

A Global Wavelet Based Bootstrapped Test of Covariance Stationarity

Jonathan B. Hill* and Tianqi Li†
University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill

October 26, 2022

Abstract

We propose a covariance stationarity test for an otherwise dependent and possibly globally non-stationary time series. We work in the new setting of [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015\)](#) who exploit [Walsh \(1923\)](#) functions (global square waves) in order to compare sub-sample covariances with the full sample counterpart. They impose strict stationarity under the null, only consider linear processes under either hypothesis, and exploit linearity in order to achieve a parametric estimator for an inverted high dimensional asymptotic covariance matrix. Conversely, we allow for linear or linear processes with possibly non-iid innovations. This is important in macroeconomics and finance where nonlinear feedback and random volatility occur in many settings. We completely sidestep asymptotic covariance matrix estimation and inversion by bootstrapping a max-correlation difference statistic, where the maximum is taken over the correlation lag h and Walsh function generated sub-sample counter k (the number of systematic samples). We achieve a higher feasible rate of increase for the maximum lag and counter \mathcal{H}_T and \mathcal{K}_T , and in the supplemental material we present a data driven method for selecting \mathcal{H}_T and \mathcal{K}_T . Of particular note, our test is capable of detecting breaks in variance, and distant, or very mild, deviations from stationarity.

Key words and phrases: Covariance stationarity test; Walsh functions; global non-stationarity; nonlinearity; dependent wild bootstrap.

AMS classifications : 62G10, 62M10, 62F40.

JEL classifications : C12, C49, C55.

1 Introduction

Assume $\{X_t : t \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a zero-mean, possibly non-stationary time series process in \mathcal{L}_2 . We want to test whether X_t is covariance stationary, without explicitly assuming stationarity under the null hypothesis. We also want to allow for linear or nonlinear processes with a

*Corresponding author. Dept. of Economics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; jbhill@email.unc.edu; <https://jbhill.web.unc.edu>.

†Dept. of Economics, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill; tianqili@live.unc.edu.

possibly non-iid innovation, and a general memory property. Such generality is important in macroeconomics and finance where nonlinear feedback and non-iid innovations occur in many settings due to asymmetries and random volatility, including exchange rates, bonds, interest rates, commodities, and asset return levels and volatility. Popular models for such time series include symmetric and asymmetric GARCH, Stochastic Volatility, nonlinear ARMA-GARCH, and switching models like smooth transition autoregression. See, e.g., [Teräsvirta \(1994\)](#), [Gray \(1996\)](#) and [Francq and Zakoïan \(2019\)](#).

Evidence for nonstationarity, whether generally or in the variance or autocovariances, has been suggested for many economic time series, where breaks in variance and model parameters are well known (e.g. [Busett and Taylor, 2003](#); [Perron, 2006](#); [Hendry and Massmann, 2007](#); [Gianetto and Raissi, 2015](#)). Knowing whether a time series is globally nonstationary has large implications for how analysts approach estimation and inference. Indeed, it effects whether conventional parametric and semi-(non)parametric model specifications are correct. Pretesting for deviations from global stationarity therefore has important practical value.

There are many tests in the literature on covariance stationarity, and concerning locally stationary processes. Tests for stationarity based on spectral or second order dependence properties have a long history, where pioneering work is due to [Priestley and Subba Rao \(1969\)](#). Spectrum-based tests with \mathcal{L}_2 -distance components have many versions. [Paparoditis \(2010a\)](#) uses a rolling window method to compare subsample local periodograms against a full sample version. The maximum is taken over the \mathcal{L}_2 -distance between periodograms over all time points. An asymptotic theory for the max-statistic, however, is not provided, although an approximation theory is (see their Lemmas 1 and 3). Furthermore, conforming with many offerings in the literature, under the null X_t is a linear process with iid Gaussian innovations. [Dette, Preuß, and Vetter \(2011\)](#) study locally stationary processes, and impose linearity with iid Gaussian innovations. Their statistic is based on the minimum \mathcal{L}_2 -distance between a spectral density and its version under stationarity, and local power is non-trivial against $T^{1/4}$ -alternatives. [Aue, Hörmann, Horváth, and Reimherr \(2009\)](#) propose a nonparametric test for break in covariance for multivariate time series based on a version of a cumulative sum statistic.

Wavelet methods have arisen in various forms recently. [von Sachs and Neumann \(2000\)](#), using technical wavelet decomposition components from [Neumann and von Sachs \(1997\)](#), propose a Haar wavelet based localized periodogram test of covariance stationarity. Local and asymptotic power are not theoretically derived. [Nason \(2013\)](#) presents a covariance station-

arity test based on Haar wavelet coefficients of the wavelet periodogram, they assume linear local stationarity, and do not treat local power.

In a promising offering in the wavelet literature, [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015\)](#) [JWW] exploit local square wavelets derived from Walsh functions and systematic samples for comparing sub-sample covariances with the full sample one. They utilize a sample-size dependent maximum lag \mathcal{H}_T and maximum systematic sample counter \mathcal{K}_T , and show their Wald test exhibits non-negligible local power against \sqrt{T} -alternatives. Linearity $X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i Z_{t-i}$ with zero mean iid Z_t , and $E|Z_t|^{4+\delta} < \infty$, $\delta > 0$, expedites characterizing a parametric asymptotic covariance matrix estimator. The iid and linearity assumptions, however, rule out many important processes, including linear and nonlinear GARCH and ARMA-GARCH; nonlinear models like regime switching and random coefficient processes; and any process with a non-iid error (e.g. ARMA-GARCH). JWW's Wald-type test statistic requires an inverted parametric variance estimator that itself requires five tuning parameters and choice of two kernels.¹ Indeed, most of the tuning parameters only make sense under linearity given how they approach asymptotic covariance matrix estimation.

Now define the lag h autocovariance coefficient at time t :

$$\gamma_h(t) \equiv E[(X_t - E[X_t])(X_{t-h} - E[X_{t-h}])], h = 0, 1, \dots$$

The hypotheses are:

$$H_0 : \gamma_h(s) = \gamma_h(t) = \gamma_h \quad \forall s, t, \forall h = 0, 1, \dots \quad (\text{covariance stationary}) \quad (1)$$

$$H_1 : \gamma_h(s) \neq \gamma_h(t) \text{ for some } s \neq t \text{ and } h = 0, 1, \dots \quad (\text{covariance nonstationary}).$$

Under H_0 X_t is second order stationary, and the alternative is *any* deviation from the null: the autocovariance differs across time at some lag, allowing for a (lag zero) break in variance. The null hypothesis otherwise accepts the possibility of global nonstationarity.

We use a Walsh function framework similar to JWW, cf. [Walsh \(1923\)](#). Walsh functions are essentially global square waves leading to many *systematic samples*, whereas wavelets are local small waves. See [Nason, von Sachs, and Kroisandt \(200\)](#) and [Nason \(2013\)](#), and see Section

¹One tuning parameter $\lambda \in (0, .5)$ governs the number $Q_T = [T^\lambda]$ of sample covariances that enter the asymptote covariance matrix estimator (see their p. 899); and four ($c_1, c_2; \xi_1, \xi_2$) are used for kernel bandwidths $b_j = c_j T^{-\xi_j}$, $j = 1, 2$, for computing the kurtosis of the iid process Z_t under linearity (see pp. 902-903). The authors set c_j equal to 1.2 times a so-called "crude scale estimate" which is nowhere defined.

2.1 below.

We do away with parametric assumptions on X_t , and impose a mixing property that allows us to bound the number of usable covariance lags \mathcal{H}_T and systematic samples \mathcal{K}_T . The mixing condition allows for global nonstationarity under either hypothesis, allowing us to focus the null hypothesis only on second order stationarity. Rather than operate on a Wald statistic constructed from transformed covariances, our statistic is the maximum Walsh transformed sample correlation coefficient, where the maximum is taken over (h, k) with increasing upper bounds $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$. We use a dependent wild bootstrap for the resulting test statistic, which allows us to sidestep asymptotic covariance matrix estimation, a challenge considering we do not assume a parametric form, and the null hypothesis requires us to look over a large set of (h, k) . We sidestep all of JWW's tuning parameters, and require just one governing the block size for the bootstrap. We ultimately achieve a significantly better upper bound on the rate of increase for $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$ than JWW. We show that penalized and weighted versions of our test statistic are possible, as in JWW and Hill and Motegi (2020) respectively. However, we argue that there is no compelling theory to justify penalties on (h, k) in our setting, and overall a non-penalized and unweighted test statistic works best in practice.

Note that Hill and Motegi (2020) study the max-correlation statistic for a white noise test, and only show their limit theory applies for some increasing maximum lag \mathcal{H}_T , but do not derive an upper bound. In the present paper we use a different asymptotic theory, derive upper bounds for \mathcal{H}_T and \mathcal{K}_T , and of course do not require a white noise property under H_0 .

Jin, Wang, and Wang (2015, Section 2.6) rule out the use of autocorrelations because, they claim, if the sample variance were included, i.e. $h \geq 0$, then consistency may still not hold because the limit theory neglects the joint distribution of $\hat{\gamma}_0$ and the correlation differences. We show for our proposed test that the difference between full sample and systematic sample autocorrelations at lag zero asymptotically reveals whether $E[X_t^2]$ is time dependent. Further, our test is consistent whether non-stationarity is caused by variances, or covariances, or both. See Section 3.1, and Example 3.5. Our proposed test is consistent against a general (nonparametric) alternative, and exhibits nontrivial power against a sequence of \sqrt{T} -local alternatives.

Finally, in the supplemental material we present an automatic method for selecting \mathcal{H}_T and \mathcal{K}_T . The method is based on Hill and Motegi's (2020) extension of a maximum lag selection technique for a Q-test based portmanteau statistic in Escanciano and Lobato (2009), cf. Inglot and Ledwina (2006). It requires sets $\{0, \dots, \bar{\mathcal{H}}_T\}$ and $\{1, \dots, \bar{\mathcal{K}}_T\}$ from which optimal

values $\{\mathcal{H}_T^*, \mathcal{K}_T^*\}$ are iteratively selected, hence we still need pre-chosen maxima $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_T$ and $\bar{\mathcal{K}}_T$. In simulation experiments not reported here, however, we find the [Escanciano and Lobato \(2009\)](#) logic applied to a Walsh function based covariance stationarity test does not lead to a dominant test the way it can for a max-correlation white noise test (cf. [Hill and Motegi, 2020](#)). The method systematically sets $\{\mathcal{H}_T^*, \mathcal{K}_T^*\}$ to the lowest value capable of detecting a deviation from covariance stationarity. This generally leads to (very) small values of $\{\mathcal{H}_T^*, \mathcal{K}_T^*\}$ and therefore low empirical power. Merely using a pre-chosen $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ leads to sharp size and competitive power. Whether another data-dependent method applies is left for future work.

The max-correlation difference is particularly adept at revealing subtle deviations from covariance stationarity, similar to results revealed in [Hill and Motegi \(2020\)](#). Consider a distant form of a model treated in [Paparoditis \(2010b, Model I\)](#) and [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, Section 3.2: models NVI, NVII\)](#), $X_t = .08 \cos\{1.5 - \cos(4\pi t/T)\}\epsilon_{t-d} + \epsilon_t$ with large d (JWW use $d = 1$ or 6). JWW's test exhibits trivial power when $d \geq 20$, while the max-correlation difference is able to detect this deviation from the null even when $d \geq 50$. The reason is the same as that provided in [Hill and Motegi \(2020\)](#): the max-correlation difference operates on the single most useful statistic, while Wald and portmanteau statistics congregate many standardized covariances that generally provide little relevant information under a weak signal.

In [Section 2](#) we develop the test statistic. [Sections 3](#) and [4](#) present asymptotic theory and the bootstrap method and theory. We then perform a Monte Carlo study in [Section 5](#), and conclude with [Section 6](#). Proofs are presented in the appendix. The supplemental material contains omitted proofs, a data-dependent method for selecting $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$, an empirical study concerning international interest rates, and complete simulation results.

We use the following notation. $[z]$ rounds z to the nearest integer.. \mathcal{L}_2 is the space of square integrable random variables; and $\mathcal{L}_2[a, b]$ is the class of square integrable functions on $[a, b]$. $\|\cdot\|_p$ and $\|\cdot\|$ are the L_p and l_2 norms respectively, $p \geq 1$. Let $\mathbb{Z} \equiv \{\dots - 2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N} \equiv \{1, 2, \dots\}$ and $\mathbb{N}_+ \equiv 0 \cup \mathbb{N}$. $K > 0$ is a finite constant whose value may be different in different places. *awp1* denotes "asymptotically with probability approaching one". Write $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T} = \max_{0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T}$. $\max_{\mathcal{K}_T} = \max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T}$ and $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} = \max_{0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T, 1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T}$. Similarly, $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T} a(h, \tilde{h}) = \max_{0 \leq h, \tilde{h} \leq \mathcal{H}_T} a(h, \tilde{h})$, etc.

2 Max-Correlation with Walsh Transformation

2.1 Walsh Functions

The following class of Walsh functions $\{W_i(x)\} \equiv \{W_i(x) : i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ define a complete orthonormal basis for functions on $\mathcal{L}_2[0, 1)$. The functions $W_i(x)$ are defined recursively (see, e.g., [Walsh, 1923](#); [Ahmed and Rao, 1975](#); [Stoffer, 1987, 1991](#)):

$$W_0(x) = 1 \text{ for } x \in [0, 1); \text{ and } W_1(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \in [0, .5) \\ -1, & x \in [.5, 1) \end{cases}$$

and for any $i = 1, 2, \dots$,

$$W_{2i}(x) = \begin{cases} W_i(2x), & x \in [0, .5) \\ (-1)^i W_i(2x - 1), & x \in [.5, 1) \end{cases} \text{ and } W_{2i+1}(x) = \begin{cases} W_i(2x), & x \in [0, .5) \\ (-1)^{i+1} W_i(2x - 1), & x \in [.5, 1) \end{cases}.$$

In the $\{-1, 1\}$ -valued sequence $\{W_i(x) : i = 0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, i indexes the number of zero crossings, forming a square shaped wave-form. See [Stoffer \(1991, Figure 5\)](#) and [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, Figure 1\)](#), and see those sources for further reading. The k^{th} discrete Walsh functions used in this paper are then for $t = 1, \dots, T$:

$$\{\mathcal{W}_k(1), \dots, \mathcal{W}_k(T)\} \text{ where } \mathcal{W}_k(t) = W_k((t-1)/T).$$

Define the covariance coefficient for a covariance stationary time series: $\gamma_h \equiv E[X_t X_{t-h}]$. Let $\hat{\gamma}_h$ denote the usual covariance estimator:

$$\hat{\gamma}_h \equiv \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h}, \quad h \in \mathbb{N}_+.$$

JWW use $\{\mathcal{W}_i(x)\}$ to construct a set of discrete Walsh covariance transformations:

$$\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} \equiv \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \left\{ 1 + (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\}, \quad h = 0, 1, \dots, T-1, \text{ and } k = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{K}$$

for some positive integers \mathcal{K} . As they point out, a sequence of systematic samples $\mathbf{T}_k : k =$

$1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{K}$ in the time domain can be defined on the basis of Walsh functions:

$$\mathcal{T}_k \equiv \left\{ t \in T : (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{W}_k(t) = 1 \right\}.$$

Now let \mathcal{N}_k be the smallest power of 2 that is at least k . The first systematic sample is the first half of the sample time domain $\mathcal{T}_1 = \{1, \dots, [T/2]\}$; the second is the middle half $\mathcal{T}_2 = \{[T/4], [T/4] + 1, \dots, [3T/4]\}$; the third \mathcal{T}_3 is the first and third time blocks, and so on. Notice \mathcal{T}_k consists of $(k + 1)/2$ blocks with at least $[T/\mathcal{N}_k]$ elements. Thus, when $h < T/\mathcal{N}_k$ then $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)}$ is just an estimate of γ_h on the k^{th} systematic sample:

$$\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \left\{ 1 + (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\} = \frac{2}{T} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}_k} X_t X_{t+h}.$$

The condition $h < T/\mathcal{N}_k$ holds asymptotically in the Section 4 bootstrap setting.

The difference between the k^{th} systematic sample and full sample estimators is:

$$\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h = (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t).$$

Under the null hypothesis and mild assumptions this difference is $O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$ at all lags h and for all systematic samples k . Thus, a test statistic can be constructed from $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h)$.

2.2 Max-Correlation Walsh Transforms

Define the sample correlation coefficient:

$$\hat{\rho}_h \equiv \frac{\hat{\gamma}_h}{\hat{\gamma}_0},$$

and a set of discrete Walsh correlation transformations, over systematic sample k :

$$\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} \equiv \frac{\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)}}{\hat{\gamma}_0} = \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} \times \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \left\{ 1 + (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\}, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, \mathcal{K}.$$

Thus, the difference between systematic sample and full sample estimators is:

$$\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h = \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h}{\hat{\gamma}_0} \quad (2)$$

The correlation difference $\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h$ is sensible even at lag 0, considering

$$\hat{\rho}_{0,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}}{\hat{\gamma}_0} - 1.$$

Thus, under nonstationarity $\hat{\rho}_{0,1}^{(k)} \xrightarrow{p} 1$ for some systematic sample k when $\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}/\hat{\gamma}_0 \xrightarrow{p} 1$; that is, when the second moment $E[X_t^2]$ is not constant over t .

Alternatively, we may incorporate the systematic sample variance estimators $\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}$. The autocorrelation estimator in that case becomes, for example:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)} &\equiv \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} \times \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} + \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &= \hat{\rho}_h + \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$\hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h = \frac{(-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)}{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t^2 \left\{ 1 + (-1)^{k-1} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\}}.$$

At lag 0 notice:

$$\hat{\rho}_{0,2}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_0 = \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T X_t^2 \mathcal{W}_k(t) = \frac{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_0}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} = 1 - \frac{\hat{\gamma}_0}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}}.$$

Compare this to $\hat{\rho}_{0,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_0 = \hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}/\hat{\gamma}_0 - 1$. Thus, again $\hat{\rho}_{0,2}^{(k)} \xrightarrow{p} 1$ for some systematic sample k when $E[X_t^2]$ is not constant over t .

The autocorrelation estimators $\hat{\rho}_{h,i}^{(k)}$ exploit Walsh functions in order to reveal autocorrelation subsample differences, but they are not identical in small samples. Asymptotically, however, their difference is negligible in probability under the null hypothesis. Notice:

$$\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)} = \left(\frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} - \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} \right) (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)$$

$$= \left(\hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_0 \right) \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0 \hat{\gamma}_0^{(k)}} \left(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h \right). \quad (3)$$

This reveals $\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)}$ for each $h \geq 0$ simultaneously captures systematic sample differences in variance *and* covariance. Under H_0 and general conditions presented in Section 3, $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h|$ and $|\hat{\gamma}_0 - \gamma_0|$ are $O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$, where $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ are sequences defined below with $\mathcal{H}_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \infty$. Thus:

$$\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)} \right) \right| = O_p(1/\sqrt{T}).$$

Under H_1 , however, *if and only if* $E[X_t^2]$ and $E[X_t X_{t-h}]$ for some $h \geq 1$ are time dependent then $\sqrt{T} \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)}| \xrightarrow{p} \infty$. This suggests $\mathcal{D}_T \equiv \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_{h,2}^{(k)})|$ could be used as a third test statistic: theory developed in Section 3 can be used to show a test based on \mathcal{D}_T will reject H_0 asymptotically with power approaching one when X_t is non-stationary in variance *and* autocovariance at some lag $h \geq 1$. Conversely, either $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\rho}_{h,i}^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h)|$ is consistent against H_1 in general: power is one asymptotically if $E[X_t^2]$ *and/or* some $E[X_t X_{t-h}]$ are time dependent.

In order to focus ideas, however, we only consider the estimator $\hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)}$, so put:

$$\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} \equiv \hat{\rho}_{h,1}^{(k)}.$$

The proposed test statistic is therefore the maximum normalized $\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h$ over (h, k) :

$$\mathcal{M}_T \equiv \sqrt{T} \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right| = \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} \max_{0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T, 1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T} \left| (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right|.$$

By construction \mathcal{M}_T uses the most informative systematic sample correlation difference. Notice we search over all lags $h \in \{0, \dots, \mathcal{H}_T\}$ including $h = 0$.

A penalized version is also possible:

$$\mathcal{M}_T^{(p)} \equiv \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left\{ \sqrt{T} \left| \hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right| - \mathcal{P}(h, k) \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{P}(h, k)$ is a non-random, positive, strictly monotonically increasing function of h and k . JWW use the additive $\mathcal{P}(h, k) = p_h + q_k$ with AIC-like lag penalty $p_h = 2h$ in an order selection-type Wald statistic. This is sensible considering the Wald statistic is pointwise asymptotically

chi-squared with mean $2h$ for each k (see also [Inglot and Ledwina, 2006](#)). For q_k they use $\sqrt{k-1}$ based primarily on empirical power considerations.²

In our setting a grounded theory for $\mathcal{P}(h, k)$ does not exist, nor do we have any comparable requirements for penalizing k . Indeed, a compelling reason for "penalizing" \mathcal{M}_T at all would be to counter the loss of observations at higher lags or to control for lag specific heterogeneity, but that historically is ameliorated with a weighted correlation, for example $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \{\sqrt{T} \mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} |\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h|\}$, where $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)}$ are possibly stochastic weights, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} > 0$ *a.s.*, and $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} - \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)}| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ where the non-stochastic $\mathcal{W}_h^{(k)}$ satisfy $\min_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)} > 0$. Choices include Ljung-Box type weights, or an inverted non-parametric standard deviation estimator, cf. [Hill and Motegi \(2020\)](#).

Consider the latter, define a covariance $\hat{v}_T(i; h, k) \equiv 1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h-i} \hat{z}_t(h, k) \hat{z}_{t+i}(h, k)$ where

$$\hat{z}_t(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \left\{ X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\}.$$

Under fourth order stationarity under the null, and because $\hat{\gamma}_0$ only operates as a scale asymptotically, cf. [Theorem 3.3](#) below, the weights are $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} = 1/\hat{\mathcal{V}}_T(h, k)$ where, e.g.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{V}}_T^2(h, k) = \hat{\gamma}_0^{-2} \left\{ \hat{v}_T(0; h, k) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{T-h-1} \mathcal{K}(i/\beta_T) \hat{v}_T(i; h, k) \right\} \quad (4)$$

with symmetric, square integrable kernel function $\mathcal{K} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ satisfying $\mathcal{K}(0) = 1$,³ and bandwidth $\beta_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $\beta_T = o(T)$.

A penalized and weighted version is thus:

$$\mathcal{M}_T^{(w,p)} \equiv \max_{0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T, 1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T} \left\{ \sqrt{T} \mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} \left| \hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right| - \mathcal{P}(h, k) \right\}. \quad (5)$$

In Monte Carlo work we studied \mathcal{M}_T , $\mathcal{M}_T^{(p)}$, $\mathcal{M}_T^{(w)}$ and $\mathcal{M}_T^{(w,p)}$ with various penalties and/or an inverted standard deviation weight or Ljung-Box weight. We find using $\mathcal{P}(h, k) = p_h + q_k$ where $p_h = (h+1)^a/2$ and $q_k = k^a/2$ with $a = [1/8, 1/2]$, or $\mathcal{P}(h, k) = \sqrt{(h+1)k}$, promotes accurate empirical size but generally does not lead to dominant power, and may

²The penalty $q_k = \sqrt{k-1}$ also satisfies a required lower bound on q_k arising from a probability bound used to tackle a maximum operator over an unbounded asymptotic set of (h, k) : see [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, eq. \(3.4\)\)](#).

³See, for example, class \mathfrak{K}_2 in [Andrews \(1991\)](#), or class \mathfrak{K} in [de Jong and Davidson \(2000, Assumption 1\)](#).

lead to decreased power in some cases. Conversely, stochastic weights $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)}$ generally lead to over-sized tests, while Ljung-Box weights do not offer an advantage under either hypothesis.

3 Asymptotic Theory

Write

$$z_t(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} \quad (6)$$

$$\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} z_t(h, k). \quad (7)$$

and define a variance function

$$\sigma_T^2(h, k) \equiv E[\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k)^2].$$

The main result of this section delivers a class of sequences $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$, and an array of random variables $\{\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) : T \in \mathbb{N}\}_{h \geq 0, k \geq 1}$ normally distributed $\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) \sim N(0, \sigma_T^2(h, k))$, such that the Kolmogorov distance

$$\rho_T \equiv \sup_{z \geq 0} \left| P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k)| \leq z \right) - P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k)| \leq z \right) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (8)$$

The approximation does not require standardized \mathcal{Z}_T and \mathcal{Z}_T in view of non-degeneracy Assumption 1.c below. We then apply the approximation to the max-correlation difference statistic.

Define σ -fields

$$\mathcal{F}_{T,t}^\infty \equiv \sigma(\{X_t X_{t+h} : 0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T\}_{\tau \geq t}) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{T,-\infty}^t \equiv \sigma(\{X_t X_{t+h} : 0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T\}_{\tau \leq t}),$$

and α -mixing coefficients (Rosenblatt, 1956), $\alpha_l \equiv \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup_{\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}_{T,-\infty}^t, \mathcal{B} \subset \mathcal{F}_{T,t+l}^\infty} |\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A} \cap \mathcal{B}) - \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{A}) \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{B})|$, for $l > 0$.

We work in the setting of Chang, Chen, and Wu (2021) who deliver high dimensional central theorems for possibly non-stationary mixing sequences or under a physical dependence setting similar to Zhang and Wu (2017). Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2013, 2015, 2017) significantly improve on results in the literature on maxima of a high dimensional sam-

ple mean of stationary independent data. Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2014, Appendix B), cf. Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2019, Supplemental Appendix), allow for *almost surely* bounded stationary β -mixing data. Zhang and Wu (2017) extend results in Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2013) to a large class of dependent stationary processes. Stationarity is not suitable here since even under the null we need to allow for global non-stationarity.

Assumption 1.

- a. (geometric mixing): $\{X_t\}$ is α -mixing with coefficients $\alpha_l = O(\exp\{-l^\phi\})$ for some $\phi > 0$.
- b. (subexponential tails): $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} P(|X_t| > c) \leq \varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_1} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}$ for some $\varpi \geq 1$, $\vartheta_1 \geq 2\vartheta_2$ and $\vartheta_2 \geq 1$, and some sequence of constants $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_T \geq 1$.
- c. (nondegeneracy): $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} E[\mathcal{Z}_T^2(h, k)] > 0 \forall (h, k)$.

Remark 1. A version of (a)-(c) are imposed in Chang, Chen, and Wu (2021, Conditions 1-3) for their Theorem 1. Their Condition 1 implies $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} E[\exp\{|X_t|^\vartheta \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta}\}] \leq 2$ for some $\vartheta \geq 1$ and $\mathcal{B}_T \geq 1$, hence from Markov’s inequality

$$\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} P(|X_t| > c) \leq 2 \exp\{-c^\vartheta \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta}\}. \tag{9}$$

(b) generalizes their Condition 1 to ensure r -tuples $\max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_r \leq T} P(|X_{t_1} \cdots X_{t_r}| > c) \leq r\varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}$, cf. Lemma A.1 in the appendix. This is required for higher order asymptotics for the bootstrapped p-value. The specific $\varpi = 2$ in Chang, Chen, and Wu (2021) is cosmetic and assured here by (a) and Lemma A.1.

Remark 2. If X_t is (locally) sub-Gaussian then $\mathcal{B}_T = O(1)$ and $\vartheta_1 = 2$, and under sub-exponentiality $\mathcal{B}_T = O(1)$ and $\vartheta_1 = 1$.⁴ Sub-exponentiality is equivalent to the existence of a moment generating function (in a neighborhood of zero), hence the existence of all moments (e.g. Vershynin, 2018, Proposition 2.7.).

Remark 3. As discussed above, the high dimensional limit theory and Gaussian approximation literatures typically assume global stationarity which would be a severe hindrance here. Even in the broad literature there are trade-offs, akin to the implied exponential moment

⁴Recall z is sub-Gaussian when $P(|z| > c) \leq \mathcal{K} \exp\{-\vartheta c^2\}$ for some $\vartheta, \mathcal{K} > 0$, and sub-exponential when $P(|z| > c) \leq \mathcal{K} \exp\{-\vartheta c\}$. *Local* sub-Gaussianity allows for a non-zero mean and imposes an upper bound for only *some* c (Chareka, Chareka, and Kennedy, 2006).

bound in (b). In Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2014, Appendix B), for example, X_t can be stationary β -mixing, provided $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} \max_{0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T} |X_t X_{t-h} - \gamma_h| \leq \mathcal{D}_T$ where $\mathcal{D}_T \rightarrow \infty$ ultimately restricts the maximum lag rate $\mathcal{H}_T \rightarrow \infty$. Zhang and Wu (2017) allow for unbounded functionally dependent and stationary $\{X_t X_{t+h}\}$ as long as $X_t X_{t+h}$ is a measurable function of iid random variables, and a set of technical conditions restricting dependence in high dimension hold (see their Theorem 3.2). Notice Chang, Chen and Wu's (2021) bound \mathcal{B}_T in (9) provides a significant improvement over Chernozhukov, Chetverikov and Katos' (2014) upper bound \mathcal{D}_T since clearly (9) allows for unbounded sequences.

Remark 4. Assumption 1 reveals a trade-off vis-à-vis JWW. We allow for nonlinear processes $\{X_t\}$ with possibly non-iid errors, and possibly global nonstationarity under the null, but X_t must have a moment generating function and exhibit geometric dependence. JWW focus exclusively on linear processes $X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i Z_{t-i}$ with iid Z_t where $E|Z_t|^{4v} < \infty$ for some $v > 1$. They impose $\psi_i = O(1/[i(\ln i)^{1+\kappa}])$ for some $\kappa > 0$ and strict stationarity under the null which yields $\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} |\gamma_h| < \infty$ since $\gamma_h = o(1/h)$. Thus JWW allow for hyperbolic and geometric memory decay and the possible nonexistence of higher moments.

Recall ϕ appears in the mixing rate $\alpha_l = O(\exp\{-l^\phi\})$, cf. Assumption 1.a.

Lemma 3.1. *Under Assumption 1, $\rho_T \leq T^{-1/9} \{\mathcal{B}_T^{2/3} [\ln(\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T)]^{(1+2\phi)/(3\phi)} + \mathcal{B}_T [\ln \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T]^{7/6}\} \rightarrow 0$, for any sequences $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $0 \leq \mathcal{H}_T \leq T - 1$, $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and*

$$\mathcal{B}_T = o\left(T^{1/6} / \{\ln(T)\}^{(1+2\phi)/(2\phi)}\right). \quad (10)$$

In this case $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k)| \xrightarrow{d} \max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{Z}(h, k)|$ where $\mathbf{Z}(h, k) \sim N(0, \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k))$ and $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k) < \infty$.

Remark 5. In a time series setting $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$ must hold to ensure consistency of sample autocovariances (and therefore consistency of the proposed test). We require $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ to ensure the mean summation $\mathcal{S}_T^{(k)}(h) \equiv 1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)$ is negligible in the proof of Theorem 3.3 below. Simply note that under H_0 , $|\mathcal{S}_T^{(k)}(h)| \leq \gamma_h |1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)| \leq \gamma_h(k+1)/\sqrt{T}$ (Jin, Wang, and Wang, 2015, Lemma 3.a). Thus $\max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{S}_T^{(k)}| \leq \gamma_h(\mathcal{K}_T + 1)/\sqrt{T} \rightarrow 0$ when $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$. Together with (10) this yields the Kolmogorov distance $\rho_T \rightarrow 0$. Theory developed in Chang, Chen, and Wu (2021, Theorem 1), however, allows for a significantly greater (exponential) upper bound on the product $\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T$ for general high dimensional means with dimension $\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T$.

Remark 6. The result reveals a memory/heterogeneity trade-off: as $\phi \searrow 0$ such that geometric mixing memory deepens, the maximum allowed rate $\mathcal{B}_T \rightarrow \infty$ is slower.

The following corollary focuses on the case $\mathcal{B}_T = O(1)$ which automatically satisfies (10) e.g. when X_t is sub-exponential.

Corollary 3.2. *Let Assumption 1 hold with $\mathcal{B}_T = O(1)$. Then $\rho_T \rightarrow 0$ for any sequences $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$.*

Define

$$\sigma^2(h, k) \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k).$$

Under H_0 and Assumption 1 $\sigma^2(h, k) \in (0, \infty)$. We now have a limit theory for the max-correlation difference.

Theorem 3.3. *Let H_0 and Assumption 1 hold, and let $\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\{\mathbf{Z}(h, k) : h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ be a zero mean Gaussian process with $\mathbf{Z}(h, k) \sim N(0, \sigma^2(h, k))$. Then it holds that $\mathcal{M}_T \xrightarrow{d} \gamma_0^{-1} \max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathbf{Z}(h, k)|$ for any $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and (10).*

Remark 7. Consider the weighed/penalized version $\mathcal{M}_T^{(w,p)}$ in (5), and assume the weights satisfy $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} > 0$ a.s., and $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} - \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)}| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ where non-stochastic $\mathcal{W}_h^{(k)}$ satisfy $\inf_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)} > 0$. Assume the penalty functions (p_v, q_v) are positive, monotonically increasing and bounded on compact sets. Then from arguments used to prove Theorem 3.3 it follows for any $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and (10):

$$\mathcal{M}_T^{(w,p)} \xrightarrow{d} \gamma_0^{-1} \max_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \left[\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+} \left\{ \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)} |\mathbf{Z}(h, k)| - p_h \right\} - q_k \right]$$

Now suppose we standardize with $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} = 1/\hat{\mathcal{V}}_T(h, k)$ with HAC estimator $\hat{\mathcal{V}}_T^2(h, k)$ in (4), and kernel function $\mathcal{K}(\cdot)$ belonging to class \mathfrak{K} in de Jong and Davidson (2000, Assumption 1), or class $\mathfrak{K}_2 \supset \mathfrak{K}$ in Andrews (1991). de Jong and Davidson (2000) allow for possibly globally nonstationary mixing sequences (or non-mixing satisfying a near epoch dependence property). In their environment with bandwidth $\beta_T = o(T)$ we have $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} > 0$ a.s. and $\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)} = 1/\mathcal{V}(h, k)$ where $\mathcal{V}^2(h, k) = \gamma_0^{-1} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k)$. Uniformity $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathcal{W}_{T,h}^{(k)} - \mathcal{W}_h^{(k)}| \xrightarrow{p} 0$ can be proved using theory developed in Section 4, omitted here for space considerations.

3.1 Max-Correlation Difference Limit under H_1

The correlation difference can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{T}(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h) &= \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]) \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\hat{\gamma}_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t).\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

Under either hypothesis $1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]) \mathcal{W}_k(t)$ is asymptotically normal. For the sample variance, we similarly have under either hypothesis and Assumption 1:

$$\sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\gamma}_0 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t^2] \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_t^2 - E[X_t^2]) = O_p(1).$$

Hence, $\hat{\gamma}_0 = g_0 + O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$ assuming existence of

$$g_0 \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t^2].$$

See below for derivations of g_0 under local and global alternatives.

In order to handle $1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)$ in (11), we need a representation of a non-stationary covariance for fixed and local alternatives. Consider a sequence of local alternatives with \sqrt{T} -drift,

$$H_1^L : E[X_t X_{t+h}] = \gamma_h + c_h(t/T)/\sqrt{T},\tag{12}$$

where γ_h is a constant for each h , $\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+} |\gamma_h| \leq K < \infty$, and $c_h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are integrable functions on $[0, 1]$ uniformly over h : $\sup_h |\int_0^1 c(u) du| < \infty$. In order to ensure a sensible variance $E[X_t^2]$ for all t , assume $\gamma_0 > 0$ and $c_0(u) \geq 0$ *almost everywhere*. The use of $c_h(u)$ allows for a natural extension of time domain functions to $[0, 1]$, expediting asymptotic theory. See, e.g., [Dahlhaus \(1997, 2009\)](#) for locally stationary processes. Notice $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} |T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0(t/T)| = |\int_0^1 c_0(u) du| < \infty$ yields:

$$g_0 \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t^2] = \gamma_0 + \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0(t/T) = \gamma_0.$$

Since discrete Walsh functions satisfy $|\sum_{t=1}^T \mathcal{W}_k(t)| \leq k + 1$ ([Jin, Wang, and Wang, 2015](#),

Lemma 3), and $\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+} |\gamma_h| \leq K$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ by supposition, it follows $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)| = o(1)$. Hence under H_1^L :

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) &= \gamma_h \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} c_h(t/T) \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &= o(1) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} c_h(t/T) \mathcal{W}_k(t) \rightarrow \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where here and below $o(1)$, and all subsequent $O_p(\cdot)$ and $o_p(\cdot)$ terms, do not depend on (h, k) .

Asymptotics in our mixing setting rest on uniform limit theory over (h, k) , which here needs to extend to the limit in (13). We therefore enhance local alternative (12) by assuming $c_h(t/T)$ satisfies for any $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$:

$$\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} c_h(t/T) \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Then from (13) $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du| \rightarrow 0$.

Now define:

$$\mathcal{C}(h, k) = (-1)^{k-1} \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du, \quad (14)$$

and use arguments in the proof of Theorem 3.3 to yield under H_1^L :

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) &= \frac{1}{g_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]) \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{g_0} \left((-1)^{k-1} \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du + o(1) \right) + O_p(1/\sqrt{T}), \end{aligned}$$

hence by Lemma 3.1, for any $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and (10):

$$\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) \right| \xrightarrow{d} \frac{1}{g_0} \max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathcal{Z}(h, k) + \mathcal{C}(h, k)| \quad (15)$$

The max-correlation difference statistic therefore has non-negligible power under a sequence of \sqrt{T} -local alternatives as long as the covariance functions $c_h(\cdot)$ satisfy $\int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \neq 0$ for some lag $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and systematic sample $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Notice under H_0 clearly $g_0 = \gamma_0$, and $c_h(u) = 0 \forall u, h$ so that $\mathcal{C}(h, k) = 0 \forall h, k$, yielding Theorem 3.3.

As a global generalization of H_1^L , we may write H_1 as

$$H_1 : E[X_t X_{t+h}] = \gamma_h + c_h(t/T). \quad (16)$$

In this case $g_0 \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t^2]$ is identically:

$$g_0 = \gamma_0 + \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T c_0(t/T) = \gamma_0 + \int_0^1 c_0(u) du > 0.$$

Repeating the above derivations, we find similar to (13),

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) = \gamma_h \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) + \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} c_h(t/T) \mathcal{W}_k(t) = \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du + o(1).$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) &= \frac{1}{g_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]) \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{g_0} (-1)^{k-1} \sqrt{T} \left(\int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du + o(1) \right) + O_p(1/\sqrt{T}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h)| \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ again as long as $c_h(\cdot)$ satisfy

$$\int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \neq 0 \text{ for some } h \in \mathbb{N}_+ \text{ and } k \in \mathbb{N}. \quad (17)$$

In this case there is no restriction on the number of systematic samples $\mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \infty$.

The next result summarizes the preceding discussion.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Assumption 1 hold, and let $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ satisfy $0 \leq \mathcal{H}_T \leq T - 1$, $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{H}_T \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \infty$ and (10).*

a. *Under H_1^L if $\int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \neq 0$ for some $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then (15) holds for non-zero $\mathcal{C}(h, k)$ in (14), and any sequence $\{\mathcal{K}_T\}$ with $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$.*

b. *Under H_1 if $\int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \neq 0$ for some $h \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ then $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h)| \xrightarrow{p} \infty$ for any $\{\mathcal{K}_T\}$.*

In the following example we study a simple break in variance in order to show how the max-test behaves asymptotically.

Example 3.5 (Structural Break in Variance). Assume covariances do not depend on time: $E[X_t X_{t-h}] = \gamma_h$ for every $h \geq 1$, but there is a structural break in variance at mid-sample (for simplicity of discussion), cf. Perron (2006):

$$E[X_t^2] = g_{1,T} \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, [T/2] \text{ and } E[X_t^2] = g_{2,T} \text{ for } t = [T/2] + 1, \dots, T$$

for some strictly positive finite sequences $\{g_{1,T}, g_{2,T}\}$, $g_{1,T} \neq g_{2,T}$. In terms of systematic samples and H_1^L , this translates to

$$c_0(u) = c_{0,1} > 0 \text{ for } u \in [0, 1/2), \text{ and } c_0(u) = c_{0,2} > 0 \text{ for } u \in [1/2, 1],$$

where $c_{0,1} \neq c_{0,2}$. All other $c_h(u) = 0$ on $[0, 1]$, $h \geq 1$. Hence, by construction of the first Walsh function $W_1(u)$, for example:

$$\int_0^1 c_0(u) W_1(u) du = \int_0^{1/2} c_0(u) du - \int_{1/2}^1 c_0(u) du = \frac{c_{0,1} - c_{0,2}}{2} \neq 0.$$

Further:

$$g_0 \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t^2] = \gamma_0 + \int_0^1 c_0(u) du = \gamma_0 + \frac{c_{0,1} + c_{0,2}}{2}.$$

The normalized correlation difference therefore satisfies for $h \geq 1$,

$$\sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) = \frac{1}{g_0} (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]) \mathcal{W}_k(t) + o_p(1).$$

Under H_1 at lag $h = 0$ and $k = 1$ we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_0^{(1)} - \hat{\rho}_0 \right) &= \frac{1}{g_0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T (X_t^2 - E[X_t^2]) \mathcal{W}_1(t) + \sqrt{T} \left(\frac{c_{0,1} - c_{0,2}}{2g_0} \right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \mathcal{Z}_T + \mathcal{C}_T + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

say. In view of asymptotic normality of \mathcal{Z}_T , and $|\mathcal{C}_T| \rightarrow \infty$, the max-correlation difference test is consistent when only the variance $E[X_t^2]$ exhibits a break given $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \sqrt{T} |\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h| \geq \sqrt{T} |\hat{\rho}_0^{(1)} - \hat{\rho}_0| = \sqrt{T} |\mathcal{Z}_T + \mathcal{C}_T| \xrightarrow{p} \infty$.

4 Dependent Wild Bootstrap

We exploit a blockwise wild (multiplier) bootstrap for p-value approximation. The method appears in various places as a multiplier bootstrap extension of block-based bootstrap methods (e.g. [Künch, 1989](#)). [Shao \(2010\)](#) presents a general nonoverlapping dependent wild bootstrap, exploiting a class of kernel smoothing weights that omits the truncated kernel, and uses only "big" blocks of data ("little" block size is effectively zero). [Shao \(2011\)](#) uses the same method exclusively with a truncated kernel for a white noise test for a stationary process that is a measurable function of an iid sequence, cf. [Rosenblatt \(1971\)](#). In both cases a sequence $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$ is decomposed into $[T/b_T]$ blocks of size $1 \leq b_T < T$, $b_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_T = o(T)$.

[Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato \(2019\)](#) exploit a Bernstein-like "big" and "little" block multiplier bootstrap for high dimensional sample means of stationary, dependent and bounded sequences. They apply a wild bootstrap on big blocks and effectively remove the little blocks. [Zhang and Cheng \(2014\)](#) expand that method for stationary processes by using two mutually independent iid sequences, one each for big and small blocks.

We expand ideas in [Shao \(2011\)](#) to non-stationary sequences. The use of only one set of "big" blocks and a truncated kernel eases technical arguments and notation, but a more general use of smoothing kernels and big/little blocks is readily supported by the theory presented here.

Set a block size b_T such that $1 \leq b_T < T$, $b_T/T^\iota \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_T/T^{1-\iota} \rightarrow 0$ for some tiny $\iota > 0$. The number of blocks is $\mathcal{N}_T = [T/b_T]$. Denote the blocks by $\mathfrak{B}_s = \{(s-1)b_T + 1, \dots, sb_T\}$ with $s = 1, \dots, \mathcal{N}_T$, and $\mathfrak{B}_{\mathcal{N}_T+1} = \{\mathcal{N}_T b_T, \dots, T\}$. Generate iid random numbers $\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{\mathcal{N}_T}\}$ with $E[\xi_i] = 0$, $E[\xi_i^2] = 1$, and $E[\xi_i^4] < \infty$. Typically in practice ξ_i is iid $N(0, 1)$, and we make that assumption here to shorten proofs. Define an auxiliary variable $\varphi_t = \xi_s$ if $t \in \mathfrak{B}_s$, and let $\Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k)$ be a (centered) bootstrapped version of $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h = (-1)^{k-1} T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)$:

$$\Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \varphi_t \left\{ X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{T-h} X_s X_{s+h} \mathcal{W}_k(s) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

An asymptotically equivalent technique centers only on $X_t X_{t+h}$, the key stochastic term:

$$\Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \varphi_t \left\{ X_t X_{t+h} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{T-h} X_s X_{s+h} \right\} \mathcal{W}_k(t).$$

The bootstrapped test statistic is then $\mathcal{M}_T^{(dw)} \equiv \hat{\gamma}_0^{-1} \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T} \Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k)|$. Repeat M times. Conditional on the sample $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$, this results in a sequence $\{\mathcal{M}_{T,i}^{(dw)}\}_{i=1}^M$ of iid draws $\mathcal{M}_{T,i}^{(dw)}$ from the limit null distribution of \mathcal{M}_T as $T \rightarrow \infty$ asymptotically with probability approaching one (this is proved below). The approximate p-value is:

$$\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M I\left(\mathcal{M}_{T,i}^{(dw)} \geq \mathcal{M}_T\right).$$

The bootstrap test rejects the null at significance level α when $\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} < \alpha$.

Recall $z_t(h, k)$ in (6) and $\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) \equiv 1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} z_t(h, k)$. Write $\ddot{g}_T(h, k) \equiv 1/(T-h) \sum_{u=1}^{T-h} E[X_u X_{u+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(u)$ and

$$\mathfrak{X}_{T,l}(h, k) \equiv (-1)^k \sum_{t=(l-1)b_T+1}^{lb_T} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \ddot{g}_T(h, k)\},$$

and define pre-asymptotic and asymptotic long run covariance functions $s_T^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k}) \equiv 1/T \sum_{l=1}^{(T-h \vee \tilde{h})/b_T} E[\mathfrak{X}_{T,l}(h, k) \mathfrak{X}_{T,l}(\tilde{h}, \tilde{k})]$ and $s^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k}) \equiv \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} s_T^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k})$.

Assumption 2.

- a. $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)| = O(1)$.
- b. (i) $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} s_T^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k}) > 0 \forall (h, \tilde{h}, k, \tilde{k})$; and (ii) $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |s_T^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k}) - s^2(h, k; \tilde{h}, \tilde{k})| = O(T^{-\iota})$ for some infinitesimal $\iota > 0$.
- c. $b_T/T^\iota \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_T = o(T^{1/2-\iota})$ for some infinitesimal $\iota > 0$.

Remark 8. Asymptotics under the null is grounded on $z_t(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\}$, centered with the weighted autocovariance $E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)$. The bootstrap, however, must hold under either hypothesis, hence we must center with $1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)$ (or $1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h}$), (a) is therefore required for valid asymptotic bootstrap inference under either hypothesis. Under H_0 note $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)| \leq \max_{\mathcal{H}_T} |\gamma_h| (\mathcal{K}_T + 1)/T = o(1/\sqrt{T})$ provided $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ (cf. Jin, Wang, and Wang, 2015, Lemma 3.a). (a) holds generally when globally $\max_{s,t \in \mathbb{N}} |E[X_s X_t]| < \infty$. In the locally stationary setting of Dahlhaus (1997, 2009), for example, cf. Section 3.1 above, we may define a

covariance function $\gamma_h : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. By the definition of the discrete Walsh functions:

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \gamma_h(t-T) \mathcal{W}_k((t-1)/T) \rightarrow \int_0^1 \gamma_h(u) \mathcal{W}_k(u) du \equiv w_{h,k},$$

where $w_{h,k}$ is the k^{th} Walsh coefficient at lag h . The assumption, therefore, reduces to $\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} |w_{h,k}| < \infty$. This generally rules out globally trending variance or covariances $|\gamma_h(u)| \nearrow \infty$ as $u \rightarrow 1$, although it allows for *bounded global trend* provided $\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\gamma_h(u)| < \infty$.

Remark 9. A second sacrifice in general is the reduced lag upper bound $\mathcal{H}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ required for Theorem 4.1 below since we generally lose $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) = o(1/\sqrt{T})$ if the null is false.

Remark 10. (b.i) is the fourth order block bootstrap version of Assumption 1.c, used to ensure a high dimensional central limit theory extends to a long run bootstrap variance, cf. Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2013, Lemma 3.1). (b.ii) seems unavoidable, and is required to link covariance functions for a high dimensional bootstrap theory, cf. Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, (2013, Lemma 3.1) and Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2015, Theorem 2, Proposition 1). The property is trivial under stationary geometric mixing, and otherwise restricts the degree of allowed heterogeneity.

Remark 11. (c) simplifies a bootstrap weak convergence proof, but can be weakened at the cost of added notation, e.g. $b_T/(\ln(T))^a \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_T = o(T^{1/2}/(\ln(T))^b)$ for some $a, b > 0$.

The blockwise wild bootstrap is valid asymptotically

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 1-2 hold, let $\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T \rightarrow \infty$, and let the number of bootstrap samples $M = M_T \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. Let $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T\}$ satisfy $0 \leq \mathcal{H}_T \leq T - 1$, $\mathcal{H}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and (10). Under H_0 , $P(\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} < \alpha) \rightarrow \alpha$ for any sequence $\{\mathcal{K}_T\}$ satisfying $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$. Under H_1 in (16) and (17), $P(\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} < \alpha) \rightarrow 1$ for any $\{\mathcal{K}_T\}$.*

Remark 12. A core supporting weak limit theory requires $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ in view of the total impact of $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$ on asymptotics. See Lemma A.2 in the appendix.

5 Monte Carlo Study

We now study the proposed bootstrap test in a controlled environment. We generate 1000 independently drawn samples from various models, with sample sizes $T \in \{64, 128, 256, 512\}$. The models under the null and alternative hypotheses are detailed below.

5.1 Empirical Size

We use four models of covariance stationary processes: MA(1), AR(1), and Self Exciting Threshold AR(1) [SETAR], in each case with iid or GARCH innovations; and GARCH (1,1) with iid errors.

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 \text{null-1} & \text{MA(1)} & X_t = \epsilon_t \\
 \text{null-2} & \text{AR(1)} & X_t = .5X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \\
 \text{null-3} & \text{SETAR} & X_t = .7X_{t-1} - 1.4X_{t-1}I(X_{t-1} > 0) + \epsilon_t, \\
 \text{null-4} & \text{GARCH(1,1)} & X_t = \sigma_t z_t, z_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1), \sigma_t^2 = 1 + .3\epsilon_{t-1}^2 + .6\sigma_{t-1}^2
 \end{array}$$

Models #1-#3 have an iid error ϵ_t distributed $N(0, 1)$ or Student's- t with 5 degrees of freedom (t_5); or ϵ_t is stationary GARCH(1,1) $\epsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t, z_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1), \sigma_t^2 = 1 + .3\epsilon_{t-1}^2 + .6\sigma_{t-1}^2$, with iteration $\sigma_1^2 = 1$ and $\sigma_t^2 = 1 + .3\epsilon_{t-1}^2 + .6\sigma_{t-1}^2$ for $t = 2, \dots, T$. The SETAR model switches between AR(1) regimes with correlations .7 and $-.7$. GARCH and SETAR models, and any model with GARCH errors, do not have a linear form $X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i Z_{t-i}$, with iid Z_t and non-random ψ_i , and therefore do not satisfy conditions in JWW and elsewhere. We simulate $2T$ observations for each model and retain the latter T observations for analysis.

5.2 Empirical Power

We study empirical power by using models similar to those used in [Paparoditis \(2010b\)](#); [Dette, Preuß, and Vetter \(2011\)](#), [Preuß, Vetter, and Dette \(2013\)](#) and JWW, with the addition of allowing for non-iid errors and non-stationarity in variance. The models are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{lll}
 \text{alt-1} & \text{(NI)} & X_t = 1.1 \cos\{1.5 - \cos(4\pi t/T)\}\epsilon_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \\
 \text{alt-2} & \text{(NVIII)} & X_t = .8 \cos\{1.5 - \cos(4\pi t/T)\}\epsilon_{t-6} + \epsilon_t \\
 \text{alt-3} & \text{(NII)} & X_t = .6 \times \sin(4\pi t/T)X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \\
 \text{alt-4} & \text{(NIII)} & X_t = \begin{cases} .5X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t & \text{for } \{1 \leq t \leq T/4\} \cup \{3T/4 < t \leq T\} \\ -.5X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t & \text{for } T/4 < t \leq 3T/4 \end{cases}
 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{alt-5 (NVI)} \quad X_t &= \begin{cases} .5X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t & \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq T/2 \\ -.5X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t & \text{for } T/2 < t \leq T \end{cases} \\
\text{alt-6 (eq. (16))} \quad X_t &= 2\epsilon_t - \{1 + .5 \cos(2\pi t/T)\} \epsilon_{t-1} \\
\text{alt-7 (NV)} \quad X_t &= -.9\sqrt{(t/T)}X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t \\
\text{alt-8} \quad X_t &= .5X_{t-1} + v_t: \begin{cases} v_t = \epsilon_t & \text{for } 1 \leq t \leq 3T/4 \\ v_t = 2\epsilon_t & \text{for } 3T/4 < t \leq T \end{cases} \\
\text{alt-9} \quad X_t &= .8 \cos\{1.5 - \cos(4\pi t/T)\} \epsilon_{t-25} + \epsilon_t
\end{aligned}$$

Models 1-7 are used in JWW: we display parenthetically their corresponding model/equation number. Models 1, 2, 4 are considered in [Paparoditis \(2010b\)](#); [Dette, Preuß, and Vetter \(2011\)](#) use models 1, 2, 4, and 6; and [Preuß, Vetter, and Dette \(2013\)](#) study 2, 5, and 7. Alt-8 presents a structural change in variance only, and alt-9 is a distant version of alt-2 and therefore more difficult to detect. As above, we use either iid standard normal, iid t_5 , or GARCH(1,1) ϵ_t .

5.3 Tests

Max-Test We perform the bootstrapped max-correlation difference test with \mathcal{M}_T and $\mathcal{M}_T^{(p)}$. The latter has penalties $p_h = (h + 1)^{1/4}/2$ and $q_k = k^{1/4}/2$. More severe penalties, e.g. $q_k = k^{1/2}/2$, do not improve test performance. A weighted version of the test with HAC estimator (4) leads to competitive size but generally lower power, hence we focus only on \mathcal{M}_T and $\mathcal{M}_T^{(p)}$.

We use 500 bootstrap samples with multiplier iid variable $\xi_t \sim N(0, 1)$. Theorem 4.1 requires a block size bound $b_T = o(T^{1/2-\iota})$ for some tiny $\iota > 0$, hence we use $b_T = \lceil T^{1/2-\eta} \rceil$ where $\eta = 10^{-10}$. Similar block sizes, e.g. $b_T = \lceil bT^{1/2-\eta} \rceil$ with $b \in [.5, 2]$ lead to similar results.⁵

Theorem 4.1 also requires $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T) = o(\sqrt{T})$. We used two pairings of sequences $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$. The first $\mathcal{H}_T = \lceil \log_2(T)^{.99} - 3 \rceil$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = \lceil T^{1/3} \rceil$ is used in JWW. The second $\mathcal{H}_T = \lceil 2T^{.49} \rceil$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = \lceil .5T^{.49} \rceil$ satisfies our assumptions but are not valid in JWW. The latter $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$ are generally larger, where \mathcal{H}_T is larger by an order of $\times 7$. This will lead to higher power for large T in theory, but in small samples obviously a larger h results in fewer observations for computation, and therefore a loss in sharpness in probability. Refer to Table 1.

⁵[Shao \(2011\)](#) uses $b_T = \lceil bT^{1/2} \rceil$ with $b \in \{.5, 1, 2\}$, leading to qualitatively similar results. [Hill and Motegi \(2020\)](#) also use $b = 1$, but find qualitatively similar results for values $b \in \{.5, 1, 2\}$.

Table 1: $\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T$ Combinations

	Case 1 (JWW)		Case 2	
T	\mathcal{H}_T	\mathcal{K}_T	\mathcal{H}_T	\mathcal{K}_T
	$\log_2(T)^{.99} - 3$	$T^{1/3}$	$2T^{.49}$	$.5T^{.49}$
64	2	4	14	3
128	3	5	20	5
256	4	6	30	7
512	5	8	42	10

JWW Test Write $\hat{\gamma}_h \equiv [\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_h]'$, $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} \equiv [\hat{\gamma}_1^{(k)}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)}]'$. The test statistic is:

$$\hat{D}_T \equiv \max_{1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T} \left[\max_{1 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T} \left\{ T \left(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h \right)' \left(\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(k)} \right)^{-1} \left(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h \right) - 2h \right\} - \sqrt{k-1} \right],$$

where $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(k)}$ is an estimator of the $h \times h$ asymptotic covariance matrix of $\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h)$. See [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, Sections 2.3-2.5\)](#) for details on computing $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(k)}$ (under the assumption of linearity $X_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \psi_i Z_{t-i}$ with an iid Z_t).⁶ We use the same tuning parameters that JWW use for covariance matrix estimation.⁷ The same $\{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$ as above are used.

We perform the test both based on a simulated critical values (denoted \hat{D}_T^{cv}) and bootstrapped p-values (\hat{D}_T^{dw}) in order to make a direct comparison with the method developed here. We simulate critical values for each pair $(\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T)$ by running a separate simulation with 200,000 independently drawn samples of size T of iid $N(0, 1)$ distributed random variables X_t , and use the true excess kurtosis value 0 in the covariance estimator. The bootstrap is performed by replacing $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h$ in \hat{D}_T with $\Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k)$ from (18). We do not prove asymptotic validity of the bootstrapped p-value, but once uniform consistency of $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(k)}$ is established, it follows identically from arguments given in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Indeed, the bootstrap is valid for linear and nonlinear processes with iid or non-iid innovations, covering the SETAR and GARCH processes used here, and covering the nonstationary processes under H_1 . The simulated critical values, however, are suitable in theory only for linear processes with iid in-

⁶There is a typo in [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, Theorem 2\)](#) concerning their covariance matrix and therefore its estimator. A parameter κ_4 , referred to as the kurtosis of the iid Z_t , is in fact the excess kurtosis (*kurtosis* -3). See Proposition 7.3.1 in [Brockwell and Davis \(1991\)](#), in particular eq. (7.3.5), cf. [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, p. 915\)](#).

⁷The bandwidth parameter λ in $[T^\lambda]$, the number of sample covariances that enter the asymptote covariance matrix estimator, is set to $\lambda = .4$ based on a private communication with the authors. Second, in order to compute the (excess) kurtosis of iid Z_t under linearity, similar to [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, eq. \(15\)\)](#) we use an estimator in [Kreiss and Paparoditis \(2015\)](#), with two bandwidths $b_j = c_j T^{-1/3}$ where $c_j = 1.25 \times \text{crude scale estimate}$ (see [Jin, Wang, and Wang, 2015, p. 903](#)). A private communication with one coauthor states the scale estimate used was $\hat{\gamma}(0)$, hence $c_j = 1.25 \times \hat{\gamma}(0)$.

novations since they rely on the specific form of $\hat{\Gamma}_h^{(k)}$ used here, and a pivotal Gaussian null limit distribution, cf. [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015, Sections 2.3-2.5\)](#).

5.4 Results

Tables [3-6](#) present rejection frequencies at (1%, 5%, 10%) significance levels. Given the amount of output under H_1 we only display results for models with a Gaussian error.

The penalized max-test does not perform better than the non-penalized test, and generally performs worse under the alternative. Indeed, as discussed above, there is no theory driven reason for adding penalties for a max-test. In the sequel we therefore only report and discuss the non-penalized test.

Similarly, the bootstrapped JWW test is generally over-sized, and massively over-sized at small n under $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ Case 1, the only valid case in this study. We suspect the cause is the estimated variance matrix due to its many components and tuning parameters. We therefore only report results based on simulated critical values.

See Appendix E in the supplemental material for all simulation results.

5.4.1 Null

Both tests are comparable for MA and AR models with iid Gaussian or t_5 errors, with fairly accurate empirical size. The max-test has accurate size in many cases, and is otherwise conservative. JWW's test tends to be over-sized in the AR model with GARCH errors under both $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ cases, and is over-sized in the AR model with t_5 errors under Case 2 when $n \leq 128$. Recall \mathcal{H}_T is much larger under Case 2, which will be a hindrance at smaller n for test statistics that simultaneously incorporate a set of autocovariances (e.g. Wald or portmanteau statistics).

In the SETAR case JWW's test is largely over-sized, while the max-test is slightly under-sized with improvement under $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ Case 2. JWW's test is over-sized for small n with the GARCH model, but otherwise works well.

5.4.2 Alternative

In [Table 2](#) we give a simple summary of which test generally dominates for each model and case based on the complete simulation results. In brief, each test dominates for certain models, and in some cases they are comparable. JWW's test generally dominates in models 1, 3, and

Table 2: Test Dominance Summary

$H_1 \setminus \epsilon_t$	$(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ Case 1			$(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{K})$ Case 2		
	$N(0, 1)$	t_5	GARCH	$N(0, 1)$	t_5	GARCH
alt-1	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$
alt-2	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$
alt-3	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$
alt-4	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$
alt-5	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ small n
alt-6	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	similar	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ large n	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ large n	similar
alt-7	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ larger n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ large n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ large n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ large n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ large n	$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ large n
alt-8	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$
alt-9	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$

Each cell dictates which test performed best (in certain cases). For example “ $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ small n ” implies $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T$ dominates for smaller sample sizes, and for other n the two tests are comparable. “ $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ ” implies $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ dominates across sample sizes.

4, and for model 7 for larger sample sizes. This applies across error cases, including GARCH errors.

The max-test dominates in models 2, 6, 8 and 9, with strong domination for model 8 (break and variance), and models 2 and 9 (distant nonstationarity). Indeed, JWW’s test has only negligible power for models 2, 8 and 9: by construction it cannot detect a break in variance (model 8), and seems incapable of detecting a distant (model 9), or even semi-distant (model 2), form of covariance nonstationarity.

Overall, both tests clearly have merit, and seem to complement each other based on the different cases in which they each excel. Both tests could be applied in practice to glean whether covariance stationarity applies. We do exactly that in the supplemental material for international exchange rates: see Appendix D.

6 Conclusion

√We present a max-correlation difference test for testing covariance stationarity in a general setting that allows for nonlinearity and random volatility, and heterogeneity under either hypothesis. Our test exploits local square wavelets derived from Walsh functions as in [Jin, Wang, and Wang \(2015\)](#). We do not require estimation of an asymptotic covariance ma-

trix, our test can detect a break in variance, and we deliver a valid dependent wild bootstrapped p-value. The test statistic is the maximum difference of full and partial sample correlations, allowing for a test of break in variance. In controlled experiments the max-test dominates JWWs in some case, while JWW's dominates in other. The max-test is best capable of delivering sharp empirical size for a nonlinear process and when errors are non-iid.

The max-test is particularly suited for detecting distant (large lag) forms of covariance non-stationarity, and a break in variance. The former corroborates findings in [Hill and Motegi \(2020\)](#), who find a max-correlation white noise test strongly dominates Wald and portman-teau tests when there is a distant non-zero correlation. We conjecture this will carry over to other nonstationary models with distant breaks in covariance, but leave this idea for future consideration.

A Appendix: Proofs

The proof of Lemma 3.1 relies on an extension of Assumption 1.b to $\prod_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}$ for any r -tuple $\{t_1, \dots, t_r\}$, $r \in \mathbb{N}$. This is required here for both couplets $X_t X_{t-h}$ and their cross-products $X_s X_{s-l} X_t X_{t-h}$ for our high dimensional results.

Lemma A.1. *Let $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} P(|X_t| > c) \leq \varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_1} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}$ for some $\varpi > 0$, any $\vartheta_1 \geq 2\vartheta_2$ and $\vartheta_2 \geq 1$, and some sequence of constants $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_T \geq 1$. It holds that*

$$\max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_r \leq T} P\left(\left|\prod_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}\right| > c\right) \leq r\varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. We prove (A.1) by induction. If $r = 1$ then $\max_{1 \leq t \leq T} P(|X_t| > c) \leq \varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_1} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\} \leq \varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}$ by assumption, given $\vartheta_1 > \vartheta_2 \geq 1$. Now let (A.1) hold for some $r \geq 1$: $\max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_r \leq T} P(|\prod_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}| > c) \leq r\varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}$. The proof is complete if we show (A.1) holds for $r + 1$. Young and Bonferroni inequalities yield for any $\vartheta_1 \geq 2\vartheta_2$

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_{r+1} \leq T} P\left(\left|\prod_{i=1}^{r+1} X_{t_i}\right| > c\right) &\leq \max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_{r+1} \leq T} P\left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}\right)^2 + \frac{1}{2} X_{t_{r+1}}^2 > c\right) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq t_1, \dots, t_r \leq T} P\left(\left|\prod_{i=1}^r X_{t_i}\right| > c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) + \max_{1 \leq t \leq T} P\left(|X_t| > c^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &\leq r\varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\} + \varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_1/2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\} \\ &\leq (r + 1)\varpi \exp\{-c^{\vartheta_2} \mathcal{B}_T^{-\vartheta_2}\}. \quad \mathcal{QED}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 3.1. Recall

$$z_t(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\}$$

and $\mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) \equiv 1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} z_t(h, k)$. Let $\{\zeta_t(i), \mathfrak{Z}_T(i)\}_{i=0}^{\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T}$ denote $\{z_t(h, k), \mathcal{Z}_T(h, k)\}_{h=0, k=1}^{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T}$, stacked h -wise over k . For example:

$$\mathfrak{Z}_T(i) = \mathcal{Z}_T(h, k) \text{ with index correspondence } i = (k-1)\mathcal{H}_T + h. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Thus $\mathfrak{Z}_T(1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}_T(\mathcal{H}_T) = \mathcal{Z}_T(1, 1), \dots, \mathcal{Z}_T(\mathcal{H}_T, 1)$; $\mathfrak{Z}_T(\mathcal{H}_T + 1), \dots, \mathfrak{Z}_T(2\mathcal{H}_T) = \mathcal{Z}_T(1, 2), \dots, \mathcal{Z}_T(\mathcal{H}_T, 2)$; and so on. Define $\sigma_T^2(i) \equiv E[\mathfrak{Z}_T^2(i)]$ and let $\{\mathbf{Z}_T(i) : T \in \mathbb{N}\}_{i \geq 0}$ be normally distributed $\mathbf{Z}_T(i) \sim N(0, \sigma_T^2(i))$. It suffice to prove the claim for $\mathfrak{Z}_T(i)$.

Under Assumption 1 with $\mathcal{W}_k(t) \in \{-1, 1\}$ and Lemma A.1, $\zeta_t(i)$ satisfies Conditions 1-3 in Chang, Chen, and Wu (2021). Their Theorem 1 and the mapping theorem therefore imply:

$$\sup_{z \geq 0} \left| P \left(\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathfrak{Z}_T(i)| \leq z \right) - P \left(\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathbf{Z}_T(i)| \leq z \right) \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

provided

$$\frac{1}{T^{1/9}} \left[\mathcal{B}_T^{2/3} \{\ln(\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T)\}^{(1+2\phi)/(3\phi)} + \mathcal{B}_T (\ln \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T)^{7/6} \right] = o(1) \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$(\ln(\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T))^{3-\phi} = o(T^{3\phi}), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where \mathcal{B}_T is the Assumption 1 exponential scale, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_T \geq 1$, and $\phi > 0$ the mixing coefficient.⁸ We need $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$ for autocovariance consistency, and $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ by Remark 5, Then (A.5) is trivial, and (A.4) becomes $1/T^{1/9} [\mathcal{B}_T^{2/3} \{\ln(T)\}^{(1+2\phi)/(3\phi)} + \mathcal{B}_T (\ln T)^{7/6}] \rightarrow 0$. It is easy to show that the first term dominates $\forall \phi > 0$, which reduces to $\mathcal{B}_T = o(T^{1/6}/\{\ln(T)\}^{(1+2\phi)/(2\phi)})$.

Finally, (A.3) implies $\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathfrak{Z}_T(i)| \xrightarrow{d} \max_{i \in \mathbb{N}_+} |\mathbf{Z}(i)|$ where $\mathbf{Z}(i) \sim N(0, \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(i))$ with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(i) < \infty$ shown below. Just note that convergence in distribution follows by construction of $\mathbf{Z}(i)$: $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P(\max_{0 \leq i \leq \mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathfrak{Z}_T(i)| \leq z) = P(\max_{i \in \mathbb{N}_+} |\mathbf{Z}(i)| \leq z) \forall z \geq 0$.

It remains to prove $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(i) < \infty$. Under Assumption 1.a and by measurability, $\{X_t X_{t-h}\}$ is for each h α -mixing with coefficients $\alpha_l = O(\exp\{-l^\phi\})$ for some $\phi > 0$. Then $\{X_t, X_{t-h}\}$ forms an \mathcal{L}_2 -mixingale with coefficients $\hat{\alpha}_l = \alpha_l^{1/2-2/r}$ and constants $K \|X_t, X_{t-h}\|_2$ by Lemma 2.1 in McLeish (1975), hence $\hat{\alpha}_l = O(\exp\{-l^{\hat{\gamma}}\})$ for some $\hat{\gamma} > 0$. Therefore for each

⁸Technically (A.4) and (A.5) require $\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T + 1$ instead of $\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T$ in view of the length of the sequence $\{\mathfrak{Z}_T(i)\}_{i=0}^{\mathcal{H}_T \mathcal{K}_T}$. Asymptotically, however, the modification is irrelevant.

i , by Theorem 1.6 in [McLeish \(1975\)](#):

$$\sigma_T^2(i) = O(1). \quad \mathcal{QED}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proof of Theorem 3.3. In view of $\sigma_T^2(i) = O(1)$ it follows $\hat{\gamma}_0 - \gamma_0 = O_p(1/\sqrt{T})$. by Chebyshev's inequality.

Moreover, by construction:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} \\ &= \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Under covariance stationarity and H_0 , $|E[X_t X_{t+h}]| < E[X_t^2] < \infty$ for all h and t under H_0 , Lemma 3.a in JWW yields for all $\{h, k\}$ and some finite $C > 0$:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (-1)^{k-1} E[X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)] = \gamma_h \times (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \leq Ck/\sqrt{T}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Hence:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_0 + O_p(1/\sqrt{T})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} \\ & \quad + (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{\gamma_0 + O_p(1/\sqrt{T})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) \\ &= \frac{1}{\gamma_0 + O_p(1/\sqrt{T})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} + O_p(k/\sqrt{T}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where the $O_p(\cdot)$ terms do not depend on h . Now exploit $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ to yield:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \left(\hat{\rho}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\rho}_h \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \frac{1}{\gamma_0 + O_p(1/\sqrt{T})} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} \right| = o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

The claim now follows from Lemma 3.1. \mathcal{QED} .

We require a weak convergence result for the bootstrapped correlation difference in order to prove Theorem 4.1. Let \Rightarrow^p denote weak convergence in probability on l_∞ (the space of bounded functions) as defined in Giné and Zinn (1990, Section 3). Recall $\{\mathcal{B}_T\}$ is the Assumption 1 exponential moment scale, $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{B}_T \geq 1$; the bootstrap index blocks are $\mathfrak{B}_s = \{(s-1)b_T + 1, \dots, sb_T\}$, $s = 1, \dots, T/b_T$, with block size b_T , $1 \leq b_T < T$, $b_T \rightarrow \infty$ and $b_T/T^{1-\iota} \rightarrow 0$ for some small $\iota > 0$; ξ_s are iid $N(0, 1)$; and $\varphi_t = \xi_s$ if $t \in \mathfrak{B}_s$. Recall

$$\Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \varphi_t \left\{ X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right\},$$

and define

$$\mathring{\sigma}_T^2(h, k) \equiv E \left[\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \varphi_t \left\{ X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^{T-h} E[X_s X_{s+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(s) \right\} \right)^2 \right].$$

Recall $\sigma_T^2(h, k) \equiv E[(1/\sqrt{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} z_t(h, k))^2]$ with $z_t(h, k) \equiv (-1)^{k-1} \{X_t X_{t+h} - E[X_t X_{t+h}]\} \mathcal{W}_k(t)$. Bound (A.6) trivially yields $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k) < \infty$. Let $\iota > 0$ be an infinitesimal number that may be different in different places. See Appendix B of the supplemental material for a proof.

Lemma A.2. *Let Assumptions 1-2 hold.*

a. Let $\{\mathring{\mathbf{Z}}_T(h, k) : 0 \leq h \leq \mathcal{H}_T, 1 \leq k \leq \mathcal{K}_T\}_{T \leq 1}$ be a Gaussian process, $\mathring{\mathbf{Z}}_T(h, k) \sim N(0, \mathring{\sigma}_T^2(h, k))$, independent of the sample $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$. For any sequences $\{\mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$, where $0 \leq \mathcal{H}_T < T - 1$, $\mathcal{H}_T = o(T)$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$ and (A.4) hold:

$$\sup_{c>0} \left| P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \leq c \mid \{X_t\}_{t=1}^T \right) - P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \mathring{\mathbf{Z}}_T(h, k) \right| \leq c \right) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

b. Let $\{\mathring{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k)\}$ be an independent copy of the Lemma 3.1 Gaussian process $\{\mathbf{Z}(k, h) : h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\mathbf{Z}(h, k) \sim N(0, \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k))$, independent of the asymptotic draw $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$. For any sequences $\{b_T, \mathcal{B}_T, \mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T\}$, such that $0 \leq \mathcal{H}_T < T - 1$, $b_T/T^\iota \rightarrow \infty$, $b_T = o(T^{1/2-\iota})$, $\mathcal{H}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$, $\mathcal{K}_T = o(\sqrt{T})$, and (A.4) hold: $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T} \Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k)| \Rightarrow^p \max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} |\mathring{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k)|$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Operate conditionally on the sample $\mathfrak{X}_T \equiv \{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$. Define max-covariance differences $\check{\mathcal{M}}_T \equiv \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h)|$ and $\check{\mathcal{M}}_T^{(dw)} \equiv \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T} \Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k)|$. By construction:

$$\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} \equiv \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M I \left(\mathcal{M}_{T,i}^{(dw)} \geq \mathcal{M}_T \right) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M I \left(\check{\mathcal{M}}_{T,i}^{(dw)} \geq \check{\mathcal{M}}_T \right). \quad (\text{A.11})$$

We therefore need only prove the claim for the bootstrapped p-value based on $\check{\mathcal{M}}_T$ and $\check{\mathcal{M}}_{T,i}^{(dw)}$.

By the Glivenko-Cantelli theorem, as $M \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\hat{p}_{T,M}^{(dw)} \xrightarrow{p} P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta g_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \geq \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} (\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h) \right| \mid \mathfrak{X}_T \right). \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Further, $\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta \hat{g}_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \Rightarrow^p \max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) \right|$ by Lemma A.2, hence

$$\sup_{c > 0} \left| P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta g_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \leq c \mid \mathfrak{X}_T \right) - P \left(\max_{h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}} \left| \check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) \right| \leq c \right) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0, \quad (\text{A.13})$$

where $\{\check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) : h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an independent copy of $\mathbf{Z}(h, k) \sim N(0, \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \sigma_T^2(h, k))$ from Lemma 3.1, independent of the asymptotic draw \mathfrak{X}_∞ . See (Giné and Zinn, 1990, eq. (3.4)).

Now impose H_0 and define $\bar{F}_T^{(0)}(c) \equiv P(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) \right| > c)$. Limit (A.13) implies:

$$P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta \Delta g_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \geq \check{\mathcal{M}}_T \mid \mathfrak{X}_T \right) - P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) \right| \geq \check{\mathcal{M}}_T \right) \xrightarrow{p} 0.$$

$[\check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k)]_{h=0, k=1}^{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T}$ is independent of \mathfrak{X}_T , hence:

$$P \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta \Delta g_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \geq \check{\mathcal{M}}_T \mid \mathfrak{X}_T \right) - \bar{F}_T^{(0)}(\check{\mathcal{M}}_T) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$\bar{F}_T^{(0)}$ is continuous by Gaussianicity, thus Lemma 3.1 and Slutsky's theorem yield:

$$\left| \bar{F}_T^{(0)}(\check{\mathcal{M}}_T) - \bar{F}_T^{(0)} \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \mathbf{Z}(h, k) \right| \right) \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Together, (A.12), (A.14) and (A.15) yield for any sequence of integers $\{M_T\}$, $M_T \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\hat{p}_{T, M_T}^{(dw)} = \bar{F}_T^{(0)} \left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \mathbf{Z}(h, k) \right| \right) + o_p(1). \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Since $\{\check{\mathbf{Z}}(h, k) : h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$ is an independent copy of $\{\mathbf{Z}(h, k) : h \in \mathbb{N}_+, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $\bar{F}_T^{(0)}(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \mathbf{Z}(h, k) \right|)$ is distributed uniform on $[0, 1]$. Hence (A.16) results in $P(\hat{p}_{T, M_T}^{(dw)} < \alpha) = P(\bar{F}_T^{(0)}(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \mathbf{Z}(h, k) \right|) < \alpha) + o(1) = \alpha + o(1) \rightarrow \alpha$ as required.

Next, impose H_1 defined by (16) and (17). Thus

$$\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) \rightarrow \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du \neq 0 \text{ for some } h \text{ and } k. \quad (\text{A.17})$$

By the triangle inequality, Lemma 3.1, $\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h = 1/T \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t)$ and $\check{\mathcal{M}}_T \equiv$

$\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h)|$ we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t) \right| \\ & \leq \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^{T-h} \{X_t X_{t+h} \mathcal{W}_k(t) - E[X_t X_{t+h}] \mathcal{W}_k(t)\} \right| + \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h)| \\ & = O_p(1) + \check{\mathcal{M}}_T. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.1 and (A.17) therefore yield:

$$\check{\mathcal{M}}_T \geq \sqrt{T} \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \int_0^1 c_h(u) W_k(u) du + o(1) \right| + O_p(1) \xrightarrow{p} \infty. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Finally, combine (A.12), (A.13) and (A.18) to deduce $P(\hat{p}_{T, M_T}^{(dw)} < \alpha) \rightarrow 1$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ because:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_{T, M_T}^{(dw)} &= P\left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T} \Delta g_T^{(dw)}(h, k) \right| \geq \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h) \right| \mid \mathfrak{X}_T\right) + o_p(1) \\ &= P\left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} |\mathbf{Z}(h, k)| \geq \max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h) \right|\right) + o_p(1) \\ &= \bar{F}_T^{(0)}\left(\max_{\mathcal{H}_T, \mathcal{K}_T} \left| \sqrt{T}(\hat{\gamma}_h^{(k)} - \hat{\gamma}_h) \right|\right) + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{p} 0. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \mathcal{QED} .

References

- AHMED, N., AND K. R. RAO (1975): *Orthogonal Transformations for Digital Signal Processing*. Springer, New York.
- ANDREWS, D. W. K. (1991): “Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix Estimation,” *Econometrica*, 59, 817–858.
- AUE, A., S. HÖRMANN, L. HORVÁTH, AND M. REIMHERR (2009): “Break Detection in the Covariance Structure of Multivariate Time Series Models,” *Annals of Statistics*, 37, 4046–4087.
- BROCKWELL, P. J., AND R. A. DAVIS (1991): *Time Series: Theory and Methods*. Springer.
- BUSETT, F., AND A. TAYLOR (2003): “Variance Shifts, Structural Breaks, and Stationarity Tests,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 21, 510–531.
- CHANG, J., X. CHEN, AND M. WU (2021): “Central Limit Theorems for High Dimen-

- sional Dependent Data,” Discussion paper, Dept. of Statistics, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.
- CHAREKA, P., O. CHAREKA, AND S. KENNEDY (2006): “Locally Sub-Gaussian Random Variables and the Strong Law of Large Numbers,” *Atlantic Electronic Journal of Mathematics*, 1, 75–81.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., D. CHETVERIKOV, AND K. KATO (2013): “Gaussian Approximations and Multiplier Bootstrap for Maxima of Sums of High-Dimensional Random Vectors,” *Annals of Statistics*, 41, 2786–2819.
- (2014): “Testing Many Moment Inequalities,” Available at arXiv:1312.7614.
- (2015): “Comparison and Anti-Concentration Bounds for Maxima of Gaussian Random Vectors,” *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162, 47–70.
- (2017): “Central Limit Theorems and Bootstrap in High Dimensions,” *Annals of Probability*, 45, 2309–2352.
- (2019): “Inference on Causal and Structural Parameters Using Many Moment Inequalities,” *Review of Economic Studies*, forthcoming.
- DAHLHAUS, R. (1997): “Fitting Time Series Models to Nonstationary Processes,” *Annals of Statistics*, 25, 1–37.
- (2009): “Local Inference for Locally Stationary Time Series Based on the Empirical Spectral Measure,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 151, 101–112.
- DE JONG, R. M., AND DAVIDSON (2000): “Consistency of Kernel Estimators of Heteroscedastic and Autocorrelated Covariance Matrices,” *Econometrica*, 68, 407–423.
- DETTE, H., P. PREUSS, AND M. VETTER (2011): “A Measure of Stationarity in Locally Stationary Processes with Applications to Testing,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 1113–1124.
- ESCANCIANO, J. C., AND I. N. LOBATO (2009): “An Automatic Portmanteau Test for Serial Correlation,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 151, 140–149.
- FRANCQ, C., AND J.-M. ZAKOÏAN (2019): *GARCH Models: Structure, Statistical Inference and Financial Applications*. Wiley, New York, 2nd edn.
- GIANETTO, Q. G., AND H. RAISSI (2015): “Testing Instantaneous Causality in Presence of Nonconstant Unconditional Covariance,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 33, 46–53.
- GINÉ, E., AND J. ZINN (1990): “Bootstrapping General Empirical Measures,” *Annals of Probability*, 18, 851–869.
- GRAY, S. F. (1996): “Modeling the Conditional Distribution of Interest Rates as a Regime-Switching Process,” *Journal of Financial Economics*, 42, 27–62.
- HENDRY, D. F., AND M. MASSMANN (2007): “Co-Breaking: Recent Advances and a Synopsis of the Literature,” *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 25, 33–51.

- HILL, J. B., AND K. MOTEGI (2020): “A Max-Correlation White Noise Test for Weakly Dependent Time Series,” *Econometric Theory*, 36, 907–960.
- INGLOT, T., AND T. LEDWINA (2006): “Towards Data Driven Selection of a Penalty Function for Data Driven Neyman Tests,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 417, 124–133.
- JIN, L., S. WANG, AND H. WANG (2015): “A New Non-Parametric Stationarity Test of Time Series in the Time Domain,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 77, 893–922.
- KREISS, J.-P., AND E. PAPANODITIS (2015): “Bootstrapping Locally Stationary Processes,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 77, 267–290.
- KÜNCH, H. R. (1989): “The Jackknife and the Bootstrap for General Stationary Observations,” *Annals of Statistics*, 17, 1217–1241.
- MCLEISH, D. (1975): “A Maximal Inequality and Dependent Strong Laws,” *Annals of Probability*, 3, 829–839.
- NASON, G. (2013): “A Test for Second-Order Stationarity and Approximate Confidence Intervals for Localized Autocovariances for Locally Stationary Time Series,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 75, 879–904.
- NASON, G., R. VON SACHS, AND G. KROISANDT (200): “Wavelet Processes and Adaptive Estimation of the Evolutionary Wavelet Spectrum,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 62, 271–292.
- NEUMANN, M. H., AND R. VON SACHS (1997): “Wavelet Thresholding in Anisotropic Function Classes and Application to Adaptive Estimation of Evolutionary Spectra,” *Annals of Statistics*, 25, 38–76.
- PAPANODITIS, E. (2010a): “Validating Stationarity Assumptions in Time Series Analysis by Rolling Local Periodograms,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 839–851.
- (2010b): “Validating Stationarity Assumptions in Time Series Analysis by Rolling Local Periodograms,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 839–851.
- PERRON, P. (2006): “Dealing with Structural Breaks,” in *Palgrave Handbook of Econometrics, Vol. 1: Econometric Theory*, ed. by K. Patterson, and T. C. Mills, vol. 1, pp. 278–352. Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, U.K.
- PREUSS, P., M. VETTER, AND H. DETTE (2013): “A Test for Stationarity Based on Empirical Processes,” *Bernoulli*, 19, 2715–2749.
- PRIESTLEY, M. B., AND T. SUBBA RAO (1969): “A Test for Non-Stationarity of a Time Series,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 31, 140–149.
- ROSENBLATT, M. (1956): “A Central Limit Theorem and A Strong Mixing Condition,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the USA*, 42, 43–47.
- (1971): *Markov Processes, Structure and Asymptotic Behavior*. Springer, New York.
- SHAO, X. (2010): “The Dependent Wild Bootstrap,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 218–235.

- (2011): “A Bootstrap-Assisted Spectral Test of White Noise under Unknown Dependence,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 162, 213–224.
- STOFFER, D. S. (1987): “Walsh-fourier Analysis of Discrete-Valued Time Series,” *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 8, 449–467.
- (1991): “Walsh-Fourier Analysis and Its Statistical Applications,” *Journal of the American Statistical Society*, 86, 461–479.
- TERÄSVIRTRA, T. (1994): “Specification, Estimation, and Evaluation of Smooth Transition Autoregressive Models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 89, 208–218.
- VERSHYNIN, R. (2018): *High-Dimensional Probability*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- VON SACHS, R., AND M. H. NEUMANN (2000): “A Wavelet-Based test for Stationarity,” *Journal of Time Series Analysis*, 21, 597–613.
- WALSH, J. L. (1923): “A Closed Set of Orthogonal Functions,” *American Journal of Mathematics*, 45, 5–24.
- ZHANG, D., AND W. B. WU, WU (2017): “Gaussian Approximation for High Dimensional Time Series,” *Annals of Statistics*, 45, 1895–1919.
- ZHANG, X., AND G. CHENG (2014): “Bootstrapping High Dimensional Time Series,” Available at arXiv:1406.1037.

Table 3: Rejection Frequencies under H_0 Case 1: $\mathcal{H}_T = \lceil \log_2(n)^{.99} - 3.5 \rceil$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = \lceil n^{1/3} + .01 \rceil$

	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$							
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$			
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$	
MA(1)	.005, .025, .093	.012, .041, .077	.001, .036, .103	.002, .027, .066				
AR(1)	.006, .043, .106	.066, .105, .162	.006, .052, .130	.064, .109, .159				
SETAR	.006, .026, .053	.052, .102, .159	.004, .025, .064	.050, .124, .173				
GARCH	.004, .038, .099	.014, .045, .096	.002, .056, .158	.004, .030, .091				
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$			
MA(1)	.002, .024, .090	.005, .041, .082	.006, .038, .105	.010, .053, .097				
AR(1)	.006, .036, .103	.045, .093, .146	.005, .052, .132	.035, .076, .140				
SETAR	.004, .034, .069	.034, .099, .178	.004, .032, .078	.024, .100, .177				
GARCH	.002, .031, .093	.005, .040, .098	.004, .046, .120	.017, .051, .087				
	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} t_5$							
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$			
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$	
MA(1)	.001, .032, .085	.003, .027, .069	.004, .039, .095	.002, .020, .062				
AR(1)	.009, .044, .116	.053, .085, .138	.007, .051, .134	.026, .069, .116				
SETAR	.004, .019, .050	.032, .080, .131	.004, .013, .035	.025, .080, .158				
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$			
MA(1)	.001, .028, .087	.000, .025, .062	.002, .035, .073	.004, .034, .074				
AR(1)	.005, .033, .107	.017, .048, .104	.002, .038, .104	.005, .054, .088				
SETAR	.000, .005, .032	.038, .129, .210	.000, .018, .047	.065, .175, .274				
	$\epsilon_t \sim \text{GARCH}$							
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$			
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$	
MA(1)	.001, .030, .088	.014, .045, .096	.002, .042, .119	.014, .045, .096				
AR(1)	.011, .060, .121	.080, .120, .186	.008, .048, .127	.080, .120, .186				
SETAR	.005, .021, .052	.064, .122, .174	.003, .018, .051	.064, .122, .174				
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$			
MA(1)	.001, .020, .097	.005, .040, .098	.001, .045, .114	.017, .051, .087				
AR(1)	.002, .035, .084	.063, .106, .162	.003, .044, .107	.034, .085, .129				
SETAR	.000, .013, .0641	.029, .099, .164	.000, .020, .069	.028, .103, .177				

$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ is the proposed max-test based on a bootstrapped p-value. $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$ is JWW's test based on simulated critical values. The GARCH model only uses iid $N(0, 1)$ innovations.

Table 4: Rejection Frequencies under H_0

Case 2: $\mathcal{H}_T = [2T^{.49}]$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = [.5T^{.49}]$

	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$											
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$							
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$					
MA(1)	.000	.012	.054	.018	.040	.075	.001	.008	.046	.008	.034	.074
AR(1)	.001	.019	.072	.068	.110	.161	.001	.020	.084	.074	.123	.172
SETAR	.001	.017	.037	.040	.089	.152	.001	.027	.050	.051	.124	.171
GARCH	.000	.021	.095	.014	.047	.103	.003	.044	.113	.008	.034	.085
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$							
MA(1)	.000	.011	.049	.008	.045	.088	.004	.027	.061	.013	.047	.109
AR(1)	.002	.015	.057	.048	.100	.154	.002	.027	.085	.033	.079	.149
SETAR	.004	.033	.059	.030	.100	.174	.004	.031	.067	.026	.097	.176
GARCH	.003	.033	.095	.007	.037	.086	.003	.035	.108	.017	.045	.083
	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} t_5$											
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$							
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$					
MA(1)	.000	.013	.050	.005	.030	.078	.001	.021	.059	.006	.026	.064
AR(1)	.002	.020	.066	.056	.091	.150	.000	.027	.081	.034	.077	.124
SETAR	.001	.018	.057	.026	.067	.118	.001	.014	.038	.020	.083	.152
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$							
MA(1)	.000	.017	.060	.003	.028	.064	.002	.021	.080	.006	.033	.070
AR(1)	.003	.014	.049	.018	.048	.093	.003	.027	.087	.007	.049	.090
SETAR	.001	.014	.033	.038	.115	.191	.003	.014	.049	.056	.165	.263
	$\epsilon_t \sim \text{GARCH}$											
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$							
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$					
MA(1)	.000	.019	.071	.014	.047	.103	.002	.031	.096	.008	.034	.085
AR(1)	.003	.025	.077	.082	.130	.190	.001	.022	.085	.073	.123	.170
SETAR	.004	.019	.057	.063	.122	.179	.001	.014	.050	.040	.106	.155
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$							
MA(1)	.002	.021	.076	.007	.037	.086	.004	.038	.110	.017	.045	.083
AR(1)	.001	.019	.064	.064	.114	.164	.000	.034	.109	.033	.077	.123
SETAR	.000	.013	.042	.023	.092	.159	.000	.023	.071	.027	.100	.174

$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ is the proposed max-test based on a bootstrapped p-value. $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$ is JWW's test based on simulated critical values. The GARCH model only uses iid $N(0, 1)$ innovations.

Table 5: Rejection Frequencies under H_1

Case 1: $\mathcal{H}_T = [\log_2(n)^{.99} - 3.5]$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = [n^{1/3} + .01]$

	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$							
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$			
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$		$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$		$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$	
alt-1	.122, .227, .336	.173, .401, .549	.436, .613, .742	.827, .936, .967				
alt-2	.031, .147, .268	.019, .048, .093	.088, .398, .424	.010, .044, .089				
alt-3	.021, .053, .201	.173, .409, .555	.354, .475, .630	.434, .696, .809				
alt-4	.081, .272, .351	.190, .413, .557	.672, .750, .838	.772, .917, .949				
alt-5	.102, .228, .342	.081, .140, .191	.494, .713, .888	.160, .336, .471				
alt-6	.024, .081, .159	.036, .084, .141	.118, .244, .377	.042, .131, .241				
alt-7	.031, .099, .135	.054, .101, .143	.073, .127, .239	.058, .140, .215				
alt-8	.001, .121, .147	.081, .140, .191	.043, .131, .408	.069, .110, .147				
alt-9	.050, .074, .103	.016, .046, .099	.067, .081, .180	.002, .025, .063				
	$n = 256$				$n = 512$			
alt-1	.794, .931, .987	.977, .997, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00				
alt-2	.108, .401, .488	.004, .035, .087	.214, .457, .512	.008, .040, .081				
alt-3	.720, .817, .954	.948, .986, .993	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.988, .999, 1.00				
alt-4	.855, .985, 1.00	.941, .983, .994	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.999, 1.00, 1.00				
alt-5	.864, .988, .998	.915, .977, .987	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00				
alt-6	.259, .320, .533	.069, .207, .296	.681, .810, .904	.153, .357, .469				
alt-7	.112, .341, .444	.164, .375, .530	.421, .695, .818	.715, .878, .939				
alt-8	.162, .217, .467	.044, .097, .148	.585, .918, .996	.070, .189, .318				
alt-9	.162, .218, .360	.009, .032, .088	.285, .466, .620	.009, .050, .103				

$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ is the proposed max-test based on a bootstrapped p-value. $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$ is JWW's test based on simulated critical values. See Appendix E in the supplemental material for results when $\epsilon_t \sim t_5$ or GARCH.

Table 6: Rejection Frequencies under H_1
Case 2: $\mathcal{H}_T = [2T^{.49}]$ and $\mathcal{K}_T = [.5T^{.49}]$

	$\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$																																			
	$n = 64$				$n = 128$																															
	$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$			$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$			$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$			$\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$																										
alt-1	.121, .234, .326	.146, .395, .552	.583, .685, .702	.803, .934, .967	.020, .059, .190	.025, .058, .089	.033, .197, .410	.009, .043, .086	.200, .313, .417	.150, .406, .553	.332, .579, .687	.382, .674, .790	.073, .292, .399	.160, .402, .548	.661, .678, .828	.739, .906, .942	.121, .207, .335	.080, .129, .178	.403, .688, .869	.143, .323, .471	.041, .123, .166	.064, .121, .190	.072, .134, .278	.053, .137, .252	.021, .073, .137	.050, .096, .145	.058, .115, .211	.066, .135, .220	.020, .115, .164	.080, .129, .178	.052, .106, .365	.075, .115, .157	.011, .039, .102	.014, .051, .099	.043, .038, .123	.003, .024, .070
	$n = 256$						$n = 512$																													
alt-1	.815, .932, .987	.972, .998, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.483, .946, .994	.012, .033, .074	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.010, .037, .085	.883, .891, .939	.931, .982, .990	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.984, .999, 1.00	.893, .977, .996	.929, .981, .992	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.997, 1.00, 1.00	.886, .983, .999	.908, .977, .991	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	1.00, 1.00, 1.00	.131, .250, .428	.067, .189, .293	.403, .762, .877	.131, .306, .449	.121, .247, .331	.151, .349, .503	.514, .666, .709	.675, .850, .920	.083, .252, .358	.049, .106, .158	.537, .851, .975	.060, .173, .285	.702, .973, .998	.004, .034, .081	.994, 1.00, 1.00	.009, .048, .101

$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_T$ is the proposed max-test based on a bootstrapped p-value. $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_T^{cv}$ is JWW's test based on simulated critical values. See Appendix E in the supplemental material for results when $\epsilon_t \sim t_5$ or GARCH.