Negative Moment Bounds for Sample Autocovariance Matrices of Stationary Processes Driven by Conditional Heteroscedastic Errors and Their Applications

Hsueh-Han Huang[1], Shu-Hui Yu[2] and Ching-Kang Ing[3]

Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica[1]
Institute of Statistics, National University of Kaohsiung[2]
Institute of Statistics and Data Science, National Tsing Hua University[3]

Abstract

We establish a negative moment bound for the sample autocovariance matrix of a weakly stationary process driven by conditional heteroscedastic errors. This moment bound enables us to asymptotically express the mean squared prediction error (MSPE) of the least squares predictor as the sum of three terms related to model complexity, model misspecification, and conditional heteroscedasticity. A direct application of this expression is the development of a model selection criterion that can asymptotically identify the best (in the sense of MSPE) subset AR model in the presence of misspecification and conditional heteroscedasticity. Finally, numerical simulations are conducted to confirm our theoretical results.

1 Introduction

Let us start by consider a weakly stationary process,

$$x_t = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_i \varepsilon_{t-i}, \tag{1.1}$$

driven by a martingale difference sequence, $\{\varepsilon_t\}$, with respect to $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$, where the value of $E(\varepsilon_t^2) < \infty$ is the same for all t and $\{\alpha_i\}$ are real numbers satisfying

$$\alpha_0 = 1, \ |\alpha_i| = O(i^{-\iota}), \text{ for some } \iota > 1, \tag{1.2}$$

and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \alpha_i z^i \neq 0 \text{ for complex } |z| \leq 1. \tag{1.3}$$

For sequences of real numbers $\{a_m\}$ and $\{b_m\}$, $a_m = O(b_m)$ denotes the existence of a constant $C > 0$ and an integer $m_0 \geq 1$ such that $|a_m| \leq C|b_m|$ for all $m \geq m_0$.

Having observed $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, define the sample autocovariance matrix of order k as

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k) = \frac{1}{n-k} \sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_j(k) \mathbf{x}_j^\top(k),$$

where k is a positive integer and $\mathbf{x}_j(k) = (x_j, \ldots, x_{j-k+1})^\top$. The exclusion of x_n in $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k)$ is done for notational convenience, enabling $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k)$ to be directly linked to the least squares (LS) estimate (see (3.2)). However, whether x_n is included or excluded does not impact the estimator's asymptotic behavior. Let $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$ denote the minimum eigenvalue of matrix $\mathbf{M}$. In this article, we aim to establish, for any fixed integer $k \geq 1$,

$$E[\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k))] = O(1), \text{ for any } q > 0, \tag{1.4}$$

when $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ also obeys a conditional heteroscedasticity assumption, (CH), described in Section 2.

Negative moment bounds like (1.4) have been used to prove the uniform integrability of the LS estimate, and have played a crucial role in statistical prediction and model selection; see, for example, Fuller and Hasza (1981), Kunitomo and Yamamoto (1985), Lewis and Reinsel (1988), Shaman and Stine (1988), Ing and Wei (2003), Schorfheide (2005), Chan and Ing (2011), Greenway-Mcgrevy (2013), West and Zhao (2016), and Chi et al. (2021). When $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables, the problem of establishing (1.4) has been well explored by Bhansali and Papangelou (1991), Papangelou (1994), Findley and Wei (2002), Ing and Wei (2003), and Chan and Ing (2011), among others. However, this type of error sequence precludes many economic or financial time series that exhibits conditional heteroscedastic behavior; see, e.g., Bollerslev et al. (1994) and Tsay (2010). Alternatively, Assumption (CH) allows $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ to accommodate a diverse family of conditional heteroscedasticity models, such as the generalized autoregressive conditional heteroscedasticity (GARCH) model (Bollerslev, 1986), the GJR-GARCH model (Glosten et al., 1993), the asymmetric power GARCH model (Ding et al., 1993), and the stochastic volatility (SV) model (cf. Taylor, 1982, 1986; Tsay, 2010), thereby substantially broadening the applications of (1.4) once it is established.

A commonly used approach to proving (1.4) is to assume that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is an independent sequence whose marginal distributions satisfy some smoothness conditions; see, e.g., Papangelou (1994), Findley and Wei (2002), and Ing (2003). This approach, however, is no longer valid for conditional heteroscedastic errors

which can be serially dependent in a highly convoluted fashion. Furthermore, given that the marginal distribution of a conditional heteroscedastic process is often mathematically intricate (Francq and Zakoian, 2019), verifying the validity of an assumption regarding its marginal distribution proves difficult. To address this challenge, we introduce smoothness conditions, (2.8)–(2.11), on the (marginal) distributions of $z_t = \varepsilon_t/\sigma_t$ instead of ε_t, where $\sigma_t^2 = E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-1})$ is the conditional variance of ε_t given information up to time $t-1$ and $\{z_t\}$ is assumed to be an independent sequence. A significant finding of our study is the demonstration that (1.4) holds true when $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ follows Assumption (CH) and the corresponding standardized innovation $\{z_t\}$ meets (2.8)–(2.11), which are readily achievable in common practices.

In addition to being of fundamental theoretical interest, our negative moment bounds play a vital role in investigating the asymptotic behavior of the mean squared prediction error (MSPE), $E\{x_{n+h} - \hat{x}_{n+h}(k)\}^2$, of the h-step LS predictor, $\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)$, of x_{n+h} when (1.1) is approximated by an autoregressive (AR) model of order $k \geq 1$, where $h \geq 1$ and $\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)$ is defined in (3.2). In particular, we show in Section 3.1 that the *second-order* MSPE,

$$n[E\{x_{n+h} - \hat{x}_{n+h}(k)\}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{n,h,k}^2)], \tag{1.5}$$

can be asymptotically decomposed as the sum of three terms related to *model complexity, model misspecification, and conditional heteroscedasticity*, where $\varepsilon_{n,h,k}$, defined in (3.1), is the model error corresponding to the working AR(k) model, and $E(\varepsilon_{n,h,k}^2)$ is referred to as the *population* MSPE. It should be noted that while Kunitomo and Yamamoto (1985) and Ing (2003) have provided an asymptotic analysis of (1.5) in the case of independent errors, the extension of this analysis to accommodate conditionally heteroscedastic errors remains unexplored, due to the challenges associated with establishing (1.4).

This work also makes a contribution to model selection. Specifically, let J be a subset of $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \ldots\}$ representing a subset AR model employed to predict x_{n+h} based on lagged variables $\{x_{n+1-i}, i \in J\}$. Let $\hat{x}_{n+h}(J)$ stand for the corresponding LS predictors, as described in (3.17), and denote the population MSPE, $E(\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2)$, of J by $f_h(J)$, where $\varepsilon_{n,h,J}$ (see (3.16)) is the model error corresponding to model J. Let $\mathcal{J}$ be a finite set of candidate subset AR models. Define

$$\mathcal{J}_1(h) = \{\tilde{J} \in \mathcal{J} : f_h(\tilde{J}) = \min_{J \in \mathcal{J}} f_h(J)\} \tag{1.6}$$

as the set of candidate models having the smallest population MSPE. Also define

$$g_h(J) = \lim_{n\to\infty} n\{E\{x_{n+h} - \hat{x}_{n+h}(J)\}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{n,h,J}^2)\}, \tag{1.7}$$

provided the limit exists, and

$$\mathcal{J}_2(h) = \{\tilde{J} \in \mathcal{J}_1(h) : g_h(\tilde{J}) = \min_{J \in \mathcal{J}_1(h)} g_h(J)\}. \tag{1.8}$$

Our objective is to select a model $\hat{J}$ through a data-driven approach so that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\hat{J} \in \mathcal{J}_2(h)) = 1. \tag{1.9}$$

Essentially, our aim is to asymptotically identify the model with the lowest population MSPE, provided that this model is unique. If, however, more than one candidate shares the lowest population MSPE, we will prefer the one that offers the lowest second-order MSPE. Note first that when $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$ only contains one element, this goal can be easily achieved by comparing the R-squared values of the candidate models. When $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$ encompasses at least two elements, accomplishing this goal is also straightforward using BIC-like criteria, provided $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is conditionally homogeneous and at least one J is correctly specified (or, equivalently, includes the smallest correct model for h-step prediction). However, in the latter scenario of $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$, achieving this objective becomes notably more challenging when $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ exhibits conditional heteroscedasticity, or when all Js are misspecified. For more details, see Section 3.2.

Recently, Hsu et al. (2019) have proposed using a misspecification-resistant information criterion (MRIC) to tackle the hurdle. For candidate model J, its MRIC for h-step prediction is defined by:

$$\mathrm{MRIC}_h(J) = \hat{\sigma}_h^2(J) + \frac{C_n}{n}\hat{g}_h(J), \tag{1.10}$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J)$ is a $\sqrt{n}$-consistent estimator of $E(\varepsilon_{n,h,J}^2) = f_h(J)$, $\hat{g}_h(J)$ is a consistent estimator of $g_h(J)$, and C_n approaches ∞ at a suitable rate. Unlike conventional information criteria, which penalize the model's cardinality, the penalty factor C_n in MRIC is utilized to penalize the second-order MSPE of the candidate model. Assuming independent errors, the authors demonstrated that the model minimizing $\mathrm{MRIC}_h(\cdot)$ across all candidates achieves (1.9), even when all J are misspecified and $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$ includes more than one member. However, it remains unclear whether their approach extends to conditionally heteroscedastic errors, as confirmation of the limit in (1.7) for such cases has not been established. In this study, we confirm the existence of the limit using (1.4), and demonstrate that the expression for $g_h(J)$ from Hsu et al. (2019) extends to cases of conditionally heteroscedastic errors. This discovery enables us to obtain a comprehensive model selection result, wherein MRIC achieves (1.9), irrespective of model misspecification, the presence of conditional heteroscedasticity in $\{\varepsilon_t\}$, or the number of elements in $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$ is larger than 1.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Equation (1.4) is established and discussed in Section 2. Section 3.1 offers an asymptotic expression for (1.5). In Section 3.2, the result in Section 3.1 is extended to subset AR models with possible misspecification. The asymptotic validity of MRIC is also confirmed in the same section. Section 4 features numerical simulations to demonstrate the theoretical findings of Section 3. All technical details are provided in Appendices A and B, as well as in the Supplementary Material. We end this section with some notation used throughout this article. C denotes a generic positive constant independent of n, whose value may vary from place to place. For real numbers x and y, $x \wedge y = \min\{x, y\}$ and $x \vee y = \max\{x, y\}$. For square matrix $\mathbf{A}$, $\|\mathbf{A}\|$ and $\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{A})$ stand for its spectral norm and the trace, respectively. For vector $\boldsymbol{l}$, $\|\boldsymbol{l}\|$ denotes its Euclidean norm. For the sequence, $X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \ldots$, of random variables, $\sigma(X_{t-1}, X_{t-2}, \ldots)$ represents the σ-field generated by the

sequence. Let the symbol '$\equiv$' represent a definition.

2 Negative Moment Bounds for minimum eigenvalues

Let $\{\mathcal{F}_t\}$ be an increasing sequence of sub-σ-fields on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$, and $\{\varepsilon_t, \mathcal{F}_t\}$ be a martingale difference sequence. We start by introducing a conditional heteroscedasticity assumption.

> **Assumption (CH).** There exist a $\mathcal{F}_t$-measurable random variable z_t, with $E(z_t) = 0$ and $E(z_t^2) = 1$, and a non-negative $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$-measurable random variable σ_t such that
>
> $$\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t. \tag{2.1}$$
>
> Moreover, z_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and
>
> (i) σ_t is $\sigma(\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_{t-2}, \ldots)$-measurable and for some $0 < c_0 < \infty$,
>
> $$\sigma_t \geq c_0 \text{ a.s.}, \tag{2.2}$$
>
> or
>
> (ii) $\{z_t\}$ and $\{\sigma_t\}$ are independent sequences, and for any $\theta_0 > 0$,
>
> $$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E\sigma_t^{-\theta_0} < \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

Assumption (CH) includes many conditional heteroscedastic models as special cases. For example, (CH)(i) is fulfilled by the asymmetric power GARCH model (Ding et al. (1993)), which is (2.1) with z_t being i.i.d. random variables and

$$\sigma_t^\mu = \varphi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p'} \varphi_i (|\varepsilon_{t-i}| - \lambda_i \varepsilon_{t-i})^\mu + \sum_{j=1}^{q'} \psi_j \sigma_{t-j}^\mu, \tag{2.4}$$

where $p', q' \in \mathbb{N}$, $\varphi_0 > 0$, $\mu > 0$, $\varphi_i \geq 0$ and $|\lambda_i| < 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq p'$, $\psi_j \geq 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq q'$, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{p'} \varphi_i E(|z_1| - \lambda_i z_1)^\mu + \sum_{j=1}^{q'} \psi_j < 1. \tag{2.5}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(z_t, z_{t-1}, \ldots)$. Then, z_t is independent of $\mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ and by (2.5), $\sigma_t \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$ (see Ling and McAleer (2002a)). In addition, $\sum_{j=1}^{q'} \psi_j < 1$ ensures

$$\sigma_t^\mu = (1 - \sum_{j=1}^{q'} \psi_j B^j)^{-1} \{\varphi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p'} \varphi_i (|\varepsilon_{t-i}| - \lambda_i \varepsilon_{t-i})^\mu\}, \tag{2.6}$$

where B denotes the back-shift operator, and hence $\sigma_t \in \sigma(\varepsilon_{t-1}, \varepsilon_{t-2}, \ldots)$. Finally, (2.4) implies $\sigma_t \geq \varphi_0^{1/\mu}$ a.s. Thus, (2.2) holds true. It is also worth mentioning that the GARCH(p', q') process is a special case of (2.4) with $\mu = 2$ and $\lambda_i = 0$ for all i.

Another example is the SV model, which is (2.1) with z_t being i.i.d. random variables and $\log \sigma_t^2$ satisfying

$$(1 - \tilde{a}_1 B - \cdots - \tilde{a}_{\tilde{p}} B^{\tilde{p}}) \log(\sigma_t^2) = \tilde{a}_0 + v_t, \tag{2.7}$$

where $\{v_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. mean zero normal random variables independent of $\{z_t\}$, $\tilde{p} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{a}_0$ is a constant, and $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_i z^i \neq 0$, for all $|z| \leq 1$; see Chapter 3 of Tsay (2010) for more details. Letting $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(z_t, z_{t-1}, \ldots, v_{t+1}, v_t, \ldots)$, we now argue that the SV model is a special case of (CH)(ii). First, it is clear that $z_t \in \mathcal{F}_t$, $\sigma_t \in \mathcal{F}_{t-1}$, and $\{z_t\}$ is independent of $\{\sigma_t\}$. Moreover, (2.3) is ensured by the fact that σ_t^2 are identically distributed log-normal random variables.

It is important to highlight that because (CH) does not prescribe any particular parametric or non-parametric model for σ_t, the condition is considerably more flexible than the previously mentioned special cases. The main result of this section is presented in Theorem 2.1, in which (CH)(i) is assumed and $z_t, t \in \mathbb{Z} = \{\cdots, -1, 0, 1, \cdots\}$, are allowed to have density functions, $g_t(\cdot)$, with respect to the Lebesgue measure. The proof of Theorem 2.1 can be found in Section S1 of the Supplementary Material. To state the theorem, define $h_{t,x}(c) = (1/c) g_t(x/c)$, where $x \neq 0$ and $c > 0$.

Theorem 2.1. *Assume (1.1)–(1.3), (CH)(i). Suppose for any $0 < x < y < \infty$,*

$$g_t(y) \leq g_t(x) \text{ and } g_t(-y) \leq g_t(-x). \tag{2.8}$$

In addition, for any $0 < \delta \leq 1$, there exist a finite positive constant M_δ and a pair $(\bar{\theta}, \bar{C})$, independent of δ, satisfying $0 < \bar{\theta} \leq 1$ and $0 < \bar{C} < \infty$, such that

$$\sup_{-\infty < t < \infty} \{g_t(\delta) + g_t(-\delta)\} \leq M_\delta, \quad \sup_{-\infty < t < \infty} \int_{-\delta}^{\delta} g_t(x) dx \leq \bar{C} \delta^{\bar{\theta}}. \tag{2.9}$$

Moreover, for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $x \neq 0$, there exists a positive number $m_t(x)$ obeying $c_1|x| < m_t(x) < c_2|x|$, where $0 < c_1 < c_2 < \infty$ are independent of t and x, such that

$$h_{t,x}(m_t(x)) = \sup_{c > 0} h_{t,x}(c), \tag{2.10}$$

and

$$h_{t,x}(c) \text{ is non-increasing for } c > m_t(x). \tag{2.11}$$

Then, for any $q > 0$, $\theta > 0$, and $k \geq 1$,

$$E[\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k))] \leq C k^{(2+\theta)q} \tag{2.12}$$

holds for all sufficiently large n.

Since we assume that k is fixed as n increases, (1.4) directly follows from (2.12). A discussion of the case where $k = k_n$ grows to infinity with n is provided in Remark 2.3 at the end of this section. Condition (2.8)–(2.11), in particular (2.10) and (2.11), enable us to show that for any unit vector $(l_1, \ldots, l_k)^\top$ in $\mathbb{R}^k$ and any integer t, the conditional distribution of $\sum_{j=1}^k l_j \varepsilon_{t+1-j}$ given $\{\varepsilon_s, s \leq t-k\}$ is sufficiently smooth. This is one of the most critical properties needed for proving (2.12). For more details, see (S1.10)–(S1.22) in Section S1 of the Supplementary Material. Two additional remarks regarding these conditions are in order.

Remark 2.1. Assumptions (2.8)–(2.11) are fulfilled by many symmetric density functions encountered in common practice. For example, they are satisfied with $M_\delta = \bar{C} = \sqrt{2/\pi}$, $\bar{\theta} = 1$, and $m_t(x) = |x|$, when $g_t(\cdot)$ is the standard normal density function, and with $M_\delta = \bar{C} = 2\sigma_\nu \Gamma\{(\nu+1)/2\}/\{\sqrt{\nu\pi}\Gamma(\nu/2)\}$, $\bar{\theta} = 1$, and $m_t(x) = \sigma_\nu |x|$, when $g_t(\omega) = \sigma_\nu J(\sigma_\nu \omega)$ is the "normalized" density function for the t-distribution with ν degrees of freedom, where $-\infty < \omega < \infty$, $\nu > 2$, $\sigma_\nu = \sqrt{\nu/(\nu-2)}$, $J(\cdot)$ is the density function for the t-distribution with ν degrees of freedom, and $\Gamma(\cdot)$ is the gamma function. Assumptions (2.8)–(2.11) even hold when $\{g_t(\cdot)\}$ are unbounded. To see this, assume that for each $t \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$g_t(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\Gamma(\xi)} |\omega|^{\xi-1} e^{-|\omega|}$$

is a symmetric Gamma density function, where $-\infty < \omega < \infty$ and $0 < \xi < 1$. Then, (2.8)–(2.11) are satisfied with $M_\delta = \delta^{\xi-1}/\Gamma(\xi)$, $\bar{C} = 1/\{\Gamma(\xi)\xi\}$, $\bar{\theta} = \xi$, and $m_t(x) = |x|/\xi$.

Remark 2.2. The centrally monotonic property of $g_t(\cdot)$, as described in (2.8), can be readily relaxed to accommodate more general $g_t(\cdot)$, such as the mixture normal density, at the cost of replacing (2.9) with a slightly stronger assumption. For more details, refer to Section S1 of the Supplementary Material.

If $\{z_t\}$ and $\{\sigma_t\}$ are two independent sequences, then the distributional assumption, (2.8)–(2.11), on $\{z_t\}$, and the lower bound condition, (2.2), on $\{\sigma_t\}$ can be substantially relaxed. In particular, when (CH)(i) is replaced by (CH)(ii), we show in the next theorem that (1.4) still follows, provided (2.8)–(2.11) are weakened to: for some positive numbers ρ, η, and $\bar{M}$, and all $|x-y| \leq \eta$,

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} |G_t(x) - G_t(y)| \leq \bar{M}|x-y|^\rho, \tag{2.13}$$

where $G_t(\cdot)$ denotes the distribution function of z_t. Note that (2.13), including the second part of (2.9) as a special case, has been used by Ing and Wei (2003) to derive (1.4) in situations where $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables. Note also that (2.3) in (CH)(ii) is weaker than (2.2) in (CH)(i).

Theorem 2.2. *Assume* (1.1)–(1.3), (CH)(ii) *and* (2.13). *Then,* (2.12) *holds.*

The proof of Theorem 2.2 is also given in Section S1 of the Supplementary Material.

Remark 2.3. Our analysis in Section S1 of the Supplementary Material shows that Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 remain valid when $k = k_n \to \infty$ and $k^2 = o(n)$ as $n \to \infty$. Thus, we effectively generalize the result of Lemma 1 in Ing and Wei (2003) to accommodate the case of conditional heteroscedastic errors. However, to further establish (1.4) with $k = k_n \to \infty$ at an appropriate rate, a moment condition more stringent than $E\sigma_1^2 < \infty$ is required. Specifically, by (2.12) and an argument used in the proof of Theorem 2 of Ing and Wei (2003), we can state the following: (a) When $k^{2+\delta} = O(n)$ for some $\delta > 0$, (1.4) holds provided that $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\sigma_t|^{q_1} < \infty$ and $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|z_t|^{q_1} < \infty$ for all $q_1 > 0$, and (b) when $k^{6+\delta} = O(n)$ for some $\delta > 0$, (1.4) holds for $0 < q < q_1$, provided that $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\sigma_t|^{2(q_1\vee 2)} < \infty$ and $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|z_t|^{2(q_1\vee 2)} < \infty$ for some $q_1 > 0$. As shown in the next section, in the analysis of MSPEs, (1.4) often needs to hold for a large q. Consequently, the moment conditions in (a) and (b) on σ_t appear restrictive for GARCH-type errors in practical applications (cf. Ling and McAleer (2002a) and Ling and McAleer (2002b)).

3 Prediction and Model Selection

In Section 3.1, we utilize Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 to derive an asymptotic expression for the multistep MSPE of the LS predictor, as detailed in Theorem 3.1. We concentrate on the "direct" multistep prediction using the LS method due to its robust performance in scenarios where the working AR model is misspecified. This approach is supported by discussions in Chevillon (2007), Ing (2003), and Jordà (2005). Additionally, a more complex estimation method based on a specific conditionally heteroscedastic model could face greater risks of model misspecification, beyond the misspecification of the mean function. With the help of Theorem 3.1, Theorem 3.2 of Section 3.2 addresses the problem of subset selection and establishes the validity of MRIC in possibly misspecified AR models with conditionally heteroscedastic errors. The proofs of Theorem 3.1 and 3.2 are offered in Sections S2 and S3 of the Supplementary Material, respectively.

3.1 Asymptotic Expressions for the MSPEs

Define $\boldsymbol{\beta}_h(k) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathbb{R}^k} E\{x_{t+h} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}_t(k)\}^2 = \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)E(\mathbf{x}_t(k)x_{t+h})$, where $\mathbf{R}(k) = E(\mathbf{x}_t(k)\mathbf{x}_t(k)^\top)$. Then, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_t(k)$ is the best linear predictor of x_{t+h} based on $\mathbf{x}_t(k)$, with $\varepsilon_{t,h,k} = x_{t+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_t(k)$ representing the associated prediction error. Note that $E(\mathbf{x}_t(k)\varepsilon_{t,h,k})$ is the k-dimensional zero vector. In what follows, the model

$$x_{t+h} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_t(k) + \varepsilon_{t,h,k}, \tag{3.1}$$

is referred to as the h-step-ahead predictive model. Given (3.1), the h-step LS predictor of x_{n+h} is

$$\hat{x}_{n+h}(k) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{n,h}^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_n(k), \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{n,h}(k) = (n-h-k+1)^{-1}\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\sum_{j=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(k)x_{j+h},$$

with

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(k) = (n-h-k+1)^{-1}\sum_{j=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^{\top}(k).$$

Since the value to be predicted, x_{n+h}, and the observed data, $x_1,\ldots,x_n$, belong to the same realization, this type of prediction is referred to as the "same-realization" prediction and is somewhat different from the "independent-realization" prediction in which the value to be predicted is independent of the observed data; see, e.g., Akaike (1969), Bhansali (1981), Findley and Wei (2002), and Schorfheide (2005).

The next theorem provides an asymptotic expression for $E\{x_{n+h}-\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)\}^2$.

Theorem 3.1. (a) *Assume* (1.1)–(1.3) *hold with* ι *in* (1.2) *satisfying* $\iota > 3/2$, (CH)(i), *and* (2.8)–(2.11). *Let* $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ *be a fourth-order weakly stationary process, and suppose there exists some* $\delta > 0$ *such that*

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^{6+\delta} < \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Furthermore, for any fixed sequences $\{\underline{m}_n\}$ *and* $\{\bar{m}_n\}$ *with* $1 \le \underline{m}_n \le \bar{m}_n \le n$,

$$\sup_{-\infty<s<\infty} E\Big|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{m}_n-\underline{m}_n+1}}\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(\varepsilon_{t+s}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t+s}^2))\Big|^{3+\delta^\star} \le C, \tag{3.4}$$

for some $\delta^\star > 0$, *and*

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-j}) - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|^{3/2} = o(j^{-3/2}), \ \text{as } j\to\infty. \tag{3.5}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty} n[E\{x_{n+h}-\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)\}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{n,h,k}^2)]\\ &= \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}(k)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(k)\},\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

where $\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(k) = E\{\mathbf{x}_k(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+s}^{\top}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+s,h,k}\}$ *and* $\sum_{i=a}^{b}\cdot = 0$ *if* $a > b$.

(b) *Equation* (3.6) *remains valid when* (CH)(i) *and* (2.8)–(2.11) *in (a) are replaced by* (CH)(ii) *and* (2.13).

The second-order MSPE of $\hat{x}_{n+h}$ in (3.6) can be further decomposed into three terms. That is,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}(k)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(k)\} = \boldsymbol{A}_{h,k} + \boldsymbol{B}_{h,k} + \boldsymbol{C}_{h,k} \\
&\equiv \left\{\operatorname{tr}\left(\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)E\{\mathbf{x}_k(k)\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\}\right) E\left(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,h}^2\right) + \right. \\
&\left. 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\operatorname{tr}[\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)E\{\mathbf{x}_k(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+s}^\top(k)\}]E(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,h}\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k+s,h})\right\} \\
&+\left(\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}^*(k)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}^*(k)\}\right) \\
&+\left(\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_{0,h}(k)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\operatorname{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_{s,h}(k)\}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{L}_{s,h}^*(k) &= E\{\mathbf{x}_k(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+s}^\top(k)(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,h}\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k+s,h} - E(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,h}\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k+s,h}))\}, \\
\tilde{\mathbf{L}}_{s,h}(k) &= E\{\mathbf{x}_k(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+s}^\top(k)(\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+s,h,k} - \tilde{\varepsilon}_{k,h}\tilde{\varepsilon}_{k+s,h})\},
\end{aligned}$$

and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{t,h} = \sum_{j=0}^{h-1}\alpha_j\varepsilon_{t+h-j}$. The first term, $\boldsymbol{A}_{h,k}$, is related to the model complexity. In particular, when $h = 1$, $\boldsymbol{A}_{h,k} = kE(\varepsilon_{k+1}^2)$ is proportional to the number of parameters of the working AR(k) model. The second term, $\boldsymbol{B}_{h,k}$, is attributed to the conditional heteroscedasticity introduced by σ_t in ε_t, and vanishes when $\sigma_t = c$ is a positive constant (implying that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a sequence of independent random variables). The presence of the third term, $\boldsymbol{C}_{h,k}$, is owing to $\varepsilon_{t,h,k} \neq \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t,h}$, which occurs when the AR(k) model is misspecified.

Note that (3.6) has been reported in Theorem 2 of Ing (2003) when $\sigma_t = c$ and (3.1) is correctly specified (i.e., $\varepsilon_{t,h,k} = \tilde{\varepsilon}_{t,h}$), and Theorem 2.1 of Hsu et al. (2019) when $\sigma_t = c$ but (3.1) is misspecified. Therefore, Theorem 3.1 can be viewed as an extension of these results to misspecified AR models with conditional heteroscedastic errors. This extension, however, is far from being trivial owing to the difficulty in developing (1.4) under (CH), as shown in Section 2. Furthermore, the complexity of the formula on the right-hand side of (3.6) increases substantially in the presence of conditionally heteroscedastic errors compared to independent errors, even when (3.1) is correctly specified. To illustrate this, assume that $x_t = \beta_1 x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, where $|\beta_1| < 1$, $\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t$, z_t are i.i.d. random variables with zero mean and variance 1, and $\sigma_t^2 = \varphi_0 + \varphi_1\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \psi_1\sigma_{t-1}^2$, with $\varphi_0 > 0$, $\varphi_1 \geq 0$, $\psi_1 \geq 0$, and $\varphi_1 + \psi_1 < 1$. The corresponding h-step-head predictive model is (3.1), with $\mathbf{x}_t(k) = x_t$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_h(k) = \beta_1^h$, and $\varepsilon_{t,h,k} = \sum_{i=0}^{h-1}\beta_1^i\varepsilon_{t+h-i}$. After engaging in detailed calculations, we can represent the right-hand side of

(3.6) as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2i}\sigma^2+\{\sum_{i=0}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2i}(\varphi_1+\psi_1)^{h-i-1}\}c_1^\star\sigma^2+2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2s}(\sum_{i=0}^{h-s-1}\beta_1^{2i})\sigma^2 \\ +2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2s}\{\sum_{i=0}^{h-s-1}\beta_1^{2i}(\varphi_1+\psi_1)^{h-i-1}\}c_1^\star\sigma^2, \tag{3.7}$$

where $\sigma^2=E(\varepsilon_t^2)$,

$$c_1^\star=\frac{(1-\beta_1^2)\varphi_1(1-\varphi_1\psi_1-\psi_1^2)(E(z_t^4)-1)}{\{1-\beta_1^2(\varphi_1+\psi_1)\}\{1-(E(z_t^4)\varphi_1^2+2\varphi_1\psi_1+\psi_1^2)\}},$$

and $1>E(z_t^4)\varphi_1^2+2\varphi_1\psi_1+\psi_1^2$ is ensured by $E(\varepsilon_t^4)<\infty$. However, when $\varphi_1=\psi_1=0$, (3.7) is substantially simplified to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2i}\sigma^2+2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\beta_1^{2s}(\sum_{i=0}^{h-s-1}\beta_1^{2i})\sigma^2,$$

which has been given by Theorem 2 of Ing (2003).

Another notable feature of Theorem 3.1 is that its moment condition (3.3) is substantially weaker than those in the existing results on the "same-realization" MSPE; see, e.g., Chi et al. (2021), Fuller and Hasza (1981), Greenway-Mcgrevy (2013), Hsu et al. (2019), Ing and Wei (2003), and Kunitomo and Yamamoto (1985), where the existence of at least finite $(8+\delta)$th moments of ε_t is required. In fact, (S2.14) in Section S2 of the Supplementary Material reveals that (3.3) can hardly be weakened in the case of same-realization prediction. Moreover, we illustrate via a numerical example in Section S6.1 of the Supplementary Material that when ε_t only has a finite $(4+\delta)$th moment, our asymptotic expression on the right-hand side of (3.6), denoted by $g_h(k)$, is about 16 times as large as the numerical approximation of (1.5), denoted by $g_{n,h}(k)$ (see (4.4)), even when n grows up to 5,000. In sharp contrast, $g_{n,h}(k)/g_h(k)$ is very close to 1 for all $n\geq 500$ as long as (3.3) is satisfied. The remainder of this section is dedicated to the discussion of (3.4) and (3.5).

Proposition 3.1. *Suppose that $\{\varepsilon_t^2\}$ admits a martingale representation,*

$$\varepsilon_t^2-E(\varepsilon_t^2)=\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\mathbf{a}_s^\top\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}, \tag{3.8}$$

where $\mathbf{a}_s$ are r-dimensional, $r\geq 1$, real vectors satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{a}_s\|=O\{(s+1)^{-\varsigma}\},\ \textit{for some}\ \varsigma>3/2, \tag{3.9}$$

and for any t, $\boldsymbol{w}_{t,t-j}$ is $\mathcal{F}_j$-measurable and obeys

$$E(\boldsymbol{w}_{t,t-j}|\mathcal{F}_{j-1})=\mathbf{0}\ \textit{a.s.} \tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, assume

$$\sup_{-\infty<t,s<\infty,} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}\|^{3+\delta^\star} < \infty, \tag{3.11}$$

with $\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s} = \mathbf{0}$ *for* $s < 0$. *Then,* (3.4) *and* (3.5) *hold.*

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is given in Section S2 of the Supplementary Material. In the following examples, we argue that (3.8)–(3.11) are easily met in common practice.

Example 3.1. Consider again the asymmetric power GARCH model, which is (2.1) with σ_t satisfying (2.4). When $\mu = 2$ in (2.4), the model can be expressed as,

$$\varepsilon_t^2 = \varphi_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{p'\vee q'} \{\varphi_i E(|z_1| - \lambda_i z_1)^2 + \psi_i\}\varepsilon_{t-i}^2 + w_{1,t} - \sum_{j=1}^{q'} \psi_j w_{1,t-j} + \sum_{l=1}^{p'} 4\varphi_l\lambda_l w_{2,t-l}, \tag{3.12}$$

where $w_{1,t} = \varepsilon_t^2 - \sigma_t^2$, $w_{2,t} = \varepsilon_t^2 I_{\{\varepsilon_t<0\}} - \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon_t^2$, and φ_i, λ_i, and ψ_j, are set to 0 when $i > p'$ and $j > q'$. As discussed in Ding et al. (1993), (3.12) includes the GARCH model (Bollerslev (1986)) as well as the GJR-GARCH model (Glosten et al. (1993)) as special cases. Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(z_t, z_{t-1}, \ldots)$ and assume that z_t are symmetric. Then, (3.8)– (3.10) hold with $\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s} = \boldsymbol{w}_{t-s} = (w_{1,t-s}, w_{2,t-s})^\top$ and $\mathbf{a}_s = (a_{1s}, a_{2s})^\top$, where a_{1s} and a_{2s}, respectively, satisfy

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} a_{1s} z^s = \frac{1 - \sum_{i=1}^{q'} \psi_i z^i}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{p'\vee q'} \{\varphi_j E(|z_1| - \lambda_j z_1)^2 + \psi_j\} z^j}$$

and

$$\sum_{s=0}^{\infty} a_{2s} z^s = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{p'} 4\varphi_i\lambda_i z^i}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^{p'\vee q'} \{\varphi_j E(|z_1| - \lambda_j z_1)^2 + \psi_j\} z^j}.$$

See Appendix B of Ding et al. (1993) and Theorem 3.1 of Ling and McAleer (2002a) for more details. Moreover, if for some $\delta_1 > 0$,

$$E|\varepsilon_1|^{6+\delta_1} < \infty, \tag{3.13}$$

then (3.11) follows from (3.13) and the i.i.d. assumption on $\{z_t\}$.

Example 3.2. Suppose that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is the SV model, (2.1) and (2.7), and obeys $E|z_1|^{6+\delta_1} < \infty$, for some $\delta_1 > 0$. Let $\mathcal{F}_t = \sigma(z_t, z_{t-1}, \ldots, v_{t+1}, v_t, \ldots)$. Then, it can be shown that (3.8)–(3.11) hold with $\boldsymbol{w}_{t,0} = \varepsilon_t^2 - \sigma_t^2$,

$$\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s} = \begin{cases} \tilde{b}_s^{-1}\{e^{\tilde{b}_s v_{t-s+1}} - E(e^{\tilde{b}_s v_{t-s+1}})\} \prod_{u=s+1}^{\infty} e^{\tilde{b}_u v_{t-u+1}}, & \text{if } \tilde{b}_s \neq 0, \\ v_{t-s+1} \prod_{u=s+1}^{\infty} e^{\tilde{b}_u v_{t-u+1}}, & \text{if } \tilde{b}_s = 0, \end{cases} \tag{3.14}$$

for $s \geq 1$, $\mathbf{a}_0 = 1$, $\mathbf{a}_1 = \tilde{b}_1 e^{\tilde{b}_0^*}$, and

$$\mathbf{a}_s = \tilde{b}_s e^{\tilde{b}_0^*} \prod_{i=1}^{s-1} E(e^{\tilde{b}_i v_{t-i+1}}), \tag{3.15}$$

for $s \geq 2$, where $\tilde{b}_0^* = \tilde{a}_0/(1-\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_i)$ and $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{b}_{i+1} z^i = (1-\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_i z^i)^{-1}$. Indeed, $\|\mathbf{a}_s\| \leq \tilde{c}_1 \exp(-\tilde{c}_2 s)$, for some $0 < \tilde{c}_1 < \tilde{c}_2 < \infty$, $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t,0}\|^{3+\delta} < \infty$, for some $\delta > 0$, and $\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty, s\geq 1} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}\|^{\tilde{\theta}} < \infty$, for any $\tilde{\theta} > 0$.

Before concluding this section, we note that (3.4) and (3.5) can also be readily satisfied by other types of weakly dependent processes, such as those whose serial dependencies are characterized using functional dependence measures (Wu (2005)) or strong mixing conditions. For additional details, refer to Appendix A.

3.2 Best Subset Selection

A natural generalization of (3.1) is the subset AR model for h-step prediction,

$$x_{t+h} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(J)\mathbf{x}_t(J) + \varepsilon_{t,h,J}, \tag{3.16}$$

where $J \subset \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{x}_t(J) = (x_{t+1-j}, j \in J)^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_h(J) = \arg\min_{\mathbf{c}\in\mathbb{R}^{\sharp(J)}} E\{x_{t+h} - \mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}_t(J)\}^2$. With model (3.16), the h-step LS predictor for x_{n+h} is

$$\hat{x}_{n+h}(J) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{n,h}^\top(J)\mathbf{x}_n(J), \tag{3.17}$$

where

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{n,h}(J) = \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(J)\frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}+1}\sum_{j=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(J)x_{j+h},$$

with

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(J) = \frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}+1}\sum_{j=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(J)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(J),$$

and $\tilde{d} \equiv$ the largest number in J. The following corollary shows that the limit of $n\{E\{x_{n+h} - \hat{x}_{n+h}(J)\}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{n,h,J}^2)\}$ exists and has an expression akin to the right-hand side of (3.6).

Corollary 3.1. *Under the same assumptions as in Theorem 3.1(a) or Theorem 3.1(b), the limit in (1.7) exists and has the following expression:*

$$g_h(J) = \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(J)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}(J)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(J)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(J)\}, \tag{3.18}$$

where $\mathbf{R}(J) = E\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(J)\}$ *and* $\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(J) = E\{\mathbf{x}_1(J)\mathbf{x}_{1+s}^\top(J)\varepsilon_{1,h,J}\varepsilon_{1+s,h,J}\}$.

The derivation of Corollary 3.1 relies on Theorem 2.1 and follows the approach used in the proof of Theorem 3.1, which is omitted here for conciseness. In fact, in the special case where ε_t are independent errors, (3.18) has been established in Theorem 3.2 of Hsu et al. (2019). These authors further suggested estimating $g_h(J)$ using

$$\hat{g}_h(J) = \mathrm{tr}\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(J)\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{0,h}(J)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\mathrm{tr}\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(J)\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{s,h}(J)\}, \tag{3.19}$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{s,h}(J) = (n-h-\tilde{d}-s+1)^{-1} \sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h-s} \mathbf{x}_t(J)\mathbf{x}_{t+s}^{\top}(J)\hat{\varepsilon}_{t,h,J}\hat{\varepsilon}_{t+s,h,J},$$

with $\hat{\varepsilon}_{t,h,J} = x_{t+h} - \hat{x}_{t+h}(J)$ and $\hat{x}_{t+h}(J) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{n,h}^{\top}(J)\mathbf{x}_t(J)$. They also demonstrated that

$$\hat{g}_h(J) = g_h(J) + o_p(1), \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J) = f_h(J) + O_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{3.21}$$

where $f_h(J) = E(\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2)$ and

$$\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J) = \frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}+1} \sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h} \hat{\varepsilon}_{t,h,J}^2. \tag{3.22}$$

As illustrate in (3.21), $\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J)$ is a $\sqrt{n}$-consistent estimate of $f_h(J)$.

When there is a set of candidate subset AR models,

$$x_{t+h} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^{\top}(J)\mathbf{x}_t(J) + \varepsilon_{t,h,J},\ J \in \mathcal{J},$$

for some finite set $\mathcal{J}$ of models, (3.20) and (3.21) have led Hsu et al. (2019) to select the best predictive candidate using MRIC, which is (1.10), with $\hat{g}_h(J)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_h(J)$ given by (3.19) and (3.22), respectively, and C_n obeying

$$\frac{C_n}{n^{1/2}} \to \infty \text{ and } \frac{C_n}{n} \to 0. \tag{3.23}$$

Define

$$\hat{J}(h) = \arg\min_{J\in\mathcal{J}} \text{MRIC}_h(J).$$

Hsu et al. (2019) have shown that (1.9) holds with $\hat{J} = \hat{J}(h)$, even when all J are misspecified and $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$, defined in (1.6), contains more than one member.

It is worth mentioning that this subtle model selection problem has been addressed by Inoue and Kilian (2006), who showed that BIC-like criteria can consistently select the model with the fewest parameters among the candidates in $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$. However, Findley (1991) and Hsu et al. (2019) have argued that when both J_1 and J_2 are incorrect, the ranking of $g_h(J_1)$ and $g_h(J_2)$ may not align with the comparison of their cardinalities. This raises the possibility that the model with the fewest parameters in $\mathcal{J}_1(h)$ may not be included in $\mathcal{J}_2(h)$, as defined in (1.8). Essentially, achieving (1.9) through model selection criteria such as AIC, BIC, and HQ appears to be difficult, as their penalty terms account only for the model's cardinality rather than its second-order MSPE. On the other

hand, although Hsu et al. (2019) established the validity of MRIC only under the assumption of independent errors, Theorem 3.2 below demonstrates that as long as the expression for $g_h(J)$ on the right-hand side of (3.18) holds, (1.9) can be attained using MRIC when model errors satisfy general conditions commonly met by most conditionally heteroscedastic processes.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that* (1.1)–(1.3) *hold, and*

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^4 < \infty. \tag{3.24}$$

Moreover, assume that

$$\sup_{-\infty<s_1,s_2<\infty} E|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\varepsilon_{t+s_1}\varepsilon_{t+s_2} - E(\varepsilon_{t+s_1}\varepsilon_{t+s_2}))|^2 \leq C, \tag{3.25}$$

and for any fixed $-\infty < j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 < \infty$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{t=1}^{n}(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4} - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4})) = o_p(1). \tag{3.26}$$

Then, (1.9)*, with* $g_h(J)$ *defined in* (3.18)*, is fulfilled by* $\hat{J}(h)$*, provided that* C_n*, which is used to define MRIC, satisfies* (3.23)*.*

Assumptions (3.25) and (3.26), similar to (3.4) and (3.5), can also be verified for weakly dependent processes that satisfy certain functional dependence properties, mixing conditions, or condition (3.8). In Appendix B, we provide a detailed discussion on this topic and demonstrate how GARCH and SV processes fulfill (3.25) and (3.26).

4 Simulation Studies

4.1 Numerical Illustrations of Theorem 3.1

This subsection provides two numerical examples to illustrate Theorem 3.1.

Example 4.1. We generate $M = 5000$ realizations from the following AR(2) model,

$$x_t = -0.5x_{t-2} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{4.1}$$

where ε_t obeys (2.1) with $\{z_t\}$ being a sequence of i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ random variables and $\{\sigma_t\}$ being either a GARCH(1,1) process,

$$\sigma_t^2 = 0.4 + 0.2\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 0.55\sigma_{t-1}^2, \tag{4.2}$$

or a SV(1) ((2.7) with $\tilde{p} = 1$) process,

$$(1 - 0.98B)\log(\sigma_t^2) = 0.01 + v_t, \tag{4.3}$$

Table 1: The values of $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$, with $k = 1$, $n = 500, 2000$, and $h = 1, \ldots, 5$, in Example 4.1

GARCH(1,1)	h=1	2	3	4	5
$g_h(1)$	3.454	2.425	3.760	3.702	3.986
$R_{500,h}$	0.814	0.910	0.795	0.928	1.058
$R_{2000,h}$	1.043	1.021	0.920	0.961	1.034
SV(1)	$h = 1$	2	3	4	5
$g_h(1)$	9.680	7.119	11.686	12.061	13.546
$R_{500,h}$	0.925	0.690	0.800	0.793	0.644
$R_{2000,h}$	1.082	0.945	1.041	0.902	1.055

in which $\{v_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. $N(0, 0.04)$ random variables. We adopt a misspecified working model, (3.1) with $k = 1$, to make prediction, and approximate (1.5) using

$$g_{n,h}(k) = \frac{1}{M}\sum_{l=1}^{M} n\{\tilde{g}^{(l)}_{1,n,h}(k) + \tilde{g}^{(l)}_{2,n,h}(k)\}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\tilde{g}^{(l)}_{1,n,h}(k) = (x^{(l)}_{n+h} - \hat{x}^{(l)}_{n+h}(k) - \varepsilon^{(l)}_{n,h,k})^2$, $\tilde{g}^{(l)}_{2,n,h}(k) = 2(x^{(l)}_{n+h} - \hat{x}^{(l)}_{n+h}(k) - \varepsilon^{(l)}_{n,h,k})(\varepsilon^{(l)}_{n,h,k} - \tilde{\varepsilon}^{(l)}_{n,h})$, and $x^{(l)}_{n+h}$, $\hat{x}^{(l)}_{n+h}(k)$, $\varepsilon^{(l)}_{n,h,k}$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}^{(l)}_{n,h}$ are, respectively, x_{n+h}, $\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)$, $\varepsilon_{n,h,k}$, and $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{n,h}$ obtained at the lth realization. Note that $M^{-1}\sum_{l=1}^{M} n\tilde{g}^{(l)}_{1,n,h}(k)$ and $M^{-1}\sum_{l=1}^{M} n\tilde{g}^{(l)}_{2,n,h}(k)$ are numerical approximations of the first and second expectations on the right hand side of (S2.14) in Section S2 of the Supplementary Material, which sum up to (1.5). We then calculate $g_h(k)$ (the right-hand side of (3.6)) based on (4.1) and (4.2) (or (4.3)), and assess the closeness between $g_h(k)$ and $g_{n,h}(k)$ by the ratio $R_{n,h} = g_{n,h}(k)/g_h(k)$, where $n = 500, 2000$ and $h = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ in our study. We report $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$ in Table 1.

Example 4.2. We generate $M = 5000$ realizations from the MA(1) model,

$$x_t = \varepsilon_t - 0.8\varepsilon_{t-1}, \tag{4.5}$$

instead of model (4.1). On the other hand, ε_t, the working model, and the values of n and h in this example are the same as those in Example 4.1. Table 2 summarizes the corresponding $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$.

It follows from (4.1)–(4.3), (4.5) and the normality of $\{z_t\}$ and $\{v_t\}$ that the assumptions in Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled by Examples 4.1 and 4.2. For the SV(1) error (4.3), Tables 1 and 2 reveal that whereas the values of $R_{500,h}$, oscillating between 0.614 and 1.284, are relatively distant from 1, $R_{n,h}$ becomes very close to 1 as n increases to 2000. The behavior of $R_{2000,h}$ under the GARCH(1, 1) error (4.2) is similar to that under the SV(1) error, although $R_{500,h}$ under the former error is generally closer to 1 than the latter. Therefore, we conclude that the numerical results in this subsection are aligned with the asymptotic results displayed in Theorem 3.1.

Table 2: The values of $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$, with $k = 1$, $n = 500, 2000$, and $h = 1, \ldots, 5$, in Example 4.2

GARCH(1,1)	h=1	2	3	4	5
$g_h(1)$	2.964	5.808	5.324	4.961	4.689
$R_{500,h}$	0.679	0.984	0.976	0.953	0.929
$R_{2000,h}$	1.077	0.979	0.975	0.981	0.976
SV(1)	$h = 1$	2	3	4	5
$g_h(1)$	7.484	17.448	17.113	16.791	16.481
$R_{500,h}$	1.284	0.768	0.614	0.731	0.865
$R_{2000,h}$	0.979	0.948	0.902	0.997	0.947

4.2 MRIC for Subset Selection

This subsection illustrates the finite sample performance of MRIC (see (1.10) and Section 3.2) through the following data generating process,

$$x_t = 0.4x_{t-3} + \varepsilon_t,$$
$$\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t,\ \sigma_t^2 = 0.4 + 0.2\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 0.55\sigma_{t-1}^2,$$

where $\{z_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ random variables. These model specifications imply that the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 follow. We are interested in performing h-step-ahead forecast, $h = 1, 2, 3$, based on two predictive models, $J_1 = \{1\}$ and $J_2 = \{2\}$, both are misspecified. It can be shown that $f_h(J_1) = f_h(J_2)$ and $g_h(J_1) > g_h(J_2)$ for $h = 1$, $f_h(J_1) > f_h(J_2)$ for $h = 2$, and $f_h(J_1) < f_h(J_2)$ for $h = 3$. Therefore, for $h = 1$, $\mathcal{C}_{M_1(1)} = \{J_1, J_2\}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{M_2(1)} = \{J_2\}$; for $h = 2$, $\mathcal{C}_{M_1(2)} = \mathcal{C}_{M_2(2)} = \{J_2\}$; for $h = 3$, $\mathcal{C}_{M_1(3)} = \mathcal{C}_{M_2(3)} = \{J_1\}$, where $\mathcal{C}_{M_1(h)}$ and $\mathcal{C}_{M_2(h)}$ are defined in (1.6) and (1.8), respectively. To implement MRIC, we set $C_n = n^{0.6}$ as suggested in Hsu et al. (2019), where n is set to 500, 1000, 2000, 3000 in our study. For comparison, we also use

$$\mathrm{AIC}(J) = \log\{\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J)\} + \frac{2\sharp(J)}{n}$$

and

$$\mathrm{BIC}(J) = \log\{\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J)\} + \frac{\sharp(J)\log n}{n}$$

to choose between J_1 and J_2. The frequency, in 1000 simulations, of each criterion to choose a candidate in $C_{M_2(h)}$ is reported in Table 3. Note that since $\sharp(J_1) = \sharp(J_2)$, the model selection results of AIC and BIC are exactly the same.

For $h = 2$ and 3, $\mathcal{C}_{M_1(h)}$ only contains one model and Table 3 reveals that all criteria can select this model about 100% of the time even when $n = 500$. This result is somewhat expected because for $h = 2$ and 3, $|f_h(J_1) - f_h(J_2)| \approx 0.305$ is bounded away from 0, making these criteria easy to identify the better predictive model through the consistent estimates, $\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J_1)$ and $\hat{\sigma}_h^2(J_2)$, of $f_h(J_1)$

Table 3: Frequency, in 1,000 simulations, of choosing candidates belonging to $\mathcal{C}_{M_2(h)}$

h	n	AIC/BIC	MRIC
1	500	476	695
	1000	509	752
	2000	502	790
	3000	487	826
2	500	1000	999
	1000	1000	1000
	2000	1000	1000
	3000	1000	1000
3	500	1000	997
	1000	1000	1000
	2000	1000	1000
	3000	1000	1000

and $f_h(J_2)$; see (3.21). On the other hand, $f_h(J_1) = f_h(J_2)$ for $h = 1$, and hence J_2 outperforms J_1 only when their $g_1(\cdot)$ values are taken into account. Since $g_1(J_1)$ and $g_1(J_2)$ are not solely dependent on the numbers of parameters in J_1 and J_2 owing to model misspecification, AIC and BIC fail to distinguish J_2, which has the smaller $g_1(\cdot)$ value, from J_1. In particular, Table 3 shows that they can only choose J_2 about 50% of the time for all cases of n. On the contrary, MRIC identifies J_2 about 70% of the time when $n = 500$, and the percentage increases to about 80% as n increases to 2000. This simulation demonstrates the advantage of MRIC in choosing the better predictive model in a very challenging situation where the underlying process possesses conditional heteroscedasticity and the competing candidates are misspecified but share the same population MSPE in terms of the values of $f_h(\cdot)$.

In Section S6.2 of the Supplementary Material, we also compare the performance of MRIC, AIC, and BIC in correctly specified cases. Our results show that MRIC continues to outperform the other two criteria in such cases.

Appendix A Further Discussion on (3.4) and (3.5)

In this appendix, we illustrate that (3.4) and (3.5) also hold for the following two classes of weakly dependent processes.

A. *Strictly stationary processes with dependencies characterized by functional dependence measures.* Assume $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a strictly stationary process of the form

$$\varepsilon_t = \tilde{g}(\ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{t-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t), \tag{A.1}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t$ are i.i.d. random variables, and $\tilde{g}$ is a measurable function such that ε_t is well-defined. Let $\{\mathbf{z}_t^\star\}$ be an i.i.d. copy of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t\}$, and define $\varepsilon_i^\star =$

$\tilde{g}(\ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{-1}, \mathbf{z}_0^\star, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_1, \ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i)$. The functional dependence measure of $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is then given by $\delta'_\xi(i) = (E|\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_i^\star|^\xi)^{1/\xi}$, $\xi > 0$. For more details, see Wu (2005).

Proposition A.1. *Assume* (A.1),

$$E|\varepsilon_1|^{6+\delta} < \infty, \tag{A.2}$$

and

$$\delta'_{6+\delta}(n) = O(n^{-\nu}), \tag{A.3}$$

for some $\delta > 0$ *and* $\nu > 2$. *Then,* (3.4), *with* $\delta^\star = \delta/2$, *and* (3.5) *follow* .

B. *Strong mixing processes.* Define the strong mixing coefficient

$$\alpha(m) = \sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} \sup_{A\in\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^t, B\in\mathcal{F}_{t+m}^\infty} |P(A\cap B) - P(A)P(B)|,$$

where $\mathcal{F}_j^l = \sigma(\varepsilon_t, j \le t \le l)$. We say that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is strong mixing if $\alpha(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$.

Proposition A.2. *Assume that* $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ *is a strong mixing process satisfying* (3.3) *and*

$$\alpha(n) = O(n^{-\nu}), \tag{A.4}$$

for some $\nu \ge 3$. *Then,* (3.4), *with* $\delta^\star = \delta/2$, *and* (3.5) *hold.*

The proofs of Propositions A.1 and A.2 are provided in Section S4 of the Supplementary Material. Together with Proposition 3.1, these results establish that a broad class of weakly dependent processes satisfies assumptions (3.4) and (3.5).

Appendix B Further Discussion on (3.25) and (3.26)

In this appendix, we demonstrate that assumptions (3.25) and (3.26) are satisfied by both the processes presented in Appendix A and the one discussed in Proposition 3.1.

Proposition B.1. *Assume* (A.1),

$$E|\varepsilon_1|^4 < \infty, \tag{B.1}$$

and

$$\Theta_4 < \infty, \tag{B.2}$$

where $\Theta_\xi = \sum_{i=0}^\infty \delta'_\xi(i)$. *Then,* (3.25) *and* (3.26) *are valid.*

Proposition B.2. *Assume* $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ *is a strong mixing process with*

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^{4+\delta} < \infty, \tag{B.3}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Moreover, suppose that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \alpha(i)^{\frac{\delta}{4+\delta}} < \infty. \tag{B.4}$$

Then, (3.25) *and* (3.26) *hold.*

Remark B.1. Define the uniform mixing coefficient as

$$\phi(m) = \sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} \sup_{A\in\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^{t}, B\in\mathcal{F}_{t+m}^{\infty}, P(A)>0} |P(B|A) - P(B)|.$$

The process $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is said to be uniform mixing if $\phi(m) \to 0$ as $m \to \infty$. If $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is uniform mixing and satisfies (B.3) along with

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \phi(i)^{\frac{2+\delta}{4+\delta}} < \infty, \tag{B.5}$$

then (3.25) and (3.26) hold. This implies that when $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ satisfies uniform mixing instead of strong mixing, the required decay rate of the mixing coefficients can be relaxed from (B.4) to (B.5).

Proposition B.3. *Suppose that* (2.1) *holds, and $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is fourth-order weakly stationary process satisfying* (3.8) *and* (3.10)*, with $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_s\| < \infty$,*

$$E(\boldsymbol{w}_{t,t-j}\varepsilon_j|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \mathbf{0} \text{ a.s., and } \sup_{-\infty<t,s<\infty} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}\|^{2+\delta} < \infty, \tag{B.6}$$

for some $\delta > 0$. Moreover, assume that z_t is symmetric for all t, and for any $-\infty < t_1, t_2 < \infty$, $\varepsilon_{t_1}^2\varepsilon_{t_2}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t_1}^2\varepsilon_{t_2}^2)$ has a martingale representation satisfying the following conditions:

$$\varepsilon_{t_1}^2\varepsilon_{t_2}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t_1}^2\varepsilon_{t_2}^2) = \sum_{s=0}^{\infty}(\mathbf{b}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(1)})^{\top}\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(1)} + \sum_{s=0}^{\infty}(\mathbf{b}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(2)})^{\top}\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(2)}, \tag{B.7}$$

where for each (t_1, t_2), $\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,(t_1\vee t_2)-j}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,(t_1\vee t_2)-j}^{(2)}$ are finite-dimensional $\mathcal{F}_j$-measurable random vectors obeying

$$E(\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,(t_1\vee t_2)-j}^{(1)}|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \mathbf{0} \text{ a.s.}, \quad E(\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,(t_1\vee t_2)-j}^{(2)}|\mathcal{F}_{j-1}) = \mathbf{0} \text{ a.s.}, \tag{B.8}$$

and

$$\sup_{-\infty<t_1,t_2,s<\infty} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(1)}\|^{1+\delta} < \infty, \quad \sup_{-\infty<t_1,t_2,s<\infty} E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(2)}\|^{2+\delta} < \infty, \tag{B.9}$$

with $\boldsymbol{w}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(v)} = \mathbf{0}$ for $s < 0$. Additionally, $\mathbf{b}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(1)}$ are finite-dimensional non-random vectors satisfying

$$\sup_{-\infty<t_1,\, t_2<\infty} \sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{b}_{t_1,t_2,s}^{(1)}\| < \infty, \tag{B.10}$$

and $\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t_1,t_2,s}, s \geq 0$, *are finite-dimensional* $\mathcal{F}_{(t_1 \vee t_2)-s-1}$*-measurable random vectors satisfying for some* $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{-\infty<t_1,t_2<\infty} (E\|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t_1,t_2,s}\|^{2+\delta})^{\frac{1}{2+\delta}} \leq C(s+1)^{-1-\epsilon}. \tag{B.11}$$

Then, (3.25) *and* (3.26) *hold.*

The following examples further illustrate the flexibility of assumptions (3.25) and (3.26).

Example B.1. Assume that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a GARCH(p', q') process, (2.1) and (2.4) with $\mu = 2$ and $\lambda_i = 0$, satisfying (B.1). Then, by Theorem 3.1 of Ling and McAleer (2002a), (A.1) holds with $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t = z_t$ and

$$\tilde{g}(\ldots, z_{t-1}, z_t) = z_t\{\varphi_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathbf{c}}^\top (\prod_{i=1}^{j} \tilde{\mathbf{A}}_{t-i})\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t-j}\}^{1/2},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{c}} = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_{p'}, \psi_1, \ldots, \psi_{q'})^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = (\varphi_0 z_t^2, 0, \ldots, 0, \varphi_0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is a $(p'+q')$-dimensional vector, with $\varphi_0 z_t^2$ and φ_0 being its first and $(p'+1)$th components, respectively, and

$$\tilde{\mathbf{A}}_t = \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \varphi_1 z_t^2 & \cdots & \varphi_{p'} z_t^2 & \psi_1 z_t^2 & \cdots & \psi_{q'} z_t^2 \\ \mathbf{I}_{(p'-1)\times(p'-1)} & & \mathbf{O}_{(p'-1)\times 1} & \multicolumn{3}{c}{\mathbf{O}_{(p'-1)\times q'}} \\ \hline \varphi_1 & \cdots & \varphi_{p'} & \psi_1 & \cdots & \psi_{q'} \\ \multicolumn{3}{c|}{\mathbf{O}_{(q'-1)\times p'}} & \multicolumn{3}{c}{\mathbf{I}_{(q'-1)\times(q'-1)} \quad \mathbf{O}_{(q'-1)\times 1}} \end{array}\right).$$

Note that for any positive integers r and s, $\mathbf{I}_{r\times r}$ denotes the $r \times r$ identity matrix, and $\mathbf{O}_{r\times s}$ denotes the $r \times s$ zero matrix. Moreover, by Proposition 3 of Wu and Min (2005), (B.2) follows. Consequently, (3.25) and (3.26) are ensured by Proposition B.1.

Example B.2. Assume that $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ is a SV process satisfying (2.1) and (2.7), in which $\{z_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables with $E|z_1|^4 < \infty$. Since $1 - \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_i z^i \neq 0$ for all $|z| \leq 1$, it follows that (A.1) holds with $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t = (z_t, v_t)^\top$ and

$$\tilde{g}(\ldots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{t-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_t) = z_t \exp(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{b}_0^\star + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \tilde{b}_{i+1} v_{t-i}),$$

where $\tilde{b}_0^\star$ and $\tilde{b}_i$s are defined in Remark 3.2. Moreover, Since σ_t is log-normally distributed, all its finite moments exist. This property, combined with $E|z_1|^4 < \infty$ and the independence of $\{\sigma_t\}$ and $\{z_t\}$, implies (B.1). In addition, (B.2) is ensured by

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (E|\sigma_i - \sigma_i^\star|^4)^{1/4} < \infty, \tag{B.12}$$

where $\sigma_i^\star$ is σ_i with v_0 therein replaced by its independent copy. As a result, Proposition B.1 guarantees the validity of (3.25) and (3.26).

To demonstrate (B.12), note first that for all $i \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} &E|\sigma_i - \sigma_i^\star|^4 = E|e^{\frac{1}{2}w_i} - e^{\frac{1}{2}w_i^\star}|^4 \\ =&E|\frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{w}_i}|^4||w_i - w_i^\star|^4 \leq (E|\frac{1}{2}e^{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{w}_i}|^8)^{\frac{1}{2}}(E|w_i - w_i^\star|^8)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.13}$$

where $w_i = \log(\sigma_i^2)$, $w_i^\star = \log(\sigma_i^{\star 2})$, and $\tilde{w}_i$ satisfies $|\tilde{w}_i - w_i^\star| \leq |w_i - w_i^\star|$. Since for all $i \geq 0$, all moments of σ_i and $\sigma_i^\star$ exist, we have

$$\sup_{0 \leq i < \infty} E|e^{\frac{1}{2}\tilde{w}_i}|^8 < \infty.$$

Moreover, by Examples 1 and 2 of Wu (2011),

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}(E|w_i - w_i^\star|^8)^{\frac{1}{8}} < \infty.$$

Combining this result with (B.13) establishes (B.12).

Supplementary Material

Supplement to "Negative Moment Bounds for Sample Autocovariance Matrices of Stationary Processes Driven by Conditional Heteroscedastic Errors and Their Applications" (DOI:). The Supplementary Material contains the proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2, and Propositions 3.1, A.1, A.2, and B.1–B.3. It also provides technical details about Remark 2.2 as well as additional numerical results.

References

Akaike, H. (1969). Fitting autoregressive models for prediction. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **21** 243–247.

Bhansali, R. J. (1981). Effects of not knowing the order of an autoregressive process on the mean squared error of prediction-I. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **76** 588–597.

Bhansali, R. J. and Papangelou, F. (1991). Convergence of moments of least squares estimators for the coefficients of an autoregressive process of unknown order. *Annals of Statistics* **19** 1155–1162.

Bollerslev, T. (1986). Generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* **31** 307–327.

Bollerslev, T., Engle, R. F. and Nelson, D. B. (1994). ARCH models. In *Handbook of Econometrics* (R. F. E. McFadden and D. L., eds.) 2961–3038.

Chan, N. H. and Ing, C.-K. (2011). Uniform moment bounds of Fisher's information with applications to time series. *Annals of Statistics* **39** 1526–1550.

Chevillon, G. (2007). Direct multi-step estimation and forecasting. *Journal of Economic Surveys* **21** 746–785.

Chi, C.-M., Ing, C.-K. and Yu, S.-H. (2021). Negative Moment Bounds for Stochastic Regression Models with Deterministic Trends and Their Applications to Prediction Problems. *Statistica Sinica* **31** 2215–2237.

Ding, Z., Granger, C. W. J. and Engle, R. F. (1993). A long memory property of stock market returns and a new model. *Journal of Empirical Finance* **1** 83–106.

Findley, D. F. (1991). Counterexamples to parsimony and BIC. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **43** 505–514.

Findley, D. F. and Wei, C. Z. (2002). AIC, overfitting principles, and the boundedness of moments of inverse matrices for vector autoregressions and related models. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **83** 415–450.

Francq, C. and Zakoian, J.-M. (2019). GARCH models: structure, statistical inference and financial applications (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

Fuller, W. A. and Hasza, D. P. (1981). Properties of predictors for autoregressive time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **76** 155–161.

Glosten, L. R., Jagannathan, R. and Runkle, D. E. (1993). On the relation between the expected value and the volatility of the nominal excess return on stocks. *The Journal of Finance* **48** 1779–1801.

Greenway-Mcgrevy, R. (2013). Multistep prediction of panel vector autoregressive processes. *Econometric Theory* **29** 699–734.

Hsu, H.-L., Ing, C.-K. and Tong, H. (2019). On model selection from a finite family of possibly misspecified time series models. *Annals of Statistics* **47** 1061–1087.

Ing, C.-K. (2003). Multistep prediction in autoregressive processes. *Econometric Theory* **19** 254–279.

Ing, C.-K. and Wei, C.-Z. (2003). On same-realization prediction in an infinite-order autoregressive process. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **85** 130–155.

Inoue, A. and Kilian, L. (2006). On the selection of forecasting models. *Journal of Econometrics* **130** 273–306.

Jordà, Ò. (2005). Estimation and inference of impulse responses by local projections. *American Economic Review* **95** 161–182.

Kunitomo, N. and Yamamoto, T. (1985). Properties of predictors in misspecified autoregressive time series models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **80** 941–950.

Lewis, R. A. and Reinsel, G. C. (1988). Prediction error of multivariate time series with mis-specified models. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **9** 43–57.

Ling, S. and McAleer, M. (2002a). Necessary and sufficient moment conditions for the GARCH(r, s) and asymmetric power GARCH(r, s) models. *Econometric Theory* **18** 722–729.

Ling, S. and McAleer, M. (2002b). Stationarity andthe existence of moments of a family of GARCH processes. *Journal of Econometrics* **106** 109–117.

Papangelou, F. (1994). On a distributional bound arising in autoregressive model fitting. *Journal of Applied Probability* **31** 401–408.

Schorfheide, F. (2005). VAR forecasting under misspecification. *Journal of Econometrics* **128** 99–136.

Shaman, P. and Stine, R. A. (1988). The bias of autoregressive coefficient estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **83** 842–848.

Taylor, S. J. (1982). Financial returns modelled by the product of two stochastic processes – a study of daily sugar prices 1961–79. In *Anderson, O. D. (ed.), Time Series Analysis Theory and Practice*, **1** 203–226. North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Taylor, S. J. (1986). *Modelling Financial Time Series*. John Wiley, Chichester.

Tsay, R. S. (2010). *Analysis of Financial Time Series, 3rd Edition*. Wiley Interscience, New York.

West, K. D. and Zhao, Z. (2016). Regressor and disturbance have moments of all order, least squares estimator has none. *Statistics and Probability Letters* **115** 54–59.

Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102** 14150–14154.

Wu, W. B. and Min, W. (2005). On linear processes with dependent innovations. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* **115** 939–958.

Wu, W. B. (2011). Asymptotic theory for stationary processes. *Statistics and its Interface* **4** 207–226.

Supplementary Material on "Negative Moment Bounds for Sample Autocovariance Matrices of Stationary Processes Driven by Conditional Heteroscedastic Errors and Their Applications"

Hsueh-Han Huang[1], Shu-Hui Yu[2] and Ching-Kang Ing[3]

Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica[1]
Institute of Statistics, National University of Kaohsiung[2]
Institute of Statistics and Data Science, National Tsing Hua University[3]

This supplement contains the proofs of Theorems 2.1, 2.2, 3.1, and 3.2, and Propositions 3.1, A.1, A.2, and B.1–B.3. It also provides technical details about Remark 2.2 as well as additional numerical results.

S1 Proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and Details on Remark 2.2

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Under (1.1)–(1.3), it can be shown that x_t has the following AR(∞) representation,

$$x_t = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \beta_i x_{t-i} + \varepsilon_t, \tag{S1.1}$$

where $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} |\beta_i| < \infty$. To see this, note that the β_i's are the Taylor coefficients of the function $1/\alpha(z)$, where $\alpha(z) = \sum_{i\geq 0} \alpha_i z^i$. The summability of β_i's follows from the Wiener theorem (see Theorem 5.2(ii) of page 245 of Zygmund (2002) and its corollary on the next

page). This, together with Proposition 3.1.1 of Brockwell and Davis (1991), implies that (S1.1) holds true. Define

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\beta_1 & \cdots & -\beta_{k-1} \\ 0 & 1 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & -\beta_1 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\boldsymbol{\phi}_j = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{x}_j(k) = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_j \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_{j-k+1} \end{pmatrix} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{j,k}, \tag{S1.2}$$

where the components of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{j,k}$ are linear combinations of $\{\varepsilon_{j-k}, \varepsilon_{j-k-1}, \ldots\}$ with absolutely summable coefficients, and the dependence of $\boldsymbol{\phi}_j$ on k is suppressed to simplify the notation. Similar to (2.6)–(2.9) of Ing and Wei (2003), we can utilize the fact $\lambda_{\min}^{-1}(\sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A})\lambda_{\min}^{-1}(\sum_{j=k}^{n-1} \boldsymbol{\phi}_j\boldsymbol{\phi}_j^\top)$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}^\top\mathbf{A}) = O(1)$, along with the convexity of the largest eigenvalue, to derive that

$$E\{\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\hat{\mathbf{R}}_n(k))\} \leq \frac{C}{k}\sum_{j=0}^{k-1}\frac{1}{C_n}\sum_{s=0}^{C_n-1}(dk)^q E\{\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\sum_{i=1}^{dk}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(i+sdk)k+j}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{(i+sdk)k+j}^\top)\}, \tag{S1.3}$$

where d is some positive integer to be specified later, $C_n = \lfloor\lfloor(n-k)/k\rfloor/(dk)\rfloor$, and $\lfloor z\rfloor$ denotes the largest integer less than or equal to z. In view of (S1.3), to establish (2.12), it suffices to show that for any $q > 0$,

$$E\{\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\sum_{i=1+l_0}^{dk+l_0}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik+j}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik+j}^\top)\} \leq Ck^{(1+\theta)q}, \tag{S1.4}$$

for all integers $0 \leq j \leq k-1$ and $0 \leq l_0 \leq \lfloor(n-k)/k\rfloor - dk$. Since the proofs of (S1.4) are similar for any j and l_0, we only provide the proof for the case of $j = l_0 = 0$ in the following. Let

$(q+3)/2 < l < \infty$ and $\tilde{\theta} \geq 1 + 2/\{(1+\theta)q\}$ be given. Then,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E\{\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\sum_{i=1}^{dk} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^{\top})\} = \int_0^{\infty} P\{\lambda_{\min}(\sum_{i=1}^{dk} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^{\top}) < u^{-\frac{1}{q}}\}\mathrm{d}u \\
\leq &\tilde{M} + \int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} P\{\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{y}\|=1} \sum_{i=1}^{dk} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^{\top}\boldsymbol{y})^2 < u^{-\frac{1}{q}}, \max_{1\leq j\leq dk^2} \sigma_j^2 < u^{\tilde{\theta}}, \max_{1\leq i\leq dk} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| < \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}}\}\mathrm{d}u \\
&+ \int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} P(\max_{1\leq j\leq dk^2} \sigma_j^2 \geq u^{\tilde{\theta}})du + \int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} P(\max_{1\leq i\leq dk} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| \geq \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}})\mathrm{d}u \\
:= &\tilde{M} + (I) + (II) + (III),
\end{aligned}
\tag{S1.5}
$$

where $\tilde{M} > (6^{2q}c_0^{-2q}k^{(1+\theta)q}) \vee e$. Since (2.1) is assumed and $E(\varepsilon_t^2)$ is a finite constant, it is easy to see that

$$
(II) \leq Cdk^2 \int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} u^{-\tilde{\theta}}\mathrm{d}u \leq C, \tag{S1.6}
$$

and

$$
(III) \leq Cdk^2 \int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} u^{-\frac{2l}{q}}\mathrm{d}u \leq C. \tag{S1.7}
$$

To deal with (I), we apply Lemma 5.2 of Eldar and Kutyniok (2012), a theory of covering numbers of the sphere, to obtain

$$
P\Big\{\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{y}\|=1} \sum_{i=1}^{dk} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^{\top}\boldsymbol{y})^2 < u^{-\frac{1}{q}}, \max_{1\leq j\leq dk^2} \sigma_j^2 < u^{\tilde{\theta}}, \max_{1\leq i\leq dk} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| < \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}}\Big\} \leq \sum_{v=1}^{m^*} P\{Q_v(u)\}, \tag{S1.8}
$$

where $m^* = m^*(u,k) \leq (1 + 2u^{(l+1/2)q^{-1}}/\sqrt{k})^k$ and

$$
Q_v(u) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{dk}\{\inf_{\boldsymbol{y}\in G_v} |\boldsymbol{y}^{\top}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}| < u^{-\frac{1}{2q}}, \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| \leq \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}}, \max_{0\leq j\leq k-1} \sigma_{ik-j}^2 < u^{\tilde{\theta}}\},
$$

in which $G_v, v = 1, \ldots, m^*$, are subsets of the $(k-1)$-sphere, $\mathbb{S}_{k-1}$, satisfying $\bigcup_{v=1}^{m^*} G_v = \mathbb{S}_{k-1}$ and for any $\boldsymbol{y}_1, \boldsymbol{y}_2 \in G_v$, $\|\boldsymbol{y}_1 - \boldsymbol{y}_2\| \leq 2\sqrt{k}u^{-(l+1/2)q^{-1}}$. Let $\boldsymbol{l}_v = (l_{v,1}, \ldots, l_{v,k})^{\top} \in G_v, 1 \leq v \leq m^*$, be arbitrarily chosen. Then, similar to (2.12) of Ing and Wei (2003), it holds that

$$
Q_v(u) \subseteq \bigcap_{i=1}^{dk}\{|\boldsymbol{l}_v^{\top}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}| \leq 3u^{-\frac{1}{2q}}, \max_{0\leq j\leq k-1} \sigma_{ik-j}^2 < u^{\tilde{\theta}}\} \equiv \bigcap_{i=1}^{dk} E_{v,i},
$$

and hence

$$P\{Q_v(u)\}\leq E(\prod_{i=1}^{dk} I_{E_{v,i}}) = E\{\prod_{i=1}^{dk-1} I_{E_{v,i}} P(E_{v,dk}|\varepsilon_s, s \leq dk^2-k)\}.$$

It is worth mentioning that due to the complicated dependence structure among $\{\sigma_i\}$, the analysis of $P\{Q_v(u)\}$ substantially differs from that in Ing and Wei (2003).

Assumption (CH)(i) implies that the conditional probability density function (pdf) of $(\varepsilon_{dk^2}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{dk^2-k+1})^\top$ given $\{\varepsilon_s, s \leq dk^2-k\}$, as a random function of $\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s}_{dk^2,k} = (s_{dk^2}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+1})$, is

$$p(\mathbf{s}) = \prod_{i=dk^2-k+1}^{dk^2} p_i(\mathbf{s}),\ p_i(\mathbf{s}) = \frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{s})} g_i(\frac{s_i}{\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{s})}), \tag{S1.9}$$

where

$$\tilde{\sigma}_i(\mathbf{s}) = \tilde{\sigma}(s_{i-1}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+1}, \varepsilon_{dk^2-k}, \varepsilon_{dk^2-k-1}, \ldots)$$

and $\tilde{\sigma} : \mathbb{R}^\infty \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is a measurable function such that

$$\tilde{\sigma}(\varepsilon_{dk^2-1}, \varepsilon_{dk^2-2}\ \ldots) = \sigma_{dk^2}.$$

According to (S1.9), we have

$$P(E_{v,dk}|\varepsilon_s, s \leq dk^2-k) = \int \cdots \int_{A_{dk^2,k}} p(\mathbf{s}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}, \tag{S1.10}$$

where

$$A_{dk^2,k} = \left\{\mathbf{s} \middle| \left| \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} l_{v,j+1} s_{dk^2-j} + \boldsymbol{l}_v^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_{dk^2,k} \right| \leq 3u^{-\frac{1}{2q}}, \max_{0\leq j\leq k-1} \tilde{\sigma}^2_{dk^2-j}(\mathbf{s}) < u^{\tilde{\theta}} \right\}. \tag{S1.11}$$

Let us introduce the function

$$\bar{p}_j(\mathbf{s}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_0} g_j(\frac{s_j}{c_0}) & \text{for } |s_j| < \frac{c_0}{c_2}, \\ \frac{M_{c^\star}}{c_1|s_j|} & \text{for } \frac{c_0}{c_2} \leq |s_j| \leq u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}}, \\ \frac{1}{c_0} g_j(\frac{s_j}{u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}}}) & \text{for } u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}} < |s_j|, \end{cases} \tag{S1.12}$$

where $c^\star = (1/c_2) \wedge 1$. In the following, we show that

$$p_j(\mathbf{s}) \leq \bar{p}_j(\mathbf{s}) \text{ for all } j \text{ and } \mathbf{s} \in A_{dk^2,k}. \tag{S1.13}$$

In the first case of (S1.12), we have $m_j(s_j) < c_2|s_j| < c_0$. This, along with (2.11), indicates that $(1/c)g_j(s_j/c)$ is non-increasing in c for all $c \geq c_0$. Given that $\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s}) \geq c_0$, the first case holds. For the second case, (2.10) directly gives $(1/\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s}))g_j(s_j/\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s})) \leq (1/m_j(s_j))g_j(s_j/m_j(s_j))$. Using this inequality with the first relation in (2.9) and the fact that $c_1|s_j| < m_j(s_j)$, we arrive at the desired conclusion. For the third case, observe that for $\mathbf{s} \in A_{dk^2,k}$, $\max_{0\leq j\leq k-1} \tilde{\sigma}^2_{dk^2-j}(\mathbf{s}) < u^{\tilde{\theta}}$. Thus, this and (2.8) lead to $g_j(s_j/\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s})) \leq g_j(s_j/u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}})$, and the conclusion can be reached by noting that $\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s}) \geq c_0$.

Let $k^* = \arg\max_{1\leq j\leq k} |l_{v,k+1-j}|$. Then, by (S1.13), the rhs of (S1.10) is bounded by

$$\int_{A_{dk^2,k}} \cdots \int \prod_{i=dk^2-k+k^*+1}^{dk^2} \bar{p}_i(\mathbf{s}) \prod_{i=dk^2-k+1}^{dk^2-k+k^*} p_i(\mathbf{s}) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{s} \tag{S1.14}$$

It is not difficult to verify that the first products in the integral (S1.14) depends only on $s_{dk^2}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+k^\star+1}$, while the second products depends only on $s_{dk^2-k+k^\star}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+1}$. Thus, we can rearrange (S1.14) into

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \cdots \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \bar{p}'(\mathbf{s}') p''(\mathbf{s}'') \left(\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z) \mathrm{d}z \right) \mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}' \mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}'' \tag{S1.15}$$

where $\mathbf{s}' = (s_{dk^2}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+k^\star+1})$, $\mathbf{s}'' = (s_{dk^2-k+k^\star-1}, \ldots, s_{dk^2-k+1})$,

$$\bar{p}'(\mathbf{s}') = \prod_{j=dk^2-k+k^\star+1}^{dk^2} \bar{p}_j(\mathbf{s}), \; p''(\mathbf{s}'') = \prod_{j=dk^2-k+1}^{dk^2-k+k^\star-1} p_j(\mathbf{s}),$$

and $B(\mathbf{s}'')$ is the interval of length

$$\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'') = 6u^{-1/(2q)}/|l_{k+1-k^*}\tilde{\sigma}_{dk^2-k+k^*}(\mathbf{s})| \leq k^{1/2}6u^{-1/(2q)}/c_0$$

centered at

$$-(\boldsymbol{l}_v^\top \boldsymbol{\eta}_{dk^2,k} - \sum_{\substack{j=0 \\ j\neq k-k^*}}^{k-1} l_{v,j+1} s_{dk^2-j})/(l_{k+1-k^*}\tilde{\sigma}_{dk^2-k+k^*}(\mathbf{s})).$$

Since $B(\mathbf{s}'')$ may not be centered at 0, there are three possible scenarios: (a) $B(\mathbf{s}'') \subset (0,\infty)$; (b) $B(\mathbf{s}'') \subset (-\infty,0)$; or (c) $B(\mathbf{s}'')$ contains 0. In scenario (a), it follows from (2.8) that

$$\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \int_0^{\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \int_{-\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')}^{\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z. \tag{S1.16}$$

Similarly, in scenario (b),

$$\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \int_{-\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')}^{0} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \int_{-\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')}^{\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z. \tag{S1.17}$$

Finally, in scenario (c), it is straightforward to see that

$$\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \int_{-\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')}^{\delta_B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z. \tag{S1.18}$$

As a consequence of (S1.16)–(S1.18) and the second part of condition (2.9), for $u > (6\sqrt{k}c_0^{-1})^{2q}$, we have

$$\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \bar{C}(k^{1/2}6u^{-1/(2q)}/c_0)^{\bar{\theta}}. \tag{S1.19}$$

According to (S1.12), we have for $u \ge e$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \bar{p}'(\mathbf{s}')\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}' \\
&\le \prod_{j=dk^2-k+k^*+1}^{dk^2} \left\{ \int_{-\frac{c_0}{c_2}}^{\frac{c_0}{c_2}} \frac{1}{c_0} g_j(\frac{s_j}{c_0})\mathrm{d}s_j + \frac{M_{c^\star}}{c_1} \int_{\{\frac{c_0}{c_2}\le|s_j|\le u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}}\}} \frac{1}{|s_j|}\mathrm{d}s_j \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{c_0}\int_{\{u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}}<|s_j|\}} g_j(\frac{s_j}{u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}}})\mathrm{d}s_j \right\} \\
&\le \prod_{j=dk^2-k+k^*+1}^{dk^2} \left\{ \tilde{c}_1 + \tilde{c}_2\log u + \frac{3}{c_0}\int_{\{u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{4}}<|\tilde{s}_j|\}} \tilde{s}_j^2 g_j(\tilde{s}_j)d\tilde{s}_j \right\} \le (\tilde{c}_3\log u)^k,
\end{aligned} \tag{S1.20}$$

for some positive constants $\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_1$, and $\tilde{c}_3$. In addition, since $p''(\mathbf{s}'')$ is the conditional pdf of $(\varepsilon_{dk^2-k+k^*-1},\ldots,\varepsilon_{dk^2-k+1})$ given $\{\varepsilon_s, s \le dk^2-k\}$, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\cdots\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p''(\mathbf{s}'')\mathrm{d}\mathbf{s}'' = 1. \tag{S1.21}$$

Combining (S1.10), (S1.14), (S1.15), and (S1.19)–(S1.21) yields for $u>(6\sqrt{k}c_0^{-1})^{2q} \vee e$,

$$P(E_{v,dk}|\varepsilon_s, s \le dk^2 - k) \le Ck^{\frac{\bar{\theta}}{2}} u^{-\frac{\bar{\theta}}{2q}} (\tilde{c}_3 \log u)^k, \text{ a.s.} \qquad \text{(S1.22)}$$

Repeating the same argument $dk-1$ times, one gets for $u>(6\sqrt{k}c_0^{-1})^{2q}\vee e$,

$$P\{Q_v(u)\} \le Ck^{\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2}} u^{-\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2q}} (\tilde{c}_3 \log u)^{dk^2},$$

and hence

$$\sum_{v=1}^{m^*} P\{Q_v(u)\} \le Cm^* k^{\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2}} u^{-\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2q}} (\tilde{c}_3 \log u)^{dk^2} \le Ck^{-\frac{k}{2}} u^{\frac{k(l+\frac{1}{2})}{q}} k^{\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2}} u^{-\frac{dk\bar{\theta}}{2q}} (\tilde{c}_3 \log u)^{dk^2}. \qquad \text{(S1.23)}$$

Finally, by letting $d > \{(2l+1+2q)/\bar{\theta}\} \vee [\{(2l+1)(1+\theta)+1\}/\bar{\theta}\theta]$, (S1.23) and the fact that $\tilde{M} > Ck^{(1+\theta)q}$ yields

$$\int_{\tilde{M}}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{m^*} P\{Q_j(u)\} du < C,$$

which, together with (S1.5)–(S1.8), gives the desired conclusion (S1.4). □

Proof of Theorem 2.2. In view of (S1.1)–(S1.5), it suffices to show that for some positive integer d and some positive real numbers M^* and θ^*,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\{\lambda_{\min}^{-q}(\sum_{i=1}^{dk} \boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^\top)\} \\
\le& M^* + \int_{M^*}^{\infty} P\Big(\inf_{\|\boldsymbol{y}\|=1} \sum_{i=1}^{dk} (\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}^\top \boldsymbol{y})^2 < u^{-\frac{1}{q}}, \min_{1\le j\le dk^2} \sigma_j > u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}, \max_{1\le i\le dk} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| < \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}} \Big) du \\
&+ \int_{M^*}^{\infty} P(\min_{1\le j\le dk^2} \sigma_j \le u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}) du + \int_{M^*}^{\infty} P(\max_{1\le i\le dk} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\| \ge \frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}}) du \\
:=& M^* + (IV) + (V) + (VI) \le Ck^{(1+\theta)q},
\end{aligned} \qquad \text{(S1.24)}$$

where l is defined as in the proof of Theorem 2.1. Note that the event $\{\max_{1\le j\le dk^2}\sigma_j^2 < u^\theta\}$ and $\{\max_{1\le j\le dk^2}\sigma_j^2 \ge u^\theta\}$ in (S1.5) have now been replaced by $\{\min_{1\le j\le dk^2}\sigma_j > u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}\}$ and $\{\min_{1\le j\le dk^2}\sigma_j \le u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}\}$, respectively. Let

$$\theta^* > \frac{2q(1+\theta)}{\theta},\ d > \left(\frac{2(l+\frac{1}{2})+2q}{\rho(1-\frac{2q}{\theta^*})}\right)\vee\left[\frac{(2l+1)(1+\theta)+1}{\rho\{(1-\frac{2q}{\theta^*})(1+\theta)-1\}}\right],\ \text{and}$$
$$M^* > (\frac{6}{\eta})^{2q}k^{(1+\theta)q}, \tag{S1.25}$$

noting that η and ρ are defined in (2.13). By (2.3) and the assumption that $E(\varepsilon_t^2)$ is a finite constant, it is not difficult to see that

$$(V)\le C \text{ and } (VI)\le C. \tag{S1.26}$$

Thus, it remains to show

$$(IV)\le Ck^{(1+\theta)q}. \tag{S1.27}$$

By an argument similar to that used to prove (S1.8), one gets

$$(IV)\le\int_{M^*}^{\infty}\sum_{v=1}^{m^*}P\{Q_v^*(u)\}du, \tag{S1.28}$$

where m^* is defined as in (S1.8), and

$$\begin{aligned}Q_v^*(u) =&\bigcap_{i=1}^{dk}\{\inf_{\boldsymbol{y}\in G_v}|\boldsymbol{y}^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}| < u^{-\frac{1}{2q}}, \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}\|\le\frac{u^{\frac{l}{q}}}{\sqrt{k}}, \min_{0\le j\le k-1}\sigma_{ik-j} > u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}\}\\ \subseteq&\bigcap_{i=1}^{dk}\{|\boldsymbol{l}_v^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}_{ik}|\le 3u^{-\frac{1}{2q}}, \min_{0\le j\le k-1}\sigma_{ik-j} > u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}}\}\equiv\bigcap_{i=1}^{dk}E_{v,i}^*.\end{aligned} \tag{S1.29}$$

Assumption (2.13) and the independence between $\{z_t\}$ and $\{\sigma_t\}$ (see (CH)(ii)) yield that for all $u\ge M^*$, all $i=1,\ldots,dk$, and all $1\le v\le m^*$,

$$\begin{aligned}&E(I_{E_{v,i}^*}|z_s, s\le ik-k, \sigma_t, t\le ik-k)\\ \le&E\{\bar{M}(\sqrt{k}u^{\frac{1}{\theta^*}}6u^{-\frac{1}{2q}})^\rho I(\min_{0\le j\le k-1}\sigma_{ik-j} > u^{-\frac{1}{\theta^*}})|z_s, s\le ik-k, \sigma_t, t\le ik-k\}\\ \le&Ck^{\frac{\rho}{2}}u^{(\frac{1}{\theta^*}-\frac{1}{2q})\rho},\ \text{a.s.},\end{aligned}$$

which, together with (S1.25), (S1.28), and (S1.29), gives

$$(IV) \le C \int_{M^*}^{\infty} m^* k^{\frac{\rho dk}{2}} u^{-\rho dk(\frac{1}{2q}-\frac{1}{\theta^*})} du < \infty.$$

Hence (S1.27) follows. □

In the rest of this section, we provide details on Remark 2.2. First, we show that Theorem 2.1 remains valid when (2.8)–(2.11) are replaced by (S1.30)–(S1.33) given below. Next, we verify that (S1.30)–(S1.33) include the mixture of normal density functions as a special case.

Theorem S1.1. *Assume* (1.1)–(1.3) *and* (CH)(i). *Suppose for all* $t \in \mathbb{Z}$, *there exist positive constants* $\bar{c}_1$, $\bar{c}_2$, *and* $\bar{c}_3$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} &g_t(y) \le g_t(x), \text{ for all } \bar{c}_1 \le x < y < \infty, \\ &g_t(-y) \le g_t(-x), \text{ for all } \bar{c}_2 \le x < y < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{S1.30}$$

and

$$\sup_{-\infty<t,x<\infty} g_t(x) \le \bar{c}_3. \tag{S1.31}$$

Moreover, for any $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ *and* $x \neq 0$, *there exist a positive number* $m_t(x)$ *and positive constants* $\bar{c}_4$ *and* $\bar{c}_5$ *obeying* $\bar{c}_4|x| < m_t(x) < \bar{c}_5|x|$, *such that*

$$h_{t,x}\{m_t(x)\} = \sup_{c>0} h_{t,x}(c), \tag{S1.32}$$

and

$$h_{t,x}(c) \text{ is non-increasing for } c > \bar{c}_5|x|. \tag{S1.33}$$

Then, (1.4) *follows.*

Proof of Theorem S1.1. To complete the proof, it suffices to show that for $u \ge (\bar{c}_1 \vee \bar{c}_2)^{4/\tilde{\theta}}$,

$$p_j(\mathbf{s}) \le \tilde{p}_j(\mathbf{s}) \text{ for all } j \text{ and } \mathbf{s} \in A_{dk^2,k}, \tag{S1.34}$$

where

$$\tilde{p}_j(\mathbf{s}) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{c_0} g_j(\frac{s_j}{c_0}) & \text{for } |s_j| < \frac{c_0}{\bar{c}_5}, \\ \frac{\bar{c}_3}{\bar{c}_4|s_j|} & \text{for } \frac{c_0}{\bar{c}_5} \le |s_j| \le u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}}, \\ \frac{1}{c_0} g_j(\frac{s_j}{u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}}}), & \text{for } u^{\frac{3\tilde{\theta}}{4}} < |s_j|, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\int_{B(\mathbf{s}'')} g_{dk^2-k+k^\star}(z)\mathrm{d}z \le \bar{c}_3(k^{1/2}6u^{-1/(2q)}/c_0) \tag{S1.35}$$

hold under (S1.30)–(S1.33). Then, the remainder of the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 2.1. Note that except for $\tilde{p}_j(\cdot)$, $\bar{c}_3$, $\bar{c}_4$, and $\bar{c}_5$, all other notations in (S1.34) and (S1.35) are consistent with those used in the proof of Theorem 2.1. To establish (S1.34), observe that by (S1.33), $(1/c)g_j(s_j/c)$ is non-increasing in c for $c \ge c_0$. Combined with the assumption $\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s}) \ge c_0$, this proves the first case of (S1.34). Moreover, using (S1.31) and (S1.32), we have for $c_0/\bar{c}_5 \le |s_j| \le u^{(3\tilde{\theta})/4}$,

$$\frac{1}{\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s})} g_j\Big(\frac{s_j}{\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s})}\Big) \le \frac{1}{m_j(s_j)} g_j\Big(\frac{s_j}{m_j(s_j)}\Big) \le \frac{\bar{c}_3}{\bar{c}_4|s_j|}, \tag{S1.36}$$

which implies the second case of (S1.34). Finally, for $\mathbf{s} \in A_{dk^2,k}$, we have $\max_{0\le j\le k-1} \tilde{\sigma}^2_{dk^2-j}(\mathbf{s}) < u^{\tilde{\theta}}$. Combined with (S1.30) and $u \ge (\bar{c}_1 \vee \bar{c}_2)^{4/\tilde{\theta}}$, this implies

$$g_j\Big(\frac{s_j}{\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s})}\Big) \le g_j\Big(\frac{s_j}{u^{\frac{\tilde{\theta}}{2}}}\Big). \tag{S1.37}$$

Further combining this result with $\tilde{\sigma}_j(\mathbf{s}) \ge c_0$ establishes the third case of (S1.34). Additionally, the proof of Theorem 2.1 shows that the length of $B(\mathbf{s}'')$ is bounded by $k^{1/2}6u^{-1/(2q)}/c_0$. Combining this with (S1.31) yields (S1.35). □

Now, assume for all $t \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$g_t(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{K}} \pi_i g_{t,i}(x) \tag{S1.38}$$

is a $\bar{K}$ ($\bar{K} \in \mathbb{N}$) component normal mixture density function, where

$$g_{t,i}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\bar{\sigma}_i} \exp\Big\{ -\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{x-\bar{\mu}_i}{\bar{\sigma}_i}\Big)^2 \Big\},$$

with the normal mixture parameter $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_{\bar{K}}, \bar{\mu}_1, \ldots, \bar{\mu}_{\bar{K}}, \bar{\sigma}_1, \ldots, \bar{\sigma}_{\bar{K}}) \in [0,1]^{\bar{K}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\bar{K}} \times (0,\infty)^{\bar{K}}$ obeying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\bar{K}} \pi_i = 1, \ \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{K}} \pi_i\bar{\mu}_i = 0, \ \text{and} \ \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{K}} \pi_i(\bar{\mu}_i^2 + \bar{\sigma}_i^2) = 1. \tag{S1.39}$$

Note that the second and the third equation in (S1.39) ensure that $E(z_t) = 0$ and $E(z_t^2) = 1$. Then, it is easy to see that (S1.30) and (S1.31) hold with $\bar{c}_1 = \max\{1, \bar{\mu}_1, \ldots, \bar{\mu}_{\bar{K}}\}$, $\bar{c}_2 = \max\{1, -\bar{\mu}_1, \ldots, -\bar{\mu}_{\bar{K}}\}$, and $\bar{c}_3 = \sum_{i=1}^{\bar{K}} \pi_i/(\sqrt{2\pi}\bar{\sigma}_i)$. Furthermore, define $h_{t,x,i}(c) = (1/c)g_{t,i}(x/c)$. Since for each $i = 1, \ldots, \bar{K}$,

$$\begin{aligned} h_{t,x,i}(c_i^+ x) &= \sup_{c>0} h_{t,x,i}(c), \ x > 0, \\ h_{t,x,i}(c_i^- x) &= \sup_{c>0} h_{t,x,i}(c), \ x < 0, \end{aligned} \tag{S1.40}$$

and for $x > 0$ ($x < 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} &h_{t,x,i}(c) \text{ is increasing, for } c < c_i^+ x \ (c < c_i^- x), \\ &h_{t,x,i}(c) \text{ is decreasing, for } c > c_i^+ x \ (c > c_i^- x), \end{aligned} \tag{S1.41}$$

where

$$c_i^+ = \frac{\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\mu}_i^2}{\bar{\sigma}_i^4} + \frac{4}{\bar{\sigma}_i^2}} - \frac{\bar{\mu}_i}{\bar{\sigma}_i^2}}{2} \text{ and } c_i^- = \frac{-\sqrt{\frac{\bar{\mu}_i^2}{\bar{\sigma}_i^4} + \frac{4}{\bar{\sigma}_i^2}} - \frac{\bar{\mu}_i}{\bar{\sigma}_i^2}}{2},$$

it follows that (S1.32) and (S1.33) hold with

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{c}_4 &= \min\{c_1^+, \ldots, c_{\bar{K}}^+, -c_1^-, \ldots, -c_{\bar{K}}^-\}, \\ \bar{c}_5 &= \max\{c_1^+, \ldots, c_{\bar{K}}^+, -c_1^-, \ldots, -c_{\bar{K}}^-\}, \end{aligned}$$

and some positive number $m_t(x)$ depending on x and the normal mixture parameter $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$.

S2 Proofs of Theorem 3.1 and Proposition 3.1

The following lemma is required in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Lemma S2.1. *Assume (1.1)–(1.3). Suppose for some $q_1, q_2 \geq 2$,*

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^{2q_1} < \infty, \tag{S2.1}$$

and for any fixed sequences $\{\underline{m}_n\}$ and $\{\bar{m}_n\}$ with $1 \leq \underline{m}_n \leq \bar{m}_n \leq n$,

$$\sup_{-\infty<s<\infty} E|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n + 1}} \sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} (\varepsilon_{t+s}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t+s}^2))|^{q_2} \leq C. \tag{S2.2}$$

Define $q = \min\{q_1, q_2\}$. *Then, (a) for any* $k \le \underline{m}_n \le \bar{m}_n \le n$,

$$E\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n + 1}} \sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} \mathbf{x}_j(k)\varepsilon_{j,h,k}\|^q \le Ck^{\frac{q}{2}}. \tag{S2.3}$$

(b) Moreover, we have

$$\sup_{n \ge h+k+1} E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(k) - \mathbf{R}(k)\|^q \le C\frac{k^q}{(n-h-k+1)^{\frac{q}{2}}}. \tag{S2.4}$$

(c) If we further assume that

$$E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^\theta = O(1), \tag{S2.5}$$

for any $\theta > 0$, *then for any* $0 < q' < q$,

$$E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|^{q'} = O(n^{-\frac{q'}{2}}). \tag{S2.6}$$

Proof of Lemma S2.1. We first prove (S2.3). By the convexity of $x^{q/2}$, $x > 0$, for any $k \le \underline{m}_n \le \bar{m}_n \le n$,

$$E\|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} \mathbf{x}_j(k)\varepsilon_{j,h,k}\|^q \le k^{\frac{q}{2}-1} \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} x_{j-l}\varepsilon_{j,h,k}|^q. \tag{S2.7}$$

Thus, it suffices for (S2.3) to prove that

$$E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} x_{j-l}\varepsilon_{j,h,k}|^q \le C(\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n)^{\frac{q}{2}}.$$

By (1.1) and (3.1), one has for all $0 \le l \le k-1$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} x_{j-l}\varepsilon_{j,h,k}|^q \\
=& E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} (x_{j-l}\varepsilon_{j,h,k} - E(x_{j-l}\varepsilon_{j,h,k}))|^q \\
=& E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{x_{j-l}(x_{j+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_j(k))\} - E\{x_{j-l}(x_{j+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\mathbf{x}_j(k))\}]|^q \\
=& E|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\alpha_i\alpha_u \sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\} \\
& - E\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\}]|^q \\
\le& E|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i||\alpha_u|| \sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\} \\
& - E\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\}]||^q \\
\le& \Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i|\Big)^{2q} E|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}p_{iu}| \sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\} \\
& - E\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\}]||^q \\
\le& \Big(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i|\Big)^{2q} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}p_{iu}E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\} \\
& - E\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\}]|^q,
\end{aligned}
\tag{S2.8}
$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j(k) = (\varepsilon_j, \ldots, \varepsilon_{j-k+1})^\top$ and $p_{iu} = |\alpha_i\alpha_u|/(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i|)^2$. In view of (1.2) and (S2.8), it remains to show that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{i,u\ge 0} E|\sum_{j=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n} [\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\} - E\{\varepsilon_{j-l-i}(\varepsilon_{j+h-u} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{j-u}(k))\}]|^q \\
\le& C(\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n)^{\frac{q}{2}}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{S2.9}
$$

It is easily seen that this relation holds if

$$\sup_{i,j\in\mathbb{Z}} E|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j}-E\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j})|^q \le C(\bar{m}_n-\underline{m}_n)^{\frac{q}{2}}. \tag{S2.10}$$

Note that when $i=j$, (S2.10) follows directly from (S2.2). For the case $i<j$, it follows from Burkholder's inequality, Minkowski's inequality, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, and (S2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&E|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j}-E\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j})|^q \\
=&E|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j}|^q \le CE|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(\varepsilon_{t+i}\varepsilon_{t+j})^2|^{\frac{q}{2}} \\
\le& C\{\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(E|\varepsilon_{t+i}|^{2q})^{\frac{1}{q}}(E|\varepsilon_{t+j}|^{2q})^{\frac{1}{q}}\}^{\frac{q}{2}} \le C(\bar{m}_n-\underline{m}_n)^{\frac{q}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.11}$$

The proof of (S2.3) is now complete. The proof of (S2.4) is analogous to the proof of (S2.3), and is thus omitted. To prove (S2.6), note that (1.1)–(1.3) indicate that the spectral density function $f(\lambda)$ of x_t obeys $f(\lambda)\le\bar{f}$ for some $0<\bar{f}<\infty$, where $-\pi\le\lambda\le\pi$. This fact, together with Proposition 4.5.3 of Brockwell and Davis (1991), ensures that

$$\sup_{k\ge1}\|\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|\le C. \tag{S2.12}$$

Then, it follows from (S2.4), (S2.5), and (S2.12) that for all large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)-\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|^{q'} = E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{q'}\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(k)-\mathbf{R}_n(k)\|^{q'}\|\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|^{q'} \\
\le& C\{E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{\frac{qq'}{q-q'}}\}^{\frac{q-q'}{q}}\{E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}(k)-\mathbf{R}(k)\|^q\}^{\frac{q'}{q}} \le Cn^{-\frac{q}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.13}$$

Thus, (S2.6) follows. □

With the help of Lemma S2.1, we are now in a position to prove Theorem 3.1.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We only prove (a) because the proof of (b) is almost identical. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&n[E\{x_{n+h}-\hat{x}_{n+h}(k)\}^2-E(\varepsilon_{n,h,k}^2)]\\
=&\frac{n}{n-h-k+1}E[\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-k+1}}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\}]^2\\
&-\frac{2n}{n-h-k+1}E[\varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\{\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\}]\\
&\equiv \text{(I)}+\text{(II)}.
\end{aligned}\tag{S2.14}$$

Our proof is divided into three steps.

Step 1: *Prove*

$$\text{(I)}=E(Y_n)+o(1),\tag{S2.15}$$

where

$$Y_n=\frac{1}{n-h-k+1}\big(\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i^\top(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\big)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\big(\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\big).$$

Let $\{l_n\}$ be a sequence of positive integers satisfying

$$l_n\to\infty \quad\text{and}\quad l_n=o(n^{\frac{1}{2}}).\tag{S2.16}$$

Define

$$Z_n=\{\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-k+1}}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k})\}^2$$

and

$$W_n=E(Z_n|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}).$$

Since

$$E(Z_n)=E(W_n)=E(W_n-Y_n)+E(Y_n),\tag{S2.17}$$

it suffices for (S2.15) to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{(C1)}: \{W_n-Y_n\} \text{ is uniformly integrable,}\\
&\text{(D1)}: W_n-Y_n=o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 1.1 *Proof of* (C1)

First, note that (1.1), (3.3), and the absolute summability of α_i's imply

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E\|\mathbf{x}_t(k)\|^{6+\delta} < \infty. \tag{S2.18}$$

Moreover, by Theorem 2.1, we have

$$E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^q = O(1), \tag{S2.19}$$

for any $q > 0$. Additionally, by applying (3.3), (3.4), and Lemma S2.1(a), one obtains

$$E\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-k+1}}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}} \le C, \tag{S2.20}$$

where $\tilde{\delta} = \min\{\delta/2, \delta^\star\}$. By using (S2.18)–(S2.20) and Hölder's inequality, we have for any $0 < \bar{\delta} < \tilde{\delta}/3$,

$$\begin{aligned} E|Z_n|^{1+\bar{\delta}} \le& E\|\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})} E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})} E\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-k+1}}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})} \\ \le& (E\|\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})(3+\epsilon)})^{\frac{1}{3+\epsilon}} (E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})(\frac{3+\epsilon}{\epsilon})})^{\frac{\epsilon}{3+\epsilon}} \\ & \times (E\|\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-k+1}}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\|^{2(1+\bar{\delta})(\frac{3+\epsilon}{2})})^{\frac{2}{3+\epsilon}} < \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{S2.21}$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ satisfies $3\bar{\delta} + \epsilon + \epsilon\bar{\delta} < \tilde{\delta}$. Similarly, using (S2.20) and the fact that

$$\sup_{k\ge 1}\|\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\| \le C, \tag{S2.22}$$

which is proved above (S2.12), we obtain for any $0 < \bar{\delta} \le 1/2 + \tilde{\delta}/2$,

$$E|Y_n|^{1+\bar{\delta}} < \infty. \tag{S2.23}$$

Furthermore, using conditional Jensen's inequality, we have, for any $\bar{\delta} > 0$,

$$E|W_n|^{1+\bar{\delta}} \le E|Z_n|^{1+\bar{\delta}}. \tag{S2.24}$$

Consequently, (C1) is ensured by the fact that $E|W_n - Y_n|^{1+\bar{\delta}} < \infty$ for some $\bar{\delta} > 0$, which in turn follows immediately from (S2.21),

(S2.23), and (S2.24).

Step 1.2 *Proof of* (D1)

First, note that for all large n,

$$\begin{aligned} W_n =& E[M_{2n}^\top \hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)M_{1n}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}] \\ &+ M_{3n}^\top E[\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)M_{2n}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}] \\ &+ M_{3n}^\top E[\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\}\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}]M_{3n} \\ &+ M_{3n}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)E[\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}]M_{3n} \\ &+ M_{3n}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k) - \mathbf{R}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)M_{3n} \\ &+ M_{3n}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\mathbf{R}(k)\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)M_{3n} \\ :=& (S1) + (S2) + (S3) + (S4) + (S5) + (S6), \end{aligned} \tag{S2.25}$$

where $M_{1n} = (n-h-k+1)^{-1/2}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}$, $M_{2n} = (n-h-k+1)^{-1/2}\sum_{i=n-h-l_n+1}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}$, $M_{3n} = (n-h-k+1)^{-1/2}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h-l_n}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n(k) = (n-l_n-k+1)^{-1}\sum_{j=k}^{n-l_n}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)$. In the following, we will show that

$$\begin{aligned} &(S1) = o_p(1),\ (S2) = o_p(1),\ (S3) = o_p(1),\ (S4) = o_p(1), \\ &(S5) = o_p(1),\ (S6) = Y_n + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{S2.26}$$

To show $(S1) = o_p(1)$, observe that by the conditional Hölder inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} |(S1)| \le& \{E(\|M_{2n}\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n})\}^{\frac{1}{3+\tilde{\delta}}}\{E(\|M_{1n}\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n})\}^{\frac{1}{3+\tilde{\delta}}} \\ &\times [E\{\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{\frac{6+2\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\delta}}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}]^{\frac{\tilde{\delta}}{3+\tilde{\delta}}}[E\{\|\mathbf{x}_n(k)\|^{6+2\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}]^{\frac{1}{3+\tilde{\delta}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{S2.27}$$

By virtue of Lemma S2.1(a), (S2.16), (S2.18), and (S2.19), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &E(\|M_{1n}\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}) = O_p(1),\ E(\|M_{2n}\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}) = o_p(1), \\ &E\{\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|^{\frac{6+2\tilde{\delta}}{\tilde{\delta}}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\} = O_p(1),\ E\{\|\mathbf{x}_n(k)\|^{6+2\tilde{\delta}}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\} = O_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Combining these with (S2.27) leads to

$$(S1) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.28}$$

Similarly, it can be shown that

$$(S2) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.29}$$

To deal with $(S3)$, observe that for all large n,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\| \\
\leq &\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)\|\|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\|\{\|\frac{1}{n-h-k+1}\sum_{j=n-l_n+1}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)\| \\
+&\|d_n\sum_{j=k}^{n-l_n}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)\|\},
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.30}$$

where $d_n = 1/(n-h-k+1) - 1/(n-l_n-k+1)$ By an argument similar to that used in the proof of Theorem 2.1, it can be shown that

$$E\|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\|^q = O(1), \tag{S2.31}$$

for any $q > 0$. Moreover, by (S2.18) and Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\|\frac{1}{n-h-k+1}\sum_{j=n-l_n+1}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}} \\
\leq &(n-h-k+1)^{-(3+\tilde{\delta})}E(\sum_{j=n-l_n+1}^{n-h}\|\mathbf{x}_j(k)\|^2)^{3+\tilde{\delta}} \\
\leq &(n-h-k+1)^{-(3+\tilde{\delta})}\{\sum_{j=n-l_n+1}^{n-h}(E\|\mathbf{x}_j(k)\|^{6+\delta})^{\frac{1}{3+\tilde{\delta}}}\}^{3+\tilde{\delta}} \\
= &O\{(l_n/n)^{3+\tilde{\delta}}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.32}$$

Analogously, it can be shown that

$$E\|d_n\sum_{j=k}^{n-l_n}\mathbf{x}_j(k)\mathbf{x}_j^\top(k)\|^{3+\tilde{\delta}} = O\{(l_n/n)^{3+\tilde{\delta}}\}. \tag{S2.33}$$

Thus, it follows from (S2.16), (S2.19), (S2.30)–(S2.33) and Hölder's inequality that

$$E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\|^{\gamma_1} = O\{(l_n/n)^{\gamma_1}\}, \tag{S2.34}$$

for $0 < \gamma_1 < 3 + \tilde{\delta}$. Using (S2.34) and an argument similar to that used in the proof of (S2.28), one obtains

$$E[\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\}\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}] = o_p(1). \quad \text{(S2.35)}$$

A direct consequence of Lemma S2.1(a) is

$$\|M_{3n}\| = O_p(1). \quad \text{(S2.36)}$$

Combining this with (S2.35) gives

$$(S3) = o_p(1). \quad \text{(S2.37)}$$

Similarly, we can derive that

$$(S4) = o_p(1). \quad \text{(S2.38)}$$

Recall that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t(k) = (\varepsilon_t, \ldots, \varepsilon_{t-k+1})^\top$. By (1.1) and Minkowski's inequality, one has

$$\begin{aligned} &E\|E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k) - \mathbf{R}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| \\ \le &\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i||\alpha_j|[E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|]. \end{aligned} \quad \text{(S2.39)}$$

We decompose the right-hand side of (S2.39) into three terms,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|\alpha_i||\alpha_j|[E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|] \\ = &\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor}\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor}|\alpha_i||\alpha_j|[E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|] \\ &+ 2\sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor}\sum_{j=\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}|\alpha_i||\alpha_j|[E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|] \\ &+ \sum_{i=\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\sum_{j=\lfloor l_n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}|\alpha_i||\alpha_j|[E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|] \\ :=&(E1) + 2(E2) + (E3). \end{aligned} \quad \text{(S2.40)}$$

For $0 \le i, j \le \lfloor l_n/2 \rfloor$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| \\
\le& E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\|_F \\
=& E\Big(\sum_{s=0}^{k-1}\sum_{t=0}^{k-1}[E\{\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t} - E(\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t})|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}]^2\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \qquad \text{(S2.41)} \\
\le& \sum_{s=0}^{k-1}\sum_{t=0}^{k-1} E|E\{\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t} - E(\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t})|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ denotes the Frobenius norm. The first inequality follows from the fact that for any real matrix $\mathbf{M}$, $\|\mathbf{M}\| \le \|\mathbf{M}\|_F$, and the second inequality follows from the fact that for any real numbers $x, y \ge 0$,

$$\sqrt{x+y} \le \sqrt{x} + \sqrt{y}.$$

Note that for $i + s \ne j + t$ and $\max\{n - i - s, n - j - t\} > n - l_n$,

$$E\{\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t} - E(\varepsilon_{n-i-s}\varepsilon_{n-j-t})|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\} = 0 \text{ a.s.}. \qquad \text{(S2.42)}$$

Moreover, it follows from (3.5) and (S2.16) that

$$E|E\{\varepsilon_{n-i-s}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{n-i-s}^2)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}| = o(1). \qquad \text{(S2.43)}$$

Thus, by (S2.41)–(S2.43), we obtain

$$E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| = o(1).$$

Combining this with the absolute summability of α_i's yields

$$(E1) = o(1). \qquad \text{(S2.44)}$$

To address $(E2)$ and $(E3)$, note that (3.3) ensures

$$\sup_{n\ge 0} E\|E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k) - E(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}^\top(k))|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| < \infty,$$

for any $0 \le i, j < \infty$. This, together with (S2.16) and the assumption that $\alpha_i = O(i^{-\iota})$ with $\iota > 3/2$, implies

$$(E2) = o(1) \qquad \text{(S2.45)}$$

and

$$(E3) = o(1). \qquad \text{(S2.46)}$$

Combining (S2.39), (S2.40) and (S2.44)–(S2.46) yields

$$E\|E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k) - \mathbf{R}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| = o(1). \tag{S2.47}$$

Hence, it follows from (S2.31), (S2.36), and (S2.47) that

$$(S5) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.48}$$

By an argument similar to that used in the proof of (S2.6), one can obtain

$$E\|\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|^{\gamma_2} = O(n^{-\frac{\gamma_2}{2}}), \tag{S2.49}$$

for $0 < \gamma_2 < 3 + \tilde{\delta}$. It can be derived from Lemma S2.1(a), (S2.16), (S2.22), and (S2.49) that

$$(S6) = M_{1n}^\top \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k) M_{1n} + o_p(1) = Y_n + o_p(1). \tag{S2.50}$$

Finally, (D1) is an immediate consequence of (S2.25) and (S2.26).

Step 2: *Prove*

$$(\mathrm{II}) = -2E(V_n) + o(1), \tag{S2.51}$$

where

$$V_n = \varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\{\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\}.$$

Similar to the proof of (S2.15), it suffices for (S2.51) to show that

$$(\mathrm{C2}) : \{\tilde{W}_n\} \text{ is uniformly integrable,}$$
$$(\mathrm{D2}) : \tilde{W}_n = o_p(1),$$

where

$$\tilde{W}_n = E[\varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^\top(k)\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\}\sum_{i=k}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}].$$

Step 2.1 *Proof of* (C2)

First, (S2.18) and the fact that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_h(k)\| < \infty \tag{S2.52}$$

imply that

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_{t,h,k}|^{6+\delta} < \infty. \tag{S2.53}$$

Moreover, from Lemma S2.1(c), we have for all $0 < \gamma < 3 + \tilde{\delta}$,

$$E\|\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\|^{\gamma} = O(n^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}}). \tag{S2.54}$$

By (S2.18), (S2.20), (S2.53), (S2.54), and an argument similar to that used in the proof of (S2.24), (C2) follows.

Step 2.2 *Proof of* (D2)

For all large n, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{W}_n =& E[\varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^{\top}(k)\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\} \sum_{i=n-h-l_n+1}^{n-h} \mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}] \\
&+ E[\varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^{\top}(k)\{\hat{\mathbf{R}}_{n,h}^{-1}(k) - \tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k)\}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}]\{\sum_{i=k}^{n-h-l_n} \mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\} \\
&+ E\{\varepsilon_{n,h,k}\mathbf{x}_n^{\top}(k)|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\{\tilde{\mathbf{R}}_n^{-1}(k) - \mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\}\{\sum_{i=k}^{n-h-l_n} \mathbf{x}_i(k)\varepsilon_{i,h,k}\} \\
:=& (S7) + (S8) + (S9).
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.55}$$

In the following, we will prove that

$$(S7) = o_p(1),\ (S8) = o_p(1),\ (S9) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.56}$$

By (S2.16), (S2.18), (S2.20), (S2.53), (S2.54) and an argument similar to that used in the proof of (S2.28), we have

$$(S7) = O_p\{(l_n/n)^{1/2}\} = o_p(1). \tag{S2.57}$$

Likewise, (S2.16), (S2.18), (S2.20), (S2.34) and (S2.53) lead to

$$(S8) = O_p(l_n/n^{1/2}) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.58}$$

As for $(S9)$, note that (1.1), (3.1), and Minkowski's inequality yield

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\|E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\varepsilon_{n,h,k}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| \\
=&E\|E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\varepsilon_{n,h,k} - E(\mathbf{x}_n(k)\varepsilon_{n,h,k})|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| \\
\le& \sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} |\alpha_i||\alpha_j| E\|E[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)(\varepsilon_{n+h-j} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}(k)) \\
&- E\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-i}(k)(\varepsilon_{n+h-j} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{n-j}(k))\}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}]\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.59}$$

Similar to the proof of (S2.47), the absolute summability of α_i's, along with (S2.42), (S2.43), and (S2.59), leads to

$$E\|E\{\mathbf{x}_n(k)\varepsilon_{n,h,k}|\mathcal{F}_{n-l_n}\}\| = o(1). \tag{S2.60}$$

Hence, it follows from (S2.36), (S2.49) and (S2.60) that

$$(S9) = o_p(1). \tag{S2.61}$$

Consequently, (D2) is ensured by (S2.55) and (S2.56).

Step 3: *Prove*

$$E(Y_n)-2E(V_n) = \mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}(k)\}+2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(k)\}+o(1). \tag{S2.62}$$

The fourth-order stationarity of $\{\varepsilon_t\}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} E(V_n) = &\sum_{i=h}^{n-h-k} E\{\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+i}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+i,h,k}\} \\ &+ \sum_{i=n-h-k+1}^{n-k} E\{\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+i}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+i,h,k}\}, \end{aligned} \tag{S2.63}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} E(Y_n) =&\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{0,h}(k)\} + 2\sum_{s=1}^{h-1}\mathrm{tr}\{\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{L}_{s,h}(k)\} \\ &+ 2\sum_{i=h}^{n-h-k} E\{\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+i}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+i,h,k}\} \\ &- \frac{2}{n-h-k+1}\sum_{i=1}^{n-h-k} iE\{\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+i}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+i,h,k}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{S2.64}$$

In view of (S2.63) and (S2.64), it remains to prove that

$$E\{\mathbf{x}_k^\top(k)\mathbf{R}^{-1}(k)\mathbf{x}_{k+n}(k)\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+n,h,k}\} = o(n^{-1}). \tag{S2.65}$$

Let $\varepsilon^*_{j,h,k} = \varepsilon_{j+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(k)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j(k)$. By (1.1) and (3.1), we have for any $0 \le u, w \le k-1$ and $n \ge 4(k+h)$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E(x_{k-u}x_{k+n-w}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\varepsilon_{k+n,h,k}) \\
=&E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{x_{k+n-w}\varepsilon_{k+n,h,k} - E(x_{k+n-w}\varepsilon_{k+n,h,k})\}] \\
=&E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{\sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\sum_{l=0}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\alpha_j\alpha_l(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k} - E(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k}))\}] \\
&+E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{\sum_{j=\lfloor n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\sum_{l=\lfloor n/4\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\alpha_j\alpha_l(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k} - E(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k}))\}] \\
&+E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{\sum_{j=\lfloor n/4\rfloor+1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor}\sum_{l=\lfloor n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\alpha_j\alpha_l(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k} - E(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k}))\}] \\
:=&(E4)+(E5)+(E6),
\end{aligned}
\tag{S2.66}
$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that for $s > t \vee (k+h)$ or $t > s \vee (k+h)$,

$$
E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{\varepsilon_s\varepsilon_t - E(\varepsilon_s\varepsilon_t)\}] = 0. \tag{S2.67}
$$

Note that for all sufficiently large n and $0 \le j \le \lfloor n/2\rfloor$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{\varepsilon^2_{k+n-w-j} - E(\varepsilon^2_{k+n-w-j})\}] \\
=&E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}E\{\varepsilon^2_{k+n-w-j} - E(\varepsilon^2_{k+n-w-j})|\mathcal{F}_{k+n-w-\lfloor\frac{3}{4}n\rfloor}\}].
\end{aligned}
\tag{S2.68}
$$

This, (3.5), (S2.18), (S2.52), (S2.53), (S2.67), Minkowski's inequality and Hölder's inequality yield

$$
(E4) = o(n^{-1}). \tag{S2.69}
$$

As for $(E5)$, note that it can be deduced from (S2.18) and (3.3) that

$$
\sup_{j,l\ge 0} E[x_{k-u}\varepsilon_{k,h,k}\{(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k} - E(\varepsilon_{k+n-w-j}\varepsilon^*_{k+n-l,h,k})\}] = O(1). \tag{S2.70}
$$

Thus, we have

$$
(E5) \le C\sum_{j=\lfloor n/2\rfloor+1}^{\infty}\sum_{l=\lfloor n/4\rfloor+1}^{\infty}|\alpha_j||\alpha_l| \le C(n^{-\iota+1})^2 = Cn^{-2\iota+2} = o(n^{-1}), \tag{S2.71}
$$

where the first inequality follows from (S2.70) and Minkowski's inequality, and the last equality is ensured by the assumption that $\alpha_i = O(i^{-\iota})$ with $\iota > 3/2$. Similarly, one can obtain

$$(E6) = o(n^{-1}). \tag{S2.72}$$

Using (S2.22), (S2.66), (S2.69)–(S2.72) and Minkowski's inequality, we obtain (S2.65). □

Proof of Proposition 3.1. By (3.8)–(3.11), Minkowski's inequality and Burkholder's inequality, we have for any $1 \le \underline{m}_n \le \bar{m}_n \le n$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{-\infty<s<\infty} E|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}(\varepsilon_{t+s}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t+s}^2))|^{3+\delta^\star} \\
=&\sup_{-\infty<s<\infty} E|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\mathbf{a}_u^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t+s,u}|^{3+\delta^\star} \\
\le&\sup_{-\infty<s<\infty}\{\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_u\|(E\|\sum_{t=\underline{m}_n}^{\bar{m}_n}\boldsymbol{w}_{t+s,u}\|^{3+\delta^\star})^{\frac{1}{3+\delta^\star}}\}^{3+\delta^\star} \\
\le&C(\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_u\|)^{3+\delta^\star}(\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n + 1)^{\frac{3+\delta^\star}{2}} \le C(\bar{m}_n - \underline{m}_n + 1)^{\frac{3+\delta^\star}{2}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.73}$$

Thus, (3.4) holds. We next prove (3.5). Observe that by Minkowski's inequality, Burkholder's inequality and (3.8)–(3.11),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-j}) - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|^2 = \sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|E(\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\mathbf{a}_s^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}|\mathcal{F}_{t-j})|^2 \\
=&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\sum_{s=j}^{\infty}\mathbf{a}_s^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}|^2 \le \sup_{-\infty<t<\infty}\{\sum_{s=j}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_s\|^2(E\|\boldsymbol{w}_{t,s}\|^2)\} \\
\le&C(\sum_{s=j}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_s\|^2) = o(j^{-2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S2.74}$$

as $j \to \infty$. Hence, (3.5) follows from (S2.74) and Hölder's inequality. □

S3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

It suffices to show (3.20) and (3.21), which are ensured by (S3.1)–(S3.5): for any finite set $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le s \le h-1$,

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}+1}\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2) = O_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{S3.1}$$

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h-s}\mathbf{x}_t(J)\mathbf{x}_{t+s}^\top(J)\varepsilon_{t,h,J}\varepsilon_{t+s,h,J} - L_{s,h}(J) = o_p(1), \tag{S3.2}$$

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n-h-\tilde{d}+1}}\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_t(J)\varepsilon_{t,h,J} = O_p(1), \tag{S3.3}$$

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}+1}\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\mathbf{x}_t(J)\mathbf{x}_t^\top(J) - \mathbf{R}(J) = o_p(1), \tag{S3.4}$$

and

$$\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_{t,h,J}|^4 + \sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E\|\mathbf{x}_t(J)\|^4 < \infty. \tag{S3.5}$$

Whereas (3.20) follows from (S3.2)–(S3.5), (3.21) is guaranteed by (S3.1), (S3.3), and (S3.4).

We first prove (S3.1). Observe that from (3.16), we have

$$\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t,h,J}^2) = \sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}(x_{t+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(J)\mathbf{x}_t(J))^2 - E(x_{t+h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(J)\mathbf{x}_t(J))^2. \tag{S3.6}$$

In view of (S3.6), (S3.1) holds if

$$\sup_{-\infty<s_1,s_2<\infty} E|\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h}(x_{t+s_1}x_{t+s_2} - E(x_{t+s_1}x_{t+s_2}))|^2 \le Cn, \tag{S3.7}$$

which, in turn, is satisfied by (3.25). Similarly, (S3.3) and (S3.4) can be concluded from (3.25). In addition, (3.24), combined with the arguments used in the proofs of (S2.18) and (S2.53), leads to (S3.5).

It remains to prove (S3.2). Note that for any finite set $J \subset \mathbb{N}$ and any $\tilde{d} \le t \le n-h-s$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbf{x}_t(J)\mathbf{x}_{t+s}^\top(J)\varepsilon_{t,h,J}\varepsilon_{t+s,h,J} \\
=&\Big\{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}\alpha_i\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-i}(J)\Big\}\Big\{\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}\alpha_j\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t+s-j}^\top(J)\Big\}\left[\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\alpha_u\{\varepsilon_{t+h-u}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(J)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t-u}(J)\}\right] \\
&\times\left[\sum_{v=0}^{\infty}\alpha_v\{\varepsilon_{t+s+h-v}-\boldsymbol{\beta}_h^\top(J)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{t+s-v}(J)\}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{S3.8}$$

In view of (S3.8), equation (S3.2) follows if, for any $0 \le s \le h-1$ and $-\infty < j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 < \infty$, the following holds:

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\tilde{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\tilde{d}}^{n-h-s}(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4}-E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4}))=o_p(1),$$

which, in turn, is ensured by (3.26). The proof of Theorem 3.2 is now complete.

S4 Proofs of Propositions A.1 and A.2

Proof of Proposition A.1. Under (A.1)–(A.3), (3.4) with $\delta^\star = \delta/2$ directly follows from (35) of Xiao and Wu (2011). To prove (3.5), note that by Minkowski's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty}E|E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-j})-E(\varepsilon_t^2)|^{3/2} \\
=&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty}E|\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}E\{\varepsilon_t^2-E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i}\}-E\{\varepsilon_t^2-E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i-1}\}|^{3/2} \\
\le&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty}(\sum_{i=0}^{\infty}[E|E\{\varepsilon_t^2-E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i}\}-E\{\varepsilon_t^2-E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i-1}\}|^{3/2}]^{2/3})^{3/2}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S4.1}$$

Moreover, by the strict stationarity of ε_t, (A.2), and (i) and (ii) of Theorem 1 of Wu (2005), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
&[E|E\{\varepsilon_t^2 - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i}\} - E\{\varepsilon_t^2 - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|\mathcal{F}_{t-j-i-1}\}|^{3/2}]^{2/3} \\
=&[E|E\{\varepsilon_{j+i}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{j+i}^2)|\mathcal{F}_0\} - E\{\varepsilon_{j+i}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{j+i}^2)|\mathcal{F}_{-1}\}|^{3/2}]^{2/3} \\
\le&(E|\varepsilon_{j+i}^2 - {\varepsilon_{j+i}^\star}^2|^{3/2})^{2/3} \\
\le&(E|\varepsilon_{j+i} - \varepsilon_{j+i}^\star|^3)^{1/3}(E|\varepsilon_{j+i} + \varepsilon_{j+i}^\star|^3)^{1/3} \\
\le&C\delta_3'(j+i) \le C\delta_{6+\delta}'(j+i).
\end{aligned} \tag{S4.2}$$

Combining (A.3), (S4.1) and (S4.2) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-j}) - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|^{3/2} \\
\le&\{\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \delta_{6+\delta}'(j+i)\}^{3/2} = \{\sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \delta_{6+\delta}'(i)\}^{3/2} = o(j^{-3/2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S4.3}$$

as $j \to \infty$, and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Proposition A.2. Under (3.24) and (A.4), (3.4) with $\delta^\star = \delta/2$ follows from Theorem 1 of Kim (1993). Furthermore, by combining (3.24), (A.4), and Theorem 14.2 of Davidson (1994), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|E(\varepsilon_t^2|\mathcal{F}_{t-j}) - E(\varepsilon_t^2)|^{3/2} \\
\le&\{2(2^{2/3}+1)\}^{3/2}\alpha(j)^{1-\frac{3/2}{(6+\delta)/2}}(\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^{6+\delta})^{\frac{3/2}{6+\delta}} \\
=&o(j^{-3/2}),
\end{aligned} \tag{S4.4}$$

as $j \to \infty$. Thus, (3.5) holds. □

S5 Proofs of Propositions B.1–B.3

Proof of Proposition B.1. Given any $-\infty < t_1, t_2, t_3, t_4 < \infty$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&E|\varepsilon_{t_1}\varepsilon_{t_2}\varepsilon_{t_3}\varepsilon_{t_4} - \varepsilon_{t_1}^\star\varepsilon_{t_2}^\star\varepsilon_{t_3}^\star\varepsilon_{t_4}^\star| \\
\le&E|\varepsilon_{t_1}\varepsilon_{t_2}\varepsilon_{t_3}(\varepsilon_{t_4} - \varepsilon_{t_4}^\star)| + E|\varepsilon_{t_1}\varepsilon_{t_2}(\varepsilon_{t_3} - \varepsilon_{t_3}^\star)\varepsilon_{t_4}^\star| \\
&+ E|\varepsilon_{t_1}(\varepsilon_{t_2} - \varepsilon_{t_2}^\star)\varepsilon_{t_3}^\star\varepsilon_{t_4}^\star| + E|(\varepsilon_{t_1} - \varepsilon_{t_1}^\star)\varepsilon_{t_2}^\star\varepsilon_{t_3}^\star\varepsilon_{t_4}^\star| \\
\le&(\sup_{-\infty<t<\infty} E|\varepsilon_t|^4)^{\frac{3}{4}}(\delta_4'(t_1) + \delta_4'(t_2) + \delta_4'(t_3) + \delta_4'(t_4)),
\end{aligned} \tag{S5.1}$$

where the last inequality follows from Hölder's inequality. Utilizing (B.1), (B.2), and (S5.1), we can apply the argument used in the proof of (35) in Xiao and Wu (2011) to derive (3.26). Inequality (3.25) can be obtained in the same manner. □

Proof of Proposition B.2. Assumption (B.3) ensures that

$$\{\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4} - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4})\}$$

is uniformly integrable for any fixed $-\infty < j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 < \infty$, thereby guaranteeing (3.26) through Theorem 2 of Andrews (1988); see also Theorem 1 of Hansen (2019). Additionally, assumptions (B.3) and (B.4) ensure that (3.25) holds through Theorem 5 of Kim (1994). □

Proof of Proposition B.3. By using (S2.11) and (S2.73) with $3+\delta$ and q therein replaced by 2, we obtain (3.25). To prove (3.26), it suffices to show that for any $0 \le s \le h-1$ and $-\infty < j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 < \infty$, with $j_u \neq j_v$ if $u \neq v$,

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s} \varepsilon_{t-j_1}^4 - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^4) = o_p(1), \tag{S5.2}$$

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s} \varepsilon_{t-j_1}^3\varepsilon_{t-j_2} - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^3\varepsilon_{t-j_2}) = o_p(1), \tag{S5.3}$$

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s} \varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}^2) = o_p(1), \tag{S5.4}$$

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s} \varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3} - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}) = o_p(1), \tag{S5.5}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s} \varepsilon_{t-j_1}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}\varepsilon_{t-j_4} = o_p(1). \tag{S5.6}$$

We first prove (S5.4). Let $\tilde{\delta} = \delta/2$. By (B.7) and Minkowski's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}^2)|^{1+\tilde{\delta}}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq&\{E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}(\mathbf{b}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(1)})^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(1)}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
&+\{E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}\sum_{u=0}^{\infty}(\mathbf{b}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(2)})^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(2)}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
:=&(I)+(II).
\end{aligned} \tag{S5.7}$$

Write $\boldsymbol{w}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(1)} = (w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,1}^{(1)},\ldots,w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,r_1}^{(1)})^\top$, for some $r_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. By using Minkowski's inequality again, we have

$$(I) \leq \sum_{u=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{b}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u}^{(1)}\|\{\sum_{v=1}^{r_1}(E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,v}^{(1)}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}}\}. \tag{S5.8}$$

Without loss of generality, we may assume that $0 < \tilde{\delta} < 1$. Then, for all $u \geq 0$, $1 \leq v \leq r_1$ and $-\infty < j_1, j_2 < \infty$, it follows from Burkholder's inequality, (B.8), (B.9), and the fact that for any real numbers $x, y \geq 0$ and $0 \leq a \leq 1$,

$$(x+y)^a \leq x^a + y^a, \tag{S5.9}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&(E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,v}^{(1)}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq&C\{E|\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,v}^{(1)})^2|^{\frac{1+\tilde{\delta}}{2}}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq&C(\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}E|\frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}w_{t-j_1,t-j_2,u,v}^{(1)}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} = o(1).
\end{aligned} \tag{S5.10}$$

Combining this with (B.10) and (S5.8) leads to

$$(I) = o(1). \tag{S5.11}$$

Moreover, by Burkholder's inequality, Minkowski's inequality, the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, (B.8), (B.9), (B.11), and (S5.9),

$$
\begin{aligned}
(II) =& \frac{1}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}(E|\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u})^\top \boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}\{E|\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}(\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u})^\top \boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u})^2|^{\frac{1+\tilde{\delta}}{2}}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}(\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}E|\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u})^\top \boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}[\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}\{\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(E|(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u})^\top \boldsymbol{w}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u}|^{1+\tilde{\delta}})^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}}\}^{1+\tilde{\delta}}]^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}[\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}\{\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(E\|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}_{t-j_1,t-j_2,t-u}\|^{2(1+\tilde{\delta})})^{\frac{1}{2(1+\tilde{\delta})}}\}^{(1+\tilde{\delta})}]^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \qquad \text{(S5.12)} \\
\leq& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}[\sum_{u=-\infty}^{n-h-s}\{\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(t-u+1)^{-1-\epsilon}\}^{(1+\tilde{\delta})}]^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
=& \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}[\sum_{u=-(n-h-s)}^{n-h-s}\{\sum_{t=u\vee\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(t-u+1)^{-1-\epsilon}\}^{(1+\tilde{\delta})}]^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
&+ \frac{C}{n-h-\bar{d}-s+1}[\sum_{u=-\infty}^{-(n-h-s)-1}\{\sum_{t=\bar{d}}^{n-h-s}(t-u+1)^{-1-\epsilon}\}^{(1+\tilde{\delta})}]^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} \\
\leq& Cn^{\frac{-\tilde{\delta}}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} + Cn^{-1}\{\sum_{u=(n-h-s)+1}^{\infty}(u+\bar{d})^{-(1+\epsilon)(1+\tilde{\delta})}\}^{\frac{1}{1+\tilde{\delta}}} = o(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, (S5.4) is a consequence of (S5.7), (S5.11), (S5.12) and Markov's inequality. It can be shown in the same manner as in the proof of (S5.4) that (S5.2) holds. Note that by (2.1), the symmetry of z_t, and an argument similar to that used in (S2.11), we have (S5.3) and

Table S6.1: The values of $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$, with $h = 1$, $k = 1$, and $n = 500, 2000, 5000$, in Example S6.1

$(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \psi_1) = (0.4, 0.5, 0.2)$		$(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \psi_1) = (0.4, 0.2, 0.55)$
$\tilde{g}_1(1)$	105.579	2.571
$R_{500,1}$	0.041	0.968
$R_{2000,1}$	0.053	0.961
$R_{5000,1}$	0.063	1.056

(S5.6). As for (S5.5), observe that by (3.8),

$$\begin{aligned}\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3} =& \{\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2 - E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2) + E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2)\}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3} \\ =& \sum_{u=0}^{\infty} \mathbf{a}_u^\top \boldsymbol{w}_{t-j_1,u}\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3} + E(\varepsilon_{t-j_1}^2)\varepsilon_{t-j_2}\varepsilon_{t-j_3}.\end{aligned} \tag{S5.13}$$

Hence, (S5.5) follows from (3.10), (B.6), (S5.13), the assumption that $\sum_{s=0}^{\infty}\|\mathbf{a}_s\| < \infty$, Minkowski's inequality and an argument similar to that used in (S2.9). The proof is now complete. □

S6 Additional Numerical Examples

S6.1 An Example Related to Theorem 3.1

In this subsection, we illustrate how sensitive (3.6) is to the moment assumption (3.3) through a numerical study. All notations used here are consistent with those in Section 4.1.

Example S6.1. We generate $M = 5000$ realizations from the following AR(1) model,

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= -0.5x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t, \\ \varepsilon_t &= \sigma_t z_t,\ \sigma_t^2 = \varphi_0 + \varphi_1\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + \psi_1\sigma_{t-1}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{z_t\}$ is a sequence of i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ random variables. We use model (3.1) with $k = 1$ to do prediction. Therefore, the working model is correctly specified. Letting $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \psi_1) = (0.4, 0.5, 0.2)$ and $(0.4, 0.2, 0.55)$, we report $g_h(k)$ and $R_{n,h}$, with $k = 1$, $h = 1$, and $n = 500, 2000, 5000$, in Table S6.1.

When $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \psi_1) = (0.4, 0.5, 0.2)$, ε_t only has a finite $(4 + \bar{\delta}_1)$th moment, where $\bar{\delta}_1$ is some small positive number (see Theorem 4

Table S6.2: Frequency, in 1,000 simulations, of selecting the correct model when the data is generated from (I).

n	AIC	BIC	MRIC
200	596	889	877
500	555	917	991
1000	558	945	1000

of Nelson (1990) for details). Table S6.1 shows that even though n increases to 5000, $R_{n,1}$ is still far away from 1. On the other hand, when $(\varphi_0, \varphi_1, \psi_1) = (0.4, 0.2, 0.55)$, ε_t has a finite $(6+\bar{\delta}_2)$th moment, for some small $\bar{\delta}_2 > 0$, and hence (3.3) follows. In this latter case, the values of $R_{n,1}$, falling between 0.961–1.056, are very close to 1 as long as $n \geq 500$. These results suggest that the moment condition (3.3) used in Theorem 3.1 can hardly be relaxed.

S6.2 Two Examples Related to MRIC

In this subsection, we aim to compare the performance of AIC, BIC, and MRIC when the model is correctly specified. Consider two data generating processes:

(I)

$$x_t = 0.8x_{t-1} - 0.5x_{t-2} + 0.35x_{t-4} + \varepsilon_t,$$
$$\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t,\ \ \sigma_t^2 = 0.4 + 0.2\varepsilon_{t-1}^2 + 0.55\sigma_{t-1}^2,$$

(II)

$$x_t = 0.55x_{t-2} - 0.4x_{t-5} + \varepsilon_t,$$
$$\varepsilon_t = \sigma_t z_t,\ \ (1 - 0.98B)\log(\sigma_t^2) = 0.01 + v_t,$$

where $\{z_t\}$ and $\{v_t\}$ are sequences of i.i.d. $N(0,1)$ and $N(0, 0.04)$ random variables, respectively. Our objective is to select the correct model for one-step-ahead prediction among all $J \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ when the data is generated from either (I) or (II). We conduct 1,000 simulations and report the frequency with which each method selects the correct model for sample sizes $n = 200$, 500, and 1000. The setting of MRIC is the same as in Section 4.2.

In scenario (I), it can be observed that BIC slightly outperforms MRIC in selecting the correct model when $n = 200$. However, as n

Table S6.3: Frequency, in 1,000 simulations, of selecting the correct model when the data is generated from (II).

n	AIC	BIC	MRIC
200	416	835	950
500	375	842	989
1000	369	828	996

increases to 500 and beyond, the performance of MRIC quickly surpasses that of BIC. On the other hand, AIC consistently underperforms in model selection, showing no significant improvement even with larger sample sizes. In scenario (II), MRIC consistently proves to be the most effective method for selecting the correct model, regardless of whether $n = 200,\ 500$, or 1000.

References

Andrews, Donald W. K. (1988). Laws of large numbers for dependent non-identically distributed random variables. *Econometric Theory* **4** 458–467.

Brockwell, P. and R. Davis (1991). *Time Series: Theory and Methods* (2nd Ed.). Springer Series in Statistics. Springer.

Davidson, J. (1994). *Stochastic Limit Theory: An Introduction for Econometricians, Advanced Texts in Econometrics*. London: Oxford University Press.

Eldar, Y. and Kutyniok, G. (2012). *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*. Cambridge University Press.

Hansen, B.E. (2019). A weak law of large numbers under weak mixing. *unpublished manuscript.*

Ing, C.-K. and Wei, C.-Z. (2003). On same-realization prediction in an infinite-order autoregressive process. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **85** 130–155.

Kim, T. Y. (1993). A note on moment bounds for strong mixing sequences. *Statistics & probability Letters* **16** 163–168.

Kim, T. Y. (1994). Moment bounds for non-stationary dependent sequences *Journal of Applied Probability* **31** 731–742.

Nelson, D. B. (1990). Stationarity and persistence in the GARCH(1,1) model. *Econometric Theory* **6** 318–334.

Wu, W. B. (2005). Nonlinear system theory: Another look at dependence. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **102** 14150–14154.

Xiao, H and Wu, W. B. (2011). Asymptotic inference of autocovariances of stationary processes. *Available at arXiv:1105.3423.*

Zygmund, A. (2002). *Trigonometric Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.