

Semiparametric Inference for Regression-Discontinuity Designs

Rong J.B. Zhu and Weiwei Jiang

Institute of Science and Technology for Brain-inspired Intelligence

Fudan University, Shanghai, China

E-mail: rongzhu@fudan.edu.cn

March 12, 2024

Abstract

Treatment effects in regression discontinuity designs (RDDs) are often estimated using local regression methods. However, global approximation methods are generally deemed inefficient. In this paper, we propose a semiparametric framework tailored for estimating treatment effects in RDDs. Our global approach conceptualizes the identification of treatment effects within RDDs as a partially linear modeling problem, with the linear component capturing the treatment effect. Furthermore, we utilize the P -spline method to approximate the nonparametric function and develop procedures for inferring treatment effects within this framework. We demonstrate through Monte Carlo simulations that the proposed method performs well across various scenarios. Furthermore, we illustrate using real-world datasets that our global approach may result in more reliable inference.

Keywords: Causal inference; Regression discontinuity design; Partially linear model; P -spline.

JEL Classification: C13, C21, C23.

1 Introduction

The regression discontinuity design (RDD) was initially introduced by Thistlewaite and Campbell (1960) to examine the influence of merit awards on students' future academic outcomes. Since then, it has evolved into one of the most reputable strategies for estimating treatment effects across disciplines, such as economics, political science, and medicine. In an RDD, units receive scores, and treatment allocation is determined by whether the score exceeds a predetermined cutoff value: units scoring above the cutoff are designated to the treatment condition, while those scoring below are assigned to the control condition. This treatment assignment rule creates a discontinuity in the probability of receiving treatment, allowing researchers to learn about the treatment effect by comparing units barely above and barely below the cutoff. For comprehensive reviews of the RDD literature, refer to Imbens and Lemieux (2008) and Cattaneo et al. (2019).

The local linear or quadratic approximation (Fan, 1992; Fan and Gijbels, 1996) is a commonly employed approach in RDDs (Hahn et al., 2001). Specifically, researchers typically estimate the treatment effect locally around the cutoff point, which depends on the chosen bandwidth. Studies have investigated optimal bandwidth selection for local linear and quadratic regression specifications (Calonico et al., 2014, 2015; Imbens and Kalyanaraman, 2012). Another approach that researchers have explored is the utilization of a global polynomial regression approach (Lee and Lemieux, 2010). In practice, researchers often employ high order (up to fifth or sixth-order) polynomials, choosing the degree of the polynomial using statistical information criteria or cross-validation. However, Gelman and Imbens (2019) have argued against the use of high-order global polynomial approximations, advocating instead for inference based on local low-order polynomials, such as local linear or local quadratic models.

In this article, we delve into a semiparametric inference framework for RDDs, proposing

a global estimation method, which could serve as an alternative to local estimation methods. Our primary focus is on identifying the treatment effect within the framework of a partially linear model. This entails capturing the treatment effect through the coefficient of the treatment assignment variable in the linear component of the partially linear model. By employing P -spline to approximate the nonparameteric part, we reformulate the semiparametric RDD framework into a linear mixed model regression. Subsequently, we derive the estimate of the treatment effect within the linear mixed model regression framework. Theoretically, we establish the asymptotic normality of the estimate under regular conditions, providing an inference procedure based on this normality. Empirically, our experiments on simulated datasets support the assertion that our global estimation provides a viable alternative to local estimation methods. Furthermore, our examination of real-world datasets demonstrates that our global estimation approach may yield more reliable inferences.

The rest of the article proceeds as follows. Section 2 proposes a semiparametric framework that incorporates the partially linear model to estimate treatment effects. Section 3 discusses estimation and inference procedures. Section 4 presents the empirical analysis. Section 5 showcases the performance on real datasets. Concluding remarks are provided in Section 6. Proofs are dispersed between the main text and the appendix.

2 A Semiparametric framework for regression-discontinuity designs

2.1 Setup and assumptions

Employing the potential outcome approach, let $(Y_i(0), Y_i(1))$ denote the pair of potential outcomes for individual $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $w_i \in \{0, 1\}$ representing the treatment received.

There are n_1 units that receive the treatment, while the remaining $n_0 = n - n_1$ units serve as controls. Each individual i is assigned only one treatment, denoted by w_i , resulting in the observation of a single realized outcome, $y_i = Y_i(w_i)$.

We study the RDDs, particularly the sharp case, where the treatment is a monotone, deterministic function of a pretreatment variable (forcing variable) x_i being on either side of a fixed and known threshold x_0 , i.e., $w_i = \mathbb{I}\{x_i \geq x_0\}$. Denote the conditional expectations of the potential outcomes as

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1(x) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(1)|x_i = x], \\ \mu_0(x) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i(0)|x_i = x].\end{aligned}$$

The average effect at the threshold x_0 is defined as

$$\tau_{x_0} = \mu_1(x_0) - \mu_0(x_0).$$

We impose the following assumptions:

Assumption 1. *Assume that the potential outcomes are modeled as*

$$\begin{aligned}Y_i(1) &= \mu_1(x_i) + \epsilon_i(1), \\ Y_i(0) &= \mu_0(x_i) + \epsilon_i(0).\end{aligned}$$

Assumption 2. *Assume that the mean functions $\mu_1(x)$ and $\mu_0(x)$ are continuous.*

Assumption 3. *Assume that the model errors $(\epsilon_i(1), \epsilon_i(0))_{i=1}^n$ satisfy the following properties: $\{(\epsilon_1(0), \epsilon_1(1))^\top, \dots, (\epsilon_n(0), \epsilon_n(1))^\top\}$ is an independent and identically distributed sequence with $(\epsilon_i(0), \epsilon_i(1))^\top \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_2)$.*

Assumptions 1 & 2 are standard in RDDs (Imbens and Lemieux, 2008). In Assumption 3, for convenience, we assume homoscedasticity in $\epsilon_i(1)$ and $\epsilon_i(0)$. Nevertheless, this assumption can be extended to accommodate heteroscedasticity in these errors, thereby allowing for two different variances.

2.2 Semiparametric RDD framework

Now, we introduce a semiparametric framework for estimating the average effect of the treatment. Denote $\epsilon_i = \epsilon_i(1)w_i + \epsilon_i(0)(1 - w_i)$, and define

$$g(x_i) = \mu_0(x_i)\mathbb{I}\{x_i < x_0\} + (\mu_1(x_i) - \tau_{x_0})\mathbb{I}\{x_i \geq x_0\}. \quad (1)$$

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. We have that the observations are generated from the following model:*

$$y_i = \tau_{x_0}w_i + g(x_i) + \epsilon_i. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, $g(x)$ is continuous at x_0 , and $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are independent with $\text{Var}(\epsilon_i) = \sigma^2$.

Proof. Model (2) is a direct result from Assumption 1 and the definition of $g(x_i)$ in (1).

From the definition of $g(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_0) &= \mu_1(x_0) - \tau_{x_0} = \mu_0(x_0) \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^+} g(x) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^+} \mu_1(x) - \tau_{x_0} = \mu_0(x_0) \\ \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^-} g(x) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^-} \mu_0(x) = \mu_0(x_0), \end{aligned}$$

where the last steps in the last two equations above are from Assumption 2. The three equations above imply that $g(x)$ is continuous at x_0 .

From Assumption 3, we have that $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are independent, and

$$\text{Var}(\epsilon_i) = \text{Var}[\epsilon_i(1)w_i + \epsilon_i(0)(1 - w_i)] = \sigma^2.$$

Therefore, Theorem 1 is proved. □

Theorem 1 establishes the identifiability of the treatment effect for RDDs using the partially linear model (2), wherein inference on the treatment effect can be construed as inference on the coefficient of w_i .

3 Semiparametric inference

3.1 P -spline approach on modeling $g(x)$

We approximate $g(x)$ using P -splines with the following function:

$$g_m(x) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x + \cdots + \beta_p x^p + \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k (x - \kappa_k)_+^p, \quad (3)$$

where p (taking values of 1 or 2) represents the degree of the spline, $(x)_+^p = x^p \mathbb{I}\{x \geq 0\}$, and $\kappa_1 < \cdots < \kappa_K$ is a set of knots over the range of x . Given the knots $\boldsymbol{\kappa} = (\kappa_1, \cdots, \kappa_K)^\top$ and p , Model (3) use the truncated polynomial spline basis $\{1, x, \cdots, x^p, (x - \kappa_1)_+^p, \cdots, (x - \kappa_K)_+^p\}$ to approximate the function $g(x)$. Denote $\mathbf{x} = (1, x, \cdots, x^p)^\top$, $\mathbf{z} = ((x - \kappa_1)_+^p, \cdots, (x - \kappa_K)_+^p)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \cdots, \beta_p)^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \cdots, \gamma_K)^\top$. Model (3) is rewritten as

$$g_m(x) = \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{z}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}. \quad (4)$$

Provided that the knots are sufficiently spread out and the number of knots K is sufficiently large, the approximation above is of a high level of accuracy. The model may encounter overfitting issues due to potential over-parameterization. To mitigate this issue, a penalty is imposed on the magnitude of the spline parameters $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, treating $\gamma_k \sim N(0, \sigma_\gamma^2)$ as a random effect with variance σ_γ^2 (Ruppert et al., 2003). Empirical studies by Ruppert (2002) suggested that the approximation bias using the P -spline approach is negligible in univariate nonparametric regression cases. Theoretical analysis by Claeskens et al. (2009) demonstrated that the bias is $O(n^{-(p+1)/(2p+1)})$ assuming $\lambda = O(1)$ and $K = O(n^{1/(2p+3)})$, which is negligible.

Ruppert et al. (2003) provided recommendations on knot selection. The knots are frequently placed at equally spaced quantiles of the distribution of x , with K chosen to be large relative to the size of the dataset. For univariate x , a typical knot choice is to have one knot every four or five observations, with a maximum number ranging from 35 to 50.

The family $\{g_m(x)\}$ includes functions with discontinuous derivatives or discontinuities themselves. Such occurrences naturally arise in splines when a knot is placed at the discontinuity location. Consequently, our proposed method can effectively handle functions g with isolated discontinuities or discontinuous derivatives.

3.2 Reformulation to linear mixed model

As the P -spline approach can be viewed as random-effects models (Ruppert, 2002), it is natural to reformulate the semiparametric RDD framework to linear mixed model regression. Define $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$. We treat the data as if they came from the regression model

$$\mathbf{y} = \tau_{x_0} \mathbf{w} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\gamma} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\gamma^2 \mathbf{I}_K)$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$.

Denoting $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\tau_{x_0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top)^\top$, we estimate the coefficients $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ using generalized least squares. In the model, the covariance matrix of \mathbf{y} is given by

$$\mathbf{V} = \sigma_\gamma^2 \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top + \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n.$$

We have $\mathbf{V}^{-1} = \sigma^{-2} \mathbf{Q}_z$, where

$$\mathbf{Q}_z = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} + \sigma^2 \sigma_\gamma^{-2} \mathbf{I}_K)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top.$$

Denote $\mathbf{U} = (\mathbf{w}, \mathbf{X})$. Assuming known variances σ_γ^2 and σ^2 , we estimate $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ using the generalized least squares estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} &= (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U})^{-1} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{U})^{-1} (\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{y}) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The estimates of σ_γ^2 and σ^2 can be obtained using maximum likelihood or restricted maximum likelihood (Patterson and Thompson, 1971), which are implemented by the “nlme” (Pinheiro et al., 2023) or “lme4” (Bates et al., 2015) packages in R. Once consistent estimators $\hat{\sigma}_\gamma^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ for σ_γ^2 and σ^2 are obtained, they can be inserted into (6) to obtain the feasible GLS estimator.

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{y} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{y} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z = \mathbf{I} - \mathbf{Z}(\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} + \hat{\sigma}^2 \hat{\sigma}_\gamma^{-2} \mathbf{I}_K)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top$.

3.3 Inference

Utilizing standard results on asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood estimates (MLE) in mixed effects models, we present the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}$ in the following theorem.

Denote $\rho_1 = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n_1/n$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z}_i$, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_i^\top$. We impose the following assumption for the theorem.

Assumption 4. (a) $K \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(b) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K/n = 0$.

(c) $r = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{rank}(\mathbf{Z})/K > 0$.

(d) ρ_1 satisfies the following inequalities and $\rho_1 > 0$ and $\rho_1 < 1/(1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z)$.

Parts (a) & (b) in Assumption 4 impose constraints on the number of knots K . These conditions require that the number of knots approaches infinity as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and that the number of knots is of a smaller order than n (i.e., $o(n)$). Part (c) permits the rank of the design matrix of \mathbf{Z} to be smaller than K but of the same order.

Part (d) imposes the conditions on the ratio of treated units. Specifically, $\rho_1 > 0$ requires the presence of treated units in the vicinity of the threshold. Now, our attention shifts to the condition $\rho_1 < 1/(1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z)$. Denoting \mathbf{V}_z as the variance of \mathbf{z}_i , we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z = \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top (\boldsymbol{\mu}_z \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top + \mathbf{V}_z)^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z = \frac{\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z}{1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z}.$$

This leads to the expression for the condition:

$$\rho_1 < (1 + \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z) / (1 + 2\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z).$$

As $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z \rightarrow 0$, the requirement simplifies to $\rho_1 < 1$. Conversely, as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z \rightarrow \infty$, the requirement becomes $\rho_1 < 1/2$. This indicates that as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$ decreases, the requirement on the ratio of treated units becomes less strict. The term $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$ quantifies the dispersion of the data \mathbf{z}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, within the space defined by the inverse of the variance-covariance matrix \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} . A larger value of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \mathbf{V}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z$ indicates that the data points tend to cluster closer to the mean vector, suggesting less dispersion or variability in the data.

Theorem 2. Define $(p + 2) \times (p + 2)$ matrix \mathbf{J} given by

$$\mathbf{J} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U} / n.$$

Under the model (5), assuming that Assumption 4 holds, we have that

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \boldsymbol{\theta}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{J}^{-1}), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (8)$$

Proof. The result in (8) from an application of Miller (1977). See details in Appendix A. \square

Theorem 2 is proven in the case where the unknown variance components are substituted by the MLE estimates. However, in the scenario where the unknown variance components are estimated using restricted maximum likelihood estimation, asymptotic normality still holds, as demonstrated by Jiang (1998). Nonetheless, further elaboration is required for a complete derivation, applying the result outlined in Jiang (1998).

The primary outcome of Theorem 2 is to offer inference on τ_{x_0} . Noting $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = (\hat{\tau}_{x_0}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^\top)^\top$, the asymptotic variance of $\hat{\tau}_{x_0}$ is obtained from $(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U})^{-1}$ using the block-wise inversion formula. Applying the block-wise inversion formula to $(\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U})^{-1}$ implies that its (1, 1)-th element is given by

$$V_\tau = (\mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Q}_z \mathbf{w})^{-1}.$$

Therefore, Theorem 2 implies:

$$V_\tau^{-1/2}(\hat{\tau}_{x_0} - \tau_{x_0}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (9)$$

The variance V_τ is estimated as

$$\hat{V}_\tau = (\mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{w} - \mathbf{w}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\mathbf{Q}}_z \mathbf{w})^{-1}.$$

Hence, an asymptotic point-wise $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence interval for τ_{x_0} is given by

$$\left(\hat{\tau}_{x_0} - z_{\alpha/2} \hat{V}_\tau^{1/2}, \hat{\tau}_{x_0} + z_{\alpha/2} \hat{V}_\tau^{1/2} \right), \quad (10)$$

where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the upper $\alpha/2$ -quantile from a standard Gaussian distribution.

4 Numerical experiments

In this section, we conduct Monte Carlo simulations to examine the finite sample performance of our proposed method. We carry out 5000 replications, generating a random sample $\{(x_i, \epsilon_i)^\top : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ with a sample size of $n = 50$ or 200 for each replication. The covariate $x_i = 2z_i - 1$, where z_i follows a beta distribution of $\text{beta}(3, 3)$, and the error term ϵ_i follows a normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with $\sigma = 0.2$.

In our method's implementation, we set the number of knots $K = 20$. We also explore the automatic way of choosing K as proposed by Ruppert et al. (2003), yielding similar

results. Once K is determined, the knots are placed at fixed quantiles of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. We consider two values for $p = 1, 2$, denoted as “PL₁” and “PL₂”, respectively.

We consider three regression functions labeled M1, M2, and M3, respectively:

$$\text{M1: } \mu(x) = x \text{ for } x < 0; \quad \mu(x) = \tau + x \text{ for } x \geq 0$$

$$\text{M2: } \mu(x) = 1 - \exp(-x) \text{ for } x < 0; \quad \mu(x) = \exp(x) - 1 \text{ for } x \geq 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{M3: } \mu(x) &= 0.48 + 1.27x + 7.18x^2 + 20.21x^3 + 21.54x^4 + 7.33x^5 \text{ for } x < 0; \\ \mu(x) &= \tau + 0.48 + 0.84x - 3x^2 + 7.99x^3 - 9.01x^4 + 3.56x^5 \text{ for } x \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

In M1, there exists a consistent linear trend between $\mu_0(x)$ and $\mu_1(x)$. In M2, both $\mu_0(x)$ and $\mu_1(x)$ exhibit nonlinearity. M3 is from Lee (2008). The outcomes are generated as $y_i = \mu(x_i) + \epsilon_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, for each model. We compare our approach to the local linear RD estimator ($p = 1$), denoted as “IK₁” (Imbens and Kalyanaraman, 2012). Additionally, we implemented local quadratic RD estimator ($p = 2$), but observed that it performed worse than the local linear estimator. Consequently, we opted not to report the performance of the local quadratic RD estimator.

Table 1 presents simulation results under $\tau = 0$, featuring metrics such as root-mean-square error (“RMSE”), bias (“Bias”), empirical coverage rate of the 95% CI (“EC”), and the average empirical interval length (“IL”). The results demonstrate a reduction of 10% in RMSE for M1 and M3 with PL₁ compared to IK₁, alongside no noticeable increases in bias. Moreover, there are shorter ILs, with EC approaching 95%. Empirically, the bias resulting from the P -spline approximation is found to be negligible, as discussed in Section 3.1. In the case of M2, PL₂ outperforms IK₁, while PL₁ performs worse. This suggests that employing $p = 2$ for nonlinear functions may enhance the effectiveness of the PL method. Additionally, a comparison of the performance under $n = 50$ and $n = 200$ reveals consistent performance across sample sizes, indicating its suitability for various applications.

Table 1: The performance of the PL method under various model settings. “RMSE”: root mean square error, “Bias”: bias values, “EC”: empirical coverage rate, and “IL”: average confidence interval Length.

n		M1				M2				M3			
		RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL
50	IK ₁	0.127	0.005	0.947	0.465	0.146	-0.043	0.894	0.488	0.135	0.037	0.926	0.472
	PL ₁	0.111	0.003	0.945	0.425	0.155	-0.087	0.833	0.448	0.116	0.033	0.943	0.427
	PL ₂	0.120	0.005	0.942	0.447	0.144	-0.050	0.882	0.472	0.126	0.036	0.937	0.449
200	IK ₁	0.059	-0.001	0.937	0.216	0.083	-0.036	0.848	0.251	0.066	0.027	0.913	0.218
	PL ₁	0.053	-0.001	0.950	0.204	0.102	-0.060	0.700	0.254	0.061	0.029	0.908	0.207
	PL ₂	0.057	-0.001	0.945	0.211	0.080	-0.033	0.870	0.254	0.065	0.029	0.910	0.213




Figure 1: An example model (M2) in the simulation setting: the fitted functions.

The performance on inference. Apart from the estimation performance, we also investigate the inference performance. Table 2 presents the type-I and type-II errors for each method. According to the table, PL₁ exhibits a type-I error of 0.05, surpassing IK₁ in M1 and showing a slightly higher type-I error than IK₁ in M3. In the case of M2, PL₂ outperforms IK₁, while PL₁ performs worse. For $\tau = 0.1$, PL₁ and PL₂ have lower type-II

error than IK_1 in M1 and M3, with PL_2 also showcasing lower type-II error than IK_1 in M2. As τ increases to 0.3, the PL method displays slightly higher type-II error, though the difference is marginal. In conclusion, our approach offers a viable alternative to the local estimator, delivering comparable performance in inference,

Table 2: Performance on Testing

	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3	M1	M2	M3
	Type-I error($\tau = 0$)			Type-II error($\tau = 0.1$)			Type-II error($\tau = 0.3$)		
IK_1	0.063	0.152	0.087	0.545	0.820	0.379	0.001	0.015	0.000
PL_1	0.050	0.300	0.092	0.536	0.872	0.316	0.003	0.038	0.002
PL_2	0.055	0.130	0.090	0.537	0.810	0.344	0.002	0.016	0.001

Impact of the distribution of x_i . We investigate the performance of the PL method under varying distributions of x_i . We generate $x_i = 2z_i - 1$ with $z_i \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$, considering two cases: $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (4, 4)$. It is notable that there are more data points around the cut-off point in the case of $(\alpha, \beta) = (4, 4)$ compared to $(\alpha, \beta) = (0.5, 0.5)$. Table 3 demonstrates the robustness of the PL method across different distributions.

Impact of the noise. Next, we explore different values of σ , specifically $\sigma = 0.1, 0.8$, and report the results in Table 4. Our method exhibits robust performance under both settings, indicating its resilience across different levels of noise variance.

5 Real data

We illustrate our method here using two applications of RDDs. The first dataset is sourced from U.S. House elections (Lee, 2008), while the other dataset pertains to a study on party-level advantage in U.S. Senate elections spanning from 1914 to 2010 (Cattaneo et al., 2015).

Table 3: The performance of the PL method under various distributions of x_i .

(α, β)		M1				M2				M3			
		RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL
(0.5, 0.5)	IK ₁	0.077	0.003	0.925	0.272	0.134	-0.069	0.832	0.375	0.092	0.017	0.935	0.356
	PL ₁	0.070	0.003	0.944	0.265	0.136	-0.071	0.868	0.417	0.110	0.039	0.943	0.438
	PL ₂	0.079	0.002	0.929	0.281	0.112	-0.044	0.912	0.388	0.109	0.011	0.943	0.418
(4, 4)	IK ₁	0.058	-0.003	0.943	0.213	0.075	-0.034	0.870	0.239	0.068	0.033	0.898	0.215
	PL ₁	0.052	-0.003	0.947	0.202	0.095	-0.061	0.689	0.231	0.059	0.027	0.918	0.204
	PL ₂	0.055	-0.003	0.945	0.207	0.076	-0.035	0.847	0.239	0.064	0.031	0.904	0.210

In these datasets, the forcing variable x_i represents the margin of victory of the Democratic party in a given election, with the outcome variable being the Democratic vote share in the subsequent election.

Similar to the analysis on simulated datasets, we compare our approach with the local estimator. The results are reported in Table 5, and the estimated curves are plotted in Figure 2. For both datasets, the PL method performs comparably to the local estimator. This finding is consistent with our observations based on the synthetic datasets, suggesting that PL could serve as a viable alternative option for RDDs in practice.

We lack knowledge of the true treatment effects in the real datasets. To further assess the performance of our method relative to the local estimator, we conduct an experiment utilizing the real-world datasets. We set a cutoff at $c = 0.05$ or -0.05 and maintained the original control and treated units, generating corresponding virtual datasets. Applying our global estimator and the local estimator to these virtual datasets, we infer the treatment effect at $c = 0.05$ or -0.05 and present the results in Table 6. Our method fails to reject the null hypothesis that the treatment effect is 0, whereas the local estimator significantly

Table 4: The performance of the PL method under various σ values.

σ		M1				M2				M3			
		RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL	RMSE	Bias	EC	IL
0.1	IK ₁	0.029	-0.001	0.939	0.107	0.048	-0.026	0.843	0.137	0.042	0.028	0.808	0.110
	PL ₁	0.027	-0.001	0.950	0.102	0.046	-0.019	0.915	0.166	0.043	0.031	0.787	0.109
	PL ₂	0.029	-0.001	0.945	0.106	0.040	-0.017	0.911	0.140	0.043	0.030	0.796	0.111
0.8	IK ₁	0.238	-0.007	0.936	0.869	0.253	-0.058	0.919	0.884	0.239	0.021	0.940	0.870
	PL ₁	0.213	-0.006	0.950	0.817	0.249	-0.109	0.906	0.828	0.214	0.024	0.947	0.818
	PL ₂	0.230	-0.005	0.945	0.846	0.250	-0.071	0.919	0.864	0.231	0.025	0.944	0.846

Table 5: The performance of the PL method for real data sets.

Method	U.S. House elections				U.S. Senate elections			
	estimate	s.e.	CL	p -value	estimate	s.e.	CL	p -value
IK ₁	5.808	1.083	2.124	9.9e-8	0.082	0.008	0.016	0
PL ₁	7.156	1.721	3.375	3.4e-5	0.065	0.016	0.031	4.3e-5
PL ₂	5.493	1.167	2.289	2.8e-6	0.074	0.013	0.026	1.4e-8

rejects it. Under the reasonable assumption that the treatment effect at $c = 0.05$ or -0.05 is truly 0, our method offers more reliable inferences within this context. This investigation highlights the potential advantage of our method over the local estimator in inference for RDDs.




Figure 2: Estimated treatment effects in the datasets of U.S. House elections (upper) and U.S. Senate elections (lower).

6 Discussion

While local estimators are commonly preferred over global estimators for RDDs, this paper demonstrates that a semiparametric inference framework provides efficient global estimation for RDDs. We have applied P -spline to represent the nonparametric part, but other nonparametric methods may be efficient as well. Further studies are needed. We have examined this inference procedure within the classical setting of sharp RDDs. It is anticipated that the semiparametric inference framework can be adapted for use with fuzzy RDDs with appropriate modifications. Further in-depth analysis is required to explore this potential extension

Table 6: The performance on the simulated datasets originated from the real datasets.

cutoff	Method	U.S. House elections				U.S. Senate elections			
		estimate	s.e.	CL	p -value	estimate	s.e.	CL	p -value
0.05	IK ₁	0.0496	0.0076	0.0149	0.0000	2.8820	1.1550	2.2663	0.0127
	PL ₁	-0.0040	0.0142	0.0279	0.7774	1.8499	2.0847	4.0897	0.3750
	PL ₂	-0.0033	0.0146	0.0287	0.8228	1.8639	1.3064	2.5628	0.1539
-0.05	IK ₁	0.0509	0.0072	0.0142	0.0000	2.2451	1.1703	2.2966	0.0553
	PL ₁	-0.0050	0.0149	0.0293	0.7401	-0.5513	1.9617	3.8484	0.7787
	PL ₂	-0.0013	0.0147	0.0288	0.9278	1.8973	1.2292	2.4114	0.1229

fully. Another potential extension is the regression kink design (Card et al., 2015), where Calonico et al. (2014) and Gelman and Imbens (2019) recommend using local quadratic approach, extending the argument presented by Hahn et al. (2001). Similar to our study on RDDs, our semiparametric inference may offer an alternative to local estimators in the regression kink design. Furthermore, exploring RDDs with covariates (Calonico et al., 2019) and RDDs with a discrete running variable (Kolesár and Rothe, 2018) could be worthwhile extensions to consider.

References

- Bates, D., Mächler, M., Bolker, B., and Walker, S. (2015), “Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4,” *Journal of Statistical Software*, 67, 1–48.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M., Farrell, M., and Titiunik, R. (2019), “Regression Discontinuity Designs using Covariates,” *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 101, 442–451.
- Calonico, S., Cattaneo, M. D., and Titiunik, R. (2014), “Robust Nonparametric Confidence Intervals for Regression Discontinuity Designs,” *Econometrica*, 82, 2295–2326.
- (2015), “Optimal Data-Driven Regression Discontinuity Plots,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 1753–1769.
- Card, D., Lee, D. S., Pei, Z., and Weber, A. (2015), “Inference on Causal Effects in a Generalized Regression Kink Design,” *Econometrica*, 83, 2453–2483.
- Cattaneo, M., Frandsen, B., and Titiunik, R. (2015), “Randomization Inference in the Regression Discontinuity Design: An Application to Party Advantages in the U.S. Senate,” *Journal of Causal Inference*, 3, 1–24.
- Cattaneo, M. D., Idrobo, N., and Titiunik, R. (2019), *A Practical Introduction to Regression Discontinuity Designs: Foundations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Claeskens, G., Krivobokova, T., and Opsomer, J. (2009), “Asymptotic properties of penalized spline estimators,” *Biometrika*, 96, 529–544.
- Fan, J. (1992), “Design Adaptive Nonparametric Regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87, 998–1004.
- Fan, J. and Gijbels, I. (1996), *Local Polynomial Modelling and Its Applications*, London: Chapman & Hall.
- Gelman, A. and Imbens, G. W. (2019), “Why High-order Polynomials Should Not Be Used in Regression Discontinuity Designs,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 37, 447–456.
- Hahn, J., Todd, P., and Van der Klaauw, W. (2001), “Identification and Estimation of Treatment Effects With a Regression-Discontinuity Design,” *Econometrica*, 69, 201–209.
- Imbens, G. and Kalyanaraman, K. (2012), “Optimal Bandwidth Choice for the Regression Discontinuity Estimator,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 79, 933–959.
- Imbens, G. and Lemieux, T. (2008), “Regression Discontinuity Designs: A Guide to Practice,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 615–635.

- Jiang, J. (1998), “Asymptotic properties of the empirical BLUP and BLUE in mixed linear models,” *Statistica Sinica*, 8, 861–885.
- Kolesár, M. and Rothe, C. (2018), “Inference in Regression Discontinuity Designs with a Discrete Running Variable,” *American Economic Review*, 108, 2277–2304.
- Lee, D. (2008), “Randomized Experiments from Non-Random Selection in U.S. House Elections,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 142, 675–697.
- Lee, D. and Lemieux, T. (2010), “Regression Discontinuity Designs in Economics,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 48, 281–355.
- Miller, J. (1977), “Asymptotic properties of maximum likelihood estimates in the mixed model of the analysis of variance,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 5, 746–762.
- Patterson, H. D. and Thompson, R. (1971), “Recovery of inter-block information when block sizes are unequal,” *Biometrika*, 58, 545–554.
- Pinheiro, J., Bates, D., and R Core Team (2023), *nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Models*, r package version 3.1-164.
- Ruppert, D. (2002), “Selecting the number of knots for penalized splines,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 11, 735–757.
- Ruppert, D., Wand, M. P., and Carroll, R. J. (2003), *Semiparametric Regression*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thistlewaite, D. and Campbell, D. (1960), “Regression-Discontinuity Analysis: An Alternative to the Ex-Post Facto Experiment,” *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 51, 309–317.

Appendix A: The proof of Theorem 2

Let $\nu_1 = n - K_r$, $\nu_2 = K_r$, where $K_r = \text{rank}(\mathbf{Z})$. We define the matrices $\mathbf{G}_1 = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\mathbf{G}_2 = \sigma_\gamma^2 \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^\top$, and introduce the 2×2 matrix \mathbf{C} with its (i, j) -element defined as follows:

$$[\mathbf{C}]_{ij} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{tr}[\mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_i \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{G}_j]}{\sqrt{\nu_i \nu_j}}.$$

Denote $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\sigma^2, \sigma_\gamma^2, \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top)^\top$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma^2, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\top)^\top$. Miller (1977) established the asymptotic properties of maximum likelihood estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$, in a general mixed model under the following conditions:

A1: $K \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

- A2: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K/n = 0$,
A3: $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} K_r/K > 0$,
A4: \mathbf{J} is positive definite,
A5: \mathbf{C} is positive definite.

Theorem 3.1 of Miller (1977) demonstrates that under conditions A1-A5, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}) \rightarrow_d \mathcal{N}(0, \text{diag}\{\mathbf{C}^{-1}, \mathbf{J}^{-1}\}).$$

Theorem 2 is an application of Theorem 3.1 of Miller (1977). It is sufficient to verify that the conditions (A1), (A2), and (A3) as stated in Theorem 2 are satisfied. It remains to demonstrate the fulfillment of (A4) and (A5).

First, we analyze the $(p+2) \times (p+2)$ matrix

$$[\mathbf{J}]_{ij} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U} / n.$$

Simple derivation shows

$$\mathbf{V}^{-1} = \sigma^{-2} \mathbf{I}_n - \sigma^{-2} \mathbf{Z} (\sigma_\gamma^{-2} \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top.$$

Note $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Z} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Z} \end{pmatrix}$, and $\mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix}$. We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^2 \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U} &= \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{U} - \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{Z} (\sigma_\gamma^{-2} \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{U} \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{w} & \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Z} \\ \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Z} \end{pmatrix} \left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_\gamma^2} \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} \right)^{-1} (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{X}). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Denoting $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{1}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{Z}$, and noting $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{w} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n_1/n = \rho_1$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{X} = \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top$, and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{w}^\top \mathbf{Z} = \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top$, (11) follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U} &= \sigma^{-2} \left[\begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 & \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top \\ \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x \end{pmatrix} - \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \end{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} (\rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top) \right] \\ &= \sigma^{-2} \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 - \rho_1^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z & \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top \\ \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For any vector $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \mathbf{u}_2^\top)^\top \neq 0 \in \mathbb{R}^{p+2}$, we have that

$$\mathbf{u}^\top \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 - \rho_1^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z & \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top \\ \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \rho_1 \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z & \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top \end{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= u_1^2(\rho_1 - \rho_1^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z) + \mathbf{u}_2^\top (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top) \mathbf{u}_2 + 2u_1 \rho_1 (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top) \mathbf{u}_2 \\
&= [\rho_1 u_1 + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top) \mathbf{u}_2]^2 + u_1^2(\rho_1 - \rho_1^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z) - \rho_1^2 u_1^2 \\
&\quad + \mathbf{u}_2^\top [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z)(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top)] \mathbf{u}_2. \tag{13}
\end{aligned}$$

In the right-hand of (13), $[\rho_1 u_1 + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top) \mathbf{u}_2]^2 \geq 0$ and

$$\mathbf{u}_2^\top [\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z)(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top)] \mathbf{u}_2 \geq 0$$

due to $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top > (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z)(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{xz}^\top)$, a result demonstrated in Lemma 1 below. Here, for matrices \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} , $\mathbf{A} > \mathbf{B}$ means that the matrix $\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}$ is positive. To ensure that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{-1} \mathbf{U}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{U}$ is positive, we only need the following inequality to hold:

$$\rho_1 - \rho_1^2 \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_z^{-1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_z > \rho_1^2 \tag{14}$$

Clearly, (14) is satisfied under the part (d) of Assumption 4.

Next, Let us check Condition (A5). Denote $\mathbf{P}_z = \mathbf{Z}(\sigma_\gamma^{-2} \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top$, implying $\mathbf{V}^{-1} = \sigma^{-2}(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{P}_z)$. Thus, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{V}^{-2} &= \sigma^{-4} (\mathbf{I}_n - 2\mathbf{P}_z + \mathbf{P}_z^2), \\
\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Z} &= \sigma^{-2} (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}_z \mathbf{Z}) = \sigma^{-2} \sigma_\gamma^{-2} (\sigma_\gamma^{-2} \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}, \\
\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{V}^{-2} \mathbf{Z}^\top &= \sigma^{-4} (\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - 2\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}_z \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}_z^2 \mathbf{Z}).
\end{aligned}$$

Based of the equations above, the elements of \mathbf{C} are represented by

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{C}]_{11} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^4}{n - K_r} \text{tr}(\mathbf{V}^{-2}) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n - K_r} (n - 2\text{tr}[\mathbf{P}_z] + \text{tr}[\mathbf{P}_z^2]) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n - K}{n - K_r} = 1, \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{C}]_{22} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma_\gamma^4}{K_r} \text{tr}[(\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top)^2] \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{K_r} \text{tr} \left[((\sigma_\gamma^{-2} \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_K + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z})^2 \right] = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K}{K_r} = 1/r, \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
[\mathbf{C}]_{12} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2 \sigma_\gamma^2}{\sqrt{K_r(n - K_r)}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{V}^{-2} \mathbf{Z}^\top) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sigma^2 \sigma_\gamma^{-2} \text{tr}[\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z} - 2\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}_z \mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{P}_z^2 \mathbf{Z}]}{\sqrt{K_r(n - K_r)}} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K}{\sqrt{K_r(n - K_r)}} = 0, \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step of (15) is from Part (b) of Assumption 4, the last step of (16) is from Part (c) of Assumption 4, and the last step of (17) is from Parts (b) & (c) of Assumption 4. Therefore, it establishes A5 as desired.

Lemma 1.

$$\Sigma_x - \Sigma_{xz}\Sigma_z^{-1}\Sigma_{xz}^\top > (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x - \Sigma_{xz}\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z)(\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\Sigma_{xz}^\top)$$

Proof. The inequality is equivalent to

$$\Sigma_x - \boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top + \boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\Sigma_{xz}^\top + \Sigma_{xz}\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \Sigma_{xz}(\Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\Sigma_{xz}^\top > 0.$$

Because $\Sigma_x - \boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top \geq 0$, it is necessary to prove that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\Sigma_{xz}^\top + \Sigma_{xz}\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \Sigma_{xz}(\Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\Sigma_{xz}^\top > 0$. This is equivalent to checking

$$\mathbf{v}^\top[\boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\Sigma_{xz}^\top + \Sigma_{xz}\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top - \Sigma_{xz}(\Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\Sigma_{xz}^\top]\mathbf{v} \geq 0. \quad (18)$$

Define

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{v}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\mathbf{x}^\top + \mathbf{x}\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{x}(\Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\mathbf{x}^\top.$$

The inequality (18) becomes $f(\mathbf{v}^\top\Sigma_{xz}) \geq 0$. Setting the first derivative of $f(\mathbf{x})$ to 0, we need to solve the following equation:

$$(\Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\mathbf{x}^\top = \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top\mathbf{v}. \quad (19)$$

Let $\mathbf{A} = \Sigma_z^{-1} + \Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}$. Since $\mathbf{I} + \boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z > 0$, \mathbf{A} is invertible by the Sherman-Morrison-Woodbury formula. Thus, we obtain the unique solution to (19) as follows:

$$\tilde{\mathbf{x}} = \mathbf{v}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1}\mathbf{A}^{-1}.$$

Moreover,

$$f(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}) = (\mathbf{v}^\top\boldsymbol{\mu}_x\boldsymbol{\mu}_z^\top\Sigma_z^{-1})\mathbf{A}^{-1}(\Sigma_z^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_z\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^\top\mathbf{v}) > 0.$$

Theorefore, the lemma is proved. □