

Inference on common trends in functional time series*

Morten Ørregaard Nielsen[†]

Aarhus University

mon@econ.au.dk

Won-Ki Seo

University of Sydney

won-ki.seo@sydney.edu.au

Dakyung Seong

University of Sydney

dakyung.seong@sydney.edu.au

May 22, 2024

Abstract

We study statistical inference on unit roots and cointegration for time series in a Hilbert space. We develop statistical inference on the number of common stochastic trends embedded in the time series, i.e., the dimension of the nonstationary subspace. We also consider tests of hypotheses on the nonstationary and stationary subspaces themselves. The Hilbert space can be of an arbitrarily large dimension, and our methods remain asymptotically valid even when the time series of interest takes values in a subspace of possibly unknown dimension. This has wide applicability in practice; for example, to the case of cointegrated vector time series that are either high-dimensional or of finite dimension, to high-dimensional factor model that includes a finite number of nonstationary factors, to cointegrated curve-valued (or function-valued) time series, and to nonstationary dynamic functional factor models. We include two empirical illustrations to the term structure of interest rates and labor market indices, respectively.

JEL codes: C32.

MSC 2010: primary 62G99, 62H99; secondary 62H25, 62M10, 91B84.

Keywords: cointegration, common trends, functional data, high-dimensional data, nonstationarity, stochastic trends, variance ratio.

*We are grateful to Brendan Beare, James Duffy, Massimo Franchi, Bent Nielsen, Hanlin Shang, and seminar participants at Australian National University, University of Oxford, University of Queensland, University of Sydney, University of Zurich, University of Amsterdam, University of Warwick, as well as the 2022 NBER-NSF time series conference, SETA 2023, ESAM 2023, and EcoSta 2023 for helpful comments. Nielsen thanks the Danish National Research Foundation for financial support (DNRF Chair grant number DNRF154).

[†]Corresponding author. Address: Department of Economics and Business Economics, Aarhus University, Fuglesangs Alle 4, 8210 Aarhus V, Denmark. Email: mon@econ.au.dk.

1 Introduction

We consider statistical inference on unit roots and common stochastic trends for time series taking values in a Hilbert space of an arbitrary dimension or a subspace of possibly unknown dimension. An important first step in the analysis of such time series is the determination of the dimension of the nonstationary subspace, i.e. the subspace in which the time series behaves like a unit root process (see Section 2). This dimension is the number of common stochastic trends. Our main objective is to test hypotheses on the dimension of the nonstationary subspace, although we also consider hypotheses on the nonstationary subspace itself.

Since we want to examine nonstationary time series in a possibly unknown dimensional subspace of a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , our tests need to be statistically valid regardless of (i) whether the dimension of the space in which the time series takes values is finite or not and (ii) whether the dimension is known in advance or not. That is, the tests need to be (at least asymptotically) invariant to the dimensionality of the time series, and due to this property they will be called Asymptotically Dimension Invariant (ADI) tests.

This is especially relevant in the recent literature on functional time series, where it is both empirically and theoretically supported that nonstationarity of such time series tends to be driven by a finite-dimensional process (e.g., [Chang et al., 2016](#), [Beare and Seo, 2020](#), [Franchi and Paruolo, 2020](#), [Li et al., 2020, 2023](#), [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)). Even when a function-valued random element can be accommodated in a finite-dimensional space, and thus can be represented by a finite number of basis functions, its dimension is generally unknown and large. In such cases, most existing cointegration rank tests are not applicable since they require either finite (preferably small) dimensionality or a priori information on the dimensionality of the time series; this is true even for recently developed cointegration tests for high-dimensional time series such as those of [Onatski and Wang \(2018\)](#) and [Bykhovskaya and Gorin \(2022, 2023\)](#).

The testing procedures we develop have wide applicability in practice; for example, they can be used (i) with cointegrated vector time series of finite dimension (e.g., [Stock and Watson, 1988](#), [Johansen, 1991](#)), (ii) in a high-dimensional factor model that includes a finite number of nonstationary factors (e.g., [Nelson and Siegel, 1987](#), [Peña and Poncela, 2004, 2006](#)), (iii) with cointegrated curve-valued (or function-valued) time series (e.g., [Chang et al., 2016](#), [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)), and (iv) for nonstationary dynamic functional factor models (e.g., [Martínez-Hernández et al., 2022](#)).

Our approach to developing ADI tests is to project onto a certain finite-dimensional subspace and then analyze generalized eigenvalues between two covariance operators on that subspace. Thus, the proposed tests will be classified as variance ratio-type tests, and some

can be seen as generalizations of existing tests (Section 6). Variance ratio tests have desirable properties for the study of nonstationary time series. First, some avoid estimation of the long-run variance, which implies a certain consistency property not shared by other tests (Müller, 2007, 2008). Second, the limiting behavior of the tests does not depend on a parametric assumption, such as a vector autoregression. As shown in the finite-dimensional case, finite-sample properties of parametric cointegration rank tests, such as those proposed by Stock and Watson (1988), Ahn and Reinsel (1990), Johansen (1991), Bewley and Yang (1995), Ahn (1997), depend crucially on the model specification; see Toda (1995), Haug (1996), Bewley and Yang (1998). Third, parametric assumptions such as the autoregressive order are not preserved by the projection operation, which implies that parametric tests cannot generally be ADI (Remark 3.1). In these regards, nonparametric variance ratio tests are appealing.

The theoretical results given in this paper can be summarized by the following four points. First, we provide limit theory for general variance ratio-type statistics based on partial summation and/or differencing, and this limit theory is applied to obtain our ADI inferential methods throughout. Second, we apply our ADI test statistics to sequentially test for the dimension of the nonstationary subspace via either a top-down, bottom-up, or hybrid approach. The bottom-up does not require the choice of an initial hypothesis, but the top-down has better finite-sample properties, while the hybrid combines these advantages. Third, we consider also a direct estimator of the dimension of the nonstationary subspace based on ratios of generalized eigenvalues. This is similar to estimation of the dimension of the “dominant subspace” in Li et al. (2020, 2023) and may be considered complementary to their estimator for curve-valued time series and that in Zhang and Chan (2018), Zhang et al. (2019), and Franchi et al. (2023) for vector-valued time series. Fourth, we also consider hypothesis testing on the nonstationary or stationary subspace.

Comparisons with existing work

First, we view the time series of interest, $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, as a sequence in a known Hilbert space \mathcal{H} , but allow for the possibility that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ takes values in a subspace of \mathcal{H} . In the latter case, the covariance operator of X_t is singular on \mathcal{H} and may allow only finitely many nonzero eigenvalues even in an infinite-dimensional setting. This violates the commonly adopted assumption in the literature of having sufficiently many (often infinitely many) nonzero eigenvalues. Of course, the exact eigenstructure of such a population covariance operator is not known in practice, and assuming that infinitely many eigenvalues are nonzero may not only be unrealistic but is also not testable. For example, we may consider the case where each functional observation of interest is constructed by only a finite number of discrete and regularly spaced points on a grid of the domain, and such empirical examples can easily be

found in the literature; see e.g., [Nielsen et al. \(2023\)](#) (age-specific employment rates), [Li et al. \(2023\)](#) (US treasury yield curves, in the working paper version), and [Section 8.1](#). This poses an obstacle to the use of existing methods, and this is precisely where our ADI inference methods have a distinctive advantage over existing ones. As will be detailed, our methods are designed to be asymptotically valid under a more general scenario where the (long-run) covariance operator of the stationary part of X_t permits only a few nonzero eigenvalues (we also provide analysis on the exact number of nonzero eigenvalues required for the proposed tests). In comparison, existing methods rule out this possibility by assumption (including our own recent work, [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)). Thus, our methodology can accommodate more general and realistic functional time series.

Second, the common requirement of infinitely many nonzero eigenvalues for existing methods distinguishes them from cointegration rank tests developed in a finite-dimensional setting, where any covariance operator necessarily permits only finitely many nonzero eigenvalues. We show a natural connection between our ADI tests and well-known tests for cointegration (or stationarity) developed in a finite-dimensional setting, and we find that our ADI tests generalize those tests. Furthermore, we demonstrate that, in specific cases, our ADI tests reduce to some recently developed tests for nonstationary functional time series. These results imply that some well-known tests, developed in both conventional and functional setups, can be understood as special cases of our ADI tests, thereby bridging the gap between them.

Third, the advantages of our methods lie not only in their applicability to a more general setting but also in their practical usefulness for real datasets. Many existing methods require a reasonable conjecture on the maximum possible number of stochastic trends (e.g., [Chang et al., 2016](#), [Li et al., 2023](#), [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)). Although some rule-of-thumb choices can be used in practice, such as those based on the scree plot, a more formal procedure may be preferable. The current study complements this aspect by providing a testing procedure based on a generalized version of the functional KPSS test ([Horváth et al., 2014](#)) that can be used in practice to construct an upper bound.

Fourth, we provide statistical inference on the space spanned by stochastic trends based on our ADI tests. Specifically, we can test whether a particular subspace of interest is contained in the nonstationary subspace, spans the nonstationary subspace, or is contained in the stationary subspace. We illustrate the empirical usefulness of these tests in [Section 8.2](#) in the context of the well-known [Nelson and Siegel \(1987\)](#) model.

Compared with our earlier work in [Nielsen et al. \(2023\)](#), all four preceding points apply. Furthermore, in [Nielsen et al. \(2023\)](#) we did not consider any eigenvalue-ratio estimators, and we only considered a particular variance ratio test statistic (VR(2,1) in [Section 3.1](#) below), whereas in this paper we consider a whole family of statistics.

Compared with recent work on cointegration testing in high-dimensional vector autoregressive (VAR) processes (Onatski and Wang, 2018, Bykhovskaya and Gorin, 2022, 2023), our setup is fundamentally different. They allow only a small number of cointegrating vectors, whereas our setup requires that the number of stochastic trends is small, and hence is more suitable when nonstationarity is driven by a small number of factors. Interestingly, a function-valued VAR setup implies that it is the number of stochastic trends that is small (Remark 2.3). Moreover, our setup does not rely on a VAR structure, and it covers intrinsically infinite-dimensional time series which theirs does not. Finally, our tests can be naturally applied to determine the number of stochastic trends while their tests are for the existence of cointegration and cannot immediately be applied as cointegration rank tests. In general, therefore, their tests serve a different purpose and may be viewed as complementary; see also Remark 2.2.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the time series of interest in Hilbert space, and in Section 3 we present our ADI variance-ratio tests. Section 4 discusses determination of the dimension of the nonstationary subspace either via sequential application of the tests or via direct estimation using eigenvalue ratios. In Section 5 we discuss testing hypotheses about the subspaces. Section 6 outlines the relations between our proposed tests and existing tests, Section 7 presents Monte Carlo simulation evidence, and Section 8 presents two empirical applications to the term structure of interest rates and to labor market indices, respectively. Finally, Section 9 concludes. Mathematical details, notation, and proofs are given in the appendix.

2 I(1) time series and stochastic trends in Hilbert space

We consider a cointegrated linear I(1) process taking values in a separable Hilbert space, \mathcal{H} , as formally defined by Beare et al. (2017). Specifically, let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ be a sequence whose first difference, denoted ΔX_t , satisfies

$$\Delta X_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Phi_j \epsilon_{t-j}, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\{\epsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an independent and identically distributed (iid) sequence with $\mathbb{E}[\epsilon_t] = 0$, $\mathbb{E}[\|\epsilon_t\|^4] < \infty$, and positive definite covariance C_ϵ . We further assume that $\{\Phi_j\}_{j \geq 0}$ is a sequence of bounded, linear operators satisfying

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j^2 \|\Phi_j\|_{\text{op}} < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(1) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \Phi_j \neq 0, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ denotes the usual operator norm. Then the long-run covariance of ΔX_t is well defined as $\Lambda_{\Delta X} = \Phi(1)C_\epsilon\Phi(1)^* \neq 0$; see Beare et al. (2017). Any stationary sequence with nonzero long-run covariance is I(0). Hence, because $\{\Delta X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfying (2.1) is necessarily

stationary and $\Lambda_{\Delta X} \neq 0$, it is $I(0)$ by construction, so that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is $I(1)$. The summability condition in (2.2) is common in the unit root literature (Phillips and Solo, 1992).

Let $\mathcal{H}_S = \ker \Lambda_{\Delta X}$ denote the kernel of $\Lambda_{\Delta X}$ and let $\mathcal{H}_N = \mathcal{H}_S^\perp$ be its orthogonal complement. Then it is known that \mathcal{H}_N is the closure of $\text{ran } \Phi(1)$. We call \mathcal{H}_S and \mathcal{H}_N the stationary subspace (cointegrating space) and nonstationary subspace, respectively. These names are related to some distinctive properties that are possessed by elements in those spaces. To see this in detail, we note that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfying (2.1) and (2.2) allows the following decomposition, see Phillips and Solo (1992),

$$X_t = \Phi(1) \sum_{s=1}^t \epsilon_s + \nu_t + X_0 - \nu_0, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\nu_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\Phi}_j \epsilon_{t-j}$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_j = -\sum_{s=j+1}^{\infty} \Phi_s$. From the summability condition in (2.2), we also find that $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \|\tilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} < \infty$. Since the random walk component in (2.3) clearly takes values in \mathcal{H}_N , it follows that $\{\langle X_t, v \rangle\}_{t \geq 1}$ is nonstationary if $v \notin \mathcal{H}_S$ or $v \in \mathcal{H}_N$; see Beare et al. (2017) for further details. We will apply the following condition throughout,

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}_N) = s_N < \infty. \quad (2.4)$$

If (2.4) is true, we say that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ contains s_N stochastic trends. Since $\dim(\mathcal{H}_N) = \dim(\text{ran } \Phi(1)) = \text{rank}(\Phi(1))$, the projection onto \mathcal{H}_N , denoted P_N , is a finite rank operator of rank s_N under (2.4), regardless of whether the dimension of \mathcal{H} is finite or not. On the other hand, the rank of the projection onto \mathcal{H}_S , denoted $P_S = I - P_N$, depends on the dimension of \mathcal{H} ; specifically, it is $p - s_N$ if $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$, while it is ∞ if \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional. In fact, we will allow X_t to take values in a subspace $\bar{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ of possibly unknown dimension $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$. In that case, the (long-run) covariance of $\{P_S X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is not injective on \mathcal{H}_S and allows at most $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}} - s_N$ nonzero eigenvalues, which may be only finitely many. It follows that $\{\langle X_t, v \rangle\}_{t \geq 1}$ is either a stationary sequence or equal to zero if $v \in \mathcal{H}_S$ or $v \notin \bar{\mathcal{H}}$.

Remark 2.1. The representation in (2.1) and (2.3) is that of a typical cointegrated vector- or curve-valued time series. However, it is also closely related to a nonstationary vector- or curve-valued dynamic factor model, where X_t allows the following representation,

$$X_t = \sum_{j=1}^{s_N} \beta_{j,t}^N f_j^N + \sum_{j=1}^{s_S} \beta_{j,t}^S f_j^S + e_t, \quad \{f_j^N\}_{j=1}^{s_N} \subseteq \mathcal{H}, \quad \{f_j^S\}_{j=1}^{s_S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}. \quad (2.5)$$

Here, s_N and s_S are nonnegative integers that can be infinite if $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$, $\{\beta_{j,t}^N\}_{j \geq 1}$ are $I(1)$ processes, $\{\beta_{j,t}^S\}_{j \geq 1}$ are stationary, and $\{e_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is a centered iid sequence with bounded covariance operator. In fact, $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfying (2.1) with compact self-adjoint Φ_j can always be written as (2.5) (Martínez-Hernández et al., 2022). Under the conditions that $s_N < \infty$, $s_S < \infty$, and e_t is a curve-valued random element, (2.5) reduces to the functional nonstationary dynamic factor model considered by Martínez-Hernández et al. (2022); see also Peña

and [Poncela \(2004, 2006\)](#) for related discussion in a Euclidean space setting.

Remark 2.2. In the context of a high-dimensional cointegrated time series, i.e. a vector time series of dimension $p \rightarrow \infty$ (as $T \rightarrow \infty$), some recent papers have provided tests for the existence of cointegration ([Onatski and Wang, 2018](#), [Bykhovskaya and Gorin, 2022, 2023](#)), but not for cointegration rank or the number of stochastic trends, s_N . These papers consider a setup that is fundamentally different from ours. Specifically, in contrast with our condition [\(2.4\)](#) that $s_N < \infty$, they assume that s_N increases such that $(p - s_N)/p \rightarrow 0$ and $s_N/p \rightarrow 1$; that is, the cointegration rank is negligible relative to s_N (e.g., eqn. (12) of [Onatski and Wang, 2018](#), or Sec. 3.2.2 of [Bykhovskaya and Gorin, 2022](#)). Thus, their methods are not applicable in our setup, and should be considered complementary to our methods since they apply in a different context. Despite this distinction, our methodology is in fact applicable to high-dimensional vector time series in some cases. For example, a vector-valued time series X_t of arbitrary dimension can be understood as a Hilbert-valued I(1) time series if the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of ΔX_t are square-summable (Lemmas 1.3–1.4 of [Bosq, 2000](#)). Finally, our methodology can be applied to time series of intrinsically infinite or large unknown dimension, and this is not considered or explored in the above-mentioned papers.

Remark 2.3. The condition in [\(2.4\)](#) seems to be reasonable in many empirical examples (e.g., those in [Chang et al., 2016](#) and [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)). From a theoretical point of view, suppose that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is generated by the following functional ARMA law of motion,

$$\Theta(L)X_t = \Psi(L)\varepsilon_t,$$

where $\{\varepsilon_t\}_{t \in \mathbb{Z}}$ is an \mathcal{H} -valued white noise, $\Theta(z) = I - \sum_{j=1}^p \Theta_j z^j$, $\Psi(z) = I + \sum_{j=1}^q \Psi_j z^j$, and p and q are allowed to be infinite. In this case, if $\Theta(z)$ is a Fredholm operator-valued function with a unit root, then it can be shown from the Granger-Johansen representation theorem in Hilbert space ([Beare and Seo, 2020](#), [Franchi and Paruolo, 2020](#), [Seo, 2023](#)) that [\(2.4\)](#) is always satisfied. A sufficient (but not necessary) condition for $\Theta(z)$ to be a Fredholm operator is that $\Theta_1, \dots, \Theta_p$ are compact. It is common to assume compactness of autoregressive operators in statistical analysis of the functional ARMA model, and thus finiteness of s_N arises as a natural consequence. Therefore, [\(2.4\)](#) does not seem to be restrictive from neither a practical nor a theoretical point of view.

3 ADI variance-ratio tests

We let \mathcal{H} be a separable Hilbert space and let $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ take values in \mathcal{H} or any subspace. \mathcal{H} can be an infinite-dimensional space of square-integrable functions or sequences depending on whether X_t is a random function or a random vector, but we do not exclude the possibility that \mathcal{H} is finite-dimensional. We assume that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 1. $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfies the conditions in Section 2; in particular (2.1)–(2.4).

A crucial input to estimation and inference on unit roots and cointegration (Chang et al., 2016, Nielsen et al., 2023, Seo, 2024) is $s_N = \dim(\mathcal{H}_N)$, i.e., the number of (linearly independent) stochastic trends. To determine this quantity, we consider the testing problem

$$H_0 : s_N = s_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : s_N \leq s_0 - 1, \quad (3.1)$$

for some $s_0 \in \mathcal{S}_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, s_{\max}\}$ and $s_{\max} < \infty$ is an upper bound on the number of stochastic trends, so that \mathcal{S}_0 is a finite set. In fact, s_{\max} can be reasonably chosen from data so that $s_{\max} \geq s_N$ but s_{\max} does not far exceed s_N (see Remark 3.9), so finiteness of \mathcal{S}_0 is a practically reasonable assumption.

As mentioned above, our tests can accommodate the case where $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ takes values in a subspace $\bar{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ of possibly unknown dimension, and the tests do not require knowledge of the dimension of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$. For this reason, they are called Asymptotically Dimension Invariant (ADI) tests. However, it should be noted that this dimension invariance property does not mean that our tests are not affected by the dimension of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ at all. Rather, it means that we do not explicitly require *a priori* information on $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ in order to implement the tests.

Our approach to developing ADI tests is based on a dimension-reduction technique that preserves stochastic trends. We call this *slack extraction* of stochastic trends. To elaborate on this, suppose that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is a \mathcal{H} -valued cointegrated $I(1)$ process described in Section 2 and takes values in a subspace $\bar{\mathcal{H}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ of dimension $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}} \leq p_{\mathcal{H}} = \dim(\mathcal{H}) \leq \infty$, where $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$ may be much larger than s_N . In addition, assume that we can find a finite integer $K \in [s_N, p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}]$ and an orthonormal set $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^K$ in \mathcal{H} such that $\text{span}\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^{s_N} = \mathcal{H}_N$ and $\{\langle X_t, \phi_{s_N+j} \rangle\}_{t \geq 1}$ is a stationary process for $j = 1, \dots, K - s_N$. Define $P_K = \sum_{j=1}^K \phi_j \otimes \phi_j$, where \otimes denotes the tensor product and thus $\phi_j \otimes \phi_j(\cdot) = \langle \phi_j, \cdot \rangle \phi_j$; that is, P_K is the unique orthogonal projection onto $\text{span}\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^K$. Then, from the fact that $\{\langle X_t, \phi_j \rangle\}_{t \geq 1}$ is an $I(1)$ sequence for $j \leq s_N$, we may deduce that (i) the projected time series $\{P_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ contains s_N stochastic trends and a $(K - s_N)$ -dimensional stationary component, and (ii) the nonstationary subspace of $\{P_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is the same as that of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. Due to these properties, we call P_K a *slack extractor* of stochastic trends. In other words, we do not lose any information about stochastic trends by using the projected time series $\{P_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ in the statistical analysis and ignoring the residual time series $\{(I - P_K)X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ (whose dimension generally depends on $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$). Therefore, a statistical test, which is not dependent on the residual part $\{(I - P_K)X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ but is constructed only from $\{P_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, naturally becomes ADI. Based on this idea, one may readily develop ADI tests by, for example, extending existing tests developed in a finite-dimensional setting (because $\{P_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ itself may be viewed as a K -dimensional cointegrated time series).

Of course, a slack extractor P_K satisfying the required conditions is not observable in

practice, but it can be replaced with a suitable estimator \widehat{P}_K . For now, we will impose some high-level conditions on \widehat{P}_K and its rank K . The latter is specified by the practitioner and typically depends on the value s_0 under the null in (3.1). Define the operator

$$\Lambda_{S,R} = \Lambda_{S,R}(a_R) = \mathbb{E}[P_S X_t \otimes P_S X_t] + 1_{\{a_R > 0\}} \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} (\mathbb{E}[P_S X_t \otimes P_S X_{t-s}] + \mathbb{E}[P_S X_{t-s} \otimes P_S X_t]), \quad (3.2)$$

where $1_{\{\cdot\}}$ is the indicator function, and a_R is a parameter that will be naturally specified (in Assumption 3 to appear) for each of the proposed tests. Note that $\Lambda_{S,R}$ is the long-run covariance (if $a_R > 0$) or covariance (if $a_R = 0$) of the stationary component of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$.

Assumption 2. (i) $K \geq s_N$, (ii) $\|\widehat{P}_K P_N - P_N\|_{\text{op}} = o_P(1)$, and (iii) $\|\widehat{P}_K P_S - P_S^K\|_{\text{op}} = o_P(1)$ for some orthogonal projection P_S^K satisfying $\text{ran } P_S^K \subseteq \mathcal{H}_S$ and $\text{rank}(P_S^K \Lambda_{S,R} P_S^K) = K - s_N$.

Since K is chosen by the researcher and we can obtain a reasonable upper bound s_{\max} of s_N , Assumption 2(i) can easily be satisfied in practice. Feasible choices of \widehat{P}_K satisfying Assumption 2(ii)–(iii) are discussed in Section 3.4 under mild low-level conditions.

Remark 3.1. It seems reasonable to ask if one can apply standard (cointegration rank) tests of (3.1) from a Euclidean space setting to the projected time series $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. This is in fact not always the case, because some statistical/mathematical properties of the time series are not preserved under projection. In particular, parametric tests based on an AR(p) law of motion, such as those proposed by Johansen (1991), cannot be directly applied since parametric relationships are not generally preserved under projection. To see this in detail, suppose that $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = p_{\mathcal{H}}$, but X_t follows an AR(1) law of motion in $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$ of (unknown) dimension $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}} \leq p_{\mathcal{H}}$ such that $\Delta X_t = \Phi X_{t-1} + \epsilon_t$ for some bounded linear operator Φ and $t \geq 1$. Then, for $s_N \leq K \leq p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$, we have $\Delta \widehat{P}_K X_t = \widehat{P}_K \Phi \widehat{P}_K X_{t-1} + \widehat{P}_K \Phi (I - \widehat{P}_K) X_{t-1} + \widehat{P}_K \epsilon_t$. The term $\widehat{P}_K \Phi (I - \widehat{P}_K) X_{t-1}$ is dependent on $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$ and nonzero in general. This means that the parametric relationship between $\Delta \widehat{P}_K X_t$ and $\widehat{P}_K X_{t-1}$ is generally different from that between ΔX_t and X_{t-1} , and also dependent on K , \widehat{P}_K and $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$. Therefore, even if \widehat{P}_K is a consistent estimator of a slack extractor P_K , a parametric test applied to $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ not only depends on $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}}$, but is in fact misspecified. In Appendix D, we provide simulation evidence that Johansen's (1991) trace test, which is a widely used parametric test in practice, does not work with a consistent estimator of a slack extractor.

A consequence of Remark 3.1 is that, even if we may have a reasonable parametric assumption such as an AR structure for the original time series $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, such an assumption is not generally preserved under the projection \widehat{P}_K . Therefore, when we use the projected time series $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ for our statistical analysis to obtain ADI tests, these need to be developed without parametric assumptions. To achieve this goal, we consider tests based on various sample (long-run) covariance operators that can be computed from the projected time series without any parametric assumptions.

Thus, define $X_{d,t}$ by

$$X_{0,t} = \Delta X_t, \quad X_{1,t} = X_t, \quad X_{2,t} = \sum_{s=1}^t X_s,$$

so that d denotes the integration order (of ΔX_t). Further define the unnormalized sample long-run covariance operator of $\{X_{d,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$, denoted $\widehat{\Lambda}_d(h, k)$, as follows:

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_d(h, k) = \sum_{s=-T+1}^{T-1} k\left(\frac{s}{h}\right) \widehat{\Gamma}_{d,s}, \quad \widehat{\Gamma}_{d,s} = \begin{cases} \sum_{t=s+1}^T X_{d,t-s} \otimes X_{d,t}, & \text{if } s \geq 0, \\ \sum_{t=-s+1}^T X_{d,t} \otimes X_{d,t+s}, & \text{if } s < 0, \end{cases} \quad (3.3)$$

where $k(\cdot)$ is a kernel function and h is the associated bandwidth parameter. From (3.3), it is readily found that $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_d(h, k) \widehat{P}_K$ is the unnormalized sample (long-run) covariance of $\{\widehat{P}_K X_{d,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$. As a special case, $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_d(0, k) \widehat{P}_K$ is the unnormalized sample covariance.

Our tests are based on the generalized eigenvalue problem

$$\mu_j \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} \widehat{P}_K \nu_j = \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d_R, R} \widehat{P}_K \nu_j, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\widehat{\Lambda}_{d_m, m} = \widehat{\Lambda}_{d_m}(h_m, k_m)$ for $m \in \{L, R\}$ (meaning left and right) and different choices of integration orders, d_L and d_R . Given that $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d_m, m} \widehat{P}_K$ are sample (long-run) covariance operators, we call (3.4) a generalized variance-ratio (VR) eigenvalue problem, and any test based on such an eigenvalue problem is called a $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ -based test. We may assume $d_L > d_R$ without loss of generality because the case $d_L < d_R$ can be obtained by simply redefining μ_j as its inverse. Of course, our ADI test can be implemented with many pairs of (d_L, d_R) , but we focus on the cases where (d_L, d_R) is given by $(2, 1)$, $(2, 0)$, and $(1, 0)$. These choices are motivated from a finite-dimensional Euclidean space setting; see Section 6.

In the sequel, $k_m(\cdot)$ and h_m are assumed to satisfy the following assumption.

Assumption 3. $k_m(\cdot)$ and h_m , for $m \in \{L, R\}$, satisfy:

- (i) $k_m(\cdot)$ is a twice continuously differentiable even function from a compact interval of \mathbb{R} to $[-1, 1]$ such that $k_m(0) = 1$, $k'_m(0) = 0$, $k''_m(0) \neq 0$, $k_m(x) = 0$ for $|x| \geq 1$, and $\lim_{|x| \rightarrow 1} k_m(x)/(1 - |x|)^2 = \text{constant}$.
- (ii) $h_m = a_m T^{b_m}$ for some $a_m \geq 0$ and $b_m \in (0, 1/2)$.

The requirements on $k_m(\cdot)$ in Assumption 3(i) are not restrictive in practice and are satisfied by many widely used kernel functions, including the Epanechnikov, Parzen, Tukey-Hanning, and quartic kernels. Moreover, the functional form of h_m depending on the sample size T given in Assumption 3(ii) is quite standard in practice.

Finally, it will be convenient to introduce some additional notation. We let $\{W_{1,q}(r)\}_{r \in [0,1]}$ denote a q -dimensional standard Brownian motion and define $W_{2,q}(r) = \int_0^r W_{1,q}(u) du$. For any matrix or compact operator A , we let $\lambda_j\{A\}$ define the j -th smallest eigenvalue of A ,

i.e. $\lambda_1\{A\} \leq \lambda_2\{A\} \leq \dots$. Given a kernel function k_m satisfying Assumption 3, we define

$$c_m = \int_{-1}^1 k_m(u) du = 2 \int_0^1 k_m(u) du. \quad (3.5)$$

Moreover, when there is no risk of confusion, we write $\int f$ to denote $\int_0^1 f(u) du$ for any f such that the integral is well defined.

3.1 Tests based on VR(2,1)

In this section we consider tests based on the VR(2,1) eigenvalue problem given by (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 1)$. Note that the required sample operators, $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} \widehat{P}_K$ and $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \widehat{P}_K$, can easily be computed from the K -dimensional time series $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. We first obtain the asymptotic properties of the eigenvalues of this problem.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold and define $\tilde{\mu}_j = n_T \mu_j$, where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^K$ are the eigenvalues from (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 1)$ and*

$$n_T = T^2 (h_L c_L + 1_{\{a_L=0\}}) / (h_R c_R + 1_{\{a_R=0\}}), \quad (3.6)$$

where h_m, a_m, c_m are given in Assumption 3(ii) and (3.5). Then

$$\tilde{\mu}_j \xrightarrow{d} \tilde{\lambda}_j = \lambda_j \left\{ \left(\int W_{2,s_N} W'_{2,s_N} \right)^{-1} \int W_{1,s_N} W'_{1,s_N} \right\} \text{ jointly for } j \leq s_N \text{ (if } s_N \geq 1), \quad (3.7)$$

$$\tilde{\mu}_j \xrightarrow{P} \infty \text{ for } j \geq s_N + 1. \quad (3.8)$$

Note that normalization factor (3.6) of the eigenvalues generally depends on the choice of bandwidth parameters h_m associated with the kernel $k_m(\cdot)$ for $m \in \{L, R\}$. However, in the case where $a_L = a_R = 0$ (i.e., $h_L = h_R = 0$), $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} \widehat{P}_K$ and $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \widehat{P}_K$ reduce to the covariances of $\{\widehat{P}_K X_{2,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ and $\{\widehat{P}_K X_{1,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$, and the convergence rate is $n_T^{-1} = T^{-2}$.

Theorem 3.1 shows that the eigenvalues in (3.4) have distinct asymptotic properties depending on whether j is greater than the dimension of \mathcal{H}_N or not. That is, if we consider the vector $(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_K)$, its first s_N elements converge jointly in distribution to the vector $(\tilde{\lambda}_1, \dots, \tilde{\lambda}_{s_N})$, while the last $K - s_N$ elements are divergent in probability. If $K \geq s_0$, for any continuous map $\mathcal{F} : \mathbb{R}^{s_0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we have

$$\mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\lambda}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \quad \text{under } H_0 \text{ of (3.1).}$$

If \mathcal{F} additionally satisfies $\mathcal{F}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ under H_1 of (3.1), we can consistently test the hypothesis of interest in an obvious way; hereafter such an \mathcal{F} is called a proper *test functional*. Among many possible choices of proper test functionals, we focus on the two most common choices, \mathcal{F}_{\max} and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$, which are defined by

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) = \max_{1 \leq j \leq s_0} \{x_j\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{x_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) = \sum_{j=1}^{s_0} x_j.$$

The following corollary delivers consistent tests of (3.1) based on VR(2,1).

Corollary 3.1. *Consider the setup of Theorem 3.1 with $K \geq s_0$. Under $H_0 : s_0 = s_N$,*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \max_{1 \leq j \leq s_0} \{\lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{s_0} \lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \left(\int W_{2,s_0} W'_{2,s_0} \right)^{-1} \int W_{1,s_0} W'_{1,s_0}$ is defined in (3.7). Under $H_1 : s_0 > s_N$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} \infty, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} \infty. \quad (3.10)$$

The test statistics in Corollary 3.1 are only functions of the K -dimensional projected time series, $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, and the associated limiting distributions are functionals of s_0 -dimensional standard Brownian motion and do not depend on $p_{\bar{\mathcal{H}}} = \dim(\bar{\mathcal{H}})$, K , or any nuisance parameters. These results not only imply that the proposed tests have the ADI property, but also that critical values can be computed depending only on s_0 and the test functional.

3.2 Tests based on VR(1,0) and VR(2,0)

We now consider VR(1,0)- and VR(2,0)-based tests, which are established from the eigenvalue problem (3.4) with (d_L, d_R) equal to either (1, 0) or (2, 0). As with VR(2,1)-based tests, the tests to be developed in this section are based on the asymptotic properties of the sample operators, $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} \widehat{P}_K$ and $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0, R} \widehat{P}_K$ for $d_L = 1, 2$. The important difference relative to tests based on VR(2,1) is that VR(1,0)- and VR(2,0)-based tests generally require $a_R > 0$; that is, $\widehat{\Lambda}_{0, R}$ must be the sample *long-run* covariance of $X_{0,t}$. This is in contrast with the case in Section 3.1, where a_R can be arbitrarily chosen; see also Remark 3.2.

The asymptotic properties of the VR($d_L, 0$) eigenvalues with $d_L = 1, 2$ are as follows.

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold with $a_R > 0$ and define $\tilde{\mu}_j = n_T \mu_j$, where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^K$ are the eigenvalues from (3.4) with $d_L \in \{1, 2\}$, $d_R = 0$, and $n_T = T^{2d_L - 1} (h_L c_L + 1_{\{a_L = 0\}})$ with h_L, a_L, c_L given in Assumption 3(ii) and (3.5). Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mu}_j &\xrightarrow{d} \lambda_j \left\{ \left(\int W_{d_L, s_N} W'_{d_L, s_N} \right)^{-1} \right\} \quad \text{jointly for } j \leq s_N \text{ (if } s_N \geq 1), \\ \tilde{\mu}_j &\xrightarrow{P} \infty \quad \text{for } j \geq s_N + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The next corollary delivers consistent tests of (3.1) based on VR($d_L, 0$) with $d_L = 1, 2$.

Corollary 3.2. *Consider the setup of Theorem 3.2 with $K \geq s_0$. Under $H_0 : s_0 = s_N$,*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \max_{1 \leq j \leq s_0} \{\lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{s_0} \lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}, \quad (3.11)$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \left(\int W_{d_L, s_0} W'_{d_L, s_0} \right)^{-1}$. Under $H_1 : s_0 > s_N$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} \infty, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} \infty. \quad (3.12)$$

Remark 3.2. Note that $a_R = 0$ is not generally allowed for the tests based on VR(1,0) and VR(2,0), which is contrast with those based on VR(2,1). This is because $\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R}$ needs to be a consistent estimator of the long-run covariance of ΔX_t for the VR(1,0)- and VR(2,0)-based tests. In the case where $\{\Delta X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is not serially correlated, the asymptotic results presented in Theorem 3.2 and Corollary 3.2 also hold with $a_R = 0$; however, this is unlikely to be the case in most empirical applications involving cointegrated time series.

Remark 3.3. To calculate the sample long-run covariance $\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R}$ it is necessary to choose a bandwidth, h_R . Data dependent plug-in bandwidth procedures that achieve certain mean-square optimality properties are available (e.g., Andrews, 1991, Rice and Shang, 2017). To use their procedures, the kernel $k_R(\cdot)$ needs to satisfy certain mild regularity conditions; however, most widely used kernel functions, such as the Epanechnikov, Parzen, and Tukey-Hanning kernels, satisfy those conditions.

3.3 Inverse VR tests

We showed in Theorem 3.1 that the first s_N eigenvalues $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{s_N}$ from the VR(2,1) problem, properly normalized, converge to a well-defined limit. As we now show, it is also possible to obtain the limiting behavior of the remaining $K - s_N$ eigenvalues, $\{\mu_j\}_{j=s_N+1}^K$. This enables us to examine the testing problem, c.f. (3.1),

$$H_0 : s_N = s_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : s_N \geq s_0 + 1, \quad (3.13)$$

for some $s_0 \geq 0$. Unlike in the testing problem (3.1), we do not require any prior information on a reasonable upper bound for s_N .

Related to testing (3.13), we will replace Assumption 2 with the following high-level assumption, which allows the possibility that $K < s_N$.

Assumption 2'. If $K \geq s_N$ then Assumption 2 holds. If $K < s_N$ then $\|\widehat{P}_K P_S\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$.

Theorem 3.3. Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2', and 3 hold with $a_R > 0$ and define $\tilde{\mu}_j = n_T \mu_j$, where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^K$ are the eigenvalues from (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 1)$ and $n_T = T(h_L c_L + 1_{\{a_L=0\}})$ with h_L, a_L, c_L given in Assumption 3(ii) and (3.5). Then

$$(\tilde{\mu}_j)^{-1} \xrightarrow{d} \lambda_{K-j+1} \{\mathcal{A}\} \quad \text{jointly for } j = s_N + 1, \dots, K \quad (\text{if } s_N < K), \quad (3.14)$$

$$(\tilde{\mu}_j)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} \infty \quad \text{for } j \leq s_N \quad (\text{if } s_N \geq 1), \quad (3.15)$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \int B_{K-s_N} B'_{K-s_N} - 1_{\{s_N \geq 1\}} \int B_{K-s_N} W'_{2,s_N} (\int W_{2,s_N} W'_{2,s_N})^{-1} \int W_{2,s_N} B'_{K-s_N}$ and B_{K-s_N} is a $(K - s_N)$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion which is independent of W_{2,s_N} .

Theorem 3.3 complements Theorem 3.1, where the asymptotic properties of the first s_N eigenvalues are presented under similar assumptions. Specifically, the asymptotic results given in Theorem 3.3 are for $s_N \geq 0$ under the requirement $a_R > 0$, which differs from

Theorem 3.1, where the limiting distributions are given under the existence of unit roots ensuring $s_N \geq 1$ but allowing $a_R = 0$. This means that Theorem 3.3 is not simply a byproduct of Theorem 3.1 that can be obtained with slight modifications, but in fact has its own theoretical and practical justification as we now illustrate.

When $K > s_0$, and given a proper test functional \mathcal{F} , the asymptotic results in Theorem 3.3 can be used to deliver consistent tests of (3.13) as follows.

Corollary 3.3. *Consider the setup of Theorem 3.3 with $K > s_0$. Under $H_0 : s_0 = s_N$,*

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_0+1}^K) \xrightarrow{d} \max_{1 \leq j \leq K-s_0} \{\lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}\}, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_0+1}^K) \xrightarrow{d} \sum_{j=1}^{K-s_0} \lambda_j\{\mathcal{A}\}, \quad (3.16)$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \int B_{K-s_0} B'_{K-s_0} - 1_{\{s_0 \geq 1\}} \int B_{K-s_0} W'_{2,s_0} (\int W_{2,s_0} W'_{2,s_0})^{-1} \int W_{2,s_0} B'_{K-s_0}$. Under $H_1 : s_0 < s_N$,

$$\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_0+1}^K) \xrightarrow{P} \infty, \quad \mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_0+1}^K) \xrightarrow{P} \infty. \quad (3.17)$$

The test functionals described in Corollary 3.3 are based on the limiting behavior of the inverse eigenvalues from the VR(2,1) problem, so we call them inverse VR tests. Compared to Corollary 3.1 concerning the testing problem (3.1), we allow $s_0 = 0$ in Corollary 3.3. This means that we can, for example, test the null of stationarity of the time series $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ against an alternative of unit root nonstationarity. Hence, this test generalizes some existing, and widely used, KPSS-type tests of stationarity that are essentially obtained when $s_0 = 0$; see Section 6 for a detailed discussion of related procedures.

Remark 3.4. Note that $a_R > 0$ is generally required in Theorem 3.3 (and Corollary 3.3), whereas $a_R = 0$ is allowed in Theorem 3.1 for the same VR(2,1) problem. This is because Theorem 3.3 requires $P_S \hat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S$ to converge in probability in the sense of the operator norm to the true long-run covariance of $\{P_S X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. If $\{P_S X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is not serially correlated, $a_R = 0$ can be allowed, but that does not seem likely in most empirical applications.

3.4 Estimation of slack extractor

To implement the VR-based tests in practice, a slack extractor \hat{P}_K satisfying either Assumption 2 or 2' is needed. As shown in Sections 3.1–3.3, both the VR and inverse VR tests require Assumption 2 to hold for $K \geq s_N$, and when $K < s_N$ the inverse VR tests require instead that Assumption 2' holds. In this section, we construct such estimators \hat{P}_K from observations $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, and we propose low-level conditions on the eigenstructure of the operator $\Lambda_{S,R}$ defined in (3.2), under which the estimators satisfy the high-level conditions.

We let $\{\tau_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ be the eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$, ordered from the largest to the smallest.

Assumption 4. If $K > s_N$ then $\tau_j \neq 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, K - s_N$ and $\tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}$.

Assumption 4 tells us that the allowable values of K , which is chosen by the practitioner, depend on the number of nonzero eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$ defined in (3.2). Specifically, it requires

that the first $K - s_N$ eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$ are nonzero and that the $(K - s_N)$ -th eigenvalue is different from the next eigenvalue, τ_{K-s_N+1} . In a large-dimensional Hilbert space, the number of nonzero eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$ is generally very large (or possibly infinite). Particularly, in a typical functional time series setting where $\dim(\mathcal{H}) = \infty$ (e.g. the case considered by [Nielsen et al., 2023](#)), $\Lambda_{S,R}$ generally has infinitely many nonzero eigenvalues and K can be any arbitrary finite integer as long as $\tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}$. The role of the requirement $\tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}$ is subtle (and may be relaxed under some additional assumptions). It is employed to make the slack extractor \hat{P}_K have a certain desirable property in our proof and can be checked by computing the eigenvalues of the sample counterpart of $\Lambda_{S,R}$; see [Theorem 3.5](#).

Remark 3.5. Even if the $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ -based tests allow choosing $K = s_0$, this is not recommended in practice. If $K = s_0$, [Assumption 2](#) requires \hat{P}_K to be an accurate estimator of P_N in the sense that \hat{P}_K is required to extract all the stochastic trends. If this fails in finite samples, it tends to result in severe over-rejection. On the other hand, \hat{P}_K for $K > s_0$ is less likely to miss relevant stochastic trends and will thus contribute to having correct size in finite samples. This issue is discussed in detail in [Nielsen et al. \(2023, e.g., Remark 13\)](#).

Remark 3.6. In a finite-dimensional space, the role of a reasonable upper bound of s_N will be relevant for the $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ -based tests in [Corollaries 3.1 and 3.2](#). For example, if $K = s_0 + \ell$ for $\ell \geq 0$, [Assumption 4](#) becomes more stringent as either s_0 or ℓ increases. Furthermore, if s_0 (resp. K) is only slightly greater than s_N (resp. s_0), [Assumption 4](#) only requires that the first few eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$ are nonzero. It is thus recommended that practitioners select small ℓ and s_0 which are not much greater than s_N . Since we can construct a reasonable upper bound on s_N ([Remark 3.9](#) and [Section 4](#)), [Assumption 4](#) does not appear to impose significant restrictions on the use of the $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ -based tests in practice.

Theorem 3.4. *Suppose that [Assumptions 1 and 3](#) hold, and if $K > s_N$ then [Assumption 4](#) also holds. Let $\{\hat{f}_j\}_{j=1}^K$ be the eigenvectors corresponding to the K largest eigenvalues of $\hat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$. Then $\hat{P}_K = \sum_{j=1}^K \hat{f}_j \otimes \hat{f}_j$ satisfies [Assumption 2](#) when $K \geq s_N$ and satisfies [Assumption 2'](#) when $K < s_N$.*

Note that practitioners can employ the usual functional principal component analysis (FPCA) in \mathcal{H} to obtain the eigenvectors in [Theorem 3.4](#). Thus, [Theorem 3.4](#) provides an easy-to-implement way to obtain an estimated projection operator \hat{P}_K that satisfies the high-level conditions in [Assumptions 2 and 2'](#).

Remark 3.7. Of course, the \hat{P}_K given in [Theorem 3.4](#) is not the only \hat{P}_K that satisfies [Assumptions 2 and 2'](#). In fact, alternative estimators from the literature satisfy [Assumptions 2 and 2'](#) under different (but stronger) low-level conditions. For example, suppose (i) $K \geq s_N$, (ii) the covariance $\Lambda_{S,R}(0)$ satisfies that $\langle v, \Lambda_{S,R}(0)v \rangle \neq 0$ for every nonzero $v \in \text{ran } P_S$

(Nielsen et al., 2023, Assumption 2(ii)), and (iii) the $(K - s_N)$ -th largest eigenvalue of $\Lambda_{S,R}(0)$ is distinct from the next one. Let the sample covariance of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ be denoted \widehat{C} with eigenvectors $\{\widehat{g}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ and let $\widehat{P}_K = \sum_{j=1}^K \widehat{g}_j \otimes \widehat{g}_j$. This choice of \widehat{P}_K is different from that proposed in Theorem 3.4 if $a_R > 0$. We may then deduce from Chang et al. (2016, Theorem 3.3) and our proof of Theorem 3.4 that $\sum_{j=1}^{s_N} \widehat{g}_j \otimes \widehat{g}_j \rightarrow_P P_N$ and $\sum_{j=s_N+1}^K \widehat{g}_j \otimes \widehat{g}_j$ converges to a non-random projection, P_S^K , satisfying $P_S^K \subseteq \text{ran } P_S$ and $\text{rank}(P_S^K \Lambda_{S,R}(0) P_S^K) = K - s_N$. That is, Assumptions 2 and 2' hold for this alternative choice of \widehat{P}_K based on the eigenvectors of \widehat{C} .

The condition $\tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}$ in Assumption 4 is generally required for the $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ -based tests and also required for the inverse VR test when s_0 is close to s_N . Practitioners might be concerned with potential violation of this condition for a chosen K . However, as shown in our proof of Theorem 3.4, the ordered eigenvalues $\{\widehat{\tau}_j\}_{j \geq s_N+1}$ of $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ converge in probability to $\{\tau_j\}_{j \geq 1}$. We may thus avoid violation of this condition by choosing K such that $\widehat{\tau}_K$ is sufficiently greater than $\widehat{\tau}_{K+1}$. This approach is pragmatic and also theoretically supported under the following assumption.

Assumption 5. (i) $\mathbb{E}[\|P_S X_t\|^{4+\delta}] < \infty$, $h_R = \mathcal{O}(T^{\delta/(4+2\delta)})$ for some $\delta > 0$ and (ii) $\|\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \widetilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-\beta})$ for some $\beta > 4$.

The conditions given in Assumption 5 are stronger than those in the previous sections. Particularly, $\{P_S X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ now needs to satisfy a stronger moment condition that is related to the choice of the bandwidth parameter h_R . For example, if $h_R = \mathcal{O}(T^{1/4})$, then Assumption 5(i) requires that $\mathbb{E}[\|P_S X_t\|^6] < \infty$, which is clearly stronger than what we require for $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ in Section 2. Moreover, in Assumption 5(ii), the coefficients $\{\Phi_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ are required to decay at a faster rate than that stated in Section 2; this can be seen from the fact that $\|\sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \widetilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}(k^{-\gamma})$ for some $\gamma > 1$ implies the summability condition given in (2.2). Nonetheless, even if Assumption 5 includes some stronger conditions, they still do not seem to be very restrictive from a practical point of view. Under these additional conditions, the following theorem establishes the desired result.

Theorem 3.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 3, and 5 hold. If $K > s_N$ then*

$$(\widehat{\tau}_K - \widehat{\tau}_{K+1}) - (\tau_{K-s_N} - \tau_{K-s_N+1}) = \mathcal{O}_P((T/h_R)^{-1/2}).$$

From Theorem 3.5 we deduce that, for any η satisfying $\eta(T/h_R)^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(\widehat{\tau}_K - \widehat{\tau}_{K+1}) &\xrightarrow{P} 0 && \text{if } \tau_{K-s_N} = \tau_{K-s_N+1}, \\ \eta(\widehat{\tau}_K - \widehat{\tau}_{K+1}) &\xrightarrow{P} \infty && \text{if } \tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}. \end{aligned}$$

This result can be applied in practice as an informal way to check whether the condition $\tau_{K-s_N} \neq \tau_{K-s_N+1}$ in Assumption 4 is likely to hold. Since we do not need to impose Assumption 4 in Theorem 3.4 when $K \leq s_N$, we do not need to consider that case in Theorem 3.5.

Remark 3.8. In our proof of Theorem 3.5, Assumption 5 is only used to show that

$$\|T^{-1}P_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}P_S - \Lambda_{S,R}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P((T/h_R)^{-1/2}); \quad (3.18)$$

see Berkes et al. (2016, Theorem 2.1). The desired result follows from (3.18). Thus, any other assumptions that imply (3.18) can replace Assumption 5 in Theorem 3.5.

Remark 3.9. A potentially useful result that may be deduced from our proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 is that the eigenvalues $\{\widehat{\tau}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ satisfy

$$\frac{\widehat{\tau}_j}{\widehat{\tau}_{j+1}} \xrightarrow{P} \infty \text{ if } j = s_N \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\widehat{\tau}_j}{\widehat{\tau}_{j+1}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1) \text{ if } j \neq s_N. \quad (3.19)$$

This result is analogous to that in Theorem 3.3 of Chang et al. (2016) for the sample covariance operator of $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ (see also Theorem 3.2 of Li et al., 2023). Based on (3.19), we may in practice easily obtain a reasonable upper bound of s_N , say s_{\max} , by computing the ratio given in (3.19) and set $s_{\max} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq \bar{s}} \{\widehat{\tau}_j/\widehat{\tau}_{j+1}\} + k$ for some large integer \bar{s} and a small nonnegative integer k . Of course, in view of the asymptotic properties of $\widehat{\tau}_j$, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq \bar{s}} \{\widehat{\tau}_j/\widehat{\tau}_{j+1}\}$ is itself a consistent estimator of s_N . This is a slight modification of the eigenvalue-ratio estimator given by Li et al. (2023). However, we found that the finite-sample properties of this estimator tend to be worse than those of a different eigenvalue-ratio-based estimator to be discussed in Section 4.2. Nonetheless, either eigenvalue-ratio-based estimator could be useful as a simple way to construct a reasonable upper bound of s_N in practice.

3.5 Inclusion of deterministic components

So far we have assumed that $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ has no deterministic component. However, in practice it is quite common that observed time series contain a deterministic component. In this section, we focus on the case with a nonzero intercept and a linear trend since those seem to be most relevant in practice.

Suppose that the observed time series $\{Y_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is

$$Y_t = \zeta_1 + \zeta_2 t + X_t, \quad t \geq 1, \quad (3.20)$$

where $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfies Assumption 1. We let $U_t^{(1)}$ and $U_t^{(2)}$ be defined by

$$U_t^{(1)} = Y_t - \bar{Y}, \quad U_t^{(2)} = Y_t - \bar{Y} - (t - \bar{t}) \frac{\sum_{t=1}^T (t - \bar{t}) Y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^T (t - \bar{t})^2}, \quad (3.21)$$

where $\bar{Y} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T Y_t$ and $\bar{t} = T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T t = (T+1)/2$. Thus, $U_t^{(1)}$ and $U_t^{(2)}$ are, respectively, the mean-adjusted and the trend-adjusted residuals of Y_t (Kokoszka and Young, 2016).

Our ADI variance-ratio tests can be adjusted to accommodate deterministic terms by replacing the sample operators computed from $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ with the corresponding operators computed from $\{U_t^{(1)}\}_{t \geq 1}$ or $\{U_t^{(2)}\}_{t \geq 1}$. When the model for Y_t is given by (3.20) with $\zeta_2 = 0$ then we use $U_t^{(1)}$, and otherwise we use $U_t^{(2)}$.

This adjustment to accommodate deterministic terms produces some obvious changes in the asymptotic results given in Theorems 3.1 and 3.2. Specifically, in those theorems, W_{1,s_N} needs to be replaced by s_N -dimensional demeaned standard Brownian motion (if $\zeta_2 = 0$) or detrended standard Brownian motion (if $\zeta_2 \neq 0$), and the definition of W_{2,s_N} needs to change accordingly. Similar changes have to be made in Theorem 3.3, but where, as may be deduced from our proof of Theorem 3.3, B_{K-s_N} needs to be replaced with the standard Brownian bridge (if $\zeta_2 = 0$) or the second-level standard Brownian bridge (if $\zeta_2 \neq 0$), while W_{2,s_N} is the integrated demeaned (if $\zeta_2 = 0$) or detrended (if $\zeta_2 \neq 0$) Brownian motion. The asymptotic results given in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 do not require any changes once $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ is constructed from the relevant residuals (our proofs of Theorems 3.4 and 3.5 contain related discussions). Following these changes to the theorems, it is quite obvious to make relevant changes to the corollaries given in the previous sections, and hence the details are omitted.

4 Determination of dimension of nonstationary subspace

Practitioners may mostly be interested in determining the dimension of \mathcal{H}_N rather than testing a specific hypotheses on the dimension. In this section we first propose sequential testing procedures for doing so, and then we consider an eigenvalue-ratio estimation approach.

4.1 Estimation via sequential testing

First, we propose a “top-down” (TD) sequential procedure to estimate s_N . Here we test (3.1) sequentially (using any of the tests given in Corollaries 3.1 and 3.2) for $s_0 = s_{\max}, s_{\max} - 1, \dots$, where s_{\max} is an upper bound on the dimension of \mathcal{H}_N that can reasonably be chosen to be (slightly) greater than s_N in practice; see Remark 3.9. We let \widehat{s}_{TD} denote the value of s_0 under the first non-rejected null hypothesis; if the null hypothesis is rejected for every $s_0 = s_{\max}, s_{\max} - 1, \dots, 1$, then $\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}} = 0$.

Second, we consider a “bottom-up” (BU) procedure, where we test (3.13) sequentially for $s_0 = 0, 1, \dots$ using any of the inverse VR tests in Corollary 3.3. We then let \widehat{s}_{BU} denote the first non-rejected null hypothesis. This procedure is attractive because no s_{\max} needs to be specified, and the condition $s_{\max} \geq s_N$ is not required; see also Remark 4.1.

In principle, the sequential procedures can be applied with a different K and \widehat{P}_K for each value of s_0 , i.e. in each step of the algorithm. Then K should be understood as a function of s_0 , denoted $K = K(s_0)$, although we mostly suppress the dependence on s_0 to simplify the notation. In practice, K can be simply set to $K = s_{\max} + m$ or $K = K(s_0) = s_0 + m$ for some integer $m \geq 1$ as in Nielsen et al. (2023); see Remark 4.1 for details.

The consistency results for both procedures are given in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold.*

(i) If $s_{\max} \geq s_{\mathbf{N}}$ and, in each step, $K \geq s_0$ and \hat{P}_K satisfies Assumption 2, then

$$P(\hat{s}_{\text{TD}} = s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad P(\hat{s}_{\text{TD}} > s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) If, in each step, $K > s_0$ and \hat{P}_K satisfies Assumption 2', then


$$P(\hat{s}_{\text{BU}} = s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha \quad \text{and} \quad P(\hat{s}_{\text{BU}} < s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 0.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.1 follows directly from earlier results and is therefore omitted. For both procedures we note that, if $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ then the procedures are consistent; that is $P(\hat{s}_{\text{TD}} = s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 1$ and $P(\hat{s}_{\text{BU}} = s_{\mathbf{N}}) \rightarrow 1$.

Remark 4.1. The conditions stated in Theorem 4.1 for each of the sequential procedures simplify nicely if simple choices of K are applied. For example, if $K = s_{\max} + m$ or $K = K(s_0) = s_0 + m$ for some integer $m \geq 1$, then the TD procedure in Theorem 4.1(i) only requires Assumption 2 to hold for $K = s_{\max} + m$. If $K = K(s_0) = s_0 + m$, then the BU procedure in Theorem 4.1 only requires Assumption 2' to hold for $K = s_{\mathbf{N}} + m$, i.e. Assumption 2 with $K = s_{\mathbf{N}} + m$. Because $s_{\max} \geq s_{\mathbf{N}}$, the condition required for the TD procedure is stronger than that for the BU procedure.

Remark 4.2. To implement the proposed sequential procedures under the lower-level conditions discussed in Section 3.4, we require Assumption 4 with $K = K(s_0) \geq s_0$, $s_0 \geq s_{\mathbf{N}}$ for the TD procedures (see Corollaries 3.1 and 3.2) or $K = K(s_0) > s_0$, $s_0 \leq s_{\mathbf{N}}$ for the BU procedure (see Corollary 3.3). In either case, for each s_0 , our tests do not require knowledge of the dimension of $\bar{\mathcal{H}}$, the subspace of \mathcal{H} in which X_t takes values, but do require $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ to have $K - s_{\mathbf{N}}$ nonzero eigenvalues. It may be deduced from Theorem 3.4 and Assumption 4 that the TD procedures based on $\text{VR}(d_L, d_R)$ tests require a stronger condition on $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ than the BU procedure based on inverse VR tests. To see this, suppose that a common choice of K (as a function of s_0) is used for both of the procedures, such as $K = s_0 + m$ for some $m \geq 1$. Because the BU procedure starts from $s_0 \leq s_{\mathbf{N}}$ and the TD procedure from $s_0 \geq s_{\mathbf{N}}$, the number of nonzero eigenvalues that we require for the TD procedure is always larger than that required for the BU procedure; this is illustrated for $m = 2$ in Figure 1. Moreover, the number of nonzero eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ required by the TD procedure is always positive when $s_0 > s_{\mathbf{N}}$ and this number increases as s_0 gets larger. This suggests that it is important to have a reasonable upper bound of $s_{\mathbf{N}}$ for the TD procedure. Similarly, it should also be noted that, all else equal, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ is required to have more nonzero eigenvalues as K increases for all three procedures, so it is preferable to choose K not too much larger than s_0 . A similar suggestion for the choice of K can be found in Nielsen et al. (2023), but their argument was based on computational advantages in a more restrictive setting than ours. Our finding thus gives a theoretical justification for their choice in our more general setting.

Figure 1: Requirements for the proposed tests, $K = K(s_0) = s_0 + 2$



As discussed in Remarks 4.1 and 4.2, the conditions required for the TD procedure are stronger than those required for the BU procedure. The BU procedure has the additional advantage that it does not require any prior information on s_N . However, Monte Carlo simulations have shown that the TD procedure has better finite-sample properties. Thus, we combine the above two sequential procedures into an “up-down” (UD) hybrid procedure that enjoys the advantages of both the TD and BU procedures. Specifically, we first use the BU procedure to obtain \hat{s}_{BU} as well as a data-driven value of the upper bound s_{max} by setting $s_{\text{max}} = \hat{s}_{\text{BU}} + m$ for an integer $m \geq 0$. Then we obtain the UD hybrid estimate by using the TD procedure initiated at the previously chosen s_{max} . We let \hat{s}_{UD} denote the value obtained by the UD hybrid procedure. The properties of this UD hybrid procedure will be investigated, along with those of the other procedures, by simulations in Section 7.

4.2 Eigenvalue-ratio estimator

Recent work concerning vector-valued time series provide ways to consistently estimate the number of stochastic trends using the fact that the eigenvalues of the sample autocovariance matrices have different stochastic orders if the time series contains components of different integration orders (e.g., Zhang and Chan, 2018, Zhang et al., 2019, Chang et al., 2021). In a functional time series setting, the eigenvalue-ratio estimator proposed by Li et al. (2020, 2023) can be used to estimate the dimension of the component of the highest integration order. As discussed in Remark 3.9, a slight modification of their estimator can be applied to estimate the dimension of the nonstationary subspace in our model.

Alternatively, based on the asymptotic results in Section 3, we may use the generalized eigenvalue problem (3.4) to construct an eigenvalue-ratio estimator for the dimension of the nonstationary subspace. Let μ_j be an eigenvalue of (3.4). By Theorems 3.1–3.3 and the arguments used in their proofs, it can be shown that $\mu_j^{-1}\mu_{j+1} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ if $j < s_N$ (resp. $j > s_N$) since both $n_T\mu_j$ and $n_T\mu_{j+1}$ converge (resp. diverge at the same rate) while $\mu_j^{-1}\mu_{j+1} \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ if $j = s_N$; for more details, see the proof of Theorem 4.2. Hence, the ratio $\mu_j^{-1}\mu_{j+1}$ will be

maximized at $j = s_N$. This motivates the estimator

$$\check{s} = \arg \max_{1 \leq j \leq s_{\max}} \left\{ \frac{\mu_{j+1}}{\mu_j} \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where s_{\max} is a pre-specified integer indicating an upper bound of s_N . We note that these eigenvalue-ratio-type estimators are only applicable when $s_N \geq 1$; hence this needs to be examined first in practical implementation of these estimators. A convenient way to do this is to test (3.13) for $s_0 = 0$ using the tests in Corollary 3.3.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that (i) $s_{\max} \geq s_N \geq 1$, (ii) Assumptions 1–3 hold with $K \geq s_{\max} + 1$, and (iii) $a_R \geq 0$ (resp. $a_R > 0$) if μ_j is obtained from (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 1)$ (resp. $(d_L, d_R) = (1, 0)$ or $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 0)$). Then $P(\check{s} = s_N) \rightarrow 1$.*

The estimator in (4.1) is very similar to the eigenvalue-ratio estimator proposed by Li et al. (2020, 2023), see also Remark 3.9, but there are some important differences. First, their estimator is constructed directly from the eigenvalues of a sample covariance operator, while we use those in the variance-ratio generalized eigenvalue problem (3.4). Second, for practical implementation of their estimator, a tuning parameter, say $\kappa > 0$, is introduced to deal with estimation error associated with small eigenvalues; specifically, they set $\hat{s}_{\text{LRS}} = \arg \min_{1 \leq j \leq s_{\max}} \{\hat{\kappa}_j\}$, where $\hat{\kappa}_j$ is the j -th eigenvalue of the sample covariance operator and $\hat{\kappa}_j$ is regarded as zero if $\hat{\kappa}_j / \max_{1 \leq j \leq s_{\max}} \{\hat{\kappa}_j\} < \kappa$. On the other hand, the eigenvalue-ratio estimator in (4.1) does not require such an additional tuning parameter.

5 Inference on subspaces

In practical applications it may be of interest to test hypotheses about \mathcal{H}_N or \mathcal{H}_S . For a specified subspace \mathcal{H}_0 , consider the following hypotheses:

$$H_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_N \text{ (or equivalently, } \mathcal{H}_0^\perp \supseteq \mathcal{H}_S) \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : H_0 \text{ is not true,} \quad (5.1)$$

$$H_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \supseteq \mathcal{H}_N \text{ (or equivalently, } \mathcal{H}_0^\perp \subseteq \mathcal{H}_S) \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : H_0 \text{ is not true,} \quad (5.2)$$

$$H_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_S \text{ (or equivalently, } \mathcal{H}_0^\perp \supseteq \mathcal{H}_N) \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : H_0 \text{ is not true.} \quad (5.3)$$

For example, we may be interested in testing if a specific element $v \in \mathcal{H}$ is included in \mathcal{H}_N , and hence can be interpreted as one of the common stochastic trends. In that case we can use (5.1) with $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{v\}$. We can also test if a specified subspace, e.g. $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{v_1, v_2\}$, contains the entire nonstationary subspace by using (5.2). Finally, it may be of interest to examine if a specified element or subspace is in \mathcal{H}_S , and then we can use (5.3). In a finite-dimensional setting, (5.3) corresponds to testing if a vector or matrix is cointegrating.

Let $P_{\mathcal{H}_0}$ denote the projection onto \mathcal{H}_0 , let $p_0 = \dim(\mathcal{H}_0)$, and let s_N be known (or replaced by a consistent estimator from Section 4). The hypotheses (5.1)–(5.3) can then be tested by investigating the dimension of the nonstationary subspace associated with the

residual series $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ or the projected series $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. Specifically, if H_0 of (5.1) is true, then $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ contains $s_N - p_0$ stochastic trends, if H_0 of (5.2) is true then $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ contains zero stochastic trends, and if H_0 of (5.3) is true then $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ contains zero stochastic trends. Under H_1 in (5.1)–(5.3), there are more stochastic trends in the relevant time series than under the null. Thus, by analyzing $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ or $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, (5.1)–(5.3) may be readily tested by our inverse VR test, assuming the projected time series satisfy the conditions for the inverse VR test.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ and $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ satisfy the conditions imposed in Theorem 3.3.*

- (i) *Consider the hypotheses (5.1). The test statistics in Corollary 3.3 computed from $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ with $s_0 = s_N - p_0 \geq 0$ satisfy (3.16) under H_0 and (3.17) under H_1 .*
- (ii) *Consider the hypotheses (5.2). The test statistics in Corollary 3.3 computed from $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ with $s_0 = 0$ and $p_0 \geq s_N$ satisfy (3.16) under H_0 and (3.17) under H_1 .*
- (iii) *Consider the hypotheses (5.3). The test statistics in Corollary 3.3 computed from $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ with $s_0 = 0$ and $K = p_0$ satisfy (3.16) under H_0 and (3.17) under H_1 .*

Of course, the high-level conditions in Assumption 2', which are applied in Theorem 5.1, may be replaced by appropriate low-level conditions as discussed in Theorems 3.4 and 3.5.

The approach to testing the hypotheses (5.1) and (5.2) based on $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is parallel to that in Seo (2024) who relied on an FPCA-based test for examining the number of stochastic trends embedded in a cointegrated functional time series. However, Seo's (2024) test requires the assumption that the long-run covariance of $\{P_{\mathcal{S}}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ is positive definite on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (see Assumption W in Seo, 2024), and this may be restrictive if \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional. This is not required under our setup.

It does not seem possible, in general, to investigate the hypothesis (5.1) (resp. (5.2)) by testing if there are p_0 (resp. s_N) stochastic trends in the projected time series $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$. For example, let $\{f_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ be an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H} and suppose $\mathcal{H}_N = \text{span}\{f_1\}$, i.e., $s_N = 1$. Consider $H_0 : \text{span}\{g\} = \mathcal{H}_N$ for $g = 0.5f_1 + 0.5f_2$, which can be a null hypothesis in either (5.1) or (5.2). Both null hypotheses are false since $g \neq f_1$ and thus neither $\text{span}\{g\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_N$ nor $\text{span}\{g\} \supseteq \mathcal{H}_N$ is true. However, the projected time series $P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t = \langle X_t, g \rangle = \langle X_t, f_1 \rangle + \langle X_t, f_2 \rangle$ is obviously nonstationary and has one stochastic trend.

Remark 5.1. In addition to testing the hypotheses (5.1)–(5.3), it may be of independent interest to examine the number of stochastic trends in the residual series $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ for a specified subspace \mathcal{H}_0 . This is particularly useful when \mathcal{H}_0 may be understood as a finite-dimensional “model” of X_t , as in our empirical example in Section 8.2. In such cases, we may be interested in determining how well the model can capture the dominant (nonstationary)

variation in the data. The number of stochastic trends in $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, denoted $s_{\mathcal{H}_0}$, can be interpreted as the dimension of the nonstationary subspace that remains unexplained by the model. We can determine $s_{\mathcal{H}_0}$ by sequential testing as in Section 4.1. Specifically, we can apply inverse VR tests on

$$H_0 : s_{\mathcal{H}_0} = s_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : s_{\mathcal{H}_0} > s_0 \quad (5.4)$$

for $s_0 = \max\{s_N - p_0, 0\}, \max\{s_N - p_0, 0\} + 1, \dots, s_N$, or we can apply VR tests on

$$H_0 : s_{\mathcal{H}_0} = s_0 \quad \text{vs} \quad H_1 : s_{\mathcal{H}_0} < s_0 \quad (5.5)$$

for $s_0 = s_N, s_N - 1, \dots, \max\{s_N - p_0, 1\}$.

6 Relationship to existing tests

Our variance ratio tests are related to some existing tests, and, in fact, reduce to well-known tests in special (mostly finite-dimensional) cases. This will be discussed in detail this section.

6.1 VR(2,1)-based tests

6.1.1 The test of [Breitung \(2002\)](#)

Suppose we are in the conventional Euclidean space setting with $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$ and consider the VR(2,1)-based test using $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$ with $K = p \geq s_0$ and $a_L = a_R = 0$. Then the VR(2,1)-based test is identical to the test proposed by [Breitung \(2002\)](#). Note that, in this simple case, $\hat{P}_K = I$, and thus Assumption 2 or its low-level counterparts are no longer needed. However, our VR(2,1)-based test can also be applied even when the number of nonzero eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{S,R}$ is smaller than $p - s_N$ using \hat{P}_K of rank $K < p$; see Section 3.4 and note that we can distinguish nonzero eigenvalues as discussed in Remark 3.8.

In the case where \mathcal{H} can be a general Hilbert space, $\{\hat{P}_K X_t\}_{t=1}^T$ can also be understood as a K -dimensional vector-valued time series, say $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$, with $x_{K,t} = (\langle X_t, \hat{f}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle X_t, \hat{f}_K \rangle)'$, where \hat{f}_j is an eigenvector of $\hat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ as used in, e.g., Theorem 3.4. Moreover, with $a_L = a_R = 0$, the unnormalized sample covariance of $\{\hat{P}_K X_t\}_{t=1}^T$ can simply be written as $\hat{P}_K \hat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \hat{P}_K$, so that the VR(2,1) eigenvalue problem reduces to the generalized eigenvalue problem associated with the sample (long-run) covariances of $\{\sum_{s=1}^t x_{K,s}\}_{t=1}^T$ and $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$. Thus, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_N})$ and its limits are identical to those of [Breitung's \(2002\)](#) test for examining (3.1), implemented assuming that $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$ are observed. From this result, it is clear that implementation of the VR(2,1)-based test with $a_L = a_R = 0$ is particularly simple because it reduces to application of [Breitung's \(2002\)](#) test to the K -dimensional time series $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$.

6.1.2 The test of Nielsen et al. (2023)

Consider the case where \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional. Then the VR(2,1)-based test using $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$ with $K \geq s_0$ and $a_L = a_R = 0$ is equivalent to the $\mathcal{T}_{\mathcal{C}}$ test proposed by Nielsen et al. (2023). However, Nielsen et al. (2023) required $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ to be injective on $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{S}}$ (such that $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ has infinitely many positive eigenvalues), but this condition is not needed for our VR(2,1)-based test. This is an important feature of our VR(2,1)-based test compared to that of Nielsen et al. (2023). Because they consider infinite-dimensional curve time series, the injectivity assumption does not seem very restrictive in their setup. However, we want to accommodate the case where the time series takes values in a possibly finite-dimensional subspace of \mathcal{H} , and in such cases the injectivity condition may not hold.

6.2 VR(1,0)-based tests

6.2.1 The test of Shintani (2001)

Consider the VR(1,0)-based test using $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$ with $K \geq s_0$ and $a_L \geq 0$ and $a_R = 0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$, $K = p$, and $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ has $p - s_{\mathcal{N}}$ positive eigenvalues. Then the VR(1,0)-based test is equivalent to the test proposed by Shintani (2001). However, as discussed in Section 6.1.1, unlike Shintani's (2001) test, our VR(1,0)-based test can also be applied even when $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ has some zero eigenvalues. As in our discussion of Breitung's (2002) test in Section 6.1.1, it may be deduced that the VR(1,0)-based test can be easily implemented by applying Shintani's (2001) test to the time series $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$, where $x_{K,t} = (\langle X_t, \hat{f}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle X_t, \hat{f}_K \rangle)'$.

6.2.2 The test of Chang et al. (2016)

Again, we consider the infinite-dimensional Hilbert space setting and the VR(1,0)-based test using \mathcal{F}_{max} with $K = s_0$, $a_L = 0$, and $a_R > 0$. We may deduce from Theorem 3.2(i) that

$$1/\mathcal{F}_{\text{max}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{d} \min_{1 \leq j \leq s_0} \left\{ \lambda_j \left\{ \int W_{s_0} W'_{s_0} \right\} \right\} \quad \text{under } H_0 \text{ of (3.1),} \quad (6.1)$$

$$1/\mathcal{F}_{\text{max}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0}) \xrightarrow{P} 0 \quad \text{under } H_1 \text{ of (3.1).} \quad (6.2)$$

Based on these results, we can construct a consistent test by rejecting the null hypothesis if $1/\mathcal{F}_{\text{max}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j\}_{j=1}^{s_0})$ is smaller than the appropriate critical value corresponding to the employed significance level. This test is equivalent to that proposed by Chang et al. (2016). Their test is constructed for $K = s_0$ regardless of how many eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ are positive while our tests, in general, allow $K > s_0$ as long as $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ has enough positive eigenvalues; note that, in this functional setting, $\Lambda_{\mathcal{S},R}$ usually has infinitely many positive eigenvalues. As discussed and shown by Nielsen et al. (2023) in detail, letting $K = s_0$ is generally disadvantageous because it requires us to extract information on the $s_{\mathcal{N}}$ -dimensional subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{N}}$ with an s_0 -dimensional projection \hat{P}_K , so under the null $s_{\mathcal{N}} = s_0$ we could fail to successfully capture

all the stochastic trends. On the other hand, if $K > s_0$ and thus \hat{P}_K is allowed to be a larger dimensional projection, such failure is less likely.

6.3 Inverse VR tests

6.3.1 The tests of Nyblom and Harvey (2000)

We now consider the inverse VR test with $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^p$, $K = p$, and $\Lambda_{S,R}$ has $p - s_N$ positive eigenvalues as in the conventional Euclidean space setting, the inverse VR test with $h_L = 0$ is equivalent to the test of Nyblom and Harvey (2000). Again, our test can be applied even when $\Lambda_{S,R}$ contains zero eigenvalues, which sets it apart from their test. As in our discussion of Breitung's (2002) test in Section 6.1.1, it may be deduced that the inverse VR test can easily be implemented in practice by applying the test of Nyblom and Harvey (2000) to the time series $\{x_{K,t}\}_{t=1}^T$, where $x_{K,t} = (\langle X_t, \hat{f}_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle X_t, \hat{f}_K \rangle)'$.

6.3.2 The KPSS-type stationarity tests

Consider still the inverse VR test with $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$, and specifically the case where $s_0 = 0$. This inverse VR test examines the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative hypothesis of unit root nonstationarity. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}$, then this test is identical to the standard KPSS stationarity test (Kwiatkowski et al., 1992). If \mathcal{H} is infinite-dimensional, then it can be shown without difficulties that the inverse VR test statistic is identical to the functional KPSS test statistic proposed by Horváth et al. (2014) (in this case, K in the present paper corresponds to the tuning parameter d in their paper). Furthermore, it is then a natural consequence of the works of Horváth et al. (2014) and Kokoszka and Young (2016) that our stationarity test based on the inverse VR test should have good power against the alternative of various types of nonstationarity such as structural breaks and/or unrecognized deterministic trends.

7 Monte Carlo study

We study the finite-sample performance of the proposed ADI tests using a Monte Carlo simulation setup similar to the functional AR(1) model in Li et al. (2023), Nielsen et al. (2023), and Seo (2024). Let $\{g_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ be the Fourier basis functions on $[0, 1]$. For each s_N , we let $P_N \Delta X_t$ and $P_S X_t$ be generated by the following stationary functional AR(1) models,

$$P_N \Delta X_t = \sum_{j=1}^{s_N} \alpha_j \langle g_j^N, P_N \Delta X_{t-1} \rangle g_j^N + P_N \varepsilon_t, \quad P_S X_t = \sum_{j=1}^{12} (0.9)^{j-1} \beta_j \langle g_j^S, P_S X_{t-1} \rangle g_j^S + P_S \varepsilon_t,$$

where $\{g_j^N\}_{j=1}^{s_N}$ are randomly drawn from $\{g_1, \dots, g_{s_N+3}\}$ ($s_N \leq 8$ in our simulation experiments), $\{g_j^S\}_{j=1}^{12}$ are randomly drawn from $\{g_{15}, \dots, g_{30}\}$, and ε_t is given by $\sum_{j=1}^{40} (0.9)^{j-1} \theta_{j,t} g_j$ for standard normal random variables $\{\theta_{j,t}\}_{j \geq 1}$ that are independent across j and t . We let α_j and β_j be independent uniform random variables on $[-0.8, 0.8]$ for each realization

of the data generating process (DGP). In practice, it is common to have a nonzero intercept or a linear time trend as in Section 3.5. We here consider the former case and add an intercept ζ_1 , which is also randomly chosen, to each realization of the DGP. Specifically, $\zeta_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{30} (0.9)^{j-1} \tilde{\theta}_j g_j$, where $\{\tilde{\theta}_j\}_{j=1}^{30}$ are independent standard normal random variables. Viewed as a time series taking values in the $L^2[0, 1]$ Hilbert space, we may obtain the eigenelements of the sample (long-run) covariance of X_t using FPCA (see e.g., Chang et al., 2016; Nielsen et al., 2023; Li et al., 2023). To this end, we represent X_t , which is assumed to be observed on 200 regularly spaced points of $[0, 1]$, using the first 40 Legendre basis functions.

For the VR(2,1) test we let $h_L = h_R = 0$ so that it generalizes Nielsen et al.'s (2023) test, see Section 6.1.2. For the remaining tests, we let $k_m(\cdot)$ be the Tukey-Hanning kernel for $m \in \{L, R\}$ and let $h_L = \lceil T^{2/5} \rceil$ and $h_R = \lceil T^{1/4} \rceil$ or $\lceil T^{1/3} \rceil$, where $\lceil x \rceil$ denotes the nearest integer to x . Note that letting $h_R/h_L \rightarrow 0$ helps certain quantities, which are negligible in our asymptotic analysis, decay at faster rates, e.g., (B.11) and (B.13). For the inverse VR test, though, we let $h_L = 0$ so that it generalizes the KPSS and Nyblom and Harvey (2000) tests, see Section 6.3. Throughout, test statistics apply the trace functional $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}$.

Table 1 reports rejection frequencies for the VR(2,1), VR(2,0), VR(1,0), and inverse VR tests. We consider true dimensions $s_N \in \{0, 1, 3, 5, 7\}$. For the VR(2,1), VR(2,0), and VR(1,0) tests we consider the null $s_0 = s_N$ and alternatives $s_0 = s_N + 1$ and $s_0 = s_N + 2$, and for the inverse VR test we consider the null $s_0 = s_N$ and alternatives $s_0 = s_N - 1$ and $s_0 = s_N - 2$. The results show that the VR(1,0) test can be seriously over-sized, especially for the larger values of s_N considered or for the smaller bandwidth value. This is somewhat alleviated for the larger sample size, but not completely. On the other hand, the VR(2,0) test is under-sized in some cases and suffers from lower power in those cases as a consequence. This is particularly bad for the larger bandwidth value, and again it is only partly alleviated for the larger sample size. The VR(2,1) test appears to be a good compromise. It has very good size properties in all cases considered except the largest value of s_N with the smallest sample size, and it has excellent power. Finally, we see that the inverse VR test has very good size properties with only a slight tendency to be under-sized in some cases with the larger bandwidth. The power is not nearly as impressive as for the VR tests, but of course the alternatives are different for the inverse VR test, and it does not have the natural upper bound s_{\max} that the VR tests have. Overall, we expect that this lack of power of the inverse VR test may lead to problems for the BU procedure when s_N is not very small.

In Table 2 we investigate the finite-sample performance of the tests when they are applied to estimate s_N using one of the sequential procedures described in Section 4.1. For comparison, we also consider the eigenvalue-ratio estimator \tilde{s} computed from the VR(2,1) problem (see Corollary 4.2), and Li et al.'s (2023) estimator, which is denoted \hat{s}_{LRS} . For each

Table 1: Rejection frequencies of VR(2,1), VR(2,0), VR(1,0), and inverse VR tests

		$T = 250$					$T = 500$				
s_0		$s_N = 0$	$s_N = 1$	$s_N = 3$	$s_N = 5$	$s_N = 7$	$s_N = 0$	$s_N = 1$	$s_N = 3$	$s_N = 5$	$s_N = 7$
VR(2,1)	s_N		0.049	0.053	0.064	0.105		0.051	0.050	0.059	0.061
	$s_N + 1$	1.000	0.998	0.999	0.999	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	$s_N + 2$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
$h_R = [T^{1/4}]$											
VR(2,0)	s_N		0.041	0.035	0.024	0.021		0.042	0.035	0.033	0.024
	$s_N + 1$	1.000	1.000	0.995	0.981	0.920	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998
	$s_N + 2$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
VR(1,0)	s_N		0.058	0.091	0.172	0.300		0.054	0.069	0.109	0.178
	$s_N + 1$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	$s_N + 2$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inv.VR	s_N	0.061	0.048	0.041	0.032	0.040	0.054	0.052	0.047	0.048	0.053
	$s_N - 1$		0.964	0.843	0.768	0.658		0.989	0.965	0.956	0.943
	$s_N - 2$			0.998	0.997	0.989			1.000	1.000	1.000
$h_R = [T^{1/3}]$											
VR(2,0)	s_N		0.040	0.027	0.013	0.006		0.043	0.031	0.025	0.014
	$s_N + 1$	1.000	0.980	0.894	0.658	0.331	1.000	1.000	0.996	0.982	0.927
	$s_N + 2$	1.000	1.000	0.995	0.948	0.752	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.999
VR(1,0)	s_N		0.051	0.067	0.113	0.179		0.052	0.057	0.084	0.121
	$s_N + 1$	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.998	0.992	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	$s_N + 2$	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Inv.VR	s_N	0.064	0.043	0.030	0.019	0.022	0.056	0.048	0.039	0.038	0.038
	$s_N - 1$		0.920	0.623	0.436	0.289		0.963	0.843	0.757	0.654
	$s_N - 2$			0.978	0.948	0.875			0.998	0.997	0.993

Notes: Based on 10,000 Monte Carlo replications. The DGP true dimension is s_N , the null hypothesized value is s_0 , and the nominal size is 5%.

method and each value of s_N , the table reports the frequencies of correctly estimating the true dimension s_N . Overall, the direct estimators \tilde{s} and \hat{s}_{LRS} perform worse than the sequential testing procedures, and between the two, \tilde{s} tends to perform better than \hat{s}_{LRS} . The TD procedures (based on the VR(2,1), VR(2,0) and VR(1,0) tests) tend to exhibit better performance than the BU one (based on the inverse VR test). This was expected based on the relatively poor power of the inverse VR test observed in Table 1. The choice of h_R seems to significantly affect the performance of the tests, especially when the sample size is small and s_N is high. Of course, this is not the case for the TD procedure based on the VR(2,1) test, and indeed, this method appears to perform the best overall.

Results for the UD hybrid procedure are also reported in Table 2. This enjoys the advantage of a data-driven selection of $s_{\text{max}} = \hat{s}_{\text{BU}} + 5$. The \hat{s}_{BU} will select a random value of s_{max} that could be close to s_N or could be quite far from s_N . However, the strong robustness

Table 2: Frequencies of correctly estimating s_N

Method	$T = 250$					$T = 500$				
	$s_N = 0$	$s_N = 1$	$s_N = 3$	$s_N = 5$	$s_N = 7$	$s_N = 0$	$s_N = 1$	$s_N = 3$	$s_N = 5$	$s_N = 7$
\ddot{s}		0.916	0.622	0.543	0.356		0.958	0.832	0.862	0.830
\widehat{s}_{LRS}		0.998	0.275	0.062	0.016		0.996	0.478	0.190	0.071
$\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}}: \text{VR}(2,1)$	1.000	0.949	0.946	0.935	0.894	1.000	0.949	0.950	0.941	0.939
$\widehat{s}_{\text{UD}}: \text{VR}(2,1)$	1.000	0.949	0.946	0.935	0.894	1.000	0.949	0.950	0.941	0.939
				$h_R = [T^{1/4}]$						
$\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}}: \text{VR}(2,0)$	1.000	0.959	0.960	0.956	0.900	1.000	0.958	0.964	0.967	0.974
$\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}}: \text{VR}(1,0)$	1.000	0.942	0.908	0.828	0.700	1.000	0.946	0.931	0.891	0.822
$\widehat{s}_{\text{BU}}: \text{Inv.VR}$	0.939	0.918	0.804	0.738	0.619	0.946	0.938	0.919	0.909	0.890
$\widehat{s}_{\text{UD}}: \text{VR}(2,0)$	1.000	0.959	0.960	0.956	0.900	1.000	0.958	0.964	0.967	0.974
$\widehat{s}_{\text{UD}}: \text{VR}(1,0)$	1.000	0.942	0.908	0.828	0.700	1.000	0.946	0.931	0.891	0.822
				$h_R = [T^{1/3}]$						
$\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}}: \text{VR}(2,0)$	1.000	0.942	0.867	0.643	0.318	1.000	0.957	0.965	0.958	0.913
$\widehat{s}_{\text{TD}}: \text{VR}(1,0)$	1.000	0.949	0.933	0.885	0.813	1.000	0.948	0.943	0.916	0.879
$\widehat{s}_{\text{BU}}: \text{Inv.VR}$	0.936	0.882	0.597	0.413	0.262	0.945	0.917	0.806	0.722	0.618
$\widehat{s}_{\text{UD}}: \text{VR}(2,0)$	1.000	0.942	0.867	0.643	0.318	1.000	0.957	0.965	0.958	0.913
$\widehat{s}_{\text{UD}}: \text{VR}(1,0)$	1.000	0.949	0.933	0.885	0.813	1.000	0.948	0.943	0.916	0.879

Notes: Based on 10,000 Monte Carlo replications. The DGP true dimension is s_N , the nominal size is 5%, and $s_{\max} = s_N + 5$ for the TD methods. For the UD procedure, the bandwidth of the Inv.VR tests is $h_R = [T^{1/4}]$.

of the TD procedures to the choice of s_{\max} , combined with the addition of 5 from \widehat{s}_{BU} , implies that in fact the UD procedures enjoy the same frequencies of correct estimation of s_N as the corresponding TD procedures. Thus, the advantage of the data-driven selection of s_{\max} comes without cost, at least for these sample sizes, and consequently the UD procedure based on VR(2,1) is the preferred method in our Monte Carlo simulations.

Finally, recall that the functional observations are constructed from 200 regularly spaced points on $[0, 1]$ by smoothing using the first 40 Legendre basis functions. However, as discussed earlier, our methodology can also be applied to the time series of 200-dimensional vector of discrete realizations of X_t with no additional theoretical modification. We thus repeated the analysis in Table 2 letting $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ be viewed as a 200-dimensional vector-valued time series, but the results were nearly identical and are hence omitted.


8 Empirical applications

In this section we illustrate our methodology with two real-world data examples.

8.1 Corporate bond yield curves

We apply the proposed tests to examine the number of common stochastic trends in the monthly time series of high quality market corporate bond yield curves (a.k.a. the HQM

Figure 2: HQM yield curves



yield curve). The data is from the US Department of Treasury available at <https://home.treasury.gov/> and spans Jan. 1984 to Dec. 2018. At each time t , we observe a corporate bond with 200 different maturities ranging from 6 months to 100 years. This data was studied by Barigozzi and Trapani (2022), who assumed that this large dimensional time series is driven by a few factors of deterministic trends and $I(1)$ and $I(0)$ processes, and estimated the number of those factors using their own testing procedure. However, it may be more natural to view this time series as realizations of yield curves that are either finite-dimensional (of high and unknown dimension) or curve-valued. With this point of view, we apply our methodology to determine the number of stochastic trends. To implement our methodology, we represent the HQM yield data by the first 40 Legendre basis functions as in Section 7.

Figure 2a shows the time series of HQM yield curves (observed at 200 different maturities) and Figure 2b shows the time series of yields at fixed maturities of 3, 6, 10, and 30 years. The figures suggest that the HQM yield data includes a linear trend. The existence of a linear trend is tested and confirmed by Barigozzi and Trapani (2022) for the data span of Jan. 1985 to Sep. 2017. Thus, we apply the trend-adjusted testing procedures discussed in Section 3.5.

The empirical results are reported in Table 3. We implement all procedures as in Section 7 using $h_R = [T^{1/4}]$. The eigenvalue-ratio estimates in the first part of the table are $\hat{s} = 6$ and $\hat{s}_{LRS} = 5$ (although the ratios are close to suggesting $\hat{s} = 2$ and $\hat{s}_{LRS} = 3$).

In the second part of Table 3 we report the VR and inverse VR test statistics for a range of values of s_0 . The inverse VR tests imply that $\hat{s}_{BU} = 2$ (at 1% level) or $\hat{s}_{BU} = 3$ (at 5% level). Given this result, the choice $s_{max} = 7$ seems like a reasonable input to the TD testing procedures. By the UD hybrid procedure we thus find $\hat{s}_{UD} = 2$ (at 5% level using either VR(2,1) or VR(2,0) and at 1% level using VR(1,0)) or $\hat{s}_{UD} = 3$ (at 1% level using either VR(2,1) or VR(2,0)). Overall, the evidence suggests that there are $s_N = 2$ stochastic trends.

Table 3: Empirical results for HQM yield curve data

Statistic	Eigenvalue ratio estimates							
	$j = 1$	$j = 2$	$j = 3$	$j = 4$	$j = 5$	$j = 6$	$j = 7$	
μ_{j+1}/μ_j	2.89	3.00	2.02	1.91	1.15	3.25	2.15	
$\hat{\kappa}_j/\max_j\{\hat{\kappa}_j\}$	0.42	0.14	0.08	0.29	0.00	0.94	0.94	
Statistic	Variance ratio test statistics							
	$s_0 = 0$	$s_0 = 1$	$s_0 = 2$	$s_0 = 3$	$s_0 = 4$	$s_0 = 5$	$s_0 = 6$	$s_0 = 7$
Inv.VR	0.60**	0.38**	0.15*	0.09 [†]	0.07 [†]	0.06 [†]	0.04	0.03
VR(2,1)	151.61	409.16	1355.09*	3484.67**	7175.13**	10623.79**	23154.51**	
VR(2,0)	6441.08	13464.83	101829.59*	301378.31**	803642.28**	1440646.14**	2949380.49**	
VR(1,0)	31.06	78.96 [†]	244.15**	535.24**	894.06**	1363.64**	2069.07**	

Notes: [†], *, and ** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

8.2 The Nelson-Siegel term structure model

Given an estimated dimension, it is possible to examine various hypotheses on the nonstationary subspace as in Section 5. A popular model for the term structure of interest rates was proposed by Nelson and Siegel (1987); henceforth the N-S model. They represent the term structure of yield curves by a linear combination of three parametric functions,

$$\gamma_0 = 1, \quad \gamma_1 = \gamma_1(\varsigma, \tau) = \varsigma(1 - e^{-\tau/\varsigma})/\tau, \quad \gamma_2 = \gamma_2(\varsigma, \tau) = \varsigma(1 - e^{-\tau/\varsigma})/\tau - e^{-\tau/\varsigma},$$

where τ is time to maturity, ς is a shape parameter, and γ_0 , γ_1 , and γ_2 denote level, slope, and curvature factors. Because γ_1 and γ_2 are nearly collinear for large τ , we subsequently consider only data for $\tau \in [0, 30]$ years. This has almost no impact on the results reported in Table 3. We now investigate to what extent the N-S model can explain the dominant (nonstationary) variation in the data. To this end, we need to specify the shape parameter, ς . Since our data is annualized, we set $\varsigma = 1.37$ following Diebold and Li (2006).

We first test the hypothesis H_0 in (5.3) with $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ using Theorem 5.1(iii). That is, we test whether “fitted values,” $\{P_{\mathcal{H}_0}X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$, from the N-S model are stationary. Not surprisingly, this hypothesis is strongly rejected. The same conclusion holds for tests of (5.3) when \mathcal{H}_0 is specified as the span of any one or two of the factors γ_i , $i = 0, 1, 2$. This confirms that none of the factors are stationary.

Next, we test if the level, slope, and/or curvature factors span the nonstationary subspace as in (5.2). From our earlier results in Table 3, we set the dimension of the latter to $s_N = 2$ (testing at 5% level). Thus, there is no possibility that the N-S model with only one factor can yield stationary residuals. With two or three factors, it is of interest to test if the N-S model can explain all the nonstationary variation in the yield curve data and, as a result, can yield stationary residuals. In this sense, the hypothesis $H_0 : \mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\} \supseteq \mathcal{H}_N$

Table 4: Test results for $(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t$ with $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$ and $\varsigma = 1.37$

Statistic	$s_0 = 0$	$s_0 = 1$	$s_0 = 2$	$s_0 = 3$
Inv.VR	0.95**	0.18*	0.16*	0.09 [†]
VR(2,1)		113.48	629.06 [†]	1577.24*
VR(2,0)		6516.06	29451.95 [†]	104973.24*
VR(1,0)		75.33**	148.22**	333.88**

Notes: [†], *, and ** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.


in (5.2) is the most interesting, and its non-rejection would be the strongest conclusion that we could obtain. However, implementing the test as in Theorem 5.1(ii) with $s_0 = 0$ and $p_0 = 3$, the inverse VR statistic is 0.95 (see Table 4) and rejects the null at the 1% level.

We proceed to test H_0 in (5.1), where \mathcal{H}_0 is specified as various choices of factor(s). That is, we test whether any one factor can reduce the dimension of the nonstationary subspace by one, and also whether any two factors can reduce the dimension by two. Of course, the latter is less likely to be accepted than the former. For one factor, implementing the test as in Theorem 5.1(i), the inverse VR statistics with $s_0 = 1$ are 0.41, 0.31, and 0.36 for $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0\}$, $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_1\}$, $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_2\}$, respectively, in each case rejecting the null at the 1% level. For two factors, the inverse VR statistics with $s_0 = 0$ are 1.10 and 0.99 for $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$, respectively, in both cases rejecting the null at 1% level. Thus, there is no evidence to suggest that any one factor is in the nonstationary subspace, i.e., that any one factor can be interpreted as one of the common stochastic trends.

Finally, following Remark 5.1, we investigate if the nonstationary subspace of the residual series, $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ with $\mathcal{H}_0 = \text{span}\{\gamma_0, \gamma_1, \gamma_2\}$, is of smaller dimension than that of X_t itself. Letting the former be denoted $s_{\mathcal{H}_0}$, we apply the sequential procedures in (5.4) and (5.5). The results are reported in Table 4. Applying the UD hybrid sequential procedure at the 5% level, we find $\hat{s}_{\mathcal{H}_0, \text{UD}} = 2$ (for the preferred VR(2,1) test and also the VR(2,0) test), but at the 10% level we find $\hat{s}_{\mathcal{H}_0, \text{UD}} = 1$. Thus, we do find some evidence that three factors in the N-S model explain some of the nonstationary variation in the data.

The empirical results for the N-S model are specific to the value of ς , at least for the slope and curvature factors. As a robustness check, we repeated the analysis for $\varsigma = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, and the results were qualitatively the same. In conclusion, the three parametric factors of the N-S model cannot fully explain the nonstationarity in the corporate yield curve data, so the residuals from the model will still exhibit nonstationarity. However, the model can capture some of the nonstationarity, in the sense that the dimension of the nonstationary subspace of the residuals is smaller than that of the original yield curve data.

Figure 3: Time series of $\langle X_t, \hat{\nu}_j \rangle$



Notes: Time series of $\langle X_t, \hat{\nu}_j \rangle$ for some selected eigenvectors $\hat{\nu}_j$ of $\hat{\Lambda}_{0,R}$.

8.3 Labor market indices

In empirical (macro) analysis, high dimensional observations are often given by a collection of potentially nonstationary variables that are closely related to each other but do not have a natural ordering. In such cases, not only is each observation naturally understood as a realization of a high-dimensional random vector that cannot generally be smoothed to a curve (unlike in our previous example of yield curve data), but also the number of linearly independent I(1) stochastic trends may be substantially smaller than the total number of variables. As discussed, in this case as well, our proposed methodology can be applied to study the number of stochastic trends and/or stationarity without any modifications. To illustrate this versatility of our methodology, we now consider another empirical example analyzing 29 monthly labor market indices provided in the FRED-MD data set (McCracken and Ng, 2016). The indices include the civilian labor force, employment/unemployment rate, hourly wage, and other labor-related economic variables; a detailed list can be found in the table labeled “Group 2” in the appendix of McCracken and Ng (2016). We apply log-transformation to the data.¹ The time span used in this analysis is Jan. 1990 to Dec. 2019.


In Figure 3 we display time series of $\langle X_t, \hat{\nu}_j \rangle$ for some eigenvectors $\hat{\nu}_j$ that are computed from $\hat{\Lambda}_{0,R}$. These are the j^{th} score processes (see Chang et al., 2016 and Section 5 of Nielsen et al., 2023). It is clear from Figure 3 that there is some nonstationary behavior (e.g., $j = 1$), but it is also clear that this eventually disappears leaving stationary processes (e.g., $j = 10$).

McCracken and Ng (2016) suggested that some of these labor market indices may be I(2) variables.² To examine the existence of this type of higher-order stochastic trends, we first display in Figure 4 the first three score processes, $\{\langle \Delta X_t, \hat{\nu}_j \rangle\}_{t=1}^T$. Some of these must

¹The log transformation was suggested by McCracken and Ng (2016) for some variables. We found that the remaining variables are often very large in scale (e.g., “HWI”) or have only positive values. Thus, those variables are also log-transformed in our testing procedure.

²Specifically, FRED ID variables CES0600000008, CES2000000008, and CES3000000008.

Figure 4: Time series of $\langle \Delta X_t, \hat{\nu}_j \rangle$



Notes: Time series of the first three score functions of ΔX_t . The estimated eigenvectors $\hat{\nu}_1, \hat{\nu}_2$, and $\hat{\nu}_3$ are computed from $\hat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$.

Table 5: Empirical results for labor indices in first-differences

Statistic	Eigenvalue ratio estimates					
	$j = 1$	$j = 2$	$j = 3$	$j = 4$	$j = 5$	
μ_{j+1}/μ_j	2.10	4.10	2.31	1.62	1.48	
$\hat{\kappa}_j / \max_j \{\hat{\kappa}_j\}$	0.57	0.82	0.96	0.62	0.70	
Statistic	Variance ratio test statistics					
	$s_0 = 0$	$s_0 = 1$	$s_0 = 2$	$s_0 = 3$	$s_0 = 4$	$s_0 = 5$
Inv.VR	0.33	0.07	0.03	0.02	0.02	
VR(2,1)		909.68**	11332.32**	58648.98**	117148.63**	190032.78**
VR(2,0)		40273.47**	557886.16**	1816887.77**	7398716.82**	15272704.89**
VR(1,0)		138.76**	768.31**	2791.49**	6097.60**	11131.45**

Notes: †, *, and ** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

behave as a unit root process if the original time series is I(2), and that does not appear to be the case. Next, we apply our testing procedures to the first differenced time series, $\{\Delta X_t\}_{t=1}^T$. The bandwidth parameters and the kernel functions are set to those applied in Section 8.1, and in this part of the analysis, we use mean-adjusted statistics (Section 3.5). The results are reported in Table 5, where we see that $\hat{s} = 2$, $\hat{s}_{\text{LRS}} = 1$ (but they cannot be zero), whereas $\hat{s}_{\text{BU}} = \hat{s}_{\text{TD}} = \hat{s}_{\text{UD}} = 0$ regardless of the choice of test statistic. From Figure 4 and Table 5, it seems unlikely that there are any I(2) stochastic trends.

We therefore proceed to apply our methodology to the level time series, $\{X_t\}_{t=1}^T$, to determine the number of I(1) stochastic trends. We now correct for a mean and linear trend. The results are presented in Table 6. For the eigenvalue-ratio estimators we find $\hat{s} = \hat{s}_{\text{LRS}} = 1$. However, the sequential testing results are quite different. We first note that, although the inverse VR test results are reported only for $s_0 = 6, \dots, 10$, the null hypotheses $s_0 = 0, 1, \dots, 5$ are all rejected at 1% significance level. Thus, we find that $\hat{s}_{\text{BU}} = 9$, and we

Table 6: Empirical results for labor indices in levels

Statistic	Eigenvalue ratio estimates						
	$j = 1$	$j = 2$	$j = 3$	$j = 4$	$j = 5$	$j = 6$	$j = 7$
μ_{j+1}/μ_j	2.06	2.02	1.74	1.37	1.34	1.42	1.46
$\hat{\kappa}_j/\max_j\{\hat{\kappa}_j\}$	0.07	0.27	0.34	0.82	0.80	0.50	0.91
Statistic	Variance ratio test statistics						
	$s_0 = 6$	$s_0 = 7$	$s_0 = 8$	$s_0 = 9$	$s_0 = 10$	$s_0 = 11$	$s_0 = 12$
Inv.VR	0.12**	0.09**	0.05**	0.03 [†]	0.03 [†]	0.02	0.02
VR(2,1)	2557.11	4531.11	6119.56	10730.08	16691.44*	22714.94**	26434.24**
VR(2,0)	95182.40	178086.71	252290.97	844250.39	1875309.92*	2850597.36*	3358301.80*
VR(1,0)	206.14	265.70	343.73	745.29**	1016.61**	1172.03**	1318.84**

Notes: [†], *, and ** indicate significance at 10%, 5%, and 1% level, respectively.

use this to set $s_{\max} = \hat{s}_{\text{BU}} + 5 = 14$. We report results for the VR tests for $s_0 = 8, 9, \dots, 12$. The larger values of s_0 are rejected at the 1% level for VR(2,1) and VR(1,0), but not for VR(2,0). This is consistent with the simulation findings in Table 1. Based on VR(1,0) we find $\hat{s}_{\text{UD}} = 8$, and based on VR(2,1) we find $\hat{s}_{\text{UD}} = 9$. Because VR(2,1) is the preferred test based on our Monte Carlo simulations, and because the results for VR(2,1) agree with those of the inverse VR tests, we conclude that there are 9 stochastic trends. This means that the number of cointegrating relationships is about 2/3 of the dimension of the original data. Given this result, one should be careful in the application of cointegration rank tests that require a small number of cointegrating relationships (Remark 2.2).

Finally, for both empirical applications we investigate the robustness of \hat{s}_{TD} to the initial hypothesis, s_{\max} , by computing \hat{s}_{TD} using the VR(2,1), VR(2,0), and VR(1,0) tests at the 5% level for a range of s_{\max} . In the HQM yield example, $\hat{s}_{\text{TD}} = 2$ for $s_{\max} = 2, \dots, 20$ using either of the three tests. In the labor index example in levels, \hat{s}_{TD} is unchanged for $s_{\max} = 9, \dots, 20$ using VR(2,1), for $s_{\max} = 8, \dots, 20$ using VR(1,0), and for $s_{\max} = 9, \dots, 12$ using VR(2,0). The latter test shows some sensitivity to s_{\max} , but that is expected given the simulation results in Table 1. The former two tests are extraordinarily robust to the choice of s_{\max} .

9 Conclusion

We have considered statistical inference on unit roots and cointegration for time series taking values in a Hilbert space of an arbitrarily large dimension or a subspace of possibly unknown dimension. This has wide applicability in practice; for example, in the case of cointegrated vector time series of finite dimension, in a high-dimensional factor model that includes a finite number of nonstationary factors, in the case of cointegrated curve-valued (or function-valued) time series, and nonstationary dynamic functional factor models. We con-

sidered mainly determination of the dimension of the nonstationary subspace (number of common stochastic trends), but we also considered hypothesis testing on the stationary and nonstationary subspaces themselves. To this end, we provided limit theory for general variance ratio-type statistics based on partial summation and/or differencing, and we demonstrated how to apply these variance ratio statistics to sequentially test for the dimension of the nonstationary subspace or to test hypotheses on the subspaces. To illustrate our methods, we included a small Monte Carlo simulation study as well as two empirical illustrations to the term structure of interest rates and labor market indices, respectively.

A Notation and preliminaries

For a real, separable Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ and norm $\|\cdot\|$, let $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ denote the collection of bounded linear operators acting on \mathcal{H} equipped with the uniform operator norm, $\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{\|v\| \leq 1} \|Av\|$. For any $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$, let $\ker A$ (resp. $\text{ran } A$) denote the kernel (resp. range) of A defined as $\ker A = \{v \in \mathcal{H} : Av = 0\}$ and $\text{ran } A = \{Av : v \in \mathcal{H}\}$, respectively. The dimensions of $\ker A$ and $\text{ran } A$ are, respectively, called the nullity and rank of A . We let A^* denote the adjoint operator of A , which is uniquely defined by the property $\langle Av_1, v_2 \rangle = \langle v_1, A^*v_2 \rangle$ for all $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{H}$. An operator $A \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$ is said to be compact if it is the limit of a sequence of finite rank operators in $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{H}}$. Moreover, whenever it is convenient, we will let $[A]$ denote the matrix representation for any operator A with respect to some orthonormal set of vectors $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^m$ for some $m > 0$ (which will be specified depending on the context); that is, $[A]_{ij} = \langle \phi_i, A\phi_j \rangle$.

An \mathcal{H} -valued random variable X is defined as a measurable map from the underlying probability space, say \mathcal{S} , to \mathcal{H} , where \mathcal{H} is understood to be equipped with the usual Borel σ -field. Such a random element X is said to be square-integrable if $\mathbb{E}\|X\|^2 < \infty$. For any square-integrable X , its expectation $\mathbb{E}[X]$ is defined as a unique element in \mathcal{H} satisfying $\mathbb{E}\langle X, v \rangle = \langle \mathbb{E}[X], v \rangle$ for any $v \in \mathcal{H}$. The covariance operator of X is defined as $C_X = \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X]) \otimes (X - \mathbb{E}[X])]$, where \otimes denotes the tensor product on \mathcal{H} . The operator C_X is guaranteed to be self-adjoint (i.e., $C_X = C_X^*$) and allows only nonnegative eigenvalues.

We will sometimes consider convergence of a sequence of random bounded linear operators. For such a sequence $\{A_j\}_{j \geq 1}$, we write $A_j \rightarrow_{\text{P}} A$ if $\|A_j - A\|_{\text{op}} \rightarrow_{\text{P}} 0$. We also write $A_j = \mathcal{O}_{\text{P}}(a_n)$ (resp. $A_j = \mathcal{o}_{\text{P}}(a_n)$) if $\|A_j\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_{\text{P}}(a_n)$ (resp. $\|A_j\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{o}_{\text{P}}(a_n)$). Under Assumption 2, \hat{P}_{K} converges in probability and in operator norm to $P_{\text{N}} + P_{\text{S}}^{\text{K}}$, which is hereafter denoted by P_{K} .

Let $\{r_j, \varpi_j\}_{j=1}^{s_{\text{N}}}$ denote the pairs of eigenvalues and eigenvectors of $\Lambda_{\Delta X} = \Phi(1)C_{\epsilon}\Phi^*(1)$; obviously, $\{\varpi_j\}_{j=1}^{s_{\text{N}}}$ is an orthonormal basis of \mathcal{H}_{N} . We then let $\{\mathcal{W}_{1, s_{\text{N}}}(r)\}_{r \in [0, 1]}$ denote a Brownian motion in \mathcal{H}_{N} , such that $(\langle \mathcal{W}_{1, s_{\text{N}}}(r), \varpi_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathcal{W}_{1, s_{\text{N}}}(r), \varpi_{s_{\text{N}}} \rangle)'$ is an s_{N} -dimensional

standard Brownian motion, and define $\mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}(r) = \int_0^r \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}(u) du$. Lastly, note that $\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}$ is well defined in terms of its eigenvalues and eigenvectors which are given by $\{\sqrt{r_j}, \varpi_j\}_{j=1}^{s_N}$.

Under Assumption 1, it is well known that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq 1} \|T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Delta X_t - \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}(r)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0; \quad (\text{A.1})$$

see Berkes et al. (2013, Theorem 1). We will repeatedly, and sometimes implicitly, use this result in the subsequent sections. Moreover, in the case when the unobserved components model (3.20) is considered, and thus $U_t^{(1)}$ or $U_t^{(2)}$ is used in the analysis, we note that

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq 1} \|T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Delta U_t^{(1)} - \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}^{(1)}(r)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\sup_{0 \leq r \leq 1} \|T^{-1/2} \sum_{t=1}^{\lfloor Tr \rfloor} \Delta U_t^{(2)} - \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}^{(2)}(r)\| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}^{(1)}$ (resp. $\mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}^{(2)}$) is the demeaned (resp. detrended) standard Brownian motion taking values in \mathcal{H}_N ; see Nielsen et al. (2023, Lemma 3). Results (A.2) and (A.3) are essential to extend our theoretical results to the unobserved components model (3.20).

Finally, we let $D_m = \text{diag}\{m^{-1/2}I_1, I_2\}$ for some identity operators I_1 and I_2 , each of which acts on a subspace of $\text{ran } \hat{P}_K$. In the proofs, the dimensions of these identities are quite obvious from the context and hence they are omitted.

B Proofs of theorems

In this appendix we give the proofs of all theorems. The corollaries follow by the continuous mapping theorem.

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We only give the proof for the case with $a_L > 0$ and $a_R > 0$; as may be expected, the proof can be extended to the other cases with only slight modifications.

First note that the eigenvalues μ_j from the problem (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 1)$ are identical to those in

$$(T^2 h_L h_R^{-1} \mu_j) \left(\frac{h_R}{h_L T^3} D_{h_R T} \hat{\Lambda}_{2,L} D_{h_R T} \right) \nu_j = \left(\frac{1}{T} D_{h_R T} \hat{\Lambda}_{1,R} D_{h_R T} \right) \nu_j. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Next, consider the decomposition $\hat{P}_K = \hat{P}_K P_N + \hat{P}_K P_S = \hat{P}_N^K + \hat{P}_S^K$. Then, for $d \in \{1, 2\}$ and $m \in \{L, R\}$,

$$\hat{P}_K \hat{\Lambda}_{d,m} \hat{P}_K = \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d,m} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* + \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d,m} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* + \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d,m} (\hat{P}_S^K)^* + \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d,m} (\hat{P}_S^K)^*. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Therefore, $\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m} \widehat{P}_K$ may be understood as the operator matrix given by

$$\widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m} \widehat{P}_K = \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,L}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \\ \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

We now obtain the limiting behavior of the operators appearing in (B.1). First,

$$\frac{h_R}{h_L T^3} D_{h_R T} \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} D_{h_R T} = \begin{pmatrix} h_L^{-1} T^{-4} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & h_L^{-1} h_R^{1/2} T^{-7/2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \\ h_L^{-1} h_R^{1/2} T^{-7/2} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & h_L^{-1} h_R T^{-3} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\widehat{\delta}_K = \widehat{P}_K - P_K$, where $P_K = P_N + P_S^K$. Using the fact that $P_K P_N = P_N$, we find $\widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* = P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_N + \widehat{\delta}_K P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_N \widehat{P}_K + P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_N \widehat{\delta}_K^*$, where Assumption 2 implies $\widehat{\delta}_K = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and $\widehat{P}_K = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$. Combining these results with Lemma C.1(i), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{h_L T^4} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* &= \frac{1}{h_L T^4} P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_N + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \frac{1}{h_L T^4} \sum_{s=-T+1}^{T-1} \kappa_L \left(\frac{s}{h_L} \right) \widehat{\Gamma}_{2,s}^N + \mathcal{O}_P(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{d} c_L \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} \left(\int \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \right) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where $\widehat{\Gamma}_{2,s}^N = \sum_{t=s+1}^T P_N X_{2,t-s} \otimes P_N X_{2,t}$ for $s \geq 0$ and $\widehat{\Gamma}_{2,s}^N = \sum_{t=s+1}^T P_N X_{2,t} \otimes P_N X_{2,t-s}$ for $s < 0$, and the convergence in distribution can be deduced from (A.1) and Phillips (1991, see especially the unnumbered equation between (A.10) and (A.11)) and the continuous mapping theorem (applied to the integral functional on $[0, 1]$). From similar arguments, using Assumption 2, Lemma C.1(i), and the fact that $h_R/T \rightarrow 0$ (Assumption 3), we can further show that

$$h_L^{-1} h_R^{1/2} T^{-7/2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = h_L^{-1} h_R^{1/2} T^{-7/2} P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_S^K + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \mathcal{O}_P(1), \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$h_L^{-1} h_R T^{-3} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = h_L^{-1} h_R T^{-3} P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} P_S^K + \mathcal{O}_P(1) = \mathcal{O}_P(1). \quad (\text{B.6})$$

On the other hand, we have

$$T^{-1} D_{h_R T} \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} D_{h_R T} = \begin{pmatrix} h_R^{-1} T^{-2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & h_R^{-1/2} T^{-3/2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \\ h_R^{-1/2} T^{-3/2} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & T^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}.$$

As in (B.4)–(B.6), it holds that

$$h_R^{-1} T^{-2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_N^K)^* \xrightarrow{d} c_R \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} \left(\int \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \right) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$h_R^{-1/2} T^{-3/2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = \mathcal{O}_P(1). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

We also find that

$$T^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = T^{-1} P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S^K + \mathcal{O}_P(1) \xrightarrow{P} P_K \Lambda_{S,R} P_K, \quad (\text{B.9})$$

where the convergence follows from Theorem 2 of Horváth et al. (2013) (also see Theorem 5.3 of Kokoszka and Young, 2016) and the fact that $\{P_S X_{1,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ is an L^4 - q -approximable sequence (Hörmann and Kokoszka, 2010, Proposition 2.1) and $q \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ under

the summability condition $\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} j \|\tilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} < \infty$ implied by (2.2).

From (B.4)–(B.9), we know that $h_R h_L^{-1} T^{-3} D_{h_R T} \hat{\Lambda}_{2,L} D_{h_R T}$ and $T^{-1} D_{h_R T} \hat{\Lambda}_{1,R} D_{h_R T}$ converge in distribution to random bounded linear operators, say \mathfrak{D}_L and \mathfrak{D}_R , acting on $\text{ran } P_K$. Using the isomorphism between \mathbb{R}^K and any K -dimensional Hilbert space, \mathfrak{D}_L and \mathfrak{D}_R may be understood as $K \times K$ matrices, say $[\mathfrak{D}_L]$ and $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$. Moreover, any orthonormal basis of $\text{ran } P_K$ can be used for these matrix representations since the eigenvalues that we are interested in are not affected by a change of basis. Therefore, we may assume that $\{T^2 h_L h_R^{-1} \mu_j\}_{j=1}^K$ in (B.1) converge to the eigenvalues associated with $[\mathfrak{D}_L]$ and $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$, where

$$[\mathfrak{D}_L] = \begin{pmatrix} c_L [\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}] & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, [\mathfrak{D}_R] = \begin{pmatrix} c_R [\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}] & 0 \\ 0 & [\Lambda_{S,R}] \end{pmatrix},$$

and these are represented with respect to some orthonormal basis $\{\phi_j\}_{j=1}^K$ of $\text{ran } P_K$. Under Assumption 2, $[\Lambda_{S,R}]$ has rank $K - s_N$ and hence $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$ is invertible almost surely. We thus find that $\{(T^2 h_L h_R^{-1} \mu_j)^{-1}\}_{j=1}^{s_N}$ converge to the s_N largest eigenvalues of $[\mathfrak{D}_R]^{-1} [\mathfrak{D}_L]$ while $(T^2 h_L h_R^{-1} \mu_j)^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ for $j \geq s_N + 1$. This proves (3.8). From the expressions for $[\mathfrak{D}_L]$ and $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$, we further find that the s_N largest eigenvalues of $[\mathfrak{D}_R]^{-1} [\mathfrak{D}_L]$ are distributionally identical to those of $(c_L/c_R) [\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}]^{-1} [\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}]$. Then (3.7) follows from the continuous mapping theorem.

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

We consider only the case with $a_L > 0$. The proof can easily be modified to deal with $a_L = 0$.

As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, the eigenvalues μ_j from (3.4) with $d_L \in \{1, 2\}$ and $d_R = 0$ are identical to those in

$$(h_L T^{2d_L - 1} \mu_j) (T^{-2d_L} h_L^{-1} h_R^2 D_{h_R}^2 \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} D_{h_R}^2) \nu_j = (T^{-1} h_R^2 D_{h_R}^2 \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} D_{h_R}^2) \nu_j, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where

$$\frac{h_R^2}{h_L T^{2d_L}} D_{h_R}^2 \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} D_{h_R}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} h_L^{-1} T^{-2d_L} \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* & h_L^{-1} h_R T^{-2d_L} \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} (\hat{P}_S^K)^* \\ h_L^{-1} h_R T^{-2d_L} \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* & h_L^{-1} h_R^2 T^{-2d_L} \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} (\hat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.11})$$

and

$$\frac{h_R^2}{T} D_{h_R}^2 \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} D_{h_R}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-1} \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* & h_R T^{-1} \hat{P}_N^K \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} (\hat{P}_S^K)^* \\ h_R T^{-1} \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} (\hat{P}_N^K)^* & h_R^2 T^{-1} \hat{P}_S^K \hat{\Lambda}_{0, R} (\hat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

We first obtain the limiting behavior of the operator given in (B.11). When $d_L = 2$ this is given in (B.4)–(B.6). When $d_L = 1$, we reverse the roles of L and R , use (B.7)–(B.9) and the facts that $h_R/T^{1/2} \rightarrow 0$, $h_L^{-1} h_R^2 T^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ (Assumption 3). Combining these results,

$$\frac{h_R^2}{h_L T^{2d_L}} D_{h_R}^2 \hat{\Lambda}_{d_L, L} D_{h_R}^2 \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} c_L \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{d_L, s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{d_L, s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{D}_L. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

We next establish the limiting behavior of the operator given in (B.12). Assumption 2,

Lemma C.1(iii), and the fact that $\{P_N X_{0,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ is L^4 - q -approximable and $q \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \|\Phi_j\|_{\text{op}} = o(1)$ imply that $T^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* = T^{-1} P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_N + o_P(1)$ and that $T^{-1} P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_N$ converges to the long-run covariance of $\{P_N X_{0,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$, which is given by $\Lambda_{\Delta X}$ (Beare et al., 2017, Section 3.1). We thus have

$$T^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* \xrightarrow{P} \Lambda_{\Delta X}. \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Similarly, from Assumption 2 and Lemma C.1(iii), we know that $h_R^2 T^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = h_R^2 T^{-1} P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_S^K + o_P(1)$ and $P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_S^K$ is the sample long-run covariance computed from $\{P_S^K \Delta X_t\}_{t=1}^T$, which may be understood as a finite-dimensional vector-valued process. Then, from similar arguments used in the proof of Lemma 8.1(a) of Phillips (1995), we may deduce that $h_R^2 T^{-1} P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_S^K \xrightarrow{P} -k_R''(0) P_S^K \Lambda_{S,R} P_S^K$. Hence,

$$h_R^2 T^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \xrightarrow{P} -k_R''(0) P_S^K \Lambda_{S,R} P_S^K. \quad (\text{B.15})$$

In the same way, from Assumption 2, Lemma C.1(iii), and the same arguments used in the proof of Lemma 8.1(b) of Phillips (1995), we find that

$$h_R T^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = h_R T^{-1} P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} P_S^K + o_P(1) = \mathcal{O}_P(h_R^{-1}) + \mathcal{O}_P((h_R/T)^{1/2}) + o_P(1), \quad (\text{B.16})$$

which implies that $h_R T^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* = o_P(1)$. Combining this result with (B.14) and (B.15), we find that

$$\frac{h_R^2}{T} D_{h_R}^2 \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} D_{h_R}^2 \xrightarrow{P} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{\Delta X} & 0 \\ 0 & -k''(0) P_K \Lambda_{S,R} P_K \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{D}_R. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

As in our proof of Theorem 3.1, we may assume that $\{h_L T \mu_j\}_{j=1}^K$ converge in distribution to the eigenvalues associated with $[\mathfrak{D}_L]$ and $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$, which are matrix representations of \mathfrak{D}_L and \mathfrak{D}_R with respect to some orthonormal basis of $\text{ran } P_K$. Given that $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$ is invertible under Assumption 2, the desired results follow from nearly identical arguments used to conclude our proof of Theorem 3.1.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

We first consider the case with $K > s_N$. As in our proof of Theorem 3.1, we only consider the case with $a_L > 0$ and rewrite the VR(2,1) eigenvalue problem as

$$h_L^{-1} T^{-2} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} \widehat{P}_K D_T^2 \nu_j = (T h_L \mu_j)^{-1} T^{-1} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \widehat{P}_K D_T^2 \nu_j, \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where

$$\frac{1}{h_L T^2} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-4} h_L^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & T^{-3} h_L^{-1} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \\ T^{-3} h_L^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & T^{-2} h_L^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

$$\frac{1}{T} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \widehat{P}_K D_T^2 = \begin{pmatrix} T^{-3} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & T^{-2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \\ T^{-2} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^* & T^{-1} \widehat{P}_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} (\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.20})$$

From Assumption 2, Lemma C.1, and the conditions on h_m for $m \in \{L, R\}$ given in Assumption 3, we may replace \widehat{P}_N^K (resp. \widehat{P}_S^K) with P_N (resp. P_S^K) in (B.19) and (B.20) with an additive $\mathcal{O}_P(1)$ component. Let $\{g_j\}_{j=1}^{K-s_N}$ be eigenvectors of $P_K \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} P_K$, and let \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N} be a random element such that $(\langle \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N}(r), g_1 \rangle, \dots, \langle \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N}(r), g_{K-s_N} \rangle)'$ is a $(K - s_N)$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion. From the functional central limit theorem and continuous mapping theorem, we find that $\sum_{s=1}^t P_S^K X_s$ and $\sum_{s=1}^t P_N X_t$, viewed as partial sum processes, jointly converge weakly to $P_K \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} P_K \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N}$ and $\Lambda_{\Delta}^{1/2} \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}$, respectively. Then, from similar arguments used in Phillips (1991, the proof of Theorem 3.1(a) or the unnumbered equation between (A.10) and (A.11)), we deduce that

$$\frac{1}{h_L T^2} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \xrightarrow{d} c_L \mathfrak{D}_L, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

where \mathfrak{D}_L denotes the operator matrix given by

$$\mathfrak{D}_L = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (\int \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} & \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (\int \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N}) \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} \\ \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} (\int \mathcal{W}_{2,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} & \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} (\int \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{K-s_N}) \Lambda_{S,R}^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.22})$$

We also find that

$$\frac{1}{T} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} \widehat{P}_K D_T^2 \xrightarrow{P} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & P_K \Lambda_{S,R} P_K \end{pmatrix} = \mathfrak{D}_R. \quad (\text{B.23})$$

As in our proof of Theorem 3.1, we let $[\mathfrak{D}_L]$ and $[\mathfrak{D}_R]$ be the matrix representations of \mathfrak{D}_L and \mathfrak{D}_R for some orthonormal basis of $\text{ran } P_K$. It then follows that $\{Th_L c_L \mu_j\}_{j=s_N+1}^K$ converges in distribution to the $K - s_N$ largest eigenvalues of $[\mathfrak{D}_L]^{-1} [\mathfrak{D}_R]$. The latter can be simplified to $(\int B_{K-s_N} B'_{K-s_N} - \int B_{K-s_N} W'_{2,s_N} (\int W_{2,s_N} W'_{2,s_N})^{-1} \int W_{2,s_N} B'_{K-s_N})^{-1}$ without affecting the distributional properties of the eigenvalues (see also our proof of Theorem 3.1), where B_{K-s_N} is a $(K - s_N)$ -dimensional standard Brownian motion which is independent of W_{2,s_N} . Then (3.14) follows immediately. Moreover, we know from Theorem 3.1 that $Th_L \mu_j \xrightarrow{P} 0$ holds for $j \leq s_N$, which implies that $(Tc_L h_L \mu_j)^{-1} \xrightarrow{P} \infty$ for such j .

If $K \leq s_N$, and thus $\|\widehat{P}_K P_S\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$, it holds that $\widehat{P}_K \rightarrow_P P_N^K$ for some (possibly random) orthogonal projection P_N^K onto a subspace of \mathcal{H}_N . We deduce from our previous discussion that both $T^{-4} h_L^{-1} \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L} (\widehat{P}_K)^*$ and $h_R^{-1} T^{-2} \widehat{P}_N^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} (\widehat{P}_N^K)^*$ converge to random bounded linear operators allowing K (almost surely) positive eigenvalues. From these results and the fact that $T/h_R \rightarrow \infty$ (Assumption 3), $(Tc_L h_L \mu_j)^{-1} \rightarrow_P \infty$ is established for every $j \leq K$.

B.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

In this proof, we let $\widehat{P}_N = \sum_{j=1}^{s_N} \widehat{f}_j \otimes \widehat{f}_j$ and $\widehat{P}_S = I - \widehat{P}_N$. First note that, under Assumption 3, $k_R(\cdot)$ has bounded support $[-\ell_R, \ell_R]$ for some $\ell_R < \infty$ and $|k_R(\cdot)| \leq 1$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\ell_R = 1$, and then $|k_R(s/h_R)| = 0$ holds if and only if $s \notin [-h_R, h_R]$.

First consider the case $K > s_N$. From the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and properties of a norm, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_R^{-1}T^{-2}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} - h_R^{-1}T^{-2}P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}P_N\|_{\text{op}} &\leq \frac{1}{h_RT^2} \sum_{s=0}^{h_R} \sum_{t=1}^T (\|P_N X_{t-s}\| \|P_S X_t\| + \|P_S X_{t-s}\| \|P_N X_t\| \\ &\quad + 2\|P_S X_{t-s}\| \|P_S X_t\|) = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.24})$$

The rate in (B.24) follows because $\sup_{1 \leq t \leq T} \|P_N X_t / \sqrt{T}\| = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ and $T^{-1} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \|P_S X_t\|^2 = O(1)$ hold under the employed assumptions. We then find, from the same arguments used in the proof of Proposition 3.2 of Chang et al. (2016), that $\widehat{P}_N - P_N = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$ and $\widehat{P}_S - P_S = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$. These results combined with (B.24) imply that $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_N \widehat{P}_S$, $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S \widehat{P}_S$, and $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_N \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S \widehat{P}_S$ are all $\mathcal{O}_P(h_R/T)$, and, in addition, that

$$T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_S \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S \widehat{P}_S \xrightarrow{P} \Lambda_{S,R}, \quad (\text{B.25})$$

where the convergence follows from Horváth et al. (2013, Theorem 2); see also our proof of Theorem 3.1. We then may deduce from Bosq (2000, Lemma 4.2) that $\sup_{j \geq 1} |\widehat{\tau}_j - \tau_j| \rightarrow_P 0$. Moreover, from Bosq (2000, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4), we find that (B.25) implies that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=s_N+1}^K \widehat{f}_j \otimes \widehat{f}_j - P_S^K \right\|_{\text{op}} \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (\text{B.26})$$

where P_S^K is the projection onto the span of $\{f_j\}_{j=s_N+1}^K$, and we know that P_S^K is a nonrandom projection since $\tau_K \neq \tau_{K+1}$. Therefore, \widehat{P}_K satisfies Assumption 2.

Next, if $K = s_N$ then Assumption 2 holds for $P_S^K = 0$ obviously.

Finally, consider the case $K < s_N$. From (B.7)–(B.9), we find that $\|h_R^{-1}T^{-2}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} - c_R \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P(h_R^{-1/2}T^{-1/2})$. Observing that the nonzero eigenvalues of $\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} (f \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N}) \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}$ are almost surely distinct and $\text{ran } \Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} = \mathcal{H}_N$, we deduce from Bosq (2000, Lemma 4.3) that

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq K} \|\widehat{f}_j - \text{sgn}(\langle \widehat{f}_j, f_j \rangle) f_j\| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad (\text{B.27})$$

where $\{f_j\}_{j=1}^K$ is an orthonormal set in \mathcal{H}_N . Thus we find that $\|(\sum_{j=1}^K \widehat{f}_j \otimes \widehat{f}_j) P_S\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$.

The above proof does not require any significant changes even if we allow for a nonzero intercept or a linear trend as in Section 3.5. Provided that $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ is computed from the relevant residuals, i.e., $U_t^{(1)}$ or $U_t^{(2)}$ given in (3.21), we may show that $\|h_R^{-1}T^{-2}\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} - h_R^{-1}T^{-2}P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}P_N\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$ as in (B.24) and that $\widehat{P}_N - P_N = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$ and $\widehat{P}_S - P_S = \mathcal{O}_P(T^{-1})$. Then $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_S \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S \widehat{P}_S \rightarrow_P \Lambda_{S,R}$ follows from Kokoszka and Young (2016, Theorem 5.3); c.f. (B.25). We thus find from Bosq (2000, Lemmas 4.3 and 4.4) that (B.26) holds if \widehat{f}_j is an eigenvector of $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ computed from the relevant residuals.

B.5 Proof of Theorem 3.5

From the same arguments used to establish (B.25) in our proof of Theorem 3.4 we find that

$$T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}\widehat{P}_S = T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S P_S \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R} P_S \widehat{P}_S + \mathcal{O}_P(h_R/T) \xrightarrow{P} \Lambda_{S,R}. \quad (\text{B.28})$$

Under the conditions in Assumption 5, we may deduce from Theorem 2.1 of Berkes et al. (2016) that $(T/h_R)^{1/2}(T^{-1}P_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}P_S - \Lambda_{S,R})$ converges to a well-defined Gaussian element. This result combined with (B.28) implies that $(T/h_R)^{1/2}(T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}\widehat{P}_S - \Lambda_{S,R})$ converges to the same Gaussian element. We then deduce from Lemma 4.2 of Bosq (2000) that the eigenvalues $\{\widehat{\tau}_j\}_{j \geq 1}$ of $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}\widehat{P}_S$ satisfy

$$\sup_{j \geq 1} |\widehat{\tau}_{s_N+j} - \tau_j| \leq \|T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}\widehat{P}_S - \Lambda_{S,R}\|_{\text{op}} = \mathcal{O}_P((h_R/T)^{1/2}). \quad (\text{B.29})$$

From (B.29) we find that

$$\widehat{\tau}_{s_N+j} - \widehat{\tau}_{s_N+j+1} = (\widehat{\tau}_{s_N+j} - \tau_j) + (\tau_j - \tau_{j+1}) + (\tau_{j+1} - \widehat{\tau}_{s_N+j+1}) = \tau_j - \tau_{j+1} + \mathcal{O}_P((h_R/T)^{1/2}), \quad (\text{B.30})$$

which proves the desired result.

The above proof does not require any significant changes if $\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}$ is computed from $U_t^{(1)}$ or $U_t^{(2)}$ given in (3.21) to accommodate a nonzero intercept or linear trend. In those cases, (B.28) still holds and $(T/h_R)^{1/2}(T^{-1}P_S\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,R}P_S - \Lambda_{S,R}) = \mathcal{O}_P(1)$ (see Theorem 5.3 of Kokoszka and Young, 2016 and Theorem 2.1 of Berkes et al., 2016). Then the rest of the proof is almost identical and hence omitted.

B.6 Proof of Theorem 4.2

If $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{s_{\max}+1}$ are the eigenvalues of the VR(2,1) problem, then the consistency result follows immediately from Theorems 3.1 and 3.3. In the case of the VR(2,0) problem, we rewrite (3.4) with $(d_L, d_R) = (2, 0)$ as

$$h_L^{-1}T^{-2}D_T^2\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}\widehat{P}_K D_T^2\nu_j = (Th_L h_R^2 \mu_j)^{-1}T^{-1}h_R^2 D_T^2\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R}\widehat{P}_K D_T^2\nu_j. \quad (\text{B.31})$$

From (B.21), we know that $h_L^{-1}T^{-2}D_T^2\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,L}D_T^2\widehat{P}_K \xrightarrow{d} c_L \mathfrak{D}_L$, where \mathfrak{D}_L is given in (B.22). From (B.14)–(B.16) and the fact that $h_R T^{-1} \rightarrow 0$, we deduce that

$$\frac{h_R^2}{T} D_T^2 \widehat{P}_K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R} \widehat{P}_K D_T^2 \xrightarrow{P} -k''(0) \mathfrak{D}_R, \quad (\text{B.32})$$

where \mathfrak{D}_R is given in (B.23). We thus find that $-Th_L h_R^2 c_L \mu_j / k''(0)$ converges to well-defined nonzero random eigenvalues for $j = s_N + 1, \dots, K$ (jointly), while it converges to zero for $j \leq s_N$. From this result combined with Theorem 3.2, the desired consistency result follows.

We next consider the case where $\{\mu_j\}_{j=1}^{s_{\max}+1}$ are the eigenvalues of the VR(1,0) problem. As in our proof of Theorem 3.1, we only consider the case $a_L > 0$ and rewrite the VR(1,0)

eigenvalue problem as

$$T^{-1}D_{h_L T}\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,L}\widehat{P}_K D_{h_L T}\nu_j = (h_R^2\mu_j)^{-1}T^{-1}h_R^2D_{h_L T}\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R}\widehat{P}_K D_{h_L T}\nu_j. \quad (\text{B.33})$$

Let $\Lambda_{S,L}$ be defined as in (3.2) but with a_R replaced by a_L . From similar arguments used to obtain (B.13) and the facts that $h_L^{-1/2}h_R T^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$ and $T^{-1}\widehat{P}_S^K\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,L}(\widehat{P}_S^K)^* \xrightarrow{P} P_K\Lambda_{S,L}P_K$, see (B.9), we find that

$$T^{-1}D_{h_L T}\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,L}\widehat{P}_K D_{h_L T} \xrightarrow{d} \begin{pmatrix} c_L\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2}(\int \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{1,s_N})\Lambda_{\Delta X}^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & P_K\Lambda_{S,L}P_K \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.34})$$

From (B.14)–(B.16) and the fact that $h_L^{-1/2}h_R T^{-1/2} \rightarrow 0$, we find, as in (B.32), that

$$T^{-1}h_R^2D_{h_L T}\widehat{P}_K\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,R}\widehat{P}_K D_{h_L T} \xrightarrow{P} -k''(0)\mathfrak{D}_R, \quad (\text{B.35})$$

where \mathfrak{D}_R is given in (B.23). From (B.33)–(B.35), the conclusions follow by the same arguments as for the VR(2,0) problem.

B.7 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Consider first the hypotheses in (5.1). Under H_0 , the dimension of the nonstationary subspace of the residual time series $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}$ is $s_N - p_0$, while it is greater than $s_N - p_0$ under H_1 . We thus know from Corollary 3.3 that under H_0 the statistics $\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_N-p_0}^K)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=s_N-p_0}^K)$ converge to the maximum eigenvalue and trace, respectively, of \mathcal{A} with $s_0 = s_N - p_0$, where \mathcal{A} is defined in Corollary 3.3. On the other hand, also by Corollary 3.3, the statistics both diverge to infinity under H_1 .

Next, consider the hypotheses in (5.2). Under H_0 , the residual time series $\{(I - P_{\mathcal{H}_0})X_t\}$ is stationary, while it is nonstationary under H_1 . In this case, we know from Corollary 3.3 that under H_0 the statistics $\mathcal{F}_{\max}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=1}^K)$ and $\mathcal{F}_{\text{trace}}(\{\tilde{\mu}_j^{-1}\}_{j=1}^K)$ converge to the maximum eigenvalue and trace, respectively, of $\int B_K B_K'$, while they diverge to infinity under H_1 .

The arguments for the hypotheses in (5.3) are similar and omitted for brevity.

C Auxiliary lemma

Lemma C.1. *Under Assumptions 1–3, the following hold:*

- (i) $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,m}P_N = \mathcal{O}_P(h_m T^4)$, $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,m}P_N = \mathcal{O}_P(h_m T^2)$, and $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m}P_N = \mathcal{O}_P(T)$.
 - (ii) $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(h_m T^3)$, $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(h_m T)$, and $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(T/h_m)$
 - (iii) $P_S^K\widehat{\Lambda}_{2,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(h_m T^2)$, $P_S^K\widehat{\Lambda}_{1,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(T)$, and $P_S^K\widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m}P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(T/h_m^2)$.
- Finally, of course, $P_S^K\widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m}P_N$ is the same order as $P_N\widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m}P_S^K$ for $d = 0, 1, 2$.

Proof. We first prove part (i). For any $v_1, v_2 \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m} P_{\mathbb{N}} v_1, v_2 \rangle &= \sum_{t=1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_2 \rangle \\ &\quad + \sum_{s=1}^{h_m} k_m \left(\frac{s}{h_m} \right) \sum_{t=s+1}^T (\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t-s}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_2 \rangle + \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t-s}, v_2 \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

As in our proof of Theorem 3.4, we will use that $|k_m(\cdot)| \leq 1$ and $k_m(s/h_m) = 0$ if $|s| > h_m$. For $d = 1, 2$ we thus find that $h_m^{-1} T^{-2d} |\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m} P_{\mathbb{N}} v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ is bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{h_m T^{2d}} \sum_{s=0}^{h_m} \left| \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t-s}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_2 \rangle + \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t-s}, v_2 \rangle \right|. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Because $\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{1,t}, v_j \rangle / T^{1/2}$, viewed as a partial sum process, converges weakly to Brownian motion, the continuous mapping theorem implies that (C.1) is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, and the results for $d = 1, 2$ follow directly. Finally, $P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_{\mathbb{N}}$ is the sample long-run covariance of $P_{\mathbb{N}} \Delta X_t$, and $P_{\mathbb{N}} \Delta X_t$ is L^4 - q -approximable with $q \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \|\Phi_j\|_{\text{op}} = o(1)$, so we find from Horváth et al. (2013, Theorem 2) that $T^{-1} P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_{\mathbb{N}} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$, which proves the result for $d = 0$.

Next, we prove part (ii). By similar arguments used to obtain (C.1), we observe that $|\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{d,m} P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{s=0}^{h_m} \left| \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{d,t}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t-s}, v_2 \rangle + \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{d,t-s}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{d,t}, v_2 \rangle \right|. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Setting $d = 2$ in (C.2) and multiplying by $h_m^{-1} T^{-3}$, this is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ for the same reasons as in (C.1) together with the fact that the partial sum process $\langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t}, v_1 \rangle / T^{1/2}$ converges weakly to Brownian motion. This proves part (ii) for $d = 2$. For $d = 1$, we note from (2.3) that $\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{1,t-s}, v_j \rangle$ is nonstationary with stationary first difference $\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} X_{0,t-s}, v_j \rangle$, while $\langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{1,t}, v_1 \rangle$ is stationary. It can then be shown, as in standard results (e.g., Phillips, 1987), that the summations over t in (C.2), multiplied by T^{-1} , converge weakly to stochastic integrals, uniformly in s . This proves the result for $d = 1$. Finally, under our assumptions, we deduce from Lemma 8.1(b) of Phillips (1995) that both $T^{-1} |\langle P_{\mathbb{N}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ and $T^{-1} |\langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_{\mathbb{N}} v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ are $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(h_m^{-2}) + \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}((Th_m)^{-1/2})$, and the desired result for $d = 0$ follows straightforwardly.

Lastly, we prove part (iii). As in (C.1), $h_m^{-1} T^{-2} |\langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{2,m} P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ is bounded from above by

$$\frac{1}{h_m T^2} \sum_{s=0}^{h_m} \left| \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t-s}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t}, v_2 \rangle + \sum_{t=s+1}^T \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t}, v_1 \rangle \langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t-s}, v_2 \rangle \right|. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

This is $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ by the continuous mapping theorem because $\langle P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{2,t}, v_j \rangle / T^{1/2}$, viewed as a partial sum process, converges weakly to Brownian motion. Next, $T^{-1} P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} \widehat{\Lambda}_{1,m} P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}}$ converges to the long-run covariance of $\{P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ since $\{P_{\mathbb{S}}^{\text{K}} X_{1,t}\}_{t \geq 1}$ is L^4 - q -approximable and

Table 7: Incorrect determination frequency of Johansen’s trace test applied to $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$

T	$K = 2$	$K = 3$	$K = 4$
250	0.2860	0.2136	0.0622
500	0.2851	0.2170	0.0637

Notes: Based on 10,000 Monte Carlo replications with significance level 5%. The results for $K = 4$ are numerically identical to those for Johansen’s trace test applied directly to $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$.

$q \sum_{j=q+1}^{\infty} \|\tilde{\Phi}_j\|_{\text{op}} = o(1)$ under our assumptions (Horváth et al., 2013, Theorem 2). Finally, we deduce from Lemma 8.1(a) of Phillips (1995) that $h_m^2 T^{-1} |\langle P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_S^K v_1, v_2 \rangle|$ is convergent, so that $P_S^K \widehat{\Lambda}_{0,m} P_S^K = \mathcal{O}_P(T/h_m^2)$. \square

D Johansen’s test augmented with a slack extractor

We simulate the time series $\{X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ taking values in \mathbb{R}^4 and generated as

$$\begin{aligned} P_N X_t &= P_N X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_{1,t}, \\ P_S X_t &= \Phi_1 P_S X_{t-1} + \Phi_2 P_S X_{t-2} + \varepsilon_{2,t}, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_N X_0 = 0$, $\varepsilon_{1,t} \sim N(0, I_2)$, $\varepsilon_{2,t} | \varepsilon_{1,t} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 1.5 \end{pmatrix} \varepsilon_{1,t} + u_t$, $u_t \sim N(0, I_2)$, and

$$\Phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.4 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.1 & 0.1 \\ 0.1 & 0.1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, $\Delta X_t = \Psi X_{t-1} + \Psi_1 \Delta X_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$ holds for some $\Psi, \Psi_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, and from this representation one may apply Johansen’s (1991) trace test to identify the number of stochastic trends.

Instead, we obtain the projected time series $\{\widehat{P}_K X_t\}_{t \geq 1}$ for $K \geq 2$, where \widehat{P}_K is a consistent estimator of the slack extractor obtained as in Section 3.4. We then apply Johansen’s trace test to the resulting K -dimensional time series. The results are reported in Table 7 and show that Johansen’s trace test is not ADI in this simple setting.

References

- Ahn, S. K. (1997). Inference of vector autoregressive models with cointegration and scalar components. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 92, 350–356.
- Ahn, S. K. and G. C. Reinsel (1990). Estimation for partially nonstationary multivariate autoregressive models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 85, 813–823.
- Andrews, D. W. K. (1991). Heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix estimation. *Econometrica* 59, 817–858.
- Barigozzi, M. and L. Trapani (2022). Testing for common trends in nonstationary large datasets. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 40, 1107–1122.

- Beare, B. K., J. Seo, and W.-K. Seo (2017). Cointegrated linear processes in Hilbert space. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 38, 1010–1027.
- Beare, B. K. and W.-K. Seo (2020). Representation of I(1) and I(2) autoregressive Hilbertian processes. *Econometric Theory* 36, 773–802.
- Berkes, I., L. Horváth, and G. Rice (2013). Weak invariance principles for sums of dependent random functions. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 123, 385–403.
- Berkes, I., L. Horváth, and G. Rice (2016). On the asymptotic normality of kernel estimators of the long run covariance of functional time series. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 144, 150–175.
- Bewley, R. and M. Yang (1995). Tests for cointegration based on canonical correlation analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 90, 990–996.
- Bewley, R. and M. Yang (1998). On the size and power of system tests for cointegration. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 80, 675–679.
- Bosq, D. (2000). *Linear Processes in Function Spaces*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Breitung, J. (2002). Nonparametric tests for unit roots and cointegration. *Journal of Econometrics* 108, 343–363.
- Bykhovskaya, A. and V. Gorin (2022). Cointegration in large VARs. *Annals of Statistics* 50, 1593–1617.
- Bykhovskaya, A. and V. Gorin (2023). Asymptotics of cointegration tests for high-dimensional VAR(k). *Review of Economics and Statistics*, forthcoming.
- Chang, J., G. Cheng, and Q. Yao (2021). Testing for unit roots based on sample autocovariances. *Biometrika* 109, 543–550.
- Chang, Y., C. S. Kim, and J. Y. Park (2016). Nonstationarity in time series of state densities. *Journal of Econometrics* 192, 152–167.
- Diebold, F. X. and C. Li (2006). Forecasting the term structure of government bond yields. *Journal of Econometrics* 130, 337–364.
- Franchi, M., I. Georgiev, and P. Paruolo (2023). Estimating the number of common trends in large T and N factor models via canonical correlations analysis. *Econometrics and Statistics*, forthcoming.
- Franchi, M. and P. Paruolo (2020). Cointegration in functional autoregressive processes. *Econometric Theory* 36, 803–839.
- Haug, A. A. (1996). Tests for cointegration: a Monte Carlo comparison. *Journal of Econometrics* 71, 89–115.
- Hörmann, S. and P. Kokoszka (2010). Weakly dependent functional data. *Annals of Statistics* 38, 1845–1884.
- Horváth, L., P. Kokoszka, and R. Reeder (2013). Estimation of the mean of functional time

- series and a two-sample problem. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society B* 75, 103–122.
- Horváth, L., P. Kokoszka, and G. Rice (2014). Testing stationarity of functional time series. *Journal of Econometrics* 179, 66–82.
- Johansen, S. (1991). Estimation and hypothesis testing of cointegration vectors in Gaussian vector autoregressive models. *Econometrica* 59, 1551–1580.
- Kokoszka, P. and G. Young (2016). KPSS test for functional time series. *Statistics* 50, 957–973.
- Kwiatkowski, D., P. C. B. Phillips, P. Schmidt, and Y. Shin (1992). Testing the null hypothesis of stationarity against the alternative of a unit root. *Journal of Econometrics* 54, 159–178.
- Li, D., P. M. Robinson, and H. L. Shang (2020). Long-range dependent curve time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 115, 957–971.
- Li, D., P. M. Robinson, and H. L. Shang (2023). Nonstationary fractionally integrated functional time series. *Bernoulli* 29, 1505–1526. Earlier working paper version available at <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/340503853>.
- Martínez-Hernández, I., J. Gonzalo, and G. González-Farías (2022). Nonparametric estimation of functional dynamic factor model. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics* 34, 895–916.
- McCracken, M. W. and S. Ng (2016). FRED-MD: a monthly database for macroeconomic research. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 34, 574–589.
- Müller, U. K. (2007). A theory of robust long-run variance estimation. *Journal of Econometrics* 141, 1331–1352.
- Müller, U. K. (2008). The impossibility of consistent discrimination between $I(0)$ and $I(1)$ processes. *Econometric Theory* 24, 616–630.
- Nelson, C. R. and A. F. Siegel (1987). Parsimonious modeling of yield curves. *Journal of Business* 60, 473–489.
- Nielsen, M. Ø., W.-K. Seo, and D. Seong (2023). Inference on the dimension of the nonstationary subspace in functional time series. *Econometric Theory* 39, 443–480.
- Nyblom, J. and A. Harvey (2000). Tests of common stochastic trends. *Econometric theory* 16, 176–199.
- Onatski, A. and C. Wang (2018). Alternative asymptotics for cointegration tests in large VARs. *Econometrica* 86, 1465–1478.
- Peña, D. and P. Poncela (2004). Forecasting with nonstationary dynamic factor models. *Journal of Econometrics* 119, 291–321.
- Peña, D. and P. Poncela (2006). Nonstationary dynamic factor analysis. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 136, 1237–1257.
- Phillips, P. C. B. (1987). Weak convergence of sample covariance matrices to stochastic

- integrals via martingale approximations. *Econometric Theory* 4, 528–533.
- Phillips, P. C. B. (1991). Spectral regression for cointegrated time series. In W. A. Barnett, J. Powell, and G. E. Tauchen (Eds.), *Nonparametric and Semiparametric Methods in Econometrics and Statistics: Proceedings of the Fifth International Symposium in Economic Theory and Econometrics*, pp. 413–435. Cambridge University Press.
- Phillips, P. C. B. (1995). Fully modified least squares and vector autoregression. *Econometrica* 63, 1023–1023.
- Phillips, P. C. B. and V. Solo (1992). Asymptotics for linear processes. *Annals of Statistics* 20, 971–1001.
- Rice, G. and H. L. Shang (2017). A plug-in bandwidth selection procedure for long-run covariance estimation with stationary functional time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 38, 591–609.
- Seo, W.-K. (2023). Cointegration and representation of cointegrated autoregressive processes in Banach spaces. *Econometric Theory* 39, 737–788.
- Seo, W.-K. (2024). Functional principal component analysis for cointegrated functional time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis* 45, 320–330.
- Shintani, M. (2001). A simple cointegrating rank test without vector autoregression. *Journal of Econometrics* 105, 337–362.
- Stock, J. H. and M. W. Watson (1988). Testing for common trends. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 83, 1097–1107.
- Toda, H. Y. (1995). Finite sample performance of likelihood ratio tests for cointegrating ranks in vector autoregressions. *Econometric Theory* 11, 1015–1032.
- Zhang, R. and N. H. Chan (2018). Portmanteau-type tests for unit-root and cointegration. *Journal of Econometrics* 207, 307–324.
- Zhang, R., P. Robinson, and Q. Yao (2019). Identifying cointegration by eigenanalysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 114, 916–927.