

Tensor Time Series Imputation through Tensor Factor Modelling

Zetai Cen*and Clifford Lam†

Department of Statistics, London School of Economics and Political Science

Abstract

We propose tensor time series imputation when the missing pattern in the tensor data can be general, as long as any two data positions along a tensor fibre are both observed for enough time points. The method is based on a tensor time series factor model with Tucker decomposition of the common component. One distinguished feature of the tensor time series factor model used is that there can be weak factors in the factor loadings matrix for each mode. This reflects reality better when real data can have weak factors which drive only groups of observed variables, for instance, a sector factor in financial market driving only stocks in a particular sector. Using the data with missing entries, asymptotic normality is derived for rows of estimated factor loadings, while consistent covariance matrix estimation enables us to carry out inferences. As a first in the literature, we also propose a ratio-based estimator for the rank of the core tensor under general missing patterns. Rates of convergence are spelt out for the imputations from the estimated tensor factor models. We introduce a new measure for gauging imputation performances, and simulation results show that our imputation procedure works well, with asymptotic normality and corresponding inferences also demonstrated. Re-imputation performances are also gauged when we demonstrate that using slightly larger rank than estimated gives superior re-imputation performances. An NYC taxi traffic data set is also analyzed by imposing general missing patterns and gauging the imputation performances.

Key words and phrases: Generalized cross-covariance matrix, tensor unfolding, core tensor, α -mixing time series variables, missingness tensor.

*Zetai Cen is PhD student, Department of Statistics, London School of Economics. Email: Z.Cen@lse.ac.uk

†Clifford Lam is Professor, Department of Statistics, London School of Economics. Email: C.Lam2@lse.ac.uk

1 Introduction

Large dimensional panel data is easier to obtain than ever thanks to a quickly evolving internet speed and more diverse download platforms. Together with the advancement of statistical analyses for these data over the past decade, researchers also open up more to time series data with higher order, namely, tensor time series data. A prominent example would be order 2 tensor time series, i.e., matrix-valued time series. Wang et al. (2019) proposes a factor model using a Tucker decomposition of the common component in the modelling. An example on monthly import-export volume of products among different countries is given in Chen et al. (2022a), where factor modelling using Tucker decomposition is explored, and generalized to higher order tensors. Focusing on matrix-valued time series, Chang et al. (2023) proposes a tensor-CP decomposition for modelling the data. Zhang (2024) and Chen et al. (2021) propose autoregressive models for matrix-valued time series. For a more comprehensive review on matrix-valued time series analysis, please refer to Tsay (2023).

A less addressed topic in large time series analysis is the treatment of missing data, in particular, the imputation of missing data and corresponding inferences. While there are numerous data-centric methods in various scientific fields for imputing multivariate time series data (see Chapon et al. (2023) for environmental time series, Kazijevs and Samad (2023) for health time series, Zhao et al. (2023) and Zhang et al. (2021) for using deep-learning related architectures for imputations, to name but a few), almost none of them address statistically how accurate their methods are, and all of them are not for higher order tensor time series. We certainly can line up the variables in a tensor time series to make it a longitudinal panel, but in doing so we lose special structures and insights that can be utilized for forecasting and interpretation of the data. More importantly, transforming a moderate sized tensor to a vector means the length of the vector can be much larger than the sample size, creating curse of dimensionality.

For imputing large panel of time series with statistical analyses, Bai and Ng (2021) defines the concept of TALL and WIDE blocks of data and proposes an iterative TW algorithm in imputing missing values in a large panel, while Cahan et al. (2023) improves the TW algorithm to a Tall-Project (TP) algorithm so that there is no iterations needed. Both papers use factor modelling for the imputations, and derive rates of convergence when all factors are pervasive and the number of factors known. Asymptotic normality for rows of estimated factor loadings and the corresponding practical inferences are also developed as well. Xiong and Pelger (2023) also bases their imputations on a factor model for a large panel of time series with pervasive factors and number of factors known, and build a method for imputing missing values under very general missing patterns, with asymptotic normality and inferences also developed.

To the best of our knowledge, for tensor time series with order larger than 1 (i.e, at least matrix-valued), there are no theoretical analyses on imputation performances. Imputation methodologies developed on

tensor time series are also scattered around very different applications. See Chen et al. (2022b) on traffic tensor data and Pan et al. (2021) for RNA-sequence tensor data for instance.

In view of all the above, as a first in the literature, we aim to develop a tensor imputation method accompanied by theoretical analyses in this paper. Like Cahan et al. (2023), we use factor modelling for tensor time series as a basis for our imputation method. Unlike Cahan et al. (2023), Bai and Ng (2021) or Xiong and Pelger (2023) though, we develop a method that can consistently estimate the number of factors, or the core tensor rank, in a Tucker decomposition-based factor model for the tensor time series with missing values. On top of this, we also allow factors to be weak. A weak factor corresponds to a column in a factor loading matrix being sparse, or approximately sparse. This implies that not all units in a tensor has dynamics contributed by all the factors inside the core tensor. In Chen and Lam (2024), they allow for weak factors in their analyses, and discovers that there are potentially weak factors in the NYC taxi traffic data, which we are going to analyse in Section 5.2.2. We prove consistency of our imputations under general missingness, and develop asymptotic normality and practical inferences for rows of factor loading matrix estimators, with rates of convergence in all consistency results spelt out. Our method is available in the R package `tensorMiss`, which has used the `Rcpp` package to greatly boost computational speed.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Section 2 introduces the notations used in this paper. Section 3 describe the tensor factor model and the imputation methodology we use. Section 4 lays down the main assumptions for the paper, with consistent estimation and rates of convergence of all factor loading matrix estimators and imputed values presented. Asymptotic normality and the estimators of the corresponding covariance matrices for practical inferences are introduced as well in Section 4.3, before our proposed ratio-based estimators for the number of factors in Section 4.5. Section 5 presents extensive simulation results for our paper, together with an analysis for the NYC taxi traffic data in Section 5.2.2. All proofs are in the supplementary materials associated with this paper.

2 Notations

Throughout this paper, we use the lower-case letter, bold lower-case letter, bold capital letter, and calligraphic letter, i.e. a , \mathbf{a} , \mathbf{A} , \mathcal{A} , to denote a scalar, a vector, a matrix, and a tensor. We also use a_i , A_{ij} , \mathbf{A}_i , $\mathbf{A}_{\cdot i}$ to denote, respectively, the i -th element of \mathbf{a} , the (i, j) -th element of \mathbf{A} , the i -th row vector (as a column vector) of \mathbf{A} , and the i -th column vector of \mathbf{A} . We use \otimes to represent the Kronecker product, and \circ the Hadamard product. We use $a \asymp b$ to denote $a = O(b)$ and $b = O(a)$.

Some tensor-related notations. Hereafter, given a positive integer m , define $[m] := \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$. For an order- K tensor $\mathcal{A} = (A_{i_1, \dots, i_K}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times \dots \times d_K}$, a column vector $(A_{i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}, j, i_{k+1}, \dots, i_K})_{j \in [d_k]}$ represents

a mode- k fibre for the tensor \mathcal{A} . We denote by $\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{A}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times d_{\cdot k}}$ (or sometimes $\mathbf{A}_{(k)}$, with $d_{\cdot k} := (\prod_{j=1}^K d_j)/d_k$) the mode- k unfolding of a tensor, defined by placing all mode- k fibres into a matrix. We denote by $\mathcal{M} \times_k \mathbf{A}$ the mode- k multiplication of a tensor \mathcal{M} with a matrix \mathbf{A} , defined by

$$\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{M} \times_k \mathbf{A}) := \mathbf{A} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{M}).$$

The notation $\text{vec}(\cdot)$ denotes the vectorisation of a matrix or the vectorisation of the mode-1 unfolding of a tensor. The i -th largest eigenvalue of a matrix \mathbf{A} is denoted by $\lambda_i(\mathbf{A})$. The notation $\mathbf{A} \succcurlyeq 0$ (resp. $\mathbf{A} \succ 0$) means that \mathbf{A} is positive semi-definite (resp. positive definite). We use \mathbf{A}' to denote the transpose of \mathbf{A} . We use $\text{diag}(\mathbf{A})$ to denote a diagonal matrix with the diagonal elements of \mathbf{A} , and $\text{diag}(\{a_1, \dots, a_n\})$ represents the diagonal matrix with $\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ on the diagonal.

Some norm notations. For a given set, we denote by $|\cdot|$ its cardinality. We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the spectral norm of a matrix or the L_2 norm of a vector, and $\|\cdot\|_F$ to denote the Frobenius norm of a matrix. We use $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ to denote the maximum absolute value of the elements in a vector, a matrix or a tensor. The notations $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ denote the L_1 and L_{∞} -norm of a matrix respectively, defined by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 := \max_j \sum_i |(\mathbf{A})_{ij}|$ and $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\infty} := \max_i \sum_j |(\mathbf{A})_{ij}|$. WLOG, we always assume the eigenvalues of a matrix are arranged by descending orders, and so are their corresponding eigenvectors. For more details on tensor manipulations, readers are referred to Kolda and Bader (2009).

3 Tensor Factor Model with Missing Entries

Suppose we observe an order- K mean-zero tensor $\mathcal{Y}_t = (\mathcal{Y}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times \dots \times d_K}$ for each $t \in [T]$, modelled by

$$\mathcal{Y}_t = \mathcal{C}_t + \mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{F}_t \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \times_2 \mathbf{A}_2 \times_3 \dots \times_K \mathbf{A}_K + \mathcal{E}_t, \quad t \in [T], \quad (3.1)$$

where \mathcal{C}_t is the common component and \mathcal{E}_t the error tensor. The core tensor is $\mathcal{F}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{r_1 \times r_2 \times \dots \times r_K}$, and each mode- k factor loading matrix \mathbf{A}_k has dimension $d_k \times r_k$. We define $d := \prod_{k=1}^K d_k$, $r := \prod_{k=1}^K r_k$, and also $d_{\cdot k} := d/d_k$, and $r_{\cdot k} := r/r_k$. The above model is an extension to the usual time series factor model ($K = 1$):

$$\mathcal{Y}_t = \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{Y}_t) = \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{F}_t \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1) + \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{E}_t) = \mathbf{A}_1 \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{F}_t) + \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{E}_t) = \mathbf{A}_1 \mathcal{F}_t + \mathcal{E}_t,$$

and also for a matrix-valued time series factor model ($K = 2$):

$$\mathcal{Y}_t = \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{Y}_t) = \mathbf{A}_1 \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{A}_2' + \text{mat}_1(\mathcal{E}_t) = \mathbf{A}_1 \mathcal{F}_t \mathbf{A}_2' + \mathcal{E}_t.$$

We normalise each factor loading matrix to $\mathbf{Q}_k = \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}$, where $\mathbf{Z}_k = \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}_k' \mathbf{A}_k)$ contains the square norm of each column of \mathbf{A}_k , representing the strength of each factor. For instance, a pervasive factor (so that the corresponding column in \mathbf{A}_k is dense) has order d_k in the corresponding position in \mathbf{Z}_k , while a weak factor (a sparser column in \mathbf{A}_k) can have order d_k^α for some $\alpha < 1$. We allow the factors to have different strength, so that \mathbf{Z}_k can have values of different orders. Such a model is closer to reality, for instance apart from a pervasive market factor, there can be weaker sector factors in a large selection of stock returns. For the exact technical details, see Assumption (L1) in Section 4.1.

With the normalization above, we can then write the mode- k unfolding of the data as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t) &= \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t \times_1 \mathbf{A}_1 \times_2 \mathbf{A}_2 \times_3 \cdots \times_K \mathbf{A}_K) + \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t) \\ &= \mathbf{Q}_k \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \mathbf{\Lambda}'_k + \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t), \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{Z,t} := \mathcal{F}_t \times_1 \mathbf{Z}_1^{1/2} \times_2 \cdots \times_K \mathbf{Z}_K^{1/2}$, and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k := \otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{Q}_j$ with the index of product being descending.

We only observe partial data. Based on the missing pattern, we define the missingness tensor $\mathcal{M}_t = (\mathcal{M}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}) \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2 \times \cdots \times d_K}$ with

$$\mathcal{M}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \mathcal{Y}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} \text{ is observed;} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we make use of the following notation:

$$\psi_{k,i,j,h} := \left\{ t \in [T] \mid \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{M}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{M}_t)_{jh} = 1 \right\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Hence $\psi_{k,i,j,h}$ is the set of time periods where both the i -th and j -th entries of the h -th mode- k fibre are observed, where $i, j \in [d_k]$, $h \in [d_{\cdot k}]$. Our aim is to recover the value for the common component $\mathcal{C}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}$ if $\mathcal{M}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = 0$. Assuming first the number of factors r_k is known for all modes, we want to obtain the estimators of the factor loading matrices, $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ for $k \in [K]$, and then the estimated core tensor series $\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t}$ for $t \in [T]$. Imputation then follows by $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t := \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t} \times_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \times_2 \cdots \times_K \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K$. We leave the discussion of estimating r_k to Section 4.5.

3.1 Estimation of factor loading matrices

Our method relies on the reconstruction of the mode- k sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_k , defined for $i, j \in [d_k]$,

$$(S_k)_{ij} := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)'_i \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)_j = \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)_{jh}. \quad (3.4)$$

With missing entries characterized by \mathcal{M}_t and $\psi_{k,ij,h}$ in (3.3), we can generalise the above to

$$(\widehat{S}_k)_{ij} = \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left\{ \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)_{jh} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

Intuitively, the cross-covariance between unit i and j at the h -th mode- k fibre is estimated inside the curly bracket in (3.5) using only the corresponding available data. PCA can now be performed on $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$, and $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ is obtained as the first r_k eigenvectors of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$.

3.2 Imputation and estimation of the core tensor series

With $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ available (which is estimating the factor loading space of \mathbf{Q}_k , albeit \mathbf{Q}_k does not contain orthogonal columns, but $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ does), we can estimate $\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}$ (equivalently $\text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t})$) by observing that

$$\text{vec}(\mathcal{Y}_t) = \mathbf{Q}_\otimes \text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) + \text{vec}(\mathcal{E}_t), \quad \text{where } \mathbf{Q}_\otimes := \mathbf{Q}_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_1.$$

If \mathbf{Q}_\otimes is known, then the least squares estimator of $\text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t})$ is given by

$$\text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) = (\mathbf{Q}'_\otimes \mathbf{Q}_\otimes)^{-1} \mathbf{Q}'_\otimes \text{vec}(\mathcal{Y}_t) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} [\text{vec}(\mathcal{Y}_t)]_j \right).$$

With missing data, using the missingness tensor \mathcal{M}_t , the above can be generalized to

$$\text{vec}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t}) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^d [\text{vec}(\mathcal{M}_t)]_j \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d [\text{vec}(\mathcal{M}_t)]_j \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} [\text{vec}(\mathcal{Y}_t)]_j \right). \quad (3.6)$$

We can then estimate the common components at time t by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t = \widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t} \times_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1 \times_2 \cdots \times_K \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K. \quad (3.7)$$

With (3.7), we can impute \mathcal{Y}_t using

$$\tilde{\mathcal{Y}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{Y}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}, & \text{if } \mathcal{M}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = 1; \\ \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}, & \text{if } \mathcal{M}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = 0. \end{cases}$$

4 Assumptions and Theoretical Results

We present our assumptions for consistent imputation and estimation of factor loading matrices, with the corresponding theoretical results presented afterwards.

4.1 Assumptions

(O1) (Observation patterns)

1. \mathcal{M}_t is independent of \mathcal{F}_s and \mathcal{E}_s for any $t, s \in [T]$.
2. Given \mathcal{M}_t with $t \in [T]$, for any $k \in [K], i, j \in [d_k], h \in [d_{-k}]$, there exists a constant ψ_0 such that

$$\frac{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|}{T} \geq \psi_0 > 0.$$

(M1) (Alpha mixing) *The elements in \mathcal{F}_t and \mathcal{E}_t are α -mixing. A vector process $\{\mathbf{x}_t : t = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots\}$ is α -mixing if, for some $\gamma > 2$, the mixing coefficients satisfy the condition that*

$$\sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \alpha(h)^{1-2/\gamma} < \infty,$$

where $\alpha(h) = \sup_{\tau} \sup_{A \in \mathcal{H}_{-\infty}^{\tau}, B \in \mathcal{H}_{\tau+h}^{\infty}} |\mathbb{P}(A \cap B) - \mathbb{P}(A)\mathbb{P}(B)|$ and \mathcal{H}_{τ}^s is the σ -field generated by $\{\mathbf{x}_t : \tau \leq t \leq s\}$.

(F1) (Time series in \mathcal{F}_t) *There is $\mathcal{X}_{f,t}$ the same dimension as \mathcal{F}_t , such that $\mathcal{F}_t = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathcal{X}_{f,t-q}$. The time series $\{\mathcal{X}_{f,t}\}$ has i.i.d. elements with mean 0 and variance 1, with uniformly bounded fourth order moments. The coefficients $a_{f,q}$ are such that $\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 = 1$ and $\sum_{q \geq 0} |a_{f,q}| \leq c$ for some constant c .*

(L1) (Factor strength) *We assume for $k \in [K]$, \mathbf{A}_k is of full rank and independent of factors and errors series. Furthermore, as $d_k \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2} \rightarrow \Sigma_{A,k}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\mathbf{Z}_k = \text{diag}(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)$ and $\Sigma_{A,k}$ is positive definite with all eigenvalues bounded away from 0 and

infinity. We assume $(\mathbf{Z}_k)_{jj} \asymp d_k^{\alpha_{k,j}}$ for $j \in [r_k]$, and $1/2 < \alpha_{k,r_k} \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{k,2} \leq \alpha_{k,1} \leq 1$.

With Assumption (L1), we can denote $\mathbf{Q}_k := \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}$ and hence $\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{Q}_k \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,k}$. We need $\alpha_{k,j} > 1/2$ in order that the ratio-based estimator of the number of factors in Section 4.5 works.

(E1) (Decomposition of \mathcal{E}_t) We assume K is constant, and

$$\mathcal{E}_t = \mathcal{F}_{e,t} \times_1 \mathbf{A}_{e,1} \times_2 \dots \times_K \mathbf{A}_{e,K} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon \circ \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t, \quad (4.2)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$ is an order- K tensor with dimension $r_{e,1} \times \dots \times r_{e,K}$, containing independent elements with mean 0 and variance 1. The order- K tensor $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times \dots \times d_K}$ contains independent mean zero elements with unit variance, with the two time series $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t\}$ and $\{\mathcal{F}_{e,t}\}$ being independent. The order- K tensor $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon$ contains the standard deviations of the corresponding elements in $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$, and has elements uniformly bounded.

Moreover, for each $k \in [K]$, $\mathbf{A}_{e,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times r_{e,k}}$ is such that $\|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_1 = O(1)$. That is, $\mathbf{A}_{e,k}$ is (approximately) sparse.

(E2) (Time series in \mathcal{E}_t) There is $\mathcal{X}_{e,t}$ the same dimension as $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$, and $\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t}$ the same dimension as $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t$, such that $\mathcal{F}_{e,t} = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathcal{X}_{e,t-q}$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q} \mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t-q}$, with $\{\mathcal{X}_{e,t}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t}\}$ independent of each other, and each time series has independent elements with mean 0 and variance 1 with uniformly bounded fourth order moments. Both $\{\mathcal{X}_{e,t}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t}\}$ are independent of $\{\mathcal{X}_{f,t}\}$ from (F1).

The coefficients $a_{e,q}$ and $a_{\epsilon,t}$ are such that $\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^2 = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q}^2 = 1$ and $\sum_{q \geq 0} |a_{e,q}|, \sum_{q \geq 0} |a_{\epsilon,q}| \leq c$ for some constant c .

(R1) (Further rate assumptions) We assume that, with $g_s := \prod_{k=1}^K d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}}$,

$$dg_s^{-2} T^{-1} d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) + 1} = o(1), \quad dg_s^{-1} T^{-1} d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} = o(1), \quad dg_s^{-1} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k} - 1/2} = o(1).$$

Assumption (O1) means that the missing mechanism is independent of the factors and the noise series, which is also assumed in Xiong and Pelger (2023) for the purpose of identification. It also means that the missing pattern can depend on the K factor loading matrices, allowing for a wide variety of missing patterns that can vary over time and units in different dimensions. Condition 2 of (O1) implies that the number of time periods that any two individual units are both observed are at least proportional to T , which simplifies proofs and presentations, and is also used in Xiong and Pelger (2023). Assumption (M1) is a standard assumption in vector time series factor models, which facilitates proofs using central limit theorem for time series without losing too much generality. Assumption (F1), (E1) and (E2) are

exactly the corresponding assumptions in Chen and Lam (2024), allowing for serial correlations in the factor series, and serial and cross-sectional dependence within and among the error tensor fibres. These three assumptions facilitate the proof of asymptotic normality in Section 4.3. Together with Assumption (M1), we implicitly restrict the general linear processes in (F1) and (E2) to be, for instance, of short rather than long dependence.

Assumption (L1) is quite different from assumptions in other papers on factor models, in the sense that we allow for the existence of weak factors alongside the pervasive ones. Chen and Lam (2024) adapted the same assumption, which allows each column of \mathbf{A}_k to be completely dense (i.e., a pervasive factor) or sparse to a certain extent. A diagonal entry in \mathbf{Z}_k then records how dense a column really is, and the corresponding strength of factors defined.

Finally, Assumption (R1) are the technical rate assumptions needed for the proof of various theorems in the paper because of the existence of weak factors. If all factors are pervasive (i.e., $\alpha_{k,j} = 1$), then the conditions are automatically satisfied. Suppose $K = 2$, $T \asymp d_1 \asymp d_2$ and the strongest factors are all pervasive (i.e., $\alpha_{k,1} = 1$), then we need $\alpha_{k,r_k} > 1/2$ for (R1) to be satisfied. This condition is the same as the one remarked right after we stated Assumption (L1). A factor with $\alpha_{k,j}$ close to 0.5 presents a significantly weak factor with only more than $d_k^{1/2}$ of elements are non-zero in the corresponding column of \mathbf{A}_k .

Remark 1 *With the missing entries imputed using the estimated common components $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}$, we have a completed data set which could be used for re-estimation and hence re-imputation. The convergence could be shown empirically to be accelerated by such a procedure. The rate improvement would be from the difference between T and $\psi_0 T$, where ψ_0 is the lowest proportion of observation among all entries from Assumption (O1). We omit the lengthy proofs as eventually the rates only differ by a constant, but we note here that re-imputation can indeed improve our imputation, which is essentially credited to the more observations used when we have an initially good imputation.*

4.2 Consistency: factor loadings and imputed values

We first present a consistency result for the factor loading matrix estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ of \mathbf{Q}_k . For $k \in [K], j \in [d_k]$, define

$$\mathbf{H}_{k,j} := \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,i} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_k} \Lambda_{k,hm} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \cdot m \right)' \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_k} \Lambda_{k,hm} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \cdot m \right)', \quad (4.3)$$

$$\mathbf{H}_k^a := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \mathbf{Q}_k \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \Lambda_k' \Lambda_k \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t})', \quad (4.4)$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k := \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ is a diagonal matrix of eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$ defined in (3.5). Hence $\mathbf{H}_{k,j} = \mathbf{H}_k^a$ if there are no missing entries, i.e., $|\psi_{k,i,j,h}| = T$ for each $k \in [K]$, $i, j \in [d_k]$ and $h \in [d_{-k}]$.

Theorem 1 *Under Assumptions (O1), (M1), (F1), (L1), (E1), (E2) and (R1), for any $k \in [K]$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j\cdot} \right\|^2 = O_P \left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \left(\frac{1}{T d_{-k}} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \frac{d^2}{g_s^2} \right) = o_P(1),$$

where g_s is defined in Assumption (R1). Furthermore, for each $i, j \in [d_k]$ and $h \in [d_{-k}]$, if the set $\psi_{k,i,j,h}$ defined in (3.3) has cardinality satisfying

$$\frac{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|}{T} = 1 - \eta_{k,i,j,h} \geq 1 - \eta = \psi_0,$$

then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j\cdot} \right\|^2 &= \frac{1}{d_k} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{H}_k^{a'} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P \left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{T d_{-k}} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \frac{d^2}{g_s^2} + \min \left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \right) \right] \right) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

The proof of the theorem can be found in the supplementary materials of this paper. The two results in Theorem 1 coincide with each other if $\eta = 0$, i.e., there are no missing values. If $\eta = 0$, $K = 2$ and all factors are pervasive, our resulting rate of convergence is $1/(d_k \min(d_k, T d_{-k}))$. This is consistent with, for example, Theorem 1 of Chen and Fan (2023) or Theorem 3.1 of He et al. (2022) (after normalizing like we do). When $K = 1$ with missing data and all factors are pervasive, the rate is $1/(d_1 \min(d_1, T))$, which is the same as the rate in Theorem 1 of Xiong and Pelger (2023) after our normalization. Hence our rate can be considered a generalization to a general order tensor, with general factor strengths and missing data.

We present the two results in the theorem to highlight the difficulty of obtaining consistency when there are missing values. Since a factor loading matrix is not uniquely defined, in the second result in Theorem 1 we are estimating how close $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ is to a version of \mathbf{Q}_k in Frobenius norm, namely $\mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{H}_k^a$, which is still defining the same factor loading space as \mathbf{Q}_k does. With missing data, such a feat is complicated, in the sense that for the j -th row of \mathbf{Q}_k , $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j\cdot}$, there corresponds an $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ different from \mathbf{H}_k^a in general, so that $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j\cdot}$ is close to $\mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j\cdot}$. The extra rate $\min(1/T, \eta^2/(1 - \eta)^2)$ in the second result is essentially measuring how close each $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ is to \mathbf{H}_k^a . See Lemma 3 in the supplementary material as well.

Theorem 2 *Under the Assumptions in Theorem 1, suppose we further have $d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}} = o(d_{-k})$. Define*

$$g_\eta := \min \left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1 - \eta)^2} \right), \quad g_w := \prod_{k=1}^K d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}}.$$

Then we have the following.

1. The error of the estimated factor series has rate

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{vec}(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t}) - (\mathbf{H}_K^{a'} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{H}_1^{a'})^{-1} \mathbf{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \right\|^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_\eta g_s d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{d}{g_w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

2. For any $k \in [K]$, $i_k \in [d_k]$, $t \in [T]$, the squared individual imputation error is

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} - \mathcal{C}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K})^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} g_w^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-1} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_\eta g_s g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{d}{g_w^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

3. The average imputation error is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{Td} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_K=1}^{d_1,\dots,d_K} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} - \mathcal{C}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K})^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} + d g_s^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + d^{-1} g_\eta g_s d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{1}{g_w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The proof can be found in the supplementary materials, which utilizes some rates from the proof of Theorem 3 in the supplementary materials (without the need for extra rate restrictions like Theorem 3 though). If $K \geq 2$, all factors are pervasive and $\eta = 0$ (i.e, no missing values), the squared individual imputation error has rate

$$\max_{k \in [K]} \left(\frac{1}{T d_k} + \frac{1}{d_k^2} \right) + \frac{1}{d} \asymp \frac{1}{\min(T d_1, \dots, T d_K, d_1^2, \dots, d_K^2)}.$$

This rate is the same as the result in Theorem 4 of Chen and Fan (2023) for $K = 2$, which is a rate for estimating the common component. On the other hand, if η is a constant and $K = 1$, and all factors are pervasive, then the second result becomes $d_1^{-1} + T^{-1} \asymp 1/\min(d_1, T)$, which is the same rate as result 3 of Theorem 2 in Xiong and Pelger (2023).

Our generalization has certainly revealed that when there are weak factors, especially when the strongest and weakest factor strengths are quite different, these rates greatly suffer. The complication of missing data comes explicitly from the rate g_η . The average squared imputation error in result 3 improves upon individual squared error in result 2 when weak factors exist, with degree of improvements larger when the difference in strength of factors is larger.

4.3 Inference on the factor loadings

We establish asymptotic normality of the factor loadings for inference purpose. In Section 4.4 we present the covariance matrix estimator for practical use of our asymptotic normality result. Before presenting our results, we need three additional assumptions.

(L2) (Eigenvalues) *For any $k \in [K]$, the eigenvalues of the $r_k \times r_k$ matrix $\Sigma_{A,k} \mathbf{Z}_k$ from Assumption (L1) are distinct.*

(AD1) *There is a constant C such that for any $k \in [K], j \in [d_k]$, as $d_1, \dots, d_K, T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sqrt{\frac{T}{d_{-k} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}}}} \cdot \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' \mathbf{A}_{k,i} \right\| \geq C > 0,$$

where $\mathbf{Q}_k = \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}$ is the normalised factor loading, $\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} := \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k})^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \Upsilon'_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}$ with $\mathbf{D}_k := \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \text{diag}\{\lambda_1(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k), \dots, \lambda_{r_k}(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)\}$, and Υ_k the eigenvector matrix of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot g_s^{-1} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \Sigma_{A,k} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}$.

(AD2) *Define the filtration $\mathcal{G}^T := \sigma(\cup_{s=1}^T \mathcal{G}_s)$ with $\mathcal{G}_s := \sigma(\{\mathcal{M}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K} \mid t \leq s\}, \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_K)$, and*

$$\Delta_{F,k,ij,h} := \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)',$$

where $\mathbf{v}_{k,h} := [\otimes_{l \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_l]_h$. With \mathbf{Q}_k being the normalised mode- k factor loading in (AD1), we have for every $k \in [K], j \in [d_k]$, for a function $h_{k,j} : \mathbb{R}^{r_k} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{r_k \times r_k}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T} d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}} \cdot \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{A}_{k,j} \\ & \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_{k,j}) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}) \quad \mathcal{G}^T\text{-stably.} \end{aligned}$$

In (AD1), $\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}$ is the probability limit of \mathbf{H}_k^a defined in (4.4). Assumption (AD1) is new to the literature. Bai (2003), Chen and Fan (2023) or Xiong and Pelger (2023) all prove asymptotic normality by arguing that in a decomposition, a certain term weakly converging to a normal distribution has asymptotic upper bound dominating the asymptotic upper bounds of other terms. We argue that comparing upper bounds *only* is theoretically not enough to guarantee that the said term's dominance results in asymptotic normality, especially when those upper bounds can be crude and using inequalities like the Cauchy-Schwarz to prove. Assumption (AD1) is to guarantee that the term leading to asymptotic normality is truly dominating others even in the lower bound, which is necessary to guarantee the dominance leading to asymptotic normality. Please refer to the proof of Theorem 3 in the supplementary materials for more details.

Assumption (AD2) is required since the missing data creates a discrepancy term $\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}$ as defined in the assumption. This assumption is also parallel to Assumption G3.5 in Xiong and Pelger (2023). We demonstrate how this assumption is satisfied with Assumption (O1), (F1), (L1) and two additional but simpler assumptions in Proposition 1 in Section 4.6.

Theorem 3 *Let all the assumptions under Theorem 2 hold, in addition to (L2), (AD1) and (AD2) above.*

With r_k fixed and $d_k, T \rightarrow \infty$ for $k \in [K]$, suppose also $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} + \alpha_{k,r_k}})$. We have

$$\sqrt{Td_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}}} \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} (Td_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} + h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_{j\cdot})) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}), \text{ where}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} := \text{plim}_{T, d_1, \dots, d_K \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' \mathbf{A}_{k,i} \right).$$

Furthermore, if $Td^{-1}g_s^2g_\eta d_k^{1+\alpha_{k,1}-3\alpha_{k,r_k}} = o(1)$ is also satisfied, then with $\omega_B := d_{-k}^{-1}d_k^{2\alpha_{k,r_k}-3\alpha_{k,1}}g_s^2$,

$$\sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, T\omega_B \cdot \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}).$$

If all factors are pervasive, the rate condition $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} + \alpha_{k,r_k}})$ reduces to $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^2)$, which is equivalent to the condition needed for asymptotic normality in Bai (2003) for $K = 1$ and Chen and Fan (2023) for $K = 2$. The first asymptotic normality result is compatible to Theorem 2.1 of Xiong and Pelger (2023) when all factors are pervasive. In their Theorem 2.1, the $\Gamma_{\Lambda,j}^{obs}$ is in fact of rate N^{-1} , so that the normalizing rate is \sqrt{TN} , which is exactly $\sqrt{Td_1}$ in our first result when $K = 1$.

Suppose all factors are pervasive. The rate condition $Td^{-1}g_s^2g_\eta d_k^{1+\alpha_{k,1}-3\alpha_{k,r_k}} = o(1)$ is automatically satisfied when there is no missing data, i.e., $\eta = 0$ so that $g_\eta = 0$. If so, the rate of convergence is $\sqrt{T\omega_B} = \sqrt{Td}$, which is compatible to Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 of Chen and Fan (2023) (after our normalisation to their factor loading matrices). The condition is also satisfied when there is only finite number of missing data, so that $\eta \asymp T^{-1}$ and $g_\eta \asymp T^{-2}$, and $d_1, d_2 = o(T)$ for $K = 2$.

Remark 2 *We do not establish asymptotic normality for the estimated factor series and common components. The reason is that for tensor with $K > 1$, the decomposition in the estimated factor series and the common components cannot be dominated by terms that are asymptotically normal. This is also the reason why Chen and Fan (2023) does not include asymptotic normality for the estimated factor series and common components. We leave the corresponding inference problems in future research.*

4.4 Estimation of covariance matrix

In order to carry out inferences for the factor loadings using Theorem 3, we need to estimate the asymptotic covariance matrix for $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}$. To this end, we use the heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation

consistent (HAC) estimators (Newey and West, 1987) based on $\{\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k, \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t), \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t)\}_{t \in [T]}$, where

$$\text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t) = (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k) \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{F}}_{Z,t}) (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k+1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1)', \quad \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t) := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t) - \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t).$$

With a tuning parameter β such that $\beta \rightarrow \infty$ and $\beta/(Td_k^{\alpha_k, r_k})^{1/4} \rightarrow 0$, we define two HAC estimators

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} &:= \mathbf{D}_{k,0,j} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{\nu}{1+\beta}\right) (\mathbf{D}_{k,\nu,j} + \mathbf{D}'_{k,\nu,j}), \\ \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC}^{\Delta} &:= \mathbf{D}_{k,0,j}^{\Delta} + \sum_{\nu=1}^{\beta} \left(1 - \frac{\nu}{1+\beta}\right) (\mathbf{D}_{k,\nu,j}^{\Delta} + (\mathbf{D}_{k,\nu,j}^{\Delta})'), \quad \text{where} \\ \mathbf{D}_{k,\nu,j} &:= \sum_{t=1+\nu}^T \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s,i} \right) \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{(k),t,jh} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t,ih} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,i,j,h}\} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s,i} \right) \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|} \widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{(k),t-\nu,jh} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t-\nu,ih} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t-\nu \in \psi_{k,i,j,h}\} \right)', \\ \mathbf{D}_{k,\nu,j}^{\Delta} &:= \sum_{t=1+\nu}^T \left[\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s,i} \right) \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t,ih} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t,jh} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,i,j,h}\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{T} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t,ih} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t,jh} \right) \right] \cdot \left[\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{s=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s,i} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{k,i,j,h}|} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t-\nu,ih} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t-\nu,jh} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t-\nu \in \psi_{k,i,j,h}\} - \frac{1}{T} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t-\nu,ih} \widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),t-\nu,jh} \right) \right]', \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}_{(k),s} := \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_s)$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{E}}_{(k),s} := \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_s)$.

Theorem 4 *Let all the assumptions under Theorem 2 hold, in addition to (L2), (AD1) and (AD2) above. With r_k fixed and $d_k, T \rightarrow \infty$ for $k \in [K]$, suppose also the rate for the individual common component imputation error in result 2 of Theorem 2 is $o(1)$, together with $Td_k = o(d_k^{\alpha_k, 1 + \alpha_k, r_k})$ and $d_k^{2(\alpha_k, 1 - \alpha_k, r_k)} [(Td_k)^{-1} + d_k^{-1}] d^2 g_s^{-2} = o(1)$. Then*

1. $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1}$ is consistent for $\mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \Xi_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}$;
2. $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC}^{\Delta} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1}$ is consistent for $(Td_k^{\alpha_k, r_k})^{-1} \mathbf{D}_k^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} h_{k,j} (\mathbf{A}_{k,j}) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}_k^{-1}$;
3. $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC}^{\Delta})^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{r_k})$.

The extra rate assumption $d_k^{2(\alpha_k, 1 - \alpha_k, r_k)} [(Td_k)^{-1} + d_k^{-1}] d^2 g_s^{-2} = o(1)$ makes sure that we have Frobenius norm consistency for $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ from Theorem 1. The imputation error from result 2 of Theorem 2 also has rate going to 0 when are all factors are pervasive, for instance. With result 3 in particular, we can perform inferences on any rows of $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$. Practical performances of result 3 is demonstrated in Section 5.1.3. The reason that we need two HAC estimators is that similar to Theorem 1, there is a component for missing data, arising from the fact that $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ is different from \mathbf{H}_k^a for each $j \in [d_k]$ in general.

4.5 Estimation of number of factors

The reconstructed mode- k sample covariance matrix \mathbf{S}_k is in fact estimating a complete-sample version of a matrix \mathbf{R}_k^* , where

$$\mathbf{R}_k^* := \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}_k \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}) \mathbf{\Lambda}'_k \mathbf{\Lambda}_k \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t})' \mathbf{Q}'_k, \quad (4.5)$$

and $\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}$ and $\mathbf{\Lambda}_k$ are defined in (3.2). It turns out that we have $\lambda_j(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k) \asymp_P \lambda_j(\mathbf{R}_k^*)$ for $j \in [r_k]$, and

$$\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}_k^*) \asymp_P d_k^{\alpha_{k,j} - \alpha_{k,1}} g_s, \quad g_s := \prod_{k=1}^K d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}} \text{ as defined in (R1).}$$

We have the following theorem.

Theorem 5 *Let Assumption (O1), (M1), (F1), (L1), (E1), (E2) and (R1) hold. Moreover, assume*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} dg_s^{-1} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} [(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}] = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,j+1} - \alpha_{k,j}}), \quad j \in [r_k - 1] \text{ with } r_k \geq 2; \\ dg_s^{-1} [(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}] = o(1), \quad r_k = 1. \end{array} \right.$$

Then \hat{r}_k is a consistent estimator of r_k , where

$$\hat{r}_k := \arg \min_{\ell} \left\{ \frac{\lambda_{\ell+1}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k) + \xi}{\lambda_{\ell}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k) + \xi}, \ell \in \llbracket d_k/2 \rrbracket \right\}, \quad \xi \asymp d[(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}]. \quad (4.6)$$

The extra rate assumption is satisfied, for instance, when all factors corresponding to \mathbf{A}_k are pervasive. An eigenvalue-ratio estimator is considered in Lam and Yao (2012) and Ahn and Horenstein (2013), while a perturbed eigenvalue ratio estimator is considered in Pelger (2019). However, all of these estimators are for a vector time series factor model. Our estimator \hat{r}_k in (4.6) extracts eigenvalues from $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k$, which is not necessarily positive semi-definite. The addition of ξ can make $\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k + \xi \mathbf{I}_{d_k}$ positive semi-definite, while stabilizing the estimator. We naturally assume that $r_k < d_k/2$, which is a very reasonable assumption for all applications of factor models. In fact, our recommended choice of ξ is

$$\xi = \frac{1}{5} d[(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}].$$

The requirement that $\xi \asymp d[(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}]$ ensures that $\xi = o_P(\lambda_{r_k}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}_k))$ from our rate assumption in the theorem. Our simulations in Section 5.1.2 suggest that this proposal works very well.

4.6 *How Assumption (AD2) can be implied

This section details how Assumption (AD2) can be implied from simpler assumptions. Readers can skip this part and go straight to the next section for a more integral reading experience. We begin by presenting

a proposition.

Proposition 1 *Let Assumption (O1), (F1), (L1) hold. For a given $k \in [K], j \in [d_k]$, assume also the following:*

1. *The mode- k factor is strong enough such that $\alpha_{k,r_k} > 4/5$, and $d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} T^{-\epsilon/2} = o(1)$ with some $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.*
2. *There exists some $\psi_{k,ij}$ such that $\psi_{k,ij} = \psi_{k,ij,h}$ for any $i \in [d_k], h \in [d_{-k}]$. Furthermore, there exists $\omega_{\psi,k,j}$ such that*

$$d_k^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} - 1 \right) \xrightarrow{p} \omega_{\psi,k,j}.$$

With the above, Assumption (AD2) is satisfied.

Condition 1 and 2 in Proposition 1 are on the factor strength and missingness pattern, respectively. Condition 1 is trivially satisfied if all factors are pervasive. Condition 2 can be easily satisfied by assuming that in $\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t)$, all the elements in each row are simultaneously missing with probability $1 - p_0$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_k^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} - 1 \right) \\ &= d_k^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T^2 \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}| \cdot |\psi_{k,lj}|} - \frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - \frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} + 1 \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{p} p_0^{-1} - 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is $\omega_{\psi,k,j}$. Similar to Assumption S3.2 in Xiong and Pelger (2023), the value of $\omega_{\psi,k,j}$ can be regarded as a measure of missingness complexity. It is a parameter related to the variance of the stable convergence, and tends to increase when there is a larger portion of data missing.

5 Numerical Results

5.1 Simulation

We demonstrate the empirical performance of our estimators in this section. Note that we do not have comparisons to other imputation methods since to the best of our knowledge, there are no other general imputation methods available for $K > 1$ apart from tensor completion methods for very specific applications as mentioned in the introduction. Under different missing patterns which will be described later, we

investigate the performance of the factor loading matrix estimators, the imputation, and the estimator of the number of factors. We also demonstrate asymptotic normality as described in Theorem 3, followed by an example plot of a statistical power function using result 3 of Theorem 4. Throughout this section, each simulation experiment of a particular setting is repeated 1000 times.

For the data generating process, we use model (3.1) together with Assumption (E1), (E2) and (F1). More precisely, the elements in \mathcal{F}_t are independent standardised AR(5) with AR coefficients 0.7, 0.3, -0.4, 0.2, and -0.1. The elements in $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$ and ϵ_t are generated similarly, but their AR coefficients are (-0.7, -0.3, -0.4, 0.2, 0.1) and (0.8, 0.4, -0.4, 0.2, -0.1) respectively. The standard deviation of each element in ϵ_t is generated by i.i.d. $|\mathcal{N}(0,1)|$.

For each $k \in [K]$, each factor loading matrix \mathbf{A}_k is generated independently with $\mathbf{A}_k = \mathbf{U}_k \mathbf{B}_k$, where each entry of $\mathbf{U}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times r_k}$ is i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, and $\mathbf{B}_k \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k \times r_k}$ is diagonal with the j -th diagonal entry being $d_k^{-\zeta_{k,j}}$, $0 \leq \zeta_{k,j} \leq 0.5$. Pervasive (strong) factors have $\zeta_{k,j} = 0$, while weak factors have $0 < \zeta_{k,j} \leq 0.5$. Each entry of $\mathbf{A}_{e,k} \in \mathbb{R}^{d_k \times r_{e,k}}$ is i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$, but has independent probability of 0.95 being set exactly to 0. We set $r_{e,k} = 2$ for all $k \in [K]$ throughout the section.

To investigate the performance with missing data, we consider four missing patterns:

- (M-i) Random missing with probability 0.05.
- (M-ii) Random missing with probability 0.3.
- (M-iii) The missing entries have index (t, i_1, \dots, i_K) , where

$$0.5T \leq t \leq T, \quad 1 \leq i_k \leq 0.5d_k \text{ for all } k \in [K].$$

- (M-iv) Conditional random missing such that the unit with index j along mode-1 is missing with probability 0.2 if $(\mathbf{A}_1)_{j,1} \geq 0$, and with probability 0.5 if $(\mathbf{A}_1)_{j,1} < 0$.

To test how robust our imputation is under heavy-tailed distribution, we consider two distributions for the innovation process in generating \mathcal{F}_t , $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$ and ϵ_t : 1) i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0,1)$; 2) i.i.d. t_3 .

5.1.1 Accuracy in the factor loading matrix estimators and imputations

For both the factor loading matrix estimators and the imputations, since our procedure for vector time series ($K = 1$) is essentially the same as that in Xiong and Pelger (2023), we show here only the performance for $K = 2, 3$. We use the column space distance

$$\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Q}, \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}) = \left\| \mathbf{Q}(\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q})^{-1}\mathbf{Q}' - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \right\|$$

for any given $\mathbf{Q}, \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}$, which is a common used measure in the literature. For measuring the imputation accuracy, we report the relative mean squared errors (MSE) defined by

$$\text{relative MSE}_{\mathcal{S}} = \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} (\widehat{C}_j - C_j)^2}{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} C_j^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

where \mathcal{S} either denotes the set of all missing, all observed, or all available units.

We consider the following simulation settings:

(Ia) $K = 2, T = 100, d_1 = d_2 = 40, r_1 = 1, r_2 = 2$. All factors are pervasive with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0$ for all k, j . All innovation processes in constructing $\mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{F}_{e,t}$ and ϵ_t are i.i.d. standard normal, and missing pattern is (M-i).

(Ib) Same as (Ia), but one factor is weak with $\zeta_{k,1} = 0.2$ for all $k \in [K]$.

(Ic) Same as (Ia), but all innovation processes are i.i.d. t_3 , and all factors are weak with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0.2$ for all k, j .

(Id) Same as (Ic), but $T = 200, d_1 = d_2 = 80$.

(Ie) $K = 3, T = 80, d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 20, r_1 = r_2 = r_3 = 2$. All factors are pervasive with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0$ for all k, j . All innovation processes in constructing $\mathcal{F}_t, \mathcal{F}_{e,t}$ and ϵ_t are i.i.d. standard normal, and missing pattern is (M-i).

(If) Same as (Ie), but all factors are weak with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0.2$ for all k, j .

(Ig) Same as (If), but $T = 200, d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 40$.

Settings (Ia) to (Id) have $K = 2$, and settings (Ie) to (Ig) have $K = 3$. They all have missing pattern (M-i), but we have considered all settings with missing patterns (M-ii) to (M-iv), with performance of the factor loading matrix estimators very similar to those with missing pattern (M-i). Hence we are only presenting the results for settings (Ia) to (Ig) in Figure 1. The imputation results for the above settings are collected in Table 1, together with those under different missing patterns.

We can see from Figure 1 that the factor loading matrix estimators perform worse when there are weak factors or when the distribution of the innovation processes is fat-tailed. However, larger dimensions ameliorate the worsen performance. The increase in the loading space distance from $k = 1$ to $k = 2$ in settings (Ia) to (Id) is due to more factors along mode-2, which naturally incurs more errors compared to smaller r_k .

From Table 1, we can see that missing pattern (M-iii) is uniformly more difficult in all settings for imputation. This is understandable as there is a large block of data missing in setting (M-iii), so that




Figure 1: Plot of the column space distance $\mathcal{D}(\mathbf{Q}_k, \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k)$ (in log-scale) for $k \in [K]$, with $K = 2$ on the left panel and $K = 3$ on the right. The horizontal axis is indexed by sub-settings (a) to (g), and the k -th boxplot within each sub-setting corresponds to the k -th factor loading matrix \mathbf{Q}_k .

we obtain less information towards the “center” of the missing block. This is also the reason why under (M-iii), the imputation performance for the missing set is worse than the observed set, unlike for other missing patterns where all imputation performances are close.

Random missing in (M-i) and (M-ii) are relatively easier for our imputation procedure to handle. Note that if the TALL-WIDE algorithm in Bai and Ng (2021) were to be extended to the case for $K > 1$, it can handle missing pattern (M-iii), but not (M-i) and (M-ii). The design of our method allows us to handle a wider variety of missing patterns, including random missingness. We want to stress that we have made attempts to generalise the TALL-WIDE algorithm to impute high-order time series data for comparisons, yet the method is almost impossible to use in tensor data. The generalisation is also too complicated, and hence is not showed here.

5.1.2 Performance for the estimation of the number of factors

In this section, we demonstrate the performance of our ratio estimator \widehat{r}_k in (4.6) for estimating r_k for $K = 1, 2, 3$. For each $k \in [K]$, we set the value of ξ in Theorem 5 as $\xi = d[(Td_{\cdot k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}]/5$. We have tried a wide range of values other than $1/5$ for ξ in all settings, but $1/5$ is working the best in vast majority of settings, and hence we do not recommend treating this as a tuning parameter for saving computational time.

We present the results under a fully observed scenario and a missing data scenario for each of the following setting:

Setting		K=2				K=3		
Missing Pattern	\mathcal{S}	(Ia)	(Ib)	(Ic)	(Id)	(Ie)	(If)	(Ig)
(M-i)	obs	.002	.020	.066	.039	2.61	120	.293
	miss	.002	.020	.066	.039	2.63	121	.294
	all	.002	.020	.066	.039	2.61	120	.293
(M-ii)	obs	.003	.025	.079	.045	5.97	154	.702
	miss	.003	.025	.079	.045	6.06	155	.703
	all	.003	.025	.079	.045	6.00	154	.702
(M-iii)	obs	.004	.025	.079	.048	6.64	136	1.75
	miss	.009	.036	.107	.061	14.7	164	4.02
	all	.005	.026	.083	.050	7.19	138	1.89
(M-iv)	obs	.004	.027	.086	.047	7.75	173	.888
	miss	.004	.028	.088	.047	8.49	179	.964
	all	.004	.027	.086	.047	8.00	175	.914

Table 1: Relative MSE for settings (Ia) to (Ig), reported for \mathcal{S} as the set containing respectively observed (obs), missing (miss), and all (all) units. For $K = 3$, all results presented are multiplied by 10^4 .

(IIa) $K = 1, T = d_1 = 80, r_1 = 2$. All factors are pervasive with $\zeta_{1,j} = 0$ for all j . All innovation processes involved are i.i.d. standard normal. We try missing patterns (M-ii), (M-iii), and (M-iv).

(IIb) Same as (IIa), but one factor is weak with $\zeta_{1,1} = 0.1$.

(IIc) Same as (IIb), but factors are weak with $\zeta_{1,1} = 0.1$ and $\zeta_{1,2} = 0.15$.

(IId) Same as (IIc), but $T = 160$.

(IIIa) $K = 2, T = d_1 = d_2 = 40, r_1 = 2, r_2 = 3$. All factors are pervasive with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0$ for all k, j . All innovation processes involved are i.i.d. standard normal, and the missing pattern is (M-ii).

(IIIb) Same as (IIIa), but all factors are weak with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0.1$ for all k, j .

(IIIc) Same as (IIIb), but $T = d_1 = d_2 = 80$.

(IVa) $K = 3, T = d_1 = d_2 = d_3 = 20, r_1 = 2, r_2 = 3, r_3 = 4$. All factors are pervasive with $\zeta_{k,j} = 0$ for all k, j . All innovation processes involved are i.i.d. standard normal, and the missing pattern is (M-ii).

(IVb) Same as (IVa), but all innovation processes are i.i.d. t_3 .

(IVc) Same as (IVa), but $T = 40$.

Since estimating the number of factors with missing data is new to the literature, it is of interest to explore the accuracy of the estimator under different missing patterns. Hence we explore different missing patterns in setting (IIa). Extensive experiments (not shown here) on the imputation accuracy using misspecified number of factors show that underestimation is harmful, while slight overestimation hardly worsen the performance of the imputations. Thus, for each of the above settings, we also compare

the performance using re-imputation and iTIP-ER by Han et al. (2022), where the re-imputation is done by using both \hat{r}_k and $\hat{r}_k + 1$ to avoid information loss due to underestimating the number of factors, see Table 2 and Table 3.

Setting (IIa) (True $r_1 = 2$)							
Missing Pattern	\hat{r}	$\hat{r}_{re,0}$	$\hat{r}_{re,1}$	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,0}$	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,1}$	\hat{r}_{full}	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,full}$
Mean(SD)							
(M-ii)	1.98 _(.13)	1.98 _(.13)	2.00 _(.06)	1.97 _(.18)	1.97 _(.22)	1.99 _(.10)	1.92 _(.28)
(M-iii)	1.92 _(.27)	1.93 _(.26)	1.97 _(.20)	1.90 _(.30)	1.92 _(.31)		
(M-iv)	1.98 _(.14)	1.98 _(.14)	2.01 _(.08)	1.97 _(.17)	1.98 _(.24)		
Correct Proportion							
(M-ii)	.982	.982	.996	.967	.949	.99	.917
(M-iii)	.921	.93	.96	.901	.898		
(M-iv)	.979	.979	.993	.97	.943		

Table 2: Results for setting (IIa). Each column reports the mean and SD (subscripted, in bracket), followed by the correct proportion of the estimates. The estimator \hat{r} is our proposed estimator; $\hat{r}_{re,0}$ and $\hat{r}_{re,1}$ are similar but used imputed data where the imputation is done using the number of factors as \hat{r} and $\hat{r} + 1$, respectively; $\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,0}$ and $\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,1}$ are iTIP-ER on imputed data (using \hat{r} and $\hat{r} + 1$ respectively); \hat{r}_{full} and $\hat{r}_{iTIP,full}$ are our estimator and iTIP-ER on fully observed data (in green), respectively.

Correct Proportion							
Setting	\hat{r}	$\hat{r}_{re,0}$	$\hat{r}_{re,1}$	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,0}$	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,re,1}$	\hat{r}_{full}	$\hat{r}_{iTIP,full}$
$K = 1$ (True $r_1 = 1$)							
(IIb)	.556	.556	.886	.526	.765	.633	.53
(IIc)	.626	.626	.762	.594	.668	.67	.539
(IId)	.791	.791	.817	.794	.837	.812	.767
$K = 2$ (True $(r_1, r_2) = (2, 3)$)							
(IIIa)	1	1	1	.995	.995	1	.994
(IIIb)	.978	.978	.987	.985	.989	.981	.986
(IIIc)	.999	.999	1	1	.996	.999	1
$K = 3$ (True $(r_1, r_2, r_3) = (2, 3, 4)$)							
(IVa)	1	1	1	.987	.987	1	.988
(IVb)	.996	.996	.999	.991	.991	1	.991
(IVc)	1	1	1	.999	1	1	1

Table 3: Results for settings (II), (III), and (IV), excluding (IIa). Refer to Table 2 for the definitions of different estimators.

From both Table 2 and 3, it is easy to see that our proposed method generally gives more accurate estimates than iTIP-ER, and it is clear that the re-imputation estimate is at least as good as the initial estimate. In fact, $\hat{r}_{re,1}$ outperforms \hat{r}_{full} which is based on full observation.

5.1.3 Asymptotic normality

We present the asymptotic normality results for $K = 1, 2, 3$ respectively. For all K considered, we present the result on $(\hat{\mathbf{Q}})_{11}$, with the parameter β of our HAC-type estimator set as $[\frac{1}{5}(Td_1)^{1/4}]$. We use (M-i) as the missing pattern for all settings.

When the data is a vector time series ($K = 1$), our approach is similar to Xiong and Pelger (2023), but their proposed estimator includes information of lag 0 only, while we use the HAC-type estimator facilitating more serial information. We do not use a β too large since it proves to be too time consuming to run simulations for high-order high-dimensional data when β is large. Because of this, there is no obvious differences in performances between our HAC estimator and the one in Xiong and Pelger (2023), except that our HAC-type estimator appears to give a smoother plot. Hence we omit the comparisons here.

The data generating process is similar to the ones for assessing the factor loading matrix estimators and imputations, but the parameters are slightly adjusted. All elements in \mathcal{F}_t , $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$, and ϵ_t are now independent standardised AR(1) with AR coefficients 0.05, and we use i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ as the innovation process. We stress that we include contemporary and serial dependence among the noise variables through our construction following Assumption (E1) and (E2), while most existing literature demonstrating asymptotic normality display results only for i.i.d. Gaussian noise.

We assume all factors are pervasive in this section. For all $K = 1, 2, 3$, given d_1 , we set $T, d_i = d_1/2$, $i \neq 1$. We generate a two-factor model for $K = 1$, and a one-factor model for $K = 2, 3$. For the settings $(K, d_1) = (1, 1000), (2, 400), (3, 160)$, we consider $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC}^\Delta)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1 (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,1} - \mathbf{H}_1^a \mathbf{Q}_{1,1})$. In particular, we plot the histograms of the first and second entry in Figure 2, whereas the corresponding QQ plots are presented in Figure 3.

The plots in Figure 2 provide empirical support to Theorem 3 and result 3 of Theorem 4. For $K = 3$, there are some heavy-tail issues, as seen in the bump at the right tail in the histogram (confirmed by its corresponding QQ plot). The QQ plot for $K = 2$ also hints on this, but the tail is thinned as the dimension increases. Our simulation is similar to that in Chen and Fan (2023) for $K = 2$, but we allow only partial data unobserved and we generalize to any tensor order K . We remark that the convergence rate of the HAC-type estimator is not completely satisfactory, such that relatively large dimension is needed, and it becomes less feasible for some applications. We leave the improvements of the HAC-type estimator to future work.

Lastly, we demonstrate an example of statistical testing for the above one-factor model for $K = 2$. More precisely, we want to test the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0 : \mathbf{Q}_{1,11} = 0$ with a two-sided test. A 5% significance level is used so that we reject the null if $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \Sigma_{HAC}^\Delta)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,11}$ is not in $[-1.96, 1.96]$. Each experiment is repeated 400 times and the power function for $\mathbf{Q}_{1,11}$ ranging from -0.02 to 0.02 is presented in Figure 4. The power function is approximately symmetric, and suggests that our test can successfully reject the null if the true value for $\mathbf{Q}_{1,11}$ is away from 0. When $\mathbf{Q}_{1,11} = 0$, the false positive probability is 7.25% which is slightly higher than the designated size of test. This is due to the slow convergence of the HAC estimators, and an increase in dimensions would improve this.




Figure 2: Histograms of the first entry of $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \Sigma_{HAC}^{\Delta})^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,1} - \mathbf{H}_1^a \mathbf{Q}_{1,1})$. In each panel, the curve (in red) is the empirical density, and the other curve (in green) in the left panel depicts the empirical density of the second entry of $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \Sigma_{HAC}^{\Delta})^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,1} - \mathbf{H}_1^a \mathbf{Q}_{1,1})$. The density curve for $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ (in black, dotted) is also superimposed on each histogram.




Figure 3: QQ plots of the first entry of $(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \Sigma_{HAC}^{\Delta})^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,1} - \mathbf{H}_1^a \mathbf{Q}_{1,1})$. The horizontal and vertical axes are theoretical and empirical quantiles respectively.

5.2 Real data analysis

5.2.1 Introduction of new measure

We propose a new measure to gauge the imputation performance in this section. Let the observed data be $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N)'$ and a vector of imputed data be $\widehat{\mathbf{y}} = (\widehat{y}_1, \widehat{y}_2, \dots, \widehat{y}_N)'$. WLOG, we let the entries in \mathbf{y} be ordered such that $y_1 \leq y_2 \leq \dots \leq y_N$, and each \widehat{y}_i is the corresponding imputed value for y_i . Given $q \in [N]$ and any integer $j = 0, 1, \dots, q$, denote by $q_j \in [N]$ the index of entry with value closest to the (j/q) -th quantile of \mathbf{y} . Hereafter, quantiles are always with respect to \mathbf{y} when referred to. For $n \in [q]$,




Figure 4: Statistical power of testing the null hypothesis $\mathcal{H}_0 : (\mathbf{Q}_{1,1})_1 = \mathbf{Q}_{1,11} = 0$ against the general alternative. The null is rejected when $|(\widehat{\Sigma}_{HAC} + \Sigma_{HAC}^\Delta)^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{1,11}| > 1.96$.

define

$$\mu_n := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=q_{n-1}}^{q_n} y_i, \quad \widehat{\mu}_n := \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=q_{n-1}}^{q_n} \widehat{y}_i.$$

Hence, μ_n is the average of the entries in \mathbf{y} between the $((n-1)/q)$ -th quantile and the (n/q) -th quantile.

With these, we define the *q-quantile relative squared error (q-RSE)* of $\widehat{\mathbf{y}}$ on \mathbf{y} as

$$q\text{-RSE} := \sum_{n=1}^q (\mu_n - \widehat{\mu}_n)^2 / \sum_{n=1}^q \mu_n^2 = \sum_{n=1}^q \left\{ \sum_{i=q_n}^{q_{n+1}} (y_i - \widehat{y}_i) \right\}^2 / \sum_{n=1}^q \left\{ \sum_{i=q_n}^{q_{n+1}} y_i \right\}^2.$$

It is obvious that $q\text{-RSE}$ is always non-negative, and $q\text{-RSE} = 0$ if $\widehat{y}_i = y_i$ for all $i \in [N]$. Note that the relative MSE defined in (5.1) is equivalent to $q\text{-RSE}$ with $q = N$, and essentially the average within each quantile interval smooths out the idiosyncratic noise in each data point. Intuitively, $q\text{-RSE}$ can be considered as a measure of how good the imputation of y_i is, compared with the overall level of y_i in each quantile interval.

As an example to demonstrate the pitfall of relative MSE, consider a one-factor model for vector time series and y_i represents some data entry for $i \in [N]$. Suppose $y_i = c_i + \epsilon_i$ and $\widehat{y}_i = c_i$, where c_i is the

common component to be imputed and ϵ_i is the noise. Hence we have perfect imputation here, and a good measure should have value close to 0. However,

$$\text{relative MSE} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^N (c_i + \epsilon_i)^2},$$

which might even be larger than 1 if the noise term is comparable to the common component. For simplicity if we set $q = 1$, then

$$q\text{-RSE} = \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i)^2}{(\sum_{i=1}^N c_i + \sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i)^2},$$

which goes to 0 if we assume sensibly that as N gets large, $\sum_{i=1}^N \epsilon_i$ goes to 0 at a faster rate than $\sum_{i=1}^N c_i$. Thus, given that we cannot distinguish between the common component and the noise term for a given set of data, the q -RSE is a better measure to gauge imputation performances.

5.2.2 NYC taxi traffic

We analyze a set of taxi traffic data in New York city in this example. The data includes all individual taxi rides operated by Yellow Taxi in New York City, published at

<https://www1.nyc.gov/site/tlc/about/tlc-trip-record-data.page>.

For simplicity, we only consider the rides within Manhattan Island, which comprises most of the data. The dataset contains 842 million trip records within the period of January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2022. Each trip record includes features such as pick-up and drop-off dates/times, pick-up and drop-off locations, trip distances, itemized fares, rate types, payment types, and driver-reported passenger counts. Our example here focuses on the pick-up and drop-off dates/times, and pick-up and drop-off locations.

To classify the pick-up and drop-off locations in Manhattan, they are coded according to 69 predefined zones in the dataset. Moreover, each day is divided into 24 hourly periods to represent the pick-up and drop-off times each day, with the first hourly period from 0 a.m. to 1 a.m. The total number of rides moving among the zones within each hour are recorded, yielding data $\mathcal{Y}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{69 \times 69 \times 24}$ each day, where $y_{i_1, i_2, i_3, t}$ is the number of trips from zone i_1 to zone i_2 and the pick-up time is within the i_3 -th hourly period on day t . We consider business days and non-business days separately, so that we will analyze two tensor time series. The business-day series is 2,519 days long, while the non-business-day series is 1,133 days long, within the period of January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2022.

As we are more interested in estimation of the tensor factor structure with missingness and hence imputation, we demean the data before imposing different missing patterns, and investigate their effects. See descriptions of missing pattern (M-i) to (M-iii) in Section 5.1. We first estimate the rank of the core tensor using our proposed eigenvalue ratio estimator. Inspired by the simulation results in Section 5.1.2,




Figure 5: Estimated loading matrices $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ (left) and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$ (right) for business-day series. The data is randomly missing with 5% probability.

we obtain the rank estimates \hat{r}_k for $k \in [K]$, and re-impute the data using $\hat{r}_k + 1$ as the number of factors along mode- k . It appears that the estimated rank is $(1, 1, 1)$ for both the business-day and non-business-day series, and both are consistent under missing patterns (M-i), (M-ii), (M-iii) and no missing. This also coincides with iTIP-ER of Han et al. (2022).

Using the above rank, we estimate the factor loading matrices for different modes. We note the resulting heatmaps of the estimated loadings are almost the same under different missing patterns, so we only display one particular example here. Figure 5 shows the heatmaps of $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$ for the business-day series under missing pattern (M-i). The two heatmaps reveal the same pattern in Manhattan, that traffic is mainly within the downtown areas (the upper east and around the Empire State Building), whereas recreation park or amusement areas (the Central Park and upper west) load slightly on the factor structure. In contrast, dining and sports areas (especially East Harlem) stand out in the factor loadings for non-business-day series. See Figure 6.

The mode-3 loading matrix conveys the information of pick-up time, and the unveiled pattern is the same over different missing patterns. Similar to $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$, we show $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_3$ under missing pattern (M-i) in Table 4 and Table 5 for the business-day and non-business-day series respectively. The highlighted parts indicate the rush-hours in business and non-business days, which depict drastically different patterns. From Table 4, we can see our single factor captures the morning rush-hours (roughly from 9 a.m. to 11 a.m.) and the afternoon-evening rush-hours (between 3 p.m. to 9 p.m.) for business days. Interestingly, we can




Figure 6: Estimated loading matrices $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_1$ (left) and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_2$ (right) for non-business-day series. The data is randomly missing with 5% probability.

see the taxi volume spikes slightly at 1 p.m. which might be due to an after-lunch period. We may notice the night life in business days almost end after 1 a.m., while the traffic remains busy even after 2 a.m. in non-business days. It is also clear from the mild sparsity in business-day loading that daily activities are more regular and tractable in business days, compared with those in non-business days.

0_{am}	2	4	6	8	10	12_{pm}	2	4	6	8	10	12_{am}												
1	3	1	1	0	0	0	1	4	6	6	6	5	6	5	6	6	5	5	6	7	6	5	5	4

Table 4: Estimated loading matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_3$ for business-day series, after scaling. The data is randomly missing with 5% probability. Magnitudes larger than 5 are highlighted in red.

0_{am}	2	4	6	8	10	12_{pm}	2	4	6	8	10	12_{am}													
1	5	5	4	3	2	1	1	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	5	5	5	5	5	6	6	6	5	5	5

Table 5: Estimated loading matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_3$ for non-business-day series, after scaling. The data is randomly missing with 5% probability. Magnitudes larger than 4 are highlighted in red.

From the above discussion, it is easy to see that with our proposed imputation procedure, the tensor factor structure could be well studied even if we cannot observe the full data set. Nevertheless, Table 6 reveals that different missing patterns have slight influence on the imputation accuracy, as also suggested by previous simulation results. The q -RSE are reported for $q=5,10,20,100$, so that the overall performance is gauged accounting for large magnitudes of noise.

Unsurprisingly, we note that the block-missingness in (M-iii) yields the worst accuracy among the experimented patterns. Lastly, the analysis on Manhattan Taxi data is for demonstration of our imputation method, and more sophisticated investigations are required to further understand the traffic pattern.

q	business-day			non-business-day		
	(M-i)	(M-ii)	(M-iii)	(M-i)	(M-ii)	(M-iii)
5	0.279	0.279	0.407	0.289	0.212	0.558
10	0.307	0.307	0.488	0.321	0.271	0.554
20	0.336	0.337	0.515	0.356	0.329	0.541
100	0.377	0.378	0.574	0.417	0.409	0.550

Table 6: q -RSE for business-day and non-business-day series under different missing patterns, with $q = 5, 10, 20, 100$.

6 Appendix: Proof of all theorems and propositions

From Section 3.1, $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ contains the eigenvectors corresponding to the first r_k largest eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$. Hence with $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k$ an $r_k \times r_k$ diagonal matrix containing all the eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k$ (WLOG from the largest on the top-left element to the smallest on the bottom right element), we have $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k = \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k$, so that

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k = \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1}. \quad (6.1)$$

To simplify notations, hereafter we fix k and only focus on the mode- k unfolded data. Define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbf{D}} &:= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k, \mathbf{Y}_t := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{Y}_t), \widehat{\mathbf{S}} := \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_k, \psi_{ij,h} := \psi_{k,ij,h}, \mathbf{Q} := \mathbf{Q}_k, \\ \mathbf{\Lambda} &:= \mathbf{\Lambda}_k, \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}), \mathbf{E}_t := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t), \mathbf{H}_j := \mathbf{H}_{k,j}, \mathbf{H}^a := \mathbf{H}_k^a, \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{k,j}$ and \mathbf{H}_k^a are defined in (4.3) and (4.4) respectively, and similarly to all respective hat versions of the above.

Before proving any theorems, we present and prove the following Proposition first.

Proposition 2 *Let Assumption (E1), (E2) and (F1) hold. Then*

1. *there exists a constant $c > 0$ so that for any $k \in [K], t \in [T], i_k \in [d_k]$ and $h \in [d_{\cdot k}]$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} = 0, \mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}^4 \leq c, \text{ and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \left| \mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jl}] \right| &\leq c, \\ \sum_{l=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} \left| \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{il} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl} \right) \right| &\leq c; \end{aligned}$$

2. there exists a constant $c > 0$ so that for any $k \in [K]$, $i, j \in [d_k]$, and any deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{r-k}$ with constant magnitudes,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{d_{-k}^{1/2}} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|^{1/2}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} \mathbf{u}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \right)^2 \leq c;$$

3. for any $k \in [K]$, $i, j \in [d_k]$, $h \in [d_{-k}]$,

$$\frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)', \quad \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' \xrightarrow{p} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k := r_{-k} \mathbf{I}_{r_k},$$

with the number of factors r_k fixed as $\min\{T, d_1, \dots, d_K\} \rightarrow \infty$. For each $t \in [T]$, all elements in \mathcal{F}_t are independent of each other, with mean 0 and unit variance.

Our consistency results in Theorem 1 can be proved assuming the three implied results from Proposition 2, on top of Assumption (O1), (M1), (L1) and (R1). Result 1 from Proposition 2 can be a stand alone assumption on the weak correlation of the noise \mathcal{E}_t across different dimensions and times, while result 2 can be on the weak dependence between the factor \mathcal{F}_t and the noise \mathcal{E}_t . Finally, result 3 can be a stand alone assumption on the factors \mathcal{F}_t .

Proof of Proposition 2.

We have $\mathbb{E}(\mathcal{E}_t) = 0$ from Assumption (E1). Next we want to show that for any $k \in [K]$, $t \in [T]$ and $i_k \in [d_k]$, $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}^4$ is bounded uniformly. From (4.2), each entry in \mathcal{E}_t is a sum of two parts: a linear combination of the elements in $\mathcal{F}_{e,t}$, and the corresponding entry in ϵ_t . By Assumption (E2), we have

$$\mathbb{E}[(\epsilon_t)_{i_1,\dots,i_K}^4] = \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q} (\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{i_1,\dots,i_K} \right)^4 \right] \leq \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} |a_{\epsilon,q}| \right)^4 \sup_t \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t})_{i_1,\dots,i_K}^4] \leq C,$$

where $C > 0$ is a generic constant. It holds similarly that $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{F}_{e,t})_{i_1,\dots,i_K}^4] \leq C$ uniformly on all indices. With this, defining $\mathbf{A}^{om} := \mathbf{A} \circ \dots \circ \mathbf{A}$ (elementwise m -th power),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}_t^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} &= \|\mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)]^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} \leq 8(\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{e,k} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{e,t}) \mathbf{A}'_{e,-k}]^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} \cdot \|\mathbb{E}\epsilon_t^{\circ 4}\|_{\max}) \\ &\leq 8(\|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_\infty^4 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k}\|_\infty^4 \cdot \|\mathbb{E}\mathcal{F}_{e,t}^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} \cdot \|\mathbb{E}\epsilon_t^{\circ 4}\|_{\max}) \\ &= 8 \left(\prod_{j=1}^K \|\mathbf{A}_{e,j}\|_\infty^4 \cdot \|\mathbb{E}\mathcal{F}_{e,t}^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} \cdot \|\mathbb{E}\epsilon_t^{\circ 4}\|_{\max} \right) \leq C, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is again a generic constant, and we used Assumption (E1) in the last line and the fact that r_j is a constant for $j \in [K]$. This is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}\mathcal{E}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K}^4 \leq c$ for some constant c .

With (4.2) in Assumption (E1), we have

$$\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t) = \mathbf{A}_{e,k} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{e,t}) \mathbf{A}'_{e,-k} + \text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon) \circ \text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_t),$$

where $\mathbf{A}_{e,-k} := \mathbf{A}_{e,K} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{A}_{e,k+1} \otimes \mathbf{A}_{e,k-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{A}_{e,1}$. Each mode- k noise fibre $\mathbf{e}_{t,k,l}$ for $l \in [d_{-k}]$ can then be decomposed as

$$\mathbf{e}_{t,k,l} := \mathbf{A}_{e,k} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{e,t}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l} + \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\epsilon,k,l}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t,k,l}, \quad (6.3)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\epsilon,k,l} = \text{diag}((\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon))_{\cdot l} (\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon))'_{\cdot l})$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{t,k,l}$ contains independent elements each with mean 0 and variance 1.

Given $h \in [d_{-k}]$, $i \in [d_k]$, from (6.3) and Assumption (E1) and (E2), we have

$$\sum_{l \neq h} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left| \mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jl}] \right| \leq \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\| \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l}\| \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_1 \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_\infty = O(1).$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left| \mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}] \right| &\leq \|\text{cov}(\mathbf{e}_{t,k,h}, \mathbf{e}_{t,k,h})\|_1 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\|^2 \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_1 \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k}\|_\infty + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\epsilon,k,h}\|_1 = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality is from Assumption (E1).

To finish the proof of the first result in the Proposition, fix indices k, t, i, j, h . From Assumption (E2) and (6.3), we have

$$[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)]_{il} = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l} + [\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{il} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{il}. \quad (6.4)$$

Hence when $l \neq h$, from the independence between $\{\mathcal{X}_{e,t}\}$ and $\{\mathcal{X}_{e,t}\}$ and the independence of the elements within $\{\mathcal{X}_{e,t}\}$ in Assumption (E2), we have for any $s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{cov}\left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{il} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl}\right) \\ &= \text{cov}\left(\left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\right) \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,j} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\right), \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,s-q}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l}\right) \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,j} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,s-q}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l}\right)\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

By (E2) again, all mixed covariance terms are zero except for $\text{cov}(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{nm}^2, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{nm}^2)$ for

all $q \geq 0, n \in [r_{e,k}], m \in [r_{e,-k}]$, with coefficient $a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 A_{e,k,in}^2 A_{e,k,jn}^2 A_{e,-k,hm}^2 A_{e,-k,lm}^2$. Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1, l \neq h}^{d_k} \left| \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{il} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl} \right) \right| \\
&= \sum_{l=1, l \neq h}^{d_k} \left| \sum_{n=1}^{r_{e,k}} \sum_{m=1}^{r_{e,-k}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 A_{e,k,in}^2 A_{e,k,jn}^2 A_{e,-k,hm}^2 A_{e,-k,lm}^2 \cdot \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{nm}^2, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{nm}^2 \right) \right| \\
&= O(1) \cdot \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 \left(\sum_{n=1}^{r_{e,k}} A_{e,k,in}^2 A_{e,k,jn}^2 \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_{e,-k}} A_{e,-k,hm}^2 \sum_{l=1, l \neq h}^{d_k} A_{e,-k,lm}^2 \right) = \sum_{q \geq 0} O(a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Assumption (E2) in the second last equality, and (E1) in the last. Consequently,

$$\sum_{l=1, l \neq h}^{d_k} \sum_{s \in \psi_k, ij, l} \left| \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{il} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl} \right) \right| = \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{s=1}^T O(a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2) = O(1),$$

where the last equality uses Assumption (E2). Now consider lastly $l = h$. All arguments starting from (6.4) follow exactly, except the following term is added in (6.5):

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,ii} \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,jj} \cdot \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t-q})_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,s-q})_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,s-q})_{jh} \right) \\
&= O(1) \cdot \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^2 a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 = O(1).
\end{aligned}$$

where we used again Assumptions (E2) in the last line. Finally,

$$\sum_{s \in \psi_k, ij, h} \left| \text{cov} \left(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{ih} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jh} \right) \right| = O(1).$$

This completes the proof of result 1 in the Proposition.

To prove the second result, fix $k \in [K], i, j \in [d_k]$ and deterministic vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{r-k}$ with $\|\mathbf{u}\|, \|\mathbf{v}\| = O(1)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_s)'] = \mathbf{v}' \mathbf{v} (r-k \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} a_{f,q+|t-s|}) \mathbf{I}_{r_k}$, as the series $\{\mathcal{X}_{f,t}\}$ has i.i.d. elements from Assumption (F1). Similarly, from (6.3) and Assumption (E1) and (E2),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{cov}(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl}) \\
&= \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}'_{e,k,j} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{e,t}) \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{e,-k,l} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_{e,s})' \mathbf{A}_{e,k,j}] + \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}'_{t,k,h} (\Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,j} \cdot \Sigma'_{\epsilon,k,l,j})^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{s,k,l}] \\
&= \mathbf{A}'_{e,-k,l} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,j}\|^2 \cdot \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} a_{e,q+|t-s|} + \mathbb{1}_{\{h=l\}} \cdot \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,jj} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} a_{e,q+|t-s|}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence if we fix $h \in [d_{-k}]$, $t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}$, then together with Assumption (E2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,l}|} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} \mathbf{u}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl} \mathbf{v}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_s)' \mathbf{u} \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,l}|} \cdot \text{cov}(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh}, \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl}) \cdot \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{u}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_s)' \mathbf{u} \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,l}|} \left[O(\mathbf{A}'_{e,-k,l} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,j}\|^2) \cdot \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} a_{e,q} a_{e,q+|t-s|} a_{f,p} a_{f,p+|t-s|} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + O(\mathbb{1}_{\{h=l\}} \cdot \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,jj}) \cdot \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} a_{e,q} a_{e,q+|t-s|} a_{f,p} a_{f,p+|t-s|} \right] \\
&= \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,l}|} \cdot O(\mathbf{A}'_{e,-k,l} \cdot \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,j}\|^2 + \mathbb{1}_{\{h=l\}} \cdot \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,jj}) = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.6}$$

where for the second last equality, we argue for the first term in the second last line only, as the second term could be shown similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} a_{e,q} a_{e,q+|t-s|} a_{f,p} a_{f,p+|t-s|} = \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} a_{e,q} a_{f,p} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} a_{e,q+|t-s|} a_{f,p+|t-s|} \\
&\leq \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} |a_{e,q}| \cdot |a_{f,p}| \cdot \left(\sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} a_{e,q+|t-s|}^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} a_{f,p+|t-s|}^2 \right)^{1/2} \leq \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} |a_{e,q}| \cdot |a_{f,p}| \leq c^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the constant c is from Assumptions (F1) and (E2). Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_{-k} \cdot |\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} \mathbf{u}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{d_{-k}^2} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \sum_{s \in \psi_{k,ij,l}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}| \cdot |\psi_{k,ij,l}|} \mathbb{E} \left[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} \mathbf{u}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_s)_{jl} \mathbf{v}' \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_s)' \mathbf{u} \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{d_{-k}^2 T} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) = O\left(\frac{1}{d_{-k} T}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

which then implies result 2 of the Proposition.

Finally, we prove result 3 of the Proposition. From Assumption (F1), we have $\mathbb{E}[\mathcal{F}_t] = 0$. Next, for any $t \in [T]$, it is direct from Assumption (F1) that all elements in \mathcal{F}_t are independent. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)'] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q}) \right) \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})' \right) \right] \\
&= \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 \mathbb{E}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q}) \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})'] = \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 \right) \cdot r_{-k} \mathbf{I}_{r_k} = r_{-k} \mathbf{I}_{r_k},
\end{aligned}$$

where we use Assumption (F1) in the last line. To complete the proof, WLOG consider the variance of the

j -th diagonal element of $\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)'$. From Assumption (F1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var}\left(\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^T[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)]'_j.[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)]_j\right) = \frac{1}{T^2}\text{Var}\left(\sum_{t=1}^T\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]'_j\right]\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]_j\right]\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{s=1}^T\text{cov}\left(\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]'_j\right]\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]_j\right],\right. \\
&\quad \left.\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,s-q})]'_j\right]\left[\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,s-q})]_j\right]\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}^4\text{Var}([\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]'_j.[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]_j) \\
&+ \frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}\sum_{p\neq q}a_{f,q}^2a_{f,p}^2\text{Var}([\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]'_j.[\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-p})]_j) \\
&= \frac{r-k}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}^4\text{Var}([\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t-q})]_{j1}^2) + \frac{r-k}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}\sum_{p\neq q}a_{f,q}^2a_{f,p}^2 \\
&= O(1)\cdot\frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}^4 + O(1)\cdot\frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T\sum_{q\geq 0}\sum_{p\neq q}a_{f,q}^2a_{f,p}^2 = O(1)\cdot\frac{1}{T^2}\sum_{t=1}^T(\sum_{q\geq 0}a_{f,q}^2)^2 = O\left(\frac{1}{T}\right) = o(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where the third equality uses the independence in Assumption (E2). This completes the proof of result 3, and hence the Proposition. \square

To prove Theorem 1, we are going to present some lemmas and prove them first. From (6.1),

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{d_k}\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i.\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_{ij} = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^{d_k}\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i.\sum_{h=1}^{d_k}\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|}\sum_{t\in\psi_{ij,h}}Y_{t,ih}Y_{t,jh}. \quad (6.7)$$

With the notations in (6.2), (3.1) can be written as $\mathbf{Y}_t = \mathbf{Q}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t}\mathbf{\Lambda}' + \mathbf{E}_t$, and hence for $i, j \in [d_k], h \in [d_k]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{t,ih} &= \left(\sum_{n=1}^{r_k}\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}Q_{in}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,nm}\right) + E_{t,ih} = \mathbf{Q}'_i.\left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right) + E_{t,ih} \\
&= \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right)'\mathbf{Q}_i + E_{t,ih}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence the product $Y_{t,ih}Y_{t,jh}$ in (6.7) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{t,ih}Y_{t,jh} &= \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right)'\mathbf{Q}_i.\left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right)'\mathbf{Q}_j + E_{t,ih}E_{t,jh} \\
&\quad + E_{t,jh}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right)'\mathbf{Q}_i + E_{t,ih}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k}\Lambda_{hm}\mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m}\right)'\mathbf{Q}_j.
\end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

We then have, from (6.7) and (6.8) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot} &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right. \\
&\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot} \right) \\
&=: \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} (\mathcal{I}_j + \mathcal{II}_j + \mathcal{III}_j),
\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_j &:= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}, \\
\mathcal{II}_j &:= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i, \\
\mathcal{III}_j &:= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot}.
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma bounds the terms \mathcal{I}_j , \mathcal{II}_j , and \mathcal{III}_j .

Lemma 1 *Under Assumptions (O1), (F1), (L1), (E1) and (E2), we have*

$$\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 = O_P \left(\frac{d}{T} + d_{-k}^2 \right), \tag{6.10}$$

$$\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{II}_j\|_F^2 = O_P \left(\frac{d_{-k} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}}}{T} \right) = \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{III}_j\|_F^2. \tag{6.11}$$

Proof of Lemma 1. To prove (6.10), we decompose

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_j &= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} - \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}])}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} + \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right) \\
&=: \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \xi_{ij} + \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \eta_{ij},
\end{aligned} \tag{6.12}$$

where

$$\xi_{ij} := \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} - \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}])}{|\psi_{ij,h}|}, \quad \eta_{ij} := \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|}.$$

We want to show the following:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \xi_{ij} \right\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{dd_k}{T}\right), \quad (6.13)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \eta_{ij} \right\|_F^2 = O_P(dd_k). \quad (6.14)$$

To show (6.13), first note that $\mathbb{E}\xi_{ij} = 0$, and also by Assumption (O1),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\xi_{ij}|^2 &= \text{var}(\xi_{ij}) \leq \frac{1}{\psi_0^2 T^2} \text{var}\left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} - \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}])\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\psi_0^2 T^2} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \sum_{s \in \psi_{ij,l}} \left| \text{cov}\left((E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} - \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]), (E_{s,il} E_{s,jl} - \mathbb{E}[E_{s,il} E_{s,jl}])\right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{\psi_0^2 T^2} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{s \in \psi_{ij,l}} \left| \text{cov}(E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}, E_{s,il} E_{s,jl}) \right| \leq \frac{cd_k}{\psi_0^2 T}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.15)$$

where the last inequality and the constant c are from result 1 of Proposition 2 (hereafter Proposition 2.1, etc). Then by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \xi_{ij} \right\|_F^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i\|_F^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \xi_{ij}^2 \right) = O_P\left(\frac{dd_k}{T}\right),$$

which is (6.13). To show (6.14), note that if we define

$$\rho_{ij,h} := \frac{\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{\left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih}^2]\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,jh}^2]\right)^{1/2}},$$

then $|\rho_{ij,h}| < 1$ and hence $\rho_{ij,h}^2 \leq |\rho_{ij,h}|$. It is then easy to prove also that

$$\rho_{ij} := \frac{\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{\left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih}^2]\right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,jh}^2]\right)^{1/2}},$$

also satisfy $|\rho_{ij}| \leq 1$ and $\rho_{ij}^2 \leq |\rho_{ij}|$. By Proposition 2.1,

$$\left| \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih}^2]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right| = O_P(d_k),$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\eta_{ij}^2 &= \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right)^2 = \rho_{ij}^2 \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih}^2]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right) \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,jh}^2]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right) \\
&= |\rho_{ij}| \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih}^2]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,jh}^2]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right)^{1/2} \cdot O_P(d_k) \\
&= \left| \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{\sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \right| \cdot O_P(d_k) = |\eta_{ij}| O_P(d_k).
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above, we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \eta_{ij} \right\|_F^2 &\leq \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i\|_F^2 \right) \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \eta_{ij}^2 \right) \leq r_k \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \eta_{ij}^2 = O_P(d_k) \cdot \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} |\eta_{ij}| \\
&= O_P(d_k) \cdot \frac{1}{|\psi_0 T|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} |\mathbb{E}[E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}]| = O_P(dd_k), \tag{6.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality used Assumption (O1), and the last equality used Proposition 2.1. This proves (6.14). Using (6.13) and (6.14), from (6.12) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \xi_{ij,h} + \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \eta_{ij,h} \right\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{2}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \xi_{ij} \right\|_F^2 + \frac{2}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \eta_{ij} \right\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{d}{T} + d_k^2\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (6.10). To prove (6.11), consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \right\|_F^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i\|_F^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{r_k}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \right)^2 \tag{6.17} \\
&= \frac{r_k d_k^2}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_k \cdot |\psi_{ij,h}|} E_{t,jh} [\otimes_{l \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_l]_h' \cdot \mathbf{F}_t' \mathbf{A}_i \right)^2 \\
&= \frac{r_k d_k^2}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_k \cdot |\psi_{ij,h}|} E_{t,jh} \mathbf{v}_h' \mathbf{F}_t' \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{u}_i\|_F} \mathbf{u}_i \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{A}_k$ and $\mathbf{F}_t = \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)$ above, and we define $\mathbf{v}_h := [\otimes_{l \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_l]_h$, $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{A}_i$. By Proposition

2.2, the last bracket in the last line of (6.17) is $O_P(d_k^{-1}T^{-1})$, and hence

$$\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{d_{-k}}{d_k T}\right) \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{u}_i\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{d_{-k}}{d_k T}\right) \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\frac{d_{-k} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}}}{T}\right),$$

where the last equality follows since for any $l \in [K]$, $\|\mathbf{A}_l\|_F^2 = O_P(\text{tr}(\mathbf{Z}_l)) = O_P(d_l^{\alpha_{l,1}})$ by Assumption (L1). The bound corresponding to $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j$ can be proved similarly (omitted), and hence (6.11) is established.

This concludes the proof of Lemma 1. \square

Lemma 2 *Under Assumptions (O1), (M1), (F1), (L1), (E1), (E2) and (R1), with \mathbf{H}_j and $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ from (6.2), we have*

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F = O_P\left(d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{-\alpha_{j,1}}\right), \quad (6.18)$$

$$\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot} \right\|_F^2 = O_P\left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \left(\frac{1}{T d_{-k}} + \frac{1}{d_k}\right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2(1 - \alpha_{j,1})}\right). \quad (6.19)$$

Proof of Lemma 2. First, we bound the term $\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F^2$ by finding the lower bound of $\lambda_{r_k}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}})$. To do this, define $\omega_k := d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k} - \alpha_{k,1}} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{\alpha_{j,1}}$, and consider the decomposition

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{R}^* + (\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3, \quad (6.20)$$

where for a unit vector γ ,

$$\begin{aligned} R(\gamma) &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \widehat{\mathbf{S}} \gamma = \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \widehat{S}_{ij} = \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} Y_{t,ih} Y_{t,jh} \\ &=: R^*(\gamma) + (\widetilde{R}(\gamma) - R^*(\gamma)) + R_1 + R_2 + R_3, \quad \text{with} \\ \widetilde{R}(\gamma) &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \widetilde{\mathbf{R}} \gamma := \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_j, \\ R^*(\gamma) &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \mathbf{R}^* \gamma := \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_j, \\ R_1 &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \mathbf{R}_1 \gamma := \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}, \\ R_2 &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \mathbf{R}_2 \gamma := \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i, \\ R_3 &:= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \gamma' \mathbf{R}_3 \gamma := \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r-k} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t,\cdot,m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_j, \end{aligned} \quad (6.21)$$

and we used (6.8) for the expansion above. Then we have the decomposition

$$R(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) = R(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) + \tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma}). \quad (6.22)$$

Similar to the treatment of the term \mathcal{I}_j in the proof of Lemma 1, since $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_1| &\leq \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \xi_{ij} \right| + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \eta_{ij} \right| \leq \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \xi_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2} + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \eta_{ij}^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &= O_P \left(d_k^{\alpha_k, 1 - \alpha_k, r_k} \left[\frac{1}{T^{1/2} d_k^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{d_k^{1/2}} \right] \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{1 - \alpha_{j, 1}} \right) = O_P \left(d[(T d_k)^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}] / \omega_k \right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

where the second last equality is from (6.15) and part of (6.16). Together with Assumption (R1), (6.23) implies that as $T, d_k, d_{-k} \rightarrow \infty$, $R_1 \xrightarrow{P} 0$.

From (6.17) and the arguments for $\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j$ immediately afterwards, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} |R_2| &\leq \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij, h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij, h}} E_{t, jh} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{r_{-k}} \Lambda_{hm} \mathbf{F}_{Z, t, \cdot m} \right)' \mathbf{Q}_i \right)^2 \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= O_P(\omega_k^{-1}) \cdot O_P \left(T^{-1/2} d^{1/2} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{\alpha_{j, 1}/2} \right) = O_P((dg_s)^{1/2} T^{-1/2} / \omega_k) = o_P(1), \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

where the last equality is from Assumption (R1). The term R_3 can be proved to have the same rate with same lines of proof as for R_2 . Hence we have

$$\sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|=1} |R(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - \tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| = \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|=1} |R_1 + R_2 + R_3| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \quad (6.25)$$

Similar to the proof of (R6) in Lemma 4 in Xiong and Pelger (2023), using the definition $\mathbf{v}_h := [\otimes_{l \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_l]_h$. as before,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) &= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij, h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij, h}} \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z, t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z, t} \mathbf{Q}_j - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z, t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z, t} \mathbf{Q}_j \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \mathbf{A}'_i \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij, h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij, h}} \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \right) \mathbf{A}_j \\ &=: \frac{1}{\omega_k} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \gamma_i \gamma_j \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \mathbf{A}'_i \Delta_{F, k, ij, h} \mathbf{A}_j, \quad \text{where} \end{aligned} \quad (6.26)$$

$$\Delta_{F, k, ij, h} := \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij, h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij, h}} \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t.$$

By the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we then have

$$|\tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| \leq \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left[\mathbf{A}'_i \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \right]^2 \right)^{1/2}. \quad (6.27)$$

With Assumption (M1), using the standard rate of convergence in the weak law of large number for α -mixing sequence and the fact that the elements in \mathcal{F}_t are independent from Assumption (F1), since $\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}$ has fixed dimension, we have for each $k \in [K]$, $i, j \in [d_k]$ and $h \in [d_k]$,

$$\|\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}\|_F \leq \left\| \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t - \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{v}_h \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \right\|_F + \left\| \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t - \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{v}_h \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \right\|_F = O_P\left(\frac{\|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2}{T^{1/2}}\right). \quad (6.28)$$

From Assumption (L1), we then have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \left[\mathbf{A}'_i \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \right]^2 &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{A}_i\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{A}_j\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \|\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}\|_F \right)^2 \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_k\|_F^4 \cdot O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2 \right)^2\right) = \|\mathbf{A}_k\|_F^4 \cdot O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \|\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j\|_F^4\right) \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \prod_{j=1}^K \|\mathbf{A}_j\|_F^4\right) = O_P\left(\frac{1}{T} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2\alpha_{j,1}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.29)$$

and hence from (6.27), we have by Assumption (R1) that

$$|\tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| = O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}}\right) = o_P(d^{-1/2} g_s^{1/2}) = o_P(1), \quad (6.30)$$

where the second last equality is from Assumption (R1). Next, with Proposition 2.3, consider

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{r_k}(\mathbf{R}^*) &= \lambda_{r_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \mathbf{Q}' \right) = \lambda_{r_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{F}_t \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right]' \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right] \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}'_k \right) \\ &\geq \lambda_{r_k}(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k) \cdot \lambda_{r_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right]' \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right] \mathbf{F}'_t \right) \\ &\asymp_P d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}} \cdot \lambda_{r_k}(\text{tr}(\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}'_j \mathbf{A}_j) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \asymp_P d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{\alpha_{j,1}} = \omega_k. \end{aligned}$$

With this, going back to the decomposition (6.20),

$$\omega_k^{-1} \lambda_{r_k}(\hat{\mathbf{D}}) = \omega_k^{-1} \lambda_{r_k}(\hat{\mathbf{S}}) \geq \omega_k^{-1} \lambda_{r_k}(\mathbf{R}^*) - \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|=1} |\tilde{R}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}) - R^*(\boldsymbol{\gamma})| - \sup_{\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|=1} |R_1 + R_2 + R_3| \asymp_P 1,$$

where we used (6.25) and (6.30). Hence finally,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F = O_P(\lambda_{r_k}^{-1}(\widehat{\mathbf{D}})) = O_P(\omega_k^{-1}) = O_P\left(d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}-\alpha_{k,r_k}} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{-\alpha_{j,1}}\right),$$

which completes the proof of (6.18).

To prove (6.19), from (6.9) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 &= \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}(\mathcal{I}_j + \mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j + \mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j)\|_F^2 \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F^2 \left[\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}_j + \mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j + \mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 \right] \\ &\leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F^2 \left[\left(\frac{2}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 \right) + \left(\frac{4}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 \right) + \left(\frac{4}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}\mathcal{I}_j\|_F^2 \right) \right] \\ &= O_P\left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1}-\alpha_{k,r_k})-1} \left(\frac{1}{Td_k} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2(1-\alpha_{j,1})}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from (6.18) and Lemma 1. This concludes the proof of Lemma 2. \square

Lemma 3 *Under the Assumptions in Lemma 2, for each $i, j \in [d_k]$ and $h \in [d_k]$, if the set $\psi_{ij,h}$ has cardinality satisfying*

$$\frac{|\psi_{ij,h}|}{T} = 1 - \eta_{i,j,h} \geq 1 - \eta,$$

then for all $j \in [d_k]$ with \mathbf{H}_j and \mathbf{H}^a from (6.2),

$$\|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 = O_P\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2}\right) d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1}-\alpha_{k,r_k})}\right) = o_P(1). \quad (6.31)$$

Proof of Lemma 3. Firstly, consider $\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}$ from (6.26), where

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}\|_F &= \left\| \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}_h' \mathbf{F}_t' - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}_h' \mathbf{F}_t' \right\|_F \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}^c} \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}_h' \mathbf{F}_t' \right\|_F + \left\| \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} - \frac{1}{T} \right) \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v}_h \mathbf{v}_h' \mathbf{F}_t' \right\|_F \\ &\leq O_P\left(\frac{T\eta}{T-T\eta} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2\right) + \frac{T\eta}{T(T-T\eta)} \cdot O_P(T \|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2) \\ &= O_P\left(\frac{\eta}{1-\eta} \|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (6.28), we have

$$\|\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}\|_F = O_P\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{T}}, \frac{\eta}{1-\eta}\right) \|\mathbf{v}_h\|^2\right). \quad (6.32)$$

Note also that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{H}_j &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \mathbf{Q}_i \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t},\end{aligned}$$

and also

$$\mathbf{H}^a = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t}.$$

We then have, for $\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_i = \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i$, and using (6.32),

$$\begin{aligned}\|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 &= \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \right) \right\|_F^2 \\ &= \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \mathbf{A}'_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \right\|_F^2 \leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1}\|_F^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_i \mathbf{A}'_i \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \right\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P(\omega_k^{-2}) \cdot \max_{i \in [d_k]} \left\| \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \right\|_F^2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_i\| \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_i\| \right)^2 \\ &= O_P(\omega_k^{-2}) \cdot O_P\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) \|\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j\|_F^4 \right) \cdot \|\widehat{\mathbf{A}}_k\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_k\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \right) = o_P(1),\end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.32) in the second last line, Assumption (L1) in the second last equality, and Assumption (R1) in the last equality. This completes the proof of Lemma 3. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.

The first result is shown in Lemma 2. Together with Lemma 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_j\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 + \frac{1}{d_k} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P\left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \left(\frac{1}{T d_k} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2(1 - \alpha_{j,1})} \right) \\ &\quad + O_P\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \right) \\ &= O_P\left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}) - 1} \left[\left(\frac{1}{T d_k} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \frac{d^2}{g_s^2} + \min\left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) \right] \right),\end{aligned}$$

where we used $d_k^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{Q}_j\|_F^2 = d_k^{-1} \|\mathbf{Q}_k\|_F^2 = O(d_k^{-1})$ by Assumption (L1). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Before we prove the consistency results for our imputations, we want to prove asymptotic normality for our factor loading estimators first. Consistency for the imputations will then use the rate obtained from asymptotic normality of the estimated factor loading matrices. We present a lemma first before proving Theorem 3.

Lemma 4 *Let Assumption (O1), (M1), (F1), (L1), (L2), (E1), (E2) and (R1) hold. For a given $k \in [K]$, let \mathbf{R}^* be from (6.20) and $\omega_k := d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k - \alpha_{k,1}} g_s$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{R}^* &\xrightarrow{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}'_k, \\ \omega_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k &\xrightarrow{p} \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{D}_k := \omega_k^{-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \text{diag}\{\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k) \mid j \in [r_k]\}, \\ \mathbf{H}_k^a &\xrightarrow{p} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} := (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{D}_k^{-1/2} \Upsilon'_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where Υ_k is the eigenvector matrix of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \Sigma_{A,k} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}$.

Proof of Lemma 4. First, let $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}, \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}, \widehat{\mathbf{D}}, \mathbf{H}^a$ be from (6.2), and $\mathbf{R}^*, \widetilde{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2, \mathbf{R}_3$ from (6.20). Define also $\mathbf{H}^{a,*} := \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\omega_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{D}} - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}) &= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{R}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\omega_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' (\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}_2 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}_3 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = o_P(1), \end{aligned} \tag{6.33}$$

where the last equality follows from the proof of Lemma 2.

Using the structure in Assumption (F1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\omega_k} \mathbf{R}^* \right] &= \frac{1}{\omega_k T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{A}_k \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}'_k \right] \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \frac{1}{\omega_k T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}'_k = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \frac{1}{\omega_k} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}'_k. \end{aligned}$$

Meanwhile, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}\left(\left(\frac{1}{\omega_k} \mathbf{R}^*\right)_{ij}\right) &= \frac{1}{\omega_k^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{s=1}^T \text{cov}\left(\mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}_{f,t-q}\right) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q}\right) \mathbf{A}_{k,j},\right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}_{f,s-q}\right) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,s-q}\right) \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\omega_k^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 a_{f,p}^2 \cdot \text{Var}\left(\mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \mathbf{X}_{f,t-q} \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-p} \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\omega_k^2 T^2} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{q \geq 0} \sum_{p \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 a_{f,p}^2 \cdot O_P(\|\mathbf{A}_{-k}\|_F^2) \\
&= O_P\left(d_k^{-2\alpha_k, r_k} \frac{1}{T} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{-\alpha_{j,1}}\right) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption (E2) in the third last equality, both (L1) and (F1) in the second last, and (R1) in the last. We can then conclude $\omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{R}^* \xrightarrow{P} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{A}'_k$. Together with (6.33) and Assumption (L2), we obtain the limit of $\omega_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ as

$$\omega_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{D}} \xrightarrow{P} \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{D} = \omega_k^{-1} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \text{diag}\{\lambda_j(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k) \mid j \in [r_k]\}. \quad (6.34)$$

Define further

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{res}} := \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' ((\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3) \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}.$$

With similar arguments in the proof of Lemma 2, we have $\|\mathbf{R}_{\text{res}}\|_F = o_P(\|\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\|_F)$. Left-multiply both sides of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}$ by $\omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}'$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})(\omega_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}) &= \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{S}} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = \omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{res}} \\
&= \left[\omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{res}} (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1} \right] (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, each column of $\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is an eigenvector of the matrix

$$\omega_k^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1} + \mathbf{R}_{\text{res}} (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}.$$

We have $(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})' (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}) \xrightarrow{P} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{D}$, since

$$\begin{aligned}
&\omega_k^{-1} \left[(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}})' (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}' \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}) - (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{D} \right] \\
&= [\omega_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} - \omega_k^{-1} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}] + [\omega_k^{-1} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}^* \widehat{\mathbf{Q}} - \omega_k^{-1} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1} \cdot \mathbf{D}],
\end{aligned}$$

which is $o_P(1)$ from the limit of $\omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{R}^*$ (for the first square bracket) and from (6.33) and (6.34) (for the second square bracket). Hence the eigenvalues of $(\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})'(\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})$ are asymptotically bounded away from zero and infinity by Assumption (L1), and also $\|(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}\|_F = O_P(\|\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\|_F)$. Let

$$\Upsilon_k^* := (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{1/2} \cdot (\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})\mathbf{D}^{-1/2}.$$

Using the limit of $\omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{R}^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{R}^*\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1} &\xrightarrow{p} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Z}_k\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}(\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2} \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\mathbf{Q}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\Sigma_{A,k}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\|\mathbf{R}_{\text{res}}(\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}})^{-1}\|_F = o_P(1)$ from the above. By Assumption (L2) and eigenvector perturbation theories, there exists a unique eigenvector matrix Υ_k of $\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \omega_k^{-1}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}\Sigma_{A,k}\mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}$ such that $\|\Upsilon_k - \Upsilon_k^*\| = o_P(1)$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbf{Q}'\widehat{\mathbf{Q}} = (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1/2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\Upsilon_k^*\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \xrightarrow{p} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{-1/2} \cdot \mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\Upsilon_k\mathbf{D}^{1/2}.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}^a &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{A}_k (\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{R}^* \mathbf{Q} \Sigma_{A,k}^{-1} \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}) \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}' \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{Q} \Sigma_{A,k}^{-1} + o_P(1) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} (\text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_{-k}\mathbf{A}_{-k}))^{1/2} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1/2} \Upsilon_k \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.35}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 4. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. Suppose we focus on the k -th mode, and hence we adapt all notations by omitting the subscript k for the ease of notational simplicity; see (6.2) for example. Moreover, we set $\mathbf{X}_{e,t} := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{e,t})$, $\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t} := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{\epsilon,t})$ and $\mathbf{X}_{f,t} := \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{X}_{f,t})$.

To proceed, we first decompose

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot} = (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{j\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot}) + (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_{j\cdot}. \tag{6.36}$$

Consider the first term $(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j)$. Using the decomposition in (6.9),

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \\
&\quad + \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \\
&\quad + \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \\
&\quad + \mathcal{I}_{H,j} + \mathcal{I}_{H,j}^* + \mathcal{II}_{H,j} + \mathcal{III}_{H,j}, \quad \text{where}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.37}$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{H,j} := \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i,$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{H,j}^* := \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i,$$

$$\mathcal{II}_{H,j} := \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j,$$

$$\mathcal{III}_{H,j} := \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{A}_{\cdot k} := \otimes_{l \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_l.$$

We want to show that $\mathcal{I}_{H,j}$ is the leading term among those in (6.37). Equivalently, we will compare the eight terms below, and show that first term has lower bound dominating the upper bound of others:

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2, \tag{6.38}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2, \tag{6.39}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2, \tag{6.40}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right\|^2, \tag{6.41}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2, \tag{6.42}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2, \tag{6.43}$$

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{i\cdot} - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_{i\cdot}) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right\|^2. \tag{6.44}$$

Note that we can easily see the rates of (6.40) and (6.41) are greater than those of (6.43) and (6.44) respectively, using Lemma 2 and the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality.

Consider (6.39) first. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \\
& \leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right)^2 \\
& = O(d_{-k}^2) \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_{-k} \cdot |\psi_{ij,h}|} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right)^2 \\
& = O(d_{-k}^2) \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{u}_i\|^2 \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_{-k} \cdot |\psi_{ij,h}|} E_{t,jh} \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{u}_i\|} \mathbf{u}_i \right)^2 \\
& = O_P \left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \left(\frac{d_{-k}}{T^2} \right) d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{v}_h := (\mathbf{A}_{-k})_h$, $\mathbf{u}_i := \mathbf{A}_i$, and we used Lemma 3, Proposition 2.2 and (L1) in the last equality.

To bound (6.40), note from Assumption (E1) and (E2) that we can write

$$E_{t,ih} = \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} + [\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} (\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}.$$

Consider first $\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}) (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j$. By Assumption (O1), (E1), (E2) and (F1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \right) (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right)^2 \right] \\
& = \text{cov} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \right), \right. \\
& \quad \left. \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \right) \right) \tag{6.45} \\
& = \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h} \cap \psi_{ij,l}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 a_{e,q}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|(\mathbf{A}_{-k})_h\| \cdot \|(\mathbf{A}_{-k})_l\| \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,l}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,i}\|^2 \\
& = O(T) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,i}\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Consider also $\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot ([\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} (\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}) (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j$. Similarly, by As-

sumption (O1), (E1), (E2) and (F1), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot ([\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q}(\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}) (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2 \right] \\
&= \text{cov} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \cdot ([\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q}(\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}), \right. \\
& \quad \left. \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}_j \cdot ([\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q}(\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q}^2 a_{\epsilon,q}^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|(\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})_h\|^2 \cdot \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,ii} \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \\
&= O(T) \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}\|^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{6.46}$$

Hence it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \|\mathbf{H}_j\|_F^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot ([\text{mat}_k(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\epsilon)]_{ih} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q}(\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}) (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2 \\
&+ \|\mathbf{H}_j\|_F^2 \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left\| \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} \right) (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2 \\
&= O_P \left(d_k^{-\alpha_{k,1}} \left(\frac{1}{T} \right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{\alpha_{j,1}} \right),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used Assumption (L1), (6.45) and (6.46) in the last equality.

For (6.41), by Assumption (O1), (E1) and (E2), we have from the proof of Proposition 2 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right) \\
&= O(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{w=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{l=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h} \cap \psi_{wjl}} \sum_{n=1}^{r_{e,k}} \sum_{m=1}^{r_{e,-k}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^4 A_{e,k,in} A_{e,k,wn} A_{e,k,jn}^2 A_{e,-k,hm}^2 A_{e,-k,lm}^2 \\
&\quad \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}_i\| \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}_w\| \cdot \text{Var}((\mathbf{X}_{e,t-q})_{nm}^2) \\
&+ O(1) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h} \cap \psi_{wjl}} \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q}^4 \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,ii} \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,jj} \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \cdot \text{Var}((\mathbf{X}_{e,t-q})_{ih} (\mathbf{X}_{e,t-q})_{jh}) \\
&= O(T + T d_{\cdot k}) = O(T d_{\cdot k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \left(\|\mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h}\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,i}\| \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_{e,k,j}\| + \Sigma_{\epsilon,k,h,ij} \right) = O(Td_k),$$

and with $\max_i \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\|^2 = O_P(d_k^{-\alpha_k, r_k})$, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right\|^2 &\leq \|\mathbf{H}_j\|_F^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right\|^2 \\ &= O\left(\frac{d_{-k}}{T} + d_{-k}^2 d_k^{-\alpha_k, r_k}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Now consider (6.42). Similar to (6.39), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i) \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i\|_F^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right)^2 \\ &= O(d_{-k}^2) \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i\|_F^2 \right) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{u}_i\|^2 \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \frac{1}{d_{-k} \cdot |\psi_{ij,h}|} E_{t,jh} \mathbf{v}'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{u}_i\|} \mathbf{u}_i \right)^2 \\ &= O_P \left(d_k^{3\alpha_k, 1 - 2\alpha_k, r_k} \left(\frac{d_{-k}}{T} \right) \left(\frac{1}{T d_{-k}} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2(1-\alpha_j, 1)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 2, Proposition 2.2 and (L1) in the last equality.

Finally, we need the rate of (6.38) to be truly dominating. Using Assumption (AD1), we consider the

following ratios with $d_1, \dots, d_K, T \rightarrow \infty$:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \left/ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \right. \\
&= O_P \left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \right) = o_P(1), \\
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_j \right\|^2 \left/ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \right. \\
&= O_P \left(d_k^{-\alpha_{k,1}} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{\alpha_{k,j} - 1} \right) = o_P(1), \\
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,ih} E_{t,jh} \right\|^2 \left/ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \right. \\
&= O_P \left(T d_{-k} d_k^{-\alpha_{k,r_k} - \alpha_{k,1}} \right) = o_P(1), \\
& \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_i) \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \left/ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \right. \\
&= O_P \left(d_k^{2(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \left(\frac{1}{T d_{-k}} + \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{2(1 - \alpha_{j,1})} \right) = o_P(1), \\
& \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{D}}(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j \right\|^2 \left/ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \right.,
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumptions (R1) and the rate assumptions $d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}} = o(d_{-k})$ and $T d_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} + \alpha_{k,r_k}})$. Hence $\mathcal{I}_{H,j}$ is indeed the dominating term in (6.37). In other words, we have

$$\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j = \mathcal{I}_{H,j} + o_P(1). \quad (6.47)$$

Then we want to show that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{H,j} &= \sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^a \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \\
&\xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \\
&\xrightarrow{D} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, T\omega_B \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}),
\end{aligned} \quad (6.48)$$

where \mathbf{D} and $\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}$ are from Lemma 4.

We will adapt the central limit theorem for α -mixing processes (Fan and Yao (2003), Theorem 2.21). Due to the existence of missing data and the general missing patterns that we allow, we construct an

auxiliary time series to facilitate the proof. Formally, define $\{\mathbf{B}_{j,t}\}_{t \in [T]}$ as

$$\mathbf{B}_{j,t} := \sqrt{\omega_B} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \frac{T}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \cdot E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{ij,h}\}. \quad (6.49)$$

Hence we have the following,

$$\sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{H,j} \xrightarrow{P} \frac{1}{\sqrt{T}} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{B}_{j,t}.$$

It is easy to see that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{B}_{j,t}] = \mathbf{0}$ by Assumption (E1), (E2) and (F1). Moreover, $\mathbf{B}_{j,t}$ is also α -mixing over t . To see this, consider

$$E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i = \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{A}'_{e,k,i} \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q} \mathbf{A}_{e,-k,h} + \sum_{\epsilon,k,h,ii}^{1/2} a_{\epsilon,q} (\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih} \right) (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \left(\sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}'_{f,t-q} \right) \mathbf{A}_i.$$

If we define $\mathbf{b}_{e,t} := \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{e,q} \mathbf{X}_{e,t-q}$, $\mathbf{b}_{\epsilon,ih,t} := \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{\epsilon,q} (\mathbf{X}_{\epsilon,t-q})_{ih}$ and $\mathbf{b}_{f,t} := \sum_{q \geq 0} a_{f,q} \mathbf{X}_{f,t-q}$ which are independent of each other by Assumption (E2), we can then rewrite

$$\mathbf{B}_{j,t} = h\left(\mathbf{b}_{e,t}, (\mathbf{b}_{\epsilon,ih,t})_{i \in [d_k], h \in [d_k]}, \mathbf{b}_{f,t}\right),$$

for some function h , and hence Theorem 5.2 in Bradley (2005) implies the α -mixing property. Then similar to Chen and Fan (2023), it is left to show that there exists an $m > 2$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{B}_{j,t}\|^m] \leq C$ for some constant C . With Assumption (E1), (E2) and (F1) and similar to the proof of Proposition 2, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{T}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \cdot E_{t,jh} \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{F}_t \mathbf{v} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{ij,h}\} \right]^2 = O(d_k),$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k}$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k}$ are any deterministic vectors of constant order. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{B}_{j,t}\|^m] \\ & \leq \omega_B^{m/2} \cdot \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^m \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}\|_F^m \cdot \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \|\mathbf{Q}_i\|^2 \right)^{m/2} \mathbb{E} \left\{ \left[\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{T}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \cdot E_{t,jh}(\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{ij,h}\} \right)^2 \right]^{m/2} \right\} \\ & = O\left((\omega_B d_k d_k^{\alpha_{k,1}})^{m/2} \right) \cdot \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^m = O_P \left(\left(\omega_B d_k d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{-2\alpha_{j,1}} \right)^{m/2} \right) = O_P(1), \end{aligned}$$

where we used Lemma 2 and the definition of ω_B in the last line. Theorem 2.21 in Fan and Yao (2003) then applies. With (6.47), (6.48) and Lemma 4, we can directly establish that

$$\sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot (\hat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{Q}_j) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, T\omega_B \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}). \quad (6.50)$$

Consider now the second term in (6.36). By Lemma 3 and 4, we have

$$\left\| (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j \right\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{A}_j\|^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\|^2 = O_P \left(\min \left(\frac{1}{T}, \frac{\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}} \right),$$

implying

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j \right\|^2 / \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_i \right\|^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\min \left(1, \frac{T\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) d_k^{3(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{2\alpha_{j,1} - 1} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which is unrealistic to be $o_P(1)$ in the presence of missing data in general. Thus $(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j$ contributes to the asymptotic distribution of $(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_j)$. Rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \left(\frac{1}{|\psi_{ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{ij,h}} \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q}'_i \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_h \boldsymbol{\Lambda}'_h \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \right) \mathbf{Q}_j \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i \mathbf{A}'_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_j \\ &= \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_i - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_i) \mathbf{A}'_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_j + \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^a \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{A}'_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_j. \end{aligned}$$

Note the first term is dominated by the second term due to Theorem 1. Using Assumption (AD2) and the Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{T d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}}} \cdot \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{-1} \mathbf{H}^a \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{A}'_i \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{\cdot k}} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{Z}_k^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}_j \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_j) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \quad \mathcal{G}^T\text{-stably.} \quad (6.51)$$

Furthermore, $\mathcal{I}_{H,j}$ and $(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j$ are asymptotically independent since the randomness of $\mathcal{I}_{H,j}$ comes from $E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{\cdot k})'_h \mathbf{F}'_t$ while that of $(\mathbf{H}_j - \mathbf{H}^a) \mathbf{Q}_j$ comes from $\Delta_{F,k,ij,h}$. From (6.50) and (6.51), we conclude that

$$\sqrt{T d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}}} \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_j) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} (T d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} + h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_j)) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}).$$

On the other hand, if we have finite missingness or asymptotically vanishing missingness such that

$$\min \left(1, \frac{T\eta^2}{(1-\eta)^2} \right) d_k^{3(\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k})} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{2\alpha_{j,1} - 1} = T d^{-1} g_s^2 g_\eta d_k^{1 + \alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}} = o(1),$$

then (6.51) is dominated by (6.50), and hence it holds at the absence of (AD2) that

$$\sqrt{T\omega_B} \cdot (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_j - \mathbf{H}^a \mathbf{Q}_j) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, T\omega_B \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}).$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. By Lemma 4, $\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k$ is consistent for \mathbf{D}_k , and \mathbf{H}_k^a is consistent for $\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}$. Similar to the proof of Theorem 5 in Chen and Fan (2023), it suffice to prove that the HAC estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{HAC}$ based on $\{\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k, \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_t), \text{mat}_k(\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_t)\}_{t \in [T]}$ is a consistent estimator for $\mathbf{H}_k^a \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^a)'$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{H}_k^a \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^a)' &= \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_{k,i} \right) \\ &= \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}' \boldsymbol{\Lambda} \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \right) \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} E_{t,jh} (\mathbf{A}_{-k})'_h \cdot \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}_{k,i} \right) \\ &= \text{Var} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k' \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{C}_t) \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{C}_t)_i \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \frac{1}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} \sum_{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{E}_t)_{jh} \cdot \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{C}_t)_{ih} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1, and the rate assumption in the statement of Theorem 4, we have $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k$ being consistent for a version of \mathbf{Q}_k (in Frobenius norm) for any $k \in [K]$. By Theorem 2 and the assumption that the rate for individual common component imputation error is going to 0, $\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K}$ is consistent for $\mathcal{C}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K}$ for any $k \in [K], i_k \in [d_k], t \in [T]$. Hence, it also holds that $\widehat{\mathcal{E}}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K}$ is consistent for $\mathcal{E}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K}$ for any $k \in [K], i_k \in [d_k], t \in [T]$. We can finally conclude that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{HAC}$ is estimating $\mathbf{H}_k^a \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{k,j} (\mathbf{H}_k^a)'$ consistently (Newey and West, 1987), which is result 1. We can also show a similar result for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{HAC}^{\Delta}$, which is result 2 (details omitted). Combining both results, and consider the general statement of Theorem 3, we can easily conclude result 3. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

We will present two other lemmas before proving Theorem 2. While we stick with the notations in (6.2), we use the following also hereafter:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{y}_t &:= \text{vec}(\mathcal{Y}_t), \quad \mathbf{m}_t := \text{vec}(\mathcal{M}_t), \quad \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} := \text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_{Z,t}), \quad \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_t := \text{vec}(\mathcal{E}_t), \quad \mathbf{c}_t := \text{vec}(\mathcal{C}_t), \quad \mathbf{f}_t := \text{vec}(\mathcal{F}_t), \\ \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} &:= \mathbf{H}_K^a \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{H}_1^a, \quad \mathbf{A}_{\otimes} := \mathbf{A}_K \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{A}_1, \quad \mathbf{Z}_{\otimes} := \mathbf{Z}_K \otimes \dots \otimes \mathbf{Z}_1, \end{aligned} \tag{6.52}$$

where the hat versions (if any) of the above are defined similarly.

Lemma 5 Under the assumptions in Theorem 2, for any $k \in [K]$ and $j \in [d_k]$,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2 = O_P\left(T^{-1} d_{-k} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}}\right). \quad (6.53)$$

Proof of Lemma 5. First, consider the case when $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k} + \alpha_{k,1}})$. From (6.50) in the proof of Theorem 3, we have $\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2 = O_P(T^{-1} \omega_B^{-1})$. Hence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2 &= O_P\left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2 + \|(\mathbf{H}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a) \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2\right) \\ &= O_P\left((T\omega_B)^{-1} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}}\right) = O_P\left(T^{-1} d_{-k} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.54)$$

where we used Lemma 3 in the second equality, and

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_{k,j}\|^2 = O_P(d_k^{-\alpha_{k,r_k}}).$$

Now suppose $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k} + \alpha_{k,1}})$ fails to hold. From the decomposition of $\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}$ in (6.37), the leading term among the expressions from (6.38) to (6.44) will be (6.41). It has rate

$$O_P\left(\frac{d_{-k}}{T} + d_{-k}^2 d_k^{-\alpha_{k,r_k}}\right) = O_P(d_{-k}^2 d_k^{-\alpha_{k,r_k}}),$$

where the above equality used the fact that $Td_{-k} = o(d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k} + \alpha_{k,1}})$ does not hold. Together with the bound on $\|\widehat{\mathbf{D}}_k^{-1}\|_F$ from Lemma 2, we have

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_{k,j} \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|_F^2 = O_P\left(d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2}\right). \quad (6.55)$$

Combining (6.54) and (6.55), we arrive at the statement of the lemma. \square

Lemma 6 Under the Assumptions in Theorem 2, with the notations in (6.2) and (6.52), we have the following for any $j \in [d]$:

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_\otimes \mathbf{H}'_\otimes\|_F^2 = O_P(1), \quad (6.56)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_\otimes \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j}\|^2 \\ &= O_P\left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d_{-k} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2} + g_\eta g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} \right\}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.57)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_\otimes - \mathbf{Q}_\otimes \mathbf{H}'_\otimes\|_F^2 \\ &= O_P\left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (6.58)$$

Proof of Lemma 6. For (6.56), we have

$$\|\mathbf{Q}_\otimes \mathbf{H}'_\otimes\|_F^2 \leq \|\mathbf{H}_\otimes\|_F^2 \cdot \prod_{k=1}^K \|\mathbf{Q}_k\|_F^2 = O_P(1),$$

where we used Assumption (L1) in the last equality.

To show (6.57), for any $j \in [d_k]$, by a simple induction argument (omitted),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_\otimes \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j}\|^2 &= \|(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_\otimes - \mathbf{Q}_\otimes \mathbf{H}'_\otimes)_j\|^2 = \left\| [(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1) - (\mathbf{Q}_K \mathbf{H}'_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{H}'_1)]_j \right\|^2 \\ &\leq \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \max_{j \in [d_k]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|^2 \prod_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \max_{j \in [d_\ell]} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\ell,j}\|^2 \right\} \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ \left[T^{-1} d_{-k} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k}} \right] \cdot \prod_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_\ell^{-\alpha_\ell, r_\ell} \right\} \right) \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d_{-k} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2} + g_\eta g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality used (6.53) and

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\ell,j}\|^2 &\leq 2(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\ell,j} - \mathbf{H}_\ell^a \mathbf{Q}_{\ell,j}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{H}_\ell^a \mathbf{Q}_{\ell,j}\|^2) = O_P(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\ell,j} - \mathbf{H}_\ell^a \mathbf{Q}_{\ell,j}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{H}_\ell^a \mathbf{Z}_\ell^{-1/2} \mathbf{A}_{\ell,j}\|^2) \\ &= O_P(\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\ell,j} - \mathbf{H}_\ell^a \mathbf{Q}_{\ell,j}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{H}_\ell^a\|_F^2 \cdot (d_\ell^{-\alpha_\ell, r_\ell/2})^2 \cdot 1) = O_P(d_\ell^{-\alpha_\ell, r_\ell}). \end{aligned}$$

Finally it also holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_\otimes - \mathbf{Q}_\otimes \mathbf{H}'_\otimes\|_F^2 &= \|(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1) - (\mathbf{Q}_K \mathbf{H}'_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{Q}_1 \mathbf{H}'_1)\|_F^2 = O(1) \cdot \sum_{k=1}^K \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_k - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{H}'_k\|_F^2 \\ &= O \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j=1}^{d_k} \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{k,j} - \mathbf{H}_k^a \mathbf{Q}_{k,j}\|^2 \right) \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_\eta d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equality could be shown by a simple induction argument using $\|\mathbf{Q}_k\| = O(1)$ (omitted), and the last equality is from (6.53). \square

Proof of Theorem 2. The equation (3.6) is essentially

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{y}_{t,j} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} (\mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} + \varepsilon_{t,j}) \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} \right) + \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \varepsilon_{t,j} \right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right) (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \varepsilon_{t,j} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} (\mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j})' \right) (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} \\
&=: (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t + \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t}, \quad \text{where} \tag{6.59}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t} &:= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \varepsilon_{t,j} \right), \\
\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t &:= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j}) \varepsilon_{t,j} \right), \\
\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} &:= \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} (\mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j})' \right) (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} - \sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \right\|_F \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \right\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^d \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \right\| \cdot \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \right\| \\
&= O_P \left(\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} - \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \right\|_F^2 + \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} - \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \right\|_F \right) \\
&= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} + d^2 g_s^{-2} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_{\eta} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\}^{1/2} \right) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, (6.56) and (6.58) in the last equality, and Assumption (R1).

Hence we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \xrightarrow{p} \sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes}. \quad (6.60)$$

Note that by (6.35) we have $\|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes}^{-1}\|_F = O_P(1) \cdot \|\mathbf{Q}'_K \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_K \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{Q}'_1 \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_1\| = O_P(1)$, which will be used later in the proof. To bound $\mathbf{f}_{Z,t}$, from Assumption (F1), we have

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{f}_t\|^2 = r = O(1),$$

and hence with Assumption (L1),

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Z,t}\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{Z}_{\otimes}^{1/2}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{f}_t\|^2 = O_P\left(\prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{\alpha_{j,1}}\right) = O_P(g_s). \quad (6.61)$$

With (6.58), (6.60) and the above result,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t}\|^2 &= O_P(1) \cdot \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j}\|^2\right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j}\|^2\right) \\ &\quad \cdot \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,K} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,1})^{-1}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes}^{-1}\|_F^6 \cdot \|\mathbf{f}_{Z,t}\|^2 \\ &= O_P\left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_{\eta} g_s d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.62)$$

where we also used Assumption (L1) in the last equality. Similarly, by (6.57),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t\|^2 &= O_P(1) \cdot \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,K} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,1})^{-1}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes}^{-1}\|_F^4 \cdot O_P\left(\max_{j \in [d]} \|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} - \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j}\|^2\right) \left(\sum_{j,\ell=1}^d |\mathbb{E}\varepsilon_{t,j}\varepsilon_{t,\ell}|\right) \\ &= O_P\left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} + d^3 g_s^{-2} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k} - 2} + d g_{\eta} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} \right\}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (6.63)$$

since $\sum_{j,\ell=1}^d |\mathbb{E}\varepsilon_{t,j}\varepsilon_{t,\ell}| = O(d)$ by Assumption (E1). By the same token,

$$\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t}\|^2 = O_P(1) \cdot \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,K} \otimes \cdots \otimes \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{A,1})^{-1}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{H}_{\otimes}^{-1}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{Z}_{\otimes}^{-1/2}\|_F^2 \cdot \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \mathbf{A}_{\otimes,j} \varepsilon_{t,j} \right\|^2 = O_P(d/g_w), \quad (6.64)$$

where we used

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^d m_{t,j} \mathbf{A}_{\otimes,j} \epsilon_{t,j} \right\|^2 \leq \max_{j \in [d]} \|\mathbf{A}_{\otimes,j}\|_F^2 \sum_{j,\ell=1}^d |\mathbb{E} \epsilon_{t,j} \epsilon_{t,\ell}| = O(d).$$

Therefore, we have from (6.62), (6.64) and (6.63),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} - (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t}\|^2 &\leq \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t}\|^2 + \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t\|^2 + \|\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t}\|^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_{\eta} g_s d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{d}{g_w} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we also used $1/2 < \alpha_{k,r_k} \leq \alpha_{k,1} \leq 1$ from Assumption (L1) to conclude that $d g_s^{-1} g_w^{-1} = o(1)$, so that in fact $\|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t\|^2 = o_P(\|\widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t}\|^2)$.

Now from (6.59) and using the notations in (6.52), we can obtain the vectorized imputed values, which are the vectorized estimated common components, as $\widehat{\mathbf{c}}_t = \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t}$ for any $t \in [T]$. Then for $j \in [d]$, we have the squared individual imputation error as

$$\begin{aligned} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} - \mathcal{C}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K})^2 &= (\widehat{\mathbf{c}}_t - \mathbf{c}_t)_j^2 = (\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}'_{\otimes,j} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} - \mathbf{Q}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t})^2 \\ &= \left[\left(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes,j} - \mathbf{H}_{\otimes} \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes,j} \right)' \left((\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t + \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} \right) + \mathbf{A}'_{\otimes,j} \mathbf{Z}_{\otimes}^{-1/2} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t + \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} \right) \right]^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} g_w^{-1} + d^2 g_s^{-1} g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + g_{\eta} g_s g_w^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{d}{g_w^2} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where we used (6.57), (6.58) and Assumption (R1) in the last equality.

Lastly, we have the average imputation error as the following,

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{Td} \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{i_1,\dots,i_K=1}^{d_1,\dots,d_K} (\widehat{\mathcal{C}}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K} - \mathcal{C}_{t,i_1,\dots,i_K})^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{Td} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{\mathbf{c}}_t - \mathbf{c}_t\|^2 = \frac{1}{Td} \sum_{t=1}^T \|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} - \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t}\|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{Td} \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \left(\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} - \mathbf{Q}_{\otimes} \mathbf{H}'_{\otimes} \right) (\mathbf{H}'_{\otimes})^{-1} \mathbf{f}_{Z,t} + \widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes} \left(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_{H,t} + \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}_t + \widetilde{\mathbf{f}}_{Z,t} \right) \right\|^2 \\ &= O_P \left(\max_{k \in [K]} \left\{ T^{-1} d_k^{3\alpha_{k,1} - 2\alpha_{k,r_k}} g_s^{-1} + d g_s^{-1} d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} - 1} + d^{-1} g_{\eta} g_s d_k^{2\alpha_{k,1} - 3\alpha_{k,r_k} + 1} \right\} + \frac{1}{g_w} \right), \end{aligned} \tag{6.65}$$

where we used (6.62), (6.64), (6.63) and Lemma 6 in the last equality, and the fact that $\|\widehat{\mathbf{Q}}_{\otimes}\|_F^2 = r = O(1)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2. \square

Proof of Theorem 5. Firstly, we use the notations in (6.2), and define also $\mathbf{Z} := \mathbf{Z}_k$ and $\mathbf{R}^* := \mathbf{R}_k^*$,

which coincides with the \mathbf{R}^* defined in (6.20). Then for $j \in [r_k]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*) &= \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{F}_{Z,t} \mathbf{A}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{F}'_{Z,t} \mathbf{Q}' \right) = \lambda_j \left(\frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{A}_k \mathbf{F}_t \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right]' \left[\otimes_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_j \right] \mathbf{F}'_t \mathbf{A}'_k \right) \\
&= \lambda_j \left(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k \cdot \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbf{F}_t \left[\otimes_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_\ell \right]' \left[\otimes_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}_\ell \right] \mathbf{F}'_t \right) \\
&\asymp_P \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k \cdot \text{tr}(\otimes_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \mathbf{A}'_\ell \mathbf{A}_\ell)) = \lambda_j(\mathbf{A}'_k \mathbf{A}_k) \prod_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}'_\ell \mathbf{A}_\ell) \\
&\asymp \lambda_j(\mathbf{Z} \mathbf{Q}' \mathbf{Q}) \prod_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} \sum_{i=1}^{r_k} d_\ell^{\alpha_{\ell,i}} \asymp \lambda_j(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{A,k}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{A,k}^{1/2}) \cdot \prod_{\ell \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_\ell^{\alpha_{\ell,1}} \\
&\asymp \lambda_j(\mathbf{Z}) d_k^{-\alpha_{k,1}} g_s \asymp g_s d_k^{\alpha_{k,j} - \alpha_{k,1}}, \tag{6.66}
\end{aligned}$$

where the third line uses Assumption (F1), and Assumption (L1) in the second last line. The last line uses Theorem 1 of Ostrowski (1959) on the eigenvalues of a congruent transformation $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{A,k}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{A,k}^{1/2}$ of \mathbf{Z} , and from Assumption (L1) that $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{A,k}$ has eigenvalues uniformly bounded away from 0 and infinity.

Since $\widehat{\mathbf{S}} = \mathbf{R}^* + (\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{R}^*)$, for $j \in [r_k]$, we have by Weyl's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*)| &\leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{S}} - \mathbf{R}^*\| \leq \|\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*\| + \|\mathbf{R}_1\| + \|\mathbf{R}_2\| + \|\mathbf{R}_3\| \\
&\leq \omega_k \left\{ \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} |\widetilde{R}(\gamma) - R^*(\gamma)| + \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} R_1 + \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} R_2 + \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} R_3 \right\} = o_P(\omega_k), \tag{6.67}
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the decomposition in (6.20) in the first line, and $\omega_k := g_s d_k^{\alpha_{k,r_k} - \alpha_{k,1}}$ is defined at the beginning of the proof of Lemma 2. The second line uses $\widetilde{R}(\gamma)$, $R^*(\gamma)$, R_1 , R_2 and R_3 defined in (6.21), and the convergence in probability in (6.25) and (6.30).

Secondly, with Assumption (R1) and our choice of ξ (see also (6.23)),

$$\xi / \omega_k \asymp d g_s^{-1} d_k^{\alpha_{k,1} - \alpha_{k,r_k}} [(T d_{-k})^{-1/2} + d_k^{-1/2}] = o(1). \tag{6.68}$$

For $r_k > 1$, if $j \in [r_k - 1]$, using (6.67) and (6.68), consider

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\lambda_{j+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi}{\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi} &\leq \frac{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{R}^*) + \xi + |\lambda_{j+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) - \lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{R}^*)|}{\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*) + \xi - |\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) - \lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*)|} = \frac{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{R}^*) + o_P(\omega_k)}{\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*) + o_P(\omega_k)} \\
&= \frac{\lambda_{j+1}(\mathbf{R}^*)}{\lambda_j(\mathbf{R}^*)} (1 + o_P(1)) \asymp_P d_k^{\alpha_{k,j+1} - \alpha_{k,j}}, \tag{6.69}
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line uses (6.66). Also, for $j \in [r_k - 1]$,

$$\frac{\lambda_{r_k+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi}{\lambda_{r_k}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi} = \frac{\lambda_{r_k+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi}{\omega_k(1 + o_P(1))} = O_P\left(\frac{\lambda_{r_k+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}})}{\omega_k} + \frac{\xi}{\omega_k}\right) \quad (6.70)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= O_P\left(\sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} (\widetilde{R}(\gamma) - R^*(\gamma) + R_1 + R_2 + R_3) + \xi/\omega_k\right) \\ &= O_P(\xi/\omega_k) = o_P(d_k^{\alpha_{k,j+1} - \alpha_{k,j}}), \end{aligned} \quad (6.71)$$

where the second last equality uses (6.23), (6.24) and (6.30) together with our choice of ξ , and the last equality uses the extra rate assumption in the statement of the theorem. In the third equality, we assume the following is true (to be shown at the end of this proof):

$$\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) = \lambda_j((\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3), \quad j = r_k + 1, \dots, d_k, \quad (6.72)$$

so that

$$\frac{\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}})}{\omega_k} = \lambda_j\left(\frac{1}{\omega_k}((\widetilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3)\right) \leq \sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} ((\widetilde{R}(\gamma) - R^*(\gamma)) + R_1 + R_2 + R_3).$$

Hence for $j = r_k + 1, \dots, \lfloor d_k/2 \rfloor$ (true also for $r_k = 1$),

$$\frac{\lambda_{j+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi}{\lambda_j(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi} \geq \frac{\xi/\omega_k}{\sup_{\|\gamma\|=1} ((\widetilde{R}(\gamma) - R^*(\gamma)) + R_1 + R_2 + R_3) + \xi/\omega_k} \geq \frac{1}{C} \quad (6.73)$$

in probability for some generic constant $C > 0$, where the last inequality uses (6.23), (6.24) and (6.30) together with our choice of ξ . Combining (6.69), (6.71) and (6.73), we can easily see that our proposed \widehat{r}_k is a consistent estimator for r_k .

If $r_k = 1$, then (6.71) becomes

$$\frac{\lambda_{r_k+1}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi}{\lambda_{r_k}(\widehat{\mathbf{S}}) + \xi} = O_P(\xi/\omega_k) = o_P(1).$$

When combined with (6.73) which is true also for $r_k = 1$, we can see that $\widehat{r}_k = 1$ in probability, showing that \widehat{r}_k is a consistent estimator of r_k .

It remains to show (6.72). To this end, from (6.66) and (6.67), the first r_k eigenvalues of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}$ coincides with those of \mathbf{R}^* asymptotically, so that the first r_k eigenvectors corresponding to $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}$ coincides with those for \mathbf{R}^* asymptotically as $T, d_k \rightarrow \infty$, which are necessarily in $\mathcal{N}^\perp := \text{Span}(\mathbf{Q})$, the linear span of the columns of \mathbf{Q} (see (4.5), where \mathbf{R}^* is sandwiched by \mathbf{Q} and \mathbf{Q}'). This means that the $(r_k + 1)$ -th largest eigenvalue of $\widehat{\mathbf{S}}$ and beyond will asymptotically have eigenvectors in \mathcal{N} , the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{N}^\perp .

Then for any unit vectors $\gamma \in \mathcal{N}$, we have from the definitions of \mathbf{R}^* , $\tilde{\mathbf{R}}$, \mathbf{R}_1 , \mathbf{R}_2 and \mathbf{R}_3 in (6.21) that

$$\gamma' \widehat{\mathbf{S}} \gamma = \gamma' (\mathbf{R}^* + (\tilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3) \gamma = \gamma' ((\tilde{\mathbf{R}} - \mathbf{R}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \mathbf{R}_3) \gamma,$$

which is equivalent to (6.72). This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Proof of Proposition 1. We can show stable convergence in law similar to Proposition 3.1 in Xiong and Pelger (2023). First, using Assumption (F1) we can write

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{T} d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k} \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \cdot \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \Delta_{F,k,ij,h} \mathbf{A}_{k,j} \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^T \sqrt{\frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k}}{T}} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} - 1 \right) \\ & \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \cdot (\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \mathbf{A}_{k,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Define the filtration $\mathcal{G}^T := \sigma(\cup_{s=1}^T \mathcal{G}_s)$ where the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{G}_s := \sigma(\{\mathcal{M}_{t,i_1, \dots, i_K} \mid t \leq s\}, \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_K)$.

Let $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^{r_k}$ be a non-random unit vector. For a given $k \in [K]$, $j \in [d_k]$, define also the random variable

$$\begin{aligned} g_{k,j,t} &:= \mathbf{u}' \sqrt{\frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k}}{T}} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_{-k}} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} - 1 \right) \\ & \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} \cdot (\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \mathbf{A}_{k,j}. \end{aligned}$$

Since each entry in \mathcal{F}_t is i.i.d. by Assumption (F1) and is independent of $(\mathcal{M}_t, \mathbf{A}_1, \dots, \mathbf{A}_K)$ by Assumptions (O1) and (L1), we have $\mathbb{E}[g_{k,j,t} \mid \mathcal{G}_{t-1}] = 0$. Define $\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k} := \text{var} \left[\text{vec}(\text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \text{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{A}'_{-k}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \right]$ and $\mathbf{x}_{F,k,j,il} := \text{vec}([\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,i})] \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} \mathbf{Q}_{k,l} \cdot \mathbf{A}'_{k,l})]')$, so that we have

$$\|\mathbf{x}_{F,k,j,il}\|^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k}\|_F^2 \cdot \|\mathbf{D}^{-1}\|_F^4 \cdot \|\mathbf{Z}_k^{-1/2}\|_F^4 = O_P \left(d_k^{4\alpha_k, 1-6\alpha_k, r_k} \prod_{j=1}^K d_j^{-4\alpha_j, 1} \prod_{j \in [K] \setminus \{k\}} d_j^{4\alpha_j, 1} \right) = O_P(d_k^{-6\alpha_k, r_k}),$$

leading to

$$\begin{aligned} & d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k} \cdot \mathbb{E} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} - 1 \right) (\mathbf{x}_{F,k,j,il} - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{x}_{F,k,j,il}]) \right\|^2 \\ &= O_P(d_k^{4-5\alpha_k, r_k}) = o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[g_{k,j,t}^2 \mid \mathcal{G}_{t-1}] &= \frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k}}{T} \cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E} \left\{ \mathbf{u}' \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} - 1 \right) \right. \\
&\quad \cdot \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \mathbf{A}'_{k,i})] \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{A}'_{-k}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \\
&\quad \left. \cdot \mathbf{vec}(\mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{A}'_{-k} \mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_{-k} \mathbf{A}'_{-k}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k)' [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}_{k,l} \mathbf{A}'_{k,l})] (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{u} \mid \mathcal{G}_{t-1} \right\} \\
&\stackrel{p}{\rightarrow} d_k^{2+\alpha_k, r_k} \cdot \lim_{d_k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{d_k^2} \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{l=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij}|} - 1 \right) \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,lj}\}}{|\psi_{k,lj}|} - 1 \right) \\
&\quad \cdot \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)] \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)]' (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{u} \\
&\stackrel{p}{\rightarrow} d_k^{2+\alpha_k, r_k} \omega_{\psi, k, j} \cdot \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)] \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)]' (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{u},
\end{aligned}$$

which satisfies the nesting condition of Theorem 6.1 in Häusler and Luschgy (2015). From Assumption (O1), we have $|(T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}\} / |\psi_{k,ij,h}|) - 1| \leq \max(\psi_0^{-1} - 1, 1)$. Hence with ϵ from Proposition 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{t=1}^T \mathbb{E}[g_{k,j,t}^{2+\epsilon} \mid \mathcal{G}_{t-1}] &\leq \|\mathbf{A}_{k,j}\|^{2+\epsilon} \cdot \frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k (1+\epsilon/2)}}{T^{1+\epsilon/2}} \cdot \|\mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*}\|^{2+\epsilon} \\
&\cdot \sum_{t=1}^T \left\| \sum_{i=1}^{d_k} \sum_{h=1}^{d_k} \left(\frac{T \cdot \mathbb{1}\{t \in \psi_{k,ij,h}\}}{|\psi_{k,ij,h}|} - 1 \right) \mathbf{Q}_{k,i} \mathbf{A}'_{k,i} (\mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t) \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \mathbf{mat}_k(\mathcal{F}_t)' - \mathbf{v}'_{k,h} \mathbf{v}_{k,h} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k) \right\|^{2+\epsilon} \\
&= O_P(1) \cdot (d_k^{\alpha_k, 1-\alpha_k, r_k} g_s^{-1})^{2+\epsilon} \cdot \frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, r_k (1+\epsilon/2)}}{T^{\epsilon/2}} \cdot d_k^{-\alpha_k, r_k (1+\epsilon/2)} g_s^{2+\epsilon} = O_P\left(\frac{d_k^{\alpha_k, 1-\alpha_k, r_k}}{T^{\epsilon/2}}\right) = o_P(1),
\end{aligned}$$

which is sufficient for the conditional Lindeberg condition in Häusler and Luschgy (2015) to hold. Then by the stable martingale central limit theorem (Theorem 6.1 in Häusler and Luschgy (2015)), we have

$$\sum_{t=1}^T g_{k,j,t} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{D}^{-1} \mathbf{H}_k^{a,*} h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_{k,j}) (\mathbf{H}_k^{a,*})' \mathbf{D}^{-1}) \quad \mathcal{G}^T\text{-stably as } T \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $h_{k,j}(\mathbf{A}_{k,j}) = d_k^{2+\alpha_k, r_k} \omega_{\psi, k, j} \cdot [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)] \boldsymbol{\Xi}_{F,k} [\mathbf{A}'_{k,j} \otimes (\mathbf{Q}'_k \mathbf{A}_k)]'$. This completes the proof of Proposition 1. \square

References

- Ahn, S. C. and Horenstein, A. R. (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica*, 81(3):1203–1227.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica*, 71(1):135–171.

- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2021). Matrix completion, counterfactuals, and factor analysis of missing data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(536):1746–1763.
- Bradley, R. C. (2005). Basic Properties of Strong Mixing Conditions. A Survey and Some Open Questions. *Probability Surveys*, 2(none):107 – 144.
- Cahan, E., Bai, J., and Ng, S. (2023). Factor-based imputation of missing values and covariances in panel data of large dimensions. *Journal of Econometrics*, 233(1):113–131.
- Chang, J., He, J., Yang, L., and Yao, Q. (2023). Modelling matrix time series via a tensor CP-decomposition. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 85(1):127–148.
- Chapon, A., Ouarda, T. B., and Hamdi, Y. (2023). Imputation of missing values in environmental time series by d-vine copulas. *Weather and Climate Extremes*, 41:100591.
- Chen, E. Y. and Fan, J. (2023). Statistical inference for high-dimensional matrix-variate factor models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(542):1038–1055.
- Chen, R., Xiao, H., and Yang, D. (2021). Autoregressive models for matrix-valued time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 222(1, Part B):539–560. Annals Issue: Financial Econometrics in the Age of the Digital Economy.
- Chen, R., Yang, D., and Zhang, C.-H. (2022a). Factor models for high-dimensional tensor time series. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(537):94–116.
- Chen, W. and Lam, C. (2024). Rank and factor loadings estimation in time series tensor factor model by pre-averaging. *Annals of Statistics*, 52(1):364–391.
- Chen, X., Lei, M., Saunier, N., and Sun, L. (2022b). Low-rank autoregressive tensor completion for spatiotemporal traffic data imputation. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(8):12301–12310.
- Fan, J. and Yao, Q. (2003). Nonlinear time series: Nonparametric and parametric methods. *New York: Springer-Verlag*.
- Han, Y., Zhang, C. H., and Chen, R. (2022). Rank determination in tensor factor model. *Electronic Journal of Statistic*, 16:1726–1803.
- Häusler, E. and Luschgy, H. (2015). *Stable Martingale Central Limit Theorems*, pages 67–122. Springer International Publishing, Cham.

- He, Y., Li, L., and Trapani, L. (2022). Statistical inference for large-dimensional tensor factor model by weighted/unweighted projection. arXiv.2206.09800.
- Kazijevs, M. and Samad, M. D. (2023). Deep imputation of missing values in time series health data: A review with benchmarking. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 144:104440.
- Kolda, T. G. and Bader, B. W. (2009). Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM Review*, 51(3):455–500.
- Lam, C. and Yao, Q. (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: Inference for the number of factors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):694–726.
- Newey, W. K. and West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. *Econometrica*, 55(3):703–708.
- Ostrowski, A. M. (1959). A quantitative formulation of sylvester’s law of inertia. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 45(5):740–744.
- Pan, X., Li, Z., Qin, S., Yu, M., and Hu, H. (2021). Sclrtc: imputation for single-cell rna-seq data via low-rank tensor completion. *BMC Genomics*, 22(860).
- Pelger, M. (2019). Large-dimensional factor modeling based on high-frequency observations. *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(1):23–42. Special Issue on Financial Engineering and Risk Management.
- Tsay, R. S. (2023). Matrix-variate time series analysis: A brief review and some new developments. *International Statistical Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/insr.12558>.
- Wang, D., Liu, X., and Chen, R. (2019). Factor models for matrix-valued high-dimensional time series. *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(1):231–248. Special Issue on Financial Engineering and Risk Management.
- Xiong, R. and Pelger, M. (2023). Large dimensional latent factor modeling with missing observations and applications to causal inference. *Journal of Econometrics*, 233(1):271–301.
- Zhang, H.-F. (2024). Additive autoregressive models for matrix valued time series. *Journal of Time Series Analysis*. To appear.
- Zhang, Y., Zhou, B., Cai, X., Guo, W., Ding, X., and Yuan, X. (2021). Missing value imputation in multivariate time series with end-to-end generative adversarial networks. *Information Sciences*, 551:67–82.
- Zhao, J., Rong, C., Lin, C., and Dang, X. (2023). Multivariate time series data imputation using attention-based mechanism. *Neurocomputing*, 542:126238.