

# Inference in IV models with clustered dependence, many instruments and weak identification\*

Johannes W. Ligtenberg  
 University of Groningen  
 j.w.ligtenberg@rug.nl

March 4, 2024

## Abstract

Data clustering reduces the effective sample size from the number of observations towards the number of clusters. For instrumental variable models I show that this reduced effective sample size makes the instruments more likely to be weak, in the sense that they contain little information about the endogenous regressor, and many, in the sense that their number is large compared to the sample size. Clustered data therefore increases the need for many and weak instrument robust tests. However, none of the previously developed many and weak instrument robust tests can be applied to this type of data as they all require independent observations. I therefore adapt two types of such tests to clustered data. First, I derive cluster jackknife Anderson-Rubin and score tests by removing clusters rather than individual observations from the statistics. Second, I propose a cluster many instrument Anderson-Rubin test which improves on the first type of tests by using a more optimal, but more complex, weighting matrix. I show that if the clusters satisfy an invariance assumption the higher complexity poses no problems. By revisiting a study on the effect of queenly reign on war I show the empirical relevance of the new tests.

*Keywords:* robust inference, many instruments, clustered data, jackknife.

*JEL codes:* C12, C26, N43.

## 1 Introduction

The wide spread use of clustered standard errors in instrumental variable (IV) models shows that studies that use IVs to identify a coefficient on an endogenous regressor often use data that are clustered, as opposed to independent data. In this paper I show that clustered data makes it more likely that the instruments are weak, in the sense that they contain little information about the endogenous regressor, or that they are many, in the sense that their number is large compared to the sample size. This is because the dependence between observations within the same cluster decreases the information in the sample, or put differently reduces the effective sample size, compared to independent observations. Consequently, weak and many instrument

---

\*I thank Stanislav Anatolyev, Tom Boot, Tom Wansbeek, Tiemen Woutersen and participants at the 16<sup>th</sup> meeting of the NESG and the 3<sup>rd</sup> international econometrics PhD conference for insightful comments and discussions.

problems, such as unreliability of tests based on two stage least squares (2SLS), are also more likely in case that the data are clustered and makes the need for tests that are reliable also in the presence of many and weak instruments more pressing.

Recently several of such tests that are robust against many and weak instruments have been proposed (Crudu et al., 2021; Mikusheva and Sun, 2022; Matsushita and Otsu, 2022; Boot and Ligtenberg, 2023; Dovì et al., 2023; Lim et al., 2024a,b), but none of these can be applied to clustered data as they all require independent data. As a consequence many IV models cannot be analysed reliably. In this paper I therefore extend two types of tests that are robust against many and weak instruments to clustered data.

In particular, I adapt the jackknife type tests by Crudu et al. (2021), Mikusheva and Sun (2022) and Matsushita and Otsu (2022) and the many instrument Anderson-Rubin (Anderson and Rubin, 1949, AR) test by Boot and Ligtenberg (2023). These are all tests for parameters on endogenous regressors in a linear IV model and allow for (i) many instruments in the sense that the number of instruments is a non-negligible fraction of the sample size (Bekker, 1994), (ii) weak or irrelevant instruments as measured by a small or zero correlation between the endogenous regressor and the instruments, and (iii) heteroskedastic data.

The first test that I propose is a generalisation of the jackknife AR test. The original AR test, although robust against weak instruments, has low power and can be oversized in case the instruments are numerous (Kleibergen, 2002; Anatolyev and Gospodinov, 2011). Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022) resolve this issue by removing the terms in the AR statistic that have non-zero expectation. For independent data this can be done by jackknifing the AR statistic, hence yielding the jackknife AR statistic. If the data are clustered, then there are additional terms that have non-zero expectation, which I remove using a new cluster jackknife to obtain the cluster jackknife AR statistic. Following an earlier version of this paper, the same jackknife was also proposed by Frandsen et al. (2023). I then show that the cluster jackknife can also be used to extend the jackknife score test (Matsushita and Otsu, 2022) to a cluster jackknife score test, which in some cases has better power than the cluster jackknife AR test.

Next, I propose several extensions and improvements for the cluster jackknife AR and score tests. Firstly, I argue that the cluster jackknife AR and score statistics converge jointly, which allows them to be combined in a conditional linear combination test (Andrews, 2016; Lim et al., 2024a) to further enhance the power.

Secondly, by leaving out terms from the AR and score statistics, information that can help to conduct inference on the parameters of interest is lost. Bekker and Crudu (2015) therefore propose an alternative jackknife procedure, called the symmetric jackknife, which aims at retaining part of this information. Crudu et al. (2021) use this alternative jackknife to omit the terms with non-zero expectation from the AR statistic and in that way obtain the symmetric jackknife AR statistic. I extend the symmetric jackknife procedure to clustered data and incorporate it in the cluster symmetric jackknife AR and score statistics. These statistics have a larger signal component about the parameters of interest than the cluster jackknife AR and score statistics.

Thirdly, Chao et al. (2023) argue that recentering statistics using the jackknife does not work well in case there are many exogenous control variables in the model, since removing these controls introduces dependence between the terms in the statistic, which causes more terms to have non-zero expectation. They therefore propose a different type of jackknife, which can handle many control variables. I also extend this type of jackknife to clustered data.

Finally, to enhance the power of the different cluster jackknife tests, I propose alternative variance estimators which transform the implied errors in the estimator by cross-fitting them (Newey and Robins, 2018; Kline et al., 2020). This improves power as it removes the part that biases the variance estimator when the hypothesised value of the parameter of interest is far from its true value (Mikusheva and Sun, 2022).

Although the cluster jackknife AR and score statistics allow for reliable inference in case the data are heteroskedastic, both statistics are based on a generalised method of moments objective function that uses a weighting matrix for homoskedastic data. This can lead to a loss of efficiency, as it does not weigh data optimally. The heteroskedastic weighting matrix, however, is difficult to control when the number of instruments is large and the data are heteroskedastic, because it contains many different variances and covariances. Boot and Ligtenberg (2023) show that for independent data the problems with the heteroskedastic weight matrix can be circumvented if the data satisfy an invariance assumption, in the sense that the distribution of the moment conditions is symmetric around zero. Therefore, the second type of test I make suited for clustered data is Boot and Ligtenberg's (2023) many instrument AR test. I show that their approach to control the heteroskedastic weighting matrix generalises to clustered data if for each cluster the joint distribution of moment conditions within that cluster is symmetric around zero.

I explore how the cluster robust tests perform in a Monte Carlo experiment in which the data is dependent within clusters. The cluster jackknife tests and cluster many instrument AR test attain close to nominal size in a range of settings. When there are many instruments the two tests also have superior power relative to the cluster adaptation of the AR test for a small number of instruments.

Finally, I illustrate the practical relevance of the new tests by revisiting Dube and Harish's (2020) study on the effect of having a queen on the likelihood for a state to be at war. They identify this effect via two instruments based on the family composition of European monarchs. The data set for the analysis consists of 18 polities observed some time between 1480 and 1913, resulting in 3 586 polity-year observations. The data is clustered in reigns, which yields 176 clusters of varying size. In the appendix three additional instruments are proposed based on interactions of the two instruments with exogenous regressors. Dube and Harish (2020) note however that these interactions are relatively weak instruments. Moreover, as mentioned earlier in this introduction, because the data are clustered the total number of instruments compared to the effective sample size is relatively large. To conduct inference in the larger models that include the extra instruments, therefore requires many and weak instrument robust tests, but since the data are not independent none of the previously developed tests can be applied. I continue the analysis with the new cluster robust tests and find that having a queen significantly increases the likelihood of an armed conflict.

My paper mainly relates to two strands of literature. The first being the one on many and weak IVs for which Anatolyev (2019) provides a survey. Weak instruments cause 2SLS estimates to be biased and tests based upon these to be size distorted. Therefore researchers check the instruments' strength via  $F$ -statistics (Stock and Yogo, 2005). If the IVs are weak, identification robust tests such as the AR (Anderson and Rubin, 1949), the Kleibergen Lagrange multiplier (Kleibergen, 2002) and the conditional likelihood ratio test (Moreira, 2003) provide alternative ways to inference that bound the type 1 error.

Similarly, Bekker (1994) showed that 2SLS is inconsistent when there are many IVs, even

when these are strong. In his linear IV model with homoskedastic normal errors limited information maximum likelihood (LIML) remains consistent on the other hand, and can be used for testing after a correction to the asymptotic variance. His results were generalised to non-normal data by [Hansen et al. \(2008\)](#), but unless the data follow a balanced group structure this is not possible for heteroskedastic data ([Bekker and van der Ploeg, 2005](#)).

The combination of many and weak instruments started with so-called many weak instrument sequences ([Chao and Swanson, 2005](#); [Stock and Yogo, 2005](#)). These sequences require the concentration parameter, which is a measure of the information contained in the instruments that depends on both the number and the strength of the instruments, to grow at a certain rate. This differs from the setting in this paper where I put no restrictions on this joint measure and therefore allow for the case in which the instruments are weak, or even irrelevant, and the number of instruments is proportional to the sample size. For homoskedastic data [Bekker and Kleibergen \(2003\)](#) and [Anatolyev and Gospodinov \(2011\)](#) study the influence of many instruments on identification robust tests and show that the statistics need to be rescaled to obtain the familiar distributions.

Tests robust against many and weak instruments as in the sense of this paper for heteroskedastic data were only proposed recently. [Crudu et al. \(2021\)](#) and [Mikusheva and Sun \(2022\)](#) jackknife an AR statistic to remove the terms that prevent the application of a central limit theorem. [Dovi et al. \(2023\)](#) use regularisation to extend these results to allow for more instruments than observations. Another extension is given by [Lim et al. \(2024b\)](#) who corrects the critical values such that the test is valid both with a fixed and a diverging number of instruments. [Matsushita and Otsu \(2022\)](#) use the jackknife to derive a jackknife score test, which [Lim et al. \(2024a\)](#) combine with the jackknife AR statistic in a linear combination test ([Andrews and Mikusheva, 2016](#)) to enhance its power.

[Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#) take a different approach and consider tests based on the continuous updating objective function, since for a fixed number of instruments tests based on this objective function have some optimality properties ([Andrews et al., 2019](#)). However, unlike the other statistics, the continuous updating objective function uses a heteroskedastic weighting matrix for the moment conditions, which is difficult to control under many instruments. [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#) show that this problem can be overcome when the data satisfy an invariance assumption and derive the joint distribution of the objective function and its score.

The second strand of literature to which my paper relates is the cluster robust covariance estimation literature. See [MacKinnon et al. \(2023\)](#) for an introduction and overview. Here I want to highlight a few recent papers.

A first related paper is the one by [Hansen \(2022\)](#). He studies jackknife cluster robust variance estimators in a linear regression model. Similar to my jackknife procedure he removes entire clusters, rather than individual observations. His jackknife cluster robust variance estimators have excellent finite sample properties, as they are never downwards biased for homoskedastic normal data. Although his approach can likely be extended to variance estimation of 2SLS estimates in the linear IV model, it does not overcome the problems that many and weak instruments cause for tests based on the 2SLS estimator.

Next, [Cai \(2023\)](#) and [Hagemann \(2023\)](#) also use invariance properties to derive tests when the data are clustered. The objectives of their tests differ from mine however, as the first paper proposes a test on the level of clustering and the second paper proposes a test on the effect of a

binary treatment in case entire clusters are treated. Furthermore, both papers consider a setting in which there is a finite number of large clusters, whereas I assume a large number of small clusters. Their tests then emerge because under the null hypothesis certain statistics of these large clusters converge to a distribution that satisfies an invariance property and thus can be used in a randomisation test. Another difference with their papers and mine therefore is that the invariance is not grounded in an assumption on the data, but is a consequence of the null hypothesis.

Given the invariance assumption in my model, an alternative way to conduct inference on the parameter of interest is to use randomisation tests as, for example, in [Canay et al. \(2017\)](#). In this paper I do not consider such tests to stay close to the literature on many weak instruments. Moreover, the approach I use here to generalise the many instrument AR statistic is interesting on its own, since it might also be used to derive a cluster many instrument score statistic similar to the score statistic in [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#), for which a randomisation test is not available due to dependence on the unknown distribution of the first stage errors.

Lastly, a couple of papers question the need to account for clustered data. [Barrios et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Chetverikov et al. \(2023\)](#) focus on settings in which the distribution of a regressor allows the use of simpler variance estimators. In particular they show that when the regressor of interest is randomly and exogenously assigned, the homoskedastic variance estimator remains valid. The regressor of interest in my model is endogenous and therefore does not fall in this specific category.

Another paper that derives conditions under which clustering is not necessary or must be accounted for in a non-conventional manner is the one by [Abadie et al. \(2023\)](#). They emphasise the different needs for clustering due to what they call the sampling based approach and the design based approach. In the former the researcher observes a small fraction of all clusters, whereas in the latter almost the entire population is observed, which requires a different type of clustering. In this paper I abstract from these questions and assume that clustering at the specified level is necessary and adequate.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In [Section 2](#) I present the linear IV model for clustered data and argue why many and weak instruments are more likely in these types of models. Next, in [Section 3](#) I derive the cluster jackknife AR and score tests and provide some extensions of these tests. [Section 4](#) proposes the cluster many instrument AR statistic. [Section 5](#) contains simulation results on the new tests. The empirical application is given in [Section 6](#) and the last section concludes. All extra results, proofs, longer derivations and alternative interpretations are in the appendices.

Throughout I use the following notation.  $\mathbf{1}$  is a vector of ones and  $\mathbf{e}_i$  is  $i^{\text{th}}$  unit vector.  $\mathbf{A}_{(i)} = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{e}_i$  denotes the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column of  $\mathbf{A}$ . I use the projection matrices  $\mathbf{P}_A = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})^{-1}\mathbf{A}'$  and  $\mathbf{M}_A = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{P}_A$ . For  $\odot$  the Hadamard product, I write  $\mathbf{D}_A = \mathbf{I} \odot \mathbf{A}$  if  $\mathbf{A}$  is a square matrix and  $\mathbf{D}_v$  the diagonal matrix with the elements of  $\mathbf{v}$  on its diagonal if  $\mathbf{v}$  is a vector.  $\dot{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{D}_A$  is the matrix with the diagonal elements set to zero. For  $\mathbf{A}$  a square matrix  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$  are the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$ . For  $\mathbf{A}$  not necessarily square  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_2 = \sqrt{\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A}'\mathbf{A})}$  is the spectral norm. Let  $\otimes$  be the Kronecker product and  $\text{vec}(\mathbf{A})$  be the column vectorisation of a matrix. I denote convergence in distribution by  $\rightsquigarrow$ , convergence in probability by  $\xrightarrow{p}$  and almost sure (a.s.) convergence by  $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$ . For two random variables  $B$  and  $C$ ,  $B \stackrel{d}{=} C$  means that  $B$  and  $C$  have the same distribution.  $\sum_{g \neq h}$  can denote the double

sum  $\sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{h=1, h \neq g}^H$ , and similarly for other types of sums. Whether this is the case and the maxima of the sums depend implicitly on the context. Finally,  $C$  denotes a finite positive scalar that is not necessarily the same in each appearance.

## 2 Model

Consider the linear IV model

$$\begin{aligned} y_i &= \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \varepsilon_i \\ \mathbf{x}_i &= \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{z}_i + \boldsymbol{\eta}_i. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Here  $y_i$  is a scalar outcome,  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  a vector of endogenous variables,  $\mathbf{z}_i \in \mathbb{R}^k$  a vector of IVs and  $\varepsilon_i \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$  are the second and first stage errors,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Assume for now that the exogenous covariates are small in number and have been partialled out. The inclusion of a large number of exogenous covariates is deferred to [Section 3.3.3](#).

The data are divided over  $G$  clusters with sizes  $n_g$ ,  $g = 1, \dots, G$  that are not necessarily equal. This division is known. Stack the observations ordered by cluster in  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)'$ , and similarly for the other variables. The model in (1) then becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y} &= \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \mathbf{X} &= \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}. \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Given the clustering structure I use the following notation. Denote the indices corresponding to cluster  $g$  by  $[g]$  and for any  $n \times m$  matrix or vector  $\mathbf{A}$  let  $\mathbf{A}_{[g]}$  be the  $n_g \times m$  matrix with only the rows of  $\mathbf{A}$  indexed by  $[g]$  selected. Also if  $m = n$ , let  $\mathbf{A}_{[g,h]}$  be the  $n_g \times n_h$  matrix with only the columns of  $\mathbf{A}_{[g]}$  indexed by  $[h]$  selected. I make the following assumptions on the data.

**Assumption A1.** *Conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\}_{g=1}^G$  is independent with mean zero,  $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g$ ,  $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i),[g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(j),[h]} | \mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_g^{(i,j)}$ , and  $\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i),[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\Xi}_g^{(i)}$  if  $g = h$  and zero otherwise,  $g, h = 1, \dots, G$ ,  $i, j = 1, \dots, p$ .*

This assumption formalises the cluster structure. It requires the observations between clusters to be independent, but allows for dependence of observations within clusters. As a consequence of this dependence, a clustered sample generally contains less information than a same sized sample of independent data. Thus clustering decreases the effective sample size down from the number of observations towards the number of clusters.

Many instruments are modelled as the number of instruments being large relative to the sample size. The reduced effective sample size under clustering makes the number of instruments more quickly large compared to the effective sample size. Hence, clustering makes the problems associated with many instruments, such as biased estimators and oversized tests, more likely than when the data are independent.

Similarly, for independent data weak instruments are modelled as the first stage coefficient  $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$  in (1) shrinking at a rate of square root the sample size. Again, the reduced effective sample size under clustering makes that  $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$  can shrink at a lower rate for clustered data, making weak instrument problems of biased estimators and oversized tests more likely to occur. I formally show this and some of its consequences in [Appendix A](#).

The goal of the tests presented in the next sections is to test the null hypothesis  $H_0: \beta_0 = \beta$  against the alternative  $H_1: \beta_0 \neq \beta$ .

### 3 Cluster jackknife tests

The first type of tests that are robust against many and weak instruments and can handle clustered data are based on jackknifing. To motivate the tests I first discuss the cluster jackknife AR test. Next, I show how the same technique can be applied to a score test and, finally, I generalise several improvements of the jackknife tests for independent data to clustered data.

#### 3.1 Cluster jackknife AR

For a given value of  $\beta$ , that is not necessarily equal to  $\beta_0$ , let  $\varepsilon(\beta) = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta$ . Then, the original AR statistic for the linear IV model converges as

$$AR(\beta_0) = \frac{1}{n} \varepsilon(\beta_0)' \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{V}_{AR}^{-1}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}' \varepsilon(\beta_0) \rightsquigarrow \chi_k^2,$$

where  $\mathbf{V}_{AR}(\beta) = \text{var}(\mathbf{Z}' \varepsilon(\beta) / \sqrt{n} | \mathbf{Z})$  captures the variance of the moment conditions.

The original AR statistic is robust against weak instruments, but it has some problems in case the instruments are numerous. For homoskedastic data and if the number of instruments is a non-negligible fraction of the sample size, the test based on the feasible version of this statistic has low power (Kleibergen, 2002), but is oversized (Anatolyev and Gospodinov, 2011). Furthermore, if in addition to many instruments, the data are heteroskedastic, then the estimation of the covariance matrix,  $\mathbf{V}_{AR}(\beta)$ , is complex due to the large number of variances and covariances which can add to the size and power problems.

Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022) therefore adapt the AR statistic in two ways to make it suited for many instruments and heteroskedasticity when the data is independent. First, they substitute  $\mathbf{V}_{AR}(\beta)$  by the homoskedasticity inspired weighting matrix  $\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}$ . This matrix does not depend on the variances and covariances of the errors and is therefore much simpler.

Second, Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022) note that the  $\chi_k^2$  distribution has many degrees of freedom in case there are many instruments. This makes the distribution spread out and causes low power. The  $\chi_k^2$  distribution however can be changed to a normal distribution if the statistic is properly centred at zero. To do so the terms in the AR statistic that involve squares of the errors and therefore have non-zero expectation need to be removed. This is done efficiently by jackknifing, and which boils down to setting the diagonal elements of the matrix that weighs the errors,  $\mathbf{P}_Z = \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'$ , to zero.

After rescaling and under certain assumptions, Crudu et al. (2021) and Mikusheva and Sun (2022) then show that Chao et al.'s (2012) central limit theorem can be applied to their jackknife AR statistic, such that it converges as

$$\frac{AR_J(\beta_0)}{\sqrt{V_J(\beta_0)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_J(\beta_0)k}} \varepsilon(\beta_0)' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \varepsilon(\beta_0) \rightsquigarrow N(0, 1),$$

where  $V_J(\beta) = \text{var}(\varepsilon(\beta)' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \varepsilon(\beta) / \sqrt{k} | \mathbf{Z})$ .

When the data are clustered not only the terms involving squares of the errors have non-zero expectation, but any product of errors within the same cluster. Hence, to centre the AR statistic it is no longer sufficient to remove only the squares of the errors. Rather, all products of errors within a cluster need to be removed.

I remove all these terms by a cluster jackknife, which sets blocks on the diagonal of  $\mathbf{P}_Z$  to zero, and that can be written more succinctly by introducing the following notation. For given cluster structure and any  $n \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , let  $\mathbf{B}_A$  be the  $n \times n$  block diagonal matrix with on its diagonal the blocks  $\mathbf{A}_{[g,g]}$ ,  $g = 1, \dots, G$ . Also, denote  $\ddot{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}_A$  for the matrix with the blocks on its diagonal set to zero. For later purposes I also define for any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  the  $n \times G$  matrix  $\mathbf{B}_v$  which in column  $g$  has on the rows corresponding to  $[g]$  the entries of  $\mathbf{v}_{[g]}$  and zeroes elsewhere.

Using this notation I have that  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)/k$  is centred at zero. I need the following assumption to derive its distribution.

**Assumption A2.** *Conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and with probability one for all  $n$  large enough, it holds that (i)  $\text{rank}(\mathbf{P}_Z) = k$ ; (ii)  $\|\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}\|_2^2 \leq C < 1$ ; (iii)  $k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $G \rightarrow \infty$ ; (iv)  $n_{\max}^5/k \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  for  $n_{\max} = \max_{g=1, \dots, G} n_g$ ; (v)  $0 < n_g/C \leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g) \leq n_g C < \infty$  a.s. for all  $g$ ; (vi)  $E(\varepsilon_i^4 | \mathbf{Z}) \leq C < \infty$  a.s. for all  $i$ .*

[Assumption A2.i](#) implies the full rank assumption on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and means that there are no redundant instruments. [Assumption A2.ii](#) generalises [Crudu et al.'s \(2021\)](#) and [Mikusheva and Sun's \(2022\)](#) requirement that the diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{P}_Z$  are less than one, which is a common assumption in the many instrument literature. It is also related to the measure of cluster leverage in the first stage regression by [MacKinnon et al. \(2022\)](#) and bounds how different the clusters can be. [Assumption A2.iii](#) specifies the asymptotic sampling scheme. It allows for many instruments in the sense that the number of IVs increases proportionally to the sample size and it states that the number of clusters tends to infinity. The fourth item of [Assumption A2](#) bounds the relative cluster sizes and ensures that there is not one cluster that dominates the sample. Such a requirement is common in the literature on clustered data and is, for example, also imposed by [Djogbenou et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Hansen and Lee \(2019\)](#). Their assumptions on the maximum cluster size are more general however. [Djogbenou et al.'s \(2019\)](#) requirement provides a trade-off between the number of moments of the data that need to exist and the degree of cluster heterogeneity that is allowed. With fourth moments, as I assume, their condition is met when  $n_{\max}^3/n \rightarrow 0$ . [Hansen and Lee \(2019\)](#) relate the maximum cluster size to the variance of the regressors and show that a central limit theorem holds when  $n_{\max}^2/n \rightarrow 0$ . My condition is not conditional on the distribution of the data and stronger than these assumptions. [Assumptions A2.v](#) and [A2.vi](#) are regularity conditions that require a positive, but bounded variance and a finite fourth moment. Under these assumptions I have the following result.

**Theorem 1.** *Under [Assumptions A1](#) and [A2](#) the cluster jackknife AR converges as*

$$\frac{AR_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}{\sqrt{V_{CLJ}^{AR}}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{V_{CLJ}^{AR} k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \rightsquigarrow N(0, 1),$$



with conditional variance

$$V_{CLJ}^{AR} = \text{var}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}|\mathbf{Z}\right) = \frac{2}{k}\sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}). \quad (3)$$

*Proof.* The result follows from an adapted form of [Theorem 2](#) below.  $\square$

### 3.2 Cluster jackknife score

The original AR statistic can have low power in overidentified IV models even when the number of IVs remains fixed. [Kleibergen \(2002\)](#) and [Moreira \(2003\)](#) therefore propose a score test, which, similarly to the AR statistic is robust against weak instruments, but is more powerful. [Matsushita and Otsu \(2022\)](#) show that jackknifing can be used to also make the score test robust against many instruments and heteroskedasticity.

Similarly, the cluster jackknife from the previous section can be used to derive a cluster jackknife score test. For this I require the following assumption.

**Assumption A3.** *Conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and with probability one for all  $n$  large enough,*

(i) *For any  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{v} = 1$  and*

$$\mathbf{M}_g(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbb{E}\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}\mathbf{v}'\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{v}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} & \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}'\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \end{bmatrix} \middle| \mathbf{Z}\right),$$

*it holds that  $0 < n_g/C \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M}_g(\mathbf{v})) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M}_g(\mathbf{v})) \leq n_g C < \infty$ ;*

(ii)  $\mathbb{E}(\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\|_F^4 | \mathbf{Z}) \leq C < \infty$ ;

(iii)  $\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\Pi}/n_g) \leq C < \infty$ ;

(iv)  $n_{\max}^5/n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$  and  $n_{\max}^5/\sqrt{kn} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ .

[Assumption A3.i](#) is a stronger version of [Assumption A2.v](#). It requires positive but finite variances and that the second stage errors are not perfectly correlated with a linear combination of the first stage errors. Taking a linear combination of the first stage errors facilitates the proof. [Assumption A3.ii](#) requires finite fourth moments of the first stage errors. [Assumption A3.iii](#) ensures convergence of the scaled instruments. The final part of the assumption is similar to [Assumption A2.iv](#) and is equivalent if  $n$  and  $k$  are proportional.

Then, define the cluster jackknife score statistic as

$$\mathbf{S}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{X}'\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Write its conditional variance under the null hypothesis as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^S &= \frac{1}{n}[\boldsymbol{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z\boldsymbol{\Sigma}\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}(\sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} + \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \\ &+ \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z})], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $\Sigma = E(\varepsilon\varepsilon'|\mathbf{Z})$ . Also, write the covariance between the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score as

$$\mathbf{C}_{CLJ} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} E\left(\sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}\right), \quad (5)$$

with  $i^{\text{th}}$  element  $C_{CLJ,(i)} = 2 \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_g^{(i)'} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) / \sqrt{nk}$  and gather the variances and covariances in

$$\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \begin{bmatrix} V_{CLJ}^{AR} & \mathbf{C}'_{CLJ} \\ \mathbf{C}_{CLJ} & V_{CLJ}^S \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then the joint limiting distribution of the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score is given by the following theorem.

**Theorem 2.** *Under Assumptions A1 to A3 and if the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score are not perfectly correlated, then*

$$\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^{-1/2} \begin{bmatrix} AR_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ \mathbf{S}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow N(0, \mathbf{I}).$$

*Proof.* The proof is given in [Appendix B.1](#) □

To use this result for testing I propose the following conditionally unbiased and consistent estimators for  $V_{CLJ}^{AR}$ ,  $V_{CLJ}^S$  and  $\mathbf{C}_{CLJ}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[g]}; \\ \hat{V}_{CLJ}^S(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{X}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta})\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta})'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{X} + \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{X}_{[h]}]; \\ \hat{\mathbf{C}}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

**Theorem 3.** *Under Assumptions A1 to A3 it holds that  $E(\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)|\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}$  and, conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is given in [Appendix B.2](#) □

To conclude this subsection, I note that the normal distribution in [Theorem 1](#) obtains only when the number of instruments goes to infinity. For smaller  $k$  on the other hand, it is expected that  $AR_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) / \sqrt{V_{CLJ}^{AR}}$  is closer to a shifted and scaled  $\chi_k^2$  distribution. Therefore, if one decides to use the cluster jackknife test in isolation, I suggest to follow [Mikusheva and Sun \(2022\)](#) and reject the null hypothesis  $H_0: \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\beta}$  whenever  $AR_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) / \sqrt{\hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta})}$  is larger than  $(\chi_{k,1-\alpha}^2 - k) / \sqrt{2k}$ , where  $\chi_{k,1-\alpha}^2$  is the  $1 - \alpha$  quantile of the  $\chi_k^2$  distribution. This way the cluster jackknife AR statistic is compared with a shifted and scaled  $\chi_k^2$  critical values for small  $k$  and standard normal critical values for large  $k$ .

### 3.3 Extensions

#### 3.3.1 Combination of AR and score

AR and score statistics can be combined to form a more powerful test (Moreira, 2003; Kleibergen, 2005; Andrews, 2016). Lim et al. (2024a) do so by combining Mikusheva and Sun’s (2022) jackknife AR statistic and Matsushita and Otsu’s (2022) jackknife score statistic in a conditional linear combination test (Andrews, 2016). The joint convergence of the two cluster jackknife statistics in Theorem 2 suggests that these can be similarly combined. Moreover, Theorem 2 gives formal support for the unproven high level assumption about the joint convergence of the jackknife AR and jackknife score statistics in Lim et al. (2024a).

The combination of the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score statistic through Lim et al.’s (2024a) framework, requires only an adaptation of the variance estimators and a rescaling of the score statistic. I give the details in Appendix C. Since this combination is computationally intensive, however, I will in the following only consider the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score statistics separately.

#### 3.3.2 Symmetric cluster jackknife

Bekker and Crudu (2015) observe that when jackknifing a statistic, the information in the terms that are removed terms is lost. Therefore they propose a different jackknife procedure that retains part of the information in these deleted observations, while still correctly centering the statistic. In particular, Bekker and Crudu (2015) propose an alternative to the jackknife HLIM and HFUL estimators from Hausman et al. (2012), which were developed for a heteroskedastic many weak IV model. The numerator of Bekker and Crudu’s (2015) estimator can be written as

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})'(\tilde{\mathbf{P}} + \tilde{\mathbf{P}}')(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta})'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}),$$

where  $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{y}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}}\mathbf{X}$ . Here  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{D}_{P_Z})\dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z$  denotes the jackknife projection matrix as used for example in Akerberg and Devereux (2009). This numerator thus treats all endogenous variables symmetrically, because it jackknifes both the  $\mathbf{y}$  and the  $\mathbf{X}$ , which lead Bekker and Crudu (2015) to call it the symmetric jackknife estimator. Crudu et al. (2021) base their jackknife AR statistic on this numerator, with the goal to retain part of the information in the deleted observations.

As the cluster jackknife AR removes entire clusters, rather than individual observations, the potential loss of information is even larger. I therefore generalise the symmetric jackknife to clustered data. In Appendix D I show that pre-multiplying a vector by the matrix  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{CL} = \mathbf{P}_Z - \mathbf{B}_{P_Z}\mathbf{B}_{M_Z}^{-1}\mathbf{M}_Z$ , cluster jackknifes the observations in the vector. Then substituting  $\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_Z$  by  $(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{CL} + \tilde{\mathbf{P}}'_{CL})/2$  in the cluster jackknife AR and score statistics and their variance estimators yields symmetric cluster jackknife AR and score statistic.

Finally, as in Bekker and Crudu (2015), I conclude that the cluster symmetric jackknife maintains a larger signal component than the cluster jackknife, because the quadratic form on

which both cluster symmetric jackknife statistics are built, is

$$\begin{aligned} E[(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})'(\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_{CL} + \tilde{\mathbf{P}}'_{CL})(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})/2|\mathbf{Z}] &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I})'\boldsymbol{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I}) \\ &\geq E[(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})'\tilde{\mathbf{P}}_Z(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})|\mathbf{Z}] = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I})'\boldsymbol{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I}) - (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I})'\boldsymbol{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{B}_{P_Z}\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{I}). \end{aligned}$$

### 3.3.3 Many controls cluster jackknife

In (1) I assumed that there are either no exogenous controls, or that they are small in number and have been partialled out of the model. Partialling out, however, introduces dependence between the observations. In case the number of control variables is small compared to the sample size, this dependence is asymptotically negligible. If the number of controls on the other hands is large compared to the sample size, the dependence might not go away asymptotically.

Chao et al. (2023) note that the additional dependence between the observations can have as consequence that jackknifing does not remove all terms with non-zero expectation from statistics. They therefore introduce a new type of jackknife, which I call the many controls jackknife, that correctly projects out the control variables, while also centring the statistic.

One particularly relevant type of control that this many controls jackknife can handle is cluster fixed effects to account for within cluster dependence. Chao et al. (2023) require however that once these effects and other controls are accounted for, the observations are independent, which therefore is different from the model considered in this paper that allows for within cluster dependence after controlling for observables.

Two remarks on the inclusion of many controls in a clustered model are in order. First, if the controls are only cluster specific, partialling out these controls introduces dependence within clusters, but not between clusters. Therefore all tests in this paper can readily be applied to these models. This is for example the case with cluster fixed effects.

Second, the many controls jackknife can be extended to clustered data for the case in which partialling out the controls introduces dependence between the clusters and that after controlling for these controls there remains within cluster dependence. An example of this type of data is when the data are clustered at two levels, where one level subsumes the other, and it is assumed that all dependence on the higher level of clustering can be modelled through a cluster fixed effect, but the dependence on the lower level of clustering cannot.

To extend the many controls jackknife to this type of data, write the model in (2) as

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathbf{y}} &= \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_2 + \bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \\ \bar{\mathbf{X}} &= \bar{\mathbf{Z}}\boldsymbol{\Pi} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Gamma}_1 + \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times l}$  are the exogenous control variables. These are partialled out by premultiplying both equations with  $\mathbf{M}_W$ , which yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\mathbf{y}} &= \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \\ \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\mathbf{X}} &= \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}\boldsymbol{\Pi} + \mathbf{M}_W\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}. \end{aligned}$$

The cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score statistics then are  $\mathbf{V}'\mathbf{M}_W\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_{M_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}}\mathbf{M}_W\bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{V}'(\mathbf{P}_{M_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}} - \mathbf{M}_W\mathbf{B}_{M_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}}\mathbf{M}_W)\bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ , with  $\mathbf{V}$  either  $\bar{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \bar{\mathbf{y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}$  or  $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ . The partialling out makes that deducting  $\mathbf{M}_W\mathbf{B}_{M_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}}\mathbf{M}_W$  from  $\mathbf{P}_{M_W\bar{\mathbf{Z}}}$  does not yield a zero block diagonal matrix in general, which makes the cluster jackknife AR and cluster jackknife score statistics not properly

centred. I therefore need to find an alternative matrix, say  $\mathbf{H}$ , such that  $\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}} - \mathbf{M}_W \mathbf{H} \mathbf{M}_W$  has zero block diagonal.

To find such a matrix, introduce the following notation. Let  $\text{vecb}(\mathbf{A})$  be the column vectorization of the blockdiagonal elements of the  $n \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ , where we leave the dependence on the clustering structure implicit. Furthermore let  $\mathbf{A} * \mathbf{B}$  be the Khatri-Rao product between  $m \times n$  matrices  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{B}$ , defined as the blockwise Kronecker product. That is, for a certain partitions,

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{1G} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{2G} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{H1} & \mathbf{A}_{H2} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{HG} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{B}_{11} & \mathbf{B}_{12} & \dots & \mathbf{B}_{1G} \\ \mathbf{B}_{21} & \mathbf{B}_{22} & \dots & \mathbf{B}_{2G} \\ \vdots & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \mathbf{B}_{H1} & \mathbf{B}_{H2} & \dots & \mathbf{B}_{HG} \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$\mathbf{A} * \mathbf{B} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A}_{11} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{11} & \mathbf{A}_{12} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{12} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{1G} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{1G} \\ \mathbf{A}_{21} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{21} & \mathbf{A}_{22} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{22} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{2G} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{2G} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \mathbf{A}_{H1} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{H1} & \mathbf{A}_{H2} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{H2} & \dots & \mathbf{A}_{HG} \otimes \mathbf{B}_{HG} \end{bmatrix}.$$

In what follows I will take the cluster structure for the partition.

I then need to find a matrix  $\mathbf{H}$  such that

$$\text{vecb}(\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}}) = \text{vecb}(\mathbf{M}_W \mathbf{H} \mathbf{M}_W).$$

Start by considering the  $h^{\text{th}}$  block and assume  $\mathbf{H}$  is a blockdiagonal matrix. Then we can write the right hand side as

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{vecb}\left(\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,g]} \mathbf{H}_{[g,g]} \mathbf{M}_{W,[g,h]}\right) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G \text{vec}(\mathbf{M}_{W,[h,g]} \mathbf{H}_{[g,g]} \mathbf{M}_{W,[g,h]}) \\ &= \sum_{g=1}^G (\mathbf{M}_{W,[h,g]} \otimes \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{H}_{[g,g]}) \\ &= \left[ \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,1]} \otimes \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,1]} \quad \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,2]} \otimes \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,2]} \quad \dots \quad \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,G]} \otimes \mathbf{M}_{W,[h,G]} \right] \text{vecb}(\mathbf{H}), \end{aligned}$$

such that  $\text{vecb}(\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}}) = (\mathbf{M}_W * \mathbf{M}_W) \text{vecb}(\mathbf{H})$ . Now let  $\text{vecb}^{-1}$  be the operator that constructs a blockdiagonal matrix out of a vector, in such a way that for any  $n \times n$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  we have  $\text{vecb}^{-1}(\text{vecb}(\mathbf{A})) = \mathbf{A}$ . Then, using  $\mathbf{H} = \text{vecb}^{-1}[(\mathbf{M}_W * \mathbf{M}_W)^{-1} \text{vecb}(\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}})]$  in the many controls cluster jackknife AR and score statistics,  $\mathbf{V}'(\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}} - \mathbf{M}_W \mathbf{H} \mathbf{M}_W) \bar{\epsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  makes them centred, while also correctly handling the many control variables. Substituting  $\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_{\bar{Z}}$  by  $\mathbf{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}} - \mathbf{M}_W \mathbf{H} \mathbf{M}_W$  in (6) gives the corresponding variance estimators.

### 3.3.4 Cross-fit variance estimators

The variance estimators in (6) are not the only possible ones. Mikusheva and Sun (2022) note that a jackknife AR that uses the equivalent of  $\hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  by Crudu et al. (2021) has low power against alternatives far from  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ , due to a bias in the residuals that makes the variance estimate unnecessarily large. Therefore they propose an alternative estimator that removes this bias by using cross-fitted values of the residuals, to improve the power (Newey and Robins, 2018; Kline et al., 2020).

Cross-fit variance estimators for clustered data can be obtained by defining  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{P}}(g, h) = \boldsymbol{Z}(\boldsymbol{Z}'_{-([g],[h])}\boldsymbol{Z}_{-([g],[h])})^{-1}\boldsymbol{Z}'_{-([g],[h])}$ , where a matrix indexed by  $-([g],[h])$  contains all rows of that matrix but those in  $[g]$  and  $[h]$ . Pre-multiplying  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{-([g],[h])}$  with  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{P}}(g, h)$  therefore gives the leave-cluster- $(g, h)$ -out fitted values of  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  on  $\boldsymbol{Z}$ . Denote this by  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h) = \tilde{\boldsymbol{P}}(g, h)\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{-([g],[h])}$ . The cross-fit variance estimators can then be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{V}_{CF}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h))'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h))'_{[h]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}; \\ \hat{V}_{CF}^S(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{\substack{g,h,j=1 \\ g \neq h \neq j}}^G \boldsymbol{X}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; h))_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} (\boldsymbol{\beta})' \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[h,j]} \boldsymbol{X}_{[j]} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{X}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h))'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} \boldsymbol{X}_{[h]} \right); \\ \hat{C}_{CF}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{X}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h))_{[h]} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h))'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z},[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[h]}.\end{aligned}\tag{7}$$

Since  $g \neq h$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h)$  neither depends on observations in cluster  $g$  nor on observations in cluster  $h$ , the terms with  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; g, h)$  in (7) have expectation zero. Consequently, the cross-fit variance estimators are unbiased.

Finally, note that substituting  $\boldsymbol{P}_{\boldsymbol{Z}}$  with  $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{P}}_{CL} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{P}}'_{CL})/2$  or  $\boldsymbol{P}_{M_W \bar{Z}} - \boldsymbol{M}_W \boldsymbol{H} \boldsymbol{M}_W$  yields cross-fit variance estimators for the cluster symmetric jackknife and many controls cluster jackknife statistics.

## 4 Cluster many instrument AR

Tests on  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  in generalised method of moments (GMM) models with weak, but a fixed number of instruments are generally based on the continuous updating (CU) estimator of Hansen et al. (1996). In the special case of a linear IV model with homoskedastic data and a certain endogeneity structure, the optimal test in terms of power is the conditional likelihood ratio test (Moreira, 2003), and is based on the CU objective function and its score (Andrews et al., 2006). Because of these good properties, Boot and Ligtenberg (2023) base their AR and score statistics in the linear IV model with heteroskedastic data and many instruments on the CU objective function. This means that, as opposed to the jackknife statistics, a weighting matrix for heteroskedasticity must be maintained. They show that this large dimensional matrix can be handled if the data satisfy an invariance assumption, which I specify below.

In this section I focus on Boot and Ligtenberg's (2023) many instrument AR statistic and how it can be extended to clustered data and leave a similar extension of the many instrument

score statistic for future research.

Boot and Ligtenberg (2023) show that if the data are independent and if  $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{d}{=} r_i \varepsilon_i$ , where  $r_i$  is a Rademacher random variable and certain other assumptions are satisfied, the many instrument AR statistic converges as

$$AR_{MI}(\beta_0) = \frac{\varepsilon(\beta_0)' \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)}^2 \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \varepsilon - k}{\sqrt{k V_{MI}}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)}^2 \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{r} - k}{\sqrt{k V_{MI}}} \rightsquigarrow N(0, 1), \quad (8)$$

where  $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_n)'$  collects the independent Rademacher random variables and  $V_{MI} = \text{var}(\mathbf{r}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon} \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon}^2 \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon} \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{Z}, \varepsilon)$ .

The extension to clustered data requires three main adaptations. First, the assumption that each  $\varepsilon_i$  is reflection invariant and can be multiplied with an independent Rademacher random variable, is no longer plausible because the errors can be dependent within clusters. A transformation of one variable, thus possibly implies a change in another variable. Therefore I assume, similar to Toulis (2024), that clusters are reflection invariant.

**Assumption A4.** *Conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$ , it holds that  $\varepsilon_{[g]} \stackrel{d}{=} r_g \varepsilon_{[g]}$  for any  $g = 1, \dots, G$ , where the  $r_1, \dots, r_G$  are independent Rademacher random variables.*

The second adaptation is that the weighting matrix now also needs to capture the covariances of observations within the same cluster. The  $\mathbf{D}_{\varepsilon(\beta)}$  in (8) is therefore no long sufficient and must be changed to  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'}$ .

Third, for the AR statistic to be distributionally equivalent to a quadratic form in the  $G$  Rademacher random variables, the moment conditions per cluster must be combined into one. Here I do that by summing them per cluster. Using Assumption A4 it then holds that

$$\iota' \mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)\varepsilon(\beta_0)'} \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \iota \stackrel{d}{=} \mathbf{r}' \mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)\varepsilon(\beta_0)'} \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{r}. \quad (9)$$

Note that  $\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)} \mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta)} = \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'}$ . Consequently, the matrix in between the  $\mathbf{r}$  in (9) is a projection matrix and can be written as  $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z}}$ . Hence, if I make the following regularity assumptions, I can apply the central limit theorem for projection matrices of growing rank in Lemma A2 in Chao et al. (2012) to obtain the limiting distribution of the cluster many instrument AR.

**Assumption A5.** *Assume that with probability 1 for all  $n$  large enough the following hold conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\varepsilon(\beta_0)$  (i)  $\mathbf{e}'_g \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{e}_g \leq C < 1$ ,  $g = 1, \dots, G$ ; (ii)  $k \rightarrow \infty$  as  $G \rightarrow \infty$  and  $k < G$ .*

The first assumption bounds the diagonal elements of the projection matrix away from one, which is a common assumption in the many instrument literature. The second assumption formalises that the number of clusters goes to infinity rather than the number of observations.

**Theorem 4.** *Under Assumptions A1, A4 and A5 it holds that*

$$AR_{CLMI}(\beta_0) = \frac{\iota' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z}} \iota}{\sqrt{k V_{CLMI}}} \stackrel{d}{=} \frac{\mathbf{r}' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_{\mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta_0)} \mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{r}}{\sqrt{k V_{CLMI}}} \rightsquigarrow N(0, 1),$$

where  $V_{CLMI} = \text{var}(\mathbf{r}' \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{B'_\varepsilon Z} \mathbf{r} | \mathbf{Z}, \varepsilon) = 2\boldsymbol{\nu}'(\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{B'_\varepsilon Z} \odot \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{B'_\varepsilon Z})\boldsymbol{\nu}/k$ .

*Proof.* The proof follows by Lemma A2 in [Chao et al. \(2012\)](#).  $\square$

Conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\varepsilon$ ,  $V_{CLMI}$  is known and non-stochastic and it can be estimated by its own value  $\hat{V}_{CLMI}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = 2\boldsymbol{\nu}'(\hat{\mathbf{P}}_{B'_{\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta})} Z} \odot \hat{\mathbf{P}}_{B'_{\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta})} Z})\boldsymbol{\nu}/k$ . For the same reason conditional unbiasedness and consistency of the variance estimator follow immediately.

**Theorem 5.** *Under [Assumptions A1 and A4](#),  $E(\hat{V}_{CLMI}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) | \mathbf{Z}, \varepsilon) = V_{CLMI}$  and, conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$  and  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\hat{V}_{CLMI}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xrightarrow{p} V_{CLMI}$ .*

[Theorems 4 and 5](#) thus provide another way to conduct inference on  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$  and similarly as for the cluster jackknife AR statistic, the asymptotic approximation for small instrument sets is improved by rejecting the null hypothesis  $H_0: \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \boldsymbol{\beta}$  whenever  $AR_{CLMI}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  exceeds  $(\chi_{k,1-\alpha}^2 - k)/\sqrt{2k}$ .

The derivation of the cluster many instrument AR statistic above starts with the many instrument AR statistic and adapts it to make it suited for clustered data. In [Appendix E I](#) provide a different interpretation, that starts by summing the moment conditions per cluster and then derives a GMM many instrument AR statistic for these new moment conditions. The final result is the same as the one presented in this section.

## 5 Simulation results

In this section I explore the finite sample performance of the different cluster robust tests relative to each other and to those for independent data. I generate data from [\(1\)](#) with a single endogenous regressor,  $p = 1$ , and a varying number of instruments,  $k$ . There are  $n = 1000$  observations divided over  $G = 100$  clusters of different sizes. I determine the cluster sizes by first setting  $n_g = \max\{1, n \exp(\gamma g/G) / [\sum_{g=1}^{G-1} \exp(\gamma g/G) + 1]\}$  for  $g = 1, \dots, G-1$  and  $n_G = \max\{1, n - \sum_{g=1}^{G-1} n_g\}$ . Next, all cluster sizes are ensured to be integer by rounding them down. Finally, to get the correct sample size, the first  $n - \sum_{g=1}^G n_g$  clusters are increased by one. Note that  $\gamma$  determines the degree of unbalancedness and  $\gamma = 0$  implies balanced clusters. I set  $\gamma = 6$  such that the smallest cluster contains 1 observation and the largest 58.

I let the first stage errors, the second stage errors and the instruments consist of a cluster common part and a idiosyncratic part. In particular,  $\mathbf{z}_{[g]} = \sqrt{\zeta} \boldsymbol{\nu} z_g^{cl} + \sqrt{1-\zeta} \mathbf{z}_g^{ind}$ , where  $z_g^{cl} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\mathbf{z}_g^{ind} \sim N(0, \mathbf{I})$ ;  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} = \sqrt{\zeta} \boldsymbol{\eta}_g^{cl} + \sqrt{1-\zeta} \boldsymbol{\eta}_g^{ind}$ , where  $\eta_g^{cl} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_g^{ind} \sim N(0, \mathbf{I})$  and;  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} = \sqrt{\zeta} |z_g^{cl}|^h \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_g^{cl} + \sqrt{1-\zeta} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_g^{ind}$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_g^{cl} = \sqrt{\rho} \boldsymbol{\eta}_g^{cl} + \sqrt{1-\rho} w_{1g}$  with  $w_{1g} \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_g^{ind} = \sqrt{\rho} \boldsymbol{\eta}_g^{ind} + \sqrt{1-\rho} \mathbf{w}_{2g}$  with  $\mathbf{w}_{2g} \sim N(0, \mathbf{I})$ . Such that  $\zeta$  governs the degree of within cluster dependence,  $\rho$  the degree of endogeneity and  $h$  the degree of conditional heteroskedasticity.


$x_i$  and  $y_i$  can then be obtained from [\(1\)](#), where I set  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Pi}$  is equal to a zero vector, with the exception of the first element which equals  $\Pi_1 = \sqrt{R\sqrt{k}/n}$ . Hence only the first instrument is informative about the regressor and  $R$  governs its relevance.

### 5.1 Size

To assess the size correctness of the different tests I generate 10000 datasets from the DGP above, where  $\zeta = 0.3$ ,  $\rho = 0.3$  and  $h \in \{1, 4\}$  to alter the degree of heteroskedasticity. I take



Figure 1: Size of non-cluster robust tests.



*Note:* Rejection rates of the AR test, jackknife AR test, jackknife score test, many instrument AR test, both without cross-fit variance, and a test based on 2SLS with White standard errors and standard normal critical values when testing  $\beta_0 = 0$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .  $k$  is the number of instruments,  $R$  measures their relevance and  $h$  is the degree of conditional heteroskedasticity. The DGP is described in Section 5.

$R = 10$  to have relatively weak instruments. Furthermore, the number of instruments varies between 1 and 90.

Figure 1 gives the rejection rate of the original AR test, the jackknife AR test, the jackknife score test, the many instrument AR test and a test based on 2SLS with White standard errors and normal critical values when testing  $H_0: \beta = 0$  at a  $\alpha = 5\%$  significance level. The figure shows that these non-cluster robust tests all severely overreject and that it is therefore important to correct for clustering in this DGP.

Figure 2 shows the rejection rates of the cluster robust versions of the same tests when testing the same hypothesis. From the left panel it becomes clear that for a single weak instrument all tests are size correct. That also the cluster 2SLS test has a correct rejection rate is surprising, as weak instruments generally makes this test unreliable. If the number of instruments increases, however, the rejection rate of the cluster 2SLS test shoots up. The cluster AR test on the other hand becomes conservative when  $k$  increases, which is in line with the earlier observation that the  $\chi^2$  distribution is too spread out for large  $k$ . The tests developed in this paper have rejection rates close to the desired 5% level. Only when the number of instruments is close to the number of clusters the cluster many instrument AR becomes slightly conservative.


Increasing the degree of conditional heteroskedasticity and variance by changing  $h$  from 1 to 4, as shown in the right panel, decreases the rejection rates of all tests. Nevertheless, the cluster 2SLS test still becomes oversized for large  $k$ . Furthermore, now also the cluster jackknife tests are slightly conservative for a large number of instruments.

## 5.2 Power

Next, I assess the power of the cluster AR, cluster jackknife AR, cluster jackknife score and cluster many instrument AR tests by generating 1 000 data sets from the DGP described above. I set  $R = 100$ ,  $k \in \{10, 50\}$  and  $h \in \{1, 4\}$ .

Figure 3 shows the rejection rate of the different tests when testing  $H: \beta_0 = \beta^*$  at a  $\alpha = 5\%$  significance level for  $\beta^* \in [-1, 1]$ . In these graphs I observe the following. First, the newly developed tests in general have higher power than the cluster AR test. The latter has especially

Figure 2: Size of cluster robust tests.



*Note:* Rejection rates of the cluster AR test, cluster jackknife AR test, cluster jackknife score test, both without cross-fit variance, cluster many instrument AR test, and a test based on 2SLS with clustered standard errors and standard normal critical values when testing  $\beta_0 = 0$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .  $k$  is the number of instruments,  $R$  measures their relevance and  $h$  is the degree of conditional heteroskedasticity. The DGP is described in [Section 5](#).

low power in case the number of instruments is large. Only when there is a moderate number of instruments and the heteroskedasticity and variance are large, I observe that the cluster AR test can have higher power than the cluster jackknife tests.

Second, the cluster many instrument AR test only has higher power than the cluster jackknife tests, when the degree of heteroskedasticity is large and the number of instruments is small. This confirms the intuition that the more complex weighting matrix of the cluster many instrument AR statistic is particularly important with strong heteroskedasticity. For larger  $k$ , however, I observe that the many instrument AR test has low power.


Third, in case the sample is relatively well behaved with not too high variance as shown in the left panels, the cluster jackknife score test has higher power than the cluster jackknife AR test. This shows the benefit of considering a score test in addition to an AR test and confirms previous findings that score tests often outperform AR tests in case there is good identification. With higher variance on the other hand, the cluster jackknife AR test performs better than the cluster jackknife score test, which suggest that a combination of the two tests, as described in [Section 3.3.1](#), can ensure good power for a range of identification strengths.

## 6 Applications

In this section I first discuss some settings in which there are many IVs and clustering. Next, I apply the cluster robust tests to the model from [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#).

A first case in which there are many instruments and clustering is important, is when one uses so-called Bartik instruments. These instruments are based on the observation that shocks common to all individuals affects them differently depending on how exposed an individual is the shocks. This variation identifies the effect of the shock. [Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. \(2020\)](#) show that if the shares that determine the exposure are exogenous, the shares are valid IVs and the Bartik instrument is a specific way of combining them, but one can also include the shares separately. See for an example [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#). In applications of Bartik instruments the observations are often on geographical areas such as municipalities, counties or

Figure 3: Power of cluster robust tests.



*Note:* Rejection rates of the cluster AR test, cluster jackknife AR test, cluster jackknife score test, both without cross-fit variance, and cluster many instrument AR test when testing  $\beta = 0$  if the true  $\beta_0 = \beta^*$  at  $\alpha = 0.05$ .  $k$  is the number of instruments,  $R$  measures their relevance and  $h$  is the degree of conditional heteroskedasticity. The DGP is described in Section 5.

states. It then makes sense to cluster the observations on location. Kovak (2013) for example clusters groups of municipalities at the state level. Another instance with Bartik instruments in which clustering is important, is when there is a panel of observations, in which case it is sensible to cluster the observations on the individual level. Moreover, with panel data the instrument set is large, because the shares from each time period are valid instruments. Thus the number of IVs grows multiplicatively with the number of time periods.

A second set of examples I want to highlight are judge design studies. In these models the identity of a randomly assigned judge or expert serves as instrument to study the effect of the outcome of the case on another variable. Each judge can handle only a limited amount of cases, which makes the instruments numerous. In these studies it is common to cluster the data at the judge level. See for example Maestas et al. (2013), Dobbie et al. (2018) and Bhuller et al. (2020).

A final type of model in which it is important to account for clustering, are panel data IV models. It is likely that the observations on an individual are dependent over time, thus the data on an individual can be regarded as a cluster. Panel data models for which many and weak instrument robust tests are particularly pressing are dynamic panel data models. Here lags of the dependent variable or transformations thereof serve as instruments, which make the number of IVs grows rapidly in the time dimension. Unfortunately one cannot readily apply the tests developed in this paper, as the moment conditions do not follow the structure of the linear IV model. An extension of the tests to a more general GMM structure is therefore desirable.

## 6.1 Dube and Harish (2020)

To illustrate the cluster robust tests I revisit the study by [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) on the effect of female leadership on the likelihood for a country to be at war. As the probability for a woman to come into power might be higher or lower depending on whether the polity is at war, the gender of the leader can be endogenous. [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) therefore propose instruments for it based on historic succession laws for monarchs in Europe. The authors note that a vacant throne was less likely to be taken by a woman if the previous ruler had a male first born child and more likely to be taken by a woman if the previous ruler had a sister.

The data contains 18 polities observed some time between 1480 and 1913 yielding an unbalanced panel with 3586 polity-year observations in total. Throughout the data are clustered on a broad indicator of a reign, resulting in 176 clusters, which vary in size. The largest cluster counts 66 observations and the smallest 1.

The estimates from the main model, which uses the two instruments described above, imply that polities lead by a woman are 39 percentage points more likely to be in war in a given year compared to polities lead by a man. As a robustness check, models with additional instruments based on interactions between the original instruments and exogenous regressors are proposed. Table A5 in [Dube and Harish's \(2020\)](#) appendix shows the 2SLS estimates from these models. The smallest and largest estimates imply that polities lead by women are 29 and 50 percentage points more likely to be at war. However, the new instruments are relatively weak, which makes the estimates and their standard errors unreliable and therefore the larger models are not investigated further.


Moreover, since the data are clustered, the effective sample size will be reduced from the number of observations towards to the number of clusters, making the total number of IVs non-negligible compared to the effective sample size, which exacerbates the problems from which the 2SLS estimates and standard errors suffer. To reliably continue the analysis of the larger models thus requires a weak and many instrument robust test suited for clustered data.

In [Figure 4](#) I draw the 95% confidence intervals for  $\beta$ , which is the effect of queenly reign on the likelihood of war relative to polities lead by kings, that I obtained by inverting the cluster AR test, the cluster jackknife AR, the cluster jackknife score, both without cross-fit variance, and the cluster many instrument AR. The groups correspond to the models in columns 1, 2, 4 and 5 of Table A5 in [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and the full model where I pooled all the instruments and regressors of the other models. The exogenous control variables have been partialled out naively.

From the figure I conclude, first of all, that most specifications yield significantly positive effects of female rule on the likelihood of being at war. Only the confidence intervals obtained by inverting the cluster jackknife score for the third model and the cluster AR test and the cluster many instrument AR test for the full model include zero. One can see this more clearly in [Table 1](#) in [Appendix F](#) in which reports the exact bounds of the confidence intervals. That the cluster AR and cluster many instrument AR tests give insignificant results is in line with the results from [Section 5](#) that showed that if the instruments become too numerous, both tests have low power.

Secondly, the cluster jackknife score tests gives relatively wide confidence intervals. [Section 5](#) suggests that this can happen in case the level of identification is relatively low, in which cases it is important to use robust tests. Only in the full model the confidence interval by the cluster

Figure 4: 95% confidence interval for the effect of queenly reign on war.



*Note:* 95% confidence interval for the effect of queenly reign on the probability of being in war relative to polities lead by a king. The confidence intervals are based on inverting the cluster AR test, the cluster jackknife AR, the cluster jackknife score, both without cross-fit variance, and the cluster many instrument AR. The data come from [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and are clustered on a broad measure of reign. The instruments are whether the previous sovereign had a first born male child (FBM), whether the previous sovereign had a sister (Sis) and interactions of these with each other and indicators whether the previous sovereign had no or two children. The control variables are the same as in columns 1, 2, 4 and 5 of Table A5 in [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and are partialled out naively. The full model pools the instruments and control variables of the other models.

jackknife score is smaller than that by the cluster jackknife AR. This is again in line with the simulation results in which the cluster jackknife score test has good power compared the cluster jackknife AR test in case of numerous instruments.

Thirdly, although most confidence intervals are wide, the cluster AR test yields generally the widest confidence intervals. The cluster many instrument and cluster jackknife AR on the other hand do not have a clear ordering in power.

Lastly, the cluster jackknife AR test yield confidence intervals that are shifted upwards relative to the cluster AR and cluster many instrument AR test.

## 7 Conclusion

In this paper I argued that the problems associated with many and weak instruments are more likely in case the data are clustered than when they are independent. This makes it particularly important to use tests robust against many and weak instrument when using clustered data, which none of the existing tests is able of.

I therefore extended two categories of many and weak instrument robust tests to allow for clustered data. I first showed that showed that in case the data are clustered the jackknife AR

and score test need to remove clusters of observations, rather than individual observations when jackknifing. I furthermore combined the cluster jackknife AR and score in a conditional linear combination test, showed how more information can be retained using the symmetric cluster jackknife, allowed for many control variables and improved the variance estimation via cross-fit.

Next, using an extension of the invariance assumption of [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#), I derived a cluster version of their many instrument robust AR test.

Monte Carlo simulations showed that the cluster robust tests are size correct, whereas the tests for independent data overreject, and that the new tests have good power. In the last section I applied the newly developed tests to the data from [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and showed that queenly reign has a significant positive effect on the probability for a state to be at war.

## References

- Abadie, A., S. Athey, G. W. Imbens, and J. M. Wooldridge (2023). When should you adjust standard errors for clustering? *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 138(1), 1–35.
- Ackerberg, D. A. and P. J. Devereux (2009). Improved JIVE estimators for overidentified linear models with and without heteroskedasticity. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 91(2), 351–362.
- Anatolyev, S. (2019). Many instruments and/or regressors: a friendly guide. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 33(2), 689–726.
- Anatolyev, S. and N. Gospodinov (2011). Specification testing in models with many instruments. *Econometric Theory* 27(2), 427–441.
- Anderson, T. W. and H. Rubin (1949). Estimation of the parameters of a single equation in a complete system of stochastic equations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 20(1), 46 – 63.
- Andrews, D. W. K., V. Marmer, and Z. Yu (2019). On optimal inference in the linear IV model. *Quantitative Economics* 10(2), 457–485.
- Andrews, D. W. K., M. J. Moreira, and J. H. Stock (2006). Optimal two-sided invariant similar tests for instrumental variables regression. *Econometrica* 74(3), 715–752.
- Andrews, I. (2016). Conditional linear combination tests for weakly identified models. *Econometrica* 84(6), 2155–2182.
- Andrews, I. and A. Mikusheva (2016). Conditional inference with a functional nuisance parameter. *Econometrica* 84(4), 1571–1612.
- Barrios, T., R. Diamond, G. W. Imbens, and M. Kolesár (2012). Clustering, spatial correlations, and randomization inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 107(498), 578–591.
- Bekker, P. and F. Kleibergen (2003). Finite-sample instrumental variables inference using an asymptotically pivotal statistic. *Econometric Theory* 19(5), 744–753.

- Bekker, P. A. (1994). Alternative approximations to the distributions of instrumental variable estimators. *Econometrica* 62(3), 657–681.
- Bekker, P. A. and F. Crudu (2015). Jackknife instrumental variable estimation with heteroskedasticity. *Journal of Econometrics* 185(2), 332–342.
- Bekker, P. A. and J. van der Ploeg (2005). Instrumental variable estimation based on grouped data. *Statistica Neerlandica* 59(3), 239–267.
- Bhuller, M., G. B. Dahl, K. V. Løken, and M. Mogstad (2020). Incarceration, recidivism, and employment. *Journal of Political Economy* 128(4), 1269–1324.
- Billingsley, P. (1995). *Probability and Measure* (Third ed.). John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Boot, T. and J. W. Ligtenberg (2023). Identification-and many instrument-robust inference via invariant moment conditions. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.07822.
- Cai, Y. (2023). A modified randomization test for the level of clustering. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 1–13.
- Canay, I. A., J. P. Romano, and A. M. Shaikh (2017). Randomization tests under an approximate symmetry assumption. *Econometrica* 85(3), 1013–1030.
- Chao, J. C. and N. R. Swanson (2005). Consistent estimation with a large number of weak instruments. *Econometrica* 73(5), 1673–1692.
- Chao, J. C., N. R. Swanson, J. A. Hausman, W. K. Newey, and T. Woutersen (2012). Asymptotic distribution of JIVE in a heteroskedastic IV regression with many instruments. *Econometric Theory* 28(1), 42–86.
- Chao, J. C., N. R. Swanson, and T. Woutersen (2023). Jackknife estimation of a cluster-sample IV regression model with many weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics*.
- Chetverikov, D., J. Hahn, Z. Liao, and A. Santos (2023). Standard errors when a regressor is randomly assigned. arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.10306.
- Cragg, J. G. and S. G. Donald (1993). Testing identifiability and specification in instrumental variable models. *Econometric Theory* 9(2), 222–240.
- Crudu, F., G. Mellace, and Z. Sándor (2021). Inference in instrumental variable models with heteroskedasticity and many instruments. *Econometric Theory* 37(2), 281–310.
- Djogbenou, A. A., J. G. MacKinnon, and M. Ørregaard Nielsen (2019). Asymptotic theory and wild bootstrap inference with clustered errors. *Journal of Econometrics* 212(2), 393–412.
- Dobbie, W., J. Goldin, and C. S. Yang (2018). The effects of pretrial detention on conviction, future crime, and employment: Evidence from randomly assigned judges. *American Economic Review* 108(2), 201–40.
- Dovì, M.-S., A. B. Kock, and S. Mavroeidis (2023). A ridge-regularized jackknifed Anderson-Rubin test. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 0(0), 1–12.
- Dube, O. and S. P. Harish (2020). Queens. *Journal of Political Economy* 128(7), 2579–2652.

- Frandsen, B., E. Leslie, and S. McIntyre (2023). Cluster jackknife instrumental variable estimation. Unpublished.
- Goldsmith-Pinkham, P., I. Sorkin, and H. Swift (2020). Bartik instruments: What, when, why, and how. *American Economic Review* 110(8), 2586–2624.
- Hagemann, A. (2023). Permutation inference with a finite number of heterogeneous clusters. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 1–24.
- Hansen, B. E. (2022). Jackknife standard errors for clustered regression. Working paper, University of Wisconsin.
- Hansen, B. E. and S. Lee (2019). Asymptotic theory for clustered samples. *Journal of Econometrics* 210(2), 268–290.
- Hansen, C., J. Hausman, and W. Newey (2008). Estimation with many instrumental variables. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 26(4), 398–422.
- Hansen, L. P., J. Heaton, and A. Yaron (1996). Finite-sample properties of some alternative GMM estimators. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 14(3), 262–280.
- Hausman, J. A., W. K. Newey, T. Woutersen, J. C. Chao, and N. R. Swanson (2012). Instrumental variable estimation with heteroskedasticity and many instruments. *Quantitative Economics* 3(2), 211–255.
- Kleibergen, F. (2002). Pivotal statistics for testing structural parameters in instrumental variables regression. *Econometrica* 70(5), 1781–1803.
- Kleibergen, F. (2005). Testing parameters in GMM without assuming that they are identified. *Econometrica* 73(4), 1103–1123.
- Kline, P., R. Saggio, and M. Sølvssten (2020). Leave-out estimation of variance components. *Econometrica* 88(5), 1859–1898.
- Kovak, B. K. (2013). Regional effects of trade reform: What is the correct measure of liberalization? *American Economic Review* 103(5), 1960–1976.
- Lewis, D. J. and K. Mertens (2022). A robust test for weak instruments with multiple endogenous regressors. Available at SSRN 4144103.
- Lim, D., W. Wang, and Y. Zhang (2024a). A conditional linear combination test with many weak instruments. *Journal of Econometrics* 238(2), 105602.
- Lim, D., W. Wang, and Y. Zhang (2024b). A valid Anderson-Rubin test under both fixed and diverging number of weak instruments. Unpublished.
- MacKinnon, J. G., M. Ø. Nielsen, and M. D. Webb (2022). Leverage, influence, and the jackknife in clustered regression models: Reliable inference using `summlust`.
- MacKinnon, J. G., M. Ørregaard Nielsen, and M. D. Webb (2023). Cluster-robust inference: A guide to empirical practice. *Journal of Econometrics* 232(2), 272–299.



- Maestas, N., K. J. Mullen, and A. Strand (2013). Does disability insurance receipt discourage work? Using examiner assignment to estimate causal effects of SSDI receipt. *American Economic Review* 103(5), 1797–1829.
- Magnus, J. R. and H. Neudecker (1998). *Matrix differential calculus: with applications in statistics and econometrics*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Matsushita, Y. and T. Otsu (2022). Jackknife Lagrange multiplier test with many weak instruments. *Econometric Theory*, 1–24.
- Mikusheva, A. and L. Sun (2022). Inference with many weak instruments. *Review of Economic Studies* 89(5), 2663–2686.
- Montiel Olea, J. L. and C. Pflueger (2013). A robust test for weak instruments. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 31(3), 358–369.
- Moreira, M. J. (2003). A conditional likelihood ratio test for structural models. *Econometrica* 71(4), 1027–1048.
- Newey, W. K. and J. R. Robins (2018). Cross-fitting and fast remainder rates for semiparametric estimation. arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.09138.
- Phillips, G. D. A. and C. Hale (1977). The bias of instrumental variable estimators of simultaneous equation systems. *International Economic Review* 18(1), 219–228.
- Staiger, D. and J. H. Stock (1997). Instrumental variables regression with weak instruments. *Econometrica* 65(3), 557–586.
- Stock, J. H. and M. Yogo (2005). Asymptotic distributions of instrumental variables statistics with many instruments. In *Identification and Inference for Econometric Models: Essays in Honor of Thomas Rothenberg*, pp. 109–120. Cambridge University Press.
- Toulis, P. (2024). Asymptotic validity and finite-sample properties of approximate randomization tests. Unpublished.
- Windmeijer, F. (2023). The robust F-statistic as a test for weak instruments. arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.01637.

## Appendix A Many and weak instruments under clustering

In this section I show that many and weak instruments are more quickly an issue for clustered data than for independent data. I split the argument in two parts. The first subsection focuses on the weak instrument problem and therefore keeps the number of instruments fixed. The second subsection on the other hand only delves into the many instrument problem.

### A.1 Weak instruments

Consider the linear IV model from (1) with  $p$  endogenous regressors and a fixed number of  $k$  instruments. For independent observations [Staiger and Stock \(1997\)](#) show that weak instruments can be modelled by shrinking the first stage coefficient with the sample size and that in that case the 2SLS estimator is biased and tests based on this estimator are oversized.

In particular, assume that the following limits exist

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}) \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\varepsilon} \\ \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta}) \end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\varepsilon & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}'_{\varepsilon\eta} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\varepsilon\eta} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \end{bmatrix}) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z} \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Furthermore, let  $\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{C}/\sqrt{n}$  for a constant  $\mathbf{C}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\mathbf{X} &= (\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z} + \boldsymbol{\eta}'\mathbf{Z})(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z})^{-1}(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n + \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\eta}'\mathbf{Z}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}\right) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}\mathbf{C} + \boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta}), \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rightsquigarrow (\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\varepsilon}$  such that the 2SLS estimator minus its true value converges to the random limit

$$(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\mathbf{X})^{-1}(\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \rightsquigarrow [(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}\mathbf{C} + \boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta})]^{-1}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \boldsymbol{\psi}'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\varepsilon}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

This randomness causes the weak instrument problems.

For clustered data, as specified in [Assumption A1](#), sample means can converge at a different rate than one over the square root of the sample size. In particular, [Hansen and Lee \(2019\)](#) show that this rate can in between one over the square root of the number of observations and one over the square root of the number of clusters, or even slower.

Denote this rate by  $1/\sqrt{r}$ . Then the limit in the first part of (A.1) becomes

$$\frac{\sqrt{r}}{n} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}) \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\varepsilon} \\ \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta}) \end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\varepsilon & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}'_{\varepsilon\eta} \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\varepsilon\eta} & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \end{bmatrix}), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\mathbf{X} &= (\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z} + \boldsymbol{\eta}'\mathbf{Z})(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z})^{-1}(\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n + \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\boldsymbol{\eta}'\mathbf{Z}\right)\left(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\right)^{-1}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta}\right) \\ &\rightsquigarrow (\sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r}}\boldsymbol{\psi}'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}\boldsymbol{\Pi}_n + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r}}\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta}). \end{aligned}$$

Such that if  $\mathbf{\Pi}_n = \mathbf{C}/\sqrt{r}$  the above is

$$(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{\Pi}'_n\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r}}\psi'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}(\sqrt{n}\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}\mathbf{\Pi}_n + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{r}}\psi_{Z\eta}) = \frac{n}{r}(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \psi'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}(\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}\mathbf{C} + \psi_{Z\eta}). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Similarly,  $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rightsquigarrow (n/r)(\mathbf{C}'\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ} + \psi'_{Z\eta})\mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}^{-1}\psi_{Z\varepsilon}$ , which makes the 2SLS estimator minus its true value converge to the same random limit as in (A.2). However, the first stage coefficient now shrinks at a different, potentially slower, rate than in the independent data case.

### A.1.1 $F$ -statistics under clustering

Weak instrument problems are often identified using  $F$ -statistics. In this section I show the effect of the lower local to zero rate of the first stage coefficients on the homoskedastic  $F$ -statistic and the robust and effective  $F$ -statistics.

**Homoskedastic  $F$ -statistic** The homoskedastic  $F$ -statistic is the minimum eigenvalue of the Cragg-Donald statistic (Cragg and Donald, 1993; Stock and Yogo, 2005)

$$F = \lambda_{\min}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\eta^{-1/2'}\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\eta^{-1/2}),$$

where  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_\eta$  is a consistent estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta$ . From (A.4) it then follows that the  $F$ -statistic diverges even with weak instruments if  $r$  grows slower than  $n$ .

**Robust and effective  $F$ -statistics** The robust and effective  $F$ -statistics are discussed in Montiel Olea and Pflueger (2013), Lewis and Mertens (2022) and Windmeijer (2023). To see their behaviour under clustering and a slower shrinkage rate of the first stage coefficient I use the central limit theorem for clustered data by Hansen and Lee (2019). Let  $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i/n$  be a sample average of clustered random variables  $\mathbf{X}_i$ . Then

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1/2}\sqrt{n}(\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbb{E}[\bar{\mathbf{X}}]) \rightsquigarrow N(0, \mathbf{I}), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \text{var}(\sqrt{n}\bar{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbb{E}(n[\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbb{E}(\bar{\mathbf{X}})][\bar{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbb{E}(\bar{\mathbf{X}})]')$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = O(n/r)$ .

For simplicity, assume that there is a single endogenous variable,  $p = 1$ . In that case the robust  $F$ -statistic is

$$F_r = \frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{Z}\hat{\mathbf{W}}_2^{-1}\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}}{nk},$$

where  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_2$  is the cluster robust variance estimator of  $\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{X}/\sqrt{n}$ . According to (A.5) this is exactly the right scaling for the robust  $F$ -statistic to have a non-degenerate limit.

The effective  $F$ -statistic in case  $p = 1$  can be written as

$$F_{eff} = \frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{P}_Z\mathbf{X}}{\text{tr}(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_2[\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}/n]^{-1})}$$

The numerator converges according to (A.4). In the denominator  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_2 = O_p(n/r)$  and  $\mathbf{Z}'\mathbf{Z}/n \xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{Q}_{ZZ}$ . Hence the rate of  $\hat{\mathbf{W}}_2$  makes that also the effective  $F$ -statistic is scaled correctly.

To conclude this short discussion, I note that [Montiel Olea and Pflueger \(2013\)](#), [Lewis and Mertens \(2022\)](#) and [Windmeijer \(2023\)](#) all make an assumption similar to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \mathbf{Z}'\boldsymbol{\eta} \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\varepsilon} \\ \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{Z\eta}) \end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \mathbf{W}),$$

for  $\mathbf{W}$  a finite and positive definite matrix, but according to above discussion it is implausible that  $\mathbf{W}$  is finite and these limits should rephrased to something similar to (A.5) or (A.3).

## A.2 Many instruments

In this section consider the linear IV model from (1) with  $p$  endogenous regressors and an increasing number of instruments  $k$ .

For starters, assume that the observations are independent. Then, by a law of large numbers,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{P}_Z \mathbf{X} &\xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}' \mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}' \mathbf{P}_Z \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} [\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \sum_{i=1}^n P_{Z,ii} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i' | \mathbf{Z})], \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $\mathbf{X}' \mathbf{P}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} / n \xrightarrow{p} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{Z,ii} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i | \mathbf{Z}) / n$ . Hence

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2SLS} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \xrightarrow{p} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{Z,ii} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_i' | \mathbf{Z}) \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n P_{Z,ii} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_i | \mathbf{Z}),$$

such that if  $\sum_{i=1}^n P_{Z,ii} / n = \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_Z) / n = k/n$  does not go to zero, the 2SLS estimator is biased.

To get a similar result for clustered data in general is difficult, as it requires a statement about the block diagonal of  $\mathbf{P}_Z$ . Nevertheless, in a simplified setting the following result holds. If the data are clustered as in [Assumption A1](#)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{P}_Z \mathbf{X} &\xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\eta} + \boldsymbol{\eta}' \mathbf{Z}' \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}' \mathbf{P}_Z \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} [\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \sum_{g=1}^G \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z})] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} [\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_j' | \mathbf{Z})], \end{aligned}$$

and similarly  $\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}' \mathbf{P}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j | \mathbf{Z})$ . Hence

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{2SLS} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \xrightarrow{p} \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\eta}_j' | \mathbf{Z}) \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j | \mathbf{Z}). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

In case the instruments are group dummies ([Bekker and van der Ploeg, 2005](#)) that coincide with the clusters, we know the structure of  $\mathbf{P}_Z$ . In particular note that  $[\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}]_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^n Z_{li} Z_{lj}$ . The product equals one only when the  $i = j$ , because each observation belongs to one group.  $\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z}$  is therefore a diagonal matrix with the group sizes on the diagonal and in case the groups are of equal size  $\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} = n/G \mathbf{I}$  and  $(\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} = G/n \mathbf{I}$ . Consequently,  $\mathbf{P}_Z = G/n \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Z}'$ . Note that

$[\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}]_{ij} = \sum_{l=1}^n Z_{li}Z_{lj}$ , which equals one only if  $i$  and  $j$  belong to the same group. Therefore  $\mathbf{P}_Z = \mathbf{G}/n\mathbf{B}_{\nu'}$ .

If we next assume that  $E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\boldsymbol{\eta}_i'|\mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta$  and  $E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j|\mathbf{Z}) = \boldsymbol{\rho}$ , then (A.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\boldsymbol{\eta}_j'|\mathbf{Z}) \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{i,j \in [g]} P_{Z,ij} E(\boldsymbol{\eta}_i\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j|\mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G n_g^2 \frac{G}{n} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G n_g^2 \frac{G}{n} \boldsymbol{\rho} \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G n_g \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \right]^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=1}^G n_g \boldsymbol{\rho} \\ &= \left[ \frac{1}{n} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\eta \right]^{-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus we have a many instrument bias. Note that in this example the number of instruments is equal to the number of clusters, which can be much smaller than the number of observations. Therefore with clustering there can be a many instrument bias even when the number of instruments grows slower than the number of observations.

## Appendix B Proofs

### B.1 Proof of Theorem 2

*Proof.* The proof uses a similar approach as Lemma A2 in Chao et al. (2012).

**Rewriting the statistic** Gather the variance of the cluster jackknife AR, the variance of the cluster jackknife score and the covariance in a matrix  $\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}$  as

$$\mathbf{V}_{CLJ} = \begin{bmatrix} V_{CLJ}^{AR} & \mathbf{C}'_{CLJ} \\ \mathbf{C}_{CLJ} & \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^S \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1} \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$  be given and define  $(c_1, c_2) = (\mathbf{t}'\mathbf{t})^{-1/2} \mathbf{t}' \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^{-1/2}$ . Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} (c_1, c_2)' \begin{pmatrix} AR(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \end{pmatrix} &= \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} c_2 \mathbf{X}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ &= \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (c_2' \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + c_2' \boldsymbol{\eta}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \\ &= \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (c_2' \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + c_2' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \\ &\quad + c_2' \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} + c_2' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \\ &= \sum_{g=2}^G y_{hg}. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows I will show that  $\sum_{g=2}^G y_{hg} \rightsquigarrow N(0, 1)$  and, hence, via the Cramér-Wold device  $\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^{-1/2} (AR(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0), \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)')' \rightsquigarrow N(0, \mathbf{I})$  (Billingsley, 1995, T29.4).

**Martingale difference array** Define the  $\sigma$ -fields  $\mathcal{F}_{h,g} = \{\varepsilon_{[1]}, \dots, \varepsilon_{[h]}; \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[1]}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]}\}$ . Then  $\mathcal{F}_{h-1,g} \subset \mathcal{F}_{h,g}$  and, conditional on  $\mathbf{Z}$ ,  $\{y_{hg}, \mathcal{F}_{h,g}; 1 \leq h \leq g, g \geq 2\}$  is a martingale difference array.

**Variance bounded away from zero** For the statistic to be well defined we need the variance  $\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}$  to be non-singular.

First consider the variance of the AR statistic. Rewrite the conditional variance as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{CLJ}^{AR} &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g=1}^G \sum_{h \neq g} \sum_{k_1=1}^{n_g} \sum_{k_2=1}^{n_h} (e'_{k_1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g^{1/2l} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{1/2} e_{k_2})^2 \\ &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\iota}' (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g^{1/2l} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{1/2} \odot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g^{1/2l} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h^{1/2}) \boldsymbol{\iota} \\ &= \frac{2}{k} \boldsymbol{\iota}' (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2l} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \odot \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2l} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}) \boldsymbol{\iota} \\ &= \frac{2}{k} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z). \end{aligned}$$

By [Assumption A1](#)

$$\frac{2}{k} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z) \geq \frac{2}{k} \lambda_{\min}^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \text{tr}(\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z) \geq \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) > 0,$$

because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) &= \sum_{h=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) - \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}^2) \\ &\geq \sum_{h=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) - \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) \\ &\geq k, \end{aligned} \tag{B.1}$$

since, by [Assumption A2](#),  $\|\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}\|_2^2 = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}^2) = \lambda_{\max}^2(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}) < 1$  implies that  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}) < 1$ .

Next, let  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  such that  $\mathbf{v}'\mathbf{v} = 1$  be given and consider a quadratic form of the variance of the score from (4). The part with  $\mathbf{Z}$  is bigger or equal than zero by [Assumption A3.i](#). The second part is

$$\begin{aligned} &E\left(\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}\right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2 \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \mid \mathbf{Z}\right) \\ &= \sum_{g \neq h} E\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} & \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} & \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathbf{Z}\right) \\ &= \sum_{g \neq h} E\left(\begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} & \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} & \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathbf{Z}\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{g \neq h} E(\lambda_{\min} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} & \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} & \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \end{bmatrix} \right) \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} & \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \mid \mathbf{Z}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that this minimum eigenvalue is bounded away from zero by [Assumption A3.i](#). Then proceed with

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon'_{[g]} & \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon_{[g]} \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} \end{bmatrix} \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{v} + \varepsilon'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \varepsilon_{[g]} \middle| \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}' \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \middle| \mathbf{Z}) \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]}) + \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{[g,h]}) > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumption A3.i](#) and [\(B.1\)](#).

Finally, using the same arguments as in [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#) I conclude that  $\mathbf{V}_{CLJ}$  is invertible since the absolute correlation between the cluster jackknife AR statistic and each element of the cluster jackknife score statistic is assumed to be strictly below 1.

**Lyapunov condition** For the Lyapunov condition it needs to hold that  $\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^4 \middle| \mathbf{Z}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ .

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \varepsilon'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (c'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} + c'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + c'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \varepsilon_{[g]} + c'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \varepsilon_{[g]} \right]^4 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h \neq g} \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \varepsilon'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} \right]^4 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&\leq C \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq g}}^G \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \varepsilon'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} \right]^4 + \left[ \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq g}}^G \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} \right]^4 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

I show that the term involving  $\mathbf{X}$  converges to zero a.s. The other term follows analogously. Expand the term involving  $\mathbf{X}$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{\substack{h=1 \\ h \neq g}}^G \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \varepsilon_{[h]} \right]^4 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4=1 \\ h_1, h_2, h_3, h_4 \neq g}}^G \mathbb{E} (c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_1]} \varepsilon_{[h_1]} c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_2]} \varepsilon_{[h_2]} \\
& \quad c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_3]} \varepsilon_{[h_3]} c'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_4]} \varepsilon_{[h_4]} \middle| \mathbf{Z}).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

This term is only non-zero when  $h_1 = \dots = h_4$ , or when  $h_i = h_j \neq h_k = h_l$  for  $i, j, k, l$  all permutations of  $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ .

Then, the terms corresponding to the first case can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \mathbb{E}((\mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]})^4 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= C \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= C \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}) \\
&\quad \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]})' (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= C \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]})' (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \\
&\quad \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z}), \tag{B.3}
\end{aligned}$$

where I used that  $\text{tr}(\mathbf{ABCD}) = \text{vec}(\mathbf{D})'(\mathbf{C}' \otimes \mathbf{A}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{B})$  (Magnus and Neudecker, 1998, Ch. 2.4). Then, by convexity of  $\lambda_{\max}$  and Jensen's inequality we have

$$\lambda_{\max}[\mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})] \leq \mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max}[\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})],$$

which can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max}[\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})] &= \mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]})' \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}] | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}(n_g \sum_{i \in [g]} \varepsilon_i^4 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq n_g^2 \max_{i \in [g]} \mathbb{E}(\varepsilon_i^4 | \mathbf{Z}). \tag{B.4}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}((\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}) \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 (\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]})') \text{vec}((\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}) \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 (\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]})')' | \mathbf{Z})], \tag{B.5}
\end{aligned}$$

for which we need to consider four cases. First,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})') \\
&= \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})' \text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}) \\
&= \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}) \\
&= (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2)^2 \\
&= \left(\frac{n_g}{n_g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2\right)^2 \\
&\leq n_{\max}^2 C,
\end{aligned}$$



by [Assumption A3.iii](#).

Second,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}))'|\mathbf{Z}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}|\mathbf{Z})] \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2 \\
&\leq n_{\max}^2C,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumptions A3.i](#) and [A3.iii](#).

Third,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]})\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}))'|\mathbf{Z}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}|\mathbf{Z})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{\Pi}'\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{Z}_{[g]}\mathbf{\Pi}\mathbf{c}_2|\mathbf{Z}] \\
&\leq n_{\max}^2C,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumptions A3.i](#) and [A3.iii](#).

Fourth,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[\lambda_{\max}(\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]})\text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}))'|\mathbf{Z}] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}(\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2|\mathbf{Z})] \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\text{tr}^2(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}|\mathbf{Z})] \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^2,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumption A3.i](#).

Therefore by [Assumptions A1](#) and [A2](#), (B.3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& C \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}((\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]})'(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \\
&\quad \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]}\mathbf{c}_2\mathbf{c}'_2\mathbf{X}'_{[g]})'|\mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^4 \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]})(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})] \\
&= Cn_{\max}^4 \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \otimes (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})] \\
&= Cn_{\max}^4 \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}^2[\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}] \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^4 \sum_{g=1}^G [\sum_{h=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})]^2 \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^4 \sum_{g=1}^G [\text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]})]^2 \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^5 \sum_{g=1}^G \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,g]}) \\
&\leq Cn_{\max}^5 k.
\end{aligned} \tag{B.6}$$

The terms corresponding to the second case following (B.2) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h_1, h_2 < g \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \mathbb{E}((\mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_1]})^2 (\mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]})^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= C \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \mathbb{E}(\text{tr}[(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{h_1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{h_1}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{h_2} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{h_2})'] \\
&\quad (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})'] | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= C \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_1}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2})'] \\
&\quad (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})],
\end{aligned}$$

which by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, (B.5) and a result similar to (B.4) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& C \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_1}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2})' (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})] \\
&= C \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} [\text{tr}((\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_1}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2})' (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]})')]^{1/2} \\
&\quad [\text{tr}(\mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z}) (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2})' \\
&\quad (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \mathbb{E}(\text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \mathbf{X}'_{[g]})' | \mathbf{Z})')]^{1/2} \\
&= C n_{\max}^4 \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} [\text{tr}((\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]}) (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]})')]^{1/2} \\
&\quad [\text{tr}((\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]}) (\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]})')]^{1/2} \\
&= C n_{\max}^4 \sum_{\substack{g \neq h_1, h_2 \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \\
&\leq C n_{\max}^4 \sum_{g, h_1, h_2=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]}) \\
&\leq C n_{\max}^4 \sum_{g=1}^G \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, g]}) \\
&\leq C n_{\max}^5 k,
\end{aligned}$$

by the same arguments as in (B.6). Therefore (B.2) converges to zero almost surely.

**Converging conditional variance** Finally it needs to hold that for any  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\mathbb{P}(|\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^2 | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}) - s_g^2| > \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where  $s_g^2 = \mathbb{E}[(\sum_{g=2}^G y_{hg})^2 | \mathbf{Z}] = \mathbb{E}[(\sum_{g=2}^G [y_{hg}]^2 | \mathbf{Z})]$ . For ease of notation, define  $y_{hg} = y_{hg}^{(1)} + y_{hg}^{(2)} + y_{hg}^{(3)}$  with

$$\begin{aligned} y_{hg}^{(1)} &= \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]}; \\ y_{hg}^{(2)} &= \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}); \\ y_{hg}^{(3)} &= \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(|\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^2 | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}) - s_g^2| > \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(|\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}[(y_{hg}^{(1)})^2 + (y_{hg}^{(2)})^2 + (y_{hg}^{(3)})^2 + 2y_{hg}^{(1)}y_{hg}^{(2)} + 2y_{hg}^{(1)}y_{hg}^{(3)} + 2y_{hg}^{(2)}y_{hg}^{(3)} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}] \\ & \quad - \mathbb{E}[(y_{hg}^{(1)})^2 + (y_{hg}^{(2)})^2 + (y_{hg}^{(3)})^2 + 2y_{hg}^{(1)}y_{hg}^{(2)} + 2y_{hg}^{(1)}y_{hg}^{(3)} + 2y_{hg}^{(2)}y_{hg}^{(3)} | \mathbf{Z}]| > \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Next, use the triangle inequality to bound above expression by a sum of terms of the form  $\mathbb{P}(|\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}[y_{hg}^{(i)}y_{hg}^{(j)} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}] - \mathbb{E}[y_{hg}^{(i)}y_{hg}^{(j)} | \mathbf{Z}]| > \epsilon | \mathbf{Z})$  for  $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ .

Define  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z})$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z})$  and first focus on the third quadratic term in (B.8), the other quadratic terms follow by the similar arguments. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}((y_{hg}^{(3)})^2 | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}) \\ &= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}((\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{h < g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]})^2 | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}) \\ &= \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \mathbb{E}(\frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_1]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_1]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \\ & \quad + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1, g}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h_2]} \mathbf{c}_2 \\ & \quad + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h_2]} \mathbf{c}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$

To write this more succinctly, and with slight abuse of notation, define

$$\mathbf{v}'_{[g]} = [\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \quad \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]}], \quad \mathbf{M}_g = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g & \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g \\ \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g & \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}.$$

For later purposes also define

$$\mathbf{P}_{Z, [g]}^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g]} \\ \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g]} & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{P}_Z^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{P}_Z \\ \mathbf{P}_Z & \mathbf{0} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M} = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} & \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)' \\ \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2) & \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{T}_g^* = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{T}_g & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{T}_g \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{T}_g$  is a  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix with ones on the diagonal elements corresponding to indices in clusters  $h \geq g$ .

Then (B.9) can be written as

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \mathbf{v}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[h_2]}.$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}((y_{hg}^{(3)})^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\ &= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{h < g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}\right)^2 | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}) + \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)_h \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}) \\ & \quad + \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}) + \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_h \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*). \end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

Hence we get that the difference between (B.9) and (B.10) is

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*) + \sum_{\substack{h_1, h_2 < g \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \mathbf{v}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h_2]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[h_2]}. \tag{B.11}$$

Plug this back into (B.8) and separate the two terms with the triangle inequality. Focus first on

the first term and use Markov's inequality to write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*)\right| \geq \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*)\right]^2 | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g_1, g_2=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h_1 < g_1 \\ h_2 < g_2}} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h_1]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h_1]} - \mathbf{M}_{h_1}] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_1, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_1, h_1]}^*) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h_2]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h_2]} - \mathbf{M}_{h_2}] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h_2, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_2, h_2]}^*) | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g_1, g_2=2}^G \sum_{h < \min\{g_1, g_2\}} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h^{(i, j)}] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_1, h]}^*) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_2, h]}^*) | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{h=1}^G \sum_{g_1, g_2 > h} \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_1, h]}^*) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{tr}([\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h] \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g_2, h]}^*) | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{h=1}^G \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right)' \text{vec}(\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h) \right. \\
& \quad \left. \text{vec}(\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h)' \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right) | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right)' \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right),
\end{aligned}$$

by a result similar to (B.4) for  $\mathbf{v}_{[h]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} - \mathbf{M}_h$ . Next,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right)' \text{vec}\left(\sum_{g > h} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z, [g, h]}^*\right) \\
& = \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G \text{vec}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^* \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'})' \text{vec}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^* \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'}) \\
& = \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^* \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^* \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{h+1}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'}) \stackrel{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by eigenvalue bounds on  $\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^*$ ,  $\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}$  and  $\sum_{h=1}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z, [h]}^*) = 2k$ .

For the second part from (B.11) we have by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h,l < g \\ h \neq l}} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,l]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l]}\right| \geq \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\left[\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h,l < g \\ h \neq l}} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,l]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l]}\right]^2 | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g_1, g_2=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h_1, l_1 < g_1 \\ h_1 \neq l_1}} \sum_{\substack{h_2, l_2 < g_2 \\ h_2 \neq l_2}} \mathbf{v}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_1, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1, l_1]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l_1]} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \mathbf{v}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_2, l_2]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l_2]} | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g_1, g_2=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h, l < \min\{g_1, g_2\} \\ h \neq l}} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1, l]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l]} \mathbf{v}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_2, l]}^* \mathbf{v}_{[l]} | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{g_1, g_2=2}^G \sum_{\substack{h, l < \min\{g_1, g_2\} \\ h \neq l}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1, l]}^* \mathbf{M}_l \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_2, h]}^*) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{h, l=1 \\ h \neq l}}^G \sum_{g_1, g_2 \geq \max\{h, l\}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h, g_1]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1, l]}^* \mathbf{M}_l \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l, g_2]}^* \mathbf{M}_{g_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_2, h]}^*) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{h, l=1 \\ h \neq l}}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{M}_h \left[ \sum_{g \geq \max\{h, l\}} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g, l]}^* \right] \mathbf{M}_l \left[ \sum_{g \geq \max\{h, l\}} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l, g]}^* \mathbf{M}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g, h]}^* \right]) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{\substack{h, l=1 \\ h \neq l}}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h]}^* \mathbf{T}_{\max\{h, l\}}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{\max\{h, l\}}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^* \mathbf{T}_{\max\{h, l\}}^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_{\max\{h, l\}}^* \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h]}^{*'}) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G \sum_{l < h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h]}^* \mathbf{T}_h^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_h^* \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^* \mathbf{T}_h^* \mathbf{M} \mathbf{T}_h^* \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h]}^{*'}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\lambda_{\max}(\sum_{l < h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^{*'} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l]}^*) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_Z^* \mathbf{S}_{h-1}^* \mathbf{P}_Z^*) = \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{P}_Z^*) \leq C$ , where  $\mathbf{S}_h^*$  is similar to  $\mathbf{T}_h^*$  but then with  $\mathbf{S}_h$  instead of  $\mathbf{T}_h$  and  $\mathbf{S}_g$  is a  $n \times n$  diagonal matrix with ones on the diagonal elements corresponding to indices in clusters  $h \leq g$ , and  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M} \mathbf{M}) \leq C$ .

Next, consider the cross product between  $y_{hg}^{(1)}$  and  $y_{hg}^{(2)}$  from (B.8). First write,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(1)} y_{hg}^{(2)} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \right] \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \middle| \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g} \right) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_1]} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(1)} y_{hg}^{(2)} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_1]} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) | \mathbf{Z}) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \right| \geq \epsilon | \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \right]^2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{g=2}^G \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \right]^2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{g=2}^G \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by the usual eigenvalue bounds.

Next, proceed with the cross-product between  $y_{hg}^{(1)}$  and  $y_{hg}^{(3)}$ . First write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(1)} y_{hg}^{(3)} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \right] \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \middle| \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g} \right) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \mathbb{E} (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(1)} y_{hg}^{(3)} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \right] \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) + \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}).
\end{aligned}$$

Such that by the triangle and Markov's inequality

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left( \left| \frac{2c_1}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right| \geq \epsilon | \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{nk} (\mathbb{E}([\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}([\text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})]^2 | \mathbf{Z})).
\end{aligned}$$



Consider the first term, the second follows by similar arguments.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right]^2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h_1, h_2 < g} \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_1]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_1,g]}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{tr}([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h_2]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2,g]}) \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{g=2}^G \text{tr}^2([\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g] \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]}) \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C}{nk} \mathbb{E} \left( \sum_{g=2}^G \text{vec}(\mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1})' (\mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]}) \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{vec}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g)' (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1}) \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{nk} \sum_{g=2}^G \text{vec}(\mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1})' (\mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]}) (\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \otimes \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]}) \text{vec}(\mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1}) \\
&= \frac{C n_{\max}^2}{nk} \sum_{g=2}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by a result similar to (B.4) for  $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} - \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_g$ , eigenvalue bounds on  $\mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  and because  $\sum_{g=2}^G \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]}) = k$ .

Finally, consider the cross product between  $y_{hg}^{(2)}$  and  $y_{hg}^{(3)}$  in (B.8). First write,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(2)} y_{hg}^{(3)} \middle| \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \middle| \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 \\
&\quad + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \middle| \mathbf{Z}, \mathcal{F}_{h-1,g}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h < g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E}(y_{hg}^{(2)} y_{hg}^{(3)} \middle| \mathbf{Z}) &= \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left[ \sum_{h < g} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} (\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \right] \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

By the triangle and Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(|\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h<g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2 + \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}| \geq \epsilon | \mathbf{Z}) \\
& \leq \frac{C}{n^2} (\mathbb{E}([\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h<g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}([\mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\mathbf{c}_2)'_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}]^2 | \mathbf{Z})).
\end{aligned}$$

The first term becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}([\sum_{g=2}^G \sum_{h<g} \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \mathbf{c}_2]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
& = \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{g=2}^G \mathbf{c}'_2 \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{S}_{g-1} \mathbf{P}'_{Z,[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi} \mathbf{c}_2 \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0
\end{aligned}$$

by eigenvalue bounds on  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{c}_2)_g$ ,  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  and by [Assumption A3.iii](#). The second term follows by similar arguments.

I conclude that [\(B.7\)](#) holds and therefore the conditions for the martingale difference central limit theorem are satisfied. □

## B.2 Proof of [Theorem 3](#)

*Proof.* The proof uses the same approach as [Crudu et al. \(2021\)](#).

### B.2.1 Unbiasedness

Consider the conditional expectation of the three components of variance estimator in (6)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\beta_0)|\mathbf{Z}) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}); \\
\mathbb{E}(\hat{V}_{CLJ}^S(\beta_0)|\mathbf{Z}) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{X}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{X} + \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{X}_{[h]}] | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \sum_{g \neq h \neq j} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[j]} \\
&\quad + \sum_{g \neq h} (\mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta})'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} (\mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \boldsymbol{\eta})_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n} [\boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi} + \mathbb{E}(\sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[g]} \\
&\quad + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z})]; \\
\mathbb{E}(\hat{C}_{CLJ}(\beta_0)|\mathbf{Z}) &= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'(\beta)_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'(\beta)_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} | \mathbf{Z}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing these expressions with those in (3) to (5) shows that  $\hat{V}_{CLJ}(\beta_0)$  is conditionally unbiased.

### B.2.2 Consistency

First consider the variance estimator of the cluster jackknife AR statistic. Write it as

$$\hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\beta_0) = \frac{2}{k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z).$$

Define  $\mathbf{H} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma} - \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_g = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g - \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]}$ , such that

$$V_{CLJ}^{AR} - \hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\beta_0) = \frac{2}{k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z + \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z + \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z). \quad (\text{B.12})$$

Now, since  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{H}_g | \mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}\left(\left[\frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{H}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})\right]^2 | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&= \frac{8}{k^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g \neq h} [\text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{H}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})]^2 | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{8}{k^2} \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{H}_g) \text{tr}(\mathbf{H}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{H}_h) | \mathbf{Z}\right) \\
&\leq \frac{C n_{\max}^4}{k^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}^2(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality on the Frobenius inner product, the result below and (B.6).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{H}_g \mathbf{H}_g) | \mathbf{Z}) &\leq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g) + 2 \mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z})) + \mathbb{E}(\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} | \mathbf{Z})) \\ &\leq 3 \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g) + \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]}) \leq n_g^2 C, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

by Assumptions A2.v and A2.vi.

The expectation of the other terms in (B.12) squared converge by the same arguments. Finally, the triangle and Markov inequality lead to the conclusion that  $\hat{V}_{CLJ}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xrightarrow{P} V_{CLJ}^{AR}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ .

For the consistency of the covariance estimator  $\hat{C}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$  consider its  $i^{\text{th}}$  element,  $i = 1, \dots, p$  and write  $\mathbf{J}^{(i)} = \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{(i)} - \mathbf{B}_{\eta_{(i)} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'}$  for  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{(i)} = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i)} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' | \mathbf{Z})$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_g^{(i)}$  be the  $g^{\text{th}}$  diagonal block of  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}^{(i)}$ . Then

$$\mathbf{C}_{CLJ,i} - \hat{C}_{CLJ}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)_i = \frac{2}{\sqrt{nk}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{J}^{(i)} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z + \mathbf{J}^{(i)} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z + \boldsymbol{\Xi}^{(i)} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z),$$

and consistency follows by similar arguments as for (B.12).

Finally, consider the  $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$  element of the variance estimator of the score. Write it as

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{V}_{CLJ}^S(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)_{ij} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} (\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[g]} \\ &\quad + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[h]} + \boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j)} \\ &\quad + \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i)} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} + \sum_{g \neq h \neq l \neq g} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,l]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[l]} \\ &\quad + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} \\ &\quad + \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[g]}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

and write the  $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$  element of the variance as

$$\begin{aligned} V_{CLJ,ij}^S &= \frac{1}{n} [\boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} + \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_g^{(i,j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) + \\ &\quad \sum_{g \neq h} \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Xi}_g^{(i)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_h^{(j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]})], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_g^{(i,j)} = \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i)} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(j)} | \mathbf{Z})$ .

Note the similarity of the first three terms in (B.14) and (B.15). Take  $\mathbf{H}$  as before, then the

expectation of the squared difference between the first terms is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}([\mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{H} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)}]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{h=1}^G [(\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \mathbf{H}_h (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)})]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{h=1}^G (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}) \\
&\quad (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \mathbf{H}_h \mathbf{H}_h (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq \frac{C n^2_{\max}}{n^2} \sum_{h=1}^G (\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} - \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) (\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} - \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}) \\
&\quad (\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} - \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]}) (\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} - \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{B.16}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (B.13), Assumption A2.ii and Assumptions A3.iii and A3.iv.

Convergence of the expectation of the squared difference between the second and third terms in (B.14) and (B.15) follow by the similar arguments as for the variance of the AR statistic and the covariance.

Next, consider the expectation of the fourth term in (B.14) squared.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}([\mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}' \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon\varepsilon'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j)}]^2 | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{\substack{g_1 \neq h_1 \neq l \\ g_2 \neq h_2 \neq l}} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1,h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h_1]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_1,l]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[l]} \\
&\quad \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(j),[l]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h_2]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h_2]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2,g_2]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g_2]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{\substack{g_1 \neq h \neq l \\ g_2 \neq h}} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,l]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_l^{(j,j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g_2]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g_2]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \\
&\quad + \sum_{\substack{g_1 \neq h_1 \neq l \\ g_2 \neq h_2 \neq l \\ h_1 \neq h_2}} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1,h_1]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_1} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_1,l]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_l^{(j,j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h_2]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{h_2} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h_2,g_2]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g_2]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} | \mathbf{Z}).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.17}$$

The first term can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{\substack{g_1 \neq h \neq l \\ g_2 \neq h}} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g_1]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g_1,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,l]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_l^{(j,j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g_2]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g_2]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{h \neq l} (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,l]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_l^{(j,j)} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{h,l=1}^G (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,l]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[l,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}) | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \mathbb{E}(\sum_{h=1}^G (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} (\sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}) | \mathbf{Z}) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumptions A3.i](#) and [A3.iv](#), [\(B.13\)](#) and the same arguments as for [\(B.16\)](#). The second term in [\(B.17\)](#) follows by similar arguments. The fifth term in [\(B.14\)](#) follows by symmetry and the sixth uses largely the same arguments.

The expectation of the seventh term is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \right]^2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)}
\end{aligned}$$

The first term consists of two quadratic parts and therefore can be bounded using the eigenvalue bounds from [Assumption A3.i](#) and the results from above. Write the second term as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \left[ \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{C}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \left[ \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(i)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(i)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \frac{C n_{\max}^4}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \left[ \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]}) \text{tr}(\mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]}) \right]^{1/2} \\
&\stackrel{\text{a.s.}}{\rightarrow} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumptions A3.i](#), [A3.iii](#) and [A3.iv](#) and [\(B.6\)](#).

The eighth term in [\(B.14\)](#) is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \mathbb{E} \left( \left[ \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \right]^2 \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E} \left( \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E} \left( \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_h \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i),[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \mathbf{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \mathbf{\Pi}_{(j)} \middle| \mathbf{Z} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

whose first term has a quadratic form and therefore can be bounded by the usual eigenvalue bounds and a result similar to [\(B.4\)](#). Use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to write the second

term as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{g \neq h} [\mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{Z}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(i),[g]} | \mathbf{Z}) \\
&\quad \mathbb{E}(\boldsymbol{\eta}'_{(i),[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Pi}_{(j)} \boldsymbol{\Pi}'_{(j)} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{(j),[g]} | \mathbf{Z})]^{1/2} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by [Assumptions A3.i](#) and [A3.iv](#) and [\(B.6\)](#). The ninth term follows by symmetry.

The triangle and Markov inequality lead to the conclusion that  $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{CLJ}^S(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \xrightarrow{P} \mathbf{V}_{CLJ}^S(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ .  $\square$

## Appendix C Conditional linear combination test

[Lim et al. \(2024a\)](#) combine a jackknife AR and score statistic for an IV model with a single endogenous regressor in a conditional linear combination test. The following distributional assumption forms the foundation of the test.

**Assumption A6** ([Lim et al. \(2024a\)](#) Assumption 1). *Under both weak and strong identification, the following convergence holds*

$$\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \mathbf{X}' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \mathbf{X}' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{X} - \mathcal{C} \end{bmatrix} \rightsquigarrow N \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_1 & \Phi_{12} & \Phi_{13} \\ \Phi_{12} & \Psi & \tau \\ \Phi_{13} & \tau & \Upsilon \end{bmatrix} \right),$$

where  $\mathcal{C} = 1/\sqrt{k} \boldsymbol{\Pi}' \mathbf{Z}' \dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{Z} \boldsymbol{\Pi}$  is the scaled concentration parameter.

By changing  $\dot{\mathbf{P}}_Z$  to  $\ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z$  in the assumption on the left hand side and using cluster robust variance and covariance estimators for the variance and covariance components on the right hand side, [Lim et al.'s \(2024a\)](#) framework can be used to obtain a cluster conditional linear combination test.

I suggest the following variance and covariance estimators

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\Phi}_{1,CLJ}(\beta) &= \frac{2}{k} \text{tr}(\mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'} \ddot{\mathbf{P}}_Z); \\
\hat{\Phi}_{12,CLJ}(\beta) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[g]} \\
&\quad + \mathbf{X}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]}; \\
\hat{\Phi}_{13,CLJ}(\beta) &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{X}_{[h]}; \\
\hat{\Psi}_{CLJ}(\beta) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{g \neq h \neq i} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \mathbf{X}'_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,i]} \mathbf{X}_{[i]} + \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\beta)_{[h]} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{X}_{[h]}; \\
\hat{\Upsilon}_{CLJ}(\beta) &= \frac{2}{k} \sum_{g \neq h} \mathbf{X}'_{[g]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[g,h]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{X}_{[h]} \mathbf{P}_{Z,[h,g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, one could use the cross-fitted versions of these.

## Appendix D Cluster jackknife

In line with [Phillips and Hale \(1977\)](#) Appendix 1, I need to find a matrix to write cluster jackknifing concisely. For any  $n \times m$  matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  write  $\mathbf{A}_{[-g]}$  for the  $(n - n_g) \times m$  matrix with the rows of  $\mathbf{A}$  but those indexed by  $[g]$ . Using the Woodburry matrix identity, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{Z}'_{-g} \mathbf{Z}_{-g})^{-1} &= (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]})^{-1} \\ &= (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} + (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_g} - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

For the next step I write

$$\mathbf{Z}'_{-g} \mathbf{X}_{-g} \mathbf{e}_i = \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{e}_i.$$

Combining the two equations I obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &(\mathbf{Z}'_{-g} \mathbf{Z}_{-g})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{-g} \mathbf{X}_{-g} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_i + (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_g} - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &\quad - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{e}_i - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_g} - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{e}_i \\ &= \hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} \mathbf{e}_i - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_g} - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})^{-1} [\mathbf{X}_{[g]} \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_i] \\ &= \hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} \mathbf{e}_i - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_g} - \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]})^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{[g]} \mathbf{e}_i. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if  $\langle j \rangle$  is the cluster number observation  $j$  belongs to, the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column of the leave- $[g]$ -out fitted values for  $\mathbf{X}$ , denoted by  $\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{JIVE}$ , can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbf{X}}_{JIVE} \mathbf{e}_i &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{e}'_1 \mathbf{Z} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} \mathbf{e}_i - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle 1 \rangle]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_{\langle 1 \rangle}} - \mathbf{Z}_{[\langle 1 \rangle]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle 1 \rangle]})^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{[\langle 1 \rangle]} \mathbf{e}_i] \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{e}'_n \mathbf{Z} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} \mathbf{e}_i - (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle n \rangle]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_{\langle n \rangle}} - \mathbf{Z}_{[\langle n \rangle]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle n \rangle]})^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_{[\langle n \rangle]} \mathbf{e}_i] \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \mathbf{Z} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} \mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{H} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathbf{e}_i \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbf{H}$  is a  $n \times n$  block diagonal matrix with in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row the columns belonging to  $[\langle i \rangle]$  filled with  $\mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle i \rangle]} (\mathbf{I}_{n_{\langle i \rangle}} - \mathbf{Z}_{[\langle i \rangle]} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}'_{[\langle i \rangle]})^{-1}$  and zeroes elsewhere, which can be written shorter as  $\mathbf{H} = \mathbf{B}_{P_Z} \mathbf{B}_{M_Z}^{-1}$ .

I conclude that

$$\hat{\mathbf{X}}_{JIVE} = \mathbf{Z} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Pi}} - \mathbf{H} \hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = [\mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{H} (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}')] \mathbf{X} = \tilde{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{X}.$$

## Appendix E Alternative interpretation of the cluster many instrument AR

An alternative way to reach the cluster many instrument AR statistic is to sum the moment conditions per cluster. The moment conditions for cluster  $g$  can be summed to  $m_g(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i \in [g]} \mathbf{z}_i \varepsilon_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[g]}$  such that  $\mathbb{E}(m_g(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) = \mathbf{0}$ . Note that the covariance matrix of the moment conditions is  $\mathbb{E}(m_g(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) m_{g'}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)') = \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_g \mathbf{Z}_{[g]'})$  when  $g = g'$  and 0 otherwise. Therefore it can be estimated by  $\sum_{g=1}^G \mathbf{Z}'_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})_{[g]} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\boldsymbol{\beta})'_{[g]} \mathbf{Z}_{[g]} = \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \varepsilon(\boldsymbol{\beta})'} \mathbf{Z}$ , which gives rise



to the CU objective function

$$Q(\beta) = \left( \sum_{g=1}^G m_g(\beta) \right)' [\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'} \mathbf{Z}]^{-1} \left( \sum_{g=1}^G m_g(\beta) \right) = \iota_G' \mathbf{B}'_{\varepsilon(\beta)} \mathbf{Z} (\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)\varepsilon(\beta)'} \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{B}_{\varepsilon(\beta)} \iota_G.$$

The distribution of the cluster many instrument AR then follows by applying Theorem 1 in [Boot and Ligtenberg \(2023\)](#).

## Appendix F Details of the application to [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#)

[Table 1](#) shows the exact bounds of the confidence intervals for the effect of queenly reign on the likelihood for a polity to be in war relative to polities led by a king.

Table 1: 95% confidence interval for the effect of queenly reign on war.

	Cl. AR		Cl. jack. AR		Cl. jack. score		Cl. MI AR	
	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper
FBM, Sis	0.087	0.827	0.127	0.817	0.083	0.853	0.096	0.812
FBM, Sis, Sis × No children	0.191	0.428	0.252	0.495	0.098	0.657	0.219	0.383
FBM, Sis, Sis × FMB	0.072	0.452	0.113	0.576	-0.013	0.659	0.093	0.428
FBM, Sis, FBM × Two children	0.025	0.940	0.078	0.806	0.088	0.832	0.035	0.888
Full	-0.021	0.547	0.014	0.580	0.025	0.551	-0.003	0.512

*Note:* 95% confidence interval for the effect of queenly reign on the probability of being in war relative to polities led by a king. The confidence intervals are based on inverting the cluster AR test, the cluster jackknife AR, the cluster jackknife score, both without cross-fit variance, and the cluster many instrument AR. The data comes from [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and is clustered on a broad measure of reign. The instruments are whether the previous sovereign had a first born male child (FBM), whether the previous sovereign had a sister (Sis) and interactions of these with each other and indicators whether the previous sovereign had no or two children. The control variables are the same as in columns 1, 2, 4 and 5 of [Table A5](#) in [Dube and Harish \(2020\)](#) and are partialled out naively. The full model pools the instruments and control variables of the other models.