γ for $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ depending on F , up to slowly varying components.

5 Simulation Study

We assess the performance of our confidence intervals with a simulation study. We consider a linear regression model with unit-specific coefficients where the outcome y_{it} is generated by covariates (x_{it}, z_{it}) as

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \eta_i x_{it} + \theta_i z_{it} + \sqrt{\frac{\text{Var}(\theta_i)}{\text{Var}(u_{it})}} \times u_{it}.$$

The parameter of interest θ_i is the coefficient on z_{it} . We are interested in the coverage and length properties of a nominal 95% confidence interval for 0.85-0.999th quantiles.

The data is generated as follows. Define $F_{F_{r,\kappa}}(\theta) = 1 - (\theta + 1)^{-\kappa}$, $\kappa > 0$, $\theta \in [0, \infty)$. $F_{F_{r,\kappa}}$ is a canonical example of a one-sided power law distribution whose moments of order below κ are finite. $F_{F_{r,\kappa}}$ satisfies assumption 2; its EV index γ is $1/\kappa > 0$. Coefficients $(\alpha_i, \eta_i, \theta_i)$ are drawn from a trivariate Gaussian copula with correlation 0.3 and the same marginals $F_{F_{r,\kappa}}$ for $\kappa = 4$. This choice of κ matches the data of our empirical application. Covariates x_{it} are generated as $0.3\eta_i + \sigma_x (1 + 0.3 \|(\alpha_i, \eta_i, \theta_i)\|)^{1/2} (0.1 + U_i)$ where U_i is a Uniform[0, 1]; z_{it} are generated similarly with θ_i in place of η_i . This is a stylized setup in which UIH and covariates are positively dependent. u_{it} is sampled independently from the coefficients and the covariates from G_β , where G_β has density $g_\beta = \beta(1 + |x|)^{-\beta-1}/2$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\beta = 8$. G_β is a two-sided power law with finite moments

of order $< \beta$. u_{it} is rescaled so that its variance matches that of θ_i . Coefficients are estimated using OLS. As a result, the estimation noise $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ is not independent from θ_i . We consider two cross-sectional sizes: $N = 200$ and $N = 1000$. In both cases $T = 10$, which matches the time dimension of the dataset of our empirical application. All results are based on 10000 Monte Carlo samples.

We construct the confidence intervals using the three approximations given in section 4.

- (1) *Extreme*: intervals based on the the feasible EVT 4.3. Quantiles of the limit distribution are estimated using subsampling as in theorem 4.4. We choose r in line with remark 6. The “mixed” CI is centered at the corresponding sample quantile for each quantile of interest, that is, $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ (line 1a on figs. 1 and 2). The “max only” CI has $r = 0$ and is centered at the maximum for all quantiles (line 1b). In both cases we pick $q = 2$ (unreported simulation evidence shows that performance of the intervals does not depend on choice of q in the range 2-10). Additionally, for $N = 2000$ we consider the “mixed” CI with critical values obtained by simulating from the limit distribution after plugging in a consistent estimator of γ (line 1c). We use the PWM estimator of remark 9. For $N = 200$, γ is not estimated reliably, and we only report the results of this method in the online appendix, along with the similar results of using the Hill estimator.
- (2) *Intermediate*: we construct two CIs based on the statistic of theorem 4.5 that differ in how the critical values are estimated: using the limiting standard normal distribution (line 2a) and by subsampling (line 2b).

For comparison, we also include a textbook confidence interval based on the extrapolation estimator of theorem 4.3.1 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) (line 2c). In line with their simulation evidence, we pick $k = \lfloor \sqrt{N} \rfloor$ and use the PWM estimator of remark 9. This CI can only be constructed for sufficiently high quantiles. The validity of the extrapolation interval hinges on a second-order condition (de Haan and Resnick, 1996) which we do not examine in the current paper.

- (3) *Central*: we reports two CIs. The first interval is based on the raw data (line 3a). We construct the CI using the raw $\vartheta_{i,T}$ using a binomial CI. The same approach is implemented in the Stata command `centile`. The second interval uses the analytical correction of Jochmans and Weidner (2022) (line 3b), based on theorem 4.6. As advocated by Jochmans and Weidner (2022), we report bootstrap confidence intervals with 1000 bootstrap samples.

We briefly discuss the validity of different approximations. The rate conditions of theorem 4.3 hold for both sample sizes by proposition 3.2 as the estimation noise has more moments than θ_i . The sufficient conditions for theorem 4.5 hold only for a range of higher quantiles due to the relationship between k and the quantile targeted in theorem 4.5, see remark 5. For central order approximations, the rate conditions for validity of using raw data do not hold, especially in the second sample, see theorem 4.6(1). The rate conditions for the analytical correction of Jochmans and Weidner (2022) hold in both samples.

We present our results on figure 1. Fig. 1 depicts coverage rates and lengths for the above confidence intervals for the two values of N considered. In order to assess the impact of estimation




Figure 1: Coverage and length for 95% nominal confidence interval. $F = F_{F_r, \kappa}, \kappa = 4$ (power law tail). $u_{it} \sim G_{\beta}, \beta = 8$. $T = 10$. Top panel: $N = 200$. Bottom panel: $N = 2000$.

noise, in fig. 2 we plot the same results in a noiseless setting, that is, with $u_{it} = 0$.

For inference on extreme quantiles, we recommend using extreme approximations. For smaller cross-section sample sizes, the quantiles of the limiting distribution should be estimated by subsampling. For larger samples, both subsampling and simulating from the limit distributions are viable options. Based on length properties, the mixed approach (1a and 1c) displays the best overall performance, and we recommend using it.

The properties of extreme approximations worsen somewhat further away from the tail, when there are many points available to the right of the corresponding sample quantile. The max-based and the mixed CIs are affected differently. First, consider the mixed CI (1a and 1c). Its coverage deteriorates somewhat for quantiles such that there are more than 100 observations to the right of the corresponding sample quantile, that is, below the 0.95th quantile on the second panel of figs. 1 and 2. This effect is primarily driven by estimation noise. To see this, note that the behavior of $\vartheta_{N-r,N,T}$ in the numerator of eq. (6) changes when r is relatively large: $\vartheta_{N-r,N,T}$ behaves more similarly to an intermediate statistic. However, the rate conditions of the IVT do not hold in that section of the tail, and estimation noise distorts inference (compare the second panels of figs. 1 and 2). The problem is alleviated by using simulated critical values (1c), effectively imposing the EV limit distribution. Second, the max-based CI (1b) only uses the top statistics and its validity is not affected. However, it has unfavorable length properties for quantiles that are sufficiently far from the tail.

Central approximations suffer from the two problems highlighted in the introduction: effect of estimation noise and failure of central approximations in the tail. The first issue is evident in the fairly poor performance of CIs based on raw data for quantiles below 0.99, especially for $N = 2000$ (3a). The analytical correction of Jochmans and Weidner (2022) uniformly improves coverage for all such quantiles (3b). The second issue is common to both using raw data and using the correction; coverage and length of confidence intervals based on central approximations collapse to 0 for high quantiles, an effect most notable for $N = 200$.

Confidence intervals based on the intermediate approximation of theorem 4.5 are a viable option in the regions where theorem 4.5 holds and the statistic (8) is stable (2a and 2b). This corresponds to 0.95-0.99th quantiles for $N = 200$ and 0.95-0.997th quantiles for $N = 2000$. We recommend subsampling (2b) to estimate critical values, as the normal distribution does not provide a good approximation for the values of N considered. Theorem 4.5 should not be used if $\lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor$ is small, as remark 11 notes. In this case the statistic (8) is unstable. This instability is correctly picked up by the subsampling procedure, resulting in very wide confidence intervals. This affects quantiles beyond the 0.99th for $N = 200$ and the 0.997th for $N = 2000$. Finally, the coverage properties of extrapolation-based CI (2c) stem from its extreme length. Extrapolation-based CIs are longer than all other approximations barring that of theorem 4.5 in the unstable region. This growth of interval length is sufficient to offset the impact of estimation noise.

We note that in the online appendix we provide additional detailed simulations for distributions F which satisfy assumption 2 with $\gamma = 0$ and $\gamma < 0$, along with results for $u_{it} \sim N(0, 1)$. Furthermore,




Figure 2: Coverage and length for 95% nominal confidence interval. $F = F_{F_r, \kappa}, \kappa = 4$ (power law tail). Noiseless data. $T = 10$. Top panel: $N = 200$. Bottom panel: $N = 2000$.

we also explore performance of the corrected estimators formed as in eq. (7).

6 Empirical Application

As an empirical illustration, we revisit the question of differences in the distribution of firm productivity between denser and less dense areas in the setting of [Combes et al. \(2012\)](#) (CDGPR12). As firm productivity has to be estimated from firm-level data, this provides a natural example of the setting of this paper.

Background We first provide a brief summary of the relevant aspects of CDGPR12. It is well-established that firms tend to be more productive in more densely populated areas ([Melo, Graham, and Noland, 2009](#)). CDGPR12 seek to disentangle the two principal possible sources of differences – agglomeration economies and firm selection. To do so, CDGPR12 propose a two-step procedure. In the first step they estimate the unobserved firm-specific productivities. In the second step they compare the distribution of productivities in areas with above-median employment density (AAMED) with the distribution in areas with below-median employment density (ABMED) using the first-step estimates. In the second stage CDGPR12 make the key assumption that the distributions of true unobserved productivity in AAMED and ABMED are formed from the same latent parent distribution and only differ in three parameters – mean, variance, and proportion of the left tail truncated. This assumption generates a continuum of moment conditions which CDGPR12 then exploit to estimate the differences in each parameter between AAMED and ABMED. The magnitudes of the differences in parameters reflect the impact of agglomeration economies and firm selection in AAMED vis-à-vis ABMED. The mean and variance reflect the effects of agglomeration economies, which make firms more productive on average; however, some firms are likely to benefit more than others. The truncation parameter reflects the effects of firm selection. As [Asplund and Nocke \(2006\)](#) argue, competition is tougher in larger markets (such as larger cities). In the setting of CDGPR12, this translates into stronger truncation of the left tail of the latent parent distribution; the minimal level of productivity required to survive in a larger market is higher than in a smaller one (up to mean and variance).

Empirical questions In this application we consider two questions. First, the key question of interest is whether the aforementioned three parameters are sufficient to capture the difference between the tails of AAMED and the ABMED distributions. A finding that the tails are identical up to these parameters would support the key assumption of the second estimation step of CDGPR12. Second, we directly compare the left and the right tails of the AAMED and the ABMED distributions with no adjustments. Comparing the right tails reveals the magnitude of the productivity advantage enjoyed by the most productive firms of AAMED relative to the most productive firms of ABMED. Analyzing the left tail allows us to examine the evidence for firm selection. The approach developed by CDGPR12 is only capable of estimating the difference in the proportion of the left tail that is truncated. It does not reveal whether truncation occurs at all, and at what level.

Data We use the publicly available replication data provided by CDGPR12.⁶ The dataset includes firm-level productivity estimates, labeled as belonging either to AAMED. From each original dataset we randomly select $N = 2000$ firms, in line with our simulation study (the full cross-section contains 58654 firms for AAMED and 78359 firms for ABMED). Estimates are constructed by CDGPR12 using data covering 1994-2002, and thus $T = 9$. We give a brief description of the estimation procedure for productivity, and refer to CDGPR12 for a detailed discussion of the data and the estimation procedure employed. Firm i in sector s generates value added in period t according to a Cobb-Douglas function of the form

$$V_{it} = \exp(\theta_i) K_{it}^{\beta_{1,s}} L_{it}^{\beta_{2,s}} \exp(u_{it} + \beta_{0,t,s}) \quad (9)$$

where θ_i is the time-invariant log total factor productivity (TFP) of firm i , V_{it} is value added, K_{it} is capital, L_{it} is a labor index, u_{it} is a mean-zero term that combines individual measurement error and time-varying productivity shocks, $\beta_{1,s}, \beta_{2,s}$ are sector-specific factor shares, and $\beta_{0,t,s}$ is a sector- and time-specific intercept. θ_i is the key measure of productivity. Firms in AAMED draw θ_i from some latent distribution F_{AM} , firms in ABMED draw θ_i from F_{BM} .⁷ The noisy estimates $\vartheta_{i,T}$ are constructed in two steps. First, sector-specific production functions are estimated. Second, firm-specific log TFP is estimated as the average residual from the estimated production function, that is, $\vartheta_{i,T} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T [\log V_{it} - \hat{\beta}_{0,s,t} - \hat{\beta}_{1,s} \log K_{it} - \hat{\beta}_{2,s} \log L_{it}]$. Last, the data is normalized so that average log TFP across ABMED is zero.

Connection to the literature on estimation of the production frontier We highlight that our analysis (and that of CDGPR12) follows the literature on production function estimation; see [Akerberg et al. \(2007\)](#) for a review. This should be contrasted with the literature on production frontier estimation (e.g. [Kneip, Simar, and Van Keilegom \(2015\)](#); [Kumbhakar et al. \(2020a,b\)](#)). In our setting, each firm may be viewed as always being on its production frontier. Each frontier is characterized by eq. (9), and interest centers on these firm-specific parameters, rather than an economy- or sector-wide production frontier.

Assumptions and rate conditions We make two key assumptions in our analysis, one related to the estimation error and the other to the underlying distributions F_{AM} and F_{BM} . First, we assume that the estimation noise affecting $\vartheta_{i,T}$ has at least 8 moments. The principal source of error in $\vartheta_{i,T}$ are the measurement errors in the value-added and year- and firm-specific productivity shocks; the estimation noise in $(\beta_{0,s,t}, \beta_{1,s}, \beta_{2,s})$ is negligible due to the large size of the cross-section. Correspondingly, this assumptions only concerns measurement error and deviations from average productivity. Second, we assume that both the left and right tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} are infinite. This is well-established in the literature for the right tail of the productivity distribution ([Melo et al., 2009](#)). For the left tail the assumption can be motivated as follows. The dataset covers (approximately) all firms that exist in the estimation period with no restriction on firm age. We

⁶Available from D. Puga’s website at <https://diegopuga.org/data/selectagg/>

⁷In principle, the distributions may be sector-specific. However, the data of CDGPR12 does not include sectoral labels, and we thus focus on the results across all sectors (compare the last line in table 1 of CDGPR12).

therefore interpret F_{AM} and F_{BM} as stationary distributions that account for firm entry and exit, in line with interpretation of [Asplund and Nocke \(2006\)](#). Correspondingly, F_{AM} and F_{BM} also include unproductive firms that have not yet exited the market. We note that this assumption is supported by the data, as we show below.

Under the above assumptions the rate conditions of theorem [4.3](#) hold in line with proposition [3.2](#) and our simulation evidence. A sufficient rate condition is $N/T^4 \rightarrow 0$, which we assume to be broadly satisfied for the sample size at hand.⁸

EV index estimation and evaluation of rate conditions We begin by estimating the EV indices γ for the left and the right tails of the AAMED and ABMED distributions. The estimates of γ for F_{BM} are 0.36 for the left tail and 0.32 for the right tail. The estimates for F_{AM} are 0.35 for the left tail and 0.30 for the right tail. These estimates of γ are computed as the average of the two estimators of remark [9](#) for $k = \lfloor N^{3/5} \rfloor$; in the online appendix we show that our estimates are robust to choice of estimator and choice of k . The estimates for γ are large and compatible with fairly heavy-tailed distributions. The estimates for both tails of the F_{BM} and F_{AM} are compatible with a distribution with three but not four finite moments.

There are two principal observations that we may make based on our estimates of γ . First, the heavy-tailed behavior serves as a confirmation of the assumption that F_{AM} and F_{BM} have infinite tails. Recall that we assume that the measurement error and deviations from θ_i have at least eight moments. Under this assumption, the EV index of the estimation noise distribution cannot exceed 0.125. Consequently, we would expect to see lower estimates of γ if the tail of the distribution of estimation noise dominated the tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} . Second, in line with our interpretation of F_{AM} and F_{BM} , the data does not support the existence of a sharp minimal threshold for productivity required for survival, at least in the sense of a barrier to entry. A threshold for survival may exist but only apply to a given firm in the long run.

Comparison of standardized tails We now examine whether the difference between the tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} can be captured by the three parameters of CDGPR12. In order to do so, we first standardize both the AAMED and the ABMED datasets to have the same mean and variance. We note that the positive estimates of the EV index for left tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} are incompatible with truncation. Correspondingly, we do not modify the tails of the data. Using adjusted data, we compute 95% confidence intervals for the tail quantiles using theorem [4.3](#). We take $r = \lfloor l \rfloor$ and $q = 10$ and estimate critical values by subsampling. The quantiles considered are 0.001-0.1 for the left tail and 0.9-0.999 for the right tail. We note that the results are robust to choice of method of confidence interval. In the online appendix we report intervals based on all the methods considered in our simulation study and find that the results are virtually identical regardless of the method used.

Our key finding is that the tails of the AAMED and the ABMED distribution are similar up to mean and variance of (F_{AM}, F_{BM}) . Both tails are statistically identical, as [fig. 3](#) shows. Overall,

⁸Additionally, under the same rate condition [Jochmans and Weidner \(2022\)](#) show in their simulation study that noisy estimates are informative for panels of size $N = 200, T = 5$. We observe that $200/5^4 \approx 2000/9^4$.

this finding supports the key assumption CDGPR12 make in their second estimation stage.




Figure 3: 95% confidence intervals for extreme quantiles (between corresponding lines), AAMED and ABMED data standardized to have the same mean and variance. CIs based on theorem 4.3 with critical values estimated by subsampling

Comparison of non-standardized tails We now turn to comparing the left and the right tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} with no standardization applied to the data. We construct 95% confidence intervals for the 0.001-0.1st and 0.9-0.999th quantiles using theorem 4.3 as above, with the results depicted on fig. 4. We first consider the left tails. As noted above, positive estimates of γ suggest that $F_{AM}^{-1}(0) = F_{BM}^{-1}(0) = -\infty$. Moreover, as the top panel of fig. 4 indicates, there is no difference between the left tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} . In contrast, the right tails of F_{AM} and F_{BM} are statistically different up to the 0.995th quantile, showing an overall productivity advantage of AAMED relative to ABMED. However, this result should be interpreted carefully in light of differences in sectoral composition between AAMED and ABMED. Sectoral labeling would necessary to quantify the exact magnitude of the productivity advantage. As the publicly available data from Combes et al. (2012)




Figure 4: 95% confidence intervals for extreme quantiles of AAMED and ABMED distributions (between corresponding lines). CIs based on theorem 4.3 with critical values estimated by subsampling

does not include this labeling, we leave a detailed investigation of the point to future research.

Additional results We remark that we provide additional robustness checks in the online appendix, including detailed plots for all the methods used in this paper, further details on estimation of γ , and results obtained using the full dataset.

References

- D. A. Akerberg, C. L. Benkard, S. Berry, and A. Pakes. Econometric Tools for Analyzing Market Outcomes. In J. Heckman and E. Leamer, editors, *Handbook of Econometrics*, vol. 6A, chapter 63, pages 4171–4276. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2007.
- M. Arellano and S. Bonhomme. Identifying distributional characteristics in random coefficients panel data models. *Review of Economic Studies*, 79(3):987–1020, 2012. ISSN 00346527. doi: 10.1093/restud/rdr045.
- M. Asplund and V. Nocke. Firm Turnover in Imperfectly Competitive Markets. *Review of Economic Studies*, 73(2):295–327, 2006. ISSN 00346527. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-937X.2006.00377.x.
- L. Barras, P. Gagliardini, and O. Scaillet. Skill, Scale and Value Creation in the Mutual Fund Industry. 2021. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.3269995.
- P. Bertail, D. N. Politis, and J. P. Romano. On Subsampling Estimators with Unknown Rate of Convergence. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(446):569–579, 1999. ISSN 1537274X. doi: 10.1080/01621459.1999.10474151.
- P. Bertail, C. Haefke, D. N. Politis, and H. White. Subsampling The Distribution of Diverging Statistics with Applications to Finance. *Journal of Econometrics*, 120(2):295–326, 2004. ISSN 03044076. doi: 10.1016/S0304-4076(03)00215-X.
- N. H. Bingham, C. M. Goldie, and J. L. Teugels. *Regular Variation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987. ISBN 9780521379434. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511721434.
- M. Browning and J. M. Carro. Heterogeneity and Microeconometrics Modeling. *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Ninth World Congress, Volume III*, pages 47–74, 2007. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511607547.004.
- M. Browning and J. M. Carro. Heterogeneity in dynamic discrete choice models. *The Econometrics Journal*, 13(1):1–39, 2010. ISSN 13684221. doi: 10.1111/j.1368-423X.2009.00301.x.
- C. Brownlees and V. Morozov. Unit Averaging for Heterogeneous Panels. 2022.
- V. Chernozhukov. Extremal Quantile Regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 33(2):806–839, 2005. ISSN 00905364. doi: 10.1214/009053604000001165.
- V. Chernozhukov and I. Fernández-Val. Inference for Extremal Conditional Quantile Models, With An Application to Market and Birthweight Risks. *Review of Economic Studies*, 78(2):559–589, 2011. ISSN 00346527. doi: 10.1093/restud/rdq020.
- P. P. Combes, G. Duranton, L. Gobillon, D. Puga, and S. Roux. The Productivity Advantages of Large Cities: Distinguishing Agglomeration From Firm Selection. *Econometrica*, 80(6):2543–2594, 2012. ISSN 0012-9682. doi: 10.3982/ecta8442.
- L. de Haan and A. Ferreira. *Extreme Value Theory*. Springer, 2006. ISBN 978-0-387-23946-0. doi: 10.1007/0-387-34471-3.
- L. de Haan and S. I. Resnick. Second-Order Regular Variation and Rates of Convergence in Extreme-Value Theory. *The Annals of Probability*, 24(1):97–124, 1996.
- A. L. Dekkers and L. de Haan. On the Estimation of the Extreme-Value Index and Large Quantile Estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 17(4):1795–1832, 1989. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176347396.
- K. Evdokimov. Identification and Estimation of a Nonparametric Panel Data Model with Unobserved Heterogeneity. 2010.
- X. Gabaix. Power Laws in Economics and Finance. *Annual Review of Economics*, 1:255–293, 2009.
- X. Gabaix. Power Laws in Economics: An Introduction. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 30(1):185–205, 2016.

- S. Girard, G. Stupfler, and A. Usseglio-Carleve. Extreme Conditional Expectile Estimation In Heavy-Tailed Heteroscedastic Regression Models. *Annals of Statistics*, 49(6):3358–3382, 2021. ISSN 21688966. doi: 10.1214/21-AOS2087.
- B. V. Gnedenko. Sur La Distribution Limite Du Terme Maximum D’Une Serie Aleatoire. *Annals of Mathematics*, 44(3):423–453, 1943. ISSN 0003486X. doi: 10.2307/1968974.
- J. J. Heckman. Micro Data, Heterogeneity and the Evaluation of Public Policy: Nobel Lecture. *Journal of Political Economy*, 109(4):673–748, 2001. ISSN 23281235. doi: 10.1086/322086.
- J. P. Higgins, S. G. Thompson, and D. J. Spiegelhalter. A Re-Evaluation of Random-Effects Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A*, 172(1):137–159, 2009. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-985x.2008.00552.x.
- B. M. Hill. A Simple General Approach to Inference About the Tail of a Distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, 3(5):1163–1174, 1975.
- J. R. M. Hosking and J. R. Wallis. Parameter and Quantile Estimation for the Generalized Pareto Distribution. *Technometrics*, 29(3):339–349, 1987. doi: 10.2307/1269343.
- K. Jochmans and M. Weidner. Inference on a Distribution From Noisy Draws. *Econometric Theory*, pages 1–38, 2022. doi: 10.1017/S0266466622000378.
- A. Kneip, L. Simar, and I. Van Keilegom. Frontier Estimation in the Presence of Measurement error with Unknown Variance. *Journal of Econometrics*, 184(2):379–393, 2015. ISSN 18726895. doi: 10.1016/j.jeconom.2014.09.012. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconom.2014.09.012>.
- S. C. Kumbhakar, C. F. Parmeter, and V. Zelenyuk. Stochastic Frontier Analysis: Foundations and Advances I. In *Handbook of Production Economics*, pages 1–40. 2020a. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-3450-3_9-2.
- S. C. Kumbhakar, C. F. Parmeter, and V. Zelenyuk. Stochastic Frontier Analysis: Foundations and Advances II. In *Handbook of Production Economics*, pages 1–38. 2020b. doi: 10.1007/978-981-10-3450-3_11-1.
- G. Makarov. Estimates for the Distribution Function of a Sum of Two Random Variables When the Marginal Distributions are Fixed. *Theory of Probability And Its Applications*, 26(4):803–806, 1981. doi: 10.1137/1126086.
- P. C. Melo, D. J. Graham, and R. B. Noland. A Meta-Analysis of Estimates of Urban Agglomeration Economies. *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 39(3):332–342, 2009. ISSN 01660462. doi: 10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2008.12.002.
- U. K. Müller and Y. Wang. Fixed-k Asymptotic Inference About Tail Properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(519):1334–1343, 2017. ISSN 1537274X. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2016.1215990.
- C. R. Nelson and R. Startz. Some Further Results on the Exact Small Sample Properties of the Instrumental Variable Estimator. *Econometrica*, 58(4):967–976, 1990. doi: 10.2307/2938359.
- R. Okui and T. Yanagi. Kernel estimation for panel data with heterogeneous dynamics. *The Econometrics Journal*, 23(1):156–175, 2019. ISSN 1937240X. doi: 10.1093/ectj/utz019.
- D. N. Politis and J. P. Romano. Large Sample Confidence Regions Based on Subsamples under Minimal Assumptions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 22(4):2031–2050, 1994. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176325770.
- D. N. Politis, J. P. Romano, and M. Wolf. *Subsampling*. Springer Series in Statistics, 1999. ISBN 978-0-387-98854-2. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4612-1554-7.
- A. Rényi. On The Theory Of Order Statistics. *Acta Mathematica Academiae Scientiarum Hungarica*, 4: 191–231, 1953. doi: 10.1007/BF02127580.
- S. I. Resnick. *Extreme Values, Regular Variation and Point Processes*. Springer, 1987. ISBN 978-0-387-75952-4. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-75953-1.

- Y. Sasaki and Y. Wang. Fixed-k Inference for Conditional Extremal Quantiles. *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 40(2):829–837, 2022. ISSN 15372707. doi: 10.1080/07350015.2020.1870985.
- R. J. Serfling. *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 1980. ISBN 9780471024033. doi: 10.1002/9780470316481.
- Y. Zhang. Extremal Quantile Treatment Effects. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6):3707–3740, 2018. doi: 10.1214/17-AOS1673.

Proofs of Results in the Main Text

A Distributional Results

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We turn to the proof of theorem 3.1. We begin by stating some auxiliary results. Let H_T be the cdf of $\vartheta_{i,T} = \theta_i + T^{-p}\varepsilon_{i,T}$. Observe that $\{\vartheta_{i,T}\}$ form a triangular array with rows indexed by T , and number of entries in each row given by N . In each row, the entries are iid and distributed according to the cdf H_T . Define the auxiliary functions U_T and U_F as

$$U_T = \left(\frac{1}{1 - H_T} \right)^{-1}, \quad U_F = \left(\frac{1}{1 - F} \right)^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Using U_T and U_F greatly simplifies notation in subsequent proofs. Observe the following useful connection between U_T and H_T . Let $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. Let N be large enough so that $N\tau > 1$. Then

$$U_T(N\tau) = H_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right), \quad U_F(N\tau) = F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right). \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We begin with a technical lemma that connects convergence of the normalized sample maximum $\vartheta_{N,N,T} = \max\{\vartheta_{1,T}, \dots, \vartheta_{N,T}\}$ and convergence of the quantiles of H_T .

Lemma A.1. *Let assumption 1 hold. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *As $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, for some constants a_N, b_N the random variable $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N$ converges weakly to a random variable X with non-degenerate cdf $Q(x)$.*
- (2) *As $N, T \rightarrow \infty$, for all $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ such that τ is a continuity point $Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$, it holds that $(U_T(N\tau) - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$.*

The same is also true for $\theta_{N,N}$ with U_F in place of U_T .

The proof is completely analogous to the proof of theorem 1.1.2 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#), which establishes a similar result for the iid case. We provide the full argument for completeness.

Proof. First consider the implication (1) \Rightarrow (2). Under assumption 1 the individual $\vartheta_{i,T}$ are iid RVs with cdf H_T , hence $P((\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N \leq x) = H_T^N(a_Nx + b_N)$. By assumption, $H_T^N(a_Nx + b_N)$ converges to some nondegenerate cdf $Q(x)$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ at all points of continuity of $Q(x)$. Let x

be a continuity point of $Q(x)$ such that $Q(x) \in (0, 1)$. Then at such an x take logs

$$N \log H_T(a_N x + b_N) \Rightarrow \log Q(x).$$

For any such x it must be that $H_T(a_N x + b_N) \rightarrow 1$, otherwise the left hand side will diverge to $-\infty$. Since $\log(1+x) \sim x$ for $x \sim 0$, this implies that

$$\lim_{N, T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{-\log H_T(a_N x + b_N)}{1 - H_T(a_N x + b_N)} = 1.$$

Replacing the logarithm above, we obtain $N(1 - H_T(a_N x + b_N)) \Rightarrow -\log Q(x)$. Taking reciprocals of both sides yields

$$\frac{1}{N(1 - H_T(a_N x + b_N))} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{-\log Q(x)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Taking inverses in eq. (A.3) and using the definition (A.1) of U_T , we obtain that weak convergence of the sample maximum is equivalent to the following convergence of quantiles of H_T :

$$\frac{U_T(Ny) - b_N}{a_N} \Rightarrow Q^{-1}(e^{-1/y}) \text{ as } N, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

Following the above argument in the reverse direction establishes (2) \Rightarrow (1). \square

The following lemma provides a condition on U_T under which $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ and $\theta_{N,N}$ have the same limit properties.

Lemma A.2. *If*

- (1) *Assumption 1 holds*
- (2) *a_N, b_N are such that as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the normalized noiseless maximum $(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)/a_N$ converges weakly to a non-degenerate random variable X .*
- (3) *For each $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ it holds that $(U_T(N\tau) - U_F(N\tau))/a_N \rightarrow 0$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow X$.*

Proof. Let Q be the cdf of X . Let $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ be a continuity point of $Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$. Then by lemma A.1 $a_N^{-1}(U_F(N\tau) - b_N)$ converges to $Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$. By assumption (3) of the lemma for all $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ continuity points of $Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$ it holds that

$$\frac{U_T(N\tau) - b_N}{a_N} - \frac{U_F(N\tau) - b_N}{a_N} = \frac{U_T(N\tau) - U_F(N\tau)}{a_N} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N, T \rightarrow \infty.$$

From this we conclude that $a_N^{-1}(U_T(N\tau) - b_N) \rightarrow Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$ for all $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ continuity points of $Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$. The result follows from lemma A.1. \square

We will make use of the following quantile inequalities due to [Makarov \(1981\)](#).

Lemma A.3 (Makarov quantile inequalities; eqs. (1) and (2) in [Makarov \(1981\)](#)). *Suppose that $X \sim F_X$ and $Y \sim F_Y$ are a pair of random variables whose joint distribution is not restricted, and*

consider their sum $X + Y \sim F_{X+Y}$. The following inequalities hold: for all $v \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} F_{X+Y}^{-1}(v) &\leq \inf_{w \in [v, 1]} \left(F_X^{-1}(w) + F_Y^{-1}(1 + v - w) \right), \\ F_{X+Y}^{-1}(v) &\geq \sup_{w \in [0, v]} \left(F_X^{-1}(w) + F_Y^{-1}(v - w) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The bounds are pointwise sharp in the following sense: for each v there exists a joint distribution of X and Y such that the v th quantile of $X + Y$ attains the lower/upper bound at v .

Proof of theorem 3.1. Let H_T be the cdf of $\vartheta_{i,T}$. Fix $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. Let N be large enough so that $N\tau > 1$. In the statement of Makarov's inequalities (lemma A.3), take $X = \theta_i$ and $Y = T^{-p}\varepsilon_{i,T}$, and $v = 1 - 1/N\tau$ and subtract $F^{-1}(1 - 1/N\tau)$ on all sides to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{w \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - w \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right) \\ &\leq H_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \\ &\leq \inf_{w \in [1 - \frac{1}{N\tau}, 1]} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 + 1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - w \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

First, by definitions of U_T and U_F (eq. (A.1)) and eq. (A.2), the middle of eq (A.4) is equal to $U_T(N\tau) - U_F(N\tau)$. Second, in the supremum condition define $u = 1 - 1/(N\tau) - w$ to write the condition as

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right)$$

Note that eventually $[0, \epsilon] \subset [0, 1 - 1/(N\tau)]$, and so the expression in eq. (A.4) may further be lower-bounded as $\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} \{ \dots \} \leq \sup_{u \in [0, 1 - 1/(N\tau)]} \{ \dots \}$. Third, define $u = -[1 - 1/(N\tau) - w]$ in the infimum condition in eq. (A.4) to represent it as (TE-Inf). Suppose that $a_N > 0$ (if not, simply reverse all inequalities below). Combining the above arguments and multiply all sides by a_N^{-1} , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{U_T(N\tau) - U_F(N\tau)}{a_N} \\ &\leq \inf_{u \in [0, \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} + u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1 - u) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Then conditions (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup) imply that $(U_T(N\tau) - U_F(N\tau))/a_N \rightarrow 0$ for all $\tau \in (0, \infty)$. By lemma A.2 it follows that $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow X$.

Now we turn to the second assertion. First, the above shows that (TE-Sup) (TE-Inf) together imply (TE-Sup'). Now suppose that at least one of (TE-Inf) and (TE-Sup') fails. We show that the limit properties of $a_N^{-1}(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)$ differ from the limit properties of $a_N^{-1}(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)$ for some sequence of joint distributions of $(\theta_i, \varepsilon_{i,T})$. Suppose it is the infimum condition (TE-Inf) that fails

to hold for some τ ; the argument for (TE-Sup') is identical. Then along some subsequence of (N, T) it holds that $\inf_{u \in [1-1/N\tau, 1]} a_N^{-1}(\dots) = \delta_{N,T}$ such that $\delta_{N,T}$ are bounded away from zero. Suppose that it is possible to extract a further subsequence such that along it $\delta_{N,T}$ converges to some $\delta \neq 0$. Pass to that subsubsequence. Theorem 2 in Makarov (1981) establishes that for each (N, T) there exists a joint distribution of θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ such that the resulting H_T attains the upper bound in inequality (A.4), and so

$$H_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) = a_N \delta_{N,T} + F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right).$$

If $(U_F(N\tau) - b_N)/a_N \rightarrow Q(\exp(-1/\tau))$, then for such a sequence of H_T it holds that $(U_T(N\tau) - b_N)/a_N \rightarrow Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau)) + \delta$. Suppose that $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N$ converges to a random variable with distribution \tilde{Q} along the same subsequence. The above discussion shows that $\tilde{Q}^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau)) = Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau)) + \delta \neq Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau))$. Thus, either the limit distribution of $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ is different from that of $\theta_{N,N}$, or $\vartheta_{N,N,T}$ does not converge.

If we cannot extract a subsequence of $\delta_{N,T}$ converging to some finite δ , then $\delta_{N,T}$ is unbounded. In this case it is possible to extract a further monotonically increasing subsequence. Proceeding as above, we obtain that along that subsequence it holds that $(U_T(N\tau) - b_N)/a_N \rightarrow Q^{-1}(\exp(-1/\tau)) + \infty$, and so $(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - b_N)/a_N$ does not converge. \square

A.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2

Before proving proposition 3.2, we state two useful results. First, let RV_γ be the class of non-negative functions of regular variation with parameter γ , that is, those measurable $f : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ that satisfy $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(tx)/f(t) = x^\gamma$ for any $x > 0$. RV_0 is the class of slowly varying functions.

Lemma A.4 (Karamata Characterization Theorem; Theorem 1.4.1 in Bingham, Goldie, and Teugels (1987)). *Let $f \in RV_\gamma$. Then there exists a slowly varying function L (that is, $L \in RV_0$) such that for all x it holds that $f(x) = x^\gamma L(x)$.*

Second, assumption 2 is equivalent to the following statement: for some sequences α_N, β_N and all $x > 0$

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{U_F(Nx) - U_F(N)}{\alpha_N} = \frac{x^\gamma - 1}{\gamma} \quad (\text{meaning } \log(x) \text{ for } \gamma = 0), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Since the left hand side is monotonic in x and the right hand side is continuous, convergence in (A.5) is locally uniform in x (that is, for any $0 < a, b < \infty$ convergence in (A.5) is uniform on $[a, b]$). See theorem 1.1.6 and corollary 1.2.4 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006). We call the constants the α_N, β_N canonical normalization constants.

Proof of proposition 3.2. Let (a_N, b_N) be such that $(\theta_{N,N} - b_N)/a_N \Rightarrow X$ for some non-degenerate random variable X . Fix $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ and define $s_{\tau,N,T}$ and $S_{\tau,N,T}$ as

$$S_{\tau,N,T}(u) = \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} + u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1 - u) \right),$$

$$s_{\tau,N,T}(u) = \frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right).$$

Condition **(TE-Inf)** for F and G_T can be written as $\inf_{u \in [0, 1/N\tau]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u) \rightarrow 0$, while condition **(TE-Sup)** can be written as $\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \rightarrow 0$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$

By lemma **A.3** and the discussion after eq. **(A.4)**

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1 - \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \left[F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} - u \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(u) \right] \leq \inf_{u \in [0, \frac{1}{N\tau}]} \left[F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} + u \right) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1 - u) \right].$$

Suppose that $a_N > 0$ (if not, simply reverse all inequalities below). The above inequality implies that $\sup_{u \in [0, 1 - 1/N\tau]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq \inf_{u \in [0, 1/N\tau]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u)$. Further, fix an arbitrary $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then eventually $[0, \epsilon] \subset [0, 1 - 1/N\tau]$, and correspondingly $\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq \sup_{u \in [0, 1 - 1/N\tau]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u)$. If $u_{s,\tau,N,T} \in [0, \epsilon]$ and $u_{S,\tau,N,T} \in [0, 1/N\tau]$, then the following chain of inequalities holds:

$$s_{\tau,N,T}(u_{s,\tau,N,T}) \leq \sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq \inf_{u \in [0, \frac{1}{N\tau}]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq S_{\tau,N,T}(u_{S,\tau,N,T}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Let F satisfy assumption **2** with EV index $\gamma > \gamma'$. Define

$$u_{S,\tau,N,T} = \frac{1}{N\tau} \frac{1}{\log(T) + 1} \in \left[0, \frac{1}{N\tau} \right].$$

Suppose that under the conditions of the proposition it holds that

$$\frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} + u_{S,\tau,N,T} \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right) \rightarrow 0, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\frac{1}{a_N} \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1}(1 - u_{S,\tau,N,T}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Under **(A.7)** and **(A.8)** it holds that $S_{\tau,N,T}(u_{S,\tau,N,T}) \rightarrow 0$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$. By inequality **(A.6)** we conclude that $\limsup_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in [0, 1/N\tau]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq 0$. An identical argument shows that $s_{\tau,N,T}(u_{s,\tau,N,T}) \rightarrow 0$ where $u_{s,\tau,N,T} = (1/N\tau)(1/\log(T))$ eventually lies in $[0, \epsilon]$ for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$; hence $\liminf_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \geq 0$. Further, $\limsup_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u) \leq \liminf_{N,T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{u \in [0, 1/N\tau]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u)$ by inequality **(A.6)**. Combining the results, we obtain that both $\inf_{u \in [0, 1/N\tau]} S_{\tau,N,T}(u)$ and $\sup_{u \in [0, \epsilon]} s_{\tau,N,T}(u)$ tend to 0, proving the result.

It remains to establish **(A.7)** and **(A.8)**. We split the proof of **(A.7)** by sign of γ .

Suppose $\gamma > 0$. We begin by making two observations. First, by the convergence to types theorem (**Resnick, 1987**, proposition 0.2) $a_N \sim \alpha_N$ for the canonical scaling α_N of eq. **(A.5)**. Further, by lemma 1.2.9 of **de Haan and Ferreira (2006)** $\alpha_N \sim U_F(N)$. Second, by corollary 1.2.10 in **de Haan and Ferreira (2006)** $(U_F(x))^{-1} \in RV_{-\gamma}$. Then by lemma **A.4** we can write $1/U_F(x) = x^{-\gamma} L(x)$ where L is a slowly varying function (that depends on F). Combining the above observations, definition of $u_{S,\tau,N,T}$ and eq. **(A.2)**, we see that

$$\frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \frac{\log(T)}{\log(T) + 1} \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sim \frac{1}{U_F(N)} \left(U_F \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right) - U_F(N\tau) \right) \\
&= N^{-\gamma} L(N) \left(\left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{L \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)} - (N\tau)^\gamma \frac{1}{L(N\tau)} \right) \\
&\propto \left(\frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)^\gamma \frac{L(N)}{L \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)} - \frac{L(N)}{L(N\tau)} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Convergence follows since L is slowly varying on infinity: $L(N)/L(N\tau) \rightarrow 1$. By local uniform convergence (proposition 0.5 in [Resnick \(1987\)](#)) $L(N)/L(N\tau \log(T) + 1)/\log(T) \rightarrow 1$.

Suppose $\gamma < 0$. As above, $a_N \sim \alpha_N$. By lemma 1.2.9 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) in turn $\alpha_N \sim (U_F(\infty) - U_F(N))$ (note that $U_F(\infty) < 1$ when $\gamma < 0$). By corollary 1.2.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#), $(U_F(\infty) - U(x))^{-1} \in RV_{-\gamma}$ and we can write $1/(U_F(\infty) - U(x)) = x^{-\gamma} L(x)$ for some slowly varying function L by lemma [A.4](#). Hence proceeding as for $\gamma > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \frac{\log(T)}{\log(T) + 1} \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)} \left(\left(U_F \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right) - U_F(\infty) \right) - (U_F(N\tau) - U(\infty)) \right) \\
&= N^{-\gamma} L(N) \left(\left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)^\gamma \frac{1}{L \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)} - (N\tau)^\gamma \frac{1}{L(N\tau)} \right) \\
&\propto \left(\frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)^\gamma \frac{L(N)}{L \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right)} - \frac{L(N)}{L(N\tau)} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose $\gamma = 0$. As above, $a_N \sim \alpha_N$. By eq. [\(A.5\)](#) $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} (U_F(Nx) - U_F(N))/\alpha_N = \log(x)$ locally uniformly in x . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{a_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \frac{\log(T)}{\log(T) + 1} \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \right) \right) \\
&\sim \frac{1}{\alpha_N} \left(U_F \left(N\tau \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right) - U_F(N\tau) \right) \rightarrow \log \left(\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(T) + 1}{\log(T)} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we focus on the G_T^{-1} term in eq. [\(A.8\)](#). First suppose that $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$. Then by Markov's inequality we obtain for any $\tau \in (0, 1)$ that $G_T^{-1}(\tau) \leq \left(\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta / (1 - \tau) \right)^{1/\beta}$. Hence

$$\frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \frac{1}{\log(T) + 1} \right) = O \left(\frac{N^{1/\beta} (\log(T))^{1/\beta}}{T^p} \right) \tag{A.9}$$

where the O term is uniform in T . First suppose that $\gamma \neq 0$. As above, $a_N^{-1} \sim x^{-\gamma} L(x)$ where L is a slowly varying function (that depends on F). For eq. [\(A.8\)](#) to hold it is sufficient that $N^{1/\beta - \gamma} L(x) (\log(T))^{1/\beta} / T^p \rightarrow 0$ (by eq. [\(A.9\)](#)). Write $\gamma = \gamma' + \delta$, $\delta > 0$. Then

$$\frac{N^{1/\beta - \gamma} L(x) (\log(T))^{1/\beta}}{T^p} = \left[\frac{N^{1/\beta - \gamma'} (\log(T))^{1/\beta}}{T^p} \right] \left[\frac{L(x)}{N^\delta} \right] \rightarrow 0$$

since the condition holds for γ' and $L(x)/x^\delta \rightarrow 0$ for any $\delta > 0$ (L is slowly varying). Second, let $\gamma = 0$. Then (A.8) holds if $N^{1/\beta}(\log(T))^{1/\beta}/(\alpha_N T^p) \rightarrow 0$. Fix an arbitrary $x > 0$ and write this as

$$\frac{N^{1/\beta}(\log T)^{1/\beta}}{\alpha_N T^p} = \frac{N^{-1/\beta-\gamma'}(\log(T))^{1/\beta}}{T^p} \frac{U_F(Nx) - U_F(N)}{\alpha_N} \frac{1}{N^{-\gamma'}(U_F(Nx) - U_F(N))}$$

By assumption, the first fraction tends to zero. The second fraction tends to $\log(x)$ by eq. (A.5). Last, there are two possibilities for $U_F(Nx) - U_F(N)$. The first one is that it is bounded away from zero. The second one is that it converges to zero (possibly along a subsequence); in this case convergence is slower than $N^{-\kappa}$ for all $\kappa > 0$ by problem 1.1.1(b) in Resnick (1987) (recall that $U_F(N) = F^{-1}(1 - 1/N)$ by eq. (A.2)). In both cases the last fraction converges to zero, as $\gamma' < 0$.

The proof is identical if $G_T \sim N(\mu_T, \sigma_T^2)$. Assumption 3 implies that μ_T and σ_T^2 are bounded. In this case

$$\frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N\tau} \left(1 - \frac{\log(T)}{\log(T) + 1} \right) \right) = O \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log(N)}}{T^p} \right),$$

where the O term is uniform in T . The rest of the argument proceeds as above. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof of theorem 3.3. By theorem 2.2.1 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006)

$$\sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U_F'\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \Rightarrow N(0, 1). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where $(N/k)U_F'(N/k) = (N/k) \times \left((1/(1-F))^{-1} \right)'(N/k) \equiv c_N$ (by eqs. (A.1) and (A.2)). We now transfer this convergence property to $\vartheta_{N-k,N}$.

It is convenient for the purposes of the proof to replace the uniform random variables U_i with $1/U_i$. Let Y_1, \dots, Y_N be iid random variables with cdf $F_Y(y) = 1 - 1/y, y > 1, F_Y(y) = 0$ for $y \leq 1$. Observe that $Y_i \stackrel{d}{=} 1/U_i$ where U_i is Uniform[0, 1]. Let $Y_{1,N} \leq \dots \leq Y_{N,N}$ be the order statistics, then $U_{k,N} \stackrel{d}{=} 1/Y_{N-k,N}$. As pointed out by de Haan and Ferreira (2006) (p. 50)

$$\theta_{N-k,N} \stackrel{d}{=} U_F(Y_{N-k,N}), \quad \vartheta_{N-k,N,T} \stackrel{d}{=} U_T(Y_{N-k,N}). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Let $c_N = (N/k)U_F'(N/k)$, as in the statement of the theorem. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{k} \frac{\vartheta_{N-k,N,T} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{c_N} &\stackrel{d}{=} \sqrt{k} \frac{U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{c_N} \\ &= \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{c_N} + \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} (U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By eqs. (A.10) and (A.11) it follows that as $N \rightarrow \infty$ the first term converges weakly to a $N(0, 1)$

variable. The conclusion of the theorem follows if

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} (U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

We establish eq. (A.13) by an argument similar to the one used in the proof of theorem 3.1. We use lemma A.3 to bound $U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) = F^{-1}(1 - 1/Y_{N-k,N})$. In lemma A.3 take $X = \theta_i$, $Y = T^{-p}\varepsilon_{i,T}$, $v = 1 - 1/Y_{N-k,N}$, subtract $U_F(Y_{N-k,N}) = F^{-1}(1 - 1/Y_{N-k,N})$ on all sides and multiply by \sqrt{k}/c_N to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{w \in \left[0, 1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}}\right]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} - w \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} \right) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} (U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})) \\ & \leq \inf_{w \in \left[1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}}, 1\right]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 + 1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} - w \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} \right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

if c_N is non-negative; the opposite inequalities hold if c_N is negative. Since $1/Y_{N-k,N} \stackrel{d}{=} U_{k,N}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{w \in \left[1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}}, 1\right]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 + 1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} - w \right) - F^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{Y_{N-k,N}} \right) \right) \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \inf_{w \in [1 - U_{k,N}, 1]} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(w) + \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} (1 + 1 - U_{k,N} - w) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0 \end{aligned}$$

Define $u = -[1 - 1/Y_{N-k,N} - w]$ to write the above as condition (3). For the supremum, instead define $u = 1 - U_{k,N} - w$ and proceed as in the proof of theorem 3.1, noting that $U_{k,N} \xrightarrow{p} 0$ and hence with probability approaching 1 $[0, \epsilon] \subset [0, 1 - U_{k,N}]$. Eq. (A.13) follows as in the proof of theorem 3.1.

Sharpness of conditions (2) and (3) is established as in the proof of theorem 3.1. Suppose that condition (3) fails (the case for condition (2) is analogous). There is some subsequence of (N, T) and some $\delta_{N,T}$ such that $\inf_{u \in [1 - U_{k,N}, 1]} \sqrt{k} c_N^{-1}(\cdot) = \delta_{N,T}$ and $\delta_{N,T}$ is bounded away from zero. Suppose that it is possible to extract a further subsequence such that $\delta_{N,T}$ converges to some $\delta \neq 0$. By theorem 2 in Makarov (1981), there exists a joint distribution of θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ such that the infimum is attained. Then along this subsequence for this joint distribution $\sqrt{k} c_N^{-1} (U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})) \xrightarrow{p} \delta$. Then from equations (A.10), (A.11), and (A.12) it follows that $\sqrt{k} c_N^{-1} [\vartheta_{N-k,N,T} - U_F(N/k)] \Rightarrow N(\delta, 1)$. This convergence result may or may not hold for the overall original sequence. If no convergent subsequence of $\delta_{N,T}$ can be extracted, $\delta_{N,T}$ is unbounded. Extract a further monotonically increasing subsequence. There exists a sequence of joint distributions of θ_i and $\varepsilon_{i,T}$ such that along that subsequence $\vartheta_{N-k,N,T}$ diverges. \square

A.4 Proof of Proposition 3.4

Proof of proposition 3.4. The proof proceeds similarly to that of proposition 3.2. As in the proof of proposition 3.2, it is sufficient to prove that for some $\tilde{u}_{S,N,T} \in [0, U_{k,N}]$ and $\tilde{u}_{s,N,T}$ that with probability approaching 1 lies in $[0, \epsilon]$ for some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N} + \tilde{u}_{S,N,T}) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) + \frac{1}{T^\rho} G_T^{-1}(1 - \tilde{u}_{S,N,T}) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N} - \tilde{u}_{s,N,T}) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) + \frac{1}{T^\rho} G_T^{-1}(\tilde{u}_{s,N,T}) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

We only show that eq. (A.14) holds, eq. (A.15) follows analogously.

Let $\rho = \delta/2 + \nu$, and set

$$\tilde{u}_{S,N,T} = U_{k,N} \frac{1}{N^\rho + 1} \in [0, U_{k,N}].$$

As in the proof of proposition 3.2, we first show that the scaled F^{-1} terms in eq. (A.14) decay, and then that the scaled G_T^{-1} term decays. First we establish that

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - U_{k,N} \frac{N^\rho}{N^\rho + 1} \right) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Let Y_1, \dots, Y_N be iid random variables with cdf $F_Y(y) = 1 - 1/y, y > 1, F_Y(y) = 0$ for $y \leq 1$. We will use that $Y_i \stackrel{d}{=} 1/U_i$, and correspondingly $Y_{N-k,N} \stackrel{d}{=} 1/U_{k,N}$, as in the proof of theorem 3.3. Observe that c_N can be written as $c_N = (N/k)U'_F(N/k)$. Then using eq. (A.2) we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \left(F^{-1} \left(1 - U_{k,N} \frac{N^\rho}{N^\rho + 1} \right) - F^{-1}(1 - U_{k,N}) \right) \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \right)} \left(U_F \left(Y_{N-k,N} \frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} \right) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N}) \right) \\ & = \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \right)} \left(U_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} \right) - U_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \right) \right) \\ & = \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \frac{\frac{N}{k} U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} x_N \right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \right)}, \quad x_N \in \left[\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N}, \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows by the mean value theorem. We now deal with the last two terms in the above expression. By corollary 2.2.2 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#), $(k/N)Y_{N-k,N} \xrightarrow{p} 1$. By corollary 1.1.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) under assumptions 1 and 4 it holds that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} U'_F(tx)/U'_F(t) = x^{\gamma-1}$ locally uniformly in x . Since $x_N \rightarrow 1$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $k \rightarrow \infty, k = o(N)$, we conclude that $U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} x_N \right) / U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \right) \rightarrow 1$. Combining these observations, we obtain that

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \right)} \left(U_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} \right) - U_F \left(\frac{N}{k} \left(\frac{k}{N} Y_{N-k,N} \right) \right) \right)$$

$$= O_p \left(\sqrt{k} \left[\frac{N^\rho + 1}{N^\rho} - 1 \right] \right) = O_p(N^{\delta/2} N^{-(\delta/2 + \nu)}) = O_p(N^{-\nu}) = o_p(1).$$

where we apply the assumption that $k = N^\delta$ in the third equality.

Now we show that

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} (1 - \tilde{u}_{S,N,T}) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Suppose that $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$ (proof is analogous if $G_T \sim N(\mu_T, \sigma_T^2)$). As in eq. (A.9)

$$\frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} \left(1 - U_{k,N} \frac{1}{N^\rho + 1} \right) \sim O \left(\frac{N^{\rho/\beta}}{U_{k,N}^{1/\beta} T^p} \right)$$

By corollary 1.1.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) $U'_F \in RV_{\gamma-1}$, hence for some slowly varying function L we can write $U'_F(x) = x^{\gamma-1} L(x)$ (be lemma A.4). Then $c_N = (N/k) U'_F(N/k) = (N/k)^\gamma L(N/k)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{c_N} \frac{1}{T^p} G_T^{-1} (1 - \tilde{u}_{S,N,T}) &= O \left(\sqrt{k} \frac{1}{\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)^\gamma L\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \frac{N^{\rho/\beta}}{U_{k,N}^{1/\beta} T^p} \right) \\ &= O_p \left(k^{1/2 + \gamma - 1/\beta} N^{-\gamma + \rho/\beta + 1/\beta} \frac{1}{L\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \frac{1}{T^p} \right) = O_p \left(\frac{N^{\delta/2(1+1/\beta) + (1-\delta)(-\gamma' + 1/\beta) + \nu/\beta} N^{-\varkappa(1-\delta)}}{T^p L(N^{1-\delta})} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality we again use corollary 2.2.2 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) to conclude that $(N/k) \times 1/U_{k,N} \stackrel{d}{=} (k/N) Y_{N-k,N} \xrightarrow{p} 1$; in the third line we write $\gamma = \gamma' + \varkappa$ where $\varkappa > 0$ by assumption. The above expression is now $o_p(1)$ by assumptions of the proposition and since L is slowly varying.

Combining together equations (A.16) and (A.17) shows that (A.14) holds. To prove that (A.15) holds, proceed as above $\tilde{u}_{s,N,T} = U_{k,N}/N^\rho$; observe that $\tilde{u}_{s,N,T}$ lies in $[0, \epsilon]$ with probability approaching 1 for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. \square

B Inference

B.1 Proof of Lemmas 4.1- 4.2, Theorems 4.3-4.4, Remark 9

Proof of lemma 4.1. We split the proof by sign of γ . First, let $\gamma > 0$. Let Fr be an RV with $P(Fr \leq x) = \exp(-x^{-1/\gamma})$ for $x \geq 0$ and 0 for $x < 0$; note that $(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} \stackrel{d}{=} Fr$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)} \left[\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right] &= \frac{1}{U_F(N)} \left[\vartheta_{N,N,T} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{l}\right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{U_F(N)} \vartheta_{N,N,T} - \frac{U_F(N \times l^{-1})}{U_F(N)} \Rightarrow Fr - (l^{-1})^\gamma = Fr - \frac{1}{l^\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

since by corollary 1.2.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) $U_F(x) \in RV_\gamma$ and $\vartheta_{N,N,T}/U_F(N) \Rightarrow Fr$ by corollary 1.2.4 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#).

For $\gamma = 0$ and let Gu be an RV with $P(Gu \leq x) = \exp(-e^{-x})$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$; note that $-\log(E_1^*) \stackrel{d}{=} Gu$. By corollary 1.2.4 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) there exists a $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ such that $\alpha_N = \hat{f}(F^{-1}(1 - 1/N))$ for α_N of eq. (A.5). For this \hat{f} we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\hat{f}\left(F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)\right)} \left(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha_N} (\vartheta_{N,N,T} - U_F(N)) + \frac{1}{\alpha_N} \left(U_F\left(\frac{N}{l}\right) - U_F(N) \right) \Rightarrow Gu - \log(l), \end{aligned}$$

where the first term converges by corollary 1.2.4 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) and the second term by eq. (A.5).

For $\gamma < 0$ necessarily $F^{-1}(1) = U_F(\infty) < \infty$. Let W be an RV with $P(W \leq x) = \exp(-(-x)^{-1/\gamma})$ for $x < 0$ and $P(W \leq x) = 1$ for $x \geq 0$, note that $-(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} \stackrel{d}{=} W$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{F^{-1}(1) - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right)} \left(\vartheta_{N,N,T} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{l}{N}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)} (\vartheta_{N,N,T} - U_F(\infty)) + \frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N/l)}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)} \Rightarrow W + \frac{1}{l^\gamma}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first term converges by corollary 1.2.4 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) and $U_F(\infty) - U_F(x) \in RV_\gamma$ by corollary 1.2.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#). \square

Proof of lemma 4.2. Let α_N be as in eq. (A.5) and let $\beta_N = U_F(N)$. First we show that for the constants α_N, β_N it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N}, \frac{\vartheta_{N-1,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \right) \\ & \Rightarrow \gamma^{-1} \left((E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - 1, (E_1^* + E_2^*)^{-\gamma} - 1, \dots, (E_1^* + E_2^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - 1 \right). \quad (\text{B.1}) \end{aligned}$$

Let E_1, \dots, E_{q+1} be iid standard exponential RVs, and E_1^*, \dots, E_{q+1}^* another iid set of standard exponential RVs. Observe that $P(U_T(1/(1 - \exp(-E_i))) \leq x) = H_T(x)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & (\vartheta_{N,N,T}, \vartheta_{N-1,N,T}, \dots, \vartheta_{N-q,N,T}) \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \left(U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp(-E_{1,n})}\right), U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp(-E_{2,n})}\right), \dots, U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp(-E_{q+1,n})}\right) \right) \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \left(U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right)}\right), U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N} - \frac{E_2^*}{N-1}\right)}\right), \dots, \right. \\ & \quad \left. \dots, U_T\left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N} - \frac{E_2^*}{N-1} - \dots - \frac{E_{q+1}^*}{N-q}\right)}\right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality follows by the [Rényi \(1953\)](#) representation of order statistics from an

exponential sample (see expression (1.9) in Rényi (1953)). We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N}, \dots, \frac{\vartheta_{N-q,N} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \right) \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} \left(\frac{U_T \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N}, \dots, \frac{U_T \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N} - \frac{E_2^*}{N-1} - \dots - \frac{E_{q+1}^*}{N-q}\right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Examine the first coordinate in the above vector:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{U_T \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} = \frac{U_T \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \\ & = \frac{U_F \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} + \frac{U_T \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - U_F \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right)}{\alpha_N}. \end{aligned}$$

We can rewrite each term in eq. (B.2) as above by decomposing it into a U_F a component and a difference term involving U_T and U_F .

We separately analyze the two terms. First, by theorem 2.1.1 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006)

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{U_F \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N}, \dots, \frac{U_F \left(\frac{1}{1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N} - \frac{E_2^*}{N-1} - \dots - \frac{E_{q+1}^*}{N-q}\right)} \right) - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \right) \\ & \Rightarrow \gamma^{-1} \left((E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - 1, (E_1^* + E_2^*)^{-\gamma} - 1, \dots, (E_1^* + E_2^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Second, the difference terms converge to zero. We show this for the first term only, the result follows analogously for the other terms. First, write the difference term as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{U_T \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - U_F \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right)}{\alpha_N} \\ & = \frac{U_T \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - U_T(N)}{\alpha_N} - \frac{U_F \left(\frac{N}{N \left(1 - \exp\left(-\frac{E_1^*}{N}\right) \right)} \right) - U_F(N)}{\alpha_N} + \frac{U_F(N) - U_T(N)}{\alpha_N}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

We show that above expression is $o(1)$ in two steps. First, we show that the difference of the first two terms in the above display tends to zero. Define $\tilde{h}_{N,T}(x) = (U_T(Nx) - U_T(N))/\alpha_N$. $\tilde{h}_{N,T}$ converges pointwise to $\tilde{h}(x) = (x^\gamma - 1)/\gamma$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ by theorem 3.1, lemma A.1, and eq. (A.5) with U_T in place of U_F . Since the limit is continuous, and $\tilde{h}_{N,T}(x)$ is monotonic in x , convergence is locally uniform in y (see section 0.1 in Resnick (1987)). Define $x_N = N(1 - \exp(-E_1^*/N))$. Then

$x_N \rightarrow E_1^*$ and x_N is a bounded sequence. Then as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ it holds that $\tilde{h}_{N,T}(x_N^{-1}) \rightarrow \tilde{h}((E_1^*)^{-1})$ (observe that E_1^* does not depend on N or T). Similarly, define $\tilde{f}_N(x) = (U_F(Nx) - U_F(N))/\alpha_N$. $\tilde{f}_N(x)$ converges to the same limit $\tilde{h}(x)$ by eq. (A.5). As $\tilde{f}_N(x)$ is monotonic, convergence is also locally uniform in x , so analogously $\tilde{f}_N(x_N^{-1}) \rightarrow \tilde{h}((E_1^*)^{-1})$. Thus the difference between the first two terms in eq. (B.4) tends to zero. Second, $(U_F(N) - U_T(N))/\alpha_N = o(1)$ as in the proof of theorem 3.1 (take $\tau = 1$ and recall that conditions of theorem 3.1 are assumed to hold).

Combining the above argument with eq. (B.3), we obtain eq. (B.1).

Last, we translate from the constants (α_N, β_N) to the constants of the statement of the lemma. We only show this for the first coordinate in eq. (B.1), the argument for the other coordinates is identical, and we split the proof by sign of γ . For $\gamma < 0$

$$\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - U_F(\infty)}{U_F(\infty) - U(N)} = \frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \frac{\alpha_N}{U_F(\infty) - U(N)} - 1 \Rightarrow -\frac{(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - 1}{\gamma} \times \gamma - 1.$$

where the result follows from lemma 1.2.9 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006). For $\gamma > 0$

$$\frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T}}{U_F(N)} = \frac{\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \beta_N}{\alpha_N} \frac{\alpha_N}{U_F(N)} + 1 \Rightarrow \frac{(E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - 1}{\gamma} \times \gamma + 1 = (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}.$$

where the result follows from lemma 1.2.9 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006). For $\gamma = 0$ the constants in the lemma statement are in fact α_N, β_N (corollary 1.2.4 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006)) We only need to represent $((E_1^*)^{-\gamma} - 1)/\gamma$ in the form given in the theorem statement. Observe that that for $x > 0$ $(x^{-\gamma} - 1)/\gamma \rightarrow -\log(x)$ as $\gamma \rightarrow 0$ (note the minus). The conclusion follows. \square

Proof of theorem 4.3. Follows immediately from lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 and the continuous mapping theorem. \square

We now turn towards the proof of theorem 4.4. We begin by computing the order of the difference between the noisy and the noiseless maximum. Define $EA_{N,T} = \max\{T^{-p}|\varepsilon_{1,T}|, \dots, T^{-p}|\varepsilon_{N,T}|\}$. Since $\vartheta_{i,T} = \theta_i + T^{-p}\varepsilon_{i,T}$, the following elementary inequality holds:

$$\theta_{N,N} - EA_{N,T} \leq \vartheta_{N,N,T} \leq \theta_{N,N} + EA_{N,T} \text{ or } |\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \theta_{N,N}| \leq EA_{N,T}. \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Lemma B.1. (1) If $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$ for some $\beta > 0$, then $\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \theta_{N,N}$ is $O_p(N^{1/\beta}/T^p)$.

(2) Let assumption 3 hold and $\varepsilon_{i,T} \sim N(\mu_T, \sigma_T^2)$ for all T . Then $\vartheta_{N,N,T} - \theta_{N,N} = O_p(\sqrt{\log(N)}/T^p)$.

Proof. Consider (1), Let $t > 0$. We compare $EA_{N,T}$ to N^s/T^p for $s \geq 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\frac{EA_{N,T}}{N^s/T^p} \geq t\right) &= P\left(\bigcup_{i=1}^N \left\{\frac{1}{T^p} \frac{|\varepsilon_{i,T}|}{N^s/T^p} \geq t\right\}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^N P\left(\frac{|\varepsilon_{i,T}|}{N^s/T^p} \geq tT^p\right) \leq NP(|\varepsilon_{i,T}| \geq tN^s) \\ &\leq N \frac{\mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta}{t^\beta N^{\beta s}} \leq \frac{\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta}{t^\beta} N^{1-\beta s}, \end{aligned}$$

where we use Markov's inequality in the penultimate step. Setting $s = 1/\beta$ shows that these probabilities are bounded, uniformly in T , hence $EA_{N,T} = O_p(N^{1/\beta}/T^p)$. The result follows by

inequality (B.5).

Consider (2). By assumption 3, (μ_T, σ_T^2) is a bounded sequence. $EA_{N,T}$ is a maximum of independent normal variables of bounded mean and variance. Then $EA_{N,T} = O_p\left(\sqrt{\log(N)}/T^p\right)$. The result then follows by inequality (B.5). \square

Proof of theorem 4.4. The proof changes depending on whether $l = 0$ or $l > 0$. We begin with $l = 0$ and $\gamma < 0$. Label

$$J(x) = P\left(\frac{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{r+1}^*)^{-\gamma}}{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}} \leq x\right), J_{N,T}(x) = P\left(\frac{\vartheta_{N-r,N,T} - F^{-1}(1)}{\vartheta_{N-q,N,T} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}} \leq x\right),$$

using notation of theorem 4.3. Theorem 4.3 shows that $J_N \Rightarrow J$.

Add and subtract $F^{-1}(1)$ in $L_{b,N,T}$ to obtain

$$L_{b,N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{b}} \sum_{s=1}^{\binom{N}{b}} \mathbb{I}\left\{\frac{\vartheta_{b-r,b,T}^{(s)} - F^{-1}(1)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} + \frac{F^{-1}(1) - \vartheta_{N,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \leq x\right\}.$$

Fix an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$ and define the event $E_{N,T} = \left\{\left|(F^{-1}(1) - \vartheta_{N,N,T})/(\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)})\right| \leq \epsilon\right\}$. The goal is to show that $P(E_{N,T}) \rightarrow 1$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ as $N, T \rightarrow \infty$. Write

$$\frac{F^{-1}(1) - \vartheta_{N,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} = \frac{F^{-1}(1) - \theta_{N,N}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} + \frac{\theta_{N,N} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

We show that both terms are $o_p(1)$, which allows us to conclude that $P(E_{N,T}) \rightarrow 1$. Focus on the first term in eq. (B.6). Recall that $F^{-1}(1) = U_F(\infty)$ and write the term as

$$\frac{F^{-1}(1) - \theta_{N,N}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} = \frac{U_F(\infty) - \theta_{N,N}}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)} \frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)}.$$

- (1) The first term is $O_p(1)$ under assumption 2 by corollary 1.2.4 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#). This term does not depend on T .
- (2) Second term is $O_p(1)$ by lemma 4.2. Lemma 4.2 applies to subsample s , since (N, T) satisfy conditions of proposition 3.2, and $b = o(N)$.
- (3) Last, $(U_F(\infty) - U_F(t)) \in RV_\gamma$ by corollary 1.2.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#). By proposition 0.5 in [Resnick \(1987\)](#) $(U_F(\infty) - U_F(xt))/(U_F(\infty) - U_F(t)) \rightarrow x^\gamma$ uniformly on intervals of the form (b, ∞) . Hence, using $b = N^m$, $m < 1, \gamma < 0$, we obtain

$$\frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N)}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N^m)} = \frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F((N^{1-m}N^m))}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(N^m)} \sim (N^{1-m})^\gamma \rightarrow 0.$$

The last term is $o(1)$.

Overall the first term in eq. (B.6) is $o_p(1)$

Now focus on the second term in eq. (B.6). Let condition (1) of proposition 3.2 hold (the proof is analogous if condition (2) holds instead). Since $\sup_T \mathbb{E}|\varepsilon_{i,T}|^\beta < \infty$, by lemma B.1 we conclude

that $\theta_{N,N} - \vartheta_{N,N,T} = O_p(N^{1/\beta}/T^p)$. By lemma 4.2, $(\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)})/(U_F(\infty) - U_F(b))$ is $O_p(1)$. In addition, by corollary 1.2.10 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) $1/(U_F(\infty) - U_F(t))$ is $RV_{-\gamma}$, so by lemma A.4 we can write $1/(U_F(\infty) - U_F(t)) = t^{-\gamma}L(t)$ for some slowly varying L . Since $b = N^m$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\theta_{N,N} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} &= (\theta_{N,N} - \vartheta_{N,N,T}) \frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \frac{1}{U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)} \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{N^{1/\beta}}{T^p}\right) O_p(N^{-\gamma m}L(N^m)). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$L(N^m)$ diverges at rate slower than any power of N^m . Then the expression in (B.7) is $o_p(1)$ if for some $\kappa > 0$ it holds that $N^{1/\beta - \gamma m + \kappa} T^{-p} \rightarrow 0$. However, such a $\kappa > 0$ exists since assumptions of proposition 3.2 hold and $\gamma < \gamma m$.

The remainder of the proof now proceeds as in Politis and Romano (1994). Define

$$\tilde{L}_{b,N,T} = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{b}} \sum_{s=1}^{\binom{N}{b}} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{\vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)} - U_F(\infty)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \leq x \right\}.$$

On the event $E_{N,T}$ it holds that $\tilde{L}_{b,N,T}(x - \epsilon) \leq L_{b,N,T}(x) \leq \tilde{L}_{b,N,T}(x + \epsilon)$. Since $P(E_{N,T}) \rightarrow 1$, the above also holds with probability approaching one. Observe that $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{L}_{n,b}(x)) = J_{b,T}(x) \Rightarrow J(x)$. $\tilde{L}_{b,N,T}$ is a U-statistic of order b with kernel bounded between 0 and 1. By theorem A on p. 201 in Serfling (1980) it holds that $\tilde{L}_{b,N,T}(x) - J_{b,T}(x) \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Then, as in Politis and Romano (1994), for any $\epsilon > 0$ with probability approaching it holds that $J(x - \epsilon) - \epsilon \leq L_{b,N,T} \leq J(x + \epsilon) + \epsilon$. Letting $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ shows that $L_{b,N,T}(x) \rightarrow J(x)$ at all continuity points x of $J(x)$. This also shows that $\hat{c}_\alpha = L_{b,N,T}^{-1}(\alpha) \rightarrow J^{-1}(\alpha) = c_\alpha$ since weak convergence of cdfs is equivalent to weak convergence of quantiles.

Now consider the case of $l > 0$. Add and subtract $U_F(b/l)$ in the subsampling estimator:

$$L_{b,N,T}(x) = \frac{1}{\binom{N}{b}} \sum_{s=1}^{\binom{N}{b}} \mathbb{I} \left\{ \frac{\vartheta_{b-r,b,T}^{(s)} - U_F(b/l)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} + \frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-Nl/b,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \leq x \right\}.$$

First, since b satisfies the conditions of theorem 4.3

$$\frac{\vartheta_{b-r,b,T}^{(s)} - U_F(b/l)}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \Rightarrow \frac{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{r+1}^*)^{-\gamma} + l^{-\gamma}}{(E_1^* + \dots + E_{q+1}^*)^{-\gamma} - (E_1^*)^{-\gamma}}.$$

Similarly to the above, fix some $\epsilon > 0$ and define the event

$$E_{N,T} = \left\{ \left| \frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-Nl/b,N,T}}{\vartheta_{b-q,b,T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b,b,T}^{(s)}} \right| \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The goal is to show that $P(E_{N,T}) \rightarrow 1$ for any $\epsilon > 0$ under the assumptions of the theorem, the proof will then proceed as above. We show this separately for different signs of γ . Let $\gamma < 0$ and

write the expression under the absolute value as

$$\left[\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}} \frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-Nl/b, N, T}}{\frac{b}{l} U'_F(\frac{b}{l})} \right] \left[\frac{U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)}{\vartheta_{b-q, b, T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b, b, T}^{(s)}} \right] \left[\frac{\frac{b}{l} U'_F\left(\frac{b}{l}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}} (U_F(\infty) - U_F(b))} \right]. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The first term is $O_p(1)$ by theorem 3.3 taken with $k = Nl/b$. Conditions of theorem 3.3 hold, since $k = Nl/b \sim N^{1-m}$ and conditions of proposition 3.4 are assumed to hold for $\delta = 1 - m$. The second term is $O_p(1)$ by lemma 4.2 as the conditions of proposition 3.2 hold for N (and hence for b). Finally, by corollary 1.1.14 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) under assumption 4 $(b/l)U'_F\left(\frac{b}{l}\right)/(U_F(\infty) - U_F(b)) \rightarrow -\gamma$. Multiplying this by $(Nl/b)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$ shows that overall the last term is $o(1)$. We conclude that overall the expression in eq. (B.9) is $o_p(1)$.

For $\gamma > 0$ instead write the expression under the absolute value in eq. (B.8) as

$$\frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-\frac{Nl}{b}, N, T}}{\vartheta_{b-q, b, T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b, b, T}^{(s)}} = \left[\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}} \frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-\frac{Nl}{b}, N, T}}{\frac{b}{l} U'_F(\frac{b}{l})} \right] \left[\frac{U_F(b)}{\vartheta_{b-q, b, T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b, b, T}^{(s)}} \right] \left[\frac{\frac{b}{l} U'_F\left(\frac{b}{l}\right)}{\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}} U_F(b)} \right].$$

The last term is $o(1)$ by corollary 1.1.12 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006), other terms are as above.

For $\gamma = 0$ write the term of interest as

$$\frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-\frac{Nl}{b}, N, T}}{\vartheta_{b-q, b, T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b, b, T}^{(s)}} = \left[\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}} \frac{U_F(b/l) - \vartheta_{N-\frac{Nl}{b}, N, T}}{\frac{b}{l} U'_F(\frac{b}{l})} \right] \left[\frac{\frac{b}{l} U'_F\left(\frac{b}{l}\right)}{\vartheta_{b-q, b, T}^{(s)} - \vartheta_{b, b, T}^{(s)}} \right] \left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{Nl}{b}}} \right].$$

The first term is $O_p(1)$ as above. The second term is $O_p(1)$ by lemma 4.2 as by corollaries 1.1.10 and 1.2.4 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) under assumption 4 we may take $\hat{f}(U_F(N)) = NU'_F(N)$. Finally, the last term is $o(1)$. \square

Proof of remark 9. Let $\gamma > 0$ and consider $\hat{\gamma}_H$. Under conditions of theorem 4.3 eq. (A.5) holds with U_T in place of U_F . By lemma 1.2.10 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006), this convergence is equivalent to $U_T(tx)/U_T(x) \rightarrow x^\gamma$ for all $x > 0$. Now proof of theorem 3.2.2 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) applies with U_T in place of U_F (U in their notation).

Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}_{PWM}$ for $\gamma < 1$ holds by theorem 3.6.1 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) as eq. (A.5) holds with U_T in place of U_F under the conditions of theorem 4.3. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4.5

We begin by establishing several supporting lemmas.

Lemma B.2. *Let $U_{1,N} \leq \dots \leq U_{N,N}$ be the order statistics from an iid sample of size N from a Uniform $[0, 1]$ distribution. If $k = o(N)$, $s = \lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor$, and $k \rightarrow \infty$, then*

$$\left(\begin{array}{c} \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N}{k} U_{k+1, N} - 1 \right) \\ \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N}{k+s} U_{k+s+1, N} - 1 \right) \end{array} \right) \Rightarrow N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Proof. By lemma 2.2.3 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) $\sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N}{k} U_{k+1,N} - 1 \right) \Rightarrow N(0, 1) \equiv Z$. To show the result, we only need to show that the suitable scaled difference between $U_{k+1,N}$ and $U_{k+s-1,N}$ converges to zero in probability. Consider

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N}{k+s} U_{k+s+1,N} - 1 \right) - \sqrt{k} \left(\frac{N}{k} U_{k+1,N} - 1 \right) \\
&= \sqrt{k} N \left(\frac{k}{k} \frac{1}{k+s} U_{k+s+1,N} - \frac{1}{k} U_{k+1,N} \right) \\
&= \frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left(U_{k+s+1} - U_{k+1} - \frac{s}{N+1} - \frac{s}{k+s} U_{k+s+1,N} + \frac{s}{N+1} \right) \\
&= \frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left(U_{k+s+1} - U_{k+1} - \frac{s}{N+1} \right) - \frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{s}{k+s} U_{k+s+1,N} - \frac{s}{k+s} \frac{k+s+1}{N+1} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left(\frac{s}{N+1} - \frac{s}{k+s} \frac{k+s+1}{N+1} \right). \tag{B.10}
\end{aligned}$$

We show that each of the terms in the last equality in eq. (B.10) is $o_p(1)$. The last term:

$$\frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \frac{s}{N+1} \left(1 - \frac{k+s+1}{k+s} \right) \sim \frac{s}{\sqrt{k}} \left(1 - \frac{k+s+1}{k+s} \right) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } s \sim \sqrt{k}, k \rightarrow \infty.$$

Consider the first term. A difference of order statistics from the uniform distribution follows a beta distribution: if $p > r$, then $U_{p,N} - U_{r,N} \sim \text{Beta}(p-r, N-p+r+1)$. Let $\delta > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left(U_{k+s+1,N} - U_{k+1,N} - \frac{s}{N+1} \right) \right| \geq \delta \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \text{Beta}(s, N-s+1) - \mathbb{E}(\text{Beta}(s, N-s+1)) \right| \geq \frac{\sqrt{k}}{N} \delta \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\text{Var}(\text{Beta}(s, N-s+1))}{\delta^2 k / N^2} = \frac{\frac{s(N-s+1)}{(N+1)^2(N+2)}}{\delta^2 \frac{k}{N^2}} \sim \frac{\frac{s}{N^2}}{\delta^2 \frac{k}{N^2}} = \frac{s}{\delta^2 k} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Last, turn to the second term. Since $U_{k+s+1,N} \sim \text{Beta}(k+s+1, n-k-s)$, for $\delta > 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\frac{N}{\sqrt{k}} \left| \frac{s}{k+s} U_{k+s+1,N} - \frac{s}{k+s} \frac{k+s+1}{N+1} \right| \geq \delta \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \text{Beta}(k+s+1, N-k-s) - \mathbb{E}(\text{Beta}(k+s+1, N-k-s)) \right| \geq \delta \frac{\sqrt{k}(k+s)}{Ns} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{\text{Var}(\text{Beta}(k+s+1, N-k-s))}{\delta^2 k (k+s)^2} = \frac{(k+s+1)(N-k-s)}{(N+1)^2(N+2)} \frac{N^2 s^2}{\delta^2 k (k+s)^2} \\
&\sim \frac{(k+s+1)s^2}{k(k+s)^2} \sim \frac{1}{k+s} \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The assertion of the lemma now follows. \square

Lemma B.3. *Let θ be sampled iid from F , let assumption 4 hold. Let $k = o(N), k \rightarrow \infty, s = \lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor$.*

Let $\theta_{N-k,N}, \theta_{N-k-s,N}$ be the order statistics from F . Then as $N \rightarrow \infty$

$$\sqrt{k} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \\ \frac{\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Proof. We use the Cramer-Wold device together with a technique used by [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) in proving an asymptotic normality result for a single statistic under a von Mises condition (see proof of theorem 2.2.1 therein). Observe that (in notation of lemma [B.2](#)) $(\theta_{N-k,N}, \theta_{N-k-s,N}) \stackrel{d}{=} (U_F(1/U_{k+1,N}), U_F(1/U_{k+s+1,N}))$. Let $(c_1, c_2) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ and examine

$$\begin{aligned} & c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F\left(\frac{N}{k} \frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s} \frac{k+s}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\ & = c_1 \sqrt{k} \int_1^{k/(NU_{k+1,N})} \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}t\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} dt + c_2 \sqrt{k} \int_1^{(k+s)/(NU_{k+s+1,N})} \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}t\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} dt. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Under assumption [4](#) $U'_F \in RV_{\gamma-1}$ by corollary 1.1.10 in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#) (up to sign). Then by Potter's inequalities (proposition B.1.9 (5) in [de Haan and Ferreira \(2006\)](#)) for any $\varepsilon, \varepsilon' > 0$ starting from some N_0 for $t \geq 1$ it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \varepsilon)t^{\gamma-1-\varepsilon'} &< \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}t\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} < (1 + \varepsilon)t^{\gamma-1+\varepsilon'}, \\ (1 - \varepsilon)t^{\gamma-1-\varepsilon'} &< \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}t\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} < (1 + \varepsilon)t^{\gamma-1+\varepsilon'}. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by \sqrt{k} and taking integrals with limits of integration as in in eq. [\(B.11\)](#), we obtain for $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} & c_1(1 - \varepsilon)\sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma-\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma - \varepsilon'} + c_2(1 - \varepsilon)\sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k+s}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma-\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma - \varepsilon'} \\ & \leq c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F\left(\frac{1}{U_{k+1,N}}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F\left(\frac{1}{U_{k+s+1,N}}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\ & \leq c_1(1 + \varepsilon)\sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma+\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma + \varepsilon'} + c_2(1 + \varepsilon)\sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k+s}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma+\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma + \varepsilon'}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar inequalities apply for different combinations of signs of c_1, c_2 , though with $(1 - \varepsilon)$ replaced by $(1 + \varepsilon)$ for the terms with $c_i < 0$. By lemma B.2 and the delta method we get that for any $\varepsilon' > 0$ that satisfies $\varepsilon' \neq \pm\gamma$

$$\sqrt{k} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma+\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma+\varepsilon'} \\ \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma+\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma+\varepsilon'} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right), \quad \sqrt{k} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma-\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma-\varepsilon'} \\ \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma-\varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma-\varepsilon'} \end{pmatrix} \Rightarrow N \left(0, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

with convergence being joint for the two vectors. Since $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, we obtain that

$$c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}$$

has the same asymptotic distribution as

$$c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k}{NU_{k+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma \pm \varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma \pm \varepsilon'} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{\left(\frac{k+s}{NU_{k+s+1,N}}\right)^{\gamma \pm \varepsilon'} - 1}{\gamma \pm \varepsilon'}.$$

Finally, the conclusion of the lemma follows by the Cramer-Wold device, \square

Proof of theorem 4.5. First, we focus on part (1) and establish the result for θ . Since F is differentiable, so is U_F , and $U'_F(t) = [(1 - F(U_F(t)))^2]/[f(U_F(t))]$. Since $F(U_F(t))$ is monotonic, the monotonicity assumption on f implies that eventually also U'_F is non-increasing/non-decreasing. Let $s = \lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor$. Recall $F^{-1}(1 - k/N) = U_F(N/k)$, then

$$\frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - F^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{k}{N}\right)}{\theta_{N-k,N} - \theta_{N-k-s,N}} = \frac{\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} (\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F(N/k))}{\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} (\theta_{N-k,N} - \theta_{N-k-s,N})}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

By lemma B.3 the numerator weakly converges to $Z \equiv N(0, 1)$

We show that the denominator converges to 1 in probability. Rewrite the denominator as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} (\theta_{N-k,N} - \theta_{N-k-s,N}) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} \left(\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) \right) - \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} \left(\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} \left(U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

The second term can be written as

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F(N/(k+s))} \left(\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) \frac{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F(N/(k+s))}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)}.$$

By assumption 4 and corollary 1.1.10 in de Haan and Ferreira (2006) $U'_F(tx)/U'_F(t) \rightarrow x^{\gamma-1}$ as

$t \rightarrow \infty$ locally uniformly in $(0, \infty)$. Hence

$$\frac{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F(N/(k+s))}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} = \frac{k}{k+s} \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k} \frac{k}{k+s}\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \rightarrow 1.$$

since $k/k+s \rightarrow 1$. Thus, by lemma [B.3](#)

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} \left(\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) \right) - \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F(N/k)} \left(\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

Last, we examine the residual. Observe that $U'_F \geq 0$. First suppose U'_F is eventually non-increasing, in which case

$$\left(U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) = \int_{(N/k) \times k/(k+s)}^{N/k} U'_F(t) dt \leq \frac{s}{k+s} \frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k} \frac{k}{k+s}\right).$$

Using the above expression, we obtain an upper bound for the residual term

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \left(U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) &\leq \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \left(\frac{s}{k+s} \frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k} \frac{k}{k+s}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{k}s}{k+s} \frac{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k} \frac{k}{k+s}\right)}{U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \rightarrow 1 \end{aligned}$$

since $s = \lfloor \sqrt{k} \rfloor$ and by local uniform convergence of the ratio of U'_F . At the same time, since U'_F is eventually non-increasing, we obtain a lower bound

$$\int_{(N/k) \times k/(k+s)}^{N/k} U'_F(t) dt \geq \frac{s}{k+s} \frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)$$

which shows that

$$\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} \left(U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right) \right) \geq \frac{\sqrt{k}s}{k+s} \rightarrow 1.$$

Hence, the residual term converges to 1. If instead U'_F is eventually non-decreasing, swap the $N/(k+s)$ and N/k terms.

By combining the above arguments and eq. [\(B.13\)](#), we conclude that the denominator of eq. [\(B.12\)](#) converges to 1 i.p. We conclude that

$$\frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F(N/k)}{\theta_{N-k,N} - \theta_{N-k-s,N}} \xRightarrow{d} \frac{Z}{1} = Z \sim N(0, 1)$$

Now turn to part (2) and consider the noisy estimates ϑ_i . If the conclusion of lemma [B.3](#) holds with ϑ in place of θ , then the proof of part (1) applies with order statistics of ϑ replacing their noiseless counterparts θ . In light of this, it is sufficient to establish the result of lemma [B.3](#) for ϑ . We proceed similarly to proof of theorem [3.3](#) and we apply the Cramer-Wold device.

Observe that $(\vartheta_{N-k,N,T}, \vartheta_{N-k-s,N,T}) \stackrel{d}{=} (U_T(Y_{N-k,N}), U_T(Y_{N-k-s,N}))$ for Y as in the proof of

theorem 3.3. Let $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$. Then as in eq. (A.12)

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{\vartheta_{N-k,N,T} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{\vartheta_{N-k-s,N,T} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\
& \stackrel{d}{=} c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_F(Y_{N-k-s,N}) - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\
& \quad + c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_T(Y_{N-k-s,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k-s,N})}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\
& \stackrel{d}{=} c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{\theta_{N-k-s,N} - U_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)} \\
& \quad + c_1 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_T(Y_{N-k,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k,N})}{\frac{N}{k} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k}\right)} + c_2 \sqrt{k} \frac{U_T(Y_{N-k-s,N}) - U_F(Y_{N-k-s,N})}{\frac{N}{k+s} U'_F\left(\frac{N}{k+s}\right)}.
\end{aligned}$$

The result now follows: the first two terms converge to the desired limit by lemma B.3; the third and the fourth term converge to zero i.p., this convergence follows as in the proof of theorem 3.3 applied at k and $k + s$. \square