

# A nonlinearity and model specification test for functional time series

Xin Huang<sup>ID</sup>    Han Lin Shang<sup>ID</sup>\*    Tak Kuen Siu<sup>ID</sup>  
Department of Actuarial Studies and Business Analytics  
Macquarie University

## Abstract

An important issue in functional time series analysis is whether an observed series comes from a purely random process. We extend the BDS test, a widely-used nonlinear independence test, to the functional time series. Like the BDS test in the univariate case, the functional BDS test can act as the model specification test to evaluate the adequacy of various prediction models and as a nonlinearity test to detect the existence of nonlinear structures in a functional time series after removing the linear structure exhibited. We show that the test statistic from the functional BDS test has the same asymptotic properties as those in the univariate case and provides the recommended range of its hyperparameters. Additionally, empirical data analysis features its applications in evaluating the adequacy of the fAR(1) and fGARCH(1,1) models in fitting the daily curves of cumulative intraday returns (CIDR) of the VIX index. We showed that the functional BDS test remedies the weakness of the existing independence test in the literature, as the latter is restricted in detecting linear structures, thus, can neglect nonlinear temporal structures.

*Keywords:* BDS test; Functional GARCH model; Financial autoregressive model; Independence test; VIX index.

---

\*Corresponding address: Department of Actuarial Studies and Business Analytics, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW 2109, Australia; Telephone: +61(2) 9850 4689; Email: hanlin.shang@mq.edu.au

# 1 Introduction

Functional time series analysis is a fusion between functional data and time series analyses. Similar to univariate and multivariate time series, a temporal dependence structure exists in functional observations, manifesting themselves in a graphical form of curves, images, or shapes. Functional time series can typically be classified into two categories: First is segmenting a univariate time series into (sliced) functional time series. For instance, [Rice et al. \(2021\)](#) consider intraday volatility to form functional time series  $[\mathcal{X}_1(\mathbf{u}), \mathcal{X}_2(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \mathcal{X}_N(\mathbf{u})]$  defined for a continuum  $\mathbf{u} \in [u_1, u_p]$ . The other category is when the continuum is not a time variable, such as age (see, e.g., [Shang, Haberman & Xu 2022](#)) or wavelength in spectroscopy (see, e.g., [Shang, Cao & Sang 2022](#)).

While functional time series are continuous objects, discrete time series are scalar-valued. Functional time series enjoy at least three advantages: 1) Compared to univariate time series, functional representation of time-series data accommodates well with data collected at ultra-high-frequency and can alleviate the burden of the parameter estimation that commonly arises in modeling a large volume of observations. 2) As by-products, functional derivatives can provide additional insight into the data under investigation (see, e.g., [Shang 2019](#), [Hooker & Shang 2022](#)). 3) Some data are more natural to be considered functions that behave like smooth curves rather than separated discrete observations, such as age-specific mortality data.

Over the past two decades, there have been rapid developments in functional time series analysis. [Ramsay & Silverman \(2002, 2005\)](#) provide comprehensive overviews of the major advances and the fundamental concepts and techniques used in functional data analysis. An important branch of developments of functional time series analysis is extending the mainstream models and analytical tools in univariate time series to functional cases (see, e.g., [Kokoszka & Reimherr 2017](#)). To name a few, [Kokoszka et al. \(2017\)](#) and [Mestre et al. \(2021\)](#) proposed a functional autocorrelation function (fACF) to quantify linear serial correlation in a functional time series. [Huang & Shang \(2023\)](#) proposed a nonlinear fACF to measure nonlinear dependence in a functional time series.

[Bosq \(1991\)](#) extended the autoregressive (AR) model to the functional case, referred to as the fAR model. Since then, many functional time series models are extended from the fAR model. They include the autoregressive Hilbertian model with exogenous variables (ARHX) model ([Da-](#)

mon & Guillas 2002), the Hilbert moving average model (Turbillon et al. 2007), the functional autoregressive moving average (fARMA) model (Klepsch et al. 2017), the seasonal functional autoregressive model (Zamani et al. 2022), and the seasonal autoregressive moving average Hilbertian model with exogenous variables (SARMAHX) model (González et al. 2017). For modeling conditional variance, they include the functional autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (fARCH) model (Hörmann et al. 2013), functional generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity (fGARCH) model (Aue et al. 2017), and fGARCH-X model (Rice et al. 2021).

Despite the increasing interest and research on functional time series, many existing measures/tools that study the structure underlying the observed functional time series, including the fACF, are based on the autocovariance and/or autocorrelation (Horváth et al. 2013, Zhang 2016, Mestre et al. 2021). They only capture the linear temporal structure. Except for nonlinear fACF in Huang & Shang (2023), there is little research to study the nonlinear temporal structures within the functional time series literature. Additionally, since linear structures restrict those tools, they cannot test all possible deviations from randomness. Therefore, a robust model specification test must be improved to evaluate the adequacy of functional time series models.

In this paper, we extend the BDS test to functional time series. Just like the univariate case, the proposed test can be used as an IID test on estimated residuals to evaluate the adequacy of the fitted model and as a nonlinearity test on residuals of functional time series after removing linear temporal structures exhibited in the investigated data.

The BDS test proposed by Broock et al. (1996) is the most widely used nonlinearity test and model specification test in univariate time series analysis. The reason behind its popularity is many folds: First, the BDS test requires minimal assumptions and previous knowledge about the investigated data sets. When the BDS test is applied to model residuals, the asymptotic distribution of its test statistic is independent of estimation errors under certain sufficient conditions. Specifically, de Lima (1996) shows that for linear additive models or models that can be transformed into that form, the BDS test is nuisance parameter-free and does not require any adjustment when applied to fitted model residuals.

Second, the BDS test tests against various forms of deviation from randomness. While the

null hypothesis of the BDS test is the investigated time series is generated by an IID process, its alternative hypothesis is not specified. It may be thought of as a portmanteau test. This implies that the BDS test can detect any non-randomness exhibited in the investigated time series. Additionally, a fast algorithm exists for computing BDS test statistics, which ensures the BDS test's easy and speedy application on empirical applications (LeBaron 1997). Also, the BDS statistic asymptotic distribution theory does not require higher-order moments to exist. This property is especially useful in financial time series analysis since many financial time series exhibit heavy-tailed distributions whose higher-order moments may not exist.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 provides the specification of the functional BDS test. In appendix B, we provide detailed proof of the asymptotic distribution of the test statistics of the functional BDS test. In Section 3, we present Monte-Carlo experiments on the IID functional time series and simulated fAR(1) functional time series to provide the recommended dimension and distance hyperparameters range. In Section 4, the functional BDS test is used to test the adequacy of the fAR(1) model and fGARCH(1,1) model of daily curves of intraday VIX index returns. Conclusions are given in Section 5, along with some ideas on how the methodology presented here can be further extended.

## 2 BDS Test for functional time series

The BDS test uses “correlation integral”, a popular measure in chaotic time series analysis. According to Packard et al. (1980) and Takens (1981), the method of delays can embed a scalar time series  $\{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  into a  $m$ -dimensional space as follows

$$\vec{x}_i = (x_i, x_{i+1}, \dots, x_{i+m-1}), \quad \vec{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^m.$$

Accordingly,  $\vec{x}_i$  is called  $m$ -history of  $x_i$ . Grassberger & Procaccia (1983) proposed correlation integral as a measure of the fractal dimension of deterministic data as it records the frequency with which temporal patterns are repeated. The correlation integral at the embedding dimension  $m$  is

given by

$$C(m, N, r) = \frac{2}{M(M-1)} \sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq M} \Theta(r - \|\vec{x}_i - \vec{x}_j\|), \quad r > 0 \quad (1)$$

$$\Theta(a) = 0, \quad \text{if } a \leq 0$$

$$\Theta(a) = 1, \quad \text{if } a > 0$$

where  $N$  is the size of the data sets,  $M = N - m + 1$  is the number of embedded points in  $m$ -dimensional space,  $r$  is the distance used for testing the proximity of the data points, and  $\|\cdot\|$  denotes the sup-norm. In essence,  $C(m, N, r)$  measures the fraction of the pairs of points  $\vec{x}_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2, \dots, M$ , the sup-norm separation of which is less than  $r$ .

[Brook \(1987\)](#) showed that under the null hypothesis that  $\{x_i : i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  are IID with a non-degenerated distribution function  $F(\cdot)$ ,

$$C(m, r) := \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} C(m, N, r)$$

$$C(m, r) \rightarrow C^m(1, r) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

According to [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#), the BDS statistic for  $m > 1$  is defined as

$$\text{BDS}(m, M, r) = \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\sigma} [C(m, N, r) - C^m(1, r)]$$

where  $M = N - m + 1$ ,

$$\sigma^2 = 4 \left( K^m + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} K^{m-j} C^{2j} + (m-1)^2 C^{2m} - m^2 K C^{2m-2} \right),$$

$C = \int [F(z+r) - F(z-r)] dF(z)$  and  $K = \int [F(z+r) - F(z-r)]^2 dF(z)$ . Note that  $C(1, N, r)$  is a consistent estimate of  $C$ , and  $K$  can be consistently estimated by

$$\frac{6}{M(M-1)(M-2)} \sum_{1 < t < s < u < M} \Theta(r - \|\vec{x}_t - \vec{x}_s\|) \Theta(r - \|\vec{x}_s - \vec{x}_u\|). \quad (2)$$

Under the IID hypothesis,  $\text{BDS}(m, M, r)$  has a limiting standard normal distribution as  $M \rightarrow \infty$ .

The above specification of the BDS test is for scalar time series. When the object is functional time series, one needs to adjust the computation of sup-norm separation of the  $m$ -histories in (1) and (2).

Given a functional time series  $\mathcal{X}(\mathbf{u}) = \{\mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{u}); \mathbf{u} \in [\mathbf{u}_1, \mathbf{u}_p], t = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$ , the  $m$ -history of  $\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{u})$  is constructed by its  $m$  neighbouring observations, namely

$$\overrightarrow{\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{u})} = [\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{u}), \mathcal{X}_{i+1}(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \mathcal{X}_{i+m-1}(\mathbf{u})].$$

The sup-norm of two sets of  $m$  functions can be measured by taking the maximum distance between the corresponding curves. Specifically, if we use  $L_2$  norm as the distance measure between two curves,

$$\|\overrightarrow{\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{u})} - \overrightarrow{\mathcal{X}_j(\mathbf{u})}\| = \max(\|\mathcal{X}_i(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{X}_j(\mathbf{u})\|_2, \dots, \|\mathcal{X}_{i+m-1}(\mathbf{u}) - \mathcal{X}_{j+m-1}(\mathbf{u})\|_2).$$

Since we adjust the specification of the BDS test statistic to be adaptive to the functional case, to determine the critical value of the BDS test after the adjustment, one needs to derive its asymptotic distribution under the null hypothesis. In appendix B, we prove that the asymptotic normality for the univariate BSD test statistic is also valid for the functional case. Indeed, the asymptotic normality result presented in Theorem 1 of Appendix B is quite versatile. It holds for any norm  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  on a separable Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ , which is more general than the  $L^2$ -norm.

The  $L_2$  norm is not the only distance measure of two functions. Other common choices include  $L_1$  norm and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  norm. All of them, including other norms, can be used for computing the sup-norm of  $m$ -histories of functional time series. However, the choice of the distance measure determines the recommended range of distance hyperparameter  $r$  as well as the speed of convergence of the test statistic and the power of the test. In Section 3, we present power and size experiments on random and structured functional time series when  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  are selected as the distance measure inside the sup-norms.

### 3 Monte-Carlo experiments

In the section, we conduct Monte-Carlo experiments on simulated IID and structured functional time series to provide the recommended range of hyperparameters of the functional BDS test, namely  $m$ ,  $r$ , and the preferred norms inside the sup-norms.

We use two metrics to evaluate the selection of the hyperparameters and the norms: 1) the resemblance of normality of the test statistics on the IID process; and 2) the power of rejecting  $H_0$  on the structured process.

For the resemblance of normality, we simulated 200 paths of 500 IID functional time series and computed the BDS test statistic on each path with  $m = (2, 3, \dots, 10)$  and  $r = (0.25\text{s.d.}, 0.5\text{s.d.}, \dots, 2\text{s.d.})$ . Table 1 provides the p-value of the Kolmogorov–Smirnov (KS) test for each combination of  $m$  and  $r$  when  $L_2$  is selected as the norm inside the sup-norms. The respective tables with  $L_1$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  being selected as the norms inside the sup-norms are provided in the appendix. The KS test examines against the null hypothesis that the computed functional BDS test statistic is from a standard normal distribution. A p-value less than 0.025 (highlighted in red) indicates the rejection of  $H_0$ , which means the generated BDS test statistics cannot be assumed to follow a standard normal distribution. On the contrary, the higher the p-value is, the closer the BDS test statistics are to a standard normal distribution.

Table 1: The p-value of the KS test on functional BDS test statistics with  $L_2$  norm computed on 200 paths of 500 simulated IID functional time series.

r	m								
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.5s.d.	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
0.75s.d.	0.00	0.03	0.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
s.d.	0.84	0.63	0.06	0.00	0.26	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
1.25s.d.	0.69	0.52	0.19	0.88	0.10	0.03	0.01	0.00	0.02
1.5s.d.	0.56	0.44	0.38	0.03	0.00	0.23	0.60	0.03	0.94
1.75s.d.	0.34	0.37	0.33	0.14	0.19	0.22	0.07	0.06	0.06
2s.d.	0.27	0.00	0.29	0.93	0.01	0.33	0.52	0.02	0.02

From the result in Tables 1 and 7, we can see that the functional BDS test with a moderate  $m$  ( $2 \leq m \leq 7$ ) and a sufficiently large  $r$  ( $r \geq \text{s.d.}$ ) ensures that the respective test statistics have distributions sufficiently close to a standard normal distribution under the null hypothesis.

For the power test, we simulated 200 paths of an fAR(1) process. In each path, we generate 500 observations, and each functional observation is formed by 100 equal-spaced points within  $(0,1)$ . Following the definition given in Bosq (2000), let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a separable Hilbert space with norm  $\|\cdot\|$  and scalar product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ , a sequence  $\{\mathcal{X}_1(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \mathcal{X}_N(\mathbf{u})\}$  of  $\mathcal{H}$  random variables is called an fAR(1) associated with  $(\mu, \epsilon, \rho)$  if

$$\mathcal{X}_{t+1}(\mathbf{u}) - \mu(\mathbf{u}) = \rho[\mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{u}) - \mu(\mathbf{u})] + \epsilon_t(\mathbf{u}), \quad (3)$$

where the linear operator  $\rho$  ( $\|\rho\| < 1$ ) acting on the Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  is compact, and a set of random error terms  $\{\epsilon_1(\mathbf{u}), \epsilon_2(\mathbf{u}), \dots, \epsilon_N(\mathbf{u})\}$  is a set of independent random variables with a distribution satisfying the conditions:  $E[\epsilon_t(\mathbf{u})] = 0$ ,  $0 < E[\epsilon_t^2(\mathbf{u})] < \infty$ , and  $E[\epsilon_t(\mathbf{u})\epsilon_s(\mathbf{u})] = \sigma^2\delta_{t,s}$ , for  $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}$  ( $\delta_{t,s} = 1$  if  $t = s$ ;  $\delta_{t,s} = 0$  if  $t \neq s$ ). Equation (3) can be easily extended to define a fAR(p) process by including additional terms of the form  $\rho_k[\mathcal{X}_{t-k}(\mathbf{u}) - \mu(\mathbf{u})]$ . We use the `simul.far` function in the ‘far’ package (Serge 2022) in  (R Core Team 2023) to generate the fAR(1) process. The simulated fAR(1) process has the linear operator  $\rho = 0.1$ . The error terms  $\epsilon_t(\mathbf{u})$  are strong white noise, and five equally-spaced sinusoidal bases  $\{1, \sqrt{2}\sin(2\pi\mathbf{u}), \sqrt{2}\cos(2\pi\mathbf{u}), \sqrt{2}\sin(4\pi\mathbf{u}), \sqrt{2}\cos(4\pi\mathbf{u})\}$  are used to construct the fAR(1) model. We specifically choose a small  $\rho$  so the generated process has relatively weak temporal structures.

After simulating 200 paths of the fAR(1) process, we compute the functional BDS test statistic on each simulated functional time series. Table 2 presents the probability that the functional BDS test successfully rejects the IID hypothesis on a structured process when  $L_2$  is selected as the norm. Table 8 in the appendix provides the respective tables with  $L_1$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$ . A value of 100% indicates that the BDS test made correct inferences at all simulated paths, whereas a value less than 100% suggests it failed to distinguish a structured process from a random one at certain paths. The value less than 100% is highlighted in red, indicating that this particular combination of  $m$  and  $r$  impairs the power of the test.

Table 2: The successful rejection rate of the functional BDS test on 200 paths of the simulated fAR(1) process ( $\rho = 0.1$ ) of 500 observations with  $L_2$  being used as the norm inside the sup-norms and different choices of  $m$  and  $r$ .

r	m									
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
0.25s.d.	100%	99%	100%	100%	98%	68%	20%	3%	0%	
0.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	93%	52%	15%	
0.75s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	
s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
1.25s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	
1.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	99%	98%	
1.75s.d.	98%	100%	99%	98%	98%	98%	99%	97%	96%	
2s.d.	98%	95%	96%	92%	90%	89%	92%	93%	86%	

In Tables 2 and 8, the results of the power experiments indicate the BDS test attains the highest successful rejection rate when  $m$  is between 2 and 7 and  $r$  is between 0.5s.d and 1.5s.d..

For the robustness experiments, we randomly replaced 1% of the simulated IID functional time series to have a distinctive higher mean than the rest of the observations and then repeated the normality resemblance experiments. Table 9 that presents the p-values of the KS test for  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$ , and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  is given in the appendix. The results showed that including random outliers does not impair the convergence to normality for the functional BDS test when  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  are used as the norm inside the sup-norms. However, when  $L_{\text{inf}}$  is used inside the sup-norms, the test is significantly affected by the outliers. The presence of outliers makes the generated test statistic fail the KS test for most of the combinations of  $m$  and  $r$  when  $L_{\text{inf}}$  is chosen as the norm inside the sup-norm.

Lastly, we performed a size experiment to guide the preferred length of the functional time series so that the BDS test has satisfactory performance. We repeat the normality resemblance experiment and the power test with  $m = 3$  and  $r = \text{s.d.}$  where the selected  $m$  and  $r$  are within the recommended range as indicated by our previous normality resemblance experiments and power test. The simulated functional time series length is 100, 250, 500, 750, or 1000. The result of the normality resemblance experiment is presented in Table 3, and the power test result is given in Table 4. The size experiment indicates that with an appropriate selection of  $m$  and  $r$ , the functional

BDS test has satisfactory performance for functional time series with a length greater or equal to 250.

Table 3: The KS test p-value of the functional BDS test statistic on IID functional time series with various lengths.

KS test p-value ( $m = 3, r = \text{s.d.}$ )	n=100	n=250	n=500	n=750	n=1000
$L_1$	0.00	0.10	0.13	0.01	0.43
$L_2$	0.00	0.50	0.43	0.81	0.81
$L_{\text{inf}}$	0.06	0.00	0.01	0.43	0.13

Table 4: The successful rejection rate of the functional BDS test on simulated fAR(1) process ( $\rho = 1$ ) with various lengths.

Rejection rate ( $m = 3, r = \text{s.d.}$ )	n=100	n=250	n=500	n=750	n=1000
$L_1$	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%
$L_2$	88%	100%	100%	100%	100%
$L_{\text{inf}}$	94%	100%	100%	100%	100%

To conclude, to ensure the convergence of normality and the power of the test, we recommend the dimension hyperparameter  $m$  to be in the range of 2 and 7, and the distance parameter  $r$  between s.d and 1.5s.d.. For the norm inside the sup-norms, we recommend  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  as they are more robust to outliers. Lastly, a functional time series with more than 250 observations is recommended for the functional BDS test to perform satisfactorily.

## 4 Evaluation of the adequacy of the fAR(1) model and fGARCH(1,1) model on VIX tick returns

This section depicts an empirical application of the functional BDS test to evaluate the adequacy of the fAR(1) model and the fGARCH(1,1) model in fitting the daily curves of intraday VIX (volatility) index returns. VIX is a forward-looking volatility measure of the future equity market based on a weighted portfolio of 30-day S&P 500 Index option prices. The VIX index is a key measure of

risk for the market. Therefore, accurately predicting the VIX index is essential in risk management, especially for hedge and pension funds.

Most existing studies that attempted to model and predict the VIX index treat it as a discrete time series. To name a few, [Konstantinidi et al. \(2008\)](#) used an autoregressive fractionally integrated moving average (ARFIMA) model, and [Fernandes et al. \(2014\)](#) employed a heterogeneous AR model to predict future VIX index. Recently, the functional time series model has provided new alternatives to extract additional information underlying the VIX dynamics and potentially provides more accurate forecasts for the market expectation for the equity risk in the future (see, e.g., [Shang et al. 2019](#)).

The data set we considered records the 15-second VIX index from 2013-03-19 to 2017-07-21, where 15 seconds is the highest frequency available for the VIX index (Chicago Board Option Exchange). The VIX index of the investigation period is plotted in Figure 1. It is worth noting that the timing of the first and last VIX records can vary slightly on different trading days. To ensure the start time and end time of the daily curves of the VIX records are constant, we use linear interpolation to fill in missing values (if any) so that the timings of the VIX indexes are the same for every trading day. After linear interpolation, we have a total of 1095 trading days (excluding weekends and holidays) in our investigated data. On each trading day, VIX indexes take from 09:31:10 to 16:15:00 of a 15-s interval, and the total constitutes 1616 points per day.




Figure 1: Plot of 15-second VIX index from 2013-03-19 to 2017-07-21.

Based on the interpolated index, we transformed the non-stationary intraday VIX index into daily curves of cumulative intraday returns (CIDR). Let  $P_i(t_j)$  denote the daily VIX value at time  $t_j$  ( $j = 1, \dots, m$ ) on day  $i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ), CIDRs are computed by

$$R_i(t_j) = 100 \times [\ln P_i(t_j) - \ln P_i(t_1)], \quad (4)$$

where  $\ln(\cdot)$  represent the natural logarithm and  $t_{j-1}$  and  $t_j$  are 15 seconds apart. The daily curves of the CIDR of the VIX index are the functional time series of interest. Figure 2 provides the plot of the functional time series curves of the CIDR VIX index over different trading days.




Figure 2: Graphical display of functional time series curves of CIDR VIX index from 2013-03-19 to 2017-07-21.


The candidate models we consider to fit the daily curves of the CIDR VIX index are the  $fAR(1)$  model and  $fGARCH(1,1)$  model. The specification of the  $fAR(1)$  model is provided in (3) of Section 3. We use the package 'far' to fit the observed data to the  $fAR(1)$  model. The  $fGARCH$

model is proposed by [Aue et al. \(2017\)](#). A sequence of random functions  $(R_i : i \in \mathbb{Z})$  is called a fGARCH(1,1), if it satisfies the equations


$$R_i = \sigma_i \varepsilon_i, \tag{5}$$

$$\sigma_i^2 = \delta + \alpha R_{i-1}^2 + \beta \sigma_{i-1}^2, \tag{6}$$

where  $\delta$  is a non-negative function, the operators  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  map non-negative functions to non-negative functions and the innovations  $\varepsilon_i$  are IID random functions. The estimation procedure for fitting the fGARCH model is described in [Rice et al. \(2021\)](#) via quasi-likelihood. The fitted VIX index returns estimated from the fAR(1) model and the fitted  $\sigma_i$  estimated from the fGARCH(1,1) model are plotted in [Figure 3](#).



(a) A plot of fitted daily CIDR VIX index curves from fAR(1) model.



(b) A plot of fitted conditional standard deviation from fGARCH(1,1) model.

**Figure 3:** Plots of fitted functional time series curves of CIDR VIX index from fAR(1) model and fitted conditional standard deviation ( $\hat{\sigma}_i$ ) from fGARCH(1, 1) model.

To evaluate the adequacy of the fAR(1) model, we apply the functional BDS test on the residuals between the observed returns curves and the fitted return curves  $((R_i(t_j) - \hat{R}_i(t_j) : j = 1, \dots, \tau; i = 1, \dots, n))$ . [Table 5](#) presents the functional BDS test statistics of fAR(1) model residuals for a variety combination of hyper-parameter  $m$  and  $r$ . Since most test statistics exceed the 1% critical value of standard normal distribution, the functional BDS test rejects the null hypothesis of IID residuals. In

other words, the fAR(1) model cannot capture all structures underlying the observed daily curves of VIX returns.

Table 5: The functional BDS test statistics of fAR(1) residuals and fGARCH(1,1) logarithm squared standardized returns fitted to daily curves of the CIDR VIX index. \* indicates the independent null hypothesis is rejected at 5% significance, and \*\* indicates rejection at 1% significance.

Model	r	m					
		2	3	4	5	6	7
fAR(1)	s.d.	7.75**	9.15**	9.52**	10.05**	10.39**	11.11**
	1.25s.d.	6.26**	7.73**	8.20**	8.57**	8.71**	9.15**
	1.5s.d.	5.05**	6.67**	7.21**	7.68**	7.76**	8.13**
fGARCH(1,1)	s.d.	1.42	2.06*	2.77**	3.25**	3.66**	3.93**
	1.25s.d.	2.32*	2.69**	3.09**	3.21**	3.47**	3.73**
	1.5s.d.	2.72**	3.13**	3.42**	3.42**	3.59**	3.75**

Since the fGARCH(1,1) is a multiplicative model, we use the standardized returns ( $R_t/\hat{\sigma}_t$ ) to evaluate its adequacy. In the univariate case, when evaluating the adequacy of the GARCH model, if the BDS test is applied directly to the standardized returns  $R_t/\hat{\sigma}_t$ , earlier studies (see [Brock et al. 1991](#)) suggest the BDS statistic needs to be adjusted to have the right size. [Fernandes & Preumont \(2012\)](#) proposed to apply the BDS test on natural logarithms of squared standardized residuals ( $\ln(R_t^2/\hat{\sigma}_t^2)$ ) so that the logarithmic transformation casts the GARCH model into a linear additive model. Table 5 records the functional BDS test statistics of the logarithm of the squared standardized returns.

To compare the newly proposed BDS test with the existing independence test in the functional time series literature, we conduct the independence test proposed by [Gabrys & Kokoszka \(2007\)](#) (abbreviated as the GK independence test) on the fAR(1) residuals and fGARCH(1,1) standardized returns. The GK independence test statistic is based on the lagged cross-covariances of the projected principal components of the functional time series. Therefore, the GK independence test statistic is restricted in detecting linear structure. The GK independence test requires two hyperparameters,  $p$  and  $H$ . The hyperparameter  $p$  represents the number of retained principal components in the dimension reduction step, and  $H$  denotes the maximum lagged cross-covariances considered in

computing the test statistics. Table 6 documents the p-value of the GK independence test for  $H = 1, 10$  and  $p = 3, 4, 5, 8, 10$ . In Gabrys & Kokoszka (2007), the authors investigated the finite-sample performance of the GK independence test with  $H = 1, 3, 5$  and  $p = 3, 4, 5$  and concluded that the test power against the fAR(1) model is very good if  $H = 1$  is used. Since the optimal parameters of the GK test depend on the underlying dynamic of the residuals, which is unknown in empirical studies, we also extend the GK test with relatively larger  $H$  and  $p$ .

Table 6: The GK test p-value of fAR(1) residuals and fGARCH(1, 1) standardized returns fitted to daily curves of the CIDR VIX index. \* indicates the independent null hypothesis is rejected at 5% significance, and \*\* indicates rejection at 1% significance.

Model	H	p				
		3	4	5	8	10
fAR(1)	1	1	1	1	0.36	1.40e-05**
	10	0.70	0.58	0.29	1.01e-4**	6.43e-11**
fGARCH(1,1)	1	0.37	0.41	0.60	0.47	0.54
	10	0.92	0.81	0.42	0.78	0.55

Comparing the inferences drawn from the functional BDS test and the GK test provides additional insights into the dynamics of the CIDR VIX functional time series. Based on the functional BDS test results, both the fAR(1) and fGARCH(1,1) models are insufficient to capture the temporal structure exhibited in the daily CIDR curves of the VIX index. However, the GK test showed evidence of a violation of independence only for the fAR(1) model when a larger  $p$  is selected. This indicates that the fGARCH(1,1) model better fits the observed curves compared to the fAR(1) model. Additionally, the seemingly contradictory conclusions regarding the fGARCH(1,1) residuals from the functional BDS test and the GK test indicate a nonlinear structure exhibited in the daily curves of the CIDR VIX index. Furthermore, the GK test results indicate that the test's inference can vary based on the parameters selected, whereas our functional BDS test provides consistent inferences across different parameter selections.

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we extended the BDS test to functional time series. Just like the BDS test in the univariate case, the functional BDS test enjoys some key desired properties, making it a plausible candidate for testing model specification and nonlinearity. Those advantages include a minimal requirement of prior assumptions and knowledge and the capacity to detect linear and nonlinear structures. We proved that the asymptotic normality previously held for the test statistics under the null hypothesis in the univariate case stays valid after adjusting the test statistics to the functional case. Additionally, we conducted Monte-Carlo experiments on the functional BDS test to provide the recommended range of its hyperparameters and data length. We showed that with the appropriate selection of the hyperparameters, the functional BDS test only required the data to be of length 250 to ensure its converges to normality and have a 100% correct rate in detecting the predictability in a simulated functional time series with a relatively weak temporal structure. Moreover, if either  $L_1$  or  $L_2$  is selected as the distance measure inside the sup-norms, the function BDS test is also robust to outliers. The code for the functional BDS test is available at [https://github.com/Landy339/functional\\_BDS\\_test](https://github.com/Landy339/functional_BDS_test).

We illustrate the significance of our research in an empirical analysis where we used the functional BDS test to evaluate the adequacy of the  $fAR(1)$  model and the  $fGARCH(1,1)$  model in fitting the CIDR VIX index functional time series. After fitting the candidate models, we applied the functional BDS test to detect the remaining structures in the residuals. The test rejects the independence null hypothesis and thus concludes that both  $fAR(1)$  and  $fGARCH(1,1)$  models are insufficient to fully capture the temporal structures exhibited in the observed curves. Additionally, our test showed added sensitivity in detecting predictability, especially the nonlinear structure, compared to the existing independence test in functional time series. We compared the results from the functional BDS test with that from the GK test, an existing linear independent test in the domain of functional time series. The results showed that our newly proposed functional BDS test remedies the weakness of the GK test by detecting the nonlinear structure in the  $fGARCH(1,1)$  residuals that the GK test neglects. With the new tool, one could be aware of the existing independence test that the  $fGARCH(1,1)$  is an adequate model for the observed data and overlook its nonlinear temporal

structures.

The functional BDS test is the first nonlinearity test and the first model specification test proposed in functional time series. However, the major limitation of the proposed test is that it can only detect the remaining structures in the residuals. Unfortunately, it cannot indicate the form of the detected structures. Consequently, if a model is deemed insufficient, practitioners have no guidance on what kind of models can fully capture the structures in the observed data.

There are several ways in which the current work may be further extended, and we briefly outline three possibilities: (1) Although our study demonstrated that with the proper selection of norms, the functional BDS test is robust to outliers, future research can examine its behavior on non-stationary functional time series, which frequently arise in real-world data. (2) The current study focused on univariate functional time series. Future work could investigate the extension of nonlinearity tests to multivariate functional time series while accounting for potential correlations among the variables. (3) Since our empirical analysis indicates the existence of nonlinearity in financial functional time series, we hope that our work will inspire further research into the dependence structure of functional time series, particularly in analyzing, modeling, and forecasting nonlinear functional time series.

## **Acknowledgments**

This work was supported by the Australian Research Council under Grant DP230102250 titled “Feature learning for high-dimensional functional time series”. The authors would like to thank Dr. Yuqian Zhao for generously sharing his code used for part of the empirical studies.

## A Appendix: Additional Monte-Carlo simulation results

In Table 7, we present the p-value of the KS test on the functional BDS test statistics computed on simulated IID functional time series with  $L_1$  norm and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  norm being used as the distance measure inside the sup-norms.

Table 7: The p-value of the KS test on functional BDS test statistics with  $L_1$  norm and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  norm computed on 200 paths of 500 simulated IID functional time series.

Metric	r	m								
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$L_1$	0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.5s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.75s.d.	0.00	0.46	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	s.d.	0.78	0.55	0.14	0.04	0.08	0.17	0.03	0.03	0.00
	1.25s.d.	0.89	0.19	0.94	0.26	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.5s.d.	0.78	0.15	0.03	0.03	0.22	0.01	0.03	0.00	0.00
	1.75s.d.	0.24	0.30	0.74	0.15	0.00	0.57	0.08	0.02	0.27
	2s.d.	0.54	0.09	0.21	0.09	0.01	0.10	0.01	0.22	0.03
$L_{\text{inf}}$	0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.5s.d.	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.75s.d.	0.10	0.19	0.29	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	s.d.	0.00	0.53	0.82	0.20	0.03	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.25s.d.	0.41	0.83	0.98	0.58	0.01	0.11	0.00	0.34	0.00
	1.5s.d.	0.72	0.29	0.72	0.17	0.12	0.25	0.09	0.02	0.01
	1.75s.d.	0.86	0.03	0.53	0.40	0.22	0.02	0.35	0.11	0.00
	2s.d.	0.00	0.16	0.29	0.13	0.91	0.17	0.22	0.93	0.00

In Table 8, we present the probability that the functional BDS test successfully rejects the IID hypothesis on a structured process when  $L_1$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  are selected as the norms.

Table 9 stores the p-value of the KS test on the functional BDS test statistics computed on simulated IID functional time series with 1% random outliers when  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  are used as the norm inside the sup-norms.

Table 8: The successful rejection rate of the functional BDS test on 200 paths of the simulated fAR(1) process ( $\rho = 0.1$ ) of 500 observations with  $L_1$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  being used as the norm inside the sup-norms and different choices of  $m$  and  $r$ .

Metric	r	m								
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$L_1$	0.25s.d.	100%	98%	100%	100%	98%	73%	19%	1%	1%
	0.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	93%	51%	15%
	0.75s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	99%	97%
	s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	1.25s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	1.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	98%	100%	100%	99%	98%
	1.75s.d.	96%	98%	98%	96%	95%	96%	94%	91%	91%
	2s.d.	91%	93%	85%	84%	89%	87%	86%	84%	78%
$L_{\text{inf}}$	0.25s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%	51%	11%	1%	1%
	0.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%	35%	8%
	0.75s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	94%
	s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	1.25s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	1.5s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	1.75s.d.	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
	2s.d.	99%	100%	100%	99%	99%	99%	99%	98%	99%

Table 9: The p-value of the KS test on functional BDS test statistics with  $L_1$ ,  $L_2$  and  $L_{\text{inf}}$  norm computed on 200 paths of 500 simulated IID functional time series with 1% random outliers.

Metric	r	m								
		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$L_1$	0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.5s.d.	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.75s.d.	0.33	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	s.d.	0.68	0.25	0.39	0.25	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.25s.d.	0.36	0.37	0.02	0.16	0.03	0.17	0.02	0.12	0.00
	1.5s.d.	0.80	0.12	0.93	0.09	0.15	0.43	0.98	0.02	0.09
	1.75s.d.	0.40	0.70	0.76	0.16	0.85	0.21	0.49	0.42	0.01
	2s.d.	0.83	0.17	0.13	0.02	0.28	0.05	0.26	0.67	0.08
$L_2$	0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.5s.d.	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.75s.d.	0.33	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	s.d.	0.67	0.30	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.25s.d.	0.62	0.23	0.10	0.23	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.5s.d.	0.57	0.95	0.07	0.15	0.35	0.05	0.00	0.11	0.00
	1.75s.d.	0.18	0.35	0.49	0.19	0.01	0.31	0.03	0.01	0.23
	2s.d.	0.01	0.16	0.16	0.03	0.02	0.19	0.33	0.26	0.01
$L_{\text{inf}}$	0.25s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.5s.d.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.75s.d.	0.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	s.d.	0.71	0.09	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.25s.d.	0.47	0.54	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.5s.d.	0.03	0.71	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	1.75s.d.	0.17	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	2s.d.	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## B Appendix: Asymptotic Normality for the BDS Test Statistic and its Proof

In Section 2, we adjust the specification of the BDS test statistic to be adaptive to the functional case. In the appendix, we prove that the asymptotic normality for the univariate BDS test statistic holds for the functional case. Firstly, we shall provide some mathematical preliminaries relevant to the asymptotic normality result. Then the BDS test statistic is related to a generalized U statistic with order 2. Finally, the asymptotic normality result and its proof are presented. It is worth noting that the following proof is not restricted by any distance measure when computing sup-norms.

### B.1 Mathematical Preliminaries

The notation and definitions to be presented here follow those in [Bosq \(1999\)](#). Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a separable Hilbert space with the inner product  $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  and the norm  $\| \cdot \|_{\mathcal{H}}$ . We equip  $\mathcal{H}$  with its Borel  $\sigma$ -field  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ . Since  $\mathcal{H}$  is a linear metric space with a countable basis, it is a topological space with a countable basis for its topology. By Proposition 3.1 of [Preston \(2008\)](#), since  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$  is the Borel  $\sigma$ -field of  $\mathcal{H}$  generated by Borel subsets of  $\mathcal{H}$ , the measurable space  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$  is countably generated. Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  be a complete probability space. We consider a discrete-time functional time series  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with values in the countably generated measurable space  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$ , where  $\mathbb{Z}$  is the set of integers. Note that the condition that the state space of a stochastic process is a countably generated measurable space was imposed in [Denker & Keller \(1983\)](#) in which some asymptotic normality results for U-statistics were presented. We shall use the asymptotic results for U statistics to prove the asymptotic normality of the BDS test statistic here. Consequently, we also impose the condition that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  takes on values in the countably generated measurable space  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$ . As in the univariate case of [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#), it is assumed that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a strictly stationary stochastic process. Let  $\mu_{X_t}$  be a measure on  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$  which is induced by the random element  $X_t$ , (i.e., an  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random variable), under the measure  $\mathbb{P}$ . That is, for any

$B \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ ,

$$\mu_{X_t}(B) := \mathbb{P}(X_t^{-1}(B)), \quad (7)$$

where  $X_t^{-1}(B) := \{\omega \in \Omega | X_t(\omega) \in B\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . Note that  $\mu_{X_t}$  is also called an image measure of  $\mathbb{P}$  under the measurable map  $X_t : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  (see, e.g., [Prakasa Rao 2014](#)).

Under the assumption that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  a strictly stationary stochastic process, the image measure  $\mu_{X_t}$  is time-invariant. Therefore, we write  $\mu_X$  for  $\mu_{X_t}$ . Let  $X_t^m := (X_t, X_{t+1}, \dots, X_{t+m-1}) \in \mathcal{H}^m$ . Note that  $X_t^m$  is a generalization of the  $m$ -history in [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#) from the univariate case to the functional case. When  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  are independent under the measure  $\mathbb{P}$ , we consider the  $m$ -product countably generated measurable space  $(\mathcal{H}^m, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes m})$ . In this case, the image measure  $\mu_{X_t^m}$  of  $\mathbb{P}$  under  $X_t^m$  on  $(\mathcal{H}^m, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes m})$  is given by:

$$\mu_{X_t^m}(B_1 \times B_2 \times \dots \times B_m) = \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_X(B_i), \quad (8)$$

for any  $B_1 \times B_2 \times \dots \times B_m \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes m}$ . Since  $\mu_{X_t^m}$  is time invariant, we write  $\mu_{X^m}$  for  $\mu_{X_t^m}$ .

For each  $i, j = 1, 2, \dots$  with  $i < j$ , let  $\mathcal{G}_{i,j}$  be the  $\mathbb{P}$ -augmentation of the  $\sigma$ -field generated by the set of  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random elements  $\sigma(X_i, X_{i+1}, \dots, X_j)$ . Then, according to [Volkonski & Rozanov \(1961\)](#), [Grassberger & Procaccia \(1983\)](#) and [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#), the  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued stochastic process  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is said to be absolutely regular if

$$\beta(k) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup \left\{ \left| \mathbb{P}(G | \mathcal{G}_{1,n}) - \mathbb{P}(G) \right| \mid G \in \mathcal{G}_{n+k, \infty} \right\} \right] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

converges to zero as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mathbb{N}$  is the set of natural numbers.

For each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ , we consider the max-norm defined by:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}} := \max_{k=1, 2, \dots, m} \{\|x_k\|_{\mathcal{H}}\}, \quad (10)$$

where  $x_i \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}}$  is the norm on  $\mathcal{H}$ . For the numerical implementation of the BDS test in the

functional case, we consider the  $L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})$  space (i.e., the space of square-integrable  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random elements under the measure  $\mathbb{P}$ ). The notation  $L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})$  follows that in [Bosq \(1999\)](#). Note that  $L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})$  is the space of  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random elements on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$  with the following norm:

$$\|X\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})} := \left( \int_{\Omega} \|X(\omega)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \mathbb{P}(d\omega) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} \|x\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \mu_X(dx) \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (11)$$

In this case, the max-norm in (10) becomes:

$$\|\mathbf{x}\|_{m, L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})} := \max_{k=1,2,\dots,m} \{\|x_k\|_{L^2_{\mathcal{H}}(\mathbb{P})}\}, \quad (12)$$

Here we attempt to prove the asymptotic normality results for the BDS test statistic in the functional case for the general case of the max-norm in (10).

Let  $I_A$  be the characteristic function of a set  $A$ . In particular, when  $A = [0, \epsilon)$ , its characteristic function is, for simplicity, denoted by  $I_{\epsilon}$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . We now extend the correlation integral in [Grassberger & Procaccia \(1983\)](#) to the case of functional time series. Specifically, the correlation integral for the functional time series  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  at embedding dimension  $m$  is defined as:

$$C_{m,n}(\epsilon) := \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{1 \leq s \leq t \leq n} I_{\epsilon}(\|X_s^m - X_t^m\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}). \quad (13)$$

As noted in [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#), under the assumption that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  is a strictly stationary stochastic process that is regular, the limit expressed as  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{m,n}(\epsilon)$  exists, and it is denoted by:

$$C_m(\epsilon) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} C_{m,n}(\epsilon). \quad (14)$$

In the case of the functional time series, the limit in Eq. (14) is given by:

$$C_m(\epsilon) = \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}) \mu_{X^m}(d\mathbf{x}) \mu_{X^m}(d\mathbf{y}). \quad (15)$$

When  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  is an independent process,

$$I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}) = \prod_{i=1}^m I_\epsilon(\|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}). \quad (16)$$

Consequently, using (8) and (16), (15) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} C_m(\epsilon) &= \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m I_\epsilon(\|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \right) \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(dx_i) \prod_{i=1}^m \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(dy_i) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(dx_i) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(dy_i) = (C_1(\epsilon))^m. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Write  $C(\epsilon)$  for  $C_1(\epsilon)$ . Then, from (17),

$$C_m(\epsilon) = [C(\epsilon)]^m. \quad (18)$$

## B.2 Generalized U Statistic with Order 2

In the sequel, some concepts of a generalized U statistic with order 2 for the functional time series are presented. The notion of U-statistic may be dated back to [Hoeffding \(1948\)](#). Here we extend the generalized U statistic in [Serfling \(1980\)](#), and [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#) to the case of functional time series. The expositions here follow those in [Denker & Keller \(1983\)](#) and [Broock et al. \(1996\)](#).

Since  $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}))$  is a countably generated measurable space, the (finite) product space  $(\mathcal{H}^m, \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})^{\otimes m})$  is also a countably generated measurable space. Let  $h : (\mathcal{H}^m)^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}$  be a measurable function  $h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ , for  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ . The measurable function  $h$  is called a kernel for the integral:

$$\int_{\mathcal{H}^m} \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}^m}(d\mathbf{x}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}^m}(d\mathbf{y}), \quad (19)$$

if  $h$  is symmetric in its arguments  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$ . That is,

$$h(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = h(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{x}). \quad (20)$$

Then a generalized U-statistic with order 2 is given by:

$$U_n = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{0 \leq s < t \leq n} h(X_s^m, X_t^m), \quad n \geq 2. \quad (21)$$

Note that

$$I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}) = I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}). \quad (22)$$

Then  $I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}})$  is a symmetric kernel for the integral in (15). Consequently, by taking  $h(X_s^m, X_t^m)$  in (21) as  $I_\epsilon(\|X_s^m - X_t^m\|_{m, \mathcal{H}})$ , the correlation integral in (13) coincides with (21). Therefore, the correlation integral in (13) is a generalized U-statistic with order 2 and symmetric kernel  $I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}})$ . Extending the definition in Broock et al. (1996) to the case of functional time series, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} K(\epsilon) &:= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(d\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 \mu_X(d\mathbf{y}) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(d\mathbf{y}) \right)^2 \mu_X(d\mathbf{x}). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The last equality follows symmetry. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var}[\mathbf{E}[I_\epsilon(\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}) | X_s]] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[(\mathbf{E}[I_\epsilon(\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}) | X_s])^2] - (\mathbf{E}[\mathbf{E}[I_\epsilon(\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}) | X_s]])^2 \\ &= \mathbf{E}[(\mathbf{E}[I_\epsilon(\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathcal{H}}) | X_s])^2] - (\mathbf{E}[I_\epsilon(\|X_t - X_s\|_{\mathcal{H}})])^2 \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(d\mathbf{x}) \right)^2 \mu_X(d\mathbf{y}) - \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(d\mathbf{x}) \mu_X(d\mathbf{y}) \right)^2 \\ &= K(\epsilon) - [C(\epsilon)]^2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Consequently,

$$K(\epsilon) \geq [C(\epsilon)]^2. \quad (25)$$

### B.3 Asymptotic Normality and its Proof

To establish the asymptotic normality results for the generalized U statistic with order 2 in (21), as in Broock et al. (1996), we focus on the non-degenerate case where  $K(\epsilon) > [C(\epsilon)]^2$ .

To simplify the notation, as in Broock et al. (1996), we write  $K$  for  $K(\epsilon)$  and  $C$  for  $C(\epsilon)$  unless otherwise stated. Define  $\sigma_m^2 := \sigma_m^2(\epsilon)$  as follows:

$$\sigma_m^2 = 4K^m - 4C^{2m} + 8 \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} (K^{m-i} C^{2i} - C^{2m}). \quad (26)$$

The following theorem gives the first asymptotic normality result, which extends Broock et al. (1996, Theorem 2.1) to the case of functional time series.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that*

1.  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  is a sequence of IID  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued random elements;
2.  $K(\epsilon) > [C(\epsilon)]^2$ .

*Then the standardized generalized U statistic with order 2 defined by:*

$$\sqrt{n} \left( \frac{C_{m,n}(\epsilon) - (C(\epsilon))^m}{\sigma_m(\epsilon)} \right) \quad (27)$$

*converges in distribution to  $N(0, 1)$ , (i.e., a standard normal distribution with zero mean and unit variance), as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\sigma_m(\epsilon)$  is given by (26).*

*Proof.* The proof follows from Theorem 1(c) in Denker & Keller (1983) and the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Broock et al. (1996). Here we consider the  $\mathcal{H}^m$ -valued stochastic process  $\{X_t^m\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  on the probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ . Under Condition 1 that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathcal{T}}$  are IID,  $X_s^m$  and  $X_t^m$  are independent if  $|s - t| \geq m$ . Then the two  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{G}_{1,n}$  and  $\mathcal{G}_{n+k,\infty}$ , for  $k \geq m$ , must be independent. Then for any  $G \in \mathcal{G}_{n+k,\infty}$  with  $k \geq m$ ,

$$P(G|\mathcal{G}_{1,n}) = P(G). \quad (28)$$

Consequently, for each  $k \geq m$ ,  $\beta(k)$  in (9) must be identical to zero. This implies that  $\{X_t^m\}_{t \in \mathcal{Z}}$  is

absolutely regular. Since it was assumed that  $\{X_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is a strictly stationary  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued process,  $\{X_t^m\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$  is an absolutely regular strictly stationary  $\mathcal{H}$ -valued process. Since  $\beta(k) < \infty$ , for all  $k \leq m$ , and  $\beta(k) = 0$ , for all  $k > m$ ,  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} [\beta(k)]^{\frac{\delta}{2+\delta}} < \infty$ , for some  $\delta > 0$ . Note that  $I_\epsilon \leq 1$ . Then

$$\mathbb{E}[I_\epsilon (\|X_s^m - X_t^m\|_{m, \mathcal{H}})^{2+\delta}] \leq 1 < \infty. \quad (29)$$

Consequently, the conditions in [Denker & Keller \(1983, Theorem 1\(c\)\)](#) are fulfilled. This then establishes the convergence of the standardized generalized U statistic with order 2 in (27) in distribution to a standard normal distribution. It remains to prove that  $\sigma_m(\epsilon)$  is given by (26). Define, for each  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{H}^m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\mathbf{x}) &:= \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} I_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{m, \mathcal{H}}) \mu_{X^m}(\mathbf{d}\mathbf{y}) - (C(\epsilon))^m \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(\mathbf{d}y_i) - (C(\epsilon))^m. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

For each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$ , let  $X_t^m(i)$  be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  component of  $X_t^m$ . Under Condition 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_1(X_t^m)] &:= \mathbb{E} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_t^m(i) - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(\mathbf{d}y_i) \right] - (C(\epsilon))^m \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[ \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_t^m(i) - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(\mathbf{d}y_i) \right] - (C(\epsilon))^m \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|x_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(\mathbf{d}x_i) \mu_X(\mathbf{d}y_i) - (C(\epsilon))^m \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m C(\epsilon) - (C(\epsilon))^m = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Using the asymptotic variance from [Denker & Keller \(1983\)](#) and writing  $\sigma_m^2$  for  $\sigma_m^2(\epsilon)$ ,

$$\frac{1}{4} \sigma_m^2 = \mathbb{E}[(h_1(X_1^m))^2] + 2 \sum_{t>1} \mathbb{E}[h_1(X_1^m) h_1(X_t^m)]. \quad (32)$$

From (30),

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\mathbf{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m))^2 \\
&= \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) - (C(\epsilon))^m \right)^2 \\
&= \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 - 2 \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \\
&\quad \times (C(\epsilon))^m + (C(\epsilon))^{2m}.
\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

Taking expectation in (33) gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m))^2] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \right] \\
&\quad - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \right] (C(\epsilon))^m \\
&\quad + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{H}^m} \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{X}^m}(d\mathbf{x}) \\
&\quad - 2 \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \right] (C(\epsilon))^m \\
&\quad + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{x}_i) \\
&\quad - 2 \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} \mathbb{I}_\epsilon(\|\mathbf{X}_t^m(i) - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \right] (C(\epsilon))^m \\
&\quad + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \\
&= \prod_{i=1}^m K(\epsilon) - 2 \prod_{i=1}^m C(\epsilon) (C(\epsilon))^m + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \\
&= (K(\epsilon))^m - (C(\epsilon))^{2m}.
\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

To evaluate  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_1^m) \mathbf{h}_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m)]$ , two cases are considered, namely  $t \leq m$  and  $t > m$ .

Recall that  $\mathbf{X}_1^m = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m) \in \mathcal{H}^m$  and  $\mathbf{X}_t^m = (X_t, X_{t+1}, \dots, X_{t+m-1}) \in \mathcal{H}^m$ . Then for  $t \leq m$ , the overlapping elements of  $\mathbf{X}_1^m$  and  $\mathbf{X}_t^m$  are  $(X_t, X_{t+1}, \dots, X_m) \in \mathcal{H}^{m-t+1}$ . The non-overlapping

elements are:

$$\begin{aligned} (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_{t-1}) &\in \mathcal{H}^{t-1}, \\ (X_{m+1}, X_{m+2}, \dots, X_{t+m-1}) &\in \mathcal{H}^{t-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

Consequently, for  $t \leq m$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &E[h_1(X_1^m)h_1(X_t^m)] \\ &= E \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) - (C(\epsilon))^m \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left( \prod_{i=t}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) - (C(\epsilon))^m \right) \right] \\ &= E \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \left( \prod_{i=t}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \right] \\ &\quad - (C(\epsilon))^m E \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \right] \\ &\quad - (C(\epsilon))^m E \left[ \left( \prod_{i=t}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \right] + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \\ &= E \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \left( \prod_{i=t}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right)^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left( \prod_{i=m+1}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right) \right] \\ &\quad - (C(\epsilon))^m \prod_{i=1}^m E \left[ \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right] \\ &\quad - (C(\epsilon))^m \prod_{i=t}^{t+m-1} E \left[ \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right] + (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

Note that

$$E \left[ \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_\epsilon(\|X_i - y_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_X(dy_i) \right]$$

$$= \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{x}_i) = C(\epsilon), \quad (37)$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \left( \prod_{i=t}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. \times \left( \prod_{i=m+1}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{X}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \right] \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{H}^{t+m-1}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \prod_{i=t}^m \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \\ & \quad \times \left( \prod_{i=m+1}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right) \mu_{\mathcal{X}^{t+m-1}}(d\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \\ & \quad \times \prod_{i=t}^m \int_{\mathcal{H}} \left( \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \right)^2 \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{x}_i) \\ & \quad \times \left( \prod_{i=m+1}^{t+m-1} \int_{\mathcal{H}} \int_{\mathcal{H}} I_{\epsilon}(\|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{y}_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{y}_i) \mu_{\mathcal{X}}(d\mathbf{x}_i) \right) \\ &= \left( \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} C(\epsilon) \right) \left( \prod_{i=t}^m K(\epsilon) \right) \left( \prod_{i=m+1}^{t+m-1} C(\epsilon) \right) \\ &= (C(\epsilon))^{t-1} (K(\epsilon))^{m-t+1} (C(\epsilon))^{t-1} \\ &= (K(\epsilon))^{m-(t-1)} (C(\epsilon))^{2(t-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Therefore, using Eq. (36), Eq. (37) and Eq. (38), for  $t \leq m$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{X}_1^m) h_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m)] = (K(\epsilon))^{m-(t-1)} (C(\epsilon))^{2(t-1)} - (C(\epsilon))^{2m}. \quad (39)$$

For  $t > m$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_1^m$  and  $\mathbf{X}_t^m$  are independent because they do not have overlapping terms. Using this fact and (31),

$$\mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{X}_1^m) h_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m)] = \mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{X}_1^m)] \mathbb{E}[h_1(\mathbf{X}_t^m)] = 0. \quad (40)$$

Consequently, using (32), (34), (39) and (40),

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{4}\sigma_m^2 &= E[(h_1(X_1^m))^2] + 2 \sum_{t>1} E[h_1(X_1^m)h_1(X_t^m)] \\
&= E[(h_1(X_1^m))^2] + 2 \sum_{t=2}^{\infty} E[h_1(X_1^m)h_1(X_t^m)] \\
&= E[(h_1(X_1^m))^2] + 2 \sum_{t=2}^m E[h_1(X_1^m)h_1(X_t^m)] \\
&= (K(\epsilon))^m - (C(\epsilon))^{2m} + 2 \sum_{t=2}^m \left( (K(\epsilon))^{m-(t-1)} (C(\epsilon))^{2(t-1)} - (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \right) \\
&= (K(\epsilon))^m - (C(\epsilon))^{2m} + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} \left( (K(\epsilon))^{m-t} (C(\epsilon))^{2t} - (C(\epsilon))^{2m} \right) \\
&= K^m - C^{2m} + 2 \sum_{t=1}^{m-1} (K^{m-t} C^{2t} - C^{2m}) \tag{41}
\end{aligned}$$

This then gives the asymptotic variance in (26) and completes the proof. □

## References

- Aue, A., Horváth, L. & Pellatt, D. F. (2017), 'Functional generalized autoregressive conditional heteroskedasticity', *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **38**(1), 3–21.
- Bosq, D. (1991), Modelization, nonparametric estimation and prediction for continuous time processes, in 'Nonparametric functional estimation and related topics', Springer, pp. 509–529.
- Bosq, D. (1999), 'Autoregressive Hilbertian processes', *Annales de l'ISUP, Publications de l'Institut de Statistique de l'Université de Paris* **XXXIII**(2-3), 25–55.
- Bosq, D. (2000), *Linear Processes in Function Spaces: Theory and Applications*, Vol. 149, Springer Science & Business Media, New York.
- Brock, W. (1987), 'Notes on nuisance parameter problems in bds type tests for iid', *Unpublished manuscript. Madison: University of Wisconsin*.
- Brock, W. A., Hsieh, D. A., LeBaron, B. D., Brock, W. E. et al. (1991), *Nonlinear Dynamics, Chaos, and Instability: Statistical Theory and Economic Evidence*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England.
- Broock, W. A., Scheinkman, J. A., Dechert, W. D. & LeBaron, B. (1996), 'A test for independence based on the correlation dimension', *Econometric Reviews* **15**(3), 197–235.
- Damon, J. & Guillas, S. (2002), 'The inclusion of exogenous variables in functional autoregressive ozone forecasting', *Environmetrics* **13**(7), 759–774.
- de Lima, P. J. (1996), 'Nuisance parameter free properties of correlation integral based statistics', *Econometric Reviews* **15**(3), 237–259.
- Denker, M. & Keller, G. (1983), 'On U-statistics and v. mises' statistics for weakly dependent processes', *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* **64**, 505–522.
- Fernandes, M., Medeiros, M. C. & Scharth, M. (2014), 'Modeling and predicting the CBOE market volatility index', *Journal of Banking & Finance* **40**, 1–10.

- Fernandes, M. & Preumont, P.-Y. (2012), 'The finite-sample size of the BDS test for GARCH standardized residuals', *Brazilian Review of Econometrics* **32**(2), 241–260.
- Gabrys, R. & Kokoszka, P. (2007), 'Portmanteau test of independence for functional observations', *Journal of the American Statistical Association: Theory and Methods* **102**(480), 1338–1348.
- González, J. P., San Roque, A. M. S. M. & Perez, E. A. (2017), 'Forecasting functional time series with a new Hilbertian ARMAX model: Application to electricity price forecasting', *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* **33**(1), 545–556.
- Grassberger, P. & Procaccia, I. (1983), 'Characterization of strange attractors', *Physical Review Letters* **50**(5), 346.
- Hoeffding, W. (1948), 'A class of statistics with asymptotically normal distribution', *Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **19**(3), 293–325.
- Hooker, G. & Shang, H. (2022), 'Selecting the derivative of a functional covariate in scalar-on-function regression', *Statistics and Computing* **32**(3), Article: 35.
- Hörmann, S., Horváth, L. & Reeder, R. (2013), 'A functional version of the ARCH model', *Econometric Theory* **29**(2), 267–288.
- Horváth, L., Hušková, M. & Rice, G. (2013), 'Test of independence for functional data', *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **117**, 100–119.
- Huang, X. & Shang, H. L. (2023), 'Nonlinear autocorrelation function of functional time series', *Nonlinear Dynamics* **111**, 2537–2554.
- Klepsch, J., Klüppelberg, C. & Wei, T. (2017), 'Prediction of functional ARMA processes with an application to traffic data', *Econometrics and Statistics* **1**, 128–149.
- Kokoszka, P. & Reimherr, M. (2017), *Introduction to Functional Data Analysis*, Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.
- Kokoszka, P., Rice, G. & Shang, H. L. (2017), 'Inference for the autocovariance of a functional time series under conditional heteroscedasticity', *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **162**, 32–50.

- Konstantinidi, E., Skiadopoulos, G. & Tzagkaraki, E. (2008), 'Can the evolution of implied volatility be forecasted? Evidence from European and US implied volatility indices', *Journal of Banking & Finance* **32**(11), 2401–2411.
- LeBaron, B. (1997), 'A fast algorithm for the BDS statistic', *Studies in Nonlinear Dynamics & Econometrics* **2**(2).
- Mestre, G., Portela, J., Rice, G., San Roque, A. M. & Alonso, E. (2021), 'Functional time series model identification and diagnosis by means of auto-and partial autocorrelation analysis', *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **155**, 107108.
- Packard, N. H., Crutchfield, J. P., Farmer, J. D. & Shaw, R. S. (1980), 'Geometry from a time series', *Physical Review Letters* **45**(9), 712.
- Prakasa Rao, B. L. S. (2014), 'Characterization of Gaussian distribution on a Hilbert space from samples of random size', *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* **132**, 209–214.
- Preston, C. (2008), Some notes on standard Borel and related spaces, Working paper, arXiv.  
**URL:** <https://arxiv.org/pdf/0809.3066.pdf>
- R Core Team (2023), *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.  
**URL:** <https://www.R-project.org/>
- Ramsay, J. O. & Silverman, B. W. (2002), *Applied Functional Data Analysis: Methods and Case Studies*, Vol. 77, Springer, New York.
- Ramsay, J. O. & Silverman, B. W. (2005), *Functional Data Analysis*, Springer, New York.
- Rice, G., Wirjanto, T. & Zhao, Y. (2021), Exploring volatility of crude oil intra-day return curves: A functional GARCH-X model, MPRA working paper 109231, University of Waterloo.  
**URL:** <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/109231/>
- Serfling, R. J. (1980), *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.

Serge, D. J. G. (2022), *far: Modelization for Functional AutoRegressive Processes*. R package version 0.6-6.

URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=far>

Shang, H. L. (2019), 'Visualizing rate of change: An application to age-specific fertility rates', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* **182**(1), 249–262.

Shang, H. L., Cao, J. & Sang, P. (2022), 'Stopping time detection of wood panel compression: A functional time-series approach', *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C* **71**(5), 1205–1224.

Shang, H. L., Haberman, S. & Xu, R. (2022), 'Multi-population modelling and forecasting life-table death counts', *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **106**, 239–253.

Shang, H. L., Yang, Y. & Kearney, F. (2019), 'Intraday forecasts of a volatility index: Functional time series methods with dynamic updating', *Annals of Operations Research* **282**(1), 331–354.

Takens, F. (1981), Detecting strange attractors in turbulence, in 'Dynamical Systems and Turbulence, Warwick 1980', Springer, pp. 366–381.

Turbillon, C., Marion, J.-M. & Pumo, B. (2007), Estimation of the moving-average operator in a Hilbert space, in C. H. Skiadas, ed., 'Recent advances in stochastic modeling and data analysis', World Scientific, pp. 597–604.

Volkonski, V. A. & Rozanov, Y. A. (1961), 'Some limit theorems for random function II.', *Theory of Probability and its Applications* **6**, 186–198.

Zamani, A., Haghbin, H., Hashemi, M. & Hyndman, R. J. (2022), 'Seasonal functional autoregressive models', *Journal of Time Series Analysis* **43**(2), 197–218.

Zhang, X. (2016), 'White noise testing and model diagnostic checking for functional time series', *Journal of Econometrics* **194**(1), 76–95.