

Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and penalized estimation under non-standard conditions ^{*}

Junichiro Yoshida^{1,2} and Nakahiro Yoshida^{1,2}

¹Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo [†]

²CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency

November 28, 2022

Summary The purpose of this article is to develop a general parametric estimation theory that allows the derivation of the limit distribution of estimators in non-regular models where the true parameter value may lie on the boundary of the parameter space or where even identifiability fails. For that, we propose a more general local approximation of the parameter space (at the true value) than previous studies. This estimation theory is comprehensive in that it can handle penalized estimation as well as quasi-maximum likelihood estimation under such non-regular models. Besides, our results can apply to the so-called non-ergodic statistics, where the Fisher information is random in the limit, including the regular experiment that is locally asymptotically mixed normal. In penalized estimation, depending on the boundary constraint, even the Bridge estimator with $q < 1$ does not necessarily give selection consistency. Therefore, some sufficient condition for selection consistency is described, precisely evaluating the balance between the boundary constraint and the form of the penalty.

Examples handled in the paper are: (i) ML estimation of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution, (ii) quasi-ML estimation of the diffusion parameter in a non-ergodic Itô process whose parameter space consists of positive semi-definite symmetric matrices, while the drift parameter is treated as nuisance and (iii) penalized ML estimation of variance components of random effects in linear mixed models.

Keywords and phrases: Quasi-likelihood; Penalized likelihood; Mixed normal distribution; Boundary; Non-identifiable; Variable selection; Diffusion process; Linear mixed model

1 Introduction

The purpose of this article is to develop a general parametric estimation theory that allows the derivation of the limit distribution of estimators in non-regular models where the true parameter value may lie on the boundary of the parameter space or where even identifiability fails. (Non-identifiable cases are dealt with specifically in the subsequent paper [22].) We generalize the local asymptotic theory, established by Ibragimov and Khas'minskii [9, 10], which uses the convergence of the random field formed by the likelihood ratios.

Let us recall their result briefly. We denote by $\mathcal{E}^\epsilon = \{\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{A}, P_\theta^\epsilon, \theta \in \Theta\}$ a sequence of statistical experiments with $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ for a parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^m$. Let $\varphi(\epsilon)$ be a positive normalizing factor tending to zero as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. For a $\theta^* \in \text{Int}(\Theta)$, define a random field Z_ϵ by

$$Z_\epsilon(u) = \frac{dP_{\theta^* + \varphi(\epsilon)u}^\epsilon}{dP_{\theta^*}^\epsilon}(X^\epsilon) \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^m). \quad (1.1)$$

^{*}2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 62F12; Secondary 62E20.

This work was in part supported by Japan Science and Technology Agency CREST JPMJCR2115; Japan Society for the Promotion of Science Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. 17H01702 (Scientific Research); and by a Cooperative Research Program of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics.

[†]Graduate School of Mathematical Sciences, University of Tokyo: 3-8-1 Komaba, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 153-8914, Japan. e-mail: nakahiro@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

Suppose that Z_ϵ can be extended on a $\hat{C}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ -valued random variable¹ and that the extended Z_ϵ converges to Z in $\hat{C}(\mathbb{R}^m)$, where Z is some $\hat{C}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ -valued random variable. Then we have

$$\hat{u}_\epsilon = \operatorname{argmax}_u Z_\epsilon(u) \xrightarrow{d} \hat{u} = \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in \mathbb{R}^m} Z(u). \quad (1.2)$$

When the experiment \mathcal{E}^ϵ is locally asymptotically normal (LAN), $Z(u)$ takes the form of $Z(u) = \exp(\Delta(\theta^*) - 2^{-1}I(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}])$, where $\Delta(\theta^*) \sim N_m(0, I(\theta^*))$ and $I(\theta^*)$ is the Fisher information matrix, and we obviously obtain $\hat{u} = I(\theta^*)^{-1}\Delta(\theta^*) \sim N_m(0, I(\theta^*)^{-1})$. In this paper, we extend this theory to a more general one that can be applied even when θ^* may lie on the boundary of Θ . Moreover, in our extended theory, Z_ϵ is not necessarily defined as (1.1) and not necessarily asymptotically quadratic. Therefore, as explained below, penalized estimation can be handled as well as quasi-maximum likelihood estimation. Besides, our results can apply to the so-called non-ergodic statistics, where the Fisher information is random in the limit, including the regular experiment that is locally asymptotically mixed normal (LAMN).

When the true parameter value θ^* lies on the boundary of Θ , a cone set locally approximating Θ at θ^* is usually used. This set was introduced by Chernoff [4], and with it, Self and Liang [17] derived the limit distribution of the maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) when θ^* is on the boundary. Also, using a cone set that is a generalization of Chernoff's cone set, Andrews [2] derived the asymptotic distribution of the quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (QMLE) when θ^* is on the boundary. These cone sets are denoted by Λ . However, if the rate of convergence of a given estimator to θ^* is different for each component, then Θ may not be locally approximated by any cone set. In this paper, the asymptotic behavior of the estimator is derived even in such complex cases by generalizing the local approximation method for the parameter space. Instead of Λ , we denote by U the general set locally approximating Θ at θ^* , which is not necessarily a cone. (Examples of U are listed in Section 2.3.) Then our theorem (Theorem 2.1) shows that (1.2) is generalized as

$$\hat{u}_\epsilon = \operatorname{argmax}_u Z_\epsilon(u) \xrightarrow{d} \hat{u} = \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in U} Z(u). \quad (1.3)$$

Besides, it is shown that our approximation method with U is a generalization of the previous ones with Λ such as Chernoff [4] and Andrews [2] (in Section 2.4). As an example of a direct application of Theorem 2.1, the maximum likelihood estimation of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution is treated in Section 2.5.

As the first main application of Theorem 2.1, we derive the limit distribution of the QMLE when identifiability is valid but the true parameter value possibly lies on the boundary (Theorem 3.1). An example is quasi-maximum likelihood estimation of the diffusion parameter in a non-ergodic Itô process whose parameter space consists of semi-positive definite symmetric matrices, while the drift parameter is treated as nuisance. For this example, a nuisance parameter $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is considered along with θ although the effect of τ is explicitly assumed to asymptotically disappear.

As the second application, we also derive the limit distribution of the penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimator (PQMLE) when identifiability is valid but the true parameter value may be on the boundary (Theorem 4.1). One of the most simple penalty terms is the Bridge (Frank and Friedman 1993) expressed as

$$p_\lambda(\theta) = \lambda \sum_{i=1}^p |\theta_i|^q \quad (\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta),$$

where $q > 0$ is a constant, and $\lambda > 0$ is a tuning parameter. For $q \leq 1$, the estimator performs variable selection. Especially, when $q = 1$, the estimator is called the Lasso (Tibshirani [18]). Under regular conditions, the penalized maximum likelihood estimator (PMLE) has been studied before. In the Bridge case, Knight and Fu [6] derived the limit distribution of the PMLE. Zou [24] proposed the adaptive Lasso and showed its oracle property.

For the PQMLE under regular conditions, various results have been recently shown: see e.g. De Gregorio and Iacus [5] and Gaïffas and Matulewicz [7]. Masuda and Shimizu [15] and Kinoshita and Yoshida [14] derived the moment convergence of PQMLE. Both of those studies derived the polynomial type large deviation inequality (PLDI), an inequality given by Yoshida [23] for the moment convergence of the estimator. Also, using the PLDI, Umezu et al. [20] derived an information criterion based on the definition of the AIC.

Under a non-regular condition that the true parameter may be on the boundary, Wong et al. [21] studied the PMLE with the adaptive Lasso and derive its oracle property, assuming that the parameter space Θ can be simply expressed in the form of a direct product. In this paper, under a boundary constraint, the PQMLE with

¹ $\hat{C}(\mathbb{R}^m)$ is the space of continuous functions on \mathbb{R}^m that tends to zero at the infinity

many kinds of penalties including the Bridge and the adaptive Lasso is studied, not assuming that Θ can be decomposed as a direct sum. Then depending on the boundary constraint, even the Bridge estimator with $q < 1$ does not necessarily show selection consistency. Therefore, some sufficient condition for selection consistency is described, precisely evaluating the balance between the boundary constraint and the form of the penalty in Section 4.3. As an example, we discuss the condition for the oracle property in penalized estimation of variance components of random effects in linear mixed models, penalizing only the diagonal elements. Random effect selection in mixed models is an important application of penalized estimation with a boundary constraint, and is an area of extensive research (see Müller et al. [16] for a review). Bondell, Krishna and Ghosh [3] and Ibrahim et al. [11] consider penalized estimation using Cholesky parametrizations, while we treat variance components without re-parametrization.

As the third application, in the subsequent paper [22], we deal with non-identifiable models where the true value of $\theta \in \Theta$ is not necessarily uniquely determined. Then the usual estimators such as the QMLE are difficult to use for the purpose of parameter estimation since their limit cannot be determined uniquely. Therefore, we stabilize the asymptotic behavior by considering a suitable penalty term, and handle the PQMLE. Let us denote by Θ^* the set consisting of the true values of $\theta \in \Theta$. We add to quasi-log likelihood function a penalty term whose minimizer on Θ^* is uniquely determined. Denote the minimizer by $\theta^* \in \Theta^*$. Then the corresponding PQMLE converges to θ^* in probability, and we can derive its limit distribution and selection consistency. This holds even when another unknown parameter $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ which can be a nuisance is considered along with θ .

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2, the general theory for (1.3) is described. The key theorem is stated in Section 2.2. (Its proof is given in Section 5.) An application to the quasi-maximum likelihood estimation is depicted in Section 3. (Some proofs are given in Section 6.) Also, in Section 4, the penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimation is described, and sufficient conditions for selection consistency are given.

2 General theory

2.1 Settings

Denote by $\Xi = \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$ the unknown parameter space, where Θ is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^p , and \mathcal{T} is a measurable subset of \mathbb{R}^q . In this section, we estimate the true value (or one of the true values) θ^* of the unknown parameter $\theta \in \Theta$, while $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$ is treated as a nuisance parameter. Given a probability space (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) specifying the distribution of the data, the statistical inference will be carried out based on a continuous random field $\mathbb{H}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for $T \in \mathbb{T} \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\sup \mathbb{T} = \infty$, where a continuous random field means that for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\mathbb{H}_T(\omega)$ is continuous on Ξ . Examples of \mathbb{H}_T are (quasi-)log likelihood functions and penalized (quasi-)log likelihood functions.

For each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, take an arbitrary \mathcal{T} -valued random variable $\hat{\tau}_T$, and suppose that we can take a Θ -valued random variable $\hat{\theta}_T$ that asymptotically maximizes $\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \hat{\tau}_T)$ on Θ . A common example of $(\hat{\theta}_T, \hat{\tau}_T)$ is the joint maximizer. Under some conditions in the next subsection, we derive the asymptotic behavior of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_T$. Note that those conditions depend neither on $\hat{\tau}_T$ nor on the way $\hat{\theta}_T$ is taken, and that the result shows that the asymptotic behavior of $\hat{\theta}_T$ is the same for different sequences $\hat{\tau}_T$.

2.2 A limit theorem

Define U_T by

$$U_T = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p; \theta^* + a_T u \in \Theta\} \quad (2.1)$$

for a deterministic sequence a_T in $GL(p)$ with $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \|a_T\| \rightarrow 0$, where for any real matrix A , denote by A' the transpose of A , and $\|A\|$ denotes $\{\text{Tr}(AA')\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$. We mimic the local asymptotic theory to define the random field $\mathbb{Z}_T : \Omega \times U_T \times \mathcal{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \exp\left(\mathbb{H}_T(\theta^* + a_T u, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\right) \quad (u \in U_T). \quad (2.2)$$

Let $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ denote the set of all continuous functions defined on \mathbb{R}^p . We give it the metric topology induced by a metric d_∞ defined as

$$d_\infty(f, g) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} \left(1 \wedge \max_{|x| \leq n} |f(x) - g(x)|\right) \quad (f, g \in C(\mathbb{R}^p)).$$

For each $T \in \mathcal{T}$, let \mathbb{V}_T be a $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ -valued random variable. Also, let \mathbb{Z} be a $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ -valued random variable which will be considered as the limit of \mathbb{Z}_T . Let \mathcal{G} be a sub- σ -algebra of \mathcal{F} .

For a topological space S , a sequence of S -valued random variables Y_T ($T \in \mathbb{T}$) and a S -valued random variable Y , we say that Y_T converges stably with limit Y and write as $Y_T \rightarrow^{d_s(\mathcal{G})} Y$ if and only if for any bounded continuous function f defined on S and for any bounded \mathcal{G} -measurable random variable Z ,

$$E[f(Y_T)Z] \rightarrow E[f(Y)Z] \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

Also, for $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$, $\delta > 0$, and $R > 0$, we define A^δ and $A(R)$ as

$$A^\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p; \inf_{a \in A} |x - a| < \delta\} \quad \text{and} \quad A(R) = A \cap \overline{B_R},$$

respectively, where $B_R = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^p; |x| < R\}$ and \overline{B} denotes the closure of B for a subset B . Then we define $U \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ by

$$U = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta. \quad (2.3)$$

It will be shown in Lemma 5.1 that U is closed. We consider the following conditions.

$$[\mathbf{A1}] \quad \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] = 0.$$

[\mathbf{A2}] For every $R > 0$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \mathbb{V}_T(u)| &\xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ \mathbb{V}_T &\xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{in } C(\overline{B_R}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

More precisely, the convergence (2.4) means $\mathbb{V}_T|_{\mathbf{C}} \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \mathbb{Z}|_{\mathbf{C}}$ for $\mathbf{C} = C(\overline{B_R})$.

$$[\mathbf{A3}] \quad U \supset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T}.$$

[\mathbf{A4}] There exists a U -valued random variable \hat{u} such that with probability 1,

$$\mathbb{Z}(\hat{u}) = \sup_U \mathbb{Z}(u)$$

and such that with probability 1, for all $u \in U$ with $u \neq \hat{u}$,

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) < \mathbb{Z}(\hat{u}).$$

[\mathbf{A5}] There exist some $T_0 \in \mathbb{T}$ and a sequence of U -valued random variables $\{\hat{v}_T\}_{T \geq T_0, T \in \mathbb{T}}$ such that with probability 1,

$$\mathbb{V}_T(\hat{v}_T) = \sup_U \mathbb{V}_T(u)$$

and such that $\{\hat{v}_T\}_{T \geq T_0, T \in \mathbb{T}}$ is tight.

Define \hat{u}_T by $\hat{u}_T = a_T^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*)$. The following theorem constitutes the general result underlying Sections 3 and 4 and the subsequent paper [22].

Theorem 2.1. *Under [\mathbf{A1}]-[\mathbf{A4}],*

$$\hat{u}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}. \quad (2.5)$$

Moreover, if [\mathbf{A5}] also holds, then

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1). \quad (2.6)$$

The proof of Theorem 2.1 is given in Section 5.

Remark 2.2. (i) If \mathcal{T} is closed, **[A1]** implies the following condition:

$$[\mathbf{A1}]^b \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\exists \tau \in \mathcal{T} \text{ s.t. } \sup_{U_T, |u| \geq R} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \sup_{U_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \right] = 0.$$

Moreover, **[A1]**^b implies the following condition:

$$[\mathbf{A1}]^{bb} \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[a_T^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*) \geq R \right] = 0.$$

Theorem 2.1 holds even if we substitute **[A1]** with **[A1]**^{bb}. (See the proof.) However, the condition **[A1]**^{bb} depends on $\hat{\tau}_T$ and how $\hat{\theta}_T$ is taken.

(ii) From Measurable Selection Theorem, if **[A1]** holds and there exists a neighborhood \mathcal{N} of θ^* in \mathbb{R}^p such that $\mathcal{N} \cap \Theta$ is closed in \mathbb{R}^p , then we can take $\hat{\theta}_T$ which satisfies the assumption that $\hat{\theta}_T$ asymptotically maximizes $\mathbb{H}_T(\cdot, \hat{\tau}_T)$ on Θ .

(iii) In **[A3]**, the reverse inclusion always holds. In fact,

$$U = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta \subset \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta = \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \left(\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \right)^\delta = \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T}.$$

2.3 Sufficient conditions for **[A3]** and explicit expression for U

Let $F \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be a non-empty closed subset. Let $f : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous map, and let $g_T : F \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a continuous map depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$. We show that if the sets U_T defined by the equation (2.1) can be explicitly expressed using f and g_T satisfying suitable assumptions, then the set U defined by the equation (2.3) can also be explicitly expressed, and furthermore the condition **[A3]** holds. More precisely, we consider the following assumptions. Note that in the following, for $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $v \geq 0$ and $v > 0$ mean that $v_i \geq 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) and $v_i > 0$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), respectively.

[U1] For any $R > 0$, there exists some $T_0 = T_0(R) \in \mathbb{T}$ such that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}$ with $T \geq T_0$,

$$U_T \cap B_R = \{u \in F; f(u) + g_T(u) \geq 0\} \cap B_R.$$

Define \mathcal{K}_+ and \mathcal{K}_c as two partitions of $\{1, \dots, n\}$. Let f^+ , f^c , g_T^+ and g_T^c denote $(f_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}_+}$, $(f_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}_c}$, $(g_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}_+}$ and $(g_k)_{k \in \mathcal{K}_c}$, respectively, where for each $k = 1, \dots, n$, f_k and $g_{k,T}$ denote the k -th component of f and g_T , respectively.

[U2] For any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{u \in F \cap B_R} |g_T(u)| \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

Also, for any $R > 0$, there exists some $T_1 = T_1(R) \in \mathbb{T}$ such that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}$ with $T \geq T_1$,

$$g_T^+(u) \geq 0 \quad (u \in F \cap B_R).$$

[U3]

$$\overline{\{u \in F; f^+(u) \geq 0, f^c(u) > 0\}} \supset \{u \in F; f(u) \geq 0\}.$$

Theorem 2.3. Assume **[U1]**-**[U3]**. Then the condition **[A3]** holds. Moreover,

$$U = \{u \in F; f(u) \geq 0\}.$$

Proof. Assume [U1]-[U3]. For any $R > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
U &= \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta \\
&\supset \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} U_T \cap B_R \\
&= \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} \{f(u) + g_T(u) \geq 0\} \cap B_R \quad (\because [\mathbf{U1}]) \\
&\supset \bigcup_{\substack{\epsilon = (\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \epsilon_0 > 0}} \bigcup_{N=1}^{\infty} \bigcap_{T \geq N} \{f^+(u) \geq 0, f^c(u) - \epsilon \geq 0\} \cap B_R \quad (\because [\mathbf{U2}]) \\
&= \{f^+(u) \geq 0, f^c(u) > 0\} \cap B_R.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $U \supset \{f^+(u) \geq 0, f^c(u) > 0\}$. Since U is closed from Lemma 5.1 and since [U3] holds, we have

$$U \supset \overline{\{f^+(u) \geq 0, f^c(u) > 0\}} \supset \{f(u) \geq 0\}. \quad (2.7)$$

Similarly, for any $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
U \cap B_R &\subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \cap B_R} \\
&\subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \cap B_{2R}} \\
&= \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} \{f(u) + g_T(u) \geq 0\} \cap B_{2R}} \quad (\because [\mathbf{U1}]) \\
&\subset \bigcap_{\substack{\epsilon = (\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_0) \in \mathbb{R}^n \\ \epsilon_0 > 0}} \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} \{f(u) + \epsilon \geq 0\} \cap B_{2R}} \quad (\because [\mathbf{U2}]) \\
&\subset \{f(u) \geq 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$U \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T} \subset \{f(u) \geq 0\}. \quad (2.8)$$

From (2.7) and (2.8), [A3] holds, and $U = \{f(u) \geq 0\}$. \square

Several examples of explicit expressions of U are given below.

Example 2.4. Take Θ as

$$\Theta = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{a}} [0, a_i] \times \prod_{j=1}^{\mathbf{b}} [-b_j, 0] \times \prod_{k=1}^{\mathbf{c}} [-c_k, d_k],$$

where a_i, b_j, c_k, d_k ($i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}, j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{b}, k = 1, \dots, \mathbf{c}$) are all positive numbers. Let $\mathbf{p} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}$, and take $a_T \in GL(\mathbf{p})$ as diagonal matrices with $\|a_T\| \rightarrow 0$. Decompose the true value θ^* of $\theta \in \Theta$ as

$$\theta^* = (\alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_{\mathbf{a}}^*, \beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_{\mathbf{b}}^*, \gamma_1^*, \dots, \gamma_{\mathbf{c}}^*),$$

where $0 \leq \alpha_i^* < a_i, -b_j < \beta_j^* \leq 0, -c_k < \gamma_k^* < d_k$ ($i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}, j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{b}, k = 1, \dots, \mathbf{c}$). Then [A3] holds, and

$$U = \prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{a}} A_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{\mathbf{b}} B_j \times \prod_{k=1}^{\mathbf{c}} \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.9)$$

where for each $i = 1, \dots, \mathbf{a}$ and each $j = 1, \dots, \mathbf{b}$,

$$A_i = \begin{cases} [0, \infty) & (\alpha_i^* = 0) \\ \mathbb{R} & (\alpha_i > 0) \end{cases}, \quad B_j = \begin{cases} (-\infty, 0] & (\beta_j^* = 0) \\ \mathbb{R} & (\beta_j < 0) \end{cases}.$$

In fact, from the definition (2.1) of U_T , for any $R > 0$, there exists some T_0 such that

$$U_T \cap B_R = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\mathbf{a}} A_i \times \prod_{j=1}^{\mathbf{b}} B_j \times \prod_{k=1}^{\mathbf{c}} \mathbb{R} \right) \cap B_R \quad (T \geq T_0).$$

Taking the set on the right-hand side of (2.9) as F and defining the functions f and g_T on F as $f = g_T = 0$, **[U1]**-**[U3]** obviously hold. (In this case, $\mathcal{K}_+ = \{1\}$ and $\mathcal{K}_c = \phi$.) Therefore, from Theorem 2.3, (2.9) holds.

Example 2.5 (The space of positive semi-definite matrices). The parameter space treated in this example appears in Section 3.2. Let m be a positive integer, and take \mathfrak{p} as $\mathfrak{p} = \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$. Denote by \mathcal{S}^m and \mathcal{S}_+^m the set of all m -dimensional real symmetric matrices and the set of all positive-semi-definite matrices included in \mathcal{S}^m , respectively. Define a bijection $\psi : \mathcal{S}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ as for any $A = (A_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} \in \mathcal{S}^m$,

$$\psi(A) = (A_{11}, \dots, A_{1m}, A_{22}, \dots, A_{2m}, \dots, A_{mm}). \quad (2.10)$$

Take $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{p}}$ as

$$\Theta = \psi(\mathcal{A}),$$

where \mathcal{A} is a compact subset of \mathcal{S}_+^m . Take the true value θ^* of $\theta \in \Theta$ as $\theta^* = \psi(A^*)$, where $A^* \in \mathcal{A}$. Assume that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\{A \in \mathcal{A}; \|A - A^*\| < \delta\} = \{A \in \mathcal{S}_+^m; \|A - A^*\| < \delta\}. \quad (2.11)$$

Define $a_T \in GL(\mathfrak{p})$ as $a_T = T^{-\frac{1}{2}}I_{\mathfrak{p}}$. We denote $\text{rank}(A^*)$ by r^* . Then **[A3]** holds, and

$$U = \psi\left(\{w \in \mathcal{S}^m; K'wK \in \mathcal{S}_+^{m-r^*}\}\right), \quad (2.12)$$

where K is a $m \times (m - r^*)$ matrix whose column vectors form a basis for $\text{Ker}(A^*)$. (If $r^* = m$, then consider U as $\psi(\mathcal{S}^m)$.)

We show (2.12) when $r^* < m$. (If $r^* = m$, then $A^* \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{A})$, and (2.12) obviously holds.) Take an arbitrary $R > 0$. From (2.11) and the definition (2.1) of U_T , for sufficiently large $T \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$U_T \cap B_{2R} = \psi\left(\{w \in \mathcal{S}^m; A^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w \in \mathcal{S}_+^m\}\right) \cap B_{2R}.$$

Define W as

$$W = \{w \in \mathcal{S}^m; K'wK \in \mathcal{S}_+^{m-r^*}\}.$$

Then we obviously have $U_T \cap B_{2R} \subset \psi(W)$ for such large $T \in \mathbb{T}$. Therefore, $U \cap B_R \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T} \cap B_R \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \cap B_{2R}} \subset \psi(W)$. This implies $U \subset \psi(W)$. Thus, for **[A3]** and (2.12), it suffices to show that

$$\psi(W) \subset U. \quad (2.13)$$

Take any $w \in W$. In order to derive (2.13), we show that for sufficiently large $T \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\psi(w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m) \in U_T, \quad (2.14)$$

where I_m denotes the m -dimensional identity matrix. Take any $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$. Decompose \mathbb{R}^m as $\mathbb{R}^m = \text{Ker}(A^*)^\perp \oplus \text{Ker}(A^*)$. We decompose x as $x = y + Kz$ for some $y \in \text{Ker}(A^*)^\perp$ and some $z \in \mathbb{R}^{m-r^*}$. Then since $w \in W$, for sufficiently large $T \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x'(A^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}(w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m))x &\geq y'(A^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}(w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m))y \\ &\quad - 2\|w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m\|T^{-\frac{1}{2}}|y||Kz| + T^{-\frac{3}{4}}|Kz|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}|y|^2 - 2\|w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m\|T^{-\frac{1}{2}}|Kz||y| + T^{-\frac{3}{4}}|Kz|^2 \\ &\geq -\frac{\|w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m\|^2}{\epsilon/2}T^{-1}|Kz|^2 + T^{-\frac{3}{4}}|Kz|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where ϵ is a positive constant depending only on A^* . Thus, for sufficiently large $T \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$A^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}(w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m) \in \mathcal{S}_+^m,$$

which implies (2.14). Since $\psi(w + T^{-\frac{1}{4}}I_m)$ converges to $\psi(w)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, we have $\psi(w) \in U$. Therefore, (2.13) holds.

Example 2.6 (Non-conical U). This example derives from Section 4.4. Take Θ as $\Theta = \psi(\mathcal{D})$, where ψ is defined as (2.10) when $m = 2$, and $\mathcal{D} \subset \mathcal{S}_+^2$ is a compact subset. Let $D^* = (D_{ij}^*)_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2}$ be the true value of $D = (D_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq 2} \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\{D \in \mathcal{D}; \|D - D^*\| < \delta\} = \{D \in \mathcal{S}_+^2; \|D - D^*\| < \delta\}.$$

Consider a case where

$$D_{11}^* > 0, \quad D_{12}^* = D_{22}^* = 0.$$

Unlike Example 2.5, take a_T as $a_T = \text{diag}(T^{-\frac{1}{2}}, T^{-\frac{1}{2}}, T^{-\frac{\rho}{2}})$,² where ρ is a positive number defined as $\rho = \frac{r}{q} \vee 1$, and $0 < q \leq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq 1$ are tuning parameters. Then [A3] holds and $U = W$, where W is defined as

$$W = \begin{cases} \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; w_3 \geq 0\} & (\rho < 2 \text{ i.e. } q > \frac{r}{2}) \\ \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; D_{11}^* w_3 - w_2^2 \geq 0\} & (\rho = 2 \text{ i.e. } q = \frac{r}{2}) \\ \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; w_3 \geq 0, w_2 = 0\} & (\rho > 2 \text{ i.e. } q < \frac{r}{2}) \end{cases}. \quad (2.15)$$

In fact, from the definition (2.1) of U_T , for any $R > 0$ and for sufficiently large $T \in \mathbb{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} U_T \cap B_R &= \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; \\ & D_{11}^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1 \geq 0, w_3 \geq 0, (D_{11}^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1)T^{-\frac{\rho}{2}}w_3 - T^{-1}w_2^2 \geq 0\} \cap B_R \\ &= \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, \infty); (D_{11}^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1)T^{-\frac{\rho}{2}}w_3 - T^{-1}w_2^2 \geq 0\} \cap B_R. \end{aligned}$$

Define $f, g_T : \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as for any $w = (w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, \infty)$,

$$f(w) = \begin{cases} D_{11}^* w_3 & (q > \frac{r}{2}) \\ D_{11}^* w_3 - w_2^2 & (q = \frac{r}{2}) \\ -w_2^2 & (q < \frac{r}{2}) \end{cases}, \quad g_T(w) = \begin{cases} T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1 w_3 - T^{-1+\frac{\rho}{2}}w_2^2 & (q > \frac{r}{2}) \\ T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1 w_3 & (q = \frac{r}{2}) \\ (D_{11}^* + T^{-\frac{1}{2}}w_1)T^{-\frac{\rho}{2}+1}w_3 & (q < \frac{r}{2}) \end{cases},$$

respectively. Then [U1]-[U3] holds for

$$\mathcal{K}_+ = \begin{cases} \phi & (q \geq \frac{r}{2}) \\ \{1\} & (q < \frac{r}{2}) \end{cases},$$

and we obtain $U = \{w \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times [0, \infty); f(w) \geq 0\}$. Thus, (2.15) holds.

2.4 Relationship to previous studies

Recall that U_T is defined by (2.1). We show that the approach of using the limit set U defined by (2.3) is a generalization of the prior work on the case where the true value is on the boundary. Chernoff [4] considers a local approximation of the set $\Theta - \theta^*$ by a cone³, and Andrews [2] extends this method. The definition of the local approximation by a cone is as follows.

Definition 2.7. We say that a sequence of sets $\{\Phi_T \subset \mathbb{R}^p; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is locally approximated (at the origin) by a cone $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ if

$$\begin{aligned} d(\phi_T, \Lambda) &= o(|\phi_T|) & \forall \{\phi_T \in \Phi_T; T \in \mathbb{T}\} \text{ such that } |\phi_T| \rightarrow 0, \\ d(\lambda_T, \Phi_T) &= o(|\lambda_T|) & \forall \{\lambda_T \in \Lambda; T \in \mathbb{T}\} \text{ such that } |\lambda_T| \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where for $A \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $d(x, A)$ denotes $\inf_{a \in A} d(x, a) = \inf_{a \in A} |x - a|$.

²For any $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{R}$, $\text{diag}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ denotes an $n \times n$ diagonal matrix whose (i, i) entry is a_i for every $i = 1, \dots, n$.

³We call a non-empty set Λ a cone (with its vertex at the origin) if for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and any $t \geq 0$, $t\lambda \in \Lambda$.

This definition is proposed by Andrews [2], and if Φ_T is simply equal to $\Theta - \theta^*$, then this definition is consistent with that put forward by Chernoff [4]. Using this concept, we consider the following conditions proposed by them.

[An] For some sequence of positive scalar constants $\{b_T\}_{T \in \mathbb{T}}$ with $b_T \rightarrow \infty$, $\{U_T/b_T; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is locally approximated by some cone Λ .

[Ch1] $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, where $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ denotes the set of all positive integers. Moreover, a_T is equal to the diagonal matrix $T^{-\frac{1}{2}}I_p$.

[Ch2] $\{\Theta - \theta^*; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is locally approximated by some cone Λ .

Note that if **[Ch1]** and **[Ch2]** holds, then **[An]** also holds with $b_T = T^{\frac{1}{2}}$. The following theorem says that **[A3]** is a generalization of these conditions.

Theorem 2.8. (i) If **[An]** holds, then **[A3]** holds, and

$$U = \bar{\Lambda}.$$

(ii) Assume **[Ch1]**. Then **[A3]** holds if and only if **[Ch2]** holds. Furthermore, in this case,

$$U = \bar{\Lambda}.$$

Remark 2.9. (i) Strictly speaking, Andrews [2] considers **[An]** only when $\mathbb{T} \subset (0, \infty)$ and $b_T \leq c\lambda_{\min}[a_T^{-1}]^4$ for some $0 < c < \infty$.

(ii) Since U can be a set other than a cone such as Example 2.6, **[A3]** is strictly weaker than **[An]** and **[Ch1] + [Ch2]**.

Proof of Theorem 2.8.

(i) Assume **[An]**. First, we show $\bar{\Lambda} \subset U$. Take an arbitrary $\lambda \in \Lambda$. Then $\lambda/b_T \in \Lambda$ for any $T \in \mathbb{T}$. Since $\{U_T/b_T; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is locally approximated by a cone Λ , we have

$$d(U_T/b_T, \lambda/b_T) = o(1/b_T).$$

Therefore, there exists a sequence $\{u_T \in U_T; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ such that

$$d(u_T, \lambda) = o(1).$$

By the definition of U , this implies $\lambda \in U$. Thus $\Lambda \subset U$, and since U is closed from Lemma 5.1, $\bar{\Lambda} \subset U$.

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that

$$(U \subset) \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T} \subset \bar{\Lambda} \quad (2.16)$$

Take an arbitrary $u \in \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T}$. Then there exist a subsequence $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of \mathbb{T} and a sequence $\{u_{T_n} \in U_{T_n}; n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that

$$u_{T_n} \rightarrow u. \quad (2.17)$$

Since $\{U_T/b_T; T \in \mathbb{T}\}$ is locally approximated by a cone Λ , we have

$$d(u_{T_n}/b_{T_n}, \Lambda) = o(u_{T_n}/b_{T_n}) = o(1/b_{T_n}).$$

Therefore, there exists a sequence $\{\lambda_{T_n} \in \Lambda; n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that

$$d(u_{T_n}, b_{T_n} \lambda_{T_n}) = o(1).$$

From (2.17), $b_{T_n} \lambda_{T_n} \rightarrow u$, which implies $u \in \bar{\Lambda}$. Thus, (2.16) holds.

(ii) Assume **[Ch1]**. Since **[An]** implies **[A3]**, the assumption **[Ch2]** also implies **[A3]**, and $U = \bar{\Lambda}$.

⁴ $\lambda_{\min}[A]$ denotes the minimum eigenvalue of a matrix A .

We show the converse. Assume [Ch1] and [A3]. We first show U becomes a cone. Take an arbitrary $u \in U$ and an arbitrary $k > 0$. From the definition of U , there exists some sequence $\{\theta_n \in \Theta; n = 1, 2, \dots\}$ such that

$$n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_n - \theta^*) \rightarrow u.$$

Take a subsequence $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ satisfying that $T_n \uparrow \infty$ and

$$(T_n - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq kn^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq T_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Then, obviously, $kn^{\frac{1}{2}}/T_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \rightarrow 1$. Therefore,

$$T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_n - \theta^*) = (T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}k^{-1}n^{-\frac{1}{2}})kn^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_n - \theta^*) \rightarrow ku.$$

Since $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}(\theta_n - \theta^*) \in U_{T_n}$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, $ku \in \bigcap_{N=1}^{\infty} \overline{\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T}$. From [A3], $ku \in U$. Since U obviously contains zero, U is a cone.

Next, we show that $\{\Theta - \theta^*; n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\}$ is locally approximated by U . That is, we show

$$d(\phi_n, U) = o(|\phi_n|) \quad \forall \{\phi_n \in \Theta - \theta^*; n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\} \text{ such that } |\phi_n| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (2.18)$$

$$d(u_n, \Theta - \theta^*) = o(|u_n|) \quad \forall \{u_n \in U; n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\} \text{ such that } |u_n| \rightarrow 0. \quad (2.19)$$

We first show (2.18). Take an arbitrary sequence $\{\phi_n \in \Theta - \theta^*; n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\}$ with $|\phi_n| \rightarrow 0$. We may assume that $|\phi_n| \neq 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Take a subsequence $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ satisfying that $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(T_n - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq |\phi_n|^{-1} \leq T_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Then, obviously, $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}|\phi_n| \rightarrow 1$. Therefore, we may assume that $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}|\phi_n| \leq 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_n|^{-1}d(\phi_n, U) &\leq T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}d(\phi_n, U) = d(T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\phi_n, T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}U) \\ &= d(T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}\phi_n, U) \quad (\because U \text{ is a cone.}) \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in U_{T_n} \cap \overline{B_2}} d(u, U). \end{aligned}$$

Take any $\delta > 0$. From Lemma 5.1 (iii), for sufficiently large number T_n ,

$$U_{T_n} \cap \overline{B_2} \subset (U \cap \overline{B_2})^{\delta}.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large number n ,

$$|\phi_n|^{-1}d(\phi_n, U) \leq \sup_{u \in (U \cap \overline{B_2})^{\delta}} d(u, U) \leq \delta.$$

This implies (2.18).

We also show (2.19). Take an arbitrary $\{u_n \in U; n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}\}$ such that $|u_n| \rightarrow 0$. We may assume that $|u_n| \neq 0$ for any $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Take a subsequence $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ satisfying that $T_n \rightarrow \infty$ and

$$(T_n - 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq |u_n|^{-1} \leq T_n^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (n = 1, 2, \dots).$$

Then, obviously, $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}|u_n| \rightarrow 1$. Therefore, we may assume that $T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}|u_n| \leq 2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} |u_n|^{-1}d(u_n, \Theta - \theta^*) &\leq T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}d(u_n, \Theta - \theta^*) = d(T_n^{\frac{1}{2}}u_n, U_{T_n}) \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in U \cap \overline{B_2}} d(u, U_{T_n}) \quad (\because U \text{ is a cone.}) \end{aligned}$$

Take any $\delta > 0$. From Lemma 5.1 (ii), for sufficiently large number T_n ,

$$U \cap \overline{B_2} \subset (U_{T_n} \cap \overline{B_4})^{\delta}.$$

Therefore, for sufficiently large number n ,

$$|u_n|^{-1}d(u_n, \Theta - \theta^*) \leq \sup_{u \in (U_{T_n} \cap \overline{B_4})^{\delta}} d(u, U_{T_n}) \leq \delta.$$

This implies (2.19). Thus, [Ch2] holds. \square

2.5 Example: generalized inverse Gaussian distribution

As an example of a direct use of Theorem 2.1, we estimate the parameters of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution $\text{GIG}(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$ that is a probability measure on $(0, \infty)$ with the density function

$$p_{\text{GIG}}(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma) = \frac{(\gamma/\delta)^\lambda}{2K_\lambda(\gamma\delta)} x^{\lambda-1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{x} + \gamma^2 x\right)\right] \quad (x > 0), \quad (2.20)$$

where K_ν is the modified Bessel function of the second kind with index ν defined by

$$K_\nu(x) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty y^{\nu-1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}x\left(y + \frac{1}{y}\right)\right] dy.$$

The function K_ν can be extended to complex ν when $\text{Re}(\nu) > -1/2$. Due to the integrability of the function on the right-hand side of (2.20), the parameters are restricted as follows. (i) $\lambda > 0$, $\delta \geq 0$, $\gamma > 0$, (ii) $\lambda = 0$, $\delta > 0$, $\gamma > 0$, and (iii) $\lambda < 0$, $\delta > 0$, $\gamma \geq 0$. Here we will treat the case (i). Case (ii) can also be approached directly or through the duality

$$X \sim \text{GIG}(\lambda, \delta, \gamma) \Leftrightarrow X^{-1} \sim \text{GIG}(-\lambda, \gamma, \delta),$$

and in particular, $X \sim \Gamma(\lambda, c) \Leftrightarrow X^{-1} \sim \text{IG}(\lambda, c)$, the inverse gamma distribution.

A special case of (i) is the Gamma distribution $\Gamma(\lambda, \gamma^2/2) = \text{GIG}(\lambda, 0, \gamma)$ having the density function

$$\begin{aligned} p_\Gamma(x; \lambda, \gamma^2/2) &= p_{\text{GIG}}(x; \lambda, 0, \gamma) \\ &= \frac{1}{\Gamma(\lambda)} \left(\frac{\gamma^2}{2}\right)^\lambda x^{\lambda-1} \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2}x\right) \quad (x > 0) \end{aligned}$$

as the limit of $\text{GIG}(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$ when $\delta \downarrow 0$ since

$$K_\nu(z) \sim \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\nu) \left(\frac{z}{2}\right)^{-\nu} \quad (2.21)$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$, when $\text{Re}(\nu) > 0$ for $\nu \in \mathbb{C}$. The property (2.21) is verified with the representation

$$z^\nu K_\nu(z) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\infty t^{\nu-1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(t + \frac{z^2}{t}\right)\right] dt \quad (2.22)$$

when $\text{Re}(\nu) > 0$.

Let us consider estimation of the parameters based on the independent observations $(X_j)_{j=1}^n$ from the experiment

$$\{\text{GIG}(\lambda, \delta, \gamma); (\lambda, \delta, \gamma) \in [\underline{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda}] \times [0, \bar{\delta}] \times [\underline{\gamma}, \bar{\gamma}]\},$$

where the end points of the intervals satisfy

$$2 < \underline{\lambda} < \bar{\lambda} < \infty, \quad 0 < \bar{\delta} < \infty, \quad 0 < \underline{\gamma} < \bar{\gamma} < \infty.$$

Suppose that the distribution generating the data is $\Gamma(\lambda^*, (\gamma^*)^2/2) = \text{GIG}(\lambda^*, 0, \gamma^*)$, that is, the true value $(\lambda^*, \delta^*, \gamma^*)$ of $(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$ is located on the boundary of the parametric model as

$$\underline{\lambda} < \lambda^* < \bar{\lambda}, \quad \delta^* = 0, \quad \underline{\gamma} < \gamma^* < \bar{\gamma}.$$

Jorgencen [13] also treated this case although the parametrization is slightly different.

To consider the problem, it is possible to re-parametrize the model into a natural exponential family and to use Theorem 3.1 described below, but it requires to transform the limit distribution after getting it to return the original parameters. We keep the original parameters here to illustrate the general approach, and derive the asymptotic distribution of the maximum likelihood estimator $(\hat{\lambda}_n, \hat{\delta}_n, \hat{\gamma}_n)$ for $(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$.

Let

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda, a, b) = \frac{b^\lambda}{2} \int_0^\infty t^{\lambda-1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(bt + \frac{a}{t}\right)\right] dt$$

Then

$$\mathcal{K}(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2) = (\gamma\delta)^\lambda K_\lambda(\gamma\delta)$$

Simply denoted by $p(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma)$, the density $p_{\text{GIG}}(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma)$ is expressed as

$$p(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma) = \frac{\gamma^{2\lambda}}{2\mathcal{K}(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2)} x^{\lambda-1} \exp\left[-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{x} + \gamma^2 x\right)\right] \quad (x > 0)$$

This model is a curved exponential family:

$$p(x; \lambda, \delta, \gamma) = \exp\left[(\lambda - 1) \log x - \frac{\delta^2}{2x} - \frac{\gamma^2}{2}x - \Psi(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2)\right] \quad (x > 0)$$

with the potential

$$\Psi(\lambda, a, b) = -\log \frac{b^\lambda}{2\mathcal{K}(\lambda, a, b)}$$

The r times tensor product of a vector v is denoted by $v^{\otimes r}$. For a tensor $T = (T_{i_1, \dots, i_k})_{i_1, \dots, i_k}$ and vectors $v_1 = (v_1^{i_1})_{i_1}, \dots, (v_k^{i_k})_{i_k}$, we write

$$T[v_1, \dots, v_k] = T[v_1 \otimes \dots \otimes v_k] = \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k} T_{i_1, \dots, i_k} v_1^{i_1} \dots v_k^{i_k}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \Psi(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2) - \Psi(\lambda^*, 0, (\gamma^*)^2) \\ &= D[\Delta(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2)] + \int_0^1 (1-s)H(s, \lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2)[(\Delta(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2))^{\otimes 2}] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Here

$$\Delta(\lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda - \lambda^* \\ \delta^2 \\ \gamma^2 - (\gamma^*)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D = (\partial_{(\lambda, a, b)} \Psi)(\lambda^*, 0, (\gamma^*)^2) = \begin{pmatrix} E[\log \xi_0] \\ 2^{-1} E[\xi_0^{-1}] \\ 2^{-1} E[\xi_0] \end{pmatrix}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} H(s, \lambda, \delta^2, \gamma^2) &= (\partial_{(\lambda, a, b)}^2 \Psi)(s\lambda + (1-s)\lambda^*, s\delta^2, s\gamma^2 + (1-s)(\gamma^*)^2) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \text{Var}[\log \xi_s] & 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_s, \xi_s^{-1}] & 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_s, \xi_s] \\ 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_s, \xi_s^{-1}] & 4^{-1} \text{Var}[\xi_s^{-1}] & 4^{-1} \text{Cov}[\xi_s^{-1}, \xi_s] \\ 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_s, \xi_s] & 4^{-1} \text{Cov}[\xi_s^{-1}, \xi_s] & 4^{-1} \text{Var}[\xi_s] \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\xi_s = \xi_s(\lambda, \delta, \gamma) = \xi(s\lambda + (1-s)\lambda^*, \sqrt{s}\delta, \sqrt{s\gamma^2 + (1-s)(\gamma^*)^2}),$$

where $\xi(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$ denotes a random variable such that $\xi(\lambda, \delta, \gamma) \sim \text{GIG}(\lambda, \delta, \gamma)$.

Let $a_n = \text{diag}[n^{-1/2}, n^{-1/4}, n^{-1/2}]$, and define U_n as (2.1). For $\mathbb{H}_n(\theta) = \sum_{j=1}^n \log p(X_j; \theta)$ and $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in U_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{Z}_n(u) &= \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^* + a_n u) - \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*) \\ &= u_1 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{\log X_j} - u_2^2 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{-1} \widetilde{X_j^{-1}} - u_3 \gamma^* n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{X_j} \\ &\quad - n \int_0^1 (1-s)H(s, \lambda^* + n^{-1/2}u_1, n^{-1/2}u_2^2, (\gamma^* + n^{-1/2}u_3)^2) \\ &\quad \times \left[\left(n^{-1/2}u_1, n^{-1/2}u_2^2, (\gamma^* + n^{-1/2}u_3)^2 - (\gamma^*)^2 \right)^{\otimes 2} \right] ds - u_3^2 2^{-1} n^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{X_j}, \end{aligned}$$

where we are writing $\widetilde{F}(X_j) = F(X_j) - E[F(X_j)]$ for a function $F(X_j)$ of a random variable X_j satisfying $X_j \sim GIG(\lambda^*, 0, \gamma^*) = \Gamma(\lambda^*, (\gamma^*)^2/2)$. Then it is possible to write it as

$$\begin{aligned} \log Z_n(u) &= u_1 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{\log X_j} - u_2^2 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{-1} \widetilde{X_j^{-1}} - u_3 \gamma^* n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{X_j} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} C[(u_1, u_2^2, u_3)^\otimes] + r_n(u) \end{aligned}$$

with the positive-definite covariance matrix

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Var}[\log \xi_0] & 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_0, \xi_0^{-1}] & \gamma^* \text{Cov}[\log \xi_0, \xi_0] \\ 2^{-1} \text{Cov}[\log \xi_0, \xi_0^{-1}] & 4^{-1} \text{Var}[\xi_0^{-1}] & 2^{-1} \gamma^* \text{Cov}[\xi_0^{-1}, \xi_0] \\ \gamma^* \text{Cov}[\log \xi_0, \xi_0] & 2^{-1} \gamma^* \text{Cov}[\xi_0^{-1}, \xi_0] & (\gamma^*)^2 \text{Var}[\xi_0] \end{pmatrix},$$

and the term $r_n(u)$ satisfying

$$\sup_{u \in U_n} \frac{|r_n(u)|}{1 + |u_1|^2 + |u_2|^4 + |u_3|^2} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$$

Then, Condition [A1] is verified by the estimate

$$\lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left[M_n \geq (2^{-1} \lambda_{\min}[C] + O_p(n^{-1/2})) R \right] = 0$$

for $M_n = |n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{\log X_j}| + |n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{-1} \widetilde{X_j^{-1}}| + |n^{-1/2} \gamma^* \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{X_j}|$. Condition [A2] is satisfied with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_n(u) &= \exp \left(u_1 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{\log X_j} - u_2^2 n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n 2^{-1} \widetilde{X_j^{-1}} - u_3 \gamma^* n^{-1/2} \sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{X_j} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{2} C[(u_1, u_2^2, u_3)^\otimes] \right), \\ \mathbb{Z}(u) &= \exp \left(\Delta \cdot (u_1, u_2^2, u_3) - \frac{1}{2} C[(u_1, u_2^2, u_3)^\otimes] \right) \end{aligned}$$

with a three-dimensional random vector $\Delta \sim N_3(0, C)$.

Now from Example 2.4, [A3] holds, and we obtain $U = \mathbb{R} \times [0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}$. Condition [A4] obviously holds. Therefore, Theorem 2.1 concludes that the MLE $(\widehat{\lambda}_n, \widehat{\delta}_n, \widehat{\gamma}_n)$ admits

$$(n^{1/2}(\widehat{\lambda}_n - \lambda^*), n^{1/4} \widehat{\delta}_n, n^{1/2}(\widehat{\gamma}_n - \gamma^*)) \xrightarrow{d} \widehat{u}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when the true distribution of the data is $GIG(\lambda^*, 0, \gamma^*) = \Gamma(\lambda^*, (\gamma^*)^2/2)$, where

$$\widehat{u} = \operatorname{argmax}_{u \in U} \left(\Delta \cdot (u_1, u_2^2, u_3) - \frac{1}{2} C[(u_1, u_2^2, u_3)^\otimes] \right).$$

3 Quasi-maximum likelihood estimation

3.1 Asymptotic behavior of the QMLE

Consider the same situation as in Section 2.1. In this section, we will apply Theorem 2.1 to a quasi-likelihood function in a regular case except that the true value θ^* may lie on the boundary. Let us suppose that Θ and \mathcal{T} are compact. Let \mathcal{N} be a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^p satisfying

- (i) for some $\delta > 0$, $\Theta \cap \{|\theta - \theta^*| < \delta\} \subset \overline{\mathcal{N}}$,
- (ii) for any $\theta \in \mathcal{N}$ and any $0 < t \leq 1$, $t\theta + (1-t)\theta^* \in \mathcal{N}$.

We suppose that \mathbb{H}_T can be extended to a continuous random field defined on $\Omega \times \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$ satisfying that for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathbb{H}_T(\omega, \cdot, \tau)$ is of class $C^2(\overline{\mathcal{N}})^5$. From Condition (ii), for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, we can consider the Taylor series of $\mathbb{H}_T(\omega, \cdot, \tau)$ around θ^* on $\overline{\mathcal{N}}$.

Let \mathcal{G} be a sub- σ -field of \mathcal{F} . Let $\Delta(\theta^*)$ be an \mathbb{R}^p -valued random variable, and let $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ be a \mathcal{G} -measurable $\mathbb{R}^p \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$ -valued random variable. Let a_T be a deterministic sequence in $GL(p)$. Define a positive sequence b_T as $b_T = \lambda_{\min}[(a'_T a_T)^{-1}]$. Define a continuous random field $\mathbb{Y}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathbb{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) = \frac{1}{b_T} (\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)) \quad ((\theta, \tau) \in \Xi).$$

Let $\mathbb{Y} : \Omega \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous random field. For **[A1]** and **[A2]**, we consider the following conditions.

[B1] $\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |\mathbb{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{Y}(\theta)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Also, with probability 1, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta \neq \theta^*$,

$$\mathbb{Y}(\theta) < 0.$$

[B2] For some $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |a'_T \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) - a'_T \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (3.1)$$

$$a'_T \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \Delta(\theta^*). \quad (3.2)$$

Also, for any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T} \\ |\theta - \theta^*| < \delta_T}} \|a'_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) a_T + \Gamma(\theta^*)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

[B3] $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ is almost surely positive definite.

Define U_T and U as (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. We also define \hat{u}_T by $\hat{u}_T = (a_T)^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*)$.

Theorem 3.1. Assume **[B1]**-**[B3]** and **[A3]**. Also, assume **[A4]** for the continuous random field \mathbb{Z} defined as

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \exp \left\{ \Delta(\theta^*)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p). \quad (3.3)$$

Then for the U -valued random variable \hat{u} defined in **[A4]**,

$$\hat{u}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}.$$

Moreover, assume **[A5]** for the continuous random field \mathbb{V}_T defined as

$$\mathbb{V}_T(u) = \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \hat{\tau}_T)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p), \quad (3.4)$$

where $\Delta_T(\theta^*, \cdot)$ represents $a'_T \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \cdot)$. Then for the U -valued random variable \hat{v}_T defined in **[A5]**,

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1).$$

Remark 3.2. Condition **[B1]** implies the following condition.

[B1]^b For any $\delta > 0$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{T} \\ |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta}} \{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \} \geq 0 \right] = 0.$$

⁵For an open set G , $C^2(\overline{G})$ denotes the set consisting of all functions which are of class C^2 in G and whose derivatives can be continuously extended on \overline{G} .

Then Theorem 3.1 holds even if we substitute **[B1]** with **[B1]^b**. (See the following proof.)

Proof of Theorem 3.1. From Theorem 2.1, it suffices to show that **[B1]**-**[B3]** imply **[A1]** and **[A2]**. Define r_T as

$$r_T(u, \tau) = -2 \int_0^1 (1-k) \{a'_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^* + ka_T u, \tau) a_T + \Gamma(\theta^*)\} dk$$

for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$. Then, from Taylor's series,

$$\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) = \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau)[u] - \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\theta^*) + r_T(u, \tau)) [u^{\otimes 2}] \right\}.$$

Note that from **[B2]**, for any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| < \delta_T} \|r_T(u, \tau)\| = o_P(1).$$

Therefore, from **[B2]**, **[A2]** obviously holds if we take \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{V}_T as (3.3) and (3.4), respectively. We show that **[A1]** holds. Let ϵ and R be positive numbers. Also, let δ_T be a positive sequence with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

From **[B1]**, we can evaluate the first term in (3.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \left\{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \left\{ \mathbb{Y}(\theta) + \mathbb{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{Y}(\theta) \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Y}(\theta) + o_P(1) \geq 0 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

(When using **[B1]^b**, stop at (3.6)). Thus, by choosing δ_T properly and using **[B1]** (or **[B1]^b**), we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] = 0.$$

Also, from **[B2]** and **[B3]**, we can evaluate the second term in (3.5) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u) \geq 1 \right] \\ & = \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau)[u] - \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\theta^*) + r_T(u, \tau)) [u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \left\{ O_P(1)|u| - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] |u|^2 + o_P(1)|u|^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \left\{ O_P(1)|u| - \frac{1}{2} \epsilon |u|^2 + o_P(1)|u|^2 \right\} \geq 0 \right] + P \left[\lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] < \epsilon \right] \\ & \xrightarrow{R \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] < \epsilon \right] \xrightarrow{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, **[A1]** holds. □

3.2 Itô process

Consider a d -dimensional Itô process

$$(Y_t)_{t \in [0, T]} = ((Y_t^1, \dots, Y_t^d)')_{t \in [0, T]}$$

having a decomposition

$$Y_t = Y_0 + \int_0^t b_s ds + \int_0^t \sigma(X_s, a) dw_s \quad (t \in [0, T]) \quad (3.7)$$

on a stochastic basis $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{F}, P)$, $\mathbf{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$, where $\{b_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an unobservable d -dimensional progressively measurable process, $w = (w_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is an r -dimensional standard Wiener process, and $(X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ is a c -dimensional \mathbf{F} -adapted continuous process. Here we parametrize an $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^r$ -valued function σ by a matrix a as

$$\sigma(x, a) = f(x) a \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^d, a \in \mathbb{R}^m \otimes \mathbb{R}^r),$$

where $f : \mathbb{R}^c \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^m$ is a C^2 map. For the sake of identifiability, we parametrize a by $A = aa'$. Denote by a^* the true value of a . Then the true value A^* of A is obviously determined as $A^* = a^*(a^*)'$. We take a compact set $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{S}_+^m$ as the parameter space of A , where \mathcal{S}_+^m denotes the set of all m -dimensional positive semi-definite matrices.

Consider a case where A^* may be degenerate. (Though we will assume in Condition [I4] below that $f(X_t)A^*f'(X_t)$ is non-degenerate for any $0 \leq t \leq T$.) Therefore, A^* may be on the boundary of \mathcal{A} . For simplicity, suppose that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\{A \in \mathcal{A}; \|A - A^*\| < \delta\} = \{A \in \mathcal{S}_+^m; \|A - A^*\| < \delta\}. \quad (3.8)$$

For when the true value is in the interior of the parameter space, see e.g. Genon-Catalot and Jacod [8] and Uchida and Yoshida [19].

We consider the following conditions.

[I1] For every $p > 1$, $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E[|b_t|^p] < \infty$.

[I2] The continuous process $X = (X_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ admits a representation

$$X_t = X_0 + \int_0^t c_s ds + \int_0^t d_s dw_s + \int_0^t \tilde{d}_s d\tilde{w}_s \quad (t \in [0, T]),$$

where \tilde{w} is an r_1 -dimensional standard Wiener process independent of w , and c , d and \tilde{d} are progressively measurable processes taking values in \mathbb{R}^c , $\mathbb{R}^c \otimes \mathbb{R}^r$ and $\mathbb{R}^c \otimes \mathbb{R}^{r_1}$, respectively, satisfying that for every $p > 1$,

$$\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} E[|X_0|^p + |c_t|^p + \|d_t\|^p + \|\tilde{d}_t\|^p] < \infty.$$

[I3] For some $C > 0$,

$$\|\partial_x^i f(x)\| \leq C(1 + |x|^C) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^c, i = 0, 1, 2).$$

[I4] With probability 1, the image of X is contained in \mathcal{X} , where $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^c$ is a closed subset, and $f(x)Af'(x)$ is elliptic uniformly in $(x, A) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A}$. (Note that $f'(x)$ denotes the transposition of $f(x)$.)

[I5] With probability 1, for any $B \in \mathcal{S}^m$ with $B \neq O$, $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} \|f(X_t)Bf'(X_t)\| > 0$, where \mathcal{S}^m denotes the set of all m -dimensional symmetric matrices

Define \mathfrak{p} as $\mathfrak{p} = \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$. For simplicity, we parametrize A by θ as $\theta = \psi(A)$, where ψ is defined as (2.10). Then the parameter space Θ of θ is determined as $\Theta = \psi(\mathcal{A})$. Also, the true value θ^* of $\theta \in \Theta$ becomes $\psi(A^*)$.

We also suppose that $\text{Int}(\Theta)^6$ is a domain of \mathbb{R}^p satisfying $\overline{\text{Int}(\Theta)} = \Theta$ and Sobolev's inequalities for embedding $W^{1,p}(\text{Int}(\Theta)) \hookrightarrow C(\Theta)$ for $p > p^*$.

Observing the data $(X_{t_j})_{j=0,1,\dots,n}$ with $t_j = jT/n$, we want to estimate the true value θ^* . For this purpose, we maximize the estimation function

$$\Psi_n(\theta) = \log \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2h} S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)^{-1} [(\Delta_i Y)^{\otimes 2}] \right) \quad (\theta \in \Theta),$$

with $\Delta_i Y = Y_{t_i} - Y_{t_{i-1}}$, where S is defined as

$$S(x, \theta) = f(x)A f(x)' \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^c, \theta \in \Theta, A = \psi^{-1}(\theta)).$$

Here $|S(x, \theta)|$ denotes $\det(S(x, \theta))$. Let $\hat{\theta}_n$ be a Θ -valued random variable maximizing $\Psi_n(\theta)$ on Θ . We derive the limit distribution of the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$ of θ^* .

Define $\Upsilon(\theta)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \Upsilon(\theta) &= -\frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \left\{ \text{Tr}(S^{-1}(X_t, \theta)S(X_t, \theta^*) - I_d) + \log \frac{|S(X_t, \theta)|}{|S(X_t, \theta^*)|} \right\} dt \\ &= -\frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \int_0^1 k \left\| (kS(X_t, \theta) + (1-k)S(X_t, \theta^*))^{-\frac{1}{2}} (S(X_t, \theta) - S(X_t, \theta^*)) \right. \\ &\quad \left. (kS(X_t, \theta) + (1-k)S(X_t, \theta^*))^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right\|^2 dk dt \quad (\theta \in \Theta). \end{aligned}$$

For any $D = (d_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq r} \in \mathbb{R}^r \otimes \mathbb{R}^r$, the r^2 -dimensional vector $(d_{11}, \dots, d_{1r}, d_{21}, \dots, d_{rr})'$ is denoted by $v(D)$. Also, we denote $\{v(D)\}'$ by $v'(D)$. Then define an $\mathbb{R}^p \otimes \mathbb{R}^{r^2}$ -valued \mathbf{F} -adapted continuous process $\rho = (\rho_t)_{t \in [0, T]}$ as

$$u\rho_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v'(\sigma'(X_t, a^*) \partial_\theta S^{-1}(X_t, \theta^*) \sigma(X_t, a^*) [u]) \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p).$$

Denote by $W = (W_t)_{t \geq 0}$ an r^2 -dimensional Wiener process that is independent of \mathcal{F} and defined on an extension of (Ω, \mathcal{F}, P) . Define a random field Z as

$$Z(u) = \Delta(\theta^*)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\theta^*) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \int_0^T \rho_t dW_t, \\ \Gamma(\theta^*)[u, v] &= \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \rho_t^{\otimes 2}[u, v] dt = \frac{1}{2T} \int_0^T \text{Tr}(S^{-1} \partial_\theta S S^{-1} \partial_\theta S(X_t, \theta^*) [u, v]) dt \end{aligned}$$

for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Also, define a subset U of \mathbb{R}^p as (2.12), that is,

$$U = \psi \left(\left\{ w \in \mathcal{S}^m; K'wK \in \mathcal{S}_+^{m-r^*} \right\} \right),$$

where K is a $m \times (m - r^*)$ matrix whose column vectors form a basis for $\text{Ker}(A^*)$. (If $r^* = m$, then consider U just as $\psi(\mathcal{S}^m)$.)

Note that under [I5], with probability one, for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p \setminus \{0\}$,

$$0 < \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|f(X_t) \psi^{-1}(u) f'(X_t)\|^2 = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|S(X_t, u)\|^2 = \sup_{t \in [0, T]} \|\partial_\theta S(X_t, \theta^*)[u]\|^2. \quad (3.9)$$

⁶ $\text{Int}(B)$ denotes the interior of B for a subset B .

⁷A sufficient condition for it is the weak cone condition defined by Adams [1] as follows: a domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is said to satisfy the weak cone condition if there exists a number $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\mu_p(\{y \in R(x); |y - x| < 1\}) \geq \delta \quad (x \in \Omega),$$

where μ_p denotes the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^p , and $R(x)$ consists of all points $y \in \Omega$ such that the line segment joining x to y lies entirely in Ω . If Ω is bounded and convex, then the weak cone condition holds. For example, when taking \mathcal{A} as $\mathcal{A} = \{A \in \mathcal{S}_+^m; \|A\| \leq R\}$ for $R > 0$ with $\|A^*\| < R$, both (3.8) and the weak cone condition on $\text{Int}(\Theta)$ hold.

Then, with probability 1, $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ is non-degenerate. Indeed, $\Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] = 0$ implies $\partial_\theta S(X_t, \theta^*)[u] = 0$ for any $t \in [0, T]$ since $\Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] = T^{-1} \int_0^T \|S^{-1/2} \partial_\theta S S^{-1/2}(X_t, \theta^*)[u]\|^2 dt$. This contradicts (3.9) when $u \neq 0$.

Similarly, with probability 1, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta \neq \theta^*$, $\Upsilon(\theta) < 0$. From the convexity of U and the convexity of \mathbb{Z} , Condition [A4] holds. Define \hat{u} as the U -valued random variable defined in [A4] which becomes the unique maximizer of \mathbb{Z} on U almost surely. Then we obtain the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\theta}_n$. The proof of the following theorem is written in Section 6.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume (3.8) and [I1]-[I5]. Then for the maximizer $\hat{\theta}_n$ of Ψ_n ,*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{F})} \hat{u}. \quad (3.10)$$

Also, consider the same situation above, and parametrize $\{b_t\}_{t \in [0, T]}$ in (3.7) by $\gamma \in \overline{\mathbf{G}}$ as $b_t = g(X_t, \gamma)$, where \mathbf{G} is a domain in \mathbb{R}^q admitting Sobolev's inequalities for embedding $W^{1,p}(\mathbf{G}) \hookrightarrow C(\overline{\mathbf{G}})$ for $p > q$, and $g : \mathbb{R}^c \times \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is a continuous function. Thus, the stochastic differential equation (3.7) is parametrized by $(A, \gamma) \in \mathcal{A} \times \overline{\mathbf{G}}$. In addition to [I1]-[I5], we consider the following condition. r

[I6] The function g has continuous derivatives satisfying that for some $C > 0$,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathbf{G}} \|\partial_\gamma^i g(x, \gamma)\| \leq C(1 + |x|^C) \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}^c, i = 0, 1).$$

As before, we parametrize A by $\theta = \psi(A)$. When estimating $\theta^* \in \Theta$, the drift parameter γ can be considered as nuisance. Therefore, we denote γ by τ . Then the parameter space $\Xi = \Theta \times \mathcal{T}$ is determined as $\Theta \times \mathcal{T} = \psi(\mathcal{A}) \times \overline{\mathbf{G}}$. Instead of Ψ_n , we maximize the estimation function

$$\tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta, \tau) = \log \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)|^{\frac{1}{2}}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2h} S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)^{-1} [(\Delta_i Y - hg(X_{t_{i-1}}, \tau))^{\otimes 2}] \right) \quad ((\theta, \tau) \in \Xi).$$

For each n , take an arbitrary \mathcal{T} -valued random variable $\hat{\tau}_n$, and take $\hat{\theta}_n$ again as a Θ -valued random variable maximizing $\tilde{\Psi}_n(\cdot, \hat{\tau}_n)$ on Θ . Also, define a random field \mathbb{V}_n as

$$\mathbb{V}_n(u) = \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\theta \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta^*, \hat{\tau}_n)[u] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p).$$

Since $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ is non-degenerate under [I5], we can take a U -valued random variable \hat{v}_n which is the unique maximizer of \mathbb{V}_n on U almost surely.

Theorem 3.4. *Assume (3.8) and [I1]-[I6]. Then for the maximizer $\hat{\theta}_n$ of $\tilde{\Psi}_n(\cdot, \hat{\tau}_n)$,*

$$\hat{u}_n := \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{F})} \hat{u}. \quad (3.11)$$

Also,

$$\hat{u}_n - \hat{v}_n = o_P(1). \quad (3.12)$$

The proof is written in Section 6.

Remark 3.5. (i) Even if we do not assume (3.8) and the form of \mathcal{A} changes, we could obtain the same results by deriving the corresponding U .

(ii) Consider the case where $T \rightarrow \infty$ and the ergodicity of X holds. Let $(\hat{\theta}_n, \hat{\tau}_n)$ be the joint maximizer of $\tilde{\Psi}$. If there exists the true value $\gamma^* \in \overline{\mathbf{G}}$ and if $nh^2 \rightarrow 0$, then under suitable assumptions, we also obtain the weak convergence of $\hat{w}_n := \sqrt{nh}(\hat{\tau}_n - \gamma^*)$. Given this background, we use $\tilde{\Psi}_n$ as the estimation function rather than Ψ_n here. To obtain the joint convergence of (\hat{u}_n, \hat{w}_n) , it is sufficient to drive the convergence of (\hat{v}_n, \hat{w}_n) .

4 Penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimation

4.1 Settings

In this section, we will apply Theorem 2.1 to a penalized quasi-likelihood function in a regular case except that the true value θ^* may lie on the boundary. Consider the same situation as in Section 2.1. Suppose that Θ and \mathcal{T} are compact in \mathbb{R}^p and \mathbb{R}^q , respectively. Consider the following penalty term.

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j) + s_T(\tau) \quad ((\theta_1, \dots, \theta_p) \in \Theta, \tau \in \mathcal{T}),$$

where $s_T : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^q \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ is a continuous random field depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$, \mathcal{J} is a subset of $\{1, \dots, p\}$, $\xi_{j,T} : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are random variables depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$, and $p_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$) are deterministic continuous functions satisfying the following conditions.

- (i) $p_j|_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}$ is of class C^1
- (ii) For any $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $p_j(x) = 0$ if and only if $x = 0$.
- (iii) There exist some positive constants δ_0 and q_j such that

$$p_j(x) = |x|^{q_j} \quad (x \in [-\delta_0, \delta_0]).$$

We consider penalized quasi-maximum likelihood estimation and the random field \mathbb{H}_T is given by

$$\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) = \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \xi_{j,T} p_j(\theta_j) - s_T(\tau) \quad ((\theta, \tau) \in \Xi),$$

where for each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, $\mathcal{H}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the continuous random field corresponding to the given quasi-log likelihood function. Recall that for each $T \in \mathbb{T}$, $\hat{\tau}_T$ is a given \mathcal{T} -random variable and $\hat{\theta}_T$ is a Θ -valued random variable that asymptotically maximizes $\mathbb{H}_T(\cdot, \hat{\tau}_T)$ on Θ .

For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we denote by θ_j^* the j -th component of θ^* . We decompose $(\theta_j^*)_{j \in \mathcal{J}}$ as

$$\theta_i^* \neq 0 \text{ and } \theta_k^* = 0 \quad (i \in \mathcal{J}_1, k \in \mathcal{J}_0),$$

where \mathcal{J}_1 and \mathcal{J}_0 are two partitions of \mathcal{J} .

4.2 Asymptotic behavior of the PQMLE

Let $\mathbf{a}_{j,T}$ ($j = 1, \dots, p$) be positive numbers depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ satisfying that $\mathbf{a}_{j,T} \rightarrow 0$. Define a $p \times p$ matrix \mathbf{a}_T as $\mathbf{a}_T = \text{diag}(\mathbf{a}_{1,T}, \dots, \mathbf{a}_{p,T})$. Define a positive sequence \mathbf{b}_T as

$$\mathbf{b}_T = \lambda_{\min}[(\mathbf{a}'_T \mathbf{a}_T)^{-1}] = \min_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{a}_{j,T}^{-2}.$$

Define a continuous random field $\mathcal{Y}_T : \Omega \times \Xi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\mathcal{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{b}_T} (\mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)) \quad ((\theta, \tau) \in \Xi).$$

Let $\mathcal{Y} : \Omega \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous random field, and \mathcal{N} a bounded open set in \mathbb{R}^p satisfying Conditions (i) and (ii) given in Section 3.1. We suppose that \mathcal{H}_T can be extended to a continuous random field defined on $\Omega \times \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T}$ satisfying that for every $\omega \in \Omega$ and $\tau \in \mathcal{T}$, $\mathcal{H}_T(\omega, \cdot, \tau)$ is of class $C^2(\overline{\mathcal{N}})$. Let $\Delta(\theta^*)$ be an \mathbb{R}^p -valued random variable, and let $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ be a \mathcal{G} -measurable $\mathbb{R}^p \otimes \mathbb{R}^p$ -valued random variable, where $\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is a sub- σ -field. Let $\rho_k \geq 1$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) be positive numbers. Also, let $c_i : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$) and $d_k : \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) non-negative random variables.

For [A1] and [A2], we consider the following conditions.

[C1] $\sup_{(\theta, \tau) \in \Xi} |\mathcal{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{Y}(\theta)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Also, with probability 1, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta \neq \theta^*$,

$$\mathcal{Y}(\theta) < 0.$$

[C2] For some $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |\mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) - \mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (4.1)$$

$$(\mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau_0), (\mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T})_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}, (\mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \left(\Delta(\theta^*), (c_i)_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1}, (d_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \right), \quad (4.2)$$

in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{p}} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_1|} \times \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_0|}$. Also, for any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \overline{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathcal{T} \\ |\theta - \theta^*| < \delta_T}} \|\mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta, \tau) \mathbf{a}_T + \Gamma(\theta^*)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

[C3] $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ is almost surely positive definite.

[C4] For each $i \in \mathcal{J}_1$,

$$\xi_{i,T} \mathbf{b}_T^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

[C5] For any $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$, if $\rho_k > 1$, then $d_k > 0$ a.s.

Take $a_T \in GL(\mathfrak{p})$ as a deterministic diagonal matrix defined by

$$(a_T)_{jj} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}_{j,T} & (j \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0) \\ \mathbf{a}_{j,T}^{\rho_j} & (j \in \mathcal{J}_0) \end{cases}. \quad (4.3)$$

Also, define a diagonal $\mathfrak{p} \times \mathfrak{p}$ matrix b as

$$(b)_{jj} = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(a_T)_{jj}}{(\mathbf{a}_T)_{jj}} = \begin{cases} 1 & (j \in \{1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0) \\ 1_{\{\rho_j=1\}} & (j \in \mathcal{J}_0) \end{cases}.$$

Recall that U_T and U are defined by (2.1) and (2.3), respectively and that \hat{u}_T is defined by $\hat{u}_T = (a_T)^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_T - \theta^*)$.

Theorem 4.1. Assume [C1]-[C5] and [A3]. Also, assume [A4] for the continuous random field \mathbb{Z} defined as for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{p}}$,

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \exp \left\{ \Delta(\theta^*)[bu] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[(bu)^{\otimes 2}] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} c_i \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} d_k |u_k|^{q_k} \right\}. \quad (4.4)$$

Then for the U -valued random variable \hat{u} defined in [A4],

$$\hat{u}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}.$$

Moreover, assume [A5] for the continuous random field \mathbb{V}_T defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_T(u) = & \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \hat{\tau}_T)[bu] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[(bu)^{\otimes 2}] - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathfrak{p}}), \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

where $\Delta_T(\theta^*, \cdot)$ represents $\mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^*, \cdot)$. Then for the U -valued random variable \hat{v}_T defined in [A5],

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1).$$

Remark 4.2. Similarly as Remark 3.2, under [C1] and [C4], the following condition holds.

[C1]^b For any $\delta > 0$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{(\theta, \tau) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{T} \\ |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta}} \{\mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau)\} \geq 0 \right] = 0.$$

Then Theorem 4.1 holds even if we substitute [C1] and [C4] with [C1]^b. (See the following proof.)

Proof of Theorem 4.1. From Theorem 2.1, it suffices to show that [C1]-[C5] imply [A1] and [A2]. Define r_T as

$$r_T(u, \tau) = -2 \int_0^1 (1-k) \{ \mathbf{a}_T \partial_\theta^2 \mathcal{H}_T(\theta^* + k a_T u, \tau) \mathbf{a}_T + \Gamma(\theta^*) \} dk$$

for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$. Then, from Taylor's series, for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) &= \exp \left\{ \Delta_T(\theta^*, \tau) [\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u] - \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\theta^*) + r_T(u, \tau)) [(\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u)^{\otimes 2}] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} (p_i(\theta_i^* + \mathbf{a}_{i,T} u_i) - p_i(\theta_i^*)) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} p_k(\mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{\rho_k} u_k) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Note that from [C2], for any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| < \delta_T} \|r_T(u, \tau)\| &= o_P(1), \\ \sup_{u \in U_T, |a_T u| < \delta_T} \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_{i,T} (p_i(\theta_i^* + \mathbf{a}_{i,T} u_i) - p_i(\theta_i^*)) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \mathbf{a}_{i,T} \xi_{i,T} \frac{d}{dx} p_i(\theta_i^*) u_i \right| &= o_P(1), \\ \sup_{u \in U_T, |a_T u| < \delta_T} \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} p_k(\mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{\rho_k} u_k) - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right| &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, from [C2], [A2] obviously holds if we take \mathbb{Z} and \mathbb{V}_T as (4.4) and (4.5), respectively.

We show that [A1] also holds. Let ϵ and R be positive numbers. Besides, let δ_T be a positive sequence with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |a_T u| < \delta_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

From [C1] and [C4], we can evaluate the first term in (4.7) as

$$\begin{aligned} &\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] \\ &= \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \left\{ \mathbb{H}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathbb{H}_T(\theta^*, \tau) \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \left\{ \mathcal{Y}(\theta) + \mathcal{Y}_T(\theta, \tau) - \mathcal{Y}(\theta) + \mathbf{b}_T^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} \xi_i p_i(\theta_i^*) \right\} \geq 0 \right] \\ &\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}, |\theta - \theta^*| \geq \delta_T} \mathcal{Y}(\theta) + o_P(1) \geq 0 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where $o_P(1)$ satisfies $\sup_{\Theta \times \mathcal{T}} |o_P(1)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$. (When substituting [C1] and [C4] with [C1]^b, stop at (4.8).) Thus, by choosing δ_T properly and using [C1] (or [C1]^b), we have

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |a_T u| \geq \delta_T} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] = 0.$$

We evaluate the second term in (4.7). Let $\epsilon > 0$. From (4.6) and [C2], for any $(u, \tau) \in U_T \times \mathcal{T}$ with $|a_T u| < \delta_T$ and for any $\omega \in \Omega$ belonging to a set

$$\left\{ \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} \geq \epsilon \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1) \right\} \cap \left\{ \lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] \geq \epsilon \right\},$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) &= \exp \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\theta^*) + o_P(1)) [(\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u)^{\otimes 2}] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} O_P(1) u_i - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\} \\
&= \exp \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \frac{1}{2} (\Gamma(\theta^*) + o_P(1)) [(\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u)^{\otimes 2}] - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\} \quad (4.9) \\
&\quad \left(\because O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_1} O_P(1) u_i = O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| \right) \\
&\leq \exp \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + o_P(1) \right) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u|^2 - \epsilon \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k|^{q_k} 1_{\{\rho_k > 1\}} \right\} \\
&\leq \begin{cases} \exp \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + o_P(1) \right) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u|^2 \right\} \\ \exp \left\{ O_P(1) - \epsilon \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k|^{q_k} 1_{\{\rho_k > 1\}} \right\} \end{cases}, \quad (4.10)
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the evaluation $\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ O_P(1) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| - \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + o_P(1) \right) |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u|^2 \right\} = O_P(1)$. Since $|u| \leq |\mathbf{a}_T^{-1} a_T u| + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} |u_k| 1_{\{\rho_k > 1\}}$, (4.10) converges to 0 as $|u| \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |\mathbf{a}_T u| < \delta_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1 \right] \\
&\leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{U_T \times \mathcal{T}, |u| \geq R \\ |\mathbf{a}_T u| < \delta_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \geq 1, \mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} \geq \epsilon \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1), \lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] \geq \epsilon \right] \\
&\quad + \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} \leq \epsilon \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1) \right] + P \left[\lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] \leq \epsilon \right] \\
&\stackrel{R \rightarrow \infty}{\rightarrow} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\mathbf{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xi_{k,T} \leq \epsilon \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1) \right] + P \left[\lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] \leq \epsilon \right] \\
&\leq P \left[d_k \leq \epsilon \ (k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1) \right] + P \left[\lambda_{\min}[\Gamma(\theta^*)] \leq \epsilon \right] \\
&\stackrel{\epsilon \rightarrow 0}{\rightarrow} 0 \quad (\cdot \cdot \text{ [C3] and [C5]}).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, [A1] holds. \square

4.3 Selection consistency

Denote by $\hat{u}_{j,T}$ the j -th component of \hat{u}_T ($j = 1, \dots, p$). When we can show that $\hat{u}_{k,T} \xrightarrow{P} 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) using Theorem 4.1, we can also show selection consistency under the following conditions [S1] and [S2]. Note that for $u = (u_1, \dots, u_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $v = (v_1, \dots, v_p) \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote $(u_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0}$, $(u_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}$, $(v_j)_{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0}$ and $(v_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}_0}$ by \bar{u} , \underline{u} , \bar{v} and \underline{v} , respectively. Define $\mathcal{J}_{0,+} \subset \mathcal{J}_0$ as

$$\mathcal{J}_{0,+} = \{k \in \mathcal{J}_0; d_k > 0 \text{ a.s.}\}.$$

[S1] $\mathcal{J}_{0,+}$ is not empty, and for any $R > 0$ and any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k = 1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
S(R, \delta_T) &= \{u \in U_T; |\bar{u}| \leq R, 0 < |\underline{u}| \leq \delta_T\} \quad \text{and} \\
I(R) &= \{v \in U_T; |\bar{v}| \leq R, |\underline{v}| = 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

[S2] For any $k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}$, $q_k \leq 1$.

Theorem 4.3. Assume that [C1]-[C5], [S1] and [S2] hold and that

$$\hat{u}_{k,T} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (k \in \mathcal{J}_0).$$

Then

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[(\hat{\theta}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} = 0] = 1.$$

Remark 4.4. Theorem 4.3 holds even if we substitute [C1] and [C4] with [C1]^b.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Take an arbitrary positive sequence ϵ_T with $\epsilon_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$. It suffices to show that

$$P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| = o_P(1)$, we can take a positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \delta_T] = 0.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in U_T, \tau \in \mathcal{T}, \\ \delta_T \geq |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \sup_{\substack{v \in U_T, \mu \in \mathcal{T}, \\ \underline{v} = 0}} \mathbb{Z}_T(v, \mu) \geq 0 \right] \\ & = \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ \tau \in \mathcal{T}, |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \sup_{\substack{v \in I(R), \\ \mu \in \mathcal{T}}} \mathbb{Z}_T(v, \mu) \geq 0 \right] \\ & = \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ \tau \in \mathcal{T}, |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{\substack{v \in I(R), \\ \mu \in \mathcal{T}}} \{ \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) - \mathbb{Z}_T(v, \mu) \} \geq 0 \right] \\ & = \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ \tau \in \mathcal{T}, |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ O_P(1)(|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|) + o_P(1)|(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1}| \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0} \xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} |u_k|^{q_k} \right\} \geq 0 \right] \quad (\because (4.9)). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \xrightarrow{d} d_k > 0$ ($k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}$) from [C2], for any $k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}$,

$$\overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[\xi_{k,T} \mathfrak{a}_{k,T}^{q_k \rho_k} \leq \eta] = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ \tau \in \mathcal{T}, |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{\substack{v \in I(R), \\ \mu \in \mathcal{T}}} \{ O_P(1)(|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + o_P(1)|(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1}| - \eta \sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k} \} \geq 0 \right] \\ & \leq \overline{\lim}_{\eta \rightarrow +0} \overline{\lim}_{R \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), \\ \tau \in \mathcal{T}, |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{\mu \in \mathcal{T}} \left\{ O_P(1) \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + o_P(1) \frac{|(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} - \eta \right\} \geq 0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Condition [S1] implies that for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{\substack{u \in S(R, \delta_T), v \in I(R) \\ |\underline{u}| \geq \epsilon_T}} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} \rightarrow 0 \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

Also, since $\{k \in \mathcal{J}_0; \rho_k > 1\} \subset \mathcal{J}_{0,+}$ from [C5], Condition [S2] implies that for any $R > 0$,

$$\sup_{|u| \leq R} \frac{|(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k > 1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} = O_P(1).$$

Thus, we have $\overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P[|(\hat{u}_{k,T})_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}| \geq \epsilon_T] = 0$. Thus, Theorem 4.3 holds. \square

The following example is a simple case where the selection consistency condition [S1] holds. A more complex case is treated in Section 4.4.

Example 4.5. Take Θ as

$$\Theta = \prod_{i=1}^p I_i,$$

where I_i ($i = 1, \dots, p$) are subsets of \mathbb{R}^p . Assume that \mathcal{J}_0 is not empty and that for any $k \in \mathcal{J}_0$, $\rho_k > 1$. Then [S1] obviously holds under [C5]. In fact, $\mathcal{J}_{0,+}$ is not empty from [C5], and for any $R > 0$ and any positive sequence δ_T with $\delta_T \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} &= \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_T)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{u}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^{q_k}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, [S1] holds. More generally, if Θ can be decomposed as

$$\Theta = \left\{ \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p; ((\theta_i)_{i \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{J}_0}, (\theta_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0}) \in A \times B \right\}$$

for some $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{p-|\mathcal{J}_0|}$ and some $B \subset \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{J}_0|}$, then the same argument goes.

4.4 Linear mixed model

We give an example where the Bridge estimator with $q < 1$ does not show selection consistency. Consider the linear mixed model

$$\begin{aligned} Y &= X\beta + Zb + \epsilon, \\ b &\sim N_e(0, D), \quad \epsilon \sim N_d(0, \sigma^2 I_d), \end{aligned}$$

where X and Z are observable random variables taking values in $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^c$ and $\mathbb{R}^d \otimes \mathbb{R}^e$, respectively. The nonrandom vector β is an unknown parameter, while b is an unobservable random effect that follows an e -dimensional Gaussian distribution with mean zero and covariance matrix D . Besides, $(X, Z), b$ and ϵ are mutually independent.

Bondell, Krishna and Ghosh [3] and Ibrahim et al. [11] consider penalized estimation using Cholesky parametrizations for D , while we use D as is without re-parametrization. Not re-parametrizing D is important not only since it is more intuitive, but also since the estimator can be invariant under reordering of the parameter components. Let us estimate the true value of the unknown parameters $\theta = (\beta, \sigma^2, \psi(D))$, where ψ is defined in (2.10) when $m = e$. Denote by $\Theta = \mathcal{B} \times \Sigma \times \psi(\mathcal{D})$ a parameter space of θ , where \mathcal{B} , Σ and \mathcal{D} are compact subsets of \mathbb{R}^c , $(0, \infty)$ and \mathcal{S}_+^e , respectively. Denote by $\theta^* = (\beta^*, (\sigma^*)^2, \psi(D^*))$ the true value of $\theta \in \Theta$. Suppose that $\beta^* \in \text{Int}(\mathcal{B})$ and $(\sigma^*)^2 \in \text{Int}(\Sigma)$ and that for some $\delta > 0$,

$$\{D \in \mathcal{D}; \|D - D^*\| < \delta\} = \{D \in \mathcal{S}_+^e; \|D - D^*\| < \delta\}. \quad (4.11)$$

Let $\{X_i, Z_i, b_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ be an n independent copies of $\{X, Z, b, \epsilon\}$. We have n couples of data (Y_i, X_i, Z_i) ($i = 1, \dots, n$). Then consider sparse estimation and maximize the estimation function

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_n(\theta) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i D Z_i' + \sigma^2 I_d)^{-1} [(Y_i - X_i \beta)^{\otimes 2}] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \det(Z_i D Z_i' + \sigma^2 I_d) \\ &\quad - n^{\frac{r}{2}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq e} \lambda_i |D_{ii}|^q \quad \left(\theta = (\beta, \sigma^2, \psi(D)) \in \Theta \right), \end{aligned}$$

where $D = (D_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq e}$, and $\lambda_i > 0$, $0 < q \leq 1$ and $0 \leq r \leq 1$ are tuning parameters. Note that we only penalize the diagonal elements of D . Let $\hat{\theta}_n = (\hat{\beta}_n, \hat{\sigma}_n^2, \psi(\hat{D}_n))$ be a maximizer of Ψ_n on Θ .

For simplicity, suppose that $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{d} = 1$ and $\mathbf{e} = 2$. Then $\theta = (\beta, \sigma^2, D_{11}, D_{12}, D_{22})$ becomes a 5-dimensional vector. Consider the case where

$$D_{11}^* > 0, \quad D_{12}^* = D_{22}^* = 0.$$

Assume $|X|, |Z| \in L^p(dP)$ for any $p > 0$, and define a continuous function L on Θ as for any $\theta = (\beta, \sigma^2, D_{11}, D_{12}, D_{22}) \in \Theta$,

$$L(\theta) = E \left[-\frac{1}{2} (Z D Z' + \sigma^2)^{-1} (Y - X \beta)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \log(Z D Z' + \sigma^2) \right].$$

Also, define a continuous random field \mathbb{Z} on \mathbb{R}^5 as for any $u = (u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^5$,

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \exp \left\{ \Delta(\theta^*)[Bu] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[(Bu)^{\otimes 2}] - 1_{\{r=1\}} \lambda_1 \frac{q}{|D_{11}^*|^{1-q}} w_1 - \lambda_2 1_{\{q \leq r\}} |w_3|^q \right\}, \quad (4.12)$$

where $\Delta(\theta^*) \sim N_5(0, \Gamma(\theta^*))$, $\Gamma(\theta^*) = (\Gamma(\theta^*)_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq 5} = -\partial_\theta^2 L(\theta^*)$ and

$$B = \begin{cases} I_5 & (q \geq r) \\ \text{diag}(1, 1, 1, 1, 0) & (q < r) \end{cases}.$$

Take $a_n \in GL(5)$ as a diagonal matrix defined as

$$(a_n)_{jj} = \begin{cases} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} & (j = 1, \dots, 4) \\ n^{-\frac{r}{2}} & (j = 5) \end{cases},$$

where $\rho = \frac{r}{q} \vee 1$. Define U_n and U as (2.1) and (2.3), respectively. Then from Example 2.6, [A3] holds, and U is determined as

$$U = \mathbb{R}^2 \times W = \mathbb{R}^2 \times \begin{cases} \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; w_3 \geq 0\} & (q > \frac{r}{2}) \\ \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; D_{11}^* w_3 - w_2^2 \geq 0\} & (q = \frac{r}{2}), \\ \{(w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^3; w_3 \geq 0, w_2 = 0\} & (q < \frac{r}{2}) \end{cases}, \quad (4.13)$$

where $W \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is defined as (2.15). Suppose that $\Gamma(\theta^*)$ is non-degenerate and that for any $\theta \in \Theta$ with $\theta \neq \theta^*$, $L(\theta) < L(\theta^*)$.

Lemma 4.6. *Condition [A4] holds for \mathbb{Z} defined in (4.12). Moreover, for the maximizer \hat{u} defined in [A4],*

$$P[\hat{u}_4 = \hat{u}_5 = 0] = 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad q < \frac{r}{2}, \quad (4.14)$$

where \hat{u}_i denotes the i -th component of \hat{u} for each $i = 1, \dots, 5$.

Proof. Assume $q = r2^{-1}$. Then from (4.12), for any $u = (u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \mathbb{R}^5$,

$$\mathbb{Z}(u) = \exp \left\{ H(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2) - \lambda_2 |w_3|^q \right\}, \quad (4.15)$$

where H is some continuous random field on \mathbb{R}^4 not depending on w_3 . Also, from (4.13), $U = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{(w_2, w_3); D_{11}^* w_3 \geq w_2^2\}$. Since w_3 can decrease when $D_{11}^* w_3 > w_2^2$, the maximizers of \mathbb{Z} on U is contained in $\partial U = \mathbb{R}^3 \times \{D_{11}^* w_3 = w_2^2\}$, and for any $u = (u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, w_3) \in \partial U$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{Z}(u) &= \exp \left\{ \Delta(\theta^*)[Bu] - \frac{1}{2} \Gamma(\theta^*)[(Bu)^{\otimes 2}] - 1_{\{r=1\}} \lambda_1 \frac{q}{|D_{11}^*|^{1-q}} w_1 - \lambda_2 (D_{11}^*)^{-q} |w_2|^r \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ C + Aw_2 - \gamma w_2^2 - \lambda_2 (D_{11}^*)^{-q} |w_2|^r \right\},\end{aligned}$$

where C and A are random variables depending on $(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1)$, and $\gamma > 0$ is a deterministic number. Then we can narrow down the candidates for the w_2 -component of the maximizers of \mathbb{Z} to two points. One of those two points equals 0. The maximizer of \mathbb{Z} on ∂U whose w_2 -component equals 0 is uniquely determined, and we denote it by $u^\dagger = (u_\beta^\dagger, u_{\sigma^2}^\dagger, w_1^\dagger, 0, 0)$. Also, denote $\log \mathbb{Z}(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, (D_{11}^*)^{-q} w_2^2)$ by $L(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2; \Delta(\theta^*))$.

If the maximizer of \mathbb{Z} of ∂U is not uniquely determined, then there exists some $(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2) \in \mathbb{R}^4 \setminus \{(u_\beta^\dagger, u_{\sigma^2}^\dagger, w_1^\dagger, 0)\}$ such that

$$F_1(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta(\theta^*)) := L(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2; \Delta(\theta^*)) - L(u_\beta^\dagger, u_{\sigma^2}^\dagger, w_1^\dagger, 0; \Delta(\theta^*)) = 0 \quad (4.16)$$

$$F_2(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta(\theta^*)) := \partial_{(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2)} L(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2; \Delta(\theta^*)) = 0. \quad (4.17)$$

Denote by Δ_i the i -th component of $\Delta := \Delta(\theta^*)$. Now we consider $\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_4$ as variables in the functions F_1, F_2 as well as $(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta)$ with $w_2 \neq 0$ satisfying (4.16) and (4.17),

$$\partial'_{(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta_4)} \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ F_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & w_2 \\ & & 0 & 0 \\ -(\Gamma(\theta^*)_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq 4} & & 0 & 0 \\ & & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + r(1-r) \frac{\lambda_2 (D_{11}^*)^{-q}}{|w_2|^{2-r}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}',$$

noting that $L(u_\beta^\dagger, u_{\sigma^2}^\dagger, w_1^\dagger, 0)$ does not depend on Δ_4 . This matrix is non-degenerate except when $|w_2|$ equals 0 or some value a depending on $\Gamma(\theta^*)$. Therefore, from the implicit function theorem, for any $(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta)$ with $|w_2| \neq 0, a$ satisfying (4.16) and (4.17), Δ_4 is locally equal to some function of $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3$. If $(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, w_2, \Delta)$ satisfies (4.16), (4.17) and $|w_2| = a$, then removing the 4-th component of F_2 and considering the Jacobian

$$\partial'_{(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1, \Delta_4)} \begin{pmatrix} F_1 \\ \partial_{(u_\beta, u_{\sigma^2}, w_1)} L \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \dots & 0 & w_2 \\ & & 0 & 0 \\ -(\Gamma(\theta^*)_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq 3} & & 0 & 0 \\ & & & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

we see Δ_4 is locally equal to some function of $\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \Delta_3$. Therefore, since the distribution of $\Delta(\theta^*)$ is 5-dimensional Gaussian, the probability that (4.16) and (4.17) hold equals 0. Thus, [A4] holds when $q = r2^{-1}$. In this case, considering when $\Delta_4(\theta^*)$ takes some large value, we have $P[\hat{u}_4 = 0] < 1$.

Similarly, when $q = r$, we can show [A4]. Also, when $q > r$, $r2^{-1} < q < r$ or $q < r2^{-1}$, we easily obtain [A4] from the convexity of U and the convexity of the function $\Delta(\theta^*)[Bu] - 2^{-1} \Gamma(\theta^*)[(Bu)^{\otimes 2}]$. Thus, [A4] holds for any q and r . If $q > r2^{-1}$, then considering when $\Delta_4(\theta^*)$ takes some large value, we have $P[\hat{u}_4 = 0] < 1$. If $q < r2^{-1}$, then we obviously obtain $P[\hat{u}_4 = \hat{u}_5 = 0] = 1$. Thus, we obtain [A4] and (4.14). \square

Denotes by $\hat{D}_{ij,n}$ the (i, j) entry of \hat{D}_n for each $i, j = 1, 2$. Then the following theorem gives the weak convergence of the estimator and the condition for its selection consistency.

Theorem 4.7.

$$\hat{u}_n := a_n^{-1}(\hat{\theta}_n - \theta^*) \xrightarrow{d} \hat{u}. \quad (4.18)$$

Moreover, selection consistency as

$$P[\hat{D}_{22,n} = 0] = P[\hat{D}_{12,n} = \hat{D}_{22,n} = 0] \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty) \quad (4.19)$$

holds if and only if

$$q < \frac{r}{2}.$$

In particular, the estimator has the oracle property if and only if $q < \frac{r}{2}$ and $r < 1$.

Proof. To apply Theorem 4.1, we ensure [C1]-[C5], [A3] and [A4]. Let \mathcal{G} be $\{\phi, \mathcal{F}\}$. Define \mathcal{J} , \mathcal{J}_0 and \mathcal{J}_1 as

$$\mathcal{J} = \{3, 5\}, \quad \mathcal{J}_1 = \{3\}, \quad \mathcal{J}_0 = \{5\}.$$

Take $p_j, q_j, \xi_{j,n}$ ($j \in \mathcal{J}$),

$$p_3(x) = p_5(x) = |x|^q \quad (x \in \mathbb{R}), \quad q_3 = q_5 = q, \quad (\xi_{3,n}, \xi_{5,n}) = (n^{\frac{r}{2}}\lambda_1, n^{\frac{r}{2}}\lambda_2).$$

Define $\mathcal{H}_n, \mathcal{Y}$ as for any $\theta = (\beta, \psi(D), \sigma^2) \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_n(\theta) &= -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i D Z_i' + \sigma^2)^{-1} (Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(Z_i D Z_i' + \sigma^2), \\ \mathcal{Y}(\theta) &= L(\theta) - L(\theta^*). \end{aligned}$$

Take a bounded open set $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^5$ satisfying Condition (i) and (ii) in Section 3.1 as

$$\mathcal{N} = \left\{ (\beta, \sigma^2) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty); |\beta - \beta^*| < 1, |\sigma^2 - (\sigma^*)^2| < \frac{(\sigma^*)^2}{2} \right\} \times \psi \left(\left\{ D \in \mathcal{S}_+^2; \det(D) > 0, \|D - D^*\| < \delta \right\} \right)$$

for $\delta > 0$ in (4.11). Take \mathbf{a}_n, ρ_k ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$), c_i ($i \in \mathcal{J}_1$) and d_k ($k \in \mathcal{J}_0$) as

$$\mathbf{a}_n = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} I_5, \quad \rho_5 = \rho = \frac{r}{q} \vee 1, \quad c_3 = \lambda_1 1_{\{r=1\}}, \quad d_5 = \lambda_2 1_{\{q \leq r\}}.$$

Then [C1]-[C5] obviously hold. Condition [A3], [A4] hold as mentioned above. Therefore, we obtain (4.18).

From Lemma 4.6, (4.14) holds. Therefore, it is sufficient to show (4.19) when $q < r2^{-1}$. For that, we show [S1]. Take any $R > 0$ and any positive sequence δ_n with $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$. Then for sufficiently large n ,

$$\begin{aligned} U_n \cap B_R &= \{u \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times [0, \infty); (D_{11}^* + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_3)n^{-\frac{r}{2q}}u_5 \geq n^{-1}u_4^2\} \cap B_R \\ S(R, \delta_n) &= \{u \in U_n; 0 < |u_5| < \delta_n, |\bar{u}| \leq R\} \\ &= \{u \in \mathbb{R}^4 \times [0, \infty); (D_{11}^* + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}u_3)n^{-\frac{r}{2q}}u_5 \geq n^{-1}u_4^2, 0 < |u_5| < \delta_n, |\bar{u}| \leq R\} \\ &\subset \{u \in \mathbb{R}^5; 2D_{11}^*n^{-(\frac{r}{2q}-1)}u_5 \geq u_4^2, 0 < u_5 < \delta_n, |\bar{u}| \leq R\}, \\ I(R) &= \{v \in U_n; v_5 = 0, |\bar{v}| \leq R\} = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^5; v_4 = v_5 = 0, |\bar{v}| \leq R\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4, u_5)$, $v = (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5)$, and \bar{u}, \bar{v} denote (u_1, u_2, u_3, u_4) , (v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4) , respectively.

Then noting that $\mathcal{J}_{0,+} = \{k \in \mathcal{J}_0; d_k > 0 \text{ a.s.}\} = \{5\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_n)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}| + |(u_k)_{k \in \mathcal{J}_0, \rho_k=1}|}{\sum_{k \in \mathcal{J}_{0,+}} |u_k|^q} &= \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_n)} \inf_{v \in I(R)} \frac{|\bar{u} - \bar{v}|}{|u_5|^q} \\ &\leq \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_n)} \frac{|\bar{u} - (u_1, u_2, u_3, 0)|}{|u_5|^q} \\ &= \sup_{u \in S(R, \delta_n)} \frac{|u_4|}{|u_5|^q} \\ &\leq \sup_{0 < |u_5| < \delta_n} \frac{|2D_{11}^*n^{-(\frac{r}{2q}-1)}u_5|^{\frac{1}{2}}}{|u_5|^q} \\ &\rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, [S1] holds. Besides, [S2] obviously holds. Thus, from Theorem 4.3, (4.19) holds. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.1. Before that, we prepare some lemmas.

Lemma 5.1. (i) U is closed in \mathbb{R}^P .

(ii) For any open sets O of \mathbb{R}^p and for any $R > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists some number $N = N(O, R, \delta)$ such that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}$ with $T \geq N$,

$$U(R) \cap O \subset (U_T(2R) \cap O)^\delta.$$

(iii) Under [A3], for any closed sets F of \mathbb{R}^p and for any $R > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists some number $N = N(F, R, \delta)$ such that for any $T \in \mathbb{T}$ with $T \geq N$,

$$U_T(R) \cap F \subset (U(R) \cap F)^\delta.$$

Proof. We define $B_\delta(x)$ by $B_\delta(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^p; |y - x| < \delta\}$ for $\delta > 0$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

(i) Let $\{x_n\}$ be an arbitrary sequence in U which converges to some $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We will show $x \in U$. Let $\delta > 0$, then there exists a number n_0 such that $x \in B_{\delta/2}(x_{n_0})$. Since $x_{n_0} \in U$, there exists a number $N = N(\delta)$ such that for all $T \geq N$, $x_{n_0} \in U_T^{\delta/2}$. Then for all $T \geq N$, $x \in U_T^\delta$, which means $x \in U$.

(ii) Take any open set O and any $R, \delta > 0$. Let $x \in U(R) \cap O$. Choose δ_0 with $0 < \delta_0 \leq \delta \wedge R$ satisfying $B_{\delta_0}(x) \subset O$. Since $x \in U$, there exists some number $N = N(\delta_0)$ such that for any $T \geq N$, $x \in U_T^{\delta_0}$. In particular, for any $T \geq N$, there exists $x_T \in U_T$ satisfying $|x - x_T| < \delta_0$. But then for any $T \geq N$, $x_T \in U_T(2R) \cap O$ and $x \in B_{\delta_0}(x_T) \subset (U_T(2R) \cap O)^\delta$.

(iii) We will prove the assertion by contradiction. Under [A3], suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} \exists F : \text{a closed subset of } \mathbb{R}^p \quad \exists R > 0 \quad \exists \delta_0 > 0 \quad \exists \{T_N\}_{N=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{T} \\ \text{s.t. } \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} T_N = \infty \quad \text{and} \quad U_{T_N}(R) \cap F \not\subset (U(R) \cap F)^{\delta_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Choose x_{T_N} satisfying $x_{T_N} \in (U_{T_N}(R) \cap F) \setminus (U(R) \cap F)^{\delta_0}$. Since $x_{T_N} \in F \cap \overline{B}_R$, there exists a subsequence $x_{T_{N_k}}$ satisfying $x_{T_{N_k}} \rightarrow x$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$ where $x \in F \cap \overline{B}_R$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} x &\in \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \bigcap_{k \geq n} U_{T_{N_k}}^\delta \subset \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcap_{n=1}^\infty \bigcup_{k \geq n} U_{T_{N_k}}^\delta \subset \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T^\delta \\ &= \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \bigcap_{\delta > 0} \left(\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \right)^\delta = \bigcap_{N=1}^\infty \overline{\left(\bigcup_{T \geq N} U_T \right)} = U. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $x \in U(R) \cap F$. But then for sufficiently large k , $x_{T_{N_k}} \in B_{\delta_0}(x) \subset (U(R) \cap F)^{\delta_0}$, which contradicts how to take x_{T_N} . \square

Lemma 5.2. Let \mathbb{V} be a $C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ -valued random variable satisfying that $\mathbb{V} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{Z}$. Assume [A4]. Let \hat{v} be a U -valued random variable satisfying that with probability 1,

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{v}) = \sup_U \mathbb{V}(u).$$

Then, with probability 1, for all $u \in U$ with $u \neq \hat{v}$,

$$\mathbb{V}(u) < \mathbb{V}(\hat{v}), \tag{5.1}$$

and

$$(\mathbb{V}, \hat{v}) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}). \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. Since $\mathbb{V} \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{Z}$, (5.1) is obviously holds from [A4]. We show (5.2). Take any open sets $G \in C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ and $O \in \mathbb{R}$. It is sufficient to show that

$$P[(\mathbb{V}, \hat{v}) \in G \times O] = P[(\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}) \in G \times O].$$

For this,

$$\begin{aligned}
P[(\mathbb{V}, \hat{v}) \in G \times O] &= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[(\mathbb{V}, \hat{v}) \in G \times O, \hat{v} \in \overline{B}_R] \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[\mathbb{V} \in G, \sup_{u \in O \cap U(R)} \mathbb{V}(u) - \sup_{u \in O^c \cap U(R)} \mathbb{V}(u) > 0, \hat{v} \in \overline{B}_R] \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[\mathbb{V} \in G, \sup_{u \in O \cap U(R)} \mathbb{V}(u) - \sup_{u \in O^c \cap U(R)} \mathbb{V}(u) > 0] \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[\mathbb{Z} \in G, \sup_{u \in O \cap U(R)} \mathbb{Z}(u) - \sup_{u \in O^c \cap U(R)} \mathbb{Z}(u) > 0] \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[\mathbb{Z} \in G, \sup_{u \in O \cap U(R)} \mathbb{Z}(u) - \sup_{u \in O^c \cap U(R)} \mathbb{Z}(u) > 0, \hat{u} \in \overline{B}_R] \\
&= \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P[(\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}) \in G \times O, \hat{u} \in \overline{B}_R] \\
&= P[(\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}) \in G \times O].
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2.1. First, we assume **[A1]**^{bb} and **[A2]**-**[A4]**, and prove (2.5) i.e.

$$\hat{u}_T \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{G})} \hat{u}.$$

Let Y be any \mathcal{G} -measurable non-negative random variable which is bounded and satisfies that $E[Y] > 0$. Define a probability measure P_Y as

$$P_Y[A] = \frac{E[1_A Y]}{E[Y]} \quad (A \in \mathcal{F}).$$

Let O be an arbitrary open set of \mathbb{R}^p . It is sufficient to show that

$$\underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y[\hat{u}_T \in O] \geq P_Y[\hat{u} \in O].$$

It is obvious when $U \cap O = \emptyset$, so we consider only the case where $U \cap O \neq \emptyset$. Then there exists $R_0 > 0$ satisfying $U(R_0/2) \cap O \neq \emptyset$. From Lemma 5.1 (ii), for sufficient large $T \in \mathbb{T}$, $U_T(R_0) \cap O \neq \emptyset$. In the following, T will be such large numbers, and let $R \geq R_0$ and $\epsilon > 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y[\hat{u}_T \in O] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y[\hat{u}_T \in O, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B}_R] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{u \in U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) - \sup_{u \in U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) > 0, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B}_R \right] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{u \in U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) - \sup_{u \in U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \hat{\tau}_T) > 0 \right] - \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y[\hat{u}_T \notin \overline{B}_R] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T - 2 \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{V}_T - \mathbb{Z}_T| > 0 \right] - \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y[\hat{u}_T \notin \overline{B}_R].
\end{aligned}$$

By **[A1]**^{bb}, the second term on the right-hand side converges to 0 as $R \rightarrow 0$. By **[A2]**, the first term can be evaluated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T - 2 \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{V}_T - \mathbb{Z}_T| > 0 \right] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > 2 \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{V}_T - \mathbb{Z}_T|, \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{V}_T - \mathbb{Z}_T| < \epsilon/2 \right] \\
&\geq \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > \epsilon \right] - \overline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} |\mathbb{V}_T - \mathbb{Z}_T| \geq \epsilon/2 \right] \\
&= \underline{\lim}_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > \epsilon \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, it is sufficient to show that

$$\varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \varliminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > \epsilon \right] \geq P_Y[\hat{u} \in O].$$

Let δ be a positive number. Considering Lemma 5.1 (ii) and (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \varliminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > \epsilon \right] \\ & \geq \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \varliminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{(U_T(R) \cap O^c)^\delta} \mathbb{V}_T > \epsilon \right] \quad (\because \text{Lemma 5.1 (iii)}) \\ & \geq \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \varliminf_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{(U_T(R) \cap O)^\delta} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U_T(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > 2\epsilon \right] \quad (\because (2.4) \text{ of } [\mathbf{A2}]) \\ & \geq \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} \varliminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U(R/2) \cap O} \mathbb{V}_T - \sup_{U(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{V}_T > 2\epsilon \right] \quad (\because \text{Lemma 5.1 (ii)}) \\ & \geq \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U(R/2) \cap O} \mathbb{Z} - \sup_{U(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z} > 2\epsilon \right] \quad (\because (2.4) \text{ of } [\mathbf{A2}]) \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U(R/2) \cap O} \mathbb{Z} - \sup_{U(R) \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z} > 2\epsilon \right] & \geq \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \varliminf_{R \rightarrow \infty} P_Y \left[\sup_{U(R/2) \cap O} \mathbb{Z} - \sup_{U \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z} > 2\epsilon \right] \\ & = \varliminf_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P_Y \left[\sup_{U \cap O} \mathbb{Z} - \sup_{U \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z} > 2\epsilon \right] \\ & = P_Y \left[\sup_{U \cap O} \mathbb{Z} - \sup_{U \cap O^c} \mathbb{Z} > 0 \right] \\ & \geq P_Y[\hat{u} \in O] \quad (\because [\mathbf{A4}]). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, under $[\mathbf{A1}]^{\text{bb}}$ and $[\mathbf{A2}]-[\mathbf{A4}]$, (2.5) holds. Therefore, under $[\mathbf{A1}]-[\mathbf{A5}]$, (2.5) holds.

Next, we also assume $[\mathbf{A5}]$, and prove (2.6) i.e.

$$\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T = o_P(1).$$

(i) We prove that for any $R_1 > 0$,

$$(\mathbb{V}_T, \hat{v}_T) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}) \quad \text{in } C(\overline{B_{R_1}}) \times \mathbb{R}^P. \quad (5.3)$$

It is sufficient (and also necessary) to prove

$$(\mathbb{V}_T, \hat{v}_T) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}) \quad \text{in } C(\mathbb{R}^P) \times \mathbb{R}^P. \quad (5.4)$$

For any diverging sequence $\{S_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ in \mathbb{T} , due to the tightness of $\{(\mathbb{V}_{S_k}, \hat{v}_{S_k})\}_{k=1}^\infty$, we can find a subsequence $\{T_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ of $\{S_k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ such that

$$(\mathbb{V}_{T_n}, \hat{v}_{T_n}) \xrightarrow{d} (\mathbb{V}_\infty, \hat{v}_\infty) \quad \text{in } C(\mathbb{R}^P) \times \mathbb{R}^P.$$

Then since $\mathbb{V}_T(\hat{v}_T) = \sup_U \mathbb{V}_T(u)$ a.s., we have

$$\begin{aligned} P \left[\forall u \in U; \mathbb{V}_\infty(\hat{v}_\infty) \geq \mathbb{V}_\infty(u) \right] & = P \left[\forall R_1 > 0; \mathbb{V}_\infty(\hat{v}_\infty) \geq \sup_{u \in U(R_1)} \mathbb{V}_\infty(u) \right] \\ & = \lim_{R_1 \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\mathbb{V}_\infty(\hat{v}_\infty) - \sup_{u \in U(R_1)} \mathbb{V}_\infty(u) \geq 0 \right] \\ & \geq \lim_{R_1 \rightarrow \infty} \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\mathbb{V}_{T_n}(\hat{v}_{T_n}) - \sup_{u \in U(R_1)} \mathbb{V}_{T_n}(u) \geq 0 \right] = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\mathbb{V}_\infty(\hat{v}_\infty) = \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{V}_\infty(u)$ a.s.. Also, **[A2]** implies that $\mathbb{V}_\infty \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbb{Z}$. Then from Lemma 5.2,

$$(\mathbb{V}_\infty, \hat{v}_\infty) \stackrel{d}{=} (\mathbb{Z}, \hat{u}).$$

Thus, (5.4) holds, which implies (5.3).

(ii) Using (5.3), we prove (2.6). Take any $\eta > 0$, and define a random set O_T depending on $T \in \mathbb{T}$ as

$$O_T(\omega) = \{u \in \mathbb{R}^p; |u - \hat{v}_T(\omega)| < \eta\} \quad (\omega \in \Omega).$$

Also, for each $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, define $\phi_v \in C(\mathbb{R}^p)$ as

$$\phi_v(u) = 2 - \left\{ \left(\frac{2|u - v|}{\eta} \vee 1 \right) \wedge 2 \right\} \quad (u \in \mathbb{R}^p).$$

Then for any $R > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ \omega; \hat{u}_T \in O_T, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right\} \\ \supset & \left\{ \omega; \sup_{(U_T(R) \cap O_T) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T - \sup_{(U_T(R) \cap O_T^c) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T > 0, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right\} \\ = & \left\{ \omega; \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) 1_{O_T}(u) - \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) (1 - 1_{O_T}(u)) > 0, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right\} \\ \supset & \left\{ \omega; \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 0, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[|\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T| < \eta \right] = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\hat{u}_T \in O_T \right] \\ \geq & \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\hat{u}_T \in O_T, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right] \\ \geq & \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 0, \hat{u}_T \in \overline{B_R} \right] \\ = & \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 0 \right] \quad (\because [\mathbf{A1}]^{bb}). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{(u, \tau) \in U_T(R) \times \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{Z}_T(u, \tau) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 0 \right] \\ \geq & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U_T(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{u \in U_T(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > \epsilon \right] \quad (\because [\mathbf{A2}]) \\ \geq & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U_T(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{u \in U(R)^\delta} \mathbb{V}_T(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > \epsilon \right] \\ & (\because \text{Lemma 5.1 (iii)}) \\ \geq & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in (U_T(R))^\delta} \mathbb{V}_T(u) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{u \in U(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \\ & (\because \text{tightness of } \{\hat{v}_T\}_{T \geq T_0} \text{ and (2.4)}) \\ \geq & \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U(R/2)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{u \in U(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \\ & (\because \text{Lemma 5.1 (ii)}) \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U(R/2)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u) - \sup_{u \in U(R)} \mathbb{V}_T(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{v}_T}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \\
& \geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U(R/2)} \mathbb{Z}(u) \phi_{\hat{u}}(u) - \sup_{u \in U(R)} \mathbb{Z}(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{u}}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \quad (\because (5.3)) \\
& \geq \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} \lim_{R \rightarrow \infty} P \left[\sup_{u \in U(R/2)} \mathbb{Z}(u) \phi_{\hat{u}}(u) - \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{Z}(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{u}}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \\
& = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0} P \left[\sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{Z}(u) \phi_{\hat{u}}(u) - \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{Z}(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{u}}(u)) > 2\epsilon \right] \\
& = P \left[\sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{Z}(u) \phi_{\hat{u}}(u) - \sup_{u \in U} \mathbb{Z}(u) (1 - \phi_{\hat{u}}(u)) > 0 \right] = 1 \quad (\because [\mathbf{A4}]).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus $\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} P \left[|\hat{u}_T - \hat{v}_T| < \eta \right] = 1$ for any $\eta > 0$, and we obtain (2.6). \square

6 Proof of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4

Proof of Theorem 3.3. The proof is similar to Uchida and Yoshida [19]. Take $\mathfrak{p} \times \mathfrak{p}$ matrices a_n as $a_n = \text{diag}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \dots, n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. Define \mathbb{H}_n as $\mathbb{H}_n(\theta) = \Psi_n(\theta)$. We ensure **[B1]**-**[B3]**, **[A3]** and **[A4]** for $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{N}$ to apply Theorem 3.1. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and any $\theta \in \Theta$, denote $S(X_{t_{i-1}}, \theta)$ and $\sigma(X_{t_{i-1}}, a^*)$ by $S_{i-1}(\theta)$ and σ_{i-1} , respectively. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_i Y &= \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (b_s - \beta_s) ds + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (\beta_s - \beta_{t_{i-1}}) ds + h\beta_{t_{i-1}} + h \frac{\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (\sigma(X_s, a^*) - \sigma_{i-1}) dw_s}{h} \\
&\quad + \sqrt{h} \frac{\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w}{\sqrt{h}},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

where $\Delta_i w = w_{t_i} - w_{t_{i-1}}$, and $\beta = \beta(n)$ is an \mathbf{F} -adapted continuous process ⁸ defined as

$$\beta_t = \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} \int_{(t-\epsilon_n) \vee 0}^t b_s \mathbf{1}_{\{|b_s| \leq \epsilon_n^{-1}\}} ds \quad (t \geq 0) \tag{6.2}$$

for some positive sequence ϵ_n with $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $h\epsilon_n^{-1} \rightarrow 0$. From **[I1]** and $h\epsilon_n^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, for any $p > 1$,

$$E \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} |b_s - \beta_s|^p ds + \int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} |\beta_s - \beta_{t_{i-1}}|^p ds \right\} \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (n \rightarrow \infty). \tag{6.3}$$

Therefore,

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) [(\Delta_i Y)^{\otimes 2}] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w}{\sqrt{h}} \right)^{\otimes 2} \right] + J_n + R_n, \tag{6.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
J_n &= -\frac{\sqrt{h}}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w}{\sqrt{h}} \right) \otimes \left(\beta_{t_{i-1}} + \frac{\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (\sigma(X_s, a^*) - \sigma_{i-1}) dw_s}{h} \right) \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{h}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \left[\left(\beta_{t_{i-1}} + \frac{\int_{t_{i-1}}^{t_i} (\sigma(X_s, a^*) - \sigma_{i-1}) dw_s}{h} \right)^{\otimes 2} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

⁸Unlike (6.2), we may define β as $\beta_t = \frac{1}{\epsilon_n} \int_{(t-\epsilon_n) \vee 0}^t b_s ds$ ($t \geq 0$) outside a P -null set where $b(\omega) \notin L^1([0, T])$. In this case, completion of \mathbf{F} may be necessary for the adaptedness of β .

and R_n is the residual term involved with the first and second terms of (6.1) satisfying $R_n = o_P(1)$ from (6.3) and [I1]-[I4]. Using Itô formula and [I2]-[I4], we also obtain $J_n = o_P(1)$. Then for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*)[u] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*)[u, h^{-1}(\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2}] + \partial_\theta \log |S_{i-1}|(\theta^*)[u] \right\} + o_P(1)|u| \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\sigma'_{i-1} \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \sigma_{i-1} \{h^{-1}(\Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2} - I_r\} [u] \right) + o_P(1)|u|. \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

Similarly, for any $\theta \in \Theta$ and any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \partial_\theta^2 S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}, h^{-1}(\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2}] + \partial_\theta^2 \log |S_{i-1}|(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} + o_P(1)|u|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

where $o_P(1)$ satisfies $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |o_P(1)| \xrightarrow{P} 0$ by using Sobolev's inequalities, noting that $\partial_\theta^2 S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta)$ simply consists of rational functions of θ . Also, for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_n(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n} \{ \mathbb{H}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*) \} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ (S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta) - S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*)) [h^{-1}(\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2}] + \log \frac{|S_{i-1}(\theta)|}{|S_{i-1}(\theta^*)|} \right\} + o_P(1). \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

Then from the following Lemmas 6.1-6.3, [B1] and [B2] hold, where $\mathcal{N} = \psi(\{A \in \mathcal{S}_+^m; \det(A) > 0, \|A - A^*\| < \delta\})$ for $\delta > 0$ in (3.8). Note that \mathcal{N} satisfies Condition (i) and (ii) in Section 3.1, and $\mathcal{N} \subset \Theta$. From [I5], [B3] also holds. From Example 2.5, we obtain [A3]. Also, [A4] obviously holds. Thus, (3.10) holds. \square

Lemma 6.1.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*) \xrightarrow{d_s(\mathcal{F})} \Delta(\theta^*).$$

Proof. From (6.5), $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*) - M^n = o_P(1)$, where M^n is an \mathbb{R}^p -valued random variable as for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\begin{aligned} M^n[u] &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Tr} \left(\sigma'_{i-1} \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \sigma_{i-1} \{h^{-1}(\Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2} - I_r\} [u] \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n v'(\sigma'_{i-1} \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \sigma_{i-1} [u]) v(h^{-1}(\Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2} - I_r). \end{aligned}$$

Define \mathbb{R}^p -valued random variables $\chi_i = \chi_i(n)$ as for any $u \in \mathbb{R}^p$,

$$\chi_i[u] = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}} v'(\sigma'_{i-1} \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \sigma_{i-1} [u]) v(h^{-1}(\Delta_i w)^{\otimes 2} - I_r).$$

Then for any $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt/T \rfloor} E[(\chi_i)^{\otimes 2} | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &\xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^t \rho_s^{\otimes 2} ds, & \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt/T \rfloor} E[\chi_i \Delta_i w | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &\xrightarrow{P} 0, \\ \sum_{i=1}^n E[|\chi_i|^4 | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &\xrightarrow{P} 0, & \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor nt/T \rfloor} E[\chi_i \Delta_i N | \mathcal{F}_{t_{i-1}}] &\xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad (N \in \mathcal{M}_b(w^\perp)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_i N = N_{t_i} - N_{t_{i-1}}$, and $\mathcal{M}_b(w^\perp)$ denotes the class of all bounded \mathbf{F} -martingales which is orthogonal to w . Thus, we can apply Theorem 3-2 of Jacod [12]. \square

Lemma 6.2. For any positive sequence δ_n with $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta, |\theta - \theta^*| < \delta_n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta) + \Gamma(\theta^*) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Proof. From (6.6),

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \partial_\theta^2 \mathbb{H}_n(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\partial_\theta^2 S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta) S_{i-1}(\theta^*) [u^{\otimes 2}] \right) + \partial_\theta^2 \log |S_{i-1}(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} + o_P(1)|u|^2 \\ &= -G(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] + o_P(1)|u|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $o_P(1)$ satisfies $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |o_P(1)| \rightarrow^P 0$ from Sobolev's inequalities, and $G(\theta)$ is defined as

$$G(\theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left\{ \text{Tr} \left(\partial_\theta^2 S^{-1}(X_t, \theta) S(X_t, \theta^*) [u^{\otimes 2}] \right) + \partial_\theta^2 \log |S|(X_t, \theta)[u^{\otimes 2}] \right\} dt.$$

Then $G(\cdot)$ is almost surely continuous on Θ , and $G(\theta^*) = \Gamma(\theta^*)$. Thus we obtain the desired result. \square

Lemma 6.3.

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \mathbb{Y}_n(\theta) - \mathbb{Y}(\theta) \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0.$$

Proof. From (6.7), for any $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_n(\theta) &= -\frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \text{Tr} \left((S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta) - S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*)) S_{i-1}(\theta^*) \right) + \log \frac{|S_{i-1}(\theta)|}{|S_{i-1}(\theta^*)|} \right\} + o_P(1) \\ &= \mathbb{Y}(\theta) + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

where $o_P(1)$ satisfies $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |o_P(1)| \rightarrow^P 0$ from Sobolev's inequalities. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.4. Redefine \mathbb{H}_n as $\mathbb{H}_n(\theta, \tau) = \tilde{\Psi}_n(\theta, \tau)$. As (6.4), from [I1]-[I4] and [I6],

$$-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{nh}} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) [(\Delta_i Y - hg(X_{t_{i-1}}, \tau))^{\otimes 2}] = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \partial_\theta S_{i-1}^{-1}(\theta^*) \left[\left(\frac{\sigma_{i-1} \Delta_i w}{\sqrt{h}} \right)^{\otimes 2} \right] + o_P(1),$$

where $o_P(1)$ satisfies $\sup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}} |o_P(1)| \rightarrow^P 0$ from Sobolev's inequalities. Therefore, $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \partial_\theta \mathbb{H}_n(\theta^*, \tau)$ satisfies (6.5). Similarly, (6.6) and (6.7) hold for this $\mathbb{H}_n(\theta, \tau)$. Then use Lemmas 6.1-6.3 as Theorem 3.3, and we obtain (3.11) from Theorem 3.1. Also, since [A5] holds for \mathbb{V}_n and \hat{v}_n , (3.12) holds from Theorem 3.1. \square

References

- [1] Adams, R.A., Fournier, J.: Cone conditions and properties of sobolev spaces. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **61**(3), 713–734 (1977)
- [2] Andrews, D.W.: Estimation when a parameter is on a boundary. *Econometrica* **67**(6), 1341–1383 (1999)
- [3] Bondell, H.D., Krishna, A., Ghosh, S.K.: Joint variable selection for fixed and random effects in linear mixed-effects models. *Biometrics* **66**(4), 1069–1077 (2010)
- [4] Chernoff, H.: On the distribution of the likelihood ratio. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **25**, 573–578 (1954)
- [5] De Gregorio, A., Iacus, S.M.: Adaptive lasso-type estimation for multivariate diffusion processes. *Econometric Theory* **28**(4), 838–860 (2012)

- [6] Fu, W., Knight, K.: Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *The Annals of statistics* **28**(5), 1356–1378 (2000)
- [7] Gaïffas, S., Matulewicz, G.: Sparse inference of the drift of a high-dimensional ornstein–uhlenbeck process. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **169**, 1–20 (2019)
- [8] Genon-Catalot, V., Jacod, J.: On the estimation of the diffusion coefficient for multi-dimensional diffusion processes. In: *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, vol. 29, pp. 119–151 (1993)
- [9] Ibragimov, I.A., Khas’minskii, R.Z.: The asymptotic behavior of statistical estimators in the smooth case. I. Study of the likelihood ratio. *Theory of Probability and its Applications* **17**, 445–462 (1973)
- [10] Ibragimov, I.A., Khas’minskii, R.Z.: Statistical estimation, Applications of Mathematics, vol. 16. Springer-Verlag, New York (1981). Asymptotic theory, Translated from the Russian by Samuel Kotz
- [11] Ibrahim, J.G., Zhu, H., Garcia, R.I., Guo, R.: Fixed and random effects selection in mixed effects models. *Biometrics* **67**(2), 495–503 (2011)
- [12] Jacod, J.: On continuous conditional gaussian martingales and stable convergence in law. In: *Seminaire de Probabilites XXXI*, pp. 232–246. Springer (1997)
- [13] Jorgensen, B.: Statistical properties of the generalized inverse Gaussian distribution, vol. 9. Springer Science & Business Media (2012)
- [14] Kinoshita, Y., Yoshida, N.: Penalized quasi likelihood estimation for variable selection. arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.12871 (2019)
- [15] Masuda, H., Shimizu, Y.: Moment convergence in regularized estimation under multiple and mixed-rates asymptotics. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics* **26**(2), 81–110 (2017)
- [16] Müller, S., Scealy, J.L., Welsh, A.H.: Model selection in linear mixed models. *Statistical Science* **28**(2), 135–167 (2013)
- [17] Self, S.G., Liang, K.Y.: Asymptotic properties of maximum likelihood estimators and likelihood ratio tests under nonstandard conditions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **82**(398), 605–610 (1987)
- [18] Tibshirani, R.: Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* **58**(1), 267–288 (1996)
- [19] Uchida, M., Yoshida, N.: Quasi likelihood analysis of volatility and nondegeneracy of statistical random field. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **123**(7), 2851–2876 (2013)
- [20] Umezu, Y., Shimizu, Y., Masuda, H., Ninomiya, Y.: Aic for the non-concave penalized likelihood method. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **71**(2), 247–274 (2019)
- [21] Wong, K.Y., Goldberg, Y., Fine, J.P.: Oracle estimation of parametric models under boundary constraints. *Biometrics* **72**(4), 1173–1183 (2016)
- [22] Yoshida, J., Yoshida, N.: Penalized estimation for non-identifiable models. arXiv (2022)
- [23] Yoshida, N.: Polynomial type large deviation inequalities and quasi-likelihood analysis for stochastic differential equations. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **63**(3), 431–479 (2011)
- [24] Zou, H.: The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical association* **101**(476), 1418–1429 (2006)