

# Covariate-informed reconstruction of partially observed functional data via factor models

Maximilian Ofner\* and Siegfried Hörmann

Graz University of Technology

May 16, 2024

## Abstract

This paper studies linear reconstruction of partially observed functional data which are recorded on a discrete grid. We propose a novel estimation approach based on approximate factor models with increasing rank taking into account potential covariate information. Whereas alternative reconstruction procedures commonly involve some preliminary smoothing, our method separates the signal from noise and reconstructs missing fragments at once. We establish uniform convergence rates of our estimator and introduce a new method for constructing simultaneous prediction bands for the missing trajectories. A simulation study examines the performance of the proposed methods in finite samples. Finally, a real data application of temperature curves demonstrates that our theory provides a simple and effective method to recover missing fragments.

*Keywords:* approximate factor models, increasing rank, multivariate functional data, partially observed, uniform consistency.

## 1 Introduction

Modern devices' ability to measure data on dense grids leads to a massive amount of high-dimensional data, posing new challenges for researchers. In the last decades, growing attention has been put to functional data analysis; see Bosq (2000), Ramsay and Silverman (2005), Ferraty and Vieu (2006), and Hsing and Eubank (2015) for some introductory books. A more recent branch of works deals with partially observed functional data (Kraus (2015), Kneip and Liebl (2020), and Delaigle et al. (2021) among others), where functions are only observable on subsets of their domain. Such a situation may arise, if an electronic device fails to record data over a certain time span (due to low battery for example). An obvious goal is then to recover the missing data from the available information. In the underlying work, we present a new reconstruction procedure for this purpose and illustrate our methodology with a sample of temperature data.

Figure 1 shows intraday temperature curves from Graz (Austria) for  $T = 76$  days between July 1 and September 14, 2022 provided by Land Steiermark (2023). The data were recorded half-hourly at measuring sites in the east and west of the city; we refer to them as Stations E and W, respectively. Whereas curves of Station W are complete, 10 out of 76 days (around 13%) are

---

\**Address for correspondence:* Maximilian Ofner, Institute of Statistics, Graz University of Technology, Kopernikusgasse 24/III, A-8010 Graz, Austria. E-mail: m.ofner@tugraz.at




Figure 1: Intraday temperature values measured half-hourly in the east and west of Graz (Austria) between July 1 and September 14, 2022. Highlighted curves reflect 10 days with missing observations.

incompletely observed at Station E. For obtaining a complete picture of the data and reducing the risk of losing important information, it is thus preferable to employ reconstruction procedures to recover the missing parts. With existing methods, the curves of Station E can be recovered using the available subsample of Station E only. Here, we propose a new approach which allows to take into account covariate information in our reconstruction problem (in the present example temperature data from Station W). A more detailed discussion of this real data illustration is given in Section 6.

Generally speaking, we aim to recover an incompletely observed random function  $X$  from its observed part and potential covariates  $X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(D)}$  for some  $D \in \mathbb{N}$ . Our main interest lies in estimating the best linear reconstruction utilizing a subsample that is observable on the full domain. The main contributions of the underlying work are summarized in the following:

- First, we allow for additional functional covariates extending related procedures by Kraus (2015) and Kneip and Liebl (2020). To this end, we make use of a Karhunen-Loève expansion for multivariate functional data. Evidently, the multivariate perspective is needed in settings similar to our real data illustration, where we add covariate information of different measuring sites to improve reconstructions.
- Second, we formulate direct assumptions on the latent functional structure which implicate an approximate factor model for the corresponding data matrix. This allows us to leverage factor models for the estimation and derivation of sharp convergence rates. Such models are rather popular in macroeconometrics and successfully applied to many practically relevant examples; see Bai (2003), Fan et al. (2013), and Bai and Ng (2023) for important theoretical contributions. From the factor model perspective, our reconstruction task can actually be viewed as a matrix completion problem, which has been recently studied by Bai and Ng (2021), Cahan et al. (2023), and Xiong and Pelger (2023). While in the classical factor models literature the number of factors (denoted by  $r$ ) is fixed and small, a larger number of factors is theoretically appealing in the case of functional data. In our asymptotic setup, we therefore allow  $r$  to diverge with the sample size which poses considerable technical challenges (see Fan et al. (2011), Li et al. (2017), or Hörmann and Jammoul (2022)).

We obtain uniform convergence rates of the proposed reconstruction estimator under mild assumptions. In particular, our theoretical results do not require differentiability of curves and allow for cross-sectionally correlated measurement errors. For functions observable on the full domain, the methodology can be used as a preprocessing tool to separate the signal from the noise which extends results of Hörmann and Jammoul (2022). Here, we focus on situations like in our real data example and do not consider the case of functional snippets, where each function is only observable on a proper subset of its domain. This case necessitates extra assumptions as the covariance structure is not identified; see for example Descary and Panaretos (2019), Delaigle et al. (2021), Lin et al. (2021), and Lin and Wang (2022).

The remainder of this work is structured as follows. In Section 2, we discuss multivariate functional data and the data generating process. Thereafter, in Section 3, we comment on the reconstruction problem and introduce a factor-based estimation procedure for the best linear reconstruction. Furthermore, we derive asymptotic convergence rates under appropriate assumptions. A method to construct simultaneous prediction bands for the missing parts is then introduced in Section 4. In Section 5, we examine finite sample properties in a simulation study and we return to our real data illustration in Section 6. Proofs and additional figures can be found in the supplementary file.

## 2 Setup and notation

### 2.1 Multivariate functional data

We study centered continuous random functions  $X = (X(u) : u \in [0, 1])$  (target) and  $X^{(d)} = (X^{(d)}(u) : u \in [0, 1])$  (covariates) indexed by  $d \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ . For the sake of a simplified presentation, the case of functions defined on different (dimensional) domains as considered in Happ and Greven (2018) is not pursued here. The random elements take values in the separable Hilbert space  $L^2([0, 1])$  of square integrable functions. For  $f, g \in L^2([0, 1])$ , the corresponding inner product  $\langle f, g \rangle_2 = \int_0^1 f(u)g(u) du$  induces the norm  $\|f\|^2 = \langle f, f \rangle_2 = \int_0^1 f(u)^2 du$ . We suppose that  $X$  were only observable on a subset  $O \subseteq [0, 1]$  of its domain (this includes the case  $O = \emptyset$ ). No information of  $X$  is then available on the set  $M = [0, 1] \setminus O$ . Define  $X^o = (X(u)\mathbb{1}\{u \in O\} : u \in [0, 1])$  and consider the multivariate random functions

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{X} : u &\mapsto (X(u), X^{(1)}(u), \dots, X^{(D)}(u))', \\ \mathcal{X}^o : u &\mapsto (X^o(u), X^{(1)}(u), \dots, X^{(D)}(u))'.\end{aligned}$$

We may view  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{X}^o$  as random elements which map to  $\mathcal{H} = \prod_{d=0}^D L^2([0, 1])$ . Using positive weights  $w_d > 0$ , one can show that  $\mathcal{H}$  equipped with the inner product

$$\langle \langle f, g \rangle \rangle = \sum_{d=0}^D w_d \langle f^{(d)}, g^{(d)} \rangle_2, \quad f, g \in \mathcal{H},$$

is a Hilbert space. Here, we set  $w \equiv 1$  and note that one could replace  $X^{(d)}$  with  $\sqrt{w_d}X^{(d)}$  for the general case. An empirical choice of the weights is discussed in Section 5.1. We expand  $\mathcal{X}^o$  in terms of its multivariate Karhunen-Loève expansion

$$\mathcal{X}^o(u) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \xi_k^o \varphi_k^o(u), \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (1)$$

where the scores  $\xi_k^o = \langle \langle \mathcal{X}^o, \varphi_k^o \rangle \rangle$  are uncorrelated random variables with variance  $\lambda_k^o$ , and  $(\lambda_k^o, \varphi_k^o)$  constitute eigenelements of the corresponding covariance operator  $\Gamma^o : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  of  $\mathcal{X}^o$  given by

$$\Gamma^o(f) = E[\langle \langle \mathcal{X}^o, f \rangle \rangle \mathcal{X}^o], \quad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Throughout the underlying work, we assume that the sequence of eigenvalues is ordered, that is to say,  $\lambda_1^o \geq \lambda_2^o \geq \dots \geq 0$ . Note that eigenvalues, eigenfunctions and scores depend on the observation set  $\mathcal{O}$ . The Karhunen-Loève expansion is optimal in the sense that it minimizes the mean squared error which results from truncating (1) at a finite level. The truncation error

$$\mathcal{R}_r^o(u) = \mathcal{X}^o(u) - \sum_{k=1}^r \xi_k^o \varphi_k^o(u), \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (2)$$

satisfies  $\mathcal{R}_r^o(u) \rightarrow 0$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , where convergence is in mean square and uniformly for  $u \in [0, 1]$ . General properties of the multivariate Karhunen-Loève expansion are discussed in Happ and Greven (2018).

## 2.2 Data generating process

In the following, we describe the data generating process in more detail. We generally allow for a time dependent sample of functional data as stated in Assumption (A1).

(A1)  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \leq T)$  is a strictly stationary  $\alpha$ -mixing series of multivariate functions.

For convenience, the definition of  $\alpha$ -mixing is given in Section G of the supplementary file.

### 2.2.1 Discrete measurements

Adopting a common framework, we suppose that functions are recorded on a discrete grid with additive noise. Accordingly, for  $d \in \{0, \dots, D\}$ ,  $t \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , and  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  we set

$$y_{ti}^{(d)} = x_{ti}^{(d)} + e_{ti}^{(d)}, \quad (3)$$

where  $x_{ti}^{(0)} = X_t(u_i)$ ,  $x_{ti}^{(d)} = X_t^{(d)}(u_i)$  for  $d \geq 1$ , and  $0 = u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_N = 1$  defines a grid of equispaced points. In addition, let

$$\mathbf{y}_t = (y_{t1}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{tN}^{(0)}, \dots, y_{t1}^{(D)}, \dots, y_{tN}^{(D)})$$

denote the vector of size  $(1 \times (D+1)N)$  which is obtained by stacking the measurements in (3). In our asymptotic setup, we assume that the number of grid points diverges, that is,  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . If  $N$  remains bounded, there is no hope of recovering  $X$  even in the absence of noise, as there exist infinitely many random functions which marginal distributions coincide on  $u_1, \dots, u_N$ ; see Hall et al. (2006).

**Remark.** *The assumption of equispaced grid points is often satisfied in practice, when measurements are taken by electronic instruments; see our real data application. However, our theoretical results still remain true if  $X, X^{(1)}, \dots, X^{(D)}$  were recorded on  $D+1$  different but sufficiently dense grids. We do not cover the case of sparse measurements but deliberately focus on the dense observation regime where we can effectively employ factor models.*




Figure 2: The figure considers a sample of  $T = 3$  multivariate functions with  $D = 1$  covariate. Each curve is measured on a regular grid of  $N = 5$  points with noise. Stacking the measurements row-wise gives  $(1 \times 10)$  vectors  $\mathbf{y}_t$ . As only the first two curves are completely observable, the index set of complete curves equals  $\mathcal{T} = \{1, 2\}$  and  $\mathbb{Y}_C = (\mathbf{y}_1, \mathbf{y}_2)'$ . The fourth element in  $\mathbf{y}_3$  is missing since  $X_3$  is not observable on  $M \ni u_4$ . The vectors  $\mathbf{y}_{o,t}$  are obtained by stacking black bullets row-wise and of size  $(1 \times 9)$ . We get  $\mathbb{Y}_O = (\mathbf{y}_{o,1}, \mathbf{y}_{o,2})'$ .

### 2.2.2 Missing data

Now suppose that a curve  $X_s$  were only *observable* on a set  $O = O_s \subset [0, 1]$ . By (3), it holds that  $y_{si}^{(0)} = X_s(u_i) + e_{si}^{(0)}$  is observed whenever  $u_i \in O$  and thus  $\mathbf{y}_s$  may be prone to missing values in the leading entries. Concerning the observation sets, we assume

(A2)  $(O_t : t \leq T)$  are i.i.d. and independent from all other quantities.

Assumption (A2) is a missing-completely-at-random condition (Rubin (1976)) and similarly imposed in the related works of Kraus (2015) and Kneip and Liebl (2020). A relaxation of the assumption is discussed in Liebl and Rameseder (2019).

To recover the missing part, we utilize a completely observable subsequence of  $(\mathbf{y}_t : t \leq T)$ . Let  $\mathcal{T} = \{t \leq T : O_t = [0, 1]\}$  be the corresponding indices of completely observable curves and set  $T_C = |\mathcal{T}|$ . In addition to  $\mathbf{y}_t$ , let  $\mathbf{y}_{o,t}$  be the vector of dimension  $(1 \times N_o)$  which stacks  $(y_{ti}^{(0)} : u_i \in O)$  with  $(y_{t1}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{tN}^{(1)}, \dots, y_{t1}^{(D)}, \dots, y_{tN}^{(D)})$ . Set  $\mathbb{Y}_C$  and  $\mathbb{Y}_O$  to be matrices with rows  $\mathbf{y}_t$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{o,t}$  for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ , respectively. Let  $\mathbf{y}_{C,i}$  be the  $i$ -th column of  $\mathbb{Y}_C$ . Define  $\mathbb{X}_O$  and  $\mathbb{E}_O$  and other quantities in the same vein. An illustration of the notation is given in Figure 2.

### 2.2.3 Factor model

When  $N$  is large, a dimension reduction step is needed to perform statistical inference. Let us gain some more intuition before we specify our model in Assumption (A3) stated below. In view of (2) and optimality of the Karhunen-Loève expansion, a finite number of scores  $\xi_k^o$  is often sufficient to capture the main variation of the random functions reasonably well. If  $\mathcal{R}_r^o$  in (2) is zero for some  $r$ ,

we may view  $\mathcal{X}_t^o(u) = \sum_{k=1}^r \xi_k^o \varphi_k^o(u)$  as the “common component” in a functional factor model. This, in turn, implies that the related data matrix  $\mathbb{X}_o$  has rank  $r$ . Under suitable assumptions on the measurement errors,  $\mathbb{Y}_o = \mathbb{X}_o + \mathbb{E}_o$  then follows a multivariate factor model. Concerning the “idiosyncratic component”  $\mathbb{E}_o$ , one typically assumes independent or mildly correlated elements (in the later case, the factor model is termed *approximate*). To leverage factor analysis in our work, we thus need to control the rank of  $\mathbb{X}_o$ . Motivated by the above discussion, we require a functional factor model in Assumption (A3) to ensure  $\text{rank}(\mathbb{X}_o) = r$ .

(A3) There exists some  $r$  such that the truncation error in (2) satisfies  $\mathcal{R}_r^o \equiv 0$ .

Assumption (A3) is only a sufficient condition for  $\mathbb{Y}_o$  to follow a factor model. In principle, the assumption  $\text{rank}(\mathbb{X}_o) = r$  would suffice for obtaining our theoretical results. Since  $\mathcal{R}_r^o$  typically vanishes rapidly as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ , Assumption (A3) should be approximately satisfied in most practical applications. To also accommodate the functional nature, we allow  $r$  to diverge in our asymptotic scenario and assume that the sequence of eigenvalues is summable,  $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k=1}^r \lambda_k^o < \infty$ .

By the above, we can rewrite  $\mathbb{Y}_o$  as

$$\mathbb{Y}_o = \mathbb{X}_o + \mathbb{E}_o = \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o + \mathbb{E}_o, \quad (4)$$

where  $\mathbb{F}_o$  is a  $(T_c \times r)$  matrix with elements  $\xi_{tk}^o / \sqrt{\lambda_k^o}$  and the columns of the  $(N_o \times r)$  matrix  $\mathbb{A}_o$  stack the elements  $\sqrt{\lambda_k^o} \varphi_k^{o(0)}(u_i)$ , for  $u_i \in \mathcal{O}$ , with the vector

$$\sqrt{\lambda_k^o} \left( \varphi_k^{o(1)}(u_1), \dots, \varphi_k^{o(1)}(u_N), \dots, \varphi_k^{o(D)}(u_1), \dots, \varphi_k^{o(D)}(u_N) \right).$$

If  $\mathbb{E}_o$  is independent of  $\mathbb{X}_o$  and if the largest eigenvalue of  $E[\mathbb{E}'_o \mathbb{E}_o]$  grows at most linear in  $T_c$ , then (4) constitutes an approximate factor model of rank  $r$  (Chamberlain and Rothschild (1983)). Main contributions to the asymptotic theory in the case of large dimensions include Bai (2003) and Fan et al. (2013). While the number of covariates  $D$  is considered to be fixed in our work, we ensure asymptotic identifiability by letting  $N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

**Remark.** *The literature usually assumes a strong factor structure which means that  $\mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o / N$  converges to a positive definite matrix. In contrast, our assumptions with summability of eigenvalues entail that  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o / N) \approx \lambda_r^o$  gets arbitrarily small as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . This should be compared to factor models with weak loadings where  $\mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o / N^\alpha$  only has a positive definite limit for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . As shown by Bai and Ng (2023), estimators are still consistent in the later case.*

### 3 Reconstruction methodology

As a next step, we propose a linear reconstruction procedure for the missing fragments in Section 3.1. An estimation procedure and corresponding convergence rates are then discussed in Section 3.2 and 3.3, respectively.

#### 3.1 Linear reconstruction operator

To reconstruct  $X$ , we seek a linear operator  $\ell : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2([0, 1])$  which minimizes

$$E[(X(u) - \ell(\mathcal{X}^o)(u))^2] \quad (5)$$

at any  $u \in [0, 1]$ . Invoking a linear regression, the solution to the above minimization problem is given by the finite-rank operator

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^o)(u) = \sum_{k=1}^r \xi_k^o \tilde{\varphi}_k^o(u), \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (6)$$

where the “extrapolated” basis functions  $\tilde{\varphi}_k^{\circ} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  are defined as

$$\tilde{\varphi}_k^{\circ}(u) = \frac{E[X(u)\xi_k^{\circ}]}{\lambda_k^{\circ}}, \quad u \in [0, 1].$$

Continuity of  $X(u)$  entails continuity of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^{\circ})(u)$ . Moreover, for  $u \in \mathcal{O}$ , it can easily be seen that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^{\circ})(u) = X(u)$ . Properties of linear reconstruction operators in the univariate setting are discussed in Kneip and Liebl (2020). Due to Assumption (A3), the reconstruction operator given in (6) is bounded.

The reconstruction of  $X$  clearly relates to extrapolation which is substantially different from the interpolation problem thoroughly studied in the functional data literature (see for instance Yao et al. (2005a)). Note that  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^{\circ})$  is only a linear approximation to  $X$  and one cannot hope to reconstruct  $X$  from  $\mathcal{X}^{\circ}$  without error as  $X$  is not even identifiable from  $\mathcal{X}^{\circ}$  in general. Rather, it will be the case that

$$X(u) = \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^{\circ})(u) + Z(u), \quad u \in [0, 1], \quad (7)$$

where  $Z = (Z(u) : u \in [0, 1])$  denotes the “reconstruction error” which vanishes on the set  $\mathcal{O}$ . The following proposition can be proven along the lines of Theorem 2.3 in Kneip and Liebl (2020).

**Proposition 1.** *It holds that*

(i)  $E[\mathcal{X}^{\circ}(u)Z(v)] \equiv 0$  for any  $u, v \in [0, 1]$ ;

(ii) the operator  $\mathcal{L}$  minimizes (5) among all linear operators  $\ell : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2([0, 1])$ .

Proposition 1 states that (i)  $\mathcal{X}^{\circ}$  is uncorrelated with the reconstruction error and (ii)  $\mathcal{L}$  is the optimal linear reconstruction operator with respect to the mean squared loss.

### 3.2 Estimation

The intrinsic factor model opens a convenient path for estimating the best linear reconstructions. We follow a general approach and estimate the factors  $\mathbb{F}_{\circ}$  via principal components. To this end, consider the singular value decomposition

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT_c}} \mathbb{Y}_{\circ} \approx \mathbb{U}_{\circ} \mathbb{D}_{\circ} \mathbb{V}_{\circ}',$$

where  $\mathbb{D}_{\circ}$  is the diagonal matrix containing the first  $r$  singular values of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{NT_c}} \mathbb{Y}_{\circ}$  in descending order. The columns of  $\mathbb{U}_{\circ}$  and  $\mathbb{V}_{\circ}$  contain the first  $r$  left and right eigenvectors, respectively. We then set

$$\hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ} = \sqrt{T_c} \mathbb{U}_{\circ}, \quad \hat{\mathbb{f}}_{\circ,s} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{y}_{\circ,s} \mathbb{V}_{\circ} \mathbb{D}_{\circ}^{-1}, \quad \widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^{\circ})}(u_i) = \hat{\mathbb{f}}_{\circ,s} (\hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ}' \hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ})^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ}' \mathbb{y}_{\circ,i}, \quad (8)$$

adopting the convention that  $\frac{1}{T_c} \hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ}' \hat{\mathbb{F}}_{\circ} = \mathbb{I}_r$ .

**Remark.**

- Pursuing the illustration given in Figure 2, the missing observation at the interrogation mark “?” is thus imputed by an estimate for  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_3^{\circ})(u_4)$  which results from a regression of the gray bullets “•” onto the factor scores of the matrix  $\mathbb{Y}_{\circ}$ .

- The procedure relates to a factor-based imputation procedure for multivariate data introduced in Cahan et al. (2023); see also Bai and Ng (2021). However, the authors essentially assume in our notation that  $\mathbb{X}_c$  and  $\mathbb{X}_o$  have equal rank  $r$ . By careful analysis of the reconstruction error, we generalize the concept to the practically relevant case of  $\text{rank}(\mathbb{X}_c) \gg \text{rank}(\mathbb{X}_o) = r \rightarrow \infty$ , which appears to be a result of its own interest.
- A separate factor model is fitted for each partially observed curve. While this adds computational cost, it is essential for proper reconstructions as the optimal linear reconstruction depends on the observation set.

An estimator for the continuous reconstruction is then obtained by linear interpolation,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_s^o)(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_s^o)(u_i) + \frac{u - u_i}{u_{i+1} - u_i} (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_s^o)(u_{i+1}) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\widehat{\mathcal{X}}_s^o)(u_i)) \right) \times \mathbb{1}\{u \in [u_i, u_{i+1})\}. \quad (9)$$

Our estimators depend on a rank  $r$  which is typically unknown and must be estimated from the data. The literature on approximate factor models considers several approaches; see for instance Bai and Ng (2002) or Onatski (2010). Moreover, Li et al. (2017) prove consistency of a criterion similar to Bai and Ng (2002) in the case of growing  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . An adaption of this result to our setting falls outside the scope of the underlying work and is of future interest. In what follows, we assume that we were given an estimator  $\widehat{r}$  such that  $P(\widehat{r} = r) \rightarrow 1$ . In Section 5.1, we choose the number of factors via 5-fold cross-validation.

### 3.3 Convergence rates

For clearer presentation, we suppose that  $T_c \asymp T$  ( $T_c/T$  is bounded from above and below) and define  $X^{(0)}(u) = X(u)$ . Let  $C > 1$  be some large absolute constant which may have a different value at each appearance. Consider the following assumptions.

- (A4) The mixing coefficients of  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \leq T)$  satisfy  $\alpha(h) = \exp(-Ch^{\gamma_1})$  for some  $\gamma_1 > 0$ ;
- (A5) there is some  $\delta > 0$  such that  $\sup_u E[X_t^{(d)}(u)^{4+\delta}] < C$ ; moreover,  $E[\sup_u X_t(u)^2] < C$  as well as  $E[(\xi_k^o)^4] \leq C(\lambda_k^o)^2$  for any  $k \leq r$ ;
- (A6)  $E[\sup_u Z_t(u)^2] < C$ ;
- (A7) it holds that  $|\text{Cov}(X_t^{(d)}(u), X_t^{(d')}(v)) - \text{Cov}(X_t^{(d)}(u'), X_t^{(d')}(v'))| \leq C\|(u, v) - (u', v')\|$  where  $\|(u, v) - (u', v')\|^2 = (u - u')^2 + (v - v')^2$ ;
- (A8)  $\sup_{k \leq r} \sup_u |\varphi_k^{o(d)}(u)| < C$ ;
- (A9) the errors  $(e_t^{(d)} : t \leq T)$  are i.i.d.  $N$ -variate random variables with zero mean, independent of the sequence  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \leq T)$ , and satisfy

- (a)  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}'_o) = O_p(\max\{N, T\})$ ,
- (b)  $\sum_{i,j=1}^N |E[e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)}]| = O(N)$ ,
- (c)  $\max_{i \leq N} E[(e_{ti}^{(0)})^2] < C$ ;



(A10) there exist  $b > 0$  and  $\gamma_2 > 0$  such that  $\gamma = (1/\gamma_1 + 3/\gamma_2)^{-1} < 1$  and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ ,

- (a)  $\sup_{k \leq r} P(|\xi_{tk}^0 / \sqrt{\lambda_k^0}| > \epsilon) \leq \exp(-(\epsilon/b)^{\gamma_2})$ ;
- (b)  $\sup_u P(|Z_t(u)| > \epsilon) \leq \exp(-(\epsilon/b)^{\gamma_2})$ ;
- (c)  $\max_{i \leq N} P(|e_{ti}^{(0)}| > \epsilon) \leq \exp(-(\epsilon/b)^{\gamma_2})$ ;

(A11)  $r/\lambda_r^0 = o(\min\{\sqrt{N}, \sqrt{T/\log(N)}\})$  and  $\log(N) = O(T^{\gamma/(2-\gamma)})$ .

The definition of  $\alpha$ -mixing coefficients is given in Section G of the supplementary file. Assumptions (A4) and (A10) are similarly considered in Fan et al. (2011, 2013) and needed for applying a Bernstein inequality in the proof of Theorem 1. Moment conditions in Assumptions (A5) and (A6) are satisfied in the special case of Gaussian processes with continuous sample paths (see Landau and Shepp (1970)). Assumption (A7) is a Lipschitz condition on the covariance function and implies mean-square continuity. Stronger smoothness conditions such as differentiability are not imposed. Particular examples of processes with Lipschitz continuous covariance functions are given by the Brownian motion or an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process. Similar to Kneip and Liebl (2020), we assume bounded eigenfunctions in Assumption (A8) which holds for a Fourier basis of sine and cosine functions. Consistency of estimators could also be shown if  $\sup_{k \leq r} \sup_u |\varphi_k^{(d)}(u)| \rightarrow \infty$  as  $r \rightarrow \infty$  but convergence rates become slower. The conditions on the noise term in Assumption (A9) are similar to Bai and Ng (2023). Assumption (A9)(a) is automatically satisfied in the special case where  $e_{ti}^{(d)}$  are i.i.d. (across time-section, cross-section, and  $d$ ) with bounded fourth moments (see Theorem 2 in Latała (2005) and Moon and Weidner (2017) for a further discussion). In general, Assumption (A9) also allows weak dependence among the errors in the cross-section and across  $d$ . Assumption (A11) puts restrictions on the joint asymptotic behavior of  $r$ ,  $N$ , and  $T$ . The second rate ensures that  $N$  does not grow too fast compared to  $T$ .

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions (A1)-(A11) are satisfied. Then it holds that*

$$\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u)| = O_p \left( \frac{r}{\lambda_r^0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T}} \right), \quad (10)$$

as  $r, N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

Related to a discussion in (Bai, 2003, p.140-141), we remark that the limit in Theorem 1 is simultaneous in the sense that  $(r, N, T)$  is allowed to grow along all paths which satisfy the restrictions in Assumption (A11). The term  $\sqrt{1/N + \log(N)/T}$  in (10) is similarly derived by Fan et al. (2013) in approximate factor models with fixed  $r$ ; the factor  $(r/\lambda_r^0)$  reflects our assumption of a growing rank. In fact, the  $r$ -th eigenvalue  $\lambda_r^0$  measures pervasiveness of the weakest factor score. For this reason, a faster decay of eigenvalues entails a more difficult reconstruction problem and  $\lambda_r^0$  therefore enters (10) in the inverse.

Theorem 1 includes the special case without additional covariates where  $\mathcal{X}_s(u) = X_s(u)$  constitutes a univariate random function. Let us have a closer look at this case and compare Theorem 1 with the related Theorem 4.2 in Kneip and Liebl (2020). From a theoretical perspective, Kneip and Liebl (2020) consider infinite dimensional functional data and derive a nonparametric estimator of the approximation  $\mathcal{L}(X_s^0)(u) = \sum_{k=1}^r \xi_{sk}^0 \tilde{\varphi}_k^0(u)$  to  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \xi_{sk}^0 \tilde{\varphi}_k^0(u)$  (employing our notation in the sequel). We note that in our setting  $r$  represents the growing dimension of the function space, while it serves as a truncation parameter in Kneip and Liebl (2020). Moreover, Kneip and Liebl (2020) assume almost surely twice continuously differentiable functions which helps to control the discretization error and is particularly useful in settings where the number

of observation points  $N$  is comparably small. Assuming that  $N$  grows at least proportional to  $T$  and  $\lambda_k^0 = k^{-\nu}$  for some  $\nu > 1$ , the estimator  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{KL}}(X_s^0)$  of Kneip and Liebl (2020) satisfies  $|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_{\text{KL}}(X_s^0)(u) - \mathcal{L}(X_s^0)(u)| = O_p(r^{\nu/2+5/2}\sqrt{1/T})$  for any fixed  $u \in [0, 1]$ . In contrast, our rate is uniform over  $u \in [0, 1]$ . Inspection of the proof of Theorem 1 actually shows that the  $\log(N)$  term in (10) is introduced by taking the supremum over  $u \in [0, 1]$ . Without the supremum, (10) reduces in the case of relatively large  $N$  to  $|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(X_s^0)(u) - \mathcal{L}(X_s^0)(u)| = O_p(r^{\nu+1}\sqrt{1/T})$ . This shows that for large  $N$ , our rate improves Kneip and Liebl (2020) when rough functions with  $\nu \in (1, 3)$  are considered.

Our approach can also be applied if  $\mathcal{O} = [0, 1]$ . It can then be used to recover the underlying signal  $X_s(u)$  from the discrete and noisy observations in (3). In fact, it holds  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u) = X_s(u)$  for any  $u \in [0, 1]$  and we denote the corresponding estimator  $\widehat{X}_s(u) = \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u)$ . The following corollary is immediate.

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions (A1)-(A11) hold for  $\mathcal{O} = [0, 1]$ . Then it holds that*

$$\sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\widehat{X}_s(u) - X_s(u)| = O_p\left(\frac{r}{\lambda_r^0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T}}\right),$$

as  $r, N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

The above result is of independent interest for preprocessing noisy functional data and should be compared to a corresponding rate derived in Hörmann and Jammoul (2022). While focusing on uniform convergence rates for the maximum over  $s \leq T$ , the authors show in our notation that  $\max_{i \leq N} |\widehat{X}_s(u_i) - X_s(u_i)| = O_p(1/T^{1/4} + T^{1/4}/\sqrt{N})$  (for simplicity, we consider the rank to be fixed). As indicated by Corollary 1, careful analysis of the involved quantities allows us to improve this bound to  $O_p(\sqrt{1/N + \log(N)/T})$ .

## 4 Simultaneous prediction bands

Once convergence of the reconstruction estimator is understood, questions concerning inferential procedures arise. In practical applications, prediction bands are useful to assess the reconstruction accuracy. A method for constructing such bands in the context of partially observed functional data has been suggested by Kraus (2015). However, as Kraus' method assumes continuous measurements with no errors, the construction of prediction bands in the noisy observation regime (3) remains an open question and is addressed in the following. The prediction bands we consider are of the form

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u) \pm q \times \omega(u), \quad u \in \mathcal{M},$$

where  $\omega : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$  is some limiting function and  $q$  a scalar which determines the width of the prediction band. To incorporate special characteristics of the curve, we choose  $\omega(u) = \text{sd}(Z(u))$ , noting that the proposed procedure can be easily adapted to other limiting functions as well. Throughout this section, we require a uniformly consistent estimator  $\widetilde{X}_t$  of completely observable curves ( $t \in \mathcal{T}$ ) as stated below.

(A12) It holds that  $\sup_{u \in \mathcal{M}} |\widetilde{X}_t(u) - X_t(u)| = o_p(1)$  for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ .

Since we do not impose additional conditions other than consistency in Assumption (A12), the procedure is flexible and combinable with a wide selection of smoothers. If the assumptions of

Corollary 1 are satisfied, one may for instance use our factor-based estimator  $\widehat{X}_t$ . To approximate the limiting function  $\omega(u) = \text{sd}(Z(u))$ , we define

$$\widehat{\omega}(u) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\widehat{Z}_t(u) - \overline{Z}(u))^2}, \quad \overline{Z}(u) = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \widehat{Z}_t(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{M},$$

where  $\widehat{Z}_t(u) = \widehat{X}_t(u) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_t^{\circ})(u)$ . Under our assumptions, one can show that  $\sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} |\widehat{\omega}(u) - \omega(u)| = o_p(1)$ . Simultaneous prediction bands are then based on the following result.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and suppose that Assumptions (A1)-(A12) are satisfied. If  $\omega$  is bounded from above and below,*

$$\lim P \left( \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^{\circ})(u) - X_s(u)|}{\widehat{\omega}(u)} > q_\alpha \right) \leq \alpha,$$

where  $q_\alpha$  is the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the variable  $\zeta_t = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \{|Z_t(u)|/\omega(u)\}$  and the limit is taken as  $r, N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .

The above result is based on the unknown value of  $q_\alpha$ . Kraus (2015) proposes to estimate  $q_\alpha$  in a similar setting by sampling from Gaussian processes. Here, we pursue a different approach and define for  $t \in \mathcal{T}$ ,

$$\widehat{\zeta}_t = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_t^{\circ})(u) - \widehat{X}_t(u)|}{\widehat{\omega}(u)}.$$

We then estimate  $q_\alpha$  by the empirical  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile  $\widehat{q}_\alpha$  of  $(\widehat{\zeta}_t : t \in \mathcal{T})$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let the assumptions of Theorem 2 be satisfied and suppose that the cdf  $F_\zeta$  of  $\zeta$  is continuous. Then,  $F_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$  in probability as  $r, N, T \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Using Theorem 2 and Proposition 2, we are finally able to state simultaneous prediction bands,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^{\circ})(u) \pm \widehat{q}_\alpha \times \widehat{\omega}(u), \quad u \in \mathbb{M}. \quad (11)$$

The proposed procedure is easy to implement and does not require computationally expensive bootstrap samples. We study numerical properties in Section 5.3.

## 5 Finite sample properties

We consider the following processes,

$$X_t(u) = \mu(u) + \sum_{k=1}^{50} \xi_{tk}^{(0)} \phi_k^{(0)}(u), \quad X_t^{(1)}(u) = \int_0^1 \beta(u, v) X_t(v) dv, \quad u \in [0, 1],$$

where we define  $\mu(u) = \sin(\pi u)$ ,  $\phi_{2\ell-1}^{(0)}(u) = \sqrt{2} \sin(2\ell\pi u)$ , as well as  $\phi_{2\ell}^{(0)}(u) = \sqrt{2} \cos(2\ell\pi u)$  for any  $\ell = 1, \dots, 25$ . Furthermore, we consider i.i.d. standard normal distributed variables  $\eta_{tk} \sim N(0, 1)$  and set  $\xi_{tk}^{(0)} = (\lambda_k^{(0)})^{1/2} \eta_{tk}$ . We study both an exponential decay of eigenvalues,  $\lambda_k^{(0)} = e^{-k}$ , and a polynomial decay,  $\lambda_k^{(0)} = k^{-3}/2$ . Concerning the covariate, set  $\beta(u, v) = \sum_{k, \ell=1}^2 b_{k\ell} \phi_k^{(0)}(u) \phi_\ell^{(0)}(v)$  for  $(b_{11}, b_{12}, b_{21}, b_{22}) = (1.1, 0.7, 0.5, 0.3)$ . The processes are recorded on a grid  $0 = u_1 < u_2 < \dots < u_N = 1$  of  $N = 51$  equispaced points and measured with error,

$$y_{ti}^{(d)} = x_{ti}^{(d)} + e_{ti}^{(d)}, \quad d \in \{0, 1\},$$

where  $e_{ti}^{(d)}$  constitute i.i.d.  $N(0, \sigma_e^2)$  distributed random variables. We suppose that  $T_c \in \{50, 100\}$  training targets are completely observable whereas 50 test targets, indexed by  $\ell = 1, \dots, 50$ , are only observable on  $O_\ell = [0, D_\ell] \subset [0, 1]$ . Define  $D_\ell \sim U(1/2, 3/4)$  (Setting A) and  $D_\ell \sim U(1/4, 3/4)$  (Setting B). The subintervals  $O_\ell$  in Setting A have mean length  $5/8$  and are generally larger than the sets in Setting B with length  $1/2$ . To assess empirical performance of different reconstruction procedures, we generate samples in  $B = 100$  simulation runs indexed by  $b = 1, \dots, B$ . The *maximum absolute error* (MAE<sub>*b*</sub>) in run  $b$  is then estimated by

$$\text{MAE}_b = \frac{1}{50} \sum_{\ell=1}^{50} \max_{i \leq N} |X_{b,\ell}(u_i) - \widehat{X}_{b,\ell}(u_i)|,$$

where  $\widehat{X}_{b,\ell}$  denotes some reconstruction of  $X_{b,\ell}$  computed on the sample  $b$ . We further define

$$\text{MAE} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \text{MAE}_b, \quad \text{SD} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\text{MAE}_b - \text{MAE})^2},$$

measuring the mean and standard deviation of maximum absolute errors over all simulation runs.

All simulations are carried out in R (R Core Team (2022)) using the packages `ReconstPoFD` of Liebl (2023) and `fdapace` of Zhou et al. (2022). The code can be downloaded from the first author's GitHub repository `fdReconstruct`.

## 5.1 Choice of parameters

The estimator of the best reconstruction  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}^o)$  in (9) depends on an unknown rank  $r$  as well as the choice of weights  $w_d$ . Below, we discuss empirical approaches.

### 5.1.1 Choice of weights

As noted by Happ and Greven (2018), a suitable choice of the weights is particularly important in the case where the components of  $\mathcal{X}$  differ in ranges (for instance if they are measured in different units). We follow their empirical approach and set

$$w_0 = \left( \int_0^1 \widehat{\text{Var}}(X(u)) du \right)^{-1}, \quad w_1 = \left( \int_0^1 \widehat{\text{Var}}(X^{(1)}(u)) du \right)^{-1},$$

where the variance is estimated from the completely observable part of the data. This ensures that all components contribute equally to the total variation (Happ and Greven (2018)).

### 5.1.2 Choice of rank

Once the weights are specified, we compute O-specific numbers of factors using 5-fold cross validation on the completely observable subsample. An implementation of the cross-validation procedure is shown in Algorithm 1.

## 5.2 Comparison of reconstruction procedures

Next, we compare our proposed methodology to alternative procedures. Concerning our factor-based estimator (9), we consider both the univariate version (UNI), where the covariate  $X^{(1)}$  is ignored, as well as the multivariate version (MULT), which comprises information of  $X$  and  $X^{(1)}$ .

---

**Algorithm 1**  $K$ -fold cross-validation for choice of rank  $r$ 

---

- 1: Select  $O$  and  $r_{\max}$ ;
  - 2: Split  $\mathcal{T}$  into  $K$  index sets  $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_K$  of approximately equal size;
  - 3: **For**  $r = 1, \dots, r_{\max}$ :
  - 4:      $\text{SSE}(r) \leftarrow 0$ ;
  - 5:     **For**  $k = 1, \dots, K$ :
  - 6:         **For**  $s$  in  $\mathcal{T}_k$ :
  - 7:             Compute the rank- $r$  reconstruction  $\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_r(\mathcal{X}_s^o)$  of the pseudo-observed part  $\mathfrak{y}_{o,s}$  using the subsample  $(\mathfrak{y}_t : t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{T}_k)$ ;
  - 8:              $\text{SSE}(r) \leftarrow \text{SSE}(r) + \sum_{i=1}^N (\widehat{\mathcal{L}}_r(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i) - \mathfrak{y}_{si})^2 \mathbb{1}\{u_i \in [0, 1] \setminus O\}$ ;
  - 9: **Return**  $\hat{r} = \arg \min_r \text{SSE}(r)$ .
- 

Second, we study the linear reconstruction procedure for univariate functional data proposed by Kneip and Liebl (2020) which is specifically intended for the partial observation regime as in the underlying work. In fact, the reconstruction procedure of Kneip and Liebl (2020) is very similar to our method for the univariate case since both are based on the linear reconstruction problem (5). However, unlike our method, Kneip and Liebl (2020) use smoothing and thus require smooth functions. The procedure comes with different options. More specifically, the authors suggest to either estimate the function’s observed and unobserved part at once using a linear reconstruction estimator, or perform smoothing on the observed part and use the reconstruction estimator solely for the missing part. In the latter case, some alignment is required to ensure continuous reconstructions. Moreover, the authors estimate scores  $\xi_k^o$  either by approximating integrals or using conditional expectations (CE). We restrict our attention to the AYESCE (with alignment and CE scores) option which has shown good performance in simulations of Kneip and Liebl (2020). Third, we examine the PACE method of Yao et al. (2005b) which in principle assumes sparse functional data and recovers functions from irregular observations inside the interval  $[0, 1]$ . As pointed out by Kneip and Liebl (2020), PACE differs fundamentally from the considered reconstruction procedures, as it approximates the expansion  $\sum_k E[\xi_k | X^o] \phi_k(u)$  instead of the linear operator  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^o)(u) = \sum_k \xi_k^o \phi_k^o(u)$ . We note that a straightforward approximation of the Karhunen-Loève decomposition  $X(u) = \sum_k \xi_k \phi_k(u)$  is not possible in the partial observation regime, as the “global” scores  $\xi_k$  are not identified in this case. The fourth procedure in our simulation study is based on the function-on-function regression model  $E[X(u)|X^{(1)}] = a(u) + \int_0^1 b(u, v)X^{(1)}(v) dv$  of Yao et al. (2005b). Here,  $a$  and  $b$  are estimated from the completely observable functions and  $X_s$  is then reconstructed by  $\widehat{X}_s = \widehat{a}(u) + \int_0^1 \widehat{b}(u, v)X_s^{(1)}(v) dv$ .

Reconstructions of two particular curves using our factor-based procedure are displayed in Figure 3. The main features of the missing trajectories are reconstructed arguably well, hidden features are covered by the simultaneous prediction bands. Table 1 summarizes the results of the comparative simulation study. As it can be seen, the factor-based procedures generally perform better than the procedures involving smoothing. Our proposed multivariate reconstruction method MULT benefits from the additional covariate and outperforms its competitors in every scenario. The univariate version UNI (like PACE and AYESCE) is solely based on  $X$  and performs second while PACE ranks third ahead of AYESCE. The benchmark model FLM, which ignores information of incomplete curves, exhibits the worst performance. Except for FLM, errors are generally higher in Setting B, where the observable sets are smaller. Factor-based procedures clearly profit by lower noise variance which is less apparent for the other approaches.




Figure 3: Reconstructions of incomplete curves for  $\lambda_k^{(0)} = e^{-k}$  (left) and  $\lambda_k^{(0)} = k^{-3}/2$  (right) in Setting A with  $\sigma_e = 0.05$  and  $T_C = 100$  using additional covariate information (MULT). Solid lines refer to factor-based reconstructions, dotted lines denote true targets, and points noisy measurements. The shaded regions correspond to 95% prediction bands (Section 4).

Table 1: MAE and SD (in parentheses) of different reconstruction procedures. The factor-based procedures proposed in this work are labeled UNI (without covariate) and MULT (with covariate). PACE refers to the smoothing procedure of Yao et al. (2005a), AYESCE to Kneip and Liebl (2020), and FLM to the function-on-function regression model of Yao et al. (2005b).

	$\lambda_k^{(0)}$	$\sigma_e$	$T_C$	UNI	MULT	PACE	AYESCE	FLM
A	$e^{-k}$	0.1	50	0.26 (0.02)	0.23 (0.02)	0.41 (0.05)	0.44 (0.03)	0.84 (0.05)
			100	0.24 (0.02)	0.21 (0.01)	0.32 (0.04)	0.40 (0.03)	0.82 (0.05)
		0.05	50	0.19 (0.01)	0.16 (0.01)	0.41 (0.07)	0.42 (0.04)	0.84 (0.06)
			100	0.17 (0.01)	0.14 (0.01)	0.28 (0.05)	0.39 (0.04)	0.81 (0.05)
	$\frac{k^{-3}}{2}$	0.1	50	0.33 (0.02)	0.30 (0.01)	0.46 (0.06)	0.47 (0.04)	0.64 (0.03)
			100	0.30 (0.01)	0.27 (0.01)	0.39 (0.05)	0.44 (0.03)	0.63 (0.04)
		0.05	50	0.29 (0.02)	0.24 (0.01)	0.44 (0.05)	0.45 (0.04)	0.63 (0.04)
			100	0.27 (0.02)	0.22 (0.01)	0.37 (0.05)	0.43 (0.03)	0.63 (0.03)
B	$e^{-k}$	0.1	50	0.39 (0.03)	0.33 (0.03)	0.51 (0.05)	0.54 (0.05)	0.83 (0.05)
			100	0.36 (0.03)	0.30 (0.02)	0.42 (0.04)	0.51 (0.04)	0.83 (0.05)
		0.05	50	0.32 (0.03)	0.26 (0.03)	0.51 (0.06)	0.53 (0.06)	0.83 (0.06)
			100	0.30 (0.03)	0.24 (0.02)	0.38 (0.04)	0.50 (0.04)	0.83 (0.05)
	$\frac{k^{-3}}{2}$	0.1	50	0.40 (0.02)	0.36 (0.02)	0.49 (0.04)	0.54 (0.04)	0.64 (0.04)
			100	0.38 (0.02)	0.33 (0.02)	0.44 (0.04)	0.51 (0.03)	0.63 (0.03)
		0.05	50	0.37 (0.03)	0.31 (0.02)	0.48 (0.05)	0.53 (0.04)	0.64 (0.04)
			100	0.35 (0.02)	0.29 (0.02)	0.42 (0.05)	0.50 (0.03)	0.62 (0.04)

Table 2: Mean coverage probabilities and standard deviations (in parentheses).

Setting	$\lambda_k^{(0)}$	$\sigma_e$	$T_C$	nominal coverage		
				75%	90%	95%
A	$e^{-k}$	0.1	50	0.78 (0.06)	0.88 (0.05)	0.93 (0.04)
			100	0.79 (0.05)	0.92 (0.03)	0.95 (0.03)
		0.05	50	0.74 (0.07)	0.87 (0.05)	0.92 (0.04)
			100	0.79 (0.05)	0.91 (0.03)	0.95 (0.03)
	$\frac{k^{-3}}{2}$	0.1	50	0.70 (0.08)	0.85 (0.06)	0.91 (0.05)
			100	0.72 (0.06)	0.88 (0.04)	0.94 (0.03)
		0.05	50	0.67 (0.08)	0.83 (0.06)	0.89 (0.05)
			100	0.71 (0.06)	0.87 (0.05)	0.93 (0.03)
B	$e^{-k}$	0.1	50	0.74 (0.07)	0.88 (0.05)	0.92 (0.04)
			100	0.79 (0.06)	0.91 (0.04)	0.95 (0.03)
		0.05	50	0.74 (0.07)	0.87 (0.05)	0.93 (0.04)
			100	0.77 (0.06)	0.90 (0.04)	0.95 (0.03)
	$\frac{k^{-3}}{2}$	0.1	50	0.69 (0.07)	0.84 (0.06)	0.90 (0.05)
			100	0.72 (0.05)	0.87 (0.04)	0.93 (0.03)
		0.05	50	0.68 (0.07)	0.83 (0.06)	0.88 (0.05)
			100	0.72 (0.06)	0.87 (0.04)	0.93 (0.03)

### 5.3 Adequacy of prediction bands

For the prediction bands (11), we consider a smoother  $\tilde{X}_t$  based on cubic splines. To analyze the performance of simultaneous prediction bands, we simulate training and test data as before and compute the proportion of bands covering the corresponding test targets in each simulation run. Table 2 reports the mean coverage probabilities along with standard deviations, where the quantities are taken over estimated coverages in  $B = 100$  simulation runs.

## 6 Real data illustration

We return to the temperature data set from the introduction to further illustrate our methodology. The data are provided by Land Steiermark (2023) and consist of  $N = 48$  half-hourly temperature values which were recorded between July 1 and September 14, 2022 in the east (Petersgasse, 362 m above sea level, referred to as Station E) and west (Plabutsch, 754 m, referred to as Station W) of Graz (Austria). See Figure 1 for a plot of daily temperature curves. The overall mean of 21.6 °C in the east is one degree higher than the western mean of 20.6 °C. A correlation of around 90% between half-hourly temperatures in Stations E and W suggests to consider measurements from Station W as an additional covariate for the reconstruction problem. Out of  $T = 76$  curves, only  $T_C = 66$  are observed at all discretization points in Station E. Using our proposed methodology, we reconstruct the remaining incompletely observed curves. The results for two particular days are shown in Figure 4, the other days are presented in the supplementary file. As it can be seen, our factor-based approaches (with and without covariate) lead to fairly similar results for August 17. However, the situation is quite different for August 18. Here, the multivariate model appears to recover some additional features of the missing signal from covariate data in Station W. The difference can be explained by a storm which hit the region on August 18 during the missing segment of Station E. This has caused a sudden drop in the temperature around 16:00. Without covariate information, the model predicts a steady decline




Figure 4: Reconstructions of incompletely observed temperature curves recorded in the east of Graz (Austria) without covariate (dotted line) and western measurements as additional covariate (solid line). Points refer to noisy measurements; 95% prediction bands were obtained from the procedure presented in Section 4 using additional covariate information and cubic splines for smoothing complete curves.

from the last available temperature at around 11:00. The cross validated number of factors in the multivariate model ( $\hat{r} = 15$  for August 17,  $\hat{r} = 24$  for August 18) further stresses the relevance of a high rank in real data examples.

## 7 Acknowledgments

This research was partly funded by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) [P 35520].

## References

- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica*, 71(1):135–171.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70(1):191–221.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2021). Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 116(536):1746–1763.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2023). Approximate factor models with weaker loadings. *J. Econometrics*, 235(2):1893–1916.
- Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear processes in function spaces*, volume 149 of *Lecture Notes in Statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York. Theory and applications.
- Cahan, E., Bai, J., and Ng, S. (2023). Factor-based imputation of missing values and covariances in panel data of large dimensions. *J. Econometrics*, 233(1):113–131.
- Chamberlain, G. and Rothschild, M. (1983). Arbitrage, factor structure, and mean-variance analysis on large asset markets. *Econometrica*, 51(5):1281–1304.



- Delaigle, A., Hall, P., Huang, W., and Kneip, A. (2021). Estimating the covariance of fragmented and other related types of functional data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 116(535):1383–1401.
- Descary, M.-H. and Panaretos, V. M. (2019). Recovering covariance from functional fragments. *Biometrika*, 106(1):145–160.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Mincheva, M. (2011). High-dimensional covariance matrix estimation in approximate factor models. *Ann. Statist.*, 39(6):3320–3356.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Mincheva, M. (2013). Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 75(4):603–680.
- Ferraty, F. and Vieu, P. (2006). *Nonparametric functional data analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York. Theory and practice.
- Hall, P., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2006). Properties of principal component methods for functional and longitudinal data analysis. *Ann. Statist.*, 34(3):1493–1517.
- Happ, C. and Greven, S. (2018). Multivariate functional principal component analysis for data observed on different (dimensional) domains. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 113(522):649–659.
- Hörmann, S. and Jammoul, F. (2022). Consistently recovering the signal from noisy functional data. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, 189:Paper No. 104886, 18.
- Hsing, T. and Eubank, R. (2015). *Theoretical foundations of functional data analysis, with an introduction to linear operators*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester.
- Kneip, A. and Liebl, D. (2020). On the optimal reconstruction of partially observed functional data. *Ann. Statist.*, 48(3):1692–1717.
- Kraus, D. (2015). Components and completion of partially observed functional data. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 77(4):777–801.
- Land Steiermark (2023). Air quality data. <https://app.luis.steiermark.at/luft2/suche.php>. Licensed under CC BY 4.0; accessed on September 28, 2023.
- Landau, H. J. and Shepp, L. A. (1970). On the supremum of a Gaussian process. *Sankhyā Ser. A*, 32:369–378.
- Latała, R. (2005). Some estimates of norms of random matrices. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(5):1273–1282.
- Li, H., Li, Q., and Shi, Y. (2017). Determining the number of factors when the number of factors can increase with sample size. *J. Econometrics*, 197(1):76–86.
- Liebl, D. (2023). *ReconstPoFD: Reconstructing Partially Observed Functional Data*. R package version 0.0.5.
- Liebl, D. and Rameseder, S. (2019). Partially observed functional data: the case of systematically missing parts. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.*, 131:104–115.
- Lin, Z. and Wang, J.-L. (2022). Mean and covariance estimation for functional snippets. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 117(537):348–360.

- Lin, Z., Wang, J.-L., and Zhong, Q. (2021). Basis expansions for functional snippets. *Biometrika*, 108(3):709–726.
- Moon, H. R. and Weidner, M. (2017). Dynamic linear panel regression models with interactive fixed effects. *Econometric Theory*, 33(1):158–195.
- Onatski, A. (2010). Determining the number of factors from empirical distribution of eigenvalues. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 92(4):1004–1016.
- R Core Team (2022). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Ramsay, J. O. and Silverman, B. W. (2005). *Functional data analysis*. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer, New York, second edition.
- Rubin, D. B. (1976). Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3):581–592.
- Xiong, R. and Pelger, M. (2023). Large dimensional latent factor modeling with missing observations and applications to causal inference. *J. Econometrics*, 233(1):271–301.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2005a). Functional data analysis for sparse longitudinal data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 100(470):577–590.
- Yao, F., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2005b). Functional linear regression analysis for longitudinal data. *Ann. Statist.*, 33(6):2873–2903.
- Zhou, Y., Bhattacharjee, S., Carroll, C., Chen, Y., Dai, X., Fan, J., Gajardo, A., Hadjipantelis, P. Z., Han, K., Ji, H., Zhu, C., Müller, H.-G., and Wang, J.-L. (2022). *fdapace: Functional Data Analysis and Empirical Dynamics*. R package version 0.5.9.

Supplementary material for:  
Covariate-informed reconstruction of partially observed  
functional data via factor models

Maximilian Ofner and Siegfried Hörmann

Graz University of Technology

## A Main proofs

In the following, we heavily rely on arguments from Bai and Ng (2023). Regarding norms, let  $\|\cdot\|_2$  and  $\|\cdot\|_F$  denote the spectral and Frobenius norm of a matrix, respectively, and  $\|\cdot\|$  the euclidean norm of a vector. Recall that  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbf{x}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_2\|\mathbf{x}\|$ ,  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbf{x}\|_F \leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_F\|\mathbf{x}\|$ ,  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_2\|\mathbb{B}\|_2$ ,  $\|\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\|_F \leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_F\|\mathbb{B}\|_F$  and  $\|\mathbb{A}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_F$ , for any matrix  $\mathbb{A}$ ,  $\mathbb{B}$  and vector  $\mathbf{x}$ .

Additionally, we introduce the following notation. Let

$$\mathbb{f}_{o,t} = (\xi_{t1}^o/\sqrt{\lambda_1^o}, \dots, \xi_{tr}^o/\sqrt{\lambda_r^o}),$$

be the  $t$ -th row of  $\mathbb{F}_o$  and

$$\lambda_{o,i}^* = (\sqrt{\lambda_1^o}\tilde{\varphi}_1^o(u_i), \dots, \sqrt{\lambda_r^o}\tilde{\varphi}_r^o(u_i)).$$

Consider the estimators  $\hat{\mathbb{f}}_{o,s} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathbf{y}_{o,s}\mathbb{V}_o\mathbb{D}_o^{-1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\mathbf{y}_{o,s}\hat{\mathbb{A}}_o\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}$  and  $\hat{\lambda}_{o,i}^* = \frac{1}{T_c}\mathbf{y}'_{c,i}\hat{\mathbb{F}}_o$ , where  $\hat{\mathbb{A}}_o = \sqrt{N}\mathbb{V}_o\mathbb{D}_o$  is an estimator for  $\mathbb{A}_o$ . Rewrite  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i)$  in (6) as

$$\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i) = \sum_{k=1}^r \xi_{sk}^o \tilde{\varphi}_k^o(u_i) = \lambda_{o,i}^* \mathbb{f}'_{o,s}. \quad (12)$$

### A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

To prove Theorem 1, we need to recover  $\mathbb{f}_{o,s}$  and  $\lambda_{o,i}^*$  from  $\mathbb{Y}$  which is only possible up to rotation. Let us define

- $\mathbb{G}_o = \mathbb{A}'_o \hat{\mathbb{A}}_o (\hat{\mathbb{A}}'_o \hat{\mathbb{A}}_o)^{-1} = \frac{\mathbb{A}'_o \hat{\mathbb{A}}_o}{N} \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}$ ,
- $\mathbb{H}_o = (\hat{\mathbb{F}}'_o \mathbb{F}_o)^{-1} \hat{\mathbb{F}}'_o \hat{\mathbb{F}}_o = \left(\frac{\hat{\mathbb{F}}'_o \mathbb{F}_o}{T_c}\right)^{-1}$ ;

the involved quantities have already been introduced before. As can be seen,  $\mathbb{G}_o$  results from the regression of columns of  $\mathbb{A}_o$  onto columns of  $\hat{\mathbb{A}}_o$ . In the same vein,  $\mathbb{H}_o^{-1}$  resembles a regression of  $\mathbb{F}_o$  onto  $\hat{\mathbb{F}}_o$ . Appendix E shows that the matrices  $\mathbb{G}_o$  and  $\mathbb{H}_o$  are asymptotically equivalent in the sense that  $\|\mathbb{G}_o - \mathbb{H}_o\|_2 = o_p(1)$ . See also Section 3.2 in Bai and Ng (2023) for a discussion on equivalence of rotation matrices. The proofs of the following lemmas are given in Appendix B and C, respectively.

**Lemma 1.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1, for every  $s \leq T$ ,*

$$\|\hat{\mathbb{f}}_{o,s} - \mathbb{f}_{o,s}\mathbb{G}_o\| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o}\sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}}\right).$$

**Lemma 2.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* - \lambda_{0,i}^* (\mathbb{H}'_0)^{-1}\| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{r}{\lambda_r^0} \left( \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T} \right)} \right).$$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We deduce from decomposition (12) of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u_i) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u_i) &= \widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* \widehat{\mathbb{f}}'_{0,s} - \lambda_{0,i}^* \mathbb{f}'_{0,s} \\ &= (\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* - \lambda_{0,i}^* (\mathbb{H}'_0)^{-1}) (\mathbb{f}_{0,s} \mathbb{H}_0)' + \widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* (\widehat{\mathbb{f}}_{0,s} - \mathbb{f}_{0,s} \mathbb{G}_0)' + \widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* (\mathbb{G}_0 - \mathbb{H}_0)' \mathbb{f}'_{0,s}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking norms, we observe

$$\max_{i \leq N} |\widehat{\mathcal{L}}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u_i) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u_i)| \leq a + b + c,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^* - \lambda_{0,i}^* (\mathbb{H}'_0)^{-1}\| \|\mathbb{f}_{0,s}\| \|\mathbb{H}_0\|_2 &&= O_p \left( \frac{r}{\lambda_r^0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T}} \right), \\ b &= \max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^*\| \|\widehat{\mathbb{f}}_{0,s} - \mathbb{f}_{0,s} \mathbb{G}_0\| &&= O_p \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_r^0} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right), \\ c &= \max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^*\| \|\mathbb{G}_0 - \mathbb{H}_0\|_2 \|\mathbb{f}_{0,s}\| &&= O_p \left( \frac{\sqrt{r}}{\lambda_r^0} \sqrt{\frac{r}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The rates follow from Lemma 1, Lemma 2, Lemma 7(ii), Lemma 8 and Lemma 10(ii), proven in the Appendix, as well as the fact  $\|\mathbb{f}_{0,s}\| = O_p(\sqrt{r})$ . We see that the first term dominates the others. As a next step, we treat the discretization error. To this end, observe that  $E[(X(u) - X(v))^2] \leq C|u - v|$  by Assumption (A7). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^0)(v)| &\leq \sum_{k=1}^r |\xi_{sk}^0| \frac{E[|X(u) - X(v)| |\xi_k^0|]}{\lambda_k^0} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|\xi_{sk}^0|}{\sqrt{\lambda_k^0}} E[(X(u) - X(v))^2]^{1/2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{k=1}^r \frac{|\xi_{sk}^0|}{\sqrt{\lambda_k^0}} \sqrt{|u - v|} = O_p \left( r \sqrt{|u - v|} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Now, define  $\mathcal{L}^* : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow L^2([0, 1])$  to be the operator which results from  $\mathcal{L}$  by linear interpolation, that is, for  $f \in \mathcal{H}$  and  $u \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^*(f)(u) &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \left( \mathcal{L}(f)(u_i) + \frac{u - u_i}{u_{i+1} - u_i} (\mathcal{L}(f)(u_{i+1}) - \mathcal{L}(f)(u_i)) \right) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{1}\{u \in [u_i, u_{i+1}]\}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

We get from (13), (14), and our assumption on the equidistant spacing of grid points,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{L}^*(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u)| &= \max_{i \leq N} \sup_{u \in [u_i, u_{i+1}]} |\mathcal{L}^*(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u)| \\ &\leq \max_{i \leq N} \left( \sup_{u \in [u_i, u_{i+1}]} |\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u)| + |\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_{i+1}) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i)| \right) \\ &= O_p \left( r \max_{i \leq N} \sqrt{|u_{i+1} - u_i|} \right) = O_p \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{N}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above, we conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)}(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u)| \\ \leq \max_{i \leq N} |\widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)}(u_i) - \mathcal{L}^*(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u_i)| + \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{L}^*(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_s^o)(u)| \\ = O_p \left( \frac{r}{\lambda_r^o} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T}} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{r}{\sqrt{N}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The second term is dominated by the first.  $\square$

## A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* The definition  $Z_t(u) = X_t(u) - \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)(u)$  yields

$$\begin{aligned} P \left( \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|X_t(u) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)}(u)|}{\widehat{\omega}(u)} > q_\alpha \right) \\ \leq P \left\{ \left( \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)(u) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)}(u)|}{\omega(u)} + \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|Z_t(u)|}{\omega(u)} \right) \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{\omega(u)}{\widehat{\omega}(u)} > q_\alpha \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, let us define

$$A = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)(u) - \widehat{\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}_t^o)}(u)|}{\omega(u)}, \quad B = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{|Z_t(u)|}{\omega(u)}, \quad C = \sup_{u \in \mathbb{M}} \frac{\omega(u)}{\widehat{\omega}(u)}.$$

For  $\epsilon > 0$ , we get

$$P \{(A + B)C > (\epsilon + q_\alpha)(1 + \epsilon)\} \leq P(A > \epsilon) + P(B > q_\alpha) + P(C > 1 + \epsilon).$$

By Theorem 1 and boundedness of  $\omega(u)$ , it holds  $P(A > \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore,  $P(B > q_\alpha) = \alpha$  by the definition of  $q_\alpha$  and  $P(C > 1 + \epsilon) \rightarrow 0$  by our assumptions. Taking  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  concludes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$

## A.3 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* Let  $\widehat{F}_\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}\{\zeta_t \leq z\}$  denote the ecdf of  $\zeta_t$  and additionally define  $\widetilde{F}_\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{1}\{\widehat{\zeta}_t \leq z\}$ . Observe  $|F_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - (1 - \alpha)| \leq |F_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - \widehat{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha)| + |\widehat{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - \widetilde{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha)| + |\widetilde{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - (1 - \alpha)|$ . Invoking the theorem of Glivenko–Cantelli,  $|F_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - \widehat{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha)| = o_p(1)$ . Moreover, using  $|\zeta_t - \widehat{\zeta}_t| = o_p(1)$  and continuity of the distribution function, it can be shown that  $\sup_z |\widehat{F}_\zeta(z) - \widetilde{F}_\zeta(z)| = o_p(1)$ , implying  $|\widehat{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - \widetilde{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha)| = o_p(1)$ . Finally,  $|\widetilde{F}_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - (1 - \alpha)| = o_p(1)$  by the definition of empirical quantiles. We thus conclude that  $|F_\zeta(\widehat{q}_\alpha) - (1 - \alpha)| = o_p(1)$ .  $\square$

## B Factors: Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof.* Using  $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{o,s} = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{y}_{o,s} \widehat{\Lambda}_o \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}$  and  $\mathbf{y}_{o,s} = \mathbf{f}_{o,s} \Lambda'_o + \mathbf{e}_{o,s}$ , we get

$$\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{o,s} - \mathbf{f}_{o,s} \mathbf{G}_o = \frac{1}{N} (\mathbf{f}_{o,s} \Lambda'_o + \mathbf{e}_{o,s}) \widehat{\Lambda}_o \mathbb{D}_o^{-2} - \mathbf{f}_{o,s} \mathbf{G}_o = \frac{1}{N} \mathbf{e}_{o,s} \widehat{\Lambda}_o \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}.$$

Taking norms,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{o,s} - \mathbf{f}_{o,s} \mathbf{G}_o\| \leq \frac{1}{N} \|\mathbf{e}_{o,s} \widehat{\Lambda}_o\| \|\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right),$$

where we used  $\|\mathbf{e}_{o,s} \widehat{\Lambda}_o\| = O_p(N/\sqrt{T} + \sqrt{N})$  by Lemma 11(iii) and  $\|\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p(1/\lambda_r^o)$  by Lemma 6(iii).  $\square$

## C Extrapolated Loadings: Proof of Lemma 2

Before proving Lemma 2, let us rewrite the matrix  $\mathbf{G}_o$ . Since

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_o = \frac{1}{T_c} \mathbf{Y}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o = \frac{1}{T_c} (\Lambda_o \mathbf{F}'_o + \mathbf{E}'_o) \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o,$$

we get

$$\mathbf{G}_o = \frac{\Lambda'_o \widehat{\Lambda}_o}{N} \mathbb{D}_o^{-2} = \left( \frac{\Lambda'_o \Lambda_o}{N} \frac{\mathbf{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o}{T_c} + \frac{\Lambda'_o \mathbf{E}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o}{NT_c} \right) \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}.$$

The above representation of  $\mathbf{G}_o$  turns out to be useful in the subsequent pages. Note however that establishing a tight bound on  $\mathbf{G}_o$  is not trivial because  $\|\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p(1/\lambda_r^o)$  and thus direct application of the spectral norm's submultiplicativity only yields a weak bound.

**Lemma 3.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o - \mathbf{F}_o \mathbf{G}_o\|_2 = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{rT}{N} + 1 \right)} \right).$$

*Proof.* Similar to (24) in Bai and Ng (2023), it can be shown that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o - \mathbf{F}_o \mathbf{G}_o = \left( \frac{\mathbb{E}_o \Lambda_o \mathbf{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{NT_c} + \frac{\mathbb{E}_o \mathbf{E}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{NT_c} \right) (\mathbb{B}_o^{-2} \mathbb{D}_o^2)^{-1} \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o - \mathbf{F}_o \mathbf{G}_o\|_2 \\ & \leq \left( \frac{\|\mathbb{E}_o \Lambda_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o \mathbf{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2}{NT_c} + \frac{\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbf{E}'_o\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2}{NT_c} \right) \\ & \quad \times \|\mathbb{B}_o^2 \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \\ & = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{rT}{\lambda_r^o N}} \right) + O_p \left( \frac{N+T}{\lambda_r^o N \sqrt{T}} \right) = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{rT}{N} + 1 \right)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \Lambda_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{rNT})$  by Lemma 11(i),  $\|\mathbb{B}_o \mathbf{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(T)$  by Lemma 12(i),  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbf{E}'_o\|_2 = O_p(N+T)$  by Assumption (A9)(a),  $\|\widehat{\mathbf{F}}_o\|_2^2 = T_c$ ,  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o})$ ,  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^2 \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p(1)$  by Lemma 6(ii) and  $1/\lambda_r^o = O(\min\{N, T\})$  by Assumption (A11).  $\square$

**Lemma 4.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$(i) \max_{i \leq N} \left\| \frac{(\mathbb{z}_{c,i} + \mathbb{e}_{c,i})' \mathbb{F}_o}{T_c} \right\| = O_p\left(\sqrt{r \log(N)/T}\right),$$

$$(ii) \max_{i \leq N} \|\mathbb{e}_{c,i}\| = O_p(\sqrt{T}),$$

$$(iii) \max_{i \leq N} \|\mathbb{z}_{c,i}\| = O_p(\sqrt{T}),$$

where  $\mathbb{z}_{c,i} = (Z_t(u_i) : t \in \mathcal{T})'$  and  $\mathbb{e}_{c,i} = (e_{ti}^{(0)} : t \in \mathcal{T})'$ .

*Proof.*

- (i) We rely on similar arguments as in Fan et al. (2011). Define  $\mathbb{z}_{ti} = Z_t(u_i)$  and  $\mathbb{f}_{o,tk} = \xi_{tk}^o / \sqrt{\lambda_k^o}$ . Using Assumption (A10), it can be seen that the choice  $\gamma_3 = \gamma_2/3$  satisfies

$$\max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} P(|\mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}| > \epsilon) \leq \exp(1 - (\epsilon/c)^{\gamma_3}),$$

for some  $c > 0$  and any  $\epsilon > 0$ . Moreover, Assumption (A4) and Assumption (A4) imply that  $(\mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk} : t \geq 1)$  is strongly mixing with coefficients  $\alpha(h) = \exp(-Ch^{\gamma_1})$ . Define  $\gamma$  by  $1/\gamma = 1/\gamma_1 + 3/\gamma_2$ . Since  $\gamma < 1$  by Assumption (A10), a variant of the Bernstein inequality (Theorem 1 in ?) gives,

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\left|\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}\right| > x\right) \\ \leq T_c \exp\left(-\frac{x^\gamma}{C_1}\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{x^2}{C_2(1 + C_3 T_c)}\right) \\ + \exp\left\{-\frac{x^2}{C_4 T_c} \exp\left(\frac{x^{\gamma(1-\gamma)}}{C_5 \log(x)^\gamma}\right)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

for any  $x > 0$ . Setting  $x = \kappa \sqrt{\log(N)T}$ , it follows from Assumption (A11) that for  $\kappa > 0$  large enough,

$$P\left(\left|\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}\right| > \kappa \sqrt{\log(N)T}\right) = o(r^{-1}N^{-1}).$$

The Bonferroni inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} \left|\frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}\right| > \kappa \sqrt{\log(N)/T}\right) \\ \leq Nr \max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} P\left(\left|\sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}\right| > \kappa \sqrt{\log(N)T}\right) = o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} \left|\frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{z}_{ti} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk}\right| = O_p(\sqrt{\log(N)/T}).$$

A bound for  $\max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T_C} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} e_{ti}^{(0)} \mathbb{f}_{o,tk} \right|$  can be derived in a similar way using Assumption (A10). The assertion of the lemma thus follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \leq N} \left\| \frac{(\mathbf{z}_{C,i} + \mathbf{e}_{C,i})' \mathbb{F}_o}{T_C} \right\|^2 &= \max_{i \leq N} \sum_{k=1}^r \left( \frac{1}{T_C} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbf{z}_{ti} + e_{ti}^{(0)}) \mathbb{f}_{o,tk} \right)^2 \\ &\leq r \max_{k \leq r, i \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T_C} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (\mathbf{z}_{ti} + e_{ti}^{(0)}) \mathbb{f}_{o,tk} \right|^2 \\ &= O_p(r \log(N)/T). \end{aligned}$$

(ii) Using Assumptions (A9) and (A10)(c) with similar arguments as before,

$$\max_{i \leq N} \left| \frac{1}{T_C} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (e_{ti}^2 - E[e_{ti}^2]) \right| = O_p(\sqrt{\log(N)/T}).$$

Together with  $\max_{i \leq N} E(e_{ti}^{(0)})^2 = O(1)$  by Assumption (A9)(c),

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{i \leq N} \|\mathbf{e}_{C,i}\|^2 &= \max_{i \leq N} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} e_{ti}^2 \\ &\leq \max_{i \leq N} \left| \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (e_{ti}^2 - E[e_{ti}^2]) \right| + T_C \max_{i \leq N} E[e_{ti}^2] = O_p(T), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used  $\log(N) = O(T)$  by Assumption (A11).

(iii) Concerning the final assertion, we deduce from stationarity of  $Z_t$  and Assumption (A6),

$$\max_{i \leq N} \|\mathbf{z}_{C,i}\|^2 = \max_{i \leq N} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} Z_t(u_i)^2 \leq \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} Z_t(u)^2 = O_p(T).$$

□

*Proof of Lemma 2.* The definition  $\widehat{\lambda}_{o,i}^* = \frac{1}{T_C} \mathbf{y}'_{C,i} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o$  implies

$$\widehat{\lambda}_{o,i}^* = \lambda_{o,i}^* \frac{\mathbb{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o}{T_C} + \frac{(\mathbf{z}_{C,i} + \mathbf{e}_{C,i})' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o}{T_C}.$$

Rearranging terms, we get

$$\widehat{\lambda}_{o,i}^* - \lambda_{o,i}^* (\mathbb{H}'_o)^{-1} = \frac{(\mathbf{z}_{C,i} + \mathbf{e}_{C,i})' \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{G}_o}{T_C} + \frac{(\mathbf{z}_{C,i} + \mathbf{e}_{C,i})' (\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o - \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{G}_o)}{T_C}.$$

Taking norms,

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{i \leq N} \|\lambda_{o,i}^* - \lambda_{o,i}^* (\mathbb{H}'_o)^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \max_{i \leq N} \left\| \frac{(\mathbf{z}_{C,i} + \mathbf{e}_{C,i})' \mathbb{F}_o}{T_C} \right\| \|\mathbb{G}_o\|_2 + \left( \max_{i \leq N} \frac{\|\mathbf{z}_{C,i}\|}{\sqrt{T_C}} + \max_{i \leq N} \frac{\|\mathbf{e}_{C,i}\|}{\sqrt{T_C}} \right) \frac{\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o - \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{G}_o\|_2}{\sqrt{T_C}} \\ &= O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{r \log(N)}{\lambda_r^o T}} \right) + O_p(1) O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{r}{N} + \frac{1}{T} \right)} \right) \\ &= O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{r}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{1}{N} + \frac{\log(N)}{T} \right)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 3, Lemma 4 and Lemma 7(i). □



## D Consistency of eigenvalues

Define the diagonal entries of  $\mathbb{D}_o^2$  by  $\widehat{\gamma}_1^o \geq \widehat{\gamma}_2^o \geq \dots \geq \widehat{\gamma}_r^o$ .

**Lemma 5.** *Under the Assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\max_{k \leq r} |\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \lambda_k^o| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right).$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\widehat{\gamma}_k^o$  is the squared  $k$ -th singular value of the matrix  $\frac{\mathbb{Y}_o}{\sqrt{NT_c}}$ . As a consequence, it is the  $k$ -th eigenvalue of  $\frac{\mathbb{Y}_o' \mathbb{Y}_o}{NT_c}$  (and  $\frac{\mathbb{Y}_o \mathbb{Y}_o'}{NT_c}$ ). To prove the assertion of the lemma, we compare it to eigenvalues of other operators. To this end, let  $\widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o$  denote the  $k$ -th eigenvalue of  $\frac{\mathbb{X}_o' \mathbb{X}_o}{NT_c}$  ( $\frac{\mathbb{X}_o \mathbb{X}_o'}{NT_c}$ ). In addition, define  $\widehat{\lambda}_k^o$  and  $\widehat{\lambda}_k^*$  to be the  $k$ -th eigenvalues of the operators  $\widehat{\Gamma}^o$  and  $\Gamma^*$ , respectively, which are given by

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^o f = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \langle \mathcal{X}_t^o, f \rangle \mathcal{X}_t^o, \quad \Gamma^* f = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \langle \mathcal{X}_t^*, f \rangle \mathcal{X}_t^*, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Here,  $\mathcal{X}_t^*$  refers to the multivariate random function

$$\mathcal{X}_t^*(u) = \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \mathcal{X}_t^o(u_i) \mathbb{1}\{u \in [u_i, u_{i+1}]\}$$

which results from  $\mathcal{X}_t^o$  by discretization. Our aim is to show that

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \lambda_k^o| \leq |\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o| + |\widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o - \widehat{\lambda}_k^*| + |\widehat{\lambda}_k^* - \widehat{\lambda}_k^o| + |\widehat{\lambda}_k^o - \lambda_k^o| = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right),$$

uniformly for  $k \leq r$ .

- Concerning  $|\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o|$ , we deduce from Weyl's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o| &\leq \frac{\|\mathbb{Y}_o \mathbb{Y}_o' - \mathbb{X}_o \mathbb{X}_o'\|}{NT_c} \leq \frac{\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}_o'\| + \|\mathbb{X}_o \mathbb{E}_o'\| + \|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{X}_o'\|}{NT_c} \\ &= O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} + \frac{1}{T} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption (A9)(a) and Lemma 11(ii).

- Comparing eigenlements of matrices and discretized operators, it can be shown that  $|\widehat{\gamma}_{X,k}^o - \widehat{\lambda}_k^*| = O_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ .
- Concerning  $|\widehat{\lambda}_k^* - \widehat{\lambda}_k^o|$ , we again infer from Weyl's inequality,

$$|\widehat{\lambda}_k^* - \widehat{\lambda}_k^o| \leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}^* - \widehat{\Gamma}^o\|_{\text{op}}.$$

We then observe that  $\|\widehat{\Gamma}^* - \widehat{\Gamma}^o\|_{\text{op}}^2$  is bounded by

$$C \sum_{d,d'=0}^D \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (X_t^{(d)}(u) X_t^{(d')}(v) - X_t^{*(d)}(u) X_t^{*(d')}(v)) \right)^2 du dv,$$

where we have used the notation  $X_t^{(0)}(u) = X_t(u)$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 E[(X_t^{(d)}(u) - X_t^{*(d)}(u))^2] du &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{u_i}^{u_{i+1}} E[(X_t^{(d)}(u) - X_t^{(d)}(u_i))^2] du \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \int_{u_i}^{u_{i+1}} |u - u_i| du = O\left(\frac{1}{N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

since  $E[(X_t^{(d)}(u) - X_t^{(d)}(v))^2] \leq C|u - v|$  by Assumption (A7). Combining the above, we get  $|\widehat{\lambda}_k^* - \widehat{\lambda}_k^o| = O_p(1/\sqrt{N})$ .

- Finally, concerning  $|\widehat{\lambda}_k^o - \lambda_k^o|$ , we deduce from Weyl's inequality and Theorem 3,

$$|\widehat{\lambda}_k^o - \lambda_k^o| \leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}^o - \Gamma^o\|_{\text{op}} = O_p(1/\sqrt{T}).$$

□

**Lemma 6.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

(i)  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\mathbb{D}_o^2 - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 = o_p(1)$ ,

(ii)  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^2\mathbb{D}_o^{-2} - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 = o_p(1)$ ,

(iii)  $\|\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p(1/\lambda_r^o)$ .

*Proof.*

- (i) Recall that both  $\mathbb{B}_o$  and  $\mathbb{D}_o$  are diagonal matrices. Then,

$$\|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\mathbb{D}_o^2 - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 = \max_{k \leq r} \left| \frac{\widehat{\gamma}_k^o}{\lambda_k^o} - 1 \right| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \max_{k \leq r} |\widehat{\gamma}_k^o - \lambda_k^o| = O_p\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T}}\right),$$

where the last bound follows from Lemma 5. The assertion then follows from Assumption (A11).

- (ii) Observe

$$\|\mathbb{B}_o^2\mathbb{D}_o^{-2} - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\mathbb{D}_o^2 - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2}{1 - \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\mathbb{D}_o^2 - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2} = o_p(1),$$

by the previous result.

- (iii) We get

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\|_2 (\|\mathbb{B}_o^2\mathbb{D}_o^{-2} - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 + \|\mathbb{I}_r\|_2) = O(1/\lambda_r^o)(o_p(1) + O(1)) \\ &= O_p(1/\lambda_r^o). \end{aligned}$$

□

## E Asymptotic equivalence of rotation matrices

**Lemma 7.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$(i) \quad \|\mathbb{G}_o\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o}),$$

$$(ii) \quad \|\mathbb{H}_o\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o}),$$

$$(iii) \quad \|\mathbb{H}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{1/r}).$$

*Proof.*

$$(i) \quad \text{Follows from the next lemma and } \|\mathbb{H}_o\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o}).$$

(ii) We deduce from Lemma 12(ii),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{H}_o\|_2 &= \left\| \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{F}_o}{T_c} \right)^{-1} \right\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \left\| \left( \frac{\mathbb{B}_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{T_c} \right)^{-1} \right\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o\|_2 \\ &= O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_r^o}} \right) O_p(1) O_p(1) = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda_r^o}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(iii) We observe

$$\|\mathbb{H}_o^{-1}\|_2 \leq \|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{F}_o\|_2 / T_c = O_p(\sqrt{r}).$$

□

**Lemma 8.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\|\mathbb{G}_o - \mathbb{H}_o\|_2 = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \sqrt{\frac{r}{N} + \frac{1}{T}} \right).$$

*Proof.* It can be shown that

$$\mathbb{I}_r - \mathbb{H}_o^{-1} \mathbb{G}_o = \left( \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{F}_o' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-2}}{NT_c^2} + \frac{\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}_o' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-2}}{NT_c^2} \right) (\mathbb{B}_o^{-2} \mathbb{D}_o^2)^{-1}.$$

The first term in the braces is bounded by

$$\frac{\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o \mathbb{F}_o' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2}{NT_c^2} = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{r}{\lambda_r^o N}} \right),$$

as it holds that  $\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2^2 = T_c$ ,  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{rNT})$  by Lemma 11(i),  $\|\mathbb{B}_o \mathbb{F}_o' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(T)$  by Lemma 12(i), and  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o})$ . The second term in the braces is bounded by

$$\frac{\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}_o'\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2}\|_2}{NT_c^2} = O_p \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{1}{N} + \frac{1}{T} \right) \right),$$

where we have used the additional fact that  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}_o'\|_2 = O_p(N+T)$ . Combining the above with  $\|\mathbb{B}_o^2 \mathbb{D}_o^{-2}\|_2 = O_p(1)$  by Lemma 6(ii) and  $1/\lambda_r^o = O(\min\{N, T\})$  by Assumption (A11), we obtain

$$\mathbb{I}_r - \mathbb{H}_o^{-1} \mathbb{G}_o = O_p \left( \sqrt{\frac{1}{\lambda_r^o} \left( \frac{r}{N} + \frac{1}{T} \right)} \right).$$

Finally, the above together with  $\|\mathbb{H}_o\|_2 = O_p(\sqrt{1/\lambda_r^o})$  by Lemma 7(ii) concludes the proof. □

## F Supplementary lemmas

**Lemma 9.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$\left\| \mathbb{I}_r - \frac{\mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \mathcal{A}'_o \mathcal{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{N} \right\|_F = O\left(\frac{r}{\lambda_r^o N}\right).$$

*Proof.* First, we show that for any  $k \leq r$  and  $d \in \{0, \dots, D\}$ ,

$$|\varphi_k^{o(d)}(u) - \varphi_k^{o(d)}(v)| \leq \frac{C}{\lambda_k^o} |u - v|. \quad (15)$$

To this end, note that by the eigenequations,

$$\Gamma^o(\varphi_k^o)(u) = \lambda_k^o \varphi_k^o(u),$$

whence,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_k^o(u) - \varphi_k^o(v) &= \frac{1}{\lambda_k^o} \left( \Gamma^o(\varphi_k^o)(u) - \Gamma^o(\varphi_k^o)(v) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\lambda_k^o} \langle E[\mathcal{X}^o(\mathcal{X}^o(u) - \mathcal{X}^o(v))], \varphi_k^o \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For the  $d$ -th component, this reads as

$$\varphi_k^{o(d)}(u) - \varphi_k^{o(d)}(v) = \frac{1}{\lambda_k^o} \sum_{d'=0}^D \langle E[X^{(d')} (X^{(d)}(u) - X^{(d)}(v))], \varphi_k^{o(d')} \rangle_2$$

Using an argument based on Cauchy-Schwarz, it suffices to bound the term  $\|E[X^{(d')} (X^{(d)}(u) - X^{(d)}(v))]\|^2$ . This, however, follows directly from Assumption (A7) and shows (15).

Accordingly, the eigenfunctions  $\varphi_k^{o(d)}$  are Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant  $C/\lambda_k^o$ . By boundedness, also the product  $\varphi_k^{o(d)} \varphi_\ell^{o(d)}$  is Lipschitz with constant  $C/\max\{\lambda_k^o, \lambda_\ell^o\}$ . A simple property of Riemann sum then implies

$$\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \varphi_\ell^{o(d)}(u_i) - \delta_{k\ell} \right| \leq \frac{C}{\lambda_r^o N},$$

uniformly for  $k, \ell \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ . We conclude

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{I}_r - \frac{\mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \mathcal{A}'_o \mathcal{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{N} \right\|_F^2 &= \sum_{k, \ell=1}^r \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \varphi_\ell^{o(d)}(u_i) - \delta_{k\ell} \right)^2 \\ &\leq r^2 \max_{k, \ell \leq r} \left( \frac{1}{N} \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \varphi_\ell^{o(d)}(u_i) - \delta_{k\ell} \right)^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{r^2}{(\lambda_r^o)^2 N^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

□

**Lemma 10.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

$$(i) \max_{i \leq N} \|\lambda_{0,i}^*\| = O(1),$$

$$(ii) \max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{0,i}^*\| = O_p(1).$$

*Proof.*

(i) The first assertion follows from

$$\max_{i \leq N} \|\lambda_{o,i}^*\|^2 = \max_{i \leq N} E \left[ \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}^o)(u_i)^2 \right] \leq 2 E \left[ \sup_{u \in [0,1]} X(u)^2 + \sup_{u \in [0,1]} Z(u)^2 \right]$$

which is  $O(1)$  due to Assumptions (A5) and (A6).

(ii) Observe that by Assumption (A5) and Lemma 4(ii),

$$\max_{i \leq N} \|\mathbf{y}_{c,i}\|^2 = \max_{i \leq N} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (X_t(u_i) + e_{ti}^{(0)})^2 = O_p(T).$$

Consequently,

$$\max_{i \leq N} \|\widehat{\lambda}_{o,i}^*\| \leq \max_{i \leq N} \frac{\|\mathbf{y}_{c,i}\| \|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2}{T_C} = O_p(1),$$

since  $\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2^2 = T_C$ .

□

**Lemma 11.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

(i)  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = O_p(rNT),$

(ii)  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{E}'_o\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 = O_p(NT^2),$

(iii)  $\|\mathbb{E}_{o,t} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_o\|^2 = O_p(N^2/T + N).$

*Proof.*

(i) Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 &= \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{k=1}^r \left( \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N e_{ti}^{(d)} \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \right)^2 \\ &\leq (D+1) \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)} \sum_{k=1}^r \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_j). \end{aligned}$$

Taking expectation and using Assumption (A9)(b) and  $\sup_u |\varphi_k^{o(d)}(u)| < C$  by Assumption (A8),

$$\begin{aligned} E[\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2] &\leq (D+1) T_C \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i,j=1}^N |E[e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)}]| \sum_{k=1}^r |\varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_i) \varphi_k^{o(d)}(u_j)| \\ &= O(rNT). \end{aligned}$$

- (ii) The factor structure entails  $\mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o = \mathbb{X}_o$ . Therefore, the independence of  $X_s^{(d)}(u_i)$  and  $e_{ti}^{(d)}$  due to Assumption (A9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} & E [\|\mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbf{e}'_{o,t}\|^2] \\ &= E [\|\mathbb{X}_o \mathbf{e}'_{o,t}\|^2] \leq (D+1) \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i,j=1}^N E[X_s^{(d)}(u_i) X_s^{(d)}(u_j)] E[e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)}], \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the notation  $X_s^{(0)}(u) = X_s(u)$ . Furthermore, since  $E[X_s^{(d)}(u_i) X_s^{(d)}(u_j)]$  is bounded, we deduce from Assumption (A9)(b),

$$E [\|\mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbf{e}'_{o,t}\|^2] \leq C(D+1) T_C \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i,j=1}^N |E[e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)}]| = O_p(NT). \quad (16)$$

- (iii) Recall that  $\widehat{\mathbb{A}}_o = \mathbb{Y}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o / T_C$ , whence

$$\mathbf{e}_{o,t} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_o = \frac{1}{T_C} (\mathbf{e}_{o,t} \mathbb{X}'_o + \mathbf{e}_{o,t} \mathbb{E}'_o) \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o. \quad (17)$$

From (16), we get  $\|\mathbf{e}_{o,t} \mathbb{X}'_o\|^2 = O_p(NT)$ . In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{e}_{o,t} \mathbb{E}'_o\|^2 &= \sum_{s \in \mathcal{T}} \left( \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{si}^{(d)} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \left( \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N (e_{ti}^{(d)})^2 \right)^2 + \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathcal{T} \\ s \neq t}} \left( \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{si}^{(d)} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Due to Assumption (A9)(c), the first term is  $O_p(N^2)$ . It is relevant only if  $t \in \mathcal{T}$  meaning that  $X_t$  is completely observed. For the second term, we deduce from Assumption (A9)(b),

$$E \left[ \sum_{\substack{s \in \mathcal{T} \\ s \neq t}} \left( \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i=1}^N e_{si}^{(d)} e_{ti}^{(d)} \right)^2 \right] \leq (D+1) T_C \sum_{d=0}^D \sum_{i,j=1}^N |E[e_{ti}^{(d)} e_{tj}^{(d)}]|^2 = O_p(NT).$$

Combining the above with (17) and the fact  $\|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2^2 = T_C$ , we conclude that  $\|\mathbf{e}_{o,t} \widehat{\mathbb{A}}_o\|^2 = O_p(N + N^2/T)$ . □

**Lemma 12.** *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1,*

(i)  $\|\mathbb{B}_o \mathbb{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(T),$

(ii)  $\|(\mathbb{B}_o \mathbb{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1})^{-1}\|_2 = O_p(1/T).$

*Proof.*

(i) Observe that

$$\frac{1}{NT_c^2} \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{Y}_o \mathbb{Y}_o' \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} = \mathbb{B}_o^{-2} \mathbb{D}_o^2. \quad (18)$$

Furthermore,  $\|\mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{E}'_o\|_F = O_p(\sqrt{NT})$  by Lemma 11 (ii) and  $\|\mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}'_o\|_2 = O_p(N+T)$  by Assumption (A9)(a). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Y}_o \mathbb{Y}'_o &= \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{F}'_o + \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{E}'_o + \mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{F}'_o + \mathbb{E}_o \mathbb{E}'_o \\ &= \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{F}'_o + O_p(\sqrt{NT} + N). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' O_p(\sqrt{NT} + N) \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} = O_p(1/\lambda_r^o(\sqrt{NT^2} + NT)) = o_p(NT^2)$  by Assumption (A11),

$$\frac{1}{NT_c^2} \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{Y}_o \mathbb{Y}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} = \frac{1}{NT_c^2} \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{F}'_o \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} + o_p(1). \quad (19)$$

Let us now define the  $(r \times r)$  matrix  $\mathbb{A} = \mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o' \mathbb{F}_o \mathbb{B}_o / T_c$  to ease notation. A trivial bound of  $\mathbb{A}$  can be obtained by observing

$$\|\mathbb{A}\|_2 \leq \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-1}\|_2 \|\widehat{\mathbb{F}}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{F}_o\|_2 \|\mathbb{B}_o\|_2 / T_c = O_p(\sqrt{r/\lambda_r^o}).$$

Then, combining (18) with (19),

$$\mathbb{A} \frac{\mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{N} \mathbb{A}' = \mathbb{B}_o^{-2} \mathbb{D}_o^2 + o_p(1).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \mathbb{A} \mathbb{A}' - \mathbb{I}_r \right\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbb{A}\|_2^2 \left\| \mathbb{I}_r - \frac{\mathbb{B}_o^{-1} \mathbb{A}'_o \mathbb{A}_o \mathbb{B}_o^{-1}}{N} \right\|_2 + \|\mathbb{B}_o^{-2} \mathbb{D}_o^2 - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2 + o_p(1) \\ &= O_p\left(\frac{r}{\lambda_r^o}\right) O\left(\frac{r}{\lambda_r^o N}\right) + o_p(1) = o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 9, Lemma 6(i), and Assumption (A11). This finally gives the stronger bound  $\|\mathbb{A}\|_2 = O_p(1)$ .

(ii) It suffices to observe

$$\|\mathbb{A}^{-1}\|_2 \leq \frac{\|\mathbb{A}\|_2}{1 - \|\mathbb{A} \mathbb{A}' - \mathbb{I}_r\|_2} = O_p(1).$$

□

## G Strong mixing

We define the mixing coefficients appearing in Assumption (A4). For a standard reference on mixing, we refer to ?; the case of random functions is treated in Section 2.4 of Bosq (2000).

*Definition 1.* Let  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  be a time series and define  $\mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^k$  and  $\mathcal{F}_{k+h}^\infty$  to be the  $\sigma$ -algebras generated by  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \leq k)$  and  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \geq k+h)$ , respectively. Let

$$\alpha(h) = \sup_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \sup \{ |P(A \cap B) - P(A)P(B)| : A \in \mathcal{F}_{-\infty}^k, B \in \mathcal{F}_{k+h}^\infty \}, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z},$$

be the mixing coefficients. Then,  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  is said to be  $\alpha$ -mixing if it holds that  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \alpha(h) = 0$ .

**Theorem 3.** *Let  $(\mathcal{X}_t : t \in \mathbb{Z})$  satisfy Assumptions (A1), (A4), and (A5) and define*

$$\widehat{\Gamma}f = \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} \langle \langle \mathcal{X}_t, f \rangle \rangle \mathcal{X}_t, \quad f \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Then,

$$E[\|\widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\text{op}}^2] \leq CT_c^{-1}.$$

*Proof.* One observes that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\text{op}}^2 \\ & \leq C \sum_{d, d'=0}^D \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} (X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v) - E[X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v)]) \right)^2 du dv, \end{aligned}$$

whence,

$$E[\|\widehat{\Gamma} - \Gamma\|_{\text{op}}^2] \leq C \sum_{d, d'=0}^D \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v) \right) du dv.$$

For the proof, it thus suffices to show that uniformly for  $u, v \in [0, 1]$ ,

$$\text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v) \right) = O(1/T_c).$$

To this end, we note that the sequence  $(X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v) : t \in \mathcal{T})$  is itself  $\alpha$ -mixing with coefficients  $\alpha(h) = \exp(-Ch^{\gamma_1})$ . Thus, Theorem 3 in ? yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov} \left( X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v), X_s^{(d)}(u)X_s^{(d')}(v) \right) \\ & \leq 8\alpha(|s-t|)^{1/\rho} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} E[X_t^{(d)}(u)^{4+\delta}]^{4/(4+\delta)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho = \frac{4+\delta}{\delta}$ . Since  $\sup_u E[X_t^{(d)}(u)^{4+\delta}] < C$  and the coefficients  $\alpha(|s-t|)^{1/\rho}$  are summable,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var} \left( \frac{1}{T_c} \sum_{t \in \mathcal{T}} X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{T_c^2} \sum_{s, t \in \mathcal{T}} \text{Cov} \left( X_t^{(d)}(u)X_t^{(d')}(v), X_s^{(d)}(u)X_s^{(d')}(v) \right) \\ & \leq \frac{C}{T_c^2} \sum_{s, t \in \mathcal{T}} \alpha(|s-t|)^{1/\rho} \leq \frac{C}{T_c} \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} \exp \left( -\frac{Ch^{\gamma_1}}{\rho} \right) \leq \frac{C}{T_c}. \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of the theorem.  $\square$



## **H Additional simulation results**

In the following, we present the estimated best linear reconstructions of the temperature data set considered in Section 6. For more details, we refer to the caption of Figure 4.




Figure 5: Reconstructions additional to Figure 4.