

Social Interactions with Endogenous Group Formation*

Shuyang Sheng[†] Xiaoting Sun[‡]

June 5, 2023

Abstract

This paper explores the identification and estimation of social interaction models with endogenous group formation. We characterize group formation using a two-sided many-to-one matching model, where individuals select groups based on their preferences, while groups rank individuals according to their qualifications, accepting the most qualified until reaching capacities. The selection into groups leads to a bias in standard estimates of peer effects, which is difficult to correct for due to equilibrium effects. We employ the limiting approximation of a market as the market size grows large to simplify the selection bias. Assuming exchangeable unobservables, we can express the selection bias of an individual as a group-invariant nonparametric function of her preference and qualification indices. In addition to the selection correction, we show that the excluded variables in group formation can serve as instruments to tackle the reflection problem. We propose semiparametric distribution-free estimators that are \sqrt{n} consistent and asymptotically normal.

KEYWORDS: social interactions, group formation, many-to-one matching, exchangeability, selection bias, reflection problem, semiparametric estimation.

*We are grateful to Denis Chetverikov, Aureo de Paula, Jinyong Hahn, Brian Krauth, Michael Leung, Arthur Lewbel, Zhipeng Liao, Adriana Lleras-Muney, Rosa Matzkin, Konrad Menzel, Krishna Pendakur, and Geert Ridder for their helpful comments. We are also grateful to seminar and conference participants at Caltech, Iowa, Jinan University (IESR), Rice, UCL, UC Riverside, UPenn, USC, Yale, 2021 Asia Meeting of the Econometric Society, 2021 Australasia Meeting of the Econometric Society, 2021 China Meeting of the Econometric Society, 2022 California Econometrics Conference, 37th Canadian Econometric Study Group Meetings, 55th Annual Conference of the Canadian Economics Association, ASSA/ES North American Winter Meeting 2021, Econometric Society World Congress 2020, and IAAE 2021 Annual Conference. Sun is grateful for financial support from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada through its Insight Development Grants Program. All errors are our own.

[†]Department of Economics, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA. Email: ssheng@econ.ucla.edu

[‡]Department of Economics, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, BC, V5A 1S6, Canada. Email: xiaoting_sun@sfu.ca

1 Introduction

Social interaction models are useful tools for exploring the interdependence of individual outcomes in various contexts, such as education, earnings, health, and crime. One notable feature of social interactions is their high tendency to occur among individuals who belong to the same social or economic group. For instance, students typically interact with fellow students within their school, and residents often engage with other residents within their neighborhood.¹ Because individuals choose the colleges they apply to or the neighborhoods they reside in, the peers they ultimately interact with are often endogenously determined. Therefore, when we observe that individuals with more advantageous peers have better outcomes, it is unclear whether this is due to the influence of peers or their choices of peer groups (Epple and Romano, 2011). This paper develops new methods to identify and estimate the causal peer effects among group members in the presence of endogenous groups.

The literature on social interactions typically assumes that peer relationships are exogenous or endogenous via unobserved group heterogeneity (see Blume et al., 2011, for a survey). A recent line of research has relaxed this assumption by introducing unobserved individual heterogeneity that influences both the formation of links and individual outcomes, resulting in endogeneity in peer relationships (Goldsmith-Pinkham and Imbens, 2013; Hsieh and Lee, 2016; Johnsson and Moon, 2021; Auerbach, 2022). Such endogeneity can be resolved by controlling for individual heterogeneity. In contrast to these studies, we explore a setting where endogeneity in peer relationships stems from selective entry into a group. For instance, students may be sorted into specific schools or colleges through an admission process (Abdulkadiroğlu and Sönmez, 2003; Azevedo and Leshno, 2016).² This kind of endogeneity cannot be rectified by the approach adopted in the aforementioned studies because their formation model does not apply to an individual’s decision to enter a group.

The main contribution of this paper is to develop a model of group formation and provide methods to correct for the selection into groups. Specifically, we characterize group formation using a two-sided many-to-one matching model, where individuals in

¹There is massive literature on peer effects in schools, classrooms, or dorms (e.g., Evans et al., 1992; Sacerdote, 2001; Dufo et al., 2011). See Epple and Romano (2011) for a survey. Examples of neighborhood effects include Katz et al. (2001) and Bayer et al. (2008).

²Other examples of selective entry include medical graduates being admitted to residency programs (Roth, 1984; Agarwal, 2015) and seniors being placed in nursing homes (Gandhi, 2022).

a group are considered as being “matched with” the group. In this model, individuals select groups based on their preferences, while groups rank individuals according to their qualifications and accept those with the highest qualifications until capacities are reached. This process closely resembles how individuals select schools or colleges (Azevedo and Leshno, 2016; He et al., 2022) and residency programs (Roth, 1984; Agarwal, 2015). The framework covers one-sided group formation as a special case, in which individuals unilaterally determine the groups they join, such as neighborhoods (Brock and Durlauf, 2001, 2005; Ioannides and Zabel, 2008). To our knowledge, we are the first to employ a matching framework to characterize group formation.

The selection into groups leads to a bias in standard estimates of peer effects. For example, students of higher ability and more favorable family backgrounds may be sorted into more selective schools, resulting in an overestimate of peer influence. To examine this selection bias, we follow the many-to-one matching literature and characterize stable groups by group *cutoffs*, where the cutoff of a group is the lowest qualification among group members (Azevedo and Leshno, 2016). Because equilibrium cutoffs depend on the (observed and unobserved) characteristics of all n individuals in a market, the selection bias is a high-dimensional function that involves the observed characteristics of the n individuals. To reduce dimensionality, we propose a novel approach that utilizes the limiting approximation of a market as n approaches infinity (Azevedo and Leshno, 2016). Under the limiting approximation, we can express the selection bias of an individual as a nonparametric function of her own preference and qualification indices. Our result extends Brock and Durlauf (2001, 2005) and Ioannides and Zabel (2008) to more general two-sided group formation with nonparametric unobservables. The expression also implies that including group fixed effects, as seen in many empirical studies, cannot effectively correct for the selection bias because the bias depends on individual characteristics in group formation.

The selection function is generally group-specific because the cutoffs and distribution of unobservables may differ across groups. This feature may pose a further challenge in identifying peer effects because the effects of group-level variables (such as average peer characteristics) cannot be distinguished from a nonparametric selection function that is also group-specific. To address this issue, we assume that the joint distribution of unobservables in group formation is exchangeable across groups. With knowledge of the cutoffs, we can represent the selection bias using a group-invariant selection function. Moreover, we propose a novel method to identify the cutoffs that

leverages between-group variation under exchangeability.

In addition to the selection correction, the identification of peer effects may be susceptible to the reflection problem (Manski, 1993). The literature has proposed achieving identification through variation in group sizes or intransitive triads (Lee, 2007; Graham, 2008; Davezies et al., 2009; Bramoullé et al., 2009). Brock and Durlauf (2001) discovered that the presence of selection can help facilitate the identification of peer effects. Building upon their insight, we propose to utilize the individual characteristics in group formation that are excluded from the outcome equation as instruments for peer outcomes. The rationale is that these excluded variables can impact which group an individual joins and consequently affect the outcomes of her peers. Because the instruments are individual-specific, it is unlikely for the predicted values of peer outcomes to be collinear with peer characteristics, thereby alleviating the reflection problem. This identification strategy remains applicable regardless of whether oneself is included in a group average, group sizes vary, or networks are present within groups. To our knowledge, we are the first to utilize excluded variables in group formation to tackle the reflection problem.

We propose semiparametric distribution-free methods for estimating the parameters (Newey, 1994a; Chen, 2007). We first develop a three-step kernel estimator for the group formation parameters based on our identification results. Building on this, we then propose a semiparametric three-step GMM estimator for the social interaction parameters, where we estimate the selection bias using a sieve estimator and the interaction parameters using GMM. Moreover, we utilize the symmetry of the selection function under exchangeability to reduce the dimensionality of sieve.

The asymptotic properties of our proposed estimators cannot be established using existing methods because the adjacency matrix is endogenous and can be correlated with the observables. We therefore generalize the methods for weighted U -statistics (Lee, 1990) to account for the endogeneity in group memberships, where the weights can be random due to networks within groups. Moreover, we establish a set of sufficient conditions that restrict the dependence through networks, enabling the attainment of the desired \sqrt{n} rate. We show that the estimators in both group formation and social interactions are \sqrt{n} consistent and asymptotically normal. In addition, we provide simulation evidence that the estimators perform well.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops the model. Section 3 derives the selection bias. Section 4 investigates the identification. Section

5 presents the estimation methods. Section 6 conducts a simulation study. Section 7 concludes the paper. All the proofs in the paper are provided in Appendix A.2. Additional results are presented in the Online Appendix.³

2 Model

2.1 Social Interactions

Consider a set of individuals $\mathcal{N} = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ who interact following the standard linear-in-means social interaction model (Brock and Durlauf, 2001)

$$y_i = \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} y_j \gamma_1 + \sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} x'_j \gamma_2 + x'_i \gamma_3 + \epsilon_i. \quad (2.1)$$

In this specification, $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ represents the outcome of interest (earnings, employment, or education), $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ is a vector of observed characteristics, $\epsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}$ is an unobserved shock, and $w_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the weight of peer j on individual i . We assume that i 's outcome y_i depends on $\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} y_j$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n w_{ij} x_j$, the weighted averages of outcomes and observed characteristics of i 's peers. Following the terminology in Manski (1993), γ_1 captures the endogenous social effect, and γ_2 captures the exogenous/contextual social effect. The parameter of interest is $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma'_2, \gamma'_3)' \in \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+1}$.

In this paper, we focus on a setting where the adjacency matrix $\mathbf{w} = (w_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n^2}$ presents a group structure. Suppose there is a set of groups $\mathcal{G} = \{1, \dots, G\}$ that the individuals can join. We assume that the number of groups G is finite and each group $g \in \mathcal{G}$ has a predetermined capacity n_g that is proportional to n . The groups are non-overlapping (such as colleges), so one joins only one group. Let g_i denote the group that i joins and $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n)'$ the $n \times 1$ vector that stacks g_i . Assume that $w_{ij} = 0$ if $g_i \neq g_j$ – an individual is influenced by her groupmates only. A typical example is given by group averages where $w_{ij} = \frac{1}{n_{g_i}}$ if $g_i = g_j$ and $w_{ij} = 0$ if $g_i \neq g_j$ (Manski, 1993). We can also allow w_{ij} to take a more general form so long as the interactions occur within a group. For example, group members may form additional friendships and only friends in the group can have an impact.

Let \mathbf{y} denote the $n \times 1$ vector that stacks y_i , \mathbf{x} the $n \times d_x$ matrix that stacks x'_i ,

³All the numbered items designated with an ‘‘O’’ are shown in the Online Appendix.

and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ the $n \times 1$ vector that stacks ϵ_i . Write equation (2.1) in a matrix form

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}\gamma_1 + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}\gamma_2 + \mathbf{x}\gamma_3 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}. \quad (2.2)$$

The literature on linear-in-means models typically assumes that the adjacency matrix \mathbf{w} is independent of the unobservables $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$. We relax this assumption to accommodate endogenous groups. Specifically, we allow \mathbf{w} to be endogenous, although endogeneity only occurs at the group level (as detailed in Assumption 1). This assumption allows us to focus on group formation to address the endogeneity of \mathbf{w} . In the next section, we develop a model of group formation to account for endogenous groups.

2.2 Group Formation

Suppose that, prior to social interactions, the groups are established through two-sided decisions. On one side, an individual chooses a group according to her preferences over groups. On the other side, a group ranks individuals based on their qualifications and admits those with the highest qualifications until its capacity is reached.⁴ Two-sided group formation has various applications including school choices, college admissions, residency program admissions, and nursing home placements. The framework nests one-sided group formation as a special case, where each group has an infinite capacity. Thus, an individual unilaterally determines which group to enter.⁵

Two-sided group formation can be equivalently characterized as two-sided many-to-one matching without transfers, where individuals in a group are considered as being “matched with” the group. Therefore, we specify group formation following the literature on two-sided many-to-one matching without transfers (Azevedo and Leshno, 2016; He et al., 2022).

Utility For individual $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and group $g \in \mathcal{G}$, let u_{ig} denote i ’s utility of joining group g and v_{gi} denote i ’s qualification for group g

$$u_{ig} = z_i' \delta_g^u + \xi_{ig} \text{ and } v_{gi} = z_i' \delta_g^v + \eta_{gi}, \quad (2.3)$$

⁴For example, in college admissions, a student’s qualifications reflect the preferences of colleges, whereas in school assignments, a student’s qualifications may depend on prioritized factors such as the student’s district of residence and whether the student has a sibling attending the school.

⁵Brock and Durlauf (2001, 2005) and Ioannides and Zabel (2008) provided examples of one-sided group formation where individuals decide whether to select into a potential group or choose one out of multiple groups.

where $z_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ represents a vector of individual- or pair-specific observed characteristics that affect the preferences and qualifications in group formation.⁶ Note that z_i may overlap with the observed characteristics x_i in social interactions. The group-specific coefficients $\delta_g^u, \delta_g^v \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ allow the effect of z_i to be heterogeneous across groups. $\xi_{ig} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\eta_{gi} \in \mathbb{R}$ represent pair-specific unobserved utility and qualification shocks of individual i for group g .⁷ Let $\xi_i = (\xi_{i1}, \dots, \xi_{iG})'$ and $\eta_i = (\eta_{1i}, \dots, \eta_{Gi})'$. We assume that the joint distribution of ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i is nonparametric, which has the advantage of allowing ϵ_i to have flexible dependence with ξ_i and η_i .⁸

It is important to note that our model does not allow for peer effects in group formation, meaning that the utility and qualification in equation (2.3) do not consider prospective group members. However, we can approximate the peer effects by incorporating past group members' characteristics and outcomes into z_i as long as these group-level measures do not vary over time. For example, we can use the percentage of female students from the previous year as a proxy for the gender peer effect, assuming that the school's gender composition remains relatively constant over time.

Example 2.1 (College admissions). College admissions provide an example of two-sided group formation, where students apply for colleges based on their utility preferences (u_{ig}), and colleges admit students based on their qualifications (v_{gi}). In this example, ξ_i represents student i 's unobserved preferences for colleges (family tradition), and η_i represents i 's unobserved ability that affects her qualifications (extracurricular activities). z_i represents observed characteristics that affect i 's preferences and qualifications, which can be individual-specific (family income, parental education, and SAT scores), or pair-specific (distance to a college, and minority status of a student interacted with the past minority composition in a college).

⁶To illustrate that the specification in equation (2.3) covers both individual- and pair-specific characteristics, suppose that there are two groups and we specify $v_{gi} = s_i \delta_{g,s} + d_{ig} \delta_{g,d} + \eta_{gi}$, where s_i is an individual-specific variable and d_{ig} is a pair-specific variable (which can be an individual-specific variable interacted with a group-specific variable). This example can be represented by equation (2.3) with $z_i = (s_i, d_{i1}, d_{i2})'$, $\delta_1^v = (\delta_{1,s}, \delta_{1,d}, 0)'$, and $\delta_2^v = (\delta_{2,s}, 0, \delta_{2,d})'$.

⁷The preference of an individual for a group may rely on the outcomes she anticipates upon joining that group. For example, students may prefer colleges that can help them secure better job opportunities. Nevertheless, the utility in equation (2.3) can be regarded as a reduced-form specification that has already accounted for the expected outcomes.

⁸The nonparametric setup implies that z_i does not include a constant or group-specific variables because these group-level heterogeneity cannot be separated from nonparametric ξ_i and η_i .

Equilibrium Following the matching literature (Roth and Sotomayor, 1992), we assume that the group formation outcome is stable.⁹ Azevedo and Leshno (2016) showed that a stable matching exists and can be characterized by group *cutoffs*. Let p_g denote the cutoff of group $g \in \mathcal{G}$. It is given by the lowest qualification among the group members if the capacity constraint is binding; otherwise, the cutoff is set to $-\infty$. Namely, $p_g = \inf_{i:g_i=g} v_{gi}$ if $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} 1\{g_i = g\} = n_g$, and $p_g = -\infty$ otherwise.

Given the cutoffs $p = (p_1, \dots, p_G)'$, let $\mathcal{C}_i(p) = \{g \in \mathcal{G} : v_{gi} \geq p_g\} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ denote individual i 's *choice set* – the subset of groups that i qualifies for. Within $\mathcal{C}_i(p)$, i chooses the group that yields the highest utility, $g_i = \arg \max_{g \in \mathcal{C}_i(p)} u_{ig}$. This is a multinomial discrete choice problem with the choice set $\mathcal{C}_i(p)$ determined endogenously by the cutoffs p . Individual i joins group g if (i) i qualifies for group g , and (ii) for any other group $h \neq g$, either i does not prefer group h , or i does not qualify for group h .¹⁰ That is,

$$\begin{aligned} & 1\{g_i = g\} \\ &= 1\{v_{gi} \geq p_g\} \cdot \prod_{h \neq g} 1\{u_{ih} < u_{ig} \text{ or } v_{hi} < p_h\} \\ &= 1\{\eta_{gi} \geq p_g - z'_i \delta_g^v\} \cdot \prod_{h \neq g} 1\{\xi_{ih} - \xi_{ig} < z'_i(\delta_g^u - \delta_h^u) \text{ or } \eta_{hi} < p_h - z'_i \delta_h^v\}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.4)$$

Equation (2.4) indicates that the group that i joins depends on i 's observed and unobserved characteristics z_i , ξ_i , η_i as well as the cutoffs p . We write $g_i = g(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p)$.

We remark that in one-sided group formation, the capacities are infinite and the cutoffs p_g are set to $-\infty$. The choice set $\mathcal{C}_i(p)$ is simply \mathcal{G} . The optimal decision in equation (2.4) reduces to $1\{g_i = g\} = \prod_{k \neq g} 1\{u_{ik} < u_{ig}\} = \prod_{k \neq g} 1\{\xi_{ik} - \xi_{ig} < z'_i(\delta_g^u - \delta_k^u)\}$, and we return to a standard multinomial discrete choice problem. The group that individual i joins is a function of z_i and ξ_i only, that is, $g_i = g(z_i, \xi_i)$.

In a stable matching, the cutoffs p clear the supply of and demand for each group.¹¹

⁹In college admissions, stability can be achieved through various means. One way is for students to apply to all acceptable colleges and use a stable mechanism like the deferred-acceptance algorithm to determine the matching (Gale and Shapley, 1962). However, if students choose not to apply to all acceptable colleges due to application costs or errors in the application process, stability can still be achieved theoretically as long as students know their own evaluations by the colleges before submitting their rank orders (Fack et al., 2019; Artemov et al., 2020).

¹⁰For simplicity of exposition, we assume that individuals always prefer to join a group. This can be relaxed by assuming that the utility of not joining any group is $u_{i0} = \xi_{i0}$. Such relaxation does not lead to substantive technical modifications of the results.

¹¹The equilibrium cutoffs p satisfy the market-clearing equations: $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} 1\{g(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p) = g\} \leq n_g$

Let \mathbf{z} denote the $n \times d_z$ matrix that stacks z'_i , $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ the $n \times G$ vector that stacks ξ_i , and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ the $n \times G$ vector that stacks η_i . An equilibrium cutoff vector can be represented as $p(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$.¹² Given the equilibrium cutoffs, the groups are formed following equation (2.4), and the equilibrium groups can be written as $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}))$.

3 Selection Bias

In this section, we investigate the bias that results from the selection into groups. Throughout the paper, we maintain the following assumptions.

Assumption 1. \mathbf{w} is independent of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ conditional on \mathbf{x} , \mathbf{z} , and \mathbf{g} .

Assumption 2. (i) x_i , z_i , ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i are i.i.d. for $i = 1, \dots, n$. (ii) The joint cdf of ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i is continuously differentiable. (iii) For all i , ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i are independent of x_i and z_i .

As previously stated, Assumption 1 requires that selection occurs only at the group level. This conditional independence assumption implies that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{w}] = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}]$. For \mathbf{w} that represents group averages with binding capacities, the assumption is trivially satisfied. For a more general \mathbf{w} , the assumption requires that \mathbf{w} is independent of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ given the group structure \mathbf{g} . For example, conditional on group memberships, how groupmates make friends is independent of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$.¹³ The assumption is satisfied if students in a school are randomly assigned to dorms or classes where they interact. Assumption 2(i) imposes an i.i.d. assumption that is typical in social interactions. Assumption 2(ii) imposes a smoothness assumption on the joint cdf of the unobservables.¹⁴ Assumption 2(iii) is a standard assumption that the observables are exogenous.

for all $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}} 1\{g(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p) = g\} = n_g$ if $p_g > -\infty$ (Azevedo and Leshno, 2016).

¹²There may be multiple equilibrium cutoffs in a finite- n economy. We denote by $p(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ the equilibrium that is selected by nature.

¹³We can potentially relax the assumption by incorporating endogenous friendship formation within a group, following the setup in Johnsson and Moon (2021). However, this endogeneity would complicate the analysis without providing additional insights. We therefore do not pursue it here.

¹⁴The assumption is to ensure that the conditional probability that individual i joins group g is continuously differentiable.

3.1 The Presence of Selection Bias

Under Assumption 1, equation (2.1) presents a selection bias if

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}))] \neq 0. \quad (3.1)$$


Under Assumption 2(i)(iii), this bias arises from the dependence between the outcome shock ϵ_i and the unobservables in group formation ξ_i and η_i . The dependence causes ϵ_i to be correlated with g_i because g_i is a function of ξ_i and η_i . Moreover, ϵ_i can be correlated with the entire group structure \mathbf{g} through the equilibrium cutoffs $p(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta})$, as the equilibrium cutoffs depend on $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ which include ξ_i and η_i (the general equilibrium effect). Below we give an example to illustrate how ϵ_i is dependent of ξ_i and η_i and how the dependence leads to a selection bias.

Example 3.1 (Example 2.1 continued). In college admissions, ϵ_i represents unobserved ability (IQ and motivation) that affects y_i (labor market outcome). If this ability also affects an student’s performance in high school, then ϵ_i is correlated with η_i . Moreover, ϵ_i is correlated with ξ_i if, for example, students of high ability prefer colleges of high (unobserved) quality. In the presence of this correlation, the admission process will sort students of higher ability into more selective colleges. Similarly, if certain family backgrounds improve a student’s qualifications and preferences for higher-ranked colleges, then students from more favorable family backgrounds will be sorted into more selective colleges. Therefore, we will observe a positive assortative matching between students and colleges in the sense that students who attend more selective colleges are of higher ability and more favorable family backgrounds. The sorting yields a positive correlation between ϵ_i and peer characteristics/outcomes in a college. Without correcting for the sorting, we will overestimate the peer effects.¹⁵

Simulation Evidence To further illustrate the selection bias, we provide simulation evidence using the design in Section 6. We consider both exogenous and endogenous group formation, depending on whether ϵ_i is correlated with η_i or not. Using the simulated data, we display in Figure 3.1 the correlation between the group average characteristic $\bar{x}_{g_i} = \sum_j w_{ij} x_j$ and the unobserved shock ϵ_i for both exogenous and

¹⁵This example neglects the general equilibrium effect. In fact, the cutoffs of certain colleges may be raised by the presence of a high-ability student, potentially reinforcing sorting and increasing bias. In Section 3.2, we show that the general equilibrium effect is negligible in a large market.

Figure 3.1: Correlation Between Group Average Characteristic and Outcome Shock



Note: The figures plot the relationship between the (residualized) group average characteristic \bar{x}_{g_i} and the (residualized) outcome shock ϵ_i , using one market in the simulated data in Section 6. In exogenous group formation (left figure), ϵ_i is independent of ξ_i and η_i . In endogenous group formation (right figure), ϵ_i is independent of ξ_i , but correlated with η_i . Other markets in the simulated data show a similar pattern.

endogenous groups.¹⁶ Under the specification that x_i and z_i are correlated in the same direction as ϵ_i and η_i are correlated, we find that \bar{x}_{g_i} is uncorrelated with ϵ_i in exogenous groups but positively correlated with ϵ_i in endogenous groups. In the latter case, if we run an OLS regression of y_i on \bar{x}_{g_i} (assuming $\gamma_0 = 0$), the estimate will be upward biased.

3.2 Limiting Approximation

Because equilibrium cutoffs depend on the (observed and unobserved) characteristics of the n individuals in a market, the selection bias in equation (3.1) is a high-dimensional function that involves the observed characteristics of all the n individuals. To reduce dimensionality, we propose a novel approach that utilizes the limiting approximation of a market as n goes to infinity. We find that the correlation between ϵ_i and \mathbf{g} through the equilibrium cutoffs becomes negligible as the market size grows

¹⁶We control for the individual characteristic x_i by regressing \bar{x}_{g_i} (resp. ϵ_i) on x_i and taking the residual of \bar{x}_{g_i} (resp. ϵ_i).

large, thereby reducing the dimensionality of the selection bias.

To this end, let $p_n = (p_{n,1}, \dots, p_{n,G})'$ denote a vector of equilibrium cutoffs in a market with n individuals. [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) showed that there is a unique stable matching in the limiting market as $n \rightarrow \infty$, which can be captured by a unique vector of limiting equilibrium cutoffs, denoted by $p^* = (p_1^*, \dots, p_G^*)'$. Unlike the finite- n cutoffs p_n , the limiting cutoffs p^* are deterministic because they are determined by the distribution of the characteristics and each individual has a negligible impact.¹⁷

In the following proposition, we follow [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) and show that the equilibrium cutoffs in a finite- n market converge to the equilibrium cutoffs in the limiting market as $n \rightarrow \infty$. By continuous mapping, the selection bias in a finite- n market also converges to the selection bias in the limiting market.

Proposition 3.1 (Limiting approximation). *Under Assumption 2(i)-(ii), we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p_n)] \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p^*)]. \quad (3.2)$$

The proposition indicates that the selection bias in a finite- n market can be approximated by the selection bias in the limiting market. Because the limiting cutoffs are deterministic, the selection bias of individual i in the limiting market depends on i 's characteristics only. This reduces the dimensionality of the selection bias from $O(n)$ to a finite number.

Large-market approximation has been widely used in the matching literature ([Menzel, 2015](#); [Azevedo and Leshno, 2016](#); [Fack et al., 2019](#); [He et al., 2022](#)). We follow the literature and assume that the selection bias takes the limiting form.¹⁸

3.3 Nonparametric Form

Now we derive the selection bias. We start with a nonparametric form where the selection function is group-specific. The group-specific selection, however, poses a challenge in identifying group-level peer effects. By imposing an exchangeability assumption, we can represent the selection bias alternatively using a group-invariant selection function.

¹⁷In order to establish the limiting approximation, [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#) made the assumption that the number of groups is finite, while the size of each group approaches infinity. Consequently, we adopt the same assumption as [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#). Exploring the scenario with a growing number of groups could be of interest, but we defer this extension to future work.

¹⁸Accounting for the sampling error due to the limiting approximation is left for future research.

3.3.1 Group-specific selection function

With nonparametric unobservables, the selection bias is a nonparametric function of the group formation indices. Specifically, let $\tau_i = (z'_i \delta_1^u, \dots, z'_i \delta_G^u, z'_i \delta_1^v, \dots, z'_i \delta_G^v)' \in \mathbb{R}^{2G}$ denote a vector of preference and qualification indices of individual i .¹⁹ We can represent the selection bias as a group-specific nonparametric function of τ_i .

Proposition 3.2 (Selection bias). *Under Assumptions 1–2, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, there exists a function $\lambda_g : \mathbb{R}^{2G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i = g] = \lambda_g(\tau_i)$.*

Below we illustrate the selection function $\lambda_g(\cdot)$ in the case of two groups.

Example 3.2. Suppose that there are two groups ($G = 2$) with the group formation indices $\tau_i = (z'_i \delta_1^u, z'_i \delta_2^u, z'_i \delta_1^v, z'_i \delta_2^v)' \in \mathbb{R}^4$. Let $\xi_i = (\xi_{i1}, \xi_{i2})'$ and $\eta_i = (\eta_{1i}, \eta_{2i})'$. Let $f(\epsilon_i, \xi_i, \eta_i)$ denote the joint pdf of ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i , and $f(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ the joint pdf of ξ_i and η_i . The selection bias of individual i if joining group 1 is

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i = 1] = \frac{\int_{R_1(\tau_i)} \epsilon_i f(\epsilon_i, \xi_i, \eta_i) d\epsilon_i d\xi_i d\eta_i}{\int_{R_1(\tau_i)} f(\xi_i, \eta_i) d\xi_i d\eta_i} =: \lambda_1(\tau_i),$$

where $R_1(\tau_i)$ denotes the set $\{(\xi'_i, \eta'_i)' \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \eta_{1i} \geq p_1 - z'_i \delta_1^v, \xi_{i2} - \xi_{i1} < z'_i (\delta_1^u - \delta_2^u) \text{ or } \eta_{2i} < p_2 - z'_i \delta_2^v\}$. Similarly, the selection bias if joining group 2 is

$$\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i = 2] = \frac{\int_{R_2(\tau_i)} \epsilon_i f(\epsilon_i, \xi_i, \eta_i) d\epsilon_i d\xi_i d\eta_i}{\int_{R_2(\tau_i)} f(\xi_i, \eta_i) d\xi_i d\eta_i} =: \lambda_2(\tau_i),$$

where $R_2(\tau_i)$ denotes the set $\{(\xi'_i, \eta'_i)' \in \mathbb{R}^4 : \eta_{2i} \geq p_2 - z'_i \delta_2^v, \xi_{i1} - \xi_{i2} < z'_i (\delta_2^u - \delta_1^u) \text{ or } \eta_{1i} < p_1 - z'_i \delta_1^v\}$.

The result in Proposition 3.2 extends the standard sample selection models (Heckman, 1979; Das et al., 2003) to social interaction models with endogenous group formation.²⁰ Brock and Durlauf (2001, 2005) and Ioannides and Zabel (2008) considered

¹⁹The qualification index of a group matters only if the capacity is binding. If the capacity is not binding, then the qualification index of this group should be dropped from τ_i . Specifically, let $\bar{\mathcal{G}} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ denote the subset of groups whose capacity is binding and \bar{G} the cardinality of $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$. Then $\tau_i = (z'_i \delta_g^u, g \in \mathcal{G}; z'_i \delta_g^v, g \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{G+\bar{G}}$.

²⁰Das et al. (2003) explored a sample selection model where the specification is fully nonparametric. They represented the selection bias as a nonparametric function of the propensity scores of a multivariate selection rule. In our setting, the propensity scores that correspond to the selection rules in equation (2.4) are not available because we do not observe individuals' rankings over the

social interactions with endogenous one-sided group formation, where the unobservables follow a parametric distribution. We extend these studies to more general two-sided group formation with nonparametric unobservables.

Proposition 3.2 and Example 3.2 indicate that the selection function $\lambda_g(\cdot)$ is group-specific for two reasons. First, the cutoffs are group-specific and are absorbed into the selection function. Second, the distribution of the unobservables (ξ_{ig}, η_{gi}) may differ across groups.²¹ The group-specific feature poses a challenge in the identification of group-level peer effects. To see this, let w_i denote the i th row of \mathbf{w} . If both $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are group averages that include i , they are invariant within a group.²² The effects of these group-level variables cannot be separately identified from a nonparametric selection bias that is also group-specific. This is similar to the case of panel data models, where the effects of time-invariant variables cannot be separately identified from an individual fixed effect. In the next section, we propose a novel idea to resolve the problem of group-specific selection.²³

We remark that the selection bias is also individual-specific because it depends on τ_i . While the selection occurs at the entry into a group, individuals with different values of τ_i are subject to different selection biases. Therefore, we cannot correct for the selection bias by simply introducing group fixed effects in the outcome equation. An appropriate correction requires us to utilize the individual-level information in τ_i .

3.3.2 Group-invariant selection function

Our idea to tackle the group-specific selection function is motivated by the observation that if the cutoffs are known, by arranging the components of τ_i properly, the selection

groups or whether they qualify for each group. Instead, we impose an index structure on the preferences and qualifications so that the selection bias can be represented as a function of these group formation indices.

²¹In addition, equation (2.4) indicates that the components of τ_i for group g and for the other groups $h \neq g$ also play different roles in the selection function. Nevertheless, this group-specific feature can be handled by separating the components for group g from those for the other groups. See equation (3.4) for a specific expression.

²²If $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are group averages that exclude i , they converge to including-oneself group averages as the number of group members goes to infinity. Hence, the variation of $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ in a group vanishes to zero as the group size grows.

²³If we have an additional network within each group, conditional on g_i there may be individual-level variation in $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ because individuals in a group can have different friends. In this case, we can partial out the group-specific selection bias by interacting the indices τ_i with group dummies and utilize the within-group variation in $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ to identify γ . This approach is not applicable if there is no within-group variation (e.g., group averages).

function becomes group-invariant so long as the distribution of the unobservables does not vary across groups.

To this end, we introduce group fixed effects to account for group-level heterogeneity and assume that the remaining individual-varying unobservables are exchangeable across groups. Specifically, rewrite the utility u_{ig} in equation (2.3) as

$$u_{ig} = \alpha_g + z'_i \delta_g^u + \xi_{ig}, \quad (3.3)$$

where α_g denotes a group fixed effect.²⁴ Let $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_G)'$ be a vector of group fixed effects, which captures vertical preferences over the groups. For example, in college admissions, α represents college quality and reputation. We assume that the joint distribution of individual-varying unobservables is exchangeable across groups.

Assumption 3 (Exchangeability). *The joint pdf of ϵ_i , ξ_i , and η_i satisfies*

$$f(\epsilon_i, \xi_{i1}, \dots, \xi_{iG}, \eta_{1i}, \dots, \eta_{Gi}) = f(\epsilon_i, \xi_{ik_1}, \dots, \xi_{ik_G}, \eta_{k_1i}, \dots, \eta_{k_Gi}),$$

for any permutation (k_1, \dots, k_G) of $(1, \dots, G)$.

Assumption 3 assumes that the joint distribution of the unobservables is invariant under permutations of the groups. Exchangeability has been used in various contexts such as differentiated product markets (Gandhi and Houde, 2019), panel data (Altonji and Matzkin, 2005), matching (Fox et al., 2018), and network formation (Menzel, 2021). We impose exchangeability so that the unobserved heterogeneity across groups is fully captured by group fixed effects. The assumption is more general than an i.i.d. assumption because it permits the unobservables (ξ_{ig}, η_{gi}) to be dependent across groups. In particular, it allows for an individual effect in ξ_i and η_i .²⁵

Given the modified utility in (3.3), rewrite the selection bias in Proposition 3.2 as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i = g] &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, \eta_{gi} \geq p_g - z'_i \delta_g^v, \text{ and } \forall h \neq g \\ &\quad \xi_{ih} - \xi_{ig} < \alpha_g + z'_i \delta_g^u - \alpha_h - z'_i \delta_h^u, \text{ or } \eta_{hi} < p_h - z'_i \delta_h^v] \end{aligned}$$

²⁴We may also include group fixed effects in the qualification v_{gi} , but they cannot be distinguished from the cutoffs and thus are normalized to 0.

²⁵Exchangeability rules out heterogeneous correlation between colleges. For example, a student's unobserved preferences may be more strongly correlated between two elite colleges than between an elite and a non-elite college. The same may be true for a college's evaluations of a student's extracurricular activities. Exchangeability also requires the unobserved preferences/qualifications to have homogeneous variances across colleges.

$$=: \lambda^e(\tau_i^e(g)), \quad (3.4)$$

where $\tau_i^e(g) = (\tau_{ig}^e, \tau_{i,-g}^e)' \in \mathbb{R}^{2G}$ is a $2G \times 1$ vector, with $\tau_{ig}^e = (\alpha_g + z_i' \delta_g^u, p_g - z_i' \delta_g^v)' \in \mathbb{R}^2$ representing the *extended* indices for group g , and $\tau_{i,-g}^e = (\tau_{ih}^e, \forall h \neq g)' \in \mathbb{R}^{2G-2}$ representing the *extended* indices for the remaining $G - 1$ groups. Because p and α are absorbed into $\tau_i^e(g)$ and the components for group g are separated from the components for the other groups, under exchangeability the selection function $\lambda^e(\cdot)$ is invariant across groups. In contrast to Proposition 3.2, equation (3.4) leverages the arguments $\tau_i^e(g)$, rather than the functional form $\lambda^e(\cdot)$, to capture the group-specific feature, thereby yielding a group-invariant selection function.

As a remark, exchangeability implies that the order of the extended indices in $\tau_{i,-g}^e$ does not matter – the selection function is symmetric in the extended indices τ_{ih}^e and $\tau_{i\tilde{h}}^e$ for any distinct $h, \tilde{h} \neq g$. This symmetry can further reduce the number of nuisance parameters, which we will delve into further in Section 5.

4 Identification

Moving on to the identification of parameters, we first discuss the identification of group formation indices, and then turn to the identification of peer effects in the presence of selection bias.

4.1 Identification of Group Formation Indices

Let $\delta = (\delta_1^u, \dots, \delta_G^u, \delta_1^v, \dots, \delta_G^v)'$ collect the slope parameters in group formation and $\theta = (\delta', p', \alpha)'$ all the group formation parameters. The identification of δ was established in He et al. (2022).²⁶ Hence, the raw indices $\tau_i = \tau(z_i, \delta)$ are identified. To identify the extended indices $\tau_i^e = \tau^e(z_i, g_i, \theta)$, we need to identify p and α in addition to δ , which we discuss below. We start with the following assumption.

Assumption 4. (i) $p_1 = \alpha_1 = 0$. (ii) The joint cdf of ξ_i and η_i is strictly increasing.

²⁶A main challenge in identifying δ is that an individual's choice set $\mathcal{C}_i(p)$ is unobservable to researchers. To achieve identification, He et al. (2022) utilized excluded variables that can act as “demand shifters” and “choice-set shifters”. By taking the derivatives of the conditional probability of joining a group with respect to all the variables, excluded and non-excluded, they derived a system of linear equations that relates the marginal effects in demand and supply. Provided that the system has a unique solution, δ is identified.

Assumption 4(i) is a location normalization because the joint distribution of ξ_i and η_i is nonparametric. Assumption 4(ii) ensures a one-to-one mapping between the conditional probability of joining a group and the extended indices. It is satisfied for a broad variety of distributions such as normal distributions.

Proposition 4.1 (Identification of p and α). *Suppose that δ is known. Under Assumptions 2-4, p and α are identified.*

The idea of identification is that under exchangeability, the extended indices for two distinct groups 1 and g have the same impact on the conditional probability of joining a third group $h \neq g, 1$. Thus, by monotonicity (Assumption 4(ii)) the two extended indices leading to the same conditional probability of joining h must be equal. We can then recover the difference between the cutoffs of groups 1 and g , and thus identify p_g under the location normalization (Assumption 4(i)). α can be identified similarly. He et al. (2022) established the identification of p in a similar setting. By imposing a large support assumption to shut down the impact of other groups, they identified p by leveraging the within-group variation. Our identification result complements theirs by leveraging the between-group variation under exchangeability.

4.2 Identification of γ

Now we turn to γ . Let $\nu_i = \epsilon_i - \lambda^e(\tau_i^e)$ represent the residual of ϵ_i after eliminating the selection bias. Write the i^{th} equation in (2.2) as

$$y_i = w_i \mathbf{y} \gamma_1 + w_i \mathbf{x} \gamma_2 + x_i' \gamma_3 + \lambda^e(\tau_i^e) + \nu_i. \quad (4.1)$$

This is a partially linear model (Robinson, 1988). By taking the expectation of equation (4.1) conditional on τ_i^e and subtracting it from equation (4.1) we obtain

$$\tilde{y}_i = \widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}} \gamma_1 + \widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}} \gamma_2 + \tilde{x}_i' \gamma_3 + \nu_i, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\tilde{y}_i = y_i - \mathbb{E}[y_i | \tau_i^e]$ and similar notation applies to other variables. The identification of γ requires that the support of the regressors $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$, $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$, and \tilde{x}_i cannot be contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+1} . This rank condition is satisfied if and only if there is no linear combination of $w_i \mathbf{y}$, $w_i \mathbf{x}$, and x_i that is a function of τ_i^e almost surely (Lemma 4.1). In particular, the condition fails if $w_i \mathbf{y}$, $w_i \mathbf{x}$, and x_i

are linearly dependent, which is referred to as the reflection problem (Manski, 1993; Blume et al., 2011).

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that X_i is a $d \times 1$ vector of random variables. The support of $X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\tau_i^e]$ is contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^d if and only if there is a $d \times 1$ vector of constants $k \neq 0$ such that $k'X_i$ is a function of τ_i^e with probability 1.*

4.2.1 The reflection problem

To investigate the reflection problem, consider the social equilibrium in equation (2.2). Let $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^e(\boldsymbol{\tau}^e)$ denote the $n \times 1$ vector that stacks $\lambda^e(\tau_i^e)$, where $\boldsymbol{\tau}^e = (\tau_1^e, \dots, \tau_n^e)'$, and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ the $n \times 1$ vector that stacks ν_i . Assume $|\gamma_1| < 1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j=1}^n |w_{ij}| = 1$, so $I - \gamma_1 \boldsymbol{w}$ is invertible and $(I - \gamma_1 \boldsymbol{w})^{-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k \boldsymbol{w}^k$. The social equilibrium is

$$w_i \mathbf{y} = w_i \mathbf{x} \gamma_3 + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k w_i^{k+2} \mathbf{x} (\gamma_1 \gamma_3 + \gamma_2) + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k w_i^{k+1} \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e + \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^k w_i^{k+1} \boldsymbol{\nu}, \quad (4.3)$$

where w_i^k denotes the i^{th} row of \boldsymbol{w}^k . The expression implies that $w_i \mathbf{y}$, $w_i \mathbf{x}$, and x_i are linearly independent if (i) the support of $x_i, w_i \mathbf{x}, w_i^2 \mathbf{x}, w_i^3 \mathbf{x}, \dots$ is not contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+1} and $\gamma_1 \gamma_3 + \gamma_2 \neq 0$, or (ii) the support of $x_i, w_i \mathbf{x}, w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e, w_i^2 \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e, \dots$ is not contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+1} .

Sufficient conditions have been established in the existing literature for case (i). For example, $w_i^2 \mathbf{x}$, $w_i \mathbf{x}$, and x_i are linearly independent if there is an intransitive triad in each group (Bramoullé et al., 2009), or if there is variation in group sizes when we consider group averages that exclude oneself (Lee, 2007). However, this identification strategy fails for group averages that include oneself because $\boldsymbol{w}^2 = \boldsymbol{w}$ (Manski, 1993; Bramoullé et al., 2009).²⁷

The presence of selection offers an alternative method of identification through case (ii). It is evident from equation (4.3) that the rank condition holds if $w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e$, $w_i \mathbf{x}$, and x_i are linearly independent and, in view of Lemma 4.1, $w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e$ is not perfectly predictable by τ_i^e . This identification strategy is applicable regardless of whether group averages include or exclude oneself, or whether there are networks within groups. The result is consistent with the insightful discovery of Brock and Durlauf (2001, Section 3.6) that identification can be achieved through self-selection as long as there

²⁷In large groups, the difference between group averages that include or exclude oneself should be minimal. Consequently, identification through variation in group sizes may become less effective as groups increase in size.

is variation in the selection within a group. Because the selection bias acts as an individual-level variable whose average is not included in the contextual effect, its presence precludes $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ from being linearly dependent.

Near multicollinearity Although the theory predicts that $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are linearly independent in the presence of selection, for group averages that include oneself we find in simulations that $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are nearly collinear, though not perfectly collinear, when the number of groups is small (e.g., $G = 5$). Note that $\mathbf{w}^2 = \mathbf{w}$ in this case, so the social equilibrium reduces to

$$w_i\mathbf{y} = w_i\mathbf{x}\frac{\gamma_2 + \gamma_3}{1 - \gamma_1} + w_i\boldsymbol{\lambda}^e\frac{1}{1 - \gamma_1} + w_i\boldsymbol{\nu}\frac{1}{1 - \gamma_1}. \quad (4.4)$$

The near multicollinearity arises because both $w_i\boldsymbol{\lambda}^e$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are group-level variables, so they appear highly collinear when the number of groups is small.²⁸ This near multicollinearity imposes an ill-conditioned problem in the estimation of γ , thereby leading to a biased estimate. Next, we propose a novel approach to resolve this issue.

4.2.2 Instrumental variables

Our idea is to use the excluded variables z_i in group formation as instruments for $w_i\mathbf{y}$. The intuition is that z_i affects the group that individual i joins and thus the average outcome of i 's peers. Because z_i brings in individual-level variation, the predicted value of $w_i\mathbf{y}$ tends to be linearly independent of $w_i\mathbf{x}$, thereby alleviating the reflection problem.

Instrument validity To show that z_i is a valid instrument, let $X_i = (w_i\mathbf{y}, w_i\mathbf{x}, x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ denote a vector of regressors and $Z_i = (z_i, w_i\mathbf{x}, x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ a vector of instruments.²⁹ Rewrite equation (4.2) as $\tilde{y}_i = \tilde{X}_i'\gamma + \nu_i$. Because $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{w}] = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{w}] - \lambda^e(\tau_i^e) = 0$, Z_i satisfies the exclusion restriction $\mathbb{E}[Z_i\nu_i] = 0$, thereby yielding the moment condition $\mathbb{E}[Z_i(\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{X}_i'\gamma)] = 0$ or equivalently $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i(\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{X}_i'\gamma)] =$

²⁸The condition number is a commonly used measure for assessing the degree of multicollinearity in a dataset. Specifically, the condition number of a matrix is given by the ratio of its largest and smallest singular values. Using our simulated samples, we calculate the condition number of the matrix $[\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}]'[\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}]$, where we use the residuals of each $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ after controlling for x_i and a sieve basis of τ_i^e . For group averages that include oneself and with 5 groups, the condition number is on average 845, indicating that $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ are highly collinear.

²⁹If z_i overlaps with x_i , we only include the variables excluded from x_i in z_i .

0.³⁰ The textbook literature on instrumental variables (Wooldridge, 2010) suggests that γ is identified if Assumption 5 is satisfied because there is a unique γ that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i(\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{X}_i'\gamma)] = 0$.

Assumption 5. (i) $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{Z}_i']$ has full rank. (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{X}_i']$ has full column rank.

Proposition 4.2 (Identification of γ). *Suppose that δ is known. Under Assumptions 1-5, γ is identified.*

Assumption 5(i) is the standard assumption that the instruments are linearly independent.³¹ Assumption 5(ii) is the standard rank condition for identification. It requires that the support of \tilde{X}_i is not contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+1} , which is guaranteed in the presence of selection as discussed in Section 4.2.1. Moreover, the rank condition requires that the linear projection of $\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}$ on \tilde{Z}_i must have a nonzero coefficient for \tilde{z}_i .³² In other words, conditional on the controls, the instrument \tilde{z}_i must be correlated with $\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}$, the relevance condition for an instrument to be valid.

The influence of z_i on $w_i\mathbf{y}$ is evident, given that z_i affects the group that i joins, thereby influencing the average outcome of i 's peers. What is not immediately apparent is that \tilde{z}_i may still impact $\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}$ even after the selection is accounted for. In fact, under exchangeability the selection bias can be corrected for without fixing the group that an individual joins. Below we provide an example that individual i joins different groups under different z_i , but the selection bias takes the same value regardless of which group i joins. Therefore, even after correcting for the selection bias, \tilde{z}_i can still influence the group that i joins and thus $\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}$.

Example 4.1. Assume two groups ($G = 2$). Suppose that $u_{ig} = \alpha_g - z_{ig} + \xi_{ig}$ and $v_{gi} = z_{ig} + \eta_{gi}$, $g = 1, 2$, where $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) = (4, 5)$. The cutoffs are given by $(p_1, p_2) = (2, 3)$. Denote $z_i = (z_{i1}, z_{i2})$. Consider two values $z = (z_1, z_2) = (1, 5)$ and $\bar{z} = (\bar{z}_1, \bar{z}_2) = (4, 2)$. Suppose the unobservables $(\xi_{i1}, \xi_{i2}, \eta_{1i}, \eta_{2i})$ satisfy $-3 <$

³⁰Note that $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\nu_i] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\mathbb{E}[\nu_i|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{w}]] = 0$.

³¹The assumption requires that z_i contains at least two variables that are excluded from x_i . Otherwise, after we partial out τ_i^e and condition on x_i , there would be no additional variation in z_i that could serve as an instrument.

³²Suppose that the linear projection of $\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}$ on \tilde{Z}_i is given by $\mathbb{L}[\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}|\tilde{Z}_i] = \tilde{z}_i'\beta_1 + \widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{x}\beta_2 + \tilde{x}_i'\beta_3$. By the property of a linear projection, we have $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i(\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y} - \mathbb{L}[\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}|\tilde{Z}_i])] = 0$ and thus $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}] = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{z}_i']\beta_1 + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{x}]\beta_2 + \mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{x}_i']\beta_3$. If $\beta_1 = 0$, then $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{y}]$ is a linear function of $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\widetilde{w}_i\mathbf{x}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{Z}_i\tilde{x}_i']$, and the rank condition in Assumption 5(ii) is violated.

$\xi_{i1} - \xi_{i2} < 3$, and $\eta_{1i}, \eta_{2i} > 1$, then individual i joins group 1 if $z_i = z$ and group 2 if $z_i = \bar{z}$. In this case, i 's extended indices under z and \bar{z} are equal because $\tau^e = (\alpha_1 - z_1, p_1 - z_1, \alpha_2 - z_2, p_2 - z_2) = (3, 1, 0, -2)$ and $\bar{\tau}^e = (\alpha_2 - \bar{z}_2, p_2 - \bar{z}_2, \alpha_1 - \bar{z}_1, p_1 - \bar{z}_1) = (3, 1, 0, -2)$. Conditional on τ_i^e , z_i can still influence the group i joins.

Example 4.1 demonstrates the impact of \tilde{z}_i on $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$. What we need further is that the impact is not through $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$ only. In fact, equation (4.4) shows that \tilde{z}_i can impact $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$ through two channels: the average characteristics $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$ and the average selection $\widetilde{w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e}$. Even after controlling for $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$, \tilde{z}_i can still operate through $\widetilde{w_i \boldsymbol{\lambda}^e}$. By affecting the group that i joins, \tilde{z}_i can influence the average selection and outcome of i 's peers.

Reducing near multicollinearity Why does using \tilde{z}_i as an instrument for $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$ help with the reflection problem? The relevance condition implies that the predicted value of $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$ is a function of \tilde{z}_i (see footnote 32). Since \tilde{z}_i contains individual-level variation, it is unlikely for the predicted value of $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$ to be collinear with $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$, thereby alleviating the reflection problem.

Equation (4.4) may motivate one to use the average excluded variables $w_i \mathbf{z}$ in group formation as an instrument for $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$. However, for group averages that include oneself, because $w_i \mathbf{z}$ is group-specific, there remains a high degree of collinearity between the predicted value of $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{y}}$ and $\widetilde{w_i \mathbf{x}}$ if the number of groups is small. Therefore, using $w_i \mathbf{z}$ as an instrument does not solve the problem.

5 Estimation

In this section, we propose semiparametric methods for estimating the parameters. First, we develop a three-step kernel estimator for the group formation parameters. Building on this, we then propose a semiparametric three-step GMM estimator for the social interaction parameters. The estimator involves estimating the selection bias using sieve, followed by estimating the interaction parameters using GMM.

5.1 Estimating the Group Formation Parameters

In order to construct the extended indices $\tau_i^e = \tau^e(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)$, we need to estimate the true parameter $\theta_0 = (\delta'_0, p^*, \alpha'_0)'$, where p^* represents the limiting cutoffs. He et al.

(2022) proposed a semiparametric GMM estimator for $\delta_0 = (\delta_{0,g}^u, \delta_{0,g}^v, g \in \mathcal{G})$.³³ In the following, we propose an estimator for p^* and α_0 .

We develop a three-step kernel estimator for p^* and α_0 that builds upon the identification result in Proposition 4.1. For simplicity, we focus on p^* , and a similar estimator can be established for α_0 . To estimate the cutoff p_g^* for group $g \neq 1$, we consider the probability that individual i joins group $h \neq 1, g$ conditional on i 's qualification index $\tau_{ig}^v = z_i' \delta_{0,g}^v$ for group g , denoted by $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) = \Pr(g_i = h | \tau_{ig}^v)$. Similarly, let $\sigma_{h|1}(\tau_{j1}^v) = \Pr(g_j = h | \tau_{j1}^v)$ denote the probability that individual j joins group h conditional on j 's qualification index $\tau_{j1}^v = z_j' \delta_{0,1}^v$ for group 1. Proposition 4.1 states that the cutoff p_g^* can be identified by the difference $\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v$ if $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) = \sigma_{h|1}(\tau_{j1}^v)$. Based on this result, we propose a three-step kernel estimator for p_g^* .

In the first step, we estimate the qualification index τ_{ig}^v by $\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v = z_i' \hat{\delta}_g^v$, where $\hat{\delta}_g^v$ is an estimator of $\delta_{0,g}^v$. In the second step, we estimate the conditional choice probability $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau)$ for $g \neq h$ and $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ by a kernel estimator $\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^n 1\{g_i = h\} K_1(\frac{\tau - \hat{\tau}_{ig}^v}{\zeta_{1n}}) / \sum_{i=1}^n K_1(\frac{\tau - \hat{\tau}_{ig}^v}{\zeta_{1n}})$, where $K_1(\cdot)$ is a kernel function and ζ_{1n} is a bandwidth. In the third step, we estimate the cutoff p_g^* by a kernel estimator

$$\hat{p}_g = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(G-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq i}}^n \sum_{\substack{h=2 \\ h \neq g}}^G \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v) - \hat{\sigma}_{h|1}(\hat{\tau}_{j1}^v)}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) (\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v - \hat{\tau}_{j1}^v),$$

where $K_2(\cdot)$ is a kernel function and ζ_{2n} is a bandwidth. The kernel function $K_2(\cdot)$ approximates the criterion that the pair (i, j) satisfies $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) = \sigma_{h|1}(\tau_{j1}^v)$. We leverage all the qualifying pairs to achieve the desired \sqrt{n} rate. As any $h \neq 1, g$ can yield an estimator, we take the average over h to improve efficiency. This estimator is similar in spirit to a propensity-score matching estimator (Heckman et al., 1998).

To establish the asymptotic properties of \hat{p}_g , we impose the following conditions.

Assumption 6 (First-Step Kernel). (i) $\int K_1(t) dt = 1$, and for a positive integer s_1 and all $j < s_1$, $\int K_1(t) t^j dt = 0$. (ii) $K_1(t)$ is twice continuously differentiable. (iii) $K_1(t)$ is zero outside a bounded set.

Assumption 7 (Second-Step Kernel). (i) $\int K_2(t) dt = 1$, and for a positive integer $s_2 \geq s_1$ and all $j < s_2$, $\int K_2(t) t^j dt = 0$. (ii) $K_2(t)$ is twice continuously differentiable. (iii) $K_2(t)$ is zero outside a bounded set.

³³He et al. (2022)'s estimator is based on average derivatives (Powell et al., 1989).

Assumption 8 (Smoothness). For any $g \neq h \in \mathcal{G}$, (i) the pdf of τ_{ig}^v is bounded away from zero on the support of τ_{ig}^v , (ii) the pdf of τ_{ig}^v is $(s_2 + 1)$ th continuously differentiable, (iii) $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau)$ is $(s_2 + 2)$ th continuously differentiable.

Assumption 9 (Bandwidth). The bandwidths $\zeta_{1n}, \zeta_{2n} \rightarrow 0$ satisfy (i) $n^{1/2}\zeta_{2n}^{-3}r_0^2 \rightarrow 0$, (ii) $\zeta_{2n}^{-3}r_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $\zeta_{2n}^{-2}r_1 \rightarrow 0$, (iii) $n^{1/2}\zeta_{1n}\zeta_{2n}^2 \rightarrow \infty$, (iv) $n^{1/2}\zeta_{1n}^{s_1} \rightarrow 0$, and (v) $n^{1/2}\zeta_{2n}^{s_2} \rightarrow 0$, where $r_0 = (\ln n)^{1/2}(n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1}$ and $r_1 = (\ln n)^{1/2}(n\zeta_{1n}^3)^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1}$.

Assumption 10 (Parameter δ^v). (i) The true parameter δ_0^v lies in the interior of a compact set. (ii) $\hat{\delta}^v - \delta_0^v = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi^{\delta^v}(z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\mathbb{E}[\psi^{\delta^v}(z_i)] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\psi^{\delta^v}(z_i)\|^2] < \infty$.

Assumption 11 (Bounded Covariates). (i) The support of z_i is bounded. (ii) The support of x_i is bounded.

Assumptions 6 and 7 impose regularity conditions on the kernel functions. Assumption 8 imposes smooth assumptions on the density of qualification indices and the conditional choice probabilities. Assumption 11 assumes that the covariates are bounded. These assumptions are standard in the kernel literature (Newey, 1994b; Li and Racine, 2007). Assumption 9 restricts the bandwidths to achieve the desired \sqrt{n} rate.³⁴ Assumption 10 imposes a restriction on the estimator $\hat{\delta}^v$, which is satisfied by the estimator proposed in He et al. (2022).³⁵

Theorem 5.1 shows that \hat{p}_g is \sqrt{n} consistent and asymptotically normal.

Theorem 5.1 (Asymptotic distribution of \hat{p}_g). Under Assumptions 2-4, 6-10, and 11(i), we have $\sqrt{n}(\hat{p}_g - p_g^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_g)$, where $V_g = \text{Var}[\psi_g(z_i, g_i)]$ and $\psi_g(z_i, g_i)$ is defined in the proof.

5.2 Estimating the Social Interaction Parameters

5.2.1 Accounting for the symmetry in the selection function

We will now focus on estimating γ . Recall that the selection function $\lambda^e(\cdot)$ exhibits symmetry in the extended indices for groups other than g_i . By exploiting this sym-

³⁴The bandwidth rates in Assumption 9 are used to (a) guarantee that the biases introduced by the kernel estimators are $o_p(n^{-1/2})$, (b) limit the impact of the estimation of a conditional choice probability, and (c) establish a Hoeffding projection for a V -statistic of degree 3 introduced by the kernel estimators. Assumption 9 is satisfied, for example, for $s_1 = 3$, $s_2 = 5$, $\zeta_{1n} = O(n^{-\frac{11}{60}})$, and $\zeta_{2n} = O(n^{-\frac{5}{48}})$.

³⁵For the estimation of α , we need to adapt Assumptions 8 and 10 by replacing v with u .

metry, we can equivalently represent the selection bias as a function of the elementary symmetric functions of those extended indices. This allows us to reduce the number of nuisance parameters and improve estimation efficiency.

Specifically, we denote the elementary symmetric functions of $\tau_{i,-g_i}^e$ as $\tau_{i,-g_i}^s$, which can be represented by the coefficients of the polynomial function $\prod_{h \neq g_i} (1 + t' \tau_{ih}^e)$ in the indeterminates $t = (t_1, t_2)'$ (Weyl, 1946).³⁶ By the fundamental theorem of symmetric functions in conjunction with the Weierstrass approximation theorem, any symmetric function can be approximated arbitrarily closely by a polynomial function of the elementary symmetric functions (Altonji and Matzkin, 2005). Therefore, there is a function $\lambda^s(\cdot)$ such that $\lambda^e(\tau_i^e) = \lambda^s(\tau_i^s)$, where $\tau_i^s = (\tau_{ig_i}^e, \tau_{i,-g_i}^s)$.³⁷

Using the symmetric representation can reduce the number of nuisance parameters in a sieve approximation. For instance, consider the τ_i^s that is constructed using utility differences as discussed in footnote 37. If we use linear basis functions, $\lambda^e(\tau_i^e)$ has $2G - 1$ approximating functions, whereas $\lambda^s(\tau_i^s)$ has only 3, including one for group g_i and two for the remaining $G - 1$ groups combined. If we consider basis functions of order two, $\lambda^e(\tau_i^e)$ has $(2G - 1)G$ approximating functions, whereas $\lambda^s(\tau_i^s)$ has 9.³⁸

5.2.2 Estimating γ

Rewrite equation (4.1) using the symmetric representation $\lambda^s(\tau_i^s)$. Partialing out the selection bias yields $y_i - \mathbb{E}[y_i | \tau_i^s] = (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \tau_i^s])' \gamma + \nu_i$. The true parameter γ_0 satisfies the moment condition

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \mathbb{E}[Z_i(y_i - \mathbb{E}[y_i | \tau_i^s] - (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \tau_i^s])' \gamma)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau_i^s])(y_i - X_i' \gamma)], \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

³⁶Recall that $\tau_{ig}^e = (\tau_{ig}^{e,u}, \tau_{ig}^{e,v})'$, where we denote $\tau_{ig}^{e,u} = \alpha_g + z_i' \delta_g^u$ and $\tau_{ig}^{e,v} = p_g - z_i' \delta_g^v$, $g \in \mathcal{G}$. The first two orders of the elementary symmetric functions are given by the sums of all individual terms ($\sum_{h \neq g_i} \tau_{ih}^{e,u}$ and $\sum_{h \neq g_i} \tau_{ih}^{e,v}$) and the sums of all pairwise products ($\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \tau_{ih_1}^{e,u} \tau_{ih_2}^{e,u}$, $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \tau_{ih_1}^{e,v} \tau_{ih_2}^{e,v}$, and $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \tau_{ih_1}^{e,u} \tau_{ih_2}^{e,v}$, where $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i}$ denotes the sum over all combinations of distinct h_1 and h_2 in $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{g_i\}$). The higher-order functions can be derived similarly.

³⁷To further reduce the dimension of τ_i^s , we can drop the utility index $\tau_{ig_i}^{e,u}$ in $\tau_{ig_i}^e$ and replace the utility index $\tau_{ih}^{e,u}$ in τ_{ih}^e for any $h \neq g_i$ with the utility difference index $\tau_{ih}^{e,u} - \tau_{ig_i}^{e,u}$.

³⁸Denote $\Delta \tau_{ih}^{e,u} = \tau_{ih}^{e,u} - \tau_{ig_i}^{e,u}$ for $h \neq g_i$. We can represent $\tau_i^e = (\tau_{ig_i}^{e,v}, \Delta \tau_{ih}^{e,u}, \tau_{ih}^{e,v}, \forall h \neq g_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{2G-1}$. For $\lambda^e(\tau_i^e)$, we have $(2G - 1)G$ functions of order two: $2G - 1$ squared indices and $(2G - 1)(G - 1)$ pairwise interactions. For $\lambda^s(\tau_i^s)$, we have the following 9 functions of order two: $(\tau_{ig_i}^{e,v})^2$, $(\sum_{h \neq g_i} \Delta \tau_{ih}^{e,u})^2$, $(\sum_{h \neq g_i} \tau_{ih}^{e,v})^2$, $\tau_{ig_i}^{e,v} \sum_{h \neq g_i} \Delta \tau_{ih}^{e,u}$, $\tau_{ig_i}^{e,v} \sum_{h \neq g_i} \tau_{ih}^{e,v}$, $(\sum_{h \neq g_i} \Delta \tau_{ih}^{e,u})(\sum_{h \neq g_i} \tau_{ih}^{e,v})$, $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \Delta \tau_{ih_1}^{e,u} \Delta \tau_{ih_2}^{e,u}$, $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \tau_{ih_1}^{e,v} \tau_{ih_2}^{e,v}$, and $\sum_{(h_1, h_2) \neq g_i} \Delta \tau_{ih_1}^{e,u} \tau_{ih_2}^{e,v}$.

where the last equality follows from iterated expectations.³⁹ Based on the last moment condition, we propose a semiparametric three-step GMM estimator for γ_0 .

In the first step, we estimate the symmetric indices $\tau_i^s = \tau^s(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)$ by $\hat{\tau}_i^s = \tau^s(z_i, g_i, \hat{\theta})$, where $\hat{\theta} = (\hat{\delta}', \hat{p}', \hat{\alpha}')'$ is an estimator of $\theta_0 = (\delta_0', p^{*'}, \alpha_0')'$. In the second step, we estimate the conditional expectation $\mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s) = \mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau_i^s]$ by a sieve estimator $\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s)$. Specifically, we construct a $K \times 1$ vector of approximating functions, denoted by $b^K(\tau_i^s) = (b_{1K}(\tau_i^s), \dots, b_{KK}(\tau_i^s))'$, for each individual i , and an $n \times K$ matrix of all approximating functions, denoted by $B_K(\boldsymbol{\tau}^s) = (b^K(\tau_1^s), \dots, b^K(\tau_n^s))'$, where $\boldsymbol{\tau}^s = (\tau_1^{s'}, \dots, \tau_n^{s'})'$. We then estimate $\mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s)$ by the predicted value $\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s)$ obtained from regressing $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)'$ on the estimated approximating functions $\hat{B}_K = (b^K(\hat{\tau}_1^s), \dots, b^K(\hat{\tau}_n^s))'$, that is, $\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s) = \mathbf{Z}' \hat{B}_K (\hat{B}_K' \hat{B}_K)^{-1} b^K(\hat{\tau}_i^s)$.

In the third step, we estimate the parameter γ_0 using GMM. Define the moment function $m(\omega_i, \gamma, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s)) = (Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s))(y_i - X_i' \gamma)$, where $\omega_i = (y_i, X_i', Z_i)'$. We denote its population mean and sample analogue by $m_0(\gamma, \mu_0^Z) = \mathbb{E}[m(\omega_i, \gamma, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s))]$ and $\hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m(\omega_i, \gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s))$. Let W be a weighting matrix and \hat{W} a consistent estimator of W . We obtain a GMM estimator $\hat{\gamma}$ by solving the problem $\min_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z)' \hat{W} \hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z)$. With the addition of the following assumptions, we show in Theorems 5.2 and 5.3 that $\hat{\gamma}$ is \sqrt{n} consistent and asymptotically normal.

Assumption 12 (Parameter θ). (i) The true parameter θ_0 lies in the interior of a compact set Θ . (ii) $\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\mathbb{E}[\phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0)] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\phi_\theta(z_i, \theta)\|^2] < \infty$.

Assumption 13 (Sieve). Let $K \rightarrow \infty$ and $K/n \rightarrow 0$. The basis functions $b^K(\tau) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ satisfy the following conditions. (i) $\mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau) b^K(\tau)'] = I_K$. (ii) There exist β^Z and a constant $a > 0$ such that $\sup_{\tau} |\mu_0^Z(\tau) - b^K(\tau)' \beta^Z| = O(K^{-a})$. (iii) $\sup_{\tau} \|b^K(\tau)\| \leq \varrho_0(K)$ for constants $\varrho_0(K)$ such that $\varrho_0(K)^2 K/n \rightarrow 0$. (iv) $\sup_{\tau} \|\partial b^K(\tau) / \partial \tau'\| \leq \varrho_1(K)$ for constants $\varrho_1(K)$ such that $\varrho_1(K) / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$.

Assumption 14 (Adjacency Matrix). The adjacency matrix $\mathbf{w} = (w_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^{n^2}$ satisfies the following conditions. (i) $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j=1}^n |w_{ij}| = 1$. (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^4] = \mathbb{E}[\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} (w_{ij})^4] = O(n^{-4})$. (iii) There exist i.i.d. ς_i , $i \in \mathcal{N}$, such that (a) $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$ is a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\varsigma_i, i \in \mathcal{N})$, (b) $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = 0$, and (c) \mathbf{w} is independent of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$. (iv) For $h_{ij} = h(\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} |h_{ij}| < \infty$,

³⁹ $\mathbb{E}[Z_i(y_i - \mathbb{E}[y_i | \tau_i^s]) - (X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i | \tau_i^s])' \gamma] = \mathbb{E}[Z_i(y_i - X_i' \gamma)] - \mathbb{E}[Z_i \mathbb{E}[y_i - X_i' \gamma | \tau_i^s]] = \mathbb{E}[Z_i(y_i - X_i' \gamma)] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau_i^s] \mathbb{E}[y_i - X_i' \gamma | \tau_i^s]] = \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau_i^s])(y_i - X_i' \gamma)]$.

$\max_{r, \tilde{r} \geq 1} \max_{i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{N}: \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset} |Cov(h_{ij}((\mathbf{w}^t)' \mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}, h_{kl}((\mathbf{w}^t)' \mathbf{w}^{\tilde{r}})_{kl})| = o(n^{-2})$, $t = 0, 1$.
(v) For K that satisfies Assumption 13, $\max_{i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{N}: \{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset} \mathbb{E}[Cov(w_{ij}, w_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^2] = o(n^{-4}/K)$ and $\max_{i, j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j])^4] = o(n^{-4}/K^2)$. (vi) For overlapping $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$, $\max_{i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{N}: |\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\}| = 1} \mathbb{E}[Cov(w_{ij}, w_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^2] = o(n^{-4})$.

Assumption 15 (GMM). (i) $\hat{W} \xrightarrow{p} W$. W is positive semi-definite and bounded, and $Wm_0(\gamma, \mu_0^Z) \neq 0$ for all $\gamma \neq \gamma_0$. (ii) The true parameter γ_0 lies in the interior of a compact set Γ . (iii) $M'_n W M_n$ is nonsingular for $M_n = \mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\gamma_0, \mu_0^Z)}{\partial \gamma'}]$.

Assumption 16 (Smoothness). (i) The unobservable ϵ_i has finite fourth moment. (ii) For any $\theta \in \Theta$, $\mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau^s(z_i, g_i, \theta)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \tau^s(z_i, g_i, \theta)]$ are continuously differentiable in $\tau^s(z_i, g_i, \theta)$.

Theorem 5.2 (Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$). Under Assumptions 1–5 and 11–16, $\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0 = o_p(1)$.

Theorem 5.3 (Asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\gamma}$). Under Assumptions 1–5 and 11–16, $\sqrt{n} \Sigma_n^{-1/2} (\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I_{d_\gamma})$, where the variance Σ_n is defined in the proof.

Assumption 12(i) requires that the true parameter θ_0 is bounded. Although we set a cutoff to $-\infty$ if the capacity is not binding, such a cutoff does not affect individuals' choices and is excluded from θ (footnote 19).⁴⁰ Assumption 12(ii) imposes a restriction on the estimator $\hat{\theta}$, which is satisfied by Assumption 10 and Theorem 5.1. Assumption 13 imposes standard regularity conditions for the sieve estimation. Part (i) is a normalization.⁴¹ Parts (ii)–(iv) impose rate conditions on the basis functions that are similar to those used in the literature (Newey, 1994a; Li and Racine, 2007).

⁴⁰Strictly speaking, we also need to assume that any market-clearing cutoff is bounded away from $-\infty$. Although the demand and supply for a group may be equal at a cutoff of $-\infty$, the group's capacity must take a particular value for that to occur. This is because a cutoff of $-\infty$ no longer makes the group selective, and the demand is solely determined by the number of individuals who do not prefer or qualify for any other group. In general, a market-clearing cutoff of $-\infty$ yields a system of equations with more market-clearing equations than unknowns (cutoffs), which typically has no solution. We assume that this unlikely case is ruled out.

⁴¹Alternatively, we can assume that the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau)b^K(\tau)']$ is bounded away from zero uniformly in K . Assuming this, let $Q_0 = \mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau)b^K(\tau)']$ and $Q_0^{-1/2}$ the symmetric square root of Q_0^{-1} . Then $\tilde{b}^K(\tau) = Q_0^{-1/2} b^K(\tau)$ is a nonsingular transformation of $b^K(\tau)$ that satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{b}^K(\tau)\tilde{b}^K(\tau)'] = I_K$. Notably, nonparametric series estimators are invariant under nonsingular transformations of $b^K(\tau)$: let $\tilde{\beta}^Z = Q_0^{1/2} \beta^Z$ then $\tilde{b}^K(\tau)' \tilde{\beta}^Z = b^K(\tau)' \beta^Z$. Furthermore, $\tilde{b}^K(\tau)$ satisfies Assumption 13(iii)(iv) if and only if $b^K(\tau)$ does. Therefore, all parts of Assumption 13 are satisfied with $b^K(\tau)$ replaced by $\tilde{b}^K(\tau)$ (Li and Racine, 2007, p.480).

Assumption 15 imposes the standard conditions for GMM.⁴² Assumption 16 is used to analyze the impact of the sieve estimator.

To derive the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\gamma}$, we apply Hahn and Ridder (2013)’s approach to account for the impact of the first- and second-step estimation. A major challenge in the asymptotic analysis is that the adjacency matrix \mathbf{w} is endogenous and can be correlated with the observables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{z} . Unlike the literature that assumes a predetermined \mathbf{w} , we generalize the methods for weighted U -statistics (Lee, 1990, Section 3.7.5) to address the endogeneity in group memberships, where the weights can be random due to networks within groups. To achieve the desired \sqrt{n} rate in the presence of random weights, we provide in Assumption 14 a set of sufficient conditions on \mathbf{w} to ensure that the dependence through networks vanishes sufficiently fast as n grows large.⁴³ In Appendix A.1, we verify that Assumption 14 is satisfied for group averages, dyadic networks with fixed effects (Graham, 2017), and strategic networks of incomplete information under restrictions (Leung, 2015; Ridder and Sheng, 2022).⁴⁴

6 Simulations

6.1 Setup

In this section, we evaluate our approach in a simulation study. We generate a market of 2,000 individuals who interact based on the linear-in-means model in (2.1). We assume that both x_i and ϵ_i are i.i.d., where $x_i \sim N(5, 25)$ and $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$, and they are independent of each other. We set the parameter $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \gamma_3)$ to $(0.5, 1, 1)$.

⁴²Both the identification condition in part (i) and part (iv) can be satisfied if the weighting matrix W is nonsingular and if Assumption 5(ii) is satisfied with τ_i^s in place of τ_i^e .

⁴³Specifically, part (i) is a row-sum normalization. Part (ii) assumes that \mathbf{w} is dense in the sense that each entry of \mathbf{w} vanishes at the rate of n^{-1} . Part (iii) is satisfied by construction if $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$, or if $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ includes additional individual heterogeneity in network formation that is independent of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ (Appendix A.2.2). Part (iv) restricts the dependence between two entries of a higher-order polynomial of \mathbf{w} that have disjoint subscripts. Part (v) imposes further rate conditions on the dependence between two entries of \mathbf{w} with disjoint subscripts, which are necessary to establish the consistency of the sieve estimator. Part (vi) restricts the dependence between two entries of \mathbf{w} with overlapping subscripts, which is used to obtain the first-order Hoeffding projection of a weighted U -statistic in deriving the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\gamma}$.

⁴⁴It is possible that there exist alternative sufficient conditions on the adjacency matrix that can accommodate sparsity and/or more complicated strategic interactions in networks within groups (Menzel, 2021; Leung and Moon, 2023). However, exploring these alternatives is outside the scope of this paper and will be left for future research.

The market consists of five potential groups, with capacities of 340, 320, 340, 320, and 340 seats, for a total of 1,660 seats. Individuals choose which group to join as described in Section 2.2. The utility and qualification of individual i for group $g = 1, \dots, 5$ are specified as $u_{ig} = \alpha_g + \delta_1^u z_{1,ig}^u + \delta_2^u z_{2,i} + \xi_{ig}$ and $v_{gi} = \delta_1^v z_{1,ig}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{gi}$, where $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5) = (9, 6, 4, 2, 0)$ and $\delta = (\delta_1^u, \delta_2^u, \delta_1^v, \delta_2^v) = (-1, 1, 1, 1)$. We also allow for an individual to not join any group, in which case her utility is $u_{i0} = \xi_{i0}$. The pair-specific characteristics $z_{1,ig}^u$ and $z_{1,ig}^v$ are i.i.d. across i and g with the distribution $N(0, 9)$, while the individual-specific characteristic $z_{2,i}$ is i.i.d. with a distribution that is correlated with x_i . Specifically, we set $z_{2,i} = \log(x_i + q_i + 20)$, where q_i is i.i.d. $N(0, 4)$. Denote $z_i = (z_{1,ig}^u, z_{1,ig}^v, z_{2,i})$. We assume that the utility shock ξ_{ig} is i.i.d. across i and $g = 0, \dots, 5$ with the type I extreme value distribution, and the preference shock η_{gi} is i.i.d. with the distribution $N(\epsilon_i, 1)$. Note that η_{gi} is correlated with ϵ_i , thereby leading to endogenous groups. We calculate stable groups using the individual-proposing Deferred-Acceptance algorithm (Gale and Shapley, 1962).⁴⁵

We consider two specifications of the adjacency matrix \mathbf{w} . The first specification takes the average among all group members including oneself; the second specification takes the average among friends in the same group, where friendships are generated independently with a constant probability of 0.5. We estimate the parameter γ using data from one market and repeat the experiment independently 200 times to calculate the mean biases, standard errors, and root MSE of the estimates.⁴⁶

6.2 Results

Table 6.1 presents the results in the absence of endogenous social interactions ($\gamma_1 = 0$). For group averages (Panel A), the OLS estimate of γ_2 is upward biased (Column 1), indicating a selection bias. Although controlling for school fixed effects (FE) reduces this bias, it cannot eliminate it entirely (Column 2). In Column 3, we construct a polynomial series of the symmetric indices of group formation (up to order two) to correct for the selection bias. The sieve OLS estimates of γ are unbiased, suggesting that the series based on group formation indices is an effective correction. The specification with networks (Panel B) produces similar results: both OLS and OLS with school FE yield biased estimates (Columns 4 and 5), whereas sieve OLS yields

⁴⁵Because the number of individuals is larger than the number of available seats, in our simulated markets all the five groups have binding capacities.

⁴⁶Appendix O.A discusses the estimation of the group formation parameters.

Table 6.1: Estimates in the Absence of Endogenous Interactions ($\gamma_1 = 0$)

		<i>Panel A: Pure Groups</i>			<i>Panel B: Networks</i>		
		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
		OLS	OLS	Sieve OLS	OLS	OLS	Sieve OLS
γ_2	Bias	0.363	0.127	-0.004	0.166	0.046	-0.002
	SE	0.397	1.067	0.122	0.140	0.106	0.058
	RMSE	0.537	1.072	0.122	0.217	0.115	0.058
γ_3	Bias	-0.005	-0.005	-0.001	-0.004	-0.005	-0.001
	SE	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005
	RMSE	0.007	0.007	0.005	0.007	0.007	0.005
Selection Correction		No	Group FE	Sieve	No	Group FE	Sieve

Note: This table presents estimates of the social interaction parameters in the absence of endogenous social interactions. We report the mean biases, standard errors, and RMSE among 200 Monte Carlo samples, where each sample contains 5 groups and 1,660 individuals who join one of the groups. The basis functions include a polynomial series of the symmetric indices of utility differences and qualifications (up to order two).

unbiased estimates (Column 6). In addition, sieve OLS has smaller standard errors and RMSE compared to OLS and OLS with school FE.

The results in the presence of endogenous social interactions ($\gamma_1 \neq 0$) are presented in Table 6.2. For group averages (Panel A), both OLS and OLS with school FE yield heavily biased estimates of γ_1 and γ_2 due to the selection and reflection problem (Columns 1 and 2). Although sieve OLS using the polynomial series corrects for the selection bias, it does not eliminate the bias caused by the reflection problem (Column 3). To address this issue, in addition to the selection correction, we use an instrument for $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and estimate γ by sieve 2SLS. Column 4 shows that using the average excluded variables in group formation $w_i\mathbf{z}$ as instruments for $w_i\mathbf{y}$ does not solve the problem: the estimates of γ are almost identical to those obtained from sieve OLS. In fact, the F-test for the instruments $w_i\mathbf{z}$ indicates that $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{z}$ are highly collinear, rendering sieve OLS and sieve 2SLS with instruments $w_i\mathbf{z}$ equivalent. In contrast, using one's own excluded variables in group formation z_i as instruments for $w_i\mathbf{y}$ alleviates the reflection problem, yielding unbiased estimates of γ (Column 5). Moreover, the F-test suggests that z_i is correlated with $w_i\mathbf{y}$, and the over-identification test confirms the exogeneity of z_i . These results support the validity of using z_i as instruments for $w_i\mathbf{y}$.⁴⁷

⁴⁷Sieve 2SLS with instruments z_i yields larger standard errors and thus larger RMSE compared

Table 6.2: Estimates in the Presence of Endogenous Interactions ($\gamma_1 \neq 0$)

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
		OLS	OLS	Sieve OLS	Sieve 2SLS	Sieve 2SLS
<i>Panel A: Pure Groups</i>						
γ_1	Bias	0.500	-0.358	0.059	0.059	-0.022
	SE	0.000	2.799	0.118	0.118	0.236
	RMSE	0.500	2.815	0.131	0.131	0.236
γ_2	Bias	-1.995	0.749	-0.267	-0.267	0.098
	SE	0.005	18.300	0.560	0.560	1.115
	RMSE	1.995	18.270	0.619	0.619	1.116
γ_3	Bias	-0.005	-0.005	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
	SE	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005
	RMSE	0.007	0.007	0.005	0.005	0.005
F-test of the Instruments					Inf ^a	74.973
p-value					0.000	0.000
Over-identification Test					2.353	9.572
p-value					0.959	0.456
<i>Panel B: Networks</i>						
γ_1	Bias	0.168	-0.812	0.003	0.010	-0.018
	SE	0.060	0.416	0.041	0.041	0.084
	RMSE	0.178	0.912	0.041	0.042	0.085
γ_2	Bias	-0.271	0.792	-0.013	-0.028	0.037
	SE	0.131	0.414	0.106	0.106	0.194
	RMSE	0.301	0.894	0.106	0.109	0.196
γ_3	Bias	-0.005	-0.005	-0.001	-0.001	-0.001
	SE	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005	0.005
	RMSE	0.008	0.007	0.005	0.005	0.005
F-test of the Instruments					4835.600	49.192
p-value					0.000	0.000
Over-identification Test					10.424	8.721
p-value					0.468	0.514
Selection Correction		No	Group FE	Sieve	Sieve	Sieve
Instruments		No	No	No	$w_i \mathbf{z}$	z_i

Note: This table presents estimates of the social interaction parameters in the presence of endogenous social interactions. We report the mean biases, standard errors, and RMSE among 200 Monte Carlo samples, where each sample contains 5 groups and 1,660 individuals who join one of the groups. The basis functions include a polynomial series of the symmetric indices of utility differences and qualifications (up to order two). For the F-test of the instrument and the over-identification test, we report the average test statistics and average p-values among the 200 samples.

a. The F-statistic is infinity in 105 (out of 200) samples, while the average F-statistic in the remaining samples is 8×10^{13} . Because $w_i \mathbf{y}$ and $w_i \mathbf{z}$ are highly collinear, sieve 2SLS using $w_i \mathbf{z}$ as the instrument reduces to sieve OLS.

For networks (Panel B), the estimates obtained from OLS and OLS with school FE remain biased (Columns 1 and 2). However, after applying the selection correction, sieve OLS, sieve 2SLS with instruments $w_i\mathbf{z}$, and sieve 2SLS with instruments z_i all yield unbiased estimates (Columns 3–5).⁴⁸ This finding suggests that correcting for the selection bias is sufficient to produce unbiased estimates, as the individual-level variation in $w_i\mathbf{y}$ and $w_i\mathbf{x}$ can effectively resolve the reflection problem.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we explore linear-in-means social interactions with endogenous group formation. We adopt a two-sided many-to-one matching framework to characterize group formation and employ the limiting approximation of a market to simplify the selection bias. By assuming exchangeable unobservables in group formation, we establish that the selection bias can be represented as a group-invariant nonparametric function of an individual’s preference and qualification indices in group formation. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the excluded variables in group formation can serve as instruments to solve the reflection problem. Our approach is applicable to various adjacency matrices, regardless of whether our interest lies in peer effects among all group members or specific friends.

A Appendix

A.1 Adjacency Matrix: Examples

In this section, we verify Assumption 14 for adjacency matrices that are commonly used in the literature. All the proofs are provided in Appendix A.2.2.

Example A.1 (Group averages that include oneself). Suppose that \mathbf{w} represents group averages that include oneself and the group capacities are binding. We can write $w_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g} 1\{g_i = g\} 1\{g_j = g\}$. By construction, $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{j=1}^n |w_{ij}| = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} |w_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{\min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} n_g} = \frac{1}{n \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} r_g}$, where $r_g = \frac{n_g}{n} > 0$ for $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^4] \leq \frac{1}{n^4 \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} r_g^4} = O(n^{-4})$ and Assumption 14(i) and (ii) are satisfied.

to both sieve OLS and sieve 2SLS with instruments $w_i\mathbf{z}$ (Columns 3–5). This finding is consistent with the commonly observed pattern that 2SLS tends to yield larger standard errors than OLS.

⁴⁸The F-tests and over-identification tests confirm the validity of $w_i\mathbf{z}$ and z_i as the instruments.

Because n_g is a constant, w_{ij} is a function of g_i and g_j – once we know the groups that i and j join, we know w_{ij} . In this case, \mathbf{w} is a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$ and w_{ij} depends on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ only through ς_i and ς_j . Therefore, Assumption 14(iii), (v), and (vi) are satisfied. Furthermore, for group averages that include oneself we have $\mathbf{w}' = \mathbf{w}$ and $\mathbf{w}^2 = \mathbf{w}$.⁴⁹ Because $h_{ij}w_{ij}$ and $h_{kl}w_{kl}$ are independent for disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$, Assumption 14(iv) is satisfied.

Example A.2 (Group averages that exclude oneself). Suppose that \mathbf{w} represents group averages that exclude oneself and the group capacities are binding. We have $w_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g-1} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}$ for $i \neq j$ and $w_{ii} = 0$. Similarly as in Example A.1, we can show that Assumption 14(i)-(iii), (v) and (vi) are satisfied with $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$. To verify Assumption 14(iv), note that the (i, j) element of \mathbf{w}^r for $r \geq 1$ takes the form $(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G c_{ij,g}(r) \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}$, where $c_{ij,g}(r)$ is a constant that only depends on r and n_g .⁵⁰ This structure suggests that $(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}$ is a function of g_i and g_j . Hence, $h_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}$ and $h_{kl}(\mathbf{w}^r)_{kl}$ are independent for disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ and Assumption 14(iv) is satisfied.

Example A.3 (Dyadic networks). Suppose that individuals in a group form additional connections (for example, schoolmates make friends). Let $d_{ij,g}$ denote an indicator for whether individuals i and j are connected in group g and $d_{i,g} = \sum_{j=1}^n d_{ij,g} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}$ the number of connections that i has in group g . Suppose that no individual is isolated so $d_{i,g_i} > 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$. Typically, we specify $w_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{d_{ij,g}}{d_{i,g}} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}$ – if both i and j join group g , then j 's weight on i depends on whether j is connected to i , normalized by the number of connections that i has in the group.

Following the literature on dyadic network formation with fixed effects (Graham, 2017; Johnsson and Moon, 2021), we specify $d_{ij,g} = \mathbf{1}\{f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i, a_j) \geq \psi_{ij}\}$, $\forall i \neq j$, and $d_{ii,g} = 0$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\psi_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ represent individual- and pair-specific unobserved heterogeneity. Without loss of generality we normalize $\psi_{ij} \sim U[0, 1]$ and assume $0 \leq f_g \leq 1$. Denote $\mathbf{a} = (a_i, i \in \mathcal{N})$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi} = (\psi_{ij}, i, j \in \mathcal{N})$. Assume that (a) both a_i and ψ_{ij} are i.i.d., (b) $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is independent of $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a})$, and (c) $(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\psi})$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ conditional on $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$. The last is consistent with Assumption 1 – conditional on $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$, \mathbf{w} is a function of $(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\psi})$ and is thus independent

⁴⁹For any $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, $(\mathbf{w}^2)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^n w_{ik} w_{kj} = \sum_{k=1}^n (\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_k = g\}) (\sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g} \mathbf{1}\{g_k = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}) = \sum_{k=1}^n \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g^2} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_k = g\} = \sum_{g=1}^G \frac{1}{n_g} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\} = w_{ij}$, where we have used $n_g = \sum_{k=1}^n \mathbf{1}\{g_k = g\}$.

⁵⁰For example, $c_{ij,g}(2) = \frac{n_g-2}{(n_g-1)^2}$ for $i \neq j$ and $c_{ii,g}(2) = \frac{1}{n_g-1}$.

of ϵ . Let $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a})$, where $\varsigma_i = (x_i, z_i, g_i, a_i)$ is i.i.d. across i . Note that $\frac{1}{n-1}\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i] = \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{j \neq i}\mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g}1\{g_j = g\}|\varsigma_i] = \mathbb{E}[f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i, a_j)1\{g_j = g\}|\varsigma_i]$. We assume that $\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i, a_j)1\{g_j = g\}|\varsigma_i] \geq c > 0$.

Lemma A.1. *For \mathbf{w} in Example A.3, Assumption 14 is satisfied with $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a})$.*

Example A.4 (Group averages, continued). Examples A.1 and A.2 assume that the group capacities are binding. If a group has an infinite capacity (as in one-sided group formation) or does not reach its capacity, then the number of members in that group is determined endogenously. This setting can be regarded as a special case of Example A.3, where we set $d_{ij,g} = 1$ for all $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$ (including-oneself averages) or $d_{ij,g} = 1$ for all $i \neq j$ and $d_{ii,g} = 0$ (excluding-oneself averages). Similarly as in Lemma A.1, we can show that \mathbf{w} satisfies Assumption 14 with $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$.

Example A.5 (Strategic networks). Follow the setup in Example A.3. To account for strategic network formation, we specify instead $d_{ij,g} = 1\{f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i; \mathbf{x}) \geq \psi_{ij}\}$, $\forall i \neq j$, and $d_{ii,g} = 0$, where a_i and ψ_{ij} are specified as in Example A.3. The specification is motivated by strategic network formation with incomplete information (Leung, 2015; Ridder and Sheng, 2022), where we assume that \mathbf{x} is publicly observed by all the individuals, and a_i and $\psi_i = (\psi_{ij}, j \neq i)$ are privately observed by individual i . The presence of \mathbf{x} is to capture the equilibrium effect that results from strategic interactions. We impose the same assumptions on \mathbf{a} and $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ as in Example A.3 and set $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a})$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \sum_{j \neq i} f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i; \mathbf{x})1\{g_j = g\}$. We assume that $\min_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i; \mathbf{x}) \geq c > 0$.

Suppose that the model has a limiting approximation in the sense that for each $g \in \mathcal{G}$ we have $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[(f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i; \mathbf{x}) - f_g^*(x_i, x_j, a_i))^4] = O(n^{-2})$ for some function $0 \leq f_g^* \leq 1$. We assume $\min_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} f_g^*(x_i, x_j, a_i) \geq c^* > 0$.⁵¹

Lemma A.2. *For \mathbf{w} in Example A.5, Assumption 14 is satisfied with $\boldsymbol{\varsigma} = (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{a})$.*

A.2 Proofs

Notation Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the Euclidean norm. For an $n \times 1$ vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and an $n \times n$ matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$, $\|x\| = (\sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2)^{1/2}$ and $\|A\| = (\text{tr}(AA'))^{1/2} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$.

⁵¹Ridder and Sheng (2022, Section 5.2) demonstrated the existence of a limiting approximation.

A.2.1 Proofs in Sections 3–5

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Following [Azevedo and Leshno \(2016\)](#), we can show that $p_n \xrightarrow{p} p^*$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and the limiting cutoffs p^* are deterministic. The selection bias $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p)]$ is continuous in p because the cdf of the unobservables is continuous under Assumption 2(ii). Therefore, by the continuous mapping theorem, we have $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p_n)] \xrightarrow{p} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p^*)]$.

The selection bias evaluated at p^* satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}, \boldsymbol{\xi}, \boldsymbol{\eta}; p^*)] &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, \mathbf{x}_{-i}, z_i, \mathbf{z}_{-i}, g_i(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p^*), \mathbf{g}_{-i}(\mathbf{z}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{-i}; p^*)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i(z_i, \xi_i, \eta_i; p^*)], \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{x}_{-i} = (x_j, j \neq i)$ and $\mathbf{z}_{-i}, \mathbf{g}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{-i}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{-i}$ are defined analogously. The last equality follows because given deterministic cutoffs p^* , g_j only depends on z_j, ξ_j , and η_j for all $j \neq i$, which are independent of ϵ_i under Assumption 2(i). Combining the results proves the proposition. \square

Proof of Proposition 3.2. Let $f(\epsilon_i, \xi_i, \eta_i)$ denote the joint pdf of ϵ_i, ξ_i , and η_i , and $f(\xi_i, \eta_i)$ the joint pdf of ξ_i and η_i . By equation (2.4) and the exogeneity of x_i and z_i (Assumption 2(iii)), individual i 's selection bias from joining group g is $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | x_i, z_i, g_i = g] = \frac{\int_{R_g(\tau_i)} \epsilon_i f(\epsilon_i, \xi_i, \eta_i) d\epsilon_i d\xi_i d\eta_i}{\int_{R_g(\tau_i)} f(\xi_i, \eta_i) d\xi_i d\eta_i} =: \lambda_g(\tau_i)$, where $R_g(\tau_i)$ denotes the set $\{(\xi_i', \eta_i')' \in \mathbb{R}^{2G} : \eta_{gi} \geq p_g - z_i' \delta_g^v, \text{ and } \forall h \neq g, \xi_{ih} - \xi_{ig} < z_i'(\delta_g^u - \delta_h^u) \text{ or } \eta_{hi} < p_h - z_i' \delta_h^v\}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We focus on p in the proof and the identification of α can be established similarly. Suppose that our goal is to identify the cutoff p_g of group $g \neq 1$. Take another group $h \neq g, 1$. Let $\sigma_{h|g}^e(p_g - \tau_{ig}^v) := \Pr(g_i = h | p_g - \tau_{ig}^v) = \Pr(g_i = h | \tau_{ig}^v)$ denote the conditional probability that individual i joins group h given her qualification index for group g . The last equality holds because p_g is a constant, so conditioning on $p_g - \tau_{ig}^v$ is the same as conditioning on τ_{ig}^v . Similarly, let $\sigma_{h|1}^e(p_1 - \tau_{j1}^v) := \Pr(g_j = h | p_1 - \tau_{j1}^v) = \Pr(g_j = h | \tau_{j1}^v)$. By equation (2.4) and Assumption 3, $\sigma_{h|g}^e(\cdot)$ and $\sigma_{h|1}^e(\cdot)$ have the same functional form, that is, $\sigma_{h|g}^e(\cdot) = \sigma_{h|1}^e(\cdot) =: \sigma_h^e(\cdot)$. Moreover, because the unobservables have a strictly increasing cdf (Assumption 4(ii)), $\sigma_h^e(\cdot)$ is strictly monotone. Therefore, for any i and j such that $0 < \Pr(g_i = h | \tau_{ig}^v) = \Pr(g_j = h | \tau_{j1}^v) < 1$, because $\Pr(g_i = h | \tau_{ig}^v) = \sigma_h^e(p_g - \tau_{ig}^v)$ and $\Pr(g_j = h | \tau_{j1}^v) = \sigma_h^e(p_1 - \tau_{j1}^v)$, we obtain $p_g - \tau_{ig}^v = p_1 - \tau_{j1}^v$. This, together with Assumption 4(i), implies that $p_g = \tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v$ is identified. \square

Proof of Lemma 4.1. Suppose that the support of $X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\tau_i^e]$ is contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . There is a $d \times 1$ vector of constants $k \neq 0$ such that $k'(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\tau_i^e]) = k'X_i - \mathbb{E}[k'X_i|\tau_i^e] = 0$ with probability 1. Because $\mathbb{E}[k'X_i|\tau_i^e]$ is a function of τ_i^e , $k'X_i$ is a function of τ_i^e with probability 1.

To show the reverse, let $k \neq 0$ be the $d \times 1$ vector of constants such that $k'X_i$ is a function of τ_i^e with probability 1. This implies that with probability 1 we have $\mathbb{E}[k'X_i|\tau_i^e] = k'X_i$ and thus $k'(X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\tau_i^e]) = 0$. Therefore, the support of $X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i|\tau_i^e]$ is contained in a proper linear subspace of \mathbb{R}^d . \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Write $\hat{p}_g = (G-2)^{-1} \sum_{h=2, h \neq g}^G \hat{p}_{g,h}$, where

$$\hat{p}_{g,h} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v) - \hat{\sigma}_{h|1}(\hat{\tau}_{j1}^v)}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) (\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v - \hat{\tau}_{j1}^v)$$

for $h \neq 1, g$. To derive the asymptotic distribution of \hat{p}_g , we derive the influence function of each $\hat{p}_{g,h}$, and take their average to obtain the influence function of \hat{p}_g . Define $\hat{\tau}_i^v = (\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v, g \in \mathcal{G})$, $\hat{\sigma}_h = (\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}, \hat{\sigma}_{h|1})$, and the function

$$h_{gn}(\hat{\tau}_i^v, \hat{\tau}_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h) = \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v) - \hat{\sigma}_{h|1}(\hat{\tau}_{j1}^v)}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) (\hat{\tau}_{ig}^v - \hat{\tau}_{j1}^v). \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We can view $\hat{p}_{g,h}$ as a V -statistic with an asymmetric kernel h_{gn} . Decompose

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{p}_{g,h} - p_g^* &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (h_{gn}(\hat{\tau}_i^v, \hat{\tau}_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\hat{\tau}_i^v)) - h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\tau_i^v))) \\ &+ \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\tau_i^v)) - \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\tau_i^v))]) \\ &+ \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\tau_i^v))] - p_g^* =: T_{1n} + T_{2n} + T_{3n}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $\tau_i^v = (\tau_{ig}^v, g \in \mathcal{G})$ and $\sigma_h = (\sigma_{h|g}, \sigma_{h|1})$. T_{1n} captures the estimation error due to the first-step estimators $\hat{\delta}^v$ and $\hat{\sigma}_h$, T_{2n} captures the estimation error in the second step if properly centered, and T_{3n} captures the bias due to kernel smoothing.

Lemmas O.B.1 and O.B.2 show that $T_{1n} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and $T_{2n} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,2}(z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Lemma O.B.3 shows that $T_{3n} = o(n^{-1/2})$ and is thus negligible. Averaging over $h \neq 1, g$, we derive $\sqrt{n}(\hat{p}_g - p_g^*) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_g(z_i, g_i) + o_p(1)$, where $\psi_g(z_i, g_i) = (G-2)^{-1} \sum_{h \neq 1, g} (\psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i) + \psi_{g,h,2}(z_i))$ and $\mathbb{E}[\psi_g(z_i, g_i)] = 0$. By the Central Limit Theorem, we have $\sqrt{n}(\hat{p}_g - p_g^*) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, V_g)$, where $V_g =$

$\text{Var}(\psi_g(z_i, g_i))$. □

Proof of Theorem 5.2. Denote $Q(\gamma, \mu^Z) = m_0(\gamma, \mu^Z)'Wm_0(\gamma, \mu^Z)$ and $\hat{Q}_n(\gamma, \mu^Z) = \hat{m}_n(\gamma, \mu^Z)'\hat{W}\hat{m}_n(\gamma, \mu^Z)$. Fix $\delta > 0$. Let $\mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0) = \{\gamma \in \Gamma : \|\gamma - \gamma_0\| < \delta\}$ be an open δ -ball centered at γ_0 . If $Q(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z) < \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)} Q(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z)$, then $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)$. Therefore,

$$\Pr(\|\gamma - \gamma_0\| < \delta) \geq \Pr(Q(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z) < \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)} Q(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z)). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

From the triangle inequality and the optimality of $\hat{\gamma}$, we obtain $Q(\hat{\gamma}, \mu_0^Z) \leq \hat{Q}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z) + |\hat{Q}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z) - Q(\hat{\gamma}, \mu_0^Z)| \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\hat{Q}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) - Q(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)| + o_p(1)$. The uniform convergence of the moment in Lemma O.C.1 together with $\hat{W} - W = o_p(1)$ and the boundedness of W and $m_0(\gamma, \mu^Z)$ (Assumptions 11, 14(i), 15(i)) implies that $\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} |\hat{Q}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) - Q(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)| = o_p(1)$, and hence $Q(\hat{\gamma}, \mu_0^Z) = o_p(1)$.

By Assumption 15(i), $Wm_0(\gamma, \mu^Z) = 0$ if and only if $\gamma = \gamma_0$ and therefore $Q(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)$ has a unique minimizer at $\gamma = \gamma_0$. Hence, by the compactness of $\Gamma \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)$ and the continuity of $Q(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)$, we have $\inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)} Q(\gamma, \mu_0^Z) = Q(\bar{\gamma}, \mu_0^Z) > Q(\gamma_0, \mu_0^Z) = 0$ for some $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma \setminus \mathcal{B}_\delta(\gamma_0)$.

Combining the results we can see that the right-hand side of equation (A.3) goes to 1, and the consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$ is proved. □

Proof of Theorem 5.3. $\hat{\gamma}$ satisfies the first-order condition $\frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z)'}{\partial \gamma} \hat{W} \hat{m}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z) = 0$. Expanding the LHS around γ_0 and solving for $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0)$ gives

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0) = - \left(\frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z)'}{\partial \gamma} \hat{W} \frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\bar{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z)}{\partial \gamma'} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\mu}^Z)'}{\partial \gamma} \hat{W} \sqrt{n} \hat{m}_n(\gamma_0, \hat{\mu}^Z), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\bar{\gamma}$ is a mean value that lies between $\hat{\gamma}$ and γ_0 .

Consider the derivatives in equation (A.4). We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z)}{\partial \gamma'} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial m(\omega_i, \gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s))}{\partial \gamma'} \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s)) X_i' + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i^s) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s)) X_i' \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s)) X_i' + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma O.C.2. By definition $M_n = \mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\gamma_0, \mu_0^Z)}{\partial \gamma'}] =$

$-n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s))X_i']$. Lemma O.C.3 shows that $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n ((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s))X_i' - \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i^s))X_i']) = o_p(1)$. Therefore, $\frac{\partial \hat{m}_n(\gamma_0, \hat{\mu}^Z)}{\partial \gamma'} - M_n = o_p(1)$.

By Lemmas O.C.11 and O.C.12, the last term in equation (A.4) has the asymptotic distribution $\sqrt{n}\Omega_n^{-1/2}\hat{m}_n(\gamma_0, \hat{\mu}^Z) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I_{d_Z})$, where Ω_n is defined in Lemma O.C.12. By equation (A.4) and Slutsky's theorem, we obtain $\sqrt{n}\Sigma_n^{-1/2}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_0) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I_{d_\gamma})$, where $\Sigma_n = (M_n'WM_n)^{-1}M_n'W\Omega_nWM_n(M_n'WM_n)^{-1}$. \square

A.2.2 Proofs in Appendix A.1

Proof of Lemma A.1. By construction, $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} d_{i,g}}$. Observe that $\frac{1}{n-1}(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]) = o_p(1)$ by the law of large numbers. Because $\frac{1}{n-1}\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i] > c$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} (\frac{1}{n-1}d_{i,g})^4}] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\frac{1}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} (\frac{1}{n-1}\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i])^4}] < \infty$ by dominated convergence and thus $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^4] = O(n^{-4})$. Conditional on $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$, \mathbf{a} is independent of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, so we have $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[\nu_i|\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}] = 0$. Moreover, conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, \mathbf{w} is a function of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and is thus independent of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$.⁵² Hence, Assumptions 14(i)–(iii) are satisfied.

To verify Assumptions 14(iv)–(vi), define $w_{ij,g} = \frac{d_{ij,g}}{d_{i,g}}$, $\bar{w}_{ij,g} = \frac{\mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g}|\varsigma_i]}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]}$, and $e_{ij,g} = w_{ij,g} - \bar{w}_{ij,g}$. By Taylor expansion,

$$e_{ij,g} = -\frac{d_{ij,g}}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]^2}(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]) + \frac{d_{ij,g}}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]^3}(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i])^2 - \dots \quad (\text{A.5})$$

It suffices to consider the leading term in $e_{ij,g}$. Recall that $d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i] = \sum_{j \neq i} r_{ij,g}$, where $r_{ij,g} = d_{ij,g}1\{g_j = g\} - \mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g}1\{g_j = g\}|\varsigma_i]$. Note that $|r_{ij,g}| \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}|\varsigma_i] = 0$. For any $j \neq k$, conditional on ς_i , $r_{ij,g}$ is a function of $(x_j, a_j, \psi_{ij}, g_j)$ and $r_{ik,g}$ is a function of $(x_k, a_k, \psi_{ik}, g_k)$, so $r_{ij,g}$ and $r_{ik,g}$ are independent. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i])^4|\varsigma_i] &= \sum_{j,k,l,m \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}r_{ik,g}r_{il,g}r_{im,g}|\varsigma_i] \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}^4|\varsigma_i] + \sum_{j \neq k, j, k \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}^2r_{ik,g}^2|\varsigma_i] \leq O(n^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Combining the two displays yields $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^4] = O(n^{-6})$. Furthermore, summing over the groups we define $\bar{w}_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G \bar{w}_{ij,g}1\{g_i = g\}1\{g_j = g\}$ and $e_{ij} = w_{ij} - \bar{w}_{ij}$. From the previous results we obtain $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} |\bar{w}_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\varsigma_i]} \leq$

⁵²Because $(\mathbf{a}, \boldsymbol{\psi})$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ conditional on $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$, we can show that $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$.

$O(n^{-1})$ and $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^4] \leq G \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^4] = O(n^{-6})$.

Assumption 14(v). For any disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$, we have $\text{Cov}(w_{ij}, w_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = \text{Cov}(w_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = \text{Cov}(e_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})$. The first equality holds because conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, w_{ij} is a function of $(\psi_{i\tilde{j}}, \tilde{j} \in \mathcal{N}_{g_i} \setminus \{i\})$, where $\mathcal{N}_{g_i} = \{j : g_j = g_i\}$, and \bar{w}_{kl} is a function of ψ_{kl} , so $\text{Cov}(w_{ij}, \bar{w}_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = 0$. The second equality follows similarly from $\text{Cov}(\bar{w}_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = 0$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Jensen's inequality, $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(e_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^2] \leq C \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^4]$. Therefore, $\max_{i,j,k,l \in \mathcal{N}: \{i,j\} \cap \{k,l\} = \emptyset} \mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(w_{ij}, w_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^2] = O(n^{-6}) = o(n^{-4}/K)$ because $K/n^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Moreover, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{N}$, $\mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j] = \mathbb{E}[e_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$ because \bar{w}_{ij} depends on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ only through ς_i and ς_j and thus $\mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$. We can bound $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[e_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j])^4] \leq C \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^4]$. Hence, $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij} | \varsigma_i, \varsigma_j])^4] = O(n^{-6}) = o(n^{-4}/K^2)$ because $K/n \rightarrow 0$. Assumption 14(v) is satisfied.

Assumption 14(vi). For $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ that overlap in one element, \bar{w}_{ij} and \bar{w}_{kl} are independent conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$. Therefore, $\text{Cov}(w_{ij}, w_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = \text{Cov}(e_{ij}, \bar{w}_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) + \text{Cov}(\bar{w}_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) + \text{Cov}(e_{ij}, e_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and Jensen's inequality, we can bound $\mathbb{E}[\text{Cov}(e_{ij}, \bar{w}_{kl} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})^2] \leq C(\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^4] \mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{kl}^4])^{1/2} = O(n^{-5}) = o(n^{-4})$ uniformly. Assumption 14(vi) thus holds.

Assumption 14(iv). For any $r \geq 1$, $(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij} = \sum_{(t_0, \dots, t_r): (t_0, t_r) = (i, j)} \dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}$, where $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r} = \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} w_{t_s t_{s+1}}$ and the sum is over tuples (t_0, \dots, t_r) with $t_0 = i$ and $t_r = j$. For any disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$, we can write $\text{Cov}(h_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}, h_{kl}(\mathbf{w}^{\tilde{r}})_{kl})$ as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{(t_0, \dots, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}): (t_0, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}) = (i, j, k, l), \\ \{t_0, \dots, t_r\} \cap \{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}\} \neq \emptyset}} \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, h_{kl} \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}) \\ & + \sum_{\substack{(t_0, \dots, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}): (t_0, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}) = (i, j, k, l), \\ \{t_0, \dots, t_r\} \cap \{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}\} = \emptyset}} \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, h_{kl} \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The first sum consists of $O(n^{(r+\tilde{r})-3})$ terms, and each term can be bounded uniformly by $C(\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^{r+\tilde{r}}] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^r] \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^{\tilde{r}}]) = O(n^{-(r+\tilde{r})})$. Hence, the first sum in (A.7) is $O(n^{(r+\tilde{r})-3}) \cdot O(n^{-(r+\tilde{r})}) = o(n^{-2})$, uniformly in i, j, k, l, r , and \tilde{r} . The second sum in (A.7) consists of $O(n^{(r+\tilde{r})-2})$ terms. To derive a uniform bound on each term, for disjoint $\{t_0, \dots, t_r\}$ and $\{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}\}$ with $(t_0, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}) = (i, j, k, l)$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, h_{kl} \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}) \\ & = \mathbb{E}[h_{ij} h_{kl} \text{Cov}(\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma})] + \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]). \end{aligned}$$

Define $\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r} = \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} \bar{w}_{t_s t_{s+1}}$ and $e_{t_0, \dots, t_r} = \dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r} - \dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}$. For any t_0, \dots, t_r , by continuous mapping and Slutsky's theorem we can bound e_{t_0, \dots, t_r} uniformly by $o_p(n^{-r})$. Observe that $\text{Cov}(\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = \text{Cov}(\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, e_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = \text{Cov}(e_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, e_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma})$. The first equality holds because conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}$ is a function of $(\psi_{t_s j}, j \in \mathcal{N}_{g_{t_s}} \setminus \{t_s\}, s = 0, \dots, r-1)$ and $\dot{\bar{w}}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}$ is a function of $(\psi_{\tilde{t}_s \tilde{t}_{s+1}}, s = 0, \dots, \tilde{r}-1)$, and thus $\text{Cov}(\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, \dot{\bar{w}}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = 0$. The second equality follows similarly from $\text{Cov}(\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, e_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) = 0$. Therefore, from the boundedness of h_{ij} and dominated convergence, we obtain that $\mathbb{E}[h_{ij} h_{kl} \text{Cov}(\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}, \dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma})]$ has a uniform bound that is of the rate of $o(n^{-(r+\tilde{r})})$.

Moreover, because $\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}$ depends on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ only through $\varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}$, $\mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}]$. For disjoint $\{t_0, \dots, t_r\}$ and $\{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}\}$ with $(t_0, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}) = (i, j, k, l)$, $h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}]$ and $h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}]$ are independent. Hence, $\text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]) = \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[e_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]) + \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[e_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{\bar{w}}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}] + \text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[e_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[e_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}])$. Similarly as before, we can derive that $\text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}])$ has a uniform bound that is $o(n^{-(r+\tilde{r})})$. Combining the results yields Assumption 14(iv). \square

Proof of Lemma A.2. For any $j \neq k$, conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, $d_{ij,g}$ is a function of ψ_{ij} and $d_{ik,g}$ is a function of ψ_{ik} , so $d_{ij,g}$ and $d_{ik,g}$ are independent. Hence, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}])^2] = O(n)$ and thus $\frac{1}{n-1}(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]) = o_p(1)$. Note that $c < \frac{1}{n-1} \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \leq 1$ for all $i \in \mathcal{N}$ and $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Following the argument in Lemma A.1, we can show that Assumptions 14(i)–(iii) are satisfied.

To verify Assumptions 14(iv)–(vi), modify $\bar{w}_{ij,g}$ and $e_{ij,g}$ in Lemma A.1 with $\bar{w}_{ij,g} = \frac{d_{ij,g}}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]}$ and $e_{ij,g} = w_{ij,g} - \bar{w}_{ij,g}$. Write $d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \sum_{j \neq i} r_{ij,g}$, where $r_{ij,g} = d_{ij,g} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\} - \mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]$. Observe that $|r_{ij,g}| \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = 0$. For any $j \neq k$, $r_{ij,g}$ and $r_{ik,g}$ are independent conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(d_{i,g} - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}])^4 | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] &= \sum_{j,k,l,m \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g} r_{ik,g} r_{il,g} r_{im,g} | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \\ &= \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}^4 | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] + \sum_{j \neq k, j, k \neq i} \mathbb{E}[r_{ij,g}^2 r_{ik,g}^2 | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \leq O(n^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Combining a modification of equation (A.5) where we replace $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_i]$ with $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]$ and equation (A.8) yields $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^4] = O(n^{-6})$. Furthermore, summing over the groups we define $\bar{w}_{ij} = \sum_{g=1}^G \bar{w}_{ij,g} \mathbf{1}\{g_i = g\} \mathbf{1}\{g_j = g\}$ and $e_{ij} = w_{ij} - \bar{w}_{ij}$. From the previous results we obtain $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} |\bar{w}_{ij}| \leq \frac{1}{\min_{i \in \mathcal{N}} \min_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}| \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]} \leq O(n^{-1})$

and $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^4] \leq G \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^4] = O(n^{-6})$. Conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, \bar{w}_{ij} is a function of ψ_{ij} .

With the modified \bar{w}_{ij} , the rest of the proof in Lemma A.1 still holds, except that \bar{w}_{ij} also depends on ς_k , $k \neq i, j$, due to the presence of strategic interactions. In fact, $\mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]1\{g_i = g\}1\{g_j = g\}$ and $\mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \frac{\mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]} = \frac{f_{ij,g}}{\sum_{k \neq i} f_{ik,g}1\{g_k = g\}}$, where $f_{ij,g}$ is shorthand for $f_g(x_i, x_j, a_i; \boldsymbol{x})$. To overcome this problem, we utilize the limiting approximation of the model.

Define $d_{ij,g}^* = 1\{f_{ij,g}^* \geq \psi_{ij}\}$ for $i \neq j$, $d_{ii,g}^* = 0$, and $d_{i,g}^* = \sum_{j=1}^n d_{ij,g}^*1\{g_j = g\}$, where $f_{ij,g}^*$ is shorthand for $f_g^*(x_i, x_j, a_i)$. Define $\bar{w}_{ij,g}^* = \frac{d_{ij,g}^*}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]}$, $e_{ij,g}^* = \bar{w}_{ij,g} - \bar{w}_{ij,g}^*$, $\bar{w}_{ij}^* = \sum_{g=1}^G \bar{w}_{ij,g}^*1\{g_i = g\}1\{g_j = g\}$, and $e_{ij}^* = \bar{w}_{ij} - \bar{w}_{ij}^*$. Note that $w_{ij} = e_{ij} + e_{ij}^* + \bar{w}_{ij}^*$. Because $\mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[\bar{w}_{ij}^*|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$, we can write $\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j] = \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j] + \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$. The proof in Lemma A.1 provides a bound for $\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$. Here we derive a similar bound for $\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]$. By Taylor expansion,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{ij,g}^* &= \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]}(d_{ij,g} - d_{ij,g}^*) - \frac{d_{ij,g}^*}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]^2}(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]^2}(d_{ij,g} - d_{ij,g}^*)(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]) \\ &\quad + \frac{d_{ij,g}^*}{\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i]^3}(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i])^2 - \dots \end{aligned} \tag{A.9}$$

It suffices to consider the first two leading terms. By the limiting approximation, we derive $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[d_{ij,g} - d_{ij,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4] = \mathbb{E}[(f_{ij,g} - f_{ij,g}^*)^4] = O(n^{-2})$ uniformly. Moreover, observe that $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \sum_{j \neq i} f_{ij,g}1\{g_j = g\}$, $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \sum_{j \neq i} f_{ij,g}^*1\{g_j = g\}$, and $\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i] = \sum_{j \neq i} \mathbb{E}[f_{ij,g}^*1\{g_j = g\}|\varsigma_i]$. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the limiting approximation, we can bound $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}])^4] \leq (n-1)^4 \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[(f_{ij,g} - f_{ij,g}^*)^4] = O(n^2)$. Next, note that for any $j \neq k$, $f_{ij,g}^*1\{g_j = g\}$ and $f_{ik,g}^*1\{g_k = g\}$ are independent conditional on ς_i . Similarly as in equation (A.6), we can thus derive $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i])^4] = O(n^2)$ uniformly. Therefore, by $(a+b)^4 \leq 8(a^4 + b^4)$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[d_{i,g}^*|\varsigma_i])^4] = O(n^2)$ uniformly. Combining these results with equation (A.9) yields $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4] = O(n^{-6})$ and hence $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4] \leq G \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij,g}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4] = O(n^{-6})$. By iterated expectations and Jensen's inequality $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]^4] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4]$, so we obtain the uniform bound $\max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j])^4] \leq C \max_{i,j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e_{ij}^*|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]^4] = O(n^{-6})$. This

proves that Assumption 14(vi) is satisfied.

Assumption 14(v) can be justified by the same proof as in Lemma A.1. As for Assumption 14(iv), the proof in Lemma A.1 remains valid except the last paragraph. Define $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^* = \prod_{s=0}^{r-1} \bar{w}_{t_s t_{s+1}}^*$. Because $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^*$ depends on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ only through $\varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}$, $\mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^* | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^* | \varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}]$. For disjoint $\{t_0, \dots, t_r\}$ and $\{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}\}$ with $(t_0, t_r, \tilde{t}_0, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}) = (i, j, k, l)$, $h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^* | \varsigma_{t_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{t_r}]$ and $h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}^* | \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_0}, \dots, \varsigma_{\tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}]$ are independent. Using a similar argument as in Lemma A.1 with $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^*$ in place of $\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}$, we derive that $\text{Cov}(h_{ij} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{t_0, \dots, t_r}^* | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}], h_{kl} \mathbb{E}[\dot{w}_{\tilde{t}_0, \dots, \tilde{t}_{\tilde{r}}}^* | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}])$ has a uniform bound that is $o(n^{-(r+\tilde{r})})$. Assumption 14(iv) is thus satisfied. \square

References

- ABDULKADIROĞLU, A. AND T. SÖNMEZ (2003): “School Choice: A Mechanism Design Approach,” *American Economic Review*, 93, 729–747.
- AGARWAL, N. (2015): “An Empirical Model of the Medical Match,” *American Economic Review*, 105, 1939–1978.
- ALTONJI, J. G. AND R. L. MATZKIN (2005): “Cross Section and Panel Data Estimators for Nonseparable Models with Endogenous Regressors,” *Econometrica*, 73, 1053–1102.
- ANDREWS, D. W. (1994): “Empirical Process Methods in Econometrics,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 4, 2247–2294.
- ARTEMOV, G., Y.-K. CHE, AND Y. HE (2020): “Strategic ‘Mistakes’: Implications for Market Design Research,” Manuscript.
- AUERBACH, E. (2022): “Identification and Estimation of a Partially Linear Regression Model Using Network Data,” *Econometrica*, 90, 347–365.
- AZEVEDO, E. M. AND J. D. LESHNO (2016): “A Supply and Demand Framework for Two-Sided Matching Markets,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 124, 1235–1268.
- BAYER, P., S. L. ROSS, AND G. TOPA (2008): “Place of Work and Place of Residence: Informal Hiring Networks and Labor Market Outcomes,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 116, 1150–1196.

- BLUME, L. E., W. A. BROCK, S. N. DURLAUF, AND Y. M. IOANNIDES (2011): “Identification of Social Interactions,” in *Handbook of Social Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 1, 853–964.
- BRAMOULLÉ, Y., H. DJEBBARI, AND B. FORTIN (2009): “Identification of Peer Effects Through Social Networks,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 150, 41–55.
- BROCK, W. A. AND S. N. DURLAUF (2001): “Interactions-Based Models,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 5, 3297–3380.
- (2005): “Multinomial Choice with Social Interactions,” in *The Economy As an Evolving Complex System, III*, Oxford University Press, 175–206.
- CHEN, X. (2007): “Large Sample Sieve Estimation of Semi-Nonparametric Models,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 6B, 5549–5632.
- DAS, M., W. K. NEWEY, AND F. VELLA (2003): “Nonparametric Estimation of Sample Selection Models,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, 33–58.
- DAVEZIES, L., X. D’HAULTFOEUILLE, AND D. FOUGÈRE (2009): “Identification of Peer Effects Using Group Size Variation,” *Econometrics Journal*, 12, 397–413.
- DUFLO, E., P. DUPAS, AND M. KREMER (2011): “Peer Effects, Teacher Incentives, and the Impact of Tracking: Evidence from a Randomized Evaluation in Kenya,” *American Economic Review*, 101, 1739–1774.
- EPPLE, D. AND R. E. ROMANO (2011): “Peer Effects in Education: A Survey of the Theory and Evidence,” in *Handbook of Social Economics*, Elsevier, vol. 1, 1053–1163.
- EVANS, W. N., W. E. OATES, AND R. M. SCHWAB (1992): “Measuring Peer Group Effects: A Study of Teenage Behavior,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 100, 966–991.
- FACK, G., J. GRENET, AND Y. HE (2019): “Beyond Truth-Telling: Preference Estimation with Centralized School Choice and College Admissions,” *American Economic Review*, 109, 1486–1529.
- FOX, J. T., C. YANG, AND D. H. HSU (2018): “Unobserved Heterogeneity in Matching Games,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 126, 1339–1373.

- GALE, D. AND L. SHAPLEY (1962): “College Admissions and the Stability of Marriage,” *American Mathematical Monthly*, 69, 9–15.
- GANDHI, A. (2022): “Picking Your Patients: Selective Admissions in the Nursing Home Industry,” *SSRN:3613950*.
- GANDHI, A. AND J.-F. HOUDE (2019): “Measuring Substitution Patterns in Differentiated-Products Industries,” *NBER Working Paper 26375*.
- GOLDSMITH-PINKHAM, P. AND G. W. IMBENS (2013): “Social Networks and the Identification of Peer Effects,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 31, 253–264.
- GRAHAM, B. S. (2008): “Identifying Social Interactions Through Conditional Variance Restrictions,” *Econometrica*, 76, 643–660.
- (2017): “An Econometric Model of Network Formation With Degree Heterogeneity,” *Econometrica*, 85, 1033–1063.
- HAHN, J. AND G. RIDDER (2013): “Asymptotic Variance of Semiparametric Estimators With Generated Regressors,” *Econometrica*, 81, 315–340.
- HE, Y., S. SINHA, AND X. SUN (2022): “Identification and Estimation in Many-to-One Two-Sided Matching without Transfers,” *arXiv:2104.02009 [econ.EM]*.
- HECKMAN, J. J. (1979): “Sample Selection Bias as a Specification Error,” *Econometrica*, 47, 153–161.
- HECKMAN, J. J., H. ICHIMURA, AND P. TODD (1998): “Matching as an Econometric Evaluation Estimator,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 65, 261–294.
- HOEFFDING, W. (1948): “A Class of Statistics with Asymptotically Normal Distribution,” *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 293–325.
- HSIEH, C.-S. AND L. F. LEE (2016): “A Social Interactions Model with Endogenous Friendship Formation and Selectivity,” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 31, 301–319.
- IOANNIDES, Y. M. AND J. E. ZABEL (2008): “Interactions, Neighborhood Selection and Housing Demand,” *Journal of Urban Economics*, 63, 229–252.

- JOHANSSON, I. AND H. R. MOON (2021): “Estimation of Peer Effects in Endogenous Social Networks: Control Function Approach,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1–51.
- KATZ, L. F., J. R. KLING, AND J. B. LIEBMAN (2001): “Moving to Opportunity in Boston: Early Results of a Randomized Mobility Experiment,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 607–654.
- LEE, A. J. (1990): *U-Statistics: Theory and Practice*, CRC Press.
- LEE, L.-F. (2002): “Consistency and Efficiency of Least Squares Estimation for Mixed Regressive, Spatial Augmented Regressive Models,” *Econometric Theory*, 18, 252–277.
- (2007): “Identification and Estimation of Econometric Models with Group Interactions, Contextual Factors and Fixed Effects,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 140, 333–374.
- LEUNG, M. P. (2015): “Two-Step Estimation of Network-Formation Models with Incomplete Information,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 188, 182–195.
- LEUNG, M. P. AND H. R. MOON (2023): “Normal Approximation in Large Network Models,” *arXiv:1904.11060 [econ.EM]*.
- LI, Q. AND J. S. RACINE (2007): *Nonparametric Econometrics: Theory and Practice*, Princeton University Press.
- MANSKI, C. F. (1993): “Identification of Endogenous Social Effects: The Reflection Problem,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, 531–542.
- MENZEL, K. (2015): “Large Matching Markets as Two-Sided Demand Systems,” *Econometrica*, 83, 897–941.
- (2021): “Central Limit Theory for Models of Strategic Network Formation,” *arXiv:2111.01678 [econ.GN]*.
- NEWBY, W. K. (1994a): “The Asymptotic Variance of Semiparametric Estimators,” *Econometrica*, 62, 1349–1382.
- (1994b): “Kernel Estimation of Partial Means and a General Variance Estimator,” *Econometric Theory*, 10, 233–253.

- (1997): “Convergence Rates and Asymptotic Normality for Series Estimators,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 79, 147–168.
- NEWKEY, W. K. AND D. MCFADDEN (1994): “Large Sample Estimation and Hypothesis Testing,” in *Handbook of Econometrics*, Elsevier, vol. 4, 2111–2245.
- POWELL, J. L., J. H. STOCK, AND T. M. STOKER (1989): “Semiparametric Estimation of Index Coefficients,” *Econometrica*, 57, 1403–1430.
- RIDDER, G. AND S. SHENG (2022): “Two-Step Estimation of A Strategic Network Formation Model with Clustering,” *arXiv:2001.03838 [econ.EM]*.
- ROBINSON, P. M. (1988): “Root-N-Consistent Semiparametric Regression,” *Econometrica*, 56, 931.
- ROTH, A. E. (1984): “The Evolution of the Labor Market for Medical Interns and Residents: A Case Study in Game Theory,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 92, 991–1016.
- ROTH, A. E. AND M. SOTOMAYOR (1992): “Two-Sided Matching,” in *Handbook of Game Theory with Economic Applications*, Elsevier, vol. 1, 485–541.
- SACERDOTE, B. (2001): “Peer Effects with Random Assignment: Results for Dartmouth Roommates,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 681–704.
- SERFLING, R. J. (1980): *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons.
- SUN, X. (2019): “Identification and Estimation of Many-to-One Matching with an Application to the U.S. College Admissions,” *Working Paper, UCLA*.
- TRAIN, K. E. (2009): *Discrete Choice Methods with Simulation*, Cambridge University Press.
- WEYL, H. (1946): *The Classical Groups: Their Invariants and Representations*, Princeton University Press.
- WOOLDRIDGE, J. M. (2010): *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, The MIT Press.

Online Appendix to

Social Interactions with Endogenous Group Formation

Shuyang Sheng Xiaoting Sun

O.A Simulations: Group Formation Parameters

We use maximum simulated likelihood (MSL) to estimate the parameter $\theta = (\delta', p', \alpha)'$. To this end, we simulate R draws from the multivariate standard normal distribution, denoted as $\eta_i^{(1)}, \dots, \eta_i^{(R)}$, and compute the simulated conditional probability

$$\check{\sigma}_g(z_i) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{\exp(\alpha_g + \delta_1^u z_{1,ig}^u + \delta_2^u z_{2,i}) \cdot 1\{\delta_1^v z_{1,ig}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{gi}^{(r)} \geq p_g\}}{\sum_{k=1}^G \exp(\alpha_k + \delta_1^u z_{1,ik}^u + \delta_2^u z_{2,i}) \cdot 1\{\delta_1^v z_{1,ik}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{ki}^{(r)} \geq p_k\}} + 1, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}$$

$$\check{\sigma}_0(z_i) = \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r=1}^R \frac{1}{\sum_{k=1}^G \exp(\alpha_k + \delta_1^u z_{1,ik}^u + \delta_2^u z_{2,i}) \cdot 1\{\delta_1^v z_{1,ik}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{ki}^{(r)} \geq p_k\}} + 1.$$

The MSL estimator $\hat{\theta}$ maximizes $L(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{g=0}^G 1\{g_i = g\} \log \check{\sigma}_g(z_i)$. To mitigate the numerical difficulties caused by the nonsmoothness of the indicator functions, we replace $1\{\delta_1^v z_{1,ig}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{gi}^{(r)} \geq p_g\}$ with a smoothed A-R simulator (Train, 2009) $(1 + \exp(p_g - (\delta_1^v z_{1,ig}^v + \delta_2^v z_{2,i} + \eta_{gi}^{(r)})) / \kappa)^{-1}$, where $\kappa > 0$ is a scale factor specified as 0.05.⁵³ Table O.A.1 shows the estimation results.

O.B Lemmas for the Asymptotics of \hat{p} and $\hat{\alpha}$

Notation Define $\tau_i^v(\delta^v) = (\tau_{ig}^v(\delta_g^v), g \in \mathcal{G})$. Then $\tau_i^v = \tau_i^v(\delta_0^v)$ and $\hat{\tau}_i^v = \tau_i^v(\hat{\delta}^v)$. For $h \neq 1, g$, define $\sigma_h(\delta^v) = (\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v(\delta_g^v)), \sigma_{h|1}(\tau_{i1}^v(\delta_1^v)))$ and $\hat{\sigma}_h(\delta^v) = (\hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v(\delta_g^v)), \hat{\sigma}_{h|1}(\tau_{i1}^v(\delta_1^v)))$. For any $g \neq h$, define $\pi_{h|g,i} = \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)$ and $\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} = \hat{\sigma}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)$. Under

⁵³The smaller κ is, the better the simulator approximates the indicator function.

Table O.A.1: Estimation Results for Group Formation

Group Formation Slope Parameters			Group Fixed Effects			Cutoffs		
	Bias	SE		Bias	SE		Bias	SE
δ_1^u	0.026	0.073	α_1	0.101	0.652	p_1	0.048	0.142
δ_1^v	0.025	0.196	α_2	0.049	0.472	p_2	0.014	0.163
δ_2^u	-0.047	0.039	α_3	-0.031	0.448	p_3	0.002	0.163
δ_2^v	-0.069	0.044	α_4	-0.044	0.467	p_4	-0.027	0.177
			α_5	-0.056	0.519	p_5	0.004	0.226

Note: This table shows the estimates of group formation parameters using the 200 Monte Carlo samples. Each sample contains 5 groups and 2,000 individuals.

Assumption 4(ii), the inverse of $\sigma_{h|g}(\cdot)$ exists and hence $\tau_{ig}^v = \sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})$.⁵⁴ Denote the pdf of $\pi_{h|g,i}$ by $f_{\pi_{h|g}}$. Let $0 < C < \infty$ be a universal constant.

Lemma O.B.1. *The term T_{1n} in equation (A.2) satisfies $T_{1n} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i)$ is defined in equation (O.B.8).*

Proof. We decompose T_{1n} as

$$\begin{aligned}
 T_{1n} &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (h_{gn}(\hat{\tau}_i^v, \hat{\tau}_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\hat{\delta}^v)) - h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))) \\
 &\quad + \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v)) - h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))) \\
 &=: T_{1n}^\delta + T_{1n}^\sigma,
 \end{aligned} \tag{O.B.1}$$

where T_{1n}^δ and T_{1n}^σ captures the estimation error due to $\hat{\delta}^v$ and $\hat{\sigma}_h$, respectively.

Step 1: we start with T_{1n}^σ in equation (O.B.1). Define the remainder term

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{n,ij} &= \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) - \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2'\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) ((\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i}) - (\hat{\pi}_{h|1,j} - \pi_{h|1,j})) \\
 &= \frac{1}{2} \zeta_{2n}^{-3} K_2''(\Delta_{n,ij}) ((\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i}) - (\hat{\pi}_{h|1,j} - \pi_{h|1,j}))^2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows by Taylor expansion, with $\Delta_{n,ij}$ an intermediate value

⁵⁴Under Assumption 4(ii), $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau)$ is strictly monotone and thus its inverse function $\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\tau)$ exists.

between $\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}$ and $\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} T_{1n}^\sigma &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2' \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) \\ &\quad \cdot ((\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i}) - (\hat{\pi}_{h|1,j} - \pi_{h|1,j})) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n R_{n,ij} (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v). \end{aligned}$$

For any $g \neq h$, write $\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} = \hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) / \hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v)$, where $\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) = \frac{1}{n\zeta_{1n}} \sum_{k=1}^n 1\{g_k = h\} K_1 \left(\frac{\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{kg}^v}{\zeta_{1n}} \right)$ and $\hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) = \frac{1}{n\zeta_{1n}} \sum_{k=1}^n K_1 \left(\frac{\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{kg}^v}{\zeta_{1n}} \right)$. Moreover, let $b_g(\tau_{ig}^v)$ denote the pdf of τ_{ig}^v , and define $b_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) = \pi_{h|g,i} b_g(\tau_{ig}^v)$. We express $\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i}$ as a linear functional of the kernel estimators $\hat{b}_{h|g}$ and \hat{b}_g . Specifically, we follow [Newey and McFadden \(1994, p.2204\)](#) and [Newey \(1994b, Lemma B.3\)](#)⁵⁵ and derive

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_i |\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i} - 1/b_g(\tau_{ig}^v) (\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - \hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) \pi_{h|g,i})| \\ & \leq \max_i 1 / (|\hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) b_g(\tau_{ig}^v)| (1 + \pi_{h|g,i})) ((\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - b_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v))^2 + (\hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) - b_g(\tau_{ig}^v))^2) \\ & \leq O_p(1) \sup_{\tau} ((\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau) - b_{h|g}(\tau))^2 + (\hat{b}_g(\tau) - b_g(\tau))^2) \\ & = O_p(((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1})^2), \end{aligned} \tag{O.B.2}$$

where the second inequality holds because $b_g(\cdot)$ is bounded away from zero under Assumption 8(i) and $\hat{b}_g(\cdot)$ is uniformly close to $b_g(\cdot)$. Under Assumption 9(i), we can bound the linearization error as $\zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_i |\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i} - 1/b_g(\tau_{ig}^v) (\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - \hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) \pi_{h|g,i})| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ and similarly $\zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_{i,j} |\hat{\pi}_{h|1,i} - \pi_{h|1,i} - 1/b_1(\tau_{i1}^v) (\hat{b}_{h|1}(\tau_{i1}^v) - \hat{b}_1(\tau_{i1}^v) \pi_{h|1,i})| = o_p(n^{-1/2})$. Applying the boundedness of $K_2'(\cdot)$ and τ_{ig}^v (Assumptions 7(ii)(iii), 10(i), and 11(i)) we can see that the overall linearization error is $o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Furthermore, observe that $\max_i |1/b_g(\tau_{ig}^v) (\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - \hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) \pi_{h|g,i})| \leq C \sup_{\tau} (|\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau) - b_{h|g}(\tau)| + |\hat{b}_g(\tau) - b_g(\tau)|) = O_p((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1})$ by [Newey \(1994b, Lemma B.3\)](#). Combining this with equation (O.B.2) yields $\max_i |\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i}| = O_p((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1})$ and similarly for $\hat{\pi}_{h|1,j} - \pi_{h|1,j}$. Hence, by Assumptions 7(ii)(iii), Assumption 8(i), 9(i), 10(i), and 11(i), the remainder term is negligible, that is, $\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n |R_{n,ij} (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v)| = \zeta_{2n}^{-3} O_p(((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1})^2) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

⁵⁵Lemma B.3 in [Newey \(1994b\)](#) holds by Assumptions 6, 8(ii)(iii), 10(i), 11(i), and $n^{1/2} \zeta_{1n} / \ln n \rightarrow \infty$. The last condition is implied by Assumption 9(ii). To see this, note that the second condition of Assumption 9(ii) implies that $n\zeta_{1n}^3 \rightarrow \infty$, or $\zeta_{1n} = c_n n^{-1/3}$ with $c_n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, $n^{1/2} \zeta_{1n} / \ln n = c_n n^{1/2} / \ln n \rightarrow \infty$, and Lemma B.3 in [Newey \(1994b\)](#) holds under the assumptions we impose here.

Overall, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{1n}^\sigma &= \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2' \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(\frac{\hat{b}_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - \hat{b}_g(\tau_{ig}^v) \pi_{h|g,i}}{b_g(\tau_{ig}^v)} - \frac{\hat{b}_{h|1}(\tau_{j1}^v) - \hat{b}_1(\tau_{j1}^v) \pi_{h|1,j}}{b_1(\tau_{j1}^v)} \right) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \text{(O.B.3)}
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\omega_i = (\tau_i^v, g_i)$. Plugging in the expressions of the kernel estimators, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{1n}^\sigma &= \frac{1}{n^2(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n 1\{i \neq j\} q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_k) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^n 1\{i \neq j \neq k\} q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_k) + o_p(n^{-1/2}) \\
&=: Q_n + o_p(n^{-1/2}), \tag{O.B.4}
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
&q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_k) \\
&= \frac{1}{\zeta_{1n} \zeta_{2n}^2} K_2' \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) \\
&\quad \cdot \left(K_1 \left(\frac{\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{kg}^v}{\zeta_{1n}} \right) \frac{1\{g_k = h\} - \pi_{h|g,i}}{b_g(\tau_{ig}^v)} - K_1 \left(\frac{\tau_{j1}^v - \tau_{k1}^v}{\zeta_{1n}} \right) \frac{1\{g_k = h\} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{b_1(\tau_{j1}^v)} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The second equality in (O.B.4) follows because the terms with $i = k$ or $j = k$ are negligible.⁵⁶ Q_n is a V -statistic of degree 3 with an asymmetric kernel function.

We derive an asymptotically linear representation of Q_n using the idea of Hoeffding projection (Hoeffding, 1948). Let $I = (i_1, i_2, i_3)$ with $i_1 \neq i_2 \neq i_3$ and $\omega_I = (\omega_i : i \in I)$. We can write $Q_n = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_I q_n(\omega_I)$. Define $q_n^*(\omega_i) = \frac{1}{(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{I:i \in I} \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I) | \omega_i]$ and $Q_n^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n q_n^*(\omega_i) - 2\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)]$. Observe that $\mathbb{E}[q_n^*(\omega_i)] = 3\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)]$ and thus $\mathbb{E}[Q_n - Q_n^*] = 0$.⁵⁷ By construction, we obtain $\text{Cov}(Q_n, Q_n^*) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(Q_n, q_n^*(\omega_i))$ and for each i ,

$$\text{Cov}(Q_n, q_n^*(\omega_i)) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{I:i \in I} \text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n^*(\omega_i))$$

⁵⁶The terms with $i = k$ are negligible because $\frac{1}{n^2(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n 1\{i \neq j\} q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_i) \leq (n\zeta_{1n}\zeta_{2n}^2)^{-1} \sup_t |K_1(t)| \sup_t |K_2'(t)| \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n 1\{i \neq j\} |\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v| (1/b_g(\tau_{ig}^v) + 1/b_1(\tau_{j1}^v)) = O_p((n\zeta_{1n}\zeta_{2n}^2)^{-1}) = o_p(n^{-1/2})$ by Assumptions 6(ii)(iii), 7(ii)(iii), 8(i), 9(iii), 10(i), and 11(i). A similar argument shows that the terms with $j = k$ are negligible.

⁵⁷The sum over I with $i \in I$ consists of $3(n-1)(n-2)$ terms.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{n(n-1)(n-2)} \sum_{I:i \in I} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i], q_n^*(\omega_i)) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(q_n^*(\omega_i)),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality holds because for $i \notin I$ we have $\text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n^*(\omega_i)) = 0$, and the second equality holds by iterated expectations. It then follows that $\text{Cov}(Q_n, Q_n^*) = n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(q_n^*(\omega_i)) = \text{Var}(Q_n^*)$ and hence $\mathbb{E}[(Q_n - Q_n^*)^2] = \text{Var}(Q_n) - \text{Var}(Q_n^*)$. By Markov inequality, we obtain $Q_n = Q_n^* + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ if $\text{Var}(Q_n) - \text{Var}(Q_n^*) = o(n^{-1})$.

To show the last result, note that $q_n(\omega_I)$ and $q_n(\omega_J)$ are independent for disjoint I and J . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(Q_n) &= \frac{1}{(n(n-1)(n-2))^2} \sum_{(I,J):|I \cap J|=1} \text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n(\omega_J)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(n(n-1)(n-2))^2} \sum_{(I,J):|I \cap J|>1} \text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n(\omega_J)). \quad (\text{O.B.5})
\end{aligned}$$

For comparison, because $\text{Var}(Q_n^*) = n^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(q_n^*(\omega_i))$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Var}(Q_n^*) \\
&= \frac{1}{(n(n-1)(n-2))^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{(I,J):\{i\}=I \cap J} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i], \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_J)|\omega_i]) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(n(n-1)(n-2))^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{(I,J):\{i\} \subsetneq I \cap J} \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i], \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_J)|\omega_i]) \quad (\text{O.B.6})
\end{aligned}$$

For I and J such that $\{i\} = I \cap J$, $q_n(\omega_I)$ and $q_n(\omega_J)$ are independent conditional on ω_i and thus $\text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n(\omega_J)) = \text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i], \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_J)|\omega_i])$. This implies that the first sum in $\text{Var}(Q_n)$ is equal to the first sum in $\text{Var}(Q_n^*)$. Moreover, the second sums in both $\text{Var}(Q_n)$ and $\text{Var}(Q_n^*)$ consist of $O(n^4)$ terms. For any I and J , by Assumptions 6(ii)(iii), 7(ii)(iii), 8(i), 10(i), and 11(i), we can bound both $\text{Cov}(q_n(\omega_I), q_n(\omega_J))$ and $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i], \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_J)|\omega_i])$ uniformly by $O(\zeta_{1n}^{-2} \zeta_{2n}^{-4})$. Therefore, the second sums in $\text{Var}(Q_n)$ and $\text{Var}(Q_n^*)$ are both $(n(n-1)(n-2))^{-2} \cdot O(n^4) \cdot O(\zeta_{1n}^{-2} \zeta_{2n}^{-4}) = O(n^{-2} \zeta_{1n}^{-2} \zeta_{2n}^{-4}) = o(n^{-1})$ by Assumption 9(iii). Combining the results yields $\text{Var}(Q_n) - \text{Var}(Q_n^*) = o(n^{-1})$ and thus $Q_n = Q_n^* + o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Now we calculate the influence function of Q_n^* . Because $\omega_i = (\tau_i^v, g_i)$ are i.i.d., to calculate $q_n^*(\omega_i)$ it is sufficient to consider $\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_I)|\omega_i]$ for the three cases where

i appears as the first, second, or third element of I . Fix $i \neq j \neq k$. We start with the case where i appears as the third element (i.e., $\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i]$). Write $q_n(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i) = q_{gn}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i) - q_{1n}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)$. Note that conditional on ω_i , τ_{ig}^v and $\pi_{h|g,i} = \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)$ are constants. By the change of variables $t = \zeta_{2n}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,j} - \pi_{h|1,k})$ and using $\tau_{k1}^v = \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,k})$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[q_{gn}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i, \omega_j] &= \frac{1}{\zeta_{1n}} K_1\left(\frac{\tau_{jg}^v - \tau_{ig}^v}{\zeta_{1n}}\right) \frac{1\{g_i = h\} - \pi_{h|g,j}}{b_g(\tau_{jg}^v)} \\ &\quad \cdot \int \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2'(t) (\sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n}) - \tau_{jg}^v) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by Assumptions 7(i)(iii), 8(ii)(iii), 10(i), and 11(i),⁵⁸ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\int \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2'(t) (\sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n}) - \tau_{jg}^v) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n}) dt \\ &= \int K_2(t) \frac{\partial((\tau_{jg}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,j} - t\zeta_{2n}))}{\partial \pi_{h|g,j}} dt \\ &= \frac{\partial((\tau_{jg}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,j})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,j}))}{\partial \pi_{h|g,j}} + r_{gn}(\tau_{jg}^v), \end{aligned}$$

with $\max_{i,j} |r_{gn}(\tau_{jg}^v)| \leq C\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}[q_{gn}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[q_{gn}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i, \omega_j]|\omega_i] \\ &= \int K_1(t) (1\{g_i = h\} - \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n})) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\frac{\partial(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n} - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n}))) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n}))}{\partial \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n})} + r_{gn}(\tau_{ig}^v + t\zeta_{1n}) \right) dt \\ &= (1\{g_i = h\} - \pi_{h|g,i}) \frac{\partial(\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i})}{\partial \pi_{h|g,i}} + r_{gn,i}, \end{aligned}$$

with $\max_i |r_{gn,i}| \leq C(\zeta_{1n}^{s_1} + \zeta_{2n}^{s_2})$. The second equality follows from the change of

⁵⁸For any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, by definition $\pi_{h|g,i} = \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)$ and thus $f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) = b_g(\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) |(\sigma_{h|g}^{-1})'(\pi_{h|g,i})| = b_g(\tau_{ig}^v) |(\sigma_{h|g}^{-1})'(\pi_{h|g,i})|$. By the chain rule, the $(s_2 + 2)$ th order continuous differentiability of $\sigma_{h|g}(\tau)$ (Assumption 8(iii)) implies that $\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\tau)$ is $(s_2 + 2)$ th continuously differentiable. Because b_g is $(s_2 + 1)$ th continuously differentiable (Assumption 8(ii)), we derive that $f_{\pi_{h|g}}$ is $(s_2 + 1)$ th continuously differentiable. The boundedness of τ_{ig}^v (Assumptions 10(i) and 11(i)) then implies that the $(s_2 + 1)$ th derivative of $f_{\pi_{h|g}}$ is bounded.

variables $t = \zeta_{1n}^{-1}(\tau_{jg}^v - \tau_{ig}^v)$,⁵⁹ and the last equality follows from Taylor expansion and Assumptions 6(i), 8(ii)(iii), 10(i), and 11(i). The form of $\mathbb{E}[q_{1n}(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i]$ can be derived similarly. Overall, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i] = \psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i) + r_{n,i}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i) &= (1\{g_i = h\} - \pi_{h|g,i}) \frac{\partial(\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i}))f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i})}{\partial\pi_{h|g,i}} \\ &\quad - (1\{g_i = h\} - \pi_{h|1,i}) \frac{\partial(\tau_{i1}^v - \sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,i}))f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i})}{\partial\pi_{h|g,i}}, \quad (\text{O.B.7}) \end{aligned}$$

and $r_{n,i}$ satisfies $\max_i |r_{n,i}| \leq C(\zeta_{1n}^{s_1} + \zeta_{2n}^{s_2})$. Using similar arguments, we can show that both $\max_i |\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_k)|\omega_i]|$ and $\max_i |\mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_j, \omega_i, \omega_k)|\omega_i]|$ are bounded by $C\zeta_{1n}^{s_1}$. We obtain $q_n^*(\omega_i) = \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_j, \omega_k, \omega_i)|\omega_i] + \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_i, \omega_j, \omega_k)|\omega_i] + \mathbb{E}[q_n(\omega_j, \omega_i, \omega_k)|\omega_i] = \psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i) + r_{n,i}^*$, where $\max_i |r_{n,i}^*| \leq C(\zeta_{1n}^{s_1} + \zeta_{2n}^{s_2})$.

Note that $\mathbb{E}[1\{g_i = h\} - \pi_{h|g,i}|\tau_{ig}^v] = 0$, so $\mathbb{E}[\psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i)] = 0$. This together with $\max_i |r_{n,i}^*| \leq C(\zeta_{1n}^{s_1} + \zeta_{2n}^{s_2})$ and Assumption 9(iv)(v) yields $\mathbb{E}[q_n^*(\omega_i)] = o(n^{-1/2})$. It follows that $T_{1n}^\sigma = Q_n^* + o_p(n^{-1/2}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$.

Step 2: now we examine T_{1n}^δ in equation (O.B.1). Under Assumption 6(ii) $\hat{\sigma}_h$ is twice differentiable in δ^v , so by applying the Taylor expansion we obtain $h_{gn}(\hat{\tau}_i^v, \hat{\tau}_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\hat{\delta}^v)) - h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v)) = \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta^{v'}}(\hat{\delta}^v - \delta_0^v) + O_p(\|\hat{\delta}^v - \delta_0^v\|^2)$. Because $\hat{\delta}^v - \delta_0^v = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi^{\delta^v}(z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, with $\mathbb{E}[\psi^{\delta^v}(z_i)] = 0$ (Assumption 10(ii)), we have

$$T_{1n}^\delta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta^{v'}} \right) \psi^{\delta^v}(z_k) + o_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

The double sum term is a V -statistic with a nested kernel estimator $\hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v)$.

Observe that $\frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta^{v'}} = \left(\frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_1^{v'}}, \dots, \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_G^{v'}} \right)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_1^{v'}} &= -\frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2' \left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) \hat{\sigma}'_{h|1}(\tau_{j1}^v) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) z_j' - \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2 \left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) z_j' \\ \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} &= \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2' \left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) \hat{\sigma}'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) z_i' + \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2 \left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) z_i', \end{aligned}$$

and the remaining $G - 2$ subvectors equal to zero. We focus on the g th subvector, and the first subvector can be analyzed similarly. Applying the mean-value theorem

⁵⁹Recall that $b_g(\tau_{jg}^v)$ is the density of τ_{jg}^v , so the two cancel out.

(with $\Delta_{n,ij}$ an intermediate value), we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{2n}^{-1} \max_{i,j} \left| K_2\left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) - K_2\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \right| &\leq \zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_{i,j} |K_2'(\Delta_{n,ij})| |\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|g,i} - (\hat{\pi}_{h|1,j} - \pi_{h|1,j})| \\ &= \zeta_{2n}^{-2} O_p((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1}) = o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

by Assumptions 7(ii)(iii), 9(ii), and Newey (1994b, Lemma B.3). Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_{i,j} \left| K_2'\left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \hat{\sigma}'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - K_2'\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \sigma'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) \right| \\ &\leq \zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_{i,j} \left| K_2'\left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \right| \sup_{\tau} |\hat{\sigma}'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) - \sigma'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)| \\ &\quad + \zeta_{2n}^{-2} \max_{i,j} \left| K_2'\left(\frac{\hat{\pi}_{h|g,i} - \hat{\pi}_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) - K_2'\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \right| \sup_{\tau} |\sigma'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)| \\ &= \zeta_{2n}^{-2} O_p((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n}^3)^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1}) + \zeta_{2n}^{-3} O_p((\ln n)^{1/2} (n\zeta_{1n})^{-1/2} + \zeta_{1n}^{s_1}) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

by Assumptions 7(ii)(iii), 8(i)(ii), 9(ii), 10(i), 11(i), Sun (2019, Lemma 3) and Newey (1994b, Lemma B.3). Therefore, by the boundedness of τ_{ig}^v and z_i (Assumptions 10(i) and 11(i)), we have the approximation

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \left(\frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \hat{\sigma}_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} - \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} \right) \right\| \\ &\leq o_p(1) \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n (\|(\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) z_i\| + \|z_i\|) = o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Following the law of large numbers for U -statistics (Serfling, 1980, p. 190), we show

$$\frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^n \frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} \right] + o_p(1).$$

Now we derive the form of $\mathbb{E}[\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))/\partial \delta_g^{v'}]$. Recall that

$$\frac{\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))}{\partial \delta_g^{v'}} = \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2'\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) \sigma'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) (\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v) z_i' + \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}^2} K_2\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) z_i'.$$

By the change of variables $t = \zeta_{2n}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j})$, integration by parts, Taylor expan-

sion, and Assumption 2(i), 7(i)(iii), and 8(ii)(iii), 10(i), and 11(i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int \zeta_{2n}^{-2} K_2' \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|1,j}) d\pi_{h|1,j} + f'_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) \right| \leq C \zeta_{2n}^{s_2} \\ & \left| \int \zeta_{2n}^{-2} K_2' \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) \tau_{j1}^v f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|1,j}) d\pi_{h|1,j} + (\sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i}) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}))' \right| \leq C \zeta_{2n}^{s_2} \\ & \left| \int \zeta_{2n}^{-1} K_2 \left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}} \right) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|1,j}) d\pi_{h|1,j} + f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) \right| \leq C \zeta_{2n}^{s_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, from Assumption 9(v), $\mathbb{E}[\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v)) / \partial \delta_g^{v'}] = D_{g,h}^{\delta_g^v} + o(n^{-1/2})$, where

$$D_{g,h}^{\delta_g^v} = \mathbb{E}[\left((\sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i}) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}))' - f'_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) \tau_{ig}^v \right) \sigma'_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v) + f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) z_i'].$$

Similarly we can derive $\mathbb{E}[\partial h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v)) / \partial \delta_1^{v'}] = D_{g,h}^{\delta_1^v} + o(n^{-1/2})$, where

$$D_{g,h}^{\delta_1^v} = \mathbb{E}[\left((\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,i}) f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i}))' - f'_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i}) \tau_{i1}^v \right) \sigma'_{h|1}(\tau_{i1}^v) + f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i}) z_i'].$$

Combining the results yields $T_{1n}^\delta = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (D_{g,h}^{\delta_g^v} \psi^{\delta_g^v}(z_i) - D_{g,h}^{\delta_1^v} \psi^{\delta_1^v}(z_i)) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\psi^{\delta_1^v}(z_i)$ and $\psi^{\delta_g^v}(z_i)$ are the influence functions for $\hat{\delta}_1^v$ and $\hat{\delta}_g^v$, respectively. Define

$$\psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i) = D_{g,h}^{\delta_g^v} \psi^{\delta_g^v}(z_i) - D_{g,h}^{\delta_1^v} \psi^{\delta_1^v}(z_i) + \psi_{g,h}^\sigma(\omega_i). \quad (\text{O.B.8})$$

We thus have $T_{1n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,1}(z_i, g_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$. \square

Lemma O.B.2. The term T_{2n} in equation (A.2) satisfies $T_{2n} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,2}(z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where $\psi_{g,h,2}(z_i)$ is defined in equation (O.B.10).

Proof. Recall that T_{2n} is a V -statistic of degree 2 with an asymmetric kernel function and $\mathbb{E}[T_{2n}] = 0$. Similarly as in Lemma O.B.1, we use the idea of Hoeffding projection and derive an asymptotically linear representation of T_{2n} . Let $I = (i_1, i_2)$ with $i_1 \neq i_2$ and $\tau_I^v = (\tau_i^v : i \in I)$. We can write $T_{2n} = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_I (h_{gn}(\tau_I^v) - \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_I^v)])$. Define $h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{I:i \in I} (\mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_I^v) | \tau_i^v] - \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_I^v)])$ and $T_{2n}^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v)$. Observe that $\mathbb{E}[T_{2n}^*] = 0$. Following Lemma O.B.1, we can show that $\text{Cov}(T_{2n}, T_{2n}^*) = \text{Var}(T_{2n}^*)$ ⁶⁰ and hence $\mathbb{E}[(T_{2n} - T_{2n}^*)^2] = \text{Var}(T_{2n}) - \text{Var}(T_{2n}^*)$. By Markov inequality, we obtain $T_{2n} = T_{2n}^* + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ if $\text{Var}(Q_n) - \text{Var}(Q_n^*) = o(n^{-1})$.

⁶⁰This is because $\text{Cov}(T_{2n}, T_{2n}^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Cov}(T_{2n}, h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v))$ and for each i , $\text{Cov}(T_{2n}, h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v)) = \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{I:i \in I} \text{Cov}(h_{gn}(\tau_I^v), h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v)) = \frac{1}{n} \text{Var}(h_{gn}^*(\tau_i^v))$.

To show the last result, we express $\text{Var}(T_{2n})$ and $\text{Var}(T_{2n}^*)$ similarly as in equations (O.B.5) and (O.B.6). Follow the argument that compares the two equations and note that for any I and J , by Assumptions 7(ii)(iii), 10(i), and 11(i), we can bound both $\text{Cov}(h_{gn}(\tau_I^v), h_{gn}(\tau_J^v))$ and $\text{Cov}(\mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_I^v)|\tau_i^v], \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_J^v)|\tau_i^v])$ uniformly by $O(\zeta_{2n}^{-2})$. Therefore, $\text{Var}(Q_n) - \text{Var}(Q_n^*) = (n(n-1))^{-2} \cdot O(n^2) \cdot O(\zeta_{2n}^{-2}) = O(n^{-2}\zeta_{2n}^{-2}) = o(n^{-1})$ by Assumption 9(iii)⁶¹ and then $T_{2n} = T_{2n}^* + o_p(n^{-1/2})$ follows.

Next we calculate the influence function of T_{2n}^* . Conditional on τ_i^v , both τ_{ig}^v and $\pi_{h|g,i} = \sigma_{h|g}(\tau_{ig}^v)$ are constants. Under Assumption 2(i), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v)) | \tau_i^v] &= \int \frac{1}{\zeta_{2n}} K_2\left(\frac{\pi_{h|g,i} - \pi_{h|1,j}}{\zeta_{2n}}\right) (\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,j})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|1,j}) d\pi_{h|1,j} \\ &= \int K_2(t) (\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i} - t\zeta_{2n})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i} - t\zeta_{2n}) dt \\ &= (\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) + \tilde{r}_{n,i}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{O.B.9})$$

with $\max_i |\tilde{r}_{n,i}| \leq C\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}$. The second equality follows from the change of variables, and the third equality holds by Assumptions 7(i) and 8. Similarly, we can derive $|\mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_j^v, \tau_i^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v)) | \tau_i^v] - (\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,i}) - \tau_{i1}^v) f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i})| \leq C\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}$. By Assumption 9(v), $O(\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}) = o(n^{-1/2})$. All together, we obtain $T_{2n}^* = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_{g,h,2}(z_i) + o_p(n^{-1/2})$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{g,h,2}(z_i) &= (\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) + (\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,i}) - \tau_{i1}^v) f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i}) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}[(\tau_{ig}^v - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) + (\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|1,i}) - \tau_{i1}^v) f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|1,i})]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{O.B.10})$$

□

Lemma O.B.3. *The third term T_{3n} in equation (A.2) satisfies $T_{3n} = o(n^{-1/2})$.*

Proof. Equation (O.B.9) implies

$$\mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))] = \int (\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i}) - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) d\pi_{h|g,i} + O(\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}).$$

From the identification result in Section 4, we can represent p_g^* as

$$p_g^* = \mathbb{E}[1\{\pi_{h|g,i} = \pi_{h|1,j}\}(\tau_{ig}^v - \tau_{j1}^v)] = \int [\sigma_{h|g}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i}) - \sigma_{h|1}^{-1}(\pi_{h|g,i})] f_{\pi_{h|g}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) f_{\pi_{h|1}}(\pi_{h|g,i}) d\pi_{h|g,i}.$$

Hence, $T_{3n} = \mathbb{E}[h_{gn}(\tau_i^v, \tau_j^v; \sigma_h(\delta_0^v))] - p_g^* = O(\zeta_{2n}^{s_2}) = o(n^{-1/2})$ by Assumption 9(v). □

⁶¹Assumption 9(iii) (i.e., $n^{1/2}\zeta_{1n}\zeta_{2n}^2 \rightarrow \infty$) implies $n^{1/2}\zeta_{2n} \rightarrow \infty$.

O.C Lemmas for the Asymptotics of $\hat{\gamma}$

Notation Let $A = (a_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2}$ denote an $n \times n$ matrix and $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote an $n \times 1$ vector. Denote by $\|A\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sum_{j=1}^n |a_{ij}|$ the maximum row sum norm and $\|A\|_1 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} \sum_{i=1}^n |a_{ij}|$ the maximum column sum norm. Note that $\|A'\|_\infty = \|A\|_1$ and $\|A'\|_1 = \|A\|_\infty$. Denote by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ and $\|\cdot\|_1$ the l_∞ and l_1 norms. That is, $\|A\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} |a_{ij}|$, $\|A\|_1 = \sum_{i,j=1}^n |a_{ij}|$, $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |x_i|$, and $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$. For $n \times n$ matrices A and B and $n \times 1$ vectors x and y , we can show $\|AB\|_\infty \leq \|A\|_\infty \|B\|_\infty$, $\|AB\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1 \|B\|_1$, $\|Ax\|_\infty \leq \|A\|_\infty \|x\|_\infty$, and $\|Ax\|_1 \leq \|A\|_1 \|x\|_1$. Moreover, $|x' Ay| \leq \|A\|_\infty \|x\|_\infty \|y\|_1 \leq n \|A\|_\infty \|x\|_\infty \|y\|_\infty$.⁶² Let $0 < C < \infty$ denote a universal constant. For simplicity, we write τ_i^s as τ_i .

O.C.1 Consistency of $\hat{\gamma}$

Lemma O.C.1 (ULLN of the moment). $\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) - m_0(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)\| = o_p(1)$.

Proof. Because $y_i - X_i' \gamma = y_i - X_i' \gamma_0 - X_i'(\gamma - \gamma_0) = \epsilon_i - X_i'(\gamma - \gamma_0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) - m_0(\gamma, \mu_0^Z) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Z_i - \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i))(y_i - X_i' \gamma) - \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))(y_i - X_i' \gamma)] \\ &= -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \epsilon_i + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) X_i' (\gamma - \gamma_0) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \epsilon_i - \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \epsilon_i]) \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n ((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) X_i' - \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) X_i']) (\gamma - \gamma_0). \end{aligned}$$

In the last expression, the first two average terms are $o_p(1)$ by Lemma O.C.2, and the last two average terms are $o_p(1)$ by Lemma O.C.3. By the compactness of Γ (Assumption 15(ii)) we have $\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \|\hat{m}_n(\gamma, \hat{\mu}^Z) - m_0(\gamma, \mu_0^Z)\| = o_p(1)$. \square

Lemma O.C.2. For $t_i = (X_i', \epsilon_i)'$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) t_i = o_p(1). \quad (\text{O.C.1})$$

⁶²These results can be found in Horn and Johnson (1985, Section 5.6) or proved similarly.

Proof. Recall that $X_i = (w_i \mathbf{y}, w_i \mathbf{x}, x_i)'$. Because $t_i \in \mathbb{R}^{2d_x+2}$ is finite dimensional, we can prove equation (O.C.1) for each component of t_i separately. For $r = 1, \dots, 2d_x+2$, let t_{ir} denote the r th component of t_i , and $\mathbf{t}_r = (t_{1r}, \dots, t_{nr})'$. By construction, we have $\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) = \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})' b^K(\hat{\tau}_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$ and $\hat{\mu}^Z(\tau_i) = \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})' b^K(\tau_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$, where $\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) = (\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K)^{-1} \hat{B}'_K \mathbf{Z}$ and $\hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = (B'_K B_K)^{-1} B'_K \mathbf{Z}$, with $\hat{B}_K = B_K(\hat{\tau})$ and $B_K = B_K(\boldsymbol{\tau})$. Denote $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z = (\mu_0^Z(\tau_1), \dots, \mu_0^Z(\tau_n))'$. The left-hand side of equation (O.C.1) for component t_{ir} satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) t_{ir} \right\|^2 &= n^{-2} \mathbf{t}'_r (\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z) (\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z)' \mathbf{t}_r \\ &\leq n^{-2} \|\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|^2 \mathbf{t}'_r \mathbf{t}_r, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows because we can bound the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $(\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z) (\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z)'$ by $\|\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|^2$.

For t_{ir} that represents a component of $w_i \mathbf{x}$ or x_i , we have $\max_i |t_{ir}| < \infty$ (Assumptions 11(ii), 14(i)). Therefore, $n^{-1} \mathbf{t}'_r \mathbf{t}_r = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n t_{ir}^2 \leq \max_i t_{ir}^2 < \infty$. For $t_{ir} = \epsilon_i$, because ϵ_i is i.i.d., by the law of large numbers and Assumption 16(i) $n^{-1} \mathbf{t}'_r \mathbf{t}_r = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^2 = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] + o_p(1) = O_p(1)$. For $t_{ir} = w_i \mathbf{y}$, we have $n^{-1} (\mathbf{w} \mathbf{y})' \mathbf{w} \mathbf{y} = O_p(1)$ by Lemma O.C.4. We conclude that $n^{-1} \mathbf{t}'_r \mathbf{t}_r = O_p(1)$.

By the triangle inequality and $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &n^{-1} \|\hat{B}_K \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|^2 \\ &\leq n^{-1} (\|(\hat{B}_K - B_K) \hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})\| + \|B_K (\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \beta^Z)\| + \|B_K \beta^Z - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|)^2 \\ &\leq 3n^{-1} (\|\hat{B}_K - B_K\|^2 \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})\|^2 + \|B_K (\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \beta^Z)\|^2 + \|B_K \beta^Z - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|^2). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that the last three terms are $o_p(1)$.

By equation (O.C.5), $n^{-1} \|\hat{B}_K - B_K\|^2 = O_p(\varrho_1(K)^2/n)$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})\|^2 &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' \hat{B}_K (\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K)^{-2} \hat{B}'_K \mathbf{Z}) \\ &\leq O_p(n^{-1}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' \hat{B}_K (\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K)^{-1} \hat{B}'_K \mathbf{Z}) \\ &\leq O_p(n^{-1}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}) = O_p(1). \end{aligned} \tag{O.C.2}$$

The first inequality follows from Lemmas O.C.5 and O.C.6.⁶³ The second inequality

⁶³By Lemmas O.C.5 and O.C.6, the smallest eigenvalue of $\hat{Q}_K = \hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K/n$ converges to one in probability and hence $(\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K/n)^{-1} \leq CI_K$ with probability approaching one.

follows because $\hat{B}_K(\hat{B}'_K\hat{B}_K)^{-1}\hat{B}'_K$ is idempotent and thus $\hat{B}_K(\hat{B}'_K\hat{B}_K)^{-1}\hat{B}'_K \leq I_K$. The last equality holds because $n^{-1}\text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}) = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n\|Z_i\|^2 < \infty$ by the boundedness of Z_i . We conclude that $n^{-1}\|\hat{B}_K - B_K\|^2\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}})\|^2 = o_p(1)$.

Observe that $n^{-1}\|B_K(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)\|^2 = n^{-1}\|B_K(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)\|^2 = n^{-1}\text{tr}((\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)'B'_KB_K(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)) \leq O_p(1)\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z\|^2$, where the inequality holds because by Lemma O.C.5 $B'_KB_K/n \leq CI_K$ with probability approaching one. By the triangle inequality, $\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z\| \leq \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})\| + \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^Z\|$. Lemma O.C.7 shows that $\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$. Moreover, by Lemma 15.3 in Li and Racine (2007) for x_i and z_i in Z_i and Lemma O.C.8 for $w_i\mathbf{x}$ in Z_i , we have $\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^Z\| = o_p(1)$. Combining these results yields $n^{-1}\|B_K(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)\|^2 = o_p(1)$.

Finally, $n^{-1}\|B_K\beta^Z - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^Z\|^2 = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n\|\beta^{Z_i}b^K(\tau_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2 \leq \sup_{\tau}\|\beta^{Z_i}b^K(\tau) - \mu_0^Z(\tau)\|^2 = O(K^{-2a})$ by Assumption 13(ii). \square

Lemma O.C.3. For $t_i = (X'_i, \epsilon_i)'$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))t'_i - \mathbb{E}[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))t'_i]) = o_p(1). \quad (\text{O.C.3})$$

Proof. Recall that $Z_i = (w_i\mathbf{x}, x'_i, z'_i)'$ and $X_i = (w_i\mathbf{y}, w_i\mathbf{x}, x'_i)'$. Because both Z_i and t_i are finite dimensional, we can prove equation (O.C.3) component by component. For simplicity, we assume that both z_i and x_i are scalars. Depending on which components of Z_i and t_i under consideration, we divide the proof into six cases.

		Component of t_i		
		x_i, ϵ_i	$w_i\mathbf{x}$	$w_i\mathbf{y}$
Component of Z_i	x_i, z_i	Case (a)	Case (c)	Case (e)
	$w_i\mathbf{x}$	Case (b)	Case (d)	Case (f)

Case (a): Since (x_i, z_i, ϵ_i) are i.i.d., the result follows by the law of large numbers.

Case (b): Take x_i in t_i as an example and ϵ_i in t_i can be proved similarly.

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n((w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))x_i - \mathbb{E}[(w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))x_i]) \\ &= n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n(w_i\mathbf{x}x_i - \mathbb{E}[w_i\mathbf{x}x_i]) - n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n(\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)x_i - \mathbb{E}[\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)x_i]). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)x_i$ is independent across i , the second term on the right-hand side is $o_p(1)$ by the law of large numbers. Write the first term on the right-hand side as

$n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}])$. Applying Lemma O.C.9 with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}$ yields $n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}]) = o_p(1)$. Equation (O.C.3) thus holds for case (b).

Case (c): Without loss of generality we take z_i in Z_i as an example. Denote $\tilde{z}_i = z_i - \mu_0^z(\tau_i)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} = (\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_n)'$. Write $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n ((z_i - \mu_0^z(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[(z_i - \mu_0^z(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{x}]) = n^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}])$. Applying Lemma O.C.9 with $\mathbf{a} = \tilde{\mathbf{z}}$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{x}$, and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}$, we prove equation (O.C.3) for case (c).

Case (d): Write

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n ((w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[(w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{x}]) \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i\mathbf{x}w_i\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[w_i\mathbf{x}w_i\mathbf{x}]) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)w_i\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)w_i\mathbf{x}]) \\ &= n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}]) - n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}]), \end{aligned}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = (\mu_0^{w_1\mathbf{x}}(\tau_1), \dots, \mu_0^{w_n\mathbf{x}}(\tau_n))'$. Applying Lemma O.C.9 twice, one with $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}$, and the other with $\mathbf{a} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$, $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}$, we obtain that the last two terms are both $o_p(1)$. Equation (O.C.3) holds for case (d).

Case (e): Recall that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}\gamma_2 + \mathbf{x}\gamma_3 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon})$, where $\mathbf{s} = (I_n - \gamma_1\mathbf{w})^{-1}$, and $\boldsymbol{\lambda} = \boldsymbol{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\tau})$ is short for $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^s(\boldsymbol{\tau}^s)$. Take z_i in Z_i as an example. Write

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n ((z_i - \mu_0^z(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{y} - \mathbb{E}[(z_i - \mu_0^z(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{y}]) \\ &= n^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_2 + n^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_3 \\ & \quad + n^{-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\tilde{\mathbf{z}}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}]). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma O.C.9 to each term in the last line proves equation (O.C.3).

Case (f): Write

$$\begin{aligned} & n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n ((w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{y} - \mathbb{E}[(w_i\mathbf{x} - \mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i))w_i\mathbf{y}]) \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i\mathbf{x}w_i\mathbf{y} - \mathbb{E}[w_i\mathbf{x}w_i\mathbf{y}]) - n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)w_i\mathbf{y} - \mathbb{E}[\mu_0^{w_i\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i)w_i\mathbf{y}]) \\ &= n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_2 + n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_3 \\ & \quad + n^{-1}(\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}]) - n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_2 \\ & \quad - n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{x}])\gamma_3 - n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}]). \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma O.C.9 to each term in the last line proves equation (O.C.3). \square

Lemma O.C.4 (Boundness of $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}$). $n^{-1}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y} = O_p(1)$.

Proof. Let $T = \mathbf{w}^2\mathbf{x}\gamma_2 + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}\gamma_3$ be an $n \times 1$ vector, and recall that $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{s}(\mathbf{w}^2\mathbf{x}\gamma_2 + \mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}\gamma_3 + \mathbf{w}\epsilon) = \mathbf{s}(T + \mathbf{w}\epsilon)$. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} n^{-1}(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y})'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y} &= n^{-1}(T + \mathbf{w}\epsilon)'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}(T + \mathbf{w}\epsilon) \\ &= n^{-1}T'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}T + 2n^{-1}T'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\epsilon + n^{-1}\epsilon'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\epsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{O.C.4})$$

We show that \mathbf{w} and \mathbf{s} are uniformly bounded in both row and column sums.⁶⁴ In fact, under Assumption 14(i), we have $\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = 1$ and thus $\|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \leq \sum_{r=0}^\infty |\gamma_1|^r \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^r < \infty$. For any $r \geq 1$, we can bound $\|\mathbf{w}^r\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^{r-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty$. Therefore, $\|\mathbf{w}^r\|_1 = \max_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \sum_{i=1}^n |(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}| \leq n\|\mathbf{w}^r\|_\infty \leq n\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty$ and thus $\|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \leq \sum_{r=0}^\infty |\gamma_1|^r \|\mathbf{w}^r\|_1 \leq \sum_{r=0}^\infty |\gamma_1|^r n\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = O_p(1)$.

By the boundedness of x_i and γ , we can bound $\|T\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^2 \|\mathbf{x}\gamma_2\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{x}\gamma_3\|_\infty < \infty$. Therefore, the first term in the last line of (O.C.4) is $n^{-1}T'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}T \leq \|\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \|T\|_\infty^2 \leq \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \|T\|_\infty^2 = O_p(1)$. The second to last term in equation (O.C.4) satisfies $n^{-1}|T'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\epsilon| \leq \|\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|T\|_\infty \|\epsilon/n\|_1 = O_p(1)$, because $\|\epsilon/n\|_1 = n^{-1} \sum |\epsilon_i| = \mathbb{E}[|\epsilon_i|] + o_p(1) = O_p(1)$ by the law of large numbers and Assumption 16(i) and $\|\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = O_p(1)$. Finally, the last term in (O.C.4) satisfies $n^{-1}\epsilon'\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\epsilon \leq n^{-1} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}) \epsilon'\epsilon = O_p(1)$, because $n^{-1}\epsilon'\epsilon = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^2 = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] + o_p(1) = O_p(1)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}) \leq \|\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{s}'\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \|\mathbf{s}\|_1 \|\mathbf{s}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = O_p(1)$. Combining the three terms, we complete the proof. \square

Lemma O.C.5. Let $Q_K = B'_K B_K/n$. Then $\|Q_K - I_K\| = O_p(\varrho_0(K)\sqrt{K/n})$.

Proof. The result follows from Lemma 15.2 in Li and Racine (2007, p.481). \square

Lemma O.C.6. Let $\hat{Q}_K = \hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K/n$. Then $\|\hat{Q}_K - Q_K\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$.

Proof. Because $\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K - B'_K B_K = (\hat{B}_K - B_K)^2 + B'_K(\hat{B}_K - B_K) + (\hat{B}_K - B_K)' B_K$, we have $\|\hat{Q}_K - Q_K\| = \|\hat{B}'_K \hat{B}_K - B'_K B_K\|/n \leq \|\hat{B}_K - B_K\|^2/n + 2\|(\hat{B}_K - B_K)' B_K\|/n$. The \sqrt{n} -consistency of $\hat{\theta}$ and boundedness of z (Assumptions 11(i) and 12(ii)) imply

⁶⁴See Lee (2002, Lemma 1) for similar results.

that $\max_i \|\hat{\tau}_i - \tau_i\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. Therefore,

$$\|\hat{B}_K - B_K\| = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|b^K(\hat{\tau}_i) - b^K(\tau_i)\|^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq n^{1/2} \varrho_1(K) \max_i \|\hat{\tau}_i - \tau_i\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)), \quad (\text{O.C.5})$$

by the mean-value theorem and Assumption 13(iv). Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\hat{B}_K - B_K)' B_K\|/n &= \text{tr}((\hat{B}_K - B_K)' B_K B_K' (\hat{B}_K - B_K))^{1/2}/n \\ &\leq O_p(1) \text{tr}((\hat{B}_K - B_K)' B_K (B_K' B_K)^{-1} B_K' (\hat{B}_K - B_K))^{1/2}/\sqrt{n} \\ &\leq O_p(1) \|\hat{B}_K - B_K\|/\sqrt{n} = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n}). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality above holds because by Lemma O.C.5 $I_K \leq C(B_K' B_K/n)^{-1}$ with probability approaching one. The second inequality follows by $B_K (B_K' B_K)^{-1} B_K'$ idempotent. The last equality follows from equation (O.C.5). We conclude that $\|\hat{Q}_K - Q_K\| \leq O_p(\varrho_1(K)^2/n) + O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n}) = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$. \square

Lemma O.C.7. $\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$.

Proof. Recall that $\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) = \hat{Q}_K^{-1} \hat{B}_K' \mathbf{Z}/n$ and $\hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau}) = Q_K^{-1} B_K' \mathbf{Z}/n$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})\| &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' (\hat{Q}_K^{-1} \hat{B}_K' - Q_K^{-1} B_K') (\hat{Q}_K^{-1} \hat{B}_K' - Q_K^{-1} B_K') \mathbf{Z}/n^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \|(\hat{Q}_K^{-1} \hat{B}_K' - Q_K^{-1} B_K')/\sqrt{n}\| \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}/n)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

By the boundedness of Z_i , $\text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}/n) = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Z_i\|^2 < \infty$. Moreover, $\|(\hat{Q}_K^{-1} \hat{B}_K' - Q_K^{-1} B_K')/\sqrt{n}\| \leq \|(\hat{Q}_K^{-1} - Q_K^{-1}) \hat{B}_K'/\sqrt{n}\| + \|Q_K^{-1} (\hat{B}_K - B_K)'/\sqrt{n}\|$. Observe

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\hat{Q}_K^{-1} - Q_K^{-1}) \hat{B}_K'/\sqrt{n}\| &= \text{tr}((\hat{Q}_K^{-1} - Q_K^{-1}) \hat{B}_K' \hat{B}_K (\hat{Q}_K^{-1} - Q_K^{-1})/n)^{1/2} \\ &= \text{tr}(Q_K^{-1} (Q_K - \hat{Q}_K) \hat{Q}_K^{-1} (Q_K - \hat{Q}_K) Q_K^{-1})^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1) \text{tr}((Q_K - \hat{Q}_K) Q_K^{-2} (Q_K - \hat{Q}_K))^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1) \|Q_K - \hat{Q}_K\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n}), \end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities follow from Lemmas O.C.5 and O.C.6.⁶⁵ The last equality follows from Lemma O.C.6. As for the second term, by equation (O.C.5), we

⁶⁵By Lemmas O.C.5 and O.C.6, the smallest eigenvalue of \hat{Q}_K converges to one in probability and hence the largest eigenvalue of \hat{Q}_K^{-1} is bounded with probability approaching one. Similarly, by Lemma O.C.5, the largest eigenvalue of Q_K^{-2} is bounded with probability approaching one.

have $\|Q_K^{-1}(\hat{B}_K - B_K)/\sqrt{n}\| = \text{tr}((\hat{B}_K - B_K)Q_K^{-2}(\hat{B}_K - B_K)'/n)^{1/2} \leq O_p(1)\|(\hat{B}_K - B_K)/\sqrt{n}\| = O_p(\varrho_1(K)/\sqrt{n})$. \square

Lemma O.C.8. $\|\hat{\beta}^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}\| = o_p(1)$.

Proof. We can write $\hat{\beta}^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} = Q_K^{-1}B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\beta}^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}\| &= \text{tr}((\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})'B_KQ_K^{-2}B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1)\|B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n\|, \end{aligned}$$

where we used that the largest eigenvalue of Q_K^{-2} is bounded with probability approaching one. Write $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} = (\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}) + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})$. We derive

$$\begin{aligned} &\|B'_K(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n\| \\ &= \text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})'B_KB'_K(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n^2)^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1)\text{tr}((\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})'B_K(B'_KB_K)^{-1}B'_K(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n)^{1/2} \\ &\leq O_p(1)\|(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/\sqrt{n}\| = O_p(K^{-a}). \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality holds by Lemma O.C.5.⁶⁶ The second inequality follows by $B_K(B'_KB_K)^{-1}B'_K$ idempotent, and the last equality follows by Assumption 13(ii).⁶⁷ If we can show $\|B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n\| = o_p(1)$, then combining the results completes the proof. Because x_i is finite dimensional, we can prove the equation for each component of x_i separately. For simplicity, assume that x_i is a scalar.

Write $B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n = n^{-1}\sum_i\sum_j b^K(\tau_i)(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i]) = n^{-1}\sum_i\sum_j r_{ij}$, where $r_{ij} = b^K(\tau_i)(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])$. Since $\mathbb{E}[r_{ij}|\tau_i] = 0$, we have $\mathbb{E}[r_{ij}] = 0$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\|B'_K(\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/n\|^2 = n^{-2}\sum_{(i,j)}\sum_{(k,l):\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}\neq\emptyset}\mathbb{E}[r'_{ij}r_{kl}] + n^{-2}\sum_{(i,j)}\sum_{(k,l):\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}=\emptyset}\mathbb{E}[r'_{ij}r_{kl}]. \quad (\text{O.C.6})$$

For any $i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $|\mathbb{E}[r'_{ij}r_{kl}]| \leq \mathbb{E}|b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])(w_{kl}x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])| \leq O(n^{-2})(\mathbb{E}[(b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k))^2])^{1/2} = O(n^{-2}\sqrt{K})$. The second inequality follows from Assumptions 11(ii) and 14(ii).⁶⁸ The last equality follows because by

⁶⁶By Lemma O.C.5, the largest eigenvalue of $Q_K = B'_KB_K/n$ converges to one in probability and hence $CI_K \leq (B'_KB_K/n)^{-1}$ with probability approaching one.

⁶⁷Under Assumption 13(ii), we have $\|(\boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}} - B_K\beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}})/\sqrt{n}\| = (n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n\|\mu_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}(\tau_i) - \beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}b^K(\tau_i)\|^2)^{1/2} \leq \sup_{\tau}\|\mu_0^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}(\tau) - \beta^{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{x}}b^K(\tau)\| = O(K^{-a})$.

⁶⁸By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $(a+b)^4 \leq 8(a^4 + b^4)$, Jensen's inequality, and it-

Assumptions 2(i) and 13(i), $\mathbb{E}[(b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k))^2] = \mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)b^K(\tau_k)'b^K(\tau_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(b^K(\tau_i)b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)b^K(\tau_k)')] = \text{tr}(\mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau_i)b^K(\tau_i)']\mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau_k)b^K(\tau_k)']) = \text{tr}(I_K) = K$. The sum over overlapping $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ contains $O(n^3)$ terms. Therefore, the first term in equation (O.C.6) is $n^{-2} \cdot O(n^3) \cdot O(n^{-2}\sqrt{K}) = O(\sqrt{K}/n)$.

Moreover, for disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[r'_{ij}r_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] &= b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)\mathbb{E}[(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])(w_{kl}x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \\ &= b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)(\text{Cov}(w_{ij}, w_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma})x_jx_l \\ &\quad + (\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])(\mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])) \\ &= b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)(\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])(\mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\varsigma_k, \varsigma_l]x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k]) \\ &\quad + b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k)e_{ij,kl}, \end{aligned}$$

where $e_{ij,kl} = \text{Cov}(w_{ij}, w_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma})x_jx_l + (\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j])x_j(\mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k]) + (\mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\varsigma_k, \varsigma_l])x_l(\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])$. By Assumptions 11(ii), 14(ii)(v), and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we derive $\mathbb{E}[(e_{ij,kl})^2] \leq o(n^{-4}/K)$. Observe that the terms $b^K(\tau_i)(\mathbb{E}[w_{ij}|\varsigma_i, \varsigma_j]x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])$ and $b^K(\tau_k)(\mathbb{E}[w_{kl}|\varsigma_k, \varsigma_l]x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])$ are independent, both with mean zero. Therefore, we have the uniform bound $|\mathbb{E}[r'_{ij}r_{kl}]| \leq (\mathbb{E}[(b^K(\tau_i)'b^K(\tau_k))^2])^{1/2}(\mathbb{E}[(e_{ij,kl})^2])^{1/2} = \sqrt{K} \cdot o(n^{-2}/\sqrt{K}) = o(n^{-2})$. The sum over disjoint $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ contains $O(n^4)$ terms. Hence, the second term in (O.C.6) can be bounded by $n^{-2} \cdot O(n^4) \cdot o(n^{-2}) = o(1)$. Combining the results we prove $\mathbb{E}\|B'_K(\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\boldsymbol{x}})/n\|^2 = o(1)$ and thus $\|B'_K(\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_0^{w\boldsymbol{x}})/n\| = o_p(1)$. \square

Lemma O.C.9. *Suppose that $\boldsymbol{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)'$ and $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)'$ are $n \times 1$ vectors in \mathbb{R}^n such that (i) (a_i, b_i) is independent across i ; (ii) \boldsymbol{a} is a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ with $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} |a_i| < \infty$; (iii) \boldsymbol{b} is either a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ with $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} |b_i| < \infty$ or independent of \boldsymbol{w} conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ with $\max_{i \in \mathcal{N}} |\mathbb{E}[b_i|\varsigma_i]| < \infty$. Let \boldsymbol{q} be a matrix that takes the form of (a) \boldsymbol{w} , (b) $\boldsymbol{w}'\boldsymbol{w}$, (c) $\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{w}'^t$, $t = 0, 1$, or (d) $\boldsymbol{w}'\boldsymbol{w}\boldsymbol{s}\boldsymbol{w}'^t$, $t = 0, 1$, where $\boldsymbol{s} = (I_n - \gamma_1\boldsymbol{w})^{-1}$. Then $n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{a}'\boldsymbol{q}\boldsymbol{b} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{a}'\boldsymbol{q}\boldsymbol{b}]) = o_p(1)$.*

Proof. By Markov's inequality, it suffices to show that the second moment of $n^{-1}(\boldsymbol{a}'\boldsymbol{q}\boldsymbol{b} -$

erated expectations, we have $(\mathbb{E}[(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])^2(w_{kl}x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])^2])^{1/2} \leq (\mathbb{E}[(w_{ij}x_j - \mathbb{E}[w_{ij}x_j|\tau_i])^4])^{1/4}(\mathbb{E}[(w_{kl}x_l - \mathbb{E}[w_{kl}x_l|\tau_k])^4])^{1/4} \leq 4(\mathbb{E}[(w_{ij}x_j)^4])^{1/4}(\mathbb{E}[(w_{kl}x_l)^4])^{1/4} \leq C\mathbb{E}[\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_\infty^4]^{1/2} = O(n^{-2})$.

$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{a}'\mathbf{q}\mathbf{b}]$) is $o(1)$. The second moment is

$$\begin{aligned}
n^{-2}\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{a}'\mathbf{q}\mathbf{b} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{a}'\mathbf{q}\mathbf{b}])^2 &= n^{-2}\text{Cov}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^na_ib_jq_{ij}, \sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^na_ib_jq_{ij}\right) \\
&= n^{-2}\sum_{(i,j,k,l):\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}\neq\emptyset}\text{Cov}(a_ib_jq_{ij}, a_kb_lq_{kl}) \\
&\quad + n^{-2}\sum_{(i,j,k,l):\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}=\emptyset}\text{Cov}(a_ib_jq_{ij}, a_kb_lq_{kl}) \quad (\text{O.C.7})
\end{aligned}$$

In the last expression, the first term sums over all the indices i, j, k , and l such that $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ have at least one common element, and the second term sums over all the indices i, j, k , and l such that $\{i, j\}$ and $\{k, l\}$ do not overlap.

Because \mathbf{a} is a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ and \mathbf{q} is a function of \mathbf{w} , if \mathbf{b} is independent of \mathbf{w} conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$, we can write the covariance as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\text{Cov}(a_ib_jq_{ij}, a_kb_lq_{kl}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[a_ia_k\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]\mathbb{E}[q_{ij}q_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]] - \mathbb{E}[a_i\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]\mathbb{E}[q_{ij}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]]\mathbb{E}[a_k\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]\mathbb{E}[q_{kl}|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}]] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[a_ia_k\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]q_{ij}q_{kl}] - \mathbb{E}[a_i\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]q_{ij}]\mathbb{E}[a_k\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]q_{kl}] \\
&= \text{Cov}(a_i\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]q_{ij}, a_k\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]q_{kl}),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality used $\mathbb{E}[b_jb_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]\mathbb{E}[b_l|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_l]$ and $\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = \mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]$ because $(b_i, \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_i)$ is i.i.d.. Let $h_{ij} = a_ib_j$ (if \mathbf{b} is a function of $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$) or $h_{ij} = a_i\mathbb{E}[b_j|\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j]$ (if \mathbf{b} is independent of \mathbf{w} conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$). Conditions (ii) and (iii) then imply $\max_{i,j\in\mathcal{N}}|h_{ij}| < \infty$.

The first sum in (O.C.7) consists of $O(n^3)$ terms. By Lemma O.C.10(i), each covariance term can be bounded by $O(n^{-2})$ uniformly in i, j, k , and l . Hence, the first sum is $n^{-2}\cdot O(n^3)\cdot O(n^{-2}) = o(1)$. The second sum in (O.C.7) consists of $O(n^4)$ terms. Applying Lemma O.C.10(ii) yields $\max_{i,j,k,l\in\mathcal{N}:\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}=\emptyset}|\text{Cov}(a_ib_jq_{ij}, a_kb_lq_{kl})| = o(n^{-2})$. Hence, the last sum in equation (O.C.7) is $n^{-2}\cdot O(n^4)\cdot o(n^{-2}) = o(1)$. \square

Lemma O.C.10. *Let \mathbf{q} be a matrix that takes the form of (a) \mathbf{w} , (b) $\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}$, (c) $\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}'$, $t = 0, 1$, or (d) $\mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}'$, $r = 0, 1$, where $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{I}_n - \gamma_1\mathbf{w})^{-1}$. For $h_{ij} = h(\boldsymbol{\varsigma}_i, \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_j) \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\max_{i,j\in\mathcal{N}}|h_{ij}| < \infty$, \mathbf{q} satisfies (i) $\max_{i,j,k,l\in\mathcal{N}}|\text{Cov}(h_{ij}q_{ij}, h_{kl}q_{kl})| = O(n^{-2})$ and (ii) $\max_{i,j,k,l\in\mathcal{N}:\{i,j\}\cap\{k,l\}=\emptyset}|\text{Cov}(h_{ij}q_{ij}, h_{kl}q_{kl})| = o(n^{-2})$.*

Proof. Part (i). Write $\text{Cov}(h_{ij}q_{ij}, h_{kl}q_{kl}) = \mathbb{E}[h_{ij}h_{kl}q_{ij}q_{kl}] - \mathbb{E}[h_{ij}q_{ij}]\mathbb{E}[h_{kl}q_{kl}]$. By the boundedness of h_{ij} and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, it is sufficient to show that

$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^2] = O(n^{-2})$. For case (a) with $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}$, the result follows immediately from Assumption 14(ii). For case (b) with $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}$, we can bound $\|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_1 \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq n\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^2$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^2] \leq n^2\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^4] = O(n^{-2})$ by Assumption 14(ii). For case (c), because $\mathbf{s} = (I_n - \gamma_1\mathbf{w})^{-1} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \gamma_1^r \mathbf{w}^r$, we have $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}\mathbf{s}\mathbf{w}^t = \sum_{r=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma_1^{r-(t+1)} \mathbf{w}^r$ and $(q_{ij})^2 = \sum_{r=t+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\tilde{r}=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma_1^{r+\tilde{r}-2(t+1)} (\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij} (\mathbf{w}^{\tilde{r}})_{ij}$, $t = 0, 1$. For any $r \geq 1$, we have $\|\mathbf{w}^r\|_\infty \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \|\mathbf{w}^{r-1}\|_\infty \leq \dots \leq \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^{r-1} \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty = \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^r$. Therefore, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{q}\|_\infty^2] \leq \sum_{r=t+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\tilde{r}=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma_1^{r+\tilde{r}-2(t+1)} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^2] = O(n^{-2})$ by Assumption 14(ii). Similarly as in cases (b)(c), we can show that the result holds for case (d).

Part (ii). For case (a) with $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}$ and case (b) with $\mathbf{q} = \mathbf{w}'\mathbf{w}$, the statement follows immediately from Assumption 14(iv). For case (c), consider $i, j, k, l \in \mathcal{N}$ such that $\{i, j\} \cap \{k, l\} = \emptyset$. We have

$$\text{Cov}(h_{ij}q_{ij}, h_{kl}q_{kl}) = \sum_{r=t+1}^{\infty} \sum_{\tilde{r}=t+1}^{\infty} \gamma_1^{r+\tilde{r}-2(t+1)} \text{Cov}(h_{ij}(\mathbf{w}^r)_{ij}, h_{kl}(\mathbf{w}^{\tilde{r}})_{kl}).$$

By Assumption 14(iv), each term in the sum has a uniform bound $o(n^{-2})$ that does not depend on i, j, k, l, r , and \tilde{r} . The statement is thus satisfied for case (c). Case (d) can be proved similarly. \square

O.C.2 Asymptotic Distribution of $\hat{\gamma}$

Lemma O.C.11 (Asymptotically linear representation of the moment). *We have*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n m(\omega_i, \gamma_0, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n ((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))\nu_i + M_\theta \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0)) + o_p(1), \quad (\text{O.C.8})$$

where $M_\theta = -\mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[Z_i|z_i] - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \frac{\partial \lambda_0(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta}]$.

Proof. Consider the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n m(\omega_i, \gamma_0, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i)) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n m(\omega_i, \gamma_0, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) + \sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) \\ & \quad + \sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \mu_0^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) - \int D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i)), \quad (\text{O.C.9}) \end{aligned}$$

where $D(\epsilon_i, \mu) = -\mu\epsilon_i$ for any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$, $\mu^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) = \mathbb{E}[Z_i|\tau(z_i, g_i, \hat{\theta})]$, and $F(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i)$ denotes the cdf of (z_i, g_i, ϵ_i) . The first term is a leading term. The second term is to adjust for the estimation of μ_0^Z , and the third term is to adjust for the estimation of θ_0 (Hahn and Ridder, 2013), Both terms contribute to the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\gamma}$. The last term is $o_p(1)$ by Lemma O.C.14.

The second term in equation (O.C.9) can be analyzed following Newey (1994a). For an arbitrary mean square integrable function $\mu(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$ that is continuously differentiable in τ , by iterated expectations we have $\mathbb{E}[D(\epsilon_i, \mu(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)))] = -\mathbb{E}[\mu(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))\mu^\epsilon(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))]$, where $\mu^\epsilon(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i|\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)]$. Hence, the correction term in Newey (1994a, Proposition 4) takes the form $\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) = -(Z_i - \mu^Z(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)))\mu^\epsilon(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))$ and thus $\sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu^Z(\hat{\tau}_i))dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \hat{\tau}_i)$. Also recall that $\hat{\tau}_i = \tau(z_i, g_i, \hat{\theta})$ and $\tau_i = \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)$. Define $\alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i) = -(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))\lambda_0(\tau_i)$. Under Assumption 16(ii), expanding $\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \hat{\tau}_i)$ around θ_0 yields $\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \hat{\tau}_i) = \alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i) + \frac{\partial \alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i)}{\partial \theta'}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) + o_p(\|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\|)$. By Lemma O.C.15 and Assumption 12(ii), $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i)}{\partial \theta'} = o_p(1)$ and $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = O_p(1)$. We thus have $\sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu^Z(\hat{\tau}_i))dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_0^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i) + o_p(1)$.

The third term in equation (O.C.9) can be analyzed following Hahn and Ridder (2013). Observe that $\frac{\partial D(\epsilon_i, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))}{\partial \mu^Z} = -\epsilon_i$ and $\mathbb{E}[\frac{\partial D(\epsilon_i, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))}{\partial \mu^Z} | \tau_i = \tau] = -\lambda_0(\tau)$. The first term in Hahn and Ridder (2013, Theorem 4) takes the form $-\mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_i - \lambda_0(\tau_i))\frac{\partial \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta}] = 0$, where we used $\epsilon_i - \lambda_0(\tau_i) = \nu_i$ and $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i|z_i, g_i] = 0$. Therefore, by Hahn and Ridder (2013, Theorem 4),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \mu^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) \\ &= -\mathbb{E} \left[(\mathbb{E}[Z_i|z_i] - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \frac{\partial \lambda_0(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau} \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta} \right] \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = M_\theta \sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0). \end{aligned}$$

Because $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0) + o_p(1)$, we can represent $\sqrt{n} \int D(\epsilon_i, \mu^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n M_\theta \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0) + o_p(1)$. Note that $m(\omega_i, \gamma_0, \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) + \alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i) = (Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))\nu_i$. Combining the results we obtain equation (O.C.8). \square

Lemma O.C.12 (CLT of the moment). *Let $\Phi_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n ((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i))\nu_i + M_\theta \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0))$. Then $\Omega_n^{-1/2} \Phi_n \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I_{dz})$, where $\varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$ is defined in equation (O.C.10), $\Omega_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i)\varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i)']$, and I_{dz} is the $dz \times dz$ identity matrix.*

Proof. Recall that $Z_i = (w_i \mathbf{x}, x'_i, z'_i)'$. While x_i and z_i are i.i.d., $w_i \mathbf{x}$ are correlated

across i . Lemma [O.C.13](#) establishes the Hoeffding projection $n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i \mathbf{x})' \nu_i = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i) + o_p(1)$, where $h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i) = \sum_j (\mathbb{E}[w_{ij} x_j \nu_i | x_i, \nu_i] + \mathbb{E}[w_{ji} \nu_j x_i | x_i, \nu_i]) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$. Define the function $\varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i) &= n^{-1/2} ((h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i)' - \mathbb{E}[(w_i \mathbf{x})' | \tau_i]) \nu_i, (x_i' - \mathbb{E}[x_i' | \tau_i]) \nu_i, (z_i' - \mathbb{E}[z_i' | \tau_i]) \nu_i)' \\ &\quad + M_\theta \phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0). \end{aligned} \tag{O.C.10}$$

Then $\Phi_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i) + o_p(1)$. Because $\mathbb{E}[h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i)] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i | \zeta] = 0$, and $\mathbb{E}[\phi_\theta(z_i, \theta_0)] = 0$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}[\varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i)] = 0$.

Write $\varphi_{ni} = \varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i)$. Observe that $\{\varphi_{ni}, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ forms a triangular array. We apply the Lindeberg-Feller CLT to derive the asymptotic distribution of $\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_{ni}$. By the Cramer-Wold device it suffices to show that $a' \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_{ni}$ satisfies the Lindeberg condition for any $d_Z \times 1$ vector of constants $a \in \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$. The Lindeberg condition is that for any $\kappa > 0$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\frac{(a' \varphi_{ni})^2}{a' \Omega_n a} 1\{|a' \varphi_{ni}| \geq \kappa \sqrt{a' \Omega_n a}\}] = 0$. The sum is bounded by $\mathbb{E}[\sum_i \frac{(a' \varphi_{ni})^2}{a' \Omega_n a} 1\{\max_i |a' \varphi_{ni}| \geq \kappa \sqrt{a' \Omega_n a}\}]$, where the random variable $\sum_i \frac{(a' \varphi_{ni})^2}{a' \Omega_n a}$ has a finite expectation and is therefore $O_p(1)$. Moreover, we can derive $\max_i |a' \varphi_{ni}| = o_p(1)$.⁶⁹ Therefore $\sum_i \frac{(a' \varphi_{ni})^2}{a' \Omega_n a} 1\{\max_i |a' \varphi_{ni}| \geq \kappa \sqrt{a' \Omega_n a}\} = O_p(1) o_p(1) = o_p(1)$. This random variable is bounded by $\sum_i \frac{(a' \varphi_{ni})^2}{a' \Omega_n a}$ which has a finite expectation. By dominated convergence, the Lindeberg condition is satisfied. By Lindeberg-Feller CLT, $\Omega_n^{-1/2} \Phi_n = \Omega_n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi_n(x_i, z_i, \nu_i) + o_p(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, I_{d_z})$. \square

Lemma O.C.13 (Hoeffding projection). *Let $W_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_i \sum_j w_{ij} x_j \nu_i$. Define $W_n^* = n^{-1/2} \sum_i h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i)$, where $h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i) = \sum_j (\mathbb{E}[w_{ij} x_j \nu_i | x_i, \nu_i] + \mathbb{E}[w_{ji} x_i \nu_j | x_i, \nu_i])$. Then $\|W_n - W_n^*\| = o_p(1)$.*

Proof. Our proof builds on [Lee \(1990, Secion 3.7.5\)](#) for weighted U -statistics. Specifically, we generalize the Hoeffding projection to allow for random weight w_{ij} that is correlated with \mathbf{x} , in contrast to [Lee \(1990\)](#)'s assumption of constant weights.

Let $I = \{i_1, i_2\}$ be an ordered 2-subset of \mathcal{N} and $t_i = (x_i, \nu_i)$. Define $w_I = w_{i_1 i_2}$ and $h(t_I) = h(t_{i_1}, t_{i_2}) = x_{i_2} \nu_{i_1}$. We can write $W_n = n^{-1/2} \sum_I w_I h(t_I)$ and $h_n^*(x_i, \nu_i) = h_n^*(t_i) = \sum_{I: i \in I} \mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I) | t_i]$. We have $\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I | \zeta] \mathbb{E}[h(t_I) | \zeta]] = 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[h_n^*(t_i)] = \sum_{I: i \in I} \mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)] = 0$ under Assumption [14\(iii\)](#). By Markov's inequality, it suffices to show $\mathbb{E}\|W_n - W_n^*\|^2 = o(1)$.

⁶⁹Because x_i and z_i are bounded, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty^4] = O(n^{-4})$, and $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i^4] < \infty$, we can bound $\mathbb{E}[\max_i (a' \varphi_{ni})^2] \leq \|a\|^2 \mathbb{E}[\max_i \|\varphi_{ni}\|^2] \leq O(n^{-1}) = o(1)$.

By definition, $\mathbb{E}[W_n' W_n^*] = n^{-1/2} \sum_i \mathbb{E}[W_n' h_n^*(t_i)]$, and for each i , $\mathbb{E}[W_n' h_n^*(t_i)] = n^{-1/2} \sum_{I:i \in I} \mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)' h_n^*(t_i)] = n^{-1/2} \mathbb{E}[h_n^*(t_i)' h_n^*(t_i)]$, where the first equality holds because for $i \notin I$, $\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)' h_n^*(t_i)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \mathbb{E}[h(t_I)' h_n^*(t_i) | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]] = 0$ under Assumption 14(iii), and the second equality follows by iterated expectations. It then follows that $\mathbb{E}[W_n' W_n^*] = n^{-1} \sum_i \mathbb{E}[h_n^*(t_i)' h_n^*(t_i)] = \mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$ and thus $\mathbb{E}\|W_n - W_n^*\|^2 = \mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$. It remains to show that $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2 = o(1)$.

To show the last result, note that for disjoint I and J , we have $\mathbb{E}[w_I w_J h(t_I)' h(t_J)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \mathbb{E}[h(t_I)' h(t_J) | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]] = 0$, where the first equality holds by Assumption 14(iii), and the last equality follows from $\mathbb{E}[h(t_I)' h(t_J) | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] = 0$ because (ν_i, ς_i) is i.i.d.. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{(I,J):|I \cap J|=1} \mathbb{E}[w_I w_J h(t_I)' h(t_J)] + n^{-1} \sum_{(I,J):|I \cap J|=2} \mathbb{E}[w_I w_J h(t_I)' h(t_J)].$$

For comparison, because $\mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2 = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\|h_n^*(t_i)\|^2$ we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2 &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{(I,J):\{i\}=I \cap J} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)' | t_i] \mathbb{E}[w_J h(t_J) | t_i]] \\ &\quad + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{(I,J):\{i\} \subsetneq I \cap J} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)' | t_i] \mathbb{E}[w_J h(t_J) | t_i]]. \end{aligned}$$

The first sums in $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$ consist of the same number of terms. Consider I and J such that $|I \cap J| = 1$. Because \mathbf{w} and $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ are independent conditional on $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[w_I w_J h(t_I)' h(t_J)] &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}, \boldsymbol{\nu}] h(t_I)' h(t_J)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] h(t_I)' h(t_J)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\text{Cov}(w_I, w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}) + \mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] \mathbb{E}[w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}]) h(t_I)' h(t_J)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_I] \mathbb{E}[w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_J] h(t_I)' h(t_J)] + o(n^{-2}), \quad (\text{O.C.11}) \end{aligned}$$

where the $o(n^{-2})$ term does not depend on I and J . To see the last equality, note that $h(t_I)' h(t_J)$ is square integrable and $\mathbb{E}[\nu_i^4] < \infty$ under Assumption 11 and 16(i). The last equality then follows from Assumption 14(ii)(v)(vi).⁷⁰ Similarly, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)' | t_i] \mathbb{E}[w_J h(t_J) | t_i]] &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}, \boldsymbol{\nu}] h(t_I)' | t_i] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}, \boldsymbol{\nu}] h(t_J) | t_i]) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] h(t_I)' | t_i] \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_J | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] h(t_J) | t_i]) \end{aligned}$$

⁷⁰Note that Assumption 14(v) implies $\max_{I \subseteq \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}] - \mathbb{E}[w_I | \boldsymbol{\varsigma}_I])^4] = o(n^{-4}/K^2) \leq o(n^{-4})$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I|_{\mathcal{S}_I}]h(t_I)'|t_i]\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_J|_{\mathcal{S}_J}]h(t_J)|t_i]] + o(n^{-2}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I|_{\mathcal{S}_I}]\mathbb{E}[w_J|_{\mathcal{S}_J}]h(t_I)'h(t_J)] + o(n^{-2}), \quad (\text{O.C.12})
\end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows because for I and J with $\{i\} = I \cap J$, $\mathbb{E}[w_I|_{\mathcal{S}_I}]h(t_I)$ and $\mathbb{E}[w_J|_{\mathcal{S}_J}]h(t_J)$ are independent conditional on t_i . The covariance in equations (O.C.11) and (O.C.12) differs by $o(n^{-2})$ uniformly in I and J . Since the first sums in $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$ consist of $O(n^3)$ terms, they differ by $n^{-1} \cdot O(n^3) \cdot o(n^{-2}) = o(1)$.

The second sums in $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$ consist of $O(n^2)$ terms. For any I and J , both $\mathbb{E}[w_I w_J h(t_I)' h(t_J)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[w_I h(t_I)'|t_i]\mathbb{E}[w_J h(t_J)|t_i]]$ can be uniformly bounded by $O(n^{-2})$ (Assumption 14(ii)). Therefore, the second sums in $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2$ and $\mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2$ are both $n^{-1} \cdot O(n^2) \cdot O(n^{-2}) = o(1)$. We conclude that $\mathbb{E}\|W_n\|^2 - \mathbb{E}\|W_n^*\|^2 = o(1)$. \square

Lemma O.C.14.

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) - \int D(\epsilon_i, \hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) dF(z_i, g_i, \epsilon_i)) = o_p(1).$$

Proof. Let $\mu = \mu(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) \in \mathbb{R}^{dz}$ be a function of $\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)$. Define the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_n(\mu) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_i (D(\epsilon_i, \mu) - \mathbb{E}[D(\epsilon_i, \mu)])$ indexed by μ . We can represent the left-hand side of the above equation as $\mathbb{G}_n(\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau})) - \mathbb{G}_n(\mu_0^Z(\tau))$.

Observe that $D(\epsilon_i, \mu) = -\mu \epsilon_i$ is linear in μ . This together with the boundedness of Z_i and $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i^2] < \infty$ (Assumptions 11, 14(i), and 16(i)) implies that the empirical process $\mathbb{G}_n(\mu)$ is stochastically equicontinuous under L_2 norm (Andrews, 1994, Theorems 1-2). It remains to show that $\int \|\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) = o_p(1)$, where $F(z_i, g_i)$ denotes the cdf of (z_i, g_i) . We prove it following Newey (1997, Theorem 1).

By the triangle inequality and $(a + b + c)^2 \leq 3(a^2 + b^2 + c^2)$, we derive

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int \|\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\tau}_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) \\
&\leq 3 \int (\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})'(b^K(\hat{\tau}_i) - b^K(\tau_i))\|^2 + \|(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau}) - \beta^Z)' b^K(\tau_i)\|^2 \\
&\quad \|\beta^{Z'} b^K(\tau_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2) dF(z_i, g_i). \quad (\text{O.C.13})
\end{aligned}$$

Consider the three terms in the last equation. The first term satisfies

$$\int \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\tau})'(b^K(\hat{\tau}_i) - b^K(\tau_i))\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) \leq O_p(\varrho_1(K)^2) \int \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\hat{\tau}_i - \tau_i\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) = O_p(\varrho_1(K)^2/n),$$

where the inequality holds by equation (O.C.2), the mean-value theorem and Assump-

tion 13(iv), and the equality holds because the \sqrt{n} -consistency of $\hat{\theta}$ and boundedness of z imply that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\hat{\tau}_i - \tau_i\| = O_p(n^{-1/2})$. As for the second term in (O.C.13), by $\mathbb{E}[b^K(\tau_i)b^{K'}(\tau_i)] = I_K$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \|(\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)' b^K(\tau_i)\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) \\ &= \text{tr}((\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)' \int b^K(\tau_i)b^{K'}(\tau_i) dF(z_i, g_i) (\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z)) \\ &= \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z\|^2 = O_p(\varrho_1(K)^2/n) + o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from $\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \beta^Z\|^2 \leq 2(\|\hat{\beta}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})\|^2 + \|\hat{\beta}^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau}) - \beta^Z\|^2)$, Lemmas O.C.7 and O.C.8, and Li and Racine (2007, Lemma 15.3). The third term in (O.C.13) has the bound $\int \|\beta^{Z'} b^K(\tau_i) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) \leq \sup_{\tau} \|\beta^{Z'} b^K(\tau) - \mu_0^Z(\tau)\|^2 = O(K^{-2a})$ by Assumption 13(ii). Combining the results yields $\int \|\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}) - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)\|^2 dF(z_i, g_i) = o_p(1)$ and $\mathbb{G}_n(\hat{\mu}^Z(\hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}})) - \mathbb{G}_n(\mu_0^Z(\boldsymbol{\tau})) = o_p(1)$. \square

Lemma O.C.15. $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i)}{\partial \theta'} = o_p(1)$.

Proof. Recall that $\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) = -(Z_i - \mu^Z(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)))\mu^\epsilon(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))$, where $\mu^Z(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) = \mathbb{E}[Z_i | \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)]$ and $\mu^\epsilon(\tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)) = \mathbb{E}[\epsilon_i | \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta)]$. By the law of iterated expectations we have $\mathbb{E}[\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))] = 0$, so $\mathbb{E}[\partial \alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i) / \partial \theta'] = \partial \mathbb{E}[\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))] / \partial \theta' = 0$.

Differentiating $\alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta))$ with respect to θ at θ_0 yields

$$\frac{\partial \alpha^Z(\omega_i, \tau_i)}{\partial \theta'} = \left(\frac{\partial \mu^Z(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i) - (Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \frac{\partial \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \right) \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta'}.$$

Because $\tau_i = \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)$ is bounded and $\mu^Z(\tau_i)$ and $\mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)$ are continuously differentiable in τ_i (Assumptions 11(i), 12(i), and 16(ii)), $\mu^Z(\tau_i)$, $\mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)$, $\frac{\partial \mu^Z(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i}$, and $\frac{\partial \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i}$ are bounded. Observe that (z_i, τ_i) is i.i.d.. By the law of large numbers, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial \mu^Z(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i) \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta'} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial \mu^Z(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i) \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta'} \right] \right) = o_p(1).$$

Moreover, following Lemma O.C.3 we can show that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left((Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \frac{\partial \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta'} - \mathbb{E} \left[(Z_i - \mu_0^Z(\tau_i)) \frac{\partial \mu^\epsilon(\tau_i)}{\partial \tau_i} \frac{\partial \tau(z_i, g_i, \theta_0)}{\partial \theta'} \right] \right) = o_p(1).$$

Combining the above two equations proves the lemma. \square